MR BAYLE'S
Hiſtorical and Critical
DICTIONARY.

THE SECOND EDITION.

To which is prefixed,

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

BY

M^R^ DES MAIZEAUX,

Fellow of the Royal Society.

VOLUME THE FIFTH.

S——Z.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE

DICTIONARY
Hiſtorical and Critical

OF

Mr PETER BAYLE.

THE SECOND EDITION,

Carefully collated with the ſeveral Editions of the Original; in which many Paſſages are reſtored, and the whole greatly augmented, particularly with a Tranſlation of the Quotations from eminent Writers in various Languages.

To which is prefixed,

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED,

BY

Mr DES MAIZEAUX,

Fellow of the Royal Society.

VOLUME THE FIFTH.

S—Z.

LONDON:
Printed for D. Midwinter; J. Brotherton; A. Bettesworth and C. Hitch;
J. and J. Hazard; W. Innys and R. Manby; T. Ward; W. Meadows;
T. Woodward; W. Hinchliffe; J. Walthoe; E. Symon;
T. Cox; A. Ward; J. and P. Knapton; S. Birt; D. Browne; T. Longman;
T. Astley; S. Austen; L. Gilliver; H. Lintot; H. Whitridge;
R. Willock; E. Wicksteed; C. Bathurst, and J. and R. Tonson.

MDCCXXXVIII.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

Mr BAYLE's
Hiſtorical and Critical
DICTIONARY.

S.

SABELLICUS (MARK ANTONY COCCIUS) was a learned man, flouriſhed towards the end of the XVth century. He was the ſon of a Farrier, and was born in a little town (*a*) of Italy upon the Teverone. He applied himſelf ſo early to his ſtudies, that before he had a beard he was found qualified to teach a ſchool at Tivoli. Having got ſome money by that means, he went to Rome in order to improve his learning by the lectures of Pomponius (*b*), who admitted him into his academy with the uſual ceremonies, and particularly with the impoſition of a new name, it was that of Sabellicus. This new diſciple of Pomponius reformed his ſtyle in that ſchool. He left Rome to go and teach at Udine near Aquileia. Some books that he publiſhed got him ſuch a name that the magiſtrates of Vicenza offered him twice as great a penſion as what he had; and by that means drew him to profeſs Philology in their city. He did not ſtay long there, for he had an invitation from the ſenate of Venice, to accept of two honourable and lucrative employments: the one was to write the Hiſtory of the republic, and the other to teach the *Belles Lettres*. He diſcharged the ſecond better than the firſt, for his Hiſtorical work was full of flatteries and lies [*A*]. He undertook afterwards to compoſe an univerſal Hiſtory from the beginning of the world, and applied himſelf to it till he died. This work has been publiſhed, and is not much eſteemed [*B*]: Sabellicus died of the Pox, being about ſeventy

(*a*) *It is called in Latin*, Vicus Varronis, *or* Vicus Valerius. *See* Leander Albertus Deſcriptio Ital. *pag. m.* 224.

(*b*) Thus Paul Jovius calls him. It is the famous Pomponius Lætus.

[*A*] *He diſcharged the ſecond better than the firſt; for his hiſtorical work was full of flatteries and lies.*] He was paid to be ſincere and exact with reſpect to his ſcholars, but not with reſpect to hiſtory; and therefore he diſcharged better the duties of a teacher, than thoſe of a Hiſtoriographer. *Nec ibi diu manſit, evocante Senatu Veneto, ea conditione, ut civitatis res geſtas à fine Juſtiniani conſcriberet, & trecentis aureis in gymnaſio profiteretur. In hoc munere perutilem juventuti operam præſtitit, quum in altero adulatione parum ſobria rerum veritatem adumbraſſe videretur* (1). Scaliger, the father, ſays, that Sabellicus confeſſed that he publiſhed or ſuppreſſed matters of fact, as he was directed by the money he received from the Venetians. Thus I paraphaſe ſomewhat freely theſe five Latin verſes:

Venalis item penna Sabellii latronis,
Qui dat, adimitque, ut libitum, cuique quod vult.
Falſa qui rogatus, undenam tot eſſet auſus?
Monſtrans Venetum perditus aureum nomiſma,
Te, inquit, quoque lux hæc faceret loqui ſi haberes (2).

Alſo Sabellicus's venal pen,
Who gives, and takes from ev'ry one at pleaſure;
And who, when he was aſk'd the reaſon why
He publiſh'd ſuch a multitude of lies,
The varlet anſwer'd, holding in his hand
A golden coin of Venice, this ſame light
Would make you ſpeak, had you but once receiv'd it.

[*B*] *His univerſal hiſtory is not much eſteemed.*] Paul Jovius ſays that things are ſo crowded in that work, that they appear only like points. It is the uſual fault of

(1) Paulus Jovius, in Elog. *cap. xlviii, pag.* 114, 115.

(2) Jul. Cæſar Scaliger de Regnor. everſionibus, *pag.* 329. *Part. ii*, Poëmat. *Edit.* 1591.

BRITISH MUSEUM

ſeventy years old [C]. Not truſting his baſtard with the care of his burial he himſelf cauſed his epitaph to be engraved upon his tomb-ſtone: it is an inſcription which is not very modeſt (c) [D]. He had been library-keeper to Cardinal Beſſarion (d). His eyes had the ſame faculty with thoſe of Tiberius (e); for when he waked in the night he could plainly ſee his books and his chamber for ſome time (f). All his works were printed at Baſil in the year 1560 [E] in four volumes in folio. When he died he acted like thoſe fathers, who are more fond of their weakeſt children, than of thoſe who are the handſomeſt and the moſt healthful. For he recommended the printing of a manuſcript by which he could get nothing but diſhonour. His colleague Egnatius got it printed, and was blamed for it [F]. You will find a noble encomium upon Sabellicus in

(c) *Taken from* Paul Jovius *in* Elog. Viror. doctor. *cap. xlviii, pag.* 114, 115.

(d) Freherus in Theatro, *pag.* 1434.

(e) Sueton. in Tiberio, *cap. lxviii.*

(f) Pierius Valerianus in Hieroglyph. apud Freherum in Theatro, *pag.* 1434, *ſays that he heard him ſay ſo.*

of thoſe, who undertake to include the hiſtory of the whole world in one or two volumes. They murder all the facts, explain nothing thoroughly, every thing they write becomes obſcure. Read theſe words of Paul Jovius. 'Sed in Enneadibus omnium temporum, ab orbe condito memoriam complexus, uti neceſſe fuit, ingenti operis inſtituto feſtinanter indulgenti, res illuſtres præclara cognitione digniſſimas perobſcura brevitate adeò vehementer offuſcavit, ut excitatam uberrimo titulo legentium cupiditatem paſſim eluſerit, quum omnia in acervum anguſtiſſimè coarctata, nequaquam certa effigie, ſed exiguis tantùm punctis, & lineis annotata deſignentur (3). - - - - *But in his Enneades, containing the hiſtory of all ages from the beginning of time, he has ſo crowded and obſcured the moſt memorable and illuſtrious tranſactions, (as was unavoidable in ſo large an undertaking haſtily executed) that he hath diſappointed the hopes of thoſe, who by his pompous titles were induced to read him, all things being ſo heaped and huddled in a narrow ſpace together, that they have not their due dimenſions, but ſeem only to be marked with ſmall points and lines.*'

(3) Jovius, Elog. *cap. xlviii, pag.* 115.

[C] *Sabellicus died of the Pox, being about ſeventy years old.*] Paul Jovius does not ſay in what year he died; but Voſſius ſhews that it was in the year 1506 (4). Pierius Valerianus was more reſerved than Paul Jovius about the nature of his diſeaſe, he does not affirm that he died of a venereal diſtemper, but the deſcription he gives of his illneſs contains ſeveral ſymptoms, that may be accounted for, if we ſuppoſe that it was the pox, as Paul Jovius will have it. Theſe are Valerianus's words: 'Eò plus infortunii, & ærumnarum pertulit Sabellicus, vir ille ſcriptorum copia, & elegantia multò clarior, quàm mea ulla poſſit commendatione creſcere, miſerabilem vitæ finem eum ſortitus eſt, quod putrida, pernicioſaque correptus elephantiaſi per annos aliquot miſerabiliter cruciatus intercluſa vocis via, cæteriſque tam ſpiritus, quàm cibi meatibus computreſcentibus, gutturiſque corruptis omnibus organis, veniſque corroſis, non ſine cruciabili tormento annos aliquot peregit, eaque tabe demum confectus interiit (5). - - *So much the more misfortunes and troubles did Sabellicus undergo, being a man more famous for the number and elegancy of his writings, than any encomium of mine can render him. He miſerably ended his life; for being wretchedly infected with a putrid and conſuming leproſy for ſome years, having the channel of his voice obſtructed, and the paſſages for his breath and victuals rotted, all the organs of his throat, and his veins corroded, he lived ſome years in excruciating torments, and at laſt being worn out by this corruption he died.*' Paul Jovius does not heſitate ſo much; ſee the margin (6). Voſſius obſerves that it is ſaid, in the liſt of the hiſtorians of Udine, that Sabellicus wrote till the year 1513. This is proved to be falſe by two letters of Bembus, written in the year 1506, wherein he mentions Sabellicus's death. The fifth letter of the fourth book (7) ſays that he died the 17th of April, 1506. The ſame Voſſius tells us that Leander Albertus teſtifies that Sabellicus lived three years after he had made an end of his Enneades, which he had carried to the year 1504. I find in Leander Albertus that thoſe Enneades were brought down to the year 1507, and that the author died in the ſame year. I have conſulted not only the Latin tranſlation (8), printed at Cologne in 1567, but alſo the Italian original folio 149, printed at Venice in 4to, 1561.

(4) Voſſius de Hiſtoricis Latin. *pag.* 670.

(5) Pier. Valerianus de Litterat. Infelicitate, *lib. i, pag.* 28.

(6) Ad ſeptuageſimum fere annum pervenit Gallica tabe ex vaga Venere quæſita non obſcure conſumptus. *Jovius, ubi ſupra.* See alſo the verſes of Latomus, recited by Jovius.

(7) Pag. m. 531.

(8) Pag. 224.

[D] *An inſcription that is not very modeſt.*] If any body elſe had made it (9), one might excuſe it. Here it is,

Quem non res hominum, non omnis ceperat ætas.
Scribentem capit hæc Coccion urna brevis.

M. Anton. Coccius Sabellicus vivus ſibi F. (10).

He, whom no bounds of hiſtory reſtrain'd,
Is now within this little urn contain'd.

'*M. Anthony Coccius Sabellicus made this epitaph upon himſelf before he died.*'

(9) Inſigne quidem & meritum elogium ſed certe honeſtius ſi alieni ingenii pietas inſcripſiſſet. *Jovius, in Elog. cap. xlviii, pag.* 115.

(10) *See* Freherus in Theatro, *pag.* 1434.

[E] *All his works were printed at Baſil in the year 1560.*] Before this edition in four volumes in folio, printed for Hervagius, there had been an edition in two volumes in folio, printed in the year 1538, for the ſame Hervagius; but this contained only the Enneades, and the ten books of his *Exempla* (11), with an *Hiſtorica Synopſis*, which carried the Enneades to the year 1538. This continuation was made by Gaſpar Hedion. Cælius Secundus Curio (12) had the direction of the edition printed in 1560, to which he added a continuation of the Enneades to that year. The fourth volume contains moſt of Sabellicus's *Opuſcula*. I ſay moſt of them; for they did not inſert in it his paraphraſe, with notes, upon Suetonius (13), nor his critical obſervations upon ſeveral authors. They are divided into two books, and have been often printed, and namely at Venice in the year 1508, in folio. Badius inſerted them in a compilation of the like pieces in 1511; Gruterus put them in the firſt volume of his Theſaurus (14). As for the reſt, thoſe who reckon the Enneades of that author among the books printed ſoon after the invention of Printing are groſsly miſtaken. Beughem mentions an edion of that work made at Mentz in the year 1442. *Sabellicus. Hiſtoriæ Enneades ſeptem* (15). It is true he doubts of it; but he ſhould have poſitively ſaid it is falſe; for Sabellicus, in 1442, *was not yet ſeven years old, and when he publiſhed thoſe ſixty-three books of his hiſtory, he dedicated them to the Doge of Venice Auguſtin Barbadigo, who was not promoted to that dignity till the year* 1486 (16).

(11) See the remark [F].

(12) And not Carion as Niccolo Toppi calls him in his additions to the *Biblioteca Napolitana*, *pag.* 164.

(13) It has been often printed by it ſelf, and inſerted in the editions *Variorum*, even in that of Paris for Sebaſtian Cramoiſi 1610. in fol.

(14) *See* Toppi, ubi ſupra.

(15) Beughem, incunab. typogr. *pag.* 150.

(16) Chevill. Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris, *pag.* 21.

[F] *He recommended the printing of a manuſcript . . . Egnatius . . . . was blamed for it.*] Here is the title of that work (17): MARCI ANTONII COCCII SABELLICI *de omnium gentium omniumque ſeculorum inſignibus memoriaque dignis factis & dictis exemplorum libri X. Quæ ad vitæ mores, prudentiam ſapientiamve comparandam conducunt plurimum. Iccirco quum omnibus qui illo libero beatoque literarum ocio perfruuntur, tum vero imprimis qui vel adoleſcentiam in ſcholis, vel populum in concionibus docent utiliſſima ſunt* (§ α).

[(§ α)] I do not know whether the Baſil edition in 8vo, 1541, has preſerved the date of Egnatius's preface. In my edition, which is of Straſburg, in 4to, large paper, 1518; this preface is dated on the laſt of December, 1508. The title of the book is: *Marci Antonii Coccii Sabellici Exemplorum libri decem, ordine, elegantia, & utilitate præſtantiſſimi. Ad Chriſtianæ pietatis augmentum & decus.* REM. CRIT.]

(17) I have it of the Baſil Edition, 1541, in 8vo.

Never did any book deſerve more than this to have the following thought of Pliny applied to it: 'Inſcriptiones propter quas vadimonium deſeri poſſit. At cum intraveris, dii deæque quam nihil in medio invenies (18)! - - - - - *Inſcriptions, for the ſake of which one would almoſt forfeit a recognizance: but when once you enter, good God, how will you be ſurprized to find nothing at all in them!*' We are told in the title page that it is a book very uſeful to thoſe who ſtudy, but chiefly to thoſe who teach youth, and to preachers. Indeed it may be of ſome uſe to thoſe, whoſe buſineſs it is to preſcribe exerciſes to young boys. Egnatius having publiſhed that book was blamed for it: ſome taxed him with inconſtancy, under pretence that there had been a long enmity between him and the deceaſed. They found fault with him for having reaſſumed the part of a good friend by the care he took of that manuſcript. Others ſaid, that he had publiſhed it only from a hatred he

(18) Plinius, in Præf. Natur. Hiſtor.

in Jacobus Philippus Bergomas, who was cotemporary with him (g). Moreri has committed ſome faults [G].

(g) Jacob. Philippus Bergomas *in* Supplemento Chronicorum, *pag.* 435, 436. *Edit. Venetæ* 1506. *apud* Leonard. Nicodemum Addizioni alla Biblioteca Napoletana, *pag.* 165.

ſtill bore to Sabellicus, and that he knew well enough that the printing of ſuch a book would tarniſh the glory of the author. Egnatius wrote a preface in his own vindication (19). He maintained, that conſtancy does not require that a mortal man ſhould cheriſh an immortal hatred, and that nothing can be more reaſonable than to free ones ſelf from the ſlavery of paſſions. He added that any body, who had not a heart of ſtone, would have been moved with the entreaties of that dying man, and that he was ſo affected with them that he could not deny him that good office. We ſhall ſee his thought better in his own words. *Nos verò cum aliis honeſtiſſimis cauſis adducti, & prius Sabellicum funebri laudatione proſecuti ſumus, & nunc pro virili opus hoc emendavimus. Cujus editionem moriens mihi ad ſe accerſito, & gratam recordationem pietatis in ſe Michaelis Triviſani Nicolai filii, qui ſub eo non parvo tempore meruerat, quique opus hoc lituris plenum exſcribendum curarat, commendavit, ut tam obſtinatum, tam durum, tam denique ferreum eſſe putem neminem, quem ſuprema illa vox moribundi hominis, atque adeò ab omni ſuſpitione immunis non emolliſſet : me certe adeò emolliit, ut nihil pro humanitatis jure negare homini præſertim jam morienti potuerim majorem hoc facto laudem à bonis ſperans, quàm quicquid de me Amaſinii, & Rabirii iſti recentes oblatrent attendens* (20).

[G] *Moreri has committed ſome faults.*] I. The place, where Sabellicus was born, is not *a ſmall borough* : Leander Albertus (21) ſays that it is a ſtrong place, both by it's ſituation, and by the works that have been made to it (22); and he adds that in 1533, Lewis Gonzaga, General of Clement VII'ths troops, beſieged it, and was killed there by a cannon-ball. II. Moreri's way of refuting thoſe, who ſay that Sabellicus deſcended *from the Cocceian family*, is a very bad one. He tells us that it *is likely enough* that Sabellicus was the ſon of a poor Farrier, *if one conſiders only the ſirname Coccius, which is only to be found in the epitaphs, and upon the monuments erected to him after his death.* What an argument is this? The ſirname Coccius is only to be found in the epitaphs, &c. therefore it is likely enough that Sabellicus's father was a Farrier. Here is another falſe reaſoning. Moreri ſuppoſes that if the ſirname Coccius had belonged to Sabellicus's family, one might very well believe that he was deſcended from the Cocceian family. What an abſurdity. Let us add to this, two errors in fact. It is certain that Sabellicus took the ſirname of Coccius in his life-time, and that the inſcription of his tomb was not made after his death. He himſelf cauſed it to be engraved. III. He did not teach *young boys in little boroughs*, but at Trivoli, which is an epiſcopal city. IV. Moreri has theſe words; *we have his* Hiſtoria Enneadum *in XI books from the beginning of the world to the year* 1504: than which nothing can be more abſurd. He had read in Voſſius, that Sabellicus made himſelf famous chiefly by his hiſtory of eleven Enneades (23), that is, by an hiſtory divided into eleven Enneades, and he fancied that Sabellicus had writ a hiſtory divided into eleven books, which contained the actions of the Enneades. The reader muſt know that Sabellicus, affecting to imitate the Antients, divided his hiſtory not from ten to ten books, or into Decades (24), as Livy did, but from nine to nine, or into Enneades. V. When Moreri ſays that the epitaph, which Sabellicus made for himſelf, *is reaſonable enough, but modeſt* (25), he perverts the ſenſe of Paul Jovius, and gives a wrong judgment of the thing itſelf.

Note, that many other authors, as well as Moreri, have miſunderſtood the paſſage of Voſſius relating to the Enneades. Zeillerus tells us that Sabellicus wrote the hiſtory of two Enneades : *cujus maxime celebratur hiſtoria Enneadum II* (26), and Konig ſays that he has left us eleven books of Enneades (27).

(19) It is prefixed to Sabellicus's book.

(20) Egnatius in Præfat. ſub fin.

(21) Leand. Albert. in Deſcript. Ital. *pag. m.* 214.

(22) Caſtellum nunc eſt cum natura loci tum opere munitiſſimum. *Id. ibid.*

(23) Maxime celebratur hiſtoria Enneadum XI. *Voſſius, ubi ſupra, pag.* 690. Note, that the laſt Ennead contains only two books.

(24) Note that he divided his Hiſtory of Venice, into Decads. It contains three whole Decads, and three books of the fourth.

(25) Perhaps the Printers have left out ſome words, and Moreri had ſaid, but not very modeſt.

(26) Martinus Zeillerus de Hiſt. *Parte i, p.* 127.

(27) Konig. Bibl. *pag.* 712.

SABEUS (FAUSTUS) born in the territory of Breſcia in Italy, was ſo much eſteemed for his learning that Leo X invited him to Rome and made him keeper of the Vatican library. He undertook ſeveral long and painful journeys in order to enlarge that library, which he did to good purpoſe. He was ill rewarded for his pains, and complained loudly of this diſgrace [*A*], but his complaints made no impreſſion on four other Popes, who kept him in their ſervice. They gave him no preferment, which made him renew his murmuring at this bad ſtate of his affairs. He died at Rome eighty years old, under the pontificate of Paul IV (*a*). We have ſome books written by him [*B*]. I have told in another place (*b*) what ſhare he had in the firſt edition of Arnobius.

(*a*) *Taken from the* Libraria Breſciana nuovamente aperta da Leonardo Cozzando, *Part. i, p.* 108, 109. *This book was printed at Breſcia, in* 1685. *Ghilini ſupplied Cozzando with all this.*

(*b*) In remark [*E*] of the article **ARNOBIUS.**

[*A*] *He was ill rewarded for his pains, and complained loudly of this diſgrace.*] This I prove by the following paſſage. ‘ Di che egli agramente ſi querela e ‘ duole. Il che pure gli ſucceſſe ſotto quattro altri ‘ Pontefici quali con multa ſua ſiniſtra fortuna infeli- ‘ cemente ſervi (1). - - - - *Of which he complains* ‘ *heavily, and laments his caſe. But ſuch was his ill* ‘ *fortune, that the ſame thing happened to him under four* ‘ *other Popes, whom he ſerved without ſucceſs.*’

[*B*] *We have ſome books written by him.*] Five books of Latin Epigrams, which he publiſhed at Rome in the year 1556, and dedicated to Henry II, king of France. He was pretty well paid in money and cloaths for his Epiſtle Dedicatory : ‘ E ne riporto da ‘ quella Maeſtà una collana d'oro, doicento ſcudi ‘ del ſole, e una giubba di veluto pavonazzo. - - - ‘ *For which he received of his majeſty a gold chain, two* ‘ *hundred crowns of the ſun, and a waſtcoat of purple* ‘ *velvet.*’ He wrote a book of Coſmography, and had a great ſhare in the collection printed at Frankfort, in 1580, with this title, *Picta poëſis Ovidiana : theſaurus propemodum omnium fabularum poëticarum Fauſti Sabæi Brixiani aliorumquæ clarorum virorum tam veterum quam recentiorum epigrammatis expoſitarum* (2).

(1) Leonardo Cozzando, Libraria Breſciana, *Part. i, p.* 109.

(2) *Taken from* Leonardo Cozzando, ubi ſupra. *See alſo* Ghilini's Theatro, *Tom. i, pag.* 51.

SACRATUS (PAUL) a canon of Ferrara, where he was born in the XVIth century, was one of thoſe, who applied themſelves to the purity of the Latin ſtyle. He ſucceeded in it, as appears from his letters to Paul Manutius, Riccobonus, Muretus, and ſeveral other learned men, which he publiſhed in the year 1579 [*A*]. He dedicated them to JAMES SACRATUS, his brother, biſhop of Carpentras. He had ſpent ſeveral years in his ſtudies at Padua, and in travelling (*a*). There are two ſhort diſcourſes at the end of his letters, wherein he apologizes for two prelates, who, contrary to cuſtom, had writ their mandates in the vulgar tongue; which they did, becauſe the greateſt part of the clergy in their dioceſes did not underſtand Latin. He compoſed ſome other books

(*a*) Paullus Sacratus, Epiſt. Dedicator.

[*A*] *The letters . . . . which he publiſhed in the year* 1579.] I have not ſeen this edition: that which I make uſe of is of Lyons, 1581, in 16mo. There was another publiſhed at Cologne in 1583. See Morhofius's Polyhiſtor (1). The other works of Sacratus are, *ſuper Geneſim liber unus. In Pſalmos Davidis liber unus.*

(1) In the 24th chapter of the firſt book, *pag.* 309, 310.

books (b), and died at ſeventy five years of age [B]. James Sadolet, biſhop of Carpentras and cardinal his uncle by the mother's ſide (c), had the care of his education.

(b) See the remark [A].

(c) *See* Sacratus's Letters, *lib. i, pag. m.* 13, 34; *& lib.* 6. *p.* 381.

unus. In Epiſtolam Canonicam B. Jacobi Apoſtoli liber unus. See the *Apparato de gli Huomini illuſtri della città di Ferrara*, written by *Agoſtino Superbi da Ferrara* (2).

[B] *He died at ſeventy-five years of age.*] So ſays (3) the epitaph engraven on his tomb in the cathedral church of Ferrara, by the care of the biſhop of Carpentras, his brother. The year of his death is not mentioned in that epitaph, which is a very extraordinary neglect.

(2) Pag. 16.

(3) Ibid.

SADEUR (JAMES) author of a *New Voyage into Terra Auſtralis*, printed in the year 1692 (a). His father's name (b) *was James Sadeur, and his mother's Guillemette Itin: they were both natives of Chatillon upon Bar, in the juriſdiction of Rethel in Champagne*, and had gone with deſign to ſettle in America; but *after nine or ten months ſtay at Port-Royal*, they took ſhipping the twenty-fifth of April, 1603 to return into France. The wife, fifteen days after they embarked, was delivered of the boy who is the ſubject of this article. Both the father and mother were caſt-away near cape Finiſterre, where their ſhip run a-ground: the child was ſaved as it were by a miracle, and given to an inhabitant of that coaſt; and then having again eſcaped in another ſhipwreck, he went to ſerve a Portugueſe lady (c), and ſtudied with her ſon. He was taken by pirates in the year 1623. He had like to have periſhed in a third ſhipwreck; but he was ſaved by a ſhip that was going into the Indies; and ſuffered a fourth ſhipwreck, which by ſeveral accidents which no body is obliged to believe, occaſioned his landing in Terra Auſtralis. The manner how, as he ſays, this came to paſs, and how he overcame the wild beaſts that were ready to devour him, and at laſt left that country after he had been there thirty two years (d), and arrived at Madagaſcar, is ſo ſtrange that I do not think there are any fictions more ridiculous in either Arioſto or Amadis. Neither do I mention James Sadeur here as a perſon that ever exiſted, or his voyage to Terra Auſtralis; as a true Hiſtory, but only becauſe I ſpoke of him in the article of Adam, and that I may give a ſupplement to the chimerical fancies of Antoinette Bourignon; for you muſt know that James Sadeur, who pretends to be an hermaphrodite, tells us that it was that very thing which preſerved his life, in a country where every body has both ſexes, and where all the men of our continent are treated as ſea monſters, and have no quarter given them (e). *All the Auſtralians*, ſays he (f), *have both ſexes; and whenever a child comes into the world having but one ſex, they ſtifle it as a monſter.* He does not clearly explain the manner how they generate [A]; but he gives us very plainly to underſtand (g), *that children grow in their bowels as fruits do upon trees* (h) [B]; *that they live without having any libidinous inclinations one towards another, and cannot ſo much as hear of them without horror; that their love is neither carnal nor brutiſh; that they are wholly ſufficient to themſelves, and want nothing to make them happy and contented.* In a word, the arguments he puts in an old Auſtralian's mouth, ſuppoſe that each individual perſon is the ſole and total cauſe of the children he brings into the world. He introduces him (i) raiſing difficulties againſt the generation, which depends upon two perſons, one of which is the father and the other the mother. The old man concludes, that man cannot be a perfect and compleat being without both ſexes, becauſe one ſex is not capable of production without the conjunction of the other. Sadeur comprehended thoſe principles and their conſequences ſo well, that to ſhew that he underſtood them, he uſes theſe words (k): *I conſidered the manner in which the ſupreme being acts; I was ſenſible that a creature could not better reſemble him than by acting alone in its productions as he does, and that an action performed by the concourſe*

(a) Note, that this book had been printed before at Vannes, in 1676, in 12mo.

(b) Avantures de Jaques Sadeur, *pag.* 2, *Dutch Edit.* 1692, *in* 12.

(c) The counteſs de Villafranca.

(d) Pag. 92.

(e) Pag. 147.

(f) Pag. 59, 62.

(g) Pag. 92.

(h) Pag. 69.

(i) Pag. 71.

(k) Pag. 69.

[A] *The manner how they generate.*] He ſays that *all the time he was* amongſt them, *he never could learn how generation is performed in that country* (1), and that *they have ſo great an averſion for whatever concerns the firſt beginning of life, that a year, or thereabouts, after his arrival, two Auſtralians hearing him ſay ſomething about it, went away expreſſing as much horror as if he had committed ſome crime* (2).

[B] *As fruits grow upon trees.*] I have quoted in another place (3) a paſſage of Antoinette Bourignon (4), wherein ſhe ſays that *ſin has disfigured the work of* GOD *in* men, *and that inſtead of being men, as they ſhould be, they are become monſters in nature divided into two imperfect ſexes, unable to produce their like alone, as trees and plants are produced, which in that reſpect are more perfect than men or women, who cannot produce without the help of another, nor without pain and miſery.* If you except the conſequences of ſin, the doctrine of that woman, and that of the Auſtralian Philoſopher, are as like one another as two drops of water. I wonder neither of them perceived that their pretended ſuperiority of plants above man, with reſpect to the faculty of generating, is a falſe ſuppoſition; for it is true indeed that each plant produces it's grain, it's fruit, and it's ſeed, independent on another plant of a different ſex; but it is not true that it produces another plant in itſelf, and by itſelf. What has it then above man? Does not a man produce in himſelf, and without the concourſe of the other ſex, the ſeed, which is like the grain or kernel in plants, from which another *individual* proceeds? It is true, will ſome ſay; but that other *individual* will not proceed from the male ſeed without a conjunction with the other ſex. I anſwer, do you think that the ſeed of plants does not want to be received into a womb that it may become a plant? Muſt it not be received into the earth? Is not this as great tho' not ſo pleaſant a dependency upon another Being as you, Mrs Bourignon and James Sadeur, find on the other ſide? It is certain that according to their ſyſtem, the perfect ſtate of man would not be like that of plants in this reſpect; man would produce in himſelf, and by his own power alone, not ſomething wherewith to make another man in another ſubject, but another man. A plant does not do that; it produces in itſelf, ſomething out of which, the earth, produces another plant. I remember to this purpoſe to have read the following verſes.

J'ai veu vif ſans fantſome
Un jeune moyne avoir

Membre

(1) Avantures de Jaques Sadeur, *pag.* 60, 92.

(2) Pag. 91.

(3) In Remark [G] of the article ADAM.

(4) *Preface to the* nouveau Ciel.

intercourſe of two perſons could not be ſo perfect as thoſe that are performed by one and the ſame perſon. Thus the inhabitants of Terra Auſtralis are of Mrs Bourignon's opinion; and one would be apt to think that James Sadeur, whoever he was, deſigned to inſinuate that thoſe people are not deſcended from Adam [*C*], but from an androgyne, who did not fall, as Adam did, from his ſtate of innocence. This might be a pretty good device to impoſe upon the cenſors of books, and remove the difficulties of a licence, if one had a mind to try the ſucceſs of a pre-adamitical ſyſtem [*D*]. If la Peyrere had made uſe of this device, he would have avoided a great deal of trouble. Cyrano Bergerac did not wholly neglect it in his travels to the ſun and moon. Perhaps the author of the Hiſtory of the Sevarambes (*l*) has taken advantage of this artifice. I ſhall obſerve by the by that

Membre de femme & d'homme
Et enfant concepvoir
Par luy ſeul en luy meſmes
Engendrer, enfanter
Comme font aultres femmes
Sans oultilz emprunter (5).

I've ſeen a fryar young that had
Both ſexes blended ſo, that he
Begot, conceiv'd, was brought to bed,
All by himſelf: not as you ſee
The courſe of other women is,
Who needs before they come to this
Muſt borrow'd tools employ - - -

They are taken from a Poem of John Molinet, intituled, *Recollection des merveilles advenues en noſtre temps.* Here is an Hermaphrodite more extraordinary than that mentioned by Mr de Beauval, in his *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans* (6). The words applied to the Porcupine, ' Seque jaculo, ſeſe pharetra, ſeſe utitur arcu, - - - *he himſelf was his own bow, arrows, and quiver,*' might have been applied to it. Iſaac Voſſius's hypotheſis, does not reach ſo far. ' Hermaphroditi ut plurimum veræ ſunt mulieres non diſcrepantes à cæteris niſi exceſſu membri quo viros imitantur, quoque omnia ea quæ viri peragunt non in ſuum tantum, ſed & virilem quoque ſexum prodigioſam frangendo venerem, ut merito Seneca epiſt. 95. de illis dixerit, *Dii illas deæque malè perdant, adeo perverſum commentæ genus impudicitiæ, viros ineunt* (7). - - - *Hermaphrodites for the moſt part are true women, in nothing different from the reſt, but in that prominent member with which they imitate men, and perform all their actions, exerciſing their prodigious luſt, not only upon their own, but likewiſe upon the male ſex: of whom Seneca juſtly ſays,* May the gods and godeſſes utterly deſtroy them, for having invented ſuch a monſtrous kind of uncleanneſs, as even to abuſe the bodies of men contrary to nature.'

But this ſtory of Molinet ought not wholly to be credited. That Monk did not get himſelf with child: he himſelf was not both agent and patient at the ſame time. I do not know whether he was puniſhed; I have only read that he was put into the hands of juſtice, and confined till he was delivered. Read this paſſage of the *Chronique Scandaleuſe de Louis XI.* ' In the ſaid year 1478, it happened in Auvergne, that there was one of the Fryars in a convent of black Monks belonging to Cardinal de Bourbon, who had both ſexes, and made uſe of them in ſuch a manner that he proved with child: whereupon he was ſeized, proſecuted, and confined till he ſhould be delivered, that he might be dealt with afterwards as the Judges ſhould think fit.' Is it not ſtrange negligence to give no account of the conſequences of this impriſonment (8).

[*C*] *That theſe people are not deſcended from Adam.*] He aſcribes many things to them, which ſuit only with the ſtate of innocence; as that they are not aſhamed of being naked, they all love one another with a ſincere affection, they never quarrel, they know no diſtinction of property, they have all things in common with an admirable fidelity and diſintereſtedneſs (9); they bring forth without any pain (10), they have no unchaſte inclination, they are ſtrong and vigorous, their health is never affected by any ſickneſs, and they make no great account of life, in compariſon of the eternal reſt that follows it, which they ardently deſire (11). It is true their notion of that eternal reſt is not very orthodox, for in their opinion it does not conſiſt in the beatific viſion, but in the privation of a particular and individual exiſtence. They ſay that after death we exiſt only in general, in an *univerſal genius, who communicates himſelf by parts to each particular Being, and has the power, when an animal dies, to preſerve himſelf till he be communicated to another. So that this genius is extinguiſhed by the death of that animal, without being deſtroyed, ſince he waits only for new organs, and a new machine to be revived* (12). This is as great nonſenſe as the ſoul of the world of ſome ancient Philoſophers. According to Sadeur's account the Auſtralians are not over-religious. They are contented *to worſhip the incomprehenſible Being without ever ſpeaking of him*; they fancy *nothing can be more offenſive to him, than to make his divine perfections the ſubject of their diſcourſe: ſo that it may be ſaid that the main part of their religion is not to ſpeak of religion* (13). This does not ſavour of the ſtate of innocence: man ought to glorify his maker by his words as well as by his thoughts; and it is in vain to ſay, as the old Auſtralian did to Sadeur, that whoever ventures to ſpeak of God, is like to ſpeak of him otherwiſe than he ſhould do; for this would prove too much, and it would follow from it that one ſhould never think of the incomprehenſible Being. I ſhall ſet down what is found on this ſubject in the book of that pretended traveller. He had told the old man (14) that in Europe God *is the ſubject of the moſt agreeable and uſeful converſations*; and being aſked, *whether people had the ſame notions concerning that incomprehenſible Being,* he *ſincerely confeſſed they differed very much in the concluſions which every one drew often from the ſame principles, and that this occaſioned many ſharp diſputes, frequently attended with a violent hatred, and ſometimes even with bloody wars, and other conſequences no leſs diſmal. The good old man,* continues he, *replied with great ingenuity, that if I had not anſwered him in that manner, he would not have ſaid a word more, but would have had, me in the utmoſt contempt, being,* ſaid he, *very ſure that men could not ſpeak of an incomprehenſible thing, without having very different and quite contrary opinions about it. A man,* added he, *muſt be blind, who can be ignorant that there is a firſt principle; but one muſt be infinite, as he is, to ſpeak of him exactly: for ſince we acknowledge that he is incomprehenſible, it follows that we can ſpeak of him only by gueſs, and that whatever we can ſay of him may indeed ſatisfy the curious, but not rational perſons. And we rather chuſe to be wholly ſilent, than to run the hazard of venting many falſities concerning his nature.* There is ſomething ſo ſpecious in theſe words, that a gentleman aſſured me, that having read them to his footman, he aſked him, *What do you ſay to it, La Fleur?* And he received for anſwer, *Zooks, Sir, that old man was no fool, I wiſh I was like him, I ſhould be a very wiſe fellow.*

[*D*] *A Pre-adamitical ſyſtem.*] Sadeur ſays (15) that the Auſtralians *reckon above twelve thouſand revolutions of the ſolſtices from the beginning of their republic, and give out that they derive their original from a Deity, who with one breath produced three men from whom all others are deſcended; that according to their account the Europeans began five thouſand revolutions after them, and that they give them a very ridiculous original; for they ſay that an amphibious ſerpent of a prodigious bigneſs, falling upon a woman in her ſleep, enjoyed her without doing her any harm; that the woman awaked about the end of the action, and was ſtruck with ſuch horror at it, that ſhe threw herſelf into the ſea.* The ſerpent carried her to a neighbouring iſland, where ſhe *repented of her deſpair,* and was delivered of two children, the one a male, and the other a female, who ſhewed ſo many ſigns of malice that their mother

---

(*l*) See what judgment Morhofius makes upon him, *p.* 75 of his *Polyhiſtor.*

(5) Les faictz & dictz de feu de bonne memoire Jehan Molinet, *fol.* 229. *verſo Paris* 1540 *in* 8*vo.* Du Verdier, *pag.* 728 *of his* Bibliotheque Françoiſe, *quotes thoſe verſes, but not according to the Orthography of the original.*

(6) For November 1692, *p.* 125.

(7) Iſaacus Voſſius, Comment. in Catul. *p.* 287.

(8) Chronique Scandaleuſe de Louïs XI, *pag. m.* 386. *See alſo Robert Gaguin, in the tenth book of his* Hiſtory of France, *fol. m.* 284 *verſo. He ſays this happened in a convent of Iſſoire in Auvergne.*

(9) Pag. 60.

(10) Pag. 93.

(11) Pag. 69.

(12) Pag. 90.

(13) Pag. 83.

(14) Pag. 88.

(15) Pag. 117.

that the author of *Religio Medici* had ſomething of the *Auſtralian* taſte [*E*]. I ſhall occaſionally explain here more exactly than I have done in another place (*m*), what concerns Plato's Androgynes [*F*].

As ſoon as this article was read at Geneva, a perſon, for whom I have a very great eſteem, was pleaſed to ſend me a memoir, which I ſhall inſert below. It appears from it

was extremely afflicted at it. The ſerpent perceiving the trouble ſhe was in, gave her to underſtand by ſigns that he would carry her into her own country, if ſhe deſired it. He did ſo, and then he came back to the little ones, who coupled and multiplied. Would not one think this a wretched alluſion to the fabulous ſtory of ſome Heretics (16), who ſaid that Eve had two children by the ſerpent which tempted her (17)?

[*E*] *The author of* Religio Medici *had ſomething of the Auſtralian taſte.*] I wiſh, ſays he, we could multiply like trees without any conjunction, or that ſome other way of getting children might be found out; for certainly there is nothing more fooliſh and unworthy of a wiſe man, nothing more ſhameful and unbecoming the greatneſs of our ſouls than to think, when the heat is over, how far the impertinence has been carried. Not that I have an averſion for that charming ſex, adds he: on the contrary, I am naturally inclined to love and admire whatever is beautiful: nay, I am extremely pleaſed with the ſight of a fine picture; were it only that of a horſe. *Mihi ſatis placeret, ſi nobis etiam arborum more citra conjunctionem procreare liceat, ſive alia quæpiam reperiatur rerum propagandarum ratio, quam coïtionis illa vulgaris, & trivialis: nihil profecto ineptius eſt, aut viro ſapiente indignius; nihil quod mentis celſitudinem turpius dejiciat, quam ſi animo jam defervente reputet, quam inſigniter ineptierit. Nec tamen hæc ita quenquam interpretari velim, quaſi à ſexu illo dulciſſimo alienatiore animo ſim, immo ultro admiror, & amplector, quicquid pulchrum eſt. Summa cum voluptate eleganti cuipiam picturæ inhæreo, etiamſi equi tantum fuerit* (18). The author of the notes upon this book of Dr Brown, obſerves that the fooleries the Doctor ſpeaks of being neceſſary to mankind, it was requiſite that men ſhould be very prone to them (19). He quotes ſome paſſages of St Auguſtin, wherein things are carried a little too far; for that Father not only ſays that the ſuperior part of the ſoul is degraded and dethroned by amorous embraces, that a wiſe man is not obliged to marry, and that thoſe who do it, ought rather to be admired than imitated; but alſo that the duty which married people pay to one another without a motive of procreation is a venial ſin. *Conjugalis concubitus generandi gratia non habet culpam; concupiſcentiæ verò ſatiandæ, ſed tamen cum conjuge propter fidem thori venialem habet culpam: adulterium verò ſive fornicatio letalem habet culpam: ac propter hoc melior eſt quidem ab omni concubitu continentia, quam vel ipſe matrimonialis concubitus, quæ fit cauſa gignendi.* Hæc habet Auguſt. *in lib. de bono conjugal. c.* 6. *in Soliloquiis c.* 10. *Si, inquit, ad officium pertinet ſapientis (quod nondum comperi) dare operam liberis, quiſquis hujus rei tamen gratia concumbit, mirandus mihi videri poteſt, at verò imitandus nullo modo* (20). The ſame commentator alledges St Auguſtin upon theſe words of Dr Brown, ' Nihil ineptius aut viro ſapiente indignius. - - - *It is the fooliſheſt act a wiſe man can commit.*' ' *Hinc Auguſtin.* in libro ſoliloquiorum cap. 10. Nihil, *inquit*, eſſe ſentio, quod magis ex arce dejiciat animum virilem, quam blandimenta fœminea, corporumque ille contactus, ſine quo uxor haberi non poteſt (21). - - - *Hence St Auguſtin ſays in his book of Soliloquies, chap* 10. *I know nothing more apt to degrade the ſoul of a man than female blandiſhments, and that touching of bodies which neceſſarily attends a married ſtate.*'

[*F*] *I ſhall . . . explain here more exactly . . . . what concerns Plato's Androgynes.*] Plato ſuppoſes that in the beginning of the world, there were three ſorts of human creatures. Some were only male, others female, and others both. Theſe laſt are the Androgynes. Each individual of thoſe three kinds had four arms, and four feet, two faces turned one towards the other and placed upon one neck, four ears, two genital parts, and ſo on. They walked upright; but when they had a mind to go faſter, they were apt to tumble heels over head. They were robuſt and bold, ſo that they attempted to make war with the gods. The celeſtial court held a council on that affair, but were greatly at a loſs what reſolution to take; for had mankind been deſtroyed by thunder, as the giants were, the gods would have been loſers by it. Who then would have offered up incenſe and ſacrifices to them (22)? On the other hand, it was not fit to ſuffer the boldneſs and inſolence of men. Jupiter found out this expedient; he divided them every one into two: but there aroſe a great inconveniency from thence; for each half endeavoured to be re-united to the other, and when they met, they embraced one another ſo tenderly, and with ſo much pleaſure, that they could not reſolve to part, and ſo died of hunger. Jupiter found out a remedy for that diſorder: he tranſpoſed the privy parts, and ſo contrived the matter that the pleaſure of their embraces ceaſed after a certain time, that each of them might have leiſure to mind their own concerns. Plato adds that the males, who are one half of an Androgyne, are very much addicted to women, and that the females, who are one half of an Androgyne are paſſionately fond of men. He pretends that the females, who love other females without minding the males, are one half of the ancient double females; and that the males, who are fond of males, are one half of the ancient double males (23). If any one deſires to ſee ſome reflexions upon what Euſebius (24) ſays, that Plato had this notion of Androgynes from Moſes, he may conſult the commentary of Ludovicus Regius (25). He confeſſes (26) that *Mercerus and Quinquarboreus, Royal Profeſſors in Hebrew, have been of great uſe to him in this place.* He finds that Marſilius Ficinus is often miſtaken. *I ſhould loſe my time,* ſaith he (27), *ſhould I take notice of all the paſſages of Plato ill tranſlated by him; I ought rather to thank him for the pains he took to ſerve poſterity by mending the old tranſlation as well as he could, and at the ſame time endeavour to ſupply its deficiencies without animoſity. . . . .* (28) *The good gentleman had no great ſkill in Greek or Latin, and has committed many faults in his tranſlation of that author, particularly in things that require the knowledge of antiquity and nature. I have diſcourſed about it with the biſhop of Montpellier and Turnebus, and Goupil, Royal Profeſſors, and every one of them helped me according to his ability.* That biſhop of Montpellier is the ſame whom he praiſes in the fiftieth leaf in theſe words. *Being in doubt about the ſenſe of that paſſage, I conſulted Meſſire G. Pelliſſier biſhop of Montpellier, a man of great judgment in the intracies of good authors, as likewiſe in the obſervation and knowledge of natural things, in which he is as much verſed as any man has been ſince the antients. This gentleman has been pleaſed to help me in this paſſage and all others, whenever I deſired his aſſiſtance.* To divert the reader he recites a Poem, that is worth reading. *After this long and tedious explication of an important paſſage,* ſays he (29), *before I proceed further, I ſhall inſert a Poem heretofore written upon the Androgyne, by Meſſire Antony Heroet, now biſhop of Digne, which he inſcribed to the late King Francis, the father of good learning. This I ſhall do for the reader's diverſion. I willingly recite that Poem, not only on account of its elegancy, but alſo by reaſon of the friendſhip and familiarity I contracted with the author, whilſt I attended at court upon Chancellor Olivier, a very wiſe and learned man, with whom he uſed to be* (30). *It is true he does not keep to Plato's notion, as any one may ſee by comparing them, but takes a poetical liberty, leaving out and adding what he thinks fit.* This is the beginning of that Poem:

Au premier aage que le monde vivoit
D'herbe, de gland: trois ſortes y avoit
D'hommes, les deux tels qu'ilz ſont maintenant,
Et l'autre double eſtoit, s'entretenant
Enſemblement tant maſle que femelle.
  Il faut penſer, que la façon fut belle:
Car le grand Dieu qui vivre les faiſoit,
Faitz les avoit, & bien s'y congnoiſſoit.
  De quatre bras, quatre pieds, & deux teſtes
Eſtoyent formez ces raiſonnables beſtes.

(*m*) In the Article of ADAM, remark [*F*].

(16) Archontici, apud Epiphan. Hæreſ. XL.

(17) See remark [*B*] in the Article EVE.

(18) Thomas Brown, Religio Medici, *Part. ii*, §. *ix*, *pag. m.* 397.

(19) Et ſi recte ineptias illas ac nugas, quas vir cum muliere agit, quoties fœminea voluptate uti decrevit, conſideremus, nihil ſtultius fingi poſſe reperiemus: Sed ob liberorum procreandorum neceſſitatem, humanique generis conſervationem, Deus proclives nos ad ejuſmodi nugas ac voluptates eſſe voluit. *Annotata ad religion. Medici*, *pag.* 403.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Ibid.

(22) Αἱ τιμαὶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἠφανίζετο. *Extincto hominum genere humanus deorum cultus venerationque periret.* Plato, in Convivio, *pag. m.* 1185.

(23) *Taken from Plato*, in Convivio, *pag.* 1185. 1186.

(24) De Præparat. Evangel. *lib. xii*, *cap. vii*.

(25) He was Regius Profeſſor at Paris, and tranſlated ſeveral Dialogues of Plato into French, and among others the Feaſt: to which he added a Commentary.

(26) Fol. 45, Paris Edit. 1559. in 4to.

(27) Fol. 51.

(28) Fol. 52.

(29) Fol. 53.

(30) La Croix du Maine, ſays that Heroet, native of Paris, was related: Chancellor Olivier.

it that a Franciſcan, who forſook his order, is the author of that pretended voyage into Terra Auſtralis [*G*]. I wonder that Mr Couſin who, with all the gravity that is peculiar to him, has given us an extract of James Sadeur's chimerical adventures, in his *Journal des Savans* (*n*), knew nothing of the Vannes edition 1676. He thought that the Paris edition printed by Barbin, 1692, was the firſt.

La reſte vaut mieux, penſée que ditte,
Et ſe verroit pluſtoſt peinte qu'eſcrite.
Chacun eſtoit de ſon corps tant ayſé,
Qu'en ſe tournant il ſe trouvoit baiſé :
En eſtendant ſes bras, on l'embraſſoit :
Voulant penſer, on le contrepenſoit :
En ſoy voyoit tout ce qu'il vouloit veoir,
En ſoy trouvoit ce qu'il falloit avoir.
Jamais en lieu ſes pieds porté ne l'euſſent,
Que quand & luy ſes paſſetemps ne feuſſent.
Si de ſon bien luy plaiſoit mal uſer,
Facile eſtoit envers ſoy s'excuſer.
De luy n'eſtoit fait ne raport, ny compte,
Ne congnoiſſoit honneſteté, ny honte.
Si de ſon cœur ſortoyent ſimples deſirs,
Il y entroit tant de doubles plaiſirs,
Qu'en y penſant chacun eſt incité
A maintenir, que la felicité
Fut de tel temps, & le ſiecle doré.

In the firſt age, while mortals ſtill were good,
And herbs and acorns were their only food,
Three ſorts of men exiſted, two of which
In ev'ry point were altogether ſuch
As they are now: the third a double kind
Had in it both the male and female join'd.
The piece, you may ſuppoſe, was very fine,
And worthy of the maker's ſkill divine.
Two heads, four arms, and juſt as many feet
Did in this rational quadruped meet.
The reſt is better far conceiv'd than ſaid,
Better in pictures than in words diſplay'd.
Each in himſelf was ſo contriv'd and bleſs'd,
That if he turn'd he found that he was kiſs'd.
If he but ſtretch'd his arms, he was embrac'd,
With ev'ry thought a counter-thought was plac'd.
In ſhort all that he wiſh'd or wanted he
Did largely in himſelf provided ſee.
He carry'd his amuſements ſtill about him,
Nor could he move a ſingle ſtep without 'em.
If of his goods he made a ſinful uſe,
With eaſe he could unto himſelf excuſe
The fault: for he had no account to give
Of what he did to any man alive.
As for ought elſe, he did not know the name
Of what is conſtru'd modeſty or ſhame.
If his heart's wiſhes pure and ſimple were,
So many double pleaſures enter'd there,
That when we think of theſe, we are inclin'd
To ſay that true felicity confin'd
Her ſhort duration to that narrow ſtage,
That ſpace of time yclep'd the golden age.

[*G*] *A memoir .... whence it appears that a Franciſcan, who forſook his order, is the author of that pretend voyage into Terra Auſtralis.*] Here follows what was written to me from Geneva, the 13th of March, 1697. ‘You will not be dipleaſed to know the true author of the relation of Terra Auſtralis, which came out under the name of James Sadeur, of which you take notice. His name was Gabriel Foigni, and he was a Franciſcan in a convent of Lorrain, his native country. He came into theſe parts in the year 1667, and embraced our religion; notwithſtanding which he continually led an irregular life. At firſt he ſettled in the little town of Morges, where he was chanter of the church; but one day going to ſing, after he had been drinking, he did ſome undecent things at church, which occaſioned his being turned out. He came hither, and, to get a livelihood, went from houſe to houſe teaching young boys, Grammar, Geography, *&c.* and inſtructing Germans in the French tongue. Some time after he married a woman of the dregs of the people, and who was not accounted ſo ſcrupulous as Lucretia. Afterwards he took it in his head to publiſh ſome ſmall books; and among the reſt, an Almanack every year, under the name of the *Great Garantus*, which was commonly very faulty as to the computation of time; a ſet of cards for Heraldry, and the Pſalms of Marot and Beza, with a prayer of his own compoſing at the end of each Pſalm, containing only ſome inſipid compliments to the Deity. Laſtly, the relations of voyages being very much in vogue at that time, he compleated his works by his Auſtralia, as he calls it; he had it printed here privately about the latter end of the year 1676. Our Clergy, who thought that book contained ſeveral things contrary to the Holy Scripture, and ſeveral obſcenities, ſent for the Printer, who declared that Foigni had given him the manuſcript. Foigni ſtoutly maintained that James Sadeur was the true author of it, and that he had received the copy from Bourdeaux: but at laſt being ſummoned to appear before the magiſtrates, he confeſſed, when he was ſtrictly examined, that he had writ that book to get a little money, and that James Sadeur was a ſuppoſititious name. As a puniſhment, he was ordered to leave the town with his family; but ſome German gentlemen, whom he taught the French tongue, having interceeded for him, he was allowed to ſtay here ſome time longer. But three or four years after, his maid being with child, and himſelf proſecuted upon that account, he went away and retired into Savoy, and got into a monaſtery, where he died five years ago.’

I ſhall recite here what a conſiderable man told me in the year 1699, *viz.* That the relation, printed under the name of James Sadeur, is the work of a gentleman of Bretagne, a great admirer of Lucretius, whom he had tranſlated into French, deſigning to publiſh his tranſlation. He publiſhed at Vannes, in the year 1676, the relation of James Sadeur. I might reconcile this with the memorial ſent to me from Geneva, by ſuppoſing that the Monk, who forſook his order, took out of that work the materials of the Auſtralia publiſhed by him, or even that he tranſcribed it word for word, and publiſhed it as an original. There are ſome things in that relation ſo nicely managed, that I can hardly believe that Foigni was maſter of ſo much art. I forgot to deſire ſome of my friends to compare Sadeur's relation with the Auſtralia. I am apt to think that there is ſome difference between thoſe two pieces.

(*n*) Of the fourth of Auguſt 1692, *pag.* 526, & *ſeq. Dutch Edit.*

SADDUCEES, a ſect, which aroſe among the Jews two hundred years or thereabouts before the birth of the Meſſias [*A*]. It is thought that Sadok, a diſciple of Antigonus Sochæus was the founder of it. He and Baithus, who was alſo a diſciple of the ſame Antigonus, put a wrong ſenſe on the doctrine which their maſter taught them: they concluded that there is neither paradiſe nor Hell, that there are neither rewards nor puniſhments after this life, from his exhorting them to ſerve GOD, not like mercenaries

[*A*] *A ſect which aroſe among the Jews two hundred years, or thereabouts, before the birth of the Meſſias.*] The moſt probable opinion is, that Sadok, a diſciple of Antigonus Sochæus, was the founder of the ſect of the mercenaries, who act only in hopes of getting by it, but like thoſe generous ſervants; who are faithful and obedient to their maſters without expecting any reward. This fine maxim ill interpreted by thoſe two diſciples of Antigonus, ſet them up for heads of a party (*a*). They founded two pernicious ſects [*B*], which utterly ſubverted religion; and foreſeeing that they ſhould be put to death, if they ventured to declare publicly all the conſequences ariſing from their principles, they durſt not reject the authority of the Scripture, they only rejected the traditions. Thoſe who embraced the ſect of Sadoc, were called Sadducees (*b*). They made already a conſiderable figure in the time of Jonathan brother to Judas Maccabeus, that is, about the year of Rome 600; for Joſephus informs us, that there were at that time three ſects among the Jews, viz. That of the Phariſees, that of the Sadducees, and that of the Eſſenes (*c*). He adds (*d*) that the Sadducees rejected the doctrine of Predeſtination, and taught that man is the only cauſe of his own proſperity or adverſity, according as he makes a good or an ill uſe of his free-will. He ſays in another place (*e*) that the Sadducees and Phariſees had many quarrels between them, and that the rich people ſided with the Sadducees, but the vulgar ſtood for the Phariſees. The latter preſcribed many rites as being tranſmitted and handed down to them from their anceſtors, though they were not written in the law of Moſes: on the contrary, the Sadducees rejected all doctrines and ceremonies not contained in the Scripture. We read in the ſame paſſage of Joſephus that the high-prieſt Hircanus (*f*), who had been a diſciple of the Phariſees, forſook and abuſed them, having declared for the ſect of the Sadducees at the ſuggeſtion of his favourite Jonathan, who was one of them. We are told in another place by the ſame Hiſtorian (*g*); that the Sadducees did not believe the immortality of the ſoul (*h*), nor that GOD concerned himſelf with evil either

the Sadducees. Now this Antigonus ſuceeded Simon the Juſt in the chair of the Sanhedrim (1). This Simon died in the year of the world 3662, or, according to others, 3690. One may therefore believe that Sadok's innovation began to appear in the year of the world 3700, that is, 248 years before CHRIST. Thus Mr Willemer argues in a theſis maintained under his direction at Wittemberg the 28th of September, 1680. Some learned men are of opinion that the hereſy of the Sadducees is more antient, and that it ſprung from a wrong ſenſe put upon the thirty-ſeventh chapter of Ezekiel, whilſt the prophets Zachariah and Malachi were ſtill living. Dr Lightfoot, who followed that opinion, in his commentary on St Matthew's Goſpel (2), departed from it on the Acts of the Apoſtles, and maintained a very different opinion, *viz.* that the hereſy of the Sadducees did not appear till a long time after Sadok's death (3). Obſerve that Joſephus the firſt time he mentions that ſect, does not repreſent it as new one, but as a party entirely formed (4). The time his diſcourſe refers to is that of Jonathan, brother to Judas Maccabeus; and therefore it muſt be placed 153 years before CHRIST. He mentions that ſect again about a hundred years after, and repreſents it as a very antient one (5). *The Jews*, ſays he (6), *had long before divided their wiſdom, or Philoſophy into three ſects*, viz. *the Eſſenes, the Sadducees, and the Phariſees.* Lucas Brugenſis has broached a very bold opinion. He ſays that the college of the Scribes, founded by Ezra, was very flouriſhing under the Maccabees, and that thoſe Scribes began then to examine the queſtion about future rewards and puniſhments, becauſe they had learned what the Greeks ſaid about it. That enquiry occaſioned two ſects, that of the Sadducees, and that of the Phariſees: the latter held the affirmative, and the former the negative. He pretends that the Jews believed only temporal rewards and puniſhments, which were the only ones propoſed in the law of Moſes, and that if the Patriarchs and Prophets ſaw farther, they did not however teach the doctrine of a future life as an article of faith. According to this hypotheſis, the Jews muſt have learned of the Greeks the immortality of the ſoul, and future rewards and puniſhments, whereas it is commonly believed that the Pagans had thoſe excellent doctrines from the Scripture. Here follow the words of Lucas Brugenſis: *Quum tempore Maccabæorum plures florerent Scribæ quorum collegium ab Eſdra exordium ſumſerat, qui ſapientiæ ſtuderent, & ut jugo Græcorum ſubjacebant, nonnunquam audirent Græcorum de his rebus (animæ humanæ immortalite, corporis reſurrectione, æternis bonorum præmiis, & malorum ſuppliciis) fabulas, factum eſt ut cæperint quæſtiones de his rebus in medium afferre, & inter ſe ventilare, atque à ſe mutuo diſſidere, aliis iſta adſtruentibus, qui vocati fuere Phariſæi, aliis negantibus qui Sadducæi. Ante hæc tempora non videtur populus Iſrael quidquam de his rebus doctus fuiſſe, aut quidquam de iſtis publice prædicatum, eò quod lex harum rerum diſertam mentionem non faceret, terrenas duntaxat ſpes minaſque bonis maliſque ob oculos ponens. Fuit quidem Patriarcharum & Prophetarum non dubia hic fides, quod vel undecimum Caput Epiſtolæ ad Hebræos teſtatum facit, ſed multa à Patriarchis & Prophetis credita prædictaque fuere quæ ut non propoſita atque enarrata, ita nec credenda neceſſario populo fuere, ut virginitas matris Meſſiæ, paupertas, paſſio, mors, reſurrectio Meſſiæ. Videtur clara publicaque hujuſmodi rerum æternarum doctrina Meſſiæ reſervata fuiſſe, interim dum Meſſias expectaretur quo paratiores forent animi ad accipiendam fidem de rebus hujuſmodi inviſibilibus, futuris & eternis, permiſerat DEUS varias de his opiniones oriri & ſapientum ſynagogas inter ſe altercationibus diſcuti* (7). Mr Willemer very much diſlikes this opinion, and refers the reader to the Orthodox Divines, who have confuted the Socinians, *&c.* concerning the belief of the Jews. 'Hactenus Brugenſis mirum in modum cumulans φορτικὰ ἀκȣ́σματα homine Theologo indigna contra fidem fidelium V. & N. Teſt. eſſentialiter eandem (8). - - - '*Thus far Lucas Brugenſis, who at a ſtrange rate loads with invidious reflections, and ſuch as are unworthy of a Divine, the faith of believers in the Old and New Teſtament, which is eſſentially the ſame.*'

[*B*] *They founded two pernicious ſects.*] Every body does not acknowledge that each of thoſe two diſciples of Antigonus founded a ſect: ſome very learned men pretend that the ſect of the Sadducees and that of the Baithuſees, were but one and the ſame ſect, which went indifferently ſometimes by the name of Sadok, one of it's two founders, and ſometimes by the name of Baithus, the other founder; but becauſe Sadok was more zealous than his colleague, in maintaining the party formed by him, his name was more frequently made uſe of than that of Baithus to denote their followers. Theſe too rather choſe to be called Sadducees than Baithuſees, becauſe Baithus being a baſtard, they were afraid it would bring a blot upon them. This opinion is to be ſeen more at large in a book of Carpzovius (9). It is the more likely becauſe ſome learned men confeſs they could never find out wherein the Sadducees differed from the Baithuſees. 'Ignoſce ignorantiæ noſtræ, *they are Dr Lightfoot's words* (10), ſi fateamur neſcire nos penitus quid intererat inter Sadducæum, & Baithuſæum, an convenirent in eodem, an diſſentirent in aliquibus? de Baithuſæis apud ſacras paginas altum ſilentium, apud Judaicas mentio frequentiſſima, & videntur in quibuſdam diſtingui à Sadducæis aſt in quibus obſcurius. - - - *Excuſe our ignorance, if we confeſs that we do not at all ſee what difference there was between the Sadducees and the Baithuſees, whether they agreed in the ſame thing, or differed in ſome points. The Baithuſees are no where mentioned in the Scriptures, but very frequently in the Jewiſh writings, and in ſome things they ſeem to be diſtinguiſhed from the Sadducees,*

tho'

(*a*) Pirke Avoth, *cap. i, num. iii*, & Maimonides Commentar. in Pirke Avoth, *fol. 25. cap. i*, *apud* John Helvicum Willemerum, in Diſſertat. Philologica de Sadducæis, *pag.* 20, 22.

(*b*) Maimon. ibid,

(*c*) Joſeph. Antiquit. Judaic. *lib. xiii, cap. ix.*

(*d*) *Id. ibid.* & *lib. ii*, de Bello, Judaico, *cap. xii*, (*alias cap. vii.*)

(*e*) *Id.* Antiq. *lib. xiii, cap. xviii, ſub. fin.*

(*f*) He died about the year of Rome 649.

(*g*) Joſeph, Antiq. *lib. xviii, cap. ii.*

(*h*) *Idem.* de Bello Judaico, *lib. ii. cap. xii.* (*alias cap. vii.*)

(1) Hujus Simeonis Juſti diſcipulus ac in cathedra Synedrali ſucceſſor fuit Antigonus Sochæus. *Joh. Helvicus Willemerus in Diſſertat. Philologica de Sadducæis*, pag. 23. Edit. Wittemb. 1680.

(2) Lightfoot, Hor. Hebraic. in Matth. iii. 7, *pag.* 236. *Edit. Carpz. apud* Johan. Helvic. Willemer, *ubi ſupra. pag.* 24.

(3) *Idem.* Hor. Hebr. in Actus Apoſt. *pag.* 123. *apud eumd. ibid. pag.* 26.

(4) Joſeph. Antiq. *lib. xiii. cap. ix.*

(5) Ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίȣ τῶν πατρίων· Jam inde à multis retro ſæculis. *Joſeph. ib. lib. xviii, cap. ii, pag.* 617.

(6) Joſephus, ibid.

(7) Lucas Brugenſis Annotat. in Matth. iii. 7, *apud.* Willemerum, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 28.

(8) Willemer, ibid.

(9) Joh. Benedictus Carpzovius, *Lipſienſis Profeſſor Linguæ Hebraicæ, in* Introduct. ad Raymundi Martini Pugionem Fidei, *cap. iii.*

(10) Lightfoot, in Horis Hebr. in Act. Apoſtol. *pag.* 128, *apud* Willemerum, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 8.

either to do it, or to take notice of it [*C*]. He obſerves (*i*) that the number of the Sadducees was not conſiderable, but that they were generally inveſted with the higheſt dignities; notwithſtanding which they had no great intereſt; for few things were done according to their advice, and thoſe among them who exerciſed the magiſtracy were obliged to comply, tho' againſt their will, with the deciſions of the Phariſees, otherwiſe they would not have been tolerated by the populace. Joſephus makes two obſervations, which, I think, will give a great light into the matter: one of them, is that the Phariſees were not ſevere in inflicting puniſhments (*k*); the other is, that the Sadducees ſhewed great ſeverity in the functions of judicature (*l*). Laſtly, he ſays (*m*) that there was no good underſtanding among them, that they lived like wild beaſts, and that friends were not better uſed in their converſation than if they had been ſtrangers. It is not eaſy to reconcile this with what he ſays in another place, that this ſect was not beloved by the meaner ſort of the people but by the rich; for the latter do not much agree with moroſe and peeviſh humours, but are for introducing the ſweets and conveniencies of life in all places where they have any intercourſe. We ought perhaps to ſuppoſe, that what he ſays concerning the diſcord of the Sadducees, and their clowniſh converſation, ſignifies nothing more than that they accounted it a virtue to take the liberty of diſputing with their maſters (*n*). It was almoſt an unavoidable conſequence from their principles, ſince they boldly rejected the authority of tradition, and did not care whether the ſeveral texts of the Scripture had been explained by the antients in ſuch a manner or not. This being laid down, a diſciple had as much right to contradict his maſter, as the latter had to contradict his predeceſſor, and ſo on. The Sadducees are often mentioned in the Holy Scripture; but tho' it informs us (*o*), that they denied the reſurrection of the dead and the exiſtence of angels and ſpirits, and that the Phariſees believed both, yet it gives us a worſe character of the Phariſees than of the Sadducees. I ſhall examine what has been ſaid of the immorality of the latter [*D*], and will make it appear that no good proofs can

' *tho' it does not appear in what.*' The learned Maimonides plainly intimates that they were only two names for one and the ſame thing (11). Nevertheleſs ſome Rabbins have found a notable difference between them, for they ſay that the doctrine of the reſurrection was never denied by the Baithuſees (12), and that the Sadducees were much more wicked, and downright infidels (13). Nay, ſome will have it that the Baithuſees were a branch of the Eſſenes (14); but that opinion has been fully confuted (15).

[*C*] *This ſect did not believe . . . . . that* GOD *concerned himſelf with evil, either to do it, or to take notice of it.*] Joſephus charges them with this impious doctrine: theſe are his words; Σαδδουκαῖοι . . . . τὴν μὲν εἱμαρμένην παντάπασιν ἀναιροῦσι, καὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ δρᾶν τι κακὸν ἢ ἐφορᾶν τίθενται: *Sadducæi . . . . fatum omnino negant, & Deum extra omnem mali patrationem inſpectionemque conſtituunt* (16). Joſephus does not ſeem to have either underſtood or truly reported their opinion; for we ſhall ſee hereafter, (17) that they believed that God rewards good men, and puniſhes the wicked in this world. They went to St John the Baptiſt, as well as the Phariſees, to be baptized by him, when they heard that he preached repentance in the deſerts of Judea (18). The Scripture ſays, that they were deſirous to avoid the evils they thought themſelves threatened with (19). How then can it be denied that they believed that the baptiſm of repentance adminiſtred by St John would appeaſe God's anger, or procure them ſome advantage? They did not therefore believe, as Joſephus will have it, that God does not concern himſelf with puniſhing evil. Saldenus is in the wrong to find fault with Voſſius, becauſe he juſtifies them on that head. 'Ex 'philoſophis gentium hanc Saducæorum opinionem '*(animam non eſſe immortalem)* amplexi ſunt Epicurei; 'imo longe deteriorem. Nam Saducæi agnoſcebant 'Deum curare res humanas, quippe eum bonis bene 'facere in hac vita. Epicurei autem in totum tolle'bant providentiam divinam (20). - - - - *Among the 'heathen Philoſophers the Epicureans embraced this opi'nion of the Sadducees, touching the* immortality of the 'ſoul, *or rather a much worſe. For the Sadducees al'lowed that* GOD *concerned himſelf with human af'fairs, ſeeing that he rewarded good men in this life. 'But the Epicureans altogether denied the Divine Provi'dence.*' I cannot tell, ſays Saldenus (21), what could move the great Voſſius to do that honour to ſuch an infamous ſect; for having conſulted ſeveral authors, who have writ books concerning the ſects of the Hebrews, I find every where that the Sadducees are plainly charged with rejecting the doctrine of Providence. Among ſeveral teſtimonies I ſhall only chuſe that of Joſephus, and then he cites what is to be found in the ninth chapter of the thirteenth book of the Jewiſh Antiquities, concerning the opinion of the Sadducees about Predeſtination and Free-will. He had better have choſen the paſſage I have quoted in the beginning of this remark; for it does not by any means follow becauſe a man rejects the fatality of Predeſtination, and teaches that men are entirely free to do good or evil, that he denies a Providence. The Pelagians, the Socinians, in a word, thoſe who have writ with the greateſt vehemency againſt the neceſſity of human actions, maintain at the ſame time that God governs the world, that he puniſhes vice, and rewards virtue. It is to be obſerved that Grotius thinks that the Greek text of Joſephus, which I have quoted, is not correct.

[*D*] *I ſhall examine what has been ſaid of the immorality of the Sadducees.*] Mr Willemer charges them with cruelty (22), and to prove it he ſays, that they induced King John Hircanus (23) to perſecute the Phariſees violently. He refers us to the eighteenth chapter of the thirteenth book of the Jewiſh Antiquities. I have conſulted that paſſage, wherein I find only what follows. Hircanus, a diſciple of the Phariſees, and very well beloved by them, entirely loſt their friendſhip. They conceived a great hatred againſt him, and becauſe, upon a certain occaſion, they gave him great reaſon to be angry with them, he forſook their ſect, and embraced that of the Sadducees at the inſtigation of Jonathan, his favourite. He aboliſhed the ordinances of the Phariſees, and ſeverely puniſhed thoſe who obſerved them. At laſt, he put an end to the ſedition, which thoſe two ſects had raiſed, and ſpent the remaining part of his life *in peace and felicity*. Mr Willemer adds, that Alexander Janneus, being flattered and inſtigated by the Sadducees, was more cruel than his father Hircanus, and that having extricated himſelf out of a thouſand difficulties in which he had been entangled by the Jews, he cauſed 800 of the chief men among the Phariſees to be crucified, and that before they expired, he ordered their wives and children to be murdered in their ſight. During thoſe executions he gave a grand entertainment to his concubines, and to the chief men among the Sadducees. This author refers us to the twenty-ſecond chapter of the thirteenth book of the Jewiſh Antiquities, where I do not find that the Sadducees are mentioned in the leaſt. As for the author of the *Cabbala Hiſtorica* quoted by him, I have not been able to conſult him; but tho' he ſhould ſay what Mr Willemer alledges out of his book, can we believe him? Can the teſtimony of a man, who lived at ſo great a diſtance from thoſe times, be valid in oppoſition to

---

(*i*) Joſ. Antiq. *lib. xviii, cap. ii.*

(*k*) *Id.* Antiq. *lib. xiii, cap. xviii.*

(*l*) *Id.* Antiq. *lib. xx, cap. vii. See the remark* [*D*].

(*m*) *Id.* de Bello Jud. *ibid.*

(*n*) *Id.* Antiq. *lib xviii, cap. ii.*

(*o*) Mat. xxii. 23. Mark xii. 18. Luke xx. 27. Acts xxiii. 8.

(11) Maimonid. Comment. in Pirke Avoth, *cap. i, fol.* 25. *apud* Willemer. *ibid.*

(12) R. Aſarias Idumæus, *apud eund. pag.* 7.

(13) R. Gedalias Ben Jechaja, *apud eund. ibid.*

(14) R. Aſarias, R. Manaſſe Ben Iſrael, *lib. i.* de Reſurrect. Mort. *cap. vi*, Fullerus, *lib. ii.* Miſcellan. Sacror. *cap. iii*, *apud eund. ibid.*

(15) *See* Waltherus, Centur. Miſcell. Theol. *pag.* 479.

(16) Joſeph. de Bello Jud. *lib. ii*, *cap. vii. ſub fin. pag. m.* 788.

(17) In the remark [*E*].

(18) Mat. iii, 7.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Voſſius, de Orig. & Progr. Idolol. *lib. i, cap. x, pag. m.* 72.

(21) Quid tanto apud Magnum virum favore propudioſum hoc hominum genus dignum fecerit, fateor me ignorare. *Salden. Otia Theolog. p.* 559.

(22) Willemer. ubi ſupra, *p.* 44.

(23) So he ſtyles him, *Johanni Hyrcano Regi autores fuerunt.* But Joſephus, Ant. *lib. xiii, cap. xix.* ſays, that Ariſtobulus, the ſon of this Hircanus, was the firſt who aſſumed the title of king.

can be given of it. It would be leſs ſurpriſing that they ſhould have been good men than

the ſilence of Joſephus. The German author goes on thus. At laſt queen Alexandra, by her huſband's advice, and with the aſſiſtance of the Phariſees, undertook to reſtrain the turbulent ſpirit of the Sadducees by ſeverities, but could not reduce them to reaſon, nor prevent the new broils which they occaſioned in the ſtate between Hircanus and Ariſtobulus; and when Herod had rid himſelf of thoſe two princes, the Sadducees made uſe of their intereſt with him to commit all manner of crimes (24). Joſephus, in the ſeventeenth chapter of the ſixteenth book of the Jewiſh Antiquities, is of opinion that Herod was moved by the counſels of the Sadducees, and their impious doctrine, concerning the fatal neceſſity of all things, to the barbarous cruelty he was guilty of in cauſing his ſons to be ſtrangled, and three hundred captains to be ſtoned to death. This is Mr Willemer's account, and thence he concludes, that it has been truly ſaid that the Sadduces were very immoral men, that they were Epicurean ſwine, and very pernicious heretics. *Ex vero igitur dictum eſt, Sadducæos fuiſſe moribus peſſimis, & Epicuri de grege porcos: ita quâ doctrinam pernicioſos omnino hæreticos* (25). But it is certain, he draws this conſequence wrong; for, 1. The matters of fact on which he builds are not to be found in Joſephus, the author he alledges to prove them: 2. Tho' they were true, it would not follow from thence that the Sadduces wallowed in ſenſual pleaſures as thoſe do who are called *Epicuri de grege porci*. All that could be proved from thence, is, that they made an ill uſe of their intereſt with princes to oppreſs the Phariſees, of whom they had great reaſon to be afraid, ſince that ſect was animated with a ſuperſtitious zeal, and ſupported by the populace. I confeſs that ſuch a conduct is unjuſt; but the like is to be ſeen in all parties, or in all factions of ſtate or religion. Thoſe who teach the doctrine of future rewards and puniſhments, have not been leſs careful to take hold of favourable opportunities in order to oppreſs their rivals. They are generally ſevere and cruel in their counſels; and therefore there would be nothing ſingular, nor any character of diſtinction in the proceedings of the Sadducees, tho' the matters of fact mentioned by the German writer were true. What will he ſay then, if I ſhew that they are falſe or uncertain? Which is not difficult to do.

It is certain that the Jewiſh Hiſtorian makes no more mention of the Sadducees than of the Great Mogul, in the chapter, where he tells us how Herod cauſed his ſons and the three hundred captains to be put to death. He would have made himſelf extreamly ridiculous, if he had ſaid that the doctrine of thoſe men, concerning the fatality of all things, moved Herod to ſuch cruelty (26); for it was notorious that they entirely rejected the doctrine of Predeſtination, and whenever he mentions them, he obſerves, that, according to their principles, a man's fate depends wholly upon his free-will. I do not deny that Joſippus ſays, that the Sadducees occaſioned the inſurrection of the Jews againſt Alexander Janneus, and the cruelty of that prince towards that people, becauſe they adviſed him to perſecute the Phariſees and their adherents (27); but the teſtimony of ſuch an author (28) is very inconſiderable, eſpecially when we may oppoſe againſt it the ſilence of ſuch an Hiſtorian as Joſephus, who never ſhews the leaſt partiality to the Sadducees. Rabbi Abraham of Salamanca is too modern a writer to give any weight to facts otherwiſe uncertain; and therefore we are not obliged to believe upon his word, what he ſays of the immorality of thoſe heretics (29). Once more; if they had been in general diſreſpected for their debaucheries and wicked actions, it is ſcarcely poſſible that Joſephus, who ſpeaks of them ſo often, would have been wholly ſilent on that head, and that the only thing mentioned by him concerning their morals ſhould ſtrongly incline us to believe that they did not live a ſenſual life. He ſays that they were men of a clowniſh and rough converſation, who ſhewed no more civility to their friends than to ſtrangers. Σαδδουκαίων δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὸ ἦθος ἀγριώτερον, αἵ τε ἐπιμιξίαι πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοίους ἀπηνεῖς ὡς πρὸς ἀλλοτρίους. *Sadducæi vero & inter ſe feris moribus diſcrepantes, & converſatio eorum circa exteros inhumana* (30). This is not the character of voluptuous men; for, on the contrary, they are very complaiſant one to another, their whole ſtudy is to multiply the ſweets of their converſation, and they baniſh every thing that diminiſheth the pleaſures of it. Mr Willemer (31) lays a great ſtreſs upon St John the Baptiſt's calling the Sadducees a *generation of vipers* (32). He runs back to the firſt ſerpent, that ſeduced Eve. Let him ſay what he pleaſes: I need only anſwer him, that the Phariſees were called ſo as well as they; and therefore if any thing be concluded from it concerning the immoral lives of thoſe, who denied the immortality of the ſoul, it will no leſs affect thoſe who believed future rewards and puniſhments. The ſame may be ſaid of the leaven, which our Saviour would have his diſciples to beware of (33). The Phariſees are as much concerned in it as the Sadducees.

Obſerve, that it is the opinion of many authors, that the Sadducees called themſelves ſo from a word, which ſignifies *juſtice*, or *righteouſneſs*. Ἐπονομάζουσι δὲ οὗτοι ἑαυτοὺς Σαδδουκαίους, δῆθεν ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ὁρμωμένης. Σεδὲκ γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται δικαιοσύνη. *Sadducæos ſe à juſtitia nominant. Sedek enim juſtitiam ſignificat* (34). Thoſe who approve this etymology, obſerve that theſe Heretics were called Sadducees, becauſe they were ambitious of being accounted juſt or upright men, and others beſtowed that encomium upon them (35). Mr Willemer cites (36) for this opinion Iſidorus, Beatus Rhenanus, Bernard de Breitenbach, and Dr Richard Montague. He ſays it is diſputed from what ſort of juſtice thoſe ſectaries were denominated. It was according to St Jerom, inherent juſtice or righteouſneſs; for they pretended to have acquired it perfectly by the obſervation of the law. Several approve this opinion of St Jerom. *D. Hieronymus* in Matthæum XXII. Tom. VI. Oper. *allegat propriam inhærentem juſtitiam, de cujus perfectione, ex lege à ſe obſervata, fuerint gloriati. Sequuntur eum multi Patrum, plurimique Scholaſticorum ut & Mathias Flacius* Part I. Clav. Script. pag. 1064. *Georgius Fabritius* Hiſtor. Sacr. lib. X. num. 432. pag. 584. *Atque Gregor.* Lex. S. pag. 236 (37). Others will have it to be diſtributive juſtice, and they are again divided; for ſome ſay it is that which conſiſts in rewarding; and others, that which conſiſts in puniſhing. The former pretend, that, according to the Sadducees, juſtice is adminiſtred wholly in this world; good men are rewarded, and wicked men puniſhed here, and nothing remains to be done after this life. The latter ſay, that thoſe Heretics were very ſevere in the adminiſtration of juſtice, and that they were called Sadducees upon that account. *Non nemo . . . . . ob remunerativam juſtitiam eos juſtos appellatos ſtatuit,* quod exiſtmarint in hac vita omnem compleri juſtitiam, h. e. juſtis bene fieri, malis evenire mala, mortuo autem homine nullam ſupereſſe judicium juſtitiæ. *Punitivam vero juſtitiam eligit Nicolaus de Lyra* Comment. in Act. V. *ita inquiens:* Dicuntur Sadducæi à Sadech, quod eſt juſtitia in Hebræo: nam Sadducæi inter alios Judæos erant in judiciis & punitionibus acerrimi, ut dicitur in Scholaſtica Hiſtoria (38), propterea ſibi nomen juſtitiæ uſurpabant (39). If the facts on which this etymology is grounded, be true, there is no room to doubt but that the ſect of the Sadducees valued themſelves on all the outward appearances of good morality, and by conſequence carefully avoided a looſe life. Be it as it will, we have here many authors, who muſt needs believe that they were regular men. There are therefore at worſt authorities againſt authorities: and after what has been ſaid, it will be no difficult matter to judge which of them are beſt. Note, that one may eaſily ſuppoſe that the Sadducees were very ſtrict adminiſtrators of juſtice; for ſince they did not believe that a malefactor would be puniſhed after this life, it was natural for them to think that he was to be condemned to a very ſevere puniſhment in this world.

LLOYD criticiſed.

I muſt take notice of ſome faults of Mr Lloyd. I think he is miſtaken, when he ſays, 1. That what Joſephus tells us of their auſtere humour, ought to be underſtood of the ſevere ſentences which they pronounced in adminiſtring juſtice. 2. That, according to the ſame Hiſtorian, the Jews hated them by reaſon of that ſeverity, and were more inclined to the Phariſees, who were naturally mild in inflicting puniſhments. *Erant enim in maleficos acerbiores; in judiciis, & pœnarum mulctis exactores rigidi, quemadmodum ex*

(24) Redigere tamen in ordinem & impedi~~re non~~ poterat novas, quas excitabant in Republica turbas inter Hyrcanum & Ariſtobulum fratres. Quibus è medio ſublatis, favore Herodis M. quo potiſſimum nitebantur ad turpia quævis facinora ſunt abuſi. Willemer, *ibid.*

(25) Id. ibid. *pag.* 45.

(26) Ipſe Herodes M. ad immanem ſævitiam . . . . . peſſimis Sadducæorum conſiliis ac impia doctrina de neceſſitate omnium fatali impulſus creditur Joſepho *lib. xvi, A. J. cap. xvii, pag.* 465. *Id. ib. pag.* 44.

(27) See the marginal note of Genebrard upon the twenty-firſt chapter of the thirteenth book of Joſephus, *fol. m.* 464. *verſo.*

(28) *See in* Voſſius de Hiſtor. Græcis, *lib. ii, cap. viii. p.* 197. what a contemptible writer he is.

(29) Sadducæi fuerunt improbi peſſimiſque moribus præditi. R. Abraham Salmanticenſis apud Willemer. *p.* 44.

(30) Joſeph. de Bello Jud. *lib. ii, cap. vii, ſub fin. p. m.* 788, 789.

(31) Willemer, *pag.* 17.

(32) Mat. iii. 7.

(33) Id. xvi. 6.

(34) Epiphan. Hæreſ. 14. *pag. m.* 31.

(35) Eo quod juſtitiæ laudem tum ipſi appeterent, tum alii iis tribuerent. *Willemerus, pag.* 5.

(36) Idem. *p.* 6.

(37) Id. ibid.

(38) Joſephus ſhould have been quoted. See below citat. (41).

(39) Willemer, ubi ſupra, *p.* 6.

than that a follower of Epicurus ſhould have been wiſe and virtuous; for that part of religion, which they retained, might influence their lives by the motives of hope and fear [*E*]. However one may very well wonder that they were not excommunicated [*F*], and

Hiſt. Scholaſtica citat Barradius, non diſſentiente Joſepho. Huc enim referimus illius illud elogium, quo moroſos, difficiles, omnino intractabiles pronunciat : adeo ut ab illorum moribus durioribus abhorreret populus, & ad Phariſæos potius propenderent ; qui φύσει, *quod ille dixit,* ἐπιεικεις ϖρὸς τὰς κολάσεις *eſſent* (40). I obſerve on the firſt head, that the deſcription of the auſtere manners of the Sadducees is improperly alledged. Joſephus does not conſider them in that place as judges. He ought to have quoted what he obſerves in the eighth chapter of the twentieth book of the Jewiſh Antiquities (41). From thence Barradius, Nicolas de Lyra, and ſeveral others, ought to have taken their proofs, and not from the *Hiſtoria Scholaſtica*. As to the ſecond, I ſay, that Mr Lloyd could not be blamed, if he had ſpoken his own thoughts ; but he aſcribes to Joſephus a connexion of matters, a reaſoning, or a propoſition, termed *cauſal*, which is not to be found in his books. A propoſition of that kind is ſometimes falſe, tho' it's parts, conſidered by themſelves, be true, for this is not ſufficient : the particle whereby they are connected together, ought not to infer a falſity (42). Mr Lloyd did not conſider this. Many authors are guilty of the ſame neglect.

[*E*] *That part of religion which they retained, might influence their lives by the motives of hope and fear.*] All things duly conſidered, I do not think that I ought to retract what I have ſaid in another book (43) : 'There was a ſect among the Jews, which openly denied the immortality of the ſoul, *viz.* the Sadducees. I do not find that notwithſtanding ſo deteſtable an opinion, they were worſe livers than the other Jews ; on the contrary, it is very likely they were more honeſt men than the Phariſees, who valued themſelves ſo much on their punctual obſervation of the law of GOD.' I muſt only add a ſhort obſervation to that paſſage, *viz.* that the good life of the Sadducees might have proceeded from the doctrine of a Providence ; for it is thought they believed that GOD puniſhes men in this world for their wicked actions, and rewards their virtue. See below the remark [G] (44). This opinion may very probably ſerve for a curb and a ſpur : it may induce men to the practice of virtue, in hopes of worldly happineſs, and deter them from evil through the fear of temporal puniſhments. Nay, it may ſeem to be a more powerful motive than the other doctrine, becauſe good and evil, when preſent, or near at hand, make a much greater impreſſion, tho' they be inconſiderable, than good or evil, tho' ever ſo great, that are viewed only at a great diſtance. This is what may be ſaid by thoſe, who examine the thing ſuperficially ; but thoſe who go to the bottom of it, judge otherwiſe. They believe that, generally ſpeaking, the true and principal power of religion, with reſpect to virtue, conſiſts in the perſuaſion of eternal rewards and puniſhments ; and that thoſe who deny the immortality of the ſoul, break the beſt ſprings of religion. This thought may be confirmed by two remarks : One is, that it is hardly poſſible to perſuade people that they ſhall proſper upon earth if they live a good life, and that they ſhall be unhappy if they live an ill one. Every body thinks he ſees daily a thouſand inſtances of the contrary ; and where are the Divines eloquent enough to perſuade people of a thing, which they fancy is contradicted by continual experience ? They may, indeed, tell us, in anſwer to our objections, that we know but little wherein true proſperity and true adverſity conſiſt (45), and that wicked men are ſufficiently puniſhed by the remorſes of their conſcience in the midſt of their wealth and glory (46), whilſt an honeſt man is ſufficiently rewarded by the ſole poſſeſſion of virtue and the teſtimony of a good conſcience (47). They will tell us a thouſand fine things upon this ſubject, and form in us a kind of perſuaſion; but they will ſtrike no durable impreſſion upon us, it will only be an intermitting faith, and they will always have reaſon to fear that, in our bad intervals, we ſhall be apt to call them falſe Doctors, and reproach them as Brutus did virtue (48). If you object to me that there is a certain impreſſion in the minds of men, which frequently rouſes itſelf, is very active, and perſuades us, contrary to experience, that piety is attended with temporal bleſſings, and that the tranſgreſſion of the law of GOD will be puniſhed in this world : I ſay, if you make this objection, I anſwer, that the Orthodox will feel the activity of that impreſſion as well as the Sadducees, and that being moreover perſuaded of a future ſtate, religion will have a greater influence upon their lives. This is my ſecond obſervation.

To conclude, I ſay it cannot be denied that if a man is fully perſuaded that the divine juſtice diſtributes rewards and puniſhments only in this life, and that our deſtiny is wholly limited to that, he may abſtain from evil, and practiſe virtue out of a religious motive. But then it muſt be ſaid, that there is ſo little probability that ſuch an opinion ſhould overcome the depravation of our nature, that it may well be affirmed that the Sadducees deſtroyed the true foundations of religion, and that the good life of a Sadducee may be looked upon as a kind of inſtance of the conjunction of moral honeſty with impiety. Mr Willemer will grant it, for he ſays that a Sadducee not believing the immortality of the ſoul could not be a good man. 'Qui vero à turpiſſimis quibuſque vitiis graviſſimiſque ſceleribus temperarent ſibi, qui per negatam animæ immortalitatem arctiſſime conjuncta huic dogmata corporum *reſurrectionem*, omnium *dijudicationem*, ſempiternam bonorum *glorificationem*, ac improborum *condemnationem* affirmare non poterant, ſed pertinaciter inficiabantur (49). - - - *But how could they refrain from the moſt abominable vices and the greateſt of crimes, who in denying the immortality of the ſoul, could not affirm, but obſtinately rejected the doctrines which had the ſtricteſt connexion with it,* viz. *the reſurrection of the body ; a future judgment, the eternal glorification of the good, and the condemnation of the wicked.*' The author of theſe Latin words brings for proof of a fact a reaſon of right which will not always hold, becauſe men do not uſe to live according to their principles. In general, when the queſtion is about a matter of fact, experience ought to be conſulted much rather than ſpeculative reaſoning. Obſerve well theſe words of Moreri, which he had from Mr Godeau (50) : *It is true that if the Sadducees were more impious than the Phariſees in their doctrine, they were not however ſo vain and ſo great hypocrites in their morals, nor did they appear ſo cruel enemies to* JESUS CHRIST. You will find the ſame obſervation in Hofman's Dictionary.

[*F*] *One may very well wonder that they were not excommunicated.*] I begin this remark with a paſſage, that contains an obſervation of Lucas Brugenſis. '*Mirum igitur videri queat quî uti ſcribit Lucas Brugenſis* annotation. in Matth. iii. ver. 7. quanquam errarent Sadducæi, & quidem graviter ; nunquam tamen à veteri Synagoga declarati ſint hæretici, h. e. deſertores fidei, aut legis à DEO traditæ, vel ut populi ſeductores, Synagogæ communione ejecti quemadmodum Samaritani, Joh. iv. 9. Imo promiſcue verſabantur etiam ipſi Phariſæi & Sacerdotes cum Sadducæis tam in ſacris quam prophanis locis, Acts iv. 1. c. xxiii. 6. & communia non raro inibant conſilia adverſus Chriſtum ejuſque diſcipulos, Matth. xvi. ver. 1. Actor. v. 1. Denique licebat cuivis, utri vellet parti adhærere. *Verum id tribuendum corruptiſſimis ſeculi illius moribus* (51). - - - *It may therefore be wondered, as Lucas Brugenſis obſerves, how it came to paſs that notwithſtanding the Sadducees held erroneous opinions, and theſe too of a very heinous nature, yet they were never by the antient ſynagogue pronounced Heretics, that is deſerters of the Faith, and the law delivered by GOD, nor expelled the ſynagogue, like the Samaritans, as ſeducers of the people. Nay the Phariſees and prieſts themſelves converſed promiſcuouſly with them both in ſacred and profane places, and they often joined in council againſt Chriſt and his diſciples. In ſhort, it was lawful for every one to ſide with which party he pleaſed. But that is to be attributed to the great corruption of thoſe times.*' It muſt be owned, that it was an exceſſive toleration ; for the errors of the Sadducees did not conſiſt in indifferent things, but concerned the moſt eſſential doctrines of religion : the modern writers for a toleration, do not deſire and that they made but one body of religion with the reſt of the Jews, as the Janſeniſts and Moliniſts do now with the other Chriſtians of the Romiſh communion. The Sadducees do not appear under that name in the Talmud, but only under the notion of Heretics and Epicureans (*p*). It is ſaid, but with very little reaſon, that they admitted only the five books of Moſes [*G*], and that therefore Christ in diſputing with them cited only the Pentateuch (*q*). Arnobius is the only author who informs us that according to

---

(40) Nicolaus Lloydius, in Diction. Hiſtor. & Poëtico. *Voce* Sadducæi.

(41) Αἵρεσιν μετήει τὴν Σαδδȣκαίων οἵπέρ εἰσι περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὠμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τȣ̀ς Ἰȣδαίȣς. *Secta Sadducæus, quod hominum genus apud Judæos in judicando eſt ſeveriſſimum.* Joſeph. Antiq. *lib. xx. ch. viii. p.m.* 698.

(42) *See* l'Art de penſer, *Part. ii, ch. ix, p. m.* 176.

(43) Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, *p.* 536.

(44) Citat. (72), (74).

(45) Neque mala vel bona, quæ vulgus putet : multos qui conflictari adverſis videantur, beatos ; ac pleroſque quamquam magnas per opes, miſerrimos : ſi illi gravem fortunam conſtanter tolerent, hi proſpera inconſulte utantur. - - - - *Neither are theſe things good or evil which the vulgar thinks ſo : for many that ſeem to be in adverſity are nevertheleſs truly happy, becauſe they bear their ill fortune courageouſly ; and moſt of thoſe that wallow in riches are extremely miſerable, becauſe they make a bad uſe of their proſperity.* Tacit. Ann. lib. vi, cap. xxii.

(46) Neque fruſtra præſtantiſſimus ſapientiæ firmare ſolitus eſt, ſi recludantur tyrannorum mentes, poſſe aſpici laniatus & ictus ; quando ut corpora verberibus, ita ſævitia, libidine, malis conſultis, animus dilaceretur. - - - - *Neither was it without reaſon that the wiſeſt of the antient Philoſophers uſed to ſay, that if we could ſee into the hearts of tyrants, we might there diſcover incurable wounds and and ſores : for in the ſame manner as bodies are torn with ſtripes, their minds are ſcourged with remorſe for their cruelty, their luſts, and vicious practices.* Id. ib. *cap. vi.*

(47) Ipſa quidem virtus pretium ſibi, ſolaque late &c. - - - - *But virtue is alone her own reward, &c.* Claudian. de Conſul. Mallii, init.

(48) Citation (5) of the article BRUTUS (Marcus Junius.)

(49) Willemer, ubi ſupra, *p.* 41.

(50) Godeau, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *Tom. i, pag.* 126, *of the Paris Edition in folio,* 1674.

(51) Willemer, *ibid. p.* 14, 15.

deſire it ſhould be ſo comprehenſive as that of the Jews was at that time; they do not deſire an eccleſiaſtical toleration for all ſects, but are contented with a civil and political one. We have ſeen that Mr Willemer aſcribes the toleration of the ſynagogue in favour of the Sadducees to the corruption of thoſe times. He gives other reaſons for it, and particularly the care thoſe Heretics took to comply in all things with the public worſhip: ‘ Magnopere impediebat ejectionem promeritam favor Magnatum plane ſingularis ‘ erga Sadducæos. Adjuvabat ingens Sadducæorum, ‘ quæ invaluerat, potentia, ac ingenioſa qua abominandam hæreſim tegebant, aſtutia: crebra item ſacrificia, atque reliqua Levitici cultus onera, quæ pro ‘ ſalute populi ſe ſuſcipere gloriabantur (52). - - - - - ‘ *What chiefly prevented the deſerved expulſion of the* ‘ *Sadducees was the extraordinary favour of the great* ‘ *men towards them. To which may be added, the great* ‘ *power the Sadducees had gained, and their ſubtilty in* ‘ *gloſſing over their abominable Hereſy; as alſo their* ‘ *frequent ſacrifices, and their complying with the other* ‘ *injunctions of the Levitical law, which they pretended* ‘ *to do for the good of the people.*’ It is certain that the moſt enormous diverſity of opinions as to ſpeculative doctrines of religion, is more tolerated than the leaſt diſpute about the public worſhip. Be careful to practiſe all the outward duties preſcribed by the prevailing religion; and notwithſtanding you may hold capital Hereſies you will be leſs moleſted than if you ſhould oppoſe the outward worſhip without being guilty of thoſe Hereſies.

I muſt obſerve that a Reformed Divine, who is now become a great oppoſer of Toleration (53), had before confuted thoſe, who ſay that Heretics ought to be puniſhed with death, among other reaſons, by alledging our Saviour's conduct towards the Sadducees. He obſerved that Jesus Christ *dealt with them with great clemency*, and did not blame the magiſtrates who tolerated them. See the *Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes* in the 185th article.

[*G*] *It is ſaid, but with very little reaſon, that they admitted only the five books of Moſes.*] Tertullian ſays they followed the hereſy of Doſitheus, who rejected the prophets; and that beſides, they were ſo impious as to deny the reſurrection. *Taceo . . . . Doſitheum, qui primus auſus eſt prophetas quaſi non in Spiritu Sancto locutos repudiare. Taceo Sadducæos qui ex hujus erroris radice ſurgentes, auſi ſunt ad hanc hæreſim etiam reſurrectionem carnis negare* (54). Origen(55), St Jerom (56), and a vaſt number of other writers ſay the ſame; I mean, that the Sadducees acknowledged no other books to be canonical beſides the Pentateuch. I have alſo advanced the ſame opinion in another work (57); but now I confeſs that it does not ſeem to me wellgrounded. There is a negative argument againſt it, which appears to me very good. The Holy Scripture, ſpeaking of the Sadducees, and their errors, never ſays that they rejected the prophets. I confeſs this ſilence is not a convincing reaſon; but what ſhall we ſay of Joſephus, who does not impute to them any ſuch rejection? It is impoſſible to conceive that he would have omitted ſuch a remarkable and important article, even when he obſerves that this ſect rejected traditions. What makes the argument yet ſtronger is, that he not only ſays nothing of their rejecting any part of the Scripture, in a place where he could not have been ſilent about it; but poſitively affirms, that when they denied the authority of unwritten traditions, they gave this reaſon for it, *Nothing ought to be accounted lawful but what is written.* Ἐκεῖνα δεῖν ἡγεῖσθαι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα: τὰ δ' ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων μὴ τηρεῖν. *Oportere eas tantum ſervari quæ ſcripto continentur* (58). Can an Hiſtorian ſpeak thus of a ſect, that rejects the greateſt part of the Scripture, without being a mad-man? I know that a caviller may ſay (59), that Joſephus's words concern only the written laws, and conſequently the Pentateuch; but I know alſo that this Hiſtorian could not have forbore mentioning in that place the contempt, which it is ſaid thoſe Heretics had for the other books of the Scripture. Mr Simon is poſitively againſt thoſe, who affirm that they acknowledged no other books to be canonical beſides the Pentateuch, and alledges the teſtimony of Joſephus. *That ſect*, ſays he (60), *retained the whole body of the Scripture, according to Joſephus, who affirms that the Sadducees received* πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα (61), all the Scripture, *and only rejected the traditions; and therefore they are miſtaken, who believe that the Sadducees retained only the five books of Moſes in imitation of the Samaritans.* There are many paſſages in the Babylonian Talmud, and in the writings of the Rabbins (62), whereby it appears that the Sadducees acknowledged the Hagiographa, and the prophetical books of the Scripture to be divine, and only deſpiſed the explications of their Doctors. Some think that the Samaritans have been confounded with the Sadducees, and take that to be the reaſon why ſeveral writers fancied that the latter as well as the former rejected all the books of the Scripture beſides the Pentateuch (63). But it is certain that theſe two ſects ought to be diſtinguiſhed; for the Jews had no communication with the Samaritans, and at the ſame time maintained Eccleſiaſtical communion with the Sadducees. Nay, ſometimes a Sadducee was their High-prieſt (64), and it is not improbable that the High-prieſt Caiaphas was of that ſect (65).

It would be a wrong way of reaſoning to urge, that the Sadducees choſe ſuch books of the Scripture as did not formally contradict their errors; that they acknowledged theſe to be canonical, and rejected the reſt, becauſe they found there plainly aſſerted the immortality of the ſoul, and the doctrine of the reſurrection, and that their idleneſs made them pitch upon this ſhort way of diſputing. *Sadducæi compendio ſtudentes & otio, immo etiam ut effugerent plurium confutationes abjectis & abolitis omnibus prophetarum libris ſolos quinque Moſis receperunt* (66). I ſay that ſuch an argument is fallacious: matters of fact ought to be proved by arguments grounded upon facts, and not by probabilities ſupported by ſpeculative reaſons. Beſides, we do not want ſuch reaſons; for men may ſo eaſily invent ſubterfuges, gloſſes, and diſtinctions, that they need not reject the authenticity of a book, to anſwer the arguments alledged againſt them out of it. Do not the Socinians profeſs to acknowledge all the New Teſtament, and yet it contains more paſſages againſt their errors than the Old Teſtament againſt thoſe of the Sadducees? Nay, what is more ſurpriſing, many Chriſtians, who ſtill acknowledge the truth of the holy Scripture, laugh at Magic, and maintain that the Devils have no power (67). I muſt obſerve that a modern Rabbi queſtions the truth of what is ſaid in the Scripture, that the Sadducees did not believe any ſpirits. It would follow from thence, ſays he, that they rejected the Pentateuch, which makes mention of angels in ſeveral places. *De eo quod Sadducæi dicantur* (Acts xxiii. 8.) *negaſſe ſpiritus, non diſputo. Sane ut multi putant ſic ſequeretur eos negaſſe legem Moſaïcam quæ variis in locis angelorum mentionem facit* (68). He argues wrong: The Sadducees made uſe of diſtinctions in order to elude the force of thoſe paſſages. See Willemer (69), and the writers quoted by him, and particularly Grotius (70). Conſult alſo Voſſius (71), whom he does not quote. What is certain is, that they practiſed the rites of the Jews, and profeſſed to hope that therefore God would beſtow upon them, the favours he has promiſed to thoſe who obſerve his law, and that they ſhould avoid the curſes wherewith the trangreſſors were threatened. *Promiſſionibus legis inhiabant, eoque nomine DEUM ſibi ſacrificiis, precibus, jejuniis, aliiſque cultus Levitici ceremoniis placare conabantur, ne iratum Numen promiſſiones ampliſſimas à populo tolleret* (72). The author of theſe Latin words ſhews againſt Dr Lightfoot, that the paſſage of Malachi (73) cannot be applied to that ſect, ſince they never believed that the law was to be deſpiſed, nor that the obſevation of it was inſignificant. ‘ Neque Sadducæorum doctrinæ & moribus convenit locus ‘ Malach.

(*p*) Marſham, Chronic. Can. Ægypt. §. *ix*, *pag. m.* 159.

(*q*) Matthew, Mark and Luke, ubi ſupra, citation (*o*).

(52) Id. ibid. *pag.* 15.

(53) Jurieu, Apolog. pour la Reformation, *Tom. ii*, *p.* 254, *Edit. in 4to.*

(54) Tertullian. de Preſcript. adverſ. Hæret. *cap. xlv.*

(55) Origenes, Tractat. xxi, in Matth.

(56) Hieronym. in Matth. *cap. xxii.*

(57) *In the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, *p.* 580.

(58) Joſeph Antiq. *lib. xiii*, *cap. xviii*, *pag.* 454.

(59) Serarius and Petavius will have it ſo. See Petavius's Notes in Epiphan. ad Hæreſ. 14. *pag.* 28.

(60) Simon, Hiſt. Critique du Vieux Teſtament, *book i*, *ch. xvi*, *p. m.* 93.

(61) I think Mr Simon would have much ado to find thoſe Greek words in Joſephus.

(62) See the Diſſertation of John Helvicus Willemer, *p.* 33, 34.

(63) See the ſame Diſſertation, *pag.* 10, 11.

(64) *See* Joſephus Antiq. *lib. xx*, *cap. vii.*

(65) See the 5th chapter of the Acts of the Apoſtles, *ver.* 17.

(66) Centur. Magdeburg. *Cent. I*, *lib. i*, *cap. v.*

(67) Mr Becker, a miniſter of Amſterdam maintained this doctrine with great heat in ſome books written in the vulgar tongue. He was depoſed upon that account. He pretended to ſay nothing contrary to the Scripture.

(68) Manaſſeh Ben Iſrael, *lib. i.* de Reſurrect. mortuor. *cap. vi*, *pag.* 43. *apud* Willemerum, ubi ſupra, *p.* 38.

(69) Willem. *pag.* 38, 39.

(70) Grotius in Matth. *cap. xxii. ver.* 23.

(71) Voſſius, de orig. & prog. Idol. *lib. i*, *cap. vi.*

(72) Willemer. *pag.* 41.

(73) Ye have ſaid, it is vain to ſerve God: and what profit is it, that we have kept his ordinance, and that we have walked mournfully before the Lord of Hoſts? *Malachi* chap. iii. ver. 14.

to ſome they aſcribed an organized body to God. He relates this in a manner that is ſomewhat liable to cenſure [*H*].

‘ Malach. III. v. 14. nunquam enim profeſſi ſunt Sadducæi, legem Dei non eſſe obſervandam, aut obſervantiam legis eſſe fruſtraneam. Contrarium docet ipſe Lightfoot *Hor. Hebr. in Act. Apoſt. p.* 122. *quænam*, inquiens, *religio Sadducæi? Orat, jejunat, ſacrificat*, obſervat legem, & *tamen non expectat reſurrectionem aut vitam æternam. Quorſum hæc religio?* Ut obtineat *ſcilicet* bona temporalia quorum *ſolum* promiſſionem *obſervat ille* factam in lege *nihil rimans ultra literam* (74). - - - *Neither can this paſſage of Malachi be applied to the doctrine and manners of the Sadducees; for they never profeſſed that the law of GOD was not to be obſerved, or that the obſervation thereof was inſignificant; Dr Lightfoot himſelf teaches the contrary, when he ſays,* What kind of a religion is that of a Sadducee? He prays, faſts, ſacrifices, *obſerves the law*, at the ſame time that he does not look for a reſurrection, nor eternal life. Why all this religion? *To the end*, forſooth, *that he may obtain temporal bleſſings, which* alone he obſerves *to be promiſed in the law*; and he ſeeks no farther than the literal ſignification.’ Note, That the paſſage of Malachi might be admirably well applied to ſome Sadducees, who, had they been guided by experience, would have detected the falſity of the maxims which their Doctors taught them.

[*H*] *According to ſome they aſcribed an organized body to GOD. Arnobius relates this in a manner that is ſomewhat liable to cenſure.*] Conſider well his words. ‘ Neque quiſquam Judaïcas in hoc loco nobis opponat & Sadducæi generis fabulas tanquam formas tribuant atque os Deo. Hoc enim putatur in eorum literis dici, & ut vel re certa, atque auctoritate firmari: quæ aut nihil ad nos attinent, nec ex aliqua portione quicquam habent commune nobiſcum: aut ſi ſunt, ut creditur, ſociæ, quærendi ſunt vobis altioris intelligentiæ doctores, per quos poſſitis addiſcere, quibus modis conveniat literarum illarum nubes, atque involucra relaxare (75). - - - *Let no man oppoſe to us here the fables of the Jews and Sadducees, as if they aſcribed a form and mouth to God. For this is thought to be ſaid in their writings, and to be confirmed as a thing certain by authority. But theſe fables are either nothing at all to us, and are in no reſpect common to us with them; or if they likewiſe affect us, as they are ſuppoſed to do, you muſt conſult Doctors of a deeper penetration, from whom you may learn in what manner it is neceſſary to explain the figurative expreſſions in the Scriptures.*’ One of thoſe who have commented upon him, cenſures him in the following manner. ‘ Nimis confuſe Arnobius, *ſaith he* (76), atque etiam periculoſe. Nam de libris Veteris Teſtamenti tanta temeritate loqui impium plane & horrendum. Hoc igitur ait quia Rabinorum ſcripta infinitis fabulis jam ſcatebant . . . . Summam imperitiam prodit hoc loco Arnobius. Atqui melius Numenius Pythagoreus qui libro de ſummo bono primo Judæos in iis nationibus numeravit quæ Deum incorporeum exiſtimabant, citatis etiam prophetarum teſtimoniis atque troporum enodatione, ſi quando contraria ſententia videbatur effici poſſe adhibita. - - - *Arnobius's reaſoning is too confuſed, and even dangerous. For it is both impious and horrible to ſpeak of the books of the Old Teſtament ſo raſhly. He ſays this, becauſe the books of the Rabbins are already ſtuffed with an infinite number of fables. - - - - Arnobius betrays great want of judgment here. Numenius Pythagoreus did much better, who, in his firſt book* de Summo Bono, *reckoned the Jews firſt among thoſe natious which believed GOD to be an incorporeal being, alledging even the teſtimonies of the Prophets, and explaining thoſe figurative expreſſions which ſeemed to warrant the contrary opinion.*’ This cenſure is not altogether groundleſs, but it ſhould have been leſs ſevere; for Arnobius means this. We are not anſwerable for the idle fancies of the Jews; but there is no harm in the things that are common to us with them, if the myſtical ſenſe be underſtood. He could not deny that, according to the literal ſenſe of the Scripture, God has hands and feet, a mouth and eyes. Therefore it was neceſſary for him to inform the heathens that the truth lies concealed under thoſe figurative expreſſions. He ſhewed himſelf to be a dextrous and able Rhetorician by not inſiſting on that objection, and by only telling his adverſaries, in four or five lines, that the Chriſtians do not aſcribe to God any figure or organical compoſition. Had he attempted to enter upon a more exact diſcuſſion of the matter, as Numenius did, he would have enervated his work; for ſince he was writing an invective againſt the Pagans, it was not his buſineſs to loſe any time in anſwering them. It was better for him to act all along the part of an aſſailant; an author ought to be upon the defenſive as little as he can, when he writes books of this nature. For the reſt, we find in Origen what Numenius did in favour of the Jews (77); which ſhews that the Pagans did not neglect the pretended advantages they hoped to draw from thoſe paſſages of the Scripture, that ſeem to aſcribe ſome imperfection to God. The Chriſtians had recourſe to the figurative ſenſe, and alledged againſt ſuch paſſages thoſe, wherein the perfection of God is clearly expreſſed. But Arnobius's work could hardly allow of ſuch a digreſſion, which afforded a pretence to anſwer that the paſſages of the Poets ought alſo to be explained one by another, and that ſome of them were to be underſtood in a figurative ſenſe. It had been improper for Arnobius to revive ſuch a notion: the commentator, who cenſures him, was not aware of this.

(74) Willem. *pag.* 25.

(75) Arnob. *lib. iii, pag. m.* 106, 107.

(76) Defid. Heraldus, in Arnobium, *pag. m.* 134.

(77) Origen. contra Celſum, *lib. i.* Heraldus *quotes the paſſage in Greek.*

SAINT-CYRAN (John du Verger de Hauranne, Abbot of) one of the patriarchs of Janſeniſm, was a native of Bayonne. Moreri ſpeaks of him (*a*). I might add many things to what he ſays of him, but I defer them till another time. He was a very learned man, as appears from his work againſt the *Somme Theologique* of Father Garaſſe (*b*), and from the books that he publiſhed againſt the Jeſuits, on which the clergy of France cauſed an encomium to be made in the year 1646 (*c*). The author did not put his name to the former; he appeared in the latter under the diſguiſe of Petrus Aurelius for reaſons mentioned by his friends (*d*). Few people know that he is the author of an apology for the biſhops, who take up arms [*A*]. This paradox is leſs ſurprizing, than that which he maintained in his *Caſus Regius*

(*a*) Under the word *Verger*.

(*b*) See the article GARASSE, remarks [*C*] and [*D*].

(*c*) By Mr Godeau. See a piece of the Jeſuit *Vavaſſeur* intituled *Antonius Godellus Epiſcopus Graſſenſis an Elogii Aureliani Scriptor idoneus.*

(*d*) In the dialogue of two pariſhioners of St Hilary du Mont, *pag. m.* 45.

[*A*] *Few people know that he is the author of an apology for the biſhops, who take up arms.*] Conſider theſe words of Mr Joly. *The canons of Munſter are obliged to prove their nobility by ſixteen deſcents, as they ſay, and they are ſo fond of it, and of their military performances, that I have ſeen an epitaph upon the tomb of a canon, which imports that he was a captain, and died in the war. Hence it is that they uſe to get their pedigrees and coats of arms painted in a cloyſter adjoining to the church, or in ſome public place. This example, in my opinion, does not deſerve to be imitated, any more than thoſe that were collected and inſerted in the book, intituled,* l'Apologie de l'Eveſque de Poitiers, *in the year* 1615, *which a learned man of that time called, in a pleaſant manner, and not without reaſon,* The Alcoran of the Biſhop of Poitiers; *tho' the author of that book, who did not put his name to it, has been ſince much talked of on account of ſome other works concerning Eccleſiaſtical matters and piety, which are much better* (1). Mr Joly would ſay no more, tho' he meant our John du Verger. That Biſhop of Poitiers, was the patron of this learned native of Bayonne, and reſigned to him the abbey of Saint-Cyran in 1620 (2). I have read in ſome compiler, that John du Verger being principal of a college in his own country, and hearing that this biſhop wanted a Reader, or a Library-keeper, offered his ſervice to him,

(1) Joly, Voiage de Munſter, *pag.* 80, 81. *See alſo the* Mêlanges *of* Vigneul Marville, *Tom. ii, pag.* 27. *Dutch Edit.*

(2) See Moreri.

Regius [*B*]. He died of an Apoplexy (*e*) at Paris, the ſecond of October 1643 (*f*) The aſſembly of the clergy was ſo much diſpleaſed with the encomium beſtowed upon him, in the *Gallia Chriſtiana* of the brothers Sammarthani, that they ordered it to be ſtruck out [*C*].

Thoſe, who ſay that he died a priſoner at Bois de Vincennes, are miſtaken, and might have avoided that miſtake if they had taken notice that among his letters [*D*], there are ſome that are dated at Paris after he had recovered his liberty (*g*). His friends pretend that he was impriſoned in 1637, for no other reaſon, but becauſe Cardinal de Richelieu had a mind to revenge himſelf on the abbot, for having refuſed to give his vote for the diſſolution of the marriage of the Duke of Orleans and the Princeſs of Lorrain (*h*). If this was the true reaſon of his confinement, yet other cauſes were alledged for it, and they endeavoured to ruin him as a teacher of errors: his trial began upon that foot (*i*). But ſome ſay that Cardinal de Richelieu looking upon him as a man very well qualified to write

him, which the biſhop accepted (3). Voëtius did not forget this warlike adventure of the Biſhop of Poitiers, in his liſt of ſome Eccleſiaſtics who took up arms. That prelate appears at the end of that catalogue. ‘Henricus Ludovicus Rupipoſæus Epiſcopus Pictavienſis non ſolum arma tractavit, & armato populo armatus præivit, ut Pictavio nonnullos ex Patritiis quibus diffidebat ejiceret: ſed etiam Apologiam edidit anno 1615, adverſus eos qui dicebant, non licere Eccleſiaſticis in caſu neceſſitatis ad arma recurrere: ſub cujus finem Catalogum bene longum texuit Cardinalium & Epiſcoporum qui tempore neceſſitatis arma tractarunt, Joannis Columnæ Legati Gregorii IX contra Fridericum, Arnoldi Pelgrue Vaſconis contra Venetos, Ægidii Albornos Cardinalis Toletani, cum Rege Caſtiliæ contra Mauros, & contra Ludovicum Bavarum & aliorum complurium, quorum nomina ibidem legi poſſunt, ſimulque videri nullam coëgiſſe neceſſitatem ut viri Eccleſiaſtici ad id negotium admoverentur; quando laicorum ducum ſatis larga copia ſuppeteret (4). - - - *Henry Lewis de la Rochepozay, biſhop of Poitiers, did not only take up arms, and put himſelf at the head of the armed populace, in order to drive out of Poitiers certain noblemen, whom he diſtruſted, but likewiſe publiſhed an apology, in the year* 1615, *againſt thoſe who ſaid that it was not lawful for Eccleſiaſtics to take up arms in any caſe; near the end of which he has inſerted a long catalogue of cardinals and biſhops, who took up arms in a caſe of neceſſity, as did John Colonna, the Legate of Gregory IX againſt Frederic, Arnoldus Pelgrue of Gaſcony againſt the Venetians, Ægidius Albornos, cardinal of Toledo with the king of Caſtile againſt the Moors, and againſt Lewis of Bavaria; beſides ſeveral others, whoſe names may likewiſe be ſeen there. At the ſame time it plainly appears, that it was not a caſe of neceſſity which had required Eccleſiaſtics to be employed in ſuch affairs, there being no want of Lay-generals.*’

[*B*] *The paradox which he maintained in his* Caſus Regius.] I have not read that book, but it is ſaid that he maintained in it that there are thirty-four caſes, wherein a man may kill himſelf innocently. *Paulo ante* (obitum) *compoſuerat librum inſcriptum* Caſus Regius, *ubi attulerat* 34 *caſus in quibus quilibet poterat libere ſe ipſum interficere. Unde unus ex diſcipulis ejus nomine* Meſter *arripuit nuper occaſionem ſe ipſum interficiendi, cum Metis eſſet* (5). See below, the remark [*I*]. Father Paul approved the principles of the Stoics in this reſpect; for when he was told that the Pope deſigned to have him carried away, he anſwered, among other things, ‘That in caſe he was taken alive, in order to be carried to Rome, the Pope could not but know, that after he had done all he could, a man had a greater power over his own life than all other men put together, and that conſequently he might deprive himſelf of life, before the Pope could have the ſatisfaction to take it from him in public (6).’ I do not know whether many people have taken notice of this maxim of Fra-Paolo.

This doctrine of our Abbot was ſometimes taken notice of in the firſt anſwers to the *Lettres Provinciales*, written by Mr Paſcal. ‘(7) You ſhould rather think of correcting the miſchievous doctrine of Saint-Cyran, who was ſo bold as to ſay that we may kill our neighbours when we are moved to it by an inward inſpiration, tho' it be forbidden by the outward law. You may ſee the proof and the practice of it in the ſecond page of the information, drawn up againſt him by order of the late king, in the year 1638. The original is in Clermont-college at Paris (8). There are ſome opinions in it concerning this matter (9), which are plainly contrary to the Chriſtian faith. . . . . (10) Some are repugnant to morality, which we call ſcandalous, as thoſe of the Abbot of Saint-Cyran *, who ſaid that we are bound to kill a man, when moved to it by inſpiration, tho' it be contrary to the outward law, which forbids it. Some are againſt common ſenſe, which we call extravagant and raſh, as that of the ſame Abbot, who goes about to prove in his *Caſus Regius*, which you acknowledge to be his principal work, that men are often bound to kill themſelves; and that this obligation being one of the moſt difficult and important, the performance of it requires an extraordinary courage and firmneſs. . . . . (11) Can thoſe, who teach, *that it is lawful to kill one's ſelf* †, *and that a man is often bound to do it*, have a right to determine when it is lawful to kill one's neighbour? And can thoſe, who ſay, *that we ought to obey the inward motion* ‡, *which prompts us to kill a man, tho' it be forbidden by the outward law*, declare at what time the outward law allows of it, and gives us a full power to do it?’ I do not think that Mr Paſcal made any anſwer to this point, tho' he was in a manner forced to it by ſuch frequent repetitions, nor do I know whether his ſilence was ever objected to him.

[*C*] *The aſſembly of the Clergy . . . . ordered the encomium on him to be ſtruck out.*] St Romuald relates it thus; ‘The ſon of one of the twin-brothers of Scævola Sammarthanus, who is lately dead, publiſhed in their name four great volumes in folio, intituled, *Gallia Chriſtiana*, and mentioning that Abbot, beſtowed on him a great encomium, as if he had been the moſt orthodox, and the moſt holy man, that lived in our days; but the general aſſembly of the Clergy of France ordered it to be ſtruck out by a formal decree (12).’ See the remark [*K*].

It is to be obſerved, that *the prelates, who, in their aſſembly, cauſed that encomium to be ſuppreſſed, would not buy any copy of the* Gallia Chriſtiana *which had it not* (13).

[*D*] *His letters.*] It is a work very much cried up by the Janſeniſts. Mr Arnauld d'Andilly publiſhed it in 1648, and dedicated it to the Clergy of France. The letters are full of devotion and maxims of piety, as we are told; I ſpeak thus becauſe I have not ſeen them. Mr Leydecker has given us ſome extracts of them, whereby the reader may have a good opinion of theſe letters (14). On the contrary, Father Bouhours quotes ſome fragments of them, written in a frightful ſtyle (15). He makes uſe of the edition of the Sieur de Preville, 1655. It is ſaid, in Moreri's Dictionary, that the Lyons edition is one of the fineſt; I do not know whether he means that of 1679. Note, that we are told in the book, intituled, *la Morale pratique des Jeſuites*, pag. 413 of the 8th volume, that *Father Pintereau, a Jeſuit, has only printed ſome ſcraps under the name of a chimerical gentleman, whom he calls the Sieur de Preville.* You may ſee in the following pages how the original letters of Janſenius and the Abbot of Saint-Cyran came into the hands of the Jeſuits.

[*E*] *Car-*

(*e*) St Romuald, Abr. du Threſor. Chronol. *Tom. iii, pag.* 452.

(*f*) Labbe, Chronol. *Tom. v, pag.* 877.

(*g*) *See* Leydecker, Hiſtor. Janſeniſmi, *pag.* 497. & Epiſtolam Chriſtiani Philireni ad Janum Palæologum, *pag.* 29.

(*h*) *See the eighth volume of* la Morale pratique, *pag.* 383. *See alſo pag.* 415.

(*i*) *See* l'Eſprit de Mr Arnaud, *Tom. i, pag.* 228. *& ſeq.*

(3) Scholarcha Baïonenſis . . . . qui audiens quod Epiſcopus Pictavienſis Lectore vel Bibliothecario opus haberet adiit eum, & ejus ſervitio prorſus ſe tradidit, à quo paulo poſt parvam Abbatiam S. Cyrani accepit. *Petrus à Sto. Romualdo in continuatione Chronici Ademari, p.* 453. *ad ann.* 1638.

(4) Giſbertus Voëtius, in Deſperata cauſa Papatus, *lib. iii*, §. *ii*, *pag.* 689.

(5) Petrus à Sto. Romualdo, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 472. *ad ann.* 1643.

(6) Vie du Pere Paul, *pag.* 194, 195. *Leyden* 1661, *in* 12*mo.*

(7) Reſponſes aux Lettres Provinciales, *pag.* 170, 171. *Liege* 1658.

(8) Ibid. *p.* 341.

(9) That is concerning Homicide.

(10) Reſponſes aux Lettres Provinciales, *p.* 342.

* It is a piece of his trial, which is to be ſeen in Clermont-College.

(11) Ibid. *p.* 360.

† The Abbot of St Cyran in his *Caſus Regius.*

‡ A maxim of the Abbot of St Cyran according to the depoſition of the witneſſes in his proceſs kept in Clermont-College.

(12) St Romuald Abregé du Threſor. Chronol. *Tom. iii, pag.* 452, 453. *ad ann.* 1643.

(13) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges, *Tom. ii, pag.* 23. *Dutch Edit.*

(14) Leydecker, in Hiſtor. Janſeniſmi, *p.* 470, *& ſeq.*

(15) Bouhours, Maniere de bien penſer, *pag.* 345, *& ſeq. Dutch Edition. See alſo the anſwers to the* Lettres Provinciales, *pag.* 234, 235, *& ſeq. Edit. of Liege* 1658.

write againſt the Proteſtants [*E*], exhorted him to go about it in priſon, and offered to ſupply him with books and all neceſſary helps. We ſhall ſee below (*k*) the Abbot de Saint-Cyran's anſwer to that propoſal. He was not much eſteemed by the famous Grotius [*F*], which is not very ſurpriſing; for Grotius, following the doctrine of the Arminians, was not very well diſpoſed to admire ſuch a rigid follower of St Auguſtin. I have ſaid in another place (*l*) that the opinion of this abbot concerning the council of Trent was diſcovered to the public by Mr Abelly in the Life of Vincent de Paul, and that the diſcovery of this ſecret was acceptable to many people. This muſt not be ſo underſtood as if the public had not known before that ſuch a thought was aſcribed to that abbot. I only meant that many were glad to know that the teſtimony of Vincent de Paul appeared in print; but before that work of Mr Abelly came out, it might have been found in ſome other books that the Abbot of Saint Cyran did not very well approve the council of Trent [*G*]. He was very ill treated in a book of Mr de Raconis, Biſhop of Lavaur. His friends accuſe that prelate of having done that out of complaiſance to Father Joſeph (*m*). He accuſes them in his turn, for *already canonizing* that abbot, *as if they were Popes, and as if he had already done a great many miracles as true, as the forged ones they had publiſhed were ridiculous* (*n*).

Here follow ſome more additions. The praiſes beſtowed on him by Mr de Balzac are doubtleſs hyperbolical; nevertheleſs, we find there one of the talents of the man whom he is commending, *viz.* that he underſtood how to ſupport his opinions in the beſt manner [*H*]. I have received a very curious memoir concerning the paradox in the remark *B* [*I*]. I ſhall give the very words of that memoir, in which there is alſo ſomething

(*k*) In the remark [*E*].

(*l*) In the remark [*C*], of the article **ABELLY.**

(*m*) Raconis, de la Primaute de Saint Pierre, *pag.* 10, *Paris edition* 1645, *in 4to.*

(*n*) Id. ibid.

[*E*] *Cardinal de Richelieu looking upon him as a man very well qualified to write againſt the Proteſtants.*] It is ſaid that this Abbot was reſolved to anſwer the Miniſters, who had writ againſt Cardinal du Perron about the Pope's ſupremacy, and the Real Preſence. His confinement put a ſtop to his deſign: Cardinal de Richelieu encouraged him to go on with it; but the Abbot made anſwer, that it was not becoming the dignity of the Church, that her head and her greateſt myſtery ſhould be defended by a priſoner. *Communis opinio eſt Abbatem Sancyranum, antequam in arce Vincenna detineretur, meditatum, & aggreſſum etiam vindicias Cardinalis Perronii adverſus heterodoxorum plures, qui in virum jam mortuum inſurrexerant, ulturi quas vivus ſibi plagas inflixerat, & ſuſcepiſſe defendenda quæ Cardinalis immortalitate dignus ſcripſerat de Euchariſtia, & de primatu Petri ab hæreticis maxime laceſſita. Id cum obaudiſſet Cardinalis Richelius, fertur ad id opus, quem currentem putabat, incitaſſe, & pollicitus ſi inchoatam apologiam vellet proſequi, curaturum, ne quidquam librorum, & ſubſidiorum deeſſet, quæ ad abſolvendam vellet, aut forent neceſſaria; ſed excelſo animo reſponſum à Sancyrano non convenire Eccleſiæ dignitati, illius caput, & myſteriorum maximum ab homine accuſato, qui ſui juris non eſſet, defendi* (16). Mr Arnauld ſays only, it is well known that his confinement was the only thing that prevented his anſwering the miniſters, who had writ againſt the doctrine of the Catholic church concerning the Euchariſt (17).

[*F*] *He was not much eſteemed by the famous Grotius.*] In order to prove this, I ſhall only ſet down a paſſage out of a letter of Balzac to the Jeſuit Leonard Allemai. ' Quam æquo utantur Grotio etiam alieni videre poteris ex his quæ ſubjungo verbis Epiſtolæ, non ita pridem ab eo ſcriptæ, ad optimum & humaniſſimum virum Joannem Cordeſium. " Et mihi Aurelius interdum ſufflaminis egere videtur. Nam quorſum tantus Suarezii contemptus; hominis, ſi quid rectè judico, in Philoſophiâ, cui hoc tempore connexa eſt Scholaſtica Theologia, tantæ ſubtilitatis, ut vix quenquam habeat parem? Quid attinet Moliniſtarum nomen Societati toties objicere, cum ſi quid Molinæ exciderit periculoſius, id poſterioribus Jeſuitarum, præcipuè Leſſii, ſcriptis ſit caſtigatum. Neque verò non nihil etiam ab illâ ſententia periculi eſt, quæ cum concilio Valentino, laudante Aurelio, ſtatuit *quorundam ſalutem Deum nolle, ſi illi quidem nudè ut homines ſpectentur* (18). - - - *How equitable Grotius is, even to people that differ from him in their principles, will appear to you from the following words, which I take out of a letter written by him not long ago, to that worthy and good natured man John Cordeſius. " Aurelius ſeems to me to want a check now and then. For why ſhould he diſcover ſo great contempt for Suarez, a man who, if I judge aright, has ſuch refined notions in Philoſophy, with which at this time ſcholaſtic Divinity is ſtrongly connected, that he has ſcarce any equal? To what purpoſe does he ſo often upbraid the Jeſuits with the name of Moliniſts, ſince if there was any thing dangerous in Molina's doctrine, it has been ſince mended in the writings of the Jeſuits, and particularly in thoſe of Leſſius. For neither is that opinion entirely free from danger which, eſtabliſhed by the council of Valentia, and approved by Aurelius, declares,* that GOD wills not the ſalvation of ſome, if we conſider them barely as men."

[G] *It might have been found in ſome other books, that he did not very well approve the council of Trent.*] It will be ſufficient for me to quote one of them, that is, the *Triumphus Catholicæ veritatis adverſus Novatores*, printed in 1651. Father Labbe, who is juſtly accounted the author of it, inſerted a memorial in it containing the dying words of Octavius de Bellegarde, Archbiſhop of Sens. It is ſaid that this archbiſhop ſent to the Pope's Nuncio by the Baron de Renti this laſt declaration of his opinions, that the Pope might be informed of it. One article of that piece runs thus: ' That the Archbiſhop of Sens . . . . is bound to believe that this whole party is rightly ſuſpected by the Church, knowing that it began with an illuſion, which produced, among other effects, a falſe devotion called, *le Chapelet ſecret du S. Sacrament* (19), condemned as ſuch by eight Doctors of the Sorbonne; and being informed by credible perſons *, that the Abbot of Saint-Cyran ſpoke of the council of Trent as of a political aſſembly, which was not in the leaſt a true council (20).'

[*H*] *The praiſes beſtowed on him by Balzac . . . we find there one of the talents . . . . that of ſupporting his opinions in the beſt manner.*] ' It muſt be owned, Sir, that you are the greateſt tyrant alive, and that your authority begins to be terrible to every body; when you ſpeak, there is no poſſibility of retaining one's opinion, if it be not agreeable to your's. You have often reduced me to that extremity, that parting from you without knowing how to anſwer you, I could ſcarce refrain from crying out in an extaſy, Reſtore me my opinion, which you have taken from me by force, and do not take away that liberty of conſcience which the king has allowed us (21).' This is what Mr Balzac wrote to him on the 12th of January, 1626. See alſo the thirty-firſt Letter of the Supplement to his works at pag. 186 of the 10th edition.

[*I*] *I have received a very curious memoir concerning the paradox mentioned in the remark B.*] We have ſeen in the remark [*B*] what Peter de St Romuald ſays on that ſubject: but what follows was communicated to me by a perſon much better informed than that monk. ' The Abbot de St Cyran did not write any ſuch book as the *Caſus Regius* in the latter part of his life. The book which occaſioned this miſtake of the good Father was printed in the year 1609: and as there is no reaſon againſt aſcribing it to the Abbot de St Cyran, the apology for the Biſhop of Poitiers muſt not be counted his firſt, but his ſecond work. The book in queſtion is intituled, *Queſtion Roiale & ſa Deciſion*, at Paris, by Touſſaint de Bray, in 1609, ' in

(16) Vincentius, Baronius Apolog. Ordinis Prædicatorum, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 163.

(17) Morale pratique des Jeſuites, *Tom. viii*, *pag.* 376, 377.

(18) Balzac, Epiſtolar. Select. *pag. m.* 172.

(19) *Concerning which, ſee* Meſnier, Port-Roial d'intelligence avec Geneve, *pag.* 5.

* See upon this point, and ſeveral others, what is obſerved in the book intituled: *Les Reliques de l'Abbé de S. Cyran.*

(20) Triumphus Catholicæ veritatis, *pag.* 159, 160.

(21) Balzac, Lettre à l'Abbé de S. Cyran. *It is the viith in the ſecond part of his works in the Paris edition* 1638.

ſomething touching the ſuppreſſion which the Sammarthani were obliged to make [*K*]. They aſcribed to our John de Verger a piece which was cenſured by the Sorbonne, and which was written by a ſiſter of Mr Arnauld. It is intituled *Le Chappelet ſecret du Saint Sacrement de l'Autel.* I ſhall ſpeak of it below [*L*].

‘ in 8vo. This is the title, and it is no otherwiſe expreſſed in the privilege, but in the firſt page we find a more circumſtantial one : *Queſtion Roiale*, &c. *The royal queſtion, wherein is ſhewn in what extremity, eſpecially in times of peace, a ſubject may be obliged to preſerve the life of his prince at the expence of his own.* This book contains fifty-ſix leaves, or 112 pages. It is true, the author in ſeveral places, parcularly fol. 46, *& ſeq.* mentions ſeveral particular occaſions in which a man may kill himſelf without being guilty of ſelf-murder. He alledges them to prove, that much more a ſubject ought to preſerve the life of his prince at the expence of his own. What occaſioned that piece is curious enough to be related. It is to be found in the book, intituled, *L'Innocence*, &c. *Innocence and Truth defended*, part 2. art. 8. p. 155, and 156. and is this.’ *King Henry the Great having aſked ſome Lords what he ſhould have done, if, at the battel of Arques, inſtead of gaining the victory, he had been forced to fly, and had embarked in the neighbouring ſea without any proviſions, and had been driven by a ſtorm into ſome remote deſart or iſland; and one of the lords anſwering, that he would ſooner have given himſelf for food to him by taking away his own life, which he muſt quickly have loſt however, than have ſuffered his king to die with hunger. The king queſtioned whether that might be done. The late Count de Cramail, who was preſent at this diſcourſe, paying a viſit ſoon after to Mr de St Cyran, his particular friend, propoſed this queſtion to him, and deſired his anſwer in writing. Mr de St Cyran, who was then in the vigour of his youth, and might poſſibly be affected with that generous reſolution, exerciſed himſelf upon that queſtion purely Metaphyſical, in the ſame manner as he would have done upon the clemency of Phalaris, the moſt cruel tyrant that ever was; and having delivered his ſolution of it in two ſhapes to the Count de Cramail, that lord ſuppreſſed of the two pieces that which was the better grounded in reaſon and authority, and cauſed the other to be printed without the author's name, and even without his knowledge, under the title of* Queſtion Royale, *becauſe the king had propoſed it, and becauſe it only concerned that Metaphyſical caſe relating to the king's perſon and life, as appears from the very title. But the Abbot of St Cyran has ever ſince declared to his friends, that the ſaid little piece did not contain his true ſentiments, but a paradox which that lord had engaged him to maintain in his youth, juſt as we ſee Iſocrates did formerly write an encomium upon Helena, and another upon Buſiris*, &c (22).

[*K*] *The ſuppreſſion which the Sammarthani were obliged to make.*] The Clergy obliged them to ſuppreſs the encomium which they had made upon John du Verger de Hauranne in the 4th volume of their *Gallia Chriſtiana*, pag. 830, ſpeaking of the Abbots of Saint-Cyran (23). ‘ They cauſed to be ſubſtituted there the encomium upon Mr de la Rochepozay, Biſhop of Poitiers, ſuch as it had been publiſhed before in the third volume, pag. 903. They likewiſe cauſed to be added in the magin of the ſubſtituted leaf, the following words over-againſt the Abbot de Hauranne's name.’ ‘ Cautum eſt decreto Cleri Gallicani quod ſi in quibuſdam exemplaribus elogium huic diverſum reperiatur, id cenſeatur inſertum ſine ejus cognitione & approbatione ; illæſâ tamen fama Sammarthanorum & Hiſtoricâ fide qui ſuis operibus de Eccleſia Gallicana bene meriti ſunt (24). - - - - ‘ *It is provided by a decree of the Clergy of the Gallican Church, that in caſe any of the copies ſhould contain an encomium different from this, it ought to be looked upon as inſerted without their knowledge and approbation ; without any prejudice however to the fame and fidelity of the Sammarthani, who have done great ſervice to the Gallican Church by their works.*’

[*L*] *It is intituled*, le Chappelet ſecret, *&c.* . . . *I ſhall ſpeak of it below.*] It is one of the pieces by which Father Meynier endeavours to prove upon the Meſſieurs de Port-Royal that they have a ſecret intelligence with Geneva, he takes ſome propoſitions out of it, and compares them with thoſe of the miniſters ; but before he comes that length, he makes the following preamble ; ‘ Notwithſtanding that he who wrote the Apology for Saint-Cyran, and that the other Janſeniſts’ . . . .

in the print, to the words (25) il eſt vray que je *excluſively*. Father Meynier obſerves (26), that the *Port-Royal condemns the Sorbonne for having cenſured this Chappelet ; but he ſays it was not without reaſon that the* Sorbonne affirmed *that beſides* the extravagances, impertinences, errors, blaſphemies, and impieties, *which this* Chappelet *contains, it introduces beſides opinions* . . .

. . . .

in the print, to the words (27) Il eſt *excluſively.*

(22) A manuſcript Memoir communicated by Mr Lancelot.

(23) See above remark [*C*].

(24) Taken from a manuſcript Memoir of Mr Lancelot.

(25) Meynier, le Port-Royal, & Geneve d'intelligence contre le très Sainct Sacrement de l'Autel, *pag.* 5, 6.

(26) Ibid. *p.* 6.

(27) Ibid. *p.* 14.

SAINT-CYRE was one of the brave men of the Proteſtant party under the reign of Charles IX. His name was Tanneguy Bouchet de Puy-Greffier [*A*]. He was one of the heads of what is called the conſpiracy of Amboiſe (*a*) ; and after the battle of Dreux he was appointed governor of Orleans, upon advice that the royal army deſigned to beſiege it (*b*). He brought the troops of Guienne to the Prince of Condé after the battle of St Denys (*c*), and was killed in that of Moncontour, being *one of the oldeſt and braveſt ſoldiers in France* (*d*). We find a more particular account of his valour in d'Aubigné's Hiſtory. ‘ The conſternation of the Reformed, *ſays he* (*e*), was not ſo great, but that they rallied in large bodies and often charged thoſe who preſſed them hard, tho' they were cloſely purſued by the companies of the Marſhals de Camp, which had not fought. The chief glory of that running fight ought to be aſcribed to the Reiſters ; but Saint-Cyre Puy-Greffier ought to have a ſhare in it. That old man having rallied three troops of horſe in the wood of Mairé, and perceiving that by one charge he might

(*a*) D' Aubigné, *Tom. i, pag.* 125.

(*b*) Idem. *p.* 238.

(*c*) Caſtelnau, Memoir, *livr. vi, chap. viii.*

(*d*) They are la Popeliniere's words.

(*e*) Hiſtoire, *livr. v, chap. xvii, pag.* 437. *ad ann.* 1569.

[*A*] *Tanneguy Bouchet de Puy-Greffier.*] ‘ He was deſcended from John Bouchet, counſellor in the parliament of Paris in the year 1372, and afterwards admitted preſident into the grand chamber the 29th of April, 1389, originally of Auvergne, who was the father of John Sieur de Puy-Greffier in Poitou, paternal anceſtor of the Sieurs du Puy-Greffier de Sainte Gemme, and de Villiers-Charlemagne, and of this Tanneguy Bouchet (1),’ whom la Popeliniere by miſtake calls *Du Bouchet* (2). The eldeſt branch of that family ended in Frances Bouchet, lady de Puy Greffier, who married Artus de Coſſé Seigneur de Gonnor, Marſhal of France, and in another Frances Bouchet half ſiſter of the former, who married firſt Andrew de Foix lord d'Aſparoth, and then Francis de la Trimouille count Benaon (3). I ſhall mention, by the by, a ſmall adventure of Frances de Bouchet the wife of Artus de Coſſé. Her huſband was deprived, on her account of the office of Superintendant of the Finances, whereby he got the firſt year enough to pay all his debts, and as much money again as he owed (4) (§ *α*). He carried his wife to court to wait upon Catherine de Medicis. She was a *country lady, who had never ſeen the court*, and who *was ſo ſimple as to thank her majeſty for the ſuperintendancy, as a favour whereby they had been enabled to pay their debts, and to get wealth. The marſhal, who heard this compliment, was provoked at his wife's folly ; but the queen was wonderfully pleaſed with ſo ingenuous a confeſſion, and that the lady had revealed enough to ruin her huſband* (5), if he ſhould fall under the diſpleaſure of that princeſs.

(1) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Mem. de Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, p.* 795.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 794.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Varillas, Charles IX, *lib. vii, ad ann.* 1567.

[(§ *α*) Brantome does not ſay that, for it was from him that Varillas borrowed the main of the ſtory. See his *Homm. Ill. Fr. Tom. ii*, in the Life of the Marſhal de Briſſac. REM. CRIT.]

(5) Varillas, ubi ſupra.

‘ might ſave the lives of a thouſand men, his miniſter, who contributed to this reſolution of his, adviſed him to harangue his ſoldiers. To brave men few words, ſaid Saint-Cyre: *brethren and friends it is thus you muſt do*: with that, armed as he was after the old French manner in armour, ſilvered over from head to foot, bare-faced, with a beard as white as ſnow, and aged eighty-five years, he advanced twenty paces before his troop, drove all the Marſhals de Camp before him, and ſaved many lives by his death.’ He was not leſs virtuous than valiant [*B*], as he ſhewed by his puniſhing adultery.

[*B*] *He was not leſs virtuous . . . . . as he ſhewed by his puniſhing adultery.*] The ſtory is very remarkable, Beza relates it in the following manner. *On the 26th of March* 1563, *the Sieur de Saint-Cyre, otherwiſe called Puy-Greffier, who had been appointed governor of Orleans from the time that the Prince left that town, a good man and a great enemy to vice, cauſed a new and remarkable execution to be made in the perſons of Deſlandes Sieur du Moulin, formerly ſecretary to the king, and of Godard* (§β) *the wife of John Godin, lieutenant to the Provoſt-marſhal of Blois. Whilſt this Godin was in the army, du Moulin debauched his wife at Orleans, for which crime he was hanged with her in the ſquare du Martroy: which being told at court appeared ſo ſtrange, that many were not aſhamed to ſay, that if there was nothing elſe in the Reformed Religion, they would be ſure not to embrace it* (6). The reflexion is very ingenious: and indeed how can a man be ſafe in a religion, which does not refer to GOD the puniſhment of adulterers, but delivers them up to the ſecular power to be puniſhed with death? This is ſufficient to put a great many people out of conceit with a religion; it is worſe than the condemnation of Polygamy, which kept ſome infidels from embracing Chriſtianity. Leſt any one ſhould ſuſpect the author I have quoted, I ſhall cite another, who was not a Proteſtant, and who relates the thing in a very pompous manner. ‘ Pridie judicium non hujus ſæculi nec tunc ſecundum Franciæ mores, ubi adulterium non puniri magni nominis Juriſconſultus Joan. Faber olim dixit, Aureliani latum eſt contra Landam Molinum, qui Godardam Jo. Godini uxorem dum vir in caſtris eſſet corrupiſſe convictus, ad mortem damnatus eſt, amboque Landa & Godarda in publica platea laqueo ſuſpenſi ſunt, Pigreferio priſci moris ac ſeveritatis viro qui à Condæo urbi præpoſitus fuerat judicium urgente, & graſſantibus vitiis exemplo opus eſſe dictitante; quod tamen in aula adeo male acceptum eſt, ut plerique ſumma impudentia palam teſtarentur ſe à Proteſtantibus ſemper alienos futuros, & vel ob eam cauſſam nunquam in eorum verba juraturos eſſe, qui adulteriis hucuſque impunitis nova & apud nos inaudita ſeveritate pœnam capitis ſtatuerent (7). - - - *On the day before, a ſentence not ſuitable to the cuſtoms of the preſent age, nor at that time to thoſe of France, where, according to the great Civilian Faber, adultery is not puniſhed, was paſſed at Orleans upon du Moulin; who being convicted of having debauched Godarde the wife of John Godin, during her huſband's abſence in the army, was condemned to death; and both he and ſhe were publickly hanged; Puy-Greffier, a man of primitive manners and ſeverity, who had been appointed governor of the city by the Prince of Condé, inſiſting upon it, and affirming that the raging vices of the time required ſuch an example to be made. It was nevertheleſs ſo ill taken at court, that moſt people openly declared with the higheſt impudence, that they would always hate the Proteſtants, and never would embrace their religion, if it were for no other reaſon but this that they made a capital crime of adultery, which before that time had not been ſo much as puniſhed.*’ Thoſe courtiers were in the right to ſay that Puy-Greffier's ſeverity was out of faſhion; nay, the Civilian Faber, quoted by Thuanus, expreſsly ſays (8), that it was never heard that any body had been puniſhed for adultery in France. Few people were able to refrain ſaying in that reſpect, *let us beware of innovations* (9). It muſt alſo be granted that this ſeverity was not of long continuance among the Proteſtants, according to the maxim, *nullum violentum durabile*. It laſted longer at Geneva (10); but at laſt it vaniſhed away: and it may be ſaid in general to the ſhame of Chriſtians, that they have ſuffered the penal laws, which many Pagan nations had enacted againſt adultery, to be aboliſhed time out of mind. There is hardly any crime which oftner eſcapes with impunity than that: whoever proſecutes any perſon for it, muſt rather expect to be the talk of the town, and to be laughed at by every body, than to have a good iſſue in his cauſe. I do not pretend to approve in every thing the penal laws of the Heathens on this head; for what could be more horrid than the cuſtom, which Theodoſius ſuppreſſed at Rome? Women guilty of adultery were condemned to live in little cells, and to proſtitute themſelves to all comers; and to make every one ſenſible that the puniſhment was executed, little bells were rung during the time of the execution (11).

Any one, who compares Thuanus's words with the Epiſtle Dedicatory of Briſſonius's book, *ad legem Juliam de adulteriis*, will wonder that this great Hiſtorian ſhould ſpeak of the impunity of adultery, as he does; for it will appear that Briſſonius, dedicating his book the 29th of November 1557, to Chriſtopher de Thou, preſident in the parliament of Paris, and the Hiſtorian's Father, praiſes him for having cauſed ſome perſons guilty of that ſin to be puniſhed; and adds, that this public example was applauded by all good men, which put the author upon writing a commentary on the law which that magiſtrate had revived. His words deſerve to be recited: ‘ (12) Superioribus temporibus hac Satyrici poëtæ querella aures noſtræ perſonavere, *Ubi nunc lex Julia dormis* (13)? Inſederat videlicet imperitorum animis ridicula quidem, ſed tamen quæ maximam ad nequitiam feneſtram patefecerat opinio, adulterorum in Gallia impunita eſſe peccata, qua paſſim corruptis moribus laudi jam duci, & in pretio haberi id vitii cœperat. Hanc tu Reipub. pernicioſam opinionem editis non ita dudum de aliquot adulteris exemplis eripuiſti, perfeciſtique, ut non tam puniendi voluntatem, quàm accuſatores majoribus noſtris antehac defuiſſe judicemus. Quod ſpectaculum cùm maximus bonorum omnium plauſus conſecutus eſſet, hinc me laudum tuarum, ad quas hunc cumulum acceſſiſſe valde gaudebam, recordatione incenſum res ipſa admonuit, ut antiquam de adulteriis coërcendis ab Auguſto latam legem, quæ quaſi poſtliminio in uſum rediret, in ordinem digererem, & interpretatione adhibita illuſtrarem. - - - - *In former times our ears rung with this complaint of the ſatirical Poet*, Why ſleeps the Julian Law? *For ignorant minds were poſſeſſed with an opinion that adultery was not puniſhed in France; which opinion, ridiculous as it was, opened a wide door for all ſort of wickedneſs; and an univerſal corruption of manners being thereby introduced, the ſaid vice begun to be highly eſteemed and praiſed. But you, Sir, have put an end to this pernicious opinion by making an example of ſome adulterers not long ago, and you have convinced us that it was not a will to puniſh but accuſers that were wanting to our forefathers. This public example was greatly extolled by all good men, and being excited by the praiſes given you, (to which I rejoiced to ſee ſuch a noble addition made) I was induced to digeſt into order, and comment upon, that old law of Auguſtus for the puniſhment of adulterers, which is now in a manner revived by you.*’ It is very probable that notwithſtanding all the applauſes of good men, Chriſtopher de Thou relaxed, and that perceiving he could not put a ſtop to the corruption, he was obliged to let things take their uſual courſe. Hence it is that his ſon took no notice of that ſhort interruption of impunity. Briſſonius intimates, that if there had been accuſers in former times, the Judges of France would have made it appear that they were not unwilling to puniſh adulterers. Indeed I believe that the accuſers for this crime have been few; but the difficulty of proving ſuch an accuſation, and the ſhame that attends thoſe who carry the cauſe, are more than ſufficient to prevent moſt ſuits of that kind (14). Montagne has been quoted on this ſubject elſewhere (15). It muſt be confeſſed that it is not ſo much the connivance of the Magiſtrates, or the ſilence of Preachers, as the greatneſs of the evil, that prevents the execution of the laws. A Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Groningen publiſhed in 1663, a collection of Diſſertations, wherein he ſays, that the Divines of Straſ-

---

[(β§) Mr Bayle has not obſerved that Godard being a Maſculin name, we ought to read here *Godarde*, agreeable to the Latin *Godardam*, of Thuanus who had conſulted the Errata of Beza's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. REM. CRIT.]

(6) Beza, Hiſtoire Eccleſ. *livr. vi, towards the end, pag.* 336.

(7) Thuanus, *lib. xxxv. init ad ann* 1563.

(8) In § ex non ſcripto Inſt. de jur. nat.

(9) See the advertiſement prefixed to the Catechiſm of the Jeſuits (§ γ).

[(§ γ) It muſt be the ſecond edition of this Catechiſm, in 16mo, printed in Holland in the year 1678. For the firſt edition in 8vo, ſaid to be printed at Villefranche 1602, does not contain this *Advertiſement*. As to what concerns the ſaying mentioned in remark [*B*], it is in the Confeſſion of Sanci, *lib. i, ch. viii.* where d'Aubigné puts it in the mouth of a Subprior of St Antony. REM CRIT.]

(10) *See the* Critique generale de l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme, *againſt Maimbourg, Letter ix.*

(11) *Socrates, Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. v, cap. xviii, See the article BABELOT. remark [*C*].

(12) Barn. Briſſon. Epiſt. Dedicat. ſingularis Libri ad legem Juliam de adulteriis.

(13 Juven. Sat. II, ver. 37.

(14) See the new Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, *pag.* 588. *& ſeq.*

(15) Ibid. *p.* 539.

bourg prevailed about thirty years before with the magiſtrates, to inflict a capital puniſhment on adulterers; and he wiſhes the Reformed Divines of the Low-Countries would not expreſs ſo much zeal againſt dancing, as againſt the too great indulgence for adultery. He fancies that if they had thundered to purpoſe againſt that abuſe, they would, with God's bleſſing upon their endeavours, have engaged the magiſtrates to inflict a more ſevere puniſhment than a fine. (16) *Qui* (Theologi) *ſi æque fervide à pluribus jam annis detonuiſſent in adulterium, (quod, pro dolor! per totum Belgium pecuniaria duntaxat mulcta expiatur) ex Dei benedictione, dubio procul, jam diu à ſuis Superioribus conſecuti fuiſſent, quod ex voto obtigit, ante annos ferme triginta, Theologis Auguſtanæ Confeſſionis, Argentinæ Evangelicam doctrinam annunciantibus: qui, licet non ſubduxerunt Auditoribus ſuis temperatis in nuptiis choreas, à Magiſtratu tamen impetrarunt gladium adulterii vindicem.* Had he been a miniſter, he would have found the difficulty of that advice.

(16) Mart. Schoockius Exercitat. xvi. *pag.* 321.

SAINTE-ALDEGONDE (Philip de Marnix Lord du Mont) born at Bruſſels [*A*], in the year 1538, made himſelf famous by his employments and writings. He fled into Germany when liberty of conſcience was ſuppreſſed by the Spaniards in the Netherlands, and at Heidelberg he had the office of counſellor in the Eccleſiaſtical council conferred upon him. He returned into his own country in the year 1572 to employ his talents for the ſupport of liberty and the intereſt of the Reformed Religion [*B*]. He was very much eſteemed by the Prince of Orange, to whom he did ſeveral important ſervices, not ſo much by his ſword as by his words [*C*]. He was one of the deputies, ſent by the States into England in 1575, to deſire Queen Elizabeth's protection. Three years after he was ſent by the Arch-duke Matthias to the diet of Worms, where he made a very

[*A*] *Born at Bruſſels.*] I would not affirm it, if Melchior Adam was the only author that ſays ſo; for I find he adds to it a falſity, whereby one might be apt to think that he was not rightly informed. He ſays that the father and mother of Philip de Marnix were natives of Burgundy, and retired to Bruſſels (1). This is not true: Sainte-Aldegonde anſwering a writer, who called him *a foreigner of Burgundy*, ſays, *Not one of my anceſtors was a native of Burgundy, that I know of; and it is notorious that I was born, educated, and allied, in this country. And likewiſe my father was born, brought up, and allied in it; ſo that except my grand-father and his predeceſſors, who were natives of Savoy, all my paternal and maternal anceſtors were born in the Low-Countries* (2). The reaſon therefore why I affirm that he was born at Bruſſels, is becauſe Verheiden ſays ſo (3), without adding any of the falſities that are found in Melchior Adam. Note, that Moreri in copying theſe falſities has rather increaſed them, for he is more particular, and ſays that the parents of our Philip were natives of the county of Burgundy. It ſeems that Swertius and Valerius Andreas knew not that Philip de Marnix was born in the Netherlands: their ignorance of this is ſurpriſing, ſince they knew this author by his controverſial books (4). Had they known his native country, they would have placed him in the catalogue of the writers of the Netherlands: they do not uſe to leave out the Proteſtant authors.

[*B*] *He returned into his country in the year* 1572, *to employ his talents . . . . . for the intereſt of the Reformed Religion.*] Since Verheiden and Melchior Adam knew nothing of the circumſtances of his return, it will not be improper for me to ſupply what they have omitted. Sainte-Aldegonde ſoon after he left the Low-Countries on account of religion, was admitted into the ſervice of the Elector Palatine; but William Prince of Orange, who looked upon him as a man well qualified for his deſigns, deſired him of the Elector: *which was granted him firſt for two months, and then for two more, and at laſt for ſo long as he ſhould want him*; *only* the ſaid Elector *reſerved to himſelf the liberty of recalling him, when he ſhould think fit* (5). Sainte-Aldegonde gives this account to ſhew that he followed the Prince of Orange only *as his private miniſter and ſervant*, and not *as a member of the States*, or *to intrude into the adminiſtration of public affairs.* And therefore, ſays he, *if I have been employed in public affairs, either in the name, and by order of the States, or otherwiſe, it was always at his deſire, and to pay him a due obedience as I was ordered by my firſt maſter.* I will alſo mention what has been omitted concerning the perſecutions he went through, before he fled into Germany. *I was,* ſays he (6), *outlawed, baniſhed, deprived of my eſtate, and expoſed to the hatred and abuſes of my friends and relations; and at laſt I lay in priſon a year under the Duke of Alva and the commander Requeſenes; and during that confinement I prayed to GOD every night at leaſt for the ſpace of three months, as if it had been the laſt night of my life, knowing that the ſaid Duke of Alva had twice ordered that I ſhould be put to death in priſon.* Obſerve that it had been objected to him, that he had been in the ſervice of the Ducheſs of Parma: but he anſwered (7) that he never had any thoughts of going into the ſervice of that lady, nor ever frequented her court, *ſeeing that during the ſpace of ſix years, ſince his return from Geneva till the beginning of the troubles, he had concealed himſelf, as it were, under the croſs of the perſecutions, which were at that time very violent.*

[*C*] . . . . *Not ſo much by his ſword as by his words.*] Melchior Adam, from whom I have taken the greateſt part of the text of this article, is my author for this. *Quo in loco,* ſaith he (8), *non tam fortiter gerendo, quam imitatione Cyneæ cordatè loquendo, non poſtremum patriæ libertatis propugnatorem ſe declaravit.* He could write and ſpeak well, and was a ſcholar and a man of parts: his ſervices were particularly memorable on account of thoſe qualifications. It was he who drew up the formulary of the famous confederacy in the year 1566, by which ſeveral great men of the Low-Countries engaged to oppoſe the Inquiſition (9). Brederode, who was the head of that league, made him treaſurer of it (10). Sainte-Aldegonde ſpoke in the name of the Prince of Orange in the aſſembly of Dort, compoſed of the deputies of all the towns, in the year 1572 He made a lively deſcription of the calamities of the country, and prevailed with that aſſembly to come to a reſolution of oppoſing the tyrants. *Ibidem ejus orator Dominus de Sancta Aldegonde effuſam de principis pio affectu, patriæ neceſſitate, Hiſpanorum tyrannide declamationem pronunciat, ac civitates novo bello contra Regem, regis tamen nomine uſurpato illaqueat* (11). The Spaniards dreaded that Orator and Negotiator ſo much, that the Duke of Parma gave expreſs orders to obſerve him narrowly in the conferences held at Cologn in the year 1579. *Monens interim ut Coloniam adventantem Philippum Marnixium . . . . ſedulo obſervaret, ab eoque uti ab homine impie callido ſibi præcaveret* (12). The Proteſtant readers knowing the character of the man, who abuſes Sainte-Aldegonde in this laſt paſſage, will never have a worſe opinion of him. He aſſiſted at the pacification of Ghent, in the name of the Prince of Orange and of the nobility of Holland and Zealand in the year 1576 (13). He was ſent to Bruſſels the year following; but we ought not to credit what is ſaid by the Hiſtorians of the contrary party, that it was to attempt upon the liberty of Don Juan of Auſtria (14). He was taken by the Spaniards, at the Hague in the year 1573 (15), and it being feared that ſuch a priſoner, who was very prejudicial to them, would meet with very ill uſage, the Prince of Orange ſent them word that he would in the ſtricteſt manner uſe repriſals againſt the Count de Boſſu (16). The year following Mondragon being forced to capitulate at Middelburg, offered to ſet Sainte-Aldegonde and three other priſoners at liberty, provided the capitulation he demanded, ſhould be granted him. *Se apud Requeſenium effecturum ut captivus Aldegundius (quod avebat Orangius) treſque inſuper alii Aldegundii arbitratu remitterentur in Zelandiam intra ſex menſes* (17). That agreement was accepted and executed: which I obſerve, to ſhew how much our Philip de Marnix was conſidered. He was to have the choice of three priſoners, who were to be ſet a very fine ſpeech, and boldly deſcribed the Spaniſh tyranny [*D*]. He was one of the plenipotentiaries, whom the States ſent into France in the year 1580, to offer the ſovereignty of their provinces to the Duke of Alençon [*E*]. He was conſul to Antwerp in 1584, when that town was beſieged by the Duke of Parma. In the year 1593 he conducted into the Palatinate the Princeſs Louiſa Juliana (*a*), who had been betrothed to the Elector Frederic IV (*b*). The books he publiſhed [*F*] were not the leaſt ſervice he did: ſome of them were on Politics, and others on Controverſy; ſome were ſerious, and others comical: the latter proved moſt uſeful [*G*]: his very ſongs procured a great advantage

---

(1) Bruxellis . . . è parentibus *Burgundicis* qui eo conceſſerant. *Melch. Adam. in Vitis Juriſc. pag.* 333.

(2) Sainte-Aldegonde, Reſponſe apologetique au Libelle intitulé Antidote, *fol. A.* 5. *verſo.*

(3) Verheiden, in Elog. preſtantium aliquot Theolog. *pag.* 141.

(4) They mention them ſpeaking of Michael Baïus, and the Jeſuit John David, who wrote againſt Sainte-Aldegonde.

(5) Sainte-Aldegonde, Reſponſe apologetique, *fol. D* 3.

(6) Id. ibid. *in the next leaf to B* 5.

(7) Id. ibid. *fol. D* 5.

(8) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Juriſc. *pag.* 333.

(9) Strada de Bello Belgico, *Decad. I, lib. v, pag. m.* 205.

(10) Brederodius coactores nominat & Philippum Marnixium . . . ærarium Queſtorem creat. *Id. ib. pag.* 291, *ad ann.* 1566.

(11) De ortu & progreſſu Calvin. Reformat. *lib. ii,* §. *iv, pag.* 47.

(12) Strada. *ubi ſupra, Dec. II, lib. ii, pag.* 127.

(13) Thuan. *lib. lxii, pag. m.* 163.

(14) Strada, *ubi ſupra, lib. ix, pag.* 527, 530. *ad ann.* 1577.

(15) Id. ibid. *lib. vii, pag.* 451.

(16) Id. ibid. *pag.* 452.

(17) Id. ibid. *lib. viii, pag.* 460, *ad ann.* 1574.

ſet at liberty with him. The States deſigned in 1587 to ſend him to the conferences about a peace with Spain (18); but having reſolved to continue the war, his deputation proved a meer project.

[*D*] *He made a very fine ſpeech, and boldly deſcribed the Spaniſh tyranny.*] Thuanus ſays it was printed and anſwered. ‘ Eo à Matthia miſſus Phil. Marnixius
‘ Santaldegondanus orationem mire liberam ad VII
‘ viros & imperii principes, qui aderant, Nonis Maii
‘ habuit, qua deplorato miſerabili Belgii ſtatu, & Al-
‘ bani Auſtriique tyrannide acerbis verbis exagitata
‘ Imperii opem imploravit; quippe commune Belgii
‘ cum Imperio periculum eſſe, prædixitque fore, ut
‘ belli incendium, niſi ſiſtatur, ſe latius ſpargat, &
‘ Coloniam, Monaſterium, Emdam, aliaſque vicinas
‘ civitates, quas ex Albani conſilio Hiſpani ſub jugum
‘ mittere jampridem decreverint, olim complectatur,
‘ proinde rogat . . . . . ad eam orationem publicatam
‘ poſtea contraria oratione Calidii Chryſopolytani no-
‘ mine Lucemburgi edita reſponſum eſt, quæ tota in
‘ exagitanda Belgarum in Deum ac principem ſuum
‘ rebellione occupatur (19). - - *Phil. Marnix of Sainte-*
‘ *Aldegonde, who was ſent thither by Matthias on the*
‘ *7th of May, made an exceeding bold ſpeech to the Electors*
‘ *and the Princes of the empire, who were preſent, in*
‘ *which having deplored the miſerable condition of the*
‘ *Netherlands, and inveighed againſt the tyranny of the*
‘ *Duke of Alva and the houſe of Auſtria, he implored*
‘ *their aſſiſtance, as the empire lay equally expoſed with*
‘ *the Netherlands to the danger, and foretold that the*
‘ *fire of the war, unleſs it was ſtopped, would ſpread*
‘ *wider and include Cologn, Munſter, Embden, and other*
‘ *neighbouring cities, which the Spaniards, by the advice*
‘ *of Alva, had long ago reſolved to bring under ſubjection.*
‘ *He therefore aſked . . . . . This ſpeech being publiſhed,*
‘ *it was anſwered by one printed at Luxemburgh under*
‘ *the name of Claudius Chryſopolitanus; which is entire-*
‘ *ly taken up in expoſing the rebellion of the Netherlanders*
‘ *againſt GOD and their ſovereign.*’ Note that this ſpeech was tranſlated into Dutch verſe by Baptiſt Hovart (20), and that Cornelius Looſe, a native of Tergow, was the perſon who anſwered it (21).

[*E*] *To offer the ſovereignty of their provinces to the Duke of Alençon.*] Melchior Adam has forgot to tell us that Sainte-Aldegonde followed that prince into England in the year 1581, and wrote to the States the falſe news of his marriage with Queen Elizabeth. It is an example, which Mr de Wicquefort ſets before the eyes of ambaſſadors, in order to ſhew how cautious they ought to be in writing news. ‘ Sometimes, ſays
‘ he (22), one cannot believe his own eyes. *Vidit*
‘ *aut vidiſſe putat.* - - - i. e. *he ſaw or imagines that*
‘ *he ſaw.* The Sieur de Sainte-Aldegonde, who was
‘ agent for the ſtates of the Low-Countries at the court
‘ of England in the year 1581, being one evening in
‘ the queen's chamber, ſaw her diſcourſing with the
‘ Duke of Alençon. The lords and ladies were at ſo
‘ great a diſtance from them that they could have no
‘ ſhare in their converſation; but every body was
‘ witneſs to a thing, from which one might draw a
‘ very great conſequence. The queen taking a ring
‘ from her finger, put it on the duke's, who quickly
‘ went out with great chearfulneſs and ſatisfaction, as
‘ having obtained an earneſt and a pledge of his mar-
‘ riage. Sainte-Aldegonde, who looked upon this
‘ action as a thing of the greateſt importance to his
‘ maſters, gave them notice of it by an expreſs he
‘ diſpatched that very ſame night. All the towns of
‘ the Low-Countries expreſſed their joy for a piece of
‘ news, that proved falſe, by the ringing of bells, the
‘ firing of guns, and the lighting of bonefires. The
‘ queen blamed Sainte-Aldegonde for being ſo haſty
‘ in giving notice of a thing, the truth of which he
‘ might have known in a few hours.’

[*F*] *The books he publiſhed.*] Meurſius gives a catalogue of them: it contains *Theſes aliquot de Eccleſiæ atque Eccleſiaſticarum traditionum κειτηρίῳ ſeu certa norma. Item de ſacramento cœnæ dominicæ. Reſponſio ad Michaelis Baii regii Profeſſoris Lovanienſis apologiam. Epiſtola conſolatoria ad fratres exules Brabantos, Flandros, Hannones, Arteſios, alioſque Belgas peregrinis in regionibus ob puram Evangelii doctrinam diſperſos. Tractatus de cœna Domini ad Galliarum Regis ſororem Lotharingiæ Duci nuptam. Contra libertinos. Apologetica reſponſio contra anonymum quendam libertinum* (23). To theſe may be added, ſays Meurſius, ſeveral pieces publiſhed at different times, *admonitiones, declarationes, tractatus, conſilia, diſputationes, conſolationes, interpretationes*, and ſeveral anonymous writings. His deſign was to refute the Romiſh controverſiſts, and to raiſe enemies to the King of Spain. I leave you to judge whether having the talent of writing with great facility, he did not diſperſe many pamphlets about the tranſactions of the time. He did then what Baron Liſola has done ſince. Note that it has been ſaid he was lucky in gueſſing the deſigns of the Spaniards, and that therefore the alarms he raiſed againſt their ambitious projects were not without ground. ‘ Prudentiæ
‘ & hiſtoriæ cognitio quanta in eo fuerit, ſcriptum il-
‘ lud declarat, in quo agit de *Hiſpanorum ſcopo*, ad
‘ quem ſua ipſi tela dirigunt; qui Monarchiam ſibi
‘ præfigentes, nihil non auſint. In eodem tanquam
‘ vates prognoſticis politicis multa prædixit: quæ eve-
‘ niſſe *Britannia, Polonia, Gallia*, aliæque regiones
‘ teſtantur (24). - - - *His great knowledge in Politics*
‘ *and Hiſtory appears from that treatiſe, wherein he con-*
‘ *ſiders the chief aim which the* Spaniards have in view:
‘ *who in order to bring about their ſcheme of univerſal*
‘ *monarchy leave nothing unattempted. In the ſame trea-*
‘ *tiſe, like a prophet or political Prognoſticator, he fore-*
‘ *told many things which have actually come to paſs, as*
‘ Great Britain, Poland, France, *and other countries*
‘ *can teſtify.*’

[*G*] . . . . . His comical books *were moſt uſeful.*] He publiſhed in Dutch the Romiſh Hive, *Alvearium Romanum*, in the year 1571, and dedicated it to Francis Sonnius Biſhop of Boiſleduc, one of the chief Inquiſitors of the Low-Countries (25). That book, full of comical ſtories, was wonderfully applauded by the people, and proved more prejudicial to the church of Rome, than a ſerious and learned work would have been. Nay, it is ſaid to have put many people upon examining more ſtrictly the controverted points of religion, and detecting the errors of the church of Rome: Eraſmus's colloquies had produced the ſame effect:
‘ Hoc ſcriptum . . . . eſt varietate hiſtoriarum, & acu-
‘ mine ſententiarum refertiſſimum: jocis facetiiſque in
‘ Papiſtarum theatrales nugas & fabulas mire condi-
‘ tum: adeò ut lectoribus iſtorum temporum præci-
‘ puè, ſingularem attulerit voluptatem: & occaſionem
‘ multis præbuerit, de religione Chriſtiana ſeriò co-
‘ gitandi. Et hic liber ut populari applauſu acceptus,
‘ ſic non ſine fructu plurimorum lectus, plus rei Bel-
‘ gicæ illa tempeſtate in religionis negocio profuit;
‘ quàm eruditi aliquot commentarii (26). - - - *This*
‘ *book . . . . is full of ſtories and witty ſayings: it is*
‘ *wonderfully ſeaſoned with jokes and facetious remarks*
‘ *upon the theatrical tales and trifles of the Roman*
‘ *Catholics: ſo that to the readers of thoſe times eſpe-*
‘ *cially, it gave an extraordinary pleaſure, and put*
‘ *many upon thinking ſeriouſly of the Chriſtian Re-*
‘ *ligion. As this book was received with general ap-*
‘ *plauſe, ſo the reading of it produced good effects,*
‘ *and it did more ſervice to the Low-Countries in the*
‘ *buſineſs of religion than ſome learned commentaries.*’
He wrote a book of the ſame nature in French, which was printed ſoon after he died, with this title, ‘ Ta-
‘ bleau des differens de la religion. - - - - *A picture*
‘ *of religious differences.*’ He is very merry in it, and brings in a poſſe of jokes and quibbles; and yet alledges very pertinent reaſons. This work proved as ſucceſsful as the *Alvearium*. The greateſt part

---

(*a*) Daughter to the Prince of Orange William the firſt of that name.

(*b*) *Taken from* Melchior Adam. in Vitis Juriſconſ. *pag.* 333, *& ſeq.*

(18) Idem. *Dec. II, lib. ix, pag.* 627.

(19) Thuan. *lib. lxvi, pag.* 239. *ad ann.* 1578.

(20) Melch. Adam. *ubi ſupra, pag.* 336.

(21) Placcius, de Pſeudonymis, *pag.* 172.

(22) Wicquefort, Traité de l'Ambaſſadeur, *book ii, pag. m.* 228, 229. *See alſo* Strada, *ubi ſupra, Dec. II, lib. iv. pag.* 248. *ad ann.* 1581.

(23) Meurſius, Athenæ Batavæ, *pag.* 180.

(24) Melch. Adam. *ubi ſupra, pag.* 335.

(25) Id. ibid. *pag.* 336.

(26) Id. ibid.

advantage to the new republic [*H*].. He tranſlated the Pſalms of David out of Hebrew into Dutch verſe; but that tranſlation was not made uſe of in churches [*I*]. He was employed about a Dutch tranſlation of the Scripture, when he died at Leyden the fifteenth of December 1598 (*c*). He had a little before made a journey into France about the prince's affairs (*d*). He did not eſcape ſlander [*K*], and it it ſaid that his retreat was the life

of the ſtories are the ſame in both. Vaſt numbers of people diverted themſelves with examining this picture, and were more confirmed in their belief thereby than if they had read the beſt work of Calvin. Thuanus did not approve this way of handling controverſy. *I have ſeen*, ſaid he (27), *Philip de Marnix de Sainte-Aldegonde at the ſiege of Paris, and I lodged three months in the ſame houſe with him . . . . . he was a polite man, but there was no great matter in him. He was chancellor of Gelderland* (28). *He treats of religion in the ſtile of Rabelais, which is very ill done.* John David a Jeſuit publiſhed another *Alvearium* in Dutch to confute that of Sainte-Aldegonde, which he called a moſt pernicious book (29). He knew well enough that the moſt dangerous way of writing againſt a doctrine is to turn it into ridicule.

[*H*] *His very ſongs procured a great advantage to the new Republic.*] I might have cited, above, Verheiden inſtead of Melchior Adam, who only tranſcribes him; but I thought it an indifferent thing, provided I ſhould once point out the original. I take another way here, and ſet down the words of Verheiden. ‘Ab hoc Viro, *ſaith he* (30), etiam profecta dicitur decantata illa CANTILENA compoſita in laudem PRINCIPIS GUILIELMI Naſſavii, Ad Belgas Tyrannide Albani oppreſſos edita. Quæ quidem Cantilena ita ſcite facta, ita concinnis rhythmis moduliſque ſuis eſt attemperata, ut plebis animos mire ad Principis, Libertatiſque Patriæ amorem excitaverit. In hoc igitur SANCT-ALDEGONDIUS ſe alterum quaſi TYRTÆUM, toties à Platone laudatum, oſtendit. Nam cum PRINCIPIS Fortiſſimi laudes, hortamenta virtutis, damnorum ſolatia, ſalutariaque conſilia contineat; magnum ardorem defendendi PRINCIPIS PATRIÆQUE LIBERTATIS populo injecit: adeo ut nihil illis temporibus convenientius prodiiſſe judicare liceat. - - - *To the ſame author is aſcribed that famous ballad, which contains a panegyric upon William Prince of Orange, and was publiſhed in Holland while that country was oppreſſed by the tyranny of the Duke of Alva. That ſong was ſo artfully contrived, and ſo well compoſed in its rhimes and notes, that it ſtirred up in the minds of the people a wonderful affection for the prince and the liberty of their native country. By this therefore Sainte-Aldegonde proved himſelf to be, as it were, another Tyrtæus, whom Plato ſo often commends. For by celebrating the praiſes of ſo heroic a prince, by exhorting the people to behave valiantly, by comforting them for the loſſes they had ſuſtained, and by intermixing wholſome advices, he inſpired them with a great zeal for the defence of the Prince and the liberty of their country. So that we may juſtly affirm that nothing could be publiſhed more ſuitable to the circumſtances of thoſe times.*’ He is in the right to ſay, that nothing could better fit the circumſtances of the time, than a pretty ſong full of invectives againſt the Duke of Alva, and of encomiums on the Prince of Orange. The deſign of erecting ſome provinces of the King of Spain into a common-wealth required many things, and particularly a continual application to prevent the ſuggeſtions of thoſe, who might have repreſented that it was almoſt impoſſible to hold out againſt ſo potent a monarch, that the charges neceſſary to carry on the war againſt him would very much exceed what he exacted from them, and that therefore it was a great piece of folly to ſpend one's All rather than bear an impoſt (31). This might have been confuted by a thouſand good reaſons, and it was of great moment to make the people ſenſible of it both from the pulpit and in books: but nothing was more proper for ſuch a deſign than a ſong; for it is a thing that remains imprinted in the mind, and every body, even the peaſants and ſervant-maids, daily repeat it with great joy and ſatisfaction. We have here therefore one of the moſt important ſervices of Philip de Marnix. This puts me in mind of the ſong about the Scalado, which the Genevois ſing in their houſes on the anniverſary day, as a thing almoſt eſſential to that ceremony. I am ſure that at firſt the impreſſions made by this ſong in the minds of the people, ſurpaſſed all others (§ α).

[(§ α) Mr Bayle does not tell us that it was Theodore Beza who, in his very old age, made the ſong upon the Scalado of Geneva. REM. CRIT.]

[*I*] *That tranſlation* of the Pſalms *was not made uſe of in churches.*] He affected to uſe none but Dutch words, and acted quite contrary to the other Poets of his nation, who inſerted in their pieces a vaſt many words taken from the French. His tranſlation was better than that which was ſung in churches; nevertheleſs it was not admitted. Thus in France the old verſion of Marot and Beza was preferred to that of Mr Conrart, which ſome had a mind to introduce. I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of Melchior Adam (32): ‘Id opus hactenus aliquoties typis publicatum, ſed nunquam communi concionatorum conſenſu eſt receptum: cum contrà verſio alterius à tot millibus ediſcatur. Nimirum

Pro captu lectoris habent ſua fata libelli.

‘*That work has been printed ſeveral times, but was never yet received by the common approbation of the miniſters: whereas the other tranſlation is conned over by ſo many thouſands. The reaſon is becauſe,*

Books have their fate, ſucceeding well or ill
Juſt in proportion to the reader's ſkill.

Here follows another paſſage, whereby it appears that Philip de Marnix, the better to introduce his verſion, made it, as much as ever he could, like that which was already uſed. Mr Conrart had the ſame precaution, but to no purpoſe (33): people were too much uſed to the common tranſlations. ‘Ante complures annos diſplicuit nonnullis apud Belgas nimius ille à textu Scripturæ per laxiores paraphraſes metricas receſſus: præſertim Pſalmorum *Datheni*, qui ex Pſalmis Gallicis *Maroti* & *Bezæ* expreſſi erant. Verſavit hæc cura inter alios nobiliſſ. *Marnixium* montis *Sanct-Aldegondis* Dominum; qui propterea novam paraphraſin rhythmo-metricam compoſuit, ſtrophis, lineis, ſyllabis, cum *Datheni* Pſalmis, pari paſſu euntem, ut cum illis in templis cantari, aut facile iis ſubſtitui poſſet. Sed cum *Datheni* Pſalmi jam memoriâ à pleriſque tenerentur, non viderunt Eccleſiæ, quomodo commodè & abſque aliquâ commotione plebis eccleſiaſticæ in publicis ſacris hic quicquam loco moveri poſſet (34). - - - *A good many years ago ſome people in Holland were diſpleaſed with theſe looſe poetical paraphraſes, which varied too much from the text of Scripture; eſpecially with reſpect to the Pſalms of* Dathenus, *which had been formed upon the French Pſalms of* Marot *and* Beza. *Among others* Philip de Marnix *lord of Mount* Sainte-Aldegonde *employed himſelf this way, and compoſed a new paraphraſe in metre, exactly agreeing with the Pſalms of* Dathenus *in the ſtanza's, lines, and ſyllables, for this reaſon that it might be ſung along with them in the churches, or eaſily ſubſtituted in their room. But whereas moſt people had already got the Pſalms of* Dathenus *by heart, the churches did not ſee how they could conveniently and without giving ſome offence to the common people introduce any alteration in the public worſhip.*’

[*K*] *He did not eſcape ſlander.*] Some inſtances of it may be ſeen in the words I have quoted out of Strada. But here is a more cutting ſtroke: that Jeſuit having ſaid that Sainte-Aldegonde was one of thoſe, who had been ordered to ſeize upon Don Juan of Auſtria by ſtratagem or by main force, adds: ‘Quod ſanè facinus etſi non abhorrebat à reliqua vita aut Aldegundii hominis ignominioſiſſimè nequam, qui Calvinum puer docentem audierat, ſenex jam alios ipſe docebat: aut Heſii . . . . tamen an illi re ipſa moliti hoc ſint, ut Auſtriacus multis authoribus exiſtimavit . . . . . affirmare non auſim (35). - - - - - *Which wicked attempt, although it was no ways inconſiſtent with the reſt of the life either of Sainte-Aldegonde, a man of an infamous character, who in his youth had been Calvin's diſciple, and taught others in* ‘*his*

(*c*) Melch Adam. *ibid. pag.* 334.

(*d*) See his Apologetical anſwer to the German gentleman. *init.*

(27) Thuana, *pag. m.* 39.

(28) I think Thuanus is miſtaken in this.

(29) *Librum peſtilentiſſimum.* Valer. Andr. Biblioth. Belg. *pag.* 490.

(30) Verheiden, in Elogiis aliquot Theologor. *pag.* 145.

(31) Omnia dabant ne decimam darent.

(32) Melch. Adam, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 335.

(33) Note, that the church of Geneva and ſeveral others have at laſt laid aſide the old verſion of the Pſalms; but the Walloon churches have reſolved to keep it. See the remark [*P*], of the article MAROT.

(34) Giſbertus Voëtius de Politia Eccleſiaſt. *Tom. i, p.* 529.

(35) Strada de Bello Belg. *Dec.* I, *lib. ix, pag. m.* 527, 528, *ad ann.* 1577.

life of a man in diſgrace. He was ſtrangely perplexed when complaints were made that he exhorted

‘ *his old age ; or of Heſius . . . . yet whether or no they* ‘ *did actually attempt ſuch a thing, as Don Juan of* ‘ *Auſtria, relying upon the authorities of many, believed,* ‘ . . . . . *I dare not poſitively affirm.*’ I have a book printed at Cologn in 1673, with this title, *De ortu & proceſſu Calvinianæ reformationis in Belgio: in quo exhibentur pacta & fœdera ibidem inita, & demonſtratur nullam eorum à Reformatoribus habitam eſſe rationem, Authore C. L. S. V. V.* Sainte-Aldegonde is very ill uſed in it, and the author ſays, among other things, that whilſt he was endeavouring to undo the Catholics of the Netherlands in the diet of Worms, he made it his buſineſs to perſuade the ambaſſadors of the Emperor and of the Electors, that the Arch-duke Matthias had been invited by the inhabitants of that country to be the protector of the Romiſh religion, which was very much endangered by the Civil war. *Belgas Archiducem Matthiam pro tuenda Catholica Romana religione ad Provinciarum regimen evocaſſe, præſertim cum illa inter civiles hoſce tumultus magnis motibus percelleretur* (36). I ſhall obſerve by the by, that the author of that book was diſcovered, though he had taken all poſſible care to conceal himſelf. He was baniſhed upon that account, and his eſtate was confiſcated. He lived at Cologn under the protection of the Pope's Nuncio in 1678. I only ſay this upon the credit of the Italian Journaliſt (37). If what is ſaid of Sainte-Aldegonde in that book were true, it would be a trick of an ambaſſador, which he did not invent, and which is common enough (38). I have another book intituled, Antidote ou contrepoiſon contre les conſeils ſanguinaires & envenimez de Philippe de Marnix Sr. de Ste. Aldegonde, &c. - - - *An antidote or counterpoiſon againſt the bloody and pernicious counſels of Philip de Marnix Sieur de Sainte-Aldegonde, contained in a book publiſhed by him againſt the ſpiritual zealots, whom he calls in his language* Geeſtdryvers. *Written in the form of a reſponſory letter by a German gentleman, a lover of peace and of the Belgic liberty.* The time and place of the impreſſion and the Printer's name do not appear in it ; but one may know that it came out about the year 1598. The author of that book abuſes Sainte-Aldegonde in the following manner. ‘ (39) That ‘ advice puts me upon ſcanning your former actions, ‘ when I call to mind that it was not without cauſe ‘ that the States of Holland and Zealand would not ‘ permit you to come into their territories. You was ‘ then in deſpair by reaſon of the unfortunate murther ‘ of the late Prince of Orange of Glorious Memory, ‘ and becauſe the deſign at the dike of Cauweſtein ‘ miſcarried. Your conſcience was very much troubled, as miſtruſting GOD's power, till ſuch time ‘ as you had contrived that pretty ſurrender of Antwerp, and the pacification then concluded in the ‘ year 1584, and not contented with that great piece ‘ of ſervice done to the Duke of Parma, you made ‘ it your buſineſs in common diſcourſe to praiſe that ‘ prince, adviſing ſome to make a general peace, ‘ the better to conceal your own fault by the ruin ‘ and deſolation of a hundred thouſand poor afflicted ‘ people ; for you preſumed ſo much upon your ability as to pretend that you knew a way to make ‘ the ſaid duke revolt againſt his maſter, and by ‘ that means to procure a re-union of the ſeventeen ‘ Provinces. You boaſted that you had opened the ‘ matter to him in the time of the parliament of ‘ Beveren, when you had ſo many private diſcourſes ‘ with him in the preſence of all your colleagues, who ‘ are venerable men and ſome of the moſt illuſtrious ‘ in the ſaid town : which was too great an undertaking for ſuch a man as you are. I ſhall ſay nothing of your ill conduct in the government of that ‘ town, ſince you might have ſupplied it with ſufficient proviſions and ammunition for a ſiege of ſome ‘ years, conſidering the abſolute power you uſurped ‘ in it, and upon this not only the preſervation of ‘ that town, but, in a manner, that of the whole State, ‘ depended, witneſs the confuſion the Provinces were ‘ in when . . . . . . (40) This wiſe Prince of Orange, ‘ of Glorious Memory, was ſenſible, ſome years before he died, of your turbulent ſpirit, when he removed you by degrees from his council and perſon, leſt he ſhould ſome time or other find himſelf ‘ in a plunge, from the effects of this deteſtable advice of your's.’

Equity requires that we ſhould hear what Philip de Marnix anſwered to that German gentleman. ‘ Since ‘ the States-General, *ſays he* (41), who would not permit me to come into their territories, have not continued in their reſolution, but, on the contrary, have ‘ been willing that I ſhould be nearer them, have ‘ converſed with me above twelve years, and imparted to me many deſigns and ſecrets, and even conferred upon me honourable employments, ordering ‘ that I ſhould be well uſed, to give me thereby ‘ ſome marks of their affection ; do not you ſee that ‘ they have by that means cleared me of the calumnies, which ſlandering men, like you, had invented againſt me, though they durſt not open their ‘ mouths in my preſence? . . . . How dare you put a ‘ conſtruction upon what the States have done, quite ‘ contrary to their intention ? How dare you blame ‘ me, becauſe, in ſuch a critical time, they thought fit, ‘ for ſome particular reaſons, that I ſhould be abſent ‘ for ſome time, by reaſon of the ill reports that were ‘ ſpread againſt me ; it being impoſſible that a man ‘ in ſuch a poſt as I had, ſhould pleaſe every body. ‘ Eſpecially if it be conſidered, that, as they very well ‘ know, a falſe report went about, that I had prevented the reading of the Queen of England's letters at ‘ Antwerp ; at which ſome Engliſh ſoldiers were ſo ‘ exaſperated, that they ſwore they would kill me : ‘ but afterwards being informed of the truth of the ‘ matter, and even that I was going to the queen in ‘ order to clear my ſelf, they changed their mind. ‘ If therefore the States, for this, or ſome other conſideration, thought fit that I ſhould be abſent for ‘ ſome time, (for the letters of the States of Zealand ‘ alledged no other reaſon but the reports that went ‘ about me) how can you be ſo impudent as to defame me for a thing which redounds to my glory ‘ and honour ?’ Afterwards he gives a long liſt of the courageous actions performed by his order or counſels ſince the death of Prince William ; which ſhews that this aſſaſſination, which made him very uneaſy, did not throw him into deſpair, and deprive him of the uſe of his reaſon. He gives a particular account of his conduct during the ſiege of Antwerp ; he proteſts that he oppoſed, as long as he could, thoſe who were for capitulating, and that he and his twenty-one colleagues *had all their inſtructions in writing* (42), when they went out of the town to ſettle the conditions upon which it ſhould be ſurrendered. He ſays, that he made the enemies believe, that *they had ſtill proviſions enough for ſeven or eight months, ſo that Mr Richardot, the ſecond day after he entered into the town, ſaid, when he ſaw what a condition it was in, that he had never been ſo much impoſed upon* (43). He is very long in juſtifying himſelf as to the praiſes he had beſtowed upon the Duke of Parma. He ſays (44), that making a report to the great council *of what had paſſed during the capitulation,* he was obliged to ſet forth the reaſons alledged by the deputies of the Duke of Parma, to remove the miſtruſt that prevailed among the people. They had enlarged upon the virtues of that duke, and made an abridgment of his life, to ſhew that on all occaſions he had faithfully kept his treaties. Sainte-Aldegonde related what they had ſaid. Here follows an inſtance of popular injuſtice, and of the wrong conſtruction that is put upon things. ‘ This diſcourſe ‘ made in ſuch an aſſembly, and ſpread all over the ‘ town, was conſtrued by many, as if what I had related to have been ſpoken by the deputies of the ‘ Duke of Parma, had been my own opinion ; ſo ‘ that every body was ſaying that I had extolled the ‘ ſaid duke to the ſky : whereupon ſome miniſters ‘ (even ſome of thoſe, whom I took care to conſult before I did any thing) made me a ſharp remonſtrance, as if I had renounced my religion and my ‘ party. I confeſs that by an effect of human infirmity, I was more nettled at it than I ſhould have ‘ been ; ſo that my anſwer was attended with ſome ‘ marks of indignation. . . . . And becauſe I perceived, that, tho' I had ſatisfied them, the ſame report prevailed ſtill all over the town, and that many ‘ of thoſe, who envied and hated me, and who retired ‘ into Holland in crouds, triumphed over me upon ‘ that account, to the prejudice of my reputation ; I ‘ confeſs I was ſo moved with it, that, in my Apology, without remembring that I had related thoſe

‘ things,

(36) De ortu & proceſſu Calvin. Reform. in Belgio, *lib. ii*, §. *ix*, *p.* 78. *He quotes* Uytenbogartius Hiſtor. Eccleſ. *Part. iii.*

(37) *See the* VI Journal de Letterati 1678. *in the extract of the book intituled,* De ortu & proceſſu, &c.

(38) See the remark [*B*], in the article BELLAI (WILLIAM DU)

(39) Antidote, *pag.* 13, 14.

(40) Ibid. *p.* 15.

(41) Sainte Aldegonde, Reſponſe apologetique à un Libelle fameux qui a eſté publié par un certain libertin s'attiltrant Gentilhomme Allemand, &c. *fol. B* 3.

(42) Id. ibid. *fol.* C 2, *verſo.*

(43) Ibid. *fol.* C 3. *verſo.*

(44) Ibid. *fol.* C 4.

exhorted the States to perſecute the ſects [*L*]. I have read a book, wherein it is obſerved that

things, as they were ſpoken by our enemies, (as I have ſaid already), I plainly and abſolutely maintained that there was no harm in praiſing our enemies, for ſuch things as are really commendable, and I mentioned ſeveral good qualities of the Duke of Parma. To which I was induced, not only by reaſon of the ſaid calumnies, but alſo by the neceſſity of the time, and becauſe I was in his power, together with the whole town; tho' I may truly ſay that I had ſtill other views (45).' I ſhall mention this new reaſon, becauſe it diſcovers to us a weakneſs, an artifice, and a corruption, which prevail in all places, and in all ages. ‘ I have always been of opinion, *ſays Sainte-Aldegonde* (46), that nothing can be more dangerous for the preſervation of a ſtate in hard and difficult times, than to deſpiſe one's enemy. For as Orators tell their ſcholars, that they ought never to fancy that their adverſaries want wit; ſo in point of war, it is very dangerous to think that our enemies are fooliſh and careleſs people. And yet many were apt to entertain ſuch thoughts, endeavouring to make every body believe that the Duke of Parma was a man of no prudence and ability in military affairs. An opinion, gentlemen, which might have proved very prejudicial to your ſtate, if your prudence had not prevented the ill effects of it, by looking for aſſiſtance every where. Since my return into Zealand, I have ſeldom ſaid any thing of the Duke of Parma, either to his advantage or diſadvantage, except when I was required to do it, by thoſe who had the power to command me; and then I told them what I truly thought of him. Thus much for the praiſes beſtowed on the duke, which have been laid to my charge by ſo many people. Wherein I believe I have done nothing but what I was obliged to do by the neceſſity of the times, and by my concern for the preſervation of the town, and of the churches that were in it.'

Here you ſee a great difference between thoſe, who are altogether for countenancing popular prejudices, and thoſe who reaſon equitably and ſolidly. The latter think themſelves obliged in juſtice and good policy not to give a wrong account of the forces, valour, and good conduct, of the enemy: the former are for telling impudent lies about thoſe things. Not but that they are ſenſible that ſuch lies may be prejudicial in ſome reſpects; but they rather chuſe to indulge by ſuch means their own paſſions and thoſe of the people; and becauſe they take them to be more advantageous than detrimental, conſidering the humour of the populace, they do not approve of ſincerity, and if any one practiſes it, they impudently charge him with treaſon.

I omit the apology relating to the letter written by Sainte-Aldegonde to the Lord de Meetkercke, concerning a general peace. He vindicates himſelf by laying the fact open, and ſhewing the drift of his deſign, and he confeſſes that *ſome falſe and fooliſh reports went about it*. I likewiſe omit what concerns his being accuſed of neglecting to ſupply Antwerp with proviſions, &c. I think he fully juſtifies himſelf as to theſe articles. Let us ſee what concerns his being told in a reproachful manner that he had been excluded from affairs, and had made himſelf ſuſpected by Prince William. We ſhall ſee in his anſwer ſeveral particulars belonging to his hiſtory (47). ‘ After the death of the ſaid elector, and even after the departure of the king's brother (48), having earneſtly deſired to be diſmiſſed, in order to live a private life, his excellency (49) was pleaſed to grant my requeſt, but on condition, that whenever he ſhould ſend for me, I ſhould be ready to ſerve him in what place he ſhould order, which I promiſed to do. Upon this promiſe he had a mind to diſpatch me to Bruges, giving me the government of that town, and what depended upon it (which was prevented by my ſickneſs, and the ſecret practices of thoſe, who invited thither the preſent Duke of Arſchot). Afterwards he ſent me to Antwerp, having little hopes of preſerving that town, by reaſon of the different inclinations of the people, and the animoſity they expreſſed againſt him, under pretence that he favoured the French. He got me admitted there into the council of Brabant, and ſoon after I was by his means appointed the head of the town, under the title of the firſt burgomaſter, ſeeing that I had abſolutely refuſed that of Margrave.' He ſays afterwards, that this prince, *a month or ſix weeks before he died* (50), ſent for him to Antwerp, on account of the reſolution that was taken to ſend into France for ſuccours. ‘ (51) Ever ſince God was pleaſed to call him to himſelf, after the ſiege of Antwerp, which laſted thirteen months, during which time I uſed my utmoſt endeavours to keep it for the States and the United Provinces, tho' God was not pleaſed to proſper my labours, I willingly laid aſide the adminiſtration of affairs, and no body can ſay I ſued for any other employment directly or indirectly. Much leſs can it be ſaid that I was turned out, ſince I always loved to live a retired and frugal life in the country, till the ſaid States were pleaſed to call me to Leyden, in order to ſpend my time in a ſacred ſtudy, on which all my friends knew that my mind was altogether bent. Which is ſo true that this man, through a kind of contradiction, ſends me into Zealand to cultivate my garden and improve my lands, as I had formerly done for a conſiderable time.'

I ſhall add ſomething out of Strada. That Jeſuit acknowledges that Sainte-Aldegonde uſed his utmoſt efforts for the defence of Antwerp. He repreſents him as a man well ſtocked with methods of leading the mob (52). His adherents, ſaid he, gave out that they knew the Duke of Parma would offer very reaſonable terms, but that he had privately promiſed the ſoldiers that they ſhould have the plunder of the town. *Addebant aliqui civium, nempè ex Aldegundii coborte, ſibi exploratum eſſe, Parmenſem Principem oblaturum quidem conditiones haud ſpernendas, clam tamen ſtipendiorum loco cum Hiſpanis pactum eſſe populationem urbis* (53). The magiſtrates ſent out emiſſaries, who declared all over the town, that ſome letters had been received from France, importing that the troops deſigned for their relief were at laſt upon their march (54). That Hiſtorian obſerves that the greateſt part of the citizens ſuſpected thoſe letters to have been forged in Sainte-Aldegonde's cloſet (55). Is not this to repreſent him as a man, who uſed his beſt endeavours to preſerve that place? He adds, that Sainte-Aldegonde having loſt all hopes, and being willing to take care of his own particular intereſt, forwarded the ſending of ſome deputies to the Duke of Parma (56). He mentions the diſcourſe he made to the duke; he ſays (57), that he had a conference of four hours with that prince, at which the other deputies were not preſent, and that he particularly inſiſted on the article of liberty of conſcience, giving hopes that upon ſuch a condition Holland, Zealand, and the reſt of the Low-Countries, might ſubmit again to the King of Spain, and that he took it upon himſelf. He pretends that the Duke of Parma, who rejected that condition, made uſe of ſuch a wonderful eloquence, that Marnix owned he had never ſeen a prince, who ſpoke better. Laſtly, Strada ſays, that he ſeemed to have altered his mind ſince that conference, and to be more inclined to conclude a capitulation, and that he publiſhed a book, wherein he not only beſtowed great encomiums upon that duke, but alſo declared that one could not bear arms againſt Philip II with a good conſcience. This confeſſion, continues Strada, of a man, who had ſo great an intereſt in his party, was prejudicial to the confederates, and they began to ſuſpect Sainte-Aldegonde to ſuch a degree that he was laid aſide. Let us ſee this as it is told in elegant Latin. *Quinetiam edito poſtea libello, quum res ab Alexandro patratas, clementiam ejus in victos, in ſervanda fide ſanctimoniam, ceteraſque Imperatorias virtutes, liberali præconio celebraſſet; adjecit inter alia,* Sumi adverſus Philippum Regem arma à ſubditis populis, integra conſcientia, nequaquam poſſe. *Quæ ſanè confeſſio non temerè inter loquendum prompta, ſed litteris ad memoriam conteſtata, ut erat hominis authoritate inter ſuos, & Calvinianâ ſapientiâ longe clariſſimi, Fœderatorum cauſæ momenti plurimum abrogavit, ipſe ſuis offenſus inviſuſque, regendam ad Rempublicam poſtea non acceſſit* (58).

[*L*] *Complaints were made, that he exhorted the States to perſecute the ſects.*] I have ſaid more than once, when there was occaſion for it, that it was a hard caſe for the Proteſtant writers of the XVIth century, to think themſelves obliged to exhort the magiſtrates to

(45) Id. ibid. *verſo & ſeq.*

(46) Id. ibid. C 5. *verſo.*

(47) Sainte-Aldegonde, *ubi ſupra, fol. D* 3. *verſo.*

(48) That is, the Duke of Alençon.

(49) That is, William, Prince of Orange.

(50) Sainte-Aldegonde, *ubi ſupra, fol. D* 4.

(51) Id. ibid. *verſo.*

(52) Aldegundius non conſumptis adhuc quas apprime callebat artibus tractandæ multitudinis, ſpargit in vulgus ſcripturum ſe Parmenſi principi. *Strada, lib. vii, Dec. II, p.* 423.

(53) Id. ibid. *pag.* 424.

(54) Id. ibid.

(55) Plerique Gallicas literas Antverpiæ natas in Aldegundiano conclavi ſuſpectabant. *Id. ibid. pag.* 425.

(56) Conſul Aldegundius ubi rem deſperatam publicam vidit, ſibi privatim conſulturus legationem . . . . feſtinavit. *Id. ibid. pag.* 427.

(57) Id. ibid. *pag.* 432.

(58) Id. ibid. *pag.* 433.

that he loved dancing, and that this is ſufficient to anſwer the ſcruples of the Preciſiſts [*M*]. It

to puniſh Heretics, whilſt they thought it ſtrange that the Catholic princes ſhould perſecute the Proteſtants. Indeed their own arguments were retorted againſt them, and they could hardly come off but by ſuppoſing, as all parties do, that their doctrine was true. Sainte-Aldegonde muſt needs have been more perplexed than many others, ſince he had taken ſo many journies, made ſo many diſcourſes, and writ ſo many books, for a ſtate, which had taken up arms againſt the Spaniards, to free themſelves from the yoke of the Inquiſition. How many things might have been ſaid againſt him, when he exhorted the ſovereigns of that ſame ſtate to exterminate ſome ſects? Here is an inſtance of the perplexity he was in. He ſuppoſes, 1. That theſe words were only objected to him (59). *It is high time, noble and venerable lords, that you ſhould go about to maintain the honour of* GOD *in this world, if you deſire that he ſhould protect and defend your country.* 2. That the antidote which was oppoſed to that exhortation, conſiſts in this: ‘ *Men ought to live quietly* ‘ *one with another, and every body ought to have the* ‘ *liberty of believing what he thinks to be right, and we* ‘ *ſhould not concern our ſelves with it.* Permitte Divis ‘ cætera, - - - - - *With all things elſe, truſt the gods.*’ He quotes the ninth and forty-firſt pages of the Antidote; but there is in the ninth page a clauſe omitted by him. He is blamed for uſing theſe words, *to ſuppreſs and entirely annihilate that mortal poiſon.* It is further ſaid (60), that he thinks it very ſtrange, *that there ſhould be ſtill ſome men ſo tender-hearted, as to queſtion whether the magiſtrates ought to inflict corporal puniſhments, and lay a fine upon thoſe who are guilty of inſolence in the ſervice of* GOD *and religion.* What he leaves out, pretending to know nothing of it, alters the ſtate of the queſtion, and removes the difficult part of it. Can ſuch a proceeding be conſiſtent with ſincerity? Is it not an unfair thing to reduce the Antidote to a ſingle propoſition of the forty-firſt page, without conſidering ſeveral ſolid arguments that go before it? It is true, that in another place of his anſwer (61), he examines what he had left out in the beginning. That examination ſhews the perplexity he was in.

Note, That he bore an ill-will to the Enthuſiaſts long before. See his letter to Beza written the tenth of January 1566 (62).

[*M*] *It is obſerved that he loved dancing, and that this is ſufficient to anſwer the ſcruples of the Preciſiſts.*] See Schoockius (63), who has inſerted in one of his books, a letter written by Sainte-Aldegonde, in 1577, to Caſpar Verheiden, a famous Dutch miniſter (64). That letter ſeems to me very judicious. I ſhall take two or three curious things out of it. The author affirms, that many people were ſo offended, becauſe dancing was forbidden in the Reformed churches, that it made them unwilling to join with them, and that ſeveral laid aſide their averſion to the church of Rome, when they came to know the practice and opinion of the Proteſtants about it. From thence he infers, that too rigid a morality, touching this bodily exerciſe, was ſo far from being edifying, that it was ſcandalous (65). He ſays that the prince (66) himſelf was very much offended when he heard that one could not dance at a wedding, without incurring the cenſure of the church. He thinks that dancing is a good and commendable thing in the Netherlands, becauſe it keeps people from drinking or gaming after meals (67). He is not much concerned becauſe the zealots have not the ſame eſteem for him as they had before; for, ſays he, I take reputation to conſiſt in the real nature, and not in the ſuperficial outſide of things. *Exiſtimationis certe (quam tu mihi apud pios omnes amiſſam hoc facto eſſe autumas) rationem, ego nunquam in rerum externarum umbris, ſed in ipſis rebus poſitam eſſe ſtatui* (68). However he approves the conduct of the church of Geneva, which, by forbidding dancing, had ſuppreſſed many unbecoming things that were practiſed every day. It was an uſual thing in thoſe parts to carry young maids to balls up and down in the night-time, and to vex them with leud poſtures. He does not think that one can be preſent at ſuch a ſpectacle without a ſin, and much leſs an actor in it. His expreſſions being much ſtronger and more expreſſive than mine, I ſhall ſet them down here, in favour of thoſe who underſtand Latin. This I do in a thouſand other places for the ſame reaſon. *Ut ego Genevates merito laudandos cenſeam, qui turpiſſima dedecora, quæ quotidie ſine fronte committebantur, hoc uno interdicto, quaſi Tenedia bipenni, reſecuerint. Sed illis erat uſitatiſſimum, quod & hodie eſt multo frequentiſſimum, apud Burgundos, Sabaudos, atque omnes Allobroges, & multos etiam Gallos, puellas virgines intempeſtiva nocte, ſine ullo cuſtode, ad choreas, quocunque vellent abducere, & quamdiu vellent in fœdiſſimis atque obſcœniſſimis geſticulationibus, quovis anni tempore, ſine ulla prope intermiſſione, prætextu chorearum, uſque ad nauſeam fatigare. Quos ego mores vel inſpectare, nedum exemplo comprobare, nefas eſſe duxerim* (69).

The Reformed churches, which forbad dancing, cannot be ſufficiently praiſed for it; and it were an abſurd thing to fancy that the miniſters blamed it, only as it is an art of moving according to the time and cadence of Muſic. It is a very lawful exerciſe under that notion, it is neither good nor bad, morally ſpeaking. But the manner of it occaſioned a thouſand diſorders, and in the very room wherein the ball was kept, it made dangerous impreſſions upon a woman's chaſtity. The proverb concerning convents, *As dangerous as the return from matins* (70), might have produced another, with a ſmall alteration, *As dangerous as the return from a ball.*

A DESCRIPTION of the ill conſequences of dancing.

To confirm what I have ſaid, that the Proteſtant churches of France did very wiſely forbid dancing, I ſhall quote a paſſage out of a book written by Lambert Daneau, if I am not miſtaken. The author maintains (71), that *the Devil never invented a more effectual way than dancing to fill the world with whoredom:* ‘ For if the bare meeting of a man and a woman can ‘ have this effect, if leud words, or wanton ſongs ‘ alone, if bare touches are ſufficient to kindle luſt, ‘ as we have but too many inſtances of it every day; ‘ one may judge of the great inconveniencies that will ‘ ariſe from the concourſe of all thoſe things in one ‘ and the ſame place, and in the ſame perſons, who ‘ beſides meet there only for the ſake of pleaſure. ‘ But all thoſe things are to be found in dancing; ſo ‘ that it may be ſaid that dancing is a compoſition of ‘ all ſorts of poiſons invented by the Devil, to ſtrike ‘ the heart more powerfully, to ſtifle the fear of GOD, ‘ and to kindle all manner of filthy luſts; that it is ‘ a bait for the eyes and ears, and, in general, for all ‘ the ſenſes to ſeduce them, and convey the poiſon into ‘ the ſoul through their channel. There, more than ‘ in any other place, the heart gives an unbounded ‘ looſe to it's deſires and wanton inclinations. . . . . . ‘ (72) Upon ſuch an occaſion every body may chuſe, ‘ even in the arms of huſbands and mothers, ſuch ‘ women as they like, that is to ſay, ſuch as their ‘ luſts direct them to; and then they take them ‘ by the hand, and, as if they were already enjoying ‘ their deſires, they kiſs, embrace, and carry them ‘ up and down: young men making it their buſineſs ‘ to appear nimble and merry, and to pleaſe women ‘ with a thouſand motions; and women, on their ‘ part, uſing their endeavours to do the like. The ‘ men know how to make them friſk and cut ſuch ‘ high capers, that the company may ſee their legs ‘ up to their very thighs, without ſhame. A ball ‘ will have it's croſs motions, ſettings, and nearer ‘ approaches; and when the parties meet, there will ‘ be glances, capers, and redoubled frolicks, on purpoſe to ſhew that the heart, in a manner, flies with ‘ joy upon ſeeing itſelf ſo near the object of it's deſires; each ſort of dance affords new ways of pleaſing, ‘ ſeeing, and touching more familiarly: all thoſe ‘ things are performed with great ſhoutings, with ‘ ſmiling countenances, that ſeem tranſported with ‘ joy, and with all the ſymptoms of hearts that are ‘ intoxicating with full draughts of pleaſure (73). . . . ‘ The dancers are not the only perſons liable to thoſe ‘ inconveniencies, but alſo thoſe who are mere ſpectators, ſince women have a full ſight of young ‘ men, whilſt they play their nimble and merry ‘ tricks; and likewiſe the men a full ſight of the ‘ women and maids, whilſt they ſhew their wantonneſs. How great a power have the eyes and ears ‘ (or rather the Devil, who makes uſe of thoſe organs) upon idle people, well fed, and greedy of ‘ pleaſures? . . . But let us ſuppoſe that ſome ‘ will dance without having any ill deſires; can it be ‘ ſaid that they will not excite them in others? For ‘ they

---

(59) Sainte-Aldegonde, Reſponſe apologetique, *fol. A* 4.

(60) Antidote, *pag.* 10.

(61) Aldeg. Reſponſe apolog. *fol. G* 5, *& ſeq.*

(62) It is the ſixth letter among thoſe of Beza.

(63) Schoockius, Exercit. xxiii, *pag.* 317, *Edit. in 4to.*

(64) *It is the LIſt of the IId Tome of the* Epiſtolæ illuſtrium Belgarum.

(65) Plane cenſeo non modo nullam eſſe in hac importuna moroſitate, & revocata ad humanæ opinionis placitum cenſura, ædificationem, ſed incredibile etiam ſcandalum. *Schoock. pag.* 318.

(66) I think he means the Prince of Orange.

(67) Imo vero his locis ſanctas duxerim choreas quæ poſt epulas ad ſiſtenda ebrioſorum pocula inhibendoſve aleatorum ludos, agitantur cum fructu. *Schoock. ibid.*

(68) Ibid. *pag.* 319.

(69) Ibid. *pag.* 320.

(70) *See* Paſquier, Recherch. de la France, *book viii, ch. xxxiii, pag. m.* 729.

(71) Traité des Danſes, *ch. x, pag.* 37, *of the third edition which is that of* 1583.

(72) Ibid. *p.* 38, 39.

(73) Ibid. *p.* 41.

It cannot be denied, without doing him injuſtice, that he was one of the illuſtrious men of

‘ they do every thing that may kindle luſt, and, as St Jerom ſays in a like caſe, they preſent the poiſon to any that will take and ſwallow it. Now there will be but too many in theſe exceſſive fits of pleaſure, and after the provocatives of a full repaſt, that will be diſpoſed to drink it. A maid is pitched upon to dance; which is ſufficient to make her fear that ſhe has excited a fooliſh deſire in the perſon, who pitches upon her. But when he kiſſes her very tenderly, and careſſes her, and whilſt ſhe is dancing, redoubles his efforts; what can ſhe think but that he does it upon her account, and that the fire of love, which kindles his luſt, makes him ſo nimble? Beſides, that maid goes up and down with a bold and merry countenance, and without any vail or mark of ſhame, as it were, to ſhew herſelf to every body. But how can ſhe be ſure, that none of thoſe, who look upon her, will feel an unlawful deſire? And if you ſuſpect that you have occaſioned an ill thought in a man, what is become of your conſcience, if you are not ſorry for it, and do not avoid ſuch meetings? The ſame may be ſaid of young men with reſpect to women (74).’ I ſhould tranſcribe the greateſt part of that book, if I was willing to mention all the reaſons alledged in it as ſtrong as theſe. That treatiſe was dedicated to the King of Navarre, by the *miniſters of the Holy Goſpel of the French Reformed churches*. His court wanted very much to be reformed in that reſpect, for it was not like that of the virtuous Joan d'Albret. Her example was alledged to that prince (75): *Thanks be to GOD, there is no body who does not aſſure himſelf, that your majeſty, beſides the great parts and excellent judgment which GOD has beſtowed upon you, having ſo good and ſo holy an education from your infancy by ſuch an excellent queen and mother, that ſhe was deſervedly called the wonder of her age, and remembering the good example ſhe gave you, (for ſhe always kept her houſe free from ſuch filthy things, ever ſince ſhe was called to the knowledge of the Goſpel, and had the command of herſelf) it is impoſſible that the corruption of this age ſhould prevail upon you more than holy precepts, the ill examples of other courts, more than the remembrance of that wherein you have been bred up, and the allurements of the world more than the piety, which you have ſucked in with your mother's milk.*

Ludovicus Vives, a Roman Catholic, had followed the ſame maxims which Lambert Daneau has ſet forth. I ſhall quote him according to the French tranſlation of Peter de Changy. ‘ In the cities of Chriſtendom we have dancing-ſchools permitted as ſtews for wantonneſs: a thing which the Infidels themſelves would by no means ſuffer, on account of the leud touches and immoderate kiſſes that are cuſtomary there. To what purpoſe is ſo much kiſſing, unleſs it be to imitate the amorous doves? In old times virgins were not allowed to be kiſſed by any but their near relations; now every body aſſumes that privilege. We are brothers and ſiſters by baptiſm, but friendſhip and charity may very well ſubſiſt among us without ſuch familiarities. What pleaſure or advantage can there be in leaping higher than a girl's ſtrength can bear her, in being raiſed between two men and hoiſted up by the arms, or in dancing a whole night without being tired of it (76). . . . . . From ſuch nocturnal meetings proceed (as is ſaid before) leud kiſſes, afterwards unchaſte looks and touches, together with obſcene diſcourſe. They disfigure themſelves at a ſtrange rate. One has her coif pulled off, another is ſeen bare-headed, joined between two doors, or ſollicited by ſqueezing of the hand and other ſigns; for ſo treacherous a buſineſs it is that there is no way of eſcaping unhurt. The body is heated; deſire inflamed; the heart beats; the will wavers; and then, if a convenient place preſents, it is odds but they carry the point ſtill farther. In ſhort it can never bear a good conſtruction among women and girls that have a tender regard to their honour, and therefore it is prudent to avoid the danger, for fear they ſhould not be able to reſiſt it (77).’ The tranſlation of Antony Tiron printed for Plantin at Antwerp in the year 1579 doth not entirely agree with the other (78). His words are as follows: *Dancing is the laſt companion which makes extravagant entertainments the ſcene of mirth and high diverſion; ſo that we may juſtly ſay that dancing is in a manner the height of all vices. Notwithſtanding this we have dancing-ſchools in Chriſtendom; upon which account the Heathens out-do us in point of modeſty: for they are utter ſtrangers to that new way of dancing which prevails among us, and which is a bait to uncleanneſs, as being full of unchaſte touches and kiſſes. What means ſo much kiſſing? Formerly men were allowed to kiſs no women but ſuch as were their relations; but now it is the cuſtom all over Burgundy and England to kiſs whomſoever one pleaſes. Baptiſm, it is true, gives occaſion to this, to the end forſooth it may appear that we are all brethren. For my part I would gladly know what is the uſe of ſo much billing, as if we could not keep up our love and friendſhip with the women by any other means: but it is the beginning of an uncleanneſs which I will not name. To ſpeak my mind freely, I am of opinion that it is a moſt ſhameful and barbarous cuſtom. But to purſue my diſcourſe upon dancing; what is the good of ſo many leaps which the girls take, ſupported under the arms by their partners, to the end that they may be able to kick up their heels higher? What pleaſure do theſe locuſts take in tormenting themſelves thus, and in ſpending the greateſt part of the nights in dancing without being either weary or ſatisfied (79)?* All the reſt of the chapter is full of moral reflexions, and laſhes maſquerades at a terrible rate.

It is plain that when dancing is attended with ſo many irregularities, it deſerves to be blamed by all thoſe, who write moral books. Sainte-Aldegonde would not have approved of it. The Count de Buſſi Rabutin condemned the uſe of balls as a very dangerous thing: reaſon and his own experience convinced him of it (80). All the Caſuiſts ought to be Preciſiſts or Rigoriſts upon this head. The Philoſopher, who wrote againſt the Preciſiſts, declared (81) that he blamed dancing under this notion; but he ſaid he did not believe it was of the ſame nature among the Proteſtants of Germany; and that the Preciſiſts, who are offended at a cuſtom, that prevails in that country, where both ſexes dance together, ſhould conſider that they do not diſapprove certain cuſtoms, at which the Germans have more reaſon to be offended. ‘ Si mixti ſaltantium chori, nos ratione Germanorum offendant, næ eos multo magis offenderint promiſcui juvenum & virginum accubitus in nuptiis, maxime oſcula ex more gentis Belgicæ, præ cæteris Hollandicæ, frequentari ſolita. Obteſtor eos, quorum zelus contra choreas forte improbari non poſſet, ſi à ſcientia convenienter dirigeretur, an non multo majus ſcandalum promiſcua & *quotidiana* hæc *oſcula* (ita loquitur Sueton. lib. iii. cap. 34.) præbeant Sarmatis, Cimbris, & Germanis, quam nobis (ſi gentilitios mores diſtinguere noluerimus) præberi poſſint à nuptialibus eorundem tripudiis (82)? - - - *If we are ſcandalized at the promiſcuous dancing which is in faſhion among the Germans, truly they have more reaſon to be offended at the promiſcuous lolling of young men and girls at a wedding, and more eſpecially at the kiſſes which are ſo cuſtomary in the Low-Countries, and particularly in Holland. I appeal to them, whoſe zeal againſt balls would perhaps not deſerve to be cenſured, if it was guided by knowledge as it ought to be, whether theſe promiſcuous and* daily kiſſes *(to make uſe of Suetonius's words) do not give much greater offence to the Poles, Holſteiners, and Germans, than we (if ſo be that we will not diſtinguiſh between the cuſtoms that are peculiar to different nations) can poſſibly take at their nuptial dances.*’ He draws up a parallel between the cuſtom of kiſſing and that of dancing, and maintains that foreigners will be more offended at the firſt, than the Preciſiſts are at the laſt. ‘ Quam *πρόφασιν* pro ſuis Batavis excogitaverit hic rigidus Theologus, idemque juratus adverſarius non minus omnigenarum chorearum, quam votorum innoxiorum propinato poculo additorum? Maxime, ſi Cimber, aut Sarmata viderit uxorem illius, convivas ſuos ad oſtium oſculo excipientem & dimittentem. Næ, peregrinus hic conviva, cum Clemente Alexand. lib. 3. Pædag. ejuſmodi oſculum, à graviſſimi licet Paſtoris uxore ex uſu gentis frequentatum, vocaverit *oſculum inceſtum, veneno plenum, ſanctitatem ſimulans, & oſculum impudicitiæ:* ex Ambroſio vero in cap. ult. 2. ad Corinth. *affectus libidinoſi indicium.* Nec eſt, quod adverſarius dicat hoc judicium, ſeu Cimbri, ſeu Sarmatæ, charitatis expers eſſe, quum ipſe longe inclementius

---

(74) Ibid. *p.* 43.

(75) *Ibid.* in the Epiſtle Dedicatory, *fol. A* 3.

(76) Vives, on the education of a Chriſtian woman, *chap. xiii, fol.* 33. *Edit. of Paris* 1543.

(77) Ibid. *fol.* 34.

(78) Plantin *affirms in his preface that the firſt tranſlator* had followed the Latin no further than he thought fit, and that the ſaid book, in the form he had put it, was rather an abridgement, collection, or alteration; than a tranſlation of the ſaid Latin of Ludovicus Vives.

(79) *Idem*, as tranſlated by Antony Tiron, *pag.* 128, 129.

(80) See in the ſecond part of the *Retour des Pieces choiſies*, his letter to the Biſhop of Autun, concerning balls and dancing.

(81) Nulla ratione tamen patrocinari volo tripudiis modernis, à Bathylli modis non abhorrentibus, atque convenientibus magis Pathico, ſive cinædo, quam homini Chriſtiano. *Mart. Schoockius, ubi ſupra, p.* 327.

(82) Id. ibid.

of the XVIth century; for he was very zealous for his religion, and had a great deal of wit and learning: beſides he was well ſkilled in the Civil Law, Politics, Negotiations, Divinity, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and ſeveral living languages (*e*).

(*e*) *See* Verheiden, in Elog. aliquot Theolog. *p.* 141, *& ſeq.*

‘inclementius judicet de ſaltationibus, quas proclamat eſſe proxima incentiva libidinis, interim non cogitando, per oſcula multo expeditius ingredi libidinem; atque Cimbro, ſeu Sarmatæ, videri proſtitutæ famæ, & pudicitiæ, fœminas eſſe, quæ præſumpſerint hoſpites oſculo excipere (83). - - - *What excuſe could this rigid Divine, this ſworn enemy to all kinds of dancing, as well as to the innocent cuſtom of drinking healths, find out for his countrymen the Dutch: eſpecially if an Holſteiner or Pole ſhould ſee his wife receiving and diſmiſſing her gueſts at the door with a kiſs. Truly that foreign gueſt would with Clemens Alexandrinus call a kiſs of that nature, though given by a grave Parſon's wife, and warranted by the cuſtom of the country, an impure kiſs, full of venom, and which under the pretence of being holy was in truth the kiſs of unchaſtity; or with St Ambroſe he would conſtrue it for the mark of a libidinous inclination. Nor could his adverſary ſay that this cenſure of the Holſteiners or Poles was void of charity, ſince he himſelf paſſes a far more unmerciful judgment upon dancing, which he avers to be the higheſt incentive to luſt, not conſidering that luſt is much ſooner raiſed by kiſſes; and that the Holſteiner, Cimbrian, or Pole, believes all theſe to be looſe and abandoned women who preſume to welcome their gueſts with a kiſs.*’ He concludes that nations ought to excuſe one another, and to conſider, above all things, that an antient and long cuſtom may make a thing innocent in one country, that is indecent in another. He inſtances upon Engliſh women walking with other men than their huſbands. ‘(84) Quæ ratione oſculi dicta ſunt, applicari poſſunt deambulationibus, quas uxores Anglorum, cum alienis viris inſtituere ſolent (85), quæ & inter primariæ dignitatis Belgas hoc tempore frequentari incipiunt. Certe offenderint hæ matronas Chriſtianas ad Septentrionem degentes; quæ mirabuntur admodum, hæc & ſimilia citra cenſuram tolerari poſſe ab illis Theologis, quorum zelus quotidie occupari ſolet circa ſaltationes & pocula votiva. Nos vero, citra pulveris jactum, ex omnibus hiſce difficultatibus expedire conſtanter poſſumus, quando docemus, in talibus gentium mores & conſuetudines ante omnia inſpici debere quorum ratione, ut rigidiores quoque Præciſiſtæ Hollando ſua concedunt ſuavia, Anglicanis matronis prodeambulationes cum maritis non ſuis; ita aliis gentibus mox invidere non deberent ſuas ſaltationes, modo ab iis abſit mollities, & illud τεχνικὸν, ad accendendum libidinem ab otioſis nepotibus excogitatum. - - - *What has been ſaid with reſpect to kiſſes may be applied to the cuſtom that Engliſh women have of walking with other men than their own huſbands, which likewiſe begins to be the faſhion among Dutch ladies of the firſt quality. This muſt certainly give offence to the Chriſtian women that live farther North, and they will wonder very much how theſe and the like things can eſcape the cenſure of thoſe Divines, whoſe zeal is daily employed againſt the cuſtom of dancing and that of drinking healths. But as for us, we can eaſily extricate ourſelves out of all theſe difficulties, by ſaying that in ſuch things the manners and cuſtoms of nations ought chiefly to be conſidered, and that ſince out of regard to thoſe, the rigid Preciſiſts allow the Dutchman his kiſſes, and the Engliſh women their walks with huſbands not their own, they ought as little to envy other nations their dances, provided they be free from effeminacy, and have none of thoſe artificial geſtures which profligate men have contrived as incentives to luſt.*’

It may be obſerved that this Philoſopher had not the ſame reaſons that Sainte-Aldegonde had, to write an apology for dancing. He proteſts that he never had a mind to dance; and that if the magiſtrates ſhould forbid dancing, it would not make him uneaſy in the leaſt (86). Sainte-Aldegonde could not have ſaid ſo with any ſincerity.

(83) Mart. Schoockius, Exercit. xxiii, *pag.* 328.

(84) Id. ibid. *pag.* 329.

(85) Henry Stephens mentions that cuſtom in his Latin Apology for Herodotus.

(86) Proteſtationi hoc unum amplius adjicio, mihi, circa choreas, ne quicquam ſive ſeri ſive meti; quum de earum exercitio ne per ſomnium quidem cogitaverim tota vita, quam exemplo *agni* illius *curionis* apud Plautum, ex Dei mei voluntate, in qua libenter acquieſco, tranſigo inter catenatas moleſtias & curas: unde & ferre poſſum Magiſtratuum Edicta, chorearum abolitionem perpetuam urgentia. *Id. ibid. p.* 321.

SANCTA-CLARA (FRANCIS OF) an Engliſhman, and a Franciſcan Monk, lived in the XVII century. He was chief lecturer in Divinity at Douay, in the convent of St Bonaventure, and provincial miniſter of the province of England, and Almoner to the Queen of Great Britain, wife to Charles I. He publiſhed ſome books [*A*], where he ſhewed himſelf favourable to thoſe of the Epiſcopal perſuaſion in England; for he endeavoured to prove that the XXXIX articles of their church might be more eaſily reconciled with the council of Trent, than is commonly imagined. He was beſides very favourable to thoſe who err with a good intention. We need only ſee his problem upon invincible ignorance (*a*). He does not appear to have any other learning or eloquence beſides what may be got by a diligent reading of the School-men and Canoniſts.

(*a*) It is the xvth of his book, intituled *Deus, Natura, Gratia.* Mr Allix has quoted it twice, (*pag.* 117, 203) in his *Reflexions Critiques & Theologiques ſur la Controverſe de l'Egliſe*, printed in the year 1686.

It has likewiſe been quoted in the *Commentaire Philoſop. ſur contrain-les d'entrer*, pag. 524, of Part. II.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books.*] I ſhall give the entire title of that which he dedicated to Charles I, king of England, and which was printed at Lyons in the year 1635 in 8vo. ‘Deus, Natura, Gratia, ſive Tractatus de Prædeſtinatione, de Meritis & peccatorum remiſſione, ſeu de Juſtificatione, & denique de Sanctorum Invocatione, Reliquiarum & Imaginum veneratione, de Indulgentiis, & Purgatorio, & ſub finem, de Excommunicatione. Ubi ad trutinam Fidei Catholicæ examinatur Confeſſio Anglicana, & ad ſingula puncta, quid teneat, qualiter differat, excutitur. Doctrina etiam Doctoris Subtilis, D. Auguſtini ſequacis acutiſſimi, olim Oxoniæ & Cantabrigiæ, & ſolemniter approbata, & honorifice prælecta, exponitur & propugnatur. Acceſſit paraphraſtica Expoſitio reliquorum Articulorum Confeſſionis Anglicæ. Tertia editio multo auctior, pluribus materiis Theologicis illuſtrior, & in articulorum diſcuſſione clarior, & fuſior. Præmittitur Epiſtolium Apologeticum lectori Catholico, in quo ratio totius operis exhibetur. - - - *God, Nature, Grace; or a treatiſe on Predeſtination, on Merits and the forgiveneſs of ſins, or on Juſtification; as alſo on the invocation of ſaints, the worſhip of relicks and images, on indulgences, and purgatory, and laſtly on excommunication. Wherein the confeſſion of the Church of England is examined by the ſcale of the Catholic Faith, and diſcuſſed in every point, both as to what it contains, and in what manner it differs from the ſaid faith. The doctrine alſo of Duns Scotus, the ſubtile follower of St Auguſtin, which formerly was ſolemnly approved of and honourably taught at Oxford and Cambridge, is explained and defended. To this is added, a paraphraſtical expoſition of the other articles of the Engliſh confeſſion. The third edition conſiderably enlarged, improved by the addition of ſeveral points of Divinity, and more diſtinct and copious in the diſcuſſion of the articles: to which is prefixed, a ſhort apologetical epiſtle to the Catholic reader, giving an account of the whole work.*’ His *Apologia Epiſcoporum, ſeu ſacri Magiſtratus Propugnatio: Præmittuntur Anarcharum politiciſmi*, was printed at Cologn in the year 1640 in 8vo.

SANTA-CROCE (PROSPER) in French *Sainte-Croix*, made a cardinal by Pius IV, had been advocate-conſiſtorial and auditor of the Rota. He was Nuncio in Germany, Portugal, Spain, and France. Catherine de Medicis procured him the archbiſhopric of Arles, where he prevented with an extreme ſeverity the eſtabliſhment of the Proteſtant religion. He died at Rome the fourth of October 1589, being ſeventy-ſix years old. I ſhall ſpeak of his books [*A*]. At his return from his nunciature in Portugal, he made Tobacco known in Italy [*B*]; which is the reaſon why that herb was called Santa-Croce (*a*).

(*a*) Ex Proſpero Mandoſio, Bibliothec. Romana; & Oldoino Athen. Roman.

[*A*] *I ſhall ſpeak of his books.*] His books are, *Deciſiones Rotæ Romanæ. Gallicarum rerum Commentaria. Epiſtolæ ad Federicum Nauſeam alioſque.* Several Orations. *Conſtitutiones laneæ artis à Sixto V. in Urbe erectæ.* The Jeſuits of the Roman college have his treatiſe, *De Officio Legati*, and one volume of his letters in manuſcript (1).

(1) Ex Proſpero Mandoſio, Bibl. Romana; & Oldoino Athen. Roman.

[*B*] *He made Tobacco known in Italy.*] This appears from ſome verſes of Caſtor Duranti, quoted by Mandoſio, wherein that herb is celebrated, as if forſooth it was an univerſal remedy.

Nomine quæ Sanctæ Crucis herba vocatur, ocellis
Subvenit, & ſanat plagas, & vulnera jungit,
Diſcutit & ſtrumas, cancrum, cancroſaque ſanat
Ulcera, & ambuſtis prodeſt, ſcabiemque repellit;
Diſcutit & morbum cui ceſſit ab impete nomen,
Calefacit & ſiccat, ſtringit, mundatque, reſolvit,
Et dentum & ventris mulcet capitiſque dolores;
Subvenit antiquæ tuſſi, ſtomacoque rigenti
Renibus & ſpleni confert, ultroque, venena
Dira ſagittarum domat, ictibus omnibus atris
Hæc eadem prodeſt: gingivis proficit atque
Conciliat ſomnum: nuda oſſaque carne reveſtit:
Thoracis vitiis prodeſt, pulmonis itemque,
Quæ duo ſic præſtat non ulla potentior herba.
Hanc Sanctacrucius Proſper quum Nuncius eſſet
Sedis Apoſtolicæ Luſitanas miſſus in oras
Huc adportavit Romanæ ad commoda gentis,
Ut proavi Sanctæ lignum Crucis ante tulere
Omnis Chriſtiadum quo nunc reſpublica gaudet,
Et Sanctæ Crucis illuſtris Domus ipſa vocatur
Corporis atque animæ noſtræ ſtudioſa ſalutis.

The herb which borrows Santa Croce's *name;*
Sore eyes relieves, and healeth wounds. The ſame
Diſcuſſes the King's Evil, and removes
Cancers and Boils: a remedy it proves
For burns and ſcalds, repels the nauſeous itch,
And ſtrait recovers from Convulſion fits.
It cleanſes, dries, binds up, and maketh warm:
The Head-ach, Tooth-ach, Cholic, like a charm,
It eaſes ſoon; an antient cough relieves,
And to the reins, the milt, and ſtomach gives
Quick riddance from the pain that each endures;
Next the dire wounds of poiſon'd arrows cures,
All bruiſes heals, and when the gums are ſore,
It makes them ſound and healthy as before.
Sleep it procures, our anxious ſorrow lays,
And with new fleſh the naked bone arrays.
No herb has greater pow'r to rectify
All the diſorders in the breaſt that lie
Or in the lungs. Herb of immortal fame!
Which hither firſt with Santa Croce *came,*
When he, his time of nunciature expir'd,
Back from the court of Portugal retir'd;
Ev'n as his predeceſſors great and good
Brought home the Croſs, whoſe conſecrated wood
All Chriſtendom now with its preſence bleſſes:
And ſtill th' illuſtrious family poſſeſſes
The name of Santa Croce, *rightly given,*
Since they, in all reſpects reſembling Heaven,
Procure, as much as mortal men can do
The welfare of our ſouls and bodies too.

A parallel between Tobacco and the wood of the true Croſs, is a very high ſtrained panegyric.

SANCTA-MAURA, an iſland formerly called Leucas (*a*), nine miles from that of Cephalonia (*b*). The Greeks call it ſtill Leucada (*c*), for properly ſpeaking they call Sancta-Maura the fortreſs, where there was formerly a monaſtery of that name. That fortreſs is three miles diſtant from the ruins of the town of Leucas [*A*], in a place where the canal between the iſle and the continent is one league broad. Nevertheleſs it has conſtant communication with the continent by the bridge, and by means of ſeveral little iſlands joined together by bridges (*d*). It has alſo an aqueduct [*B*] a mile long, which ſerves for a bridge to thoſe, who go on foot (*e*). There are about thirty villages in the iſland: the Greeks have a biſhop in it. It abounds with corn, wine, oil, and ſeveral ſorts of fruit, and is about twelve or fifteen leagues round (*f*). The Turks made themſelves maſters of it in 1479 [*C*]. The Venetians took it from them under the conduct of the Captain-general Peſaro in 1502, and reſtored it to them ſoon after by a treaty of peace. They retook it under the General Moroſini the twenty-third of July 1684. The Pirates of

(*a*) See the article LEUCAS.

(*b*) Coronelli, Memoires Hiſt. & Geogr. *Printed at Amſterdam* 1686.

(*c*) Spon. Voiag. *Tom. I, p.* 102. *Dutch Edit.*

(*d*) Coronelli, *ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Spon, *ubi ſupra, p.* 104.

(*f*) Father Coronelli ſays it is ſeventy miles in circumference.

[*A*] *Three miles diſtant from the ruins of the town of Leucas.*] Spon (1) cenſures Ortelius and Ferrarius for *believing as other Geographers do, that Sancta-Maura is ſtill in the ſame place with the town of Leucas*, the ruins of which are to be ſeen three miles from Sancta-Maura. I do not find in Ortelius's *Theſaurus Geographicus* that the town of Sancta-Maura, and that of Leucas are in the ſame ſituation; but only that the iſle of Leucas is now called Sancta-Maura. Now is there any thing in this that deſerves to be cenſured? Spon adds, that the town of Leucas was built *upon a riſing ground a mile from the ſea, at the narroweſt part* of the canal that was made when the iſthmus was cut, and that this part is not above fifty paces broad. I confeſs I cannot apprehend that a town ſhould be built upon a canal fifty paces broad, and yet be a mile diſtant from the ſea; for is not that canal in the ſame place where the iſthmus was? Now can a town built upon an iſthmus fifty paces broad be above fifty paces diſtant from the ſea? Suppoſing the Engliſh channel to be only thirty toiſes broad, will it follow from thence that Dover and Calais are not upon the ſea-ſhore.

(1) Spon, Voiag. *Tom. I, p.* 103.

[*B*] *It has alſo an aqueduct.*] Spon (2) who ſaw that aqueduct ſays, that it *ſerves for a bridge to thoſe who go on foot, though it be hardly above three foot broad, and has no breaſt-height.* He adds, *though a man be never ſo fearleſs, he trembles when he goes over it, eſpecially if he meets any body that comes from the place he goes to; for two men have much ado to go over it a-breaſt.* But Father Coronelli ſays (3) *it is a ſtately aqueduct, built with ſtone, and ſupported by three hundred and ſixty arches.* The ſupplement of Moreri's Dictionary calls it *a magnificent aqueduct of ſtone .... ſupported by three hundred and ſixty arches which croſs the great pond.*

(2) Spon, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 104.

(3) Coronelli, Memoires Hiſt. & Geographiques.

[*C*] *The Turks made themſelves maſters of it in the year* 1479.] It was under Mahomet II. See the particulars of it in that Sultan's life written by Mr Guillet (4); they are curious enough. Leonard Tocco, Deſpotes or Dynaſta of Acarnania, was then poſſeſſed of Sancta-Maura.

(4) In Tom. ii, pag. 329.

of Sancta Maura have been much talked of: They were the firſt that made uſe of galliots. The Baſhaw of the Morea went on purpoſe into that iſland in 1675, to burn their ſmall veſſels (g). Durag Bey, a famous corſair of Lepanto, had ſeven or eight corſairs of Sancta-Maura under his command.

(g) Spon, *ibid.*

SANCTESIUS (*a*) (Claudius), in French *de Sainctes*, one of the chief controverſiſts of the XVIth century, was a native of Perche [*A*]. He took the habit of canon regular in the year 1540 (*b*), in the monaſtery of St Cheron near Chartres (*c*), and was ſent to Paris ſome time after, where he ſtudied claſſical learning, Philoſophy and Divinity in the college of Navarre (*d*). He took his degree of Doctor of Divinity in 1555, and then applied himſelf very much to controverſy, and was admitted into the houſe of the Cardinal de Lorrain (*e*). In the year 1561, he was one of the diſputants for the Romiſh party in the conference of Poiſſi, and afterwards one of the twelve Divines, whom Charles IX ſent to the council of Trent. He and Simon Vigor diſputed with two miniſters in the houſe of the Duke of Nevers in 1566 (*f*). I ſpeak of this in another place (*g*). He preached a conſiderable time in Paris, and was made Biſhop of Evreux in the year 1575. He was ſo incenſed againſt the Proteſtants, that he maintained that thoſe, whom they had baptized, were to be baptized again [*B*]. He left nothing unattempted to turn them out of his dioceſe, and to get all the canons of the council of Trent admitted into the kingdom without any reſtriction [*C*]. He did not ſcruple to ſay that Calvin and Beza taught Atheiſtical doctrines (*h*). He joined in the League with ſuch a fury, that he maintained that Henry III had been juſtly aſſaſſinated, and that Henry IV deſerved the ſame puniſhment [*D*]. The manuſcript, wherein he aſſerted that doctrine, was found in his cloſet, when Biron made himſelf maſter of Louviers, and ſeized upon that unhappy prelate. He was not treated like a priſoner of war, but he was ſent to Caen (*i*) to be tried; and becauſe he obſtinately continued to maintain that pernicious doctrine, he would have been put to death, had not the Cardinal de Bourbon, and ſome other Eccleſiaſtics who were with the king, prevailed with him to remit that puniſhment, which they thought he juſtly deſerved, and to condemn him to a perpetual impriſonment. He died ſoon after in his confinement (*k*): it was in the year 1591. It is to be obſerved that long before, out of ſpite to the Proteſtants, he had ſaid in a book, that ſubjects ought never to oppoſe the ordinances

(*a*) Thuanus calls him *Sanctius.*

(*b*) Moreri at the word *Claude de Sainctes*, letter C.

(*c*) In Cœnobio Sancti Carauni ad Carnutum. *Jo. Launoius Hiſt. Gymnaſii Navarr. p.* 769.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) Id. ibid.

(*f*) And not 1556, as Launoi will have it. *ibid.*

(*g*) See the article ROSIER.

(*h*) *See the book which he intituled,* Declaration d'aucuns Atheïſmes de la Doctrine de Calvin & de Beze.

(*i*) The parliament of Normandy had been removed thither.

(*k*) Taken from Thuanus. See his words in the remark [*D*].

[*A*] *He was a native of Perche.*] I know that according to La Croix du Maine and Moreri, he was a native of Chartres: but I rather believe John de Launoi, who has theſe words: *Claudius Sanctesius ortum habuit in ea Galliæ regione cujus populi nunc Perticenſes, Gregorio Turonenſi Pertenſes; antiquioribus Aulerci Diablintes dicti fuere* (1).

[*B*] *He maintained, that thoſe whom the Proteſtants had baptized, were to be baptized again.*] He himſelf tells us that Pius V having decided, that thoſe who had been baptized by the innovators, ought neither ſimply, nor yet with any addition, to be baptized again, ordered his Nuncio to command him, and the other preachers of Paris, to teach no longer the contrary. That brief of Pius V is very ſcarce. I ſhall ſet down the words of Dr de Launoi. *Ad annum MDLXXII Lutetiæ concionabatur, cum Pius V Pontifex ſtatuit, neque ſimpliciter, neque cum adjectione repetendum eſſe baptiſmum, quem Novatores dediſſent. Id teſtatur in Synodo, quam cum Epiſcopus fuit, anno MDLXXVII habuit.* Quam, *inquit*, definitionem Pius Pontifex ante quinque vel ſex annos per Breve, ac per Internuntium Apoſtolicum dignatus fuit nobis atque aliis, qui tum Lutetiæ Pariſiorum fungebantur concionatorum officio, ſignificare atque inhibere, ne aliter doceremus. *Breve illud vix invenitur* (2).

[*C*] *He left nothing unattempted . . . . to get all the canons of the council of Trent admitted into the kingdom, without any reſtriction.*] This I ſhall prove by the words of the ſaid doctor. *Porro autem*, ſays he (3), *in Epiſcopali munere nulli non pepercit labori ac diligentiæ, ſive ut hæreſim à finibus ſuis exterminaret, ſive ut Tridentini Concilii decreta penitus admitterentur ac ſervarentur.*

[*D*] *He maintained that Henry III had been juſtly aſſaſſinated, and that Henry IV deſerved the ſame puniſhment.*] Let us tranſcribe the whole account Thuanus gives of this. 'Captus in oppido (4) Claudius Sanctius 'Ebroicenſium Epiſcopus famoſus Theologus regiis 'partibus infeſtiſſimus cum libris & chartis, inter quas 'ſcriptum repertum eſt, quo parricidium Regis tan'quam juſte factum tuebatur, & idem licere in Regem 'hodiernum defendebat. Itaque non lege belli cum 'eo actum, ſed Cadomum ſub cuſtodia miſſus, ut in 'eum Senatus inquireret, & tanquam de perduelli ſupplicium ſumeretur. Nec enim ſacri ordinis prærogativæ in crimine læſæ Majeſtatis apud nos ratio 'habetur, ſed in convictos, ſive ſacerdotes ſive epiſ'copi ſint, tanquam ſolutos ac profanos legum ſeve'ritas exercetur, parumque res ab executione abſuit: 'Sanctio jam peracto reo, ut erat pervicaci ingenio 'errorem præfracte propugnante. Sed interceſſerunt 'poſtea Cardinalis Borbonius aliique è ſacro ordine, 'qui cum Rege erant, tenueruntque, ut pro mortis 'pœna, quam legibus noſtris, ut ipſi fatebantur, me'ruerat, carceri perpetuo manciparetur, in quo paulo 'poſt deceſſit (5). - - - *Claudius Sanctesius, Biſhop of 'Evreux, a famous Divine, and a bitter enemy to the 'king's party, was taken in the town, with his books 'and papers, among which was found a piece, wherein 'he juſtified the murder of the late king, and maintained 'that the ſame thing might lawfully be done to his preſent 'majeſty. For this reaſon he was not treated like a 'priſoner of war, but was ſent under a guard to Caen, 'that he might be tried before the parliament, and 'puniſhed as a traytor. For with us no regard is 'had to the privileges of the holy order in crimes of high 'treaſon; but the rigour of the law takes place upon all 'ſuch as are convicted, upon prieſts and biſhops, as well 'as lay men; and it was very near being executed 'here; Sanctesius, even after he was found guilty, con'tinuing obſtinately to defend this error. But afterwards, 'the Cardinal de Bourbon, and ſome other Eccleſiaſtics that 'were with the king, interceded for him, and obtained 'that inſtead of being puniſhed with death, which they 'confeſſed he deſerved by our laws, he ſhould be con'demned to a perpetual impriſonment, in which he died 'ſoon after.*' Henry IV acted, without doubt, upon this occaſion according to the clemency and generoſity that were natural to him; but there was likewiſe ſome ſmall mixture of that timorous prudence, which frequently ſhook his great courage, when he came to obſerve that the monſter of the league he was to overcome, more fierce and dangerous than Hercules's Hydra, would grow more furious and terrible by the effuſion of his blood. Wherefore that prince thought himſelf obliged to uſe mildneſs in order to tame and pacify that wild beaſt. Clemency, on the one hand, and policy on the other, ſpared Sanctesius the ſhame of loſing his life upon a ſcaffold, as he deſerved.

[*E*] *He*

(1) Jo. Launoius, in Hiſtor. Gymnaſii Navar. *pag.* 769.

(2) Launoius, *ibid. pag.* 770.

(3) Ibid. *p.* 772.

(4) That is, *Lupariæ*, at Louviers in Normandy.

(5) Thuanus, *lib.* ci, *pag.* 418.

ordinances of their ſovereigns [*E*]. He publiſhed a ſmall piece in 1561, to ſhew that Heretics ought not to be tolerated [*F*]. It is a very ancient opinion, and very common to

[*E*] *He had ſaid in a book, that ſubjects ought never to oppoſe the ordinances of their ſovereigns* (6).] The book, wherein he advances this opinion, was printed at Paris, in 1561, with this title, *Confeſſion de Foi Catholique, contenant en bref la Reformation de celle que les Miniſtres de Calvin preſenterent au Roi en l'Aſſemblée de Poiſſi*. The fifty-ſeventh article of that Confeſſion contains theſe words: ‘ We hold that ſubjects ought to obey their laws and ordinances, to pay tributes, impoſts, and other duties, and bear the yoke of ſubjection with a ready will, *tho' princes were infidels*, and *the empire of* GOD *ſhould not be preſerved entire*. And therefore we deteſt thoſe, who would reject ſuperior powers, ſet up communities at their pleaſure, introduce a confuſion of goods, and overthrow the order of juſtice. *We alſo reject* all murderers and aſſaſſins, hired and ſworn to follow and ſupport ſects, and *thoſe who declare* all thoſe *to be worthy of death*, without form of trial, who diſpleaſe or reſiſt them, and *who get kings*, lords, churches, and towns, *attacked under pretence of the word of* GOD.' The author undertook to ſhew that the Catholics went farther than the Proteſtants; for the latter added a clauſe to the article, wherein they declared their opinion about the obedience of ſubjects; *provided*, ſay they, *the empire of* GOD *be preſerved entire* (7). Tho' this clauſe has been often reflected upon, as being too general and captious, it is very juſt and orthodox, if it be rightly underſtood, tho' it may be wreſted to a pernicious ſenſe againſt the intention of the authors. But it is certain that Sanctesius left it out of his Confeſſion from a motive of mere oſtentation, and out of hatred to Geneva; and no man did ever contradict himſelf more impudently than he did: which is the uſual fate of thoſe who argue without principles, and embrace an opinion only to differ from their enemies, that they may have a pretence to inſult them, and render them ſuſpected. When that paſſion is over, or when the intereſt and exigencies of their party require another thing, they renounce their firſt opinions, and eſpouſe quite contrary ones. We have ſome late inſtances of it.

[*F*] *He publiſhed a ſmall piece . . . . . to ſhew that Heretics ought not to be tolerated.*] His book is intituled, *Ad edicta veterum Principum de licentia ſectarum in Chriſtiana religione. Item methodus contra ſectas quam ſequuti ſunt primi Catholici Imperatores.* He approves that Heretics ſhould be put to death, and declares that if the fires, which had been lighted in France to deſtroy Calviniſm, had not been extinguiſhed, that ſect would have made no progreſs. ‘ Audivi Severum Sulpitium de Priſcilliani hiſtoria, quaſi tabulam abſolutionis per domos judicum aliquorum circumlatum, cum adhuc in Gallia exercerentur judicia de capite pro religione ex Chriſtianiſſimorum regum edictis, atque ex ea hiſtoria plus damni noſtræ fidei, quàm à Calvino libris & emiſſariis illatum. Non enim ultro citroque intrepide commeaſſent, & ad factionem tot homines ſollicitaſſent, ſi conflagratio non fuiſſet temere reſtincta, & à nonnullis quaſi fides publica data Religionis & Reipub. perturbatoribus (8). - - *I have heard that Sulpitius Severus's hiſtory of Priſcillianus, was carried round to the houſes of ſome of the Judges, as if it had been a decree of abſolution, during the time that capital puniſhments were ſtill inflicted on a religious account in France, according to the edicts of the moſt Chriſtian kings; and that this hiſtory did more damage to our faith than the books and emiſſaries of Calvin. For they could not have gone up and down ſo without any fear, and ſtirred up ſuch a number of men to ſedition, if the fires had not been imprudently extinguiſhed, and if ſome few had not preſumed to give a kind of public ſecurity to theſe enemies of religion and the ſtate.*' The whole ſtrength of this book is grounded upon cuſtom and practice; for he alledges few reaſons, and thoſe he offers are not good. Whoever impartially compares the arguments for or againſt Toleration, muſt needs confeſs that he could not have alledged any good reaſon for perſecution, tho' he had been a man of much greater abilities than he was. The reaſons for a Toleration have been ſet forth with the utmoſt evidence by ſome late writers. See the prefaces to the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes; the book (9) intituled, *Traité de la Liberté de Conſcience, ou de l'Autorité des Souverains ſur la Religion des Peuples, oppoſée aux Maximes de Hobbes & de Spinoſa, adoptées par le Sieur Jurieu dans ſon Hiſtoire du Papiſme, & dans ſon Syſtéme de l'Egliſe*; the Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe words, *Compel them to come in*; and the Latin letter printed at Tergow, in 1689, Mr de Beauval (10) aſcribed it to Mr Bernard, a French miniſter, very well known by his works, and very well qualified to write a book that contains ſuch cloſe reaſoning; but it is certain he is not the author of it, and it is thought to be written by an Engliſh gentleman (11), whoſe books on Metaphyſics, Morality, *&c.* appear frequently in the Journals. But without undertaking to read a long-winded work, one needs only read a ſmall piece written at London, in 1685, by an illuſtrious magiſtrate of a town in Holland (12). It is intituled, *H. V. P. ad B * * * de nuperis Angliæ motibus Epiſtola, in qua de diverſorum à publica religione, circa divina ſentientium diſſeritur tolerentia.* That letter was printed at Rotterdam, in 1685, in Latin, French, and Dutch.

The reaſons alledged for Toleration muſt needs be very cogent, ſince all thoſe, who have done their utmoſt endeavours to anſwer them, have been obliged to have recourſe to unfair means, and to acknowledge that Heretics ought not however to be puniſhed with death (13). Their malice and unfairneſs appear by their endeavouring to create a belief, that thoſe who are for Toleration favour the Socinians; that they are ill affected towards the government, and deprive the ſupreme powers of one of the moſt conſiderable rights that GOD has given them. This is a baſe and unjuſt proceeding: at this rate one muſt not find fault with the cruel decrees, by virtue of which ſo many Proteſtants have been burnt in France, the Netherlands, Spain, and Italy; for the Socinians do mightily exclaim againſt thoſe cruelties. They inveigh no leſs againſt the Papiſts, who have put to death thoſe, that are mentioned in the Proteſtant Martyrology, and againſt thoſe, who put to death Servetus, Gentilis, *&c.* In a word, one muſt not write againſt the Pope, the Jews and the Turks; for it is manifeſt, that Socinus and his followers do not ſpare them, but confute them with all their might. If they who ſhew that no penal laws ought to be eſtabliſhed againſt thoſe who err in matters of faith, are wanting in the reſpect due to ſovereigns; if they diveſt the ſupreme powers of one of their moſt conſiderable prerogatives; our late apologiſts for perſecution will be found guilty of that crime, ſince they maintain that no blood ought to be ſhed upon account of religion. Does not this take away from ſovereigns the brighteſt gem in their crown? Have they not the power of life and death over malefactors? Beſides, can it be ſaid that GOD has put the ſword into the hands of the magiſtrates of Holland, to puniſh thoſe who tranſgreſs againſt the firſt table of the Law, as well as thoſe who tranſgreſs againſt the ſecond, without reflecting upon them, and expoſing them to the hatred of their ſubjects? If this be true, is not their toleration of idolatry as great a crime, as if they tolerated murderers and highway-men? Further, could there be any thing more ridiculous than to inflict no other puniſhment than baniſhment upon notorious aſſaſſins and poiſoners, without diſtinction of age or ſex (14). See the diſpute of Meſſieurs de Wallemburch (15) about this queſtion, Whether ſuppoſing that the magiſtrates have a right to puniſh Heretics, they may put them to death. They reduce their diſpute with the Lutherans to this point; for they alledge the famous Gherard, who was for enacting penal laws againſt ſectaries, but did not approve that they ſhould be puniſhed with death. They clearly ſhew him that it is a frivolous exception. But in order to ſee the confuſion of thoſe, who are againſt Toleration, we need only obſerve that they unwarily ſay, that the ſovereigns, who oppoſe the introduction of a true doctrine, are very commendable. ‘ I cannot blame the Swiſs, *ſays one of them* (16) who will not permit by any means the growth of any new ſect amongſt them. Holland abounds with different religions. It were to be wiſhed that thoſe diſorders had been prevented from the beginning.' The author of theſe words being a miniſter, two abſurdities contained in them were objected to him.

---

(6) It was the doctrine of the Roman Catholics before the League; but they ſung to another tune ſoon after, as one of them told the Leaguers in a reproachful manner in a book printed at Caen, 1590, and intituled, *Deploration de la mort du Roy Henry III, & du ſcandale qu'en a l'Egliſe.* They themſelves, *ſays he, pag.* 54, in the beginning of the troubles made uſe of this argument againſt the Huguenots, *They are Heretics, for they take up arms againſt the magiſtrates, they will not obey them, but are for planting their religion with the ſword, which is only given to the magiſtrates.*

(7) Confeſſion of Geneva, *Art. xl.*

(8) *Frater* Claudius de Sainctes, in Methodi quam ſequuti ſunt Principes, *cap. xiii, fol.* 112. *verſo.*

(9) Printed at Amſterdam, 1687. in 12mo.

(10) Hiſtoire des Savans, *for September* 1689, *Art. ii.*

(11) Mr Locke.

(12) Mr PAETS. See a ſhort encomium upon him in the *Nouvelles de la Republiq. des Lettres*, for October 1685. *Art. ii, p.* 1093, 1094, of the ſecond edition. That great man died the eighth of October 1686.

(13) See the eighth letter of the *Tableau du Socinianiſme.*

(14) Note, that this may ſerve to confute that author of the eighth letter of the *Tableau du Socinianiſme*, by his own aſſertions. See them above in citat. (105), of the article LOYOLA.

(15) *See their book* De unitate Eccleſiæ, *lib. vi, Part. i, cap. ii, & ſequent. pag.* 222, *& ſequent, Edit. Colon.* 1656, in 4to.

(16) Eſprit de Mr Arnaud, *Tom. ii, pag. m.* 335.

to this very day, tho' no doctrine was ever confuted with more ſolid arguments (*l*). The titles of his other books may be ſeen in the hiſtory of the college of Navarre. Moreri and du Sauſſai have committed unpardonable miſtakes [*G*]. It is to obſerved likewiſe that Sancteſius confeſſed he was ſuſpected for ſome time of being inclined to Calviniſm [*H*], and that he repreſented Cardinal de Lorrain as a ſaint under perſecution [*I*].

He

him. Neither the Catholic nor the Reformed Cantons, was he told (17), ‘ will tolerate new ſects : Is it then upon this account that you cannot blame them ? How little is your zeal for the propagation of your religion ! Is it not your duty to wiſh earneſtly that the Catholic Cantons would tolerate the Reformed amongſt them, and ought you not to blame them exceedingly for refuſing to hear Jeſus and his prophets ? Truly you are no good Apoſtle of Chriſt.' He had been told before : ‘ (18) If your opinion had been followed in theſe happy provinces . . . . the Proteſtant religion had never prevailed in them . . . And if Spain had been always uppermoſt, and had prevented thoſe diſorders from the beginning, you would not live ſo comfortably in the habit you wear ; for the Proteſtant religion would be ſo far from prevailing in this country, that one would hardly have a notion of it. Truly the Reformed are very much beholden to you.'

[*G*] *Moreri and du Sauſſai have committed unpardonable faults.*] I only ſay this of ſome of them : I. I have already obſerved (19) Moreri's miſtake about Sancteſius's country. II. He could not be at the conference of Poiſſi after his return from the council, ſince he did not go to that council till after that conference was held. III. How could Charles IX, who died the 30th of May 1574, name him to the biſhopric of Evreux, in the year 1575 ? I do not queſtion that our doctor ſued for that dignity before that prince died, and had a promiſe of it; but it is certain he did not obtain it till the reign of Henry III. He himſelf ſays ſo ; nor does he diſſemble that his patron (20) told him, in a reproachful manner (21), that he ſued for biſhoprics in remote provinces, to free himſelf from the ſlavery of the court. ‘ Quoniam Chriſtianiſſimi Regis Caroli mors interceſſit, ne qua factione vel gratia mutaretur, quod ſemel Principi placuerat. Quibus potuit precibus apud Reginam matrem, novum Regem, Regiſque fratrem, optimos maximos Principes, & Sanctitatem veſtram, ac fratrum Cardinalium claſſem egit, ut is mihi maneret Epiſcopatus ; nec prius quievit, quam accepit promotionis meæ diploma ad te perferri. Quod accidit illis diebus, quibus Avenione, non annis, ſed curis Eccleſiæ ac reipublicæ confectus, agebat animam (22) : quaſi moriens hanc mihi cum Epiſcopatu tradit & commendavit (23). - - - - *Becauſe the death of the moſt Chriſtian King Charles fell out in the mean time ; leſt what had been the will and pleaſure of that prince ſhould be rendered of no effect by any faction or favour, he employed his utmoſt intereſt with the queen-mother, the new king, and the king's brother, theſe great and good princes, as likewiſe with your Holineſs, and the college of cardinals, to get me confirmed in that biſhopric : nor did he reſt until he had procured my nomination to be ſent to you. This happened during the time that he lived at Avignon, worn out not with years, but with the cares of the church and ſtate ; ſo that dying, he, in a manner, gave up, and recommended his ſoul to me at the ſame time with the biſhopric.*' This ſhews that his nomination was drawn up at the court of France, and ſent to the court of Rome in December 1574 ; but becauſe he did not receive his bulls before the year 1575, Dr de Launoi was in the right to ſay that he was preferred to a biſhopric in 1575. Here follow the groſs miſtakes. IV. The innovators mentioned by Moreri had ſo little intereſt at the court of France, before Sancteſius turned rebel, that if they had undertaken to vent any calumny againſt him, they would rather have done him good than harm. Perhaps they repreſented to Henry III, who was no leſs perſecuted by the league than they, the exceſſes of that factious biſhop ; but this was no calumny. V. What an abſurdity, to pretend that they poiſoned him ? He was no longer in a capacity to do them any prejudice ; for tho', by the king's favour, he had eſcaped capital puniſhment, he was to be confined in a priſon the remaining part of his life. VI. To ſay nothing of his trial, and of the reaſon why he was thought to deſerve death, is an unpardonable omiſſion. Spondanus, before him, was guilty of the ſame omiſſion : the Muſe, who preſides over Hiſtory, muſt needs look upon ſuch writers as great prevaricators. Dr de Launoi has not committed the ſame fault ; for he names the author who mentions the puniſhment of that biſhop, and he thinks he deſerved it. ‘ Anno MDXCI deceſſit perpetuo mancipatus carceri propter ea, quæ Jacobus Auguſtus Thuanus memoriæ tradidit in Hiſtoriarum libro CI. Sic virum tantum, & de Eccleſia olim tam bene meritum periiſſe valde dolendum, niſi pereundi cauſa id juſte poſtulaſſet (24). - - - *He died in the year 1591, being condemned to perpetual impriſonment, for the reaſons which Thuanus has related in the 101ſt book of his hiſtory. The loſs of ſo great a man, who had formerly done ſuch good ſervice to the church, would have been very much to have been lamented, if he had not given juſt cauſe for his own deſtruction.*' I wonder that the miniſters of ſtate, in France, ſhould ſuffer ſo many writers to ſuppreſs the infamy of rebel biſhops. It is giving ſuch as ſhall think fit to imitate their example, ſtrong reaſon to hope that Hiſtorians will take no notice of it.

Here follow the miſtakes of Andrew du Sauſſai. I. He ſays that Sancteſius was Profeſſor in the year 1533, in a monaſtery of regular canons (25). II. He tells us that Sancteſius went to the council of Trent before the conference of Poiſſi was held. III. That he aſſiſted at a provincial council of Rouen in the year 1576 ; but that council was not held before the year 1581, as Dr de Launoi informs us (26), who adds that Sancteſius publiſhed the year following a French tranſlation of the acts of that aſſembly, which he had promoted and directed (27). IV. That invincible hero of the Gallican church did not confine himſelf within thoſe bounds, if we believe du Sauſſai : he and Simon Vigor diſputed with Spina and du Roſier, two of the chief miniſters, and got a compleat victory. That is, the biſhop of Evreux was not contented to aſſiſt at a provincial ſynod in the year 1576 (28), and to put in order and publiſh the ſynodal decrees of his dioceſe, but engaged alſo in a regular diſputation with thoſe two miniſters. What an anachroniſm is here ! that conference was held eight or nine years before Sancteſius came to be a biſhop. V. He died in 1591, and not in the foregoing year. VI. It is an inexcuſable prevarication in mentioning the death of that Prelate, to call him *eximius*, - - - *excellent*, without ſaying any thing of his rebellion, and abominable doctrine, and of the infamous puniſhment he had like to have undergone. What du Sauſſai ſays of him is contained in fifteen lines. How many faults would he have committed, if he had made an encomium of fifteen pages ?

[*H*] *He confeſſed that he was ſuſpected of being inclined to Calviniſm.*] He ſays thoſe ſupicions were grounded on his appearing much more moderate, when he engaged in a diſpute in the Hôtel de Nevers, than he had been at the conference of Poiſſi. ‘ Ego qui Piſſiaci habebar acrior, & tantum non ſeditioſus, anno ſuperiore in collatione facta cum Spina & Roſeo Miniſtris, credebar mutatus, ac paulo momento ad Calviniſmum poſſe impelli, quoniam de priſtina vehementia tantum remiſeram, quantum in domino Vigoreo Calviniſtis infeſtiſſimo Doctore magis ac magis cernebam inflammari & exardeſcere (29). - - - *I who at Poiſſi was eſteemed too fiery, and not far diſtant from ſedition, in the conference held the year before with the miniſters Spina and Roſier ; was now thought to be changed and very much inclined to Calviniſm ; becauſe I had abated of my former violence, in proportion as I ſaw it flame out with more and more heat in that bitter enemy to the Calviniſts, Simon Vigor.*'

[*I*] *He repreſented the Cardinal de Lorrain as a ſaint under perſecution.*] If we may believe Sancteſius, that cardinal was very ſick *of the bruiſe of Joſeph* ; he daily afflicted *his righteous ſoul*, like another Lot, ſeeing the evils of the church. He was a-dying every day in the midſt of the tribulations and anguiſhes he endured for the cauſe of GOD, and was continually preparing himſelf for martyrdom, being told every day that there was a deſign upon his life ; and he would ſay ſometimes,

(*l*) See the remark [*F*].

(17) Lettre à Monſieur J.... ſur ſon Livre intitulé l'Eſprit de Monſieur Arnaud, *pag.* 11. *That letter, according to the title, was printed at Deventer by the heirs of John Colombius in the year* 1684.

(18) Ibid. *p.* 8, 9.

(19) In the remark [*A*].

(20) Ante omnia me ut fugitivum ſervum increpavit, quem non ignoraret CAPTASSE remotiores Epiſcopatus, ut me in libertatem à ſervitute aulica, atque ejus comitatu aſſererem. *Claud. Sancteſius, Epiſt. Dedicator. Libri de Euchariſtia, ad Gregorium XIII.*

(21) That is the Cardinal de Lorrain.

(22) The Cardinal de Lorrain died at Avignon, the 26th of December 1574.

(23) Sancteſius, *Epiſt. Dedicator.* Libri de Euchariſtia.

(24) Launoius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 773.

(25) *Ordinis Sancti Auguſtini Canonicorum Regularium . . . . anno* 1533 *Profeſſor.* Andr. du Sauſſai, de Script. Eccleſiaſt. Continuat. *pag.* 38. *Edit. Colon.* 1684, *in* 4*to*.

(26) Launoius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 772.

(27) Synodum provincialem . . . promovit, rexit, compoſuit. *Id. ibid.*

(28) According to du Sauſſai's computation.

(29) Sancteſius, in Reſponſione ad Apolog. Bezæ, apud Launoium, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 769, 770.

He was one of thoſe Divines, who found it a difficult thing to anſwer the paſſages of St Auguſtin alledged by the Proteſtants againſt Free-will. Wherefore he leſſened the authority of that holy doctor as much as he could in his controverſial writings about the doctrine of Grace [*K*].

times, Let us go and die with him. ‘ Per annos fere ‘ ſexdecim à comitatu illuſtriſſimi Principis, ac maximi ‘ Cardinalis Caroli Lotharingi, niſi alicujus officii ‘ publici cauſa, non receſſi, nec ille me ſtudiorum tantum, ſed ad exteros omnium profectionum, colloquiorum & negotiorum multorum, quæ difficillimis Galliæ temporibus ipſi contra hæreticos inciderunt, me ‘ participem fecit, ut tentationum & paſſionum, quibus per tot annos quotidie moriebatur, & omni hora ‘ de vita periclitabatur, cui quoties nunciabatur, paratas eſſe inſidias, tam parum timidus, quam nimium eſſe putabatur, ſolebat ad me converſus dicere: ‘ Sequeris Sacerdotem Levita; aliquando vero: Eamus, & moriamur cum illo. Cum deſereretur ab ‘ intimis, addebat: Socii paſſionum erunt & conſolationis (30). - - - *For almoſt ſixteen years I cloſely attended that illuſtrious Prince and great Cardinal Charles ‘ de Lorrain, unleſs when ſome public buſineſs required ‘ my abſence. He not only made me a partaker in his ‘ ſtudies, but likewiſe in all his travels, conferences, and ‘ the many weighty affairs which he tranſacted againſt ‘ the Heretics during the troubles of France. I was beſides a witneſs to the temptations and ſufferings in which ‘ for ſo many years he was dying daily, and was every ‘ hour in danger of his life. As often as he was told ‘ that there was a plot againſt him, being as little fearful as he was thought to be much ſo, he uſed to ſay, ‘ Turning towards me: You follow a Prieſt being yourſelf a Levite; and ſometimes, Let us go and die with ‘ him. When he was deſerted by his intimate friends, ‘ he added: They ſhall be the companions of my ſufferings ‘ and conſolation.*’ Thoſe, who have read in Mezerai and other Catholic writers, that this cardinal was a worldly, proud, and voluptuous, man, that he had a great power and intereſt (31), and violently proſecuted the Proteſtants, will not read this deſcription of his pious ſufferings without laughing. In another book Sancteſius begs of GOD that he would ſtrengthen the cardinal his ſervant, perſecuted for a good cauſe. Beza ridiculed him upon this head. ‘ Omittam vero ‘ libens tum pleraſque illius libelli ineptias, veluti ‘ quòd invitum ſeſe à ſuis ſodalibus huc pertractum ‘ dicit, ac tandem etiam ſuo Cardinali virtutem & ‘ conſtantiam in perſecutionibus precatur, quæ quidem ‘ non ſine riſu legi poſſunt (32). - - - *I will gladly ‘ paſs over moſt of the fooliſh things in that book, as for ‘ example, his ſaying that he was drawn ſuch a length ‘ by his friends contrary to his own inclination, and his ‘ praying for reſolution and conſtancy to the cardinal ‘ under his perſecutions: all which it is impoſſible to ‘ read without laughing.*’ I have long thought of a thing, that would very much perplex the Aſiatics, if they had a mind to take notice of that part of our Hiſtories of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries, relating to the troubles of religion. Each church complains that ſhe is under ſufferings, and looks upon her victories as a means, in GOD's hands, to free her from the ſlavery and ſlaughter ſhe was threatned with. I need not ſhew that the Proteſtants expreſs themſelves in that manner with reſpect to the conqueſts of Guſtavus Adolphus; but I ſhall make it appear that the Jeſuits did the ſame when they conſidered the great ſucceſs of the emperor. In order to it I ſhall ſet down an extract of a letter written to James Reihing by a Jeſuit, who was chaplain to the famous Count de Tilly. ‘ Rem ‘ noſtram, id eſt Catholicorum . . . . . bene ſe habere ‘ hoc doceret bellum, in quo jam quarto anno verſor ‘ cum Illuſtriſſimo Comite de Tilli, &c. Erant mira ‘ Conſilia noſtrorum Adverſariorum: ſed quam mirabilis in altis Dominus! moliebantur nobis internecionem, inciderunt in foveam, quam fecerunt: & ‘ ut libenter noſtri hoſtes confitentur, nunquam dediſſent, quod acceperunt, beneficium Vitæ. Ut vel ‘ inde pateat, quæ pars furorem, quæ ſequatur æquitatem (33). - - - *Our affairs, that is of the Catholics, ‘ . . . . . would ſeem to be in a thriving way by this ‘ war, in which it is now the fourth year that I am ‘ preſent with the moſt illuſtrious Count de Tilly, &c. The ‘ deſigns of our adverſaries were amazing: but how ‘ wonderful is GOD in the higheſt? They were meditating our utter deſtruction, but they have fallen into the ‘ pit which they themſelves have digged: and, our enemies make no ſcruple of confeſſing, they would never ‘ have given the quarter which they received: ſo that ‘ from this very thing it may appear which ſide is directed by fury and which by equity.*’

[*K*] *He leſſened the authority of St Auguſtin as much as he could . . . . .*] The Janſeniſt, who publiſhed in 1689, ſome letters written by the Prince of Conti to Father de Champs, added to them among other things a diſſertation intituled, ‘ S. Auguſtin juſtifié du ſoupçon ou des apparences de Calviniſme. ‘ - - - *St Auguſtin juſtified from the ſuſpicion or the appearance of Calviniſm.*’ I find the following paſſage in it concerning Sanctesius. ‘ He was one of thoſe, ‘ who thought it neceſſary always to take the oppoſite ‘ ſide of the queſtion with the Heretics, in order to get ‘ the more advantage over them, and who, conſidering the frightful part of St Auguſtin's doctrine concerning Predeſtination, more than the ſolid foundation ‘ of the ſcripture and tradition, on which it is grounded, were too eaſily frighted at that doctrine. That ‘ author made bold to ſay, *That St Auguſtin writing ‘ againſt the Pelagians with too much heat, did too haſtily deſpiſe the unanimous opinion of all thoſe, who lived before him.* A man who ſpeaks of St Auguſtin in ‘ this manner, and charges him with having changed ‘ his opinion three times, does certainly deſerve to be ‘ delivered up to Father de Champs, that he may deal ‘ with him, as he thinks fit. Father John Martinon, ‘ likewiſe a Jeſuit, who wrote under the diſguiſe of ‘ Antoninus Moraines, was aſhamed of it. *That author,* ſays he, *will give me leave to obſerve that he ‘ would have acted a much better part, and more becoming the reſpect that is due to ſo great a Doctor, if ‘ he had conſtantly followed him, giving ſometimes a favourable ſenſe to his words, inſtead of imputing to him ‘ ſuch an inconſtancy in his opinions* (34).’ We may compare the opinion of this biſhop of Evreux, with that of the Jeſuit John Adam (35).

SALISBERI (JOHN OF) Biſhop of Chartres in the XIIth century. See SARISBERI.

SALMACIS, a fountain at Halicarnaſſus, which was ſaid to effeminate thoſe who drank of it, or went into it [*A*]. The Poets being willing to account for this ill quality, ſuppoſed

[*A*] *A fountain . . . . which was ſaid to effeminate thoſe who drank of it, or went into it.*] Strabo having ſaid that the fountain Salmacis was in Halicarnaſſus, adds that it had an ill name, as having the power of making thoſe, who drank of it, voluptuous and effeminate. Διαβεβλημένη ἐκ οἶδ' ὁπόθεν, ὡς μαλακίζουσα τοὺς πιόντας ἀπ' αὐτῆς, *neſcio qua de cauſa infamis quod ex eo bibentes molliciem contraherent* (1). But, according to Ovid, none could experience this unhappy change without going into it.

Unde ſit infamis, quare male fortibus undis
Salmacis enervet, tactoſque remolliat artus,
Diſcite (2).

. . . .

Quiſquis in hos fontes vir venerit, exeat inde
Semivir, & tactis ſubito molleſcat in undis (3).

How Salmacis, with weak infeebling ſtreams
Softens the body and unnerves the limbs,
And

---

(30) Sanctesius, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* Librorum de Euchariſtia, *ad Gregorium XIII, apud* Launoium, ubi ſupra. *pag.* 771.

(31) See his article, and particularly the paſſage quoted out of Brantome.

(32) Beza, ad Claud. de Xaintes, Apolog. I, *init. Oper. Tom. II, pag.* 288.

(33) Johan. Agricola, in Epiſt. ad Jacobum Reihingum, apud Henning. Witte, Memoriæ Theologor. in Orat. funebri Reihingi, *pag.* 912, 913.

(34) Lettres du Prince de Conti, ou l'Accord du Libre arbitre avec la Grace de J. Chriſt. *pag.* 190, 191.

(35) See above the remark [D] of the article ADAM. (JOHN).

(1) Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag.* 451.

(2) Ovid. Metam. *lib. iv, fab. ix, ver.* 285.

(3) *Ibid. ver.* 385. *He ſays in book xv, ver.* 319.
Cui non audita eſt obſcœnæ Salmacis undæ?
Who has not heard of Salmacis obſcene.
DRYDEN.

ſuppoſed that a nymph, who was paſſionately in love with Hermaphroditus, the ſon of Venus and Mercury, threw herſelf into that fountain, whilſt he was bathing himſelf, and cloſely embraced him; and that her careſſes and entreaties not being able to move the heart of that inſenſible youth [*B*], ſhe begged of the gods that ſhe might remain for ever

And what the ſecret cauſe, ſhall here be ſhown.

. . . .

Oh grant, that whomſoe'er theſe ſtreams contain,
If man he enter'd, he may riſe again
Supple, unſinew'd, and but half a man!

ADDISON.

Strabo makes a judicious reflexion upon this. Voluptuous men, ſays he, in order to clear themſelves aſcribe to the elements what proceeds only from the ill uſe they make of their wealth. Good cheer makes them leud, and they find fault with the air and water; which is a great illuſion. Ἔοικε δ' ἡ τρυφὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων αἰτιᾶσθαι τοὺς ἀέρας ἢ τὰ ὕδατα. τρυφῆς δ' αἰτία οὐ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ πλοῦτος, καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰς διαίτας ἀκολασία. *Enimvero luxuria hominum videtur in aëris & aquæ temperiem culpam referre: atqui non hæc cauſam luxuriæ præbent, ſed divitiæ & victus intemperans ratio* (4). According to Vitruvius the fountain Salmacis was reported to have that ill quality, not becauſe thoſe, who drank of it, became leud and voluptuous, but becauſe it afforded the Barbarians an opportunity of growing civil and tractable, and leaving off their fierceneſs: for being expelled by the colony, which the Argivi ſettled in Halicarnaſſus, they were obliged to return to that fountain for want of water, and ſo they converſed with the Grecians, and grew polite. *Deſcendebant aquatum ad notum ſibi fontem, atque ibi in Græcorum conſuetudinem & ſuavitatem ſua voluntate reducebantur. Hinc aqua illa, non impudico morbi vitio, ſed humanitatis dulcedine mollitis animis barbarorum eam famam eſt adepta* (5).

(4) Strabo, ubi ſupra.

(5) Vitruvius, *lib. ii, cap. viii.*

[*B*] *Her intreaties not being able to move the heart of that inſenſible youth.*] Hermaphroditus began to travel through the world at fifteen years of age. He was a very handſome boy; the nymph Salmacis did no ſooner perceive him on the banks of her fountain but ſhe fell in love with him. Though her amorous paſſion made her very impatient, ſhe nevertheleſs put on her beſt apparel and painted her face before ſhe went to him.

Nec tamen ante adiit, etſi properabat adire,
Quam ſe compoſuit, quam circumſpexit amictus,
Et finxit vultum, & meruit formoſa videri (6).

(6) Ovid. Met. lib. iv, ver. 317.

Fain would ſhe meet the youth with haſty feet,
She fain would meet him, but refus'd to meet;
Before her looks were ſet with niceſt care,
And well deſerv'd to be reputed fair.

ADDISON.

Her compliment contained few needleſs things: If you are not a god, ſaid ſhe to him, you look like one: happy is your father, happy are your mother, your ſiſter and your nurſe, but happier ſtill ſhe, who is, or ſhall have the honour to be your wife. If you are a married man, be unfaithful to your wife for my ſake; and if you are not married, I deſire to become your wife immediately.

Sed longè cunctis longeque beatior illa eſt,
Si qua tibi ſponſa eſt, ſi quam dignabere tædâ.
Nunc tibi ſive aliqua eſt, mea ſit furtiva voluptas:
Seu nulla eſt, ego ſim, thalamumque ineamus eundem (7).

(7) Id. ibid. ver. 325.

But oh how bleſt! how more than bleſt thy bride,
Ally'd in bliſs, if any yet ally'd.
If ſo, let mine the ſtolen enjoyments be;
If not, behold a willing bride in me.

ADDISON.

Theſe words made the young man bluſh; but his modeſty and his ſilence did not put a ſtop to her violent paſſion: ſhe aſked him many kiſſes, at leaſt ſuch as are given to a ſiſter: and at laſt ſhe was ready to take him about the neck, when he plainly told her that he would run away, if ſhe would not be quiet.

Poſcenti Nymphæ ſine fine ſororia ſaltem
Oſcula, jamque manus ad eburnea colla ferenti,
Deſinis? aut fugio, tecumque ait, iſta relinquo (8).

(8) Ovid. *ibid.* ver. 334.

The nymph ſtill begs, if not a nobler bliſs,
A cold ſalute at leaſt, a ſiſter's kiſs:
And now prepares to take the lovely boy
Between her arms. He innocently coy,
Replies, or leave me to myſelf alone,
You rude uncivil nymph, or I'll be gone.

ADDISON.

Being thunder-ſtruck with this ſpeech, ſhe withdrew, but did not loſe all hopes: ſhe hid herſelf in a thicket, and perceiving Hermaphroditus in the water, ſhe was ſo inflamed with love that ſhe threw herſelf into it ſtark naked. She took hold of him, kiſſed him in ſpite of all that he could do, pawed him, and hugged him ſo cloſely that he was not able to extricate himſelf: but that was all ſhe could get of him; he perſiſted in his indifferency.

Veſte procul jacta, mediis immittitur undis,
Pugnantemque tenet, luctantiaque oſcula carpit;
Subjectatque manus, invitaque pectora tangit:
Et nunc hac juveni, nunc circumfunditur illac.
Denique nitentem contrà, elabique volentem
Implicat ut ſerpens, quam regia ſuſtinet ales.

. . . .

Perſtat Atlantiades, ſperataque gaudia Nymphæ
Denegat: illa premit, demiſſaque corpore toto
Sicut inhærebat, Pugnes licèt, improbe, dixit,
Non tamen effugies. Ita dii jubeatis, & iſtum
Nulla dies à me, nec me deducat ab iſto!
Vota ſuos habuêre deos (9).

(9) Id. ibid. ver. 357.

He's mine, he's all my own, the Naïd *cries,*
And flings off all and after him ſhe flies.
And now ſhe faſtens on him as he ſwims,
And holds him cloſe, and wraps about his limbs.
The more the boy reſiſted, and was coy,
The more ſhe clipt and kiſt the ſtruggling boy.
So when the wrigling ſnake is ſnatch'd on high
In eagles claws . . . . . .

. . . .

The reſtleſs boy ſtill obſtinately ſtrove
To free himſelf, and ſtill refus'd her love.
Amidſt his limbs ſhe kept her limbs intwin'd,
And why, coy youth, ſhe cries, why thus unkind!
Oh may the gods thus keep us ever join'd!
Oh may we never, never part again!
So pray'd the nymph, nor did ſhe pray in vain.

ADDISON.

It was then that the nymph begged of the gods that ſhe might never be parted from the beloved object ſhe held between her arms. What ſhe aſked was granted her; and this was the origin of Hermaphrodites.

Every body knows the moral reflexions grounded upon that fable; but every body does not know the myſtery that ſome have found in it. They pretend that the Antients did thereby inſinuate, that the fair ſex ought not to begin the attack, but leave it to men, and ſtand upon the defenſive. If the parts were changed, ſay they, there would be a great decay in the empire of love. It is true that women would make vigorous and furious attacks; but men would make a better defence ſtill, and all this would end in nothing but monſters and prodigies. See Mr de Fontenelle in his dialogue between Sappho and Laura;

ever in the poſture ſhe was in. Her requeſt was granted: her body and that of Hermaphroditus made but one perſon with the diſtinguiſhing marks of both ſexes. Hermaphroditus perceiving that change, obtained from Venus and Mercury by his entreaties that the water of that fountain ſhould have the virtue of making people effeminate. Strabo and Vitruvius deny that it had that virtue, and alledge ſome other reaſons for the ill report that was made of it *(a)*. It is a miſtake to ſay that this ſon of Venus and Mercury was born with the parts of both ſexes, and that, according to Peter Gregory, it was Mercury who ſhewed ſo much indifference for the nymph Salmacis [*C*].

(a) See the remark [*A*].

the reſult of which is as follows. ‘ Men would defend themſelves too well. When it is required that a ſex ſhould reſiſt, it is required that it ſhould carry this reſiſtance juſt ſo far as is neceſſary to make the other ſex reliſh the victory, but not far enough to obtain the victory itſelf. A ſex ought not to be ſo weak as to ſurrender immediately, nor ſo ſtrong as never to ſurrender. This is our character, and perhaps it would not be that of the men. Believe me, after many reaſonings about love or any other matter whatſoever, it will be found at laſt that things are very well as they are, and that a reformation would ſpoil all (10).’ It were a difficult thing to foreſee what would happen, if the ſex that reſiſts ſhould become the aggreſſor, and if the ſex which attacks ſhould ſtand upon the defenſive. The conjectures, that may be made upon ſome few haſty advances of the fair ſex, which have proved unſucceſsful, cannot be depended upon. It is likely that ſuch advances have oftner ſucceeded. What is certain is that men upon a thouſand occaſions wherein they ſtand upon the defenſive, betray a great weakneſs, make but little reſiſtance, and are baſely overcome. Though they are convinced that they have been deceived and betrayed, though they are reſolved to revenge themſelves, though they threaten, and ſwear they will never ſee that unfaithful woman; yet ſome flattering words, ſome ſighs, and one or two tears will quickly pacify them.

(10) Fontenelle, Dialogues des Morts anciens avèc les modernes, *pag*. 47. *Dutch Edit.*

Et quod nunc tute tecum iratus cogitas:
Egone illam? quæ illum? quæ me? quæ non? ſine
modo?
Mori me malim: ſentiet qui vir ſiem.
Hæc verba me hercule una falſa lacrumula,
Quam oculos terendo miſere vix vi expreſſerit,
Reſtinguet: & te ultro accuſabis, & ei dabis
Ultro ſupplicium (11).

(11) Terent. Eunuch. *Act. I, Scena I.*

Being ſenſible that what is required of them is unjuſt and ſhameful, they are reſolved not to grant it; but can they refuſe it, if it be begged of them with great importunity, and if they mind the craftineſs and fawning of a cocquet? It is a great miſtake to depend upon their reſiſtance: if nature had put them upon the defenſive, they would be quickly overcome. It is better that the reſiſting part ſhould be allotted to women. Let us remember Moliere's weakneſs (12).

(12) See the article POQUELIN, remark [*C*].

As for thoſe, who in order to prove that reſiſtance has not been rightly allotted to women, maintain that they defend themſelves only by an ill principle; they ought to be rejected as moroſe, capricious, and unjuſt cenſurers: and though they ſhould repeat a hundred times over and over that women make a reſiſtance only to kindle a greater fire, and ſet a higher price upon themſelves, without pretending to a final perſeverance; though they ſhould ſay as many times that the reaſon why they diſpute the ground, is becauſe they are afraid of giving a quick diſguſt, and that therefore their long delay is not very meritorious, they would not deſerve to be heard. Neither they, nor their verſes ought to be minded (13). Grant them only that nice men are willing to meet with ſome difficulties, and do not congratulate themſelves upon their meeting with none, as did the perſon upon whom the following epigram was made.

(13) *See* Chevreau's Oeuvres diverſes, *p*. 531.

Hoc te nomine prædicas beatum,
Gilli, quòd facili fruare amica
Et benigna adeò, ut rogata nondum,
Mox ſupina cadat, pedeſque tollat.
Sed erras nimiùm, miſelle Gilli:
Nam quæ nil penitus negare neſcit,
Opus, non homines, amat puella:
Et quæcunque nimis cadit libenter,
Surgit iſta nimis quoque illibenter (14).

(14) Beza, in Juvenilibus, *fol. m.* 56.

You glory, Gillius, in this
That you an eaſy miſtreſs kiſs,
So kind, ſo coming, and ſo free
That, long before you aſk her, ſhe
Will proſtrate fall, ſubmiſſive lie,
And toſs her wanton leg on high.
Alas, poor man, how ill you chuſe!
Since one that nothing can refuſe,
Does not the man but work affect:
And as you'll find, if you reflect,
She who ſo readily doth fall
Is loth to riſe again at all.

I repeat the words of Mr de Fontenelle, *Things are very well as they are.* If the queſtion was about bodily ſtrength, they ſhould want to be reformed; the reſiſting part had not been rightly allotted: but ſince the queſtion is about attacks upon the heart, it belongs in juſtice to the ſex, which exceeds the other in beauty, good air, and addreſs.

[*C*] *It is a miſtake to ſay, that he was born with the parts of both ſexes, and that . . . . it was Mercury, who ſhewed ſo much indifference for Salmacis.*] A modern author ſays, that Venus being got with child by Mercury, was delivered of an infant, which had both ſexes. ‘ Venerem à Mercurio compreſſam autumant (*poëtæ*) talem prolem genuiſſe, quæ ſexum utrumque participarit, ſicuti apud Ovidium, *lib. iv. Metamorph.* videre eſt, dum ſcribit.

Mercurio puerum & divâ Cithereide natum
Naïades Ideis enutrivere ſub antris,
Cujus erat ſpecies, in quâ materque paterque
Cognoſci poſſent, nomenque traxit ab iſtis.

Item;

Nec duo ſunt, ſed forma duplex, nec fœmina dici,
Nec puer ut poſſit, neutrumque & utrumque videtur.

‘ Tametſi eundem ex Mercurio & Salmacide, unâ Nympharum Naïadum genitum dicat Petrus Gregorius *in Syntagm. Jur. univ. lib. vii. cap.* 2. *num.* 8. (15). --- *The Poets affirm that Venus, being impregnated by Mercury, was delivered of a child, which had both ſexes; as we find in the 4th book of Ovid's Metamorphoſis, where he ſays,*

(15) *Jacob. Mollerus*, Cameræ Elector. Brandeb. & Regiminis Neo-Marchici Advocatus, patriæque Franco-Viadrinæ Juris Practicus, in *Diſcurſu Juridico-Philologico de Hermaphroditis, eorumque jure*, cap. i, pag. 145. That book was printed in 1692.

The Naïds nurs'd an infant heretofore,
That Cytherea once to Hermes bore:
From both th' illuſtrious authors of his race
The child was nam'd: nor was it hard to trace
Both the bright parents thro' the infant's face.

Likewiſe;

Both bodies in a ſingle body mix,
A ſingle body with a double ſex.

ADDISON.

‘ *Altho' Gregorius Toloſanus ſays that this ſame child was begotten of Mercury and Salmacis, one of the Naïds.*

There are two things in theſe words which want to be rectified. The two laſt verſes do not concern the ſtate that the ſon of Venus was in, before Salmacis embraced him; for he had then only the maſculine ſex: they concern the ſtate he found himſelf in, when the prayers of Salmacis were heard. There is a vaſt number of ſuch proofs in authors. Here are the

the words of Gregorius Toloſanus. *Non ſecus quam & illi nugantur qui cum fabula Ovidii*, lib. (16). Metamorph. fab. 10 (17). *narrant Androgynem factum ex Salmacide una Nympharum Naïadam, & filio Mercurii.* - - - - *No otherwiſe than thoſe authors fancy, who, according to the* 10*th fable in the* 4*th book of Ovid's Metamorphoſes, tell us, that an Androgyne, or Hermaphrodite, was made out of Salmacis, one of the Naïds, and the ſon of Mercury.* That Civilian had been ſaying, that, according to Plato, all men were at firſt Androgynes, but being divided into two, nothing remained of them but the name, which even became a ſhameful one. This is partly true, and partly falſe. Plato does not ſay that all men were Androgynes (18), but he obſerves that this name was opprobrious (19). He is in the right to ſay ſo; for beſides that it is queſtioned whether Hermaphrodites are not monſters, that name is beſtowed upon the moſt infamous debauchees. *Licet etiam Hermaphroditus is dicatur, qui turpiter & facit & patitur adverſus & averſus impudicus, uti docet Suidas in voce* ἑρμαφρόδιτος (20). There is a book intituled, *L'Iſle des Hermaphrodites nouvellement deſcouverte, avec les mœurs, loix, couſtumes, & ordonnances des habitans d'icelle.* It is an ingenious ſatire upon the court of Henry III.

(16) The number 4 ſhould have been inſerted here.

(17) It is the eleventh in the good editions.

(18) See in the article SADEUR, a true account of Plato's *Androgynes. Mollerus, ubi ſupra*, pag. 147, relates the thing as Gregorius Toloſanus does.

(19) Ἐν ὀνείδει ὄνομα κείμενον. *Nomen infame relictum.* Plato, in Convivio, *pag. m.* 1185.

(20) Jacob Mollerus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 145.

SAMBLANÇAI (JAMES DE BEAUNE, BARON DE) ſuperintendant of the finances in the reign of Francis I, was condemned to be hanged for imbezzling the king's treaſure. That ſentence, which happened to be too ſevere, was executed the twelfth of Auguſt 1527 (*a*); but he was declared innocent ſome time after his death (*b*). He was a native of Touraine (*c*). I ſhall ſet down ſomewhat at large the circumſtances of his trial, as they are to be found in a book of Varillas [*A*].

(*a*) Bouchet, Annales d'Aquitaine, *fol.* 232, *where you will find the ſentence.*

(*b*) Varillas, Hiſt. de François I, *livr. iii, pag. m.* 216.

(*c*) Bouchet, ubi ſupra, *fol.* 232, *verſo.*

[*A*] *I ſhall ſet down . . . . the circumſtances of his trial, as they are to be found in . . . . Varillas* (1)]. The king being informed that Lautrec had not received the money deſigned for him, ſent for Samblançai: ‘ And inſtead of calling him his father, as he uſed to do, looked upon him with an ill eye, and aſked him why he had not remitted to Lautrec the three hundred thouſand crowns, which had been promiſed ſo poſitively. Samblançai not being yet ſenſible of the danger he was in, anſwered, with his uſual ingenuity, that upon the ſame day that aſſignments for the Milaneſe had been drawn up, his majeſty's mother came to the treaſury, and demanded the whole payment of what was due to her, as well in penſions and gratifications, as for the duchies of Valois, Touraine, and Anjou, that were ſettled upon her: that he repreſented to her, that if he ſhould give her ſuch a great ſum all at once, the king's treaſure would be drained, and the fund deſigned for the duchy of Milan diverted contrary to what had been ordered by the king that morning in her preſence, and which ſhe had agreed to: but that this princeſs perſiſted in her demand, and threatened to undo him, if he refuſed to give her all that ſhe aſked: and upon his repreſenting to her that his life would be in danger, if Lautrec found no money upon his arrival at Milan, ſhe replied, that her intereſt with the king was ſufficient to prevent his being proſecuted, and that if he ſhould be called to an account for miſapplying the money deſigned for Italy, it was * but ſaying he had done it by her order. The king, to be better informed of the matter, ſent for his mother, and Samblançai repeated the whole ſtory in her preſence; upon which ſhe fell into ſuch a paſſion, that, notwithſtanding the reſpect ſhe owed to her ſon, ſhe gave the lie to Samblançai, and deſired to be revenged of that raſh man, who pretended that ſhe was guilty of high-treaſon. But becauſe it would have appeared by the dates of the receipts, ſhe had left in the king's treaſure, that ſhe had received the money deſigned for Lautrec, ſhe confeſſed that ſhe had demanded the payment of her penſions; but ſhe maintained that Samblançai had paid her the money, without telling her that it was the ſame which was to have been ſent to Milan. She denied what Samblançai had further ſaid, and ſo earneſtly deſired he ſhould be impriſoned, proteſting, however, that it was only the better to clear herſelf of the crime laid to her charge, that the king was obliged to give orders for his being arreſted in the anti-chamber. . . . . (2) Samblançai was no ſooner a priſoner, but commiſſioners were appointed for his trial (3). . . . The imbezzling of the king's treaſure was the only crime he was tried for; and he was condemned to death, whether becauſe the judges were afraid of exaſperating the king's mother if they ſhould vote for a leſſer puniſhment; or becauſe they were prepoſſeſſed with an opinion, that a man cannot have for a long time the management of the king's money with clean hands. The execution was public. . . . . . All authors do not agree about the circumſtances I have mentioned, and ſome will have it that Samblançai was undone by another court-intrigue. They ſay † that the king's mother gave him her receipts written and ſigned with her own hand for the money ſhe took of him; but that the chief deputy ⸸ of that treaſurer fell paſſionately in love with a lady belonging to the king's mother, who perſuaded him to ſteal the receipts of that princeſs; which was done; that the king's mother being thereby enabled to undo Samblançai, when ſhe pleaſed, without any riſk to her ſelf, denied that ſhe had received any money of him, and that Samblançai not finding the receipts to convict her, was apprehended and condemned; that he was publickly executed; but that the truth did not come out till the king's mother, being a-dying, revealed it to the king, and begged his pardon for it. Laſtly, ſome manuſcripts affirm, that the way they took to ruin Samblançai was, by demanding a vaſt ſum of him for the preſſing neceſſities of the ſtate; that he excuſed himſelf not only becauſe the king's treaſure was empty, but alſo becauſe the king owed him above three hundred thouſand livres; and that this afforded a pretence to make him give an exact account of his adminiſtration; that he gave it in form, and becauſe his papers were in good order, he made it appear that his majeſty owed him the ſum mentioned by him; that the thing had gone no farther, if he had been as great a Politician as he was a great Financier; but that he unſeaſonably gave way to the itch of proſecuting thoſe who had unjuſtly accuſed him, being not contented with his glorious defence, and that beſides he perſiſted in requiring immediate payment of the money the king owed him, tho' no body knew better than he that his majeſty was not able to pay him; that Samblançai came ill off in the affair, becauſe the miniſters not knowing any other way to get rid of his importunity, bribed a man of Tours, called Prevoſt, his deputy, who ſtole from him the private receipts; that when they had in their hands what had been hitherto wanting in order to his being convicted of imbezzling the king's money, he was arreſted, and commiſſioners out of the parliaments of Paris and Bourdeaux were appointed to try him; that he deſired to be tried by his ordinary, who was the Archbiſhop of Tours, by virtue of his letters of Tonſure, which he ſhewed; but that the archbiſhop, who was his ſon, happened to die at that time; that Samblançai was ‡ condemned to be hanged; and was executed on the 14th of Auguſt, 1523, being ſixty-two years of age; that he was carried to the gallows at Monſaucon at one of the clock in the afternoon, and that he got his execution put off till ſeven a-clock in the evening, in hopes that the king would ſend him his pardon upon the ladder, as he had ſent it to Saint Vallier upon the ſcaffold; but that the perſon who attended on him, having at laſt told him that there was no pardoned to be hoped for *, he put himſelf into the hands of the executioner, ſaying, that he knew too late that it was better to ſerve the King of Heaven than the kings of the earth, and that if he had done for GOD what he had done for the king, he had been better rewarded. Neverthele ſs it appears by the epigrams of the famous Poet Clement Marot, which contains ſeveral particulars of the life of

(1) Varillas, Hiſt. de François I. *livr. iii, pag.* 214. *ad ann.* 1522. *Dutch Edit.*

* In the trial of James de Beaulnes, Seigneur de Samblançay, Treaſurer of the king's exchequer.

(2) Varillas, *ibid. pag.* 215.

(3) *Viz.* Chancellor du Prat, who was beholden for his fortune to the king's mother, Preſident Gentil, and ſome other counſellors who were the chancellor's friends. Varillas, *ibid. pag.* 216. Belcarius ſeems to me more worthy of credit, who does not ſay that Chancellor du Prat, *bipedum omnium nequiſſimus.* - - - *The greateſt of all villains*, was one of the commiſſioners but that he choſe them. *Belcarius, lib. xvii, numb.* 12.

† Towards the latter end of the old chronicle of Angers.

⸸ Viz. Gentil. who was made afterwards preſident.

‡ *In Bochel's* Pratique criminelle.

* *In the* Annales d'Aquitaine.

‘ Francis I, not to be found any where elſe, that Samblançai died bravely, and that the timorouſneſs of ‘ the perſon, who conducted him to the place of ‘ execution, gave a greater luſtre to his courage.’

The firſt account of this author is a paraphraſe upon Belcarius, who obſerves that Lautrec fell under the indignation of the king's mother, becauſe he ſpoke too freely of her amorous intrigues (4). Note, that Gentil, who, according to Varillas, had been one of Samblançai's Judges, was hanged (5) ſome years after (6).

(4) Eam (*curam*) ad matrem Lautrecio infeſtam, quod de ejus impudicitia liberius loquutus fuiſſet, rejecerit. *Belcarius, Comment. Rerum Gallicar.* lib. xvii, num. xii, pag. 509.

(5) See his epitaph in Beza's *Juvenilia*, fol. m. 30. verſo.

(6) *Bouchet, Annales d'Aquitaine*, pag. 281, ſays it was about the year 1538, and that he was preſident in the court of Inqueſts in the Parliament of Paris, and a native of Italy, and that he was guilty of ſtealing the receipts of Treaſurer Poncher, who had been hanged at Paris for want of them.

SAMBLANÇAI (William de Beaune, Baron de) the ſon of the foregoing, was the father of four ſons and one daughter, who made a great figure in the court of France. I. James de Beaune, Baron de Samblançai, viſcount of Tours, &c. was the eldeſt. He was knight of the order of St Michael, and Gentleman of the king's bed-chamber in ordinary; and left behind him but one daughter, who was very much talked of by reaſon of her beauty and galantry under the name of Madam de Sauve (*a*). The third ſon of William de Beaune was known by the name of Monſieur la Tour d'Argi, and was the Father of Mary de Beaune, the wife of Annæus de Montmorency Marquis de Turi. The fourth was Chancellor to Catherine de Medicis, Biſhop of Puy (*b*), and Abbot of Royaumont (*c*). He died in the year 1565. I have paſſed over the ſecond becauſe I have ſo many things to ſay of him that I deſign to beſtow a paragraph upon him. The daughter was married firſt to Lewis Burgenſis, firſt Phyſician to the King, and Sieur de Montgauguier (*d*), and then ſhe was the fourth wife of Claudius Gouffier, Marquis de Boiſi, Duke of Rouanez, and maſter of horſe to the king. She died without iſſue. Brantome (*e*) ſays, that before ſhe was called Madam de Rouanez, ſhe went by the name of Madam de Chateaubrion. He adds, that ſhe was *a great favourite of Queen Catherine de Medicis, her miſtreſs.* He is in the right to ſay ſo; Thuanus ſays the ſame [*A*].

Renaud de Beaune, the ſecond ſon of William, was Archbiſhop of Bourges and then of Sens in the reign of Henry IV, and one of the moſt eloquent and learned prelates of that time. But what makes him more illuſtrious, is, that he did not depart, as ſo many other Eccleſiaſtics did, from the laws of the kingdom concerning the ſucceſſion to the crown. He maintained to the laſt that though the King of Navarre was a heretic, the crown of France did lawfully belong to him after the deceaſe of Henry III. In order to maintain this aſſertion he ſet forth in the conferences of Surene (*f*) the moſt ſpecious reaſons that the Law and the Scripture can afford: but his wit, eloquence, and learning, did not perſuade the deputies of the League; for beſides their being reſolved not to yield, whether they could anſwer the reaſons of the royaliſts or not, they were headed by Peter d'Epinac Archbiſhop of Lyons, who was not inferior to Renaud de Beaune in wit, eloquence, and learning, and who alledged, as well as he, divine and human laws [*B*]; ſo that after ſeveral fine diſcourſes they were obliged to think

(*a*) See the Memoirs of Queen Margaret, and Mezerai, Hiſtoire de France, *Tom. iii, in fol. p.* 361.

(*b*) Le Laboureur, Addit. à Caſtelnau, *Tom. i, pag.* 513.

(*c*) Moreri, at the word *Beaune*, a family.

(*d*) Le Laboureur, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 322.

(*e*) Eloge de Catherine de Medicis, *pag.* 97.

(*f*) In 1593.

[*A*] *Thuanus ſays the ſame.*] He ſays (1) that Margaret (2) de Beaune, the wife of Claudius Gouffier, Marquis de Boiſi, ſiſter to Renaud de Beaune, Archbiſhop of Bourges, procured very noble employments to her brother, becauſe ſhe had a great intereſt at court; ſo far that Rouanez was erected into a duchy in conſideration of her marriage with the Marquis de Boiſi. *Commendatione ſororis Margaritæ gratioſæ in aula fæminæ, quæ ſub id Claudio Guſerio Boſſii marchioni & Rodamnæ ob id creato duci magno Franciæ ſcutifero nupſit, maximis jam tum negotiis adhibitus, etiam Franſciſci Alenconii Ducis Cancellarius fuit* (3). This is one of the things daughters are good for in a family: they are ſometimes the only cauſe of the fortune of their brothers and relations. Perhaps Renaud de Beaune, notwithſtanding all his fine qualities, would have remained all his life-time in a mean condition, had not his ſiſter's intereſt put him in the way of raiſing himſelf, and given him the opportunities of diſcovering his merit, and of being rewarded for his firſt ſervices by more conſiderable employments. That Hiſtorian adds, that the family of Beaune, and that of Thou, had contracted a very ſtrict friendſhip long before; and that after the ſad death of James de Beaune ſuperintendant of the finances, his children, forſaken by every body at court, and in the city, as it happens on like occaſions, found a ſanctuary among the de Thou's; that Renaud de Beaune lodged for ſome time in the houſe of Auguſtin de Thou, grandfather to the Hiſtorian Thuanus, and that from that very time there was a talk of marrying Chriſtopher de Thou, Auguſtin's ſon, to Margaret de Beaune, Renaud's ſiſter; that tho' this project had no effect, that lady had always been a hearty friend to Chriſtopher de Thou, and uſed her intereſt for him, when ſhe was in favour, more than for any body elſe, except her brothers; that ſhe intruſted him, as being her particular friend, with her laſt will, many years before ſhe died. Beſides ſhe made him executor of her will (4).

[*B*] *Who alledged, as well as he, divine and human laws.*] Thuanus has inſerted, in the 106th book of his hiſtory what was alledged on both ſides. Cayet (5) relates it more at large, and ſays, (6) among other things, that the Archbiſhop of Bourges, who could not deny *that each party alledged ſeveral examples, and made uſe of the authority of the Scripture to prove their opinions, and retorted it in a different ſenſe*, confined himſelf to this maxim, that one might have the right underſtanding of the Scripture, ‘ by invoking the holy Spirit of ‘ God, who gives it to thoſe that aſk for it, and imprints the knowledge of truth in their minds, *intellectum bonum dat petentibus eum.*’ He added, ‘ that ‘ the voice of Christ and his Apoſtles was evident, ‘ and that Chriſtians were continually told that they ‘ ought to fear God, honour the king, and render to ‘ God what is due to him, and to Cæſar what belongs to him; that every ſoul was to obey the powers ordained by God . . . but that he would no ‘ longer ſpend time in confuting the paſſages, and ‘ examples, that had been alledged, which could not ‘ hinder our ſubmitting to what is expreſly commanded in the word of God.’ This ſeems to be his meaning: when the Scripture is made uſe of to maintain contrary opinions, the beſt way to extricate one's ſelf from the difficulties that confound our reaſon, is humbly to implore the direction of the holy Spirit. By the help of this direction we may be able to ſee what ſide we ought to chuſe, as knowing that the expreſs orders of God ought to be our rule, and not ſome particular examples, which ſeem to be exceptions to thoſe orders. This maxim ſeems to be reaſonable, but I do not ſee how it can compoſe differences; for

(1) Thuan. de Vita ſua, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 1194.

(2) Mr le Laboureur, Addit. *to* Caſtelnau, *Tom. i, pag.* 322. *and Father Anſelme*, Hiſt. des grands Officiers de la Couronne, *pag.* 469, *call him Claudius.*

(3) Thuan. *ibid.*

(4) Ante mortem diu condito teſtamento illud apud ſingularem amicum, ſic eum vocabat, depoſuit, ejuſque executorem ipſum nominavit. *Id. ibid.*

(5) In the fifth book of the *Chronologie Novenaire.*

(6) Ibid. fol. 170, verſo.

think of another expedient [*C*], viz. that the King of Navarre ſhould change his religion. This was the only thing which cut the Gordian knot. The pleadings of Renaud de Beaune do at this day more honour to the Clergy of France [*D*], than they did good at that time to Henry IV. Thuanus ſays a pretty remarkable thing of this prelate, which is, that he was a prodigious eater [*E*]. I add that he was at firſt counſellor in the parliament of Paris, afterwards preſident of the court of Inqueſts, and then maſter of the Requeſts; after that Biſhop of Mande, and Chancellor to the Duke of Alençon, ſon of Henry II *(g)*. He had an admirable memory; for forty years after he had ſtudied the Claſſics under James Tuſanus and James Stracel, he remembred the fine paſſages which they had taught him in good Greek and Latin authors, and applied them with a good grace, and very judiciouſly, though the great affairs that paſſed thro' his hands might have blotted out of his memory thoſe old ideas which he had no leiſure to refreſh *(h)*.

The

for each party will boaſt that they have implored the direction of the holy Spirit, and will maintain, if the intereſt of their cauſe requires it, that commands ought to be explained by examples, that is, that their caſe requires that the example of the Maccabees, *&c.* ſhould be imitated, inſtead of conforming to St Paul's precept, *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher powers.* We muſt therefore allow, that whilſt ſovereigns have no better ſupport than the doctrines of Divines, they rely upon weather-cocks, that turn with every wind, and uſe the word of GOD as a noſe of wax, to the great ſcandal of good and pious ſouls, and the great ſatisfaction of prophane men, and free-thinkers, who are charmed with having an opportunity to ſay of the Spirit that inſpired the Prophets and Apoſtles, the ſame thing which the Proteſtants ſay of the Spirit that makes the Pope ſpeak *ex Cathedra*, and the councils; *viz.* that he believes like a common father between the Thomiſts and the Scotiſts (7), that he qualifies his expreſſions in ſuch a manner as to favour both parties alike, that he will neither diſarm thoſe who revolt, nor ſhelter them from the attacks of thoſe who perſiſt in their obedience; in a word, that he follows the example of neutral cities, where they ſell arms to both ſides.

[*C*] *They were forced to think of another expedient.*] Maimbourg does agreeably and neatly relate what he took out of Victor Cajet. 'The two heads of the 'deputation on both ſides, *ſays he* (8), two of the moſt 'dexterous and eloquent men of their age, were men 'of too great abilites, and maintained their opinions 'with too much wit and ſtrength, to come to an 'agreement in their diſpute. The Archbiſhop of Bourges, in the three ſpeeches he made to prove his aſ'ſertion, and to confirm it by confuting the anſwer 'made to it, alledged the ſtrongeſt arguments to per'ſuade the Leaguers of theſe three things, which he 'conſtantly maintained to the laſt as ſo many unde'niable truths. 1. That men are obliged to acknow'ledge and honour as their king the perſon, to whom 'the kingdom belongs, by the inviolable right of a 'lawful ſucceſſion, without any regard to the religion 'he profeſſes, or to his morals.' 2. That King Henry IV was neither a Heathen nor an Arian, nor a perſecutor of the Catholic Church, and was reſolved to renounce his errors, as ſoon as he ſhould be inſtructed in the truth. 3. That all the French ought to acknowledge him, and then unanimouſly endeavour to inſtruct him. The Archbiſhop of Lyons anſwered (9), thoſe three points one after another, and declared that ſo long as the King of Navarre remained an Heretic they would have no commerce with him. The Archbiſhop of Bourges replied with great force; but ſeeing the Leaguers were not to be ſhaken, he told them the king was thoroughly reſolved to be converted (10). Here is a ſovereign prince indeed: he cannot ſo much as prevail upon his ſubjects, that they would be ſo good as to let him ſerve GOD according to the light of his conſcience. It is a ſhame to Chriſtianity to have introduced into the world ſo great a diſorder. It is the part of ſubjects to beg liberty of conſcience of their ſovereign; but here are ſubjects who refuſe it to him.

[*D*] *His pleadings do at this day more honour to the Clergy of France.*] The League has furniſhed the Proteſtants with abundance of unanſwerable arguments againſt the ſeditious maxims of the court of Rome, adopted by an infinity of Laymen and Eccleſiaſtics. Theſe objections would have been ſtronger, if all the Clergy of France had followed the rebellion; but ſince one of the principal prelates, ſpeaking for a conſiderable part of the Catholics, maintained ſo ſolemnly the doctrine of obedience, people fancy there is nothing to be feared for the future, and that the acts of the conference of Surene can afford both defenſive and offenſive arms.

[*E*] *He was a prodigious eater.*] Scarce had he ſlept four hours, but hunger forced him to riſe and eat his breakfaſt; which he did regularly at one of the clock in the morning, or rather ſooner, he repoſed till four a-clock, and then he went to eat: he did the ſame at eight: he dined at the uſual hours: he eat a collation four hours after: he ſupped plentifully at the uſual hour, and took another collation before he went to bed. He did not eat after the French faſhion; for in winter he was at leaſt an hour at table, and an hour and a quarter in ſummer. For this reaſon he cared not to dine abroad, and when a great prince, who had often invited him, and found him always armed with excuſes, aſked him the reaſon of his refuſal, he gave him this anſwer, *You do not eat like a man, but like a dog*; that is, you make too much haſte. That prince promiſed to remedy this inconvenience, and was as good as his word, for he ordered his ſteward, that when this prelate ſhould be there, he ſhould put a pretty diſtance of time between each courſe (11). *Cibum autem ita per otium ſumebat, ut ſumendo horam integram impenderet hieme, æſtate, in qua tardior orexis, horæ etiam quadrantem adderet, & ambulantibus, quales in aula noſtra, cœnis ſummopere offendebatur; adeo ut cum ſæpius à principe primario ad prandium invitaretur, & toties ſe excuſaret, rogatus quî id faceret, facete reſponderit, illum non humano ſed canino more prandium uſurpare, feſtinatus nimis epulas intelligens. Quo intellecto ille eum ſe non ſolum laute quod ſemper faciebat, ſed prolixe accepturum promiſit, & eo invitato ſemper ſtructorem monebat, ut miſſibus adponendis legitimum tempus interponeret* (12). Another thing in him was very ſingular; this prodigious quantity of meat did not make him heavy nor drowzy, nor full of vapours: he was always well diſpoſed for the exerciſes of the mind (13); as for thoſe of the body he took care to uſe none; he durſt not walk for fear of exciting his appetite. 'In 'tanta ciborum, quibus alebatur copia, cum nec mem'brorum agitatione, nec deambulationibus, ne exupe'rantem appetitum proritaret, corpus exerceret, na'turam ſucco nimio turgentem medicamentis purgan'tibus crebro adjuvabat, quæ medicæ rei non ignarus 'domi per homines peritos ſibi parabat. Itaque raro 'ægrotabat, & quamvis in ſumma corporis pigritia 'mens ſemper laboraret, nunquam fatigabatur (14). '- - - *After ſuch quantities of victuals which he eat, 'as he uſed no ſort of exerciſe, nor walking, for fear of 'exciting his voracious appetite; he eaſed nature, over'burthened with too much nouriſhment, by frequent pur'gatives; which, as he had ſome notion of Phyſic, he 'took care to have made up at home by ſkillful perſons. 'Thus he was ſeldom ſick, and, notwithſtanaing his 'great bodily indolence, his mind, tho' conſtantly at work, 'was never tired.*' What Thuanus ſays of this method of eating at the court of France in haſte, and as it were walking, which did not pleaſe our René de Beaune, puts me in mind of a ſtory I have heard more than once. It is well known that Marſhal de Turenne commanded armies where were ſeveral foreign officers. They praiſed the good chear of his table, but could not endure that the meals ſhould be ſo ſhort, and eſpecially when they obſerved that the French officers were ſcarce riſen from table, but they began to aſk one another, what ſhall we do? Alas! ſaid the ſtrangers,

---

(g) Thuan. de Vita propria, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 1194.

(h) Id. ibid.

(7) *See the* Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, *Feb.* 1686, *pag.* 127.

(8) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, *livr. iv, pag.* 465.

(9) Ibid. *p.* 468.

(10) Ibid. *p.* 472.

(11) Thuan. de Vita, propria, *lib. iii, circa init. pag.* 1194.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Nunquam commotior aut ſomnolentior viſus, nulla gravedine aut dolore capitis tenebatur, ſemper æque ſui compos & ad omnia paratus, extra negotia quietem & confabulationes ſectabatur. *Id. ibid.*

(14) Id. ibid.

The fables he uttered out of the pulpit, I mean in the funeral oration of Catherine de Medicis, are ſo ridiculous [*F*] that they would ſcarce be pardonable in thoſe writers of romances, who have publiſhed the Hiſtory of the fair Maguelona and of Peter of Provence, of the four ſons of Aimon, and of Palmerin of Oliva, &c. Henry IV acknowledged ſeveral ways his fidelity and ſervices, but above all by the conſtancy with which he applied himſelf to ſurmount the long difficulties he met with at the court of Rome [*G*], about his tranſlation from the archbiſhopric of Bourges to the archbiſhopric of Sens.

gers, we were ſo well at table ; you ſeemed ſo impatient that one would have thought you had ſome great buſineſs to diſpatch, and now you know not what to do. Why did not you keep where you were, and let others do ſo too, ſince you do not know how to ſpend the time ?

[*F*] *The fables he uttered . . . . in the funeral oration of Catherine de Medicis are ſo ridiculous.*] Here is a ſpecimen of them. ‘ At the time that the great Captain Brennus led his army through all Italy and Greece, there were with him two French gentlemen, the one called Felonius, and the other Bono, who ſeeing the ill deſign that Brennus conceived after his great conqueſts, to go and ſeize upon the temple of Delphos, to pollute himſelf and his army with the ſacrilege of that temple, they both retired and went into Aſia, with their ſhips and men, where they penetrated ſo far that they came into the country of the Medes, which is near Lydia and Perſia, where having made ſeveral conqueſts, and obtained great victories, they retreated, paſſing through Italy, hoping to come back again to France. Felonius ſtopped at a place where Florence is now ſituated along the river Arno : the ſituation ſeemed very pleaſant and delightful to him, it being like one that before had pleaſed him in the country of the Medes, and he built there a city which is now called Florence. His companion Bono built the city of Bononia, not far from it : and from that time, by reaſon of the conqueſts and victories that Felonius had got in the country of the Medes, he was called Medicus among his people, the ſirname remaining in his family ; as we read of Paulus who was called Macedonicus, becauſe he had conquered Macedonia, and taken priſoner King Perſeus ; and of Scipio, who was called Africanus, for having done the ſame thing to Africa (15).’ Brantome, from whom I have this paſſage, adds ; *I do not know from whence Mr de Beaune had this ſtory ; but it is very probable that before the king, and ſo great an aſſembly as was there at the queen's funeral, he would not have alledged it without ſome good authority* (16). He had obſerved before he mentioned this fabulous genealogy, that this *Archbiſhop of Bourges was as learned and as worthy a prelate as any in Chriſtendom, but that ſome ſaid of him that he was too credulous, and not fit to be weighed in the ſcales of St Michael, who weighs all good Chriſtians at the day of judgment, as they ſay* (17). The Leaguers gave out that he was an Atheiſt (18).

Since I have mentioned his funeral oration of Catherine de Medicis, I ſhall obſerve that he alſo made that of the Duke of Alençon, in 1584 ; ‘ and becauſe in pronouncing the ſaid oration, which was very indifferent, he put his hand often to his beard, the following diſtich was made upon him (19)’ :

> Quod timet & patulo promiſſam pectore barbam
> Demulcet Biturix, hoc Ciceronis habet (20).

> *In that he pants, and ſtrokes, and ſtrokes again*
> *His long large beard, this native of Touraine*
> *Reſembles Cicero* . . . . . .

[*G*] *The conſtancy with which he applied himſelf, to ſurmount the long difficulties he met with at the court of Rome.*] I do not pretend to ſay that he withſtood thoſe difficulties without ever yielding : I only mean that having expected a more favourable time, he renewed his application till ſuch time as the thing was done. You will find the particulars of all this in the following account of Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie (21). ‘ In 1596, *ſays he*, the king had writ to the Pope in favour of Renaud de Beaune, Archbiſhop of Bourges, to have him tranſlated to the Biſhopric of Sens, and to obtain it for him *gratis* *. But the abſolution which this prelate had given the king in the abbey-church of St Dennis, and the motion he had made to the clergy in the aſſembly of Mantes, for creating a patriarch in France, had made him ſo odious to the court of Rome, that the Pope would not hear of him. Our cardinal (only then Biſhop of Rennes) in vain repreſented to the Pope and Cardinal Aldobrandino, *that ſuch a refuſal or delay might, at the long run, be interpreted as done, becauſe this archbiſhop had taken the king's part, which would not only give offence to the king, but alſo to all the princes, prelates, lords, and gentlemen, who had followed him ; and it would be thought that there remained in the ſoul of his Holineſs ſome memory of the paſt offences and rancours : that the ill reports that were made of him to his Holineſs, were only grounded upon this*, viz. *That this prelate had found out a ſhorter way to ſerve the Catholic religion, and the authority of the holy See, than thoſe had done, who thinking to preſerve them, would have ruined them both, if their advice had been taken.* All this did not move them, and the Pope excuſed his rigour, by ſaying that this affair would never paſs in the conſiſtory, and that the cardinals would oppoſe it, and from thence take occaſion to think ill of the king himſelf †. The affair remained thus till the promotion of Mr d'Oſſat, who in obedience to the king's orders, in the firſt days of his cardinalſhip began afreſh to ſollicit for this prelate's tranſlation. ⸸ But the Pope anſwered him again in the ſame ſtrain, and ſaid, *That if he propoſed the affair to the conſiſtory he would receive an affront, being certainly informed that there were ſome cardinals who would oppoſe it.* And the Cardinal Nephew added, *That it was not even for that prelate's intereſt, that his affair ſhould be propoſed in the conſiſtory* ‡‡ : by which he gave to underſtand, that there would be ſome things ript up there which would be to his confuſion. . . . . The king ſeeing the extream repugnancy the Pope had to the matter, and perceiving that his Holineſs would make him pay dearer for the favour than the thing was worth, reſolved at laſt to follow the prudent counſel of the Cardinal of Florence . . . (22) and he ordered our new cardinal (23) to tell the Pope, *that tho' he had many reaſons to deſire the expedition of the Archbiſhopric of Sens in the perſon of the Archbiſhop of Bourges ; nevertheleſs, to comply with the will of his Holineſs, he would ceaſe to importune him any more.* ** And ſo the Pope was delivered from this purſuit, which infinitely diſpleaſed him, for the reaſons I have given ; till the beginning of the embaſſy of the Count de Bethune, who had orders to renew it three years after. And Cardinal d'Oſſat laboured ſo hard with him about it, that they obtained at laſt the tranſlation of the Archbiſhop of Bourges to the Archbiſhopric of Sens, which was expedited in the conſiſtory of the 29th of April, 1602 ⸸⸸.’

(15) Brantome, Mémoires des Dames illuſtres, *pag.* 32, *& ſeq.*

(16) Id. ib. *p.* 34.

(17) Id. ib. *p.* 32.

(18) *See the notes upon the* Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci, *p.* 87. *& ſeq. Edit.* 1699.

(19) Journal d'Henry III, *ad* 26 *Junii* 1584, *pag. m.* 80.

(20) *See* Martial, Epigramm. lxxxix. *lib. ii.*

(21) Amelot de la Houſſaie, Vie du Cardinal d'Oſſat, *pag.* 25, 26.

* Letter 76, 95.

† Letter 95.

⸸ In his audience the nineteenth of March.

‡‡ Letter 178.

(22) Amelot, ib. *pag.* 27.

(23) That is, d'Oſſat.

** Letter 183.

⸸⸸ Letters 310, 312.

SAMSON,

SAMSON, a judge of God's people. I ſhall not relate his Hiſtory, it is known to every body; you may read it in Moreri, and more at large in the Dictionary of the Bible (*a*). I will only obſerve one thing, which ſeems to me very ſingular. Some would have it, that by the words of the Scripture which tell us that the Philiſtines made him grind, is to be underſtood that they made him lye with their wives [*A*], that they might have a race from ſo brave a man. The allegory which La Mothe le Vayer found in the actions of this hero is more ingenious than true. He ſays they repreſent the Sceptic Philoſopher (*b*).

(*a*) Compoſed by Mr Simon, Doctor of Divinity, and printed at Lyons, 1693.

(*b*) See his Sceptical Treatiſe on the ſaying, *n'avoir pas le ſens commun*, in the ninth volume of his works, *pag.* 286, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *That they made him lie with their wives.*] According to this we might find a new conformity between his hiſtory and that of Hercules. Be it as it will, it is certain that the Hebrew word, which ſignifies *to grind*, is ſometimes taken in an obſcene ſenſe. What is tranſlated in the book of Job, *Let my wiſe grind unto another* (1), ſignifies according to the vulgar, *May my wiſe become the concubine of another, ſcortum alterius ſit uxor mea.* But ſome would aſk, would Job ſay the ſame thing twice together? For it is clear that the following words, *let others bow down upon her, ſuper illam incurventur alii*, ſignify proſtitution. It is clear that *incurvari* ſignifies the ſame thing here as *inclinare ſe* in Plautus (2). This difficulty is nothing; for all antient writers, both ſacred and profane, afford us a thouſand examples of ſuch repetitions. Theſe words of the Lamentations of Jeremiah (3), *They took the young men to grind*, ſignify, according to the vulgar tranſlation, *they have leudly abuſed the youth, adoleſcentibus impudice uſi ſunt.* But here is a paſſage of St Jerom, quoted by Bruſius, which will afford me the proof I want. 'In tertio decimo commentariorum ſuper Jeſaiam, cap. 47. ad locum, *Tolle molam, mole farinam*, ita ſcribit, *(Hieronymus) quia ſequitur denuda turpitudinem tuam, etiam mola ab Ebræis figuraliter intelligitur: quod ſcilicet in morem ſcorti victorum libidini pateat. Illudque quod in Judicum libro de Samſon ſcribitur, ad molam eum à Philiſtim eſſe damnatum, hoc ſignificare volunt, quòd pro ſobole robuſtiſſimorum virorum hoc in Allophylas mulieres facere ſit compulſus* (4). - - - *In the 13th book of commentaries upon the Prophet Iſaiah, chap. xlvii, at the words,* Take the mill and grind meal, *St Jerom writes thus:* The word *mill* being followed by theſe words, *uncover thy nakedneſs*, is alſo underſtood in a figurative ſenſe, by the Hebrews, *viz.* becauſe like a harlot it lies open to the luſt of the conqueror. In the ſame manner, what we read in the book of Judges, of Samſon's being condemned by the Philiſtines, to grind in a mill, is thought to ſignify that he was compelled to lie with foreign women, in order to beget a race of very ſtrong men.' Druſius obſerves (5), that *molere, to grind*, in this obſcene ſenſe, ſignifies the action of the male; for which reaſon he makes a gloſs upon the words of Job. *Molere in hoc ſenſu viris tribui ſolet. De lingua Latina loquor, in qua notiſſimum illud*, alienas permolere uxores (6). *Forſan apud Jobum paſſivè ſumendum*, molatur alteri, *ab altero, hoc eſt, ut ſenſus ſit, molat alter uxorem meam.* I think they are in the right who can ſcarce perſuade themſelves that the Philiſtines, who were his great enemies, would have condemned him to a puniſhment ſo agreeable; for Samſon loved women, and he would have been well kept to perform the office of a ſtallion, there had been nothing to fear but compulſion.

Nulla eſt tam facilis res, quin difficilis fiet,
 Quam invitus facias (7).

There is nothing ſo eaſy, but becomes hard, when done by compulſion.

(1) *Job* xxxi, 10.

(2) Pol iſtuc quidem omne jam ego uſurpabo domi;
Nam jam inclinabo me cum liberta tua, *Plaut. in Perſa, Act. IV, Scene viii.*

(3) Chap v. ver. 13.

(4) Druſius, Quæſt. Ebraicar. *lib. ii, num.* 38. *pag. m.* 97. *See* Petri Petiti Miſcellan. Obſervationes, *lib. iii, cap. ii, pag.* 152, *& ſeq.*

(5) Ubi ſupra.

(6) They are Horace's words, *Sat. II, lib. i, ver.* 33.

(7) Terent. Heautontim. *Act. IV, Scene vi, init.*

SANCHEZ (FRANCIS) profeſſor of Phyſic at Toulouſe, born at Braga in Portugal, was carried over in his infancy to Bourdeaux by his father, who was a very ſkillful Phyſician. He travelled into Italy, and ſtaid ſome time at Rome, from whence he returned into France, and ſtudied at Montpellier, where he took his degree of Doctor of Phyſic at the age of twenty-four. The wars about religion having forced him to leave that city, he went to Toulouſe, where he taught Philoſophy twenty-five years, and Phyſic eleven. He died aged ſomething more than ſeventy years. His life is prefixed to his works (*a*) [*A*]. He was a great Sceptic, as I take notice in the remark. He is very much praiſed in the Patiniana (*b*), where we read that he was *born of Jewiſh parents*, and that he died at Toulouſe, *being threeſcore and ten years old, in the year* 1632.

(*a*) *Taken from* Don Nicolas Antonio, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpan. *Tom. i, p.* 362, 363.

(*b*) Pag. 72, 73. Edit. of Paris 1701.

[*A*] *His life is prefixed to his works.*] The author of this life, called Raimond Delaſſus, had been his ſcholar. The greateſt part of the writings of Sanchez are about Phyſic; they were printed at Toulouſe, in 4to, 1636. There were added to them four treatiſes of Philoſophy, which were re-printed in 12mo, at Rotterdam, in the year 1649. Here are the titles of them: *Quod nihil ſcitur. De divinatione per ſomnum ad Ariſtotelem. In librum Ariſtotelis Phyſiognomicon Commentarius. De longitudine & brevitate vitæ.* The treatiſe *quod nihil ſcitur,* - - - *that we know nothing* (1), repreſents ingeniouſly and ſubtilly the vanity of what we call ſcience, ſtudy, compoſition of books, *&c.* It was publiſhed before the edition of all the works of the author; for I find in Barthius that two diſſertations were re-printed in Germany, in the year 1618; one of Maturinus Simonius, an Italian doctor, *de Litteris pereuntibus*; the other of Francis Sanchez, a Spaniſh doctor, *Quod nihil ſciatur* (2). Sanchez underſtood Geometry, and made ſome objections againſt Clavius, which he pretended that Jeſuit had not well anſwered (3).

(1) John Uldric Wildius confuted it in ſome theſes, intituled, *Quod aliquid ſcitur*, maintained at Leipſic in 1664.

(2) Barthius in Statium, *Tom. i, pag.* 447.

(3) Delaſſus in ejus Vita, apud Nicol. Antonium, Biblioth. Script. Hiſpan. *Tom. i, pag.* 363.

SANCHEZ (THOMAS) a Spaniſh Jeſuit, born at Corduba in the year 1551, entred into the ſociety in the year 1567. The auſterity of his life, his ſobriety, his mortifications, his application to ſtudy, his chaſtity, are prodigies, if what Alegambe (*a*) and Southwell (*b*) ſay of him be true. He died at Granada, the ninteenth of May, 1610, and was buried there (*c*) magnificently (*d*). He was certainly a learned man; he has given public proofs of it in the great volume that was printed at Genoa, in the year 1592 [*A*], and in the four volumes in folio that were printed after his death. It were

(*a*) In Biblioth. Scriptor. Societ. Jeſu, *pag.* 436.

(*b*) In ead. Bibl. *pag.* 767.

(*c*) See the remark [*C*], citation (11).

(*d*) Alegambe & Sotuel, Biblioth. Scriptor. Societ. Jeſu, *pag.* 436, 767.

[*A*] *In the great volume printed at Genoa, in the year* 1592.] It treats fully of what concerns marriage. It is pretended that Clement VIII declared that no man had examined with more diligence, nor cleared with more exactneſs the controverſies that concern this ſacrament. 'Vehementer admiratus eſt ſubtile hominis acumen, peracre judicium, raram perſpicuitatem, ſingularem & exquiſitam in rebus indagandis ſolertiam, in tradendis facillimam methodum, in evolvendis citandiſque Auctoribus exactiſſimum & planè indefeſſum were to be wiſhed that the work printed at Genoa, and afterwards in ſeveral other towns, had given as great proofs of his judgment (*e*) as of his wit and learning; for the temerity he had to explain an incredible number of filthy and horrible queſtions in that work may produce great diſorders. Bitter complaints are made of it [*B*], and

‘ indefeſſum ſtudium; ſerioque pronunciavit, nullum unquam Scriptorem extitiſſe, qui dubias de Matrimonio controverſias uberiùs & accuratiùs enodaſſet (1). - - - *He greatly admired the ſubtile genius of the man, his penetration, his rare perſpicuity, his ſingular and exquiſite dexterity in finding things out, his eaſy method in explaining them, his accurate and unwearied pains in turning over authors, and taking quotations out of them; and he declared ſeriouſly that no man,* &c.’ Among all thoſe elogies, there is hardly any that does him more honour than what relates to the exactneſs of his quotations. It is a talent much more rare than people think, and I am very glad that Nicolas Antonio is of that opinion: *Celebratur (ne id taceam quod minime vulgare eſt) inter alias dotes Thomæ diligentia quædam ſingularis in allegandis fideliter ſcriptoribus quorum teſtimoniis utitur* (2). Several perſons have abridged this great volume *de Matrimonio*; ſome diſpoſing the matter according to an alphabetical order (3), others obſerving the method of the author. The other volumes of Sanchez contain either an explication of the precepts of the decalogue, or of monaſtic vows, or of ſeveral queſtions in law matters.

[*B*] *Bitter complaints are made of it.*] Here is a paſſage of the Abbot of St Cyran: ‘ Si de urberrima & ſubtiliſſima ſpurcitiarum omnigenarum ventilatione agitur, nemo unquam eam laudem Thomæ Sanchez eripiet, quin omnium primus Sacramentum matrimonii cum tanta cogitationum ſermoniſque licentia, imaginatione potius quam judicio duce, verſarit, quantam ante ipſum Eccleſia ab initio Chriſtiani nominis nec viderat, nec audierat (4). - - - *If we talk of a copious and ſubtile enquiry into all manner of filthineſs, no man will ever be able to deprive Thomas Sanchez of this praiſe, that he was the firſt who, guided rather by his imagination than judgment, handled the ſacrament of marriage with ſuch a freedom of thought and ſpeech, as the church from the beginning of Chriſtianity had never ſeen nor heard of.*’ Let us cite, after this, the words of a miniſter. ‘ It may be, *ſays he*, you have heard of a great volume compoſed by Thomas Sanchez, *de Matrimonio*. You cannot come to any Bookſeller's ſhop at Antwerp or Liege, but you may ſee the title of it in great letters. This book is the work of a Jeſuit, who treats of all the caſes of conſcience concerning marriage. It contains more impurity than all the moſt infamous Italian books together. See how the Clergy of France ſpeak of it by the mouth of one of their members. That prodigious * volume *contains a moſt ſubtile examination of all imaginable impurities; it is a common-ſhore that includes moſt horrible things not fit to be ſpoken. It may be called juſtly a ſhameful work, compoſed with an enormous curioſity, horrible and odious for it's diligent exactneſs, penetrating into moſt monſtrous, filthy, infamous, and diabolical matters. It is impoſſible to apprehend how an author could be ſo ſhameleſs, to compoſe ſuch a book, ſeeing a man now that has not quite diveſted himſelf of all modeſty, ſuffers terribly in reading it.* The reſt of the cenſure is ſtronger, but I ſuffer too much in tranſlating it: it is not an old cenſure, it was only made in 1632 (5).’ I believe it is a miſtake to attribute this cenſure to the Clergy of France; for that aſſembly gave no orders to Petrus Aurelius to examine this work, and to give his judgment of it in the name of the Clergy. I confeſs that they approved the writings of Petrus Aurelius; but, notwithſtanding, it is not to ſpeak exactly, to maintain that this aſſembly ſaid, by one of their members, all that is found in thoſe writings. Mr Rivet is contented to aſcribe this cenſure to the Sorbonne, and even that is not exact; for under pretence that this body of Divines give their approbation to a book wherein a certain author is ill treated, it cannot be ſaid that the Sorbonne has cenſured that author. That is never ſaid but when the Faculty proceeds in due form againſt a book, and qualifies the propoſitions of it. I do not think that ever the Sorbonniſts proceeded in this manner againſt Sanchez's book; and if they had done it, I cannot believe that Theophilus Raynaud would have dared to deny it, as he does in the following words, (6) ‘ Volo per hanc occaſionem non ſilere, quàm iniquè ac malignè . . . . Thomas Sanches, laceratus ſit à quibuſdam fori rabulis (7), quorum vitæ ſpurcitias, & fidem heteroclitam, alii jam pridem prodiderunt. Sed & hæretici . . . magno hîc zelo concitantur, quod recens admodum petulanter fecit Ludimagiſter Bernenſis Chriſtophorus Luthardus, ad parallelum Calvini cum priſcis hæreticis Simonianis: ſpurciloquia ſua in Sanchem, MENDACITER affingens Academiæ Pariſienſi. - - - *I will not omit this opportunity of taking notice how unjuſtly and maliciouſly . . . . . Thomas Sanchez has been abuſed by certain petty-foggers, whoſe leud lives and unſound faith have been long ago detected by others. The Heretics alſo . . . . . ſhew great zeal upon this head, as Chriſtopher Luthardus, a School-maſter of Bern, has done lately in a very inſolent manner, upon occaſion of the parallel drawn between Calvin and the old Simoniac Heretics; falſly aſcribing his own dirty invectives againſt Sanchez, to the Faculty of the Sorbonne.*’ Be it as will, let us cite the miniſter who is not very exact (8). ‘ Hîc omittere non debeo & lectori meo invidere, laude digniſſimam Sorbonæ Pariſienſis Cenſuram in Librum Thomæ Sanchez, prout ea habetur in *invidiciis Cenſuræ* à doctoribus Sorbonicis approbatis, & à Petro Aurelio editis, pag. 517. & ſeq. *De illo opere Matrimoniali*, inquiunt, *dicere ſpeciatim poſſumus, eſſe opus non gloriandum, ſed pudendum; tàm immani curioſitate, tàm inviſâ in rebus ſpurciſſimis & infandis ſagacitate horrendum, ut mirum ſit pudoris alicujus hominem, ea ſinè rubore ſcripſiſſe, quæ quivis modeſtioris ingenii vix ſinè rubore legat. Portenta iſta ſunt, non ſcripta; animorum inſidiæ, non mentium ſubſidia, incentiva libidinum, ſchola flagitiorum, non honeſtæ diſciplinæ, non ſcientiæ Chriſtianæ inſtrumenta. Infœlix ſcientia, quæ omnes perdere, paucos juvare nata eſt. Quæ circà ſordes & ſterquilinia volvenda & revolvenda volutatur, ut ejus doctorem jure cum ſcarabæo conferas, vel cum iis qui latrinariam factitant* (§ *α*). - - - *I ought not here to omit nor conceal from the reader that praiſe-worthy cenſure which the Sorbonne paſſed upon the book of Thomas Sanchez, as it is to be found in the* Vindication *of that* Cenſure, *approved of by the Sorbonniſts, and publiſhed by Petrus Aurelius.* As to that book *de Matrimonio, ſay they,* we can particularly affirm, that it is a work of which one has more reaſon to be aſhamed than proud: for ſuch a monſtrous curioſity does this horrid piece diſcover, and ſuch an odious exactneſs in dwelling upon filthy ſubjects, that are not even fit to be mentioned, that it may be juſtly wondered how a man of any ſhame could write without bluſhing at ſuch things, as a perſon of a modeſt diſpoſition can ſcarcely read without bluſhing. Theſe are monſters, and not writings, ſnares for the mind, not helps, incentives to luſt, and a ſchool for wickedneſs, not the inſtruments of honeſt inſtruction, or Chriſtian knowledge. An unhappy ſcience it is, contrived to to ruin all, and to do good to few. It wallows in filth, and is conſtantly employed in turning over dunghils; ſo that the teacher of it may rightly be compared to a black beetle, or to ſuch perſons whoſe buſineſs lies in raking filth and naſtineſs.’

[§ (*α*) Before the Abbot of St Cyran others had complained of the book of Sanchez. Here follows, upon this head a very curious paſſage of an author not much known. ‘ He that would know the maſterſhip and degree to which whoredom is arrived, let him read Sanchez in his treatiſe *de Matrimonio*; where he has endeavoured not ſo much to comment upon as to ſurpaſs, not ſo much to reprove as to ſhew the leacherous ſtupidity of Aretin, notwithſtanding that he was one of the moſt experienced, and, in a manner, the ſenior wit of this Faculty. But he had not gone ſo far, nor entered into ſo many dialogues upon the ſtrange and prodigious things that are revealed in confeſſion, as Sanchez, who, in this reſpect, ſurpaſſes all others. He teaches all the poſtures fit for ſtallions to uſe in the haunt of iniquity; which is horrible to think of. The ladies often quit the amours of Ronſard, and Amadis, for the *Summa of Benedicti*

‘ the

(*e*) See the paſſage of Petrus Aurelius at the beginning of the remark [*B*].

(1) Nat. Sotuel, Biblioth. Scriptor. Societat. *pag.* 767.

(2) Nicol. Antonius, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpan. *Tom. ii, p.* 252.

(3) I have an abridgment of it in an alphabetical order made by Emanuel Laurence Soares, a prieſt of Liſbon, in the year 1621. in 12mo.

(4) Petrus Aurelius, in Vindiciis Cenſuræ.

* Petrus Aurel. Vindic. Cenſuræ Facult.

(5) Jurieu, Apologie pour les Reformateurs, *ch. ix, pag.* 150. *Edit. in 4to.*

(6) Theophil. Raynaudus, de malis & bonis libris, *num.* 85, *pag.* 53.

(7) *In his* Hoplotheca, *pag.* 362. *he ſpeaks thus:* Thomas Sanchez à pleriſque fori rabulis ſpurcus audivit, quod in Opere de Matrimonio, librum nonum qui eſt de debito conjugali infecerit ſpurcitiis, & multa chartis commiſerit quæ àbſque fœdo ſenſu & verecundiæ contrucidatione, vix legi poſſint. - - - - *Thomas Sanchez has been called a filthy writer by ſeveral petty-foggers, becauſe in his work* de Matrimonio, *he has filled the ninth book, which treats of conjugal duties, with much filth, and wrote ſeveral things which can ſcarcely be read without a leud imagination, and the ruin of modeſty.*

(8) Andr. Rivetus, Explicat. Decalogi, *Oper. Tom. i, p.* 1400. *col.* 2.

and all that has been ſaid for his juſtification is weak [*C*]; and yet there are ſome Caſuiſts, who

‘ the Franciſcan †: and indeed we find the extravagances of leachery better deſcribed in ſuch authors than in Rabelais, or any where elſe. What an odd appearance it has, that theſe men, who would have it believed that they are mines of chaſtity and inexhauſtible ſprings of continence, ſhould nevertheleſs caſt up ſuch ill humours, and publiſh an iliad of ſo many impurities? But to ſpeak truly, what have prieſts to do to thruſt their noſes within the curtains of wedlock, or to ſet up for ſecretaries to the ſtews? They bend their utmoſt thought upon theſe things, with ſuch an unbounded extravagance of imagination that nothing can be more ſubtile: they feign caſes that have rather a metaphyſical than a moral poſſibility. The moſt inſatiable and burning luſt cannot by any means riſe ſo high. You will find there ſuch leacherous inventions as all the pillars of the ſtews could never have hit upon. Thoſe who have a mind to ſet up ſhop with them, will find enough there both to gain a livelihood, and to ruin their ſouls. Pagan authors never penetrated ſo licentiouſly into this abomination as theſe fine architects and chief miniſters of luxury: they have enlarged the dimenſions of it at a furious rate, and acquired a great many novices to ſtudy under them. They have ſweetened the practice of it, chalked out new poſtures, and enriched the whole with deſcriptions Cynically invented, and moſt ſinfully publiſhed. In ſhort, Venus never received more homage from any than from their ſcience. The treatiſe of Sanchez is a true library of Venus: ſuch books have made, and will make, more proſelytes to fornication, than all the Penitentiary of Rome has made, or ever will make, to chaſtity. They are much more proper to teach than to diſſuade ſin: and tho’ all the other books upon whoredom were deſtroyed and ſunk, theſe would be more than ſufficient to revive it. They contain forms, formalities, materialities, categories, and tranſcendencies, that are ſpick and ſpan new. Carnality and unnatural luſt are deſcribed there in their full extent. If Horace or Martial were to return, they would make fine odes and epigrams upon thoſe operators that wanted to caſtrate them. In five hundred Martial’s or Horace’s there is not ſo much room for clipping off, and caſtrating as in one page of this laſt author ‡.’

† See the laſt quotation of the text of this article.

‡ Franc Archer de la vraie Egliſe, *pag.* 266, 267, 268.

As for the reſt, if ſuch a dangerous book was neither cenſured by the aſſembly of the French Clergy, as Mr Jurieu ſays, nor by the Faculty of Divines at Paris, as Mr Rivet pretends; it has at leaſt been prohibited by a famous magiſtrate; a thing which redounds very much to his honour. This appears by the following words: *Thomas Sanchez has not been wanting in this,* (viz. in repleniſhing the caſes of conſcience with an infinite number of vile impurities); *for he has ſo ſtuffed his book* de Matrimonio *with theſe, that he is remarkable upon ſuch a carnival ſubject, beyond all that ever handled the ſame before. . . . . One of the worthy actions of Preſident le Jay, when he was lieutenant of the Policy at Paris, was, to have made ſtrict ſearch after this book, and to have forbid the Bookſellers of Paris to ſell it* under pain *of death* ††. Theſe words, as well as the long paſſage that precedes them, are taken from a very ſcarce book, intituled, *Le Franc-Archer de la vraye Egliſe contre les Abus & Enormitez de la fauſſe,* written by Antony Fuſi, and printed in the year 1619, in 8vo. REM. CRIT.]

†† Ibid. *pag.* 867, 868.

[*C*] *What has been ſaid for his juſtification is weak.*] The cenſurers of this author may pretend two things: the firſt is, that he could not poſſibly write ſo many particular impurities, without being unchaſte himſelf: ‘ Extant inter alia nonnullorum Jeſuitarum de his argumentis ſcripta, in quibus explicantur talia, quæ vix diabolus ipſe, ſtudium omne adhibendo, ſuggerere poſſet: ubi non ſolùm genera, ſpecies, ſed & modos omnes, objecta, ſubjecta, circumſtantias, ita minutatim examinant, ut nemo ſanus ea profecta fuiſſe judicet à mente purâ & caſtâ. Inter quos eminet Thomas Sanchez Hiſpanus Jeſuita, in prolixo tractatu *de Matrimonio* (9). - - - - *There are extant, among others, the writings of ſome Jeſuits upon theſe ſubjects; where ſuch things are explained, as the Devil himſelf, with his utmoſt thought, could hardly ſuggeſt: where not only the kinds, ſpecies, but likewiſe all the different ways, objects, ſubjects, circumſtances, are ſo minutely conſidered, that no man in his ſenſes can ſuppoſe this to proceed from a pure and chaſte mind. Among theſe authors the moſt remarkable is, Thomas Sanchez, a Spaniſh Jeſuit, in his large book* de Matrimonio.’ The ſecond is, That he could not communicate to the public the knowledge of ſo many monſtrous irregularities, without doing a prejudice to good morals. It being certain that ſeveral perſons are inclined to commit theſe abominations when they know they are practiſed. Therefore a man that is wiſe and zealous for the ſalvation of his neighbours, ought carefully to avoid letting them know the impurities that are diſcovered to him in the tribunal of confeſſion; for we may be aſſured that thoſe who know nothing of the matter, will more eaſily abſtain from it, than thoſe who know the enormity and filthineſs thereof.

(9) Rivetus, ubi ſupra.

As to the firſt of theſe two accuſations, the friends of Sanchez anſwer, That he was a man of an admirable virtue and perfect chaſtity. His immaculate virginity accompanied him to his grave, ſay they, and the day he was buried all people thronged in, either to kiſs, or to touch with their beads his body covered with flowers, and ſhining with a virginal beauty (10). *Ad communis parentis funus (ſic eum vocabant) advenit Illuſtriſſimus Archiepiſcopus, graviſſimuſque Senatus Regius: confluxere ſacrorum Ordinum viri Religioſi; urbis univerſa Nobilitas, & promiſcuæ plebis innumera multitudo, qui defuncti corpus floribus conſperſum, & eximiâ quadâm ſpecie ac virginali nitore micans certatim conabantur vel roſariis contingere, vel oſculis ſuppliciter venerari* (11). They refer us to ſome authors, who have praiſed the purity of his life. *Ejus innocentiam & vitam puriſſimam exhibent Crombetius l.* 2. *de ſtudio perfect. cap.* 12. *& Joannes Bourgheſius l. cui titulus eſt* Societas JESU, Deiaparæ ſacra *cap.* 20 (12). This implies, that his mind and imagination were filled with thoſe filthy matters, but his heart and body were free from that contagion. Many people think this as hard, as to be like the Hebrew children in the Babylonian furnace without being burnt. But after all, it is not impoſſible but that the horror that might be conceived for thoſe execrable abuſes of matrimony, and the deſire of correcting them, might preſerve the innocence of an author who ſhould wallow in thoſe ordures; of an author, I ſay, whoſe, age, temper, and education, might be powerful preſervatives againſt the pollutions of the fleſh. There is ſome reaſon to think that authors who dwell too much upon the explication of the *Priapeïa*, and the obſcene paſſages of Catullus and Martial, are not very chaſte; and it is but too certain that there have been ſome commentators who dwelt upon thoſe matters too long, and made a deep ſcrutiny into them, only becauſe they were unchaſte. But that is not to be taken for a general rule; for the ſole deſire of ſhewing a great deal of reading, and an uncommon learning, is very capable of engaging an humaniſt to comment largely upon the Poets I have mentioned. The firſt reading of thoſe poems does ſtrongly attack virtue, eſpecially that of young men: by degrees one grows harder; and there are Critics, who, after having read ſeveral times Catullus and Martial, either to clear up ſome old cuſtom, or to comment on them, are no more moved with their impure expreſſions, than if they read an aphoriſm of Hippocrates. It happens to thoſe Critics as it happens to Phyſicians and Chirurgeons, who being uſed to handle filthy ulcers, after ſome time, find no offence from the ſtink. I pray GOD it may happen ſo to Confeſſors, and Caſuiſts, whoſe ears are the common-ſhores of all the filth of human life. There are but too many of them, doubtleſs, who never riſe to ſuch a pitch, and whoſe virtue is overcome, when they hear the impurities of their penitent: no conſequence can be drawn from hence againſt this or that man in particular; ſo that we ſhould be very raſh, ſhould we aſſert that Sanchez was not poſſeſſed of this inſenſibility, and that he was infected with the ſtinking ordures he ſtirred with ſo much application: and after all, he has an excuſe, which the moſt chaſte commentators upon the *Catalecta* cannot have; for he may ſay he only put his hand to this filth with a deſign to purge the world of it. It is by this, that they endeavour to anſwer the ſecond accuſation, which is a great deal more perplexing than the firſt.

(10) Homo vitæ puriſſimæ innocentiſſimeque actæ, & nulla unquam graviori labe contaminatæ. . . . Caſtimoniæ tantum decus, ut virginitatis florem in tumulum intulerit. *Sotuel, ubi ſupra.* Sanchem, hominem ſanctiſſimæ vitæ & perpetuo virginitatis candore nitentem, ut graves ſcriptores prodiderunt. *Th. Raynaud, ubi ſupra.*

(11) Sotuel. ibid.

(12) Theoph. Raynaud. Hoplotheca, §. *ii, Serie III, cap. x. pag.* 362.

I have ſaid elſewhere (13) what is alledged to juſtify Albertus Magnus in the ſame caſe. His friends pretend

(13) See the article ALBERTUS, remark [*D*].

who continue every day to publiſh ſuch like impurities (*f*). They have done ſo a long time,

(*f*) See the cenſure upon a book of *Amadeus Guimenius* made by the Faculty of Divinity at Paris, the third of February 1665. They condemn ſeveral propoſitions, that are only denoted by the firſt words, and cannot be modeſtly tranſlated into French.

tend that there ought to be books, wherein Confeſſors may meet with neceſſary inſtructions againſt the diſorders imparted to them; and therefore that a great doctor like him ought to write upon that ſubject. The ſame anſwer is alſo given for Sanchez. The filthy queſtions, ſay they, and the enormous obſcenities which he examines ſo exactly, are very ſerviceable to the directors of conſcience. We have therefore no reaſon to be ſcandalized at them. Do we blame a Phyſician for ſtirring filthy excrements, in order to procure his patient's health? This conſideration hindered the Jeſuits from curtailing Sanchez. One of them ſays, among other things, that being to judge of one of the moſt impure matters that are contained in it, he could never have reſolved the inſurmountable difficulties which offered themſelves, without the ſolutions of this author. *Fuiſſe autem eam de Matrimonio ſcriptionem neceſſariam, audire memini ex homine & probatorum morum ſeveritate, & eruditione clariſſimo, P. Valerio Reginaldo. Is cùm in quadam Provinciali Congregatione, à nonnullis meticuloſis propoſitum eſſet ut opus Patris Thomæ Sanchez de Matrimonio truncaretur ea tractatione cujus fœtor toties pro tribunalibus à malevolis Cauſidicis extra cauſam ingeſtus erat; graviter conteſtatus eſt, nihil eſſe in eo opere conſcientiarum duntaxat arbitris conſcripto, quod offenſionem meritò moveret. Cùm non modò apud Juriſperitos, (Tiraquellum præſertim in legibus Connubialibus,) tetriora abſque neceſſitate ad merum curioſitatis pabulum legantur, ſed etiam apud alios de Matrimonio Scriptores, nec non apud Summiſtas eadem occurrant; quæ omnia Lybitinæ addicere, & impoſſibile & damnoſum foret. Apud Sanchem certè, quod maximè ſpurcum ac vel lectu fœdum videri poterat, ſibi aliquando ad dijudicandum fuiſſe propoſitum; & niſi ex eo Autore enodationem habuiſſet, ſalebras ſibi inexpedibiles fuiſſe futuras. Itaque non plus offendi quemquam debere, ea fœtidorum dubiorum tractatione ad directionem pœnitentium neceſſaria, quàm ſuccenſeamus, cum Medici olida ejectamenta in ægri bonum & curationem emovent* (14). The Abbot of St Cyran, under the name of Petrus Aurelius, had refuted beforehand this bad reaſon. He maintained that this work might do a great deal of harm, but little good. By ſetting before the eyes of the public an infinity of infamous impurities that are committed in the nuptial-bed, good ſouls are ſcandalized, the curioſity of ſome is excited, and the laſciviouſneſs of others, *&c.* But if the directors of conſciences are to paſs their verdict in ſuch caſes, it is much better that they ſhould have recourſe to the living voice of doctors, than to a public work, where it is hard to find the caſe in queſtion with all it's circumſtances. It muſt be granted, this remark is very ſolid: the Roman Catholics are in the wrong not to imitate ſects of the antient Philoſophy, where the whole ſyſtem was never put in writing: a part being reſerved to be taught by word of mouth to the favourite diſciples: this was only preſerved by tradition. The Pope ſhould have forbid the Caſuiſts to print any thing about the caſes of luxury; he ſhould have ordered the matter ſo, that the inſtruction of the confeſſors, either with reſpect to the queſtions, or to the penances upon this head, might be communicated from the one to the other in private, or at moſt in manuſcript under the ſeal of ſecrecy. Let us quote Petrus Aurelius. *Modeſtiores fuerunt ſemper Eccleſiaſtici tractatores. . . . Nec tanti fecerunt ancipitem iſtam & periculoſam conjugalium arcanorum, flagitiorum, piaculorumque ſcientiam. Maluerunt iſta neſciri à paucis, quorum fortè intereſſet, quàm ſciri à plurimis ad peſtilentiſſimæ curioſitatis illecebram, ad cupiditatum fomitem, ad publicum dedecus, dùm promiſcuè, maximis voluminibus, ante ora omnium propoſitis, explicantur. Nam & raròuſu venit ut talium nefandorum cognitione ſit opus; & cùm uſum venit, tutius viri probi, Eccleſiaſticarum rerum peritiores conſuluntur, qui iſta ex æquo & bono, & ex Eccleſiaſticæ diſciplinæ comparatione dijudicent, quàm ex libro quopiam publicè noxio aut periculoſo, ubi aliquid generatim tantùm, aut obſcurè, aut à præſenti negotio remotè, ut ferè accidit, ſcriptum ſit, quæſtionis fortaſſè diverſiſſimæ expoſitio privato cujuſque judicio repetatur. Atque ita hactenus obſervarat Eccleſia, donec Thomas Sanchez ſuperiorum ſeculorum caſtiorem modeſtioremque conſuetudinem ſpernens, prodigioſo volumine, velut CLOACA ingenti, fanda infandaque convolvit* (15).

The other reaſons of Theophilus Raynaud are not better. He cites (16) long paſſages out of St Chryſoſtom, which prove that this Father of the Church has repreſented to the life, and, in plain terms, the infamous impurities of his time. He ſhews (17) that St Epiphanius has deſcribed in the ſame manner the impurities of the Gnoſtics, and that St Cyril made uſe of the ſame liberty to deſcribe thoſe of the Manichees. He maintains that Hincmarus, in his book about the divorce of Lotharius and Telberga, ſpoke more obſcenely than Sanchez (18). He ſays that the excuſes which St Chryſoſtom, St Epiphanius, St Cyril, and Hincmarus, made to their auditors or readers, may ſerve as an apology for his fellow-Jeſuit. He mentions what Radulphus Flavicenſis obſerved, againſt the falſe niceneſs of thoſe who blamed the obſcene terms which Moſes made uſe of in Leviticus (19). But it is ſo eaſy to perceive the difference between thoſe examples and the conduct of the Spaniſh writer, that I ſhall not ſtand upon the proofs of the weakneſs or inſignificancy of that parallel. Every body eaſily perceives, that the ſame things which are permitted to thoſe who know a fact, which the enquiries of Hiſtorians, or juridical proceedings have manifeſted, ought not to be allowed to thoſe who only knew it by way of auricular confeſſion. The antient Fathers had a right to make known the execrable deportments of the Heretics. Hincmarus might compoſe a relation upon the moſt impure conduct of a divorced queen; and when once vice is atteſted either by hiſtory, or by a verbal proceſs, authors have a right to mention it, if it be to the purpoſe: but as to vices that are only revealed to the confeſſors, another method ought to be taken with them. I paſs by what a great many people would not have omitted; that now a-days no famous preacher would be ſo bold as to take the ſame liberty in this reſpect that St Chryſoſtom and St Cyril took, and that if any writer of the antient Church is to be imitated on that ſcore, it is Salvian, of whom Theophilus Raynaud cites theſe fine words. ‘ Quæ quidem ‘ omnia tam flagitioſa ſunt, ut etiam explicare ea ‘ quiſpiam atque eloqui ſalvo pudore non valeat. Quis ‘ enim integro verecundiæ ſtatu, dicere queat illas vo‘ cum ac verborum obſcœnitates, illas motuum tur‘ pitudines, illas geſtuum fœditates? quæ quanti ſint ‘ criminis, vel hinc intelligi poteſt, quod & rela‘ tionem ſui interdicunt. Nonnulla quippe etiam ma‘ xima ſcelera, incolumi honeſtate referentis, & no‘ minari & argui poſſunt, ut homicidium, latroci‘ nium, adulterium, ſacrilegium, ceteraque in hunc ‘ modum; ſolæ theatrorum impuritates ſunt, quæ ‘ honeſtè non poſſunt vel accuſari: ita nova in coar‘ guendâ earum turpitudinum probroſitate res evenit ‘ arguenti: ut cùm abſque dubio honeſtus ſit qui accu‘ ſare ea velit, honeſtate tamen integra, ea loqui & ac‘ cuſare non poſſit (20). - - - *All which things are ſo* ‘ *ſcandalous that one cannot even modeſtly deſcribe and* ‘ *expreſs them. For who, without offence to modeſty,* ‘ *can explain ſuch obſcene words and ſpeeches, ſuch filthy* ‘ *motions, and ſuch leud geſtures? From this very thing* ‘ *it may be underſtood, how criminal they are, ſince they* ‘ *will not allow us to deſcribe them. Some, even of* ‘ *the worſt of crimes, may be named, and proved, with*‘ *out any ſhame to the teller, as murder, robbery, adul*‘ *tery, ſacrilege, and others of the like nature: only theſe* ‘ *theatrical impurities cannot decently be expoſed and cen*‘ *ſured. This, a new and extraordinary thing, hap*‘ *pens to ſuch as would attempt to ſhew the infamy of thoſe* ‘ *vile practices: for whereas he muſt undoubtedly be a* ‘ *virtuous and modeſt man whoever is willing to expoſe* ‘ *them; ſo, without caſting a blemiſh upon his virtue, it* ‘ *is impoſſible for him to deſcribe and expoſe them.*’ Obſerve here the opinion of Salvian touching the impurities of the ſtage: it was neceſſary to have honour and modeſty to condemn them, but one muſt have had impudence to deſcribe them (21). This is the model which Sanchez, and many other Caſuiſts, ought to have followed. I ſay many others; for he is neither the firſt, nor the laſt that has writ in that manner (22).

See

(14) Theoph. Raynaud. Hoploth. *Ibid. pag.* 362.

(15) Petrus Aurelius, in Vindiciis Cenſuræ, apud Andr. Rivetum Oper. *Tom. iii, p.* 1400. *col. i.*

(16) Theophil. Raynaud. Hoplotheca, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 362, 363.

(17) Ibid. *pag.* 364.

(18) Coactus eſt ſtylum demittere in ſpurcitias longe fœdiores quam uſpiam apud Sanchem legantur. *Theophil. Raynaud. de malis & bonis Libris, pag.* 53. *See alſo his* Hoplotheca, *pag.* 363.

(19) *Idem*, Hoplotheca, *p.* 364. & de malis Libris, *pag.* 56.

(20) Salvianus de Providentia, *lib. vi, pag. m.* 199, 200.

(21) *The words of Cicero, Philip. II, againſt Marc Antony may be applied to this ſubject,* Tu eo liberior quod ea in te admiſiſti quæ à verecundo inimico audire non poſſes. - - - *You are the more free upon this account, becauſe you have committed ſuch crimes as your modeſt adverſary cannot mention.* See the uſe that has been made of theſe words in the *Cabale Chimerique, pag.* 194, of the ſecond Edition.

(22) Ita factum videmus ante Sanchem, ac poſt eum à quamplurimis, ut mirum ſit hunc æſtum efferbuiſſe in unum Sanchem. *Raynaud. Hoplotheca, pag* 364.

time, and it is a deplorable thing to ſee that courtiers, who had their memories ſtuffed with all manner of ſuch filthy accounts, did cite as a common-place-book the ‘ *Summa* ‘ *Benedicti*, who is a Franciſcan Doctor, who has written very well of all ſorts of ‘ ſins, and ſhews that he has both ſeen and read a great deal (*g*).’ This book of Benedictus is tranſlated into French: It was publiſhed in that language at Lyons in 1584 (*h*), and at Paris in the year 1602, which might well have been let alone.

(*g*) Brantome, Dames Galantes, *Tom. i, pag. m.* 51. *See alſo pag.* 185.

(*h*) Du Verdier, Bibl. *pag.* 651.

See Mr Jurieu in the Apology for the Reformers in the chapter I have cited. Let us conclude, that it is a thing very blameable and deplorable that there ſhould be ſo many books of that nature; but it is infinitely more deplorable that the impurities they contain ſhould be ſo many real crimes. The ſchool-men ſpin things ſo fine, that, even in matters of morality, they have debated very needleſs queſtions and things that never happen; and you ſee continually the Caſuiſts diſtinguiſh between the practice and the theory, and propoſe Metaphyſical and imaginary caſes. This, probably, was one of the reaſons which made Mr Rivet judge that the infamies that are read in Sanchez had been invented by that author; and therefore being at Aix-la-Chapelle with a Jeſuit, he told him he could not ſufficiently wonder that a man who had made a vow of chaſtity, ſhould ſuppoſe ſuch abominations as were not practiſed. I ſee, replied the Jeſuit, you have never been a confeſſor. We hear often more impure caſes than thoſe; ſo that it is neceſſary that confeſſors ſhould be provided with directions, according to which they may be enabled to impoſe due penances. Mr Rivet replied, ſmiling, It is ſtrange that you ſhould boaſt ſo much of the holineſs of your church, ſince, according to your confeſſion, ſuch things are practiſed in it, of which the very Heathens knew not the name. *Hæc ego cum ante aliquot annos objicerem Jeſuitæ cuidam Aquiſgrani, adderemque me non exiſtimare reperiri exempla talium abominationum, meque valdè mirari ab homine caſtitatem profeſſo fuiſſe excogitatas: Regerebat, me nunquam fuiſſe admotum audiendis confeſſionibus, atrociora multò & ſpurciora ſæpiſſimè audiri ab ore confitentium, ut neceſſariò opus ſit confeſſarios inſtitui ſuper iſtis, ni velint hærere talibus occurrentibus peccatis, juxta quæ eſt injungenda pœnitentia. Subridens dicebam, mirum igitur eſſe quod tantopere gloriarentur de ſanctitate Eccleſiæ ſuæ, in quâ, & ſæpe, ut ille fatebatur, ea perpetrarentur, quæ apud Ethnicos ne nominata quidem fuerant* (23). We do not know the domeſtic privacy of the antient Pagans, as we know thoſe of the countries where auricular confeſſion is practiſed; and therefore we cannot tell whether marriage was ſo brutiſhly diſhonoured among the Pagans as it is among the Chriſtians: but at leaſt it is probable that the Infidels did not ſurpaſs, in this reſpect, many perſons who believe all the doctrines of the Goſpel. Thoſe for whom the book of Sanchez is writ, are ſuch as go to confeſſion, and ſubmit to the penances enjoined them by their confeſſors. They therefore believe what the Scripture teaches us of Heaven and Hell, they believe purgatory, and the other doctrines of the Romiſh communion; and yet, in the midſt of this perſuaſion, you ſee them plunged into abominable impurities, which are not fit to be named, and which draw down ſevere reproaches upon the head of ſuch authors as dare to mention them. I obſerve this againſt thoſe who perſuade themſelves that the corruption of manners proceeds from mens doubting, or being ignorant that there is another life after this.

(23) Rivet, in Decalog. *ad ver.* 13. *Oper. Tom. i. pag.* 1400, *col.* 2.

SANDERS or **SAUNDERS** (NICHOLAS) an Engliſh Prieſt, but not a Jeſuit as ſome have ſaid [*A*], ſhewed great zeal for the Pope's intereſt, and miſerably ended his days in a kind of military miſſion in Ireland, where he was gone to encourage the Roman Catholics who had taken up arms againſt Queen Elizabeth [*B*]. I forbear to give his article, becauſe it is to be found, not only in Moreri's Dictionary, but alſo in other Books which are every where to be met with (*a*). I ſhall only ſay ſomething of his Hiſtory of the Engliſh Schiſm [*C*]. It is a book where there is a great deal of paſſion and very little exactneſs, two qualities which generally go together. In the

(*a*) *In the* Hiſtoire du Divorce de Henri VIII, par Mr le Grand, *Tom. ii, pag.* 7, *& ſeq. and in the* Anti *of Mr Baillet, article* 159.

[*A*] *He was a . . . . Prieſt, but not a Jeſuit, as ſome have ſaid.*] Of this number was the author of the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (1); but that error, into which he had been drawn by guides whom he had reaſon to think creditable, was corrected ſoon after (2). That author had obſerved that du Moulin gives Sanders the title of Jeſuit (3), and had read the following words in a book of Mr Daillé: Richard Crackenthorp, one of the learned Engliſh writers, *ſays that Sanders the Jeſuit was not aſhamed to be the firſt who publiſhed this ſtory* (4); that is to ſay that Queen Elizabeth was created head of the Church. He had ſeen that Schoockius, for an inſtance of the Jeſuitical impoſtures, alledges what Sanders the Jeſuit wrote upon the birth of Queen Elizabeth (5).

[*B*] *He miſerably ended his days in a kind of military miſſion in Ireland, where he was gone to encourage the Roman Catholics . . . againſt Queen Elizabeth.*] His countryman Edward Riſhton, when he publiſhed the Hiſtory of the Engliſh Schiſm, prefixed to it a ſhort preface wherein he ſays what follows: *As the ſaid Sanders, being very zealous for the ſalvation of his countrymen the Engliſh, had retired from Spain into Ireland, to comfort the diſtreſſed Catholics who had taken up arms in defence of Religion (in which holy work he ſoon after gave up his bleſſed ſoul to his Creator; his continual labours and ſufferings, the indiſpoſition of the air and place, the want of neceſſaries, and other difficulties and miſeries having occaſioned his death) he left this work of the Engliſh Schiſm.* They put in the margin that he died in the year 1581. I have made uſe of the old French tranſlation, and not that of Mr Maucroix. We find in Camden, that the ill ſucceſs of the rebellion made Sanders loſe his ſenſes, and that ſeeing himſelf forſaken by all, he wandered up and down in the woods and mountains, and died of hunger in the year 1583. Upon this Camden makes the following reflexion; that the Divine Juſtice, if we may be allowed to judge of it, made uſe of hunger to ſtop a mouth which had been always ready to preach, revolt, and publiſh calumnies. *Inter quos* (Sacerdotes) *facile primus erat Nicholaus Sanderus Anglus, qui fame eodem fere momento miſerrimè periit, cum derelictus, & ex adverſo rebellionis ſucceſſu mente motus, per ſylvas, ſaltus, & montes errabundus nullum reperiret ſolatium. In ejus pera deprehenſæ erant Orationes quædam & Epiſtolæ ad rebelles confirmandos conſcriptæ, amplis à Pontifice Rom. & Hiſpano promiſſis refertæ. Ita divina Juſtitia, (ſi fas ſit judicare) os illud ad rebelliones concitandas, & calumnias cum mendaciis eructandas ſemper apertum, fame obſtruxit. Ille enim primus omnium horrendum illud (ut alia taceam) contra matris Elizabethæ natales mendacium conflavit, quod nemo temporibus illis, recenti in eam Pontificiorum odio novit, Anglia totis XL poſtea annis non audivit, temporum ratio falſitatis & vanitatis liquidiſſimè convincit, & ipſe ſui immemor quod mendacem non oportuit, plane coarguit* (6). Conſult Mr Burnet (7), who will tell you the different accounts that were given of this perſon's death.

[*C*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his Hiſtory of the Engliſh Schiſm.*] He compleated it in Spain; but he had not as yet put the laſt hand to it, *being almoſt continually hindered by other affairs, and likewiſe by other compoſitions* (8). Nevertheleſs there were ſome copies of it in Spain and Italy, and it was no difficult matter for Riſhton to get one of them, when, being prevailed upon by the importunity of one of his friends (9), he reſolved to publiſh this Hiſtory (10). *I have read over,*

(1) For the month of Nov. 1685, Art. VI, pag. 1238, of the firſt edition.

(2) In the ſecond edition, *p.* 1250.

(3) Du Moulin, Defenſe du Roi de la Grand' Bretagne, *pag.* 45, *Edit. of Geneva* 1631.

(4) Daillé, Replique à Adam & à Cottibi, *Part. ii, pag.* 78.

(5) Schoock, de Fabula Hamel. *pag. m.* 222.

(6) Camdenus, Hiſt. Reginæ Elizabethæ, *Part. iii, pag. m.* 372.

(7) Burnet, his Criticiſm on the ninth book of Varillas, *pag.* 35, & 131.

(8) Edward Riſhton, preface to the Hiſtory of the Engliſh Schiſm.

(9) He was at Cologn, and was called *Jodocus Skarnbert.*

(10) Riſhton, *ibid.*

the confutation (*b*) of the ſeventh book of his viſible monarchy of the Church, that author is upbraided not *with having invented what he wrote but with truſting ſomewhat too raſhly to common reports in matters of importance* (*c*). It is the general fault of thoſe who ſuffer perſecution for their religion. This was the caſe of Sanders. He embraced the ſentiments of the Spaniards and Italians touching the Pope's authority, and ſtrongly defended them in his book *de viſibili Monarchia Eccleſiæ*, printed *for the firſt time in the year* 1571 (*d*) at Louvain *in folio* (*e*), and in another work intitled *de Clave David*, which was one of his laſt productions (*f*)

(*b*) This confutation is intituled *Fidelis ſervi infideli ſubdito Reſponſio*, and was printed in the year 1573.

(*c*) Le Grand, Hiſt. du Divorce de Henri VIII, *pag.* 9, 10.

(*d*) Ibid. *pag.* 8.

(*e*) Epit. Biblioth. Geſneri.

(*f*) Nicolaus Sanderus cygnæa ſua cantione in Libris de Clave David egregie ſedis hujus (*pontificiæ*) dignitatem extulit. *Schultingius*, Epiſt. Dedic. Tom. i. *Bibliothecæ Catholicæ*,

over, ſaid he, *from beginning to end the ſaid work, and have corrected ſome paſſages, which had been either corrupted by the fault of the tranſcribers, or not ſufficiently explained by the author; through the haſte he was in: and to the end that the thread and order of the Hiſtory might be the better kept up, I have curtailed ſome things, which ſeemed to be intangled with too long diſputes. I have likewiſe added many that were wanting, particularly ſuch as happened after the death of Mr Sanders: and whereas the bulk and ſize of the work did not appear to be very large, I have comprehended the whole under the title of one ſingle book. Laſt of all I have delivered it, thus corrected, to my ſaid friend M. Joſſe, together with this epiſtle, to the end that he might ſend it to his Printer, who deſired it ſo earneſtly* (11). In this manner did they publiſh the firſt edition, which was that of Cologn 1585. Riſhton had no hand in the following editions where many things were added (12); for he died the ſame year at St Menehou (13). This book of Sanders had ſuch a prodigious ſale, that being reprinted at Rome in the year 1586, a Bookſeller of Ingolſtad (14) immediately counterfeited that edition. He dates his Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Archbiſhop of Saltzburg on the 5th of November 1586: which makes me conclude that his edition came out that year, and that the copy which I make uſe of, and which has the year 1588 marked in the title, is of a ſecond edition at Ingolſtad. Note, that in the edition of Rome the work contains three books, according to the diviſion of Sanders with the paſſages which Riſhton had curtailed. Mr le Grand obſerves (15) that the editions of Rome and Ingolſtad *are ſo different from the firſt that one may ſay it is a new work*; and he pretends (16) that *no edition has yet appeared which is better* than the firſt. Others were publiſhed at Cologn in the year 1610, and the year 1628. The latter is the fulleſt of all; for it contains ſeveral additions taken from a book of Ribadeneira upon the ſame ſubject.

A man who marked his name only by the initial letters J. T. A. C. tranſlated this book of Sanders into French the ſame year that it was publiſhed at Cologn, I mean in 1585; *but afterwards*, adds he, this Hiſtory *having been augmented at Rome with licences in the year* 1586, *and ſent to me ſome months ago, I have mended and tranſlated it into our French tongue.* The advertiſement where he ſpeaks in this manner is dated the 9th of July 1587. This tranſlation was printed in the year 1587 in 8vo. We are not told in what place; but the title informs us that it was printed *by the command of the moſt illuſtrious and reverend Cardinal de Vaudemont, at the requeſt of certain Engliſh gentlemen who had been obliged to fly their country for the Catholic Faith.* I have ſeen another French tranſlation printed in the year 1587 in 8vo. It is very different from the former: I do not paſs this judgment upon it, becauſe the words that are in the title of the one are not in the title of the other, or becauſe the Preface ſigned J. T. A. C. and dated the 9th of July 1587, is in the one and not in the other. Theſe are not proofs of a different edition. The Bookſellers ſometimes change all the firſt pages without reprinting the body of the book. But here are my proofs: it is impoſſible to give more convincing ones. The tranſlation printed by the command of the Cardinal de Vaudemont, contains 281 leaves, the other contains 296, although it be printed in ſmaller characters. I have found in the latter ſeveral paſſages otherwiſe tranſlated than they are in the former. I ſhall give an example of it. We read in the 187th leaf of that tranſlation which wants the Preface ſigned J. T. A. C. that Millon Coverdale being gone to Oxford, got up into the pulpit to diſcourſe upon the Euchariſt, and becauſe people rallied him on account of his bringing with him 'Sororem quamdam ſuam, - - - *a certain ſiſter of his,*' he ſharply replied 'qui in eum ſtomachati fuiſſent quod vas commoditatis haberet (ita enim ſuam meretriculam appellabat) - - - *thoſe who had rallied him for his having always with him his veſſel of conveniency (for ſo he called his whore).*' Here follow the terms of the other tranſlation in the 166th leaf (17). 'Milon Coverdal . . . having heard that the Univerſity of Oxford was wonderfully addicted to the Catholic Faith, and for no conſideration in the world could be prevailed upon to abandon it, in order to embrace Hereſy; and that, beſides this, there were ſome who girded at him on account of his carrying every where along with him a certain ſiſter of his, imagining that he ſhould find a great many copies of himſelf, and being perſuaded that he ſhould be able to ſeduce a vaſt number of people, he came to Oxford, got up into the pulpit, every body was very attentive. . . . . . For this reaſon after he had firſt of all ſharply reproved thoſe who were offended at his having the Veſſel of Conveniency (for ſo he called his little whore) he added, that, &c.'

The ſtile of theſe two tranſlations is extremely barbarous and unpoliſhed, even for that time: the author who marks his name by the initial letters J. T. A. C. does juſtice to himſelf when he owns that he has had *more regard to the ſenſe and meaning, or corruption of Sanders, than to a ſhew and orderly placing of quaint words, contenting himſelf with being underſtood by thoſe who conſider rather the marrow and truth of Hiſtory, than the ornaments and figures of Rhetoric.* We muſt nevertheleſs own that his tranſlation is not ſo barbarous as the others, and contains fewer paſſages miſunderſtood, for example, he has not blundered in this, as the other has done. 'The river Thames which waters the city of London, on the 17th of December 1550, in leſs than nine hours, ebbed and flowed three times contrary to cuſtom. The ſame year a certain ſweating diſeaſe, peſtilential and mortal, and before that time unknown to Phyſicians, ſpread all over England, and killed an almoſt infinite number of people, ſo that in leſs than ſeven days there died in the city of London alone eight hundred perſons: ſeveral thouſands more being ſuffocated with the ſame diſtemper in other places: it had nevertheleſs nothing of the nature and quality of the Plague: but it was a kind of miracle and prodigy, by which the almighty and merciful God thought fit to warn the Engliſh of the enormous ſin which they had committed againſt him: it has done no ſervice however to a wicked and reprobate generation (18).' In the other tranſlation the Latin words *Sudatorius quidam peſtifer morbus nunquam antea Medicis cognitus* (19), have been rendred *a certain diſeaſe called the Pox formerly unknown to Phyſicians.* Here are two errors fit for a ſchool-boy: the Pox, which was not the thing in queſtion, had already been the ſubject of ſeveral printed volumes. My reaſon for quoting this paſſage of the Hiſtorian ſomewhat at length, is to ſhew the turn of his mind, and becauſe he has publiſhed a groſs falſity not to be excuſed in an Engliſhman. He ſays that the Engliſh ſweating diſeaſe which was felt at London in the year 1550 had never before that time been known to the Phyſicians (20). He was then ignorant it ſeems that it began to be known in the year 1486 (21), and that afterwards it frequently made great havock. Do not fancy that the leaſt bad tranſlation of the two was written by a man that underſtood the Latin well. You are going to ſee a miſtake which will be pretty ſufficient to convince you that he ſometimes miſunderſtood the ſenſe of the original. 'The Printers made every where ſtrict ſearch after the works of Mr Nicholas Sanders . . . . . and eſpecially thoſe which had not yet been printed, but which he had either depoſited with his particular

(11) Ibid.

(12) Le Grand, Hiſt. du Divorce de Henri VIII, *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 6.

(13) A French town in Champaign.

(14) Named Wolfgangus Ederus.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Ibid. *p.* 7.

(17) Note that I have not cited word for word the whole paſſage of the other tranſlation, as I do of this, It is ſufficient that in ſome words we ſee the difference.

(18) Sanderus, du Schiſme d'Anglet. *livr. ii*, *fol* 168 *of an old French tranſlation.*

(19) Sanderus, de Schiſmate Anglican. *lib. ii*, *pag.* 233, *Edition of Ingolſtat.* 1588.

(20) Nunquam antea Medicis cognitus. *Id. ibid.*

(21) See the remark [*D*], of the articie AMMONIUS (ANDREW) & *Sethus Calviſius*, ad ann. 1486, who obſerves that the Scurvy likewiſe began this year in Low-Germany.

‘ particular friends, before his death, or left to his ‘ adverſaries.’ It is in this manner that he tranſlates theſe Latin words of Riſhton : *D. Nicolai Sanderi . . . . Opera . . . . à Typographis undique conquiri ad prælum, maximè verò ea quæ nondum impreſſa, ſed ab illo . . . . vel apud amicos depoſita, vel in adverſariis relicta.* You ſee how by a groſs ignorance he imagined that *in adverſariis*, that is to ſay, *among his papers*, ſignified *to his enemies*. Mr Maucroix gave a new French tranſlation of this book of Sanders in the year 1677. It is very polite : we have three editions of it (22).

(22) Two of Paris, and one in Holland: this laſt was printed in the year 1683.

To know whether this Hiſtory of the Schiſm be impartial and of any weight, we muſt conſult the criticiſm which Biſhop Burnet has given of it (23), and what Mr le Grand has anſwered in behalf of Sanders (24). How paſſionate this author is has been ſaid in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* at the ſixth article for the month of November 1685. An anonymous writer had already criticized upon that Hiſtorian in the year 1593. His book was printed at Cambridge, and is intituled, *Anti-Sanderus, duobus Dialogis Venetiis habitis in quibus Sanderi & aliorum calumniæ in Elizabetham Reginam refelluntur.* See likewiſe Schoockius in the fifth chapter of the third part of the *Fabula Hamelenſis* (25).

(23) He has obſerved at the end of the firſt part of the Hiſtory of the Reformation of the Church of England, 123 errors in Sanders, and at the end of the ſecond part 83 errors in the ſame, and 12 in the continuator. The edition he goes by is that of Cologn 1628.

(24) In the ſecond volume of his Hiſtory of the Engliſh Schiſm. Some pieces have been written *pro* and *con* ſince the firſt. Theſe too may be conſulted.

(25) Pag. 222. Edit. ſecunda.

SANSON (JAMES) a bare-footed Carmelite, known in his order by the name of Ignatius-Joſeph de Jeſus Maria, was born at Abbeville on the tenth of February 1595. He took the habit of this order at Paris on the thirtieth of November 1618, and was ſent *to the convent where the Noviciate of the province was,* and where . . . . . *Father* Clement de Sainte Marie, *a native of Geneva, and nephew to Calvin* (*a*), *was Prior, and . . . . Father* Alexander, *nephew to Pope Leo XI, miniſter of the Novices . . . . . A year after his profeſſion he was ſent to ſtudy Divinity, at which time he continued the exerciſes of the Noviciate . . . . .* ‘ He took holy orders, and . . . . . about three ‘ months after his ordination, he was employed by his ſuperiors in hearing confeſſions and ‘ preaching ; afterwards he was ſent to Limoges to begin that foundation, where he had ‘ the happineſs to converſe familiarly with the venerable mother *Iſabelle des Anges*, one of ‘ the firſt ſix Carmelite Nuns that came from Spain, to eſtabliſh the order in France. ‘ At his return from Limoges he was choſen ſub-prior of the convent at Paris, then ‘ maſter of the Novices at Charenton . . . . . He was afterwards appointed maſter of ‘ the Novices in the convent of Toulouſe.’ He was choſen *ſome time after that to be confeſſor to the Ducheſs of Savoy, and to govern the Carmelites newly eſtabliſhed at Turin. It was he that perſuaded* Madame la Peſtrie *to found a convent of Urſuline-Nuns in Canada, by giving a hundred thouſand livres for ſo good a work. This happened at his return from Turin, while he was at Paris ; he applied himſelf at the ſame time to found a covent of bare-footed Carmelites in Abbeville*, and ſucceeded therein beyond his expectation [*A*]. He died in the convent of Charenton on the nineteenth of Auguſt 1664 (*b*). Strange things are ſaid of his devotion [*B*]. He has written ſome books [*C*]. He had two brothers, the one a Capuchin and the other a Carthuſian Fryar [*D*]. He was of the ſame family with the

(*a*) See the remark [*DD*], of the article CALVIN.

(*b*) *Taken from a book intituled,* Les Fleurs du Carmel cueillies du Parterre des Carmes Dechauſſez de France, - - - - - - par le R. P. Pierre de la Mere de Dieu Carme Dechauſſé, *pag.* 292, *& ſeq. Edit. of Antwerp* 1670. *in* 4to.

[*A*] *He applied himſelf . . . . to found a Convent of barefooted Carmelites in Abbeville, and ſucceeded therein beyond his expectation.*] I ſhall quote what one of his brethren ſays : ‘ He obtained more than he had aſked, ‘ ſince he not only ſaw the foundation of our Fathers ‘ in Abbeville, but likewiſe in the city of Amiens, ‘ where I had the happineſs to accompany him : and ‘ I am obliged to declare this truth, that the people ‘ held him in ſuch veneration that they did not call ‘ him otherwiſe than the Holy Father : notwithſtanding that ſome Fryars turned this into ridicule, it ‘ did not hinder his reputation from increaſing daily, ‘ nor parents from preſenting their ſick children to ‘ him, in order to receive his bleſſing, as being perſuaded that this would contribute towards their recovery (1).’ To know what hand he had in eſtabliſhing the Monks of his order at Abbeville, we muſt conſult the *Annals of the barefooted Carmelites* (2) written by Father Lewis de Saint Thereſa.

(1) Les Fleurs du Carmel, *pag.* 299.

(2) Ad ann. 1640 : I have been informed of this by Mr Lancelot, one of thoſe who take care of the books in the Mazarin library.

[*B*] *Strange things are ſaid of his devotion.*] During the exerciſes of the Noviciate, ‘ He was ſometimes ‘ ſo powerfully drawn and tranſported out of himſelf ‘ that he rather ſuffered than acted, and the ſweetneſs ‘ of Heaven was ſuch, that, as he himſelf writes, it ‘ was difficult for him to bear it. Theſe infuſed lights ‘ and inward riches of virtue made him ſenſible that ‘ ſupernatural prayer cannot be acquired by any human means : how a ſoul ought to behave when, according to St Dionyſius the Areopagite, it ſuffers divine things paſſively (3) : . . . . Several believed that ‘ he converſed familiarly with, and that he even ſaw, ‘ his good angel, to whom he paid a ſingular devotion : ‘ as he was one day with the reverend Father Euſtace ‘ de S. Marie upon the moving ſand, haſtening towards ‘ the little town of Crottoy, the ſea had like to have ‘ buried them in its waves, had not a child, as beautiful as an angel, appeared to ſhew them the way, ‘ and obliged them to double their pace, who after ‘ having conducted them into a place of ſafety, diſappeared. His companion was firmly perſuaded that ‘ this child was an angel who had taken that viſible ‘ form in order to reſcue them both from the manifeſt ‘ danger of loſing their lives. Our venerable Father ‘ confeſſes that he never was in ſuch an extremity ; ‘ and indeed he was very thankful upon that account, ‘ ſince he prepared himſelf for a happy death with ‘ more application than before. . . . . . He gave directions in writing how he would have every thing ‘ done at this laſt hour ; among other things he deſired to have a halter about his neck ; to die upon ‘ the flat ground ; to do *amande honorable* to the ‘ whole ſociety for the ill example which he fancied ‘ he had given from the time that he had the happineſs to wear the holy habit of the Holy Virgin, ‘ and to be received into our holy order. I confeſs ‘ that having read all that he writes upon this head, ‘ the ardent ejaculations he makes to his GOD, and ‘ the heroic acts he brings forth from the bottom of ‘ his heart, I have been very much edified, eſpecially ‘ by his profound humility (4).’

(3) Fleurs du Carmel, *p.* 297.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 299, 300.

[*C*] *He has written ſome books.*] In the year 1646 he cauſed his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the city of Abbeville, and of the Archdeaconry of Ponthieu, to be printed at Paris in 4to. Eleven years after he publiſhed at the ſame place in folio the Hiſtory of the Earls of Ponthieu, which I have cited in the article of Abbeville. In this laſt book (5) he frequently refers to the former. For the reſt, Mr de la Roque, in the 153d page of his *Traitté de la Nobleſſe*, ſhould not have called him Ignatius Sanſon, but James Sanſon (6). This was joining his family name and his religious name together. After this Carmelite's death there was found *written with his own hand a piece, intituled,* Preparation for Death, *wherein he ſpeaks of himſelf without mentioning his name.* He dedicated it to his good guardian angel. That Epiſtle Dedicatory is ſingular : you will find it in the 290th and 291ſt pages of the *Fleurs du Carmel de France.*

(5) See particularly *pag.* 825.

(6) He tells us in *pag.* 830, of his *Hiſtoire des Comtes de Ponthieu*, that in the world he was called James Sanſon. Mr Lancelot communicated theſe remarks to me.

[*D*] *He had two brothers, the one a Capuchin, and the other a Carthuſian Fryar.*] I am going to cite a paſſage which contains ſomething that ought not to be believed. ‘ When he was about fourteen years of age he the famous Geographer Nicholas Sanſon (*c*).

(*c*) He was ſecond couſin to that Geographers father. I was informed of it by Mr Lancelot.

'he made a trip to Paris, where he had the happineſs 'to ſee his eldeſt brother, the Capuchin named Peter 'Matthew d'Abbeville, who died in the convent of 'St Honoré, having been poiſoned by the Heretics 'who could not endure the great converſions which 'God wrought by him, in the city of Alençon where 'he was the guardian. The poiſon having not im'mediately killed him made him ſuffer a long martyr'dom and pains for ſeveral years. He led ſuch an 'exemplary life, and died ſuch a holy death, that his 'name has deſerved to be inſerted in the Gallican 'Martyrology. He ſaw him but once lying upon a 'poor bed in his cloaths, and overwhelmed with ſick'neſs: he was ſo ſenſibly touched with the example 'of this good brother's humility, and with the words 'he ſaid to him, that the tears guſhed from his eyes 'for joy and grief: for joy to ſee him, and for grief 'to find him ſo emaciated. He had another brother, 'a Carthuſian, named Dom John Sanſon, who did not 'live long in his order: his life however was ſo ex'emplary that it deſerved to be written, that it 'might ſerve poſterity by way of an incentive to 'virtue (7).'

(7) Fleurs du Carmel, *p.* 294.

SAPORTA (**Antony**) royal profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Montpellier, and chancellor of the ſame univerſity, lived in the XVIth century. His treatiſe *de Tumoribus præter naturam* was publiſhed at Lyons in the year 1624 in 12mo by the care of Henry Gras (*a*), Phyſician of the faculty of Montpellier, and fellow of the college of Phyſicians at Lyons. It had been for a conſiderable time depoſited among the papers of Francis Ranchin to whom it was dedicated. I cannot tell whether or not our Saporta was the ſon of **Lewis Saporta** a famous Phyſician [*A*]; but I know that he was father to **John Saporta** author of a treatiſe *de Lue venerea*, which was printed with that *de Tumoribus præter naturam*.

(*a*) And not by the care of the author himſelf, as Mr Konig affirms.

[*A*] **Lewis Saporta** *a famous Phyſician.*] 'He was Doctor and Profeſſor in the Univerſity of 'Lerida, where he had taught Phyſic for the ſpace of 'nine years (1).' After this he retired to Avignon; but *before he could ſettle there, he was obliged to go through all the neceſſary forms in order to be made a Doctor of that Univerſity. From thence having an inclination to retire to Montpellier, he was obliged to go through the ſame degrees again, in order to be made a Doctor* of the Univerſity there, *as* Laurence Joubert *informs us*; *ſo that he was thrice created Doctor* (2).

(1) Riolan, Recherches ſur les Eſcholes en Medecine, *pag.* 165.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 166.

SAPPHO was one of the moſt famous women of all antiquity for her verſes and her amours: ſhe was a native of Mitylene in the iſle of Leſbos (*a*), and lived in the time of Alcæus her countryman, and in the time of Steſichorus, that is to ſay, in the XLIId Olympiad, ſix hundred and ten years before Jesus Christ. She compoſed a great number of odes, epigrams, elegies (*b*), epithalamiums, &c (*c*). All her verſes run upon love [*B*], and had ſuch natural and moving charms that one ought not to be ſurprized if ſhe

(*a*) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 425. Suidas, in Σαπφώ.

(*b*) Suidas, ibid.

(*c*) Servius in Virgil. Dionyſ. Halicarn.

[*A*] *She lived . . . . in the XLIId Olympiad.*] This fully confutes the ſtory of the amours of Anacreon and Sappho; for though we ought not to place between them an interval of 100 or 120 years, as Mrs le Fevre does (1), yet it is true, that their ages do not well enough agree for a commerce of gallantry. We may very well ſuppoſe that in the LIId Olympiad Anacreon was capable of love; but ſince the Chronologers place Sappho in the XLIId Olympiad, we muſt conclude that ſhe was then in her greateſt reputation, and that ſhe might be about thirty years old. Now when ſhe threw herſelf headlong from the rock, ſhe was in love with a young man ſhe had hoped to regain: therefore there is no probability that ſhe lived till the time when Anacreon was born, and we may be well aſſured he never ſaw her, nor ever was in love with her. It was only to give his fancy a full ſcope that Hermeſianax ſuppoſed ſhe was beloved by Anacreon. *Ἐν τούτοις ὁ Ερμησιάναξ σφάλλεται συγχρονεῖν οἰόμενος Σαπφὼ καὶ Ἀνακρέοντα, τὸν μὲν κατὰ Κῦρον καὶ Πολυκράτην γενόμενον, τὴν δὲ κατ' Ἀλυάττην τὸν Κροίσου πατέρα. . . . ., Ἡγοῦμαι παίζειν τὸν Ἑρμησιάνακτα περὶ τούτου τοῦ ἔρωτος.* In his fallitur Hermeſianax qui Sappho coævam Anacreonti fuiſſe putat, cum ea ſub Alyatte Crœſi patre vixerit, Anacreon verò ſub Cyro & Polycrate. . . . . Hermeſianactem per luſum de Anacreontis amore id ſcripſiſſe arbitror (2). - - - *In this Hermeſianax is miſtaken, who fancies that Sappho and Anacreon were cotemporaries; whereas ſhe lived in the time of Alyattes, the father of Crœſus, and he in the time of Cyrus and Polycrates. . . . . For my part I imagine that Hermeſianax only writ of this intrigue to give his fancy a full ſcope.* Others (3) by the ſame poetical liberty handed about ſome verſes, wherein Anacreon played the gallant to Sappho, and ſhe anſwered him. Diphilus (4) a comic Poet introduced Archilochus and Hipponax courting Sappho in one of his Plays. This is a witty conceit of the ſame kind. Madam Scuderi has not therefore made uſe of this anachroniſm without examples, when ſhe ſuppoſes (5) that Anacreon courted Sappho. If Sappho had been ſuch an one as ſhe is characterized in the Grand Cyrus, ſhe had been the moſt accompliſhed perſon of her age. The lady, who made her ſo great a model of perfection, went a long time by the name of Sappho in the ingenious writings wherein ſhe was ſpoken of. This was to do a great deal of honour to the antient Sappho, ſince they gave her name to a lady who writ perfectly well in verſe and in proſe, and whoſe virtue was admired. Of whom one might have ſaid,

Caſtior hæc & non doctior illa fuit (6).

In learning equal, ſhe ſurpaſt
The other by her manners chaſt.

For the reſt, there is reaſon to think that if Anacreon and Sappho had ſeen one another in their youth, they would have made love to one another, and that we ſhould have had a more certain account of the gallant's good ſucceſs than we have of that of Alcæus (7). Nay perhaps they would have married together, but I do not know whether they would have long agreed; each of them loved too much his like. I do not know where Tanaquillus Faber (8) found that Diphilus made mention of their amours; it ſhould be in Athæneus, but he ſays nothing of it. I have already ſaid that Mrs le Fevre puts between them the ſpace of a hundred or ſixſcore years; but I add that this does not agree with what ſhe aſſerts, that Anacreon *was cotemporary with Solon, Æſop, Cyrus, Crœſus, and Piſiſtratus.* Theſe two laſt remarks are equally againſt the father (9) and the daughter.

[*B*] *All her verſes run upon love.*] Pauſanias obſerves that Anacreon was the firſt, who, after Sappho, writ ſcarce any thing but love verſes (10), and that Sappho writ a great many things upon this ſubject which did not agree well together (11). The meaning of it is that ſhe turned this ſubject ſo many ways, that

(1) Preface to Anacreon.

(2) Athenæus, *lib. xiii, p.* 599.

(3) Chamæleon, apud Athen. *lib. xiii, p.* 599.

(4) Apud eundem, ibid.

(5) In the Grand Cyrus.

(6) Martial. Epigr. lxviii, lib. vii.

(7) See the article ALCÆUS.

(8) Vie des Poëtes Grecs, *pag. m.* 49. Mrs le Fevre ſays ſo too in the Life of Anacreon.

(9) Mr le Fevre, *Vie des Poëtes Grecs*, places Anacreon in the LXXIId Olympiad; and in his Latin notes upon Anacreon he makes him cotemporary with Solon, Æſop, Crœſus, and Piſiſtratus, &c.

(10) Pauſanias, *lib. i. pag.* 23.

(11) Pauſanias, *lib. ix*, 302.

ſhe was called the tenth Muſe (*d*). Strabo looked upon her as a wonder (*e*), and ſaid that never any woman could come near her in Poetry. There remains nothing of ſo many Poems ſhe made but ſome ſmall fragments which the ancient Scholiaſts have cited, and a Hymn to Venus, and an Ode to one of her miſtreſſes [*C*]; for you muſt know that her amorous paſſion extended even to the perſons of her own ſex [*D*], and this is that for which ſhe was moſt cried down. Suidas has preſerved the names of three of her miſtreſſes (*f*), who ruined her reputation and diſgraced themſelves by a ſtrange ſingularity which was imputed to their commerce. He has alſo preſerved the names of three of her female diſciples whom ſhe did, in all probability, initiate into her myſteries. Since Lucian (*g*) does not obſerve that the women of the iſle of Leſbos, who he ſays were very ſubject to this paſſion, learned it of Sappho, it is better to believe that ſhe found it already eſtabliſhed in her country than to aſcribe to her the invention of it.

(*d*) Antholog. *lib. i, cap. lxvii.* Auſonius, Epig. xxxii.

(*e*) Θαυμαστὸν τι χρῆμα, *admirandum quid.* Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 424.

(*f*) Ovid names two more, *Epiſt. Sapph. ad Phaon.* See the remark [*D*].

(*g*) Dialog. Meretric. *Tom. ii, pag.* 714.

that ſhe ſpoke of it ſometimes in one manner and ſometimes in another. The ſport pleaſed her. Among other things ſhe had made a calculation of the ſigns by which one might know an amorous perſon; and ſhe had ſo good ſucceſs in it that the Phyſician Eraſiſtratus knew by thoſe ſigns the diſtemper of Antiochus (12). Every body knows that this young prince was deſperately in love with Stratonice, his mother in-law, and that not daring to diſcover it he pretended to be ſick, and the cauſe of his illneſs being known, his father parted with her to him: but as often as this adventure is ſpoken of, people do not think, as it is fit they ſhould, of Sappho who afforded the Phyſician the neceſſary expedients. Thoſe, who intended to denote the Poems of this woman by their true character, called them her fires and her amours.

(12) Plutarch. in Demetrio, *pag.* 907.

Spirat adhuc amor
Vivuntque commiſſi calores
Æoliæ fidibus puellæ (13).

And Sappho's charming lyre
Preſerves her ſoft deſire,
And tunes our raviſh'd ſouls to love.

Creech.

(13) Horat. Od. IX, lib. iv.

Plutarch compares her to Cacus the ſon of Vulcan, of whom the Romans writ that he caſt out of his mouth fire and flame: *what ſhe ſings is a compoſition of fire,* ſays he, *her verſes are the expulſion of the flame ſhe has in her heart.* Αὐτὴ δὲ ἀληθῶς μεμιγμένα πυρὶ φθέγγεται καὶ διὰ τῶν μελῶν ἀναφέρει τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας θερμότητα. *Ipſa autem vere igni mixta loquitur, & per carmina calorem corde conceptum emittit* (14).

(14) Plutarchus de Amore, *p.* 762.

[*C*] *There remains nothing . . . . but ſome ſmall fragments . . . . a Hymn to Venus, and an Ode to one of her miſtreſſes.*] The Hymn to Venus was preſerved by Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (15), who inſerted it in his works as an example of a perfection he had a mind to characterize. With the ſame view Longinus (16) has preſerved to us the Ode to her miſtreſs. Catullus has tranſlated part of this Ode (17): all theſe circumſtances are a proof of the ſingular eſteem the antients had for her verſes.

(15) De colloc. verborum, *cap.* 81.

(16) Περὶ ὕψους, *cap. ix.*

(17) See in Iſaac Voſſius's Commentary upon Catullus, *pag.* 113, thoſe two pieces of Sappho corrected.

Tanaquillus Faber was reſolved to publiſh ſome obſervations upon that ode; but he abſtained from it becauſe he was brought into trouble for ſome things he had put in his edition of Anacreon (18). ‘Ut ne tandem bona fide ἄπος . . . . fiam, *ſaith he* (19), ‘quod ſane haud neceſſe eſt, decrevi nil quidquam ad hoc admirabile odarium dicere. Fuit olim, fateor, cum Sapphonem amabam; ſed ex quo illa me perditiſſima femina pæne miſerum perdidit cum ſceleratiſſimo ſuo congerrone, (Anacreontem dico, ſi neſcis, Lector,) noli ſperare quidquam à me dictum iri, unde aut ipſa, aut ipſius opera, (queis tamen olim in Græcia nil elegantius, nil magis terſum aut venuſtum quidquam extitit,) probari videantur. Itaque quando mihi impoſita fibula eſt, hîc lacuna eſto. - - - *Leſt I ſhould be excommunicated in good earneſt, which is a thing that I am by no means fond of, I have taken a reſolution to ſay nothing at all upon this admirable ode. I confeſs that I formerly looked upon it as ſuch; but having been ruined by that leud woman, and by her moſt wicked and tattling companion, (if you are at a loſs, reader, to know who that is, I mean Anacreon), do not expect that I ſhould ſay any thing by which I might ſeem to approve either her or his work, (tho', in Greece, no productions were eſteemed more elegant, polite, and beautiful). Since therefore ſilence is impoſed upon me, here let there be a gap.*' The fragment which he cites (20) out of his notes on Anacreon, ſhews us that he was perſuaded that Sappho writ this ode for a woman ſhe was in love with. We ſhall ſee in the following remark that his daughter was not of this opinion; and that nevertheleſs it is a very probable one. For the reſt, if there is no better proof than the above quoted Latin paſſage of this author (21), to pretend that he ceaſed to eſteem Sappho (22), it is to rely upon an ill foundation.

(18) See above remark [*D*] of the article of the firſt BATHYLLUS.

(19) Tanaq. Faber, Not. in Longinum, *pag.* 292.

(20) Id. ibid. *pag.* 293.

(21) Above citat (19).

(22) See the notes upon the Greek Poets by Mr le Fevre.

[*D*] *Her amorous paſſion extended even to the perſons of her own ſex.*] I cannot blame the charity of Mrs le Fevre (23), who has endeavoured, for the honour of Sappho, to render the fact uncertain; but I think her too reaſonable to be angry with us for believing our own eyes. The ode which Longinus has mentioned, is not in the ſtile of one female friend writing to another: it ſavours of love all over, and not of friendſhip: otherwiſe, Longinus, who was ſo good a judge, would not have brought it as a model of the art with which great maſters repreſent things: he would not, I ſay, have given us as an example of that art, the manner wherewith the ſymptoms of an amorous fury are collected in that ode, Τὰ συμβαίνοντα ταῖς ἐρωτικαῖς μανίαις παθήματα; and Plutarch would not have cited this ſame ode to prove that love is a divine fury, which cauſes more violent enthuſiaſms than thoſe of the prieſteſs of Delphos, or the Bacchantes, and of the prieſts of Cybele. Τί τοσοῦτον ἡ Πυθία πέπονθεν ἁψαμένη τοῦ τρίποδος; τίνα τῶν ἐνθεαζομένων οὕτως ὁ αὐλὸς καὶ τὰ μητρῷα καὶ τὸ τύμπανον ἐξιστᾶσιν (24). The poetical tranſlation of this is to be found in theſe verſes of Horace, if inſtead of *iræ, anger,* you put *amor, love*:

(23) In the Life of Sappho.

(24) Plut. de Amore, *pag.* 763. *Here is Xylander's verſion,* Quid tale aut tantum accidit Pithiæ cum tripodem attigit? Quemnam orgia agentium tibia & Magnæ matris carmina atque tympanum ſic animo abalienaverunt.

Non Dindymene, non adytis quatit
Mentem ſacerdotum incola Pythius,
  Non Liber æque, non acuta
    Sic geminant Corybantes æra,
Triſtes ut iræ (25).

Not Cybele ſuch heat inſpires
Ne'er Phœbus with ſuch raging fires
  His prophet's ſoul poſſeſs'd,
Nor Bacchus ſelf can raiſe a man
Half ſo much as anger can,
  When once it burns the breaſt.

Creech.

(25) Horat. Ode XVI, lib. i.

People were ſo perſuaded in Ovid's time, that Sappho loved women as men do; that he makes no difficulty of introducing her making a ſacrifice to Phaon of the female companions of her debauchery.

Nec me Pyrrhiades Methymniadeſve puellæ,
  Nec me Leſbiadum cetera turba juvant,
Vilis Anactone, vilis mihi candida Cydno:
  Non oculis gratia eſt Atthis, ut ante meis.
Atque aliæ centum quas non ſine crimine amavi
  Improbe, multarum quod fuit, unus habes.

. . . .

Leſbides infamem quæ me feciſtis amatæ,
  Deſinite ad citharas turba venire meas (26).

No more the Leſbian dames my paſſion move,
Once the dear objects of my guilty love;

(26) Ovidius, Epiſt. Sapph. ad Phaon.

it. Be it as it will, Sappho paſſed for a famous *Tribas*, and ſome are of opinion that this was the reaſon why ſhe was ſirnamed *Maſculine (b)* [*E*]. If her deſign was to diſpenſe with the other half of mankind, ſhe was fruſtrated of her expectation; for ſhe fell deſperately in love with Phaon, and did in vain all that ſhe could to make him love her: but he deſpiſed her and forced her by his coldneſs to throw herſelf headlong from a rock [*F*], to extinguiſh her devouring flame. How cruel he was

All other loves are loſt in only thine,
Ah, youth ungrateful to a flame like mine!
. . . .
Ye Leſbian virgins, and ye Leſbian dames,
Themes of my verſe, and objects of my flames;
No more your groves with my glad ſongs ſhall ring,
No more theſe hands ſhall touch the trembling ſtring.
POPE.

Horace is another evidence againſt her in the complaints he ſuppoſes ſhe made of the maids of Leſbos;

Et Æoliis fidibus querentem
Sappho puellis de popularibus (27.)

And Sappho, in Æolian ſtrains,
Who of the Leſbian maids complains.

for if ſhe had reaſon to complain that the ladies of her country envied her merit, ſhe would not have choſen the young ones for the ſubject of her complaint: but becauſe ſhe had ſpoke to them of love, and the greateſt part of them were either too ſimple, or, to ſpeak better, too crafty to be catched, and thoſe who had complied, had made her infamous; for this reaſon ſhe complained of the young maids. This verſe of Ovid, *Deſinite ad citharas turba venire meas*, ſhews, that the women of Leſbos had done juſtice to her fine verſes. For the reſt, I leave it to a new Father Sanchez to decide, whether a married woman, who had complied with the paſſion of Sappho, would have committed adultery, and made her huſband a cuckold, properly ſpeaking? I do not know whether this queſtion has eſcaped the inexhauſtible curioſity of the Caſuiſts about matrimonial cauſes.

Let us confirm this by the teſtimony of a great wit, who did not believe that his complaiſance for Mrs le Fevre ſhould go ſo far as to approve the pains ſhe has taken in favour of Sappho. After the death of her huſband, ſays he (28), *Sappho, tho' young, renounced marriage, but not the pleaſure of loving. She had a ſoul too amorous to be without it; which may be eaſily judged by the tenderneſs which runs through her poems, and which undoubtedly ſets her above all the Poets as to that point. Thus finding herſelf too weak to vanquiſh ſo violent an inclination as that, ſhe wholly gave herſelf up to it, and loved all manner of ways, going even far beyond the bounds which modeſty naturally preſcribes to her ſex. It is in vain to juſtify her on that head; it cannot be done but at the expence of truth: and neither her averſion for the ſhameful love of Charaxus, nor all the honours ſhe received from the Leſbians, can waſh off a ſtain, which all thoſe who have ſpoke of her could not diſguiſe, notwithſtanding the encomiums they have given her, and which her own works evidence more clearly ſtill. Several beautiful women are put in the number of her miſtreſſes.*

[*E*] *She was ſirnamed* Maſculine.] It is not ſo eaſy as it is thought to know truly what Horace means by *Maſcula Sappho*; but if he pretended to reproach her with her love againſt nature, it is eaſy to know he took the wrong time. The epithet would be very cold, and too far fetched without any neceſſity. There are, notwithſtanding, learned men who underſtand it ſo. Chabot (29) places among them the interpreter of Juvenal and Porphyrio, an antient ſcholiaſt upon Horace; and gives us Domitius for his author as to the latter. Without doubt he means Domitius Calderinus, whoſe commentary upon Martial I have not (30), but, according to Chabot, we find there, that Porphyrio has interpreted the word *maſcula* both in a proper and figurative ſenſe, 'Vel 'quia Sappho in poëtico ſtudio verſata eſt, in quo 'ſæpius enituit, vel quia tribas diffamata fuit. - - - '*Either becauſe ſhe made Poetry her ſtudy, in which ſhe* '*frequently excelled, or becauſe ſhe was an infamous* '*tribas*' Cruquius, who has publiſhed the old ſcholiaſts upon Horace, has not publiſhed theſe words of Porphyrio. As for the interpreter of Juvenal, cited by Chabot, it is reaſonable that we ſhould take him for the ſcholiaſt of that Poet; but I do not find that he ſays what is imputed to him: It is Britannicus who ſays it upon the forty-ſeventh verſe of the ſecond ſatire (31). However it be with the antient commentators, it is certain that the moderns do commonly mention three opinions about the ſenſe of *maſcula Sappho*. 1. That this word means that ſhe was a tribas. 2. That it denotes the inclination ſhe had for the ſciences, inſtead of handling the ſpindle and diſtaff. 3. The courage ſhe had to precipitate herſelf at Leucas. This laſt opinion is Scaliger's (32), and Turnebus's (33), which is ſtrongly confirmed by the following verſes of Auſonius (34).

Et de nimboſo ſaltum Leucate minatur,
Maſcula Leſbiacis Sappho peritura ſaggitis.

And manly Sappho, with the Leſbian dart
Sore wounded, to relieve the cruel ſmart
From ſteep Leucate's formidable height
Threatens a furious leap. . . .

See the article LEUCAS, and the following remark.

Thevet rejects the firſt ſenſe of *maſcula Sappho*, and follows the ſecond and third, but not without confounding himſelf childliſhly. Horace and Auſonius, ſays he (35), *when they called this Leſbian woman* maſcula, *meant nothing elſe but that ſhe did what was proper for men, in compoſing ſo excellent verſes, or that ſhe had undertaken to get into thoſe beautiful places of Leucas, near which the men durſt not come.* What an abſurdity to give the name of *beautiful places* to a dreadful precipice, whither none went but out of deſpair? *This therefore*, continues he (36), *is to wrong our Sappho, and to calumniate her without a juſt reaſon, ſince the divine Philoſopher Plato admired her for her dexterity and vivacity of wit, and for her profound wiſdom, which ſet her, not only above the reſt of her ſex, but alſo above the moſt able men.* I make no manner of doubt but Thevet is a falſe witneſs here: I do not believe that ever Plato ſpoke of her profound wiſdom, and if he had given her that elogy, it ſhould not be underſtood in the ſenſe of Thevet, but in the ſenſe wherein it is taken at this very day among the Walloons, and was formerly taken in France. The midwives were called *ſages*, *wiſe*, not becauſe of their virtue, but becauſe they knew many things that other women knew not. They are called at this day *femmes ſages* in Guienne and Languedoc, but in other provinces, where they ſpeak more exactly the French, to avoid the equivocation, they make uſe of a tranſpoſition, and call them *ſages-femmes*. Tell at this day a Walloon, that he is happy in his children, that his daughters are ſages, he will think you laugh at them, and he will tell you they are not, that it is not proper for their ſex, and that it is enough for a maid to fear GOD, and underſtand houſwifry. This ſhews that he underſtands, by being ſage, to be learned, to know Latin, &c. The Greek word σοφός ſignified ſometimes a knowing man, and in this ſenſe Plato takes it ſometimes, and particularly when he ſpeaks of Anacreon. This is what a very good Critic has obſerved (37). In the ſame manner this word ought to be underſtood, if Plato had made uſe of it in praiſing Sappho. Let us conclude with theſe words of a commentator upon Tanaquillus Faber (38): 'It is very well known 'why Horace and Auſonius called her *maſcula*, not 'for her courage, but in the ſame ſenſe as γυνὴ ἀνδειχὴ 'in Lucian, where an impudent woman explains herſelf, ſaying, ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἀνδρὸς ἐςὶ μοι, 'and τὸ ϖὰν ἀνήρ εἰμι. - - - *I have the inclinations* '*of a man, and am thoroughly maſculine.*'

[*F*] *Phaon forced her, by his coldneſs, to throw herſelf headlong from a rock.*] Mrs. le Fevre ſays that Sappho could not forbear following Phaon into Sicily, whither

---

(*b*) *Maſcula Sappho*. Hor. Epiſt. XIX, ver. 28, *lib. i*, Auſonius, Cupid. Crucif.

(27) Horat. Ode XIII, lib. ii, & *ibid.* Lambinus, Cruquius, Mr Dacier, &c.

(28) Longe-Pierre, in the Life of Sappho prefixed to the tranſlation of Sappho's Poems into French verſe.

(29) In Horat. Epiſt. XIX, lib. i.

(30) Chabot *quotes it* in Epigr. ad Philænim. *lib. vii.*

(31) Tale monſtrum libidinis dicitur Sappho excogitaſſe, unde maſcula eſt appellata ab Horatio in Epiſtolis. - - - *Sappho is ſaid to have invented ſuch a prodigy of luſt, from whence ſhe was called Maſcula by Horace in his Epiſtles.* See Vinetus upon Auſonius Cupid. crucif. *ver.* 25.

(32) In Auſon. Cupid. crucif. & in Virgil. Cirin.

(33) Adverſar. *lib. x, cap. ii.*

(34) Cupid. crucif.

(35) Thevet, Eloges des Savans Hommes, *Tom. i, pag.* 226.

(36) Id. ibid. *pag.* 227.

(37) See Mr le Clerc in the firſt volume of his *Ars Critica*, pag. 194, 195.

(38) Reland, Remarques ſur les Vies des Poëtes Grecs, *folio G* 4.

was [*G*]! She had been long before the widow of one of the richeſt men of the iſle of Andros, called Cercala, by whom ſhe had a daughter called Cleïs (*i*). So the mother of Sappho was called. I do not know her father's name, for we have eight to choſe upon (*k*), there being juſt ſo many different fathers aſſigned to her by authors (*l*). She had three brothers, one of whom, called Charaxus, ſold Leſbian wine in Egypt (*m*), and fell in love there with a famous courtezan, by ſome, called Rhodope; but Sappho calls her Doricha. She was very angry with her brother for this ſhameful engagement

whither he retired that he might not ſee her; and that *during her ſtay in that iſland, ſhe made the fineſt verſes in the world*; and that it is very probable ſhe made there the hymn to Venus, that is ſtill extant, in which ſhe begs ſo ardently the aſſiſtance of that goddeſs. Her prayers proved ineffectual; the ſweet and tender verſes ſhe compoſed ſo often on this ſubject (39) were to no purpoſe: Phaon was cruel to the laſt degree. The unfortunate Sappho was forced to take a dangerous leap; for ſo I may juſtly call the remedy to which ſhe had recourſe, which was to go upon the promontory Leucas, and throw herſelf into the ſea. It was looked on in thoſe days as the true means to cure the pains of love, and for this reaſon that place was called the *Lovers Leap*. Some ſay (40) that Sappho was the firſt that made a trial of this way of curing love: others ſay, ſhe was the firſt woman that did it; but that, before her time, ſome men had done it (41). Several Poets have ſpoke of this deſpair of Sappho: one of them (42) having exhauſted all the counſels he could give to an unfortunate lover, and at laſt referring him to the great remedy of all evils, makes uſe of this expreſſion.

Quod ſibi ſuaſerunt Phædra & Eliſſa dabunt,
Quod Canace, Phylliſque, & faſtidita Phaoni.

What Phædra and the Tyrian queen adviſ'd,
And ſhe whom Phaon cruelly deſpiſ'd;
What Canace and Phillis did approve
As the beſt remedy for hopeleſs love,
That may you chuſe, by their example taught.

See here what Statius ſays;

Steſichoruſque ferox, ſaltuſque ingreſſa viriles
Non formidata temeraria Leucade Sappho (43).

And fierce Steſichorus with Sappho join'd,
Who, when ſhe took her manly leap of old,
With raſh, unſhrinking courage did behold
Leucate's dreadful precipice. . . . .

Pliny tells us a ſtory about the cauſe of Sappho's love for Phaon. It was ſaid that the occult qualities of a certain herb had excited that paſſion. Here are the words of Pliny, *Ex his:* he ſpeaks of the different ſorts of *eryngo*, or hundred-headed thiſtle, *candidam noſtri centum capita vocant . . . . Portentoſum eſt, quod de ea traditur: Radicem ejus alterutrius ſexus ſimilitudinem referre, raram inventu: ſed ſi viris contigerit mas, amabiles fieri. Ob hoc & Phaonem Leſbium dilectum à Sappho. Multæ circa hoc non Magorum ſolum vanitates, ſed etiam Pythagoricorum* (44). That is to ſay, according to the verſion of du Pinet, *the Latins call the white eryngo* Centum capita . . . *and certainly it is a wonderful thing, if what they ſay of this root be true. For there are ſome that ſay, that the root of white eryngo (which is very rare) reſembles the parts of a man or a woman: and it is held, that if a man meets with one that repreſents the parts of man, he ſhall be beloved by women: and it is thought, this made Sappho in love with Phaon. And indeed, not only the Magicians, but alſo the Pythagoreans, tell ſtrange wonders of this root.* Theſe are idle ſtories. Sappho was ſo well tempered for love that ſhe needed no occult qualities of roots to enflame her.

[*G*] *How cruel he was!*] The cruelty of Phaon will not ſurpriſe us ſo much, if we reflect that Sappho was only a widow upon the decline, who had never been handſome, who was ill ſpoken of in her widowhood, and who kept no meaſure in ſhewing the violence of her paſſion. A man that is never ſo little nice, does not care for ſuch unbecoming addreſſes, and draws ill conjectures from them. Add to this, that Sappho had not the endearment of novelty, which often, even with nice people, makes amends for the defect of beauty and the flower of youth. Phaon knew all ſhe was capable of; the trees and the graſs had been her confidents; and perhaps his flight proceeded more from being ſpent than from indifference. Conſider what ſhe herſelf writes to him by the pen of Ovid.

Hæc quoque laudabas, omnique à parte placebam,
  Sed tum præcipue cum fit amoris opus,
Tunc te plus ſolito laſcivia noſtra juvabat,
  Crebraque mobilitas, aptaque verba joco:
Quique, ubi jam amborum fuerat confuſa voluptas,
  Plurimus in laſſo corpore languor erat.

. . . .

Invenio ſilvam quæ ſæpe cubilia nobis
  Præbuit, & multa texit opaca coma.
Agnovi preſſas noti mihi ceſpitis herbas;
  De noſtro curvum pondere gramen erat.
Incubui tetigique locum qua parte fuiſti.

In all I pleas'd, but moſt in what was beſt;
And the laſt joy was dearer than the reſt.
Then with each word, each glance, each motion fir'd,
You ſtill enjoy'd, and yet you ſtill deſir'd,
Till all diſſolving in the trance we lay,
And in tumultuous raptures dy'd away.

. . . .

I find the ſhades that did our joys conceal,
Not him that made me love thoſe ſhades ſo well.
Here the preſ'd herbs with bending tops betray,
Where oft entwin'd in am'rous folds we lay;
I kiſs that earth which oft was preſ'd by you.

POPE.

She was not then ſo capable of hearkening to reaſon, as when ſhe repreſented to a young man, who courted her for marriage, that being older than him, ſhe would not marry him (45). The younger Phaon had been, the more ſhe would have found her account in him. If I have ſaid that ſhe was not handſome, it was becauſe I thought we ſhould prefer to the authority of Plato, who calls her *the beautiful Sappho* (46), the authority of Ovid, who makes her ſpeak thus:

Si mihi difficilis formam natura negavit,
  Ingenio formæ damna rependo meæ.
Sum brevis. At nomen quod terras impleat omnes
  Eſt mihi: menſuram nominis ipſa fero.
Candida ſi non ſum: placuit Cepheia Perſeo.

To me what nature has in charms deny'd,
Is well by wit's more laſting charms ſupply'd.
Tho' ſhort by ſtature, yet my name extends
To Heav'n itſelf, and Earth's remoteſt ends.
Brown as I am, an Æthiopian dame
Inſpir'd young Perſeus with a gen'rous flame.

POPE.

Mrs le Fevre had ſet me an example for not giving credit to Plato or Athæneus; for ſhe ſays *that Sappho was not beautiful, that ſhe was neither tall, nor little, that ſhe had a very brown complexion, and very lively and ſparkling eyes.* What ſhall I ſay of Maximus Tyrius (47), who pretends that as ſhe was black and little, Socrates (48) called her beautiful, only by reaſon of the beauty of her verſes.

(*i*) Suidas, in Σαπφῶ.

(*k*) Id. ibid.

(*l*) See the remark [*K*], in the article ANACREON.

(*m*) Strabo, *lib. xvii, pag.* 556. Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 596.

(39) Οὗτος δ' Φάων ἐςὶν ἐφ' ᾧ τὸν ἔρωτα αὐτῆς ἡ Σαπφῶ πολλάκις ᾆσμα ἐποίησε. Hic ille Phaon eſt in cujus amorem Sappho ſæpe carmen cecinit. - - - *This is that Phaon whom the enamoured Sappho frequently made the ſubject of her verſes.* Palæphatus de Incredibil. *cap. xlix, p. m.* 231. Phaſianinus having read αἷμα *blood*, inſtead of ᾆσμα *ſong*, made a ridiculous tranſlation.

(40) Menander, apud Strabon. *lib. x, p.* 311.

(41) Scaliger in Auſonium Cupid. crucif.

(42) Auſon. Epigr. XCII.

(43) Stat. lib. v, Silv. III, ver 154.

(44) Plinius, *lib. xxii, cap. viii, pag. m.* 183.

(45) In a fragment of a letter quoted by Mrs le Fevre.

(46) In Phædro, *pag. m.* 1214. Athenæus calls her alſo the *beautiful Sappho, lib. xiii, p.* 596, and ſo does Plutarch *de Amore, pag.* 763, and Julian the Apoſtate, *Epiſt. ad Alypium Cæſar.*

(47) Orat. VIII, *pag. m.* 86.

(48) Id eſt Plato, ubi ſupra.

ment [*H*]. It is ſaid that the Mitylenians did her the honour after her death to ſtamp their money with her image [*I*]. Some authors make mention of another Sappho [*K*].

Mr Moreri found one in Martial, only through an extreme inadvertency (*n*). We read in Ariſtotle the proof Sappho made uſe of to ſhew that death is an evil. The gods, ſaid ſhe (*o*), have judged it ſo, for otherwiſe they would die. There was in the Prytaneum of Syracuſe, a moſt beautiful ſtatue of Sappho: ſee what Cicero ſays of it, when he reproaches Verres with ſtealing it (*p*). It was the work of Silanion, and probably the ſame that Tatian ſpeaks of in reproaching the Gentiles with the honour they paid to diſhoneſt women. See citation (59).

(*n*) See the remark [*K*] towards the end.

(*p*) Cicero in Verrem, Orat. VI, *fol. m.* 78.

(*o*) Ἣ ὥσπερ Σαπφὼ ὅτι τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν κακόν· οἱ θεοὶ γὰρ οὕτω κεκρίκασιν· ἀπέθνησκον γὰρ ἄν. Aut quemadmodum Sappho, mori malum eſſe, Dii enim ſic judicarunt: alioqui mortui eſſent. *Ariſtot. Rhetor. lib. ii, cap. xxiii, pag. m.* 445. *E.*

[*H*] *She was very angry with her brother for this ſhameful engagement.*] See how Ovid tells us this particular.

Arſit inops frater victus meretricis amore,
  Miſtaque cum turpi damna pudore tulit.
Factus inops agili peragit freta cærula remo,
  Quaſque male amiſit, nunc male quærit opes.
Me quoque, quod monui bene multa fideliter, odit;
  Hoc mihi libertas, hoc pia lingua dedit.

My brother next, neglecting wealth and fame,
Ignobly burn'd in a deſtructive flame.

POPE.

I leave you to judge what repriſals he might have made, and what weight the remonſtrances of ſuch a ſiſter could have. Athenæus obſerves that the invectives againſt the courtezan of Naucratis, were grounded upon the exceſſive ſums ſhe extorted from her lovers. Ἣν ἡ καλὴ Σαπφὼ ἐρωμένην Χαράξου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῆς κατ' ἐμπορίαν εἰς τὴν Ναύκρατιν ἀπαίροντος, διὰ τῆς ποιήσεως διαβάλλει ὡς πολλὰ τοῦ Χαράξου νοσφισαμένην. *Quam pulcra Sappho Charaxi fratri ſuo mercaturæ gratia Naucratim profecto nave dilectam verſibus ſuis proſcindit, quod multa illum pecunia emunxiſſet* (49). Herodotus calls that courtezan Rhodopis, and ſays that Charaxus, who had ſpent a great ſum to redeem her, was ill treated by the invectives of his ſiſter Sappho (50).

(49) Athen. *lib. xiii, cap. vii, pag.* 596.

(50) Herodot. *lib. ii, cap. cxxxv.*

[*I*] *They ſay that the Mitylenians ſtamped their money with her image.*] I ſhall obſerve on this occaſion, that Lambinus, for want of underſtanding a paſſage of Pauſanias (51), ſays falſely, That there was in the citadel of Athens a ſtatue of Sappho. *Anacreontis Teii*, ſays he (52), *qui majore ex parte res amatorias ſcripſit, ſtatua in arce Athenienſium prima poſt Sapphonem locata eſt.* Here is the Greek. Τοῦ δὲ τοῦ Ξανθίππου πλησίον ἕστηκεν Ἀνακρέων ὁ Τήϊος, πρῶτος μετὰ Σαπφὼ τὴν Λεσβίαν τὰ πολλὰ ὧν ἔγραψεν ἐρωτικὰ ποιήσας. It is evident that theſe Greek words mean nothing elſe, but that the ſtatue of Anacreon was put near that of Xanthippus; the ſtatue, I ſay, of Anacreon, who is the firſt after Sappho, who conſecrated to matters of love the greateſt part of the things he writ.

(51) Ex lib. i, pag. 23.

(52) Lambin. in Horat. Od. XVII, lib. i.

I ſhould be glad to know whether Thevet is miſtaken or not, when he aſſures us, *That the Romans erected in memory of Sappho a ſtatue of Porphyry richly wrought* (53). It is Tanaquillus Faber, who has obſerved, that *the Mitylenians ſtamped their money with the image of this heroine, and by this treated her like a queen when ſhe was dead* (54). He cites no body for it; but Mr Reland, who has made notes upon this work of Tanaquillus Faber (55), quotes this paſſage of Julius Pollux, οἱ μυτιληναῖοι μὲν Σαπφὼ τῷ νομίσματι ἐνεχάραττον. and obſerves that there are ſtill in being ſome medals of Sappho, which bear the name of the Mitylenians, ΜΥΤΙΛΕΝΑΙΩΝ. Thevet ſays, that he has taken the picture of Sappho *from an antient medal*, which he brought from the iſle of Leſbos, and that *one like that, was given with ſeveral others, to the Baron de la Garde, then the French ambaſſador at Conſtantinople, by the firſt Phyſician of Sultan Soliman* (56). Ariſtotle obſerves that the Mitylenians had paid honours to Sappho, but he does not tell us in what thoſe honours conſiſted (57). Tatian reproaches the Greeks with the ſtatue of the courtezan Sappho made by Silanion; of that courtezan, ſays he, who ſung her own incontinency, and was amorous, even to madneſs (58). Καὶ ἡ μὲν Σαπφὼ γύναιον πορνικὸν ἐρωτομανὲς καὶ τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἀσέλγειαν ᾄδει. *Et quidem Sappho meretricia muliercula inſano amore capta ſuam ipſa laſciviam cantat* (59). Pliny ſpeaks of a Painter called Leo, who had drawn the picture of Sappho (60).

(53) Thevet, Elog. des ſavans Hommes, *Tom. i, pag.* 223, *Edit.* 1671, *in* 12*mo.*

(54) Le Fevre, Vie des Poët. Grecs, *p. m.* 23.

(55) *See the* Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres. *Oct.* 1700, *pag.* 461.

(56) Thevet, ubi ſupra, *p.* 224.

(57) Ariſtot. Rhetor. *lib. ii, cap. xxiii, pag.* 445. Mr Reland in his remarks upon Mr le Fevre, quotes the words of Ariſtotle.

(58) Tatian. Orat. contra Græcos, *pag. m.* 168, *B.*

(59) Id. ibid.

(60) Plin. *lib. xxxv, cap. xi, pag. m.* 235.

[*K*] *Some authors make mention of another Sappho.*] Mr Moreri ſays there are ſome, *who mention a ſecond maid of this name of Erythræ, who made verſes, and that this is the opinion of Athenæus, lib.* 13. Athenæus does not ſay that this other Sappho was a Poeteſs, or that ſhe was born at Erythræ: he ſays that ſhe was of Ereſſus (61), by profeſſion a courtezan, and that ſhe fell in love with Phaon. According to this opinion the great Sappho, the Sappho of Mitylene, who made ſuch excellent Poems, might, without much trouble, be reſtored to a good reputation; there would be nothing elſe to do but to tranſport her bad fame upon the other Sappho. The worſt is, that a lame paſſage of Athenæus, ſeconded as much as you pleaſe by the evidence of Ælian (62), is not to ſerve us for a guide preferably to a thouſand authorities that are againſt it. Mr Lloyd, and Mr Hoffman adviſe us to diſtinguiſh well between the two Sappho's, the one of Eretria, and the other beloved by Phaon, as we ſee, ſay they, in Athenæus *lib.* 13. This is copied out of Voſſius (63), and is not the more true for all that; for Athenæus only ſpeaks there of one Sappho a native of Ereſſus, who was deſperately in love with Phaon: whether their love was mutual or no, he does not ſay. Suidas might occaſion a doubt, were it not probable that he has divided what ought to remain united. He ſpeaks of two Sappho's: what he ſays of the firſt, beyond all doubt belongs to her that excelled in Lyric poetry: what he ſays of the ſecond, *viz.* that ſhe was of Mitylene in the iſle of Leſbos, that ſhe threw herſelf from Leucate into the ſea for the love of Phaon, that ſhe played on inſtruments, and was famous for Lyric Poetry, certainly agrees no leſs with the firſt. I therefore ſee no reaſon of any weight for admitting two women of that name, eſpecially if we muſt diſtinguiſh the one from the other, by the qualities which Suidas and Charles Stephens attribute to them.

(61) A town in the iſle of Leſbos.

(62) Ælian. *lib. xii, cap. xix.* Var. Hiſt.

(63) Voſſius, de Poët. Græc. *pag.* 17.

Here is a very abſurd fault. (64) *Canius, a Latin Poet, a native of Cadiz* (65), *and a friend of Martial .... married two wives, Thecphila a learned woman, but a little too free, and Sappho, not ſo well learned, but more reſerved. .... Martial mentions what I write,* lib. 3. epig. 63. & lib. 7. epiſt. 68.

Caſtior hæc & non doctior illa fuit, &c.

This is what we read in Moreri's Dictionary. But if we conſult Martial, we find (66) that he only mentions one wife of Canius, and ſays ſhe was called Theophila; that ſhe was learned and made verſes which Sappho might praiſe; that the latter was not more learned than Theophila, but that Theophila was more chaſte than Sappho. The verſe which Moreri quotes is the laſt of the epigram. He ſhould not therefore have added an *Etcætera*. This is but a trifle in compariſon of his blunder in giving to Canius a wife called Sappho, leſs learned, but more modeſt than Theophila. I ſay nothing of two other faults which are in the article Canius of Moreri's Dictionary. He quotes the 19th epig. of the third book of Martial, inſtead of the 20th, and *æmulator* is put inſtead of *æmulatur*.

(64) Moreri, at the word *Canius.*

(65) This appears from the LXIId epigram of the firſt book of Martial, not quoted by Moreri.

(66) Mart. Epigramm. LXVIII, *lib. vii.*

SARAH, ſiſter and wife of Abraham [*A*], was his faithful companion in all his travels. She was already married to him, when they retired from Ur of the Chaldees to go to Haran (*a*). The barrenneſs, with which ſhe was afflicted in her own country, did not leave her in foreign countries; and this made her take the reſolution of giving her huſband a ſubſtitute, that ſhe might become a mother in the perſon of that ſubſtitute, ſince ſhe could not be one in her own perſon. Hagar, her ſervant, whom ſhe choſe for this employ, was quickly with child and paid her with ingratitude (*b*). She deſpiſed Sarah; but Sarah not being able to bear this inſolence, made ſuch uſe of the full power her huſband gave her over Hagar, that ſhe forced her in a little time to fly out of the houſe. One may ſee in another place (*c*) the return of this ungrateful ſervant and the extremities ſhe was reduced to, when ſhe was turned out a ſecond time. We ſhall not repeat it. It is better to ſay that at laſt by a particular bleſſing of God, Sarah proved with

(*a*) Geneſis xi. 29, 31.

(*b*) Geneſis xvi.

(*c*) In the article of AGAR.

[*A*] *Siſter and wife of Abraham.*] That is ſo clear from the XXth chapter of Geneſis, that were it not for the ill habit contracted by ſome, of ſacrificing the natural ſenſe of the words of Scripture to the leaſt difficulties that ariſe, there could not be two different opinions about the matter. Let us take right the circumſtances of the fact. Abraham being come into the country of the Philiſtines, made Sarah paſs there for his ſiſter. Whereupon Abimelech taking her to be a maid, or a widow, ſo that nothing could hinder him from making her one of his wives, cauſed her to be brought to him. But knowing by revelation that ſhe was Abraham's wife, he reſtored her, complaining of their lies, which had expoſed him to great miſchief. I ſay, *their lies*; for, on the one ſide, Abraham had ſaid of his wife, *ſhe is my ſiſter*; and Sarah had ſaid of her huſband, *he is my brother*. Abraham excuſed himſelf, in the firſt place, on account of the fear he was in for his life, if he had ſaid ſhe is my wife; in the ſecond place, becauſe ſhe was *truly* his ſiſter, *the daughter of my father*, ſaid he (1), *though ſhe is not the daughter of my mother*. After this, he endeavoured to juſtify his wife by ſaying, that he had aſked of her as a favour, that whereſoever they came ſhe ſhould declare that he was her brother. I admire that they do not ſee in this diſcourſe, that Sarah was Abraham's ſiſter, not by the mother's ſide, but by the father's ſide. Theſe are my reaſons.

I. In the firſt place, if Sarah had not been the ſiſter of Abraham in this manner, the apology of her huſband would only have ſtill more deceived the good prince, who upbraided him with his former diſſimulation; for if the Patriarch's excuſes found credit, it was impoſſible to take Sarah for any other than the true and real ſiſter of Abraham by the father's ſide, nor could any man living gather from ſuch diſcourſe that ſhe was only his niece. I leave all knowing people to judge whether Abimelech could form any other ideas from Abraham's apology. But then I require that they be capable of placing themſelves in the exact ſituation, and in all the circumſtances of this adventure. It is to no purpoſe to ſuppoſe that Sarah was the daughter of Haran, and conſequently the grand-child of the father of Abraham; and to add, that a nephew is ſometimes called brother (2), and that a grand-ſon is ſometimes called ſon; that, I ſay, is to no purpoſe in this affair, for the circumſtances required that Abraham ſhould uſe the words in the moſt proper ſignification; for if he had not, he muſt have paſſed for a man who deſigned to impoſe upon Abimelech.

II. Beſides to what purpoſe ſhould he make uſe of this diſtinction, *Daughter of my father, daughter of my mother*, if he meant only that he was the uncle of Sarah? put the caſe that he might have called ſiſter, her that was only his niece; to what purpoſe ſhould he ſay that his mother was not the grand-mother of this niece? It is, will ſome ſay, to repreſent ingeniouſly the degree of his kindred in reſpect of Sarah. But why did he uſe the word *daughter* in an ambiguous ſignification? Why does he not uſe it in its right ſenſe, as I ſuppoſe he did. Beſides, the ingenuity ſpoken of would have been very unſeaſonable; it would have weakened the apology of the Patriarch; for it would make the bonds of kindred appear leſs ſtrong. If it be objected, that in my ſuppoſition that ſame ingenuity weakens the apology more then it ſtrengthens it; I will give a reaſon why Abraham declared that Sarah was not his ſiſter by the mother's ſide. They made a difference between the marriage of a man with his ſiſter both by the father's and mother's ſide, and the marriage of a man with his half ſiſter. The Athenians who permitted the marrying of the ſiſter by the father's ſide, forbad the marrying of the ſiſter by the mother's (3). Solon decided it ſo. On the contrary, Lycurgus permitted the Lacedemonians to marry the ſiſter by the mother, and not by the father (4). Some have ſaid, that as the community of blood is more certain between a brother and a ſiſter by the mother, than between a brother and a ſiſter by the father; the permiſſion of Solon was, generally ſpeaking, leſs odious (5) than the permiſſion of Lycurgus. Will any one pretend, after this, that, on my ſuppoſition, Abraham would have ſaid without any neceſſity, that his wife was not his ſiſter by the mother's ſide; as by the contrary ſuppoſition it would have been to no purpoſe to ſay, that his mother was not the grand-mother of Sarah?

III. Add to this, that if Abraham meant nothing elſe but that his father Terah was the grand-father of Sarah, he took the terms of father and ſiſter in a large and leſs proper ſignification. Why therefore did he declare that his mother was not the mother of Sarah. Was ſhe not ſo, in the ſenſe that he took the word *father* in relation to Terah; that is to ſay, was ſhe not the grand-mother of Sarah, juſt as Terah was her grand-father? Some think to clear the difficulty by ſuppoſing that Haran was the father of Sarah, and that he was not the brother of Abraham by the mother: they aſſign therefore two wives to Terah, and they ſuppoſe he had Haran by the one and Abraham by the other. Conſequently if Sarah was the daughter of Haran, her grand-father was the father of Abraham; but her grand-mother was different from the mother of Abraham. I anſwer, all this falls to the ground as ſoon as it is ſuppoſed that this Patriarch made uſe of the words *ſiſter* and *daughter* in a large ſignification; for upon this foot it is certain, that the mother of Abraham is grand-mother to the children of Haran, whether ſhe bore Haran, or whether ſhe was only the wife of him who begat him. As ſoon as you leave the proper and ſtrict ſignification of the words which denote the kindred, and follow the cuſtom obſerved in families, the word *mother* agrees to the wives in relation to all the children of their huſbands, and by conſequence that of grand-mother, with reſpect to all the children of all the children of their huſbands: ſo that if Abraham had taken the terms in the large ſignification, which the ſtile of friendſhip or civility has introduced into families, he could not have denied, as he did, that his mother was the grand-mother of Sarah. Some wiſh they could ſay that he took the ſame words ſometimes in a proper, and ſometimes in an improper ſignification. But would not this be to ſuppoſe that he acted the Sophiſter, and impoſed upon the honeſty of Abimelech?

IV. My fourth reaſon is taken from thence, *viz.* that it cannot be ſuppoſed upon any good grounds that Sarah was adopted by Terah. If it were ſo, Abraham might have made uſe of his diſtinction without departing from exactneſs of ſpeaking; for in that caſe his father might have been called the father of Sarah in a ſignification proper enough. But ſee here what ruins this evaſion: they have recourſe to it only to avoid the imputation of inceſt, and they do not avoid it by that; for a fraternity or brotherhood, founded upon adoption, properly ſo called, was no leſs an obſtacle to marriage than a natural fraternity. According to the laws, a brother who ſhould marry, his adopted ſiſter, committed inceſt, properly ſo called. ‘ Inter fratrem ſororemque nuptias eſſe prohi-
‘ bitas

(1) Geneſis xx. 12.

(2) Lot, Abraham's nephew, is called his brother, *Geneſis* xiv. 16: but this example is of no uſe to thoſe who ſuppoſe that Sarah was Lot's ſiſter; for upon this ſuppoſition Lot would be called brother, as being a brother-in-law, rather than as being a nephew,

(3) *See the proofs of it* apud Muretum, *lib. xv, c. v*, Variar. Lect. & apud Gebhardum in Corn. Nepotem Vit. Cimonis. *Conſult the article* CIMON *remark* [*D*].

(4) See the ſame authors.

(5) Filia patris (*ſoror, non uterina*) jure conjungebatur Noachidi, quoniam inter gentes ratio conſanguinitatis paternæ non habebatur. *Jarchius, apud Heidegg. Hiſt. Patriarch. Tom. ii, pag.* 78.

with child being ninety years old, and was brought to bed of a ſon called Iſaac. She lived 127 years (*d*). We ought not to forget that ſhe was very beautiful, and that her beauty and the complaiſance ſhe had for her huſband, not to call herſelf his wife but his ſiſter, expoſed her to the danger of two rapes [*B*], whereby her chaſtity had ſuffered ſhipwrack,

'bitas ſive eodem utroque parente, ſive altero tantum 'nati ſint: verum ſi per adoptionem ſoror facta ſit 'quandiu manet adoptio, etiam nuptias prohiberi: 'at ſi per emancipationem adoptio diſſoluta ſit, poſſe 'inter eos ritè iniri connubium (6). - - - *Marriage is 'prohibited between a ſiſter and brother, whether they 'have both parents or only one in common: if the wo'man be a ſiſter by adoption, ſo long as that adoption 'continues, marriage is likewiſe prohibited: but if the 'adoption ſhould happen to be diſſolved, then they may 'lawfully marry.*'

V. From hence I draw one of my chief reaſons. If any thing ſhould determine us not to take in a literal ſenſe the preciſe declaration of Abraham, that *Sarah is truly his ſiſter, daughter of his father, but not of his mother*, it would be the inceſtuous marriage that reſults from this fraternity. But does not that very thing refute thoſe, who ſay that Sarah was Abraham's niece (7)? Is it not agreed upon that this degree of kindred renders marriages inceſtuous? Our adverſaries therefore muſt ſeek out excuſes for the inceſt of Abraham. If they can find any, it will be as well for us as for them; the differences being only leſs or more, it will not be hard for us to give their reaſons the extent that will be needful for us; eſpecially conſidering that Jacob made no ſcruple to be married at the ſame time to two ſiſters, which in other times would have been an abominable thing. Clemens Alexandrinus looks upon this to be ſo ſmall a difficulty, that he tells us very coldly, that the words of the Patriarch teach us, that men muſt not marry a ſiſter by the mother's ſide. Τὰς ὁμομητρίας μὴ δεῖν ἄγεσθαι πρὸς γάμον διδάσκων. *Docens eas quæ ex eadem matre natæ ſunt non eſſe ducendas uxores* (8). It is certain there are good reaſons given to juſtify the Patriarch on that head; I ſhall not mention them; you may eaſily find them in other books. I ſhall only tell thoſe, who would accuſe me of undervaluing the conſcience of Abraham with reſpect to the crime of inceſt; that before they come at me, they muſt overthrow and defeat a great many antient and modern Divines, both Catholics and Proteſtants (9). I ſet no great value upon what is found in the Annals of Eutychius (10), that the firſt wife of Terah, mother of Abraham, was called Jona, and that his ſecond wife, mother of Sarah, was called Tehevitha; however it is a ſign, that there is an antient tradition for the opinion I have followed.

VI. Here is another reaſon. If Sarah was not the daughter of Terah, but his grand-daughter, ſhe muſt be the daughter of Haran, or of Nachor. But ſhe was neither. I prove it thus. We find in Geneſis (11), that the wife of Nachor was called Milca, and that ſhe was the daughter of Haran, father of Milca and Jiſca. Since the latter is named without there being the ſame reaſon for doing it as there was for naming the other, (for no huſband is aſſigned to her as to the other) it is probable that if Haran had had other daughters, they would have been named at the ſame time, and above all, Sarah would not have been forgotten, ſince mention had been made juſt before of her marriage with Abraham. We may then ſafely conclude that Haran had only two daughters, Milca and Jiſca. This reaſon is ſo convincing, that it obliges ſeveral of our adverſaries to ſuppoſe that Sarah and Jiſca are the ſame perſon. They do no great honour to the ſacred Hiſtorian. What an admirable writer would he be, if in three lines he ſhould give two different names to a woman, without telling us that they are only two names of the ſelf-ſame perſon? See in the XXIId chapter of Geneſis, the liſt of the children of Nachor: you will not find Sarah there, and you will ſee that his firſt-born came into the world after Abraham went out of his country; for it was at his return from mount Morija; where Abraham would have ſacrificed his ſon Iſaac, that he heard that Milcha had brought forty eight children to her huſband Nachor, *viz.* Huts, her firſt-born, *&c.* Beſides, were it poſſible, that if Sarah had been the daughter of Haran, the Scripture ſhould never have mentioned Lot as her brother?

VII. It is eaſy to anſwer thoſe who object the words of the Scripture (12), where Sarah is called the daughter-in-law of Terah; for a married woman is conſidered rather by the relations of her marriage, than by thoſe of her birth.

[*B*] *To the danger of two rapes.*] They reſemble one another as much as two drops of water. In both of them Abraham concealed his being Sarah's huſband; and bid her ſay he was her brother; and he did it becauſe he was afraid they would kill him, if they knew he was her huſband, and to the end that they might be kind to him for her ſake, if they believed that ſhe was not his wife. In both of them the raviſhers were puniſhed from above, before they could ſatisfy their luſt, reſtored Sarah, gave large preſents to her huſband, and reproached him with his lies. The firſt rape happened in Egypt by king Pharaoh; the ſecond in Guerar by Abimelech, king of the Philiſtines. Sarah was at leaſt ſixty-five years old when Pharaoh took her away, and ninety when ſhe was raviſhed by Abimelech; for ſhe was ten years younger than her huſband (13), and their voyage into Egypt was after their going out of Charan, that is to ſay, after the ſeventy-fifth year of Abraham (14). As for the journey to Gerar, it was after the foretelling of the birth of Iſaac, that is to ſay, when Abraham was a hundred years old. Say what you will, this hiſtory is a proof that Abraham feared death more than any conjugal diſhonour, and that he was far from being a jealous huſband. He leaves to the paternal care of Providence the honour and chaſtity of Sarah; but he is beforehand for the preſervation of his life, and neglects no human means. Not to acknowledge therein the infirmity of corrupt nature is to be voluntarily blind. That patriarch might have ſaid on this occaſion, *Homo ſum, humani nihil à me alienum puto.* (15) - - - *I am a man, and therefore think myſelf liable to any thing which may happen to men.* Thoſe who believe that the fear of danger made him reaſon ill, are miſtaken; *there is no fear of GOD in this country*, ſaid he (16), *and they will kill me becauſe of my wife.* He believed therefore that thoſe, who would make no ſcruple to kill a man, would make ſome to take away a married woman. Yes, he believed it, and not without reaſon. The good of ſociety, without doubt, more than the love of virtue, made the rape of a married woman to be looked on as an enormous injuſtice, the ill conſequences of which ſovereigns themſelves dreaded; but it was not looked upon as ſo great a matter, if a great lord took away a woman that was not married, in order to increaſe the number of his concubines. Therefore Abraham reaſoning ſolidly, might be ſure, that at leaſt the fear of men would hinder the Egyptians and the Philiſtines from taking away his wife, ſuffering him to live at the ſame time, becauſe he would be a perpetual witneſs of the violence done to a married woman. The reaſonable concluſion of this was to be afraid, leſt they ſhould privately diſpatch him, that they might keep Sarah, and yet not be reproached with taking away a married woman, for the public would have had no knowledge of that huſband, if he had been quickly diſpatched. This fear is not the worſt paſſage of this hiſtory. Who does not know the underhand dealings of David, in in order to deſtroy the huſband of his miſtreſs. The deſire of being well treated, as being the brother of the beautiful Sarah, is more blameable than the fear of being killed. However we ought to abhor the brutality of Fauſtus the Manichee (17), and content our ſelves with what St Jerom ſays of the matter (18). St Chryſoſtom (19), and St Ambroſe have found here matter for a Panegyric on the charity of Sarah, who was willing, in favour of her huſband, to expoſe her chaſtity to the greateſt dangers. 'Extrema adiit, 'ſororem ſe ejus aſſeruit, contenta, ſi ita eſſet neceſſe, 'periclitari pudore potius quam virum ſalute: ut 'tueretur maritum mentita eſt germanitatem, ne inſidiatores

---

(*d*) Moreri ſays falſly 137.

(6) Juſtinian. *lib. i. Inſtitut.* See the text of the article OCTAVIA.

(7) *See* Rivet in Geneſ. *Exercit. lxxiii*, Heidegg. Hiſt. Patriarch. *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 79.

(8) Clem. Alexandr. Stromat. *lib*, *ii*, *pag.* 421.

(9) Celmens Alexandrinus, St Jerom, Lipomanus, Oleaſter, Cajetanus, Sotus, Petavius, Codomannus, Father Abram, Muſculus, Piſcator, Heidegger, *&c.*

(10) Pag. 66. apud Heidegg. pag. 78.

(11) Chap. xi, ver. 29.

(12) Geneſis xi. 31.

(13) It is ſaid *Geneſis* xvii. 17. thas ſhe was ninety years of age when Abraham was a hundred years old.

(14) Geneſis xii. 4.

(15) Terent in Heautont. *Act. I, Scene i, pag. m.* 112.

(16) Geneſis xx. 11.

(17) *He accuſed Abraham*, Quod matrimonii ſui infamiſſimus nundinator avaritiæ ac ventris cauſa duobus regibus Abimelech & Pharaoni diverſis temporibus, Saram conjugem ſororem mentitus, quod erat pulcherrima, in concubitum venditarit. - - - - *For that, like an infamous vender of his marriage rights, he had at different times, to gratify his avarice, and gluttony ſold his wife Sarah to the embraces of two kings, Pharaoh and Abimelech, falſely putting her off for his ſiſter, becauſe ſhe was extremely handſome.* Vide Auguſtinum contra Faſtum, *lib. xxii*, *cap. xxxiii.*

(18) *He calls it* fœdum neceſſitatem. - - *A ſcandalous neceſſity.*

(19) Homil. xxxii, in Geneſ. See the remark [*A*] in the article ABIMELECH.

ſhipwrack, if God had not prevented it [*C*]. A ſingular providence ſaved her in this danger, and reſtored her to her huſband, with her honour ſafe and ſound, beſides the favours that were heaped upon him by the two princes who fell in love with her. This might ſweeten the ſad experience he had of the inconveniences which they find, who carry about with them a beautiful wife, which are ſometimes greater, than if they travelled with an ugly one. One cannot eaſily clear Abraham [*D*] and Sarah in this matter, nor about the buſineſs of Hagar; therefore they are in the wrong who are ſo angry with Calvin, for reproving them on this ſubject (*e*). We ought to keep at an equal diſtance from the irreverence of Fauſtus the Manichee (*f*), and from the superſtitious

(*e*) *See* Rivet, in Exercit. lxxxvii, *Tom. i, Oper. pag.* 333. Heidegg. Hiſt, Patr. *Tom. ii, pag.* 151, *and the remark* [*I*] *of this article.*

(*f*) See remark [*B*], citat. (17).

‘ ſidiatores pudoris ejus tanquam æmulum & vindicem uxoris necarent (20). - - - *She expoſed herſelf to the greateſt dangers, and affirmed that ſhe was his ſiſter, chuſing rather to hazard her own chaſtity than the life of her huſband: to ſave him, ſhe falſly called herſelf his ſiſter, for fear that her lovers ſhould put him to death, as their rival, and his wife's defender.*’ Origen was of another opinion; he found ſuch a ſcandal in the literal ſenſe, that he had recourſe to types and allegories. ‘ Alioquin, *ſays he* (21), quæ nobis ædificatio erit legentibus Abraham tantum Patriarcham non ſolum mentitum eſſe Regi, ſed pudicitiam conjugis prodidiſſe? Quid nos ædificat tanti Patriarchæ uxor, ſi putetur contaminationibus expoſita per conniventiam maritalem? Hæc Judæi putent & ſi qui ſint amici literæ non ſpiritus. - - - *Otherwiſe what edification ſhall we have in reading that ſo great a Patriarch as Abraham was, not only told a lie to the king, but alſo betrayed the chaſtity of his wife? Or how ſhall the wife of ſo great a patriarch edify us, if we ſuppoſe that ſhe was proſtituted by the connivance of her huſband? Let the Jews imagine theſe things, and ſuch who are friends to the letter, and not to the ſpirit.*’ Others have recourſe to inſpiration, and pretend that Abraham was directed by a prophetical ſpirit (22). This is the way never to be ſilent. This remedy ought to be better managed, and never to be uſed but as extream unction. Some (23) apply it to Sarah as to her deſiring her huſband to lie with her ſervant maid. As for thoſe who ſay (24), to excuſe Abraham, that his life was ſo neceſſary for the accompliſhment of the divine promiſes, that he was obliged to preſerve it at any rate, even at the expence of his wife's honour, they confute themſelves: they alledge for his juſtification, what is againſt him; for if his life was neceſſary for the fulfilling of the divine decrees, he might have been aſſured that no body could kill him.

The looſe Caſuiſts and protectors of equivocations, take a great advantage of this conduct of the Patriarch. See the laſt anſwer to the *Lettres Provinciales*, that is, the *Entretiens de Cleandre & d'Eudoxe* (25).

[*C*] *Her chaſtity had ſuffered ſhipwrack, if GOD had not prevented it.*] The Scripture does not tell us what diſtemper it was that hindered Pharaoh from lying with Sarah; it ſays only that God *ſtruck him with great plagues, and all his houſe* (26). As to Abimelech, the Scripture ſays, that God threatened him, in a dream, to kill him with all his family (27); but at the end of the chapter, it ſays, that at *Abraham's prayer GOD cured Abimelech, his wife, and his ſervant-maids*, and that afterwards *they had children*; *for*, adds the Scripture, *The Lord had entirely ſhut up the wombs of the houſe of Abimelech, becauſe of Sarah the wife of Abraham.* I believe one might ſooner have killed the interpreters, than hindered them from making conjectures upon thoſe plagues of Pharaoh: the field is more large, in this reſpect, than in relation to Abimelech; for the Scripture ſeems to denote a ſort of diſtemper, with reſpect to the latter. But they, probably, have judged of the one by the other, and, as it is likely, that the perſonal chaſtiſement of Abimelech fell upon the parts deſigned for generation, ſince his wife and maid-ſervants were afflicted in thoſe parts, it is believed that it was ſo likewiſe with Pharaoh (28). The Rabbins ſay (29), he was tormented with ſo violent a gonorrhœa, that he had no pleaſure to think of women, ſo far was he from being able to lie with them. They add, that Sarah had a guardian angel, who ſtruck in ſuch a manner all thoſe ſhe would have him ſtrike, that they had neither the deſire nor the power to come near her; and that it was by means of that angel that ſhe preſerved herſelf from the laſcivious purſuits of Pharaoh. Philo (30) ſays only, that this prince endured inſupportable pain and vexation, and was ſo far from thinking of the pleaſures of love, that he only thought of his diſtemper, and the means how to get rid of it. His whole court was viſited with the ſame ſcourge, becauſe they had aſſiſted or applauded him in the rape of Sarah. Eupolemon (31) ſays, that the plague got into the houſe of Pharaoh, and that Sooth-ſayers having anſwered, it was for the rape of a woman, he reſtored her without touching her. Joſephus (32) adds ſeditions to the plague. A modern author (33), who bears him an ill will, criticiſes him pretty ſmartly on this head. The reaſon he goes upon is, That a popular ſedition does not hinder a prince from diverting himſelf with a woman, and that neither it, nor the plague has any particular relation with the ſin of Pharaoh. This author therefore would have it, that he was afflicted in thoſe parts that ſhould have been the inſtruments of his debauchery, and he confirms his thought by the maxim of the wiſe man (34), *Per quæ peccat quis per eadem & torquetur.* - - - *By what a man commits a ſin, by the ſame is he puniſhed.* Be it as it will, it cannot be denyed, but that Sarah ſtayed ſome time in the houſes of her raviſhers: this is certain, at leaſt, as to the laſt rape, ſince they had leiſure to find out, that it was upon her account that the wombs of all the women in the court of Abimelech were ſhut up. From thence ariſes this ſmall difficulty. That prince reſtored Sarah, as ſoon as he underſtood by a dream, that ſhe was the wife of Abraham; he therefore knew nothing of it till ſhe had been ſome time in his houſe. What did he deſign to do with her, ſeeing he let her alone all that time? Was it for this that he took her into his houſe? Thoſe who make this objection, know not the cuſtom of the Eaſtern princes. They have many wives, and others are ſent to them from time to time: but we muſt not fancy that they careſs them one after another by turns; there are ſome, whoſe turn never comes, tho' they be moſt beautiful. Abimelech was contented to have Sarah in his houſe, knowing that he could lie with her when he pleaſed: but God prevented it, before he choſe his time. We may ſay the ſame of Pharaoh. I do not take him to have been ſogreat a monarch, as to obſerve the ceremonies that were practiſed in the court of Perſia, where a woman that pleaſed the king, was ordered to waſh and perfume herſelf a year before ſhe was brought to him (35). I ſhall not therefore inſiſt on the conjecture of St Jerom (36), who explains by this method, the reaſon why Sarah was ſometime unemployed in the houſe of Pharaoh. But let us ſay of this laſt king, what we have juſt now ſaid of the king of the Philiſtines; or we may ſay that they were ſtruck with a dangerous diſtemper the very firſt day they took her. Joſephus ſays Abimelch was ſo ſick that his life was deſpaired of by the Phyſicians. Others ſpecify the nature of his diſeaſe; they ſay he had ſuch violent pains in his genital parts, that he could not perform the act of copulation (37). For the reſt, St Chryſoſtom (38), and St Jerom do well agree; for the firſt maintains, that it required as great a miracle to make Sarah come out of the houſe of Pharaoh undefiled, as to preſerve Daniel in the midſt of hungry lions, and the three Hebrew children in the fiery furnace. There is a little difference to be obſerved between the two narratives of Moſes; he ſays expreſsly, that Abimelech did not come near Sarah, but he gives no account whether Pharaoh did ſo or no. Theodoretus (39) believed that the ſacred Hiſtorian uſed that precaution, with reſpect to Abilemech, to ſtop the mouth of ſlander, becauſe Sarah was brought to bed the ſame year ſhe had been with that prince.

[*D*] *One cannot eaſily clear Abraham.*] For beſides what we have ſaid above, would it not be an authority for the pernicious doctrine of equivocations if it was once certain that neither he nor Sarah told a lie? Thoſe who attack the ill morals of Leſſius, and ſome other Jeſuits, ſay ſtitious flattery of ſome others. The beauty of Sarah had ſomething peculiar in it, which ought not to be forgotten; viz. that it continued, at leaſt, till ſhe was ninety years old [*E*]. Several reaſons are given for it. Some ſay, that it was becauſe ſhe had had no children, and becauſe ſhe had renounced all matrimonial commerce, after ſhe ſaw herſelf barren [*F*]. In caſe theſe reaſons do not ſatisfy, there is added to them a particular

---

(20) Abroſ. de Abrah. *cap. ii.*

(21) *In cap. vi. Geneſeos. Heidegger. pag.* 149, pretends that Origen inſulted and cenſured Abraham, *quod per conniventiam maritalem Saram contaminationibus expoſuerit.* But how could he reproach him with it, ſince he rejects the literal ſenſe?

(22) Paulus Burgenſis, apud Heidegg. *pag.* 149.

(23) Joſeph. Antiq. *lib. i, cap. x.*

(24) Apud Heidegger. ubi ſupra.

(25) Pag. 128, & *ſeq.* of the Dutch Edit. 1696.

(26) Geneſis xii. 17.

(27) Geneſis xx.

(28) *See* Pererius in Geneſis. *cap. xii, ver.* 17.

(29) Apud Lyranum, citante Saliano, *pag.* 413.

(30) In Libr. de Abrah.

(31) Apud Euſebium, Præp. *lib. ix, cap. iv.*

(32) Lib. i, cap. viii.

(33) Salian. *Tom. i, pag.* 413.

(34) Cap. xi, ver. 17.

(35) Eſther, *ch. ii.*

(36) In Tradit. Hebraic. in Geneſ. Vide Pererium, *in cap. xii. ver.* 19.

(37) Tradunt quidam eum in veretro ita eſſe divinitus percuſſum ut nec coire cum muliere poſſet ne dum vellet & magnis ea in parte cruciatibus afflictaretur. *Pererius in Geneſim. cap. xx, ſub. fin.*

(38) Homil. XXXI, in Geneſ.

(39) Apud eundem Pererium, *in cap. xii, ver.* 19.

ſay that thoſe lie who make anſwers which have no relation to the intention of him who aſks a queſtion. Such anſwers, tho' they contain nothing but truth, do not ceaſe for all that to be lying; for example, if a ſon of Cain had been juridically interrogated who he was, with a deſign to know who was his father, and had anſwered that Cain was his uncle, he had ſaid nothing but truth, for his mother was Cain's ſiſter; yet his anſwer had not been exempt from deceit. The ſame may be ſaid of Sarah. Abimelech aſked her what relation ſhe had to Abraham; he had all the right imaginable to aſk her, for he was king of the country; his intention was to know whether ſhe was married, or no; and upon this he was to regulate his conduct as to her. She anſwered, *I am Abraham's ſiſter*; her huſband who had ſuggeſted to her this anſwer, ſaid on his part, *I am Sarah's brother.* Is it not the ſame thing, as if he had anſwered, the *relation of brother and ſiſter is the greateſt relation that is between us*, and would not this anſwer have been a formal lye? If one, that knows all the circumſtances of a great conſpiracy, ſhould be aſked, *what do you know of it*, and ſhould anſwer, *I know ſuch a thing of it*, which ſhould not be the chief matter of the conſpiracy, would not he be a deceiver, would he not be a liar? For his anſwer would be equivalent to this, *I only know this.* A commentator upon Geneſis (40), deſigning to prove that marriage between brothers and ſiſters was not practiſed in Abraham's time, makes uſe of this remark. Sarah anſwering, ſays he, that ſhe was Abraham's ſiſter, was preſently believed not to be his wife; therefore, at that time, theſe two relations were concluded to be incompatible. This reaſoning is falſe; for ſuppoſe that theſe marriages took place in a country, the cuſtom there would be, that the ſiſter, after her marriage, would no longer be called the ſiſter of her huſband, but his wife; ſo that every ſiſter, not called the wife of ſuch a one, but only his ſiſter, would be looked upon then not to be his wife: and for this reaſon, Abraham and Sarah neceſſarily and viſibly deceived the Egyptians and the Philiſtines, by ſuppreſſing the relation of marriage, and ſpeaking only of that of brotherhood; though thoſe nations were not ignorant of the compatibility of thoſe relations. But it was enough to be deceived by Abraham, that they ſhould know that the one ſwallowed up the other, much as the quality of father abſorbed that of uncle in the perſon of Cain, with reſpect to his children. In a word, the ſuppreſſion of a truth is a real lye, as often as it is deſigned to make the hearer form a falſe judgment, and when according to the uſe of the language ſpoken it cannot fail to produce that effect. Abraham and Sarah are in the caſe. Thoſe who deny that marriages between brothers and ſiſters, were known among the Canaanites, ought to read the chapter of Leviticus, where marriages in ſuch and ſuch degrees are forbid to GOD's people. Let us not forget that Iſaac made uſe of the diſſimulation of his father upon a like principle; he ſaid alſo, for fear of being killed, that Rebekah was his ſiſter (41).

[*E*] *The beauty of Sarah . : . . continued . . . . till ſhe was ninety years old.*] This is proved by the twentieth chapter of Geneſis, where it is ſaid, that Abraham, being gone into the country of Gerar, would only paſs for the brother of Sarah; which was the reaſon why Abimelech took her into his houſe with a deſign to marry her. The birth of Iſaac had been already fore-told to this patriarch: but his wife was ninety years old when this happened; therefore, &c. I know the Scripture does not ſay in this paſſage, that Sarah was beautiful, but it is no hard matter to collect it from the circumſtances of that journey. We find in the twelfth chapter, that the reaſon which obliged Abraham to ſay, in Egypt, that Sarah was his ſiſter, was, becauſe he ſaw ſhe was beautiful, and was afraid that they would kill him, that they might the more eaſily enjoy her. Sarah no ſooner appeared, but they took and carried her to the king's houſe. There is no doubt but Abraham diſſembled his marriage in Gerar upon the ſame motive. He himſelf declares (42) that he was afraid of being killed becauſe of his wife; he knew therefore ſhe was beautiful enough to inſpire love. The event ſpeaks it ſtill more clearly; for as ſoon as ſhe was ſeen by the king of Gerar, he took her to his houſe in order to make her his wife. It was without doubt for her beauty; for to ſay with Father Salian, that he took her as a venerable widow, who underſtood the management of a houſe, and as the ſiſter of a man whoſe alliance he looked on to be very advantageous to him, is a meer illuſion. It is probable, that Abraham went only into the country of the Philiſtines to avoid the famine that purſued him; it was therefore eaſy for the king of that country to gain Abraham without making himſelf a ſacrifice to the marriage of a widow fourſcore years old. He would have purchaſed, at a dear rate, the friendſhip of Abraham, if Sarah had been decayed as commonly women are at that age. Let us therefore acknowledge as a certain truth, that ſhe was ſtill a beautiful woman. An honeſt Capuchin of Paris (43) pleaſantly imagined that Abimelech took Sarah only to talk with her about devotion: he was, ſays he, a prophet and a man who reckoned it a ſingular happineſs to hold familiar converſation with Sarah upon the ſubject of a future ſtate. He thought this reverend mother would teach him many things concerning the kingdom of GOD. But would he have been chaſtiſed for ſuch good and ſpiritual intentions? What a ſtrange fancy! Fleſh and blood, without doubt, would have had a greater ſhare in their diſcourſes than devotion, if they had let him do what he pleaſed.

We ought not to mind the thought of Hugo de St Victor; the conſequences of it are dangerous: let us not open a breach in the holy Scripture; prophane men would enter into it that way, like wolves into a ſheep-fold, and commit a thouſand diſorders. This author pretends (44) that Moſes has not put in its proper place the taking away of Sarah by Abimelech, but in a time diſtant from the true time above thirty years. Let us maintain that Sarah was really ninety years old, when Abimelech deſigned to marry her. Nor ought we to have recourſe to the expedient of thoſe who ſay (45), that it is no greater wonder that Sarah ſhould have been handſome at ninety, than to ſee a handſome woman at forty now a-days; for, ſay they, women lived then to be 130 years, as now they live to be fourſcore. By their leave, they calculate wrong: where would they find, according to their ſupputation, the deadneſs of Sarah's womb of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks (46)? Why *did it ceaſe to be with Sarah after the manner of women* (47)? What would become of Abraham's celebrated faith with reſpect to the birth of Iſaac? Is it ſtrange, at this day, that a woman at forty, ſhould conceive? Let us adjuſt their calculation better: ninety years are to 130 much as fifty-ſix to eighty. It is therefore with our beauties of fifty-ſix years that we muſt compare Sarah. Now I confeſs that though it be very rare that a woman of fifty-ſix ſhould be taken away for her beauty, much leſs be deſigned for the bed of a ſovereign, as a dainty and royal bit, yet there are ſome for all that, that have beautiful remains at that age. See what I have related elſewhere out of Brantome concerning Joan of Arragon and the Ducheſs of Valentinois. We may therefore ſay, without having recourſe to miracles, which ought to be kept as much as poſſible for a great neceſſity, that the good conſtitution of Sarah, and her being exempt from lying-in and nurſing, might preſerve her beauty even to the age of ninety. Procopius thinks that when ſhe was made capable of conceiving, ſhe recovered her loſt beauty (48), and that GOD, by a ſpecial favour, made her thoſe two preſents at once. Procopius may ſay what he pleaſes.

[*F*] *Some ſay . . . . . ſhe renounced all matrimonial commerce after ſhe ſaw herſelf barren.*] Let us cite Pererius: *Deinde id accidit Saræ ob ſummam ejus caſtitatem & continentiam, quippe quæ ſtatim ut ſenſit ſe ſterilem & invalidam ad generandum abſtinuit à copula carnali,*

(40) Pererius in Caput xi, *Diſput. xvi.* Bellarmin. Libr. de Matrimon. *cap. xxviii, argues in the ſame manner.*

(41) Geneſis xxvi, 9.

(42) Geneſis. xx, 11.

(43) Boulducus de Eccleſ. ante legem, *lib. iii, cap. iv*, apud Heidegger. *pag.* 157.

(44) Apud Pererium, I. Diſput. in Geneſ. *cap. xx.*

(45) Id. ibid.

(46) Rom. iv, 19.

(47) Geneſis xviii, 11.

(48) Addit Procopius divinitus cum fœcunditate Sara reſtauratam fuiſſe priſtinam pulchritudinem. *Cornel. à Lapide in Geneſ. p.* 149.

particular providence of GOD, who, as they ſay, preſerved from all the attacks of old age, the beauty of Sarah, amongſt other motives, to try the faith of Abraham [*G*]. This was not attended to by thoſe, who in the heat of their homilies exaggerated ſo much her decay [*H*], to make the greater wonder of the milk that filled her breaſts. It is pretended (*g*) that ſhe had ſo great a plenty of it, that ſhe was forced to take ſeveral children to nurſe; and that the day that Iſaac was weaned, ſhe gave all the children of thoſe that came to the feaſt, her breaſt to ſuck. They add, that ſhe herſelf would ſuckle her ſon, to remove all ſuſpicions that might ariſe from her age of Iſaac's being a ſuppoſititious child. St Chyſoſtom approves this thought (*h*). There is no probability that this holy woman died of grief, when ſhe was told that Iſaac was ſacrificed by Abraham; and we may boldly place this among the fables of the Rabbins (*i*). Joſephus ſays, that Sarah died a little after the return of her huſband and ſon: But according to his own calculation, ſhe lived twelve years longer; for he ſays with the Scripture, that ſhe was 90 years old when ſhe was brought to bed of Iſaac, and 127 when ſhe died; and, on the other hand, he aſſures us, that Iſaac was twenty-five years old when his father would have ſacrificed him.

It is here that I muſt ſhew, 1. That Calvin is wrongfully accuſed of having thrown the groſſeſt reproaches upon Sarah [*I*], becauſe ſhe deſired her huſband to make uſe of their

(*g*) *See* Pererius in Geneſ. *cap. xxi*, Salian. *pag.* 473, 474.

(*h*) Homil. xlv. in Geneſ.

(*i*) Who ſay ſo *apud Toſtatum.* See Salian, *pag.* 489.

carnali, ut ſupra oſtendimus ſuper illis verbis quæ ſunt in capite 18. Poſtquam conſenui & Dominus meus vetulus eſt, voluptati operam dabo (49)? It will not be improper to ſee on what he grounds his opinion. He makes uſe of theſe words of Sarah, *Poſtquam conſenui & Dominus meus vetulus eſt voluptati operam dabo* (50)? That is, *after I am waxed old, ſhall I have pleaſure, my Lord being old alſo?* Theſe are two difficulties that Sarah ſtarted to her ſelf when ſhe heard the promiſe that was made to Abraham, that his wife ſhould be brought to bed of a ſon the year following. *Muſt I then,* ſaid ſhe, *notwithſtanding my great age, receive the careſſes of my huſband?* this is the firſt difficulty: *but is not my huſband too old for that?* This is the ſecond difficulty. So that according to Pererius ſhe muſt have ſtarted almoſt the ſame objection which the virgin Mary did, *how ſhall this be, ſeeing I know not a man* (51)? I think we cannot reaſonable deny to this author that the words of Sarah ſignify, that ſhe and her huſband obſerved then a perfect continence; but all the reſt is nothing but meer conjecture, viz. That they had already above fourteen years agreed on a mutual abſtinence; that is to ſay, from the time that Hagar became the concubine of Abraham. But let us ſuppoſe it to be ſo: we muſt infer from thence, that Sarah put an end to matrimonial comforts when ſhe came to be ſeventy-five years of age. How then comes Pererius to draw from this one of his reaſons, why the beauty of that lady was preſerved to ninety years? *Intemperantia Veneris cito mulierem inveterat & vehementer deformat ac turpat* (52). That is to ſay, *the immoderate uſe of Venereal pleaſures makes a woman ſoon grow old, and ugly.* Be it ſo. I leave the diſcuſſion of it to Phyſicians; but does it follow from thence, that a total abſtinence from that exerciſe has a quite contrary effect, upon women; I mean that it puts off old age, and preſerves their beauty? No Logician will find any ſtrength in ſuch conſequences, generally ſpeaking, conſidering the great number of things, of which the two extreams are bad, and pernicious both for the body and ſoul. In particular, the conſequence here in queſtion, is ſtrongly impugned by Phyſicians (53). But if we ſhould be ſo complaiſant, as to grant it to Pererius, what ſervice would it do him in relation to Sarah, who, according to him, deprived her ſelf of the matrimonial right, only at the age of ſeventy-five years.

[*G*] *To try the faith of Abraham.*] This ſeems at firſt ſight to be very ſtrange: for men can ſcarce conceive a greater temporal happineſs, than the perpetual beauty of what they love. What vows or wiſhes are ſo favourable to new married perſons, as to wiſh that they may never ſeem old one to another?

Diligat ipſa ſenem quondam, ſed & illa marito
  Tunc quoque cum fuerit non videatur anus (54).

May ſhe love him, when he ſhall antient grow;
And when ſhe's old, may he not think her ſo.

But if you conſider it well, you will find that for a man who is to travel with a family, a beautiful woman is no ſmall burthen. However, Abraham found it ſo, and may ſerve for an example. What fears was he not under of being killed, and what mortifying expedients was he not thereby obliged to have recourſe to? Be it as it will, a famous Divine of Zurich ſpoke in this manner: 'Puto pulcritudinis Saræ 'cauſam non fuiſſe aliam quam ſupernaturale Dei 'donum & ſpecialem ejuſdem providentiam, qui eam 'in extrema ſenectute voluit fieri matrem Iſaaci, atque 'ſimul cotem fidei & patientiæ Abrahami, quæ in 'hac ob formam uxoris immiſſa tentatione non parum 'explorata fuit (55). - - - *I think that Sarah's beauty was* '*owing to nothing elſe but a ſupernatural gift, and an* '*eſpecial providence of GOD, who deſigned that ſhe* '*ſhould be the mother of Iſaac in her extreme old age, and* '*at the ſame time a whet-ſtone to the faith and patience* '*of Abraham, which were not a little tryed by the* '*temptation, which he was expoſed to on account of his* '*wife's beauty.*

[*H*] *Thoſe who . . . . exaggerated ſo much her decay.*] St Chryſoſtom ſays, that the rod of Moſes, which made water ſpring out of the rock, wrought a leſs difficult miracle, than was done when milk ſprung out of Sarah's breaſts. *Non ſic admirabile fuit quod ex petra in deſerto ſcaturierint fontes aquarum quando illam virga Moyſes percuſſit, ſicut de vulva jam emortua puerum naſci, & lactis fontes ſcaturire* (56). Here are the words of another Father: *Portabat uterum gravem talis mater quæ inanis ambulare vix poterat . . . . . . Marcidæ mammæ quas in vacuos folles ſubducti ſucci detrimenta laxaverant, lactei fontis ubertate tenduntur* (57).

[*I*] *Calvin is wrongfully accuſed of having thrown out the groſſeſt reproaches upon Sarah.*] Let us begin with the words of the accuſer. 'Non eſt prætereundum 'impiè loqui Calvinum qui Saram quaſi lenam & 'Abraham quaſi adulterum ancillæ ſuæ carpit (58). - - - '*It is not fit I ſhould paſs over the impiety of Calvin,* '*who reflects upon Sarah as being little better than a* '*bawd; and reflects on Abraham as if he had* '*committed adultery with his own maid.*' Theſe words, and ſeveral others that follow, are ſo like thoſe of Cornelius à Lapide, that there is reaſon to think Merſennus tranſcribed them from him. His work was printed in 1623. And that of Cornelius à Lapide in 1616. *Carpit hic Calvinus Saram quaſi lenam, Abram quaſi adulterum ancillæ ſuæ Agar* (59). This calumny againſt Calvin goes yet higher: I have, as much as I could, ſought for the firſt author of it, but I dare not ſay, I have found him in the perſon of Feuardentius. What is certain is, that this Monk preceded the Minime (60), and the Jeſuit (61) whom I have cited. His accuſation was not well known to Leonard Coqueus, who certainly would have named Calvin, and cited the *Theomachia Calviniſtica*, if he had known what is to be found there. He has done neither of them; his reproaches are indeterminate; they fall in general upon the Modern Heretics, and he cites another work of Feuardentius. Firſt he ſays that Fauſtus, the Manichee, blamed the conduct of the Patriarch Abraham, as a thing that betrayed his incredulity, and ardent deſire of having children (62), and

(49) Pererius in Geneſ. *cap. xx, ver.* 2. Torniellus & Cornelius à Lapide, *are of the ſame opinion.*

(50) Geneſis, xviii. 12.

(51) St Luke i, 34. Zecharias, in ver. 18 of the ſame chapter, alledges a difficulty like that of Sarah.

(52) Perer. in Geneſ. *cap. xx. Diſput. i.*

(53) *See* Gaſpar à Reies, Elyſio jucund. Quæſt. Campo, *Quæſt. XLVI. where he maintains,* quod omnimoda coitus dimiſſio magna damna parit præſertim in aſſuetis, in fœminis frequentiſſimè, in viris rariſſimè & cum minori noxa.

(54) Martial. *lib. iv,* Epigr. xiii.

(55) Heidegg. Hiſt. Patr. *Tom. ii, pag.* 148. Rivet had ſaid the ſame before him, *Oper. Tom. i, pag.* 277, *and Pererius in Geneſ.* had ſaid ſo before Rivetus.

(56) Chryſoſt. Homil. xlvi.

(57) Auguſt. Serm. lxviii, de Temp.

(58) Merſennus Obſervat. in Problemata Veneti, *num.* 119, *pag.* 165.

(59) Cornel. à Lapide in Geneſ. *cap. xvi, ver.* 2. *pag.* 170, *Edit.* 1623.

(60) Father Merſenne.

(61) Cornelius à Lapide.

(62) Crimen inurebat & quod habendæ prolis inſana flagrans cupiditate, & Deo, qui id jam ſibi de Sara conjuge promiſerat minime credens, cum pellice volutatus ſit. *Leonh. Coqueus, in Auguſt. de Civit. Dei.* lib. xvi, cap. xxv. He cites *D. Auguſt. lib. xxii. contra Fauſtum. cap. xxx.*

their maid-ſervant. 2. That St Auguſtin has not made a good apology for this conduct of Abraham [*K*].

and afterwards he adds: ‘ Refert etiam Feuardentius in appendice ad libros Alphonſi à Caſtro contra hæreſes lib. 1. verbo Abraham, quoſdam hæreticos modernos . . . . . non minus impios fuiſſe in ſanctiſſimum Patriarcham Abrahamum, ut cui crimen adulterii impingant (63) - - - *Feuardentius alſo relates in his appendix to the books of Alphonſus à Caſtro againſt Hereſies lib.* 1. *at the word Abraham, that certain modern Heretics . . . . did with no leſs impiety reflect upon the moſt holy Patriarch Abraham, whom they accuſed of adultery.*’ The particular accuſations againſt Calvin are contained in the following quotation. ‘ Piiſſimam aviam Chriſti Saram multis vexat contumeliis, multis jactat injuriis: † *Sarai rationem alienam à verbo Dei apud ſe quærit. In ipſo progreſſu non leviter peccavit, quod orbitatis impatiens, à verbo Dei diſceſſit. Obrepit deſperatio. Connubii legem pervertit, lectum conjugalem polluendo. Nec culpa etiam vacat Abram, quod ſtulto ac præpoſtero uxoris conſilio obſequutus eſt. Reprehenſione digna eſt Abrahæ facilitas. Utriuſque autem claudicat fides. Dei virtutem non debuit alligare ordini naturæ, vel reſtringere ad ſuum ſenſum.* Et in ſequentibus ⸸. *Admittit concubinam quæ inſtar pellicis futura erat. Ad eandem qua ipſa fervebat impatientiam maritum ſollicitat. Vacillat quidem Abrahæ fides, cum à verbo Dei declinans, uxoris impulſu ad remedium prohibitum transferre ſe patitur. Momento uno tentationi ſuccumbit.* Deinde, doloſiſſimo ſchemate utens, id ipſum quod negare ſe de illa fingit, palam adfirmat ‡: *Neque enim domui ſuæ voluit erigere lupanar, nec ancilla ſuæ productrix, vel mariti lena eſſe* . . . . . . O hominem in diſputando vafrum, veteratorem, & malitioſum! Ecquid enim aliud eſt Abræ, *uxorem proſtituere, pudicitiam ejus nudare præſidio, pudicitiam prodere* (quod Calvinus palam tribuit Abrahæ) quam ei lenocinari? Aut quid, *Conjugii legem pervertere, lectum conjugalem polluere, pellicem viro quærere & subminiſtrare, alienam in thorum mariti inducere* (quorum à Calvino inſimulatur Sara) quam domi ſuæ lupanar erigere, & mariti lenam eſſe, quod hic ſimulate Calvinus negat & damnat (64)! - - - - He throws out many groſs reflexions and reproaches upon Sarah the pious progenitrix of Chriſt. Sarah *ſeeks a contrivance of her own not warranted by the word of GOD. In the courſe of her proceedings ſhe tranſgreſſed not a little, for not bearing the want of children with patience ſhe ſwerved from the word of GOD. She gave way to deſpair. She perverted the laws of wedlock, by polluting the marriage-bed. Neither is Abraham blameleſs, ſince he complyed with the fooliſh and prepoſterous counſel of his wife. The eaſineſs of Abraham deſerves to be cenſured. Both of them were deficient in their faith. They ſhould not have tied down the power of GOD to the order of nature, nor have confined it to their own ſenſe.* Afterwards he ſays. *She introduces a concubine who was to act the part of a harlot. She inſpires her huſband with the ſame impatience by which ſhe herſelf was tranſported. Abraham's faith did ſtagger, when ſwerving from the word of GOD; he ſuffered himſelf to be prevailed upon by the inſtigation of his wife, to make uſe of the forbidden remedy. In a moment he yielded to the temptation.* After this, carrying on his deceitful ſcheme he openly aſſerts what he pretends to deny concerning her. *For neither would ſhe convert her houſe into a brothel, nor do the office of a procureſs in bringing her huſband and maid together* . . . O arch caviller and ſpiteful old fox! If *Abraham proſtituted his wife, and betrayed her chaſtity by leaving it expoſed and defenceleſs* (which Calvin plainly imputes to Abraham) what elſe did he do but . . . . for her? Or what elſe was it *but to pervert the laws of wedlock, to pollute the marriage-bed, to ſeek out and provide a harlot to her huſband, and to lodge a ſtranger in his arms,* of all which things Sarah is accuſed by Calvin, I ſay, what elſe was this but to convert her houſe into a brothel, and to be her huſband's . . . . which Calvin here artfully denies and blames?’ We may obſerve two frauds in the proceeding of this Franciſcan. He ſuppreſſes the expreſſions, wherein Calvin endeavours to extenuate the fault of Sarah and that of Abraham: this is the firſt foul play. He aſſerts impudently, that Calvin uſes a ſhameful turn of ſophiſtry, to accuſe, in effect, under a falſe appearance of negation, this holy woman of having been a . . . . . . to her huſband. This is, the ſecond fraud, and it is of ſuch a heinous nature that it may be called a dreadful calumny, The free manner with which Calvin judges of the conduct of the huſband and the wife, clearly ſhews that he ſought no artful evaſions: he ſpeaks his thoughts with the greateſt liberty; and makes uſe of all the right, that reaſon and Scripture give us of paſſing our judgment upon the quality of an action. It is therefore manifeſt, that he ſpeaks ſincerely, when he denies that Sarah acted as . . . . &c. This appears further by the words which follow, and which Feuardentius has ſuppreſſed. ‘ Improprie tamen vocatur uxor, quæ præter Dei legem in alienum thorum inducitur. Quare ſciamus hunc concubitum hic illicitum fuiſſe ut inter ſcortationem & conjugium quaſi medius fuerit. Idem omnibus commentis accidit quæ Dei verbo aſſuuntur. Quamlibet enim honeſto tegantur prætextu corruptela ſubeſt, quæ à verbi puritate degenerat, eamque vitiat (65) - - - - - *Nevertheleſs a woman that is introduced into another's bed, in a manner not warranted by the law of G O D, is improperly called a wife. Let us therefore conclude, that as this commerce was unlawful, ſo it was a kind of middle ſtate between fornication and matrimony. The ſame thing happens in all thoſe inventions which are patched to the word of GOD. For however they may be diſguiſed under a plauſible pretence, there is a corruption in them which degenerates from the word of G O D, and taints the purity of it.*’ This is the language of a plain and ſincere Caſuiſt; one may therefore be well aſſured that this is the worſt that Calvin deſigned to ſay. Now he ſays plainly, that the commerce of Abraham and Hagar was a kind of middle ſtate between fornication and marriage. Feuardentius has ſuppreſſed this remarkable paſſage of Calvin's commentary: ‘ Benedictionis (quam ſciebat divinitus promiſſam eſſe) potiundæ voto, conjugalem thorum ſponte alteri cedit . . . . ſic laudabile fuit votum Sarai quoad finem vel ſcopum in quem tendebat, ut tamen in ipſo progreſſu non leviter peccarit . . . . . . Utriuſque autem claudicavit fides, non in ſubſtantia quidem, ſed in medio ipſo (ut loquuntur) vel agendi ratione (66) - - - - *It was from her deſire to obtain the bleſſing (which they knew GOD had promiſed) that ſhe voluntarily reſigned the conjugal bed to another . . . . . Thus the deſire of Sarah, as to the end and ſcope to which it tended, was laudable, yet not ſo but that ſhe ſinned greatly in the way ſhe took to compaſs it . . . . . . But the faith of both was defective, not indeed in the ſubſtance, but in the medium (as they ſay) or manner of acting.*’

Obſerve, that copiers are very apt to magnify things. Cornelius à Lapide and Marinus Merſennus ſay plainly and abſolutely, that Calvin accuſes Sarah of . . . . and Abraham of adultery. Feuardentius was contented to ſay, that the accuſation was propoſed indirectly, and under a deceitful ſhew of a juſtification.

[*K*] *St Auguſtin has not made a good apology for this conduct of Abraham.*] He made uſe of four reaſons. The firſt is, That Abraham was not induced to this act by any motive of ſenſual love, but in order to have children: *Uſus eſt ea* (concubina) *quippe ad generandam prolem, non ad explendam libidinem* (67). The ſecond is, That he did it, not to injure his wife, but rather out of complaiſance to her, and to give her the conſolation which her ſtate of barrenneſs made her wiſh for. The third is, That this conduct was grounded upon the right, which St Paul ſpeaks of in the ſeventh chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians: *Likewiſe the man has not power over his own body, but the woman.* There is no fault here, either on the wife's, or on the huſband's ſide; ſhe gives her maid to her huſband, in hopes of iſſue, and he takes the maid with the ſame view. *Nulla eſt hîc cupido laſciviæ, nulla nequitiæ turpitudo. Ab uxore cauſa prolis ancilla marito traditur, à marito cauſa prolis accipitur; ab utroque non culpæ luxus ſed naturæ fructus exquiritur* (68). The fourth reaſon is, That Abraham ſent away Hagar as ſoon as his wife deſired it. I have cited elſewhere (69) the words of St Auguſtin on this ſubject: Leonard Coqueus, a commentator on that Father, makes no ſcruple to refute him. He alledges againſt the firſt reaſon this axiom of St Paul, *It is not lawful to do evil that*

(63) Id. ibid.

† In cap. xvi. Gen. v. 1.

⸸ Ver. 2.

‡ Ver. 3.

(64) Feuardentius, Theom. Calviniſticæ, *lib. ix, cap. i, pag. m.* 426.

(65) Calvin. in Geneſ. *cap. xvi, ver.* 3. *pag. m.* 83, 84.

(66) Calvin. ibid. *ver. i, pag.* 83.

(67) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, *lib. xvi, cap. xxv.*

(68) Id. ibid.

(69) In remark [*C*] of the article AGAR.

that good may come (70); and the common doctrine of the Moraliſts, That to make an action good, it is requiſite not only that the motive be good, but alſo that it be about a lawful matter. *Ad hoc quod ſit actio honeſta, requiritur non modo bonus finis & reliquæ circumſtantiæ, verum etiam quod ſit circa debitam materiam* (71). This furniſhes him with the refutation of the ſecond reaſon; for if the commerce of the Patriarch with his maid was bad in itſelf, it did not become lawful by Abraham's compliance with the deſire of Sarah: the counſels or ſuggeſtions of a wife do not excuſe a huſband in regard to unlawful things; which appears clearly by the fall of the firſt man, who, in vain alledged, that the wife whom GOD had given him had perſuaded him to eat the forbidden fruit. The third reaſon is no better than the reſt; for a wife cannot convey to another woman the right of which St Paul ſpeaks, any more than a huſband can yield to another man the right of which the ſame Apoſtle ſpeaks. *Non poteſt uxor jus illud quod habet in corpus viri transferre in alteram mulierem, ut congreſſum viri ſui cum alia muliere aſſenſu ſuo poſſit facere licitum, ut nec vir poteſt transferre in alterum virum illud jus quod habet in uxorem* (72). Leonard Coqueus ſays nothing on the fourth reaſon, becauſe he did not look upon it as part of the apology: but the moſt ſtupid reader may eaſily perceive, that it ſerves only to ſhew that the Patriarch was not moved to it by any impurity. It is a very good thing readily and eaſily to quit an unlawful intercourſe, but that does not prove that the enjoyment was lawful. This commentator ſuppoſes, that St Auguſtin did not alledge theſe reaſons as proofs of the purity of the commerce of Abraham and Hagar, but only as proofs ſufficient to refute the aſſertion of the Manichees, who affirmed that this Patriarch was deſperately in love with Hagar, and lay with her only to ſatisfy his paſſion. He ſuppoſes alſo, that the ſame Father knew very well the true reaſon that cleared Abraham, which was, that there was a real marriage between Hagar and her maſter. He examines afterwards the three reaſons of St Ambroſe. The firſt is taken from this, That Abraham lived before the law of GOD had forbidden adultery. ‘Abraham ante legem Moyſi & ante Evangelium fuit, cum nondum interdictum adulterium videretur, pœna criminis ex tempore legis eſt, quæ crimen inhibuit, nec ante legem ulla rei damnatio eſt (73). - - - *Abraham lived before the law of Moſes, and before the Goſpel, when adultery does not appear to be forbid: the puniſhment of a crime, takes place from the time that the law forbids it; nor is there any condemnation of a thing before the law is in being.*’ The ſecond is the ſame with the firſt and ſecond of St Auguſtin. The third is taken from hence, That the conjunction of Abraham and Hagar was one of the types of the Old Teſtament. The commentator obſerves (74), that Sixtus Senenſis (75) found in the firſt reaſon of St Ambroſe, two principles widely different from the common opinion of Divines. Firſt, That the action of Abraham was adultery. Secondly, That adultery was at that time lawful, ſeeing the law had not forbid it. He maintains that Hagar was the lawful wife of Abraham, and that adultery was a crime even before it was forbid by any poſitive law. It was enough that it was contrary to the law of nature: *Erat tamen, per ſe illicitum & prohibitum lege divina naturali* (76). As to the third reaſon of St Ambroſe, he refutes it by this aphoriſm, that the quality of a type does not infuſe any morality into things, nor conſequently take from them what is bad. ‘Plerumque, *ſays St Gregory* (77), res quælibet per hiſtoriam virtus, per ſignificationem culpa, & aliquando res geſta in facto cauſa damnationis eſt, in ſcripto autem prophetia virtutis. - - - *Frequently a thing is, as to the hiſtory, a virtue, but by ſignification, a fault; and ſometimes the thing done, is, in fact, the cauſe of damnation, but in writing a prophecy of virtue.*’ St Auguſtin follows the ſame principle. ‘In peccatis, *ſaith he* (78), magnorum virorum aliquando rerum futurarum figuram animadverti & indagari poſſe - - - *In the ſins of great men, ſometimes we may obſerve and diſcover the figure of things to come.*’

Let us obſerve here four things. In the firſt place, Coqueus makes St Auguſtin take an injudicious and inſincere courſe. He knew, ſays he, the true proof of the innocence of Abraham, and ſuppreſſed it; he contented himſelf with clearing him as to the reproach of being in love with his ſervant-maid. But was this enough? Had not the Manichees ſcope enough to load him with reproaches, tho' they had granted that he was not in love with Hagar? It is therefore to reproaches of this kind that St Auguſtin ought to have anſwered, and he did certainly do it. He pretended, that ſuppoſing the circumſtances, as he put them, a man was juſtifiable who lay with his wife's maid. But was there ever a looſer morality than his? Would they not at this day run down the Bauni's, and the Eſcobar's, if they taught that provided a man thinks only of leaving ſucceſſors behind him, his wife may prompt him to lie with her maid, and he may follow her counſel? Do not tell me that St Auguſtin conſiders only the age that Abraham lived in; for ſince he grounds his reaſoning on the right which St Paul gives to a huſband over his wife, and to a wife over her huſband, he propoſes, without doubt, to account for it at all times. We have ſeen, in another place (79) what he ſays of the action of Acindynus. My ſecond remark is, That the doctrine of Calvin is much purer on this point, than that of the antient Fathers. He condemns the conduct of Abraham and Sarah, plainly and directly. He ſeeks no excuſe for them from the uſe of Polygamy already eſtabliſhed among the nations. He ſays they had no right to oppoſe the law that ties married perſons one to another. ‘Nec valet excuſatio quod concubinam uxoris loco eſſe voluerit, quia fixum illud manere debuerat, mulierem viro adjunctam eſſe, ut eſſent duo in carnem unam. Tametſi jam polygamia apud multos invaluerat, legem tamen illam qua duo inter ſe mutuo obligantur convellere nunquam fuit in hominum arbitrio (80). - - - - *Nor is it any excuſe that he deſigned the concubine to be in the place of a wife; for this ought to remain for certain, that the wife is joined to the huſband, ſo that they two ſhould be one fleſh. Notwithſtanding that polygamy had prevailed among many, yet that law by which the two are bound one to the other, was never to be diſpenſed with at any man's pleaſure.*’ Nay, he obſerves, that this fall of Abraham ought to ſet us upon our guard againſt the ambuſhes of Satan, who attacks us, not only by perſons that are manifeſtly criminal, but alſo by good people. ‘Porro cum Sarai tam ſancta mulier inſtar flabelli, ad eandem qua ipſa ſervebat impatientiam maritum ſollicitet: hinc diſcamus quam ſedulo nobis agendæ ſint excubiæ ne qua occulta fraude nos circumveniat Satan. Neque enim improbos tantum & ſceleratos ſubornat qui ex profeſſo fidem noſtram oppugnent: ſed ut incautos opprimat, clam interdum ac furtim per bonos & ſimplices nos adoritur (81). - - - - *Now as Sarah, ſo holy a woman, ſollicits her huſband to the ſame impatience wherewith ſhe herſelf was tranſported, hence let us learn how diligently we are to be on our guard, leſt by any ſecret fraud Satan circumvents us. For he does not only ſuborn wicked and reprobate men openly to oppoſe our faith; but that he may catch us unawares, he ſometimes attack us ſecretly, and by ſtealth, by means of the good and ſimple.*’ In the third place, I obſerve that the liberty Calvin took of cenſuring ſeverely this action of Sarah and Abraham, is of much greater uſe to Chriſtian morality than the pains the Fathers have taken to juſtify Abraham and his wife. They have ſacrificed the general intereſts of morality to the reputation of a private perſon: I could almoſt find in my heart to apply to all thoſe, who are animated with that ſpirit, this fine ſaying of Cicero: *Urbem philoſophiæ proditis dum caſtella defenditis* (82). - - - *You betray the town of Philoſophy while you defend the outworks.* Laſtly, I obſerve, that Joſephus ſuppoſes a thing, of which the Scripture ſays not a word; that GOD commanded Sarah to put Hagar in her huſband's bed. Σάῤῥα τοῦ Θεοῦ κελεύσαντος ἐπικλίνει μίαν τῶν θεραπενίδων. *Sara Deo jubente in thalamum ejus adducit unam famularum* (83). Here is truly the *Deus ex machina*, - - - *God in the plot*, of the tragic Poets, and the *ancora ſacra*, - - *ſheet-anchor*, of the proverb. Several commentators upon Geneſis alledge the authority of this Hiſtorian, and obſerve that St Auguſtin has inſinuated the ſame thing. *Idem inſinuat St Auguſtinus lib. 10. contra Fauſt. cap. 32* (84). There is no Gordian-knot but may be broke that way.

---

(70) Rom. iii. 8.

(71) Leonh. Coqueus, ubi ſupra, *pag. m.* 351.

(72) Id. ibid.

(73) Ambroſ. *lib. i*, de Abrah. *cap. iv*, apud Leonh. Coqueum, ibid.

(74) Leonh. Coqueus, ibid. *pag.* 352.

(75) Sixt. Senenſis, Bibl. Sanctæ, *lib. v*, *Annot. xciv*, apud Coqueum, ibid.

(76) Idem, Coqueus, ibid.

(77) Gregor. *lib. iii*, Moral. *cap. xvi*, aqud Coqueum, ibid.

(78) Auguſt. *lib. iii*, de Doctr. Chriſt. *cap. xxiii*, apud cund. ibid.

(79) See the remarks in the article ACINDYNUS (SEPTIMIUS).

(80) Calvin. in Geneſ. xiii. 1.

(81) Id. ibid. ver. 2. See alſo what he ſays a little after.

(82) See the arcle FRANCIS I. remark [*P*].

(83) Joſeph. *lib. i. Antiq. cap. xi*, *pag.* 19, C.

(84) Cornel. à Lapide, ubi ſupra. *See alſo* Merſennus, ubi ſupra.

SARISBERI (*a*) (JOHN OF) in Latin *Sariſberienſis*, an Engliſhman, Biſhop of Chartres, was born about the year 1110. He went into France at the age of ſixteen or ſeventeen. *He afterwards had a commiſſion from the king, his maſter, to reſide near Pope Eugenius about the affairs of England.* Some would have done him an ill office with that Pope, and falſely accuſed him; but at laſt the truth came to light, and he was continued near Eugenius, *with all the favours* he deſerved. He was ſtill more eſteemed by the ſucceſſor of that Pope, and being recalled into England, he received great marks of eſteem from Thomas Becket who was then High-chancellor. This chancellor wholly governed his maſter, Henry II, *and as he wanted aſſiſtance under ſo heavy a burthen . . . . he made uſe of the counſel of* Joannes Sariſberienſis, *eſpecially about the education of the king's eldeſt ſon, and of many young noble Engliſh lords, whom he had undertaken to educate in good manners and learning. He deſired him alſo to take care of his houſe, whilſt he was abroad in Guienne with the king, his maſter.* Being returned from that voyage, he was made Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and left the court to reſide in his dioceſe. Sariſberienſis accompained him, and faithfully followed him, when this prelate was obliged to retire into France, and when about ſeven years after he was recalled into England. It is well known that he was murdered in his own archiepiſcopal church. *Sariſberienſis undertook to ward off a blow that one of the aſſaſſins aimed at the head of his maſter, but he received it on his arm: the wound was ſo great, that the Surgeons after they had attended him near a twelve month, diſpaired of his cure.* It is pretended that he was cured by a miracle of Thomas Becket. *He was made Biſhop of Chartres at the earneſt intreaty of the province* ſome years after [*A*], *and he lived in this Epiſcopal ſee with the ſame modeſty, and the ſame virtue which he had always preached up and recommended in his writings.* He died about the year 1180 (*b*). He compoſed, among other books, a treatiſe in Latin intituled *Polycraticus* [*B*]. *He was one of the greateſt wits of his age, and one of the moſt polite and moſt able men in good literature* (*c*).

(*a*) *Or* Sariſberienſis, *or* Sariſburienſis, *&c.*

(*b*) Taken from the Life of Joannes Sariſberienſis, prefixed to the French tranſlation of his book *de Nugis Curialium.*

(*c*) Du Pin. Bibl. *Tom. ix, p.* 167. *Dutch. Edit.*

[*A*] *He was made Biſhop of Chartres . . . . ſome years after.*] Here is again one of thoſe writers of elogies, who neglect the dates (1). He could not mark in a more uncertain manner the time of the promotion of Joannes Sariſberienſis to that biſhopric, ſince he had not aſſigned the year of Thomas Becket's Death. Let us ſupply this defect, and ſay that this archbiſhop was killed about the end of the year 1170. This is certain, but it is not agreed in what year Joannes Sariſberienſis was made Biſhop of Chartres. Voſſius ſays it was in 1164 (2), but he is miſtaken. Father Labbe, who reproves him for it, places the promotion of that biſhop in 1172 (3), and adds, that he died in 1182, and was buried in the abbey of Notre Dame de Joſaphat. Father Oudin ſays the ſame (4). But Mr du Pin has not followed their chronology, except in the year of his death. *Joannes Sariſberienſis*, ſays he (5), *was at laſt made Biſhop of Chartres in* 1179, *and died three years after.*

[*B*] *He compoſed, among other books, a treatiſe in Latin, intituled,* Polycraticus.] This is a well known book, and there are ſeveral editions of it. It is intituled, *Polycraticus, ſive de Nugis Curialium, & veſtigiis Philoſophorum.* Father Labbe tells us that the firſt edition is that of Paris 1513, and that Conſtantine Frandinus procured it (6). I make uſe of the Leyden edition, *ex officina Plantiniana apud Franciſcum Raphelengium* 1595, in 8vo. Mr du Pin looks upon it as an excellent book, 'relating to the employments, the duties, the virtues, and vices of great men, and eſpecially of princes and great lords, which contains a great many moral thoughts, ſentences, fine paſſages of authors, examples, apologues, pieces of hiſtory, and common topics (7).' Lipſius ſays, it is a patch-work, that contains ſeveral pieces of purple, and fragments of a better age. *In quo centone multos pannos purpuræ agnoſco & fragmenta ævi melioris* (8). Janus Douza uſes this author too ſeverely; for he puts him in the claſs of compilers, who take on every hand, and are like Horace's crow. *Omnium diſertiſſimè*, ſays he (9), quoting the teſtimonies of authors who have ſaid, that a certain workman had found out the ſecret of making glaſs malleable, *Joannes Saliſberienſis, quamvis ab exemplis ſuprà dictis in partem nonnihil diſſentiens, libro* de Nugis Curialium iv. cap. v. *qui* Policraticus *inſcribitur, non quidem de ſuo, ne quid erres, ſed verò de alieno (id quod Corniculæ iſti cum fartoribus illis ſemipriſcis, Solino puta, Macrobio, Iſidoro, atque aliis ejuſdem farinæ mangonibus commune) ſolens utique, præſertim de Satura Arbitri noſtri.* See what James Thomaſius has anſwered to this cenſure of Douza (10). Note, That this work of Joannes Sariſberienſis has been tranſlated into French, and printed at Paris in 4to, 1640, with the title, *Les Vanitez de la Cour.* The author of the tranſlation only puts for his name D. M. at the bottom of his Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Marquis d'Aſſerac.

His other books are *Metalogicus, ſeu Tractatus de Logica, Philoſophia,* &c. printed at Paris 1610, and at Leyden 1639, in 8vo. *Vita atque paſſio Sancti Thomæ Cantuarienſis Archiepiſcopi & Martyris.* A book of letters publiſhed at Paris 1611, in 4to. *Ex Bibliotheca Papyrii Maſſonis.* Seven other hiſtorical letters inſerted by du Cheſne, in the fourth volume of his Collection of the Hiſtorians of France. There are many other letters of our author among thoſe of Thomas Becket, collected by Father Lupus, and printed at Bruſſels in 1682, in two volumes in 4to. Baleus ſays, that this biſhop compoſed a comment upon the Brunellus (11) of Vigelli; but a learned Critic (12) denies it for this reaſon, becauſe that poem was dedicated to William de Long-Champ, whom Richard, King of England, made Biſhop of Ely, in 1189, and who died in exile in 1197, fifteen years after the Biſhop of Chartres, who is the ſubject of this article.

(1) See the remark [*D*] in the article RUFFI.

(2) Voſſius de Hiſtor. Latinis, *pag.* 421.

(3) Labbe, Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. i, pag.* 606.

(4) Oudin, in Supplem. de Scriptor. Eccleſ. *pag.* 441.

(5) Du Pin, Bibl. des Auteurs Eccleſ. *Tom. ix. pag.* 167. *Dutch. Edit.*

(6) Labbe, ubi ſupra.

(7) Du Pin, ubi ſupra.

(8) Lipſius in Tacit. Ann. *lib. xii.*

(9) Janus Douza Præcidan. in Petronium, *lib. iii, cap. ix. pag. m.* 594, 595.

(10) Thomaſ. de Plagio Literar. *pag.* 240.

(11) It is the title of a Latin poem, which is alſo called *Speculum ſtultorum.*

(12) Reineſius, Epiſt. ad Daumium, *pag.* 197. *He does not ſay* Vigellus *but* Nigellus.

SARNANUS, or DE **SARNANO** (CONSTANTIUS) ſo called becauſe he was a native of Sarno in the kingdom of Naples (*a*), lived in the XVIth century. He was a Monk of the order of St Francis, and was accounted a very ſubtile Philoſopher and Divine. He taught Philoſophy at Padua, and Divinity at Rome and Perugia (*b*). Pope Sixtus invited him from this laſt city to Rome where he honoured him with a cardinal's cap, and made him Biſhop of Vercelli (*c*). We have ſeveral books written by this Monk [*A*]. He died at Rome in the year 1595, and was

(*a*) And not in Umbria as Quenſtedt ſays, *de Patr. Viror. illuſtr.* pag. 346.

(*b*) Nomenclat. Cardinal. *p.* 170.

(*c*) Quenſtedt, ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *We have ſeveral books written by this Monk.*] The epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheca* miſcals him Conſtantinus Sarmanus, and only mentions his book upon the *Univerſalia* printed at Venice in 8vo in the year 1576 (1). He compoſed beſides that, a book *De ſecundis intentionibus juxta doctrinam Scoti: Summa Theologica: Directorium Theologicum: Conciliatio Aureoli & Capreoli: Conciliatio Thomæ Aquinatis & Scoti,* &c. This

(1) Epit. Geſn. *pag.* 174.

was buried at Sarno in the church of St Francis which he had cauſed to be built in a magnificent manner (*d*). His family name was Buccafoco. You will find his article in Moreri under the word *Bucafoci*.

(*d*) Nomenclat. Cardinal. *p.* 171.

This laſt book is one of his moſt conſiderable productions. He has made there *a collection of ſeven or eight hundred opinions, wherein Thomas Aquinas and Scotus contradict one another*. This is what the author of the *Apocalypſe de Meliton* (2) takes notice of, after having ſaid that the miniſter, who, in anſwer to the Franciſcan Feu-ardent, author of a book intituled, *Entremangeries Miniſtrales*, - - - *The diſſentions among the Miniſters*, had publiſhed, *Les Entremangeries Monachales*, - - - - - *The diſſentions among the Monks*; had taken great advantage of the continual diſputes of the Jacobins and Franciſcans.

(2) *Apocalypſe de Meliton*, pag. 25. This book was printed in the year 1663. The author was called Mr Pithois. He had been a Friar Minime, but afterwards turning Proteſtant, he was Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Sedan, where he died very old in the year 1676.

SAVONAROLA (MICHAEL, or JOHN MICHAEL) a native of Padoua practiſed Phyſic with ſo much reputation that Nicholas D'Eſte ſent for him to Ferrara (*a*), and took him into his ſervice, giving him a very conſiderable ſalary (*b*). Leonel the ſon of Nicholas, and Borſa (*c*) brother to Leonel continued him in his employment (*d*). He obtained the freedom of the place, acquired an exceeding great character, and made a good deal of profit by his buſineſs (*e*). He was a man of piety, and took no fee from the poor (*f*). He died at Ferrara knight of the order of St John of Jeruſalem in the year 1431. The books he wrote were well received by the public (*g*), and have been printed in divers places (*h*). They treat of Phyſic. He left two ſons, the younger of whom was father to the famous Dominican (*i*) who is the ſubject of the following article.

(*a*) Joh. Franc. Picus, in Vita Hieron. Savonarolæ, *pag.m.* 108.

(*b*) Ghilini Teatro, *Part. ii*, *pag.* 197.

(*c*) He was the firſt that had the title of Duke of Ferrara and Modena. *Jo. Fr. Picus, ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) Ghilini, ubi ſupra. (*e*) Id. ibid. (*f*) Jo. Fr. Picus, ubi ſupra. (*g*) Ghilini, ubi ſupra.
(*h*) *See* Lindenius renovatus, *pag.* 643. (*i*) Jo. Fr. Picus, ubi ſupra.

SAVONAROLA (JEROM) grandſon to the foregoing was born at Ferrara on the twenty-firſt of September 1452, and, without the knowledge of his parents, took the habit of a Dominican Fryar at Bologna in the year 1474. His ſuperiors employed him to teach Phyſics and Metaphyſics; but after having followed that buſineſs for ſeveral years, he took a diſguſt at theſe vain ſubtleties, and applyed himſelf wholly to the reading of pious books, particularly of the holy Scripture. He was employed to preach and confeſs, and did both with great aſſiduity, till ſuch time as he quitted the latter, that he might have the more leiſure for the former (*a*). He was ſent for in the year 1492, to prepare Laurence de Medicis for death (*b*). It is certain, 1, that he diſtinguiſhed himſelf in an extraordinary manner by the auſterity of his life, and by the fervent eloquence with which he preached againſt immorality [*A*], without ſparing the the diſorders of the clergy, nor even the court of Rome; 2, that he pretended to partake in divine revelations; 3, that by all theſe means he acquired a great authority in Florence and the veneration of the whole city [*B*]; 4, that he loſt his credit, was excommunicated, degraded from his Eccleſiaſtical orders, hanged and burnt, in the year

(*a*) Taken from his Life, written by John Francis Picus, Count of Mirandola, in *Collectione Bateſiana, pag.* 108, *& ſeq.*

(*b*) Politianus, Epiſt. IV. *libr. ii, fol. m.* 92, *verſo. See likewiſe John Francis Picus, in* Vita Savonarolæ, *pag.* 115.

[*A*] *He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by the auſterity of his life, and by the fervent eloquence with which he preached againſt immorality.*] To the end I may not cite partial evidences, I ſhall quote the words of Paul Jovius, who has obſerved a pretty exact neutrality. 'Hieronymus Savonarola, *ſays he* (1), . . . uſque adeo auſtera vitæ diſciplina, ac erudito ſubtilique ingenio & in ſacris concionibus admirabili facundia valuit, ut &c. *Savonarola diſtinguiſhed himſelf in ſuch a manner by the auſterity of his life, his learning, his ſubtle genius, and his admirable eloquence in preaching, that &c.* He expreſſes himſelf ſtill more ſtrongly in another book. 'Tanta rerum atque animorum commutatio, ' . . . Florentiæ conſecuta eſt, ut Hieronymus, qui modò ſinglari ſanctîmonia, virtutiſque nomine animis civium imperitarat & in numerum divorum ut vivens referretur, publico conſenſu meruerat, concurſu populi, ſenatuſque decreto damnatus ſit, & in area curiæ fœdiſſimo ſupplicio concrematus. . . . Atque ita qui ab excellenti doctrina ac vitæ continentia, & honeſtate, facundiaque incredibili in admiratione hominum aliquandiu fuerat, omnibus contumeliis & cruciatibus affectus, miſerabile, & fortaſſe indignum tanta virtute, incerto levique populo ſpectaculum præbuit (2). - - - *There followed ſuch a change of affairs and ſentiments, . . . at Florence, that Savonarola, who, a little before, had obtained a great power over the citizens by his ſingular ſanctity, and the reputation of his virtue, and had, in the opinion of all, deſerved to be canonized alive, was now condemned by a decree of the ſenate, and with the approbation of the people, and was ignominiouſly burnt in the yard of the court. - - - Thus he who for ſome time had been univerſally admired on account of his excellent doctrine, temperate life, and incredible eloquence; was forced to undergo all manner of indignities and torments, and afforded a miſerable ſpectacle, and perhaps, unworthy of ſo much virtue, to a fickle and inconſtant populace.*' If you have a mind to ſee what has been ſaid touching the great ſucceſs of his ſermons, you need only conſult the appendix to Dr Cave's book (3). It is pretended, that the Florentines were converted by his preaching, much more than the Ninevites were by that of Jonas; for the city of Florence was reformed, not for a day, but for a long time, and caſt all the inſtruments of luxury into the fire. *Quæ de Hieronymi Savonarolæ eloquentia Chriſtiana narrantur, mira eſſent & incredibilia, niſi fidem facerent ejus ſcripta, quæ incredibilem ſpirant pietatem & ardorem; & facilè perſuadent quod ferunt, efficacia verbi Civitatem Florentinam, deliciis abundantiâ opum diffluentem, fere totam non ſolum ad meliorem frugem ac modeſtiam Chriſtianam revocaſſe, ſed & ad planctus Ninive vitam civium convertiſſe, unde illis nomen gementium adhæſit, omniaque luxus inſtrumenta, appenſa Pyramidi flammis abſumpſerunt. Neque ad tempus & horam putes id genus vitæ arripuiſſe, aut ſervaſſe, ſuperſtite Savonarola; non minus diuturna & perennis fuit quam mira & repentina converſio* (4). I give you notice that it is from one of Savonarola's brethren, and an apologiſt for the Dominicans, that I borrow theſe words.

(1) Jovius, in Elogiis, *cap. xlii*, *pag. m.* 99.

(2) Idem, in Vita Leonis X. *pag. m.* 52.

(3) Wharton, in Appendice ad Hiſtoriam Literariam Guil. Cave, *pag.* 162, 163. He quotes John Francis Picus, in Vita Savonarolæ. *See alſo* Spizelius in Infelice Literato, *p.* 642.

(4) Vincentius Baronius Apolog. Ordin. Prædicat. *Tom. ii, pag.* 220, 221.

[*B*] *He acquired a great authority in Florence, and the veneration of the whole city.*] They conſidered him as a prophet ſent by God for the reformation of manners, and did not think that any thing ought to be undertaken without his advice, neither in the ſenate, nor in the houſes of private perſons. Thus Jovius ſpeaks of him. *Hieronymus Savonarola . . . . literis admirabili præſertim eloquentia inſignis, qui in ſacris concionibus, & in privatis colloquiis ita multitudinis animos opinione virtutis ceperat, ut illum rerum omnium, quæ imminebant, verum vatem, divinumque depravatis moribus cenſorem* year 1498 [*C*]. Theſe are things which are not conteſted; but people are divided in their ſentiments as to the point whether he was an honeſt man or an hypocrite. Some authors maintain that his conduct was the effect of a great zeal for truth, and for the reformation of the Church: others pretend that he was an impoſtor, who, to gratify his luſt of power, borrowed the maſk of virtue, and ſet up for a prophet. It is hard to find out the truth exactly in this conflict of opinions: for if, on the one hand, it be certain that the moſt impious hypocrites find apologiſts; it is no leſs certain, on the other, that the moſt honeſt zealots find accuſers; and it is equally certain that on both ſides, whether in defending or accuſing, people generally give full ſcope to party-intereſt, artifice, and diſingenuity. Methinks therefore that I ought to content myſelf with making ſome collections concerning what has been ſaid for or againſt this Dominican. Theſe will be found chiefly in the remarks. Philip de Comines, who had ſeen him, praiſes him much, and aſcribes to him the glory of having foretold certain things that came to paſs [*D*]. It is likewiſe upon his teſtimony that the greateſt ſtreſs is laid by perſons who

cœlo miſſum crederent. Creveratque ei tanto aſſenſu authoritas, perpetuo omnis generis hominum ſexúſque & ætatis ſtudio collecta, ut nihil privatis in domibus, nihil in ſenatu ſine ejus viri conſilio rectè geri poſſe videretur (5). Varillas paraphraſes this paſſage by ſuch particulars as every body will not approve. He had been ſaying (6), that Savonarola was the moſt learned man (7) that had been in Italy from the age of the firſt Cæſars . . . ; *that he had foretold ſo many extraordinary things, which proved true in every circumſtance, that he paſſed for a great prophet*; and that the Florentines *had ſuch a firm belief of his ſanctity, that they had canonized him* (8) *even in his life-time*. Afterwards he goes on thus: ‘ His true and ſuppoſed talents made him ‘ act in Florence with more authority than if he had ‘ been the ſovereign of the place; ſince not only his ‘ advices were ſubmitted to in the public aſſemblies, ‘ but he was moreover an abſolute judge in domeſtic ‘ affairs, and decided the quarrels that happened be‘tween huſbands and wives, in ſuch a manner, that ‘ what he enjoined never failed to be executed without ‘ the leaſt complaint.’ No body has deſcribed the power of this Monk better than Juſtus Lipſius (9). I muſt not forget that among the ſigns of his credit, they reckon the honour he had to be deputed by the Florentines to the King of France (10). Let us ſee the obſervation which Mr Bullart makes upon this. ‘ Perſons of the higheſt rank ſinking their authority ‘ in order to raiſe his, he was pitched upon to go in ‘ quality of ambaſſador from the Republic to the ‘ King of France, Charles VIII, at Poggibone, to ‘ demand of him the reſtitution of Piſa to the ſtate ‘ of Florence. He diſcharged this commiſſion with ‘ great vigour, and threatned the king, by a ſpi‘rit of prophecy, with the anger of God, if he ‘ did not make this reſtitution, in conſequence of ‘ the treaties ſworn to in ſuch a ſolemn manner. ‘ Though the affair did not ſucceed according to his ‘ deſire, and the expectation of the Florentines; yet ‘ as he ſaw, that every thing in Italy ſubmitted to the ‘ power of the French; he befriended the intereſt of ‘ Charles, in order to gain his favour; but after the ‘ death of that prince, which happened on the day ‘ before Palm-ſunday, in the year 1498, his great au‘thority ſunk very much, and he was ſuſpected of ‘ having laboured in that negotiation more for him‘ſelf than the Republic (11).

There is a great want of judgment in the laſt part of this paſſage: for in the oppoſite ſide of the leaf, the author obſerves, that the death of Charles VIII, happened only four or five days before that of Savonarola; and he relates the things which ruined the reputation of that Dominican, and which were followed by his impriſonment, and the drawing up of his proceſs. Does not this utterly overthrow what he had ſaid in the preceding page, *viz.* that by the death of Charles VIII, *the great authority of Savonarola ſunk very much*; The truth is, that his fortune was ruined before the death of that prince was known at Florence (12). Freherus has committed the ſame blunder (13).

We ſhall ſee in the following remarks a good many quotations which ſerve to prove the text of.this.

[*C*] *That he was hanged and burnt in the year* 1498.] I am of opinion that it was the twenty-third of May, as ſeveral authors affirm (14). Perhaps, it will be objected to me that Porcacchi (15) tells us, that Peter Delphino, General of the Camaldules, takes notice in his letters that Savonarola was executed on the very day of Aſcenſion, and that ſince he makes this remark in a letter purpoſely written the twenty-ſixth of July, 1498, on that Friar's death, we have reaſon to believe that he is not miſtaken. Now Aſcenſion-day that year was the twenty-fourth of May. They may ſay what they will, I rather chuſe to believe John Francis Picus (16), and Bzovius (17), who tell us that Savonarola was executed on Aſcenſion-eve. Porcacchi quotes this letter of Peter Delphino for no other reaſon, but to ſtart an objection againſt Guicciardin, whom he ſuppoſes to have affirmed, that Savonarola was put to death on Palm-ſunday, the ninth of April. But it is not true that Guicciardin ſays ſo: he only ſays, that the authority of that Friar came to an end the day after that on which Charles VIII died, being Palm-ſunday. *Finì il dì ſeguente a quello, nel qual terminò la vita di Carlo (giorno celebrato da' Chriſtiani per la ſolennità delle palme) in Firenze l' autorità del Savonarola* (18). One cannot tell to what his parentheſis relates, whether it be to the day on which Charles VIII died, or to the day following; but we may be very well aſſured that he intended to ſay, that the eighth of April was the laſt day of Savonarola's authority; for he had juſt before obſerved that Charles VIII ended his life on the day before the eighth of April (19). There is alſo reaſon to believe that he places on the day after that monarch's death, not the death of Savonarola, but his impriſonment; and thus the criticiſm of Porcacchi is not well grounded. I think there are ſome little failures in Guicciardin's words, and am therefore more inclined to follow the dates of John Burchard (20), according to which Savonarola was impriſoned the ninth of April, two days after the great ſhew for making the proof by fire; and as beſides it is certain that ſaturday the ſeventh of April, being the eve of Palm-ſunday, was the day on which Charles VIII died; one does not ſee how Guicciardin could ſay that Palm-ſunday was either the day of that prince's death, or of the ruin of Savonarola's power. Obſerve, by the by, how much thoſe people are miſtaken, who ſay that Charles VIIIth's death contributed towards the downfal of this Monk (21). They could not ſo much as have heard at Florence of that monarch's ſickneſs (22), when Savonarola was impriſoned. Philip de Comines is miſtaken, when he ſays that Charles VIII and Savonarola died *within four or five days of one another* (23). Petavius is likewiſe miſtaken, in putting down the ninth of April for the day of that Friar's puniſhment (24). Nauclerus ſays in general, that it was in the month of April (25). Peter de St Romuald places it in the twenty-firſt of September 1493 (26).

[*D*] *Philip de Comines . . . praiſes him much, and aſcribes to him the glory of having foretold certain things that came to paſs.*] Being come to Florence, where he went to meet Charles VIII on his return from Naples in the year 1495, he made a viſit to *Friar Jerom living at a reformed Convent, a man of a holy life as it was ſaid, and who had reſided fifteen years in that place* (27). ‘ My reaſon for going to ſee him,’ continues who ſtrive to juſtify the revelations of Savonarola; but as he mentions a prophecy which

---

(5) Jovius, in Vita Leonis X, *pag.* 47. *Add to this what he ſays in his* Elogies of learned men, *cap. xlii, p.* 99. Hieronymus Savonarola . . . . uſque adeo . . . . valuit; ut populum . . . quo vellet facile impelleret, privatiſque familiarum, ac ipſis quoque ſummi magiſtratus conſiliis miſceretur. Futura enim prædicere, veluti divino adflatum numine credebant. - - - *The authority of Savonarola . . . . was ſo great that he did what he pleaſed with the people . . . and had a ſhare in directing not only the private concerns of families but alſo the reſolution of the chief magiſtrates. For they believed him to be a Prophet inſpired by God.* See likewiſe *Volaterran*, lib. v, pag. m. 181, *& Gratianus, de Caſib. Viror. illuſtr.* pag. 131, 132.

(6) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, *pag.* 212.

(7) It is an Hyperbole; for John Picus, Hermolaus Barbarus, and ſome others were more learned than Savonarola.

(8) This expreſſion is too ſtrong when compared with the Latin of Jovius. See the foregoing remark, citat. (2).

(9) Lipſius, Monitor. & Exempl. Polit. *lib. i, cap. iii, pag. m.* 139.

(10) Ut ad Carolum Regem, Piſas legatus mitteretur. *Jovius in Elogiis, p.* 99.

(11) Bullart, Academie des Sciences, *Tom ii, pag.* 5. *See alſo* Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles VIII, *book iv, p.* 345, *Dutch Edition.*

(12) See the remark [*C*].

(13) Mutatis deinde rebus, Rege Carolo defuncto, & Florentinis diffidentibus, *Hieronymi* autoritas imminuebatur in dies. *Freher. in his Theatre, p.* 96. *Verheiden in Iconibus, pag.* 14. *ſays the ſame thing.*

(14) Jo. Franciſcus Picus, in Vita Savonarol. *pag.* 136. Reuſnerus in Diario Hiſtorico, *p.* 79. Wharton in Appendice ad Hiſtor. Literar. *p.* 163. Du Pin, Biblioth. *Tom. xii, p.* 115, *and ſeveral others.*

(15) In his marginal notes upon Guicciardin, *fol.* 99, *verſo.*

(16) In Vita Savonarol. *p.* 130.

(17) Bzovius, Annal. *Tom. xviii, ad ann.* 1498.

(18) Guicciardin, *lib. iii, fol. m.* 99, *verſo.*

(19) La notte innanzi all' ottavo dì d'Aprile morì il Re Carlo. *Id. ibid. fol.* 99.

(20) See remark [*G*].

(21) See remark [*C*].

(22) It was an Apoplexy that carried him off in a very ſhort time. See Varillas, in his Hiſtory of that Prince, the laſt page but one.

(23) Comines, *book viii, ch. xix.*

(24) Petavius, Ration. Temp. *Part. i, lib. ix, cap. x, pag. m.* 623.

(25) Naucler. *Part. ii, Gener. L, pag. m.* 990.

(26) In his Journal Chronol. *Tom. ii, p.* 334.

(27) *Comines,* book viii, ch. ii, pag. m. 498. *John Francis Picus in Vita Savonarolæ*, pag. m. 114, ſays that Savonarola went to Florence in the year 1489. Sixtus of Siena, *apud Pope Blount Cenſ. Auth. pag.*345, ſays that Savonarola preached at Florence for the ſpace of 7 years. Theſe calculations do not agree with that of Philip de Comines.

continues he (28), ‘ was becauſe he had always preached very much in the king's favour, and his words had kept the Florentines from turning againſt us: for never had a preacher ſo great an influence over a city: he had conſtantly foretold the king's coming, (notwithſtanding all that was ſaid or written to the contrary) affirming, that he was ſent by God to drive the tyrants out of Italy, and that nothing could reſiſt nor withſtand him: he had likewiſe ſaid that he would come to Piſa, and that he would enter the city, and that on the ſame day the Florentine ſtate would come to an end: and ſo it happened; for that very day was Peter de Medicis expelled: and many other things had he foretold in his ſermons before they came to paſs, as the death of Laurence de Medicis: and he likewiſe ſaid publickly that it was revealed to him. He had preached, that the ſtate of the Church ſhould be reformed by the ſword. This is not yet accompliſhed, but it is very near the point: and he ſtill maintains that it ſhall be *. Several perſons blamed him for pretending to divine revelations, others believed him. For my part I think him a good man: and I aſked him, whether the king could proceed in his journey without any danger to his perſon, conſidering the great preparations of the Venetians againſt him, of which he was able to give a better account than I could, who was juſt come from Venice. He anſwered, that the king would meet with ſome difficulties by the way, but he would overcome them all, and gain immortal honour by it, though he had not above a hundred men in his company; and that God, who had conducted him hither, would guard him in his return; but becauſe he had not applied himſelf as he ought, to the reformation of the Church, and becauſe he had ſuffered his ſoldiers to plunder and rob the people, as well thoſe of his own party, and ſuch as had opened their gates freely to him, as his enemies, that God had pronounced judgment againſt him; and that he ſhould ſhortly feel a laſh of the whip. However, he bid me tell him that if he would have compaſſion on the people, keep his army from doing miſchief, and puniſh them when they did it, as his duty required, God would revoke or mitigate his ſentence; and that it was not ſufficient for him to plead, *I my ſelf do no harm*. He added, that he would go himſelf to meet the king, and would tell him theſe words, and ſo he did, and ſpoke of the reſtitution of the Florentine places. When he mentioned that ſentence of God, the death of the dauphin came very freſh into my mind; for I knew nothing elſe that the king could lay ſo much to heart: and this I likewiſe ſay, to the end it may the better be underſtood, how the whole of this expedition was a myſtery conducted by God himſelf.’ It is thus that he ſpeaks in the ſecond chapter of the eighth book. Let us ſee what he ſays in the nineteenth chapter, where he relates the tragical end of this Dominican. ‘ Friar Jerom, who foretold many things before they came to paſs, ... had always maintained, that the king would paſs the Alps, and he preached it publickly, ſaying, that God had revealed to him as well that, as other things which he ſpoke of. He ſaid that the king was choſen by God to reform the Church by force, and to puniſh the tyrants; and becauſe he gave out that he knew things by revelation, ſeveral people murmured againſt him, and he drew upon himſelf the hatred of the Pope, and of ſeveral in the city of Florence. His life was exceedingly virtuous, as it plainly appeared, and his ſermons were levelled againſt vice, by which means he brought many of his fellow-citizens to live well, as I have ſaid. . . . . He has all along affirmed publickly in his ſermons, that the king would return once more into Italy, to fulfil that commiſſion which God had given him, to reform the Church by the ſword, and to drive the tyrants out of Italy, and that in caſe he did not do it, God would puniſh him ſeverely. He printed all his firſt ſermons with thoſe which he preached lately, and they are now to be ſold. As for that ſevere puniſhment with which, as he ſaid, God threatned the king, if he did not come back; Savonarola frequently wrote to him concerning it, not long before his death; and to the ſame purpoſe were the words which he ſaid to me, when I talked with him at the time of our return from Italy: for he told one that ſentence was given out in heaven againſt the king, in caſe he did not execute the will of God, and if he did not keep his men from plundering (29).’ He ſays (30), that the crimes laid in Savonarola's charge, were only *that he ſowed diſcord in the city, and that as to what he pretended to ſpeak by prophecy, he had private information of it from his friends that were of the council. I will neither accuſe nor excuſe them*, continues he; *I do not know whether they did well or ill in putting him to death: but he ſaid many true things which the Florentines could not poſſibly have told him: and as touching the king, and the evils that were to befal him according to Savonarola's prediction, you ſee what has happened to him; firſt his ſon's death, and then his own. I have ſeen ſome letters which he wrote to that prince.* Note he obſerves (31), that there were ſome *Florentines who ſtill expected the king's return, and wiſhed for it, on account of the hopes which Savonarola gave them, and that they waſted and exceedingly impoveriſhed themſelves by reaſon of the expence they were at, from an earneſt deſire to recover Piſa, and the other places which they had delivered to the king: among which, Piſa was then in the hands of the Venetians.*

REFLECTIONS upon this narrative of Philip de Comines.

I. This may induce us to believe that Savonarola foretold the return of Charles VIII, in a preciſe and abſolute manner; for if he had only foretold it as a thing probable, and grounded himſelf on this, *viz.* that God required and threatned to puniſh the king if it was not executed, he would not have inſpired the Florentines with ſo much confidence. It is then very likely, that he promiſed to them abſolutely as a certain fact, the ſecond expedition of Charles VIII; but that in addreſſing himſelf to that prince, he did not hold the ſame language, but only gave him to underſtand, that it was the will of God he ſhould return into Italy, and, in caſe of failure, denounced againſt him the indignation and the ſevere judgments of his Creator. He found no better way than this to verify the prophecies which he gave out at Florence. Philip de Comines, who was better acquainted with affairs of ſtate, than with the intrigues of prediction-makers, did not diſtinguiſh theſe two ſprings, or this duplicity of language: he confounded the one with the other, and ſuppoſes that the Monk added an *if* in his ſermons, as he did in his letters (32); which is contrary to all likelihood. It is proper to obſerve, that if this prophet had been very ſure in the matter, he would not have denounced theſe terrible judgments of God to Charles VIII; for in ſo doing, he believed it poſſible for that monarch not to make the ſecond expedition. How then durſt he foretel it, and ſay that God had revealed it to him? When God reveals that ſuch a thing will happen, is it in the power of man to hinder it from coming to paſs? Can they chuſe any meaſures that will prevent it? Is it neceſſary to threaten them with ſome misfortune, in caſe they ſhould make it miſcarry? Let us conclude, that the threatnings uſed with Charles VIII, and the certainty of the revelation touching his return into Italy, are things which can never be reconciled in any wiſe head. If you ſhould anſwer, that theſe threatnings were to ſerve as the means to bring about the event, and that therefore they were no ſign of Savonarola's uncertainty, I will deny the fact; for Charles VIII did not return into Italy, and conſequently the threatnings of that Monk were not one of the means which God had fore-ordained to that end. Turn yourſelf which way you will, you can never diſprove his being a falſe prophet in this point. He puts me in mind of the Drabicius's and Knotterus's of our days, people that began by wiſhing earneſtly for the ruin of the emperor, and who proceeded by foretelling it, afterwards by looking every where round for a prince able to procure it; and laſt of all, by ſignifying to that prince that he was predeſtinated to that great work, and that if he did not ſet about it, God would puniſh him ſeverely (33). There is ſometimes more malice than enthuſiaſm in this proceeding, a war is only aimed at: for as a man very well ſkilled in theſe artifices ſaid, it is certain that prophecies, whether ſuppoſed or true, have often inſpired the perſons for whom they were made, with the deſign of undertaking the things that were promiſed to them (34).

(28) Comines, ibid. *p.* 499.

* That might relate to the future taking of Rome, and the ranſom of Pope Clement VII, in the year 1527. This marginal note which I find in my edition, is not made by Philip de Comines, and I do not underſtand why he expreſſes himſelf in the preſent tenſe, and he ſtill maintains it, ſince he wrote his Memoirs, after Savonarola's death.

(29) Comines, *cap. xix, pag.* 594, 595.

(30) Ibid. *pag.* 596.

(31) Ibid. *pag.* 595.

(32) For example the king will return, or if he does not return, God will puniſh him.

(33) See the remark [*C*], of the article DRABICIUS.

(34) See the remark [*H*] of the article KOTTERUS. See alſo the remark [*C*], of the ſame article near the end.

which proved falſe, I mean that which affirmed that Charles VIII would come a ſecond time into Italy, he ſerves as a witneſs to thoſe who cenſure the ſaid prophet. This will appear from a paſſage that I quoted out of Gabriel Naudé [*E*], one of the authors who blame the conduct of our Monk. He does not do it with ſo much harſhneſs as Volaterranus who has roundly affirmed that Savonarola was an arrant cheat, and that riſing

II. I ſhall make another reflection upon the narrative of Philip de Comines. This author is too ready to help Savonarola out with the accompliſhment of his predictions. He verifies the threatnings of that monk in the death of the Dauphin, and in that of Charles VIII. They were looſe threatnings, and did not much expoſe him; for that prince might meet with vexations from a hundred quarters, and more eaſily than perſons of a private condition; ſo that one riſked nothing at all in threatning him with ſome misfortune. A prophet has nothing to fear when he keeps to ſuch generalities. He may even ſave himſelf by a back-door, in caſe the princes whom he threatens ſhould fall into no affliction: he may ſay, that ſuch long proſperity is a judgment from God, that it hinders them from minding their ſalvation, as they would have done in adverſity. Comines is too charitable and good-natured; he might have very well excuſed himſelf from making the applications. This fault has produced others; there are writers who have very falſly alledged his authority, for ſaying that Savonarola propheſied, that the King of France would not long ſurvive the Dauphin. *Neque inficias tamen ire Cominæus potuit, Savonarolam multa verè prædixiſſe, de quibus nemo mortalium potuiſſet admonere*, Nam & Regi, *inquit*, fore prædixit, ut extincto filio ipſe quoque non diu ſupereſſet (35).

Sleidan is perhaps the cauſe of the error which I have juſt taken notice of; for thus he has tranſlated the end of the paſſage of Philip de Comines: *Nam & Regi prædixit, fore, ut extincto filio, ipſe quoque non diu ſupereſſet, atque has illius ad regem literas, ipſe legi* (36). Nothing could be more unfair than this tranſlation; it does not at all anſwer to theſe words of the original: ‘Et touchant le Roy, & les maux qu'il dit luy devoir advenir, luy eſt advenu ce que vous voiez, qui ſeut (37) premier la mort de ſons fils, puis la ſienne, & ay veu des lettres qu'il eſcrivoit audit Signeur.’ The tranſlation has ſo confounded things, that it directly and formally aſcribes to the prophet what is no more than a pure comment of the hiſtorian. Beſides, it affirms, that the hiſtorian had ſeen the letters which contained that pretended prediction; but Comines only ſays, that he had ſeen ſome letters from Savonarola to the king. To make a faithful tranſlation, it ſhould have been expreſſed thus: *& quidem quoad Regem mala ipſi contigerunt quæ is eventura dixerat, quod ipſimet cernitis, nempe primo obitus filii, ac deinde ipſius Regis. Nonnullas vidi epiſtolas ſupradicto Principi ab eo ſcriptas.* This ſimplicity without elegance is much better than a fine Latin ſtile which corrupts the ſenſe of the original.

III. Here follows a third reflexion. The event has proved, that Charles VIII was not choſen by GOD to *reform the Church by the ſword*, and to *drive the tyrants out of Italy*. He no ways reformed the Church: Hiſtorians (38) mark his expedition as one of the æra's of the greateſt calamities of Italy; and it is certain that no advantage accrued from it to that part of the world. What elſe can we conclude from this, but that the Monk was deceived in his pretended revelations. He did not ſee farther than another into the decrees of GOD; but he had the confidence to boaſt that he knew them. Let it not be alledged that if Charles VIII had reformed the Church by his ſword, and cauſed his ſoldiers to obſerve an exact diſcipline, Savonarola's predictions would have had their full accompliſhment. Theſe are idle evaſions. When GOD predeſtinates to the end, he likewiſe predeſtinates to the means: ſo that if the means of reſtoring to the Church her primitive form, and to Italy her liberty, had depended on the ſword of Charles VIII, and on the good diſcipline of his troops, that prince would have been predeſtinated to theſe means, and if ſo, he would have put them in execution, for nothing can hinder the decrees of GOD. It is then falſe that providence had pitched upon him for this work; and conſequently Savonarola, who affirmed it, ought to be looked upon as a falſe prophet in that reſpect. I ſhall not repeat what has been ſaid elſewhere (39) in anſwer to the evaſions and ſubterfuges of thoſe who, after not ſucceeding in their predictions, lay the fault on the ſins of men. If theſe ſins were to hinder the event, there was no decree in heaven concerning the exiſtence of that thing: for which reaſon, every man who foretold that it would come to paſs was miſtaken; and if he had been truly inſpired, he would have known the real obſtacles that would happen, and not the pretended exiſtence of what was not to happen.

I do not know what authority Varillas had for ſaying that when there was a dearth at Florence, *it did no ſervice to Savonarola that he had foretold it, that on the contrary, the Florentines were ſo much the more offended at his not having applied a proper remedy* (40). They would not have been altogether in the wrong: for he governed the whole city; and if he was obliged as a prophet to foretel the barrenneſs of the earth; as director of the affairs of ſtate he was obliged to provide ſupplies of corn: otherwiſe, his prediction was to no purpoſe.

I muſt not omit that his converſation with Philip de Comines has been ill related by Varillas, who has not only tacked to it extravagant additions and enlargements, but likewiſe an intolerable falſity, *viz.* that Savonarola affirmed that Charles VIII would not return into Italy (41).

[*E*] *Philip de Comines ſerves as a witneſs to thoſe who cenſure Savonarola. This will appear from a paſſage of .... Gabriel Naudé.*] ‘Since all the praiſes which have hitherto been beſtowed upon that perſon, are to be aſcribed either to the affection of his friends and followers, or to the artifice and ſubtlety of heretics, who would gladly make him more zealous than St Paul, more learned than St Auguſtin, and more eloquent than St Chryſoſtom, becauſe they appropriate him to themſelves; I reckon that in order to judge of him with more reaſon and equity, we may in the firſt place ſay of the predictions which brought him into ſuch vogue and eſteem, that ſo far were they from being occaſioned by a divine enthuſiaſm, like thoſe of the prophets, and of many other ſaints and favourites of GOD, that on the contrary, they have been almoſt every one falſe †, as appears in his having affirmed that Charles VIII would come a ſecond time into Italy, that the perſon who ſhould graſp at the dominion of Florence would come to a miſerable end, that John Picus would recover of the illneſs of which he died two days after, and in many more of his prophecies, ſtill more vain, which are amply deduced and told in the book that John Poggius wrote upon the falſity of them: and that if any of them proved true, it muſt be owned, that this happened either by chance, or becauſe he had private information given him of what was to be done by a great number of friends that he had in the council of the Florentines, and in that of the King of France. Laſtly, As to what concerns the reſt of his actions, we may truly judge by theſe, that he was a very great politician, dignified ſometimes with the moſt honourable employments, and endowed with ſuch a ready and perſuaſive eloquence, that he may juſtly be compared to thoſe antient orators, who had no leſs dominion and influence upon popular and democratical ſtates, than the winds have upon the ſea, keeping them at pleaſure in the calm of peace, or in the ſtorms of war, making them roll ſometimes one way and ſometimes another, turning them upſide down, and, in ſhort, managing them at pleaſure, and to the tune of their diſcourſes. Savonarola may boaſt of having done this for above the ſpace of ten years at Florence, although he likewiſe made uſe of his revelations, and of his counterfeit and diſſembled piety, to keep up his credit and reputation ſo long, knowing from the examples of Arius and Mahomet, that the reſpect of religion has an extreme influence upon our minds; and that when once a man has got the fame of living holily, he makes the people believe what he pleaſes, eſpecially if he be endowed with a graceful

(35) Spizelius, in Infel. Literato, *pag.* 666. *He quotes p.* 636. *a paſſage of* John Francis Picus contra capitulum 11, Samuelis Caſſinenſis *where that error is to be found.*

(36) *Cominæus*, ex Verſione Latina *Sleidani* Edit. Amſt. 1656, in 12mo. As I have not this tranſlation at preſent by me, I quote it upon the authority of Mr Crenius, *Præf. ad Chriſtoph. Helvici Elenchum Judaicum*, *&c.* Edit. Lugd. Batav. 1702.

(37) It is *ſceut* in the editions of Sleidan, but the whole ſeries of the diſcourſe ſhews that we ought to read *feut*, or *fut*.

(38) See Guicciardin and Jovius at the beginning of their Hiſtories.

(39) See remark [*E*] of the article St BERNARD.

(40) Varillas, Ancedotes de Florence, *p.* 214.

(41) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles VIII, *book iv, pag.* 345, 346. *Dutch Edition.*

† Comines, *lib. viii, cap. xix.*

riſing up in rebellion againſt the Church he endeavoured to found a new ſect (*c*). What he adds, that Savonarola, when he went to church in order to preach, got armed men to accompany him (*d*), is no ſmall proof of a factious ſpirit. It cannot be denied that he concerned himſelf too much with political affairs [*F*]. This is always blameable in perſons who have dedicated themſelves to the miniſtry of the word of GOD; but they are chiefly to be condemned when they meddle with the government, in a ſtate which is divided into factions. Now this was preciſely Savonarola's caſe. There were two factions in the republic of Florence: the one endeavoured to ſupport the houſe of Medicis, or at leaſt the Ariſtocracy; the other wanted to extirpate that houſe, and to ſet up a popular governmnent. In theſe diviſions he made himſelf the head of a party, and the ſoul or *primum mobile* of the Democratical faction (*e*); ſo that he may be well compared

‘graceful delivery, and an uncommon eloquence (42).’ Naudé concludes, that it was eaſy for Savonarola *to bear rule at Florence*, quando, *as Jovius, in ſpeaking of him, has very well obſerved*; ‘Nihil validius eſſet ad perſuadendum, ſpecie ipſa pietatis, in qua etiam tuendæ libertatis ſtudium emineret (43). - - - - *Since there it not a more powerful inſtrument of perſuaſion than a ſhew of piety, in which alſo a great zeal for the ſupport of liberty is conſpicuous.*’

We ſhall ſee below ſome other ſtrokes of his cenſure. Take notice, if you pleaſe, that he might have found in Philip de Comines another proof of Savonarola's illuſions (44), and do not forget what he obſerves touching the information which that prophet could receive from the court of France, and the council of the Florentines. This was no bad method of foretelling. It has been ſaid, that there were confeſſors who revealed to him the ſecrets of their penitents, and that he owned it in priſon. Another good way of making it to be thought that he had revelations from above. ‘Frater Hieronymus carceribus mancipatus poſtquam ſepties quæſtionibus & tormentis expoſitus fuit, ſupplicavit pro miſericordia, offerens dicturum & ſcripturum omnia quibus deliquiſſet. Dimiſſus eſt de tortura & ad carceres repoſitus, & aſſignata ſibi carta & atramento ſcripſit crimina & delicta ſua in foliis, ut aſſerebant, LXXX & ultra, ſcilicet quod non habuit unquam aliquam revelationem divinam, ſed habuit intelligentiam cum pluribus ex Fratribus in civitate Florentia & extra eam per multa milliaria reſidentibus qui ei *Confeſſiones Chriſti fidelium revelarent* cum confitentium nominibus & cognominibus, ex quibus ſibi plura dicebantur, & confitentes ipſos pro hujuſmodi peccatis & criminibus privatim, aliquando in genere publicè corripiebat, aſſerens ſibi à Salvatore noſtro Domino Jeſu Chriſto eſſe revelata (45). *Savonarola being committed to priſon, after he was ſeven times put to the rack, begged for mercy, promiſing that he would make a full diſcovery of all his crimes in writing. He was releaſed from the torture, and remanded back to priſon, and having paper and ink given him, he wrote down his crimes and offences in eighty leaves and upwards, as it is affirmed,* viz. *confeſſing that he never had any divine revelation, but that he held a correſpondence with ſeveral Friars reſiding in the city of Florence, and many miles out of it, who revealed to him the confeſſions of their penitents, together with their names and ſirnames, which gave him ſtill farther information; and that he ſometimes publickly reproved in general thoſe who had confeſſed the like crimes in private, affirming that they had been revealed to him by our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.*’ This is what we meet with in the journal of a maſter of the ceremonies under Pope Alexander VI. I have not the book where John Poggius gives the particulars of Savonarola's prophetical lies; but the following paſſage ſpecifies ſome of them. *A perſon named John Poggius* wrote a *treatiſe which was printed at Rome, containing thirteen chapters, in all which, addreſſing his ſpeech to Savonarola himſelf, after having proved his predictions to be falſe, particularly, for that having ſent his cap to Charles Strozza, when he was upon his death-bed, and foretold that he ſhould be inſtantly and throughly cured by putting it on, the ſaid Strozza had no ſooner touched it but he gave up the ghoſt; and in the like manner, having ſent it to a Goldſmith called Coſmo, and to ſeveral other ſick perſons for the ſame purpoſe,* viz. *of a cure, foretold and promiſed, they all of them died in a very ſmall time: and likewiſe for that he had publickly affirmed that John Picus of Mirandola, would recover of the illneſs of which he died two days after that prediction. I ſay, the ſaid John Poggius after having confuted the reaſons of Savonarola, and exhorted him to return under the obedience of the Pope, proves him to be an infidel, an infamous apoſtate, a ſeditious man, a diſturber of the publick peace and happineſs, a ſchiſmatic, a rebel to the ſupreme biſhop, and therefore juſtly excommunicated* (46). Read alſo this other paſſage: *Quam ille multa de Eccleſiæ reformatione, de Turcarum & Maurorum converſione, de Florentinorum fœlicitate, quæ mox adimplenda & aſtantium multi erant viſuri antequam moreretur, prædixit? addens* (in revelationum compendio) *illas abſolutas & immutabiles Prophetias eſſe? Attamen nihil horum ferè adhuc contigit, pleraque omnia intra centum ferme annos contraria contigerunt* (47). Martin del Rio reproaches him in theſe words, with having foretold abſolutely, and without condition, three or four things as immutable and near events, the reverſe of which had happened before the revolution of a century He had foretold the converſion of the Moors and Turks, and the felicity of Florence, that is to ſay according to the principles of Democracy. But ſo far were the Florentines from recovering that government, that they fell under a monarchical one. He ſeemed to be ſo firmly perſuaded of the certainty of his predictions, and had ſo rivetted that perſuaſion in the Monks of his convent, that he and they conſented to verify by the teſt of fire (48), the following poſitions; I. The Church of GOD wants reformation: II. It ſhall be ſcourged; and III. It ſhall be renewed: IV. Florence ſhall be ſo too after having been ſcourged: V. There ſhall be hopes after that, and the infidels ſhall be converted to JESUS CHRIST: VI. All theſe things ſhall happen in our days: VII. The excommunication of Friar Jerom is void, thoſe who pay no regard to it do not ſin (48*). He affirmed, that he had ſuch a diſtinct view of futurity, and was ſo thoroughly ſatisfied with the evidence of that object, that it would have been as difficult for him not to give his aſſent thereto, as to deny the firſt principles (49). It is in this ſtrain that a perſon muſt ſpeak, who deſires that what he preaches up in a prophetical manner ſhould make a deep impreſſion upon peoples minds; but the return from this voyage is ſomewhat dangerous.

[F] *It cannot be denied that he concerned himſelf too much with political affairs.*] *He begun by little and little to ſhew ſome marks of his ſecret ambition, when ſo ſoon as in the year* 1484, *as he himſelf ſays in the book he wrote on his prophecies, he mixed with Politicians, and procured himſef to be called to the council, which at that time was held at Florence for eſtabliſhing a popular government, where he excited all the citizens to embrace it with one conſent; and propoſed to them four or five points of great conſequence, in order to ſupport themſelves in it, ſaying, that theſe were revealed to him by* GOD *Almighty, and that they ought punctually to obſerve them, if they were deſirous of making their ſtate the moſt flouriſhing in all Italy. Whereupon, tho' affairs had not taken the turn that he expected, he nevertheleſs did not fail to improve, day after day, his credit with the people, teaching, in the ſermons he preached in the year* 1489 *on St John's revelation, that the Church was threatned with a ſpeedy reformation, after that of the petty kings and tyrants of Italy, who were ſhortly to feel the avenging ſcourge of all their iniquities. He proved this in ſuch a manner by paſſages of the holy ſcripture, and by maintaining the certainty of his revelations, that after the expedition of Charles VIII into Italy, which he had foretold and proclaimed two years before, every body ſo confidently expected that he would return again, as Savonarola affirmed, that they did not loſe hopes of it till the year* 1498, *in which King Charles, and*

(*c*) Volaterran. ubi infra.

(*d*) Non religioſis ſed Militum gladiis atque lictoribus ſtipatus ad templum divinumque verbum prædicandum accedebat. *Volaterran. lib. v, pag. m.* 181.

(*e*) See remark [*G*].

(42) Naudé, Apologie des grands Hommes accuſez de Magie, *chap. xvi, pag. m.* 455. *& ſeq.*

(43) Id. ibid. *pag.* 460.

(44) That which I have obſerved in the remark [*C*], viz. that Charles VIII was deſtined to procure the reformation of the Church, and the deliverance of Italy.

(45) Excerpa ex Diario Johannis Burchardi, *pag.* 55. *Edit. Hannoveranæ* 1696. *See alſo pag.* 46, *and the* Preuves & Obſervations ſur les Memoires de Comines, *pag.* 335, *the Hague Edition* 1683.

(46) Du Verdier Vauprivas, Proſopographie, *Tom. iii, pag.* 2333, 2334.

(47) Martin. Del Rio, Diſquiſ. Magicar. *lib. iv, cap. i, Quæſt. III,* §. *vi, pag. m.* 197.

(48) See the remark [*G*].

(48*) Excerpta ex Diario Burchardi, *pag.* 46. Preuves ſur Comines, *pag.* 331; *but inſtead of* fideles, *we muſt read* infideles.

(49) Adeo clare cernant futura, iiſque præbeant aſſenſum; ut æque facilè ſint negaturi prima, & receptiſſima notiſſimaque Scientiarum principia, quod de Savonarola ille dictitabat. (*in Compendio Revel*) & de quodam ſuo familiari, quem non nominat, Picus affirmat, quem ego Hieronymum hunc fuiſſe opinor. *Mart. Del Rio, Diſquiſ. Magicar.* lib. iv, cap, i, Quæſt. I, pag. 139. See *John Francis Picus, in Vita Savonarolæ*, pag. m. 113.

compared to the tribunes of the people, who favoured Marius againſt Sylla in the Roman republic, or rather to the Athenian Demagogues, who ſo frequently became the directors of the ſtate. Can a Fryar, a miniſter of the altar, in a word, a clergyman, embark in this ſtormy ſea? Is it not a kind of engagement to ſin? Will not ſuch a man be almoſt neceſſarily obliged to ſupport himſelf by foul intrigues, and by plots that generally end in popular tumults (*f*), in plunderings, in maſſacres, in proſcriptions, and in ſentences of death haſtily paſſed, and no leſs haſtily executed, by the faction which hath prevailed. Savonarola's party redered themſelves odious by ſuch an execution upon ſeveral conſiderable perſons (*g*), and he thereby ſowed the ſeeds of his own ruin. He did no leſs contribute to it by his contempt for the thunders of the Vatican, and his declamations againſt the Pope; but what compleated his deſtruction was, that having agreed that his doctrines ſhould be verifyed by the trial of fire, he viſibly ſhuffled, and his heart failed him, when the time came for executing his engagement [*G*]. By

and he that had favoured him ſo much in his ſermons, were tranſlated from this life into another (50) . . . . . *He had incurred the hatred not only of Pope Alexander VI, and of the greateſt part of the clergy, againſt whom he uſed to declaim in the pulpit; but likewiſe of all the principal citizens of Florence, by the execution which he adviſed to be made of ſeven or eight of the chief noblemen amongſt them: ſo that having no friends left but the partiſans of Paul Antony Soderini, who made uſe of him to ſupport the popular government, in oppoſition to Guy Antony Veſpucci, who wanted to eſtabliſh an Ariſtocratical form, they were not able to reſiſt thoſe of the contrary party, who, during this commotion, broke open the gates of his convent, and dragged him to puniſhment. This they did in order that their city might have reſt and quiet, by the death of that man who kept them at variance with the Pope, on account of his new doctrine, and nouriſhed factions and diviſions amongſt them, which, if they had been ſuffered to go any further, could not have failed to end in the ruin of their ſtate and authority* (51). Had he meddled with the government, with no other view but to maintain concord, and had ſucceeded in his deſign, he could hardly be excuſed; for as laymen have no buſineſs with things appertaining to the altar, ſo Monks have as little to do with political affairs: every one ſhould keep within the bounds of his own profeſſion. What ſhall we ſay then of a man who immerſed himſelf wholly in cabals of ſtate, and occaſioned ſo many troubles and diviſions? Paul Jovius is moderate enough in the cenſure which he paſſes upon him. 'Is Mediceo nomini maximè erat 'infeſtus, oppugnabatque eum Reipublicæ ſtatum, 'quem paucorum potentium, uti prædicabat, vis & 'libido regere poſſet: ob id civitatem in partes jam 'planè diduxerat, ita ut à gravibus ſaniſque civibus 'non ineptè reprehenderetur, quòd a religione divi'narumque rerum contemplatione, ambitioſius quam 'ſacratum virum deceret, ad munia regendæ Reipub'licæ tranſiviſſet (52). - - - *He was chiefly ſet againſt the 'family de Medicis, and oppoſed that form of a Re'public, which, as he ſaid, was liable to be governed 'by the violence and luſt of a few great men. For this 'reaſon he had evidently divided the city into parties, 'and was very juſtly cenſured by grave and wiſe citi'zens; becauſe, that laying aſide his religious profeſſion, 'and the contemplation of divine matters, he had con'cerned himſelf in the management of the ſtate, with 'more ambition than became a man of his holy profeſ'ſion.*' See in Guicciardin (53), how he declared it to be the will of God, that the government of the people ſhould be ſet up, and neverthelеſs, he conſented that they ſhould infringe the prerogatives of that form of government, in the point of executing four or five perſons that were condemned for high treaſon. 'Their 'relations having appealed from the ſentence to the 'great council of the people, by virtue of a law 'which had been made at the eſtabliſhment of the 'Democracy; thoſe who had been authors of the con'demnation, fearing leſt compaſſion for their age and 'quality, and the multitude of their relations, ſhould 'mitigate in the minds of the people the ſeverity of 'the ſentence, beſtirred themſelves ſo much, that they 'procured it to be debated before a ſmaller number 'of citizens, whether they ſhould be ſuffered to pro'ceed in their appeal or not; where, as the advan'tage both in number and authority was on their 'ſide, who maintained, that it was a dangerous thing, 'and might very poſſibly end in ſedition; and that 'the laws themſelves allowed they might be diſpenſed 'with in the like caſe to prevent tumults; ſome of 'the chief magiſtrates were impetuouſly, and in a 'manner by force and threatnings, forced to conſent, 'that, notwithſtanding the appeal lodged, the execu'tion ſhould be performed that very night; and in 'this the friends of Savonarola were more zealous 'than the reſt, to the great ſcandal of him who did 'not diſſuade, even his own followers, from violating 'a law which he himſelf had propoſed a few years 'before, as very uſeful, and almoſt neceſſary for the 'preſervation of liberty (54).' We may diſcover in this conduct of Savonarola, ſome marks of the unregenerated man, and of the unchriſtian Politician. Note, That Varillas ſuppoſes that this Monk endeavoured to ſave the lives of theſe ſtate-criminals (55). Had that been true, Guicciardin would not have ſaid juſt the reverſe. I add, that Antony Maria Gratiana, Biſhop of Amelia, obſerves, that the relations of the condemned perſons in vain beſought Valori and Savonarola upon their knees; they could not obtain for them that they ſhould enjoy the privilege of an appeal to the people (56).

[*G*] *What compleated his deſtruction was, that having agreed that his doctrines ſhould be verified by the trial of fire, he viſibly ſhuffled . . . . when the time came for executing his engagement.*] Guicciardin has diſcovered ſo great an inclination to juſtify Savonarola, that I cannot chuſe a leſs ſuſpected narrative than his. I ſhall quote it ſomewhat at length, that I may ſhew all the cauſes of this Monk's ruin. *Savonarola . . . . having been long before accuſed to the Pope of the following crimes, that he preached ſcandalouſly againſt the manners of the clergy, and of the court of Rome, that he nouriſhed diviſions in Florence, that his doctrine was not entirely Catholic, and having, for theſe reaſons, been ſummoned to appear at Rome by ſeveral apoſtolical briefs, refuſed to go there, alledging divers excuſes; and, on this account, he had at laſt in the preceding year been excommunicated by the Pope. By reaſon of this ſentence he abſtained ſome months from preaching, and if he had abſtained longer, he might have obtained his abſolution eaſily; becauſe the Pope, who made no great account of Savonarola, had proceeded againſt him rather by the inſtigation and perſuaſion of his adverſaries, than for any other cauſe. But he, concluding that it was owing to his ſilence that his reputation declined ſo faſt, or that the end which he had in view was thereby interrupted, as he had chiefly raiſed himſelf by his vehemence in preaching, deſpiſed the Pope's orders, and returned afreſh to the public diſcharge of that office; affirming that the cenſures publiſhed againſt him were unjuſt and void, as being contrary to the will of God, and prejudicial to the intereſt of ſociety. He railed moſt ſeverely at the Pope and the whole court: which occaſioned a violent uproar. His adverſaries (whoſe authority with the people increaſed daily) deteſted this diſobedience, and laid to his charge that by his raſh conduct the Pope's mind was altered, and that too at a time when he was treating with other confederates about the reſtitution of Piſa, and when it was proper to do every thing that might confirm him in that inclination. On the other hand, his followers defended him; ſaying, that people ought not, for the ſake of worldly conſiderations, to diſturb the works of God; nor conſent that, under ſuch pretexts, the Popes ſhould begin to meddle with the affairs of their Republic. This diſpute having laſted ſeveral days, and the Pope being ſtrangely provoked, and thundring out new briefs and threatnings of excommunication againſt the whole city, he was at length commanded by the magiſtrates to deſiſt from preaching. He obeyed their orders, but ſeveral of his brethren did in divers churches the ſame thing that he*

(*f*) In Republics ſeditions are commonly the *Sacra Anchora*, the laſt reſource, or the laſt reaſon of one of the parties. They are the ſame that great guns are in kingdoms, *Ratio ultima Regum*, - - *The laſt argument of kings*. They are *Deus in Machina*, the God that unravels the incidents of the plot, and who decides the cauſe.

(*g*) See Paul Jovius, in Vita Leonis X, *pag. m.* 51.

(50) Naudé, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 447, & *ſeq.*

(51) Id. ibid. *pag.* 449, & *ſeq.*

(52) Paulus Jovius, in Vita Leonis X, *pag.* 48.

(53) Guicciardin, *lib. ii. folio m.* 45, *verſo.*

(54) Guicciardin, *lib. iii. fol.* 124.

(55) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, *pag.* 216.

(56) Gratianus, de Caſibus Virorum illuſtrium, *pag.* 133.

By this means he loſt his reputation, and the very next day (b) a number of armed men haſtened to his convent, and having dragged him from thence delivered him into the

he had done. As the clergy was no leſs divided than the laity, the Monks of other orders did not ceaſe to preach againſt him with great vehemence: and they were inflamed at length to ſuch a degree, that one of the Friars who adhered to Savonarola, and one of the Friars minors, agreed to enter into the fire in the preſence of the whole people, to the end, that, according as Savonarola's Friar ſhould eſcape or be burnt, every one might plainly ſee whether he was a prophet or an impoſtor: becauſe formerly he had ſeveral times affirmed in his ſermons, that, as a ſign of the truth of his predictions, he would obtain of G O D, *when it ſhould be neceſſary, the favour to paſs unhurt through the middle of the fire. Being nevertheleſs vexed, that the propoſal of coming to an immediate proof of it ſhould have been made without his knowledge, he dexterouſly tried to divert it. But as the thing had already gone too far, and was preſſed by ſome citizens, who deſired to ſee their country rid of ſo much vexation, it was at laſt neceſſary to proceed. Wherefore the two Friars, accompanied by all their brethren, being come on the day appointed to the place which is before the public palace, where were aſſembled, not only all the people in Florence, but likewiſe ſeveral others from the neighbouring towns: The Friars minors were informed, that Savonarola had ordered his Monk to carry the ſacrament in his hand when he entered into the fire. As they begun to proteſt againſt this, and to alledge, that by ſuch means an attempt was made to endanger the authority of the Chriſtian faith, which would decline very much in the minds of the ignorant, if the Hoſt ſhould burn; and as Savonarola, who was preſent, ſtill perſiſted in his reſolution, there aroſe ſuch a diſcord between them, that they did not proceed to make the experiment. He loſt ſo much credit by this, that the next day his adverſaries, encouraged by ſome accidental tumult* (57), *took arms, and joining to theſe the authority of the ſupreme magiſtrate, they entred by force into the convent of St Mark, where he reſided, and carried him, together with two of his brethren, to the publick goal* (58).

We ought not to blame Guicciardin for omitting the minute particulars of this amazing challenge; for ſuch an hiſtorian is not obliged to trace the progreſs of things of that kind. It is ſufficient for him to give the ſubſtance of them: but the reader will no doubt be very glad to find here ſupplements to Guicciardin's narrative, ſince we are ſpeaking of a very ſingular adventure. I ſhall ſay then, that the ſeven theſes which I have mentioned above (59), were the firſt ſubject of the challenge. Savonarola having given notice that he would defend them, a Friar minor inveighed againſt them in his ſermons, and offered to maintain that they were heretical. He was ſeconded by his brethren, and Savonarola by his, ſo that a violent diſpute aroſe between the two orders. The Dominicans declared, that they were ready to forfeit their lives, if they did not make out the truth of thoſe theſes before an unſuſpected judge, and they choſe the fire for ſuch a judge (60). The Franciſcans having accepted of it; Dominic de Peſcia a Jacobin, ſigned a writing by which he engaged to enter into the fire with the Friar minor that had preached againſt the theſes. He declared, that he hoped to come out ſafe and ſound from the middle of the flames. The Friar minor declared that he was ready to diſpute with Friar Savonarola, and that another Franciſcan ſhould enter into the fire with Dominic de Peſcia. Some other Franciſcans offered themſelves to this trial, with the hopes of paſſing thro' it unhurt: but there was one who required that Savonarola ſhould enter with him into the fire, and who confeſſed that he believed he himſelf ſhould periſh in it (61). A great number of Dominicans bound themſelves by writing to undergo the trial: a great many others made the ſame offer; and on the firſt day of April 1498, almoſt every one of Savonarola's hearers cried out, Here am I, Sir, here am I, that will enter into the fire for your glory. *Queſta matina ultimamente che ſiamo a di primo d'Aprile, parrechie migliara di perſone, di quelle che ſi trovano in ſancto Marco noſtro alla predica con grandiſſimo fervore, gridando ciaſcuno, ecco io, ecco io, andarò in queſto fuoco per gloria tua ſignore* (62). It was thought ſtrange that Savonarola did not accept the challenge of the Franciſcan, who demanded him by name for an antagoniſt. He juſtified himſelf, by ſaying that it was not worth his while to enter into the fire with a ſingle Franciſcan; but that if his adverſaries, and eſpecially ſuch of them as reſided at Rome, and their adherents, would expoſe themſelves to the fire, he was ready to accompany them; being well aſſured that he ſhould come off in the ſame manner as the three Hebrews that were caſt into the furnace at Babylon. *Si maſſimamente per che il mio entrare nel fuoco con un ſolo frate non farebbe quella utilità nella chieſa che richiede una tant' opera, quanto e queſta ch' iddio ci hà poſta nelle mani. Et però mi ſon offerto & mi offeriſco de novo, di far io proprio Iſperienza, ogni volta che gl' auverſarii di queſta noſtra doctrina & maxime que' de Roma e lor adherenti vogliano commettere la cauſa in queſto padre ò in altri, & mi confido nel noſtro Salvatore Jeſu Chriſto & non dubito punto ch'io andarò per il fuoco come fece Sidrac, Meſach & Abednago nella fornace ardente, non non per miei meriti ò virtu, mà per virtu di Dio, il quale vorrà confirmare la ſua verità & manifeſtare la ſua gloria in queſto mundo* (63). I paſs by the other anſwers which he made to the objections: they are to be ſeen in this book which I quote (64).

The magiſtrates of Florence having well conſidered all theſe challenges, and the commotions which this thing bred in the city, gave orders that they ſhould proceed to the execution of their engagements on ſaturday the ſeventh of April 1498. The Friar minor, accompanied only with one of his brethren, went to the place of execution before the hour appointed; but Dominic de Peſcia let it paſs, and came, a little after, in proceſſion with the croſs and the Hoſt, and with Savonarola, and all his brethren, and a great multitude of people. The Friar minor declared to the magiſtrates that he did not at all doubt but that he ſhould be burnt, and begged of them not to paſs a judgment in Savonarola's favour, unleſs the Dominican ſhould come out of the fire without receiving any harm. This was promiſed to him: and becauſe there were people who ſuſpected, that the one or other of the Friars, or perhaps both, had hid ſome charm under their gown, they were ordered to pull off their clothes, and to put on new ones, which had been juſt made for them. The Friar minor conſented to it, and even offered to go naked into the flames. The Dominican on the other hand made uſe of ſubterfuges to keep his gown; and it was granted him at the requeſt of the Friar minor himſelf, who repreſented, that ſince it was of cloth it would infallibly burn with the perſon that had it on. Afterwards, the Dominican proteſted that he would not enter into the fire without the crucifix. This was agreed to at the entreaty ſtill of the Friar minor, who repreſented that the crucifix was of wood, and that conſequently inſtead of being a preſervative againſt the fire, it would be burnt with the Dominican. The latter aſked, as a new favour, that he might be allowed to enter into the fire with the holy ſacrament, and declared, that without that he would not expoſe himſelf to the trial. The magiſtrates refuſed to grant his petition, and thereupon the aſſembly broke up; every one returned to his own houſe; and this was the iſſue of an affair which had drawn the attention of the whole city (65). People murmured, chafed, and entertained ſuſpicions againſt Savonarola; and on the monday following, which was the ninth of April, they atacked the monaſtery of the Dominicans, and took that Friar out by force (66).

I take this from the Journal of John Burchard, who was clerk of the chapel to Pope Alexander VI, and maſter of the ceremonies. He ſays, that theſe things were thus notified to the Pope by the Florentine ambaſſador. I confeſs, that the narrative of an apologiſt for Savonarola (67) does not agree in every circumſtance with this, and that it contains a curious particular, which is not in the other, *viz.* that Savonarola offered to forfeit his life, in caſe the very ſilk that covered the holy ſacrament ſhould receive the leaſt damage by the fire. The Apologiſt adds, 1. That Dominic de Peſcia would have entered into the flames without the conſecrated Hoſt, if one of his companions (68) had not been warned by Angels, that it was not fit he ſhould enter otherwiſe: 2. That perhaps this angelical warning was deſigned to hinder people from imputing this miracle to ſome magic virtue, the

(b) Two days after according to ſome authors.

(57) Bullart, Academie des Sciences, *Tom. ii, pag.* 6, ſays that Savonarola raiſed this tumult among the people.

(58) Guicciardin, book iii, near the end. *fol. m.* 127, *ad ann.* 1498.

(59) In the rem. [*E*], citat. (48).

(60) My author, who ſays this pag. 46, quotes pag. 51, ſome Extracts from a diſcourſe of Savonarola which intimate that the Franciſcans were the firſt that propoſed the teſt of fire. See below citat. (72).

(61) Bench' io creda ardere, ma per ſalute dell' anime ſon molto contento che io ardi. *Excerpta ex Diario Burchardi*, pag. 48.

(62) Ibid. *p.* 50.

(63) Ibidem.

(64) Ibid. & pagina ſequenti.

(65) *It might well have been ſaid upon that occaſion,*
Spectatum admiſſi riſum teneatis amici?
Would you not laugh to ſee this fooliſh ſhow?
Horat. de Arte Poet. ver. 5, *or*
Parturiunt montes naſcetur ridiculus mus.
The lab'ring mountain breeds a ſilly mouſe.
CREECH.
Id. ibid. ver. 129.

(66) *Taken from the* Excerpta ex Diario Joh. Burchardi, *pag.* 49, & *ſeq.*

(67) Joannes Franciſcus Picus, in Vita Savonarolæ, *pag.* 128, & *ſeq.*

(68) He was called Sylveſter of Florence.

the hands of juſtice. He was put to the rack, and it is ſaid that he confeſſed his impoſture [*H*]. He was hanged and burnt with two other Jacobin Friars, Dominic of Peſcia and Sylveſter of Florence, of whom the one had refuſed to enter into the fire

the effects of which are reſtrained by the preſence of the holy ſacrament. I obſerve, that Volaterranus has not related this adventure well; for he ſuppoſes (69) that Savonarola having boaſted that he had the gift of miracles, and that he could paſs unhurt thro' the middle of the fire, the magiſtrates ordered him to make the trial, and diſcovered the cheat, by ſeeing him reſolved not to do it without the Hoſt in his hand. This error of Volaterranus in ſuch an eſſential circumſtance of a fact, which he had almoſt ſeen with his own eyes is unpardonable.

Reflections upon Savonarola's conduct, with regard to the challenge of the Franciſcan.

For the reſt, we cannot accuſe thoſe people of being raſh, who entertained ſuſpicions to Savonarola's diſadvantage; all appearances were againſt him. It was already a prejudice againſt him, that being perſonally challenged to enter into the fire, he declined to enter himſelf, and ſubſtituted a deputy. He made a very fooliſh excuſe, when he pretended that by reaſon of the great work to which he was deſtined by God, it was beneath him to engage with a ſingle Franciſcan; for he could have done nothing more uſeful towards the advancement of that work, than the good ſucceſs of the trial would have been. What more authentic proof could he give of his extraordinary miſſion, than to convince the people that he paſſed unhurt thro' the middle of the flames which conſumed his accuſer? Would not this have been as ſufficient to legitimate his miſſion, as the puniſhment of Korah was to confirm that of Moſes? Obſerve well, that this Monk did not expreſs any doubt of the activity of the fire. He ſaid, he was fully perſuaded that he ſhould receive no manner of damage (70): ſince therefore he was to ſurvive the tryal, he had no reaſon to believe that it would incapacitate him for executing his deſigns. On the contrary, he had reaſon to believe that it would render him the more capable of bringing them about. We ſee then that he gave grounds for a violent ſuſpicion, that he was afraid of loſing his honour and his life at the ſame time; and it was no ſign of courage his offering himſelf to the perſonal proof, provided his enemies at Rome would undergo it with him: for there is no manner of difference between promiſing nothing at all, and promiſing upon ſuch conditions as one knows will not be accepted.

Do not object to me his conſenting that one of his brethren ſhould enter into the fire, and let it not be concluded from thence that he acted ingenuouſly. I confeſs that he hazarded his reputation, as he ſays himſelf, and that he would have been obliged to abſcond, if his deputy had loſt his life. *Si uno di queſti tali andando ſotto la mia fede & per far l'ubedienza da me impoſta come ſi ſono promptiſſimamente offerti, ardeſſe nel fuoco, chi non vedde ch'io & che queſta tutt'opera & impreſa di Dio andarebbe meco in ruina & ch'io non potrei piu in alcun luogo comparire* (71). But that does not prove his ſincerity; for the challenges of the Franciſcans had him reduced to ſuch a non-plus, that he could not preſerve his reputation but by expoſing himſelf to that teſt of fire, or by conſenting that one of his brethren ſhould do it. He confeſſes, that without this, the honour of GOD, and his holy truth, would fall to the ground: *Concioſia che noi non habbiamo offerto queſta tale iſperienza & fuoco,* mà loro ſono quelli che ce l'hanno meſſo inanzi; *& noi ſiamo coſtanti ad accettar la, accio che l'honor di Dio & la ſua ſanta verità non vadi per terra* (72). What was to be done in ſo great an extremity? It was neceſſary to ſhew confidence at leaſt in the perſon of a deputy, truſting to this, that the magiſtrates would not order the proof, or that, at worſt, expedients might be contrived to elude it, which would be of leſs conſequence, being employed by Dominic de Peſcia, than if Savonarola himſelf ſhould make uſe of them. Such were actually invented. It is true they were of no great ſervice; but the thing was gone ſo far, that it was not now the queſtion, whether one ſhould hazard nothing at all, but whether one ſhould hazard more or leſs.

The Friars minors obtained an indiſputable advantage: their champion diſcovered both a great deal of charity, and a great deal of courage; for he preſented himſelf to a certain death; he had good ſenſe enough to be perſuaded that the fire would give no quarter to him, he was ready to die for the ſalvation of ſo many ſouls, who, as he thought, were miſled by Savonarola. He hoped, that their eyes would be opened, and that the deceit would laſt no longer than they ſhould ſee the ſubſtitute of the deceiver periſh in the flames. He had ſome grounds to fear leſt they ſhould judge that, ſince the two antagoniſts periſhed alike, both ſides were in the wrong; but without doubt he hoped that the evil would entirely ceaſe, provided it was once believed that Savonarola erred. Note, That if the Dominicans, who offered themſelves to the trial, were fully perſuaded, that the fire would reſpect them, they did not ſhew much courage. Note alſo, that by virtue of that perſuaſion, they thought themſelves innocent of the crime of ſelf-murther. 'Mi 'confido, *ſaid Savonarola* (73), nel Sig. & Salvatore 'Jeſu Chriſto, & nel ſuo S. Evangelio, che ciaſcuno 'di loro ne uſcirà illeſo, cioe ſenza alcun damno, & 'quando di queſto dubitaſſe punto, non lo direi, per 'non eſſer homicida. - - - - *I truſt in our Lord and* '*Saviour* JESUS CHRIST, *and in his Goſpel, that every* '*one of them ſhall come out unhurt, and if I had the leaſt* '*doubt of it, I would not ſay ſo, for fear of being a* '*murtherer.*' He laid that crime to the charge of his adverſaries, who offered themſelves to the proof, believing at the ſame time that they ſhould periſh in it (74).

[*H*] *It is ſaid that he confeſſed his impoſture.*] What Guicciardin relates, ſavours of a man who is tender of unfortunate peoples reputation. *Savonarola,* ſays he, *was examined with tortures, although they were not very ſevere; and upon the examination, a proceſs was publiſhed, which (laying aſide all the injurious reproaches that had been thrown out againſt him, of avarice, or bad morals, or of his having carried on ſecret intrigues with princes) contained, that his predictions had not proceeded from divine revelation, but from his own opinion, grounded upon the doctrine and obſervation of the holy ſcripture, and that he had not been induced thereto from any ill deſign, nor from a deſire of acquiring high preferments in the Church by that means: but that he had earneſtly wiſhed to be the inſtrument of calling a general council, in which the corrupt manners of the clergy might be reformed, and the ſtate of the Church of* GOD, *which had deviated ſo far, might be reduced to as great a reſemblance as poſſible of thoſe days that were neareſt to the times of the Apoſtles; and that he would have thought it a much greater honour to finiſh that great and uſeful work, than to obtain the papal dignity; becauſe the former could only proceed from a moſt excellent life and doctrine, and a ſingular reſpect for all men, whereas the latter was very often obtained by ill means, or by the favour of fortune. In conſequence of this proceſs, confirmed by him in the preſence of ſeveral Friars likewiſe of his order, but (if what his adherents publiſhed afterwards be true) in few words, and in ſuch as were capable of divers interpretations; by ſentence of the general of the Dominicans, and of Biſhop Romolino, who was afterwards Cardinal of Surrente, the commiſſaries deputed by the Pope, he and the other two Friars were with the uſual ceremonies in the Church of Rome degraded from their holy orders, and being delivered over to the ſecular arm, they were hanged and burnt* (75). He adds, that Savonarola ſuffered death courageouſly, *without ſaying one word that might ſhew either his guilt or his innocence*; but that this *did not put an end to the difference in the opinions and paſſions of men; becauſe ſeveral perſons conſidered him as an impoſtor; and, on the other hand, ſeveral believed that the confeſſion which was publiſhed had been falſly invented, or that the torture had more power than truth, upon a man of his conſtitution, which was very delicate. They excuſed his frailty by the example of the prince of the Apoſtles, who, without being impriſoned, or conſtrained by any torture or extraordinary violence, did at the bare words of chambermaids and ſervants, deny that he was the diſciple of that Maſter, from whom he had ſeen ſo many holy precepts and miracles proceed.*

There are three things to be conſidered in this narrative. The firſt is, That Savonarola was delivered over fire without the conſecrated hoſt (i), and the other had exhorted him to it under the pretext of a revelation. The vigorous reſiſtance, which the Jacobins made when their

---

(69) Volaterran. *lib. v, pag. m.* 181.

(70) See above citat. (63).

(71) Excerpta ex Diario Burchardi, *p.* 50.

(72) Ibid. *p.* 51.

(73) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 48.

(74) Nè per queſto ſiamo noi crudeli & homicidi, ancorche li auverſarii, quali ſi ſono ſottoſcritti publicamente confeſſano d'haver in queſto fuoco à morire . . . . & però non gia noi, ma loro ſono crudeli & homicidi di ſe medeſimi. *Ibid. pag.* 51.

(75) Guicciardin, *lib. iii,* near the end. *fol. m.* 128.

over to the ſecular arm, becauſe, as he himſelf confeſſed, he had known things to come by acquired lights, and had aimed at nothing elſe in his actions, but to bring back the Church to her antient purity. The ſecond is, That the confeſſion he made thereupon was expreſſed in ambiguous words. The third is, That at his execution he neither owned that he was guilty, nor proteſted that he was innocent, and that neverthele/s there were a good many perſons who continued to look upon him as a ſaint, though they made no doubt of his having denied the truth in priſon.

GUICCIARDIN cenſured.

I. I obſerve upon the firſt of theſe three articles, that Guicciardin has not diſcharged the duty of an hiſtorian well; for he has not only ſuppreſſed the greateſt part of the accuſations which were acknowledged as true by Savonarola, but he has likewiſe unfairly repreſented thoſe which he has related. It was very allowable for him to believe that the Judges had oppreſſed the innocence of that Friar; but he had no right to mangle or diſguiſe the repreſentations which had been publiſhed of that caſe. Now he has done both, ſince it is certain that they contain ſeveral heads of accuſation and confeſſion which he has paſſed over in ſilence, and that in thoſe which he has mentioned, he has ſtruck out what things were criminal, and only left an idea of innocence. If an hiſtorian can be allowed thus to diſcharge the office of an advocate, he ought at moſt to do ſo by ſome reflexions apart, and not in the thread of the narration itſelf, which ſhould be ſtrictly conformable to the publick records. Guicciardin is too hard upon the Judges, and too eaſy to the party accuſed: it is not his fault if it be not believed that they cauſed a man to be burnt for having dared to affirm that by a ſtrong meditation upon the oracles of the Bible, he had learned that certain things would happen. The pretenſion of ſuch a man may be very raſh, and liable to cenſure; but it does not render him worthy of corporal puniſhment: and conſequently Savonarola's Judges would have been murtherers and aſſaſſins, if they had put him to death for an offence of that nature. Let us ſee wherein the artifice and miſrepreſentation of the hiſtorian conſiſts. He has ſeparated two things which ſhould have been put together; the one is what Savonarola confeſſed in priſon, the other is what he had preached before. This Friar confeſſed that his knowledge of things to come was not infuſed, or an immediate revelation of the Holy Ghoſt; but he had boaſted of ſuch a revelation (76); and it is upon that account that his confeſſion, which otherwiſe would have been a trifle, rendered him vaſtly guilty. He found himſelf convicted by his own confeſſion of an horrible and infamous impoſture. Guicciardin has taken great care not to furniſh his readers with hints for this remark: he wiſhed, no doubt, that they might not compare Savonarola's confeſſion with his preceding conduct. If you have a mind to know part of what Guicciardin has ſuppreſſed, read the following paſſage of Nauclerus; we find there, that, according to the acts of the proceſs which was publiſhed, Savonarola acknowledged that his conduct had been one continued ſeries of vanity and ambition, to which he had made his pretended prophecies ſubſervient. ‘Die nona menſis Aprilis, dictus F. Hieronymus, præſentibus multis teſtibus, fuit interrogatus & examinatus in aula Baroncelli, primò verbis, pòſt minis, dein cum tortura. demum 19. ejuſdem menſis ſine læſione dixit, omnia per ipſum prophetizata, fuiſſe ficta, & quòd ob gloriam humanam aucupandam talia prædicaverit, & quòd videbatur civitas Florentia bonum inſtrumentum ad faciendum creſcere ſuam gloriam. Et ad coadjuvandum ſuum finem, confeſſus eſt ſe prædicaſſe res, per quas Chriſtiani cognoſcerent abominationes quæ fiebant Romæ, & quòd reges & principes ſe congregarent ad faciendum concilium: quod ubi factum fuiſſet, ſperaſſet deponi multos prælatos, etiam Papam: & quando fuiſſet æſtimatus in concilio, manſiſſet & ſtetiſſet in magna reputatione in toto mundo: & ſi non fuiſſet in papam electus, ſaltem primum locum tenuiſſet. De renovatione eccleſiæ & converſione infidelium, dixit ſe habere ex ſcriptura ſacra, ſed quòd fieri deberet citò, non habuerit ex ſcripturis aut revelatione. Quòd oſtenderit ſe iviſſe in paradiſum, hoc feciſſe ſe ad attribuendum ſibi reputationem & gloriam. Circa factum inobedientiæ pontificis, quòd non ivit Romam, feciſſe ſe, ne occideretur in via. Circa factum excommunicationis reſpondit, quanquam multis aliter videretur, crediderit ipſe tamen illam eſſe veram & obſervandam, obſervaverit per aliquod tempus. Sed ubi viderit quòd ibat opus ſuum in ruinam, ceperit modum non obſervandi, & quòd pertinaciter ſteterit contrà pro honore, reputatione ac manutentione operis ſui. Hæc & multa alia interpretatus eſt, prout in examine quod impreſſum eſt, continetur (77). - - - - *On the ninth day of April the ſaid Savonarola was, before many witneſſes, interrogated and examined in the hall Baroncelli, firſt with words, afterwards with threatnings, and laſt of all with the torture. At length, on the nineteenth of the ſame month, he freely owned, without being racked, that all his predictions had been feigned, and that he had preached up ſuch things for the ſake of human glory, and becauſe the city of Florence ſeemed to him a proper inſtrument for procuring it. He confeſſed that in order to promote his ends, he had preached things, by which Chriſtians might know the abominations which were practiſed at Rome, and kings and princes might jointly procure a council to be called; in conſequence of which he had expected that many prelates, and the Pope himſelf, would have been depoſed; that after he had been once reſpected in the council, his reputation ſhould have been firmly eſtabliſhed throughout the whole world; and that if he had not been choſen Pope, he would at leaſt have held the firſt rank. As to the reformation of the Church, and the converſion of the infidels, he ſaid, he had the knowledge of thoſe things from ſcripture, but as to their happening ſoon, he neither knew it from ſcripture nor revelation. With reſpect to his ſaying that he had been in Paradiſe, he confeſſed, that he did it for the ſake of acquiring glory and reputation to himſelf; and as to his diſobeying the Pope, in not going to Rome, he attributed it to his fear of being killed by the way. Concerning the fact of excommunication, he anſwered, that though many were of a different opinion, he himſelf had believed it true and proper to be complied with, and that therefore he had ſubmitted to it for ſome time. But when he ſaw his deſigns go to ruin, he took a reſolution not to mind it, and that he had oppoſed it obſtinately for the honour, reputation, and ſupport, of his undertaking. Theſe and many other things did he confeſs, as they are contained in the proceſs that was printed.*’

II. The ſecond thing which I ſaid was to be conſidered in Guicciardin's narrative, is, that Savonarola made uſe of expreſſions which had a double meaning. His apologiſts are perplexed a little upon that head, and they own that ſome votaries of that new ſaint wavered upon that occaſion (78); but there were others who juſtified him by the example of the antient prophets, whoſe anſwers ſeemed to ſignify quite the reverſe of what they intended. ‘Illud affirmantes fuiſſe in uſu prioribus illis veteris Teſtamenti prophetis, perfidis interrogantibus obliquè adeò ambiguèque reſpondere, ut quæ affirmaverant negaviſſe viderentur, contraque quæ negaverant viderentur affirmaſſe. Sic *Micheam* Acabo Regi de Aſſyriis expugnandis reſpondiſſe; ſic Prophetam Amos nec ſe Prophetam eſſe, ſed nec Prophetæ filium dixiſſe. Sic *Joannem Baptiſtam* dum de Prophetiæ munere rogaretur loquutum fuiſſe. Et in hanc quoque ſententiam Prophetæ *Ezekielis* nonnulla, deque reſponſo *Eliſei* ad Hazaelem depromi dicebant (79). - - - *Affirming that the antient prophets of the Old Teſtament were uſed to make ſuch oblique and doubtful anſwers to the queſtions of the wicked, that they ſeemed to deny what they affirmed, and, on the other hand, to affirm what they denied. Thus ſuch was Micaiah's anſwer to king Ahab concerning his victory over the Aſſyrians; thus did the prophet Amos ſay, that he was neither a prophet, nor the ſon of a prophet. Thus, ſaid they, John the Baptiſt anſwered, when he was aſked whether he was a Prophet; they add, that ſome things to the ſame purpoſe might be quoted out of the Prophet Ezekiel, and out of Eliſha's anſwer to Hazael.*’ They alledged (80) that their convent was attacked [*I*], did not well become the diſciples of a prophet of the New Law, eſpecially ſince this attack was countenanced by the authority of the magiſtrates (*k*). Some believed that Savonarola was very juſtly puniſhed; but others conſidered him as a martyr, and endeavoured to have part of his aſhes that they might keep them as a relick (*l*); for which reaſon they were thrown into the river. Books were written for his juſtification [*K*], and we muſt not omit that the Proteſtants have

---

(i) See the remark [G].

(76) Guicciardin himſelf affirms it in another place, *viz. book ii, fol. m.* 44, *verſo.* Affermando non predire queſto, & molte altre coſe, le quali continuamente predicava, per diſcorſo humano, ne per Scientie di Scritture; ma ſemplicemente per divina rivelatione. - - - - *Affirming that he did not foretel this and many other things which he conſtant- preached up, by any human reaſoning, nor by the knowledge of the Scriptures; but purely by divine revelation.*

(77) Naucler. *Part. ii, Gener.* L, *pag. m.* 990. *See in* Spizelius in Infel. Literato, *pag.* 659, a confeſſion of Savonarola, in terms that are ſtill more barbarous: it is taken from the book of John Poggius, *Edit.* 1498.

(78) See John Francis Picus, ubi ſupra, *pag. m.* 132.

(79) Id. ibid.

(80) Ibid. *pag.* 133.

(*k*) See in the remark [*H*], the words of Guicciardin.

(*l*) Sixt. Senenſis, Biblioth. *lib. iv*, apud Pope Blount, Cenſ. Auth. *pag*. 345. *See likewiſe the* Proſopographie *of* Du Verdier, *Tom. iii, pag.* 2333, *and what I quote from John Francis Picus, in the remark* [*H*] *near the end.*

---

that Thomas Aquinas affirms, that a perſon accuſed is not obliged to confeſs the truth before unjuſt judges. They remembered (81), that there had been martyrs whom the violence of torture had compelled to ſpeak againſt their conſcience, and thus they confirmed themſelves in the credit which they had given to that new prophet. Such are the effects of being infatuated with a man, who acquires the reputation of an inſpired ſaint. Such an infatuation is generally an incurable diſeaſe. Let the event give the lye to that man's prediction, let him vary, let him recant, let him contradict himſelf, let him fall into weakneſſes and groſs faults; for all this, people are not cured of their prepoſſeſſion, they ſeek to juſtify him at the expence of the greateſt ſaints of the antient and new law, they will rather ſtrip faults of their vicious nature, than believe that he is guilty of any faults (82).

(81) Ibid.

(82) See the remark . . . . of the article . . . .
. . . . .
or what Seneca ſays of Cato's drunkenneſs.

The prepoſſeſſion of Savonarola's votaries was ſo extravagant, that they religiouſly preſerved all they could of the wood-pile where he was burnt. This ſuperſtition of theirs was foreſeen, and for that reaſon all the aſhes had been ſuddenly taken away and thrown into the river: but ſomething remained, and there was even a bone that fell from amidſt the aſhes, and part of a finger which was carried off, during the time that they were throwing ſtones at the gibbet, where the three Dominicans were hanged, All theſe were kept as relicks, and, as ſome ſay, wrought a good many miracles. ‘ Corporum abſumptorum cineres quoſcum- ‘ que potuerunt in unum redactos, plauſtriſque delatos, ‘ in Arni fluvium injecerunt. Ex incendio ſuperfuere ‘ nonnulla, quæ cautè rapta, religioſeque ſervata ſunt. ‘ Item os, quod puer quidam dum veheretur in Ar- ‘ num, delapſum vehiculo pertulit ad matrem: Item ‘ & digiti cujuſdam pars dum penderent de cruce, ſax- ‘ orum decuſſa grandine. Ab ipſis reliquiis quæ pro- ‘ dierunt ſigna divinitùs ſuis referemus locis (83).

(83) Jo. Franciſcus Picus, ubi ſupra, *p*. 166: he ſays, in that very place that Savonarola's heart was found in the river Arno two days after. He boaſts that he had a part of it. See the following remark citation (97).

III. My third remark upon Guicciardin's narrative is, that St Peter's example does but little ſerve to juſtify the Florentine prophet; for that Apoſtle's fault was followed by a quick repentance, and repaired by a long fidelity; but we do not find that Savonarola made uſe of the only means left to attone for his fault. It was to declare upon the ſcaffold, that he entreated GOD to forgive him, for having been ſo weak as to deny in priſon, what he had affirmed in the pulpit. Guicciardin obſerves that he did not ſay a word, either to accuſe or clear himſelf.

Let us not forget to obſerve that it is a difficult matter to reduce the apologiſts for certain people to a non-plus, for they almoſt continually find examples, which they place before us, as a barrier which we are obliged to reſpect. You ſee how Savonarola's friends endeavoured to ſhelter themſelves under the antient prophets, and the martyrs of the primitive church; and though they ſhould be forced to confeſs that he had been ſeduced by the illuſions of the devil, they would have modern ſaints to alledge in his juſtification. This is the obſervation of a Proteſtant divine. *Et dato interveniſſe*, ſays he (84), *illi imaginationi illuſionem aliquam & allocutionem diabolicam ſive internam ſive externam, hoc non magis ipſius orthodoxiæ, pietati, & particulari cauſæ, ob quam paſſus eſt præjudicare poteſt, quam Jordani, aliorumque ſanctorum Papalium monachorum: de quorum illuſionibus paſſim legendæ, & vitæ*, Delrio l. 4. c. 1. qu. 3.

(84) Voetius, Diſput. Theolog. *Tom. ii, pag.* 1070.

Theophilus Raynaud ſays that, according to Baptiſta Fulgoſius, Savonarola confeſſed his impoſtures (85); but I do not find this in the chapter which he (86) cites. Father Baronius anſwering that paſſage of Theophilus Raynaud takes no notice of this falſe quotation (87). The teſtimony of Pierius Valerianus would have turned to better account (88).

(85) Theophilus Raynaud, de immunitate Cyriacorum, *Diatr. vi, pag.* 298, Apopompæi.

(86) Theophilus Raynaud, *quotes* Baptiſta Fulgoſius l. tit. de Religioſo cultu. c. i. *I make uſe of the edition printed* Coloniæ 1604, in 8vo.

(87) Vincent. Baronius, Apolog. Ordinis Prædicat. *Tom. ii, pag.* 88, *& ſeq.*

(88) See his words in the remark [*M*].

[*I*] *The vigorous reſiſtance which the Dominicans made when their convent was attacked.*] They made proviſion of fire-arms, and killed five perſons. Three of them were killed, and particularly the brother of Savonarola. *Quem* (conventum S. Marci) *Fratres ejuſdem conventus benè clauſerant & in eo bombardis & aliis armis offenſivis muniti erant, quæ in populum traxerunt, qui tandem conventum vi intravit interfectis quinque ex ſuis, tribus autem ex monachis, quodam Fratre profeſſo Ordinis prædicatorum germano dicti fratris Hieronymi & duobus aliis* (89). They were obliged to ſet fire to the convent, in order to get the better of the Monks who defended it (90).

(89) Excerpta ex Diario Burchardi, *pag*. 54.

(90) Concrematis templi foribus nec incruenta irruptione (*Savonarola*) comprehenditur. *Jovius, in Elog.* cap. xlii, pag. 190. See him alſo in *Vita Leonis X*, pag. 52.

[*K*] *Books were written in his juſtification.*] ‘ Dominic Benivenius publiſhed a book of his miracles ‘ and prophecies, and Francis Picus † was ſo warm in ‘ his defence that, notwithſtanding he was extremely ‘ religious and a ſtrict Catholic, he did not ſcruple to ‘ attack and very much to abridge the power and au- ‘ thority of the Pope, in order to ſhew that Alexander ‘ VI had no reaſon to forbid him the pulpit and to ‘ excommunicate him (90*).’ This is what Gabriel Naudé ſays. He does not obſerve that this Benivenius publiſhed his book before Savonarola's death; I ſhall therefore add this particular as I find it in Du Verdier Vau Privas. *Savonarola had acquired among the greateſt part of the Florentines the character of a holy man and of a prophet, and as ſuch had been cryed up and defended in printed pieces, particularly in a treatiſe written by Dominic Benivenius, a Florentine Prieſt, in order to vindicate and prove the truth of the doctrine and prophecies preached up by the ſaid Savonarola; which treatiſe was printed at Florence by Francis Bonacorſo, in the year* 1496 (91). Giſbert Voëtius obſerves, that this Benivenius publiſhed after the author's death the abridgment which Savonarola had written of his prophecies, and that he prefixed to it a Preface full of commendations (92). The ſame Voëtius adds, that Sabellicus in the IX book of the X Ennead, and Ferronus in the IId book of the Hiſtory of France, make a profeſſed apology for this Dominican. He is miſtaken (93) as to Arnoldus Ferronus, who only ſaid, that there are people who pretend that Savonarola was juſtly put to death as an impoſtor, but that no body refuſes him this commendation, that he was temperate, and beſides a man of wit and learning. *Hunc quod eſſet Gallorum ſtudioſior quàm alii vellent, à Florentinis adnitente Pontifice quaſi violatæ perſuaſionis reum damnatum: alii, cum impoſturis plebem falleret, & Auguris divini nomen aucuparetur, jure cæſum volunt: certe ad temperantiæ & ſobrietatis laudem, doctrinæ & ingenii gloriam adjeciſſe eum nemo diffitetur* (94). Without doubt what miſled Voëtius was his ſeeing Sabellicus and Ferronus quoted near one another in the margin of Martin del Rio, and his not conſidering the disjunctive which that author makes uſe of. It plainly inſinuates, that Ferronus is only alledged as an Hiſtorian who doubts whether Savonarola deſerved death. ‘ Ex partium ‘ ſtudio, & Alexandri VI atque Mediceorum odio ‘ factum, ut non conſideranter Hiſtorici nonnulli † ‘ defenſionem Savonarolæ ſuſceperunt, vel damnationis ‘ juſtitiam in dubium vocarent (95). - - - *It was owing ‘ to party-zeal, and their hatred to Alexander VI and the ‘ family de Medicis, that ſome Hiſtorians raſhly under- ‘ took the defence of Savonarola, or called the juſtice of ‘ his ſentence in queſtion.*’

† In Apolog. pro Hieron. Savonarol. viri prophetæ innocentia.

(90*) Naudé, Apologie des grands Hommes, *pag*. 452.

(91) Du Verdier, Proſopogr. *Tom. iii, pag*. 2333.

(92) Voëtius, ubi ſupra, *p*. 1068.

(93) He has miſled Spizelius, ubi ſupra, *pag*. 628.

(94) Arnoldus Ferronus, de Rebus geſtis Gallorum, *lib. ii, circa fin. fol.* 45, *Edit. Pariſ.* 1555, in 8vo.

† Sabellic. Ennead. 10, lib. ix, Arn. Ferron. lib. ii, Rerum Francicar. & alii.

(95) Mart. Del Rio, Diſquiſ. Magic. *lib. iv, cap. i, Quæſt. iii*, §. *vi, pag. m.* 197.

Naudé is in the right to ſay that *John Francis Picus was warm in the defence of Savonarola*. He makes him a Saint who wrought miracles; and he intreats his readers to remember him in their prayers to GOD, and to Jerom Savonarola (96). He ſays (97) that the heart of that holy man was found in the river, that he has a part of it, and that it is ſo much the dearer to him as he has found by experience that it cures ſick people, and drives out Devils. He obſerves (98) that a great number of thoſe who perſecuted that Dominican died miſerably (99), and among theſe he reckons Pope Alexander VI. He mentions two traditions touching that Pope's death, which, as he ſays, happened

(96) Jo. Franciſcus Picus, ubi ſupra, *p*. 108.

(97) Id. ibid. *pag*. 136, 137.

(98) Id. ibid. *pag*. 137, & ſeq.

(99) Father Baronius, Apologet. Ord. Prædicat. *Tom. ii, pag*. 88, *threatens Theophilus Raynaud in the following manner.* Non videt vindictam capiti ſuo impendentem, qualem ſenſerunt adverſariorum 80, qui in illum conjuraverant, eoſque omnes mors immatura & infeliciſſima abſtulit. - - - - *He does not ſee the vengeance that hangs over his head, ſuch as was felt by eighty of his adverſaries, who had conſpired againſt him, and who all came to an untimely and miſerable end.*

have declared for him [*L*]. He died however like a good Roman Catholic (*m*). There is

---

(*m*) See the paſſage of Coëffeteau in the remark [*L*].

pened ſoon after (100). There were however four years between Savonarola's death and Pope Alexander's. One of theſe traditions is that the Devil ſtrangled him; the other that the poiſon which he prepared for ſome cardinals was given to him by miſtake (101). Note that according to the firſt tradition he had made himſelf over to the Devil upon condition that he ſhould attain to the Papal dignity. The apologiſt makes mention of another book which he had written in defence of Savonarola's revelations. ‘Ad hæc viſa quæ ſibi divinitus offerebantur ſcriptis mandata, uno complexus eſt libro, cui titulus eſt *Revelationum Compendium*, in quem inſipienter invectus eſt quidam *Samuel Caſſinenſis* ex ordine Minorum, qui vulgo Zoccolanti dicuntur libello proprio & peculiari, quem vix in publicum datum inita defenſione *Hieronymi* confutandum ſuſcepi, defenſionemque illius inſcripſi *Hieronymo Tornelio* præſidi ordinis Minorum (102). - - - *Moreover he comprehended his celeſtial viſions, which he had deſcribed at large before, in one book intituled* Revelationum Compendium. *Againſt this one* Samuel Caſſinenſis, *of the order of Fryars Minors, who are commonly called* Zoccolanti, *inveighed fooliſhly in a particular book, which was no ſooner publiſhed than I undertook to confute it and defend Savonarola This vindication I inſcribed to* Hieronymus Tornelius, *general of the ſaid order of Fryars.*' He had likewiſe written a book to ſhew that Savonarola had been excommunicated unjuſtly. *Defenſio Hieronymi Savonarolæ ſive de injuſta ejus excommunicatione ad Herculem Æſtenſem* (103). He delayed publiſhing the life of our Dominican till the year 1530. Dr Bates has inſerted it in his *Vitæ ſelectorum aliquot Virorum*, printed in the year 1681 at London. Father Quetif, the Jacobin, had publiſhed it at Paris in the year 1674: he was the firſt that publiſhed it entire. He added notes to it, and ſeveral other tracts (104); and he is one of the moſt conſiderable apologiſts for Savonarola. Several of his brethren have ſignalized themſelves in the defence of that prophet. See particularly Bzovius (105), Vincent Baronius (106), Noel Alexander (107), &c.

I am ſurprized that Gabriel Naudé has made no mention of the apology written by the Dominican Thomas Neri (108), nor of that which was compoſed by Ambroſe Catharinus. One Timothy Peruginus (109) was likewiſe an advocate for Savonarola. Note that Catharinus did not adhere to his firſt ſentiments. ‘*Anno Domini* 1494, Hieronymum Savonarolam, Ordinis ſui fratrem, propter fructum prædicationis defendit, licet per errorem, ut nunc ſenex in tertio de Conſyderatione libro ſuo fatetur (110). - - - *In the year* 1494, *he defended Savonarola, a Fryar of his order, on account of his great ſucceſs in preaching. But therein he did wrong, as he confeſſes, now when he is old, in his third book upon Conſideration.*' He is even numbered among thoſe who have attacked Savonarola (111). I ſhould never have done if I were to give the liſt of all thoſe who have praiſed that Dominican: we ſhould find there particularly Marſilius Ficinus, Mathew Toſcanus (112), and Flaminius. The laſt made four verſes which Jovius has thought proper to give (113) in that very place where he owns that out of tenderneſs he paſſes by the inſulting epitaph which another Poet had compoſed. That which Flaminius wrote is as follows.

Dum fera flamma tuos, Hieronyme, paſcitur artus,
   Religio flevit dilaniata comas;
Flevit, & ô dixit crudeles parcite flammæ;
   Parcite, ſunt iſto viſcera noſtra rogo.

While, holy Jerom, the devouring flame
Prey'd on thy tender limbs, religion came;
The goddeſs wept, and tore her ſacred hair,
Then, in an agony of wild deſpair,
Oh ſtop, ſhe cry'd, ſtop cruel flames, a while,
And ſpare my bowels in the burning pile.

[*L*] *The Proteſtants have declared for him.*] Let us begin with a paſſage of Gabriel Naudé: it is in page 453 of his apology for the great men that have been accuſed of Magic. *Beza, Vigner, Cappel, du Pleſſis Mornai* ‡, *and all the Lutherans of Germany commonly call Savonarola in their books the faithful witneſs of Truth, the forerunner of the Evangelical Reformation, the ſcourge of the great Babylon, the ſworn enemy of the Roman Anti-Chriſt, and to conclude in a word with Jeſſenius à Jeſſen, the Luther of Italy. I wonder they do not likewiſe call him the John Hus of the ſame country, ſince they were both put to the ſame death, were both Hereſiarchs, and both have their names marked with great letters in the Regiſter and Journal of their Martyrs, witneſs the following verſes which they put under his effigies,*

En Monachus ſolers: rerum ſcrutator acutus
Martyrio ornatus, Savonarola pius.

Behold acute Savonarola, here
The Monk, the Martyr, and the Saint appear.

He adds that Beza *ſays expreſly when he ſpeaks of him in his elogies*, that his having ſo far diſpleaſed Alexander VI, was a great proof of his ſingular piety, that this wicked Pope could have no reſt till he had cauſed him to be moſt unworthily burnt. *Homini tam perditè ſcelerato, quàm fuit Alexander ille Borgia Pontifex hujus nominis ſextus uſque adeo diſplicuiſſe, ut non niſi te indigniſſimè damnato & cremato quieſcere potuerit, maximum eſſe videtur ſingularis tuæ pietatis argumentum* (114). It is an argument good enough for an Orator, but not for a writer that would ſpeak hiſtorically or dogmatically, ſince the moſt cruel tyrants put ſome people to death juſtly (115).

Naudé might have quoted Bale, Flacius Illyricus, John Wolfius, and Verheiden. This laſt author ſpeaks of Savonarola in a ſtile of admiration (116). It muſt nevertheleſs be acknowledged that he only conſidered Savonarola in an advantageous light: a great ſource of falſe reaſonings. Mr du Pleſſis Mornai gave into the ſame ſnare; he did not ſhew this perſon but on the ſide that appeared fair to him (117). This was the reaſon that when one of his antagoniſts preſented the other ſide to the readers, the diſpute became more intricate, and there was a neceſſity for going back. I ſhall cite Coëffeteau's words. *He that deſires to ſee Savonarola's doctrine defended againſt thoſe who accuſed him of Hereſy, let him read the learned apology which Thomas Neri a Florentine Monk of his order wrote for him; and particularly as to what concerns the article of Juſtification, which du Pleſſis does moſt of all inſiſt upon, let him read the anſwer to the firſt objection, and he will know that never any man ſpoke more like a Catholic than he, nor in a manner more agreeable to the doctrine of the Church of Rome. . . . . Such reaſon is there to believe that he died a Catholic,* ‘and here follows the account which his great friend the learned Prince of Mirandola gives of the matter †. Savonarola, ſays he, having notice given him of his being condemned to die, called immediately for a Prieſt to whom he might confeſs his ſins, and deſired to receive the moſt holy communion, which being brought to him, he begged earneſtly that they would allow him to take and hold the Sacrament between his hands; and this being granted to him, he began to ſay, with great chearfulneſs and devotion, that he knew and was aſſured that therein was the great and true God, the fountain of ſupreme goodneſs, and the maker of heaven and of earth, and of all creatures: that he knew for certain that therein alſo was preſent the moſt holy, indiviſible, and inſeparable Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, *&c.* Do you think, Mr du Pleſſis, that a Lutheran or Calviniſt would have died in this manner, and made ſuch a confeſſion of faith? Let your Beza therefore take him from among the idols of your party: let not Luther call upon him any more, as a voucher to his impiety, and as for you do not perſiſt in making him an Heretic contrary to his own confeſſion. Certain it is, that if he had been ſuch, neither Picus Mirandolanus, nor Marſilius Ficinus, nor Neri, nor ſo many other famous men, who have always lived in the Communion of the Church of Rome, would have taken it into their heads to celebrate his praiſe, ‘even

(100) Had multo poſt tempore. *Jo. Fr. Picus, ubi ſupra*, pag. 139.

(101) Id. ibid.

(102) Id. ibid. *pag.* 125.

(103) Spizelius, ub ſupra, *pag.* 633, quotes a paſſage of it. I believe it is of this book that Mr Du Pleſſis, *Myſtere d'Iniquite, p.* 571, ſpeaks, when he ſays that John Picus Mirandolanus, (he ſhould have ſaid John Francis) wrote a book on purpoſe to defend Savonarola againſt the Pope.

(104) See the Journal des Sçavans of the 20th of January 1676, *pag.* 23. Dutch edition.

(105) In Tom. xviii, Annalium.

(106) In Apologet. Ord. Præd. *Tom. ii, pag.* 88, *& ſeq.*

(107) In Select. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Capit. Sæc. xv, xvi.

(108) See in the following remark the paſſage of Coëffeteau.

(109) In the Life of Savonarola.

(110) Cochleus, Append. *Part. iii.* ad Conradum Brunum de Seditionibus, *p.* 350.

(111) *See* Voëtius, ubi ſupra, *Part. ii, p.* 1068, *who quotes* Sandæus *lib. iii*, theolog. var. comment. 22, *pag.* 567.

(112) In Peplo illuſt. Viror. Italiæ.

(113) Jovius in Elog. *pag.* 100.

‡ *In Elogiis*, in the third part of his *Biblioth. Hiſt.* at the year of our Lord 1498, in his *Apologie contre Leſſius & Coton, ch.* 52, in his *Myſtere d'Iniquité. in Epiſt. Philoſoph. Savonarolæ præfixa.*

(114) Naudé, ubi ſupra, *p.* 455.

(115) See the remark [*A*] of the article of the Marſhal de MARILLAC, num. II.

(116) *Verheiden, in Iconibus*, pag. 14, 15. Note, that he is miſtaken in ſaying that Savonarola was burnt at fifty years of age.

(117) *See the* Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 570, *& ſeq.*

† Pic. Mirand. in Apolog.

is ſome foundation for doubting whether the title of Martyr, which has been beſtowed upon him

even after his death. But with what face can you reckon among the Lutherans and Calviniſts, a Monk who lived continually in his cloyſter, ſtrictly obſerving his vows, and ſo earneſtly exhorting his brethren to do the like, that he appeared to be ſuperſtitious in his way of life? With what face can you reckon among the Lutherans and Calviniſts, a Monk who conſtantly celebrated the holy ſacrifice of the Maſs, and who has even written books to explain the myſteries of it, and to teach us how we muſt partake of the fruit which God communicates to us therein †? How can people place in the liſt of Lutherans or Calviniſts, a man that always believed in the ſeven Sacraments of the Church, always invoked the Saints, and always prayed for the dead, whom he believed to be in Purgatory. Let any one take the pains to read Savonarola's books, and if he does not find there all that I have been ſaying of him, I am willing to paſs for a calumniator. What if he had ſome particular opinions? We do not call people Heretics who only err, but ſuch as join obſtinacy to error. To conclude, it was not for having groaned under the heavy load of abuſes after a Reformation, that he was burnt: but his greateſt crime was a ſtate-crime, inaſmuch as he preached in a Republic that was divided into factions, the moſt powerful of which, being oppoſed by him, put him to death as a ſeditious perſon (118).’

This paſſage did a little ſurprize the apologiſt for Mr du Pleſſis, and obliged him to give good words. *True it is,* replied Andrew Rivet (119) *that either Savonarola did not know all the doctrine of Luther and Calvin,* ‘ amidſt the darkneſs of the time, or elſe he durſt not in every point make an open profeſſion of that doctrine, being ſurrounded by Inquiſitors. It cannot be denied however that he ſaw the neceſſity of a Reformation in the Church, that he ſighed after it, and expected it: and upon that account we place him in general among the witneſſes of truth: knowing alſo, that in ſeveral particulars he taught more purely than the Monks of his time, as ſtill appears by the books we have of his, eſpecially by the collections of his Sermons preached at Florence upon the ſubject of reforming the Church. It is a ſign that his writings were not reliſhed by the Church of Rome, ſince Pope Clement VIII forbids the greateſt part of his Sermons, and his Italian dialogue upon truth, to be read till they had undergone a purgation ‡. If this truth were for his advantage, he would not conſent to have his eyes ſhut. . . . . . It is a great prejudice in our favour his being among the prohibited authors. As for the circumſtances of his death, it is very poſſible that there were ſome things which we ſhould be unwilling to approve. But that does not at all oblige us to reject what he either did or ſaid well. For in this and other things of the like nature, we follow St Paul's advice, *Try all things, and hold faſt that which is good* ⸸, receiving no man, as the author of our faith who is only a man. . . . . For the reſt, if his crime had only been a ſtate-crime (120), it is not at all likely that they would have burnt him: and what our Hiſtory had advanced upon the authority of Guicciardin, ſhews that there was ſomething elſe, namely that he preſſed hard for a council to reform the corrupt manners of the Clergy, and to bring back the ſtate of the Church of God, which had deviated ſo much, to the model of the Apoſtles. Upon this account it is that we conſider him as one of us, notwithſtanding that he was a Dominican (121).’ All this is weak; for he finds himſelf obliged tacitly to acknowledge that Savonarola died an idolater, and that he taught ſeveral doctrines which Luther and Calvin held in abomination. If his mind was earneſtly ſet upon the Reformation of the Church, that might only concern bad morals, and the abuſes which had crept into diſcipline; and in that caſe he would not deſerve to be excluded from the number of true Roman Catholics. It is not at all to be doubted but that in the moſt corrupt ages, thoſe who were the moſt devoted to the deciſions of Councils, and to the Pope's authority, were nevertheleſs ſenſible that ſtrange diſorders were committed in the diſtribution of Indulgences, and in the election of Popes, and by the non-obſervance of the rules of diſcipline, that there was an exceſſive worldly pomp in the court of Rome, and that it were to be wiſhed a ſtop could be put to theſe diſorders. Do we not ſee at this day monks (122), and pariſh-prieſts (123) write books againſt the abuſes which are committed in religious worſhip? Are they for all that the leſs averſe to what is called the ſect of Calvin, the ſect of Luther? Let us therefore ſay that Mr Rivet does not extricate himſelf well. He was to prove that Savonarola condemned the deciſions of Councils which Calvin and Luther have condemned. But this is what he has not done; he contents himſelf with ſaying, that the Pope did forbid ſeveral of Savonarola's pieces to be read till they had undergone a purgation. This remark is too looſe, for we know that the congregation of the Index does ſometimes take the ſame method with certain books where there is nothing but trifles, or equivocal expreſſions, to be corrected. Rivet expoſes ſome faults of Coëffeteau concerning the diſpute between John Fiſher and Luther; he ſays (124), that as Fiſher does not make the leaſt mention of Savonarola's writings, it is without any reaſon aſſerted, that he has *ſhewn by all the writings of this great man, that he was entirely againſt what Luther taught.* Rivet alſo obſerves, *that it is falſe that Luther quoted any thing from Savonarola in point of doctrine; he only ſaid,* that he ſeemed to deſerve a place among the ſaints of JESUS CHRIST, whom the murtherers had burnt in divers places. It is nevertheleſs true (125), that Luther quotes him as an author that is very orthodox upon the ſubject of Juſtification and the merit of good works; but if he had known that this Monk died in committing acts of idolatry, would he have preſumed to reckon him among the ſaints of JESUS CHRIST?

If you have a mind to know what Savonarola's Orthodoxy was, read this paſſage of Mr du Pleſſis. *He explodes human traditions as much as poſſible* in his books, *acknowledges no ſalvation but in gratuitous juſtification by faith in* CHRIST, *and to that he adheres without depending upon any other merit: he is for giving the ſacrament in both ſpecies, abſolutely condemns indulgences, and, as well in point of life as in point of doctrine, owns Antichriſt to be in the court of Rome. The doctrine of free juſtification, in particular, is excellently handled in his Meditations upon the Pſalms xxx and l, which Poſſevinus, the Jeſuit, acknowledges to have been written by him the evening before his execution* *. *As for his ſermons, and other books, the Index Romanus has maimed and diſfigured them at pleaſure* (126). Since Mr du Pleſſis only cites Poſſevinus, a man, who ſometimes judged of books that he had never read (127), it would have been proper that Rivet, his defender, had oppoſed to Coëffeteau good extracts from Savonarola's works, to the end that the reader might certainly know whether that Monk condemned the doctrine itſelf of indulgences, or only the abuſes in the practice, and whether, ſetting aſide all traditions, he was for retaining nothing but what was contained in the Scripture. It is not at all probable that his views were ſuch, ſince he approved of monaſtic vows. It is not a ſure way to judge of what an author believed dogmatically concerning gratuitous juſtification, and the merit of good works, from a work which he compoſes in order to prepare himſelf for death; for in that ſituation people humble themſelves as much as they can, and have recourſe to the moſt certain remedy, which is the grace and mercy of God (128). Laſtly, it is neceſſary to diſtinguiſh whether an author ſwerves from the deciſion of councils, or from the particular ſentiments of ſchoolmen. Theſe ſentiments did ſometimes acquire ſuch a large extent, that they almoſt hid the deciſion of the council under their ſhadow. It may therefore appear that a man, who oppoſes them, does really ſwerve from the doctrine of the Church of Rome, but ſometimes it is only a falſe appearance: the doctrine of Juſtification is no longer ſo great a ſubject of diſpute, ſince it has been thoroughly ſifted and explained. I ſay this without adopting entirely the following words of Mr Peliſſon. ‘A great part of Germany is long ago weary of being called Lutherans and Proteſtants rather than Catholics. They are privately aſhamed of having made a breach for the ſake of queſtions that are forgotten, and which him by ſome authors, juſtly belongs to him [*M*]. It is ſaid that the council of Piſa promiſed

---

† Liber Savan. de Myſt. Miſſæ.

(118) Coëffeteau Reſponſe au Myſtere d'iniquité, *pag.* 1217.

(119) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *Tom. ii, p.* 632.

‡ Oracolo della riformatione della Chieſa. In Venetia al Segno del Pozzo. ann. 1560. Index lib. prohib. ſub Clemente VIII.

⸸ 1 Theſſal. ii. ver. 4.

(120) We ſhall ſee in remark [*M*], that his crime included an execrable impoſture, *viz.* his making people believe that he had immediate Revelations.

(121) Rivet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 633.

(122) *Father Mabillon in his treatiſe* de ignotorum Sanctorum cultu.

(123) Mr Thiers, in ſeveral books, and particularly in that of the *Devotion la plus neceſſaire & la plus négligée.* See alſo the treatiſe on the Jubilee of which the Journaliſts of Trevoux have given an extract in their month of July 1702, edition of France.

(124) Rivet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 632.

(125) In the preface which he prefixed to the Meditations of Savonarola, *Edit.* 1523. Mr Seckendorf Hiſtor. Lutheran. *quotes this whole preface.*

* Poſſevinus in Apparat. *Tom. i.*

(126) Du Pleſſis, ubi ſupra, *p.* 572.

(127) Se the remark [*F*], of the article MACHIAVEL.

(128) See what I have quoted from BELLARMINE, in the text of his article, citation (*g*).

'ceaſe to be queſtions, now that people are leſs warm, 'and more willing to hear and underſtand one another: diſputes which made ſo great a noiſe in the beginning of the ſchiſm, and which no body mentions 'now, concerning juſtification by faith, or by the merit 'of good works, concerning the efficacy of the ſacraments, by the *opus operatum*, or by the *opus operantis*, and other things of the like nature (129).'

As Coëffeteau was a Dominican, and conſequently very much diſpoſed to ſave the honour of Savonarola, I ſee, without ſurpriſe, that he does not complain of Du Pleſſis, for having left out of the long quotation of Guicciardin what concerns the trial of fire. I think it as little ſtrange, that he does not find fault with an explication of his, which is very liable to cenſure. *Guicciardin alledging here*, they are the words of Mr Du Pleſſis, *no other crime but this, that whereas he had formerly aſcribed his predictions to divine revelation, at his death he acknowledged that he had them from the obſervation and interpretation of the holy Scripture, without doubt of the Apocalypſe, which with us ſignifies the ſame thing as Revelation, and which we are very well aſſured is divine* (130). This interpretation cannot agree with Guicciardin's text; for as we have ſeen above (131), that hiſtory affirms (132) that Savonarola had not grounded his ſermons upon the knowledge of Scripture, nor upon human reaſoning, but merely upon a celeſtial revelation; that nevertheleſs he confeſſed before his judges (133) his having foretold things to come, not by a divine revelation, but by a particular opinion into which he had been led by the ſtudy of the word of GOD. It is then evident that there is a contradiction between what he confeſſed to his Judges, and what he ſaid before: and it is not neceſſary to point out the illuſion of Du Pleſſis; every body may readily perceive it, and conclude from thence, that the force of prejudices is very apt to ſeduce people, and that it ſtrangely miſleads ſuch authors as have a mind to juſtify, at any rate, thoſe whoſe teſtimony ſeems uſeful to them. John Francis Picus aſſures us, that Savonarola believed he had at laſt received a meaſure of prophetic light, which delivered him from all thoſe uncertainties that remained with him while he joined his own reaſonings to the inſpiration of GOD (134). We ſhall ſee preſently whether the lie contained in the contradiction, which I have juſt mentioned, was worthy of puniſhment.

[*M*] *There is ſome reaſon for doubting whether the title of martyr . . . . juſtly belongs to him.*] We have ſeen (135), that Luther gave him this title. Reuſnerus (136), Heidegger (137), and ſome other Proteſtants, give it to him; but Rivet, who had read Coëffetau, was more reſerved, as has been ſeen in the foregoing remark. It is not very eaſy to conceive how the Proteſtants could place among the martyrs of JESUS CHRIST a man who had celebrated the maſs, and invoked the ſaints all his life, and who, in the article of death, had communicated, according to the ceremonies of Rome, with an act of faith touching the real Preſence, and with an act of adoration to the ſacrament, which he held between his hands. This, according to the principle of the Proteſtants, was to live and die in the boſom of idolatry, and conſequently out of the way of ſalvation. Now a reprobate and damned perſon cannot be a true martyr, although even he ſhould loſe his life for the ſake of orthodox opinions. Is it not certain that if Alexander VI had put a man to death, who preached up the greateſt part of the Proteſtant doctrines, but who at the ſame time was an Antitrinitarian, the miniſters would think that neither ſuch a perſon's ſufferings, nor his declamations againſt Rome, nor his zeal for the reformation of the Church did any honour to their party? Why? Becauſe dying in the guilt of an hereſy, which damns people, he could not be conſidered otherwiſe than as a ſon of Gehenna, and ſlave to the Devil. The very ſame thing muſt be ſaid of thoſe who die in a ſtate of idolatry.

Among ſo many authors who affirm that Savonarola ſuffered the puniſhment of fire for the zeal which had moved him to preach againſt the Pope, there is not, perhaps, one that has duly examined his trial. It is nevertheleſs highly neceſſary to read, with attention, all the acts of a martyrdom, before one pronounces that this or that perſon died the martyrs of JESUS CHRIST. For if the Judges, who condemn an orthodox man to death, declare in their ſentence that they do not puniſh him for the ſake of his opinions, but becauſe he had endeavoured to eſtabliſh them by ſeditious ways, he cannot be accounted a martyr, unleſs it be certain that he was falſly accuſed of ſedition. It is therefore requiſite to examine maturely, and without prejudice, all the parts of a trial, and if we find by this examination that the orthodox man was convicted of having ſpirited up the people to demoliſh the altars and plunder the churches, and of having even ſet his hand to the work, we ought to acknowledge that the ſentence, which condemns him to death for this cauſe, is not the condemnation of a martyr. A miniſter who ſhould return at this day (138) into France, and who ſhould be taken and hanged for preaching privately, would deſerve the title of a martyr, altho' even the Judges ſhould expreſsly affirm in their ſentence, that they condemned him becauſe he had acted againſt the edicts of the prince; but if they grounded their condemnation wholly upon this, that he had been convicted of acting as a ſpy, and of plotting inſurrections in favour of the enemies of the ſtate, there would be no more any room for pretending that he was a martyr. I ſuppoſe the proofs to be legal and ſuitable to the practice of criminal courts with reſpect to the depoſitions of witneſſes, or intercepted letters, or the accuſed party's own confeſſion, ſhould it even be extorted by the rack; for this laſt proof is a legal one in ſeveral countries, and it cannot be invalidated juridically under pretence that pain forces ſome people, of a delicate make, to accuſe themſelves of what they have not done. It would not be ſufficient to ſay at random, that the Judges had ſuborned falſe witneſſes, and forged letters: it would be neceſſary to bring good proofs for this, without reſting upon probabilities. All the world knows that the Jeſuits are reproached with having converted into martyrs ſome of their brethren who were puniſhed as ſtate-criminals. The compilers of Martyrologies ought to have the delicacy of Julius Cæſar, who deſired that his wife ſhould be not only virtuous, but alſo free from ſuſpicion (139). If Judges are to be arraigned in the caſe of martyrdom, things ſhould be brought to a moral demonſtration; for otherwiſe the innocence of the martyrs will be a perpetual ſubject of diſpute, a dubious virtue, and liable to ſuſpicion at leaſt.

I put this queſtion now to thoſe who ſay that Savonarola was burnt for no other reaſon, but becauſe he had incurred the diſpleaſure of the court of Rome, *Have you read the acts of his trial? Did you find there that he was charged with no other crime but railing at the Pope, deſpiſing the excommunications of Rome, and preaching, that the Church wanted to be reformed? In that caſe I yield the point to you. But as you cannot have read them without finding that among ſeveral other ſhameful confeſſions which were drawn from him, he acknowledges that his predictions were only grounded upon the conſequences which he had deduced from Scripture it is impoſſible for you to juſtify yourſelves, your report is very unfaithful.*

In effect, this acknowledgment of Savonarola convicted him of an impoſture that was full of prophanation and impiety, ſince he had ſaid, for ſome years, that his knowledge of things to come proceeded from an immediate and prophetical inſpiration. This, no doubt, was the principal reaſon which the Judges alledged for ſentencing him to be burnt. The manner in which Mr Du Pleſſis Mornai endeavours to reconcile theſe two things, is wrong; I have ſhewn the invalidity of it (140). Thoſe who would excuſe Savonarola by the goodneſs of his intentions, do not deſerve a hearing; for it is certain that Numa Pompilius, and ſome other antient legiſlators had the public intereſt in view, when they gave out that GOD dictated to them the ordinances which they eſtabliſhed. Is this pretext ſufficient to clear them from the infamous character of impoſtors? But granting that they might be excuſed, it would be impoſſible to excuſe Savonarola. A Chriſtian, a Monk, who profanes the name of GOD to ſuch a degree as to put off his particular opinions for immediate revelations, is infinitely more criminal than the Gentiles, who were wanting in their reſpect for the falſe gods of Paganiſm.

(129) Peliſſon, de la Tolerance des Religions, *pag.* 141, 142.

(130) Du Pleſſis, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 572.

(131) In the remark [*H*].

(132) Guicciardin, *lib. ii, fol. m.* 44, *verſo*.

(133) Id. ibid. fol. 100.

(134) Jo. Franc. Picus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 112, 113.

(135) In the remark [*L*], citation (126).

(136) Reuſner. in Diario, *p.* 79, & in indice.

(137) Heidegg. in Hiſtor. Papatus, *pag.* 191, 192, & in indice.

(138) I write this in the year 1702.

(139) Τὴν Καίσαρος γυναῖκα καὶ δίαβολῆς δεῖ καθαρὰν εἶναι. Cæſaris uxorem etiam criminationis (*and not* criminis *as Xylander has tranſlated*) immunem, Plut. Apoph. *p.* 306, *A. See him alſo in* Vita Cæſaris, *pag.* 712, *and* Sueton. in Cæſ. *cap. lxxiv*.

(140) In the foregoing remark.

If

promiſed his canonization to the Dominicans, provided they would take part againſt Pope

If you anſwer, that this was not the true reaſon of Savonarola's puniſhment, it was only the pretence, I aſk you, is a man allowed, upon certain facts, to give his conjectures, and interpretations, which are charitable, with reſpect to the party accuſed, and malicious with reſpect to the Judges? And after all, this does not juſtify the perſons whoſe narratives he examines; for they ſay not a word concerning the motives which the Judges alledged. They decide the point without ſetting forth the tenor of the acts. Does not this ſhew a conduct full of temerity and paſſion?

This does not concern thoſe who acknowledge that the records of the trial charge ſeveral great crimes upon Savonarola, but who pretend that foul play was uſed in drawing up theſe records, and that there appeared falſified copies of them. Spizelius tells us, that the famous Mr Magliabechi communicated to him ſeveral remarks concerning this falſification. ‘Quid, quod inquiſitionis etiam ſeu examinis libellus & commentarius duplex fabricatus ſit; ſincerus unus, alter à Ceccone quodam Actuario falſatus & legitimo ſuppoſitus referente Timotheo Peruſino, cap. 49. Vit. Hieron. ‡. Qui de iniquiſſimâ & ſceleratiſſimâ proceſſus Savonaroliani adulteratione haud ita pridem pluribus etiam per litteras me edocuit & clariſſima fraudis impoſturæque (ab hoſtibus Hieronymi commiſſæ) indicia fecit Ampliſſimus & famigeratiſſimus Bibliothecarius Florentinus, D. ANTONIUS MAGLIABECIUS (141). - - - - *What ſhall we ſay as to this, that there was a double account of the trial, or examination, drawn up; the one genuine, the other falſified, and put in the room of the true one, by a certain Notary, whoſe name was Cecco, as we learn from the narrative of Timothy Peruſinus. But the perſon who, not long ago, fully informed me, by his letters, of the moſt unjuſt and ſcandalous manner in which Savonarola's trial had been falſified, and gave me the cleareſt proofs of the fraud and impoſture committed by the enemies of that Dominican, was the famous Florentine Library-keeper, Mr* ANTONY MAGLIABECHI.’ I will neither doubt of this, nor of the paſſion which may poſſibly have prevailed in the minds of the Judges: I ſhall only warn thoſe who ſo poſitively affirm, that the ſole cauſe of Savonarola's death was, his having railed at the Pope, that Guiciardin, who is rather his Apologiſt than his Hiſtorian, owns, that the party accuſed renounced the title of a Prophet. He was therefore convicted of impoſture in point of prophecy, by his own confeſſion: a moſt heinous and execrable crime upon which the Judges condemned him. ‘Graviſſimum crimen viſum, quod ſe à Deo futurorum moneri, cœleſtique juſſu ea populo enunciare mentitus, plebis ſtudia ac voluntates falsâ ſpecie religionis captâſſet, aut divinum ſe vatem ferens, impendiò mendacio hominibus impoſuiſſet. (142). - - - *His greateſt crime ſeemed to be, that falſly pretending to be warned of things to come by* GOD, *and to be commiſſioned from Heaven to declare them to the people, he had gained upon the ſpirits and inclinations of the mob by a counterfeit ſhew of religion; or that feigning himſelf to be a divinely inſpired prophet, he had impoſed upon men by an extravagant lie.*’ Can people boaſt of ſuch a martyr? The different courſes which his followers took to juſtify him in this point (143), ſhew too plainly that they did not doubt but the records of the trial were faithful, with reſpect to this confeſſion of Savonarola. It is to be carefully noted, that if his accuſers are ſuſpected of calumny, his apologiſts are ſuſpected either of being guided by infatuation, or by the intereſt of their order. Thoſe who have made it their buſineſs to juſtify him, were either his diſciples, or monks of his order. There is nothing that people will not do rather than own that they have been the dupes of an hypocrite; and when once they have ſuffered themſelves to be prepoſſeſſed with a notion that ſuch a devotee is a Prophet, they hardly ever give it up; they will ſooner exclaim againſt the Judges who condemn him, than acknowledge their own weakneſs. Neither the Franciſcans, Savonarola's adverſaries, nor the Dominicans, his brethren, ought to be conſulted here. We muſt have recourſe to the teſtimony of ſuch as have no ſhare in the quarrels of the two orders. Pierius Valerianus, and Juſtus Lipſius (144), who come under that claſs, are not at all favourable to our Dominican. One of them declares, without any ceremony, that he was burnt for the impoſture and impiety of which he was convicted. ‘Savonarola Divi Dominici ſacris initiatus non modo literatus, ſed magnæ apud literatos omnes auctoritatis, Chriſtianæ diſciplinæ concionator egregius, admirabilis omninò doctrinæ, niſi pravo eam ingenio contaminaſſet, poſtquam facundia fretus ſuâ Florentinum populum eò compulerat, ut ab Alexandro Pontifice Maximo, atque adeò ab Eccleſiæ Romanæ inſtitutis diſſentiret, majoremque ſibi adrogaret auctoritatem, quam ab ipſo rerum opifice per manus traditam adſecutus eſſet Petri ſucceſſor Rom. Pontifex; de doctrina ſua, deque Dei familiaritate, quæ ſe ad colloquium uſque dignatum palam profitebatur, fidem æquo pertinacius tueri perſeverat, mendacitatis & impoſturæ demum convictus, impietatiſque damnatus, in urbis, quam deceperat, medio cum aſſeclis aliquot concrematus eſt (145). - - *Savonarola the Dominican was not only learned himſelf, but likewiſe a man of great authority among the learned, and an excellent preacher of Chriſtian diſcipline. His doctrine was thoroughly admirable, if he had not corrupted it by an evil diſpoſition. By his eloquence he induced the people of Florence to diſſent from Pope Alexander, and conſequently from the inſtitutions of the Romiſh church. He took upon him a greater authority than the Pope of Rome, as St Peter's ſucceſſor, had received, handed down to him from* GOD *himſelf. He perſiſted with an unreaſonable obſtinacy in defending his doctrine, and boaſting of his familiarity with* GOD, *which he publickly declared had gone ſo far as to be admitted to converſe with him. At laſt, being convicted as a liar and impoſtor, and condemned for his impiety, he was burnt, with ſome of his under-agents, in the middle of that city which he had deceived.*’ The judgment which Gratianus paſſes upon him is much of the ſame nature (146).

I cannot tell whether the Judges knew of the letters which Savonarola wrote to Charles VIII, exhorting him to return into Italy, and to reform the Church by the ſword (147). They would have found there a juſt cauſe to condemn him for treaſon, for it is an act of rebellion to call in foreign armies: the heads of a faction cannot lawfully uſe ſuch means to render it the uppermoſt in their country. On the other hand, it was a ſtrange, if not a mad, project, to think of making the ſword of a king of France the inſtrument of reforming the Church. Did he want him to employ dragooning? Or was it only his deſire, that he ſhould oblige the court of Rome, by the terror of his arms, to call a council? But what freedom could there be in an aſſembly held by the will of a conqueror? Would people dare to give their opinions otherwiſe than he ſhould think fit.

To ſay ſomething of Savonarola's ſentiments with reſpect to excommunication, I ſhall obſerve that the Proteſtants are miſtaken, perhaps when they conceive him to be orthodox upon this point. Take notice, I pray, that on his being excommunicated by Alexander VI, he left off going into the pulpit for ſome time; but when he perceived that ſilence diminiſhed his credit, and put a ſtop to his deſigns, he began to preach again, and continued to do it till the magiſtrates forbad him (148). This unequal conduct is neither worthy of a Prophet, nor of a new Apoſtle; the ſame reaſon which hindered him from ſubmitting to the Pope's orders, ſhould have hindered him from ſubmitting to the orders of the magiſtrates; for if the intereſts of the great work, to which he fancied himſelf commiſſioned in an extraordinary manner, required that notwithſtanding the Pope's orders, he ſhould exerciſe the function of a preacher, ſince it is better to obey GOD than men (149), they likewiſe required him to exerciſe it notwithſtanding the prohibition of the ſecular arm. There is ſome probability that he would have alledged the ſame reaſons againſt a council which he did againſt Alexander VI, in caſe the council ſhould have treated him in the ſame manner that the Pope had done. He would have believed then that there was no tribunal upon earth which could put him to ſilence; and who knows if he did not fancy that as a prophet he ought to hold immediately of GOD, and enjoy the privilege of a ſpecial commiſſion to bring all his cauſes directly before the court of Heaven?

---

‡ Narrat. ibid. Peruſinus, verum & ſincerum Proceſſum Hieronymi, ab eodem Ceccone nequam, Lucretiæ de Medicis, Leonis Papæ X ſorori, Jacobi Salviati conjugi fuiſſe poſtea conceſſum, cujus & ipsâ lectione commota mitior exinde & æquior in Hieronymum fuerit. - - - *Peruſinus relates in the ſame place, that the true and genuine tryal of Savonarola was afterwards communicated by the ſaid villain Cecco to Lucretia de Medicis, ſiſter to Pope Leo X. and wife to James Salviati, and that the reading of it made ſuch an impreſſion upon her as to give her a more favourable opinion of Savonarola from that time.*

(141) Spizelius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 662.

(142) Gratianus, de Caſibus, Viror. illuſtr. *pag.* 140.

(143) See the remark [*K*].

(144) Lipſius, Monit. & Exempl. Politic. *lib. i, cap. iii, pag m.* 139, 140.

(145) Pierius Valerianus, de Literat. Infelicitate, *lib. ii, p. m.* 78, 79.

(146) Gratianus, ubi ſupra, *p.* 141.

(147) See in the remark [*D*] the words of Philip de Comines.

(148) Taken from Guicciardin. *lib. iii*: I have quoted his words in the rem. [*G*].

(149) Cui Mandato (*Papæ*) non obedivit aſſerens Deo obedire oportere magis quam hominibus. *Burchardus in Diario, pag.* 46.

Pope Julius II, but that they refuſed to buy it at that price (*n*). He wrote many books wherein we find a great deal of unction and piety [*N*]. I ſay ſomething of a letter which he wrote to the Pope, wherein he examines, among other things laid to his charge,

Heaven? The diſcipline of the Proteſtants does not allow of ſuch notions: it eſtabliſhes tribunals which forbid preaching, ſuſpend, and excommunicate; it requires that their authority ſhould be ſubmitted to, and treats as ſchiſmatical and contumacious perſons, thoſe who ſhake off this yoke, under the pretence that they have been unlawfully condemned (150).

But what ſhall we ſay of the ſubmiſſion which Savonarola promiſed in his letter to the Pope, dated the twenty-ninth of September, 1497. He clears himſelf as well as he can from every thing that had been ſaid of him to the Pope; he alledges ſtrong reaſons why he had not taken a journey to Rome when the Pope ſent for him. He treats as ſlanderers thoſe who termed it diſobedience: he declares that he is ready to retract any thing ſaid or written by him, which his Holineſs ſhall judge worthy of cenſure. He concludes by ſubmitting his perſon, his writings, and his words, to the authority of the Church, and to that of the Pope. *Dignetur Sanctitas veſtra mihi ſignificare quid ex omnibus quæ ſcripſi vel dixi ſit revocandum, & ego id libentiſſime faciam; nam & hac vice & ſemper, ſicut ſæpius dixi, ac etiam ſcpripſi, meipſum & omnia mea dicta & ſcripta ſubjicio correctioni S. R. E. &. S. V. cui ſemper meipſum & fratres meos ejuſdem pedibus proſtratus plurimum commendo* (151). If he had pretended that as a Prophet, he was exempted from all Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction; and if he had been ſuch a man as the Proteſtants extolled, what I have juſt now quoted would be the language of a great hypocrite.

A PROOF of Savonarola's Fanaticiſme.

Let us obſerve, that if this Dominican was not an impoſtor, he muſt neceſſarily have been a prodigious Fanatic. I prove it thus: He foretold, among other things, the approaching converſion of the Mahometans, and ſhewed himſelf to be ſo fully perſuaded of the certainty of this prophecy, that he declared, that whoever ſhould enter into the fire for the ſupport of it, would come off without receiving any damage (152). If he ſpoke ſincerely, his perſuaſion was as ſtrong as it could poſſibly be. Now ſince the falſity of the prediction makes it plainly appear that he was not inſpired, we ought to conclude that his Fanaticiſm was come to the higheſt pitch. Every body, I think, muſt know that the virtue of a Fanatic, his zeal, his mortifications, are not words of a double meaning. It is generally a virtue proceeding from vapours, an irregularity of the organs, a diſorder in ſome fibres of the brain. I am willing to believe that thoſe who have ſo much cried up the martyrdom of Savonarola had never read the facts which I have mentioned in this remark, nor made the reflexions which naturally ariſe from them. I muſt do this juſtice to Voëtius, that altho' he has diſputed the ground by inches in favour of that Dominican, he does not fail to acknowledge that he had ſomewhat of a vertigo. He does not make him a true Prophet of the New Law, as others have done (153). 'Ego, ut viri illius ſanctitas & zelus communiter deſcribitur & in ſcriptis ejus, præſertim practicis elucet, partim politicis conjecturis, (ut erat perſpicaciſſimus politicus), partim ferventiſſimo ſtudio & forti imaginationi talium rerum, quas prædicebat, & inde ortæ phantaſticæ infirmitati ac vertigini prædictiones illas tribuerem (154). - - - *As the zeal and holy life of that man are generally deſcribed, and as they ſhine forth in his writings, eſpecially in his practical ones, I am tempted to impute his predictions, partly to his political conjectures, (for he was a moſt diſcerning Politician) partly to his fervent ſtudy and ſtrong imagination of ſuch things as he foretold, and to a fantaſtical infirmity and vertigo proceeding from thence.*' When he ſays that the Proteſtants contented themſelves with alledging this man to their adverſaries as a domeſtic evidence, and for an argument *ad hominem*, he ſhews what they all ſhould have done, but not what they all did. 'Nec obſcurè perſtringit noſtros *(Naudæus)* qui propter communionem ſcil. hæreſios virum illum laudaverint. Sed duo illi repono: quorum primum eſt in illo quinque admiranda prædicari, eruditionem; eloquentiam; ſanctitatem & zelum; ſtudium orthodoxiæ & reformationis eccleſiæ: prophetias & hinc tantam ejus æſtimationem apud optimum quemque in orbe Papali: nil ergo mirum, ſi noſtri ad hominem (uti ajunt) hunc domeſticum teſtem adverſariis ſuis oppoſuerint; quidquid ipſi de eo ſenſerint. Alterum eſt, &c. (155). - - - - *Neither does he* (Naudé) *obſcurely glance at the Proteſtants, as if they had praiſed this man on account of his being a joint partaker with them in Hereſy. But I ſay two things in anſwer to him; firſt, that five admirable qualities were aſcribed to him, learning, eloquence, ſanctity and zeal, a concern for orthodoxy and the reformation of the Church, and the gift of prophecy, for which he was ſo much eſteemed by the beſt of the Roman Catholics; ſo that it was no wonder if the Proteſtants in an argument* ad hominem *(as the phraſe is) oppoſed this domeſtic evidence to their adverſaries, whatever their own private opinion of him was. The other is*, &c.' It is certain that Savonarola not only knew the corruption of the Church, but alſo ſhewed a great deſire to correct it. If he had only known it, he had been in the ſame caſe with other people; for even the moſt licentious prieſts knew very well, that a clergyman guilty of concubinage, ſimony, &c. was in a diſorderly way; but they did not wiſh for a reformation of abuſes. There are few people at this day in Rome itſelf who do not think that the intrigues made uſe of for the election of the Popes are an evil; and how many good Papiſts are there who wiſh to ſee a ſtop put to this diſorder, and to ſeveral others? What was particular in Savonarola, was therefore his daring to ſay, that it was neceſſary to baniſh the corruption: and upon that footing, the Proteſtants might place him in general among the witneſſes of truth. I do not believe that the compilers of theſe witneſſes have always acted with a ſuitable diſcernment. This by the by. If Ferrante Palavicino, who was hanged for his books againſt the Pope; if the authors of the Syndicat of Alexander VII, and the Hiſtorian of Dona Olympia, had lived in the XIIIth or XIVth century, Flacius Illyricus might have put them in his catalogue; nevertheleſs there are no perſons leſs worthy of that place than ſuch authors.

Note, That there are Proteſtants who maintain that Savonarola was an impoſtor. Read the theſis *Artes tyrannicas Hieronymi Savonarolæ repræſentans*, - - - *Repreſenting the tyrannical arts of Jerom Savonarola*, which was defended at Iëna in the year 1690, under the preſidency of Mr Buddeus.

[*N*] *He wrote a great many books, wherein we find a good deal of unction and piety.*] This is Mr Du Pin's judgment upon them: *He has compoſed* (ſays he) *a* (156) *prodigious number of books, moral, ſpiritual, and practical: they abound in the unction and maxims of piety: he there freely cenſures vice, and teaches the pureſt and the moſt ſublime morality* (157). Mr Du Pin has given us the catalogue of this Fryar's works, we find it alſo in the Appendix to Dr Cave, with a great many particulars concerning the different editions (158). Some of them were put in the *Index Librorum prohibitorum & expurgandorum*, and there aroſe a great diſpute under Pope Paul IV, whether or not they ſhould all be treated in the ſame manner; but by the extraordinary vigilance of the Dominicans it was carried in the negative, and it was reſolved to ſtand to what had already been decreed againſt ſome of them, and that even theſe ſhould not be branded as heretical or erroneous: the penalty of ſuſpenſion was thought ſufficient (159). Of all the many books written by Savonarola, none has been more univerſally approved of than that which is intituled, *Triumphus Crucis, ſeu de Fidei Chriſtianæ veritate*, - - - *The Triumph of the Croſs, or of the Truth of Chriſtianity*. Cardinal Onophrius (160), who died at Rome in the year 1646, *ordered by a codicil annexed to his laſt will*, that they ſhould cauſe it to be reprinted *in good characters . . . . with the Paraphraſe of the ſame author* upon the Miſerere, *and left five hundred crowns for that purpoſe* (161). Let us obſerve that Savonarola's book againſt Judicial Aſtrology, was printed in Italian, at Florence, in the year 1495, and that it was tranſlated into Latin, and illuſtrated with notes, by Thomas Boninſignius. This tranſlation was printed at Florence in the year 1581, in 8vo (162). The ſame book was tranſlated into High Dutch, by Thomas Eraſtus (163). It is ſaid that Savonarola encouraged John Picus to write againſt Judicial Aſtrology (164). The reaſon that is given for his hatred

to

(*n*) Baron Apologet. Ordinis Prædicat. *Tom. ii, pag.* 91.

(150) Witneſs what paſſed in Holland in the year 1667, againſt the miniſter Labadie, who among other books cauſed one to be printed with this title, *Traitté de ſaiſon eccleſiaſtique & theologique tout enſemble, des Cenſures reeles Eccleſiaſtiques, Suſpenſions, Interdictions ou Excommunications, &c.*

(151) Savonar. Epiſt. ad Alexandrum VI, *in the* Preuves ſur l'Hiſtoire de Comines, *p.* 346.

(152) See the remark [*G*].

(153) Gurtlerus, (for example) profeſſor of Divinity at Deventer. He proves it by the paſſage of Philip de Comines, which he quotes according to the bad tranſlation of Sleidan. See his *Syſtema Theologiæ Propheticæ*, cap. xxiv, pag. 430, 431, Edit. Amſt. 1702.

(154) Voëtius, ubi ſupra, *Part ii, pag.* 1070.

(155) Id. ibid. *pag.* 1069.

(156) Du Pin, Biblioth. *Tom. xii, pag.* 115, *Dutch Edition.*

(157) Ib. *p.* 116.

(158) Wharton, Appendix ad Hiſtor. Literariam Gul. Cave, *pag.* 164, *& ſeq.*

(159) *See* Wharton, ibid. *p.* 163.

(160) He was brother to Urban VIII, and had been a Capuchin Friar. *Pierre de S. Romuald, Journal Chronol.* Tom. ii, pag. m. 289.

(161) Ibid. *See alſo the* Preuves ſur Philippe de Comines, *pag. m.* 346.

(162) Wharton, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 164.

(163) Verheiden, in Iconib. *p.* 15.

(164) Bullart, Academie des Sciences, *Tom. ii, pag.* 6.

charge, the accuſation of his boaſting that he converſed with God [*O*]. He had great conflicts with the devils, and rendered himſelf formidable to theſe princes of darkneſs [*P*]. I muſt not forget that one of the things which ſerved to make him odious was his affection for the King of France (*o*). There is room to believe that he was attached to that prince, becauſe having preſumed to propheſy that great revolutions would happen, and turning his eyes on all ſides to ſeek out the Cyrus deſtined by God to fullfil that great work (*p*), he found none ſo fit for that purpoſe as Charles VIII. From that moment he declared him to be the choſen Cyrus of God, and dedicated all his ſervices to him. It is the common practice of theſe falſe prophets, and we have examples of it

to Aſtrologers appears to me very chimerical: however, I ſhall recite it, it will ſerve to ſhew the credulity of Florimond de Remond. ‘ The exceſſive vanity of ‘ Savanarola, who pretended to be a prophet, was pre- ‘ ſently found out by the very Aſtrologers; for as there ‘ was a conjunction of Venus and Saturn, and the ‘ Moon was in the meridian of her hemiſphere, on ‘ the twenty-firſt of September, 1452, at forty-four ‘ minutes paſt five in the afternoon, they immediately ‘ ſaw the pride and arrogance of that Monk. For ‘ this reaſon was he ſuch a bitter enemy to Aſtrology, ‘ having armed Picus Mirandolanus againſt it (165).’

[*O*] *I ſay ſomething of a letter . . . wherein, among other accuſations, he examines that, of his boaſting that he converſed with GOD.*] There is no doubt but that he was ſaid to enjoy that excellent prerogative; but this is no proof that he himſelf had acknowledged it expreſsly. Thoſe who are fond of a devotee, aſcribe many more things to him than he himſelf pretends to. They preſently go beyond bounds, by amplifying. If he confeſſes that God has been graciouſly pleaſed to reveal ſome event to him, and that he partakes of immediate illumination, they officiouſly decide the manner of it, and affirm, at laſt, that God converſes with him as he did with Moſes. Be it as it will, the prevailing opinion was, that he himſelf pretended to talk with God. Here is a great witneſs for this opinion. *The people of Florence are not fooliſh, whom, nevertheleſs, Friar Savonarola perſuaded that he converſed with GOD.* It is thus that Gabriel Naudé (166) cites the teſtimony of Machiavel. I ſhall give it more at large, to the end that the tenderneſs of the author, and the occaſion of his diſcourſe may be ſeen. He had juſt ſaid that, tho' it be more eaſy to perſuade ignorant people into a new thing, it is not impoſſible to do the ſame by people of ſenſe. After that, he quotes the example of Friar Jerom. ‘ Al popolo di ‘ Firenze non pare eſſere ne ignorante ne rozzo, non- ‘ dimeno da Fratre Girolamo Savonarola fu perſuaſo ‘ che parlava con Dio. Io non voglio giudicare s'egli ‘ era vero ò nò, perche d'un tanto huomo ſe ne deb- ‘ be parlare con riverenza. Ma io dico bene che in- ‘ finiti lo credevano, ſenza havere viſto coſa neſſuna ‘ ſtraordinaria, da farlo loro credere; perche la vita ‘ ſua, la dottrina, il ſoggetto che preſe, erano ſuf- ‘ ficienti à fargli preſtare fede (167). - - - - *The people* ‘ *of Florence neither ſeem to be ignorant nor fooliſh,* ‘ *and nevertheleſs they ſuffered themſelves to be perſuaded* ‘ *by Friar Jerom Savonarola that he converſed with* ‘ *GOD. I will not pretend to judge whether this was* ‘ *true or falſe, becauſe one ought to ſpeak with reverence* ‘ *of ſo great a man: but this I may ſay, that vaſt num-* ‘ *bers of people believed it, without having ſeen any* ‘ *thing extraordinary to make them do ſo; becauſe his* ‘ *life, his doctrine, and the ſubject that he pitched upon* ‘ *were ſufficient to gain credit to him.*’ We have ſeen above (168) the teſtimony of Pierius Valerianus. I could cite a great many others, but where is the neceſſity of compiling? Do we need any other proofs but the letter which Savonarola wrote to Pope Alexander VI, to vindicate himſelf from the accuſations contained in a brief of the ſaid Pope? The fourth of theſe accuſations is, that he was ſaid to converſe with God (169). He anſwers, that he never ſpoke ſo in expreſs words, but that, ſuppoſing he had even made uſe of that expreſſion, he ſhould not deſerve to be puniſhed, ſince there is no law for puniſhing thoſe who ſay that they converſe with God. He adds, that ſuch a law would be abſurd and impious, ſince no man can impoſe a law upon God, who may converſe with whom he pleaſes. *Quarto dicitur & cum deo loqui: hoc etiam nunquam expreſsè dixi, nec unquam utor tali modo loquendi, ut teſtis eſt univerſus populus Florentinus: quod etiam ſi dixiſſem nullam propter hoc incurrerem pœnam; non enim invenitur in aliquo loco ſcriptum, nec in toto corpore Juris Canonici nec Civilis nec in aliquo authentico libro, quod qui dixit ſe cum Deo loqui puniatur: ſtultum etiam eſſet & impium facere talem legem, cum nullus poſſit imponere legem Deo; poteſt enim ipſe loqui cum quibus vult, & eis præcipere ut dicant, Hoc dixit Dominus meus, ſicut Prophetæ faciebant* (170).

His anſwers to the greateſt part of the other accuſations go almoſt upon the ſame foundation. He denies (171), for example, that he had boaſted of being a prophet; but he maintains, that if he had done ſo, he ſhould not be liable to puniſhment. He does not acknowledge (172) that he ſaid abſolutely, and with a deſign to make himſelf equal to God, *If am a liar,* Jesus Christ *is ſo.* He confines himſelf to certain particular caſes, wherein he pretends that he might lawfully uſe that expreſſion. He has recourſe to a diſtinction of the like nature, when he tries to juſtify himſelf for having ſaid (173), that ſuch as did not give credit to his predictions were out of the way of ſalvation. I only meant that, ſays he, of ſuch people as oppoſed me through a ſpirit of obſtinacy. He was no bad proficient in the art of Sophiſtry, that art which is ſo neceſſary to thoſe who deal in predictions (174).

[*P*] *He had great conflicts with the devils, and rendered himſelf formidable to theſe princes of darkneſs.*] Naudé puts him ‘ in the rank . . . . of thoſe Monks ‘ of whom St Jerom ſays, qui dæmonum contra ſe ‘ pugnantium portenta fingunt, ut apud imperitos & ‘ vulgi homines miraculum ſui faciant, - - - *who in-* ‘ *vent ſtrange ſtories of their fighting with devils, in* ‘ *order to excite the admiration of vulgar and ignorant* ‘ *people,* ſince the half of the book, which he wrote ‘ upon his prophecies, contains nothing elſe but the ‘ conference he had with the devil whom he miſtook ‘ for a hermit (175).’ John Francis Picus affirms, that the devils which tormented the bodies of poſſeſſed people, or haunted the convent of the Dominicans, very much dreaded the ſight of Savonarola, and that out of pure ſpite and rage they always pronounced his name, with ſome alteration or abridgment of the letters. They threatned him often, and fled as faſt as they could, being awed by the words which he pronounced againſt them. He drove them from the cells of the monaſtery, among other means, by the ſprinkling of holy water, accompanied with the ſinging of Pſalms. For this reaſon they deſiſted from tormenting the other Monks, and redoubled their efforts againſt him alone. He was ſometimes obliged to ſtop ſhort, while he was walking the rounds in the convent, with a deſign to protect the Friars from their inſults; for they had thickned the air to ſuch a degree, that he could not go any further. I ſhall quote my author words; they are more emphatical than the idea which I give of them. *Dæmones qui vel obſeſſa corpora vexabant, vel ad hominum terriculamenta per ædes ſancti Marci ſtrepebant, mirum in modum ab aſpectu* Hieronymi *formidabant, nec unquam ejus ſincere nomen præ rabie exprimebant, ſed aut literas invertentes, aut nomen decurtantes aut in aliud ludicrum transformabant* (176). . . . . *Minabantur illi perſæpe, ſed illicò evaneſcebant, ſanctiſſima quæ in eos effunderet verba ſubveriti. Eo tempore quo Ethruriæ ſodales fratres à Ciſalpinis ſecreverat, dæmonum numeroſa cohors, bono quod inde ſequi conjectabatur infeſta, cæptum præpedire opus molita eſt: proinde & cænobii habitatores univerſos moleſtiis impetere, & terroribus quatere, quorum inſultibus, tum orationibus, tum adjurationibus continuis* Hieronymus *obſiſtebat, & noctu etiam ſanctæ aquæ aſperſione per Monaſterium pſallens eos à cellis & edibus abigebat. Sed poſtquam juvari Diſcipulos* Hieronymi *precibus magis quam lædi ſuis infeſtationibus ac umbratilibus bellis animadvertêre dæmones, ceſſandum ſibi duxerunt: plus tamen in* Hieronymum *conaminum, quo poterant impetu molientes, cui & noctis intempeſtæ ſilentio conſuetum dum iter arriperet,*

(*o*) See in the remark [*K*], the words of Arnoldus Ferronus.

(*p*) See Nauclerus, *Gener. L. Part. ii, pag. m.* 989.

(165) Florimond de Remond, Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, *livr. i, chap. v, num.* 4, *pag. m.* 30.

(166) Naudé, ubi ſupra, *ch. iii, pag. m.* 52.

(167) Machiav. Diſcorſi ſopra Tito Livio, *lib. i, cap. xi, p. m.* 32.

(168) In the remark [M], citat. 146.

(169) Quarto *dicitur & cum deo loqui.* Savon. Epiſt. ad Alexandrum VI: *It is in the* Preuves ſur les Memoires de Phil. de Comines, *p. m.* 337, *& ſeq.* Burchard, *in his* Diarium, *pag. m.* 46, *ſays* In prædicationibus ſuis publicè dicebat Salvatorem noſtrum ſæpe ſibi loqui. - - - *He ſaid publickly in his ſermons that our Saviour often converſed with him.*

(170) Savonar. ibidem.

(171) Ibid. *pag.* 340.

(172) Ibid. *pag.* 339.

(173) Ibid.

(174) See the remark [*K*] of the article DEJOTARUS.

(175) Naudé, ubi ſupra, *p.* 451.

(176) Jo. Franc. Picus, in Vita Savonarolæ, *pag.* 123.

it which are of a fresher date still than that of Drabicius. I do not know whether Savonarola had not attended to a maxim which Machiavel has published since, quoting him for an example of it [*Q*]. This maxim is, that Prophets who are not supported by the secular arm, nor by any other weapons besides their own tongue and the prepossession of the people, *sola Majeſtate armati*, *armed with nothing else but majeſty*, are exposed to terrible changes of fortune. I ſhall make a remark upon the different ways of writing his name [*R*].

& cellas omnes pſalmis & aquæ ſacræ guttis ſeu propugnaculis armaret, ſic denſarunt aërem (mihi poſtea ſicut ipſe retulit) ulterius ut ſibi facultas omnino per cænobium incedendi præcluſa videretur; hiſque ſunt illi verbis interminati. Quot tibi malorum acervas & quæris; Nos in te namque tot & tanta concitabimus, ut ſuſtinere non valeas. Ad quæ lætus ille reſpondit, quæcumque vellent pararent & exererent, horum nihil ſe formidare, quià adjutorium ejus in nomine Domini qui fecit cœlum & terram (177). This paſſage is in the chapter where the author relates the extaſies of Savonarola, and that the Holy Ghoſt appeared in the ſhape of a dove, and put his bill to that Friar's ear. ‘ Silveſter ejus vitæ comes & Martyrii conſors, roganti mihi de *Hieronymi* ſanctitate, atque obſecranti ut occulti quippiam in rerum ejus confirmationem (ſciebam enim eum multorum ſecretorum conſcium) affirmavit, columbæ ſpeciem, quæ ſancti Spiritus præſentiam gratiamque indicaret, ſemel atque iterum ſe vidiſſe *Hieronymi* humero inſidentem, argenteis aureiſque coruſcantem pennis redimitam, & roſtro in aurem ipſius porrecto inſuſurrantem (178). - - - *Sylveſter, who was companion to Savonarola in his life, and partaker with him in his martyrdom, when I aſked him concerning Savonarola's ſanctity, and begged that he would give me ſome ſecret proof of it, (for I knew that Sylveſter was well acquainted with many ſecret particulars of Savonarola's life) aſſured me, that he had ſeen oftener than once the appearance of a dove, which intimated the preſence and grace of the Holy Ghoſt, perch upon Savonarola's ſhoulder, and glittering with gold and ſilver feathers, whiſpering him with it's bill in his ear.*’

(177) Id. ibid. *pag.* 124.

(178) Id. ibid. *pag.* 123.

REFLEXIONS upon a paſſage of Mr Claude, concerning Luther.

In reading this remark, perhaps, ſome people will call to mind a certain circumſtance in the diſputes which Mr. Claude had with the gentlemen of Port Royal, and will poſſibly imagine that theſe gentlemen did a raſh thing, when they challenged him to prove, that in Luther's time the Monks talked loudly of their exploits againſt the devils. This makes me ſay, that Savonarola's example would have been of no ſervice to Mr Claude. Every body knows that the controverſy-writers of the church of Rome object, as a very ſtrong argument, the diſpute which Luther relates to have paſſed between him and the devil concerning the maſs. Mr Claude, when he comes to anſwer this objection, ſays, among other things, that *Luther, following the ſtile of the Monks of that time, who uſed by a kind of rhetorical figure to ſtuff books with their exploits againſt the devil, relates that once upon his waking in the night, the devil accuſed him that he had cauſed the people of* GOD *to commit idolatry, and had committed idolatry himſelf during the ſpace of fifteen years that he had ſaid private maſſes* (179).

(179) Claude Défenſe de la Réformation, *pag.* 136.

The reply that was made to this paſſage is reduced to three queſtions, the laſt of which I leave out: for it is ſufficient to mention here the firſt and ſecond. ‘ The firſt is, whether a ſenſible perſon can believe that Luther's ſtory is a rhetorical figure. The ſecond, whether this figure be an uſual thing with the Monks (180).

(180) Addition aux Préjugez Legitimes contre les Calviniſtes, *p.* 364: *the Bruſſels edition* 1683.

What was ſaid upon the firſt queſtion would be ſuperfluous here; I ſhall only ſpeak of the explication of the ſecond.

‘ The ſecond queſtion † may be decided with as little difficulty; for it conſiſts in a fact which it concerns Mr Claude to prove, and he deſerves to be looked upon as a ſlanderous perſon, unleſs he can juſtify the ſame by examples. He ſays, that *the Monks of that time uſed, by a kind of rhetorical figure, to ſtuff books with their exploits againſt the devil.* We confeſs that we know no examples of ſuch figures. There are Monks who relate apparitions of devils, but then they relate them as true, and with an intention to make them paſs for ſuch. If theſe apparitions are well-grounded, they were in the right to relate them, and the holy fathers have done ſo before them. If they have believed them upon too ſlight a foundation, their credulity is to be cenſured. If they have related them without believing what they told, they deſerve the character of knaves and impoſtors. But Mr Claude cannot prove that any one has related ſtories like that which Luther tells, and with circumſtances as particular as thoſe inſerted by him, at the ſame time that he only wanted to make them paſs for rhetorical figures. We therefore ſtill expect that Mr Claude ſhould explain himſelf upon this point, and unleſs he do ſo, he cannot eſcape being condemned by wiſe people, as guilty of a diſhonourable malignity (181).

† This ſecond queſtion is, whether the Monks in Luther's time uſed to ſtuff books with their exploits againſt the Devil by rhetorical figures like the ſtory which Luther tells of his conference with the Devil, which ſtory Mr Claude would gladly put off for a rhetorical figure.

(181) Ibid. *pag.* 372, 373.

It is manifeſt that Savonarola's exploits againſt the devils cannot be alledged as a proof of what Mr Claude had advanced; for they are not at all things that were related by a kind of rhetorical figure.

[*Q*] *A maxim that Machiavel has publiſhed ſince, quoting him for an example of it.*] I ſhall cite him according to the French tranſlation of Mr Amelot, and with his notes. ‘ To (182) underſtand this point well, it is neceſſary to ſee whether theſe Legiſlators ſtand by themſelves, or depend upon others, that is to ſay, whether, in order to carry on their enterprize, they are obliged to make uſe of prayers and entreaties, and in that caſe they are always unſucceſsful: or if they are able to force an obedience, and then they hardly ever fail to ſucceed. From thence it comes that all the princes, whom I have named, with arms prevailed, and without them were undone. For, beſides the reaſons mentioned, there is a fickleneſs in the nature of people. It is eaſy to perſuade them of a thing, but difficult to keep them up in that perſuaſion. Things ſhould therefore be ſo well ordered, that when they no longer believe, they may be compelled to believe by force. Moſes ‡, Cyrus, Theſeus, and Romulus, could never have got their laws to be obſerved long, if they had been unarmed, as it happened in our days to the Dominican Jerom Savonarola, who was ruined for want of having the means in his hands of obliging thoſe who had once believed his words to perſiſt in their faith, and of compelling the incredulous to believe them ‡.

(182) Machiavel, in his treatiſe, *Del Principe*, chap. vi.

‡ Whoever reads the Bible with a ſound judgment, ſays Machiavel, (in the 30th chapter of the third book of his Diſcourſes) will ſee that Moſes, to render his laws inviolable, was obliged to put to death an infinite number of people, who oppoſed his deſigns out of envy. Moſes having called the Iſraelites together, ſaid unto them: *Thus ſaith the Lord God of Iſrael, put every man his ſword by his ſide, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and ſlay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbour. And the children of Levi did according to the word of Moſes: and there fell of the people that day about three thouſand men.* (Exod. xxxii. 27, 28.)

‡ Machiavel ſays, he had perſuaded the people of Florence, that he converſed with God (*Diſc. lib. i, cap. xi.*) Nardi ſays that thoſe of Savonarola's party were called at Florence, *Piagnoni*, that is to ſay, the Weepers or Hypocrites: and his enemies, *Arrabiati*, that is to ſay, the mad or undiſciplinable (*Hiſtor. Flor. lib. ii.*)

[*R*] *I ſhall make a remark upon the different ways of writing his name.*] The true name is Savonarola; but the French have been allowed to change the termination a little by ſaying Savonarole. They ſhould be ſatisfied with this alteration, and not ſay Savanarole, as they almoſt all do. Some have carried their liberty a great deal further; Du Verdier Vauprivas (183) writes Savoranole: Prateolus (184) Sevanarola: Du Pleſſis Mornai (185), and James Gohori (186), Savonaroola: Florimond de Remond (187) Savonarolle: a diſciple of Mr Buddeus (188) Savanorola.

This confirms what I have ſaid in other places (189).

(183) *In his* Proſopographie, *Tom. iii, p.* 2330. (184) *In Vol. II, of his* Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe, *fol.* 304. (185) *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, the Saumur edition in folio, and the Geneva edition in 8vo. (186) In the tranſlation of Machiavel upon Titus Livius, *lib. i, ch. xi.* (187) Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, *livr. ii, ch. i, p. m.* 121. (188) In a theſis maintained at Iëna, in the year 1690. (189) In the remark [*B*] of the article EPHORUS. See likewiſe the article MONTMAUR, at the beginning of the text, in the margin.

SAWICKI (GASPAR) a Jeſuit, was born at Vilna in Lithuania in 1542. He entered into the ſociety of Jeſuits at Rome in 1566, and after having ſtudied Divinity, he returned into Poland and taught controverſy at Vilna. He was for nine years Prefect of the novices at Cracow, and ſuperior of the profeſſed houſe five years in the ſame city. He had in other places no leſs honourable employments. He was alſo a preacher. He followed the ambaſſadors of the King of Poland into Muſcovy, and was a great aſſiſtance to them during the three years of a cloſe impriſonment he ſpent with them. Notwithſtanding his great age, and his ſickneſs, he was obliged to accept the office of procurator of the Jeſuits at Rome, and acquitted himſelf very well in it: but as he was returning into Poland, he died in a poſt-chariot near Francfort upon the Oder, the nineteenth of January 1620. He compoſed many books, wherein, inſtead of his own name, he took a ſuppoſititious one (a) [A]. I do not believe now that it is he, who treated Eraſmus ill, in a book publiſhed under the name of Gaſpar Cichocius [B].

[A] *He compoſed many books, wherein, inſtead of his own name, he took a ſuppoſititious one.*] That which he intituled, *Anatomia conſilii editi de ſtabilienda pace Regni Poloniæ, Jeſuitis pulſis*, was publiſhed in 1611, under the name of Gaſpar Cichocki. He publiſhed in the Poliſh tongue a dialogue, *Curſoris & Nautæ in quo de violentia Gedanenſium Monialium S. Brigittæ per Hereticos facta proſcriptione narratio inſtituitur*; and he took the name of Lunowſki. He compoſed under that of John Golubſki, *Replica rumorum Poſnanienſium ab hæretico Miniſtro per Pruſſiam ſparſorum. Triplica contra duplicam Miniſtri Torunienſis. Mirabilis concordia, ſeu potius veriſſima rabies Evangelicorum inter ſe, contra Joannem Tiviecki Hæreticum* (1).

[B] *That he treated Eraſmus ill.*] Father Theophilus Raynaud having mentioned ſome things very diſadvantageous to Eraſmus, refers his reader to Gaſpar Chicocius: *Videndus qui varias ejus impietates & adverſus eum judicia ſapientum addenſat Gaſpar Chicocius*, lib. 1. Alloquiorum cap. 19. & 20 (2.) Guy Patin, who knew books well, and had a good library, was ſhort in the matter: it is probable he thought he could hear no news of that book at Paris, ſince he conſulted the oracle at Lyons, I mean the author himſelf, who had cited Chicocius. *Give me leave*, ſays he to his friend of Lyons, *to be a little importunate with you: When you ſee Father Theophilus, try to know of him who Gaſpar Chicocius is*, lib. 1. Alloquiorum, *who writ againſt Eraſmus, and where that book was printed* (3). He gives us no account of any anſwer. As for me, I ingenuouſly confeſs I never ſaw that book: thoſe whom I have conſulted about it, told me that they had never heard of ſuch an author.. I thought it was Gaſpar Sawicki, and I affirmed it in the firſt edition of this Dictionary; but I am now of another opinion: I find it was a canon and curate of Sendomir. He is cited in a book of Staniſlaus Lubienietſki (4). I have read in Simon Starovolſcius, that Gaſpar Cichocius, born at Tarnowitz, a city of the leſſer Poland, was made Maſter of Arts in 1567, and that afterwards he obtained of Cardinal George Radziwil, this canonry and rectory, and that he compoſed two books, the one called *Anatomia*, to juſtify the Jeſuits, and the other *Alloquia Oſieciana*, to refute the errors of Heretics (5). This laſt work would have brought a great miſchief upon him, for he treated the King of England very ill in it; but death freed him from the danger. *Fecit* .... librum .... Alloquia Oſieciana dictum, quo Hæreticorum errores oſtendit ac refutat ſimul, *quamvis ſucceſſu parum felici, quod minus honorificam in eis Regis Angli mentionem feciſſet: tuliſſetque ſane multa acerba & gravia, ni mors ſenem opportune liberaſſet* (6).

(a) Taken from the *Bibliotheque* of Alegambe, *p.* 152.

(1) *Taken from* Alegambe, Bibl. Scriptor. Societatis Jeſu, *p.* 152, 153.

(2) Th. Raynaudus, Erotemat. de malis ac bonis Libris, *p.* 25.

(3) Patin, *Tom. ii, letter cclxxxvi.*

(4) Gaſpar Cichocius Canonicus & Parochus Sendomirienſis in Alloquiis Oſiecenſibus memoriæ prodidit. *Staniſl. Lubieniecius, Hiſtor. Reform. Polon.* pag. 20.

(5) Simon Starovolſcius, Elog. & Vit. centum Poloniæ Scriptor. *cap. lxxix, pag.* 100.

(6) Id. ibid.

SCALA (BARTHOLOMEW) a learned man in the XVth century, was born at Florence in the year 1424 (a). He was the ſon of a Miller [A]; but he raiſed himſelf by his induſtry and and learning. He was a domeſtic of Coſmo de Medicis, after which the Florentines raiſed him by degrees to ſeveral conſiderable employments, and ennobled him, and gave him a place in the ſenate [B]. He was alſo ſecretary to that Republic (b). He wrote Latin tolerably well for thoſe times, but now and then a barbariſm eſcaped him (c). Politian having criticiſed on a little Poem of Scala, opened the way to a quarrel, which increaſed much by the anſwers and replies (d). It is ſaid that Scala bore him already a private grudge, becauſe ſeveral letters he had writ in the name of the Republic had not pleaſed Laurence de Medicis, who had employed Politian to write others (e). Be this how it will, Scala undertook to write the Hiſtory of Florence, from the foundation of that city till the year 1450. His work comprehends twenty books, but he only compleated five, becauſe death hindered his going on. Neverthele ſs he lived ſeventy-three years, for he did not die till the year 1497. He alſo compoſed the life of Vitalian Borromeo, and an harangue to Innocent

[A] *He was the ſon of a Miller.*] It is Leander Albertus who tells us ſo. ‘ Bartholomæus Scala, *ſays he* ‘ (1), vir doctus, ut potius Muſarum alumnus, quam ‘ inter rotas molarum natus videretur. - - - - *Bartholomew Scala, a learned man, who rather ſeems to have* ‘ *been the foſter-child of the Muſes than one born in a* ‘ *mill.*’ Scala writes himſelf, that he was of a low extraction. ‘ Veni nudus, omnium rerum bonarum ‘ egenus ad remp. viliſſimis ortus parentibus, multa ‘ cum fide, nullis omnino divitiis, aut titulis, nullis ‘ clientelis, nullis cognationibus (2). - - - - *I came to* ‘ *the Republic naked and deſtitute of every thing, being born* ‘ *of the meaneſt parents. I brought with me a great deal* ‘ *of integrity, but no riches nor titles, neither dependents* ‘ *nor relations.*’ Politian having called him *monſtrum furfuraceum*, - - *a mealy monſter*, gives this reaſon for it: ‘ Monſtrum quidem qui ex colluvione monſtro‘rum compoſitus es: furfuraceum verò in priſtini ſor‘dibus natus, & quidem piſtrino digniſſimus (3.) - - *You* ‘ *are a monſter truly, as being made up of a filthy jumble* ‘ *of monſters; and mealy, as having been born in a dirty* ‘ *grinding-houſe, which is indeed much the fitteſt place* ‘ *for you.*’

[B] *The Florentines raiſed him, and gave him a place in the ſenate.*] Speaking of this in the letter juſt now cited, he ſays: ‘ Coſmus tamen pater patriæ noſtræ ‘ me complexus eſt, recepitque in familiæ obſequia. ‘ Interea Florentinus populus ad prioratum me evexit, ‘ deinde ad vexilliferatum; tandemque & in Senato‘rium me ordinem equeſtremque collocavit, tanto pro‘fecto ſuffragiorum conſenſu, ut nihil eſſe factum un‘quam popularius multi putarent (4). - - - *Neverthele ſs* ‘ *Coſmo, the true father of our country, caſt a favourable* ‘ *eye upon me, and received me into the number of his* ‘ *domeſtics. In the mean time the people of Florence raiſed* ‘ *me to the dignity of a prior, afterwards to that of a* ‘ *ſtandard-bearer, and laſt of all they placed me in the* ‘ *rank of ſenators and knights, with ſuch an unanimity* ‘ *of ſuffrages, that, in the opinion of many, nothing was* ‘ *ever done in a more popular way.*’ Politian would have thought, that he had treated him too well if he had ſaid to him, *Cabal did as much towards it as merit:*

He

(a) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *p.* 616.

(b) Politian. Epiſt. III, *lib. v*, & Ep. xviii, *lib. xii.*

(c) As *culex* in the feminine gender, and *monſtrum* in the maſculine gender. *Polit. Epiſt. viii, & xvi, lib. xii,*

(d) See the 12th book of Politian's letters. You will find alſo three letters of Scala in the fifth.

(e) Scis autem tu quoque literas illum ſæpe tuas publice ſcriptas rejeciſſe, nobiſque dediſſe formandas, quæ prima odii livoriſque in me tui cauſa extitit. - - - *But you likewiſe know that he often rejected the letters, which you had written in the name of the Republic, and gave me the charge of compoſing them, which was the firſt cauſe of your hatred and ill will to me.* Polit. Ep. xviii. *lib. xii.*

(1) Deſcript. Ital. *p.* 70.

(2) Scala, Epiſt. ad Ang. Politian. *It is the 16th of the 12th book of Politian's Letters. Paris* 1526, *in* 4*to.*

(3) Politian. Epiſt. xviii, *lib. xii.*

(4) Scala, ibid.

Innocent VIII &c (*f*) [C]. Alexandra Scala his daughter was well verſed in the Greek and Latin tongues, as I ſhall preſently ſhew, and thereby ſhe came to be married to a learned Greek. Politian praiſed her much, he did not think it at all fit that he ſhould extend to the daughter the reflexions which he had caſt upon the father. The daughter on her ſide had no regard to that quarrel, but anſwered the civilities of Politian with other civilities.

(*f*) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *p.* 616.

He pretends that it was a mere ſport of fortune. ‘ De honoribus quidem nihil eſt quod tibi nimium placeas ; vetus enim ludus hic, ut indigni tollantur in altum, videlicet ut hoc quoque poſſe fortuna declaret, cujus tu ſolius opus es (5). - - - *You have no reaſon to value yourſelf on account of your preferments, becauſe they are entirely owing to fortune, whoſe old game it is to exalt men of no merit, on purpoſe to ſhew that to this alſo her power extends.*’

[C] *He alſo compoſed . . . . . an harangue to Innocent VIII,* &c.] The liſt of his works, if I am not miſtaken, is pretty compleat in the catalogue of the Florentine writers, compoſed by Pocciantius, and printed at Florence in 1589. There were then but few of Scala's writings printed. Two learned Danes took care to publiſh the chief of them, *viz.* the Florentine Hiſtory (6), and the Life of Vitalian Borromeo (7) I cannot tell whether the Apologies, which Marſilius Ficinus very much eſteemed, and the Letter which he writ upon the queſtion, *Whether a wiſe man ought to marry* (8), have been publiſhed. *Apologi centum ad Laurentium Medicem, quos miris encomiis exornat Ficinus in 8vo, libro epiſtolarum* (9).

(5) Politian. ubi ſupra.

(6) Oliger Jacobæus publiſhed it in 4to. It is mentioned in the fourth Journal of Italy 1677.

(7) Chriſtopher Bartholinus publiſhed it. It is mentioned in the ſame Journal of Italy.

(8) *This queſtion was handled by Heinſius. See in* Baudii Amores *the letter,* An & qualis viro literato ſit ducenda uxor? *To which is added the diſſertation of an anonymous writer,* De Matrimonio Literati, an cœlibem eſſe an nubere conveniat? *It is in a collection of ſeveral pieces, printed in the year* 1606.

(9) Pocciantius de Scriptor. Florentinis, *p.* 24.

SCALA (Alexandra) daughter to one learned man and wife to another, was her ſelf well ſkilled both in the Greek and Latin tongues (*a*). Her father was the abovementioned Bartholomew Scala. I have ſpoken in its proper place, of Michael Marullus her huſband. Politian lived in a more amicable way with her than with her father. He praiſed her often in Greek ; ſhe anſwered him in the ſame language (*b*). They writ verſes to each other, which were printed: but what Marullus and Politian writ to one another, was the fartheſt thing in the world from compliments (*c*) ; it was a war of erudition, full of animoſity and injurious words. The reaſon why Marullus married Alexandra Scala, was becauſe he would perfect himſelf in the Latin tongue [*A*], if we may believe Paulus Jovius: but if we may believe her huſband, ſhe was very beautiful, and very virtuous, and why ſhould we doubt that thoſe good qualities, and the employments of her father might not have procured to her the courtſhip of Marullus? It would be a very edifying thing to ſee this Poet make verſes in praiſe of his wife [*B*] ; for we ſcarce ſee any

(*a*) Voſſius, Hiſt. Lat. *p.* 616.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Cum Politiano . . . maledicentiſſimis epiſtolis lites extenderat. *Jovius, Elog. cap. xxviii.*

[*A*] *Becauſe he would perfect himſelf in the Latin tongue.*] I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of Paulus Jovius. ‘ Nihil jam Græcè doctum eſſe ſatis ad laudem putabat, niſi tota patrii ſermonis facultas Romanæ facundiæ jungeretur, Propterea Florentiæ Alexandram eruditi ingenii puellam uxorem duxit (1). - - - *He did not think it a ſufficient praiſe to him that he was maſter of the Greek tongue, unleſs to his native ſtock he could likewiſe join the Roman eloquence, for which reaſon he married, at Florence, Alexandra, a young woman of wit and learning.*’ Mr Varillas paraphraſing according to his cuſtom what he finds in books, enlarges upon Paul Jovius in this manner : ‘ The love Marullus had for the Latin tongue, made him marry the daughter of Bartholomew Scala (2), who underſtood and ſpoke it admirably well. She taught him ſo well, that Laurence de Medicis found him capable of tranſlating the Morals of Plutarch (3).’ I have already ſhewed that Marullus made Latin verſes before he married Alexandra Scala ; and therefore Jovius ſays too much, and Varillas, inſtead of rectifying it, amplifies it. We may compare his pen to ſpectacles.

[*B*] *Make verſes in praiſe of his wife.*] We are not to believe, that all the verſes we find in Marullus's poems to the praiſe of Alexandra Scala, were made after he married her ; we can, at moſt, only ſuſpect this little epigram to have been ſo (4).

Quod tam tota decens, formoſaque tota venuſta
  Rara quidem, ſed non unica Scala mea es ;
At quod caſta, decens, at quod formoſa pudica,
  Diſpeream ſi non unica Scala mea es.
Nam cum Pieridum reputo commercia ſacra,
  Jam non ulterius unica, Scala dea es.

My Scala, while I mark and trace
Your ev'ry charm, and ev'ry grace,
I own ſuch beauty to be rare ;
Yet others may be found as fair.
But when your heav'nly charms I ſee
From all immodeſt tincture free,
Then let me periſh, but I find
Scala the phœnix of her kind.
While laſt, as preſident of wit,
I ſee you with the Muſes ſit,
Scala no more a phœnix, is
A goddeſs mix'd with goddeſſes.

But if we conſider it well, we ſhall find no expreſſion here that ſignifies any thing of marriage ; *mea Scala* may as well be applied to a miſtreſs as to a wife ; and we ſee that Marullus makes uſe of the ſame mark of tenderneſs towards Sappho,

Hoc Sappho melior mea,
  Cujus facta domi dictaque plurima
Præſtans ingenium inquinant.

In this my Sappho's overcome,
Whoſe actions and diſcourſe at home
Defile her noble wit.

ſays he (5), praiſing the good manners which Alexandra Scala learned in the ſervice of the Muſes. All the other verſes he made in her praiſe, do manifeſtly relate to the time that preceded their marriage. There are ſome wherein he praiſes her (6), becauſe when ſhe was about fifteen years of age, ſhe made admirable verſes.

Cum verſu referas novem ſorores,
Vix luſtris bene adhuc tribus peractis,
Cùm dulci ſale ſeriiſque blandis
Ipſum jam ſuperes puella patrem,
Quo nihil gravius facetiuſque eſt.

Since e're three luſtrums of your age
Be reckon'd up, you thus engage
In Verſe and Poetry divine
To be the rival of the Nine ;
Since you at ſuch an age excel
Your father who compoſ'd ſo well,

Both

(1) Jovius, Elog. *cap. xxviii.*

(2) The Printers have put *Seula.*

(3) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, *p.* 179.

(4) Lib. iv, pag. m. 80.

(5) Epigr. lib. iv, pag. m. 71.

(6) Lib. iii, p. 64.

any now of this nature [C]: marriage commonly dries up the Poetical vein, which flowed ſo abundantly for a miſtreſs. But it does not appear that when he made thoſe verſes on her, he was her huſband. This learned Florentine woman died in 1506 (d).

(d) Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

Both in the humorous and gay,
And in the grave and ſolemn way.

In this ſame epigram he calls her *mea Scala*; yet one cannot believe that he was then her huſband. Let us ſee what he ſays to her father.

Plus multo tamen, ô beate amice, eſt
Quod Scalam Latio pater dediſti,
Aucturam numerum novem ſororum
Caſto carmine, caſtiore vita (7).

(7) Lib. iii, p. 54.

But this, O happy friend, is more
Than all which you have done before,
In that you gave us Scala. She
Will one among the Muſes be;
So chaſte her numbers are, and ſtill
Her life more chaſte . . . .

He was not then his ſon-in-law, when he ſpoke to him in that manner. That is plain.

[C] *We ſcarce ſee any now of this nature.*] There are many modern Poets, who would look upon themſelves to be highly reproached for having prodigally ſpent their praiſes, if they ſhould be told that they had praiſed their very wives. They would think that this expreſſion would have more force, than if it ſhould be ſaid of them, that they had praiſed all from the ſcepter down to the ſhepherd's crook, and from the cedar of mount Lebanon, to the hyſſop that grows on the wall. They would believe that this idea would give their flatteries the ſame extent which is given to love, in the following verſes (8):

(8) Hiſtoire Amour des Gaules.

Je penſerois n'être pas malheureux,
Si la beauté dont je ſuis amoureux
Pouvoit enfin ſe tenir ſatisfaite
De mille amans avec un Favori;
Mais j'enrage que la coquette
Aime encor juſqu'à ſon mari.

Yet ſhould not I unhappy prove
If that the fair-one, whom I love,
Could with a thouſand lovers be
Content and eaſy: but that ſhe
Should love her very huſband too
It makes me mad . . . . .

The moſt gallant Poets among the Antients did not pretend to ſo falſe and abſurd a nicety. Ovid praiſes his wife extreamly (9); Martial would have poſterity to know that his wife ſpoke well, and that ſhe kept him from being ſorry that he had left Rome.

(9) Ovidius, Triſt. *lib. iv, Eleg. ix.*

Tu deſiderium dominæ mihi mitius urbis
Eſſe jubes: Romam tu mihi ſola facis (10).

(10) Martial. Epig. xxi, lib. xii.

At my long abſence from the town
You bid me leſs afflicted be,
Since I am not aſham'd to own
That you alone are Rome to me.

I ſhall omit Statius, who hath ſo much praiſed his wife (11).

(11) Stat. Silvar. V. *lib. iii.*

SCAMANDER, a river of Phrygia near Troy. It was alſo called Xanthus; but there was a great difference between theſe two names: Scamander belonged to human language, Xanthus to that of the gods (a). This is the opinion of Homer. Some writers pretend that this Poet means that Xanthus was the antient name of this river [A], and that Scamander was the modern: others ſay, that it was called Scamander before it was called Xanthus [B], and ſeveral etymologies are given of thoſe two names (b). It is pretended that the waters of that river had the property of making womens hair that bathed in it, of a light colour, and that the Trojan women

(a) See the remark [*A*].

(b) See the remark [*B*].

[*A*] *Some writers pretend, that Homer means that Xanthus was the antient name of this river.*] Let us firſt cite what he ſays.

Ἄντα δ' ἄρ' Ἡφαίστοιο μέγας ποταμὸς βαθυδίνες
Ὃν Ξάνθον καλέουσι θεοὶ, ἄνδρες δὲ Σκάμανδρον.

Contra autem & Vulcanum magnus Fluvius verticibus profundus
Quem Xanthum vocant dii, homines vero Scamandrum (1).

(1) Homer. Iliad. lib. xx, ver. 73.

With fiery Vulcan laſt in battle ſtands
The ſacred flood that rolls on golden ſands;
Xanthus his name, with thoſe of heav'nly birth,
But call'd Scamander by the ſons of earth.

Pope.

Meziriac makes this remark upon it: 'As, *ſays he*, 'Vigenere has well obſerved upon the Scamander of 'Philoſtratus, when Homer gives two names to ſome 'things, one according to the gods, and the other 'according to men; it is to be underſtood that that 'of the gods is the antient, and almoſt forgotten 'name, and that of men the modern and moſt in 'uſe (2).' He might have cited the ſcholiaſt upon Homer to this purpoſe, and not Vigenere. Τῶν διωνύμων τὸ μὲν πρεσγενέστερον ὄνομα εἰς θεοὺς ἀναφέρει ὁ ποιητὴς, τὸ δὲ μεταγενέστερον εἰς ἀνθρώπους (3). Obſerve that Plutarch owns that Xanthus was the antient name (4). He adds, that this river was not called Scamander till Scamander the ſon of Coribas, had drowned himſelf in it, having loſt his ſenſes by an exceſs of devotion; that is, by having aſſiſted too aſſiduouſly at the myſteries of the mother of the gods. For ſo Meziriac (5) explains the Greek of Plutarch. Mauſſac explains it otherwiſe. Τῶν τῆς Ῥέας μυστηρίων τελουμένων αἰφνιδίως θεασάμενος, ἐμμανὴς ἐγένετο. Dum Rheæ myſteria celebrarentur derepente conſpectus furere cœpit (6). - - *Being ſuddenly diſcovered and ſeen by thoſe who were celebrating the myſteries of Rhea, he went mad.*

(2) Meziriac upon Ovid's Epiſtles. *p.* 467.

(3) Schol. in Iliad. *lib. xx. ver.* 74.

(4) Plutarch. de Fluviis, *p. m.* 43.

(5) Meziriac, ubi ſupra, *p.* 468.

(6) Plutarch. *ib. p.* 44.

[*B*] *Others ſay it was called Scamander before it was called Xanthus.*] Meziriac quotes three authors upon this matter. Theſe are his words (7): 'Ariſtotle 'book iii. chap. 12. of his hiſtory of animals, ſpeaks 'thus: Δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σκάμανδρος ποταμὸς ξανθὰ πρόβατα ποιεῖν, διὸ καὶ τὸν Ὅμηρον ἀντὶ 'Σκαμάνδρου Ξανθὸν προσαγορεύειν αὐτόν. *It ſeems 'that the river Scamander makes ſheep of a reddiſh 'colour, and that for this reaſon Homer calls it Xanthus, inſtead of Scamander.* Antigonus paradox 74, 'follows Ariſtotle and cites him. Ælian book viii. 'chap. 21. *de animalibus*, ſays the ſame more clearly 'ſtill. Ὁ δὲ ἐν Τροίᾳ Σκάμανδρος, ἐπεὶ ξανθὰς 'ἀποφαίνει πιούσας τὰς ὄϊς, πρὸς τῷ Σκαμάνδρῳ τῷ 'ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἄλλο ὄνομα ἡ τῶν προβάτων ἐπίκτητος 'χρόα ἔθετο. τὸν Ξάνθον. *The river of Troas called 'Scamander, becauſe it makes the ſheep rediſh that drink 'of its waters, has got the name of Xanthus, beſides 'that of Scamander, which it had before.*' After this Meziriac ſays (8), that the river Scamander, according to ſome, owes its origin to Hercules. That Hero being ready to die of thirſt, *fell a digging the earth, out of which ſprung the head of a river, which from thence was called Scamander, as if one ſhould ſay* σκάμμα ἀνδρὸς, *the digging of a man.* There is a ſcholiaſt

(7) Meziriac, ubi ſupra, *p.* 468. *Note that* Mauſſac *in* Plut. de Fluviis, *p.* 281, *quotes that paſſage of Ariſtotle.*

(8) Meziriac, ibid. *pag.* 469. ex Euſtathio, in Iliad. *lib. xx,* & autore Magni Etymologici.

women made uſe of that advantage [*C*]. It is alſo ſaid that the maids of that country, as ſoon as they were betrothed, went thither, to offer their virginity to Scamander; which gave an opportunity to a young Athenian to enjoy Callirrhoë [*D*]. I do not think that

ſcholiaſt (9) who ſays, that the place where Hercules digged the ground yielded ſome drops of water, becauſe it had been ſtruck with thunder, as a conſequence of the prayers which that hero had directed to Jupiter, when he was much diſtreſſed with thirſt. This ſcholiaſt pretends that the river that flowed out of this place was called Scamander, becauſe it eaſed Hercules, *as if one ſhould ſay Camander*, γενόμενον καμάτου ἄκος αὐτῷ. He adds, That it was called Xanthus, becauſe the *Trojan women, by waſhing themſelves in it, made their hair become light-coloured* (10). The author of the great *Etymologicon* tells us, that *this river took its name from Scamander the ſon of Teucer, who came into Phrygia out of the iſle of Crete his native country; but that afterwards this river was called Xanthus, becauſe the three goddeſſes, before they ſet themſelves before Paris to be judged by him, went and waſhed themſelves in this river, which made their hair light coloured* (11). All this overthrows the hypotheſis of thoſe, who ſay that the name Xanthus preceded that of Scamander.

[*C*] *It is pretended that it's waters . . . had the property of making the women's hair that bathed in it of a light colour, and that the Trojan women made uſe of that advantage.*] See the proofs of all this in the preceding remark. It had alſo the ſame virtue upon ſheep, as may be ſeen by the three authorities of Meziriac; to which I add theſe words of Pliny: ‘In ‘Bœotia amnis Melas oves nigras *(facit)* . . . rufaſ‘que juxta Ilium Xanthus unde & nomen amni (12). ‘*The river Melas in Bœotia makes the ſheep black* . . . ‘*and Xanthus near Troy makes them red, from whence* ‘*alſo the name of that river is derived.*’

[*D*] *And that the maids . . . offered their virginity to Scamander, which gave occaſion to a young Athenian to enjoy Callirrhoë.*] I will relate this ſtory as we find it in Vigenere. ‘In this river, (as Æſchines relates ‘in his epiſtles) young maids were wont to bathe them‘ſelves when they were betrothed, invoking the river ‘in theſe words, λάβε μου Σκάμανδρε τὴν παρ‘θενίαν. *Receive, oh Scamander, my virginity.* This ‘gave an opportunity to Cimon the Athenian, who ‘was deſperately in love with Callirrhoë already pro‘miſed to another, to hide himſelf among the buſhes ‘that grew along the waterſide, and put on a hat ‘of ruſhes and reeds; and when the damſel came as ‘uſual to bathe, and had pronounced in ſinging the ‘aforeſaid words, he came out of his ambuſcade, and ‘told her he willingly accepted of it: And ſo hav‘ing carried her upon the bank, he preſently deflow‘red her (13).’ It is certain that this is found in one of Æſchines's letters (14), and therefore the citation is juſt; but Vigenere has not related all that he ſhould have told his readers: It is neceſſary they ſhould know ſome other circumſtances to make the moſt inſtructive reflexions. I ſay then that Æſchines does not ſpeak of this adventure, as of a hiſtory learned by tradition, or read in ſome old chronicle. If he had ſpoke of it in this manner, we might place his ſtory in the rank of Boccace's novels; it would be more reaſonable not to believe it, than to believe it. He ſpeaks of it as of a thing almoſt done in his ſight: Ἡμεῖς ἅμα τε τοῖς οἰκείοις τῶν γαμουμένων καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὄχλοις πόῤῥωθεν τὴν ἑορτὴν καὶ τὰ λουτρὰ τῶν παρθένων, ᾗ θέμις τοῖς ἐξωτέρω ὁρᾷν, ἐθεόμεθα. Nos una cum cognatis nupturarum & cæteris turbis eminus feſtum & lavacra virginum quatenus fas nobis externis erat, ſpectabamus (15). - - - *We, together with the relations of the bride's, and the other multitude, looked on at a diſtance, and ſaw the feſtival and bathings of the virgins, as far as it was allowed to us ſtrangers.* His fellow-traveller was the perſon, who committed that infamous act; he cenſured him for it, and found that he was impenitent, and alledged for his excuſe, that many had played the ſame trick before. It is neceſſary alſo to know the ſimplicity of the young maid, who was abuſed: She was fully perſuaded that it was the god Scamander who had got her maidenhead; for, four days after, ſpying Cimon among thoſe that were looking on to ſee a proceſſion paſs, ſhe ſaluted him with a great deal of reſpect, and told her nurſe, There is Scamander, on whom I beſtowed my virginity. The nurſe made a great cry, and ſo the matter was divulged. Τέτταρσιν ὕστερον ἡμέραις πομπὴ μὲν ἦν Ἀφροδίτης· ἐπόμπευον δὲ αἱ νεωστὶ γεγαμημέναι· καὶ ἡμεῖς τὴν πομπὴν ἐθεώμεθα. ἡ δὲ νύμφη ἰδοῦσα τὸν Κίμωνα ὡς μηδὲν αὐτῷ κακὸν συνειδότα ἅμα ἐμοὶ θεώμενον. προσεκύνησε. καὶ ἀποβλέψασα πρὸς τὴν τροφὸν· ὁρᾷς ἔφη, τίτθη. τὸν Σκάμανδρον, ᾧ τὴν παρθενίαν ἔδωκα. καὶ ἡ τίτθη ἀκούσασα, ἀνέκραγε, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἔκπυστον γίνεται. *Cum quatriduo poſt pompa eſſet veneris, & recens nuptæ ei pompæ intereſſent, nos quoque illam ſpectabamus. Sponſa autem Cimonem conſpicata, ut nullius mali ſibi conſcium, unà mecum ſpectantem, honorem ei præbuit: & nutricem intuita, Vides (inquit) mea nutrix, Scamandrum, cui virginitatem dedi? quo illa audito, exclamat: itaque facinus divulgatur* (16). When we conſider that wit and learning never appeared with ſo much luſtre, as in the age that Æſchines lived in, we may the better apprehend the fatal power of a falſe religion. It deſtroys good ſenſe, it extinguiſhes the light of nature, and in ſome ſort degrades a man to the condition of a brute beaſt. Callirrhoë, was born of an illuſtrious family (17), and was without doubt, nobly educated; and yet the impertinencies of the poets, canonized by the heathen prieſts, had ſo much corrupted her judgment, that in good earneſt ſhe believed rivers were deities, who crowned themſelves with reeds, and could enjoy a woman. In the reign of Tiberius, an illuſtrious lady was not leſs ſimple (18); ſhe believed ſhe had lain with Anubis, and bragged of it as of a great favour. The Monks, who have played ſo many tricks chiefly to inveigle women, never durſt, that I know of, tell them that ſuch a ſaint would lie with them. The ideas of purity and immateriality have always been ſtrictly joined in Chriſtianity with thoſe of beatification. But I make no doubt, if they would undertake ſuch a thing, but they might bring ſome devout women, that now are, to believe what the Roman votary of Anubis ſuffered herſelf to be perſuaded of. This maxim, *The corruption of the moſt excellent things is the worſt* (19), is verified by the example of religion. There is nothing ſo advantageous to man, if we conſider either the mind or the heart, as to know God well: On the other hand, nothing is ſo fatal to all the faculties of a reaſonable mind, as to know God ill, as the Pagans did. Obſerve what Homer ſays, that the prieſt of Scamander was honoured at Troy as a god.

Ὑψήνορα δῖον
Υἱὸν ὑπερθύμου Δολοπίονος, ὅς ῥα Σκαμάνδρου
Ἀρητὴρ ἐτέτυκτο, θεὸς δ' ὡς τίετο δήμῳ.

Hypſenora nobilem
Filium magnanimi Dolopionis qui Scamandri
Sacerdos factus fuerat, Dei vero inſtar honorabatur
à populo (20).

Then dy'd Hypſenor, generous and divine,
Sprung from the brave Dolopion's mighty line;
Who near ador'd Scamander made abode,
Prieſt of the ſtream, and honour'd as a god.
Pope.

A reflexion upon a thought of Cicero, concerning the Divinity of Romulus.

I ſhall make one obſervation more upon the ſmall effect which the light of learning had againſt the darkneſs of idolatry. Cicero admired the divinity of Romulus, becauſe it was not eſtabliſhed in the days of ignorance, when it was ſo much the more eaſy to put off fictions, becauſe rude and ignorant minds were brought without any difficulty to believe them; but in an age, when learning was already far advanced, and had entirely aboliſhed the antient barbarity, under which the uncultivated ſpirit of the firſt men had been detained. It ſeems, that from this principle, he would conclude that neither fiction nor impoſture had any ſhare in the belief of the Romans concerning the divinity of Romulus. *Magis eſt in Romulo admirandum, quod cæteri, qui* that this river merited the reputation which it has acquired by the help of the Poets, but, on the other hand, it was more conſiderable than ſome fancy [*E*]. Julia, the daughter of Auguſtus, had like to have been drowned in it; Agrippa, her huſband, was very much affected with the danger ſhe had been in [*F*], and ſhewed his indignation, for what had happened, againſt the Trojans, tho' they ought not to have been made accountable for it

---

(9) The ſcholiaſt upon Homer, *in Iliad. xxi*, apud Meziriac, *ibid. p.* 469.

(10) Ξάνθος δὲ ἐκλήθη ὅτι ξανθῦναι τοῦ ὕδατος αἱ Τρωάδες ξάνθας κόμας ἔσχον.

(11) Meziriac, ibid.

(12) Plin. *lib. ii, cap. ciii, p. m.* 252, 253.

(13) Vigenere, on the Scamander of Philoſtratus, *p.* 8. *of the firſt volume, Edit. in* 4*to*.

(14) It is the tenth. They are printed with Demoſthenes. See *p.* 125, of the Geneva edition 1607.

(15) Æſchines, ubi ſupra.

(16) Id. ubi ſupra, *p.* 126. *A.*

(17) Πατρὸς δὲ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν, illuſtre patri nata. *Id. ibid. p.* 125.

(18) *See* Joſephus, Antiq. *lib. xviii, ch. iv.*

(19) Corruptio optimi peſſima.

(20) Homer. Iliad. lib. v, ver. 76.

qui dii ex hominibus facti eſſe dicuntur, minus eruditis hominum ſeculis fuerunt, ut fingendi proclivior eſſet ratio, quum imperiti facilè ad credendum impellerentur. Romuli autem ætatem minus his ſexcentis annis jam inveteratis literis, atque doctrinis, omnique illo antiquo ex inculta hominum vita errore ſublato fuiſſe cernimus . . . . Ex quo intelligi poteſt, permultis annis ante Homerum fuiſſe quam Romulum, ut jam doctis hominibus ac temporibus ipſis eruditis ad fingendum vix quicquam eſſet loci. Antiquitas enim recepit fabulas fictas etiam nonnunquam inconditè. Hæc ætas autem jam exculta præſertim eludens omne, quod fieri non poteſt, reſpuit (21). St Auguſtin refutes extremely well this reaſoning. He ſays, 1. There was no place but Rome that believed Romulus was a god. 2. That it was little, and as it were in its infancy, when it embraced this opinion. 3. That poſterity was obliged to retain this faith, to render the city more flouriſhing, and more capable of founding a great empire. 4. That the people that were ſubdued by the Romans, did not believe of Romulus, what they believed of him at Rome; but out of policy they ſaid the ſame the Romans did. You will ſee better in the original words the thoughts of St Auguſtin. *Cicero propterea dicit divinitatem Romuli mirabiliter creditam, quòd erudita jam tempora fuerunt, quæ falſitatem non reciperent fabularum. Quis autem Romulum Deum niſi Roma credidit, atque id parva & incipiens? Tum deinde poſteris ſervare fuerat neceſſe, quod acceperant à majoribus, ut cum iſta ſuperſtitione in lacte quodammodo matris ebibita creſceret civitas, atque ad tam magnum perveniret imperium, ut ex ejus faſtigio velut ex altiore quodam loco alias quoque gentes, quibus dominaretur, hac ſua opinione perfunderet: ut non quidem crederent, ſed tamen dicerent Deum Romulum, ne civitatem cui ſerviebant, de conditore ejus offenderent, aliter eum nominando quam Roma, quæ id non amore quidem hujus erroris, ſed tamen amoris errore crediderat* (22). He forgot the two principal anſwers which he might have made. He ſhould have ſaid in the firſt place, That the light of learning, and the improvement of the mind, had not made their way as far as Rome, when the Divinity of Romulus was propoſed. 2. That this light, and this improvement, cannot hinder ſuch like fictions from taking root. Did not Alexander paſs for a god? Did they not make decrees upon this article of faith (23), in the moſt learned cities of Greece, when learning was come to the higheſt pitch it had ever been at? Did not the Romans, in the greateſt knowledge, believe that the ſoul of Julius Cæſar was converted into a ſtar (24)? Did they not erect temples and altars to a living emperor (25)? Could the Philoſophers cure the crafty ſpirit of flatterers, and the credulous ſpirit of the mob? If other things than learning and ſcience had not interpoſed, the divine worſhip of Alexander, Cæſar, Auguſtus, &c. had continued as long as that of Hercules and Romulus.

[*E*] *It merited not the reputation which it has acquired by the help of the Poets, but, on the other hand, it was more conſiderable than ſome fancy.*] Homer (26) making Scamander the ſon of Jupiter, always repreſents it as a great river, and liberally beſtows on it the epithets, δινήεις, *vorticoſus, full of whirl-pools*; βαθυδινήεις, *profunde vorticoſus, full of deep whirl-pools*; βαθύῤῥοος, *profunde fluens, deep-flowing*; and the like, theſe expreſſions are exceſſive. Pomponius Mela had reaſon to ſay, that Scamander and Simois paſs for greater rivers than they really are (27). The moderns ſpeak of them with the utmoſt contempt. 'As 'to the rivers Simois and Xanthus, ſo much celebrat'ed by the Poets, which watered the meadows of 'Troy, we can ſay nothing of them, but that they 'are rather little brooks, where ſcarce a Loach or 'Minnow can live; for in ſummer they are dry, and 'in winter a Gooſe can hardly ſwim there. If we 'have raiſed any doubts about thoſe rivers, it is no 'new thing; for in Ariſtotle's time they could not be 'found. Read the 12th chapter of the 3d book of 'the hiſtory in this manner: *Scamander etiam amnis 'flavas reddere oves creditur: quamobrem Xanthum pro 'Scamandro nuncupatum ab Homero autumant.* As if 'Ariſtotle meant that Homer had taken Scamander 'for Xanthus; for Xanthus is as much as to ſay *fla'vus*, fair. Let the queſtion therefore be put, whe'ther Scamander and Xanthus be the ſame or no (28)?' If the laſt half of this paſſage had not been full of faults, I had not quoted it. I find there firſt of all this falſity, that, in the time of Ariſtotle, the river Scamander was not to be found. In the ſecond place, it is falſe that the words which are quoted out of Ariſtotle, do prove what Belon deſigned to prove. Laſtly, He ſhould have ſaid that Xanthus and Scamander are all one. I do not criticiſe upon the other half of the paſſage. Belon ſpeaks as an eye-witneſs. I will not bring into queſtion his ſincerity, nor give any credit to Thevet, who ſays that Xanthus and Simois are great rivers. *I ſhould be ſorry to contradict ſuch a man.* They are Lewis Guion's words (29) concerning Thevet; *but what I ſay of it* (30), *I have borrowed from Belon, a Phyſician of Mans, out of the ſecond book of his Obſervations, and I have often heard him relate it, being at Paris, to Poſtel, whoſe company I frequented four years. Beſides, one called Albert le Bon, who ſays he was in thoſe parts, and ſtayed there a whole winter, perfectly agrees with what Belon has written on that ſubject. I believe Thevet never was there, and that what he writ was only by hear-ſay.* But as on the one ſide I do not deny what Belon ſays, I am ſure on the other ſide, that thoſe rivers were not antiently ſo little. Their waters may have taken another courſe, either under the earth, or otherwiſe: So that tho' the Moderns may ſay, without any hyperbole, what they aſſert; they cannot engage us to believe that Pliny is miſtaken, when he ſpeaks of the Scamander as of a navigable river (31). *Scamander amnis navigabilis, & in promontorio quondam Sigeum oppidum, dein portus Achæorum, in quem influit Xanthus* (32) *Simoenti junctus, ſtagnumque prius faciens Palæſcamander.* The words of Strabo are not leſs favourable to me: They teach us that the Scamander having received the Simois, dragged along ſo much mud and ſand, that they had almoſt filled up the mouth of the river, and formed lakes and moraſſes (33). This cannot be ſaid of a little brook or rivulet, but of rivers that are pretty conſiderable.

[*F*] *Agrippa, her huſband, was very much affected with the danger ſhe had been in.*] The fragments of Nicolas Damaſcen tell us that Julia had like to have been drowned there, in the year of Rome 738, and that Agrippa was ſo angry with the Trojans, under the pretence of their not having ſent guides to this princeſs, that he fined them in a hundred thouſand drachms (34). This puniſhment was unjuſt, for they had not received any notice of her arrival. Behold, will ſome ſay, a man who may be put in the number of cuckolds who have been very obliging and kind to their wives. If ever man was a cuckold, Agrippa was: I appeal to the anſwer that ſhe gave to thoſe who wondered that her children were ſo like Agrippa: I never am unfaithful to him, ſaid ſhe, but when I find myſelf with child. *Cumque conſcii flagitiorum mirarentur quo modo ſimiles Agrippæ filios pareret, quæ tam vulgo poteſtatem ſui corporis faceret: ait*; Numquam enim niſi navi plena tollo vectorem (35). Suetonius obſerves that one of the reaſons why Tiberius made ſome difficulty to marry Julia was, becauſe ſhe had been too free with him during her marriage with Agrippa (36). How often were the galants of that princeſs put to the torture? Pliny reckons this inquiſition among the misfortunes of Agrippa (37). The cuckoldom of this favourite is therefore a certain thing: but can his good nature towards her be ſufficiently proved by the indigation he ſhewed againſt the Trojans? I do not believe it; for it is probable his love for Julia was not the true cauſe of his anger; it was an effect of policy. He was angry, either to make Auguſtus believe that he ſeriouſly eſpouſed the intereſt of Julia, or to maintain his credit. A ſubject married

(21) Cicero, de Republica, *lib. iii*, apud Auguſtin. de Civit. Dei, *lib. xxii, cap. vi, p. m.* 1036, 1037.

(22) Auguſt. ibid. *p.* 1037.

(23) See the remark [*F*], of the article OLYMPIAS.

(24) *See* Suetonius, in Cæſare, *cap.* 88.

(25) Horat. Ep. i, lib. ii.

(26) Homer. Iliad. lib. xxi, ver. 2.

(27) Huc ab Idæo monte demiſſus Scamander exit, & Simois fama quam natura majora flumina. *Pompon. Mela, lib. i, cap. xviii.*

(28) Belon, Singularitez, *book ii, ch. vi, p.* 182.

(29) Louïs Guyon, Diverſes Leçons, *Tom. i, book ii, ch. x, p.* 261.

(30) He had juſt before quoted Belon's words, about the ſmallneſs of thoſe two rivers.

(31) Plinius, *lib. v, ch. xxxi, p. m.* 610.

(32) Pliny ſhould have ſaid that Xanthus and Scamander are the ſame river.

(33) Strabo, *lib. xiii, p.* 410.

(34) Nicol. Damaſcen. in excerptis à Valeſio editis, *p.* 418.

(35) Macrob. Saturnal. *lib. ii, cap. v, p. m.* 275.

(36) Juliæ mores improbaret ut quam ſenſiſſet ſui quoque ſub priore marito appetentem quod ſane vulgo etiam exiſtimabatur. *Sueton. in Tiberio, cap. vii.*

(37) In tormentis adulteriorum conjugis. *Plin. lib. vii, cap. viii. pag. m.* 22.

it. Strabo criticiſes upon Homer concerning the ſpring of the river Scamander [*G*]. There were other rivers of the ſame name [*H*]. I ſhall not have much to ſay againſt Mr Moreri [*I*].

married to the daughter of his ſovereign, is not at liberty to forbear puniſhing ſuch as diſhonour his wife: Whatever he may be inwardly, he is outwardly obliged to appear on ſuch occaſions revengeful. Beſides, Agrippa knew very well, that the Trojans had not grounded their conduct upon any diſcontent which he could have to his wife. Thus, the contempt they might have ſhewed for her, had fallen upon himſelf; and conſequently he thought himſelf obliged, out of policy, to puniſh them for it, to teach all ſubjects to fear and honour him.

[*G*] *Strabo criticiſes upon Homer, about the ſpring of the Scamander.*] That Poet ſays, that this river had two ſprings, the one cold, and the other hot, near Troy (38); but Strabo (39) aſſures us, that it had only one ſpring upon mount Ida, and that this ſpring was cold. He conjectures the hot ſpring was deſtroyed, and conſequently he does not accuſe Homer of being miſtaken in that point.

[*H*] *There were other rivers of the ſame name.*] There was one of them in Sicily (40), near Ægeſta, and another in Bœotia. The latter was a monument of the frailty of the female ſex. The matter of fact was thus. Deimachus, the ſon of Eleon, accompanied Hercules to the expedition of Troy. The war growing long, he deſigned to divert himſelf with a young maid that was much in love with him. She was the daughter of Scamander, and was called Glaucia. She at laſt moved Deimachus, he gratified her deſires, and got her with child. Some time after he was killed in a battle. Glaucia, who was afraid ſhe could not hide her fault, fled to the protection of Hercules, and told him all that had paſſed between Deimachus and her, and found him a man full of compaſſion, who, beſides, was glad that the race of his friend was not extinct. He carried her into Bœotia with the ſon of which ſhe was delivered, and put her into the hands of Eleon. This ſon was called Scamander, and reigned in the country. He gave his name to the river Inachus (41).

[*I*] *I have not much to ſay againſt Moreri.*] I. According to him, Caſtaldus aſſures us, that the Scamander is at preſent called Simois; but Ortelius cites Gaſtaldus, to prove that the modern name is Simoeres (42). II. It is too general an expreſſion to ſay, that this river *falls into the Ægean ſea*. He ſhould have ſaid, that it's mouth is at the promontory of Sigeum (43). III. Theſe words *epotaque flumina Medo prandente*, are ill placed immediately after theſe, *Herodotus relates, that the army of Xerxes dried it up*; for there is none but would imagine that this Latin is the tranſlation of the very words of Herodotus: which is falſe. It is Juvenal whom he ought to have cited for theſe Latin words (44). He ought to have cited Herodotus, ʼΑπέλιπε τὸ ῥέεθρον, οὐδ᾽ ἀπέχρησε τῇ στρατιῇ τε καὶ τοῖσι κτήνεσι πινόμενος. *Hunc* (Scamandrum) *profluentem ſua aqua deſtituit nec hominibus jumentiſque potantibus ſuffecit* (45).

(38) Homer. Iliad. lib. xxii, ver. 147.

(39) Strabo, *lib. xiii, p.* 414.

(40) *See* Strabo, *lib. xiii, and* Diodorus Siculus, *lib. xx.*

(41) *Taken from* Plutarch in quæſtionib. Græcis, *p.* 301.

(42) Ortelius, in Theſauro Geograph. Voce Scamandrus, *in Edit. Hanov.* in 4to.

(43) Strabo, *lib. xiii, p.* 411.

(44) Juven. Stat. X, ver. 177.

(45) Herodot. *p. m.* 400.

SCHEFFER (John) Profeſſor in the univerſity of Upſal, and one of the moſt learned men of his time, was born at Straſburg in 1621. He was not thirty years old when he went into Sweden, where Queen Chriſtina gave a favourable reception to all learned men. He had already ſhewed his learning by the works he had publiſhed [*A*]. The profeſſorſhip, to which he had been called, was given him (*a*) in the univerſity of Upſal, by the care and intereſt of the Barons Skytte. It was the ſame profeſſorſhip that Freinſhemius had, and which he left to be the queen's library-keeper; it was, I ſay, the profeſſorſhip of Eloquence and Politics (*b*). Scheffer gained great applauſe in this profeſſorſhip, and was much eſteemed by the learned Chriſtina, who ſettled a very good penſion upon him, which ſhe paid him even after ſhe had abdicated her dominions. He compoſed, by her order, ſome books [*B*]. His employments multiplied afterwards, for he was made library-keeper of the univerſity of Upſal, Regius profeſſor honorary of the Law of Nature (*c*), and member of an academy which was wholly taken up in illuſtrating the Swediſh antiquities. The works he publiſhed in this laſt quality are a moſt illuſtrious proof of his diligence, and of his zeal for the honour of that nation. He died the twenty-ſixth of March 1679 (*d*). The catalogue of his writings has been printed more than once [*C*].

(*a*) It was in the year 1648.

(*b*) It was founded by John Skytte in the year 1625.

(*c*) Profeſſor Juris Naturæ ac Gentium.

(*d*) Taken from his Elogy prefixed to a book printed at Amſterdam in 1698, with this title, *Joh. Schefferi Miſcellanea*, which differs only from the *Lectionum Academicarum Liber*, printed at Hamburgh 1675, as to the title and ſome Prolegomena.

[*A*] *He had already ſhewed his learning by the works he had publiſhed.*] Theſe three are mentioned in his elogy (1): *Diſſertatio de varietate Navium*, printed in 1643, in 4to. *Agrippa liberator ſeu de novis Tabulis*, printed in 1645, in 120. *Æliani variæ Hiſtoriæ Notis illuſtratæ*, printed in 1647, in 8vo.

[*B*] *He compoſed, by her order, ſome books.*] Queen Chriſtina obliged him to tranſlate out of Greek into Latin the *Strategicum Mauritii*, and to illuſtrate the Philoſophy of Pythagoras. The *Strategicum* and the *Arriani Tactica*, which he cauſed to be printed (2) in Greek and Latin, with notes, at Upſal, in the year 1664, were never printed before. He publiſhed the ſame year, and in the ſame place (3), an eſſay of his enquiries into the Philoſophy of Pythagoras, *De natura & conſtitutione Philoſophiæ Italicæ ſeu Pythagoricæ Liber prodromus magni Operis de Philoſophia Pythagorica, de Vita Pythagoræ, & de claris Pythagoricis.*

[*C*] *The catalogue of his writings has been printed more than once.*] He himſelf prefixed it to his *Lectiones Academicæ*, publiſhed at Hamburgh, 1675; and he informed his reader that the catalogue of his books had been added by his Bookſeller to his Political Diſſertations upon Livy, in the year 1665. From that time, continues he, my friends have exhorted me from ſeveral places, to publiſh the ſequel of that catalogue. I do it, the more willingly, becauſe I am certain it contains ſome works, that are not known in foreign countries, and that lie here in the duſt, either through the negligence of my Bookſeller at Upſal, or for other reaſons. *Quem* (Indicem) *eo libentius juris facio publici quo ſcio certius, eſſe quæ ſive oſcitantia Librarii Upſalienſis, ſive cauſis aliis hic jacent pulvere ſepulta, & iccirco alibi ignorantur* (4). I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that it is of great importance to an author, that his works be printed by a Bookſeller who knows how to ſell them; for among idle or unſkillful Bookſellers, the beſt books lie upon their hands. There is to be ſeen a more exact catalogue of the works of Schefferus in *Suecia literata*; and we have a new one prefixed to a book ſold at Amſterdam as printed in 1698, with the title of *Joh. Schefferi Miſcellanea*. It is divided into four claſſes. The firſt contains what he has writ concerning Sweden: I will only mention the *Upſalia Antiqua, cujus occaſione plurima in Antiquitatibus Borealibus & gentium vicinarum explicantur.* This work was printed at Upſal in 1666, in 8vo. The author has left it to his heirs, corrected and enlarged. *De ſitu & vocabulo Upſaliæ Epiſtola defenſoria*, at Stockholm, 1677, in 8vo. *Memorabilium Suecicæ Gentis Exemplorum Liber*, at Hamburgh, 1671, in 8vo. *De tribus orbibus aureis nuper in Scania erutis è terra Diſquiſitio Antiquaria*, at Stockholm, 1676, in 8vo. *De antiquis veriſque Regni Sueciæ Inſignibus*, at the ſame place, 1678, in 4to. *Lapponia ſive Gentis Regioniſque Lapponum Deſcriptio accurata cum figuris*, at Francfort, 1673, in 4to. This work was printed in Engliſh at Oxford, 1674, in High Dutch at Nuremberg the ſame year, in 4to, and in French (5) at Paris, in 1678, in 4to. It was found very much enlarged in the

(1) Prefixed to his *Miſcellanea*, at Amſterdam 1698.

(2) In 8vo.

(3) Likewiſe in 8vo.

(4) Joh. Schefferus, ad Lector. benevolum.

(5) Father Lubin is the author of that verſion.

the ſtudy of the author. *Suecia Literata ſeu de Scriptis & Scriptoribus Gentis Sueciæ, Opus poſtumum*, Stockholm, 1680, in 8vo. There is in it a catalogue of the Swediſh writers and of foreigners who have writ books in Sweden. It is diſpoſed, not according to an alphabetical order, but according to Chronology. There is a great defect in the index, for the authors are placed in it only according to their Chriſtian names. The author, perhaps, would have mended that fault, if he had been alive when it was printed. Mr Mollerus has given a ſecond edition (6) of it, and has added many curious and inſtructive remarks to it; *Hypomnemata*, as he calls them, *Hiſtorico-Critica paucula è pluribus ſelecta*. The ſupplements he has made to the article of our Scheffer, may be of very great uſe to thoſe who would know the circumſtances or dependencies of the writings of this profeſſor. The ſecond claſs of his writings contains *Autores Græcos & Latinos illuſtratos*. You may ſee there that he has publiſhed, with Notes, the Panegyric of Pacatus (7), the various Hiſtories of Ælian, the Fables of Phædrus, the Fragment of Petronius, Juſtin, Hyginus, Obſequens, *&c.* The third claſs contains the Miſcellanies, that is to ſay, the work I have already mentioned, *de Philoſophia Pythagorica*, and his book *de Militia navali Veterum*, printed at Upſal in the year 1653, in 4to, which was found with ſo many corrections and additions in the ſtudy of the author, that it is a new work (8). That *de Antiquorum Torquibus*, printed at Stockholm in 1656, in 8vo. That *de Re Vehiculari Veterum, cum Pyrrhi Ligorii Libro ejuſdem argumenti ex Italica Lingua in Latinam verſo & Animadverſionibus illuſtrato*, printed at Francfort in 1671, in 4to. That *de Arte pingendi*, printed at Nuremberg in 1669, in 8vo. *Index in Libros Grotii de Jure Belli & Pacis. Conſilium de Inſtitutione Literaria*, &c. The fourth claſs contains the books not printed, which conſiſt of Notes upon the author of the book concerning the Pre-Adamites, of Letters, Harangues, Programs, *Adverſaria*, &c.

In the ſupplements of Mr Mollerus to the ſecond edition of *Suecia Literata*, it is obſerved, that there were publiſhed after the death of the author, *Breviarium Politicorum Ariſtotelis*, at Stockholm, 1684, in 8vo, and *Hugo Grotius de Jure Belli & Pacis, in uſum Guſtavi Adolphi Comitis de la Gardie, enucleatus*, at Stetin, 1693, in 12mo. Obſerve that Scheffer, under the ſuppoſititious name of Conſtantinus Opellus (9), printed a letter, wherein he attacks the book of Mark Meibomius *de Triremium fabrica*, publiſhed at Amſterdam, 1671, in 4to.

(6) At Hamburgh 1698, in 8vo.

(7) At Stockholm, in 1651. & 1668, in 8vo.

(8) Quos ita auctos mutatos atque emendatos reliquit Schefferus, ut haberi poſſint pro aliis & novis.

(9) Joh. Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Sueciam Literatam, *p.* 460.

SCHEIBLERUS (Christopher) was born in the year 1589 at Armsfeld (*a*) where his father was miniſter. He made ſuch a conſiderable progreſs in his ſtudies that he was appointed profeſſor of the Greek tongue in the univerſity of Gieſſen, and afterwards of Logic and Metaphyſics in the year 1610, when he was no more than one and twenty years of age. In the year 1614 he was made profeſſor of Natural Philoſophy. He behaved in his employments with great diligence, till ſuch time as the univerſity was tranſported from Gieſſen to Marpourg in the year 1624. He was called in 1625 by the magiſtrates of the imperial city of Dortmund (*b*), and accepted of the place which they offered to him of ſuperintendant of the church and rector of the college. He contented himſelf with theſe during his whole life, for he always refuſed the more conſiderable employments that were preſented to him elſewhere. He was going to preach a ſermon in praiſe of Luther on the tenth of November 1653, when he was ſurpriſed with an Apoplexy of which he died ſuddenly in the veſtry (*c*) of St Mary's Church (*d*). He was a laborious man, and moſt aſſiduous in diſcharging his painful functions. He preached twice a week and gave ſeveral lectures every day. He taught Divinity, Metaphyſics, and Hebrew, and pretty often cauſed Theſes to be maintained before him (*e*). He publiſhed divers books [*A*]. Among other children he left **JOHN SCHEIBLERUS**, who has been profeſſor of church-hiſtory in the univerſity of Gieſſen.

(*a*) In Germany in the county of Waldec in the circle of Weſtphalia.

(*b*) In Latin *Tremonia*. It is in the county of Marck, in the circle of Weſtphalia.

(*c*) Taken from the Theatre of Paul Freher, *p.* 571, 572. The death of Sheiblerus is put there on the 21ſt of November; but his ſon has put it on the 10th according to the old ſtyle, which is the 20th according to the new.

(*d*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the Logic of Scheiblerus, in the Gieſſen edition 1654.

(*e*) Freher in Theatro, *pag.* 572.

[*A*] *He publiſhed divers books.*] You may find a liſt of them in pag. 572, of the Theatre of Paul Freherus, and a better ſtill in the *Diarium Biographicum* (1). I ſhall only ſpeak of his Logic, which, of all his writings, had the greateſt run. He began with publiſhing, in the year 1613, the *Introductio Logicæ*; he added to it, in the year 1614, *Commentaria Topica*, and, in 1619, the treatiſe *de Propoſitionibus*, and another, *de Syllogiſmis & Methodis*. Then the work was compleat. There have been ſeveral editions of it; but many errors crept into them. The author reviſed and corrected it ſome time before his death, a Bookſeller having undertaken to publiſh a new edition of it, which he actually did in the year 1654, in 4to. It is better than the foregoing editions, without even excepting the Geneva one (2), in 1651 (3). We muſt obſerve that Scheiblerus had publiſhed his Metaphyſics before the two laſt parts of his Logic were printed. He underſtood perfectly well the ſubtilties and abſtract notions of the ſchools.

(1) Witte, Diarium Biograph. *ad* 10, *Nov.* 1653.

(2) They call it *Ebrodunenſis* in the title of the Gieſſen edition. This makes me believe that the Geneva Bookſeller, cauſed to be put in ſome of the copies, *Ebroduni*, that is at Iverdun, a town of the Canton of Bern, where they printed for the Bookſellers of Geneva.

(3) Taken from the preface of Scheiblerus's Logic, in the edition of Gieſſen, 1654.

SCHESTED (Annibal) a Daniſh nobleman of great wit and merit, married a daughter of Chriſtian IV King of Denmark, ſiſter of the Counteſs Eleonora, of whom I ſhall ſpeak in the article of Count Ulefeld. It has been ſaid (*a*) that this count and Mr Scheſted loved, both at once, the Counteſs Eleonora, and that this rivalſhip was the cauſe of the great hatred that was between them all their life. They were always on different ſides; and when Mr Scheſted pleaded the cauſe of the king, who wanted to divorce his wife, the other pleaded for the queen. The Judges pronounced ſentence in favour of the wife againſt the huſband, and the breach was made up ſoon after. Mr Ulefeld married the Counteſs Eleonora; his rival afterwards married one of her ſiſters: but his hatred continued, and it is ſaid that he gave ſad proofs of it when this count was detained priſoner at Malmoë by the Swedes (*b*). The Chevalier de Terlon (*c*) tells us, that Mr Scheſted was made priſoner near Copenhagen by a Swediſh party, and that the great civilities which the King of Sweden ſhewed him, made him ſuſpected by the court of Denmark; and on the other ſide the Swedes ſuſpected that he had ſuffered himſelf to be taken on purpoſe, that he might ſend advice to Copenhagen of what paſſed in their camp. This Chevalier ſays hereupon, that Annibal Scheſted always gave to the King of Denmark conſtant proofs not only of a *great reſpect, but likewiſe of all the zeal and fidelity that a prince*

(*a*) See the book intituled, *Le Comte d'Ulfeld, Nouvelle Hiſtorique*, printed at Paris in 1677.

(*b*) See the remark [*L*] of the article ULEFELD.

(*c*) *Memoir*, pag. 141, Dutch Edit.

can expect from the moſt affectionate of his ſubjects. He was ſent ambaſſador into Sweden after the treaty of peace concluded the twenty-ſeventh of December 1659. You will find in the Supplement of Moreri (*d*), that he died at Paris the twenty-third of October 1666, aged fifty-eight years, and that he was there as plenipotentiary of Denmark for the negotiation of a treaty of peace.

(*d*) At the word Hannibal.

SCHILLER (ELIAS) publiſhed in the German tongue a book of controverſy, which was confuted by a profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker, in the year 1641. That profeſſor's name was Nicolas Vedelius: he informs us that Dr Schiller's book had been printed a very few years before at Cologn, under the title of *The Grounds of the Catholic Truth*, that it was a piece well digeſted and extremely capable of impoſing upon the people, and that it was not at all ſurpriſing if ſuch a book, conſidering the ſituation of affairs at that time, had ſhaken or perverted ſeveral Proteſtants in Germany: that the author, who preſumed too much upon the force of his pretended proofs [*A*], and who had forſaken Lutheraniſm to embrace Popery, did at bottom exhibit nothing elſe but quirks and cavils, and only ſought to withdraw the deciſion of controverſies from the tribunal of Scripture (*a*).

(*a*) Taken from Vedelius, in the preface of his *Ecclesiaſtes Catholicus*, printed at Franeker in the year 1641, in 12mo.

[*A*] *He preſumed too much upon the force of his pretended arguments.*] Some of his rodomontados appear in the following words of Vedelius: 'Placet autem Schillerus in labore iſto ſibi adeò, ut capite nono glorietur *libellum ſuum eſſe invictum & irrefutabilem: concidere per eum, totum miniſterium Evangelicorum, Confeſſionem Auguſtanam, formulam Concordiæ, Catecheſes, Reformationem, pretenſionem* SUB UTRAQUE *& omnia. Etiam quemvis indoctum & imperitum Scripturæ Laicum poſſe omnia noſtra beneficio ſui tractatus refutare*, & è *contrario totam Catholicam*, ut loquitur, *Religionem defendere.* Hinc capita ſingula ferè Thraſonicâ jactatione concludit: *Quid quæſo*, ait, *adverſum hæc dici poteſt?* Et cap. 14. ex argumentis ſuis quibus probare volebat Eccleſiam Romanenſem habere aſſiſtentiam perpetuam Spiritus S. educit conſequentias, quas *irrefragabiliter inde ſequi* pronunciat. Eodemque capite gloriatur *ſe poſuiſſe fundamentum Catholicæ veritatis, quod nullo modo everti & concuti poſſit; idque adeo declarâſſe & probâſſe ut etiam idiota & Scripturæ Sacræ ignarus quivis homo non ſolum tuto & infallibiliter ſuperſtruere poſſit omnes & ſingulos articulos ſuæ Catholicæ Religionis & fidei, ſed etiam omnibus Hæreticis uno ictu os obturare, & omnes ipſorum fidei Confeſſiones proſternere queat, &c.* Sic ille ipſe de ſuo opere judicat oblitus cum reliquâ veritate etiam moniti à Spiritu S. profecti: *laudet te os alienum, &c* (1). -- *Schillerus*, ſays he, *is ſo pleaſed with this performance, that in the ninth chapter he proudly aſſerts* his book to be unanſwerable: and that by it the whole miniſtry of the Proteſtants, the confeſſion of Augſburg, their form of concord, their catechiſm, reformation, their pretenſions of communicating in both ſpecies, *&c.* fall to the ground at once. That by the help of his treatiſe any ignorant layman is able to confute all our arguments, *and to* defend *every part* of the Catholic religion, as he calls it. *There is ſcarce a chapter which he does not end with a vain-glorious inſult:* and what, *ſays he*, can be anſwered to theſe things? In the *fourteenth chapter, where he endeavours to prove the continual preſence of the Holy Ghoſt with the Church of Rome, he draws conſequences from his arguments, which*, as he ſays, *follow inconteſtibly. And in the ſame chapter he boaſts*, that he had laid down a true and unalterable foundation for the Catholic truth; and this he pretends to have made ſo certain, and clear, that any ſimple or illiterate man, who knows nothing of the Bible, may not only ſafely and infallibly build every article of his Catholic faith upon it, but may likewiſe be capable of putting Heretics to ſilence, and demoliſhing all their creeds at a blow, *&c. In this manner does he extol his own work, forgetting, among other ſacred truths, the wholſome advice of the Scripture, which ſays*, Let the mouth of another commend thee, *&c.*' Vedelius undertook to confute him, becauſe he heard that a Proteſtant gentleman, being ſtaggered with the reading of his book, was ready to fly off. He ſpent no more than eleven days in confuting him, amidſt his other public and private buſineſs (2). His anſwer contains 125 pages in 12mo.

(1) Nicol. Videlius, *Præfation.* Eccleſiaſt. Catholici, *folio* d 2.

(2) Idem, ibid.

SCHILLING (CHRISTOPHER) was one of the learned men of the XVIth century, eſpecially in Greek (*a*). He was a native of Franckenſtein in Sileſia, and taught firſt at Hirſchberg in his own country, and afterwards in the Palatinate, and at laſt he was admitted Phyſician in the univerſity of Padua. The reaſon that made him leave Hirſchberg, was becauſe he had a diſpute concerning the Euchariſt with Balthaſar Tileſius, miniſter of that place; for he inſerted in the Catechiſm which he dictated to his diſciples, certain things which he had of Melanchthon (*b*), and which did not pleaſe Tileſius. The concluſion of this diſpute was, that Schilling loſt his place, as I have already obſerved in the article of David PAREUS. He retired into the Palatinate, and was made rector of the college, which the Elector Frederic III founded at that time at Amberg. It was in the year 1566. He was afterwards rector of the college of Heidelberg, from whence, I think, he went away becauſe of ſome diſpute about precedency. He is an author [*A*].

(*a*) See the Life of David Pareus, *pag. m.* 8, 11, 12, 25.

(*b*) He had been Melanchthon's Diſciple at Wittemberg for the ſpace of nine years.

[*A*] *He is an author.*] There is a collection of his Greek and Latin poems, printed at Geneva in the year 1580 (1), and ſome letters upon queſtions of Phyſic, in a collection of pieces printed in 1598 at Francfort (2).

(1) Konig, Bibl. *pag.* 734.

(2) Linden, *renovat. p.* 180.

SCHOMBERG (NICOLAS OF) Cardinal and Archbiſhop of Capua in the XVIth century, was a German, of the noble and ancient family of Schomberg in Miſnia. He had been a Dominican friar, and it was Savonarola who gave him the habit at Florence in 1497 (*a*), and who by his preaching had ſtirred up in him a deſire of entring into that order; for Schomberg travelled into Italy only out of curioſity. He had ſeveral employments among the Dominicans; he taught Divinity at Rome and Florence; he was prior in a convent of the latter city, and was made Procurator-general of that order by the choice of the famous Thomas de Vio who was General of it, and who has made himſelf ſo well known under the name of Cardinal

(*a*) According to Seckendorf, *Hiſt. Luther. lib. iii, pag.* 93. It was in the year 1495.

Cajetan. Leo X (*b*) gave to Schomberg the Archbiſhopric of Capua in the year 1520. Clement VII made him one of his moſt intimate counſellors, and ſent him into France to negotiate a peace between Charles V and Francis I. As he was not a very acceptable man to the French, he had much ado to obtain leave to be at the conferences of Cambray, where he contributed much to the peace that was concluded there. Paul III made him a cardinal-prieſt by the title of Saint Sixtus in the year 1535 (*c*). It is ſaid that even before he was made a cardinal, he had like to have been elected Pope in the conclaves, wherein Hadrian VI and Clement VII were choſen (*d*). He preached five ſermons before Pope Julius II upon the temptation of JESUS CHRIST, which were much eſteemed [*A*]. There are ſome of his letters in the collection of thoſe of princes (*e*), and one among the reſt upon the death of Sir Thomas More chancellor of England (*f*). It is ſaid that he was couſin of the nun who was married to Luther (*g*). He died at Rome September 29, 1537, aged a little more than ſixty-five years, and was buried in the convent della Minerva near Cardinal Cajetan his good friend (*h*). Conſult the Hiſtory of Lutheraniſm by Seckendorf, pag 92. lib. iii. You will find a fine elogy upon this prelate prefixed to each of the two dialogues of Alcyonius *de Exilio*.

(*b*) Cardinal Pallavicini, ubi infra *ſays it was Clement VII.*

(*c*) Ex Bibl. Ordin. Prædic. Altamuræ, *p.* 271.

(*d*) *Id. ib.* Rupipozæus, Nomenclat. Cardinal. *pag. m.* 125. Lettere di Principi, *lib. iii, fol.* 33. Ughellus, *Tom. vi.* in Archiep. Capuan.

(*e*) Oldoinus, Athen. Roman. *pag.* 506.

(*f*) It is to be found fol. 33, of the third book, printed at Venice in 1581.

(*g*) Palavic. Iſtor. del Concil. *lib. iii, cap. xvii,* ex Relatione Legati Soriani. *Mr Seckendorf,* Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. iii, pag.* 92, *denies it.*

(*h*) Altamura, ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *He preached five ſermons .... which were much eſteemed.*] He preached them in the year 1505 (1). They were printed in the year 1511. The very next year they were re-printed at Leipſic (2), where they were alſo printed again in the year 1684 (3). becauſe the copies of them were become very ſcarce. Altamura had no reaſon to ſay, that theſe ſermons were preached before Leo X; for they came out of the preſs before the creation of that Pope.

(1) Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. iii, p.* 93.

(2) By the care of John Schleiniz his couſin, Biſhop of Meiſſen. *Seckend. ibid.*

(3) Acta Erudítor. Lipſ. 1684. *pag.* 486.

SCHOMBERG (THEODORICUS OF) a German gentleman, ſerved in the army of the Reiſters, which Prince John Caſimir, ſon of the Elector Palatine brought into France, to the aſſiſtance of the Proteſtants in the year 1567, and performed a very courageous action at the paſſage of the river Seine [*A*]. He continued afterwards to do a great many good ſervices, till he was killed at the battle of Ivri in the year 1590, having given great proofs of his valour, and contributed notably to the victory which Henry IV gained (*a*).

(*a*) Thuanus, *lib. xcviii.* Divila, *lib. xi.*

[*A*] *He performed a very courageous action at the paſſage of the river Seine.*] The Royaliſts had caſt into the ford, *planks nailed with circles and caltrops,* and were in order of battle on the other ſide of the river. The Proteſtants placed four hundred Arquebuſiers, *by the willows on the banks of the river, for a guard to thoſe who cleared the ford with rakes.* Schomberg threw himſelf into the river a-croſs all this, and made ſo briſk a charge upon the enemy, that *he killed forty upon the ſpot, and brought two ſtandards to the Prince of Condé,* who having no order of knighthood to give him, put about his neck a chain worth two-hundred crowns at the head of the army (1).

(1) D'Aubigné, *Tom. i, livr. iv, ch. xv.*

SCHOMBERG (GASPER DE) Count of Nanteuil, a German gentleman of an ancient family in Miſnia [*A*], being in France during the religious wars, was ſo much eſteemed, that Charles IX took him into his ſervice. He was at firſt engaged in the Huguenot party; for while he ſtudied at Angers in the year 1562, he put himſelf at the head of the Proteſtants, to hinder the Catholics from making themſelves maſters of that city (*a*); but not having ſucceeded in his deſign, he retired to the Prince of Condé, who ſent him into Germany to carry letters to the Duke of Deux-Ponts, to haſten the levies that were expected from him, and to the Landgrave of Heſſe, to obtain aſſiſtance of men and money. He became afterwards a Royaliſt, and very much thwarted the deſigns of his firſt maſter. He hindred him dexterouſly [*B*] in the year 1568 from being ſuccoured by the troops of the Prince of Orange. He was often ſent into Germany to make levies there, and acquitted himſelf with a great deal of honour in the command that he had of thoſe troops (*b*). But he was not leſs fit for the cabinet than for the field, as he plainly made it appear in many important negotiations. Thuanus, who negotiated with him the accommodation of the Duke of Mercœur, and many affairs concerning the edict of Nantes, does very much commend him (*c*): he aſſures us, that he was a man of great wit, and of an admirable prudence, very

(*a*) Thuan. *lib. xxx.*

(*b*) Magnis Germanorum exercitibus cum ſupremi caſtrorum Tribuni dignitate præfuit. *Thuanus, lib. cxxii. Mr le Laboureur,* Addit. to the Memoirs of Caſtelnau, *ſays that he had that command under the title of Colonel of the Black Bands.*

(*c*) See Thuanus's Life and his Hiſtory, *lib. cxxii, ad ann.* 1599.

[*A*] *Of an ancient family in Miſnia.*] I remember to have read the funeral oration of Henry de Schomberg, ſon of this gentleman, pronounced at Toulouſe by Peter de Bertier, who was afterwards Biſhop of Montauban. I have forgot the words he made uſe of to celebrate the high birth of the deceaſed: I can nevertheleſs affirm, that he gave out that his anceſtors had been raiſed to the moſt eminent employments in Saxony, and that they had been of the firſt rank for many ages in thoſe parts. But Mr de Seckendorf obſerves, that his family was never raiſed in Germany to the dignity of a count; and that Gaſpar de Schomberg was of a branch collateral to that of Cardinal de Schomberg. See his Hiſtory of Lutheraniſm, book 3. p. 92.

[*B*] *He dexterouſly hindred.*] I ſhall make uſe of the very words of d'Aubigné. 'Near Soiſſons, *ſays he* (1), Gaſpard Schomberg came by the king's order to the prince (2), with whom he treated of a general agreement to aſſiſt his army with money, and make them return into Germany; but he privately managed the greateſt part of the captains ſo well, that when the Prince ſpoke to them of going to join the Prince of Condé, he found them all cold divines, and bad partiſans, diſcourſing of the juſtice of war, without forgetting the right of kings, and the affairs they had in their own country. Schomberg went away, having received ſome abuſive language, and even a box of the ear from Genlis; and the Prince was forced to go towards Straſbourg, and ſell 'his

(1) D'Aubigné, Hiſtoire Univerſelle, *Tom. i, livr. v, ch. xxviii, pag. m.* 482.

(2) That is, to the Prince of Orange.

very ſkillful in the affairs of war, dextrous and experienced in negotiations, of a manly perſuaſive eloquence, of a ſingular probity, civil, magnificent, officious and obliging to every body. He gave evidence of a particular zeal for the good and glory of France, under three kings ſucceſſively, during the ſpace of thirty-five years. He loved learned men; and, to ſay all in few words, he did every thing with ſo much honour and diſintereſtedneſs, that neither the dignities with which he was inveſted, nor the great affairs that went through his hands both in peace and war, prevented his leaving a great many debts behind him. He died of a ſudden death in his coach near St Antony's gate in returning from Conflans, where he had aſſiſted at a council held there by Henry IV, to name commiſſioners for executing the edict of Nantes. It was on the fifteenth of March 1599. He had been naturalized in 1570, and made ſome time after governor of the upper and lower Marche (*d*). He had married Joan Chateigner de la Rochepozai, widow of Henry Clutin Sieur d'Oiſel, ambaſſador of France at Rome, by whom he had two ſons and three daughters [*C*]. I could not diſcover for a long time whoſe ſon the young Schomberg was, who was killed at the famous duel of Quelus and Entraguet in the year 1578 (*e*). He was one of the ſeconds of the latter; and this was the firſt time that ſeconds fought (*f*): but at laſt I have found in Father Anſelme (*g*) that he was brother to our Gaſpar de Schomberg.

Thoſe who have a mind to ſee a particular account of his actions and employments, with remarks upon the antiquity of his family and the glory of his anceſtors, need only conſult the elogies of Sammarthanus (*b*).

(*d*) *Father Anſelme*, Hiſt. des grands Officiers, *pag*. 248.

(*e*) Journal de Henri III.

(*f*) Mezerai, Abregé Chronolog. *Tom. v, pag.* 231, *ad ann.* 1578.

(*g*) *Pag.* 678, *of Tom. i, of the* Palais de l'Honneur.

(*b*) *You find there at the end of the fifth book,* Abelii Sammarthani Scævolæ F. Elogium illuſtriſſimæ gentis Schombergiæ.

‘ his plate, his tapeſtry, his moveables, and his ſpare ‘ cloaths, dividing all among the chiefs, and giving ‘ them (if not what he ought) at leaſt what he could; ‘ and afterwards he mortgaged to them the principality of Orange and Montfort, promiſing to pay ‘ them the intereſt and principal within twelve years: ‘ And he and thoſe, who were better minded, joined ‘ the Duke of Deux-Ponts, who was then preparing ‘ for the wars of France.’ See Mr Varillas in the life of Charles IX, in the year 1568, but eſpecially Thuanus lib. 43. in the ſame year.

[*C*] *Two ſons and three daughters.*] HENRY, of whom I give an article; HANNIBAL, who was killed in the war of Hungary againſt the Turks; CATHERINE, who died before her father, without leaving any children by her marriage with Lewis de Barbançon, Sieur de Cany; MARGARET, who was not married, and FRANCES, who left children by her marriage with Francis de Daillon, Count du Lude (3).

(3) Anſelme, Hiſt. des grands Officiers, *pag.* 248.

SCHOMBERG (HENRY DE) ſon of the foregoing, was a Marſhal of France, and of a much diſtinguiſhed merit, not only for his brave actions, but alſo for his excellent qualities. One may ſee an account of his employs and actions in Mr Moreri, who has copied it out of Father Anſelme. He might alſo have copied what follows (*a*), viz. That Henry de Schomberg was firſt married in the year 1599, to Frances d'Epinai (*b*), ſiſter and heireſs to Charles Marquis d'Epinai in Bretagne; and afterwards, in 1631 to Anne de la Guiche, daughter and heireſs to Philibert de la Guiche, Great-Maſter of the Ordnance of France. He had by his firſt wife Charles de Schomberg, of whom I ſhall ſpeak below, and a daughter who was married to Roger du Pleſſis, Duke de la Roche-Guyon, Knight of the king's orders, and firſt gentleman of the bed-chamber. By the ſecond marriage he had a poſthumous daughter, who was baptized at Paris the fifth of March 1633, and who was married to Charles de Rohan, Duke of Mombazon, and Prince of Guemené.

(*a*) Anſelme, Hiſt. des grands Officiers, *p.* 248.

(*b*) She died the ſixth of January, 1602.

SCHOMBERG (CHARLES DE) ſon of the foregoing, was Duke of Haluïn by his marriage with the ducheſs of that name, and Marſhal of France. You may ſee an account of his dignities and exploits in Moreri, copied word by word from Father Anſelme (*a*). He ſhould alſo have copied that Anne Ducheſs of Haluïn (*b*), his wife, died of the ſmall Pox at Nanteuil, without iſſue, in November 1641 and that he was married again on the twenty-fourth of September 1646, to Mary de Hautefort, tire-woman to the queen, and daughter to Charles, Marquis de Hautefort, by whom he had no children. This Mary de Hautefort, was much celebrated, for her virtue, by Scarron and other Poets: but a modern ſatiriſt has given her a furious ſtab [*A*]. Lewis XIII had

(*a*) Hiſtoire des grands Officiers, *pag.* 257.

(*b*) The book intituled, *L'Etat preſent de la France*, printed in 1657, ſays *pag.* 89, that this Anne d'Haluïn's ſecond huſband, was Henry de Foix, and de la Valette, Count de Candale, eldeſt ſon of the late Duke d'Epernon, from whom ſhe cauſed herſelf to be divorced, in order to marry Monſ. de Schomberg.

[*A*] *A modern ſatiriſt has given her a furious ſtab.*] It is the author of a book which was printed at the Hague (1), in the year 1687, with this title; *Memoires de Mr L. C. D. R. concernant ce qui s'eſt paſſe de plus particulier ſous le regne du Cardinel de Richelieu, & du Cardinal Mazarin.* It is not well known who writ this book (2); it is only gueſſed that it was one who had been ſecretary to the Counteſs de Soiſſons, neice to Cardinal Mazarin. He has, without doubt, a great deal of wit; but there never was ſuch a packer of all ſorts of ſtories, nor ſuch a compiler of all the ſatirical rhapſodies that are to be picked up in the taverns and armies. There is nothing more falſe than than what we read in the firſt tome of the Mêlanges of Vigneul Marville (3) in theſe words: ‘ From that ‘ time (4), the Petits Maîtres were not heard of till ‘ the time of cardinal de Richelieu, who kept in his ‘ ſervice a certain number of bold and reſolute fellows, ‘ whom he employed in the execution of his deſigns. ‘ Rochefort, whoſe memoirs are publiſhed, was one ‘ of them.’ This pretended Rochefort was either not born, or at leaſt was very young when this cardinal died. Be this how it will, he ſays, pag. 93. *That the Ducheſs of Chevreuſe was apprehenſive, leſt la Porte whom, though he was a Taylor by trade, ſhe had taken into her bed, ſhould ſacrifice her to the wife of the Mareſchal of Schomberg, who, after having reſiſted the king's addreſſes, could not, according to common fame, defend herſelf from a perſon ſo meanly deſcended.* Before I mention what the Abbot Faydit has pubilſhed on this

(1) *The title ſays* A Cologne, chez Pierre Marteau.

(2) He is the ſame man who for a long time wrote the Hiſtorical and Political Mercury, who compoſed the Life of Mr de Turenne, the Memoirs d'Artagnan, of the Marchioneſs de Freſne, the the Annals of the Court and Paris, the Converſations of Colbert and Bouin, the Memoirs of Fontaine, of the Marquis de Mombrun, &c. He came back to Holland after the peace of Ryſwic, and took the name of Mr de Milli. His true name is De Courtille: he is of Champagne.

(3) Pag. 324, of the firſt edition of Rouën.

(4) That is from the time of Henry III.

had a great kindneſs for her, and ſhe ſuffered a diſgrace which rather heightned than diminiſhed her reputation [*B*].

this ſubject, I ſhall make this little remark; that the time that is allotted for this affair, is that which paſſed between the death of Cardinal de Richelieu, and that of Lewis XIII. Now at that time the Marſhal de Schomberg had not married the lady in queſtion; and therefore, it is an abſurd thing to give her that title. Let us ſee what the Abbot Faydit ſays.

I confeſs, ſays he, 'That what determined me, when I compoſed my book (5), to ſet down at length the paſſage of Celſus, was only the deſign I had effectually to comfort, by the example of the moſt bleſſed virgin, a moſt virtuous lady, whoſe honour was attacked by a moſt unjuſt and cruel calumny. Thoſe who know me, are not ignorant that I have a long time made profeſſion of honouring an illuſtrious Ducheſs and Mareſchalleſs of France, who having been, in her youth, the ornament and admiration of the court, as well for her eminent piety as for her beauty and wit, is become, in her old age, the edification of all the town by the continual examples of her virtues, and the joy of all thoſe who ſee her, by the ſweetneſs of her converſation. But as there is nothing ſo pure but what is attacked by calumny, there is an inſolent ſcribbler, who in a book full of falſities, intituled, *Memoires de M. L. C. D. R.* has had the impudence to beſpatter with his venomous ſatire ſo fine a life, and without conſidering that this lady, of whom he ſpeaks ſo ill, is the ſame whom the poets, who are naturally ſatirical, called in her youth Sainte Haut .... (6): he has not been afraid, with the baſeſt and moſt ridiculous detraction that could be thought of, to give her for a galant, a man whom ſhe had never either ſeen or known. Going one day to viſit her, I found her a little aſtoniſhed to ſee herſelf ſo baſely treated in that impertinent book: I could not forbear telling her, on purpoſe to comfort her, that the moſt bleſſed virgin herſelf, who was the pureſt of all creatures, had been either not able, or not willing, to eſcape the calumnies of inſolent men; and that a little after her death, a famous writer had the impudence to aſſert, *That ſhe had lived in a criminal correſpondence with a ſoldier called* PANTHER, *and that he was the father of* JESUS CHRIST. As this ſeemed new to her, and was beſides a proper ground of conſolation in her caſe; ſhe gave me to underſtand, that ſhe ſhould take it as a favour, if I would write out that paſſage for her (7).

I thought myſelf obliged not to leave out any thing in this diſcourſe; for it ſeemed to me, that every thing in it might be of ſome uſe to one or other. I will add one obſervation; which is, that ſo many perſons ought not to be ſuffered to have the boldneſs to defame the greateſt names. I know ſeveral perſons, who are very much grieved at the impunity of this licentiouſneſs. It would be more tolerable, if thoſe ſatirical authors were ſure of what they publiſh: but for the moſt part they have no certainty of it, and ſometimes they know they lie, and they would obſtinately refuſe to retract, if their calumnies were made evident. They would not imitate the act of an honeſt man, which is publiſhed in the *Mercure Politique*, for the month of December 1695. Let us copy the paſſage. Theſe are the words of the author of that work: 'Since I am upon the ſubject of the late Archbiſhop of Paris, I find myſelf obliged to ſay, that I am ſorry I have related *, what the author of l'Eſprit de Mr Arnaud, has ſaid of the Ducheſs de la Meilleraye. The author of that ſatire, who has advanced indiſcreetly, ſo many facts that are found to be falſe, has put her in the number of ſome ladies, with whom it is pretended that this archbiſhop was in a correſpondence of gallantry; and yet it is certain, that ducheſs never in her life ſpoke with that prelate. It is the teſtimony which all Paris gives her. I am convinced that Madam de la Meilleraye was little concerned at the report of this chimerical commerce upon the credit of an author, who will never paſs for canonical. I am very willing, notwithſtanding, for my own intereſt, to diſown what I have ſaid, tho' in truth I believed nothing of it, as I did plainly enough inſinuate. (8).

[*B*] *Lewis XIII had a great kindneſs for her, and ſhe ſuffered a diſgrace, which rather heightned than diminiſhed her reputation.*] One may ſee a pretty large account of this amour, in the *Intrigues Galantes de la Cour de France*. Cardinal de Richelieu, as we are told, was much alarmed at this paſſion of the king, tho' Mademoiſelle de Hautefort had not *the ſame penetration, nor a mind ſo capable of intrigues* (9), *as the firſt miſtreſs* (10); he was alarmed, I ſay, after he *diſcovered that ſhe was wholly governed by the counſels of Mademoiſelle de Chennerault* (11). He and St Mars *preſſed the king ſo much, that he ſent orders to thoſe two ladies to be gone preſently from the court, and they entred forthwith into a convent at Paris: But the cardinal would not let them ſtay long there; he obliged them to retire; Mademoiſelle de Chennerault into Poictou, and Mademoiſelle de Hautefort to one of her country ſeats, forty leagues from the court* (12). This paſſion of the king was mixed with great reſpect, and great jealouſy. *He durſt not take the leaſt liberty with that lady, as may be judged by what I am going to ſay. One day the queen having received a billet, of which ſhe was willing to make a myſtery, pinned it to the tapeſtry of her chamber, that ſhe might not forget to anſwer it, and the king coming in a little while after, the queen not deſiring that he ſhould ſee it, commanded Madam de Hautefort, who was her lady of honour, to take it, and hold it faſt, which ſhe did. The king would needs take it from her, and they ſtruggled a pretty while in ſport; but Madam de Hautefort, not being able to defend herſelf any longer, put the billet in her boſom, which proved a ſure ſanctuary to it; for the king durſt not touch there, and had no more the curioſity to ſee it* (13). That is a proof of his reſpect; here is another of his jealouſy. The Marquis de Gevres was killed, while all things were making ready for his marriage with Mademoiſelle de Hautefort. The king, 'entring ſome days after into her chamber, found her upon her knees before her praying-deſk, and coming ſoftly up to her, he ſaw that ſhe was reading the veſpers for the dead, and imagining that it was for the Marquis de Gevres, he conceived ſo ſtrong a jealouſy, that he would not for ſix weeks hear her ſpoken of, tho' he himſelf had propoſed the match; which may be attributed to the uſual caprices of love, which often looks upon, as an evil, the things that it has earneſtly wiſhed for (14).' I deſire to be looked upon here, only as a copyer; for I will not warrant that this author is exact, as to the bottom of this affair, and much leſs, that he has not made tranſpoſitions of times and places. I have ſome ſcruple about this ſtory, in the Continuation of the Menagiana. *Madem. de Schomberg de Hautefort, was one of the ladies that Lewis XIII uſed to ſee; but ſhe was diſguſted with the court, and retired to the Magdelonnettes. The Abbot de la Victoire going thither to ſee her, ſaid to her: Madam, is it then to honour the king that you are retired hither* (15)*?* I make upon this three obſervations. 1. This lady could never be called Mademoiſelle de Schomberg; for the latter name came only by her marriage with the Marſhal de Schomberg. 2. Her retreat from the court was againſt her will. 3. It is very odd, that among ſo many ſorts of convents, ſhe ſhould chuſe the Magdelonnettes, a place in ſome manner deſigned for publick penance. This made me doubt of her having retired thither; but I have been well informed that ſhe did.

As to what further concerns her, ſhe was a ſecond time diſgraced under the regency of Anne of Auſtria. See the ſtanzas that Benſerade made upon that ſubject (16).

---

(5) Viz. The abſtract of a ſermon preached on St Polycarp's day in the church of St John en Greve at Paris, with the proofs of the facts alledged therein. That book was printed in the year 1689, ſee *pag.* 36.

(6) Scarron did it.

(7) *The Abbot Faydit*, Suplément à la Diſſertation ſur le Sermon de Saint Polycarpe.

* It is in the ſixth volume, for the month of Auguſt, *p.* 189.

(8) Mercure Hiſtorique & Politique, *December* 1695, *pag.* 661, 662.

(9) Intrigues Galantes de la Cour de France, *Tom.* ii, *pag.* 183, *Edit.* 1695.

(10) Madam de la Fayette, whom the cardinal had removed from the court.

(11) I think it ſhould be Chemerault.

(12) Intrig. Galantes, *ibid. pag.* 186.

(13) Ibid. *p.* 184.

(14) Ibid. *p.* 115.

(15) Suite du Menagiana, *pag.* 379, *Dutch Edit.*

(16) They are in the 5th volume of the collection of the beſt pieces of the French Poets, printed in 1692, *p.* 187, of the Dutch Edition.

SCHOMBERG (Frederic de) created Marſhal of France on the thirtieth of July, in the year 1675, and killed at the famous paſſage of the Boyne in Ireland, on the tenth of July 1690, was one of the greateſt captains of his time, and commanded armies under more kings, and was raiſed to eminent dignities in more countries than any other. He would deſerve a long article here; but not having received the memoirs which I expected, I am forced to refer it to another time. He is one of thoſe great men, whoſe Hiſtory ought to be written by an able pen. I do not doubt but that the Duke of Schomberg, his worthy ſon, has already thought of procuring this honour to his family (*a*), and this fine preſent to the common-wealth of learning.

In the mean time, one may be informed of many things, by conſulting the memoires of Mr Fremont d'Ablancourt, publiſhed in the year 1700. You will find an extract of them in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans* - - - *Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned*, for the month of November 1700.

(*a*) It is different from that of the Marſhals of Schomberg, mentioned in the foregoing articles. See *Seckendorf, Hiſtor. Lutheran.* lib. iii, pag. 93, *litera b*, where he ſhews that their ſeat was upon the Rhine, in the dioceſe of Triers. *Theodoric de Schomberg, de quo ſupra*, was of this family, if we believe the State of France, *Tom ii, pag.* 166, *Edit.* 1680.

SCHORUS (Antony) a native of Hoochſtraten in Brabant (*a*), was one of the beſt Grammarians of the XVIth century. He laboured very diligently to introduce Cicero's Latin into the ſchools (*b*), and compoſed ſome books very uſeful for that purpoſe [*A*]. A comedy, which he made his ſcholars act at Heidelberg, where he taught the *Belles Lettres*, was the cauſe that he was forced to fly [*B*]. He died at Lauſanne, in the year 1552 (*c*).

(*a*) Valer. Andr. Bibliotheca Belg. *pag.* 76.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Id. ibid. & Simlerus, in Epitom. Bibl. Geſneri, *p.* 67.

[*A*] *He compoſed ſome books very uſeful for that purpoſe.*] That which is called *Theſaurus Ciceronianus*, is a methodical abridgment of Robert Stephens, and of the obſervations of Nizolius. His *Phraſes Linguæ Latinæ, ratioque obſervandorum eorum in authoribus legendis quæ præcipuam ac ſingularem vim aut uſum habent*, were printed at Baſil in 1550 (1), and afterwards re-printed a great many times (2). They printed at Straſbourg in 1549, his two books *de ratione diſcendæ docendæque Latinæ & Græcæ Linguæ* (3).

[*B*] *A comedy . . . . was the cauſe that he was forced to fly.*] This comedy was only acted in his own houſe, in the preſence of few people: Nevertheleſs, it made a noiſe, which ſoon reached the emperor's ears, and obliged him to give orders that this fault ſhould not go unpuniſhed. The Elector Palatine, Frederic II, having read the emperor's letter to him about it, was much troubled; he knew nothing of the matter; but he quickly informed himſelf of it. Schorus made his eſcape; ſome of his ſcholars were impriſoned by the rector of the univerſity. Here is the ground of the complaint. This comedy introduced religion, deſiring to be lodged with great men; they ſhut the doors againſt her; ſhe addreſſed herſelf at laſt to perſons of the meaneſt rank, who gave her a lodging. What will people think of the great ones, ſaid the emperor, if it be once permitted to decry them upon the ſtage as the perſecutors of religion? You will find this account in the thirteenth book of the annals of Hubert Leodius. A modern author has cited this, to ſhew that comedies may be permitted (4), and he obſerves, that in England and the Low-Countries, the liberty of the comedians was very ſerviceable to the introduction of the Reformation. *Sæpe actores quam artificioſe perſtringunt vitia inveterata publiceque graſſantia, quod alii certe vix tanta cum* παῤῥησίᾳ *auderent. Nec abſque fructu: prout contigit circa Reformationis initia in Anglia, uti obſervavit vir pietate atque doctrina conſpicuus Johannes Foxus in Hiſtoria Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ. Similiter in Belgio comœdiæ, à viris doctis ſcriptæ, cum exhiberent quam graphice in Theatro Babylonis turpitudinem, haut parum ſub initium Reformationis quam plurimos commoverunt, nec minus cum fructu ſpectatorum proſtituerunt Antichriſtianam doctrinam, quam Orthodoxam veritatem eidem oppoſitam aſſeruerunt* (5). I muſt needs ſay here, that in 1558, there was acted at Rochelle, before the King and Queen of Navarre (6), a comedy, which repreſented the abuſes of Popery, and the remedy that might be brought to it out of Scripture. *The clergy was offended at it, and made complaints to the King of Navarre himſelf* (7). Mr Vincent, Miniſter of Rochelle, adds to the recital of this adventure a ſolid reflexion. 'I do not think, *ſays he* (8), That, under pretence of 'the hiſtorical account I have given, it will be im'puted to me, that I pretend to authorize this man'ner of treating things that belong to religion. . . . '(9). If it be true, as it was loudly ſaid at Ro'chelle, that all this (10) came from Joan d'Albret, 'Queen of Navarre, who would, in her turn (11), 'make uſe of the liberty of the ſtage, to make it tell 'truths, which the doctors of the Church of Rome 'had but too juſtly drawn upon themſelves (12); we 'cannot at all give our approbation to it. We 'know that religion is too grave and too holy to be 'brought upon the ſtage under any pretence whatſo'ever, and that ſhe is too much an enemy of the world, 'and its fooliſh vanities, to beg aid of its miniſters. 'Nevertheleſs, as God is admirable in all his ways, 'and knows how to draw good out of evil when he 'pleaſes; and as, to correct a prophet that was go'ing aſtray from his duty, he made an aſs ſpeak*: He 'permitted here one of the ſtages of the world to 'ſpeak, ſince the pulpits were ſilent; he permitted, I 'ſay, to the ſhame of the paſtors of that time, that 'ſome comedians, whoſe profeſſion it is to repreſent 'fables, ſhould at that time be doctors of truth, ſince 'the paſtors, whoſe buſineſs it was to preach that 'truth, did no longer teach any thing but fables.'

(1) Epitom. Bibl. Geſneri, *p.* 67.

(2) I make uſe of the Cologn edition 1595, in 8vo.

(3) Epitom. Bibl. Geſneri, *p.* 67.

(4) Martinus Schoockius, Exercit. xxix, *pag.* 507, 508.

(5) Id. ib. *pag.* 507.

(6) Antony de Bourbon and Joan d'Albret.

(7) Vincent, Recherches ſur les commencemens & les premiers progrés de la Reformation en la Ville de la Rochelle, *pag.* 40. See above the ſecond article NAVARRE, remark [*E*].

(8) Id. ibid. *pag.* 40, 41.

(9) Id. ib. *p.* 43.

(10) Id. ibid. *pag.* 42.

(11) To underſtand this, the reader ought to know that the author had been ſpeaking of a dramatic piece acted at Paris, in the college of Navarre, againſt Margaret de Valois, mother to Joan d'Albret. See above the firſt article NAVARRE, citat. (22).

(12) Id. ib. *p.* 43.

* Num. xxii. 28.

SCOT (Reginald) an Engliſh gentleman, compoſed a book, whereof all the copies that could be found were burnt (*a*). He endeavoured to ſhew, that all the accounts of Magicians and witches are chimerical. The firſt part of this work was tranſlated into Dutch, and printed in 1609, and made a great impreſſion upon the readers (*b*). Mr Voëtius complains much of it [*A*].

(*a*) Voët. ubi infra, *pag.* 544.

(*b*) Voët. Diſputat. Theol. *Tom. iii, pag.* 573.

[*A*] *Mr Voëtius complains much of it.*] The paſſage I am going to cite, will ſerve both for a proof of, and a comment on this article. 'Reginaldus Scot (1) 'nobilis Anglus magiæ crimen apertè negavit, & ex 'profeſſo oppugnavit, omnes ejus mirabiles effectus 'aut ad melancholiam, alioſve naturales morbos, 'aut ad artem, induſtriam, & agilitatem hominum 'figmentis & præſtigiis ſuis illudentium, aut ad ſtolidas imaginationes, dictorum magorum, aut ad vanas 'nugas & fictiones eorundem magorum referens. Ejus '*liber* tit. *Diſcovery of witchcraft* in Anglia combuſtus 'eſt; quem nominatim etiam perſtringit Sereniſſ. 'Magnæ Britanniæ Rex Jacobus *in Dæmonologia*, eum'que tangit diffuſiſſimæ eruditionis Theologus Johan'nes Raynoldus, *in cenſ. lib. Apocryph. tom.* 2. *prælect.* '169 (2). In eundem, ſed innominatum calamum 'ſtrinxit eximius & ſubacti judicii Theologus Gulielm. 'Perkinſius *in tractatu de Baſcanologia. Pars libri* iſtius

(1) He calls him twice Schot, *pag.* 544.

(2) It ſhould be 196. That fault proceeds from a tranſpoſition of figures, which is a thing but too common among Printers.

‘ *Reginaldi Scot elenctica* (nam reliqua in editione Anglicana conjurationes continebat) in Belgicum idioma tranſlata eſt, ante annos aliquot Lugd. Batav. per Thomam Baſſon; ex illius libri lectione, ſeu fonte perenni, non pauci ab illo tempore docti & indocti in Belgio fluctuare, & de Magia σκεπτικίζειν ac λιβερτινίζειν, (ut Libertinis & Semilibertinis infeſta eſt patria noſtra) quin eo ignorantiæ ſæpe prolabi, ut non iniquè illis applicari potuerit, quod Sereniſſ. *Rex Jacobus in Dæmonologia* ſubdito ſuo Reginaldo Scot: *eſſe quaſi novos Sadducæos:* cum omnes diabolorum operationes, & apparitiones ſuaviter exibilant, tanquam anicularum, aut ſuperſtitionis meticuloſæ phantaſmata ac fabellas (3). *An Engliſh nobleman openly denied, and profeſſedly wrote againſt the crime of witchcraft, imputing all it's wonderful effects either to melancholy and other natural diſtempers, or to the art, induſtry, and agility of men, that delude people with their ſubtle contrivances and tricks, or to the fooliſh imaginations, idle talk, and groundleſs fictions of thoſe called witches. His* book *intituled,* The diſcovery of witchcraft, *was burnt in England. His moſt ſerene majeſty* James, *King of Great Britain, ſtrikes at it by name in his* Dæmonologia. *John Raynold, a divine of a moſt extenſive learning, touches upon it* in his cenſure on the Apocryphal books. *Againſt the ſame book, tho' without naming it,* William Perkins, *an excellent divine, and of a well formed judgment, alſo exerciſed his pen.* The reaſoning part *of this* book of Scot, *was tranſlated into Dutch ſome years ago at Leyden by Thomas Baſſon. From the reading of that book, as from a perpetual ſpring, not a few from that time in Holland, both learned and unlearned, began to waver and to grow Scepticks and Libertines in the article of witchcraft,* (*as our country is very much peſtered with Libertines and Half-libertines*) *nay, to ſuch a depth of ignorance do they often fall, that what* King James in his Dæmonologia *ſaid of his ſubject Reginald Scot, may be very juſtly applyed to them*: that they are a kind of new Sadduces: *Since they laugh at all the operations and apparitions of devils, accounting them no better than the fantoms and ſtories of old women, or of a fearful ſuperſtition.*’

SCHULTINGIUS (CORNELIUS) a licentiate in Divinity and canon of St Andrew at Cologn towards the latter end of the XVIth century, was of Steinwich (*a*) in Over-Yſſel. He applied himſelf very much to controverſy, and after having publiſhed ſeveral books againſt the Proteſtants [*A*], he undertook as his maſter-piece to confute the Inſtitution of Calvin. He thought this would be attacking them in their chief fortreſs (*b*). I ſhall ſpeak of this confutation, and thereby make a ſupplement to what I have ſaid already (*c*) upon the editions of that book of Calvin [*B*]. There is a great

[*A*] *Several books againſt the Proteſtants.*] Valerius Andreas gives us the following catalogue. *Edidit* Eccleſiaſticæ Diſciplinæ *Libros VI. Coloniæ.* Bibliothecam Eccleſiaſticam. *Ibid.* 1599, & 1602. Opus variarum Lectionum & Animadverſionum *adverſus Libr. I. Inſtitutionum Joan. Calvini. Ibid.* 1601. 4. Refutationem totius Theologiæ Calvinianæ, *præſertim Inſtitutionum ejuſdem Calvini. Ibid.* 4. Theſaurum Antiquitatum Eccleſiaſticarum, *è VII prioribus Annalium Baronii Tomis, contra Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes ac Calviniſtas, totidem Tomis ordine Alphabetico contextum. Ibid.* Tragicomœdiam Conſtantini Magni & S. Helenæ. *Ibid.* 1602. Confeſſionem Hieronymianam, *è D. Hieronymi Operibus juxta Locorum Theologicorum capita. Tomis IV, apud Mylium,* 1584. *fol. Denique* Hierarchiam Anacryſin *adverſus varios Calviniſtarum Libros & celebratas ab iiſdem Synodos. Ibidem apud Herm. Hobergium,* 1604 (1). The Oxford catalogue takes notice that the *Bibliotheca Eccleſiaſtica, ſeu Commentarius de explicatione Miſſalis & Breviarii,* comprehends four volumes, and that the *Variæ Lectiones & Animadverſiones contra Inſtitutiones Calvini & Petri Martyris Locos communes,* comprehends five, printed in the year 1602. The whole title of this book will be ſeen in the following remark. Valerius Andreas is not at all diſtinct upon this head: he has firſt taken notice of what the author publiſhed againſt the firſt book of Calvin's Inſtitution; and afterwards he has marked down, in a looſe manner, the confutation of the Inſtitution. He ſhould have ſaid that the *Opus variarum Lectionum,* &c. contains four volumes againſt the four books of the Inſtitution, and that they were printed in the year 1602, at Cologn, by Stephen Hemmerden, at the author's expence. Obſerve, he fancied that his books nettled the Heretics very much, and that his pen was ſo formidable to them that the Engliſh would not ſuffer what he publiſhed to be imported into their country. *Mordere, ſugillare, arrodere Calviniſtæ non prætermittunt, cùm Hieronymianam Confeſſionem, de Diſciplina Eccleſiaſtica libros, Theſaurum Antiq. Eccleſiaſticarum, tum omnium maximè Bibliothecam Eccleſiaſticam, ſeu Comment. ſacros de explicatione Miſſalis & Breviarii, propter eorum cœnas, ritus, agendas, & formulas reprehenſas adeò in Anglia in primis exploſerunt, ut publicè prohibuerint in inſulam importari* (2).

[*B*] *I ſhall ſpeak of this confutation, and thereby make a ſupplement to what I have ſaid already upon the editions of Calvin's Inſtitution.*] The title which Schultingius gave to the firſt volume of his book is *Bibliothecæ Catholicæ & Orthodoxæ, contra ſummam totius Theologiæ Calvinianæ in Inſtitutionibus Joannis Calvini & Locis communibus Petri Martyris, breviter comprehenſæ: vel potius, Variarum Lectionum & Animadverſionum contra primum Librum Inſtitutionum Joannis Calvini Tomus primus.* The title of the following volumes differs only from this in reſpect of the number as well of the volume, as of the book of the Inſtitution which is confuted. It may be affirmed, with reaſon, that this book of Schultingius is no more than an indigeſted heap of collections, and a laborious rhapſody. It is almoſt nothing but a piece compoſed of borrowed paſſages, and an index of the authors who have confuted Calvin on the matters in controverſy. The errors of pointing, and orthography, and all others, which Printers are liable to commit, are innumerable in it; but be this how it will, it may ſerve for a repertory, and I have found in it facts concerning Calvin's Inſtitution, which ſeemed to me very well worth being taken notice of, allowing them even to be fabulous.

Our canon begins with comparing Calvin's Inſtition and the common-places of Martyr (3). He finds in both the ſame diſpoſition of the ſubjects, the ſame order of books and chapters, and the ſame arguments againſt the Romiſh religion. He will not declare himſelf on either ſide of the queſtion, whether Calvin be the plagiary of Martyr, as ſome great men believe (4), or whether he took all from his own ſtock, as ſome others imagine; but however it be, he peremptorily decides that Martyr was a more learned man than Calvin. If he had read the preface to the common-places of Martyr, he would have known certainly how to regulate his opinion touching the queſtion of plagiariſm; for it appears by that preface that theſe common-places were drawn up and digeſted after the death of Martyr. Dr Burnet has made uſe of this obſervation to expoſe a miſtake of Mr Varillas (5). Let us remember that Martyr did not embrace the Proteſtant religion till the year 1542, and that he died three years after the laſt reviſal of Calvin's Inſtitution, from whence it follows that neither his common-places, nor even his other books, could have ſerved as models, nor as an original ground-work to the Inſtitution, the third edition of which, as enlarged by the author, was in the year 1543.

After that the canon obſerves the great credit which this book of Calvin's has obtained among the Proteſtants. He quotes (6) a miniſter (7), who has given an abridgement of it in the German tongue, and who aſſures us, that ſince the birth of JESUS CHRIST there has not appeared a more pious nor a more uſeful book than this. He ſays that Piſcator, in his epitome of the ſame book (8), and Beza, in the preface to his Confeſſion of Faith, make the ſame judgment of it; and that in England they want little great deal of paſſion and heat in the writings of this canon of Cologn: he obſerves that the

---

(3) Giſb. Voëtius, Diſputat. Theolog. *Tom. iii, pag.* 564, 565.

(*a*) From thence comes the firname of *Lithocomus.*

(*b*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory to his firſt volume againſt the Inſtitution of Calvin.

(*c*) In the remarks [*F*] and [*BB*] of the article CALVIN.

(1) Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belgic. *pag.* 164.

(2) Schulting. Epiſt Dedicat. *Tom. i,* Bibl. Catholicæ.

(3) Schulting. *Tom. i,* Biblioth. Cathol. *pag.* 1.

(4) Quod magni viri ſentiunt. *Id. ibid.*

(5) See the ſecond Criticiſm of Dr Burnet, upon Varillas's Hiſtory of Hereſy, *p.* 12, *and following.*

(6) Schulting. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 6.

(7) Caſpar Olerianus, miniſter of the Elector Palatine.

(8) Printed at Herborn in the year 1586.

little of preferring Calvin's Inſtitution to the Bible, that the biſhops order all the miniſters to get that book almoſt by heart; that they lay it upon the pulpit in their churches; that in Scotland they make the ſtudy of Divinity begin with the reading of this Inſtitution; that at Heidelberg, Geneva, Herborn, and in the Calviniſts univerſities, they expound it publickly; that in Holland the laymen as well as miniſters have it always in their hands, curiouſly bound. This is the ſubſtance of a more ample diſcourſe, which I ſhall quote entire, for the rarity of the fact, according to the Latin of the author. *In Anglia ejus* (Calvini) *Inſtitutiones ipſis penè Biblicis ſcripturis præferuntur, mandant pſeudoepiſcopi omnibus miniſtris, ut penè ad verbum has ediſcant, nec unquam de manibus deponant, collocantur in templis ſublimi loco in pulpito, cuſtodiuntur tanta diligentia ac ſi Sibyllina forent oracula, quæ ſumma fidelitate apud Romanos aſſervata fuiſſe, veteres Romani ſcriptores tradidere* †. *In Scotia omnes ſtudioſi adoleſcentes poſt ſuſceptum gradum magiſterii, ſtudium Theologiæ ab his principiis nempe lectione Inſtitutionem incohant. Omnes Apoſtatæ Monachi, Sacerdotes, Canonici, quotquot à nobis ad ipſos deficiunt, jubentur initio ſuæ ſcilicet converſionis fundamenta prima Theologiæ ex hiſce Inſtitutionibus addiſcere, ut ex Synhodis eorum Belgicis collegi. Heidelbergæ, Genevæ, Herbornæ & in Univerſitatibus Calviniſtarum vel ipſæ Inſtitutiones, vel earum compendia publicè à doctoribus Studioſis Theologiæ explicantur. Hæ Inſtitutiones ab ipſis in omnes linguas vertuntur, ut omnium nationum homines hoc veneno peſtifero inficere, & corrumpere poſſint. In Belgio nullus eſt verbi miniſter & præco, nullus Senatorii ordinis vir paulò latior, nullus præſes vel præfectus, breviter, nullus ſacrarum literarum cupidus (omnes autem penè ſunt ejuſmodi in Theologia Calviniana verſati à ſupremo conſiliario uſque ad infimum aurigam & nautam) qui non haſce aureas ſcilicet eorum judicio Inſtitutiones nocturna verſet manu verſetque diurna, extrinſecus auro, purpura omnique precioſiſſimo ornatu veſtiunt & ornant tanquam præſtantiſſimam margaritam evangelicam & quaſi theſaurum cœlitus delapſum, ex his libris omnes controverſias decidunt & dijudicant* (9). Every body perceives that there are too many hyperboles and childiſh exaggerations in this paſſage.

Let us ſee what he ſays upon the editions of Calvin's Inſtitution.

He finds that they became more correct in proportion as the author multiplied them, and therefore as the firſt is the moſt imperfect, the laſt, which is that of the year 1559, is the moſt perfect, it ſeems to him that Calvin, looking on that work as his favourite production, he applied his whole wit and vigour to correct, embelliſh, and enlarge it, to the end that he might therein give a very compleat ſyſtem, and a perfect idea of his Theology. *Videtur autem mihi Joannes Calvinus, ab eo tempore quo ſcribere cœpit, deinceps uſque ad finem vitæ ſuæ, omne ſtudium ſuum omnemque operam & vires ad has inſtitutiones augendas, locupletandas ſic contuliſſe, ut ſuæ Theologiæ perfectam idæam & ſpecimen exhiberet* (10). This notion agrees well enough with the preface which Calvin has put before the edition of the year 1559. Scultingius obſerves (11), that the firſt edition is of Baſil 1536, *in 8vo*; that the ſecond is of Straſbourg, 1539, *in folio*; that the third is of Geneva, 1545, *in folio*, and in 8*vo*; and the fourth is of Geneva, 1559, *in folio*, and *in* 8*vo*. That the edition which the univerſity of Heidelberg cauſed to be publiſhed in the year 1572, differs from the reſt in ſeveral things, and is the worſt of all; that two were publiſhed at Lauſanne, with notes; the one in the year 1576, the other in 1585: that the German tranſlation of Heildelberg differs prodigiouſly (12) from the text of John Calvin; that the firſt, *viz.* that of Baſil, 1536, is divided into no more than eight chapters (13), and contains no advertiſement to the reader; that the Geneva Catechiſm has been added to the third edition; that Bellarmin, in the fourth chapter of the firſt book *de Pontifice*, quotes an edition of the year 1554, and ſhews wherein it is contrary to the edition which followed; that the edition of Straſbourg, 1539, carries this title, *Inſtitutio Chriſtianæ Religionis nunc vere demum ſuo titulo reſpondens, auctore Alcuino: Argentorati apud Wendelinum* (14) *menſe auguſto anno Domini* 1. 5. 3. 9., and that before the Epiſtle Dedicatory are to be read theſe words, *Potentiſſimo Illuſtriſſimoque Monarchæ magno Francorum Regi Principi ac Domino ſuo Alcuinus*, which inſinuates that it is Alcuinus who addreſſes his diſcourſe to Charlemaign; the falſe name of Alcuinus having appeared in the firſt edition, they wrongfully put in the ſecond *nunc demum ſuo titulo reſpondens* (15); that many variations are found in the doctrine of Calvin when the different editions which he has given of this book are compared together (16); that the editions publiſhed by the Bookſellers, without his being concerned in them, vary ſtill more, they have added, changed, and left out, many things in them, according to the taſte of particular men: *Si ſæpius & plures editiones inveniantur ſunt Typographorum non Calvini, ibi ſunt multa adjecta, mutata, ablata pro judicio privatorum hominum* (17); that the method of this book is wonderful, and that it may be compared to the Inſtitutes of Juſtinian, which, as the Lawyers juſtly acknowledge, have been formed with ſo much order and ſymetry, that nothing can go beyond them. *Methodus profecto adeò inſignis eſt & artificioſa ut cum Inſtitutionibus Juſtiniani conferri poſſint, quo Libro Jureconſulti meritò ſentiunt, nihil ſcriptum eſſe magis methodicè, niſi forte hoc alicui meritò diſplicere poſſit quod de Principiis Theologiæ (à quibus omnis ordiri debet diſputatio) non in* 1. *ſtatim libro, ut fieri oportuiſſe multi ſentient, ſed in ultimo libro* 4. *tractarit, nempè de auctoritate Eccleſiæ, Pontificis, Conciliorum & Sacræ Scripturæ. Methodum Albertus Pighius valdè laudat & filum orationis ac ſtylum dicendi* (18). That as ſoon as this book of Calvin came out of the preſs at Straſbourg about the year 1545, Bernard Cincius, Biſhop of Aquila carried a copy of it to Cardinal Marcellus Cervinus, the Pope's legate, at the court of the emperor (19); that theſe two able men, being of opinion that this book was more dangerous than the other writings of the Lutherans (20), put Albertus Pighius upon examining it, who having judged that Calvin was an antagoniſt worthy of his notice, undertook to confute him; and that he began with the ſubject of Grace and of Free-will; upon which he publiſhed ten books againſt Calvin; that he had a deſign to publiſh others upon Juſtification and the principle of faith, but that death hindered him from finiſhing them. *Hic* (Albertus) *Calvinum nequaquam contemnendum ſed dignum antagoniſten, quo cum congrederetur, in quem calamum ſtringeret, ac pro pietate & orthodoxa fide decertaret judicavit. Quo factum eſt, ut decem libros de gratia, & libero arbitrio contra Joan. Calvinum in lucem emiſerit, cui ſi diuturnior vita ſuperſtes fuiſſet, propoſuerat etiam de juſtificatione hominis, & de principiis credendorum contra eundem Calvinum ſcribere, & ad iſta tria primaria puncta eiſdemque annexa, nempè de gratia & libero arbitrio, de juſtificatione, de Principiis credendorum inchoatos non abſolvit, nec in lucem edidit* (21).

Let us make ſome remarks upon this account of the canon of Cologn.

I. Firſt of all we muſt lay it down as a certain fact (22), that the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the Inſtitution was dated from Baſil, not on the firſt of Auguſt 1536, as ſeveral editions have it, but on the firſt of Auguſt 1535, as it is to be ſeen in ſome others. It is a ſtrong preſumption that the firſt edition is of the year 1535, ſince it is highly probable that the book was compleat and ready for the preſs when the author dedicated his Epiſtle Dedicatory. If it was, we ſhould have room to conclude that the copy which is kept in the Library of Geneva (23), which wants the forty-two firſt pages, but which takes notice, at the end, that the impreſſion was finiſhed in the month of March 1536, is not the firſt edition; for if it were, we muſt ſay that Calvin left Baſil before his book was printed, and that the Printer made no great haſte, and did not finiſh the edition till the month of March 1536. This is not probable, and it is far leſs ſo than to ſuppoſe that a book ſo well written as this, and ſo fit for the times, was ſold off with ſo great diſpatch that it was very ſoon neceſſary to think of a ſecond edition, which was finiſhed in the month of March 1536. Obſerve well, that Theodore Beza aſſures us (24), that Calvin cauſed his Inſtitution to be printed at Baſil, and departed not from Baſil till after the edition of the book (25): Secondly, That he relates ſo many journies which the author made

† Libri Inſtitutionum in Anglia in tanto precio ſunt, ut tum Anglicè exactiſſimè verſi in ſingulis Eccleſiis à parochis legendi appendantur, tum in utraque illic Academia, curſu Philoſophico abſoluto, futuris Theologis hi primum ante omnia prælegantur. D. Stapletonius in Promptuario quadrageſimali in feria 4 Hebdomadæ Sanctæ.

(9) *Schult. ubi ſupra*, pag. 7: he repeats the ſame thing, *pag.* 487 of the ſecond volume, and in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the third volume.

(10) Id. ibid. *pag.* 18.

(11) Id. ibid. *pag.* 19.

(12) Toto cœlo aberrat. *Id. ibid.*

(13) Nevertheleſs he ſays, *pag.* 39, that it contained ſixteen chapters.

(14) He ſhould have added here *Ribelium.*

(15) Id. ibid. *pag.* 20.

(16) Calvinus in tempore editionum diverſarum & in doctrina Inſtitutionum non ſibi conſtat, ſed modis variis mutavit. *Idem, ibid. pag.* 19. *See alſo the beginning of the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the fourth volume.*

(17) Schult. Bibl. Cathol. *Tom. i*, *pag.* 19.

(18) Id. ib. *p.* 7.

(19) Id. ibid. *pag.* 39.

(20) Reliqua Lutheranorum Scripta eſſe dilutiora, hoc acrius mordere & fortius ſtringere. *Id. ibid. p.* 39, 40.

(21) Id. ibid.

(22) See the remark [*F*], of the article CALVIN.

(23) See the ſame remark of the ſame article.

(24) Beza, preface to the Commentaries of Calvin upon Joſhua, *pag.* 7.

(25) Edito hoc libro ſuaque veluti præſtita Patriæ fide, Calvinum viſendæ Ferrarienſis Duciſſæ . . . . deſiderium inceſſit. *Beza, in Vita Calvini, p.* 367, 368. *Tom. iii*, Operum.

the Heretics cenſured them, and that their coming into England was abſolutely forbidden (*d*). He died on the twenty-third of April 1604 (*e*). Mr Konig makes, two authors of him, the one called Conrad Schultingius, the other Cornelius Schultingius.

made from that time till the ſummer of 1536 (26), that Calvin muſt neceſſarily have gone from Baſil ſoon after the date of this Epiſtle Dedicatory. It will be objected, that the Printer has ſet down the year 1536 in the title page, although the book was to be ſold from the month of Auguſt 1535. I confeſs that this way of anticipating upon the following year is frequent among Bookſellers, but generally they do not begin it in the month of Auguſt, and after all, that does not remove the difficulty which I ground upon the date of the month of March 1536, which is to be ſeen in the Geneva copy. I conclude that tho' there be ſome probability that the firſt edition was dated in the year 1536, by the Bookſeller, it is likewiſe probable that it was dated from the year 1535. It is thus that one might expatiate on every ſide in the vaſt field of probability, if there was not a fixed point which determines the whole diſpute in my favour. They are the words of Calvin himſelf, which I have quoted in another place (27), and by which we learn that he went from Baſil ſoon after his book had ſeen the light there. This is a demonſtration that the edition, which was compleated in the month of March 1536, is not the firſt.

II. In the ſecond place I obſerve, that Schultingius was in the right not to reckon for the ſecond and third editions any beſides thoſe which were made upon the reviſals of Calvin. He does well, according to this rule, in giving the ſecond place to the edition of Straſbourg, 1539, but he is in the wrong to reckon that of Geneva, 1545 for the third: for it was preceded by the edition of Straſbourg, 1543, corrected and enlarged by the author.

DATE of the Geneva Catechiſm.

III. His obſervation, that the Geneva catechiſm was added to the third edition, that is, according to his way of reckoning, to the edition of Geneva 1545, may poſſibly be true; for the Epiſtle Dedicatory (28) of that catechiſm is dated the twenty-eighth of November, 1545. Calvin compoſed that Catechiſm in French, in the year 1536, and publiſhed it in Latin at Baſil, in the year 1538 (29). He changed the form of it in the year 1541, *reducing it to queſtions and anſwers, for the greater eaſe of children, whereas in the other edition, things were treated by way of ſummaries and ſhort chapters* (30). He himſelf made a Latin tranſlation of it, which was printed in the year 1545. It is at the end of the Inſtitution, in the Geneva edition of 1550, and may very well be in that of 1545, as Schultingius obſerves. We have ſeen elſewhere (31), that a learned Dominican has fixed the Æra of that book to the year 1540, both as to the French and Latin editions of it. He miſtakes a little in his calculation.

IV. I cannot allow to Schultingius the chronology he makes uſe of, with reſpect to the edition, which animated Pighius to write againſt Calvin. It was neither that of 1545, nor even that of 1543, but that of 1539. He was no longer alive in the year 1543. His book had appeared ſome time before, and was confuted by Calvin in the beginning of the year 1543.

V. Our canon ſhould have reckoned, according to his hypotheſis, the edition of the year 1559, for the laſt; for Calvin then put the laſt hand to his book, and has neither added nor changed any thing in it ſince. I have the French edition of Geneva, 1566, in folio; it has the ſame preface with that of the year 1559, and if it contains two Indexes (32), which are not in that of 1559, Calvin is not the author of them. Marlorat compoſed them, with a particular care, in the year 1562. He did not truſt *to the quotations placed in the margin, and printed before that time: for having ſeen and compared all*, he found *that many of them were falſe* (33), *ſeveral omitted, and ſome miſplaced.* He reſtored *every thing as well as he could, and added what had been left out* (34).

VI. I can ſcarce believe that there are editions of the Inſtitution where ſo many things have been changed, added, and retrenched, as Schultingius affirms. The diſcovery and proof of ſuch a thing would be difficult, conſidering the prodigious number of editions that this book of Calvin has undergone.

A CRITICISM on the *Eſſais de Literature.*

It has been ſo often reprinted, that it is not to be conceived how the author of the *Eſſais de Literature* could make (35) an article of the *Chriſtian Inſtitution of Calvin*, without ſaying one word which ſhould make us underſtand that it had been printed oftener than once. He has contented himſelf with obſerving (36) that the author publiſhed it at Baſil about the year 1534. I do not know whether he himſelf perceived this fault, or whether he was told of it; but he corrected it by an addition at the end of his little book. That addition tells us (37), that this book of Calvin is dated *from Baſil the firſt of Auguſt* 1536; that *it was, in ſome reſpect, no more than the firſt draught of a larger performance*; that *it was then that Paul Tharius* (38) *compoſed the diſtich which made ſo much noiſe* (39); that *there has been five editions of this book*; *that of Baſil*, 1535; *that of Straſbourg*, 1539; *the ſecond of Straſbourg*, 1543; *the third of Straſbourg, in 4to*, 1544; *that of Geneva, which is the fifth*, 1550; and that *in the year* 1558, *the author reviſed* his book *and divided* it *into four parts.* I wiſh he had corrected the falſe date of the firſt of Auguſt 1536. He was more obliged to it than any other, ſince he was ready to ſay that the firſt edition is of Baſil, 1535. He would be very much puzzled, if he ſhould undertake to prove that Paul Thurius compoſed his diſtich in the year 1535. Nothing is more eaſy than to prove to him that he has been in the wrong to reduce the editions of Calvin's Inſtitution to five. He reckons up ſix himſelf, for undoubtedly he meant, that the reviſal made by Calvin in the year 1558 was followed by a new edition, and it is very certain that it was ſo. People will very juſtly think it ſtrange, that the author of the Eſſays of Literature, having propoſed to himſelf to ſpeak of none but ſcarce books, ſhould have made an article of Calvin's Inſtitution; for no book was ever ſo common as this; it has been ſo many times reprinted, that copies of it are to be found in the very Brokers ſtalls through all the towns of Holland; and unleſs it be a fine edition, and in folio, they do not coſt above three pence or a groat. See the margin (40).

An obſervation has been made which ſhews that this book of Calvin has been ſifted, ſcanned, anatomiſed, in all the different manners poſſible, by the Roman Catholics. They have taken notice that the firſt word is *all*, and the laſt *impiety*, and this has appeared very myſterious. The fact is certain in the French tranſlation, but not in the original Latin. *Inſtitutionem Calvini obſervarunt quidam hoc verbo* omnis *incipere & in iſtud* impietas *deſinere; id tamen præter mentem Authoris, ita divino conſilio contigiſſe cenſent, ut Argumento ſit Librum totius impietatis eſſe quaſi Encyclopædiam, eâque ſola conſtare* (41).

The editions of Calvin's Inſtitution, which I have ſeen, are the following: that of Geneva, 1550, in 4to, *ex Officina Joannis Gerardi*; that of Robert Stephens, 1553, in folio (42). Theſe two are in Latin, and contain no more than twenty-one chapters, divided each into ſeveral ſections. The French edition of Geneva, printed for John Gerard, 1553, in 4to. The Latin edition of Geneva, printed for Francis Perrin, 1568, in folio. Six other French editions of the ſame city: one printed for Conrad Badius, 1560, in folio; one from the Printing-houſe of James Bourgeois, 1562, in 4to; one from the Printing-houſe of Thomas Courteau, 1564, in 8vo; the French edition of Lyons, printed for John Martin, 1565, in 8vo; one printed for Francis Perrin, 1566, in folio: and one from the Printing-houſe of Jacob Stoer, 1609, in folio. I have likewiſe ſeen the Latin edition, publiſhed at Geneva, by John Le Preux, in folio, in the year 1590. It is augmented with the analyſis, and ſome other pieces compoſed by different authors. The editions of Geneva, in 8vo, printed for John Le Preux, 1592, and 1602, are agreeable to this. I add, that the Geneva edition of 1617, in folio, *apud Joh. Vignon*,

---

(*d*) See the remark [*A*] at the end.

(*e*) Valer. Andreas, Bibl. Belgic. *pag.* 164.

(26) *Id. ibid.* See the remark [*U*], of the article CALVIN.

(27) In the remark [*U*] of the article CALVIN.

(28) To the miniſters of Frieſland.

(29) Beza, preface to the Commentaries of Calvin upon Joſhua, *pag.* 8.

(30) The ſame, *pag.* 12.

(31) In the remark [*B*] of the article SPAIN (JOHN OF).

(32) The one of the matters, the other of the places of Scripture.

(33) The Bookſeller of Geneva, who publiſhed the Latin edition of 1550, made an excuſe for having truſted to the edition of Straſbourg, where the greateſt part of the quotations were falſely ſet down in the margin, which he remedied in the Index.

(34) Marlorat, *Preface to the Indexes.*

(35) In the Eſſays of Auguſt, 1702, *p.* 96.

(36) Ibid. *p.* 98.

(37) Pag. 148.

(38) He ſhould have ſaid *Thurius.*

(39) You will find it in the remark [*F*] of the article CALVIN.

(40) There is in the Journal of Trevoux, January 1703, edition of Amſterdam, a Memoir touching the Eſſays of Literature, in which there is a cenſure on what concerns the Inſtitution of Calvin.

(41) Vincent. Baronius, Parænet. ad Th. Raynaud. *in limine* Apologet. Ord. Dominic. *folio, quod præcedit folium i.*

(42) The printing of it was finiſhed on the fourth of February 1553.

Vignon, Petrum & Jacobum Chouët, makes the ſixth volume of a Latin edition of John Calvin's works. Together with his letters it likewiſe makes a volume of his works in the Amſterdam edition, printed for John-James Schipper, in the year 1667, in folio.

SCHUTZE (JOHN) a Lutheran miniſter in Germany in the XVIth century, publiſhed among other books a piece to which he gave the title of *Sacramentarius Diabolus* - - - *The Sacramentarian Devil*. One may judge by this of the rage which animated him againſt the Zuinglians [*A*]. He likewiſe publiſhed in the year 1579, a book containing fifty reaſons why a man ſhould not embrace the communion of the Calviniſts.

[*A*] *The rage which animated him againſt the Zuinglians.*] To the end that one may judge of the piece by the pattern, I ſhall quote a paſſage which I find in George Braunius. We ſhall ſee there, that our Schutze repreſented the Calviniſts as perſons that were the moſt turbulent, ſeditious, and cruel. ‘Hic ſeditionis genius non tantum Lutheranos, ſed & Galainiſtici furoris miniſtros, magis exagitat quod Lutherani in Confratribus ſuis accurate obſervarunt, dum inter varias cauſas, quare Sacramentariam Calviniſtarum Doctrinam acceptare nequeant præcipuam & illam allegent, quod ſeditioſi, & tumultuoſi ſint, pacis publicæ & tranquillitatis politicæ turbatores, quorum hoc unicum inſtitutum eſt, ut ſeditionum factiones, tumultum, diſſidia, ac tandem cædem ac ſanguinis effuſionem procurent. Maxime cum duplici nomine latrones exiſtant, non ſatiati ſi hominum animas Doctrinæ falſitate interimant, verum etiam, omnem quam poſſunt cunque diligentiam adhibeant ut per ſeditiones, latrocinia, & cædes pro nefario ſuo genio in civitatibus inſtituant. Hoc Joannes Schutzius in cauſarum explicatione, & in Sacramentario ſuo Diabolo pagina 354 (1). - - - *This ſpirit of ſedition*, ſays he, *not only poſſeſſes the Lutherans, but rages ſtill more among the furious miniſters of Calvin, which the Lutherans have taken notice of in their brethren; ſince among the various reaſons why they cannot embrace the ſacramentary doctrine of the Calviniſts, they alledge this for the chief, that they are a diſorderly and riotous ſect, enemies to the publick peace and tranquillity, and that their only principles are to beget tumult, diſcord, ſedition, and at length murder and bloodſhed. Eſpecially ſince they are robbers in a double reſpect, as they do not ſatisfy themſelves with killing the ſouls of men by their falſe doctrine, but likewiſe apply their utmoſt diligence to blow up ſeditions, and thereby to fill cities with murder and rapine, for to ſuch things the wicked bent of their genius prompts them.* This ſays John Schutze, *&c.*’

It is to be obſerved, that George Braun, a clergyman of Cologn, here accuſes the Proteſtants of a ſeditious and violent humour, which is a reproach that is caſt upon them by an infinite number of other Popiſh writers, and which is the ſame, that on all occaſions they object to the Romiſh party. Juvenal certainly could not have read this paſſage of George Braun without crying out:

Quis tulerit Gracchos de ſeditione querentes?
Quis cœlum terris non miſceat, & mare cœlo,
Si fur diſpliceat Verri? homicida Miloni?
Clodius accuſet mœchos? Catilina Cethegum?
In tabulam Syllæ ſi dicant diſcipuli tres (2):

. . . . . *In vain*
The Gracchi of ſediton muſt complain.
'Twould make you ſwear the planets from their ſpheres,
Should Verres peach thieves, Milo murderers,
Clodius tax bawds, Cethegus Cataline,
Or Scylla's pupils, Scylla's rules declince.

TATE.

Be that as it will, let us cite another inſtance of Schutze's rancour. *Sacramentariſmus Camerina ac ſentina eſt quædam, in quam multæ hæreſes confluent, ultima Satanæ ire, quam furiis agitatus contra Chriſtum ejuſque Eccleſiam exercet. Et qui Sacramentariorum partes ſequitur, is manifeſtus eſt, atque ejuratus hoſtis Dei & fidei, quàm in Baptiſmo Chriſto dedit, oblitus* (3).

This is maintaining that the opinion of the Calviniſts touching the Euchariſt is the ſink of many hereſies, and the utmoſt effort of Satan's rage, and that one cannot adhere to it without becoming the ſworn enemy of GOD, and without forgetting what he promiſed to JESUS CHRIST in his baptiſm. Now to maintain ſuch a thing as this, is it not a downright fit of madneſs. I appeal to the Lutheran miniſters of the preſent time. They are a good deal more moderate than their anceſtors, and they doubtleſs ſee, that the quality of the tenets in which the two Proteſtant communions differ, is not of the ſame kind which they believed formerly, when the ſacramentary war heated their ſpirits too much, and ſpread on both ſides a flood of defamation. That furious ſtorm being calmed by degrees, they have found out at laſt, that the ſubject of the diſpute was not of that importance. How many things of that nature are diſcovered by experience (4)? But alas! how little do we profit thereby! There ariſe very frequent diſputes among divines: they are treated as if the fundamentals of religion were concerned, and they do not remember that they treat as a meer trifle now, what their predeceſſors had looked upon as a debate of the utmoſt conſequence.

(1) Georg. Braunius, in Tremonenſium Catholicorum Defenſione, *p.* 165, 166.

(2) Juven. Sat. II, ver 24.

(3) Schutzius, *Præfat. in Librum* 50 *Cauſarum, apud* Braunium in Tremonenſium Catholicorum Defenſione, *pag.* 29.

(4) See the remarks [*E*] and [*F*], of the article AMYRAULT, and the remark [*D*] of the article GOMARUS.

SCIOPPIUS (*a*) (GASPAR) one of the moſt famous writers of the XVIIth century, was a German. His enemies have publiſhed many ſhameful things concerning his family [*A*]. He ſtudied at Amberg, and then at Heidelberg, and afterwards at Altdorf, at the charges of the Elector Palatine. Having made a conſiderable ſtay at Ingolſtad,

[*A*] *His enemies have publiſhed many ſhameful things concerning his family.*] They publiſhed (1) that he was born in a village, where his father was ſexton, *hoc veſpillone atque æditui in pago quodam non ignoto, natus eſt Gaſpar Schoppius*; That his father one day made a grave too little, and being unwilling to make it longer, he cut off the feet of the dead body. *Hiberno quodam tempore, terra firmiter gelu conſtricta, ſepeliendum acceperat cadaver, cui jam ſepulchrum effoderat, ſed menſura breviore quam pro mole; ibi vir fortiſſimus ne tanto in frigore terra deducenda eſſet, pedibus cadaver mutilat, & in foſſam quam ſepulchrum verius recondit* (2). That having got ſome money together he went into Poland, where he ſerved a Printer; that afterwards he was a pedlar, and went from village to village, as the Savoyards do, to ſell ſmall wares; that he left off that trade, and liſted himſelf a ſoldier; that he came back into the Palatinate after the death of Frederic III, and obtained there a ſmall employment (3); that he ſold corn, and gained ſomething by it; that he obtained the judicature of a ſmall place, and at the end of the year liſted himſelf for the expedition of Cologn, and was made provoſt of the army; that after the death of the Elector Lewis, he returned to his firſt poſt, and made himſelf a good Miller there; that he was ſent to a town that mutinied, and commanded the ſoldiers there; that he was a Brewer there; that he was there with his wife and his daughter, but would not let them ſee any body. They add, that his wife was a Heſſian, and had followed into Hungary a man who kept her. From the day after he was killed, ſhe lay with Scioppius, who afterwards deſpiſed her ſo much, that he made her work like a ſervant, without either ſeeing or ſpeaking to her. On the contrary, he made his maid eat at his table, and admitted her to his bed from time to time (4). The daughter,

(*a*) His true name was *Schoppius*, but he changed it into *Scioppius*, to bring it to the Italian pronunciation.

(1) *See the book intituled*, Vita & Parentes Gaſp. Schoppii, *printed at Leyden, in* 1609, *with* Confutatio Fabulæ Burdonum.

(2) Ibid. *p.* 138.

(3) In præfectura Burcktreſwiciana, tenue officiolum ac vile obtinuit, quod Notarium ſive Actuarium præfecturæ vocare poſſis. *Ibid. pag.* 139.

(4) Contra vero, quaſi verſis rerum vicibus ancillæ fortiſſimo Herculi adhærere, cibum una capere, & ſi res ita ferret, thorum genialem occupere. *Id. ibid. pag.* 141.

Ingolſtad, he returned to Altdorf, and publiſhed ſome books of Criticiſm which made him very proud: he could not ſee without vanity, his great youth joined to a diſtinguiſhed merit in print [*B*]. It is ſaid that one of the early productions of his pen, was a commentary upon the Priapeia, which drew a great many reproaches upon him, eſpecially, becauſe therein he envied the condition of ſparrows (*b*). He made a journey into Italy, and after

daughter, a faithful companion of her mother in this retired ſtate, married a rogue, who would have been executed for the crime of beſtiality, if he had not fled for it. In his abſence, his wife proſtituted herſelf to another man, who got her with child. She was impriſoned, and if ſhe had not found means to eſcape, they would have puniſhed her in a public manner for her adultery. *Hæc ne fratre tali indigna eſſet, ſcelerato nupſit homini, qui (honor ſit verecundis auribus) conſtante matrimonio obbrutuit: cum vacca enim conſueviſſe convictus eſt, & effugiendi cauſa ſupplicii uxore deſerta ſe ſubduxit, quæ ſuperſtite facinoroſo illo ac fugitivo, alteri cuidam ſui copiam fecit, ac mox prægnans facta eſt. Ob id flagitium, cum in carcerem conjecta, ſupplicium vix evaſura eſſet, vinculis perfractis in Auſtriam pervenit, relicta adulterina apud patrem ſobole. In Palatina ſane ditione, deprehenſa ſi fuerit, publicam animadverſionem non evadet* (5). To conclude, it is ſaid, that Scioppius bragged he was the baſtard of a gentleman of Franconia, called Munſter, and that he took that name; but that a lady of that noble family, convicted him of being an impoſtor, and forbad him in a threatning manner to uſurp that quality. *Quoties ſymbolum amicitiæ in adoleſcentum philothecas, qui mos hodie obtinet, referre ſolebat, totidem literis nomen conſignabat: G. S. à Munſter, addito ad Scaligeri exemplum, FUIMUS TROES. Donec Ingolſtadii à nobiliſſima ejus gentis matrona convictus eſt; cujus tamen minis nondum abſterreri potuit, quin Italis, ad quos poſtea profectus eſt,* gentilem hominem, *ut Longobardi vacant, ſe Germanum eſſe perſuaderet* (6).

It is certain, that Scioppius ſtiled himſelf a gentleman all his life, and that having got intelligence of the calumnies, that the friends of Scaliger had publiſhed, he appeared before the civil judges of the apoſtolical chamber at Rome, to be admitted to prove his nobility, and his good conduct (7); and that the witneſſes which he brought, having been juridically examined, an act ſealed by the apoſtolical chamber was delivered to him, by which it appears that the witneſſes depoſed that he was born a gentleman, and in lawful wedlock. *Sibi ex publica fama & multorum, qui id ſcire potuerint, teſtimoniis conſtare, Scioppium legitimè natum & ex nobili familia oriundum eſſe, tametſi majorum nobilitatem paupertatis injuria propè jam extinctam ejus demum pater virtute ſua geſtiſque honoratiſſimis muneribus & officiis rursùs excitârit* (8). He dedicated to his father one of his books (9), wherein he ſays nothing elſe of his anceſtors, but that his great-grand father lived 110 years, and his great-grand-mother 105 (10). He made a journey into the Palatinate in 1608, to take poſſeſſion of his father's eſtate, or rather to obtain a replevy; for it is ſaid the magiſtrates had ſeized on it, becauſe of the miſdemeanor of the deceaſed in relation to the taxes of the prince upon beer, and to other duties of the like nature. *Patre mortuo ad matrem adeundæ hæreditatis cauſa veniſſe dicitur, quæ à magiſtratu eam ob cauſam ſequeſtrata putatur, quod pater .... publicum vectigal quod de bonis ac cereviſia inferri ærario ſolet, fraudarit, cujus modi ibi fures, aut ſaltem Norimbergæ, ſeveriſſime plectuntur* (11). He denied that there had been any ſuch embezzling, and alledged ſome other reaſons why he could not enjoy his patrimony (12).

[*B*] *He could not ſee without vanity his great youth joined to a diſtinguiſhed merit in print.*] Mr Baillet, who has placed him with reaſon in the catalogue of famous children, ſpeaks of him thus. ‘We may conſider the love which he expreſſed for learning, and his indefatigable labour, which God did moſt times reward with a good ſucceſs, as an example that deſerves to be propoſed to young people. * Ottavia Ferrari, a Milaneſe, and a famous profeſſor at Padua, ſeems to affirm that he was a very good ſcholar in his younger years; and he adds, that being but ſixteen years of age, he publiſhed ſome books, which deſerved to be admired by old men (13).’ The words of Ottavia Ferrari are theſe: ‘Ab ineunte ætate ita totus literis affixus fuit, ut ſexto decimo anno libros evulgaret quos ſenes admirarentur (14).’ In another ſpeech he beſtows this encomium upon him: ‘Adoleſcentem ac pœne puerum id ingenii, atque eruditionis ſpecimen dediſſe, ut vix tribus luſtris expletis non unum opus publici juris faceret, quod exactæ ætatis judicium, totiuſque antiquitatis ſolidam cognitionem præ ſe ferret (15). - - - *That while he was a ſtripling, and almoſt yet a boy, he gave ſuch proof of his wit and learning, that before he was ſcarcely in his fifteenth year he had publiſhed more than one book, which ſhewed his ripe judgment, and his well-digeſted knowledge of all antiquity.*’ But it will be better to judge of Scioppius by what he ſays of himſelf. It appears from the following words, that he was near ſeventeen years of age, when he publiſhed his firſt book: It conſiſted of Latin verſes. ‘Extant typis Heidelbergenſibus impreſſa complura Scioppii carmina anno 1593, cum haud etiam ſeptimum decimum ætatis annum compleſſet, antiquaria illa plus ſatis, ſic tamen ut variam eruditionem accurata probatiſſimorum auctorum lectione comparatam paſſim præferant: quo ipſo tempore etiam Dialectica & Rhetorica æquales & convictores ſuos, illuſtres nobileſque adoleſcentes, cum eos à Magiſtris ſuis negligi doleret, docere, auſus eſt (16). - - - - - *There are extant ſeveral poems of Scioppius, printed at Heidelberg in the year* 1593, *when he was not full ſeventeen years of age. They have indeed too much of an antique form, but in ſuch a manner, that they every where ſhew his various erudition, acquired by a diligent reading of the beſt books. At the ſame time he had the courage to inſtruct ſeveral young gentlemen of diſtinction, that were his fellow-ſtudents and companions in Logic and Rhetoric, perceiving them to be neglected by their maſters.*’ To know how many books he publiſhed before he was twenty-four years of age, we need only caſt our eyes upon the following liſt. Let us remember that in the year 1593, he was in his ſeventeenth year, as we have been juſt told by himſelf. *Veriſimilium libri quatuor. Editi Noribergæ* in *8vo apud Paulum Kaufmannum Anno* 1595, *Diſputatio de Injuriis. Apud eundem* in *4to Anno* 1597. *Suſpectarum Lectionum libri quinque. Apud eundem* in *8vo Anno* 1597. *Commentarius de Arte Critica. Noribergæ* in *8vo apud Valentinum Furmannum Anno* 1597. *Notationes Criticæ in Phædrum cum Ritterſhuſii in eundem ſcriptorem Commentario editæ Lugduni Batavor.* in *8vo apud Fr. Raphelengium Anno* 1597. *Libellus de ſua ad Catholicos migratione* (17), *deque auctoritate Eccleſiæ in ſacra ſcriptura interpretanda. Editus Romæ apud Zannetum* in *8vo* 1599. *Epiſtola de variis fidei controverſiis ad primarium quendam Germaniæ Juriſconſultum. Ingolſtadii* in *4to apud Angermarium Anno* 1599 (18).

They ſay that we muſt add to this liſt the commentary upon the Priapeia, whereof the epiſtle dedicatory is dated from Ingolſtad in the year 1595, and that the author did not think fit to mention it in the catalogue of his works, becauſe his enemies cried him down for having commented upon ſuch an obſcene collection of verſes as the Priapeia are. He defended himſelf from that reproach by denying the fact, and maintained, that this commentary was a work of Goldaſtus, who by an egregious fraud had publiſhed it, ſaid he, as the performance of Scioppius (19): However, he alledged in his vindication, that Scaliger had made ſome commentaries upon the Priapeia, and upon Catullus, and that Douza had made one upon Petronius. But he changed the ſtate of the queſtion; for the true ground of the accuſation was, not that he had commented upon obſcene verſes, but that he had ſtuffed his commentary with ſo great a number of filthy particulars (20). Beſides, he complained in that book, that men have not received from nature the ſame ſtrength as ſparrows. His enemies took him up for it, and he was laughed at to ſome purpoſe in the ſatire intituled, *Hercules tuam fidem* (21). He did certainly deſerve it; here is the paſſage, and his reflexion upon it. ‘Cum Ingolſtadii agerem, vidi è regione Muſæi mei paſſerem coitum vicies repetentem, & inde adeo ad languorem datum, ut avolaturus,

I

(*b*) See the remark [*B*].

(5) Ibid. *p.* 142, 143.

(6) Ibid. *p.* 141.

(7) *See the book intituled*, Oporini Grubinii Amphotides Scioppianæ, *pag.* 28.

(8) Oporinus Grubinius, Amphot. Sciopian. *pag.* 31.

(9) *His Theſes* de Injuriis.

(10) Vita & Parentes, Gaſp. Schoppii, *init.*

(11) Ib. *p.* 151, 152.

(12) *See* Amphotides Scioppianæ, *p.* 190, *& ſeq.*

* Proluſion. *pag.* 202.

(13) Baillet, Enfans celebres, *num.* 69.

(14) Octavius Ferrarius, in Proluſione *cui titulus* Quo pretio viri principes literas ac literatos habuerint.

(15) *Id.* in Proluſione *cui titulus* Literatorum funus.

(16) Oporinus Grubinius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 39.

(17) Freherus is therefore miſtaken, *pag.* 775, of his *Theatrum*, where he ſays that Scioppius turned Papiſt, in the year 1601.

(18) Theſe titles are taken from the *Indiculus* of Scioppius's works prefixed to the *Amphotides Scioppianæ.*

(19) *See the* Amphotides Scioppianæ, *pag.* 102, *& ſeq, and his letter* ad Saulum Mercerum, *at the end of the* Scaliger hypobolimæus.

(20) Luſus diverſorum in Priapum poëtarum libero commentario illuſtravit, quo poſt hominum memoriam, nihil fœdius ab ullo cinædo aut lubidini omnium proſtituto in lucem editum fuiſſe, omnes fatentur. *Vita & Parentes Gaſpar. Schoppii, p.* 142.

(21) *Pag.* 59. *See alſo* Merici Caſauboni Pietas, *pag.* 21.

after he had been ſome time at Verona, he returned into Germany, from whence he went again into Italy, and publiſhed at Ferrara a panegyric upon the King of Spain, and Clement VIII. He endeavoured to raiſe himſelf at the court of Rome, and uſed all his induſtry towards it; nevertheleſs his fortune was but mean, and he was not well pleaſed with it, for all the lofty titles he beſtowed upon himſelf (*c*) [*C*]. Before he travelled into Italy the firſt time, he plaid Gifanius a trick, which I have mentioned in another place (*d*). He turned a Roman Catholic about the year 1599. I do not know the reaſon why he was ſo angry with the Jeſuits; but it is certain he was their great enemy, and wrote many ſharp libels againſt them under divers ſuppoſititious names [*D*]. On the other ſide he inveighed with the utmoſt fury againſt the Proteſtants, and ſollicited the

‘rus in terram decideret. En ſortem iniquam. Hoc paſſeribus datum; negatum hominibus? Næ qui facinus hujuſmodi imitari auſit, faxim ut Picos qui aureos montes colunt, divitiis ille ſolus ſuperet. Præ milite Plautino omnes eum ſectaturas fœminas ſcilicet (22). - - - - *While I lived at Ingolſtad, I ſaw oppoſite to my ſtudy, a ſparrow repeating the act of love twenty times, and afterwards ſo faint and weary that he fell to the ground, when he attempted to fly away. Unequal fortune! Why is this given to ſparrows and denied to men? Truly, I will grant that he alone, who can imitate an action of this kind, ſurpaſſes in riches the Pici who live upon the golden mountains.*’

Take notice of theſe two things, 1. Thoſe who took his part, denied that he was the author of that commentary on the Priapeia. 2. His reflexion about the pretended happineſs of ſparrows was enlarged upon, and made worſe than it was. To prove the firſt head, I ſhall ſet down the words of the author of a ſmall book, intituled *de tribus Capellis:* He was a Jeſuit, as I have ſaid in another place (23). ‘*De Commentario ſi tibi, Joſephe, Scioppius hoc dicat:* Scripſi fateor, commentarium in Priapeia: Sed ſeptenum denum annorum puer, ſed in hereticorum ſcholis inſtitutus, ſed exemplo tuo invitatus. Atque nollem id factum. Et ſi fas dicere (ſed fas) cum illa ſcribebam, *Optarem nullas tunc habuiſſe manus.* Quid hoc autem, Burdo, dic, tua fide, ad rem attinet? Num tu idcirco Scaligerum te eſſe evinces, quia Scioppius neſcio quid ineptiarum per ludum atque jocum puer verius, quam adoleſcens olim chartis illevit, quod nunc ævi conſiliique maturior, vero vultu *damnat & opus*. . . . . Hoc igitur tibi ſi dicat ille, non te elinguem protinus, & Burdonem efficiat? Quid ſi autem dicat hoc Scioppius tibi quod dixit jam aliis prius, Non ſcripſi. Scripſit ea vero, inquit: certe vulgavit *quidam quem dicere nolo*, quia tu illum ignorare non potes (24). - - - If Scioppius ſhould ſay to you, Scaliger, concerning his commentary: *I confeſs that I writ the commentary upon the Priapeia: but I was a boy of ſeventeen years of age, but I was brought up in the ſchools of heretics, but I was prompted to it by your example. I wiſh that I had not done it. And if it be lawful for me to ſay ſo, (but it is lawful)* I could wiſh that I had had no hands at the time *when I writ thoſe things. But tell me truly, you Burdo, what is that to the purpoſe? Will you therefore prove yourſelf to be Scaliger, becauſe Scioppius long ago, whilſt he was yet a boy rather than a young man, writ ſome fooliſh things which, now that his age and judgment are riper,* he ſincerely condemns. . . . *If therefore Scioppius ſhould ſpeak in this manner to you, would not he preſently ſtrike you dumb like a Burdo as you are? But what if Scioppius ſhould ſay to you, as he has ſaid to others before, I did not write it. But it was written, ſays he, at leaſt publiſhed by* a certain perſon whom I will not mention, *becauſe you cannot but know him.*’ One would think there are ſome oblique expreſſions in thoſe words, that look like an acknowledgment of his fault; but at the bottom, they contain, a plain denial of his being guilty of it. Note, That Scioppius ſet ſo great a value on the *tres Capellæ*, that he inſerted that peice in one of his books (25). As to the ſecond head, I need only quote the author of the *Cenſure de la Doctrine curieuſe* of Father Garaſſe; theſe are his words: pag. 705. *Garaſſe ſays, that a ſmall book came out without the author's name, written by one of the new dogmatiſts, who conſidering the indefatigable heat of pigeons and ſparrows in their fits of love, made a vow to renounce heaven, if G O D would be pleaſed to change him into a pigeon or into a ſparrow. Garaſſe needs not trouble himſelf about the name of this new dogmatiſt: It is his good friend Scioppius, that wonderful good man, that great wit, who makes this fine and pious wiſh in his commentaries,* in Priap. pag. 63 (26). It is certain, that theſe words of Mr Ogier (27) contain a calumny againſt Scioppius; for this vow of renouncing heaven is not to be found in the place quoted by him.

I think I may ſay, that if one of Scioppius's books gave occaſion to have an ill opinion of his morals, all his books in general ſhewed that he was not a debauched man; for if he had loſt his time in making love and drinking, he could not have produced ſo many books. They muſt be the fruit of great labour, and required a continual and ſtrong application to ſtudy, and the converſation of learned men. Accordingly we find, that he calls the profeſſors of Altdorf and Ingolſtad to witneſs, that the life he had led was quite different from that of the youth whom they inſtructed (28). He mentions a poem that he publiſhed to exhort the rector Weſenbecius to ſuppreſs the debaucheries of the ſcholars. *Cum Petrus Weſenbecius Juriſconſultus Academiæ Rector creatus fuiſſet, longum Scioppius carmen Noribergæ imprimendum dedit, quo corruptos juventutis mores acerbè deſcribit, ipſumque Rectorem cohortatur, ut diſciplinam reſtituere, frena nimis laxata contrahere, nominatim verò chriſtatorum pileorum uſu & nocturnis commeſſabundæ juventutis concurſationibus interdicere Academicis velit, in contumaces verò & refractatorios ſevere animadvertat* (29). He alledges an epiſtle dedicatory, wherein he told us why he had ſo few friends, and why the ſcholars looked upon him as a Miſanthrope: The reaſon of it was becauſe he ſhunned their collations, their walks, and their drinking-bouts, and kept cloſe in his ſtudy all day long. *Frequentes iſtas adoleſcentibus compotationes ut fugiam ſuadere mihi poteſt vel valetudinis ratio, quam diligenter cordi habeo, vel conſilium quod à meis præceptoribus neglectus, & ceteroquin ingenio non nimis docili præditus jam olim cepi de ſtudiis ſolidum diem ab uſque mane ad veſperam ſine ullo potu & cibo naviter perſequendis, vel cura denique quam in majoribus meis imitandis ponere decrevi &c. Aliis itaque pro divinitate & facilitate ingenii ſui, ad quæ ego impenſo labore meo & indefeſſo ſtudio adſpiro nihil agendo vel commeſſando conſequuntur, per me quidem potare, plurimoſque ſibi hac comitate ſua amicos parare licet: dum mihi viciſſim hoc non ægre largiantur, ut quam illi ex cauponis ego ex laboribus voluptatem capiam, & laudem continentiæ, ut ego voco, ut illi, Moroſitatis, à majoribus meis acceptam & in me tranſmiſſam, ſtudioſè conſervem &c* (30). He was juſtly accounted an ill man; but his faults, like thoſe of ſome other proud, ſatirical, and paſſionate learned men, were not irregularities of the body, but vices of the mind.

[*C*] *The lofty titles he beſtowed upon himſelf.*] He was made Patrician of Rome, Knight of St Peter, counſellor to the Emperor, counſellor to the King of Spain, counſellor to the Archduke, Count Palatine (31); and laſtly, he was adorned with the title of Count de Clara Valle.

[*D*] *He wrote many ſharp libels againſt* the Jeſuits *under divers ſuppoſititious names.*] It is affirmed in the book I have quoted ſeveral times (32), that before he changed his religion, he publiſhed ſome verſes, wherein he called their ſociety, *Iberam parricidalem cohortem,* - - - - *a Spaniſh cohort of parricides,* and that afterwards he fell violently upon them in a piece that was ſeen at Rome by ſeveral people: *Quos petulantiſſimo poſtea ſcripto quod Romæ plurimi viderunt, & è quo nonnulla hic adferri poterant, petivit.* Mention is made of a fragment of a letter, importing, that he ſaid long after his apoſtacy, that there were few learned perſons, and very few honeſt men in that order (33). He anſwers as to the Poem, that he ſpoke of the Jeſuits

---

(*c*) *Taken from a book intituled,* Vita & Parentes Gaſp. Schoppii à Germano quodam contubernali ejus conſcripta, *printed at Leyden, with* Confutatio Fabulæ Burdonum.

(*d*) In the remark [*F*] of the article GIFANIUS.

(22) Scioppius, Commentar. in Priapeia, *Carm. xxv, pag.* 35, *Edit.* 1664, *in* 8*vo.*

(23) In the article MATMAN.

(24) Cornelius Denius Brugenſis, in Capellis, *pag. m.* 320, 321.

(25) *In the* Amphotides Scioppianæ, *which he publiſhed in* 1611. *I make uſe of that edition.*

(26) Cenſure de la Doctrine Curieuſe, *p.* 190.

(27) *He is the author of the* Cenſure de la Doctrine Curieuſe de Garaſſe.

(28) *See the* Amphotides, *p.* 40, *& ſeq.*

(29) Ibid. *pag.* 40, 41.

(30) Ibid. *pag.* 43, 44. See below remark [*Y*].

(31) Vita & Parentes Schoppii, *p.* 156.

(32) Ibid. *p.* 146.

(33) Inter Jeſuitas viros eruditos paucos, pauciſſimos bonos reperiri ait. *Ibid. pag.* 155.

the princes to extripate them by the moſt bloody means [*E*]. He was not contented to

ſuits according to the notions Giſanius had given him of them; but he denies that thoſe verſes had been made public (34). He alſo denies (35) what is charged upon him in the fragment of the letter, and only confeſſes that he does not approve the conduct of the Jeſuits in every thing, and cannot reſolve to court them (36), though he acknowledges that God is the author of their inſtitution, and that their ſociety is not only of great uſe to Chriſtianity, but alſo very neceſſary; ſo that he is ſure that if they carefully obſerve their ſtatutes, Hereſy will be quickly deſtroyed. *Tamen Societatis Jeſu inſtitutum ab ipſo deo auctore profectum, totique reipublicæ Chriſtianæ non modo ſummopere utile, ſed omnino etiam neceſſarium eſſe credit, cui ſi convenienter vivant, qui religioſo Sacramento ei ſe obſtrinxerunt, propediem fore confidit, ut ad tibicines mittatur, Hæreſique leſſus fiat, neque cuiquam ſine ſcelere aliter videri poſſe, perſuaſum habet* (37). In order to know whether he altered his opinion, we need only read theſe words of Father le Tellier (38). *He* (39) *muſt not pretend to have the honour of being the firſt who formed the deſign* of converting the Jeſuits. *The glory of it is due a long time ago to his worthy predeceſſor the famous Gaſpar Scioppius, who writ ſo much upon that matter, making it the ſubject of ſeveral libels. It is no wonder that thoſe, who have inherited his implacable hatred againſt the Jeſuits, ſhould be likewiſe acted by the odd and hypocritical zeal of that writer, the moſt furious and infamous calumniator that ever was, as every body confeſſes, and that they ſhould tread in his ſteps to this very day.* Mr Arnauld, at whom theſe words were levelled, anſwered many things: I ſhall tranſcribe ſome of them. ‘(40) Are you ſearchers of hearts boldly to decide, that it was *through an implacable hatred againſt the Jeſuits*, that Scioppius gave an ill character of your ſociety in ſeveral books, and that if he ſhews any zeal for the Church, it can only have been an *hypocritical zeal.* If this be allowed, what virtue may not be cried down by making it paſs for hypocriſy? . . . . . . (41) I am not concerned in the leaſt for Scioppius's good or bad reputation. But ſince thoſe, who abuſe him moſt, acknowledge that he was a man of great parts, and a very learned Critic and Humaniſt, he deſerves I ſhould ſay ſomething of him, and obſerve that whereas you do now furiouſly inveigh againſt him, you did formerly beſtow great encomiums upon him. Scioppius had three ſorts of enemies, who jointly cried him down as being too ſatirical and paſſionate. The firſt were the Proteſtants, whom he had forſaken to turn Catholic, and particularly Joſeph Scaliger, and his friends, who looked upon that pretended Prince of Verona as the hero of their ſect. They were particularly offended becauſe he had wounded their Scaliger in the moſt ſenſible part, by making his pretended deſcent from the Princes of Verona, paſs for an idle ſtory; and the moſt judicious perſons are now agreed that he was in the right. His ſecond enemies were the men of letters; he fell under their indignation by his too great fondneſs for the purity of the Latin tongue. Perhaps, no man ſince the age of Auguſtus knew better than he the niceties of that language. But he was ſo ſcrupulous that he could not endure any word ſhould be taken in a different ſenſe, from what it had at Rome in the beſt times, or that any other conſtruction ſhould be put upon it; hence it was that he found barbariſms and ſoleciſms in moſt authors of this time, who pretended to write good Latin. He would have been ſerviceable to the common-wealth of learning, had he been contented to obſerve thoſe faults in civil, gentle, and polite terms. But he did it in too harſh and ſhocking a manner, ſo far as to ſay that the taking of a certain word in a certain ſenſe deſerved *Naticidium* (42). This was, no doubt, very ſcandalous and pedantic; but it was no ſufficient reaſon to give him ſo many hard words, and to call him *the moſt cruel of all wild beaſts.* For thoſe, who took ſo much pride, as well as he, in ſpeaking good Latin, might have deſpiſed thoſe mean things, and profited by his reproofs. But it is well known that Philologers are a ſort of choleric people, that are very apt to fall into a paſſion for meer trifles; and that they are as much vexed at being reproached with a ſoleciſm, as if an honeſt man was accuſed of having betrayed his friend: and becauſe they know how to give hard words in a very fine ſtyle, they inſpire many people with their paſſions. This is the chief reaſon why Scioppius has been ſo much cried down. His too free and too vehement criticiſms, upon many authors that were the moſt eſteemed for their ſtyle, have ſtirred up againſt him almoſt the whole poſſe of the Latiniſts. You, Fathers, have been his third and laſt enemies. But I muſt obſerve, that whilſt he wrote only againſt the Proteſtants, the Scaligers, and the Philologers, you heaped praiſes upon him. Nay, you forgave him, though he blamed your method of teaching human learning; and you did not take it ill that he was praiſed and eſteemed by Popes, Kings, and Emperors. He publiſhed a ſmall piece in 1636, wherein, to vindicate himſelf againſt thoſe who reviled him, he mentions a brief of Urban VIII, to the moſt Chriſtian King, which is very much to his honour, and ſome other letters of the Emperor Ferdinand II, of his Catholic Majeſty Philip IV, of the Dukes of Florence and Mantua, and ſome very advantageous teſtimonies of Cardinal Bellarmin, and many other Jeſuits, who praiſe him for his wit, learning, eloquence, zeal, virtue, integrity, piety, religion, prudence, wiſdom, and great knowledge of the true ſenſe of the ſcripture; who profeſs to admire him as a man famous all over the world, and call him the king of learned men, *Perilluſtri viro Gaſpari Scioppio eruditorum Regi.* Do you think, Fathers, you can eaſily make the public believe that a man, whom you have ſo much commended for ſo long a time, is become all of a ſudden the moſt wicked man in the world; and that his zeal for the Church, which you highly extolled, is become *an odd hypocritical zeal*, becauſe he has declared in ſome of his books what he blamed in your conduct, as ſo many perſons eminent for their piety have done before and after him, ſuch as Arias Montanus, Lanuſa, Lewis Sotelo, Diego Collado, Dom John de Palafox, and many others? If he has been too ſharp, and too paſſionate, if he has mentioned ſome matters of fact too ſcandalous, I do not pretend to juſtify him in that reſpect. But unleſs you give ſeven or eight pregnant inſtances of his falſities, you muſt not expect to be believed, when you call him *the moſt furious calumniator that ever was.*’

Mr Baillet ſays, that Scioppius *appeared in print under many falſe names, that he might attack with more impunity not only ſeveral private perſons of great note, but chiefly the whole body of the Jeſuits, againſt whom he wrote above thirty treatiſes, the very titles whereof are enough to ſtrike us with horror.* He promiſes *to unmaſk him in his treatiſe of authors diſguiſed under the names of* Juniperus Anconitanus, Denius, A Fano Sancti Benedicti, Groſippus, Grubinius, Hay, Krigſoeder, Sotelo, Vargas, *and ſome others* (43). You will find in Placcius the titles of a prodigious number of books publiſhed or made ready for the preſs by Scioppius againſt the Jeſuits (44).

[*E*] *He ſollicited princes to extirpate the Proteſtants by the moſt bloody means.*] You need only read the book he publiſhed at Pavia in the year 1619, with this title, *Gaſp. Scioppii Conſiliarii Regii Claſſicum belli ſacri, ſive Heldus redivivus, hoc eſt ad Carolum V. imperatorem Auguſtum Suaſoria de Chriſtiani Cæſaris erga Principes Eccleſiæ rebelles officio, deque veris compeſcendorum Hæreticorum Eccleſiæque in pace collocandæ rationibus.* A Lutheran of Straſbourg (45) anſwered it, and his anſwer is worth the reading: it is intituled, *Tuba pacis occenta Scioppiano belli ſacri claſſico, Salpiſte Theodoſio Berenico, Norico, hiſtoriarum & patriæ ſtudioſo.* See alſo Juſtus Meyerus's (46) treatiſe, intituled, *Juris publici capitalis quæſtio, ſint ne Proteſtantes jure Cæſareo heretici & ultimo ſupplicio afficiendi, contra ſanguinarium Caſp. Scioppii Claſſicum.* You may ſee likewiſe the book intituled, *Cancellaria Hiſpanica*, wherein you will find ſome extracts of that book of Scioppius (47). Note, that he boaſts of having been the principal contriver of the Catholic League, which proved ſo prejudicial to the Proteſtants in Germany. Having publiſhed a liſt of his exploits, to let the public ſee in what manner he had improved the talents which God committed to him (48), he reckons in the ſeventh place, ‘Fœdus Catholicum in Germania, cujus primum auctorem &

actorem

(34) Oporinus Grubinius, Amphotides Scioppian. *pag.* 126.

(35) Ib. *p.* 129.

(36) Neque etiam ut multum Italis præſertim & Graëtienſibus Jeſuitis blandiatur animum inducere poteſt. *Ibid.*

(37) Ibid.

(38) Defenſe des nouveaux Chrétiens, *Part. i, ch. i, Art. i, pag. m.* 5.

(39) That is, the author of the *Morale Pratique.*

(40) Morale pratique, *Tom. iii, pag.* 124.

(41) Id. ibid. *pag.* 125.

(42) See the paſſage quoted below in the remark [*F*].

(43) Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Critiques Gramm. *num.* 535.

(44) Placcius, de Anonymis, *ch. ix, num.* 248, *p.* 67, 68.

(45) Matth. Bereggerus, *profeſſor of Hiſtory.*

(46) Profeſſor of the Civil-Law at Straſbourg.

(47) Adjecti ſunt ſub finem Flores Scioppiani ex Claſſico Belli ſacri.

(48) Talenta Chriſti Gaſpari Scioppiani ad negotiandum credita.

to vent his rage againſt Scaliger, Caſaubon (*e*), and du Pleſſis Mornai [*F*], &c: he attacked even the King of England, without any regard [*G*]; which was the reaſon why the Ambaſſador of that Prince, at the court of Spain, made uſe of violent means againſt ſuch an inſolent writer, who afterwards boaſted of the wounds [*H*] which it was thought he had received upon that occaſion. Going through Venice in the year 1607, he had a conference with Father Paul, and endeavoured by promiſes and threatnings to bring him over to the Pope's party. That, and perhaps other reaſons beſides, occaſioned his being impriſoned for ſome days. He was reproached with it, but the circumſtances of his impriſonment were not well repreſented [*I*]. One of the things which he moſt pretended to, was a fine Latin ſtyle. He found out Barbariſms in

‘ actorem fuiſſe Sciopppium, literis ipſius Cæſaris manu conſcriptis, & Trevirenſis Electoris teſtimonio doceri poteſt: ſicut etiam Comes Tillius in poculi aurati, quod ei donavit, inſcriptione, fœderis illius primum auctorem appellat: qui ſcyphus apud Benedictinos Weingartenſes etiamnum ſervatur (49). - - - *The Catholic league in Germany, of which Sciopppius was the principal author and manager, may be proved by a letter, written with the Emperor's own hand, and by the teſtimony of the Elector of Treves; as likewiſe Count Tilli in the inſcription of the gilded cup, which he gave him as a preſent, calls him the chief author of that league: which cup is ſtill preſerved in the convent of Benedictines at Weingart.*’

[*F*] *He vented his rage . . . . . againſt du Pleſſis Mornai.*] The fury with which he endeavours to turn him into ridicule (50) in his *Alexipharmacum Regium felli draconum & veneno aſpidum ſub Philippi Mornæi de Pleſſis nupera Papatus hiſtoria abdito oppoſitum, & Seren. D. Jacobo Magnæ Britanniæ Regi, ſtrenæ Januariæ loco muneri miſſum* (51), is ſo exceſſive, that I do not think any thing more ſevere can be written againſt an author. I could, ſays he (52), make a pretty large volume of the ſoleciſms, barbariſms, and other faults of elocution, which I have found in the *Myſtery of Iniquity* (53); but I will ſpare the Calviniſts the grief of ſeeing their Hector deſerving not only the ferula of Caſaubon, the Prince of Pedants, *Alpha Cathedrariorum*, but alſo the rod of the meaneſt ſchool-maſter, *quem quicunque virgator ubere virgidemia afficiat, & multiplicem jactura natis expiare culpam cogat.*

[*G*] *He attacked . . . . . the King of England, without any regard.*] See among other books his *Eccleſiaſticus auctoritati Sereniſſimi D. Jacobi Magnæ Britanniæ Regis oppoſitus*, printed in the year 1611, and his *Collyrium Regium Britanniæ Regi graviter ex oculis laboranti muneri miſſum*, printed the ſame year. But ſee particularly his *Corona Regia* (54); for I ſtill maintain that he is the author of that piece (55). Ferrarius, who praiſed him ſo much, reproaches him with, what he reckons a great fault, his having lampooned and criticized upon all ſorts of people, without even ſparing the ſupreme powers, and crowned heads. *Cum quæ de ejus ingenio, doctrina, immenſiſque in re literaria laboribus inficiari non poſſet, quæ eſſent totius Orbis teſtimonio comprobata, vertit accuſationem nimiamque ejus ingenii aſperitatem, judiciumque ſubauſterum, omnibuſque infeſtum arguebat. Nam ne ipſis quidem Regibus ſupremiſque poteſtatibus unquam peperciſſe, cum nimia, ac pænè Cynica detrahendi libidine omnes ordines non ſolum multo ſale defricaret, ſed in omnem verborum etiam prætextatorum amaritudinem effuſus, ipſa literarum capita viroſque ſuperum cultu reverendos totis voluminibus concideret, aſperiſque facetiis jocum ac ludibrium faceret* (56). He was ſo inſolent as to abuſe King Henry IV, in a moſt outrageous manner in his *Eccleſiaſticus*; which was the main reaſon why that book was burnt at Paris. See the Continuator of Thuanus's Hiſtory in the fifth book, pag. 314, under the year 1612.

[*H*] *He boaſted of the wounds.*] I have already quoted the book, wherein he gives an account how he had employed his talents: we find there, that the ſervants of the Engliſh ambaſſador ſet upon him at Madrid, in the year 1614, and that they cried out, thinking they had killed him, Well, well, we have at laſt made away with that great Papiſt. *Sicariorum undecim de familia Oratoris Anglici, qui cùm anno* 1614, *Madriti Sciopppium multis vulneribus, ut rebantur, confoſſum pro mortuo relinquerent, ita ſibi per vias rem præclarè geſtam gratulantes audiebantur:* Euge, jam tandem magnum illum Papiſtam jugulavimus. *Qua de re typis deſcripta extat Narratio, quæ* Legatus Latro *inſcribitur* (57). Mr Colomiés has publiſhed a letter, wherein Sciopppius declares that he has been perſecuted by the Proteſtants, and that they have ſhot at him, and given him ſeveral thruſts, ſo as to believe they had killed him; but that, though he had rendered himſelf odious to the Heretics, for having ſtoutly maintained the eccleſiaſtical authority of the Pope, he ſhould think himſelf to be a more pernicious Heretic than Luther and Calvin, if he ſhould write according to Baronius's principles, in favour of the pretended power of the Pope over the temporalities of kings. *Io per difender l' Apoſtolato del Papa ho ſcritto tanti libri, quante forſe niſſun altro, e fui perſeguitato da Proteſtanti, che mi tirarono delle archibugiate, e ſtoccate, & mi laſciarono per morto. Ma Dio mi guardi che non mi metta mai à dir una parola ſola in difeſa del Dominato, con che mi farei maggior heretico che Luthero e Calvino, ſi como piu volte con voſtra D. Reverendiſſima mi ſono dichiarato, e ſpero di morir buon Catolico Romano à diſpetto della Corte Romana e di tutti i ſuoi adulatori* (58). It appears from the laſt part of this paſſage, that Sciopppius was not well pleaſed with the court of Rome. He had been ſaying (59) that it is very proper Baronius ſhould be diſcredited, as an enemy to ſovereign princes, and to acknowledge that the annals of that cardinal contain many falſities, and that a Benedectine Monk had collected two thouſand of them (60). Sciopppius ſpoke otherwiſe, when he wrote, againſt King James, his *Eccleſiaſticus*, that was burnt at Paris. He glories in the diſgrace of his book, and ſays that his effigies was hanged in England, in a farce that was acted before the king. Nay, he ſays the Proteſtant league declared, that the public good required Sciopppius ſhould be put to death; which was the reaſon why the ambaſſador of his Catholic Majeſty ſent him to Milan. Here follows the ſixth article of the account which he gives of his adminiſtration. (61) *Contemptus mortis: cujus ſpecimen eſt Eccleſiæ & Sedis Apoſtolicæ defenſio.* 1. *Contra Gallos à quibus Eccleſiaſticus ejus publice crematus fuit, quem tamen librum Cardinalis Bellarminus, aliique magni Theologi ſummis tulerunt laudibus.* 2. *Contra Regem Angliæ, cujus librum quatuor diverſis libris editis profligavit: qui propterea ſcripto publico remedium ei violentum fuit comminatus, ejuſque libros in foro exurendos curavit. In Mimo tandem, ſeu Comœdiæ ludicro coram ſe acto perſonam ejus induci fecit, hancque in ipſum pœnam ſtatui, ut faucibus fune eliſis animam per inferiorem gutturem exploderet* (62)*: velut in* Hæretici Elenchomeni *præfatione videre eſt.* 3. *Contra Principes Proteſtantes fœderis Hallenſis ſocios, qui Rotemburgi in concilio decreverunt, ipſis Sciopppio ſublato omnino opus eſſe: quæ oratori Hiſpanico D. Baltaſari Zunicæ cauſa fuit, ut eum Germania relictâ Mediolanum concedere juberet, Inſubriæque Præſidi ſalutem ejus literis accuratiſſimè commendaret.*

[*I*] *He was reproached with it, but the circumſtances of his impriſonment were not well repreſented.*] We muſt keep to Brother Fulgentius's narrative. Which is as follows (63): ‘ At the time that thoſe diſputes were adjuſted at Venice, Gaſpar Sciopppius arrived there, a man well known in the world by the many books which he has publiſhed. He came from Rome in his way to Germany, as he ſaid, whither he was going, as it was diſcovered, to carry a book injurious to the Republic, in order to get it printed there, with ſome other pieces full of impious things, as that of a certain Dominican Monk, called Thomas Campanella. . . . . . (64) Whether it was upon that account, or for ſome other unknown reaſon, it is certain, that he fell into diſgrace, and was arreſted by a public order, and detained three or four days, after which they commanded him to depart inſtantly. Before this misfortune happened to him, he had a conference with the Father, in which they diſ-

(*e*) See the remark [*S*].

(49) *See the book intituled*, Gaſp. Sciopppius de pædia humanarum ac divinarum literarum, *p.* 25.

(50) Among other things for exhorting King James to make war againſt the Pope.

(51) It is a book in 4to of 79 pages, printed at Mentz in 1612.

(52) Pag. 32.

(53) That is, in the Latin edition.

(54) See the article PUTEANUS, remark [*F*].

(55) *See* Forerus in Mantiſſa Ant-Anatomiæ Jeſuiticæ, *pag.* 63.

(56) Octavius Ferrarius, in Literatorum funere.

(57) Gaſp. Sciopppius, Pædia humanarum ac divinarum Literarum, *pag.* 26.

(58) A letter of Sciopppius to Father Fulgentius, Theologer of the Republic of Venice. It is dated from Padua the ninth of June 1636. Mr Colomiés has inſerted it in his *Obſervationes ſacræ, pag.* 6, *& ſeq.*

(59) So bene che egli per ignoranza ed inadvertenza ſcriſſe molte coſe falſiſſime; di tal maniera che un Padre di San Benedetto, mio allievo, dice di haver raccolto due mila errori di ſuoi Annali, ed jo giudico che importi non poco, che queſt' huomo ſia diſcreditato, come nemico della giuridittione di tutti i Sovrani Principi, li quali volſe ancora *in temporalibus* ſoggettare al Papa, *Ibid. pag.* 8.

(60) *See what Patin ſays in the* Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres. *April* 1684, *pag.* 117.

(61) Sciopppius, Pædia, *p.* 25.

(62) *See* Merici Caſauboni Pietas, *pag.* 23.

(63) Vie du Pere Paul, *pag.* 191, *Leyden* 1661.

(64) Ibid. *pag.* 192.

in the writings of the modern authors, that were the moſt eſteemed for their eloquence, and did not even ſpare the moſt eloquent writers of antient Rome [*K*]. He deſerved as a Grammarian the odious title that was given to Diogenes as a Philoſopher (*f*). This is ſaying all. He had got himſelf ſo many enemies, that at laſt he was afraid he ſhould not find a place of ſafety to retire into. It was to no purpoſe that he kept himſelf quiet at Padua, and was taken up with apocalyptical chimeras, wherewith he troubled Cardinal Mazarin [*L*], he did not for that ceaſe to be in fear of ſome attempt upon his life. This inclines one to believe that there did not want a foundation for ſaying that he turned

coursed a long time about learning, and particularly about the doctrine of the Stoics, which he profeſſed that he would retrieve from obſcurity, and ſet it in the faireſt and moſt advantageous light imaginable, as well as many other of his learned reflexions, intermixing therewith a great deal of ſtate-affairs, and particularly ſuch as concerned the Proteſtants of Germany. And then taking the Father aſide, he repreſented to him, that the Pope, as being a great prince, had very long hands, and that therefore ſome misfortune would certainly happen to him, ſince the Pope thought he had been very much offended by him; and that he would have cauſed him to be killed, had he been willing to revenge himſelf in that manner. But that the Pope had no other deſign but to take him alive, cauſing him to be fetched away from Venice itſelf, in order that he might be conducted to Rome. Neverthelefs Sciopppius offered, if he would give him leave, to negotiate his reconciliation, with as much honour and advantage as he could deſire; adding, that he was impowered to treat with the Princes of Germany, even about their converſion. The Father anſwered that he knew nothing he had done at which his Holineſs had reaſon to be offended (65)...... (66) That, as for the reſt, he thanked him for his good affection, but gave himſelf no manner of trouble about his advices, and was reſolved not in the leaſt to depart from the intereſt of the public, ſince he had not undertaken the defence of it till he was fully aſſured of the juſtice of his cauſe. His two propoſitions, of cauſing the Father to be killed, or of carrying him away alive, ſeemed very ſtrange, and almoſt incredible; but by what happened ſoon after, one may eaſily judge that Scioppius knew what he ſaid, and that ſuch deſigns had been formed againſt the Father long before. After he was gone from Venice, he wrote a ſatirical diſcourſe, wherein mentioning his conference with the Father, he declared that he had found him to be a man neither unlearned nor timorous (67).’

It appears from this account, that the friends of Scaliger were groſly miſtaken, when they publiſhed that Scioppius went to Venice ſoon after the ſenate's proclamation againſt thoſe who had endeavoured to aſſaſſinate Father Paul; and that Scioppius was arreſted upon a ſuſpicion that he had a hand in the aſſaſſination. *Venetiam profectus eſt. Promulgata erat paulo ante capitalis ſententia in ſicarios aliquos (aſſaſſinos vocant) qui Paulum illum Servitam, cujus ſcriptum pro aſſertione juris Venetæ Reip. in manibus omnium verſatur, aggreſſi fuerant, & vulnera aliquot, quæ tamen lethalia præter mentem eorum non eſſent, inflixerant. Eo ergo in tempore in urbem cum veniret, juſſu magiſtratus in carcerem deductus eſt, quaſi rei hujus conſcius, aut qui alterius eo explorator veniſſet* (68). Such a falſity muſt needs have been prejudicial to Scaliger's cauſe; and the more, becauſe he and his friends made it appear upon other heads, that they received bad memoirs concerning Scioppius. Had they conſulted Lingelſheim, they might have known that Scioppius was not arreſted on account of Fra-Paolo's aſſaſſination; but becauſe he had made himſelf ſuſpected, by reaſon of the haughty and threatning words which he made uſe of in a converſation with that Servite (69). Scioppius ſays he was arreſted, upon information that he was the author of a book injurious to the Republic of Venice; and that he was going to negotiate againſt it in the Pope's name, with ſome princes of Germany. *Fidem habuerunt Julio Adolpho Weiteriſhemio, homini Saxoni, qui . . . clam ad eos detulit Scioppium auctorem eſſe libri cujuſdam pro Pontifice adverſos ipſos ſcripti & Monachii typis impreſſi, hoc titulo, Nicodemi Macri Romani cum Nicolao Craſſo Veneto diſceptatio, &c. (quod quidem opus perpetuo ſale ut facetia diffluens, & eruditionis varietate admirabile, præ quo Ivo tuus Villiomarus nec hiſcere auderet, multi docti viri non niſi à Scioppio proficiſci potuiſſe perſuaſum habebant) & tunc quoque Pontificis miſſu ad Principes quoſdam in rempublicam ipſorum inflammandos in Germaniam proficiſci* (70). It is certain, that Scioppius writ that book: Rhodius and Placcius are miſtaken in aſcribing it to a profeſſor of Bologna called Aſcanius Perſius (71). See the Viſiera Alzata (72) of Peter James Villani of the Academy of the *Humoriſti, Geniali, & Infecundi.*

[*K*] *He did not even ſpare the moſt eloquent author of antient Rome.*] Read theſe words of Balzac ‘The accuſer of Cicero, about whom you deſire to be informed, is the dreadful Scioppius. He has publiſhed a book at Milan, in which he accuſed Cicero of improprieties and barbariſms. There is but one copy of it in France, and Meſſieurs Du Puy lent it me when I was at Paris. This injuſtice done to Cicero would prove a conſolation to Scaliger, if he was to return again into the world. But I expect that the ſame Scioppius will ſhortly put out another book, wherein he will undertake to prove that Cato was a wicked man, and Julius Cæſar a bad ſoldier (73).’ When he was but twenty years of age, he found out that Phædrus ſavoured ſometimes of the barbarouſneſs of Thrace his native country (74). It is therefore no wonder, that he ſhould accuſe (75) Scaliger, Lipſius, Caſaubon, Thuanus, Poſſevin (76), Voſſius, Strada, &c. of incongruity of ſpeech. His criticiſms are ſometimes well-grounded, but not always. See what the learned Borrichius wrote againſt him, in defence of Voſcius and Father Strada (77). A Jeſuit (78) of the college of Rome made an apology for the latter, but I do not know whether it has been printed. Thoſe who affirm magiſterially, that certain phraſes are meer barbariſms and ſoleciſms, venture very much; for how often have the words and expreſſions, which they condemned, been ſhewed to them in claſſical authors? The difficulty that is to be found in ſuch kind of diſputes (79), will plainly appear to thoſe, who will be at the pains to examine the books of John Vorſtius, *De Latinitate merito aut falſo ſuſpecta*; thoſe of Chriſtopher Cellarius, *De Latinitate mediæ & infimæ ætatis*, and *De barbariſmis & idiotiſmis ſermonis Latini*; and thoſe which Voſſius, Borrichius, &c. have publiſhed upon that ſubject. But to return to Scioppius, I muſt obſerve that he promiſed a book, intituled *Hercules Coprophorus*, wherein he had collected a vaſt number of barbariſms and ſoleciſms: It was there that he was to ſhew (80) the faults of Julius Cæſar Scaliger's ſtile. Obſerve well theſe words of Lambecius; they fully repreſent the cavilling and troubleſome humour of that critic. ‘Homo, ut notiſſimum eſt, ingenii maligni, & oris maledicentiſſimi, qui propter præſtantiſſimorum & de re literaria optime meritorum virorum invidas ac injurioſas calumniationes, merito *Canis* Grammaticus appellatur (81). - - - *A man, as is very well known, of a malignant genius, and of a moſt ſlanderous tongue, who on account of his ſpiteful and injurious way of calumniating men, that are truly excellent and famous for their learning, is juſtly called the grammatical* Cur. See the margin (82).

His boldneſs in criticiſing upon the ſtile or the expreſſions of Cicero, will be leſs ſurpriſing, if it be conſidered, that this father of eloquence has been cenſured by ſuch men at all times. Their number is incredible. See the preface to the book intituled, *Cicero à calumniis vindicatus*, written by Andreas Schottus: It is a very curious piece; the eighth chapter is an anſwer to thoſe who pretend that Cicero is guilty of ſoleciſms.

[*L*] *Apocalyptical chimeras, wherewith he troubled Cardinal Mazarin.*] This is a particular not very well known. Naudé, in order to refute thoſe who complained that the cardinal did not anſwer all the letters that

---

(*f*) See the paſſage of Lambecius in the remark [*K*].

(65) The words which I leave out contain the paſſage concerning ſelf-murder, which I have ſet down in the article SAINT-CYRAN, citat. (6).

(66) Vie du Pere Paul, *p.* 195.

(67) *See* Vita & Parentes Gaſpar. Schoppii, *pag.* 156.

(68) Ibid. *p.* 150, 151.

(69) Sciopppium Monaci jam eſſe & in tranſitu jus civitatis Venetæ adeptum biduana carceratione, cum Paulum Servitam inſolentius ac minaciter allocutus ſuſpectum ſe feciſſet. *Lingelſheim, Epiſtola lxxx ad Bongarſium*: It is dated the ſeventh of November 1607.

(70) Oporinus Grubinius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 162, 163.

(71) *See* Placcius, de Anonymis & Pſeudonymis, in Appendice, *pag.* 33.

(72) The Journal of Leipſic, for the month of June 1690, *pag.* 363, mentions it.

(73) Balzac, Letter xii, to Chapelain, *bock ii*, dated the 22d of April 1637.

(74) See Scheſſerus in the Life of Phædrus. That author is miſtaken in the preface, wherein he calls Scioppius Conrad, inſtead of Gaſpar.

(75) *See his* Scaliger hypobolimæus, *and the Tract* de Stilo Hiſtorico.

(76) The Phyſician who wrote a Hiſtory of the houſe of Gonzaga, *&c.*

(77) *It is the Appendix of the book intituled*, Olai Borrichii Cogitationes de variis Latinæ Linguæ ætatibus & ſcripto . . . Voſſii de Vitiis Sermonis, *printed at Copenhagen* 1675, *in* 4*to*.

(78) *Called* Pierucci. *See* Borrichius, *ibid. p.* 268.

(79) *See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, *for May* 1701, *pag.* 517.

(80) *See his* Alexipharmacum Regium.

(81) Lambecius, apud Magirum, Eponymolog. Critico, *pag. m.* 740.

(82) Mr Grævius has very well deſcribed the ſatirical humour of Scioppius in his preface to the works of Daniel Eremita, printed at Utrecht in 1701.

turned his eyes toward Holland, and expreſſed ſome deſire of going back to the communion of the Proteſtants [*M*]. Authors do not agree about the year wherein he died ;

that were written to him, ſays (83), ‘That the office of firſt miniſter in France . . . is like a net, in which all mad, melancholy, hypochondriac, and extravagant men are catched ; like a rock, on which the ſhip of fools *(navis illa narragonia ſive Stultifera Brentii)* ſplits ; and like a load-ſtone, which attracts all the viſionaries that are in the kingdom. So that if the firſt miniſter was obliged to read all the chimerical deſigns, all the extravagant propoſals, and all the ridiculous and impertinent advices of thoſe men, he would not have time enough to read and examine them, though he ſhould lay aſide his moſt ſerious affairs, to mind none but thoſe. . . . (84) I have known within theſe five years (85), three men of great virtue, and extraordinary learning, of whom the firſt, who is Cattius, a canon of the city of Arras, maintains, that there is a mountain of gold in Paleſtine, which the holy ſcripture promiſes to Chriſtians, when they ſhall have conquered the Turks ; and that GOD will have a new temple built for him in the middle of Jeruſalem : He has got the plan of that temple engraved, with all the proofs and explications of his opinion, taken from holy writ. The ſecond, who is Scioppius, a perſon ſufficiently known all over Europe, pretends that no father or doctor of the church did ever underſtand the holy ſcripture better, or by means thereof more certainly know the end of the world, and the myſteries of St John's Revelation than he : and the third, called Dr Colombi, is now buſy to get a general council aſſembled, wherein the pretenſions of the king of France to Navarre and Franche Comté, may be decided in his favour, and has even drawn up all the decrees and canons, which it will be requiſite to make for that purpoſe. As I have ſeen part of the writings which thoſe three men have ſent to the cardinal, with a view to ſupport their chimerical deſigns by his authority ; I am perfectly well aſſured, that if the cardinal had been ſo injudicious as to mind them, they would have cut out more work for him than his beſt ſecretary could have diſpatched. And becauſe every body pretends to be a politician, fooliſh and extravagant men muſt needs be more numerous among thoſe of that profeſſion, than among others : Which does likewiſe multiply the number of advices, counſels, deſigns, memoirs, and ſuch like pieces, which are all equally impertinent, and alike proper to make the miniſters to whom they are addreſſed loſe their time, if they ſhould be ſimple enough to mind them. And yet becauſe they are not ſo, and becauſe their experience and knowledge of affairs enable them to know immediately, *quid ſolidam crepet*, - - - *what things have a ſolid appearance* ; thoſe hypochondriac and melancholy gentlemen, thinking themſelves repulſed, take from thence occaſion to blame them, and to ſay, that they do not anſwer letters of conſequence, for they look upon their follies as things of great moment, *juxta illud*, - - - - *according to the ſaying*,

Quiſquis amat ranam, ranam putat eſſe Dianam.

A frog to him who ſuch a thing eſteems,
No more a frog, but fair Diana ſeems.

That they neglect great affairs, and the certain means of getting money, of making peace, and of ſaving the kingdom, to mind trifling things, and to play with monkeys. And it happens, by reaſon of their many complaints and clamours, that a poor miniſter, whoſe buſineſs ſometimes gives him no breathing time, is accuſed of not diſcharging the duties of his office, of too much indulging his pleaſures, of neglecting the letters and advices he receives, and of being unworthy of ſuch a poſt : In ſhort, if they were to be credited,

Collige ſarcinulas dicet libertus & exi,
Jam graves es nobis.

Pack up your baggage, ſhall the ſteward ſay,
And go, for you are burthenſome, away.’

Several people will doubtleſs blame me for not leaving out what does not belong to Scioppius in this long paſſage ; but I refer them to many other readers, who will be very well pleaſed with the reflexions of Gabriel Naudé which I have quoted.

Such was the fate of Scioppius : After he had ſpent many years in cenſuring, biting, and defaming every body, he applied himſelf to the prophecies of the holy ſcripture ; he looked for the key of them, and flattered himſelf that he found out the key which St Peter left, which no body had diſcovered till then (86). Weary of ſo many engagements, and of the many blows he had given and received, he ſhut himſelf up in that tower, he fixed upon that work and impoſed this upon himſelf for the taſk of his old age. A happy man, if he wholly left off his ſatirical humour, and had no deſire of exciting people to great revolutions, by telling them that the promiſes contained in the Apocalypſe would be ſhortly fulfilled. All thoſe who have concerned themſelves in ſuch an undertaking, did not ſtay, as he did, till they were weary of their ſlanders : On the contrary, ſome made their weapons ſharper by it, and grew more ſatirical ; others deſigned only to excite the paſſions, and to ſtir up the people. You will find the plan of Scioppius's book, in a letter written by him from Padua, the twentieth of February 1642. It appears from it, that great things were to happen in a ſhort time, and that he brought the art of propheſying into a ſyſtem. *Quatuor libellos*, ſaid he (87), *iſtis indicibus ſeu titulis jam confectos habeo.* 1. *Fons ſapientiæ intento digito monſtratus, hoc eſt, Eclogæ ex Sacra Scriptura & ſanctis Patribus de Sacræ Scripturæ ſtudio, ejuſque ſtudii neceſſitate, utilitate, adjumentis & temporibus.* 2. *Clavis ſcientiæ ad aperienda regni cœlorum myſteria propediem conſummanda, hoc eſt ; ſpecimen Exegeſeos Propheticæ in Pſal.* xlv. 3. *Annunciatio regni Chriſti ac populi Chriſtiani in orbem terræ futurum uſque ad noviſſimum annorum & expeditionem Gog & internecionem ejus.* 4. *Syſtema artis prophetandi, continens ejus artis finem, officia, materiam ſubjectam & inſtrumenta, exemplo Galeni in ſyſtemate artis medicæ.*

[*M*] *That he expreſſed ſome deſire of going back to the communion of the Proteſtants.*] Mr Arnauld could not believe it. ‘There is one thing that would give a very ill opinion of Scioppius, if it were true : *viz.* That he had a mind, in his old days, to enter into articles with the Dutch, about his religion, and that accordingly he writ to Leyden, that he would turn Proteſtant if they were willing to receive him. But this is ſo unlikely, that the bare authority of Hornius is not ſufficient to make us believe it. He expreſſes in all his books ſo much zeal for the Catholic religion, and ſo great an averſion for heretics, that it is highly improbable he intended to return to his firſt religion. Beſides, he was a man of ſo great parts, not to mention his noble birth, that if he had been mean enough to entertain ſuch a thought, he would have found but too many Proteſtant princes ready to receive him with open arms, without being obliged to aſk a livelihood of the profeſſors of Leyden, whom he had cruelly offended by his uſage of Joſeph Scaliger, their hero and their idol. This is all that I could ſay, not having Hornius's book by me. But I have juſt now received the whole paſſage of that author, which I have inſerted at the bottom of the page, becauſe the bare reading of it is ſufficient to hinder us from giving any credit to it ; it is ſo full of paſſion and fury againſt the Catholics in general, and Scioppius in particular, accuſing the former of a barbarous deſign of murdering all the Proteſtants, and the latter, of being the promoter of that cruel reſolution (88).’ Here follows the paſſage that was ſent to Mr Arnauld : I take it from the 386th page of George Hornius's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (89), continued and commented upon by Mr Leydecker. ‘Nunquam res *Evangelicorum* in majori poſitæ erant diſcrimine, quam poſt illam Bohemiorum calamitatem. *Jeſuitæ* enim jam quaſi *parta* de *Univerſa Germania*, imo omnibus *Evangelicis*, victoriâ, inſolenter triumphabant, ac nil niſi cædem Proteſtantium ſpirabant, quodam flagitioſiſſimo *Grammatico*, & ob ſcelera *Altorfi* Noricorum commiſſa infami, *Gaſpare* Schoppio,

(83) Naudé Dialogue de Maſcurat, *pag.* 454.

(84) Ib. *p.* 455.

(85) That book of Naudé was written in 1649.

(86) Me jam exegeſi ſeu prophetia ſcripturæ (quam S. Petrus vocat) plus quingenta folia expleviſſe, ea ipſa clave ad aperienda ejus myſteria uſum quam idem Apoſtolus nobis reliquit vix tamen à quoquam adhuc intellectum. *Scioppius, Epiſt. ad Voſſium.* It is the 334th among the letters written to Voſſius, *pag. m.* 225.

(87) Sciopp. Ep. ad Voſſium, *pag.* 225.

(88) Morale pratique, *Tom. iii, ch. vi, pag.* 129, 130.

(89) *Edit. Lugd. Bat.* 1687. I ſhall obſerve for the benefit of thoſe who have another edition, that this paſſage is to be found *numero* 6, of the third article of the third period.

died; but I think his death ought to be placed in the year 1649 [*N*]. It cannot be denied that he was a very learned man; and had he had as much moderation and probity as he had learning and wit, he would be juſtly reckoned one of the heroes of the common-wealth of learning. His application to ſtudy, his memory, the multitude of his books, the quickneſs of his parts, his eloquence, and his aſcendant over his enemies [*O*], are ſurpriſing things: but his victories coſt him dear, for he was

‘ Schoppio, ex Palatinatu ſuperiore Neagora oriundo, ‘ ſed indigno, qui tam præſtanti nationi apud poſteros accenſeatur, (ſive, ut ſe appellari Italice malebat ‘ *Scioppio*) homine in apoſtaſiam prolapſo, claſſicum canente & *totale excidium* Proteſtantium promittente, ‘ ac ſuadente: qui tamen nihil niſi *miſerabilis* literator ‘ fuit, ut opera ejus *inepta* & *maligna* oſtendunt, ac ‘ extrema ſenecta, ſcriptis Patavio, ubi præ *Jeſuitarum*, vitæ ejus inſidiantium, metu deliteſcebat, *Leidam literis*, tranſitionem iterum ad evangelicos offerebat, ſi in gratiam reciperetur, ſed rejectus *Apoſtata* ‘ contemtuſque ob *vanitatem fuit.* - - - - *The affairs of the Evangelics were never in a more dangerous ſituation, than they were after that calamity of the Bohemians. For the* Jeſuits, *as if they had* obtained *a compleat victory over all* Germany, *nay over the whole body of the* Evangelics, *triumphed inſolently, and meditated nothing leſs than a maſſacre of the Proteſtants; a certain* Grammarian *of a moſt wicked life, and infamous on account of the crimes which he had committed at* Altdorf, *I mean* Gaſpar *Schoppius, born at Neagora in the Upper Palatinate, though unworthy that poſterity ſhould reckon him to be of that noble nation, (or as he rather choſe to be called after the Italian manner* Scioppius*) a man that had apoſtatized, ſounding the charge, and promiſing and adviſing the* ‘ total deſtruction *of the Proteſtants: who nevertheleſs was no more than a* miſerable *ſmatterer in learning, as it evidently appears from his* fooliſh and ſpiteful ‘ *productions; when he was extremely old, he wrote letters to* Leyden *from Padua, (where he was lurking for fear of the* Jeſuits, *who had deſigns againſt his life) in which letters he offered to return to the Proteſtants, if he could be received into favour, but the* ‘ Apoſtate *was rejected and deſpiſed on account of his* ‘ vanity.’ I have hardly read any author, who mentions this deſign of Scioppius, without quoting Hornius for it. Which makes me apt to think, that no other authority can be alledged; and I doubt one voucher is not ſufficient in a fact of ſuch a nature. I have heard a learned Lutheran ſay, that Scioppius’s letters, upon that ſubject have been in Boëclerus’s hands. But why then where they not publiſhed; for it is well known, that many people look upon Hornius’s narrative as a meer fable? It is at leaſt an indiſcretion, which deſerved to be cenſured by the academical ſenate. One cannot ſay, that the moſt illuſtrious univerſity of Leyden rejected Scioppius’s offers, without doing them wrong. Such a conduct would have been neither conſiſtent with human prudence nor Chriſtian charity. It would have been a glorious thing for the Proteſtants to regain ſuch a man; beſides, ought not the Church to open her arms at all times to her revolted children? Muſt ſhe not, like the good ſhepherd, go in ſearch of all the ſheep that are gone aſtray? Much more would ſhe be guilty, if ſhe ſhut the door againſt the ſheep, that are willing to return into the ſheepfold. Was it an impoſſible thing for Scioppius to repent? Could it be certainly detemined that his requeſt was a trick? But, however that was, might they not have taken care to prevent his doing any miſchief. Take notice, that he obſerves in his letters to Voſſius, that the prophetical books which he deſired to publiſh, contained nothing contrary to the Church of Rome. He gives plainly to underſtand, that he acknowledges the injuſtice and uſurpation of the court of Rome, but he ſays nothing whereby it appears that he intended to retire among the Proteſtants. ‘ Vix autem ſperare audeo, fore ut quicquam iſtorum in Italia edendi venia mihi detur, non ‘ quod quicquam in eis vel decretis Romanæ Eccleſiæ ‘ de fide, vel bonis moribus adverſetur, ſed quod mores ‘ Curiæ Romanæ omnes Eccleſiæ leges jam olim in ‘ poteſtatem ſuam perduxerint, nec jam cuiquam fas ‘ ſit quicquam tale dicere aut ſcribere, quale ipſi Pontifices in D. Bernardo, Brigitta & Catherina Senenſi ‘ non modo verè recteque dictum faſſi ſunt, ſed etiam ‘ pro ſaluberrimo fidelium dogmate religioſè obſervari ‘ voluerunt (90).’ Obſerve alſo, that this letter contains all ſorts of civilities, and ſeveral marks of confidence with reſpect to Voſſius.

[*N*] *His death ought to be placed in the year* 1649 (91).] It will appear from the following words of Mr Baillet, that few people know when Scioppius departed this life. This uncertainty would have vexed him, had he foreſeen it, when he made ſo great a noiſe all over Europe. ‘ (92) I have not been able ‘ hitherto to know preciſely in what year he died. Mr * ‘ Patin, the father, ſays it was in 1649. Mr † Lambecius ‘ tells us he was writing books ſtill in 1652. Others ‘ ſeem to ſay that he lived beyond the year 1660. ‘ Mr ⸸ Galois, ſpeaking of him in 1665, ſays he had ‘ been lately dead. Mr ‡ Conigius writing in 1678, ‘ has theſe words, *Paucis ab hinc annis vivere deſiit*, - - ‘ *he ceaſed to live a few years ago.*’ To which I add, that others place his death in the year 1663 (93). Of all thoſe writers, Mr Patin is he who comes neareſt to the truth; for it is certain Scioppius died in the year 1649. Ferrarius ſpeaks of him, as of a man who was no longer alive, in a ſpeech (94) which he delivered in the ſixteenth year of his profeſſorſhip at Padua (95). But he began to be a profeſſor in that univerſity in the year 1634 (96), and therefore he ſaid ſo in 1650. From whence it ought to be concluded that Patin had not been ill informed about the year in which Scioppius died, when he wrote the following paſſage, on the thirteenth of July, 1649. ‘ (97) This ‘ year proves very fatal to men of letters: ſince ‘ Mr Hofman’s and Mr Pietre’s deceaſe, we have alſo ‘ loſt Mr des Yveteaux, who had been the late king’s ‘ preceptor; Mr Juſtel, ſecretary to the king, a learned man, who did formerly belong to the Marſhal ‘ de Bouillon. Beſides, Voſſius and Spanheim are ‘ dead in Holland; Paganinus Gaudentius in Italy, ‘ and likewiſe Gaſpar Scioppius, who wrote about ‘ forty-three years ago a very infamous book againſt ‘ the incomparable Joſeph Scaliger. This Scioppius ‘ was a Lutheran in his youth; he turned Roman ‘ Catholic by reading Baronius’s Annals, as he ſaid. ‘ Afterwards he went to Rome; where he was a domeſtic of Cardinal Madrucio’s. He had a mind ‘ then to turn Jeſuit (98); but the ſociety were of ‘ opinion that it was better for him to remain a layman, and that he could do them greater ſervices, ‘ which he actually did by writing againſt Scaliger. ‘ He made ſome journies for them to Germany and ‘ Venice in diſguiſe (99). Afterwards he had a penſion from the emperor: but at laſt he declared ‘ himſelf an enemy to the emperor and the Jeſuits, ‘ and went to Padua for the ſafety of his perſon, ‘ where he lived ſecure from all his enemies, having ‘ obtained a pardon for his paſt life from the Republic of Venice. He is ſuſpected to be the moſt conſiderable author of many ſmall pieces publiſhed ‘ againſt the Jeſuits within theſe fifteen years, and, ‘ among others, of the *Anatomia Societatis*, *& de Strategematis Jeſuitarum*. He formerly told one of his ‘ friends, who is alſo very much mine, that Cardinal ‘ Baronius had ſollicited him by letters, when he was ‘ in Germany, to turn Catholic, and promiſed, in ‘ that caſe, to procure him a Cardinal’s hat (100); ‘ and that Baronius himſelf hoped to be made Pope ‘ after Paul V.’

[*O*] *His application to ſtudy, his memory, the multitude of his books . . . . . his aſcendant over his enemies.*] Ferrarius tells us, in the paſſage which I am going to cite, that he ſtudied night and day; that during the fourteen laſt years of his life he kept himſelf ſhut up in a little room, and that his converſation with thoſe that went to viſit him, run only upon learning; that, like another Ezra, he might have reſtored the holy Scripture, if it had been loſt; and that he repeated paſſages of it at a breath for ſeveral hours together with ſuch a memory, that thoſe who heard him was ſtrangely abuſed ; nay, he miſtruſted ſometimes his dreadful pen [*P*]. He had the whole Bible at his fingers end (*g*). It is not ture that he would not ſuffer his picture to be drawn [*Q*]. He left behind him ſeveral manuſcripts which are very

---

(90) Scioppius, Epiſt. ad Voſſium, *p.* 225, 226: *It is dated the 20th of February* 1642.

(91) *As Mr Witte does*, in Diario Biographico.

(92) Baillet, Enfans celebres, *Art.* 69.

* In his Letters.

† Tom. i, Bibl. Vind. Ceſ. cap. l. lib. i.

⸸ Journal des Sçavans.

‡ Bibl. vet. & nov.

(93) Obiit anno 1663 octogenario major. *Pope Blount*, *Cenſura Auctorum*, pag. 692. He would have lived eighty ſeven years if he had lived till 1663.

(94) *That which is intituled* Funus Literatorum.

(95) Per ſexdecim annos in Patavino Gymnaſio . . . . Rhetoris partes implet. *Ibid.* circa fin.

(96) Carolus Patinus in Lyceo Patavino, *p.* 15.

(97) *Guy Patin*, Letter xv, of the 1ſt edition, and xxii of the 2d, page 96, of the firſt volume, Edit. of Geneva 1691.

(98) Others ſay he was a Jeſuit, and that he left that order. See Mr Baillet, *Jugem.* on the *Critic-Grammarians*, num. 535. It is a miſtake. See *Ampbot. Sciopp.* p. 169.

(99) This ſeems to be falſe: The firſt journey he made into Germany after his turning Roman Catholic, was in the year 1607, when he was arreſted at Venice for ſome days. He appeared in Germany with pomp, and as being in the ſervice of the Archduke Ferdinand. (See *Vita & Parentes Gaſparis*, *Schoppii*, p. 155, 156.) Nay he dined at Amberg with the Prince of Anhault, governor of the Palatinate, and was kindly uſed by him. See *Ampbot. Sciopp.* pag. 129, 130.

(100) *See* Amphotides Scioppianæ, *pag.* 169.

him could not ſufficiently admire him, eſpecially conſidering that he drew from them very ſingular doctrines, and ſuch as were unknown to the moſt learned. The number of his books exceeded the number of his years. Ferrarius having mentioned the intereſt he had with the Popes and ſeveral princes, and the public employments beſtowed upon him, goes on thus (101) : *Donec inanium pertæſus in ſe ipſum recederet, & partim Mediolani, partim in hac Urbe* (102) *victuris, æternum libris bona fide poſteritatis negotium tranſigeret. Eos libros in ore famæ in commendatione omnium verſari. Quumque per omnes fere diſciplinas capax ingenium circumtulerit, duo tamen in ipſo ſine exemplo ſatis exprimi, nedum laudari poſſe, judicii vim in aliorum ſcriptis æſtimandis, & ad latinæ orationis cenſuram exigendis miram, atque exactam, tantam vero ſacrarum literarum peritiam, quantam fortaſſe nullus ad hanc diem, quantamque nemo credat, qui illam auribus non uſurparit. Ut, quod olim de Eſdra dictum eſt, deperditos linguæ ſanctæ Codices ſolus reparare potuerit. Scilicet uſque ad extremam ſenectam, nuntio rebus humanis remiſſo, noctu dieque in ſacrarum literarum commentatione incredibili labore verſatum ut ipſum adeuntibus per plures horas uno veluti ſpiritu infinita ſacræ paginæ loca inuſitata memoriæ felicitate ſtupentibus, atque attonitis repræſentaret, atque ex ipſis divinæ ſapientiæ penetralibus arcana etiam doctiſſimis ignorata exprimeret. Nimirum cum rarò alias prodire in publicum ſoleret, extremis temporibus quatuordecim annos domo, ac ferme anguſto cubiculo clauſum diebus noctibus jungentem lucubrare perpetuo ſolitum, cumque à doctis inviſeretur, ne unquam à literis abſcederet variis, ac feſtivis de re literaria ſermonibus profundæ eruditionis fructus uberrimos communicare conſueviſſe, huncque ipſi ludum, hoc otium, hoc laborum levamen ſemper fuiſſe. Nec mirum ſi ætate exacta plures libros à ſe confectos, quam annos numeraret, ejuſque opera vel magnam Bibliothecam inſtruere poſſent, ipſe viva ac perambulans Bibliotheca merito appellaretur.*

The aſcendant he had over his adverſaries is a kind of prodigy. I have quoted above a paſſage out of Mr Baillet in his book concerning famous children, wherein that author confeſſes (103), that *GOD did almoſt in every thing reward* his indefatigable labour *with great ſucceſs* ; the ſequel of that paſſage runs thus (104) : *GOD permitted not that his exceſſive labours ſhould occaſion his death, or prejudice his health ; but was pleaſed to let him live in the world for the ſpace of twenty olympiads, and perhaps more* (105), *for the execution of his deſigns, and the trial of many people.*

[*P*] *For he was ſtrangely abuſed ; nay, he miſtruſted his pen.*] Soon after the publication of the Scaliger Hypobolimæus, ſome outrageous pieces came out againſt him. Baudius took Scaliger's part in verſe, and Heinſius (106) in proſe. Another author made a bloody ſatire, intituled, *Vita & parentes Gaſparis Schoppii*. Scaliger did not remain idle : he publiſhed *Confutatio Fabulæ Burdonum*, under the name of *Janus Rutgerſius*, which he denoted only by the initial letters J. R. (107). Barthius came in for one, and wrote three ſatires againſt Scioppius, which I have mentioned in another place (108). Here follow the titles of ſome other pieces againſt the ſame man. *Alberti de Albertis Lydius lapis ingenii, ſpiritus ac morum Gaſparis Scioppii. Ejuſdem Vindiciæ generales adverſus famoſos Scioppii Libellos in Jeſuitas*, at Munich, 1649, in 12mo. *Henrici Wottoni Epiſtola de G. Scioppio cui propter argumenti ſimilitudinem etiam alia adjecta ſunt*, at Amberg, 1637. One of the chief writers for the Jeſuits againſt him was Father Laurence Forerus, who publiſhed *Grammaticus Proteus, arcanorum Societatis Jeſu Dædalus dedolatus, & genuino ſuo vultu repræſentatus : acceſſit auctarium animadverſionum in Gaſparis Scioppii Eccleſiaſticam Aſtrologiam*, at Ingolſtad, 1636, in 8vo. *Appendix ad Grammaticum Proteum quid de relatione Alphonſi de Vargas ſit ſentiendum*, in the ſame place, and in the ſame year, in 8vo. 'The Jeſuits, *they are Mr Baillet's words* (109), repreſent 'him as the greateſt knave, and the moſt profligate 'man in the world, and as the public peſt of learning 'and of human ſociety. And indeed the greateſt men 'of that time complained of him, almoſt all with 'one voice, Catholics, Heretics, and even the Deiſts, 'and all of them voted for his proſcription, becauſe 'he attacked every body without diſtinction, defamed 'the moſt honeſt men with as much pleaſure as impu'dence, and took a pride in neither ſparing quality 'nor merit.' Ferrarius, who praiſed him ſo much, acknowledges that he was forced to hear very unpleaſant ſtories (110).

I have ſaid that he did not always truſt his pen : the thing is this. A pretender to great matters in the common-wealth of learning took delight in abuſing Scioppius, and placing him in the loweſt rank of men of letters. He even threatened to write a book againſt him, which ſhould convict him in the eyes of the whole world to be nothing but a mere ignoramus. Scioppius ſent him word that he ſhould hold his tongue, and that if he continued to vex him, he would bring himſelf into trouble, not in the court of Parnaſſus, before the Muſes, but before the tribunal of the Magiſtrates ; that Scioppius laying down the weapons of learning, would employ no other writings againſt him, but ſuch as the records of Bologna could afford him ; that he would take care to get a copy of the information and ſentence, whereby that man was convicted of ſeveral crimes. Theſe are, ſaid he, the arms I ſhall make uſe of, if he continues to be troubleſome to me. When the man had been threatned thus, he gave over the deſign of writing againſt Scioppius, but continued to ſpeak ill of him. Nicius Erythræus relates the thing very handſomely ; the reader will be glad to ſee his Latin ; the thing would want ſome of it's principal beauties if I did not give it in my author's own terms. 'Cum de ſingulis, de'trahendi gratia, maledice contumelioſeque loquere'tur, Gaſparem vero Scioppium, qui in literaria Rep. 'in primis ordinibus numeratur, imi ſubſellii virum, 'atque inter literatos proletarios, ut ita dicam, refe'rendum eſſe ajebat ; quem ille Scioppium, quoniam 'in quodam libello ſua tempora, quaſi literatis viris 'non amica, modeſte reprehenderat, cœpit contume'liis omnibus lacerare, atque palam eum infantem, 'rudem, & omnino omnis eruditionis expertem atque 'ignarum aſſerere, minitarique, ſe libro edito ejus 'inſcitiam palam omnibus facturum. At Scioppius mi'ſit illi, qui diceret, ſi ſibi amplius moleſtus eſſet, 'non ſe pugnaturum cum eo eloquentiæ doctrinæque 'armis, ſed dictis teſtium, ac ſententiis judicum, in 'publicas tabulas relatis, quibus Bononiæ, malorum 'facinorum argutus, evictus, ac condemnatus fuiſſet ; 'his ſe armis curaturum, ut ejus projecta ad detra'hendum bonis viris audacia infringeretur, ac retun'deretur. Hic auditis, à ſcribendi contra illum ſen'tentia deſtitit, ſeque tantum intra verba continuit '(111).' This may be looked upon as a very mortifying diſgrace for Scioppius. Properly ſpeaking, Zoilus Ardelio triumphed over him ; for when a man of letters, in a diſpute of learning, has recourſe to magiſtrates, bailiffs, and attornies, it is a ſign he miſtruſts his pen and his knowledge. He changes the ſtate of the queſtion ; he ſhuns the fight, he dares not enter the liſt with his antagoniſt (112).

[*Q*] *It is not true that he would not ſuffer his picture to be drawn.*] Thomas Bartholinus ſays, that Scioppius would never ſuffer his picture to be drawn or engraved, tho' his friends deſired it ; and he conjectures that this was owing to his fear of enchantments. But becauſe he is miſtaken as to the fact (113), his conjecture ought not much to be minded. However I ſhall ſet down his words, which contain ſome other examples that are a little more certain (114). 'Adduci nun'quam potuit. *Caſpar Scioppius*, quanquam ſæpe ab 'amicis rogatus, ut effigiem ſuam vel coloribus picto'rum vel æri cælatorum committeret. Neſcio an 'faſcini metu, quod adverſariorum, quos & magnos '& multos habuit, præſtigias timeret. Hinc maluit 'cum *Accio* Poëta, voluminum non imaginum certa'mina exercere. Certè nec *Palæottus*, nec *Velſerus* (115) 'nec *Pinellus*, Viri magni ſe vivos depingi voluerunt, 'ſicut *Calceolarius* in Muſeo prodidit. - - - - - Gaſpar 'Scioppius *could never be prevailed upon, tho' he was 'often importuned by his friends, to ſuffer his picture to*

(*g*) See Ferrarius's words in the remark [*O*].

(101) Octavius Ferrarius, *in* Proluſione *cui titulus* Funus Literatorum.

(102) That is, at Padua.

(103) Baillet, Enfans celebres, *Art.* 69.

(104) Ibid.

(105) Mr Baillet, *Jugem des Sçavans, ſur les Crit. Gramm.* num. 535, ſays he lived above eighty years : it is certain he lived but ſeventy-three.

(106) *It is he who made the ſatire intituled,* Hercules tuam fidem ſive Munſterus hypobolimæus, *and another piece intituled,* Virgula divina ſive Apotheoſis Lucretii Veſpillonis.

(107) *See* Thomaſius, *Præfat. in* Orationes Mureti, *p.* 24.

(108) In the article BARTHIUS, rem. [*Q*].

(109) Baillet, Jugem. des Sçavans, ubi ſupra, *num.* 535.

(110) Ita multorum in ſe odia concitaſſe ut amaras ipſe quoque hiſtorias audire cogeretur, belliſque pluſquam civilibus Muſarum pacem inquietaret. *Ferrar, ubi ſupra.*

(111) Nicius Erythræus. Pinacoth. I, *p.* 241. *He ſpeaks of one Zoilus Ardelio. It is doubtleſs a ſuppoſititious name.*

(112) Compare with this what ſhall be ſaid in the remarks [*D*] and [*E*] of the article THOMAS.

(113) Scioppius, mentions his Print, *p.* 51, *and* 150, of his *Amphotides Scioppianæ.* It may be ſeen in Freherus's *Theatrum, pag.* 766.

(114) Thom. Bartholin. de legendis Libris, *pag.* 65, 66.

(115) I ſpeak of it in the remark [*G*] of his article.

very much commended [*R*]. I have not been able to find the elogies of Julius Cæſar Capaci, wherein honourable mention is made of him. Two little books have appeared under the name of ANDREAS SCIOPPIUS, Gaſpar's brother [*S*]. It is a ſuppoſititious name.

If any one deſires to know how earneſtly Sciopius applied himſelf in his youth to get an exact knowledge of the Latin tongue, he muſt read his *Scaliger Hypobolimæus* folio 401. Being told that the reading of the ancient Poets was dangerous for young people, and being deſirous to learn Latin from the beſt authors, without doing any prejudice to his virtue, he made uſe of a remedy, which deſerves to be mentioned [*T*].

'*be either painted or engraved. I do not know whether* '*this proceeded from his fear of enchantments, becauſe he* '*dreaded the tricks of his adverſaries, who were both* '*many and conſiderable. But he rather choſe, with the* '*Poet* Accius, *to diſtinguiſh himſelf by books than by* '*pictures. Certain it is, that neither* Palæottus, *nor* 'Velſerus, *nor* Pinellus, *all three great men, would* '*ſuffer their pictures to be drawn, while they were* '*alive, as* Calceolarius *has given an account in his* '*Muſeum.*' Batholinus might have added to the three examples of Calceolarius, a King of Lacedæmon (116), the Philoſopher Plotinus (117), and a famous Engliſh Divine (118), *&c.*

[*R*] *Several manuſcripts that are very mucb commended.*] Read theſe words of Morhoſius: ' Libri 'Scioppiani ἀνέκδοτοι multi, atque inter illos ejus '*Theſaurus, ſive abſolutiſſimi de linguâ Latinâ Commen-* '*tarii* apud Joh. Michaelem Pieruccium, Profeſſorem 'Patavinum, latitant, neque hunc in diem lucem, cum 'indignatione eruditorum, vident; de quibus legen-'dus eſt Gregor. Let. *Ital. regnante part* 3. *lib.* 3. '*pag.* 325. Magna hujus libri expectatio apud litera-'tos eſt, & qui viderunt, ita commendant, ut in illo 'genere nil ſimile à quoquam ſcriptum illis eſſe vi-'deatur (119). - - - *Several books of Sciopius are in* '*manuſcript, and among them his* Theſaurus ſive abſolu-'tiſſimi de Linguâ Latinâ Commentarii, *remain in* '*the hands of John Michael Pieruccius, profeſſor at* '*Padua, and are not yet publiſhed, to the no ſmall in-* '*dignation of the learned world. Concerning theſe read* '*Gregor. Leti* Ital. regnante part. 3. lib. 3. pag. 325. '*Great is the expectation of that book which we have* '*mentioned, and good judges, who have ſeen it, praiſe* '*it to ſuch a degree, that they think no writing of the* '*kind was ever to be compared with it.*' This Pieruccius is probably the ſame upon whom Sciopius beſtowed ſo many encomiums in his letter to Voſſius, and who wiſhed he might have been profeſſor of Philoſophy in Holland. Sciopius had taken him into his houſe, and made him his ſole heir (120).

[*S*] *Andreas* SCIOPPIUS, *Gaſpar's brother* . . . . *is a ſuppoſititious name.*] It is thought (121) that the Jeſuit Garaſſe is the author of two ſatires, one of which is intituled, *Andreæ Schioppii Caſparis fratris Horoſcopus Anticotonis, ejuſque Germanorum Martillerii, & Hardivillerii vita, mors, cenotaphium, Apotheoſis* (122); and the other, *Andreæ Schioppii Caſparis Fratris Elixir Calviniſticum, ſeu lapis Philoſophiæ reformatæ à Calvino Genevæ primum effoſſus, dein ab Iſaaco Caſaubono Londini politus, cum teſtamentario Anticotonis codice nuper invento* (123). Mr Baillet (124) does very well obſerve that Gaſpar Sciopius had no brother, that writ any thing; but that, *in point of ſatire*, the pretended Andreas deſerved to be Gaſpar's brother. The ſon of Iſaac Caſaubon made the ſame obſervation. *Peream*, ſays he (125), *niſi meruerit hic homo quiſquis ſit, ut Gaſparis Schoppii frater credatur eſſe.* He had been ſaying, *Certum eſt tale illud eſſe ſcriptum ut ipſe Gaſpar Schop. illius author eſſe potuerit: adeo mendaciis & calumniis refertum eſt, adeo plenum maledictis & conviciis*, &c. Soon after he ſpeaks of a ſatire written by Gaſpar Sciopius, as Eudæmon-Joannes acknowledges (126). That ſatire is intituled, *Holofernis Kriſſæderi Landſperga Bavari reſponſio ad epiſtolam Iſaaci Caſauboni, Regii in Anglia Archipædagogi pro viro clariſſimo Gaſpare Scioppio* (127). Caſaubon is accuſed in it not only of being ignorant of the Latin tongue, but alſo of being a pimp, a whoremonger, an adulterer, and a thief, and ſome thing worſe ſtill: *Ille meo patri, quem ſcit ipſe ſpectatiſſimæ ſemper integritatis fuiſſe, ſtupra, furta, lenocinia, adulteria, (hæc ipſa enim crimina illi impingit, & alia quoque vel dictu fœda) audet objicere? mirum mihi videtur & incredibile, niſi quod Schoppium cogito* (128). The reading of that book, if Sciopius may be believed, threw Caſaubon into a fit of melancholy of which he died (129). Meric Caſaubon (130) refutes this by his father's journal, whereby it appears, under the firſt of the ides of March, that Caſaubon deſpiſed that ſatire. Having read the infamous things that are publiſhed in it againſt himſelf, his father, and his wife, he wrote in his Journal that he gloried in ſuffering with his family all thoſe reproaches for the ſake of JESUS CHRIST. His ſon obſerves in the margin, that there is nothing in that libel of Sciopius againſt his mother. He accuſes that ſatirical writer of Atheiſm, and proves it in the following manner. Sciopius has collected the fineſt paſſages of the ſcripture, wherein we are forbidden to rail at our neighbours; and at the ſame time the tract wherein he has inſerted them is a violent ſatire: his deſign was therefore to let the public know that he laughs at the ſcripture. *Quum intenderet alios inaudito exemplo calumniari, & omni convitiorum genere proſequi, congerit præcipuos è S. Scripturis locos quibus vetamur aliis ullam omnino contumeliam facere, aut convitium dicere: nonne ut omnibus palam faciat, quo loco Dei mandata habeat homo perditus, atque Deo ipſi (horreſco referens) illudat* (131)? The following words of Mr Baillet may be added to that Latin paſſage. ' Caſaubon † calls him the moſt 'cruel of all wild beaſts, and pretends in another 'book of his ‡ that Sciopius was a profeſſed enemy 'to GOD, and that he had found in one of his books 'execrable blaſphemies againſt the divine authority of 'the holy ſcripture (132).' But it is to be obſerved that thoſe blaſphemies are only ſtrained expreſſions about the authority, which the Roman Catholics pretend the Church has received from GOD to explain the ſcripture. *Ducit hodie familiam*, they are Caſaubon's words (133), *inter hujus generis hæreticos hoſtis Dei certiſſimus Sciopius; in cujus Eccleſiaſtico leviter inſpecto, multas legi ſuperioribus diebus adverſus* τὰς θεοπνεύστους *Scripturas, blaſphemias longe diriſſimas.*

After this digreſſion I return to Father Garaſſe, and I ſay he could not have pitched upon a more proper brotherhood. Mr Baillet (134) obſerves, that *there was in the beginning of our century one Andrew* SCIOPPIUS, *in Saxony, a Lutheran; but I cannot believe*, adds he, *that he was Gaſpar's near relation.* I can ſay nothing upon this ſubject, I only know that our Sciopius calls Conrad Schoppius, a learned man, who was ſtill living in 1633, his couſin (135). He taught Rhetoric at Berne (136), and had been Profeſſor of Eloquence and Poetry at Heidelberg (137). I would not affirm that CONRAD SCHOPPIUS, a Taylor of Francfort (138), one of the chief authors of the inſurrection which happened in that town in the year 1614, and beheaded two years after (139), was not related to Gaſpar. There has been a miniſter, called CONRAD SCHOPPIUS, who publiſhed ſome Latin ſermons (140).

[*T*] *He made uſe of a remedy, which deſerves to be mentioned.*] It conſiſted in mortifying his body by a ſtrict diet. He faſted whole days in Germany poring upon his books; and when he was at Rome, he wholly abſtained from wine, meat, eggs, and fiſh: he made but one meal in a day, and eat then nothing but very common things and in a ſmall quantity; half a cabbage, a little rice, a ſmall piece of cheeſe, a pear or an apple; and both in winter and ſummer, he had no other bed than boards, two blankets, and a pillow (141). There is no doubt but theſe are excellent remedies againſt the rage of incontinency, when a man does ſincerely deſire to live chaſte. Thoſe, who pretend that they are not very effectual, and that marriage is the only true remedy, are ſuch as never tried them, or do not much care to reſiſt luxury; and therefore their teſtimony is of no great force: but the affair we are now upon is a relation, not a diſpute. Here follow Scioppius's words (142). ‘Cum primis ineuntis adoleſcentiæ meæ annis veteres ſcriptores, & in primis poëtas legere cuperem, & viros autem doctos audirem, qui *arma pruriginis*, hoc eſt, obſcena illa poëtarum carmina iſti præſertim ætati propter periculum etiam atque etiam cavenda dicerent; excogitavi rationem, qua cum minimo meo damno aut periculo utilitates, quæ ex lectione iſta peti poſſunt, haurirem. . . . . . Ego qui lubricas illas poëtarum cantilenas tutò, &, ut ait Lucretius, *mea ſine parte pericli* percipere cuperem, temperantiæ & abſtinentiæ ultrò me colligandum præbui. Nam ut Terentius ait, *ſine Cerere & Baccho friget Venus:* ſive ut ante ipſum Euripides:

---

(116) AGESILAUS: ſee the end of his article.

(117) See his article, remark [*A*].

(118) Gataker, *ſee the beginning of his Life.*

(119) Morhof. Polyhiſt. *lib. i, cap. vii, p.* 62.

(120) See the letters written to Voſſius, *pag. m.* 224.

(121) *See* Mr Baillet, Auteurs deguiſez, *Part. iii, cap. iii, §.* 2. *and in the Catalogue.*

(122) Printed at Antwerp for Jerome Verduſſen, 1614, in 4to.

(123) Printed at Antwerp for the heirs of Martin Nutius 1615, in 4to.

(124) Baillet, *in Tom. i, of the* Anti, *Art.* 15, §. 1.

(125) Mericus Caſaubonus, in Pietate, *p.* 18.

(126) Caſtigationum, *lib. ii, pag.* 125.

(127) Printed at Ingolſtad, 1615, in 8vo.

(128) Mericus Caſaubonus, ubi ſupra, *p.* 21.

(129) Scribit hic nebulo patrem meum poſtquam legerat hunc ſuum libellum, ex deſperatione vitæ renuntiaſſe, atque inde vivere deſiiſſe. *Id. ibid. pag.* 24.

(130) Ib. *p.* 25.

(131) Ib. *p.* 20.

† Iſaac. Caſaubon. in Epiſtol.

‡ *Id.* Caſaub. Exercit. i, in Baron. *pag.* 109. *M.*

(132) Baillet, Jugemens des Sçavans, ubi ſupra, *num.* 535.

(133) *In* Apparat. Baronii, §. *xxxiii, pag.* 133, *Edit. Genev.* 1663.

(134) In Vol. i, of the *Anti, Art.* 15, §. *i*,

(135) See the 20th letter of the fifth book *Suſpectarum Lectionum* of Gaſpar Sciopius.

(136) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of Freinſhemius's Commentary upon Quintus Curtius.

(137) See the verſes he made for Philip Pareus: they are prefixed to the *Lexicon Criticum*, of the ſame Pareus.

(138) See the Continuator of Thuanus's Hiſtory, *lib. vii, pag.* 433.

(139) Idem, *lib. ix, pag.* 658.

(140) Draudius mentions them in his *Bibliotheca Claſſica.*

(141) Cubitus . . . aſſeres ſine ulla culcita cervicali tantum duabuſque lodicibus inſtructi. *Sciopius, ubi infra,* fol. 251.

Ἐν πλησμονῇ τοί Κύπεις, ἐν πινῶντι δ᾽ οὔ.

Saturis adeſt Venus, non eſurientibus.

Monſtrum ſcilicet haberetur libido ſine gula (ait Tertullianus) (143). . . . . . . (144) In libidinem ebullire, res laterum eſt ac virium. *Vires* autem, *ne infirmitas forſan perdat militiam, cibis excitantur. Scitis*, ait ille, *quid tentare ſoleat humanam ſatietatem.* Toto itaque biennio ſic in Germania vixi, ut integros dies aridus, ſiccus ac jejunus in ſtudendo conſumerem, omninoque prandia ignorarem. Veni poſtea in Italiam; ubi cum pleroſque omnes ſcriptores veteres tam Græcos, quàm Latinos, diligenti lectione contriviſſem, excerpſiſſemque ſedulò omnia, quæ ad corrigendos ordinandoſque mores & affectus & ad vitam quàm tranquilliſſimè agendam uſui fore viſa eſſent. . . . . . . Non modo bis, quod in ſiculis ſibi non probari Plato oſtendit, ſed etiam ſemel in die ſaturum fieri, & vino carere nolle, non ſatis eo dignum eſſe deprehendi, qui ſibi legendis ſapientiæ magiſtris illis operæ pretium feciſſe videretur. . . . . . . Quare ne in legendis iſtis oleum & operam perdidiſſem, tamquam germanus *Stoicus* quique ad vitam potius, quæ didiciſſet, quàm ad diſputationes referenda cenſeret, vinum aqua ex præfluente Tiberi hauſta mutavi, quod *ignem ſcilicet*, ut Plato ait, *igni addendum non putarem:* tum carnes in perpetuum à menſa mea proſcripſi, non ſolum † διὰ τὴν νωθρίαν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς κρεοφαγίας ἐγγινομένην, ſed etiam ἀσκήσεως χάριν καὶ τοῦ μὴ σφειγᾶν περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια τὴν σάρκα, ut idem Clemens loquitur, cùm veriſſimè à S. Hieronymo dictum ſit: *Eſum carnis eſſe ſeminarium libidinis.* Sed etiam piſcibus & ovis culina ac menſa mea interdixi, quod hæc quidem * στυτικὰ plus ſatis experimentis didiciſſem, piſcium vero eſu majorem etiam, quam carnium, voluptatem capere ſolerem: quare dimidiato caule & aliquantulo oryzæ cum piro aut pomo & caſei fruſtillo contentus, ipſas viginti quatuor horas durare ſoleo, eadem opera jentans, prandens, cœnans ac commiſſans. - - - *While very early in my youth I had an inclination to read the antient authors, and eſpecially the Poets, and hearing learned men ſay that theſe* inſtruments of wantonneſs, *I mean the obſcene verſes of the Poets, ought ſtrictly to be guarded againſt at thoſe years, on account of their dangerous conſequences, I thought of a way by which with the leaſt prejudice or hazard to myſelf I might reap the advantages of ſuch reading. . . . . . Deſiring to peruſe theſe dangerous productions of the Poets in ſafety, and* without my ſhare in the danger, *as Lucretius words it, I frankly bound myſelf over to temperance and abſtinence. For, as Terence ſays,* Love languiſhes without good victuals and drink: *or, as Euripides before him:*

Love thrives with plenty, but with hunger dies.

Luſt without good cheer *(ſays Tertullian)* would be looked upon as a prodigy. . . . . . . *The bubblings of luſt are the effects of a vigorous and healthy body. But* this vigour is provoked and ſet on by victuals. You know, *ſays he*, what temptations a man generally has after a belly-full, &c. . . . . *Wherefore like a true* Stoic, *and one who thought his learning was rather to be applied to his life and manners than to diſputes, that I might not loſe my labour in reading theſe books, I changed my wine for the water of the Tiber, becauſe* I was unwilling, *as Plato ſays*, to add fire to fire. *I likewiſe for ever baniſhed meat from my table, not only* on account of the heavineſs which is occaſioned by the eating thereof, *but alſo* for the ſake of exerciſe, and that my fleſh might not have too great an itching to love-affairs, *as the ſame Clemens ſays; and as it is moſt truly affirmed by St Jerome:* That the eating of fleſh is the nurſery of luſt, &c.’ Take notice that he ſays (145) that before he had read Father Coſter's books, he practiſed moſt of thoſe things only to live in conformity to reaſon, but after he had read theſe, he directed them to God. It is alſo to be obſerved that he believed the reading of ſome books could excite the moſt drowſy tempers. He reckoned among thoſe books ſome commentaries of Scaliger and their text. ‘(146) Vos autem capulares illi, vieti, edentuli, & jam diu Acheronti debiti, ſi jam vos opus perdere & tamquam caballos in clivo non facere pudet, ut Satyrion compendi faciatis, familiaris hujus mei auctores, in eoſdemque notas legite,

- - - - Accendi queis frigidus ævo
Laomedontiades aut Neſtoris hernia poſſit (147).

But ye, decrepit, ſhrivelled, toothleſs old men, whoſe bodies are long ago due to their graves, if ye be not henceforth aſhamed to loſe your labour, and to fumble like worn out jades upon the mountain, inſtead of all provocatives, read the authors of this friend of mine, and his notes upon the ſame,

So full, ſo fierce, ſo vig'rous, and ſo ſtrong
That looking on would make old Neſtor young.

Dryden.

And becauſe he took hold of every opportunity to inſult that great man, he tells him in a reproachful manner that he ſlighted his father's judgment, in commenting upon certain authors. I ſhall ſet down his words, that the reader may ſee that men of great virtue and learning, though belonging to the ſame family, are divided in their opinions about obſcenities. ‘(148) Cum pater tuus obſcenos & immemorabiles Auſonii, Martialis, ſimiliumque poëtarum verſus negarit à Critico cenſendos, atque adeò ne legendos quidem omninò, aut audiendos, ſed deteſtandos & flammis expiandos, & pro ſignis Priapi, adeoque pro libris honori ejus ſcriptis, ſanctorum imagines à nobis habendas eſſe contenderit. . . . . (149) Tu exortus es homo ſanctiſſimus & caſtitatis ac pudicitiæ exemplar atque ſpecimen, qui non modò illum ipſum cenſura patris tui notatum Auſonium, ſed hoc etiam Burdigalenſi Triphallo *nihilo deterius mutoniatos* Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium, & Priapeiorum verſuum ſcriptores, magna temporis curæque impenſa à te recenſitos, caſtigatos, nec pœnitendis (ut gloriaris) commentariis illuſtratos emittere & adoleſcentibus commendare auderes. Hoc, ſatis ſcio, nullo modo patri tuo probare poſſes. - - - *After your father had declared that the leud and infamous productions of Auſonius, Martial, and the like Poets, did not deſerve the remarks of any Critic, and therefore that they were not to be read or heard, but to be deteſted and burnt, and that inſtead of the ſtatues of Priapus, and books written in honour of him, we ought to have the images of the Saints. . . . . . You appeared, a man of eminent ſanctity, forſooth, and a ſingular inſtance of modeſty, who have taken care to publiſh, for the benefit of the youth, not only that ſame Auſonius, whom your father marked with a note of infamy, but likewiſe theſe other maſter-pieces of ribaldry Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and the authors of the Priapeia, after having reviſed and corrected them with great loſs of time and pains, and illuſtrated them, with a commentary of which, as you boaſt, you have no reaſon to be aſhamed. This, I am well aſſured, you could no ways juſtify to your father.*’

(142) *Idem*, in Scalig. hypobolim. *fol.* 250.

(143) You will find above in the remark [*I*], num. iv, of the article EREMITA, the ſequel of Tertullian's words, and ſeveral paſſages of the like nature.

(144) Scioppius, *ibid*, *verſo*.

† Non ſolum propter hebetudinem, quæ ex carnium eſu generatur, ſed etiam exercitationis gratia, & ne caro nimis perpruriſcat ad Venerem.

* Pruriginem commoventia.

(145) Id. *fol.* 250, *verſo*.

(146) Id. ib. *fol.* 272, *verſo*.

(147) Juven. Sat. vi, ver. 323.

(148) Scioppius, *ibid. fol.* 281. *verſo*.

(149) Ibid. *fol.* 282.

SCOTUS (MICHAEL) a learned man, and a great lover of Mathematics and Aſtrology, lived in the XIIIth century. He was well beloved by the Emperor Frederic II to whom he dedicated all his books. They have put him in the claſs of Magicians, and they tell us that he frequently invited ſeveral perſons to dinner, without cauſing any thing to be got ready for them, but that having made his gueſts ſit down at table, he forced the ſpirits to bring him meat from all parts, and when it was come he told the company, *Gentlemen, this comes from the kitchen of the King of France, and this from the kitchen of the King of Spain; that comes from England, &c* (*a*). Merlinus Coccaius has diverted himſelf with deſcribing his enchantments (*b*) (§ *a*). The Poet Dante adopted the common error [*A*]. We have more reaſon to believe John Bacon, an Engliſh Carmelite, and *the Prince of the Averroïſts* (*c*), who quotes (*d*) Michael Scotus as a great Divine. We have likewiſe more reaſon to believe Pitſeus who commends him very much [*B*]. However it be, it is ſaid that this pretended Magician foreſaw in what manner he ſhould die, and that he foretold the place where the Emperor Frederick II ſhould loſe his life [*C*]. I ſhall ſay ſomething of his books [*D*].

(*a*) Marcel, *ch. viii, of the* delectable Folie, *pag.* 123, *Lyons* 1650.

(*b*) Naudé Apolog. des grans Hommes, *ch. xvii, p. m.* 496.

[(§ *a*) In his 18th Macaronic. The paſſage begins with, *Ecce Michaelis de incantu Regulæ Scoti.* REM. CRIT.]

(*c*) Naudé, *ibid.*

(*d*) Part. iii, *Sentent.* Diſtinct. xxxiii.

[*A*] *The Poet Dante adopted the common error.*] Theſe are his words at the end of the XXth Canto of his Hell.

Quell' altro, che ne' fianchi è così poco,
Michele Scotto fù, che veramente
Delle Magiche frode ſeppe il gioco.

He there with meagre ſides was Michael Scot,
Who truly had the art of Magic got.

[*B*] *Pitſeus commends him very much.*] He *ſays in expreſs words*, that though Michael Scot *was accounted a Magician by the vulgar and rabble of the ignorant*, yet wiſe men have entertained a quite different opinion of him. ' * Prudentum tamen & cordatorum hominum longè aliud fuit judicium, qui potius perſpicax ' ejus in ſcrutandis rebus abditis admirabantur ingenium, laudabant induſtriam, quam reprehendendam ' judicabant curioſitatem, inſpiciebantque hominis ſcientiam, non ſuſpicabantur culpam (1). - - - *The opinion of wiſe and ſenſible men was far different. They ' rather admired the quickneſs of his apprehenſion in ' making diſcoveries, and rather praiſed his application ' than blamed his curioſity. In ſhort they conſidered his ' knowledge without ſuſpecting a fault.*'

* Pitſeus 1. volum. de rebus Anglicis.

(1) Naudé Apologie des grans Hommes, *ch. xvii, pag.* 498.

[*C*] *He foreſaw in what manner he ſhould die, and marked the place where the Emperor Frederic II ſhould loſe his life.*] This I find in a commentator upon Dante. ' Michael the Scotchman, *ſays he* (2), lived ' in the reign of the Emperor Frederic II, and foretold to him the place where he ſhould die, which ' he ſaid was Florence. Wherein the ſaid emperor ' was deceived by reaſon of the equivocal name; for ' he did not die at Florence, the chief town of Tuſcany, but in a caſtle of Apulia called Fiorenzola. ' That Magician foreſaw that he himſelf ſhould die ' by the fall of a ſtone, that ſhould break his head. ' Which accordingly came to paſs; for one day being ' at church bare-headed to worſhip the body and ' blood of JESUS CHRIST, the rope faſtened to ' the bell that was ringing, made a large ſtone fall ' upon his head, and immediately he thought he ' ſhould die, which he did ſuddenly.'

(2) Grangier in his French Commentary upon Dante's Inferno, *pag.* 254, 255.

[*D*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his books.*] He wrote a treatiſe about Phyſiognomy, and a book containing ſeveral queſtions upon Sacroboſco's ſphere, and a Hiſtory of Animals (3). He ſhould have been mentioned in the great catalogue of Voſſius (4), on account of the ſecond of theſe three books; but I did not find him there. The treatiſe about Phyſiognomy was written at the requeſt of the Emperor Frederic II, I have it in Italian: The title runs thus: *Phyſionomia laqual compilo Maeſtro Michael Scotto, à prieghi di Federico Romano Imperatore, huomo di gran ſcienza: & è coſa molto notabile, e da tener ſecreta però che l'è di grande efficacia, & comprende coſe ſecrete della natura, baſtanti ad ogni Aſtrologo: & è diviſo in tre parti.* It was printed at Venice *per Marchio Seſſa*, in 1533. It is a book in octavo conſiſting of ſeven ſheets.

(3) *See* Naudé, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 496.

(4) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem.

SCRIBONIUS (WILLIAM ADOLPHUS) a German Phyſician and Philoſopher, and author of ſeveral books [*A*], was born at Marpurg, and lived towards the latter end of the XVIth century. As he had a great eſteem for the method of Ramus, he publiſhed Logical Expoſitions of ſome of the ſciences, and I believe that he begun with *Rerum Phyſicarum juxta leges logicas methodica Explicatio.* It is a book of 107 pages in 8vo, printed at Francfort in the year 1577. He was one of thoſe who maintained that witches ought to be puniſhed, and that the proof of water was lawful in this kind of proſecution (*a*). One may ſee in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (*b*), that they reprinted in the year 1686 a letter which he wrote upon this ſubject.

(*a*) *See* Voëtii Diſputat. Select. *Tom. iii, p.* 568, 573.

(*b*) For the month of Auguſt 1686, *Art. ii, pag.* 890.

[*A*] *Author of ſeveral books.*] I have taken notice in the text of what I reckon to be his firſt production. He cauſed it to be reprinted oftner than once, and enlarged it conſiderably, ſo that in the edition of Baſil 1583 he divided it into three books. It was reprinted the ſame year at London with his *Iſagoge Sphærica methodicè propoſita*, in 8vo. His Phyſics were reprinted at Cambrige *cum Animadverſionibus Timothei Bright*, in the year 1584 in 8vo. His *Idea Medicinæ ſecundum Logicas leges informandæ* came out at Lemgow the ſame year in 8vo. He added to it a treatiſe *de inſpectione urinarum contra eos qui ex qualibet urina de quolibet morbo judieare volunt. Item de hydrope, de podagra, & dyſenteria phyſiologia corporis.* His book *de ſagarum natura & poteſtate deque his recte cognoſcendis & puniendis: ubi de purgatione earum per aquam frigidam contra Johannem Ewichium & Henricum Neuwaldum*, was printed at Marpurg the year 1588 in 8vo. His *Anti-Piſcator Logicus ad Logicas exercitationes Johannis Piſcatoris reſpondens* was printed at Baſil the ſame year in 8vo. I do not think that he was an Anti-Ramiſt, as Mr Baillet believed (1) on account of that book. He ſtyles Ramus in an epiſtle dedicatory (2) *Philoſophiæ ſinceriores antiſtes, - - - the head of a better Philoſophy.* Let us not forget that he procured a new edition of *Theſaurus pauperum Petri Hiſpani*, and of *Theſaurus ſanitatis* of Liebault, at Francfort 1578 in 8vo.

(1) *Tom. ii, of the* Anti, *Art.* 140.

(2) *That of* Rerum Phyſicarum juxta leges logicas methodica Explicatio.

SCULTETUS (ABRAHAM) profeſſor of Divinity at Heidelberg, and author of ſeveral books [*A*], was born at Grunberg in Sileſia on the twenty-fourth of Auguſt

[*A*] *He is author of ſeveral books.*] We have ſeen in the text of this article that he taught ſcholars in his room while he was yet a ſcholar himſelf. The lectures he read to them upon Morality and the Sphere

Auguſt 1566 (a), and after he had ſtudied there till the year 1582, he was ſent to Breſlaw to make further improvements. He was quickly recalled from thence, becauſe his father, who had lately loſt all that he had in the great fire of Grunberg (b), was no longer able to maintain him at the college, and deſigned to make him learn a trade. The young man did not like ſuch a propoſal, and in order to purſue his ſtudies went in queſt of a tutorſhip. He found a good one in the houſe of a burgo-maſter of Freiſtad (c); which gave him an opportunity to hear Abraham Bucholcer preach (d). He made a journey into Poland in the year 1584, and the year following went to Gorlitz in Luſatia, where he ſtaid above two years, going conſtantly to the public lectures, and reading private ones to others (e). He acted thoſe two parts in the univerſity of Wittemberg in 1588, and 1589, and then in that of Heidelberg till he was admitted miniſter in the year 1594. He exerciſed his miniſtry, in a village of the Palatinate (f) for ſome months, and then he was invited by the Elector Palatine to be one of his preachers. I ſhall ſpeak of a conference he had with Samuel Huberus [B]. He was choſen miniſter of St Francis's church at Heidelberg in the year 1598, and two years after he was admitted into the Eccleſiaſtical ſenate. He was ſeveral times employed to viſit the churches and ſchools of the Palatinate; and notwithſtanding thoſe avocations, he wrote ſome books which required great labour. He followed the Prince of Anhalt to the war of Juliers in the year 1610, and applied himſelf to ſettling Eccleſiaſtical affairs in thoſe parts, with great prudence and vigilance. He attended the Prince Palatine Frederic V in his journey into England, in the year 1612; and got himſelf acquainted with the moſt learned men of that country. He went to the court of Brandenburg, in the year 1614, the Elector John Sigiſmund, who was ready to renounce Lutheraniſm, having deſired to concert with him the meaſures it was proper for him to follow in this change. He executed well the commiſſions that were given him in ſuch a juncture (g). Being returned to Heidelberg, he, for very good reaſons, accepted of the charge of preacher to the court. He obtained leave to reſign it in the year 1618, when he was appointed profeſſor of Divinity. He was ſoon after deputed to the ſynod of Dort, and endeavoured at firſt to reconcile the contending parties; but perceiving that it was in vain, he ſtoutly maintained the doctrines of the Contra-Remonſtrants. He preached at Francfort the year following, during the ſitting of the electoral diet; for his maſter appointed him preacher to the deputies he ſent thither. He followed that prince into Bohemia, and having retired into Sileſia, after the fatal battle of Prague, he reſolved to return to Heidelberg, in order to diſcharge the office of profeſſor. He was no ſooner arrived there, but all academical exerciſes ceaſed: the enemies being at the gates, moſt of the profeſſors fled away. He retired to Bretten, and then to Schorndorf, in the duchy of Wirtemberg, from whence he went to Embden, in Auguſt 1622. The King of Bohemia, his maſter, had conſented that the city of Embden ſhould offer him a miniſter's place. This call was accepted of (h): but the Profeſſor of Heidelberg

at Heidelberg, produced a book which was ſoon after printed and explained in ſome illuſtrious ſchools. *In eadem Scholâ meâ privatâ Auditoribus petentibus doctrinam Morum & Siderum explicabam; unde mihi Ethicorum libri duo, Sphæricorum libri tres confecti, qui non ita multò poſt publicati, & in aliquot Illuſtribus Scholis fuerunt enarrati* (1). Samuel Huberus being called to Wittemberg, in the year 1593, made an oration *de diſſidiis in religione*. - - - *of diſſentions in point of religion.* Scultetus publiſhed a confutation of it without putting his name to it. *Scholia & Notas in illam, ſed ſine nomine edidi, in quibus homini craſſos errores in Logica, craſſiores in Grammaticâ, craſſiſſimos in Theologiâ commonſtro* (2). He compoſed at the ſame time, 1. An Analyſis of the works of the Fathers, which was printed ſome years after at Amberg, and intituled *Medulla Patrum* (3). 2. An *Iſagoge Hiſtorica in V. T. libros*, together with an Analyſis of Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, &c. He loſt that work and ſeveral others after the battle of Prague, and particularly the Hiſtory of the Reformation (4). He took a journey into Sileſia in 1594, and returning to Heidelberg he went through Gorlitz, where he made a funeral oration on Laurentius Ludovicus (5), which was printed, and afterwards inſerted by Melchior Adam in his lives of the Philoſophers. This Laurence had been Melancthon's ſcholar, and principal of a college at Gorlitz (6). Martin Mylius, who ſucceeded him, deſired Scultetus to pay that duty to his old maſter (7). Scultetus publiſhed in 1611, an expoſition of the goſpels for Sunday, which was tranſlated out of German into ſeveral languages (8), and put into the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, - - - *of prohibited books*, at Rome (9). He publiſhed two ſermons he had preached in the ſynod of Dort, two other ſermons preached by him at Heidelberg in the ſecular year of the Reformation, and that which he had preached at Prague againſt idols. Take notice that he did not loſe all his Annals of the Reformation; for he publiſhed the two firſt decads before he went into Bohemia with the Elector his maſter. I find that he wrote *Idea concionum in Eſaiam, Epiſtolas D. Pauli ad Romanos & Hebræos & Pſalmos Davidis*, & *obſervationes Grammaticæ, Logicæ, Hiſtoricæ, & Theologicæ in hiſtoriam Jeſu Chriſti nati, educati, baptizati & tentati, & in hiſtoriam concionum & miraculorum Jeſu Chriſti*, & *de precatione tractatio logica & Theologica*, & *Joannes Baptiſta logice deſcriptus.* See Freherus's *Theatrum* (10). He had a hand in the Greek and Latin edition (11) of St Athanaſius, and of the councils of Nice and Epheſus; to which, he added a ſhort Hiſtory of the ſeven univerſal councils, and his tranſlation of twenty Greek ſermons (12). I ſhall ſay nothing of his German books againſt a Jeſuit of Mentz, againſt M. de Neer's apoſtacy, and againſt the confeſſion of Cologn, &c (13). See again Freherus's *Theatrum.*

[B] *I ſhall ſpeak of a conference which he had with Samuel Huberus.*] In the year 1606 he was ſent to Newſtad to confer with a mathematician (14), who had been employed to finiſh and publiſh a book of Rheticus (15), and who put off from day to day the publication of that work. He went in the name of the great council, to diſcourſe with him about what was neceſſary to be done, in order to make an end of that edition. He found Samuel Huberus at Spire, in the inn where he lay. That man was preparing a book for the next Francfort fair, and no ſooner knew who Scultetus was, but he propoſed to him a diſpute upon controverſies in religion: It was accepted, and laſted from nine a-clock in the morning till three in the afternoon, in the preſence of the Lutheran miniſters. It turned upon the doctrine of Predeſtination (16). Scultetus came off at laſt by an argument, which was a kind of a perſonal jeſt. ' Tandem abſolvi

---

(a) And not 1556, as Freherus, *Theatri, p.* 424, affirms. He ſays in the following page that Scultetus died the 24th of October 1625, aged 59 years. It is a wrong calculation.

(b) The 26th of July 1582.

(c) Near Grunberg.

(d) The author of ſome Chronological books.

(e) Publice didici, privatim docui. *Abraham Scultetus*, ubi infra, citation (h), *pag.* 16.

(f) Called Schriſheim, near Heidelberg.

(g) Profectus ſum Berlinum ibique rem Chriſti, pro virili ad menſem uſque Octobrem, egi. - - - *I went to Berlin, where I exerted myſelf as much as I could in the ſervice of Chriſtianity till the month of October.* Id. ibid.

(h) Taken from a book of Abraham Scultetus intituled, *de curriculo vitæ . . . Narratio apologetica*, printed at Embden 1625, in 4to.

(1) Scultetus, in Narrat. Apologetica de curriculo vitæ, *pag.* 23.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) That work contains four parts, which came out one after another.

(4) Scultetus, ubi ſupra.

(5) Id. ibid. *pag.* 28.

(6) Id. ib. *p.* 16.

(7) Id. ib. *p.* 28.

(8) Id. ib. *p.* 52.

(9) Id. ibid. *pag.* 67. It was in the decree of the 10th of May 1613.

(10) Freher. Theatrum, *pag.* 425.

(11) Printed for Commelin 1601.

(12) Scultet. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 35.

(13) Id. ibid. *pag.* 24.

(14) *Called* L. Valentinus Otto.

(15) *I think it was* Canon triangulorum. *See* Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. *pag.* 66.

(16) *Taken from* Scultetus, ubi ſupra, *p.* 32, 33.

Heidelberg did not enjoy it very long, for he died on the twenty-fourth of October 1625 *(i)*. He was married three times, and left but one daughter behind him [*C*]. No man was ever more cruelly ſlandered by his enemies [*D*]. I have ſaid in another place *(k)*, that he did not approve that the Proteſtants ſhould write one againſt another. What

‘ me argumento in ſpeciem quidem ſed reipſa minime jocoſo, quo docui Huberum non eſſe Eccleſiæ veræ filium (17). - - *At laſt I got off clear by an argument which ſeemed to be, but in truth was not, a joke, by which I proved that Huberus was not a ſon of the true Church.*’ I will prove to you, ſaid he to Huberus, that you do not belong to the true Church: it is certainly either among the Reformed, or among the Lutherans, or among the Roman Catholics. But you have left the communion of the Reformed, you have been expelled from that of the Lutherans, and you write againſt the Roman; therefore, &c. The diſpute went on quietly, for the two chief qualities of a good diſputant met in Huberus; he patiently heard his antagoniſts, tho' never ſo prolix, and meekly bore their hard words. *Acta & peracta ſunt omnia tranquillè: Neque enim diſſimulandum eſt: quæ duæ virtutes in Diſputatore primæ ſunt, eas ambas me in Hubero deprehendiſſe, patientiam adverſarium prolixè ſua explicantem audiendi, & lenitatem etiam aſperè dicta perferendi* (18). He maintained that all men are elected, and perplexed Hunnius, who denied the election of ſome perſons (19). *Primum laudo Huberi ratiocinationem qua Ægidium Hunnium Witembergæ conſtrinxerat, qui nec Huberi generalem, nec Reformatorum ſpecialem electionem agnoſcere voluit* (20).

[*C*] *He was married three times, and left but one daughter behind him.*] His firſt wife was Catherine Bergia, whom he married at Heidelberg in November 1594 (21). He loſt her the twenty-fifth of March 1605, and continued ſixteen months a melancholy widower(22), ſo ſickly, that he thought his health required he ſhould have ſome body to take care of it (23). He therefore married Catherine Lorichia, the widow of Dr Rhodingus, and having loſt her the twentieth of October 1607, he married another widow the eighteenth of July 1608 (24), by whom he had a daughter, the firſt of December 1609 (25), who, together with her mother, were the companions of his exile at Embden, in the year 1624 (26).

[*D*] *No man was ever more cruelly ſlandered by his enemies.*] He expreſſes himſelf thus in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his ‘ Narratio Apologetica. Dentatis ſcriptis, infamibus Theſibus, contumelioſis anagrammatiſmis, picturis, cantilenis, in nomen, in famam, in doctrinam meam involarunt, perindeque omnis generis convitiis in me debacchati ſunt, ac ſi ego unus eſſem qui omnem Iſraelem turbarim & ſolem, quod dicitur, ex univerſo mundo ſuſtulerim. - - - *They attacked my reputation and doctrine with ſatirical writings, infamous theſes, contumelious anagrams, pictures, ballads; and they railed at me in ſuch a furious manner, as if I had been the only man that had troubled Iſrael, or who, as the ſaying is, had taken the ſun out of the world.*’ I cannot tell whether there was any good ground for thoſe ſlanders, but I believe the free acceſs he had to princes, made him odious to ſeveral people; and that the uneaſineſs of ſome, and the joy of others, after the misfortune of the Elector Palatine in Bohemia, brought to light the ill effects of envy. The court preacher was attacked when thought to be under diſgrace, and the ice being once broken, every body fell upon him; the firſt ſatires made way for others; it was like a ſnow-ball that went always increaſing. He was accuſed (27) of having adviſed the Elector Palatine to accept of the crown of Bohemia: He was made anſwerable for all the calamities which followed that enterprize; it was objected to him, that inſtead of diſcharging the duties of his profeſſorſhip at Heidelberg, he had acted the part of an intriguing man, and an Iconoclaſt in Bohemia; and that he ſhewed himſelf an Atheiſt, by approving the union of the kingdoms of Hungary and Bohemia: he was blamed for having perſecuted the Roman Catholics, the Lutherans and the Unitarians; and it was given out that he had loſt his maſter's favour, and all his employments, after the battle of Prague. This was diſperſed by word of mouth, and in writing in the courts of princes, and in the univerſities and towns. He was four years without juſtifying himſelf; but at laſt he took up the pen in his own defence, in imitation of St Baſil. ‘ Hæc dicta, ſcripta, decantata per Regum, per Principum aulas, per Academias, per urbes & oppida: Quæ niſi reprimerem, famæ meæ prodigus jure merito haberer. Quod ſi quis quærat: Cur in quartum annum reſponſum, ad tam atroces calumnias diſtulerim? is hoc à me audiat: imitatum me fuiſſe Baſilium illum Magnum, qui cùm undique appeteretur, adeò perturbatus fuit, ut non veritus ſit ſcribere Epiſtolâ ſeptuageſimâ nonâ, *parum aliquando abfuiſſe, quin de omnium hominum fide & ſinceritate dubitaret:* indixit autem ſibi ipſi ſilentium in tertium uſque annum ne quid præcipitantur effunderet: poſtea varias apologias texuit (28). - - - *If I ſhould give no check to theſe ſpeeches and writings that are ſo much talked of in the courts of kings, in the univerſities, towns, and cities, I might juſtly be conſidered as a man prodigal of his reputation. But if any one aſk me why I have delayed making a proper reply to ſuch bitter calumnies for the ſpace of four years, I anſwer that in this I have imitated the great St Baſil, who, when he was attacked from all quarters, in his confuſion, did not ſcruple to ſay, that* he was ſometimes ready to call the truth and ſincerity of all men into queſtion: *he therefore preſcribed ſilence to himſelf for three years, leſt he ſhould utter any thing raſhly: afterward he compoſed ſeveral vindications.*’ Obſerve, by the by, that thoſe words of St Baſil are wonderful. Men are ſo eaſily prepoſſeſſed by ill reports, or ſo blindly adapt their behaviour to the ſervice of calumny, that there is ſometimes ground to believe that equity and uprightneſs are wholly baniſhed from this world. Scultetus anſwers (29), 1. That he had no hand in the deliberation, whether the Elector Palatine ſhould accept of the crown of Bohemia; but he confeſſes, that he preached a ſermon, wherein he congratulated him for having accepted of this preſent of the Bohemians; and encouraged him by the words of the Lord, to behave himſelf valiantly in that enterprize (30). 2. That Frederic Balduinus, profeſſor of Divinity at Wittemberg, who blamed him for leaving his church and his profeſſor's chair (31), had a colleague who went to preach in the country of Brandenburg, contrary to the prince's edicts. This is approving at home what one condemns abroad, though the domeſtic action be much more inexcuſable than that of the foreigner; for, adds Scultetus, I followed my elector's orders with the conſent of the univerſity. *Magnum crimen profectò, ac indubiè, Balduino judice, majus longè eo, cui D. Meiſnerus Balduini collega obnoxius: cui è Saxoniâ in Marchiam ire, contra Sereniſſ. Electoris Brandeburgici edictum, in Gynæceum Electorale irripere, ibidem concionari nulla religio fuit. Hæc, quæ nullo colore defendi poſſunt, probat domi Balduinus: foris autem in me culpat: quòd Principem meum, cujus in ſervitio concionatorio adhuc vivebam, volentem, jubentem, conſentiente Academiâ, in Boëmiam ſequutus ſum* (32). 3. That (33) the new King of Bohemia promiſed to all his ſubjects a free exerciſe of their religion, and kept his word to them; that he took only for his own uſe, the church of the citadel of Prague, out of which he removed all the idols. Scultetus owns that he adviſed him to it, and that he gave himſelf no reſt till he had obtained it. He maintains, that he acted in that reſpect like a good Chriſtian. He ſays, that as ſoon as the ſermon he had preached upon that ſubject came to be publiſhed, the Lutherans and the Papiſts raiſed a dreadful noiſe every where, which was ſuppreſſed by a learned anſwer of Theophilus Moſanus. 4. That when he ſaid (34), in his ſermon upon the alliance renewed between Bohemia and Hungary, on the fifteenth of April 1620, that this confederacy was acceptable to GOD, ſince all thoſe who entred into it profeſſed the ſame faith; he only meant the Reformed and the Lutherans, and not the Papiſts, Anabaptiſts, and Arians. He complains (35), that Luke Oſiander (36) having read this ſermon, openly maintained in a public diſputation, that Scultetus was an Atheiſt (37), ſince he made no difference between Lutheraniſm, Calviniſm, and Popery. 5. He proteſts that he never excited the king, his

---

(i) Paul. Freher. *in Theatr. pag.* 425, but according to Witte in his *Diarium*, it was in 1624.

(k) In the article PITISCUS, remark [*B*].

(17) Id. ibid. *pag.* 33.

(18) Id. ibid.

(19) See the remark [*E*] in the article HUNNIUS.

(20) Scultet, ubi ſupra, *p.* 33.

(21) Id. ib. *p.* 29.

(22) Id. ib. *p.* 44.

(23) In viduitate ſedecim menſes vixi, quibus corpuſculum meum cùm non uno morbo attentaretur, valetudinis curatricem quæſivi. *Id. ibid.*

(24) Id. ib. *p.* 45.

(25) Id. ib. *p.* 47.

(26) Id. *p.* 23. 45.

(27) Id. ibid. *pag.* 76, 77.

(28) Id. ibid. *pag.* 77.

(29) Id. ibid.

(30) Pro concione Majeſtati ipſius gratulatus, illamque verbis Domini è Joſuâ petitis ad id, quod ſuſceperat, fortiter agendum, cohortatus ſum. *Id. ibid.* p. 78.

(31) In libello quodam Germanico, quem de idolis ſcripſit, πολυπραγμοσύνης damnat, qui Eccleſiæ & Academiæ Palatinæ obligatus, in Boëmiam cum Rege meo profectus ſim. *Id. ibid.*

(32) Id. ibid. *pag.* 78.

(33) Id. ibid.

(34) Id. ibid. *pag.* 81.

(35) Id. ibid. *pag.* 83.

(36) Profeſſor of Divinity at Tubingen, and chancellor of the univerſity.

(37) Quibus fundamentis jactis Oſiander publicis theſibus me ATHEUM proclamat. *Id. ibid.*

What he obſerves in anſwer to a man, who accuſed him of having raiſed a ſacramental war in the Palatinate [*E*], is a remarkable thing. I ſhould make no difficulty to believe that

his maſter, to perſecute the Papiſts and the Lutherans, and that it was falſe to ſay they had been perſecuted. *Circumferuntur varii libelli de Reformatione Boëmica, partim Latinâ, partim Germanicâ linguâ ſcripti: quibus ſi fides habenda; in Boëmiâ, me inſtigatore, Pontificii duriter afflicti: Lutherani magno numero ejecti: ipſi proceres Regni de libertate religionis ſuæ ſunt periclitati* (38). He refers the reader (39) to a German book, wherein it was plainly made out, That this perſecution was a chimerical thing; and takes advantage (40) of the contradictions of thoſe, who had mentioned that revolution of Bohemia in their writings. He ſpeaks (41) of a letter handed about under the ſuppoſititious name of a man of Antwerp, wherein he was deſired to recommend the doctrine of Ubiquity to the king his maſter. He does not deny (42) that being conſulted about the reformation of the Churches immediately ſubject to the king, he anſwered, That the king's religion might be eſtabliſhed in them, ſince the people deſired it, and the prieſts were not qualified to explain the Scripture. 6. Laſtly, He ſhews, that after the battle of Prague, he did not loſe his maſter's favour, as his enemies had given out. In order to colour that lie, they invented ſeveral reaſons of his diſgrace, and they went even ſo far as to accuſe him of a heinous crime. *Unde haud difficulter colligere eſt cujus ſpiritus filii fuerint: qui, me Uratiſlaviâ vix digreſſo, diſſeminare hoc in orbem Germaniæ non dubitarunt: me omni gratiâ Regis excidiſſe; officio motum eſſe. Et ut res colorem haberet; pro ſuâ quiſquam libidine cauſas finxit: alius, conſilia mea de ſuſcipiendo regno Boëmico: alius, demolitionem ſtatuarum & idolorum Pragenſium: alius (quod Deus æternùm averruncaſſit) atrox aliquod crimen* (43).

The libellers perſecuted him in his very exile. He was informed from good hands (44), in the year 1624, that the ſecretary of a certain prince had affirmed in the Lower Saxony, and even at the court of the King of Sweden, that Scultetus had departed this life towards the latter end of the year 1623, three days after having publiſhed a book full of abſurd and heterodox opinions, which had obliged the magiſtrates of Embden to ſuppreſs it. Some body writ into the country of Brandenburgh, that he had foreſeen it long ago: and yet there never was any ſuch book. A Dutch piece was publiſhed the year following, which contained a deſcription of the devaſtations made in Eaſt-Frieſland by Mansfeld's troops. The author having employed his ſlander againſt the States-General, and ſome illuſtrious perſons, attacked Scultetus particularly, and accuſed him of having thanked God in the pulpit, for the irruption of thoſe troops. And yet it was a notorious thing, that he had only thanked him for the retreat of thoſe furious ſoldiers; which was atteſted in a book written to confute that libel.

I ſhall make no excuſe for the length of this remark, being perſuaded, that all men of ſenſe will grant, that there are no collections of greater uſe than thoſe which can any ways ſerve to reſiſt two ſuch terrible plagues, as the impudence of libellers, and the credulity of thoſe who read their books. It is of great concern for the pubilck good, to make it appear by many plain inſtances, that there are no lies which paſſionate men are not capable of divulging againſt their neighbour's honour, and which the people is not capable of believing. It ſignifies nothing to confute thoſe ſatirical writers by the abſurdity of their ſtories. and by their contradictions, they perſiſt in their boldneſs, and new calumniators are no ways daunted thereby. It ſignifies nothing to make thoſe bluſh, who have been raſh and ſimple enough to ſwallow down a thouſand fabulous ſtories, maliciouſly and groſly invented. The very next day, they as readily give ear to others. To this kind of writings we may juſtly apply theſe lines,

> Mais ils trouvent pourtant, quoi qu'on en puiſſe dire,
> Un marchand pour les vendre, & des ſots pour les lire (45),

> - - - *In ſpite of all that one can ſay,*
> *Yet ſtill they find a Bookſeller to vend them,*
> *And fools beſides to read and to commend them,*

nay, what is worſe, to believe them. One ſhould not therefore be weary of collecting ſtories that reſemble the facts which I have juſt now compiled.

Take notice that I do not pretend to juſtify Scultetus in all reſpects. I make no doubt, that he was guilty of the fault, which a court divine does ſeldom avoid. I fancy, he concerned himſelf too much with political affairs, and brought temporal intereſts too often into his ſermons. He was ſomewhat haſty in adviſing the deſtruction of images, and did not conſider, that his maſter was not ſufficiently ſettled upon his throne, to undertake ſuch an innovation. But how can it be helped? Men are blinded by the firſt favours of fortune; they fancy, that ſince the kingdom of God is concerned in the caſe, one good ſucceſs will follow another, as in the time of Joſhua, and that there is nothing like making haſte.

[*E*] *A man having raiſed a ſacramental war in the Palatinate.*] Here follow ſome further ſlanders againſt Scultetus, which he rejects as horrid lies. A certain apoſtate, *ſays he* (46), has given out, that I excited a ſacramental war in the Palatinate, in the year 1603. No body ever heard of ſuch a war, but only of a little diſpute about euchariſtical phraſes, between the profeſſors of the univerſity, and the miniſters of the church. It is well known, *continues he*, that the doctrine of the ſacraments was purified from the Romiſh idolatry, and from ſcholaſtical phraſes by Zuinglius and Oecolampadius; and that the loſs which the canton of Zurich ſuſtained in the fight, wherein Zuinglius was killed, broke the league lately concluded between ſome cantons of Swiſſerland, the city of Straſbourg, and the Landgrave of Heſſe. Whereupon Martin Bucer being too timorous, was afraid that the whole party would ſink, unleſs he ſtrengthened, with a new aliance, the towns of the Upper Germany, and particularly Straſbourg, where he taught. He caſt his eye upon the potent Duke of Saxony, and the better to gain him, he endeavoured to make every body believe that Luther's and Zuinglius's opinions concerning the Lord's-ſupper, were the ſame in the main, and that a mere diſpute about words had prevented their agreement. He further ſaid, that it was better to uſe Luther's than Zuinglius's expreſſions, becauſe the latter ſpoke too meanly of the euchariſt, and the other in a ſublime manner. He inſpired the ſame thoughts into John Calvin, who had fled from France to Straſbourg (47). This intrigue of Bucer introduced the Lutheran expreſſions into the towns of the Upper Germany eſpecially after the fatal concordate of Wittemberg. The Divines, who taught in Saxony, under the Elector Chriſtian, uſed themſelves to thoſe phraſes of Conſubſtantiation, *Phraſibus illis ſynuſiaſticis aſſueverant*; ſo that being expelled after that prince's death, and retiring into the Palatinate, they took the miniſters, who uſed Zuinglius's expreſſions in that country, to be heterodox: which occaſioned a diſſention; but it was ſo happily, and ſo quickly ſuppreſſed, that from that time forward there was viſibly a better underſtanding between the Divines of the univerſity and the reſt. The apoſtate had given out, That the Elector Palatine cauſed a book, written upon that quarrel, to be burnt. Scultetus maintains that it is a lie (48). One may very well preſume, that he ſpeaks truth; for tho' it be a great piece of boldneſs, to affirm that a prince has cauſed ſuch or ſuch a book to be condemned to the fire, when it is falſe; it is ſtill a greater piece of impudence to deny it, when it is true.

A man well acquainted with the ſecret hiſtory of the Church, might inform us that journies and conferences about religion, are generally ſet a foot by ſome temporal motive. Bucer's conduct affords an inſtance of it: I have elſewhere mentioned (49) another like it taken from the ſame Scultetus. We are told that Bucer repented of having mediated the formulary of concord (50). *Bucerus dixit ſe pœnas dare quod cauſam publicam homo privatus voluiſſet componere, & tam multa prava dogmata conciliare* (51). Peter Martyr, who heard him ſay ſo in England, told Bullinger of it; Daniel Toſſanus had it from Bullinger, and Pezelius from Daniel Toſſanus, in the preſence of Scultetus, who inſerted it in the hiſtory of his life.

---

(38) Id. ibid. *pag.* 86.

(39) Id. ibid.

(40) Id. ibid. *pag.* 87.

(41) Id. ibid. *pag.* 89.

(42) Id. ib.

(43) Id. ibid. *pag.* 93.

(44) Id. ibid. *pag.* 99.

(45) Boileau, Satire II, ver. 81.

(46) Scult. ibid. *pag.* 39.

(47) Hence it was, probably, that Calvin in his Catechiſm and elſewhere, made uſe of phraſes, which ſeem to imply the ſubſtantial preſence of the body of our Lord.

(48) Eſſe autem vel à me, vel ab aliis Miniſtris Palatinis, vel ab omnibus conjunctim ſcriptum aliquod ſuper hac re publicatum, quod Sereniſſimi Electoris juſſu Vulcano fuerit conſecratum; tam ego conſtanter nego, quam id deſperatus Apoſtata petulanter affirmat. *Id. ibid. p.* 40, 41.

(49) Remark [*M*] of the article BEZA.

(50) That is to ſay, that of Wittemberg in 1536.

(51) Scultet. ubi ſupra, *p.* 25.

that he would have cleared himſelf better from the charge of his having induced the Elector, his maſter, to accept of the crown of Bohemia, if that enterpriſe had proved ſucceſsful. In that caſe there would have been no neceſſity for him to deny the fact [*F*], he would have been loaded with benedictions, and admired for his prudence: men do very ſeldom judge of things any otherwiſe than by the event.

[*F*] *In that caſe there would have been no neceſſity for him to deny the fact.*] Certain Critics ſevere, and ſometimes too peeviſh, take delight in exclaiming againſt preachers, who encourage princes to make war, without conſidering that they are the miniſters of the Prince of peace. A preacher will patiently bear this cenſure when the war, which he exhorted to, proves very ſucceſsful: but ſince the enterprize of the Elector Palatine, Frederic V, was attended with great misfortunes; it could not but be an unpleaſant thing for a church-man to be told, in a reproachful manner, that he had engaged him in it. If a Divine, preaching before him, had exhorted him to undertake that war, alledging the moſt proper texts of the Scripture, and particularly theſe words of the Pſalmiſt, *Accingere gladio tuo ſuper femur tuum potentiſſime*, &c (52). Which may be tranſlated thus:

Gird on thy ſword, moſt mighty prince,
  And clad in rich array,
With glorious ornaments of pow'r,
  Majeſtic pomp diſplay.
Ride on in ſtate, and ſtill protect
  The weak, the juſt, and true;
Whilſt thy right hand, with ſwift revenge
  Does all thy foes purſue.

Such a preacher, I ſay, would have made a merit of it, if the new king well ſettled upon the throne of Bohemia, had ſecured the peace of Germany, and liberty of conſcience from the ill deſigns of the court of Vienna. But that enterprize proved unfortunate, and then no body was willing to confeſs he had adviſed it: ſo much men are afraid of the wrong cuſtom of judging of things by the event. I call it wrong; for on many thouſand occaſions, there is more prudence in thoſe who do not ſucceed, than in thoſe who do. How many ill-concerted enterprizes have proved ſucceſsful? And how many well laid deſigns have proved fatal? Nay, it frequently falls out, that a great deſign carried on according to the beſt rules of policy, ſucceeds by unforeſeen means, and ſuch as no body depended upon. Be that as it will, the poſture of affairs was ſuch in Germany, when endeavours were uſed to beſtow a crown upon the Elector Palatine, that prudence required the venturing a great deal. By running no hazard, there was ground to fear a ſlavery, which includes all ſorts of miſery under the Popiſh domination; but if the revolution of Bohemia could have been ſupported, it would have put the Proteſtants in a condition to give law. It was therefore chiefly on account of his profeſſion that Abraham Scultetus ought to have been aſhamed of the advices which he had given.

SEBONDE (*a*) (Raymundus) profeſſor of Phyſic, Philoſophy, and Divinity [*A*] at Toulouſe in the XVth century, was a native of Barcelona. He was eſteemed for his parts and learning, and wrote ſome books, whereof the moſt conſiderable is that which is intituled, *Theologia naturalis, ſive Liber Creaturarum.* That book muſt certainly not ſavour of the notions of a vulgar author, nor of one that creeps upon the ſurface of prejudices, ſince Montagne ſet a ſingular value upon it [*B*]. He tranſlated it into French [*C*], and made an apology for it [*D*], which is the longeſt chapter of his eſſays.

[*A*] *Profeſſor of Phyſic*, &c.] I follow Mr de Mauſſac, who gives him all thoſe titles in his *Prolegomena* upon Raymond Martini. ‘ Sciendum eſt, *ſays he,* ‘ Raymundum Sebonde nec Dominicanum, nec in ‘ Hebraicis aliiſque linguis Orientalibus valde verſatum ‘ fuiſſe, quamvis eum ex Judæo Chriſtianum nobis ‘ repræſentet Michael à Monte *toto capite Apologiæ* ‘ . . . . . Sed tantum Hiſpanum & Barcinonenſem atque in Academia Toloſana Medicinæ Profeſſorem, ‘ Philoſophiæ, ſacræque ſcientiæ, eoque gradu illic ‘ inſignitum. - - - - - *We muſt know*, ſays he, *that* ‘ *Raymond Sebonde was neither a Dominican, nor well* ‘ *ſkilled in the Hebrew and Oriental tongues, although* ‘ *Montagne*, through the whole chapter of his Apology, *repreſents him as one who, of a Jew, had turned* ‘ *Chriſtian . . . . but only a Spaniard of Barcelona,* ‘ &c.’ I find in the abridgment of Geſner's *Bibliotheque* the title of a book (1), which is a dialogue, *inter Raimundum Sebundium Artium Medicinæ ac Theologiæ Profeſſorem & Dominicum Seminiverbium.* I have juſt now run over that Apology for Sebonde, on purpoſe to know whether the author repreſents him as a Jew converted to Chriſtianity, and I have not been ſo lucky as to diſcover the leaſt hint of it; but becauſe I have not read every line of it, I do not pretend to deny in all reſpects what Mr de Mauſſac affirms. I ſhall only affirm that Montagne ſays little of Sebonde in all that long Apology, except in the beginning. Note, that Geſner calls him Sebeyde, and ſays, in the margin, he is alſo called Sabunde (2). The title prefixed to the prologue of the *Liber Creaturarum* in the Straſbourg edition, 1496, favours this laſt name: *Compoſitus à venerabili viro magiſtro Raimundo de Sabunde in artibus & medicina doctore, & in ſacra pagina egregio Profeſſore.*

[*B*] *Montagne ſet a ſingular value upon it.*] See the following remark, and the remark [*D*].

[*C*] *He tranſlated it into French.*] I ſhall give an account of this tranſlation: it may help to make Sebonde known. Let us hear what the tranſlator ſays (3); ‘ Peter Brunel (4), a man accounted very ‘ learned in his time, having been for ſome time at ‘ Montagne in my father's company, with ſome other ‘ perſons of his character, preſented him, at his departure, with a book, intituled, *Theologia naturalis,* ‘ *ſive liber creaturarum Raymondi de Sebonde*. And becauſe the Italian and Spaniſh languages were very ‘ familiar to my father, and that book is written ‘ in a kind of Spaniſh jargon, dreſſed out with Latin ‘ terminations, he hoped my father might make uſe ‘ of it with a very little help, and recommended it ‘ to him as a book very uſeful, and ſuited to the ‘ time when he gave it him, which was when the ‘ new doctrine of Luther began to be in vogue. . . . . ‘ (5) My father, ſome days before he died, having ‘ by chance found that book, under a heap of uſeleſs papers, ordered me to tranſlate it into French. ‘ It is an eaſy taſk to tranſlate ſuch authors as him, ‘ where there is little to do but to repreſent the matter; but when a book is written with great politeneſs and elegancy, the tranſlation of it is a difficult ‘ undertaking, eſpecially into a language that has not ‘ the ſame force. It was a very ſtrange and new ‘ employment for me; but being then, as it happened, at leiſure, and being unwilling to diſobey ‘ the leaſt command of the beſt father that ever was, ‘ I did it as well as I could; which pleaſed him wonderfully, and he ordered the tranſlation to be printed, ‘ which was executed after his death.’ La Croix du Maine places that impreſſion in the year 1569. *Thoſe dialogues* concerning the nature of man (ſo he intitles the book of *Raymond Sebonde,* tranſlated by Montagne) *have been printed at Paris for Gabriel Buon, in* 1569, *and for Giles Gourbin, in the ſame year* (6). Du Verdier (7) does not mention the ſame title, nor ſo antient an edition. Theſe are his words: *Le livre des creatures. Raymond Sebon is the author of it: that book contains three hundred and thirty chapters, and was* eſſays. Few people have known exactly in what time Sebonde lived, or what he was. Montagne wonders how ſuch an author could remain in ſo great an obſcurity: *all that we know of him*, ſays he (*b*), *is that he was a Spaniard, who made profeſſion of Phyſic at Toulouſe about two hundred years ago.* Scaliger ſays in a letter written in the year 1606 (*c*), that Sebonde lived at Toulouſe two hundred and thirty years before, or thereabouts. This does not very well agree with the Abbot Trithemius (*d*), who places the death of that Phyſician in the year 1432. I have obſerved in another place (*e*), the other miſtakes of Scaliger concerning that man. He took him to be a Dominican Monk, and aſcribed to him a book againſt the Jews, intituled, *Pugio fidei - - the dagger of faith*, of which Raymund Martini is the author. Our Sebonde was not very well known to Gabriel Naudæus, a man of a prodigious memory, and who had a vaſt knowledge of books and manuſcripts; for ſpeaking of what Scaliger ſays concerning Galatinus and Sebonde, he does not obſerve any fault in it (*f*). What concerns the other writings of our Sebonde will be ſeen in a remark [*E*].

---

(52) Pſalm xlv.

(*a*) See the end of the remark [*A*].

(1) The ſame with *Viola Animæ.*

(2) Geſner, in Bibliotheca.

(3) Montagne, Eſſays, *book ii, ch. xii, pag. m.* 184.

(4) It ſhould be *Bunel.*

(5) Montagne, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 185.

(6) La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Françoiſe, *pag.* 329.

(7) Bibl. *p.* 872, *at the word* Michael de Montagne.

(*b*) Eſſays, *lib. ii, ch. xii, p.* 186, of Tom. ii, Paris 1659, in 12mo.

(*c*) It is the 241ſt.

(*d*) *See Mauſſac's* Prolegomena *prefixed to the* Pugio fidei.

(*e*) In the remark [*C*] of the article MARTINI.

(*f*) Naudæus, in Bibliogr. Polit.

---

printed at Paris in 8vo, for Giles Gourbin, in 1581. *I have ſeen*, continues he, *another tranſlation of the ſame book in very old French.* Theſe laſt words ſhew he does not mean John Martin's tranſlation publiſhed in the year 1551 (8). There is another reaſon for it, *viz.* That John Martin and Montagne did not tranſlate the ſame book. The book tranſlated by John Martin contains ſeven dialogues. But the book tranſlated by Montagne is not written by way of dialogue: it is divided into three hundred and thirty chapters, as du Verdier obſerves; and it is certain there is but one man, who ſpeaks in the book of Sebonde, which contains three hundred and thirty chapters. From whence we may infer that La Croix du Maine does not well quote the title of Montagne's tranſlation, and that the dialogues of Sebonde are only a cold diſh heated again; for it appears from the very title of the tranſlation that it contains the ſame things as the book of the Creatures. The title runs thus: *La Theologie naturelle de Raymond Sebond compriſe en ſept dialogues intitulez autrement, de la nature de l'homme* (9). See hereafter the titles of the books of that doctor.

(*D*] *He made an apology for it.*] He himſelf tells us what moved him to it (10). I thought the notions of 'that author were very fine, the contexture of his diſ'courſe very cloſe, and his deſign very pious. And 'becauſe many people read that book, and parti'cularly the ladies, to whom we ought to be more 'ſerviceable, I have often had occaſion to help them, 'by anſwering two main objections raiſed againſt that 'author. His deſign is noble and bold, for he un'dertakes to eſtabliſh and prove againſt the Atheiſts 'all the articles of the Chriſtian religion, by natural 'and human arguments.' This occaſioned the two objections which Montagne propoſed to anſwer. Some ſaid (11) *that the Chriſtians hurt themſelves by pretending to build their belief upon human arguments, ſince it is the work of faith, and of a particular inſpiration of the divine grace.* Others ſaid (12), that *Sebonde's arguments were weak and unfit to prove what he intends, and undertook to confute them eaſily.* Montagne thought himſelf obliged to anſwer (13) the former gently and reſpectfully, becauſe it ſeemed to him that there was ſomething of a pious zeal in their objection: but, ſays he (14), the others *ought to be handled more roughly, for they are more dangerous and malicious than the firſt.* The method he took, was *to wreſt out of their hands the weak arms of their reaſon*, by ſhewing them the emptineſs and ignorance of men, and the divine Majeſty, *to which alone belongs knowledge.* Thoſe, who know Montagne's character, may eaſily gueſs that he gave himſelf a large ſcope. The judgment he makes of the arguments alledged by his author, is too edifying not to be inſerted in this place. *To ſpeak the truth*, ſays (15), *I find*, him ſo reſolute and ſucceſsful in eſtabliſhing the articles of the Chriſtian religion by natural proofs, *that I think no body can go farther than he upon that ſubject, and that none did ever equal him . . . I aſked formerly Hadrian Turnebus, a very knowing man, what that book might be: he anſwered, that he thought it was a quinteſſence drawn out of Thomas Aquinas; and indeed that vaſt genius, full of an unbounded learning, and of an admirable ſubtilty, was the only man capable of ſuch notions . . . . . I know*, Montagne goes on (16), *a man of note, bred up a ſcholar, who confeſſed to me, that he had been reclaimed from his unbelief, by Sebonde's arguments.* Every body has not ſo good an opinion of that book as Montagne. Father Theophilus Raynaud (17) ſpeaks of it with contempt; and a Lutheran profeſſor (18) laughed heartily at Comenius, for ſaying (19) that Sebonde has ſo demonſtratively proved whatever concerns the knowledge and glory of GOD, and the knowledge and ſalvation of man, that nothing can be alledged againſt it. That profeſſor maintains, that in many things, which are not very obſcure, that Spaniard argues pitifully, and he alledges, as an inſtance of it, the explication of the cauſes which produce diſcord among men.

[*E*] *The other writings of our Sebonde.*] His other books are *Quæſtiones diſputatæ. Viola animæ per modum dialogi de hominis natura tractans ad cognoſcendum ſe, Deum & hominem, & omne debitum quo Deo obligatur & proximo. Coloniæ apud Henricum Quentel* 1501, in 4to (20). The dialogues *de Natura Hominis*, printed at Lyons in 1568, are probably the ſame book with *Viola Animæ*; the latter differs from the *Theologia Naturalis*, only as to the method. This plainly appears from the bare conſideration of the following title: *Theologia naturalis, ſive liber Creaturarum, ſpecialiter de homine & de natura ejus in quantum homo, & de his quæ ſunt ei neceſſaria ad cognoſcendum ſe ipſum & deum, & omne debitum ad quod homo tenetur & obligatur tam Deo quam proximo.* The author was one of thoſe men, who, when they have publiſhed a book which pleaſes them, or for which they are eſteemed, produce it from time to time under different attires, like thoſe Cooks, who ſerve the ſame meat dreſſed in different ways. I never ſaw any body that did not allow, that the firſt edition of the *Theologia Naturalis* is that of Paris, 1509: neverthele ſs, I have one of Straſbourg, in folio, printed in a Gothic letter, in the year 1496.

(8) Ibid. *p.* 720.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Montagne, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 186.

(11) Ib. *p.* 187.

(12) Ib. *p.* 202.

(13) Pag. 187.

(14) Pag. 202.

(15) Pag. 186.

(16) Pag. 201.

(17) Prolegomen. *Theolog. Nat.* num. 86.

(18) Jacob. Thomaſius, Præfat. LXXVII, *Leipſ.* 1681.

(19) Comenius, de uno neceſſario, *cap. vi, p.* 49.

(20) *See the* Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque.

SEDULIUS (CAIUS CÆLIUS, or CÆCILIUS) flouriſhed in the Vth century [*A*]. He was a prieſt (*a*), and wrote a Poem, intituled, *Paſchale Carmen*, and a book in proſe upon the ſame ſubject, intituled, *Paſchale Opus.* Theſe two pieces have been

(*a*) See the remark [*C*] towards the end.

[*A*] *He flouriſhed in the Vth century.*] Some think he wrote his Poem under the reign of Theodoſius the younger, and Valentinian III. This is obſerved in the manuſcript of Petrus Pithœus (1), and in another antient manuſcript mentioned by Archbiſhop Uſher (2). According to this way of reckoning he muſt have flouriſhed about the year 430. Father Sirmond found in the beſt manuſcripts of Gennadius, that Sedulius died in the reign of the emperors above-mentioned (3). Neverthe leſs Archbiſhop Uſher places him after the year 470. The reaſon alledged by him, *viz.* That Sedulius's book was found ſcattered among his papers, and put into a good order, and publiſhed by the conſul Turcius Ruſius Aſterius (4), is not a convincing one; for that Aſterius may very well be the ſame that was conſul with Protogenes in the year 449. And though it were granted to Archbiſhop Uſher, that it is he who was conſul with Præſidius, in the year 494; yet there will be no neceſſity to grant him what he ſays, ſince there might have been ſome years between the death of Sedulius, and the time when his book was put into order, and imparted to the public (5). There is in the

(1) *See Father Labbe*, Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. ii, p.* 329.

(2) Iis conſona exhibet Uſſerius ex Thorneyana Bibliotheca. *Id. ibid.*

(3) Id. ibid. *pag.* 333, 334.

(4) See Father Labbe, *ibid. pag.* 325.

(5) See Labbe, *ibid. pag.* 333, 334.

been preſerved [*B*]. He is ſaid to have written a commentary upon St Paul's Epiſtles, but it ought rather to be aſcribed to one Sedulius a Scotchman, of a much later ſtanding [*C*]. We are told that the fault of a tranſcriber, who put the word *Hæreticis* inſtead of *Heroicis*, was the cauſe why the Poet Sedulius was hated; and that this hatred did extend to all the Poets [*D*]. It is allowed that he was a man *of parts*, and that *there*

the old editions of the *Carmen Paſchale*, an epiſtle dedicatory in verſe, from which it ſhould be inferred, that this work was dedicated to the Emperor Theodoſius I; but it is very likely that this epiſtle belonged to a more antient Poem, and that it was prefixed to this by a miſtake, on account of the conformity of the ſubjects. This is Archbiſhop Uſher's, and Father Labbe's opinion (6). However it be, it is not doubted but that Sigebert is miſtaken, who ſays, that Sedulius flouriſhed in the reign of Conſtans and Conſtantius; that is, between the year 340, and the year 350. It is alſo thought that Albertus Stadenſis is in the wrong, to place him about the year 378 (7). What is certain is, that this Poem of Sedulius came out before Pope Gelaſius made his decree, and conſequently before the year 496, in which that Biſhop of Rome died: That, I ſay, is very certain; for this piece of Sedulius is mentioned in that decree (8).

[*B*] *Theſe two pieces have been preſerved.*] The *Paſchale Carmen, id eſt, de Chriſti miraculis libri quinque* (9), has been often printed with the epiſtle dedicatory to the prieſt Macedonius and without it. The *Paſchale Opus*, which is alſo divided into five books, and dedicated to the ſame Macedonius, was publiſhed at Paris by Franciſcus Juretus in 1585, from Pithœus's manuſcript. It is the firſt edition. Note that the prieſt Macedonius exhorted the author to put the *Paſchale Carmen* into proſe: and therefore Sigebert is miſtaken, who ſays that the proſe was publiſhed before the verſes. *Sedulius Epiſcopus ad Macedonium Preſbyterum ſcripſit libros de miraculis Veteris & Novi Teſtamenti, quos poſtea ſub metrica lege redactos prætitulavit Paſchale carmen* (10). We have alſo ſome other Poems of Sedulius: the firſt edition of his poetical works is that of Aldus Manutius 1502. The beſt is that of Paris 1624, in the eighth volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. See Father Labbe (11) and Dr Cave (12).

[*C*] *To one* Sedulius *a Scotchman, of a much later ſtanding.*] Mention is made of one Sedulius *Epiſcopus Britanniæ*, who, together with Ferguſtus a Scotch biſhop, aſſiſted at a council held at Rome in the year 721. Bale, Simler, and ſome others, call that Sedulius biſhop of the Southern Scotch, and ſay he writ the canons of a council held at Rome. The ſubſcriptions in the printed books run thus, *Sedulius Epiſcopus Britanniæ de genere Scotorum, & Ferguſtus Epiſcopus Scotiæ Pictus huic conſtituto à nobis promulgato ſubſcripſimus* (13). Hepidannus (14) a Monk of St Gall mentions one Sedulius a Scotchman, under the year 818. *Sedulius Scotus clarus habetur.* It is to him that Father Labbe (15) aſcribes the *Collectaneum ſive explanatio in omnes epiſtolas S. Pauli*, printed firſt at Baſil in 1528, and then inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. It is nothing elſe but a rhapſody made up of ſeveral extracts from Origen, Euſebius, St Jerom, *&c.* Aubertin (16) aſcribes it to Biſhop Sedulius, who, together with Ferguſtus, aſſiſted at a council of Rome under Gregory II, or Gregory III. Here follow the reaſons alledged by Father Labbe. That manner of commenting upon the ſcripture, does very much ſavour of the IXth century (17), and it ſeems that the author of that *Collectaneum in Paulum*, wrote likewiſe the *Collectaneum in Matthæum*, which is to be found in the library of the Jeſuits of Paris, written upon very fine parchment, and with a very fair hand, above ſeven or eight hundred years old. Were it true that the *Collectaneum in Matthæum*, and the *Collectaneum in Paulum* were written by one and the ſame author, it would afford us a convincing proof againſt the learned Uſher, Archbiſhop of Armagh, who pretended that the *Collectaneum in Paulum* was the work of the ſame Sedulius, who wrote the *Carmen Paſchale* in the Vth century; for the author of the *Collectaneum in Matthæum*, quotes not only the Poet Sedulius, but alſo Pope Gregory I, St Iſidorus, Arculfus, and the venerable Bede, who flouriſhed in the VIIIth century (18). If what Mr Du Pin affirms (19), were true, *viz.* That the author of the *Collectaneum in Paulum* quotes Pope St Gregory and the venerable Bede; Father Labbe would be very much to blame for not alledging that reaſon againſt Archbiſhop Uſher, and I ſhould very much wonder at Uſher's poſitively ſaying, that the Poet Sedulius wrote the commentary upon St Paul's epiſtles. I do not wonder that he ſaid ſo, though doubtleſs he was not ignorant that the Jeſuit *Juſtiniani* (20) obſerves, that the author of that *Collectaneum in Paulum* tranſcribed ſome words from the twenty-firſt chapter of the nineteenth book of St Gregory's *Moralia* upon Job; for as he knew that this Jeſuit declares, that thoſe words were tranſcribed without naming St Gregory, *cujus verba tranſcripſit tacito ejus nomine*, he might have thought that Sedulius did not tranſcribe from St Gregory, but that this Pope tranſcribed from Sedulius. He was not obliged to be of Juſtiniani's opinion, who does not think it likely that St Gregory ſhould have borrowed any thing from Sedulius: ‘Nec veriſimile videatur Gregorium ea à Sedulio mutuatum eſſe, cum plane Gregoriani ſtyli ſimplicitatem redoleant qui more ſuo hæc Apoſtoli verba non tam ad ſcribentis mentem, quàm aptè ad mores informandos explicat (21). - - - *Nor does it ſeem probable that Gregory borrowed theſe things from Sedulius, ſince they plainly ſavour of the ſimplicity of Gregory's ſtyle, who, according to his cuſtom, in explaining theſe words of the Apoſtle, does not ſo much conſider the expreſs meaning of the author, as how they may be fitly applied to form the manners.*’ All this ſerves to ſhew that Mr du Pin is miſtaken.

It would not be ſufficient to know that Sedulius, the author of that commentary upon St Paul, is a different man from Sedulius the Poet; it is further neceſſary to know whether the latter was a Scotchman. Many affirm it, but I do not find they alledge good reaſons for it. The inſcription of an excellent manuſcript in the abbey of Fulde, *Sedulii Scoti Hibernienſis in omnes Epiſtolas Pauli collectaneum*, which Archbiſhop Uſher alledges as a very good argument, can be of no force, ſo long as one may believe with great probability, that the author of that *Collectaneum* is not the Poet Sedulius. Trithemius may repeat as often as he pleaſes, that theſe words *Sedulius Scotigena*, are prefixed to a book of letters, he will never prove the affirmative of this queſtion. It ſhould be proved firſt of all that Sedulius the Poet is the author of thoſe letters. In a word, ſince the antient authors never ſaid that our Sedulius was a Scotchman, we are not at all to mind what the following ages can ſuggeſt to us upon that head. One might lay ſome ſtreſs upon it, if there had been no Sedulius, that was a Scotchman; but ſince it is certain that there has been one or two, it is no difficult thing to apprehend that the Poet has been confounded with one of them. See Father Labbe (22).

It were to be wiſhed that he had made as many diſcuſſions upon each eccleſiaſtical writer, as upon the Poet Sedulius. I obſerve, by the by, that he has very well confuted thoſe, who pretend that this Poet was a Biſhop. He alledges the ſilence of the antients; he ſhews that Gennadius's teſtimony is inſignificant: Gennadius, ſays he, Salvian, Proſper Aquitanus, and ſome others, have been improperly ſtiled biſhops by ſeveral authors. The title of *Antiſtes* beſtowed upon Sedulius was beſtowed upon prieſts. Dexter's Chronicle, wherein mention is made of Sedulius, *Epiſcopus Oretanus* in the year 428, is a ſuppoſititious book. Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis would not have ſtiled Sedulius barely a prieſt, if he could have honoured the Spaniſh nation with ſuch a biſhop (23).

[*D*] *The fault of a tranſcriber . . . . was the cauſe . . . . that the Poet Sedulius was hated, and that this hatred did extend to all the Poets.*] It is ſaid that Paul II, conceived a great hatred againſt the Poets, by reaſon of that fault of the tranſcribers, and that many Profeſſors of the Canon Law, for the ſame reaſon, looked upon all ſorts of Poems as heretical works. What a ridiculous thing would this be! Let us quote Mr de Boiſſieu. ‘Veteres librarios indiligenter ſcripſiſſe, vel ex Tullii, Strabonis, Hieronymi, & aliorum querelis patet. Unde multi graviſſimorum virorum errores emanarunt: quod hoc duntaxat exemplo probaſſe mihi ſufficiat. Cùm in prima parte Decreti,

A remarkable Story of St Ursula from ye Jesuit Sirmond. Ursula. Undecimilla blundered into, Undecim mille i.e. 11000 —

---

(6) See the ſame, *ibid. pag.* 333.

(7) See the ſame, *pag.* 332.

(8) Gratian. Can. Sancta Romana, *Diſt. XV*, *apud* Labbe, *ibid. pag.* 325.

(9) Mr du Pin, *Bibl. Tom. iii*, *Part. ii*, *p.* 75, of the Dutch Edition mentions only four books.

(10) Sigebertus, *cap. vi*, Catalogi, *apud* Labbe, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 328, 329.

(11) Labbe, *ibid. pag.* 335.

(12) Cave, Hiſtor. Liter. *pag.* 337.

(13) Taken from Father Labbe, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 328.

(14) He compoſed ſome ſhort Annals inſerted by du Cheſne, in the third volume of his Collection of the Hiſtorians of France.

(15) Labbe, ubi ſupra, *p.* 338.

(16) See Labbe, *ibid.*

(17) Id. ib. *pag.* 335.

(18) See Labbe, *ibid.*

(19) Du Pin, ubi ſupra. *pag.* 175.

(20) Benedict. Juſtinianus in I ad Corinth. *cap. vi, ver.* 5, *apud* Labbe, *ibid. pag.* 337.

(21) Idem, *apud* eundem, *p.* 338.

(22) Labbe, ubi ſupra, *p.* 330.

(23) Ex eodem, *pag.* 331, 332.

there is ſomething great and noble in the turn of his Poem, that his thoughts are Poetical, and his verſes tolerable (b) [*E*]. What Moreri ſays of him wants to be new moulded from the beginning to the end.

(*b*) Du Pin, Bibl. *Tom. iv, pag. m.* 75.

‘ Decreti, diſtinct. 15. c. 3. hæc Gelaſii Pontificis verba, *Item venerabilis viri Sedulii Paſchale opus, quod heroïcis verſibus deſcripſit, inſigni laude præferimus*, depravata eſſent, & pro *heroïcis*, librariorum incuria, legeretur, *hæreticis*, mendum hoc, Paulum ſecundum, Pontificem maximum ad Poëtarum capitale odium perduxit, & plurimis aliis, Legum Profeſſoribus, impoſuit, ut omnia poëmata, quamvis ſacra, hæretica eſſe duxerint; ut Pierius Valerianus, in oratione *pro Sacerdotum barbis* ſcriptum reliquit. O rem ridiculam, Cato, & jocoſam (24). - - - *The complaints of Tully, Strabo, Jerom, and others make it very plain that the old tranſcribers wrote incorrectly; from whence proceeded the errors of many great men. It will be ſufficient for me to prove this by one example. Whereas in the firſt part of the decree, theſe words of Pope Gelaſius*, We likewiſe honour and praiſe very much the Paſchal performance of the venerable Sedulius, which he wrote in heroic verſe, *were corrupted, and through the careleſſneſs of the tranſcribers the word* Heretic *was written inſtead of* Heroic, *this error induced Paul II, &c. . . . . as Pierius Valerianus has written in his Oration, &c. A merry ſtory indeed!* Others apply this to Pope Hadrian VI. Read the following paſſage, and compare it exactly with Boiſſieu's words. *Unum adhuc addam, unde pateat, quæ damna plerunque depravati Codices afferant. In Canonibus à Gratiano* digeſtis, diſt. 15. *Ubi recitatur inſigniter ſalutare Decretum Gelaſii, hæc ſententia eſt:* Venerabilis viri Sedulii Paſchale opus, quod heroïcis deſcripſit verſibus, inſigni laude proferendum. *Ibi vulgata ante hac exemplaria pro* heroicis, hæreticis *habuêre.* ‘ *Quod bonis quibuſdam Canoniſtis ſuſpicionem movit, Poëmata omnia eſſe hæretica, Poëtaſque inter pios, etſi ſacra tractent, neutiquam annumerari.*’ *Id quod* Hadriano *illi Batavo, qui Caroli V. Præceptor fuerat, adeò perſuaſum fuit, ut nullum hominum genus majori proſequeretur odio, quàm Poëtas.* ‘ *Et adhuc aliqui, ut Pierius clariſſimus affirmat, non mali alioqui præſules, depravata illius loci lectione inducti, neminem ſacerdotio dignum arbitrantur, qui unquam in Parnaſſo ſomniarit* (25).’ By comparing thoſe two paſſages one with another, there is ground to ſuſpect that one of thoſe two authors quoted Pierius Valerianus without reading him; for if what concerns Paul II (26), is to be found in that writer, how comes it that Philippus Carolus ſays nothing of it? Why does he only mention Hadrian VI? Take notice that what he ſays of this laſt Pope does not prove that the word *hæreticis* inſtead of *heroicis* made him hate the Poets. He only ſays occaſionally that Hadrian VI, being fully perſuaded that they were unworthy to be numbered among pious men, hated them to the higheſt degree. And therefore I do not pretend to prove by the teſtimony of that author, that what Boiſſieu ſays of Paul II, is applied to Hadrian VI. The proof I bring for it is a paſſage probably occaſioned by a careleſs and haſty reading of Philippus Carolus's words. ‘ Ajunt eum (*Hadrianum*) nullum hominum genus majore proſecutum fuiſſe odio quam poëtas, eo quod in antiquis exemplaribus Canonum à Gratiano digeſtorum legatur decretum Gelaſii in hæc verba: *Venerabilis viri Sedulii Paſchale opus, quod hæreticis deſcripſit verſibus, &c.* cum ibi *heroicis* legi debere jam pridem monuerint viri eruditi (27). - - - *They ſay that he* (*meaning* Hadrian) *hated no ſort of men more than the Poets, becauſe in the old copies of the Canons, digeſted by Gratian, the decree of Gelaſius was thus worded:* Venerabilis viri, *&c.*’

I ſuſpect the truth of this account, and am apt to take it for a ſtory forged by the Italian Humaniſts, on purpoſe to ridicule the enemies of good literature. Nevertheleſs I do not deny that the fault of a tranſcriber may have frequently produced diſorders both in the heart and underſtanding. But I know that Paul II, and Hadrian VI, had ſome other reaſons for hating the Poets; and I cannot apprehend that ignorance ſhould be able to make one and the ſame perſon act ſo contrary to good ſenſe as to hate the Poets for the reaſon alledged here, and yet to reverence Pope Gelaſius: for it ought to be obſerved that the decree into which the word *hæreticis* had crept inſtead of *heroicis* contains an encomium upon Sedulius's Poem. It is alſo to be obſerved that we are not told that this miſtake did leſſen in the leaſt the veneration that Pontif was in.

[*E*] *It is allowed that he was a man of great parts, and that there is ſomething noble in the turn of his Poem, &c.*] I ſhall add to this teſtimony of Mr du Pin Borrichius's own words, whereof Mr Baillet gives us the ſenſe (28). ‘ Dictio *Sedulii* facilis, ingenioſa, numeroſa, perſpicua, ſic ſatis munda (ſi excipias proſodica quædam delicta) (29). - - - *Sedulius's ſtyle is eaſy, harmonious, elegant, perſpicuous, and correct enough, (if you only except a few errors in the proſody).*’ Venantius Fortunatus beſtows pretty large encomiums upon our Poet.

Quod tonat Ambroſius, Hieronymus atque coruſcat,
  Sive Auguſtinus fonte fluente rigat,
Sedulius dulcis, quod Oroſius edit acutus,
  Regula Cæſarii linea nata ſibi eſt (30).

In thunder Ambroſe does his mind declare,
Jerom in words that ſwift as light'ning are;
Sedulius is ſweet, Oroſius ſowre,
And Auſtin waters like a ſummer ſhow'r:
The rule of great Cæſarius is a line
Made for himſelf, and perfectly divine.

And in another place:

Majeſtatis opus metri canit arte Juvencus,
Hinc quoque conſpicui radiavit lingua Seduli (31).

The learn'd Juvencus in heroic verſe
Does the great work of majeſty rehearſe.
Hence too Sedulius choſe his radiant theme,
And grew conſpicuous in the book of fame.

See ſome other encomiums in Father Labbe (32).

(24) Dionyſ. Salvagnius Boeſſius, Not. ad Poëm. Ovidii in Ibin, *pag. m.* 127.

(25) Philippus Carolus, *in* Diſſertat. de Criticis, *pag.* 17, 18. *It is prefixed to his notes upon Aulus Gellius, printed at Nuremberg, in* 1663.

(26) I have conſulted the diſſertation of Pierius Valerianus, *pro Sacerdotum barbis*, and I have found in *pag.* 24, of the Paris edition 1531, *apud Chriſt. Wechel*, the ſenſe of the whole quotation of Philippus Carolus, but nothing concerning Paul II.

(27) Autor anonymus Notar. ad Sannazarii Poëmata, *Epig. IV, lib. iii, pag.* 237, *Edit. Amſtel.* 1689.

(28) Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1192.

(29) Borrich. Diſſert. de Poëtis, *pag.* 76.

(30) Venant. Fortunatus, Epig. I, *lib. viii, apud* Phil. Labbe, de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt. *Tom. ii, pag.* 326.

(31) *Id. initio, lib. i,* de Vita Sancti Martini, *apud eund. ibid.*

(32) Labbe, *ibid. pag.* 327.

SEGLA (WILLIAM DE, SIEUR DE CAIRAS) was counſellor in the parliament of Toulouſe towards the beginning of the XVIIth century. It was he, who made a report of a criminal proceſs, which has been placed among the Tragical Hiſtories of that time [*A*], and for the clearing up of which Mr de Verdun, firſt preſident in the parliament

---

[*A*] *Among the tragical Hiſtories of that time.*] There is an account of it in the *Mercure François* (1). Violante de Bats, a native of Spain, and a very leud woman, conſented to the aſſaſſination of her huſband, being angry with him, becauſe he would not allow her the liberty ſhe deſired of receiving her lovers, the chief of whom was an Auguſtin Monk, Profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity of Toulouſe. His name was Peter Arias Burdeus, and he was born at Granada in Spain. He, and a counſellor in the Seneſchal's court were the chief contrivers of the aſſaſſination. That woman's huſband was killed with ſeventeen wounds, in the month of July 1608. Burdeus being convicted of adultery and murder was condemned to be beheaded and quartered, which was executed in the month of February 1609. Violante was likewiſe put to death with ſome others of her ruffians. Burdeus's adultery ‘ was proved againſt him by a ſufficient number of witneſſes, *viz.* by a woman who maintained in the preſence of him and Violante, that ſhe had ſeen them in the very fact in the wood of the farm of Launaquet, belonging to a convent of Nuns; and by another, who affirmed that ſhe had ſeen them going into the ſaid wood by themſelves. There were alſo

(1) Tom. i, fol. 325 verſo, & ſeq. ad ann. 1609.

parliament of Toulouſe, took all poſſible pains. The parties accuſed were at laſt convicted, and puniſhed according to their deſerts: and becauſe William de Segla was thoroughly acquainted with that cauſe, the firſt preſident (a) exhorted him to publiſh it. The Latin letter he received from him was prefixed to the book which he put out, wherein you find, beſides an account of the proceedings, a hundred and thirty one obſervations full of learning [B]. The family of Segla is ſtill in being at Toulouſe, where they hold places in the parliament.

(a) In 1611, Mr de Verdun was then firſt preſident in the parliament of Paris.

‘ſome other particular witneſſes, one of which had ſeen them kiſs one another in a laſcivious manner, while they were ſitting at table in his garden in one of the ſuburbs of the town. The other had ſeen them twice in a chamber for the ſpace of two hours. . . . . That crime was alſo called a ſacrilege, there being ſome ground to ſuſpect that he had lain with Violante in a confeſſionary in St James's church; for two witneſſes depoſed that he had been two full hours in the ſaid confeſſionary with a pretty tall gentlewoman, ſuch as Violante was. Beſides, there was a ſpiritual inceſt and adultery in the caſe, becauſe Violante was his daughter by confeſſion, whom he owned to have confeſſed two or three times in our Lady's chappel in the cloyſter of the convent of the Auguſtins. As for what concerns the murder the common report, &c (2).’

[B] *Obſervations full of learning.*] They are intermixed with the moſt curious paſſages of the antient authors, according to the faſhion of that time. Thoſe, which concern the diſorders occaſioned by love, and the artifices of courtezans, have not been forgotten. That book was printed at Paris in the year 1613, in 8vo, Corras, a counſellor in the parliament of Toulouſe, who made a report of the proceſs of the man, who through an impoſture, pretended to be Martin Guerre, had before publiſhed a like commentary upon a proceſs and a ſentence.

SEYMOUR (ANNE, MARGARET, and JOAN) three ſiſters illuſtrious for their learning in England in the XVIth century. They compoſed a hundred and four Latin diſtichs upon the death of Margaret de Valois Queen of Navarre, and ſiſter to Francis I, which were ſoon after tranſlated into Greek, French, and Italian, and printed at Paris in the year 1551, with this title, *Tombeau de Marguerite de Valois Royne de Navarre.* Nicolas Deniſot (a), who had been tutor to theſe three learned Engliſh ladies [A], made a collection containing the tranſlations of their diſtichs, and ſome other verſes both in their praiſe, and upon the death of the Queen of Navarre, and dedicated it to Margaret de Valois Ducheſs of Berry, ſiſter to Henry II [B]. The little

(a) He ſtyled himſelf d'Alſinois, *Alcinous Comes* in Latin, as chancellor de l'Hôpital calls him.

[A] *Deniſot . . . . had been tutor to theſe three learned Engliſh ladies.*] Ronſard deſerves to be heard upon this head, tho' his phraſes ſavour of the barbarouſneſs, that was ſtill in the French language when he wrote.

Denizot ſe vante heuré
D'avoir oublié ſa terre,
Et paſſager, demeuré
Trois ans en voſtre Angleterre,
Et d'avoir cogneu vos yeux,
Où les Amours gracieux
Doucement leurs fleſches dardent
Contre ceux qui vous regardent:
  Voir & d'avoir quelquefois
Tant levé ſa petiteſſe,
Que ſous l'outil de ſa vois
Rabota voſtre jeuneſſe,
Vous ouvrant les beaux ſecrets
Des vieux Latins & des Grecs,
Don't l'honneur ſe renouvelle
Par voſtre Muſe nouvelle (1).

Denizot vaunts that he was bleſt
  For having left his native ſhore,
And lived in England as a gueſt
  Full ſix and thirty months; - - - or more.
'Twas there he knew your eyes ſo well,
Where all the graceful cupids dwell,
And ſoftly let their arrows fly
At every gazing ſtander-by.
For this he likewiſe did rejoice,
  Accounting it his higheſt praiſe,
That you allow'd his humble voice
  Your tender ſentiments to raiſe,
While it diſcloſed unto your view,
All that the Greeks or Romans knew,
Whoſe honour is reviv'd again
By your ſweet Muſe's rival ſtrain.

The ode, that contains theſe verſes, was printed in the collection of the diſtichs; but Ronſard made many alterations in it afterwards. I make uſe of the laſt editions.

[B . . . *He dedicated the whole to Margaret . . . ſiſter to Henry II.*] The Chancellor *de l'Hoſpital* did not forget that circumſtance in the following verſes, which he made on that learned princeſs.

Et tibi judicium, tibi doctas Delius aures
Præbuit ac regale referſit pectus honeſtis
Artibus: eximiam raramque in Principe laudem.
Tantum nulla decus tulit unquam regia virgo.
Innumeros hæc cauſa viros, ut condere carmen
Utque ſuos vellent tibi conſecrare labores
Impulit: hæc fuit iis ſcribendi cauſa poëtis,
Virginibuſque tribus veſtigia preſſa terendi.
Atque hic longinquis ſua cœpit prima Britannis
Aureus incrementa liber ſermone Latino.
Inde per Eurypos & formidabile nautis
Invadens ſpatium Belgas devenit & urbem
Pariſiam, novus hoſpes iit perque ora manuſque.
Res placuit noſtris argumentumque poetis:
Continuoque alii maternâ vertere linguâ.
Grecâ alii, atque Itala, mox & nova jungere verſis
Collibuit, juſtique voluminis addere formam.

Phœbus your judgment and your ear refin'd,
With noble arts repleniſhing your mind:
High praiſe indeed! But ſuch a praiſe as we
Moſt ſeldom due to your high ſtation ſee.
No royal virgin ever did poſſeſs
True fame to ſuch a glorious exceſs.
Hence is it that ſo many authors do
Inſcribe and conſecrate their works to you:
From hence inſpir'd the chearful poets ſing,
And the three virgins to their chorus bring.
Far off in Britiſh land this golden book
In Latin verſe it's firſt beginning took.
It was tranſported into Belgium next,
Paſſing the formidable ſpace betwixt.
To Paris laſt the welcome ſtranger came,
Was read by all and praiſ'd. The noble Theme

---

(2) Segla, Hiſt. tragique, p. 14, & ſeq.

(1) Ronſard, ubi infra, pag. 618.

little exactneſs of thoſe, who have mentioned this collection [*C*], occaſioned my affirming in the project of this Dictionary, that the diſtichs were a different work from the epitaphs on the Queen of Navarre. I mend that fault now, and I do ingenuouſly confeſs that I have diſcovered the falſity of my conjectures by reading the epitaph of that queen. Which ſhould teach us, that a man ought to be very cautious in making conjectures about matters of fact. It is much better for him to ſuſpend his judgment till he has ſeen all the writings concerning it. I retract what I have ſaid againſt Mr Joli, and Moreri (*b*); and I do particularly acknowledge that they are excuſable, for calling thoſe three ſiſters PRINCESSES, for they may poſſibly have ſeen that title prefixed to the collection publiſhed at Paris by Deniſot; but I maintain ſtill that they were not princeſſes. They have been praiſed by divers authors, particularly by Ronſard [*D*], and Nicolas de Herberai Sieur des Eſſars [*E*], ſo well known by his French tranſlation of Amadis de Gaule. It is ſomewhat ſtrange that they ſhould be ſo little known at this day [*F*].

In all our Poets rouz'd the like deſire,
Some quickly cloth'd it in a French attire:
By ſome it was tranſlated into Greek;
And others made it in Italian ſpeak.
Many did furniſh it with new ſupplies,
To make the volume of a proper ſize.

[*C*] *The little exactneſs of thoſe who had mentioned this collection.*] Ronſard calls the diſtichs of thoſe three ſiſters *a Chriſtian ſong*. Richelet, who commented upon him, obſerves, that they were Chriſtian diſtichs. Neither of them ſays any thing, whereby it may appear that thoſe diſtichs concerned the deceaſed Queen of Navarre. Neither does Chancellor de l'Hoſpital intimate any ſuch thing. Who therefore would have thought that they were epitaphs upon a queen? What do poets commonly put into ſuch pieces but extravagant flatteries? Can any thing be more remote from Pibrac's Quatrains, or Michael Verin's diſtichs, than the tears of Poets upon the graves of great perſons? I thought therefore (2), that thoſe diſtichs ſtiled *Chriſtian* were moral ſentences, and not funeral elegies, and laviſhed incenſe. It would have deceived better judges than I am. But ſince I have ſeen that work, I muſt acknowledge that there are more chriſtian and moral reflections than poetical phraſes, in ſome verſes of thoſe illuſtrious ſiſters.

[*D*] *They have been praiſed particularly by Ronſard.*] His ode on thoſe three Engliſh ladies (3), contains this praiſe among others, that if Orpheus heard them, he would be their ſcholar.

Mais ſi ce harpeur fameux
Oyoit le chant des Serenes,
Qui ſonne aux bords eſcumeux
Des Albionnes arenes
Son Luth Payen il fendroit,
Et diſciple ſe rendroit
Deſſous leur chanſon Chreſtienne,
Dont la voix paſſe la ſienne.

. . . . .

La ſcience auparavant
Si long tems Orientale
Peu à peu marchant avant,
S'apparoiſt occidentale;
Et ſans jamais ſe borner
N'a point ceſſé de tourner,
Tant qu'elle ſoit parvenuë
A l'autre rive incogneuë.
Là de ſon grave ſourcy
Vint affoler le courage
De ces trois Vierges icy,
Les trois ſeules de nôtre âge.
Et ſi bien les ſceut tenter,
Qu'ores on les oit chanter
Maint vers jumeau, qui ſurmonte
Les noſtres, rouges de honte (4).

If that harper ſo renown'd,
Could theſe charming ſyrens hear
From the ſhores of Albion ſound,
Wonder would perplex his ear.
He would break his pagan lyre,
And their ſcholar turn'd deſire
Their ſweet Chriſtian ſong to know
Which his own ſurpaſſes ſo.

. . . . .

Learning, for ſo many years
To the Eaſt confin'd before
In the Weſt at length appears,
Still advancing more and more.
No where did ſhe make a ſtand
'Till ſhe reach'd that unknown land
Of the noble virgins three,
Theſe three wonders of our age,
Whoſe extreme affection ſhe
Came on purpoſe to engage.
Them ſhe has inſtructed well,
As their many diſtichs tell.
Ours, as far as they have gone,
Bluſh to ſee themſelves outdone.

I ſhall occaſionally obſerve that Richelet, who made a Commentary upon Ronſard's odes, did not underſtand the laſt verſe but one of the quotation. It is plain, that *maint vers jumeau, - - - many twin-verſes*, ſignifies the hundred diſtichs of thoſe three ladies, or thoſe verſes which they coupled two and two together, in imitation of Cato and Michael Verin: And yet the Commentator found himſelf here very much in the dark. He thinks that *jameau, (twins)* ſignifies *like one another*; *becauſe*, ſays he, *they are ſiſters*; *or, it is an alluſion to the tops of mount Parnaſſus, which are double, whither the Poets go to learn how to make well a verſe, which he calls* jumeau, *as if one ſhould ſay Parnaſſian.* You may judge whether the Commentators upon the antients Poets do not frequently deceive us, ſince thoſe who undertake to explain the Poets of their own time, and of their own country, are liable to ſuch miſtakes. I could eaſily ſhew, that Muret, who commented upon ſome poems of Ronſard, did not always rightly underſtand his French words.

[*E*] . . . *and by Nicolas de Herberai Sieur des Eſſars.*] The praiſes he beſtows upon the three Engliſh ſiſters are contained in a letter he writ to them, which was prefixed to the collection of epitaphs upon Queen Margaret.

[*F*] *It is ſtrange that they ſhould be ſo little known at this day.*] I aſked ſome Engliſhmen very learned and well verſed in the knowledge of books and authors, what thoſe three famous Engliſh ladies were, telling them at the ſame time the little I knew of the matter: They anſwered me, that they were abſolutely unknown to them. I had the ſame anſwer from Paris, tho' I conſulted ſome perſons, who are hardly equalled by any body elſe in the knowledge of ſuch things. Theſe three illuſtrious Engliſh ladies muſt needs have fallen into oblivion, ſince Mr Juncker ſays nothing of them in the catalogue of learned women, lately publiſhed by him (5). He quotes Pitſeus ſometimes; and therefore ſince he does not ſpeak of the three ſiſters Seymour, it is a ſign Pitſeus does not ſpeak of them neither. A friend of mine had aſſured me before, that neither Bale nor Pitſeus, who have ſo fully treated of the writings of that learned nation, ſay any thing of theſe three ſiſters.

(*b*) All theſe faults have been acknowledged in the extract of a Letter dated the 23d of March 1693, inſerted in the *Courier Galant* for April 1693.

(2) See the project of this Dictionary, *pag.* 364, 365.

(3) It is the third of the fifth book.

(4) Ronſard, *book v, of his* Odes, *pag. m.* 617.

(5) It is an Appendix to the book *de Ephemeridibus ſive Diariis Eruditorum*, publiſhed by him at Leipſic in 1692 in 12mo.

SELEMNUS, a river of Achaia, had been a very handſome young ſhepherd. The nymph Argyra fell ſo paſſionately in love with him, that ſhe uſed to come out of the bottom of the ſea to go and lie with him. But when the prime of Selemnus's beauty vaniſhed away by age, the nymph left off going to him. The young man died of grief for it, and was metamorphoſed into a river by the goddeſs Venus. That change did not cure him of his paſſion: Venus was obliged to interpoſe; ſhe granted him the favour of forgetting that nymph. It is ſaid that from that time the river Selemnus had an admirable virtue; which was that the perſons of both ſexes who bathed themſelves in it, no longer remembered the object of their love (*a*). Pauſanias is in the right to ſay, that if the water of that river had ſuch a virtue, it would be more valuable than great ſums of money [*A*].

[*A*] *If it's water had ſuch a virtue, it would be more valuable than great ſums of money.*] We muſt not believe all that the Poets and writers of romances make amorous people ſay; the deſcriptions of their ſufferings are hyperbolical: however, it muſt be granted, that love is an inexhauſtible ſource of miſeries and diſorders. It is a very neceſſary paſſion upon earth for the preſervation of animals: It is the ſoul of the world with reſpect to them; nay, it is certain, that the Divine Providence has annexed a thouſand charms and pleaſures to ſo neceſſary a paſſion; but, on the other hand, it is attended with a thouſand troubles. How many people can neither eat, nor drink, nor ſleep, and loſe their health and wits upon that account? The number of thoſe who die of it is greater than it is thought: Thoſe who hang themſelves for it, are indeed few; nevertheleſs, there are ſome. This concerns thoſe whoſe love is not anſwered. As for thoſe who are as much beloved as they love others, they pay dear for their pleaſures; for not to ſay, that their reaſon is diſordered, and that their paſſion is frequently contrary to their true intereſt, whereby they are expoſed to a vaſt number of troubles; does not bare jealouſy, which commonly attends their paſſion, make them ſufficiently unhappy? Can there be a more lamentable, melancholy, and dreadful condition than that of jealous people? Let their jealouſy be well or ill-grounded, it is all one; their torment is equally great; they are not the leſs perſecuted by the chimeras and phantoms of their imagination; the fire wherewith they are waſted and conſumed, is not more tolerable for it: and therefore it may be ſaid, that if there was a river in the world which could cure lovers, it would be more valuable than gold. Εἰ δὲ μέτεστιν ἀληθείας τῷ λόγῳ τιμιώτερον χρημάτων πολλῶν ἐστὶν ἀνθρώποις τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ Σελέμνου. *Quod niſi commentitium eſſet, quantavis pecunia videri poſſet ea Selemni aqua pretioſior* (1). Of this water one might truly ſay, ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ, *Water is an excellent thing*. But then gold ought not to be mentioned afterwards without being placed far beneath it (2). See the margin. Zuccolo makes a very natural deſcription of the fury of jealouſy, when he introduces in his dialogues, a man extremely greedy of the ſweet pleaſures of love, and yet determined to renounce them, provided his beloved object be not kind to any body elſe. ‘Non
‘hò già cuore di sì gagliarda lena, che baſti a reſiſtere
‘a quel reo veleno di Geloſia,

Che, mentre con la fiamma il gelo meſce,
Tutto il Regno d' Amor turba, e contriſta.

‘Siami altiera e ſdegnoſa la mia Dellia, purche non
‘rivolga corteſe, e pia lo ſguarde ſoave altrove: mi
‘ſia ſcarſa de ſuoi favori: avara delle ſue gratie, che
‘tuttavia,

- - - - Un più gentile
Stato del mio non è ſotto la Luna,
Si dolce è del mio amaro la radice.

‘Ma non poſſo già ſoffrire, che i begli occhi ſereni,
‘i quali acceſero nel mio petto fiamma ineſtinguibile
‘d' Amore habbiano a riſchiarare il foſco d'Horatio
‘co'i raggi della lor luce,

Si nieghi a me, purche a ciaſcun ſi nieghi;
Che, purche altrui non ſplenda il mio bel Sole,
Ne le tenebre ancor vivrò beato (3).

‘*I have not a heart of ſuch impenetrable ſtuff as can*
‘*reſiſt the black poiſon of jealouſy,*

Which, intermixing ice with flame, confounds,
And ſhakes love's empire to it's utmoſt bounds.

‘*Let my Delia be haughty and diſdainful to me, pro-*
‘*vided that ſhe do not, in the height of her courteſy*
‘*and compaſſion, beſtow her ſweet glances elſewhere:*
‘*let her be ſparing of her favours to me; niggardly of*
‘*her graces, yet ſtill,*

A more delightful ſtate than what I feel,
Not the broadfield of fancy does contain,
So ſweet the root is of my bitter pain.

‘*But I cannot bear that thoſe bright and beautiful eyes,*
‘*which have kindled in my breaſt an unquenchable fire*
‘*of love, ſhould illuminate the darkneſs of Horatius with*
‘*their beams of light.*

If that fair ſun do not to others ſhine;
Although he never chear theſe eyes of mine,
Yet ſhall I live in darkneſs happy ſtill.

But becauſe he cannot even promiſe to himſelf this melancholy comfort, he gives himſelf up to deſpair, and eaſes his grief only by curſing jealouſy as a monſter come out of hell. ‘Ma, ſe il mio male
‘rimane affatto ſenza rimedio, non mi ſi tolga alme-
‘no, ch'io ſfoghi in qualche modo il mio cordoglio
‘co'i lamenti, e co'i pianti.

O ſorella di morte, onde veniſte,
D'invidia figlia, fiero, horribil moſtro,
Che fai miei giorni lagrimoſi, e triſti;
Tornati à l'infernale, oſcuro chioſtro,
Che troppo co' tuoi morſi il ſen m'apriſti,
Onde il venen, la piaga, e'l dolor moſtro (4).

‘*But if there be no remedy left for my misfortune, at*
‘*leaſt let me not be hindred from diſcharging ſome*
‘*part of my bitter anguiſh in lamentations and com-*
‘*plaints.*

Siſter of death, whence art thou come? - - Away
Thou child of envy, and thou beaſt of prey,
By whom in ſorrow all my days I tell;
Return black monſter to thy native hell.
Too deep thy tuſks are in my boſom found,
For ſee, the poiſon feſters in the wound.

I have read in a certain book which was printed with the ſatire upon the hermaphrodites (5), that a lady having ſung *with a melancholy tune* (6), and made it appear by her looks (7) *that her heart was ſorrowful*; ſome body aſked her what made her ſo melancholy; and that *inſtead of giving any anſwer to the queſtion, ſhe ſpoke the words of Ludovico,*

Che dolce piu, che piu giocondo ſtato,
Saria, di quel, d'un amoroſo core:
Che viver piu felice, & piu beato,
Che ritrovarſi in ſervitu d'amore,
Se non foſſe ciaſcuno ſtimulato,
Da quel ſoſpetto rio, da quel timore,
Da quel martir, da quella freneſia,
Da quella rabia detta gelozia.

What joys ſo pure could any mortal find
As thoſe which harbour in a love-ſick mind.

(*a*) Ex Pauſania, *lib. vii, p.* 229.

SOME conſiderations upon jealouſy.

(1) *To underſtand this, one muſt read theſe verſes of Pindar,* Od. I Olymp. Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ· ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς, αἰθόμενον πῦρ ἅτε διαπρέπει νυκτὶ μεγάνορος ἔξοχα πλούτου. Optima quidem eſt aqua: & aurum, velut ignis noctu ardens, coruſcat eximie inter ſuperbificas divitias.

(2) Pauſanias, *lib. vii, p.* 229.

(3) Lodovico Zuccolò, *Academico Filopono di Faenza*, Dialogo, della Geloſia, *p.* 129, 130.

(4) Id. ibid. *pag.* 137.

(5) See the remark [*C*] in the article SALMACIS, at the end.

(6) Diſcours de Iacophile à Limne, *pag.* 96.

(7) Ibid.

What life could to our ſweet experience prove
More happy than the ſervitude of love;
But that there is a ſting in every breaſt
Of curs'd ſuſpicion, enemy to reſt,
A ſpark of frenzy which poſſeſſes all,
And which the rage of jealouſy we call.

Doubtleſs, it was the torments of jealouſy which obliged a Poet of the ſame country to make a ſonnet (8), wherein he tells his confeſſor, If you deſign to puniſh me for the faults which love has made me commit, enjoin me to fall in love again, for there is no greater torment than that.

Se pur brami punir l'anima errante,
Fa ch'io torni ad amar, che fra mortali
Non v'è pena maggior ch' eſſer' amante.

If you would puniſh me for errors paſt,
Then bid me love again. What can be worſe?
To be a lover is the greateſt curſe.

(8) It is to be found in page 548, of *Chevreau's Oeuvres Meſlées.*

SELVE (JOHN DE) firſt preſident in the parliament of Paris, in the reign of Francis I. See his article in Moreri's Dictionary. I ſhall only add to it three or four particulars, imparted to me by Mr Baluze, whereby it may be rectified and improved. It is not true that this preſident was originally from the Milaneſe: he was born in the Limouſin; and it is very likely that he and his anceſtors were natives of the city of Tulle [*A*]. They father upon him a book which he did not write [*B*], and it is without any good reaſon that an Hiſtorian charges him with having corrupted the memoirs of Philip de Comines [*C*]. His true name was John de SALVA [*D*]. Thoſe, who made the elogies of the firſt preſidents of Paris ‘place his death in Auguſt 1529. But John Bertaud, who made and printed his epitaph in that ſame year, informs us, that he was buried at St Nicolas du Chardonnet the eleventh of December. That epitaph is not upon his tomb, but another very modern (*a*).’

(*a*) Memoir communicated by Baluzius.

[*A*] *He was born in the Limouſin, and it is very likely that he and his anceſtors were natives of the city of Tulle.*] My reaſons for it are theſe. I ſhall uſe the very words of the learned man, who has done me the honour to furniſh me with ſome memoirs for this article. ‘(1) John de Selve was a native of Limouſin: There is no difficulty in it. Clear proof of it may be ſeen at the beginning of the treatiſe *de Beneficio*; beſides, the ſame is confirmed by Gabriel Lurbæus, in his book concerning the illuſtrious men of Aquitain. But it is not known from what town or place of the Limouſin he came. There is reaſon to believe he was born at Tulle, the chief town of the Lower Limouſin. What makes me think ſo is, that I find in an old record of the year 1431, John de Salva, named among the chief inhabitants of that town; and his poſterity continues ſtill there; but they go by the name of la Selve. It is very likely then, the reputation of John de Selve, firſt preſident of the parliament of Paris, made the authors in that family who live ſtill at Tulle, change their name into that of Selve become famous by that firſt preſident. Beſides this conjecture, which is very probable, I find in the inqueſt of nobility of Chriſtopher de Leſtange, Biſhop of Carcaſſonne, and commander of the king's order, made in the year 1617, that the firſt preſident was the ſon of John de Selve, which perfectly agrees with John de Salva, mentioned in the year 1431, ſince there are a hundred full years from that year to 1529, when the firſt preſident died. Beſides the ſame inqueſt informs us, that Margaret de Selve his ſiſter, was married to Peter de Juyé an inhabitant of Tulle.’

‘From whence it is eaſy to infer, that the genealogy of the family of Selve, printed in the elogies of the firſt preſidents of Paris, is not exact, particularly in ſaying, that the grandfather of the preſident, was a gentleman of the Milaneſe.

[*B*] *A book of which he is not the author, is fathered upon him.*] ‘He is commonly ſaid to be the author of the treatiſe *de Beneficio*. But John Bertaud (2) informs us, that it is not he, but his brother, who is the author of it. *Adde ſe. recor. Do. Joannem de Salva ſenatus Parrhiſini principem: cujus frater Joannes de Salva inter reliquos quum primis honoris, ſicuti probitatis ſuæ facile dedit documentum quum de beneficio inſignem tractatum edidit* (3).’

[*C*] *It is without any good reaſon that an hiſtorian charges him with having corrupted the memoirs of Philip de Comines.*] ‘What Belcarius biſhop of Metz, advances in his hiſtory, book vii. chap. x. is not likely, *viz.* That the firſt preſident de Selve, who, ſays he, was ignorant of the tranſactions in the reign of Lewis XI, and Charles VIII his ſon, corrupted and curtailed in ſeveral places, the memoirs of Philip de Comines. For the firſt edition of thoſe memoirs came out in 1524. But the firſt preſident was hardly at leiſure then to print books, and particularly other peoples works. Beſides, the editions agree with ſeveral antient manuſcripts, as it has been obſerved by M. Godefroy in his preface to thoſe memoirs (4).

[*D*] *His true name was John de* SALVA.] ‘So he is called in the epiſtle dedicatory to John Raulin's epiſtles printed at Paris in the year 1521. *Robertus Raulin Joanni de Salva Pariſienſis ſenatus primo præſidi.* And in the epiſtle, alluding to his name, he ſays among other things, *te natura Salvum fecit, ut alios abſque improperio ſalvos faceres.* And in the epigram printed next to the epiſtle dedicatory:

‘*Aſtruit ante obitum nullum cenſura Solonis*
‘*Salvum. Te talem primulus ortus habet.*

‘In the relation of the conference held at Madrid in the year 1525, in order to get Francis I. releaſed; he is called John de Salva, in a copy made at that time which I have by me. It is true, that the word Salva has been daſhed out ſince, and the word Selve has been put into the margin.

‘In the treaty of marriage between Hercules d'Eſte, the ſon of Alphonſus Duke of Ferrara, with Renata of France, made at St Germain en Laye, on the nineteenth of February 1527, that preſident, who was Renata's attorney, is called Johannes de Salva, in an old copy of that time, which I have likewiſe by me.

‘John Bertaud a native of Perigord, publiſhed in the year 1529, three books, *de cognatione ſacerrimi Joannes Baptiſta*; wherein making an enumeration of the famous Canoniſts and Civilians, particularly of thoſe of Aquitain, he ſays, *Adde ſe. recor. Do. Joannem de Salva ſenatus Parrhiſini principem.* And in the epiſtle to Francis de Marſillac, firſt preſident in the parliament of Rouën, who had married a daughter of the firſt preſident de Salva, he ſays; *fideliſſima uxor tua Magdalena à Salva.* The ſame made an epitaph upon the firſt preſident de Salva, wherein making an abridgment of his life, he begins with theſe verſes:

‘*Salva domus dedit hanc, qui Salvos fecit utique*
‘*Oppreſſos miſera conditione reos* (5).

---

(1) A Memoir communicated by Baluzius.

(2) In the book mentioned at the beginning of the laſt paragraph of the remark [*D*].

(3) The ſame Memoir.

(4) The ſame Memoir.

(5) Ibid.

SENGEBERE (Polycarp) a Civilian in the XVIIth century, was a native of Brunſwic. He wrote a book againſt Salmaſius [*A*]. 'He diſputed with one Macquin for a profeſſorſhip of the Civil-Law in the univerſity of Angers (*a*).' Menage, who had been his diſciple, *did not forget to ſerve him on that occaſion; but Macquin was preferred to him, becauſe he was more learned. Nevertheleſs, by reaſon of his merit, and becauſe he was a man of parts, the magiſtrates of Angers beſtowed upon him a yearly penſion of an hundred crowns to keep him in their town; and Mr de Boileſve, jointly with ſome others, gave him as much, ſo that he had ſix hundred livres a year. He was accuſed of having bribed his judges; but Mr Menage made his defence.* Thoſe, who have publiſhed ſome memoirs for Menage's life (*b*), ſay that he pleaded ſeveral cauſes in the parliament of Paris, *one, among others, for M. Sengebere, who had a mind to divorce his wife on account of adultery* (*c*). It is very ſtrange that he ſhould ſay nothing of it ſpeaking of that proceſs [*B*]; for the occaſion ſeemed neceſſarily to require, that he ſhould not forget to

[*A*] *He wrote a book againſt Salmaſius.*] Here follows a piece of Menage's converſations. 'Sengebere, my maſter in the Civil-Law, wrote againſt Salmaſius's book *de Mutuo*: The ſheets were ſent to Salmaſius as they were printing, and he wrote to me, that Sengebere gave him no hard words, but that his railleries were as ſharp as injurious words. He acquainted me, at the ſame time, that he would anſwer that book. But Sengebere cleared the matter better than he, and he made no anſwer (1).'

[*B*] *It is very ſtrange that he ſhould ſay nothing of it, ſpeaking of that proceſs.*] He ſpeaks of that proceſs with great ingenuity, and without any deſign of concealing the weak ſide of his maſter. 'Sengebere, doctor of the Civil-Law at Angers, having accuſed and convicted of adultery his wife, who was a very handſome woman, got her confined to a convent, and took a concubine in her place. A jeſter happening to be in a company where they were diſcourſing of his caſe, ſaid in a pleaſant manner: ſince he wanted a whore, he might as well have kept his wife (2).' If Menage pleaded for the huſband upon that occaſion, one can hardly apprehend why he did not ſay ſo, when he related that Sengebere carried the cauſe. He did not forget to ſay that he had been his defender upon a leſs important ſubject (3), *viz.* when Sengebere was charged with having bribed the judges of the diſpute about a profeſſorſhip. This is not very intelligible, for he had been caſt. Is it cuſtomary for thoſe, who carry the cauſe, to accuſe the perſon who loſes it, of having bribed the judges? Would not ſuch an accuſation reflect upon the judges, rather than the perſon accuſed of having bribed them? Is not a judge, who ſuffers himſelf to be bribed, more guilty than the briber? That paſſage of the Menagiana ought therefore to be rectified; and inſtead of theſe words, *he was accuſed of having bribed the judges*, it ſhould be, that he was accuſed of having endeavoured to bribe them. The judges would not have been intereſted in that cauſe; they would not have been forced to ſide with Sengebere: and it may very well happen that a man, who caſt his adverſary, is willing to carry his triumph further, and load him with a new confuſion, by proving that he intended to have recourſe to fraud and bribery.

I have ſaid in another place (4), that ſome wiſhed this pleading of Menage had been printed. He was an advocate very well qualified to ſucceed in ſuch a cauſe. He might have ſaid many things fitly applied and handſomely turned: and ſince the wife was convicted, and her beauty, though ever ſo great, could not ſave her; it is to be preſumed, that the proofs of the huſband were as ſtrong as his advocate could have wiſhed. But it was a great advantage for his advocate, and a circumſtance the more favourable, becauſe it afforded a character of ſuperiority very proper to confound the common topics, alledged by the wife's advocate. When a cauſe about adultery is doubtful, the advocate who pleads againſt the huſband, ſpeaks in an inſulting manner, and ridicules him unmercifully; at which the advocate, who pleads againſt the wife, is not a little embarraſſed. But why do I ſay, when ſuch a cauſe is doubtful? I ſhould have ſaid even when it is not at all doubtful (5). I ſhall quote Mr Chevreau for it, who gives us the following account of an antient gentleman, who had married a young woman. 'Ever ſince ſhe found herſelf miſtreſs of the beſt part of his eſtate by virtue of that donative, ſhe minded nothing but fine clothes and good cheer, and expreſſed a great contempt or indifference for all the careſſes of her old huſband.

> 'Hinc dolor, hinc lachrymæ,
>
> '*Hence grief, hence tears.*

But there is ſomething more afflicting for the good old man, and if you deſire to know it in a few words, it is that for men of his age

> 'Eſt indeclinabile cornu.
>
> '*Horns are unavoidable.*

In reality, he had as undeniable proofs, as any geometrical demonſtrations can be, that ſhe made him a cuckold, and that his wife, whom he uſed to call his treaſure, was only a treaſure of iniquity. Whatever reaſons his relations could alledge to induce him, for their own credit, not to make the cauſe of his vexation public, he only conſulted his anger, being reſolved to get her confined to a nunnery, by the ſame ſentence that ſhould make the donative void. He has powerfully carried on the proſecution, and produced many writings againſt her, and even mortgaged a fine eſtate in land in order to execute his project. The lady pitched upon an advocate, who expreſſed himſelf with a wonderful eaſineſs; and is not covetous in the leaſt, being as rich as he is voluptuous; and it is ſaid, he never pleads a great cauſe for a handſome lady, but he has an enjoyment for it. He mightily exaggerated the noble birth, and the perſonal merit of that lady; her virtue, which appeared in her very looks; the intolerable jealouſy of her huſband grounded upon dreams; and the loathſomeneſs and ridiculouſneſs of old age. It was alſo ſaid, this pleading was that of an advocate, who was to be paid by enjoyment and love, and that his fair client rewarded him accordingly. The cauſe had been twice heard, and was put off till the month of September after the feſtival of St Martin. The two parties are gone, the gentleman to his village, and the lady to the houſe ſhe is poſſeſſed of by the contract of her marriage. In the mean time, a nephew of the old gentleman gave him a viſit to know the particulars of his law-ſuit, of which he had been informed only by imperfect and partial accounts, although he had been told that the young lady's advocate had abuſed him in a moſt inſulting manner (6).' The nephew adviſed him to put an end to that ſuit by a good reconciliation, and even told him, that it had been better if he had not begun it. He alledged himſelf for an example, and did not forget his brother's conduct. 'My brother, and I, *ſaid he* (7), do not much care to dive into things, that would vex us, if we ſhould find them out; nor does it appear to us that the greateſt happineſs of a huſband conſiſts in being a ſhrewd diviner. We only aim at a quiet life; and it is our opinion, that a man who continually watches his wife, muſt needs take an ill courſe. The remonſtrances of a jealous huſband are ſuſpected; his prohibitions frequently exaſperate a wanton woman, prepoſſeſſed with this opinion, that ſtolen waters are the ſweeteſt: And we could never apprehend, that a tutoring huſband proved more acceptable than a tyrannical one. Violent means betray a brutiſh temper; and whoever has recourſe to the law, muſt expect to be laughed at by the judges,

---

(*a*) Menagiana, *pag.* 94, of the firſt Dutch edition.

(*b*) They are prefixed to the continuation of the Menagiana.

(*c*) See remark [*C*] of the article MENAGE.

(1) Menagiana, *pag.* 287, of the firſt Dutch edition.

(2) Ibid. *pag.* 137.

(3) See the text of this article.

(4) Remark [*C*] of the article MENAGE.

(5) This is not repugnant to what I have ſaid; for it will be true ſtill, that the wife's advocate is leſs to be feared, when the huſband's right is more evident.

(6) Chevreau Oeuvres meſlées, *pag.* 52, & *ſeq.*

(7) Ibid. *p.* 57.

to mention the ſervice he had done to his maſter.

‘who are wiſer in a like caſe, and take care that a court of juſtice ſhould not ring with their wives gallantry, which they conceal even from their confeſſors. Indeed, if the judges were to take cognizance of all ſuch diſorders, the parliaments, preſiduals, bailiwicks, and inferior courts would not be ſufficient for it; beſides, ſuch proceedings are very chargeable, and lawyers and attorneys would quickly grow the richeſt men in the kingdom at our coſt.’ Here follows part of the reply. ‘(8) I muſt needs tell you, replied the uncle, that the laſt pleading of my unfaithful wife's advocate broke my heart: had he been credited, I ſhould have been accounted the moſt fooliſh and the moſt wicked man in the world. I muſt further tell you, that I was no ſooner come out of the court, but I heard a confuſed voice of Bookſellers and Shopkeepers aſking me whether I would buy, *The curious impertinent*; or, *the imaginary cuckold*; and *Horncombs:* Nay, the wretched ſhop-boys would follow me to the loweſt ſteps of the great court, playing, thro' a ſilly alluſion, upon a *Cornemuſe* (a bag pipe), when I came there, all the Shop-keepers cried out with a common conſent, Horn-combs; and I was forced to bear a thouſand ſilly jeſts (9).’ The nephew dextrouſly uſed thoſe circumſtances to perſuade the huſband to a reconciliation; and becoming mediator between him and his wife, he happily put an end to their quarrel (10). Perhaps, the old man would not have been ſo lucky as Sengebere, who got his wife confined to a nunnery. His demands muſt have been very juſt, and doubtleſs his right was very plain, ſince he carried the cauſe. But if we conſider the puniſhment inflicted upon his wife fully convicted of adultery, it will appear ſo ſlight, that one may cry out as in Juvenal's time (11), *ubi nunc lex Julia? dormis?* - - - *What is become of the Roman laws*, the laws of Auguſtus (12), Conſtantine, and Juſtinian? The firſt was leſs ſevere than the ſecond; for the *lex Julia* did not condemn adulterers to death: but by the law of Conſtantine, that puniſhment was inflicted upon them. Juſtinian moderated it as to women, being contented to condemn them to be whipped and ſhut up in a nunnery: Nay, he allowed huſbands to take them again at two years end; and if they died before that time, or were not willing to have them again, their wives were condemned to be ſhaved, and to take the monaſtical habit, and to ſpend the remaining part of their lives in that condition. ‘(13) Primus Conſtantinus capitis pœna adulterii crimen vindicandum conſtituit †, . . . Capitalem autem pœnam Juſtinianus in maſculis probat, mulierem verò verberibus cæſam in monaſterium detrudi præcipit, data poteſtate marito intra biennium, ſi hoc exiſtimaverit, eam inde revocandi, quo tranſacto, aut viro præmortuo, eam raſo capite, monaſtico habitu amiciri, & illic omni vitæ tempore manere ‡ jubet. - - - *Conſtantine was the firſt who decreed a capital puniſhment for the crime of adultery . . . Juſtinian approved that men ſhould ſuffer death, but that women ſhould be whipped, and then ſhut up in a monaſtery, giving power to their huſbands to take them thence within two years; which if not done, he ordered her to be ſhaved, cloathed in the monaſtic habit, and there to remain during life.*’ That ſeverity was abated by degrees, and in ſome provinces (14) an adultereſs was allowed one half of the eſtate purchaſed by her huſband. Pope Honorius III, reformed that ſcandalous cuſtom. ‘Apud Rupellanos . . . jam olim invaluere nonnullæ conſuetudines, quarum duo capita à jure, & honeſtate publica abhorrentia damnavit Honorius III. P. in Epiſtola decretali ad Majorem & Burgenſes de Rupella. Primum fuit . . . . Alterum fuit, ut mulier ob adulterium non amitteret lucrum mediæ partis omnium bonorum per virum quæſitorum conſtante matrimonio: conſuetudinem emendavit Pontifex, quoad proderat mulieribus adulteris (15). - - - *With the Rochellers . . . . ſome cuſtoms had long prevailed, of which two that were inconſiſtent with juſtice and common decency, were condemned by Pope Honorius III, in a decretal epiſtle to the magiſtrates and inhabitants of Rochelle. The firſt was . . . . The other was, that a woman for adultery ſhould not loſe her privilege of enjoying half her huſband's eſtate, which was acquired during the marriage. Theſe were aboliſhed by the Pope, as to the privilege of adulterous women.*’

It is to be obſerved that the jeſt, mentioned by Menage (16), is faulty, as moſt witty ſayings are: if it be ſtrictly examined, it will be found to imply a falſity; for, in mens opinion, the unfaithfulneſs of a wife is the diſgrace of the huſband. The keeping of a concubine is not liable to ſuch a conſtruction, and does not require that a man ſhould have the ſame regard for her as for a wife; and therefore Sengebere's choice was not attended with like inconveniences, as the jeſter ſuppoſed.

(8) Ibid. *p.* 58.

(9) Compare what you will find citat. (14) of the article SAINT-CYRE.

(10) Chevr. *ibid. pag.* 60.

(11) Juven. Sat. II, ver. 37.

(12) The *Lex Julia de Adulteriis* is aſcribed by ſeveral learned men to Auguſtus and not Julius Cæſar.

(13) Barnabas Briſſonius ad legem Juliam de Adulteriis, *pag.* 150.

† L. quamvis 2. C. de adulter.

‡ Nov. ut nulli judic.

(14) Rochelle for inſtance.

(15) Alteſerra Rerum Aquitanic. *lib. iii, cap. xviii, pag.* 227.

(16) I think he repeated it upon another occaſion; for methinks he ſays in another place of the Menagiana (I cannot find the page again) that a gentleman having parted with his wife, and taken a concubine, his man ſaid, Ah ſir, ſince you could not be without a . . . . . why did not you keep your lady?

SENNERTUS (DANIEL)

SENNERTUS (DANIEL) an eminent Phyſician, was born the twenty-fifth of November 1572 at Breſlaw, where his father was a Shoe-maker. He was ſent to the univerſity of Wittemberg in the year 1593, and there made a great progreſs in Philoſophy and Phyſic (*a*). He viſited the univerſities of Leipſic, Jena, and Francfort upon the Oder, and then went to Berlin in the year 1601, to practiſe Phyſic; he ſtaid not long there but quickly returned to Wittemberg, where he took his degree of Doctor of Phyſic the tenth of September in the ſame year, and at a year's end he was made profeſſor of the ſame faculty: He was the firſt, who introduced the ſtudy of Chymiſtry into that univerſity; and he acquired a great reputation by his works [*A*], and by his practice [*B*]. He had three wives, and had no children by the two laſt; but he had ſeven by the firſt. He died of the plague at Wittemberg the twenty-firſt of July 1637 (*b*). He got ſome adverſaries by the liberty he took to contradict the antients; but none of his opinions was leſs approved than what he advanced concerning the origin of ſouls. He

(*a*) In ſtudiis philoſophicis eos progreſſus fecit, ut anno 1597 die 3 menſ. Apr. . . laurea philoſophica inter 58 candidatos quarto loco ornatus ſit. *Vita Sennerti*, in limine *Operum*.

(*b*) Taken from his Life, at the beginning of his works. See alſo his funeral Oration ſpoken by Auguſtus Buchnerus. It is in Witte's *Memoriæ Medicorum*, pag. 88, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *He acquired a great reputation by his works.*] They are many, and have been often printed in France and Italy. The laſt edition, if I am not miſtaken, is that of Lyons, 1676, it is divided into ſix volumes in folio. The foregoing editions were only divided into three volumes (1).

[*B*] . . . . *and by his practice.*] Sick people had recourſe to him from all parts, and he denied no body his aſſiſtance. He took what they gave him for his fees, and exacted nothing; nay, he reſtored to the poor what they gave him (2). The plague raged at Wittemberg above ſeven times whilſt he was a profeſſor in that town; but he never went away, and never refuſed to aſſiſt ſick people. The Elector of Saxony, whom he cured of a great ſickneſs in the year 1628, made him one of his Phyſicians in ordinary, and yet allowed him the liberty of living at Wittemberg. Several dukes, princes, counts, and gentlemen, uſed, with ſucceſs, his advice and preſcriptions in their ſickneſſes. Nicolas Sapieha, great ſtandard-bearer of Lithuania, not knowing what to do to recover his health, applied himſelf to the Phyſicians of Padua. They adviſed him to put himſelf into Sennertus's hands (3). Accordingly he took a journey to Wittemberg, and went home again perfectly recovered. ‘Polonus . . . . non vidit tantum atque coram admiratus SENNERTUM eſt; ſed mactus ingenti beneficio etiam, cùm vidiſſet, diſceſſit. Ut intelligeret, nil ſupra verum narraſſe famam: & pauciora propemodum retuliſſe: expertus noviſſimè opitulatorem feliciſſimum; quem Medicæ eruditionis principem ſalutaverat ante (4). - - - - *The Polonian . . . . not only ſaw and admired Sennertus; but after having received wonderful benefit by him, departed, well ſatisfied that fame had not ſaid more, but rather leſs of him than what he deſerved, having found in him a moſt happy aſſiſtance, whom before he had called the prince of Phyſicians.*’

(1) *See* Mercklinus *in* Lindenio renovato.

(2) Pauperibus honoraria afferentibus ea reſtituit. *Vita Sennerti*, in limine *Operum*.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Auguſtus Buchnerus, *in* Orat. funebri Sennerti, *apud* Witte, Memor. Medicor. *p.* 97.

He believed that the ſeed of all living creatures is animated [*C*], and that the ſoul of that

[*C*] *He believed that the ſeed of all living creatures was animated.*] The difficulties he found in other opinions made him embrace this. The common doctrine of the ſchool-men ſeemed to him abſurd (5), *viz.* That ſubſtantial forms are not produced; for they ſay, the attribute of being produced belongs to a natural compound, and not to it's parts: He was not ſatisfied with the opinion of Avicenna, that there is a celeſtial intelligence appointed for the formation of ſouls, which makes uſe of ſeeds only as of an inſtrument. ‘ Avicennas animas viventium non à parentibus, ſed à quadam formarum datrice, ſeu ut Scaliger *Exerc.* 97. loquitur, formarum promaconda intelligentia quam Colcodeam nominat, provenire ſtatuit, docetque cœleſtem hanc mentem uti ſemine tanquam inſtrumento ad producendam animam vegetantem & ſentientem (6). - - - *Avicenna maintained, that the ſouls of all things living proceeded not from the parents, but from a certain giver of forms, or, as Scaliger ſpeaketh, from an intelligence which is the diſpenſer, or, as it were, the ſteward of forms, which he called* Colcodea ; *and he taught, that this celeſtial mind uſed the ſeed as an inſtrument to produce the vegetative and ſenſitive ſouls.*’ Nor did he more approve Fernelius's opinion (7), that the heavens form human ſouls, and ſend them into a well prepared matter. He derided, not without reaſon, the common opinion of the ſchool-men, that ſubſtantial forms are taken out of the power of matter, *educuntur è potentia materiæ.* He rejected the plaſtic virtue, which ſeveral authors have aſcribed to the ſeed (8). He therefore believed that there was a neceſſity to follow the opinion of ſome antient and modern authors, that the ſoul is in the ſeed before the organization, and is that which forms that admirable machine, we call a living body. He quotes (9) two fine paſſages; one out of Galen (10), and the other out of Titelmanus (11), which contain a deſcription of the art that is obſerved in plants and animals. The laſt of theſe two authors takes the uſual way of generations, to be a more amazing thing than the firſt production of animated beings; and indeed, one may more eaſily conceive that GOD immediately produces plants and animals, than one can conceive that the ſeed ſhould have the virtue to produce an organized body, a machine ſo induſtriouſly contrived, that in compariſon of it, all the works of the Mathematicians are but mean and childiſh inventions. ‘ Quod hæc humani corporis diſpoſitio ex operatione eſt virtutis, quæ latet in paterno ſemine (fœdiſſima, & vix nominanda ſubſtantia, quam abſque abominatione nemo conſpicit) quodque in eo tam præclara lateat virtus, corpus tam admirabile ſic efficiendi ac fabricandi, quòd tota iſtius admirabilis diſpoſitionis efficacia in illo realiter inexiſtat, id nobis merito in immenſum aggravat pondus conſiderationis noſtræ, id prorſus ſtupidos & attonitos reddit, cogitque exclamare nos, & voce apertâ confiteri, quod non ſolùm ipſe magnus ſit in ſemetipſo, neque ſolum magnus in magnis, ſed & in abjectiſſimis, contemptibiliſſimiſque & minimis glorioſus (12). - - - - *That this diſpoſition of the human body, is, by operation of the power lying concealed in the parent's ſeed, and that ſo excellent a virtue ſhould be therein of making, and framing a body ſo admirable, this does juſtly perplex our conſideration, render us utterly aſtoniſhed, and make us cry out, and plainly confeſs, that he is not only great in himſelf, and his great works, but glorious even in the moſt abject, contemptible, and meaneſt productions.*’ Galen could not apprehend what is the ordinary cauſe of ſuch an excellent work; but Sennertus fancies that the ſouls contained in the ſeed have, each of them in it's kind, the faculty and induſtry of the organizing matter. ‘ Etſi vero Galenus cauſſam, unde illa omnia fiant, ſe invenire poſſe deſperavit, nihilque hac in re vel probabile reperire ſe potuiſſe, atque ideò magnâ triſtitia affectum eſſe teſtatur, *lib. de fœt. format. cap.* 6. tamen ſi conſideraſſet, iſtas operationes animæ cujuſque ſpeciei proprias eſſe, non ita difficulter cognoſcere potuiſſet, ab anima in ſemine latente iſtas operationes provenire (13). - - *But altho' Galen deſpaired of ever finding the cauſe of all theſe things, and confeſſeth that he could not, in this matter, diſcover even a probability, for which he was exceedingly grieved, notwithſtanding if he had conſidered that theſe operations are proper to the ſoul of every ſpecies, he might, without ſuch difficulty, have perceived, that theſe operations proceed from the ſoul, which lies concealed in the ſeed.*’ I had rather ſay, as Galen does, that we are altogether in the dark about it, than aſcribe to a ſoul, hid in a ſmall egg, the ability that is requiſite to form the body of an ant, the body of a chicken, &c. Sennertus does very well confute the hypotheſes different from his; but he admits of certain things, which cannot be underſtood. He ſays (14), that human ſouls have no quantity, and that they are indiviſible, and yet that each of them can produce it's kind; that is, that the ſoul of a dog can produce many other ſouls of dogs. This would be a true creation, and a more difficult work than the converſion of the ſeed into an organized body. Had he known the hypotheſis, which has been invented ſince he he died, I believe he would have heartily embraced it; it is the hypotheſis mentioned by me before (15), which has afforded many fine hints to the illuſtrious Mr Leibniz: It is that of modern Natural Philoſophers, who having diſcovered, with the help of microſcopes, that there are animals in the ſeed, think that living bodies are organized before they are born, and probably from the beginning of all things. Which leads them to this thought, That ever ſince the firſt original of things, the ſouls have been united to the ſame organized bodies, and that generation or birth is only the extenſion or growth of the *individuum*, which is the primitive and continual ſubject of the ſoul; that this ſubject is not deſtroyed by death; that it loſes only the particles of matter wherewith it was enlarged; that it recovers new ones in another birth, &c. This hypotheſis removes the great difficulties that occur in aſſigning the cauſe of organization. To have recourſe to GOD as to the immediate cauſe, is not to philoſophize. To have recourſe to the general laws of the communication of motion is but a poor ſolution; for ſince it is agreed by all ſects, that thoſe laws cannot produce, I will not ſay a mill, or a clock, but the coarſeſt tool that is in a Smith's ſhop, how ſhall they be able to produce the body of a dog, or even a roſe and a pomegranate? To have recourſe to the celeſtial bodies, or to ſubſtantial forms, is a pitiful ſhift. We want, in this caſe, a cauſe which has an idea of it's work, and knows how to form it: thoſe two things are requiſite in thoſe who make a watch, and build a ſhip; much more are they neceſſary in the cauſe of the organization of living bodies. It is certain the celeſtial bodies have no idea of a human body, and that they know not how it ought to be formed. The Peripatetics own that the ſubſtantial forms of plants and beaſts know not how matter ought to be modified, to give it the organs that are in a tree or in a chicken; and therefore they are not the cauſe of that organization. Thoſe who ſay they are the cauſe of it, tho' they know not the contrivance of that work, are a thouſand times more abſurd than thoſe, who ſhould ſay that a man can make a clock without thinking of it, without having even had any idea of it, and without knowing what he does, or what he deſigns. This objection ſhews the falſity of Sennertus's opinion; for he would not have ſaid that the ſouls he admitted in the ſeed of plants and animals, had an idea of all the organs of plants and animals, and knew how to frame and place them in their proper places. And therefore it had been a great help to him, if he had been told that there are organized individuums in the ſeed; for it is more eaſy to conceive that a ſoul united to ſuch individuum's may be the cauſe of their growth, than it is to apprehend that it can organize a drop of liquor, and change it into the body of a dog.

WHETHER the general laws of motion are ſufficient for the organization of bodies.

I know ſome underſtanding men, who pretend to comprehend that the general laws of the communication of motion, tho' never ſo ſimple and ſo few, are ſufficient to make a *fœtus* grow, provided it be already organized. But I confeſs my own weakneſs; I cannot well apprehend it. It ſeems to me, that a ſmall organized atom cannot become a chicken, a dog, a calf, &c. unleſs an intelligent cauſe directs the motion of the matter that makes it grow; a cauſe, I ſay, which has an idea of that little machine, and knows how to extend and increaſe it according to it's due proportions. I think it will be granted me, that it is not more eaſy to conceive that the laws of motion may be the only cauſe of the building of a little houſe; than

(5) Toletus, Conimbricenſes, & *alii*, *apud* Sennertum de Generat. viventium, *cap. i*, *pag.* 123, *Tom. i*, *Edit. Lugd.* 1676.

(6) Sennert. *ibid. cap. ii.*

(7) Fernelius, *lib. i*, *de abdit. rerum cauſis pluribus in locis*, acriter defendit omnem animam à cœlo proficiſci, & à cœlo animam omnem in materiam præparatam & idoneam immitti, *Id. ibid. pag.* 124.

(8) *Vide* Jacobum Schegkium, *lib. i*, de plaſt. ſeminis facultate, *apud* Sennert. *Ibid. cap. v*, *pag.* 127.

(9) Ibid. *p.* 130.

(10) Galen. *lib. iii*, *de* Uſu Part. *cap. x.*

(11) Franc. Titelmanus, *lib. viii*, Phyſ. *cap. xi.*

(12) Titelmanus, *ibid. apud* Sennertum, de Generat. vivent. *cap. i*, *pag.* 130, *Tom. i.*

(13) Sennert. *ibid.*

(14) Sennert. *ibid. pag.* 132, *col.* 1, 2.

(15) In the article RORARIUS remark [*H*].

that ſeed produces organization. He was accuſed of blaſphemy and impiety on pretence that he taught that the ſouls of beaſts are not material [*D*]; which was ſuppoſed to be the ſame thing as if he had taught that they are no leſs immortal than thoſe of men. He

than it is to conceive, that they can change it into a large palace, in which each room, each door, each window, &c. keep the ſame proportions obſerved by the builder of the little houſe (16). If thoſe two things are equally difficult, why ſhould we believe that the laws of motion, which cannot organize a ſmall particle of matter, will be able, if it be organized, to change it into an animal a thouſand times bigger, all the proportions being duly obſerved in an almoſt infinite number of organs of different nature; ſome of which are ſoft, others fluid, others hard, &c.? I ſhould therefore think it probable that the growth of a *fœtus*, tho' organized ever ſince the beginning of the world, is directed by a particular cauſe, which has an idea of that work, and knows how to enlarge it; as an Architect has an idea of a building, and knows how to enlarge it, when he executes a plan ready made, which he lays upon his table. A great many people will grant me that animals have their parts unfolded in the womb; that they are there nouriſhed; and receive their growth by the direction of a providence; but they will ſay that GOD directs all thoſe things (17). I declare to them that they go from the queſtion; for we do not enquire here into the firſt cauſe, the general author of all things; we enquire into the ſecond cauſe, and the particular reaſon of each effect. To aſſign no other cauſe than GOD in this enquiry, does not become a Philoſopher. Tell me, I pray, ſuppoſe there were rational inhabitants in the planets, and they ſhould come down into one of our houſes, and diſcover the uſe of rooms, of windows, of bolts, &c. and at laſt they ſhould be contented to admire the providence of GOD, who has raiſed ſuch a convenient building for men, would they not be rightly accounted ignorant? They would not know that this houſe was built by men, and that a human Architect directed the ſituation of the ſtones, boards, &c. according to the uſes he deſigned them for. It is true, man receives that knowledge from GOD; but GOD is not the next, natural, and immediate cauſe of that building. The ſame ought to be ſaid of the machine of trees and animals, they depend upon the particular direction of ſome ſecond cauſe, which has received from GOD the knowledge and induſtry that are requiſite for ſuch a work. The difficulty lies in aſſigning that ſecond cauſe. Some will have it that the ſubſtantial form of each mixed body is a ſpirit, on which GOD has beſtowed the knowledge that is neceſſary to produce the temper, and effects, of that mixed body (18). Dr Henry More, who believed the pre-exiſtence of ſouls (19), was of opinion, that being united to matter, they themſelves frame an organized body to reſide in it. That hypotheſis may be confuted by our ignorance of what ought to be done, in order to put together nerves, veins, bones, &c. It might be anſwered, that the ſoul forgets all thoſe ideas, as ſoon as her lodging is finiſhed, becauſe the coarſeneſs of the organs of a human body breaks the communication ſhe had before with very ſubtile occaſional cauſes. But I had rather ſuppoſe that the ſoul itſelf does not direct the motions neceſſary for the growth of it's own *fœtus*; I had rather aſcribe that direction to another ſpirit. If any one had a mind to rectify the ſuppoſitions of Avicenna (20), he might ſay that there is a created intelligence, which preſides over the organization of animals, and makes, as it were, a kind of a general manufacture of them; that it has an infinite number of workers under it's direction, ſome for the bodies of birds, others for the bodies of fiſhes, &c. juſt as in our towns we ſee great variety of tradeſmen; ſome make watches, others make cloaths, &c.

[*D*] *He was accuſed . . . . . of impiety, becauſe he taught that the ſouls of beaſts are not material.*] He rejects (21) the opinion of thoſe, who maintain that they are not of a more noble nature than the elements; and he ſays, that they are by their nature as immortal as the ſouls of men; ſo that if the latter do not periſh with their bodies, as the others do, it is through a ſpecial favour of the Creator (22). He could not deny that he aſcribed an incorporeal nature to the ſouls of beaſts; for he acknowledged that they are not produced from matter, and he laughed at the ſchoolmens eduction: but he would not ſay that they are immortal. Freitag (23), who writ againſt him with great fury, did not fail to object to him that his doctrine was impious and blaſphemous: which was the reaſon why a book was publiſhed (24) in his vindication with this title. *De origine & natura animarum in brutis ſententiæ clariſſ. Theologorum in aliquot Germaniæ Academiis, quibus ſimul Daniel Sennertus à crimine blaſphemiæ & hæreſeos à Joh. Freitagio ipſi intentato abſolvitur.* Freitag giving the alarm, applied himſelf to all the univerſities in Chriſtendom, and to all the lovers of orthodoxy, earneſtly exhorting them not to ſuffer thoſe pernicious innovations. He aſked the Divines, whether they would bear that impious opinion, which aſcribed immortality to the ſouls of beaſts, which revived the doctrine of the Tranſmigration of ſouls, &c. ‘Admittent ne Theologi impiam illam de actu formarum entitativo, quo animis brutorum talis aſſignatur eſſentia & ſubſtantia, quâ extrà propriam quam informant materiam, alibi ſubſiſtere & exiſtere poſſint, opinionem? quâ Metempſychoſis reducitur, Palingeneſia adſtruitur, & pecudum animabus immortalitas comparatur. Ferentne commentum de generatione formarum corruptibilium ex nihilo, è diametro ſacræ ſcripturæ adverſum & inimicum (25) - - - - - *Will Divines agree to that impious opinion concerning the eſſential act of forms, whereby ſuch an eſſence and ſubſtance is aſcribed to the ſouls of beaſts, that they can ſubſiſt and exiſt ſeparate from their proper matter which they inform? whereby the tranſmigration of ſouls is revived, their regeneration eſtabliſhed, and immortality attributed to the ſouls of brutes. Can they bear the fiction concerning the production of corruptible forms from nothing, diametrically oppoſite and contrary to the ſacred Scripture?*’ He ſuppoſes that the greateſt part of the profeſſors of Wittemberg were willing to ſtifle thoſe monſters, but that the great intereſt of their colleague prevented their riſing up againſt him. *Non ignoro Reverendos & celeberrimos Theologiæ in Academiâ Witebergicâ Profeſſores, cæteroſque Clariſſimos Profeſſores & Philoſophos, paucis de fæce Sennertiana, qui ab ipſius auſpiciis dependent, & ſputa Sennerti lingunt, quod ejus promotione gaudeant, exceptis, non tantum diſſentire, ſed & omni conatu id velle, ut errores hi in ipſâ herbâ ſupprimantur, verùm ita cohiberi quod adverſus iſtum Væjovem Sennertum magnatum quorundam favore fultum ſubnixumque vix mutire & hiſcere auſint* (26). Sennertus complained that Freitag imputed to him ſuch conſequences as he did not acknowledge. ‘Malitia verò eſt, *ſays he* (27), quòd paſſim opiniones mihi affingit, quæ mihi nunquam in mentem venerunt. Inter quas non poſtrema eſt, quòd ſcribit, me ſtatuere beſtialium animarum immortalitatem. Pro bono Viro Freitagium non habebo, donec monſtraverit locum, in quo ſtatuerim, animam canis, equi, bovis, leonis, anſeris, anatis, corvi, & ſimilium brutorum eſſe immortales, & poſt mortem ſupereſſe. Conſequentiæ verò, quibus id è meis opinionibus extorquere vult, nullæ ſunt. Etſi enim inſectorum, & ſponte natorum formæ corpore organico ad ſenſum diſſoluto in materia inſtar ſeminis ſeſe habente aliquandiu conſiſtere poſſint: tamen immortales non ſunt, ſed ſuo tempore abolentur. Neque ideò animæ brutorum ſunt immortales, quia ex nihilo à Deo creatæ ſunt. Neque enim immobilis, ut putat regula eſt, quod aliquid quod ſemel fuit, in nihilum redigi nequeat. Longe rectiùs J. C. Scaliger, exerc. 307. ſect. 20. ſcribit, &c. - - - *But it is from malice, that he every where imputes to me opinions which never came into my mind. Among which it is not the leaſt, that I maintain the immortality of the ſouls of brutes. I ſhall not take Freitagius for a good man until he point out the place, in which I have affirmed, that the ſoul of a dog, horſe, ox, lion, gooſe, duck, raven, and the like brutes, are immortal, and remain after death. And there are no conſequences whereby that can be extorted from my opinions. For altho' the forms of inſects, and things beginning naturally, the organical body, as to ſenſe, being diſſolved, may, for ſome time, remain in a matter reſembling ſeed: yet they are not immortal, but periſh in their uſual time. Neither are the ſouls of brutes therefore immortal, be-*

---

(16) Note, that I own there is this difference between the enlarging of a houſe and the growth of a *fœtus*, that the organs of a *fœtus* are moulds, thro' which a new matter may be filtrated and diſtributed. A little houſe has no ſuch thing.

(17) Alphonſus Caranza, a Spaniſh Civilian, in the firſt chapter of his tract *De partu natur. & legitimo*, having rejected all the cauſes that are alledged of the formation of our bodies, aſcribes it to God. *Sennertus, ubi ſupra*, cap. xii, p. 144. confutes him.

(18) See remark [*M*], of the article MORIN (J. BAPT.)

(19) Henr. Morus, de Anima, *lib. ii, cap. iv.*

(20) See above citation (6).

(21) Sennert, ubi ſupra, *cap. ix, pag.* 137.

(22) Abs qua divina voluntate & peculiari erga homines gratia ſi fuiſſet, formæ humanæ non minus perituræ eſſent quam brutorum. *Ibid. cap. xiv, p.* 147.

(23) A Phyſician and profeſſor of Philoſophy at Groningen.

(24) *At Francfort* 1638, *in* 8*vo*, *See* Lindenius renovatus, *pag.* 237.

(25) Joh. Freitagius, *in* Apolog. ad Orbis Chriſtiani Academias, *p.* 18. *It is prefixed to the book intituled*, Novæ Sectæ Sennerto Paracelſicæ recens in Philoſophiam & Medicinam introductæ, quâ antiquæ veritatis oracula, & Ariſtotelicæ ac Galenicæ doctrinæ fundamenta convellere & ſtirpitus eruderare moliuntur novatores, Detectio & ſolida Refutatio, *printed at Amſterdam* 1637, *in* 8*vo*.

(26) Joh. Freitag. *in* Apolog. ad Orbis Chriſtiani Academias, *pag.* 18.

(27) Sennertus, Epiſt. ad Joh. Sperlingen, *in Libro cui Titulus*, Defenſio Tractatus de origine formarum pro D. Daniele Sennerto, contra D. Johannem Freitag. Auctore M. Johanne Sperlingen, Phyſ. Prof. P. *at Wittemberg*. 1638, *in* 8*vo*.

He rejected that conſequence; he durſt not ſay, as others do, that the ſouls of brutes ſubſiſt after the death of the ſubjects which they had animated [*E*]. His opinion about the

‘ *cauſe they are created of nothing by* GOD. *For it is* ‘ *not, as he thinks, an unchangeable rule, that any thing* ‘ *which once exiſted, cannot be reduced to nothing. Much* ‘ *better does J. C. Scaliger write,* &c.’ It is not impoſſible but that Sennertus, tho’ a man of great parts, might not perceive that the conſequences aſcribed to him, did naturally reſult from his principle; but it is ſtill more likely that he perceived them, but durſt not own them, *propter metum Judæorum,* - - *for fear of his enemies.* And therefore he rather choſe, by diſowning theſe conſequences, to be accounted a man, who did not argue well, and propoſed a confuſed ſyſtem, than to expoſe himſelf to all the conſequences of the doctrine of the immortality of beaſts. However it be, any Philoſopher, who pretends to argue conſequentially, will always chuſe rather to ſay, that he knows not what the ſouls of beaſts are, than to maintain, on the one ſide, that they are produced out of nothing, independently upon matter, and on the other, that they are not created beings, and that they are annihilated as ſoon as the brute ceaſes to live. Such was the confuſed opinion of Sennertus. His apologiſt (28) poſitively declares, that the ſouls of beaſts are made out of nothing, and yet that they are not produced by creation. He quotes Dannhawerus (29), who alledged the *ſpecies intellectuales,* to ſhew whatever is made out of nothing, is not a created being. He quotes Thummius (30), who alledged the habits of the ſoul to prove the ſame thing. Thus the Peripatetics elude every thing with arguments *ad hominem.* Freitag does continually object to Sennertus, that he believes the immortality of the ſouls of beaſts; he falls into a Poetical enthuſiaſm to exhort all manner of beaſts to ſhout with joy and triumph; he pretends that our Phyſician revives the idle fancies of Paracelſus, who taught, that all ſouls returned again into the world from time to time. ‘ Plaudite ait, oves & ‘ & boves, lupi & ſcarabæi, & veſpæ & quicquid ‘ uſpiam crabronum eſt.

Vita equidem veſtris animis à funere reſtat,
  Reſtat & in corpus poſſe redire novum.
Fœlices animæ quod ubivis eſſe poteſtis,
  Dum triplicis mundi flamma reſolvat opus.
Dicite quæ vobis ſtatio & fortuna ſuperſit,
  Cum ruat in priſcum machina trina Chaos?

‘ Subjicit. Hi ſcilicet ſunt fructus floreſque novæ ‘ doctrinæ à Paracelſo profectæ, quam Chriſtiani etiam ‘ (proh pudor!) ferè amplecti non erubeſcunt, qua ‘ ſtatuitur formas rerum præter humanam corruptibilium, officio informationis functas, eſſentiam & ‘ exiſtentiam ſuam ſervare, ubi Paracelſus addit eas ire ‘ ad Orcum & Iliadum ſuum, & quotannis aut certis ‘ temporibus redire in mundi theatrum, & aſſumpto ‘ fabricatoque corpore perſonam ſuam pro ævo ſibi ‘ deſtinato ſuſtinere, eaque depoſitâ viciſſim ad ſuos ‘ ibi avos & proavos immortali quiete beatos redire (31). - - - - *Rejoice,* ſays he, *ye ſheep and oxen,* ‘ *wolves and beetles, waſps and all hornets. Your* ‘ *ſouls live after death, and may return into a new body.* ‘ *Happy ſouls! that may be where you will, whilſt* ‘ *flames conſume the triple world. Say what place and* ‘ *fortune you can have, when the threefold machine* ‘ *ſhall tumble into it’s antient chaos. He adds. Thoſe,* ‘ *forſooth, are the fruits and flowers of the new doctrine* ‘ *of Paracelſus, which even Chriſtians, alas! are not* ‘ *aſhamed to embrace, which teaches, that beſides the* ‘ *human ſoul, the forms of things periſhable do preſerve* ‘ *their eſſence and exiſtence, where Paracelſus adds,* ‘ *that they go into their place of reception, and yearly,* ‘ *or at certain times, return upon the ſtage of the world,* ‘ *and having aſſumed and framed a body, act their part* ‘ *for the time appointed, and quitting it again, return to* ‘ *their grandfathers and anceſtors happy in an immortal* ‘ *reſt.*’ Sperlingen anſwers in few words, That it is neither his nor Sennertus’s doctrine (32): He therefore tacitly confeſſes, that they know not how to draw from a principle the conſequences ariſing from it, and that they aſcribe a very ſtrange conduct to GOD, *viz.* That he has ordered an almoſt infinite number of incorporeal ſubſtances to be created, which he is to abolish and annihilate in a ſhort time after. Heat produces every year an infinite number of little animals, which live no longer than the heat laſts. What diſorder is it in nature, that ſo many ſpiritual ſouls ſhould be annihilated, becauſe there happens ſome alteration in the organs of animals? It is to be obſerved that the ſchool Philoſophers have uſed againſt the Carteſians the ſame cunning which Dannhawerus and Thummius did uſe. They brought in ſome inſtances to ſhew, that ſome things are produced out of nothing, and yet are not properly created. The accidents of matter afforded them thoſe inſtances; but the Carteſians anſwered, that thoſe accidents are not beings diſtinct from the ſubject which they modify: and therefore the arguments made uſe of to prove that ſubſtantial forms would be created beings, cannot be retorted. The Carteſians reduce all the alterations of matter to local motion, and maintain that the motion of a body is the body itſelf, as it receives exiſtence with new relations. They muſt therefore acknowledge that matter, conſidered as being in motion, is created, and that GOD alone can produce motion; for none but GOD can create. This might paſs, if the ſchoolmen had not recourſe to other examples; but they aſk whether the free acts of a man’s ſoul are diſtinct from the ſoul. If they are diſtinct from it, they are beings produced out of nothing, and yet not created; nothing then hinders but it may be ſaid that ſubſtantial forms are not created. If they are not diſtinct from it, a man’s ſoul, conſidered as willing a ſin, is created: and therefore it is not the ſoul that forms that act of her will; for ſince it is not diſtinct from the ſubſtance of the ſoul, and ſhe cannot be the cauſe of her own exiſtence, it plainly follows, that ſhe cannot be the cauſe of any of her thoughts. She is not therefore anſwerable for willing ill things *hic & nunc,* no more than for exiſting *hic & nunc.* The Carteſians know not how to anſwer that objection: the perplexity they are in brings in again the doctrine of ſubſtantial forms, and all the chimera’s of the ſchools, becauſe the arguments alledged by them prove too much. Such is the fate of diſputes: they ſpring again out of their own aſhes; the party ready to lay down their arms find at laſt ſome retorſion, whereby they recover their ſtrength, and the ground they had loſt, and diſpute it as before.

[*E*] *He durſt not ſay, as others do, that the ſouls of brutes ſubſiſt after the death of the ſubjects which they had animated.*] Joannes Scotus Erigena maintained not only that they are not material, but alſo that they continue to live after the death of the brutes. John Lippius, profeſſor of Divinity at Straſbourg taught the ſame thing (33). Dr Henry More, a Cambridge Divine, aſſerts, that they ſubſiſt out of the body, and thinks it probable enough that they continue to live in that ſtate, but dares not affirm it; only he alledges the reaſons *pro* and *con* (34). I have verified what a profeſſor of Leipſic aſcribes to him (35). *Morus & ſuperſtites* (animas brutorum) *& in corpora alia remeare tradit, cap.* 5. (36). That profeſſor tells us a curious thing, *viz.* That a certain man had taught, a few years before, that if man had not ſinned, brutes had never died, and that they ſhall be raiſed with men, to be tranſported into Heaven: which is the opinion of the Turks. *Abſurdiſſime omnium M. B. Semigentilis & ſemi Chriſtianus ante paucos annos cum monſtroſis opinionibus aliis etiam hanc protulit, bruta niſi peccaviſſet homo, moritura non fuiſſe, atque eadem tamen licet nunc moriantur, cum hominibus olim reſuſcitanda, & ab hoc centro mundi ad liberiora cœli ſpatia transferenda; quod ſomnium olim Muhammedis à Turcis hodie credi, teſtis eſt* Joh. Andreas in libro de Confuſione Sectæ Muhammeticæ (37). He obſerves, that according to Taurellus, the ſouls of beaſts are ſpiritual, and yet die with their bodies (38). Perhaps Taurellus argued inconſiſtently for fear of expoſing himſelf; he rather choſe to prejudice his reaſon than his fortune. Or perhaps he and Sennertus came to believe, out of a principle of religion, that GOD deſtroys the ſouls of beaſts, that none might ſubſiſt for ever but thoſe of men. Perhaps this was the opinion of the moſt eminent Rabbi that hath flouriſhed in the XVIIth century; for endeavouring to prove that the ſouls the cauſe of metals and minerals was ſomewhat ſingular ; he believed they were formed by intelligent and ſpiritual Beings [*F*].

---

(28) Sperlingen, *pag.* 182, of the book, the title of which I have juſt now ſet down,

(29) Dannhawerus, *in* Collegio Pſych. *Diſput.* *VI.*

(30) Thummius, *in* Diſputat. de traduce.

(31) Sperlingen, Defenſio Tractatus, &c, *p.* 206, 207.

(32) Mendacium eſt, brutorum animas nobis immortales & poſt mortem ſuperſtites eſſe. Mendacium eſt, nobis animas illas ubique eſſe, & abſque omni in mundo vagari materia. Mendacium eſt, nobis ortum ac interitum hominum & brutorum unum eundemque eſſe. Mendacium eſt, nobis bruta & homines formâ ſimiles & materiâ pares eſſe. *Ibid. pag.* 210.

(33) Subſtantiam incorpoream docuerunt *Joannes Scotus Erigena, lib. iii, de diviſione naturæ, n.* 41 . . . . *Joan. Lippius* . . . . *in Metaphyſica magna lib. ii, cap. i, pag.* 386 . . . . *ille,* adverſus Baſilium & Gregorium Nyſſenum diſputans, vitam ſeparatas à corpore non amittere; *hic,* quoque ſejunctas in aëre exiſtere atque modo aliquo operari opinatur, forte cum univerſo olim in nihilum redigendas. *Joan. Cyprianus, Hiſtor. Animal. Continuat.* pag. 24.

(34) Henr. Morus, de Anima. *lib. ii, cap. vi, num.* 105, *pag. m.* 106.

(35) Joan. Cyprianus, ubi ſupra.

(36) He ſhould have added *lib. ii, pag.* 90.

(37) Cyprian. Hiſt. Animal. Continuat. *pag.* 24.

(38) Subſtantiam incorpoream docuerunt . . . . *Nicolaus Taurellus* . . . . . *in libello de vita & morte quæſt. altera, propoſit.* IV. . . . . brutorum animas à morte ſupereſſe negat. *Id. ibid.*

ſouls of brutes do not ſubſiſt after this life, as mens ſouls do, he does not alledge any reaſon taken from the internal conſtitution, or from the eſſence of thoſe ſouls. He merrily thus argues : We often dream, *ſays he*, that we ſee people that are deceaſed ; but we never ſee in a dream any animal after it's death, tho' it has been familiarly bred in our houſes. Spizelius has reaſon to reject this Logic, he ſhould likewiſe have denied the fact. A great many people may diſprove the Rabbi ; they dream a thouſand times of their dead dogs and horſes. *Satis ineptè Menaſſe Ben Iſrael* lib. I. de Reſurr. Mort. cap. IX. *contendit*, Animam hominum, non brutorum eſſe ſuperſtitem ex eo, quod ſæpe de illis ſomniemus qui jam diu è vita exceſſere, nunquam tamen ſomniemus de ulla beſtia, quæ mortua ſit, etiamſi nobis familiaris ac domeſtica fuerit (39). Obſerve, that the pretended blaſphemies charged upon Sennertus, by a Phyſician and profeſſor of Philoſophy at Groningen, were not looked upon as an ill doctrine by the German Divines. ‘ Non negandum eſt, poſt Franzii librum hunc (40) aliquoties editum Theologos Lipſienſes, Roſtochienſes, Baſileenſes, Regiomontanos quinquagintâ abhinc annis de animâ beſtiarum interrogatos, inclinaſſe magis in Danielis Sennerti opinionem, cui aſſerenti animas brutorum olim ex nihilo creatas, & hodie etiam alterius quam elementaris naturæ eſſe, blaſphemiam & hæreſim *Johannes Freitagius Profeſſor Medicus Groningæ* intentaverat. Enim verò & eoſdem nominatos Theologos legimus in Reſponſis ſuis candide diſceptationem de naturâ elementari ejus animæ à ſe ad Philoſophos devolviſſe, eorumque libertati permiſiſſe (41). - - - *It is not to be denied, that after ſome editions of this book of Franzius, the Divines of Leipſic, Reſtock, Baſil, Konigſberg, and others, being about fifty years ſince conſulted about the ſoul of beaſts, inclined more to the opinion of Daniel Sennertus, whom* John Freitag, Profeſſor of Medicine at Groningen, *had charged with blaſphemy and hereſy, for aſſerting that the ſouls of beaſts were at firſt created of nothing, and even at this day are not of an elementary nature. For we read that theſe ſame Divines did fairly refer to the Philoſophers the controverſy concerning the elementary nature of theſe ſouls, leaving them to their freedom of thought therein.*’

I ſhall make a reflexion before I conclude this remark. Tho' Sennertus was pleaſed to ſay, that the ſouls of brutes do not ſubſiſt after this life, as human ſouls do, he laid down a doctrine, whereby it plainly appears, that the ſouls of beaſts are of the ſame ſpecies with thoſe of men. The difference of their fate, as to duration, does not proceed from the difference of their perfections, but from the free will of the ſupreme maſter, who is a cauſe wholly external. Medals and money, which princes order to be ſtamped, are an image of the conduct which that Phyſician aſcribes to GOD. Medals are ſtamped to laſt for ever : money is coined to laſt till a new order to the contrary ; for after a certain time it is cried down, and melted, and converted into other forms : and medals and money are made of the ſame metal. According to Sennertus, a human ſoul is like medals, and the ſoul of a brute is like money. This is a dangerous opinion ; it would follow from thence, that we cannot be ſure of the immortality of our ſouls but by revelation. Honoratus Fabri, the Jeſuit, who uſes Sennertus with the utmoſt contempt, and taxes him with grounding his doctrine upon frivolous objections and anſwers, maintains that this opinion is ſomewhat impious (42). ‘ Ad rationes n. 2. & 3. adductas nonnulla reponit, *(Sennertus, Hypomen.* 4. *c.* 10.*)* quæ nemo ſapiens refellere dignetur : v. g. vult, animam rationalem ex natura & indole ſua immortalem non eſſe, ſed tantum ex voluntate ac decreto Dei ; ſed contrarium demonſtravi, & hoc nonnihil impietatis ſapit : præterea vult ſemen deciſum divina benedictione carere, ac proinde animam, quæ ipſi inerat, interire ; ſi hæ nugæ non ſint, nuſquam invenies . . . . . Denique quod adducit ex ſcriptura creſcite & multiplicamini . . . . (43) pluſquam inane eſt . . . . ſed hæc mittamus, ſinamuſque hominem, ut egregium medicum, ita vix mediocrem Philoſophum, & prorſus Catholicum (44). - - - - *To the reaſons mentioned n.* 2. *and* 3. *Sennertus gives ſome anſwers, which no wiſe man would vouchſafe to refute ; for inſtance, he ſays, the rational ſoul is not, of it's proper nature and diſpoſition, immortal, but only by the will and decree of* GOD ; *but I have demonſtrated the contrary, and it ſavours ſomewhat of impiety : moreover, he will have the ſeparated ſeed to be without the divine benediction, and therefore the ſoul which was in it dies ; if this is not trifling, nothing is. . . . Finally, what he brings from Scripture,* be fruitful and multiply . . . . *is moſt inſignificant . . . . . but we will let theſe things paſs, and let the man alone, who though an excellent Phyſician, was ſcarcely an indifferent Philoſopher, and altogether uncatholic.*' But notwithſtanding his great contempt for the Philoſophy of that Phyſician, he takes his objections againſt the common opinion of the ſchool-men, concerning the ſouls of brutes, to be unanſwerable. He forſakes theſe men, and all the hypotheſes oppoſed by Sennertus ; and all that he ſays comes to this, that the ſouls of beaſts are not produced anew, that they are not abſolute beings, but a reſultance of a certain mixture of the four elements (45). This is an abſurd opinion, which would lead us to ſay the ſame thing of human ſouls.

[*F*] *He believed that* metals *are formed by intelligent and ſpiritual Beings.*] He did not ſay what his antagoniſt imputed to him, that a ſtone produced another ſtone, and a piece of gold another piece of the ſame metal ; but he ſaid that ſome ſpirits, whoſe abode was unknown to him, and who keep only in certain places, inſinuate themſelves into mines and quarries, and there produce the ſeveral ſorts of foſſiles that are to be found in them. Let us ſee how he expreſſes himſelf : he invented not this opinion ; many learned men have had the ſame thought. ‘ Malitioſè & illud mihi affingit ; quaſi ſtatuam in lib. de conſenſ. & diſſenſ. cap. 9. quod lapis lapidem, gemma gemmam, metallum metallum generet. Neque enim tam ſtultus ſum, ut credam, hunc adamantem, hanc cryſtallum, hoc aurum generare alium adamantem, aliam cryſtallum, aliud aurum, ſicut planta una aliam, aut bos bovem (hæc enim generatio ſolum viventium eſt) generat. Hæc verò mea, Anſhelmi Boëtii, & aliorum doctorum Virorum mens eſt, omnia metalla, lapides, gemmas, quæ hactenus è terra eruta ſunt, & adhuc eruuntur, omnia in prima creatione ſecundum individua creata non eſſe, ſed fodinas gemmarum & metallorum quod alleg. loc. pluribus hiſtoriis probavi, iterum repleri : & eſſe quoſdam ſpiritus formam architectonicam metallorum & gemmarum in ſe continentes, qui in terra, quiſque ſecundum ſuam ſpeciem, producant metalla, lapides, gemmas, iiſque figuram, colorem, & alia propria accidentia tribuant, & hos ſpiritus in fodinas & matrices gemmarum & metallorum ſeſe diffundere, atque iſta metalla & gemmas producere. Idque eſſe formas metallorum multiplicari, dixi. E quibus autem ſedibus & locis ſpiritus illi proveniant, nobis ignotum eſt, utpote ignorantibus quænam globi terreni in terra conſtitutio ſit. Hoc certum eſt, ſpiritus iſtos non ubivis terrarum reperiri, ſed in quibuſdam ſaltem locis (46). - - - - *He maliciouſly alſo and falſly repreſents me ; as if I had ſaid, that a ſtone generates a ſtone, a metal a metal. For I am not ſo fooliſh as to believe, that this diamond, this cryſtal, this gold, begets another diamond, another cryſtal, another gold, as one plant produces another plant, or one bull another ; for this manner of production is only of things that have life. But this is not my opinion only, but is alſo that of Anſhelm, Boëtius, and of other learned men, that all metals, ſtones, gems, which hitherto have been, and ſtill are, dug out of the earth, were not every individual formed at the firſt creation, but that the mines of gems and metals, are again repleniſhed, as I have proved in the places above-mentioned by many Hiſtories : and that there are certain ſpirits that have in them the architectonic forming of metals, and gems, which produce in the earth, every one according to it's ſpecies, metals, ſtones, gems, and give them figure, colour, and other proper accidents ; and that theſe ſpirits diffuſe themſelves into the mines and veins of gems and metals, which there they produce. And this, I ſaid, was to multiply forms of metals : but from what ſeats or places theſe ſpirits come, is to us unknown, being ignorant of the internal conſtitution of the terreſtrial globe. This is certain, that theſe ſpirits are not be found every where, but*

---

(39) Spizelius, *in* Scrutinio Atheiſmi, *pag.* 125.

(40) That is, *Hiſtoria Animalium ſacra*, written by Wolfgang Franzius Doctor of Divinity, where theſe words are to be found, *cap. ii, pag. m.* 14. *Sciendum eſt* animum bruti non eſſe ſpiritum incorporeum, *qualis eſt noſtra mens inviſiblis & immortalis, alias quoque bruta eſſent immortalia.*

(41) Joh. Cyprianus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 27.

(42) Honoratus Fabri, de Generat. Hominis, *lib. vii, Propoſit. L, pag.* 535, *Edit. Norimberg.* 1677.

(43) He ſays in another place, *Bonus Sennertus fruſtra ſe torquet & recurrit ad ſuum* Creſcite & multiplicamini ; *fruſtra alios ignorantiæ accuſat, rerum iſtarum Philoſophicarum ſatis imperitus.* Idem. *lib. v,* de Gener. Animal. *Propoſit. lxvi, pag.* 178.

(44) I think it ſhould be *Acabolicum*.

(45) *See his fifth book*, de Generat. Animalium, *Propoſit. lvi, & ſeq. pag.* 164, *& ſeq.*

(46) Daniel Sennertus, Epiſtola ad Joh. Sperlingen : *It is in Sperlingen's tract intituled*, Defenſio Tractatus de origine formarum.

‘ *only in certain places.*’ This ſeems to be abſurd; but if it be conſidered, 1. That a good Philoſopher muſt aſſign another cauſe of the phænomena than God's will. 2. That neither the earth, nor the elementary qualities of foſſils, nor their ſubſtantial forms, ſeem capable of any effect, that requires a certain diſpoſition of parts, a choice, a knowledge of what is proper: I ſay, if this be conſidered, and beſides that one cannot apprehend that the laws of motion ſhould be able to place the particles of matter exactly as they ought to be in order to make gold, a diamond, an emerald, &c. or to chuſe thoſe that are fit for it, that opinion of Sennertus ſeems to have ſome probability in it (47). Can the virtues of bodies, and the general laws of motion, make any thing in our ſhops and laboratories without our direction? Could they make a ſhoe, a glove, a needle, if men did not meddle with them? How then can one believe that they produce, without any direction, a vaſt number of things, a thouſand times more difficult than our clocks?

(47) Compare what is ſaid remark [*M*] of the article MORINUS, (J. BAPT.)

SENNERTUS (ANDREW) profeſſor of the oriental languages in the univerſity of Wittemberg his birth-place, publiſhed a great many books [*A*], which ſhew, that he learnedly and worthily diſcharged the duties of his profeſſorſhip. He exerciſed it fifty one years (*a*), and died the twenty-ſecond of December 1689 (*b*), being eighty-four years of age. He learned the Arabic tongue of Golius at Leyden, and found out a very good method to teach it (*c*). Dr Pocock, who underſtood it admirably well, gave him that encomium (*d*). He was commended for ſeveral other things in his funeral oration, and particularly for this, that the purity of his morals, and the temperance always viſible in his conduct, procured him the advantage of attaining to a great old age, with the vigor of body and mind, that is neceſſary to bear the fatigues of ſtudy, and the cares of a profeſſor (*e*).

(*a*) Witte, Diar. Biograph. *Tom. ii, pag.* 172.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Conradus Samuel Schurzfleiſchius, Orat. funeb. Andreæ Sennerti, *pag.* 91, *Edit. Witt.* 1697.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 95.

[*A*] *He publiſhed a great many books.*] You will find a catalogue of them in the ſecond volume (1), of Witte's *Diarum Biographicum*, out of which I ſhall only tranſcribe the following lines. *Athenæ & inſcriptiones Wittenbergenſes. Diſſertatio de quatuor linguæ Ebraicæ ætatibus. Scrutinium religionum, de religionum varietate, & una ſola Chriſtiana & vera. De principio religionis in genere, & Chriſtianæ in ſpecie. De punctorum vocalium Ebr. neque cum literis, neque cum verbo Dei coævitate; de Urim & Tummim.*

(1) Pag. 172, 173.

SERBELLONE, an Italian family, which has afforded ſeveral men of note, as will appear hereafter. According to fabulous genealogies, it derives its original from Cerdubellius, the head of the Spaniards in the time of Scipio Africanus (*a*). We are told, that ſome ages ago, it was divided into three branches, becauſe three brothers left Burgundy, where their family flouriſhed, and one of them went to the kingdom of Valencia, the other to Naples, and the eldeſt to Milan. The Spaniſh branch removed long after into Sardinia, where it continues to this day. That of Naples is extinct, or has been re-united to that of Milan, which made a greater figure than the reſt, and is ſtill conſiderable (*b*). The perſons I am going to ſpeak of deſcended from it.

(*a*) Gio-Petro de Creſcenzi *nel ſuo* Amfiteatro Romano, *apud* Prioratum, Scena d'Huomini illuſtri.

(*b*) Priorato, Scena d'Huom. illuſtri; *and obſerve that his book was printed in* 1659.

SERBELLONE (JOHN PETER) was the father and uncle of ſeveral illuſtrious perſons. He married in the year 1506, Elizabeth Rainoldi, a woman of a noble and ancient family in Milan, and aunt of John Baptiſt Rainoldi, preſident of the ſenate of that town. He had by that marriage five ſons and two daughters: one of the two daughters was a nun; the other was married to the Count de Macagno. GABRIEL his eldeſt ſon, was a very great captain. I ſhall beſtow an article upon him. The ſecond, whoſe name was JOHN BAPTIST, took orders, attached himſelf to the court of Rome, was made Biſhop of Caſſano in Calabria, where he did not reſide, becauſe he was employed in ſeveral important intrigues at Rome, and was appointed by Pope Pius IV, governor of the caſtle of St Angelo during his whole pontificate. The third ſon of Peter Serbellone was called FABRICIUS: I ſhall alſo beſtow an article upon him. The fourth ſon was called JOHN ANTONY, who was Biſhop of Foligno, and then of Novara, and the firſt cardinal whom Pope Pius IV made in the year 1560. He was governor of ſeveral towns in the Eccleſiaſtical ſtate, legate of Peruggia and Romagna, Biſhop of Oſtia and Velletri, and died Dean of the ſacred college in the year 1591. He was a cunning Polititian, who had a hand in the moſt ſecret negotiations of the court of Rome, under the Popes Pius IV, Pius V, Gregory XIII, and Sixtus V. Being couſin to Pius IV, he eaſily obtained ſome very conſiderable privileges for the college of Doctors at Milan. He found it more difficult to get them confirmed by Sixtus V, who had reſolved to ſuppreſs them; but at laſt he carried his point, and even got thoſe privileges enlarged. The laſt ſon concerned himſelf only with his domeſtic affairs. Our Serbellone had a ſiſter called CECILIA, who was married in the year 1485, to Bernard de Medicis [*A*]. From this marriage came ſix ſons and ſeven daughters (*a*) [*B*].

(*a*) *Taken from Count* Gualdo Priorato, Scena d'Huomini illuſtri.

[*A*] *Cecilia . . . was married to Bernard de Medicis.*] Priorato ſeems to approve thoſe, who ſay that this Bernard was of the family of Medicis, which has obtained the ſupreme power at Florence (1); but many other writers call the family of Pius IV, by the name of Medequin, and not by that of Medicis.

[*B*] . . . . *From this marriage came ſix ſons and ſeven daughters.*] John James the eldeſt ſon, was the famous Marquis de Marignan, one of the greateſt captains of his age. The ſecond, who was made cardinal by Paul III, was elected Pope in 1559, and took the name of Pius IV. Two other ſons of Cecilia Serbellone, were ſucceſſively Marquiſſes of Marignan, after the death of their eldeſt brother. Their brother Gabriel ſerved in the armies of Charles V with great courage: The youngeſt brother died a child. Of the ſeven daughters, none but two, *viz.* Margaret and Clara, remained in the world; the other five were made Nuns.

(1) Bernardo della nobiliſſima famiglia de Medici, che ſi era traſferito ad habitare da Fiorenza in Milano come ſcrive Bernardino Cario.

Nuns. Margaret was married to the Count Gilbert Borromeo, and was the mother of St Charles Borromeo. Clara was the wife of Count Mark d'Altaemps (2). I have mentioned in another place (3) a cardinal who proceeded from this marriage.

(2) *Taken from Count* Gualdo Priorato, Scena d'Huomini illuſtri.

(3) In the article ALTAEMPS.

SERBELLONE (Gabriel) eldeſt ſon of the foregoing, was a warrior of great repute in the XVIth century. He was knight of Malta, and grand prior of Hungary. He gave proofs of his valour when he defended Strigonia againſt the Ottoman forces, and ſignalized himſelf *(a)* at the famous paſſage of the Elbe, and at the battle that was fought ſoon after, in which Charles V, obtained a victory over the Duke of Saxony. He was Lieutenant-general of the imperial army. He had the ſame poſt in Italy in the army of the Marquis de Marignan his couſin, during the war of Siena, and it was to him that this place ſurrendred at laſt. He had before ſubdued *(b)* Saluſſes in Piedmont for the Emperor Charles V. After the taking of Siena, he took ſeveral other towns in Tuſcany, which refuſed to acknowledge the houſe of Medicis; and being made general of the holy Church, both by ſea and land, under the pontificate of Pius IV, he recovered Aſcoli, he built ſeveral fortreſſes in the Ecceſiaſtical State fortified the caſtle of St Angelo, re-built Civita Vecchia, and performed ſeveral other things of that nature; for he was a very good engineer, which was the reaſon why, after the death of Pius IV, the King of Spain ſent him into the kingdom of Naples, and into Sicily, to take a view of all the places, and order what he ſhould think fit. Being gone occaſionally into the iſle of Malta, he there drew the plan, and laid the foundations of the new town *(c)*. The Duke of Alva took him with him in the famous expedition of the Netherlands *(d)*. Serbellone was general of the artillery, and went conſtantly before to make the ways ready; ſo that he had a great ſhare in the glory of that famous march, one of the moſt remarkable operations that ever was ſeen in that kind. Though the engineer Paciotti, whom the Duke of Alva obtained of the Duke of Savoy, directed the conſtruction of the citadel of Antwerp; yet it is certain, that Serbellone was the chief ſuperviſor of that work *(e)*. He returned ſome time after into Italy, and was at the battle of Lepanto, where he acquired great glory. He was there Captain-general of the artillery *(f)*, and commander of a ſquadron of Spaniſh gallies. He was ſo much for giving battle, that he made Don Juan of Auſtria reſolve upon it. The year following he commaded in Sicily, and was made viceroy of Tunis. The Turks having taken Gouletta, beſieged him with ſo many troops in Tunis *(g)*, where the citadel he was building was not yet finiſhed, that after they had been repulſed in fourteen ſeveral aſſaults, at laſt they took the place ſword in hand. He was made priſoner, and carried to Conſtantinople. He was exchanged for thirty-ſix Turkiſh officers taken at the battle of Lepanto [*A*]. When he arrived at Milan, his birth-place, in 1575, that city publickly expreſſed their joy for his arrival. He was Lieutenant-general to the Marquis d'Aimonte, governor of the Milaneſe, the two following years, that is, he governed that country alone; for the governor durſt not ſtay in it by reaſon of the Plague. Afterwards Serbellone received orders to repair to the Netherlands, to command there immediately under Don Juan *(h)*. He brought thither two thouſand men raiſed in the Milaneſe. That prince had a great eſteem for him, and gave him the title of father. He entruſted him with the care of haſtening, as much as he could, the conſtruction of the citadel of Namur *(i)*; but they fell ſick both of them [*B*], which put a ſtop to the work. Don Juan, who was only in the thirty-third year of his age died of his ſickneſs: Serbellone, though above ſeventy years old, recovered of his *(k)*. He had a great ſhare in the taking of Maeſtricht [*C*]; and returned into Italy towards the latter end of the year 1579. He had been choſen to command the army which Philip II, intended to ſend into

(a) In 1547.

(b) In 1552.

(c) Ex Priorato; Scena d'Huomini illuſtri.

(d) In 1567.

(e) Ex Strada, de Bello Belg. *I. Dec. lib. vi, vii.*

(f) In 1571.

(g) In 1574. See Thuanus, *lib. lviii,*

(h) Ex Priorato, ubi ſupra.

(i) In 1578.

(k) Ex Strada, ubi ſupra, *Dec. I, lib. x.*

[*A*] *He was exchanged for thirty ſix Turkiſh officers, taken at the battle of Lepanto.*] Gregory XIII made that exchange. ' Nec multo ante redierat Gabriel ' Serbellonius ex Tunetana captivitate in libertatem aſ- ' ſertus à Gregorio XIII, commutatione captivorum ' qui navalis victoriæ reliqui Adriana mole attinebantur, charum in primis Auſtriaco ac partibus caput, ' exactæque non magis ætatis quam diſciplinæ militaris exemplum (1). - - - - *Not long before this Gabriel Serbellone returned from his captivity at Tunis, ' being ſet at liberty by Pope Gregory XIII, in exchange ' for the priſoners, who remaining after the naval victory, were kept at Caſtle-Angelo, a man exceeding dear ' to Don Juan of Auſtria, and both an example of ' honourable old age, and a pattern for military diſcipline.*'

[*B*] *They fell ſick both of them.*] Strada (2) obſerves upon this occaſion, that the ſymptoms being the ſame, all the Phyſicians excepting that of the Duke of Parma (3) affirmed, that Don Juan would recover, and that Serbellone would die. And yet the latter was on the mending hand that day the other died; whereupon Pennoni was as much admired as he had been laughed at. Three things might have made him be looked upon as an inconſiderate man; the old age of Serbellone, of whoſe life he did not deſpair, and the youth and quality of Don Juan, whom he gave over; but ſince the Duke of Parma was to ſucceed Don Juan, Pennoni's freedom is not much to be wondered at.

[*C*] *He had a great ſhare in the taking of Maeſtricht.*] Priorato ſays, it was Serbellone that took that town, and was the firſt that got into it. I durſt not ſay ſo much, the thing being not likely, conſidering the age of that great captain. It ſhould have been the action of an adventurer; for we muſt remember that Maeſtricht was taken by ſtorm. Priorato is guilty of a ſurpriſing omiſſion; for he ſays nothing of Serbellone's firſt journey into the Netherlands; and tho' he aſcribes to him the conſtruction of the citadel of Antwerp, which was built in his firſt journey, it plainly appears that he did not know that the Duke of Alva brought with him Gabriel Serbellone; he mentions the citadel of Antwerp only, after having mentioned Serbellone's journey in 1577, and the taking of Maeſtricht

Thuanus mentions one Count Cernellone (§ *a*), knight of Malta, and Prior of Hungary, who is the ſame with our Gabriel Serbellone, and yet he diſtinguiſhes them: for having ſaid, that the Duke of Alva cauſed the citadel of Antwerp to be built, being adviſed to it by Chapin Vitelli and Count Cernellone, who had taken

(1) Strada, *lib. x. Dec. I.*

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Hippolitus Pennonius.

[(§ *a*) An error of the preſs corrected, letter C, of the Index of Thuanus, Rem. Crit.]

into Portugal, to ſeize on that kingdom as ſoon as Cardinal Henry ſhould die; but he had not time to crown his glorious life with that great exploit. He died in January 1580, being ready to go into Spain (*l*). One of his ſons was killed at the ſiege of Tunis (*m*).

(*l*) Ex Priorato, ubi ſupra.

(*m*) Thuan. *lib. lviii, pag.* 76.

taken a view of that place, he obſerves that the firſt who commanded in the citadel was Gabriel Serbellone. ‘ Cum arcis cuſtodia primo cum idoneo præſidio attri-‘ buta eſſet Gabrieli Serbellonio Mediolanenſi ſpecta-‘ tæ virtutis Duci, cujus aliquoties à nobis ſupra facta ‘ mentio eſt (4). - - *When the defence of the caſtle had been ‘ committed to Gabriel Serbellone the Milaneſe, a gene-‘ ral of approved valour, whom we have mentioned be-‘ fore.*’ It is certain he means two perſons, and that he, who the Duke of Alva conſulted, and ſent to ſee the place, was Gabriel Serbellone: ‘ Antuerpiæ ‘ arcem fundabat, Paciotti Machinatoris ingenio, Ser-‘ bellonii judicio (5). - - - - *He built the citadel of ‘ Antwerp, by the contrivance of the engeneer Paciotti, ‘ and the advice of Serbellone.*’

(4) Thuan. *lib. xli, pag.* 830.

(5) Strada, *lib. vii.*

SERBELLONE (Fabricius) brother to the foregoing, was general of the Pope's troops in the country of Avignon, during the Civil wars in the reign of Charles IX. He was at firſt captain of an independant company, and governor of Pavia for the Emperor Charles V. Afterwards he exerciſed the office of Commiſſary-general of the army in Piedmont, and in the year 1560 he was appointed governor of the ſtate of Avignon, by Pope Pius IV, and general of his armies (*a*). He violently ſided with the Catholics againſt the Proteſtants, and was horribly hated and dreaded by the latter, by reaſon of the cruelties he exerciſed in Orange [*A*], wherein he was furiouſly ſeconded by the commanders of the French troops [*B*]. Pius V continued him in the ſame poſts his predeceſſor had beſtowed upon him in that country; but Serbellone did not long enjoy them: he went home in 1566, and being gone to Rome towards the latter end of the ſame year, to take upon him the chief command of the Pope's troops, he died in the houſe of the cardinal his brother. He had married Frances Maleſpina ſiſter to the Marquis de Malgrado (*b*).

(*a*) Priorato, Scena, d'Huom. illuſtri.

(*b*) Ibid.

[*A*] *The cruelties he exerciſed in Orange.*] Having promiſed in another place (1) to ſpeak of thoſe cruelties in this article, the beſt thing I can do is to ſet down the words of an author who is accounted a good Catholic (2). He informs us that Fabricius Serbellone, a gentleman of Milan, *of an antient family, and of great experience, who gave himſelf over to moſt vices that prevail among his countrymen, as he was endowed with their virtues*, joined with the Catholics of Provence, whom the Counts de Sommerive, de Suze, de Carces, *&c.* had gathered together, and perſuaded them (3) to make an attempt upon Orange. He inveſted that town when the whole garriſon was gone out, and taking advantage of that favourable juncture, he gave an aſſault as ſoon as his battery had made a ſufficient breach. During the aſſault *the Catholics, that were left in Orange, opened one gate to him. He went in thro' it, and his men were contented at firſt to kill every body they met in arms; but afterwards, they renewed the examples of the moſt refined cruelty invented formerly by tyrants. They employed their ingenuity in contriving how to make thoſe, who had been ſo unhappy as to eſcape their firſt fury, feel themſelves die, and killed them gradually. Some were thrown headlong upon ſtakes, halberds, ſwords, and pikes. Some were hung in the chimnies, and burnt with a ſlow fire. They took delight in cutting the privy parts; and their fury ſpared neither children, nor old and ſick people, nor the reapers, tho' the latter had no other arms than their ſickles. Women and maids did not come off with the loſs of their honour, and with being proſtituted to the rabble; for they were ſet for a mark to be ſhot at, and after hung upon the windows. The boys were kept to compleat the abomination; and to add deriſion to their outrage, the ladies, who rather choſe to die than to ſatisfy the leudneſs of the victors, were expoſed ſtark naked for a publick mockery, with horns thruſt into thoſe parts, which modeſty does not permit to name. Some of both ſexes were larded with ſlips of paper cut out of the Geneva Bibles. The very Catholics, who opened the gate, were not ſpared: For after a place had been appointed for them, and they had been told that they would be ſafe in it with their wives and children, they were all cut to pieces. There were only a hundred and nine ſoldiers in the caſtle, who not being ſufficient to defend it, deſired to capitulate. All they propoſed was granted them; but as ſoon as they came out, they were ſurrounded; and thoſe who were not thought worthy of being killed by the ſoldiers, were thrown headlong from the top of a rock. After the plunder had been ſecured, the victors employed themſelves in demoliſhing the walls of Orange; and Serbellone thinking that it would be a piece of madneſs to leave ſo near the country of Avignon a conſiderable town, the ſovereign whereof was a Calviniſt, ſet fire to it, which quickly conſumed the biſhop's palace, and three hundred houſes with thoſe, who had concealed themſelves in them. The burning had gone on, had it not been for an extraordinary rain, which put it out in a moment, and diſappointed thoſe who ſtirred the fire.*

D'Aubigne had ſaid long before, that the Catholic hiſtorians had related what he ſays of the cruelties exerciſed at Orange (4). Doubtleſs he meant Thuanus, who relates (5) the whole matter as fully as related in the paſſage taken from Varillas, and as fully as Theodore Beza had related it (6). He meant, I ſay, Thuanus; but he had ſome reaſons not to name him. It will be granted me that the hiſtorian, whoſe words I have tranſcribed, is a writer of greater authority, *ad hominem*, conſidering the time he wrote in.

[*B*] *He was furiouſly ſeconded by the commanders of the French troops.*] It is obſerved in the relation of the ſacking of Orange (7), that the caſtle, the biſhop's palace, and ſeveral other places, were ſet on fire, and part of the walls pulled down at the ſollicitation of the Count de Suze. He ſatisfied his avarice as well as his cruelty; for he *took part of the beſt booty*, and furniſhed his houſe with it. Theſe are the men, on whom we poor private people beſtow ſo many panegyrics, upon account of their pretended zeal for religion and the glory of God: The Monlucs, the Tavannes, the Suzes, and the Guiſes will be praiſed for ever among the votaries of the Church of Rome; but what did they do for their religion but get wealth, plunder, and domineer? Was this a ſervice done to God, for which they deſerved to be rewarded? *O curas hominum, ô quantum eſt in rebus inane* (8)! - - - *O empty toils! O vanity of things.*

(1) Remark [*C*] of the article BEAUMONT.

(2) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charl. IX, *Tom. i, pag.* 202, 203.

(3) The ſixth of June 1562.

(4) D'Aubigné, *Tom. i, p.* 204.

(5) Thuan. *lib. xxxi, pag. m.* 627.

(6) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib. xii, pag.* 262.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Perſius, Sat. I, *initio.*

SERBELLONE (John) the ſixth ſon of John Baptiſt Serbellone, Count de Caſtillon, and Lord of Romagnano, was a great commander in the ſervice of the King of Spain in the XVIIth century. He was a native of Milan. He performed his firſt military exploits in the year 1616. Being informed at Rome of the preparations that were making in the Milaneſe againſt the Duke of Savoy, he immediately repaired to Count John Peter his brother, colonel of horſe, and general of the artillery, and governor of Gattinara. He applied himſelf ſo diligently to the ſervice, that he made it appear he was born for the war, and would raiſe himſelf in time. His brother having been killed at Verceil, as he was taking a view of that place, he had his regiment given him. He increaſed in that poſt the eſteem he was in. He was wounded with a muſket ſhot at the ſiege of Verceil, and loſt his regiment ſome time after (a); but the ſame Duke of Feria, who had diſbanded that regiment, gave him another of three thouſand foot in 1620, during the troubles of the Valteline. The Proteſtants and the Catholics being come to blows in that country, our Count Serbellone was ordered to go and ſupport the Catholics; and it is likely he did not uſe the Proteſtants too gently, ſince the governor of Milan was well pleaſed with his zeal and conduct, and gave a good character of him to the court: this implies it ſufficiently. Notwithſtanding which, his regiment was diſbanded, when the Valteline was depoſited into the hands of Gregory XV; but the troubles beginning ſoon again in that country, Serbellone was ſent thither a ſecond time, having the ſame poſt (b), and fuller commiſſions; and gave great ſatisfaction by his manner of oppoſing the French troops [*A*]; as it appeared by the offices beſtowed upon him: he was made counſellor in the ſupreme council of Spain in the year 1625, commiſſary-general in the Milaneſe in 1627, general of the artillery and governor of Montferrat in 1628. He ſerved under the Marquis of Spinola at the famous ſiege of Caſal; and ſome years after (c) he went into Germany to ſerve in the quality of Captain-general of the artillery under the Duke of Feria. From the death of that Duke till the arrival of the Cardinal Infant, he had the chief command of the army in Alſace. He performed wonders at the battle of Nortlingen [*B*], which the Swedes loſt the ſixth of September 1634; and having followed the Cardinal Infant into Flanders, he ſettled winter quarters in the biſhopric of Liege, and the next ſpring (d) obtained leave to go home. He did great ſervices to the King of Spain againſt the Duke of Rohan in the Valteline [*C*], whilſt they were raiſing in Germany the army he was deſigned to command. It was thought more proper to ſend him into Catalonia, where he commanded the horſe [*D*] in the year 1637. He formed a very noble deſign, which was to beſiege Leucate, the taking

(a) In 1618.

(b) In 1624.

(c) In 1633.

(d) In 1635.

[*A*] *His manner of oppoſing the French troops.*] I do not follow my author in every thing, to avoid advancing falſities. Priorato will have it, that the following things happened in 1624, and 1625. 1. Serbellone's regiment was ſet on foot again. 2. He ſo diligently guarded the poſts he had been truſted with in the Valteline, that the Marquis de Cœuvres, who commanded the French troops, could never get an inch of ground on that ſide. 3 Serbellone being ſent againſt the Duke of Savoy, beſieged and took Nice de la Paglia. 4. He returned to his former poſts in the Valteline, where Colonel Papenheim (1) had commanded in his abſence. 5. The Duke of Rohan ſucceeded the Marquis de Cœuvres, and could make no progreſs any more than he by reaſon of Serbellone's vigilance. 6. Serbellone being recalled to Milan upon more urging buſineſs, left the command to Guaſco colonel of horſe. 7. The Duke of Rohan being informed of that change, advanced as far as Gravedone. 8. Serbellone was immediately ſent back to ſtop him, and obliged him upon the news of his return to ſet fire to the palace of the Duke d'Alviti, and to retire for fear of engaging ſo brave a captain. The hiſtorian, having mentioned all theſe things, adds, that for an acknowledgment of all thoſe ſervices, Serbellone was made counſellor in the ſupreme council of Spain in July 1625. It is certain, that there are ſome falſities in this account. The Duke of Rohan did not command in the Valteline at that time. The Marquis de Cœuvres was there ever ſince France employed her forces there in 1624, till the execution of the treaty of peace in 1627. The Duke of Rohan was then buſy enough in France, being engaged in the wars of religion. As for what concerns Serbellone's reſiſtance, which was ſo great, according to Priorato, that the Marquis de Cœuvres could never get an inch of ground; I will not alledge againſt it, the hiſtories which mention that Marquis's progreſs; for I might be anſwered, that Priorato does not mean the whole Valteline, but only a certain part of it, into which poſſibly, the French troops could not penetrate. But to ſpeak the truth, this would be but a poor ſhift, and not much warranted by the author's expreſſions (2). I can convict him by his own words, of having confounded the time: And indeed, when he relates in another work (3) what happened in the Valteline, he places the Duke of Rohan's excurſion to Gravedone in the year 1636. He is in the right as to that.

[*B*] *He performed wonders at the battle of Nortlingen.*] He was poſted upon a riſing ground, which the council of war, held the day before the battle, took to be of the greateſt importance for the ſucceſs of that great day. The Swedes had the ſame opinion of it, ſince they uſed their utmoſt endeavours to poſſeſs themſelves of that poſt; but they were always vigorouſly repulſed by Serbellone. Therefore he had the ſatisfaction to hear the Cardinal Infant ſpeak theſe words to him, in the preſence of the King of Hungary; *Conde, por Dios y vos tenemos la vittoria* (4). - - - - *God and you have given us the victory.*

[*C*] *He did great ſervices . . . againſt the Duke of Rohan, in the Valteline.*] This belongs to the year 1635, and 1636. The author is in the right, with reſpect to that time, to ſay that the Duke of Rohan and Count Serbellone acted in the Valteline; But I doubt whether he gives a faithful account of what they did; for he ſuppoſes that there being three bodies of troops for France, the Duke of Rohan, who commanded one of thoſe bodies, always endeavoured to join the two others, which might have proved very prejudicial to the Spaniards; but that the count prevented that junction. This is ſtill falſe, if we depend upon the hiſtory of the Duke of Rohan (5). Therein we are told, that he had all his troops by him; but that he was ſo poſted, that he had the Germans on one ſide, and the Spaniards on the other. Fernemont (6) commanded the Germans; Serbellone commanded the Spaniards. The Duke beat the Germans three times one after another; and then attacked Serbellone, who was advantageouſly intrenched at Morbeigne, and beat him. Of this Priorato ſays nothing at all. But it can hardly be doubted, conſidering that this hiſtory of the Duke of Rohan, eſpecially what concerns the exploits in the Valteline, is all grounded upon memoirs, which ſeem to be very good. But what need we have recourſe to memoirs. Does not Priorato in another book (7) mention the defeat of the Germans? And does not he ſay, that Serbellone was ſoundly beaten at Morbeigne? His own teſtimony is ſufficient to confute whatever he ſays in his encomium upon Serbellone with reſpect to the Duke of Rohan. I muſt not forget what he ſays concerning Fornemont, *viz.* that he fell out with Serbellone, becauſe he did not give him his due titles in a letter (8).

[*D*] *He commanded the horſe.*] Not that he commanded that army in chief; for it is certain he was under the Duke of Cardonna. It is true, the preſence of that duke did not leſſen his authority, as general of horſe, during the ſiege of Leucate, for he was not there in perſon; and there was a French account, wherein to confute thoſe who had given out that *he had been killed in the field of battle*, it was poſitively ſaid, *he had not been in* the

(1) He who was killed at the battle of Lutzen.

(2) Governava il Conte Sorbellone con tanta prudenza, accuratezza, e vigilanza tutti i Forti DI QUELLE PARTI, che non quanti tentativi faceſſe il Marcheſe di Coure Generale allhora di Francia IN QUELLE PARTI, non pote mai auvanzar ne pure un palmo, tanto erano ben cuſtoditi i detti poſti.

(3) Hiſtor. delle Guerre di Ferdinando, &c. *lib.* *xi.*

(4) Priorato, ubi ſupra.

(5) Printed at Paris in 1666, and in Holland in 1667, in 12mo.

(6) Others call him Fornemont.

(7) Hiſtor. delle Guerre di Ferdinando, &c.

(8) Ibid. *lib. x. pag. m.* 337.

taking whereof would have made France very uneaſy; but he was forced to raiſe the ſiege. He received many wounds as he was diſcharging the duties of a good general; and he was hardly recovered from his wounds, when he fell ſick without any hopes of recovery. He died at Perpignan the twenty-firſt of February 1638. He had married Donna Luiſa, daughter of the Marquis John Jerome Marin, deſcended from Thomas Marin Duke of Terranova. He had ſeveral children by her: the eldeſt was made Marquis de Romagnano by his Catholic Majeſty (*e*).

(*e*) Ex Gualdo Priorato, Scena d'Huomini illuſtri.

the battle, and that in imitation of the Catholic Kings, he was contented to be the ſpiritual and inviſible head of that army, reſerving to himſelf the title of General, but leaving the functions of that office to Serbellone (9). Priorato does not expreſs himſelf clearly enough: Any body would infer from his expreſſions (10), that the count had none above him but the court of Spain.

(9) Merc. François, *Tom. xxi*, *pag.* 502.

(10) Fu chiamato dal Re in Iſpagna, e fatto Maſtro di Campo Generale dell' eſercito di Catalogna. Nel paſſar d'Italia in quelle parti hebbe il commando ſopra tutti i Generali e capi da guerra di quell' eſſercito . . . . . benche prima del combattimento haveſſe fatta inſtanza per altri ſei mila huomini, o almeno quattro, fu dal Conte Duca Privato del Re mantenuto con lettere affeuttoſe in ſperanze grandi, ma non mai ſoccorſo d'un ſolo fantacino. *Scena d'Huom. illuſtri.*

SERRONI (HYACINTHUS) firſt Archbiſhop of Alby, lived in the XVIIth century. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (*a*), but correct two faults in it [*A*]. See alſo Moreri's Dictionary.

(*a*) For January 1687. *p.* 113.

[*A*] *Correct two faults in it.*] You will find in that book that this Prelate was born the third of Auguſt: it ſhould be the thirtieth. You will find alſo there that the Biſhop of Pamiers was his nephew; which is not true. The author ſhould have ſaid the Abbot de Camps, inſtead of that biſhop. That abbot is a perſon of great learning, and merit, who has made a very fine collection of the moſt curious medals that can be found. This appears by the book, intituled, *Selectiora Numiſmata in ære maximi moduli è Muſeo Illuſtriſſimi D. D. Franciſci de Camps, Abbatis S. Marcelli, & B. Mariæ de Siniaco, conciſis interpretationibus per D. Vaillant D. M. & Cenomanenſium Ducis Antiquarium illuſtrata.* It was printed at Paris in the year 1693, in 4to. Mr Vaillant, who is ſo famous for his great ſkill in medals, ſpeaks of that abbot in the following manner at the beginning of that book. ‘Nummos veteres ex omni materia, omnique modulo ſummâ curâ multiſque ſumptibus collegit undique multis ab hinc annis Illuſtriſſimus ABBAS DE CAMPS, tàm proſpero ſucceſſu, ut rei nummariæ ſtudioſis omnibus, Principibus etiam non paucis opulentior in eâ re tandem evaſerit: hi ſiquidem nummos habent permultos, ille verò numiſmata maximi moduli mole, cælaturâ, raritate, eximia, in quibus Imperatorum ſeriem, ſi paucos excipias, cernere licet, ut & res ab eis præclarè geſtas, & quidquid in hiſtoriâ Romana legitur auguſtius. Ab amicis ſæpe invitatus, ut quæ privatæ ſtudens, tùm utilitati, tùm voluptati ſibi comparaverat, in publicum commodum transferret, annuit comiter votis amicorum, ipſe tamen diverſis negotiorum generibus implicatus ea in ære priùs, prout extant in ipſis exemplaribus, accuratè inciſa, explicanda mihi poſtmodùm tradidit. - - - *The moſt illuſtrious* ABBOT DE CAMPS, *with the greateſt care, and at the greateſt charge, many years ago, made a collection of antient coins, of every matter and ſize, from all parts, ſo ſucceſsfully, that at length he became more rich in this reſpect than all that were curious in coins, yea even than many princes: theſe, it is true, may have much money, but he has medals of greateſt rarity for their ſize, engraving, and rarity, wherein is to be ſeen the ſeries of the emperors, their moſt noble atchievements, and whatever elſe worthy of admiration is read in the Roman hiſtory. Being often deſired by his friends to communicate to the public what he had purchaſed for his own particular uſe and pleaſure, he conſented, and being himſelf taken up with variety of buſineſs, after he had cauſed them to be engraved in braſs, delivered them to me to be explained.*’ If you conſult the Abbot de la Roque (1) in the extract of a diſſertation of the Abbot de Camps upon a Greek medal (2) of Antoninus Caracalla, you will find the following words in it: ‘The curious of Rome and France have taken great pains to explain it, and have been divided in their opinions about the truth and ſingularity of the games repreſented upon it. The Abbot de Camps, who has a greater ſkill in medals than one would think, conſidering his age, and his great occupations, is of opinion that it is a ſhew of Funambuli, or Rope-dancers: whereupon he propoſes his conjectures full of wit, and of a profound learning (3). . . . . Having thus explained, with great wit and learning, the true ſenſe of the reverſe of that medal, he examines why they are Funambuli on the reverſe of a medal of Caracalla, and what reaſon moved the Cyzicenians to preſent them to him (4).’ We are told elſewhere, that he had ſearched, with great care, the rareſt manuſcripts, we are told this, I ſay, on occaſion of a *Canon Burdigalenſis ex M. S. Codice vetuſtiſſimus*, which is in his hands (5). ‘This council was never before publiſhed by any. We are obliged for it to the Abbot de Camps, who making a diligent ſearch into every thing that may illuſtrate the hiſtory of the ſuffragancy of Alby, which he is writing, has inſerted it at length in that hiſtory. He took it out of a manuſcript of councils and tracts of antient Fathers, whoſe antiquities, &c (6).’ It is not to be doubted that he undertook to write the hiſtory of the ſuffragancy of Alby on account of our Hyacinthus Serroni, with whom he was in great favour, but not his relation. In the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* I went upon a hearſay, which I believed to be true the more readily, becauſe I had read (7) that the abbot *had the honour to be related* to that archbiſhop, which was the reaſon why I was miſtaken in this particular. Whilſt I mend that fault, I am glad it appears that notwithſtanding my miſtake, I aſcribed nothing to the Abbot de Camps, but what the archbiſhop, his patron, thought him worthy of. This is the ground of my commentary upon this article.

(1) In the *Journal des Sçavans* of the 29th of November 1677, *pag.* 309, Dutch Edition.

(2) Which repreſents on the reverſe ſome ſpectacles and public games, very ſingular, and hitherto little underſtood. *Id. ibid.*

(3) *Journal des Sçavans*, of November 29, 1677, *pag.* 310.

(4) Ibid. *p.* 312.

(5) *Journal des Sçavans* of the 20th of November 1679, *pag.* 317, Dutch edition.

(6) We find in the *Mercure Galant*, for the month of May, 1678, *pag.* 105, Holland edition, an Elogy of the Abbot de Camps.

(7) *In the* Mercure Galant, *ibid. pag.* 106.

SERVILIA, ſiſter by the mother's ſide to Cato Uticenſis (*a*), was married, firſt to Marcus Junius Brutus, by whom ſhe had Brutus, who murdered Julius Cæſar; and after to Decimus Julius Silanus (*b*), who was conſul in the year of Rome 691. She did not behave her ſelf like a virtuous woman; for ſhe was not only Julius Cæſar's miſtreſs, and improved that opportunity to enrich herſelf with the ſpoils of unhappy people; but beſides, ſhe proſtituted one of her daughters to her lover [*A*]. Her brother Cato

(*a*) Plut. in Catone minore, *init. p.* 759.

(*b*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 769. *See alſo* Cicero in Bruto, *pag. m.* 354.

[*A*] *She was Julius Cæſar's miſtreſs, and improved . . . . to enrich herſelf . . . . but beſides, ſhe proſtituted one of her daughters to her lover.*] See the remark [*A*] in the article PORCIA, and the article CASSIUS (1), to which add theſe words of Suetonius: ‘Ante alias dilexit (*Cæſar*) M. Bruti matrem Serviliam:

(1) Citation

Cato was very much ſurpriſed when they made him read a letter written by her [*B*]. She pretended to be deſcended from Servilius Ahala (*c*), who had killed Spurius Melius who had raiſed ſome factions at Rome in the year 316.

(*c*) Plut. in Bruto, *ibid. pag.* 984.

‘ Serviliam: cui & proximo ſuo conſulatu ſexagies H. S. margaritam mercatus eſt: & bello civili ſuper alias donationes, ampliſſima prædia ex auctionibus haſtæ minimo addixit. Cum quidem pleriſque vilitatem mirantibus, facetiſſime Cicero, *Quo melius*, inquit, *emptum ſciatis, Tertia deducta eſt*: exiſtimabatur enim Servilia, etiam filiam ſuam Tertiam Cæſari conciliare (2). - - - - *Above others Cæſar loved Servilia, the mother of M. Brutus: for whom, in his next conſulſhip he purchaſed a pearl for ſixty ſeſterces: and in the civil war he gave her large manors, which he purchaſed at an eaſy rate. When moſt people were admiring their cheapneſs, Cicero very wittily replied*, Quo melius emptum ſciatis, Tertia deducta eſt; *playing upon the ambiguity of the words, which may either ſignify*, That you may the better underſtand how cheap they are, a third was abated, *or* ſhe gave her own daughter (*whoſe name was Tertia*) to Cæſar's embraces.’

[*B*] *Cato was very much ſurpriſed when they made him read a letter written by her.*] Plutarch having ſaid that Julius Cæſar gave orders to prevent Brutus's being killed in the battle of Pharſalia (3), adds the following words: ‘ And this he is believed to have done out of a tenderneſs to Servilia, the mother of Brutus; for Cæſar had, it ſeems, in his youth, been very intimate with Servilia, and ſhe paſſionately in love with him: and foraſmuch as Brutus was born about that time, in which their loves were at the higheſt, Cæſar believed that he was begot by him. There goes a report too, that when ſome great and weighty matters, concerning the conſpiracy of Catiline, which had like to have been the deſtruction of the common-wealth, were debated in the ſenate; Cato and Cæſar, tho' differing in their opinions, were placed near to one another. In the middle of the debate, a paper was brought to Cæſar, which he took and read to himſelf. Upon this Cato cried out aloud, and blamed Cæſar for holding correſpondence, and receiving letters from the enemies of the common-wealth. Upon which ſeveral of the ſenate murmured. Wherefore Cæſar delivered the note, as he had received it, to Cato, who reading it, found it to be a leud love-letter from his own ſiſter Servilia; wherefore he threw it back again to Cæſar, with theſe words, *Keep it to yourſelf, you ſot*, Which being done, he reſumed his diſcourſe, and went on to tell his opinion, as before; ſo public and notorious was Servilia's love to Cæſar (4).’

(2) Sueton. in Cæſare, *cap. l.*

(3) See the article BRUTUS (MARC JUNIUS), in the text over againſt citation (*f*).

(4) Plut. in Bruto, *pag.* 986. *See alſo the ſame author in* Catone minore, *p.* 770.

SERVILIA, ſiſter to the foregoing, and wife of Lucullus, was yet more leud than ſhe. See the remark [*A*] of the article of PORCIA. Lucullus, who had divorced Clodia, a woman diſſolute to the laſt degree, and infamous for her inceſt with her brothers, was not much better for marrying Servilia; for, except the inceſt, ſhe was not in the leaſt inferior to leud Clodia [*A*]. Her huſband bore it as well as he could, out of reſpect to his brother-in-law (*a*); but at laſt he could bear his wife no longer, and divorced her.

(*a*) Cato Uticenſis.

[*A*] *Except the inceſt, ſhe was not the leaſt inferior to leud Clodia.*] Plutarch uſes the moſt ſevere expreſſions that can be employed to ſignify a diſſolute life. Τῆς δὲ Κλωδίας, ἀπηλλαγμένος οὔσης ἀσελγοῦς καὶ πονηρᾶς, Σερουϊλίαν ἔγημεν, ἀδελφὴν Κάτωνος, οὐδὲ τοῦτον εὐτυχῆ γάμον· ἓν γὰρ οὐ προσῆν αὐτῷ τῶν Κλωδίας κακῶν μόνον, ἡ τῶν ἀδελφῶν διαβολή. τἄλλα δὲ βδελυρὰν ὁμοίως οὖσαν καὶ ἀκόλαστον ἠναγκάζετο φέρειν αἰδούμενος Κάτωνα. τέλος δὲ ἀπεῖπεν. Repudiata autem Clodia, laſciva & improba muliere, Serviliam duxit Catonis ſororem: quæ item nuptiæ parum fauſtæ fuere. Una enim carebat ſola Clodiæ macularum infamia ex fratribus: cætera pariter flagitioſam & impudicam ut ferret Catonis reverentiâ vim intulit ſibi. Poſtremò tolerare eam non valuit (1). - - - *But having divorced Clodia, who was a moſt laſcivious and wicked woman, he married Servilia the ſiſter of Cato; nor was this a happy marriage: for only one thing was wanting in her of the wickedneſs of Clodia, the criminal converſe with her brothers. But otherwiſe being equally incontinent and flagitious, he bore with her out of regard to Cato. But at laſt put her away.*

(1) Plutarch. *in* Lucullo, *p.* 517.

SEVERUS (CORNELIUS) a Latin Poet in Auguſtus's reign. I mention him only that I may correct ſome miſtakes of la Popeliniere, Andreas Schottus, &c [*A*].
See

[*A*] *Some miſtakes of la Popelinere, Andreas Schottus, &c.*] La Popeliniere confounds that Poet with the Orator Caſſius Severus, for which he was cenſured by Voſſius (1); but Voſſius ſhould not have quoted him *in ſua Hiſtoria*: he ſhould have ſaid *in ſua Hiſtoria Hiſtoriarum*, to prevent the ambiguity; for the thing in queſtion is to be found in the *Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires* (2), - - - *hiſtory of hiſtories*, and not in the hiſtory of the civil wars: tho' one might eaſily ſuſpect that la Popelinere committed that miſtake in this laſt book, ſince the modern Hiſtorians make ſometimes digreſſions, or reflexions, which give them occaſion to ſay what they know of antiquity. La Popeliniere is not exact in what he ſays of Cornelius Severus: he tells us that he had three different profeſſions, that of an Hiſtorian, of a great Orator, and of an Epic Poet, The antient writers repreſent him as a Poet, but they ſay nothing of his being an Hiſtorian or an Orator. It is true, ſome of his verſes are to be found among the fragments taken from ſeveral pieces of Oratory (3); but he who collected all thoſe fragments, ſays nothing whereby it appears, that Cornelius Severus made profeſſion of Rhetoric, or the art of Oratory. Nevertheleſs this very thing, if I am not miſtaken, led Crinitus into that error, and then la Popeliniere, who had it from him. Crinitus (4) gives it as a certain thing, that Cornelius Severus ſpent ſeveral years in making declamations, whilſt Aſinius Pollio, Pompeius Silo, Aſelleius Fuſcus, Sextilius Hena, Cæſtius Pius, Porcius Latro, and Aufidius Baſſus exerciſed the ſame profeſſion. They are part of thoſe mentioned by Seneca, who has collected their rhetorical flouriſhes. La Popeliniere names four of thoſe declaimers with Cornelius Severus, going upon the ſame ground, *viz.* That Seneca has inſerted ſome verſes of that Cornelius in his Cento's.

Andreus Schottus, the Jeſuit, is partly guilty of the ſame miſtake, for in his tract *De claris apud Senecam Rhetoribus*, he mentions Cornelius Severus as one of them. Nay, he has committed a fault in the very beginning of his account of Severus, for he applies to him what ought only to be underſtood of Sextilius Hena, a Spaniſh Poet in Seneca. That Spaniſh Poet had made a poem, which began with this verſe,

Deflendus Cicero eſt, Latiæque ſilentia linguæ.

Cornelius Severus gave a better turn to that thought by ſaying,

Abſtulit una dies ævi decus, ictaque luctu
Conticuit Latiæ triſtis facundia linguæ.

Whereupon Seneca ſays he will not commend his countryman for having made a very good verſe upon Cicero's death, ſince there was a much finer one, *viz.*
that

(1) Voſſius de Hiſtor. Latinis, *pag.* 109.

(2) Pag. 304.

(3) In Seneca the father, Suaſor. ii, & vii.

(4) De Poët. Lat. *cap. lvii.*

See Moreri's Dictionary (*a*), I ſhall alſo obſerve ſome of his miſtakes [*B*].

that of Cornelius Severus. On the contrary, Father Schottus makes him ſay, that he will not commend his country-man Cornelius-Severus, for having made, &c. ſince it had produced a much finer one, *viz.* that of Cornelius Severus: which would be odd, and is not the author's meaning. Beſides, it is not true that Cornelius Severus was a Spaniard; nor has that Jeſuit placed him in the catalogue of the antient writers of his nation (5).

Voſſius, in one of his books (6) ſays, that the old ſcholiaſt upon Perſius (7) quotes this verſe of our Severus, *Pinea frondoſi dum murmurat Apennini*; but in another book (8) he aſcribes it to the antient ſcholiaſt upon Horace, which is a miſtake.

[*B*] *See Moreri's Dictionary, I ſhall alſo obſerve ſome miſtakes.*] I. Quintilian ought never to be quoted in French by the name of Fabius: It is an ambiguous and barbarous way of quoting him. II. The two Seneca's ſhould not have been confounded. He, who wrote the *Controverſiæ* is the father of the author of the letters to Lucilius; and yet Moreri quotes them as being one and the ſame perſon. III. Moreri ſhould have quoted the lxxixth letter of Seneca, and not the lxixth. IV. He ſhould have quoted the *Suaſoriæ*, and not the controverſy of Seneca. V. He ſhould have ſaid *Severus* and not *Severo*, in the verſe of Ovid quoted by him. VI. This quotation of Seneca, *in Contr. ſua* 6. is faulty in three reſpects. He ſhould have put a full ſtop after *ſua*, and have quoted the viith *Suaſoria*, and not the vith (9), and *Contr.* ſhould have been left out. But this is requiring too many things of Moreri; he took little care to enquire whether there is any difference between Seneca's *Controverſiæ* and *Suaſoriæ*. But however that be, the reader, who ſhall believe him, will not doubt that one of Seneca's books is intituled, *Controverſiæ Suaſoriæ*; a miſtake which may be eaſily known, by the bare looking into good editions.

SEVERUS (SULPICIUS) flouriſhed towards the beginning of the Vth century. He was illuſtrious for his birth, and eloquence, and more ſtill for his virtue [*A*]. After he had appeared with great luſtre at the bar, he married very advantageouſly (*a*), and ſoon after loſt his wife, whereupon he quitted the world and became a Prieſt [*B*]. It is certain he was a native of the province of Aquitain [*C*]; but it may be doubted whether he was born in the dioceſe of Agen (*b*). The firſt edition of his works is little known [*D*]. An account of his life may be ſeen in Moreri's Dictionary, and in Mr du Pin's Bibliotheque; and therefore I ſhall not dwell upon it.

He has been cenſured for ſome things by Poſſevin (*c*), but much leſs than Sigonius who commented upon him. Guibert, Abbot of Gemblours, is very much miſtaken in ſaying, that after St Martin's death, our Sulpicius Severus was promoted to the biſhopric of

[*A*] *He was illuſtrious for his birth . . . . and more ſtill for his virtue.*] Read theſe words of Gennadius, 'Vir genere & litteris nobilis, & paupertatis atque 'humilitatis amore conſpicuus (1). - - - *A man illuſtrious by his birth and learning, and eminent for his 'love of poverty and humility.*' But particularly read theſe verſes of Paulinus, Biſhop of Nola;

Teſtis adeſt docto mirabilis ore Severus,
Et totâ Chriſtum cordis virtute ſecutus
Inſignis mundi titulis, ſed clarior illâ
Quâ mundum tempſit ſanctæ virtute fidei,
Nobilitate potens, ſed multò extentius idem
Nobilior Chriſti cultu, quàm ſanguinis ortu (2).

[*B*] *And ſoon after loſt his wife . . . . whereupon he became a prieſt.*] This appears by a letter Paulinus writ to him. 'Tu frater dilectiſſime, ad Dominum miraculo majore converſus es, quia ætate florentior, laudibus abundantior, oneribus patrimonii levior, ſubſtantia facultatum non egentior, & in ipſo adhuc 'mundi theatro, id eſt fori celebritate diverſans, & 'facundi nominis palmam tenens, repentino impetu 'diſcuſſiſti ſervile peccati jugum, & lethalia carnis & 'ſanguinis vincula rupiſti. Neque te divitiæ de matrimonio familiæ conſularis adgeſtæ, neque poſt conjugium peccandi licentia, & cœlebs juventus ab anguſto ſalutis introitu, & arduo itinere virtutis, in 'mollem illam & ſpacioſam multorum viam revocare potuerunt (3). - - - - *But you, my dear brother, 'were more wonderfully converted to the Lord, inſomuch 'as amidſt all the ſecular advantages of blooming youth 'and wealth, and eloquence, in pleading before the 'courts of juſtice, you ſuddenly threw off the ſlaviſh yoak 'of ſin, and broke the deadly bonds of fleſh and blood. 'Neither could youth, nor increaſe of riches, by marrying with a noble family, turn you from the ſtrait and 'arduous path of virtue and ſalvation to the ſpacious and 'eaſy way of the multitude.*'

[*C*] *It is certain he was a native of the province of Aquitain.*] Gennadius ſays ſo (4); but the thing is ſtill more certain from theſe words of Sulpicius Severus: 'Sed dum cogito me hominem Gallum inter Aquitanos 'verba facturum, vereor ne offendat veſtras nimium 'urbanas aures ſermo ruſticior (5). - - - - *But when I 'conſider that I a Gaul am to ſpeak before the Aquitainians, I am afraid leſt my unpolite language ſhould offend 'your nicer ears.*' This paſſage is taken from a dialogue, the interlocutors whereof are Poſthumianus, Sulpicius Severus, and Gallus. Take notice of the compliment of this laſt; he tells the two other interlocutors, that he is afraid, being a Gaul, that his language will appear harſh and barbarous to the nice ears of the Aquitainians. He looks upon himſelf as a gooſe among ſwans (6). That modeſty, that humility, was ſuited to the ſtate of that time: the Aquitainians were then the flower, the ornament, and the glory, of all the Gauls, in matter of wit and eloquence. The beſt Poets, the beſt Rhetoricians, and the moſt excellent Orators of the Roman empire were to be found in Aquitain. I except the Greeks, and I ſpeak only of thoſe, who wrote in Latin. See the catalogue of illuſtrious Aquitainians, collected by Alteſerra (7).

[*D*] *The firſt edition . . . . is little known.*] The abbreviators of Geſner, Father Labbe, Dr Cave, Mr du Pin, &c. who mention ſo many editions of that author, ſay nothing of the firſt. It was publiſhed by Matthias Flacius Illyricus, who put to it only the firſt letters of his name; which was the reaſon why a Catholic writer beſtowed thoſe praiſes upon him, of which he afterwards repented, when he came to know that he was a Lutheran. This I find in a ſatirical piece of Father Vavaſſeur againſt Biſhop Godeau. 'Iſto ferme pacto, *ſays he* (8), quamvis minùs turpiter, utpote unus ac privatus, atque in cauſa leviore, 'clariſſimus ſe ſcriptor deceptum ſenſit, & doluit. 'Cum enim mirificis laudibus extuliſſet eum, qui primus perelegantes Sulpitii Severi libros edidiſſet in 'lucem, neque theſaurum hunc, quem teneret ſolus, 'invidiſſet diutius literatis ac doctis; eumque cùm 'propter tantum beneficium, tum maximè modeſtiæ 'nomine ſuſpiceret, quòd celaſſet nomen, literas modo, M. & F, adſcripſiſſet: intellectum eſt poſteriùs, 'Matthiam Flaccium eſſe ejuſmodi, hominem non 'ſolùm non modeſtum, qui hoc modéſtiæ cauſa non 'feciſſet, ſed etiam impurum & nequam hæreticum, 'qui in centurias Magdeburgenſes multa de ſuo, non 'tacito nomine, contuliſſet. Ut dictum nollet præpoſterus laudator, & eum bonæ, ſed falſæ de altero 'opinionis, & ridiculæ credulitatis ſuæ pœniteret. - - - '*Much after the ſame manner, though leſs ſhamefully, 'as being only a ſingle and private perſon, and in a 'ſmaller matter, a very famous writer found himſelf 'miſtaken, and was vexed at his miſtake. For having 'mightily*

(*a*) At the word *Severus.*

(5) Bibliothecæ Hiſpanicæ, *Tom. ii.*

(6) Voſſius de Poëtis Latinis, *pag.* 33.

(7) That Scholiaſt quotes this verſe, *ad Sat. I. ver.* 95.

(8) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 109.

(9) Voſſius, de Poëtis Lat. *pag.* 33, *quotes the vith.*

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(*b*) He ſays that Phœbadius, Biſhop of Agen, was his biſhop: which does not prove that he was born in that dioceſe.

(*c*) Poſſev. Bibl. Select. *Tom. i, pag. m.* 202.

(1) Gennadius, de Scriptor. Eccleſ. *cap. xix.*

(2) Paulin. *lib. v.* de Vita Sancti Martini.

(3) Idem, *Epiſt. vii.*

(4) Severus Preſbyter cognomento Sulpicius Aquitanicæ Provinciæ. *Gennadius, ubi ſupra.*

(5) Sulpit. Severus, de Vita S. Martini, *lib. iii.*

(6) Argutos inter ſtrepere anſer olores. *Virgil. Eclog. IX, ver.* 36.

(7) Ant. Dadinus Alteſerra, Rerum Aquitanicarum *Libri quinque.*

(8) Paulus Romanus Candido Heſychio, Antonius Godellus Epiſcopus Graſſenſis, an Elogii Aureliani Scriptor idoneus, *p.* 33.

of Beziers, notwithſtanding his reluctancy to it. It is certain he roſe no higher than to the degree of prieſthood. There has indeed been one Sulpicius among the biſhops of Beziers; but that biſhop was raiſed to that ſee one hundred and ninety years after St Martin's death (*d*).

(*d*) Ex Alteſerra, Rerum Aquitanic. *lib. v*, *cap. viii*, *pag.* 336.

‘ *mightily extolled the man who had firſt publiſhed the moſt elegant works of Sulpicius Severus, and had no longer detained from the ſtudious and learned, this treaſure which he had alone poſſeſſed, and having greatly eſteemed him, both for ſo great a benefit, but chiefly on account of his modeſty in concealing his name, and putting only two letters M and F; he afterwards underſtood that Matthias Flaccius was the perſon, a man not only immodeſt, but likewiſe a foul mouthed and wicked heretic, who had put into the* Centuriæ Magdeburgenſes *many things of his own, without ſuppreſſing his name. So that he wiſhed his prepoſterous praiſes had not been given, and repented of his good but falſe opinion, and of his ridiculous credulity.*’

The largeſt Commentary we have upon our Severus's *Hiſtoria ſacra*, is that of Chriſtian Schotanus, printed in folio at Franeker, 1664.

SFORZA, an illuſtrious family, derives its original from a peaſant of Cotignola (*a*), who became one of the chiefeſt and moſt valiant captains of his age: his name was Giacomuzzo [*A*]; but according to the cuſtom of the peaſants of thoſe parts, the two firſt ſyllables of his name were left out, and he was only called Muzzo. He left the plough and liſted himſelf, and quickly got the reputation of a reſolute ſoldier. He ſpoke of nothing but of devaſtations and ranſackings, and would get by force whatever he had a mind to. Which was the reaſon why he was ſirnamed Sforza (*b*), which became afterwards the proper name of the family deſcended from him (*c*). I muſt not forget that he was alſo ſirnamed Attendolo (*d*). See the firſt remark of this article. The famous Braccio was his fellow-ſoldier, under the General Alberic de Barbiano. At firſt they loved one another, as if they had been brothers; but their emulation or jealouſy, which aroſe inſenſibly in their familiar converſation, turned at laſt into enmity. From that time they always embraced contrary parties, ſo that when one of them was made general of the troops of any prince or any republic, the other had the like imployment in the ſtate that

(*a*) A ſmall town of Romagna between Imola and Faenza.

(*b*) Some ſay that Alberic de Barbiano gave it him, after he had ſeen him boldly revenge an injury that was done him.

(*d*) *Taken from* Leandro Alberti, Deſcrittione di tutta Italia, *fol.* 317, *verſo* & 318, *Venice edition* 1561, *in* 4*to*.

(*c*) Collenuccio, Hiſt. Neap. *lib. v*, *pag. m.* 409, *ſays that Queen Joan ordered it ſo.* Voluit ut in illius memoriam omnibus deinde qui illo genere naſcerentur, Sfortiæ cognomen inderetur.

[*A*] *A peaſant of Cotignola ... his name was Giacomuzzo.*] That name is made up of two chriſtian names, James Muzzo contracted into one: His ſirname was Attendolo. It is not agreed on all hands that he was a peaſant's ſon: Sanſovino ſays he was the grandſon of a gentleman called John Attendolo, father of Michelin, a captain in the ſervice of the Republic of Venice. He adds, that Michelin the father of our Sforza, married Polyxena de Sanſeverino, and that he had two ſiſters, one of which was the wife of Ugolin Count de Centona, and the other was married to Martin Caraccioli Count de Santangelo, brother to the great Marſhal of Naples (1). We read in Paulus Jovius, that Sforza was a man of a good family, *honeſta familia* (2). But Leandro Alberti going upon the teſtimony of a writer, a native of Cotignola (3), ſays that Giacomuzzo was a peaſant, and actually digging the ground, when he began to conſider whether he ſhould liſt himſelf, as ſome of his companions adviſed him. He flung his ſpade upon a tree, and ſaid he would be a ſoldier if it lodged there. It ſtaid on the tree, and he liſted himſelf. *Muzzo lavorando la terra con la zappa indotto da alcuni compagni, la gittò ſopra un'albero, promettendogli, che ſe la rimanea ſopra quello, d'andar con loro alla guerra, la qual vi rimaſe, & coſi andò con loro, come dinota Pietro M. Caranto con molti altri ſcrittori* (4). The ſame author obſerves (5), that ſome writers, to ingratiate themſelves with the Sforzas, pretended that neither Giacomuzzo nor Muzzo was the true name of that man; but that he was called Mutio, and was deſcended from Mutius Scævola; and they deny the whole ſtory of the ſpade. Theſe were flatterers, who had a mind to gain the favour of Giacomuzzo's poſterity. This is what Leandro Alberti ſays. *Auvenga che alcuni cercando di acquiſtar gratia, ſcrivono altrimente* (6). I do not know whether I am miſtaken, but I imagine that ſome flatterers, even in the life-time of our Sforza, extolled his birth, and denied what was the common report; for tho' it be infinitely more glorious to be raiſed to a great fortune by noble exploits, notwithſtanding the meanneſs of extraction, than to attain by the ſame means to the higheſt dignities with the help of a noble birth; yet moſt people are unwilling to be upbraided with the obſcurity of their original. Moſt of thoſe, who raiſe themſelves from the loweſt to the higheſt degree, are at laſt more willing not to be accounted ignoble, than to be looked upon as men, who have overcome by their perſonal merit the obſtacles of a mean extraction (7). They are very glad when they are ſaid to be deſcended from very illuſtrious anceſtors, and when care is taken to make every body forget the mean condition they were born in. They are ſeldom of Agathocles's mind, who being made king, would be ſerved at a table not only in plate, but alſo in earthen-ware, to let every body know that he was a potter's ſon (8).

Fama eſt fictilibus cænaſſe Agathoclea regem,
Atque abacum Samio ſæpe oneraſſe luto,
Fercula gemmatis quam poneret horrida vaſis,
Et miſceret opes pauperiemque ſimul.
Quærenti cauſam, reſpondit: Rex ego qui ſum
Sicaniæ, figulo ſum genitore ſatus (9).

He pretended with good reaſon to heighten his glory, by ſhewing that he was the artificer of his own fortune. There are ſome Panegyriſts in our days, who acknowledging on one hand, that their hero was a man of a moſt noble extraction; obſerve, on the other, that this luſtre of his family did not contribute to his high preferments. So true it is, that the recommendation of relations is thought to weaken the proofs of the merit of thoſe who are raiſed by that means. Here follows a paſſage of the funeral oration of Francis de Harlay Archbiſhop of Paris (10). ‘Such noble talents could not be buried in obſcurity, and there was no occaſion to aſk, how came he that was born ſo great to arrive at greatneſs. He was not beholden to favour for his elevation. His family, though never ſo noble, and ſo much reſpected, was not then in the happy circumſtances of thoſe houſes, wherein the ſtar of living fathers ſends down favourable influences upon children; wherein children, born with merit, have the advantage of diſcovering it ſooner than others, and of being more worthily rewarded for it; and wherein thoſe, who are leſs favoured by nature than fortune, need only have a good conduct to receive the favours, which the credit of their families cannot fail to procure to them. But the ſucceſſive preferments of the perſon we ſpeak of, were not owing to ſuch fortunate anticipations. Being more animated by the example of his relations to deſerve dignities, than helped by their intereſt to attain to them; he muſt himſelf have been the author of his fortune.’ However it be, I fancy Giacomuzzo was not much inclined to imitate Agathocles, and

(1) *Taken from* Franceſco Sanſovino dell' origine delle Caſe illuſtri d'Italia, *fol. m.* 10, *verſo* & 11.

(2) Jovius, Elog. viror. bellica virtute illuſtrium, *lib. ii*, *pag. m.* 192.

(3) Pietro M. Caranto.

(4) Leandro Alberti, Deſcrittioni di tutta Italia, *fol. m.* 318.

(5) Id. ibid. *fol.* 317, *verſo.*

(6) Id. ibid. *fol.* 318.

(7) Compare this with what is ſaid in the remark [*A*] of the article AMIOT.

(8) Plut. *in* Apophthegm. *pag.* 176.

(9) Auſonius, Epigr. VIII, *pag. m.* 9.

(10) Delivered in the Metropolitan church of Paris, by Father Gaillard a Jeſuit, the 23d of November 1695. See pag. 16, 17, of the Dutch edition.

that was at war with that prince, or that republic. They ſold their ſervices very dear, and took care to keep up the war [*B*]; it was the beſt way they could pitch upon to ſatisfy their exorbitant ambition. Sforza commanded the troops of Queen Joan in the Kingdom of Naples, whilſt Braccio commanded thoſe of Alfonſo of Arragon. Both of them died in that war. Sforza marching to relieve the town of Aquila, beſieged by Braccio, was drowned at the paſſage of the river Aterno [*C*]; and Braccio was killed ſome time after in the fight, wherein he was engaged near Aquila, againſt Queen Joan's troops, commanded by a ſon of Sforza, and againſt the Pope's troops. Sforza's body was not found. His rival was not much more fortunate with reſpect to burial; for the Pope ordered that the body of Braccio, who was excommunicated, ſhould be buried without the walls of Rome in a prophane place (*e*). Sforza had been Gonfalonniere of the Holy Church, and created Count of Cotignola by Pope John XXIII. He was put in poſſeſſion of Cotignola for the payment of the money the church owed him, which amounted to fourteen thouſand ducats (*f*). He left a numerous family behind him; his poſterity continues to this day [*D*]. He was a very ſtrong man, and plain, and minded not delicious fare [*E*]. It is ſaid he was one of thoſe who lay with the Queen of Naples (*g*). **FRANCIS SFORZA** who is the ſubject of the following article, was the chief

and that his deſcendants were ſtill leſs willing to glory in the advantages that might accrue to them, by deriving their original from a man, who, notwithſtanding the meaneſt of conditions he was in, found the way to become ſo great a man. What makes me think ſo is, that ſome writers, in order to make their court, publiſhed very pompous genealogies. But I am apt alſo to believe that ſome made it their buſineſs to repreſent the extraction of our Sforza meaner than it was. People run into extreams upon ſuch an occaſion (11).

[*B*] *They took care to keep up the war.*] Paul Jovius hath very well obſerved this part of the character of thoſe two famous generals, and hath very juſtly ſaid, that it was a baſe trick, and a perfect trade. ‘Qui ab initio fraterna charitate inter ſe conjuncti, pari ſpe, parique induſtria, & paribus inſignium, laciniarumque coloribus militantes, uſque adeo inclaruere, ut fatali demum ambitione atque ſuperbia diducti, diverſas militiæ ſectas de nomine conderent, ac æmulatione gloriæ atque potentiæ, ex amicis hoſtes facti, ex adverſo ſemper arma tractarent; qua diſſentione potius quam ſimultate opimis ſtipendiis ſummiſque honoribus clari, atque opulenti evadebant; quum ſeſe infami aſtu, promercalique militia principibus Italiæ & liberis civitatibus venditarent, bellaque alere quam finire mallent; quod uterque de fortuna ſua immodicè ſperandum putaret, & nihil impervium vividæ virtuti, generosè & fortiter agentibus arbitrarentur (12). - - - *Being at firſt united in brotherly love, fighting with the ſame hope and equal diligence, under the ſame banners, they became ſo famous, that when they were afterwards ſeparated by a fatal ambition and pride, they ſet up two military parties with different names, and of friends becoming enemies in emulation of glory and power, always engaged in oppoſite ſides; by which diſſention rather than hatred, they became famous and opulent, by means of their high commands and great pay, having by an infamous artifice ſet to ſale their mercenary ſervice in the wars, to the Princes and free States of Italy, endeavouring rather to protract the war, than put an end to it; for both of them conceived vaſt hopes of their good fortune, and believed nothing impoſſible to the vigorous induſtry of ſuch as act with courage and generoſity.*’ This ambitious and mercenary ſpirit is the fault of moſt generals, who are not ſovereigns; but when they are ſoldiers of fortune, and in the pay of a prince whoſe ſubjects they are not, they are more apt to be guilty of that ſort of honourable treaſon, which conſiſts in not depriving a vanquiſhed enemy of all reſources, and to build him a bridge of gold, that the war may be kept up (13). They hope no peace will be made, whilſt neither of the parties get a conſiderable advantage, or ſuch as is not deciſive; and therefore they leave ſomething behind to do, and contrive the matter ſo, that the enemies do quickly make up their loſſes.

[*C*] *Was drowned at the paſſage of the river Aterno.*] This is the ancient name of that river; now called Peſcara. That General periſhed in it the third of January 1424, at fifty-four years of age, if we believe Collenuccio (14), and ſeveral other hiſtorians; but I have ſeen in a genealogy of the houſe of Sforza (15), that he was drowned the third of January 1426, being fifty-ſix years old.

[*D*] *He left a numerous family behind him; his poſterity continues to this day.*] He was married three times; firſt to Antonia Salimbeni, widow of the Lord de Cortona, who brought him Montegione, Montenegro, Ripa, Bagno, and Cluſi. His ſecond wife was ſiſter to Pandolfo Alopo, a Neapolitan, great chamberlain of the Kingdom of Naples. His third wife was Mary de Marciano, daughter of the Count de Seſſa. He left fifteen children behind him. CHARLES, one of his ſons, was Archbiſhop of Milan. Another called ALEXANDER married Conſtantia, daughter of Galeazzo Malateſta, and was Lord of Peſaro. Another named BOSIO married Eleonora Aldobrandini, Counteſs de Santa Fiore (16). The latter was Sforza's ſon by his firſt wife, and all the Sforzas that are now alive, are deſcended from him. The head of that family was made knight of the orders of St Michael and the Holy Ghoſt, in the year 1675, and married by proxy in the month of October 1678, Louiſa Adelaïde de Damas, daughter of the Marquis de Thiange, and neice to Madam de Monteſpan (17). He was ſixty-four years of age: his wife was but nineteen, and ſet out from Paris the twenty-ſeventh of April 1679, to go to him in Italy. The following paſſage relating to him, is to be found in the Mercure Galant (18). ‘The bridegroom is well-ſhaped, tho' ſomewhat advanced in years. He is a man of an agreeable humour, and of a ſound and ſolid wit. He is Duke of Onano in the patrimony of St Peter, and of Segni in the Campana di Roma, Count de Santa Fiore, in the territory of Siena, and ſovereign of Caſtel Arquato in Lombardy, and of Sforzeſca in the ſame patrimony of St Peter. Beſides all thoſe eſtates, the Duke Mario Sforza, father of the preſent duke, poſſeſſed the Duchy of Valmontone in the Campagna di Roma. He ſold it to the Lords Barberini for eleven hundred thouſand Roman crowns.’ As for the other children of our Sforza, I need not ſpeak of them, if you except him who became Duke of Milan, on whom I ſhall beſtow an article. Take notice that ALEXANDER SFORZA, Lord of Peſaro, was the father of Conſtantio who ſucceeded him. JOHN ſon (19) of the latter was poſſeſſed of the lordſhip of Peſaro, and married Lucretia Borgia, daughter of Pope Alexander VI, and afterwards the daughter of Matthew Tiepoli, a Venetian ſenator. Francis Mario della Rovere, Duke of Urbino, ſucceeded this John Sforza in his eſtates (20).

[*E*] *He was a very ſtrong man, and plain, and minded not delicious fare.*] He was very different in all this from his rival Braccio. Therefore we find that Paul Jovius ſets them in oppoſition as to theſe things. ‘In Braccio aſtuti & efficacis ingenii vis ardens eminebat; in Sfortia autem naturæ ſimplicitas, nullo fuco, nulloque literarum ſubſidio ſubnixa; apertique animi conſtans, & indomitus vigor laudabantur; in robuſto præſertim corpore ad ferendos labores geſtandaque arma prævalido. Braccius habitu corporis proximus delicato, ſplendore vitæ rerumque omnium apparatu ſumptuoſo, mirè gaudebat, utpote qui vel cum injuria alienæ pecuniæ appetens & profuſus eſſet. Ex adverſo Sfortia ad delitias rudis & agreſtis, frugi

---

(*e*) *Taken from Paul Jovius* in Elogiis Virorum bellica virtute illuſtrium, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 152, & *ſeq.*

(*f*) *Taken from* Leandro Alberti, ubi ſupra.

(*g*) See the remark [*E*].

(11) See the remark [*A*] in the article TOUCHET.

(12) Paulus Jovius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 192, 193.

(13) Compare what is ſaid in remark [*B*] of the article CESAR, between citat. (13) and (14), and the remark of the article GONTAUT (ARMAND DE).

(14) Pandulphus Collenucius Hiſtor. Neapolit. *lib. v, pag.* 408. *Edit. Latinæ Dordrac.* 1618, in 8vo.

(15) It is in the *Mercure Galant*, for November 1678, page 164, of the Dutch edition.

(16) *Taken from* Sanſovino, ubi ſupra.

(17) See the *Mercure Galant* for November 1678, pag. 164, in the genealogical table.

(18) Ibid. *pag.* 165.

(19) Not his lawful but his natural ſon, as Leandro Alberti obſerves, *Deſcrit. d'Italia, folio* 318, *verſo.*

(20) Taken from *Sanſovino, ubi ſupra.*

chief heir of his valour (*b*) and fortune. *He had him by a woman of pleaſure, who followed the army* (*i*); her name was Lucia Terzana (*k*).

(*b*) This muſt not be underſtood, as if none of the reſt had been warriors. *Varillas, who ſays, ubi infra,* that none of them had a martial inclination, is miſtaken.

(*i*) Varillas, Hiſt. de Louïs XI. *livr. ii, pag.* 134. *Dutch edition.*

(*k*) See the Genealogical table of the houſe of Sforza, *p.* 164, of the *Mercure Galant* for November 1678, Dutch edition.

‘frugi diſciplina, convictu ſubitario & planè militari, contemptuque prorſus omnis luxuriæ lætabatur; utpote qui valida potius quam decora arma, proceros & peracres generoſæ ſobolis equos, vir equitandi peritiſſimus, vera imperatoriæ dignitatis inſtrumenta eſſe putaret, nec quicquam ad inanem ſpeciem exquiſiti ornatus oſtentare conſueſſet (21). - - - - *In Braccio, the lively force of a crafty and prevailing wit was conſpicuous; but in Sfortia ſimplicity of nature, without craft, without learning, a conſtant and undaunted vigour, of an open mind, eſpecially being joined to a robuſt body fitted for the fatigues of war. Braccio, being of a more delicate habit of body, took great pleaſure in living ſplendidly, and in ſumptuous proviſions of all ſorts, being profuſe and covetous, even to injuſtice, of what was the property of others. On the contrary, Sfortia, being unacquainted with nice living, and frugal, was pleaſed with eaſily provided military fare, utterly deſpiſing all luxury, for he judged ſtrong rather than beautiful armour, tall and high mettled horſes of a generous breed, to be the proper furniture of martial dignity; nor had he ever uſed exquiſite ornament for an empty ſhew.*’ Perhaps, ſome will think that Sforza's plain way, and his averſion for luxury, may be alledged to ſhew the falſity of the ſlanderous reports that have been ſpread of his and the Queen of Naples amours; but this would be an ill-grounded imagination, ſince it is otherwiſe certain he loved women, and was of ſignal ſtrength of body, which was no ſmall bait for that princeſs (22). She loaded him with favours. ‘Coſtui . . . fondò la grandezza della ſua famiglia, non ſolamente col nome, chiamandola Sforza, mai col Stato; percioche fatto Generale de gli eſſerciti di Giovanna 2. Regina di Napoli, con laquale ſi dice, che hebbe da fare, hebbe in dono da lei, Benevento, Manfredonio, Baroli, & Trani con più di 20, caſtella (23). - - - *Being made general of the army of Joan II, Queen of Naples, with whom he is ſaid to have had an amorous correſpondence, he was preſented by her with Benevento, Manfredonia, Baroli, and Trani, and more than twenty caſtles.* See the Margin (24).

(21) Paulus Jovius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 192.

(22) See before the remark [*I*], of the article NAPLES (JOAN II, QUEEN OF.)

(23) Sanſovino, ubi ſupra.

(24) We read in pag. 88, of the *Ritrati & Elogii, di Capitani illuſtri*, edition of Rome, 1646, that after he had overcome near Aquila, the troops of Antognaccio and of James Caldora, and then made Caldora and the Count de Monte Riſo priſoners, and forced ſeveral barons to take an oath to Queen Joan, ſhe made him High Conſtable of the kingdom.

SFORZA (Francis) natural ſon of Giacomuzzo Attendolo, who is the ſubject of the foregoing article, made ſtill a more ſplendid fortune than his father. He was created Count of Tricarico at thirteen years of age, by Ladiſlaus King of Naples (*a*), and was early accounted a great warrior. He defeated the troops commanded by Braccio, which diſputed the paſſage of the Peſcara (*b*): but that advantage proved of no uſe to him; for his father having been drowned in that river, the deſign of raiſing the ſiege of Aquila was laid aſide. Francis Sforza was then but twenty-three years of age (*c*). He was confirmed by Queen Joan in all the dignities, and in the poſſeſſion of all the lands ſhe had beſtowed upon Giacomuzzo, and he received orders from that princeſs to make himſelf ready for the ſiege of Naples. He very much contributed to the reduction of that town (*d*), and then to the victory obtained near Aquila over the troops of Braccio, the ſecond of June 1425 (*e*). Pope Martin V ſent him againſt Nicolas Trincio, Lord of Foligno, and he forced him to accept of a peace upon the conditions he propoſed to him. Afterwards he ſerved the Duke of Milan both againſt the Florentines and the Venetians, and ſignalized himſelf on ſeveral occaſions (*f*). He did alſo many ſervices to Queen Joan; and when ſhe died, which happened in 1435, he applied himſelf, to Renatus d'Anjou, whom ſhe had made her heir. That prince was unhappy, and obliged to yield to his ill fortune. But Sforza, who had no leſs induſtry than courage, never wanted means to ſupport himſelf. He made himſelf maſter of ſeveral places in the March of Ancona, and even uſurped ſome ſtates belonging to the Church. Whereupon he was excommunicated by Pope Eugenius IV (*g*) [*A*], who, not ſatisfied to have ſtruck him with the ſpiritual thunder-bolt, had recourſe to temporal arms and confederacies, whereby Francis Sforza loſt the March of Ancona in 1444 (*h*). He quickly recovered himſelf by gaining a battle, in which the ſon of Picenini and Cardinal de Fermo, the Pope's legate, were taken priſoners (*i*). I ſhould be too long, if I was to give a particular account of all the wars wherein he was engaged; and therefore I ſhall only ſay, that by the treaty of peace concluded the twenty-ſecond of November 1441, it was agreed that he ſhould marry the natural daughter of the Duke of Milan (*k*). Accordingly he married her, which made way for a great fortune; for he became Duke of Milan after the death of his father-in-law [*B*]. That ſucceſſion did belong to a prince of the houſe of France (*l*), and yet it fell to Francis Sforza, who was favoured therein by Lewis XI (*m*). He poſſeſſed this ſtate till he died, and governed it with great moderation, and was accounted one of the greateſt princes of Italy. It has been *ſaid of him*

(*a*) Sanſovino, dell' origine delle Caſe illuſtri d'Italia, *folio* 11.

(*b*) Jovius, in Elogiis Viror. bellica virtute illuſtrium. *lib. ii, pag.* 195.

(*c*) Collenucius, Hiſt. Neapol. *lib. v, pag. m.* 409, *Mr Varillas,* Hiſtoire de Louïs XI, *livr. ii, p.* 134, *ſays he was only* 20.

(*d*) It was ſubdued for the queen in January 1425.

(*e*) *Ex eodem* Collenuc. *ibid. pag.* 409, 410.

(*f*) See the book intituled *Ritratti & Elogii di Capitani illuſtri,* pag. 131, edition of Rome 1646.

(*g*) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1442, *num.* 11.

(*h*) Vianoli, Hiſtoria Veneta, *Tom. i, pag.* 598.

(*i*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 599.

(*k*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 590.

(*l*) *See* Varillas, Hiſt. de Louïs XI, *book ii.*

(*m*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *Whereupon he was excommunicated by Pope Eugenius IV.*] This was a great alteration; for the ſame Pope had given him formerly the keeping of the March of Ancona, the dignity of Gonfaloniere of the Church, and a commiſſion to make war againſt Nicolas Fortebraccio, who had ſeized upon ſeveral places in the Eccleſiaſtical State. Sforza did very well diſcharge that commiſſion, and defeated the troops of Fortebraccio at Tivoli. Note, that afterwards this Pope, the Venetians, and the Florentines, gave him the command of their troops, when they declared war againſt the Duke of Milan (1).

[*B*] *He became Duke of Milan after the death of his father-in-law.*] Philip Maria Viſconti, who poſſeſſed that duchy, died in the month of Auguſt 1447, leaving no other child behind him, but a natural daughter married to Francis Sforza. Many laid a claim to that ſucceſſion. The Emperor Frederic III maintained that this duchy was devolved to the empire, ſince the laſt duke had left no lawful iſſue. Alfonſo, King of Naples,

(1) *Taken from the* Rittratti & Elogii di Capitani illuſtri, *pag.* 131, 132, *edition of Rome* 1646.

him that no uſurper was ever a better ſovereign (n). He was certainly endowed with ſeveral good qualities, and though he had never ſtudied, yet he promoted learning, and ſpoke with as much eloquence as an Orator [C], and argued about political affairs with a wonderful ſtrength of wit and judgment. The animoſity wherewith he went about to deſtroy the whole faction of Braccio, was thought to be exceſſive [D]. He died the eighth

Naples, alledged the laſt will of that duke, who had made him his heir. The Duke of Orleans alledged his being related to him, for he was the ſon of Valentina, ſiſter to that duke. Francis Sforza grounded his pretenſion upon the duke's adoption, to which he added the right of his wife (2). During thoſe contentions, the Milaneſe thought they had a favourable opportunity to erect themſelves into a Republic. Wherefore they elected twelve magiſtrates, whom they called the conſervators of liberty (3), and tore the laſt will of the late duke, and gave the command of the troops to Francis Sforza, to continue the war with the Venetians (4). This laſt point of their conduct was very impolitic, and inconſiſtent with their deſign of eſtabliſhing a republican government. They were not ſenſible that there is nothing more favourable to thoſe, who have a mind to ſway a ſcepter, than to put the ſword into their hands (5). That captain-general of the Milaneſe gained great advantages over the Republic of Venice. His reputation was more and more increaſed by it; and doubtleſs it was the reaſon why the Milaneſe deprived him of new occaſions of ſignalizing himſelf: they divided his army, and leſſened his troops that he might not form any conſiderable enterprize. He underſtood the meaning of it, and found out an expedient which did very much favour his ambition. He made a propoſal of peace to the Republic of Venice. ‘Doppo queſti auvenimenti moſtrò inclinatione lo Sforza à reconciliarſi coi Veneti; moſſo à ciò principalmente dai trattamenti che riceveva dai Milaneſi troppo aſpri; e come di geloſi della di lui potenza ingrati, e ſpiacevoli, mentre con la diviſione delle ſue genti, e con lo ſcemamento dell' eſercito gli andavano tarpando l'ali per impedirgli il volo alla Ducale altezza; onde fù ſpedito da eſſo à Venetia Clemente Tealdino Secretario, che ſi trovava prigione con Almorò Donato nella Rocca di Cremona à proporre la trattatione della pace (6). - - - *After theſe events, Sforza appeared inclined to make his peace with the Venetians, being chiefly induced to it by the harſh uſage he met with from the Milaneſe, who being jealous of his power, and afterwards ungrateful to him and diſſatisfied with him, endeavoured, by dividing his troops and reducing his army, to ſtop him in his progreſs to the ducal honour. Whereupon he diſpatched to Venice the ſecretary Clemente Tealdino, who was then priſoner in the caſtle of Cremona with Almoro Donato, to propoſe a treaty of peace.*’ His propoſals were approved of, and a treaty was concluded, whereby the Republic engaged to aſſiſt him with men and money, in order to make himſelf maſter of the town and duchy of Milan; and it was agreed upon, that all the conqueſts, as far as the river Adda, ſhould belong to the Republic of Venice (7). As ſoon as the Duke of Savoy heard of that confederacy, he reſolved to aſſiſt the Milaneſe, but the troops he ſent them were cut to pieces by Francis Sorfza before they joined thoſe of Milan; and then he made it his buſineſs to ſtreighten that great city (8). The Venetians being apprehenſive that he would ſubdue it, broke with him, and confederated with the Milaneſe. Nevertheleſs he purſued his point; he made an agreement with the Duke of Savoy, and confirmed the alliance between him and the Florentines. He hindered the Venetians from ſuccouring Milan: a famine, and the diviſions of the Milaneſe, and their ſpite againſt the Venetians, brought that great affair to an end; they ſubmitted to him, and received him into their town the twenty-ſixth of February, 1450 (9), and acknowledged him for their duke (10). Thus the meaſures that city and ſeveral other neighbouring towns had taken to ſet themſelves at liberty, after the death of Philip Maria Viſconti, vaniſhed into ſmoak. Spondanus rightly obſerves, that many towns in Italy fell at that time into ſlavery, becauſe they were too fond of avoiding it; for ſeveral factions ſtarting up, they were ſometimes for one form of government, and ſometimes for another; and when one of the factions was uppermoſt, they cruelly treated the contrary party. Was not this making way for ſlavery? *Mediolanenſes ſervandæ per ſe libertatis impotentes erant; & ut in his fieri mos erat civitatum Italicarum, illam tueri quærentes, mutuis diſſenſionibus, ac diverſis regiminis mutationibus, crudelitatibuſque faciliorem ſervituti viam ſternebant* (11). That annaliſt obſerves, that the populace of Milan killed the Venetian ambaſſador, having mutinyed, becauſe the ſuccours promiſed by the Republic had not entered the town; and he adds, that the Venetians did cunningly put off the relief of it, in hopes to oblige the Milaneſe to ſubmit to their domination (12).

[C] *He was endowed with many good qualities, and tho' he had never ſtudied, yet he promoted learning, and ſpoke with as much eloquence as an Orator.*] He expreſſed, upon ſeveral occaſions, his great grief for his want of learning: his liberality towards learned men proceeded from his great deſire that they ſhould write his actions, and immortalize his name. He took care to procure that honour to his father, by the pen of a famous writer; but his own Hiſtorian was more famous ſtill, and went about that work with an extream diligence. I mean John Simoneta, who wrote the hiſtory of Francis Sforza in thirty-one books, and declares he advances nothing but what he had ſeen, or was very ſure of. His work was printed at Milan in 1479, and reaches from the year 1424, to 1466 (13). Here follows a paſſage of Paul Jovius, which proves the text of this remark. ‘In hunc hominem præter invictum corporis atque animi robur, ſumma etiam dona, quæ tribui poterant, natura contulerat perſonæ ſcilicet dignitatem eximiam; os probum, & in omni congreſſu aſpectum ſine ſuperbia ſuis pariter atque hoſtibus venerabilem, ſic, ut cuncti in eo ſæpius concionante facundiam abſoluto oratore parem admirarentur, eoque plenius, quòd nullas attigiſſet literas; & nihilo ſecius in omni civili militarique negocio, efficacis prudentiæ, divinique judicii vim expeditam & incredibilem afferret. Sed literarum decus, quum ſeſe ejus expertem ingenuo pudore ſæpe dolens fateretur, liberaliſſimè tuebatur. Juſtæ ſiquidem & veræ laudis, quæ viventi ornamento eſſet, & tranſiret ad poſteros, erat avidiſſimus. A Joanne Simoneta namque inſigni hiſtorico, & à Philelpho poeta percelebri res ſuas bello paceque geſtas perſcribi celebrarique jubebat, ſicuti etiam patris vitam Leodorix Cribellus ejus juſſu antea perſcripſerat (14). - - - - *Upon this man, beſides an invincible ſtrength of body and mind, nature had beſtowed all manner of gifts; namely, a ſingular dignity of perſonage; an excellent feature, and, on all occaſions, an aſpect without pride, reſpected by friends as well as enemies, ſo that all admired the eloquence of his frequent ſpeeches equal to that of a compleat Orator, and ſo much the more, as being unlearned; yet nevertheleſs in all civil and military affairs, he exerted a ready and wonderful ſtrength of a prevailing prudence and a ſublime judgment. But he would often acknowledge, ingenuouſly and with regret, his want of learning, of which he was a very liberal encourager. He was moſt deſirous of a juſtly deſerved praiſe, which might be his ornament whilſt alive, and after paſs to his poſterity. He ordered his tranſactions in war and peace to be recorded, and publiſhed by John Simoneta, an eminent Hiſtorian, and by Philelphus, a very famous Poet, in like manner as Cribellus, by his command alſo, had written the life of his father.*’ He had been ſaying that Francis Sforza governed the Milaneſe for the ſpace of ſixteen years, with ſo much wiſdom, juſtice, and mildneſs, and kept himſelf ſo free from all manner of vice (15), that he was accounted the beſt prince of that time. But Nauclerus ſays, that the love of women made him commit ſome injuſtices in his old age (16).

[D] *The animoſity, wherewith he went about to deſtroy the whole faction of Braccio was thought to be exceſſive.*] He had ſubdued it, but being afraid that the ſon of Picininus might revive it again, he reſolved to deſtroy him; and the better to ſucceed in it, he pretended to love him, and married him to one of his daughters. Afterwards he delivered him to Ferdinand, King of Naples, who, contrary to his word given, and all the rights of hoſpitality, cauſed him to be beheaded in priſon.

(n) Varillas, *ibid. pag.* 140.

(2) *See* Spondanus's Annals. *ad ann.* 1447. *num.* 7.

(3) Leand. Albertus, Deſcript. Italiæ, *pag.* 678, *Edit. Latinæ* 1657, in folio.

(4) Vianoli, Hiſtor. Veneta, *Tom. i. p.* 604.

(5) Ben convenendozi la ſpada à quella mano che vuole ſcettro. *Vianoli, ubi ſupra.*

(6) Id. ibid. *pag.* 605, 606.

(7) Id. ibid. *pag.* 606.

(8) Id. ibid. *pag.* 607.

(9) Vianoli, ſays 1449.

(10) Id. ibid. *pag.* 613, 614.

(11) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1449, *num.* 7, *p. m.* 9.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) *See* Voſſius, de Hiſt. Latin. *pag.* 625.

(14) Jovius, in Elogiis Viror. bellica virtute illuſtrium, *lib. iii, pag.* 222.

(15) Adverſus omnem vitiorum intemperiem. *Id. ibid. p.* 221.

(16) Hic etſi cunctos prudentia & felicitate principes ſui temporis excelluiſſet, in ſenectute tamen mulierum ardore deceptus nimium prævaricatus eſt. *Nauclerus*, Generat. XLIX, pag. m. 970.

eighth of March 1466, aged ſixty-five years (*o*). He left fifteen children behind him, ſome lawfully begotten, and others not; but his poſterity was wholly extinct in 1535 [*E*]. The condition, which he required in treating of the marriage of his ſon with the daughter of the Marquis of Mantua, has ſomething ſingular in it [*F*]: I ſhall make a remark

(*o*) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1466, *numb.* 6, *pag. m.* 109.

priſon. This was an horrid crime: Paul Jovius condemns it in very ſtrong words. *Fuere qui ei* (Franciſco Sfortiæ) *inexorablis odii notam inurerent, quòd perſequendæ Bracciacæ factionis nunquam oblitus, Jacobum Piccinini filium ſummæ ſpei ducem, ſub quo Bracciana arma refloreſcere poſſe viderentur, nequaquam ſyncera fide in generum aſciverit; ſcilicet ut eo vinculo pignoreque deceptum, ad teterrimam necem Ferdinando Neapolitano regi proderet. Ab eo enim rege contra fidem refricata veterum offenſionum memoria, vir impiger in carcere per Æthiopem ſervum averſa ſecuri mactatus eſt, ſingulari quidem cum infamia tantorum principum, qui vindictæ libidinem ſacroſanctæ fidei & hoſpitalis menſæ religioni prætuliſſent* (17).

[*E*] *He left fifteen children* (18) *behind him, ſome lawfully begotten, and others not; but his poſterity was . . . . extinct in* 1535.] His firſt wife was Polyxena Ruffa, whoſe dowry made him lord of three towns and above twenty caſtles. His ſecond wife, as has been ſaid above, was the only daughter of the Duke of Milan. The ſon who ſucceeded him was called JOHN GALEAZZO MARIA SFORZA (19). I have ſaid in another place (20) how he was killed. His ſon JOHN GALEAZZO SFORZA, who ſucceeded him, was then but four years of age, and LUDOVIC SFORZA his uncle, ſon of Francis, took care of his education. You may ſee in another place (21), how he periſhed in the year 1494. His ſon was excluded from the ſucceſſion by the intrigues of Ludovic Sforza, who got himſelf declared Duke of Milan, and thereby obtained the imperial inveſtiture, which his predeceſſors could never obtain: that inveſtiture extended to natural children, in caſe the lawful iſſue ſhould fail. *Is poſtquam à Maximiliano Imperatore novi principatus auctoritatem obtinuiſſet, magna cum ſolemnitate totiuſque civitatis gratulatione Ducatus inſignia cepit, die qui D. Theodoro martyri feſtus habetur, anno à C. N.* MCCCCXCV. *Primus ex Sfortia gente Mediolanenſis Ducatus titulum ac dignitatem jure nactus eſt, quoniam anteriores auctoritatem principatus ab Sacro Imperio Romano hactenus impetrare non potuerant. Fuit autem in formula Ludovici non ſolum de filiis juſtis ut invicem ſibi ſuccedendi jus haberent, comprehenſum, ſed etiam de nothis, uti ego vidi, ſi juſtos non extare contingeret* (22). He was deprived of his ſtates in the year 1499, by Lewis XII King of France, grandſon to Valentina Viſconti, daughter of John Galeazzo, Duke of Milan. He raiſed ſome troops in Swiſſerland, and the year following returned into the Milaneſe, and recovered moſt places of that duchy; but the Swiſs delivered him to the French, and from that day till his death, which happened in the year 1508, he was kept in priſon. Lewis XII poſſeſſed the Milaneſe for ſome years following; but loſt it in 1512, and MAXIMILIAN SFORZA Ludovic's ſon, recovered it. He could not keep it after the victory which Francis I. obtained over the Swiſs in the year 1515, at the battle of Marignan, and was forced to ſurrender himſelf. He was ſent into France, where he died. FRANCIS SFORZA, his brother, was eſtabliſhed in 1522, Duke of Milan, by the power of a league, which had overcome the French. He did not enjoy that ſtate quietly, nor without interruption, being ſometimes expelled by the French, and then reſtored by Charles V, and ſometimes alſo ill uſed by that emperor, who at laſt admitted him into his favour in the year 1530. From that time he peaceably enjoyed his ſtates till the year 1535, in which he died. He was the laſt of all thoſe who deſcended from Francis Sforza, firſt of that name (23). Charles V then poſſeſſed himſelf of the Milaneſe, and he inveſted his ſon, Philip II, with it the twelfth of December 1549. The terms of the inveſtiture take in Philip II and all his poſterity, both males and females for ever, according to the order obſerved in the hereditary ſucceſſions of ſtates, that may fall to women.

[*F*] *The condition which he required in treating of the marriage of his ſon to the daughter of the Marquis of Mantua, has ſomething ſingular in it.*] I have ſaid in another place (24), that according to the agreement between him and Lewis Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua, his ſon Galeazzo was to marry Dorothy, that Marquis's daughter, *provided it ſhould appear that ſhe had no crooked back, nor any other imperfection in her body, at fourteen years of age.* By virtue of that agreement, he ſent ſome Phyſicians to inſpect the naked body of Dorothy; but the Marquis would not ſuffer it. A very learned Civilian being conſulted about that queſtion, maintained, that Francis Sforza was in the right. Many people were ſurprized at the anſwer of that advocate. Read the following paſſage of Camerarius in his hiſtorical meditations. 'Many wonder 'how Franciſcus Aretinus, a famous Civilian, under- 'took to prove that Francis Sforza Duke of Milan, 'was in the right to require that Dorothy daughter 'of Ludovic Marquis of Mantua, contracted to Ga- 'leazzo the ſon of that duke, ſhould be viewed naked 'by ſome Phyſicians he had ſent for that purpoſe, 'to know whether there was any deformity in her 'body: That on the contrary, the Marquis was in 'the wrong to refuſe ſuch an inſpection, offering only 'to ſhew them his daughter dreſſed in the peticoat, 'which Galeazzo had ſent her (25).' Camerarius had read this particular in a book of Tiraquellus, whom he quotes. I ſhall ſet down Tiraquellus's own words, whereby it will appear that Philip Decius, a famous Civilian, approved the opinion of the Advocate Aretinus. 'Proinde non recte fortaſſis pleriſque videbitur 'conſuluiſſe vir alioquin doctiſſimus autorque graviſſi- 'mus Fran. Are. conſ. 142. ex facto proponitur quòd 'illuſtris in tertio, & iterum in quarto dubio ejuſdem 'conſ. cum omnibus nervis contendit probare Fran- 'ciſcum Sfortiam Ducem Mediolani jure petiiſſe, ut 'Dorothea filia Ludovici Marchionis Mantuæ Galea- 'tio ipſius Ducis filio deſponſata, nuda à quibuſdam 'Medicis à ſe miſſis conſpiceretur, ut hinc detegere- 'tur, ſi qua puellæ eſſet deformitas: contra Ludovi- 'cum hoc ipſum injuria recuſaſſe, ſed tantum filiam 'obtuliſſe videndam, Cotta (ſic enim appellat) quam 'ad eam Galeatius ipſe miſerat, coopertam. Cujus 'tamen conſilium probat Philip. Dec. in d. ca. pro- 'poſuiſti in 2. notab. An tamen bene uterque ſen- 'ſerit, aliorum ſit judicium (26). - - - *Wherefore it 'will poſſibly be thought, that a right advice was not 'given by the Counſellor Francis Aretin, otherwiſe a 'moſt learned perſon and grave author, in maintaining 'that Francis Sforza, Duke of Milan, was in the 'right to demand, that Dorothea daughter of Lewis 'Marquis of Mantua, betrothed to Galeazzo the Duke's 'ſon, ſhould be viewed naked by ſome Phyſicians ſent on 'purpoſe, to ſee if there was any defect in her. On the 'other hand, that Lewis was in the wrong to refuſe it, 'and only to offer his daughter to be ſeen in a petticoat, 'which Galeazzo himſelf had ſent. Whoſe advice was 'notwithſtanding approved by Philippus Decius. But 'whether they both were in the right, or not, let others 'judge.*' You ſee that Tiraquellus durſt not decide whether thoſe two Civilians were in the right; and yet he comments in that very place upon a law, which he reduced to theſe terms, *Let the betrothed couple diſcover their deformities one to another; however, let them not ſtrip themſelves ſtark naked, and particularly let the woman forbear doing it. Suam quiſque deformitatem futuro marito, aut uxori detegito. Ne tamen ſe propterea, præſertim fœmina, nudato* (27). He had been ſaying, that if women have any bodily imperfection, that is not known, they ought to acquaint with it thoſe whom they are to marry, verbally only, but not by ſhewing it. (28) *Illud fœminas ipſas monemus, ut ſi qua in eis ſit occulta deformitas, ei certe cui nubere velint, non re quidem, id eſt corporis nudatione, ſed verbis adaperiant, propter eam maxime rationem* (29) *quæ à nobis dicta eſt cum de viris in hujus capitis initio loqueremur.* It ſeems therefore, that to avoid contradicting himſelf, he ſhould have altogether condemned the opinion of the Civilian Franciſcus Aretinus. It may be anſwered in his vindication, that there are ſome particular caſes, or ſpecial agreements which diſpenſe with the law, and that therefore he would not interpoſe his judgment about the conduct of Francis Sforza, and the Marquis of Mantua. He might have thought that there were ſome circum-

(17) Jovius, *in* Elog. Virorum bellica virtute illuſtrium, *lib. iii*, *pag.* 222, 223.

(18) Sanſovino, dell' orig. delle Caſe illuſtri d'Italia, *folio ii*, *verſo*.

(19) Id. ibid.

(20) In the article LAMPONIANO.

(21) In the article ARAGON. (ISABELLA OF)

(22) Leand. Albertus, *in* Deſcript. Italiæ, *pag.* 680.

(23) *Taken from* Leander Albertus, ubi ſupra,

(24) Above, remark [*C*] of the article ARETIN (FRANCIS).

(25) Camerarius, Meditat. Hiſtoriques, *Tom. i*, *book ii*, *ch. xiv*, *pag. m.* 168.

(26) Tiraquellus in Legem IV, connubial. num. 28, *pag. m.* 85.

(27) Id. ibid. *pag.* 87.

(28) Id. ibid.

(29) See that reaſon towards the latter end of this remark.

remark on it.

circumſtances in the caſe, which made the thing problematical. It is very likely Francis Sforza meant by the words of his agreement with Dorothy's father, that ſhe ſhould be ſearched, but that it was not in expreſs words ſaid, ſhe ſhould be ſeen ſtark naked. Had this clauſe been expreſſed, the Marquis of Mantua would have broke his word by refuſing what the Duke required; and if it was not expreſſed, he might ſay he never meant that his daughter ſhould be inſpected after the manner the Duke would have it. Wherefore the reaſons *pro* and *con* might have been ſpecious, and hindred Tiraquellus from attempting to decide the matter. He was not ignorant that it was more neceſſary for ſovereign princes than for private perſons, to know whether there are any concealed imperfections, that may make one fear a woman's barrenneſs. Francis Sforza deſigned to marry his ſon to the daughter of Lewis Gonzaga; and therefore it highly concerned him that ſhe ſhould want nothing: And it is well known, that there are many cuſtoms contrary to the common practice in favour of princes. See what I have ſaid before (30) concerning the cuſtom of the Muſcovites. It affords another reaſon for the doubting of Tiraquellus, and ſhewing that he does not contradict himſelf.

I ſhall occaſionally obſerve, that he alledges a great number of things upon this ſubject, and is ſometimes miſtaken. He is in the wrong to ſay (31), that in antient times, maids that were to marry, went to the temple of *Fortuna Virilis*, where they pulled off their clothes, that it might be known whether there was any concealed imperfection in their bodies. Mr Du Boulay gives a better account of that cuſtom. He ſays, that on the firſt day of April, ‘the Roman ladies being crowned with myrtle, offered a ſacrifice to Venus, after they had well waſhed themſelves under the myrtle. Ovid mentions the cauſe of that cuſtom in the fourth book of the Faſti; He ſays, that Venus one day drying her wet hair upon the banks of a river, the ſatyrs perceived her ſtark naked as ſhe was, of which ſhe was ſo aſhamed, that immediately ſhe covered herſelf with myrtle, which was conſecrated to her ever ſince, and this occaſioned the celebration of that feaſt. Upon that ſame day the maids that were ready to be married, ſacrificed to *Fortuna Virilis* with a little perfume and frankincenſe, and there ſtripped themſelves ſtark naked before the goddeſs, ſhewing her all the imperfections of their bodies, and beſeeching her not to diſcover them to their future huſbands (32).’ He has omitted one circumſtance, *viz.* That the ladies before they waſhed themſelves, ſtripped the goddeſs Venus, and waſhed her. Here follow the words of the Roman Poet, who informs us of all thoſe ceremonies.

Rite Deam Latiæ colitis matreſque nuruſque;
Et vos, quis vittæ longaque veſtis abeſt.
Aurea marmoreo redimicula ſolvite collo:
Demite divitias: tota lavanda Dea eſt.
Aurea ſiccato redimicula reddite collo:
Nunc alii flores, nunc nova danda roſa eſt.
Vos quoque ſub viridi myrto jubet illa lavari:
Cauſſaque, cur jubeat, (diſcite) certa ſubeſt.
Litore ſiccabat rorantes nuda capillos.
Viderunt Satyri turba proterva Deam.
Senſit, & appoſita texit ſua corpora myrto.
Tuta fuit facto: voſque referre jubet.
Diſcite nunc, quare Fortunæ thura Virili
Detis eo, calida qui locus humet aqua,
Accipit ille locus poſito velamine cunctas;
Et vitium nudi corporis omne videt.
Ut tegat hoc, celetque viros, Fortuna Virilis
Præſtat: & hoc parvo thure rogata facit (33).

That cuſtom of the Roman virgins, ſo ill related by Tiraquellus, was a trick and a fraud, wholly contrary to the ſincerity he recommends to women, in the preliminaries of marriage. They applied themſelves to *Fortuna Virilis*, as others made their addreſs to the goddeſs Laverna, and begged of her that ſhe would render inviſible the faults they were guilty of.

Pulcra Laverna
Da mihi fallere, da juſtum ſanctumque videri,
Noctem peccatis & fraudibus objice nubem (34):

Good, good Laverna, grant me aid
For ſuch a cheat, let all believe me good;
Let me ſeem juſt and honeſt to the croud,
And o'er my cheats and forgeries caſt a cloud.
CREECH.

In a word, that practice of the Roman ladies was a very bad one, tho' it was not ſo abominable as that of the Egyptian women, who ſhewed their nakedneſs to the ox Apis, for the ſpace of forty days. That ox was the chief deity of the Egyptians. Ἐν δὲ ταῖς προειρημέναις τετταράκονθ' ἡμέραις μόνον ὁρῶσιν αὐτὸν αἱ γυναῖκες, κατὰ πρόσωπον ἱστάμεναι, καὶ δεικνύουσιν ἀνασυράμεναι τὰ ἑαυτῶν γεννητικὰ μόρια. *Per XL. illos dies fœminæ duntaxat ipſum* (Apis) *vident, ante faciem ejus conſtitutæ, elevatiſque peplis inguina oſtentant* (35). What an abominable notion had they of the gods, whom they made the ſpectators of ſuch things! This was not only a ſin offending againſt modeſty, but alſo an impious thing; and I make no doubt, that all the Romans, who knew the rules of a modeſt education, condemned the ceremonies practiſed on the firſt day of April. One may, without reading St Jerom, approve what he ſays, to ſhew that we ought to be aſhamed of our own nakedneſs. ‘Scio præcepiſſe quoſdam, ne virgo Chriſti cum eunuchis lavet, nec cum maritatis fœminis: quia alii non deponant animos virorum: aliæ tumentibus uteris præferant fœditatem. Mihi omninò in adulta virgine lavacra diſplicent, quæ ſe ipſam debat erubeſcere, & nudam videre non poſſe (36). - - - *I know ſome have taught, that a Chriſtian virgin ought never to go into a bath with an eunuch or married women, becauſe thoſe have not laid aſide their maſculine inclinations; and the others, by their big-bellies may ſhew what is unſeemly. As for my ſelf, I am of opinion, that a virgin that is marriageable, ſhould not go into a bath, who ſhould even bluſh, and be averſe to behold herſelf naked.*’ It is not enough to condemn the impudent practices authorized by the laws of Lycurgus (37), we ought alſo to condemn the anniverſary cuſtoms mentioned by Ovid: and if the difference between the Duke of Milan, and the Marquis of Mantua was to be decided, it were much better to praiſe the conduct of the Marquis than that of the Duke. The complaints of Cieco d'Hadria ought only to be looked upon as witticiſms. He exclaims againſt the vaſt difference between all other purchaſes and marriage. If a man buys a houſe, he will ſee every nook and corner of it from the cellar to the garret; and yet he does not confine himſelf to it for his life: He may ſell it again, or let it, if he does not like it. It is the ſame with all other merchandiſe. The only thing, ſays Cieco d'Hadria, a man cannot part with, when he has purchaſed it, is that about which he ſtrikes a bargain without examining it. ‘Tutte le coſe ſi conſiderano prima che ſi comprino. Le caſe ſi mirano, gli ſtromenti ſi odono, le popone ſi annaſano, il vino ſi guſta, il panno ſi tocca, le fuſa ſi maneggiano, le caraffe ſi palpano d'ogni parte ſe ſon intere, i leuti s'abbraciano, le ſtringhe ſi ſtendono, i legni ſi miſurano, le ſcarpe ſi calzano, i cavalli ſi cavalcano, le vacche ſi ſcegliono, e in ſomma tutte le coſe ſi provano con quei ſenſi, con cui le habbiamo à goder prima, che ſi conchiuda il mercato. Le mogli ſole, che non ſi poſſano mai più rifiutare in vita, con cui biſogna ſtar ſempre fino alla morte, ſi prendono à chiuſi ochi, à gatt' orba, e come ſi dice, gatta in ſacco. Ne pur ſi provano, perche non riuſcirebbono al paragone. Ne pur ſi moſtrano, perche ſe ſi vedeſſero ſi ſprezzerebbono prima, che ſi pigliaſſero (38). - - - *We examine every thing, before we purchaſe it. We view a houſe, try a muſical inſtrument, ſmell a melon, taſte wine, feel a piece of cloth, turn a ſpindle, view every ſide of a flaſk, to know if it is whole. We ſound a lute, wind up ſtrings, meaſure wood, try on ſhoes, ride horſes, chuſe out cows; and in ſhort we prove every thing in the manner we are to uſe it, before we make the bargain. Women alone, whom we can never return*

---

(30) Citation (64), of the article FULVIA.

(31) Sed & legimus olim in templum Fortunæ virilis ventitare mulieres ſolitas quæ nuptui dabantur: & corpore nudato, num quo vitio aut labe eſſent affectas explorari ſolere. *Tiraquell. ubi ſupra, num. xi, pag.* 82.

(32) Du Boulay, Threſor des Antiquitez Romaines, *pag.* 516.

(33) Ovidius, Faſtor. lib. iv, ver. 133.

(34) Horat. Epiſt. xvi, lib. i, ver. 60.

(35) Diodorus Siculus, *lib. i, pag. m.* 54, *cap. lxxxv. See the* Hexameron Ruſtique, *pag. m.* 91.

(36) Hieronym. Epiſtola ad Lætam de inſtitut. filiæ, *Epiſtol. lib. ii, pag. m.* 264.

(37) See before the remarks [*C*], [*D*], and the following, of the article LYCURGUS. See alſo the article QUELLENEC, citation (41). Note that Montagne in book iii of his Eſſays, *ch. v, pag. m.* 129, & *ſeq.* ſeems willing to excuſe Lycurgus.

(38) Lettere famigliare del Cieco d'Hadria, *pag. m.* 35. *See above the remark* [*C*], *of the article* LYCURGUS.

‘*turn as long as we live, and whom we muſt keep till we die, are taken blindly, like a pig in a poke. They are not tryed, becauſe they would not anſwer the teſt. neither do they ſuffer themſelves to be viewed, becauſe if they were ſeen, they would be ſlighted before they went off.*’ How comically they talk. He would introduce into our contracts of marriage, either the cuſtom of the Taxites, an antient nation among the Indians (39), or that of the old Romans when they bought ſlaves; a cuſtom which the Emperor Auguſtus made ſubſervient to his unlawful love, as has been ſeen before in the article of Fulvia, citation (64).

I have promiſed above (40) to mention the reaſon alledged by Tiraquellus, why a man and a woman, who deſign to marry, ſhould diſcover their bodily imperfections to each other. A huſband, ſays he, who does not declare them in due time, runs the hazard of being hated by his wife when ſhe comes to know them: It is in vain for him to hope that ſhe will not perceive them; people that lie together in the ſame bed muſt needs find them out. Contempt, hatred, and horror, will be the conſequence of ſuch a diſcovery; and then the wife will think of other men. *Si vir quiſpiam qui ſe matrimonio velit addicere, quicquam latentis vitii aut deformitatis in corpore habeat, id in primis uxori quam ducturus eſt, detegat, ne ſi jam conſummato matrimonio reſciſcat (neque enim illam qua cum dies nocteſque verſaris diu latere poteſt . . .) te contemnat, deteſtetur, abhorreat: proindeque alios petulanter ſectetur* (41). Let no man fancy (Tiraquellus goes on) that he will have a wife like that, who being married to one that had a ſtinking noſe, did not complain of it, becauſe ſhe thought all men had the ſame defect (42). There are but two ſuch inſtances mentioned by antient authors; and none but a madman will expect ſuch a thing now a-days. *Et ſane futurum adeo neminem inſanum reor qui noſtris præſertim temporibus, ſpem concipiat uxorem ſe his ſimilem inventurum, eaque ſpe ductus ſuum illi vitium non patefaciat* (43). This is what he ſays to perſuade a man to conceal none of his imperfections, and to imitate the good example of the Philoſopher Crates (44), and of the father (45) of the Emperor Galba. He uſes the ſame arguments as to women, which he confirms by this, that marriage is a kind of purchaſe, and that juſtice requires the buyer ſhould be informed of the latent faults of what he buys (46). He proves all this by ſeveral authorities.

I do not know what was the iſſue of the difference between the Duke of Milan and the Marquis of Mantua about Dorothy's marriage. I cannot tell whether any expedient was found out to ſatisfy the father of the betrothed; but I find in Sanſovino (47), that John Galeazzo Maria, the ſon of our Francis Sforza, had two wives: One of them was Suſanna de Gonzaga, and the other Bonna of Savoy. The Abbot de Marolles affirms that Suſanna de Gonzaga, the daughter of Lewis Marquis of Mantua, was married to Galeazzo Maria Sforza Duke of Milan (48). The ſame Sanſovino ſays in another place (49), that Dorothy Gonzaga, daughter of Lewis Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua, was married to Galeazzo Maria Sforza Duke of Milan. It is very likely, that thro' a miſtake he is frequently liable to, he calls the ſame perſon Suſanna in one place, and Dorothy in another. From whence it ought to be inferred that, according to him, the ſon of Francis Sforza was married to a daughter of the Marquis of Mantua; which would prove that the difference, concerning which Francis Aretin was conſulted, was made up, and the marriage accompliſhed. But then it might be ſaid, that Sanſovino, who is no exact writer, ſpeaks of a mariage in general, tho' the thing went no farther than a betrothing.

(39) Strabo, *lib. xv, pag. m.* 491, ſays, that among them, when a man could give no portion to his daughter, he carried her to the market-place, and gathered the people together by ſound of trumpet. If any body offered to marry her, ſhe ſtripped herſelf firſt backwards to the ſhoulders and then forwards.

(40) Above, citation (29).

(41) Tiraquellus, ubi ſupra, *num. i, pag.* 79.

(42) See above remark [*D*] of the article DUELLIUS.

(43) Tiraquellus in Legem IV, connubial. *num. ii, pag.* 80.

(44) See the remark [*A*] in the article HIPPARCHIA.

(45) He pulled off his gown, to ſhew a rich and handſome lady, who courted him, that he had a crooked back. See *Suetonius in Galba, cap. iii.*

(46) See citation (*f*) of the article ABDAS.

(47) Sanſovino, ubi ſupra, *fol.* 11, *verſo.*

(48) Marolles, Memoires, *pag.* 428.

(49) Fol. 359, verſo.

SFORZA (CATHERINE) grand-daughter of the foregoing, was a lady of great courage; but ſhe did an action which ſavoured much more of a man's boldneſs, than of a woman's modeſty. Her ſubjects having made themſelves maſters of the caſtle of Rimini, ſhe gave them her children as hoſtages to recover it; and then ſhe threatned with death thoſe, who had occaſioned the inſurrection; they anſwered her, that they would kill her children; thereupon ſhe turned up her ſhift, and ſaid, here is wherewithal to get others [*A*]: barbarouſly, deſtroy the innocent hoſtages that are in your hands; I conſent to it, provided my juſtice inflict upon you ſuch a puniſhment as your wickedneſs deſerves (*a*). She was the natural daughter of Galeazzo Maria Sforza, and was

(*a*) *Taken from* Balthaſar Bonifacius Hiſtoriæ Ludicræ, *lib. v, cap. iv, pag.* 127. He quotes the eighth book of Michael, Brutus's Hiſtory of Florence.

[*A*] *Here is wherewithal to get others* (1).] There could not be a more modeſt tranſlation of the following words. ‘Illa magno & virili animo ſublata veſte nudatoque ventre, En inquit, quo poſſim liberos iterum procreare. - - - - *She with a great and manly courage, taking up her garment, and uncovering her belly, Behold, ſays ſhe, that whereby I can have more children.*’ The author, from whom I have this, and whom I have quoted in the margin of this article, had been relating the action of a Lacedemonian woman, who ſeeing her ſons run away from a fight, ſhewed them her nakedneſs, and aſked them whether they would get in again into the ſame belly out of which they came when they were born, or whether they expected ſhe ſhould put them under her gown, that the enemies who purſued them, might not ſee them. She added to this queſtion ſuch a ſmart reprimand for their want of courage, that they returned to the fight and got the victory. He quotes the Apophthegms of the Lacedemonian women, collected by Plutarch; but all theſe circumſtances are not to be found in that author: He only ſays, that a woman of Lacedæmon ſhewed her belly to her ſons when they ran away, and aſked them whether they had a mind to get into it again (2). The other particulars are a fabulous addition of Balthazar Bonifacius. I call it fabulous, tho' it is to be found in Juſtin, with reſpect to other women, *viz.* the Perſian women, when Cyrus engaged in a deciſive battle againſt Aſtyages king of the Medes. ‘Pulſa itaque cum Perſarum acies paulatim cederet; matres & uxores eorum obviam occurrunt: orant in prælium revertantur: cunctantibus, ſublata veſte, obſcœna corporis oſtendunt, rogantes num in uteros matrum vel uxorum velint refugere. Hac repreſſi caſtigatione, in prælium redeunt: & facta impreſſione, quos fugiebant, fugere compellunt (3). - - - - *The Perſian army being worſted, began gradually to give ground, they were met by their mothers and wives: they pray them to return to the fight: but delaying, they lift up their garments, ſhew their ſecret parts, aſking if they would again take ſhelter in the wombs of their mothers or wives. Being checked by this reproof, they return to the battle, and charging afreſh, put to flight thoſe from whom they were flying.*’ A commentator (4) obſerves, that Tacitus mentions a thing like this concerning the women of Germany; which is not true: The difference between that fact, and that of the Perſian women, is great enough to make it a different thing. The women mentioned by Tacitus uſed only intreaties, and ſhewed nothing but their breaſts. ‘Memoriæ proditur, quaſdam acies inclinatas jam, & labantes à feminis reſtitutas, conſtantia precum & objectu pectorum, & monſtrata cominus captivitate, quam longe impatientius feminarum ſuarum nomine timent: adeo ut efficacius obligentur animi civitatum quibus inter obſides puellæ quoque nobiles imperantur (5). - - - - *It is recorded, that armies giving ground and ready to fly, have been reſtored by women, inceſſantly intreating, ſhewing their breaſts, and telling them what ſlavery they were to undergo; which they dreaded ſo much the more upon account of their women. So that thoſe cities are moſt effectually kept in ſubjection, by which amongſt the hoſtages noble virgins are delivered up.*’ It were an unjuſt thing to ſay that I am a rambling commentator, and that I make digreſſions to fill up my page; for I only take notice of ſuch miſtakes as I meet in my way, after having cenſured Balthaſar Bonifacius for advancing a falſity. His book, and thoſe of innumerable other authors, are full of ſuch liberty; therein you will find a thouſand things, which the authors quoted by them ſay nothing of. If I had a mind

(1) Compare this with the anſwer of the Egyptians, in the remark [*D*] of the article PSAMMITICHUS.

(2) Plut. in Apophthegm. Lacænarum, *pag. m.* 241.

(3) Juſtin. *lib. i, cap. vi, p. m.* 20. *See alſo* Plutarch, de Virtutibus Mulierum, *pag.* 246.

(4) Bernegger on Juſtin, *lib. i, cap. vi, pag. m.* 20.

(5) Tacit. de Germ. *cap. viii.*

was married to Jerom Riario [*B*], Lord of Forli, and of Imola (*b*), by whom ſhe had, among other children, Octavio Riario, who was lord of the ſame ſtates, which he held of the holy ſee (*c*). She had the government in her hands, as being her ſon's guardian (*d*), and knew well how to advance her intereſt, during the tumults occaſioned by the French expedition into Italy in 1494, and the years following. She defended herſelf with great courage in the fortreſs of Forli, againſt the Duke of Valentinois ſon of Alexander VI, in the year 1500; but not being able to reſiſt the violent aſſaults of his troops ſhe was made a priſoner and ſent to Rome, where ſhe was confined to the caſtle of St Angelo (*e*). It was upon this occaſion, if we may believe ſome writers, that ſhe ſhewed her nakedneſs; but they are miſtaken [*C*]. She was ſet at liberty ſoon after, by the incerceſſion of Ives d'Allegre (*f*), and was privately married to John de Medicis (*g*) [*D*]; which was one of the reaſons why ſhe did great ſervices to the Florentines, and to Ludovic Sforza Duke of Milan, who was well affected towards the Medicis (*h*). A French Hiſtorian commends her very much: he ſays (*i*) ſhe was very handſome, *and a widow at twenty-two years of age, having one only ſon* (*k*) *in the cradle, and that the inhabitants of Imola and Forli were ſo happy under her adminiſtration, that they had no occaſion to lament the loſs of her huſband.* He obſerves that this only ſon of her's was but fourteen years old in 1494 (*l*). He enlarges upon the military qualities ſhe diſcovered during the ſiege of Forli. Take notice that ſhe did never recover her ſtates. The Duke of Valentinois was inveſted with them, and they were re-united to the holy ſee after the death of Alexander VI (*m*). I ſhall make a reflexion upon the ſcruples, which hindred the continuator of Moreri's Dictionary from mentioning the immodeſt action of that lady [*E*]; and I ſhall obſerve an error of the tranſlator of a book of Lewis

mind to ſwell my compilation by bringing in things by head and ſhoulders, ſhould I forget to cenſure the ſame Bonifacius, for mentioning the action of Catherine Sforza, in a chapter wherein his buſineſs was only to bring ſome proofs of the phyſical virtues of the *muliebre pudendum* (6). Is that action well connected with the other accounts heaped up by him, and which concern I know not what faculty of driving away hail, laying ſtorms, and frighting lions? I ſuſpect he is guilty of a much greater blunder; I think he falſifies the main parts of the narrative of the hiſtorian quoted by him: it is quite different in the Supplement to Moreri's dictionary (7).

[*B*] *She was married to Jerom Riario.*] She brought him the Lordſhip of Imola for her portion; Galeazzo Sforza her father, had made himſelf maſter of it, by taking advantage of the quarrels, which aroſe in 1472, between Tadeo Manfredi Lord of Imola and his ſon. Jerom Riario, nephew to Sixtus the fourth, did very much embelliſh that town (8).

[*C*] *It was upon this occaſion, if we may believe, ſome writers . . . . . but they are miſtaken.*] Thomas Porcacchi confutes thoſe authors in his marginal notes upon Guicciardin's hiſtory: he ſhews, that the lady did that action when her huſband was killed. Theſe are his words: ‘ Hanno ſcritto alcuni, che Madama ‘ Caterina trovandoſi aſſediata nella Rocca di Forlì ‘ dal Valentino, & havendo egli, per indurla ad arrenderſi, minacciato d'a mazzarle i figlivoli, ſe non ‘ ſi arrendeva; ella con animo coſtante alzataſi i panni ‘ dinanzi; gli moſtrò le parti vergognoſe, dicendo ‘ d'haver le forme da ſtamparne de gli altri: il che ‘ pero ſi vede diſcordar da queſto autore, che dice come ‘ la Rocca fu preſa incontinente, che dentro ella vi ‘ fu ritirata: & è chiaro, che non hora, ma quando ‘ fu da Lodovico Panſecco amazzato il Sig. Girolamo ‘ Riario marito di lei, ella fece queſto atto (9). - - - ‘ *Some have written, that when Valentine beſieged Catherine Sforza in the caſtle of Forli, and, in order to* ‘ *force her to ſurrender, threatned, that if ſhe did not* ‘ *he would immediately put her children to death; Catherine, with a reſolute mind, pulled up her coats, and* ‘ *ſhewed him her privy parts, telling him that ſhe had* ‘ *the mould for caſting more. This however ſeems to* ‘ *diſagree with what that author ſays,* viz. *that the* ‘ *caſtle was taken as ſoon as ſhe entred it: It is plain,* ‘ *that ſhe did this action, not at that time, but when* ‘ *her huſband Girolamo Riario was murdered by Ludovico Panſecco.*' The good Father Hilarion de Coſte durſt not relate the thing, as it happened: He leaves out all the impudence of that action, to the end, queſtionleſs, that he might not let ſlip the opportunity of increaſing the number of his heroins. But he is miſtaken as to the circumſtance of time, if Porcacchi is in the right. That Minime expreſſes himſelf thus (10): ‘ Catherine Sforza, the wife of John de Medicis, the moſt courageous and valiant lady that ever ‘ was ſeen in Italy, gave her (11) the name of Catherine, ‘ when ſhe was chriſtened. That magnanimous heroin, the worthy god-mother of Queen Catherine, ‘ gave a proof of her valour and courage, when ſhe ‘ was beſieged by Cæſar Borgia Duke of Valentinois ‘ in the fortreſs of Forli; for being threatned by that ‘ cruel tyrant and monſter of nature, with the loſs and ‘ deſtruction of her children, if ſhe refuſed to ſurrender, ‘ ſhe boldly appeared upon the walls, and laughed at ‘ the rodomontades of that captain, laying her hand ‘ upon her gown, and telling him that ſhe was young ‘ enough to get others.'

[*D*] *She was privately married to John de Medicis.*] That marriage was known in time. Catherine Sforza had by that ſecond huſband John de Medicis, who was the Father of Coſmo de Medicis, the firſt great Duke of Tuſcany. Boccalini has a witty conceit about it. He feigns that Catherine Sforza having declared, that ſhe had the courage to ſhew the mould wherein ſhe took upon herſelf to form other children (12), deſired, that ſince ſhe had been very much commended by all hiſtorians for that action, Apollo would be pleaſed to aſſign her a proper place upon Parnaſſus. The judges were divided in their opinions; ſome of them looked upon it as a brutiſh piece of leudneſs. *Ad alcuni atto di ſfacciatezza, e di bruta impudicitia parve quello, che coſi nobil ſignora haveva raccontato* (13). Apollo judged that a regular obſervation of modeſty did belong to private women; but that princeſſes were obliged upon ſome occaſions to ſhew their virility. A counſellor gave his opinion in this manner: The place, out of which John de Medicis, father of the great Coſmo, came, did certainly deſerve to be expoſed to the public view. *Ben degno di eſſer veduto da ogn' uno era quel luogo, donde era uſcito il famoſo Campione Giovan de Medici padre di quel gran Coſimo,* &c (14).

[*E*] *The ſcruples, which hindred the continuator of Moreri's Dictionary, to mention the immodeſt action of that lady.*] He hath coloured over the matter with an affected preciſeneſs, which infinitely ſurpaſſeth that of the Monk; for he ſays, that lady was contented to anſwer that *ſhe might make up* the loſs of her children, and that *it would bring an unavoidable calamity* upon the rebels. Do what you can, and ſet it in what view you will, you will never be able to ſhew that he has diſcharged the duty of an hiſtorian, and that he has not neglected it in ſuch a manner as is inexcuſable; for we can diſcover in his words no ſhadow or footſtep of what was done by Catherine Sforza; and yet it was an action ſo ſingular and ſo extraordinary, that it ought not to be paſſed over in ſilence. Perhaps, it will be ſaid, that the thing was ſo impudent, that chaſte ears would have been offended at it; and that inſtead of repreſenting her as a moſt illuſtrious woman, ſhe would have been expoſed to the contempt of every reader.

(*b*) Thomas Porcacchi, in his notes upon Guicciardin, *lib. i, fol.* 29, *verſo.*

(*c*) Guicciardin, *lib. i, fol.* 20, *verſo.*

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) Id. ibid. *folio* 126. See alſo Thomaſi's Life of Cæſar Borgia, *pag.* 270.

(*f*) Guicciardin, *ibid.*

(*g*) Idem, lib. iv, fol. 104, verſo.

(*h*) Id. ibid.

(*i*) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles VIII. *book iii, p.* 242.

(*k*) He is miſtaken; ſhe had more than one ſon. See Guicciardin, *book iv, fol.* 126.

(*l*) Varillas, Hiſt. de Louïs XII, *book i, pag.* 55, 56.

(*m*) Volaterranus, *lib. iv, pag. m.* 135.

(6) *It's title is* de vi muliebris pudendi.

(7) In the article SFORZA (CATHERINE).

(8) Leand. Albert. in Deſcript. Ital. *pag.* 493.

(9) Porcacchi, notes upon Guicciardin, *lib iv, fol.* 126.

(10) Hilarion de Coſte, Eloges des Dames, *Tom. i, pag.* 224.

(11) That is, to Catherine de Medicis, who has been Queen of France.

(12) In tanto non ſi ſpaventò punto, che anzi alzatoſi le veſti, e loro moſtrando le parti vergognoſe diſſe, che de ſuoi figlivoli faceſſero à voglia loro, che à lei rimaneva la ſtampa di rifarne de gli altri. *Boccalin, Ragguagli di Parnaſſo*, Centur. I, cap. xxxv, *pag. m.* 102.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Ibid. *pag.* 103.

Lewis Guicciardin [*F*].

reader. I anſwer, that thoſe two excuſes are inſignificant: that if the firſt was a good one, a vaſt number of words ſhould be ſuppreſſed in our language; we ſhould never be allowed either to ſpeak or to write *naked, nakedneſs, adultery, fornication*, and a thouſand more which excite unavoidably obſcene ideas. At this rate the Bible ſhould be corrected, and the writers inſpired by God, would be liable to cenſure; for they mention the nakedneſs of Noah (15), and of the Apoſtles (16), and did not ſcruple to expreſs themſelves naturally, and without circumlocution, upon ſuch occaſions, wherein one ſhould have a regard to chaſte ears, according to the principles I confute. Thoſe, who underſtand the Hebrew tongue, are not ignorant that Moſes made uſe of a very vulgar word (17), to denote the mortal blow the Midianitiſh woman had received. *Tu fortaſſe, ut ſunt ferè hypocritæ, verbis tetrici, rebus obſcœni, ne ipſum quidem Moſen iſtâ noxâ immunem abs te dimiſeris; cùm alibi ſæpius, tum etiam ubi Phineæ haſta, quâ parte mulierem transfixerit, ſiqua fides Hebræis, apertè narrat* (18). The ſecond excuſe is worſe ſtill, and would be of no uſe but to a writer of Romances. I confeſs that if ſuch an author pitched upon Catherine Sforza to be his heroine, and the ſubject of an hiſtory, like ſo many ſorry pieces that come out every day, which contain a thouſand fables and chimeras, grafted upon real fact; I ſay, ſuch an author might paſs over in ſilence the faults of that lady: But an hiſtorian ought not to do it, he is obliged to repreſent the ill qualities of people: juſtice requires that what is blameable ſhould be actually blamed, and whoever conceals the faults of perſons, or extenuates them, impoſes upon the world in ſeveral reſpects (19). Are we not thereby deprived of a knowledge that belongs to us, and induced to miſapply our approbation. If our Catherine committed a fault, is it not reaſonable ſhe ſhould ſuffer for it in ſome meaſure, by the judgment which the readers will paſs upon it? And if all hiſtorians imitated the writer I ſpeak of, would not men be exempted from the fear of being condemned by poſterity, which is a mighty curb to keep them to their duty, and one of the greateſt advantages that can be reaped from hiſtory? Will you ſay, that there was a neceſſity to paſs over in ſilence ſuch a piece of impudence, leſt it ſhould be imitated by others? But for the ſame reaſon all the leud and diſorderly actions of mankind ſhould be omitted by hiſtorians: and they would not be allowed to write but in the ſtile of panegyriſts. The profeſſion of an hiſtorian ſhould be ranked amongſt the arts prohibited, and all nations obliged to uſe it as the Jews did painting. All hiſtorians ſhould be ordered to confine themſelves to the enquiry of natural things, and not to meddle with human life. Pliny would not have been much againſt ſuch an order; for the care that was taken to write annals in order to make a diſcovery of crimes, whilſt the works of nature remain unknown, was looked upon by him as a very pernicious thing. *Mira humani ingenii peſte, ſanguinem, & cædes condere annalibus juvat, ut ſcelera hominum noſcantur mundi ipſius ignaris* (20). Perhaps, it will be ſaid, that the author of the Supplement thought he was to expreſs himſelf, as if he had told a ſtory in the preſence of the moſt virtuous women in the world. I anſwer, this is a wrong notion: Thoſe, who maintain that every word, which cannot be ſpoken before a virtuous women, ought to be baniſhed from a book, are miſtaken. It is a maxim of over-nice and preciſe women; which you will eaſily grant, if you conſider never ſo little the difference between a converſation and a book. An honeſt woman will be juſtly offended, if any one tells her an obſcene ſtory; but ſhe will not blame an hiſtorian for relating it, provided he abſtain from filthy words: An hiſtorian ſpeaks to the public, and not to ſuch or ſuch a woman in particular; and therefore what he ſays is not offenſive, as it would be, if it was ſaid in a converſation or in a letter. In theſe two laſt caſes he would have no very favourable notion of the modeſty of thoſe to whom he ſpeaks or writes; and that is it that gives offence. They would apply the conſequence perſonally to themſelves; but none applies to himſelf in ſuch a manner what concerns only the public. We are obliged to hear what we are told, or to read the letters that are written to us; but every body may read or lay aſide a printed book. In fine, I obſerve that of all writers, thoſe of dictionaries ought leaſt to be over ſcrupulous, ſince ſuch works are deſiged to give a clear and preciſe explication of things.

[*F*] *I ſhall obſerve an error of the tranſlator of a book of Lewis Guicciardin.*] I do not know that tranſlator's name; but I know that he has tranſlated ſeveral Italian books into French. He himſelf ſays ſo in his preface to the tranſlation of *l'Hore di ricreatione di M. Lodovico Guicciardini, Patritio Fiorentino.* Theſe hours of recreation of Lewis Guicciardin are a collection of ſtories, ſentences, and witty ſayings. He did not there forget the action of our Catherine Sforza. Guicciardin ſays ſhe did what I have related above in the citadel of Forli, when her huſband had been killed. ‘Ma la conteſſa animoſa non mutando faccia, ‘alzataſi toſtamente i panni davanti con fiero ſguardo ‘diſſe loro: Et non vi pare egli ſtolti ch'io habbia le ‘forme di farne delli altri?’ The tranſlator renders thoſe Italian words thus: ‘*But the courageous counteſs,* ‘*without altering her countenance, ſuddenly turning up* ‘*her coats, told them with a proud look, Do not you* ‘*think, you fools, that I have ſtill beauty enough to get* ‘*others* (21)? Nothing can be more abſurd than to make her ſay upon ſuch an occaſion *I have ſtill beauty enough.* If it was ſaid in the foregoing words, that ſhe unmaſked herſelf to ſhew her face, there would be ſome coherency and juſtneſs in her diſcourſe; but there is none at all if it be compared with what ſhe had been doing. The author cannot be excuſed upon account of preciſeneſs or modeſty; for had he acted on ſuch a principle, he would have omitted or wrapped up that action, inſtead of relating it as plainly as he does. His miſtake proceeds from not knowing that the word *forme* in that place ſignifies moulds. This ignorance has occaſioned a ſtrange diſorder in the ſequel of the diſcourſe.

---

(15) Geneſ. ix.

(16) John xxi. 7.

(17) Num. xxv.

(18) Miltonus, in Defenſione pro ſe contra Alexandrum Morum, *pag. m.* 75.

(19) See the remark [*A*], in the article DOMITIA.

(20) Plin. *lib.* ii, *cap.* ix, *pag. m.* 152.

(21) L'Hore di ricreatione di Lodov. Guicciardini, *folio* 290, *verſo*, *edition of Paris*, 1624, *in* 12mo.

SFORZA (Iſabella) may be placed among learned women. She lived in the XVIth century. Some of her letters may be ſeen in the collection publiſhed at Venice by Hortenſio Lando in the year 1549 [*A*]. And among others a letter of conſolation,

[*A*] *The collection publiſhed at Venice by Hortenſio Lando, in the year* 1549.] Chriſtofano Bronzini has recourſe to that collection, being obliged to confute one of the interlocutors of his dialogues, who ſays, that few women were capable of writing two words. His anſwer is (1), ‘Sono ſtate tante, che paſſano le ‘centinaia; e tanto degne di lode, che ſe voi vedeſte ‘le lettere loro (che con tanto ſudore, con tanta diligenza, e ſpeſa furono raccolte dal Sign. Hortenſio ‘Lando; & à perſuaſione, e preghiere di Ottavian ‘Raverta, eletto poi Veſcovo di Terracina) date in ‘luce, e ſtampate da Gabriel Giolito, l'anno 1549, ‘vi chiarireſte, con quanta eloquenza, con quanto artificio, con quanta oſſervanza, & bella maniera di ‘dire, elle ſapeſſero porre in carta altro, che quatro ‘parole. - - - - *There have been ſo many, that we* ‘*may reckon more than a hundred, and ſo worthy of* ‘*praiſe, that if you ſaw their letters (which were* ‘*collected with great labour and diligence, and at great* ‘*expence by Hortenſio Lando; at the perſuaſion and intreaty of Ottaviano Raverta, afterwards made Biſhop* ‘*of Terracina) publiſhed and printed by Gabriel Giolito in the year* 1549, *you would know with how* ‘*great eloquence, art, propriety, and beautiful elocution,* ‘*they were able to write more than four words.*’ He is not contented in general to refer to that collection, he alſo took ſome letters out of it, and inſerted them in his work; particularly with reſpect to our Iſabella Sforza. You will find there the letter ſhe writ to Bobbia. For the reſt, ſuch a work as that of Hortenſio, conſolation, which ſhe wrote to Bonna Sforza, widow of the King of Poland, who was lately dead and that which ſhe writ to Margaret Bobbia in vindication of Poetry.

---

(1) Chriſtofano Bronzini, della dignita e Nobilta delle Donne, *Giornata quarta*, *pag.* 40.

tenſio Lando, did very well deſerve I ſhould mention ſome circumſtances of it; and therefore I hope the moſt ſevere critics will excuſe me for taking the liberty to ſet down Bronzini's words ſomewhat at large.

SICYON, a town of Peloponneſus, and the moſt antient kingdom that ever was in Greece. Ægialeus is ſaid to have been the firſt King of Sicyon, and we are told that he began to reign ſeventy-four years before the birth of Abraham (*a*). Zeuxippus was the laſt king: he was the twenty-ſixth, and reigned thirty-two years. The form of the government was changed after his death: the prieſts exerciſed the ſupreme authority. That kingdom laſted nine hundred and ſixty two years [*A*]: it ended when Eli was High-prieſt and judge of the Jews (*b*). The worſhip which the Sicyonians paid to Bacchus, was not one of the leaſt ridiculous parts of the Pagan religion [*B*].

(*a*) Euſebius, in *Chron. pag.* 11. ſuppoſes that Abraham was born the 22d year of the reign of Europs, ſecond king of Sicyon, who ſucceeded Ægialeus, whoſe reign had laſted 52 years.

(*b*) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei. *lib. xviii, cap. xix.*

[*A*] *That kingdom laſted nine hundred and ſixty-two years.*] It laſted three years leſs, if we believe St Auguſtin (1). A commentator upon that Father (2) has committed two faults in few words. He ſays, that according to Euſebius, that kingdom laſted eight hundred and ſixty-two years; and he adds, that if the years be caſt up, they will amount to nine hundred and ſeventy-two. It is certain Euſebius (3) mentions a duration of nine hundred and ſixty-two years, and that the addition of the years of each king of Sicyon makes but nine hundred and ſixty-two years. Euſebius reckons from Abraham's birth, and ſuppoſes that Patriarch was born in the twenty-ſecond year of Europs, the ſecond king of Sicyon, who ſucceeded Ægialeus, and reigned fifty-two years; and that the Kings of Sicyon failed in 889 (4). Add the numbers, and you will find the ſecond fault I have cenſured.

[*B*] *The worſhip which the Sicyonians paid to Bacchus was not one of the leaſt ridiculous parts of the Pagan religion.*] They worſhipped Bacchus under ſuch an obſcene name, that none but very impudent people can pronounce it in a free converſation. It is the name that ſuch impudent people at this day give to midwives. Clemens Alexandrinus does juſtly blame the Heathens for ſuch a turpitude. *Διόνυσον δὲ ἤδη σιωπῶ τὸν χοιροψάλην. Σικυώνιοι τοῦτον προσκυνοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῶν γυναικείων τάξαντες τὸν Διόνυσον μορίων ἔφορον αἰσχους καὶ τῆς ὕβρεως σεβάζοντες ἀρχηγόν.* Bacchum enim jam taceo pudendi contrectatorem. Eum adorant Sicyonii, qui Bacchum membris præficiunt muliebribus tanquam turpitudinis ac fœditatis inſpectorem, & quaſi libidinis colant præfectum (5). ---- *The Sicyonians*, ſays he, *worſhip Bacchus as the inſpector of the ſecret parts of women: they have allotted to him theſe parts as his demeſn, his juriſdiction, and his province.* Mr Coſtar writing in proſe, took a more than poetical liberty, when he made uſe of thoſe words of Clemens Alexandrinus to explain ſome verſes of Horace. Such a liberty did not go unpuniſhed; Mr de Girac did ſeverely banter him for it under the following irony (6). 'I will not imitate him in 'his ill humour; on the contrary, I find he has been 'very ſucceſsful in his explication of theſe verſes of 'the ſame Poet (7),

Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus
Vidi docentem, credite Poſteri,
Nymphaſque diſcentes, & aures
Capripedum Satyrorum acutas.

Born out by an unuſual rage,
I ſaw (believe it future age)
Where Bacchus taught the nymphs a ſong,
In diſtant vales; from ev'ry wood
With prick'd up ears the ſatyrs ſtood,
And ſmiling fauns compos'd a liſt'ning throng.

Creech.

'*I did not think fit*, ſays Mr Coſtar (8), *to write to* '*you a pleaſant thing concerning Bacchus's ſcholars, fear-* '*ing my letter might fall into other hands than your's.* '*But here I will be bolder, becauſe I fancy this paper* '*will be more ſecret. I have read in Clemens Alexan-* '*drinus, that Bacchus was worſhipped among the Sicyo-* '*nians under the name of* χοιροψαλῶν *, *which ſigni-* '*fies . . . . . If it be ſo, do not aſk me what he was* '*doing* in remotis *with thoſe beautiful nymphs. Certainly,* '*none of them could come off. He felt them all one after* '*another; and this was the fine leſſon he gave them. I* '*think, Sir, they wanted no pocket-book to write it* '*down. Pray, let me know by the firſt opportunity what* '*you think of it, &c. I am ſorry I was not there, for I* '*fancy this Bacchus was a jolly doctor, and that it was* '*worth one's while to ſee him act ſuch a part. He had* '*an honeſt fellow for his tutor, a man of good example,* '*who ſets forth very fine moral reflexions in Euripides's* '*Cyclopes.* I do not aſk Mr Coſtar what he would 'have done with thoſe nymphs: but if he had lived 'at that time, we ſhould not have known ſuch fine 'things. However, I hope he will excuſe me for 'leaving out two or three words, which none can be 'ſo impudent as to write or utter, excepting Bacchus's 'maſter, or his diſciple, I mean, Silenus, and Mr Coſtar.' Mr Menage knowing that the Latin word *Porcus*, and the Greek word χοῖρος, ſignified that part of a woman, which modeſty does not permit to name, made uſe of that erudition to give us the etymology of the epithet, under which Bacchus was worſhiped at Sicyon (9).

Iſaac Voſſius advances an etymological conjecture grounded upon the obſcenities over which Bacchus preſided. *Non ab hoc Orthagora* (10), ſays he (11), *nomen Orthagoriæ eſt arceſſendum, ſed vero à numine ſalaciſſimo, ut exiſtimo. Nullus dubito quin Bacchus ipſe aliquando dictus ſit Orthagoras. Antequam enim ille hortorum cuſtos Lampſaci naſceretur, notum eſt Bacchum comiteſque ejus curam locorum muliebrium habuiſſe. Hinc fit ut non tantum* ἰθύφαλλον *ipſum vocarint, verum etiam idem ſignificantibus vocabulis,* ὄρθον, ὀρθανὴν, *&* ὀρθάγοραν. *Sane apud Ariſtophanem* ἐκκλησιαζούσαις, *cum juvencula hortatur anum prurientem, ut vocet Orthagoram, id non niſi de hoc dæmone peculiato videtur intelligendum, uti ad illum locum fuſius oſtendemus.*

(1) Auguſtin. de Civitate Dei, *lib. xviii, cap. xix.*

(2) Leonardus Coqueus in hunc locum Auguſtini, *pag.* 605, *Editionis Francof.* 1661.

(3) Euſeb. in Chron. *ad ann.* 889, *pag. m.* 96.

(4) That is, reckoning from Abraham's birth.

(5) Clem. Alexand. Admonit. ad Gentes, *pag.* 25.

(6) Girac, Replique à Coſtar, §. *iii, pag.* 26.

(7) Horat. lib. ii, Od. XIX.

(8) Note, that this is not to be found in the printed books of that author. He wrote it to Balzac: his letter came into Girac's hands, who inſerted in this part of his reply, ſo much of it as he thought fit.

* Mr Coſtar is miſtaken; it ſhould be χοιροψάλας.

(9) Quinde χοιροψάλης. *Cunni contrectator*, cognome di Bacco preſſo à Sicionii, ſecondo lo teſtifica Clemente Aleſſandrino nell' Ammonizione alle genti: il qual cognome viene anche da Eſchilo attribuito à Bacco. *Menag. Origini della Lingua Italiana*, in Voce *Potta*, pag. 383.

(10) An Hiſtorian mentioned by Strabo, Ælian, and Philoſtratus.

(11) Iſaacus Voſſius, in Pomponium Melam, *lib. ii, cap. ii, pag. m.* 133.

SILANION, a famous Sculptor, flouriſhed in the time of Alexander the Great, about the CXIVth Olympiad (*a*). He was an Athenian (*b*), and got a great ſkill in his art without being taught by any body (*c*). The ſtatue of Sappho (*d*), that of one Satyrus, who had often carried the prize at the Grecian games (*e*), that of another champion called Demaratus (*f*), and that of Apollodorus a Sculptor, who could not be pleaſed with his own works [*A*], were accounted his chief pieces. He wrote a tract, wherein

(*a*) Plinius, *lib. xxxiv, cap. viii, pag. m.* 110.

(*b*) Pauſan. *lib. vi, cap. iv, pag.* 461.

(*e*) Pauſanias, ubi ſupra.

(*f*) Pauſanias, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 487.

(*c*) Plinius, ubi ſupra. (*d*) See the end of the text of the article SAPPHO.

[*A*] *That of Apollodorus, a Sculptor, who could not be pleaſed with his own works.*] What Pliny ſays upon this is very remarkable, and ſhews Silanion's great ſkill in his art. *Silanion Apollodorum fudit, fictorem & ipſum,* wherein he explained the rules of Symmetry if we may believe Vitruvius (*g*).

ipſum, ſed inter cunctos diligentiſſimum artis, & inimicum ſui judicem, crebro perfecta ſigna frangentem, dum ſatiari cupiditate artis non quit, & ideo inſanum cognominatum. Hoc in eo expreſſit, nec hominem ex ære fecit, ſed iracundiam (1). Theſe words have been well enough underſtood by du Pinet; but he is ſtrangely miſtaken in the ſequel of this paſſage. His tranſlation runs thus: ‘Silanion made the ſtatue of Apollodorus, who was alſo a Sculptor, and very much eſteemed. But he was ſo intent upon improving himſelf in his art, that he never liked his own work; ſo that very often, he broke very noble pieces out of anger, after he had made an end of them, thinking he could never do a thing well enough: which was the reaſon why many called him a madman. Silanion intending to ſhew it, made a ſtatue of Anger, in a woman's cloaths, inſtead of Apollodorus.’ I think there is a miſtake in theſe words of the tranſlator, *in a woman's cloaths inſtead of Apollodorus.* I do not believe this is Pliny's meaning; but only that Apollodorus's ſtatue appeared ſo paſſionate and choleric, that one would have taken it to be the very figure of Anger. See the epigrams of the Anthologia, quoted by Father Hardouin (2), upon a thought like that of Pliny. This miſtake of du Pinet is inconſiderable, if compared with thoſe that follow. Read firſt the Latin words of Pliny (3). *Et Achillem nobilem. Item Epiſtaten exercentem athletas: Strongylion Amazonem, quam ab excellentia crurum Eucnemon appellant, ob id in comitatu Neronis Principis circumlatam. Item fecit puerum, quem amando Brutus Philippenſis cognomine ſuo illuſtravit* (4). Du Pinet renders them thus: ‘He made alſo an Achilles very much eſteemed, and Epiſthates, who exerciſed the wreſtlers. He alſo made Strongylion an Amazon, which he ſirnamed Eucnemos, that is, fine-legged; which the emperor Nero eſteemed ſo much, that he had it commonly carried along with him. He alſo made a ſtatue of a young boy, ſo beautiful, that Brutus of Philippopolis in Romania, was ſo much in love with it, that he called it by his own name.’ You ſee he aſcribes to Silanion all the works mentioned in the paſſage from Pliny, whereas he ſhould only have aſcribed to him the two firſt. The two others belonged to a famous ſtatuary, whoſe name was Strongylion. He is mentioned in the firſt and ninth books of Pauſanias (5): the tranſlator took Strongylion for the name of an Amazon, whoſe ſtatue had been made by Silanion. Beſides, he was in the wrong to think that that ſtatue was ſirnamed Fine-legged, by the Sculptor that made it; this is not what Pliny means. Laſtly, if he had a mind to be underſtood, he ſhould not have mentioned one Brutus of Philippopolis in Romania, but Brutus, who periſhed at the battle of Philippi, the ſame who murdered Julius Cæſar.

That the remark contained in this article, may ſerve as a ſupplement to the collections I have made in another place (6), concerning thoſe who are never pleaſed with their productions, and ſpoil them by much reviſing them; I ſhall add to what Pliny ſays of Apollodorus, the words of the ſame author, wherein he does ſo well expreſs the ſame fault of the Sculptor Callimachus. ‘Ex omnibus autem maxime cognomine inſignis eſt Callimachus, ſemper calumniator ſui, nec finem habens diligentiæ, ob id Cacizotechnos appellatus, memorabili exemplo adhibendi curæ modum. Hujus ſunt ſaltantes Lacænæ; emendatum opus ſed in quo gratiam omnem diligentia abſtulerit (7). - - - *But of all, Callimachus was the moſt noted becauſe of his ſirname, always blaming himſelf; nor ever ſetting any bounds to his care, for which he was called*, Cacizotechnos, Spoil-work, *a memorable example for preſcribing bounds to our diligence. The Lacedemonian dancers are his work, a finiſhed piece, but deprived of all it's graces by his too great care.*’ Protogenes, amongſt the Painters, was affected with the ſame diſeaſe, as Callimachus and Apollodorus among the Sculptors. We have ſeen (8), in another place, what judgment Apelles made of him; and we may add here, that this judgment was approved by Cicero. I ſhall ſet down his own words, becauſe they may ſerve as an inſtruction to the writers, who are never weary of mending their compoſures: they know not that every thing ought to be kept within certain bounds. ‘In omnibus rebus videndum eſt quatenus. Etſi enim ſuus cuique modus eſt, tamen magis offendit nimium, quàm parum. In quo Apelles pictores quoque eos peccare dicebat, qui non ſentirent, quid eſſet ſatis (9). - - - - *In all things it is to be conſidered what is enough. For ſeeing every thing has it's meaſure, too much is no leſs diſpleaſing than too little. Whereupon Apelles ſaid, that thoſe Painters were to be blamed, who never perceived what was ſufficient.*

SYLVIUS (FRANCIS) profeſſor of Eloquence, and principal of Tournay-college at Paris, towards the beginning of the XVIth century, was a native of Amiens, where his father Nicolas du Bois was a Camblet-weaver (*a*). This Nicolas had fifteen children, eleven ſons, and four daughters. Francis was the third; and being bred up a ſcholar, he became a learned man and ſettled at Paris. He Latinized his family name according to the cuſtom of thoſe times. He ſent for two of his brothers, and inſtructed them very well in Claſſical learning: one of them called JOHN was made canon of Amiens, and curate of Monceaux; the other, whoſe name was JAMES, became a very learned Phyſician, as we ſhall ſee in the following article. Francis Sylvius found great barbariſms in the colleges; but he made it his buſineſs to reſtore the uſe of good Latin, and was one of the greateſt promoters of polite learning in France. He directed the ſcholars to the beſt Latin authors; and ſo earneſtly recommended to them the reading of Cicero, that it was not his fault if that Roman Orator was not made the only model of a good ſtyle (*b*) [*A*]. It is true, that before he gave ſuch advices, he himſelf had been taught bad Latin (*c*), as it appears from ſome of his compoſures. He publiſhed ſeveral books [*B*]. I muſt not forget one thing that is very glorious to him: he

[*A*] *It was not his fault, if that Roman Orator was not made the only model of a good ſtyle.*] Renatus Moreau expreſſes this in very fine words, in the life of James Sylvius. I ſhall not ſet them down, but as to the epigram made upon Sylvius, by Gilbert Ducheri, I ſhall tranſcribe it entire, as I find it in the ſame life.

FRANCISCI SYLVII RHETORIS TUMULUS.

Quod nunquam potuit multorum exercitus olim
Barbariem Francis finibus exigere;
Illud militibus ter centum Sylvius egit,
Quo duce habet regnum lingua Latina ſuum.
Rem vero aggreſſus majorem, ut clarior eſſet
Romani princeps Tullius eloquii.
O mortem properam, Lacheſiſque breviſſima penſa!
Re prope confecta Sylvius oppetiit.

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] *Progymnaſmatum in artem Oratoriam Centuriæ tres.* A Commentary upon twenty-one Orations of Cicero; upon his tract *de Senectute*, and his Paradoxes; and upon the Letters of Politian, and ſome other illuſtrious men (1). This laſt work has been reprinted ſeveral times. The third edition is of the year 1526. He dedicated it to Euſtachius,

---

(*g*) Vitruvius, *Præf. lib. vii.*

(1) Plinius, *lib. xxxiv, cap. viii. pag. m.* 126.

(2) Harduin. in Plin. *Tom. v, pag.* 126.

(3) Plinius, ubi ſupra.

(4) Martial, Epigram. lxxvii, lib. ii, & Epig. li, lib. ix, & Epig. clxxi, lib. xiv. *mentions that ſtatue of a boy which Brutus loved.*

(5) Pauſan. *lib.* i, *pag.* 97, & *lib. ix, pag.* 767, *Edit.* 1696.

(6) In the article LINACER remark [*F*], (where you will find in citation (17) the words of Pliny, concerning Protogenes) and remark [*G*] of the article MALHERBE.

(7) Plin. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 326.

(8) Above citation (17) of the article LINACER.

(9) Cicero de Oratore, *cap. xxii,*

(*a*) *Cilicii panni & undulati hiſto.* Renatus Moreau, in Vita Jacobi, Sylvii.

(*b*) Ex eod. *Ibid.*

(*c*) See the remark [*C*].

(1) Geſner. in Biblioth.

he procured an edition of Martial cleared from many obſcenities in that Poet [*C*], that the youth might improve themſelves by the reading of him, without endangering their morals.

ſtachius de Croy, Biſhop of Arras, whom he had taught for the ſpace of four years at Louvain; from whence it may be inferred, that he had ſome ſchool in that univerſity.

[*C*] *He procured an edition of Martial, cleared from many obſcenities.*] Father Vavaſſeur would not deprive our Sylvius of the glory of being the firſt, who curtailed Martial, tho' the ſame thing was objected to the Jeſuits, and he might have turned it to their advantage. Theſe are his words: ‘Quod utinam feciſſemus primi rem tantam, tam utilem omnibus, tam neceſſariam juventuti, eaque nobis ſolida & integra laus & propria maneret, cœpiſſe vel ſic de virtutis ac morum diſciplina bene mereri. Sed eſt qui hanc nobis lauream præripuerit, antequam etiam nati, ut ſic dicam, eſſemus. Anno enim ſuperioris ſæculi decimo quarto Franciſcus quidam Sylvius, Ambianus, in Academia Pariſienſi qui tum degeret ac literas publice profiteretur, quaſi Augiæ ſtabulum purgaturus, hunc ſe laborem Herculeum ſuſcepiſſe declarat, horrida quidem & inſolenter ac barbarè ſcripta epiſtola, facile ut appareat potiorem ei curam fuiſſe morum quam Latini ſermonis; ſed ex qua tamen intelligatur, *&c* (2.) - - - *I wiſh we had been the firſt who did a thing ſo great, ſo profitable to all, ſo neceſſary to youth; and that the whole praiſe of having ſo well deſerved, for inſtruction in virtue and good manners had belonged to us. But there is one who carried off the prize, even before we were born. For in the fourteenth year of the laſt century, one Francis Sylvius of Amiens, who then taught in the univerſity of Paris, declared he had undertaken that Herculean taſk, in an unpoliſhed and barbarous epiſtle; ſo that it plainly appeared, he regarded more the purity of manners, than of his Latin ſtile; whereby nevertheleſs may be known*, &c.’ Afterwards he gives us the title of that edition. *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton lectoris caſtimonia dignorum liber: ubi omnia Veneris illius deſpuendæ quaſi irritamenta, quibus paſſim ſordidatus lectorum nares corrugabat, accurata Franciſci Sylvii Ambianatis diligentia deletili ſpongia deterſa ſunt & eluta.* He alſo gives us the title of the Epiſtle Dedicatory. *Reverendum in Chriſto Patrem D. Nicolaum Couſturanum; & D. Hadrianum Henoncurium, Horeſteæ amicitiæ ferrumine conferruminatos Franciſcus Sylvius Ambianas ſalute plurima impertitur.* He tells us that this Epiſtle Dedicatory is written in a very barbarous ſtile, and very different from that which the author acquired ſome time after. *Reſpondet inſcriptioni fœda & ridicule etiam informis quæ ſequitur epiſtola, quem ſermonem tamen ſuum Sylvius, quod vix credas, Montauſeri* (3), *aliquot poſt annis ita emendavit, ut à ſe totus diverſus & alius planè ſcriptor eſſe videatur.* The concluſion of that epiſtle runs thus: *Sylvio veſtro qui literarum haſce bonas ſegetes ab illis officium linguæ turpitudine multa ſuperantibus diſcriminavit, plauſibiliter adplaudite.* Laſtly, he ſays that Martial was not ſufficiently purged, and that he has ſeen ſome very obſcene words in that edition. *Vidi ego hunc ipſum librum à Jacobo Kerverio, Chriſti anno* 1535 *publicatum, hac inſcriptione quam modo poſui, hac epiſtola quæ caſtiſſima & ſanctiſſima omnia promitteret, nudis tamen & prætextatis aliquot vocibus ſpurcum atque infamem.*

(2) Vavaſſor, de Epigrammate, *pag.* 255, *& ſeq.*

(3) Father Vavaſſeur ſpeaks to the Duke of Montauſier thro' the whole book.

SYLVIUS (**JAMES**) brother to the foregoing, was one of the moſt famous Phyſicians of the XVIth century. He was born at Amiens in the year 1478, and went through his ſchool learning at Paris under Francis Sylvius his brother. He learned in that ſchool, and taught in Tournay-college the Latin tongue with much greater purity, than it had been taught for a long time; which was the reaſon why his writings were ſo much taken notice of becauſe of the elegance of the ſtyle. Having an inclination to the ſtudy of Phyſic, he was contented to learn ſome Hebrew under the famous Vatablus, and reſolved to learn Greek and Latin perfectly, in order to qualify himſelf for that ſtudy. It is true, he applied himſelf very diligently likewiſe to the Mathematics, and made ſo great a progreſs in that ſcience, that he invented ſome machines, which he preſented to the Provoſt of Merchants, and to the Echevins of Paris. When it was time for him to apply himſelf wholly to Phyſic; he ſtudied it in the original authors, and ſo far engaged in the reading of Hippocrates and Galen, that he ſpent all his time in examining and tranſlating thoſe two authors. This made him ſenſible of the uſefulneſs of Anatomy; and he applied himſelf to it ſo earneſtly, that his ſkill in it was as great as the age he lived in could permit. He ſtudied Pharmacy with no leſs application, and made ſeveral journies to ſee the remedies produced by different countries in the places which produced them. Being retuned to Paris, he betook himſelf to read lectures, whereby he got a great deal of money, of which he was too greedy [*A*]. He explained in two years time, a whole courſe of Phyſic taken from Hippocrates and Galen; and his reputation was ſo great, that people reſorted to him from all parts of Europe. But before he was ſo well known, he

[*A*] *Of which he was too greedy.*] A prodigious avarice obſcured the ſplendor of many bright and fine qualities of our James Sylvius. He had ſo many ſcholars, that he ſhould not have narrowly minded whether each of them paid him; and yet he was ſo rigid about it, that he made a horrid noiſe, when they did not pay him exactly five pence (1) per month a-piece, which was his pay. He fell once into ſo great a paſſion, becauſe one or two of his ſcholars had not brought him his monthly money, that he ſwore he would leave off reading lectures, if the other ſcholars did not turn them out, or force them to pay him (2). He lived a moſt ſordid life; he gave nothing but bare bread to his ſervants, and had no fire all the winter. Two things he uſed as a remedy againſt cold; he played at foot-ball, and carried a great log upon his ſhoulders from the loweſt part of the houſe to the garret; and he ſaid, the heat he got by ſuch an exerciſe was more advantageous for health than a fire. It is no wonder if he got a great deal of money, living ſuch a ſordid life, and if he hid his gold under ground. He had a houſe in St Marceau's ſuburb, where, it was ſaid, he had hid five hundred Ducats: Some maintained they had ſeen them in a red purſe; which was confirmed by a magician, who deſired to have one half of that treaſure for his pains of directing to it: But tho' they ſearched and dug the ground, they did not find a penny. When the houſe in which Sylvius had lived, in St James's ſtreet, was pulled down (3), in order to be re-built, the Maſons found ſome piſtoles in it, and it was thought many more had been hid in it (4). Buchanan made a diſtich by way of epitaph, when Sylvius was ſo angry, that he was for turning out the two poor ſcholars who had not paid him (5). We are told (6), that on the funeral day, that diſtich was poſted up to the church-door (7) by ſome of his hearers. It runs thus:

(1) *Henry Stephens*, Apologie d'Herodote, *pag. m.* 168. *Says it was a teſtoon.*

(2) Henry Stephens, *ibid.* Says he was preſent at that action.

(3) In 1616.

(4) Ex Renato Moreau, *in ejus* Vita.

(5) Henry Stephens, Apologia d'Herodote, *pag.* 168.

(6) Scæv. Sammarthanus, *in* Elogiis, *pag. m.* 27.

(7) Moreri ſays, on the door of his houſe, he did not mind the words *in ipſis templi valvis* of Sammarthanus, which he quoteth.

he was very much thwarted by the Paris Phyſicians, who took it very ill, that a man who had taken no where his doctor's degree, ſhould undertake to teach Phyſic in the Metropolis of the kingdom. Whereupon he went to Montpellier in 1530, to take his degree. He was there for ſome time, and then left the place in order to return to Paris, without being admitted doctor. His avarice allowed him not to be at the neceſſary charges [*B*]. Going by Lyons, he publiſhed there, at the requeſt of two Phyſicians (*a*), a Diſputation *de vini exhibitione in Febribus*. It is the firſt book he printed. Being come to Paris, he endeavored to reconcile himſelf with the Phyſicians, that he might have leave to teach; and he publiſhed a French Grammar, a work which coſt him a great deal of pains, and was to be followed by another, which never came out, wherein he treated of the origin of the French tongue. He was admitted Bachelor of Phyſic in June 1531 [*C*], and it appears by the records of the Faculty, that in the year 1535, he taught in Tricquet-College, whilſt Fernelius taught in Cornwall-College; but the latter had few auditors, whereas Sylvius had a great many [*D*]. The reaſon of which was becauſe he made diſſections, and taught Botany, and the preparation of remedies, which Fernelius did not do. Vidus Vidius, profeſſor of Phyſic in the Royal College, being invited into Italy in the year 1548, none was thought better qualified than Sylvius to fill his place. He was unreſolved for the ſpace of two years, whether he ſhould accept of that employment; but at laſt he accepted it in 1550, and continued in it until his death, which happened the thirteenth of January 1555. It was the ſeventy-ſeventh year of his life (*b*) [*E*]. He was buried in the burying-place of poor ſcholars [*F*]. He never was married, and even had an averſion to women. He took more care to clear his ſtyle from the barbariſms that prevailed in the ſchools, than to leave off his rough and wild way [*G*]. He was ſo addicted to Galen's opinions, that he obſtinately maintained his errors. Judicial Aſtrology was the only thing wherein he departed

Sylvius hic ſitus eſt, gratis qui nil dedit unquam,
Mortuus & gratis quod legis iſta, dolet.

Henry Stephens tranſlated it into French verſe, thus (8).

Ici git Sylvius auquel onq en ſa vie
De donner rien gratis ne prit aucun' envie,
Et ores qu'il eſt mort, & tout rongé de vers,
Encores ha depit qu'on lit gratis ces vers.

Here lies Sylvius in his grave,
Who when alive nought gratis gave,
And even grumbles now he's dead
That you theſe verſes gratis read.

Another ſatirical piece was publiſhed againſt him, wherein he was taxed with avarice in a pleaſant manner: Moreau aſcribes it to Henry Stephens. That libel was a dialogue, intituled *Sylvius ocreatus*, and the author of it took the name of Ludovicus Arribavenus Mantuanus. It is matter of fact, that Sylvius called for his boots a little before he died, and put them on, to ſit by the fire ſide, and expired booted. Whereupon the author of the ſatire feigned that Sylvius had put on his boots to croſs the Acheron without a boat, and without paying any thing for the ferriage. He was alſo bantered in that book, for loving to talk, in a Shoemaker's ſhop; which was ſomewhat ſtrange for a man ſo learned, and ſo little ſociable. One of his ſcholars, called John Melet, wrote an anſwer to that ſatire, under the fictitious name of Claudius Burgenſis (9).

[*B*] *His avarice allowed him not to be at the neceſſary charges.*] Renatus Moreau heard an old Phyſician of Montpellier ſay, that Sylvius promiſed the profeſſors of that univerſity to bring a vaſt number of ſtudents from all parts of the kingdom, if they would admit him into their ſociety gratis; and that his propoſal not being accepted, he reſolved to return to Paris, to deſire the Faculty to give him leave to teach.

[*C*] *He was admitted Bachelor of Phyſic in June 1531.*] The records of the Faculty, which prove this fact, irrefragably confute thoſe, who would maintain, after Ranchin (10), that Sylvius was a Phyſician at Montpellier; for ſince he was made bachelor of Phyſic after his journey to Montpellier, it is undeniable, that he was not admitted doctor at Montpellier, before he returned to Paris: Beſides, it is certain he did not leave Paris after he took his bachelor's degree in that univerſity (11).

[*D*] *Sylvius had a great many.*] He publiſhed for the uſe of his ſcholars, the practice of Mark Gattinaria: it is ſaid that nine hundred copies were ſold off in one or two days, and that the Bookſeller was obliged to make a ſecond edition (12). A Poet (13) who made his epitaph, ſays, that a thouſand eyes were fixed upon him, when he read his lectures:

Quem certa methodo medicis de rebus agentem,
Aſſiduè in ludo totius principe terræ,
Mille acri aſſiduè ſpectabant lumina viſu.

Moreau underſtands it of five hundred auditors, and quotes Sylvius himſelf, who ſays, he had but four hundred, *auditoribus circiter quadringentis* (14). If it be ſo, Moreau ſhould not have ſaid that Sylvius's ſchool might be compared with that of Theophraſtus (15), who had two thouſand ſcholars. Henry Stephens (16) ſays only that Sylvius had two or three hundred ſcholars.

[*E*] *He died the thirteenth of January* 1555. *It was in the ſeventy-ſeventh year of his life.*] Renatus Moreau quotes five authors for it, *viz.* Mizaldus, Paſchalis Gallus, Arrivabenus (17), Claudius Burgenſis, and la Croix du Maine. But he obſerves, at the ſame time, that Sammarthanus (18), and Geſner (19) ſay, that he lived only ſixty-three years; that Du Breul (20) places his death on the firſt day of February 1554; and that according to Nancelius and Rouville, he flouriſhed in 1557, and 1560. My edition of Du Bruel of the year 1639 in quarto, places Sylvius's death in the ſixty-third year of his life, and on the tenth of January 1554. Moreri, Merklinus (21), and Freherus (22) have committed the ſame miſtake with Sammarthanus.

[*F*] *He was buried in the burying-place of poor ſcholars.*] He ordered it ſo by his will. That burying-place is before Montaigu-college. The funeral was performed with great pomp; all the univerſity were preſent at it, and the Phyſicians put on their ſcarlet gowns, the name of that burying-place puts me in mind of a tract written by Sylvius in favour of poor ſcholars: It is intituled, *De victus ratione facili ac ſalubri pauperum Scholaſticorum.* He preſcribes them a diet, which, ſaid he, GOD had put into his heart to publiſh; and he enters upon ſuch a detail as would make the men of our age laugh, who are leſs tractable than thoſe of Sylvius's time. He adviſes the ſcholars, who awake in the night, to cough and ſpit ſtoutly, and gives them ſeveral little expedients for keeping themſelves from being cold in bed. 'Ut citius incaleſcas 'pedes etiam in nates raduces, in lectum inſpira. - - - '*To be the ſooner warm, draw up your feet into your 'breech, and breathe in your bed.* It is likely, he knew the benefit of them by his own experience.

[*G*] *His rough and wild way,*] He ſeldom jeſted, and ſeldom departed from his gravity; and when he had a mind to appear more ſociable, by ſome witty conceit,

---

(*a*) Symphorianus Champier, & Jerome Du-Mont.

(*b*) Taken from his Life prefixed to his works, and written by Renatus Moreau.

(8) Apolog. d'Herodote, *pag.* 168.

(9) *Ex* Renato Moreau, in Vita Jacobi Sylvii.

(10) In Catalogo Doctor. Monſpel.

(11) Moreau, in Vita Jacobi Sylvii.

(12) Ibid.

(13) J. Væ-vræus, *apud* Moreau, *ibid.*

(14) *Præfat.* Libri de Oſſibus.

(15) Diog. Laërt. *in ejus* Vita.

(16) Apologie d'Herodote, *pag.* 168.

(17) See, above, the remark [*A*].

(18) In Elogiis, *pag. m.* 27.

(19) In II Catal. Libr. Galeni.

(20) In Antiquit. Pariſienſ.

(21) In Lindenio renovato.

(22) In Theatro Virorum Eruditione clarorum.

departed from him [*H*]. I ſhall ſay ſomething of his writings [*I*]. He was very much at variance with Veſalius [*K*].

conceit, he did it ſomewhat uncouthly. Here is the only merry thought that is told of him: He ſaid one day, *That he had parted with three beaſts; his cat, his mule, and his maid.*

[*H*] *Judicial aſtrology was the only thing.*] It had never been ſo much in vogue both at court and in the town, as in Sylvius's time; and yet (23) he oppoſed it ſtoutly, whenever there was occaſion for it. One day after he had railed bitterly at the Aſtrologers, he told his good friend Turnebus, that he had often been at the trouble to run over the whole almanack, in the beginning of the year, and ſet down fair weather wherever there was *rainy weather*; *wind* inſtead of *calm*; *cloudy weather* inſtead of *clear weather*; and having obſerved the event, he had found at the year's end, that he had been a much better Aſtrologer than they (24).

[*I*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his writings.*] The chief books he compoſed, and which made him moſt to be known, are, *Methodus medicamenta componendi ad uſum medicorum concinnata*; *Libri de medicamentorum ſimplicium delectu in Pharmacopœorum gratiam conſcripti*; *Caſtigationes & emendationes in Joannem Meſuæum.* His books of anatomy were publickly explained by the profeſſors of Paris. His treatiſe *De menſibus mulierum*, was the text on which Lewis Duret read public lectures. The ſame tract, and another *De generatione hominis*, were tranſlated into French by William Chretien, Phyſician to Henry II. His tracts of Anatomy and Pharmacy have been tranſlated into French, and re-printed ſeveral times. They are probably the ſame that were publickly explained by one of the moſt zealous diſciples of Veſalius; which is much, conſidering how violently he and Veſalius hated one another (25). There is an edition (26) in folio of Sylvius's works, publiſhed by Renatus Moreau, who prefixed to it the life of that great man, out of which I have extracted this article. This life is ſo well written, that it were to be wiſhed, that the work (27) from which it was taken, was printed. Next to it there are many encomiums upon Sylvius, collected out of divers authors, whereby it appears that he was a man in great eſteem.

[*K*] *He was very much at variance with Veſalius.*] The latter gave Sylvius the greateſt trouble that ever he had. Sylvius's excellency lay in Anatomy, and he was preparing a work upon that ſubject, which he looked upon as his maſter-piece. In the mean time, Veſalius publiſhes in 1541, his *Opus Anatomicum*, ſo well done, and with ſo many fine cuts, that every body admires it. Veſalius had been Sylvius's ſcholar for the ſpace of three years, which was another cauſe of his vexation; the diſciple ſupplants the maſter. Beſides, he writes againſt Galen, and not only charges him with ſeveral faults, tho' perhaps without reaſon, but plainly ſhews ſome of his real errors. How could Sylvius bear this, being looked upon as the reſtorer and firſt interpreter of Galen? Sylvius kept no meaſures, he maintained that Galen had writ nothing but what was true, and indulged his anger to ſuch a degree, that he continually inveighed againſt his antagoniſt. *Sylvius ita exarſit in iras tantoque odio commotus eſt in Veſalium, primo ut nihil à Galeno ſcriptum prolatumque eſſe contenderet quod veritati non eſſet conſentaneum; ſecundo ut nulla habita ratione ætatis & gravitatis ſuæ, impetu quodam mentis fervidiore elatis anſam declamandi in* Veſalium *(quem* Veſanum *appellabat) ſingulis diebus arriperet, & contumelioſius exciperet, quam vel ipſe propter prudentiam longa rerum experientia comparatam, vel* Veſalius *ob laudabile ſuum inſtitutum ad utilitatem publicam deſtinatum mereretur* (28). The emperor's Phyſician, and even ſome courtiers, who hated Veſalius, becauſe of his preſumption and merit, threw oil into the fire. That quarrel produced many books, and the progreſs of it may be known by reading Sylvius's book in Veſanum, Veſalius's letter *de China radice*, a piece of Francis Puteus *in Veſalium*, another of Renatus Henerus *in Sylvium*, Fallopius's Anatomical Obſervations, and Cuneus's Apology againſt Puteus.

---

(23) Note, that inſtead of *and yet*, one might ſay, *and therefore.* This ſort of things have two faces.

(24) Turnebus, Epiſt. ad. Cardinal. Lotharingum, *præfixa* Opuſc. Plutarchi de Orac. defectu.

(25) See the remark [*K*].

(26) Mine is that of Geneva 1635. The Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated the firſt of September 1629.

(27) De illuſtribus Medicis Pariſienſibus, *by Renatus Moreau.*

(28) Renatus Moreau, in Vita Sylvii.

SIMON or **SIMONIS** (Theodorus) was born at Berchſtede in the country of Holſtein (*a*). See the remark [*I*] of the article of Janſenius, to which you may add what follows. Fromondus maintains (*b*); that this man being ſet at liberty, abjured his Hereſies at Louvain, and that Janſenius gave him wherewithal to pay his charges in the tavern, and to make his journey. He further ſays, that he had forſaken his order at Magdeburg before he came to Louvain. I ſhall ſpeak of the anſwer that was made to this account [*A*]. Some perſons may think that a certain very impious book concerns our Simonis [*B*]; and therefore I here give notice that it is falſe. He changed his name into that of *Philippus Coſmius* (*c*).

[*A*] *I ſhall ſpeak of the anſwer that was made to this account.*] I ſhall not repeat what concerns Simonis's journey to Louvain, and his conferences with Janſenius (1). I ſhall only ſay, that after he had left that town, he writ a piece, *De falſis principiis fidei Pontificiæ ejuſque Idololatria*, which he ſent to Janſenius in 1631. It contained the motives of his converſion, and he hoped that Janſenius would anſwer him; but he was miſtaken: his ſilence made him proceed, and write a letter (2) to him, wherein he earneſtly deſired to have an anſwer from him, and publiſhed it. That letter contains the hiſtory of his impriſonment: it was inſerted in a book of Voëtius (3), in 1635. Whereupon Fromondus thought himſelf obliged to ſpeak of Simonis, in anſwer to that book of Voëtius. He gave a very unfaithful account of the matter, if we may depend upon the anſwer that was made him. See the Apologetical Letter which Simonis inſcribed to him: it is prefixed to his treatiſe *De ſtatu & Religione propria Papatus adverſus Cornelium Janſenium Epiſcopum Iprenſem*, printed at Leyden in 1638. He maintains that Fromondus falſified and ſuppreſſed ſeveral circumſtances of the fact; he denies that he had abjured the Catholic religion at Louvain; he owns that he was for ſome time in the order of the Premonſtratenſes, but that he left it before he made any vow (4).

[*B*] *Some . . . . may think that a certain very impious book concerns our Simonis.*] To know in general that Simonis's name is in the title of ſuch a book, and that Theodorus Simonis was ſucceſſively a Lutheran, a Papiſt, a Lutheran, and a Socinian; and was rector of a Socinian college in Poland, and that the book in queſtion was printed in Poland, are things which may make people judge that this book was written by that Socinian; for the time is not always minded. This is the ſubject of this remark. Thoſe, who deſire to know ſomething of that impious book, need only read the following paſſage of Spizelius: ‘ *De Atheiſmo in Po-*
‘ *lonia, ex Atheo libello, Cracoviæ anno* 1588 *tit*: Si-
‘ monis Religio, authore incerto edito, *judicium fieri*
‘ *poterit in quo præter portenta innumera hæc quoque*
‘ *verba reperiuntur*; Credo in tria, Cœlum, Terram,
‘ & Cœli formam, in Cœlum patrem, atque creato-
‘ rem omnium. In Terram omnium matrem, atque
‘ nutricem, & in Cœli formam omnia ſentientem, &
‘ intelligentem. Ede itaque, bibe, lude, jam Deus
‘ figmentum eſt (5). - - - *One may form a judgment of*
‘ *the Atheiſm in Poland, by an impious book publiſhed at*
‘ *Cracow, in the year* 1588, *intituled,* Simonis Reli-
‘ gio, authore incerto edito; *wherein beſides innume-*
‘ *rable monſtrous things theſe words are alſo found*; I
‘ believe in three, the Heaven, the Earth, and the
‘ form of Heaven; in Heaven, the Father, and Crea-
‘ tor of all things. In the Earth, the mother and
‘ nurſe of all things; and in the form of Heaven, per-
‘ ceiving all things, and underſtanding them.

(*a*) Mollerus, Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſ. Cimbricæ, *Part. iii, pag.* 108.

(*b*) Lib. Fromondus Criſi Deſperatæ Cauſæ Papatus, *cap. xlv, pag.* 284.

(*c*) Bibl. Antitrinit. *pag.* 143.

(1) See the article JANSENIUS, remark [*I*].

(2) Dated from Emmeric, the 12th of February 1632.

(3) *Intituled* Deſperata Cauſa Papatus, *See pag.* 762, *& ſeq.*

(4) A voti monaſtici & Ordinis religione liber in hunc uſque diem perſtiti.

(5) *Spizelius, in Scrutinio Atheiſmi*, pag. 43, 44. See alſo the ſame *Spizelius, in infel. Literato*, pag. 355, where he ſpeaks more at large of that impious book. See alſo the remark [*D*] of the article SIMONIUS (Simon).

SIMONETTA (**Hyacinthus**) a Gentleman of Milan, was much eſteemed for his bravery, and experience in war. He was made priſoner by a Gentleman of Bretagne, called James de Rommelin, Lieutenant of a company of the Seneſchal d'Armagnac. This Briton, who *amongſt the Military men was called the little Captain la Lande, becauſe he was a younger brother of the houſe of la Lande*, carried his priſoner to the city of Aſti, and ſet him at liberty, after he had received his ranſom. Simonetta complained that la Lande had treated him unworthily, and wrote ſomething to him concerning it, and having received an anſwer, he ſent him *a challenge to fight*, which he accepted, inſomuch that the conditions thereof being ſettled by John James Trivulſo, who commanded in the Aſteſan for the King of France, Charles VIII, and by Lucio Malvecio, Lieutenant of the Duke of Milan, the two champions entred the liſts in the year 1496. The victory fell to the Gentleman of Bretagne (*a*), of which Trivulſo gave a certificate, that may be ſeen at length in Bertrand d'Argentré (*b*), who corrects ſome miſtakes concerning that famous duel [*A*].

(*a*) *Taken from* Bertrand d'Argentré Hiſtoire de Bretagne, *lib. xii, cap. lxi*,

(*b*) Ibid.

[*A*] *D'Argentré corrects ſome miſtakes concerning that famous duel.*] He cenſures (1) Arnoldus Ferron (2) for having ſaid that la Lande was a native of Bourdeaux, deſcended of a citizen family, and that the duel was fought in the preſence of Charles VIII. Here are three things that are falſe; for la Lande was a gentleman of Britany, and did not fight till 1496; and the king returned into France in the beginning of the year 1495. La Lande's antagoniſt was not called Chriſtopher Zerbulo, and was not of Genoa, as Arnold Ferron affirms: he was called Hyacinthus Simonetta, and was a native of Milan. They did not fight on foot with ſwords, nor did la Lande run his ſword into the belly of his enemy, as Ferron pretends. They fought on horſeback, and *their firſt attack was with their lances running in a full carreer one againſt the other, and afterwards with battle-axes*. Simonetta was wounded in the face (3), as Trivulſo, who was a ſpectator of the combat, hath declared in his atteſtation. Note, that Symphorianus Champier (4) in his life of Charles VIII, is diſpleaſed with Sabellicus, who, out of hatred to the French, hath made no mention of this duel, notwithſtanding it was ſo memorable that a trophy was erected in the place where it was fought. D'Argentré adds (5), that Alciatus, who was then a profeſſor of the Civil Law at Milan, ſpoke of that adventure *in a book which he wrote* de Duello: but that he is miſtaken in ſaying (6) that Simonetta fought with Baiard; for the duel of Baiard was with Dom Alfonſo de Sotomajore, in the year 1503. This criticiſm is right; but it is not true that Alciatus at that time taught Civil Law at Milan. He never was profeſſor of that ſcience: and he was not above four or five years old when la Lande and Simonetta fought. He dedicated his treatiſe *de ſingulari Certamine* to Francis I. the firſt day of March, 1529; he was then at Avignon.

(1) D'Argentré, Hiſt. de Bret. *book xii. ch. lxi, p. m.* 702, 704.

(2) Ferron. in Hiſt. Caroli VIII. *folio m.* 37, *verſo*.

(3) D'Argentré, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 703.

(4) Ferron. ubi ſupra, *fol.* 38.

(5) D'Argentré, *pag.* 704.

(6) Alciat. de ſingulari certamine, *cap. xxxviii*, *pag.* 67, *Edit. Lugd.* 1543 *in* 8*vo*.

SIMONIDES, an Iambic Poet, was born at Minoa (*a*) a town of the Iſle of Amorgos one of the Sporades (*b*). If we will believe Suidas, he flouriſhed 406 years after the taking of Troy; but it is very likely he is not ſo ancient. He is quoted by Athenæus, Julius Pollux, Ælian, and ſome other authors. He made a very ridiculous ſatire againſt women [*A*].

(*a*) Stephanus Byzantinus, *Voce* Ἀμοργός.

(*b*) Strabo, *lib. x*, *ſub fin.*

[*A*] *He made a very ridiculous ſatire againſt women.*] He ſuppoſed that their ſouls had a different original, according to the diverſity of their humours; that the ſouls of ſome women came from horſes, foxes, or apes, &c. and that the ſouls of others proceeded from the ſea, or the earth, &c. Ælian quotes what he ſaid concerning women, who loved to paint and trick up themſelves: he derived their ſouls from horſes. Καὶ ὁ Σιμωνίδης δὲ, ἐκ παντοδαπῶν θηρίων λέγων τὰς γυναῖκας γενέσθαί τε, καὶ διαπλασθῆναι, φησὶν ἐνίαις ἐκ τῶν ἵππων τό τε φιλόκοσμον καὶ φιλόμυρον συντεχθῆναι κατ᾽ ἐκείνους φύσει: *Quin & Simonides fabulans ex diverſis beſtiis natas & conformatas eſſe mulieres, nonnullis earum ornatus & unguentorum ſtudium ex equorum naturâ innatum eſſe ſcribit* (1). I omit the Greek verſes that follow in Ælian, and I ſhall only ſet down the concluſion of that paſſage in Latin. *Talis quidem uxor præbet ſe ſpectaculum aliis jucundum, ſed viro nocet ſuo: Niſi ille fuerit aut rex, aut vir præpotens. Hujuſmodi uxor oblectare quem queat.* The meaning of which is, that ſuch a woman is a pleaſant ſight to other men, but very prejudicial to her huſband, unleſs he be a king or a great lord. You will find in Stobæus not only the ſame verſes mentioned by Ælian, but alſo many more out of the ſame work of Simonides (2). That Poet was very near as unjuſt as the Italian author, who maintained that women have no ſouls (3). For the reſt, if I aſcribe to this Simonides, and not to that mentioned in the following article, the verſes quoted by Ælian, I do but follow Leo Allatius's opinion (4).

(1) Ælian. de Animal. *lib. xvi*, *cap. xxiv*, *pag. m.* 941.

(2) Stobæus, Sermone LXXI, de Vituperio Mulierum, *fol. m.* 252, *verſo*.

(3) *See* Vigneul Marville's Melanges, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 16, 17.

(4) Allatius, de Simeonum Scriptis, *pag.* 206, 207.

SIMONIDES, one of the beſt antient Poets, was a native of Ceos, an iſland of the Ægean See. He flouriſhed ſtill in the time of Xerxes's expedition, that is, about the LXXVth Olympiad. He exerciſed his talent in compoſing ſeveral ſorts of Poems; but he ſucceeded chiefly in elegies [*A*]. It is ſaid that he was preſerved twice from the

[*A*] *He ſucceeded chiefly in elegies.*] This we learn of Quintilian. 'Simonides tenuis (1), alioqui ſermone proprio & jucunditate quadam commendari poteſt: præcipua tamen ejus in commovenda miſeratione virtus, ut quidam in hac eum parte omnibus ejuſdem operis autoribus præferant (2). - - - *Simonides's ſtile was plain, but fitted to the ſubject with a certain ſweetneſs; but his principal excellency lay in raiſing commiſeration, and he was by ſome preferred to all authors on that account.*' Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus acknowledges, among other virtues, that Simonides had the talent of moving to pity, and places him in that reſpect much above Pindar. Σιμωνίδου δὲ παρατήρει τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων, τῆς συνθέσεως τὴν ἀκρίβειαν, πρὸς τούτοις καθ᾽ ὃ βελτίων εὑρίσκεται καὶ Πινδάρου τὸ οἰκτίζεσθαι μὴ μεγαλοπρεπῶς, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἐκεῖνος παθητικῶς. *Simonidis vero obſerva nominum delectum compoſitionis accuratam rationem; ad hæc, in quo etiam multo melior eſt ipſo Pindaro, miſerationem commovet, non ut ille magnifice, ſed ſuo ipſe more pathetice* (3). When Horace has a mind to denote lamenting Muſes, he uſes an expreſſion which repreſents our Poet.

Sed ne relictis, Muſa procax, jocis
Ceæ retractes munera næniæ (4).

Catullus may be alſo quoted for the ſame thing (5). One of the moſt famous works of Simonides was intituled *Lamentations* (6). I have ſaid, in another place (7), that he carried the prize of the elegy from Æſchylus.

(1) Concerning this ſimplicity of Simonides. See Mr le Fevre, *Abregé de la Vie des Poëtes Grecs*, *pag. m.* 38.

(2) Quintil. Inſtitut. Orat. *lib. x*, *cap. i*, *pag. m.* 468.

(3) Dionyſ. Halicar. de veter. Scriptor. Cenſ.

(4) Horat. Ode I, lib. ii.

(5) Paulum quid lubet adlocutionis mœſtius lacrymis Simonideis. *Catullus*, *Epig. XXXIX.*

(6) *See* Mr le Fevre, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 39.

(7) In the article ÆSCHYLUS, remark [*G*].

the danger of imminent death, and that this was a reward of his virtue [*B*]. The invention of local memory is aſcribed to him [*C*]. He is one of thoſe Poets, whoſe vein and memory laſted a long time; for at eighty years of age he diſputed the prize of Poetry, and carried it (*a*), and boaſted of having the beſt memory of any man in the world

[*B*] *It is ſaid that he was preſerved twice from the danger of imminent death, and that this was a reward of his virtue.*] One day he ſupped at Scopas's houſe, who was a conſiderable man for his noble birth, and great riches. After he had recited the Poem he had made for a ſet price in that man's honour, wherein he inſerted an encomium upon Caſtor and Pollux, he was told, that he ſhould receive one half of the price agreed upon, that he might, if he thought fit, aſk the other half of the Tyndarides (8), on whom he had beſtowed as many praiſes as upon Scopas. Soon after he was informed that two young men ſtood at the door, and deſired to ſpeak with him. He went out and ſaw no body. In the mean time the room, where he had left Scopas, and the other gueſts, fell down, and they were all killed. Cicero relates this in very fine words. *Dicunt quum cœnaret Gramnone in Theſſalia Simonides apud Scopam fortunatum hominem & nobilem, ceciniſſetque id carmen, quod in eum ſcripſiſſet, in quo multa ornandi cauſa poëtarum more in Caſtorem ſcripta, & Pollucem fuiſſent, nimis illum ſordide Simonidi dixiſſe, ſe dimidium ejus ei quod pactus eſſet pro illo carmine, daturum, reliquum à ſuis Tyndaridis, quos æque laudaſſet, peteret, ſi ei videretur. Paulò poſt eſſe ferunt nunciatum Simonidi, ut prodiret, juvenes ſtare ad januam duos quoſdam, qui eum magnopere evocarent, ſurrexiſſe illum ipſum, prodiſſe, vidiſſe neminem. Hoc interim ſpatio conclave illud, ubi epularetur Scopas, concidiſſe, ea ruina ipſum oppreſſum cum ſuis interiſſe* (9). Valerius Maximus relates the ſame thing (10), but he is guilty of an inexcuſable omiſſion; for he does not ſay why Caſtor and Pollux did that good ſervice to Simonides. Note, that Solinus aſcribes to Pindar what all other writers aſcribes to Simonides, with reſpect to this divine favour (11). Salmaſius ſuſpects that Solinus did ſo to conceal his theft, I mean, to make people believe that he was not a mere tranſcriber of Pliny (12). Obſerve alſo that Quintilian calls this apparition of the Tyndarides a fable (13), becauſe that Poet, who doubtleſs would not have deprived himſelf of ſo great a glory, does not mention it in his works. He obſerves that authors do very much differ as to the perſon in whoſe honour Simonides made that poem: nor did they agree about the town where the entertainment was given. But he informs us of one thing, which Cicero ſhould not have omitted. He tells us that the perſon, whom Simonides praiſed, was a victorious wreſtler. *Cum pugili coronato carmen, quale componi victoribus ſolet, mercede pacta ſcripſiſſet; abnegata ei pecuniæ pars eſt, quòd more poëtis frequentiſſimo digreſſus, in laudes Caſtoris & Pollucis exierat* (14). The omiſſion of this particular by Cicero is very prejudicial to Simonides; for one would think he had made improper digreſſions, and that he was ſo imprudent as to obſcure the glory of the man, who had bought his panegyric, by inſerting in it an encomium upon the gods. But if we conſider that Simonides was to celebrate the victory of a wreſtler, the objection vaniſhes away, and it is plain that Caſtor and Pollux (15) were to have a ſhare in his praiſes. Wherefore it is not a blameable digreſſion, but a neceſſary epiſode. As for the reſt, Mr de Girac makes a wrong criticiſm upon Quintilian. *The learned Rhetorician,* ſays he (16), *would not have made uſe of a* negative argument, *if he had read in Callimachus that Simonides himſelf mentions that adventure in words full of gratitude towards his deliverers.* It is certain that Quintilian might have ſaid what he ſays, notwithſtanding Callimachus's verſes. There is a vaſt difference between what a Poet relates in his poems, and what others make him ſay in their writings.

Here follows the other miracle. Simonides having landed, found the dead body of an unknown man upon the ſhore, and buried it. That unknown man warned him in a dream, not to take ſhipping again the next day: Simonides followed his advice, and he ſaw the veſſel ſhipwrecked. He made a poem upon that adventure. ‘ Longe indulgentius Dii in poëta ‘ Simonide, cujus ſalutarem inter quietem admoni‘ tionem conſilii firmitate roboraverunt. Is enim cùm ‘ ad littus navem appuliſſet, inhumatumque corpus ‘ jacens ſepulturæ mandaſſet, admonitus ab eo ne pro‘ ximo die navigaret, in terra remanſit: Qui inde ‘ ſolverant, fluctibus & procellis in conſpectu ejus ‘ obruti ſunt. Ipſe lætatus eſt, quòd vitam ſuam ſom‘ nio, quam navi, credere maluiſſet. Memor autem ‘ beneficii, elegantiſſimo eum carmine æternitati con‘ ſecravit, melius illi & diuturnius in animis homi‘ num ſepulchrum conſtituens, quàm in deſertis arenis ‘ ſtruxerat (17)- - - - - *The gods were far more indulgent* ‘ *to the Poet Simonides, and confirmed him in the reſolu*‘ *tion which he had taken from the wholeſome advice* ‘ *he had received in his ſleep. For when he was ready* ‘ *to take ſhipping, and had buried the dead body of a* ‘ *man which lay on the ſhore, he was warned by the* ‘ *ſame man not to go to ſea the next day, and ſtay at* ‘ *land. They who had taken ſhipping periſhed, in his* ‘ *ſight, by a ſtorm, and were ſwallowed up in the* ‘ *waves. Simonides rejoiced, becauſe he had truſted his* ‘ *life rather to a dream than a ſhip. Being mindful* ‘ *of the favour, he immortalized that man in a moſt* ‘ *elegant poem, erected a better and more durable tomb* ‘ *to him, than that which he had formerly built upon* ‘ *the deſart ſands.*’ He did not think that humanity required any thing from him beſides the burying of the dead body; but being ſo well rewarded for that favour, he went farther, and put this glorious epitaph upon the tomb of that unknown man.

Οὗτος μὲν Κείοιο Σιμωνίδου ἐστὶ σαωτήρ,
Ὃς καὶ τεθνειὼς ζῶντι παρέσχε χάριν.

Hic quidem Cei Simonidis eſt ſervator,
Qui & mortuus vivo retulit gratiam (18).

This is the tomb of the man who ſaved the life of Simonides of Ceos, and who, after his death, was grateful to the living.

[*C*] *The invention of local memory is aſcribed to him.*] It will not be improper to obſerve upon what occaſion he invented it. When Scopas and his gueſts were cruſhed by the fall of the room, they were ſo disfigured that they could not be known one from another. And yet there was a neceſſity to know them; for thoſe, who deſigned to bury them, deſired to perform that duty, each to his kinſman. Simonides removed the difficulty; he remembred in what place each gueſt ſat down at table, and was thereby enabled to tell each of their relations which of them was to be buried by him. Afterwards conſidering how neceſſary order is to preſerve the ideas of objects, he invented the method of annexing them to certain places, that is, he was the inventer of local memory. Cicero ſhall be my voucher (19). *Non ſum tanto ego, inquit, ingenio, quanto Themiſtocles fuit, ut oblivionis artem quàm memoriæ malim, gratiamque habeo Simonidi illi Chio, quem primum ferunt artem memoriæ protuliſſe. Dicunt enim quum cœnaret* . . . . (20) *Quos quum humare vellent ſui, neque poſſent obtritos internoſcere ullo modo, Simonides dicitur ex eo quod meminiſſet quo eorum loco quiſque cubuiſſet, demonſtrator uniuſcujuſque ſepeliendi fuiſſe. Hac tum re admonitus inveniſſe fertur, ordinem eſſe maxime, qui memoriæ lumen afferret. Itaque iis qui hanc partem ingenii exercerent, locos eſſe capiendos, & ea quæ memoria tenere vellent effingenda animo, atque in his locis collocanda: ſic fore, ut ordinem rerum locorum ordo conſervaret, res autem ipſas rerum effigies notaret, atque ut locis pro cera, ſimulacris pro literis uteremur.* That author obſerves, in another place, that Simonides had a very good memory (21). Theſe words of Philoſtratus give a great idea of it: Apollonius *being an hundred years old had ſtill a better memory than Simonides ever had in his greateſt vogue; and he uſed to ſing a canticle which that Poet had made in praiſe of memory, wherein he ſays, that every thing fades and vaniſhes away in time, whereas time never grows old, is never corrupted, and always remains the ſame, with memory that goes along with it* (22). Some authors ſay, that Simonides took ſome remedies to acquire a good memory, which produced the intended effect (23).

[*D*] *At eighty years of age he diſputed the prize of Poetry.*] This he mentioned in one of his poems. ‘ Simonides,

---

(*a*) Plutarchus an ſeni ſit gerenda Reſpubl. *pag.* 785, *A.*

(8) That is, Caſtor and Pollux.

(9) Cicero de Oratore, *lib. ii, fol.* 87. *D. See alſo* Phædrus, *lib. iv, fab. xxiv.*

(10) Val. Maximus, *lib. i, cap. viii, num. vii, in Ext.*

(11) Solin. *cap. i, pag. m.* 11.

(12) Salmaſ. Exercitat. Plin. *Tom. i, pag.* 53.

(13) Qanquam mihi totum de Tyndaridis fabuloſum videtur, neque omnino hujus rei meminit uſquam poëta ipſe, profecto non taciturus de tanta ſua gloria. *Quintilian, lib. xi, cap. ii, pag. m.* 517.

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) They were in a manner the patrons of wreſtlers.

(16) *Girac, Replique à Coſtar, §. liii, pag. m.* 465. He quotes the words of Callimachus, cited by Suidas: I ſhall ſpeak of it afterward in remark [*E*], citat (26).

(17) Valer. Maximus, *lib. i, cap. vii, num. iii, in Ext. See alſo* Cicero, de Divinatione, *lib. i, fol.* 308, C.

(18) Tzetz. *Chiliad. i, Hiſt.* **xxiv.** *He quotes one Ariſtides. See* Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græcis, *lib. iii, cap. xxx, pag.* 331, *where he corrects this paſſage of Tzetzes.*

(19) Cicero de Oratore, *lib. ii, fol.* 87, *D. See alſo* Quintilian, *lib. xi, cap. ii, pag.* 517.

(20) You may ſee in the foregoing citation (9), the words I omit here.

(21) Cicero, Tuſculan. Quæſt. *lib. i, fol.* 249, C.

(22) Philoſtratus, *in the life of Apollonius, book i, ch. ix. See the ſame* in Vitis Sophiſtar. *lib. ii,* in Proclo.

(23) Scriptores varii memorant Cyrum regem & Simonidem Lyricum, & Hippiam Eleum . . . . ideo valuiſſe memoria quod epotis quibuſdam remediis id impetrarunt. *Amm. Marcell. lib. xvi, cap. v, pag. m.* 116.

world (*b*). He lived ſtill above ten years longer (*c*). It is ſaid that the deſtruction of his tomb by a General of the Agrigentines did not remain unpuniſhed [*E*]. The anſwer which he gave to a prince, who aſked him the definition of GOD, is very famous [*F*]. I mean,

‘ Simonides vero Poëta octogeſimo anno & docuiſſe ſe carmina, & in eorum certamen deſcendiſſe ipſe gloriatur: nec fuit iniquum, illum voluptatem ex ingenio ſuo diu percipere, cùm eam omni ævo fruendam traditurus eſſet (24). - - - - *But the Poet Simonides gloried that at eighty years of age, he both compoſed verſes, and conteſted for the prize: nor was it unreaſonable that he ſhould long enjoy the pleaſure of his own wit, which from him was to be enjoyed by all ages.*’

[*E*] *The deſtruction of his tomb . . . . did not remain unpuniſhed.*] Phœnix, General of the Agrigentines, being at war with the Syracuſans, pulled down Simonides's tomb (25), and built a tower with the materials of it: and it happened that the town was taken through that part of the wall where the tower was built. Callimachus brought in Simonides complaining of that impious action, and ſaying, that Phœnix had not been afraid of Caſtor and Pollux, who, added he, preſerved me from the fall of a houſe (26). Suidas's negligence cannot be ſufficiently wondered at; for he does not name the town, where a tower was built of the ſtones of Simonides's tomb. But becauſe he ſays that a General of the Agrigentines cauſed that tomb to be demoliſhed, and the tower to be built, we have ſome reaſon to think that it was Agrigentum. Unleſs one had rather ſay, that Phœnix having conquered Syracuſe, and being beſieged in it, cauſed a wall to be fortified by the building of a tower, and that Syracuſe was re-taken, through that place. It is likely Simonides died at Hiero's court. A very learned Chronologer places the death of this Poet a year before that of the prince. ‘ Utriuſque obitus contiguos, ut ita dicam, in annos incurrit, Simonidis quidem in annum mundi 3516. Hieronis autem 3517, apud P. Petavium lib. 13. *de doctrina temporum* (27). - - - *Both their deaths happened, if I may ſay ſo, in contiguous years, that of Simonides in the year of the world* 3516. *But Hiero's in* 3517, *as Petavius ſays.*’ We may obſerve that Petavius follows Diodorus Siculus, who ſays that Hiero died in the ſecond year of the LXXVIIIth Olympiad (28); and therefore he believed that Simonides died in the firſt year of the ſame olympiad (29). But becauſe he places (30) the beginning of the olympiads in the year of the word 3208, he placed the death of Simonides in the year of the world 3517.

[*F*] *The anſwer he gave to a prince, who aſked him the definition of GOD, is very famous.*] Hiero, tyrant of Sicily, deſired that Poet to tell him what GOD is. The Poet anſwered him, that it was not a queſtion that could be immediately anſwered, and that he wanted a whole day to think upon it. When that term was over, Hiero aſked the anſwer; but Simonides deſired two days more to conſider of it. This was not the laſt delay he aſked: he was often called on to give an anſwer, and every time he deſired double the time he had laſt demanded. The tyrant wondring at it, deſired to know the reaſon of it. I do ſo, anſwered Simonides, becauſe the more I examine the matter, the more obſcure it appears to me. I am going to give the ſame account of this in Latin, to the end it may be ſeen, that Cicero, in the perſon of Cotta the pontiff, declares, that, in the like caſe, he would give the ſame anſwer as Simonides did. ‘ Nec ego nunc ipſe aliquid afferam melius; ut enim modo dixi, omnibus fere in rebus, & maximè in phyſicis, quid non ſit, citiùs, quàm quid ſit dixerim. Roges me; quid aut qualis ſit Deus: auctore utar Simonide; de quo cùm quæſiviſſet hoc idem tyrannus Hiero, deliberandi cauſſâ ſibi unum diem poſtulavit. Cùm idem ex eo poſtridie quæreret, biduum petivit; cum ſæpius duplicaret numerum dierum, admiranſque Hiero quæreret cur ita faceret, QUIA QUANTÒ, inquit, DIUTIUS CONSIDERO, TANTÒ MIHI RES VIDETUR OBSCURIOR. Sed Simonidem arbitror (non enim Poëta ſolùm ſuavis, verùm etiam cæterqui doctus, ſapienſque traditur) quia multa venirent in mentem acuta, atque ſubtilia, dubitantem quid eorum eſſet veriſſimum, deſperaſſe omnem veritatem (31). - - - *Neither can I now offer any thing better: for as I have juſt ſaid in all ſubjects, and eſpecially in Phyſics, I can more readily tell what a thing is not, than what it is. Aſk me what, or what kind of a being is GOD; I will anſwer in the words of Simonides; who, when the tyrant Hiero had aſked him this queſtion, required a day to conſider of it. When next day he aſked him the ſame queſtion, Simonides required two days more: When he had often doubled the time he required, and Hiero being ſurpriſed, aſked him the reaſon of it.* IT IS, *ſays he*, BECAUSE THE LONGER I CONSIDER, THE MORE OBSCURE THE SUBJECT APPEARS TO ME. *But I think that Simonides, (who is recorded to have been not only a delightful Poet, but beſides a learned and wiſe man) when many acute and ſubtile things came into his mind, doubted which were trueſt, and at length deſpaired of all truth.*’ Obſerve well the laſt words of Cicero: they ſtrike home, they come to the point. Simonides might eaſily have anſwered, had he been contented with popular notions, and thoſe lively impreſſions which are now called inward proofs. But as he had to do with a diſcerning prince (32) who had refined his judgment, by his frequent converſations with men of learning, he was afraid to hazard his reputation. Therefore he took time to examine the matter, he viewed it in all lights, and on every ſide; and becauſe his mind no ſooner furniſhed him with ſeveral anſwers, but it ſuggeſted the refutation of them: he found nothing ſolid; he diſcovered every where a ſtrong and weak ſide, and depths unſearchable: he feared therefore leſt he ſhould be deceived, whatever principles he might lay down to ſettle the definition of GOD: he no longer entertained any hopes of finding the truth, and ſo gave it up. A man of mean parts would not have been ſo nice; but would have been dazzled with the firſt hypotheſis he had met with, he would not have apprehended the difficulty in it, and would have dogmatically laid it down as the immoveable point of truth, beyond which there was nothing but folly and extravagance. There are even perſons of great parts, who quickly deliver their opinion as the only one that ought to be embraced; they decide, that it is evident, and abuſe thoſe who do not acknowledge it. A ſtrong perſuaſion inſpires them with this conduct. Tertullian will ſupply us with another example. He will have it, that this happened not at the court of Syracuſe, but at that of Lydia: According to him, Crœſus demanded of Thales a definition of GOD, but had it not, what time ſoever he granted that Philoſopher to examine that queſtion. ‘ Quid enim Thales ille princeps Phyſicorum ſciſcitanti Crœſo de divinitate certum renuntiavit, commeatus deliberandi ſæpe fruſtratus? Deum quilibet opifex Chriſtianus & invenit, & oſtendit. Et exinde totum, quod adeo quæritur, re quoque aſſignat: licet Plato affirmet factitatorem univerſitatis, neque inveniri facilem, & inventum enarrari in omnes difficilem (33). - - - - *For what certain anſwer did Thales, the chief of natural Philoſophers, give to Crœſus aſking him concerning the Deity; when he had often found that the time he required for conſidering of it, was not ſufficient? Any Chriſtian tradeſman can both diſcover and declare what GOD is, and from thence can impart to others a full and ſatisfactory anſwer: though Plato affirms, that the Maker of the univerſe neither can eaſily be diſcovered, nor, when diſcovered, can be eaſily deſcribed to all men.*’ You ſee how much this Father extolleth the knowledge of the meaneſt Chriſtian artificer above that of the moſt famous heathen Philoſophers. All our tradeſmen, ſays he, find GOD and declare him, and effectually explain whatever may be called in queſtion concerning the divine nature. Which is as much as to ſay, that if Crœſus or Hiero had aſked

(24) Valer. Maximus, *lib. viii, cap. vii, num.* 13, *in Ext.*

(25) Διαλύει τὸν τάφον τȣ̃ Σιμωνίδȣ μάλα ἀκηδῶς τε καὶ ἀνοίκτως. Simonidis ſepulchrum cum magna contemptione & crudeliter diſſolvit. *Suidas, in* Σιμωνίδης, *pag. m.* 741, 742.

(26) Taken from Suidas, *ibid.*

(27) Leſcalopier. in Ciceron. de Natura Deorum, *lib. i, pag.* 84.

(28) Petavius, in Rationario Tempor. *Parte. i, lib. iii, cap. vi, p. m.* 136.

(29) Id. ibid. *Part. ii, lib. iii, cap. i, pag. m.* 153.

(30) Suidas ſays that Simonides lived till the LXXVIIIth Olympiad.

(31) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, *lib. i, pag.* 83, *Edit.* Leſcaloperii.

(32) *See* Ælian Var. Hiſtor. *lib. iv, cap. xv, & lib. ix, cap. i.*

(33) Tertullianus, in Apologetico, *cap.* xlvi.

(*b*) See the Greek Diſtich mentioned by Ariſtides περὶ τȣ̃ παραφθέγματος. Valeſius in Amm. Marcell. *lib. xvi, cap. v, pag. m.* 116, *quotes it.*

(*c*) Σιμωνίδης ὁ Κεῖος ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐνενήκοντα (ἔζησεν). Simonides Ceus ſupra nonaginta (vixit.) *Lucian.* in *Macrobiis*, ſub finem, pag. m. 644, Tom. ii. *Suidas makes him live eighty-nine years, and not ninety-nine, as Giraldus does.* Dialog. IX, Hiſtoriæ Poëtarum, *pag.* 463.

mean, the anſwer he gave to Hiero, tyrant of Syracuſe, to whoſe court he went, notwithſtanding

aſked the moſt ignorant of the Chriſtians, *What is GOD, and which are his attributes*, they would immediately have received a direct anſwer, and ſo full, that nothing would have been wanting. Tertullian goes too faſt, and ſuffers himſelf to be carried away by his imagination. He conſidereth not that the Pagan Philoſophers, who acknowledged themſelves unable to ſatisfy the curioſity of thoſe who aſked them, what God was, were only at a loſs for an anſwer, becauſe they would not reſt contented with the vulgar notions, as an ignorant perſon would have done. Nothing could have been more eaſy than for them to have anſwered, God is an infinite being, and omnipotent, who framed the univerſe and governs it, who puniſhes and rewards, who is angry with ſinners, and is attoned by our ſacrifices. In this manner would our tradeſmen have anſwered Hiero, adding what we read in the Catechiſm concerning the perſons in the Trinity, and the death and paſſion of Jesus Christ, *&c*. Once more, if Thales or Simonides had been ſatisfied with theſe general notions, they would not have demanded time to prepare their anſwer, they would have had it in readineſs. But as they deſired that all the terms of the definition required ſhould be evidently indiſputable, and found themſelves, that whatever they could propoſe might be diſputed, they demanded one delay after another, and at laſt were not able to anſwer. I believe Simonides imagined, that his anſwer would be propoſed to be canvaſſed by all the fine wits of the court of Syracuſe, and that he would be obliged to defend it by reſolving all their difficulties.

This is what probably he thought with himſelf. If I ſay, that God is a being diſtinct from all the bodies which compoſe the univerſe, I ſhall be aſked if the univerſe always exiſted, at leaſt as to the matter of it? Had that matter an efficient cauſe? And if I anſwer that it had one, I oblige myſelf to maintain that it was made of nothing, but this is a doctrine I ſhall never be able to make either Hiero or the fine wits of his court to comprehend, and which I cannot comprehend myſelf: wherefore I have reaſon to be uncertain my ſelf, whether that point is true or not: for ſo long as it is to me incomprehenſible, I cannot be rightly aſſured of its ſtate and nature. If I ſay, that the matter of the univerſe hath no efficient cauſe, I ſhall be aſked, whence comes God to have the power over it, and why hath it not as much power over God as he hath over it (34)? I muſt give good reaſons, why of two beings independent one of the other as to exiſtence, equally neceſſary and eternal, one hath all power over the other, without being reciprocally liable to be acted upon by the other. It is not ſufficient to ſay, that God is a being diſtinct from bodies which compoſe the univerſe. They will deſire to know, whether he is like them with reſpect to extenſion, that is, whether he is extended. If I anſwer, that he is extended, they will infer that he is corporeal and material: and I do not find myſelf able to make them underſtand, that there are two kinds of extenſion, one corporeal, the other incorporeal; one compoſed of parts and conſequently diviſible, the other perfectly ſimple and of conſequence indiviſible. If I ſay that God is not extended, it will be inferred that he is no where, and that he cannot have any union with the world. And how then ſhall he move the bodies? How can he act where he is not? Beſides, our underſtanding is not capable to conceive a ſubſtance unextended, and a ſpirit entirely ſeparated from matter (35). But ſuppoſing it ſhould be granted me, that God is an immaterial and unextended ſubſtance, a ſpirit infinite and omnipotent. How many new queſtions ſhould I have to reſolve? Does this ſpirit not neceſſarily exiſt, either with reſpect to his ſubſtance, or with reſpect to his qualities? Is not his power an attribute as neceſſary as his knowledge? Therefore he does not act freely, taking freedom to be the power of acting, or not acting. Whatever he does therefore is neceſſary and unavoidable; I ſhall be told that I entirely deſtroy religion, for religion is neceſſarily founded upon the ſuppoſition that God changeth his behaviour to men, as they change their manner of living; and if they did not appeaſe him by their prayers, he would do a great many things, which, in regard to their devotion, he will abſtain from doing. But if to avoid this troubleſome inconveniency, I have recourſe to the hypotheſis of the liberty of indifferency, and of conditional wills, I lay myſelf under an obligation to explain, both how this ſort of liberty can be conſiſtent with a being that is not the cauſe of its own power (36), and how an infinite train of conditional decrees, is compatible with a cauſe infinitely wiſe and independent, which muſt have followed a plan fixed and immoveable, and which at bottom hath no attribute more eſſential than immutability; for there is not any excellency more evidently contained in the idea of a being infinitely perfect than this of unchangeableneſs. Theſe are, if I am not miſtaken, a few of the reaſons which offered themſelves to Simonides, when he ſought for the definition demanded of him, and which made him determine not to give any, ſo afraid was he of affirming what was not true.

I may venture to ſay, that of moſt men it becomes Tertullian the leaſt to inſult our Thales, and to boaſt of our tradeſmen, for had he been in the place of Thales or Simonides, he would have but poorly come off. His zeal and haſty temper would have prompted him to give an immediate anſwer to the queſtion of Crœſus, or that of Hiero. But if you deſire to know what anſwer he would have made, read theſe words of Daillé (37): *How ſtrange is his Philoſophy, concerning the nature of GOD* †, *whom he ſeems to make ſubject to paſſions like ours, to anger, to hatred, to grief? He aſcribes* ⸸ *to him a corporeal ſubſtance, not believing (as he ſays) that any one would deny that GOD is a body, which will ſurpriſe us leſs, if he boldly aſſerts* ‡, *that there is no ſubſtance but what is corporeal.* Every one may ſee, that Tertullian would have defined God to be *a corporeal ſubſtance ſubject to paſſions*. If he had explained his definition, he would have ſaid, that our ſins exaſperate the Deity, that he hates the crime, and feels a real ſorrow when his laws are violated: but is eaſily appeaſed when his mercy is implored. Would he have been able to maintain this anſwer before Simonides, and the other ſages, whom King Hiero entertained at his court? Would they not have objected to him that every body is diviſible, and compounded of parts; and of conſeqence, that the infinitely perfect being is not a body. Would they not have ſaid, that ſupreme happineſs is eſſential to the divine nature, which therefore is not ſubject to paſſion, nor to any trouble or vexation? Would they not have ſaid, that the divine nature is unchangeable, and conſequently cannot alter either from love to hatred, or from hatred to love, nor from compaſſion to wrath, nor from wrath to compaſſion? If he had recurred to metaphors, would he not have been told, that Hiero wanted not a rhetorical anſwer, but an accurate definition, exactly conformable to the laws of Logic, or right reaſoning. It will be owned, I aſſure myſelf, that Tertullian had done better had he been ſilent, as he was whom he inſults. Let us ſuppoſe, that his Chriſtian tradeſman whom he repreſents ſo knowing, were aſked by Hiero, and ſhould anſwer, *GOD is a being immaterial, infinite, all-powerful, perfectly good, perfectly happy, and infinitely juſt, who created all things according to the good pleaſure of his own will*; can we think, that Simonides examining that anſwer, would not have ſaid, all this I knew as well as you; but I would not venture to aſſert it, becauſe it appears to me, that a being infinitely powerful, infinitely good, infinitely holy, and who had created all things with a perfect liberty of indifference, would not have ſubjected man to that ſinful and miſerable ſtate in which he lives. Had he left the ſoul at liberty to unite it ſelf to the body or not, it would never have entred into the body; for by ſuch a choice, the ſoul would have appeared too fooliſh to be the workmanſhip of a being infinitely perfect. If it is he who joins our ſouls to bodies, he muſt be induced to it by ſome determination natural and irreſiſtible; for acting freely, that is, having power to act or to abſtain from acting, to act after one, or after another manner, it cannot be imagined that he would have taken that courſe, ſeeing the ſoul by its union with the body, becomes ſubjected to a thouſand

---

(34) See, above, the remark [*T*] of the article EPICURUS, and Dr Burnet, Biſhop of Saliſbury, in the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, October 1699, *pag*. 442.

(35) Si mentem iſtam quaſi animal aliquod eſſe voluit, erit aliquid interius ex quo illud animal nominetur. Quid autem interius mente? Cingitur igitur corpore externo. Quod quoniam non placet, aperta, ſimplexque mens nullâ re adjunctâ quæ ſentire poſſit, fugere intelligentiæ noſtræ vim & notionem videtur. *Cicero*, lib. i, *de Natura Deorum*, pag. 39. Edit. Leſcaloperii.

(36) The nature of God, with all his attributes, doth neceſſarily exiſt, wherefore his power and his will are neceſſary beings, but neceſſity excludes indifference.

(37) Daillé of the right uſe of the Fathers, *book ii, ch. iv, pag. m* 354.

† Tertull. lib. i, adv. Marc. cap. 25, & 1, 2, cap. xvi.

⸸ *Id. adv. Orig. cap. vii, & lib. ii, contra Marc. cap. xvi.* Quis negabit Deum corpus eſſe, etſi Deus ſpiritus eſt?

‡ *Id. lib. adv. Hermog. cap.* 35. Cum ipſa ſubſtantia corpus ſit cujuſque.

withſtanding his great age; being prompted to it by his covetouſneſs, for he loved money

a thouſand diſgraceful and abſurd diſorders, and to almoſt a continual miſery. ‘Quinetiam dicunt, ſi anima eſt divina poteſtque vivere ſejuncta à membris mortalibus, ut quid ſe miſeræ carni inſinuat? cujus vitio tot perpetitur mala, & admittat tot flagitia? ergo ſtulta eſt, ſi ſponte hoc facit: at ſi invita nefandas corporis ingreditur latebras, quis cogit? an ipſe Juppiter? ergo Deus nequaquam hanc diligit: imo carcere quam clauſit tam turpi, odiſſe videtur (38). - - - - *But, moreover they ſay, If the ſoul is divine, and can live ſeparated from its mortal members, why does it join itſelf to a miſerable body? by the pravity of which it ſuffers ſo much evil, and commits ſo much wickedneſs? therefore it is fooliſh, if it does this of its own accord: but if unwillingly it enters the vile caverns of the body, who compels it? Does Jupiter himſelf? therefore GOD loves it not; yea, he appears to hate what he hath ſhut up in ſo deteſtable a priſon.*’ But we will not leave our Chriſtian tradeſman to ſuſtain all the charge: we will call in a Divine, who may explain to Simonides the whole ſyſtem of Grace, and all the oeconomy of the decrees of Predeſtination: undoubtedly this Poet would anſwer him, you carry me from one dark region to another ſtill more obſcure. I cannot comprehend how under the government of a God who had the attributes you mention, there can ever be occaſion for any puniſhment; for the ſovereign power of ſuch a deity, together with an unlimited goodneſs and holineſs, would never permit any puniſhable crime to be perpetrated in his dominions. Such a being as this ſeems to me incapable of making his glory to reſult from the miſery of another, or depend on the endleſs duration of infernal torments: I even apprehend there is a downright inconſiſtency betwixt theſe two things, three Perſons who are but one God, of which the one puniſheth, and the other is puniſhed, and yet it cannot be ſaid, that he who is puniſhed, puniſheth, and that he who puniſheth is puniſhed, tho' yet both, one and the other are only one and the ſelf ſame ſubſtance, only one and the ſame God! Theſe three Perſons, I ſay, are to me a direct contradiction. Wherefore I choſe rather to give no anſwer to the Prince of Syracuſe, than to have propoſed to him ſuch definitions of God.

But, it may be ſaid, Is then Tertullian groſsly miſtaken, when he prefers Chriſtian tradeſmen to the Philoſophers? I anſwer, That what he aſſerts may very well be rectified. There needs only be ſaid, that the meaneſt Chriſtian tradeſman does ſtedfaſtly believe more things concerning the nature of God, than the greateſt of heathen Philoſophers have been able to attain the knowledge of. He needs only declare that with his bare Catechiſm, he will give ſo great a number of particulars, that for one thing they did partly affirm, he will aſſert forty without heſitation. This is what Tertullian might have ſaid without being miſtaken. But theſe Chriſtians ſo knowing in compariſon of Thales, and any other Philoſophers of antient Greece, would have been as much at a ſtand what to ſay, and as ſilent as Thales, if they had offered nothing but what they did clearly and diſtinctly comprehend; and they are beholden for their great knowledge, only to their having the happineſs of being educated in a Church, where they obtained an hiſtorical, and even ſometimes a juſtifying faith of revealed truths. This convinces them of the exiſtence of ſeveral things which they do not comprehend. Our greateſt divines, if they acted as Simonides did, that is, if they affirmed nothing for certain concerning the nature of God, but what by the light of reaſon appeared to them undeniable, evident, and proof againſt all objections, would have continually demanded farther delays of all the Hieroes in the world. Add moreover, that though Simonides ſhould have had the opportunity of conſulting and examining the ſcriptures, without the influence either of education or grace, he would not have got out of his labyrinth and ſilence. Reaſon would forbid him to deny the facts contained in the ſcripture, and make him perceive ſomething ſupernatural in the connection and order of theſe facts; but this would not have been ſufficient to bring him to a determination. The powers of reaſon, and Philoſophical examination, go no farther than to hold us in ſuſpence, and to keep us in fear of erring, whether we affirm, or whether we deny (39). Either the Grace of God, or education muſt neceſſarily come in to their aſſiſtance. And carefully obſerve, that there is not any ſyſtem againſt which reaſon affords more objections than that of the goſpel. The myſtery of the Trinity, the incarnation of the Word, his death for the expiation of our ſins, the propagation of Adam's ſin, the eternal predeſtination of a few men to heavenly happineſs, the eternal condemnation of almoſt all men to the torments of hell, which will never have an end; the loſs of free-will ever ſince the fall of Adam, &c. are matters, which would have furniſhed Simonides with greater doubts, than his imagination did ever ſuggeſt to him. Let us mind what St Paul ſays (40), not only that the goſpel was a ſtumbling-block to the Jews, and fooliſhneſs to the Greeks, but alſo that God ſaved men by the fooliſhneſs of preaching.

Here follows a conſideration which, perhaps, ought not to be ſlighted. Simonides was, in all likelihood, in great difficulty, about the genus of the definition: he durſt not ſay that God was matter, an hundred objections hindred him. He durſt not ſay that God was a ſpirit; for he could apprehend nothing but under the notion of extenſion. Until Des Cartes, all our doctors, both Divines, and Philoſophers, attributed extenſion to ſpirits; infinite extenſion to God, and finite to angels, and rational ſouls. It is true, they maintained that this extenſion was not material, nor compounded of parts, and that ſpirits are wholly in every part of the ſpace wherein they are, *Toti in toto & toti in ſingulis partibus*. Hence proceeded the three ſpecies of local preſence, *ubi circumſcriptivum, ubi definitivum, ubi repletivum*, the firſt for bodies, the ſecond for created ſpirits, the third for God. The Carteſians have rejected all theſe tenets, they ſay, that ſpirits have no kind of extenſion, nor local preſence; but their opinion is rejected as very abſurd. Wherefore almoſt all our Philoſophers, and all our Divines, do at this day ſtill teach according to the popular opinion, that the ſubſtance of God is diffuſed through infinite ſpaces. But certainly, this is pulling down with one hand, what hath been ſet up by the other; it is, in effect, aſcribing to God materiality, which had been denied of him. You ſay, that he is a ſpirit, very well, this is aſcribing to him a nature different from matter; but at the ſame time you ſay, that his ſubſtance is diffuſed every where: you ſay therefore that he is extended: but we have no idea of two kinds of extenſion; we clearly conceive that all extenſion of whatever kind it be, hath diſtinct parts, impenetrable, and ſeparable from one another: it is monſtrous to ſay that the ſoul is all in the brain, and all in the heart. It is inconceivable, that the divine extenſion, and the extenſion of matter can be in the ſame place; this would be a real penetration of dimenſions, which our reaſon cannot apprehend. Beſides, things which are penetrated by a third, are penetrated by one another (41), and thus the heavens, and the terreſtrial globe, are mutually penetrated; for they would be penetrated with the divine ſubſtance; which, according to you, has no parts; hence it follows, that the ſun is penetrated by the ſame being as the earth. In one word, if matter is matter only becauſe it is extended, by conſequence all extenſion is matter: you cannot ſhew any attribute different from extenſion, by virtue of which matter is matter. The impenetrability of bodies can only reſult from their extenſion, we can conceive no other grounds of it, and ſo you muſt grant, that if ſpirits were extended, they would be impenetrable, wherefore they would not be different from bodies by penetrability. After all, according to the common doctrine, the divine extenſion is neither more nor leſs impenetrable or penetrable, than that of body. Its parts, call them virtual as much as you pleaſe, its parts, I ſay, cannot be penetrated one by another, but they may be penetrated by the parts of matter. Do not you ſay the ſame thing concerning the parts of matter; they cannot penetrate one another, but they can penetrate the virtual parts of the divine extenſion? If you will but attentively conſult common ſenſe, you will perceive, that when two extenſions are penetratively in the ſame place, the one is as penetrable as the other. It cannot therefore be ſaid, that the money (*d*), and knew that Hiero was a liberal prince. Some Divines would not have made

---

(38) Palingenius, in Zodiaco Vitæ, *lib. vii, pag. m.* 189.

(39) Obſerve that the matter in queſtion between Hiero and Simonides, was not the exiſtence of God, but a true definition of what he is.

(40) 1 Cor. i. 21, 23.

(41) Quæ penetrantur cum uno tertio penetrantur inter ſe. *By this axiom, thoſe are refuted who ſay that a ſolid body is made up of mathematical points.*

(*d*) See the remark [*N*], citation (86).

---

the extenſion of matter differs from any other ſort of extenſion by impenetrability: It is therefore certain, that all extenſion is matter, and conſequently you only take from God the name of matter, and attribute to him the thing itſelf; when you affirm that he is extended. Since therefore it was not poſſible for you to have done otherwiſe, you ought not to wonder, that Simonides durſt not deny that God was matter; neither durſt he affirm it; he choſe rather to be ſilent. We muſt remember, that the moſt ſubtle Carteſians maintain, that we can form no idea of a ſpiritual ſubſtance. We only know by experience that it thinks, but we know not what is the nature of that being, whoſe modifications are thoughts; we know not what is the ſubject in which theſe thoughts exiſt, or the ground that ſupports them. Simonides perhaps, was hereby obliged not to ſay that God was a ſpirit. He could not conceive what a ſpirit was.

A Jeſuit, who writ a commentary upon Cicero's books *De Natura Deorum*, does not blame Simonides for being ſo reſerved, and wiſhes the antient Poets and Philoſophers, and the heretics had imitated him. What he obſerves, concerning the incomprehenſibility of God, deſerves to be tranſcribed here. ‘ Quæ *Tertullianus* inſcitiæ, alii modeſtiæ dederunt. Atque utinam veteres philoſophi, & poëtæ, quique illos conſecuti ſunt Hæretici, hac in parte tam verecundi, quam Thales, aut Simonides, fuiſſent: nunquam profecto adeò abſurda, impia, & blaſphema Divinæ Naturæ affinxiſſent, nunquam impegiſſent in fœdiſſimos errores, in quos per ſummam impudentiam præfidentes homunculos videmus, & dolemus impegiſſe. Nimirum tenemur omnes magno quodam ſciendi ſtudio, cognoſcendi verò numinis, multò majore: ex quo Deum quidem à nobis cognoſci velle licet intelligere; ſed intra fines præſtitutos, & intra columnas, quibus ſuo ipſe quaſi digito inſcripſit, *Ne plus ultra*: ſunt enim divinis in rebus adyta quædam, in quæ Magnus Deus noluit nos penetrare: quod ſi quis temeritate, & confidentia ſui elatus porro pergit, ac perrumpere, hoc ſacrarium attentat, quò penitiùs ingreditur, eò denſiores illi tenebræ offunduntur, ut vel ſic, & Divinæ Naturæ majeſtatem imperveſtigabilem, & humanæ mentis imbecillitatem, ſi quid ſapit, agnoſcat, ac confiteri cum Simonide cogatur, *Quanto diutiùs conſidero, tantò mihi res videtur obſcurior*. Quemadmodum de ſpecu quodam Coricio narrat Pomponius Mela, qui primùm jucundâ quadam amœnitate allectat adeuntes ad ſe, donec altiùs, atque altiùs ingreſſos tandem horror quidam ac Majeſtas numinis illic inhabitantis pedem referre compellat (42). - - - - *What Tertullian imputes to ignorance, others have aſcribed to modeſty, and I wiſh the antient Philoſophers and Poets, and the heretics who came after them, had in this matter been as reſerved as Thales or Simonides were: They would never have attributed to the divine nature things ſo abſurd, impious, and blaſphemous, or ever have broached ſuch deteſtable errors, as bold, impudent, and deſpicable men have done. All men are naturally very deſirous of knowledge, but eſpecially of the Deity: whereby we may perceive that GOD would be known by us, but he hath ſet certain bounds to our knowledge, beyond which we neither ought nor can proceed, and hath as it were erected pillars, engraven, as it were, with his own finger, with a* Ne plus ultrà: *For in things divine, there are holy receſſes into which the great GOD will not permit us to enter; but if any, puffed up with raſhneſs and confidence, will preſumptuouſly attempt it, the further he goes, the more he will be ſurrounded by darkneſs, ſo that he will be obliged to acknowledge the unſearchable majeſty of the divine nature, and the imbecillity of the human mind, and confeſs with Simonides,* The longer I conſider, the matter appears to me the more obſcure. *As Pomponius Mela relates of a certain cave, that with a delightful pleaſure at firſt allured thoſe that entred, till going ſtill further, a certain horror, and the majeſty of the inhabiting Deity forced them to retire.*’ Afterwards, he quotes a remarkable paſſage of St Auguſtin (43). A French author looked upon Simonides's modeſty as a pious action, and took from thence occaſion to inveigh againſt the boldneſs of the Eunomians. ‘ Remember, *ſays he* (44), the pious modeſty of Simonides, who having aſked but one day of King Hiero, to diſcourſe of the divine eſſence before him, aſked him afterwards two days, and then three, proteſting that the more he thought upon it, the more he found it difficult to perform his promiſe. For my part, I make no doubt, but that this humble acknowledgment of his ignorance was more acceptable to the Supreme Being, as much a heathen as Simonides was, than the boldneſs of an Eunomius, and of that kind * of Arians, who followed him, and boaſted of comprehending God as fully as he could comprehend himſelf.’ Du Pleſſis Mornai, in the chapter wherein he proves by reaſons and authorities that it is impoſſible to comprehend God (45), did not forget Simonides's anſwer. He obſerves (46), without quoting any body, that this Poet *taught very well that GOD is wiſdom itſelf.* He ſays in another place (47), that *Ariſtotle in his Metaphyſics mentions and commends the known anſwer of Simonides to Hiero, importing in ſhort that none but GOD is a Metaphyſician, that is, can ſpeak of things that are above nature.* In peruſing the Metaphyſics of Ariſtotle I could not find that paſſage. But be that as it will, the thought is very good, and is of the ſame import.

When I ſaid that I have not in that work of Ariſtotle, met with that paſſage which Mr Du Pleſſis quotes, it was in reſpect of the circumſtances of that citation, namely, that it is an anſwer of Simonides to Hiero commended by Ariſtotle; for otherwiſe I found the following words in the ſecond chapter of the firſt book. Διὸ καὶ δικαίως ἂν οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνη νομίζοιτο αὐτῆς ἡ κτῆσις. πολλαχῆ γὰρ ἡ φύσις δούλη τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν. ὥστε κατὰ Σιμωνίδην, Θεὸς ἂν μόνος τοῦτο ἔχοιτο γέρας· ἄνδρα δ' οὐκ ἄξιον μὴ ζητεῖν τὴν καθ' αὐτὸν ἐπιστήμην. *Quocirca merito, ejus poſſeſſio non humana exiſtimari poteſt. Multis enim in rebus ſerva natura hominum eſt. Itaque ut Simonidi placet, ſolus Deus hunc ſibi honorem vindicat. At non decet virum eam ſcientiam, quæ ſibi congruit, non quærere* (48). Thoſe words amount to this: The knowledge of the firſt principles is ſo ſublime, that it might be reaſonably ſaid, that the poſſeſſion of it does not belong to man; and therefore, according to Simonides, that poſſeſſion is the privilege of God only: But it were an unbecoming thing for man not to endeavour to know himſelf, or to neglect the knowledge that concerns him. I fancy, that if I had lived in Ariſtotle's time, I ſhould have found his thought clearer than it is: However, I can find nothing in it, whereby it may appear that he commends or approves Simonides's opinion, and I have read ſome Commentators, who directly affirm that he confutes it. Fonſeca making a paraphraſtical note upon thoſe words of Ariſtotle puts in the margin *Refutatio ſententiæ Simonidis*. Here is the text which anſwers to that ſummary. ‘ Adeo compertum eſt hanc ſcientiam non eſſe humanam poſſeſſionem, ut inde ſumpſerit Simonides poëta ſui erroris occaſionem. Monebat enim iis tantùm ſcientiis dandam eſſe hominibus operam, quæ cum mortali vita congruerent; proinde hanc ſcientiam, quæ de divinis rebus inſtituitur, relinquendam eſſe Deo, diviniſque ſubſtantiis, quod ſit ſupra humanum captum. Cui inepto conſilio, & virilis animi magnitudine indigno reſpondet Ariſtoteles, *Non decere virum eam ſcientiam negligere, quæ maximè intellectui congruat*, neque enim eſt putanda aliena ab humana natura, cujus præcipua pars eſt mens ipſa (49). - - - - *That this knowledge* (viz. *of a GOD*) *is not in man's poſſeſſion, is a truth ſo well known, that it occaſioned the error of Simonides. For he adviſed that men ſhould apply only to thoſe ſciences, which concerned this mortal life; wherefore that knowledge which concerns things divine, is to be left to GOD and divine beings, becauſe it ſurpaſſes human capacity. To which unwiſe advice, unbecoming the excellency of the human ſoul, Ariſtotle hath given this anſwer,* viz. That a man ought not to neglect that knowledge, which ſuits beſt to his mind; for that is not to be thought foreign to human nature, ſince the mind is the chief part of it.’ He will have it (50) that Ariſtotle condemns a like thought of Simonides in another place, and that this Poet is hinted at in the following words: Χρὴ δὲ οὐ κατὰ

(42) Leſcaloperius in Ciceron. de Natura Deorum, *lib. i, pag.* 84, 85.

(43) Certè hoc eſt Deus, quod & cùm dicitur, non poteſt dici: cùm æſtimatur, non poteſt æſtimari: cùm comparatur, non poteſt comparari: cùm definitur, ipsâ definitione creſcit. *Auguſtin. Sermone de tempore CIX*, apud *Leſcaloperium*, ibid. pag. 85.

(44) La Mothe le Vayer. Letter cxvi, *pag.* 26. *of the* 12*th vol. Edit. in* 12*mo*.

* Theodor. l. hær. fabul.

(45) It is the 4th chapter of his book concerning the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

(46) Ibid. *fol. m.* 35.

(47) Ibid. *ch. xx, fol.* 266, *verſo. There is in the Latin edition of that book of Du Pleſſis, pag. m.* 446. Ariſtoteles tritum illud Simonidis ad Hieronem laudat, *de rebus*, inquit, *quæ præter naturam Deo ſoli credendum.*

(48) Ariſtotel. Metaphyſ. *lib. i, cap. ii, pag. m.* 644, *E.*

(49) Fonſeca in Ariſt. Metaphyſ. *lib. i, cap. ii, pag. m.* 99, 100.

(50) Id. ibid. *See alſo* Theophil. Raynaud, Theol. Natur. *pag.* 1.

made the ſame acknowledgment he did, that he could not give a definition of God [G]. His

τȣ̀ς παραινȣ̃ντας, ἀνθρώπινα φρονεῖν, ἄνθρωπον ὄντα, ȣ̓δὲ θνητὰ τὸν θνητὸν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ὅσον ἐνδέχεται ἀπαθανατίζειν, καὶ ἅπαντα ποιεῖν πρὸς τὸ ζῆν κατὰ τὸ κράτισον τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ. *Neque nos oportet humana ſapere ac ſentire, ut quidam monent, cum ſimus homines: neque mortalia, cum mortales: ſed nos ipſos, quoad ejus fieri poteſt, à mortalitate vindicare, atque omnia facere, ut ei noſtri parti, quæ in nobis eſt optima, convenienter vivamus* (51). If this be true, this ſentence ought to be placed among thoſe of Simonides: *viz.* ſince we are but men, our knowledge ſhould be but human; and ſince we are mortal, we ought to be contented with the knowledge of things mortal. We ſhall ſee another miſtake of Du Pleſſis Mornai. The firſt conſiſts in affirming that the abovementioned ſaying of Simonides was approved by Ariſtotle.

We find in Plato's Protagoras (52), that that ſaying was in a poem inſcribed to Scopas, ſon of Creon the Theſſalian. It was not therefore an anſwer to King Hiero: And it is to be obſerved that the thing ſpoken of in that place is not ſcience but virtue: and that therefore it might be ſaid, that Ariſtotle's application is not right; or that our Poet made uſe of the ſame thought ſometimes with reſpect to moral, and ſometimes in relation to intellectual qualities. Plato is very particular in his diſcuſſion of ſome verſes, wherein Simonides had ſaid, that it is a difficult thing to become a perfectly honeſt man, and that Pittacus was very much miſtaken in ſaying, that it is a difficult thing to continue an honeſt man. Ὅτι ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν, χερσί τε καὶ ποσὶ καὶ νόῳ τετράγωνον, ἄνευ ψόγȣ τετυγμένον. *Difficile eſſe virum vere bonum fieri, manibus pedibuſque & mente ad amuſſim quadratis* (53). Χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι. *Difficile eſt bonum manere* (54). One of Plato's interlocutors maintains that thoſe words of Simonides are contradictory. Another maintains they are not, and underſtands them in this ſenſe: It is a difficult thing to become an honeſt man, and impoſſible to continue ſo always; and therefore Pittacus is miſtaken, for he ſuppoſes it is poſſible for a man to perſevere in the practice of virtue: Had he not believed the poſſibility of it, he would not have ſaid that it is a difficult thing. This explication is proved by a ſentence of Simonides, inſerted in the ſame place, which imports, that it is the privilege of God alone to be always good (55). Ὅτὶ θεὸς ἂν μόνος ἔχοι τȣ̃το γέρας. *Quod ſolus Deus hoc munere frui dignus ſit.*

[G] *Some Divines would not have made the ſame acknowledgment he did, that he could not give a definition of GOD.*] A proof of this may be ſeen in the preceding remark; but here is an author who ſpeaks more plainly to the purpoſe. It is the famous Peter Charron, a Prebend of Condom. ‘The Deity, *ſays he* (56), being ſo high, far removed from us, and above our capacity, that we know not at all what he is, either afar off or near, it is on one ſide, the greateſt and moſt outrageous preſumption to decide and determine concerning him, as the Atheiſts do: who in all their objections ſpeak of him as of a limited Being, circumſcribed, and of neceſſity ſuch and ſuch, ſaying, if there were a God, he muſt have been ſo and ſo; and being ſo, he would, ſhould, and might, do this thing, and the other which is not done: *Ergo:* on the other hand, it is an error to think to find any reaſon ſufficiently demonſtrative to prove and eſtabliſh evidently and neceſſarily what God is: at which we ought not to be ſurpriſed, but might well remain aſtoniſhed if we ſhould meet with ſuch. For it is not poſſible that human comprehenſion, nor the capacity of any created being, ſhould be able to reach ſo far . . . Deity, is what cannot be known, nay even perceived, between finite and infinite there is no proportion, no tranſition: infinity is altogether inacceſſible, nay imperceptible, God is the one, true, and only infinite. The moſt exalted underſtanding, the higheſt ſtretch of imagination, are as far from comprehending him, as the loweſt and meaneſt apprehenſion. The greateſt Philoſopher, and the moſt learned Divine, know not more or leſs of God, than the meaneſt tradeſman. Where there is no paſſage, no way, no acceſs, there can be neither far nor near . . . God, Deity, Eternity, Omnipotence, Infinity, are only words, and nothing more to us: they are not things that can fall under human underſtanding . . . . If all we ſpeak and affirm concerning God were rigourouſly canvaſſed, it would be found only vanity and ignorance. Wherefore it was the ſaying of a great and antient Doctor, that, *To ſpeak of GOD even the things that were true, was moſt dangerous.* The reaſon of which ſentence is, becauſe not only ſuch and ſo ſublime truths were debaſed in paſſing through our ſenſes, underſtandings, and mouths, but we even do not know, nor can be certain, that they are true. It is by chance we find them: for we are altogether blind, and know neither what he is, nor what he operates. But to ſpeak of God with doubting and uncertainty, and as it were groping in the dark, and by conjecture, is dangerous, and we know not if God will approve it; unleſs it be becauſe we have ſuch confidence in his goodneſs, that he takes well what is ſaid of him with a good intention, and to honour him as much as we can. But, beſides, who knows if this reliance on him is pleaſing to him, and that the divine goodneſs is ſuch as to accept what is done with a good intention, and to do him honour? This indeed is the duty and effect of human goodneſs, created, and finite: but who knows if that which is divine, uncreated, and infinite, be of a like nature? And even it is not univerſally agreed, as to that which is human, what are its rules and offices . . . Therefore the fitteſt courſe that can be taken by one that is deſirous to think, and to frame an idea of the Deity, is, that the ſoul, after an univerſal abſtraction from all things, raiſing itſelf above all, as in a vacuum, indeterminate, and boundleſs, with a profound and pure ſilence, an awful aſtoniſhment, an admiration full of a timorous humility, raiſe in it ſelf an imagination of a luminous abyſs, without bottom, without banks, without ſhores, without high or low, without laying hold upon, or attaching itſelf to any thing preſent to the imagination, only to loſe itſelf, to be immerged, and yield itſelf to be ſwallowed up in that infinity. To which come very near theſe antient ſentences of the ſaints. The true knowledge of God is an intire ignorance of him. To approach God is to know him to be a light unacceſſible, and to be ſwallowed up by it. It is knowing him in ſome meaſure to be ſenſible, that being above all, he cannot be known: eloquently to praiſe him, is with aſtoniſhment and terror to be ſilent, and in ſilence to adore him in the ſoul. But becauſe it is extremely difficult, and next to impoſſible for the ſoul, to remain in ſo uncertain and unconfined an infinity (for ſhe would be bewildred, and at a ſtand) like one, who confounded by the turning of his head, not any more knowing where he is, lets himſelf fall down: and although ſhe could, being ſtupified, uncapable of moving, and ſeized with terror and admiration, ſhe would not be able in any manner to have communion with God, to pray to him, call upon him, acknowledge him, honour him; which are the firſt and principal points of all religion: for in theſe performances, it is neceſſary, that he be conceived with ſome quality, good, powerful, wiſe, underſtanding, accepting our good intentions: It is neceſſary, and cannot be otherwiſe in this preſent ſtate of life, that every one frame and repreſent to himſelf an image of the Deity, which he may regard, addreſs, adhere to, and which may be as his God. This the ſoul does, by raiſing her imagination above all things, and conceiving with all her might an infinite goodneſs, power, and perfection. For the utmoſt and higheſt degree, any one can riſe to by the greateſt ſtretch of apprehenſion, is his God, and ſerves him for an image of the deity: an image nevertheleſs falſe, that is, deficient and imperfect: For the deity being, as hath been ſaid, unimaginable and infinite, to which the ſoul cannot be ſaid to approach by any conception, either near or far off, nor can form any true image, more than of a thing it knows not at all; it is ſufficient that ſhe make it the leaſt falſe, leaſt imperfect, the moſt high, and the moſt pure ſhe can.’ Thouſands of readers who ſhall find theſe thoughts of a ſublime genius in this Dictionary, had never known

(51) Ariſtot. Moral. *lib. x, cap. vii, pag. m.* 102, *H.*

(52) Plato, in Protagora, *pag.* 235, *E.*

(53) Id. ibid.

(54) Id. ibid. *pag.* 236, *A.*

(55) Plato, in Protagora, *pag.* 237, *D. See alſo pag.* 239, *C.*

(56) Pierre Charron, des trois Veritez, *livr. i, ch. v.*

His anſwer to a King of Lacedemon produced the ſame effect as that of Solon to Crœſus [*H*]. Another anſwer is aſcribed to him very like that of the Philoſopher, who boaſted that he carried about him his whole eſtate [*I*]. What he anſwered to Hiero's wife, ought not to be taken in a literal ſenſe [*K*]. It was rather a jeſt than a ſerious declaration

them had I not recited them. This is the reaſon I cauſed them to be inſerted in this remark.

It will poſſibly be ſaid, that Charron is a Divine too much ſuſpected to deſerve that his principles ſhould be regarded. We will remove this objection, and ſay that Arnobius has expreſſed himſelf in ſuch a manner, as will highly juſtify the anſwer of Simonides. Has he not ſaid that our words can expreſs nothing concerning the nature of God, and that we ought to be ſilent, if we would form an idea of him; and to the end that our looſe conjectures may make ſome ſearch into this matter, as under a cloud, and in the dark, we ought to ſhut cloſe our mouth? ‘O maxime, ô ſumme rerum inviſibilium procreator! ô ipſe inviſe, & nullis unquam comprehenſe naturis! . . . Prima . . . tu cauſa es, locus rerum ac ſpacium, fundamentum cunctorum quæcunque ſunt, infinitus, ingenitus, immortalis, perpetuus, ſolus, quem nulla delineat forma corporalis, nulla determinat circumſcriptio, qualitatis expers, quantitatis, ſine ſitu, motu, & habitu, de quo nihil dici & exprimi mortalium potis eſt ſignificatione verborum: qui, ut intelligaris, tacendum eſt; atque, ut per umbram te poſſit errans inveſtigare ſuſpicio, nihil eſt omnino mutiendum (57). - - *O immenſe, O ſupreme Creator of things inviſible! O thou unſeen, and uncomprehended by any beings! . . . Thou art the firſt cauſe, the place of beings, and the ſpace, the foundation of all things that are, infinite, unbegotten, immortal, everlaſting, alone, whom no corporeal form can repreſent, no limits can bound, without quality, quantity, without ſituation and motion, of whom nothing can be ſaid or expreſſed in the language of mortal men: of whom, that thou mayſt be known, we muſt be ſilent; and that wandring ſuſpicion may ſearch thee out in the dark, nothing is even to be uttered.*’ It would be no ſmall ignorance to tell me, that this paſſage ought to be reckoned amongſt the errors of Arnobius; for all who have read his Commentators may have ſeen, that the moſt orthodox Fathers of the Church have agreed with him in his opinion (58). Be pleaſed to read the Commentators on theſe words of Minucius Felix. ‘Nobis ad intellectum pectus anguſtum eſt: & ideo ſic eum (*Deum*) digne æſtimamus, dum inæſtimabilem dicimus. Eloquar quemadmodum ſentio, magnitudinem Dei, qui ſe putat noſſe, minuit; qui non vult minuere, non novit. Nec nomen Deo quæras (59). - - - *Our mind is too narrow to comprehend; and therefore we eſteem GOD as we ought when we believe him ineſtimable: I will plainly declare what I think, whoever believes that he knows the immenſity of GOD does diminiſh it: he that will not leſſen it, owns he knows it not. Neither do thou ſeek for the name of GOD.*’ You ſhall find that they refer you to innumerable paſſages wherein the antient Fathers agree with Arnobius in this matter. And obſerve, that the Jeſuit Leſcaloperius alledges thoſe very words of Minutius Felix, to confirm the remark he had made, that the wiſeſt and moſt modeſt Philoſophers confeſs every where, that God is not only inviſible and inexpreſſible, but alſo unintelligible. *Sapientiſſimi quique ac modeſtiſſimi philoſophorum Deum* ἄγνωστον, *non intelligibilem,* ἀειδῆ *minimè ſpectabilem,* ἄῤῥητον καὶ ἀνεκφώνητον indicibilem, &, *ſi fas,* invocabilem, innominabilem, *ubique confitentur, at nihil hunc in locum afferri poteſt illuſtrius, quàm quod habet Minutius Felix*(60).

[*H*] *His anſwer . . . produced the ſame effect as that of Solon to Crœſus* (61).] Pauſanias ſitting at table with Simonides, ordered him to ſpeak ſome ſentence. *Remember,* anſwered he, *that you are a man.* This ſaying appeared ſo inſipid to Pauſanias, that he did not mind it; but when he happened to be in a place of refuge, where he ſtruggled with an intolerable hunger, and out of which he could not come, without running the hazard of being put to death, a misfortune he brought upon himſelf by his ambition, he remembered the words of that Poet, and cried out three times, *O Simonides! how important was the meaning of the exhortation you gave me* (62)! Τηνικαῦτα ἐμνήσθη τοῦ Σιμωνίδου, καὶ ἐξεβόησεν εἰς τρὶς, ὦ ξένε Κεῖε, μέγα τι ἄρα χρῆμα ἦν ὁ λόγος σου, ἐγὼ δὲ ὑπ' ἀνοίας οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ᾤμην εἶναι. *Tunc in mentem ei venit Simonidis, & ter magna voce exclamavit: O Cee hoſpes, magnum quiddam in tuo ſermone inerat, ego vero inani perſuaſione eram adductus, ut eum nullius momenti putarem* (63). It is certain, that if this ſentence were ſufficiently conſidered, and viewed with the eye of a Philoſopher, nothing would be more mortifying and inſtructive, than to think ſeriouſly that we are men. This comprehends all the weakneſs, miſery, and inconſtancy, that can be thought of.

[*I*] *Another anſwer is aſcribed to him . . . very like that of a Philoſopher, who boaſted that he carried about him his whole eſtate.*] It is ſaid that Simonides, in order to free himſelf from poverty, went about the great towns of Aſia, where he ſang for money the praiſes of conquerors. Being enriched by that means, he took ſhipping for the iſle of Ceos, his native country. The ſhip was caſt away: every body ſtrove to ſave himſelf with whatever he could carry. Simonides took nothing, and being aſked the reaſon of it, he anſwered (64), *It is becauſe all that I have is with me.* Several of his ſhip-wrecked companions were drowned, ſinking under the weight of what they had endeavoured to ſave. Thoſe who landed, were plundered by robbers: Every one went to Clazomenæ, a town not far from the place where the ſhip was caſt away. A citizen, who loved learning, and had read Simonides's poems with great admiration, knowing him, afforded him all neceſſaries, whilſt the reſt were forced to beg in the ſtreets. The Poet meeting them, told them his anſwer was right (65).

[*K*] *What he anſwered to Hiero's wife, ought not to be taken in a literal ſenſe.*] That princeſs deſired to know whether it was better to acquire learning than riches. Simonides anſwered her, That riches were better than learning; for, ſaid he, I ſee every day learned men waiting upon rich people (66). We muſt not believe that he indeed valued ſilver and gold more than learning; but he made uſe of a nice raillery to blame the diligence of the generality of men of letters, who court rich people, and endeavour to get ſome preſents from them. He himſelf was touched by his own jeſt, ſince he went to the court of Syracuſe, thro' a motive of intereſt; and on ſeveral other occaſions had made it his buſineſs to procure the means of life, and to mend his condition by the liberality of others. It might be ſaid alſo, that he preferred riches to learning, conſidering the advantage that accrues from them. It is manifeſt, that riches are more proper than learning to procure temporal advantages, and whatever is moſt earneſtly wiſhed for in human life. In this ſenſe it were true literally, that it is better to be rich than learned. I muſt not forget the reflexion that was made upon the proof alledged, by Simonides. It has been ſaid, that it is the part of Phyſicians to viſit ſick people, and that for the ſame reaſon, it is requiſite learned men ſhould frequently viſit thoſe that are rich. Here are two witty ſayings of an antient Philoſopher. Somebody was ſaying that he always ſaw the Philoſophers reſort to rich mens houſes; Ariſtippus anſwered him, *Do not Phyſicians go to ſick people, and yet no body would rather chuſe to be ſick than to be a Phyſician* (67). Another time Diogenes aſked him, *Why do Philoſophers viſit rich people, and how comes it that rich people do not viſit the Philoſophers?* His anſwer was (68), *It is becauſe the Philoſophers know what they want, but rich people do not know it.* Eraſmus explains that anſwer in the following manner: The Philoſophers are not ignorant that one cannot live without money, and therefore they aſk of thoſe that have it; but if rich men knew that they had need of learning, they would be more careful to make their court to the Philoſophers. I omit Eraſmus's moral reflexion; it may be ſeen in theſe Latin words. ‘Philoſophi ſciunt abſque pecunia vivi non poſſe: itaque petunt eos qui quod opus eſt dare poſſunt. Quòd ſi divites æquè intelligerent ſe egere ſapientia, multo magis tererent philoſophorum limina. Miſerior enim eſt egeſtas animi quam corporis: atque hoc miſerius egeni ſunt

‘divites

---

(57) Arnob. *lib. i, pag. m.* 17.

(58) See Elmenhorſt upon this paſſage of Arnobius, *pag. m.* 28, 29.

(59) Minut. Felix, *p. m.* 143.

(60) Leſcalop. in Cicer. de Natura Deor. *pag.* 2.

(61) See *Herodotus,* lib. i, cap. LXXXVI.

(62) See Cornelius Nepos in the Life of Pauſanias.

(63) Ælian. Var. Hiſtor. *lib. ix, cap. xli.* *See alſo* Plutarch, in Conſolat. ad Apollonium, *pag.* 105, *A.*

(64) Mecum inquit mea ſunt cuncta. *Phædrus, ubi infra.*

(65) Taken from Phædrus, *fab. xxi, lib. iv.*

(66) Ariſtoteles, Rhetoric. *lib. ii, cap. xvi, pag. m.* 438.

(67) Diogenes Laërtius, in Ariſtippo, *lib. ii, num.* 70.

(68) Id. ibid. *num.* 69.

declaration of his opinion. He acknowledged himſelf uncapable to deceive ſtupid people [*L*]. Some verſes, wherein he cenſured a maxim of Pittacus, were thought very difficult to be underſtood (*e*). It appears from the examination of thoſe verſes that he was none of thoſe ſevere Critics, who praiſe nothing but what ſeems to them perfectly good, and who cenſure the leaſt faults. He was infinitely more tractable, and could bear with human imperfections. He was well enough pleaſed with a man provided he was not very wicked (*f*). There would be no end, ſaid he, if we ſhould cenſure all thoſe who are guilty of follies. The number of fools is infinite, and I do not look upon earth for a man of an unblameable life. There is no ſuch man; and I ſhall never have occaſion to praiſe any on that account. It is enough for me that a man be tolerably good and free from crimes (*g*). He was of opinion that men ſhould uſe all the things of this life, as an amuſement and not too ſeriouſly to mind them (*h*). Though the chief character of his Poetry was a kind of a moving and ſoftning ſweetneſs, he made himſelf dreaded by ſharp invectives [*M*]. No body denies that he was an excellent Poet; and if it be conſidered that he reconciled two princes extremely incenſed, and actually at war againſt one another (*i*), it will be confeſſed that all his merit did not conſiſt in making very good verſes. He had doubtleſs many other qualities, which made him a conſiderable man; but his avarice is not to be excuſed, nor his mercenary pen [*N*]. His glory muſt needs fall upon that account; I mean they are ſhades, which inſtead of ſetting off the fineſt parts of

(*e*) See the remark [*F*] towards the end.

(*f*) Ἔμοιγε ἐξαρκεῖ ὃς ἂν μη κακὸς ᾖ, μηδ᾽ ἄγαν ἀπάλαμνος. Mihi ſatisfacit & ille quiſquis malus non eſt, nimiumve ignavus. *Plato, in Protag.* pag. 240.

(*g*) Ex Platone, *ibid.*

(*h*) Παίζειν ἐν τῷ βίῳ καὶ περὶ μηδὲν ἁπλῶς σπουδάζειν. Ut ludamus in vita, neque ulli rei ſtudeamus ſerio. *Theo, Progymn.* cap. v, pag. m. 84.

(*i*) *See the* Scholiaſt upon Pindar in Oden II, Olymp. *and the remark* [*C*] *of the article* HIERO I.

'divites quòd non intelligant, quàm pretioſa quamque 'neceſſaria re careant (69). - - - - *Philoſophers know 'that it is impoſſible to live without money, therefore 'they ſeek ſuch as can give what is wanted. But if 'the rich were ſenſible of their want of wiſdom, they 'would be much more aſſiduous at the houſes of Philoſophers. For the indigence of the mind is more miſerable than that of the body; and the more wretchedly indigent are the rich, becauſe they know not how precious, and how neceſſary a thing they want.*'

[*L*] *He acknowledged himſelf uncapable to deceive ſtupid people.*] Eraſmus did not forget, in his collection of Apophthegms, Simonides's anſwer to thoſe who aſked him, why he did not endeavour to engage the Theſſalians to give him ſomething, ſince he was ſo careful to get what he could in other countries: *Thoſe men*, ſaid he, *are not ingenious enough to be deceived by ſuch as I am* (70). I ſhall ſet down the whole paſſage of Eraſmus, becauſe it contains a good reflexion. *Idem* (Simonides) *quum cæteros laudando veneretur, ut aliquid darent, interrogatus cur non & Theſſalos captaret, Stupidiores ſunt, inquit, quàm ut à me falli poſſint. Qui quærunt cui imponant, ad ſtupidos eunt. At qui tam erant ſtupidi, ut non ſentirent ingenium poëmatum illius, nec tangerentur amore nominis in poſteros tranſmittendi, non poterant ab illo falli* (71). Eraſmus is in the right: thoſe who have a mind to deceive others, look for fools; but thoſe, who are too ſtupid to be ſenſible of the beauties of a poem, or to deſire a long fame, were not fit to be deceived by Simonides. A thought of Gorgias Leontinus may be applied to this ſubject. He had defined tragedy a deceit, wherein the deceiver is more juſt than he, who does not deceive, and he who is deceived is more knowing than he who is not deceived (72). Whereupon Daniel Heinſius makes this obſervation. 'A tantis viris poſſe decipi paucorum 'eſt: & illorum fere tantum, qui præſtantiam eorum, ſi non aſſequi re ipſa, mente ac intellectu æſtimare ac complecti poſſunt, qui cum aliquo judicio 'decipiuntur (73). - - - *Few are capable of being deceived by ſo great men, and almoſt only thoſe who have 'ſome confuſed notions of their excellency, can be deceived 'with ſome judgment.*' I have ſaid elſewhere (74), that a great captain complained that his enemies were ſo ſilly, that he could not ſucceed in his ſtratagems againſt them. I have ſaid alſo (75), that Balzac obſerved that the maids of his village were too ſilly to be deceived by a man of wit.

[*M*] *He failed not to make himſelf dreaded by ſharp invectives.*] Timocreon was his enemy (76). He was one of the Poets of the antient Comedy (77), and conſequently he knew how to rail, and did it with an impudent licentiouſneſs.

> Eupolis atque Cratinus, Ariſtophaneſque Poëtæ,
> Atque alii, quorum Comœdia priſca virorum eſt,
> Si quis erat dignus deſcribi, quòd malus, aut fur,
> Quòd mœchus foret, aut ſicarius, aut alioqui
> Famoſus; multâ cum libertate notabant (78).

> *Cratin and Eupolis, that laſh'd the age,*
> *Thoſe old Comedian furies of the ſtage;*
> *If they were to deſcribe a vile, unjuſt,*
> *And cheating knave, or ſcourge a lawleſs luſt,*
> *Or other crimes: regardleſs of his fame*
> *They ſhow'd the man, and boldly told his name.*'
>
> CREECH.

He compoſed a comedy againſt Simonides (79); and therefore it may be thought he uſed him ſeverely: neverthelеſs, ſome verſes are ſtill extant, wherein he confeſſes that he had been the ſufferer, and we have his epitaph made by Simonides. It is very abuſive. (80) Id non impune feciſſe (*Timocreontem*) colligo ex carminibus ejuſdem Timocreontis nondum editis, qui in ſemetipſum Simonidis dicacitatem accuſat, & plane vituperat metro Trochaico pentametro: Κατὰ μετάθεσιν τῆς λέξεως, dictionibus ſcilicet tranſpoſitis.

> Κήϊα μὲ προσῆλθε φλυαρία οὐκ ἐθέλοντα,
> Οὐκ ἐθέλοντά με προσῆλθε Κηΐα φλυαρία.

> Ceia me inceſſit importuna loquacitas invitum,
> Invitum me inceſſit Ceia importuna loquacitas

Extatque hodie num Simonidis Epigramma in Timocreontis ſepulchrum, quo injurias ſibi illatas ultus pulchre fuiſſe ſibi viſus eſt.

> Πολλὰ φαγὼν, καὶ πολλὰ πιὼν, καὶ πολλὰ κακ᾽ εἰπὼν
> Ἀνθρώπους κεῖμαι Τιμοκρέων Ῥόδιος.

> Cum multa comederim & multa biberim, multa mala dixerim
> Hominibus, jaceo Timocreon Rhodius (81).

I find in thoſe poems of Timocreon which have not yet been publiſhed, that he did not abuſe Simonides without ſuffering for it. He accuſes himſelf for the prating ſharpneſs of Simonides, and plainly blames it, ſaying, I was ſeized with the troubleſome loquacity of Simonides. *And there is ſtill extant an epigram of Simonides on the tomb of Timocreon, by which he thought he had handſomely revenged the injuries which had been done by him.* After I have eaten and drunken plentifully, and ſpoken a great deal of ill of men, here I lie, Timocreon of Rhodes.

[*N*] *His avarice is not to be excuſed, nor his mercenary pen.*] I know what he anſwered thoſe, who aſked him why he was ſo covetous in his old age; becauſe, ſaid he (82), I had rather leave ſomething to my enemies after my death, than want the aſſiſtance of my friends during my life. This anſwer is not altogether amiſs; for there is nothing one ought more carefully to avoid than to be chargeable to any body, or to depend upon the diſcretion and caprices of others: but Simonides ſhould not have been afraid of it; he might have avoided that misfortune, without being ſo intent upon getting money. Another anſwer, leſs tolerable than the firſt, is aſcribed to him. You may ſee that Plutarch does not approve of it. 'For not only, *Venus* of his picture, make them dark and ugly. Of all the ſayings that are aſcribed to him, I ſhall only mention this: he ſaid, that neceſſity was a thing which the gods themſelves would not oppoſe or reſiſt (*k*). His father, Leoprepes, hath deſerved to be mentioned for a good advice he gave to two young men [*O*]. Though Gyraldus's collections are very good (*l*), they do not equal thoſe of Allatius concerning our Simonides (*m*). He gives us the titles of all his Poems, as far as they can be known by the antient monuments that are extant; but we do not find there Simonides's egg, mentioned by Mr Blondel the Architect (*n*). Mr Blondel is miſtaken in this: he has confounded Simonides with Simmias Rhodius. If

---

(69) Eraſm. in Apophthegm. *lib. iii, in* Ariſtipp. *num.* 10, *pag. m.* 186.

(70) *I uſe the words of Mr le Fevre,* Journal du Journal, *pag.* 19. *Here are the words of Simonides,* Ἀμαθέστεροι γάρ εἰσιν ἢ ὡς ὑπ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐξαπατᾶσθαι. Plut. de audiend. Poëtis, *circa init. p.* 15.

(71) Eraſm. in Apophthegm. *lib. vi, pag. m.* 499, 500.

(72) Gorgias ille Leontinus . . . tragœdiam definiebat, *Fallaciam, qua qui deciperet, juſtior eo qui non deciperet, qui deciperetur, ſapientior eo qui non deciperetur, eſſet.* Daniel Heinſius, Orat. de utilitate, quæ ex lectione Tragœdiarum percipitur, *init. p. m.* 269. Plutarch. de audiendis Poëtis, *pag.* 15, *quotes that ſaying of Gorgias.*

(73) *Id.* Heinſius, *ibid.*

(74) In the article AGESILAUS II. remark [*C*].

(75) Above citation (9) of the article PYRRHO.

(76) Suidas, in Τιμοκρέων.

(77) Id. ibid.

(78) Horat. Sat. IV, lib. i, init.

(79) Suidas, in Τιμοκρέων.

(80) Leo Allatius, de Simeonum Scriptis, *pag.* 213.

(81) Athenæus, *lib. x, pag.* 415.

(82) Stobæus, Serm. VIII, *fol. m.* 55.

Venus to old men is averſe, ...

‘ as Euripides has it; but their appetite alſo to their meat and drink is for the moſt part dull, and as one would ſay, toothleſs; ſo that they have but little guſt and reliſh in them. They ought therefore to furniſh themſelves with pleaſures of the mind, not ungenerous or illiberal, as Simonides ſaid to thoſe, who reproached him with covetouſneſs, that being by his years deprived of other pleaſures, he recreated his old age with the only delight he took in heaping up riches. But the political life, or the management of the common-wealth, has in it pleaſures exceeding great, and no leſs honourable; being ſuch, as it is probable the very gods do only, or at leaſt chiefly enjoy themſelves in; and theſe are the delights which proceed from doing good, or being beneficial to many, and the glory of great and honourable actions (83).’ Had I curtailed this paſſage, I ſhould have left out ſome things, that may be profitable to the reader; but if he only draws from thence a proof of the avarice of our Poet, I ſhall be contented with it. His way of living was ſomewhat ſordid, as Chamæleon (84) rightly obſerved. Ὄντως δὲ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς κίμβιξ ὁ Σιμονίδης καὶ αἰσχροκερδὴς ὡς Χαμαιλέων φησίν. Fuit autem revera præparcus Simonides & quæſtus vel turpis avidus, ut ait Chamæleon (85). *But Simonides was indeed frugal to an exceſs, and covetous even of diſhoneſt gain.* Read this paſſage of Ælian: Οὐκ ὤκνησέ γε Σιμονίδης βαρὺς ὢν ὑπὸ γήρως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφικέσθαι· ἦν μὲν γὰρ καὶ φύσει φιλάργυρος ὁ Κεῖος· προὔτρεπε δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ πλέον ἡ τοῦ Ἱέρωνος φιλοδωρία φασί. Neque Simonidem impedivit ſenectus profunda, quo minus ad eum veniret. Erat enim Ceus avidiſſimus pecuniæ, magiſque ipſum commovit Hieronis propenſus ad largiendum animus, ut fama eſt (86). *Nor did the great age of Simonides keep him from going to Hiero: for the Cean was exceeding covetous, and it is ſaid that the great generoſity of Hiero the more readily induced him to it.* He was never at a loſs for an anſwer when aſked why he took ſuch pleaſure in ſaving: but his anſwers, as has been ſeen above, were far from being ſatisfactory. Whilſt he was at Syracuſe, the king ſupplied him plentifully from day to day, with every thing that was neceſſary for his maintenance. He ſold the greateſt part of it, and alledged for his reaſon, that he had a mind to ſhew his frugality, and Hiero's magnificence (87): which was a poor ſubterfuge.

He has been blamed for being the firſt that let out the Muſes for hire: which, I think, ought not to be underſtood as if the Poets, who lived before him, had refuſed rewards. I believe they had an eye to the preſents and liberalities of thoſe, for whom they ſung, and that they made heavy complaints againſt thoſe ungrateful men, who gave them nothing, or gave them too little. How then ſhall we underſtand theſe reproachful words of Callimachus?

Οὐ γὰρ ἐργάτιν τρέφω
Τὴν μοῦσαν, ὡς ὁ Κεῖος Ὑλλίχου νέπους.

Non enim mercenariam alo
Muſam, ut Ceus ille Hyllichi nepos (88).

My Muſe, *ſays he*, is not mercenary like that of Simonides. The latter was taxed with the ſame fault by Anacreon (89), and it is thought Pindar levelled a like ſtroke at him, when he ſpoke of a certain time when the Muſes were not yet mercenary.

ἁ μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής
πω τότ' ἦν, οὐδ' ἐργάτις,
οὐδ' ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖαι
μελίφθογγοι ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας,
ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα,
μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί (90).

Theſe Greek verſes are thus paraphraſed by Benedictus. ‘ Nondum enim Muſa lucri amans erat, nec quemadmodum operarii operam mercede locabat. Neque à Terpſichore Lyricorum magiſtra dulces cantilenæ, molli vocis ſono pronuntiandæ, ſuaque ſuavitate adblandientes, atque argenti in fronte mentionem facientes vendebantur. - - - - *For the Muſes were not yet become lovers of gain; nor, like labourers, hired themſelves out for money. Nor did Terpſichore, the miſtreſs of Lyric Poets, ſet to ſale her pleaſing ſongs, to be ſoftly pronounced, flattering with their ſoft ſweetneſs, and mentioning money in the beginning.*’ If it be ſo, we muſt ſuppoſe that Simonides introduced an innovation, which conſiſted in making verſes for a ſet price. He would not ſing upon truſt, nor rely on the generoſity of his heroes: he would have, firſt of all, his wages agreed upon; and, perhaps, he deſired ſometimes to be paid before hand, or, at leaſt, took an earneſt. However it be, he does not deſerve to be reckoned among the inventers of good things; he ought to be placed among thoſe who have depraved or corrupted good cuſtoms. He diſhonoured the Muſes by his mercenary ſpirit, and diſgracefully became a proverb (91). We are told (92), that he uſed to ſay, I have two trunks, one for ſalaries, and the other for favours; I open them from time to time, and I always find the trunk of ſalaries full, and that of favours empty. He needed not wonder at it; for ſince he did nothing *gratis*, he could not pretend to free gifts, but only to be paid according to his agreement he had made with his heroes. Perhaps, he intended only thereby to excuſe the precautions he uſed. How do we know but this might be the thought: I had prepared two trunks, one for what I ſhould receive by way of gift, and the other for what I ſhould receive by way of payment: I never found any thing in the firſt, and therefore I have ſet a price to my poems: It has turned to a good account; the trunk for payments is always full. Some will have it, that by the trunk for favours, he meant thanks: if ſo, his meaning would be, that the trunk of thanks was of no uſe to him. He thought fit to ſearch for ſome aſſiſtance from it, but never found any (93).

We read in Phædrus's Fables, that Simonides went about the towns of Aſia to get money by ſinging the praiſes of conquerors. The editions have *Mercede accepta laudem victorum canens* (94); but ſeveral Critics maintain, it ſhould be *pacta* inſtead of *accepta*, becauſe he uſed to make a bargain before hand. Which appears from another paſſage of the ſame Phædrus (95). This alſo appears from a ſtory mentioned in Ariſtotle's Rhetoric. A man, who got the prize of the race, deſired Simonides to make a triumphal ſong upon that ſubject: the Poet not being ſatisfied with the reward offered to him, anſwered, he could not treat that ſubject worthily; for that victory had been obtained in a race with mules, and he pretended that a mule did not afford matter for an encomium. But having a better price offered him, and at laſt ſuch as he thought ſufficient, he then made the Poem according to that man's deſire (96).

[*O*] *His father, Leoprepes, hath deſerved to be mentioned for a good advice he gave to two young men.*] Two good friends aſked him which was their beſt way to

---

(*k*) Ἀνάγκη οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται. Cum neceſſitate neque Dii pugnant. *Suidas, in* Σιμωνίδης, *pag.* 741.

(*l*) Gyrald. Dial. IX de Poëtar. Hiſtor. *p.* 462, *& ſeq.*

(*m*) Allatius de Simeonum Scriptis, *pag.* 207, *& ſeq.*

(*n*) In his *Comparaiſon de Pindare d'Horace*, pag. 32, Dutch edition. That fault has been obſerved in the remarks publiſhed in French, by a Dutch Advocate upon that work of Mr Blondel, at Rotterdam 1701.

(83) Plut. an ſeni ſit gerenda Reſpubl. *pag.* 786.

(84) He wrote the Life of Simonides.

(85) Athen. *lib. xiv, pag.* 656.

(86) Ælian. Var. Hiſtor. *lib. ix, cap. i.*

(87) Ὅπως εἶπεν ἥτε Ἱέρωνος μεγαλοπρέπεια καταφανὴς ᾖ, καὶ ἡ ἐμὴ κοσμιότης. Ut perſpecta ſit inquit, & Hieronis magnificentia & mea temperantia. *Athen.* lib. xiv, pag. 656.

(88) Callimach. in Fragm. *p.* 337, *Edit. Grævii* 1697.

(89) See Tzetzes, *Chil. viii, num.* 228.

(90) Pindar. Od. II, Iſthm. *p. m.* 675.

(91) See Eraſmus upon the proverb *Simonidis cantilenæ*, Chil. II, Centur. IX, num. 12.

(92) Plut. de Curioſitate, *p.* 520.

(93) See Ritterſhuſius upon Phædrus, *pag.* 381, *Edit.* 1698.

(94) Phædr. Fab. XXI, *lib. iv.*

(95) Simonides . . . victoris laudem cuidam Pyctæ ut ſcriberet CERTO condixit PRETIO. *Id. Fab. XXIV*, lib. iv,

(96) *Ex Ariſtot.* Rhetor. *lib. iii, cap. ii.*

If I have any thing to ſay againſt Moreri in the following Article.

to render their friendſhip perpetual. You muſt never be angry, ſaid he, one with another at the ſame time; but one of you muſt ſhew reſpect to the anger of the other (97). It is a very judicious advice.

(97) Ælianus, Var. Hiſtor. *lib. iv, cap. xxiv.*

SIMONIDES, ſon of the daughter of the foregoing, was a native of the iſle of Ceos: ſome think he was ſirnamed Melicertes [*A*]. He flouriſhed before the Peloponneſian war, and writ three books of Genealogies, and three books of inventions (*a*). I ſhall take notice of ſome ſmall faults in Moreri's Dictionary [*B*]. Though there have been ſeveral Simonides's (*b*), It would be I think a difficult thing to name any of them that lived with Phalaris [*C*].

(*a*) Taken from Suidas.

(*b*) *See* Voſſius, de Poëtis Græcis, *pag.* 14.

[*A*] *Some think that he was ſirnamed Melicertes.*] They are miſtaken. This is not Suidas's meaning; but Voſſius aſcribes it to him, when he ſays that Simonides the grandfather, was ſirnamed Melicertes (1).

[*B*] *I ſhall take notice of ſome ſmall faults in Moreri's Dictionary.*] I ſhall take notice of thoſe, which concern the other Simonides. I. Moreri, ſays that *he was eſteemed in the LXVth Olympiad*, and that he died in the LXXXVIIIth, being eighty-nine years old. This is a wrong calculation. Simonides was at leaſt twenty years of age when he came to be in repute; and therefore, according to Moreri, he ſhould have been born in the LXth Olympiad: from whence it follows, that he would have died at 112 years old, or thereabouts, if he had lived till the LXXXVIIIth Olympiad. If Moreri ſhews himſelf a ſorry Arithmetician in that reſpect, he makes it appear alſo, that he knew not how to tranſcribe the author quoted by him (2), for that author places the birth of Simonides in the LVIth Olympiad, and his death in the LXXVIIIth Olympiad: which will make up the eighty-nine years of life, that he gives him. II. Moreri mentions one *Simonide de Melece* (they are his words) *more antient* than the Lyric Poet, and, in all likelihood, the inventor of four letters of the Greek alphabet. Here is a very childiſh overſight; for theſe words *Simonide de Melece*, are the tranſlation of theſe, *Simonides Melicus*, which ſignify *Simonides the Lyric Poet*, and which Moreri had read in Voſſius. I could wiſh, for the honour of Voſſius, that theſe two lines were not to be found in the fourteenth page of his book, concerning the Greek Poets. 'Simonides Melicus qui temporibus belli Medici vixit, 'quatuor vel quinque literas alphabeto finito adjecit, 'atque ita illud primus abſolvit. - - - - *Simonides, the* '*Lyric Poet, who lived in the time of the* Bellum 'Medicum, *added four or five letters to the alphabet,* '*and ſo was the firſt who compleated it.*' He refers this to the XXIXth Olympiad: but we know not what he means by his *Bellum Medicum* at that time. Beſides, when in the LVth Olympid he mentions Simonides, who makes the ſubject of the foregoing article, he calls him a Lyric Poet, and aſcribes to him the invention of four letters (3). Whereby the reader is induced to believe, that he mentions the ſame Poet twice, and that he makes him flouriſh from the XXIXth Olympiad till the LXXVth (4). I confeſs he obſerves in the fourteenth page, that Simonides, placed by Euſebius in the XXIXth Olympiad, cannot be he that was born at Ceos; but why then does he call them both Lyric Poets, and aſcribe to them the invention of four letters? But to return to Moreri. III. He ſays that Simonides the younger *was the ſon of a ſiſter* of the other Simonides. He ſhould have ſaid *the ſon of a daughter*. He ſtumbled in a fair way, ſince he miſunderſtood theſe words of Voſſius, *Simonides junior, Simonidis Lyrici è filia nepos* (5). IV. Moreri ſhould not have aſcribed ſome poems to him, ſince Suidas aſcribes none to him, and ſeeing Voſſius does not reckon him among the Poets. *Ambigo an & in Poëtis ei ſit locus* (6). V. Why does Moreri aſcribe to him *a treatiſe concerning things lately invented?* Does Suidas, or any other writer, mention that circumſtance? Were it not an abſurd thing to ſay, that Polydore Virgil wrote a book, wherein he treats of thoſe who had lately invented ſome things?

[*C*] *It would be . . . . a difficult thing to name one* Simonides, *that lived with Phalaris.*] I have read a thing in Voſſius's letters, which gives me occaſion to make this remark. Voſſius being uneaſy on account of his friend Puteanus, who was brought into trouble for a political book, wiſhes his enemies may be contented to tell him what Phalaris did adviſe Simonides, *Mind only the Muſes* (7). Doubtleſs there is here a ſlip of memory: I thought at firſt, that Voſſius had ſaid Phalaris inſtead of Hiero; from whence I concluded that Simonides concerned himſelf with ſome court intrigue, that was like to bring him into trouble: but at laſt, I found out where the miſtake lay. Voſſius named Simonides inſtead of Steſichorus, for it is Steſichorus whom Phalaris exhorted to meddle no more with ſtate-affairs, and to mind only his Muſes: Μέλοιεν δέ σοι μȣσῶν εὐκλεεῖς πόνοι. *Curæ tibi ſint præclara muſarum ſtudia* (8).

(1) Simonides Ceus ex filia nepos fuit Simonidis Lyrici, cognomento Melicertæ qui memoriæ artem inveniſſe dicitur. *Voſſius, de Hiſt. Græcis, lib. iv, cap. vi, p.* 454.

(2) Viz. *Suidas.*

(3) Voſſius, de Poëtis Græcis, *pag.* 20.

(4) *He ſays he writ a Poem upon the battle of Salamis.* Scripſit, *ſays he*, navale prælium ad Salaminem quod commiſſum Olympiade LXXV. *Id. ibid.*

(5) Id. ibid. *pag.* 34. *See alſo the ſame* Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græcis, *p.* 454.

(6) *Idem*, de Poëtis Græcis, *pag.* 34.

(7) Utinam non aliud audire cogatur quam quod olim in ſimili fere negotio à Phalaride aiunt fuiſſe dictum Simonidi, μέλοειν σοὶ μȣσῶν εὐκλέεῖς πόνοι. Voſſius, Epiſt. CXCIX, *pag. m.* 218. *See above citation* (22) *of the article* PUTEANUS.

(8) Phalaris, Epiſt. CXLVII, *pag.* 141, *Edit. Oxon.* 1695.

SIMONIDES (SIMON) one of the beſt Latin Poets of the XVIth century, was born at Lemberg in Poland, and after having gone through a courſe of Philoſophy at Cracovia, he went to Italy to compleat his ſtudies; from whence he returned, ſo well ſtored with learning that John Zamoſki, the greateſt hero that was in Poland, choſe him for his ſecretary, and ſhewed him much affection, and procured him the honour of knighthood. Pope Clement VIII honoured him with the poetic garland. Juſtus Lipſius gives him very great praiſes, comparing him to Catullus, and maintaining that his poeſy might have raiſed the jealouſy of the Antients (*a*). Simonides entertained in his houſe at Lemburg in the year 1597, with a very ſingular affection, George Douza in his journey to Conſtantinople, who was the ſon of Janus Douza, a good Poet, and good Humaniſt. This procured him an encomium to be ſeen below, together with the title of his Poems [*A*].

(*a*) *Taken from* Starovolſcius in Centum Script. Polon. *pag.* 130, 131.

[*A*] *An encomium to be ſeen below, with the title of his poems.*] George Douza writing to his father a relation of his journey, ſpeaks thus of his ſtay at Lemberg: 'Huic urbi (*Leopoli*) plurimum me debere fa'teor quod hic cum Simone Simonide hoſpitium & 'amicitiam contrahere licuerit: qui Vir quanto orche'ſtræ plauſu Parnaſſi collem inſtiterit, è Scriptis ejus 'editis Ælinopæane videlicet, & caſto Joſepho, tum 'Joëlis illâ Paraphraſi ſatis ſuperque conſtare arbi'tror (1). - - - - *To this city* (*Lemberg*) *I confeſs I am* '*much indebted, becauſe here I had opportunity to lodge in* '*the houſe of Simon Simonides, and to obtain his friend*'*ſhip: with how much applauſe of the learned this man* '*appeared upon Parnaſſus, is, I think, ſufficiently ma*'*nifeſt from the works which he publiſhed, namely, his* '*Ælinopæane, his Joſephus, and his paraphraſe on Joel.*' His father wrote him a letter from Conſtantinople, wherein he expreſſed his gratitude for the good offices of Simonides, and his eſteem he had long entertained for the poems of that Poliſh gentleman. 'Ne'ſcis,

(1) Georg. Douza, de Itinere ſuo Conſtant. *pag.* 14.

‘ ſcis, mi fili, quantâ cum animi voluptate illam Epiſtolæ tuæ particulam legendo ruminaverim, ubi non modo tanti viri (*Interpretis Polonici, natione Armenii*) faventiam ultrò tibi oblatam gloriaris ac prædicas: verum etiam incomparabilis Viri Simonis Simonidis benevolentiæ fores jam pridem patefactas aditum tibi porrò ad doctiſſimi illius ac diſertiſſimi Interpretis amicitiam concinnaſſe. . . . . Nunc ceſſator eſſe cogor, ac commodiori tempori hoc ſcribendi officium reſervare, præſertim ad Simonem Simonidem, quem virum ego jam pridem ex Scriptis editis, Ælinopæane puta, atque Odis Pindaricis tum Joëlis Paraphraſi illâ Poëticâ multò quæſitiſſimâ, procul diſſitus licet, & veneratus ſum & admiratus (2). - - - *You cannot think, dear ſon, with what ſatisfaction I read that part of your letter, wherein you not only mention the friendſhip which ſo great a man* (the Poliſh interpreter, by nation an Armenian) *offered to you of his own accord; but alſo that the obliging incomparable Simonides, by having received you kindly into his own houſe, has given ſome acceſs to the friendſhip of that moſt learned and moſt eloquent interpreter . . . . but now I am obliged to put off to a more convenient opportunity my thanks, eſpecially to Simon Simonides, a man whom I have long honoured and admired, tho' at a great diſtance, becauſe of the works he hath publiſhed, namely, Ælinopæane, his Pindaric Odes, and his poetical Paraphraſe on Joel, which hath been much ſought after.*’

Beſides the poems, whoſe titles I have already mentioned, Simonides compoſed *Hercules prodicius: Pantezilea: Flagellum livoris: Odæ in victoriam, nuptias, atque obitum Samoſcii, inque victoriam Thomæ Samoſcii Joannis filii*, &c (3).

(2) G. Douza de Itinere ſuo Conſtant. *pag.* 129.

(3) *See* Simon Starovolſcius, in Centum Script. Polon. *pag.* 131.

SIMONIUS (SIMON) a Phyſician and Philoſopher, and author of ſeveral books [*A*], lived in the XVIth century. He was of Luca. I think he left his country that he might elſe where make open profeſſion of the Reformed Religion. He was for ſome time, profeſſor of Philoſophy at Geneva, and afterwards in the univerſity of Heidelberg. After this he was made profeſſor *of Phyſic in the univerſity of Leipſic*, whence he withdrew *into Sileſia and Moravia, and thence into Poland, where there is ſome ground to believe he became an Anti-Trinitarian about the end of his days (a)*. Two letters of Theodore Beza greatly confirm this conjecture; for it cannot well be doubted that they were written to Simonius [*B*], and it appears that he, to whom they were written at Heidelberg in 1568 and in 1569, followed the opinions of Valentinus Gentilis *(b)*. The ſame letters inform us that Simonius was twice impriſoned at Geneva, and that he was cenſured by the miniſters, and was of a reſtleſs ſpirit and at variance with all the world (*c*). He had the preſumption to ſay before a full auditory at Heidelberg that he could raiſe objectons to which St Paul himſelf could not have given an anſwer [*C*]. I know not

(*a*) Baillet, *num.* 150, *of the Anti.*

(*b*) See the remark [*C*].

(*c*) Beza, Epiſt. LIV, *pag. m.* 264.

[*A*] *He is the author of ſeveral books.*] He publiſhed at Geneva in 1566 a commentary on Ariſtotle's book *De ſenſu & ſenſili*, in folio. You will find in *Lindenius renovatus* (1), that his *Synopſis breviſſima novæ theoriæ de humoralium febrium natura, periodis, ſignis, & curatione*, was printed at Leipſic in the year 1577, in 8vo, and at Baſil in the year 1580, in 8vo, with his *Examen ſententiæ à Brunone Seidelio latæ de iis quæ Joubertus ad explicandam febrium humoralium naturam in paradoxis ſuis diſputavit*; that his, *Vera & indubitata ratio periodorum, nec non continuationis intermiſſioniſque febrium humoralium* was printed at Leipſic, in the year 1575, in 4to; that his *Methodus artificioſa curandæ peſtis* was printed in the ſame city, in the year 1576, in 4to; that the *Simonius ſupplex* was printed at Cracow in the year 1585, in 4to; that the *Scopæ quibus verritur Confutatio quam advocati Nicolai Buccellæ, Itali, Chirurgi Anabaptiſtæ, innumeris mendaciorum, calumniarum, errorumque purgamentis infertam poſtremo emiſerunt*, was printed at Olmuts in the year 1589, in 4to; that his *Diſputatio de putredine* was printed at Cracow in the year 1584 in 4to; and that his *Reſponſum de obitu Stephani Polonorum Regis* was printed at Olmuts in the year 1588, in 4to. The catalogue of the Bodleian Library aſcribes to him a treatiſe *De vera Nobilitate*, printed at Leipſic in the year 1572, in 4to: it was reprinted at Iëna, in the year 1616, by the care of Thomas Sagittarius. This book is commended by Naudæus (2). What concerns the writings which Simonius publiſhed againſt James Schegkius will afterwards be ſeen.

[*B*] *It cannot well be doubted that* . . . . two letters of Theodore Beza *were written to Simonius.*] One is the LIVth, and the other the LVIth. The latter is dated the 13th of March, 1569, and the former the 26th of May. The year is not ſet down, but it is undoubtedly the year 1568. What may perſuade us that they were writ by Beza to Simonius, is his cenſuring a bad doctrine, which was ſeen in a book of Simonius (3). It is thereby that Mr Crenius has proved his conjecture. ‘ Epiſtolæ LIV & LVI (*Bezæ*) D. Simoni Simonio inſcribendæ ſunt. Nam quæ in hac ultima epiſtola Beza perſtringit, iſta omnia docuit Simonius in Lectione, quâ explicavit principium illud Phyſicum: ex nihilo nihil fit; d. 30. Decemb. 1568. Heidelb. (4). - - - - *The fifty-fourth and fifty-ſixth letters* (of Beza) *muſt be aſcribed to Simon Simonius. For all that Beza cenſures in this laſt epiſtle, was taught by Simonius in the lecture wherein he explained that principle of Natural Philoſophy; Of nothing nothing is made; on the 30th day of December, 1568, at Heidelberg.*’ If theſe words did not clearly ſhew that Simonius lived at Heidelberg when Beza wrote him thoſe two letters, I could mention a thing which inſinuates it. Simonius had written a letter to Theodore Beza, that being willing to diſpute with thoſe who condemned the Geneva diſcipline, he found himſelf unable to defend it, and there he particularly mentions Thomas Eraſtus (5), who was then profeſſor at Heidelberg.

[*C*] *He had the preſumption to ſay . . . that he could raiſe objections to which St Paul himſelf could not have given an anſwer.*] Beza teſtifies his indignation thereupon as it deſerved. ‘ Sed quo tandem loco, *wrote he to him*, poſtremum iſtud tuum dictum habebimus, poſſe te multas rationes afferre, quibus ne Paulus quidem ipſe, ſi viveret, reſpondere poſſe? Itáne verò te potuiſſe deſipere, ut iſtud quod vel cogitare impium & in Deum ipſum blaſphemum eſt, palam etiam, tot audientibus, auſus ſis effutire? Tune miſer homuncio, auſus organo Dei electo, cujus tonitrua ferre univerſa mundi ſapientia non potuit, tune, inquam Spiritui Chriſti per os Apoſtolorum loquentis opponere quicquam poſſis, quod refellere Dei ſapientia non poſſit? An ignoras quid Elymæ mago, quid Alexandro fabro ærario, ſeſe Pauli ſapientiæ opponentibus contigerit (6)? - - - - *But what can we think of that laſt aſſertion of your's, that you could bring many objections which St Paul himſelf, were he alive, could not anſwer? Is it poſſible you could be ſo void of ſenſe, as publickly, and in the hearing of ſo many people, to utter what was impious and blaſphemous even to think? Would you have dared, wretched man, to oppoſe any thing againſt that choſen inſtrument of GOD, whoſe thundering eloquence all the wiſdom of the world was unable to withſtand, could you, I ſay, have objected any thing againſt that Spirit of CHRIST, ſpeaking by the mouth his Apoſtlcs, which the wiſdom of GOD could not refute? Know you not what befel Elymas the Sorcerer, and Alexander the Copperſmith, who oppoſed the wiſdom of Paul.*’ Obſerve that Beza was telling him his opinion of a tract concerning the Divine Eſſence. ‘ Allatum eſt ad nos ſcriptum de Dei eſſentia, quod aiunt vel à te dictatum, vel ex te fuiſſe exceptum, breve quidem illud, ſeu ejuſmodi ut ſummopere bonos & doctos omnes Theologos ſit optimo jure offenſurum (7). - - - *A diſſertation was brought us, which they ſay was either dictated by or received from you; indeed, it is ſhort, but ſuch as will extreamly offend all good and learned Divines, and moſt juſtly.*’ Simonius in that tract maintained, that it may be ſaid that the Son,

(1) At the pages 979, 980, Edit. 1686.

(2) Naudæus, Bibliogr. Politic. *pag. m.* 544.

(3) See the remark [*C*].

(4) Crenius, Animadv. *Part. ii, pag.* 91.

(5) *It is of him Beza ſpeaketh, when he ſays in his LIVth letter, pag.* 265: Et quod de quorundam hac in re judiciis commemoras, nihil me movet. Imò ne de illo quidem ipſo cujus theſes ſunt, aliud mihi perſuaſi, quàm veritati ſponte ceſſurum. - - - *And what you mention of the opinion of ſome in this matter, ſurpriſes me not even as to the perſon, whoſe theſes they are: I never thought otherwiſe, but that he, of his own accord, would yield to the truth.*

(6) Beza, Epiſt. LVI, *pag.* 267.

(7) Ibid. *p.* 266.

not whether we might not conjecture that a book of which I have ſpoken before, and which bore the title of *Simonis Religio*, was a ſatire publiſhed againſt him [*D*]. I ſhall relate the diſputes he had with James Schegkius [*E*].

Son of God was made (8). He added, 1. That the doctrine of the Orthodox concerning the Trinity had no other advantage, but that it was leſs abſurd than that of the Heretics. And, 2. That the Scripture did not afford wherewithal to anſwer the objections of the Arians, ſince it affords paſſages which they wreſt to their own advantage. ‘ Jam verò quis illud ferat quod ‘ dicis, nempe eo differre, dogma adverſariorum à ‘ noſtro, id eſt mendacium à veritate, tenebras à luce, ‘ quòd illud quidem plura, noſtrum verò pauciora ab‘ſurda conſequantur ? . . . . Quòd autem dicere ‘ audes teſtimoniis & veris principiis Scripturæ ‘ quamvis malè accommodatis niti Antitrinitari‘os, ideòque ex verbo Dei ipſis reſponderi non ‘ poſſe, certè vox eſt piis omnibus intolerabilis, & ‘ quod ad me attinet, ſi ita ſentis, vix alio te loco ‘ habuerim, quàm hominis prorſus impii (9) - - - *But ‘ now who can bear what you ſay, namely, that the opi‘nion of our adverſaries differs only from ours, that is ‘ a falſhood from the truth, darkneſs from light, in this, ‘ that theirs is attended with more, ours with fewer ab‘ſurdities ? As to what you preſume to ſay, that the ‘ Anti-Trinitarians rely upon teſtimonies and true prin‘ciples of Scripture, tho' ill applied, and that therefore ‘ they cannot be anſwered from the word of GOD, this ‘ certainly is an aſſertion intolerable to all pious per‘ſons ; and as for myſelf, if this is indeed your perſuaſion, ‘ I cannot think of you otherwiſe, than as a perſon alto‘gether impious.*’

[*D*] *I know not whether we might not conjecture that a book . . . . intituled,* Simonis Religio, *was a ſatire written againſt him.*] That book was printed at Cracow in the year 1588, as I have ſaid elſewhere (10). Which I believe was the time when our Simonius was in Poland. Poſſibly ſome adverſary may have deſigned to defame him by publiſhing a book which might be taken for a deſcription of the opinions of this Phyſician. This I give as a conjecture, which may excite ſome curious perſon to examine the matter, if he ſhould have the opportunity of a large library.

[*E*] *I ſhall relate the diſputes he had with James Schegkius.*] Here is the account which Mr Baillet hath given of it. ‘ The diſpute began about the year 1569, ‘ and it extended to matters of Philoſophy, Phyſic, ‘ and Theology. Simonius had advanced ſomething ‘ concerning the cauſe and nature of the fever, which ‘ was not at all approved by Schegkius, and which ‘ the latter had occaſionally cenſured. Simonius was ‘ no leſs diſſatisfied with this, than with what Scheg‘kius had objected to him ſome time before upon ‘ ſome points of Ariſtotle's Phyſics, and he refuted it ‘ in a book, which he called *Anti-Schegkius*, or rather ‘ *Anti-Schegkiana*. The work came out at Baſil about ‘ the end of the year 1570, in 8vo, with the title of ‘ *Anti-Schegkianorum liber unus in quo ad objecta Scheg‘kii reſpondetur, vetera nonnulla ejuſdem errata incul‘cantur, novaque quamplurima pejora deteguntur.* Scheg‘kius preparing to anſwer this work, proviſionally ‘ publiſhed the forerunner of his anſwer under the ‘ title of *Prodromus Anti-Simonii contra Simonem Simo‘nium*, printed at Tubingen in Suabia in the year ‘ 1571, in 4to. When Simonius had ſeen that eſſay, ‘ he made a ſhort reply, which he publiſhed not long ‘ after. This laſt work being come to Schegkius's ‘ hands he examined it throughout, and his confuta‘tion was ready to be prefixed to his *Anti-Simonius*, ‘ and was printed in 1572, under the title of *Anatome ‘ Reſponſi Simonii ad Prodromum Anti-Simonii.* After ‘ that he publiſhed his large anſwer to the *Anti‘Schegkiana* of Simonius, printed at Tubingen in the ‘ year 1573, under the title of *Anti-Simonius*, five, ‘ *Refutatio errorum in Philoſophia Simonii in ſuo libro ‘ Anti-Schegkianorum, in quo plures quàm trecenti errores ‘ ejuſdem repelluntur*, &c. Theſe two diſputants had ‘ yet another conflict upon ſome controverſial points in ‘ Theology, with reſpect to a book which Schegkius ‘ had writ concerning the union of the two natures of ‘ JESUS CHRIST (11).’

(8) Quum factum dici poſſe Filium dicis, jacis Arianæ blaſphemiæ fundamentum, loqueris contra Scripturæ & omnium orthodoxorum morem, objicis omnes noſtras Eccleſias calumniis adverſariorum, ut nemo pius hoc audire ſine offenſione poſſit, quibuſcunque poſtea interpretationibus utaris. - - - *When you ſay that the Son of God may be ſaid to have been made, you lay the foundation of the Arian blaſphemy, ſpeak contrary to the Scripture, and the expreſſion of all Orthodox Divines, you expoſe all our churches to the reproach of their adverſaries, ſo as no pious ears can hear it without offence, whatever explanations you may after give.* Id. ibid. *See alſo pag.* 265.

(9) Id. ibid. *pag.* 267.

(10) In the remark [*B*] of the article SIMON (THEODORE).

(11) Baillet, *num.* 150. of the Anti. Note that he thought Simonius was in Saxony, who was then at Heidelberg.

SYNERGISTS. So they called in the XVIth century ſome German Divines, who thinking that Luther's hypotheſis about Free-will was too harſh, taught that men are not converted by the Divine Grace, without the co-operation of human will. This was the fifth ſchiſm that aroſe among the Lutherans (*a*). Melanchthon laid the foundation of it; for Victorinus Strigelius, and ſome other Divines, who had a great regard for his authority, conſidered ſome phraſes which they found in his books, whereby it appeared that he aſcribed a great power to man's will. Wherefore they maintained that the natural power of Free-will concurred with grace in the converſion of a ſinner. George Major, Paul Eberus, Paul Crellius, and Piperinus were the other chief defenders of that opinion (*b*), and were perſecuted by the faction of Illyricus. It is certain that Melanchthon could not approve the rigid method of Luther and Calvin about the doctrine of Grace [*A*] ; and it were in vain to alledge, as a proof of his being of the ſame

(*a*) Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *pag. m.* 865.

(*b*) *Ex eodem*, ibid.

[*A*] *Melanchthon could not approve the rigid method of Luther and Calvin about the doctrine of Grace.*] Balduinus has given a good proof of it, when he publiſhed an abſtract of a letter which Melanchthon writ to Calvin, the 11th of May 1543. Calvin had dedicated to him his book *de ſervitute humani arbitrii* (1). Here is part of the letter wherein he thanks him for it. ‘ Malint te illam tuam excellentem eloquentiam in ‘ aliis materiis magis propriis Eccleſiæ conſumere ‘ quam in queſtione ϖερὶ τῆς ἀνάγκης. Habebam ‘ amicum Tubingæ doctum hominem Franciſcum Sta‘dianum, qui dicere ſolebat ſe utrumque probare, ‘ evenire omnia ut divina providentia decrevit, & ‘ tamen eſſe contingentiam : ſed ſe hæc conciliare non ‘ poſſe. Ego cum hypotheſin hanc teneam, Deum non ‘ eſſe cauſam peccati nec velle peccatum ; poſtea con‘tingentiam in hac noſtra infirmitate judicii noſtri ad‘mitto, ut ſciant rudes Davidem ſua voluntate ultro ‘ ruere. Et eundem ſentio cum haberet Spiritum ſan‘ctum, potuiſſe eum retinere & in ea lucta aliquam ‘ eſſe voluntatis actionem. Hæc etſi ſubtilius diſpu‘tari poſſunt, tamen ad regendas mentes hoc modo ‘ propoſita, accommodata videntur. Accuſamus ipſi ‘ noſtram voluntatem cum labimur : non quærimus in ‘ Dei conſilio cauſam. E contra cum nos erigimus ‘ ſcimus Deum & velle opitulari & adeſſe luctantibus. ‘ Μόνον ϑέλησον (inquit Baſilius) καὶ Θεὸς ϖαρὰ ‘ ϖάντα. Excitatur ergo cura in nobis & laudatur ‘ Dei immenſa bonitas, qui & promiſit auxilium, & ‘ præſtat ſed petentibus (2). - - - *They wiſh you had ‘ rather employed your excelling eloquence in other matters ‘ more beneficial to the church than in the queſtion con‘cerning Neceſſity. I had a friend at Tubingen, a learned ‘ man, Francis Stadianus, who uſed to ſay, that he be‘lieved all things happened according to the decrees of ‘ divine providence, and that notwithſtanding there were ‘ things contingent : but he knew not how to reconcile theſe ‘ two things. I hold this principle, that GOD is not ‘ the cauſe of ſin, nor willeth it, and at the ſame time ‘ admit of contingency in this weakneſs of our judgment, ‘ that the ignorant may know that David ſinned of his ‘ own free choice. And, I think, that having the holy Spirit, ‘ he might have retained it, and that in this conflict he ‘ might have ſome power over his will. Tho' theſe things ‘ might be argued more ſubtilly, yet thus propoſed they ſeem ‘ ſufficiently ſuited for the direction of our mind. We blame ‘ our own will when we fall ; and do not ſeek the cauſe in ‘ the decree of GOD. On the contrary, when we hold out, ‘ we know that GOD both will and does aſſiſt us. Be ‘ willing only and GOD is all ſufficient, ſaith Baſil. Thus ‘ our care is excited, and the boundleſs goodneſs of GOD ‘ is praiſed, who hath both promiſed aſſiſtance, and ‘ grants*

(1) Balduin. in Reſponſ. altera ad Jo. Calvinum, *pag. m.* 139.

(2) Melanchth. Epiſt. ad Calvin. apud Balduinum, *ibid.*

ſame opinion with them upon that head, the great praiſes he beſtowed upon their piety ; for

grants it to thoſe who aſk it.’ Every body knows that Calvin and Caſtalio were like fire and water with reſpect to thoſe doctrines. Now Melanchthon being at Worms in 1557, writ a very obliging letter to Caſtalio, which was a kind of a ſymbol of fraternity, about the doctrine of Predeſtination. ‘ Porro cum ex eo (ut ſcis) conventu amiciſſime ſcripſiſſet ad Caſtalionem, & ejus ſententiam neſcio quam de prædeſtinatione & libero arbitrio ſuam eſſe ſignificaret : ſcire potuiſti, & quàm damnaret tuam in eo viro vexando intemperiem, & quàm ne tum quidem probaret omnia tua paradoxa (3). - - - *Moreover ſeeing (as you know) that after the interview he had writ in a moſt friendly manner to Caſtalio, and ſignified his approbation of I know not what opinion of his concerning Predeſtination and Free-will : you might have underſtood, both how much he blamed your exceſſive vexation of that man, and how even then he diſapproved all your paradoxes.*’ They are Balduinus’s words to Calvin ; and it is to be obſerved, that he declares to him, he knows not wherein Caſtalio’s opinion conſiſts. This ignorance proceeded from two cauſes : one was, that Caſtalio’s book had been ſuppreſſed ; the other, that Balduinus did not much care to examine the doctrine of Predeſtination. He confeſſes he does not underſtand it (4). ‘ Equidem arcanam illam περὶ ἀνάγκης quæſtionem non excutio, neque Caſtalionem . . . . unquam vidi vel audivi, ac ne per literas quidem unquam ſum allocutus . . . . neque quod de ea quæſtione ſcripſit (nam & id ſupprimi pro tuo imperio juſſiſti) unquam legi : neque quod de fatali neceſſitate diſputas ſatis intelligo, & in meis ad Minucium annotationibus nuper non diſſimulavi mihi non liquere (5). - - - *Indeed I do not much ſearch into that abſtruſe queſtion concerning neceſſity, neither have I ever either ſeen or ſpoke with Caſtalio . . . nor ſo much as had any correſpondence by letters . . . nor did I ever read what he wrote concerning this controverſy, for you commanded it to be ſuppreſſed : neither do I ſufficiently underſtand what you argue about fatal neceſſity, nor did I diſſemble my ignorance of it in my notes upon Minutius.*’

Let us ſee what Beza anſwered to that part of Balduinus’s book. Firſt, he denied that Melanchthon had writ ſuch a letter to Caſtalio (6) : his reaſon for it was, that all the books of Melanchthon, and even the letter produced by Balduinus, ſhewed that this German Divine differed from Calvin only in his way of expreſſing himſelf. In the ſecond place, he alledged a fragment of that letter, to prove that there was a perfect agreement between Melanchthon and the Divines of Geneva as to the doctrine. ‘ *In rebus ipſis quam inter illum & nos convenerit, unde tandem meliùs quàm ex ipſius teſtimonio probabitur ? Sic ergo ſcribit in iis literis quarum tu ipſe partem citaſti :* Quum autem & honorifico me teſtimonio ornaris, & de tota re non ſolùm piè, ſed etiam eloquenter diſſerueris, de utraque re, videlicet de mea gratitudine, & de ipſa diſputatione coram nos, ut ſoliti ſumus quoties unà fuimus, prolixè colloqui poſſe optarim. Etſi enim, tantum vel ingenii vel doctrinæ mihi non arrogo quantum tribuis, & nos imprimis in Eccleſia agnoſcere noſtram imbecillitatem decet, tamen benevolentia erga me tua vehementer delector, tibique gratiam habeo quòd in ſcripto luculento *(loquitur autem de Calvini libris de libero arbitrio adverſus Pighium ſcriptis)* tanquam in illuſtri poſitam loco extare ſignificationem amoris erga me tui voluiſti. *An hæc verba ſunt, Balduine, hominis à Calvino diſſentientis* (7) *?* - - - *How far we agreed with him as to the things themſelves, whereby can it better be proved than by his own teſtimony ? Thus he writes in theſe letters, a part of which you have quoted :* Seeing then you have both given me an honourable teſtimony, and have reaſoned upon the whole matter, not only piouſly but eloquently, I could have wiſhed we might have diſcourſed at large of both matters, namely of my gratitude, and of the diſpute itſelf before us, as we were wont when we were together. For although I do not arrogate to myſelf ſo much either of wit or learning, as you are pleaſed to aſcribe to me, and it becomes us, eſpecially in the Church, to acknowlege our own weakneſs, notwithſtanding I am exceedingly delighted with your benevolence towards me, and eſteem myſelf much beholden to you, that you would have the teſtimony of your love to me to be recorded in your excellent works *(he ſpeaks of Calvin’s books concerning Free-will againſt Pighius). Are theſe, Balduinus, the expreſſions of a man, who differs from Calvin ?*’ Thirdly, he taxed Balduinus with a notorious falſification ; and to prove his charge againſt him, he alledged a period maliciouſly left out of Melanchthon’s letter. That period runs thus : ‘ Hæc non ſcribo ut tibi tradam quaſi dictata homini & eruditiſſimo & peritiſſimo exercitiorum pietatis : & quidem SCIO HÆC CUM TUIS CONGRUERE, ſed ſunt παχύτερα, & ad uſum accommodata (8). - - *Theſe things I write not, as if dictating to you, a man moſt learned and moſt ſkillful in all exerciſes of piety : and indeed I* KNOW THESE THINGS AGREE WITH YOUR THOUGHTS, *but they are coarſer, and fitted for uſe.*’ Beza’s firſt obſervation is not ſolid ; he himſelf affords us the refutation of it ; for in a book, wherein he did not think of Balduinus, and was not aware of ſaying ſomething that might ſerve that adverſary, he ingenuouſly confeſſes that Melanchthon had cenſured the Divines of Geneva, as if they had introduced the fatality of the Stoics. ‘ Baſileæ verò Caſtellio . . . . . non obſcurè Pelagianiſmum tuebatur. Quinetiam his de rebus ita ſcribere cœperat Philippus, ut quamvis antea Calvini adverſus Pighium libro diſertè ſubſcripſiſſet, tamen Genevenſes quaſi Stoicum Fatum invehentes notare quibuſdam videretur (9). - - - *At Baſil Caſtellio . . . . did clearly enough mention Pelagianiſm. And even Melanchthon began ſo to write of theſe things, that though before he had directly ſubſcribed to Calvin’s book againſt Pighius, he, notwithſtanding, ſeemed to ſome to charge thoſe of Geneva as introducing the fate of the Stoics.*’ Theſe words of Beza plainly ſhew, that neither all the books of Melanchthon, nor the very letter he writ to Calvin, (I mean the letter, out of which Balduinus quoted a paſſage) were proper to refute thoſe who maintained that he had writ a letter of approbation to Caſtalio. The ſecond part of Beza’s anſwer has no force in it ; for the praiſes Melanchthon beſtowed upon Calvin, do not prove that he was of his opinion. He had ſo much equity, moderation, and civility, that he did juſtice even to thoſe who maintained opinions he did not approve. Tho’ he was prepoſſeſſed in favour of Free-will, he could diſcern the great parts, and the piety, and eloquence which Calvin diſcovered in maintaining the contrary opinion, and could not forbear to congratulate him on account of his being author of ſuch a work. I ſhall enlarge hereafter upon this thought (10). What Beza ſays in the third place is his beſt remark, and yet it is not very ſolid. He juſtly exclaims againſt Balduinus, and treats him as a deceiver : the omiſſion of that period ſhews Balduinus’s unfairneſs ; he would not have left it out, had he not been afraid of doing himſelf ſome prejudice by producing it. And therefore he deſigned to impoſe upon his readers, and to carry the cauſe by a trick and *dolo malo*. But I muſt obſerve, that on this occaſion Balduinus ſhewed as little judgment as ſincerity ; for had he conſidered well, he might eaſily have perceived that the period he left out was not prejudical to him. A man who hath declared that he admits an active and even an antecedent concourſe of the will, and that he wiſhes no body would write books to maintain the neceſſity of human actions, ſhews plainly enough that he is not of Calvin’s opinion. Now this is what Melanchthon had declared in the words alledged by Balduinus : .and therefore if he declares afterwards, that he does not advance thoſe things, as if Calvin wanted to know them, and that he thinks they agree, at the bottom, with Calvin’s doctrine, tho’ they are not propoſed with the ſubtilty of that Divine, but in a plain, coarſe, and more popular manner ; I ſay, if he acts thus, it is plain he does it out of civility, and compliment, to diveſt himſelf of the odious appearance of a man, who takes upon himſelf to adviſe and cenſure others. Every body knows there is a civil way of putting people in mind of their duty, which conſiſts in telling them they are not ignorant that ſuch and ſuch things ought to be done, and that they do not want to be told of it. I cannot ſufficiently wonder how Beza could undertake to maintain againſt Balduinus, that Melanchthon, and the Divines of Geneva taught the ſame thing concerning Free-will.

(3) Balduin. *ibid. pag.* 138.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) *He ſpeaks thus, pag.* 141 : Me unum, qui talia non tracto, nec fortaſſe intelligo, in Gallia exagitas.

(6) De Philippi vero literis quicquid garris falſiſſimum eſt. *Beza, Reſponſ. ad Balduin. pag.* 230, *Tom. ii, Operum.*

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Id. ibid.

(9) Beza, in Vita Calvini, *ad ann.* 1552, *Oper. Tom. iii, pag.* 376.

(10) In the following remark.

for he was a man who knew very well how to avoid the ill conſequences of prepoſſeſſion. He believed that men might err through a good motive [*B*]. What I ſhall ſay thereupon will

This he maintained in the year 1563. He knew what he wrote ſince in the life of Calvin (11); he was not ignorant of the diſputes of the Synergiſts mentioned by Balduinus (12). But what will a man not do in the heat of diſpute? *En quo diſcordia cives* (13)?

I fancy the readers will not be diſpleaſed to know what Balduinus replied. He was ſilent as to the omiſſion of the period, finding no other way to hide his ſhame; but as to the reſt, he anſwered haughtily, and in a few words, ‘ Nil quicquam impudentius dici aut fingi poteſt ‘ quam quod jam contendis, hac tota in re Philippum ‘ idem quod vos, & vos idem quod Philippus ſentire. ‘ Nam etſi nonniſi poſtremis ejus libris & ſententiis ‘ ſtandum eſſe dicas, tamen quod poſtremo ad articulos Bavaricos ſcripſit, an cum doctrina in hoc genere veſtra plane conſentit (14)? - - - *Nothing more ‘ impudent can be ſpoken or imagined than what you affirm, that in all this matter Melanchthon is of the ‘ ſame opinion as you, and you as he. For though you ‘ ſay we muſt ſtand to his laſt books and opinions, yet ‘ what he laſt wrote upon the Bavarian articles, does ‘ it plainly agree with your doctrine upon this ſubject?*’

[*B*] *Melanchthon believed that one might err through a good motive.*] A haughty and choleric Divine, will be ſo exceſſively fond of his opinions, that he thinks none can oppoſe them without acting againſt common ſenſe, or the dictates of his conſcience. He hardens and devotes himſelf to his own prejudices the more, as you ſtrongly argue againſt him. But a moderate, modeſt, and humble Divine, and of a phlegmatic temper, as Melanchthon was, takes a different courſe. Though he rejects an opinion as being falſe and dangerous, yet he will do juſtice to thoſe who maintain it: He acknowledges not only their other excellent qualities, and commends them for them, but alſo does not ſcruple to own that they have very ſpecious reaſons to maintain it. He will not therefore break with them, nor looſen the bonds of fraternity, whilſt the diſſention is confined within certain bounds. From whence it appears that neither Melanchthon's letters to Calvin, nor the praiſes he beſtowed upon him in printed books, can prove that they agreed in the doctrine of Free-will. All that can be inferred from thence is, that he was ſo equitable as to diſtinguiſh theſe two things one from another, Calvin's doctrine, as he conſidered it, and that ſame doctrine as Calvin himſelf conſidered it. He thought that doctrine made God the author of ſin; but he very well knew that Calvin did not teach it under that notion, and would have looked upon it as an abominable tenet if ſo conſidered. He was not ignorant, under what form it appeared to Calvin, namely, under the appearance of a ſyſtem, grounded upon ſeveral paſſages of the ſcripture, and tending to maintain the rights of GOD's providence, and thoſe of the diſpenſation of the new law. He was not ignorant that the doctrine of Free-will appeared to Calvin under a monſtrous ſhape, as deſtructive of providence, and directly contrary to St Paul's Epiſtles, and to the glory that redounds to God from mens ſalvation. And therefore, tho' Melanchthon did not approve Calvin's opinion, yet he believed that it was grounded upon a motive worthy of a good man, and a zealous ſervant of God: Notwithſtanding their different notions, they agreed in this maxim, That of two opinions, that which is moſt conſonant to the ſcripture, and to the glory of God, ought to be preferred to the other. Their perfect agreement in this point, occaſioned their diſcord; for, in conſequence of this maxim, Calvin embraced the doctrine of Neceſſity, and Melanchthon that of Free-will. One of them believed that the ſupreme empire of God over all things, and the rights of a providence, worthy of the Infinite Being, required an abſolute Predeſtination. The other believed that the goodneſs, holineſs, and juſtice of the Supreme Being required there ſhould be ſome contingency in our actions. Such were the grounds they went upon. Both of them aimed at the ſame thing, *viz.* at the greateſt glory of God, but they took different ways. Was this a ſufficient reaſon for them not to own one another for brethren, and fellow-labourers in the Lord's vineyard (15)?

I foreſee it will be objected to me, that thoſe different ways ſhould have obliged thoſe two Divines to anathematize one another, ſince Melanchthon ſhould have believed that, under pretence of aſſerting the rights of the divine authority, Calvin deſtroyed the goodneſs, the holineſs, and the juſtice of God, by making him the author of ſin and eternal miſery; and, on the contrary, Calvin ſhould have maintained, that under colour of preſerving thoſe three divine attributes, Melanchthon overturned providence and the empire of God, by aſſerting that man has a Free-will. But here is a very good ſolution to this difficulty. If Calvin had argued thus: Not being able to preſerve all the attributes of God, I give over part of them, that I may preſerve the reſt, and I rather chuſe to ſacrifice the moral virtues to the phyſical ones, than the phyſical to the moral; I rather chuſe to make him a powerful maſter, than a good maſter; he would have deſerved to be anathematized by all men. But he maintained on all occaſions, that, by aſſerting the ſupreme authority of GOD, he did not intend in the leaſt to derogate from the moral Perfections of the infinite being, from his goodneſs, his holineſs, his righteouſneſs. And therefore Melanchthon had been very unjuſt to have cavilled perſonally with him on that account, I mean to have imputed to him conſequences, which at the worſt were only drawn from his doctrine, ſince Calvin diſowned them; which he did in theſe words. ‘ Ubique in ſcriptis ſuis clamitat ‘ (*Calvinus*) quoties de peccato agitur, non miſcendum eſſe Dei nomen: quia in Dei naturam non niſi ‘ perfecta rectitudo & æquitas competit. Quàm putida igitur calumnia eſt, hominem de Eccleſia Dei ‘ bene meritum, crimine hoc involvere, quaſi Deum ‘ faciat authorem peccati? Docet quidem ubique ‘ nihil fieri niſi volente Deo. Interea quæ ſceleratè ‘ fiunt ab hominibus Deum arcano judicio ita moderari aſſerit, ne quid affine habeat hominum vitio. ‘ Summa doctrinæ ejus eſt, Deum mirabiliter, & modis nobis incognitis, in quemcunque vult finem omnia dirigere, ut æterna ejus voluntas prima ſit rerum ‘ omnium cauſa. Cur autem velit Deus quod nobis ‘ videtur minimè conſentaneum, fatetur eſſe incomprehenſibile. Ideòque nimis curioſè & audacter inveſtigandum eſſe negat: quoniam judicia Dei ſint ‘ abyſſus multa, & myſteria quæ modulum noſtrum ‘ ſuperant, reverenter adorare conveniat potius, quam ‘ excutere. Interea principium illud retinet, Quamvis ‘ nos ratio conſilii lateat, ſemper tribuendam eſſe Deo ‘ juſtitiæ laudem: quia ejus voluntas ſumma ſit equitatis regula (16). - - - - - *Calvin in his writings ‘ every where declares, when he treats of the cauſe of ‘ ſin, that the name of GOD ought not to be mentioned: becauſe the nature of GOD is perfectly upright ‘ and righteous. How rank a calumny therefore is it, ‘ to charge a man who hath ſo well deſerved of the ‘ Church of GOD, with making GOD the author of ‘ ſin? He teaches indeed on all occaſions, that nothing can ‘ be but what GOD wills. He ſays, that the wicked ‘ actions of men are ſo ruled by the ſecret judgment of ‘ GOD, as that he is no ways acceſſary to them. The ‘ ſum of what he teaches is, that GOD wonderfully, ‘ and in ways to us unknown, directs all things to ‘ whatever end he pleaſes, ſo that his eternal will is the ‘ firſt cauſe of all things. But why GOD willeth ‘ what ſeems to us not ſuitable to his nature, he acknowledges to be incomprehenſible. And therefore denieth that it ſhould be over-curiouſly and boldly ſearched into: becauſe the judgments of GOD are a vaſt ‘ abyſs, and myſteries beyond our reach, which ought with ‘ awful reverence to be adored rather than ſearched ‘ into. But ſtill he keeps to this principle, tho' the reaſon of his counſel be unknown to us, the praiſe of ‘ righteouſneſs is ever to be given to GOD: becauſe ‘ his will is the ſupreme rule of equity.*’ Warm and paſſionate men will not be ſatisfied with ſuch a wiſe anſwer; but Melanchthon, who was a lover of peace, and whoſe great equity and modeſty enabled him clearly to diſcover the weak and the ſtrong ſide of the opinions he approved or rejected; Melanchthon, I ſay, being of ſuch a diſpoſition of mind, was always ready to do juſtice to Calvin. Every body ſhould imitate that equitable Divine. Tho' you ſhould clearly prove againſt a Predeſtinarian, that his ſyſtem is neceſſarily

(11) See above citation (9).

(12) Audiveras paulo antequam hæc ſcriberes in Saxonia inter Illyricum & Victorinum magnam fuiſſe quæſtionem περὶ αὐτεξουσίου ἢ συνεργείας. Tu Illyricum qui tecum ſentit, ferre non potes: Victorinum qui Melanthonem ſequitur non oppugnas. *Balduinus, in Reſponſ. altera ad Calvin.* pag. 141.

(13) Virgil. Eclog. I, ver. 72.

(14) Reſponſ. ad Calvinum & Bezam pro Franc. Balduino, *fol.* 145, *verſo.*

(15) Note, that I do not pretend to extend this notion on all the ſects, that ſhould agree in the general maxim of aiming at God's glory.

(16) Calvinus, in brevi Reſponſione ad diluendas nebulonis cujuſdam calumnias, *pag. m.* 730, *Tractat. Theologicor. See at the end of this Dictionary, citation* (49), *of the explication on the Manichees.*

will give me occaſion to examine the anſwer [*C*], that was made to a paſſage in the Philoſophical

neceſſarily attended with this conſequence, Therefore God is the author of ſin, you ſhould be contented with this anſwer as to his perſon; I ſee, as well as you, the connexion of my principle with that conſequence, and my reaſon that ſees it, does not afford me a ſufficient knowledge to make me underſtand how I am miſtaken in ſeeing it; nevertheleſs, I am fully perſuaded, that God finds in the infinite treaſures of his wiſdom, a certain way of breaking that connexion; a way, I ſay, certain and moſt infallible, tho' it be unknown to me, and ſurpaſſes the reach of my knowledge. A Chriſtian ought chiefly to value himſelf upon his ſubmitting to God's authority. Not to believe what is ſeen, ought frequently to be the motto of a Chriſtian, as well as to believe what is not ſeen. This is, in effect, the ſenſe of Calvin's words, which we have juſt now ſeen. Melanchthon, and any other Divine, who aſſerts man's Free-will, would be the more to blame for not being ſatisfied with this anſwer, becauſe they are forced to have recourſe to ſuch an explanation; for, provided they have any ſincerity, they acknowledge that the manner of reconciling God's providence, and his preſcience with man's Free-will, is incomprehenſible to them (17). Thus they are driven into the ſame precipice into which they drove others; they take refuge in their turn in the incomprehenſibility of God's nature, with reſpect to the weakneſs of human reaſon.

It is therefore a great ſubject of ſcandal to ſee the diviſions occaſioned by the diſputes about Grace. Every ſect taxes the other with teaching impious things and horrid blaſphemies, and carries animoſity to the higheſt degree; and yet, it is about ſuch doctrines that a mutual toleration ſhould moſt readily take place. The too immoderate zeal of either of the parties might be excuſed, if they could clearly prove their opinions, and anſwer all objections clearly, directly, and in a convincing manner; but that men who are obliged to ſay, that they have no better ſolution to give, but that theſe are ſecrets impenetrable to the human mind, and concealed in the infinite treaſures of the incomprehenſible divine immenſity: for ſuch perſons, I ſay, to practiſe barbarous cruelty, to thunder out anathema's, baniſh and hang thoſe who diſſent from them, is a thing which appears to me inexcuſable. Melanchthon was more human. He did not believe that thoſe, who deny Free-will, are unworthy of being looked upon as God's ſervants; he excuſed them on account of the obſcurity of the matter, and the goodneſs of their motives.

Nothing would be more uſeful than to make ſerious reflexions upon what is to be found concerning that controverſy in a book of Dr Burnet, Biſhop of Saliſbury (18).

[*C*] *The anſwer, that was made to a paſſage in the Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe words,* Compel them to come in.] I think one of the reaſons why Melanchthon expreſſed ſo great a moderation about this diſpute, was his conſidering that the method God thought fit to uſe, was choſen by him among infinite others equally worthy of the moſt perfect being. Now this conſequence ariſes from that conſideration; *viz.* that a man may be miſtaken in explaining Theological doctrines, without aſcribing any thing to God that is prejudicial to his perfections: for thoſe are miſtaken, who embrace an hypotheſis not conſonant to what God has actually done; but if it be agreeable to one of the other methods he might have choſen, it aſcribes to God a conduct altogether worthy of him. Let us clear the matter by an example. Let us ſuppoſe that Solomon, who uſed to exchange riddles with the King of Tyre (19), writ to him a letter in cyphers, wherein he argued about a ſtate affair. Let us ſuppoſe that Titius and Mevius being ordered to decypher that letter, did not make uſe of the ſame key; one of them took for an A what the other took for an O, and ſo with the other figures, Titius found out Solomon's intentions, and conſequently Mevius miſſed it; but nevertheleſs Mevius found out ſo reaſonable and ſo coherent a ſenſe, that Solomon's wiſdom appeared as much by it as by that of Mevius. It might have been objected to Mevius, that he aſcribed ſome things to Solomon inconſiſtent with the uſual courſe of prudence; but he might have anſwered, that Solomon being a man of a vaſt genius, dived ſo far into political affairs, as to find out things that were above the capacity of other men. And therefore, would he have ſaid, what ſurpriſes us in the preſent caſe, ought to be looked upon as an effect of his extraordinary wiſdom. A like objection might have been raiſed againſt Titius, and he would have anſwered it the ſame way. The great genius of that King of Jeruſalem would have ſerved for a new key to reſolve the particular difficulties in the explication of the cypher. None but he could have determined whether Titius had been either more fortunate or more knowing than Mevius; but perceiving, on one hand, that Mevius aſcribed to him a ſublime reaſoning, and on the other, that if there remained any difficulty in it, it was removed by a ſuppoſition very glorious to his wiſdom, he might have been as well-pleaſed with Mevius as with Titius and might have ſpoken thus to them: One of you makes me think what I have thought, and the other what I might have thought with an equal glory.

It will be readily granted me, that this is an image of the fate of Aſtronomers, who explain the celeſtial phænomena by oppoſite ſyſtems. Thoſe phænomena are like an enigmatical letter, delivered by God to be decyphered by Aſtronomers: Some take the motion of the earth, and others its reſt, for their key. The revolution of the earth round it's axes, is by ſome of them uſed to account for the preceſſion of the equinoxes (20); others chuſe rather ſpiral lines (21), and ſo of the reſt. The three ſyſtems, *viz.* of Ptolemy, Copernicus, and Tycho Brahe, though never ſo different, each explains the phænomena; and yet there is but one that is true. This was Mr Marion's meaning (22), when he ſaid that Copernicus's *ſyſtem was an opinion true in art, and falſe in nature.* But as all the followers of thoſe ſyſtems are agreed in admiring in the work the infinite power and infinite wiſdom of the author of it, they are not afraid of offending God if they ſhould be miſtaken. They think that if he does not perform thoſe things as they fancy he does, he might ſo do it without any prejudice to his perfections, and that having an infinite knowledge, he has the ideas of infinite plans of the world, all perfectly beautiful, and worthy of the moſt wiſe and moſt perfect being. I am ſure that a Copernician, after much exclaiming againſt Ptolemy's ſyſtem, and the perplexities of ſo many circles and epicycles, and againſt the inſignificancy of the prodigious ſwiftneſs of the firmament, *&c.* will confeſs, if he conſiders it, that all the faults he obſerves in that hypotheſis might be made up by advantages, not to be found in the ſimple mechaniſm of the motion of the earth. Whoever conſiders the ideas of an infinite knowledge, will ſee the poſſibility of ſuch a compenſation; he will perceive that man is not the only being, for whom ſuch great objects are deſigned. He will be ſenſible that the inconceivable rapidity of the celeſtial ſpheres might be of a wonderful uſe, with reſpect to ſome parts of the univerſe, placed beyond the reach of our ſight; in a word, that if Ptolemy's ſyſtem is falſe, yet it is ſtill poſſible, and conſequently very worthy of the Creator's wiſdom; for if it was unworthy of it, it would not be poſſible. I do not think that any Aſtronomer, who is conſcious to himſelf, that he prefers that ſyſtem to all others, becauſe all things duly conſidered, he believes it to be more conſonant to God's choice, would be afraid of appearing before the judge of the world with ſuch an opinion, tho' it ſhould prove falſe. I think he would expect that the Copernican and himſelf ſhould, both of them, receive an anſwer, much like that which I have ſuppoſed Solomon would have made to Titius and Mevius. Few people will deny this; but if the queſtion was about a point of Divinity, an infinite number of Divines would deny it (23). I preſume that Melanchthon would be none of them, as to the two ſyſtems, concerning Predeſtination, that of Liberty, and that of Neceſſity. He would ſuppoſe that the ſyſtem is falſe probable, poſſible, and not contrary to God's perfections.

Laying aſide the doctrinal part of thoſe queſtions, I ſhall mention a fact, which the laws of hiſtory warrant me to take notice of; and if I add ſome criticiſms to my narrative, I ſhall do nothing inconſiſtent with the deſign of this Dictionary. A miniſter of of Utrecht, in his reflexions upon the Philoſophical Commentary, has confuted the following paſſage as ſtrongly as he could. ‘ Here is a hint that may ſerve to remove the phantoms and panic fears, wherewith Divines have been ſo long troubled upon the ſubject of error; for it is certain, that the reaſon why men find ſo many arguments, which ſeem to be of an equal ſolidity to maintain truth and falſhood in controverſies about religion, is that moſt falſities that appear in them are as poſſible as the truths. In effect, we all ſuppoſe that revelation depends upon a free decree of God; for he is not neceſſitated by his nature to make men or any other being. And conſequently he might, if he had pleaſed, have produced nothing, or produced a world different from this; and if he had deſigned to place therein men, he might have directed them to his ends, by methods quite contrary to thoſe he has pitched upon, and which would have been equally worthy of the moſt perfect being; for an infinite wiſdom has infinite ways of manifeſting itſelf, that are all worthy of it. Which being ſo, it is no wonder if Divines find as many arguments to maintain Free-will as to impugn it; for we have ideas and principles to apprehend and to prove, that God could have made man a free creature, and not have beſtowed upon him a liberty of indifference, as it is called; and the ſame may be ſaid of an hundred other contradictory propoſitions, 2 *Tom. Suppl. chap.* 24. *pag.* 308, 309, 310 (24).’ The reflexions upon this paſſage, as far as they concern the preſent ſubject, may be reduced to this interrogation: *Who told him that we have ideas and principles to apprehend and to prove, that GOD could make man a free creature, and forbear beſtowing upon him a liberty of indifference* (25). I believe Mr Saurin would not have aſked ſuch a queſtion, if he had well-conſidered, that for the ſpace of one hundred and fifty years, a vaſt number of books have been publiſhed all over Europe, for and againſt liberty, in which each party make unanſwerable objections. He would have confeſſed then that we have *ideas and principles to apprehend*, &c. Let him peruſe ſome books written by the Arminians or the Calviniſts, the Moliniſts or the Janſeniſts, and he will ſee that thoſe ideas and principles are very plentiful in mens minds. He adds (26) that *there are contradictory things, repugnant to GOD's nature; and conſequently impoſſible . . . that GOD could not create bodies without extenſion and three dimenſions, nor ſpirits without being endowed with the faculty of thinking*. Theſe words are to no purpoſe; for the commentator ſaid nothing, whereby he inſinuates that there are not ſome things abſolutely impoſſible: To what purpoſe then does Mr Saurin obſerve, that the attributes, which conſtitute the eſſence of a creature, cannot be ſeparated from it? Did the Commentator doubt of that truth? If God (Mr Saurin goes on) (27), *has not made man endowed with his liberty of indifference, our Philoſopher cannot know whether he could have created him with that liberty; and whether that liberty is not as contradictory as a ſquare circle, or an independent creature*. I do not underſtand this well enough to confute it; but I think that Melanchthon being to anſwer ſuch an objection, would have been contented to ſay, I do not love to uſe ſubtilties upon this ſubject, I follow the notions of the people, I believe God has freely made all his works, and I wonder a miniſter calls ſuch a truth into queſtion (28). His intimating that the liberty of indifference is as contradictory as a ſquare circle is ſtill more ſtrange to me, ſince he affirms a little after, *that it is impoſſible GOD ſhould produce an intelligent creature, without giving him ſome laws* (29). The laws God gave to Adam were attended with promiſes and threatnings: which clearly ſuppoſes that it was in Adam's power to obey or diſobey. The moſt rigid Divines, St Auguſtin and Calvin, expreſſly teach, that men have loſt their free-will only becauſe Adam made an ill uſe of it in the terreſtrial Paradiſe. I deſire no more than this to be certain, that it is poſſible for God to beſtow a liberty of indifference upon men. Had he not beſtowed it upon Adam, all our ſyſtems of religion would come to nothing: From whence I conclude, that God gave him ſuch a liberty; now every body knows, that from *the act to the power, the conſequence holds good* (30). But I conceive he might have made him determined to good things, in ſuch a manner, as never to waver between good and evil; and therefore the hypotheſis of man's liberty, and that of neceſſity, appear both poſſible to me. This is what I think Melanchthon might have anſwered. I think alſo he would have taken it ill, that the author of the reflexions upon the Philoſophical Commentary did not declare his opinion, but was contented with an *If GOD*, &c. an indeterminate phraſe, from which one may infer, that the privation of free-will implies a contradiction: For if it ſhould follow from God's creating Adam without a liberty of indifference, that it is a liberty which implies contradiction; others would maintain, that if he had created him with that liberty, it would follow, that the determination to one of the contraries would be as impoſſible as a ſquare circle. I omit what the author of the reflexion ſays againſt the commentator, who advances that the proofs of a falſe thing are ſometimes as good as the proofs of a true one. What Mr Saurin anſwers to it is full of needleſs things; for it is needleſs in a diſpute to prove to an adverſary what he does not deny. The only thing that does not ſeem ſuperfluous is his ſaying, that the *reaſons which determine us to the choice of a religion, ought to be moral demonſtrations* (31): But even that is of no uſe in the controverſy about Free-will mentioned by the commentator; for ſince each party pretends to ſuch demonſtrations, it is referring us to equivocal ſigns.

---

(17) Beza objects to them, that they have no other anſwer when they are preſſed hard. I have quoted his words in the remark [*H*] of the article CASTALIO, citation (93).

(18) *Mr de Beauval gives an extract of it, in his* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *Oct.* 1699, *pag.* 435, *& ſeq. and alſo Mr Bernard, in the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *for Auguſt* 1700, *pag.* 155, *& ſeq.*

(19) Joſeph. Antiq. Jud. *lib. viii, cap. ii, fol. m.* 315.

(20) *See* Rohault's Phyſics, *Tom. ii, ch. xix, pag. m.* 77, *and* Regius's Philoſophy, *Vol. iii, lib. iii, Part ii, ch. vi, pag. m.* 128, *Edit. in* 12*mo.*

(21) *See the book intituled,* Uranie ou les Tableaux des Philoſophes, *Tom. iii, pag.* 44.

(22) *In one of his pleadings. See Mr Arnauld,* Difficult. à Steyaert. *Part. ix, pag.* 101.

(23) If the queſtion was only to foretel eclipſes, and other phænomena, to ſatisfy our curioſity, or for the uſe of life, one might be free to chuſe a ſyſtem: different hypotheſes might be reconciled with the ſame phænomena; or if one had an ill ſucceſs, it were but a miſtake attended with no ill conſequence. Whether we follow Ptolemy's ſyſtem, or Tycho-Brahe's, or Kepler's, or Copernicus's, it ſignifies but little, as long as we do not poſitively affirm a thing of which we have not a mathematical certainty. But it is not ſo with ſyſtems of religion. *Saurin, ubi infra,* p. 335.

Here follows another paſſage of the Commentary. ‘ (32) What do they do then, when the revelation is doubtful about ſome point? Why ſome explain it by one ſyſtem, and others by another. Granting that one of thoſe ſyſtems is conſonant to the method which God has actually pitched upon, it does not follow that the other ſyſtem is not conſonant to what he might have done with the ſame glory and wiſdom he has diſcovered by doing another thing, ſince we conceive that God might have done things otherwiſe than he has done them, a thouſand different ways, all worthy of his infinite perfection: otherwiſe, he would not be a free being, and would not differ from the God of the Stoics, chained down by an unavoidable fate, a doctrine little better than Spinoziſm. And conſequently, no falſe ſyſtem can be pernicious; but when a Divine builds it upon notions, which he believes to be contrary to God's word, and unbecoming his majeſty. But I think there are no ſuch Divines in the world. 2 *Tom. Suppl. chap.* 24. *pag.* 310, 311.’ Mr Saurin comparing thoſe words with another paſſage, wherein the commentator ſays, *he will not take advantage of the compariſon of a prince, whoſe vaſt empire ſhould contain many nations, that have different laws, ways, cuſtoms, and languages*, thinks (33), that the commentator thereby juſtifies, not only all the ſects of Chriſtianity, but all thoſe of Paganiſm. I wonder he did not perceive that his adverſary confines himſelf to the ſyſtems grounded on the different ſenſes put upon the ſcripture (34). Here follows another paſſage, at which you will be ſurprized. *GOD might have done things otherwiſe than he has done them, a thouſand different ways, all worthy of his infinite perfection*. Mr Saurin (35) having quoted again thoſe words of the Philoſophical Commentary, confutes them with a diſtinction between the eſſential parts of religion, and thoſe that are not eſſential; and then he ſays (36): ‘ The author makes no ſuch diſtinction; he uſes an univerſal propoſition; *GOD might have done things otherwiſe than he has done them, an hundred different ways*. And what is there remarkable, is that among thoſe different ways he reckons thoſe, that have been imagined by the heathen Poets, and the Chineſe Philoſophers; for he will juſtify all the ſyſtems of religion, that have been invented by Divines, and received by the people. In order to prove his aſſertion, he alledges the liberty of God. *Otherwiſe*, ſays he, *he would not be a free being, and would not differ from the GOD of the Stoics, chained down by an unavoidable fate, a doctrine little better than Spinoziſm.* Were this conſequence right, God would have the moſt dreadful liberty of *indifference* that can be imagined. He might lie and perjure himſelf, when he ſwears by himſelf: he might command us to hate him, and forbid

---

(24) Saurin, Reflex. ſur les Droits de la Conſcience, *pag.* 323.

(25) Id. ibid. *pag.* 324.

(26) Id. ibid.

(27) Id. ibid. *pag.* 325.

(28) *Theſe words*, if God has not made man endowed with a liberty of *indifference imply a doubt.*

(29) Saurin, Reflex. ſur les Droits de la Conſcience, *pag.* 330.

(30) Ab actu ad potentiam valet conſequentia.

(31) Id. ibid. *pag.* 326.

(32) Id. ibid. *pag.* 327.

(33) Id. ibid. *pag.* 329.

(34) What do they do then, when THE REVELATION is doubtful about ſome point? *Comment. Philoſoph.* quoted by Mr Saurin, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 327.

(35) Id. ibid. *pag.* 329.

(36) Id. ibid. *pag.* 330.

‘forbid us to love him: he might command us treachery, and perjury, in a word all ſorts of crimes: in ſhort, he might turn all virtues into ſo many vices, and all vices into as many virtues.’ Theſe few words are ſufficient to refute thoſe reflexions: mind this clauſe, ALL WORTHY OF HIS INFINITE PERFECTION. It ſhews, with the utmoſt evidence, that GOD's liberty does not conſiſt in being able to act right or wrong, wiſely or imprudently; but in having the power of chuſing among infinite plans, equally beautiful and good, one or another, as he thinks fit. Can this ſignify that he might have introduced the falſe worſhips ſung by the heathen Poets? Are they worthy of his infinite perfection?

SIRIS, a river of Italy, at the mouth of which there was a town called SIRIS, went ſucceſſively by ſeveral other names [*A*]. That town was ſaid to have been built by the Trojans, and to prove it, they ſhewed there a ſtatue of the Trojan Minerva (*a*). It was ſhewn ſtill in Strabo's time, as a miraculous image; for it looked downwards, and the reaſon given for it is, that the goddeſs conceived a great horror, when the Ionians took the town, and ſhewed no reſpect for that ſtatue. Several inhabitants fled to that Minerva, and there implored the clemency of the conquerors, as in a place of refuge which they thought to be inviolable; but the enemies had no regard to their intreaties, and they were barbarouſly dragged out of that ſanctary (*b*). The goddeſs had not the courage to behold ſuch an irreverence. This was the reaſon why ſhe caſt her eyes downwards. It was not the firſt time that a dreadful ſight made her turn her eyes another way: ſhe had done it before at Troy when Caſſandra was raviſhed (*c*). The author, from whom I have theſe particulars, makes a judicious reflexion upon the great number of ſtatues, which the Trojans were ſaid to have conſecrated ſince their diſperſion [*B*]. Mr de Marolles, Abbot of Villeloin, made the ſame obſervation [*C*], upon the frequent multiplication of the ſame relick. I have obſerved in another place (*d*) Florus's miſtake about the river *Siris*.

[*A*] *Went ſucceſſively by ſeveral other names.*] Conſult Cluverius (1), he will tell you it was called *Leuternia*, *Polieum*, *Heraclium*. He ſays that the Tarentines having built Heraclea three miles above the mouth of the river Siris, removed thither the inhabitants of Siris; ſo that from that time the town of Siris was only the port of the town of Heraclea. According to Stephanus Byzantinus, the town of Siris was called *Polieum* by the Trojans; but according to Tzetzes it was called *Polieum*, before it went by the name of Siris. It may be inferred from Lycophron, Strabo, and the ſame Tzetzes, that Leuternia was it's firſt name (2).

[*B*] *Strabo makes a judicious reflexion upon the great number of ſtatues . . . . which the Trojans had conſecrated ſince their diſperſion.*] It is a piece of impudence, ſays he, to pretend, not only that a ſtatue did formerly caſt it's eyes downwards, but even, that ſuch a ſtatue may be ſeen to this day. It is ſtill a greater impudence to mention a great number of ſuch ſtatues brought from Troy. They boaſt at Rome, at Lavinium, at Luceria, and at Siris, that they have the Minerva of the Trojans; and what is ſaid of the Trojan women is applied to ſeveral other places; and therefore tho' the thing be poſſible, it does not appear credible. Ἰταμὸν μὲν οὖν καὶ τὸ οὕτω μυθεύειν ὥς τε μὲ μόνον καταμῦσαι φαινόμενον, καθάπερ καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἰλίῳ ἀποστραφῆναι κατα τὸν Κασάνδρας βιασμὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταμύον δείκνυσθαι. Πολὺ δὲ ἰταμώτερον τὸ τοιαῦτα ποιεῖν ἐξ Ἰλίου κεκομισμένα ξόανα ὅσα φασὶν οἱ συγγραφεῖς. καὶ γὰρ ἐν Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν Λαουϊνίῳ, καὶ ἐν Λουκερίᾳ, καὶ ἐν Σειρίτιδι Ἰλιὰς Ἀθηνᾶ καλεῖται ὡς ἐκεῖθεν κομισθεῖσα. Καὶ τὸ τῶν Τρωάδων δὲ τόλμημα περιφέρεται πολλαχοῦ, καὶ ἄπιστον φαίνεται, καίπερ δυνατὸν ὄν. *Enimvero protervum eſt fingere, ſimulacrum aliquod non modo viſum fuiſſe connivere, ſicut imaginem Minervæ Illii ferunt oculos avertiſſe cum violaretur Caſſandra: ſed fabulæ adjicere, ſimulacrum etiamnum connivens conſpici. At multo etiam protervius eſt ea ab Ilio allata fabulari, quæ ſcriptores ponunt. Nam & Romæ, & Lavinii, & Luceriæ, & Siritidi Minerva habetur Iliaca, quaſi ab Ilio allata: & facinus mulierum Trojanarum multis adſcribitur locis, eoque fides ei derogatur cùm fieri tamen potuerit* (3). I have ſet down the Greek for the ſatisfaction of thoſe, who are never pleaſed, unleſs they ſee the original words, and likewiſe to exempt my ſelf from a ſtrict tranſlation of that paſſage. Strabo's reflexion is very judicious; for if the variations of Hiſtorians are not a certain character of falſity, they afford at leaſt a juſt pretence to ſuſpend one's belief: and when ſeveral towns pretend to have the ſame miraculous image, it is a very ſtrong preſumption that all of them falſly boaſt of it, and that the ſame trick, and the ſame intereſt moves them to ſet up their traditions.

[*C*] *The Abbot of Villeloin made the ſame obſervation.*] Let us ſee his own words. ‘As they were ſhewing (4) her the head of St John the Baptiſt, which the people there reverence as one of the moſt conſiderable relics in the world; after ſhe had kiſſed it, ſhe bad me come near, and do the ſame. I conſidered the ſhrine, and what was in it: I kiſſed it as others did, and was contented to ſay, as ſoftly as poſſible, that it was the fifth or ſixth head of St John the Baptiſt, which I had had the honour to kiſs: at which her highneſs was a little ſurpriſed, and could not forbear ſmiling, but it was not perceived: and the ſacriſtan, or treaſurer, who alſo took notice of what I ſaid, replied, he could not deny that ſeveral others were mentioned (for perhaps he had been told that the ſame head was to be ſeen in St John's Church at Lyons, at St Jean de Morienne, at St Jean d'Angeli in Saintonge, at Rome, in Spain, in Germany, and in ſeveral other places) but that the head he ſhewed was the true one. And to prove the truth of his aſſertion, he deſired us to obſerve the hole that was in the ſcull of that relic above the right eye, that it was the ſame hole that Herodias made in it with her knife when the head was brought to her in a diſh. I think, ſaid I, the Goſpel does not mention ſo remarkable a particular; but perceiving he was reſolved to maintain the contrary, I yielded very reſpectfully: and without entring into a farther examination of the matter, or alledging the authority of St Gregory Nazianzen, who ſays that all the bones of St John the Baptiſt were burnt in his time by the Donatiſts, in the town of Sebaſta, and that nothing remained of them but a ſmall part of the head, which was carried to Alexandria, I was contented to tell him that the tradition of ſo venerable a church as that of Amiens, was ſufficient to authorize ſuch a belief, tho' it was not above four hundred years old, and tho' it was not an article of faith. However, people purchaſed many repreſentations of that holy relic, and the honeſt prieſt was very well ſatisfied (5).’ The author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (6), ſpeaking of a book written about the holy handkerchief, mentioned this paſſage of the Abbot of Villeloin, and related theſe words of Charles Patin, the ſon (7). *I am only ſorry to ſee ſo often* the picture of the Virgin drawn by St Luke; *for it is certain people are miſtaken about moſt of them, it being unlikely that St Luke ſhould have drawn ſo many pictures of the Virgin.*

(*a*) Strabo, *lib. vi, pag.* 182.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

(*d*) In the ſecond article PYRRHUS, remark [*G*].

(1) Cluver. Ital. Antiq. *lib. iv, cap. xiv, pag.* 736, Epitom. Bunon.

(2) Cluver. *ibid.*

(3) Strabo, *lib. vi, pag.* 182.

(4) He means the Princeſs Mary Gonzaga, who was then at Amiens.

(5) Marolles, Memoires, *pag.* 132, *at the year* 1641.

(6) For the month of September, 1685, *Art. v, pag.* 999. He examines whether it be an imprudent thing to multiply thoſe things.

(7) Relations Hiſtoriques, *p.* 221. *Edit. of Lyons* 1676.

SIXTUS IV.

SIXTUS IV, made Pope in the year 1471, had been General of the Franciſcans and his name was *Franceſco della Rovere*. He was born the twenty-ſecond of July 1414 at Cella (*a*) a town of the Riviera di Genoa, five miles from Savona. One of his Hiſtorians (*b*) aſcribes to him all ſorts of good qualities, a great learning, an ardent charity for the poor, a great liberality to the princes oppreſſed by the Turks, an admirable exactneſs in cauſing juſtice to be duly adminiſtred, and a great care of repairing the ruins of Rome, and adorning that town. He does not diſſemble the faults for which he was blamed. 1. His committing many injuſtices in favour of his creatures [*A*]: 2. his ſtirring up a war in Italy very unſeaſonably: 3. his excommunicating Laurence de Medicis: 4. and then exerciſing all manner of hoſtilities againſt the Florentines. He does not charge him, as others do (*c*), with knowing and having contrived the conſpiracy of the Pazzi. He ſays nothing of the diſſolute life of the cardinals who were in favour under that reign, one of which, as many believe, is deſcribed in ſome verſes of Baptiſta Mantuanus [*B*]. Nor does he mention the abominable leudneſs, to which ſome ſay that Pope lent a helping hand. They will have it that he granted a petition,

[*A*] *He was blamed . . . . for committing many injuſtices in favour of his creatures.*] 'He was more indulgent to his relations than any other Pope, and he is blamed for having done and granted many things upon their account *præter fas juſque*, againſt all human and divine laws (1).' The three Cardinals of his firſt promotion were *Peter Riario of Savona, whom he brought up being a little boy, with his brother Jerome, both born in the ſame town, (not without myſtery) and Julian his brother's ſon, who was afterwards Julius II* (2). He beſtowed great benefices upon Peter, a man *ſo luxurious and prodigal, that he ſeemed to be born to throw away money, having ſpent, during the two years of his cardinalſhip, two hundred thouſand crowns for his ordinary, and when he died, he owed ſixty thouſand crowns, and left many rich houſhold goods*, departing this world *all over rotten, by reaſon of his debaucheries* at twenty-eight years of age (3). 'It is he, whoſe prodigious prodigality has been deſcribed by Baptiſta Fulgoſius †, which he carried ſo far as to give his whore Tireſia pattins covered with pearls. Baptiſta Mantuanus ‡ made alſo the following verſes upon him, wherein he repreſents him ſaluted by Jupiter in Hell.

> At tu implume caput cui tanta licentia quondam
> Fœmineos fuit in coïtus, tua furta putabas
> Hic quoque prætextu mitræ impunita relinqui?
> Sic meruit tua fœda Venus, *&c* (4).
>
> *But thou bald-pate who ſo delighted was*
> *With womens leud embraces*, &c.

We ſhall ſee hereafter that Mr Jurieu applies thoſe verſes to Pope Sixtus (5), tho' he had read in Du Pleſſis that they were made upon the cardinal I ſpeak of. Coëffeteau does not deny the diſſolute life of that cardinal, and adds that *Sixtus was not more lucky in his choice of Jerome, if the Hiſtorians are to be credited, excepting that he was not given to ſenſuality, being only fond of hunting. This Jerome being made Prince of Imola and Friuli* (6) *by the Pope, married the baſtard daughter of the Duke of Milan*; *and upon account of that marriage, Sixtus gave a cardinal's hat to Aſcagno, the duke's ſon. Sixtus raiſed alſo Leonard, his brother's ſon, and married him to a baſtard of King Ferdinand, and made him governor of Rome. When this nephew died, he raiſed in his room another nephew, brother . . . . of Cardinal Julian, and made him Prince of Sorra and Senegaglia. This ſecond nephew married Joan, daughter of Frederic de Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino, by whom he had Francis Maria, who, after the death of his uncle Guy Ubaldino, who died without male iſſue, ſucceeded by adoption to the Duchy of Urbino* (7). Du Pleſſis relates an abominable action in the following words. 'Sixtus, who deſigned to raiſe his dear Jerome, had a mind to make himſelf maſter of Florence; but Laurence and Julian de Medicis were an obſtacle to it. He practiſed upon Francis Pazzi, who was the leader of the contrary faction, to attempt upon their lives; and, in order to carry on the thing with greater ſafety, he ſent to Florence Raphaël Riario, Cardinal of St George, a young man, and Jerome's nephew, to encourage the conſpirators. Accordingly, upon a Sunday, they fell upon the Medicis in the middle of the ſervice in St Reparada's church. Julian was there killed; Laurence was wounded, whom the ſextons carried into the veſtry, *&c* (8).'

[*B*] *One of the Cardinals that were in favour, as many believe, is deſcribed in ſome verſes of Baptiſta Mantuanus.*] You have ſeen in the foregoing remark four Latin verſes of that Poet, which relate to the Cardinal Peter Riario, if we believe Mr du Pleſſis. He is not the only author who applies them to him: others pretend they ought to be underſtood of Pope Sixtus. But the better to judge of the whole matter, it is neceſſary to conſider the reflexions which an ingenious perſon has been pleaſed to ſend me. Here they are. (9) 'In order to underſtand thoſe verſes of Mantuanus, in the 4th book of his poem, intituled *Alphonſus*, we muſt know that in that work, which is only a deſcription of Alphonſus's going through hell, the Poet repreſents the ſtate of ſeveral ſouls, ſome of which were condemned to eternal torments, and others to thoſe of purgatory. He feigns that Alphonſus, ſon of John II, and grandſon of Henry III, Kings of Caſtile, going with his father and grandfather from purgatory to the terreſtrial Paradiſe, heard a long dialogue between the ſoul of a Pope in purgatory, and a Devil called Jupiter, who tormented him. The Pope's ſoul diſcovers it's quality in theſe verſes:

> Apud ſuperos ego templa tenebam
> Vaticana, dabant Reges his oſcula plantis.
>
> *When living I poſſeſs'd*
> *The Vatican, and ſoveraigns kiſs'd theſe feet.*

The Devil, in one of his replies, ſpeaks to him thus,

> At tu implume caput cui tanta licentia quondam,
> Fœmineos fuit in coïtus, *&c.*
>
> *But thou bald-pate who ſo delighted was*
> *With womens leud embraces*, &c.

from whence it follows that theſe verſes ought to be underſtood of a Pope. The queſtion is, Whether they are to be applied to Sixtus IV? The Commentator Badius ſays, he found in the margin of the copy he made uſe of this annotation *S. P. or. Minorum* in two places, *viz.* over-againſt theſe verſes:

> Prima ſono vox languenti, miſerere dolentum,
> Et ſine, clamabat, feſſos ſpirare parumper.
>
> *The firſt I heard, with languid mourning voice,*
> *Cries, pity us in pain, and let us breathe a while.*

And eighty verſes after, over-againſt this:

> At tu implume caput, *&c.*
>
> *But thou bald-pate*, &c.

From whence it appears, ſays he, that Pope Sixtus is meant by them, though he will not warrant the

---

(*a*) Ghilini, Teatro, *Parte ii*, p. 93. *Rivet is miſtaken in his* Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *Part. ii, p.* 622. *where he makes him a native of Albizzola.*

(*b*) See the Life of Sixtus IV, at the end of Platina, *fol.* 363, 364. *Edit. Lugd.* 1512.

(*c*) See *Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, p.* 70, and the remark [*A*], citation (8) of that page. Conſult alſo Machiavel, book viii, of the Hiſtory of Florence.

(1) Du Pleſſis Mornai, ex Volaterrano & Onuphrio, *in his* Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 555.

(2) Du Pleſſis, ibid.

(3) Volaterran. *lib. xxii, p. m.* 818.

† Baptiſt. Fulgoſ. dictor. & factor. memorabil. *lib. ix.*

‡ Baptiſt. Mantuan. in Alphon. *lib. iv.*

(4) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 555.

(5) Simon Goulart in his Continuation of the *Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis*, does likewiſe apply them to Sixtus, and alſo what has been ſaid above of the great expences of Cardinal Peter Riario. *Gretſer, in Examin. Myſterii Pleſſ.* pag. 544, takes advantage of thoſe variations.

(6) It ſhould be *Forli.*

(7) Coëffeteau, Reponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 1205.

(8) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 556.

(9) A manuſcript Memoir of de la Monnoie.

petition, wherein he was deſired to permit the exerciſe of Sodomy, during three months in a year. I have traced this fact up to the origin [*C*], and ſhall give my thoughts of it in

‘ truth of it: Nam Sixtus, *they are his words*, inter bonos numeratur Pontifices. Verum nullus malus purgatorio infertur, purique tam pauci decedunt, ut nihil purgandum ſecum ferant, opera enim illorum ſequuntur illos. - - - *For Sixtus is reckoned among the good Popes; but wicked men are not ſent to purgatory, and ſo few die ſo pure, as to want no purgation, for their works follow them.* The ſame Commentator upon the verſe: *At tu implume caput*, adds, that the Poet not having ſpecified the Pope, he dares not ſpecify him neither, notwithſtanding the marginal note. And three lines after explaining this verſe, At niſi feminea tandem prece motus olympi Rex afferret opem, *&c.* - - - *Had not the Lord of Heaven, moved by a woman's prayer, at laſt aſſiſted thee*, &c. by *feminea prece*, - - - *a woman's prayer*, words which the Devil uſes out of contempt, he underſtands Divæ Virginis cui, *ſays he*, ſi de Sixto quarto loquitur, ſtudioſus admodum fuit, ejuſque conceptionis diem celebrari indixit. - - - *The holy virgin Mary, for whom Sixtus the IVth, if he is here meant, had the greateſt regard, and appointed the day of her conception to be kept holy.* Badius, for want of chronology, prepoſterouſly entangled himſelf. Properly ſpeaking, thoſe verſes cannot be underſtood of Pope Sixtus, ſince Alphonſus, who is the hero of the Poem, dying on the fifth of July 1468, remained in purgatory, according to Mantuanus, till the taking of Negropont by Mahomet II, the 12th of July 1470; after which the Poet ſuppoſes that Alphonſus goes from purgatory to the terreſtrial Paradiſe, and from thence to Heaven, where he arrived on Eaſter-day, the year following 1471, and conſequently near four months before Sixtus was made Pope, and above thirteen years before he died. It is therefore more reaſonable to believe that Mantuanus deſigned to make in general a deſcription of a proud and voluptuous Pope, who however having obtained before his death the remiſſion of his ſins, by the Virgin's interceſſion, *Feminea prece*, was condemned in the other world, not to hell torments, as ſome authors have raſhly affirmed, but only to thoſe of purgatory. This is what the Devil himſelf owns, whom the Poet introduces ſpeaking to that Pope in theſe words:

At niſi feminea tandem prece motus olympi
Rex afferret opem, cum jam ſuſpiria raucus
Ultima vix traheres, & mors incumberet ori,
Noſter eras, ego jam ſtratum tibi molle parabam
Larga ubi tartareas intrat ſentina cloacas,
Par meritis locus ille tuis, Deus iſte malorum
Fautor, ut antiquis viduatam civibus aulam
Et noſtro mœſtam exilio repararet, in aſtra
Colluviem vulgi humani, paſſimque volentes
Ire levat, *&c.*
Sic illi placet, & placeat, mihi forſitan olim
Non impune feres, & non ſine vulnere multo
In loca pervenies quondam mea.

Had not the Lord of Heaven, moved by a woman's prayer, at laſt aſſiſted thee when thou couldeſt hardly gaſp, and death lay heavy on thee, thou hadſt been mine. For thee I had prepared a downy bed, where the wide ſink is diſembogued into the infernal ſhore: a place moſt due to thy deſerts. That God, abettor of the wicked, in order to repair his court, abandoned of it's old inhabitants, and ſad for our exile, calls up to heaven, the dregs of human race, &c. *For this is his good pleaſure. So let it be. I may, in time, make thee ſeverely ſuffer for it, and many laſhes ſhalt thou feel, before thou enter thoſe regions formerly poſſeſſed by us.*

‘ I do not deny that the Poet, who was naturally ſomewhat ſatirical, was pleaſed with putting into his deſcription ſome ſtrokes relating to the licentious life of ſome Popes and Prelates, whoſe memory was ſtill freſh. Some curious perſons have exerciſed their wit in making their applications. Some have ſaid that the author meant Sixtus IV, and others that he meant Paul II. At leaſt, I find in the edition of Bologna, in folio, of the 11th of June 1502, over-againſt theſe verſes, *Prima ſono vox languenti miſerere dolentum, Et ſine, clamabat*, &c. this marginal note, *Papa P.* And lower, over-againſt the verſe, *At tu implume caput*, there is in the margin of the ſame edition *F. P. or. Minorum*, which ſome read, *Frater Petrus ordinis Minorum*, viz. Peter Riario a Cordelier, and afterwards a Cardinal, nephew to Pope Sixtus. I confeſs there is nothing in theſe laſt verſes but what ſuits that Cardinal; but becauſe it is certain the Poet brings only two interlocutors into his dialogue, *viz.* a Pope, whoever he be, and a devil, called Jupiter, it follows that a third cannot be admitted, and conſequently that this conjecture, tho' never ſo probable, vaniſhes away.’

There is another thing, whereby it may be proved, that Baptiſta Mantuanus did not mean Pope Sixtus, which is, that he commends him very much in the ſame work, wherein he deplores the corruption of his age. He praiſes him ſo far as to ſay, that if that corruption had not been ſo great as to be paſt curing, that Pope might have cured it.

Poſtquam rerum te Roma potentem
Fecit, & obſcuro jubar hoc reſplenduit orbi,
Exanimis virtus, ſcelerum ſub mole ſepulta
Reſpirare parum viſa eſt, & tollere frontem;
Et niſi tot vitiis hæc ſecula noſtra fuiſſent
Depravata, boni poterant rectoris habenæ
Errantes frenare rotas, ſed tantus equorum
Impetus aurigam ſuperat, fruſtraque retractans
Lora gubernator ſine lege per invia fertur,
Propterea ſortem doleo mitiſſime Patrum
Sixte tuam, fueras annis melioribus aptus
Eſt tibi quæ tanto ſatis eſt in principe virtus (10).

When Rome made thee it's ſovereign, a light ſhone o'er the darkned world; virtue expiring, and groaning under crimes, appeared again to breathe and raiſe her drooping head. Had not our age been ſo depraved by crimes, the reins in the hands of a good prince, might have reſtrained the wandring wheels of government. But the impetuous fury of the ſteeds o'ercomes the charioteer, who pulling back the reins in vain, is carried over pathleſs ground. Therefore, O Sixtus, I lament thy fate, Sixtus, the mildeſt of fathers, born for better times, endowed with every princely virtue.

[*C*] *I have traced this fact up to the origin.*] In the year 1686, Mr Jurieu publiſhed his *Prejugez legitimes contre le Papiſme*, wherein he ſays, among other things (11), that Sixtus IV *was more debauched and vicious than one can imagine, and a Popiſh writer* (12) *ſays of him, that a petition was preſented to him, by the family of the Cardinal of Santa Lucia, that they might be permitted to perform the act of ſodomy during the three hotteſt months of the year, June, July, and Auguſt* (§ *α*). *He wrote under the petition,* Let it be done as deſired. *It is for him that Baptiſta Mantuanus, who lived at that time made theſe verſes* (13):

At tu implume caput cui tanta licentia quondam
Fœmineos fuit in coitus: tua furta putabas
Hic quoque pretextu mitræ impunita relinqui,
Sic meruit tua fœda Venus: ſic prodigia in omnem
Nequitam, ad virtutis opus tua avara libido,
Illa Dioneæ Cythereia munera conchæ,
Illa pudicitiam quibus impugnare ſolebas,
Et noctes emere & nudæ indulgere paleſtræ.

But thou bald-pate who was ſo delighted with womens leud embraces, fancied thy crimes, protected by the mitre, might alſo here eſcape unpuniſhed. This recompence thy wantonneſs deſerves, thy filthy luſt, profuſe in every wicked act, and covetous in virtue, thoſe leacherous arts by which you oft enſnared chaſtity, and purchaſed nights of pleaſure, ſporting in naked combats.

---

(10) Bapt. Mantuanus, de calamit. ſuorum tempor. *lib. iii.*

(11) Jurieu, Prejug. légitim. *Tom. i, p.* 246.

(12) See, below, citation (20).

[(§ *α*) This petition ſuppoſes that the family which preſented it, deſired of the Pope the expedient propoſed, only as a ragout, which might revive the appetite in a ſeaſon, when it is not very ſtrong for the uſual food. Rem. Crit.]

(13) Mr Zuinger, profeſſor of Divinity at Baſil, affirms the ſame thing, *p.* 135, of his *Tractatus de Feſto Corporis Chriſti*, printed in 1685.

The Poet introduces a devil ſpeaking to Sixtus IV in Hell, and telling him, that his Papal mitre and bald pate will not prevent his being puniſhed for his luxury, and leudneſs, and for the venereal ſports, upon which he beſtowed ſo many days and nights. He quotes for the petition, *Weſſelius Groningenſis. Tractatu de Theſauro Eccleſ. Indulg.* I have been told that a very honeſt man, and a very good Proteſtant, having read that particular, went to Mr Jurieu in his ſtudy, and deſired him to ſhew him the author, who relates ſuch a monſtrous thing; and that Mr Jurieu ingenuouſly confeſſed to him that he had him not, but that it is to be found in ſeveral good writers. That honeſt man went away very well ſatisfied with that anſwer. For my part, I confeſs I ſhould not have been contented with it: the author of the *Prejugez* ſhould have quoted Du Pleſſis Mornai, from whom he had that paſſage; in a word, he ſhould have added to the quotation, *apud Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſt. d'Iniquité, pag.* 557. But notwithſtanding this addition, I would have made further inquiries; for in ſhort we ought to be informed how Du Pleſſis came to know that Weſſelus of Groningen relates ſuch a thing. It is ſo ſtrange, and ſo improbable, that one ought not to believe it without ſeeing it. I have therefore endeavoured to find out that book of Weſſelus, and not being able to get it, I have looked for the anſwers that were made to Du Pleſſis. Coëffeteau's anſwer ſeems to me weak; for he only excepts againſt the witneſs, becauſe he was a Heretic, and becauſe ſuch a depoſition ſhews his impudence. 'It is ſufficient for the reader, *ſays he* (14), to know that Weſſelus was a Heretic. Beſides, it is a piece of impudence to write ſuch a thing, nor can it be imagined that any man ſhould have been ſo profligate as to think of what he imputes to Pope Sixtus, and to the Cardinals of St Sixtus, and Santa Lucia. I cannot apprehend how a gentleman could write down ſuch filthy things.' This anſwer of Coëffeteau ſhews that he owns the thing to be in Weſſelus, whereby he grants to Du Pleſſis whatever he could deſire. The Jeſuit Gretſer comes off much better; he denies that Weſſelus ſaid ſuch a thing, and proves that he has not ſaid ſo (15). 1. Becauſe his treatiſe of Indulgences quoted by Du Pleſſis, and publiſhed by Goldaſtus, a good Calviniſt, contains not a word relating to the petition preſented to the Pope. 2. Becauſe Flacius Illyricus, who took out of Weſſelus's works whatever he thought favourable to his deſign, did not mention what concerns that petition. From whence it plainly follows, that neither Flacius Illyricus, nor Goldaſtus, men throughly verſed in the knowledge of ſuch books, found in any library a manuſcript of Weſſelus's works, that contained the fact mentioned by Du Pleſſis. The only authority that we have, is therefore that of Bale, who having related that particular (16), quotes for it the book of Papal Indulgences, written by Weſſelus of Groningen. Not being willing to ſtop here, I further looked into the reply to Coëffeteau, made by a very learned miniſter (17), who had as much reading as any man in his time. He was not ignorant of what Gretſer had anſwered; he replies nothing to it; which ſhews that Gretſer did not tell a lie, in what he affirmed concerning Goldaſtus's edition, and Illyricus. From whence it ought to be concluded, that it is only upon Bale's credit that Weſſelus mentioned the petition in queſtion.

Which being ſo, I ſay that none will mention again ſuch a petition, but a wretched rhapſodiſt, who tranſcribes and heaps up without any judgment, whatever he finds in the writers of his party; for, in ſhort, if the author of the *Prejugez* had conſidered what he did, would he not have foreſeen that ſuch a petition would be denied, and would he not have made himſelf ready to maintain the truth of it; but then would he not have quickly found out that the thing could not be maintained? and if he had been a wiſe man, he had wholly laid aſide that objection. Let us ſuppoſe an adverſary, who attacks him upon that ſubject. Prove to me, will he ſay, that Sixtus IV granted the exerciſe of ſodomy for three months yearly to thoſe who petitioned him for it. Mr Jurieu will anſwer, that Weſſelus of Groningen affirms it in his book concerning indulgences. This is not true, will the adverſary reply; here is the book of Weſſelus, publiſhed by a Proteſtant, but that fact is not to be found in it. Illyricus, another Proteſtant, who had ſo much peruſed Weſſelus, did not find it neither: and therefore you calumniate Weſſelus. No, will Mr Jurieu ſay; I do not calumniate him, for Bale aſcribes to him the thing in queſtion. But the adverſary will anſwer, if you had common ſenſe, could you believe that the authority of a writer, ſo much cried down, and ſo much deteſted by the Church of Rome, will counterbalance Illyricus's ſilence, and Goldaſtus's edition? Why not, will Mr Jurieu reply: the Papiſts have ſtruck that paſſage out of Weſſelus's book, and therefore Illyricus and Goldaſtus could not find it; but Bale had a copy that was not interpolated. And I maintain, will the antagoniſt ſay, that Bale made uſe of a copy, into which a man, who was no better than he, foiſted that paſſage, if Bale himſelf was not the impoſtor; and after all, you are to ſhew me a manuſcript of Weſſelus, which favours you, and which you may oppoſe to Goldaſtus's edition, which confounds you. I do not know what Mr Jurieu could reply; and therefore he is like thoſe imprudent accuſers whom Cicero laughed at, who are nonpluſſed when their aſſertions are denied (18). Every wiſe man will grant, that the believing of a crime is not ſufficient to charge any body with it, and that one muſt be in a capacity to prove it to thoſe that deny it. Tho' you believe never ſo much that Sixtus IV. was guilty of ſuch an abomination, and that Weſſelus wrote ſo, you will not affirm it in a book, if you are a man of judgment, and if you have no better proofs than Mr Jurieu. For the reſt, I do not pretend that theſe critical obſervations concern Mr Du Pleſſis Mornai: he wrote in a time when men were not ſo nice; and Goldaſtus's edition was unknown to him (19).

I had almoſt forgot to obſerve, that none but a very ignorant or inſincere man can maintain that Weſſelus was a Papiſt. If he had been a Papiſt, would Luther have beſtowed this encomium upon him? 'Prodiit en Weſſelus, vir admirabilis ingenii, rari & magni ſpiritus, quem & ipſum apparet eſſe vere theodidactum, quales prophetavit fore Chriſtianos Eſaias: neque enim ex hominibus accepiſſe judicari poteſt, ſicut nec ego. Hic ſi mihi antea fuiſſet lectus, poterat hoſtibus meis videri Lutherus omnia ex Weſſelo hauſiſſe, adeo ſpiritus utriuſque conſpirat in unum, &c (20). - - - *Here is Weſſelus, a man of admirable parts, of an excellent and great ſpirit, and who alſo appeared to be truly taught of GOD, ſuch as Eſaias propheſied Chriſtians would be: for he cannot be judged to have learned of men, no more than I. Had I read him before, my enemies might have thought that Luther had taken all from Weſſelus, ſuch agreement there is betwixt the genius of both,* &c.'

Note, That Mr Saldenus, a Dutch miniſter at the Hague, affirms, that according to Agrippa, the permiſſion I have been ſpeaking of, was granted to a cardinal by Sixtus IV. *Idem hic Sixtus, teſte Agrippa, Cardinali cuidam maſculæ Veneris uſum certis menſibus ſecure indulſit* (21). Agrippa ſays no ſuch thing (§ β). See below the remark [*E*].

[(§ β) Obſerve alſo that Johannes Lydius was very near falling into the ſame miſtake with reſpect to Volaterranus. 'Quid dixiſſet pia Fœmina, *ſays he* *, ſi Sixti Quarti audiviſſet impietatem, qui Cardinali Luciæ Sodomiam tribus menſibus calidioribus permiſit: teſte Volaterrano in Declam. ad Leu. - - - - *What would the pious woman have ſaid, had ſhe heard of the impiety of Sixtus the fourth, who granted to the Cardinal of Lucia a diſpenſation for ſodomy in the three hotteſt months: witneſs Volaterranus,* &c. in Declam. ad Leu.' This paſſage was not unknown to Mr Bayle, who, finding the citation obſcure and unintelligible, conſulted Mr La Croze †. He received from him an explanation of it, which he did not publiſh, and which I aſked of that learned man. Here is the ſubſtance of it. A book intituled, *Mus exenteratus*, printed for the firſt time at Stutgard, in 1593, after having ſpoken of the pretended diſpenſation of Sixtus IV, in favour of ſodomy, puts in the margin, *Volater. Lib. 22 Antroph. Stella in Sixto IV. Joh. Baleus Anglus. Agrippa in Declam. ad Lovanienſes, &c.* It is eaſy to perceive, that divers authors are there quoted indiſcriminately who have ſpoken ill of Sixtus IV. Lydius, in all likelihood, uſed this teſtimony againſt him; and, whether by the error of the Printer, or of Lydius, or that of ſome author who had copied it before him, the words that are between *Volater.* and in *Declam.* were omitted. I add, that by an error of the preſs *Lov.* might very eaſily be changed into *Leu.* Mr Bayle hath acknowledged that Mr La Croze had very well gueſſed from whence the wrong citation of Lydius, in the remarks. It is highly improbable [*D*]. If Sixtus IV, had granted ſuch a petition, he

---

(14) Coëffeteau, Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 1207.

(15) Sed in illo libro (*de Indulgentiis Papalibus*) prout tomo primo *monarchiæ* Goldaſticæ à Goldaſto Calviniſta evulgatus eſt; nullum penitus de hac inexpiabili enormitate verbulum reperitur; nec, quod mireris, Illyricus in Catalogo ejus meminit, eo loco ubi ex operibus Weſſeli, ea, quæ ad ſuum forum facere credebat, excerpſit. *Gretſerus, in Examin. Myſterii Pleſſæani*, *p.* 545.

(16) Cent. VIII, cap. I.

(17) Andrew Rivet. *See the ſecond part of his book*, pag. 625.

(18) Jam invideo magiſtro tuo, qui te tanta mercede . . . nihil ſapere doceat. Quid eſt enim minus non dico Oratoris, ſed hominis, quam id objicere adverſario, quod ille ſi verbo negarit, longius progredi non poſſit qui objecerit? *Cicero Philipp. II*, pag. 532, Edit. *Abrami. To which theſe words of Lactantius may be added.* Turpe eſt hominem ingenioſum dicere id quod ſi neges probare non poſſit. *Inſtit. Divin. lib. iii, cap. xxviii, p. m.* 219.

(19) The firſt volume of his *Monarchia*, did not come out till after the *Myſtere d'Iniquité*.

(20) Luther in a preface that was prefixed to a book of Weſſelus. See Geſner's *Bibliotheque*, fol. 628.

(21) Saldenus, Otia Theolog. *p.* 164. *He quotes* Agrippa *de Vanit. Scient. cap.* 64.

* Pag. 9. Analect. ad Clemeng. de corrupto Eccleſ. ſtatu.

† See Mr Bayle's Letters, *Tom. iii, Letter CCXLII, p.* 914. of the Amſterdam edition, 1729.

Lydius proceeded; and he obſerves that Volaterranus ſpeaks not at all of that diſpenſation in the XXIId book of his Anthropologia, and that he had read over the *Declam. ad Lovanienſes* of Agrippa, without finding there any ſuch thing †. Thus this teſtimony falls ſtill to the ſhare of *Bale* alone. REM. CRIT.]

[*D*] . . . . *It is highly improbable.*] My deſign is not to extenuate the vices of thoſe, who are ſaid to have preſented that petition; on the contrary I aggravate them: for I maintain, that if thoſe men had been ſo wicked as to preſent it, and make uſe of the permiſſion granted them, they were too profligate to care for ſuch a permiſſion. You may be ſure that ſuch men would not forbear plunging themſelves into vice, till the Pope had granted their petition. Beſides, was it neceſſary to draw up a petition in form, and to expect an anſwer to it in writing? Was it not ſufficient to whiſper it in the ear, without diſcovering ſuch an abominable impudence to ſeveral perſons? In ſhort, I could be ſooner perſuaded of the truth than of the probability of ſuch a propoſition. The moſt profligate men do commonly obſerve a decorum, when they cannot offend againſt it without acting needleſſly, or to their prejudice. If that Pope had a mind to grant a privilege, he might have done it by word of mouth, without expoſing his reputation. If he grants it in writing, the conſcience of the petitioners will not be more at reſt for it, and he runs the hazard of being convicted of an abominable action by his own hand. Will a profligate man, if he has any wit, commit ſuch a fault?

I muſt not forget an obſervation that is proper enough to ſhew the falſity of this ſtory. It is ſuppoſed that the family of the Cardinal of Santa Lucia aſked leave *to perform the act of ſodomy during the three hotteſt months in the year*, viz. *June*, *July*, and *Auguſt*. There is in it a miſtake in matter of fact, which makes the whole ſtory ſuſpected: it is ſuppoſed that leud people in Italy are more tormented with their paſſion during the greateſt heat, than at any other time; which is a falſe ſuppoſition. If you conſult Phyſicians, they will tell you, that of all the ſeaſons of the year, men are leſs inclined to venery in ſummer, becauſe the heat weakens and enervates them. ‘Coitum porro mulieres æſtate magis appetunt, quia ſemen earum frigidum tunc calore temporis contemperatur, ac movetur, in viris autem fit exhalatus, conſumptio, ac debilitas à calore adaucto: Hyemis vero frigore vigoratur, & vegetior ac fortitor redditur, ideoque magis appetunt viri hyeme, quam mulieres (22). - - - *The amorous deſires of women are ſtrongeſt in ſummer, becauſe the female ſeed being cold, is tempered and put into motion by the heat of that ſeaſon; whereas the increaſe of heat produces exhalation, waſting, and weakneſs in the male ſeed, but the coldneſs of winter adds vigour, life, and ſtrength to it. And therefore the amorous deſires of men are ſtronger in the winter, than thoſe of women.*’ If thoſe, who vented this ſtory, had pitched upon March, April, and May, it had been more likely. We are told in the *Menagiana* of a woman, who confeſſed ſhe would not engage to be chaſte in May, tho' ſhe pretended to overcome the temptations of the fleſh all the other months of the year. In France the month of May is accounted the ſtrongeſt in that reſpect: and becauſe all the effects of the ſpring are earlier in Italy, the month of April muſt needs be there what the month of May is in other countries. I would not have any conſequences drawn from what we obſerve in plants and animals to man; they might be unexact, becauſe man's induſtry affords him a thouſand remedies againſt the ſeverity of the winter, which are unknown to vegetables and beaſts: however, I ſhall take notice of what the Naturaliſts obſerve, that the ſpring is the uſual time of generations (23).

Nam ſimul ac ſpecies patefacta'ſt verna diei,
Et reſerata viget genitalis aura Favoni;
Aëriæ primum volucres te, Diva, tuumque
Significant initum percuſſæ corda tua vi:
Inde feræ pecudes perſultant pabula læta,
Et rapidos tranant amneis; ita capta lepore,
Illecebriſque tuis omnis natura animantum
Te ſequitur cupide, quo quamque inducere pergis:
Denique per maria, ac monteis fluvioſque rapaceis,
Frundiferaſque domos avium, campoſque virenteis,
Omnibus incutiens blandum per pectora amorem,
Efficis, ut cupide generatim ſæcla propagent (24).

When firſt the riſing ſpring adorns the mead,
And a new ſcene of nature ſtands diſplay'd,
When teeming buds and cheerful greens appear,
And weſtern gales unlock the lazy year,
The joyous birds thy welcome firſt expreſs,
Whoſe native ſongs thy genial fire confeſs:
Then ſavage beaſts bound o'er their ſlighted food,
Struck with thy darts, and tempt the raging flood:
All nature is thy gift; earth, air, and ſea:
Of all that breathes the various progeny,
Stung with delight, is goaded on by thee.
O'er barren mountains, o'er the flow'ry plain,
The leafy foreſt, and the liquid main,
Extends thy uncontroll'd and boundleſs reign.
Thro' all the living regions doſt thou move,
And ſcatter'ſt where thou goeſt the kindly ſeeds of love.
DRYDEN.

What you have juſt now read out of the Menagiana, was quoted by me without book: I had not then time to look for the page; I have found it ſince; and tho' I ſaw I had not miſtaken the ſenſe of the author, I am ſenſible that I omitted ſome circumſtances, that deſerved to be mentioned. Here follows the whole paſſage. ‘One day as we were diſcourſing of the effects of the month of May, which heats a-new, not only the earth, and what is on it, but alſo revives love in the very bottom of the water: after a great deal of talk about that ſubject, the Marchioneſs de C. L. . . . mother of the Marchioneſs de S. . . . told me, I will engage to be chaſte in all the months of the year, but I cannot be ſure of it in May (25).’ A Phyſician, who continued the work of Laurence Joubert about popular errors, examines this queſtion: *Whether this ſaying be right, Do not ſport much with women, but drink hard in the months that have no R* (26). He diſapproves that rule no farther than as it excludes the month of May; a month, ſays he (27), *the moſt devoted to love: and I could eaſily believe that in antient times people did not marry in that month, not ſo much out of jealouſy, or for fear of getting bad wives, according to the Poet's ſaying,* Maio nubunt malæ, *as by reaſon of the fury of love, which is then ſo violent in women, that they can hardly be ſatisfied, and therefore they may think of other men, to be as* Marte viri, Maio mulieres. He had made uſe of theſe words in the foregoing page: ‘If therefore the ſpring is the moſt proper time for ſuch a ſport, it ſeems unreaſonable to abſtain from it in all the months that have no R, ſince the ſpring begins only about the latter end of March, and laſts all April and May, which has the true qualities of heat and moiſtneſs; and it is then that the gayity of the ſeaſon fills all ſorts of animals with love.

In furias ignemque ruunt, furor omnibus idem.

All are on fire, and the like flame
With equal fury burns the ſame.

‘At this rate the ſpring, which is the beſt time of the year for ſuch performances, would paſs away without them (28).’ The doctrine of Rodericus à Caſtro above-mentioned (29), is that of the antient Naturaliſts. One of the properties of ſummer, according to Heſiod, is to weaken the males, and kindle a greater love in females.

Τῆμος ποιόταταί τ' αἶγες, καὶ οἶνος ἄριστος,
Μαγλόταταί δὲ γυναῖκες, ἀφαυρότατοι δέ τε ἄνδρες
Εἰσὶν.

Tunc

---

† Letter CCLIII, pag. 957, ubi ſupra.

(22) Rodericus à Caſtro, de morbis mulierum, *lib. iii, cap. iii, p. m.* 108.

(23) Vere tument terræ, & genitalia ſemina poſcunt. *Virgil. Georg. lib. ii, ver* 324. Continuoque avidis ubi ſubdita flamma medullis Vere magis (quia vere calor redit oſſibus.) *Id. ibid. lib. iii, ver.* 271.

(24) Lucret. lib. i, ver. 10.

(25) Menagiana, *p.* 170, *of the ſecond Dutch edition.*

(26) Bachot, ubi infra.

(27) Bachot, Erreurs populaires touchant la Médecine & Regime de Santé, *book ii, ch. ix, p.* 301.

(28) Id. ibid. *p.* 300.

(29) Above, citation (22).

he would have fallen far ſhort of the prudence and virtue which Clement VII diſcovered, when he thought that ſome ladies deſired of him a permiſſion to do an unlawful thing [*E*]. It

Tunc pingueſque capræ, & vinum optimum,
Salaciſſimæ vero mulieres, & viri imbecilliſſimi
ſunt (30).

The Poet Alcæus was of the ſame opinion (31). Ariſtotle ſuppoſes it to be true, and enquires into the reaſons of it (32). The Moderns, who ſo much criticize the antient Naturaliſts, have nothing to ſay againſt them upon that point. Mr Venette, a famous Phyſician, follows their opinion, and expreſſes himſelf fully to that purpoſe. ‘ The great heat of the months of July and of Auguſt, together with our fiery temper, deſtroys our natural heat, waſtes our ſpirits, and weakens all the parts of our bodies. It produces a great deal of choler, and many ſharp excrements, which afterwards make us weak and languiſhing. If we have then a mind to ſport with women, our ſtrength ſoon fails us; and tho' at firſt our paſſion enables us to make ſome efforts, we quickly find ourſelves ſo weak, and ſo exhauſted, that it is impoſſible for us to be ſtout champions. And if we have a mind to loſe all our ſtrength, and to be ſick, we need only ſport frequently with women. On the contrary, women are much more laſcivious in ſummer time. Their cold and moiſt temper is mended by the ſchorching heat of the ſun . . . . . Truly thoſe amorous paſſions are not well diſtributed. Whilſt women are fiery, we are languiſhing. Their paſſion no ſooner begins to appear, but ours vaniſhes away, as if nature intended thereby to teach us, that the exceſs of love is wholly prejudicial to mens health (33).’ This moral reflexion of Mr Venette puts me in mind of a paſſage in Pliny, wherein I thought he acknowledged a providence of nature in ſuch a diviſion of paſſions (34); but having more narrowly conſidered it, I find it ought not to be underſtood in that ſenſe: nay, it ſeems to me that Pliny has committed a fault, which perhaps no body has taken notice of, and therefore I ſhall ſet down his words. *Urinam ciere præcipue traditur* (ſcolymos) *ſanare lichenas & lepras ex aceto. Venerem ſtimulare in Vino, Heſiodo & Alcæo teſtibus: qui florente ea cicadas acerrimi cantus eſſe, & mulieris libidinis avidiſſimas, viroſque in coitum pigerrimos ſcripſere, velut providentia naturæ hoc adjumento tunc valentiſſimo* (35). That is to ſay, according to the verſion of du Pinet: ‘ It is ſaid that the artichoak (36) is very proper to provoke urine: and that uſed with vinegar, it cures tetters, itch, and ſhingles. Heſiod and Alcæus ſay, that it excites love: and they maintain, that when the artichoaks are in flower the graſs-hoppers make the loudeſt noiſe; for they are then moſt bent upon ſinging. They alſo ſay, that women are at this time moſt laſcivious, and men, on the contrary, moſt languiſhing in the ſports of love: inſomuch that nature, in order to ſupply the neceſſities of the ladies, ſends the artichoak as a food very proper to warm the men.’ This ſeems not to be a bad tranſlation; wherefore, if there are errors in this paſſage, I impute them to the original. It ſeems to me that Pliny did not apprehend Heſiod's meaning, nor that of Alcæus; for thoſe two Poets ſay nothing of the virtue of the *ſcolymos*: They only ſay that it is a plant, which flowers during the greateſt heat of the ſummer, and when graſs-hoppers ſing moſt, *&c*. They deſcribe the ſummer by thoſe two marks, and by ſome others, but without pretending that there is any relation between them as between a cauſe and it's effect.

I ſhall conclude with ſaying, that thoſe, who mentioned the petition in queſtion, did wrongly chuſe the three months of the diſpenſation. They pitched upon the three hotteſt months in the year, which were thoſe they ought leaſt of all to have choſen. The Spaniards would not have made ſuch a choice; as it appears from theſe words of the continuator of Laurence Joubert (37): *Celſus ſeems to have learnedly concluded this chapter, when he ſays* (38), *that amorous exerciſes are not dangerous and pernicious in winter; that they are very ſafe in the ſpring; and neither good in the ſummer nor in the autumn, tho' more tolerable in the autumn. For one ought wholly to forbear in the ſummer, if it be poſſible. The Spaniards ſeem to have better obſerved that common ſaying* (39) *than we have, by excluding May, and reckoning only three months:* Junio, Julio, y Auguſto, Dieta olguetta & quatre nodios in braguetta. - - - *A moiſt diet in June, July, and Auguſt, and four buttons on the codpiece.*

If any one ſhould ſay that ſome reaſons, well known at Rome to debauched people, did, pehaps, occaſion the aſking of a diſpenſation for *the three hotteſt months in the year*, he ſhould deſerve no anſwer. Such a general diſcourſe ought neither to be examined nor minded; and until a better reaſon be alledged, the firſt who mentioned that petition, will juſtly be accounted one of thoſe ſatirical writers, who know not how to obſerve the rules of probability. We may apply to him theſe words of an antient Father, *Voluntatem eum habere mentiendi, artem fingendi non habere*: he is very willing to tell a lie, but he does not underſtand the art of lying (40). This does not concern Weſſelus of Groningen; for firſt, it is not known whether he mentioned that petition; that fact is not to be found in his books that are extant: and, in the ſecond place, it may be preſumed, that if he ſaid ſomething of it, it was upon the credit of another. He quoted ſomebody, or at leaſt he made uſe of this clauſe, *Fama eſt, fertur*, - - - *It has been reported, it is ſaid*, &c. However it be, I declare I do not take him to be the firſt author of that ſtory. Many controverſiſts have been impoſed upon by the name of ſuch a wiſe and eminent Divine; but ſince they knew not how he ſpoke of it, whether he gave ſome proofs of it, or none at all, whether it was upon a hear-ſay, or upon the teſtimony of grave men, they have been too haſty in their judgment, and in their quotations. It is particularly about libels diſperſed againſt ſuch perſons as Sixtus IV, that one ought to act with deliberation. He had diſturbed the public peace of Italy; he had laid an interdict upon the Republics of Venice and Florence, and engaged in a violent war with both. There was not a little corruption in his court; his relations had made themſelves odious by their ambition and debauchery. It was impoſſible but that many paſquinades would come out againſt him (41). Any Venetian or Florentine, ſkilled in the art of ſlandering, could not fail to pleaſe his ſovereigns or his fellow-citizens, by uſing his talent againſt the Pope. He might expect that his ſatirical ſtrokes, whether true or falſe, would be very acceptable: it is a conſolation for thoſe who fear or hate a prince, to ſee him abuſed in libels; they believe every thing, every thing goes down in ſuch a diſpoſition, and therefore ſatirical writers do not much care to obſerve the rules of probability, being ſure to make people believe the groſſeſt lies. Which they are particularly ſure of, when they can juſtly charge others with ill actions: thoſe truths ſerve as a ſafe conduct to the falſities that go along with them (42). This obſervation might be of uſe at all times to thoſe, who are not willing to confound well-grounded ſlanders with malicious calumnies. But to ſpeak only of Sixtus IV. I obſerve, that if there was any ground for the petition in queſtion, Weſſelus would not be the only writer that had ſaid ſomething of it. How could he have found out what was unknown to the ſatirical writers of Venice and Florence?

[*E*] *The virtue which Clement VII diſcovered, when he thought that ſome ladies deſired he would permit them to do an unlawful thing.*] This particular may be ſeen in a chronicle; it is not a ſtory preſerved by tradition. It may be found in the annals of Aquitain, publiſhed ſeveral times by John Bouchet, who lived at that time (43). He ſpeaks of the interview between Clement VII, and Francis I, at Marſeilles in 1533. ‘ During that interview between the Pope and the King, where all the royal family of France was, and ſeveral princes and lords, and alſo the Queen of France and her retinue, there was a common report, that a pleaſant trick, deſerving to be remembered, had been plaid to three ladies of the queen, who were all virtuous, chaſte, and devout women. Thoſe three ladies, who were all widows, having a weakly and ſickly conſtitution, deſired to have a licence from the Pope to eat fleſh upon prohibited days; and in order to it, they made their application to the Duke of Albania, his near relation, who gave them his promiſe, and then ſent for them to come to the Pope. That duke, who was very familiar ‘ with

---

(30) Heſiod. Oper. & Dier. ver. 585.

(31) *See* Proclus in Heſiod. *ibid. Conſult Menage*, in Diog. Laërt. *lib. ix, p.* 352, *and Father Harduin*, in Plinium, *Tom. iv, p.* 205, 206.

(32) Ariſtot. Problem. §. *iv, Quæſt. xxvi.*

(33) Venette, Tableau de l'Amour Conjugal, *p.* 180, 181. *Edit.* 1696.

(34) As if nature had deſigned thus to diſtribute the ſeaſons of love, to prevent the ill conſequences of exceſs.

(35) Plin. *lib. xxii, cap. xxii, p. m.* 205, 206.

(36) Obſerve that according to Salmaſius the *Scolymos* of which Pliny ſpeaks after Heſiod, is not the Arti choak. See Mr le Clerc in his Notes on Heſiod, *p.* 282. *Edit.* 1701.

(37) Bachot, Vulgar Errors, *book ii, ch. ix. p.* 302, 303.

(38) Venus tum (*hieme*) non æque perniciofa eſt . . . Neque æſtate vero, neque autumno utilis Venus eſt. Tolerabilior tamen per autumnum: æſtate in totum, ſi fieri poteſt, abſtinendum eſt. *Corn. Celſus, lib. i, cap. iii. p.* 33, 34.

(39) Viz. that which I nave mentioned above citation (26).

(40) It is obſerved in the eighth volume of the *Morale pratique des Jéſuites*, pag. 152, that this ſaying was aplied to the Jeſuit Briſacier.

(41) Non modo omnes Italiæ potentatus in eos (*Venetos*) concitavit, ſed etiam veluti Clemens VI, alias fecerat, illos execravit, interdixit, & omnibus dignitatibus privavit. Nec quoad vixit, illis abſolutionis beneficium impendere voluit. Ex quo multos detractores habuit. *Nauclerus, Gener. l, fol. m.* 979.

(42) Note, that on the other hand this mixture of truths and falſities is favourable to thoſe who make an apology for perſons that are defamed; for when the writer of a libel is convicted of falſhood upon ſeveral points, he becomes ſuſpected of calumny in every thing elſe.

(43) He ſays, fol. 270, *verſo*, edition of Poitiers 1557, that they were printed at Poictiers the third time, in the beginning of the year 1535.

It is ſaid that Sixtus died in the year 1484, of the grief he conceived, when he heard that the peace was concluded between the Duke of Ferrara and the Venetians [*F*]. He loved the war, and he has been looked upon as the diſturber of the repoſe of Italy. Agrippa ſays one thing of him which deſerves to be mentioned [*G*]. You may ſee in Moreri (*d*), that it has been ſaid that this Pope got himſelf admitted into the houſe of la Rovere, which was very illuſtrious in Piedmont. That family was in poſſeſſion of a ſtrange prerogative [*H*].

All authors are agreed that Sixtus IV was a learned man. He had received his doctor's degree at Padua, and had read public lectures in the univerſity of Bologna, at Pavia, at Siena, at Florence, and at Peruggia. From the employment of a lecturer in the univerſities, he was promoted to ſeveral dignities: he was made firſt of all Provincial of the province of Liguria, and then Procurator-General of his order at the Court of Rome, and afterwards Vicar-General of Italy, and at laſt General of the Franciſcans. After thoſe preferments he received a cardinal's hat. He got a great reputation by the works,

he

' with thoſe ladies, having a mind to give ſome ſport to the Pope and to the King, told the Pope, holy Father, there are three young ladies, who are widows, and of an age to get children, whom I take to have ſome luſtful temptations, becauſe they have deſired me to beg of you that they may be allowed to make uſe of a man without marrying, when they are in great want of one. How, couſin, ſaid the Pope, it were againſt GOD's commandment, from which I can diſpenſe no body? I beſeech you, holy Father, to hear them, and to make this remonſtrance to them. Whereupon the ladies came into the hall where the Pope was, and after they had kneeled and kiſſed his feet, one of them ſaid to him, Holy Father, we have deſired the Duke of Albania to beg a favour of you, and to repreſent to you our age, frailty, and weak conſtitution. Daughters, ſaid the Pope, your requeſt is not reaſonable, for it is contrary to the command of GOD. The widows not knowing what the Duke of Albania had told him, anſwered, Holy Father, be pleaſed to give us ſuch a diſpenſation, three times in a week, at leaſt in Lent, and without ſcandal. How, replied the Pope, muſt I give you leave to commit fornication? I ſhould be damned if I did. Whereupon the ladies were ſenſible that there was ſome jeſt in the matter; and one of them ſaid, We beg a a diſpenſation to eat fleſh upon prohibited days. The Duke of Albania told them, I thought, ladies, you meant live fleſh. The Pope perceiving the jeſt, ſmiled, and told the duke, Couſin, you make the ladies bluſh; when the queen comes to hear of this, ſhe will be diſpleaſed with it. The king, the queen, and the princes, were immediately told of it, and liked the humour very well (44).' You will find this adventure in Brantome's Memoirs, towards the end of the ſecond volume of his *Dames Galantes* (45), where it is related more at large than in the Annals of *Aquitain*. He knew not that this ſtory was to be found in that book: for he concludes thus: *I have been told the names of theſe three ladies,* viz. *the Lady de Chateau-briant, the Lady Chaſtillon, and the widow of the Bayliff of Caën, all very virtuous women. I have this ſtory from the old courtiers* (46).

[*F*] *It is ſaid he died . . . of the grief he conceived when he heard that a peace was made between the Duke of Ferrara and the Venetians.*] He had declared a war againſt the Republic of Venice, in favour of the Duke of Ferrara, and had a mind to keep it up; but his allies forſook him, and made a peace without conſulting him. The grief he conceived upon it increaſed his gout, and carried him off in five days. What a vicar of the Prince of Peace, who ſays in his goſpel, *Bleſſed are the peace makers. Quum pacem à ſociis præter ejus voluntatem & conſenſum fieri conſpiceret, ex animi uti putatur dolore, podagra inſuper aggravante qua in ultimis annis maxime laborabat, in quintum diem expiravit* (47). He deſerved the epitaphs, which the Poets made upon him (48).

I will not forget a fine paſſage of Alcyonius. ' Ad id (49) adductus videri poterat Ferdinandus à Xyſto Pont. Max. qui & officii Pontificii, & religionis & Dei oblitus non ſecus in Italia bella excitare ſolebat atque illa Aſiæ aut Africæ provincia eſſet, in qua Turcæ & Pœni regnarent, non pars Europæ ex flore clariſſimorum virorum conſtans, cujus princeps eſſet pontifex maximus qui moderatiſſime & ſapientiſſime clavum tanti imperii tenere & gubernacula Reip. tractare in maximo curſu & fluctibus deberet. Dein eodem Xyſto ſi non ſuaſore & impulſore certe approbatore Veneti terra & aquis arma intulerunt Herculi Ferrarienſi Principi (50). - - - *Ferdinand was thought to be brought into the war againſt Tuſcany by Sixtus; a man who forgetting his duty as a Pope, forgetting his religion and his* GOD, *uſed to raiſe his wars in Italy, as if that country was a province of Aſia, or of Africa, under the dominion of Turks or Carthaginians, and not that part of Europe which produces the moſt eminent and moſt illuſtrious men, and which has for it's prince, a Pope, who ought to ſteer the helm of ſo great a government amidſt the moſt violent ſtorms with the greateſt moderation and wiſdom. Afterwards if it was not by the perſuaſion and inſtigation of Sixtus, it was certainly by his approbation that the Venetians made war by ſea and land upon Hercules, Prince of Ferrara.*' Take notice that I have been informed by Mr de la Monnoie, that the firſt of the three epitaphs, which I have mentioned (51), from Du Pleſſis Mornai, does not concern Pope Sixtus, and that it contains two verſes of Sannazarius againſt Pope Alexander VI; alſo that it ought to be read *Sextum*, and not *Sixtum*; and that Sannazarius did rather praiſe Sixtus than blame him, as it appears from this epigram againſt the ſame Alexander. *Viſuram ſe iterum Sixtum cum Roma putaret, Pro Sixto Sextum vidit & ingemuit.*

[*G*] *Agrippa ſays one thing of him which deſerves to be mentioned.*] Du Pleſſis relates it thus. *Among the pimps of theſe latter times,* ſays Agrippa, *Sixtus IV was moſt remarkable, who built a noble bawdy-houſe at Rome . . . . The courtezans of Rome pay a Giulio every week to the Pope, and this yearly income does ſometimes amount to above twenty thouſand ducats; and that office is ſo particularly appropriated to the chiefs of the Church, that the rent of pimping is reckoned part of the Eccleſiaſtical revenues. For,* ſays he, *I heard formerly the computation made in the following manner: He has two benefices, a curacy of twenty ducats, a priory of forty, and three whores in a bawdy-houſe, who bring him twenty giulio's every week* (52). Thoſe, who deſire to ſee Agrippa's words, need only read the following paſſage. ' Sed & recentioribus temporibus Sixtus Pontifex Maximus Romæ nobile admodum lupanar extruxit . . . . . Multi alii magiſtratus . . . . in civitatibus ſuis lupanaria conſtruunt foventque, nonnihil ex meretricio queſtu etiam ærario ſuo accumulantes emolumenti: quod quidem in Italia non rarum eſt, ubi etiam Romana ſcorta in ſingulas hebdomadas Julium pendent Pontfici, qui cenſus annuus nonnunquam viginti millia ducatos excedit, adeoque Eccleſiæ procerum id munus eſt, ut unâ cum Eccleſiarum proventibus etiam lenociniorum numerent mercedem. Sic enim ego illos ſupputantes aliquando audivi; Habet, inquientes, ille duo beneficia, unum curatum aureorum viginti, alterum prioratum ducatorum quadraginta, & tres putanas in burdello, quæ reddunt ſingulis hebdomadibus Julios viginti (53).

[*H*] *The family of Rovere . . . . poſſeſſed a ſtrange prerogative.*] It was a right over the maidenheads of the virgins, whom their vaſſals married. A cardinal of that houſe threw into the fire the patent of that privilege. ' Cotal coſtume (54) de pagani & da gentili, fu gia in Piemonte, & il Cardinale Illuſtriſſimo Hieronimo della Rouere mi diceva haver egli ſteſſo abbrucciato il privilegio, che havea di cio la ſua Caſa (55). - - - *This Pagan cuſtom prevailed formerly*

' *in*

(*d*) Under the word *Ruvere.*

(44) Bouchet Annales d'Aquitaine, *fol. m.* 267.

(45) Pag. m. 356, & ſeq.

(46) Brant. Dames Galantes, *Tom. ii, p.* 358.

(47) Volaterran. *lib. xxii, p.* 819.

(48) Non potuit ſævum vis ulla extinguere Sixtum; Audito tandem nomine pacis, obit. *See the end of this remark, Item.* Dic unde Alecto pax iſta refulſit, & unde Tam ſubito reticent prelia? Sixtus obit. *Item,* Pacis ut hoſtis eras, pace peremptus obis. *Apud* du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 556.

(49) That is, to make war againſt Tuſcany.

(50) Petrus Alcyonius, in Medice legato poſteriore, *fol.* 1, *verſo.*

(51) Above citation (48).

(52) Du Pleſſis, Myſtery of Iniquity, *p.* 557.

(53) Agrippa, de vanitate Scientiar. *cap. lxiv, Tom. ii,* Operum, *p.* 135.

(54) The author had been ſpeaking of that, which Malcolme king of Scotland had eſtabliſhed.

(55) Bonifacio Vannozzi, Auvertimenti Politici, *Tom. ii, p.* 253.

he publiſhed [*I*], and being raiſed to the Papal See he made it appear that he was ſtill a lover of learning; for he ſet up the library of the Vatican (*e*), and gave the direction of it to the learned Platina, and allowed yearly penſions to ſeveral other perſons, who were to help him in taking care of the books, and tranſcribing Greek, Latin, and Hebrew manuſcripts (*f*). He ordered the ſame Platina to write the Hiſtory of the Popes (g). It has been obſerved that he was much more liberal to his ſiſters ſons than to his brothers ſons, and that among his ſiſters ſons he particularly favoured Peter and Jerome Riario. This would not be a meer fantaſtical humour, as it is pretended but rather a very natural thing, were it true that he was their father, as ſome writers will have it [*K*]. He was the firſt who inſtituted the feaſt of the Conception and Preſentation of the Holy Virgin, as alſo that of St Anne and St Joſeph, and that of Francis of Aſſiſi (*b*). He canonized Bonaventura (*i*), and appointed him a feaſt among thoſe of the apoſtolical palace (*k*). He reſtored a devotion invented by St Dominic, which was diſcontinued, viz. that of the Roſary and the Pſalter of the Holy Virgin (*l*). It is a miſtake to ſay that he was the firſt who ordered that the Jubilee ſhould be celebrated once in twenty-five years. That ordinance was made by Paul II, his predeceſſor, in the year 1470. He only confirmed it, and was the firſt who put it in execution in the year 1475 (*m*). The place which Polydore Virgil gives him among the inventers of things, does him little honour; for he aſcribes to him the firſt creation of ſeveral offices that were bought [*L*]. This was the ſource of a diſorder that increaſed daily. All authors are

(*e*) See the article PLATINA, in the text, citation (*g*), and Bonanni, *ubi infra*, citation (*k*), pag. 430.

(*f*) *Taken from* Ghilini Teatro d'Huomini Letterati, *Tom. ii*, *p.* 93.

(*g*) *Platina*, Epiſt. dedicat. ad Sixtum IV.

(*b*) Vita Sixti IV, *ad calcem* Platinæ, *fol. m.* 364.

(*i*) Id. ibid.

(*k*) Bonanni, in Numiſm. Pontificum, *Tom. i*, *p.* 91.

(*l*) Id. ibid.

(*m*) Id. ibid. *p.* 98.

'*in Piedmont, and the moſt illuſtrious Cardinal Jerome* '*della Rovere, told me that he himſelf had burnt the* '*patent which his family had for that privilege.*' They are the words of an author, who lived in the beginning of the XVIIth century. See the margin (56).

[*I*] *The works which he publiſhed.*] Here follow the titles of them. *De ſanguine Chriſti liber: De futuris contingentibus: Commentarii de Potentia Dei: De Conceptione B. Virginis: Contra errores cujuſdam Carmelitæ Bononienſis qui affirmabat Deum ſua omnipotentia, damnatum hominem ſalvare non poſſe.* He writ alſo a book to ſhew that Thomas Aquinas and Scotus, who differ ſo much in words, are at the bottom of the ſame opinion (57).

[*K*] *He particularly favoured Peter and Jerome Riario. This would not be .... a fantaſtical humour .... were it true that he was their father, as ſome writers will have it.*] '(58) He had nine nephews, '*viz.* five, whoſe name was de la Rovere, as his 'was and [illegible] ere the ſons of his three bro'thers deceaſed, and four who went by the names of 'Riario, Baſſo, and Sanſoni, the three families into 'which his ſiſters, and one of his nieces, had been 'married..... (59) It was not barely the exceſs of 'the Pope's ambition that made it intolerable, ſince 'it was attended with a kind of oddneſs, grounded 'neither upon intereſt, nor upon probability: for 'tho' Sixtus in all appearance ſhould have ſhewn more 'kindneſs to the five nephews I have juſt now men'tioned, than to the other four, who were only re'lated to him by his ſiſter's ſide; and tho' he had 'all the reaſon in the world to do it; and that 'Julian, the eldeſt of them all, was endowed with 'all the wonderful qualities, which made after'wards his Pontificate ſo famous under the name of 'Julius II; it is certain he never could obtain of 'his uncle that he ſhould behave as head of the 'houſe of la Rovere, or perform the functions of 'Cardinal Nephew, or that his brother, or his three 'couſins ſhould have what was denied him. In a 'word, the ſtrongeſt inclinations of Sixtus were al'ways in favour of his ſiſters children, eſpecially to 'thoſe of the eldeſt, who had two ſons, *viz.* Peter 'and Jerome Riario. Peter had been a Franciſcan 'as well as his uncle, and perhaps deſerved upon that 'account to have a great ſhare in his uncle's affe'ction. He was made cardinal on the ſame day 'that Julian was; but he had this advantage above 'him, that he was declared Cardinal Nephew, and 'obtained the biſhopric of Treviſo, which Julian had 'aſked. Afterwards the moſt conſiderable benefices, 'that came to be vacant, were beſtowed upon him; 'and he became ſo powerful, that he had a greater 'train than the reſt of the ſacred college..... '(60) His brother Jerome .... whom the Pope de'ſigned to make his chief heir, *&c.*' Machiavel will tell us that Peter and Jerome Riario were called Sixtus's nephews, only to conceal the relation of paternity under ſuch a name. 'Fù queſto Pontefice, *ſaith* '*he* (61), il primo che cominciaſſe à moſtrare quanto 'un Pontefice poteva, & come molte coſe chiamate 'per l'adietro errori, ſi potevano ſotto la Pontificale 'autorità naſcondere. Haveva tra la ſua famiglia 'Piero e Girolamo, i quali (ſecondo che ciaſcuno 'credeva) erano ſuoi figlivoli, nondimeno ſotto altri 'più honeſti nomi gli palliava. - - - - *This Pope was* '*the firſt who began to ſhew how much a Pope could* '*do, and that many things, formerly called errors, could* '*be concealed under the Papal authority. Among others* '*of his family, he had Peter and Jerome, who (as* '*every one believed) were his own children; however* '*he concealed them under honeſter names.*' John Michael Brutus affirms, that Sixtus begot thoſe two boys when he was but a Franciſcan, and had them bred up under the name of his nephews to conceal his fault. *Ab eo cum adhuc ageret in Franciſcanorum familia liberos ſuſceptos fuiſſe: ac quo minor Parentis infamia eſſet, propinquorum honeſtiori nomine liberaliter quidem & honeſte, ſed non tamen in ſpem tantam educatos* (62).

Some ſay he was neither the father nor the uncle of Peter and James Riario, but that they were only his favourites. Coëffeteau put that ſenſe upon the parentheſis of a paſſage above quoted (63), which contains theſe three words, *not without myſtery*. Theſe are Coëffeteau's words. *Du Pleſſis endeavours to find an abominable myſtery in that love, which is a thing that a man who loves honour ſhould have no thought of* (64). I own it, replies Rivet (65), 'in order to approve it, 'and much leſs to delight in it; but an honeſt man 'may take notice of it, and deteſt it in a ſinful man, 'and it will no more defile his imagination than the 'words of the Scripture concerning the ſodomites, or 'thoſe of St Paul ſpeaking of the heathens, in the firſt 'chapter of his epiſtle to the Romans. Certainly the 'words of Raphael Volaterranus, together with that 'extraordinary indulgence, may raiſe a ſuſpicion in 'the moſt charitable perſons; for, ſpeaking of thoſe 'two men, he ſays, *Petrum à puero, una cum Hieronymo fratre,* SIBI *educaverat*, that he had brought 'them up for himſelf from their infancy.' Obſerve, that Mr Du Pleſſis has not taken care to expreſs himſelf clearly. His words are ſo ill placed, that the beſt ſenſe which can be put upon them is a falſhood. *Having provided for theſe two*, ſays he (66), *who were nearer related to him by love than kindred, he comes next to his relations. Jerome, his brother of the ſame nurſery, whom he made Prince of Furli and of Imola.* Compare this with the words preceding, you ſhall find that by *having provided for theſe two*, he underſtands the promotion of *Peter and Jerome Riario*, from whence it follows that he meant, that Jerome, who was made *Prince of Furli*, was brother of Pope Sixtus, and a different perſon from that Jerome Riario whom he had mentioned: but this is a grand miſtake.

[*L*] *Polydore Virgil .... aſcribes to him the firſt creation of many offices that were bought.*] See the ſecond chapter of the eighth book *de Inventoribus Rerum*, out of which I ſhall ſet down the following paſſage. 'Pius II .... following the example of John XXII, 'created ſome Abbreviators, and made it an office, 'which was bought as well as the reſt. Afterwards 'Paul II, being a conſcientious man, turned out 'thoſe

(56) Mr Pars, miniſter of Katwick ſays in a Dutch book, intituled, *Katwykſe Oudbeden*, that is *Antiquities of Katwic*, pag. 196, that certain lords in Holland (he names ſome of them) had ſuch a privilege, and that it was ſuppreſſed by the States who gave them ſome money for the ſuppreſſion of it.

(57) *Taken from* Ghilini, Teatro, *Part ii*, *p.* 94.

(58) Varillas, Anecd. de Florence, *p.* 67.

(59) Id. ibid. *p.* 68.

(60) Id. ibid. *p.* 69.

(61) Machiavelli, delle Hiſt. Florentine, *lib. vii*, *p. m.* 289.

(62) Jo. Michael Brutus, Hiſtor. Florent. *lib. vii*, *p.* 387, apud Joan. Zuingerum, de Feſto Corporis Chriſti, *pag.* 133.

(63) Citat. (2).

(64) Coëffeteau, anſwer to the Myſtery of Iniquity, *p.* 1205.

(65) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Réſponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *Part. ii*, *p.* 623, *Note that he is miſtaken in calling Peter and Jerome Riario by the name of la Ruere. Mr Zuinger*, de Feſto Corporis Chriſti, *p.* 133, *has committed the ſame fault:* Ad Petri Ruerii, *ſays he*, quem pro Cinædo habuerit Sixtus & Hieronymi fratris ſui (*it ſhould be* ejus) poſtulationes, &c.

(66) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 555.

are not agreed that this pontif was a man of a mean extraction [*M*]. If he was, he may be properly alledged in confirmation of what I have ſaid in another place (*n*), that the moſt haughty and daring men may be born among the dregs of the people; for his haughtineſs was very great: the Florentines found it ſo by experience; for they could not be reconciled to him, but by ſubmitting to the moſt ſhameful humiliations (*o*). Never was ſatisfaction more ſevere than what he impoſed upon them. It is in vain for Father Bonanni to ſay that John Michael Brutus has no reaſon to complain of the harſh anſwer that was made by that Pope to their deputies: what he relates and what he confeſſes is a ſufficient proof of the great mortification they ſuſtained (*p*).

In refuting the error of Mr Saldenus (*q*), I might have cenſured ſtill upon better grounds the author of *Turco-Papiſmus*; for he quotes Agrippa as having related that this Pope appointed places of proſtitution as well for ſodomitical leudneſſes, as for others more ordinary, and granted the permiſſion of the ſin contrary to nature to a cardinal. He adds that Weſſelus alſo ſpeaks of it [*N*].

(*n*) Remark [*L*] of the article GREGORY VII.

(*o*) In the year 1480.

(*p*) *See* Bonanni, ubi ſupra, *p.* 102, *& ſeq.*

(*q*) At the end of remark [*B*].

those blood-ſuckers; but Sixtus reſtored them as ſo many ſervants neceſſary to a maſter, who is reſolved to get money by any means whatſoever. Nay, he did worſe, for he ſet up a band of ſollicitors, proctors, and ſetters, without whom no patents, called Bulls could be drawn up, that being examined by ſeveral perſons they might not be ſo eaſily interpolated and falſified. At laſt he appointed nine comptrollers or ſupervisors of the treaſury, to whom he gave a ſalary, that their offices might be the better ſold. Nor was he fruſtrated in his expectation; for an office that was ſold before for five hundred ducats, ſold moſt times for one, two, or three thouſand ducats by reaſon of that ſalary, ſo carefully do they ply their buſineſs who buy their places. This gain proved ſuch a charm to Innocent VIII, who ſucceeded Sixtus, that he ſet up an office of ſecretaries . . . . . and increaſed their number. Alexander VI appointed the collectors of briefs to the number of fourſcore. I leave you to judge whether among an army or innumerable multitude of recorders and ſcriveners, there is any want of ſerjeants, whoſe faces (as the Poet has it) are always pale with hunger, and who greedily feed upon the people: to whom we may add the Griffins, thoſe who ſo well know how to ſhear ſheep, I mean notaries and ſcriveners who ſuck poor peoples ſubſtance, whom Nicolas III turned out, being afraid they would deſtroy the whole ſheepfold (67).' I need not inform my reader that this invention of Sixtus IV is blamed, not only as an unlawful means of getting money, but alſo as a very ill example which makes way for greater miſchiefs. I might ſay many things upon it, if I would ſet up for a maker of political reflexions; but I do not pretend to that. I rather chuſe to quote another writer, who mentions the ſame conduct of Sixtus IV: it will appear from his words, that it was grounded upon the deſire of aggrandizing one of his nephews. Conſider well the words of Varillas. 'The only thing that remained to be done by Riario, in order to compleat his ſettlement, was to get footing in Umbria, from whence he might have eaſily penetrated into Romagna, and perhaps alſo into Tuſcany; but having no troops, and wanting a great deal of money to raiſe ſome, his uncle did not ſcruple to ſell the offices of the Chancery, and of the Court of Rome, which had been the reward of virtue and ability under the foregoing Popes. He created five colleagues, through whoſe hands all the diſpatches of the Datary were to go ſucceſſively, and nine new offices in the apoſtolical chamber, which were bought very dear. He neither conſidered the ſhameful trade he was going to introduce, nor the honeſt liberty of which he deprived the Court of Rome, nor the inconveniences that would ariſe from putting an end to the labour and induſtry of the moſt refined Italians; by taking from them offices freely given, which was an allurement to them, and kept up their emulation. He increaſed the old taxes, and laid new ones: He alſo ordered extraordinary tithes to be paid (68).'

[*M*] *All authors are not agreed that this Pontif was a man of mean extraction.*] He was ſo, if we believe Machiavel (69), and many other authors who ſay his father was a Fiſherman. Their proof for it would be a weak one, ſhould they go upon the authority of Panvinius, who obſerves that the inhabitants of the village, where he was born, do hardly get their livelihood any other way but by fiſhing; for that Hiſtorian ſays on the other ſide, that the family of that Pope was none of the moſt inconſiderable in the town of Savona, and that it was a branch of the houſe della Rovere, one of the moſt antient in Piedmont (70). It appears by ſeveral letters of that Pope, that he pretended to be a native of Savona; and it is obſerved that he was born by chance in the village of Cella, becauſe his father and mother had fled thither during the plague that raged at Savona. It is further ſaid, that family bore the arms of the houſe *della Rovere* (71) before Sixtus was born; which is alledged by ſome, to confute thoſe who ſay, that the lords of that family beſtowed their name and their arms upon Pope Sixtus. Francis Carriere ſays ſo in his expoſition of the Prophetical Symbols of Malachi the Iriſh man. Father Oldoini has collected ſeveral reaſons, to prove that our Franceſco della Rovere was of a noble family, and that he turned Franciſcan of his own motion, and not becauſe poverty put him upon looking for a livelihood at the expence of others (72). See Father Bonanni's Hiſtory of the Popes by medals, and compare with this the remark [*A*] in the article JULIUS II.

[*N*] *He quotes Agrippa as having related, &c.*] You ſhall ſee that it is an expreſs, not an indirect, quotation; for he hath put in Italic characters what he hath taken from Agrippa. 'Sixto quarto nihil cogitari poteſt turpius aut inquinatius; erat enim, & propter lenocinium, & nefandiſſimas libidines, infamis. *Lupanaria*, ut inquit Agrippa †, *utrique Veneri erexit, cardinalique cuidam maſculæ veneris uſum certis menſibus indulſit:* hoc etiam attigit * Weſſelus Groningenſis (73). - - - - - *Nothing can be imagined more baſe and filthy, than Sixtus IV; for he was infamous, both for his practiſing and encouraging the moſt abominable luſts.* He erected ſtews, *as Agrippa relates*, to both ſorts of Venery, and indulged the uſe of Sodomy, to a certain cardinal in certain months. *This is alſo mentioned by Weſſelus of Groningen.*' It is moſt falſe that Agrippa ſays any of theſe two things. See above (74).

(67) Polyd. Virgil. de Inventor. Rerum, *lib. viii, cap. ii, p. m.* 482, 483. *See* Du Pleſſis Mornay, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 556, 557.

(68) Varillas, Anecd. de Florence, *p.* 70.

(69) Huomo di baſſiſſima & vile conditione. *Machiavelli, delle Hiſtor. Fiorentine*, lib. vii, *p.* 289.

(70) *See* Bonanni, Numiſmat. Pontific. Romanor. *Tom. i, p.* 91.

(71) They are rebuſſes, *viz.* that kind of Oak which the Latins call *Robur*, the Italians *Rovere*, or *Ruvere*, and the French *Rouvre*.

(72) Bonanni, Numiſm. Pontif. Romanor. *Tom. i, p.* 92.

† De vanit. ſcient. c. de lenocinio.

* Lib. de indulgentiis.

(73) Sutlivius, in Turco-Papiſmo, *lib. i, cap. xvii, p.* 115.

(74) In the remark [*G*].

SMIGLECIUS (MARTIN) a native of Lemberg in Poland, turned Jeſuit at Rome in the year 1581, where he ſtudied with great application and good ſucceſs. Being ſent back into Poland, he taught Philoſophy at Vilna four years, and Divinity ten years. He was rector of ſeveral colleges, and ſuperior of the religious houſe at Cracow. He died at Kaliſs after a long ſickneſs the twenty-ſixth of July 1618, at fifty-ſix years of age. He ſhewed an admirable patience in his adverſity, eſpecially during the ſickneſs which conſumed him by degrees (*a*). He applied himſelf very much to controverſy both againſt the Proteſtants and the Unitarians. This appears from the books

(*a*) *Taken from* Sotuel, Biblioth. Scriptor. Societat. Jeſu, *p.* 592, 593.

books he publiſhed [*A*]. His Logic is very much eſteemed [*B*]: it was printed in two volumes in 4to at Ingolſtad in the year 1618.

[*A*] *The books he publiſhed.*] I omit thoſe he wrote in his mother tongue, ſome of which are againſt the Arians (1); and I ſhall only ſet down the titles of thoſe he compoſed in Latin, as I find them in Father Alegambe (2). *Latine edidit* de Zechariæ Prophetæ pro Chriſti divinitate illuſtri teſtimonio, *adverſus Fauſti Socini Anabaptiſtæ cavillationes. Vilnæ MDXCVI in 4to.* Nodum Gordium, *ſeu*, de Vocatione Miniſtrorum. *Cracoviæ MDCIX in 4to.* Nova Monſtra novi Arianiſmi. *Niſſæ MDCXII in 4to.* Verbum Caro factum, *ſeu*, de Divinâ Verbi Incarnati Natura, *contra novos Arianos. Cracoviæ MDCXIII in 4to.* Refutationem vanæ Diſſolutionis Nodi Gordii de Vocatione Miniſtrorum, *contra Joannem Volkelium Miniſtrum Arianum. Ib. MDCXIV in 4to.* De erroribus novorum Arianorum, *lib. ii, contra Valentinum Smalcium, Ibid. MDCXV in 4to.* De Chriſto vero & naturali filio Dei, ejuſque pro nobis ſatisfactione, *adverſus Valentinum Smalcium Arianum, lib. ii. Acceſſit* Reſponſio ad Refutationem C. errorum Smalcio objectorum. *Ibidem MDCXV in* 4to. De Baptiſmo, *adverſus Hieronymum Moſcorovium Arianum, lib. i. Ibidem eodem anno ac formâ.* De Ordinatione Sacerdotum in Eccleſiâ Romanâ, *contra Jacobum Zaborovium Calvinianum Miniſtrum. Cracoviæ MDCXVII.* De Notis Miniſtrorum. *lib. ii. contra eundem. MDCXVII.* Vanam ſine viribus iram Miniſtrorum Evangelicorum. *Coloniæ apud Antonium Boëtzerum MDCXI in 16mo.* Refutationem Epicherematis miſſionem Miniſtrorum Evangelicorum propugnantis. *MDCXII.*

[*B*] *His Logic is very much eſteemed.*] 'Smiglecius, a Poliſh Jeſuit, was one of the laſt Logicians, who wrote upon Ariſtotle's Logic with the greateſt ſubtilty and ſolidity. He dived into the bottom of that ſcience with a clearneſs and exactneſs, hardly to be found in any other author. His Logic is an excellent work (3).' This teſtimony of a fellow Jeſuit will not appear a flattering one to thoſe, who are capable of judging of ſuch a book. The Engliſh have done juſtice to that work; it has been reprinted in their country.

(1) *See* Alegambe *and* Sotuel, in Biblioth. Scriptor. Soc. Jeſu.

(2) Alegambe, ibid. *pag.* 331. *col.* 2.

(3) Rapin, Reflexions ſur la Logique, *num. viii, pag. m.* 383.

SOCINUS (MARIANUS) a famous Civilian, was born at Siena the fourth of September 1401. He taught the Canon-Law at Padua and then at Siena: it appears from his works (*a*) that he underſtood it perfectly. He received in his country all the honours due to his great merit. He was deputed by his countrymen to Pope Pius II, who made him Advocate-Conſiſtorial, and gave him ſeveral marks of a particular eſteem. He was of a low ſtature [*A*], but of a ſtrong conſtitution: he had a more univerſal knowledge than any other man in his time (*b*). It is ſaid that one day he eaſily checked Politian's vanity [*B*]. What he anſwered to thoſe, who aſked him why he left off reading lectures, ſince he had a wife [*C*], is curious. He died at Siena the thirtieth of September 1467. See his encomium in the letters of Pius II (*c*). He left ſeveral children behind him, and among others a ſon, who exceeded him [*D*].

(*a*) See the remark [*D*], at the end.

(*b*) Æneas Silvius, Epiſt. cxii, *lib. i, apud* Panzirol. de claris Legum Interpret. *lib. iii, c. xxxv, p. m.* 456, *& ſeq.*

(*c*) *Taken from his Life, written by* Panzirolus, *in lib. iii,* de claris Legum Interpretibus, *p. m.* 456, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *He was of a low ſtature.*] Æneas Silvius, his countryman, who was Pope by the name of Pius II, ſpeaks of him thus (1). 'Nihil ei præter formam natura invidit. Humuncio eſt, naſci ex mea familia (2) debuit cui parvorum hominum eſt cognomen. - - - *Nature had been liberal to him in every thing, but his ſtature. He is a little man, he ſhould have been of my family, whoſe firname is Piccolomini, i e. little men.*'

[*B*] *It is ſaid that one day he .... checked Politian's vanity.*] That great critic, who ſhould have been contented with the reputation of an excellent Philologer, pretended alſo to be a Civilian of the firſt rank. He ſaid one day that he could make better lectures of the Civil-law, than the famous Accurſius; but our Socinus nonpluſſed him by the firſt queſtion he put to him. '(3) Semel etiam Angelum Politianum virum Græcis, Latiniſque literis impensè eruditum, cum Senis in Juris civilis interpretationibus ſe vel Accurſium ſuperaturum jactabundus gloriaretur, leniter correxit, ab eo enim interrogatus Angelus, quis eſſet in jure ſuus hæres, ob imperitiam obmutuit, ac pudore ſuffuſus ſuæ audaciæ pœnas dedit †. - - - *He one time gently reproved Politian, a man very well ſkilled in Greek and Latin, when he vainly boaſted that he could exceed Accurſius, in interpreting the Civil-law. Socinus aſked him who was his heir at law, being ignorant, he made no anſwer, and ſuffered for his raſhneſs, by the ſhame he was put to.*'

This ſeems to me a fabulous ſtory, for Politian was but fifteen years of age, when Socinus died.

[*C*] *Since he had a wife.*] He only anſwered, I have got a wife; and being told that Socrates did not leave off his lectures after he was married: it is, replied he, becauſe Xantippe was an ill humoured woman, and perhaps ugly, whereas I have got a handſome and complaiſant wife. *Uxore ducta, cum docendi munus intermiſiſſet, interrogatus, cur id non continuaret, ſe conjugem duxiſſe reſpondit*; ‡ *cùm verò replicaretur, Socratem nunquam philoſophiam ob uxorem deſeruiſſe, ſubjecit, illum moleſtam, & fortè turpem Xantippem, ſe autem formoſam, & obſequentem habere* (4).

[*D*] *He left ... behind him ... a ſon who exceeded him* (5).] *Viz.* BARTHOLOMEW SOCINUS, born at Siena the twenty-fifth of March 1437. He taught the Civil-law at Siena, and then at Piſa, whither he was called in 1474. Having a greater reputation than all the Civilians of his time, he was called to Ferrara, where he was a profeſſor four years; and then he performed the ſame function at Bologna, from whence he returned to Piſa, where he had a ſalary of a thouſand ducats. There aroſe a great emulation between him and Jaſo Mainus: they grew ſo hot in their diſputes, that Laurence de Medicis went to Piſa on purpoſe, to have the pleaſure of ſuch a fight. He removed ſeveral times from one univerſity to another, and at laſt a kind of palſey in the tongue having deprived him of his ſpeech, he was only a chamber counſellor. He died at Siena in 1507 (6). He had more learning than virtue, for he lived a debauched life, and made ſo many fooliſh expences, that he was buried at the public charges. 'Illiberalibus verò moribus inſignem doctrinam maculaſſe dictus eſt, qui chartarum, & aleæ ludo ſupra modum deditus, non modo debitis lectionibus quandoque auditores fraudaſſe, ſed inſomnes etiam noctes turpiter egiſſe dicitur. Eo vitio paternis opibus conſumptis, & univerſa, quam docendo, & de jure reſpondendo plurimum coëgerat, pecunia effuſa, ad extremam inopiam deductus eſt, uſque adeo ut nec quod funeri ſuppeteret, poſt ſe reliquiſſe dicatur. Eam ob cauſam ſemper egens undique pecuniam avarius conquirere cogebatur (7). - - - - *He is ſaid to have ſullied his excellent learning by his ſordid life, being ſo addicted to cards and dice, that he not only deprived his ſcholars of their lectures, but ſpent therein whole nights. Hereby having conſumed his patrimony, and whatever he gained by his ſcholars and conſultations, he was reduced to extreme poverty, inſomuch that he is ſaid not to have left wherewithal to bury him. And therefore being always in want, and covetous, he was forced to get money any how.*' His memory failed him upon two remarkable occaſions. 'Memoriæ imbecillitate bis inter orandum excidit. Primo cum anno MCCCCXCII. à Republica Senenſi Alexandro VI. Pont. Max. ſuæ civitatis nomine gratulatum miſſus in prima propè oratione, quam illi Angelus Politianus dictaverat, defecit, quod ubi Pontifex deprehendit, manum ſublevans ſatis ſibi notam viri virtutem eſſe dixit, eùmque Advocati Conſiſtorialis titulo honeſtavit. Idem iterum illi Venetiis contigit, ubi dum apud Auguſtinum Barbadium Reipublicæ Principem dicere conatur, excidentibus quæ antea excogitaverat, nihil exprimere potuit (8). - - - - *By the weakneſs of his memory, he failed twice in his ſpeech. Once, when ſent by his Republic to congratulate Pope Alexander VI,*

(1) Æneas Silvius, Epiſt. cxii, *lib. i, apud* Panzirol. de claris Legum Interpretibus, *lib. iii, cap. xxxv, p. m.* 458.

(2) Pius II, was of the family Piccolomini.

(3) Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpretibus, *p.* 457.

† Corraſ. lib. iii, miſcell. cap. xvi.

‡ Tiraquell. in 2 l. connubia glo. 1. part. 2. n. 25. Æneas Sylvius, de dictis & factis Alfonſi Regis, *lib. iii, cap. xxvii.*

(4) Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpret. *pag.* 457.

(5) Eo provectus eſt ut patrem ſuperaverit. *Panzirol. ibid. lib. ii, cap. cxxvi, pag.* 276.

(6) *Taken from* Panzirolus, ubi ſupra, *p.* 275, *& ſeq.*

(7) Id. ibid. *p.* 279.

(8) Id. ibid. *p.* 280.

‘ *he ſtopped almoſt in the beginning of his oration, which* ‘ *Angelus Politianus dictated; this, when the Pontif per-* ‘ *ceived, lifting up his hand, he ſaid, that he ſufficiently* ‘ *knew the ability of the man; and honoured him with* ‘ *the title of a Conſiſtorial Advocate. The ſame thing hap-* ‘ *pened to him another time at Venice, where, when he* ‘ *was endeavouring to make a ſpeech before Auguſtinus* ‘ *Barbadius, the Doge of that Republic, forgetting what* ‘ *he had deſigned to deliver, he could not expreſs any* ‘ *thing.*’ His conſultations, and thoſe of his father, have been collected into four volumes (9). Beſides, eath of them wrote ſeveral other books that are printed.

SOCINUS (MARIANUS) grand-ſon of the foregoing *(a)*, was not leſs famous than his grand-father in the profeſſion of the law. He was born at Siena the twenty-fifth of March 1482, and having taken his degree of Doctor of the Civil-law at Siena at twenty-one years of age, he taught that ſcience there for ſeveral years, after which he was called to Piſa, where he taught it ſeven years. He was recalled to Siena, from whence at a year's end he went to Padua to be profeſſor of the ſame ſcience. From that place he removed to Bologna *(b)*, to fill up the chair that was vacant by the return of Alciatus to Pavia in the year 1540. The penſions and privileges beſtowed upon him, at Bologna, were ſo conſiderable, that he would not leave it, though he had very great offers made him in ſeveral other univerſities. He married Camilla Salvetta at Siena, and loſt her after he had been married forty-ſix years. Having been uſed for a long time to lie with a woman, he could not be without one; he gave up himſelf to incontinency [*A*], whereby he got ſome diſtempers, which proved ſo troubleſome to him, that at laſt the violence of the remedies he uſed, conſumed his ſtrength, and occaſioned his death the nineteenth of Auguſt 1556 *(c)*. If we believe Panzirolus *(d)*, he had thirteen children *(e)*, two of which only, viz. CELSUS and PHILIP out-lived him. Celſus who was profeſſor of the Canon-law at Bologna, obtained there the profeſſorſhip of the Civil-law after his father's death, and left it. Panzirolus ſhould have known that Marianus left behind him a third ſon, called LELIUS SOCINUS, the firſt author of the Socinian ſect [*B*]. ALEXANDER SOCINUS ſon of the ſame Marianus, and

[*A*] *He gave up himſelf to incontinency.*] I will expreſs it in the words of Panzirolus. *Apud eos* (Bononienſes) *Camillam uxorem LXIII annum agentem amiſit, quicum annis XLVI vixerat. Poſtea uxori aſſuetus parum continenter vixiſſe dicitur; unde contracto morbo non ſemel ægrotavit, ac demum dum præſentaneis remediis ſibi mederi conatur, potentium pharmacorum vi oppreſſus LXXIV. ætatis anno deceſſit* (1).

[*B*] *He left behind him a third ſon called LÆLIUS SOCINUS, the firſt author of the Socinian ſect.*] He was born at Siena in the year 1525 (2). Being deſigned for the Civil-law by his father, he began early to look for the foundations of that ſcience in the word of God; and by that ſtudy he came to diſcover that the church of Rome taught many things contrary to revelation. Deſiring to dive more and more into the true ſenſe of the holy Scripture, he ſtudied the Greek and the Hebrew, and even Arabic, and quickly left Italy to go into a Proteſtant country. Fear contributed alſo to his removing; for he knew that private opinions in matters of religion were not tolerated in his country. He began to travel in the year 1547, and ſpent four years in going thro' France, England, the Netherlands, Germany, and Poland; and then he ſettled at Zurich. He made himſelf known to the moſt learned men of that time, who expreſſed their eſteem for him in their letters to him: but having diſcovered, by the doubts he propoſed to them, that he ſuffered himſelf to be infected with the poiſon of the Arian or Photinian hereſy, he made himſelf very much ſuſpected. Calvin gave him very good advice about it in the year 1552. ‘ Quod pridem teſtatus ſum, ſerio iterum moneo, niſi ‘ hunc quærendi pruritum mature corrigas, metuendum ‘ eſſe, ne tibi gravia tormenta accerſas (3). - - - - *What* ‘ *I formerly repreſented to you, I now again put you in* ‘ *mind of, that unleſs you in time reſtrain that itch of in-* ‘ *quiry, it is to be feared, you will bring upon yourſelf* ‘ *grievous troubles.*’ Socinus making a good uſe of that advice, and more ſtill of Servetus's execution, took care not to diſcover his thoughts but in a proper time and place, and behaved himſelf ſo dexterouſly, that he lived among the mortal enemies of his opinions, without being in the leaſt injured by them. An example, that is propoſed in his nephew's life to thoſe, who expoſe themſelves raſhly to martyrdom, being ſometimes more greedy of a great reputation, than truly zealous for truth. ‘ Sciant, quos nimia veri libertas ‘ in pericula ſæpe intempeſtiva præcipitat, ipſam illam, ‘ quam propugnant, veritatem in circumſpecta pru- ‘ dentiæ lenitate, quam in effreni zelo plus habere ‘ præſidii. Ut qui ultro ſuis diſcriminibus occurrunt, ‘ magis ad privatam laudem, quam ad publici emolu- ‘ menti rationem feſtinare videantur (4). - - - *Let them* ‘ *know, whom too great liberty in ſpeaking unſeaſonably* ‘ *the truth oftentimes throws into dangers unexpected, that* ‘ *what they maintain, is better advanced, by a circum-* ‘ *ſpect prudential meekneſs, than by a headſtrong zeal.* ‘ *And thoſe who of their own accord go to meet the danger* ‘ *ſeem more to haſten to their own glory, than to regard* ‘ *the public good.*’ He found ſome diſciples, who reſpectfully heard his inſtructions: they were Italians, who wandred up and down in Germany and Poland. He alſo communicated his errors to his relations by ſome writings he ſent to them at Siena. He took a journey into Poland after his father's death (5), and obtained from the king ſome letters of recommendation to the Doge of Venice, and the Duke of Florence, that he might be ſafe at Venice all the time his affairs ſhould require his ſtay there; for he intended to poſſeſs himſelf of his father's eſtate, and to ſettle the matter with his relations. It was about the year 1558, that he travelled into Poland. *Circa annum* 1558, *&* 1559, *literis Poloniæ atque Bohemiæ Regum muniri voluit, ut ſecurius in urbe Veneta cum amicis de patrimonio agere poſſet. Tunc profecto patuit apud pleroſque Germaniæ atque Poloniæ proceres, ipſoſque adeo Reges, quantum is gratia potuerit. Summis enim ſtudiis in ejus cauſa apud Ludovicum Priulum Venetiarum, atque Coſmum Hetruriæ Duces certatum eſt* (6). His family was diſperſed at that time: they were ſuſpected of Hereſy: his brother Camillus was impriſoned; ſome others fled away, and his nephew Fauſtus was one of them. Lælius returned into Swiſſerland, and died at Zurich in May 1562. Fauſtus was then at Lyons, and ſet out immediately when he heard that his uncle was dead. He arrived at Zurich before any of Lælius's papers had been conveyed away; he took poſſeſſion of them, and made uſe of them afterwards (7).

Some other circumſtances are to be found in the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum.* LÆLIUS SOCINUS, born in the year 1525, began to confer about matters of religion in the year 1546, with above forty perſons. They privately met in the territory of the Venetians (8), and brought into queſtion particularly the myſtery of the Trinity; and of Chriſt's ſatisfaction. Ochinus, Valentinus Gentilis, and Paul Aciatus, aſſiſted at thoſe conferences. They were diſcovered: ſome of thoſe innovators were apprehended, and condemned to death; the reſt fled away. The Chronology of that author is not right, for Ochinus left Italy about the year 1542. Zanchius ſays, that Lælius Socinus endeavoured to infect him with his heretical notions, not by maintaining them in expreſs words, but propoſing them as doubts, and by way of a diſpute. He adds, that and father of FAUSTUS SOCINUS, of whom I am going to ſpeak, died very young, and with the reputation of a learned Civilian [*C*]. We have ſome works of his

---

(9) Printed at Venice in 1579.

(a) He was the ſon of ALEXANDER SOCINUS, the ſon of Marianus. To diſtinguiſh thoſe two Marianus's, the firſt is ſirnamed *Senior*, and the ſecond *Junior*.

(b) See, above, remark [*G*], of the article ALCIATUS (ANDREW), the reputation he there acquired.

(c) *Taken from* Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpretibus, *lib. ii, cap. clxii, pag.* 338, *& ſeq.*

(d) Ibid. *p.* 341.

(e) Panzirolus having ſaid that they were ten ſons, and three daughters, calls them all *Filios* a little after.

(1) Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpret. *pag.* 341.

(2) Bibliotheca Antitrinitar. *pag.* 18.

(3) See the Life of Fauſtus Socinus, prefixed to the firſt volume of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.*

(4) Ibid.

(5) His father as I have ſaid before, died at Bologna, in the year 1556.

(6) Vita Fauſti Socini, *pag.* 2.

(7) Taken from the Life of Fauſtus Socinus.

(8) Circa annum 1546, inſtituerat cum ſociis ſuis itidem Italis, quorum numerus quadragenarium excedebat, in Veneta, ditione, collegia colloquiaque de religione, in quibus potiſſimum, &c. *Biblioth. Antitrinit. pag.* 18.

father

that Lælius underſtood very well Greek and Hebrew, and was a man of an unblameable life. ‘ Fuit is Lælius, nobili honeſtaque familia natus: bene Græcè & Hebraicè doctus; vitæque etiam externæ inculpatæ: quarum rerum cauſa mihi quoque interceſſerat cum illo non vulgaris amicitia; ſed homo fuit plenus diverſarum hæreſium: quas tamen mihi nunquam proponebat, niſi diſputandi cauſa: & ſemper interrogans, quaſi cuperet doceri (9). - - - - *This Lælius was deſcended of a noble and honourable family: well learnt in Greek and Hebrew; and alſo of an unblamable outward life: wherefore there was betwixt us a more than ordinary friendſhip; but he was a man full of Hereſies: which yet he never propoſed to me, but by way of diſpute: and always aſking queſtions, as deſiring to be informed.*’ It is certain, that when Zanchius wrote thoſe words, Lælius had compoſed a paraphraſe upon the firſt chapter of St John's Goſpel full of Photinianiſm (10). The ſame Lelius wrote a dialogue in 1554, againſt the book publiſhed by Calvin, to ſhew that Heretics ought to be puniſhed with death. Calvinus and Vaticanus are the interlocutors of that dialogue (11): ſome aſcribe it to Caſtalio; but others, as Cloppenburg (12) and Hoornbeek (13) aſcribe it to Lælius Socinus. He is ſaid alſo to be the author of the book, intituled, *de Hæreticis capitali ſupplicio non afficiendis*, that was publiſhed (14) under the fictitious name of *Minus Celſus Senenſis*, and there is more reaſon to aſcribe it to him, than to Fauſtus Socinus. Some pretend that Lælius is the author of a book, intituled, *Martini Bellii Dialogus Lælius de Hæreticis gladio coërcendis*, publiſhed againſt Calvin, and they endeavour to prove it againſt Placcius by the teſtimony of the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum* (15). Obſerve, that Placcius aſcribes that dialogue to Caſtalio, and refers us to Calvin's Life, where Beza boaſts of having confuted that book of Caſtalio (16); but it is certain Beza makes no mention there of a piece, intituled, *Dialogus Lælius*. He only ſpeaks of a *Farrago*, which he aſcribes to Caſtalio, and againſt which he wrote a book. What he calls Farrago, is intituled, *De Hæreticis, an ſint perſequendi, & omnino quomodo ſit cum eis agendum, Luteri & Brentii, aliorumque multorum tum veterum tum recentiorum ſententiæ. Liber hoc tam turbulento tempore perneceſſarius, & cùm omnibus, tum potiſſimum principibus & magiſtratibus utiliſſimus, ad diſcendum, quodnam ſit eorum in re tam controverſa, tamque periculoſa, officium*; and contains the following pieces, MARTINI BELLII *præfatio, in qua quid ſit hæreticus, & quidnam cum eo agendum ſit, demonſtratur.* MARTINI LUTERI *ſententia, in qua apertè oſtenditur, hæreticorum punitionem ad magiſtratum non pertinere.* JOANNIS BRENTII *de Anabaptiſtis, & cæteris qui hæretici habentur, ſententia, quæ idem docet. Aliorum authorum, tum veterum, tum recentiorum, eadem de re ſententiæ. Baſilii Montfortii refutatio eorum, quæ pro perſecutione dici ſolent.* We may obſerve another ſmall error in Mr Placcius; for he refers us to a book of Hoornbeek (17), wherein he only mentions the dialogue between *Calvinus* and *Vaticanus*. A learned German whom I have quoted (18), alledges this teſtimony of Placcius, and does not rectify it: he alſo alledges Mr Teiſſier, who only ſays in page 238, of the firſt volume of his additions to the elogies taken from Thuanus, that *Caſtalio is the author of a book publiſhed under the name of Martin Bellius, in which he endeavours to prove that Heretics ought not to be puniſhed.* Thus here are two authors quoted, the laſt of which does not ſay what is imputed to him, and the other is miſtaken: but let us ſee whether the objection raiſed againſt the latter is a ſolid one. It is objected againſt Placcius, that *Martini Bellii Dialogus Lælius de Hæreticis gladio coercendis*, is aſcribed to Lælius Socinus in the *Bibliotheque* of the *Antitrinitarians*. *Verum in Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum . . . . pag. LXIV, & XX. ille tractatus Lælio Socino tribuitur, allegata in hanc ſententiam auctoritate Johannis Cloppenburgii & Hoornbeekii* (19). Conſult the 64th page of that *Bibliotheque*, and you will find that it is thought *Lælius Socinus Senenſis* took the name of Minus Celſus Senenſis in a book, *De Hæreticis non capitali ſupplicio afficiendis*. Conſult the 20th page, and you will find that the dialogues between *Calvinus* and *Vaticanus*, wherein it is aſſerted that the power of the ſword ought not to be extended to Heretics, is aſcribed to Lælius Socinus by Cloppenburg and Hoornbeek. I need not ſay that there is little exactneſs in this account. As for what concerns the other writings of Socinus, the uncle, ſee the ſame *Bibliotheque*.

I muſt not forget a paſſage of Hoornbeek quoted in it, which teſtifies the eſteem that Melanchthon had conceived for Lælius Socinus. That paſſage will confirm what has been ſaid above of Lælius's deſign to take a journey to Venice. ‘ Uti Zanchium, quamdiu cum eo viveret, mirifice fefellit Lælius; ſimiliter bono viro Philippo Melanthoni, quocum triennium exegit familiariter, adeo impoſuit, ut Philippus pro eo tanquam optimo viro a. cIↄ Iↄ lvii. interceſſerit tum ad Imp. Maximilianum II. tum ad Poloniæ regem Sigiſmundum, ut horum nomine Lælius Legati vicem Venetiis obire, eaque ratione paternam hæreditatem, ſibi ob conſuetudinem cum Proteſtantibus in Germaniâ, intercluſam adire tutius poſſet (20). - - - *As Lælius wonderfully deceived Zanchius, ſo long as he lived with him; in like manner he ſo impoſed on the good man Philip Melanchthon, with whom he paſſed three years in a familiar manner, that Melanchthon interceeded for him, as for a deſerving perſon, both with the Emperor Maximilian II, and with Sigiſmund, King of Poland, that Lælius might execute in their name an embaſſy to the Venetians, and by that means more ſafely get poſſeſſion of his paternal inheritance, detained from him becauſe of his familiarity with the German Proteſtants.*’ Father Maimbourg has committed ſome faults, which ought to be obſerved. *Lælius Socinus*, ſays he (21), *and Matthew Gribaldus, came to Gentilis in Poland.* He had been ſaying, that Gentilis being ſent for by Blandrata, went into Poland, after he had privately left Geneva. Now you muſt know, that Gentilis having left Geneva, ſome time after he had made *l'amende honorable* on the ſecond of September 1558, acted ſo many parts before he went into Poland (22), that it is probable he went not thither till about the year 1560. The Socinian Hiſtorians place that Journey in the year 1562, or in the year 1563 (23), and therefore he did not make it with Lælius Socinus; for the latter was in Poland about the year 1558 (24). Maimbourg adds, that *as Gentilis and Lælius Socinus were returning thro' Germany and Swiſſerland into Italy, teaching their Doctrine every where, Socinus died at Baſil, and Gentilis was apprehended by the magiſtrates of Berne* (25). But we may remember that Socinus died at Zurich the ſixteenth of May 1562, and Gentilis did not leave Poland till the year 1566.

[C] *ALEXANDER SOCINUS . . . . father of FAUSTUS SOCINUS . . . . died very young, and with the reputation of a learned Civilian.*] He was admitted Doctor of the Civil-law at Siena in 1530. He had before maintained, during five days at Padua, and during two days at Siena, three hundred theſes with great ſucceſs. After he had been made Doctor he explained the Inſtitutes in his native country, and then he was called to Padua to be profeſſor in ordinary. The quarrels, that aroſe between him and the other profeſſors, obliged him to return to Siena, where he continued to read publick lectures. He went to Macerata in the year 1540, to teach the Civil-law in the univerſity lately founded there, where he died the twenty-ſixth of April 1541 (26). He had married Agnes Petrucci daughter of Burgeſio Petrucci, and of Victoria Piccolomini. This Petrucci having ſucceeded his father Pandolphus, who had been the head of the Republic of Siena, could not keep his poſt long: he was driven from it by a contrary faction, and died ſoon after. Victoria Piccolomini his widow, ſiſter, niece, or couſin to many great lords, bore that misfortune with great conſtancy, and lived fifty-ſix years after the death of her huſband, in the conſtant practice of the virtues moſt eſſential to her ſex. Her daughter, brought up by ſuch a mother, anſwered her education, and was married to Alexander Socinus a young man of great parts (27). Theſe are the father and mother of Fauſtus Socinus. *Relicta vidua Victoria animum, quem in prioris faſtigii ſplendore nunquam ſuſtulerat, tam iniqua rerum viciſſitudine frangi non permiſit. Itaque annis quinquaginta ſex, quibus mariti vitæ & communi fortunæ ſuperfuit,*

ſingulari

---

(9) Zanchius, *in Præfat. Libri* de tribus Elohim, apud Bibl. Antitrinit. *pag.* 19.

(10) He wrote it in the year 1561. *Biblioth. Antitrin*. pag. 21.

(11) It was reprinted in Holland in the year 1612, with ſome other pieces of the ſame nature. The year following it was printed in Dutch in the ſame country. *Ibid. pag.* 20.

(12) *In Præfat.* Compendioli Socinianiſmi confutati.

(13) In Summa Controverſ.

(14) *In the* Bibl. Antitrinitarior. *pag.* 21, *the ſecond edition of that work is placed in the year* 1584. *But* Placcius, de Pſeudon. *pag.* 176, *mentions an edition in* 1577, Chriſtlingæ, *in* 8*vo. which probably is not the firſt.*

(15) Joh. Albertus Faber, Decad. *num.* 25.

(16) Placcius, de Pſeudonymis, *pag.* 161.

(17) Summa Controverſ. *pag.* 563, *of the ſecond edition, and* 442 *of the firſt.*

(18) Joh. Albertus Faber. *His* Decas Decadum, *was printed in* 1689.

(19) Joh. Albertus Faber, ubi ſupra, *num.* 25.

(20) Hoornbeek, Summa Controverſ. *lib. vii, pag.* 442, *Edit.* 1653.

(21) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de l'Arianiſme, *book xii, Tom. iii, pag.* 351, 352, *Dutch Edit.*

(22) See his article.

(23) See the article ALCIATUS (JOHN PAUL) remark [*A*].

(24) See the Life of Fauſtus Socinus, *pag. ii.*

(25) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de l'Arianiſme, *Tom. iii, pag.* 361.

(26) *Taken from* Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpret. *p.* 341.

(27) Alexander ſubtilitatum & pater ejus Marianus Junior Juriſconſultorum principes vocati ſunt. *Vita Fauſti Socini*, initio.

father [*D*].

ſingulari modeſtia & ſpectata integritate ac pudicitia vidui ſtatus ſolitudinem toleravit. Filiam Agnetam, quam, ut tanto genere dignum erat, ſanctiſſimis moribus imbuerat, Alexandro Socino in matrimonium dedit, patricio quidem juveni, ſed tamen privato. Is fuit Fauſti noſtri pater (28). Had Panzirolus known how Fauſtus Socinus turned his ſtudies, he would not have uſed the following words. ‘ Ex eo (*Alexandro*) & Agnete ex Burgheſia Pandulfi Petruccii Senarum Principis nepte natus, fauſtus præclari ingenii Juvenis parentum veſtigia ſecuturus eſſe ſperatur (29). - - - - *Fauſtus Socinus, ſon of Alexander Socinus and Agnes Petrucci, a youth of an excellent diſpoſition, gave hopes that he would follow the footſteps of his parents.*’

[*D*] *We have ſome works of Marianus Socinus.*] The catalogue of the Bodleian library mentions a *Conſilium in materia monetaria*, printed at Cologne in the year 1591. He is ſaid to be the author of Bartolus's diſtinctions, printed at Venice in the year 1564, and we are told that his conſultations furniſhed materials for the book of the common opinions of the Doctors, publiſhed by one Muſculus (30).

SOCINUS (Faustus) grand-ſon of the foregoing, and the chief founder of a very ill ſect that goes by his name, and which, notwithſtanding the perſecutions, hath flouriſhed a conſiderable time in Poland [*A*], was born at Siena the fifth of December 1539. He ſtudied but little in his youth; he only had a tincture of Claſſical learning, and learned only the elements of Logic. The letters his uncle Lelius did write to his relations,

[*A*] *A ſect . . . which notwithſtanding the perſecutions, hath flouriſhed a conſiderable time in Poland.*] Sigiſmund Auguſtus granted liberty of conſcience to the ſects which forſook the Church of Rome. They made no ſeparate bodies at firſt; but when the Evangelics came to know the opinions of the Unitarians, they would no longer communicate with them; which occaſioned two different communions. That rupture began at Cracow by the care of Gregory Pauli. The Unitarians had ſeveral churches in Poland and Lithuania, ſome in the great towns (1), and others in the country-ſeats of gentlemen. They eſtabliſhed their metropolis at Racovia, in the Leſſer Poland. There they had a yearly ſynod, there they erected a college, and ſet up a printing-houſe. Some Catholics ſent their children to that college; and ſome joined with thoſe heretics. Some Proteſtants did the ſame, and a vaſt number of books came out of the printing-houſe of Racovia, and were diſperſed in foreign countries. This proſperity was interrupted in 1638; for ſome ſcholars of the college of Racovia having broke a wooden croſs ſet up in a high-way, the Diet of Warſaw ordered that the college ſhould be demoliſhed, the Church of Racovia ſhut up, the printing-houſe of the Unitarians deſtroyed, and the miniſters and teachers baniſhed (2). This was executed. Some time after the Judges of Lublin deſtroyed the church of Kiſelin, and that of Bereſc in Volhinia, under pretence that the miniſters of Racovia, and the teachers of the college, had fled thither. The Diet of the year 1647 baniſhed Jonas Slichtingius for publiſhing a book intituled, *Confeſſio Chriſtiana*, and that book was burnt by the hands of the executioner. But, notwithſtanding theſe misfortunes, the Unitarians performed their religious exerciſes in many places of that kingdom, till the year 1658. They were then expelled upon pretence that ſome of them had put themſelves under the protection of the King of Sweden, who had conquered the greateſt part of Poland. However that reaſon was not alledged in the edict of baniſhment; for they were afraid of offending the Swedes, who had ſtipulated a general amneſty for all the ſubjects of the King of Poland, who adhered to them during the invaſion. Their baniſhment was only grounded upon their doctrine: they pretended, that in order, to draw God's bleſſing upon the kingdom, it was neceſſary to baniſh thoſe, who denied the eternal Divinity of the Son of God. They were therefore ordered to depart from it upon pain of death: all their eſtates were confiſcated, all perſons were forbidden upon the ſame penalty, to give them any aſſiſtance, or any mark of affection in their exile (3). *Quum Sueci Poloniam invaſiſſent, & pleraque ejus loca occupaſſent, ita ut & provinciæ multæ miſſis legatis Regi Suecorum ut victori ſeſe ſubjicerent, & exercitus ipſi cum Ducibus ſuis eidem ſeſe addicerent, quia ex Unitariis nonnulli etiam ad Suecorum patrocinium & protectionem confugerant, quamvis multi eorum nullam cum Suecis inirent ſocietatem, poſt Suecorum diſceſſum, omnes ii quos Arianos vocant, publica regni conſtitutione,* 1658 *non prætextu perduellionis, ne Sueci, qui per tractatus amneſtiam iis qui ipſis adhæſerant pacti ſunt, offenderentur, ſed directe ob religionem, ob id quod Jeſu Filii Dei prææternam, quam vocant, Deitatem non agnoſcant, extorres acti ſunt, ut ſcilicet Deus hiſce blaſphemis amotis, omnia proſpera iſti regno tribueret: ita ut niſi patria excederent, accuſati pœna capitali ſubjicerentur: bona quoque eorum fiſco publico ſunt applicata* (4): *& vetitum ne quiſquam eos ullo modo juvare, vel extra ſolum patrium exſulantes, aliquo benignitatis ac benevolentiæ indicio proſequi audeat, alioqui eidem cum ipſis pœnæ obnoxius futurus* (5). The Socinians never recovored of that ſevere blow: they diſperſed themſelves as well as they could in Tranſylvania, Sileſia, Pruſſia, *&c.* There is a great fault in thoſe Latin words, for they intimate a great falſity, *viz.* That the eſtates of the Unitarians were confiſcated; and they ſay nothing of their being permitted to ſtay two years in the kingdom to ſettle their affairs. It is an uſual thing for thoſe, who complain of their ſufferings, to ſuppreſs whatever might make their perſecution look leſs violent than it was. And therefore in order to repreſent the true ſtate of the thing, I muſt give another account of it contained in the following paſſage. ‘ As during the laſt war of the Swedes in Poland, it was found out that the Arians, or Socinians intending to raiſe themſelves upon the ruins of the ſtate, kept intelligence with Ragotſki Prince of Tranſylvania, who had attacked that kingdom at the ſame time; the Catholic Lords, in the general Diet of Warſaw, in the year 1658, took hold of that opportunity to exterminate out of Poland that abominable Hereſy, which might bring ſtill greater calamities upon the ſtate, that had not been far from ruin. The Lutheran and Calviniſt deputies, who were in that Diet, being apprehenſive that a law enacted againſt thoſe Heretics might be a precedent againſt themſelves, and that in time they would be treated in the ſame manner, joined together in order to oppoſe it. But becauſe their number was very ſmall, if compared with the Catholics, and they were not deprived of their liberty, and beſides they did not love the Arians, having more than once before demanded that they ſhould not be tolerated in Poland, a law was at laſt enacted, with a common conſent, againſt Arianiſm; and the Arians and Socinians comprehended under the ſame name, were obliged to abjure their hereſy, or to depart the kingdom within two years, which were allowed them to ſell their eſtates. That law, which was afterwards confirmed in the other general Diets, was none of thoſe that loſe by degrees the force that was given them in the heat of a zeal conceived from time to time againſt public diſorders. It was executed, and is ſo to this day (6).’

Leſt any one ſhould think that the Jeſuit Maimbourg has given an unfair account, to praiſe the King and the States of Poland for having obſerved a kind of moderation, I muſt acquaint the reader that ſome Socinian writers (7) ſay, that the edict of the year 1658, allowed them three years to ſell their eſtates, and that afterwards one of thoſe three years was taken from them; ſo that the 10th of July 1660, was the day appointed for their departure (8). There is hardly any thing more lamentable than the deſcription they make of the miſeries they were expoſed to from the year 1648, till they left Poland. They ſuffered a thouſand inſults during the two years allowed them; they could not ſell their eſtates but at a very low rate; their miſery was aggravated by all ſorts of artifices.

---

(28) Ibid.

(29) Panzirol. de claris Legum Interpret. *p.* 342.

(30) Scripſit diſtinctiones Bartoli, quas Venetiis A. MDLXIV edidit, & Socino vindicavit, Simon Schardius. Etiam ex ejus conſiliis collecta ſunt communes Doctorum opiniones, editæ ab Eraſmo Muſculo Hanojenſe. *Hoornbeek, Apparatu ad Socinian. Controverſ. pag.* 50.

(1) Such as Cracow, Lublin, and Novogrod.

(2) I ſhall quote an author in the remark [*L*], who denies that all thoſe things were contained in the decree of the Diet.

(3) Taken from the perface to the firſt volume of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.*

(4) This is only to be underſtood of thoſe effects which they could not ſell in the time allowed them.

(5) The ſame preface, pag. *2.

(6) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de l'Arianiſme, *lib. xii, pag.* 375, 376. *of the ivth Tom. Dutch edition.*

(7) *See the two Letters printed at the end of the* Hiſtoria Reformationis Polonicæ, *pag.* 278. & ſeq.

(8) Ibid. *pag.* 294.

relations, whereby they and their wives had imbibed many ſeeds of hereſy (*a*), made an impreſſion upon him; ſo that knowing himſelf not innocent he fled away as the reſt, when the inquiſition began to perſecute that family. He was at Lyons when he heard of his uncle's death, and immediately ſet out to take poſſeſſion of all the writings of the deceaſed. He returned into Italy, and became ſo acceptable to the Great Duke, that the charms of the court, and the honourable employments beſtowed upon him, hindered him for the ſpace of twelve years from remembring that he had been looked upon as the man, who was to put the laſt hand to the ſyſtem of the Samoſatenian Theology, which his uncle Lælius had begun. At laſt, the ſearch after the Goſpel truths appearing to him more valuable than the delights of a court life, he voluntarily left his country, and went into Germany in the year 1574, nor would he hearken to any perſuaſions to return, though he was deſired to do it by the Great Duke. He ſtayed three years at Baſil, where he ſtudied Divinity with great application; and having embraced a doctrine very different from that of the Proteſtants, he reſolved to maintain and ſpread it; and in order to it, he wrote a book *de Jeſu Chriſto Servatore* [*B*]. He diſputed at Zurich with Francis Puccius, in the beginning of the year 1578. The differences occaſioned by the ill doctrine of Francis David, about the honours and the power of the Son of GOD, cauſed a great diſturbance in the churches of Tranſilvania. Blandrata, a man of great authority in thoſe churches, and at court, ſent for Socinus, whom he took to be a perſon well qualifyed to pacify thoſe troubles. He lodged him in the ſame houſe with Francis David; but the latter would not be undeceived, and maintained his opinion ſo openly and ſo boldly, that he was impriſoned. He died ſoon after; and Socinus was ill ſpoken of upon that account, though it is affirmed he had no hand in the counſels that were given to the Prince of Tranſilvania, to oppreſs Francis David. He retired into Poland in the year 1579, and deſired to be admitted into the communion of the Unitarians; but becauſe he differed from them in ſome points, and would not be ſilent,

he

(*a*) Hos inter quoque, ſuggerendæ veritatis mirus artifex Lælius, ejus ſemina ſparſerat, eaque longis licet terrarum ſpatiis diviſus, tam efficaci ſtudio fovebat, ut nonnullorum uxores ignotus adhuc & abſens in partes traxerit. *Vita Fauſti Socini, pag.* 2.

artifices. They do not forget the open infraction of perpetual and irrevocable edicts, and of the royal oaths, by virtue of which, they had been unmoleſted near one hundred years: much leſs do they forget to obſerve, that the Clergy moved the States of the kingdom to ſuch an infraction, and King John Caſimir to break the oath he had taken ten years before. ‘Cœpit id primum odium Theologicum & furor vulgi; vis deinde confecit ſacerdotalis occupata authoritate Comitiorum, reſciſſis, projectis, ſpretis, pro omnium Diſſidentium pace ac ſecuritate, quâ annis admodum centum gaviſi ſumus inviolati, ſeveriſſimis legibus, graviſſimis ſtatutis, pactis, fœderibus, promiſſis quæ omnium ordinum ſanctiſſimo ſcito & conceptiſſimo Regum, hujus nominatim & quidem ter repetito jurejurando, ſæpè & nuperrimè erant religioſiſſimè & ampliſſimè renovata, aſſerta, atque confirmata; ut vim juris obtinerent inviolabilis atque æterni (9). - - - - *It was begun firſt by the hatred of the clergy and the fury of the vulgar; and after carried on and compleated by the violent rage of the prieſts, who prevailed both with the Diets to diſannul, diſregard, and deſtroy the moſt expreſs, important, ſacred promiſes, laws, and ordinances made for the peace and ſecurity of all diſſenters in religion, which we enjoyed for near a century of years unviolated; and, with our kings, to break the moſt expreſs and ſolemn oaths, and our preſent king in particular his oath thrice renewed, and moſt religiouſly and amply confirmed; which ſhould have had the force of an eternal and inviolable law.*’ Two pages after, they ſet down the oath taken by the king, in 1648, and then they ſay (10): ‘Decimo poſt anno, octavo videlicet quinquageſimo menſe eodem, Papali plerique faſcino incantati, Ordines Regni, ac fidei ſuæ, honoris ac conſcientiæ religioſiſſimis nexibus obligatæ turpiter obliti, perculſis qui rectè ſentiebant violentis clamoribus & minaci turba, Sanctiſſimam & Saluberrimam pacis legem, tot Comitiorum cautionibus, pactis, fœderibus, ſtipulationibus, tot Regum à Sigiſmundo Auguſto continua ſerie ſuccedentium, publicis Sacramentis firmiſſimè conſtitutam, & nuper adeo tam ſollicitè ac ſolemniter conſtabilitam nobiſcum, proſcribunt, noſque hoc feriunt, & natali ſolo exterminant diro decreto. - - - *Ten years after, namely the fifty-eighth year, in the ſame month, the eſtates of the kingdom, moſt of them by a Papal faſcination, baſely forgetting their faith given, with the ſacred ties of honour and conſcience, and the ſounder part overborn by the violent clamours and threats of the rabble, diſannul and aboliſh the moſt ſacred and wholeſome law of peace, moſt firmly eſtabliſhed by ſo many proviſions, promiſes, laws, obligations of general Diets, and aſſured by the public ſolemn oaths of ſo many kings by an uninterrupted ſucceſſion from Sigiſmond Auguſtus; and but lately carefully and ſolemnly confirmed to us; and by this terrible decree, they proſcribe and drive us from our native country.*’ In order to know the vexations they were under before the revocation of the edicts, you need only read the Latin paſſage I am going to quote. It will appear from it, that the King and the Republic of Poland ſtruck many blows one after another, before they came to the laſt extremities. France took the ſame courſe (11) againſt the Proteſtants. It appears alſo from the ſame paſſage, that the Unitarians aſcribed all the calamities of Poland to the perſecution which the ſects, ſeparated from the Church of Rome, had ſuffered in that kingdom, contrary to the faith of edicts. ‘Poloniam deinde infauſto omine commemorant, patriam noſtram; quæ dum non tantum nobis, ſed etiam Evangelicis, & aliis, contra jurisjurandi & fœderum fidem, templa adimit, exercendæ religionis libertatem labefactat, & variis preſſuris ob diverſum in ſacris ſenſum, infeſtam ſeſe præbet; vindicem Dei manum in ſe provocavit, & iis ſeſe cladibus & calamitatibus involvit, quarum necdum finem videmus ullum: quæ quamdiu ſartam tectam cuivis ſervavit conſcientiæ & religionis libertatem, altiſſima pace, & omnium bonorum felicitate cumulata floruit; ſed ubi vinculum illud, æquali lege omnes de rebus divinis diſſentientes continens, ſolvi cœpit, omnia

In pejus ruere, & retro ſublapſa referri (12).

‘- - - - *Then they mention Poland, our country, with an unlucky omen; which, while it takes away the churches and liberty of religion, not only from us, but alſo the Proteſtants and others, contrary to the faith of oaths and covenants, and oppreſſes us with manifold injuries, becauſe of our different ſentiments in matters of religion, hath provoked the avenging hand of* GOD *againſt it ſelf, and incurred theſe deſtructions and calamities, of which we can yet ſee no end: ſo long as it preſerved to every one their liberty of conſcience and religion, it flouriſhed in profound peace and plenty of all bleſſings; but when that bond, which by an impartial and juſt law comprehended all that have different ſentiments about religion, began to be diſſolved, all things grew worſe, and tended towards utter deſtruction.*’ Thus they ſpeak in a writing which they preſented to the States of the province of Holland in the year 1654.

[*B*] *A book* de Jeſu Chriſto Servatore.] Therein he diſputes againſt a miniſter of Paris (13), who being come to Baſil, in his way to Francfort, lodged in the

ſame

(9) Hiſtor. Reformat. Polonicæ, *pag.* 290.

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 293.

(11) That is before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685.

(12) Apologia pro Veritate accuſata, adverſus Edictum Ordinum Hollandiæ, *pag.* 40.

(13) Called James Couet. He has been miniſter of the French Church at Baſil: See above the remark [*E*] of the article ROTAN.

he met with a repulſe. Nevertheleſs, he ceaſed not to write in favour of their churches againſt their enemies. The book he wrote againſt James Paleologus afforded his enemies a pretence to exaſperate the King of Poland; and yet that book did not at all favour ſedition [*C*]. But though the bare reading of that book was ſufficient to confute the informers, Socinus thought it expedient to leave Cracow, after he had been there four years, and to take ſanctuary in the houſe of a Poliſh lord (*b*). He lived above three years under the protection of ſeveral lords of the kingdom, and alſo married a woman of a good family. He loſt her in the year 1587, at which he was extremely afflicted

ſame houſe with him. That book was printed in 1595, by a diſciple of the author. Socinus's name was put to it; it was the firſt time his name appeared in his works. ‘ Diſputationem illam edidit poſtmodum Socini amicus & ſequax, Elias Arciſſevius, Polonus, An. MDXCV. præfixo, quod nunquam ante factum in aliis ſcriptis fuerat, Auctoris nomine (14). --- *Elias Arciſſevius, a native of Poland, a friend and follower of Socinus, publiſhed afterwards that diſpute, prefixing to it the author's name, which had never been done in his other writings.*’ I ſhall ſay by and by (15), why he was ſo long without putting his name to his books.

[*C*] *The book did not at all favour ſedition.*] He therein ſo fully condemns the ſubjects who take up arms againſt their prince, and the Proteſtant divines who ſaid that it was lawful to oppoſe thoſe who oppreſſed the liberty of conſcience, that perhaps the greateſt ſticklers for the arbitrary and deſpotical power of ſovereigns never ſpoke more poſitively. He ſpeaks rather like a monk, who let out to hire his pen, to make the Proteſtant Reformation odious, than like an Italian refugee. Theſe are his words: ‘ Veſtris belli gerendi Chriſtiano populo conceſſionibus factum eſt, ut contra ipſum magiſtratum Chriſti nomine gaudens populus arma capere non dubitaverit, vobis non modo aſſentientibus, & approbantibus, verum etiam ſuadentibus, atque impellentibus, & libris præterea editis, id & poſſe, & debere fieri publice conteſtantibus, ac contendentibus. Teſtis eſt hodie eorum quæ dico orbis ipſe terrarum, qui hæc fieri aut vidit, aut certiſſima fama accepit, ſed teſtes potiſſimum ſunt duæ nobiliſſimæ provinciæ Gallia, & Germania inferior, quæ civili ſanguine jam diu madent, atque redundant, eo quod perſuaſum ſit, ex certis quibuſdam cauſis populo, ſeu populi parti, adverſus dominum & principem ſuum Bellum gerere licere. Itaque hac ætate noſtra ab iis, qui Chriſtianos ſe eſſe præ cæteris jactant, per ſpeciem Chriſtianæ Religionis aſſerendæ, id fieri vidimus, quod barbari atque efferati homines facere exhorreſcunt, ut ſcilicet contra proprios reges arma ferant. Et tamen (ſi Deo placet) eos, qui ob prædictam ſive in ipſa acie, ſive alibi ceciderunt, & obtruncati ſunt, in martyrum Chriſti numerum referri, publice audivimus. O ſeculum! Hi nimirum ſunt, ut dixi, veſtrarum belli gerendi conceſſionum fructus. Egregii vos ſcilicet magiſtratuum defenſores eſtis, qui populos contra magiſtratum, id eſt reges ſuos armatis, dum magiſtratu jubente, bello juſte geri poſſe docetis. Rege enim tyranno facto (quod quid ſit, quilibet ſuo modo interpretatur) non regem amplius, ſed populum ipſum, ſive aliquos ex regni proceribus magiſtratum eſſe, vulgus hominum vobis ipſis indicantibus, vel certe annuentibus, contendit, quibus auctoribus, ex veſtra diſciplina, tyrannum illum, ut ipſi putant, ejuſque vim armis repellere, cumque eo aperte bellum gerere non dubitant. Unde quot ingentia mala neceſſario proficiſcantur plus ſatis jam experientia novimus, quæ miſere deplorari magis quam apte verbis explicari poſſunt (16). - - - - *By your allowing Chriſtian people to take up arms, it is come to paſs, that people called by the name of Chriſt have not ſcrupled to riſe up in arms againſt their magiſtrates, not only with your conſent and approbation, but alſo by your advice and perſuaſion, and by printed books, publickly declaring and maintaining, that it may and ought to be done. All the world at this day, who have either ſeen or heard that ſuch things are done, can witneſs the truth of what I ſay, but eſpecially two famous countries,* viz. *France, and Lower Germany, which of a long time have been ſtained and overflowed with civil blood, becauſe they are perſuaded that it is lawful for a people, or a part of them, for certain cauſes, to fight againſt their lord and prince. Wherefore in theſe our days we have ſeen that done by thoſe, who pretend to a greater perfection in Chriſtianity than others, in defence, as they alledge, of religion, which barbarous and ſavage men would abhor; namely, to fight againſt their own kings. And notwithſtanding ſuch as have died on this account, whether in battle, or otherwiſe, have been publickly ranked amongſt martyrs for* CHRIST. *Theſe are, as I have ſaid, the fruits of your allowing of making war. You are rare defenders of magiſtrates, who arm people againſt their magiſtrates, that is, their kings, whilſt you teach that people may riſe in arms without, and contrary to the command of their magiſtrates. For when a king becomes a tyrant, (and who is a tyrant every one pretends to judge) he is no more king, but the power devolves upon the people themſelves, or ſome of the nobles, according to the opinion of the vulgar taught by you, or at leaſt aſſented to, and that it is lawful to reſiſt him, to repel force by force, and to wage open war againſt him, according to your doctrine. From whence, what prodigious and fatal miſchiefs do neceſſarily ariſe, we are taught by woful experience, which may ſooner be ſadly lamented, than ſufficiently deſcribed by words.*’ Hoornbeek having quoted this long paſſage, adds a ſhort confutation to it, and obſerves, among other things (17), that ſuch a malicious reflexion upon the conduct of the Dutch againſt Philip II, might have been alledged by the States-General, when they expelled the Socinians in the year 1598. I wonder that Cocceius, who quotes another paſſage out of that book of Socinus, knew not that this Heretic did particularly condemn the wars of the Dutch againſt Spain. Cocceius's words deſerve to be inſerted here: it appears from them, that in 1654, the Socinians did very much commend the conduct which Socinus had ſo much blamed in 1581. ‘ *Socinus contra Palæologum, p.* 261, *dicit:* Ex quo intelligi poteſt, quam præpoſterè ii ſe gerant, qui arma adverſus eos, qui dominantur, capiunt, ut (quemadmodum ajunt ipſi) Dei cultum & religionem tueantur. *Ita Socinus A. C.* 1581. *locutus eſt. Neque eſt, puto, qui credat, eum non harum provinciarum proceres deſignaſſe. Nunc eques laudat ſcilicet Illuſtrium Ordinum pro præſumpta iſta libertate conſcientiæ geſtum bellum, & Deum hanc præclaram Rempublicam elegiſſe dicit, ut illius libertatis, imò licentiæ, ſedes eſſet* (18). - - - Socinus writing againſt Palæologus, ſays; *Whereby it may be judged how prepoſterouſly thoſe act, who take up arms againſt their governours, that (as they give out) they may defend the worſhip of* GOD *and religion.* Thus ſpoke Socinus in the year 1581. Nor is there any one, I think, who can imagine, that he did not here point out the chiefs of theſe provinces. Now truly the knight commendeth the war carried on by the illuſtrious States for that pretended liberty of conſcience, and ſays, that GOD has choſen this famous Republic to be the ſeat of that liberty, or rather licence.’ But obſerve by the by, that informers are a ſort of men that will do any thing; for Socinus was accuſed to the King of Poland as being the author of a ſeditious libel; and yet Socinus openly condemned in that book all the writers, who ſay that ſubjects may take up arms, and ſet up for judges of this queſtion, Whether a prince is a tyrant or not? ‘ Stephanus tunc Regnum Poloniæ obtinebat. Ejus aures accuſator imbuit ſeditioſi contra Magiſtratum ſcripti criminatione. Indignum eſſe, ſi authore vago atque exuli Italo impune abeat hæc audacia. Libellus contra Palæologum deſignabatur. Qui licet aliud non poſtularet innocentiæ teſtimonium, quam ſui lectionem, declinari tamen periculum placuit (19). - - - - *Stephen was at that time King of Poland. He was told by an informer, that a ſeditious writing had been publiſhed againſt governours. That it would not be commendable to let this boldneſs of a vagrant author, an Italian, to go unpuniſhed. The book againſt*

(*b*) Chriſtophorus Morſtinius Pawlikovii Dominus.

(14) Hoornbeek, in Apparatu ad Controverſ. Socinianas, *pag.* 51.

(15) In the remark [*E*].

(16) Socin. in Libro de Magiſtratu, adverſ. Paleologum, *Part i, pag.* 144, 145, *apud* Hoornbeek, in Apparatu ad Controverſ. Socinianas, *pag.* 58.

(17) Hoornbeek, ibid. *pag.* 59.

(18) Cocceius in Examine Apologiæ Equitis Poloni, *pag.* 141.

(19) Vita Fauſti Socini, *fol.* **: *verſo.*

afflicted [*D*]; and to compleat his affliction, he was deprived of the yearly income of his patrimony by the death of Francis de Medicis, Great Duke of Florence [*E*]. The conſolation he had to ſee his doctrine approved at laſt by many miniſters, was very much diſturbed in 1598; for he received a thouſand inſults at Cracow, and his friends had much ado to reſcue him out of the hands of the mob. He loſt his houſhold-goods, and ſome of his manuſcripts, the loſs of which he extremely lamented [*F*]. He loſt, among others, that which he had writ againſt the Atheiſts. To avoid the like dangers for the time to come, he retired to a village about nine miles diſtant from Cracow, and he ſpent the remaining part of his life in the houſe of Abraham Blonſki a Poliſh Gentleman *(c)*. He died there the third of March 1604 *(d)*. His ſect was ſo far from dying with him, that it very much increaſed; but ſince it was expelled from Poland in 1658, it is very much decayed and very much diminiſhed as to its viſible ſtate: I expreſs my ſelf ſo, becauſe moſt people are perſuaded that it has made an inviſible progreſs, and grows daily more numerous; and it is thought, conſidering the preſent ſtate of things, that Europe would be amazed to perceive itſelf Socinian in a little time, if potent princes made a public profeſſion of that hereſy, or only ordered that thoſe, who profeſs it, ſhould be freed from the temporal diſadvantages that attend it. It is the opinion of ſeveral people, which makes them uneaſy and alarms them. But others pretend there is nothing to fear, and that princes will never embrace a ſect, which does not approve war, and the exerciſe of magiſtracies [*G*]. That very thing, ſay they, will always prejudice particular

‘ *Palæologus was meant. Which, tho’ it wanted no* ‘ *other teſtimony of it’s innocence than only to be read,* ‘ *yet he thought fit to withdraw from that danger.*’

I do not think that any Socinian has hitherto maintained, That it is lawful to take up arms againſt one’s prince; the reaſon of it is, that they have had no occaſion to juſtify their ſect upon that head. It has ſtill it’s virginity in that reſpect, and is not like many others, which might ſay as the courtezan in Petronius, *Nunquam memini me Virginem fuiſſe, &c.* It is likely the Socinians have not had any convenient opportunity to imitate them.

[*D*] *He loſt his wife, in the year* 1587, *at which he was extremely afflicted.*] His grief was ſo violent, that his health was much impaired by it: he could not ſtudy for ſome time; he could not overcome the weakneſs that affected his body. His wife, ſome months before ſhe died, was delivered of a daughter, who was afterwards married to a Poliſh gentleman, by whom ſhe had ſeveral ſons and daughters. ‘ *Filiam Agnetem ſuſtulit circa Pentecoſtem anni* 1587, *ætatis* 48, *ex qua, cum poſt mortem patris Staniſlao Wizowatio Equiti Polono nupſiſſet, nepotes nepteſque etiamnum ſuperſunt. Eodem anno in Septembre amiſit uxorem Eliſabetham: quem caſum viro luctuoſum & acerbum gravis ægritudo corporis excepit: adeo quidem pertinax, ut per aliquot menſes ſtudiorum uſum interciperet* (20).

[*E*] *He was deprived of the yearly income of his patrimony, by the death of Francis de Medicis, Great Duke of Florence.*] During the life of Iſabella de Medicis, ſiſter to the Great Duke, and wife of Paul Giordano de Urſini, the inquiſitors endeavoured, in vain, to get that Heretic deprived of his eſtate. When ſhe died, the Great Duke himſelf took care to protect him. He ſent him word to return into Italy, and aſſured him that whatever happened, he would let him enjoy his income, and only recommended to him, not to put his name to his books. This was certainly a very great favour in a country where the court of Rome is ſo powerful. *Ne qua calamitatis ſpecies abeſſet, eadem fere tempeſtate, per mortem Franſciſci Magni ducis Hetruriæ, fructus bonorum ejus, quem quotannis ex Italia capiebat, penitus ipſi fuit ereptus. Sane aliquanto ante, criminatorum acerbitate ac minis Pontificum, bona ejus in periculum venerant. Sed Iſabellæ Mediceæ Magni Ducis Hetruriæ ſororis, quæ Paulo Jordano Urſino, quem ſupra memoravimus, nupta fuerat, dum vixit, enixo ſtudio, & poſtea ipſius Franciſci Magni Ducis benevolentia, factum eſt, ut illo ſuperſtite annuos ex iis reditus Socinus caperet. Adeo nondum illic meritorum ejus exoleverat memoria, ut literis ac precibus, damnati & exulis, pridem deſtituti ac ſæpe depudiati, principes difficillima in re gratificarentur. Humaniſſimis quoque literis compellatus, & in poſterum quoque bono animo eſſe juſſus eſt, quamdiu vita illis ſuppeteret, dum ne in libris edendis nomen ſuum publice extare pateretur. Sed tunc illos principes infeſtum Socini fatum abſtulerat* (21).

[*F*] *He loſt . . . . ſome . . . . manuſcripts, the loſs of which he extremely lamented.*] The ſcholars of Cracow having ſtirred up ſome of the dregs of the people, they entered Socinus’s houſe; they dragged him half naked out of his chamber, tho’ he was ſick; they carried him along the ſtreets; they cried, that he ſhould be hanged; they beat him, and it was with extreme difficulty that a profeſſor got him out of the hands of this rabble. His houſe was plundered, he loſt his goods; but he particularly lamented the loſs of ſome manuſcripts, which he would have redeemed at the price of his blood. Let us hear what his Hiſtorian ſays. *Anno* 1598. *commota per Scholaſticos infimæ plebis fæce, æger tunc & forte curandæ valetudini intentus, extrahitur è cubiculo ſeminudus, & per forum ac celeberrimas plateas, depoſcentibus ad ſupplicium pleriſque contumelioſe raptatur. Tandem in illa furentium colluvie peſſime mulctatus, à M. Vadovita Profeſſore Cracovienſi ægre furenti multitudini eripitur. Direptas tunc ſarcinas & ſuppellectilem, quæque alia rapi potuere, longe minori dolore tulit, atque ſcriptorum quorundam jacturam irreparabilem, quam ipſius vitæ impendio ſeſe redempturum fuiſſe ſæpe profeſſus eſt. Periit ibi una inſignis contra Atheos labor, quem refellendis ingenioſis magni cujuſdam Viri commentis ſuſceperat* (22).

[*G*] *Princes will never embrace a ſect, which does not approve war, and the exerciſe of magiſtracy.*] How many princes make a trade of their own ſubjects, as a private man deals in horſes and ſheep? They raiſe troops not to defend their frontiers, or to attack their enemies, but to make them ſerve other princes for money (23). They are very glad to have ſubjects always ready to liſt themſelves upon the firſt beating of a drum; they get a great deal by it, and therefore they would be ſorry if they ſhould turn Socinians; their treaſury would be the worſe for it. On the other ſide, moſt ſovereign princes love to make irruptions into the neighbouring ſtates, or to confederate with other princes who are at war; and it is of great moment for them that it ſhould be known, that whoever attacks them will not do it with impunity. In all theſe views nothing could be more inſignificant than to rule over men, who are engaged not to bear arms out of a principle of religion. There goes a ſtory, which perhaps is only a meer jeſt, *viz.* That the King of Poland being attacked by the rebellious Coſſacks, and by the Tartars, and wanting all his ſubjects to oppoſe the enemies, ſent word to the Socinians to take up arms. They anſwered, that their conſcience did not allow them to ſhed human blood, nor to do any harm to reaſonable creatures. Whereupon, it was propoſed to them to go to the army without putting any ſhot in their muſkets: they were told that they would make a ſhew; which would prove of ſome uſe, becauſe their enemies would be more afraid: but they had much ado to reliſh that expedient. See the end of the next remark. I have it from very good hands, that the Poliſh gentlemen of the Socinian perſuaſion went to the war, when the laws of the kingdom required it, and even that ſome of them profeſſed a military life, without being obliged to it out of a neceſſity of obeying the laws of the kingdom: their ſect did not approve their conduct in the laſt caſe.

(*c*) Cum ad tam barbarum ſævitiæ exemplum minæ quoque accederent, Cracovia Luclavicias migravit, in pagum ultima ſua habitatione atque obitu nobilem, novem circiter milliaribus Cracovia diſſitum; ubi aliquot annos, uſus menſa & ædibus viri nobilis Abrahami Blonſcii, vicinus Stoinio vixit. *Vita Fauſti Socini, folio* ** 3.

(*d*) Taken from his Life, written by Samuel Przipcovius, a Poliſh gentleman. It is prefixed to the firſt volume of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.*

(20) Vita F. Socini, *ibid.*

(21) Ibid.

(22) Ibid. *fol.* ** 3.

(23) Compare what is ſaid above, at the end of the remark [*L*] of the article ANABAPTISTS; and the remark [*E*], of the article BULLINGER.

cular men againſt Socinianiſm; for few people can renounce ambition, and give over a military life [*H*]. To be convinced of it we need only conſult experience; and conſider what is

[*H*] *Few people can renounce ambition, and give over a military life.*] Thoſe, who love war, are innumerable, and are acted by very ambitious motives. Gentlemen, and thoſe who live nobly, are excited thereto either by the ſole deſire of raiſing themſelves, and acquiring glory, or, by a deſire of ſupplying their wants. The ſoldiers are animated by lazineſs, and by debauchery: they hope to be idle the greateſt part of the time; they hope to pillage and plunder, and to have plenty of good wine, and debauched women. In every town, thoſe who are qualified to pretend to offices, ſue for them with great earneſtneſs, and leave nothing unattempted to obtain them. As ſoon as there is a vacancy, you immediately ſee ſeveral competitors, who have long before opened the way by their ſollicitations and liberalities: a plain demonſtration that the deſire of honours and dignities is very powerful, and very general. From whence it ought to be concluded that the Socinian religion cannot ſuit a whole nation, nay, nor the greateſt number; it is only adapted to ſome perſons of a particular temper: and if it be true, that a Pope hearing that the Proteſtants puniſhed adulterers and fornicators, cried out, that their religion would be of no long continuance (24), it may be affirmed that his prognoſtication would have been more juſt, if he had applied it to a ſect of men, who will neither bear arms nor exerciſe any office.

Whether the rejection of myſteries is a good way to get followers.

Give me leave to impart to my readers an obſervation that was made in my hearing againſt thoſe, who ſay that all the ingenious Italians, who forſook Calviniſm to ſet up a new Arianiſm, deſigned to form a greater party than that of the Reformers of Germany and Geneva. It is ſuppoſed that tho' they believed myſteries, they pretended to oppoſe them, in order to have many followers. The captivating of one's underſtanding to the belief of three perſons in the Divine Nature, and of a God-man, is a heavy yoke for reaſon (25): Chriſtians are therefore very much eaſed when freed from ſuch a yoke; and conſequently it is probable that vaſt crowds will follow a man, who removes ſo great a burthen. Behold the reaſon why thoſe Italians, who fled into Poland, denied the Trinity, the hypoſtatical Union, Original Sin, abſolute Predeſtination, *&c.* They thought that ſince Calvin ſhaking off the neceſſity of believing all the incomprehenſible things contained in Tranſubſtantiation, brought over many people to him; they ſhould make a greater progreſs ſtill, if they rejected all the inconceiveable doctrines which that Reformer had kept. But it may be anſwered, that they had been very ſilly and unworthy of the Italian education, if they had made uſe of ſuch a cheat. The ſpeculative myſteries of religion are little troubleſome to the people: they will, indeed, tire a profeſſor of Divinity very intent upon them in order to explain them, and anſwer the objections of the Heretics. Some other ſtudious men, who examine them with great curioſity, may be alſo troubled by the reſiſtance of their reaſon; but all other men are at perfect eaſe about it: they believe, or fancy they believe, all that is ſaid of them, and quietly reſt in that perſuaſion. Whereforehe would not be far from Fanaticiſm, who could imagine that citizens and peaſants, ſoldiers and gentlemen, would be freed from a heavy yoke, if they were diſpenſed from believing the Trinity, and the hypoſtatical Union. They like much better a doctrine that is myſterious, incomprehenſible, and above reaſon: they are more apt to admire what they do not comprehend; they form to themſelves an idea of it more ſublime, and alſo more comfortable. All the ends of religion are much better to be found in incomprehenſible things: they inſpire a greater admiration, reſpect, fear, and conſtancy. If falſe religions have had their myſteries, it is becauſe they have been forged by the ape of the true one. God out of his infinite wiſdom has accommodated himſelf to the ſtate of man (26), by mixing darkneſs with light in his revelation. In one word, it muſt be granted, that in certain matters incomprehenſibility cauſes approbation (27). If a man had a mind to invent an hypotheſis only for Philoſophers, and ſuch as might be called *Religio Medici*, it is likely, he would think himſelf obliged to lay aſide the doctrines difficult to be comprehended; but then he muſt not have the vanity to expect to be followed by the multitude. If he had a mind to ſatisfy his vanity in that reſpect, he ſhould do as the hero of Lorenzo Gratian (28). But granting that thoſe Italians have been ſo ſilly as to think that people would be freed from an intolerable yoke, if they were diſpenſed from believing the Trinity, *&c.* muſt we alſo grant that they thought the prohibition of civil and military employments would not be a yoke a thouſand times heavier than that which they intended to break? Will any one be ſo unreaſonable as to require that we ſhould have ſuch a notion of thoſe men, who wanted neither wit nor addreſs, as every body owns? What I am going to ſay will doubtleſs reſolve the queſtion. When men of parts, deſigning to ſet up a new ſect, pitch upon a looſe method, and ſubſtitute an eaſy doctrine in the room of a difficult one, it may be ſaid that they do not pitch upon the moſt proper method to ſucceed in their deſign; but it ought not to be ſuppoſed that they are contented to ſuppreſs ſpeculative myſteries, and that they keep the whole practical part, and even aggravate the yoke of the moral precepts. And yet this is ſuppoſed concerning the founders of the Socinian hereſy; and therefore what is ſaid of their deſign is a miſtake. They are more rigid than other Chriſtians about the prohibition of revenge, and the contempt of worldly honours; they are not for any mitigated or figurative explications of ſuch texts of the Scripture as relate to morality. They have revived the ſeverity of the Primitive Church, which did not approve that the Faithful ſhould concern themſelves with magiſtracies, and ſhould have any hand in the death of their neighbour, ſo far that they would not have them to accuſe malefactors. 'Non enim cum occidere Deus vetat, latrocinari nos tantum prohibet, quod ne per leges quidem publicas licet, ſed ea quoque ne fiant monet, quæ apud homines pro licitis habentur. Ita neque militare juſto licebit, cujus militia eſt in ipſa juſtitia, neque vero accuſare quemquam crimine capitali, quia nihil diſtat, utrumne ferro, an verbo potius occidas, quoniam occiſio ipſa prohibetur. Itaque in hoc Dei præcepto nullam prorſus exceptionem fieri oportet, quin occidere hominem ſit ſemper nefas, quem Deus ſanctum animal eſſe voluit (29). ---- *For when God forbids killing, he does not only prohibit robbery, which is done by the laws of the ſtate, but alſo ſuch things as by men are accounted lawful. Wherefore it is not lawful for a juſt man to fight, whoſe warfare muſt be the fight of faith; nor to accuſe any of a capital crime; for if you kill it is no matter how, whether by ſword or otherwiſe, becauſe all killing is forbidden. Wherefore in this command of God, there ought to be no exception; but it is always a crime to kill a man, an animal, whom God would have ſacred.*' The prohibition of civil and military offices is a heavier burthen than the prohibition of revenge; for it excludes the expedients both of deceiving one's ſelf, and alſo of deceiving others. Thoſe, who preach moſt earneſtly againſt revenge, find out a thouſand diſtinctions to elude that precept. Some ſay, they do not hate their neighbour as he is a man, but as he is an enemy of God: others proteſt, that they do him no harm to revenge a private quarrel, but for God's glory. This is approving, by the help of ſome diſtinctions, what one pretends to condemn. Some deceive themſelves; others are mere hypocrites, who deceive the world: but no ſubterfuge can be alledged as to the doctrine which forbids going to the war, and exerciſing civil offices; thoſe who profeſs ſuch a doctrine muſt neceſſarily follow it; the practice cannot be ſeparated from the theory; there are no diſtinctions, nor equivocations. It is therefore a true conſtraint; it is not a tranſient mortification, like that of thoſe who diſcipline themſelves once a year; it is a perpetual and continual ſtate. We may therefore affirm that thoſe Italian refugees were no cheats: they were deceived by their ſubtilties, and by relying too much upon the natural light of their reaſon; and if they kept only part of the Chriſtian doctrines, it is becauſe their firſt principle, whereby they will admit nothing that is directly againſt their reaſon, led them to it. This is apparently the cauſe of their choice; had they been meer cheats, greedy of followers, they would

(24) See the article ABELIANS, citat. (3).

(25) *See* l'Eſprit de Mr Arnaud, *Tom. i, cap. vi, pag.* 211.

(26) *According to* Cæſar, de Bello Civili, *lib. ii, cap. iv, that ſtate would be vitious.* Communi ſit vitio naturæ, *ſays he,* ut inviſis, latitantibus atque incognitis rebus magis confidamus, vehementiuſque exterreamur.

(27) Madam de Sablé, ſays in one of her Maxims (it is the xxxixth) We eſteem thoſe men moſt, the extent of whoſe ability we know not; for we always preſume the beſt of what we ſee but by half.

(28) *That author ſays, that* el Heroe platique incomprehenſibilidades de caudal; *and that he diſcovers himſelf without being comprehended.* Gran treta en el arte de entendidos oſtentarſe al conocimiento, pero no a la comprehenſion. *See Father* Bouhours, Entretiens d'Ariſte, *pag. m.* 54.

(29) Lactant. *lib. vi, cap. xx, pag. m.* 426.

is daily practiſed. They alledge ſome other reaſons [*I*] very proper to ſhew that this ſect is not like to increaſe. Thoſe, who ſay that the Socinians have a full liberty of conſcience in the United Provinces, are little acquainted with Hiſtory [*K*], and will plainly ſee the contrary, if they read the anſwer that was made to Mr Stoupp's letters (*e*): they will find in it (*f*) the dates of many ordinances publiſhed againſt the ſectaries. I ſhall ſay (*g*) ſomething of thoſe which concern the Socinians, and I ſhall dwell ſomewhat longer

would have gone another way to work. Let us therefore condemn their principle, as a deceitful one, and not uſurp the place of him that ſearcheth the reins and hearts. Their principle debaſes religion, and changes it into Philoſophy. The greatneſs, authority and ſovereignty of GOD require that we ſhould here walk by faith and not by ſight. A Spaniſh politician hath wiſely ſaid, that it is an excellent qualification to keep ſecret one's thoughts and reſolutions. *Si todo exceſſo en ſecreto, lo es en caudal; ſacramentar una voluntad ſera ſoberania . . . Arguye eminencia de caudal penetrar toda voluntad agena; y concluye ſuperioridad ſaber celar la propria.* See Father Bouhours, at page 201, of his *Entretiens d'Ariſte & d'Eugene.*

The Heathens ſaid, that myſteries better diſcover GOD's majeſty, and are an image of his nature, becauſe he cannot be perceived by our ſenſes. Ἡ κρύψις ἡ μυστικὴ τῶν ἱερῶν σεμνοποιεῖ τὸ θεῖον, μιμουμένη τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ ἐκφεύγουσαν ἡμῶν τὴν αἴσθησιν. *Myſtica ſacrorum occultatio majeſtatem numini conciliat imitans ejus naturam effugientem ſenſus noſtros.* They are Strabo's words, page 322, of the 10th book.

But what I am going to ſay may undeceive thoſe, who flatter themſelves that the averſeneſs of the Socinians for military and civil offices will always be a great obſtacle to the progreſs of that ſect. It is no article of the Socinian faith, that one ought to renounce civil and military offices. The Socinians are, in that reſpect, more indulgent than the Mennonites. They do not ſcruple to exerciſe public employments in Tranſylvania, and it is likely they would bear arms as other men do, if they had a prince of their religion.

[*I*] *They alledge ſome other reaſons.*] For if it be conſidered, that moſt men are more inclined to acquieſce in the inward ſentiments, than to follow the thread of innumerable conſequences methodically connected, and proceeding from diſtinct notions, and that they may be quickly and eaſily offended by the paradoxes which reaſon throws them upon, it will appear ſomewhat probable that the Socinian ſyſtem is not very proper to gain the people. It may rather lead ſtudious and ſpeculative men to Scepticiſm. There will always be ſomething defective in that ſyſtem, whereby people may be kept from it. The eternity of matter, GOD's extenſion, the limitation of this extenſion, and of the Divine knowledge, and of hell torments, are Socinian doctrines, which being eloquently repreſented to princes and their ſubjects, will always inſpire them with great horror. If it be a convenient thing to each private perſon not to be afraid of being puniſhed after this life, yet it is more inconvenient to think that one is daily converſant with people who are not afraid of it. And therefore it is not the intereſt of private perſons, that any doctrine tending to leſſen the fear of hell torments ſhould be admitted in their country; and it is probable that the preachers of ſuch a looſe doctrine will always be more offenſive than acceptable to the public. A certain author ſays, that *the ſame perſons, who reject the Goſpel by reaſon of the auſterity of it's moral precepts, would expreſs a greater horror for a religion enjoyning them to plunge themſelves into the moſt infamous diſorders, if it was offered to them, when they are able to reaſon, and before they are blinded by the prejudices of education* (30). He has made ſome reflexions upon this, but he has omitted one of the beſt; for he ſays nothing of ſelf-love, and perſonal intereſt. It is true, that a wicked man would like a doctrine, with reſpect to his own conſcience, that ſhould allow him to be a poiſoner, and to commit adultery, perjury, *&c.* but he would not like it upon many other accounts. He has a mother, a wife, a ſiſter, and nieces, who would vex him horribly, if they grew infamous for their leudneſs. There are more people, who can poiſon, rob, and cheat him, *&c.* than there are againſt whom he can commit the ſame crimes. Every body is more capable of being offended than of offending others; for of twenty equal perſons, it is evident that every one of them is leſs ſtrong againſt nineteen than nineteen againſt one (31). It is therefore the intereſt of each private perſon, tho' never ſo wicked, that men ſhould be taught ſuch doctrines as will terrify the conſcience.

[*K*] *Thoſe who ſay that the Socinians have a full liberty of conſcience in the United Provinces, are little acquainted with Hiſtory.*] The Unitarians made ſeveral attempts to ſettle in Holland. The firſt is aſcribed to Eraſmus Johannes, rector of a college at Antwerp, who publiſhed a book in the year 1585, without putting his name to it. That book is intituled, *Antitheſis doctrinæ Chriſti & Antichriſti de uno vero Deo.* Zanchius confuted it the year following. The ſecond attempt was that of Cornelius Daems, a Civilian of Mechlin, who removed from Tergow, where he reſided, to Utrecht, in order to diſperſe there ſome manuſcript tracts of Socinus. The magiſtrates having notice of it, reſolved to arreſt him; but he ran away, and his papers were ſeized. He recovered them ſome months after, becauſe the government of the town came into other hands. The third attempt was that of Oſtorodus and Vaidovius, who came from Poland to Amſterdam in the year 1598, with many Socinian books printed and manuſcript, which they began to get tranſlated into Dutch (32). The magiſtrates having cauſed all thoſe books to be ſeized, ſent them to the univerſity of Leyden, and then to the States-General; having firſt given a ſevere reprimand to thoſe two Socinians, and commanded them to leave the country. The States-General being informed of the judgment paſſed upon thoſe books by the Divines of Leyden, ordered them to be burnt in the preſence of Oſtorodus and Vaidovius, and commanded thoſe two men to depart from the United Provinces within ten days (33). The judgment of the Leyden Divines imported, that thoſe books were little different from Mahometiſm, and that they contained ſome blaſphemies, that could not be tolerated among Chriſtans without great impiety. *Scripta iſta ad Turciſmum proxime accedere, & veram æternamque Deitatem Chriſti Filii Dei, & Spiritus Sancti, officium Chriſti, beneficia ejus ſalutaria, & Baptiſmi ſancti inſtitutionem, & noſtrum Religioſum erga eum officium evertere, & ſimilia multa adeo blaſphema, ut ſine graviſſima impietate nec in vulgus ſpargi, nec inter Chriſtianos ferri poſſint continere* (34). Adolphus Venator, a Miniſter of Alcmaer, was confined to an iſland in 1617, for writing a book, that favoured of Socinianiſm, *quod portenta Sarmatica ſaperet* (35). The ſchiſm of the Arminians favoured the introduction of Socinianiſm into Holland; for they do not refuſe to hold an eccleſiaſtical communion with the Socinians. Inſomuch that the latter might reſide in many towns of the United Provinces without being known. The Prince of Tranſylvania intercepted a letter in 1638, wherein the Socinian John Sartorius (36), who lived at Amſterdam, acquainted a miniſter of his ſect (37), that there were in Holland many perſons (38) of their perſuaſion (39). It is certain that they had gained ſome followers at that time, and that their books were diſperſed up and down. In order to put a ſtop to it, the magiſtrates of Amſterdam condemned ſome pieces of Volkelius to be burnt in the year 1642 (40). The ſynods of Holland have appeared very zealous to prevent the propagation of that hereſy. They preſented a petition to the States of the province in 1628, wherein they alledged ſeveral reaſons why they ſhould not tolerate it (41), and repreſented, among other things, that ſuch a toleration would make the common-wealth of the United Provinces (42) ſtink all over Chriſtendom. That remonſtrance was publiſhed, and confuted. Thoſe who confuted it, ſaid in anſwer to that particular reaſon, that Poland then muſt be very ſtinking (43), ſince it granted liberty of conſcience to the Socinians. Whereupon Voëtius ſays, that it is not true they ever had ſuch liberty in Poland; and that the contrary appeared ſome years after by the ill uſage they there met with. (44) *Sed infelices illi hiſtorici* *perperam*

(*e*) Apologie pour la Religion des Hollandois, *by John Brun, printed in the year* 1675.

(*f*) Page 173.

(*g*) In the remark [*L*].

(30) Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, *num.* 189, *pag.* 592.

(31) Even without ſuppoſing that the nineteen, act in concert againſt the twentieth.

(32) *Taken from* Giſbertus Voëtius, Diſputat. *Tom. iii, p.* 811.

(33) Hoornbeeck, Apparatu, ad Controverſias Socinianas, *pag.* 98.

(34) Id. ibid.

(35) Voëtius Polit. Eccl. *Tom. ii, lib. iv, p.* 533.

(36) So Hoornbeeck, and Voëtius, below citation (44), call him; but they ſhould have ſaid *John Statorius.*

(37) Adam Francus, miniſter of Clauſemburg.

(38) Magnam in his terris Socinianorum meſſem eſſe. *Hoornbeeck, ubi infra.*

(39) Hoornbeeck, Apparatu ad Controverſias Socinianas, *p.* 97.

(40) See the article VOLKELIUS.

(41) Voëtius, ubi ſupra, *Tom. ii, pag.* 532.

(42) Inter alias motivas hanc ſuggererent, quod hac ratione toti orbi Chriſtiano fœtidum redderetur fœderatum Belgium. *Id. ibid.*

(43) Oportere ut Regnum Poloniæ admodum fæteat. *Id. ibid.*

(44) Id. ibid.

longer upon that of the year 1653 [*L*]. The accuſation publiſhed by a modern author, is

perperam præſupponebant Regis & regni conceſſionem; quæ nulla erat (45), *nec unquam fuerat: & paucis annis poſt ſatis oſtendit regnum Polonicum quid iſtic libertatis cuivis ſectæ, & inter eas Socinianæ conceſſum ſit. Quærant modo ex fratribus ſuis* Sartorio, Jona Slichtingio, *aliiſque, quo loco nunc ſit libertas ipſorum.*

[*L*] *I ſhall dwell ſomewhat longer upon the ordinance of the year* 1653.] I do not know what the States of Holland anſwered, in the year 1628, to the remonſtrances of their ſynods; but I have read the acts of what was done in a like caſe in the year 1653. The deputies of the ſame ſynods repreſented to them that the followers of Socinus, a ſort of men who deſtroyed all Chriſtianity, the reſurrection of the dead, the hopes of an eternal life, *&c.* were ſo bold as to come into the United Provinces, and particularly into Holland, that there to pervert the Faithful, and rend the Church; that it was well known how zealous the Ragotſki's had been againſt thoſe Heretics in Tranſylvania, and what decrees had been made againſt them in Poland in the years 1638, and 1647. That they had been expelled from Poland; that their church, their library, and their printing-houſe had been deſtroyed, becauſe they had in the preſs a very ſcandalous book againſt the myſtery of the Trinity. *Quemadmodum Rakociana domus in Tranſylvania adverſus hos errorum ſeminatores zelaverit; quid Anno* 1638, *&* 1647, *in Polonia contra ipſos actum ſit, quomodo ex Polonia ſint ejecti, & ipſorum bibliotheca diſperſa, ipſorum cœtus disjectus, templum, ſchola, typographeum, ipſis ademta, quòd librum ſub prelo haberent hac inſcriptione,* Tormentum throno Trinitatem deturbans, *in recenti memoria eſt* (46). That the States-General proceeded ſeverely againſt them in the year 1598. That in 1639, by the ſuggeſtion of the Engliſh ambaſſador, all the provinces were informed of the arrival of ſome Socinians, and deſired, in time, to prevent the evil by their decrees. That in the year 1640, the States of Holland acquainted the Synod of Amſterdam with their reſolution, importing that in what concerned the proſcription of the Socinians and their books, all neceſſary orders would be given about it, as ſoon as the ſtate of the thing ſhould be more exactly known. *Anno* 1640 *Synodo Amſterodamenſi hoc decretum Illuſtrium & Præpotentum Ordinum intimatum eſt: Quod attinet Socinianorum excluſionem & librorum ejus Sectæ ſcitum eſt, ſi accuratius illuſtres Ordines doceantur, Socinianos aut libros ipſorum in hac provincia apparere, ipſos tunc promtè adverſus ipſos & ipſorum libros, prout res exegerit, ſtatuturos* (47). That the States-General ordered, the 17th of July 1651, purſuant to the advice of the States of the province of Holland, given the 12th of April foregoing, that the inſolence of the ſectaries ſhould be effectually repreſſed, and good edicts publiſhed againſt the Socinian books, *&c* (48). After this, the deputies of the ſynods repreſent, that it is plain thoſe Heretics go all over the country, they uſe all their endeavours to get proſelytes, and diſperſe many ill books (49); that they are the moſt dangerous enemies the Church can have, ſince, beſides their being cunning, and apparently devout, they teach a doctrine that is not above the reach of reaſon. They conclude, 1. With moſt humbly beſeeching their illuſtrious lordſhips to prevent the evil in due time, by proceeding againſt the perſons, and forbidding the conventicles, and prohibiting the books: 2. With intimating that they hope that at laſt their lordſhips will execute the ordinances already made. *Rogant ſubmiſsè Illuſtrium VV. DD. cultores, Deputati Synodorum Auſtralis & Borealis Hollandiæ, ipſarum nomine, ut huic malo in tempore obviam eatur, ut in perſonas ſtatuatur, ut conventicula ipſorum & libri prohibeantur, ut præla & typographiæ iſto ſtercore non contaminentur, & officinæ tam damnoſa merce vacuentur* (50). The States of Holland communicated this ſynodal petition to the Faculty of Divinity of Leyden, deſiring to have their opinion about it. The Faculty anſwered, that nothing could be more horrid and abominable than the Socinian ſect; that it differed but little from Paganiſm (51); that it was certain it crept into the country, and that there was a neceſſity to pray to GOD that he would inſpire the States with a ſteady and holy reſolution of removing all thoſe blaſphemies, and ſuppreſſing ſuch wicked books. *Conſilium ſapiens, utile avertendis omnibus Blaſphemiis & abolendis tam noxiis libris.* Whereupon the States made an edict, whereby all perſons, whatever condition they might be of, were forbidden to bring any of the Socinian hereſies into the country, or to impart them to others, or to hold any aſſembly with ſuch an intent. They declared that all offenders ſhould be baniſhed the firſt time from the province, as blaſphemers of GOD's name, and diſturbers of the public peace; and in caſe of a relapſe they ſhould be puniſhed as ſhould be thought fit. They alſo forbad, under ſevere penalties, the impreſſion and the ſale of the Socinian books, and ordered that this edict ſhould be publiſhed, and poſted up wherever it ſhould be requiſite, that none might pretend to be ignorant of it. This is what they decreed the 19th of September 1653. The magiſtrates of Utrecht publiſhed a like edict in the year 1655 (52).

The Socinians were not ſilent: they employed one of their ableſt pens (53) to compoſe an apology, that came out in the year 1654, with this title, *Apologia pro veritate accuſata ad illuſtriſſimos & potentiſſimos Hollandiæ & Weſt-Friſiæ Ordines, conſcripta ab Equite Polono.* That piece is well written; and with a great deal of art; there is in every part of it a great air of moderation, with an artful boldneſs in denying the accuſations. The author alledges the ſame general reaſons (54) made uſe of by Tertullian in his Apology, and by Calvin in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his Inſtitutions, and by ſeveral other Reformers in their books againſt the Sorbonne. This is an unavoidable inconveniency: a falſe Church, which pleads for Toleration, and complains of the penal laws, alledges the ſame common topics with the true Church in like circumſtances. The true Church, which deſires that the ſovereigns would extirpate a falſe one, uſes the ſame motives and arguments alledged by the falſe one for the extirpation of the true Church. It were to be wiſhed, that communions ſo different in the main, ſhould not be like one another in uſing the ſame ſtile and the ſame topics; but ſuch a thing is not to be expected in this world. The evil is paſt curing in that reſpect: man, among other exerciſes, is obliged to ſearch after truth, in the midſt of a hundred pretenders, who expreſs themſelves the ſame way as to general reaſons. But I proceed to another obſervation.

When people preſent petitions againſt a party, they ought to take ſpecial care not to alledge any facts whereof they are not well informed, or which are only equivocal proofs; for ſome time after they are confuted in a manner very diſpleaſing. For inſtance, the Poliſh knight maintains, 1. That the Ragotſki's never perſecuted the Socinians (55), and always maintained them in the liberty of conſcience which they had promiſed them, and did ſtill maintain them in it (56). 2. That no advantage ſhould have been taken of the oppreſſion the Socinians were expoſed to in Poland, nor of the deſtruction of their church at Racovia, ſince the Evangelics met with the ſame troubles in that country, and received at Vilna a treatment like that of Racovia two years after, and under the ſame pretence. (57) *Poloniam deinde, infauſto omine commemorant, patriam noſtram; quæ dum non tantum nobis, ſed etiam Evangelicis* (58) *& aliis, contra jurisjurandi & fœderum fidem, templa adimit, exercendæ religionis libertatem labefactat, & variis preſſuris, ob diverſum in ſacris ſenſum, infeſtam ſeſe præbet; vindicem Dei manum in ſe provocavit* . . . . . (59) *Everſum nobis fuerit Racoviæ templum, quanquam de everſione templi decretum nihil habet, eo quo dicunt anno: ſed eodem exemplo everſum eſt & Vilnæ Evangelicis biennio poſt ſuum templum. Pulſi fuerint Miniſtri Racovia, quanquam miniſtri Racovia decreto pulſi non ſunt, ſed ſoli Profeſſores; pulſi ſunt & Vilna; proſcripti fuerint illi; proſcripti ſunt & iſti; & quidem illi ipſi, qui paulo ante Racoviano caſui ex ambone inſultaverunt. Sic in nobis cœptum, in Evangelicis, qui permiſerant, ulterius progreſſum eſt exemplum. Exempla enim tramites quærunt, nec ibi conſiſtunt, ubi cœpere. Occaſio & prætextus utriuſque injuriæ & calamitatis innocentibus inferendæ fuit idem, nempe imago juvenili quorundam temeritate violata.* 3. That what happened at Racovia was not grounded upon the impreſſion of a book, whoſe title was injurious to the Trinity. He proves it demonſtratively by the decree of the Diet, which mentioned no ſuch book, and would have certainly mentioned it, if it had been the reaſon of inflicting ſuch a puniſhment upon is altogether improbable, viz. that the Socinian Hereſies were privately taught at Port-Royal; and it is certain the ſtory he has told about it is falſe. The public has ſeen the refutation

---

(45) The Socinians maintain the contrary in the paſſages above quoted remark [*A*]. See alſo the remark [*L*], citat. (56).

(46) *See Cocceius's anſwer*, ad Apologiam Equitis Poloni, *fol.* **** 2 *verſo.*

(47) Ibid.

(48) Decretum eſt, ut non tantum protervia & inſolentia Sectariorum, ut oportet, corrigatur, ſed & idonea Edicta adverſus omnia gravia peccata, ſcandaloſos libros, & ſcripta Sociniana, & ſimilia, publicentur & proponantur. *Ibid.*

(49) Several of them are ſpecified in the Remonſtrance.

(50) Cocceius, in Reſponſ. ad Apologiam Equitis Poloni, *fol.* **** 3 *verſo.*

(51) Nihil exitiabilius & magis horrendum iſta hæreſi excogitari poteſt . . . . nihil aut parum differt à Paganiſmo

(52) Voëtius, Polit. Eccleſiaſt. *Tom. i, pag.* 533.

(53) *That of* Jonas Slichtingius. *See* Biblioth. Antitrinitaires, *pag.* 130.

(54) I uſe this epithet, becauſe the circumſtances with reſpect to the ſeverity of the penal laws, *&c.* are not the ſame as here in Tertullian's and Calvin's apologies.

(55) Apolog. pro Veritat. accuſata, *pag.* 39.

(56) Quibus hæc illuſtriſſima Domus pacem & libertatem conſcientiæ ac religionis juratam, ſacroſancte cuſtodivit ſemper, & etiamnum cuſtodit. *Ibid.*

(57) Ib. *p.* 40.

(58) See John Lætus, *in Compend. Hiſtoriæ*, pag. m. 532, *& alibi*, where he ſhews the Evangelics of Poland loſt their churches in ſeveral places, ſometimes by popular commotions, and ſometimes by unjuſt pretences.

(59) Apolog. pro Veritat. accuſata, *pag.* 41. *What I have omitted, is found above, citation* (12).

upon their ſect. He adds, that John Lætus, the only author who mentions the pretended impreſſion of that book, yet does not ſay that it occaſioned the deſtruction of their ſchool, and of their printing-houſe. 'Nam cauſa diſturbationis Racovianæ, quam accuſatores noſtros coram vobis pro vera venditare non pudet, ipſo Decreto Comitiali manifeſtæ vanitatis coarguitur. Ajunt enim cauſam fuiſſe, quod librum habuerimus ſub prælo, hoc titulo, *Tormentum throno Trinitatem deturbans*. Nullus liber unquam hoc titulo inter nos extitit, nedum ut ſub prælo fuerit. . . . Auctor * iſtius commenti fuit Lætus quidam, Moravus, qui profugum ſeſe ex Moravia, religioniſve an rebellionis cauſa oblitus; ſed odii in nos ex ſuorum diſciplina concepti non immemor, in ipſa patria noſtra, quæ exulem benigne ſuſcepit & fovit, eo proterviæ progreſſus eſt, ut nobis patriæ civibus inſultare auſus fuerit, edito fumorum pleno libello; inter quos & hæc de libro iſto fabula eſt. Et tamen hic ipſe, quamvis vanus Auctor, dicit quidem illo ipſo tempore, quo res Eccleſiæ noſtræ Racoviæ ſunt everſæ, *deſudaſſe noſtros in extrudendo iſto peſtifero*, quem ait, *libello:* ſed hanc fuiſſe cauſam adverſariis illarum evertendarum non dicit: *Juventus*, inquit, *Scholæ anſam præbuit, quæ effigiem crucis dejecerat*. Sed narrationi illius per ſe vanæ, quo ſpecioſior eſſet, aſſuendum aliquid fuit ab accuſatoribus (60). - - - - *For the cauſe alledged of our diſturbance at Racovia, which our enemies are not aſhamed to maintain for truth, is manifeſtly convicted of falſhood by the decree of the ſenate. For they ſay, that we had a book in the preſs with this title,* Tormentum Throno Trinitatem deturbans. *There was never any book with ſuch a title amongſt us much leſs was there any ſuch in the preſs. . . . . The author of this fiction was one Lætus, a Moravian, who, forgetting whether he had fled his country for religion, or rebellion, but not unmindful of his hatred to us, even in our country, which had ſo favourably received and entertained him, when exiled from his own, had the impudence to inſult us in our own country, by publiſhing a book full of ſtories, among which is this fable concerning that book. And yet this very man, tho' he ſays, that at the time when our our churches at Racovia were deſtroyed,* we were labouring to haſten the publiſhing of that prenicious book, *as he calls it; yet that this was the cauſe our enemies did ſo, he ſays not.* The youth of the ſchool, *ſays he,* which had thrown down a picture of the croſs, gave occaſion thereto. *But to this relation of his, ridiculous in itſelf, ſomething was to be tacked by our enemies, that it might have the better appearance.*' Cocceius publiſhed a very ſolid anſwer to that manifeſto of the Socinians, in the year 1656. I have conſulted it particularly upon thoſe three heads; for I expected there to find the apologiſt confounded: but I have found nothing in it neither upon the firſt, nor upon the ſecond head; and as for the third, all that Cocceius ſays, is, that there was a report, that the Socinians had ſuch a book in the preſs, when they were ſo ill uſed at Racovia. *Quam cauſam habuerint Poloni eripiendæ vobis Racoviæ, non diſputo. Certum eſt, eo tempore vulgatum fuiſſe rumorem, tale, quale libellus Deputatorum memorat, ſcriptum ſub prælo ſudaſſe* (61). Uncertain reports ſhould never be depended upon in juridical pieces, ſuch as the remonſtrance of a ſynod to their ſovereign, deſigned to obtain the ſuppreſſion of a ſect. In accuſations that concern doctrines, it is more eaſy to juſtify an unexact aſſertion: for inſtance, it was poſitively ſaid in the remonſtrance, that the Socinians denied the reſurrection of the dead, and eternal life. The Faculty of Divinity at Leyden affirmed likewiſe that they deny, as the Sadduces do, the life of the ſoul ſeparated from the body, and the reſurrection of the wicked. The Poliſh knight maintained that ſuch an accuſation was a calumny (62). *Quis non cupiat animas etiam corporibus carentes vivere, agere, intelligere; Dei conſpectu & gaudiis cæleſtibus perfrui, pro nobis, in corpore adhuc, tanquam in carcere agentibus, Deum orare, noſtrique curam gerere? quis non pedibus in hanc ſententiam eat? . . . .* (63) *Nos animarum, quamdiu ſine corporibus ſunt ſtatum, Deo relinquimus, certiſſima fide, quæ propria Chriſtianorum eſt, mortuorum reſurrectionem complexi . . .* Negare nos *ajunt* impiorum reſurrectionem. *Nos vero cum Apoſtolo* † ſpem habemus in Deo, reſurrectionem fore mortuorum, juſtorum & injuſtorum; *juſtorum ad vitæ æternæ gaudia; injuſtorum ad ignis æterni ſupplicia. Et* ‡ hunc terrorem Domini, *(qui haudquaquam vanus in ullis futurus eſt)* ſcientes, homines ſuademus, Deo autem manifeſti ſumus, ſperamus vero etiam conſcientiis veſtris fore manifeſtos (64). Cocceius was not ſilenced by this denial, grounded upon a book, in ſome meaſure liturgical and at leaſt authentic, ſince it was an apology for the confeſſion of faith: he confeſſed he knew nothing of that book (65), but alledged ſeveral quotations, and had ſomething to ſay.

CONSIDERATION, on the Doctrine of the eternity of Hell torments.

I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that nothing has proved more prejudicial to the Socinians, than a certain doctrine which they thought very proper to remove the greateſt difficulty a Philoſopher can find in our Theology. A thinking man, who only conſults reaſon, and the bright idea of infinite goodneſs, which, morally ſpeaking, makes up the principal character of the divine nature, will be offended at what we read in the Scripture concerning the eternity of hell torments; eſpecially if he adds to it the paraphraſes, and the many explications that are to be found in ſeveral books (66).' *Deus optimus maximus* were the current and uſual titles of the Divine Nature among the antient Heathens: It was their ſet form, when they ſpoke of God, and they never ſaid *Deus ſeveriſſimus, implacabiliſſimus*. The two epithets *Optimus* and *Maximus*, properly ſpeaking, were only the image and expreſſion of one ſole quality, I mean a ſupreme goodneſs; for goodneſs ought to be attended with greatneſs to appear in all it's luſtre. But what, I pray you, is greatneſs? Is it any thing elſe beſides magnanimity, generoſity, liberality, magnificence, and pouring out of favours? This natural idea, which made the Heathens ſpeak in that manner, is confirmed by the Scripture, wherein the goodneſs of God is all along extolled above his other attributes. Doing good, ſhewing mercy, is the daily and pleaſant work of God, according to the Scripture: chaſtizing, puniſhing, ſhewing ſeverity, is to him unuſual and unpleaſant work. And therefore ſo long as a man ſhall adhere to his natural reaſon, and not humbly ſubmit to ſome paſſages in the goſpel, he will look with abhorrence upon that doctrine of the infinite torments and puniſhments of the whole human race, except a few only. The Socinians, relying too much upon reaſon, have limited thoſe torments, ſo much the more carefully, becauſe they conſidered that men would be made to ſuffer only for ſufferings ſake, ſince no advantage would accrue from thoſe torments to the ſufferers or the ſpectators; a thing never done by any well regulated legiſlature. They hoped to bring over to Chriſtianity by that means thoſe, who are offended with a notion, that ſeems little conſiſtent with the ſupreme goodneſs. But thoſe Heretics were not aware that this very thing would make them more odious, and more unworthy of a toleration than all their other tenets. After all, few people are offended with the doctrine concerning the eternal duration of hell torments, and are like Theodorus Camphuſius (67). He was a miniſter, born at Gorcum in Holland: he turned Socinian, and publickly declared he ſhould have had no religion, had he not met with ſome books, wherein he found that hell torments will not laſt for ever. *Memini, meminerunt & alii, fuiſſe quendam Didericum Camphuſium, qui in epiſtola typis expreſſa, & canticis ipſius adjuncta, profiteretur, ſe pronum fuiſſe ad relinquendam omnem religionem, donec inciderit in illos libros, qui docerent, perpetuos ignes nihil eſſe & eternos cruciatus* (68).

[*M*] *A modern author hath publiſhed, that the Socinian Hereſies were privately taught at Port-Royal.*] The author of the *Politique du Clergé de France* affirms, that there is a third party, from which the Gallican Church has every thing to fear. *They profeſs*, ſays he (69), *to believe that the Church of Rome is the true Church, to which one ought to be inſeparably united, and ſhould never be ſeparated from it; and yet they do not follow her doctrines, and have no reſpect for her worſhip. Such men were never ſo numerous in that kingdom as they* refutation of it (*b*). There are very few people that would not be extremely concerned, if

---

* Joan. Læti Compend. Hiſt. Leidæ 1643. pag. 766, *and it is pag.* 543, *of the edition of* 1661.

(60) Apolog. pro Veritat. accuſata, pag. 42.

(61) Cocceius, in Examine Apologiæ Equitis Poloni, *pag.* 138.

(62) Apologia Equitis Poloni, pag. 73, 74.

(63) Ib. *p.* 76.

† Act. xxiv. 15.

‡ 2 Cor. v. 11, 12. Vide Confeſſ. vindic. cap. xx.

(64) This may ſerve as a proof of what I obſerved in the article of ORIGEN, remark [*C*], at the end.

(65) Negari à ſuis impiorum reſurrectionem, negat Eques. Citat in margine Confeſſ. vindic. *cap. xx.* Ipſa Confeſſio Belgica, quæ Apologiæ adjungi ſolet, in capita diſtincta non eſt. Quid libri ſit *Confeſſ. vindic.* adhuc ignoro. *Cocceius, in Examine Apolog. Equitis Poloni, pag.* 220.

(66) See the book, intituled, *Les Merveilles de l'autre Monde*, written by a canon of Riez called *Arnoux*.

(67) In the vulgar Tongue, *Dirk Raphaels Camphuyſen*. He was born in the year 1586, and died at Dockum in Frieſland in the year 1627. See the *Biblioth. Antitrin. p.* 112, and therein mend *Worcomi denatus*. He wrote ſeveral pieces in Dutch, and among others one printed above twenty times in ſeveral ſizes, which conſiſts of ſongs, and other Spiritual Poems, very much eſteemed by thoſe who are ſkilled in Dutch Poetry. The author dexterouſly inſerted in them his opinions about ſeveral Chriſtian Doctrines, eſpecially upon thoſe that concern morality.

(68) Cocceius, in Examine Apolog. Equitis Poloni, pag. 305.

(69) Politiq. du Clergé de France, pag. m. 90.

(*b*) See below the paſſage quoted citation (103).

---

they are now. Some of them carry their unbelief ſo far as to call in queſtion the moſt important doctrines of Chriſtianity. They are Socinians; they believe neither the myſtery of the Trinity, nor that of the Incarnation. I know ſome things about it, that are ſo particular that I cannot doubt of it: I ſhall not impart them to you, for fear of ſcandalizing you. And what is moſt terrible is, that it is not only the religion of our young Abbots, but alſo of ſome grave and wiſe ſocieties, that make a great ſhew of the purity of their morals, and of their adherence to the Catholic Faith. Let us ſee what Mr Arnauld anſwered to that author. ‘A man muſt have neither honour nor conſcience, who aſcribes diſmal and odious crimes to many perſons, when every body may eaſily know that ſuch horrid accuſations are only grounded upon a meer calumny. But who does not ſee that no other thoughts can be entertained of this writer? There may be in France, and even among Abbots, ſome perſons that are ſo impious as to believe neither the Trinity nor the Incarnation: but ſomething elſe is requiſite to ſay, without being guilty of a notorious calumny, that *it is now the religion of our young Abbots.* He muſt be ſure that there are at leaſt many of thoſe young Abbots, who have no other religion but that. But how could he know it? If any of them were ſo unhappy as to entertain ſuch impious opinions, would they be ſo imprudent as to declare them up and down, and thereby expoſe themſelves to the dangerous conſequences of it? Could ſuch a folly be common to ſo many perſons, that one might ſay, without fearing to be accounted an impoſtor, that *it is the religion of young Abbots?* And yet he is ſo impudent as to ſuppoſe it as a thing ſo well known, that it ſerves him only for a prelude to authorize a more horrid calumny; for he affirms it as a thing, of which he is very ſure, that ſome grave, wiſe, and orderly ſocieties, very regular in their life, and which are accounted Catholic, believe neither the Trinity nor the Incarnation no more than thoſe Abbots. *And what is more terrible,* ſays he, *is, that it is not only the religion of our young Abbots, but alſo of ſome grave and wiſe ſocieties, that make a great ſhew of the purity of their morals, and of their adherence to the Catholic Faith.* This exceeds all impudence to impute not to ſome private perſons, but to ſocieties, and not to one only, but to ſome ſocieties, whom he very much commends for their wiſdom and morals, that they do not believe the firſt myſteries of the Chriſtian religion; and to ſuppoſe that thoſe, who could put a ſtop to ſo great a diſorder, know nothing of it, or knowing it are unwilling to ſuffer it; and laſtly, to fancy that the world will be ſo ſilly as to believe ſuch an incredible thing, upon the credit of an inconſiderable writer, who ſays in an anonymous book: *I know ſome things about it that are ſo particular, that I cannot doubt of it,* adding with a ſorry craftineſs, *I ſhall not impart them to you, for fear of ſcandalizing you.* One can hardly conceive how a man can carry boldneſs and calumny to ſuch a degree. However, the thing is not ſo ſurprizing in a Calviniſt, he hath only, *&c* (70).’

The author of the *Politique du Clergé* could not well be ſilent after ſuch a vigorous anſwer: I ſhall ſet down what he ſaid in his vindication. *He thought,* ſays he (71), ſpeaking of Mr Arnauld, that the author *meant the Janſeniſts by* thoſe grave and wiſe ſocieties, that make a great ſhew of the purity of their morals, and of their adherence to the Catholic Faith. *Perhaps he is not in the wrong. I do not know the thoughts of the author of the* Politique du Clergé (72); *but I do very well know that there is ground to ſuſpect thoſe gentlemen of having a Theology not agreeable to Chriſtianity, and bordering upon Socinianiſm. I am ſorry I am obliged to ſay what we think on this, and what we have altogether reaſon to think. We do not love to oppreſs thoſe unhappy men, who are already loaded with the public hatred. And indeed, were it not that we are forced to it by thoſe gentlemen, we would not expoſe to the public view, what may confirm that ſuſpicion. But they force us to it; and if they are diſpleaſed with what we are going to ſay, they muſt blame themſelves for it. We would not be ſo poſitive as Filleau, and the Jeſuite Meynier, who ſay that* thoſe who go by the name of Janſeniſts are downright Deiſts, enemies to the myſteries of the Chriſtian religion. *But it is certain they have dropped ſome words againſt the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, which give ground to ſuſpect that they harbour dreadful monſters in their breaſts.* Pray, mind the proofs he alledges. *Thoſe gentlemen,* ſays he (73), *do not ſcruple to confeſs that the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt is not ſufficiently proved in the holy Scripture. . . . . .* (74) *The author of the* Perpetuité de la Foy, *aſks,* ‡ *Why did not Jeſus Chriſt diſcover his Divinity in ſuch clear words that they might not be eluded?* From thoſe words, and from theſe, *God was not willing that the Chriſtian doctrines ſhould be propoſed with the utmoſt evidence,* the author of the *Politique du Clergé* infers, that the Janſeniſts admit this principle: *The Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Trinity, are not clearly expreſſed in the Scripture* (75). Afterwards he tells us, 1. *That this principle is utterly falſe; for it is not true that the paſſages which prove Jeſus Chriſt's Divinity, may be any ways eluded. We know there are no paſſages, tho' ever ſo clear, but what the Heretics may cavil upon. If this be called eluding, there is nothing in the holy Scripture, nor in any book in the world, or language of men, but what may be eluded.* This he proves by ſhewing how one might cavil about ſome texts in the goſpel, wherein Chriſt's humanity is aſſerted, and about the canons of the council of Nice (76), and a paſſage contrived on purpoſe (77), to be the cleareſt and the moſt diſtinct proof of the Trinity and Incarnation that can be imagined. In the ſecond place he ſays (78), that *it is the moſt ſhameful thing, and the greateſt prevarication an orthodox Divine can be guilty of againſt the eternal Divinity of the Son of God, thus to give it up to the Hereticks, by acknowledging a thing ſo falſe, ſo dangerous, and ſo proper to confirm them in their errors. . . . . .* (79) *This confeſſion, that the Divinity of the Son is not ſufficiently explained in the written Revelation, is that very thing which confirms the Socinians in their Hereſy, and may induce others to embrace it.* In the 3d place he ſays (80), that Mr Arnauld ought to acknowledge, *That until the council of Nice, it was lawful to deny the Divinity of Chriſt without running the hazard of one's ſalvation,* and that if *the Divinity of the Son was not an article of faith, neceſſary to ſalvation, for the ſpace of three hundred years, it could not become ſo by the deciſion of a council; becauſe, according to the wiſeſt Doctors of the Romiſh Church, among whom the gentlemen of Port-Royal are to be reckoned, the Church, the Pope, nor the Councils, cannot make new articles of faith. From whence it follows, that to this very day the Divinity of the Son is not an article of faith, for which thoſe who deny it deſerve to be anathematized. Thus, by proceeding from one principle to another, it is plain it is not unreaſonable to ſuſpect that Mr Arnauld does not believe the myſteries of the Incarnation and Trinity, or at leaſt, that he does not look upon them as eſſential parts of the Chriſtian religion.* In the 4th place he proves (81), that thoſe gentlemen have made it appear that they have no great regard for the authority of the Church. *Which being ſo,* concludes he (82), *ſince on one ſide the myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation cannot be proved by any paſſages of the Scripture, but what may be eluded, according to thoſe gentlemen; and, on the other hand, ſince they are only grounded upon deciſions, to which they do not think themſelves obliged blindly to ſubmit; it is plain thoſe myſteries are built upon no ſolid foundation, and are only meer problems according to the Theology of the Port-Royal.* In the fifth and laſt place, he entertains us with a ſtory, to which he prefixes a preamble worth its weight in gold. *I ſhall add a ſtory,* ſays he (83), *which I publiſh with reluctancy, and after long debating with myſelf. If thoſe gentlemen had not provoked us ſo unjuſtly and ſo cruelly, we would have been more reſerved; but we are not obliged to ſhew any regard to ſuch a man as Mr Arnauld, who ſo plainly tranſgreſſes againſt the laws of charity and ſincerity.*

Here follows a ſhort account of that ſtory. ‘(84) About 15 or 20 years ago (85), a young man, the ſon of a treaſurer of France in the Generality of Orleans, whoſe name was Picaut or Picot, and who was deſigned for the Church, ſtudied at Paris, in the houſe of the gentlemen of Port-Royal.’ The converſation of a miniſter, who had changed his religion, and

(70) Arnauld, Apologie pour les Catholiq. *Part. ii, ch. iv, pag.* 31, *& ſeq.*

(71) Eſprit de Monſr. Arnauld, *Tom. i, ch. vi, pag.* 196.

(72) Obſerve how little that author ſcruples to lie; for he wrote the *Politique du Clergé*, tho' he denies it.

(73) Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, *Tom. i, ch. vi, pag.* 197.

(74) Id. ibid. *pag.* 198.

‡ Pag. 103.

(75) Eſprit, ubi ſupra, *p.* 201.

(76) Ibid. *pag.* 203, *& ſeq.*

(77) Ibid. *pag.* 205, *& ſeq.*

(78) Ibid. *pag.* 209.

(79) Ibid. *pag.* 211.

(80) Ibid. *pag.* 212, 213.

(81) Pag. 213, to 219.

(82) Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, *Tom. i, ch. vi, pag.* 220.

(83) Ibid.

(84) Ibid.

(85) Note, that the author wrote his book in the year 1683.

if they had publiſhed a ſtory as ill circumſtantiated as that which concerns young Picaut, the

and the reading of ſome books, convinced him that the Pope is Anti-Chriſt; whereupon he wrote a piece for his own uſe, and being informed that it was come into the director's hands, and that his family had notice of it, he run away. 'He came into Perche, where he had a living, to try whether he could get ſome money by it. He fell, by chance, into the hands of a Proteſtant gentleman, a perſon diſtinguiſhed by his birth, and particularly by his merit. That gentleman being very well ſkilled in matters of religion, aſked him ſeveral queſtions about the motives of his change; and as he proceeded from one ſubject to another, he perceived that this young man had the notions of the Socinians about the Trinity and Incarnation, and knew all their ſorry objections; but otherwiſe, he was very fond of the opinions of the Church of Rome, and very little diſpoſed to embrace the doctrines of the Reformed, excepting this, that the Pope is Anti-Chriſt. The gentleman was very much ſurprized to find this young man a Socinian, and aſked where he had learned that doctrine. The young man anſwered, very freely, that he had learned it at Port-Royal, where he had ſtudied; that ſeveral perſons had the ſame opinions in that houſe; that the Novices and the Students were not allowed to read the books of Calvin and of the Calviniſts, and that he had never read them; but for the Socinian books they were not ſhut up by themſelves in the library, and every body might read them. Afterwards the young man made his eſcape into a remote province, and at laſt left the kingdom to avoid being moleſted by his relations. And it has been known ſince, that thoſe who went about to inſtruct him, could never cure him of his Socinianiſm (86).' What follows is the moſt curious part of the ſtory, and therefore I muſt not forget it. 'The author of the apology for the Catholics, who falls into a violent paſſion when he meets with a word that vexes him ever ſo little, will doubtleſs call this ſtory a piece of impudence, an impoſture and a calumny. He will ſay, that all the fire in hell will not be ſufficient to puniſh the author of ſo horrid a ſlander. But I muſt tell him, that I only warrant the truth of theſe two things. 1. That this young man told that ſtory, and even to many perſons very credible, and of known probity. 2. That this young man was truly Socinian, when he left the Divines of Port-Royal, and that he learned Socinianiſm in their houſe. As for what he adds, that his maſters were infected with the ſame Hereſy, I cannot tell whether it be true. But I ſee no reaſon why that Student ſhould invent ſo horrid a calumny. And this, together with their way of ſpeaking of the Trinity and Incarnation, may form, if not a proof, at leaſt a very ſtrong ſuſpicion. This is what we know of the matter, and what we had to ſay about it. The public will judge of it, as they think fit. This is what people get by provoking others (87).'

This author did not think that Mr Arnauld's reply would contain but few words; he expected abundance of reflexions and exclamations, for he believed his Hiſtory would produce great effects. But Mr Arnauld was contented to confute it in a few words, and with great moderation, tho' he knew very well how to be paſſionate. His anſwer runs thus: *He had a mind to make people believe that the Divines of Port-Royal had an averſion for Calviniſm, but that they were very much inclined to the Socinian Hereſy, for which he gives this proof. Some young children of quality were inſtructed at Port-Royal, in human learning, and at the ſame time care was taken to give them a pious education. Moſt of them were but ten, twelve, or fourteen years of age, and the oldeſt was hardly ſixteen. The Greek and Latin methods, and the Greek roots in French verſe were made for them. Now let us ſee what Mr Jurieu tells us in his famous book, intituled,* L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld. *He ſays the books of the Calviniſts were carefully kept from them; but that they had a full liberty to read thoſe of the Socinians, as much as they would; and that by the reading of thoſe books, one of thoſe children whom he names, and who was a native of Orleans, as he ſays, taking a liking to the Socinian errors, left the church, and turned Huguenot. But this ſtory is utterly falſe. There never was a child at Port-Royal of ſuch a name and family as this is ſaid to be; nay, there never was there any of the city of Orleans. The ground on which he builds that ſtory,* viz. *that children of that age were allowed to read the Socinian books, ſufficiently ſhews that one may expect any thing from a man, who does not ſcruple to publiſh ſuch horrid and incredible lies* (88).

Many reflexions might be made on the pains the author of *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld* took to convict the gentlemen of Port-Royal of Socinianiſm; but I ſhall only make three.

The firſt is, that if any one accuſed that writer of the ſame thing, he would find the proofs of his accuſation in *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld*, for he needs only form this ſyllogiſm.

A man who believes on the one ſide, that the myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation cannot be proved by any paſſages of the ſcripture, but what may be eluded, and who on the other ſide does not blindly ſubmit to the deciſions of councils (89), is a Socinian.

But the author of *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld* believes ſo, and makes no ſuch ſubmiſſion.

Therefore he is a Socinian.

The major propoſition of this ſyllogiſm is plainly the doctrine of that author; for intending to juſtify what he had ſaid (90), that Socinianiſm was the Theology of ſome grave ſocieties, meaning the gentlemen of Port-Royal, he alledges for a proof their teaching that Chriſt's Divinity has not been revealed with a ſufficient evidence, and their giving ground to ſuſpect that they do not believe one ought to ſubmit to councils. He muſt therefore look upon this as an undoubted ſign of the Socinian Hereſy, otherwiſe he could not clear himſelf of calumny; his accuſation would be ill proved, and he would be a falſe accuſer. Wherefore I need only prove the minor propoſition. It conſiſts of two parts: the laſt does not want to be proved; for it is manifeſt enough that a Proteſtant miniſter does not blindly ſubmit to councils: And the following words afford the proof of the firſt. *I am far from deſigning to leſſen the force and clearneſs of thoſe characters of the Divinity of the ſcripture; but I dare ſay that there is none of them but may be eluded by prophane men. None of them makes a proof, to which ſomething may not be anſwered; and if they be conſidered together, tho' they have a greater force than when they ſtand by themſelves, yet they are not ſtrong enough to form a moral demonſtration* (91). It were needleſs to object to me that this paſſage does not concern Chriſt's Divinity; for it were in vain to pretend that GOD has evidently revealed to us the Divinity of his Son in the ſcripture, if it was affirmed that it does not clearly appear, that the ſcripture is the word of GOD. But, beſides, that author has (92) a diſpute with another miniſter (93) about this queſtion, Whether the belief of our myſteries ſuppoſes the evidence of the teſtimony; and does not only deny it, but alſo maintains that the affirmative is a pernicious opinion. I am going to ſhew that he may receive another wound with his own weapon. You have ſaid that *it is not true that the paſſages, which prove Chriſt's Divinity, cannot be any ways eluded* (94). You have ſaid that they are as clear as the paſſages which concern his humanity, and as clear as the deciſion of the council of Nice, or any text that one could contrive on purpoſe. The meaning of which is, that the cavils that might be raiſed againſt them are as inſignificant, as thoſe that ſhould be raiſed againſt a text made on purpoſe. How come you then to confeſs (95) that the characters of the Divinity of the ſcripture may be eluded? How come you to ſay that the objections of the Socinians are conſiderable? Theſe are your words: *The proofs of the ſcripture, on which* the Trinity, *the* Incarnation, *and the* neceſſity of Grace, *are grounded, have not the utmoſt degree of evidence: Thoſe myſteries are liable to and admit of difficulties, not only with reſpect to human reaſon, but alſo in relation to the holy ſcripture, wherein there are ſeveral paſſages that want to be reconciled with the truth. Thoſe, who take the objections of the Socinians againſt myſteries, and thoſe of the Pelagians againſt Grace, to be vain and inconſiderable, are miſtaken, and do not conſider the thing with a due attention. They are real difficulties, and deſerve to be cleared* (96). Remember that in the book, intituled, *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, it is the greateſt baſeneſs,* the chief witneſs alledged by the modern author I ſpeak of [*N*]. I do not give a particular account of what concerns the opinions and books of Socinus: it may be ſeen in general in Moreri's Dictionary. A German Hiſtorian (*i*) has reduced the doctrine of the Socinians into 229 Propoſitions.

---

(86) Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, *Tom. i, ch. vi, pag.* 222.

(87) Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, *Tom. i, p.* 224.

(88) Arnauld, Diſſertation ſur le prétendu bonheur du plaiſir des ſens, *pag.* 13, 14.

(89) *See* l'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, *Tom. i, pag.* 220.

(90) *In the* Politique du Clergé, *pag.* 90.

(91) Jurieu, Traité de la Nature & de la Grace, *pag.* 246.

(92) I write this in July 1696.

(93) See his two books againſt Mr Saurin.

(94) Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, *Tom. i, p.* 201.

(95) Above citation (91).

(96) Jurieu, Defenſe de la Doctrine Univerſelle de l'Egliſe, *pag.* 467.

(*i*) Daniel Hartnaccius, in Continuatione Jo. Micrælii Syntagm. Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſt.

The moſt general objection, raiſed againſt them, is, that by refuſing to believe what they think to be contrary to Philoſophical truths, and by denying the unconceivable myſteries of the Chriſtian religion, they open a way to Scepticiſm, Deiſm, and Atheiſm. Perhaps it might be objected to them, that they do the ſame, at leaſt indirectly, by their way of explaining the paſſages of the Scripture, which concern the conſubſtantiality of the Word. For it ſeems to follow from their explications that the apoſtles, being animated with an ardent zeal for the glory of JESUS CHRIST, made uſe of the moſt ſtrained figures and expreſſions that devotion can ſuggeſt, when they ſpoke of his perfections. Thus the votaries of the Holy Vigin have carried it as high, and as near a true and real deification as ever they could. But if the expreſſions of the Apoſtles were to be aſcribed to an Enthuſiaſtic zeal, and not to the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit, it is plain the Scripture would be of little more authority than the panegyrics upon the ſaints. But by over-throwing the inſpiration of the ſacred writers, the whole revelation comes to nothing, and then every thing will be a meer Philoſophical diſpute.

I forgot

baſeneſs, and the higheſt prevarication an orthodox Divine can be guilty of againſt the eternal Divinity of the Son, thus to give it up to the Heretics, by making a confeſſion ſo falſe, ſo dangerous, and ſo proper to confirm them in their errors (97), that is, by confeſſing as you do, that *Chriſt has not diſcovered his Divinity in words ſo clear as not to be eluded* (98).

My ſecond reflexion is, That if thoſe proofs alledged to ſhew that the gentlemen of Port-Royal are Socinians, were good, it would follow from thence that the whole Romiſh Church is Socinian; for what has been ſaid by thoſe gentlemen concerning the obſcurity of the ſcripture, is the general doctrine of that Church. Beſides, few Roman Catholics believe the Pope's infallibility in matters of fact; nay, they do not aſcribe that privilege to univerſal councils. The Janſeniſts never denied the infallibility of thoſe councils in point of doctrine, and even have acknowledged that the five propoſitions were heretical, in the ſenſe they pretend the Popes have condemned them. What they have ſaid in particular to juſtify ſome Nuns, who refuſed to ſubſcribe to certain formularies, and to ſubmit to ſome epiſcopal mandates, is of ſuch a nature, that all Monks would ſay the ſame, if they were moleſted by Biſhops. How often have they been at law with their Prelates? How often have they appealed againſt them to ſynods, or to the Pope? Is it not a plain demonſtration, that they do not believe one ought to ſacrifice one's knowledge to the authority of inferior tribunals? I confeſs, ſome ſay that a Monk ought blindly to obey his ſuperior; but it is only in what concerns the diſcipline and obſervances; and they would not think themſelves obliged to obey him, if he commanded them to believe what they know to have been condemned by the councils. And therefore if the gentlemen of Port-Royal are Socinians, becauſe they ſay, on the one ſide, that our myſteries are not evidently contained in the ſcripture; and, on the other, that one ought not to ſubſcribe againſt one's conſcience an epiſcopal mandate, or a bull that decides only a matter of fact, there is no univerſity, nor religious community in the Church of Rome, but what is Socinian. Let us therefore admire the diſcerning faculty of Mr Arnauld's adverſary; and let us confeſs that no man was ever more lucky than he in the choice of his proofs. It is not to be doubted, that if the Jeſuits found themſelves in the ſame circumſtances with the Divines of Port-Royal, they would do what thoſe Divines have done (99). Would that prove their being Socinians?

My third reflexion concerns the great care that writer takes to excuſe himſelf to the public, for revealing the ſecret of *one Picaut, or Picot*. He is afraid of undoing Port-Royal; he declares he has been a long time doubtful whether he ſhould ſtrike ſuch a blow; he would never have done it, had thoſe gentlemen been leſs unjuſt, and leſs cruel to his party: However, he applauds himſelf for his victory; *this is what people get*, ſays he, *by provoking others*. Does it not look like a convincing proof? Would not one think it is one of thoſe productions, that put an end to all cavils, and further proceedings in a cauſe? But, after all, it appears that the only thing he objects againſt the gentlemen of Port-Royal is a ſtory, which he dares not warrant: He knows not whether it be true. Who will then believe it, ſince he himſelf doubts of it, being otherwiſe ſilly enough to fancy that his tale would caſt ſo ſhameful a blot upon thoſe gentlemen, that he is afraid of being guilty of a piece of cruelty? But let not that trouble his conſcience: He may be very ſure that ſuch ſtories will never make any impreſſion upon impartial men, nor even upon the Jeſuits. I would not deny that Picaut ſaid ſo; but he muſt be compared to thoſe deſerters, who tell a thouſand lies to the beſiegers about the ſtate of the towns that are beſieged out of which they eſcaped. I have a book printed at Cologn for Peter Marteau in the year 1679, and intituled, *Traité des Parlemens ou Eſtats generaux, composé par Pierre Picault*. This is doubtleſs our fugitive; for there is a great deal of Socinianiſm in that book. When a grave man, who has a great reputation, leaves his country and his Church, what he ſays may be depended upon. This is what makes me believe that the author of the *Politique du Clergé* knew not what he ſaid when he ſpoke of a third party, and of that vaſt number of Socinians of which he ſuppoſes France is full; for when I aſked two or three years ago (100) a famous Father of the Oratory (101), whether it was true that there were many Socinians among the Clergy of France, he anſwered me that there was hardly any body who knew the works and doctrines of that ſect. There are every where Unbelievers and Sceptics; but they are not Socinians.

Let us conclude, That the author of the *Politique du Clergé* not being able to prove the heinous accuſation publiſhed by him againſt Port-Royal, is duly convicted of being a downright calumniator. The proofs alledged by him, ought to be compared with thoſe of a man, who having ſaid that the governor of a place is a traitor to his ſovereign, ſhould prove it; Firſt, By imputing to him a conduct like that of all other governors, and of thoſe whoſe fidelity he could not deny. Secondly, By publiſhing ſome ſilly ſtory, which a ſoldier, who deſerted from the place, told the enemies.

[*N*] *What concerns young Picaut, the chief witneſs alledged by the modern author I ſpeak of.*] Here follows what Mr le Vaſſor did me the honour to write to me, the ſecond of January 1697. ‘ If you had told me ‘ that you deſigned to ſpeak of Picaut's adventure, ‘ which Mr Jurieu relates very wrong, I would have ‘ given you a good account of it. He was my countryman (102), and I was very well acquainted with ‘ him. His eldeſt brother married a near relation of ‘ mine. He was a young man, whom Aubert de Verſé ‘ ſpoiled with Socinianiſm, not at Port-Royal, but in ‘ a houſe of the Oratory, where they happened both ‘ to be. The Fathers of the Oratory ſent away de ‘ Verſé as ſoon as they perceived that he dogmatized, ‘ and they kept Picaut for ſome time in order to cure ‘ him, but they could not do it.’ This account does perfectly agree with a printed letter of Mr Simon, who ſays (103), ‘ I can aſſure you that there are in that ‘ libel (104); many falſe ſtories, which could not be ‘ ſpoiled by M. J. (105). For inſtance, can any ‘ thing be more falſe and more ridiculous than that, ‘ which is to be found at large in the two hundred

‘ and

(97) Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, *Tom. i, pag.* 209.

(98) *See* l'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, ibid. *pag.* 198.

(99) During the congregation *de Auxiliis*, Clement VIII, being not favourable to them, they publickly maintained at Rome, that it was no article of faith, to believe that Clement VIII was Pope. Others taught that he was not infallible. See the Hiſtory of that Congregation printed in the year 1687, *pag.* 49. *Matthieu, Hiſt. de France*, book ii, is quoted in it.

(100) I write this in July 1696.

(101) *Viz.* Mr le Vaſſor, who is now at London, and is very well known by his works, who profeſſed Divinity in the Oratory, and is perfectly acquainted with the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical State of France.

(102) Mr le Vaſſor is a Native of Orleans.

(103) Lettres Choiſies de Mr Simon, *pag.* 145.

(104) *That is*, L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld.

(105) This refers to theſe words of the ſame page. The man being vexed at that blunder, anſwered me very ingenuouſly, and without much conſideration on what he ſaid, ſpeaking of Mr J..... That man ſpoils every thing that is ſent to him.

I forgot to ſay that there are ſome of the Orthodox who have complained that certain refutations of his books have notably conduced to the increaſing of his ſect [O].

and twenty firſt page, and the following, of the firſt volume. He ſuppoſes the gentlemen of Port-Royal had a houſe in Paris, where they taught their ſcholars Socinianiſm, and permitted them to read the books of the Socinians. That romance is ſo well circumſtantiated, that any body would think at firſt, it is rather a true hiſtory than a fictitious ſtory. And yet it is certain, the gentlemen of Port-Royal have had no ſchool in Paris where they taught youth. Here is what gave occaſion to that romance. The young man ſpoken of in that book, called Picaut, was in the inſtitution of the Fathers of the Oratory, which is properly a place for the novices, who deſire to be admitted into that congregation. A man very well known in the world, who had been a miniſter in Burgundy, and was expelled by his brethren, being convicted of Socinianiſm, happened to be there at the ſame time. The Fathers of the Oratory, who took him to be a converted miniſter, admitted him into their inſtitution. It was he who turned the young man's brains with what he told him about the Apocalypſe and Socinianiſm. Thus that Socinianiſm proceeded from your people, and not from the gentlemen of Port-Royal, nor from the Fathers of the Oratory. That ſchool, wherein the Socinian books are not locked up, is a meer dream of your men, who give out through the whole book manifeſt lies for true ſtories.'

[O] *They have complained that certain refutations of his books have . . . . . conduced to the increaſing of his ſect.*] This is the judgment of Druſius (106) concerning a work publiſhed againſt Socinus by Sibrandus Lubbertus in the year 1611. 'Credebat ille (*Lubbertus*) . . . . rectè ſe facere atque utiliter, quòd Socinum de Servatore integrum ederet cum prolixa refutatione. Sed vide quid collega ipſius J. Druſius de facto iſto judicaverit: Plures ſolâ libri Socini lectione, & parum accuratâ ejus confutatione, Socinianos brevi tempore factos fuiſſe ſcribit, quàm multis ante annis per cæteros libros eorum facti fuerant. Nec mirum. Qui enim argumenta adverſarii ſui, cum nervis ſuis omnibus vibrata ac torta, validè non retorquet, is proponendo illa, plus obeſt cauſſæ ſuæ, quàm confutando prodeſt (107). - - - *Lubbertus thought he did an uſeful thing in publiſhing the book of Socinus,* de Servatore, *entire, with a large refutation of it. But ſee what his collegue Druſius thought of it. He writes, that in a little time more people were made Socinians, by the reading of Socinus's book only, and its inſufficient refutation, than for many years paſt by all their other writings. And no wonder. For whoever does not ſufficiently anſwer all the arguments ſkilfully propoſed and managed by an adverſary, does more hurt to his own cauſe by propoſing, than good by refuting them.*' This we find in a work printed in the year 1624. The ſame thing is to be found in a letter which Arnold Poëlenburg publiſhed in the year 1655. I will give you his own words, which cenſure two other authors who refuted the Socinians. 'Laudant vulgò & magnificè deprædicant Reformati conſilium Magiſtratus Amſtelodamenſis, quô libros Crellii & Volckelii de vera religione juſſit exurere. At à quo decretum iſtud Ampliſſimi Magiſtratus majore contemptu violatur, quàm a D. Mareſio, qui nobis duas jam partes iſtius operis combuſti ac intermortui in lucem vitámque revocavit? Qua in re aliorum Reformatorum exemplum imitari ſe dicit; nec dubium eſt, quin hunc quoque alii ſecuturi ſint, qui pro ſua parte diligenter incumbant, ut plurima Socinianorum ſcripta protrudant in lucem. Adjicitur quidem, fateor, in pleriſque adverſariorum libris refutatio; ſed ut eſt hominum indoles ad deteriora proclivior, multò faciliùs hæreſin, quàm veritatem allubeſcere vulgo creditum eſt. Deinde addita refutatio interdum uſque adeò frigida & infirma eſt, ut nulla res efficaciùs errorem in animos inſtillet, quàm ejuſmodi refutatio. Hinc cùm Sibrandus Lubbertus Socini librum de Servatore edidiſſet integrum, additâ prolixâ reſponſione, Vir Clar. Joan. Druſius ipſius collega hoc factum ſanè quàm ægerrimè tulit, ſcripſitque ejus libri editione, & parum accuratâ refutatione, plures ad Socinianiſmum brevi ſpatio temporis adductos, quàm omnibus Socinianorum libris, qui multis retrò annis exſtitiſſent. Conſtat mihi ex relatu viri cujuſdam & docti, & pii, & à Socinianiſmo alieni, D. Gomarum (at qualem virum!) olim in Academia Leidenſi prælegentem, argumenta quædam Socini refutâſſe; ſed ita infeliciter, ut multô facturus fuiſſet ſatiùs, ſi ea penitus intacta reliquiſſet. Quod idem affirmare poſſis de pleriſque ſcriptoribus hodiernis, qui ex Socini refutatione ſtudent inclareſcere, magnúmque nomen (imperitiæ credo ſuæ) ad poſteros tranſmittere, cùm paſſim paucas rationes, & multa convitia, velut de plauſtro, in adverſarios congerant. Junium tamen, Placæum, alióſque his ſimiles ſemper excipio, qui non maledictis, ſed ut Theologos decuit, argumentis Socinum oppugnârunt (108). - - - *The methods taken to ſuppreſs the Socinian ſect and their writings, by burning or anſwering their books, was ſo far from ſucceeding, that thereby their numbers were more increaſed, and their books became more known and ſought after. That after the magiſtrates of Amſterdam had ordered the books of Crellius and Volckelius* de vera religione *to be burnt publickly, Mareſius began to reprint them, and had publiſhed two parts. That there was no doubt that example would be followed by others of the Reformed. That when Sibrandus Lubbertus had publiſhed the entire book of Socinus* de Servatore, *together with a long confutation, the famous Joannes Druſius, his colleague, was exceedingly diſpleaſed, and wrote to him, that by his publiſhing that book, and his inſufficient anſwer, more people had been turned to Socinianiſm, than for many years paſt. That a certain learned and pious perſon, who alſo was averſe from Socinianiſm, had told him, that Gomarus, formerly a Profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity of Leyden, had endeavoured to refute ſome of the arguments of Socinus, but ſo unhappily, that he had done much better not to attempt it. And, finally, that the like might be ſaid of moſt of the writers at that time, who thought to tranſmit their names to poſterity by refuting Socinus; who may indeed be famous (or rather infamous) for uſing reproaches inſtead of arguments. But that Junius, Placæus, and others like them, who oppoſed to the Socinians not foul language but ſtrong arguments, as it became Divines, were always to be excepted.*' See alſo the preface which Chriſtian Hartſoeker (109) hath prefixed to this letter. Druſius, who is there quoted on the ſame account, is ſtiled *doctiſſimus & ὀρθοδοξότατος, moſt learned and moſt orthodox.*

I leave my reader to judge of all this, and content myſelf to obſerve in general, that a ſlight refutation of a book, does only ſerve the more to recommend it. Mezerai has ſaid the ſame thing many years ago. 'Du Pleſſis Mornai . . . . . had written a large volume againſt the Maſs: the importance of the ſubject, the quality of the author, the politeneſs of his ſtile, and ſtrength which appeared in his arguments, and the authorities taken from the Fathers, to the number upwards of four thouſand, had acquired him a great reputation; and it had been ſtill heightened by the weak attacks of all who had attempted to refute him (110).'

Others have obſerved that nothing is more pernicious than to uſe bad arguments againſt impious perſons (111). The author of *Religio Medici* obſerves (112) that a man who would confirm himſelf in his opinions ought to diſpute with ſuch as are not well able to defend themſelves, and that every one is not qualified to maintain the truth, there being ſuch as know not the firſt principles, and that ſuffer themſelves to be led by a prepoſterous zeal. They give occaſion to the erroneous to attack ſome truths, which weak defenders are not able to ſupport. Obſerve what St Auguſtine (113) acknowledges concerning diſputes wherein he triumphed over the orthodox. It muſt not be forgot, that the moſt underſtanding authors chooſe rather to be ſilent than to attack a book which they find too hard. In this reſpect they take that courſe, which a great Politician would have to be purſued, when abuſes are ſo confirmed by long cuſtom, that a magiſtrate who would attempt a reformation, would but diſcover his own want of power, and indiſcreetly expoſe his authority (114). Theſe things were taken into conſideration by Father Paul, when he was deſired to write againſt the *Squittinio della Liberta Veneta* (115).

Neverthe leſs I think, that this aſſertion, It is better to give no anſwer at all to a dangerous book than a bad one, admits of a diſtinction; it is better, I ſay, with

(106) See his Letter, *ad Fratres Belgas*, it is the CCLIIId of the collection of Letters publiſhed by the Remonſtrants, *Edit. Amſt.* 1684.

(107) Bodecherus ineptiens, *pag.* 15, *apud* Crenium Animadv. *Part. xi, pag.* 120, 121.

(108) Arnoldus Poelenburg, in Epiſtola ad C. H. *that is*, Chriſtianum Hartſoekerum, *pag.* 59, *apud* Crenium, ibid. *pag.* 122.

(109) He was miniſter of the Arminians at Rotterdam, and is the father of Mr Hartſoeker the Philoſopher.

(110) Mezerai, Abrégé Chron. *Tom. vi, at the year* 1600, *pag. m.* 223.

(111) See the remark [*A*] of the article GARASSE, and what I quote from Monconis, in the remark [*M*] of the article HOBBES.

(112) Religio Medici, §. *vi, pag. m.* 36.

(113) See the remark [*D*] of his article.

(114) Omittere potius prævalida & adulta vitia quam hoc adſequi ut palam fieret quibus flagitiis impares eſſemus. *Tiberius, apud Tacitum, Annal. lib. iii, cap. liii. See in the remark* [*L*] *of the article* NESTORIUS, *the application I have made of this paſſage of Tacitus.*

(115) *See the Abbot de St Real, pag. m.* 37, *of the* Conjuration des Eſpagnols contre Veniſe.

with regard to thoſe, who, laying aſide prejudice, compare the objections and their anſwers, and who attentively conſider every thing. But good ſouls, pious, and eaſy to be ſatisfied in matters which they believe, are much more ſcandalized with no anſwer than a weak one. They do not readily diſcern when an anſwer is inſufficient: they always find ſome occaſion to triumph; for there is no refutation ſo pitiful as not to diſcover ſome defects in the book of an adverſary. Theſe obſervations, I own, will ſignify little, and will be no deciſion of the principal queſtion: but, however, they will pleaſe, and give ſatisfaction by an idea of ſuperiority, to the prepoſſeſſed readers, and ſuch as compare not one whole book to another whole book.

For the reſt, the quotation from Mezerai brings to my memory what hath been ſaid of the famous Count de Tilli, that *he often acquired honour, partly by his own good conduct, and partly by the bad conduct of thoſe he had to do with* (116). He is not the only perſon of whom this may be ſaid, Cæſar obſerved that Pompey, by a very ſingular good fortune, had acquired the ſirname of Great, for having vanquiſhed ſome people that knew nothing of war (117). It hath been ſaid of ſome princes that they were great by their own virtues, and by the evil qualities of others, *magni ſuis virtutibus & vitiis aliorum.*

[*P*] . . . .] The treatiſe *de Auctoritate S. Scripturæ*, which Vorſtius cauſed to be reprinted at Steinfurt in the year 1611, in 8vo, with ſome additions, is a work of Fauſtus Socinus, who publiſhed it in the year 1588, under the name of *Dominicus Lopez Societatis Jeſu.* They put in the title that it was printed at Sevil, *Hiſpali ex officina Lazari Ferrerii.* This work was printed in French at Baſil without the author's name in the year 1592. In the advertiſement of the Bookſeller it is ſaid that the Divines of Baſil had approved it after a careful examination, and that they had only diſallowed three places, the cenſure whereof was inſerted (118). The care of Vorſtius to procure a new edition of it was uſed as a proof of his Socinianiſm. It cannot be denied that the doctrine of Socinus is to be found in that book; but it is otherwiſe full of very good proofs of the truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

(116) Soldat Suedois, *pag.* 133. *See alſo what I quote from Mr de la Rochefoucaut in the* Penſées ſur les Cometes, *pag.* 793.

(117) *See* Appian. de Bello Civili, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 793: *and* Suetonius, in Cæſare, *cap. xxxv.*

(118) See the preface to the edition of Steinfurt.

SOMMONA-CODOM. So the Siameſe call a certain extraordinary man, whom they think to have attained to the ſupreme felicity (*a*). I mention him only to have an opportunity of examining a very ſubtile objection which Mr du Rondel propoſed to me [*A*] againſt what I have ſaid in the article of Lucretius (*b*), *that the belief of GOD's exiſtence without the belief of a providence, cannot be an inducement to virtue.*

Father

(*a*) *See* Mr de la Loubere, Relation de Siam. *Tom. i, ch. xxii, num.* 4, 5, *pag. m.* 500, 501.

(*b*) At the end of the remark [*K*], of the article LUCRETIUS, the Philoſopher.

[*A*] *I mention him only to have an opportunity of examining an objection . . . . which Mr du Rondel propoſed to me.*] Mr du Rondel having read what I have ſaid at the end of the remark [*I*], in the article of Lucretius, was pleaſed to write to me, that he thought it would be oppoſed both by examples and arguments. ‘For in the firſt place, at Siam, and in other countries, where they believe in Sommona-Codom, it is an undoubted doctrine that this GOD concerns himſelf with nothing in his Nireupan, and ſuffers every thing upon earth to take its own courſe; and yet they pray to him, call upon him, and uſe all their endeavours to imitate him in the practice of virtue. See the firſt tome of Mr de la Loubere's relation. But in the ſecond place, ſuppoſing there was no Sommona-Codom, nor any other god in this world, the bare ſpeaking of the gods, and annexing to thoſe ideas all the beauty of morals, would induce many people to aſpire to that degree of glory (1).’ Being under a neceſſity of laying aſide a great many things till another time, I am forced, to my great grief, to ſuppreſs the ſequel of Mr du Rondel's fine letter; but I ſhall give the ſubſtance of it in theſe few words: he in a lively manner ſets forth the power of admiration, and ſhews by great examples, that the bare deſire of imitating an excellent model, has induced men to very difficult actions (2).

I. I ſhall anſwer firſt the objection he grounds upon the conduct of the Siameſe; and the better to clear the matter, I ſhall firſt of all ſet down the words of the Hiſtorian. ‘Sommona-Codom ordered, before he died, that ſtatues and temples ſhould be conſecrated to him, and ſince his death he is in that ſtate of reſt, which they expreſs by the word *Nireupan*. It is not a place, but a manner of being; for, ſay they, to ſpeak properly, Sommona-Codom is no where, and enjoys no felicity: he has no power, and is not in a condition to do men either good or harm: the Portugueſe call it annihilation. Nevertheleſs, the Siameſe believe on the other ſide, that Sommona-Codom is happy, they put up prayers to him, and aſk him whatever they want: whether it be that their doctrine is inconſiſtent with itſelf, or that they carry their worſhip beyond their doctrine: but in whatever ſenſe they aſcribe a power to Sommona-Codom, they are agreed in this, that he has no power, but over the Siameſe, and does not concern himſelf with nations, that worſhip other men than him (3).’ By this it plainly appears, that the Siameſe ſpeak inconſiſtently of their Sommona-Codom. They ſay that *he enjoys no felicity; and, on the other hand, they think he is happy.* One may therefore believe, that though they ſay *he has no power*, they take him to be very powerful: and therefore, it is no wonder if they pray to him; their notions are ſo confuſed, that they allow them to affirm contradictory things of one and the ſame object. When they conſider it in a certain ſenſe, they ſay one thing of it, and when they conſider it in another ſenſe, they deny it. Their notions are different from their inward ſentiments, which is the reaſon why their theory does not agree with their practice: however it be, we ought to believe that they do not invoke Sommona-Codom, as a Being to which they aſcribe no power, and which minds nothing, but as a Being in which they acknowledge ſome power in ſome reſpects, by virtue of an inward ſentiment, which commonly has a greater influence upon people, than the clear doctrines of ſpeculative men. The Hiſtorian does clearly inſinuate, that they aſcribe ſome power to him; *in whatever ſenſe*, ſays he, *they aſcribe it to him, they are agreed in this, that he has no power but over the Siameſe.* This is my firſt remark, to which I add this obſervation. They are fully perſuaded that ſome things lead the ſoul to an eternal happineſs or miſery, and that whatever they can do in the honour of Sommona-Codom is fine, praiſe-worthy, juſt, and proper to make one attain to the ſupreme good. And therefore, though they ſhould teach conſtantly, and without any appearance of contradiction, that he concerns himſelf with nothing, that he has no power, and does not hear the prayers put up to him, yet they would apply themſelves to him in their neceſſity, and practiſe ſuch virtues as he was pleaſed with; for it muſt, in their opinion, be the way to the ſupreme felicity. And therefore, I ſay, that their devotion and their practical morality are not contrary to what I advance; for they believe both an exiſtence and a providence. It is true, they aſcribe no providence to Sommona-Codom; but it is ſufficient for my purpoſe, that they attribute it to ſomething elſe, from which they expect to be rewarded for their good works. *They have loſt the idea of GOD, as well as the Chineſe*: but they have nevertheleſs *preſerved that antient maxim according to which virtue is to be rewarded, and vice to be puniſhed* (4). They aſcribe therefore *that diſtributive Juſtice to a blind fatality.* It is from this fatality they expect their happineſs, if they live virtuouſly; and they are perſuaded it will reward them for the honours paid to Sommona-Codom. To have a right notion of their impious doctrine, one needs only conſider the opinions of the *Literati* among the Chineſe: they are *thoſe, who have degrees of literature, and the only men who have a ſhare in the government.* They are *grown altogether impious, and though they have not altered the language of their predeceſſors, yet have made the ſoul of the heavens, and all other ſouls, to be I know not what aërial ſubſtances, deſtitute of intelligence: and they have eſtabliſhed a blind fatality, as the only judge of mens actions.*

(1) A Letter of Mr du Rondel, of the 28th of January, 1696.

(2) See the anſwer to the ſecond part of the objection, below.

(3) La Loubere, Relation de Siam, *Tom. i, ch. xxiv, pag. m.* 533, 534.

(4) Id. ibid. *ch. xxiii, num.* 15, *pag.* 515.

Father Tachard relates ſeveral things of this Sommona-Codom, whom he calls
Sommonokhodom. He is, ſays he (*c*), the god whom the Siameſe *worſhip at this time.*
They ſuppoſe he ‘ was born a god by his own virtue, and that immediately after his
‘ birth, without any maſter to inſtruct him, he acquired, by a bare intuition of his mind,
‘ a perfect knowledge of whatever concerns Heaven and Earth, Paradiſe and Hell,
‘ and of the moſt impenetrable ſecrets of nature; that he remembred at the ſame time,
‘ whatever he had done in all the ſeveral lives he had lived; and that after he had taught
‘ thoſe

actions, that does, as they believe, what an omnipotent and moſt wiſe juſtice could do. They pretend that *it is a thing conſonant to the principles of nature, that virtue ſhould be always attended with happineſs, and vice with miſery, by a certain, though unknown, ſympathy between virtue and happineſs, and between vice and miſery* (5). Thus the Chineſe and Siameſe very much differ from Epicurus: they deny the exiſtence of God, and acknowledge a providence (6), whereas Epicurus rejected a providence, and acknowledged the exiſtence of a Deity. It is not therefore ſtrange that the Siameſe ſhould invoke Sommona-Codom, and endeavour to imitate his virtuous life; but one might wonder at Epicurus, if he had prayed to Jupiter, and laid a great conſtraint upon himſelf to honour the gods; for he was perſuaded that his prayers and endeavours would be of no uſe to him. On the contrary, the Siameſe believe that their worſhip of the heroe will bring them an ample reward. The blind fatality, the natural laws and ſympathies they acknowledge between virtue and happineſs, and between vice and miſery, are as powerful a motive and as great a curb as the belief of a knowing providence.

That the Doctrine of a natural and blind connection betwixt virtue and happineſs, and between vice and miſery, would have a greater influence on men, than the Chriſtian doctrine, concerning providence.

I go farther ſtill, and I ſay that according to the courſe of nature (7), that belief has not ſo great an influence as the opinion of the Siameſe. A natural connexion between virtue and happineſs, and between vice and miſery, would be more proper to act upon a mercenary mind, than the perſuaſion of the orthodox, without the divine grace. That connexion would never fail to produce it's full and perfect effect, ſince it would not be ſubmitted to a cauſe, which thinks fit ſometimes to derogate from it's laws, to extend or confine them, and to haſten or retard the execution of them, in a word, to diſpoſe of them according to it's deſigns and various circumſtances. That connexion, for that very reaſon that it were only a blind fatality, would afford good men a perfect certainty of a quick reward, and fill the wicked with a neceſſary fear of a quick puniſhment. But by ſuppoſing a providence, which diſpoſes of all things according to it's will, and with a wiſdom, all the deſigns of which we do not comprehend, one cannot be certain that a good action will be profitable, or a bad one detrimental; for one may think, in each particular juncture, that it is one of the caſes, wherein God is not pleaſed to follow the general law of rewarding good actions, or that of puniſhing evil ones. Chriſtians are agreed that God ſuſpends the execution of thoſe laws as long as he thinks fit. They even ſay, that an old ſinner, who has enjoyed all the pleaſures of life, will be eternally happy, provided that on his death-bed he perform one act of true repentance; and that whoever in his old age departs from the way of virtue, tho' he hath purſued it for a long time through many troubles, will be eternally damned (8). Doubtleſs this may be the reaſon why the fear of God's judgments, or the hope of his rewards, make no great impreſſion upon worldly people. If there was an indiſſoluble connexion between devoutly aſking a good thing of God, and obtaining it, none could doubt of the efficacy of a devout prayer; but, according to the doctrine of divines about that part of Divine worſhip, none can be ſure that the moſt earneſt and devout prayers of a mother for the recovery or converſion of her ſon, or for the deliverance of her huſband unjuſtly impriſoned, will be heard. Thoſe, who have heard ſome Divines preach about the efficacy of prayer, or who have read ſome books upon that ſubject, know that the proofs alledged and grounded either upon arguments or examples, are very ſtrong and cogent: however, the difficulties muſt be examined at laſt. Preachers do not conclude without ſuppoſing that it will be aſked, How comes it that ſome things are not obtained tho' they be aſked with faith, and for the greateſt glory of God? Their anſwer is, That God refuſes us what we aſked of him upon ſeveral occaſions, in order to try us, or humble us more and more, or becauſe he knows that the favours we pray for would be prejudicial to us, and becauſe our wants, and what concerns his glory, are better known to him than to us. There is no caſe in which every body may not judge that his prayers may not be granted thro' one of thoſe motives; hence it is that the hope of being heard is always mixed with great uncertainty, and that many people grow remiſs in the practice of prayer, or only aſk of God the general grace of acquieſcing in his will. Men would act quite otherwiſe, were they perſuaded that there is a neceſſary connexion between a devout prayer, and the obtaining of what is prayed for; they would apply themſelves to providence in all their wants, as they come near a fire, when they are troubled with cold. And therefore ſince the Siameſe are perſuaded that there is a fatal, immutable, and neceſſary connexion between virtue and happineſs, and between vice and miſery, that doctrine ſhould be a more powerful inducement to virtue among them, than religion is in other countries. They ſhould apply themſelves to virtue in order to be happy, as they have recourſe to food, when they are hungry; and they ſhould depart from vice to avoid miſery, as they keep off from the fire when they are afraid of being burnt. But then their morals would be wholly mercenary. The pure notions of honeſty would not be their principle. I muſt obſerve, by the by, that it is very ſtrange they ſhould believe what is told of them concerning that fatal connexion. Is there no man among them that grows rich by unlawful means, or is poor without being accounted vicious, or that is wounded by endeavouring to ſave another man's life? I fancy, if they were preſſed hard upon this head, they would come off with ſome Stoical notions, *viz.* that diſeaſes, vexation, and poverty, are no evils, and that riches, pleaſure, and health, are not good things (9). I could eaſily believe that the common people do not follow that opinion of a natural ſympathy between virtue and happineſs, and between vice and miſery; and that it is only a doctrine of their men of letters, who have denied a providence, and nevertheleſs were ſenſible that it is an uſeful thing to preſerve the common opinion concerning rewards and puniſhments.

Whether the admiration of an excellent Being, that can do neither good nor harm, may be of any uſe to make us virtuous.

II. I come now to examine the other part of the objection. I grant, that a man may admire and honour an object without expecting any reward for it, beſides the ſatisfaction of doing juſtice to merit; but I cannot grant that any man will invoke it againſt his inclinations, and offer ſacrifices to it in order to pleaſe it, and appeaſe it's anger, if he be well perſuaded, 1, That it concerns itſelf with nothing; takes care of nothing; that the ill lives of men do not diſpleaſe it, and that their good lives are not acceptable to it. 2. That there is no other Being that can reward the honours paid to that Being, or puniſh men for indulging their paſſions. This is the ground of the maxim I have advanced, that *the belief of the exiſtence of GOD without the belief of a providence, cannot be an inducement to virtue, nor a curb to vice.* But, will ſome ſay, May not men full of admiration for an excellent, holy, and happy being, that is honoured all over the world, propoſe it to themſelves as the model of their lives, and reſiſt their bad inclinations, and uſe their utmoſt endeavours to practiſe virtue in order to imitate it? I anſwer, they may do it, if they believe that this painful imitation will make them like that being, or procure them ſome other advantage of great value. But then their belief of the Divine exiſtence will be attended with the belief of a providence: they will believe, either as the Siameſe and Chineſe do, that nature has inſeparably united, by a blind fatality, happineſs with virtue, and miſery with vice; and that the imitation of one Sommona-Codom will in time put them in a ſtate like his; or they will believe that an intelligent legiſlator has deſigned rewards for thoſe, who ſhall chuſe the holy and happy life of the immortal gods for their pattern. At

---

(*c*) Tachard, Voiage de Siam, *book vi, p.* 205, *Dutch Edit.*

(5) Id. ibid. *num.* 14. *p.* 514.

(6) That is, a law whereby evil is puniſhed, and virtue rewarded.

(7) That is, without conſidering the operation of the Divine Grace, upon ſouls predeſtinated.

(8) Compare with this the xviiith chapter of Ezekiel.

(9) Compare what is ſaid before remark [*E*] of the article SADUCEES.

‘ thoſe great things, he left them in writing, that poſterity might be benefitted by them. He ſays in thoſe books, that being a god, he deſired one day to manifeſt his divinity to men by ſome extraordinary prodigy . . . . . (*d*). That immediately he found himſelf carried through the air on a throne ſhining with gold and precious ſtones, that came out of the earth in the very ſame place where he was; and that the angels at the ſame time coming down from Heaven paid him the honour and worſhip due to him . . . . . . (*e*). That ever ſince he aſpired to be a god, he returned into the world five hundred and fifty times under different ſhapes; that in each new birth, he had always been the firſt, and as it were the prince of thoſe animals under whoſe ſhapes he came into the world; that he had often given his life for his ſubjects, and that being an ape he delivered a town from a horrid monſter which deſolated it; that he had been a moſt potent king, and that ſeven days before he obtained the empire of the world, he removed, in imitation of a certain anchoret, with his wife and his two children, into remote ſolitudes, where he renounced the world and his paſſions . . . . . (*f*) That he had gone all over the world teaching men what is good and evil, and the true religion, which he writ down to leave it to poſterity. He had ſeveral diſciples, who, in the quality of prieſts, where to imitate him in a moſt particular manner by wearing an habit like his, and obſerving the rules he preſcribed to them, when at laſt he attained to the eighty ſecond year of his age . . . . . He was ſeized with a violent cholic of which he died. His ſoul aſcended into the eighth Heaven [*B*].’ We ſhall ſee below what is related of his brother [*C*].

leaſt, they will hope that mankind will be ſo equitable as to admire their virtue, and to beſtow glorious rewards upon it; and that, perhaps, ſome time or other they ſhall be deified. The glory of Miltiades had a great influence over Themiſtocles, tho' Themiſtocles expected nothing from Miltiades; I grant it: May not at this day the memory of the Alexanders and Cæſars have ſuch a power over the paſſions of ſome men, as to make them undertake the moſt difficult things? And yet they are fully perſuaded that thoſe conquerors know not what paſſes upon earth, and can do neither good nor harm. I own all this; but did not Themiſtocles know that by imitating Miltiades, he would attain to the ſame glory he did? Could thoſe who ſhould now tread in the ſteps of Cæſar and Alexander, be ignorant that trophies, panegyrics, and the immortality of their name would be the price and glorious reward of their labours? And therefore all the examples of the power of admiration and imitation, that can be alledged, ſuppoſe the exiſtence of a cauſe, which rewards the trouble of the admirer and the imitator; and conſequently they are not contrary to my aſſertion. Here is another reflexion. The belief of the Divine exiſtence, without a belief of a providence, ought not to be accounted an inducement to virtue, if whatever it can produce, may be produced by the meer idea of what is honeſt, and by the meer deſire of being praiſed: but the meer idea of what is honeſt, and the meer deſire of being praiſed, may produce whatever the admiration and imitation of the gods of Epicurus could effect. This is manifeſt if it be attentively conſidered. Therefore, *&c.* I would not take advantage of this, *viz.* That a follower of Epicurus could not flatter himſelf, that by imitating the virtues of the gods, he would be in time as happy as they were (10). That had been to no purpoſe, ſince Mr du Rondel does not ſuppoſe that Epicurus is alſo concerned in the objection. See the margin (11).

[*B*] *His ſoul aſcended into the eighth heaven.*] ‘ It is properly the paradiſe called *Nyruppaam:* the ſoul is no longer ſubject to pain and miſery, and enjoys a perfect felicity; and therefore ſhe will never be born again: this is what they call being annihilated, For they do not underſtand by that word the entire deſtruction of a thing, whereby it is reduced to nothing; but they only mean that it appears no longer upon earth, though it lives in heaven. As for his body it was burnt; and his bones, as they ſay, have been preſerved to this preſent time. They are partly in the kingdom of Pegu, and partly in that of Siam. They aſcribe a wonderful virtue to thoſe bones, and affirm that they ſhine with a divine ſplendor (12).’ It may be inferred from theſe laſt words, that the worſhip which the Siameſe pay to that god, is attended with the hopes of ſome advantage accruing from it.

[*C*] *We ſhall ſee below what is related of his brother.*] His name was Thevathat (13). ‘ (14) He was always born anew with his brother *Sommonokhodom*, of the ſame kind with him; but always inferior in dignity, becauſe *Sommonokhodom* was the prince of the animals, whoſe figure he aſſumed. But Thevathat aſpiring likewiſe to become a god, and not being able to bear any thing above him, would never ſubmit to his brother. On the contrary, he endeavoured, by continual revolts, to diſturb his reign, and left nothing unattempted to deprive him of the empire: at laſt he accompliſhed his deſign in ſome meaſure, for he killed him when they were both apes (15). . . . . (16) Having a great deal of wit and addreſs he found means to form a new ſect, in which he engaged ſeveral kings, and ſeveral nations, who followed him, to be his imitators. This occaſioned a ſchiſm, which divided the world into two parts, and gave birth to two religions, whereas before there was but one. Some . . . became diſciples to *Thevathat*, and others to *Sommonokhodom*. *Thevathat*, tho' the younger brother, finding himſelf ſupported by ſo many princes, who had undertook to defend him, made uſe of open force, as well as treachery, to deſtroy his brother, and invented the moſt horrid calumnies to blaſt his reputation; but he did not ſucceed in his deſigns. Nay, he was overcome more than once, when, in order to confirm his followers in his doctrine, he durſt contend with his brother, who ſhould work the greateſt miracles. His ambition made him wiſh to be a god; but not being truly one, he was ignorant of many things, whereof his brother had a perfect knowledge; and becauſe his pride did not permit him to hear *Sommonokhodom*, he did not learn of him what paſſed in paradiſe and in hell, nor the doctrine of tranſmigration, nor the changes which had happened and were to happen in all ages.’ The Siameſe (17) *believe that the doctrine of* Thevathat, *as a ſource of ſchiſm and diviſion, has produced ſeven other ſects, which have a great affinity one with another.* ‘ . . . (18) *Thevathat* having done ſo many injuries to his brother, without any reſpect for the rights of nature, and for the deity itſelf, it was juſt he ſhould be puniſhed for it. Accordingly the writings of the Siameſe mention his puniſhment; and *Sommonokhodom* alſo ſays in thoſe books, that being made a god, he ſaw his impious brother in the deepeſt part of hell. I ſaw him, ſays he, overwhelmed with evils, and groaning under the weight of his miſery. He was in the eighth abode, that is, in the place where the greateſt malefactors are tormented, where he expiated, by a horrid puniſhment, all the ſins he had committed, eſpecially the injuries he had done me. Afterwards, explaining the puniſhment he inflicted upon *Thevathat*, he ſays he was faſtened to a croſs with large nails (19), which piercing his hands and his feet, gave him violent pain; that he had a crown of thorns on his head, that his body was full of wounds, and to compleat his miſery, the infernal fire burnt him without conſuming him. He was moved with compaſſion at the ſight of ſuch a dreadful ſpectacle; he forgot all the injuries his brother

---

(*d*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 206.

(*e*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 207.

(*f*) Ibid. *pag.* 214.

(10) Epicurus and his followers taught that the ſoul dies for ever with the body.

(11) I propoſe this only as a problem, which Mr du Rondel may examine, and I deſire him to confute it as much as he will think fit, for the further inſtruction of my readers.

(12) Tachard, Voiage de Siam, *book vi, pag.* 215, *Dutch Edit.*

(13) Id. ibid. *pag.* 206.

(14) Id. ibid. *pag.* 208.

(15) This ſtory ſeems to be derived from the Hiſtory of *Cain* and *Abel.*

(16) Tachard, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 209.

(17) Id. ibid. *pag.* 211.

(18) Id. ibid. *pag.* 212, 213.

(19) This makes them believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the ſame with Thevathat, and what confirms them moſt in that opinion (*theſe are Father* Tachard's *words,* ubi ſupra, *book vi, pag.* 214,) is that we worſhip the image of the crucified Saviour, which does perfectly repreſent the puniſhment inflicted upon Thevathat.

had done him, and he could not ſee him in that condition without reſolving to come to his aſſiſtance. In order to it, he propoſed to him to adore theſe three words, *Pputhang*, *Thamang*, *Sangkhang*: words ſacred and myſterious, for which the Siameſe have a profound veneration; the firſt whereof ſignifies God, the ſecond the word of God, and the third the imitator of God; promiſing him, that if he would accept ſuch reaſonable and eaſy terms, he would deliver him from all the torments to which he was condemned. *Thevathat* conſented to adore the two firſt words, but utterly refuſed to adore the third, becauſe it ſignified prieſt, or imitator of God, proteſting that prieſts were ſinful men, who deſerved no reſpect. It is for a puniſhment of ſuch a pride that he is under ſufferings to this day, and will ſuffer in hell for the ſpace of many years.

Judge by this whether the Siameſe can ſay, without contradicting themſelves, that he is a god who has no power. Do they not acknowledge that he can deliver from the moſt horrid torments of hell thoſe, who accept the conditions he propoſes to them? If you anſwer me, that this concerns the time when he was not yet in the eighth heaven; I will reply, that the example of Thevathat may make them afraid of being miſerable, if they do not conform to the good pleaſure and to the rules preſcribed to them by Sommonokhodom; and conſequently, their worſhip is not free from ſelf-intereſt. They fancy (20) that the Chriſtians are Thevathat's diſciples (21), *and they are ſo afraid of being thrown into hell with Thevathat, if they follow his doctrine, that they cannot be perſuaded to embrace Chriſtianity.*

(20) Tachard, ubi ſupra, *book* vi, *pag.* 209.

(21) Id. ibid. *pag.* 213.

SOPHRONIA, is the name that is given to a Roman lady, whom Euſebius commends for her courage and chaſtity. I cannot tell where they have found her name; for Euſebius does not name her either in the xivth chapter *(a)* of the viiith book of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, or in the xxxivth chapter of the firſt book of Conſtantine's life. He only ſays that this lady was married to the governor of Rome, and that knowing that the ſoldiers whom Maxentius made uſe of to bring him the woman he intended to raviſh, were already got into her houſe, with a permiſſion extorted from her huſband; ſhe demanded a little time under pretence of dreſſing her ſelf; and afterwards finding ſhe was alone in her chamber, ſhe thruſt a ſword into her breaſt, and ſhewed by this action, to that and the following ages, that nothing but Chriſtian virtue is invincible and proof againſt death. This is Euſebius's account. He does not ſay that ſhe *aſked her huſband's leave, and GOD's pardon, for what ſhe was going to do*; nor that *the Church has given a teſtimony of the truth of her martyrdom by the declaration of her holineſs.* They are meer gloſſes, which Moreri, being deceived by Charles Stephens [*A*], falſely aſcribes to that Hiſtorian.

(*a*) Moreri quotes the 17th after Charles Stephens, and ſeveral other Dictionaries.

[*A*] *Moreri, being deceived by Charles Stephens.*] The article of Sophronia not being very long in Charles Stephens, I ſhall ſet it down at length. ‘ Sophronia matrona Romana, altera Lucretia Chriſtiana, cum vim Decii Principis videret ſe paſſuram, conſentiente viro arrepto gladio ſeipſam transfixit, ac inter ſanctas mulieres eſt relata. Euſeb. lib. 8. cap. 17. - - - - *Sophronia, a Roman lady, another Chriſtian Lucretia, perceiving that, with her huſband's conſent, ſhe was to be raviſhed by Decius, ſhe ſtabbed herſelf with a ſword, and was numbred amongſt the holy women.*’ Moreri had from thence, that Sophronia *is called the Chriſtian Lucretia*; which is one fault, for he gives too large an extent to the words of the Latin Dictionary. The words *conſentiente viro*, which ought to be referred to *paſſuram*, and not to *arrepto gladio*, was a trap for Moreri; a comma ill placed, which made him believe that this lady did not kill herſelf without aſking her huſband's permiſſion to do it, cauſed his miſtake. Perhaps the comma ſignifies nothing to the matter; for if you put one next to *paſſuram*, and one next to *viro*, as Lloyd and Hofman do, the ambiguity will be the ſame. An exact and careful writer would have placed *paſſuram* next to *viro*, and then the reader would not have been uncertain. I need not take notice of the other miſtakes. I ſhall only ſay, that Moreri has not tranſcribed all the miſtakes of Charles Stephens; he has left out *Decii Principis*, and put the tyrant Maxentius in the room of Decius. Lloyd and Hofman have not corrected one ſyllable. I wonder Rivetus ſhould ſay, that Euſebius tells us, that Sophronia having prayed to God upon her knees, as it were to ſacrifice her chaſtity to Jesus Christ, killed herſelf in the preſence of the tyrant Maxentius. *Euſeb. lib.* 8. *Hiſtoriæ refert de Sophronia præfecti Romanæ urbis uxore quod cum animadverteret maritum metu mortis perterritum, prodidiſſe pudicitiam ſuam Maxentio Tyranno, cum prius defixis genibus Deum oraſſet, tanquam pudicitiam ſuam Chriſto immolaturam, pectus coram eo ferro transfixiſſe* (1). From whence I learn that he is alſo one of thoſe, who quote from the modern writers, without conſulting the originals. I had a better opinion of him. I was not ſurprized that Raviſius Textor in his *Officina*, and Decimator in his *Sylva Vocabulorum*, had committed the ſame faults with Charles Stephens. Thoſe authors did not think of verifying their quotations. Decimator ſeems to me more exact than all the reſt as to the alluſion to Lucretia; he does not ſay, as Moreri does, that Saphronia was called the Chriſtian Lucretia; but that ſhe might juſtly be called ſo: *Caſtitatis nomine celebris, ita ut altera Lucretia Chriſtiana non immerito dici poſſit.*

(1) *Andr. Rivet. in Geneſ. Exercit. lxxiii*, Oper. Tom. i, pag. 281. I have referred *coram eo*, to *Maxentius*; perhaps it ſhould be referred to *maritus*. Rivetus has committed a ſoleciſm in this place.

SORANUS (Quintus Valerius) flouriſhed in the VIIth century of Rome (*a*). He was eſteemed for his eloquence, but much more for his learning. He was the moſt learned man, that had been ſeen among the Latin authors. Though he was born near Rome (*b*), he had the country pronunciation [*A*], which doubtleſs did ſome prejudice to his eloquence. He had obſerved in his works a method, which Pliny followed

(*a*) See the remark [*A*], citation (2).

(*b*) See the ſame remark, citat. (4).

[*A*] *The moſt learned man . . . . . he had the country pronunciation.*] The proof of all this is to be found in the IIId book *de Oratore*; where Cicero ſays, that the moſt agreeable pronunciation of the Greek tongue was that of the Athenians (1). They ſpoke better without any learning, than the moſt learned Aſiatics. This is not to be underſtood as if their words had been better placed; it concerns only the tone of their voice, and their accent. Cicero ſays the ſame to the praiſe of the city of Rome: he obſerves that the moſt ignorant Roman ſurpaſſed in that reſpect the learned Soranus; learned, did I ſay, I ſhould rather call him the moſt learned man of that time. *Hanc dico ſuavitatem, quæ exit ex ore, quæ quidem ut apud Græcos Atticorum, ſic in latino ſermone hujus eſt urbis maxime propria . . . . Noſtri minus ſtudent literis quàm Latini, tamen ex iſtis quos noſtis; urbanis, in quibus minimum eſt literarum, nemo eſt quin literatiſſimum togatorum omnium Q. Valerium Soranum lenitate vocis, atque ipſo oris preſſu & ſono facile vincat* (2). Theſe words plainly inſinuate that Soranus was then living; and therefore I had reaſon to ſay, that he flouriſhed in the VIIth century of Rome; for Cicero ſuppoſes that the diſcourſes, which make up his work *de Oratore*, were made in the year 662.

(1) Eruditiſſimos homines Aſiaticos quivis Athenienſis indoctus, non verbis, ſed ſono vocis, nec tam bene quam ſuaviter loquendo facile ſuperabit. *Cicero, lib. iii, de Oratore, folio.* 90, *D.*

(2) Id. ib.

followed [*B*], for he added ſeveral ſummaries to his books, whereby the reader could chuſe what he had a mind to, without giving himſelf the trouble of reading them all over. It is ſaid he was ſo bold as to divulge a myſtery which the Romans kept very ſecret; it was the name of the tutelar god of their city. It is ſaid that he was puniſhed with death upon that account [*C*]. Perhaps he ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from that Quintus Valerius, whom Pompey cauſed to be put to death [*D*]. I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that the reaſon why the Romans concealed the name of their tutelar god, has little ſolidity

662. Many believe that this Soranus was a friend of Cicero, and underſtand the following paſſage of him: *Q. & D. Valerii Sorani, vicini & familiares mei non tam in dicendo admirabiles, quam docti & græcis literis & latinis* (3). What goes before, ſhews that thoſe two Soranus's were not born at Rome, but in the Latium. I believe they were natives of Sora, a town of that country, according to Pliny and Ptolomy (4).

[*B*] *A method which Pliny followed.*] Theſe are his words in his preface to Titus ſon of Veſpaſian: ‘Quia occupationibus tuis publico bono parcendum ‘erat, quid ſingulis contineatur libris huic epiſtolæ ‘ſubjunxi: ſummaque cura, ne perlegendos eos habe‘res, operam dedi. Tu per hoc & aliis præſtabis ne ‘perlegant: ſed ut quiſque deſideraverit aliquid, id ‘tantum quærat & ſciat quo loco inveniat. Hoc ‘ante me fecit in litteris noſtris Valerius Soranus, in ‘libris quos ἐποπτίδων inſcripſit (5). - - - *Becauſe ‘your time was to be ſaved for the public good, I have ‘ſubjoined to this epiſtle the contents of each book, and ‘endeavoured to ſpare you the pains of reading them over. ‘And hereby others may by you be benefitted; not being ‘obliged to read them over: but as any thing is wanted, ‘to look only for that, and know where to find it. This ‘was done before me, by Valerius Soranus, in the books ‘which he intituled,* ἐποπτίδων.’ I muſt not forget the note of Father Hardouin: *Epoptides ſcripſerat, hoc eſt, ut Turnebus quidem interpretatur, de Grammatica libros: tanquam de myſteriis literarum & doctrinæ. Erat enim* ἐπόπται *qui ad inſpicienda ſacra occulta admittebantur* (6). It is certain our Soranus wrote ſome grammatical books. See Varro (7), and Aulus Gellius (8).

[*C*] *To divulge a myſtery .... that he was puniſhed with death upon that account.*] Pliny does not ſay in expreſs terms that Soranus divulged the name of the tutelar god of Rome; but it may be inferred from his words; *Cujus* (Romæ) *nomen alterum dicere arcanis cæremoniarum nefas habetur: optimaque & ſalutari fide abolitum enunciavit Valerius Soranus luitque mox pœnas* (9). He ſays the city of Rome had two names: one that was known to every body; and the other ſo myſterious that religion did not permit it ſhould be revealed, and that Soranus having divulged it, was immediately puniſhed for it. It is not to be doubted, but that the myſterious name was the ſame with that of the tutelar god of the town, or at leaſt, that it was looked upon as a thing that protected it (10). Solinus, who tranſcribes Pliny, took the liberty to ſpecify the puniſhment inflicted upon Soranus for his profanation: he ſays that he was condemned to death (11); but ſpeaks only of the unknown and myſterious name of the city, and does not ſay it was the name of the tutelar god of Rome. I am going to quote two authors, who are more particular upon this point, and leave us not to the trouble of making inferences: *Verum nomen ejus numinis quod urbi Romæ præeſſet, ſciri ſacrorum lege prohibetur, quod auſus quidam tribunus plebis enuntiare, in crucem levatus eſt* (12). This is the ground on which ſome ſay that our Soranus was tribune of the people; and that he was crucified (13). They are obliged to add ſomething of their own, for Servius names no body. The other paſſage, which I am to quote, is out of Plutarch. Διὰ τί τὸν Θεὸν ἐκεῖνον ᾧ μάλιστα τὴν Ῥώμην σώζειν προσήκει καὶ φυλάττειν, εἴτε ἐστὶν ἄῤῥην εἴτε θήλεια, καὶ λέγειν ἀπείρηται καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ ὀνομάζειν; ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἀπόῤῥησιν ἐξάπτουσι δεισιδαιμονίας, ἱστοροῦντες Οὐαλέριον Σωρανὸν ἀπολέσθαι κακῶς διὰ τὸ ἐξειπεῖν. Cur tutelarem Romæ Deum, maſne ſit an femina, dicere aut quærere, ejuſque nomen efferre nefas eſt? quod quidam interdictum à ſuperſtitione repetunt, narrantes Valerium Soranum malè periiſſe, quod nomen illud edidiſſet (14). - - - - *Why is it a crime to ſpeak or aſk, whether the tutelar god of Rome is male or female, and to pronounce his name? Which prohibition ſome aſcribe to ſuperſtition, ſaying that Soranus miſerably periſhed for divulging his name.* Note, that according to Plutarch, it was not allowed to inquire into the ſex or the name of the tutelar god of Rome. Note alſo, that ſome authors find ſomething more myſterious in Soranus's puniſhment; for they ſay, that as ſoon as he uttered that concealed name, he fell dead upon the place. They affirm (15) that this is to be found in Pliny, and ſeveral other writers. It is falſe that Pliny ſays ſo. We ſhall ſee in the remark [*D*] that, perhaps, Soranus's indiſcretion was not the occaſion of his death. Finally, take notice of a great miſtake in Gyraldus. Having ſaid, 1, (16) That Pliny and Solinus relate that Valerius Soranus was condemned to death for being ſo bold as to pronounce the occult name of Rome (17); 2, That Sempronius (18) wrote the ſame thing; he adds, that others affirm, that this Soranus was crucified, which occaſioned the worſhip of the goddeſs Angerona, the patroneſs of Silence. *Alii in crucem ſublatum tradunt, &* PROPTEREA *cultam Deam Angeronam ſilentii præſidem* (19). Servius is the only author who mentions the crucifixion of that impious perſon who divulged that myſtery; but neither he, nor any other, hath obſerved that this puniſhment gave occaſion to the worſhip of the goddeſs Angerona. It plainly appears from Pliny that this was a very antient worſhip, grounded upon the myſtery of the occult name of Rome. *Exemplum religionis* ANTIQUÆ *ob hoc maxime ſilentium inſtitutæ. Namque Diva Angerona,* &c (20). Solinus expreſſes himſelf more clearly ſtill: *Inter* ANTIQUISSIMAS *ſane religiones Sacellum colitur Angeronæ* (21). There is hardly any illuſion more dangerous than that of the particles termed *cauſales* by the Grammarians. They have occaſioned horrid blunders in the moſt learned compilers; and when a man goes about to give a different turn to what he tranſcribes, and to ſhorten it as much as he can, he will be apt to perplex and confound himſelf, unleſs he be very attentive. The learned Gyraldus was miſtaken for want of duly conſidering Pliny's words.

[*D*] *Perhaps he ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from that Quintus Valerius, whom Pompey cauſed to be put to death.*] If I am not miſtaken, Plutarch is the only author who informs us of this particular. He ſays that Pompey being well informed of that man's learning, took him aſide, and walked with him. Note, that Pompey was then in Sicily, and that very day judging the criminals, that is, thoſe of Marius's party who were to be put to death. When he ſaw Quintus Valerius brought to the tribunal, he roſe up to diſcourſe with him in private; but as ſoon as he knew of him what he deſired to know, he ordered him to be killed. Plutarch relates this only upon the credit of an author, whom he miſtruſts as to thoſe things which concerned the friends or enemies of Cæſar (22). Γάϊος δὲ Ὄπιος, ὁ Καίσαρος ἑταῖρος, ἀπανθρώπως φησὶ καὶ Κοΐντῳ Οὐαλερίῳ χρήσασθαι τὸν Πομπήϊον. ἐπιστάμενον γὰρ ὡς ἐστι φιλολόγος ἀνὴρ καὶ φιλομαθὴς ἐν ὀλίγοις ὁ Οὐαλέριος, ὡς ἤχθη πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἐπισπασάμηνον καὶ συμπεριπατήσαντα, καὶ πυθόμενον ὧν ἔχρῃζε καὶ μαθόντα, προστάξαι τοῖς ὑπηρέταις εὐθὺς ἀνελεῖν ἀπαγαγόντας. *Addit C. Oppius Cæſaris familiaris ſævum Pompeium etiam in Q. Valerium extitiſſe: quum enim ſciret humanitatis & literarum inter paucos ſtudioſum Valerium, ut actus ad ipſum eſt, ſeduxiſſe illum & deambulaſſe una, ubi accepit & didicit ab eo quæ cupiebat, imperaſſe lictoribus ut illicò auferrent eum & interficerent* (23). May not one ſuppoſe, 1, That it was upon this occaſion that our Soranus divulged the unknown name of the city of Rome? 2, That Oppius omitted this particular, not to afford a pretence to excuſe Pompey? For if it might have been alledged that Soranus revealed to him ſuch a ſecret, he who cauſed him to be put to death might have been cleared, and his ſeverity might have been looked upon as an act of devotion, and a holy zeal againſt prophane men. I affirm nothing, and leave it to the judgment of the Critics.

I ſhall

---

(3) Cicero, in Bruto, *pag. m.* 283.

(4) *See* Corradus, in Brutum Ciceronis, *pag.* 284.

(5) Plinius, *in Præfat. in fine.*

(6) Harduin. in hunc locum Plinii.

(7) Varro de Lingua Latina, *lib. vi, pag. m.* 71.

(8) Aulus Gellius, *lib. ii, cap. x.*

(9) Plinius, *lib. iii, cap. v, pag. m.* 330, 331.

(10) See the paſſage of Macrobius in the remark [*E*].

(11) Valerium denique Soranum, quòd contra interdictum id eloqui auſus foret ob meritum profanæ vocis neci datum. *Solin. cap. i, pag.* 1.

(12) Servius, in lib. i, Georg. ver. 499.

(13) Vives in Auguſt. de Civitate Dei, *lib. vii, cap. ix.*

(14) Plut. in Quæſt. Romanis, *pag.* 278, *E.*

(15) Hermolaus, apud Gyraldum de Poëtis, *Dialogo vi, p.* 192, *Edit. Lugd.* 1696.

(16) Gyraldus, de Poët. Hiſtoria, *Dial. iv, pag.* 192.

(17) Pliny does not ſay ſo.

(18) It were to be wiſhed that Gyraldus had more clearly expreſſed what Sempronius he means; for Sempronius Tuditanus, and Sempronius Aſellio, who wrote books, lived before Valerius Soranus, mentioned by Cicero.

(19) Gyraldus, ubi ſupra.

(20) Plin. *lib. iii, cap. v, pag.* 331.

(21) Solin. *p.* 1.

(22) Ὀπίῳ μὲν, ὅταν περὶ τῶν Καίσαρος πολεμίων ἢ φίλων διαλέγηται, σφόδρα δεῖ πιστεύειν μετὰ εὐλαβείας. Cæterum Oppio quum de Cæſaris hoſtibus vel amicis agit non temere adjungenda fides eſt. *Plut. in Pompeio, pag.* 623, *E.*

(23) Plut. in Pompeio, *pag.* 623, *E.*

ſolidity in it [E]. It appears from two verſes of Soranus, which are ſtill extant, that he believed that God is the immanent cauſe of all things. That opinion does not differ from

I ſhall only ſay, that it is not to be imagined that Pompey had a mind to learn of him ſome political ſecrets, and ſome intrigues of Marius; for his deſire of having a private diſcourſe with him, was only grounded upon his knowing that he was a man of great learning. Plutarch obſerves it in expreſs words. Now it is certain that the knowledge of the *Belles Lettres*, and the ſtudy of Antiquity enabled Soranus to diſcover to Pompey a ſecret of religion, an unknown law, an old ceremony; but not the moſt private intrigues of Marius's factions. On the other ſide, it is not improbable that, as things ſtood then, Pompey was willing to know the occult name of Rome. His party, which was that of Sylla, had lately taken that town. Was Pompey ſure that the other party would never conquer it again? Did not Pompey ſee that the Republic would be expoſed to civil wars? was he not ſenſible of his own ambition? Could he think that the diſcovery of the name of the tutelar god would be of no uſe to him? However it be, if Quintus Valerius in Plutarch, and Soranus in Pliny are one and the ſame man, which is very likely, there is little reaſon to ſay that the profane indiſcretion of the man, who divulged the unknown name of Rome, was immediately puniſhed; for, according to Plutarch, he was puniſhed as one of Marius's accomplices. It is not true that Plutarch calls him a Philoſopher (24). Ludovicus Vives (25), Charles Stephens, Lloyd, and Hofman, are in the wrong to ſay ſo. Note, that Florus reckons the death of the Prætor Soranus among the cruel actions of Sylla's party. *Piget poſt hæc referre*, ſays he (26), *ludibrio habita fata Carbonis, fata Sorani prætoris*, &c. This might be of ſome uſe to thoſe, who would prove that our Soranus was Prætor, and the ſame Valerius whom Pompey cauſed to be put to death.

[E] *The reaſon why the Romans concealed the name of their tutelar god, has little ſolidity in it.*] They had called forth, on ſome occaſions, the tutelar gods of other towns, and were afraid the like would be done to them. This was the reaſon why they were not willing that the name of their tutelar deity ſhould be known. They hoped the ignorance of that name would ſecure his protection to them, as the Tyrians believed they might keep their gods from removing by loading them with chains. This is one of Plutarch's anſwers to the queſtion above-mentioned (27). Πότερον, ὡς τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν τινὲς ἱστορήκασιν, ἐκκλήσεις εἰσὶ καὶ γοητεῖαι Θεῶν; αἷς νομίζοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ Θεούς τινας ἐκκεκλῆσθαι παρὰ τῶν πολεμίων, καὶ μετῳκηκέναι πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ἐφοβοῦντο τὸ αὐτὸ παθεῖν ὑφ' ἑτέρων; ὥσπερ οὖν Τύριοι δεσμοὺς ἀγάλμασι λέγονται περιβαλεῖν, ἕτεροι δὲ αἰτεῖν ἐγγυητὰς ἐπὶ λουτρὸν ἢ καθαρμόν τινα προπέμποντες, οὕτως ᾤοντο Ῥωμαῖοι τὸ ἄῤῥητον καὶ τὸ ἄγνωστον ἀσφαλεστάτην εἶναι Θεοῦ καὶ βεβαιοτάτην φρουράν. *An quia, ut nonnulli rerum Romanarum ſcriptores tradunt, carmina quædam ſunt & præſtigiæ quibus dii eliciuntur: quibus uſi Romani cùm putarent ſe quoſdam hoſtium deos ad ſe traduxiſſe, cavere voluerunt ne idem ſibi ab aliis eveniret? Itaque ſicut Tyrii* (28) *vincula injicere ſimulacris dicuntur, alii autem cùm ea ad lavacrum aut luſtrationem aliquam deducunt, fidejuſſores pro reditu exigunt: ita Romani tutiſſimè ac conſtantiſſimè adſervari deum crediderunt, qui neque de nomine notus aliis eſſet.* I have found in Pliny a paſſage ſo full of particulars, that the reader will be well pleaſed to find it here: ‘Verrius Flaccus auctores ‘ponit, quibus credat, in oppugnationibus ante omnia ‘ſolitum à Romanis ſacerdotibus evocari Deum, cujus ‘in tutela id oppidum eſſet: promittique illi eundem, ‘aut ampliorem apud Romanos cultum. Et durat in ‘Pontificum diſciplina id ſacrum: conſtatque ideo ‘occultatum, in cujus Dei tutela Roma eſſet, ne qui ‘hoſtium ſimili modo agerent (29). - - - *Verrius ‘Flaccus relates from thoſe he can credit, that the firſt ‘thing done by the Romans in beſieging a city, was, by ‘their prieſts, to call forth the deity, in whoſe protection it ‘was, and to promiſe him the ſame, or a more ſumptuous ‘worſhip. And this religious ceremony ſtill remains in ‘the rituals of the prieſts: and therefore the god peculiar ‘to Rome was kept ſecret, leſt her enemies ſhould do the ‘like.*’ Macrobius informs us of two things: one is (30), that every town is under the protection of a god, and that the Romans perceiving that it was likely the towns they beſieged, would be obliged to ſurrender, called forth their tutelar gods, whether they believed they could not take a town without it, or becauſe they thought it an impious thing to make the gods priſoners. The other is, that for theſe reaſons they concealed the name of the tutelar god of Rome, and the Latin name of that town. He adds, that the name of that deity was nevertheleſs ſeen in the books of ſome Antients: It is true they mentioned it differently; but as for the occult name of Rome, it was never known, no not to the moſt learned men; for the Romans took an effectual care to prevent their being treated as they had treated others, by calling forth the gods who protected them. *Propterea ipſi Romani & deum in cujus tutela urbs Roma eſt ut ipſius orbis Latinum nomen ignotum eſſe voluerunt, ſed dei quidem nomen nonnullis antiquorum licet inter ſe diſſidentium libris inſitum: & ideo vetuſta perſequentibus quidquid de hoc putatur innotuit .... Ipſius vero urbis nomen etiam doctiſſimis ignotum eſt: caventibus Romanis ne quod ſæpe adverſus urbes hoſtium feciſſe ſe noverant, idem ipſi quoque hoſtili evocatione paterentur, ſi tutelæ ſuæ nomen divulgaretur* (31). I wonder Macrobius did not know what Pliny and Plutarch relate of Soranus. He knew it not, ſince he ſays the myſterious name of Rome was always unknown even to the moſt learned men. I wonder alſo at his diſtinction between the tutelar god of Rome, and the concealed name of that city, to which he aſcribes likewiſe the ſame protection. But I wonder more ſtill, that having ſaid what I have juſt now mentioned, he ſhould give us the formulary of calling forth tutelar gods; for it appears by that formulary that there was no neceſſity to know the name or the ſex of the deities who protected a town. They called them forth without naming them, and with this clauſe, Whether you be a god or a goddeſs. *Eſt autem carmen hujuſmodi, quo di evocantur cum oppugnatione civitas cingitur.* SI. DEUS. SI. DEA. EST. CUI. POPOLUS. CIVITAS. QUE. KARTHAGINIENSIS. EST. IN. TUTELA. TE. QUE. MAXIME. ILLE. QUI. URBIS. HUJUS. POPOLI. QUE. TUTELAM. RECEPISTI. PRECOR. VENEROR. QUE. VENIAM. QUE. A. VOBIS. PETO. UT. VOS. POPOLUM. CIVITATEM. QUE. KARTHAGINIENSEM. DESERATIS. LOCA. TEMPLA. SACRA. URBEM. QUE. EORUM. RELINQUATIS. ABSQUE. HIS. ABEATIS. *&c* (32). Was not I in the right to ſay that the reaſon why the Romans kept the name of their tutelar god ſecret, was not a ſolid one? They knew not the names, nor even the ſex of the tutelar gods they called forth, and yet they called them forth; and therefore, what could it avail them that their enemies ſhould not know the name of the god who was the protector of Rome, or the true name of that city? Could this prevent practiſing againſt the Romans what they had done againſt other towns? Macrobius in particular is leſs excuſable than the other writers, ſince, in the very ſame page where he ſpeaks as they do, he recites a formulary of evocation, which confutes what he ſays. It is moſt certain that the conditional particle *ſi Deus, ſi Dea*, undeniably proves that they knew not the name of the god whom they called forth; for Varro affirms that they uſed thoſe words, when they were afraid of miſtaking the name of one deity for that of another. They made uſe of them when they offered ſacrifices upon occaſion of an earthquake; becauſe they knew not the name of the god, who was the cauſe of ſuch a calamity. Aulus Gellius is my author for it. *Propterea*, that is, becauſe the name of that god was unknown, *veteres Romani .... ubi terram moviſſe ſenſerant, nunciatumve erat, ferias ejus rei cauſa edicto imperabant; ſed dei nomen, ita uti ſolet, cui ſervari ferias oporteret, ſtatuere & edicere quieſcebant; ne, alium pro alio nominando, falſa religione populum alligarent, eas ferias ſi quis polluiſſet, piaculoque ob hanc rem opus eſſet, hoſtiam,* SI. DEO. SI. DEAE. *immolabat. idque ita ex decreto pontificum obſervatum eſſe M. Varro dicit: quoniam & qua vi & per quem deorum dearumve terra tremeret incertum eſſet* (33).

---

(24) He calls him a *Philologer*, and not a *Philoſopher*.

(25) Lud. Vives in Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, *lib. vii, cap. ix.*

(26) Florus, *lib. iii, cap. xxi.*

(27) Plut. in Quæſt. Roman. *pag.* 278, 279.

(28) *See* Quintus Curtius, *lib. iv, cap. iv, num.* 22, & *ibi* Freinſhemius.

(29) Plin. *lib. xxviii, cap. ii, pag.* 559, 560.

(30) Conſtat omnes urbes in alicujus Dei eſſe tutela, moremque Romanorum arcanum & multis ignotum fuiſſe, ut cum obſiderent urbem hoſtium eamque jam capi poſſe confiderent, certo carmine evocarent tutelares deos: quod aut aliter urbem capi poſſe non crederent, aut ſi poſſet nefas æſtimarent deos habere captivos. *Macrob. Saturnal. lib. iii, cap. ix, pag. m.* 323.

(31) Id. ibid.

(32) Macrobius, ubi ſupra. *He ſays he takes it from the fifth book* Rerum reconditarum, *of Sammonicus Serenus, who had found it in a book of Furius.*

(33) Aulus Gellius, *lib. ii, cap. xxviii.*

from Spinoziſm [*F*]. I muſt alſo obſerve (*c*) why ſome think that he was tribune of the people. I make no doubt that he was related to D. VALERIUS SORANUS, who, as well as he, made himſelf more conſiderable for his learning, than for the beauty of his diſcourſes (*d*).

(*c*) In the remark [*C*].

(*d*) See the remark [*A*], citation (3).

[*F*] *That opinion does not differ from Spinoziſm.*] I need only quote a paſſage of St Auguſtin to prove this: (34) ‘Jovem ut Deus ſit, & maximè ut rex deorum, non alium poſſunt exſtimare, quàm mundum: ut in diis cæteris ſecundum iſtos ſuis partibus regnet. In hanc ſententiam etiam quoſdam verſus Valerii Sorani exponit idem Varro, in eo libro, quem ſeorſum ab iſtis de cultu deorum ſcripſit, qui verſus hi ſunt.

Jupiter omnipotens regum rex ipſe, deuſque (35),
Progenitor, genitrixque deum, deus unus, & omnis.

Exponuntur autem in eodem libro, ita ut eum marem exiſtimarent, qui ſemen emitteret, fœminam quæ acciperet: Jovemque eſſe mundum, & eum omnia ſemina ex ſe emittere, & in ſe recipere, qua cauſa, inquit, ſcripſit Soranus: Jupiter progenitor genitrixque: nec minus cum cauſa unum & eundem omnia eſſe. Mundus enim unus, & in eo uno omnia ſunt. - - - - *They think that Jupiter, as a god, and eſpecially as king of the gods, can be nothing elſe but the world, that he reigns by the other gods in their ſeveral reſpects: in this ſenſe, the ſame Varro likewiſe explains ſome verſes of Valerius Soranus, found in that book, which he wrote ſeparately from his books concerning the worſhip of the gods. Theſe are the verſes:*

Omnipotent Jove, king and god of kings,
Progenitor and progenitrix of the gods, one god, and
containing all.

And in that book they are ſo explained, as if he was underſtood to be the male who emitted, and the female who received the ſeed: and as if Jupiter was underſtood to be the world, and the being who emitted ſeeds of all kinds, and who received them. For this reaſon ſays he, Soranus wrote Jupiter Progenitor genitrixque; *and that the world is nevertheleſs one and the ſame with it's cauſe: for the world is one, and in it are all things.*’

(34) Auguſtin. de Civitate Dei, *lib. vii, cap. ix, pag. m.* 637.

(35) There is in the old manuſcripts, as Lodovicus Vives obſerves, *rerumque deumque*, and I find the ſame reading in the 11th chapter of the ſame book of St Auguſtin in my edition.

SOUBISE, a town in Saintonge. Many perſons of quality had their name from it. In 1575, it fell to the houſe of Rohan by the marriage of Catherine de Parthenai, daughter and heireſs of John de Parthenai-l'Archeveſque, with Renatus de Rohan II of that name. This John de Parthenai, known by the name of Soubiſe, will be the ſubject of the following article.

SOUBISE (JOHN DE PARTHENAI LORD OF) is one of the heroes of the XVIth century among the Proteſtants of France. He began to learn their doctrine at the court of the Duke of Ferrara (*a*); when Renata of France, daughter of Lewis XII, and wife of that Duke, received there ſome preachers of the Reformed Religion, and embraced their opinions. Being returned into France, he laboured with great zeal [*A*] to propagate the truths he had learned; and Catherine de Medicis was like to become his proſelyte [*B*]. In the very begining of the criſis, which made the war unavoidable between the two religions in 1562, he was one of the moſt conſiderable aſſociates of the Prince of Condé, who choſe him to command at Lyons, when that great town, which had declared for the Cauſe, did not ſeem to be ſafe in the hands of the Baron des Adrets. Soubiſe wonderfully juſtified the choice that was made of him to keep ſuch a place; for notwithſtanding all the difficulties he went through, he preſerved it, and gave a good account of it. He performed there many valiant and maſterly actions (*b*). The Duke of Nemours beſieged that town to no purpoſe, and the queen-mother endeavoured in vain to impoſe upon him by negotiations (*c*). He was very much ſuſpected of having a hand in the murder of the Duke of Guiſe; and it appears that Poltrot laid many things to his charge in his depoſitions: nevertheleſs, it is the opinion of the moſt equitable writers of the Church of Rome [*C*], that he was not concerned in that abominable action. He had

(*a*) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſ. *lib. x, towards the end.*

(*b*) *See* Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, *Tom. i, pag.* 212, 215, *Dutch edition; but ſee particularly*, Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *book xi.*

(*c*) Varillas. ibid. *pag.* 225.

[*A*] *He laboured with great zeal.*] The author of the hiſtory of the Reformed Churches, makes the following obſervation concerning the Reformation of the town of Soubiſe (1). ‘As for the town of Soubiſe, the lord of that place, who was a man of an extraordinary piety, had ſo ordered it, that many people, living in his lands, were already very well inſtructed. Which that good old man (2) perceiving, he ſo earneſtly laboured in the work of the Lord, that every body looked upon his labours as a miraculous thing. He never ſlept in the night, (becauſe they durſt not meet but in the night, and very ſecretly) and then went through all the adjacent places, being often obliged to make his eſcape into the woods, where he ſpent whole nights. In ſhort, the lord did ſo effectually employ him in his work, that in a little time a great part of the people forſook the maſs in the neighbouring country.’

(1) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib. ii, ad ann.* 1559, *pag.* 199.

(2) He means a miniſter, called Michael Mulot, who was above ſixty years old.

[*B*] *Catherine de Medicis was like to become his proſelyte.*] I ſhall quote an author (3), who read a manuſcript life of Soubiſe, wherein, doubtleſs, he found many particulars. ‘The admiral, *ſays he*, was only miſtaken in believing that Catherine de Medicis was a Calviniſt in her heart; but any body elſe would have been deceived in it Soubiſe acquainted him with the long conferences he daily had with that princeſs about Calviniſm. He aſſured him that ſhe was as well inſtructed in it as the Queen of Navarre. He ſuppoſed at leaſt, that ſhe was no leſs inclined to it . . . The Ducheſs of Montpenſier was always preſent at thoſe converſations, and ſeemed to be ſo well perſuaded of Soubiſe's diſcourſes, that ſhe oppoſed, as much as ſhe could, the deſign of her huſband, who intended to put into a nunnery their three laſt daughters. . . . . And, indeed, the ducheſs being at the point of death, when diſſimulation can be of no uſe, ſent for John Malot, a miniſter of Paris, and deſired to receive the ſacrament in the Calviniſtical way, which was denied her.’ Varillas informs us in another place (4), that *Soubiſe, who left the queen at laſt, being weary of her delays, affirmed, that tho' ſhe wanted courage to declare herſelf a Calviniſt, ſhe would not be ſorry to be forced to it.* He was not much miſtaken in thinking ſo, witneſs what ſhe ſaid (5), when ſhe heard the falſe news that the Proteſtants had won the battle of Dreux, *Well, we muſt then pray to GOD in French*; to which I add, the great fondneſs ſhe ſhewed *to the friends of the new opinions.* She would have quickly reſolved to abjure Popery, if it had been worſted, and to procure to Soubiſe the glory of a great converter. Varillas owns (6), that ſhe *ſided with the Catholic party more out of neceſſity than out of choice.*

(3) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, *Tom. i, pag.* 60.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 139.

(5) Mezerai, Abrége Chronol. *Tom. v, pag. m.* 72, *ad. ann.* 1562.

(6) Varillas, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 332.

[*C*] *It is the opinion of the moſt equitable writers of the Church of Rome.*] Mr Le Laboureur made no ſcruple to publiſh theſe remarkable words. ‘The Admiral had been gentleman of the kings chamber (*d*), and was made knight of the order the ſeventh of December 1561 (*e*). He had commanded the army of Henry II, in Tuſcany [*D*]; and to uſe Le Laboureur's words (*f*), he was a man of great conduct and experience. He died in 1566 (*g*), being about fifty-four years of age (*h*). He had married Antoinette Bouchard, eldeſt daughter of the houſe of Aubeterre. She was a lady very zealous for her religion [*E*]. They left but one daughter; viz. Cartherine de Parthenai, whom I have mentioned in it's proper place. The firſt huſband ſhe had, viz. the Baron du Pont in Bretagne, took the name of SOUBISE: it is he who makes a glorious figure in the moſt remarkable actions of the ſecond and third civil wars. He was taken priſoner at the battle of Jarnac in 1569; but he dextrouſly made his eſcape (*i*). La Nouë being wounded at the ſiege of Fontenai-la-Comte the year following (*k*), Soubiſe commanded in chief, and made himſelf chief maſter of the place. In the ſame year he received two wounds at the ſiege of Saintes (*l*). He was killed during the Paris maſſacre [*F*], after he had defended himſelf like a lion. The ladies (*m*) were curious to ſee what ground there was for the action (*n*) that was brought againſt him. I ſpeak of it in another place (*o*).

(*d*) Beza, Hiſt. Eccl. *book iii*, *pag*. 257.

(*e*) Le Laboureur, Addit. à Caſteln. *Tom. i*, *pag*. 378.

(*f*) Le Labour. ibid. *pag*. 804.

(*g*) Id. Ibid. *pag*. 378.

(*h*) Varillas, Charles IX, *Tom. i*, *pag*. 275.

(*i*) D'Aubigné, *Tom, i*, *p*. 396.

(*k*) Vraye Hiſt. des Troubles, *lib. xiii*.

(*l*) D'Aubigne, *Tom. i*, *pag*. 475.

(*m*) Id. ibid. *pag*. 546.

(*n*) It was a proceſs about impotency.

(*o*) In the article QUELLENEC, and in the remark [*C*] of the article PARTHENAI.

'miral de Chatillon, the Count de la Rouchefoucaut, 'and the Sieurs de Soubiſe and Feuquieres had no hand 'in Poltrot's conſpiracy . . . One cannot belive ſuch 'a thing of men of their quality; and it is ſo ill 'proved by the interrogatories of the murderer, that 'it is plain, his only deſign in accuſing them was to 'make the world believe, that ſome leaders of a 'faction that was actually in arms, had a hand in 'that plot (7).'

[*D*] *The army of Henry II in Tuſcany.*] If we believe Brantome, he was brought into trouble when he had that employment. That Hiſtorian ſays (8), that as to the affair of Poltrot, *Mr de Soubiſe was by many accuſed of ingratitude; for being charged by the Svieneſe with ſeveral things he had done in Tuſcany, when he was employed there in King Henry's reign, the Duke of Guiſe interceded for him.* I cannot tell why Varillas amplifies and paraphraſes thoſe words in the following manner (9). *After the war of Siena, in which it was ſaid that Soubiſe had been guilty of a miſdemeanour, both as to the war, and the diſtribution of money, ſome accuſations were brought againſt him by his enemies, tending to deprive him of his honour and life; but the Duke of Guiſe openly protected him.*

[*E*] *A lady very zealous for her religion.*] A report being ſpread that the Catholics deſigned to take her, to carry her to the gates of Lyons, and to threaten to ſtab her and her daughter in the ſight of her huſband, if he refuſed to ſurrender that place; Soubiſe ſent to her Poltrot, who came back with ſome letters of that lady, wherein ſhe *intreated him to ſuffer them both to be killed, and to remain faithful to his party* (10). She was a worthy wife of a man, who *expreſſed an unſurmountable averſion for all ſeparate treaties, and proteſted he would never ſign none but ſuch as ſhould be already ſigned with the Prince of Conde's hand* (11). She was likewiſe a worthy ſiſter of the viſcount d'Aubeterre, who forſook all for the Proteſtant religion, and ſubmitted to a very hard life. Brantome ſpeaks of him in the following manner (12): 'He was a refugee at 'Geneva, and a Button-maker by trade; for there 'was a law in that town, that every body ſhould 'have a trade and live by it, tho' he were a gentleman or a lord. The ſaid Aubeterre, tho' a man of 'a noble family, was a Button-maker: I ſaw him 'once, as I went through Geneva, very poor and 'miſerable. Afterwards he was taken, during the 'conſpiracy of Amboiſe, and condemned like the reſt; 'but the duke of Guiſe, at the requeſt of the Mare'chal de St André, procured him his pardon, and 'ſaved his life.' Some have ſaid (13) that by the recommendation of the lady de Soubiſe, counſellor Fumée was ſet at liberty, when he run the ſame danger as counſellor du Bourg; but others (14) aſcribe it to the expedients ſuggeſted by Soubiſe to the Queen-mother, who *had been kind to him long before. Catharina*, they are Thuanus's words (15), *in gratiam Joannis Parthenæi Soubiſæ reguli ſibi percari, & Fumeo amiciſſimi ſua commendatione apud judices illius cauſam non parum ſublevaſſe creditur.* It is very likely d'Aubigné miſtook the wife for the huſband.

[*F*] *Was killed during the Paris maſſacre.*] Varillas ſays, that after Poltrot's attempt, *Soubiſe went but once to court, which he left before he had been taken notice of, being afraid that the Guiſes were not perſuaded of the truth of what was publiſhed, to invalidate the depoſition of an aſſaſſin, who had been his domeſtic.* If this be true, he would not have gone to the King of Navarre's wedding, or to the Pariſian Veſpers, if he had been living; and it would be a new proof that Soubiſe mentioned by d'Aubigné, was the Baron du Pont (16).

(7) Le Laboureur, Addit. à Caſteln. *Tom. ii*, *pag*. 225.

(8) Mémoir. *Tom. iii*, *in the life of the Duke of Guiſe*.

(9) Varill. Charl. IX, *Tom. i*, *pag*. 327.

(10) *The manuſcript life of Soubiſe, quoted by* Varillas, Charles IX, *Tom. i*, *pag*. 331.

(11) Varillas, Charles IX, *pag*. 277, upon occaſion of the truce which des Adrets concluded for the Proteſtants of Dauphiné, and to which he endeavoured to have Soubiſe's conſent.

(12) Memoirs, ubi ſupra.

(13) D'Aubigné, *Tom. i*, *p*. 123.

(14) La Planche, Hiſt. de Franç. II, *pag*. 147. Beza, Hiſt. Eccl. *lib. iii*, *pag*. 257.

(15) Thuanus, *lib. xxiii*, *pag. m*. 467.

(16) This is undeniable.

SOUBISE (BENJAMIN DE ROHAN, DUKE OF [*A*]) grand-ſon of the foregoing, and the ſon of Renatus de Rohan II of that name, and of Catherine de Parthenai vigorouſly ſeconded the enterpriſes of the Duke of Rohan his brother, both to relieve Rochelle, and to ſupport the Proteſtant party in France. He had learned the art of war in Holland, under Prince Maurice, and he was one of the French gentlemen who threw themſelves into Bergue (*a*), when the Spaniards beſieged that place in the year 1606. He ſuſtained the ſiege of St Jean d'Angely in 1621, againſt an army commanded by Lewis XIII in perſon; and when he ſurrendred the place, obtained an amneſty for what was paſſed, upon promiſe of obedience for the time to come [*B*]. Nevetheleſs he made himſelf maſter of Royan towards the latter end of the ſame year. In the month of February

(*a*) Grotius, Ann. *lib. xv*.

[*A*] *Duke of Soubiſe.*] I give him that title in imitation of the author who publiſhed the life of theDuke of Rohan in 1666. That writer only follows the common road. Nevertheleſs, it muſt be acknowledged, that the lordſhip of Soubiſe was never erected into a duchy, and that the Geographer du Val, who affirms it (1), does it without reaſon. It is an abuſe that ſtrangely prevails in the noble families of France, to annex ſometimes one title, and ſometimes another to an eſtate, without expecting letters of erection. Do not we ſee that the ſons of dukes bear, under the title of marquiſate, the name of the eſtates of which their fathers ſtyle themſelves dukes? Nay, there are ſome eſtates that belong no longer to a family, and yet the perſons belonging to that family take the name of thoſe eſtates; one calls himſelf *Marquis*, another *Count*, another *Viſcount* or *Baron*, &c. of the ſame eſtate. Mr le Laboureur exclaims very juſtly againſt it (2).

[*B*] *Upon promiſe of obedience for the time to come.*] The author who anſwered the Duke of Soubiſe's manifeſto in 1625, pretends (3), that the duke aſked the king's pardon when he came out of St Jean d'Angeli, and that he *ſwore to be for ever his moſt faithful ſubject and ſervant; to bear arms no longer againſt his ſervice, upon any pretence whatſoever; and to adhere no more to the aſſociations and aſſemblies that ſhould be made without his majeſty's authority.* He pretends alſo that the *Proteſtant Hiſtorians took care not to inſert in their Hiſtories* the

(1) In his book, intituled, *la France*, in the chapter of Xaintonge.

(2) Addit. à Caſteln. *Tom. ii*, *pag*. 793.

(3) Mercure Franç. *Tom. xi*, *pag*. 262.

February 1622, he ſeized upon Olonne, and was ſo fully maſter of the country in the lower Poitou, that his parties went and made ſome priſoners within five leagues from Nantes. This good fortune was of ſhort continuance, for he was ſo vigorouſly attacked in the iſle of Rié [*C*], ſoon after he had ſubdued it, that all his forces were there ſcattered. He retired to Rochelle, where the inhabitants expreſſed ſome contempt and diſſatisfaction againſt him; which moved him to go the ſooner into England to aſk for ſuccours. The court of France being informed of it, he was declared guilty of high-treaſon the fifteenth of July 1622. He found means to fit out ſome ſhips, notwithſtanding the refuſal of his Britannic Majeſty; but they were caſt away at Plymouth. In the beginning of the year 1625 (*b*), he ſeized on the iſle of Ré, and made an attempt upon Blavet or Port-Louïs in Bretagne, in which he had but an imperfect ſucceſs; for it was commonly his fate not to be very fortunate [*D*] in the vaſt projects he formed. He took the port and ſix men of war he found in it; the landing forces took the town; but meeting with ſome reſiſtance in the fort, he re-embarked his troops, and went away, not without leaving behind him ſome ſhips that run a-ground [*E*]. One of thoſe he took, called the Virgin Mary, carried eighty guns, and coſt above two hundred thouſand crowns. He had the mortification of being diſowned by the Proteſtants, though it was not doubted that he had concerted every thing with the Duke of Rohan his brother, in the conferences he had with him at Caſtres, during the autumn of the year 1624. He publiſhed a manifeſto, which was aſcribed to La Milletiere, who ſtyled himſelf *intendant of the Church's Admiralty:* and while he waited a proper time to make a deſcent near Bourdeaux, he made himſelf formidable by taking ſeveral merchant-ſhips, and kept all the coaſt in awe from the mouth of the Garonne to the mouth of the Loire. He entered the Garonne the eleventh of June 1625 with a fleet of ſeventy-four ſail, and making a deſcent into the Medoc, poſſeſſed himſelf of Caſtillon. After all, this undertaking ſignified but little; he was quickly obliged to return into the iſle of Ré, from whence advancing ſome days after towards the fleet of the enemy's, he burnt the Dutch Admiral [*F*], which made the court haſten the preparations that were making to clear that coaſt. The Duke of Montmorency, Admiral of France, ſupported by the Dutch ſhips, beat Soubiſe's fleet. He was driven from the iſle of Ré, and then from that of Oleron, and forced to retire into England (*c*). He was there very inſtrumental to procure to the Rochellers the ſuccours that were ſent to them; and when that town was taken, notwithſtanding that aſſiſtance, he did not care to enjoy the benefit of the amneſty in France, but rather choſe to ſtay in England, where he died without iſſue, and from whence

(*b*) This event is placed in the year 1624, in the *Miniſtere du Card. de Richelieu.*

(*c*) Taken from ſeveral volumes of the *Mercure François.*

the oath taken by M. de Soubiſe, and by thoſe that came out of St Jean d'Angeli with him, but that it is to be found in the regiſtry of the Provoſtſhip of the Hôtel, and in the memoirs of the Sieur de Modene, great Provoſt of France, printed at Toulouſe in the year 1621.

[*C*] *In the iſle of Rié.*] Mr de Puyſegur has confounded that defeat with the loſs which the Duke of Soubiſe ſuſtained in the iſle of Ré in the year 1625. *After the ſiege of Montpellier,* ſays he (4), *there was no war againſt the Proteſtants for the ſpace of four years. The king cauſed a fort to be built near Rochelle . . . . . . and then he went into the iſle of Ré with his army commanded by the Prince of Condé. The Duke of Soubiſe, who had four thouſand men in that iſland, was beaten.* Thus you ſee how the reſemblance of names occaſions Anachroniſms. The victory of the iſle of Rié, wherein Lewis XIII was in perſon, was obtained before the ſiege of Montpellier; but neither he nor the Prince of Condé were preſent at that of Ré, which happened after that ſiege.

(4) Memoires, *pag.* 37, *Dutch Edit.*

[*D*] *It was his fate not to be very fortunate.*] If this was the only thing charged upon him in the relations of the Roman Catholic writers, they could not be ſuſpected of being too paſſionate; but they go ſo far as to accuſe him of want of courage. It is too great an inſult. They pretend that a great lord told the king, *Sir, M. de Soubiſe having ſhunned your preſence at Rié, and now that of your admiral in the iſle of Ré, there is reaſon to believe that if he goes on, he will be, one day, the oldeſt captain in your kingdom* (5). It is ſaid in the ſame relations (6), that he did not engage in the fight of the iſle of Ré, and that as ſoon as he ſaw the ill ſucceſs of it, he haſtily made his eſcape in a ſhallop, without his hat and his ſword. Nay, we are told, that his captain of the guards having ſeen that ſword, *ſaid it had certainly dropt from his belt, becauſe he was ſure he had not drawn it.* The ſatires upon the defeat in the iſle of Ré are ſtill more injurious (7). He has been reproached with another thing very different from that, *viz.* That at his return from England, *he made a gentleman belonging to him ſwear, that if he ſaw his ſhip ready to be taken, and if they could not make their eſcape, he would ſet the powder on fire to burn them all, chuſing to die in ſuch a manner, rather than make their enemies triumph by their being made priſoners* (8). But that the reader may have a better reaſon to miſtruſt the Hiſtories publiſhed by the Catholic party, I ſhall mention a ſlander that looks like one of thoſe calumnies, that are ſpread among the people to keep up their zeal by ſtirring their paſſions. It was given out (9), that when the inhabitants of Olonne deſired to capitulate, Mr de Soubiſe anſwered *them haughtily and impudently, that he would have them chuſe the moſt handſome maids they had, to be beſtowed on his favourites, after he had ſatiated himſelf, or give him a hundred thouſand crowns*; that both conditions being rejected, he promiſed to exempt them from being plundered for twenty thouſand crowns, eighty pieces of canon, and three ſhips, and that he plundered them, tho' they had granted him all his demands.

(5) Merc. Franc. *Tom. xi, pag.* 891.

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 882. *See alſo the* Miniſtere du Cardinal de Richelieu, *at the year* 1625, *pag.* 179, *Dutch Edit.*

(7) *See the* Mercure Franç. *Tom. viii, pag.* 559.

(8) Mercure Franç. *Tom. xi, pag.* 281.

(9) Claudius Malingre Hiſt. de la Rebellion, *Tom. ii, pag.* 225.

[*E*] *Not without leaving behind him ſome ſhips that run a-ground.*] To ſhew the partiality of thoſe relations, I ſhall ſet down here what a Catholic author (10) tells us about that attempt upon Blavet. He ſays that the Duke of Soubiſe *with only three hundred ſoldiers and a hundred ſeamen, ſo vigorouſly attacked the large ſhip called the Virgin, that, after ſome reſiſtance, he boarded her ſword in hand, took her, and then all the reſt. . . . . .* And that the Port having been ſhut up with men, *and with an iron chain and a large cable,* he was confined in it three weeks; *but the wind turning about, he made uſe of it, and cauſed the chain and the cable to be cut with hatchets, notwithſtanding the fire that was made upon him, and went out with the king's ſhips, and poſſeſſed himſelf of the iſle of Oleron.* How come theſe paſſages that are glorious to him, to be omitted in the *Mercure François?*

(10) The author of the Hiſtory of the Duke of Rohan, printed at Paris 1666. I have ſaid in another place that this Hiſtory is aſcribed to M. Fauvelet du-Toc.

[*F*] *He burnt the Dutch Admiral.*] I have ſeen no author yet, that makes a ſolid anſwer to thoſe, who ſay that the Duke of Soubiſe broke his word to the Dutch admiral. We are told (11) they had agreed to undertake nothing one againſt another, during the negotiations for a peace that were carrying on at the court; but that Soubiſe taking advantage of the promiſe the Admiral had made him, came up with him in half an hour's time by the help of the wind and tide, took

(11) Miniſt. du Card. de Richelieu, *p. m.* 177.

whence he endeavoured to prejudice the court of France as much as he could [G]. The name of Soubise continues ſtill in the houſe of Rohan, in the perſon of Francis de Rohan, ſon of Hercules de Rohan Duke of Mombazon, which Francis de Rohan ſtyles himſelf Prince of Soubise. He married the ſixteenth of April 1663 Anne de Rohan, daugther of Henry Chabot and of Margaret de Rohan, heireſs of the Duke of Rohan. He is captain of the Gendarmes, and has ſignalized himſelf on ſeveral occaſions, for inſtance, at the battle of Seneſ, where he had his leg broke. The Princeſs of Soubiſe, his conſort, was lady of honour to the late Queen of France, and has been accounted one of the greateſt beauties of the court (*d*). She has been very much praiſed by the authors of that time, and no leſs admired for her virtue and wiſdom than for her beauty. The news writers in Holland gave out that the Prince of Soubiſe was one of thoſe, who laid down their commiſſions of lieutenants-general, becauſe they were not comprehended in the promotion of the Mareſchals of France, that was made in March 1693.

The Abbot de Soubise, his ſon, diſtinguiſhed himſelf during the courſe of his ſtudies. He was made coadjutor of the biſhopric of Straſburg ſome months ago (*e*). His elogy may be ſeen in the epſtile dedicatory of the poſthumous works of the Chevalier de Meré.

(*d*) See *Cotin's Oeuvres Galantes.* Mr Menage made ſome Greek verſes upon that lady's being adviſed to bath herſelf in the ſea, after ſhe had been bitten by a dog. They are very fine verſes, and may be ſeen at pag. 178, of his Poems, *Edit. Amſtel.* 1687.

(*e*) I write this in May 1701. The Prince of of Rohan, elder brother of this coadjutor, was made Field-Marſhal, in 1702; and married the heireſs of Ventadour, (*Mercure Galant*, January 1702, pag. 421, 422) widow of the Prince de Turenne killed at the battle of Steinkerk. *Ibid.* July 1701, pag. 345.

took his ſhip, when he expected no ſuch thing, and burnt it by means of two pinaces full of fire-works. It is further ſaid in the *Mercure François* (12) that hoſtages had been given on both ſides. It is likely the aggreſſor was not without an anſwer, when he was charged with unfaithfulneſs in that reſpect. The Catholic writer of the Duke of Rohan's life makes no mention of that reproach: he ſays that Soubiſe *being informed that Manty, and Hautin, Admiral of Zealand, came upon him with forty ſhips, he went to meet them, ſunk five of their ſhips, and killed above fifteen hundred men.* I have juſt now read what the Proteſtant author, who took the fictitious name of *Theophile Miſathée*, publiſhed in Soubiſe's vindication (13). It is ſomething, but I could deſire a better diſcuſſion, and a more exact verification.

[G] *To prejudice the court of France as much as he could.*] For it appears by a declaration of Lewis XIII, dated the eighth of June 1641 (14). That *it was a year ſince ſome of thoſe who had been ſent by the Sieurs de Soubiſe and la Valette, to corrupt the fidelity of ſeveral Frenchmen, fell into* his majeſty's hands, and had confeſſed, *that the ſaid Soubiſe and la Valette . . . . were treating with the king of Spain to make a deſcent into Bretagne and Aulnis, or into the river of Bourdeaux.*

(12) Tom. xi, pag. 874.

(13) Apologie pour les Egliſes Réformées de France, *printed in* 1625, *chap.* x.

(14) *See* Montreſor's Memoirs, *pag.* 366.

SOUCHES (Lewis Rattuit, Count de) ſon of a gentleman of Rochelle [*A*] called John Rattuit Sieur de Barres, left France after the war of the Proteſtants, and went through Holland and Germany in his way to Sweden. He was no ſooner arrived there but he had a proſpect of being raiſed by the good offices of Count de la Gardie, who quickly procured him a regiment of Dragoons, and then a regiment of Foot. After he had ſerved ſome years, he had a quarrel with his General (*a*), laid down his commiſſion, and fought him; and intending to return into France by the way of Auſtria and Italy, he ſtaid ſome days at Vienna; and becauſe the Arch-Duke William, brother

(*a*) *Called* Stallhans.

[*A*] *He was ſon of a gentleman of Rochelle.*] The author of the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary was ſadly deceived by what he had heard in common diſcourſe; when he affirmed that Count de Souches was *the ſon of a Grocer of Rochelle.* There is not any occaſion, wherein a hear-ſay is more to be miſtruſted, than when it concerns the birth of a perſon raiſed to great poſts, whoſe anceſtors are not mentioned in Hiſtory. This ſilence proves only that they did not appear at court, or had no conſiderable employments in their provinces; but it is no proof that they were not gentlemen. And yet through I know not what baſe or malicious inclination to tell lies, people take delight in vilifying, as much as they can, the birth of a favourite, a miniſter of ſtate, or a general of an army, who is the firſt of his family, that was raiſed to great preferments (1). Some ſay, his father was a Peaſant, a Fiſherman, or a Servant; others will have it, that he was the ſon of a Shoemaker, a Pedlar, or at moſt, of a Scrivener, or an Attorney's Clerk. They are ſometimes in the right, and very often miſtaken; and therefore prudence requires one ſhould miſtruſt thoſe common reports; for when the thing is narrowly examined, it commonly appears that this pretended ſon of a Pedlar, or Fiſherman, is of a very noble family, but little known out of its diſtrict. However it be, here are the proofs of Count de Souches's nobility, as they have been communicated to me (2).

The ſixth of Auguſt 1686, before Gabriel Beraudin Eſq; lord of Grandjai, counſellor to the king, and his lieutenant-general in the Senechauſſée, and preſidial court of the city and government of Rochelle; at the requeſt of Meſſire Amathée Huet, Knt. lord of Rivau, captain of the Marines, appeared fourteen of the moſt eminent perſons of the country d'Aunix, whoſe names and offices are ſpecified in the act whereof I have a copy, collated with the original at Vienna in Auſtria the 18th of September 1692, by Henry Caſtellani d'Aviſter, ſworn apoſtolical protonotary. The lieutenant-general in the Senechauſſée of Rochelle abovenamed declares, that thoſe fourteen perſons *all living and ſettled in Aunix have certified to all thoſe, whom it may concern, that Meſſire Lewis Ratuit Count de Souches, was born a gentleman, being the ſon of John Ratuit, Eſq; Sieur de Barres, and of the Lady Margaret de Bourdigale, and that they have good and certain knowledge, that the ſaid late John Ratuit, father of the ſaid late Lord Count de Souches, was deſcended from a noble family, and one of the moſt conſiderable in the city of Rochelle, where he and his predeceſſors made their abode, and kept their rank among other gentlemen, ſuitable to their noble extraction. In witneſs whereof they have ſigned this preſent declaration, and put to it the ſeal of their arms; which declaration we have received, and given a copy of it to the ſaid lord at his requeſt, for his uſe and ſervice, which we have alſo ſigned, and for a greater approbation we have cauſed his majeſty's ſeal to to be put to it in this preſidial chancery of the city of Rochelle.* I need not name all thoſe, who ſigned that act; it being ſufficient to ſay that Mr Millet, marſhal de camp, governor of the principality of Chateau-Renaud, and lieutenant-general in the government of Aunix; Mr Arnou, intendant of the province; Mr Gabaret, firſt Commodore; Mr de Chaſtellaillon, commander for the King at Rochelle, were ſome of thoſe who certified it.

Here follows another atteſtation: I have a copy of it collated with the original at Vienna in Auſtria the 18th of September 1692, by the ſame Henry Caſtellani d'Aviſter above-mentioned. 'We whoſe names 'are under-written, atteſt and certify that we certainly know, that Mr Lewis Ratuit de Souches is of a 'noble extraction both by the father's and mother's 'ſide, and of one of the moſt ancient families of this 'country, and that they have enjoyed the honours, 'privileges and exemptions granted by our kings to

(1) See the remark [*A*] in the article TOUCHET, and the end of the remark [*A*] of the firſt article SFORZA.

(2) They have been ſent from Vienna to the Bookſeller by Mr * *. See the marginal note (*b*).

brother of the Emperor Ferdinand III propoſed to him to ſerve in the Emperor's armies, he agreed to it, and accepted a regiment of Dragoons, that was vacant and profered him. He made a great fortune in the ſervice of his Imperial Majeſty; for he was ſucceſſively raiſed to the dignities of Gentleman of his Chamber, Counſellor of War and State, Field-Marſhal, and Commander-General of the frontiers of Sclavonia. He died in Moravia in the year 1682, being ſeventy-four years of age, and left children as we ſhall ſee below [*B*]. Theſe are the contents of a memoir communicated to me, which comes from very good hands (*b*). I ſhall add to it a thing, which very much heightens the glory of Count de Souches, viz. that he was the principal cauſe of the long reſiſtance of the town of Brin againſt the Swedes, who were forced to raiſe the ſiege upon that account. This proved of great ſervice to the Emperor [*C*]. I ſhall take notice of ſome miſtakes in Moreri's Dictionary [*D*], and make ſome obſervations on what concerns the Count

'the nobles and gentlemen of this kingdom, and that 'they always kept their rank among other gentle-'men. In witneſs whereof we have ſigned the pre-'ſent atteſtation for his uſe and ſervice. Done at 'Rochelle the 12th of March 1687.' This atteſtation was ſigned by eighteen perſons: the firſt is the Biſhop of Rochelle (3); the ſecond Mr de Chaſtellaillon, Commander for the King in Aunix and at Rochelle; the third Mr Beraudin lieutenant-general of Rochelle. Amongſt the others are Mr Villette Commodore, the Chevalier de Blenac, the Chevalier d'Arbouville, Captain of a Ship of War; Mr d'Oſmont Knight of Malta, *&c.* I add that I have ſeen the copy of a letter written by the Bailif of la Vieuville from Paris the 29th of March 1699, to Count de la Tour, ſon-in-law to Count de Souches. He writes to him, *that he has been very well pleaſed to find an opportunity to write to Malta what he had heard, being at Rochelle, of the family of Count de Souches, whoſe anceſtors*, ſays he, *without much raiſing themſelves in the war, have always enjoyed the privileges of nobility, and never done any thing derogatory to it.*

Note, that Mr Menage obſerves that the name Souches is the name of a lordſhip belonging to the Count I ſpeak of. He ſays the antient name was Des-Ouſches. I ſhall ſet down his words, which I take from a chapter, wherein he proves by ſeveral examples, that proper names are not always pronounced according to the antient and true Orthography. 'Likewiſe 'they always ſay de Souches inſtead of Des-Ouſches, 'ſpeaking of the governor of Moravia, who com-'mands now the Emperor's troops in Flanders. Sou-'ches is the name of that General's lordſhip, for his 'name is Rattuit. Rattuit is a family of the city of 'Rochelle, where that lord was born; and Ouſche is 'an old French word, which ſignifies a garden incloſ-'ed with a hedge, and full of trees, under which 'they ſow pulſe, or hemp. And that French word 'is derived from the Latin *ulca*, which is to be found 'in *Gregorius Turonenſis*, much in the ſame ſenſe (4).'

[*B*] *He left children as we ſhall ſee below.*] He was married twice, firſt to Anne Elizabeth Counteſs of Hoffkirk, and then to Anne Salome Counteſs of Aſpermont and Reckheim (5). He had two ſons and one daughter by his firſt wife. JOHN LEWIS, his eldeſt ſon, is ſtill living, and is married to Eve Eleonora de Notthafft and Werenberg, Counteſs of the Empire, by whom he has had three daughters, *viz.* 1, LOUISA, lady of honour at the Empreſs's court, and now the wife of Count de Horn. 2, CLAUDIA, lady of honour at the Empreſs's court in her ſiſter's room. 3, THERESA, a Carmelite Nun in Stiria. The ſecond ſon of Count de Souches was called CHARLES. He was General of the Emperor's Infantry, and died of a wound he received at the battle of Salankemen in Hungary in the year 1691. He had loſt his wife Marianne Counteſs de Bucham, by whom he left two ſons, LEWIS and CHARLES-JOSEPH. The latter has been admitted Knight of Malta in the priory of Bohemia. The daughter of Count de Souches is married to Count Charles de la Tour, and has ſeveral children (6).

[*C*] *He was the principal cauſe of the long reſiſtance of the town of Brin .... againſt the Swedes .... which proved a great ſervice to the Emperor.*] Torſtenſon having beaten the Imperialiſts in February 1645, made himſelf maſter of ſeveral places in Moravia, and was ſo dreaded, that upon the news of his march the enemies raiſed the ſiege of Olmutz; and then he beſieged Brin, the only ſtrong place that was ſtill for the Emperor in that province (7). The beſieged made ſuch a vigorous defence, that his Imperial Majeſty had time to ſettle his affairs which were in a very ill poſture. He made a treaty with Ragotzki, Prince of Tranſylvania, and yielded to *him ſeven lordſhips in Hungary: ninety churches were opened in his conſideration, wherein the Proteſtants were to teach their doctrine publickly, and the privileges of the Hungarians were reſtored to them. This treaty ſeemed diſadvantageous to the Catholics; but it proved more prejudicial to the Swedes: for the Emperor having removed this rub out of his way, relieved Brin, and forced Torſtenſon to raiſe the ſiege. Then Lewis Count de Souches, a French gentleman, who had been the principal cauſe of its preſervation, was made governor of it as a reward for ſo great a ſervice* (8). An Hiſtorian obſerves that Torſtenſon loſt more ſoldiers before that place, than he would have loſt in a pitched battle: he adds that in the mean time the Emperor repaired his forces. *Longa illic difficiliſque obſidio, atque ad extremum irrita fuit. Ac ſatis conſtat plus ibi militum, quam ſi juſta acie depugnatum foret, Dorſtenſohnio periiſſe. Interea Cæſari ſpacium datum reparandi vires, colligendique & conſcribendi novum exercitum, quem hoſti opponeret* (9). Never was ſervice more ſeaſonable than that, and Count de Souches did certainly deſerve to be rewarded for it. Note, that the town of Brin was alſo rewarded as it deſerved; for the Emperor gave it the firſt rank among the towns of Moravia: that rank formerly belonged to the town of Olmutz, which was deprived of it by reaſon of their weak reſiſtance againſt the Swedes. This obſervation is to be found in the voyage of Count de Brienne. *Cracovia relicta Vindobonam verſus pergimus, per Sileſiam, & Moraviam: ubi præter Olomutium & Brinnum nihil notatu dignum: illud, ſede Epiſcopali; hoc, obſidione quam adverſus Suecos tam fortiter ſuſtinuit, ut inde ob memoriam facti extiterit caput regionis, virtutis præmium; dignitate illa Olomutio ſublata, nota vecordiæ* (10).

[*D*] *I ſhall take notice of ſome miſtakes in Moreri's Dictionary* (11).] I. The firſt concerns the extraction of Count de Souches, and has been ſufficiently confuted in the remark [*A*]. II. He ſhould not have been called General of the Empire; he was only the Emperor's General. III. It is certain, from the memoir communicated to me, out of which I have compoſed the text of this article, that *his father* did not give him *to a German gentleman*, and that he entred not into the Emperor's ſervice before he had fought that gentleman. IV. An exact Hiſtorian will take care not to ſay that this Count *was defeated at the battle of Senef by the Prince of Condé*, in the year 1674. For, properly ſpeaking, that battle was neither won nor loſt by either of the parties. The Allies, as well as the French, aſcribed the victory to themſelves, and cauſed *Te Deum* to be ſung, and bonefires to be made: both did it out of policy, being fully convinced that there was no ground to boaſt of any advantage (12). The beginning of that bloody battle was advantageous to the French, and the end proved advantageous to their enemies. Many are of opinion that the Prince of Condé behaved himſelf like a great captain for ſome hours, and then like Orlando; but which Orlando, him of Boiardo or of Arioſto? *Orlando Furioſo*, Roland the furious, Roland like Hercules in Seneca, *Hercules furens*, Hercules in a fury? Was it not a kind of Enthuſiaſm, and Delirium (13), ſay they, to leave the beſt troops ſo long expoſed to the fire of the enemy well covered with hedges and hop-fields; I ſay, to leave them expoſed to a perfect ſlaughter, which they could not avoid, and to ſuſtain, as it were, with folded

---

(*b*) Mr * * ſent it from Vienna, whilſt he was there Envoy Extraordinary of the United Provinces. He ſent alſo the acts mentioned by me in the remark [*A*].

(3) Henry de Laval.

(4) Menage, Obſervations ſur la Langue Françoiſe, *Tom. i, pag.* 307, *Paris* 1675.

(5) See, above, the remark [*A*] of the article RECKHEIM.

(6) Taken from the Memoir, quoted in the margin of the text of this article, noto (*b*).

(7) See John Cluverius's Univerſal Hiſtory, in the Appendix, *p.* 759. *Edit. of* 1668.

(8) Lewis du Mai, Diſcours Hiſtorique & Politique ſur les cauſes de la Guerre de Hongrie, *pag. m.* 283.

(9) Appendix Joh. Cluveri, *pag.* 759.

(10) Lud. Hen. Lomenii Briennæ Comitis Itinerar. *pag.* 58. *Edit.* 1662.

(11) See alſo the article LEUWENTZ.

(12) We went near Mons, where *Te Deum* was ſung as it was at Paris; both parties pretended to have got the victory. For my own part I have always been of opinion that neither party had reaſon to boaſt of it. *Mémoires de Chavagnac*, pag. 388, 389, Dutch Edit. This is perhaps the beſt thing that is in thoſe Memoirs.

(13) Compare what is above, citation (37), of the ſecond article PYRRHUS.

Count de Souches in Chavagnac's memoirs [*E*]. That book was reprinted in Holland in the year 1700, after the ſtyle had been mended in ſeveral places.

As it does not plainly enough appear in a paſſage which I have quoted (*a*) whether he was governour of Brin when that town reſiſted the Swedes, I ſhall produce another which will

folded arms, a dreadful ſhower of muſket-ſhots? At laſt he was forced to retire, and he left behind him a vaſt number of dead bodies (14). They add, that the Prince of Condé was much diſpleaſed with himſelf on occaſion of that battle, and did not care to hear it mentioned: the remembrance of it made him uneaſy. This is the opinion of many people; I do not pretend to give my judgment upon ſuch things. However it be, whether he was well pleaſed with that journey or not, whether he obtained or loſt the victory, this at leaſt is no problematical thing, that Count de Souches had no hand in the misfortune of the Allies, and very much contributed to their advantages. The Dutch and Spaniſh troops ſuſtained the whole loſs, the Imperial troops commanded by him did not begin to fight till the reſt were diſordered; and after they had joined their allies the enemy loſt his advantage, and was much worſted in his turn. V. What has been added to Moreri's Dictionary in the Dutch editions (15) is not right. Theſe words have been foiſted into it: *by refuſing to expoſe his troops he occaſioned the victory obtained by the Prince of Condé.* They can only be underſtood of the battle of Senef; but the enemies of France do not uſe to own that ſhe got the victory on that day. However it be, it is not true that ſhe got it becauſe our Count refuſed to expoſe his troops; for it was by expoſing them that he put a ſtop to the progreſs of the enemy. The Dutch relations agree in this, that (16) *Count de Souches, who was gone before with the Imperialiſts, and was at ſome hours diſtance from the army, being informed of what paſſed, went back with great diligence, and came at one a-clock in the afternoon near the main body of the Allies; ſo that his Highneſs* (17) *placed the Imperialiſts and Spaniards in an advantageous poſt on the left hand, and his own troops in the right wing, and then it was that the battle was renewed with greater fury than before.* . . . . . . (18) *The Prince of Condé endeavoured firſt to make his men turn to the left, but Mr de Fariaux, a man of a known valour, and major-general of the Dutch army, was ſent thither with ſome battalions, and being ſupported by Count Chavagnac, who commanded a ſquadron of horſe near that place, he made ſuch a reſiſtance that the French were forced to retire; ſo that the ſaid Count cauſed four pieces of canon to be placed there, and by that means did very much annoy the French. The left wing, the greateſt part whereof was made up of Imperialiſts and Swiſs* (19), *gave ſo many proofs of their valour, that above one half of the Swiſs were killed upon the ſpot, according to the report of the priſoners. Count de Souches, their General, threw himſelf wherever the enemies were thickeſt, and gave proofs of an extraordinary valour, as he had done before on many other occaſions. The Prince of Lorrain did the ſame, and was ſeen ſeveral times fighting in the firſt ranks, but this was not without loſs of blood, for he was ſo much wounded in the head that he was forced to retire. Prince Pio, who was near the village of Senef with his ſquadron, being attended by the Marquis de Grana, and Count Starnberg, ſhewed a wonderful bravery, and was alſo wounded in the thigh with a muſket-ſhot. The Marquis de Grana, and the ſon of Count de Souches, fought ſo valiantly at the head of their ſquadrons, that the Swiſs could not get an inch of ground from them, ſo that they contributed much to the happy iſſue of that battle.* This account is confirmed by the Prince of Orange's letter to the deputies for the ſecret affairs of the States-General (20); for having deſcribed what paſſed before the Germans came back again, he adds (21): 'The enemies endeavoured at firſt to wheel a little to 'the left, but ſome battalions were detached to 'oppoſe them; and Mr de Chavagnac, who was 'there with a body of Imperial horſe, repulſed them 'with all imaginable vigour, and kept that poſt, 'where at the ſame time he placed four pieces of 'canon, which much annoyed the enemy. . . . . . . '(22) Among the Imperial troops Count de Souches 'has given proofs of the courage and bravery he has 'diſcovered on ſo many other occaſions. The Prince 'of Lorrain has no leſs ſignalized himſelf, but at laſt 'he was wounded in the head, and Prince Pio in 'the thigh. The vigorous reſiſtance of the Marquis 'de Grana, who was near the village with his battalion, has much contributed to the happy ſucceſs of 'the battle; as well as the bravery of the battalions 'of the regiment of Souches commanded by the ſon 'of the ſaid Count.' How then can it be ſaid that Count de Souches, by refuſing to expoſe the Imperialiſts, occaſioned the victory obtained by the French?

There are ſtill three faults in the ſupplement to Moreri's Dictionary, which ought to be corrected. VI. Count de Souches did not live fourſcore years, but only ſeventy-four. VII. His ſon did not command the armies of the empire; he has been only employed in the Emperor's troops. VIII. He was not killed at Rhinfeld in 1678, but in Hungary in the year 1691.

[*E*] *Upon what concerns Count de Souches in Chavagnac's Memoirs.*] He is there deſcribed (23) as the moſt ſilly and moſt cowardly man in the world; and after having mentioned whatever may induce one to think that he was a traytor, he nevertheleſs ſays, *I do not think he was; but he was a malicious and ignorant man, and the greateſt robber that ever lived* (24). Many reaſons convince me that theſe ſlanders ought not to be minded. 1. The author of thoſe memoirs commends himſelf eternally. He pretends to have given all the counſels that have proved ſucceſsful; if a thing does not ſucceed, it is becauſe they would not believe him; he has frequently prevented great inconveniencies; he takes upon him the boldeſt and the moſt laborious enterprizes; in a word, every thing goes well, and always ſucceeds when he is concerned in it, and every thing goes ill without him. His commending himſelf ſo much, ſhews he had a great opinion of his merit, and was willing others ſhould have the ſame. It appears from his own hiſtory that he was a haughty, ambitious, fantaſtical, and impatient man. From whence it may be inferred, that whoever was his enemy could not miſs being ſlandered by him. I obſerve in the ſecond place, that he was at variance with Count de Souches from the beginning of the campaign of 1674 (25); and that probably his rude way moved ſometimes that General to make him ſenſible of his inferiority. Thus ſubaltern officers expoſe themſelves to ſeveral mortifications, when they have not that deference for their General which they owe him. This irritated Count de Chavagnac more and more, and diſpoſed him to ſpeak ill of Count de Souches. Note, in the third place, that he loved to ſpeak ill of Generals. He gives us a moſt wretched character of Count Montecuculi (26); and that with reſpect to the moſt fortunate, moſt glorious, and brighteſt campaign that can be found in the long life of that renowned General: I mean, the campaign of 1673, in which he diſappointed all the deſigns of M. de Turenne, and deſtroyed by the taking only of one town (27), all the advantage the French had gotten in Holland in the year 1672. Can any body give credit to ſuch ſlanders? Are they not contrary to the rules of probability? And therefore muſt we not conclude that what ſuch a writer ſays of his enemies ought to be ſuſpected? I omit many ſharp and ſatirical ſtories, to be found in his memoirs againſt the chief officers of the imperial troops, which ſeem to proceed from a reſentment, that made him unwilling to do them juſtice. For every body owns that the imperial armies have been above theſe hundred years one of the beſt ſchools of war, and that there are very few that form ſo many good officers. Note, in the fourth place, that he is often miſtaken in his accounts, even when he does not deſign to ſpeak ill of thoſe with whom he was diſpleaſed. Conſult the notes inſerted in the Dutch edition, which concern what paſſed in Germany in the year 1675. The Marquis de *** who is the author of thoſe notes, and who commanded one of the beſt French regiments in that year, contradicts him in ſeveral important points: If other officers would give themſelves the trouble of criticizing him, doubtleſs they would find matter enough for it. In the fifth place, there are ſo many incredible things in what he ſays againſt Count de Souches, that this alone is ſufficient to confute him. 'Souches, who had received 'orders

(*a*) In the remark [*C*].

(14) *The battle of Senef was with reſpect to the French, as the picture mentioned by* Horace, de Arte Poet. ver. 3.
--- ut turpiter atrum
Deſinat in piſcem mulier formoſa ſuperne.
At the beginning, it wore a ſmiling face of beauty, but it ended in blackneſs and horrour.

(15) This addition is alſo to be found in Moreri's Dictionary, printed at Paris in 1699.

(16) Mercure Hollandois, *for the year* 1674, *pag.* 451.

(17) That is the Prince of Orange.

(18) Mercure, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 452, 453.

(19) It ſhould not be, *and Swiſs*, but *oppoſed to the Swiſs*, or ſomething like it; for it appears by the whole thread of the diſcourſe, that the author means the Swiſs in the French army.

(20) Ibid. *pag.* 457.

(21) Ibid. *pag.* 462, 463.

(22) Ibid. *pag.* 464.

(23) See Chavagnac's Memoirs from page 390, to page 401, Dutch edition.

(24) Ibid. *pag.* 401.

(25) Ibid. *pag.* 371.

(26) Ibid. from page 339, to page 358.

(27) Bonn in the country of Cologn. He took it jonitly with the Dutch troops, commanded by the Prince of Orange now King of England.

will put it out of doubt, and let us into the knowledge of ſome circumſtances very much to the glory of that brave man [*F*]. It hath been falſely publiſhed in one of the pamphlets that appeared in Holland in the year 1702, concerning the inſurrection in the Cevennes, that he was a native of that country.

‘orders from the Emperor not to paſs the Maeſe upon any pretence whatſoever, to act only between the Maeſe and the Moſelle, and to give four thouſand horſe, with a General, if the Allies wanted them, ordered me to ſtay in the camp, whilſt he went and dined with all the Generals in the camp of the Spaniſh troops (28). . . . . Souches decamped to go and beſiege Mont-Olympe; but becauſe the Prince of Orange demanded the four thouſand horſe which the Emperor had promiſed him, I was detached to command them; ſo that I went back and encamped in the ſuburb of Namur: I cannot tell what jealouſy he had upon my account; but he himſelf came thither with his whole army. Every body who knew that the orders were poſitive, could not imagine what he meant; but he was not long unreſolved, for he brought the army through Namur. Monterey and the Prince of Orange joined him, and aſked him what good angel had moved him to paſs the Maeſe: He anſwered that he paſſed the Moſelle and not the Maeſe. I could not forbear laughing, and telling him that I pitied him, and that the Moſelle was above fifteen leagues from thence. He told me that I was not a man of a ſufficient capacity to teach him the country, and fell into a great paſſion againſt me. Caplieres, our Commiſſary-General, and the Emperor's agent, came upon this, and aſked him what was the matter. This gentleman, ſaid he, uſes me like a child, but I will complain of it to his Imperial Majeſty. I told Caplieres what was the ſubject of his diſcontent, and Caplieres told him that I was in the right: Whereupon he grew angry again, and aſked his guides what river we had paſſed: They told him it was the Maeſe; which made him change his countenance, and cry out, I am undone (29)’. The falſity contained in thoſe words is ſo plain and obvious, that one may perceive it on firſt reading, without any examination; but whoever conſiders the circumſtances of the narrative, when, I ſay, one conſiders that this General *brought his army into the country of Liege* (30), that he went and dined in the camp of Count Monterey (31), which he could not do without paſſing the Maeſe, that he went up again towards Charleville to form the ſiege of Mont-Olympe, a place ſituated on the Maeſe (32), that he came again near Namur, another place ſtanding on the Maeſe (33), will think it impoſſible that he ſhould have been ignorant of the ſituation of that river. The moſt ſtupid ſoldiers could not be ignorant of it, after ſo many marches and countermarches of that nature; how then can one believe that a General above ſixty years old knew it not, he who had received an expreſs order to act only between the Moſelle and the Maeſe (34). Whoever can believe ſuch a thing muſt be more credulous than a child of four years of age. The abſurdity of Chavagnac's narrative will be more evident, if it be conſidered that Count de Souches had raiſed himſelf to ſo high a poſt in the Emperor's court. He was a Frenchman, and this was an obſtacle not eaſily to be removed in that court. He was a gentleman born; but his nobility not being attended with a title, and ſupported by the credit and wealth of his family, would hardly have been of greater uſe to him to become a General in the French armies, than if he had been a citizen's ſon: Much more was it inſignificant to him in Germany. He had therefore no other way to raiſe himſelf but his valour, and the art of war; and he muſt needs have excelled in it to overcome all the obſtacles which a meer French gentleman could meet with at the Emperor's court. We ſhould therefore be very ſilly to believe that a General beſieges and takes a town upon a river (35), and goes along that river for whole months, without knowing its name, nor thoſe of the fortreſſes that are waſhed by it; without knowing, I ſay, that Namur, to which he hath ſeveral times approached, is ſituated upon the Maeſe, and not upon the Moſelle. Had he behaved himſelf in that manner, when he had a particular reaſon to be well informed of the ſituation of the Maeſe, ſince he had been ordered not to ſerve beyond that river, he would have been the moſt ridiculous man in the world; but we ſhould be very near as ridiculous as he, ſhould we believe that he thought he went over the Moſelle, when his troops croſſed the Maeſe at Namur (36). We may therefore look upon this as one of thoſe romances, which to ſome never appear too extravagant, when they intend to give out a ſingular thing, or to ridicule an enemy. I omit ſaying that it is not likely the Emperor gave expreſs orders to Count de Souches not to paſs the Maeſe. Did not the Emperor deſign to do as much miſchief to the enemy as ever he could? Why then ſhould he have forbidden his General to join with the Dutch and the Spaniards, if ſuch a conjunction was neceſſary to ſtrike a greater blow? To which I add, that if Count de Souches had perceived that he had been ſurpriſed, he would have ordered his army to repaſs immediately. He would have choſe rather to mend his fault in ſuch a manner, than to expoſe himſelf to loſe his head for having acted againſt the expreſs orders of his Imperial Majeſty. How comes it that Count de Chavagnac, having ſaid that this General cried out, I am undone, forgets to tell us whether his fault was approved or excuſed? This was neceſſary in an accurate account; but the writer of thoſe memoirs did not much trouble himſelf about it. All this confirms the ſuſpicion that there are numberleſs falſhoods in this part of Count de Chavagnac's memoirs.

After all the obſervations I have made, the reader will be apt to give no credit to the ſatirical deſcription he gives of Count de Souches's conduct before Oudenarde (37). I am willing to believe according to the moſt common opinion that this General would not follow the advice of the reſt, nor take with them the neceſſary meaſures for the good ſucceſs of that enterprize; but none can believe the extravagance and cowardly ſtupidity that he is taxed with in Chavagnac's memoirs. It is plain that author was angry when he wrote that paſſage. The reader perceives that his pen was guided by the reſentment of ſome offence, and is confirmed in that opinion by conſidering the conduct of the Imperial court. The puniſhment inflicted upon Count de Souches was ſo ſlight and ſo diſproportioned to what he deſerved, were Chavagnac's memoirs true, that this very thing is ſufficient to convince us that this author has much aggravated matters. I do not think the relations of Count de Souches need give themſelves any trouble to juſtify him againſt the reflections of ſuch an enemy (38), who knew not how to obſerve any appearance of probability or equity; for it is not to be thought that he was ignorant of the reaſons on which the Count de Souches grounded his opinions and his conduct. Why did not he ſay ſomething of the matter at leaſt to confute him? equity required it of him.

[*F*] *I ſhall produce another paſſage, which will put it out of doubt, and let us into the knowledge of ſome circumſtances very much to the glory of that brave man*]. ‘The Swedes took Crembs by ſtorm, and laid ſiege to Brin. It was here their good fortune made a ſtand, gave time to the Imperialiſts to take breath, to take care of themſelves, and of the people beyond the river, and to put themſelves in a better poſture. The commander in the place was Mr de Souche a Rocheller, who, upon ſome great diſcontent, had left the Swedes, whom he had ſerved with a religious zeal, and affection, and had the poſt of a colonel, which he alſo enjoyed on the other ſide. Torſtenſon, after a ſiege of three weeks, ordered the place to be ſummoned, and gave notice, that if they refuſed to ſurrender, they ſhould have no quarter: He made anſwer, that neither would he demand, neither would he grant any . . . . Torſtenſon, after having ſeveral times ſtormed the place, mined, ſapped, and thrown a great number of grenades into it, was forced to retire. That ſiege laſted four months, coſt the Swedes four thouſand men, without reckoning the deſerters, acquired immortal honour to the governor, and the favour of his Imperial Majeſty, who being deſirous to diſtinguiſh a man of ſo rare virtue, made him a Baron, raiſed his fortune, and gave him a place in the privy-council (39).’

SOZOMENUS

(28) Mémoires de Chavagnac, *pag.* 372, 373.

(29) Ibid. *pag.* 374, 375.

(30) Ibid. *pag.* 372.

(31) Ibid. *pag.* 373.

(32) Ibid. *pag.* 374.

(33) Ibid.

(34) Ibid. *pag.* 373, 374.

(35) Dinant, which he took before his army paſſed the Maeſe at Namur. See the *Mercure Hollandois, ubi ſupra*, pag 436.

(36) To confirm all this, I add that if he had thought that he was paſſing the Moſelle, when he went thro' Namur, he muſt have believed that he had not yet followed the order of acting between the Maeſe and the Moſelle, or he muſt have thought that he was paſſing the Moſelle to go towards Philliſburg or Nancy, which are monſtrous ſuppoſitions.

(37) Chavagnac, Memoires, *pag.* 390, & *ſeq.*

(38) Perhaps they apply to him what the Janſeniſts ſaid of the Jeſuit Briſacier, above, citation (40), of the article SIXTUS IV.

(39) Parival, Abrége de l'Hiſtoire de ce Siecle de fer, *Tom.* i, *pag.* 401, *Edit. of Bruſſels,* 1658.

SOZOMENUS (JOHN) a Civilian of Venice in the XVIIth century, was originally of the iſle of Cyprus, from whence his anceſtors retired when it fell under the power of the Turks (*a*). He hath given a new Latin tranſlation of the ten books of Plato's Republic, which he has reduced to a continued diſcourſe, being originally in the form of a dialogue. This renders the work clearer and ſhorter. That tranſlation was printed at Venice in the year 1626 in 4*to*.

(*a*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his tranſlation of *Plato de Republica*.

SPANHEIM (FREDERIC) profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, was a man of great merit. He was born at Amberg in the Upper Palatinate the firſt day of January 1600 (*a*); and very carefully bred up under the eye of a father, who was not only a learned man, but alſo very much eſteemed at the Electoral Court [*A*]. After he had ſtudied in the college of Amberg till the year 1613, he was ſent the next year to the univerſity of Heidelberg, which was then in a very flouriſhing condition, where he made ſo great a progreſs both in the languages and Philoſophy, that it appeared he would one day prove a great man. He returned to his father's houſe in 1619, and ſoon after was ſent to Geneva to ſtudy Divinity. The unhappy ſtate of the Palatinate made him reſolve to ſave his father the charges of his maintenance; and therefore he went into Dauphiné in the year 1621, and was three years in the houſe of the governor of Ambrun (*b*) in the quality of preceptor. He had twice a ſet conference about matters of controverſy (*c*), which was an uſual thing at that time, and came off glorioully. He returned to Geneva, and then went to Paris, where he found a kinſman, who was miniſter of Charenton [*B*], and diſſuaded him from accepting the profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy at Lauſanne, which the magiſtrates of Berne offered him. He took a journey into England for four months in 1625, and after he had made a further ſtay at Paris, he returned to Geneva, where he diſputed for a chair of Philoſophy in 1626, and carried it. The year following he married a gentlewoman originally of Poitou [*C*]. Some time after he was admitted miniſter, and in the year 1631, he ſucceeded Benedict Turretin in his profeſſorſhip of Divinity which was vacant. He diſcharged the duties of thoſe places both as an able, and an indefatigable man; ſo that his great reputation, ſpreading every where, made ſeveral univerſities deſirous to have him, that by his means they might become more famous. That of Leyden ſucceeded beſt in their ſuit, for he accepted their offers: but the utmoſt endeavours were uſed to keep him at Geneva, and the marks of eſteem and affection he received at his departure cannot be expreſſed. He took his degree of Doctor of Divinity at Baſil, to comply with the uſe of the country he was going to; for neither at Geneva nor in the Proteſtant academies of France, the profeſſors of Divinity were admitted doctors; it had been of no uſe to them. He ſet out from Geneva in the year 1642, after he had been profeſſor of Divinity eleven years ſucceſſively. He happened to be rector, when they celebrated the jubilee or the ſecular year of the Reformation, and he made a very fine oration upon that ſubject. He arrived at Leyden the third of October 1642, where he kept up, and even increaſed, the reputation he had got; but he died in May 1649. His great labours ſhortened his days. His lectures, his academical diſputations, his ſermons (*d*), the books he wrote, and ſeveral domeſtic cares, and ſeveral viſits he made, did not hinder him from holding a great correſpondence by way of letters. Beſides, he was obliged to make viſits to the Queen of Bohemia and the Prince of Orange; he was very much eſteemed in thoſe two courts. Queen Chriſtina did him the honour to write to him, in order to let him know her great eſteem for him, and how much ſhe was pleaſed with the reading of his works. He publiſhed ſeveral

(*a*) Ut ita annos cum ſeculo computaverit, qui lucem cum incipiente anno & ſeculo primam vidit. *Heidanus, in Orat. fun. Fr. Spanhemii*. He is miſtaken in taking the year 1600, to be the firſt of the XVIIth century. It is the laſt of the XVIth. Many commit the ſame fault.

(*b*) John de Bonne, Baron de Vitrolle.

(*c*) Firſt with Father Hugo, a Jeſuit of Avignon, who preached the Lent Sermons at Ambrun, and then with a Franciſcan of Naples.

(*d*) He was miniſter of the Walloon church at Leyden.

[*A*] *He was born .... of a father, who was not only a learned man, but alſo very much eſteemed at the Electoral Court.*] His name was WIGAND SPANHEIM; he was Doctor of Divinity, and eccleſiaſtical counſellor to the Elector Palatine. He married Renata Toſſan, daughter of Daniel Toſſan, miniſter of Orleans, and then profeſſor of Divinity at Heidelberg. Daniel Toſſan had married Mary Coüet, a Pariſian, daughter of Philibert Coüet, advocate in the parliament of Paris, who had fled to Orleans for her religion with her mother and two ſiſters in the year 1562. Toſſan, in order to avoid the perſecution, retired through ſeveral by-ways to Montargis, where his wife was brought to bed of a daughter, and Renata of France, Ducheſs of Ferrara, was her god-mother. That ducheſs, daughter of Lewis XII, being extremely zealous for the Reformed Religion, received at Montargis as many refugees as ſhe could; but it is not true, as Heidanus will have it, that ſhe kept there Daniel Toſſan till the year 1575. We ſhall ſee in the article of TOSSAN in what year he retired to Montargis, and when he went away from thence. His daughter Renata (god-daughter of the Ducheſs of Ferrara) was married to Wigand Spanheim, and was the mother of our Frederic and of two daughters (1). Wigand was a very pious man, a learned Divine, and a good Philologer, as it appears from his letters to Chriſtian Becman (2). He died in the year 1620, having in his hands a letter of his ſon, which made him cry with joy. Freherus mentions (3) this particular as being taken from the funeral oration of Frederic Spanheim; but he is miſtaken, for it is not there. *Lecto affixus poſtquam literas à filio Geneva accepiſſet eas præ gaudio totas lachrymis conſperſit, & tenaciter ambabus manibus retinuit, donec in Chriſto exſpiravit A.* 1620.

[*B*] *A kinſman, who was miniſter of Charenton*]. His name was Samuel Durant: I cannot tell in what degree he was related to him, for the Latin words of my author are ambiguous. *Humaniſſimè à Samuele Durantio ---- cognato ſuo (erat enim Durantii mater ſoror aviæ parentis ejus) exceptus eſt* (4). The ambiguity lies in the parentheſis. For it is uncertain whether the word *parens* ſignifies there the father or the mother; beſides, every man having two grand-mothers, we muſt look back into many families, in order to find the grand-mother of our Spanheim, ſiſter to Durant's mother. The beſt of it is, that Durant left his whole library to our Frederic Spanheim (5).

[*C*] *He married a gentlewoman originally of Poitou.*] Heidanus (6) calls her in Latin *Carlottam à Portu*, which I take to ſignify Charlotte du Port She was the daughter of Peter du Port, Lord of Mouillepied and Boiſmaſſon, counſellor to the king, and commiſſary for proviſions in his majeſty's armies, only ſon of Joachim du Port, a gentleman of Poitou, Lord of

(1) Ex Heidano, in Orat. funebr. Frid. Spanhem. *pag.* 6, 7.

(2) De Wigando Spanhemio nihil aliud mihi compertum eſt niſi ſingularis planè & exquiſitæ pietatis hominem fuiſſe, nec Theologica ſolum ſed & Philologica eruditione inſtructiſſimum, & linguarum Latinæ imprimis & Græcæ callentiſſimum. Id quod ex literis ἀμοιβαίαις quæ in operibus Philologicis Chriſtiani Becmanni ... leguntur conſtat. *Heidanus, Orat. funebr. pag.* 7.

(3) Theatr, *pag.* 406.

(4) Heidanus, ibid. *pag.* 17.

(5) Id. ibid. *pag.* 18.

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 19.

ſeveral books [*D*]. He left ſeven children (*e*), whereof the two eldeſt are become very famous [*E*]. He was rigid in point of innovations [*F*], and in that reſpect, ſpared neither friends nor foes. He could not forbear writing againſt Amyraldus, and did not live long enough to reply to him in the manner he intended. His adverſaries boaſted of it [*G*]. A man who cannot be ſuſpected of flattery, hath beſtowed upon him praiſes which will be ſeen below [*H*].

Mouillepied. The mother of Peter du Port, called Joan du Chêne, was the only daughter of Joſeph du Chêne (Sieur de la Violette, Counſellor and phyſician to the king) and of Anne de Trie, daughter of Margaret Budé, whoſe father was the learned William Budé (Budæus) (7).

[*D*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] At the requeſt of the Envoy of Guſtavus Adolphus, at Geneva, he wrote a book intituled, *Le Soldat Suedois* (8), which ſold very well. That book was quickly followed by the *Mercure Suiſſe* (9). He publiſhed in 1639, a *Commentaire Hiſtorique de la vie & de la mort de Meſſire Chriſtofle Vicomte de Dhona*, at the widow's requeſt: I ſhall ſpeak of it hereafter. He publiſhed ſix years after, ſome memoirs upon the life and death of the moſt Serene Princeſs Louiſa Juliana, Electreſs Palatine, born Princeſs of Orange. He undertook that work, at the requeſt of the Queen of Bohemia, all theſe books are anonymous (10). *Le Throne de Grace, de Jugement, & de Gloire*, are three ſermons exceſſively long, and written in pretty old French, but they contain excellent things. The firſt was preached at Charenton. His *Dubia Evangelica*, in three parts, written at Geneva, on occaſion of the objections diſperſed among the ſtudents of Divinity, by one Antoine, who being a Chriſtian, had turned Jew, is a good book. He compoſed his *Chamierus Contractus*, for the benefit of the ſtudents of Divinity, who could not conveniently make uſe of Chamierus's vaſt *Panſtratia*. Whilſt he lived at Leyden, he wrote againſt Amyraut's hypotheſis *Exercitationes de gratia univerſali*, in three volumes, in 8vo. *Item Epiſtolam ad Cottierum de conciliatione gratiæ univerſalis*. He alſo wrote a letter *ad Buchananum de Controverſiis Anglicanis*, and *Vindiciæ de Gratia univerſali* (11). It is a reply to M. Amyraut, which he could not finiſh, and it ſavours of a poſthumous piece. The author I quote has omitted a letter, which M. Spanheim wrote to Prince Edward, when he changed his religion. Since he mentions a conſolatory letter upon the death of an only ſon (12), he might alſo have mentioned this other letter. I muſt not forget M. Spanheim's ſpeeches, which are very good, eſpecially his funeral oration of Frederic Henry, Prince of Orange. See Balzac's letter of thanks to him, after he had read that oration (13).

I have ſaid that this Profeſſor of Divinity, is the author of the *Commentaire Hiſtorique de la vie & de la mort de Meſſire Chriſtofle Vicomte de Dhona*. But I muſt add, that the word Viſcount he made uſe of, is very improper, and does not anſwer the title of Burggrave, which has been given to the illuſtrious family of DHONA for ſeveral ages. It is a nobler title than than that of Viſcount. See the *Nouveau Journal des Sçavans*, publiſhed at Berlin, by Mr Chauvin (14), in 1696: and look for the extract of the firſt and ſecond volumes of Mr Manget's (15) *Bibliotheca Practica*, dedicated to Count Alexander de Dhona, governor to the Electoral Prince of Brandenbourg, where you will find ſome things very inſtructive concerning the Burggraves. This is not a proper place to enlarge upon the great merit of that count, and the glory of the houſe of Dhona. I ſhall only refer the reader to Moreri's Dictionary, and occaſionally obſerve that a fault has crept into it; for inſtead of ſaying that Count Alexander's mother was Counteſs *de Terraſſieres Montbrun*, it ſhould be *de Feraſſieres Montbrun*. She was the only daughter of Count de Feraſſieres, Lieutenant-General in the French armies, and brother to Mr de St André Montbrun, who was General of the Venetians in Candia, and whoſe hiſtory was printed at Paris, in the year 1698 (16).

[*E*] *He left ſeven children, whereof the two eldeſt are become very famous.*] The firſt (17) has a perfect knowledge of medals, and all ſorts of literature: beſides, his embaſſies give him a glorious rank among ſtateſmen. He is a perſon of an extraordinary merit. The ſecond (18) died within theſe few days (19), being Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden. He had been a long time in that employment, and was juſtly accounted one of the moſt conſiderable men in the Reformed Church. He has written ſeveral books, which have procured him a great reputation. The Journaliſts have often made honourable mention of him. That of Paris, tho' it ſeldom ſpeak of books written by Proteſtant miniſters, yet has given large extracts of this learned man's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory: you will find them in the twenty-eighth volume of the *Journal des Sçavans*. Whoever deſires to be informed of the great learning of Mr Spanheim the eldeſt, need only read his book *de Præſtantia & uſu Numiſmatum*, which I have quoted before (20); the five letters he wrote to Mr Morel, a famous Antiquarian, and a great Medaliſt, which have been printed with the *Specimen univerſæ rei nummariæ antiquæ*, publiſhed by the ſame Mr Morel at Leipſic, in 1695; his notes upon Callimachus, and Julian's Cæſars, and ſome other tracts, the titles whereof may be ſeen in Moreri's Dictionary of the Paris edition 1699; together, with a liſt of all his employments in the courts of princes (21), till he was ſent the fourth time to the court of France after the peace of Ryſwic. He was at Paris from that time till the beginning of the year 1701, that is, till his Electoral Highneſs of Brandenbourg became King of Pruſſia. He took then his audience of leave, becauſe the change of the ceremonial was not yet regulated at the court of France. He is lately (22) gone into England by order of the new king, his maſter. I ſhall obſerve by the by, that this new epoch of the royalty of Pruſſia will ſignalize the beginning of the XVIIIth century, and that there was in it a remarkable concourſe of circumſtances; for about the ſame time that the Electreſs of Brandenbourg was crowned Queen of Pruſſia, the Electoreſs of Brunſwic, her mother, daughter to the King of Bohemia, was named to ſucceed to the crown of England. Never have two princeſſes better deſerved than theſe to fill a throne, or to renew the glory acquired by Queen Elizabeth.

[*F*] *He was rigid in point of innovation.*] It was a maxim with him, that we ought to make war even againſt our own brethren, whenever they act againſt Orthodoxy: The neglect of little evils, *ſaid he*, will ſometimes occaſion the greateſt diſorders. *Sæpe profitentem audivimus ſe licet mallet cum Eccleſiæ hoſtibus congredi, tamen & bellum illis etiam fratribus indicendum judicare, qui vel data opera, vul ex ignorantia & infirmitate per cuniculos illam ſubruerent. Quod enim initio parvum videtur, id ſæpe neglectum magna incendia dare in progreſſu. Cum cui quis ſemel patrocinium commodavit ei mordicus inhæret, & ſæpe error non detectus cum occultè ſerpat, placere incipit, & tandem pudor eſt retractare quæ ſemel defenderis* (23). A hundred fine reaſons may be alledged to maintain this common topic, and this great maxim: but, in order to perſuade, they ought to be attended with choler. With ſuch an ingredient they generally produce a conviction; but without it, they are weak, and are confuted by a hundred other fine maxims. Heidanus obſerves, that the perſon he praiſes, was a man of a fiery temper (24). That fire is a wonderful light to ſhew that the reaſons alledged for toleration, are bad ones, and that thoſe who cry out, *to arms, to arms, bella, horrida bella*, have well dived into the bottom of things. *Tros Rutuluſve fuat, nullo diſcrimine habebo* (25); no matter tho' they be friends, allies, or relations; let us fall upon them, *per calcatum perge patrem* (26); this is the cauſe of truth.

[*G*] *His adverſaries boaſted of it.*] See the paſſage quoted by Colomeſius out of a book of M. Amyaut (27).

[*H*] *A man . . . . . hath beſtowed upon him praiſes which will be ſeen below.*] Sorbiere is the perſon I ſpeak of: what he ſays of M. Spanheim deſerves to be tranſcribed; it contains ſome particulars that will be acceptable to the curious; and beſides, they belong to the deſign of this Dictionary. Barlæus, ſays he (28), *having made a* funeral oration *in verſe, upon the death of the Prince of Orange, and Dr* Spanheim *having delivered one in proſe, was very much diſpleaſed with the unequality of their reward; for, as* Salmaſius *wittily ſaid,*

(*e*) Taken from his Funeral Oration, ſpoken by Heidanus, the 21ſt of May 1649. It is a fine piece.

(7) Heidanus, Orat. funebr. Fr. Spanheim. *pag.* 19, 20.

(8) Printed in 1633.

(9) Printed in 1634.

(10) The Epiſtle Dedicatory of the *Commentaire Hiſtorique*, is ſigned F. S. that is, *Frederic Spanheim*. He made uſe of the ſame ſignature in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of *Geneva reſtituta*. The Catalogue of the Bodleian Library, places thoſe two books under the unknown name of F. S. If it be reprinted, theſe words may be added to it, *id eſt Fridericus Spanhemius*.

(11) Heidanus, in Orat. funeb. Spanhemii, *pag.* 38, *& ſeq.*

(12) He obſerves that it was tranſlated out of French into Dutch and German.

(13) It is the 19th Letter among thoſe that are at the end of the collection of his Letters to Conrart.

(14) He is profeſſor of Philoſophy at Berlin.

(15) A Phyſician of Geneva.

(16) See an Extract of it in the *Journal des Sçavans*, of the fourth of Auguſt 1698, *pag.* 551, *& ſeq. Dutch Edit.*

(17) EZECHIEL SPANHEMIUS.

(18) FRIDERICUS SPANHEMIUS.

(19) I write this the 26th of May 1701.

(20) In the text of the article ABDERA.

(21) That liſt had already appeared in the Dutch edition of Moreri's Dictionary, down to the year 1693.

(22) I write this in May 1701.

(23) Heidan. in Orat. fun. Fr. Spanhem. *p.* 32.

(24) Οξὺχολος, etiam ut ipſe fatebatur, fuit & ſubtilis choleræ nonnihil habuit, quæ inſtar flammulæ ſalpetræ momento incendebatur, at ſine fumo & nidore momento diſpergebatur. *Ibid. pag.* 33.

(25) Virgil. Æn. lib. x, ver. 108.

(26) Ita apud illum præponderabat amor veritatis ut nulla amicitiæ jura, nullæ neceſſitudines, nullus metus illum à defendenda illa avertere potuiſſent. *Heidan. in Orat. funeb. Fr. Spanhemii, pag.* 32.

(27) Colomeſ. in Gallia Orientali. *pag.* 206.

(28) Sorbiere, *Letter lxiv, pag.* 442, 445.

ſaid, it was a great overſight to give the pay of a trooper to a foot-ſoldier, and that of a foot-ſoldier to a trooper. Barlæus *received but five hundred livres, and the other five hundred crowns. All that I can tell you of the latter, is what was ſaid of him after his deceaſe,* viz. *That* Salmaſius *had killed him, and that* Morus *had been the dagger. It is a long ſtory, and, to be ſhort, I ſhall only tell you that* Salmaſius *did not love the late Mr Spanheim, from a jealouſy of merit and reputation for learning; that, in order to mortify him, he cauſed* Mr Morus *to be ſent for into Holland, whom he only knew by his name, but he was the ſcourge and the averſion of his colleague; that the doctor left no ſtone unturned to prevent his coming, and that he died when he heard that his adverſary was ſet out on his journey. However I muſt do this juſtice to that learned German, even by* Salmaſius's *confeſſion, who was not prodigal of his praiſes,* that he had a ſtrong head, and full of learning; that he was fit for buſineſs, ſteady and dexterous, zealous and laborious. *He read public lectures of Divinity four times in a week; and beſides made private ones upon different ſubjects to his ſcholars; he heard the probation ſermons of the ſtudents of Divinity; he preached in two languages, German and French; he viſited the ſick; he wrote a vaſt number of letters; he compoſed at the ſame time, two or three books upon quite different ſubjects; he aſſiſted every Wedneſday at his Highneſs's council, who ſent for him to the Hague; he was rector of the univerſity; and notwithſtanding ſo many occupations, he kept an account of all the expences of his houſe, that was full of boarders.*

SPIFAME (James Paul) Biſhop of Nevers in the XVIth century, left his biſhopric, and retired to Geneva, in order to profeſs the Reformed Religion. He went by the name of Monſieur de Paſſi (a), and at laſt he *became miniſter, to have,* as it is ſaid, *a more eaſy acceſs into the councils, and a greater ſhare in affairs* (b). The parliament of Paris iſſued out a warrant againſt him in the year 1559 (c). He was very ſerviceable to the Proteſtant cauſe in Germany, whither the Prince of Condé ſent him to juſtify his taking up arms (d). He publiſhed there the four letters which Catherine de Medicis had written to that prince, to recommend to him the welfare of the kingdom, and the intereſt of the king her ſon (e); he diſcovered many ſecrets, obtained great ſuccours *of the Princes of Germany* (f), and harangued the Emperor at the Diet of Francfort in the year 1562, with ſo much force, that it proved one of the beſt manifeſto's of the Proteſtants (g). He cauſed the *Reiſters and Lanſquenets to be recalled, and Count de Rocquendolfe, and other chiefs, who commanded them in the king's ſervice, to be put to the ban of the empire* (h). He made three ſpeeches in that country. His end was not anſwerable to ſuch a noble beginning (i); for he found himſelf involved in ſome crimes, for which he was beheaded at Geneva the twenty-third of March 1566 [*A*]. His birth, his parts, and his learning, might have raiſed him to the higheſt dignities in France, where he had quickly gone through ſeveral employments [*B*]. Nothing can be more abſurd than what Moreri ſays, that Calvin cauſed him to be put to death [*C*]. Others aſcribe his tragical end to Beza's jealouſy [*D*], but cannot prove it. I have confuted in another book

(a) Le Laboureur, Addit. à Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 29.

(b) Id. ibid. *pag.* 53.

(c) Spondan. Annal. Eccleſ. *ad ann.* 1559, *num.* 18. *See alſo* Thuanus, *lib. xxii, pag.* 453.

(d) Le Laboureur, Addit. à Caſtelnau, *Tom. i, pag.* 796.

(e) Id. ibid.

(f) Id. ibid. *Tom. ii, pag.* 29.

(g) You will find his Oration in Le Laboureur's additions, *ibid. pag.* 29.

(h) Id. ibid. *pag.* 42.

(i) Thuan. *lib. xxxiii, pag.* 675.

[*A*] . . . *In ſome crimes for which he was beheaded at Geneva the twenty-third of March,* 1566.] Mr Spon gives the following account of it (1): 'James Paul Spifame, Biſhop of Nevers, having left his biſhopric, and a yearly income of forty thouſand livres, retired to Geneva, to profeſs the doctrine of the Proteſtants. He preſented a petition to be made a citizen, which was granted him, and even was admitted into the counſels of two hundred and of ſixty. The magiſtrates, and the men of letters, had a great eſteem for him on account of his learning. Some time after he was ſent into France to ſerve there as a miniſter; but the magiſtrates of Geneva were informed that he privately endeavoured to get another biſhopric. Wherefore at his return, his conduct was more narrowly obſerved, and his former life examined. It was found out that before his marriage he had a child by the woman he married, and leſt it ſhould be accounted a baſtard, he cauſed a falſe contract of marriage to be made and antidated, and a falſe ſeal to be put to it, that his ſon might inherit his eſtate, which was pretty conſiderable. For all theſe cauſes he was impriſoned, and having confeſſed the whole matter, he was beheaded in the place du Molard, with a great repentance of his faults, which he ſhewed by a fine diſcourſe he made to the people upon the ſcaffold. Some will have it that thoſe accuſations were only a pretence to condemn him, but that he was really executed to gratify Catherine de Medicis, who had bribed the Syndics, being ſolicited to it by the Pope.' See the paſſage of Mr de Rocolles in the remark [*E*].

[*B*] *His birth, his parts, and his learning, might have raiſed him . . . . he had . . . . gone through ſeveral employments.*] 'He was of a noble family, originally come from Lucca, and ſettled at Paris in the year 1350, when Bartholomew Spifame was living, from whom are deſcended all thoſe of that name, lords of Biſſeaux, Granges, and Paſſy. His father was John Spifame, Sieur de Paſſy, ſecretary to the king, and pay-maſter-general to the army; and his mother Jaquette Ruzé: he was the youngeſt of five brothers . . . . The progreſs he made in learning procured him an office of counſellor in the parliament of Paris; afterwards he became preſident of the inqueſts, maſter of the requeſts, and counſellor of ſtate; and he ſhewed ſo great a capacity and learning in all his employments, that having devoted himſelf to the Church, there was no dignity above the great reputation he was in. From a canon of Paris, chancellor of the univerſity, and and abbot of St Paul of Sens, he became great vicar of Charles Cardinal de Lorrain, Archbiſhop of Rheims, and in that quality, he was named by Henry II, to the biſhopric of Nevers, of which he took poſſeſſion in the year 1548 (2) . . . . Being intoxicated with his learning and reputation, he followed the new opinions as ſome of the moſt learned prelates had done, and left the Romiſh Church to take a wife (3).

[*C*] *Nothing can be more abſurd than what Moreri ſays, that Calvin cauſed him to be put to death.*] See with what rhetorical flouriſhes he adorned his Dictionary. *Calvin, who was then the great Califf of Geneva, the infamous receptacle of Hereſy and Heretics, being acted by an intolerable vanity, thought that every body was to ſubmit to him, and was not ſatisfied with the civility Spiſame ſhewed him, and perhaps, having obſerved that Spiſame repented of his Apoſtacy, he falſly accuſed him of ſome crimes, eſpecially of being a meer ſpy at Geneva, and cauſed him to be beheaded to be revenged of him. This happened on the* 25*th of March* 1565 (4). That paſſionate author might be confuted ſeveral ways; but I ſhall only uſe this chronological reaſon. Calvin died the 27th of May 1564, and Spifame was beheaded the 23d of March 1566, according to Mr Spon, who, in that reſpect, is a more credible author than thoſe who place that execution on the 25th of March 1565 (5). Though we ſhould prefer this date to that of Mr Spon, and ſuppoſe it agrees with the cuſtom of beginning the year in January, it were ſtill moſt certain, that Calvin died above nine months before this late Biſhop of Nevers was executed.

[*D*] *Others aſcribe his death to Beza's jealouſy.*] Le Laboureur ſpeaks of it as confidently as if he had ſome proofs for it. *Beza,* ſays he (6), *who envied him mortally, did ſo narrowly obſerve him, when that man* (7) *was vexed to be reduced to a miſerable and private life,* that

(1) Spon, Hiſtoire de Geneve, *book iii, pag.* 263, *Utrecht* 1685. *See alſo* Mr Leti, Hiſtoria Genevrina, *Tom. iii, p.* 162.

(2) Le Laboureur, Addit. à Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 51, 52.

(3) Id. ibid. *pag.* 53.

(4) Moreri, at the word *Spifame.* This paſſage has been left out in the Dutch editions.

(5) Mr Le Laboureur, *Tom. ii, pag.* 53, *is one of them.*

(6) Le Laboureur, *ibid.*

(7) *Man* refers to Spifame. A good author would not have left ſo fallacious an equivocation.

book (*k*) Maimbourg's reflexions, and therefore I need not do it again. One of thoſe, who wrote againſt his Hiſtory of Calviniſm, wants to be rectified. He has given us ſeveral curious particulars concerning the true cauſe of that biſhop's execution [*E*]. It is not true that Spiſame wrote a book under the name of Peter Richer [*F*]. Some ſay he aſſiſted at the council of Trent, and was afterwards miniſter of Bourges and Iſſoudun (*l*). It is certain, that when the Reformed received the communion in the town-houſe of Bourges, towards the beginning of the year 1562, it was he who officiated. He went thither from Iſſoudun, with a guard of 150 troopers (*m*). The author, who informs me of this, ſays, in a letter dated from Paris the eleventh of December 1561, that Spiſame had been called by the Reformed Church of Lyons, to be their miniſter, and that four years before he had been accuſed of Lutheraniſm, for which he would have been put to death, had he not quickly fled to Geneva (*n*).

(*k*) *See the* Nouvelles Lettres de la Critique Générale du Calviniſme de Mr Maimbourg, *pag.* 460, *& ſeq.*

(*l*) Catherinot, Calviniſme de Berri, *pag.* 3.

(*m*) Huber. Languetus, Epiſtola lxvii, *lib. ii*, *pag.* 197.

(*n*) *Ibid.* Epiſt. lxiv, *ejuſd. lib.* *pag.* 184.

that he made him ſuſpected of keeping intelligence with Queen Catherine and the Catholics, and of intending to leave Geneva. He was impriſoned, tried, and beheaded the 25th of March 1565, *and was the firſt victim of the liberty he had procured to that city* (8). *Beza, who was his enemy, not contented with his execution, made the following Latin verſes againſt his memory, wherein he could not forbear reflecting upon him, contrary to the maxims of his religion, for preferring a wife to a biſhopric; and beſides, he owns, that ſhe was rather a concubine than a lawful wife.* That author quotes ten Latin verſes, which he aſcribes to Beza, upon the death of James Spiſame, with a cruel anſwer that was made to them likewiſe in Latin verſe. I queſtion whether it can be proved that the epigram of ten verſes has been juſtly aſcribed to Beza. It will not be improper to ſee what he anſwered to Claudius de Sainctes, who had reproached him with ſome things relating to James Spiſame: ‘Spiſamius mihi nunquam collega fuit, & cur ego illum odiſſem, à quo nunquam injuriam acceperam? num, ſicut in alterius nomine ineptus ille tuus monitor mihi exprobrat, quòd vererer ne meis luminibus officeret? Atqui, neque hoc ille unquam cogitavit, opinor, neque (abſit verbo invidia) cauſa ulla fuit cur id timerem. Ais tamen illi à me intentata vana crimina fuiſſe proditionis, illiciti matrimonii, & ſtupri, quum longe gravius ipſo in iſtis deliquiſſem. Quòd ſi vana illa fuerunt, quomodo ille minùs quàm ego graviter deliquerit? an quòd apud vos iſta pro nihilo ducantur? At tu hominum vaniſſime, vide quàm teipſum fallas. Num enim ego accuſator, num ſubſcriptor in iis fui quæ nunquam in illius cauſa in diſceptationem venerunt? Nam de proditione vel ſtupro nulla quòd ſciam fuit mentio. Sciunt autem omnes ex hujus civitatis more qua quiſque de cauſa damnetur. Nec de adulterio quæſitum eſt. De quo igitur dices? hoc verò tu ex me non audies, qui ne hæc quidem niſi à te coactus commemoro. Jure tamen damnatum fuiſſe ſi mihi non credis, ipſimet ſaltem credere te oportuit (9). - - - *Spiſame was never my colleague, and why ſhould I hate him who never did me any injury? Is it, what your fooliſh monitor upbraids me with in the name of another perſon, becauſe I am afraid leſt he ſhould eclipſe my glory? But he never had ſo much as any thoughts of doing it, in my opinion, nor (to ſpeak without envy) had I any ground to fear it. But you ſay that I have charged him with the vain crimes of treaſon, unlawful marriage, and fornication, when I am much more guilty of theſe crimes than Spiſame. If theſe are vain crimes, how could he be more innocent of them than I am? Are they accounted trivial with you? But, moſt vain man, ſee how you deceive yourſelf. Could I accuſe him of any thing, or could I ſubſcribe to any thing which was never conſidered in his trial? For as to treaſon or fornication, in my knowledge there was no mention made of them. And every body knows, according to the cuſtom of this city, for what crimes any man is condemned. Nor was he charged with adultery. With what then ſay you? But this you ſhall not know from me, who would not have mentioned theſe things, if you had not forced me to it. But if you will not believe me, that he was juſtly condemned, you ought to believe himſelf.*’ There are three things in this Latin paſſage. 1. That Spiſame was not a man who pretended to eclipſe Beza's glory, and that Beza had no ground to be afraid of ſuch a thing. 2. That Beza did not ſet up for an accuſer of Spiſame. 3. That Spiſame was not accuſed either of adultery, or of fornication, or of treaſon. Mezerai is therefore to blame for ſaying that *upon I know not what umbrage that was taken at him, at Geneva, he was accuſed of adultery, and beheaded for that pretended crime* (10).

[*E*] *Rocoles wants to be rectified. He has given us ſome curious particulars about the true cauſe of that biſhop's execution.*] ‘Spiſame . . . . . having retired to Geneva could not be quiet. Having formed an intrigue with the counſellors of the Queen-mother, Catherine de Medicis, to get the Catholics reſtored in the town, and to enable the biſhop to come into it with main force, in hopes of being provided with a new biſhopric, better than that of Nevers, his treacherous practices were diſcovered by Grillon, Colonel of the regiment of guards, who gave notice of it to the agent of Geneva who attended the court. The agent took care to acquaint the magiſtrates of Geneva with it: whereupon Spiſame was arreſted; and the pretence on which he was brought to his trial, was that he kept a married woman, and not, as Maimbourg brutiſhly ſays, that he had made a falſe contract, or falſe ſeals. Spiſame not being guilty of any ſuch crime; but adultery may be puniſhed with death according to the law *Julia de adulteris*. It was upon this juſt pretence that he was beheaded in the place du Molard, without mentioning his conſpiracy, for fear of diſpleaſing the court of France. And to prevent that court from concerning themſelves for him, and ſending an expreſs to ſave his life, the council made a quick diſpatch of his trial, which ended the third day after he had been arreſted (11).’ You ſee here a ſevere reflexion upon Maimbourg without a cauſe; for that Jeſuit goes upon the credit of a Proteſtant writer (12). The ſame author tells us that Spiſame was condemned under pretence of adultery, which is not true. He takes no notice of a falſity in Maimbourg. *The Prince of Condé*, ſays he (13), *employed Spiſame in other things beſides making ſermons; for he ſent him* into Germany to demand *the ſuccours, which he could not obtain*. It is certain he obtained them. Beza (14), d'Aubigné (15), Le Laboureur (16), and ſeveral others ſay ſo. And Maimbourg himſelf mentions *above three hundred Reiſters, and four thouſand Lanſquenets* (17), whom the Prince of Condé received from Germany.

[*F*] *It is not true that Spiſame wrote a book under the name of Peter Richer.*] Du Verdier Vau-Privas ſays (18), that James Spiſame, *who left his biſhopric*, wrote, *under the name of Peter Richer, a confutation of the idle fancies and lies of Nicholas Durand, called the Chevalier de Villegaignon*, in the year 1562, in 8vo. Moreri affirms the ſame thing. But I have ſhewed before (19) that Peter Richer is a real man, and not a fictitious name.

---

(8) It is not true that Spiſame procured the liberty of Geneva.

(9) Theod. Beza, Apologia altera ad F. Claudium de Xaintes, *pag. m.* 361.

(10) Mezerai, Abrége Chronol. *Tom. vi, towards the end, pag. m.* 450.

(11) Rocolles, l'Hiſtoire véritable du Calviniſme, *pag.* 444, 445.

(12) Mr Spon. See the remark [*A*].

(13) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calviniſme, *lib. iv*, *pag.* 285.

(14) Beza, Hiſt. des Egliſes, *book, vi*, *pag.* 88.

(15) D'Aubigné Hiſt. Univ. *Tom. i*, *book iii*, *ch. xii*, *pag.* 226.

(16) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Memoires de Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 42. *See the text of this article.*

(17) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calviniſme, *book iv*, *pag.* 285.

(18) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franç. *pag.* 620.

(19) In the article of this RICHER.

SPINA (Alphonsus) a Spaniſh Jew being converted to the Chriſtian religion became a Franciſcan Friar, and was rector of the academy of Salamanca, and at laſt Biſhop of Orenſe (*a*). He wrote a book intituled, *Fortalitium Fidei contra Judæos, Saracenos, alioſque Chriſtianæ Fidei inimicos* [*A*]. He tells us himſelf that he was compoſing it at Valladolid in the year 1458 (*b*).

[*A*] *He wrote a book intituled* Fortalitium Fidei, &c.] Some have been of opinion that a Dominican Friar, called William Totan, was the author of it; but they ſhould only have ſaid that he publiſhed a new edition of it, which is that of Lyons in 1511. The firſt is printed at Nuremberg in 1494, in 4to. The name of the author was not put to it, only it was ſaid in the title, that it was compoſed *per quemdam Doctorem eximium Ordinis Minorum anno* 1459 *in partibus Occidentis.* Mariana hath informed us, that it is a work of Francis Spina (1). Mr Wharton, who hath made an analyſis of it (2), cenſures thoſe who have aſcribed it to Thomas *Patriarchæ Barbarienſi.* He might have cenſured thoſe who attribute it to Bartholomew de Spina who lived in the XVIth century. Selden and Mr Hoornbeeck give it, either to that Bartholomew, or to William Totan (3). Mr Hoornbeeck has been cenſured (4) for having ſaid that this work was printed in the year 1490. He might alſo have been criticized for having ſaid that this Bartholomew de Spina was a Carmelite Friar of Cologn (5): he was a Dominican and a native of Piſa. Theophilus Raynaud affirms that this ſame Bartholomew hath ſet his name to the *Fortalitium Fidei*, in order to appropriate the work to himſelf (6); but he doe not name the edition where that is to be ſeen.

The opinion of Mr du Pin concerning the *Fortalitium Fidei*, is as follows. ‘It is a work which promiſes more in the title than is to be found in the body of the book; for it is not well done: there is nothing in it ſufficiently examined, and he often brings very weak proofs, reaſonings, and anſwers. Neverthleſs there is ſome learning in it, and it may be of ſome uſe (7).’

(*a*) A city of Gallicia.

(*b*) Fortalit. Fidei, *lib. ii, Conſider. vi, Hær. v, fol.* 61, *apud* Henr. Wharton, Append. ad Cave de Scriptor. Eccleſ. *pag.* 143.

(1) Mariana, de Rebus Hiſpan. *lib. xxii, cap. xiii.*

(2) Whart. Append. ad Cave de Script. Eccl. *pag.* 143.

(3) *See* Crenii, Animadv. Philol. & Hiſt. *Part. xiii, pag.* 87.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 88.

(5) Hoornb. de convert. Judæis, *in Prolegom. p.* 9.

(6) Theoph. Rayn. de malis ac bonis Libris, *num.* 272, *pag. m.* 166.

(7) Du Pin, Bibl. *Tom. xii, pag.* 100, *Edit. of Holland.*

SPINA (*a*) (John de) in Latin *Spinæus*, a Proteſtant miniſter in the XVIth century, had been a Monk. I ſhall obſerve upon what occaſion he forſook his order [*A*], and ſided with the Proteſtants. He did many ſervices to the cauſe. He was one of the deputies at the conference of Poiſſi: I have ſaid in another place (*b*), that he was diſtinguiſhed from the miniſters that were called factious, and that he and du Roſier diſputed with two Catholic doctors in the year 1566 (*c*). The Church of Rochelle deſired him to be their miniſter in the year 1561, and ſent ſome deputies to him at Fontenai le Comte (*d*); but the conſequences of that deputation are not known. He wrote very edifying books [*B*], full of piety and good morality. He died at Saumur in 1594 (*e*). Anjou was his native country, as La Croix du Maine obſerves. He eſcaped the Paris maſſacre, becauſe the murderers were too eager in running after a lady whom he accompanied, and killing her in the river (*f*). I do not think he was then ſeventy-eight years old, as it is affirmed in a marginal note of Varillas's Hiſtory of Charles IX, of the Paris edition in 12*mo* 1684.

[*A*] *I ſhall obſerve upon what occaſion he forſook his order.*] Mr Vincent's grandmother by his mother's ſide ſaid, that John Rabec was taken at Chateau-Gontier, in Anjou, in her father's houſe. *Mr de l'Eſpine, who was then a Carmelite, and was going to preach at Angers, happened to be in that houſe, where he was known and well beloved, as one who had a great reputation, though he was but a young man. He had been there ſome days with Rabec, without knowing him; but being well pleaſed with his converſation, he was very much concerned for his impriſonment: which moved him to pay him ſeveral viſits in his priſon, in order to diſſuade him from the Reformed Religion, and bring him back to the Catholic. His viſits had an effect quite contrary to his intention; for Rabec's arguments convinced him, and prevailed upon him by degrees. Beſides, he was extremely moved with the admirable conſtancy Rabec expreſſed when he was burnt, and with the wonder GOD wrought in him; for though his tongue had been cut off, he ſung at the place of execution with an audible voice, the LXXIXth Pſalm.*

> O God, the Gentiles do invade
> Thine heritage, to ſpoil, &c.

As he was continually reflecting upon thoſe things, he made no doubt that the doctrine, againſt which he had ſo much diſputed with Rabec, was that which he ought to embrace. He therefore preached it at Angers above a year, though without openly profeſſing it, and quitting his habit. He cenſured ſeveral abuſes; and inſtead of inſiſting, as others of his profeſſion did, upon Indulgences, Pilgrimages, and the Interceſſion of the Saints, he exhorted his hearers to repent, and to implore the Divine Grace through JESUS CHRIST. He was very much followed at firſt; but at laſt he was ſuſpected, which made him think of removing. He went to Renata of France, Ducheſs of Ferrara, who was a Proteſtant and reſided at Montargis. This is what Mr Vincent, a miniſter of Rochelle (1), heard his grandmother ſay ſeveral times. He obſerves, that ſhe *was twelve or thirteen years of age, when Mr de l'Eſpine and Rabec happened to meet at Chateau-Gontier,* and that ſhe died *in the year* 1624, *being about* 80 *years old* (2). This Chronology is not very exact; and indeed a great accuracy is ſeldom minded in ſuch narratives. We read in Beza, that Rabec was arreſted at Chateau-Gontier the firſt of Auguſt 1555, and that he ſuffered martyrdom the 24th of April 1556 (3). Mr Vincent's grandmother muſt therefore have been then younger than ſhe ſaid, or muſt have lived more years than her grandſon gives her. Note, as he obſerves (4), that L'Eſpine *had been an Auguſtin Monk*, if we rely upon the preface of his tracts. Others ſay, he had been a Dominican (5). D'Aubigné (6) ſays he did not make an open profeſſion of the Proteſtant religion, until the conference of Poiſſi.

[*B*] *He wrote very edifying books.*] Here follow the titles of them: *Traicté des tentations, & moien d'y reſiſter*, Lyons 1566, in 8vo. *Traicté conſolatoire contre toutes afflictions, qui adviennent ordinairement aux fideles Chreſtiens*, Lyons 1565, in 8vo. *Traicté pour oſter la crainte de mort, & la faire deſirer à l'homme fidele*, Lyons 1558, in 8vo. He publiſhed alſo ſome controverſial pieces, among others, *Diſcours du vrai ſacrifice & du vrai ſacrificateur*, Lyons 1564. *Defenſe & Confirmation du Traicté du vrai ſacrifice & ſacrificateur à l'encontre des frivoles reſponſes & argumens de René Benoiſt Docteur en Theologie*, Geneva 1567, in 8vo (7). Some of his works were tranſlated into Latin; for we have of him the following books in that tongue, *De tranquillitate animi libri* 7. *De juſtitia Chriſtiana, de confeſſione peccatorum, de ægrotis conſolandis & de Providentia Dei.* He made an *excellent Sermon* at Rochelle *in* 1587, *upon the LORD's Supper, which* Mr Vincent intended to publiſh (8). Simon Goulart of Senlis publiſhed in 1591, a collection of excellent diſcourſes made by John de l'Eſpine, to which, as he uſed to do, he added notes and ſummaries. They are the ſame ſeven books concerning the tranquillity of the mind, which, as has been ſaid above, were tranſlated into Latin (§ *a*).

[(§ *a*) The edition of Rochelle in 16mo printed by Jerom Haûtin, 1594, hath an Epiſtle Dedicatory of Simon Goulart to Mr de la Noüe, dated in the year 1587. Rem. Crit.]

(*a*) He is alſo called *de L'Eſpine.*

(*b*) In the article CHARPENTIER, remark [*A*].

(*c*) In the article ROSIER, remark [*B*].

(*d*) Vincent, Recherches ſur les commencemens de la Reformation de la Rochelle, p. 65.

(*e*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 68.

(*f*) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, *Tom. ii, pag. m.* 458. *See alſo* Thuanus, *lib. lii, pag. m.* 1078.

) Vincent, Re-
erches ſur les
mmencemens
la Reforma-
n en la Ville
la Rochelle,
g. 65, & ſeq.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 68.

(3) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. *book ii, pag.* 108.

(4) Vincent, Recherches, &c.

(5) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, *book xxiv, pag. m.* 254.

(6) D'Aubigné, Hiſt. Univerſ. *Tom. i, book ii, ch. xxv, pag.* 146.

(7) *Taken from* Du Verdier's, Bibliotheque Françoiſe. *pag.* 688.

(8) Vincent, Recherches, &c. *pag.* 69.

SPINOSA (John de) lived in the XVIth century. He was born at Belovado in the province of Rioja in the kingdom of Caſtile, and at fourteen years of age was taken into the houſe of the Marquis d'Alarcon. He became an able man, and ſhewed ſo much integrity, that the marquis conceived a particular affection and eſteem for him, ſo far as to entruſt him with the greateſt ſecrets, and to conſult him on the moſt important affairs. After the deceaſe of that lord, Don Pero Gonçalez de Mendoça, his ſon-in-law, ſucceeded him in his offices, and was afterwards made Captain-General in Sicily by the Emperor Charles V. He made John de Spinoſa ſecretary of the cyphers, and of ſtate affairs, and was very well ſatisfied with his conduct; for when Barberouſſe's fleet occupied all the ſtreights of Meſſina, John de Spinoſa was ſo fortunate and dexterous as to croſs the Streights, and bring into Sicily the emperor's orders, and the money due to the ſoldiers. Some time after he quelled the mutiny of the troops in the kingdom of Naples. He followed the ſame Mendoça in the wars of Piedmont, and was his ſecretary; and after the death of that lord, he was ſent twice to Venice for the affairs of the Milaneſe. That employment made him ſtay twelve years at Venice, and gave him occaſion to diſcover ſome qualities, which procured him the approbation and the praiſes of the Venetians. He alſo received ſeveral marks of a particular eſteem from the Emperors Charles V, and Ferdinand, and from Philip II. He commanded in ſome provinces of Lombardy under the Duke de la Cueva, governor of the Milaneſe, and General of the Spaniards in Italy. He had before commanded in a part of Abruzzo with great probity, where he cauſed two famous robbers to be puniſhed [*A*]. He loved ſtudy, applied himſelf to it as much as his employments and journies could permit him; and even wrote ſome pieces (*a*) [*B*].

(*a*) Taken from the preface which Jerome Serranus prefixed to the *Gynæcepænos*, of John de Spinoſa, printed at Milan in 1580.

[*A*] *Where he cauſed two famous robbers to be puniſhed.*] One of them was ſo cruel, that he drank the blood of thoſe whom he killed; the other added a horrid leudneſs to his robberies and murders, for he raviſhed as many women as he could get. Here are the Spaniſh words of my author. 'Gouernò en Abruzzo el eſtado de la valle Siciliana, dando de ſu integridad muy grandes ſennales, con ſu pobreza: De ſu prudentia con diverſos juizios, y ſententias notables: y de ſu juſtitia con la muerte de Proſpera Camisòla cruelíſſimo homicida, e, inſolentiſſimo violador de mugeres, y de Entino de Baxan, atroce ſalteador de caminos, (y tan inhumano, que como fiera ſaluaje acoſtumbraua beuer la ſangre de aquellos aquien por los boſques heria, ò mataua:) y con la cabeça de ſcachia diabolo pueſta por terròr de los mal hechores, en una pica a las almenas; y ſu cuerpo en quatro partes, en los pàſſos mas peligroſos del eſtado (1). - - - *He governed in Abruzzo, in the Sicilian valley, and gave very great proofs of his integrity, notwithſtanding his poverty; of his prudence by ſeveral remarkable ſentences and puniſhments; and of his juſtice by putting to death Proſpero Camiſola, a moſt cruel murderer, and a moſt inſolent raviſher of women, and Entino de Baxan, a notorious highwayman, (ſo inhuman that, like a wild beaſt, he uſed to drink the blood of thoſe whom he wounded or murdered in the woods) he ordered his head to be placed on a pole for the terror of wicked men, his body to be quartered, and his quarters to be placed in the moſt ſuſpicious roads of the country.*'

(1) Hieronymus Serranus, *in Præfat. Dialogi* en laude de las Mugeres.

[*B*] *And even wrote ſome pieces.*] I have only ſeen his *Gynæcepænos*, or his *Dialogo en laude de las Mugeres*. It was printed at Milan in 4to, in the year 1580, and dedicated by the author to Mary of Auſtria, daughter of the Emperor Charles V, and wife of the Emperor Maximilian II. Women are highly praiſed in that book, which is ſtuffed with examples and quotations; the choice whereof is none of the beſt. The author promiſed a ſecond part, wherein he was to beſtow encomiums upon ſeveral illuſtrious ladies of that age. I wiſh he had performed his promiſe, and that I might ſee his book. He wrote another book, intituled, *Micracanthos*, wherein he inſerted the actions and memorable ſayings of great men, and obſerved the tragical end of the wicked, that his book might teach his readers how to attain to glory, and how to avoid infamy. He inſerted in it a digreſſion concerning thoſe, who take delight in ſpeaking ill of a book. It will be thought to be good, if we judge of it by the following words. They are very judicious, and teach us how to make a difference between cenſures and flatteries, and then between cenſures that may be uſeful, and thoſe that can be of no uſe. 'Pero contra aquellos que . . . quiſieſſen por ventura en otras coſas tacharme: dexare por agora de hazer excuſationes, ò, reſpueſta defenſiua; refiriendome ala apologia que enel micracanthos tengo ſcrita. Donde ſuficientemente ſe tratta delas ſpecies de maldicientes, y detractores; y dela reprehenſion que deue (excluſas todas las de mas) aceptarſe, y como obra ſaludable, y virtuoſa, agradeſcerſe. Alo qual remi tiendome, ſolamente dire agora, que ſin deſear contra los mal dicientes, y arrogantes burladores; mas venganza de aquella con que la ſcriptura los amenaza diziendo, † *parata ſunt deriſoribus judicia*. Y ſin admitir por otra parte, las alabanzas engannoſas delos aduladores: ſperare gratamente con deſeo, y humildad la correction delos buenos, y ſabios varones. Teniendo para ello ſiempre enla memoria, aquellas divinas palabras del Eccleſiaſte, que dizen, ‡ *Melius eſt à ſapiente corripi: quàm ſtultorum adulatione decipi* (2). - - - *As for what relates to detraction, I ſhall not enter now upon that ſubject, but refer to what I have ſaid in my* Micracanthos, *wherein I treat of the different ſpecies of ſlanderers and detractors, and of the reproofs that are to be thankfully received, as wholſome and virtuous. I ſhall only ſay as to ſlanderers and proud ſcoffers, that they ſhall meet with a due chaſtiſement, as the Scripture threatens them,* Judgments are prepared for ſcorners. *And, on the other ſide, as we ought not to give ear to the deceitful praiſes of flatterers, ſo we muſt receive with gratitude, pleaſure, and humility, the corrections of good and wiſe men, always remembring theſe divine words of Eccleſiaſtes,* It is better to hear the rebuke of the wiſe, than for a man to hear the ſong of fools.' Nicolas Antonio (3) never ſaw that *Micracanthos*; add, that our Spinoza made a large collection of proverbs, and filled it with moral reflexions. He did not publiſh it, and gave his reaſons for it in the ſecond part of the Micracanthos. 'Ha ſcrito algunas otras obras. Entre las quales (allende de los Dialogos dichos): no es de poca importantia, la que yo he viſto de mas de ſeiſmil proverbios vulgares que ha recogido, y parte dellos compueſto; (aunque no acabada de comentar, ni imprèſſa; por las cauſas que in los poſtreros razonamientos de la ſegunda parte del Micracanthos, ſe dize) obra çierto de marauilloſa Doctrina, y provecho, y muy agradable: (ainſi como las otras) por la copia, y diverſidad de las materias, Todas ellas puramente aplicadas ala virtud (4). - - - *He wrote ſome other works; among which (beſides the above-mentioned dialogues) the moſt conſiderable part which I have ſeen, contains more than ſix thouſand proverbs, which he collected, and part of which he himſelf compoſed (tho' he did not finiſh his comments on them, nor publiſh them, for the reaſons he gave in his laſt diſcourſes in the ſecond part of the Micracanthos), a work ſurely of wonderful doctrine, profitable, and very entertaining, (as well as his other works) by the copiouſneſs and variety of matters which they contain. He employed them for the advancement of virtue.*'

This author may be therefore added to thoſe, who were mentioned in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* for the year 1686. I ſhall ſet down the paſſage, without minding the moroſe humour of thoſe, who will

† Prov. Salom. cap. xix.

‡ Eccl. cap. vii.

(2) John de Spinoſa, advertiſement to the reader prefixed to the *Gynæcepænos*.

(3) *See his* Bibl. Scriptor. Hiſpaniæ, *at the word* Joannes de Eſpinoſa, *Tom. i, pag.* 521.

(4) Hieronym. Serranus, *in Præfat. Dialogi* en laude de las Mugeres.

Authors, w have written on Proverbs.

will not like it: I rather chuſe to have a regard for thoſe, who will be very well pleaſed with it. ‘Mr Menage promiſes to publiſh an etymological treatiſe upon the French proverbs. There are few ſubjects that are ſo curious as that is, and that require a greater ſkill in the knowledge of hiſtory. There has been a vaſt number of proverbs in all languages. Dydimus made a collection of them in ten books, which he dedicated to thoſe, who had writ upon that ſubject. Aldus Manutius publiſhed ſomething of Didymus's work with Tharræus's proverbs, in the year 1505. But it is to be obſerved, that Greek and Latin proverbs are not ſo numerous, as Eraſmus, and thoſe who have collected what was omitted by him, would make us believe; for it is certain, and they have been ſufficiently cenſured for it, that they took for a proverbial expreſſion what was not ſo. Oudin made a pretty large collection of French proverbs, intituled, *Curioſitez Françoiſes*, but he does not give their etymologies. The dialogues between a clown and a Philoſopher have been often reprinted at Paris; they contain the origin of a conſiderable number of proverbs, ſometimes right, and ſometimes wrong. The edition of 1665 is intituled, *Les illuſtres Proverbes nouveaux & Hiſtoriques expliquez par diverſes Queſtions curieuſes & morales 2 vol. in 12mo.* Mr Furetiere, who has publiſhed a ſecond caſe very ſatirical againſt ſeveral members of the French academy, pretends that the proverbs of his Univerſal Dictionary are not taken from that of the academy, *and that in order to remove their meanneſs, he has enriched moſt of them by enquiring into their origin, or applying to them curious hiſtories, and comparing them with the proverbs of other nations, which Paquier, Belinghen, and other grave authors, have not thought unworthy of their pen* (5).’ A good ſupplement might be made to this long paſſage. It might be ſaid that Belinghen, mentioned by Furetiere, ſhould have been called Fleury de Bellinghen, which was his true name. I think he taught French in Holland. He publiſhed at the Hague in 1656, *L'Etymologie ou Explication des Proverbes François*, divided into three books by way of a dialogue. It is a book in 8vo of 363 pages. The *Premiers eſſais des Proverbes*, publiſhed by that author in 1653, having met with a good reception, he reſolved to put out a ſecond edition much larger, *viz.* that whoſe title I have juſt now mentioned. Mr de Brieux publiſhed at Caën the origins of ſome proverbs in the year 1672, in 12mo. If we go higher, we ſhall find at the end of Nicod's Dictionary (6) the *Explications morales d'aucuns Proverbes communs en la Langue Françoiſe*, with a tranſlation of ſome French proverbs into Latin verſe, by *Joannes Ægidius Nucerienſis*. You will find in Morhofius's *Polyhiſtor* many things upon this ſubject; you will find there that Angelus Monoſinius has treated at large of the Italian proverbs in a book printed at Venice in the year 1604, and (7) that Julius *Varini* wrote a book, intituled, *Scuola del Volgo* (8), wherein the Italian proverbs are placed according to the order of human actions, and attended with ſome prudential precepts. You will ſee there that the alphabetical collection of Italian proverbs, made by Orland Perſquet, is to be found in Gruterus's Theſaurus, and that one Thomaſo Buoni, who is mentioned, publiſhed a collection of Italian proverbs, in two volumes (9). But you will not find there the *origine de volgari Proverbii*, publiſhed by Aloyſio Cinthio, at Venice, in the year 1526 (10). Morhofius had forgot the name of a modern author, who has collected the Italian proverbs, and is mentioned in the Journals (11): This new author is no other than Mr Menage. It does not appear that Morhofius was well acquainted with the writers of our French proverbs. He only mentions the collection of an anonymous author, and that of *Joh. Ægidius Nucerienſis*, and the firſt edition of Belinghen's proverbs, and laſtly, of one le Duc, who put out a book (12), intituled, *Proverbes en Rimes, ou Rimes en Proverbes*. Morhofius knew the collection of Spaniſh proverbs made by Ferdinand Nunnez, Profeſſor of Eloquence and of the Greek tongue at Salamanca, and the *Filoſophia vulgar* of Juan de Mal Lara (13), and the *Medicina Eſpannola contenida en Proverbios vulgares de nueſtra Lengua*, compoſed by Juan Soropan de Rieros. That *Filoſophia vulgar* is a collection of a thouſand proverbs, with their explication. I do not wonder he does not mention the book of our Spinoſa; for it is loſt. He does not forget the compilers of German, Engliſh, and Dutch proverbs. I know no author that mentions Polydore Virgil, who pretends to have broke the ice, both with reſpect to proverbs, and to the inventors of things. His treatiſe of proverbs came out in 1498, and was dedicated to Guido Ubaldo, Duke of Urbino (14). I have an edition of it reviſed and enlarged the fourth time. It was printed at Baſil 1541, it contains 456 pages in 8vo.

SPINOZA (BENEDICT DE) a Jew by birth, who forſook Judaiſm, and at laſt became an Atheiſt, was a native of Amſterdam. He was a ſyſtematical Atheiſt, and brought his Atheiſm into a new method, tho' the ground of his doctrine was the ſame with that of ſeveral antient and modern Philoſophers, both in Europe and the Eaſtern countries, [*A*]. As for the latter, one needs only read what I have ſaid

[*A*] *He was a ſyſtematical Atheiſt, and brought his Atheiſm into a new method, tho' the ground of his new doctrine was the ſame with that of ſeveral antient and modern Philoſophers, both in Europe and the eaſtern countries.*] I think he is the firſt who reduced Atheiſm into a ſyſtem, and formed it into a body of doctrine, ordered and connected according to the manner of the Geometricians; but otherwiſe his opinion is not new. It has been believed long ago, that the whole univerſe is but one ſubſtance, and that God and the world are but one Being. Pietro della Valle mentions certain Mahometans, who call themſelves *Ehl Eltahkik*, or *men of truth, men of certainty*, who believe *that there is nothing exiſtent but the four elements, which are GOD, man, and every thing elſe* (1). He alſo mentions the Zindikites, another Mahometan ſect. *They come near the* Sadducees, and *have their name from them. They do not believe a providence, nor the reſurrection of the dead, as Giggoius ſhews upon the word Zindik* (2). . . . . *One of their opinions is, that whatever is ſeen, whatever is in the world, whatever hath been created is GOD* (3). There have been ſuch Heretics among Chriſtians; for we find in the beginning of the XIIIth century, one David of Dinant, who made no diſtinction between God and the firſt matter. It is a miſtake to ſay that he is the firſt who vented ſuch a fooliſh doctrine (4). Does not Albertus Magnus mention a Philoſopher, who had done the like? ‘Alexander Epicureus dixit Deum eſſe materiam, vel non eſſe extra ipſam, & omnia eſſentialiter eſſe Deum, & formas eſſe accidentia imaginata; & non habere veram entitatem, & ideo dixit omnia idem eſſe ſubſtantialiter, & hunc Deum appellavit aliquando Jovem, aliquando Apollinem, & aliquando Palladem; & formas eſſe peplum Palladis, & veſtem Jovis; & neminem ſapientum ajebat ad plenum revelare poſſe ea quæ latebant ſub peplo Palladis & ſub veſte Jovis (5). - - - - *Alexander the Epicurean held, that GOD was matter, or was not different from it, and that all things were eſſentially GOD, and that forms were imaginary accidents, and had no real entity, and therefore he ſaid all things were ſubſtantially the ſame; and this GOD he called ſometimes Jupiter, ſometimes Apollo, and ſometimes Pallas: and that forms were the robe of Pallas, and garment of Jupiter; and he aſſerted that none of the wiſe men could fully reveal what was concealed under the robe of Pallas, and the garment of Jupiter.*’ Some believe that this Alexander lived in Plutarch's time (6); others ſay in expreſs words, that he lived before David of Dinant. *Secutus fuit Alexandrum qui fecit librum de materia, ubi probare conatur omnia eſſe unum in materia.* This we find in the margin of the treatiſe, in which Thomas Aquinas confutes that monſtrous and extravagant opinion (7). Perhaps, David of Dinant knew not that there was ſuch a Philoſopher of the Epicurean ſect,

---

(5) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *for February* 1686, *Art. iii. In the Abſtract of the Etymologies of the Italian tongue written by Mr Menage, at the end of which there is an explication of ſeveral Italian Proverbs.*

(6) The edition I make uſe of is that of Paris 1606, in folio.

(7) Morhofius, Polyhiſt. *lib. i, cap. xxi, pag.* 256.

(8) Printed at Verona 642, in 12mo.

(9) Printed at Venice in 8vo, in the year 1604 and 1606.

(10) *See* Nicolas Antonio, Bibl. Hiſp. *Tom. i, pag.* 559.

(11) Mentio etiam fit, ſi rectè memini, in poſtremis Ephemeridibus Gallicis novi cujuſdam autoris qui Proverbia Italica congeſſerit, cujus mihi nunc nomen excidit. *Morhofius, Polyhiſtor. lib. i, cap. xxi, pag.* 256. *The* Journal des Sçavans, 1686, *pag.* 164, *Dutch Edit. and the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, *for the ſame year pag.* 64, *mention that collection of Mr Menage.*

(12) Printed at Paris, 1665, in 12mo.

(13) It ſhould be *Mallara.*

(14) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the book *de Inventoribus Rerum*, written by Polydore Virgil.

A LIST of ſome perſons who had the ſame opinion with Spinoza.

(1) See the article ABUMUSLIMUS, remark [*A*].

(2) Beſpier, Remarques curieuſes ſur Ricaut, Etat préſent de l'Empire Ottoman, *pag.* 648.

(3) Pietro della Valle, *pag.* 394, *of the iiid Tom.* apud Beſpier, *ib.*

(4) Aſſeruit Deum eſſe materiam primam, quod nemo ante eum deliraverat. *Theoph. Raynaud. Theol. Naturali,* Diſtinct. vi, num. 6, pag. 563.

(5) Albertus in I Phyſ. *Tract. iii, cap. xiii,* apud Pererium de communibus Principiis, *lib. v, cap. xii, pag. m.* 309, 310.

(6) Is eſt, opinor, quem inter ſodales ſuos memorat Plutarchus II, ſympoſ. 3. *Thomaſius, Diſſertat. XIV, ad Phil. Stoic.* pag. 199.

(7) Ad lib. i, Tomæ contra Gentil. cap. xvii, f. 23 ed. Lugd. A. 1586. *Thomaſ. ibid. p.* 200.

ſaid in the remark [*D*] of the article JAPAN, and what I ſhall ſay below concerning the
Theology

ſect; but at leaſt it muſt be granted me, that he knew very well he had not invented that doctrine. Had he not learned it of his maſter? Was he not the diſciple of that Amalricus, whoſe dead body was dug up and burnt in the year 1208, and who taught that all things were God, and but one Being (8)? 'Omnia ſunt Deus: Deus eſt omnia. Creator & creatura idem. Ideæ creant & creantur. Deus ideò dicitur finis omnium, quòd omnia reverſura ſunt in ipſum, ut in Deo immutabiliter conquieſcant, & unum individuum atque incommutabile permanebunt. Et ſicut alterius naturæ non eſt Abraham, alterius Iſaac, ſed unius atque ejuſdem: ſic dixit omnia eſſe unum, & omnia eſſe Deum. Dixit enim, Deum eſſe eſſentiam omnium creaturarum (9). - - - - *All things are GOD, GOD is all things. Creator and creature the ſame. Ideas create and are created. GOD is therefore ſaid to be the end of all things, becauſe they all return into him, that they may reſt unchangeably in GOD, and continue one individual and unalterable. And as Abraham is not of one nature, Iſaac of another, but of one and the ſame: ſo he aſſerted that all things were one, and all things were GOD. For he affirmed GOD to be the eſſence of all creatures.*' I dare not affirm that Strato, a Peripatetic Philoſopher, was of the ſame opinion; for I do not know whether he taught that the univerſe or nature was a ſimple and only ſubſtance: I only know, that he believed it to be inanimate, and that he acknowledged no other God than nature. 'Nec audiendus ejus (*Theophraſti*) auditor Strato, is qui Phyſicus appellatur, qui omnem vim divinam in natura ſitam eſſe cenſet, quæ cauſas gignendi, augendi, minuendi habeat, ſed careat omni ſenſu ac figura (10). - - - - - *Neither is Strato, Theophraſtus's diſciple, to be heard, he who is called the Natural Philoſopher, who thinks that all divine power was lodged in nature, in which are the cauſes of producing, increaſing, and diminiſhing, but is without any ſenſe or figure.*' As he laughed at Epicurus's atoms and vacuum, one might think that he made no diſtinction between the ſeveral parts of the world; but this is no neceſſary conſequence. All that can be concluded is, that his opinion comes a great deal nearer Spinoziſm, than the ſyſtem of atoms. Here follows a paſſage, wherein it is more largely ſet forth. 'Negas ſine Deo poſſe quicquam, ecce tibi è tranſverſo Lampſacenus Strato, qui det iſti Deo immunitatem magni quidem muneris. Sed quum Sacerdotes Deorum vacationem habeant, quanto eſt æquius habere ipſos Deos? Negat opera Deorum ſe uti ad fabricandum mundum. Quæcunque ſint docet omnia effecta eſſe natura, nec ut ille qui aſperis, & levibus, & hamatis, uncinatiſque corpuſculis concreta hæc eſſe dicat interjecto inani, ſomnia ſenſet hæc eſſe Democriti non docentis, ſed optantis. Ipſe autem ſingulas mundi partes perſequens, quicquid aut ſit, aut fiat, naturalibus fieri, aut factum eſſe docet ponderibus & motibus: ſic ille & Deum opere magno liberat, & me timore (11). - - - *You deny any thing to have power but GOD; behold, on the contrary, how Strato of Lampſacus, gives to that GOD an immunity from acting. And ſeeing the prieſts of the gods enjoy a vacation, how much more reaſonable is it that the gods themſelves ſhould have it? He denies that he uſes the operation of the gods in fabricating the world. All things that exiſt, he ſays, are effected by nature, not as he who ſaid, that all things were formed by the coalition of rough, ſmooth, crooked, and hooked particles, vacuities being interſperſed, he thinks theſe to be the dreams of Democritus. But, conſidering all the parts of the world, he aſſerts that all things which exiſt, or are made, are produced by weights and motions: ſo he hath exempted GOD from great labour, and me from fear.*' There is even ground to believe that he did not teach, as the Atomiſts did, that the world was a new work, and produced by chance; but that he taught, as the Spinoziſts do, that nature has produced it neceſſarily and from all eternity. I think the following words of Plutarch, if rightly underſtood, ſignify, that nature made all things of itſelf, and without knowledge, and not that it's works began by chance. Τελευτῶν τὸν κόσμον αὐτὸν οὐ ζῶον εἶναι τὸ δὲ κατὰ φύσιν ἕπεσθαι τῷ κατὰ τύχην. ἀρχὴν γὰρ ἐνδιδόναι τὸ αὐτόματον, εἶτα οὕτω περαίνεσθαι τῶν φυσικῶν παθῶν ἕκαστον. Denique mundum ipſum animal eſſe negat (*Strato*) vultque naturam ſequi temerarios fortunæ impetus, initium enim rebus dare ſpontaneam quandam naturæ vim, & ſic deinceps ab eadem natura phyſicis motibus imponi finem (12). - - - *Finally, Strabo denies that the world itſelf is an animal, and will have it, that nature obeys the caſual impulſes of fortune, for a certain ſpontaneous power of nature gives to things a beginning, and in like manner afterwards, an end is put by the ſame nature to Phyſical motions.* This tranſlation, which I have found in page 58 of Leſcaloperius's commentary upon Cicero *de Natura Deorum*, and to which I have added *enim* after *initium*, is better than that of Amyot, and that of Xylander: nevertheleſs, there is ſomething in it that does not ſuit the notion one ought to have of the opinion of that famous Philoſopher, the greateſt of all the Peripatetics (13). The words *temerarii fortunæ impetus* ſpoil the ſymmetry of his ſyſtem; and we ſee that Lactantius diſtinguiſhes it from that of the Epicureans, and aſcribes no chance to it. 'Qui nolunt, *ſays he* (14), divina providentia factum eſſe mundum, aut principiis inter ſe temerè coëuntibus dicunt eſſe concretum, aut repente natura extitiſſe. Natura verò (ut ait Straton) habere in ſe vim gignendi, & vivendi, ſed eam nec ſenſum habere ullum, nec figuram: ut intelligamus, omnia quaſi ſua ſponte eſſe generata, nullo artifice, nec authore. Utrumque vanum, & impoſſibile. - - - - *Thoſe who will not have the world to have been made by divine providence, ſay, that it either proceeded from the fortuitous concourſe of principles, or, on a ſudden, exiſted by nature. But nature (as Strato ſays) has in itſelf the power of producing, and of living, but hath neither any ſenſe nor figure: that we may underſtand all things to be produced ſpontaneouſly, without any artificer or author. But both theſe opinions are frivolous and abſurd.*' Note, that Seneca repreſents Plato's doctrine and that of Strato, as two oppoſite extremes: one of them deprived God of a body, and the other deprived him of a ſoul (15). I think I have read in Father Salier's book upon the ſpecies of the Euchariſt, that ſeveral antient Philoſophers or Heretics taught the unity of all things; but becauſe I have not that book now, I only mention this by the by. Father Salier is a French Minime. His book printed at Paris, in the year 1689, is intituled, *Hiſtoria Scholaſtica de Speciebus Euchariſticis, ſive de formarum materialium natura ſingularis obſervatio ex profanis ſacriſque Autoribus.* It has been mentioned in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans*, for September 1690, page 13.

The doctrine of the ſoul of the world, which was ſo common among the Antients, and made the principal part of the ſyſtem of the Stoics is, at the bottom, the ſame with that of Spinoza. Which would more clearly appear, if it had been explained by authors verſed in Geometry; but becauſe the books wherein it is mentioned, are written rather in a rhetorical than a dogmatical method; whereas Spinoza is a preciſe writer, and avoids the figurative ſtyle, which often hinders us from having a juſt notion of a body of doctrine; hence it is that we find ſeveral material differences between his ſyſtem, and that of the ſoul of the world. If any one ſhould maintain that Spinoziſm is more coherent, he ſhould alſo maintain that it is not ſo orthodox; for the Stoics did not deprive God of his providence; they re-united in him the knowledge of all things; whereas Spinoza aſcribes to him only ſeparated and very limited knowledge. Read theſe words of Seneca. 'Eundem quem nos Jovem intelligunt, cuſtodem RECTOREMQUE univerſi, animum ac ſpiritum, mundani hujus operis dominum & artificem, cui nomen omne convenit. Vis illum fatum vocare? non errabis. Hic eſt, ex quo ſuſpenſa ſunt omnia, cauſa cauſſarum. Vis illum providentiam dicere? recte dices. Eſt enim, cujus conſilio huic mundo providetur, ut inconcuſſus eat, & actus ſuos explicet. Vis illum naturam vocare? non peccabis. Eſt enim, ex quo nata ſunt omnia, cujus ſpiritu vivimus. Vis illum vocare mundum? non falleris. Ipſe enim eſt, totum quod vides, totus ſuis partibus inditus, & ſe ſuſtinens vi ſua (16). Quid eſt autem, cur non exiſtimes in eo divini aliquid exiſtere, qui Dei pars eſt? Totum hoc quo continemur, & unum eſt, &

'Deus,

(8) *See* Prateolus, in Elencho Hæreſum, *Voce* Almaricus, *pag. m.* 23. *He ſays, that according to ſome authors, that Heretic and his adherents were burnt alive.*

(9) Hæc de Amalrico Gerſon tract. de Concord. Metaph. cum Leg. Part. IV, Oper. alphab. 20, lit. N. ex Hoſtienſi & Odone Tuſculano. *Thomaſius, Diſſert. XIV, ad Phil. Stoïc.* 200.

(10) Cicero de Nat. Deorum, *lib. i, cap. li.*

(11) *Idem*, Academ. Quæſt. *lib. ii, cap. xxxviii.*

(12) Plutarchus adverſus Colotem, *p.* 1115, B.

(13) Τῶν ἄλλων Περιπατητικῶν ὁ κορυφαιότατος Στράτων. Peripateticorum reliquorum ſummus Strato. *Plutarch. ubi ſupra.*

(14) Lactant. de ira Dei, *cap. x, pag.* 533.

(15) Ego feram aut Platonem aut Peripateticum Stratonem, alter fecit Deum ſine corpore, alter ſine animo? *Seneca, in Libro contra Superſtitiones, apud Auguſtin. de Civit. Dei*, lib. vi, cap. x.

(16) Seneca, Quæſt. Natur. *lib. ii, cap. xlv.*

Theology of a ſect of the Chineſe [*B*]. I have not been able to learn any particulars relating

Deus, & ſocii ejus ſumus & membra (17). - - - *They mean the ſame Jupiter as we, the preſerver and* GOVERNOR *of the univerſe, a mind and ſpirit, the Lord and artificer of this mundane fabric, to whom every appellation doth agree. Will you call him Fate? You will not be miſtaken. It is he upon whom all things depend, the cauſe of cauſes. Will you name him Providence? You will be in the right. For it is he by whoſe care this world is ſo ordered that it goes on ſteadily, and exerts it's operations. Will you give him the name of Nature? You miſtake not. For it is he from whom all things receive their beginning, by whoſe ſpirit we live. Will you call him the World? You ſpeak the truth. For he is all what you ſee, all diffuſed through all it's parts, and ſupporting himſelf by his own power. Why therefore do not you believe that there is ſomething divine in that which is a part of God? All that in which we are contained, is both one, and God, and we are his companions and members.*' Read alſo Cato's diſcourſe in the ninth book of Lucan's *Pharſalia*, eſpecially theſe three verſes:

Eſtne Dei ſedes niſi terra, & pontus, & aër,
Et cœlum & virtus? Superos quid quærimus ultra?
Juppiter eſt quodcunque vides, quocunque moveris (18).

Is not the ſeat of Jove, earth, ſea, and air,
And heaven, and virtue? Where wou'd we further trace
The god? Where'er we move, whate'er we ſee
Is Jove. - - - - -

I ſhall obſerve, by the way, an abſurdity of thoſe, who maintain the ſyſtem of the ſoul of the world. They ſay, that all the ſouls both of men and brutes, are particles of the ſoul of the world, which are re-united to their whole, by the death of the body: And to make us underſtand it, they compare animals to bottles full of water; floating upon the ſea. If thoſe bottles were broke, their water would be re-united to its whole; thus it is with particular ſouls, ſay they, when death deſtroys the organs in which they were ſhut up. Nay, ſome ſay that extaſies, dreams, and intenſe meditations, re-unite a man's ſoul to the ſoul of the world, and that this is the reaſon why people foretel things to come by compoſing figures of Geomancy. *Nihil heic attingo de arte illa prophetica deque Geomantia, quibus ipſe Fluddus quam plurimum tribuit. Etſi enim mens cogitando ſic in ſeipſam colligi, ac veluti abſtrahi poſſit, ut humanas res contempletur velut è quadam ſpecula: attamen quod illa poſſit, quandiu hoc mortali circumveſtitur corpore, ita uniri animæ mundanæ, ut ſicut illa omnia cognoſcit, ita ipſa particeps fiat cognitionis hujuſmodi: quòd illa item in hac extaſi digitos regat ad exprimenda varia punctula, ex quibus effectus ſive arbitrarios, ſive fortuitos colligere liceat: hoc aut longe fallor, aut fabulam ſapit* (19). - - - - It is no difficult thing to perceive the falſity of this parallel. The matter of the bottles floating in the ſea is an incloſure, which keeps the ſea water from touching the water they are full of; but if there was a ſoul of the world, it would be diſperſed through all the parts of the univerſe, and therefore nothing could prevent the union of the ſoul to its whole, and death could not produce that re-union. I ſhall ſet down a long paſſage of Bernier, whereby it will appear, that Spinoziſm is only a particular method of explaining a doctrine, which very much prevails in the Eaſt Indies.

'You are not ignorant of the doctrine of many antient philoſophers concerning the great ſoul of the world, whereof they ſay our ſouls and thoſe of Brutes are portions. Should we thoroughly examine Plato's and Ariſtotle's doctrine, perhaps we ſhould find that it was their opinion. This is in a manner the univerſal doctrine of the Pendets, Pagans in the Eaſt Indies; and that very ſame doctrine conſtitutes to this day the cabala of the Soufys, and of the greateſt part of the men of letters in Perſia, and is explained in Perſian verſes very ſublime and emphatical in their Goult-chez-raz, or parterre of myſteries; as it has been the doctrine of Flud, which our great Gaſſendus has ſo learnedly confuted, and that wherein moſt of our Chymiſts are bewildred. Now thoſe Cabaliſts, or Indian Pendets, carry the extravagance farther than all thoſe philoſophers, and pretend that God, or that Supreme Being, which they call Achar, immutable, immoveable, has not only produced or taken ſouls out of its own ſubſtance, but alſo whatever is material and corporeal in the univerſe, and that their production was not made in the way of efficient cauſes, but as a ſpider produces a cob-web out of its own bowels, and re-aſſumes it whenever it pleaſes. Creation therefore, ſay theſe imaginary doctors, is only an extraction or extenſion, which God makes of his own ſubſtance, of thoſe webs which he draws, as it were, out of his own bowels, in the ſame manner as deſtruction is only his re-aſſuming that divine ſubſtance, thoſe divine webs into himſelf; ſo that the laſt day of the world, which they call Maperlé, or Pralea, in which they believe there will be a general deſtruction of all things, will only be a general re-aſſuming of all thoſe webs which God had thus emitted out of himſelf. And therefore, ſay they, there is nothing real and effective in any thing which we think we ſee, hear, ſmell, taſte, or touch: this world is nothing but a kind of dream, and a meer illuſion, becauſe that multitude and great variety of things, that appear to us, are but one and the ſame thing, viz. God himſelf, as all our different numbers, ten, twenty, one hundred, a thouſand, and ſo of others, are but one and the ſame unity repeated ſeveral times. But if you aſk them a reaſon of ſuch a fancy, and if you deſire them to explain that emanation and return of ſubſtance, that extenſion, that apparent diverſity, or how it comes to paſs that God, who is not corporeal, but Biapek, as they own, and incorruptible, ſhould neverthеleſs be divided into ſo many portions of bodies and ſouls; their anſwer conſiſts only in compariſons, that GOD is like an immenſe ocean, in which many vials full of water ſhould move; that thoſe vials, wherever they ſhould go, would be always in the ſame ocean, in the ſame water; and that if they ſhould break, the waters contained in them would then be united to their whole, to that ocean of which they are portions. Or they will tell you, that it is with GOD as it is with light, which is the ſame all over the world, and yet appears a thouſand ways different, according to the variety of the objects (20) on which it falls, or according to the different colours and figures of the glaſſes thro' which it is conveyed. They will anſwer you, I ſay, only with theſe compariſons, which have no proportion to GOD, and are only fit to caſt a miſt before the eyes of ignorant people; and no ſolid anſwer can be expected from them. If they be told that thoſe vials would indeed be in the like water, but not in the ſame (21), and that there is indeed a like light all over the world, but not the ſame; and ſo with many other ſtrong objections, with which they are perpetually confounded; they repeat ſtill the ſame compariſons, and the ſame fine words, or, as the Soufys do, the fine poems of their Goult-chez-raz (22)'.

It appears from the following paſſage that Peter Abelard is accuſed of aſſerting that all things are GOD, and that GOD is all things. 'Primam elementorum concordiam eſſe Deum & materiam ex quâ reliqua fierent, docuit Empedocles...... Hæc erat illius ætatis Theoſophia, hæc notitia quæ de Cauſa principe habebatur. Jam tandem obſoleverat, & inter veterum ſomnia & phantaſmata recenſebatur. Eam inter veteris Philoſophiæ parietinas & rudera revocavit Petrus Abailardus, ingenio audax, & famâ celeber: Sepultam cineribus invenit, & quaſi Eurydicen Orpheus ab inferis tandem revocavit. Teſtor Vazquezium *i. part. quæſt.* 3. *art.* 8. *numb.* 28. & Smiſingum *de Deo uno tract.* 1. *diſp.* 2. *quæſt.* 2. *numb.* 54. Deum eſſe omnia, & omnia eſſe Deum, eum in omnia converti, omnia in eum tranſmutari aſſeruit, quia Empedoclœâ, aut fortè Anaxagoricâ præventus Theoſophiâ, diſtinguebat ſpecies ſecundum ſolam apparentiam, nempe quia aliquot Atomi in uno ſubjecto erant eductæ quæ latebant in alio (23)..... *Empedocles taught, that the firſt amicable conjunction of the elements was* GOD *and matter, of which the other beings were made - - - - This was the Theology of that age, this their opinion of the firſt cauſe. But at laſt it grew obſolete, and was reckoned amongſt the dreams and chimeras of the antients. This among the ruins and rubbiſh of the antients was revived by Peter Abelard,* relating to Spinoza's family; but there is ground to believe it was mean and inconſiderable

---

(17) *Idem*, Epiſt. XCII, *pag. m.* 381.

(18) Lucan. Pharſal. lib. ix, ver. 578.

(19) Gaſſendus, in Examine Philoſoph. Fluddanæ, *num.* 29, *Operum Tom. iii, pag.* 247.

(20) There is here an error of the preſs in the original.

(21) Note, that the Spinoziſts make no better anſwer to the diſtinction between *ſame* and *like*.

(22) Bernier, Suite des Memoires ſur l'Empire du grand Mogol, *pag.* 202 *& ſeq, Dutch Edit.*

(23) Caramuel, Philoſophiæ Realis, *lib. iii*, §. *iii*, *pag.* 175.

‘*a man bold, and famous: he found it buried in aſhes, and, as Orpheus did Eurydice, brought it back from hell. My authors are Vaſquez and Smiſingus. He aſſerted, that* GOD *was all things, and all things were* GOD, *that* GOD *was converted into all things, and all things transformed into God, becauſe prepoſſeſſed with the Theology of Empedocles, or perhaps of Anaxagoras, he diſtinguiſhed the ſpecies according to appearance only, namely, becauſe ſome atoms appear in one ſubject which lay hid in another.*’

[*B*] *What I ſay concerning the Theology of a ſect of the Chineſe.*] The name of that ſect is Foe Kiao. It was eſtabliſhed by royal authority among the Chineſe in the year 65 of the Chriſtian Æra. Its firſt founder was a ſon of the King *In fan vam*, and was at firſt called *Xe*, or *Xe Kia* (24); and afterwards when he was thirty years of age, *Foe*, that is, *no man* (25). The Prolegomena of the Jeſuits prefixed to Confucius's book publiſhed by them at Paris, treats of that founder at large. It is ſaid there, that ‘(26) having retired into a deſart, as ſoon as he came to be nineteen years of age, and having put himſelf under the diſcipline of four Gymnoſophiſts to learn Philoſophy of them, he remained under their direction till the age of thirty years, when riſing in the morning before break of day, and contemplating the planet Venus, that bare ſight gave him immediately a perfect knowledge of the firſt principle; ſo that being full of a divine inſpiration, or rather of pride and folly, he betook himſelf to inſtruct men, gave out himſelf as a god, and drew after him fourſcore thouſand diſciples .... At ſeventy-nine years of age, being upon the point of death he declared to his diſciples, that for the ſpace of forty years that he had preached to the world, he had not told them the truth; that he had concealed it under the vail of metaphors and figures; but that it was time now to declare it to them. *There is nothing, ſaid he, to be inquired after, and on which one may place ones hopes, but nothingneſs and a vacuum* *, *which is the firſt principle of all things.*’ Here is a man very different from our unbelievers: they do not leave off ſpeaking againſt religion but towards the latter end of their life; they only renounce their Libertiniſm, when they think the time of departing this life draws near (27). But it was then that Foe began to declare his Atheiſm. *Teterrimum virus Atheiſmi jam moriturus evomuiſſe perhibetur, diſerte profeſſus, ſe per annos quadraginta eoque amplius non declaraſſe mundo veritatem, ſed umbratili & metaphorica doctrina contentum, figuris, ſimilibus, & parabolis nudam veritatem occultaſſe; at nunc tandem, quando eſſet morti proximus, arcanum ſenſum animi ſui ſignificare velle: extra vacuum igitur & inane, primum ſcilicet rerum omnium principium, nihil eſſe quod quæratur, nihil in quo collocentur ſpes noſtræ* (28). His method was the reaſon why *his diſciples divided his doctrine into two parts: one is outward, and is that which is publickly preached and taught; the other is inward, which is carefully concealed from the vulgar, and diſcovered only to thoſe that are initiated. The outward doctrine, which, as the Bonzes expreſs it,* ‘*is only like the wooden frame on which an arch is built, and that is afterwards removed, when the building is finiſhed, conſiſts* 1. *In teaching that there is a real difference between good and evil, juſtice and injuſtice:* 2. *That there is another life wherein men ſhall be puniſhed or rewarded for what they have done in this world:* 3. *That happineſs may be attained by thirty two figures and fourſcore qualities.* 4. *That* Foe *or* Xaca *is a deity and the ſaviour of men, that he was born for their ſake, out of compaſſion for the errors he ſaw them in, that he has expiated their ſins, and that by virtue of his expiation they ſhall obtain ſalvation after death, and ſhall have a new and more happy birth in another world* (29). They add to this five moral precepts, and ſix works of mercy, and threaten with damnation thoſe who neglect thoſe duties.

‘The inward doctrine, which is never imparted to the vulgar, becauſe they ought to be kept to their duty by the fear of hell, and ſuch like ſtories, as thoſe Philoſophers ſay, is however in their opinion, the ſolid and true one. It conſiſts in laying down, as the principle and end of all things, a certain vacuum and real nothingneſs. They ſay, our firſt parents iſſued from that vacuum, and returned into it when they died, and that it is ſo with all men, who are reſolved into that principle by death; that men, all the elements, and all creatures, make part of that vacuum; and that therefore there is but one and the ſame ſubſtance, which is different in all particular beings only by figures and qualities, or an internal configuration, much like water, which is always eſſentially water, whether it has the form of ſnow, hail, rain, or ice (30).’ If it be a monſtrous thing to aſſert that plants, brutes, and men are really the ſame thing, and to ground ſuch an opinion upon this that all particular beings are not diſtinct from their principle (31), it is ſtill more monſtrous to ſay, that this principle has no thought, no power, no virtue. And yet, this is the doctrine of thoſe Philoſophers, they place the ſupreme perfection of that principle in its inaction, and abſolute repoſe. *Hoc autem principium cum doceant eſſe prorſus admirandum quid, purum, limpidum, infinitum, ſubtile, quod nec generari poſſit nec corrumpi, quod perfectio ſit rerum omnium ipſumque ſumme perfectum & quietum; negant tamen, corde, virtute, mente, potentia ulla inſtructum eſſe: imo hoc eſſe maxime proprium eſſentiæ ipſius, ut nihil agitet, nihil intelligat, appetat nihil* (32). Spinoza was not ſo abſurd: the only or ſole ſubſtance he admits, is always acting, always thinking; and his moſt general abſtractions could not enable him to diveſt it of action and thought. The foundations of his doctrine do not allow it.

QUIETISM taught and practiſed by ſome Chineſe.

Obſerve, by the by, that the followers of Foe teach Quietiſm; for they ſay that all thoſe, who ſeek true happineſs, ought to be ſo far abſorbed by profound meditations, as to make no uſe of their intellect, and that they ought, through a perfect inſenſibility, to ſink into the repoſe and inaction of the firſt principle; which is the true way of being perfectly like it and partaking of happineſs. They further ſay, that thoſe, who have attained to that ſtate of quietude, may follow the uſual courſe of life as to the outſide, and teach others the doctrine commonly received. It is only in private and inwardly, that one ought to practiſe the contemplative inſtitute of the beatifical inaction. *Quocirca quiſquis bene beateque vivendi ſit cupidus, huc aſſidua meditatione, ſuique victoria eniti oportere, ut principio ſuo quam ſimillimus, affectus omnes humanos domet ac prorſus exſtinguat, neque jam turbetur, vel angatur re ulla, ſed ecſtatici prorſus inſtar abſorptus altiſſima contemplatione, ſine ullo prorſus uſu vel ratiocinio intellectus, divina illa quiete, qua nihil ſit beatius, perfruatur: quam ubi nactus fuerit, communem vivendi modum & doctrinam tradit aliis, & ipſemet ſpecie tenus ſequatur, clam vero ſibi vacet ac veritati, & arcana illa quiete vitæque cæleſtis inſtituto gaudeat* (33). Thoſe who were moſt intent upon this contemplation of the firſt principle, formed a new ſect, called *Vu guei Kiao*, that is, the ſect of the idle or ſlothful, *nihil agentium*. Thus among Monks thoſe, who pretend to the moſt ſtrict obſervance, form new communities, or a new ſect. The greateſt lords and the moſt illuſtrious perſons ſuffered themſelves to be ſo infatuated with this Quietiſm, that they believed inſenſibility to be the way to perfection and beatitude, and that the nearer a man came to the nature of a block or a ſtone, the greater progreſs he made, the more he was like the firſt principle, into which he was to return. It was not enough that the body ſhould be without motion for ſeveral hours; the ſoul was alſo to be unmoveable, and deſtitute of all manner of ſenſe. What I have ſaid comes ſhort of the Latin which follows: *Optimates imperii & ſummos quoſque viros hac inſania adeo occupatos, ut quo quiſque propius ad naturam ſaxi truncive acceſſiſſet, horas complures ſine ullo corporis animique motu perſiſtens, ſine ullo vel ſenſuum uſu vel potentiarum, eo profeciſſe felicius, propiorque & ſimilior evaſiſſe principio ſuo aërio, in quod aliquando reverſurus eſſet, putaretur* (34). A follower of Confucius refuted the impertinences of that ſect, and fully proved this maxim of Ariſtotle, that nothing can be made out of nothing (35), nevertheleſs they maintained and ſpread themſelves, and there are many people to this day, who apply themſelves to thoſe vain contemplations (36). Did we not know the extravagances of our Quietiſts (37), we ſhould be apt to think that the writers, who mention thoſe ſpeculative Chineſe, neither well underſtood nor faithfully related what they ſay of them; but if we conſider

(24) The Japoneſe call him *Xaca*.

(25) See the *Acta Eruditor.* 1688, *pag.* 257, in the Extract of the book of Confucius, printed at Paris in the year 1687.

(26) Biblioth. Univerſ. *Tom. vii, pag.* 403, 404, *in the Extract of the ſame book of Confucius.*

* P. 29. Vacuum & inane, Cum hiu *in the Chineſe Language.*

(27) See, above, remark [*E*] of the article BION the Boryſthenite.

(28) Acta Eruditor. Lipſienſ. 1688, *pag.* 257.

(29) Biblioth. Univerſelle, *Tom. vii, pag.* 404, *& ſeq. See alſo the remark* [*C*], *of the article* JAPAN, *and the* Nouveaux Mémoires ſur l'etat préſent de la Chine par le Pere le Comte, *Tom. ii, pag.* 103, *Amſt.* 1698.

(30) Bibl. Univerſelle, *Tom. vii, p.* 406.

(31) Omnia, quæcunque exiſtunt, vita, ſenſu, mente prædita, quamvis inter ſe uſu & figura differant, intrinſece tamen unum quid idemque eſſe, quippe à principio ſuo indiſtincta. *Acta Erudit. Lipſ.* 1688, *pag.* 258.

(32) Ibid.

(33) *Acta Eruditor.* 1688, pag. 258. See alſo the remark [*K*] of the article BRACHMANS.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Copioſe probans Ariſtotelicum illud ex nihilo nihil fieri. *Ibid.*

(36) Ibid.

(37) See the remark [*K*] in the article BRACHMANS.

able [C]. He learned the Latin tongue of a Phyſician (*a*) who taught it at Amſterdam, and applied himſelf early to the ſtudy of Divinity (*b*), and beſtowed many years upon it: and afterwards he wholly devoted himſelf to the ſtudy of Philoſophy. Having a Geometrical Genius, and being deſirous to have a good reaſon for every thing, he quickly diſliked the Doctrine of the Rabbins: ſo that the Jews eaſily perceived, he did not approve ſeveral articles of their religion; for he was againſt any conſtraint in matters of belief, and a great enemy to diſſimulation, and therefore he freely declared his doubts and his opinions. It is ſaid that the Jews offered to tolerate him, provided he would comply outwardly with their ceremonies, and even that they promiſed him a yearly penſion; but he could not reſolve upon ſuch an hypocriſy. However, it was only by degrees that he left their ſynagogue; and perhaps he would not have broke with them ſo ſoon, had he not been treacherouſly attacked coming from a play, by a Jew, who gave him a thruſt with a knife. The wound was ſlight but he believed the aſſaſſin deſigned to kill him. From that time he left them altogether, which was the reaſon of his excommunication. I have enquired into the circumſtances of it, but have not been able to find them out (*c*). He wrote, in the Spaniſh tongue, an apology for his leaving the ſynagogue, which has not been printed. However it is known that he inſerted ſeveral things in it, that have appeared ſince in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (*d*), printed at Amſterdam (*e*) in the year 1670, a pernicious and execrable book, which contains all the ſeeds of the Atheiſm he plainly diſcovered in his *Opera Poſthuma.* Mr Stoupp has no reaſon to inſult the miniſters of Holland for not anſwering the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* [D]. What he ſays of him is not always true [E]. When Spinoza

(*a*) Called *Francis Vanden Ende.* Note, that Mr Kortholt, in the preface to the ſecond edition of his father's book *de tribus Impoſtoribus*, ſays that a young woman taught Spinoza Latin, and that ſhe was afterwards married to Mr Kerkering, who was her ſcholar at the ſame time with Spinoza.

(*b*) See the remark [F].

(*c*) Taken from a Memoir imparted to the Bookſeller.

(*d*) See the book of Mr Van Til, miniſter and profeſſor of Divinity at Dort, intituled, *Het Voorhof der Heidenen voor de Ongeloovigen geopent.* That book is mentioned in the *Acta Erudit.* 1695, *pag.* 393.

(*e*) And not at Hamburgh, as it is in the title page.

what paſſes among Chriſtians, we cannot with reaſon diſbelieve the extravagancies aſcribed to the ſect *Foe Kiao*, or *Vu guei Kiao*.

I am apt to believe either that the ſenſe, which thoſe men put upon *Cum hiu*, is not exactly expreſſed, or that their notions are contradictory. They tell us that thoſe words ſignify *emptineſs and nothingneſs*, *vacuum & inane*; and in order to confute that ſect, this axiom, Nothing can be made out of nothing, has been alledged againſt them; therefore thoſe who alledged it, muſt have believed that, according to that ſect, nothing is the principle of all Beings. I cannot believe that thoſe Chineſe take the word *nothing* in its proper ſignification, and I fancy they underſtand it, as people do, when they ſay that there is nothing in an empty trunk. We have ſeen that they aſcribe ſome attributes to the firſt principle, which ſuppoſe that they conceive it as a liquid (38). And therefore it is likely they only diveſt it of the groſs and ſenſible parts of matter. If it be ſo, the diſciple of Confucius would be guilty of the ſophiſm called *ignoratio elenchi*; for he would have underſtood by the word *nihil*, what has no exiſtence; whereas his adverſaries underſtood by it what has not the properties of ſenſible matter. I fancy they meant by that word, near the ſame as what the moderns mean by the word *ſpace*; I ſay, the moderns, who being neither Carteſians nor Ariſtotelians, maintain that ſpace is diſtinct from matter, and that its indiviſible, unpalpable, penetrable, unmoveable, and infinite, extenſion is ſomething real. The diſciple of Confucius would have eaſily proved that ſuch a thing cannot be the firſt principle, if it is beſides deſtitute of activity, as the ſpeculative Chineſe will have it. An extenſion, tho' never ſo real, can produce no particular Being, unleſs it be moved; and if it be ſuppoſed that there is no mover, the production of the world will be equally impoſſible, whether there be an infinite extenſion, or nothing at all. Spinoza would not deny that poſition; but he does not admit of a firſt principle without action. The abſtracted extenſion he gives it in general is only, properly ſpeaking, the idea of ſpace; but he adds motion to it, which may produce the varieties of matter.

[C] *His family . . . . was poor and very inconſiderable.*] It is well known that Spinoza would not have had a ſufficient ſubſiſtence, if one of his friends had not left him by his will, wherewithal to maintain himſelf. The penſion that the ſynagogue offered him, ſhews that he was not rich.

[D] *Mr Stoupp has no reaſon to inſult the miniſters of Holland for not anſwering the* Tractatus Theologico-Politicus.] He is the author of ſome letters, intituled, *La Religion des Hollandois.* That book was written at Utrecht in the year 1673, whilſt the French were maſters of it. Mr Stoupp was then lieutenant-colonel of a Swiſs regiment. He raiſed himſelf afterwards ſo far as to be made a Brigadier, and would have been promoted to higher offices, had he not been killed at the battle of Steinkerken (39). He had been formerly a miniſter, and had officiated in the French Church of the Savoy at London in Cromwell's time. He affected in the letters I ſpeak of to make an odious deſcription of the great number of ſects that are in Holland. Here follows what he ſays of Spinoziſm. 'I ſhould think that I have not mentioned all the religions of this country, if I ſhould ſay nothing of a famous and learned man, who, as I have been aſſured, has many followers wholly devoted to his opinions. His name is Spinoza; he was born a Jew, and has not abjured the Jewiſh religion, nor embraced the Chriſtian: and indeed he is a very bad Jew, and not a better Chriſtian. He has publiſhed within theſe few years a Latin book intituled, *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, wherein the chief thing he ſeems to aim at is, to deſtroy all religions, particularly the Jewiſh and the Chriſtian, and to introduce Atheiſm, Libertiniſm, and a full liberty for all religions. He maintains that all of them have been invented for the public good, to the end that all citizens may live honeſtly and obey their magiſtrates, and practiſe virtue, not in hopes of any reward after death, but for the excellency of virtue itſelf, and the advantages that accrue in this very life to thoſe who follow it. He does not openly declare in that book what he thinks of the Deity; he only gives ſome hints of it, and thereby diſcovers it, whereas in converſation he plainly declares that GOD is not an intelligent, and a moſt perfect and happy Being, as we fancy; but only the power of nature, diffuſed all over the world. Spinoza lives in this country; he has been ſome time at the Hague, where he was viſited by all the curious, and even by ſome women of quality, who pretend to more wit than is allotted to their ſex His followers dare not diſcover themſelves, becauſe his book wholly overthrows the foundations of all religions, and has been condemned by a public decree of the States, and the ſale of it is forbidden, tho' they ſell it ſtill publickly. Among all the Divines that are in this country, none has ventured to confute the opinions contained in that treatiſe. I am the more ſurpriſed at it, becauſe the author diſcovers a great knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, of all the ceremonies of the Jewiſh religion, of all the cuſtoms of the Jews, and of Philoſophy; and therefore thoſe Divines cannot ſay that it is a book that deſerves no anſwer. If they continue to be ſilent, it will be ſaid that they have no charity, ſince they leave ſuch a pernicious book unanſwered, or that they approve the opinions of the author, or have not the courage and ability to confute them (40).'

The reader may be pleaſed to obſerve, that whereas in the firſt edition of this Dictionary, I quoted this paſſage, according to my own tranſlation, from the Italian, in this I give it according to the words of the original,

(38) *Purum, limpidum, ſubtile,* See before the citation (32), *aërium*, ſee above, citation (34).

(39) In the beginning of *Auguſt*, 1692.

(40) Religion des Hollandois, *Letter iii, pag.* 65, *& ſeq.*

Spinoza betook himſelf to the ſtudy of Philoſophy, he quickly grew out of conceit with the common ſyſtems, and was wonderfully pleaſed with that of Des Cartes (*f*). He felt ſo ſtrong an inclination to inquire after truth [*F*], that he renounced the world in a manner, the better to ſucceed in that enquiry. Not contented to free himſelf from all

(*f*) *Præfat.* Operum poſthum.

original, ſuch as Mr Des Maizeaux (41) did me the favour to communicate to me.

An anſwer to thoſe letters of Mr Stoupp was printed in 1675. It is intituled, *La veritable Religion des Hollandois, avec une Apologie pour la Religion des Etats Genereaux des Provinces Unies . . . . par Jean Brun* (42). The ſubſtance of what concerns Spinoza in that anſwer is as follows (43); ‘ I think Stoupp is miſtaken, when he ſays, *that Spinoza has not abjured the Jewiſh religion*, ſince he has not only renounced the opinions of the Jews, having forſaken all their practices and ceremonies; but alſo eats and drinks every thing that is ſet before him, be it even ſwine's fleſh, or wine come from the Pope's cellar, without enquiring whether it be *Caſcher* or *Neſech*. It is true, he profeſſes no other religion, and he ſeems to be very indifferent for all religions, unleſs GOD moves his heart. I ſhall not enquire whether he maintains all the opinions which Stoupe aſcribes to him; and it had been more edifying if Stoupe had ſaid nothing of it: let him juſtify himſelf, if he will. Neither ſhall I enquire whether he is the author of the book, intituled, *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. However I am aſſured that he does not own it; and if we may believe the title-page, it has been printed at Hamburgh, and not in theſe provinces. But ſuppoſe this wicked book had been printed in Holland; the States endeavoured to ſtifle it in it's birth, they have condemned it, and have prohibited the ſale of it by a public decree, as ſoon as it came out in their country, as Stoupe himſelf confeſſes, pag. 67. I know it has been ſold in England, in Germany, and France, and even in Swiſſerland as well as in Holland; but I do not know whether it has been prohibited in thoſe countries. The States, whilſt I am writing this, expreſs their piety by forbidding that book again, with many others of the ſame ſtamp.’ As for what concerns the reproaches and complaints, that this book had not been confuted, the author anſwers, 1. (44), That ſince it has *been printed at Hamburgh, at leaſt according to the title*, Stoupp ſhould rather complain of *the Divines of that city*, than of the Dutch. 2. (45) That ſince that pernicious book tends *to the ſubverſion of Chriſtianity, the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans were no leſs obliged to confute it than the Reformed, and among the Reformed, the Divines of Germany, France, England, and Swiſſerland, ſhould have done their duty in that reſpect as well as the Dutch Divines.* 3. *That Mr Stoupe may be blamed for the ſame thing. Why did he not anſwer it himſelf?* 4. (46) *That Spinoza's book is not more pernicious than his; for, if the firſt teaches Atheiſm openly, the other does it covertly: both of them ſhew the ſame indifference for religion. An enemy, who attacks us privately, and under the appearance of friendſhip, is much more dangerous than an open enemy. It is neceſſary to cry out againſt a private enemy, that every body may know of it, whereas every body ſtands upon his guard againſt a profeſſed enemy. Perhaps, this is the reaſon why the Divines of Holland and Swiſſerland have been of opinion that there was no neceſſity to make a ſpeedy anſwer to Spinoza, believing that the horror of his doctrine is a ſufficient confutation of it; the more, becauſe there is nothing new in that treatiſe, what is contained in it having been a thouſand times repeated by prophane men, and yet, thanks be to God, the Church has received no great harm by it.* 5. (47), That he (John Brun) has written *ſeveral remarks upon that execrable book*, which, perhaps, he would have publiſhed, had not the war prevented it: *Tho'*, ſays he, *I think I have ſpent my time much better upon ſome other works: nay, I never took Spinoza's book to be ſo pernicious as the defamatory libel of Stoupe's.* 6. (48) That, *in fine, Spinoza's tract has been confuted in Holland by an excellent man, who was a very good Divine, and a great Philoſopher*, viz. *by the late Mr Mansfeldt, Profeſſor at Utrecht. Doubtleſs that confutation had been ſooner publiſhed, had not the author been prevented by death. And I do not queſtion that others would have confuted it long ago, had not Stoupe, and his accomplices, hindered it by this bloody war.* I ſhall ſet down below (49) the titles of ſome other anſwers to that book of Spinoza.

[*E*] *What he ſays of him, is not always true.*] Does he not ſay, that, according to Spinoza, religions have been invented to induce men to the practice of virtue, not in hopes of being rewarded in another world, but becauſe virtue is an excellent thing in itſelf, and profitable in this life? Is it not certain that this Atheiſt had no ſuch thoughts, and that he could not have argued thus without making himſelf ridiculous? All the religions in the world, both the true and the falſe ones, turn upon this great hinge, That there is an inviſible Judge, who rewards and puniſhes after this life, as well the outward, as the inward actions of men. The great uſe of religion is ſuppoſed to derive from that; and if religion had been invented, this had been the chief motive of the contrivers of it. It is plain enough that in this life good actions do not generally procure temporal advantages to men, and that bad ones are the moſt uſual and moſt effectual way to wealth and power; and therefore in order to inſpire men with the love of virtue, and prevent their running into vice, it had been neceſſary to propoſe to them rewards and puniſhments after this life. This is the craft which the libertines aſcribe to thoſe, whom they pretend to have been the firſt contrivers of religion. This is what Spinoza ſhould have believed, and doubtleſs he believed it; and therefore Mr Soupp did not underſtand him in that reſpect, but took him in the quite contrary ſenſe to what he meant. I wonder this fault was left in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary, in an article that bears Mr Simon's name. Note, that thoſe who deny the immortality of the ſoul, and providence, as the Epicureans did, are thoſe who maintain, that virtue ought to be followed by reaſon of it's excellency, and becauſe the practice of morality is attended in this life with ſo conſiderable advantages, that we have no reaſon to complain. Doubtleſs, this is the doctrine Spinoza would have taught, if he had been ſo bold as to dogmatize publickly.

[*F*] *He found himſelf ſo ſtrongly inclined to enquire after truth.*] The proof of theſe words, and of ſeveral others in the text of this article, is to be found in the preface to the poſthumous works of this author. ‘ Fuit ab ineunte ætate literis innutritus, & in adoleſcentiâ per multos annos in Theologiâ ſe exercuit; poſtquam verò eo ætatis pervenerat, in quâ ingenium matureſcit, & ad rerum naturas indagandas aptum redditur, ſe totum Philoſophiæ dedit: quum autem nec preceptores, nec harum Scientiarum Auctores pro voto ei facerent ſatis, & ille tamen ſummo ſciendi amore arderet, quid in hiſce ingenii vires valerent, experiri decrevit. Ad hoc propoſitum urgendum Scripta Philoſophica Nobiliſſimi & ſummi Philoſophi Renati des Cartes magno ei fuerunt adjumento. Poſtquam igitur ſeſe ab omnigenis occupationibus, & negotiorum curis, veritatis inquiſitioni magnâ ex parte officientibus, liberaſſet, quò minus à familiaribus in ſuis turbaretur meditationibus, urbem Amſtelædamum, in quâ natus, & educatus fuit, deſeruit, atque primò Renoburgum, deinde Voorburgum, & tandem Hagam Comitis habitatum conceſſit, ubi etiam IX Kalend. Martii anno ſupra milleſimum & ſexcenteſimum ſeptuageſimo ſeptimo ex Pthiſi hanc vitam reliquit, poſtquam annum ætatis quadrageſimum quartum exceſſiſſet. Nec tantum in veritate perquirendâ totus fuit, ſed etiam ſe ſpeciatim in Opticis & vitris, quæ Teleſcopiis ac Microſcopiis inſervire poſſent, tornandis, poliendiſque exercuit; & niſi mors eum intempeſtiva rapuiſſet, (quid enim in his efficere potuerit, ſatis oſtendit) præſtantiora ab eo fuiſſent ſperanda. Licet verò ſe totum mundo ſubduxerit, & latuerit, plurimis tamen doctrinâ, & honore conſpicuis Viris ob eruditionem ſolidam, magnumque ingenii acumen innotuit: uti videre eſt ex Epiſtolis ad ipſum ſcriptis, & ipſius ad eas Reſponſionibus. Plurimum temporis in Naturâ rerum perſcrutandâ, inventis in ordinem redigendis, & amicis communicandis, minimum in animo recreando inſumpſit: quin tantus veritatis expiſcandæ in eo ardor exarſit,

‘ ut,

(41) Of whom I have ſpoken in citation (90) of the article RAMUS.

(42) The author of that anſwer was then miniſter and profeſſor of Divinity at Nimeguen. He is profeſſor at Groningen. His Latin name is *Braunius*, and has appeared in the title of ſeveral books.

(43) Pag. 158.

(44) Pag. 160.

(45) Ibid. *pag.* 161.

(46) Ibid. *pag.* 162.

(47) Brun, Veritable Religion des Hollandois, *pag.* 163.

(48) Ibid. *pag.* 164.

(49) In the remark [*M*].

all manner of buſineſs, he alſo left Amſterdam, becauſe the viſits of his friends too much interrupted his ſpeculations, and retired into the country, where he meditated without any hindrance, and made Microſcopes and Teleſcopes. He continued in the ſame courſe of life after he had ſettled at the Hague; and was ſo well pleaſed with meditating, and putting his meditations into order, and communicating them to his friends, that he ſpent very little time in any recreation, and was ſometimes three whole months without ſtepping out of doors. Though he lived a very retired life, his name and his reputation flew every where. Free-thinkers reſorted to him from all parts [*G*]. The Palatine court deſired to have him, and offered him a profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy at Heidelberg [*H*]. But he refuſed it, as being an employment little conſiſtent with his great deſire of inquiring into truth without any interruption. He fell ſick of a lingring diſeaſe, of which he died at the Hague, the twenty-firſt of February 1677, being ſomewhat above forty-four years of age (*g*). I have heard ſay that the Prince of Condé being at Utrecht in the year 1673, ſent him word that he would be glad to ſee him (*b*). Thoſe who have been acquainted

(*g*) Taken from the Preface of his Poſthumous Works. See the remark [*F*].

(*b*) See the remark [*G*].

‘ ut, teſtantibus iis apud quos habitabat, per tres continuos menſes in publicum non prodierit: Quinimò, ne in veritatis indagine turbaretur, ſed ex voto in eâ procederet, Profeſſoratum in Academiâ Heidelbergenſi, ei à Sereniſſimo Electore Palatino oblatum, modeſtè excuſavit, uti ex Epiſtola quinquageſimâ tertiâ (50) & quartâ perſpicitur (51). - - - - *He was brought up to learning from his youth, and for many years ſtudied Theology; but when he came to greater maturity of underſtanding, he applied himſelf wholly to Philoſophy; but neither his teachers, nor the authors of theſe ſciences, anſwering his expectations, or being able to ſatiate his ardent deſire of knowledge, he reſolved to try the ſtrength of his own reaſon. To further this deſign, the Philoſophical works of the moſt renowned and excellent Philoſopher Renatus Des Cartes were a great aſſiſtance. Wherefore after he had laid aſide all ſort of buſineſs and care of affairs, which greatly hindered his ſearch after truth, that he might not be interrupted in his meditations by his acquaintance, he left the city of Amſterdam, where he was born, and educated; and after having often changed his reſidence, went at laſt to live at the Hague, where he died of a conſumption in February* 1677, *in the forty-fifth year of his age- He alſo exerciſed himſelf in turning and poliſhing optic glaſſes for Teleſcopes and Microſcopes; and, had he not been removed by an utimely death, greater things might have been expected of him, for he had ſufficiently ſhewn his ability. But tho' he had altogether withdrawn himſelf from the world, yet he was known to many learned and honourable perſons, for his great learning and capacity; as appears by the letters ſent to him, and his anſwers. He ſpent much time in ſearching into the nature of things, and communicating what he had found to his friends, but very little in recreation: yea, he was inflamed with ſuch an ardent deſire of finding out the truth, that he hath not been ſeen in public for three whole months, as hath been teſtified by thoſe with whom he lived. Beſides, that he might not be interrupted in his purſuit of truth, he modeſtly excuſed himſelf from accepting a profeſſorſhip, in the univerſity of Heidelberg, offered him by the Elector Palatine, as appears from the fifty-third, and fifty-fourth epiſtles.*’ The Theology he ſtudied ſo long was that of the Jews. It is ſaid that he was not well verſed in their Literature, and in the critical knowledge of the Scripture (52). However it is certain that he underſtood Hebrew (53) better than Greek (54).

[G] *Free-thinkers reſorted to him from all parts.*] I have named one in another place (55). I omit the reſt, and I ſhall only ſay that the Prince of Condé, whoſe learning was almoſt as great as his courage, and who loved the converſation of Free-thinkers, deſired to ſee Spinoza, and procured him a paſs to come to Utrecht. He commanded there the troops of France. I have been told, that he was obliged to go and viſit a poſt the day Spinoza was to come, and that the term of the paſs expired before that prince returned to Utrecht: ſo that he did not ſee the author of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*; but he had given orders, that, in his abſence, Spinoza ſhould meet with a good reception, and ſhould not go without a preſent. The author of the anſwer to the book, intituled, *La Religion des Hollandois*, mentions this in the following manner. ‘ Before I leave this ſubject, I muſt needs ſay that I wonder Stoupe ſhould ſo much inveigh againſt Spinoza, and ſay that he is viſited by many people in this country, ſince he contracted ſuch a ſtrict friendſhip with him when he was at Utrecht. For I have been aſſured that the Prince of Condé, at his ſollicitation, ſent for him from the Hague to Utrecht on purpoſe to diſcourſe with him, and that Stoupe praiſed him very much, and was very familiar with him (56).’

Having more exactly informed my ſelf in this matter, I learned that the Prince of Condé was returned to Utrecht before Spinoza left it, and that it is very true that he diſcourſed with that author.

[H] *The Palatine court .... offered him a profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy at Heidelberg.*] M. Chevreau ſays thereupon a thing that wants to be rectified. ‘ Being at the court of the Elector Palatine, ſays he (57), I gave a good character of Spinoza, though I then knew that Proteſtant Jew only by the firſt (58) and ſecond parts of Des Cartes's Philoſophy, printed at Amſterdam for John Rieuwertz in 1663. The Elector had that book; and after I had read ſome chapters of it to him, he reſolved to call him to his univerſity of Heidelberg to teach Philoſophy, *on condition that he ſhould not dogmatize*. Mr Fabricius, who was then profeſſor of Divinity, was ordered to write to him; and though Spinoza was not in very good circumſtances, yet he refuſed to accept that honourable employment. The reaſons of his refuſal were enquired into; and I conjectured from ſome letters I received from the Hague and Amſterdam, that theſe words, *on condition that he ſhould not dogmatize*, had frighted him’. M Chevreau is miſtaken as to the condition that he ſhould not dogmatize, and Mr Bernard rightly obſerves that it had been a contradiction. Theſe are his words, ‘ One may very well wonder, that ſince Spinoza was already ſo well known, the Elector ſhould have been willing to entruſt him with the care of teaching young people Philoſophy, and much more to require from him that he ſhould not dogmatize; for ſince his impious doctrine was built upon the grounds and principles of his Philoſophy, how could he have taught Philoſophy without inſtilling his poiſonous errors? Such a propoſal, together with the law impoſed on him, implied a kind of contradiction (59)’. It is certain, that this condition was not required from him, and that Mr Chevreau is miſtaken in that particular: We may eaſily prove it by the letter that was written to him. Mr Fabricius, who was ordered to write it, promiſed Spinoza a full liberty of philoſophizing; of which, adds he, the Elector thinks you will not make an ill uſe to the prejudice of the religion by law eſtabliſhed. If you come hither, you will live a pleaſant life, and ſuch as becomes a Philoſopher. *Philoſophandi* LIBERTATEM *habebis* AMPLISSIMAM, *quâ te ad publice ſtabilitam Religionem conturbandam non abuſurum credit ..... Hoc unum addo, te, ſi huc veneris, vitam Philoſopho dignam cum voluptate tranſacturum, niſi præter ſpem & opinionem noſtram alia omnia accident* (60). Spinoza anſwered, that if he had ever wiſhed to be a Profeſſor, he could not have wiſhed for any other profeſſorſhip than that which was offered him in the Palatinate, eſpecially on account of the liberty of philoſophizing, which his Electoral Highneſs granted him. *Si unquam mihi deſiderium fuiſſet alicujus facultatis profeſſionem ſuſcipiendi, hanc ſolam optare potuiſſem quæ mihi à Sereniſſimo Electore Palatino per te offertur,* PRÆSERTIM OB LIBERTATEM PHILOSOPHANDI *quam Princeps Clementiſſimus concedere dignatur* (61). I confeſs, that among other reaſons for which he declares he does not find himſelf diſpoſed to accept that profeſſorſhip, acquainted with Spinoza, and the peaſants of the villages where he lived a retired life for ſome time, do all ſay that he was a ſociable, affable, honeſt, friendly, and a good moral man [*I*]. This is ſtrange; but after all, it is nota more ſurpriſing thing than to ſee men live an ill life, though they be fully perſuaded of the truth of the Goſpel (*i*). Some will have it that he followed the maxim, *Nemo repente turpiſſimus*, and that he became an Atheiſt only by degrees, and that he was very far from being ſo in the year 1663, when he publiſhed the Geometrical demonſtration of Des Cartes's principles (*k*). He appears as orthodox in that book upon the nature of GOD, as Des Cartes himſelf; but we muſt know that he did not then ſpeak according to his perſuaſion [*K*]. There is ground to believe that the ill uſe he made of ſome maxims of that Philoſopher, occaſioned his Atheiſm. Some ſay that the pſeudonymous piece *de Jure Eccleſiaſticorum*, printed in 1665,

---

(50) Mr Fabricius, profeſſor of Divinity at Heidelburg, and counſeller to the Elector Palatine, wrote that letter to Spinoza, by his maſter's order, the 16th of February 1673. The following letter is Spinoza's anſwer to Mr Fabricius. Note, that he was then known to be the author of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*.

(51) *Præfat*. Oper. poſthumor. B. D. S.

(52) See the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary, at the word *Spinoza*.

(53) See at the end of his *Opera Poſthuma*, his abridgment of the Hebrew Grammar.

(54) Tam exactam linguæ Græcæ cognitionem non habeo, ut hanc Provinciam ſuſcipere audeam. *Spinoza, in Tractatu Theologico-Politico, cap. x, ſub fin. pag.* 136.

(55) See the article HENAULT.

(56) Brun, veritable Religion des Hollandois, *pag*. 164.

(57) Chevræana, *Tom. ii. pag*. 99, 100. *Dutch Edit.*

(58) To ſpeak like an orthodox, Mr Chevreau ſhould have ſaid, *becauſe I only knew that Proteſtant Jew by the firſt, &c.*

(59) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *for September*, 1700, *pag*. 301.

(60) Epiſt. liii, Spinozæ, *pag*. 562, Oper. poſthumor.

(61) *Ibid*. Epiſt. liv.

feſſorſhip, he ſays, he does not know within what bounds he muſt confine himſelf, that he might not ſeem to be a diſturber of the religion eſtabliſhed by law. *Cogito deinde, me neſcire, quibus limitibus libertas iſta philoſophandi intercludi debeat, ne videar publice ſtabilitam Religionem perturbare velle* (62). But this does not prove that the condition mentioned by Mr Chevreau was required from him. This ſhews that even good authors are very apt to give a wrong account of a fact. Mr Chevreau ſhould have been contented to ſay, that Spinoza was given in a civil manner to underſtand, that if he ſhould impugn the principles of the Reformed Church, it would be taken amiſs. Inſtead of which he uſes a general propoſition, importing a formal prohibition of dogmatizing: This is a perfect contradiction in the terms. However, it is certain that the clauſe inſerted in the letter written to Spinoza, ſeemed very inconvenient to him: and this is what I meant to expreſs in a general way, when I ſaid, That he refuſed that profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy, *being an employment little conſiſtent with his great deſire of inquiring after truth without any interruption*; for he had reaſon to believe he ſhould be continually interrupted, and that the divines of the Palatinate would make him loſe a great deal of time in juſtifying to the prince what he ſhould dictate to his ſcholars, or what he ſhould ſay in his lectures. They would have found in them ſometimes one thing directly contrary to the catechiſm of the country, and ſometimes another indirectly contrary to it. Which would have occaſioned many complaints and accuſations: He knew not how far the thing would go, and therefore he could not be ſure of living a quiet life; and though he had not fore-ſeen that it would make him loſe a great deal of time, he was ſenſible that his meditations would be very much interrupted by the obligation he would be under of giving lectures at ſtated times, and by many other functions belonging to a profeſſor. I deſire my reader to join with this explanation, which has been publiſhed in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (63).

[*I*] *He was . . . . . a good moral man.*] If you except what he told his intimate friends, who were very deſirious to be his diſciples, he ſaid nothing in converſation but what was edifying. He never ſwore; he never ſpoke diſreſpectfully of God; he went ſometimes to hear ſermons, and exhorted others to go conſtantly to church (64). He did not care for wine, good chear, or money. What he paid for his lodgings at a Painter's at the Hague was very inconſiderable. He minded nothing but ſtudy, in which he ſpent the greateſt part of the night. He lived a perfect ſolitary life. It is true, he did not refuſe the viſits occaſioned by his reputation; and that ſometimes he viſited conſiderable perſons, not to talk of trifling things, or for his diverſion, but to diſcourſe of ſtate-affairs. He underſtood them well, though he had no ſhare in them, and gueſſed pretty right what courſe general affairs would take. I find all theſe particulars in a preface of Mr Kortholt (65), who in a journey he made to Holland, informed himſelf of Spinoza's life as well as he could. ‘Vacavit interdum doctis & principibus viris, ſays he (66), quos non tam convenit, quam admiſit, cum iiſque de rebus civilibus ſermones inſtituit. Politici enim nomen affectabat, & futura mente ac cogitatione ſagaciter proſpiciebat, qualia hoſpitibus ſuis haud rara prædixit . . . . . Se profeſſus eſt Chriſtianum, & vel Reformatorum vel Lutheranorum cœtibus non modo ipſe adfuit, ſed & aliis auctor ſæpenumero & hortator extitit, ut templa frequentarent, domeſticiſque verbi quoſdam divini præcones maximopere commendavit. Nec unquam jusjurandum aut petulans de Deo dictum ex ore Spinoſæ exiit; nec largiore uſus eſt vino, & ſatis duriter vixit. Ideoque hoſpiti quavis anni parte LXXX, aureos Belgicos tantummodo perſolvit, & ſummum CCCC, quotannis impendit. Auro plane non inhiabat. - - - - - *He ſometimes paſſed his ſpare hours in converſing with learned and conſiderable men, whoſe company he rather admitted than deſired, and with whom he talked of political affairs. For he loved the name of a Politician, and ſagaciouſly pierced into futurity, and foretold his friends ſeveral events. He profeſſed to be a Chriſtian, and not only went himſelf to the churches of the Calviniſts or Lutherans, but likewiſe frequently exhorted and encouraged others to go to church and greatly recommended ſome preachers to his domeſtics. Nor did ever an oath, or indecent expreſſion concerning GOD, come from the mouth of Spinoza. He uſed wine very moderately, and lived an abſtemious life. Thus he paid his landlord only eighty guilders in the quarter, and ſpent about* 400 *guilders yearly. He was certainly not covetous of money.*’

[*K*] *He did not then ſpeak according to his perſuaſion.*] On the contrary, he believed then the ſame things which are to be found in his poſthumous works, viz. That our ſouls are but modifications of the ſubſtance of God. This may be certainly inferred from the preface of the book, by any perſon who knows Spinoza's ſyſtem. I ſhall ſet down the paſſage of that preface, wherein it is ſaid, that having a ſcholar to whom he had promiſed to explain Des Cartes's Philoſophy, he ſcrupled to depart ever ſo little from the opinions of that Philoſopher, though he did not approve of them in ſeveral things, eſpecially in what concerns the will, and human liberty. ‘Cum Diſcipulum ſuum Carteſii Philoſophiam docere promiſiſſet, religio ipſi fuit, ab ejus ſententia latum unguem diſcedere, aut quid, quod ejus dogmatibus aut non reſponderet, aut contrarium eſſet, dictare. Quamobrem judicet nemo, illum hic, aut ſua, aut tantum ea, quæ probat, docere. Quamvis enim quædam vera judicet, quædam de ſuis addita fateatur; multa tamen occurrunt, quæ tanquam falſa rejicit, & à quibus longè diverſam fovet ſententiam. Cujus notæ inter alia, ut ex multis unum tantùm in medium afferam, ſunt, quæ de voluntate habentur. *Schol. Prop.* 15. *part.* 1. *Principior. & cap.* 12. *part.* 2. *Appendic.* quamvis ſatis magno molimine atque apparatu probata videantur: Neque enim eam diſtinctam ab intellectu, multò minus tali præditam eſſe libertate exiſtimat. Etenim in his aſſerendis, ut ex *Diſſertat. de Method. part.* 4. *& Meditat.* 2. aliiſque locis liquet, tantùm ſupponit, non probat Carteſius, mentem Humanam eſſe ſubſtantiam abſolutè cogitantem. Cum contrà author noſter admittat quidem, in Rerum natura eſſe ſubſtantiam cogitantem: Attamen neget illam conſtituere eſſentiam Mentis humanæ; ſed ſtatuat, eodem modo quo Extenſio nullis limitibus determinata eſt, Cogitationem etiam nullis limitibus determinari: adeòque, quemadmodum corpus humanum non eſt abſolutè, ſed tantum certo modo ſecundum leges naturæ extenſæ per motum & quietem determinata extenſio; ſic etiam mentem ſive Animam humanam non eſſe abſolutè, ſed tantùm ſecundum leges naturæ cogitantis per ideas certo modo determinatam cogitationem: quæ neceſſario dari concluditur, ubi corpus humanum exiſtere incipit. Ex quâ definitione, non difficile demonſtratu eſſe putat, Voluntatem ab intellectu non diſtingui, multò minus eâ, quàm illi Carteſius adſcribit, pollere libertate; quin imò ipſam affirmandi & negandi facultatem prorſus fictitiam (67). . . . . . *When he had promiſed to teach his diſciple the Philoſophy of Des Cartes, he religiouſly obſerved this rule, not to depart in the leaſt from Des*

(*i*) Taken from the Memoir imparted to the Bookſeller.

(*k*) *Here is the title of that work:* Renati Des Cartes Principiorum Philoſophiæ Pars I, & II, more Geometrico demonſtratæ per Benedictum de Spinoza Amſtelodamenſem. Acceſſerunt ejuſdem Cogitata Metaphyſica, in quibus difficiliores, quæ tam in parte Metaphyſices generali, quàm ſpeciali occurrunt, Quæſtiones breviter explicantur.

(62) Ibid. *pag.* 563.

(63) In December, 1700, pag. 689, 690.

(64) See the remark [*Y*].

(65) Sebaſtian: he is profeſſor of Poetry at Kiel, ſince the month of February 1701.

(66) Sebaſtianus Kortholtus, *Præfat. Editionis* 2 *Tractatus* Chriſtiani Kortholti *patris ſui* de tribus Impoſtoribus.

(67) Ludovicus Meyer, *Præfat.* Renati Des Cartes, &c. Principiorum more Geometrico demonſtr. per Benedictum de Spinoza.

1665, was the fore-runner of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* [*L*]. All thoſe, who have confuted the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, have diſcovered in it the ſeeds of Atheiſm; but none has done it ſo clearly as Mr John Bredenburg [*M*]. It is not ſo eaſy to anſwer all the difficulties contained in that book, as utterly to deſtroy the ſyſtem

‘*Cartes's opinions, nor dictate any thing which either was not agreeable, or was contrary to them. Therefore let no man think that he here teaches his own opinions, or even ſuch as he approves. For though he judges ſome things in this book to be true, and owns that he has added ſome of his own, yet it contains many tenets which he rejects as falſe, and which are very different from thoſe he entertains. Of this I ſhall give one inſtance among many, in what concerns the Will, though that ſeems to be copiouſly proved. For he does not believe the will to be diſtinct from the underſtanding, much leſs does he believe it to be endowed with ſuch a liberty. For it appears from ſeveral places in Des Cartes's books that in theſe aſſertions he only ſuppoſes that the human mind is an abſolutely thinking ſubſtance; but does not prove it. Whereas our author admits indeed that there is in nature a thinking ſubſtance: but he denies that it conſtitutes the eſſence of the human mind, and lays it down that Thought, like Extenſion, is not determined by any limits. Thus, as the human body is not extenſion abſolutely, but extenſion determined in a certain manner by motion and reſt, according to the laws of extended nature, after the ſame manner the human mind or ſoul is not thinking abſolutely, but thinking determined in a certain manner by ideas, according to the laws of thinking nature; which thinking is concluded neceſſarily to be in the human body when it begins to exiſt. From this definition it appeared to him not difficult to demonſtrate that the will is not diſtinct from the underſtanding, much leſs that it has that liberty which Des Cartes aſſigns to it; nay even that the faculty of affirming and denying is fictitious.*’ - - - - It appears from a letter of Spinoza (68), that he deſired the author of the preface ſhould uſe the advertiſement we have juſt now read. From which you may conclude, that a Divine might have taken many thoughts and phraſes from that book of Spinoza, without being heterodox. See the book, intituled, *Burmannorum Pietas* (69), printed at Utrecht in 1700.

[*L*] *The pſeudonymous piece* de Jure Eccleſiaſticorum, *which was printed in the year* 1665, *was the fore-runner, &c.*] Mr Dartis inſerting in his journal ſome objections againſt a book of M. de la Placette (70), ſays that ſincere men, ‘who depreſs the eccleſiaſtical authority, and at the ſame time ſo much the more raiſe the temporal one..... do not obſerve that they fall into the firſt ſnare laid by Spinoza, to open the way to his impious doctrine. This conjecture is grounded upon the date of two books publiſhed by that pernicious man, one in 1665, and the other in 1670. The firſt is intituled, *Lucii Antiſtii Conſtantis de jure Eccleſiaſticorum liber ſingularis quo docetur: Quodcumque Divini humanique juris Eccleſiaſticis tribuitur, vel ipſi ſibi tribuunt, hoc aut falsò impieque illis tribui, aut non aliundè quàm à ſuis, hoc eſt ejus Reipublicæ ſivè Civitatis Prodiis, in qua ſunt conſtituti, accepiſſe.* The ſecond is his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, which made a much greater noiſe than the firſt. The ſtyle and the principles of thoſe two books are ſo like, that one needs only compare them together, to be fully convinced that they were written by the ſame author. And the bare reading of them is ſufficient to ſhow, that he has only diſcredited the authority of the Clergy in the firſt, and at the ſame time raiſed that of Kings and Magiſtrates, only to make way for the impious doctrines which he aſſerts in the ſecond (71).

[*M*] *All thoſe, who have confuted the* Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, *have diſcovered in it the ſeeds of Atheiſm . . . but none has done it ſo clearly as Mr John Bredenburg.*] I have already mentioned the poſthumous anſwer of a profeſſor of Philoſophy in the univerſity of Utrecht (72). To which I add, that a Socinian called Francis Cuper, who died at Rotterdam in 1695, intituled his anſwer to that book of Spinoza, *Arcana Atheiſmi revelata, philoſophicè & paradoxè refutata.* It is a book in 4to, printed at Rotterdam, in 1676. Mr Yvon, a diſciple of Labadie, and miniſter of the Labadiſts, at Wiewert in Frieſland, confuted the ſame book of Spinoza, in a work which he intituled, *L'Impieté convaincuë*, and publiſhed it Amſterdam in 1681, in 8vo. It is ſaid in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary, 1. That Mr Huet, in his *Demonſtratio Evangelica*, and Mr Simon, in his book concerning the Inſpiration of the Sacred Writings, have confuted the impious ſyſtem contained in the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. 2. That this *Tractatus* has alſo been tranſlated into French, and printed with this title, *Reflexions curieuſes d'un Eſprit deſintereſſé ſur les matieres les plus importantes au ſalut tant public que particulier.* I add, that this tranſlation, printed in the year 1678, in 12mo, came out with two other titles (73), as it has been rightly obſerved in the catalogue of the library of the Archbiſhop of Reims, and that the Latin original has been reprinted in 8vo, with ſeveral odd and chimerical titles, as the Bookſellers thought fit, to deceive the public, and elude the prohibitions of the magiſtrates. I further add, that Father le Vaſſor (74) has very well confuted Spinoza, in his treatiſe concerning the true religion, printed at Paris, in the year 1688. See the *Journal des Sçavans* of the thirty-firſt of January, 1689; the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, and the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans* of the ſame year. Mr Van Til, a miniſter of Dort, wrote very good books in Dutch, to maintain the Divinity and authority of the Scripture againſt that impious man (75). The paſſage I am going to quote out of Mr Saldenus, a miniſter at the Hague, will inform us of the names of ſome other writers againſt Spinoza. That miniſter does not approve that Spinoza ſhould be confuted in the vulgar tongue; he is afraid that perſons curious, and lovers of paradoxes, will learn by that means, what it were better for them never to know all their life. ‘Neque defuêre, qui ſe abominandis ipſius Hypotheſibus (76) voce calamoque oppoſuerunt. Hos inter fuêre, *Batelerius* (77), *Manſveldius*, *Cuperus*, *Muſæus*, &c. qui omnes an æque feliciter contra eum decertârint, non ſine ratione à quibuſdam dubitatur. Hos ſecutus poſtmodum eſt *Guilielmus Blyenbergius* (78), civis Dordracenus, qui idiomate etiam vernaculo confodere ipſum laboravit; licet neſciam, an conſilio ſatis tuto; *tum* quod, quem oppugnat, Adverſarius Sermone illo non ſcripſerit, *tum* quod periculo vix careat, ne peſtilentiſſimum impudentiſſimi *Novatoris* venenum, quod ſub linguâ ignotâ latere hactenus plurimos poterat, Sermone vulgato in ipſum etiam vulgus, plus juſto fere curioſum, & in paradoxo proclive, proſerpat tandem & tranſeat (79). - - - - *Nor were there wanting men who both preached and wrote againſt his abominable tenets; among whom were* Batelerius, Manſvelt, Cuper, Muſæus, *&c. Some very reaſonably doubt whether all theſe writers attacked Spinoza with equal ſucceſs. After them appeared* William Blyenberg, *a citizen of Dort, who endeavoured to refute him in Dutch; tho' I know not whether this was ſafely done, both becauſe the adverſary whom he attacked, wrote not in that language, and becauſe there is ſome danger, leſt the poiſonous venom of that impudent innovator, which, till then, might have lain hid from ſeveral people, in an unknown language, ſhould, by being brought into the common language, creep, and diffuſe itſelf among the generality of people who are too curious and prone to embrace paradoxes.*’

An anonymous writer, who denoted his name by theſe initial letters, J. M. V. D. M. publiſhed a Latin letter at Utrecht, in the year 1671, againſt the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. As for thoſe, who have inſerted in ſome books, which they did not write deſignedly againſt that tract of Spinoza, ſeveral things whereby they confute his principles, I cannot name them all, they are ſo many: I ſhall only point out two famous profeſſors of Divinity, Mr Witzius, and Mr Majus, one in Holland, and the other in Germany, and Mr de la Mothe, a French miniſter at London.

I ſhall now ſpeak of Mr John Bredenburg. He was a citizen of Rotterdam, who publiſhed there a book in 1675, intituled, *Joannis Bredenburgii Enervatio Tractatus Theologico-Politici, una cum Demonſtratione, geometrico ordine diſpoſita,* NATURAM NON ESSE DEUM, *cujus effati contrario prædictus Tractatus unice innititur*

(68) It is the ninth.

(69) Pag. 41, & ſeq.

(70) His book concerning conſcience.

(71) Journal de Hambourg, *Monday the 26th of October*, 1694, *pag.* 133.

(72) Called *Regnier de Manſvelt*. His book was printed at Amſterdam 1674, in 4to.

(73) *One of them is*, Traité des Ceremonies ſuperſtiteuſes des Juifs tant anciens que modernes, *and the other* La clef du Sanctuaire.

(74) He was then Father of the Oratory: He is turned Proteſtant ſince.

(75) *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *for March* 1696, *Art. iii.*

(76) *See how he ſpeaks of the* Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, *p.* 23.

(77) *He ſhould have ſaid* Batalerius (Jacobus): *his book was printed at Amſterdam* 1674, *and contains* 103 *pages in* 12mo. *It is intituled,* Vindiciæ Miraculorum per quæ divinæ Religionis & Fidei Chriſtianæ Veritas olim confirmata fuit, adverſus profanum auctorem Tractatus Theologico-Politici.

(78) I think he wrote againſt the Poſthumous Works, and not againſt the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*.

(79) Saldenus, in Otiis Theologicis, *pag.* 25.

ſyſtem of his *Opera poſthuma*; for it is the moſt abſurd and monſtrous hypotheſis that can be imagined, and the moſt contrary to the moſt evident notions of our mind [*N*]. It ſeems as if providence puniſhed in a particular manner the boldneſs of that

innititur (80). He ſet in a full light what Spinoza had endeavoured to wrap up and diſguiſe, and made a ſolid confutation of it. The readers were ſurprized that a man, who was no profeſſed ſcholar, and who had very little learning (81), ſhould have been able to dive into all the principles of Spinoza, and to confute them ſo ſucceſsfully, after he had repreſented them in their full ſtrength, by a fair analyſis. I have heard of a remarkable thing, *viz.* That this author having many times conſidered his anſwer, and the principle of his adverſary, found, at laſt, that his principle might be brought to a demonſtration. Whereupon he undertook to prove, that there is no other cauſe of all things, but a Being, which neceſſarily exiſts, and acts, by an immutable, unavoidable, and unalterable neceſſity. He followed the method of the Geometricians, and after he had drawn up his demonſtration, he examined it all manner of ways; he endeavoured to find out the weak ſide of it, and could never think of any way to confute it, nor even to weaken it. Which made him very uneaſy; he groaned, and ſighed, he was angry with reaſon, and deſired his moſt learned friends to help him to find out the fault of that demonſtration. Nevertheleſs, he ſuffered no body to take a copy of it. Francis Cuper tranſcribed it by ſtealth, tho' he had promiſed not to do it (82). That man, perhaps, moved by the mutual jealouſy of authors, for he had writ againſt Spinoza, and had not been ſo ſucceſsful as John Bredenburg, made uſe of that copy ſome time after to accuſe him of Atheiſm. He publiſhed it in Dutch with ſome reflexions; Bredenburg defended himſelf in the ſame language: ſeveral pieces were publiſhed on both ſides, which I have not read, for I do not underſtand Dutch. Orobio, a Jew, who was an able Phyſician (83), and Aubert de Verſé (84) engaged in that quarrel, and ſided with Cuper. They maintained that the author of the demonſtration was a Spinoziſt, and conſequently an Atheiſt. As far as I have been able to underſtand by what I have heard, the latter defended himſelf, by alledging the common diſtinction between faith and reaſon. He pretended that as the Proteſtants and the Catholics believe the myſtery of the Trinity, tho' inconſiſtent with the light of nature, he believed free-will, tho' reaſon afforded him ſtrong proofs that every thing happens by an unavoidable neceſſity, and conſequently that there can be no religion. It is no eaſy thing to drive a man out of ſuch an entrenchment. It may be ſaid that he is not ſincere, and that is impoſſible to believe, as a truth, what is contrary to a Geometrical demonſtration: but can this be ſaid without ſetting yourſelf up for a judge in a caſe, wherein incompetency may be objected againſt you? Have we a right to decide what paſſes in other mens hearts? Have we a ſufficient knowledge of a man's ſoul, to be poſitive that ſuch and ſuch combinations cannot be found in it? Have we not many inſtances of abſurd combinations, and ſuch as come nearer to a contradiction than that which John Bredenburg alledged? For it ought to be obſerved that there is no contradiction between theſe two things: 1, Reaſon teaches me that this is falſe; 2, And yet I believe it, becauſe I am perſuaded that reaſon is not infallible, and becauſe I had rather follow an inward ſenſe, and the impreſſions of conſcience, in ſhort, the word of GOD, than a metaphyſical demonſtration. This is not believing, and diſbelieving at the ſame time one and the ſame thing. Such a combination is impoſſible, and no man ought to be admitted to alledge it for his vindication. However it be, the man I ſpeak of made it appear that the ſenſe of religion, and the hopes of another life prevailed in his ſoul againſt his demonſtration; and I have been told that the marks he gave of it, during his laſt ſickneſs, put his ſincerity out of all doubt. The Abbot de Dangeau (85) ſpeaks of ſome men, whoſe religion is in their mind, and not in their heart; they are perſuaded of the truth of it, but their conſcience is not affected with the love of GOD. I think it may likewiſe be ſaid that there are ſome men, whoſe religion is in their heart, and not in their mind. They loſe ſight of it, when they make uſe of reaſon to come to the knowledge of it; it eſcapes the ſubtilties and ſophiſms of their Logic; they know not which way to turn whilſt they proclaim the arguments *pro* and *con*: but when they leave off diſputing, and mind only their inward ſenſe, the inſtinct of conſcience, the power of education, *&c.* they are perſuaded that there is a religion, and conform their lives to it as much as human infirmities can permit. This was the caſe of Cicero: one can hardly doubt it who compares his other books with thoſe *de Natura Deorum*, wherein he makes Cotta triumph over all the interlocutors, who maintained the exiſtence of the gods.

Whoever deſires to know the ſhifts and equivocations made uſe of by Spinoza to conceal his Atheiſm, needs only read Chriſtian Kortholt's book *de tribus Impoſtoribus magnis* (86), printed at Kiel in 1680, in 12mo. The author has there collected ſeveral paſſages of Spinoza, and ſhown all the venom and artifice that lie in them. This is not the leaſt curious part of the hiſtory and character of that Atheiſt. He quotes (87), among other things, his letter (88), wherein Spinoza complains that there was a report (89) that he had a book in the preſs to prove that there is no GOD.

[*N*] *The moſt abſurd and monſtrous hypotheſis . . . . the moſt contrary to the moſt evident notions of our mind.*] He ſuppoſes (90) that there is but one ſubſtance in nature, and that this only ſubſtance is endowed with infinite attributes, and among others, with extenſion and thought. Afterwards he affirms, that all bodies in the univerſe are modifications of that ſubſtance, as it is extended; and that for inſtance, the ſouls of men are modifications of that ſubſtance, as it thinks: ſo that GOD, the neceſſary and moſt perfect Being, is the cauſe of all things that exiſt, but does not differ from them. There is but one Being, and one Nature, and that Being produces in itſelf, and by an immanent action, whatever goes by the name of creatures. He is at once both agent and patient, efficient cauſe, and ſubject; He produces nothing but what is his own modification. This is the moſt extravagant hypotheſis that can be thought of. The moſt infamous things ſung by the heathen Poets againſt Jupiter, and againſt Venus, do not come near the horrid notion Spinoza gives us of GOD. For the Poets did not aſcribe to the gods all the crimes that are committed, all the infirmities of mankind; but, according to Spinoza, there is no other agent, nor other patient but GOD, with reſpect to phyſical and moral evil. Let us obſerve ſome of the abſurdities of his ſyſtem.

THAT according to Spinoza, God and extenſion are the ſame thing.

I. It is impoſſible that the univerſe ſhould be the only ſubſtance; for whatever is extended muſt neceſſarily conſiſt of parts, and whatever conſiſts of parts muſt be compounded: and as the parts of extenſion do not ſubſiſt one in another, it neceſſarily follows that extenſion in general is not a ſubſtance, or that each part of extenſion is a particular ſubſtance, and diſtinct from all others. But, according to Spinoza, extenſion in general is the attribute of a ſubſtance. He owns, as all other Philoſophers do, that the attribute of a ſubſtance does not really differ from that ſubſtance; and therefore he muſt acknowledge that extenſion in general is a ſubſtance: from whence it ought to be concluded, that each part of extenſion is a particular ſubſtance; which overthrows the foundation of the whole ſyſtem of that author. He cannot ſay that extenſion in general is diſtinct from the ſubſtance of GOD; for ſhould he ſay ſo, it would follow that this ſubſtance is in itſelf unextended: and therefore it could never have acquired the three dimenſions but by creating them, ſince it is manifeſt that extenſion cannot proceed from an unextended ſubject, but by way of creation. But Spinoza did not believe that any thing could be made out of nothing. Again, it is manifeſt, that a ſubſtance unextended by it's nature, can never become the ſubject of the three dimenſions; for how could they be placed upon a mathematical point? They would therefore ſubſiſt without a ſubject; and therefore they would be a ſubſtance: ſo that if this author admitted a real diſtinction between the ſubſtance of GOD and extenſion in general, he would be obliged to ſay, that GOD is compoſed of two ſubſtances diſtinct one from another, *viz.* of his unextended being, and of that author, by blinding him to ſuch a degree, that in order to avoid ſome difficulties, which

---

(80) It is a book in 4to, of 100 pages.

(81) He owns in his preface, that not being able to expreſs himſelf in Latin, he had writ his book in Dutch and then had it tranſlated into Latin.

(82) I have been informed juſt now, that Cuper did always deny it, and that he always proteſted that he found the demonſtration among the papers of the Sieur Hartighvelt, whoſe heir he was.

(83) *I have ſeen the tract he publiſhed at Amſterdam, in* 1684, *intituled*, Certamen Philoſophicum propugnatæ veritatis divinæ ac naturaralis, adverſus J. B. principia, *&c. It is in Latin and Dutch.*

(84) I have ſeen ſomething of what he publiſhed in the ſame year under the name of *Latinus Serbaltus Sartenſis*. It is a book in Latin and Dutch.

(85) See his third Dialogue at the end, or the extract of it in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, for Auguſt 1684, Art. VI, *p. m.* 605.

(86) *Viz.* Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury; Thomas Hobbes; and Benedict de Spinoza.

(87) Chriſt. Korth. de tribus Impoſtor. *p.* 171.

(88) Written to Mr Oldenbourg, in 1675.

(89) Qui quidem rumor, *ait*, à plurimis accipiebatur. Unde quidam Theologi (hujus forte rumoris auctores) occaſionem cepere de me coram Principe & magiſtratibus conquerendi. - - - *Which report went among a great many people. From whence ſome Divines (who perhaps were the inventers of it) took occaſion to complain of me to the prince and the magiſtrates.*

(90) See among his Poſthumous Works the piece intituled *Ethica*.

of extenſion. Thus he is obliged to acknowledge that extenſion and GOD are but one and the ſame thing; and beſides, as he maintains that there is but one ſubſtance in the univerſe, he muſt needs teach that extenſion is a ſimple Being, and as much compounded as Mathematical points. But is not this a moſt ridiculous aſſertion, and contrary to our moſt diſtinct ideas? Is it more evident that the number one thouſand is made up of a thouſand units, than it is evident that a body of an hundred inches is made up of a hundred parts really diſtinct one from another, each of which has the extenſion of an inch?

THAT extenſion is compoſed of parts, each of which is a particular ſubſtance.

It were in vain to raiſe any objections againſt our imagination and our ſenſes; for the moſt intellectual and the moſt immaterial notions diſcover to us, with the utmoſt evidence, that there is a moſt real diſtinction between things, one of which has a property, which the other has not. The ſchool-men have been very ſucceſsful in ſhowing the characters and infallible ſigns of diſtinction. When, ſay they, we may affirm of one thing, what cannot be affirmed of another, thoſe two things are diſtinct: things that may be ſeparated one from another, either with reſpect to time, or with reſpect to place, are diſtinct. If we apply thoſe characters to the twelve inches of the foot of extenſion, we ſhall find a true diſtinction between them. I can affirm of the fifth, that it is contiguous to the ſixth, and I can deny it of the firſt and ſecond, &c. I can remove the ſixth to the place of the twelfth; and therefore it may be ſeparated from the fifth. Note, that Spinoza cannot deny that the characters of diſtinction made uſe of by the ſchool-men are very juſt; for it is by theſe characters he acknowledges that ſtones and animals are not the ſame modification of the infinite Being. He acknowledges therefore, will they ſay, that there is ſome difference between things. He muſt needs own it, for he was not ſo extravagant as to believe that there was no difference between him and the Jew, who gave him a ſtab with a knife; or to ſay, that his bed and his chamber were, in all reſpects, the ſame being with the Emperor of China. What did he ſay then? He taught, not that two trees are two parts of extenſion, but only two modifications. You will be ſurprized that he ſpent ſo many years in forging a new ſyſtem, ſince one of the main pillars of it was to be the pretended difference between the word *part* and the word *modification*. Could he expect any advantage from this change of a word? What ſignifies it, whether he declines to uſe the word *part*, and ſubſtitutes the word *modification* in the room of it? Will the notions annexed to the word *part* vaniſh away? Will they not be applied to the word *modification?* Are the ſigns and characters of difference leſs real or evident, when matter is divided into modifications, than when it is divided into parts? Not at all. The idea of matter ſtill remains the idea of a compound being, of a ſyſtem of ſeveral ſubſtances. This will be fully proved by what I am going to ſay.

MODIFICATIONS inconſiſtent, require diſtinct ſubjects.

Modifications are beings, which cannot exiſt without the ſubſtance they modify; and therefore there ought to be a ſubſtance wherever there are modifications; nay, it muſt needs be multiplied in proportion as modifications inconſiſtent one with another are multiplied: ſo that wherever there are five or ſix ſuch modifications, there are alſo five or ſix ſubſtances. It is evident, and no Spinoziſt can deny it, that the ſquare and the circular figures cannot be in the ſame piece of wax. And therefore the ſubſtance modified by a ſquare figure is not the ſame ſubſtance with that which is modified by the circular figure. When therefore I ſee a round table, and a ſquare table, in a room, I may affirm that the extenſion, which is the ſubject of the round table, is a ſubſtance diſtinct from the extenſion, which is the ſubject of the other table; for otherwiſe the ſquare figure and the round figure would be at the ſame time in one and the ſame ſubject; which is impoſſible. Iron and water, wine and wood, are incompatible; and therefore they require diſtinct ſubjects. The lower end of a ſtake driven into a river is not the ſame modification with the other end: It is ſurrounded with earth, whilſt the other is ſurrounded with water; and therefore they have two contradictory attributes, viz. being ſurrounded with water, not being ſurrounded with water: and therefore the ſubject they modify muſt be at leaſt two ſubſtances; for one only ſubſtance cannot be at the ſame time modified by an accident ſurrounded with water, and by an accident not ſurrounded with water. This ſhows that extenſion is made up of as many diſtinct ſubſtances as there are modifications.

THE immutability of God is inconſiſtent with the nature of extenſion. That matter is actually divided into parts.

II. If it be an abſurd thing to ſay that God is extended, becauſe, it is depriving him of his ſimplicity, and aſcribing to him an infinite number of parts; what ſhall we ſay when we conſider that this opinion reduces him to the condition of matter, the vileſt of all beings, and ſuch as moſt of the antient Philoſophers have placed immediately next to nothing. Matter is the ſtage of all ſorts of changes, the field of battle of contrary cauſes, the ſubject of all corruptions, and of all generations; in a word, there is no being, whoſe nature is more inconſiſtent with the immutability of God. And yet the Spinoziſts maintain that it ſuffers no diviſion; and the reaſon they alledge for it is the moſt frivolous and moſt ſilly cavilling in the world. They pretend that if matter was divided, one of its portions ſhould be ſeparated from others by empty ſpaces; which never happens. This is certainly a very wrong definition of diviſion. We are as really ſeparated from our friends, when the ſpace that divides us is taken up by other men placed a breaſt, as if it was full of earth. And therefore when the Spinoziſts maintain, that matter reduced into aſhes and ſmoak is not actually divided, they advance a thing quite contrary to our notions and manner of ſpeaking. But what will they get, if we ſhould lay aſide the advantage we may draw from their wrong defining diviſion? There will remain ſtill many proofs of the mutability and corruptibility of the god of Spinoza. All men have a very clear idea of an immutable Being: They underſtand by that word a Being, which never acquires any thing new; which never loſes what it is once poſſeſſed of; which is always the ſame, both with reſpect to its ſubſtance, and to the manner of its Being. The clearneſs of this idea enables us to apprehend moſt diſtinctly what a mutable Being is: It is not only a Being, whoſe exiſtence may begin and have an end; but a Being, which always ſubſiſting as to its ſubſtance, may ſucceſſively acquire ſeveral modifications, and loſe the accidents or forms which it once had. All the antient Philoſophers have acknowledged, that the continual ſeries of generations and corruptions, which is obſerved in the world, neither produces nor deſtroys any portion of matter: hence it is, that they ſaid that matter is ingenerable and incorruptible as to its ſubſtance, though it be the ſubject of all generations and all corruptions. The ſame matter which is fire now, was wood before; all its eſſential attributes remain the ſame under the form of wood, and under the form of fire: and therefore it loſes and acquires nothing but accidents and modes, when wood is changed into fire, bread into fleſh, fleſh into earth, &c. And yet it is the moſt ſenſible and the moſt proper example that can be given of a mutable Being, and actually liable to all ſorts of alterations and internal changes. I call them internal; for the different forms under which it exiſts are not like the different cloaths under which actors appear upon the ſtage. The bodies of thoſe actors may ſubſiſt without any manner of change or alteration under a thouſand different dreſſes: Cloth and linnen, ſilk and gold, are not united with the man that wears them; they are ſtill foreign bodies, and outward ornaments; but the forms produced in matter are inwardly and penetratively united to it; it is their ſubject of inherence, and according to right Philoſophy, there is no other diſtinction between them and matter, than what is to be found between modes and a thing modified. From whence it follows, that the god of the Spinoziſts is a Being actually changing, that goes continually through ſeveral ſtates internally and really different one from another. It is not therefore the moſt perfect Being, *with whom there is no variableneſs, neither ſhadow of turning* (91).

Note, that the Proteus mentioned by the Poets, their Thetis, and their Vertumnus, who were images and examples of inconſtancy, and which occaſioned

(91) Jam. i. 17.

which may perplex a Philoſopher, he run himſelf into others infinitely more inexplicable, and

the proverbs whereby the oddeſt fickleneſs of men was denoted, would have been immutable gods, if the god of the Spinoziſts was immutable; for it was never pretended that there happened any alteration in their ſubſtance, but only new modifications.

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo (92).
What charm can hold this varying Proteus faſt.
CREECH.

..... ſæpe notatus
Cum tribus annellis, modo læva Priſcus inani,
Vixit inæqualis, clavum ut mutaret in horas:
Ædibus ex magnis ſubito ſe conderet, unde
Mundior exiret vix libertinus honeſte.
Jam mœchus Romæ, jam mallet doctus Athenis
Vivere: Vertumnis, quotquot ſunt, natus iniquis. *

Fop Priſcus with himſelf doth diſagree,
Sometimes he wears no rings, and ſometimes three.
He changes every hour his cloaths and gown,
Now takes the beſt houſe, now the worſt in town,
And there he goes as naſty as a clown.
Now ſtudies hard at Athens, now he'll come,
And turn gallant, and follow whores at Rome;
The moſt unſteady, fickle man on earth
As if Vertumna's ſelf had rul'd his birth. CREECH.

See below remark [*CC*]. If any reader wants here ſomething to entertain him, let him read theſe Verſes of Virgil concerning Proteus.

Verum, ubi correptum manibus, vincliſque tenebis,
Tùm variæ illudent ſpecies, atque ora ferarum:
Fiet enim ſubitò ſus horridus, atraque tigris,
Squamoſuſque draco, & fulvâ cervice leæna:
Aut acrem flammæ ſonitum dabit, atque ita vinclis
Excidet: aut in aquas tenues delapſus abibit.
Sed, quantò ille magis formas ſe vertet in omnes,
Tantò, nate, magis contende tenacia vincla:
Donec talis erit mutato corpore, qualem
Videris, incepto tegeret cùm lumina ſomno (93).

Thus ſurely bound, yet be not over bold,
The ſlippery god will try to looſe his hold.
And various forms aſſume, to cheat thy ſight;
And with vain images of beaſts affright.
With foamy tuſks will ſeem a briſtly boar,
Or imitate the lion's angry roar;
Break out in crackling flames to ſhun thy ſnares,
Or hiſs a dragon, or a tyger ſtares:
Or with a wile, thy caution to betray,
In fleeting ſtreams attempt to ſlide away.
But thou, the more he varies forms, beware
To ſtrain his fetters with a ſtricter care.
Till tiring all his arts, he turns agen
To his true ſhape, in which he firſt was ſeen.
DRYDEN.

As for what concerns Thetis ſee Ovid (94): See alſo the ſame Poet concerning Vertumnus (95), and beſides conſult the fourth book of Propertius in the ſecond Elegy.

THAT God cannot be the ſubject of inherence of mens thoughts, ſince they are contrary to one another.

III. We ſhall ſee ſtill more monſtrous abſurdities, if we conſider the god of Spinoza as being the ſubject of all the modifications of thought. The combination of extenſion and thought, in one and the ſame ſubſtance, is already one great difficulty; for the queſtion is not about a mixture like that of metals, or that of wine and water, which requires only a *juxta-poſition*: But the combination of thought and extenſion ought to be an *identity*; thought and extenſion are two attributes *identified* with ſubſtance. They are therefore *identified* among themſelves, by the fundamental and eſſential rule of human Logic (96). I am ſure that if Spinoza had found the ſame intricacy in another ſect, he would have thought it unworthy of his attention; but he did not much trouble himſelf with it in his own cauſe: So true it is that the moſt diſdainful cenſurers of other mens thoughts, are very indulgent to themſelves. Doubtleſs, he derided the myſtery of the Trinity, and wondered that ſo many people ſhould ſpeak of a nature terminated by three hypoſtaſes; and yet, properly ſpeaking, he aſcribed as many perſons to the divine nature as there are men upon earth. He looked upon thoſe as fools who believed Tranſubſtantiation, and who ſay that a man may be in many places at one and the ſame time, may be alive in Paris, and dead at Rome, &c. and yet he maintains, that the extended ſubſtance, though but one and indiviſible, is all at once every where, cold in one place, hot in another, melancholy in one place, merry in another, &c. This by the by: but mind what I am going to ſay. If there is any thing certain and undeniable in human knowledge, it is this propoſition: *Oppoſita ſunt quæ neque de ſe invicem, neque de eodem tertio ſecundum idem, ad idem, eodem modo atque tempore vere affirmari poſſunt* (97). That is, two oppoſite terms cannot be truly affirmed of the ſame ſubject in the ſame reſpects, and at the ſame time. For inſtance, one cannot ſay without lying, *Peter is well, Peter is ſick: He denies that, and he affirms it:* ſuppoſing, that the terms have always the ſame relation, and are taken in the ſame ſenſe. The Spinoziſts deſtroy that idea, and falſify it in ſuch a manner, that I do not know whence they can take the character of truth; for if ſuch propoſitions were falſe, there is none that can be warranted to be true. And therefore it is vain to diſpute with them; for if they deny this, they may as well deny any other reaſon alledged againſt them. I ſhall make it appear that this axiom (98) is very falſe in their ſyſtem; and in order to it, I lay down firſt of all this undeniable maxim, that all the names that are given to a ſubject to ſignify what it does, or what it ſuffers, do properly and phyſically belong to its ſubſtance, and not to its accidents. When we ſay iron is hard, iron is heavy, it ſinks into water, it cleaves wood, we do not pretend to ſay that its hardneſs is hard, that its heavineſs is heavy, &c. This would be an impertinent way of ſpeaking: we mean that the extended ſubſtance it is made of reſiſts, is heavy, goes down into water, and cleaves wood. In like manner when we ſay that a man denies, affirms, is angry, is kind, praiſes, &c. we aſcribe all thoſe attributes to the ſubſtance of his ſoul, and not to his thoughts, as they are accidents or modifications. And therefore were it true, as Spinoza will have it, that men are modifications of GOD, we ſhould ſpeak falſly ſhould we ſay, Peter denies this, he wills that, he affirms ſuch a thing; for, according to that ſyſtem, it is properly GOD who denies, who wills, who affirms, and conſequently all the denominations, reſulting from the thoughts of all men, do properly and phyſically belong to the ſubſtance of GOD. From whence it follows that GOD hates and loves, denies and affirms, the ſame things, at the ſame time, and according to all the conditions requiſite, to make the rule I have mentioned concerning oppoſite terms falſe: for it cannot be denied, that according to all thoſe conditions ſtrictly taken, ſome men love and affirm what other men hate and deny. I go further ſtill: the contradictory terms, to will and not to will, belong at the ſame time to different men according to all thoſe conditions; and therefore according to Spinoza's ſyſtem they belong to that ſole and indiviſible ſubſtance he calls GOD. It is therefore GOD who at the ſame time forms an act of will, and does not form it with reſpect to the ſame object. And therefore two contradictory terms are true of him; which overthrows the firſt principles in Metaphyſics (99). I am not ignorant that in diſputes concerning Tranſubſtantiation, a cavil is made uſe of which might help the Spinoziſts. It is ſaid that if Peter wills a thing at Rome, which he does not will at Paris, the contradictory terms to will and not to will, are not true with reſpect to him; for ſince it is ſuppoſed he wills at Rome, it were a lie to ſay he wills not. I leave them this vain ſubtilty, and I ſhall only ſay, that as a ſquare circle is a contradiction, a ſubſtance is ſo too, when it loves and hates the ſame object at the ſame time. A ſquare circle would be and would not be

(92) Horat. Epiſt. I, lib. i, ver. 90.

* Horat. Sat. VII, lib. ii, ver. 8.

(93) Virgil. Georg. lib. iv, ver. 405. *See alſo* Horace, Sat. III, lib. ii. *They took it from* Homer, Odyſſ. lib. iv.

(94) Ovid. Metam. lib. xi, Fab. vii, ver. 221, & ſeq.

(95) Id. ibid. lib. xiv, Fab. xvi, ver 647, & ſeq.

(96) Quæ ſunt idem uni tertio, ſunt idem inter ſe.

(97) *See* Logica, Conimb. in Caput. x, Ariſtotelis de Prædicamentis, *pag. m.* 275, *and the Logic of* Burgerdiſcius, *lib.* 1, *cap. xxii, p. m.* 127.

(98) That is, the abovementioned definition of oppoſite terms, citation (97).

(99) Duo contradictoria non poſſunt eſſe ſimul vera: de qualibet re vera eſt affirmatio vel negatio. *See* Ariſtotle's Metaphyſics, *ch. iii, &c. of the fourth book.*

and ſo obvious that any man of a right judgment muſt needs perceive them. They who complain that the authors who have undertaken to confute him, have not been ſucceſsful, confound

be a circle; which is a plain contradiction: It would be a circle according to the ſuppoſition, and it would be no circle, ſince the circular figure is wholly inconſiſtent with the ſquare figure. I ſay the ſame of a ſubſtance, that loves and hates the ſame thing: it loves, and does not love it; this is a downright contradiction: it loves it, according to the ſuppoſition; it does not love it, ſince hatred does eſſentially exclude love. Thus you ſee what it is to be over-nice. Spinoza could not bear the leaſt obſcurity of Peripatetiſm, Judaiſm, or Chriſtianity; and yet he heartily embraced an hypotheſis, which reconciles two things ſo contrary to one another, as the ſquare and the circular figures, and whereby an infinite number of inconſiſtent attributes, and all the variety and antipathy of the thoughts of mankind are made true and conſiſtent at the ſame time in one and the ſame moſt ſimple and indiviſible ſubſtance. We commonly ſay, *quot capita tot ſenſus*, as many men ſo many minds; but according to Spinoza all the minds or thoughts of men are in one head. The bare relating of ſuch things is a ſufficient confutation of them, and clearly ſhews they are contradictory; for it is manifeſt either that nothing is impoſſible, no not that two and two ſhould make twelve, or that there are in the univerſe as many ſubſtances as ſubjects, which cannot receive at the ſame time the ſame denominations.

ANOTHER proof of what has been ſaid, taken from the wickedneſs of man's thoughts.

IV. But if it be, phyſically ſpeaking, a prodigious abſurdity, that a ſimple and only Being ſhould be modified at the ſame time by the thoughts of all men, it is an execrable abomination, if it be conſidered with regard to morality. How then? ſhall not the infinite, the neceſſary, the moſt perfect Being be ſteady, conſtant, and immutable? Why do I ſay, immutable? it will not be one moment the ſame; its thoughts will continually ſucceed one another; the ſame odd mixture of paſſions and ſentiments will never happen twice. This is hard to be digeſted; but here is ſomething worſe. This continual changeableneſs will be very uniform in this ſenſe, that for one good thought the infinite Being will have a thouſand fooliſh, extravagant, filthy, and abominable. It will produce in it ſelf all the follies, idle fancies, leud and unjuſt practices of mankind: it will be not only the efficient cauſe of them, but alſo the paſſive ſubject, the *ſubjectum inhæſionis*: it will be united to them by the moſt intimate union that can be conceived; for it is a penetrative union, or rather a perfect *identity*, ſince the modification is not really diſtinct from the modified ſubſtance. Several great Philoſophers not being able to apprehend how the moſt perfect Being can permit that man ſhould be ſo wicked and ſo unhappy, have ſuppoſed two principles, the one good, and the other bad (100); but here is a Philoſopher, who is pleaſed to make GOD himſelf the agent and patient, the cauſe and ſubject of all the crimes and miſeries of men. If men hate and aſſaſſinate one another, if they form themſelves into armies to kill one another, if the conquerors eat ſometimes the conquered; it is a thing that may be apprehended, becauſe it is ſuppoſed they are diſtinct one from another, and that *meum* and *tuum* produce contrary paſſions in them. But to affirm that men are only the modification of one and the ſame Being, that conſequently GOD only acts, and that the ſame individual GOD being modified into Turks and Hungarians, there are wars and battles, is to advance a thing more monſtrous and chimerical than all the deliriums of men ſhut up in mad-houſes. Take particular notice, as I have ſaid before, that modes do nothing, and that ſubſtances only act and ſuffer. This phraſe, *the ſweetneſs of honey pleaſes the palate*, is only true, as it ſignifies that the extended ſubſtance of which honey is made up pleaſes the palate. Thus according to Spinoza's ſyſtem, whoever ſays, *the Germans have killed ten thouſand Turks*, ſpeaks improperly and falſely, unleſs he means *GOD modified into Germans has killed GOD modified into ten thouſand Turks:* And therefore all the phraſes made uſe of to expreſs what men do one againſt another, have no other true ſenſe but this, *GOD hates himſelf*; *he aſks favours of himſelf, and refuſes them to himſelf*; *he perſecutes himſelf, kills himſelf, eats himſelf* (101), *calumniates himſelf, executes himſelf*, &c. This would be leſs incomprehenſible, if Spinoza had repreſented GOD as a collection of many diſtinct parts; but he reduces him to the moſt perfect ſimplicity, to an unity of ſubſtance, to indiviſibility. And therefore he aſſerts the moſt infamous and the maddeſt extravagances that can be conceived, infinitely more ridiculous than thoſe of the Poets concerning the gods of the Heathens. I wonder he either did not perceive them, or, if he did, how he perſiſted obſtinately in his principle. A man of ſenſe would rather chuſe to grub up a piece of ground with his teeth and nails, than to cultivate ſuch an offenſive and abſurd hypotheſis.

ANOTHER proof of what has been ſaid above, taken from man's miſery.

V. Here follow two other objections. Some Philoſophers have been ſo impious as to deny the being of a GOD; but they did not carry their extravagance ſo far, as to ſay, that if he did exiſt, he would not be perfectly happy. The greateſt Sceptics among the Antients ſaid, that all men have an idea of GOD, according to which he is a living, happy, and incorruptible Being, of a perfect felicity, and ſuſceptible of no evil. Κοινὴν πρόληψιν ἔχουσι πάντες ἄνθρωποι περὶ θεοῦ, καθ' ἣν μακάριον τι ἐστι ζῶον καὶ ἀφθαρτὸν, καὶ τέλειον ἐν εὐδαιμονίᾳ, καὶ παντὸς κακοῦ ἀνεπίδεκτον: *Communem anticipatam homines omnes habent de Deo notionem, ex qua eſt beatum quoddam animal, ab interritu alienum, in fælicitate perfectum, in quod nullum poſſit malum cadere* (102). Happineſs was the moſt inſeparable property contained in this idea: thoſe who deprived him of power and the direction of the world, acknowledged his felicity and immortal beatitude.

Omnia enim per ſe Divum natura neceſſe eſt
Immortali ævo ſumma cum pace fruatur,
Semota ab noſtris rebus ſejunctaque longe;
Nam privata dolore omni, privata periclis,
Ipſa ſuis pollens opibus, nihil indiga noſtri,
Nec bene promeritis capitur, nec tangitur ira (103).

For whatſoe'r's divine muſt live in peace,
In undiſturb'd and everlaſting eaſe:
Not care for us, from fears and dangers free,
Sufficient to it's own felicity:
Nought here below, nought in our power it needs;
Ne'er ſmiles at good, ne'er frowns at wicked deeds.
CREECH.

Thoſe who made him ſubject to death, ſaid at leaſt, that he was happy all his life-time. It was, doubtleſs, a horrid extravagance not to aſcribe immortality as well as happineſs to the Divine nature. Plutarch does very well confute this abſurdity of the Stoics: I ſhall ſet down his words ſomewhat at large, becauſe they prove a thought, which I have advanced above, and becauſe they confute the Spinoziſts; for his argument is inconſiſtent with the hypotheſis, according to which GOD is ſubject to death, as to his parts or modalities, that he is, as it were, the matter of generations and corruptions, that he deſtroys his own modalities, that he ſupports himſelf with that deſtruction, &c. Καὶ ἴσως εντύχοι τις ἂν ἔθνεσι βαρβάροις καὶ ἀγρίοις θεὸν μὴ νοοῦσι. θεὸν δὲ νοῶν, μὲ νοῶν δὲ ἄφθαρτον μηδὲ ἀΐδιον, ἄνθρωπος οὐδὲ εἷς γέγονεν. οἱ γοῦν ἄθεοι προσαγορευθέντες οὗτοι, Θεόδωροι, καὶ Διαγόραι, καὶ Ἵππωνες, οὐκ ἐτόλμησαν εἰπεῖν το θεῖον ὅτι ἄφθαρτόν ἐστιν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν ὡς ἔστι τι ἄφθαρτον· τοῦ μὲν ἀφθάρτου τὴν ὕπαρξιν μὴ ἀπολείποντες, τοῦ θεοῦ δὲ τὴν πρόληψιν φυλάττοντες. ἀλλὰ Χρύσιππος καὶ Κλεάνθης ἐμπεπληκότες (ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν) τῷ λόγῳ θεῶν τὸν οὐρανὸν, τὴν γῆν, τὸν ἀέρα, τὴν θάλατταν, οὐδένα τῶν τοσούτων ἄφθαρτον οὐδὲ ἀΐδιον ἀπολελοίπασι, πλὴν μόνου τοῦ Διός· εἰς ὃν πάντας καταναλίσκουσι τοὺς ἄλλους. ὥστε καὶ τούτῳ τὸ φθείρειν προσεῖναι τοῦ φθείρεσθαι μὴ ἐπιεικέστερον. ἀσθενείᾳ γάρ τινι καὶ τὸ μεταβάλλον εἰς ἕτερον φθείρεται, καὶ τὸ τοῖς ἄλλοις εἰς ἑαυτὸ φθειρομένοις τρεφόμενον σώζεται. Ac fieri ſanè poteſt, ut incidat aliquis in homines barbaros & feros, qui Deum eſſe nullum putent: deum eſſe qui exiſtimet: ſed eundem non ſecurum interitus, non æternum, inventus eſt ne unus quidem homo. Certè qui athei appellantur quod negarent eſſe deos, Theodorus, Diagoras, Hippo: non auſi ſunt dicere deum eſſe interitui

(100) See the articles MANICHEES, MARCIONITES, PAULICIANS.

(101) The fable of Saturn, who devoured his own children, is infinitely leſs unreaſonable than Spinoza's aſſertion.

(102) Sextus Empiricus adverſus Mathem. *lib. viii*, §. *ii*.

(103) Lucretius, lib. i, ver. 57. *The Epicureans aſcribed to the gods whatever Homer aſcribes to them in theſe words ſo often repeated:* Μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἐόντες. Beati Dii ſemper exiſtentes. --- *The gods always happy.*

confound things: they would have the difficulties, under which he ſunk, wholly removed [O]; but they ſhould be contented to ſee his hypotheſis entirely overthrown, as

teritui obnoxium, ſed non crediderunt aliquid eſſe ab interitu immune, ac talem naturam aliquam eſſe poſſe negantes, notitiam de deo reliquerunt in medio. Chryſippus verò & Cleanthes, cùm impleviſſent (ut ſic dicam) ſuis dictis cœlum, terras, aërem, mare diis: nullum horum ab interitu liberum aut ſempiternum ſtatuerunt: ſolo Jove excepto; in quem reliquos omnes conſumi putant; ut jam is perdat, quod nihilo eſt quàm perire melius. Eſt enim imbecillitas ut pereundo in alium tranſire, ita interitu aliorum in ſe tranſeuntium nutriri atque ſervari (104). - - - *And, indeed, we may happen to meet with barbarous and ſavage men, who believe that there is no* G O D. *But there was never found any man, who believing that there was no* G O D, *did not at the ſame time believe him incorruptible and eternal. For thoſe who are called Atheiſts, ſuch as Theodorus, Diagoras, and Hyppo, did not dare to ſay that* G O D *was corruptible; they, indeed, believed that there was nothing exempt from corruption, while they denied that no Being was incorruptible, they determined nothing concerning* G O D. *But Chryſippus and Cleanthes, having filled (as one may ſay) the Heavens, the Earth, the Air, the Sea, with gods, affirmed that none of theſe gods was incorruptible or eternal: they excepted Jupiter only, into whom they thought that all the other gods were diſſolved, and they made him decay, which is no better than periſhing. For as it implies a weakneſs and defect in one Being to periſh and be diſſolved into another, ſo it implies a weakneſs and defect in that other Being to be nouriſhed and preſerved by the former diſſolving into it.* But tho' this doctrine of the Stoics was never ſo extravagant, it did not deprive the gods of happineſs during their life. Perhaps the Spinoziſts are the only men, who have made the Deity ſubject to miſery (105). But what miſery? A miſery ſo great, that he falls into deſpair, and would annihilate himſelf if he could; he endeavours to do it; he deprives himſelf of as many things as he can; he hangs himſelf, he throws himſelf headlong down a precipice, being no longer able to bear the terrible melancholy that conſumes him. This is not declamation; it is an exact and Philoſophical language: for if man is only a modification, he does nothing: it were an impertinent, ridiculous, and burleſque, expreſſion to ſay, *Joy is merry, ſadneſs is ſad*: it is a phraſe no leſs impertinent in Spinoza's ſyſtem, to affirm, *man thinks, man afflicts himſelf, man hangs himſelf*, &c. All thoſe propoſitions ought to be affirmed of the ſubſtance, whereof man is only a mode. How could Spinoza think that an independent and ſelf-exiſtent Being, endowed with infinite perfections, is ſubject to all the miſeries incident to mankind? If ſome other Being forced it to vex itſelf, and to feel pain, it's ſtriving to make it's ſelf unhappy would be leſs ſurprizing; one might ſay, it muſt needs obey a ſtronger power; it is likely it torments itſelf with the gravel, the cholic, a fever, and madneſs, to avoid a greater evil. But it is the only Being in the univerſe, there is nothing that commands, exhorts, or intreats, it. It is it's own nature, will Spinoza ſay, that moves it under ſome circumſtances, to give itſelf a great deal of vexation, and a very violent pain. But I will aſk him whether he does not find ſomething monſtrous and unconceivable in ſuch a fatality.

The ſtrong reaſons alledged againſt thoſe, who maintained that our ſouls are a portion of GOD, are ſtill more ſolid againſt Spinoza. It is objected againſt Pythagoras, in a piece of Cicero, that three palpable falſities reſult from that doctrine: 1, That the Divine Nature would be torn in pieces. 2, That it would be miſerable whenever men are ſo. 3, That man's mind would be ignorant of nothing, ſince it would be GOD. *Nam Pythagoras qui cenſuit*, &c (106).

THE ſyſtem of Spinoza makes his whole conduct, and all his diſcourſes ridiculous.

VI. Were it not that I remember I do not write a book againſt that man, but only ſome ſhort obſervations by the by, I could find many other abſurdities in his ſyſtem. I ſhall conclude with this. He engaged in an hypotheſis, which makes all his labours ridiculous; and I am ſure that every page of his Ethics affords a horrid piece of nonſenſe. Firſt, I would fain know whom he has in view, when he rejects ſome doctrines, and propoſes others. Does he deſign to teach ſome truths? Would he confute ſome errors? But how can he ſay that there are any errors among men? Are not the thoughts of the common Philoſophers, thoſe of the Jews, thoſe of the Chriſtians, modes of the Infinite Being, as well as thoſe of his Ethics? Are they not realities as neceſſary to the perfection of the univerſe, as all his ſpeculations? Do they not ariſe from the neceſſary cauſe? How then can he pretend that they want to be rectified? In the ſecond place, does he not ſay that the nature, whereof they are modalities, acts neceſſarily, and always ſollows it's courſe; that it can neither turn aſide nor ſtop; and that being the only nature in the univerſe, no outward cauſe will ever ſtop or rectify it. And therefore nothing can be more needleſs than the inſtructions of this Philoſopher. Does it become him, who is but the modification of a ſubſtance, to preſcribe to the Infinite Being what it ought to do? Will that Being hear him? And if it ſhould hear him, could it be the better for what he ſays? Does it not always act according to the whole extent of it's power, without knowing either whither it goes, or what it does? Such a man as Spinoza would ſet his mind at reſt, if he reaſoned well. If it be poſſible, would he ſay, for ſuch a doctrine to take root, the neceſſity of nature will eſtabliſh it without my book: if it be not poſſible, all my writings will be inſignificant.

[O] *They would have the difficulties, under which Spinoza ſunk, wholly removed.*] I think it may be ſuppoſed that he run into theſe abſurdities, becauſe he could not apprehend either that matter is eternal, and different from GOD, or that it has been produced out of nothing, or that an Infinite Mind, perfectly free, and the Creator of all things, could produce ſuch a work as the world. A matter that neceſſarily exiſts, and yet is deſtitute of activity, and ſubject to the power of another principle, is a thing that does not ſuit with reaſon. We ſee no affinity between thoſe three qualities; ſuch a combination is repugnant to the idea of order. A matter created out of nothing cannot be conceived, tho' we ſtrive never ſo much to form an idea of an act of will, which changes into a real ſubſtance what was nothing before. This principle of the Antients, *ex nihilo, nihil fit*, - - - *Nothing is made of nothing*, offers itſelf continually to our imagination, and there appears with ſuch evidence, that it ſtops us ſhort, in caſe we have begun to frame any conception of creation. Laſtly, that a GOD, infinitely good, infinitely holy, infinitely free, who could make creatures always holy, and always happy, ſhould rather chuſe to make them criminal, and eternally miſerable, is a thing that ſhocks reaſon; and ſo much the more, becauſe it cannot reconcile man's free-will (107) with the quality of a Being created out of nothing. But unleſs thoſe two things be reconciled, it cannot conceive how man deſerves any puniſhment under a free, good, holy, and juſt Providence. Theſe three inconveniencies put Spinoza upon looking for a new ſyſtem, wherein GOD ſhould not be diſtinct from matter, and ſhould act neceſſarily, and according to the whole extent of his power, not out of himſelf, but in himſelf. It reſults from this ſuppoſition, that this neceſſary cauſe, whoſe power is not limited, and whoſe actions are not directed by goodneſs, juſtice, and knowledge, but only by the infinite power of it's nature, muſt needs have modified itſelf according to all poſſible realities, ſo that errors and vices, pain and grief, being modalities as real as truth, virtue, and pleaſure, all thoſe things muſt have been in the univerſe. Spinoza hoped to reſolve by that means the objections of the Manichees, againſt the one only principle. Thoſe objections have no force but on the ſuppoſition that one only principle of all things acts by choice, and can act or forbear acting, and confines it's power according to the rules of goodneſs and equity, or according to the inſtinct of malice. This being ſuppoſed, the queſtion is, if that one only principle be good, whence comes evil? If it be bad, whence comes good? 'Deteriora velle, noſtri fuerit fortaſſe defectus: 'poſſe vero contra innocentiam, quæ ſceleratus quiſ-'que conceperit, inſpectante Deo, monſtri ſimile eſt: 'unde haud injuria tuorum quidam familiarium quæ-'ſivit: Si quidem Deus, inquit, eſt, unde mala? 'bona vero unde, ſi non eſt (108)? - - - *To have a 'will to do evil, is, perhaps, our defect: but for a 'villain, in the ſight of God, to do againſt an innocent 'man whatever he deviſes, is a thing monſtrous. From*

'hence,

---

(104) Plutarch, adverſus Stoïcos, pag. 1075. *A.*

(105) Their predeceſſors, whom I have mentioned in the firſt remark, have not cleared and dived into the conſequences of their principle, as Spinoza does.

(106) You will find the ſequel of theſe words of Cicero, in the remark [O], citation (112) of the article PYTHAGORAS.

(107) That is, the liberty of indifference.

(108) Boëthius, de Conſolat. Philoſoph. *lib. i, Proſa iv, pag. m.* 11.

as has been done even by his weakeſt adverſaries [*P*]. It muſt not be forgot that this impious

‘ *hence one of your friends aſked, and not without reaſon, If there is a God, whence comes evil; and if there is no God, whence comes good?*’ Spinoza would anſwer, my one only principle being able to do good and evil, and doing whatever it can do, good and evil muſt neceſſarily be in the world. But if you conſider the three inconveniencies he intended to avoid, and the extravagant and abominable conſequences of his hypotheſis, you will find that his choice is neither that of a good man, nor that of a man of parts. He lays aſide ſome things, of which, the worſt that that can be ſaid is, that the weakneſs of our reaſon does not allow us clearly to perceive the poſſibility of them; and he admits others, which are evidently impoſſible. There is a great difference between not comprehending the poſſibility of a thing, and comprehending the impoſſibility of it. Now ſee the injuſtice of the readers. They require from all thoſe, who write againſt Spinoza, that they ſhould remove the difficulties which perplexed him, and ſet in a clear light the truths he could not comprehend; and becauſe they find no ſuch thing in the writings of the Anti-Spinoziſts, they declare they have not ſucceeded. Is it not ſufficient to overthrow the ſyſtem of that Atheiſt? Reaſon teaches us that cuſtom ought to be maintained againſt innovators, unleſs they bring in better laws; and if their opinions were not better than thoſe that are commonly received, they would deſerve to be rejected, tho' they were not worſe than the abuſes they intend to ſuppreſs. It ought to be ſaid to thoſe men, ſubmit to cuſtom, or give us ſomething better (109). Much more ought we to reject the ſyſtem of the Spinoziſts, ſince in freeing us from ſome difficulties, it involves us in more inextricable perplexities. If the difficulties were equal on both ſides, the common ſyſtem ſhould be preferred to the other, becauſe, beſides the privilege of poſſeſſion it hath alſo this advantage, that it promiſes us a great happineſs for the time to come, and affords us a thouſand comforts in the miſeries of this life. How great a ſatisfaction is it in our adverſity to hope that GOD will hear our prayers, and that, if he does not hear them, he will however reward our patience, and indemnify us in a glorious manner? It is a great comfort to flatter one's ſelf that other men will have ſome regard to the dictates of their conſcience, and to the fear of GOD. Wherefore the common hypotheſis is both truer and more agreeable than the atheiſtical (110). Therefore ſince the ſyſtem of Spinoza is not liable to leſſer objections than the Chriſtian hypotheſis, it were a ſufficient reaſon to reject it. So that any author, who ſhews that Spinoziſm is obſcure, and falſe in it's firſt propoſitions, and perplexed with impenetrable and contradictory abſurdities in it's conſequences, ought to paſs for having very well confuted it, tho' he does not clearly reſolve all the objections of Spinoza. The whole matter may be reduced to theſe few words. The common hypotheſis, if compared with that of the Spinoſiſts in thoſe things that are clear, has a greater evidence: and if it be compared with the other in thoſe things that are obſcure; it appears leſs oppoſite to the light of reaſon. And beſides, it promiſes us an infinite happineſs after this life, and procures us a thouſand comforts in this; whereas the other gives us no proſpect of a future happineſs, and deprives us of confidence in our prayers, and of the advantage we may expect from the remorſes of our neighbours: and therefore the common hypotheſis is to be preferred to the other.

[*P*] *As has been done even by his weakeſt adverſaries.*] I ſhall not ſet up for a maſter of the ceremonies, to place thoſe gentlemen in their higher or lower ranks, but ſhall only name thoſe who are come to my knowledge (111). Mr Velthuyſe (112) publiſhed a book againſt Spinoza in the year 1680. It is intituled, *Tractatus de cultu naturali, & origine moralitatis.* Four years after, the Sieur Aubert de Verſé put out a book with this title, *L'Impie convaincu, ou Diſſertation contre Spinoza, dans laquelle l'on réfute les fondemens de ſon Athéiſme* (113). Mr Poiret inſerted in the ſecond edition of his *Cogitationes de Deo, Anima & Malo* (114), a treatiſe, intituled, *Fundamenta Atheiſmi everſa, ſive Specimen abſurditatis Atheiſmi Spinoziani.* In the year 1690, a poſthumous book of Mr Wittichius came out, intituled, *Anti-Spinoza, ſive Examen Ethices Benedicti de Spinoza, & Commentarius de Deo & ejus Attributis.* To which I add a Dutch piece, quoted by Mr Saldenus (115).

I add to theſe; 1. A Dutch book, publiſhed by the ſame Francis Cuper whom I have mentioned at the beginning of the remark [*M*]. This Dutch book is only a tranſlation of what Henry Morus ſaid in Latin againſt Spinoza in ſome paſſages of his works. It appeared very ſolid to Cuper, tho' his *Arcana Atheiſmi revelata* had been uſed with the utmoſt contempt by Henry Morus (116). 2. The book publiſhed at Paris in the year 1696, by Dom Francis Lami, a Benedictine. It is intituled, *Le nouvel Athéiſme renverſé, ou Refutation du Syſteme de Spinoſa, tirée pour la plupart de la connoiſſance de la nature de l'homme.* You will find an extract of it in the *Journal des Savans* of the 28th of January 1697 (117). And you may ſee a juſt encomium upon it in the 101ſt page of the ſecond part of the *Chevræana,* Dutch edition. 3. The work which Mr Jaquelot (118) cauſed to be printed at the Hague in 1697. It is intituled, *Diſſertations ſur l'Exiſtence de Dieu, où l'on démontre cette vérité par l'Hiſtoire Univerſelle de la prémiere Antiquité du Monde, par la Réfutation du Syſteme d' Epicure & de Spinoza,* &c. You will find a good extract of it in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans* (119). 4. The book publiſhed by Mr Jens at Dort, in the year 1698. The title of it runs thus: *Examen Philoſophicum ſextæ definitionis Partis I Eth. Benedicti de Spinoza, ſive Prodromus Animadverſionum ſuper unico veterum & recentiorum Atheorum Argumento, nempe* una ſubſtantia; *ubi infirmitas & vanitas argumentorum pro ea evincetur. Accedent quædam necdum propoſita argumenta pro vera exiſtentia Dei.* It is a book of ſixty-ſix pages in 4to. The author is a Phyſician at Dort, and the father of Mr Jens, rector of the college of the ſame town, and a learned humaniſt, and a good critic, as appears from his *Lectiones Lucianeæ,* printed at the Hague, in 8vo, in the year 1699. I muſt not forget the Dutch book, publiſhed by Mr Van Til, in the year 1696, an abſtract of which may be ſeen in the *Acta Eruditorum Lipſienſium* (120). I ſhall ſpeak below (121) of a Dutch piece, that is juſt come out.

You will find that the principles of Spinoza are overthrown in all thoſe books; you will there find that from the very beginning of his work, he advances falſe propoſitions; and therefore, what he concludes from them afterwards can be of no force. Let him run as much as he pleaſes: what can he do by running much, if he loſes his way from the firſt ſtep he makes? Note, that his greateſt admirers acknowledge, that if he had taught the doctrines laid to his charge, he would be an execrable man; but they pretend he has not been underſtood. ‘ Si igitur prædicti philoſophi intentio vel opinio fuit naturam cum Deo hoc modo tam fædè confundere, judico illum ab adverſariis juſtè impetitum atque condemnatum, imo & memoriam ejus in omne ævum execrandam eſſe: attamen quia de alicujus intentione ſolus poteſt judicare intimus cordium perſcrutator Deus, nobis nihil aliud reſtat niſi ut judicemus de opinione quæ continetur in ſcriptis quæ memoratus vir in lucem emiſit; & licet inter illius adverſarios habeantur etiam perſpicaciſſimi, puto tamen eos horum ſcriptorum verum ſenſum minimè aſſecutos fuiſſe, quoniam in iis nihil reperio niſi id quod abunde ſatis indicat hunc virum minimè confundere velle Deum & naturam: ſaltem ego ita judico ex ejus ſcriptis, quæ ſi alii melius intelligant, quæ dixi indicta ſunto, patrocinium illius hominis in me ſuſcipere nolo, peto duntaxat ut quod aliis licuit, id & mihi liceat, nempe ut exprimam quem puto horum ſcriptorum genuinum ſenſum eſſe (122)...... *If therefore it was the intention of this Philoſopher to confound GOD and nature together, in ſo ſhameful a manner, or if his opinion comes to that, I think he was juſtly attacked and condemned by his adverſaries; nay, that his memory ought to be for ever execrable: but becauſe GOD alone, who is the ſearcher of hearts, can judge of any man's intention, it only belongs to us, to judge of the opinions contained in the writings which this man has publiſhed; and though there are ſome among his adverſaries of great penetration, yet I think they have not at all diſcovered the* ‘ *true* impious man was not ſenſible of the unavoidable conſequences of his ſyſtem; for he laughed at the apparition of ſpirits (*l*), and there is no Philoſopher, who has leſs reaſon to

---

(109) Sin melius quid habes, acceſe, aut imperium fer. *Horatius, Epiſtola V, lib. i, ver* 6.

(110) I have already ſaid in the article SOCINUS, (FAUSTUS), remark [*I*], that it is the intereſt of every one, that all authors be conſcientious, and fear God.

(111) Note, that I ſpeak only of thoſe who have confuted the Poſthumous Works of Spinoza.

(112) Being exhorted to it, and helped by the deceaſed Mr PAETS (of whom I ſpoke above, citation (12), of the article SANCTESIUS) to whom he dedicated it.

(113) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *for October* 1684, *pag.* 862.

(114) At Amſterdam 1685. See the ſame *Nouvelles*, for April 1685, pag. 450.

(115) Above citation (78). The author's name was Blyenberg: he was a merchant at Dort, who died in 1696.

(116) Oper Philoſoph. *Tom. i, pag.* 600.

(117) Page 72, of the Dutch edition.

(118) He was miniſter of the church of Vaſſy in Champagne, and is now miniſter at the Hague.

(119) For September 1696, Art. iii.

(120) Page 295, & ſeq. of the year 1696.

(121) In the remark [*BB*].

(122) Autor anonymus Speciminis Artis ratiocinandi naturalis & artificialis, *pag.* 113. *Note that ſince the firſt edition of this Dictionary I have ſeen that* Specimen Artis ratiocinandi, &c. *with the author's name and picture. It is Mr Kuffelaer. That book is aſcribed to Spinoza himſelf, in* Micrælius's Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica, *pag.* 2260, *Edit.* 1699. *Micrælius thought that Spinoza was ſtill living in the year* 1684, *which is not true.*

'*true ſenſe of his writings, becauſe I find nothing in them, but what abundantly ſhews that he was far from confounding GOD and nature together. At leaſt I judge ſo from his writings, which if others underſtand better than I do, I retract what I now ſay; I do not take it upon me to protect this man; I only aſk that the liberty which is granted others, may likewiſe be granted me, which is that I may be allowed to explain what I take to be the genuine ſenſe of theſe writings.*' Theſe words taken from a book of one of his followers, printed at Utrecht in 1684 (123), clearly ſhew that Spinoza has been ſo ſucceſsfully confuted by his adverſaries, that the only way of replying to them, is like that of the Janſeniſts againſt the Jeſuits, viz. That his opinion is not ſuch as it is ſuppoſed to be. This is the reſult of what his apologiſt ſays. And therefore in order to ſhew that his adverſaries have attained a compleat victory over him, we need only conſider that he has in effect taught what is imputed to him, or that he contradicted himſelf wretchedly, and knew not what he ſaid. He is accuſed of teaching that all particular beings are modifications of GOD. This is plainly his doctrine, ſince his fourteenth propoſition runs thus: 'Præter Deum nulla dari neque concipi poteſt ſubſtantia: ----- *Beſides GOD no ſubſtance can exiſt, nor be conceived:* And he affirms in the fifteenth, 'Quicquid eſt, in Deo eſt, & nihil ſine Deo eſſe neque concipi poteſt:' ----- *Whatever exiſts is in GOD, and nothing can exiſt nor be conceived without GOD:*' which he proves by this reaſon, that every thing is a mode or a ſubſtance, and that modes can neither exiſt nor be conceived without a ſubſtance. When therefore an apologiſt ſpeaks in this manner: were it true that Spinoza teaches that all particular beings are modes of the divine ſubſtance, I would not deny that his adverſaries have obtained a compleat victory over him; I only deny the fact, I do not believe that the doctrine they have very well confuted, is contained in his book: I ſay when an apologiſt ſpeaks in ſuch a manner, he had as good own that his hero has been defeated; for certainly the doctrine in queſtion, is in Spinoza's Ethics (124).

SPINOZA knew not that the word *Idem* is ſometimes uſed for *ſimile*.

Here I muſt give an inſtance of the falſity of his former propoſitions; it will be of uſe to ſhew how eaſy it was to overthrow his ſyſtem. His fifth propoſition contains theſe words, 'In rerum natura non poſſunt dari duæ aut plures ſubſtantiæ ejuſdem naturæ ſeu attributi. ----- *It is impoſſible that two or more ſubſtances of the ſame nature or attribute ſhould exiſt.*' This is his *Argumentum Achilleum*, and the moſt ſteady foundation he builds upon; but at the ſame time, it is ſuch a wretched ſophiſm, that no ſcholar, who has read what is called *parva logicalia*, or the five *Predicabilia Porphyrii*, could be perplexed with it. All thoſe who teach ſchool-Philoſophy, begin with telling their ſcholars what *Genus*, *Species*, and *Individuum* are. This lecture is ſufficient to put Spinoza to a ſtand. The following diſtinction will do the buſineſs: *Non poſſunt dari plures ſubſtantiæ ejuſdem numero naturæ ſive attributi, concedo; non poſſunt dari plures ſubſtantiæ ejuſdem ſpecie naturæ ſive attributi, nego.* What could Spinoza ſay againſt this diſtinction? Muſt he not admit of it with reſpect to modifications? Is not man, according to his notion, a ſpecies of modification, and is not Socrates an individuum of that ſpecies? Would he have us maintain that Benedict Spinoza, and the Jew, who attempted to thruſt a knife into his body, were not two modifications, but one only? This might be proved invincibly, if his proof for the unity of ſubſtance was a good one; but ſince it proves too much, for it proves that there is but one modification in the world, he ought to be one of the firſt to reject it. He ought therefore to know that the word *idem* ſignifies two things, *identity*, and ſimilitude. We ſay, that ſuch a one was born the ſame day as his father, and died the ſame day with his mother. With reſpect to a man born the firſt of March 1630, and who died the tenth of February 1655, whoſe father was born the firſt of March 1610, and whoſe mother died the tenth of February 1655. The propoſition would be true in the two ſenſes of the word *ſame*. It would ſignify *like* in the firſt part of this propoſition, but not in the ſecond. Pythagoras and Ariſtotle, according to Spinoza's ſyſtem (125), were two like modifications: each of them had the whole nature of a modification, and yet the one differed from the other. The ſame may be ſaid of two ſubſtances: each of them has the whole nature, and all the attributes of ſubſtance, and yet they are not one only ſubſtance, but two. I ſhall ſet down what a Spaniard ſays againſt thoſe, who, through a ſophiſm like that of Spinoza, thought that the *Materia prima* did not differ from GOD. 'Quis non obſtupeſcat fuiſſe ullo tempore aliquos adeò deſipientes, & in clariſſima luce cæcutientes, qui Deum eſſe materiam primam & conſtanter aſſeverarent, & pugnaciter defenderent? At qua ratione tam ſtultam & impiam opinionem confirmabant? Si materia prima & Deus (inquiunt) non ſunt idem, ergò differunt inter ſe; quæcunque autem differunt, ea neceſſe eſt aliquo differre, quare compoſita eſſe oportet ex eo in quo conveniunt, & ex eo in quo differunt; cùm igitur nec in Deo nec in materia prima ulla ſit compoſitio, nulla quoque differentia inter ea eſſe poterit; quare neceſſe eſt eſſe unum & idem. Vide quàm levi argumento in tam gravem errorem ſeu potiùs amentiam inducti ſunt, non intelligentes diſcrimen quod eſt inter differens & diverſum, quod etiam traditur ab Ariſtotele 10. lib. Metaphyſ. text. 12. Differunt enim inter ſe, quæcunque in aliquo conveniunt & in aliquo diſtinguuntur; ut homo & leo conveniunt in genere, quia uterque eſt animal, & diſtinguuntur per proprias differentias, alter enim eſt rationis particeps, alter verò expers: Diverſa autem ſunt quæcunque ſeipſis diſtinguuntur, quoniam ſunt ſimpliciſſima (126). ----- *Who is not ſurprized that ever there were men ſo ſtupid and ſo blind amidſt the cleareſt light, as conſtantly to affirm, and obſtinately maintain, that GOD is the firſt matter* (materia prima). *But by what reaſon did they ſupport ſo fooliſh and impious an opinion? If, ſay they, GOD and the firſt matter are not the ſame, therefore they differ from one another. But whatever things differ, muſt neceſſarily differ in ſome properties, and therefore they muſt be compoſed of thoſe properties wherein they agree, and of thoſe wherein they differ. But there being no compoſition either in GOD or the firſt matter, they cannot differ from one another, therefore they muſt be one and the ſame. Obſerve how ſlight an argument leads thoſe men into ſo grievous an error, or rather madneſs, who do not underſtand the diſtinction between* different *and* diverſe, *which Ariſtotle has mentioned. Thoſe things are different from one another, which agree in ſome properties and are diſtinguiſhed in others; as a man and a lion agree in their genus, both being animals; and are diſtinguiſhed by their proper differences, one being rational the other not. But thoſe things are diverſe, which are diſtinguiſhed from one another, becauſe they are moſt ſimple.*' There are few notions in our mind clearer than that of *identity*. I grant that it is confounded, and very ill applied in the common language: Nations, rivers, *&c.* are accounted the ſame nations, and the ſame rivers during ſeveral ages; the body of a man is accounted the ſame body for the ſpace of ſixty years or more: but thoſe popular and improper expreſſions do not deprive us of the certain rule of *identity*; they do not blot out of our minds this idea: *A thing of which one may deny or affirm what cannot be denied, or affirmed of another thing, is diſtinct from that other thing. When all the attributes of time, place,* &c. *which belong to a thing, belong alſo to another thing, they are but one Being.* But notwithſtanding the clearneſs of theſe ideas, it would be difficult to ſay how many great Philoſophers have erred in that point, and reduced all ſouls and intelligences (127) to unity, though they acknowledged that ſome were united to bodies, to which others were not united. This opinion was ſo common in Italy in the XVIth century, that Pope Leo X, thought himſelf obliged to condemn it, and to threaten with ſevere penalties all thoſe that ſhould teach it (128). Here are the words of the bull, dated the nineteenth of December 1513. 'Cum diebus noſtris Zizaniæ ſeminator nonnullos pernicioſiſſimos errores in agro Domini ſeminare ſit auſus, de natura præſertim animæ rationalis, quod videlicet mortalis ſit aut unica in cunctis hominibus; & nonnulli temere Philoſophantes

'ſecundùm

(*l*) See his lvith and lviiith Letters.

(123) There is in the title *Hamburgi*, as in the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*.

(124) The Apologiſt I have quoted (viz. Mr Kuffelaer) maintains with might and main, in the 14th page, that there can be but one ſubſtance in the univerſe.

(125) *Note, by the by, that by virtue of this principle,* Quæ ſunt idem uni tertio, ſunt idem inter ſe, *Spinoza cannot deny that Pythagoras and Ariſtotle were but one man.* Erant enim idem uni tertio, nempe ſubſtantiæ Dei.

(126) Benedictus Pererius, de communibus Principiis, *lib. v, cap. xii, p. m.* 309.

(127) See the article CESALPINUS, remark [*C*], and compare what is ſaid of the Scotiſts in the article ABELARD, remark [*C*].

(128) Omnes hujuſmodi erroris adſtrictionibus inhærentes, veluti damnatiſſimas hæreſes ſeminantes per omnia ut deteſtabiles & abominabiles hæreticos & infideles, Catholicam fidem labefactantes, vitandos & puniendos fore decrevimus. --- *We have decreed that all thoſe who adhere to the reſtrictions of this kind of error ſhould be ſhunned and puniſhed as ſowers of damnable Hereſies, as every where deteſtable and abominable Heretics, and Infidels, who deſtroy the Catholic Faith.*

to deny it [Q]. Spinoza ought to acknowledge that every part of nature thinks, and that man is not the moſt knowing and moſt intelligent modification of the univerſe; and therefore he muſt admit the exiſtence of Demons. The diſpute of his followers about miracles is a meer quibble [*R*], and a further proof of the unexactneſs of his notions

‘ ſecundùm ſaltem Philoſophiam verum eſſe aſſeverent: Contra hoc, ſacro approbante concilio, damnamus & reprobamus omnes aſſerentes, Animam intellectivam mortalem eſſe aut unicam in cunctis hominibus; aut hoc in dubium vertentes: cum illa..... immortalis, & pro corporum quibus infunditur multitudine ſingulariter multiplicabilis & multiplicata & multiplicanda ſit. ---- *Whereas in our days a ſower of tares, has dared to ſow ſome moſt pernicious errors in the field of* GOD, *eſpecially concerning the nature of a rational ſoul; namely, that it is mortal, and that there is but one ſoul in all men, and ſome raſhly philoſophizing, have aſſerted this to be true, at leaſt, according to Philoſophy. In oppoſition to this, with the approbation of the holy council, we condemn and pronounce to be reprobate all thoſe who aſſert that the intelligent ſoul is mortal, or that there is but one ſoul in all men; or thoſe who call this in queſtion: ſince the ſoul..... is immortal, and according to the multitude of bodies into which it is infuſed, may be particularly multiplied, is and muſt be multiplied.*’ This was lopping off a conſiderable branch of Spinoziſm. I muſt obſerve, that ſome Philoſophers do ſtrangely confound the idea of *identity*; for they maintain (129), that the parts of matter are not diſtinct before they be actually ſeparated. Nothing can be more abſurd.

[Q] *There is no Philoſopher who has leſs reaſon to deny the apparition of ſpirits.*] I have ſaid it in another place (130); when it is ſuppoſed that a moſt perfect mind has created all things out of nothing, without being determined to it by his nature, but by the free choice of his own good pleaſure, the exiſtence of angels may be denied (131). If it be aſked, why ſuch a Creator has not produced other ſpirits beſides human ſouls? The anſwer will be, That ſuch was his good pleaſure, *ſtat pro ratione voluntas:* No reaſonable reply can be made to this anſwer, unleſs the fact be proved, I mean, that there are angels. But when it is ſuppoſed, that the Creator did not act freely, and exhauſted all his power without any choice or rule, and beſides that thinking is one of his attributes, it is a ridiculous thing to aſſert, that there are no Demons. According to this ſyſtem, it ought to be believed, that the thinking attribute of the Creator hath been modified, not only in the bodies of men, but alſo throughout the whole univerſe; and that beſides the animals which we know, there is an infinite number of others which we know not, and which exceed us in knowledge and in malice, as much as we exceed in that reſpect dogs and oxen: For it were the moſt unreaſonable thing in the world, to fancy that man's mind is the moſt perfect modification that an infinite Being, acting according to the whole extent of its power, could produce. We can conceive no natural connexion between the underſtanding and the brain; and therefore we ought to believe, that a creature without brain may as well think, as a creature organized as we are. What is it then that could move Spinoza to deny what is ſaid of ſpirits (132)? Why did he believe that there is nothing in the world, that can excite in our machines the ſight of a ſpectre, make a noiſe in a room, and produce all the magical phænomena mentioned in books? Was it becauſe he believed that no Being can produce ſuch effects unleſs it has as bulky a body as that of man; and that therefore the Demons could not ſubſiſt in the air, nor come into our houſes, nor ſteal away from our ſight? But ſuch a thought would be ridiculous: the bulk of fleſh of which we are made up, is rather an obſtacle than a help to wit and power. I mean a mediate power, or the faculty of applying the moſt proper inſtruments for the production of great effects. The moſt ſurpriſing actions of men ariſe from that faculty; as it appears from thouſands of examples. An Engineer as little as a dwarf, lean, and pale, performs more things than two thouſand ſavages, ſtronger than Milo, are able to perform. An animate machine a thouſand times ſmaller than an ant, might produce greater effects than an elephant; it might diſcover the inſenſible parts of plants and animals, and place itſelf upon the ſeat of the firſt ſprings of our brain, and open ſome valves, by which means we might ſee phantoms, hear a noiſe, &c. (133). If Phyſicians knew the firſt fibres, and the firſt combinations of the parts in vegetables, minerals, and animals, they would alſo know the inſtruments proper to put them out of order, and might apply thoſe inſtruments in ſuch a manner as to place thoſe parts in a new order, whereby good meat would be turned into poiſon, and poiſon into good meat. Such Phyſicians would be incomparably more knowing than Hippocrates; and were they little enough to get into the brain and the entrails, they might cure any body, and alſo produce whenever they pleaſed the moſt ſtrange diſeaſes that can be ſeen. The whole may be brought to this queſtion, *Is it poſſible that an inviſible modification ſhould be more knowing and malicious than man?* If Spinoza denies it, he knows not the conſequences of his hypotheſis, and acts raſhly and without principles. A man might make a long diſſertation upon this ſubject, wherein he might prevent all Spinoza's ſubterfuges and objections. Compare with this what I have obſerved in the articles of Lucretius (134), and in that of Hobbes (135.)

[*R*] *The diſputes of the Spinoziſts about miracles is a meer quibble.*] The common opinion of orthodox Divines is, That GOD produces miracles immediately, whether he makes uſe of creatures as agents or not. In either caſe, it undeniably appears that he is above nature; for if he produces ſomething without employing other cauſes, he does not want the help of nature; and he never employs them in a miracle, but after he has diverted them from their uſual courſe: And therefore he ſhews that they depend on his will, that he ſuſpends their power when he pleaſes, or applies it in a different manner from their ordinary determination. The Carteſians, who make him the immediate cauſe of all the effects of nature, ſuppoſe, that when he works miracles, he does not obſerve the general laws he has eſtabliſhed; he makes an exception, and applies bodies quite otherwiſe than he would do, if he followed the general laws. Whereupon they ſay, that if there were any general laws, whereby GOD had engaged to move bodies according to the deſires of angels, and if an angel had deſired that the waters of the Red-Sea ſhould be divided, the paſſage of the Iſraelites would not be a miracle properly ſo called. This conſequence, which neceſſarily ariſes from their principles, makes their definition of a miracle leſs convenient than it were to be wiſhed, and therefore it were better for them to ſay, that all the effects, contrary to the general laws we know, are miracles; and by this means the plagues of Egypt, and ſuch other extraordinary actions related in Scripture will be miracles, properly ſpeaking. Now, in order to ſhew the inſincerity, and the illuſions of the Spinoziſts upon this head, we need only ſay, that when they deny the poſſibility of miracles, they alledge this reaſon, that GOD and nature are the ſame Being; ſo that if GOD did ſomething againſt the laws of nature, he would act againſt himſelf; which is impoſſible. Speak plainly, and without any ambiguity: Say, that the laws of nature being not made by a free Legiſlator, who knew what he did, but being the action of a blind and neceſſary cauſe, nothing can happen that is contrary to thoſe laws. If ſo, you alledge your own poſition againſt miracles: which is a *petitio principii*; but however, you ſpeak plainly. Let us bring them off from this general reaſoning and aſk them what they think of the miracles mentioned in the Scripture. They will abſolutely deny all thoſe, which they cannot aſcribe to a cunning trick. Not to inſiſt upon their impudence in denying ſuch facts, I ſhall only argue againſt them by their own principles. Do not you ſay that the power of nature is infinite? But would it be infinite, if there was nothing in the whole univerſe that could reſtore a dead man to life? Would it be infinite, if there was but one way of forming man, *viz.* that of ordinary generation? Do not you ſay that the knowledge of nature is infinite? You deny that divine underſtanding, in which we believe the knowledge of all poſſible Beings to be reunited; but by diſperſing the knowledge, you do not deny

(129) Sir Kenelm Digby does alſo maintain it, if I am not miſtaken.

(130) In the article RUGGERI, remark [*D*].

(131) I ſuppoſe that the authority of the Holy Scripture is laid aſide, and that a man declares he only reaſons like a Philoſopher.

(132) See his letters lvi, lviii, lx.

(133) Note, by the by, that nothing can be more improper than to inquire whether angels, when they appear, aſſume a living or dead body. They have no need of it. They need only move the Optic and Acouſtic nerves, as they are moved by the light reflected from a human body, and by the air that comes out of the mouth of a man who ſpeaks.

(134) Remark [*F*].

(135) Remark [*N*].

notions. It is ſaid, he died fully perſuaded of his Atheiſm, and that he took ſome precautions to conceal his inconſtancy, if there ſhould be occaſion for it [*S*]. Had he reaſoned conſequentially, he would not have treated the fear of Hell as a chimerical thing [*T*]. His friends ſay that, out of modeſty, he deſired that no ſect ſhould go by his

deny its infinity. And therefore you ought to ſay that nature knows all things, much in the ſame manner as we ſay that man underſtands all languages: one man does not underſtand them all; but ſome underſtand one, and ſome another. Can you affirm that the univerſe contains nothing, which knows the conſtruction of our bodies? If you can affirm it, you contradict yourſelves; you can ſay no longer that the knowledge of GOD is infinitely divided; the contrivance of our organs would be unknown to him. You muſt therefore acknowledge, if you argue conſequentially that ſome modification knows it; you muſt acknowledge that it is very poſſible for nature to bring a dead man to life, and that your maſter confounded his ideas, and knew not the conſequences of his principle, when he ſaid (136) that if he could believe the reſurrection of Lazarus, he would break his ſyſtem to pieces, and willingly embrace the Chriſtian Faith.

This is ſufficient to ſhew that the Spinoziſts contradict their own hypotheſis, when they deny the poſſibility of miracles; I mean, (to avoid all ambiguity) the poſſibility of the facts mentioned in the Holy Scripture.

[*S*] *He took ſome precautions to conceal his inconſtancy, if there ſhould be occaſion for it.*] I mean he took care, that in caſe the approach of death, or the ſymptoms of his illneſs, ſhould make him ſpeak againſt his ſyſtem, no ſuſpected perſon ſhould be witneſs of it. The caſe is this; or at leaſt we find the following account of it in a printed book (137). Perhaps it will be ſaid that Atheiſts ‘ are not greedy of praiſe? But what can any ‘ man do more than what was done by Spinoza, a ‘ little before he died? The thing is of a freſh date ‘ (138), and I have it from a great man, who had it ‘ from good hands. He was the greateſt Atheiſt that ‘ ever lived, and he grew ſo fond of certain philoſo‘phical principles, that the better to meditate upon ‘ them, he confined himſelf to a cloſe retirement, re‘nouncing all the pleaſures and vanities of the world, ‘ and minding nothing but thoſe abſtruſe meditations. ‘ Being upon the point of death, he ſent for his land‘lady, and deſired her not to ſuffer that any miniſter ‘ ſhould ſee him in that condition. His reaſon for it ‘ was, as his friends ſaid, that he had a mind to die ‘ without diſputing, and was afraid that the weak‘neſs of his ſenſes might make him ſay ſomething in‘conſiſtent with his principles. That is, he was afraid ‘ it would be ſaid in the world that his conſcience, ‘ awakening at the ſight of death, had damped his ‘ courage, and made him renounce his opinions. Can ‘ there be a more ridiculous and extravagant vanity, ‘ and a more fooliſh paſſion for a wrong notion of con‘ſtancy?’

A Preface, which I have quoted above (139), and which contains ſome circumſtances of the death of that Atheiſt, ſays nothing of this. I find in it that he told his landlord who was going to church, I hope you will return, GOD willing, and ſpeak with me when the ſermon is over (140). But he died quietly before his landlord returned, and no body ſaw him die but a Phyſician of Amſterdam (141). For the reſt, we are told in that preface, that he was extremely deſirous to immortalize his name, and would have willingly ſacrificed his life for it, though, in order to obtain it, he had been torn in pieces by the mob. ‘ Auro plane ‘ non inhiabat, alioqui delata ſibi Profeſſoris munera ‘ aliquoties non reſpuiſſet homo gloriæ avidior & ni‘mis ambitioſus, qui vel cum Wittiis amicis ſuis cru‘deliter dilacerari ſublatius optavit, modo vita brevi ‘ gloriæ curſus foret ſempiternus (142). - - - *Surely he ‘ was not covetous, otherwiſe he would not have ſo often ‘ refuſed the Profeſſorſhip which had been offered him, ‘ being a man deſirous of glory and too ambitious, who ‘ would have wiſhed to be cruelly torn to pieces with the ‘ De Wits, his friends, provided the ſhortneſs of his life ‘ was recompenſed with immortal glory.*’

[*T*] *Had he reaſoned conſequentially, he would not have called the fear of Hell a chimerical thing.*] Thoſe, who believe that the world is not the work of GOD, and is not directed by a Being ſimple, ſpiritual, and diſtinct from all bodies, muſt at leaſt confeſs that there are ſome things which are endowed with intelligence and will, and which are jealous of their power, which exerciſe authority over others, which command them to do ſome things, chaſtiſe them, uſe them harſhly, and revenge themſelves ſeverely. Is not the earth full of ſuch things? Does not every man know it by experience? It would be a thing altogether unreaſonable to fancy that all Beings of that nature are only upon earth, which is but one point if compared to the world. Muſt reaſon, wit, ambition, hatred, and cruelty, be upon earth rather than any where elſe? Why ſo? Can any reaſon good or bad be given for it? I do not think ſo. Our eyes induce us to believe that thoſe vaſt ſpaces we call Heaven, which have ſuch powerful and rapid motions, may as well form men as our earth, and deſerve no leſs than the globe we inhabit to be divided into ſeveral dominions. We do not know what paſſes there; but if we conſult only reaſon, it will appear very probable, or at leaſt poſſible, that there are thinking Beings in thoſe vaſt ſpaces, which extend their empire as well as their light to our globe. Our not ſeeing them is not a proof that we are unknown or indifferent to them: Perhaps we are part of their dominions: they make laws, which they reveal to us by the dictates of our conſcience, and are very angry with thoſe that tranſgreſs them. The poſſibility of it is ſufficient to make Atheiſts uneaſy; and nothing but denying the immortality of the ſoul can make them fearleſs. For thereby they would eſcape the vengeance of thoſe ſpirits, which otherwiſe might be more dreadful than GOD himſelf. I explain myſelf. There are ſome men, who believe a GOD, a Paradiſe, and a Hell; but they create illuſions to themſelves, and imagine that the infinite goodneſs of the moſt perfect Being does not permit him to torment his own work for ever. He is the father of all men, ſay they; and therefore he chaſtiſes like a father thoſe who diſobey him, and after he has made them ſenſible of their faults, he reſtores them to his favour in Heaven. Origen argued in that manner. Others ſuppoſe that GOD will annihilate the rebellious creatures, and will be appeaſed, and moved to compaſſion with a *quem das finem Rex Magne laborum* (143). *What end of labours has your will decreed?* They carry their illuſion ſo far, as to think that the everlaſting torments mentioned in the Scripture, are only comminatory. If ſuch men were ignorant of the Being of a GOD, and by conſidering what paſſes in our world, ſhould believe that there are Beings in other worlds, which concern themſelves with mankind, they could not be eaſy when they come to die, unleſs they believed that the ſoul is mortal; for if they believed it to be immortal, they might be afraid of falling under the power of a cruel maſter, angry with them by reaſon of their actions; it would be to no purpoſe to hope to come off after having been tormented for ſome years. A limited Being may be deſtitute of all manner of moral perfection; it may be like our Phalaris's and Neros, a ſort of men who could have left an enemy in a dungeon for ever, had they been able to get an eternal authority. Will they hope that miſchievous Beings will not laſt for ever? But how many Atheiſts pretend that the Sun had no beginning, and will have no end? This is what I meant, when I ſaid that ſome Beings might appear more dreadful than GOD himſelf? A man may flatter himſelf, when he conſiders that GOD is infinitely good, and infinitely perfect; and he may fear every-thing from an imperfect Being: he does not know whether its anger will not laſt for ever. Every body knows the choice of the prophet David (144).

To apply what has been ſaid to a Spinoziſt, let us remember that he is obliged by his principle to acknowledge the Immortality of the Soul; for he looks upon himſelf as the modification of a Being eſſentially thinking. Let us remember, that he cannot deny that ſome modifications are angry with others, put them to the torture, make their torments laſt as long as ever they can, ſend them to the gallies for life, and would make that puniſhment laſt for ever, if the death of one party or the other did not prevent it. Tiberius,

(136) I have been aſſured that he ſaid ſo to his friends.

(137) Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, *num.* 181, *pag.* 565, 566. *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans, *for March* 1689, *pag.* 82.

(138) *The* Penſées ſur les Cometes *were printed in the year* 1683.

(139) In the remark [*H*].

(140) Ad audiendum oratorem ſacrum horis pomeridianis tendentem, finita, inquit, concione, DEO volente, ad ſermones redibis. *Sebaſt. Kortholtus*, Præf. Libri *de tribus Impoſtoribus*, *pag.* 6.

(141) Id. ibid.

(142) Id. ibid.

(143) Virgil. Æneid. lib. i, ver. 245.

(144) *Being to chuſe either to be overcome by his enemies, or to be afflicted with a plague ſent from God, he anſwered the Prophet Gad.* I am in a great ſtrait: Let us fall now into the hand of the Lord, (for his mercies are great) and let me not fall into the hand of man. *2 Sam.* xxiv. 14.

his name [*U*]. It is not true that his followers are very numerous. Few people are ſuſpected of adhering to his doctrine; and among thoſe, who are ſuſpected of it, few have ſtudied it; and among the latter, few have underſtood it, and moſt of them are diſcouraged by the difficulties and impenetrable abſtractions that attend it (*m*). But the thing is this: at all adventures thoſe, who have little religion, and do not much ſcruple to own it, are called Spinoziſts. Thus in France all thoſe who are thought not to believe the myſteries of the Goſpel, are called Socinians, though moſt of them never read Socinus nor his followers. For the reſt, the ſame thing happened to Spinoza, which inevitably happens to all thoſe who frame impious ſyſtems; they ſecure themſelves from ſome objections, but they lie open to others that are more perplexing. If they cannot be orthodox, if they are ſo fond of diſputing, it were better for them not to dogmatize. But of all Atheiſtical ſyſtems, none is leſs capable of deceiving than that of Spinoza; for, as I have ſaid before, it is contrary to the moſt diſtinct notions of our minds. Objections throng in upon him; and he can make no anſwers but what are more obſcure than the aſſertions he ſhould maintain (*n*): and therefore, his poiſon brings a remedy along with it. He would have been more formidable, had he uſed all his ſkill to clear an hypotheſis, that is very much in vogue among the Chineſe [*X*], and very different from that which I have mentioned in the ſecond remark of this article. I have been juſt now informed

Tiberius, Caligula, and many others are examples of ſuch modifications. Let us remember that a Spinoziſt makes himſelf ridiculous, if he does not acknowledge that the univerſe is full of ambitious, moroſe, jealous, and cruel, modifications; for ſince the earth is full of them, there is no reaſon to believe that the air and the heavens are not likewiſe full of them. Laſtly, Let us remember, that the eſſence of human modifications does not conſiſt in being cloathed with a bulk of fleſh. Socrates was Socrates the day of his conception, or ſoon after (145); whatever he had at that time may remain entire, when a mortal diſeaſe has put an end to the circulation of the blood, and the motion of the heart, in the matter wherewith it was enlarged: and therefore he is after his death the ſame modification as he was during his life, if we conſider only what is eſſential to his perſon: death cannot therefore free him from the juſtice or caprice of his inviſible perſecutors. They may follow him wherever he goes, and torment him whatever viſible form he may aſſume.

Theſe conſiderations might be made uſe of to induce to the practice of virtue, even thoſe who adhere to the impious doctrine of ſuch ſects; for it ſtands to reaſon that they ſhould be chiefly afraid for having tranſgreſſed the laws revealed to their conſcience. It is more likely that thoſe inviſible Beings would concern themſelves with the puniſhment of ſuch faults.

[*U*] *His friends ſay, that, out of modeſty, he deſired that no ſect ſhould go by his name.*] I ſhall ſet down the words of the Preface of his *Opera Poſthuma*, without curtailing them. ‘ Nomen Auctoris in libri fronte, & alibi literis duntaxat initialibus indicatum, non aliâ de causâ, quam quia paulò ante obitum expreſſe petiit, ne Nomen ſuum Ethicæ, cujus impreſſionem mandabat, præfigeretur; cur autem prohibuerit, nulla alia, ut quidem videtur, ratio eſt, quàm quia noluit; ut *Diſciplina ex ipſo haberet vocabulum.* Dicit etenim in Appendice quartæ partis Ethices capite vigeſimo quinto, quòd, *qui alios conſilio, aut re juvare cupiunt, ut ſimul ſummo fruantur bono, minimè ſtudebunt, ut Diſciplina ex ipſis habeat vocabulum*; ſed inſuper in tertiâ Ethices parte Affectuum Definit. XLIV. ubi quid ſit ambitio explicat, eos, qui tale quid patrant, non obſcurè, ut Gloriæ cupidos, accuſat. - - - *The two initial letters only of the author's name were put to the book, becauſe a little before his death he expreſsly deſired, that his name ſhould not be prefixed to his Ethics, which he had ordered to be printed. And why he did ſo, it ſeems no other reaſon can be given, but becauſe he would not have* the Doctrine called by his name. *For he ſays in the twenty-fifth chapter of the Appendix to the fourth part of his Ethics, that* thoſe who would help others to the attainment of the ſupreme good, together with themſelves, will not deſire that their doctrine be called by their name; *and where he is explaining what ambition is, he plainly taxes ſuch as do this with being ambitious of glory.*’

[*X*] *He would have been more formidable, had he uſed all his ſkill to clear an hypotheſis, that is very much in vogue among the Chineſe.*] A Father of the Church owned a thing, which perhaps would not be excuſed at this day in a Philoſopher, *viz.* that thoſe, who deny the Deity or a Providence, alledge probable reaſons both for their cauſe, and againſt their adverſaries. ‘ Deos nonnulli eſſe abnegant: prorſus dubitare ſe alii an ſint uſpiam dicunt: alii vero exiſtere, neque humana curare: immo alii perhibent, & rebus intereſſe mortalium, & terrenas adminiſtrare rationes. Cum ergo hæc ita ſint, neque aliter fiat, quin ſit unum ex omnibus verum, pugnant tamen argumentis omnes, neque ſingulis deeſt id, quod probabiliter dicant, ſive cum ſuas res aſſerunt, ſive cum alienis opinionibus contradicunt (146). - - - - - *Some deny that there are any gods: others ſay they doubt whether there are any: others that there are gods, but that they take no care of human affairs: and others affirm it, and ſay that they are concerned in human affairs, and adminiſtrate them. Since therefore theſe things are ſo, and one of all theſe opinions muſt neceſſarily be true, yet each of them contradicts the other with arguments, and does not want ſomething probable to advance in its favour, and in refutation of the contrary opinions.*’ If he was in the right, perhaps it were chiefly with reſpect to thoſe, who ſuppoſe a great number of ſouls in the univerſe diſtinct one from another, each of which exiſts by itſelf, and acts by an inward and eſſential principle. They are more powerful one than another, *&c.* Herein conſiſts the Atheiſm ſo generally ſpread among the Chineſe. The author of the following paſſage tells us how he fancies they have by degrees obſcured the true notions. ‘ (147) GOD, that moſt pure and perfect Being, is become at moſt the material ſoul of the whole world, or of its fineſt part, which is Heaven. His providence and his power became limited, tho' of a much greater extent than the power and prudence of men. . . . . . The Chineſe doctrine hath always aſcribed ſpirits to the four parts of the world, to the ſtars, mountains, rivers, plants, towns, and their ditches, houſes, and their hearths, in a word to every thing. They do not ſay that all ſpirits are good; they acknowledge wicked ones, which they take to be the immediate cauſe of the evils and miſeries incident to human life. . . . . . (148) And therefore as the ſoul of man was, in their opinion, the cauſe of all the vital actions of man; in like manner they aſcribed a ſoul to the ſun, to be the ſpring of its qualities and motion. And becauſe, according to this principle, the ſouls, that are diſperſed every where, produced in all bodies the actions which appeared natural to thoſe bodies, this was ſufficient in their opinion to explain the whole œconomy of nature, and to ſupply the omnipotence and infinite providence, which they admitted in no ſpirit, no not in that of Heaven. It is true, that becauſe it ſeems that man, uſing natural things for his nouriſhment and conveniency, has ſome power over natural things; the antient opinion of the Chineſe, which aſcribed in proportion a like power to all ſouls, ſuppoſed that the ſoul of Heaven could act upon nature with a prudence, and a power incomparably greater than the prudence and power of men. But at the ſame time, they acknowledged in the ſoul of every thing an inward power, independent by its own nature of the power of Heaven, and

---

(*m*) This is the reaſon why ſome are of opinion that he ought not to be refuted. See the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres*, for June 1684, Art. vi, pag. m. 388, 389.

(*n*) Conſult his Letters: you will ſee that his anſwers have ſeldom any relation to the ſtate of the queſtion.

(145) Spinoza, who made microſcopes, ſhould have believed that man is organized and animated in the ſeed, and that therefore Socrates was Socrates before his mother conceived him.

(146) Arnobius adverſus Gentes, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 82.

(147) *La Loubere, Relation de Siam*, Tom. i, ch. xxiii, num. 2, pag. 503, 504. See above the citation (55) of the article MALHERBE, and the article SOMMONA-CODOM, remark [*A*].

(148) La Loubere, ibid. *num. iii, pag* 505, 506.

informed of a pretty curious particular, viz. That after he had forſaken Judaiſm, he publickly profeſſed Chriſtianity, and frequented the aſſemblies of the Mennonites, or thoſe of the Arminians of Amſterdam (*o*). Nay he approved a confeſſion of faith communicated to him by an intimate friend [*Y*].

What is ſaid of him in the continuation of the Menagiana is ſo falſe [*Z*], that I wonder Menage's friends did not perceive it. Mr de Vigneul Marville would have adviſed them to leave it out, had he been concerned in the edition of that work; for he has acquainted the public, *that there is reaſon to doubt of the truth of that fact* (*p*). The reaſons he alledges for his doubt are very reaſonable: he would not have been too forward, had he poſitively denied the thing. I ſhall take notice of a miſtake he has committed in the ſame page [*AA*]. I muſt ſay ſomething concerning the objections I have propoſed againſt the ſyſtem of Spinoza. I might add a very large ſupplement to thoſe objections, did I not perceive that they are already too long, conſidering the nature of my work: this is not a proper place to engage in a formal diſpute; it is ſufficient for my deſign to make ſome general obſervations in order to undermine the foundations of Spinoziſm, and to ſhew that it is a ſyſtem grounded upon ſuch a ſtrange ſuppoſition, that it overthrows moſt of the common notions, which are the rule of Philoſophical diſcuſſions. Whoever ſhews that this ſyſtem is contrary to the moſt evident, and the moſt univerſal axioms we have had hitherto, does certainly go the right way to confute it, though perhaps it is not ſo proper to reclaim the old Spinoziſts, as if it was proved to them that the propoſitions of Spinoza are contrary to one another. They would be more ſenſible of their prejudices, were they forced to confeſs that he does not always agree with himſelf, that his proofs are wrong, that he does not prove what wants to be proved, that his concluſions are not juſt, &c. This method of confuting him by ſhewing the abſolute defects (*q*) of his work, and the relative defects of its parts compared one with another, has been well managed by ſome of thoſe who wrote againſt him (*r*). I have been juſt now

(*o*) See the remark [*I*].

(*p*) Vigneul Marville Mêlanges, *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 320, *Dutch Edit.*

(*q*) I underſtand by that word the defects, which do not proceed from Spinoza's aſſerting things contrary to the maxims which other Philoſophers generally acknowledge to be true.

(*r*) *See* Wittichius's Anti-Spinoza, *or the Extracts of them in the* Acta Eruditor. 1690, pag. 346, & ſeq. *and in the 23d volume of the* Bibliotheque Univerſelle, *pag.* 323, *& ſeq.*

‘ acting ſometimes againſt the deſigns of Heaven. ‘ Heaven governed nature as a potent king, whom ‘ the other ſouls were to obey, and they were gene- ‘ rally forced to it; but ſome of them did ſometimes ‘ exempt themſelves from it.’ I confeſs, it is an abſurd thing to ſuppoſe ſeveral eternal Beings, independent one of another, and of an unequal power; nevertheleſs, this ſuppoſition appeared true to Democritus, Epicurus, and ſeveral other great Philoſophers. They admitted an infinite quantity of ſmall bodies of different figure, uncreated, ſelf-moving, *&c.* This opinion is ſtill very common in the Eaſt (149). Thoſe who admit the eternity of matter, are not more reaſonable than if they admitted the eternity of an infinite number of atoms; for if there can be two Beings co-eternal and independent as to their exiſtence, there may be a hundred thouſand millions, and ſo *in infinitum*. Nay, they ought to ſay that the number of them is actually infinite; for matter, though never ſo ſmall, contains diſtinct parts. And it is to be obſerved that all the Antients were ignorant of the creation of matter; for they never departed from the axiom, *ex nihilo nihil fit*. And therefore they were not ſenſible that it is an abſurd thing, to acknowledge an infinity of ſubſtances co-eternal, and independent one of another as to exiſtence. However abſurd that Hypotheſis may be, it is not liable to the frightful inconveniencies of Spinoziſm. It would account for many phænomena, by aſſigning to every thing an active principle, a more powerful one to ſome, and a leſs powerful to others; or if their power was equal, it might be ſaid that thoſe which prevail have a greater combination. I do not know whether any Socinian did ever ſay or believe, that the ſouls of men, not being made out of nothing, exiſt, and act of themſelves. Their liberty of indifference would manifeſtly flow from thence.

[*Y*] *He even approved a confeſſion of faith communicated to him by an intimate friend.*] One Jarig Jellis, his intimate friend, being ſuſpected of heterodoxy, thought himſelf obliged to publiſh a confeſſion of his faith for his vindication. Having compoſed it, he ſent it to Spinoza, and deſired him to write to him his opinion of it. Spinoza made anſwer, that he had read it with pleaſure, and found nothing in it that wanted to be altered. *Domine ac amice Clariſſime: ſcripta tua ad me miſſa cum voluptate perlegi, ac talia inveni ut nihil in illis mutare poſſim.* That confeſſion of faith is in Dutch, and was printed in the year 1684 (150).

[*Z*] *What is ſaid of him in the continuation of the* Menagiana *is falſe.*] The ſtory runs thus: ‘ I have ‘ heard that Spinoza died for fear of being ſent to the ‘ Baſtille. He came into France at the ſollicitation of ‘ two perſons of quality, who deſired to ſee him. ‘ Mr de Pomponne was informed of it; and being a ‘ miniſter very zealous for religion, he did not think ‘ it proper to ſuffer Spinoza in France, where he ‘ might have done a great deal of miſchief; and to ‘ prevent it, he reſolved to ſend him to the Baſtille. ‘ Spinoza having notice of it, made his eſcape in the ‘ diſguiſe of a Cordelier; but I do not warrant the ‘ truth of this laſt circumſtance. What is certain is, ‘ that many perſons, who ſaw him, have told me ‘ that he was a little man, of a yellowiſh complexion, ‘ that he had ſomething diſmal in his looks, and ſome- ‘ thing ominous in his face (151).’ The laſt part of this paſſage is, I believe, very true; for, beſides that Spinoza was originally come from Portugal or Spain, as his name ſufficiently ſhews, I have heard ſome perſons, who had ſeen him, ſay the ſame thing of his complexion, as is related in the *Menagiana*. But the firſt part of this ſtory is a wretched falſity: from whence one may judge how many lies are told in ſuch aſſemblies as Mr Menage's *Mercuriales*, whereof there are many at Paris and in other cities.

[*AA*] *I ſhall take notice of a fault Mr de Vigneul Marville has committed.*] ‘ The Jew, or rather the ‘ Atheiſt, mentioned by Huetius in the preface of his ‘ *Demonſtratio Evangelica*, without naming him, who ‘ occaſioned his writing that learned book, is the fa- ‘ mous Benedict Spinoza, with whom he had ſome warm ‘ converſations about religion at Amſterdam (152).’ The Jew, with whom Huetius had ſome conferences at Amſterdam, is *Manaſſes Ben Iſrael*, whom he hath named in the Latin poem of his journey into Sweden.

Altera lux ſpectare dedis myſteria gentis
Judææ, ductor Judæus & ipſe Manaſſes.
Aſt adducta ſecans dirus præputia culter
Dum tenet attentum, & ſublati inſania ritus,
Ecce abaci; quo inferre pii cæleſtia Moſis
Scripta ſolent, ſummo extremum limbum pede tango
Inſcius; inſueto cuncti fremuere tumultu:
Diffugio veritus damnoſi vulnera cultri (153).

Next morn the Jewiſh myſteries I view,
My guide Manaſſes Ben Iſrael the Jew:
The lengthen'd prepuce now the dreadful ſteel
Cuts off, and now ſuſpends in air, while all
The Iſraelites in noiſy tumult bawl.
I gazing on, unthinking touch the cheſt,
Where holy Moſes's ſacred law is plac'd:

(149) See the anonymous book printed in the year 1690, at Amſterdam, and intituled, *Philoſophia vulgaris refutata*

(150) *At Amſterdam. The title amounts to this,* A Catholic and Chriſtian Confeſſion of Faith, in a letter to N. N. by Jarig Jellis.

(151) Sequel of the Menagiana, *pag.* 15, *Edition of Holland.*

(152) Vigneul Marville, Mêlang. *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 320, *Dutch Edit.*

(153) Petrus Daniel Huetius, Poëm. *pag.* 53, 54, *Edit. Ultraj.* 1700.

now informed that the author of a ſmall Dutch book, printed within theſe few days [*BB*], makes uſe of it with great force and ability. But to ſpeak of the ſupplement I deſign to give: it conſiſts in an explanation of the objection I have grounded on the immutability of God [*CC*], and in the examination of this queſtion, whether it be true, as I am told ſeveral

Behold they ſtart, and ſtare, and all around
Loud ſhouts and cries from every part reſound.
All in a maze, dreading the bloody knife
And furious Jews, I ran away for life.

That Jew is, I ſay, the Rabbin Manaſſes Ben Iſraël. The character Huetius gives of him in the preface of his *Demonſtratio Evangelica*, does not agree with Benedict Spinoza, who never made a figure among the Jews; for he left them being very young, and after many conteſtations, which had made him odious. ‘ Unicum ſelegi de multis argumentum, *ſays Mr Huetius* (154), ex Prophetiarum eventu conſlatum, quod propoſui hoc opere, & quo olim ad retundendam Judæi cujuſdam, viri acuti ſane & ſubtilis, contumaciam uſus ſum. Cum enim eſſem Amſtelodami, & Judæorum, quorum magna eſt his in locis frequentia, ritus ac myſteria penitius introſpicere vellem, ad eum deductus ſum, qui tum inter illos peritiſſimus, ac totius Judaicæ diſciplinæ conſultiſſimus habebatur. - - - - *Among many arguments I ſingled out one, taken from the fulfilling of Prophecies, which I have propoſed in this work, and had long ago employed to beat down the contumacy of a certain Jew, a man of wit and ſubtilty. For when I was at Amſterdam, and was deſirous narrowly to obſerve the rites and ceremonies of the Jews, who are very numerous in thoſe parts, I was carried to him who, at that time, was accounted among them to be the moſt knowing and ſkillful in all the Jewiſh diſcipline.*’ You ſee he ſpeaks of a remote time, and of the moſt famous Rabbin of Amſterdam: and it is to be obſerved, that this paſſage is to be found at the beginning of a large book in folio, which came out in the year 1678 (155), and whoſe compoſition and impreſſion took up ſome years. I think that the time Huetius denotes by the word *olim*, is the year 1652, in which he travelled into Sweden; but if I was miſtaken in this particular, it were ſtill true that he means Manaſſes Ben Iſrael, who died in the year 1659, and not our Spinoza, who, as I ſaid before, never kept a conſiderable rank in the ſynagogue.

[*BB*] *The author of a ſmall Dutch book, printed within theſe few days* (156)]. He only calls himſelf *N. N. Philalethes*: the title of his book comes to this; *A demonſtration of the weakneſs of Spinoza's argument, concerning the only one abſolutely infinite ſubſtance.* He lays down as a fact; 1. That the whole ſyſtem of Spinoza is grounded on this propoſition: *That there is but one only ſubſtance, and that it is abſolutely infinite.* 2. That from ſuch a principle Spinoza drew this conſequence, *That particular Beings are only modifications of that abſolutely infinite ſubſtance.* The author maintains that this principle, being conteſted by every body, ſhould have been proved with all imaginable care, and yet that Spinoza gave no proof of it. I could give ſome extracts of that piece, for I have ſeen a French tranſlation of it in manuſcript; but becauſe it is but a ſmall book, and in all probability it will be printed in French or Latin, before my Dictionary comes out, it were a needleſs thing to enlarge upon it.

[*CC*] *An explanation of the objection which I have grounded upon GOD's immutability.*] You will find that objection above in the remark [*N*], numb. II. I muſt confirm it, ſince ſome perſons maintain that the weakneſs of it ſufficiently appears, if it be conſidered that no alteration happens to the god of Spinoza, as being a ſubſtance infinite, neceſſary, &c. Tho' the face of the whole world ſhould change at every moment, tho' the earth ſhould be reduced to duſt, the ſun darkened, and the ſea become a luminous body, there will only be a change of modifications: the one only ſubſtance will always remain a ſubſtance infinite, extended, thinking, and ſo will all ſubſtantial or eſſential attributes. When they ſay this, they ſay nothing but what I have already confuted beforehand (157): but the better to ſhew their miſtake, I muſt obſerve here that they diſpute againſt me, as if I had maintained that, according to Spinoza, the Deity ſucceſſively annihilates and produces again. This is not what I object, when I ſay that he makes God ſubject to change, and diveſts him of his immutability. I do not confound, as they do, the notion of things, and the ſignification of words: by changing, I mean the ſame thing which all reaſoning men have ever meant by that word: I do not mean the *annihilation* and total deſtruction of a thing, but it's paſſing through ſeveral ſtates, the ſubject of the accidents it ceaſes to have, and of thoſe it begins to acquire, remaining the ſame. The learned, and the illiterate, the Mythologiſts and the Philoſophers, the Poets and the Naturaliſts, are agreed in this notion, and the ſignification of this word. The fabulous Metamorphoſes, ſo much ſung by Ovid, and the true generations explained by Philoſophers, equally ſuppoſed the preſervation of the ſubſtance, and kept it immutably as the ſucceſſive ſubject of the old and new form. Theſe notions have been only confounded by the unhappy diſputes of Chriſtian Divines: and yet it muſt be confeſſed that the moſt ignorant miſſionaries come into the right way again, when the queſtion is no longer about the Euchariſt If you aſk them, upon any other ſubject, what is meant by the change, converſion, tranſelementation, and tranſubſtantiation of one thing into another; they will anſwer you, the meaning of it is, for inſtance, that wood becomes fire, that bread becomes blood, and blood fleſh, and ſo on. They do not think then of the improper expreſſions conſecrated to the controverſy of the Euchariſt, that the bread is converted and tranſubſtantiated into the body of our Saviour. This way of ſpeaking does by no means agree with the doctrine deſigned to be explained by it: it is as if one ſhould ſay, that the air of a caſk is transformed, changed, converted, and tranſubſtantiated into the wine poured into the caſk. The air goes ſomewhere elſe, and the wine ſucceeds it in the ſame place: one of them is not in the leaſt metamorphoſed into the other. Neither is the myſtery of the Euchariſt, as it is explained by the Roman Catholics, any metamorphoſis: the bread is annihilated, as to it's ſubſtance; the body of CHRIST takes the place of the bread, and is not the ſubject of inherence of the accidents of that which are preſerved without their ſubſtance. But I repeat it again, this is the only caſe wherein the miſſionaries make a wrong uſe of the words *change, converſion,* or *tranſelementation,* of one Being into another: in all other things, they ſuppoſe, with the reſt of mankind, 1. That it is eſſential to a transformation, that the ſubject of the forms, that are deſtroyed, ſhould ſubſiſt under the new forms. 2. That tho' the ſubject be preſerved, as to what is eſſential in it, yet it undergoes an internal change, properly ſo called, and inconſiſtent with an immutable Being. Let the Spinoſiſts therefore no longer imagine that they will be allowed to coin a new language, contrary to the ideas of all mankind. If they have any ſincerity left, they muſt confeſs, that, according to their ſyſtem, GOD is ſubject to all the viciſſitudes, and all the revolutions, to which the *materia prima* of Ariſtotle is liable, in the ſyſtem of the Peripatetics. But could any thing be more abſurd than to maintain, that ſuppoſing Ariſtotle's doctrine, matter is a ſubſtance which never undergoes any change?

But in order to embarraſs the Spinoſiſts, it is but deſiring them to give a definition of change. They muſt define it in ſuch manner, that either it will not differ from the total deſtruction of a ſubject, or that it will agree with that one only ſubſtance, which they call GOD. If they define it in the firſt manner, they will make themſelves more ridiculous ſtill than the tranſubſtantiators; and if they define it in the ſecond manner, they will give up the cauſe.

I add, that the reaſon they alledge to elude my objections, proves too much; for if it was a good one, they muſt needs teach that there never was, nor will be, any change in the world, and that all manner of change is impoſſible, whether great or ſmall. Let us prove this conſequence. The reaſon, ſay they, why GOD is immutable, is, becauſe, as a ſubſtance, and an extenſion, ſeveral perſons pretend that I have not at all underſtood Spinoza's doctrine [*DD*]. It were a very ſtrange thing, ſince I have only undertaken to confute the propoſition, which

---

(154) Petrus Daniel Huetius, *in Præfat.* Demonſtrat. Evangelicæ, *p. m.* 3.

(155) The firſt edition of Huetius's *Demonſtratio Evangelica* was publiſhed in 1678, though the year 1679, is in the title page.

(156) At Amſterdam for Bernard Viſſcher 1701.

(157) See number II, of the remark [*N*].

extenſion, he neither is nor can be ſubject to any change. He is an extended ſubſtance under the form of fire, as well as under the form of wood, which is converted into fire, and ſo with other things. I will prove to them by this very reaſon, that the modifications themſelves are immutable. Man is according to their ſyſtem, a modification of GOD; they own that man is ſubject to change, ſince he is ſometimes merry, and ſometimes melancholy; ſometimes he wills one thing, and ſometimes he wills it not. This is no change, will I ſay; for he is as much a man when merry as when melancholy: the eſſential attributes of man remain immutably in him, whether he be willing to ſell his houſe, or to keep it. Let us ſuppoſe the moſt inconſtant man in the world, and ſuch as might fitly apply to himſelf theſe verſes of Horace:

Mea . . . . pugnat ſententia ſecum.
Quod petiit, ſpernit: repetit, quod nuper omiſit.
Æſtuat, & vitæ diſconvenit ordine toto.
Diruit, ædificat, mutat quadrata rotundis (158).

My mind is with itſelf at ſtriſe,
And diſagrees in all the courſe of life;
And what it hated now, it now deſires;
What now it throws away, it now admires;
Unſettled as the ſea, or fleeting air,
It razes, builds, and changes round to ſquare.
CREECH.

Or who might, more than any body elſe, be the true original of theſe verſes of Mr Boileau.

Mais l'homme ſans arrêt, dans ſa courſe inſenſée,
Voltige inceſſamment de penſée en penſée,
Son cœur toûjours flottant entre mille embarras,
Ne ſçait ni ce qu'il veut, ni ce qu'il ne veut pas
Ce qu'un jour il abhorre, en l'autre il le ſouhaite.
. . . .
. . . .
Voilà l'Homme en effet. Il va du blanc au noir
Il condamne au matin ſes ſentimens du ſoir.
Importun à tout autre, à ſoi-même incommode,
Il change à tous momens d'eſprit comme de mode;
Il tourne au moindre vent, il tombe au moindre choc.
Aujourd'hui dans un caſque, & demain dans un froc (159).

But ſillier man, in his inconſtant courſe,
Is wilder'd, and oft ſtrays from bad to worſe:
Toſs'd by a thouſand guſts of wavering doubt,
His reſtleſs mind ſtill rolls from thought to thought:
In each reſolve unſteady and unfix'd,
And what he one day loaths, deſires the next.
. . . .
. . . .
This is our image juſt: ſuch is that vain,
That fooliſh, fickle, motly creature man:
More changing than a weather cock, his head
Ne'er wakes with the ſame thoughts he went to bed.
Irkſome to all beſide, and ill at eaſe,
He neither others, nor himſelf can pleaſe:
Each minute round his whirling humours run,
Now he's a trooper, and a prieſt anon,
To day in buff, to morrow in a gown.
OLDHAM.

Let us ſuppoſe a man, who has ſincerely profeſſed all religions in leſs than two years: let us ſuppoſe that he is gone through all the conditions of human life; that he has been ſucceſſively a merchant, a ſoldier, and a monk, and then a married man; that he divorced his wife, and then turned regiſter, financier, and clergy man, *&c.* If the Spinoziſts tell him, you have been very inconſtant: Why? will he ſay, you are miſtaken, I have never changed, I have been as conſtantly a man ever ſince I was born, as a mountain has been a mountain. What could they reply to that argument *ad hominem*? Is it not moſt evident that the whole eſſence of the human ſpecies remains in the man, whether he wills the ſame things, whether he hates to day, what he loved yeſterday, and daily changes his inclinations?

But to make uſe of an example very proper for a country, the inhabitants whereof are uſed to the ſea; let us ſuppoſe that a Spinoziſt, at his retutn from Batavia, ſhould ſay that his voyage has been longer than uſually, becauſe the winds changed almoſt every day. He might be anſwered, You are miſtaken, the winds never change. Indeed it may be ſaid, that they blow ſometimes from the North, ſometimes from the South, *&c.* but they always retain the eſſence of wind; and therefore they do not change as they are winds, and remain as immutable as your one only ſubſtance of the world: for you ſay it is immutable, becauſe it never changes it's ſtate as to it's eſſential properties. No more does the wind change it's ſtate as it is wind, it always retains the whole nature and eſſence of it; and therefore it is as immutable as your Deity.

I go farther, and I ſay, that even when a man is burnt alive, no alteration happens to him. He was a modification of the divine nature when alive; and is he not ſo in the flames, or under the form of aſhes? Could he loſe the attributes that conſtitute a modification? Could he go through any change as he is a modification? If he changed in that reſpect, muſt it not be ſaid that flame is not a mode of extenſion? Could Spinoza affirm it without contradicting himſelf, and deſtroying his own ſyſtem? This is ſufficient to ſhew that thoſe are miſtaken, who pretend I have not proved that this ſyſtem makes GOD ſubject to change. My argument cannot be denied, without aſſerting that modifications themſelves are immutable, and that no alterations happen in man's thoughts, nor in the diſpoſition of matter; which is a moſt abſurd thing, and contrary to the doctrines which the Spinoziſts are forced to acknowledge; for they dare not deny that the modifications of the infinite ſubſtance are ſubject to corruption and generation.

Let us deſire of them to grant us, for a moment, by a *dato non conceſſo*, as the Logicians ſpeak, that Socrates is a ſubſtance. They muſt then acknowledge, that each particular thought of Socrates is a modality of his ſubſtance. But is it not true, that Socrates paſſing from affirming to denying, changes his thought, and that it is a real internal change and properly ſo called? And yet Socrates remains ſtill a ſubſtance, and an individuum of the human ſpecies, whether he affirms or denies, whether he wills or rejects a thing. And therefore, tho' he does not change as he is a man, he cannot be ſaid to be immutable; and it may very well be ſaid that he is mutable, and actually changes, becauſe his modifications are not always the ſame. But let us grant to the Spinoziſts in our turn, by a *dato non conceſſo*, that Socrates is but a modification of the divine ſubſtance; let us grant, I ſay, that his relation to that ſubſtance is, as in the common opinion, the relation of Socrates's thoughts to the ſubſtance of Socrates. Since therefore the change of thoſe thoughts is a good reaſon to maintain that Socrates is not an immutable Being, but rather an inconſtant and mutable ſubſtance which very much varies, it ought to be concluded that the ſubſtance of GOD (160) does actually undergo a change and a variation, properly ſo called, whenever Socrates, one of it's modifications changes his ſtate. It is therefore a moſt evident truth, that for a Being actually and really to paſs from one ſtate into another, it is ſufficient that it changes, as to it's modifications: and if any thing further is required, to wit, that it ſhould loſe it's eſſential attributes, annihilation, or a total deſtruction, would be groſly confounded with change or alteration. See the Margin (161).

[*D D*] *Whether it be true, as I am told, ſeveral perſons pretend that I have not at all underſtood Spinoza's doctrine.*] I have it from ſeveral hands; but no body could tell me the reaſons of thoſe who make ſuch a judgment of my diſpute. And therefore I can neither preciſely

(158) Horat. Epiſt. I, lib. i, ver. 97. *See alſo the paſſage cited above citation* (92).

(159) Boileau, Sat. VIII, ver. 35 & 49.

(160) *Note, that* Ariſtotle, de Prædicam. *cap. v, reckons among the properties of a ſubſtance, to remain the ſame in number under contrary qualities.* Μάλιϛα δὲ ἴδιον τῆς οὐσίας δοκεῖ εἶναι τὸ, ταὐτὸν καὶ ἓν ἀριθμῷ ὂν, τῶν ἐναντίων εἶναι δεκτικόν. Maxime verò ſubſtantiæ proprium hoc eſſe videtur, IDEM UNUMQUE NUMERO permanens contrariorum eſſe ſuſceptivum.

(161) One may ſee in the *Janua Cœlorum reſerata*, pag. 127, & ſeq. ſeveral remarks upon what would be ſufficient to infer the generability and corruptability of the Divine nature, if the Fathers had taught what is imputed to them.

which is the baſis of his ſyſtem, and which he has very clearly expreſſed. I have confined my ſelf to the confutation of what he diſtinctly lays down as his firſt principle, viz. That God is the only ſubſtance that is in the univerſe, and that all other Beings are

preciſely confute them, nor examine if I ought to yield to their reaſons, for I know them not. All that I can do, is to juſtify myſelf in a general manner; and I think I may ſay, that if I have not underſtood the propoſition I undertook to confute, it is not my fault. I would not be ſo poſitive, if I had writ a book againſt the whole ſyſtem of Spinoza, examining it paragraph by paragraph. Doubtleſs I ſhould not have always underſtood him; and it is not likely he himſelf underſtood every part of his doctrine, and could make all the conſequences of his hypotheſis intelligible. But ſince I have confined myſelf to (162) a ſingle propoſition, expreſſed in few words, which appear clear and preciſe, and are the foundation of the whole ſtructure, I muſt have underſtood it, or it contains ſome ambiguities altogether unbecoming the founder of a ſyſtem. However I need not be uneaſy upon this account, both becauſe the ſenſe I put upon that propoſition of Spinoza is the ſame his other adverſaries have put upon it, and becauſe the beſt anſwer his followers can make, is, that he has not been underſtood (163). Notwithſtanding this charge, the laſt author who wrote againſt him (164), underſtands the propoſition in queſtion as I do; which ſhews that their accuſation is looked upon as very ill grounded.

But to be more particular, what I ſuppoſe in my objections amounts to this. I ſay, that Spinoza taught, 1. That there is but one only ſubſtance in the univerſe. 2. That this ſubſtance is God. 3. That all particular Beings, material extenſion, the ſun, the moon, plants, beaſts, and men, their motions, ideas, imaginations, and deſires, are modifications of God. Now I aſk the Spinoziſts, whether their maſter taught thoſe things or not? If he taught them, it cannot be ſaid that I have been guilty of the *Ignoratio Elenchi*, or of miſtaking the ſtate of the queſtion; for my objections, ſuppoſe that this is his very doctrine, and attack it upon that ſuppoſition. I am therefore ſafe, and whoever ſays that I have undertaken to confute what I did not apprehend, is miſtaken. If it be ſaid that Spinoza does not teach the three things above-mentioned, I aſk why he expreſſed himſelf juſt as thoſe would do, who ſhould be extremely deſirous to make the reader believe that they teach thoſe three things? Is it a fair and laudable thing to uſe the common ſtyle, without annexing to the words the ſame ideas other men annexed to them, and without informing the reader of the new ſenſe put upon them? But in order to diſcuſs the matter, let us enquire wherein the miſtake may lie. I cannot have been miſtaken as to the word *ſubſtance*; for I have not confuted Spinoza upon that head; I have admitted what he ſuppoſes, that a thing cannot be a ſubſtance, unleſs it be independent of all cauſes, or have an eternal and neceſſary ſelf-exiſtence. I do not think I was miſtaken in ſaying, that, according to Spinoza, God only has the nature of a ſubſtance; and therefore I believe that if there was any miſtake in my objections, it would be only in putting a different ſenſe upon the words *modalities*, *modifications*, *modes*, from that of Spinoza. But I repeat it again, If I was miſtaken in it, it would be his fault: I underſtand thoſe words as they have been always underſtood, or, at leaſt, as they are underſtood by all the new Philoſophers (165); and I had reaſon to believe he took them in that ſenſe, becauſe he gave no public notice that he uſed them in any other ſignification. It is the general doctrine of Philoſophers, that the idea of Being contains two ſpecies under it, *viz.* ſubſtance and accident, and that a ſubſtance ſubſiſts by itſelf, *ens per ſe ſubſiſtens*, and that an accident ſubſiſts in another Being, *ens in alio*. They add, that ſubſiſting by one's ſelf, ſignifies only not depending upon a ſubject of inheſion; and becauſe, according to their notions, this agrees with matter, angels, and human ſouls; they admit two ſorts of ſubſtance, one of which is uncreated, and the other created; and they ſubdivide the created ſubſtance into two ſpecies. One of thoſe two ſpecies is matter; the other our ſouls. As for accidents, they all believed before the wretched diſputes, which have divided Chriſtianity, that they do ſo eſſentially depend upon their ſubject of inheſion that they cannot ſubſiſt without it. This was their ſpecific character, by this they were diſtinguiſhed from ſubſtance. The doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation deſtroyed that notion, and forced the Philoſophers to ſay, that an accident may ſubſiſt without a ſubject. They could not avoid ſaying ſo, ſince they believed, on the one hand, that after the conſecration, the ſubſtance of the bread in the Euchariſt ſubſiſted no longer, and they ſaw, on the other hand, that all the accidents of the bread ſubſiſted as before. Wherefore they admitted a real diſtinction between a ſubſtance and it's accidents, and a mutual ſeparability between thoſe two ſorts of Beings, by virtue of which, each of them could ſubſiſt without the other. But ſome of them maintained ſtill that there are ſome accidents, whoſe diſtinction from their ſubject is not real, and which cannot ſubſiſt without it. They called thoſe accidents modes (166). Des Cartes, Gaſſendus, and, in general, all thoſe who have forſaken the ſcholaſtic Philoſophy, deny that an accident can be ſeparated from it's ſubject, ſo as to ſubſiſt after it's ſeparation, and they give to all accidents the nature of thoſe that were called modes, and uſe the terms of *mode*, *modality*, or *modification*, rather than that of accident. Now ſince Spinoza was a great Carteſian, it is reaſonable to think that he put the ſame ſenſe upon thoſe words as Des Cartes did. If it be ſo, he underſtands by the modification of a ſubſtance only a manner of Being, which has the ſame relation to the ſubſtance, as figure, motion, reſt, and ſituation have to matter; and pain, affirmation, love, *&c.* to the ſoul of man. For this is what the Carteſians call modes. They acknowledge no other modes; from whence it appears that they have kept the old notion of Ariſtotle, according to which, an accident is of ſuch a nature, that it makes no part of it's ſubject, and cannot exiſt without it, and the ſubject can loſe it without loſing it's exiſtence. Ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ δὲ λέγω ὃ ἔν τινι μὴ ὡς μέρος ὑπάρχον, ἀδύνατον χορὶς εἶναι τοῦ ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν. *Atque id in ſubjecto eſſe dico quod in aliquo quidem eſt: & non uti pars: ut ſi autem ſeorſum ab eo in quo ineſt, fieri nequit* (167). All this agrees with roundneſs, motion, and reſt, with reſpect to a ſtone, and likewiſe with pain, and affirmation with reſpect to the ſoul. If Spinoza annexed the ſame idea to what he calls modification of ſubſtance, my objections are certainly juſt; I have attacked him directly according to the true ſignification of his words, I have rightly underſtood his doctrine, and confuted it according to it's true ſenſe. In a word, there is no ground for the accuſation I examine. But if he had the ſame notion of matter or extenſion, and of human ſouls, as Des Cartes had, and yet would not give the name of ſubſtance to extenſion, or to our ſouls, becauſe he believed that a ſubſtance is a Being that depends upon no cauſe; I confeſs I have not rightly attacked him, but have aſcribed to him an opinion which was none of his. This was what remains to be examined.

Having once laid down, that a ſubſtance is what exiſts by itſelf, as independently upon any efficient cauſe, as upon any material one, or any ſubject of inheſion, he ought not to have ſaid that matter and human ſouls are ſubſtances: and becauſe, according to the common doctrine, he divided Being only into two ſpecies, *viz.* into ſubſtance, and modification of ſubſtance; he ſhould have ſaid that matter and human ſouls are only modifications of ſubſtance. No orthodox man will deny that, according to this definition of ſubſtance, there is but one ſubſtance in the world, and that this ſubſtance is God. Then the only thing that will remain to be known, is, whether he ſubdivides the modification of ſubſtance into two ſpecies. If he uſes ſuch a ſubdiviſion, and if he means by one of thoſe two ſpecies, what the Carteſians and other Chriſtian Philoſophers call created ſubſtance, and by the other ſpecies what they call accident or mode, there will only be a diſpute about words between him and them, and it will be a very eaſy thing to make his whole ſyſtem orthodox, and to put an end to his ſect: for a man is a Spinoziſt only becauſe he believes that Spinoza has utterly deſtroyed the ſyſtem of the Chriſtian Philoſophers, and the exiſtence of an immaterial God, who governs all things with a perfect liberty. From whence we may conclude, by the by, that the Spinoziſts and their adverſaries do perfectly agree about the ſenſe of the word *modification of ſubſtance*. Both the one are only modifications of that ſubſtance. If we do not underſtand what he meant by it, it is doubtleſs, becauſe he put a new ſenſe upon his words, without giving notice of it to the reader. Which is an effectual way to become unintelligible by one's own fault. If there is any term that he took in a new ſenſe, and unknown to Philoſophers, it is in

---

(162) See the remark [*P*].

(163) See the ſame remark.

(164) See the remark [*BB*].

(165) I uſe this reſtriction becauſe of the difference there is between the doctrine of the modern peripatetics, and that of the Carteſians, Gaſſendiſtes, &c. about the nature of accidents. It is a notable difference; but all comes to the ſame with reſpect to the objections againſt Spinoza.

(166) Such as union, action, duration, and ubiquity.

(167) Ariſtot. de Prædicam. *cap. ii.*

one and the other believed that Spinoza meant by it, a Being of the ſame nature with what the Carteſians call modes, and that he never underſtood by that word a Being, which had the properties, or the nature of what we call created ſubſtance.

Thoſe, who, by all means, would maintain, that I am miſtaken, might ſuppoſe that Spinoza rejected only the name of ſubſtance given to Beings that depend upon another cauſe, as to their production, preſervation, and operation, *in fieri, in eſſe, & in operari,* as they ſpeak in the ſchools. They might ſay that tho' he retained all the reality of the thing, he avoided the word, becauſe he believed that a Being ſo dependent upon its cauſe, could not be called *ens per ſe ſubſiſtens, ſubſiſting by itſelf,* which is the definition of ſubſtance. I anſwer, as I have done above, that if it be ſo, there is only a diſpute about words between him and other Philoſophers, and that I ſhall willingly confeſs my miſtake, if it appears that Spinoza was indeed a Carteſian; but only that he has been more nice than Des Cartes in the application of the word *ſubſtance,* and that all the impiety laid to his charge, lies only in a miſunderſtanding. He only meant (will they add) what is to be found in the books of Divines, *viz.* That the immenſity of God fills up heaven and earth, and all imaginary ſpaces *in infinitum* (168), and conſequently that his eſſence penetrates and locally ſurrounds all other Beings, ſo that it is in him we have life and motion (169), and that he has produced nothing out of himſelf; for ſince he fills up all ſpaces, he could not place any thing but in himſelf, there being nothing out of him. Beſides, it is well known, that no Being can exiſt without him; and therefore it is true, that the properties of the Carteſian modes agree with what is called created ſubſtances. Thoſe ſubſtances are in God, and cannot exiſt out of him and without him. It is therefore no wonder if Spinoza called them modifications; but on the other hand, he did not deny that there was a real diſtincon between them, and that each of them conſtituted a particular principle of actions or paſſions, in ſuch a manner, that one of them does what the other does not; and that when one denies of one of them what is affirmed of the other, it is according to the rules of Logic, and no body can object to Spinoza, that it follows from his principles, that two contradictory propoſitions are true of one and the ſame ſubject at the ſame time.

All this ſignifies nothing; and in order to come directly to the point, a plain anſwer ſhould be given to this preciſe queſtion: does the true and proper character of modification agree to matter with reſpect to God; or does it not agree to it? Before you anſwer it, let me explain by ſome examples, what the proper character of modification is. It is to be in a ſubject in the ſame manner as motion is in matter, and thought in the ſoul of a man, and the form of a porrenger in the veſſel called a porrenger. A thing cannot be a modification of the Divine ſubſtance, only becauſe it ſubſiſts in the immenſity of God, becauſe it is penetrated by, and ſurrounded with it on all ſides, becauſe it exiſts by the power of God, and cannot exiſt without him, nor out of him; it is further requiſite, that the Divine Subſtance ſhould be its ſubject of inherence, juſt as, according to the common opinion, the human ſoul is the ſubject of inherence of ſenſe and deſire; pewter is the ſubject of inherence of the form of a porrenger, and matter is the ſubject of inherence of motion, reſt, and figure. Anſwer now: and if you ſay that, according to Spinoza, the ſubſtance of God is not in ſuch a manner the ſubject of inherence of that extenſion, of that motion, and of thoſe human thoughts; I will confeſs that you make an orthodox Philoſopher of him, that there was no ground to raiſe ſo many objections againſt him, and that he is only to blame for taking great pains to perplex a doctrine which every body knew, and to forge a new ſyſtem built only upon the ambiguity of a word. If you ſay, that he believed that the ſubſtance of God is the ſubject of inherency of matter, and of all the varieties of extenſion and of thought, in the ſame ſenſe as Des Cartes ſays that extenſion is the ſubject of inherency of motion, and the ſoul of man the ſubject of inherency of ſenſations and paſſions, you grant all that I deſire: It is in this ſenſe I underſtood Spinoza, and all my objections are grounded upon it.

The reſult of what has been ſaid, is a queſtion of fact concerning the true ſenſe of the word *modification* in the ſyſtem of Spinoza. Muſt it be taken for the ſame thing, that is commonly called created ſubſtance, or muſt it be taken in the ſenſe it has in the ſyſtem of Des Cartes? I believe the laſt ſenſe is the right; for in the other ſenſe, Spinoza would have acknowledged ſome creatures diſtinct from the Divine Subſtance, and made either of nothing, or of a matter diſtinct from God. But it were an eaſy thing to prove by a great many paſſages of his books, that he admits neither of thoſe two things. Extenſion, according to him, is an attribute of God; from whence it follows, that God is eſſentially, eternally, and neceſſarily, an extended ſubſtance, and that extenſion belongs to him as much as exiſtence. The reſult of which is, that the particular varieties of extenſion, which make the ſun, the earth, trees, the bodies of brutes, the bodies of men, &c. are in God, as the School-Philoſophers ſuppoſe they are in the *materia prima,* or firſt matter. But if thoſe Philoſophers ſuppoſed that the firſt matter is a ſimple and one only ſubſtance, they would conclude that the ſun and the earth are really the ſame ſubſtance. And therefore Spinoza muſt needs draw the ſame concluſion. If he does not ſay that the ſun is compoſed of God's extenſion, he muſt acknowledge that the extenſion of the ſun was made out of nothing; but he denies creation; and therefore he muſt ſay that the ſubſtance of God is the material cauſe of the ſun, is what compoſes the ſun, *ſubjectum ex quo,* and conſequently that the ſun is not diſtinct from God (170); but God himſelf, God entirely, ſince, according to his notion, God is not a Being compoſed of parts.

Let us ſuppoſe for a moment, that a maſs of gold has the power to convert itſelf into plates, diſhes, candleſticks, porrengers, &c. it will not be diſtinct from thoſe plates, and diſhes; and if it be further ſuppoſed, that this maſs is ſimple and not made up of parts, it muſt certainly be entire in each plate, and in each candleſtick; for if it was not entire in each of them, it would have divided itſelf into ſeveral pieces, and therefore it would be compoſed of parts, which is contrary to the ſuppoſition. Theſe reciprocal and convertible propoſitions would then be true, *the candleſtick is the maſs of gold, the maſs of gold is the candleſtick. The candleſtick is the whole maſs of gold, the whole maſs of gold is the candleſtick.* This is an image of the God of Spinoza: He has the power to convert or to modify himſelf into an earth, a moon, a ſea, a tree, &c. and he is abſolutely one, and without any compoſition of parts; and therefore it may be affirmed that the earth is God, that the moon is God; that the earth is God entire, that the moon is ſo too; that God is the earth, that God is the moon; that God entire is the earth, that God entire is the moon.

There can be but three ways, according to which, the modifications of Spinoza are in God: but none of thoſe ways is what the other Philoſophers ſay of the created ſubſtance. It is in God, ſay they, as in its efficient and tranſitive cauſe; and conſequently it is really and wholly diſtinct from God. But according to Spinoza, the creatures are in God, either as an effect in its material cauſe, or as an accident in its ſubject of inheſion, or as the form of a candleſtick in the pewter it is made of. The ſun, the moon, the trees, as they are things that have three dimenſions, are in God as in the material cauſe of which their extenſion is compoſed; and therefore there is an Identity between God and the ſun, &c. The ſame trees, as they have a form, whereby they are diſtinguiſhed from a ſtone, are in God, as the form of a candleſtick is in pewter. To be a candleſtick is only a manner of being of the pewter. The motion of bodies, and the thoughts of men, are in God, as the accidents of the Peripatetics are in the created ſubſtance; they are entities inherent in their ſubject, which are not compoſed of it, and which make no part of it. See the margin (171).

---

(168) Note, that the Carteſian Divines explain God's immenſity in another manner.

(169) Ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζώμεν, καὶ κινούμεθα, καὶ ἐσμέν. In ipſo enim vivimus, & movemur, & ſumus. *Act. Apoſtol. ch. xvii, ver.* 28.

(170) *Matter, as Ariſtotle ſays,* Phyſic. lib. i, cap. ix, remains in the effect it produces, λέγω γὰρ ὕλην τὸ πρῶτον ὑποκείμενον ἑκάστῳ, ἐξ οὗ γίνεταί τι ἐνυπάρχοντος. Dico enim materiam quod rei cujuſque ſubjectum eſt primum ex quo inexiſtente fit aliquid.

(171) Obſerve this difference, that the accidents of the Peripatetics are really diſtinct from their ſubject of inheſion, and that Spinoza cannot ſay ſo of the modifications of the Divine ſubſtance; for if they were diſtinct from it, without being compoſed of it, they would be made out of nothing. Spinoza would own it: he would not cavil about it, as the Peripatetics do, when they are told that accidents would be created, if they were diſtinct from the ſubſtance. See *Journ. de Trev.* June 1702, *pag.* 480, edition of Amſterdam.

in all appearance the word *modification*. But whatever ſignification he takes it in, he cannot avoid being confounded, as may be ſeen in a remark of this article (*a*). Thoſe who will carefully examine the objections I have propoſed, will eaſily perceive that I have taken the word *modification* in the ſenſe it ought to have, and that the conſequences I have drawn, and the principles I have laid down to confute thoſe conſequences, do perfectly agree with the rules of reaſoning. I do not know whether it be neceſſary to obſerve, that the ſide which I attack, and which always appeared to me very weak, is that which the Spinoziſts take the leaſt care to defend [*EE*]. I ſhall conclude with this obſervation, that ſeveral perſons have aſſured me that his doctrine, even conſidered without a relation to religion, appears very contemptible to the greateſt Mathematicians of our days (*b*). This may be eaſily believed, if theſe two things be conſidered: firſt, that no man ought to be more fully perſuaded of the multiplicity of ſubſtances, than thoſe, who apply themſelves to the conſideration of extenſion; ſecondly, that moſt of thoſe gentlemen admit a vacuum. But there is nothing more contrary to Spinoza's hypotheſis, than to aſſert that all bodies do not touch one another; and there never were two ſyſtems more oppoſite than his and that of the Atomiſts. He agrees with Epicurus in rejecting Providence, but in all other things their ſyſtems are like fire and water.

I have juſt now been reading a letter (*c*) where it is ſaid that *he lived for ſome time* in the city of Ulm, that *the magiſtrates made him depart from thence, becauſe he there diſperſed his pernicious doctrine*, and becauſe *it was there alſo that he began to write his* Tractatus Theologico-Politicus. I very much queſtion all this. The author of the letter adds *that his father, whilſt he continued a Proteſtant, was Spinoſa's great friend, and that it was chiefly by his means that excellent genius renounced the ſect of the Jews.*

I am not ignorant, that an apologiſt of Spinoza (172) maintains that this Philoſopher does not aſcribe a material extenſion to GOD, but only an intelligible extenſion, and ſuch as falls not under our imagination. But if the extenſion of the bodies we ſee and imagine, is not the extenſion of GOD, whence comes it? How has it been made? If it has been produced out of nothing, Spinoza is an orthodox man, his new ſyſtem ſignifies nothing. If it has been produced out of the intelligible extenſion of GOD, it is ſtill a true creation; for the intelligible extenſion being but an idea, and not having really the three dimenſions, cannot form the matter of the extenſion, which formally exiſts out of the underſtanding. Beſides, if we diſtinguiſh two ſorts of extenſion, one intelligible belonging to GOD, the other imaginable belonging to matter, we muſt alſo admit two ſubjects of thoſe extenſions diſtinct one from another; and then the unity of ſubſtance will be deſtroyed, and the whole ſtructure of Spinoza falls to the ground. We may therefore ſay, that his apologiſt does not reſolve the difficulty, and raiſes greater ones.

The Spinoziſts may take advantage of the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; for if they conſult the writings of the Spaniſh ſchool-men, they will find many ſubtilties to anſwer ſomething to the arguments of thoſe, who ſay, that one and the ſame man cannot be a Mahometan in Turky, and a Chriſtian in France, ſick at Rome, and well at Vienna; but perhaps they will at laſt find themſelves obliged to compare their ſyſtem with the myſtery of the Trinity, to clear themſelves from the contradictions that are objected to them. If they do not ſay that the modifications of the divine ſubſtance, Plato, Ariſtotle, that horſe, that ape, this tree, this ſtone, are as many perſonalities, which tho' *identified* with the ſame ſubſtance, may be, each of them a particular and determined principle, and diſtinct from the other modifications; they will never be able to anſwer the objection grounded upon their overthrowing this principle, *Two contradictory terms cannot belong to the ſame ſubject at the ſame time.* Perhaps they will ſay ſome time or other, that as the three perſons of the Trinity, without being diſtinct from the divine ſubſtance, as Divines teach, and without having any abſolute attribute that is not the ſame in number in each of them, have nevertheleſs each of them ſome properties that may be denied of the others; ſo Spinoza may have admitted in the divine ſubſtance an infinite number of modalities or perſonalties, one of which does a thing, which the others do not. This will not be a true contradiction, ſince Divines acknowledge a virtual diſtinction, *in ordine ad ſuſcipienda duo prædicata contradictoria*, with reſpect to the ſuſceptibility of two terms that contradict one another. But, as the ſubtle Arriaga judiciouſly obſerves, ſpeaking of Metaphyſical degrees (173), which ſome will have to be ſuſceptible of two contradictory oppoſitions, that would be entirely to deſtroy Philoſophy, to transfer to natural things what Revelation teaches us concerning the nature of GOD; for it would make way to prove that there is no real diſtinction between the creatures (174). *Dices quartò, dari diſtinctionem virtualem inter animalitatem, & rationalitatem, æquivalentem reali, quatenus, etiamſi à parte rei ſint idem, una tamen poteſt terminare cognitionem, altera verò non, quod eſt æquivalere duabus rebus diſtinctis; ſicut, licet eſſentia divina ſit idem realiter cum Paternitate, tamen eſſentiæ convenit communicari tribus perſonis, Paternitati verò non convenit ea communicatio. Reſpondeo . . . . . explicare res creatas per hoc adeò difficile exemplum, eſt res faciles per difficillimas intelligere, præterquam quòd, ſi ex divinis liceret argumentari ad creata, etiam poſſet inferri, animalitatem poſſe produci, quin producatur rationalitas. . . . . .* (175) *Imò etiam poſſet inferri res omnes creatas eſſe idem realiter inter ſe, & virtualiter, ſolùm diſtinctas, & quando una illarum perit, altera producitur, una movetur, altera quieſcit, id fieri ſecundùm diverſas formalitates ejuſdem entitatis. . . . . Cùm ergo Deus ex una parte propter ſuam infinitatem neceſſariò careat compoſitione phyſica, & ex alia parte non poſſit natura divina eſſe multiplex, ſed unica tantum in tribus perſonis, quæ omnia non poſſunt intelligi ſine virtuali diſtinctione in ordine ad ea duo prædicata contradictoria, non licet ponere in creaturis ſimilem diſtinctionem, cùm neque creaturarum perfectio, neque ulla ratio efficax poſſit eſſe ad illam ponendam: imo potiùs (ut jam dixi) ſi ſemel poneretur, non eſſet ullum fundamentum ad diſtinguendas inter ſe realiter creaturas; & conſequenter deſtrueretur tota Philoſophia.* How much are we beholden to Spinoza! He deprives us as much as in him lies, of the moſt neceſſary of all principles; for if it was not certain that one and the ſame thing cannot be at the ſame time, ſuch as it is, and not ſuch as it is, all our meditations and reaſonings would be inſignificant. See what Averroës ſaid (176).

[*EE*] *The ſide which I attack . . . . . is that which the Spinoziſts take the leaſt care to defend.*] I have attacked Spinoza's ſuppoſition, that extenſion is not a compounded Being, but one numerical ſubſtance; and I have pitched upon that part of his ſyſtem, becauſe I knew the Spinoziſts ſay the difficulties do not lie in that. They think they are much more perplexed, when they are aſked how thought and extenſion can be united in one and the ſame ſubſtance. There is ſomething odd in this; for if it be certain, according to our ideas, that thought and extenſion have no affinity one with another, it is ſtill more evident that extenſion conſiſts of parts really diſtinct one from another; and yet they are more ſenſible of the firſt difficulty than of the ſecond, and call the latter a trifle if com-

pared

(*a*) The remark [*DD*].

(*b*) They have named to me among others, Meſſieurs *Huygens, Leibniz, Newton, Bernoulli, &* *Fatio.*

(*c*) It is inſerted in the *Mercure Galant*, for the month of September 1702, and was written by an officer in the army of the Elector of Bavaria. That officer ſays, that he will ſpeedily give in medals, the Hiſtory of the Ottoman Empire, from it's foundation, that it is a work wherein he has laboured two and twenty years, and that he will have it printed at Geneva. He alſo ſays that he deſigns to tranſlate Quintus Curtius, into the Turkiſh language, which he has been deſired to do by ſome perſons at Adrianople.

(172) *Kuffelaer, Specim. Artis ratiocinandi*, pag. 222. Note, that he is very angry with Blyenburg, who ſaid that Spinoza aſcribed a material extenſion to God. Note alſo, that *pag.* 230, *& ſeq.* He confutes one Adrian Verwer, who had ſaid ſomething againſt the ſyſtem of Spinoza.

(173) So they call the attributes *ens, ſubſtantia, corpus, vivens, animal, rationalis*, which conſtitute the nature of a man. It is agreed that they are not diſtinct one from another, but that they really are one and the ſame entity.

(174) Arriaga, Diſput. V Logica, §. *ii*, *num.* 29, *pag. m.* 83.

(175) Id. ibid. *pag.* 84.

(176) Quo fit ut merito dicat Averrois hoc loco ſine hoc pronunciato non modo poſſibile non eſſe philoſophari, ſed ne diſputare quidem aut ratiocinari. *Fonſeca in Mtaphyſ. Ariſtotel.* lib. iv, cap. iii, pag. m. 655.

pared with the other. I thought therefore it was neceſſary to give them occaſion to argue thus: if that ſide of our ſyſtem can hardly be defended, which we took to be proof againſt all attacks, how ſhall we defend the weak ſides of it?

SPON (CHARLES) a Phyſician of Lyons. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (a).

SPON (JACOB) a Phyſician of Lyons, and an Antiquarian, ſon of the foregoing. See the ſame *Nouvelles* (a).

SPONDANUS (JOHN DE) ſon of a counſeller and ſecretary of Joan of Albret Queen of Navarre, was born at Mauleon de Soule in the country of Biſcay in the year 1557 (a). He made ſo ſpeedy a progreſs in the *Belles Lettres*, that he undertook to comment on Homer's Iliad and Odyſſey, when he was twenty years of age [*A*]. He enjoyed conſiderable poſts, that of Lieutenant-General to the Preſidial of Rochelle, and afterwards that of Maſter of the Requeſts to King Henry the IVth. He abjured the Reformed Religion in the year 1593, and immediately after publiſhed the declaration of his motives to that change [*B*]. A great many ſlanders were ſpread about againſt him [*C*]. He left the court a little after he had forſaken the Proteſtants, and hid himſelf among the mountains of Biſcay. There he undertook to write a book of controverſy, but,

[*A*] *He made ſo ſpeedy a progreſs: . . . that he undertook to comment on the Iliad and Odyſſey, when he was twenty years of age.*] This is what Frizonius obſerves; he adds, that Spondanus was the firſt who publiſhed ſuch a commentary in Latin, ‘Joannes Spondanus ſummo à naturâ inſtructus ingenio vir literatiſſimus, qui annos natus viginti Iliadem & Odyſſeam Homeri . . . Latine PRIMUS MORTALIUM commentatus (1). - - - *John Spondanus, a man of great genius and learning, was the firſt who ever commented in Latin on the Iliad and Odyſſey of Homer, at twenty years of age*’. If by this he meant, that when Spondanus was twenty years of age, he publiſhed that commentary, it would be a miſtake, for the firſt edition was publiſhed at Baſil in the year 1583, in folio. He dated the Epiſtle Dedicatory at Baſil the twelfth of June in the ſame year. He had taken care of that edition himſelf (2), and was then twenty-ſix years old, but we may believe that he was only twenty when he began that work. He dedicated it to his Mecænas the King of Navarre, who was afterwards King of France. The ſecond edition was alſo dedicated to that Prince by Sebaſtian Henric Petri, Bookſeller at Baſil in the year 1606. Florimond de Remond cannot be ſo eaſily excuſed as Frizonius, ſince he ſays that Spondanus publiſhed his Commentary on Homer when he was nineteen years of age. Here are his words, *In order to finiſh his work, he retired to the fartheſt extremity of this kingdom, to the mountains of Biſcay, the place of his birth. There, amidſt deſarts and ſolitudes, moved by the incredible zeal which he had, to bring back to the way of ſalvation thoſe whom he had left in the paths of perdition, he undertook to anſwer a book which Theod. Beza had juſt publiſhed (as his maſterpiece) concerning the Marks of the Church. For that purpoſe he employed the moſt ſerious hours of three or four months, beſtowing the reſt, as it were for his amuſement, in finiſhing his tranſlation of Seneca, which will ſoon be publiſhed, and in reviſing his Heſiod and Homer, whom that rare genius had commented upon and publiſhed, when he was nineteen years of age* (3). *Mr Moreri juſtly ſays that Spondanus's Commentaries on Homer are not eſteemed* (4). The author whom he quotes ſpeaks of them with contempt; *Notæ nullius momenti, quaſque* Caſaubonus futiles *vocavit* (5). Notes of no importance, and ſuch as Caſaubon called trifling. Notwithſtanding we may admire how ſo young an author acquired the learning which appears in that commentary.

Let us note, that in the year 1583 he publiſhed at Baſil in 8*vo.* Ariſtotle's Logic in Greek and Latin with marginal notes. The Greek text was corrected in ſome places, and the Latin Verſion joined with it was new (6).

[*B*] *Immediately after he publiſhed the declaration of his motives to that change.*] He ſays in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to Henry the IV, that though he had imitated that prince in changing his religion, yet that example was not his motive: he acquaints us in his preface that he retired from the court, before his book was printed, that having put it *in the hands of the Printer of Melun*, he was obliged to go to his own country, on account of his *father's death*, and in order to *place his* affairs *on a better footing*. During that time adds he, *I have heard the reports which went concerning me. Some were ſorry for me; becauſe I loſt myſelf ſo unreaſonably, and withdrew from my advancement near the King's perſon. Others laughed at me, as if my boaſted converſion had only procured me a ſhameful retreat . . . . They afflicted me moſt, who publiſhed that I was going again to change, and to reſume my former errors, that the Sorbonne of Paris had cauſed my declaration to be burnt, becauſe ſaid they, it contained ſeveral Mahometan impieties; and all the mountains reſounded with this report. For my part, I know that the moſt conſiderable Doctors of that faculty had ſeen it, and approved it under their hand. However, I was very deſirous to find a copy of it, that I might more clearly prove this report to be falſe* (7). At laſt he recovered one, he reviſed the work, and gave it to be printed. The Antwerp edition of it by Arnault Coninx 1595 in 8*vo*, is that which I have uſed. I have not ſeen that of the year 1597 (8). Florimond de Remond is not exact, when he affirms that Spondanus, *after he had publiſhed the reaſons of his happy converſion . . . . took the reſolution to leave the court* (9).

[*C*] *A great many ſlanders were ſpread about againſt him.*] You need only ſee the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the Confeſſion of Sanci, and the notes added to it in the Amſterdam edition 1699: but as the book I am going to quote is much more ſcarce than that I have juſt mentioned, I ſhall give a long paſſage of it. ‘His death, which was ſo happy and ſo peaceable, could not eſcape the malice of thoſe, who, bearing his converſion impatiently, have dared to publiſh that he died in a miſerable and deſperate condition, and that his death, which followed his converſion, was the ſentence of his condemnation, and a judgment of GOD upon him. This is entring very far into the ſecrets of the council of GOD . . . . It is truly a judgment of GOD, not upon Spondanus, but upon us. For it is a great ſign of the wrath of GOD, when he takes off thoſe who are uſeful and neceſſary to us, and who may promote the good and profit of the publick. And perhaps it was a particular providence of heaven which called him from among us, before he was encompaſſed with the torrents of abuſe, which gathered on all hands to pour upon him. For let a man be ever ſo well armed with confidence; calumny will often ſtrike home, and even innocence trembles at the approach of that monſter, which Apelles repreſented in ſo lively a manner to the ſhame of the calumniator Antiphilus. While he lived a Catholic, he looked on all theſe ſlanders with contempt: now he is in heaven, he pities and compaſſionates thoſe who are the authors of them. I remember that one day when ſome perſon had ſhewn him on purpoſe the defamatory letters which were written againſt him: truly, ſaid he, ſmiling, the author of them ſays not enough, if you conſider his cuſtom, but indeed too much, if you conſider my innocence. It is his temper to revile with animoſity, and it is mine to bear it with patience. Let him attack me, like an Huguenot, with but wanting ſeveral helps, he removed to Bourdeaux, where he applied himſelf, with all his might, to compoſe that work (b), though the bad ſtate of his health ſhould have induced him to interrupt his labour. He died before he had finiſhed it, on the eighteenth of March 1595. He was buried at Bourdeaux in the Cathedral Church of

---

(a) For July 1684, Art. V.

(a) For February 1686, Art. IX.

(a) Petrus Frizonius in Vita Henrici Spondani, *initio*.

(1) Petrus Frizonius in Vita Henrici Spondani, *initio*.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 3, *cap. v.*

(3) Florimond de Remond (*or* Ræmound, *as he calls himſelf before his preface*) Préface *de la* Reponſe *du* Sr. de Sponde au Traicte des Marques de l'Egliſe.

(4) Moreri knew not that he was brother to Henry Spondanus, Biſhop of Pamiers.

(5) Bibliogr. Hiſtoric. Philologica-Curioſa, *folio D*.

(6) *See the* Epitome of Geſner's Biblioth. *pag.* 498.

(7) Jean de Sponde, *preface to his* Declaration, *pag. m.* 7, 8.

(8) The author of the Notes on the Confeſſion of Sanci, ſpeaks of it, *pag.* 18, in the edition of 1699.

(9) Florimond de Remond, *Preface, ubi ſupra.*

St Andrew

'with abuſe, and I will defend myſelf, like a 'Catholic, with modeſty (10)'.

REFLEXIONS on the ſlanders publiſhed againſt thoſe who change their religion.

There is a great miſtake in theſe laſt words; for they ſuppoſe that the ſpirit of modeſty was peculiar to the Roman Catholics, and the ſpirit of ſatire to the Proteſtants. We muſt own that on both ſides there prevailed a cruel cuſtom of loading with infamy thoſe who changed their Religion, and of employing all manner of abuſe for that purpoſe (11). Their whole life was ſifted, even back to their infancy; all the ſins of their youth were brought together, every part of their behaviour was pried into; looſe reports, facts which might be true, and ſuch as could admit of a bad conſtruction were all aſſembled and blended together, when minds full of ſuſpicion and diſtruſt examined them without mercy: and an infinite number of ſatires compoſed after this manner were dealt about in the world. We need not aſk *cui bono*, to what purpoſe. For it is manifeſt enough that both ſides propoſed two or three conſiderable advantages by this proceeding. They hoped that the conduct of deſerters would give no ſcandal, provided they repreſented theſe deſerters as perſons who had ſold themſelves to iniquity, and were void both of honour and conſcience. By this they would prevent its being believed, that the uncertainty of the doctrines which they maintained, and the reaſons alledged by the other ſide had prevailed with thoſe deſerters to abjure their religion. They would leſſen the triumph of their adverſaries, by maintaining that they had only gained proſelytes who were ruined and infamous in their character. In ſhort, by expoſing to infamy thoſe who had revolted, they propoſed to raiſe a greater horror againſt revolting; and to frighten any who ſhould think of apoſtatizing: it being probable that thoſe who were afraid of ſatire, would not dare to lay themſelves open to it by changing their Religion, when ſo many formidable examples might teach them that their party would fully execute this threatning.

> Quid me commorit (melius non tangere clamo)
> Flebit & inſignis tota cantabitur urbe (12).
>
> *For if he does, he ſhall repent the wrong:*
> *The warning's fair, his vices ſhall be ſhewn,*
> *And life expos'd to all the cens'ring town.*
>
> Creech.

But if the advantage was viſible in thoſe reſpects, the loſs was not leſs viſible on other accounts; and thus it is ſurpriſing that the foreſight of the bad conſequences of this reſentment, did not temper it. Nothing could harden the adverſe party in their errors more than the laſh of theſe perſonal ſatires. Each ſide imagines that the followers of the other are ſlaves to a blind prejudice, and a paſſionate obſtinacy. And does not each confirm the other in ſuch an opinion, when they blacken the character of the man who has left them, and employ againſt him, not a modeſt, a civil, and charitable anſwer to the motives which he publiſhes, but a violent anſwer, and perſonal defaming invectives. That ſide which has won a proſelyte gives no credit to the ſtories publiſhed by the ſide which he has left; but looks upon them as baſe calumnies, and thus they perſuade themſelves more and more, that nothing prevails on the other ſide but paſſion and obſtinacy, without the leaſt mixture of an evangelical temper. Surely to perſecute a convert with libels, is the way to alienate him wholly. Perhaps he would have returned into the pale of the Church, had he been calmly and civilly admoniſhed of his fault: his return would have been a triumph which might have been advantageouſly oppoſed to the victory which their enemies boaſted of. But that advantage is loſt, if they irritate this weak brother. He cannot but be very ſenſible of his innocence with regard to ſome points in the ſatires which defame him (13). From thence forward he conceives a bad opinion of his antient brethren, and of the motive by which they act. If the truths which they divulge make him uneaſy, the lies ſerve not a little to make him more ſo: he contracts a hatred againſt their perſons, which diſpoſes him to hate their opinions; ſo that he who was at firſt only an outward convert, now becomes one inwardly. Anger produces this effect. It is probable that Spondanus, poſſeſſed with this paſſion, by reaſon of the terrible calumnies which were ſpread about againſt him, baniſhed every idea which might recommend to him his former religion. He grew a ſtanch Catholic out of a reſentment againſt the Proteſtants (14). Du Perron's diſcourſes could not ſo much confirm him in the Romiſh Religion as his own reſentment.

It will be in vain to object to me in the words of the Pſalmiſt, *Imple faciem eorum ignominia, quærent nomen tuum Domine*, --- *Lord cover their face with reproach, and they will ſeek thy name* (15): I will anſwer, that when we make this prayer, we ought to leave the iſſue of it to Providence, and not aſſign it to the pens of ſatirical writers. They are very unfit perſons to bring back into the way of truth, thoſe whom they defame for having turned aſide from it. They have not well underſtood that an evangelical ſpirit is a fire which ought to enlighten and warm, but not to burn, calcinate, and ſtigmatize. We muſt ſay the ſame thing of this fire, that a Spaniſh author ſaid of the fire of virtuous love, *Arde y no quema; alumbra y no danna; quema y no conſume, reſplende y no laſtima, purifica y no abraſa; y aun calienta y no congoxa* (16).---- *It glows, but ſcorches not; it enlightens, but hurts not; it burns, but conſumes not; it glitters, but dazzles not; it refines, without deſtroying; and though it be hot, yet it is not painful.*

As to the profit which may ariſe from the art of being formidable by ſatire, it is a diſputable point. I would not deny that when people obſerve that their failings are ſupported, while they appear zealous for their religion, but that, if they leave it, theſe failings will furniſh matter for defamatory libels, they may be reſtrained from abjuring, by the fear of ſlander. A Satiriſt may ſtrike with terror thoſe who are not conſcious of their innocence.

> Enſe velut ſtricto, quoties Lucillius ardens
> Infremuit, rubet auditor cui frigida mens eſt
> Criminibus, tacita ſudant præcordia culpa (17).
>
> *But when Lucillius brandiſhes his pen,*
> *And flaſhes in the face of guilty men,*
> *A cold ſweat ſtands in drops on every part.*
> *And pain and anguiſh ſeize the vitious heart.*

He may even alarm the mind of a good man, who is deſirous of an honeſt fame. We know too well the power of calumny. The teſtimony of a good conſcience does not ſecure us againſt the credulity of mankind. But after all, is it not a conſiderable advantage to keep weak members within the pale of the Church; and ſhould we not imagine that the fear of ſlander will be but a weak barrier to thoſe whom other paſſions animate to revolt, and who may depend upon being cordially received by the oppoſite party, and on being reputed by them as virtuous perſons, and undeſervedly caluminated (18). The change of Religion is a marvellous waſh in the eye of converters. They may be ſaid to claim the right of promiſing what God promiſes in the Bible: *Though your ſins be as ſcarlet, they ſhall be as white as ſnow; though they be red like crimſon, they ſhall be as wool* (19). Note, that in order to weaken the ſtrength of ſatires, the adverſe party made them paſs for an artifice, and at laſt pretended that this mine having taken air, had no effect. Let us quote a modern author.

'This declamation . . . . . . is not more ſerviceable 'to this author's (20) deſign, which is to blacken the 'reputation of all thoſe who are converted, to the 'end, that the fear of being ranked among defamed 'perſons might hinder others from turning Catholics. 'I own that when the Proteſtant party bethought 'themſelves of this ſtratagem, ſome people at firſt 'were ſimple enough to be deceived by it, and to be 'kept in their errors for fear of loſing their reputation. But that artifice is become entirely uſeleſs, 'becauſe

---

(b) See the remark [*D*].

(10) Idem.

(11) Compare with this the remark of the article WEIDNERUS.

(12) Horace, Sat. I, lib. ii, ver. 45.

(13) They contain hearſays, conjectures, and the additions of Tale-tellers, &c.

(14) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *September* 1686, *p.* 1096.

(15) See the ſame *Nouvelles*, February 1685, Art. II, p. 151, of the ſecond edition.

(16) Guevarra. See the preface of Scuderi, before the Poem of Alaric.

(17) Juven. Sat. I, ver. 165.

(18) See remark [*M*], of the article CAYET, at the end, and the words of Mr Daillé to Father Adam: As ſoon as that man (Mr Cottiby) whom you have for ſome years continually blackened with the baſeſt crimes, preſented himſelf to you, he was cordially received. In a moment he is become whiter than the ſnow. *Daillé, Replique au Pere Adam, Part. iii.*

(19) Iſaiah i. 18.

(20) That is Mr Jurieu.

St Andrew and his book of Controverſy was publiſhed imperfect [*D*]. There was ſubjoined to it a ſmall book, intituled *Tumulus Joannis Spondani*, from whence I have taken ſome of the particulars which I have juſt mentioned. That author declares (*c*) that Spondanus paſſed his days, *with great fatigue and miſery, both in his ſtudies, and in all his other public and private occupations*; and (*d*) that *his impriſonment at Orleans was the fourth which GOD had ſent* him during the *Civil Wars*. He was elder brother to HENRY SPONDANUS, who has continued the annals of Baronius.

(*c*) Jean de Sponde, Declaration des Motifs, &c. *pag. m.* 25.

(*d*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 28.

'becauſe all the world knows at this time that reaſonable people, whether they be Catholics or Proteſtants, give no longer any credit to calumnies of this nature, ſince they have become general, and ſpare no body. Every body knows that he who returns to the Catholic religion thereby loſes with the Proteſtants the character of a good man, and is as much deſpiſed by them as he was formerly valued (21). So that they who declaim on this head have the misfortune of being minded by no body, and of having loſt their time in whetting ſatirical weapons which wound no body, and return upon themſelves (22).'

There was ſomething very odd in the affair we ſpeak of; for before a man abjured his religion, he met with marks of eſteem from his own party, and was defamed by the other; but whenever he had abjured, things took another turn. He was ſatiriſed by his antient brethren, and extolled by his new ones. Father Adam reproached the Proteſtants with this conduct, with regard to the late Miniſter Cottiby; but Mr Daillé very well returned the charge (23): he ſhewed him that the Catholics who had defamed the Miniſter Cottiby by ſongs and printed books (24), beſtowed great encomiums on him after his converſion.

Mr Brueys has made an obſervation which has a relation to that of Father Adam. 'I will not juſtify myſelf in this place, ſays he (25), againſt what one of theſe authors charges me with, viz. that I have ſpent all my life in gaming and debauchery, that I have no piety, and hardly any religion. I know that the Proteſtants have not always had ſuch thoughts of me; at leaſt, they had not when all the Miniſters of Montpelier did me the honour frequently to paſs whole days in my houſe, both in town and in the country; when the Proteſtants of Languedoc truſted me with their moſt ſecret and moſt important affairs; when they deputed me to Toulouſe, and to their ſynods; and, in ſhort, when they cauſed the book which, when I was of their party, I compoſed in defence of their religion, to be tranſlated and printed at Geneva, at Saumur, and Amſterdam.'

The late Capuchin, Father Baſile, who having turned Proteſtant, was defamed by the Catholics (26), defended himſelf among other means, by the eſteem which had been always paid him in his order. See his *Menteur confondu*, printed at Sedan in the year 1639.

[*D*] *His book of Controverſy was publiſhed imperfect.*] It is intituled, *Reſponſe au Traicté des Marques de l'Egliſe faict par Th. de Beze.* It contains 317 pages in 8*vo*, and was printed at Bourdeaux by Simon Millanges in the year 1595, by the care of Florimond de Remond, who prefixed a preface to it, out of which I have already given ſome paſſages. Here are a few more; *hardly had* the author *arrived at the middle of his work*, 'when he found that he wanted ſeveral good books which were neceſſary to him. To have theſe books, and to converſe with the learned, for he had there no converſation but with himſelf, he came to this town of Bourdeaux. As he laboured day and night with a marvellous ardor, and more than his health allowed. (For he had a weak and crazy body, but a ſtrong and vigorous mind) the length of his watching, his aſſiduous bent upon books amidſt the rigour and unuſual ſeverities of laſt winter, impaired his health; yet for all that he did not give over his undertaking. And when his friends told him the prejudice he did himſelf, by thus conſtantly poring upon books, and in a cold and rugged ſtudy, without giving any reſpite either to his body, or his mind; I muſt make haſte, ſaid he, for I forſee that the evening approaches, and that I muſt ſoon depart from my ſtation. If I die, it will be honourably, with ſword in hand, as a brave Chriſtian champion ought to die. In ſhort, his indiſpoſition and his diſeaſe increaſing with his labour, he was ſeized with a pleuriſy, which ſoon conquered his weak and emaciated body .... *His diſeaſe..... laſted only nine days*'. Towards the end of the preface we find the following words. 'Now reader, here thou haſt his book: a book imperfect indeed, but which, however, ſhews the perfection of its writer. It is a great pity that it was not compleated: and that what we have of it is not fully corrected, ſince it is only the plan of his firſt conceptions, which promiſed that the work would be divided into three books, and contain a ſeries of arguments ſtronger and in a better order: to ſay nothing of the ſtile, which is the laſt thing that is poliſhed in a book. GOD knows whether Spondanus was ill furniſhed with ſtile, for the embelliſhing what he had undertaken, he who ſeemed accompliſhed with all the ornaments of a perfect eloquence, as his writings teſtify, and who had a marvellous facility in giving a lively picture of his conceptions, ſo that hardly were there three words daſhed out in three leaves of this work. I believe that in this reſpect he was inimitable. His capacity would have fully diſcovered itſelf in the book intituled *l'Idée des Religions*, which he deſigned to write; but death interrupted that, and ſeveral others of his projects for the defence of the Church (27).'

(21) You will ſee in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, Auguſt 1689, pag. 879, that he has changed ſomething in that reflexion. See alſo Cottiby's Reply, *pag.* 209, 210, and what Mr Daillé anſwers him in chap. xxii, of Part. ii.

(22) Brueys, Réfutation des Réponſes faites à ſon Examen, *pag.* 299, 300, Dutch edition 1686.

(23) Daillé, Réponſe à Adam & Cottiby, *Part. iii, ch. iv, vi, vii.*

(24) Idem. *pag.* 144, 145.

(25) Brueys Refutation, &c. *pag.* 312.

(26) See Father Veron, in the book intituled *l'Apoſtat vicieux.*

(27) Florimond de Remond, Préface de la Reſponſe de Sponde au Traité des Marques de l'Egliſe.

STANCARUS (FRANCIS) a native of Mantua, lived in the XVIth century. He was one of thoſe, whoſe endeavours to eſtabliſh the Reformed Religion in Poland proved moſt ſucceſsful. He had been called to Cracow [*A*], to teach the Hebrew tongue (*a*); but when it was obſerved that he inſinuated the doctrines of the Proteſtants in his lectures, he was complained of to the Biſhop of Cracow (*b*), who had procured him that place; the Biſhop being informed that he was a Heretic, had him impriſoned (*c*). He was releaſed by the addreſs or intereſt of ſome lords, and found a good place of refuge in the houſe of Nicolas Oleſnicki (*d*), a gentleman, whoſe quality, merit, and courage, conſpired to make him conſiderable (*e*). He propoſed to him to put an end to the Romiſh worſhip, and to throw down the images; but Oleſnicki having

conſulted

(*a*) Lætus, Compend. Hiſt. Univerſ. *pag. m.* 389.

(*b*) His name was Samuel Maciejowſki.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

(*d*) Staniſlaus Lubieniecius, Hiſt. Reform. Polonicæ, *lib. i, cap. v, pag.* 31.

(*e*) Id. ibib. *pag.* 32.

[*A*] *He had been called to Cracow.*] John Lætus affirms that the Biſhop of Cracow himſelf called him thither to be profeſſor of the Hebrew tongue. *A Maciejovio Epiſcopo Cracovienſi: evocatus erat ut linguam S. Cracoviæ doceret* (1). But others (2) ſay, that having been expelled from Italy as an Heretic, and not being able to ſettle in Germany, he went into Poland, where he was permitted to teach Hebrew in the college of Cracow, becauſe they knew not what he was; they only knew that he underſtood that language. Thoſe, who ſay this, being both his enemies, and the Biſhop of Cracow's friends, may have omitted ſome circumſtances. However, I believe that biſhop did not ſend for him out of Italy, and that he knew nothing of his being qualified to teach Hebrew, till he ſaw him in Poland. See the remark [*N*].

[*B*] *Oleſnicki*

(1) Jo. Lætus Compend. Hiſt. Univ. *pag. m.* 389.

(2) Staniſlaus Orichovius, in Chimæra, *fol.* 4, & 23.

conſulted his friends, did not think it proper to be ſo haſty [*B*], and was contented to have the Sacrament adminiſtred in his caſtle with ſuch ceremonies as Stancarus ſhould think fit to appoint. Some time after, the firſt deſign of that Reformer was put in execution; the Monks, who officiated in the church of that place, were expelled, and the images were broke, and burnt to aſhes (*f*). Oleſnicki founded a Reformed Church at Pinczovia in the year 1550, whither he called ſeveral perſons illuſtrious for their piety and learning (*g*). Stancarus ſet up there a noble ſchool (*h*), and drew up fifty rules of Reformation for the Churches of Poland [*C*]. He was ſent into Pruſſia ſome time after, and was Hebrew profeſſor for a year at Koningſberg (*i*). There aroſe violent quarrels between him and Oſiander, the conſequences whereof proved fatal for orthodoxy. Oſiander taught that man is juſtified by the eſſential righteouſneſs of GOD, and that JESUS CHRIST is our righteouſneſs according to his divine nature. Stancarus being too eager to contradict, and departing from that error with too great a vehemence, run into the oppoſite extreme; for he maintained that JESUS CHRIST is our Mediator only according to his humane nature (*k*). It is ſaid that he learned this doctrine from Peter Lombard, an author whom he much admired [*D*]. He attempted to eſtabliſh it in Poland, but he met with ſome obſtacles which he could not overcome. It

[*B*] *Oleſnicki . . . . did not think it proper to be ſo haſty.*] A Roman Catholic gives the following account of it. ‘ Cæpit errorem (*Stancarus*) inſtaurare Zwinglii, in idque operam dare, ut abduceret Oleſnicium ‘ à religione paterna & perſuaderet illi religionem ‘ externam. Cujus ad præſcriptum imagines è fano tolli, cœnam pro uſitata peregrinam inſtitui, Sacra ‘ quæ Monachi in ejus oppidi fano religionibus vetuſtis adminiſtrabant, explodi jubet. Erat hoc fanum ‘ cum adjuncta Monachorum domo, munificentiâ ‘ Sbignei Oleſnicii operosè extructum ac liberaliter ditatum, quod profanare Stancarus properabat, cujus ‘ conſilium cum Oleſnicio videretur periculoſum eſſe, ‘ ne quid inconſiderate faceret, vocat amicos ac in ‘ conſilium adhibet, in quo, variatis ſententiis, illa ‘ poſtremo vicit, ut imagines cum reliqua ſupellectili ſalvæ in fano manerent: Monachi etiam veteri ‘ inſtituto ſacra facerent: quod nihil earum rerum ‘ mutari tùm poſſet impunè: adeſſe Regem in proximo, Epiſcopum etiam Cracoviâ nondum diſceſſiſſe, ‘ fore hiſce rebus mutandis aliud tempus magis idoneum. In præſentia placere cœnam inſtitui, idque ‘ fieret in Arce privatim non in fano publicè, quod in ‘ oppido ſubjectum eſt arci. Secundùm hanc ſententiam permittunt Stancaro novæ cœnæ modum preſcribere, ac illius uſum docere (3). - - - *He began to renew the error of Zwinglius, and to labour to withdraw* ‘ *Oleſnicki from the religion of his anceſtors, and perſuade him to embrace an extraneous religion. Accordingly he ordered the images to be taken out of the church,* ‘ *a foreign communion to be adminiſtred inſtead of the* ‘ *uſual, and the religious worſhip, which the Monks performed in the church of that town after the antient* ‘ *manner, to be abrogated. That church, with the* ‘ *neighbouring houſe of the Monks, which Stancarus* ‘ *haſtened to profane, was built with much labour, and* ‘ *liberally endowed by the munificence of Sbigneus Oleſnicki. Oleſnicki having thought his advice dangerous,* ‘ *that he might do nothing raſhly, conſulted his friends,* ‘ *who being of different opinions, it was reſolved, at laſt,* ‘ *that the images, and other ornaments, ſhould remain in* ‘ *the church untouched; that the Monks likewiſe ſhould perform their religious worſhip after the antient manner, becauſe it was not ſafe at that time to change any of thoſe* ‘ *things. That the king was at hand, and the biſhop ſtill in* ‘ *Cracow, and they hoped there would be a more convenient* ‘ *time to make a change in thoſe things. For the preſent it* ‘ *was agreed that the communion ſhould be adminiſtred* ‘ *privately in the caſtle, and not publickly in the church.* ‘ *According to this reſolution, they allowed Stancarus to* ‘ *appoint the ceremonies which ſhould be uſed in the new* ‘ *communion, and to teach the uſe of them.*’ Stancarus's temper may be known from theſe words. If he had not the gift of perſeverance, it ought not to be aſcribed to any lukewarmneſs: he was a very fiery man; his patron, who was a ſword's-man, threw water upon that great fire by the advice of ſome lay perſons, who examined that affair. Take notice of a negligence of the Socinian writer, whom I have quoted. He relates the whole Latin paſſage to prove by the teſtimony of a Poliſh Annaliſt, that Stancarus cauſed the Monks to be turned out, and images to be thrown down; and yet it appears from the words of that Annaliſt, that no ſuch thing was done: Lubienietſki betrays therefore his want of judgment. He might have found in Spondanus what he ſhould have quoted. (4) ‘ Adverſus *Stancarum* prodiit Orichovii Roxolani elegans ‘ libellus titulo Chimæra . . . . ubi ait . . . . (5) ‘ eum Pinczoviam Cracovienſis municipii oppidum ſe ‘ contuliſſe, ibique punico incitatum furore in templa ‘ irruiſſe, imagines ſanctorum ſuſtuliſſe, memorias ‘ Martyrum deleviſſe, altaria evertiſſe, ſacra profanaſſe, gazam eccleſiaſticam diripuiſſe, denique ſacerdotes ex oppido exterminaſſe. - - - - *There appeared* ‘ *againſt Stancarus, a little book of Orichovius Roxolanus, intituled* Chimæra . . . . *where ſays . . . that* ‘ *he went to Pinczovia, a town in the diſtrict of Cracow,* ‘ *where, being incited with a furious rage, he ruſhed into* ‘ *the churches, threw down the images, defaced the monuments of the martyrs, overthrew the altars, profaned the holy things, laid violent hands on the eccleſiaſtical treaſury, and, in ſhort, baniſhed the prieſts out* ‘ *of the town.*’ See the remark [*O*].

[*C*] *He drew up fifty rules of Reformation for the Churches of Poland.*] We ſhould wrong him ſhould we ſuppoſe that he was a ſedentary Reformer, who keeping in his ſchool at Pinczovia, ſent his orders and his counſels every where. It is certain that he travelled into ſeveral parts to perform the work of the Reformation. *Stancarus Eccleſias à papatu reformavit. L. Canones inſtaurandarum Eccleſiarum conſcripſit* (6). This proof being too weak, do not mind it, but hold by this. ‘ Stancarus . . . . ad reformandas Eccleſias ab ‘ Anno 1553, magno ſtudio incubuerat: in quam rem ‘ hortatu Jacobi Comitis Oſtrorogii libros conſcripſerat. Cum enim ei, tùm Felici Crucigero & aliis ‘ piis viris, motâ in ditione Cracovienſi perſecutione ‘ . . . . aliæ ſedes quietæ quærendæ eſſent, in majorem Poloniam conceſſerat & Oſtrorogii protectu tutus ‘ permanſerat. A quo Anno 1553, dimiſſus in minorem Poloniam cum eodem illo Crucigero reverterat, ‘ & reformandis ab idololatria eccleſiis pro tempore ‘ operam dederat, favore Staniſlai Stadnicii, Hieronymi Philipovii, Nicolai Oleſnicii & aliorum Patronorum Virorum Nobiliſſimorum & Generoſiſſimorum ‘ fretus (7). - - - *Stancarus laboured with great pains* ‘ *to reform the church, in the year* 1553: *and for this* ‘ *purpoſe he wrote ſome books at the perſuaſion of James* ‘ *Count Oſtroroſke. For a perſecution having ariſen in* ‘ *the diſtrict of Cracow, and he, with Felix Cruciger,* ‘ *and other pious men, being obliged to ſettle in ſome ſafer* ‘ *place, came into the Greater Poland, and continued ſafe* ‘ *under the protection of Oſtroroſke. In the ſame year* ‘ *having been ſent into the Leſſer Poland, he came* ‘ *back with Cruciger, and endeavoured to reform the* ‘ *church from idolatry, being ſupported by the favour* ‘ *of Staniſlaus Stadnicki, Jerom Philipowſki, Nicolaus* ‘ *Oleſnicki, and other moſt noble, and moſt generous* ‘ *patrons.*’

[*D*] *It is ſaid that he learned this doctrine from Peter Lombard, an author, whom he much admired.*] I have read the following paſſage long ago in Micrælius. ‘ *Hic homo tanti fecit* Magiſtrum ſententiarum *ex cujus* ‘ *lacunis hauſerat errorem, ut dicere non ſit veritus,* ‘ unum Petrum Lombardum plus valere, quam C. ‘ Lutheros, CC. Melanchthones, CCC. Bullingeros, ‘ CCCC. Martyres & Iↄ. Calvinos: ex quibus omnibus, ſi in mortario contunderentur, non exprimeretur una uncia veræ theologiæ (8). - - - *This man ſo* ‘ *much eſteemed Peter Lombard, from whom he had im-* ‘ *bibed*

(*f*) De hinc Monachos cœnobio & imagines templo ejecit, quin & has frangi & comburi fecit (Oleſnicius.) *Id. ibid.* pag. 31.

(*g*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 33.

(*h*) Lætus, ubi ſupra.

(*i*) Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *pag. m.* 866, 870.

(*k*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 866.

(3) Orichovius, Annal. III, apud Staniſlaum Lubieniecium, Hiſt. Reformat. Polonicæ, *lib. i, cap. v, pag* 31, 32.

(4) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1551, *num.* 22, *pag.* 538.

(5) Orichovius, in Chimæra, *fol. m.* 24, *verſo.*

(6) Lætus, Compend. Hiſt. Univ. *pag. m.* 389.

(7) Staniſlaus Lubieniecius, ubi ſupra, *lib. ii, cap. vi, p.* 116, 117.

(8) Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *pag.* 890.

It was condemned in ſome ſynods (*l*) [*E*], and that condemnation was confirmed in the ſynod of Xian, at which fifty miniſters aſſiſted, with moſt of the great lords of the Proteſtant party, and many gentlemen, in the year 1560. Nevertheleſs, the Churches of Poland were troubled with that diſpute during Stancarus's life [*F*]. He died at Stobnitz in the houſe of Peter Zborow (*m*), and then that diſpute was over; but it appeared that Arianiſm had accidentally got new ſtrength by it [*G*]. It is a ſubject

‘ *bibed his error, that he was not afraid to ſay that Peter Lombard alone was worth more than one hundred Luthers, two hundred Melanchthons, three hundred Bullingers, four hundred Martyrs, and five hundred Calvins. Out of all whom, if they were pounded together in a mortar, there would not be extracted one ounce of true Divinity.*’ Florimond de Remond (9), who mentions part of thoſe things, and ſome others, quotes Stancarus's apology againſt the Divines of Zurich. I have conſulted it, and in it found (10) Micrælius's words. Note, The author boaſts that he took his doctrine from the holy Fathers, and not from Peter Lombard, who has only collected, ſays he, the authorities of the Fathers, and the doctrines of the Church.

[*E*] *It was condemned in ſome ſynods.*] John Lætus (11) names three, that of Sendomir, that of Vladiſlavia, and that of Pinczovia. But Lubienietſki affirms, that Stancarus's opinion was ſo carefully diſcuſſed (12) in the ſynod of Pinczovia in November 1558, and ſo well defended and attacked, that both parties broke up without without coming to any concluſion, and neither gaining the victory. *Æquo tunc Marte ab utrinque diſceſſum eſt, quoque cum ſua Sententia ad ſua, Stancaro Dubietzcum ad Patronum Staniſlaum Stadnicium revertente* (13).

[*F*] *The Churches of Poland were troubled with that diſpute during Stancarus's life.*] We have juſt now ſeen that he had ſome partizans in the ſynods. We need not wonder at it: he underſtood the Languages and the Fathers, he was a man of parts, he could ſpeak and write well, he was full of his own opinion, and diſputed about a very difficult ſubject, which afforded too much matter to the boldneſs of a Logician; and therefore had he had no followers, one might well wonder at it. *Stancarus ut multa erat non tantum linguarum ſcientia ſed & eruditione, ex ſcripturis & antiquitate ſententiam ſuam ratione profecto ſuffragante probabat* (14). John Laſcus, Liſmaninus, Gonezius, Crovicius, Blandrata, and ſeveral others, could never make him change his opinion (15). The churches of Poland being alarmed at thoſe diviſions, and perplexed with the ſubtilties of that man, conſulted the Conſiſtory of Geneva, who ſent them a ſhort and good inſtruction, drawn up by Calvin in the year 1560 (16). They were obliged to ſupport it by another very accurate piece, that is to be found among Calvin's letters (17). There are no perſonal reflexions on Stancarus in that piece, Calvin complains of his paſſion againſt Melanchthon. The latter, and Peter Martyr, publiſhed ſomething againſt his doctrine. Melanchthon did it with great moderation, knowing that he had to do with a paſſionate man (18). Stancarus refuſed to ſubmit to the ſynods, which condemned him. It appears from the letter, which the miniſters of Poland writ to the church of Straſbourg, in the year 1562 (19), that he charged them with Arianiſm, and introduced a kind of Sabellianiſm. He inſtantly demanded a new conference; but it was denied him, and his books were condemned and burnt. ‘ Pincovienſes, rejectâ cum Stancaro, quam multum expetebat, diſputatione, in dubium vel in diſputationem trahi communem Eccleſiæ ſententiam, in gratiam unius inquieti, & arrogantis hominis indignum exiſtimantes, libros ejus condemnaſſe, & tradidiſſe rogo, lego apud Staniſlaum Hoſium, in Judicio de Cenſura Heidelbergenſium, ac Tigurinorum de dogmate contra Trinitatem in Poloniâ tum ſparſo (20). - - - *I find in a book of Staniſlaus Hoſius, that the ſynod of Pinczovia having refuſed to enter into a diſpute with Stancarus, which he ſo much deſired, and judging it an unworthy thing, that the common opinion of the Church ſhould be brought into queſtion or diſpute for the ſake of one turbulent and arrogant man, condemned his books, and ordered them to be burnt.*’ The ſchiſm laſted ſtill in the year 1568, as it appears from a letter of Beza, wherein he exhorts the Schiſmatics, and Stancarus by name, to ſubmit to a confeſſion, not doubting that if they do it, they will be reſtored to the communion of the Church. I ſhall ſet down his words the more willingly, becauſe they contain a curious circumſtance, *viz.* That Stancarus offered ſome formularies of faith full of ambiguous expreſſions. ‘ Omnes illos qui à vobis diſceſſionem fecerunt, totque conſequutis malis aditum patefecerunt, ipſumque adeò Stancarum, precor & obteſtor per viſcera miſericordiæ Dei noſtri, ut & ſui & pacis Eccleſiarum majorem habeant rationem, iſtaque abjecta in defendendo ſemel arrepto dogmate pertinacia, in animum inducant cum Eccleſiis in verè fraternam gratiam, abolitis prioribus omnibus, redire, & ſynceris omnium Eccleſiarum orthodoxarum confeſſionibus apertè potiùs acquieſcere, quàm novas & ambiguas conciliationum formulas ſcribendo, ſuſpicionem præbere, quaſi fucare potius manifeſtè defenſos errores, quàm ſemel abjectis illis veram cum fratribus concordiam inire velint. Id verò ſi fecerint, non dubito quin dextram illis ultro præbeatis, exultent in cœlis Angeli, applaudant omnes Eccleſiæ (21). *I beſeech and obteſt, by the bowels of the mercy of our God, all thoſe who have ſeparated from you, and have opened a door to the many evils which have followed, and even Stancarus, to have more regard for their own peace, and for the peace of the Churches; and laying aſide that obſtinacy in defending an opinion too haſtily taken, to reſolve to come back into the true brotherly favour of the Churches, and rather to acquieſce in the ſincere confeſſion of faith of all the orthodox Churches, than by writing new and ambiguous forms of reconciliation, to raiſe a ſuſpicion that they would rather ſet off their errors, which they have openly defended, than lay them aſide, and enter into a true concord with their brethren. If they would do this, I doubt not but you would chearfully receive them, angels would rejoice at it in Heaven, and all the Churches applaud it.*’ We ſhall ſee hereafter (22) what he ſaid of the perſecutions he had ſuffered.

[*G*] *Arianiſm had accidentally got new ſtrength by it.*] The chief argument of Stancarus was this: If CHRIST is our mediator as he is GOD, he is inferior to his Father as to the divine nature; and therefore he is not coeſſential with GOD the Father; and conſequently thoſe who ſay he is a Mediator as he is GOD, revive the Hereſy of the Arians. He urged this conquence with all the ſubtilties his wit and the nature of the ſubject could afford him: which occaſioned a third party; ſome being moved on the one hand with his reaſons, and on the other with the arguments of his adverſaries, laid down that JESUS CHRIST was a Mediator, both with reſpect to his human nature, and with reſpect to a divine nature inferior to that of his Father. Blandrata, and ſome others, who had fled from Geneva for ſome errors concerning the Trinity, took advantage of Stancarus's objections, and pretended that ſince his adverſaries could not reſolve them, it was neceſſary to think of another ſyſtem. This gave birth to Tritheiſm and Arianiſm in Poland, and at laſt to Socinianiſm. Lubienietſki ſays, that the ſynod of Pinczovia, wherein Stancarus's cauſe was thoroughly diſcuſſed, and both parties had an equal advantage, made way for the deſtruction of the doctrine of the Trinity. ‘ Hæc mox, ut & illa Serveti de præeminentia Patris, Viros pios & doctos ad hoc argumentum diſcutiendum haud leviter incitavit. Itaque meritò illam Synodum Pinczoviæ Anno 1558, celebratam Andreas Lubieniecius Senior in M. S. de Synodis magnum ingreſſum ad demoliendum dogma Trinitatis feciſſe dixit . . . & certè ex his, quæ ſecuta ſunt in illa Pinczoviana Synodo portam ad diſcutienda vulgò recepta dogmata apertam eſſe, nemo non videbit. Hoc enim ipſo anno cum veniſſet Pinczoviam Blandrata, quem invidia Calvini Geneva expulerat, habitis Pinczoviæ cum Liſmanino, multis de hoc argumento ſermonibus, & videns Stancari adverſarios ei non ſatisfeciſſe, tantùm effecit, ut & ille de dogmate Trinitatis dubitare incæperit. Hinc Liſmaninus in ſuſpicionem Arianiſmi apud Miniſtros inolitis erroribus tenacius adhærentes

‘ incidit

(*l*) Lætus, Compend. Hiſt. Univ. *pag.* 411.

(*m*) Id. ibid.

(9) Flor. de Remond, Hiſt. de la Naiſſ. & Progrés de l'Hereſie, *book ii, ch. xv, pag. m.* 222.

(10) Folio k 5, Edit. Cracovienſ. 1562, in 8vo.

(11) Lætus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 411.

(12) *Acriter diſcuſſa fuit.* Staniſl. Lubieniecius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 117.

(13) Id. ibid.

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) Id. ibid. *pag.* 118.

(16) It is among Calvin's Tracts, *pag. m.* 682.

(17) It is the 352d letter.

(18) Reſponſionem de Stancari controverſia perſcripſi quæ multo eſt & brevior & ſummiſſior quam poſtulat magnitudo cauſæ. Sed hominem iracundum & bilioſum non volui accendere. *Melancht. Epiſtola dcccix,* lib. iv, pag. m. 925: It is dated in the year 1553.

(19) *It is the firſt among thoſe of Zanchius. See* Hoornbeeck, in Apparatu ad Controv. Socinianas, *pag.* 29.

(20) Hoornbeeck, *ibid.*

(21) Theod. Beza, Epiſt. xxviii, *pag.* 241, *Tom. iii,* Operum. *It is dated the firſt of September* 1568.

(22) In the remark [*L*].

ſubject, that might afford many reflexions [*H*]. Stancarus loſt all the glory of his firſt actions

incidit (23). - - - - *Soon after, this opinion, as likewiſe that of Servetus, concerning the ſuperiority of the Father, did not a little induce pious and learned men to examine this argument. Wherefore Andreas Lubieniecius,* ſenior, *in his manuſcript,* de Synodis, *had juſt reaſon to ſay, that the ſynod of Pinczovia, held in the year* 1558, *made way for the deſtruction of the doctrine of the Trinity . . . . And, indeed, it will evidently appear to every body, that by what followed in this ſynod of Pinczovia, a door was opened for the examining of opinions which had been commonly received. For in that ſame year Blandrata, being driven out of Geneva by the influence of Calvin, came to Pinczovia; where having had much diſcourſe with Liſmaninus upon this ſubject, and perceiving that the enemies of Stancarus had not been able to anſwer him, he ſo wrought upon him, that he alſo began to call the doctrine of the Trinity in queſtion. For this reaſon Liſmaninus came to be ſuſpected of Arianiſm by the miniſters, who ſtiffly maintained their inveterate errors.*’ Calvin had been all along afraid that Stancarus's adverſaries would run into another extreme, and ſaw, to his great grief, that his fear was not groundleſs. Here follows what he writ to the brethren of that country. ‘Tabulam nuper in Polonia editam, quæ Chriſtum & Spiritum ſanctum alios à Patre deos facit, non ſine acerbiſſimo mœrore inſpexi. Pridem me hæc cura, non abs re anxium tenuit, ne fratres minus in Scriptura exercitatos abriperet Stancari importunitas, ut vitandæ unius abſurditatis cauſa, in aliam fœdiorem laberentur. Accidit ergo quod timui, ac triſti exemplo patefactum eſt quam noxia ſit peſtis contentio, ubi magis propoſitum eſt, adverſarium vincere, quàm bonam cauſam ſimpliciter tueri. Craſſum Stancari delirium meritò à fratribus Polonicis repudiatum eſt. Sed dum ſibi ab una diaboli aſtutia cavent, obrepſit alter impoſtor Blandrata Stancaro deterior: & hac occaſione abuſus eſt ad errorem non minus deteſtabilem ſpargendum (24). - - - *It gave me great grief to find that there had been a treatiſe publiſhed in Poland, which makes Jeſus Chriſt and the Holy Ghoſt two diſtinct Gods from the Father. I was along ago in pain, and, not without reaſon, apprehenſive, leſt the troubleſome ſpirit of Stancarus ſhould pervert ſuch brethren as were not well enough verſed in the Scripture, and ſo far work upon them, that in order to avoid a leſs abſurdity they ſhould fall into a greater. What I feared is come to paſs, and we have a melancholy proof how pernicious the plague of contention is, where people ſtudy more how to get the better of an adverſary, than ſimply to defend a good cauſe. The groſs conceit of Stancarus was juſtly rejected by the brethren in Poland. But while they were guarding themſelves againſt one trick of the Devil, Blandrata, another impoſtor, worſe than Stancarus, ſurpriſed them, and took hold of this opportunity to propagate an error no leſs deteſtable.*’ I ſhall ſet down a very fine paſſage of another letter he wrote to them in 1563, which ſhews the pernicious effects of diſputes, and that God ſends a curſe upon the work of thoſe, who diſpute rather to triumph over their enemies, than for the ſake of truth. (25) *Porrò te terrimus hic error, qui apud vos graſſatur, favorem obtinuit ex immodico contentionis fervore. Nam cùm Stancarus inſulſus Sophiſta, & rabula improbiſſimus commenta ſua ingereret, Chriſtum Mediatorem duntaxat eſſe, quatenus homo eſt, ideoque apud totam Trinitatem intercedere, optimum compendium quidam eſſe duxerunt, ſi reſponderent ſolum Patrem verè & propriè eſſe Deum. Ita effugium illud nimis cupidè multi arripuerunt, quòd ita putarent nullo negocio refutari Stancari ineptias. Sic ut veteri proverbio dicitur, nimium altercando veritas amiſſa fuit. Equidem non dubito quoſdam inſcitia vel inconſiderata facilitate lapſos eſſe: verùm conjicere ſimul licet, nonnullos* (26) *aſtutè captaſſe occaſionem, ut execrabile delirium, quod plauſibile fore ſperabant, ſimplicibus impunè obtruderent.* That is, ‘Furthermore, this pernicious error, that is ſpread among you, proceeds from too great a contention. For when Stancarus, that ſilly Sophiſt, and wicked babbler, maintained that Christ is our Mediator only as he is man, and that therefore he intercedes with the whole Trinity; ſome were of opinion that the beſt way was to ſay, that the Father only is truly and properly God. Many were too fond of this ſubterfuge, becauſe they fancied the abſurd notions of Stancarus would be eaſily confuted by that means. Thus, as the proverb has it, Truth has been loſt by too much contending. I do not doubt that ſome have been miſled through ignorance and inconſiderateneſs; but it is very likely others have cunningly waited for an occaſion to ſet forth ſuch an execrable doctrine without any danger, hoping it would be acceptable to the ignorant.’ Beza does alſo acknowledge, that Tritheiſm and Arianiſm, which then revived in Poland, were occaſioned by Stancarus's diſputes (27).

Examination of the complaints against the multitude of univerſities and profeſſors.

[*H*] *It is a ſubject that might afford many reflexions.*] I ſhall only make a few, and will begin with the complaints ſome make againſt learning. Were it not better to ſuppreſs the univerſities than to maintain ſo many profeſſors in all faculties? They are the men, who give birth to Hereſies, or bring up thoſe, who ſpread and multiply erroneous doctrines. The people, that is, all thoſe who are not called to explain matters of religion, preſerve the faith, imparted to them, ſound and undefiled. Teach them that they muſt believe the Trinity, the Unity of the Divine Nature, the Incarnation, Christ's Mediation, *&c.* they will believe all thoſe myſteries, without altering the purity of them, and raiſing any diſturbance about them. But the Doctors take a contrary courſe: ſome are willing to diſtinguiſh themſelves by ſubtile interpretations, and others will not ſuffer it. Which occaſions diſputes, that trouble the ſpring, and divide it into ſeveral muddy ſtreams. The firſt diviſion is quickly followed by a ſecond, and ſo on: that fecundity, or rather contagion, is very ſurpriſing. In a little time you will hear of many ſectaries, Apollinariſts, Arians, Eutychians, Macedonians, Monothelites, Neſtorians, Sabellians, *&c* (28). If any one drew the genealogy of Hereſies, it would appear that their deſcent is chiefly grounded upon theſe two cauſes. 1. The diſputants are willing to keep at too great a diſtance from their adverſaries; and therefore they run into another extreme. 2. The deſire of getting the victory, makes them carry their objections ſo far, that they may be retorted againſt them, or favour a third party. What do they do to remedy that inconveniency? They yield the ground they are not able to defend, and have recourſe to ſome new invention. This produces a quite different ſyſtem, which another doctor will reform a-new, not finding it ſo exact as it ſhould be, and ſo on. Another, who fancies that both parties have the advantage, and are worſted by turns, as they act offenſively, or ſtand upon the defenſive, thinks himſelf obliged to pitch upon another hypotheſis. All theſe diſorders appeared in the caſe of Stancarus. He fell out with his colleague Oſiander in the univerſity of Konigſberg; and the better to oppoſe him, he aſcribed to Christ's humanity what the other aſcribed to the Divine Nature. When he removed from Konigſberg to Francfort upon the Oder (29), he found there an antagoniſt (30), who run into a new extreme, that he might the better contradict him; for it is ſaid (31), that he taught that Jesus Christ, our juſtification and our mediator as he is God and man, died according to his divine nature. Stancarus returning into Poland maintained his opinion ſo warmly, and accuſed his adverſaries ſo violently of favouring Arianiſm, that he gave many perſons occaſion to revive the ſect of the Arians, and then that of the Samoſatenians. I believe they went upon this: 1. That the objections of the other miniſters proved, that the ſole humanity of Christ was not our mediation. 2. That his objections proved that a co-eſſential Son of God could not be a Mediator. They therefore took a medium between thoſe extremes: they ſaid that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, not co-eſſential, and cloathed with our nature, was our Mediator as to his human nature, and as to the ſpiritual nature he had before he was born. Theſe are the unhappy effects of Theological diſputes, and Profeſſors chairs.

There is another thing to be conſidered. If a profeſſor advances a new opinion, and gives ground to believe that he does it to get ſome reputation, an antagoniſt immediately ſtarts up, who maintains that it is an ill opinion. They grow hot by degrees, and at laſt hate one another in earneſt. To colour their proceedings, which are ſo like human paſſions, the aggreſ-

(23) Staniſl. Lubieniecius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 118.

(24) Calvin. in Admonitione ad Fratres Polonos ne triplicem in Deo Eſſentiam pro tribus Perſonis imaginando tres ſibi Deos fabricent. *init. pag.* 683. Tractatuum Theolog.

(25) Idem. *pag.* 686.

(26) *He means* Blandrata, Gentilis, John Paul Alciatus, *whom he names ſoon after.*

(27) Beza, in Apologia altera ad Claudium de Xainctes, *pag.* 345, *Tom. ii,* Operum. *See alſo what he ſays in Calvin's Life, ad ann.* 1560, *pag.* 381, *Tom. iii,* Operum.

(28) I follow an alphabetical order and not a chronological one.

(29) Melch. Adam. in Vit. Theol German. *pag.* 234.

(30) *Called* Andreas Muſculus.

(31) Staphylus, apud Prateolum, *Voce* Stancarini, *pag. m.* 458.

actions by the troubles he raiſed afterwards, indulging too much his vanity and ſubtilty (*n*). He publiſhed ſeveral pieces [*I*]. Some are ſtrangely miſtaken about the nature of his opinions, as I ſhall make it appear, when I obſerve Moreri's faults [*K*]. The books

for muſt ſay that the queſtion is about a thing of great moment to the Church. He that is attacked muſt ſay the ſame, and ſhew that the opinion he has altered gives a great advantage to the enemies. When things are come to this paſs, there is no going back; the ſuperiors muſt intervene. But what is the uſual effect of their deciſions? an actual and virtual ſchiſm. No ſuch thing would happen, if men were not over-fond of their own thoughts. For example, had Stancarus confeſſed, as he ſhould have done, that his opinion was of little importance for the good of the Church, he would not have thought himſelf obliged in honour to maintain it; he would have been ſilent, as ſoon as he perceived that his aſſertion occaſioned troubles. How many diſorders might have been avoided in the world, if men had been contented to diſpute about things neceſſary to ſalvation? At this rate Oſiander and Stancarus had never writ two pages one againſt another. Is there any body among the people that follows either of thoſe doctrines, when they put their truſt in the death of CHRIST? Nay, do not thoſe very Divines, who have moſt diſputed about thoſe queſtions, worſhip him without thinking of theſe diſtinctions between the human and Divine Nature?

Here is another conſideration. In all countries where many perſons are paid to explain a body of Divinity, ſome will doubtleſs be ſo raſh as to ſtart queſtions, which it were better to let alone (32), as land-marks that divide inheritances. The example of ſuch men is much to be feared; for every body thinks he may do what is done by others, that have not more authority than himſelf: hence it is, that new diſputes never ariſe more eaſily, than when they have been lately preceded by many others. This is what ſome ſay againſt the great number of univerſities.

I ſhall anſwer all thoſe complaints in a few words, It is a moſt certain maxim that good things ought not to be ſuppreſſed, becauſe ſome make an ill uſe them: and therefore ſince the improving of one's mind is very worthy of man, and the appointing of maſters for that end is a good thing, it ought not to be aboliſhed under pretence, that ſome learned men make an ill uſe of their knowledge to raiſe Theological diſputes. To which I add, that the ill conſequences of ignorance are ſtill more to be feared. Ignorance would not prevent diviſions: ſome men leſs ignorant than others, tho' they had never been in an univerſity, would be ſo preſumptuous and ſo vain as to ſow new doctrines, and might eſtabliſh them the more eaſily, becauſe their hearers would be ſilly and ignorant.

I ſhall conclude with deploring the miſerable condition of mankind. They cannot avoid one evil but by running into another: if you cure them of their ignorance, you expoſe them to ſcandalous diſputes, and ſuch as frequently ſhake and even overthrow the government.

[*I*] *He publiſhed ſeveral pieces.*] An Hebrew Grammar at Baſil, 1546. An Expoſition of St James's Epiſtle, with the conciliation of ſome paſſages of the Scripture, at Baſil, 1547. This conciliation was taken almoſt word for word from Bullinger's commentaries (33); and therefore Stancarus may be placed in the catalogue of Plagiaries. *De decem captivitatibus Judæorum: De ſanguine Zachariæ*, and ſeveral other tracts, the titles whereof may be ſeen in the epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque. I ſhall only tranſcribe what follows: *De Trinitate, & Mediatore Domino noſtro Jeſu Chriſto, adverſus Henricum Bullingerum, Petrum Martyrem, & Joannem Calvinum, & reliquos Tigurinæ ac Genevenſis Eccleſiæ Miniſtros, Eccleſiæ Dei perturbatores. De Trinitate, & Unitate Dei, deque Incarnatione & Mediatione Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti adverſus Tritheitas, Arrianos, Eutychianos, Macharianos, Cerinthianos, Ebionitas, & Photinianos. Opus novum de reformatione tum Doctrinæ Chriſtianæ, tum veræ intelligentiæ Sacramentorum, cum matura conſideratione & fundamento Scripturæ ſanctæ & conſilio SS. Patrum*, at Baſil, 1547, in 8vo (34). It is obſerved in the epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque, that Stancarus's book againſt the miniſters of Zurich and Geneva is full of injurious words, and that it was confuted by Joſias Simler. Here is an apoſtrophe of Stancarus: 'Concluſum eſt, ô Calvine, 'doctrinam tuam de filio Dei eſſe plane Arrianam, à 'qua reſilias quam primum te oro atque obſecro, & 'has hæreſes quam citius fieri poteſt retractes, & 'liberes Eccleſiam Dei ab iſtis blaſphemiis quibus eam 'contaminaſti (35). - - - *It is agreed, O Calvin, that 'your doctrine concerning the Son of GOD is plainly 'Arian, which I therefore beſeech you to renounce as ſoon 'as poſſible. Make haſte to abjure ſuch hereſies, and 'free the Church of GOD from thoſe blaſphemies with 'which you have defiled it.*' He ſays, in another place, that he has demonſtrated, that the Churches, called Reformed, were Arian and Eutychian. *Omnes Eccleſiæ quas vos appellatis reformatas per Evangelium filii Dei, Arrianæ & Eutychianæ ſunt, nec hoc negari poteſt, ut ſupra demonſtrativè probavi* (36). Andrew Jurgiewſki, canon of Vilna, alledges thoſe two paſſages in his *Bellum quinti Evangelii* (37). From whence it appears that Calvin and Stancarus gave one another the ſame hard words; each of them accuſed the other of being a blaſphemer, and a diſturber of the Church; and if Calvin blamed Stancarus's vanity, I make no doubt that the latter charged him with the ſame fault. 'Eſt 'illud non abſurdum modò, ſed exitiale commentum, 'quo vir ille faſtu turgidus & novitatis nimium cupi'dus orthodoxæ fidei principia labefactare conatus eſt. 'Dolendum ſanè eſt, quòd hominem qui prodeſſe alio'qui poterat, mater hæreſeôn ambitio ad nocendum 'impulit. Adeò enim frivolæ ſunt quas obtendit ra'tiones, ut ſatis appareat, nihil aliud quàm acuti in'genii famam ab aliis diſſentiendo captaſſe (38) . . . . 'Utinam his moveatur Stancarus: quod tunc demum 'fore ſperandum eſt, ubi ingenium, quod ſua vanitate 'nimis in ſublime elatum eſt, ad manſuetudinem & 'modeſtiam ſe flexerit (39). - - - *That is not only an 'abſurd but a pernicious invention, by which this writer, 'puffed up with pride, and extravagantly fond of new 'opinions, has endeavoured to ſap the fundamental prin'ciples of Orthodoxy. It is truly a pity that a man who 'was capable of doing good, ſhould have been induced by 'ambition, the mother of Hereſies, to do miſchief. The 'reaſons which he offers are ſo frivolous, that it is plain 'enough that in differing from other people he only 'hunted after the reputation of a penetrating wit . . . . 'I wiſh Stancarus could be prevailed upon by theſe things. 'Which we may then hope for, when his temper, too 'much ſwoln with ſelf-conceit, ſhall be reduced to a 'due pitch of modeſty and meekneſs.*'

[*K*] *Taking notice of Moreri's faults.*] He ſays, 'That Stancarus being willing to oppoſe the errors of 'Oſiander, who taught that the human nature of 'CHRIST is the cauſe of our juſtification, run into 'the contrary extream, and wrote againſt the Divinity 'of CHRIST like an Arian.' He quotes *Florimond de Remond, Bellarmin, Onuphrius,* and *Gualtherius.* The firſt miſtake of Moreri, is his ſaying that Oſiander taught that the humanity of CHRIST is the cauſe of our juſtification; on the contrary, he ſhould have ſaid that Oſiander believed that the eſſential juſtice of GOD, and that CHRIST, as he is GOD, are our juſtification. The ſecond miſtake, which unavoidably follows from the firſt, is his ſaying, that Stancarus taught that the Divinity of CHRIST is the cauſe of our juſtification; whereas his doctrine was diametrically oppoſite to that. Thirdly, Stancarus was ſo far from oppoſing the Divinity of CHRIST, like an Arian, that, on the contrary, the only reaſon why he grew ſo fond of his doctrine, was, becauſe he pretended that the oppoſite opinion neceſſarily introduced Arianiſm. Sandius, who put into his catalogue of Antitrinitarians, as many men as ever he could, and ſometimes under equivocal pretences, has omitted Stancarus; which plainly ſhews, that he did not in the leaſt oppoſe the co-eſſential Divinity of CHRIST. Moreri is therefore groſſly miſtaken in point of fact. His wrong conſequence is his fourth miſtake. He falſly believed that Oſiander aſcribed our juſtification to the humanity of CHRIST. How then could he ſay, that Stancarus, contradicting Oſiander, ſo far as to run into another extreme, oppoſed the Divinity of the Meſſias? For it is a natural conſequence of the direct oppoſition, which Moreri ſuppoſes between thoſe two men, that Stancarus rigidly maintained the Divine Nature of the Mediator, as he did. Fifthly, The authors quoted by Moreri ſay the contrary to what he aſcribes to them concerning Oſiander's

(*n*) See the remark [*I*].

(32) Μὴ κίνει Καμαρίναν, ἀκίνητος γὰρ ἀμείνων. Ne move Camarinam, immota enim melior. *Stephan. Byzant. Voce* Καμαρίνα.

(33) Epit. Bibl. Geſneri, *pag.* 245.

(34) Taken from the Epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheca*, ibid.

(35) Stancarus contra Miniſtros Genevenſes ac Tigurinos, *folio* 118, 123, *apud* Jurgiewicium, ubi infra.

(36) Id. ibid. folio 94, 95, apud eund.

(37) Andreas Jurgiewicius, Bellum quinti Evangelii, *pag.* 161, 162. *Colon.* 1595.

(38) Calvinus, in Reſponſo ad Fratres Polonos, *pag.* 682, Tractat. Theolog.

(39) Id. ibid. *pag.* 683.

books he writ againſt his antagoniſts are full of injurious words: he alledged for his juſtification the law of retaliation, the importance of the hereſies he oppoſed, and even the example of the apoſtles (*o*). He gloried that he had been perſecuted and condemned, as

Oſiander's error. I ſhall only prove it as to Father Gaulterius, who has miſled Moreri. ‘ Franciſcus Stancarus Mantuanus, *ſays he* (40), tueri cupiens, ut ‘ Oſiandro (41) obſiſteret, Jeſu Chriſti humanitatem eſſe ‘ noſtræ juſtificationis cauſam, in oppoſitum extremum ‘ eodem circiter tempore ſe præcipitem egit, Jeſu ‘ Chriſti nimirùm divinitatem Arianorum more impugnando: ejus enim erat opinio, Chriſtum dominum ‘ eſſe juſtificatorem noſtrum ſecundum ſolam humanitatem excluſa divina natura. - - - - - *About the ſame* ‘ *time Francis Stancarus of Mantua ſtriving to maintain,* ‘ *in oppoſition to Oſiander, that the human nature of* ‘ *JESUS CHRIST was the cauſe of our juſtification, fell into the contrary extreme, and attacked his* ‘ *Divinity like an Arian: for it was his opinion that* ‘ *our Lord JESUS CHRIST is the author of our* ‘ *juſtification only, as he is man, not as he is GOD.*’ You may plainly ſee in thoſe words three miſtakes of Moreri, and another near as bad as the fourth. For though a man aſſerts, that JESUS CHRIST is our Mediator, and our juſtification, as he is man, and not as he is GOD, it does not follow that he favours Arianiſm: And therefore Gaulterius made uſe of an *enim, for*, unworthy of an author, who ſhould pretend to argue right. The greateſt over-ſight lies in the matter of fact, that is, in his being ignorant that Stancarus aſcribed the mediation of CHRIST to the human nature, becauſe he believed that the contrary opinion favoured Arianiſm. If Gaulterius had ſaid that Stancarus revived the doctrine of Neſtorius, there had been ſome appearance of truth in it, and he would have been a little more faithful in his quotation; for Florimond de Remond, quoted by that Jeſuit, touches upon Neſtorianiſm. Thus this author wrongly ſtates the matter of fact, draws wrong conſequences, and is not right in his quotation. He is more faithful in what he quotes out of Prateolus, for what he advances, is to be found in that author; but becauſe the words of Prateolus are taken from Lindanus, it had been better to quote Lindanus, though an author of no authority, who had read nothing of Stancarus, and only goes upon the teſtimony of one Palladius (42). I dare ſay that there are few books that caſt a greater blot upon the Church of Rome, than thoſe which contain a catalogue of the hereſies of the XVIth century. There are two great faults in thoſe catalogues: The firſt is, That they are ſtuffed with a vaſt number of imaginary ſects (43); the ſecond is, That the authors of thoſe libels tranſcribe one another, and it does not appear that any of them has read the books of the Hereſiarchs they ſpeak of. But though they be never ſo abſurd in what they ſay of other pretended party leaders, I think their account of Stancarus ſhews their ignorance more than any other; ſince, on the one hand, they aſcribe to him an hereſy which he oppoſed, and wherewith he continually charged his adverſaries; and, on the other hand, the opinion, whereby he got many enemies among the Proteſtants, is a doctrine which the Roman Catholics maintain againſt the Proteſtant Divines. Read theſe words of the famous Turretin. ‘ An Chriſtus ſit mediator ſecundum utramque naturam? *affir. cont. Pontificios & Stancarum.* Quæſtio ‘ hæc nobis intercedit cum Pontificiis qui ut facilius ‘ obtineant plures dari poſſe Mediatores, pertendunt ‘ Chriſtum Mediatorem fuiſſe ſecundum naturam humanam tantùm, ut poſt Lombar. lib. 3. diſt. q. 19. ‘ l. 9. Thom. p. 3. q. 26. art. 2. Bell. contro 1. de ‘ Chriſto lib. 5. c. 3. Becanus in Manu. lib. 3. cap. ‘ 2. & alii aſſerunt. Quos hîc Stancarus ſequitur (44). ‘ *Whether CHRIST be Mediator both as GOD and* ‘ *man?* We affirm it againſt the Roman Catholics ‘ and Stancarus. *This is a diſpute between us and the* ‘ *Roman Catholics, who, in order to pave the way for* ‘ *the ſuppoſition of ſeveral mediators, pretend that* ‘ *JESUS CHRIST was mediator with reſpect to his* ‘ *human nature only, as Lombard . . . . St Thomas, Bellaron, Becanus, and others affirm: whom Stancarus* ‘ *follows here.*’ I have juſt now conſulted the *Summa Theologica* of the Jeſuit Becanus, and I find theſe words in it. ‘ Secunda concluſio. Chriſtus ſecundum humanitatem eſt Mediator non ſecundum divinitatem. Eſt contra Lutheranos & Calviniſtas qui ‘ docent Mediatorem eſſe ſecundum utramque naturam (45). - - - - - *The ſecond concluſion.* CHRIST is ‘ mediator with reſpect to his human, not with reſpect to his Divine nature: *It is againſt the Lutherans and Calviniſts, who maintain that he is mediator with reſpect to both.*’ He confutes their arguments; he quotes the Fathers for his opininon, and refers the reader to Vaſques and Bellarmin.

WHETHER Stancarus was an Heretic.

Perhaps it will be aſked whether the particular opinions of Stancarus ought to be accounted heretical. It is none of my buſineſs to decide the caſe. I ſhall only ſay, that in order to judge of the nature of a doctrine, one ought to know the principles and deſign of its author: For inſtance, Stancarus ought to be aſked whether he denies the mediation of CHRIST, according to the Divine Nature, becauſe he does not believe that he is both GOD and man; or whether he denies it, becauſe he will acknowledge no inferiority in the Divine Nature of CHRIST, and is afraid it will make way for Arianiſm? If he alledges the firſt reaſon, he is a Samoſatenian and a Socinian; but if he alledges only the ſecond, it is quite another thing; he is an orthodox man as to the co-eſſential and conſubſtantial Divinity of CHRIST; and his error, at the worſt, conſiſts only in his ſuppoſing that the Mediation implies an inferiority inconſiſtent with the Divinity of the Eternal Word. Perhaps, the circumſtances of the time, and that man's haughtineſs, were the true reaſon why the miniſters of Swiſſerland and Geneva exclaimed ſo much againſt him. The churches of Poland were then in ſuch a condition, that nothing could be more prejudicial to them than ſuch a diſpute; and it was thought that Stancarus acted more out of vanity than out of zeal. Perhaps, his doctrine would not appear ſo pernicious at this preſent time; for ſince the objections of the Socinians have obliged ſome Proteſtant Divines to ſay, that CHRIST is not adorable, as he is Mediator; one would think they believe he is not Mediator, as he is GOD. He is certainly adorable, as he is GOD; and therefore if he ought not to be worſhipped, as he is Mediator, it is becauſe he is not Mediator, as he is GOD. - - - - ‘ Hinc nata quæſtio de ‘ adoratione Chriſti qua mediatoris, circa quam in ‘ partes itum eſt aliis affirmantibus aliis negantibus . . . ‘ licet fatendum ſit quæſtionem hanc prout inter orthodoxos agitatur problematicam eſſe, & minus principalem, de qua utrinque diſputari poteſt ſalva fidei ‘ compage, imo & multum logomachiæ involvat (46). ‘ - - - - *Hence ſprung the queſtion about the adoration of* ‘ *CHRIST as Mediator, upon which people have been* ‘ *divided, ſome chuſing the affirmative, others the negative . . . . although it muſt be confeſſed that the queſtion,* ‘ *as it is handled by orthodox Divines, is problematical,* ‘ *and not of the higheſt importance, becauſe one may diſpute on either ſide with a ſafe conſcience, and after all* ‘ *it is little more than a meer contention about words.*’ As for the letter of the Miniſters of Poland to the Divines of Straſburg (47), I think it ought to be obſerved that it was written by men, who had excommunicated Stancarus, and diſputed with him upon ſeveral occaſions. It is an uſual thing to aſcribe to a man the conſequences which are thought to ariſe from his Doctrine, whether he owns them or not; for it is ſuppoſed he does not fairly diſown them. And therefore prudence requires we ſhould judge of the doctrine of that writer not by that letter, but by his own writings: I do not think they contain Sabellianiſm. However, read the following paſſage (48). ‘ Neque in ‘ eo ſolo ſubſtitit Stancari intemperies, quod doceret, ‘ Chriſtum Mediatorem eſſe juxta humanam tantum ‘ naturam; ſed ultra progreſſus, quoque veram Perſonarum Trinitatem ſuſtulit, unum Deum confusâ ‘ Trinitate, apud quem Chriſtus homo mediatorem ‘ ageret, Trinomium, cum Sabellio imaginans, cæteras Eccleſias ut Arianas traduxit: quod patet ex ‘ litteris Miniſtrorum Polonorum, è Synodo Pincovienſi ſcriptis A. MDLXII. ad Theologos Argentinenſes, (quæ extat prima inter epiſtolas Zanchii) ‘ (49) . . . . . Præterquam de Deo & Chriſto, etiam ‘ alia in cæteros fidei articulos movit Stancarus non

‘ ſana,

(*o*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory to his anſwer to the Divines of Zurich and Geneva.

(40) Gualterus, in Tab. Chronogr. *Sæc. xvi, cap. xxi, pag. m.* 797. *He quotes* Prateol. V. Stancariani Florim. *lib. ii,* de orig. hæreſ. *cap. xv, num.* 1.

(41) He had juſt before faithfully explained the doctrine of Oſiander.

(42) Lindanus, in Dubitantio, *Dial. ii, pag. m.* 127.

(43) See the article BEZANITES.

(44) Franciſcus Turrettinus, Inſtitut. Theol. Elencticæ, *Part. ii, Loco xiv, pag.* 411, *Edit. Genev.* 1682.

(45) Martinus, Becanus, Summa Theolog. *Part. iii, cap.* 21, *pag.* 716, *Edit. Pariſ.* 1634.

(46) Turretin. ubi ſupra, *Quæſt. xviii, pag.* 539. *See alſo Mr Saurin,* Examen de la Theologie de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 749, *& ſeq.*

(47) See the remark [*F*].

(48) Hoornbeeck in Appar. ad Diſput. Socinian. *pag.* 29.

(49) Id. ibid. *pag.* 30.

as St Athanaſius was [*L*]. I know that he taught with great zeal, in Tranſylvania, but I do not know certainly, at what time *(p)*. The book, intituled *Chimæra (q)*, which Staniſlaus Orichovius wrote againſt him, contains many reaſons and hard words: as for his reaſons, the only deſign of them is to prove, that his Poliſh Majeſty ought to deſtroy that man, and all thoſe who ſow new opinions in the kingdom. Thus he thinks the arguments of Sectaries ought to be refuted. He confeſſes that he had married a wife being a prieſt, but he is ſilent with reſpect to the apoſtacy which Stancarus reproaches him with [*M*].

I ſhall

‘ ſana, de Juſtificatione, &c. quod video ex Reſponſione Melanthonis, de controverſiis Stancari ſcriptâ, A. MDLIII. atque extat inter Melanthonis Declamationes, Tom. iv. --- *Neither did the fury of Stancarus ſtop here, viz. In teaching that CHRIST was mediator with reſpect to his Human Nature only. He went further, and took away the real Trinity of Perſons; for, according to the confuſſed notion of Sabellius, he imagined one GOD under three different names, with whom CHRIST, as man, acted the part of mediator. He accuſed the other Churches of Arianiſm; as it appears by a letter of the Poliſh Miniſters, written from the Synod of Pinczovia in the year* 1562, *to the Divines of Straſburg. (This letter is the firſt among the Epiſtles of Zanchius)..... Beſides his notions about GOD and JESUS CHRIST, Stancarus had other heterodox opinions, concerning Juſtification, &c. as I find by an anſwer of Melanchthon's concerning the controverſies of Stancarus, written in the year* 1553. *It is extant among tke declamations of Melanchthon, vol. iv.* Mind theſe words of Melchior Adam (50); ‘ ita diſſeruit (Stancarus) de duabus naturis ut non diſtinguere, verum ſeparare pleriſque ſit viſus. ---- *Stancarus diſcourſed in ſuch a manner upon the two Natures, that, in the opinion of moſt people, he ſeemed not to diſtinguiſh but to divide them.*’ They plainly intimate that Stancarus's enemies took the liberty to impute to him a doctrine which he did not teach. Many thought that he divided the two Natures of CHRIST. Which ſhews that he did not actually divide them, and even that ſuch a diviſion did not neceſſarily reſult from his principles; for in both caſes all his adverſaries would have accuſed him of Neſtorius's hereſy. We may therefore ſay, that Melchior Adam means the ſenſe which many put upon Stancarus's doctrine. But there is nothing more fallacious than to judge of a man's doctrine by the interpretations of his adverſaries. For a confirmation of what I ſay, I ſhall quote Stancarus himſelf. The Divines of Zurich made uſe of theſe words: ‘ Videat Stancarus qui noſtram ſententiam vult gravare ſuſpicione hæreſeos, ne ipſe interea jure convincatur Neſtorianus à quo tam parum abeſt ut difficillimum ſit eum ab illo internoſcere. ---- *Let Stancarus, who ſtudies to brand our opinion with the imputation of Hereſy, take care leaſt we convict him of being a Neſtorian; for he comes ſo near it, that it is hard to make any diſtinction.*’ His anſwer was, ‘ Cum Tigurini non affirment me eſſe Neſtorianum, non opus eſt ut me defendam; quod ſi etiam affirmarent, cum non probent, ſed ſimpliciter accuſent, illis docti viri non crederent, quia ipſimet Tigurini ignorant prorſus quod fuerit dogma Neſtorii, ut jam probabo. Hoc tamen profiteor & coram Deo & hominibus fateor me nihil negotii habere cum Neſtorio, & Neſtorii doctrina (51). ---- *Since the Divines of Zurich do not affirm that I am a Neſtorian, I have no occaſion to juſtify myſelf; if they ſhould affirm it, ſo long as they only laid ſuch a thing to my charge without proving it, the learned would not believe them; becauſe they themſelves are utterly ignorant of what the opinion of Neſtorius was, as I ſhall preſently make it appear. I profeſs however, and acknowledge before GOD and man, that I have nothing at all to do with Neſtorius or his doctrine.*’ This proteſtation ought to make us wary in the preſent caſe.

We ought chiefly to miſtruſt Orichovius, who ſays that Arius, Macedonius, Neſtorius, and Aerius were revived in Stancarus (52). What he imputes to him with reſpect to the Euchariſt (53) is ſo extravagant, and even contradictory, that it ought to be looked upon as a calumny. It does not appear that the Divines of Zurich and Geneva exclaimed againſt Stancarus upon this head. The writers of the catalogues of Heretics (54), accuſe him of teaching that the Lord's Supper is an earneſt of the body of our Saviour. Is this an opinion contrary to that of Zuinglius's or Calvin's doctrine? They add, that he was infected with Rabbiniſm. This accuſation was only grounded upon his ſkill in Rabbinical learning, and his mentioning ſometimes the opinions of the Rabbins (55).

[*L*] *He gloried that he had been perſecuted and condemned, as St Athanaſius was.*] I have adviſed, ſays he (56), ſeven times at leaſt, Philip Melanchthon, Oſiander and Felix, the Superintendant of the Poliſh Churches, and the Miniſters of Zurich and Geneva: I have done it civilly, I diſſembled their errors, the way I took was to aſk them whether they were ſtill orthodox as to the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation. They all joined againſt me. The following words contain a particular account of his complaints. ‘ (57) Omnes inſurrexerunt contra me. Alii enim vitam meam quæſiverunt ut Melancthon (58) per Joachimum Marchionem Brandenburgenſem & Electorem Imperii. Alii carceres præparaverunt perpetuos mihi, niſi admonitus aufugiſſem, ut Oſiander. Alii expulerunt me è domo mea (59) & literas ſcripſerunt ad omnes nobiles majoris & minoris Poloniæ & Ruſſiæ, ut nemo me reciperet, ſed expelleret, ut Fœlix ille impius & hypocrita cum ſuis Pinczovianis. Alii tam in Germania quam in Hungaria, Tranſylvania & Polonia minori multas Synodos celebraverunt contra me & fidem Catholicam de Trinitate & mediatore, & multos libellos plenos blaſphemiis Arrianis & Eutychianis, conviciis & horrendis calumniis ediderunt, ut me tandem cum pura doctrina catholicæ fidei perderent, at nihil facere potuerunt, ſicut, nec poterunt. Durum enim eſt contra ſtimulum, unum Deum Trinitatem calcitrare. Hoc enim modo Conſtantius Imperator Arrianus cum Arrianis novem Concilia celebravit contra D. Athanaſium, quem miris modis afflixerunt, proſcriptionibus, exiliis, & perſecutionibus, ſed veritas tandem vicit. ----- *They all roſe up againſt me; for ſome ſought after my life, as Melanchthon did by means of Joachimus Marquis of Brandenburg, and Elector of the Empire. Some, of whom Oſiander was one, deſigned a perpetual impriſonment for me, unleſs I had been forewarned to make my eſcape. Others again drove me out of my houſe, and writ letters to all the Noblemen of the greater and leſſer Poland and Ruſſia, that none ſhould receive or entertain me, but drive me away. Of this number was that impious hypocrite Felix, together with his brethren of Pinczovia. Others as well in Germany as in Hungary, Tranſylvania, and the leſſer Poland, held many Synods againſt me and the Catholic faith concerning the Trinity and the Mediator, and publiſhed many libels full of Arian and Eutychian blaſphemies, injurious words and horrible aſperſions, in order to ruin me and the pure Catholic doctrine at once. Nevertheleſs they could not prevail, neither indeed ſhall they. For it is hard to kick againſt the pricks, one GOD in Trinity. In this manner did the Emperor Conſtantius, an Arian, hold nine councils with the Arians againſt St Athanaſius, whom they miſerably diſtreſſed by proſcriptions, baniſhments, and perſecutions: but truth was victorious in the end.*’ He adds, That the Miniſters of Zurich writ to thoſe of Poland in 1560, to expel him from their churches. Take notice that he compoſed this work at Dubectz in Ruſſia, in the year 1561, and had it printed at Cracow the year following. Staniſlaus Matthew Stadnicki had ſheltered him at Dubectz (60).

[*M*] *Orichovius .... confeſſes that he had married a wife being a prieſt.*] So far he confeſſes that his fault was as great as Stancarus's, who had alſo married being a prieſt; but in other reſpects he clears himſelf of the ſin whereof he accuſes his adverſary. He alledges for his vindication, that he had kept within the pale of the Church, and that he abſtained from the ſacerdotal functions after his marriage. Thus he ſubmitted

to

(*p*) Stancarus, de Trinitate & Mediatore, adverſus Tigurin. *folio* 7, *of the ſheet* F.

(*q*) It was printed at Cologne in 1563, in 8vo.

(50) Melch. Adam. in Vita Bullingeri, *pag.* 494.

(51) Stancarus, de Trinitate & Mediatore adverſus Tigurin. & Genevenſes, *folio* 6, *verſo*, *of the ſheet* F.

(52) Orichovius, in Chimæra, apud Spondanum, *ad ann.* 1551. *See the folio* 78, *of that book of Orichovius.*

(53) Ibid. *See alſo* Florim. de Remond, *lib. ii, ch. xv.*

(54) Lindanus, Prateolus, Gaultier.

(55) *One of his books is intituled,* de Rabinorum & Anabaptiſtarum falſa opinione. *Another is intituled,* de Locuſtis, juxta Scripturam & Rabinos. *See the Epitome of Geſner's* Bibliotheca, *pag.* 245.

(56) Stancarus de Trinitate & Mediatore adverſus Tigurinos, *in the laſt leaf but one of the ſheet* [*K*].

(57) Id. ibid.

(58) This is ſo contrary to Melanchthon's genius, that it ought not to be credited.

(59) *In the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the ſame book, he ſpeaks thus.* Expuliſtis me paralyticum cum familia ex domo mea (non omnes damno) & ex toto regno quantum in vobis fuit. --- *Notwithſtanding I was ſick of the Palſy, you drove me and my family out of my houſe, and, as far as in you lay, out of the whole kingdom. Nevertheleſs I do not blame you all.*

(60) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of this work.

I ſhall add ſomething to what I have ſaid already. Some authors ſay that he was at Villach (*r*) when the Biſhop of Cracow ſent for him in the beginning of the year 1550 [*N*], to teach the Hebrew tongue. They tell us that having eſcaped out of the priſon to which that prelate had confined him (*s*), he retired to the houſe of Staniſlaus Stadnizki at Dubreczko, and ſet up a ſchool there, which was pretty flouriſhing during the life of Staniſlaus; that after this patron's death he retired to the houſe of Jerom Philippow, and afterwards to the houſe of Nicholas Oleſnicki at Pinczovia. I have quoted (*t*) a Poliſh author, who places the foundation of the Proteſtant church of Pinczovia in the year 1550; but Regenvolſcius places it in the year 1559 [*O*]. He obſerves that Stancarus was called from that place by Count Oſtrorog to reform the churches of Great Poland, and that he had for a companion in this work Felix Cruciger (*u*). Take notice that Stancarus received the degree of Doctor of Phyſic at Baſil, and that Sigiſmund Auguſtus naturalized him in Poland in the year 1569 (*x*). He died at Stobnitz on the twelfth of November 1574, aged ſeventy-three years. FRANCIS STANCARUS, his ſon, born on the ſecond of October 1562, was miniſter of the church of Oxa till his death which happened on the twenty-eighth of March 1621 (*y*).

(*r*) A city of Carinthia.

(*s*) See the remark [*O*].

(*t*) In the body of the article, citation (*g*).

(*u*) *Taken from* Regenvolſcius, Hiſt. Eccleſ. Slavon. Provin. *pag.* 125, 126.

(*x*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 414.

(*y*) Id. ibid.

to the holy canons, and underwent the penance impoſed on married prieſts; but Stancarus married and forſook the church of Rome. (61) *Do hoc tibi, atque concedo, me inter ſacerdotes publicos, tantiſper ſacrificaſſe, quoàd licuit, & quoad fas fuit: cùm autem ſacerdos duxiſſem uxorem, à ſacrificio me funditùs removi, & quod Canon jubet, in ordinem redegi, ita unus de multis factus, offero nunc Deo cor contritum & humiliatum, quod ne deſpiciat Deus, ſupplex plebe in media poſco. An ego te imitarer arrogantem, atque contumacem? cui parùm erat viſum mulieroſo ſacerdoti uxorem ducere, cum qua tibi connubii jus aliter non erat, niſi ſi à ſacrificio, & à ſacris adminiſtrandis abſtineres: ni etiam ſacrilegio ſtatas ſolenneſque ceremonias ſacerdotii pollueres, atque impiis in Eccleſiam introductis ſacris, omnia ſacra vetera, unà cum ſacerdotio, ex Eccleſia exterminares.* . . . . . (62) *Uxorem ego ſacerdos, contra legem duxi: ſed idem tamen ejus legis pœnam ſuſtinui: abrogationem nempe ſacerdotii. Hæc enim mulcta ſola ſequitur meum factum, legis atque Canonis præſcripto. . . . . Cùm factum, Stancare, in ducenda uxore, par ſit noſtrum, audi, quàm ipſius facti conditio ſit inter nos diſpar: tibi enim, in diſſenſione, ac diſſidio, per ſummum Eccleſiæ contemptum, uxor ducta eſt: mihi verò, ſumma voluntate, ac judicio ipſius Eccleſiæ, hæc eadem eſt adjudicata. Quid ita? quia pœnam legis ſuſtinui: & quod obedientem decuit, Canonis juſſu, à ſacris me removi: tu contrà, & pœnam legis contemnis, & ſacris te immiſces.* But we muſt not depend upon all that he ſays; he diſſembles and ſuppreſſes what he thinks diſadvantageous in the accuſation. He does not confeſs that he had entirely broke with the church of Rome, and that he had diſputed againſt it a long time. Nevertheleſs this is very true (63): he returned afterwards into the pale of that church; which was the reaſon why Stancarus called him an apoſtate. He ſhuns this blow without confeſſing any thing.

[*N*] *He was at Villach when the Biſhop of Cracow ſent for him . . . . in the year* 1550.] I quote Regenvolſcius for my voucher in this fact. *Abſente Liſmanino,* ſays he (64), *ille idem Epiſcopus Cracov. Maciejovius, Franciſcum Stancarum Mantuanum Italum, virum doctum, Villaco evocat, initio A.* 1550, *ad profeſſionem literarum Hebraicarum in Academia Cracovienſi.*

(61) Staniſl. Orichovius, in Chimæra, *fol.* 5.

(62) Id. ibid. fol. 6.

(63) *See* Simon Starovolſcius, in Elog. centum Polonorum, *pag.* 78, 79.

(64) Adrianus Regenvolſcius, Hiſt. Eccleſ. Slavonicarum Provinciarum, *lib. i, cap. xv, pag.* 125.

[*O*] *Regenvolſcius places it in the year* 1559.] This ſeems more probable; for if Stancarus, who was called to Cracow in the beginning of the year 1550, ſtopped at divers places after his flight before he went to Pinczovia, it is not eaſy to conceive how he could be at the houſe of Oleſnicki in the year 1550. It therefore ſeems more reaſonable to ſay that it was in the year 1559, when he urged him to drive out the Monks. *Ab hoc* (Hieronymo Philippovio) *Pinczoviam, ad Nicolaum Oleſnicium, qui Pinczoviâ, Monachis ejectis, puram religionem A.* 1559 *induxit* (65). But the ſame author confounds us, by affirming in another place, that Oleſnicki drove out the Monks in the year 1550, and that he was accuſed of this to the king, as likewiſe for having afforded a retreat to Stancarus, of whoſe promotion he gives the following account. 'Epiſcopus Cracovienſis . . . . . Franciſcum Stancarum . . . . . trahi jubet in Caſtellum Lipoviec, ubi 'Epiſcopalis carcer eſt, quinto ab Urbe Cracovia milliari. Sed ex eo, induſtriâ Georgii Nigri famuli ſui, 'conciſo in longas faſcias: uno atquè altero linteo, 'liberatus, Staniſlao Laſſocio ſubcamerario Lancicenſi, 'atque Andrea Triceſio, delabentem expectantibus; 'exceptus, venit in oppidum Dubieczko, ad Staniſlaum Stadnicium, inde Pinczoviam ad Nicolaum 'Oleſnicium (66). - - - - *The Biſhop of Cracow . . . . . 'ordered Francis Stancarus . . . . . to be carried to the 'caſtle of Lipoviech, where the epiſcopal priſon is, five miles 'from the city of Cracow. Making his eſcape from thence by 'the contrivance of his ſervant George Niger, who cut a 'pair of ſheets in long pieces, and by the aſſiſtance of Staniſlaus Laſſocius and Andrew Triceſius, who received him 'as he ſlid down, he came to Staniſlaus Stadnizki at Dubrezko, and from thence to Nicholas Oleſnicki at Pinczovia.*' He furniſhes us with ſome hints to unravel theſe difficulties, for he obſerves (67) that Oleſnicki was prevailed upon at laſt to diſmiſs Stancarus, and to re-call the Monks, upon condition that they would behave well, which they did not. They run away after, having been guilty of new diſorders, upon which their monaſtery was converted into a ſchool. We may therefore admit two Reformations eſtabliſhed at different times in the city of Pinczovia, the one in the year 1550, and the other in the year 1559. The Hiſtorian is nevertheleſs blameworthy for being ſo indiſtinct in his narratives.

(65) Id. ibid. *pag.* 126.

(66) Id. ibid. *pag.* 228.

(67) Ib. *p.* 229.

STELLINGI.

STELLINGI. It is the name that thoſe Saxons took to whom Lotharius the ſon of Lewis the Debonnaire granted leave to make profeſſion of the Pagan Religion which Charlemaigne had obliged their fathers to renounce. Du Tillet ſpeaks of it; but he does it in much fewer words than an author that has quoted him [*A*].

[*A*] *Du Tillet ſpeaks of it, but he does it in much fewer words than an author that has quoted him.*] The Emperor 'Lotharius . . . . . turned monk at Pruina, 'to do penance for his ſins, particularly for his diſobedience to his father, and becauſe in order to have 'ſuccours againſt his brothers Lewis and Charles the 'Bald, he had reſtored to part of the Saxons, whom 'his grandfather, Charlemaigne, had made Chriſtians, 'their idolatrous worſhip, to which as ſoon as they 'were returned, they took the name of Stellingi, living in full liberty of conſcience, and every man profeſſing what religion he liked beſt (1).' We ſhall ſee how Peter de St Julien enlarges upon this. He had been inveighing againſt liberty of conſcience, and, among other things, he had ſaid (2), that thoſe who aſk it without any reſtriction, ſeem to aſpire at the privileges of the Thelemites in Rabelais, who had cauſed this motto to be put upon the frontiſpiece of their temple, *Do what thou wilt*; 'and to this purpoſe, *continues he* (3), I 'remember to have read in the collections of the Recorder du Tillet; that the Emperor Lotharius by 'name, and ſon to Lewis the *debonnaire*, finding himſelf greatly embarraſſed, by reaſon of the wars he 'was carrying on againſt his brothers, required his

(1) Du Tillet, Recueil des Rois de France, *pag. m.* 45, *See alſo* Fauchet, Hiſt. de Charles le Chauve, *ch. vii, folio m.* 27.

(2) Pierre de Saint Julien, Meſlanges Paradoxales, *p.* 199.

(3) Id. ibid.

‘Saxon ſubjects to ſuccour him with men and money, which they refuſed to do, unleſs he would grant them a liberty of conſcience. Lotharius, whoſe heart was more ſet upon victory than upon the intereſt of religion, did not then conſider the importance of the Saxons demand, and, without any further reflexion, complied with it. Now theſe Saxons were ſo much addicted to Paganiſm and Idolatry, that tho' Charlemaigne had ſo harraſſed and weakened them by a war of thirty-three years ſtanding, that they had no other way left of ſaving their lives but by receiving baptiſm, they nevertheleſs ſubmitted to it rather out of fear than devotion. Wherefore having now obtained a liberty of conſcience, they plainly diſcovered that the Chriſtian religion, which they had embraced through conſtraint, was not planted in their hearts, and could take no root there. It likewiſe happened that as all ſects are accuſtomed to take their name from their author, or elſe to invent a new one for themſelves, theſe Saxons called themſelves *Stellingi*, and returned to their former idolatry. Afterwards the Emperor Lotharius, coming to a better way of thinking, was touched with a remorſe of conſcience, (as well for his diſobedience and harſhneſs to his father, as for having taken upon him to diſpenſe the Saxons from their baptiſmal vows and engagements, and preſumed to diſpoſe of their conſciences, which were not at all ſubject to his power and juriſdiction) and quitting the world, (where he had lived without either fearing GOD, or honouring his parents) turned Monk.’

By comparing the words of Peter de Saint Julien with thoſe of du Tillet, one may form a juſt idea of the liberty which many writers take of adding a hundred things to the teſtimony of the authors whom they quote.

It is not neceſſary to make any reflexions upon the maxims of Peter de Saint Julien (4): they have been confuted a thouſand times over by the Advocates for Toleration (5).

(4) See the remark [*F*], of the article VIRET.

(5) See the remark [*F*] of the article SANCTESIUS (CLAUDIUS.)

STEPHANUS Byzantinus was an expert Grammarian, who lived in the Vth or VIth century. He compoſed a dictionary, wherein he inſerted the Nouns Adjective derived from the Nouns Subſtantive of places, which ſerved to denote the inhabitants of thoſe Places [*A*]. This was attended with many obſervations borrowed from Mythology and Hiſtory, which diſcovered the origin of cities and colonies, and their changes and differences, whereby the author equally ſhewed his exactneſs and learning. We have nothing left but a ſorry abridgment of that work, which the Grammarian Hermolaus thought fit to make, and which he dedicated to the Emperor Juſtinian (*a*). Notwithſtanding the injury this curious book has ſuffered by the ignorance of the abbreviator and tranſcribers, it has proved very uſeful to the learned, who thought that no antient book did better deſerve to be corrected and explained in a critical way. Sigonius, Caſaubon, Scaliger, Salmaſius, &c (*b*), took upon them to illuſtrate it; but it did not appear in Latin till 1678 [*B*]. That edition publiſhed at Amſterdam was followed by that of Leyden ten years after. The Dutch diſperſed before-hand ſome ſheets of thoſe editions, which hindred Father Lubin from publiſhing this author, on whom he had

(*a*) Suidas, in Ἑρμόλαος.

(*b*) *See* Colomiés's Bibliotheque Choiſie, *pag.* 46. *&* *ſeq. where you will find the names of ſeveral authors, who have writ upon Stephanus.*

[*A*] *The nouns adjective . . . . which ſerved to denote the inhabitants of thoſe places.*] The title, περὶ πόλεων, *de urbibus*, which is commonly given to that work, is neither that which the author, nor that which the abbreviator put to it. The true title of the book was ἐθνικὰ: hence Hermolaus intituled the abridgment he made of it, ἐθνικῶν ἐπιτομή. ‘But becauſe ſeveral perſons have undertaken, at ſeveral times, to abridge this abridgment, and to leave out even the name and the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the firſt abbreviator, it is no wonder if the antient titles of the book are loſt. In the room of which ſome ſmatterers in learning have ſubſtituted this περὶ πόλεων, becauſe they thought the main deſign of the author was to write a Geographical book. But they were miſtaken, his real deſign was to write a Grammatical work, to explain the names derived from nations, cities, and provinces, juſt as if one ſhould explain grammatically the words Pariſian, Frenchman, Dutchman, *&c.* and ſhew the great variety that may be obſerved in the formation of theſe *derivative* terms (1).’ This is the opinion of thoſe who have publiſhed Stephanus, as it is related in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*. This opinion might have been criticized upon; for there is no appearance that the principal deſign of this Grammarian was the explication of theſe derivative terms. It was probably the leaſt part of his project, and only an acceſſory to his work. I own he is very careful to obſerve that ſort of nouns, but takes up but little room, compared with the facts that he relates, and the teſtimonies he quotes; which would be more apparent if we had the whole work. There we ſhould find a line or two in an article for the explanation of the noun adjective, derived from the name of a city, and ſometimes whole pages in one article only. I believe, till I be better informed, that the title ἐθνικὰ implies all the obſervations that can be made upon a nation, a city, and a place, in as much as an author confines himſelf to the origin of places and Geographical hiſtory. See in the remark [*G*] the paſſage of Father Lubin. (2) ‘What is very pleaſant is, that when they cite the author of this book they call him *Stephanus de Urbibus*, whence it came to paſs that many perſons took *de Urbibus* to be the name of the author's family. Father Lubin had a mind to call him *Stephen of the Cities* in his Geographical tables on Plutarch; but having conſulted the gentlemen of the French academy, he could never make them approve his deſign. He ſeems to complain of their hardneſs in his Geographical Mercury (3).’ He was much in the wrong to complain of it.

[*B*] *It did not appear in Latin till the year* 1678.] There were three Greek editions, that of Aldus Manutius, that of the Junti, and that of Xylander; but tho' the laſt engaged to publiſh his Latin verſion forthwith, and tho' the continuator of Geſner's *Bibliotheca* affirmed, that the book of our Stephanus was publiſhed by Xylander in Greek and Latin, in 1568, it is certain it did not thus appear till the year I have mentioned. A Portugueze Jew, named Pinedo, publiſhed it at Amſterdam in 1678, with a Latin tranſlation of his own making, and a commentary (4). Six years after, Mr Rijk, profeſſor at Leyden, publiſhed the notes of Lucas Holſtenius on that ſame book of Stephanus, which he had from Cardinal Francis Barberini. There was a new edition of Stephanus printed at Leyden in 1688, in Greek and Latin, as that of Pinedo: the Latin tranſlation was made by Berkelius (5). This tranſlator added to it a large and learned commentary. His remarks on the laſt letters are ſhorter, and not ſo learned, becauſe he died before the work was printed. Mr Gronovius has much contributed to the amendment of this edition.

[*C*] *Which hindered Father Lubin from publiſhing that author, on whom he had beſtowed much pains.*] This diſappointment vexed him, and made him inveigh againſt the Dutch. Here I ſhall tranſcribe the words of a Journaliſt. ‘Having mentioned Father Lubin, I will not forget the indignation he has conceived againſt the Dutch, ſince he has been informed that they were printing *Stephanus de Urbibus*, with a Latin tranſlation, and a commentary. If you conſult the ſixty-third page of his Geographical Mercury, you may ſee with what anger he ſpeaks. The occaſion of his grief is, that they have maliciouſly ſupplanted him, as he ſays, and deprived him of the fruit of his long ſtudies. *He had been ten years tranſlating that book, and corrected the faults of the three editions, by the help of two Greek manuſcripts of the king's library, which had been very obligingly lent him by Mr Carcavi; he had made ſome Geographical notes* upon

(1) Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres, *for July* 1684, *Art. iv*, *pag.* 485.

(2) Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres, *ibid. pag.* 486.

(3) Pag. 62.

(4) See the judgment which Colomiés paſſes on it in his *Bibliotheque, Choiſie*, pag. 46.

(5) He was rector of the college of Delft.

had beſtowed much pains [*C*]. The fragment of Stephanus [*D*] concerning Dodona, plainly ſhews, that Hermolaus left out a thouſand good things; and becauſe he adds ſometimes ſomething of his own, one cannot certainly tell whether Stephanus Byzantinus made profeſſion of Chriſtianity or not [*E*], for who knows whether the paſſages wherein he ſeems to ſpeak like a Chriſtian are his? Moreri deſerves to be cenſured [*F*]. Father Lubin very juſtly obſerves that a great ſervice would be done to the readers, if the Nouns adjectives of inhabitants were inſerted in Geographical Dictionaries [*G*]. If I might adviſe, I would have them inſerted in the ſecond edition of Furetiere's Dictionary. Mr Colomiés (*c*) quotes ſome words of Scaliger, which appear very obſcure to me [*H*].

upon it, filled up the chaſms, and compared all the authorities of the authors cited with the originals that are extant. Thoſe who ſaw his manuſcripts were amazed at his great labour; when lo, the Dutch, all of a ſudden, diſperſed the firſt ſheets of their edition over all Europe, that no Bookſeller might undertake the printing of that book. This is certainly a ſevere blow for an author, and eſpecially for a monk of the order of St Auguſtin, who was going to ſhew the world his great ſkill in the Greek tongue and critical learning, which people will not eaſily believe without plain proofs of it. It is ſo true, that people can hardly believe ſuch a thing, that the Abbot Baudrand having informed the public, in his Dictionary, that *Stephanus de Urbibus* had been tranſlated and adorned with very learned notes, by the R. F. Lubin; Pinedo writ on purpoſe to Paris to know the truth of it, and was anſwered, that Mr Baudrand had given it out *in fide parentum*, *upon hearſay* (6).'

[*D*] *The fragment of Stephanus concerning Dodona.*] It was taken from a very antient manuſcript, which was in the library of Mr Seguier, Chancellor of France. Tennulius, profeſſor in the illuſtrious ſchool of Nimeguen, was the firſt that publiſhed it. He added to it a Latin tranſlation, with notes. Berkelius made a ſecond edition of it (7), which contained a new tranſlation of his own, and ſome remarks. Pinedo made a third verſion of it, and publiſhed it at the end of his Stephanus with notes. Mr Grovonius made a fourth edition of it in 1681 (8), wherein the three preceding verſions were to be ſeen: he added to it ſome learned diſſertations.

[*E*] *One cannot certainly tell whether Stephanus . . . . made profeſſion of Chriſtianity.*] The reflexion of a Journaliſt ſeems to me very proper to ſhew, what a little command the writers of theſe laſt ages have over their prejudices; for there is hardly any book wherein their unhandſome way of ſpeaking of other religions does not diſcover what religion they profeſs. The reflexion is as follows. 'Although Lucas Holſtenius believed that Stephanus Byzantinus was a Chriſtian, the thing is ſtill diſputable. There are the ſame difficulties concerning Ammianus Marcellinus: ſome ſay he was a Pagan, others maintain that he was not. I conclude from thence, that the writers of this age are infinitely more partial or conceited than the antient. Are there any geographical or hiſtorical Dictionaries, or even Hiſtories, that do not diſcover the partiality of the author for or againſt the Church of Rome? It will never be diſputed in future ages, whether Moreri, the Abbot Baudrand, *&c.* were Roman Catholics or Proteſtants. One may know the ſect of a Grammarian by the very rudiments of a Grammar (9).' If I was to give my opinion, I had rather ſay, that our Stephanus was a Chriſtian (10), than that he was a Pagan, as a very learned man will have it; and had he always related the ridiculous opinions of the Heathens, without criticizing on them, it would be no crime. 'Non eſt igitur audiendus Septimius Florens Chriſtianus, quem non puduit Stephanum auctorem Ethnicum appellare; in Commentariis ſuis ad Ariſtoph. Irenam p. 77. (11). - - *We ought not therefore to believe Septimius Florens a Chriſtian, who in his Commentaries on Ariſtophanes's Irena has not bluſhed to call Stephanus a Pagan writer.*'

[*F*] *Moreri deſerves to be cenſured.*] For he refers his reader to a book that was never publiſhed, and ſays nothing at all of Pinedo's edition. *Father Lubin, an Auguſtin*, ſays he, *has tranſlated it into Latin, and hath added to it very learned remarks. See his tranſlation.* Would any man doubt, after the reading of theſe words, that Father Lubin's Stephanus has been actually publiſhed? I believe Moreri thought ſo, but however he deceived his readers. He had read in Mr Baudrand (12), 'Quod (*opus Stephani*) nunc Latinum reddidit, reſtituit, & notis illuſtravit doctiſſimis P. Auguſtinus Lubin Auguſtinianus. - - - *Which book of Stephanus is now turned into Latin, reſtored, and illuſtrated with very learned notes, by Father Lubin, an Auguſtin Friar.*' He did not doubt, after ſuch a teſtimony, that he might ſpeak as poſitively as he did. Mr Baudrand made a good uſe of Pinedo's reflexion (13); he declared in his new edition, that Father Lubin's work was not yet printed (14). Such a clauſe ſhould never be forgotten, by thoſe who mention a work that is ſtill in the author's ſtudy.

[*G*] *Father Lubin had reaſon to believe, that a great ſervice would be done, if the Nouns Adjectives of inhabitants were inſerted . . . . .*] Here follows the paſſage which I promiſed above. You will find in it, among other things, the author's thoughts about the deſign of Stephanus. *The deſign of* Stephanus de Urbibus *was*, ſays he (15), *to teach his ſcholars the Greek Hiſtory; and leſt in reading they ſhould take the people of one city for that of another, he made it his buſineſs, ſpeaking of cities, to obſerve* τὰ ἐθνικὰ *of them, which we may tranſlate the* familiar names (16) *that are given to thoſe people, derived from the name of the city where they dwell; for inſtance,* ἀντιόχεια, τὸ ἐθνικὸν ἀντιοχεύς, ἀθῆναι, ὁ πολίτης ἀθηναῖος. *We have good reaſon to wiſh, that ſome learned man would undertake the ſame thing about Latin names of towns, adding to them the derivative name by which the inhabitants are called; as from* Roma, Romanus, *from* Carthago, Carthaginenſis. *The ſame might be done in our own language, and it would not be unbecoming a man of parts to obſerve how the inhabitants of our cities and provinces are called, how an inhabitant of* Bretagne *is called a* Breton, *of* Anjou *an* Angevin, *of* Paris *a* Pariſian, *and the like of others: the reading of our Hiſtories would be more pleaſant, and there would not be ſo many faults in our tongue; thoſe derivative words ſhould not be wanting in our Geographical Dictionaries.*

[*H*] *Some words of Scaliger, which appear to me very obſcure.*] 'Pinedo does not obſerve in his preface that Nicolas Sophianus had in his poſſeſſion an entire Stephanus: Præter alios codices Græcos, *ſays Scaliger in a letter to Gruterus,* quos Nic. Sophianus habebat, erat & integer Stephanus cum toto Κ & Λ, quæ hodie imperfecta circumferri non ignoras (17). - - - *Beſides other Greek manuſcripts in the poſſeſſion of Nicholas Sophianus, there was an entire Stephanus with the letters K and L whole, which, as you very well know, are now imperfect.*' I cannot apprehend what he means by an entire Dictionary, with the whole letters *K* and *L*; it is a riddle to me. Juſt as if one ſhould ſay, that a man has read the whole New Teſtament, with the Goſpel of St John and the Acts of the Apoſtles (§ *a*).

[§ *a*) If after the word *Stephanus* in the *Scaligerana*, one was to read *nempè*, *to wit*, the ſenſe would be more diſtinct; but it is clear enough without that, and ſo great an exactneſs of expreſſion is not neceſſary in ſuch a familiar diſcourſe as this, which perhaps after all belongs leſs to Scaliger than to thoſe who compiled the *Scaligerana*. Rem. Crit.]

(*c*) Colomiés, ubi ſupra, *p.* 49.

(6) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 487.

(7) At Leyden, 1674, in 8vo.

(8) That edition is in 4to.

(9) Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 486.

(10) See in Berkelius's preface, the paſſages which ſhew that Stephanus was a Chriſtian

(11) Berkelius, *ibid.*

(12) *Ad* Philipp. Ferrarii Alexandrini Lexicon Geographicum, *Tomo ii*, *folio* 357, *citante* Pinedo *in Præfatione.*

(13) Cum hujus ſcrutandi gratia ad amicum quemdam literas dediſſem, ille lepide reſcripſit, illud à Michaele Antonio Baudrand dictum fuiſſe *in fide parentum.* - - - *Having writ to a friend for information, I received this pleaſant anſwer from him that Michael Antony Baudrand had affirmed ſuch a thing upon the faith of tradition.* Pinedo, ibid.

(14) Ejus opus notis nondum editis illuſtravit P. Auguſtinus Lubin. *Baudrand Geograph.* Tom. ii, pag. 444.

(15) Mercure Geographique, *pag.* 64.

(16) The word *familiar* ſeems here to be very improper.

(17) Colomiés, ubi ſupra, *p.* 49.

STEVIN (Simon) one of the beſt Mathematicians of the XVIth century, was born at Bruges, and ſettled in Holland, where he was alſo made Overſeer of the dikes (*a*). He was in high eſteem with Maurice of Naſſau Prince of Orange who loved and underſtood the Mathematics very well. The books which Stevin publiſhed met with a good reception [*A*]. He invented a kind of ſailing chariots, which went very faſt [*B*]. One of his beſt productions is his treatiſe upon Staticks [*C*].

[*A*] *The books which Stevin publiſhed met with a good reception.*] He publiſhed a book of Arithmetic in French, in the year 1585, printed by Plantin at Antwerp in 8vo. *Problematum Geometricorum Libri V*, in the year 1583 in 4to (1), and divers other treatiſes in Flemiſh, moſt of which have been tranſlated into Latin by Willebrord Snellius; but that on the finding out of harbours was tranſlated by Grotius (2). The works of Stevin were collected and publiſhed in Latin in the year 1608, and in French in the year 1634, in folio. Here follows a particular account of the titles according to the French edition. The work is divided into ſix volumes, the firſt of which contains his Arithmetic, that is, *the computations of Vulgar or Arithmetical numbers: likewiſe Algebra with the equations of the five quantities. The ſix books* of Algebra by Diophantus of Alexandria, *the four firſt of which are tranſlated by* Simon Stevin, *and the laſt two are done newly by* Albert Girard, Samielois. *The practice of Arithmetic by* Simon Stevin, *containing the tables of Intereſt, Decimals; likewiſe a treatiſe of incommenſurable quantities with the explication of the tenth book of Euclid.* The ſecond volume comprehends Coſmography, that is to ſay the doctrine of Triangles, Geography, and Aſtronomy. The third comprehends the practice of Geometry. The fourth the ſcience of Weights or Staticks. The fifth Opticks. The ſixth Caſtrametation, Fortification by Sluices, and general Fortification. Obſerve that the 2d, 3d, 4th and 5th volumes are intitled *Mathematical Memoirs of Prince Maurice*, Grotius (3) made a fine poem upon this part of Stevin's works. The French tranſlator's name was Albert Girard: he reviſed, corrected, and enlarged, the former editions. It is eaſy to diſtinguiſh what is his. About a year after his death his widow and eleven children dedicated to the States-General the Mathematical works of Stevin, which he had tranſlated, and which were printed (4) in the year 1634, as I have already taken notice.

[*B*] *He invented a kind of ſailing chariots which went very faſt.*] Valerius Andreas ſpeaks of them in this manner. ‘Inventor fuit Curruum velivolorum apud Batavos, quos ne equus quidem, licet celeritate ingenti præſtans, longe ſpatio æquare poſſit. Ferunt enim ſedentes in ejuſmodi curru duarum horarum ſpatio leucas Hollandicas quatuor, videlicet Sceveringâ Pettenum uſque confeciſſe (5). - - - *He invented chariots with ſails in Holland, which the ſwifteſt horſe could not long keep up with. For it is reported that people ſitting in one of theſe chariots did in the ſpace of two hours travel four Dutch leagues,* viz. *from Sceveringh to Putten.*’ Voſſius affirms the ſame thing (6). Grotius has writ a Poem intitled *Iter Currus veliferi* (7), which is a beautiful deſcription of their method of ſailing in thoſe chariots.

[*C*] *One of his beſt productions is his treatiſe upon Statics.*] Swertius affirms, that Stevin ſo throughly underſtood the Statics, that he could raiſe any burthen whatſoever with ſmall ſtrength and an eaſy machine (8). Valerius Andreas makes uſe of the ſame words as Swertius; but he adds, that this inſtrument was called *Pantocrator*, - - *all-ſufficient*, and he quotes Adrian of Rome, as a perſon who had given this teſtimony to Simon Stevin (9). We find in Voſſius (10) an exact idea of Stevin's treatiſe upon Statics; but he calls the inſtrument by the name of *Pancratium*. Let us obſerve a groſs error in Valerius Andreas: he ſays (11) that the method of finding out harbours is what they call Statics, a very noble and abſtruſe part of the Mathematics, and in a manner reared anew by Stevin, whoſe treatiſe on that ſubject is incomparable, and has been tranſlated by Grotius. Certain it is, that Grotius put into Latin what Stevin had writ in Flemiſh on the art of finding out harbours. But this is no part of Statics. Stevin treats of that in the fifth book of his Geography. This book in the French tranſlation is intitled *Du Trouve-Port, ou la maniere de trouver les Havres* (12).

(*a*) Valer. Andr. Bibliotheca Belg. *pag.* 813.

(1) Valer. Andr. Biblioth. Belg. *pag.* 813.

(2) *See* Voſſius de Scient. Mathem. *pag. m.* 259, 285.

(3) See the ſecond book of his *Sylvæ*, pag. 62, & ſeq. edition. *Poëmatum* 1617.

(4) At Leyden for Bonaventure and Abraham Elzevir.

(5) Valer. Andr. ubi ſupra.

(6) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, *cap. lvii, num.* 19, *pag.* 337.

(7) *See* Grotii Poemata, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 224.

(8) Adeo rei ponderariæ peritus fuit, ut nullum offerri illi poſſet pondus, quantumvis grave, quod non parvis viribus ac facili inſtrumento movere potuiſſet. *Swert. Athen. Belg. pag.* 677.

(9) Valer. Andr. ubi ſupra.

(10) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, *cap. xlvii, num.* 11, *pag.* 284, 285.

(11) Valer. Andr. ubi ſupra.

(12) See page 170, of the Mathematical Works of Stevin, Edit. of Leyden 1634.

STIFELIUS (Michael) a Lutheran miniſter in the village of Holtzdorff near Wirtemberg, lived in the XVIth century. He perſuaded his hearers that the end of the world would come on the third of October 1533 at ten in the morning. He had made this fine diſcovery by the computation of ſquare numbers [*A*]; but he gave it out as a revelation from Heaven. A great number of country people ſuffered themſelves to be ſo infatuated with this notion, that they neglected their work and ſpent their ſubſtance. The day appointed being come Stifelius got into the pulpit, and exhorted his hearers to be ready, for that the moment was at hand in which they were to aſcend into Heaven with the ſame cloaths they had on. The hour paſſed, but nothing appeared of what they expected, and Stifelius himſelf began to be in doubt, when ſuddenly a ſtorm aroſe which revived his hopes, and made him renew his exhortations: *behold*, ſaid he, *the prelude to the laſt judgment*. The ſtorm laſted but a ſhort time, and the peaſants that were aſſembled there ſoon perceived that the ſky was clear. Upon this they grew angry with their miniſter, dragged him out of his pulpit, bound him, and carried him to Wirtemberg; where they accuſed him as an impoſtor, and inſiſted upon ſome reparation being made to them. It is ſaid that their pretenſions and complaints were declared void, and that Stifelius by the intereſt of Luther was re-eſtabliſhed in his church. Hanard Gameren gives a pleaſant account of this in the IXth Eclogue of his Bucolics (*a*). Tilman Bredenbach recites it intire (*b*), after having related the adventure in proſe. I ſhould not be very ready to believe theſe two authors, if I did not find it related

[*A*] *He had made this fine diſcovery by the computation of ſquare numbers.*] Others ſay that it was by the numeral letters of a paſſage of ſcripture. ‘Ex ſupputatione quadratorum numerorum, tanquam ex divina revelatione, diem ultimi judicii futurum prædixit Anno 1533. 3. Octob. circa 10. diei horam. . . . . . Referunt nonnulli *Stifelium* collegiſſe, vaticinium ſuum ex verbis iſtis, *VIDebVnt In qVeM transfIXerVnt*, quorum literæ numerales continent numerum 1533 (1). - - - *He foretold, by the computation of ſquare numbers,* &c. . . . . . *Others ſay that Stifelius collected that prophecy from theſe words,* VIDebVnt In qVeM transfIXerVnt *(they ſhall look upon him whom they have pierced) the numeral letters of which include the number* 1533.’ Is it not a deplorable caſe, that the mind of man ſhould be liable to ſuch groſs illuſions, and that theſe ſhould be ſo catching.

(*a*) He was a native of the country of Liege, and he taught the Greek tongue in the univerſity of Ingolſtad. See *Valerius Andreas's Bibliotheca Belgica, pag.* 339.

(*b*) *In the 32d chapter of the 7th book* Sacrarum Collationum, *pag. m.* 707. *It is from him that Florimond de Remond,* Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, *livr. ii, ch. vi, num.* 7, *has taken it.*

(1) Marcus Fridericus Wendelinus, Contemplat. Phyſicarum §. *ii, cap. xvi, pag.* 322.

related by an eminent Proteſtant Divine [*B*]. It is true he does not mention Luther nor the ſtorm which rouzed the expectation of the auditory afreſh. Spondanus tells this ſtory with other circumſtances [*C*]. I do not think that we ought to diſtinguiſh this Stifelius from him whoſe Arithmetical works were highly commended, and who died in the year 1567 [*D*], nor from him to whom Luther writ the letters of which I ſpeak

[*B*] *If I did not find it related by an eminent Proteſtant Divine.*] It is Marcus Fridericus Wendelinus. He relates it in the ſixteenth chapter of the ſecond ſection of his Contemplations upon Phyſics. That chapter is intitled *De tempore excidii mundani*, and contains a long catalogue of falſe ſuppoſitions concerning the time of the end of the world. Wendelinus, who writ this in the year 1624 could not confute by the event all thoſe of whom he ſpeaks. He could not prove a falſhood (2) upon Philip Nicolai, who ſaid that the world would come to an end in the year 1670; nor upon Oſiander who had aſſigned the year 1689; nor upon him who aſſigned the year 1700, to confute whom Remalcus writ a book on purpoſe. When Wendelinus compoſed that chapter, Germany was full of predictions about the end of the world, or the concluſion of the wars which at that time diſtreſſed Europe. *Si præſentium temporum*, ſays he, *Prophetias de fine ſeculi liberet examinare, volumen ſatis ſpiſſum labor hic abſumeret: Quod enim Germaniæ noſtræ eſt antrum, quod de fine ſeculi, & præſentium turbarum eventu vaticinia non ſpirat* (3)? He ſays that for three years before divers pamphlets were ſpread about, ſignifying that the golden age was to begin in the year 1624. He mentions one Nagelius, who had foretold ſurpriſing revolutions, and was a man of ſo great obſtinacy, that however contrary an event proved to his predictions, he would ſtill maintain that they were true. He always brought himſelf off by aſking a further delay. *De anno, quem jam agimus, à Chriſto nato milleſimum ſexcenteſimum viceſimum quartum, quot quæſo per Orbem, intra triennii ſpacium, chartæ volitarunt, quæ aurei in eum ſeculi exordium conjecerunt? Inter Prophetas hoſce familiam ducit* Paulus Nagelius, *qui vaticiniis ſuis planè Propheticâ fiducia promulgatis, multorum animos hactenus ſuſpenſos tenuit; dum inſignium mutationum momenta in Calendariis ſuis notavit. Scriptis etiam compluribus neſcio quas viſiones & arcanorum apocalypſes prædicavit, tantâ animi fiduciâ, ut ne ab eventu quidem contraria monſtrante, vaticiniorum ſuorum veritatem ſuſpectam debere reddi contenderit. Saxonicis ſubinde, ad fidem impetrandam dilationibus ſibi indultis. Mihi quidem, aliorum exemplo, virum illum exagitare non eſt animus; in quo unum hoc probo, quod ſeriâ vitæ noſtræ emendatione imminentes pœnas effugere publicus pœnitentiæ præco jubet. Attamen vitio, opinor, nemo mihi vertet, ſi majorem illi vel in arcanis revelandis ſapientiam, vel in ignotis reticendis prudentiam exoptem* (4).

What has been ſaid will occaſionally ſerve to ſhew the fanatic Nagelius in a proper light, and to prove that the ſtory which Gameren has put into verſe is not without a foundation, ſince Wendelinus relates it among ſeveral others which are very certain.

I make no doubt but Philip Camerarius, a Proteſtant writer, meant the ſame Stifelius in the following paſſage. ‘It is very well known in our parts what the reaſons ‘were which a parſon (5) of our time, a man of tolerable learning and a great Arithmetician, alledged, ‘not with any ill deſign, as I think, but becauſe he ‘truſted too much to his numbers and calculations, ‘grounded upon four words of one of the Evangeliſts, ‘*Videbunt in quem pupugerunt*, from which he drew ‘his computations, taking the ſix V. the two I. the ‘D. and M. and out of theſe forming a cypher of ‘years, to make his pariſhioners believe in an arithmetical ſermon, with which he entertained them, ‘that the end of the world was come, ſo as to aſſign ‘the day and the hour. He ſo much inſiſted upon ‘it, that many ſimpletons gave credit to him, and, ‘as the cuſtom of fools is, they reſolved before every ‘thing periſhed to live merrily, and ſo they ſpent ‘their all in good eating and drinking. . . . . When ‘the day and hour fixed by him was near, thoſe who ‘had believed in his ſermons met in a chapel, very ‘devoutly expecting the end of the world; and that ‘they might be the better prepared for it, he preached ‘a new ſermon to them, ſuited to this fancy of his. ‘Before he had done, there aroſe a violent ſtorm in ‘the air with thunder and lightening, which was ‘part of his prophecy. This made the poor creatures ‘imagine that their hour for leaving the world was ‘come. But ſoon after the ſtorm ceaſed, and the ſky ‘appeared as it was before; upon which the miſerable ‘pariſhioners perceiving that the parſon had impoſed ‘upon them, and that they had been fooliſhly induced ‘by his perſwaſion to ſit at table longer than it was ‘convenient for them, enraged at ſuch an affront, ‘were preparing to fall foul upon him, with an intention to drub him ſoundly, nay marry to diſpatch ‘him upon the ſpot, if he had not quickly made his ‘eſcape, and if ſome of them, more compoſed than ‘the reſt, had not mitigated their anger (6).’ Simon Goulart, Camerarius's French tranſlator, obſerves in his additions that there were *ſome moderns who, laying down falſe principles, and making groundleſs ſuppoſitions, have preſumed to fix the end of the world about the year* 1696 (7). The event has ſhewn that they were miſtaken.

Perhaps it will be aſked whether it is better to follow Camerarius who puts down the year 1532, or Wendelinus who puts 1533, and who ſuppoſes that Stifelius made uſe of the word *transfixerunt*, and not of *pupugerunt*, in the paſſage of the Evangeliſt? I anſwer ſome people affirm that Stifelius had adopted both theſe calculations. See Spondanus's narrative in the following remark.

[*C*] *Spondanus tells this ſtory with other circumſtances.*] Michael Stifelius, ſays he (8), an apoſtate Monk, born at Eſlingen, propheſied that the end of the world would come in the month of October 1532. He took Luther for that angel of the Revelation who flew through the midſt of heaven, in order to preach the goſpel to the inhabitants of the earth; and as for himſelf he fancied that he was the ſeventh angel, whoſe trumpet was to proclaim the end of the world *. He was not inclinable to proclaim this coming of JESUS CHRIST, but the expreſs command of GOD obliged him to it. Having communicated his thoughts to Luther, he wrote a book wherein he declared that in the tenth month of the year 1533, on the ſecond day of the forty-ſecond week, at eight a clock of the morning, JESUS CHRIST would come upon earth to judge the world. He grounded his calculation upon thoſe words, JESUS NAZARENUS REX JUDÆORUM, and upon theſe VIDEBUNT IN QUEM TRANSFIXERUNT. The numeral letters of the firſt paſſage give 1532: thoſe of the ſecond 1533. The year 1532 being elapſed, he was ſo obſtinately perſuaded that his prediction would be accompliſhed in the year 1533, that he was amazed at Luther's adviſing him to have other thoughts, and at his not ſeeing a thing ſo evident. The 18th of October, which was St Luke's day, not proving to be the day of judgment, as he had poſitively affirmed it would, every body laughed at his predictions. Nevertheleſs though he was impriſoned at Wittemberg, he ſeverely reprimanded Luther for exhorting him to be more wiſe, and to profit by the double experience of his miſtake, and perſiſted all his life in the vain employment of changing his hypotheſis by the ſuperſtitious virtue of numbers. He died in the year 1567, aged fourſcore (9). Selneccerus, who was preſent at his death, ſays that he received it with ſigns of mockery. Luther, who held it raſh in Stifelius to prefix a certain time, was nevertheleſs firmly perſuaded that the end of the world was to come ſoon, and he always expected it after the vernal Equinox in the month of April about Eaſter-tide, when every thing that the winter had killed returns to life. He thought he had reaſon to believe that JESUS CHRIST would return at that time. So ſays Spondanus, but he brings no quotation to vouch for him. Mr Teiſſier and Moreri have erred about the cypher: for they quote Spondanus as having applied this fact to the year 1553.

[*D*] *I do not think that we ought to diſtinguiſh this Michael Stifelius from him whoſe arithmetical works were highly commended, and who died in the year* 1567.] Quenſted ſpeaks of one Michael Stifelius born at Eſlingen ſpeak elſewhere (c), and who was miniſter at Eſslingen in the year 1525 (d). He was expelled that church, and retired into Auſtria, where he was preacher to a perſon of quality (e) to whom Luther recommended him as a learned, pious, modeſt, and diligent man (f). They were obliged to diſmiſs him in the year 1527 (g). He had been an Auguſtin-friar at Eſslingen (h). He writ a Poem in the German tongue upon the conformity of Luther's doctrine with that of Jeſus Chriſt (i). For the reſt, he was not the only perſon that inſpired the country people with indoIence under pretext that the end of the world was near. Bredenbach tells us that one Campanus did the ſame thing in the country of Juliers [E].

---

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 324.

(3) Id. ibid. *pag.* 326, 327.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) *It is in the Latin* quidam Parochus.

(6) Camerarius, Meditations Hiſtor. *Tom. i, livr. iii, chap. i, pag.* 203, *Lyon* 1610.

(7) Id. ibid. *pag.* 208.

(8) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1533, *num.* 15.

* Revelat. X.

(9) Permanſit uſque ad vitæ exitum (qui contigit anno Chriſti 1567 octogenario) in ſuis ſubinde renovatis fatuitatibus ex numerorum vana ſuperſtitione. *Id. ibid.*

(c) In the remarks [B] and [H] of the article BORE.

(d) Seckend. Hiſt. Luther. *lib. ii, pag.* 16.

(e) Id. ibid. *pag.* 84.

(f) Id. ibid. *lib. iii, pag.* 122.

(g) Id. ibid.

(h) *Idem, in* Scholiis ad I Indicem, *num.* 76.

(i) Id. ibid.

Eſslingen upon the Necker, a great Arithmetician, and paſtor to ſome Evangelical Churches: 'Cujus 'libri Arithmetici, *adds he*, reconditiore numerorum 'ſcientia referti in magno, uti debent, pretio inter 'doctos habentur (10). - - - *Whoſe arithmetical books 'are filled with a deeper knowledge of numbers, and on 'that account are deſervedly in great eſteem with the 'learned.*' Thuanus makes uſe of the ſame words, ſpeaking of the death of Stifelius in the year 1567: a man, as he obſerves, who had been a long time Profeſſor in Saxony and Pruſſia, and who died at Iena in Thuringia, when he was fourſcore years of age (11). According to Voſſius he died there at the age of fifty-eight (12); but I am more inclined to believe Bucholcer, who ſays that he died in that place on the 19th of April 1567, in the 81ſt year of his age, after having been miniſter to ſeveral churches in Saxony and Pruſſia (13). I do indeed believe that he was not a Profeſſor, as Thuanus pretends; but a parſon. However that be, his arithmetical works are called very exact by the ſame Bucholcer. You will find in Voſſius (14), 1, That Poſſevin has obſerved that Stifelius's Arithmetic printed at Nuremberg, with a Preface by Melanchthon, has the approbation of great men. 2, That in the opinion of Joſeph Blancanus (15) the method in which Stifelius has treated Algebra, and all the parts of Arithmetic, is an excellent one. Voſſius places the edition of his complete Arithmetic in the year 1544, and obſerves that Stifelius publiſhed a ſyſtem of Arithmetic according to the Italian practice, a treatiſe of Algebra, and likewiſe an eccleſiaſtical computation in the German tongue.

You will obſerve that Wendelinus, Spondanus, &c. agree that the Stifelius who foretold the end of the world was an excellent Arithmetician.

Apply here the reflexion which I made (16) upon the long life of Comenius.

[E] *Bredenbach tells us that one Campanus did the ſame thing in the country of Juliers.*] He inſinuates as if an artful fellow had encouraged this man in his whimſical notions, in order that he might purchaſe at a cheaper rate the lands of the credulous country people. I ſhall give the ſtory compleat, and obſerve that it is taken from Lindanus, who is not a very authentic writer. 'Perſuaſerat Joannes Campanus miſeris ruſticis, non longè à fluvio Rura degentibus, 'quod vel hodie res ipſa loquitur, & teſtantur vicini, 'ne amplius auſteri ſeſe frangerent agriculturæ laboribus: non ſeſe fruſtra duris vexarent, diutius fatigarent, enecarent, fodiendi, arandi, metendi ſudoribus; inſtare diem judicii; brevi omnia inundationibus aquarum delenda: indulgerent genio igitur: 'molliter ſeſe tractarent, ſuavius viverent, quod miſellæ ſupererat vitæ ruſticanæ, omnia prope diem 'certo certius peritura. Illi ſtolidi ſtolido ac deliro 'Prophetæ creduli ſuos vendunt agellos: qui illos 'emit ſenſis non fruſtrà ſeſe illum aluiſſe Prophetam (17). - - - *John Campanus had perſuaded the poor 'peaſants near the river Rura, as the thing itſelf appears at this day, and as their neighbours teſtify, that 'they ſhould no longer conſume their ſtrength by the rough 'labours of huſbandry, nor haraſs, fatigue, and kill themſelves to no purpoſe, by the heavy toils of digging, ploughing, and reaping; for that the day of judgment was at 'hand, and every thing was in a ſhort time to be deſtroyed by a deluge of water. For this reaſon he exhorted them to make much of themſelves, and to ſpend 'the poor remains of their country life in eaſe and pleaſure, nothing being more certain than that all things 'were ſoon to periſh. Thoſe poor creatures giving credit 'to a ſimple and delirious prophet ſold their lands: you 'may gueſs that the perſon who bought them did not 'keep that prophet for nothing.*' He quotes afterwards an epigram of Martial upon a man, who had ſpent a very great eſtate in leſs than a year, becauſe an Aſtrologer had foretold him that he was to die ſoon.

Dixerat aſtrologus periturum te cito, Munna,
 Nec, puto, mentitus dixerat ille tibi.
Nam tu dum metuis, ne quid poſt fata relinquas,
 Hauſiſti patrias luxurioſus opes.
Biſque tuum decies non toto tabuit anno:
 Dic mihi, non hoc eſt, Munna, perire cito (18)?

Munna, th' Aſtrologer conjectur'd well
Who did that you ſhould periſh ſoon foretel:
Since while you haſten'd to prevent your fate,
In luxury you ſpent your whole eſtate,
And were in leſs than one ſhort twelve-month found
To have conſum'd two hundred thouſand pound.
Now, Munna, tell me, ſince the caſe is ſo,
Is this to periſh very ſoon or no.

Compare with this the conſequences of the great promiſes of Comenius (19), and theſe words of Camerarius: 'Niſeus, tyrant of Syracuſe, did as much (20) a 'great while ago; for being told by a Soothſayer that 'the end of his life drew near, he ſpent all that he 'had upon feaſts, looſe women, and other debauches 'of the like nature. The ſame thing is ſaid to have 'happened in our days to a rich man at Lyons, who 'having cauſed a calculation of his nativity to be 'made, and fancying that his death was certainly 'foretold, very raſhly diſtributed all his wealth, as 'if he had had one foot already in the grave, ſo 'that he left himſelf nothing. But being deceived by 'the Aſtrologer, he was forced to beg charity for his 'ſubſiſtence, having lived to a great age, and much 'longer than he expected (21).'

(10) Quenſt. de Patriis Illuſtr. *pag.* 164.

(11) Thuanus, *lib. xli, pag. m.* 832.

(12) Voſſius, de Scientiis Mathem. *pag. m.* 317.

(13) Bucholc. Index Chronol. *ad ann.* 1567, *pag.* 620.

(14) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, *he quotes* Poſſevin, Biblioth. Sel. *lib. xv, cap. iii, pag.* 182. *Edit. Rome.*

(15) In Mathematicorum Chronologia, *pag.* 60.

(16) In the remarks [I] and [K], of article COMENIUS.

(17) Bredenbachius, Sacrarum Collationum, *lib. xxxiii, pag. m.* 711, *ex Lindano lib. i, cap. ix, de fugiendis Idolis.*

(18) Martial. Epigr. lxxxiv, *lib. ix.*

(19) See the remark [K], of the article COMENIUS.

(20) That is to ſay, as much as the peaſants, of whom he had been juſt ſpeaking, as we have ſeen in the remark [B].

(21) Camerarius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 203.

STILPO

STILPO, a native of Megara, was one of the moſt famous antient Philoſophers. He was either diſciple of Euclid himſelf, or of ſome of Euclid's diſciples; and acquired ſuch a reputation by his eloquence, and the acuteneſs of his wit, that people left the other ſchools in crowds to go to Megara, in order to improve by his lectures (a). In a journey he made to Athens, trades-people left their ſhops to ſee him (b). Being jeſted upon by reaſon of that curioſity, he had an anſwer ready [A]. Some ſay he kept

(a) Diogen. Laertius, *lib. ii, num.* 113.

(b) Id. ibid. *num.* 119.

[A] *Being jeſted upon by reaſon of that curioſity, he had an anſwer ready.*] Every body is eager to ſee you, ſaid one to him, they admire you as a wild beaſt; ſuch an eagerneſs is like that which people expreſs to ſee a bear or an elephant. You are miſtaken, anſwered he, they admire me as a true man. θαυμάζουσί σε ὡς θηρίον· οὐ μὲν οὖν, εἶπεν ἀλλ' ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἀληθινόν. *Admirantur te veluti belluam. Minime, inquit ille, ſed velut hominem verum* (1). This thought was not unlike that of Diogenes the Cynic, who, with a lanthorn in his hand, looked for a man in ſuch places where he ſaw moſt people. The men he ſaw having not a human reality and perfection, ſeemed to him counterfeit men; they had nothing of the man but the name. In this ſenſe Stilpo, a true and real man, ſhould have been accounted by the Athenians

(1) Diogenes Laertius, *lib. ii, num.* 119.

kept a miſtreſs beſides his lawful wife; but this is not certain [*B*]. He was naturally very much given to wine and women; and yet it did not appear that he made himſelf drunk, or that he lived a leud life: he had corrected the bad inclinations of his temper by the ſtudy of Philoſophy [*C*]. The fear of the gods did not work that effect in him; for he is reckoned among Atheiſts, or among thoſe Philoſophers, who had little religion [*D*]. Some alledge, as a proof of his impiety, a thing which happened

nians a more ſcarce and admirable animal, for which trades-people ſhould leave their work, than the moſt extraordinary beaſts of the Indies.

[*B*] *Some ſay that he kept a miſtreſs . . . but this is not certain.*] Diogenes Laërtius ſays ſo only upon the credit of an inconſiderable author. Καὶ γυναῖκα ἠγάγετο, καὶ ἑταίρῃ συνῆν Νικαρέτῃ, ὥς φησί πȣ καὶ Ὀνήτωρ: Ac præter uxorem quam duxerat, Nicarete etiam pellice utebatur, ut Onetor ait (2). - - - - *Onetor ſays, that, beſides a wife he had married, he likewiſe kept Nicarete, a concubine.* Had there been any ground for this ſlander, Athæneus would not have forgot to mention it, ſince he makes it his buſineſs to cry down every body upon that account, eſpecially the Poets, the Wits, and the Philoſophers. But he only ſays that Nicarete, a courtezan, illuſtrious for her birth and learning, heard Stilpo's lectures. Would he not have added, that ſhe was his concubine, if he had believed what Onetor ſays of it? Νικαρέτη δὲ ἡ Μεγαρὶς (3) ἐκ ἀγεννὴς ἦν ἑταίρα, ἀλλὰ καὶ γονέων καὶ κατὰ παιδείαν ἐπέραστ☉ ἦν. ἠκρόατο δὲ Στίλπων☉ τȣ̃ φιλοσόφȣ. *Megarenſis quoque Nicarete non obſcura & ignobilis meretrix fuit, ſed & natalium ſplendore, & doctrinâ perquàm amabilis. Philoſopho namque Stilponi operam dederat* (4). See in the following remark the glorious teſtimony that was given to our Philoſopher's perfect chaſtity.

[*C*] *He had corrected the bad inclinations of his temper by the ſtudy of Philoſophy.*] This we find in a paſſage of Cicero. 'Stilponem Megaricum philoſophum, acutum ſanè hominem, & probatum temporibus illis accepimus. Hunc ſcribunt ipſius familiares & ebrioſum, & mulieroſum fuiſſe: neque hoc ſcribunt vituperantes, ſed potiùs ad laudem: vitioſam enim naturam ab eo ſic edomitam, & compreſſam eſſe doctrina, ut nemo unquam vinolentum illum, nemo in eo libidinis veſtigium viderit (5). - - - - *We are told that Stilpo, of Megara, the Philoſopher, was truly a man of parts, and had a very good character in thoſe times. His acquaintances relate that he had a ſtrong inclination for wine and women; nor do they write this in a cenſorious way, but rather as commending him: for he ſo curbed and ſubdued the vitious tendency of his nature, by the help of Philoſophy, that no body ever ſaw him drunk, nor perceived in him the leaſt ſymptom of leudneſs.*' We ſhall ſee below the noble encomiums beſtowed upon his virtue by Plutarch (6), and Athenæus (7).

[*D*] *He is reckoned among Atheiſts, or among thoſe Philoſophers who had little religion.*] He ſpoke his thoughts too freely; ſo that he was baniſhed, notwithſtanding the ſubterfuges wherewith he endeavoured to rectify his expreſſions in the Areopagus. I ſhall uſe La Mothe le Vayer's words, and at the ſame time correct them when there is occaſion for it. *Stilpo was more cautious; for being aſked, at an improper time, by Crates, whether our prayers and worſhip are acceptable to the gods, he ſmartly anſwered, that ſuch a queſtion ſhould not be aſked in the ſtreet, but in private, and in a cloſet: which is the ſame anſwer that Dion* (8) *made to another, who aſked him, whether or no there were any gods. The great Pontiff Cotta gave alſo the ſame anſwer to Velleius, who ſuppoſed that it was a very difficult thing to deny the exiſtence of the gods.* Credo, *ſays he,* ſi in concione quæratur, ſed in ejuſmodi ſermone & conſeſſu facillimum. *But Stilpo found himſelf much perplexed upon another occaſion, being ſummoned to appear before the Areopagites for ſaying that the Minerva of Phidias was not a god: neverthelesſ he came off cunningly enough, by ſaying that ſhe was a goddeſs, and not a god, making a diſtinction between male and female. Which made Theodorus aſk him, as he was going from the court, whether he had ſeen Pallas under her petticoats, ſince he ſpoke ſo pertinently of her ſex. Neverthelesſ he was baniſhed for this freedom of ſpeech* (9). To ſatisfy every body, I ſhall relate the thing in the words of the original. Κράτητ☉ αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσαντ☉, εἰ οἱ θεοὶ χαίρȣσι ταῖς προσκυνήσεσι καὶ εὐχαῖς; φασὶν εἰπεῖν,

Περὶ τȣ́των μὴ ἐρώτα, ἀνόητε, ἐν ὁδῷ, ἀλλὰ μόνον· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ Βίωνα ἐρωτηθέντα εἰ θεοί εἰσιν, εἰπεῖν,

Ὀυκ ἀπ' ἐμȣ̃ σκεδάσεις ὄχλον ταλαπείριε πρέσβυ.

Quum rogaſſet illum Crates an Dii precationibus ac divinis honoribus gaudeant, Noli me inquit, fatue, in via de hiſce rogare, ſed ſolum ac ſeorſum. Hoc ipſum & Bionem interrogatum, an ſint Dii, dixiſſe tradunt,

Tunc ſenex turbam à nobis propellere curas (10)?

Being aſked by Crates, &c. . . . . It is ſaid that Bion, when the queſtion was put to him, whether there was any gods, made the ſame anſwer;

Old man, why do you not remove the croud,
That ſtandeth near me? . . . . .

Diogenes Laërtius means, without doubt, Bion the Boryſthenite, one of the boldeſt Atheiſts mentioned by the Antients. The conformity of his thought, with that of Stilpo, is very diſadvantageous to the latter. Cotta in Cicero was little more orthodox, ſince he found it no difficult thing to deny the exiſtence of the gods, but when there was ground to be afraid of informers, and of the fury of the people. 'Queritur primum in ea quæſtione quæ eſt de natura Deorum, ſintne Dii, necne ſint? Difficile eſt negare credo, ſi in concione quæratur; ſed in hujuſcemodi ſermone & conſeſſu facillimum (11). - - - *In the queſtion concerning the nature of the gods, the firſt thing to be aſked is, Whether there are any gods or not? If ſuch a queſtion were put to one in a public aſſembly, I grant that it would be difficult to chuſe the negative; but in a converſation and meeting like this there is nothing more eaſy.*' Thoſe men would have made a great alteration in the maxim mentioned by Balzac; *De divinis etiam vera dicere periculoſum eſt* (12). - - - *In religious matters it is even dangerous to ſpeak the truth:* they would have put in *præcipue, above all*, inſtead of *etiam, even*. They had been right in a certain ſenſe; for the Pagans would not allow that the ideas of the unity and perfect ſimplicity of GOD ſhould take place of their pernicious and ridiculous opinions concerning the Divine Nature (13).

A STRANGE opinion of the Heathens concerning the ſtatues of their gods.

Here follows an inſtance of the blindneſs of the Heathens. Can any thing be more ſtrange than the opinion of the Athenians, otherwiſe an ingenious and learned nation, concerning the ſtatues of their gods? Did they not fancy that the work of a ſculptor became a GOD, as ſoon as it was conſecrated to a deity? Did they not believe that Phidias's Minerva was the very goddeſs that ſprang out of Jupiter's head? Doubtleſs they had ſuch a fooliſh conceit, otherwiſe there had been no neceſſity for Stilpo to uſe ſuch a diſtinction as he made to vindicate himſelf. His crime was this: he aſked one day, whether Minerva, the daughter of Jupiter, was a god: he was anſwered, that ſhe was. But, replied he, that Minerva is Phidias's work, and not Jupiter's daughter; and therefore ſhe is not a god. Whereupon he was cited before the Areopagites, and did not deny what he had ſaid: he pretended that he had expreſſed himſelf exactly; Minerva, ſaid he, is not a god, but a goddeſs, for the gods are males. Ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ εἰς Ἄρειον πάγον προσκληθέντα, μὴ ἀρνήσασθαι, φάσκειν δ' ὀρθῶς διειλέχθαι. μὴ γὰρ εἶναι αὐτὴν θεὸν, ἀλλὰ θεάν· θεȣ̀ς δὲ εἶναι τȣ̀ς ἄῤῥενας. *Qua ex re quum in Arium pagum pertractus fuiſſet, nihil inficiatum ferunt, imo recte ſe loquutum aſſeruiſſe: non enim deum eſſe, ſed deam: deos quippe mares eſſe* (14). It is plain, that if the Pagans had made a real diſtinction between the ſtatues and the gods to whom they were conſecrated, there had been no neceſſity for Stilpo to alledge the difference between a god male and a god female, in order to juſtify himſelf. This happened to him in a temple [*E*], and perhaps they have done him no wrong. He had an extreme indifference for the good things of fortune, and looked upon the qualities of his ſoul as his only good. Which appears from the anſwer he made after the deſtruction of his country [*F*]. Nay, he looked upon the infamy of his daughter as an inſignificant thing; for he could never be brought to own that it was a diſhonour or a misfortune to him. Many learned men want ſuch a turn of mind [*G*]. The innovations

---

(2) Id. ibid. *num.* 114.

(3) He had been ſpeaking of another Nicarete, a courtezan, *p.* 593.

(4) Athen. *lib.* xiii, *pag.* 596.

(5) Cicero de Fato, *cap.* v.

(6) See the remark [*H*], at the end.

(7) See the remark [*E*].

(8) It ſhould be *Bion.*

(9) La Mothe le Vayer, Dialogue de la diverſité des Religions, *pag. m.* 358, 359. *It is the laſt of the five Dialogues of Oraſius Tubero.*

(10) Diog. Laërt. *lib. ii, num.* 117, *pag.* 148.

(11) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, *lib. i, cap. xxxii.*

(12) Balzac, Lettre III à Chapelain, *livr. i, pag. m.* 21.

(13) See, above, the words of Joſephus, citation (116), of the article PYTHAGORAS.

(14) Diog. Laërt. *lib. ii, num.* 116, *pag.* 148.

This way of clearing himſelf was inſignificant, ſince the word Θεός among the Greeks, and the word *Deus* among the Latins (15) did very properly belong to the goddeſſes. The beſt apology had been to ſay, that Minerva, as Jupiter's daughter, was a god; but that the piece of metal out of which Phidias had made a ſtatue conſecrated to Minerva, was not a god. This apology would have been a very good one, if Stilpo had been arraigned before other judges; but it ſignified nothing in the court of the Areopagites, and therefore Stilpo did not make uſe of it. He was not ignorant that the gods were thought to incorporate themſelves in their ſtatues, and therefore it was believed that the ſtatues were metamorphoſed into gods by virtue of the conſecration.

[*E*] *A thing which happened to him in a temple.*] All thoſe who eat garlic were forbidden to enter into the temple of the mother of the gods. Stilpo had ſo little regard for that prohibition, that he went into the temple of that goddeſs after he had eat garlic, and even lay in it. He dreamed that the goddeſs appeared to him, and ſaid, *Stilpo, you are a Philoſopher, and yet you offend againſt the holy laws.* He thought he anſwered her, *Give me ſomething better to eat, and I will engage to leave off garlic.* Menage alledges this particular as a proof that this Philoſopher had no religion (16). And indeed this ſavours of a prophane man, who derided both the law and the goddeſs. I confeſs that Athenæus, who relates this adventure, makes a quite contrary judgment of it; for he alledges it as a ſign of Stilpo's temperance. Στίλπων δ' οὐ κατεπλάγη τὴν ἐγκράτειαν καταφαγὼν σκόροδα καὶ κατακοιμηθεὶς ἐν τῷ τῆς μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν ἱερῷ. ἀπείρητο δὲ τῷ τούτων τὶ φαγόντι μηδὲ εἰσιέναι. ἐπιστάσης δὲ αὐτῷ τῆς θεοῦ κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους, καὶ εἰπούσης ὅτι φιλόσοφος ὢν ὦ Στίλπων παραβαίνεις τὰ νόμιμα; καὶ τὸν δοκεῖν ἀποκρίνασθαι κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους. σὺ δέ μοι παρέχε ἐσθίειν, καὶ σκορόδοις οὐ χρήσομαι. Enimverò Stilpo ſua confiſus temperantia, non ideò perterritus eſt, quod cum allium comediſſet in templo matris Deûm obdormierit. Arcebatur enim delubro qui horum quidquam guſtaſſet. Ei porrò ſomnum capienti, adſtans dea cum diceret, Philoſophus es, ô Stilpon, & ſacras tamen leges violas, viſum ſibi fuiſſe hæc reſpondere in ſomnis, Præbe mihi quod edam, & allio non veſcar (17). - - - - *Stilpo, truſting to his temperance, was not therefore frightened, because he had ſlept in the temple of the mother of the gods, after having eaten garlic; though every one that had taſted any thing of that kind, was forbidden ſo much as to enter there. He dreamed that the goddeſs appeared to him,* &c.

[*F*] *The anſwer he made after the deſtruction of his country.*] Demetrius Poliorcetes having ſubdued Megara, gave orders that Stilpo's houſe ſhould be ſpared, and that whatever was taken from it ſhould be reſtored. I relate the thing as I find it in Diogenes Laertius (18). Were I to deſcribe it of my own head, I would add ſomething to it, I would ſay that the ſoldiers plundered Stilpo's houſe without any regard to the orders of Demetrius; but this is not the thing in queſtion: The queſtion is, that Demetrius writ to Stilpo, to know of him what he had loſt in the plundering of the town. Stilpo anſwered him that he had loſt nothing, ſince no body had deprived him of his reaſon and learning. He added ſeveral other things to inſpire him with humanity and a noble deſire of being beneficial to men; and the prince was ſo moved with his advice, that he conformed to it. I believe ſeveral devout people would do the ſame; but I believe alſo that ſome would go by this maxim, *Charity well ordered begins at home.* Should a prince, after the plundering of a town, promiſe them the reſtitution of all their effects, they would certainly take hold of ſuch an opportunity to inſpire him with clemency, and recommend to him the welfare of the people; but they would not forget themſelves; they would ſend him an exact liſt of all their loſſes, and endeavour to make them up with advantage. But here is a Philoſopher who was far from being a devout man, who uſes his intereſt with a victorious prince, to no other end than to perſuade him to put a ſtop to the diſorders of war, and to beſtow his favours upon the people; he does not ſend a liſt of what he had loſt. His houſe has been plundered, they offer him a full reſtitution; but he anſwers that he has loſt nothing, and that his goods did not conſiſt in ſuch things as the ſoldiers could take from him. This is doubtleſs, very generous. I wiſh Seneca had not ſuppoſed that Stilpo had loſt his wife and children; for a man who boaſts in ſuch a caſe that he has loſt nothing, carries his Philoſophy too far. It is probably a falſe gloſs of Seneca; he is the only author that mentions ſuch a loſs. (19) ‘Omne intra ſe bonum terminabit, & dicet quod Stilpon ille dixit, Stilpon quem Epicuri epiſtola inſequitur. Hic enim capta patria, amiſſis liberis, amiſſa uxore, cum ex incendio publico ſolus, & tamen beatus exiret, interroganti Demetrio, cui cognomen ab exitio urbium Poliorcetes fuit, Num quid perdidiſſet? Omnia, inquit, bona mea mecum ſunt. Ecce vir fortis ac ſtrenuus, ipſam hoſtis ſui victoriam vicit. Nihil, inquit, perdidi. Dubitare illum coëgit, an viciſſet. Omnia mea mecum ſunt. Juſtitia, virtus, temperantia, prudentia, hoc ipſum, nihil bonum putare quod eripi poſſit (20). - - - - *He will make all good terminate within himſelf, and he will ſay as Stilpo ſaid; Stilpo, againſt whom Epicurus inveighs in his epiſtle. That Philoſopher, having loſt his wife and children, and been an eye-witneſs to the deſtruction of his country, whilſt he eſcaped out of the public flames alone, tho' ſtill happy, was aſked by Demetrius, ſirnamed Poliorcetes, from his deſtroying ſo many cities, Whether he had loſt any thing? To which he anſwered, I have all my goods with me. In this manner did that brave and reſolute man triumph over his victorious enemy. I have loſt nothing, ſays he. He forced Demetrius to doubt, whether he had overcome. I have all my goods with me. Juſtice, virtue, temperance, and prudence, were his goods; he reckoned nothing good which can be taken from us.*’ It is ſaid (21), that Ptolemy, ſirnamed Soter, having taken Megara, offered money to Stilpo, and deſired him to take ſhipping with him. That Philoſopher accepted of a little money, and refuſed the honour of following that prince into Egypt. He retired into the iſle of Ægina till Ptolemy returned into his kingdom. This ſhews a great diſintereſtedneſs, tho' it falls very ſhort of the preceding inſtance.

[*G*] *Nay, he looked upon the infamy of his daughter as an inſignificant thing . . . . . Many learned men want ſuch a turn of mind.*] He married her to Simmias: It is not ſaid whether the huſband of that leud woman did patiently bear his diſgrace; but we are told that the Father expreſſed an extraordinary indifference. Your daughter's behaviour is a diſgrace to you, ſaid one to him. Not at all, anſwered he, ſhe can no more caſt a blot upon my reputation, than I can adorn her's. Ταύτης οὐ κατὰ τρόπον βιούσης, εἶπέ τις πρὸς τὸν Στίλπωνα, ὡς καταισχύνοι αὐτόν· ὁ δέ, ΟΥ' μᾶλλον (εἶπεν) ἢ ἐγὼ ταύτην κοσμῶ. *Hæc dum laſcivius viveret, Stilponique à quodam renuntiatum eſſet eam ſibi probro eſſe, Non, inquit, iſta majori mihi probro eſt, quam ego illi ornamento* (22). See in Plutarch (23) how he maintained that the ſins of his daughter were only a misfortune to herſelf. Happy are thoſe who can give ſuch a turn to their minds.

A LIST of ſome learned men diſgraced by the leudneſs of their families.

Such an indifference would have been very neceſſary to many learned men, in order to make their lives eaſy; for their wives or daughters have been very unchaſte: and I think there are ſtill ſome inſtances of ſuch a diſorder. Fernelius (24) and Druſius (25) have been in that category; and Cujas likewiſe: *The daughter of that great man was of ſuch an amorous temper that* innovations of his Logic cannot be approved; he rejected the universals [*H*]: and tho' it

---

(15) *See Menage's Notes*, in hunc locum Laërtii, *p.* 128.

(16) Fuit Stilpon parcus Deorum cultor & infrequens, imo ἄθεος. Narrat Athenæus X. 5. in Templo matris Deûm allium &c. *Menagius, in Laërt. lib. ii, num.* 117, *pag.* 128.

(17) Athenæus, *lib. x, cap. v, pag.* 422.

(18) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 115.

(19) Diogenes Laërtius ſays nothing of it, nor Plutarch in the two places wherein he mentions Stilpo's anſwer, *viz.* in his tract, *de educatione puerorum*, pag. 5, and in the tract *de animi tranquillitate*, pag. 475.

(20) Seneca, Epiſt. IX, *pag. m.* 178, 179. *See alſo the ſame* Seneca de conſtantia ſapientis, *cap.* 5.

(21) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 115.

(22) Id. ibid. *num.* 114.

(23) Plut. de tranquillitate animi, *pag.* 468.

(24) See the article FERNELIUS, citation (32).

(25) See the article DRUSIUS, remark [*O*].

that though Thuanus procured her a husband when she was but fifteen years of age, having doubtless observed that she was in haste, yet he could not prevent her anticipating her marriage; and after she was married, *she carried on her love intrigues so openly, that her husband, who was an honest gentleman, died of grief for it. She married another, and grew worse and worse* (26). The author from whom I have these words, had been saying, That *the scholars, who did what they pleased with her, called it* commenting upon Cujas's works, *and that some of them,* out of respect to her father's memory, abstained from such an infamous commerce. It is said, That a colleague of Cujas was not so discreet, and that he caressed his daughter, even during her father's life. Paul Manutius was in the same case. He put his daughter into a convent, hoping by that means to free himself from the troublesome care of looking after her; but even after she had made her vows, she writ several letters to him one after another to let him know, that if he did not take her out of that confinement, she would steal away. That poor man made several journeys, and used so many sollicitations, that he obtained from the Court of Rome the dispensation his daughter desired. She quickly got a husband, and though he was a very honest man, she gave up herself to all manner of dissoluteness. Her father did not sink under his grief, nor under the inconveniences occasioned from time to time by the remains of a venereal disease; but it made him very uneasy. *Sacris in claustris jampridem conjecta filia, eo dementiæ, ac furoris abrepta est impetu, ut inde se clàm egressuram minaretur misero patri, nisi omni studio ipsam extrahere niteretur. Quò factum, ut is plurium itinerum vexatione, morosaque apud Romanos judices prehensatione, æger animo, adflictusque corpore, tandem hujusmodi poculum, licet peramarum, tamen justa necessitate quæsitum exorbere sit coactus, inusitato exemplo virginem pluribus annis Deo dicatam, mundanis iterum angustiis devovendi, quæ cum posteà honesto conjugi nupta, prava se libidinis fœdarit indole, infeliciterque peregerit, intestino is mœrore correptus, reliquum vitæ solicita cogitatione traduxit. Quum vero etiam ei accesserint vetusta luis gallicæ inquinamenta, quibus alternatim vel temporum, vel locorum, vel victuum lædebatur mutatione, deterrimam prorsus vitæ conditionem sortitus videri potuit, nisi commoderato semper, infractoque animo, eam se perferre singulis ostendisset* (27). Some learned men have had a leud wife and a leud daughter at the same time. Barnabas Brissonius was one of them, if we believe Scaliger (28). Some others have been so deeply engaged in one half of that misfortune, that no mention is made of their daughters. Such was Paulus Perusinus, that learned man, so highly praised by Boccacio, and so well beloved by Robert, King of Naples. His wife made him a cuckold; and when he died, his finest writings were treacherously destroyed by his wife (29). I could give a list, wherein one might see great names, besides the learned of a low rank, 'quos 'fama obscura recondit. --- *who are lost in obscurity.*' but I leave it to those who will undertake to carry on the subject which Pierius Valerianus began (30). It will not be amiss to put in one class, by themselves, all the learned, who have been unhappy by their marriage. All those men wanted our Stilpo's indifference.

[*H*] *He rejected the universals.*] Being a sharp disputant (31), he rejected the very species. Who says man, says nothing of this or that man; he does not speak of one more than of the other, and therefore he says nothing of any body. The grass that is shown me, is not grass; for grass existed a thousand years ago; and therefore it is not the grass you shew me. Such was Stilpo's way of arguing (32). Perhaps it will be thought that he proposed those objections only to play upon an equivocation, which the Greek construction of the words afforded him, and to which the modern languages are not liable. There is a great difference between these two propositions, *Peter is man, Peter is a man*. The first is false and not used; the second is true, and generally used: but the Greeks and Latins would have made use of the same terms, to say, *That Peter is man, and that Peter is a man.* Hence it is that Stilpo might suppose that if he asked, shewing a cabbage, *What is that?* he would be answered, *It is cabbage*. But he might have answered, *You are mistaken; cabbage existed a thousand years ago; and therefore it is not what I shew you.* Such a cavil would be groundless now-a-days; for the answer to Stilpo's question would be, *It is a cabbage*, and not *it is cabbage*. Is it not then likely that this Philosopher had no other design than to divert himself with cavils, grounded upon the turn of the expression? I believe he had another thought, and that he was altogether against universal terms, and what they call Predicables in the Aristotelian schools. There was something real in his objection; it was more than playing upon words. I think he meant that the species is not affirmed of individuums, and that therefore the species are a meer chimera. Man is not more this man than that man, and it does not signify John rather than Peter; and therefore it signifies no body. His meaning appears more clearly in Plutarch than in Diogenes Laërtius. We read in Plutarch that Colotes violently exclaimed against Stilpo, and accused him of overturning human life; for how could we live, said Colotes, if we were not allowed to call a man good, or a captain; and if we should say *man is man*, and then by itself *good is good.* Τραγῳδίαν ἐπάγει τῷ Στίλπωνι, καὶ τὸν βίον ἀναιρεῖσθαι φησιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, λέγοντος ἕτερον ἑτέρου μὴ κατηγορεῖσθαι. πῶς γὰρ βιωσόμεθα, μὴ λέγοντες ἄνθρωπον ἀγαθὸν, μηδὲ ἄνθρωπον στρατηγὸν ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπον ἄνθρωπον, καὶ χωρὶς ἀγαθὸν ἀγαθόν. καὶ στρατηγὸν στρατηγόν. *Tragœdiam adversus Stilponem excitat, aitque ab eo vitam tolli, quod dixisset, Alterum de altero non prædicari. Quomodo enim, inquit, vivemus, si non dicamus hominem bonum, hominem imperatorem, sed hominem hominem seorsum, bonum bonum, ducem ducem* (33). It appears from this objection of Colotes, that Stilpo would not allow that a thing should be affirmed of another, but that every thing should be affirmed of itself, and that the attribute of a proposition should not reach farther than the subject. Here is the ground he went upon. That two things may be affirmed one of another, they ought to have the same nature; for in every affirmative and true proposition, the attribute and the subject are really the same. But man and good are not of the same nature; the definition of the one differs from the definition of the other; and therefore good and man cannot be joined together, one of them cannot be affirmed of the other. In like manner running cannot be attributed to a horse; it is an action, the definition whereof is not the same with that of a horse. Besides, should you affirm of a man that he is good, and of a horse that he runs, that is, should you affirm that good and man are the same thing, and that a horse and running are the same thing, how could you affirm that aliments and medicaments are good, and that lions and dogs run? Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ταυτὸν ἐστι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ ἀγαθὸν, καὶ τῷ ἵππῳ τὸ τρέχειν, πῶς καὶ σιτίου καὶ φαρμάκου τὸ ἀγαθόν; καὶ νὴ Δία πάλιν λέοντος καὶ κυνὸς τὸ τρέχειν, κατηγορούμενον δ' ἕτερον, οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἄνθρωπον ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἵππον τρέχειν λέγομεν. *Nam si idem sunt homo & bonum, & equus ac currere, quo pacto bonum etiam de cibo & medicamento dicetur? rursusque currere de leone & cane? Ergo non recte dicemus de homine prædicari bonum, de equo currere, cum diversa sint* (34). These are logical subtilties, whereby all languages would be confounded, and all men would be obliged to be silent or to speak ridiculously; and yet a Sophist trained up in the art of disputing, and used to cavils about abstractions, would give a great deal of trouble to his adversaries, if he undertook to maintain Stilpo's opinion to the utmost. He would not be immediately silenced by the distinction of the attributes *in concreto* and *in abstracto*, and by the *secundum id quod important in obliquo*, or *in recto*; it would be requisite to dispute a long time about this question, *utrum universale maneat in actuali prædicatione*. These trifles, though contemptible in themselves, and such as cannot perplex a man of a solid judgment, might nevertheless carry a wrong-headed man into Spinozism: 'Hæ nugæ seria ducunt in mala: ---- *These trifles 'bring on substantial evils*.' For those who deny universal attributes, cannot admit any individuum's that resemble one another. They must say, that two beings, of which the attribute of substance should be truly affirmed, would be one and and the same substance; which is to say in equivalent terms, that it were ſuppoſed that he did it only to ridicule the Sophiſts, he ſhould be blamed for his ill taſte and his wrong ſubtilties.

---

(26) Nouv. de la Rép. des Lettres, *for June* 1686, *pag. m.* 722.

(27) Joannes Imperialis, in Musæo Historico, *pag.* 108.

(28) In Scaligeranis, *Voce* Miron.

(29) Quem librum maximo hujus operis incommodo Biellæ impudicæ conjugis crimine, eo defuncto, cum pluribus aliis ex libris ejusdem, perditum comperi. *Boccacius, de Genealogia Deor. lib. xv, cap. vi, apud Vossium, de Hist. Lat. pag.* 526.

(30) *He wrote a book intituled,* De Infelicitate Literatorum.

(31) Δεινὸς δὲ ἄγαν ὢν ἐν τοῖς ἐριστικοῖς, ἀνῄρει καὶ τὰ εἴδη. Quum esset disputator acerrimus, species quoque tollebat. *Diogen. Laërt. ubi supra, num.* 119.

(32) *Apud.* Diogen. Laërt. *ibid.*

(33) Plutarch. adversus Colotem, *p.* 1119, *C.*

(34) Plutarch. ibid, *p.* 1120, *A.*

Inſtead of improving one's judgment, they were only fit to ſpoil it. A courtezan rallied him about it [*I*], in anſwer to what he ſaid to her by way of cenſure or rallery. I muſt not forget a dream of his, which ſeems to ſignify that he was a prieſt, and which ſhews, that even in his ſleep, he knew how to philoſophize [*K*].

there is but one ſubſtance in the whole univerſe. Common ſenſe agrees, in this point, with the moſt evident notions of Philoſophy. A peaſant does clearly conceive, without being miſtaken, that the whole eſſence of man belongs to each man, and ought to be affirmed of each man, and yet that each man is diſtinct from all others. And therefore he clearly conceives that the ſame eſſence, which is affirmed of Peter is not affirmed of Paul; but that the eſſence, which is affirmed of the one, is like the eſſence which is affirmed of the other. The Scotiſts are pitifully miſtaken in this point, with their *Univerſale formale à parte rei.* The moſt perplexing ſubtilties will never prevail over theſe notions in a man of ſolid parts; and whoever cannot reſolve them, may juſtly laugh at them. I remember that in a public diſputation, one of the opponents endeavoured to prove that there are no univerſals; he went about it thus: If there were univerſals, Genus's would have two ſpecies under them; but it is impoſſible: for a ſpecies cannot differ from another: I prove it. The difference of a ſpecies is altogether like the difference of another; therefore there are not two ſpecies. The conſequence is right, and I am going to ſhew the truth of the antecedent by an example. Rationality, the ſpecific difference of a man, does not at all differ from irrationality, the ſpecific difference of a beaſt. Rationality does not really differ from the human ſoul; therefore it is a ſubſtance: Irrationality (35) does not really differ from a beaſt; therefore it is a ſubſtance. Thus rationality, as it is a ſubſtance, does not differ from irrationality. How then does it differ from it? Are there ſome entities of realities in it that are not in irrationality? But are thoſe entities accidents or ſubſtances? If they are ſubſtances, they make no difference between rationality and irrationality. If they are accidents, they have the eſſence of being; but irrationality has it likewiſe, and therefore it perfectly reſembles them; they cannot therefore make it differ from rationality. If it be ſaid, that they differ from being, ſince they have the attribute of inherence, which being has not; I reply that inherence, is a being, and therefore cannot make an accident differ from being. And if you anſwer that inherence implies ſomething elſe beſides being, I repeat my inſtance: that other thing does neceſſarily contain the eſſence of being; it is therefore like being; and you will always have that objection in your way, though you ſhould ſuppoſe *in infinitum* that the conſtitutive character of inherence contains ſomething that has ſomething beſides being. This objection proves that being has not under it ſubſtance and accident, and that ſubſtance has not under it body and ſpirit, and conſequently that there are no univerſals, *Quod erat probandum.* The reſpondent did not apprehend the difficulty; nor did the preſident apprehend it much better. The aſſembly did not apprehend it neither, and the opponent was like to be hiſſed. Doubtleſs it was the beſt way to ſilence him: His argument was altogether wrong; for it would prove that there is no difference between white and black, pain and pleaſure.

If you conſult Ariſtotle's Metaphyſics, in that part of his work wherein he examines what concerns the unity of Being, you will ſee that the queſtion about univerſals was ſurrounded with a thouſand perplexing difficulties. He does not forget this objection? If being and unity are ſomething, how can there be ſeveral beings beſides that thing? How can there be more than one being? For what differs from being is nothing; and therefore we muſt conclude, as Parmenides did, that all beings are but one; becauſe, if there were many, they would be different from being, that is, they would be nothing at all. Εἰ δ᾽ ἔστι τὶ αὐτὸ ἓν καὶ αὐτὸ ὂν, ἀναγκαῖον οὐσίαν αὐτῶν εἶναι τὸ ὂν καὶ τὸ ἕν. οὐ γὰρ ἕτερόν τι καθόλου κατηγορεῖται, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα αὐτά. ἀλλὰ μὴν εἴ γ᾽ ἔσται τι αὐτὸ ὂν καὶ αὐτὸ ἓν, πολλὴ ἀπορία πῶς ἔσται τι παρὰ ταῦτα ἕτερον. λέγω δὲ πῶς ἔσται πλείω ἑνὸς τὰ ὄντα. τὸ γὰρ ἕτερον τοῦ ὄντος οὐκ ἔστιν. ὥστε κατὰ τὸν Παρμενίδου συμβαίνειν ἀνάγκη λόγον ἓν ἅπαντα εἶναι τὰ ὄντα, καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ ὄν. *Quòd ſi quid eſt ipſum unum, & ipſum ens, neceſſe eſt, eorum ſubſtantiam eſſe unum, & ens: non enim aliquid aliud univerſaliter prædicatur, ſed eadem ipſa. At vero ſi quid erit ipſum ens, & ipſum unum, magna dubitatio eſt, quonam modo aliquid aliud præter hæc erit. Dico autem quomodo entia erunt plura uno. Quod enim aliud ab ente eſt, non eſt. Quare ſecundum Parmenidis rationem, neceſſe eſt accidere omnia entia eſſe unum, & hoc eſſe ens* (36). It does not appear that Ariſtotle was able to reſolve that difficulty.

But to return to Stilpo. Colotes is blamed for two things: one is, that he exclaimed againſt the ſubtilties of that Philoſopher, without reſolving them categorically; the other is, that he pitched on a doctrine, in order to criticize upon it, which Stilpo advanced meerly out of a witty conceit (37), and to ridicule the Sophiſts of that time, by giving them a bone to pick. Plutarch was the more exaſperated at this choice of Colotes, becauſe a great many fine things might have been ſaid of Stilpo, of which Colotes did not ſpeak one word. It will appear from the following paſſage of Plutarch, that Stilpo was a very honeſt man. Μετὰ δὲ Σωκράτην καὶ Πλάτωνα προσμάχεται Στίλπωνι, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀληθινὰ δόγματα καὶ τοὺς λόγους τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, οἷς ἑαυτόν τε κατεκόσμει καὶ πατρίδα καὶ φίλους, καὶ τῶν βασιλέων τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν σπουδάσαντας, οὔτε γέγραφε, οὐδὲ ὅσον ἦν φρόνημα τῇ ψυχῇ μετὰ πραότητος καὶ μετριοπαθείας. ὧν δὲ παίζων, καὶ χρώμενος πρὸς τοὺς σοφιστὰς λογαρίων προὔβαλε γέλωτι αὐτοῖς, ἑνὸς μνησθεὶς, καὶ μηδὲν εἰπὼν πρὸς τοῦτο, μηδὲ λύσας τὴν πιθανότητα, τραγῳδίαν ἐπάγει τῷ Στίλπωνι. Poſt Socratem & Platonem Stilpo oppugnatur. Hujus quidem vera decreta, & ſermones, quibus ſeipſum, patriam, amicos regeſque ipſi operam navantes exornavit, tum animi elationem manſuetudini & affectuum mediocritati conjunctam, Colotes non retulit. Quas vero jocans ille ſophiſtis ridenſque objecit ſententiolas, harum unam allegans, cum neque refelliſſet neque ſolviſſet ipſe probabilitatem, tragœdiam adverſus Stilponem excitat (38). ---- *Next to Socrates and Plato, he falls upon Stilpo. As for the ſolid opinions of that Philoſopher, and his diſcourſes, by which he has done honour to himſelf, to his country, to his friends, and to the kings who favoured him, Colotes takes no notice at all of theſe, nor of his other good qualities, ſuch as his magnanimity, his gentleneſs, and his moderation. But from among the little objections which he makes to the Sophiſts by way of rallery he calls out one, and without ſaying any thing that can ſhew the improbability of it, he abuſes Stilpo in a tragical manner.*

[*I*] *A courtezan rallied him about it.*] Athenæus ſays, That Stilpo ſitting at table with Glycera, upbraided her with corrupting young men. To which ſhe anſwered, You are charged with the ſame fault, for people complain that you ſpoil their judgment with your needleſs and ſophiſtical ſubtilties; and they add, that it ſignifies but little which way they are ſpoiled, whether it be by a Philoſopher or a courtezan. Μηδὲν οὖν διαφέρειν ἐπιτριβομένοις καὶ κακῶς πάσχουσιν ἢ μετὰ φιλοσόφου ζῆν, ἢ ἑταίρας. *Nihilque referre iis qui ſic in miſerias incidunt ac pereunt, an apud philoſophum degant, an apud ſcortum* (39). Athenæus had been ſaying that Courtezans took great pride in their learning, whereby they got the art of quick repartees and witty ſayings; but Glycera's anſwer alledged by him, is no proper inſtance to ſhew the juſtneſs of their railleries. That courtezan defended herſelf by advancing a falſity; for there never was ſo great a corruption in antient Greece, that people ſhould have been as unwilling to ſee young men learn nothing but vain ſubtilties of a Philoſopher, as to ſee them engaged in leud practices with women.

[*K*] *A dream of his . . . which ſhews that even in his ſleep he knew how to philoſophize.*] Plutarch will afford me the commentary I went upon theſe words. ‘ It is reported of Stilpo the Philoſopher, that he thought he ‘ ſaw Neptune in his ſleep, and that he ſeemed very ‘ much diſpleaſed with him, becauſe he had not, as was

(35) By irrationality the opponent underſtood the poſitive attributes which conſtitute the beaſt, conſidered as not having the faculty of reaſoning.

(36) Ariſtotel. Metaphyſ. *lib. iii, cap. iv, pag. m.* 663. *C.*

(37) Plutarch is perhaps miſtaken in ſuppoſing this.

(38) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 1119, *C.*

(39) Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 584.

‘was uſual with his prieſts, ſacrificed an ox in honour of him; not in the leaſt daunted at the apparition, he thus boldly accoſted it. *Neptune! What is this buſineſs you here complain of? You come hither like a child, and are angry with me, becauſe I did not borrow money and run in debt to pleaſe you, and fill the city with the ſmell of roaſt meat, but privately ſacrificed to you in my own houſe, ſuch ordinary victims as I could get.* At this confident reply, Neptune ſmiled, and (as the ſtory goes) reached him his hand, as an aſſurance of his good will to him, and told him, *That for his ſake he would ſend the Megarenſians abundance of ſea Loaches that ſeaſon* (40)’.

STOFLERUS (JOHN) a famous Mathematician and Aſtrologer, was born at Juſtingen, in Suabia, on the tenth of December 1452. Notwithſtanding the meanneſs of his birth, he made ſo great a progreſs in his ſtudies, that he was admired for it. He particularly minded thoſe things, for which he was naturally beſt qualified; for being ſenſible that he had a genius for Mathematics, he applied himſelf to that ſcience much more than to any other. He taught it at Tubingen with ſo good ſucceſs, that he got a wonderful reputation. The books he publiſhed [*A*], kept up and increaſed the glory he had acquired by his lectures (*a*); but he did not ſucceed in the prognoſtications he had the boldneſs to publiſh. He foretold that there would be a great deluge in the year 1524, and ſtruck a great terror all over Europe [*B*]: but he was confounded by the

[*A*] *The books he publiſhed.*] His *Kalendarium Romanum Magnum*, dedicated to the Emperor Maximilian, was printed (1) in 1518. He publiſhed his Aſtronomical Tables at Tubingen, the year before. He alſo publiſhed *Rationem compoſitionis Aſtrolabiorum*; *Coſmographicas* aliquot *deſcriptiones, de Sphæra Coſmographica, hoc eſt, de globi terreſtris artificioſa ſtructura; de duplici terræ projectione in planum, hoc eſt, qua ratione commodius chartæ Coſmographicæ, quas Mappas mundi vocant, deſignari queant.* A Latin commentary upon Proclus's ſphere, and a German tract about the dimenſion by the aſtrolabe and the quadrant, and the calculation of conjunctions and oppoſitions, with a cenſure upon the ancient cycles, and the prediction of eclipſes (2). Voſſius ſays his Ephemerides begin with the year 1432, and end with the year 1525 (3); but according to Melchior Adam, they begin with the year 1532, and reach to the twenty years following. Voſſius is more credible than Melchior Adam. Doubtleſs the latter took for the whole work what was only a continuation of it.

[*B*] *Foretold there would be a great deluge in the year* 1524, *and ſtruck a great terror all over Europe.*] Auguſtin Niphus perceiving the great amazement of the people after that prediction, publiſhed a book to ſhew that there was no reaſon to fear ſuch a deluge. *Cum ſtatim à publicata* Joan. Stoefleri *Ephemeride diluvii iſtius prænuncia, Auguſtinus* Niphus *ut homines à gravi timore liberaret, quem ipſa omnibus incutiebat, libellum ſuum de falſa diluvii prognoſticatione Carolo V. obtuliſſet, non defuit*, &c (4). Princes, and even learned men, were afraid of that calamity as well as the people; which was doubtleſs occaſioned, in ſome meaſure, by the agreement of ſeveral Aſtrologers, in publiſhing ſuch a prediction, among whom there were ſome of the beſt Aſtronomers. Cirvellus, profeſſor of Divinity at Alcala, put out a book in the vulgar tongue, wherein, without blaming in general the precautions that were uſed againſt the deluge, he was contented to blame thoſe who made fooliſh expences upon that account: he propoſed ſome expedients to preſerve one's ſelf from the inundation at a reaſonable rate. Thoſe, who had their houſes near the ſea, or near ſome rivers, left them, and ſold their land and houſhold-goods at a great loſs. *Simile falſis hujuſmodi, & extremæ dementiæ prognoſticis, fuiſſe illud mihi perſuadeo, quo non vulgarium Ephemeridum conſarcinatores dumtaxat, ſed ex Aſtronomis peritiores multi, ſupremam ex imaginaria quadam eluvione, cunctis mortalibus perniciem impendere contendebant; adeoque rumoribus iſtis, vulgarium hominum animos perterruerant, ut metus etiam ad ſapientiores pervenerit. Nam Petrus* Cirvellus *Hiſpanorum omnium ſui temporis doctiſſimus, cum Theologiæ, in almo Complutenſi Gymnaſio, Lectoris munere fungeretur, & verò* multos, *ut ipſemet inquit,* fluviis, vel mari finitimos populos, jam ſtupido metu perculſos, domicilia ac ſedes mutare vidiſſet, ac prædia, ſupellectilem, bonaque omnia, contra juſtum valorem ſub actione diſtrahere, ac alia loca vel altitudine, vel ſiccitate magis ſecura requirere, ſui officii eſſe putavit, *in publica illa conſternatione, quam de nihilo excitare perſuaſum non habebat, Conſilium vernaculo ac materno idiomate conſcribere, ut paſſim ab omnibus legeretur, quo ſingulis modum præſcriberet, impendentis ejuſmodi calamitatis præcavendæ: atque adeò ita rebus ſuis conſulendi, ut minimum ab illa damnum reciperunt* (5). The great Chancellor of the Emperor Charles V, conſulted Peter Martyr about that conſternation, who told him that the calamity would not be ſo dreadful as people fancied; but that thoſe conjunctions of the planets would certainly occaſion a great diſorder. The Duke of Urbino ſtood in need of a good Philoſopher, who proved to him, in a printed book, that the fear of ſuch a flood was ill-grounded. *Quod rumor ille non per Hiſpanias modo, ſed longè lateque per Europam diſſeminatus fuerit, teſtem ſiſtere poſſum Petrum* Martyrem, *qui de illo à Caroli V, magno Cancellario percunctatus, ipſi hunc in modum ex Valleoleto reſpondet Epiſtola* 20. *libri* 34. Quid ego ſentiam de pluviis, in initio anni quarti & vigeſimi prædictis ab Aſtronomis interrogas, veras fore conjunctiones illas omnium Planetarum, & iiſdem locis ſcio, in materiis præcipuè diſpoſitis, & particularibus regionibus aliquid magni parituras arbitror; ſed neque auſim eorum ſententias approbare, qui ore aperto abſolutè fore alluviem ita generalem vociferantur, ut neque mari, aut ulli terrarum parti, ſit ignoſcendum, quin horrenda ſint incommoda perpeſſuræ, &c. *Neque verò tantùm Cancellarius ille ſe ex eorum numero eſſe oſtendit, quos vaniſſimus diluvii metus percellebat, ſed Urbini Dux non priùs ab eodem liberari potuit, quàm* Paulus de Middeburgo *Foroſempronienſis Epiſcopus, variis rationibus Mathematicis, & Philoſophicis, quas poſtea typis commiſit, ei liquido demonſtraſſet, inanem eſſe prorſus metum omnem, quem de futuro diluvio conceperat* (6). Guido Rangone, General of the army at Florence, being afraid that the reaſons alledged by Auguſtin Niphus, would remove the fear of Charles V, and make him neglect the neceſſary precautions, engaged a famous Phyſician to write againſt that book of Niphus, in order to oblige his Imperial Majeſty to provide for his ſafety, and to appoint inſpectors, who ſhould view the ground in the provinces, and mark out the places where men and beaſts would be leſs expoſed to the waters of the flood. *Non defuit Thomas quidam Philologus patria Ravennas, & celeberrimæ famæ Medicus, qui è veſtigio libellum alium de vera diluvii prognoſticatione, ad eundem Imperatorem miſit, cum præfatione, quam iſthuc maxima parte referre, non alienum à propoſito duxerim.* Ne ex illo conventu tot ſyderum in piſcibus, diffortunium quodquam patereris, Guido Rangonus Rei Florentinæ armorum generalis gubernator, me monuit, & excitavit, ut de futuro diluvio anni MDXXIIII, exactam ad te compoſitionem dirigerimus; Quatenus amoto Sueſſani Philoſophi, jam impreſſo errore, locis huic maximo diluvio ſubditis, & ab hoc ipſo alienis, diligentiùs circumſpectis, & annotatis, humanum genus & cætera viventia, vel tu ipſe ad minus (nam ubi Imperatoris periculum, hîc pro viribus & manu, & corpore, & ingenio utendum) ab eo diffortunato & horribili aſpectu liberareris (7). Some other writers imitated that Phyſician. ‘Quemadmodum contingit aliquando ut cæcus cænum ducat, ſic nonnulli alii Philologum hunc licet aberrantem ſequuti ſunt; ex quibus *Nicolaus Peranzonus,* vaticinum de vera diluvii prognoſticatione, cum xx. inundationum hiſtoria, Anconæ edidit. Mihique præterea videre contigit, cujuſdam *Michaëlis de Petra ſancta, Ordinis Prædicatorum de obſervantia, ſacræ Theologiæ Doctoris, Regentis ſtudii in Conventu Minervæ, & Metaphyſicam in Romano Gymnaſio profitentis libellum, in defenſionem Aſtrologorum, judicantium ex conjunctionibus Planetarum* the event. I ſhall mention ſeveral particulars relating to this, whereby it will appear that

---

(40) Plut. de profectu virtutis ſentiendo, *pag.* 83.

(*a*) *Taken from* Melchior Adam, in Vitis Philoſophorum, *pag.* 73, 74.

(1) At Oppenheim.

(2) *Taken from* Melchior Adam in Vitis Philoſophorum, *p.* 74.

(3) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. *pag.* 186.

(4) Naudæus, in Judicio de Auguſtino Nipho, *pag.* 48.

(5) Id. ibid. *pag.* 46, 47.

(6) Id. ibid. *pag.* 47, 48.

(7) Id. ibid. *pag.* 48.

‘ *rum in Piſcibus MDXXIV diluvium futurum.* Hunc enim veluti conceptis verbis, operi ſuo titulum fecit (8). - - - - *As it ſometimes happens, that the blind lead the blind, there were others that imitated this blundering Philologer, among whom was Nicolas Peranzonus, who publiſhed at Ancona a prophecy concerning the true prognoſtication of the flood, together with the hiſtory of twenty inundations. I have likewiſe ſeen a ſmall book of Michael de Petra Sancta, of the Order of Obſervators, Regent in the convent of Minerva, Doctor of Divinity, and Profeſſor of Metaphyſics in the college at Rome, written in defence of thoſe Aſtrologers, who concluded, from the conjunction of the planets in the ſign Piſces, in the year* 1524, *that there would be a flood. For this is almoſt, in expreſs words, the title which he gives to his book.*’ There was ſo great a terror in France, that many people were like to grow distracted upon that account. ‘ In Gallia parum abfuit quin ad inſaniam homines non paucos, periculi metu *(diluvium)* adegerit, quemadmodum apud Joannem *Bochellum* ſcriptorem Annalium Aquitaniæ; Claudium *Duretum*, cap. 27. libri de fluxu & refluxu maris; Spiritum *Roterium* ordinis ſancti Dominici, & ſacræ apud Toloſates fidei quæſitorem, in refutatione doctrinæ cujuſdam Aſtrologi; Augerium *Ferrerium* in libro quem ſcripſit adverſus Rempublicam Bodini; Albertum *Pighium* in Aſtrologiæ defenſione ad Auguſtinum Niphum? *Euſtorgium à Bello loco* Poëtam vernaculum in Rythmis ſuis, multoſque alios videre eſt (9). - - - *In France, not a few were almoſt diſtracted with this fear, as may be ſeen in John Bochel, who writ the Annals of Aquitain; Claudius Duret, in the 27th chapter of his book on the ebbing and flowing of the ſea; Spiritus Rotter, a Dominican Friar, and Inquiſitor at Toulouſe, in his confutation of the doctrine of a certain Aſtrologer; Augerius Ferrier, in a book which he writ againſt the Republic of Bodin; Albertus Pighius, in his defence of Aſtrology to Auguſtinus Niphus, Euſtorge de Beaulieu, a French Poet, in his rhimes; and many others.*’ Read theſe words of Bodin (10). ‘ GOD has promiſed that there ſhall be no deluge for the time to come, and has performed his promiſe. For tho’ the great conjunction of Saturn, Mars, and Jupiter, happened in the ſign Piſces, in the year 1524, when all the Aſtrologers of Europe, Aſia, and Africa, foretold an univerſal deluge, and many unbelievers built up arches to ſave themſelves, and even Preſident Auriol at Toulouſe, tho’ they were told of GOD’s promiſe and oath, that he would no more deſtroy men by a flood; that year was indeed attended with ſtorms and great floods in many countries, but there happened no deluge.’ A writer, who animadverted upon Bodin, denied the fact as to Auriol; but the following reply was made to him, ‘ I think I have omitted nothing but what is frivolous and inconſiderable, and deſerves no anſwer. And, amongſt others, what you ſay, pag. 47, that Auriol did not make a boat to avoid being deſtroyed by the deluge, which the Aſtrologers foretold, was to happen in the year 1524, but to go a fiſhing; and yet you tell us, that the boat ſtands upon four pillars: it is not uſual to put boats upon pillars. But I have read a book written againſt Aſtrologers, by a Dominican, called *Spiritus Roterus*, an Inquiſitor of the Faith, when he was at Toulouſe, which was lent me by Raymund l’Eſtonat of Pamiers, who has ſettled in theſe parts, and told me how that Monk undertook to write that book againſt an Aſtrologer who was then at Toulouſe, and pretended to tell one’s fortune by the ſtars. That author ſays in that book, that Auriol cauſed an arch to be built at Toulouſe, in order to avoid the deluge; which he could know better than you, ſince you lived neither in the ſame place, nor at the ſame time with Auriol. As for what you ſay in the ſame page, that Bodin is very much to blame for ſaying that Auriol was a preſident; ſince he was only a doctor of the Canon-law, whom you call a bold, rich, and learned man; I confeſs that Bodin was miſtaken in that point (11).’ The northern nations were not free from thoſe alarms, as it appears from this paſſage. ‘ Mali iſtius impendentis metum ad extremum uſque Septentrionem pervaſiſſe, teſtatur manifeſtè Cornelius *Scepperus* Neoportuenſis, cùm inter cauſas quibus fuit compulſus, ut librum adverſus Aſtrologos de ſignificationibus conjunctionum ſuperiorum Planetarum anni MDXXIV conſcriberet, eas potiſſimum enumerat. *Adde me neque in Aſtrologiam ſcribere, ſed in eos tantùm, qui falſa prædictione totum in ſe orbem converterant. Neque enim ſolùm vulgo eam rem perſuaſerunt, ſed ſummis etiam Regibus, & Principibus. Occurrunt quæ hac de re me percunctatus eſt ſereniſſimus Princeps D. Chriſtiernus Daniæ, Sueviæ, Norvegiæque Rex, occurrunt & crebra vulgi ſuſpiria, tamdiu mala ſibi ominantis: quem autem hominum non impellerent hæ lacrymæ? quem non permoveret impoſtura, incitaret iniquitas* (12)? - - - *Cornelius Scepperus Neoportuenſis plainly affirms, that the dread of this impending calamity had reached as far as the extremities of the North; ſince among the reaſons which moved him to write a book againſt the Aſtrologers concerning what was ſignified by the conjunction of the planets in the year* 1524, *he chiefly inſiſts upon the following.* Add, *ſays he,* that I do not write againſt Aſtrology, but againſt thoſe who had alarmed the whole world by their falſe prediction. for they not only perſuaded the common people of it, but alſo kings and princes. I reflect upon the queſtions that were put to me on this head, by the moſt ſerene Prince, Chriſtiern King of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. I reflect upon the frequent ſighs of the vulgar, ſo long kept in a fearful expectation of evils that were to come upon them. What man would not be rouzed by theſe tears? or who could be unmoved at the ſight of ſo much fraud and iniquity?’

We have ſeen what Bodin ſays, that rains and floods made a great devaſtation in ſeveral places, in the year of that pretended deluge; but ſome authors, who are more to be credited than he, affirm, that the month of February 1524, was, contrary to cuſtom, very dry and clear. Now this was the time of the conjunction pointed out by the Aſtrologers for a deluge; ſo that one would think the extraordinary dryneſs of that month happened on purpoſe to confound thoſe men. Cardan and Origanus were vexed that Stoflerus had brought ſuch a diſgrace upon their trade by a prognoſtication ſo contrary to the event. Read theſe words of the learned Gaſſendus. ‘ Memorabile certè eſt, quod in hiſtoriis, † ac omnibus penè ſuperioris ſæculi libris legitur; cum Aſtrologi ob plureis Conjunctiones magnas, & nonnullas mediocreis in Aqueis Signis celebrandas, prædixiſſent menſe Februario anni MDXXIV fore Diluvium generale, ac ſtragem tantam, quanta fuiſſet ante id tempus inaudita; adeò ut non paucis conſternatis per Galliam, Hiſpaniam, Italiam, Germaniamque animis, apparaſſent navigia, aut comportatis farinis, aliiſque rebus neceſſariis, petiiſſent loca editiora; contigiſſe tamen, ut totus Februarius ſereniſſimus, pulcerrimuſque exſtiterit; planè, ut ſi operata data comparatus fuiſſet vaticiniis Aſtrologorum refellendis (cùm ſit alioquin inſolitum, abire Februarium impluvium) quod ne ipſis quidem Cardano ⸸, & Origano ‡ diſſimulare licuit; dolentibus illud de futuro Diluvio judicium fuiſſe non ſine Aſtrologiæ infamia à Stœflero prolatum (13). - - - *It is certainly a memorable thing, which we read in every hiſtory, and almoſt in every book, of the laſt century; that whereas the Aſtrologers, on account of ſeveral great and ſome ſmaller conjunctions that were to happen in the watery ſigns, had foretold, that in the month of February* 1524, *there would be a general flood, and ſuch a devaſtation as had been never heard of before that time; which ſo frightened numbers of people in France, Spain, Italy, and Germany, that ſome provided ſhips, others took with them a ſtock of meal, and other neceſſaries, and fled to the mountains; nevertheleſs it ſo fell out that the whole month of February was extremely clear and fine. One would think*.... &c.’ Take notice, that Bodin, a credulous man, and infatuated with Aſtrology, vindicates Stoflerus as well as he can; for, on one hand, he gives us to underſtand, that if there was not a ſecond deluge in the year 1524, it was becauſe GOD prevented it to perform his promiſe; and, on the other hand, he enlarges upon the calamities wherewith Chriſtendom was afflicted after the conjunction of the planets: and the better to mend the that it is no eaſy matter to diſcredit Aſtrologers [*C*]; for notwithſtanding this falſe prediction, they found afterwards a vaſt number of cullies. Some ſay he foretold that the end of the world would be in the year 1586. I believe they are miſtaken [*D*]; and I cannot

---

(8) Id. ibid. *pag.* 49.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Bodin, de la République, *book iv, pag. m.* 550.

(11) Renatus Herpin, Apologie pour la République de Jean Bodin, *in the laſt page.*

(12) Naudæus, ubi ſupra, *p.* 50.

† Bochell. in Annal. Aquit. Bodin. 4. de Rep. 2. Duret. de flu. & refl. mar. c. 27, *&c.*

⸸ Lib. 7. aphor. 34.

‡ 3. Par. introd. 3.

(13) Gaſſendus, Phyſicæ. §. *ii, lib. vi,* Oper. *Tom. i, pag.* 729. *col. i.*

the buſineſs he has recourſe to ſome falſities; for he ſpeaks (14) of the war of the Boors in Germany, and of the league againſt *the King of France, who was taken*, and of the conqueſt of Rhodes by the Turks. That iſland had been ſubdued in the year 1522. I ſhall have occaſion by and by to mention another fraud of that writer.

[*C*] *I ſhall mention .... ſeveral particulars, whereby it will appear that in is no eaſy thing to diſcredit Aſtrologers.*] I have mentioned, in the foregoing remark, ſeveral facts concerning the chimerical prediction of that pretended deluge; to which I add what follows: ‘In the ſaid year 1523, reckoning as they do in Aquitain, where the year begins in March upon Lady-day, and ends on the ſame day, all the provinces of France were extremely afraid of an univerſal deluge, becauſe the Aſtronomers had foretold, that in the month of February of the ſaid year, and in the beginning of the year 1524, according to their computation, (for they begin with the firſt day of January) there would be twenty conjunctions, great and ſmall together, ſixteen of which would poſſeſs watery ſigns, portending to the greateſt part of the world, to climates, kingdoms, provinces, ſtates, and dignities, and to all land and ſea creatures, a certain change and alteration, ſuch as our foreſathers never ſaw, nor read in hiſtories. Whereupon men and women were in great fear. Many removed from their low habitations, went into high places, provided themſelves with meal, and other neceſſaries, and made public proceſſions and prayers, that GOD would take pity on his people; and yet there happened no ſuch thing: on the contrary, the ſaid month of February proved as fine as ever it was, and the months following finer than they had been ten years before. Whereby GOD made it appear that Aſtronomy is not a certain ſcience; and whatever the planets may foretel, GOD is above it (15).’ The author from whom I have this paſſage, does not forget the chicaneries which the Aſtrologers alledged to cover their ſhame. ‘However, ſays he (16), ſome Aſtrologers alledged in their vindication, that thoſe conjunctions had produced their effect the year before, becauſe there had been many great floods in ſeveral places, which had drowned houſes and lands. Others ſaid, that ſuch conjunctions would not have their effect till ten years after, during which many great, dreadful, and detrimental, things would happen; which proved true, as will appear hereafter. For, that very ſame year 1523, in November, there was a little froſt, which froze up the greateſt part of the wheat, and moſt cabbages, and ſhort-ſhanked apple-trees; and a good number of ſmall treaſurers, who conſumed the public finances of France, were put out of their places; whereupon this diſtich was made in a bantering way.

L'an mil cinq cens vingt & quatre moins ung
Le Choux d'yver & Treſoriers tout ung.

The fifteen hundredth year and twenty three,
For Cabbages and Treaſurers ſhall be.

How comes this author to reckon among the public calamities the turning out of the treaſurers, who waſted the finances and devoured the people? He ſhould rather have accounted it a happineſs. As for what concerns the froſt in the month of November, which he calls a ſmall one, tho' he aſcribes great effects to it, the ſame doubts ariſe in my mind, which I have propoſed in the article BERQUIN (17). It is a remarkable thing that Beza ſhould mention ſuch a froſt upon the year 1528, as a curſe, which the execution of an innocent man brought upon the whole kingdom. Cunæus, Profeſſor at Leyden, made an oration about climacterical years in 1638, when he left the Rectorſhip, wherein he mentioned the prediction of a new deluge in the year 1524 (18), and laughed at it. He added, that according to the teſtimony of Ludovicus Vives, that year proved as clear, happy, and plentiful, as ever was ſeen (19). Vives does not preciſely ſay all this; nevertheleſs his words are ſtill more proper than Cunæus's to ſhew the falſity of the prediction. ‘Illud quoque Noë diluvium non ſiderum commiſtionibus aſſignatur, ſed ultioni numinis. Verum iſti (*aſtrologi*) ſolita temeritate ſub certum horoſcopum reducunt eluviem illam orbis, & ſimilem horoſcopum contigiſſe ferunt anno vigeſimo quarto, qui annus orbem fere totum inſanis iſtorum prædictionibus terruit, quum nullus annus memoria eorum qui viverent aut mitior aut ſerenior fuerit, aut ſuis omnibus partibus tempeſtivior? Primùm in tanta varietate, tamque incertis iis qui annales ſcribunt, quem annum poſſunt ipſi annotare quo diluvium contigerit? Ita non dicunt hoc eveniſſe, quia hic erat aſtrorum coitus: ſed quia id contigerit, talem affirmant fuiſſe. Hoc verò non eſt ab experimentis ſcientiam colligere, ſed ad tuendam temeritatem aſſertionis confingere ſibi experimenta. Verum irriſit iſtos natura, qui quo tempore natatoria in aquis omnia erant minati, ſereniſſimi ut ſi quando antea fulſerunt ſoles, & ver fuit omnium amœniſſimum (20). - - - *Noah's flood is not aſcribed to the conjunction of the Planets, but to the vengeance of the Deity. Nevertheleſs thoſe Aſtrologers with their uſual impertinence account for that inundation of the world by a certain conſtellation, and pretend that the like conſtellation fell out in the year* 1524, *when they terrified the whole world with their mad predictions; whereas no year, as far as thoſe that were then alive could remember, had been more mild, more ſerene, and more ſeaſonable in all its parts. And firſt in ſo great a variety and doubtfulneſs of the Hiſtorians, to what year can they fix the deluge? Thus they do not ſay that this happened becauſe the conjunction of the Planets was ſuch, but they affirm that ſuch was the conjunction of the Planets becauſe this happened; which is not gathering knowledge from experiments, but feigning experiments to ſupport an impertinent aſſertion. Nature ſufficiently ridiculed them, becauſe at the very time when their threatened inundation was to take place over all, the ſun ſhone forth exceedingly bright, and there never was a more pleaſant ſpring.*’ A learned German, who publiſhed ſome notes upon Cunæus's orations, quotes this paſſage of Ludovicus Vives, and ſays, that Cardan maintained that Stoflerus was miſtaken for want of a ſufficient ſkill in Phyſics. Cardan endeavours to ſhew, that the ſame poſition of the Planets which was to produce an inundation, according to Stoflerus, was really to produce fair weather (21); but this pretended juſtification of Aſtrology, by cenſuring thoſe who do not well underſtand it, does not deſerve to be minded upon this occaſion.

[*D*] *Some ſay he foretold that the end of the world would be in the year* 1586. *I believe they are miſtaken.*] I have here in view Mr Petit, Intendant of the Fortifications, who uſes theſe words. ‘Did not Stoflerus foretel, that, in the year 1524, there would be ſo great inundations, that if the world was not to be deſtroyed by fire, there would be then an univerſal deluge, by reaſon of the great conjunctions of the Planets in watery ſigns? Which frighted all Europe to that degree, that many people repaired to the mountains with all manner of proviſions. Others provided barks and ſhips to avoid being drowned; and yet the month of February, in which all theſe things were to happen, proved extremely dry, to the ſhame of Aſtrologers. Did not he ſay likewiſe that in the year 1586, after an eclipſe of the ſun in May, and the conjunction of all the Planets, the world would be at end by the fury of winds and ſtorms, which proved ridiculous (22).’ I believe one might boldly deny what he ſays in his ſecond queſtion, and affirm, that Stoflerus foretold no ſuch thing for the year 1586. In the firſt place, his Ephemerides do not reach ſo far. In the ſecond place, that year is not characterized by an eclipſe of the ſun in May, nor by *the conjunction of all the Planets*. I think I have found out what led that author into this miſtake: he had read in Gaſſendus, next to what concerns the prediction of a deluge, an account of a prediction concerning the year 1186. Some time after, truſting too

(14) Bodin, de la République, *livr. iv, pag.* 553.

(15) Jean Bouchet, Annales d'Aquitain, *fol. m.* 213, Naudæus and Gaſſendus call him wrong *Bochellus* in the paſſages above quoted, citatations (9) and (13).

(16) Id. ibid.

(17) Remark [*A*].

(18) The Printers put 1504. That fault has been corrected in the Leipſic edition 1693.

(19) Proditum memoriæ Ludovicus Vives, auctor certiſſimus, reliquit, nullum annum æque ſerenum, nullum æque fauſtum, & ubertate notabilem fuiſſe. *Cunæus, Orat. IV, pag.* 78, *Edit. Lipſ.* 1693.

(20) Lud. Vives, de Veritate Fidei Chriſtianæ, *lib. i, cap. x, pag.* 120, *Edit. Baſil.* 1544.

(21) Cardan. Aphor. Aſtrol. *Segmento vii, Aphoriſm. xxxiv, apud* Aug. Buchnerum in Orat. Cunei, *pag. m.* 375.

(22) Petit, Diſſertation ſur la nature des Cometes, *pag.* 337.

I cannot tell whether thoſe are to be credited, who give out, that he made ſome predictions upon the year 1588 [*E*]. Authors are not agreed about the circumſtances of his death: ſome ſay (*b*) he died of the plague at Blaubeurs, on the ſixteenth of February 1531. Others will have it that he died of a wound in his head, which he received by the fall of a board in his cloſet: they add, that he foreſaw that danger [*F*]. He had a great affection for Munſter, his ſcholar; which proved very beneficial to the commonwealth of learning: for had he not ſuffered him to tranſcribe his writings, they had been loſt for ever, when the originals were burnt (*c*). It is to be obſerved, that he was

much to his memory, he thought that Gaſſendus upbraids Stoflerus with a ſecond overſight; and on this ſuppoſition he ſet down 1586, inſtead of 1186. What will confirm my conjecture is, that the year 1186 has the two characters abovementioned, *viz.* an eclipſe of the ſun (23), and a conjunction of all the Planets, as it appears from theſe words of Gaſſendus. ‘Simile vaticinium fuit, quod ex Rigordo Scaliger * refert, ſcribente Aſtrologos tantum portendiſſe exitium, à ventorum, tempeſtatumque vehementia, ob Planetas tam inferiores, quàm ſuperiores coituros menſe Septembri anni MCLXXXVI præeunte Solis defectione XI Kal. Maij, ut rerum finem imminere à nemine dubitaretur; cùm eventus tamen poſtea coarguerit ejuſce Oraculi vanitatem (24). - - - *Like to this was the prophecy of which Scaliger gives an account taken from Rigordus. That author ſays, the Aſtrologers had foretold ſo great a deſtruction by the fury of winds and tempeſts, upon the conjunction of the higher and lower Planets, which was to happen in the month of September* 1186, *after an eclipſe of the ſun on the* 21*ſt of April, that no body doubted but the end of the world was at hand. Nevertheleſs the event ſhewed how groundleſs the prediction was.*’ Naudæus obſerves that the weather proved very fine, inſtead of the dreadful ſtorms foretold by the Aſtrologers. ‘Vide ſodes apud *Rigordum*, quid anno Chriſti MCLXXIX acciderit. Orientales Aſtrologi omnes, literis per totum orbem miſſis, tam ſecurè quàm ſi Regio diplomate res ipſa ſancita fuiſſet, edixerant, anno ſeptimo poſt, qui fuit MCLXXXVI, Planetas omnes tam inferiores, quàm ſuperiores, in unum coïturos ineunte Septembri, ſcilicet poſt Eclipſim factam XI Kalend. Mai. Indeque tantùm ex ventorum, & tempeſtatum violentia periculi ſecuturum, ut fermè rebus humanis, extremum finem imminere aſſererent. Quid igitur poſtea factum eſt, niſi ut mortales innumeros, qui per totum illud ſeptennium, vitam ſibi præ metu, & periculorum expectatione acerbam putaverant, ineunte termino ab Aſtrologis illis præſtituto, molles potiùs Favonii, quàm Aquilones, & blanda ſedataque Autumni temperies, quàm nubila vel perturbata exciperet (25)? - - - *Conſult Rigordus touching what happened in the year* 1179. *The eaſtern Aſtrologers having ſent letters all over the world, with as much confidence as if the royal ſignet had been annexed to them, proclaimed that in the ſeventh year after that,* viz. *the year* 1186, *there was to be a conjunction of all the upper and lower Planets towards the beginning of September, after an eclipſe of the ſun on the* 21*ſt of April. They affirmed that this would occaſion ſuch ſtorms and winds, that the end of all things was very near at hand. What followed upon this? Nought elſe but that vaſt numbers of people, who had led an uneaſy life for ſeven years through fear and the expectation of danger, when the term fixed by the Aſtrologers was come, were agreeably ſurprized with gentle Zephyrs, inſtead of north-winds, and with a mild and peaceable autumn, inſtead of clouds and tempeſtuous weather.*’ Bodin has been a prevaricator upon this occaſion: he ſuppoſes the Aſtrologers did not foretel great winds, but great revolutions of ſtate. He had a mind to ſave their honour by ſuch a ſubterfuge; for take the hiſtory of the world where you will, you will find ſome revolutions within the ſpace of fifteen or twenty years. We read alſo, ſays he (26), ‘that in the year MCLXXXVI in September, the lower and upper Planets were in conjunction, when the eaſtern Aſtrologers by letters ſent into all parts, as the Chronicles of Saint Denys has it, threatened all nations with a change of government, which proved true. But it muſt be confeſſed that the Hiſtorian is miſtaken in ſaying that there was an eclipſe of the ſun the eleventh of April (27), and the fifth of that month an eclipſe of the moon: which is naturally impoſſible.’

[*E*] *I cannot tell whether thoſe are to be credited who give out that he made ſome predictions upon the year* 1588.] A year ‘which all Judicial Aſtrologers called a wonderful one, becauſe they foreſaw ſo many ſtrange accidents, and ſo much confuſion in natural cauſes, that they affirmed, that if the world was not then at an end, there would happen at leaſt an univerſal change (28).’ The author of the Mercurius Gallo-Belgicus ſays, that Stoflerus found as many calamities in the prognoſtications for the year 1588, as Regiomontanus: which is as much as can be ſaid. ‘Joannes Regiomontanus, Mathematicus ſummus, aliquantò antequàm Romæ anno à partu Virginis 1475, ætatis ſuæ 42 in vivis eſſe deſiit, prognoſticum ſeu vaticinium in hanc ferè ſententiam edidit:

Poſt mille expletos à partu virginis annos,
  Et poſt quingentos rurſus ab axe datos,
Octuageſimus octavus mirabilis annus
  Ingruet, & ſecum triſtia fata trahet.
Si non hoc anno totus malè concidet orbis,
  Si non in nihilum terra fretumque ruet;
Cuncta tamen mundi ſurſum ibunt atque deorſum
  Imperia, & luctus undique grandis erit.

Eadem Joannes Stœflerus, inſignis Aſtrologus, & noſtro ſeculo generoſiſſimus Heros Henricus Rantzovius, in ſuo de annis climactericis & imperiorum periodis libello, vaticinatus eſt (29). - - - *John Regiomontanus, a great Mathematician, ſome time before his death, which happened at Rome in the year of Chriſt* 1475, *and in the* 42*d of his age, publiſhed a prognoſtic or prophecy almoſt to this purpoſe.*

The year of Chriſt five hundred eighty eight
  Shall bring, when added to a thouſand more
Evils of an intolerable weight
  Such as were never felt before.
For in that year if ſea and earth and all
Do not into their antient nothing fall,
At leaſt it will diſturb the courſe of things,
And hatch the fate of Empires and of Kings.
Strong fear ſhall ev'ry mortal heart confound,
And ſorrow ſhall in ev'ry place abound.

‘*John Stoflerus, a famous Aſtrologer, and in our days, that illuſtrious hero Henry Rantzovius, in his treatiſe on climacterical years and the periods of empires, foretold the ſame things.*’ That author imitates Bodin, for he falſifies Hiſtory to ſave the honour of thoſe Aſtrologers: he places (30) the execution of the Queen of Scotland in the year 1588 (31). For the diverſion of the reader I ſhall ſet down a flight of Mr Petit, Intendant of the Fortifications. *Do not you think*, ſays he (32), after having quoted the four laſt verſes of Regiomontanus's prophecy, *that it was word for word the ſame Prognoſtick with that of the Sieur Andreas* (33), *only Regiomontanus is not ſo poſitive as to the year, and does not ſo much contradict himſelf. That fooliſh fellow* (Andreas) *ſays poſitively, that the world will be at an end in two years time at fartheſt: and immediately after he affirms*, that all the powers will be deſtroyed, and fall into the hands of the Turks; *that is, after the end of the world, and when there will be neither men nor beaſts. Would to GOD he might be the laſt beaſt, and the laſt Aſtrological fool.*

[*F*] *Of a wound in his head, which he received by the fall. . . . They add, that he foreſaw that danger.*] This I find in Seth Calviſius. ‘Johan. Stofflerus, *ſays he* (34), Juſtingenſis, Mathematicus inſignis, certo die ſibi periculum ruinâ imminere præviderat, & quia ædes ſuas ſatis firmas noverat, convocat in Muſæum ſuum viros eruditos, quorum conſuetudine

‘& ſer-

(*b*) Melch. Adam, ibid. *pag.* 74.

(*c*) Omnibus libris inſtrumentiſque Stofleri incendio fortuito Tubingæ conſumtis, nihil illarum lucubrationum evaſiſſet; niſi multa Munſterus deſcripta adſervaſſet. *Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra.*

(23) Not in May, as Mr Petit ſays, but the 21ſt of April, Mr Petit, for want of attention, did not mind the word *Kal.* in Gaſſendus.

* Præfat. in Manil.

(24) Gaſſendus, ubi ſupra.

(25) Naudæus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 45. Conſult Calviſius, *ad ann.* 1186, who obſerves that the Arabians in Spain gave notice of that conjunction. *Hinc prædixerunt:* Tantus, *inquiunt*, erit ventus, ut pulvere repleturus ſit arbores & turres. *Inde ſequentur hæc miracula:* Veniet vir ſapiens, Doctor veritatis. Deinde orietur quidam ex Elam, qui magnas ſtrages faciet. *Sed nihil annotatum eſt, quod evenerit.* - - - Hence they foretold that there ſhould be a violent ſtorm of wind, *which would fill the trees and towers with duſt*; after which theſe miracles ſhould follow, viz. *a wiſe man and the teacher of truth ſhould come; and afterwards another man ſhould ariſe out of Elam, and commit great havock. . . . .* But nothing of all that was foretold came to paſs. *He quotes Richardus: it is likely he meant Rigordus.*

(26) Bodin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 557.

(27) Probably it is an error of the tranſcriber; for all authors place that eclipſe on the 21ſt of April.

(28) Perefixe, Hiſt. de Henri le Grand, *pag. m* 92.

(29) Janſonius Doccomenſis Friſius, in Mercurio Gallo-Belgico, *ad init. anni* 1589, *apud* Wolfium, Lect. memorabil. *Tom. ii, pag.* 1028. *See above remark* [*E*] *of the article* BRUSCHIUS.

(30) Ibid. apud eumdem, *Wolfium, ibid.*

(31) She was beheaded the eighth of February 1587, old-ſtile.

(32) Diſcours ſur l'Eclipſe de Soleil du 12. d'Août 1654, *printed at the end of his Diſſertation upon Comets, pag.* 338.

(33) Upon occaſion of the eclipſe of the year 1654, a diſcourſe in German and French was handed about under the name of the Sieur Andreas, ſometimes ſtiled a Mathematician of Padua, and ſometimes of Prague, with an atteſtation of the Chancery of Meningen. *Id. ibid. pag.* 326.

(34) Sethus Calviſius, *ad ann.* 1531, *pag. m.* 1165.

was one of thoſe who went about the reformation of the calendar [*G*]; but this undertaking was not finiſhed until a long time after his death.

‘ & ſermonibus recrearetur: orta inter ſobria pocula diſputatio: ad controverſiam explicandam è ſuperiori loco librum depromit: ſed laxato clavo aſſer, in quo ſtabant libri, in caput ejus decidit, & inſigne vulnus infelici ſeni infligit, ex quo mortuus eſt die 16 Febr. Tubingæ. - - - *John Stoflerus, of Juſtingen, a famous Mathematician, foreſaw that ſuch a day he ſhould be in great danger of having ſomething fall upon his head; for which reaſon, as he knew that his own houſe was pretty firm, he got ſome learned men to bear him company in his ſtudy. While they were ſitting over a moderate glaſs of wine, a ſmall diſpute aroſe, and he to decide the controverſy took down a book from a higher place. But as the nail was looſened, the ſhelf on which the books ſtood fell upon his head, and gave the poor old man a grievous wound, of which he died at Tubingen on the 16th of February*.’ Voſſius did not know that this particular is to be found in Calviſius; for he mentions it only upon the credit of a *ſomebody* (35).

[*G*] *He was one of thoſe, who went about the reformation of the calendar.*] After the neceſſity of that reformation had been propoſed in the council of Conſtance, ſome Aſtronomers conſidered how it might be effected. I need not name here thoſe who began: I ſhall only ſay, that under the Pontificate of Leo X, two writers publiſhed their thoughts about it: one of them was Paul of Middleburg (36); and the other our John Stoflerus, who inſcribed his propoſitions to the council of Lateran (37). I ſay nothing of Joannes Maria de Tholoſanis, a Dominican, whoſe book *de emendatione Calendarii Romani* was dedicated to the council of Trent. That Monk ſays, that Stoflerus propoſed three expedients, one whereof was to leave out ten days, and this was pitched upon to put an end to that affair. ‘ Frater Joan. Maria de Tholoſanis ordinis prædicatorum de emendatione Calendarii Romani cap. 3. ad Concilium Tridentinum ſic ſcribit: *Circa hujus æquinoctii reformationem reperiuntur variæ formulæ: quarum tres ponit Joan. Stoefflerus in ſuo Calendario propoſitione* 39. *Prima earum inter alias potiſſima eſt & facillima, ſecunda difficilis eſt, & gignens perturbationem magnam, & diſſidium in eccleſia Dei per orbem diffuſa. Ultima abſque difficultate ſervari poſſet.* Hæc ille. Secundam autem formulam vocat, qua noſtri temporis correctores uſi ſunt, 10 dies eximentes ex uno menſe (38). - - - *Friar John Maria de Tholoſanis, a Dominican Friar, in his treatiſe on the Correction of the Roman Calendar, writes thus*: Several expedients have been offered for the reformation of this equinox; three of which John Stoflerus lays down in the 39th propoſition of his Calendar. The firſt of theſe, which is the principal one, is very eaſy, the ſecond hard, and fit to breed great diſturbance and diſſention in the Church of God throughout the world. The laſt may be obſerved without any difficulty. *Thus he. Now what he calls the ſecond expedient is the ſame which the correctors of our time made uſe of, by leaving ten days out of one month.*’

(35) De morte ejus ſic non nemo, penes quem fides eſto. - - - *In this manner does ſomebody ſpeak of his death. Let him anſwer for the truth of it.* Voſſius, *in Addit, Libri* de Scient. Mathem. *pag.* 450.

(36) He was Biſhop of Foſſombrone in Italy.

(37) Henricus Wolphius, ubi infra, *pag.* 121.

(38) Henricus Wolphius, in Tractatu de Tempore & ejus mutationibus, *pag.* 129.

STOUPPA, or STOUP, (JOHN NICOLAS) in Latin *Stupanus*,

profeſſor of Phyſic at Baſil, was born in the country of the Griſons on the eleventh of December 1542. He was ſent to Baſil at fifteen years of age, and there obtained at the age of twenty ſeven the degree of Doctor in Phyſic. He ſucceeded Hoſpinianus as profeſſor of Logic in the year 1575, and Theodore Zwingerus, as profeſſor of Phyſic, in the year 1589. He died at Baſil in the year 1621, aged ſeventy-nine years (*a*). It is of him, if I am not miſtaken, that Francis Hotman ſpeaks in a letter, which deſerves to be quoted [*A*]. Among other works of his [*B*] we have a Latin tranſlation of the Neapolitan

(*a*) Taken from the Theatrum of Paul Freherus, *pag.* 1344.

[*A*] *It is of him . . . . that Francis Hotman ſpeaks in a letter, which deſerves to be quoted.*] It appears by that letter that a Profeſſor of Baſil, named Stupanus, had been Rector of the univerſity in the year 1578, and that he maintained he did not know whether the Maſs was a blaſphemy, and that the like queſtions were of ſmall importance to him. ‘ Idem ille bonus Typographus Perna, qui toties à Magiſtratu ob impios & execrandos libellos à ſe impreſſos in carceres detruſus fuit, deteſtanda opera omnia Machiavelli ab eodem illo Stupano Latinè converſa hic imprimit. Scis illa opera propter tam apertas in Moſem & Chriſtum blaſphemias ne in Italia quidem aut divendi licere. . . . . Hæc tamen blaſphemia & verborum portenta Baſileæ cum Magnifici D. Rectoris privilegio & auctoritate promulgantur, latinè converſa ab eo qui biennio ante illam Magnificam Rectoris perſonam geſſit, diu mendiculus, pane pauperum & Senatus eleemoſyna educatus, nunc nuper opulentæ uxoris ſecundæ maritus: Qui mihi biennio antè Rectoratu fungens coram D. Wrſtiſio dicere auſus eſt, ſe neſcire an Miſſa Papiſtica eſſet blaſphemia: neque talia ad ſe pertinere (1). - - - *That ſame honeſt Printer Perna, who has been ſo many times impriſoned by the magiſtrates on account of the wicked and execrable books put forth by him, is nevertheleſs printing here all the deteſtable works of Machiavel, turned into Latin by that ſame Stupanus. You know that theſe works, by reaſon of their open blaſphemies againſt Moſes and Jeſus Chriſt, are not even allowed in Italy to be ſold. . . . . Nevertheleſs theſe blaſphemies and ſtrange words are printed at Baſil with the privilege and authority of the moſt noble Rector, being turned into Latin by the perſon who filled that honourable poſt two years before. This man was originally a beggar, and had been brought up as a poor ſcholar by the charity of the Senate, but had lately married a rich ſecond wife. While he was Rector two years before, he had the impudence to ſay before Urſtiſius that he did not know whether the Popiſh Maſs was blaſphemy, and it was not his buſineſs to enquire about it.*’ In this manner does Francis Hotman ſpeak of him in a letter to Rodolphus Gualtherus miniſter of Zurich, dated from Baſil the 25th of December 1580. He had mentioned that diſpute to him in a former letter of the 27th of September preceding, where he obſerves that his adverſary did highly praiſe the conduct of the Elector Palatine for having driven a great number of Calviniſt miniſters out of his dominions. They were ſo many conſpirators, as Stupanus ſaid. He had prefixed a preface to a book that was corrected; nevertheleſs it was ſold without any alteration to the Papiſts. Hotman communicated it to Gualtherus, to the end that he might be the better informed of Stupanus's religion. *Decertaveram aliquoties cum Stupano tunc* (2) *Rectore qui negabat ſe ſcire, an Miſſa Papiſtica eſſet blaſphemia. Contendebat rectè à Palatino factum, quòd tot conſpiratores (ut appellabat) ex ditione ſua expuliſſet. Tandem cujuſmodi fuerit meus Antagoniſta, ex incluſa ejus præfatione cognoſces. Mutatum tandem fuit folium. Sed iſtud apud Papiſtas divenditur* (3). Hotman relates that as ſoon as he had heard theſe words of Stupanus, where he ſpeaks with ſuch indifference of the Maſs, he went to three Profeſſors, to conſult with them how he might be ſoundly reprimanded before the Academical Senate. They anſwered him in ſuch a manner as left him no room to hope, which grieved him very much. He committed the vengeance of ſuch enormous profanity to God, and deplored the ſtate of the univerſity where the intereſt of religion was neglected in this manner. *Quo audito acceſſi ad Zulcerum, Amerbachium, Zwingerum* (4), *ſperans fore ut mihi daretur locus, illum* (Stupanum) *apud Collegium objurgandi. Nihil addo, quid reſponſi habuerim. Ego demiſſo vultu, Baſileenſem Religionem admirans & ad hæc nova prope obſtupeſcens, tacitus domum redii, & tantæ profanitatis (ne quid acerbius dicam) ultionem Deo commiſi. Nam quod te non ignorare arbitror, ſimillima eſt aliis omnibus in rebus ad Religionem pertinentibus Academiæ iſtius ratio: Ad* quam

(1) Franciſcus Hotomanus, Epiſtola xcix, *pag.* 139, *Edit. Amſtel.* 1700.

(2) It ſhould be thus, and not as it is in the printed copy *nunc, now*; for it appears by the xcixth letter, that Stupanus had been rector two years before 1580.

(3) Hotoman. Epiſt. xcvii *pag.* 135, 136.

(4) It ſhould be read thus, and not *Zwinglium*, as in the printed copy.

Neapolitan Hiſtory writ in Italian by Pandolphus Collenuccio. His ſon **Emanuel Stouppa**, Doctor of Phyſic, ſpoke the funeral Oration of Gaſper Bauhinus, and publiſhed the *Lexicon Medicum Caſtelli* with additions, and the Aphoriſms of Hippocrates ranged and illuſtrated in a new method, as alſo ſome other books (*b*). He was born in the year 1587, and died in 1664 (*c*). I believe that **Antony Stouppa**, who writ ſome books, was of the ſame family [*C*].

quam tamen Magiſtratus omnia quæ ad Religionem pertinent, referre ſolet. Ego apud familiares meos Zwingerum & Amerbachium non ceſſo tantam iſtam profanitatem execrari, ſed reſponſi nihil aliud refero niſi quod iſta negotia non ad ſe, ſed ad Theologos pertinent (5). He had, not long after, ſome ground of conſolation adminiſtered to him; becauſe at the ſollicitation of the deputies of Zurich, they proceeded ſome length at Baſil againſt Profeſſor Stouppa (6). I do not know what the conſequences of it were.

[*B*] *Among other works of his.*] Theſe other works are *Oratio de Cælii ſecundi Curionis Vita atque obitu*, printed at Baſil in the year 1576 in 4to; a Latin tranſlation of the dialogues of Francis Patricius *de ratione ſcribendæ legendæque Hiſtoriæ*; another of ſome philoſophical treatiſes of Alexander Piccolomini: and another of the war between Selim II and the Venetians (7). He alſo writ *de Holometri fabrica & uſu inſtrumento Geometrico olim ab Abele Fullonio invento, nunc verò ipſius Stupani opera, Sermone Latino ita explicato, ut ad omnis generis dimenſiones inveſtigandas, & regiones deſcribendas utiliſſimum ſimul, facillimumque eſſe queat. Acceſſit etiam Federi Delphini jucundiſſima Diſputatio de æſtu maris & motu octavæ Sphæræ, folio Baſileæ per Petrum Pernam* 1577 (8), and a *Medicina Theorica* printed at Baſil in the year 1614 in 8vo, and *binæ Epiſtolæ Medicæ* printed at Nuremberg in the year 1625 in 4to, with the *Ciſta Medica* of John Hornungus (9).

[*C*] *Antony* Stouppa, *who write ſome books, was of the ſame family.*] He was born in the country of the Griſons, was a Phyſician, and died of the plague at Baſil in the year 1551 (10). He made additions *ad Diſpenſatorium medicamentorum Nicolai Myrepſi*, printed at Lyons in the year 1543. He tranſlated into better Latin *Albohazen Hali filii Abenragel libros octo de judiciis aſtrorum.* That was printed at Baſil in the year 1551 in folio (11).

(*b*) *Vide* Lindenium renovatum, *pag.* 259.

(*c*) Konig, *pag.* 783.

(5) Hotoman. Epiſt. xcix, *pag.* 139.

(6) Heri primum audivi Stupanum noſtrum eſſe delatum, rogatu (ut mihi quidam confirmarunt) Legatorum veſtrorum. *Id. ibid. pag.* 138.

(7) Written in Italian by John Peter Contarino. The Latin tranſlation was printed at Bazil in the year 1573, in 4to.

(8) Taken from the Epitome of *Bibliotheca Geſneri*, pag. m. 477, col. 2.

(9) Lindenius renovatus, *p.* 651.

(10) Epitome Biblioth. Geſneri, *pag. m.* 68.

(11) Ibid.

STRIGELIUS (Victorinus) was born at Kaufbeir (*a*) the twenty-ſixth of December 1524. He loſt his father (*b*) in 1527, and was ſent to Friburg in Briſgaw, in the year 1538, to continue his ſtudies. There he went through a courſe of Philoſophy under John Zinckius, and left that place in 1542, to go to the univerſity of Wittemberg, where he made it his buſineſs to inform himſelf of the opinion of the Proteſtants. He went to Luther's lectures, but more frequently to thoſe of Philip Melanchthon. After he had taken his degree of Maſter of Philoſophy in 1544, he betook himſelf to read private lectures, which procured him a great reputation, and proved very uſeful to his ſcholars. He went on with this exerciſe till the war forced him to leave Wittemberg, and to go to Magdeburg, and then to Erford. The war being ended he went to Iëna in 1548, where he married the year following; and being a widower two years after, he married again in 1553. He aſſiſted at the conference of Eiſenac in 1556 [*A*], and had a friendly diſpute with Menius, upon a queſtion concerning the neceſſity of good works, about which the divines were divided. He reduced that controverſy to ſeven propoſitions, on which the whole diſpute run. The concluſion was, that Menius engaged before the Elector of Saxony, and the whole aſſembly, not to depart from the doctrine contained in the ſeven propoſitions, which he acknowledged to be very conſonant to the word of God. Afterwards Strigelius, purſuant to the prince's order, drew up a form of confeſſion, to which all the divines ſubſcribed. The year following he was attacked by Illyricus, and had a verbal diſpute with him at Weimar [*B*]. The acts of the conference were publiſhed, but not faithfully, ſo that he complained that ſomething had been left out (*c*). He was impriſoned [*C*] with two others in 1559, becauſe they had diſapproved ſome Theological Doctrines, and the piece which thoſe of Weimar had publiſhed againſt thoſe of Wittemberg. He was ſet at liberty three years after, and betook himſelf again to read lectures; but becauſe he

[*A*] *He aſſiſted at the conference of Eiſenac in* 1556.] George Major, a Divine of Wittemberg, openly declared for the *interim* (1), and for the phraſe inſerted in it concerning the neceſſity of good works (2). Ambſdorf ran into another extreme, for he maintained, that good works were pernicious to ſalvation (3). This was the fourth ſchiſm of the Lutherans (4). Such was the ſubject of the conference of Eiſenac, in which our Strigelius acted the moſt conſiderable part. Thuanus (5) confounds the time and the place when he ſays that Strigelius aſſiſted at the conference of Altemburg (6) in the year MDLXVIII, and MDLXIX. Bochſtadius (7) ſhowed long ago that it is a miſtake.

[*B*] *He was attacked by Illyricus, and had a verbal diſpute with him at Weimar.*] They were both Profeſſors in the univerſity newly founded at Iëna (8). Their diſpute ran upon two points (9): firſt, Whether God creates a new ſubſtance, when he regenerates a ſinner: ſecondly, Whether the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt leaves any liberty to man. Strigelius denied the firſt point, and affirmed the ſecond. (10) Note, that Flacius Illyricus was a rigid aſſertor of Luther's doctrine *de ſervo arbitrio*. On the contrary, Strigelius approved the moderate expreſſions of Melanchthon: and therefore he was looked upon as one of the leaders of the Synergiſts, that is, of thoſe who acknowledge that man's will co-operates with Grace. This was the fifth ſchiſm of the Lutherans (11). According to Quenſtedt, Strigelius was the incendiary and trumpeter of that war, *Belli ſynergiſtici*, κορυφαῖος, *fax & tuba* (12). I have mentioned in another place (13) the conference of Weimar: many authors place it not in the year 1557, as Melchior Adam and Hoornbeeck (14) do, nor in the year 1561, as Spondanus (15), but in the year 1560. And they are in the right; for I have now lying before me the Acts of that Conference printed in the year 1562, with this title; *Diſputatio de originali peccato & libero arbitrio, inter Mathiam Flacium Illyricum & Victorinum Strigelium publicè Vinariæ per integram hebdomadam, præſentibus Illuſtriſſ. Saxoniæ Principibus, Anno* 1560 *initio menſis Auguſti habita.* It is a book of 394 pages in 4to.

[*C*] *He was impriſoned.*] Falling ſick during his impriſonment he had leave to get himſelf carried to his wife, but upon condition that he ſhould be at home as a priſoner. Several princes, and even the Emperor Maximilian, interceded for him, and obtained that he might be viſited by his friends (16).

[*D*] *He*

(*a*) It is an imperial city in Suabia, near the Alps. *Melch. Adam, in Vit. Theologor. German. pag.* 423.

(*b*) He was a native of Memminguen, and Phyſician to the Lords de Fronſberg, *Id. ibid.*

(*c*) See the remark [*E*].

(1) Micrælius, Synt. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. *p. m.* 766.

(2) Id. ib. *p.* 865.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Thuan. *lib. xlvi*, *pag.* 941.

(6) It was held towards the latter end of 1568, and in the beginning of 1569.

(7) See the letters written to Goldaſtus, and publiſhed in 1688.

(8) Henr. Alting. Theol. Hiſt. *pag.* 298.

(9) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theolog. German. *pag.* 420.

(10) Alting. ibid.

(11) Micræl. ubi ſupra, *pag. m.* 865.

(12) Quenſtedt, de Patriis Viror. illuſtr. *pag.* 158.

(13) In the remark [C], of the article Illyricus.

(14) In Summa Controverſiarum, *pag.* 527. *Edit.* 1653.

(15) Spondanus, *ad. ann.* 1560, *num.* 32, *pag.* 602.

(16) *Taken from* Melchior Adam, ibid. *pag.* 421.

he quickly perceived that the poſt he was in was not a ſafe one [*D*], he left Iëna, and did not regard the remonſtrances which the univerſity of that name writ to him to perſuade him to return. He went to Leipſic, where he publiſhed notes upon the Pſalter. He obtained from the Elector the liberty of teaching in the univerſity of Wittemberg, or in that of Leipſic, and choſe to live in this laſt city. He began his lectures there on the firſt of March, 1563, and explained not only Divinity, but alſo Logic and Morals. He had carried his common-places as far as the article of the Euchariſt, which he was to begin in February 1567; but the ſchool door was ſhut againſt him, and they ſent him word to leave off reading lectures. He applied himſelf to the Elector of Saxony for redreſs, and not obtaining the juſtice he expected, he yielded to the *Odicum Theologicum* (*d*), - - *The Hatred of Divines*, and retired into the Palatinate. He hoped the Elector would take care of him, and he was not miſtaken, for he was called to Heidelberg to be profeſſor of Morality, and for ſome other employments. He worthily diſcharged the duties of thoſe places till he died, which happened on the twenty-ſixth of June 1569, after a very ſhort ſickneſs, according to his wiſhes (*e*). He was a good Philoſopher and a good Divine, and he had an admirable talent of teaching youth. His life was attended with a thouſand vexations; he was accuſed of hereſy; he was defamed to the higheſt degree, anathematized, and expoſed to penal laws [*E*]. This was the reaſon why

(*d*) Ceſſit impotentiæ Theologorum. *Melch. Adam, ibid.* pag. 423.

(*e*) Conſecutus eſt quod ſæpe in votis habuit, videlicet ne difficili & producto morbi genere ſpiritum edere cogeretur. *Id. ibid. pag.* 425.

[*D*] *He perceived . . . . that the poſt he was in was not a ſafe one.*] He thought he could not continue in it without endangering his conſcience, his reputation, and his life. He perceived that the peace, ſuch as it was, which the Divines of Iëna had concluded between him and his enemies, was ill obſerved: beſides, he was warned by many credible perſons, that he ſhould uſe all poſſible diligence to avoid the ſnares, or rather the open violence, deſigned againſt him. His fear was not groundleſs, for he knew that Solomon adviſes us *not to truſt to an enemy*, and to keep off from him; and he remembred Menander's ſaying, That *reconciliations produce a wolf's friendſhip* (17). When he anſwered the letter of the univerſity of Iëna, he declared, That if his going away was not free from blame, it was rather to be aſcribed to the inconveniencies of the time and place, and the ſnares of falſe brethren, than to himſelf (18), and, in a word, that he had rather retire into the moſt dreadful ſolitude, than return to Iëna. '(19) Paucis ut dicamus: ſumma propoſiti ipſius hæc fuit: *nolle ſe redire Iënam: ſed potius iturum quocunque Deus vocarit: etiamſi in ea loca migrandum eſſet:*

. . . Pigris ubi nulla campis
Arbor æſtiva recreatur aura:
Quod latus mundi nebulæ, maluſque
Jupiter urget (20).

' - - - *To ſay all in a few words; the ſum of his reſolution was, that he would not return to Iëna; but would rather go wherever GOD ſhould call him; although it were into thoſe places,*

. . . Where no ſun appears,
Or wrapt in clouds or drown'd in tears;
Where woods with whirling tempeſts toſt;
Where no relieving ſummer's breeze
Does murmur thro' the trees,
But all lies bound and fix'd in froſt.

CREECH.

If we conſider all thoſe things, we ſhall be leſs ſurprized to ſee that the diſputes of Divines are now a-days ſo ſcandalous. They were more ſcandalous ſtill at that time. Take notice that Strigelius was diſmiſſed by the Elector for not keeping his word, and raiſing unneceſſary conteſtations (21). He anſwered that he had promiſed to be modeſt only upon condition of doing nothing contrary to truth and his conſcience. *Strigelio contra affirmante ſe modeſtiam quidem promiſiſſe, ſed duabus adjectis conditionibus ſalva veritate, & ſalva conſcientia.* Thoſe two conditions do certainly deſerve to be underſtood, or expreſsly mentioned in all treaties: but they open a way for reviving old quarrels; and with thoſe two pretences, one may break the bonds of any engagement.

[*E*] *His life was attended with a thouſand vexations; he was accuſed of Hereſy, he was defamed to the higheſt degree, anathematized, and expoſed to the penal laws.*] Melanchthon having conſidered Strigelius's nativity, ſaid, That the ſtars threatened him with all manner of aſſaults. 'De ſchemate ejus genethliaco, *Melanchthon*, ubi id conſideraſſet, ita ex ſiderum poſitu ratiocinatus fuit; fore, ut artibus innumeris oppugnaretur; non aliter,

Quàm lapis æquoreis undique pulſus aquis (22).

' - - - *Melanchthon, having conſidered his nativity, concluded from the poſition of the ſtars, that he ſhould ſuffer an infinite number of aſſaults; no otherwiſe than*

A rock that's buffeted on every ſide
By the rude billows . . . .

Perhaps the man born under ſuch malignant conſtellations, explained that prediction by theſe verſes of Horace, when he found himſelf expoſed to ſlanders, and ſchool diſputes:

. . . . Inſtat fatum mihi triſte, Sabella
Quod puero cecinit, divinâ motâ anus urnâ:
Hunc neque dira venena, nec hoſticus auferet enſis,
Nec laterum dolor, aut tuſſis, nec tarda podagra,
Garrulus hunc quando conſumet cunque: loquaces,
Si ſapiat, vitet, ſimulatque adoleverit ætas (23).

For now the fatal hour, the time is come,
The midwife told me, when ſhe read my doom;
She turn'd the ſieve, and ſaid, Nor ſword, nor cough,
Nor poiſon, plague, nor charms, ſhall take him off:
Nor the catarrh, nor flux, nor pox deſtroy,
But an eternal tongue ſhall kill the boy,
And therefore would he have his life be long,
When grown a man avoid a talking tongue.

CREECH.

However it be, let us ſee how he deſcribes his anguiſh (24): 'De meis rebus quid multa attinet ſcribere, cum non ſolum in veteri luto adhuc hæream; ſed etiam ad reliquas moleſtias accedat truncata & mutilata editio diſputationis inter me & hominem barbarum (25) agitatæ, & aliorum ſcriptorum: quibus fama mea atrociſſimè, apud eos, qui vitam & mores meos non penitus perſpexerunt, læditur ac deformatur. Nam inter reliquas criminationes ipſa morte acerbiores tribuitur mihi impia & extrema levitas, vanitas, inconſtantia, perfidia in negocio religionis, & pertinax odium veritatis. Ad hæc convicia, quorum molem vix una navis vehat, accedit fulmen injuſtæ condemnationis, quam Paulus vocat Anathema Maranatha. - - - *To what purpoſe ſhould I write a great deal touching my own affairs; ſince I am not only ſtill entangled in the old mire, but likewiſe to my other vexations I have a freſh misfortune added,* viz. *a lame and curtailed edition of the diſpute between me and the Barbarian, and of my other books: by which means my reputation ſuffers grievouſly with thoſe who are not thoroughly acquainted with my life and converſation. For, among other accuſations more inſupportable than death itſelf, I am charged with an*

(17) Id. ibid. *pag.* 421, 422.

(18) Id. ibid. *pag.* 422.

(19) Id. ibid.

(20) Theſe verſes are to be found in Horace, Od. XXII, lib. i.

(21) Quod violaſſet promiſſa, ac certamina moviſſet non neceſſaria. *Id. ibid. pag.* 424.

(22) Id. ibid. *pag.* 417.

(23) Horatius, Sat. IX, lib. i, ver. 29.

(24) Strigelius, Epiſt. ad Wolfgangum à Kotteritz, *apud* Melchior. Adamum, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 420. *That letter was written in* 1562.

(25) *That is* Flaccius Illyricus.

why, like Melanchthon in a like caſe, he often begged of GOD that he would take him out of this world (*f*) [*F*]. I ſhall not give a catalogue of his works; it may be ſeen in Mr Teiſſier (*g*). I muſt obſerve as a remarkable thing, that he made no ſcruple to uſe the thoughts and expreſſions of other writers [*G*]. It has been ſaid, that he retracted

‘*impious and unbounded levity, pride, fickleneſs, treachery in the point of religion, and an obſtinate hatred to truth. Add to theſe reproaches, which would be more than a ſufficient cargo for any one ſhip, the thunder-bolt of unjuſt condemnation, which St Paul calls Anathema Maranatha.*’ He adds, that though the teſtimony of a good conſcience ſerves him for a ſhield againſt the darts of calumny, yet he could not forbear being touched with the falſities publiſhed againſt him. His greateſt grief was to have his hands tied, that is, to be forced by the circumſtances of time and place to ſay nothing, though his ſilence made him ſuſpected by ſeveral perſons. Such is the fate of thoſe, who are perſecuted by enemies whoſe faction is uppermoſt, and ſupported by the ſecular power. Thoſe enemies publiſh whatever they pleaſe, and lye impudently to conceal their ſhameful artifices, and their iniquity from the public. Thoſe, who are calumniated by them, could not make a good defence without ſaying ſome things that would exaſperate their common maſter, and expoſe them to new miſeries. They are therefore ſilent; but ſuch a conduct produces an ill effect: the enemy triumphs at it, and many people, haſty in their judgments, put a ſiniſter interpretation upon it. There is nothing more advantageous, according to the notions of the world, than to be always for the ſtrongeſt faction; and, on the contrary, nothing can be more diſadvantageous, with reſpect to one's temporal intereſt, than to be for the party that is in the right, if it be inferior in credit and power. ‘Multis etiam, *they are Strigelius's words*, meum ſilentium, quo has calumnias diſſimulare cogor, ſuſpectum eſt, perinde quaſi mihi honeſta oratio deſit ad has labes & maculas detergendas. Sed boni viri, quibus conditio mea, triſtis ſane & luctuoſa, notior eſt, non ignorant, quibus vinculis conſtrictus impediar, quo minus vel cauſam ipſam explicare, vel innocentiam meam à morſibus venenatiſſimis hominum vindicare poſſim (26). - - - *The ſilence in which I am obliged to paſs by theſe reproaches is ſuſpected by many; as if I wanted a ſolid defence againſt ſuch foul imputations. But good men, that are acquainted with my ſad and mournful condition, are not ignorant by what fetters I am bound up and hindered from juſtifying my cauſe, and clearing my innocence from the venemous attacks of men.*’ All that I can do, ſays he, is to implore GOD's juſtice, and to cry out, as the prophet David did, *O Lord God the avenger, O God the avenger, ſhew thy ſelf clearly. Exalt thy ſelf, O judge of the world, and render a reward to the proud* (27). When he gave the reaſons why he had left Leipſic, the chief he alledged was the injury done, not ſo much to himſelf, as to truth, by forbidding him to mention a doctrine that was dearer to him than his life (28). His ſecond reaſon was, That no body offered to aſſiſt him, when his innocence was ſuppreſſed. The third, That he had received a threatning anſwer from the court; and laſtly, That he was oppreſſed by the threatnings of the Divines, and the anathema's of the Preachers (29). But the better to know the unhappineſs of his fate, and how unfortunate he was in being expoſed to the injuſtice of a violent faction, and more ſtill, in being too ſenſible of the injuries he received from them; it is ſufficient to obſerve that he grew old before his time. He was worn out, and decrepit in body and mind at forty-four years of age. He complained of it ſome few months before he died, as it appears from theſe words, ‘Cum ante annos decem & corpore & animo vigerem: nunc tot calamitatibus tum victus tum fractus, vix ægra membra traho, & animi alacritatem ſeneſcere comperio. Quare me omni cura & cogitatione præparo ad iter, quod ducit ex hujus vitæ miſeriis ad æternam tranquillitatem (30). - - - *Whereas ten years ago I was vigorous both in mind and body, I am now ſo far ſubdued and broken with ſuch a number of calamities, that I can ſcarce drag along my weary members, and I perceive a ſenſible decay in the chearfulneſs of my mind. For which reaſon I am preparing myſelf with the utmoſt diligence and thought, for that journey which leadeth out of the miſeries of this life to eternal tranquillity.*’ A verſe of Virgil with a ſmall alteration in it might have been applied to him (31).

[*F*] *Like Melanchthon, in a like caſe, he often begged of GOD that he would take him out of this world.*] I deſire to die, ſaid Melanchthon (32); firſt, that I may enjoy the beatifical viſion; ſecondly, that I may be no longer expoſed to the implacable hatred of Divines. Strigelius had the ſame thoughts: read theſe words of Melchior Adam. ‘A Flacio Illyrico, & ejus manipularibus, objectum ei eſt crimen hæreſeos: quod graviſſimè tulit: nominatim accuſatus eſt; quod non rectè ſentiret & doceret de ea parte doctrinæ; quæ appellatur, de libero arbitrio. *Ab aliis verò aliorum inſimulatus eſt errorum: ut vita ejus perpetua fuerit pugna & dimicatio. Itaque ut* Melanchthon *ante mortem dixit:* cupio ex hac vita migrare propter duas cauſas: *primum* ut fruar deſiderato conſpectu Filii DEI & cœleſtis eccleſiæ: *deinde* ut liberer ab immanibus & implacabilibus odiis Theologorum: *ita ipſe eaſdem cauſas ſæpè inter precandum uſurpare ſolitus fuit: cum videret ſe hoc fato natum: ut omnibus eorum telis, qui eſſent arguti cives ſine virtute, vita & fama ſua propoſita eſſet* (33). - - - *The crime of Hereſy was objected to him by Flaccius Illyricus and his followers, which grieved him very much. He was chiefly accuſed by them of thinking and teaching amiſs concerning what is called the doctrine of free-will. Others charged him with different errors, in ſuch a manner that his life was a continued fight and ſtruggle. Wherefore as Melanchthon ſaid before his death, I wiſh to die for two reaſons,* &c. . . . . *Strigelius frequently made uſe of the ſame reaſons in his prayers, perceiving that he was born to this fate, that his life and reputation ſhould be expoſed as a mark to the darts of ſuch men as had a great deal of wit but no virtue.*’ If his father and mother had been witneſſes of his great trouble, their grief for it would have proceeded from a cauſe very different from that which made Iſaac and Rebecca uneaſy. The latter were troubled to ſee how well their ſon agreed with ſtrangers; but the former would have been afflicted at the war kindled between their ſon and his brethren, a war which grieved him no leſs than the alliance of ſtrangers grieved Eſau's mother. See the margin (34). It is to be obſerved that the Church, who is a good mother, bears her grief a little better than Rebecca; ſhe is troubled to ſee her children at war, and is ſo uſed to it, that one would think it is become familiar to her. She bears prudently, and ſhews a greater or ſmaller degree of patience, according as people have more or leſs dexterity in huffing her. But what is moſt admirable is the patience of the people; it may be ſaid that as in ſome countries they patiently bear all manner of taxes, they are every where no leſs tame with reſpect to controverſies.

[*G*] *He made no ſcruple to uſe the thoughts and expreſſions of other writers.*] In this reſpect he ſeemed to be for a community of goods; he did not think that in doing ſo he was a plagiary, and he was very willing that other authors ſhould deal with him as he dealt with them. If you find any thing in my books, ſaid he, that fits you, you may freely uſe it; every thing is at your ſervice. ‘Cùm Victorinus noſter diu multumque verſatus eſſet in lectione eorum Autorum, qui libros Ariſtotelis quaſi in ſuum ſuccum convertiſſent, illorum potiùs veſtigia voluit, ubi & quantum poſſet, conſectari, quàm novam per omnia cudere verſionem. Ac quidem ille vir & factus erat, & natus, ut ſi qua ei de re dicendum eſſet aut ſcribendum, & ipſi, quæ de eadem illa ipſa re alii etiam recentiores, & qui viverent adhuc, rectè tradidiſſent, in mentem venirent, non puderet hinc illum verba ab iis & ſententias mutuari. Non enim hoc dicebat plagium eſſe literarium, ſed ingenuam atque candidam doctis atque bonis viris dignam κοινωνίαν. Et faciat, inquit, aliquis idem, ſi ſe cum fructu hoc poſſe ſperat, de meis quoque (35). - - - *As our Victorinus was extremely well verſed in thoſe authors who had thoroughly ſtudied and digeſted the books of Ariſtotle, he rather choſe to follow their footſteps, as much as poſſible, than to coin a tranſlation that ſhould be*

(*f*) *Taken from* Melch. Adam, in Vitis Theolog. German. *pag.* 417, *& ſeq.*

(*g*) Teiſſier, Addit. aux Eloges, *Tom.* i, *p.* 325.

(26) Strigel. *apud* Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theolog. German. *pag.* 421.

(27) Pſalm xciv, ver. 1.

(28) Melch. Adam, in Vitis Theolog. *pag.* 424.

(29) Ad hæc omnia acceſſerunt *minæ Theologorum & fulmina anathematum* adverſus ipſum in concionibus edita. *Id. ibid.*

(30) Melch. Adam, in Vitis Theolog. *pag.* 425.

(31) *The* 114*th of the* vi*th book of the Æneid,* Invalidus vires ultra ſortemque ſenectæ. *And bore beyond the ſtrength decrepit age ſupply'd.* *Let us ſay of Strigelius,* Invalidus vires infra ſortemque juventæ. *Leſs firm than is the fate of luſty youth.*

(32) See above the remark [*G*] of the article MELANCHTHON.

(33) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 427.

(34) Eſau … took to wife *two daughters of Heth*, which were a grief of mind to Iſaac and Rebekah. *Geneſ.* xxvi. 34, 35. And Rebekah ſaid to Iſaac, I am weary of my life becauſe of the daughters of Heth. If Jacob take a wife of the daughters of Heth …. what good ſhall my life do me. *Geneſ.* xxvii, 46.

(35) Jacobus Monavius, Præf. Nicomacheorum Ariſtotelis cum verſione, Argumentis & Scholiis Strigelii, *apud* Thomaſium de Plagio Literario, *num.* 194, *p.* 82.

retracted at his death; but I take it to be a meer ſtory [*H*].

‘ *new in every part. And indeed that man was ſo* ‘ *framed by nature, that when he was about to ſpeak or* ‘ *write upon any ſubject, if any thing occurred to him* ‘ *which other modern writers, ſome of whom were then* ‘ *alive, had handſomely expreſſed, he was not aſhamed* ‘ *to borrow words, and even ſentences from them: for* ‘ *he did not think*, &c . . . .

[*H*] *It has been ſaid that he retracted at his death, but I take it to be a meer ſtory.*] We are told that a gentleman, who ſtudied at Heidelberg, met one day Strigelius in the ſtreet, and told him, Sir, ſome years ago you did not believe or teach the Calviniſtical doctrines you teach now. I was your ſcholar at Iena, where you gave other inſtructions to your diſciples. Strigelius made no anſwer, and went home, and finding himſelf very ill, moſt humbly intreated the Elector (36) to be ſo kind as to come to him, giving him to underſtand that he would impart to him ſome things relating to ſalvation. The Prince went to him, being accompanied by Count George de Hundſructen. What I have taught hitherto at Heidelberg in favour of the Calviniſts, ſaid Strigelius to him, does not well agree with the word of GOD; but the doctrines, which the Lutherans have profeſſed till now, are very true. The Elector having heard thoſe words, went away in anger. Strigelius quickly expired with a groan (37) This ſtory is taken from the relation of a journey to Conſtantinople, made by Gerlach, to whom Andreas Carolus (38), Abbot of St George, refers the reader, after having mentioned what you have juſt now read. He doubts whether one ſhould ſay that Strigelius had an unconſtant ſoul, rather than call it an unhappy one (39). He had called him before a weather-cock in point of religion, and a favourer of the Synergiſts and Zuinglians (40).

(36) It was Frederic III.

(37) Mox autem ægrotans Victorinus animam (inconſtantem dicam, an infelicem?) gemebundus exhalavit. *Andr. Carolus, memorab. Eccleſiaſt. ſeculi xvii, pag.* 49.

(38) Andr. Carolus, ibid.

(39) It ſeems in this place that he means a damned ſoul.

(40) Homo varius & verſipellis tum Synergiſtis, tum Zinglianis addictus. *Id. ibid. pag.* 34.

STROZZI (PHILIP) of an antient and rich family of Florence (*a*), was one of thoſe, who, after the death of Clement VII, moſt earneſtly endeavoured to recover the liberty of their country, by expelling Alexander de Medicis. When he ſaw that their ſollicitations at the court of the Emperor Charles V [*A*] were inſignificant, he took a ſhorter and more criminal method; which was to cauſe the pretended uſurper to be aſſaſſinated [*B*]. He engaged a man in this plot who put it in execution; but the ſucceſs of that enterprize was more fatal to the liberty of the Florentines, than the diſcovery

(a) See the remark [*A*], near the end.

[*A*] *Their ſollicitations at the court of the Emperor Charles* V.] There is ſomething about this in Rabelais's letters. The Cardinals Salviati and Rodolphus went to Naples with our Strozzi in the year 1536, to engage the Emperor to ſet up again a republican government in Florence: they did not ſucceed in it. ‘ I hear their affairs have not had the ſucceſs they ‘ hoped for, and that the Emperor told them peremp- ‘ torily that he had, at theirs and the late Pope Cle- ‘ ment's requeſt, appointed Alexander de Medicis, ‘ Duke of the territories of Florence and Piſa, which ‘ he never thought of, and had never done, had it ‘ not been for them; that if he ſhould depoſe him, it ‘ were acting the part of a juggler, doing and undo- ‘ ing; and that therefore they ſhould reſolve to ac- ‘ knowledge him for their Duke and Lord, and to ‘ obey him as vaſſals and ſubjects ought to do. As ‘ for the complaints they made againſt the Duke; he ‘ told them he ſhould take cognizance of them upon ‘ the place (1).’ I ſhall add the following words out of the firſt letter (2). ‘ I hear that it is (3) about the ‘ affair of Florence, and the difference between Duke ‘ Alexander de Medicis and Philip Strozzi, whoſe ‘ eſtate the Duke deſigned to confiſcate. It is no ‘ ſmall eſtate, for next to the Fourques of Auſburg, ‘ he is accounted the richeſt merchant in Chriſtendom. ‘ The Duke had appointed ſome men in that town ‘ to poiſon or kill him. Being informed of it he ob- ‘ tained the Pope's leave to bear arms, and he was ‘ commonly attended by thirty ſoldiers well armed. ‘ The Duke of Florence being informed that Strozzi ‘ and thoſe Cardinals were gone to the Emperor, and ‘ that he offered him four hundred thouſand ducats, ‘ if he would appoint ſome perſons to inquire into ‘ the Duke's tyranny and wickedneſs, ſet out from ‘ Florence, appointed Cardinal Cibo governor in his ‘ abſence, and arrived in that city (4) the day after ‘ Chriſtmas.’ In the thirteenth letter Rabelais ſays (5). ‘ That thoſe Cardinals, and Strozzi, with his money, ‘ could not prevail with the Emperor, though they ‘ offered, in the name of all thoſe that were baniſhed ‘ from Florence, to give him a million of gold ready ‘ money, to finiſh La Rocqua, that was begun in ‘ Florence, and to keep a good garriſon in it in the ‘ Emperor's name, and to pay him a hundred thou- ‘ ſand ducats every year, provided he would get their ‘ eſtates and former liberty reſtored to them’. Afterwards the author mentions the honours that were done to the Duke of Florence by Charles V, and then he adds: ‘ (6) From that time the ſaid Cardinals, the ‘ Biſhop of Xaintes, and Strozzi have continued their ‘ ſollicitations; the Emperor has at laſt referred the ‘ thing till he comes to Florence . . . . And the Duke ‘ has proceeded ſo cunningly in his tyranny, that the ‘ Florentines have proteſted to the Emperor *nomine* ‘ *communitatis*, that they deſire to have no other ‘ Lord but him. It is certain he has ſeverely puniſh- ‘ ed the exiles.’

Take notice that the author of the notes upon Rabelais's epiſtles, will not believe that Philip Strozzi was a merchant (7). But it is hardly conceivable how at that time a family of Florence could have got ſo much wealth without trading. However, if he was not a famous Banker, he deſerved to be accounted one. The baron de Forquevauls gives him that title. ‘ Philip ‘ Strozzi, *ſays he* (8), and Bartholomew Valori, better ‘ Bankers than Captains, were forced at Montemurlo. He adds (9), ‘ That he was prodigiouſly rich for a ‘ citizen. Peter Strozzi, notwithſtanding his loſſes ‘ and expences, had ſtill four hundred thouſand crowns ‘ in the banks of Venice and Lyons, that remained ‘ out of his father Philip's inheritance (10).’ He went to Francis I, at the camp of Marolles, with a troop of two hundred Arquebuziers on horſeback, which had coſt him above fifty thouſand crowns (11). This I find in Brantome, who adds (12): ‘ He was vaſtly ‘ rich, and ſaved a great deal of money at Venice, ‘ where he kept for ſome time with Mr Strozzi, his ‘ ſon (13). That brave lord ſpent that vaſt eſtate in ‘ the ſervice of our kings; for, as I have it fro[illegible]is ‘ ſon, and his antient ſervants, whereas he was worth ‘ above five hundred thouſand crowns, when he came ‘ into the ſervice of our kings, he did not leave ‘ twenty thouſand crowns to his ſon when he died: ‘ that is ſpending to ſome purpoſe.’ Here is another paſſage of Brantome, which fully confirms what I have quoted out of him. ‘ The king gave to Mr Strozzi, ‘ ſon of the Mareſchal of France, fifty thouſand ‘ crowns as a reward for the office of Colonel-General ‘ of the infantry, with which he bought Breſſuire in ‘ Poitou; and this is all that he and his father left of ſo ‘ great an eſtate as he brought into France: for I have ‘ heard many people ſay, That when he came thither, ‘ hehad a million of gold in bank, or in goods and ‘ jewels, or in money, or books (14)’.

[*B*] *Which was to cauſe the pretended uſurper to be aſſaſſinated.*] I ſhould be very much to blame, ſhould I think that I can comment upon this text more elegantly, by uſing my own words than by uſing Balzac's expreſſions; and therefore I ſhall make no alteration in the proof he affords me (15). ‘ Philip Strozzi, ‘ the huſband of Clarice de Medicis, ſiſter (16) to ‘ Pope Leo, not being able to bear the reign of Duke ‘ Alexander de Medicis, exhorted Laurence de Me- ‘ dicis, his couſin, to conſpire againſt the life of ‘ Duke Alexander, and to reſtore the liberty of his ‘ country,

(1) Rabelais, Letter viii, *pag.* 29.

(2) Idem, *pag.* 8, & *ſeq.*

(3) That is, that the Cardinals Salviati and Rodolphus were gone to the court of Charles V, at Naples.

(4) That is, at Rome.

(5) Rabelais, ibid. *pag.* 55.

(6) Id. ibid. *pag.* 56.

(7) Obſervat. ſur les Epitres de Rabelais, *pag.* 61.

(8) Francois de Pavie, Baron de Forquevauls, Vies de pluſieurs grands Capitaines, *pag.* 379.

(9) Id. ibid. *pag.* 382.

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 383.

(11) Brantome, Capitaines Etrangers, *Tom. ii, pag.* 287.

(12) Brantome, ibid. *pag.* 288.

(13) Philip Strozzi, Colonel-General of the French infantry. See Moreri, and Father Anſelm, whom he tranſcribes. See alſo the following article.

(14) *Idem*, Brantome Memoir. des Capit. François, *Tom. iv, pag. m.* 311, 312.

(15) Balzac, Entretien, xxxiv, *ch. vi, pag. m.* 330.

(16) Balzac ſhould have ſaid niece.

diſcovery of the whole conſpiracy would have been. The death of Alexander de Medicis made room for a ſucceſſor better qualified than he was, to ſettle a new ſovereignty. He beat the Malecontents: Strozzi was made a priſoner, and found no better expedient than to kill himſelf [*C*]. He had married Clarice de Medicis, nearly related to Leo X, by whom he had ſeveral children, and among others **Peter Strozzi**, Mareſchal of France, mentioned in Moreri's Dictionary (*b*). It is not true that the Nun, who wrote ſome Latin hymns, was that Mareſchal's ſiſter [*D*].

'country. Laurence appeared willing to undertake 'ſuch a dangerous enterprize; but he was afraid that 'his two daughters would run the hazard of loſing 'their honour, becauſe his eſtate would be confiſcated. Philip told him that ſuch a fear ſhould not 'hinder him, and aſſured him that whatever the ſucceſs of his enterprize might be, he would marry 'two of his ſons to his two daughters. Which he 'did, for Laurence having made his eſcape after 'Duke Alexander's murther, without reaping any 'advantage from it, Philip religiouſly performed his 'promiſe, and gave Laodamia de Medicis to Peter 'Strozzi, who was ſince Mareſchal of France, and 'Magdalen to Robert Strozzi, who lately died at 'Rome (17).'

[*C*] *He found no other expedient than to kill himſelf.*] I ſhall ſtill uſe Balzac's words (18). 'The ſame 'Philip, after the death of Duke Alexander oppoſed 'Coſmo, his ſucceſſor, firſt great Duke of Tuſcany. 'But having loſt the battle of Marone, near Florence, 'he was made priſoner; and believing that his enemy 'would poiſon him or put him to an ignominious 'death, reſolved to kill himſelf. Before he executed 'that ſtrange reſolution, he made his will, the original whereof I have ſeen at Rome, among the 'papers of the late Signor Pompey Frangipane, in 'which among other things, that man, whom the 'antients would have adored, orders and entreats his 'children to dig up his bones out of the place where 'they ſhall lie in Florence, and to get them tranſported to Venice; to the end, ſays he, that ſince 'he could not be ſo happy as to die in a free city, 'he may enjoy that bleſſing after his death, and his 'aſhes may reſt in peace out of the conqueror's dominion. Afterwards he engraved upon the mantle-piece of the chimney with the very ſame point of 'the dagger wherewith he killed himſelf, this verſe 'of Virgil,

> Exoriare aliquis noſtris ex oſſibus ultor.
>
> *Riſe ſome avenger of our Libyan blood.*
>
> Dryden.

'Which was faithfully executed by his children, who 'came into France to ſerve the king againſt the Emperor Charles V, who had founded the domination 'of the Medicis at Florence. I muſt not forget that 'the ſame Philip Strozzi, at the beginning of his 'will, expreſſes a great confidence in God's mercy, 'hoping he will forgive him for killing himſelf, ſince 'he did it like a man of honour to maintain his liberty; being of opinion that when a free man has 'loſt it he may lawfully die. But the Goſpel is contrary to ſuch an opinion, and New Rome calls deſpair what Old Rome called greatneſs of ſoul. She 'excommunicates now thoſe whom ſhe would have 'formerly deified.'

Note, That one of the reaſons that moved Strozzi to kill himſelf was the fear of expoſing his friends to great dangers by what he might confeſs againſt his will upon the rack (19), which appears from a paper that was found in his chamber, wherein he '(20) upbraided Cardinal Libo (21), a friend and truſty 'counſellor to the Duke, with his great cruelty, and 'exhorted him to fill himſelf with the blood he had 'ſo much thirſted after. As for me, added he, ſince 'I have not been able to help my friends in my lifetime, I will do them no prejudice after my death ... 'A remarkable inſtance of human miſery, ſays the 'Baron de Forquevauls, and of the uncertainty of the 'things of this world! Philip Strozzi, who a few 'months before was as much eſteemed and honoured 'as any man in Italy, not only for his riches, that 'were prodigious for a citizen, and for the antiquity 'of his family, which had continued in honour for 'ſeveral hundred years, but alſo for his agreeable 'converſation, magnificence, and liberality, for his 'learning, and his great knowledge and experience of 'the world, finds himſelf a captive in that very 'town whoſe liberty he deſigned to preſerve, and is 'obliged to kill himſelf with his own hands to avoid 'the cruelty of his ungrateful fellow-citizens.' It is allowed that he was a man of learning. 'Fortes non 'ſunt, qui alicujus deſiderii potiundi ſpe privati, aut 'calamitate oppreſſi, manus ſibi intulerunt, qualis 'paucis annis ante Philippus Stroſſius, opibus florens, 'literis non ineruditus, cætera felix, ſi ſua ſorte contentus, partibus adverſis non faviſſet (22). - - - - *Such 'are not truly brave who, upon ſome diſappointment or 'calamity that oppreſſes them, take away their own life; 'as Philip Strozzi did a few years ago; a man of 'great riches, not unlearned, and happy in all other 'reſpects, if he had been contented with his own lot, 'and not favoured the oppoſite faction.*'

[*D*] *It is not true that the Nun, who wrote ſome Latin hymns, was that Mareſchal's ſiſter.*] Brantome, who ſays ſo, is miſtaken. 'He had a ſiſter, ſays 'he (23), who is a Nun, and an Abbeſs in Italy, 'a very honeſt lady, and very well ſkilled in divine 'and human learning, eſpecially in Latin Poetry. 'She wrote ſeveral fine hymns and ſpiritual canticles 'in Latin verſe, which have been ſung in the 'churches of Italy with great admiration and devotion: nay, I have heard ſay that they are ſung ſtill 'in ſome churches.' Colomiés knew not this miſtake of Brantome: he quotes him (24) to confirm what he had cited out of Thuanus in praiſe of Laurentia Strozzi, a Dominican Nun, who died in 1591, aged ſeventy-ſeven years, and whoſe hymns were printed at Paris ten years after (25). That Nun was not ſiſter to Peter Strozzi, Mareſchal of France, as Colomiés thought upon Brantome's credit: ſhe was ſiſter to Cyriacus Strozzi (26), profeſſor of Philoſophy and of the Greek tongue at Florence, and then profeſſor at Bologna, and at laſt at Piſa, ſon of Zachary Strozzi, deſcended from the ſame anceſtors with our Philip. There is more reaſon to ſay that Signor Flaminio's wife (27) was ſiſter to Peter Strozzi, Mareſchal of France. Brantome ſpeaks of her thus: 'She had 'alſo another ſiſter, Signora Magdalena Strozzi, an 'able, ingenious, and very beautiful woman, whom 'I ſaw at Rome in my younger years. She had 'married Signor Flaminio, Count of Anguilara, 'who commanded ſome gallies with the Prior of Capua, his brother-in-law. That Count was the ſon 'of that brave Count de Anguilara, who was killed 'in the ſervice of King Francis I.' This Magdalen might very well be the ſame that is mentioned in the *Prejugez legitimes contre le Papiſme*, on occaſion of a ſteel-box, containing among other relicks our Saviour's prepuce. 'A devout lady, called Magdalen Strotia '(28), was commiſſioned to look over thoſe precious 'treaſures, and put them in order. When ſhe came 'to the little bag wherein the prepuce was, ſhe went 'about to unty the ſtring of the bag; but her fingers 'grew ſtiff and without motion at three ſeveral times: 'Upon this they cried out a miracle, a miracle; and 'another perſon was appointed to open the bag, viz. 'Clarice, daughter of Madam Strotia, who was a 'virgin, and young enough to be ſure of her virginity. For none but a virgin's fingers could touch 'that prepuce (29).' Read the ſequel of this paſſage in the original; it is a ſharp ſatire and a pleaſant ridicule upon many other things, beſides the imprudence of thoſe who write ſo many chimerical things about relics.

(*b*) He quotes there *Baron Forquerauls*: he ſhould have ſaid *Baron Forquevauls*.

(17) When Balzac writ this, Robert muſt have been dead a long time before.

(18) Balzac, ibid. *pag.* 331, 332.

(19) *See the* Baron de Forquevauls, *p.* 381.

(20) Id. *p.* 382.

(21) It ſhould be Cibo.

(22) Rorarius, quod animalia bruta ratione utantur melius homine, *pag.* 15.

(23) Brantome, Capit. Etrangers, *Tom. ii, pag.* 294.

(24) Colomiés, Bibliotheque Choiſie, *p.* 207.

(25) See an Encomium upon that Nun in Hilarion de Coſte, *Tom. ii, pag.* 97. *& ſeq.*

(26) See her Encomium among thoſe of Papyrius Maſſo, *Tom. ii, pag.* 223, *& ſeq.* See alſo Mr Teiſſier, *Addit. aux Eloges tirez de Mr de Thou, Tom. i, p.* 275, *& Tom. ii, pag.* 188. *Edit.* 1696.

(27) Father Anſelme, *Hiſt.* des grans Officiers, *pag.* 387, *calls him* Flaminio d'Aſtaba.

(28) It ſhould be *Strozzi.*

(29) Jurieu, Préjugez légitimes contre le Papiſme, *Tom. ii, pag.* 227. *He quotes Tolet.* in ſecundum Luc. poſt. annotat. 31.

STROZZI (Philip) grandſon (*a*) of the foregoing. You will find in Moreri that he was born at Venice in 1541; *and that he was brought into France at ſeven years of age.* He *was bred up with King Francis II, who was then Dauphin*, and *began to bear arms in Piedmont, under Mareſchal de Briſſac* (*b*). A ſally of youth moved him to go into Piedmont, without telling his father of it. We ſhall ſee, below, the particulars of that mad prank [*A*], and I ſhall mention likewiſe the care that was taken of his ſtudies [*B*]. He was a very brave man, and teſtified upon many occaſions the utmoſt intrepidity (*c*). He was made Colonel-General of the French Infantry, after the deceaſe of Mr Dandelot, in the year 1569 *(d)*. It was he who *did ſo well arm* the Infantry, and *brought in the uſe of large bored arquebuſes* (*e*). He reſigned that office when they gave him the command of the army that was ſent to the Tercera iſles, to attempt the re-eſtabliſhment of Don Antonio, King of Portugal [*C*]. That expedition proved very unfortunate; he loſt his life in it [*D*] the twenty-ſixth of July 1582, and was uſed by the enemies as an infamous pirate: ſeveral

(*a*) He was the ſon of Peter Strozzi, Marſhal of France.

(*b*) Anſelme, Hiſt. des grans Officiers, *pag.* 386.

(*c*) See Brantome in the Encomium upon Strozzi, in the fourth volume of his Memoirs.

(*d*) Anſelme, ibid. *See alſo* Brantome, ibid. *pag.* 270.

(*e*) Brantome, ibid. *pag.* 289.

[*A*] *We ſhall ſee . . . . the particulars of that mad prank.*] ‘Being but a boy, and bred up with the young King Francis II, who was then Dauphin, and hearing of the noble war that was made in Piedmont, he ſtole away only with two horſes, and a Milan arquebuſe at his ſaddle-bow, and went thither, having for his guide that ſpecial rogue John de Eſt, a German, who was lately hanged at Blois, having been made ſome years before Knight of the order of St Michael . . . . . . That fellow adviſed him to ſteal ſome ſilver baſons, cups, and ewers from his mother, in order to make his journey. When the Mareſchal, his father, came to know this, and what reaſon had moved him to it, he ſaid, That if it had been for any thing elſe, and not for ſuch a glorious deſign as that of going to the war, he would have hanged him; but that he forgave him, and would do ſo for the time to come, if he took more from him, provided it were upon ſuch a noble account. Mr Strozzi told me ſo himſelf. Afterwards when he ſaw him, though he was naturally very ſevere, he laughed at it before his mother, who deſired he ſhould be puniſhed for it: however he gave him a ſevere reprimand (1).’

[*B*] *I ſhall mention . . . . the care that was taken of his ſtudies.*] ‘His father took care of his education, and particularly that he ſhould be inſtructed in good learning; he himſelf had made a great proficiency in it: his ſon could not come near it; however he had learning enough. I have heard him ſay that one day his father aſked him what he had done that morning. He told him that he had rid, plaid at tennis, and then breakfaſted. Ah! unhappy young man, ſaid his father, you feed the body before you feed the ſoul? Do ſo no more; firſt of all fill your mind with good reading and ſtudy, and then deal with your body as you think fit. Such were the wiſe precepts which that father gave to his ſon, who made a good uſe of them; for he had as much knowledge as valour, tho' I believe that ever ſince he left his books to betake himſelf to the war, he did not beſtow half an hour upon reading (2).’

[*C*] *He reſigned that office, when they gave him the command of the army . . . . to attempt the re-eſtabliſhment of Don Antonio, King of Portugal.*] Varillas is miſtaken as to the circumſtances of this fact. I ſhall make it appear when I have ſet down Brantome's words. ‘Not long before he undertook that voyage by the queen's order, he was deſired and preſſed to lay down his office of Colonel, being told that he could not be General of that Army, and Colonel in France. Such a propoſal was unacceptable to him, and he was unwilling to comply with it. However, becauſe the king had a mind to raiſe Mr d'Epernon, and to gratify him with that poſt, of which he was more ambitious than of any other, Mr Strozzi was forced to reſign it, to his great grief; for I know what he told me then: he added, that if he did not die in the enterprize, he would be preferred to a greater poſt than that was, and that none ſhould ever dare to deprive him of it. The king gave him fifty thouſand crowns as a reward, wherewith he purchaſed Breſſuire in Poitou (3).’ It appears from the laſt words of this paſſage, that Varillas ſhould not have ſaid that Philip Strozzi, going to the Tercera iſles, *had nothing to loſe in France, ſince he was ſo far from having made any purchaſe in it, that he had ſpent the three millions his grandfather had left* (4). That Hiſtorian is the more inexcuſable, becauſe he quotes Brantome's encomium upon Philip Strozzi. Let us ſee his other miſtakes. ‘The court had lately done Strozzi the greateſt injury he could receive, for King Henry III had deprived him without a cauſe, and even without a pretence, of his office of Colonel of the French infantry, to beſtow it upon the Duke d'Epernon; and becauſe all thoſe that are out of favour grow contemptible, tho' their merit be never ſo great, it was not to be thought that the French, on board the Queen-Mother's fleet, would have a ſufficient eſteem for the General ſhe had given them, ſince they knew that the court made ſo little account of him, that they had taken from him the moſt important poſt in the army, without making him any amends; which had never been practiſed in the foregoing reigns, nor in that of Henry III, before the prodigious fortune of the Duke d'Epernon (5).’ There are two things in this paſſage, the falſity whereof appears from the words of Brantome, above quoted. It is not true that Strozzi was deprived of his office of Colonel *without any pretence, and without making him any amends*. I am contented with this criticiſm, tho' I might proceed farther in my obſervations againſt Varillas; for the hiſtory of the French monarchy may doubtleſs afford ſome examples of what he affirms to have never been practiſed.

[*D*] *That expedition proved unfortunate; he loſt his life in it.*] The Marquis de Sainte Croix, who commanded the Spaniſh fleet, obtained a compleat victory over the French; but he caſt a blot upon his victory, by his cruel uſage of the vanquiſhed. A particular account of his cruelty may be ſeen in a book of Varillas (6), out of which I ſhall only take what concerns our Strozzi. He was forced to ſurrender, after he had made a brave defence (7): ‘(8) Binvile, a gentleman of Picardy, who wrote fifty years after three volumes *des Véritez Françoiſes* (9) in Cardinal de Richelieu's vindication, with more eloquence and neatneſs than any other apologiſt of that prime miniſter, relates from the depoſition of the French, who made their eſcape from the expedition on the Tercera iſles, that Strozzi was wounded above his knee with the ſhot of an arquebuſe, ſo that he could not ſtand; and that he was carried in that condition to the Marquis de Sainte Croix, who turned his head another way with diſdain, that he might not ſee him; that being told he was the General of the French fleet, he ordered him to be removed, becauſe he did but foul and poiſon his ſhip; that a Spaniſh ſoldier, in obedience to the marquis, made an end of Strozzi, by giving him two ſtabs, and then they threw him into the ſea. Other relations do not agree about theſe particulars; and tho' they own that Strozzi had been wounded in the fight, ſo that he could not have recovered, and yet that the Marquis de Sainte Croix ordered they ſhould make an end of him; they add, that he kept his corpſe to have it hanged with the other priſoners, on whom he deſigned to inflict that puniſhment, under pretence that they were men whom no body would own, who came to make war with Spain in the Tercera iſles, tho' that monarchy was at peace with that of France.’ Varillas ſhould not have quoted Binvile, for that author ſays nothing in particular about Strozzi: he only ſays (10), that the Marquis de Sainte Croix uſed him barbarouſly; and of all the facts he relates thereupon, there is none he grounds upon the teſtimony of the French, who returned from the Tercera iſlands. Varillas ſhould have quoted Brantome, who expreſſes himſelf thus (11): When

(1) Brantome, Mémoirs des Capitaines François, *Tom. iv, pag. m.* 303.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 304.

(3) Id. ibid. *pag.* 311.

(4) Varillas, Hiſt. de Henri III, *livr. vi, pag. m.* 134.

(5) Id. ibid. *pag.* 135.

(6) The Hiſtory of Henry III.

(7) Varillas, ibid. *pag.* 145.

(8) Id. ibid. *pag.* 146.

(9) Moreri under the word *Barthelemi* (*Charles*) mentions the author of that book; he ſtyles him *Sieur de Bienville.*

(10) Véritez Françoiſes, *Part. ii, pag.* 403, *Edit. of Paris* 1643, *in* 4*to.*

(11) Brant. ubi ſupra, 307.

ſeveral gentlemen, who had followed him, were delivered up to the executioner, like ſo many robbers on the ſea, who had no commiſſion for what they did [*E*]. He was *extremely ſevere*; which appeared when he ordered *eight hundred women of pleaſure, who followed the camp, to be thrown into the river Loire* (*f*). His free diſcourſe about religion occaſioned a belief that he was little perſuaded of the truth of Chriſtianity; but Brantome affirms he was wronged in that reſpect, and that he was otherwiſe *a very honeſt man* (*g*) [*F*]. This teſtimony proceeding from a man, who acknowledges on the other hand (*h*) that Strozzi plaid him *a trick of a moſt ungrateful friend*, and that he had the *reputation of being neither a bad enemy nor a good friend*, is of great weight: for men offended upon ſuch a nice account, do not uſe to conceal the other faults that are known to them, and do not ſay that this was the only one (*i*). It is affirmed that he gave great credit to Judicial Aſtrology, and that it proved very prejudicial to him in his laſt expedition [*G*].

(*f*) Varillas, Hiſt. de Henri III, *book vi, pag. m.* 142.

(*g*) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 305.

(*h*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 310.

(*i*) As honeſt a man as ever came from Florence: He had but one fault; he was the coldeſt friend that ever was ſeen. *Id. ibid. pag.* 311.

Mr Strozzi ‘ſaw the fleet, commanded by the Marquis de Sainte Croix, making towards him, he was ſo deſirous of preventing him, that his ſhip being heavy, and a bad ſailer, for it was a large Flanders hulk, he removed into a lighter ſhip, on which was Mr de Beaumont, lieutenant to Mr de Briſſac, whoſe governor he had been, and without any farther delay came up to the admiral, and they fought a long while hand to hand; but being wounded in the thigh, near the knee, with a muſket-ſhot, his men being diſcouraged, left off fighting: whereupon the Spaniards eaſily boarded him, and carried him to the Marquis de Sainte Croix, who ſeeing what a miſerable condition he was in, ſaid, he would only be a troubleſome and offenſive nuiſance on board the ſhip, and ordered they ſhould make an end of him; which was done by giving him two ſtabs, and then they threw him into the ſea.’ See the margin (12).

[*E*] *He was uſed as an infamous pirate: ſeveral gentlemen, who had followed him, were delivered up to the executioner as robbers on the ſea, who had no commiſſion for what they did.*] ‘As ſoon as the Marquis de Sainte Croix landed in the iſland of St Michael, he cauſed about three-hundred French priſoners, among whom there were fifty-two gentlemen, to be brought into the public place, called *Villa Franca* (13). They were expoſed, by his order, upon ſcaffolds to the public view, or rather to be laughed at by the people; and then they were ſentenced to be hanged; as the interrupters of commerce, the enemies of the public peace, and favourers of rebels and pirates, who made bold to come from France in a body, to ſerve Don Antonio againſt Philip II, King of Spain, lawful heir of Portugal, notwithſtanding the peace between the Spaniards and the French (14).’ Thuanus's words are more energetical. ‘Tum per tubicinem captivis ſiſti juſſis, ex numero procerum XXVIII numerati ſunt, ex nobilitate circiter L, ex omni numero CCC, quos omneis ad mortem damnavit (*Santacrucius*) publicato elogio, quod pacem inter Chriſtianiſſimum & Catholicum reges juratam violaſſent; Antonio Crati Priori ad claſſem Indicam intercipiendam inſidias ſtruenti operam navaſſent; inſulas R. Catholici, uti jam ad S. Michaelis inſulam fecerant, prædaturi veniſſent; conſerta pugna Catholici claſſem oppugnaſſent. Proinde tanquam publicæ tranquillitatis ac commercii perturbatores erga majeſtatem Catholicam perduelles ac piratæ infames utriuſque Regis bono, ſic Santacrucii ſententia ferebat, criminalium cauſarum judici capite plectendi traduntur (15). - - - *Then the priſoners being produced at a ſignal given by a trumpeter, were found to make in all three-hundred; among whom there were twenty-eight noblemen, and about fifty gentlemen. All theſe the Marquis de Sainte Croix condemned to death, having firſt cauſed a public declaration to be made, that they had broken the peace concluded between their Chriſtian and Catholic Majeſties; that they had aſſiſted the Prior Antony Crates in his ſcheme for intercepting the Weſt-India fleet; that they had come to plunder the iſlands of his Catholic Majeſty, as they had already done to the iſland of St Michael; and that they had openly attacked his fleet. For which reaſons, as enemies to the public peace and trade, as traytors to his Catholic Majeſty, and as infamous pirates, they were delivered over, as the ſentence run, for the good of both kingdoms, to the Judge of criminal cauſes, in order that they ſhould be puniſhed with death.*’ It is affirmed in ſome relations, that the Marquis having cauſed Strozzi to be put to death, *kept his corpſe, to have it hanged with the other priſoners, on whom he intended to inflict ſuch a puniſhment* (16). Henry III required no ſatisfaction for that bloody affront, which ought to be reckoned one of the moſt ſhameful paſſages of his reign. The Hiſtorian *Conteſtagio . . . . tho' he was a penſioner of Spain . . . . owns that Strozzi acted in Henry the third's name, and had a patent for being General of that army* (17). The author, from whom I have theſe words, adds, that the nobility and the ſoldiers who followed Strozzi, *had engaged in that voyage by the moſt Chriſtian's King's ſpecial command*; and *that his majeſty had declared to Pope Gregory XIII, by his ambaſſador, and Philip II, by Mr de Saint Goart, afterwards Marquis de Piſany, that he avowed that naval expedition, as being obliged, by antient treaties, to protect the kingdom of Portugal.* It was therefore an inexcuſable baſeneſs to expreſs no reſentment for ſuch a breach of the laws of war, and ſuch an ignominious puniſhment inflicted upon the French priſoners, as if they had been pirates and men whom no body would own. Thoſe who blame that prince for giving too great a power to his favourites, do him no injuſtice; but they ſhould blame him much more for being ſo weak as to approve all the fancies of his mother, an ambitious woman, who pretended to the crown of Portugal out of an intolerable vanity. She was one of thoſe, who laid a claim to that kingdom (18), and made no ſcruple to produce ridiculous and chimerical pretenſions, that the world might think her anceſtors had been more illuſtrious than it was reported. Having made ſuch a ſtep out of meer vanity, ſhe proceeded to warlike preparations in order to conquer Portugal; ſhe ſent a fleet into the Tercera iſlands, which had the ill ſucceſs I have mentioned; ſhe had the confuſion to ſee that thoſe who acted in her name, and by her ſon's authority, were uſed like pirates, and France was obliged to leave ſuch an ignominious affront unpuniſhed. That queen, who pretended to be ſo great a Politician, had a wrong notion of things, and will never ſerve for a proof that women are capable of governing. Could any thing be more imprudent and impertinent than to engage in ſuch a war, when the kingdom was full of factions, and laboured under great diſtempers, the curing of which ſhould have been the principal care of the court.

REFLEXION upon the conduct of Catherine de Medicis.

[*F*] *His free diſcourſe about religion occaſioned a belief that he was little perſuaded . . . but Brantome affirms, he was wronged in that reſpect, and that he was otherwiſe a very honeſt man*] Theſe laſt words are Brantome's: here follows what he adds. ‘Moſt people looked upon him as a man who had little religion; they might think ſo if they pleaſed, but they never ſounded the bottom of his ſoul. It was true, he was no biggot, no hypocrite, and no devourer of crucifixes, and that he little minded maſſes and ſermons; but then he believed the main things which ought to be believed; and beſides, he would not have wronged any body for any thing in the world. Indeed when he was in a merry mood, he would ſometimes laugh at Purgatory and Hell; but no ſtreſs ſhould have been laid upon it, for he did cerly believe Hell-torments, tho' he laughed at the great dragon repreſented by Painters. To conclude, he ſaid many things, which he might as well have let alone; but that was more out of mirth than out of any ill deſign. I have been familiarly converſant with him about thirty years, and I may ſay he was no impious man (19).’ It is in vain for Brantome to palliate the thing; what he ſays is ſufficient to ſhew that Strozzi had infinitely more morality than religion.

[*G*] *It is affirmed that he gave great credit to Judicial Aſtrology, and that it proved very prejudicial to him in his laſt expedition.*] Read theſe words of Varillas (20). ‘The French plundered and burnt ‘the

(12) You will find in *d'Aubigné Hiſt. Univ.* Tom. ii, book v, ch. xxi, pag. 1160, an account very different from this.

(13) Varillas ſhould have ſaid to the public place of Villa Franca: Villa Franca is a town, and not the name of the public place of a town.

(14) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 147.

(15) Thuanus, *lib. lxxv, pag. m.* 422, 423.

(16) Varillas, ibid. *pag.* 146. *See alſo* Thuanus, ibid. *pag.* 423.

(17) Véritez Françoiſes, *Part. ii, pag.* 405.

(18) *See Mezerai in the fifth volume of his* Abrégé Chronologique, *pag. m.* 238.

(19) *Id. ibid. Tom. iv, p.* 305.

(20) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 137.

'the town of Aguna, and cauſed ſuch a conſternation through the whole iſle of St Michael, that they would have made themſelves maſters of it on the ſame day, if they had purſued their victory; but it was Strozzi's fault as well as the Queen-mother's, his near relation, to be too much addicted to Judicial Aſtrology. He was perſuaded that there were fortunate and unfortunate days for him, and he had made a kind of calendar, which he obſerved with all poſſible exactneſs. The day on which he had been fighting was marked in it with a black ſpot; which made a greater impreſſion upon his mind than the victory he had obtained. He fancied that if he purſued it, he ſhould fall into the precipice his fate had prepared for him; and that his ill fortune began to favour him, the better to bring him to it. This was ſufficient to ſtop him, tho' the circumſtances were ſo favourable, that the citizens of the two chief towns of the iſle of St Michael, had deſerted them, and fled to the mountains, where they hoped to be more ſafe.' There is no body, whom it more concerns to be free from ſuch ſuperſtitions, than the General of an army. See above (21) what I have ſaid concerning Pericles and Nicias.

(21) Remark [B] of the article PERICLES.

STURMIUS (JAMES) was born at Straſburgh in the year 1489 [*A*], of one of the moſt noble families of that place, and made himſelf illuſtrious by the ſervices he did to his country. He exerciſed the moſt conſiderable offices with great capacity and probity, and glorioully performed ſeveral deputations both in the diets of the empire, and at the courts of Vienna and England. He very much contributed to the alteration that was made in religion at Straſburgh in the year 1528, and to the erection of the college that was opened ten years after (*a*), and to Sleidan's Hiſtory [*B*]. He died at Straſburgh on the thirtieth of October 1553 (*b*). He had been ſome years without receiving the ſacrament, being offended at the diſputes of Divines about the ſenſe of theſe words, *this is my body*. See the remark [*D*] in the following article.

(*a*) See remark [*B*], of the following article.

(*b*) *Taken from* Melchior Adam, in Vitis Juriſc. *pag.* 91, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *He was born at Straſburgh in the year* 1489.] Melchior Adam places his birth in the year 1490 (1); but he mentions his epitaph (2) wherein it is placed in the year 1489. I rather chuſe to follow the epitaph, then the narrative of that writer. It is ſaid in Moreri's Dictionary, *that our James Sturmius was born at Sleida, near Cologne, according to Verheiden.* This is taken from Mr Teiſſier (3); but it is certain Verheiden does not ſay ſo, for he ſpeaks of John Sturmius, and not of James. What Mr Teiſſier adds, *That Sturmius, after he had begun his ſtudies at Liege, went on with them at Paris, and that he had the direction of the univerſity of Straſburgh, in the quality of Rector*, is a conſequence of his firſt miſtake, viz. of his falſly ſuppoſing that Verheiden ſpeaks of James Sturmius. What follows is not better. *He died, not eighty years old, as Verheiden ſays, but in his climacterical year* (4). Verheiden does not deſerve ſuch a cenſure; he only ſays that John Sturmius died being above eighty years old (5), which is true. Thuanus is miſtaken when he ſays that *James Sturmius died in his climacterical year* (6). His epitaph (7) imports, that he died in his ſixty-fourth year. Note, that Pantaleon (8), who quotes Sleidan, tells us, that James Sturmius departed this life in his climacterical year ſixty-three. Sleidan does not ſay ſo; on the contrary he obſerves that Sturmius lived above ſixty-three years. I ſhall ſet down the whole paſſage, becauſe it contains a juſt encomium upon the perſon, who makes the ſubject of this article. 'Octobris die penultimo, Jacobus Sturmius, vir longè & prudentiſſimus & integerrimus, ac planè decus nobilitatis Germanicæ, propter eximias animi dotes & doctrinam inſignem, è vita decedit Argentorati, cùm ex febri quartana per tempus bimeſtre decubuiſſet. Ætatis annum exceſſerat tertium & ſexageſimum (9). ---- *On the thirtieth of October, James Sturmius, a man of the greateſt prudence and integrity, and who was truly an honour to the German Nobility, by reaſon of his exquiſite parts and uncommon learning, died at Straſburgh; after having been confined to his bed for two months by a Quartan Ague. He was paſt his ſixty-third year.*' See how dangerous it is to truſt to quotations, that have not been compared with the original.

[*B*] *He very much contributed ..... to Sleidan's hiſtory.*] That Hiſtorian acknowledges it. 'Hiſtoriam nihil magis decet quàm veritas atque candor. Ego certè, ne quid in ea parte poſſet in me deſiderari, diligenter incubui: nec enim ex vano quicquam hauſi, vel auditione levi, ſed ſcribendi materiam mihi ſuppeditarunt acta, quæ ſtudioſè collegi, de quorum fide nemo dubitare poſſit: Intervenit etiam verè nobilis & præclari viri, Jacobi Sturmii, ſubſidium & opera, qui per annos amplius triginta verſatus in publicis & arduis negociis, maxima cum laude, quum ſua me non dedignaretur amicitia, quæ fuit ipſius humanitas, dubitantem & hærentem aliquando in vadis atque ſcopulis, peritus ipſe gubernator, ſubinde reduxit in viam æquabilem minimeque ſalebroſam, & majorem operis partem, ante morbum, quo ſublatus interiit, meo rogatu perlegit, & quorum oportuit, diligenter admonuit (10). ---- *Nothing is more becoming hiſtory than truth and candour. I for my part have been at all poſſible pains not to fail in this point; for I have taken nothing at random, nor upon ſlight hear-ſay, but have carefully collected my materials out of records, the authority of which cannot be doubted. I have likewiſe been greatly aſſiſted by that noble and eminent perſon James Sturmius, who was himſelf employed for above thirty years in public and arduous affairs, and acquitted himſelf with great reputation. As he was pleaſed to honour me with his friendſhip, ſo when he found me ſometimes wavering and entangled amidſt rocks and ſhallows, like a ſkillful pilot he conducted me into an even and ſecure track. Before the ſickneſs of which he died, he peruſed at my entreaty the greateſt part of the work, and took pains to give me all neceſſary hints and admonitions.*'

(1) Melch. Adam, ubi infra, *pag.* 91.

(2) Ibid. *p.* 95.

(3) Teiſſier, Addit. aux Eloges, *Tom. i, pag.* 72.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Verheiden, in Iconibus, *pag.* 138.

(6) Thuan. apud Teiſſier, ibid.

(7) Apud Melch. Adam, in Vitis Juriſconſultor. *pag.* 95.

(8) Pantaleon, in Diario Hiſtorico, *ad diem* 30 *Octobr. pag.* 327.

(9) Sleidanus, Hiſtor. *lib. xxv, folio m.* 725, *ad ann.* 1553.

(10) Jo. Sleidanus, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* Hiſtor. *folio m.* a v.

STURMIUS (JOHN) was born at Sleida in Eifel (*a*) near Cologne (*b*) the firſt of October 1507. He ſtudied firſt in his native country, with the ſons of Count Manderſcheid, whoſe receiver his father was. Afterwards he ſtudied at Liege in St Jerom's college, and then he went to Louvain in 1524, where he ſpent five years, three in being inſtructed and two in inſtructing others; and his ſchool-fellows were John Sleidan, Gonthier Andernac, Chriſtopher Montius, Bartholomew Latomus, Andrew Veſalius, James Omphalius, and ſome others, who became famous, and had a great affection for him. He ſet up a Printing-houſe with Rudger Reſcius, Greek-profeſſor, and printed ſome Greek authors, beginning with Homer, and ſoon after he carried thoſe editions to Paris in 1529 (*c*). What Melchior Adam ſays, is not true, that he was familiarly acquainted with Conrad Goclenius at Louvain [*A*]. He was very much eſteemed

(*a*) See his Epiſtle Dedicatory in the ſecond volume of Cicero's Orations.

(*b*) Melch. Adam, in Vitis Philoſophor. *pag.* 342.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *It is not true that he was familiarly acquainted with Conrad Goclenius.*] Melchior Adam expreſſes himſelf thus: 'Ibidem (Lovanii) cum familiariter verſaretur cum Rudgero Reſcio, & Conrado Goclenio, hominibus eſteemed at Paris, where he read public lectures upon Greek and Latin authors, and upon Logic. He alſo married there, and kept many boarders; but becauſe he liked the new opinions, as they were called, he found himſelf in danger more than once, which doubtleſs was the reaſon why he removed and went to Straſburgh in the year 1537, to fill up the place the magiſtrates offered him. The year following he opened a ſchool there, which became famous [*B*], and by his means obtained of the Emperor Maximilian II, the title of an univerſity in the year 1566. He was a good Philologer, and writ Latin with great purity, and his way of teaching was very methodical. Upon this account the college of Straſburgh, of which he was rector, became the moſt flouriſhing in all Germany. His talents were not confined within the bounds of his ſchool; for he was intruſted with ſeveral deputations in Germany, and into foreign countries, and acquitted himſelf in thoſe employments with great honour and vigilance. He ſhewed an extraordinary charity to the Proteſtant refugees. He was not contented to beſtir himſelf in order to help them in their miſery by his advices and recommendations; but he ran in debt and grew poor

---

‘ hominibus literatiſſimis, utriuſque linguæ Græcæ & ‘ Latinæ Lovanii tum Profeſſoribus, &c. (1). - - - *As he* ‘ *was familiarly acquainted at the ſame place with Rudgerus* ‘ *Reſcius and Conrad Goclenius, two very learned men,* ‘ *and at that time profeſſors at Louvain of both the* ‘ *Greek and Latin languages, &c.*’ Theſe words are not clear enough: the plain meaning of them ſeems to be that Conrad Goclenius was profeſſor of the Greek and Latin tongues, as well as Rudgerus Reſcius; but it was not ſo. Goclenius was only profeſſor of the Latin tongue, and Reſcius of the Greek. The words I am going to quote out of John Sturmius will inform us of this diſtinction, and, beſides, that he applied himſelf to Reſcius, who had fallen out with Goclenius, and was little acquainted with the latter. ‘ Memini ego, Hermanne princeps Illuſtriſſime, *So* ‘ *Sturmius ſpeaks to the Archbiſhop of Cologn in the epi-* ‘ *ſtle dedicatory of the ſecond volume of Cicero's Orations,* ‘ cum Lovanii ante annos quindecim eſſem, præclaram ‘ de Comite Schauemburgio, quem tu tibi adjutorem ‘ atque ſucceſſorem cooptaſti, ſpem nobis omnibus da‘ tam eſſe. Audivit ille tum quotidie in Latina lingua ‘ doctorem, diſertum hominem Conradum Goclenium: ‘ cum ego Rutgeri Reſcii propter græcas literas, quas ‘ ille omnium optime tradebat, eſſem ſtudioſus: ob ‘ eamque cauſſam minus ego Conrado familiaris qui a ‘ Rutgero diſſentiebat. Sed de Schauemburgio conſen‘ tientes noſtri ſenſus erant, maximum aliquando ‘ ornamentum atque lumen in ſua Repub. futurum, ‘ ſi eum curſum ſtudiorum, in quo tum erat, poſſet ‘ conficere. - - - - *Moſt illuſtrious Prince Hermanus, I* ‘ *remember that about fifteen years ago, while I was at* ‘ *Louvain, we had conceived excellent hopes of Count* ‘ *Schauemburg, whom you choſe for your aſſiſtant and* ‘ *ſucceſſor. At that time he daily frequented the ſchool* ‘ *of the eloquent Conrad Goclenius, profeſſor of the Latin* ‘ *tongue; whereas I applied myſelf to Rudgerus Reſcius,* ‘ *who taught the Greek language the beſt of any: and for* ‘ *this reaſon I was the leſs familiarly acquainted with* ‘ *Conrad, who was at variance with Rudgerus. Never‐* ‘ *theleſs we had all the ſame notion of Schauemburg,* ‘ *viz. that he would prove a ſhining light, and an* ‘ *exceeding great ornament to his country, if he could but* ‘ *finiſh the courſe of ſtudies in which he was then en‐* ‘ *gaged.*’ I have ſaid more than once, that it is a fault not to date Epiſtles Dedicatory and Prefaces, and I have been confirmed in this opinion as I was tranſcribing this paſſage of Sturmius; for as it is not ſaid in my edition, which is that of Straſburgh, *apud Joſiam Ribelium* 1558, whether it be the ſecond or the third, &c. I ſhould have thought that it is the firſt, and conſequently that Sturmius dedicated it in the year 1558: but had I drawn ſuch a conſequence, I had been miſtaken in ſeveral things; I had falſely believed that he ſtudied at Louvain in 1543, and that Conrad Goclenius was then living. In order to avoid thoſe miſtakes I have been obliged to enquire into the true date of the firſt edition of Cicero's Orations, publiſhed by Sturmius, and I have found that it came out in 1540. Is it not a ſad thing to loſe one's time by the negligence of others? Is it reaſonable that the omiſſion of a thing, which required no more than a daſh of a pen (2), ſhould expoſe many readers to a very great trouble?

[*B*] *He opened a ſchool in* 1538, *which became famous.*] This ought not to be ſo underſtood as if no publick lectures had been read in the city of Straſburgh, before that year. The contrary is true; for Sturmius ſays, that when he arrived there Capito expounded the Bible, Hedio explained the Goſpels, James Bedrot taught Greek, Michael Delius (3) Hebrew, Chriſtian Herlin explained Euclid, Bucer, who was writing his retractation without any conſtraint put upon him, and correcting his Commentaries upon the Goſpels, explained in his houſe Themiſtius's Paraphraſes, and James Sturmius, Nicolas Cniepſius, and James Meyer were curators of the ſchool (4). The ſame Sturmius ſays, that when he made a journey from Louvain to Straſburgh in the year 1528, he found there a ſchool (5), where Bucer read lectures upon the Pſalms. What was done in the year 1538 is as follows. The college received an authentic form under the ſtatutes drawn up after Sturmius's arrival, and began to be ſolemnly regulated according to the diviſion of its ſeveral claſſes, and the functions aſſigned to each teacher and profeſſor. Read this inſcription, which is to be ſeen at Straſburgh (6). ‘ Anno poſt milleſimum ‘ 538, depoſitis armis, & pacata gravi inter Caro‘ lum V. Imperatorem Rom. & Franciſcum I. Gal‘ liarum Regem, diſcordiâ, S. P. Q. Argentin. ‘ juventuti CHRISTIANÆ religione & liberalibus diſ‘ ciplinis inſtituendæ ludum literarium aperuit.

‘ Præfecto primario Jacobo Sturmio,
Rectore Joan. Sturmio.

‘ *In the year* 1538, *the war being come to an end, and the* ‘ *great quarrel between the Emperor Charles* V *and* ‘ *Francis I, King of France, being made up, the Senate* ‘ *and people of Strasburgh erected a ſchool for inſtructing* ‘ *the youth in Chriſtianity and the liberal arts.*

‘ *James Sturmius was ſuper-intendant,*
John Sturmius Rector.

Thoſe, who ſay (7) that James Sturmius was Rector of the college of Straſburgh (8), would not have confounded that illuſtrious magiſtrate with our John Sturmius, if they had read that inſcription. This confuſion is to be found in a contrary ſenſe in the *Memorabilia Eccleſiaſtica* of Andreas Carolus. That author ſtiles John Sturmius Firſt Senator and Syndic of the city of Straſburgh. It is in that part of his work where he obſerves that the Academy of that place was not made an univerſity till the year 1621. ‘ Anno ‘ ſuperioris Centuriæ ſexageſimo octavo (9), Gymna‘ ſium literarium Argentinenſe, à Johanne Sturmio ‘ fundatum, qui primarium Senatorem & Syndicum ‘ loci agebat, gratiâ Maximiliani ſecundi privilegia ‘ Academica accepit, & Sturmius, qui commodam ‘ rationem inſtituendæ juventutis monſtraverat, perpe‘ tuus Rector creatus eſt; Sed hoc demum anno jus ‘ Univerſitatis ei Ferdinandus II impertiit, ac poteſta‘ tem conferendi omnium Facultatum gradus honora‘ rios dedit. Micræl. Hiſt. Eccleſ. 172 (10). - - - - - ‘ *In the year* 68 *of the laſt century the ſchool at Straſburgh,* ‘ *founded by John Sturmius, who was Firſt Senator and* ‘ *Syndic of the place, received the privileges of an* ‘ *Academy by the favour of Maximilian II; and Stur‐* ‘ *mius, who had propoſed a proper method for inſtructing* ‘ *the youth was created perpetual Rector. But it was* ‘ *not before the preſent year that Ferdinand II beſtowed* ‘ *upon it the rights of an univerſity, and the power of* ‘ *conferring degrees in all the different faculties.*’ This writer, you ſee, quotes Micrælius, though the latter has not committed that fault; for he has very well diſtinguiſhed the two Sturmius's: he ſays that James, a Senator

(1) Melch. Adam, in Vitis Philoſophor. *pag.* 342.

(2) That is, the date of a letter.

(3) Note that he was married to Anne Mychſnera, who ſpoke Latin fluently. *Abſque hæſitatione latine cum domeſticis loquens,* Jo. Sturmius, *in Part. i*, Anti-Pappi quarti, *pag. m.* 17.

(4) Ex Sturmio, ibid. *p.* 17, 18.

(5) Tum ſchola etiam conſtituta erat. *Id. ibid. pag.* 10.

(6) *See* Nathan Chytræus, in Itinerum Deliciis, *pag. m.* 430.

(7) See the remark [*A*], in the foregoing article, and the laſt remark of this.

(8) *See* Melchior Adam, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 343.

(9) *According to* Melchior Adam, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 344, *it was in* 1566.

(10) Andr. Carolus Memorab. Eccleſ. Sæculi XVII, *ad ann.* 1621. *pag.* 526.

poor for them [*C*]. He publiſhed ſeveral books (*d*), and lived till the third of March 1589, that is, eighty-one years, five months, and two days. Tho' he had loſt his ſight, he minded the public good (*e*). He was married three times (*f*), and left no children behind him. He had many troubles in his life-time, the greateſt whereof was his being expoſed to the perſecutions of the Lutheran miniſters. When he came to Straſburgh he found a moderate Lutheraniſm, which he liked well enough, tho' he was of Zuinglius's opinion. The Lutheran miniſters grew angry by degrees with thoſe, who did not believe the Real Preſence: he was diſpleaſed with their violent ſermons, and it is ſaid he abſtained ſeveral years from the public exerciſes of religion [*D*]. He was preſſed hard, and

a Senator and a Syndic, founded the college, and that John, who taught the ſcholars, was made Rector of it for life. Anno 1568, *Argentinenſis ſchola, quam jam ante XXX annos Jacobus Sturmius, ſenator primarius & ſyndicus, adornari curaverat, privilegia à Maximiliano II accepit, & Johannes Sturmius, qui rationem inſtituendæ juventutis monſtraverat, perpetuus Rector eſt creatus. Noſtra demum ætate, A. 1621, jus univerſitatis à Ferdinando II accepit* (11).

[*C*] *He ran in debt, and grew poor for them.*] Read theſe words of Melchior Adam. ‘Cum domus illius optimo cuique dies ac noctes pateret, eſſetque velut commune quoddam exulum aſylum, peregrinorum ac pauperum hoſpitium, quos omnes fovendo, alendo, foris domique juvando, facultates haud exiguas abſumſit: maxime Gallorum Evangelicorum ſalutem tuendo, in quam omnes ſuas divitias impendit, ipſeque cum ſuis egere maluit, quam communem cauſam deſerere: animo laudabili & perpetua gratitudine digno (12). - - - - - *His houſe was open day and night to every honeſt man, being as it were a common ſanctuary for baniſhed people, and a place of entertainment for the poor and ſtrangers. He laid out very conſiderable ſums of money in ſupporting, cheriſhing, and aſſiſting thoſe at home and abroad; particularly in providing for the welfare of the French Proteſtants; for upon this he ſpent his whole eſtate, chuſing rather to be in want with his family than to deſert the common cauſe: of ſuch a commendable diſpoſition was he, and ſo worthy of a perpetual gratitude.*’ Sturmius being called *veſpertilio, a bat,* by Oſiander, anſwered, that perhaps it was an alluſion to the *veſpertilio* in the proverb, to ſignify that he was very much in debt (13). He does not deny that he was, but he maintains that he never abſconded to cheat his creditors, and that his debts, contracted upon a glorious account, were prejudicial to no body (14); that he was the only ſufferer, and that for above ſixteen years (15) that he groaned under that yoke, and exhauſted himſelf, by paying large intereſts, and contracting new debts to pay the old ones, not one creditor could be produced who had loſt one farthing by him. *Heus bone vir: quando ego unquam, fraudationis cauſa latitavi? vel potiùs, quando ego unquam latitavi? vel creditorem nomina, vel indicem produc: qui me fraudationis cauſa latitaſſe dicat, aut qui dicat, me latitaſſe, & quando latitarim: & quo tempore: & propter quem creditorem. Creditorem unum nomina: qui annos jam ſedecim uno nummo in hoc ære alieno fraudatum ſe à me verè poſſit dicere. Sedecim enim annos & eo amplius in hac miſeria verſor; unum creditorem produc, qui unius teruncii, mea cauſa, & meo nomine jacturam feciſſe jure conqueratur, tametſi graviſſimis uſuris & verſuris, tot jam annos exhauriar* (16). Afterwards he declares that he has run in debt to maintain his Proteſtant brethren. *Cur non iſtud potiùs cogitavit innocentia & caritas, & ſimplicitas tua? Hic homo horum hominum Eccleſias defendit, propter quas eſt ære alieno oppreſſus, & propter quas omne æs ſuum, jam alienum eſt: & qui propter æs alienum, in extremam egeſtatem dejectus eſt* (17). I do not think Oſiander alluded to that proverb. I believe he uſed the word *veſpertilio* only to reflect upon Sturmius for being neither a profeſſed Lutheran nor a profeſſed Calviniſt. Sturmius was ſenſible that it might be Oſiander's meaning, and vindicated himſelf in that reſpect (18).

[*D*] *It is ſaid he abſtained ſeveral years from the public exerciſes of religion.*] Oſiander laid to his charge that he had never been at church for the twenty laſt years. Sturmius made him this anſwer (19): If you ſhould preach thirty years at Straſburgh I would never go to your ſermons. During the laſt thirty years I would have conſtantly avoided to hear you preach, if I had been obliged to be ſilent, and to approve your invectives by my ſilence. (20) After I had been ſilent and kept off a long time from the ſermons and diſputes of your miniſters, I was preſent at the laſt public diſputation of Pappus; and becauſe I ſaid ſomething, which might have removed the perplexity the opponent had reduced him to, I raiſed a ſtorm againſt me, by which I have been almoſt overwhelmed: how then can you object to me that I have been twenty years without going to your ſermons? *Et mihi objicis viginti annorum neglectas conciones; cum una diſputatiuncula, cui vix interfui, me prope perdiderit?* He mentions to him thoſe, who in the primitive Church, put off receiving baptiſm till the laſt moment of their lives; which ſhews that they were a long time without communicating. He alledges, James Sturmius, who had been ſeveral years without receiving the communion, and abſtained from it, by reaſon of the diſpute the miniſters had raiſed about the Euchariſt. ‘Quis Jacobo Sturmio fuit diligentior, in noſtræ urbis religione, & Senatus autoritate defendenda? Quàm multos annos ille vir ad menſam Domini non acceſſit? Quam quæſo ob cauſam aliam, quàm propter hoc Theologorum diſſidium? Idcircone aut Eccleſiam, aut Senatus autoritatem contemſit (21). - - - - *What man in this city was more active in ſupporting our religion, and the authority of the ſenate, than James Sturmius? Neverthelеſs he abſtained many years from the holy communion, becauſe of the difference of Divines upon this point. But did he for that deſpiſe either the Church, or the authority of the ſenate?*’ His other anſwers give ground to believe that Oſiander accuſed him of hindering his wife, his ſervants, and his boarders, from going to church. He calls it a falſity, and defies his adverſary to produce a witneſs of his accuſation. I married, ſays he, my third wife ſeven years ago; I lived twenty years with the firſt (22), and as many years with the ſecond (23). No body can ſay that they have not conſtantly heard ſermons, and received the communion, and been very careful to give alms. I ſhall ſet down in Latin what concerns his ſervants. ‘Tot jam annos, tot ſcribas & famulos, tot ancillas, tantam familiam habui: ex his unum aliquem bonum compares, qui dicat, ſe meo juſſu, aut me autore à concionibus, & à ſacra menſa abfuiſſe (24). - - - - *I have had for ſo many years ſuch a numerous family of tranſcribers, footmen, and ſervant-maids. Now find one honeſt perſon among all theſe, who can ſay that he had my commands or authority, for not hearing ſermons and receiving the ſacrament.*’ He names ſome of his boarders, and, among others, two grand-ſons of a ſiſter of Martin Luther, who, ſays he, will witneſs that I never reproved them for hearing ſermons. Hitherto he has ſaid nothing that contains a formal denial of what was objected to him, that he had been twenty years without hearing any ſermon; but afterwards he calls it a lie, as you may ſee in theſe words: ‘At viginti jam annos nullas conciones audiviſti: at ſi tu iſtud viginti annos affirmes, totos viginti annos mentieris, quod pace tua dictum velim. Quamobrem, inquis, non venis? tot jam annis. An non reſpondi? ſi tu tot annos conciones tales haberes, cujuſmodi tu & Pappus ſæpe habetis: tot ego te etiam deinceps, audire nequeam, & cauſam quæris, quam tibi jam expoſui (25)? - - - - *But you ſay that I have heard no ſermons for twenty years. If you inſiſt upon its being twenty years, I muſt beg leave to tell you that it is a groſs falſhood. You aſk why I have not come to church for ſo many years? Have I not already anſwered you? If you were to preach for ſo many years in the manner that you and Pappius do, juſt ſo long would I refuſe to hear you, and yet you aſk the reaſon, which I have already told you.*’ To make this part of his anſwer coherent, we muſt ſuppoſe that he did not avoid all ſorts of ſermons in general; but only thoſe of ſuch rigid Lutherans as Pappus was.

(*d*) *See the Catalogue of them in* Teiſſier, Additions aux Eloges, *Tom. ii, pag.* 117, 118, *Edit.* 1696.

(*e*) *Taken from* Melchior Adam, in Vitis Philoſophor. *pag.* 342, *& ſeq.*

(*f*) See the remark [*D*].

(11) Micræl. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *pag.* 570, *Edit.* 1699.

(12) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 345.

(13) Sturmius, in IV Anti-Pappi, *Part. iii, pag.* 148.

(14) Propter æs alienum nemini noxium vexor . . . . ob æs alienum honeſtiſſima de cauſa conflatum. *Id. ibid.*

(15) He ſpoke ſo in the year 1580.

(16) Sturmius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 149.

(17) Id. ibid.

(18) Id. ibid. *and pag.* 150.

(19) Id. ibid. *pag.* 165.

(20) Id. ibid. *pag.* 166.

(21) Id. ibid.

(22) *Joanna Ponderia.* Id. ib. pag. 167. *Melchior Adam, ubi ſupra,* pag. 343, & 345, calls her *Johanna Piſonia,* which doubtleſs made Mr Baillet, article lxxv, of the Anti call her *Joanne le Pois. Melchior Adam,* pag. 345, ſays ſhe was a native of Paris, and that ſhe died a few years after her huſband had ſettled at Straſburgh. Which cannot be, ſince ſhe lived twenty years with him.

(23) Margarita Wigandia: ſhe was the daughter of the wife of John Sapidus, colleague of Sturmius: the only ſon ſhe had by him died a child. *Melch. Adam, ibid.*

(24) Sturm. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 167.

(25) Id. ibid.

and forced to declare himſelf, and was not the ſtrongeſt, for they turned him out of his place [*E*]. I have mentioned in another place the encomium he beſtowed upon Calvin's

Nevertheleſs it is certain that a Divine of the Confeſſion of Augſburgh, has aſſerted that John Sturmius was above twenty years without going to church and receiving the ſacrament, and that he uſed to play at cheſs in ſermon-time. *Venerabile Miniſterium Argentoratenſe non ignorat, Sturmium ultra 20 annos nec templum frequentâſſe, nec ſacra cœna uſum. Retulit mihi M. Frideric. Rhodius, olim Superintendens Arnſtadienſis in Thuringia, gravis Theologus, quique multos per annos Sturmii fuerat domeſticus convictor, ſe illum vidiſſe nunquam in templo, ſed plerumque ludo ſcachorum diebus Dominicis ſub concionis tempus triviſſe* (26). Mr Crenius, who affords me this curious paſſage, mentions another, which ſhews what John Pappus anſwered, being accuſed of never praying for the Reformed Churches of France. How could John Sturmius, ſays he, hear me pray for them ? I have ſerved theſe ten years the church and univerſity of Straſburgh, and he has never heard my lectures nor my ſermons. *Tu vero audiveris ? Ecquam igitur ſcholam meam, aut concionem toto hôc decenniô, quò in ſchola & Eccleſia jam miniſtro audiviſti* (27)*?* Afterwards Pappus tells him what he begs of GOD, not only for the Proteſtants of France, but alſo for all perſecuted Churches. 1. That the errors which their miniſters teach them, be not imputed to them. 2. That GOD would be pleaſed to diſcover to them the truths they are ignorant of. 3. To ſtrengthen them in their afflictions, and enable them to ſuffer them patiently, and not to relapſe into Popiſh Idolatry. 4. To convert or reſtrain their perſecutors. *Atqui ego quotidie, & in Eccleſia, & domi Deum precor, non modò pro Gallicanis, ſed pro omnibus afflictis & perſecutionem patientibus Eccleſiis : & ne neſcias, hæc ipſis precor.* 1. *Ne Dominus ipſis errores, quibus inſcientes imbuuntur à ſuis Doctoribus imputet, &c* (28).

I muſt not forget that Sturmius was accuſed of flattering the Roman Catholics. If this accuſation was grounded on his writing againſt them in a civil, and not in a paſſionate and injurious manner, it was very unjuſt. His moderation was very acceptable to his Popiſh adverſaries ; and Cardinal Sadolet, and John Cochlæus writ very civilly againſt him (29). He aſked (30) whether they would alledge as a proof, a piece of poetry, wherein he had lately congratulated the Biſhop of Straſburgh upon his coming to town, and his agreement with the magiſtrates ; and he maintained that it would be a very wrong reaſon, ſeeing the friendſhip eſtabliſhed between that prelate and the magiſtrates, was a very proper ſubject for a congratulation ; and he adds a particular reaſon, grounded upon the family of that prelate. He was Count of Manderſcheidt, related to thoſe with whom our Sturmius had learned the Latin tongue. He confeſſed that many illuſtrious perſons of the Church of Rome had been his friends and his patrons, and he declared, that tho' we are diſpleaſed with the conduct of great men and princes in ſome reſpects, yet we ought to eſteem their virtues and fine qualities. (31) 'In magnis autem viris & in Principibus, etiamſi aliqua diſpliceant, tamen virtutes magnæ ſunt conſiderandæ, ut in Sadoleto, Bembo, Julio Phlugio, aliiſque doctiſſimis viris. In Carolo V pater tuus (32), ſi meminiſti, quid improbarit, noſti : tamen quæ nobis non placebant in hoc Imperatore, ita non placebant, ut illi in ratione militari gloriam, & in victoriis æquitatem, & fortunam non adimeremus. - - - - *Great men and princes, tho' they may diſpleaſe us in ſome things, are nevertheleſs to be eſteemed for their eminent virtues and good qualities ; for example, Sadoletus, Bembo, Julius Phlugius, and other learned men. You remember, I ſuppoſe, what your father found fault with in Charles V : nevertheleſs thoſe things which did not pleaſe us in that emperor, diſpleaſed us in ſuch a manner, that we did not ſeek to ſtrip him of his glory in war, of his moderation in victory, and of his good fortune.*' To this example of Charles V he adds that of the Guiſes, pretending that the French Proteſtants did not ſcruple to acknowledge their valour, their parts, &c. It muſt be confeſſed that thoſe maxims are very reaſonable ; but they are little practiſed by men tranſported with zeal, or of a fiery temper.

[*E*] *He was preſſed hard . . . . . and was not the ſtrongeſt ; for they turned him out of his place.*] He was ſuſpected of Calviniſm from the year 1561, as it appears from the letter he writ to Melchior Speccer, on the 26th of October, of the ſame year (33) ; for he informs him of the reaſons that moved him to expound St Chryſoſtom, and anſwers what was ſaid of him, that he was like a ſnail, which began to ſhew it's horns after they had been hid for a long time (34). He clearly diſcovered his thoughts about the Euchariſt, which occaſioned the firſt perſecution he was expoſed to (35). He defended Zanchius in the quarrel, of which I ſhall ſpeak in another place (36), which made him more odious ſtill to the Lutherans ; and he was ſo much diſpleaſed with their proceedings, that he had a mind to leave Straſburgh and to go to Zurich. I find this particular in a letter of Zanchius to Henry Bullinger. 'Sed quid ſi Sturmius quoque me ſequatur, vel potiùs ego ipſum ? Is enim conſtituit, ſe ad vos conferre, &, ſi fieri poſſit, prædium aliquod ſibi apud vos comparare, & ibi tamquam in quodam Tuſculano, totum ſe S. literarum ſtudio conſecrare, & contra adverſarios ſuum ſtylum in hac ſenecta pro Chriſto exercere. Sed hoc cupit interim celari, donec videat, quem exitum habitura ſit cauſſa. Si igitur, ut antè dixi, aliter cadat cauſſa noſtra quam ipſa meretur : non ſolùm ego ſed etiam Sturmius, libentiſſimè vobiſcum vivemus. Si verò ita controverſia noſtra componatur, nt nobis quoque liceat veritatem tueri : Sturmius quidem manebit, ego verò faciam, quod tu ipſe conſultius gloriæ Dei futurum judicaveris (37). - - - - *But what if Sturmius ſhould follow me, or rather I him ? For he is reſolved to retire among you, and to purchaſe a ſmall eſtate there, if poſſible, where he may dedicate himſelf wholly to the ſtudy of the holy Scriptures, and exerciſe his pen in his old age againſt his adverſaries in behalf of CHRIST. But he deſires that this may be kept ſecret in the mean time, till he ſee what iſſue the cauſe will have. If therefore, as I have already hinted, our cauſe ſhould be otherwiſe determined than juſtice requires, both Sturmius and I will chuſe to come and live with you. But if the difference ſhould be ſo made up, as that we likewiſe ſhall be allowed to defend the truth ; in that caſe Sturmius will remain where he is ; and I for my part ſhall do whatever you think moſt adviſable for the glory of GOD.*' The quarrel wherein Zanchius was concerned, had ſuch an iſſue, that Sturmius did not find himſelf obliged to retire. But he happened to have much leſs credit and good fortune, when there aroſe ſome difference between him and Pappus, Doctor of Divinity, and Miniſter of Straſburgh. He publiſhed (38) ſeveral Anti-Pappus's, and many books were publiſhed againſt him. You will find many things relating to this in Mr Baillet's *Anti*. At laſt Pappus, being ſupported by authority, obtained the victory, and had Sturmius deprived of the rectorſhip of the univerſity, and the Calviniſts turned out of their places. 'Idem (39) . . . . . adverſus Pappum Argentinenſem Theologum, turbonem verius, à quo quod loco illo moti ſint Noſtri, initio facto à venerando ſene Johanne Sturmio, cœpit, probavit Michael Beutherus, in *Declaratione Agendæ Eccleſiæ Argentinenſis* (40). - - - - *Beutherus . . . . proved the ſame thing againſt Pappus, a Straſburgh Divine, or rather a trubulent fellow, who violently diſplaced thoſe of our profeſſion, beginning with that venerable old man John Sturmius.*' They are the words of a reformed Divine, who calls Pappus a ſhuffling and factious man ; but the Lutherans maintain that he was an excellent ſervant of GOD, a very ſtout champion, and an invincible combatant in the ſpiritual war for the pure Goſpel (41) ; and that Sturmius was deprived of his place for no other reaſon but becauſe he had raiſed ſome troubles. *Joh. Pappus . . . . . inſignis Argentinenſium Athleta* adverſus Joh. Sturmium, *Rectorem Academiæ, Rhetorem Calvinianorum, & ob turbas datas tandem ab officio remotum.* (42). Perhaps not to overwhelm the good old man, and to make the thing more tolerable to him, the odious words of deſtitution and expulſion were omitted, and they gave him to underſtand that they diſpenſed him from the rectorſhip of the univerſity by reaſon of his old age. I have read a reformed author, who makes

---

(26) Conradus Schluſſelburg, in extrema, conſtante, chriſtiana, neceſſaria Reſponſione & Explicatione ad calumnioſum Script. Chriſtoph. Pelargi, *apud* Crenium, Animadverſ. Philol. & Hiſtoric. *Part. vi, pag.* 142.

(27) Jo. Pappus, Defenſ. III, contra Sturmium, *pag.* 118, *apud* Crenium, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 140.

(28) Id. ibid. apud *Crenium*, ibid. pag. 141.

(29) Sturmius, *in Part. iii*, Anti-Pappi IV, *pag.* 150.

(30) Id. ibid. *pag.* 169.

(31) Id. ibid.

(32) He ſpeaks to Andreas Oſiander a Divine of Tubingen.

(33) It is among thoſe of Zanchius in the ſecond book, *pag.* 223, *& ſeq.*

(34) Innuis me limacem eſſe qui annos jam multos latuerim, nunc demum cornua exeram. *Epiſt. Zanchii, lib. ii, pag.* 225.

(35) Ibid. *pag.* 28.

(36) In the article ZANCHIUS (JEROME).

(37) Epiſt. Zanchii, *lib. ii, pag.* 17.

(38) At Neuſtad, in the Palatinate in the year 1579, and in the year 1580, in 4to.

(39) Viz. that the Formulary of Concord had been often altered by the Lutherans.

(40) Hoornbeeck, Summa Controverſ. *pag. m.* 505.

(41) Strenuum ſe præſtitit in bello ſpirituali pro Eccleſia puriore militem atque Athletam invictum. *Andr. Carolus, ubi ſupra, ad ann.* 1610, *pag.* 226.

(42) Micrælius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 785.

Calvin's Inſtitution [*F*]. I ſhall take notice of ſome faults in Moreri [G].

makes uſe of this turn, that Heaven declared him *emeritus* in the year 1583. ‘ Uſque ad annum Chriſti ‘ 1583 quo Deo placuit eundem rude donare (43) . . . ‘ Exiſtimo autem D. Sturmium noſtrum, rude, quo ‘ divinitus donatus eſt, contentum *&c* (44). - - - - ‘ *Till the year* 1583, *when it pleaſed* G O D *to diſcharge* ‘ *him as one that had ſerved his time* . . . . *Now I fancy* ‘ *that Sturmius was very well contented with this diſ-* ‘ *charge*, &c.’ I take this from a letter, which contains a handſome parallel between Theophraſtus and Sturmius. Here follows a paſſage that wants to be rectified. ‘ John Sturmius . . . . having continued in ‘ his office till he was eighty years old and above, ‘ found himſelf no longer able to diſcharge the duties ‘ of it, and obtained from the magiſtrates of Straſ- ‘ burgh, that his place ſhould be filled up by Mel- ‘ chior Junius, his ſcholar (45).’ It is not true that he exerciſed his office till he was eighty years of age and above; he loſt it in 1583, which was the ſeventy-ſixth year of hs age. He deſired no ſucceſſor, becauſe he was no longer able to continue in it; it was taken from him.

[*F*] *I have mentioned, in another place* (46), *the encomium he beſtowed upon Calvin's Inſtitutions.*] And I ſaid that this encomium concerns the edition of the year 1543, which is the third. I went upon two reaſons: one is, that it is certain the ſecond edition is that of the year 1539 (47); the other is that theſe words of Sturmius, ‘ Inſtitutio Chriſtianæ Religionis ‘ quam primo inchoatam, deinde locupletatam, hoc ‘ vero anno abſolutam edidit; - - - - *The Inſtitution of* ‘ *the Chriſtian religion, which he firſt begun, and after-* ‘ *wards enlarged; but the compleat edition of it he pub-* ‘ *liſhed this year*,’ ſuit only with the third edition. But to conceal nothing, I ought to mention here what I have read in the ſecond Anti-Pappus, *viz.* that Calvin being miniſter at Straſburgh, enlarged his Inſtitution, and publiſhed it in the ſame city, *apud Wendelinum Rihelium*, and that Sturmius prefixed to that book the judgment he made of it. *Ego meam ſententiam in fronte ejus libri de Calvino affixi* (48). Which does not agree with the third edition, *viz.* that of the year 1543, for Calvin was not at Straſburgh that year; he returned to Geneva in September 1541. My conjecture is thus: Sturmius knowing that the book was reprinting at Straſburgh in 1543, inſerted ſome words, in his judgment, which ſhewed that it was a third edition. And therefore it is true that the words of Sturmius, which I have quoted in the article of CALVIN, (citat. 27.) concern the third edition, and conſequently I have ſaid nothing but what is true; but I think I ſhould have obſerved that Sturmius had prefixed the ſame encomimum (49) to the ſecond edition, 1539. Let thoſe who have this ſecond edition, judge whether my conjecture be right or not.

[*G*] *Some faults in Moreri.*] I. It is not true that Verheiden ſays that James Sturmius *was born at Sleida near Cologne*. See the remark [*A*] in the foregoing article. II. It is not true that this Sturmius *began his ſtudies at Liege*, and went on with them at Paris. III. And that he perſuaded *John Sleidan to write the hiſtory that made him ſo famous*. See in the remark [*B*] of the foregoing article, how far he contributed to that hiſtory. IV. It is not true that John Sturmius perſuaded him to undertake the eſtabliſhment of an univerſity at Straſburgh: the only thing they had in view then was a ſchool, or what they call in Holland and Germany an *illuſtrious ſchool* (50), which is different from an univerſity: however it be, John Sturmius did not adviſe ſuch an eſtabliſhment; for he was ſent for from Paris for no other reaſon, but becauſe they had already formed the project of that ſchool, that is, they had reſolved to introduce into the ſchool that was already at Straſburgh, and of which James Sturmius was one of the Curators, the beſt regulations, and the moſt proper method to promote ſtudy; and they thought, with great reaſon, that John Sturmius was a man well qualified both to teach and to have the direction of the ſchool. V. Moreri ſhould not have ſaid, that the deſign of founding an univerſity was happily executed; for, I repeat it again, nothing but a ſchool was deſigned at that time. VI. He ſhould therefore have ſaid, not that John Sturmius had the foundation of that univerſity confirmed by the emperor, but that he obtained from that prince, that the ſchool ſhould be erected into an univerſity. VII. When Moreri ſays, that *after* the year 1566, *John Sturmius performed . . . ſeveral embaſſies . . . . and aſſiſted at ſeveral conferences*; he intimates that Sturmius had no ſuch employment before that time, which is a miſtake; for not to mention the other deputations that preceded the year 1566, it is certain that in 1540, he was ſent to the conferences of Worms with Calvin, Capito, and Bucer (51). VIII. He did not loſe his ſight after he had *taught at Straſburgh for the ſpace of fifty-one years*. He began to teach there in 1538, and was deprived of his place in 1583, and therefore he taught but forty-five years. IX. If he had taught *for the ſpace of fifty-one years*, and then if he had loſt his ſight, Moreri ſhould not have diſtinguiſhed between the time when he died, and the time when he loſt his eyes: for the year 1589, in which he died, according to Moreri, and according to the truth, falls in with the fifty-firſt year ſince he began to teach in that city. X. Moreri ſhould not have ſaid that he died at eighty years of age; for he had ſaid that Sturmius was born in the year 1507, and died in 1589. Judge whether Moreri had got the art of writing; how careleſly does he make uſe of Melchior Adam? I omit his calling James and John Sturmius's deputations, by the names of embaſſies. He ſhould have known that an imperial city has, indeed, agents, reſidents, envoys, and deputies, but not ambaſſadors. He knew not that the Latin word *legatio* has a larger ſenſe than the words *embaſſy* and *deputation*.

(43) Jo. Jacobus Grynæus, Epiſt. IX, *lib. i*, *pag.* 151.

(44) Ibid. *pag.* 153.

(45) Thuanus, *apud* Teiſſier, Addit. aux Elog. *Tom. ii*, *p.* 116.

(46) In the article CALVIN, remark [*F*].

(47) This appears by a ſhort Epiſtle of Calvin to the reader, dated at Straſburgh, Auguſt 1, 1539.

(48) Sturmius, in Anti-Pappo ſecundo, *p.* 111.

(49) Except the words, which ſignify that it is the third edition.

(50) Note, that in the illuſtrious ſchools, they do not teach Grammar and Rhetoric; but they were taught in the ſchool of Straſburgh.

(51) See the ſecond *Anti-Pappus* of Sturmius, *pag.* 112.

SUETONIUS PAULINUS (CAIUS) Governor of Numidia, in the year of Rome 794, overcame the Mauri as far as mount Atlas (*a*); and was the firſt Roman captain, who went beyond that famous mountain (*b*). He writ a relation of that war (*c*). He was one of the beſt warriours in his time, and people did not ſcruple to ſay, that he contended with Corbulo for military glory (*d*). He performed very noble exploits in Britain (*e*) [*A*], where he commanded in the year 814, and 815; but having overcome the rebels, he puniſhed them too ſeverely for the devaſtations and ſlaughter they had

(*a*) Dio, *lib. lx.*

(*b*) Plinius, *lib. v*, *cap. i.*

(*c*) *Pliny*, *ibid.* ſays ſomething of it.

(*d*) See the remark [*A*], at the beginning.

(*e*) That is to ſay England, according to the ſtyle now-a-days.

[*A*] *He performed noble exploits in Britain.*] Emulation was no ſmall help to him; for he endeavoured to equal the glory Corbulo had got by recovering Armenia. *Sed tum Paullinus Suetonius obtinebat Britannos, ſcientia militiæ, & rumore populi, qui neminem ſine æmulo ſinit, Corbulonis concertator, receptæque Armeniæ decus æquare domitis perduellibus cupiens* (1). Having obſerved that the iſle of Mona (2) ſerved the rebels for a ſhelter, he reſolved to take it, and ſucceeded in his deſign with no great difficulty, though the multitude of the iſlanders, who expected him on the ſhore, and their wives dreſſed like furies, and their Druids lifting up their hands to heaven, and uttering imprecations, ſurprized the Roman ſoldiers by the novelty of the ſpectacle. He cauſed their ſacred groves to be cut down, in which the inhabitants ſacrificed human victims (3), and ſettled garriſons; but whilſt he was taken up with thoſe things, he was informed that the Britons, under the conduct of the widow of Praſutagus, King of the Iceni, had riſen up in arms, and committed great diſorders. Whereupon he went over, and took ſuch effectual meaſures to prevent the progreſs of thoſe rebels, that he obtained over them a victory as remarkable as thoſe of former times (4). It is ſaid that about eighty thouſand Britons were killed in that battle, and that the Romans

(1) Tacit. Annal. *lib. xiv*, *cap. xxix*, *ad ann.* 814.

(2) It is thought to be that now called Angleſey.

(3) Exciſi luci, ſævis ſuperſtitionibus ſacri; nam cruore captivo adolere aras, & hominum fibris conſulere deos fas habebant. - - - *He cut down the groves that were conſecrated to their barbarous ſuperſtitions; for they held it lawful to ſacrifice their priſoners, and to conſult the gods by looking into the intrails of men.* Id. ibid. *cap. xxx.*

(4) Clara & antiquis victoriis par ea die laus parta. *Id. ibid. cap. xxxvii.*

had made, and therefore he was ſucceeded by a more indulgent man (*f*). It is thought he was conſul in the year of Rome 819 [*B*]. He was one the chief commanders of the troops of the Emperor Otho (*g*), and did not keep up in that war the reputation he had got. The ſoldiers openly murmured at his conduct (*b*); and it is certain that his maxims, which conſiſted in venturing nothing, and taking his meaſures with the utmoſt circumſpection,

mans did not loſe four hundred men, which was not quite ſo many as their wounded. Suetonius's courage and firmneſs, and his prudence and experience, appeared glorioſly on that occaſion. You will find a curious account of this in Tacitus's Annals (5), and in Xiphilinus (6). The vanquiſhed were ſeverely treated, which was the reaſon why many rebels remained in arms, fearing the conſequences of their ſubmiſſion. ‘Tenentibus arma pleriſque, quos conſcientia defectionis, & proprius ex Legato timor agitabat. Hic cum egregius cetera, arroganter in deditos, & ut ſuæ quoque injuriæ ultor, durius conſuleret; miſſus Petronius Turpilianus tanquam exorabilior, & delictis hoſtium novus, eoque pœnitentiæ mitior (7). - - - *Moſt of them remained in arms, being terrified with the conſciouſneſs of their revolt, and particularly afraid of the General. In other reſpects he was a man of great worth; but as he treated arrogantly thoſe who ſurrendered themſelves, or rather, like a perſon who revenged his own quarrels, ſeverely; Petronius Turpilianus was ſent in his room, a man of a milder temper, and who, being a ſtranger to the faults of the enemies, was for that reaſon the better diſpoſed to accept of their ſubmiſſions.*’ Theſe words of Tacitus want a ſupplement; we muſt add to them the account he gives in the fourteenth book of his Annals. There we find what happened before Turpilian ſucceeded Suetonius, *viz.* that Julius Claſſicianus, who was Intendant in Britain after Suetonius's victory, fell out with that General, and cried him down as much as he could. He aſcribed to him the ill ſucceſſes, and imputed the good ones to the fortune of the Romans. He gave out that a General would quickly come, who would uſe clemency towards the vanquiſhed, and he writ to the court, that the war would never be ended, unleſs Suetonius was recalled. *Julius Claſſicianus ſucceſſor Cato miſſus, & Suetonio diſcors, bonum publicum privatis ſimultatibus impediebat: diſperſeratque* novum Legatum opperiendum eſſe, ſine hoſtili ira & ſuperbia victoris clementer deditis conſulturum. *Simul in Urbem mandabat,* nullum prælio finem exſpectarent, niſi ſuccederetur Suetonio: *cujus adverſa pravitati ipſius, proſpera ad fortunam Reipub. referebat* (8). Nero hearing of this, ſent Polycletus, one of his freedmen, into Britain, looking upon him as a fit man to reconcile the governor and intendant of the province, and to make the rebels accept of a peace. This freedman appeared with great pomp, and Suetonius was obliged to make his court to him (9); however he kept his poſt, till it was thought proper to beſtow it upon Turpilian.

If any one, in order to excuſe Suetonius's ſeverity, ſhould alledge the horrid barbarities the Britons exerciſed upon the Romans, it might be anſwered that the Britons did not do it till after they had ſuffered prodigious violences and extortions, and that therefore the Roman General ſhould not have been ſo implacable towards the vanquiſhed; for there is a vaſt difference between thoſe, who riſe up againſt a new maſter, whoſe yoke is pretty eaſy, and thoſe who ſhake off a new domination the moſt tyrannical in the world. In the firſt caſe an inſurrection attended with cruelty deſerves a ſevere puniſhment; but in the ſecond caſe, clemency ought quickly to ſucceed ſeverity. Tacitus ſays (10), that after the death of a Britiſh King, who had made the Roman Emperor joint heir with his two daughters, his houſe and his eſtates were plundered, his widow was whipped, his two daughters were raviſhed, the chief perſons of the country were turned out of their eſtates, and the King's relations reduced to the condition of ſlaves. The Roman colony of Camalodunum, made up of Veteran ſoldiers, ſeized every body's goods, and turned people out of their houſes, being countenanced by the Roman ſoldiers, who hoped to have ſome time or other the ſame liberty of plundering the iſlanders. *In coloniam Camalodunum recens deducti, pellebant domibus, exturbabant agris,* captivos, ſervos *apellando: foventibus impotentiam veteranorum militibus, ſimilitudine vitæ, & ſpe ejuſdem licentiæ* (11). Theſe proceedings inſpired the Britons with ſuch a hatred againſt the Romans, and with ſuch a violent deſire of recovering or preſerving their liberty, that there happened quickly a general inſurrection, the effects whereof were bloody and barbarous. The King's widow (12) put herſelf at the head of the Britons, and made them a very pathetical ſpeech (13). She did not forget the laſhes ſhe had received, nor the rape of her daughters; but alledged them, the better to encourage them to ſhake off ſuch a hard ſlavery. ‘Solitum quidem Britannis feminarum ductu bellare *teſtabatur*; ſed tunc non ut tantis majoribus ortam regnum & opes; verum ut unam è vulgo, libertatem amiſſam, confectum verberibus corpus, contrectatam filiarum pudicitiam ulciſci: eo provectas Romanorum cupidines ut non corpora, nec ſenectam quidem aut virginitatem impollutam relinquant (14). - - - *She remonſtrated that it was indeed an uſual thing for Britons to fight under the conduct of women, but that ſhe did not then, as a perſon deſcended from ſuch noble anceſtors, ſeek to be avenged for the loſs of her kingdom and wealth: ſhe only reſented, like one of the vulgar, the loſs of her liberty, the ſtripes that ſhe had endured, and the violated chaſtity of her daughters; for that the luſts of the Romans were come to ſuch a height, that they did not ſpare the bodies, nor refrain their unclean hands from old age and virginity.*’ Suetonius's abſence favoured the enterprize of the Britons; they deſtroyed ſeventy thouſand Romans or allies of the Romans (15); they gave no quarter, they killed, hanged, or burnt, every man they took. *Neque enim capere aut venundare, aliudve quod belli commercium, ſed cædes, patibula, ignes, cruces, tanquam redituri ſupplicium, ac prærepta interim ultione, feſtinabant* (16). They were no leſs cruel to the women of the beſt quality and the greateſt virtue (17); they hanged them ſtark naked, and cut off their breaſts and ſowed them in their mouths, that they might ſeem to eat them, and then they laid them at full length on ſmall and ſharp ſtakes, that ran into their bodies. This is what happens when new ſubjects are delivered up to the ſoldiery; but on the other ſide the Britons paid dear for their barbarity; for Suetonius puniſhed them cruelly. Note, that the Queen, who put herſelf at the head of them, poiſoned herſelf after the loſs of the battle (18).

[*B*] *It is thought he was conſul in the year of Rome 819.*] It plainly appears from a paſſage of Pliny that he was conſul (19); which is no leſs evident from theſe words of Tacitus. ‘Acque eo duces Othonianos ſpatium an moras ſuaſiſſe; præcipuè Paullinum, quod vetuſtiſſimus CONSULARIUM, & militia clarus, gloriam nomenque Britannicis expeditionibus meruiſſe (20). - - - *And that for this reaſon the Generals of Otho moved for time or delays, eſpecially Paullinus, the eldeſt* Conſular *perſon, and a man famous for war, having acquired a great deal of glory by his Britiſh expeditions.*’ If it be ſaid that there is no need of this paſſage of Tacitus, and that it is ſufficient to alledge theſe words out of the 14th chapter of the 16th book of his Annals: ‘C. Suetonio L. Teleſino Conſulibus Antiſtius Soſianus . . . . . ſibi conciliat. - - - - *In the conſulſhip of Caius Suetonius and Lucius Teleſinus,* &c.’ I anſwer that this paſſage of the Annals, which is commonly alledged to prove Suetonius's conſulſhip, does not appear deciſive, if we conſider a note of Mr de Tillemont (21). We have ſeen that Suetonius was, in the year of Rome 822, the moſt antient of thoſe who had been conſuls. But Lucius Piſo was ſtill living (22), and had been conſul in the year 809; and therefore Suetonius muſt have been conſul before the year 809, and conſequently the words of Tacitus's Annals do not concern his conſulſhip, ſince they belong to the year 819, or 818. Mr de Tillemont (23) conjectures that Caius Suetonius, who was conſul with Lucius Teleſinus in the 66th year of the Chriſtian Æra, that is, in the year 818, or 819, of Rome, was the ſon of Suetonius, who is the ſubject of this article. Father Hardouïn (24), and all the

(*f*) See the remark [*A*].

(*g*) Tacit. Hiſt. *lib. i, cap. lxxxvii.*

(*b*) Id. ibid. *lib. ii, cap. xxiii, & alibi.*

(5) Lib. xiv, cap. xxix, & ſeq.

(6) In Epitome Dionis in Nerone, *pag. m.* 173, *& ſeq.*

(7) Tacitus, in Vita Agricolæ, *cap. xvi.*

(8) Tacitus, Annal. *lib. xiv, cap. xxxviii.*

(9) Mirabantur (*hoſtes*) quod dux & exercitus tanti belli confector ſervitiis obedirent. - - - - *The enemies wondered to ſee a general and an army, who bad finiſhed ſuch a glorious war, paying homage to a freedman.* Id. ibid. *cap. xxxix.*

(10) Id. ibid. *cap. xxxi.*

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Xiphilinus calls her Βȣνδȣίκα *Bunduica.* Tacitus, in his Annals, *lib. xiv, cap. xxxi*, calls her *Boadicea*, and in the Life of Agricola, *cap. xvi, Voadica.* It is very likely he always called her by the ſame name, and that the tranſcribers have ſpoiled the original in both places. I believe the true name is that we find in Xiphilinus.

(13) *See her ſpeech in* Xiphilinus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 169, *& ſeq. See alſo* Tacitus, ibid. *cap. xxxv.*

(14) Tacit. Annal. *lib. xiv, cap. xxxv.*

(15) Id. ibid. *cap. xxxiii.*

(16) Id. ibid.

(17) Xiphilin. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 173.

(18) Tacit. ubi ſupra, *cap. xxxvii, but according to* Xiphilinus, ibid. *pag.* 175, *ſhe died of ſickneſs.*

(19) Pliny, *lib. v, cap. i.*

(20) Tacit. Hiſt. *lib. ii, cap. xxxvii, ad ann.* 822.

(21) Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. *Tom. i, pag. m.* 464.

(22) This plainly appears from a paſſage in Pliny the younger, *Epiſt. VII, lib. iii.*

(23) Tillem. ibid.

(24) Harduin, in Plin. *lib. v, cap. i, pag.* 526.

circumſpection, prevented his improving favourable opportunities [*C*], and afforded the enemies a ſufficient time to take care of their affairs. The worſt was that he ran away on the day of the general and deciſive battle, and that he boaſted to Vitellius that he had betrayed Otho [*D*], which probably was not true; but he was believed upon his word, and that ſaved his life. It has been ſaid that the hopes he had of being made Emperor, moved him to adviſe that the war ſhould be kept up between Otho and Vitellius; but Tacitus thinks he was too wiſe a man to have ſuch thoughts

the other authors I have conſulted, ſay, that our Suetonius Paulinus was Teleſinus's colleague. You will find the ſame opinion in Voſſius, and a fault in Chronology; for Voſſius ſuppoſes that this conſulſhip belongs to the year of Rome 811 (25). Father Harduin (26) places it in the laſt year of Nero's life, and quotes the ſixth book of Tacitus's Annals. He ſhould have quoted the ſixteenth, and remembred that Nero died the ſecond year after the conſulſhip of Suetonius and Teleſinus. For the reſt, Mr de Tillemont (27) ſuppoſes, as a thing undeniable, that Suetonius had been conſul before he was ſent into Britain; and the reaſon he goes upon, is, that all thoſe who were ſent thither had been conſuls. I cannot tell whether he is in the right as to this laſt point, and the proof he takes from theſe words, *vetuſtiſſimus conſularium*, does not appear to me a convincing one; for perhaps the meaning of them is, that Suetonius was older than all thoſe who had been conſuls, tho' ſome of them had exerciſed the conſulſhip before him; and therefore I do not abſolutely condemn the common opinion, nor his neither. There may be ſome reaſons on both ſides: it were ſomewhat ſtrange that Tacitus ſhould never mention the conſular quality of Suetonius, if it had belonged to him, when he commanded in Britain.

[*C*] *His maxims, which conſiſted in venturing nothing . . . . . prevented his improving favourable opportunities.*] Cæcina, General of Vitellius's troops, made uſe of a ſtratagem, which did not ſucceed, and was like to be fatal to him, becauſe the Generals of Otho having diſcovered it, avoided the ſnare, and laid another which the enemy did not perceive. By this means they obtained a conſiderable advantage, but not ſuch as it might have been, if Suetonius had been bolder and leſs cautious. Tacitus gives the following character of him. ‘ Signum pugnæ non ſtatim à ‘ Suetonio Paullino pediti datum. Cunctator natura, ‘ & cui cauta potius conſilia cum ratione, quam proſpera ex caſu placerent; *compleri foſſas, aperiri campum, pandi aciem* jubebat, ſatis cito incipi victoriam ‘ ratus, ubi proviſum foret ne vincerentur. Ea cunctatione, ſpatium Vitellianis datum, in vineas nexu ‘ traducum impeditas refugiendi: & modica ſilva adhærebat; unde rurſus auſi promptiſſimos prætorianorum equitum interficere (28). - - - - *Paullinus did ‘ not preſently give the ſignal of battle to the infantry. He ‘ was naturally ſlow, and preferred wary counſels ‘ grounded upon reaſon to ſuch as proved ſucceſsful by ‘ chance. He ordered the trenches to be filled up, the ‘ ground to be cleared, and the army to be drawn out. ‘ By that delay the troops of Vitellius had time given ‘ them to make a retreat into vineyards, which the knitting of the branches made difficult of acceſs. There ‘ was likewiſe a ſmall wood adjoining, from which they ‘ ſallied out and ſlew the boldeſt of the Prætorian horſe.*' He rather choſe to give his opinion according to the rules of prudence, than to obtain an advantage by meer chance. Had he not ſounded the retreat on that day, the whole army of Vitellius had been cut in pieces; at leaſt it was the opinion of both parties: the reaſons he gave of his conduct were not approved; and I think warriors would readily change the proverb, *Too much precaution is craft*, into this, *Too much precaution is an overſight*. Let us ſtill hear Tacitus. ‘ Cæterum ea ubique formido fuit, apud fugientes, ‘ occurſantes, in acie, pro vallo, ut *deleri cum uni‘verſo exercitu Cæcinam potuiſſe, ni Suetonius Paulli‘nus receptui ceciniſſet*, utriſque in partibus percrebuerit. *Timuiſſe ſe* Paullinus ferebat, *tantum inſuper ‘ laboris atque itineris; ne Vitellianus miles recens è ‘ caſtris feſſos aggrederetur, & perculſis nullum retro ‘ ſubſidium foret.* Apud paucos ea ducis ratio probata, in vulgus adverſo rumore fuit (29). - - - *There ‘ was ſo great a conſternation among thoſe who fled, ‘ while they met one another in the field, or before the ‘ trenches, that, as it was generally believed by both ‘ parties, Cæcina might have been cut off with his ‘ whole army, if Suetonius Paullinus had not ſounded a ‘ retreat. He gave out that he dreaded the great fatigue and journey which ſtill remained to go through, ‘ and that he was apprehenſive leſt the troops of Vitellius ‘ ſhould have ſallied freſh out of their camp, and ſet ‘ upon his men when they were weary, who, if they had ‘ met with any repulſe, were wholly deſtitute of all reſource. This reaſon of Paullinus was approved by ‘ ſome few, but was not at all acceptable to the vulgar.*' But if on the one ſide Suetonius's circumſpection proved ſometimes prejudicial to Otho, it might on the other have prevented his ruin occaſioned by the raſhneſs of the other Generals. Suetonius was for protracting the war, and his opinion grounded upon very ſolid maxims (30), was alſo that of Marius Celſus, and Annius Gallus, his colleagues (31). But Titian, Otho's brother, and Proculus, Præfect of the Prætorium, who had the greateſt intereſt with that emperor (32), adviſed the quite contrary, and brought things into the greateſt danger. The following paſſage is to Suetonius's honour. ‘ Otho conſultavit, ‘ trahi bellum, an fortunam experiri placeret. Tum ‘ Suetonius Paullinus, dignum fama ſua ratus, qua ‘ nemo illa tempeſtate militaris rei callidior habebatur, ‘ de toto genere belli cenſere; *feſtinationem hoſtibus, ‘ moram ipſis, utilem* diſſeruit (33). . . . . Otho pronus ‘ ad decertandum; frater ejus Titianus, & præfectus ‘ prætorii Proculus, imperitia properantes, *fortunam ‘ & deos & numen Othonis adeſſe conſiliis, affore conatibus* teſtabantur, neu quis obviam ire ſententiæ ‘ auderet, in adulationem conceſſerant (34). - - - *Otho ‘ held a conſultation whether it was better to ſpin out ‘ the war, or to try his fortune at once. Suetonius Paullinus thinking it worthy of his reputation in the military art, which no man in his days was thought to ‘ underſtand better, to give his opinion of the war in general, argued, that diſpatch was for the intereſt of ‘ the enemy, delay for theirs. . . . . . Otho was inclined ‘ to a battle; his brother Titian, and Proculus, Prefect ‘ of the Prætorium, hurried on by ignorance, affirmed ‘ that good fortune, the gods, and the deity of Otho, favoured their counſels, and would proſper their undertakings; and leſt any one ſhould contradict their opinion, they gave into a ſtrain of flattery.*' A battle being reſolved upon, it was debated whether Otho ſhould be there or not, and it paſſed in the negative; Suetonius and Celſus not daring to oppoſe it, leſt they ſhould be accuſed of expoſing the prince to danger (35). They ſent him therefore with very good troops into a ſafe place: which weakened the army, and diſcouraged the ſoldiers (36), and after that retreat Suetonius and Celſus had only the name of Generals (37); their counſels were not followed, every thing depended upon Proculus's fancy. It is therefore no great wonder if the battle was loſt, and if Suetonius ran away and durſt not return into the camp. But he cannot be excuſed for what I am going to relate; it is a downright infamy.

[*D*] *He boaſted to Vitellius that he had betrayed Otho.*] The commanders of the victorious army, and thoſe who had been vanquiſhed, went to Vitellius at Lyons. He cauſed ſeveral captains of Otho's party to be put to death, and left Suetonius and Proculus in the uncertainty of the event. At laſt they were heard, and obtained their pardon, becauſe they made him believe they had betrayed Otho, and gave an account of the meaſures they had taken to deſtroy him. *Suetonium Paullinum, ac Licinium Proculum, triſti mora ſqualidos tenuit: donec auditi, neceſſariis magis defenſionibus, quam honeſtis uterentur. Proditionem ultro imputabant:* ſpatium longi ante prælium itineris, fatigationem Othonianorum, permixtum vehiculis agmen, ac pleraque fortuita, fraudi ſuæ *adſignantes, & Vitellius credidit de perfidia, & fidem abſolvit* (38). Can any thing be more unworthy of the Roman name?

---

(25) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Latin. *lib. i, cap. xxvi, pag. m.* 133.

(26) Harduin, ubi ſupra.

(27) Tillem. ubi ſupra.

(28) Tacitus, Hiſtor. *lib. ii, cap. xxv, ad ann.* 822.

(29) Id. ibid. *cap. xxvi.*

(30) They may be ſeen in Tacitus, *ibid. cap. xxxii.*

(31) Ibid. *cap. xxxi.*

(32) Id. ibid. *lib. i, cap. lxxxvii.*

(33) Id. ibid. *lib. ii, cap. xxxi.*

(34) Id. ibid. *cap. xxxiii.*

(35) Id. ibid.

(36) Id. ibid.

(37) Profecto Brixellum Othone, honor imperii penes Titianum fratrem, vis ac poteſtas penes Proculum Præfectum. Celſus & Paullinus, cum prudentia eorum nemo uteretur, inani nomine ducum, alienæ culpæ prætendebantur. *Id. ibid. cap. xxxix.*

(38) Id. ibid. *cap. lx.*

thoughts [*E*]. We ſhall ſee below (*i*) that it was a miſtake to take him for the father of Suetonius the Hiſtorian, and to ſay that he wrote the life of Otho.

[*E*] *Tacitus thinks he was too wiſe a man to have ſuch thoughts.*] He had read in ſome authors, that the armies of Otho and Vitellius, whether they were afraid of the war, or were diſguſted at both emperors, whoſe infamy diſcovered itſelf daily, thought of coming to an agreement, and electing a new maſter, or intruſting the ſenate with that election, and that this was the reaſon why the commanders of Otho's troops, eſpecially Paulinus, were for prolonging the war (39). Tacitus is willing to believe that ſome few men wiſhed in their hearts the public peace and a good prince; but he cannot perſuade himſelf that Suetonius, who was ſo prudent a man, could hope that in ſo corrupt an age, the ſoldiers, who had broke the peace to have a war, would give over the war out of a deſire of peace. Nor can he believe that armies, whoſe manners and languages were ſo different, could agree in ſuch a deſign, nor that moſt of the chief officers, being conſcious of their luxury, indigence, and crimes, would have been contented with an honeſt emperor, not beholden to them for his dignity. *Neque Paullinum, qua prudentia fuit, ſperaſſe, corruptiſſimo ſeculo, tantam vulgi moderationem reor, ut qui pacem belli amore turbaverant, bellum pacis caritate deponerent: neque aut exercitus linguis moribuſque diſſonos, in hunc conſenſum potuiſſe coaleſcere: aut Legatos ac duces, magna ex parte luxus, egeſtatis, ſcelerum ſibi conſcios, niſi pollutum obſtrictumque meritis ſuis Principem paſſuros* (40).

SUETONIUS (**Caius Suetonius Tranquillus**), a Roman Hiſtorian, ſon of Suetonius Lenis [*A*], flouriſhed under the empire of Trajan and Hadrian. He applied himſelf very much to ſtudy, and I think it may be ſaid that he taught Grammar and Rhetoric (*a*). It is certain he pleaded ſome imaginary cauſes; and I think he alſo pleaded ſome real ones before the judges. Pliny, who places him among thoſe who were called *Scholaſtici* (*b*), a ſort of men who never pleaded or made orations but in a hall, or by way of exerciſe (*c*), affirms in another place (*d*) that Suetonius deſired him to procure

[*A*] *Son of Suetonius Lenis.*] The proof of this is contained in the following paſſage. ‘ Interfuit huic ‘ bello pater meus Suetonius Lenis, tertiæ decimæ legionis Tribunus anguſticlavius (1). - - - *My father* ‘ *Suetonius Lenis was preſent at this battle, being Tribune* ‘ *of the thirteenth legion, and an Anguſticlavian.*’ It appears alſo from theſe words, that Suetonius's father was Tribune of the thirteenth legion, and that he was at the battle of Bedriacum, in which Vitellius's troops defeated thoſe of Otho. Had Muretus exactly remembred the paſſages of Tacitus, alledged by him, he would have made a better uſe of his critical learning. He found *Linus* with a little hole before it in a manuſcript, whereupon he fancied that three letters were loſt, and that inſtead of *Linus*, the true reading was *Paulinus*; from whence he inferred that Suetonius the Hiſtorian was the ſon of Suetonius Paulinus, who is the ſubject of the forgoing article. *Vidi ego librum, qui cariem & tineas ſenſerat, in quo poſt nomen* Suetonius *foramen erat exiguum: deinde ſequebatur* linus: *& ſupra alia manu emendatum* lenis: *Omnino autem legendum eſt* Paulinus; *id enim ei verum cognomen fuit. Teſtem in eam rem laudabo Tacitum, qui fortis viri neque nomen, neque virtutem tacitam eſſe ſivit. Ejus enim & ſæpe in annalibus, & in Agricolæ vita perhonorificam mentionem facit* (2). He was ſo fond of his conjecture, that he did not mind the teſtimonies of Tacitus, which he made uſe of; for if he had conſidered them with attention, he might eaſily have perceived that they were wholly inconſiſtent with his critical obſervation; and he would have concluded that Suetonius, whoſe exploits are mentioned by Tacitus, could not be him who was only a Tribune in the war of Vitellius. To which I add, that according to the ſame Tacitus, in a work (3) not quoted by Muretus, Suetonius Paulinus was one of Otho's Generals during the ſame war, which uterly deſtroys Muretus's correction. Theſe are very ſtrange faults, and yet a Critic ought never to take notice of them in an inſulting manner, being always mindful that he may want the ſame indulgence when he commits the like miſtakes, which is unavoidable. Were I allowed to compare the inferior with the great, I would apply to myſelf the inference drawn by Lipſius from this miſtake of Muretus (4). ‘ Quid dicam? Non ‘ inſector te vir elegantiſſime, ſed bona fide hæc ſcribis. ‘ Erras nimis. Suetonius ille Lenis, Tribunus fuit: ‘ noſter belli dux. Ille anguſticlavius, id eſt, non‘ dum Senator, ſed inter equites: Iſte Conſularis, nec ‘ tenue uſquam veſtigium confuſionis ejus quam facis. ‘ Hoc mihi in tranſcurſu monitum, non ut carpam ‘ (Fidem teſtor); ſed ut claro ſub exemplo doceam ‘ quàm fallax hæc Critica, & ignoſcendum etiam ‘ nobis eſſe, ſi labimur interdum in proclivi iſtâ viâ. ‘ - - - - *What ſhall I ſay? Far be it from me to inſult* ‘ *ſo ingenious a man as you are. You write theſe things* ‘ *candidly, tho' your error is too plain: for that Suetonius* ‘ *Lenis was a Tribune; our's a General. The one was* ‘ *an Anguſticlavian; that is to ſay, not yet a ſenator but* ‘ *a knight; the other was a conſular perſon, nor is there* ‘ *the leaſt footſtep of that jumble which you make. I take* ‘ *notice of this by the by, not from an itch of finding* ‘ *fault, as I ſolemnly declare, but that I may prove from* ‘ *an evident example how deceitful a thing Criticiſm is,* ‘ *and ſhew that we ought alſo to be excuſed if we ſtumble* ‘ *now and then in ſuch a ſlippery path.*’

Perhaps ſome will think that Suetonius Lenis, father of Suetonius the Hiſtorian, was the ſon of Suetonius, who is the ſubject of the foregoing article; but there is no ground for ſuch an opinion; for if Suetonius had been the grandſon of that great warrior, and of that Roman Conſul, he would not have ſpoken of his grandfather ſo plainly as he does: ‘ Avum meum ‘ narrantem puer audiebam, cauſſam operis ab interioribus aulicis proditam, *&c* (5). - - - - *When I was* ‘ *a boy, I have heard my grandfather tell the true cauſe* ‘ *of that work, which he had learned from ſuch courtiers* ‘ *as had the beſt opportunities of knowing theſe things,* ‘ &c.’ An Hiſtorian may be ſo modeſt as not to inſert in his work occaſionally the glorious titles of his anceſtors; but it is hardly poſſible, that when he mentions his father or grandfather, he ſhould be contented to name them without mentioning the important offices conferred upon them. Our Suetonius did not forget his father's tribuneſhip; much more would he have mentioned his father's generalſhip; the occaſion neceſſarily required it; for it is on account of the battle of Bedriacum that he obſerves that his father commanded a legion, during the war of Otho and Vitellius: but it was in that war that Suetonius Paulinus commanded Otho's troops.

One Sicco Polentonus had ſaid before Muretus, that Suetonius Paulinus is the father of Suetonius the Hiſtorian. Beſides, he aſcribes to him ſome books that were written by the latter, *viz. De Inſtitutione Officiorum, de Illuſtribus Scriptoribus, deque hiſtoria ludicra.* It is in a life of Suetonius, which Pighius inſerted in his Annals (6), and which is of no value. This Polentonus was ſecretary of the city of Padua in the beginning of the XVth century (7). Voſſius (8) affirms two things: 1. That Geſner ſays that Suetonius Lenis is the ſame with Suetonius Paulinus, and that he was the father of Suetonius the Hiſtorian, and author of a life of the Emperor Otho: 2. That La Popeliniere ſays the ſame. There is no ſuch thing in Geſner's *Bibliotheca* quoted by Voſſius; but the following words are to be found in the abridgment of it, made by others: ‘ Suetonius Lenis, Suetonii Tran‘ quilli pater, Lucii Othonis imperatoris vitam de‘ ſcripſit. Item librum de inſtitutione obſervata, & ‘ librum Prætorum (9). - - - - *Suetonius Lenis, father* ‘ *to Suetonius Tranquillus, writ the life of the Emperor* ‘ *Lucius Otho. Alſo a book,* De Inſtitutione Obſervata; ‘ *and another book concerning the Prætors.*’ There is nothing in theſe words, whereby it may appear that the

---

(*i*) In the remark [*A*] of the following article.

(39) Ex eodem, *ib. cap. xxxvii,*

(40) Id. ibid.

(*a*) Suidas, in Τράγκυλλος, calls him only a Grammarian, and mentions the titles of ſeveral grammatical books written by Suetonius.

(*b*) Plinius, Epiſt. xxiv, *lib. i.*

(*c*) Id. Epiſt. iii, *lib. ii.*

(*d*) Id. Epiſt. xviii, *lib. i.*

(1) Sueton. in Othone, *cap. x.*

(2) Muret. Variarum Lect. *lib. xv, cap. xi, pag.* 1144.

(3) The firſt and ſecond book of Tacitus's Hiſtory.

(4) Lipſius, in Tacit. Hiſtor. *lib. ii, pag. m.* 484.

(5) Sueton. in Caligula, *cap. xix.*

(6) *Ad annum* 818. *See* Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Latinis, *pag.* 134, *&* 167.

(7) *See* Voſſius, ibid. *pag.* 804.

(8) Voſſius, ibid. *pag.* 135.

(9) Epitome Bibl. Geſneri, *pag.* 769, *Edit.* 1583.

procure him a delay, becauſe a dream made him afraid of miſcarrying in a cauſe at the bar. There was a long and very ſtrict friendſhip between thoſe two writers (*e*); and it proved advantageous to Suetonius, for Pliny did him great ſervices. He procured him an office of Tribune (*f*), and then he had it beſtowed upon another, at Suetonius's requeſt. He obtained for the latter, whoſe wife was barren, the *jus trium liberorum*, that is, the privileges of thoſe who have three children. That favour was ſeldom granted, and Pliny had not obtained it for his friend, had it not been for the great intereſt he had at the Imperial court, and for the earneſt deſire he expreſſed to obtain it (*g*). He was then (*h*) governor of Bithynia, under the empire of Trajan. Suetonius raiſed himſelf conſiderably afterwards, for he was ſecretary to the Emperor Hadrian; but he loſt that office about the year 121, when ſeveral perſons were put out of favour for not paying a due reſpect to the empreſs [*B*]. He wrote many books [*C*], moſt of which are loſt. We have only his Hiſtory of the firſt twelve Emperors, and part of his treatiſe concerning the illuſtrious Grammarians and Rhetoricians. That hiſtory is very much commended by our moſt learned Humaniſts [*D*]: he ſpeaks much more of the Emperors than of the affairs of the Empire; and the diligence wherewith he has collected ſo many particulars concerning their actions and inclinations, cannot be ſufficiently admired. He does not obſerve the order of time; and no Hiſtory was ever more different from annals than this is. He reduces every thing to ſome general heads, and places together what relates to each head. He is very conciſe, and frequently touches upon

(*e*) Id. *lib. i*, Epiſt. xxiv; *lib. x*, Epiſt. xcv.

(*f*) Id. Epiſt. viii, *lib. iii*.

(*g*) See the 95th and 96th Letters of the 10th book of Pliny.

(*h*) About the year 104.

the author of them believed that Suetonius Lenis, and Suetonius Paulinus are the ſame perſon. La Popeliniere expreſſes himſelf thus: *Suetonius Lenis, the father of Tranquillus, wrote the life of the Emperor L. Otho, and a book concerning the Prætors* (10). This is all falſe.

Note, That Suetonius taking the ſir-name of Tranquillus, retained the whole ſenſe of the ſir-name *Lenis*, [*Gentle*] which his father had. But we do not know the reaſon which made him prefer the one to the other: perhaps he only conſulted his ear, and *Tranquillus* ſounded better to him.

[*B*] *He loſt that office . . . . . when ſeveral perſons were put out of favour for not paying a due reſpect to the empreſs.*] This is to be found only in a paſſage of Spartianus. *Septicio Claro præfecto prætorii, & Suetonio Tranquillo Epiſtolarum magiſtro, multiſque aliis qui apud Sabinam uxorem, injuſſu ejus, familiariùs ſe tunc egerant quàm reverentia domus aulicæ poſtulabat, ſucceſſores dedit* (11). The ſenſe of thoſe words is thus repreſented by Mr de Tillemont: ‘ Adrian put out of favour many perſons in England, for having behaved ‘ themſelves too freely, without his order, towards ‘ the Empreſs Sabina, which is not farther explained ‘ in hiſtory. Suetonius Tranquillus, who doubtleſs is ‘ the Hiſtorian, loſt his office of ſecretary, &c (12).’ This is very judicious: we ſhall ſee in the remark; wherein I take notice of Moreri's miſtakes, that every body has not been ſo cautious as Mr de Tillemont.

[*C*] *He wrote many books.*] I ſhall uſe ſtill the expreſſions of the ſame writer (13). ‘ Suidas . . . . . ‘ aſcribes to him ſeveral works, which concern that ‘ profeſſion (14). Beſides, he obſerves that he had ‘ writ a book about the Grecian games, two upon the ‘ ſhews of the Romans, two upon the laws and ‘ cuſtoms of Rome, one upon the life of Cicero, or ‘ upon his books *de Republica*, a catalogue of the il‘ luſtrious men of Rome, and the eight books, ſtill ‘ extant, of the hiſtory of the emperors. * He had ‘ alſo writ three books of kings, of which St Pauli‘ nus made an abridgment in verſe. † The book of ‘ the inſtitution of Offices, quoted by Priſcian, may be ‘ the book concerning the laws and cuſtoms of Rome. ‘ The ſame Priſcian quotes eight books of his con‘ cerning the Prætors. A book intituled, *De Rebus* ‘ *Variis*, is aſcribed to him, wherein he treated of ‘ things that concern Grammar. ⸸ It appears by ‘ ſeveral authors, who quote his works, that they ‘ have been very much eſteemed even among the ‘ Greeks. ‡ Tertullian quotes his book concerning ‘ ſhews, ** and St Jerome that of the illuſtrious ‘ men, in whoſe imitation he wrote his. It is likely ‘ that what is now extant of Suetonius concerning the ‘ illuſtrious Grammarians, Poets and Orators, made ‘ part of that work. He ſpeaks of ſome Grecians, ‘ but they taught at Rome.’

[*D*] *That hiſtory of the firſt twelve emperors, is very much commended by our moſt learned Humaniſts.*] It is a continued ſeries of choice and curious facts, related ſuccinctly without digreſſions, reflexions, and reaſonings. There is in it a character of ſincerity, which plainly ſhews that the author feared and hoped for nothing, and that his pen was not directed by hatred or flattery. He repreſents abundance of vices, with all their deformity, without diſcovering any inclination to ſlander, and without omitting the good qualities of thoſe whoſe crimes he deſcribes (15). Which muſt needs pleaſe the judicious readers, who are extreamly offended, when they obſerve that an author loves ſlandering, and relates wicked actions, not ſo much to perform the part of an Hiſtorian, as to ſatisfy his ſatirical humour. Many readers do not much care whether an Hiſtorian diſcovers ſuch a humour, or appears free from it; it is enough for them if he be ſatirical; thoſe men have doubtleſs wrong notions of things, and little honeſty; but all things being otherwiſe alike, I think they would rather chuſe a hiſtory, wherein wicked princes are ingenuouſly deſcribed, than one that may be ſuſpected by reaſon of the author's malignity; and therefore they may agree with men of a good taſte in approving Suetonius. He found the art of perſuading the reader of his ſincerity; which plainly ſhews that he is no paſſionate writer. Let us ſee what judgment has been made of him by ſome learned men: I begin with the eloquent Politian. ‘ Hæc ſingula ita Suetonius hic noſter perſecutus in ſua Hiſtoria eſt, ut præ‘ ter explicandi ſcientiam, qua mirifice eſt uſus, etiam ‘ diligentiam nobis fidemque, & libertatem ſuam plane ‘ probaverit. Nulla in his libris ſuſpicio eſt gratiæ, ‘ nulla ſimultatis, nihil ſtudio dictum, nihil ſuppreſſum ‘ metu, rebus ipſis data omnia, veritati in primis ſer‘ vitum eſt, ut plane appareat ad perpetuam magis ‘ poſſeſſionem (ut Thucydides ait) quam ad intuitum ‘ hoc opus, pugnamque præſentem comparatum eſt. ‘ Nam qui aut fœdis aſſentationibus, aut malignis ‘ obtrectatiunculis, ſupra quam res ipſa poſtulet, quaſi ‘ ſervire hiſtoriam cogunt, ii mihi haud minus eam ‘ dehoneſtare videntur, atque ii qui Herculem ipſum ‘ depingant, Lydiæ Omphalæ in muliebri & crocina ‘ tunicula famulantem (16). . . . . . Hanc in ‘ primis captare Hiſtoricus laudem debet, ut liber‘ tate uſus maxima in ſcribendo, ut neque aſſenta‘ tioni quaſi obnoxius, neque obtrectationi quaſi ‘ offenſus, ſed fidei ſerviſſe atque incorruptæ veri‘ tati exiſtimetur, ne quid in eo ſervile, neve quid ‘ malignius deprehendatur, ſic ut nec ullis conditioni‘ bus ſolicitatus, neque mercedula cuiquam auctoratus, ‘ ſed ſui homo juris, rectus, atque intrepidus neutram ‘ in partem præponderet (17). . . . Tantum abeſt, ut ‘ hic noſter quicquam vel metu, vel ſtudio adductus, ‘ rebus ipſis detraxerit, ut Nervæ etiam, Trajani, ‘ Adrianique ſuæ ætatis Imperatorum vitas tacere præ‘ optaverit, quam aut periculoſe de viventibus male ‘ ſentire, aut extollendo potentiores, parum videri ‘ liber (18). - - - - *Every one of theſe things is ſo well* ‘ *executed by Suetonius in his hiſtory, that beſides his de*‘ *ſcriptive art, which is admirable, he has likewiſe* ‘ *given us plain proofs of his diligence, veracity, and* ‘ *freedom. There is no room for any ſuſpicion of par*‘ *tiality or ill-will in his books; nothing is ſaid out of* ‘ *favour, nor ſuppreſſed out of fear: the facts themſelves* ‘ *have engroſſed his whole attention, and he has con*‘ *ſulted truth in the firſt place; by which it appears that* ‘ *his* upon cuſtoms and ordinances, ſo that thoſe who read his Hiſtory with a good commentary, or hear it explained by a learned Critic, may learn a vaſt number of things relating to antiquity. Some blame him for being ſo particular in deſcribing the leud actions and horrid debaucheries of Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, &c [*E*]. It cannot be denied that the inquiries he made into thoſe things are very ſingular, and that he allowed a great deal of liberty to his pen; and therefore it has been ſaid that he writ the lives of the Emperors with the ſame freedom as they lived. Neverthelеſs he was a man of very good morals, and great virtue (*i*). He made no haſte to publiſh his works, and wanted to be intreated not to keep them ſo long in his cloſet (*k*). The beſt commentaries upon that writer are thoſe of Torrentius and Caſaubon. They have been inſerted at large, with

---

(10) La Popeliniere, Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires, *livr. vi, (and not v, as Voſſius quotes it) pag.* 344.

(11) Ælius Spartian. in Vita Adriani, *cap. xi, pag. m.* 102, *Tom. i*, Hiſtoriæ Auguſtæ Scriptor.

(12) Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. *Tom. ii, pag. m.* 418, *ad ann.* 121.

(13) Id. ibid. *pag.* 486.

(14) That is, that of a Grammarian.

* Auſon. Ep. 19, *pag.* 466.

† Suet. prol.

⸸ Prol.

‡ Tert. ſpec. c. 5. pag. 92. c.

** Hier. v. ill. præf. pag. 261. a.

(15) *See* Bodin. Method. Hiſt. *cap. iv, pag. m.* 65.

(16) Politianus, *Præfat.* in Suetonium, *folio m. b.* 3.

(17) Id. ibid. *folio b.* 4.

(18) Id. ibid. *fol. b.* 5.

(*i*) See the paſſage of Pliny in the remark [*E*] citation (31).

(*k*) See the remark [*F*], citation (50).

‘ *his work was framed (as Thucydides ſays) for a perpetual poſſeſſion, not for a tranſitory view, or to ſerve a preſent purpoſe. For ſuch perſons as make hiſtory ſubſervient to vile flattery, or ſpiteful detraction, beyond what the truth requires, do no leſs diſhonour it than thoſe who introduce Hercules himſelf in petticoats, performing the offices of a domeſtic drudge to Omphale, Queen of Lydia . . . . . An Hiſtorian ought chiefly to aim at this commendation,* viz. *of being eſteemed a moſt free and impartial writer, who neither flatters nor detracts, but ſtrictly obſerves the laws of ſincerity and truth. He muſt take care not to diſcover any thing ſervile or malicious, nor to give ground for ſuſpecting that he is acted by an undue influence, or bound, as a hireling, to any one, but he muſt ſhew himſelf to be a man independent, upright, and undaunted, who is no ways byaſſed to either ſide. . . . . . Our Hiſtorian was ſo far from being influenced by the motives of fear or favour, to detract any thing from the truth, that he rather choſe not to write the lives of Nerva, Trajan, and Adrian, the emperors of his time, than to run any riſque by ſpeaking ill of the perſons then alive, or to ſeem leſs free and impartial, by extolling his ſuperiors.*’ I ſhall add the following words of Lipſius to this fine encomium. ‘ Suetonium Tranquillum non injuria commendo ſæpe juventuti. Verba vides? Pura, terſa, propria. Filum totum orationis? Breve, nervoſum. Rem ipſam? Utilis pariter & jucunda hiſtoria eſt: & quod mihi caput, plena moris & doctrinæ antiquæ. Quis obſecro, ritus publicus olim privatuſque fuit, quem velut de induſtria non tangat? Quod munus, quis magiſtratus, quem non libet? Tangat & libet, dico. Non enim explicet: quod inſtitutum ejus vetuit & ratio ſcribendi. At viam tamen latam ſternit ad indagandum: & aures atque animum imbuit auditione aliqua, imò cognitione (19). - - - - *I very often recommend Suetonius Tranquillus to the youth, not without reaſon. If you examine his words, they are pure, neat, proper: if the whole thread of it's diſcourſe, it is ſhort and nervous. If you conſider his ſubject, it is both an uſeful and pleaſant hiſtory: and which chiefly weighs with me, it is full of morality and antient learning. What rite is there either public or private which he does not purpoſely touch upon? What office or magiſtracy which he does not briefly mention? I ſay, touch upon, and briefly mention; for he does not fully explain them, becauſe the deſign and method of his book hindered him from doing ſo. Neverthelеſs he opens a large field for enquiry, and communicates to the ears and mind ſome hints, or rather ſome degrees of knowledge.*’ One witneſs more: ‘ Suetonius vitas aliquot deſcripſit Auguſtorum. Fidem ſi ſpectes, nihil certius. Acumen ſcribentis ſi conſideres, & prudentiam, nihil acutius nihil prudentius. Verborum, quantum ſatis eſt, adhibet; copiam autem rejicit. Formulas fori & curiæ omnes ſervat in loquendo. Mirificus planè vir, & dignus qui ab omnibus ametur & legatur (20). - - - - *Suetonius has writ the lives of ſome of the Cæſars. As to his veracity, there is nothing more certain than what he ſays. If you conſider his wit and diſcretion, in theſe no man has exceeded him. The words that he makes uſe of are as many as are ſufficient, but he rejects a copious ſuperfluity. He keeps up all the phraſes of the Forum and the court in his ſtyle. In ſhort, he is truly an admirable writer, and deſerves to be read and liked by all.*’ If any one deſires a greater number of teſtimonies, he needs only read Hanckius in the firſt volume *de Romanarum rerum ſcriptoribus*, pag. 112, and 113; and in the ſecond volume, pag. 287, and 288. See alſo Sir Thomas-Pope Blount, pag. 104, of the *Cenſura celebriorum Autorum*. But the reader ought alſo to find here what the Antients have ſaid of Suetonius's candor and ſincerity. ‘ Suetonius Tranquillus, emendatiſſimus & condidiſſimus ſcriptor Antouinm & Vindicem tacuit, contentus eo quod eos curſim perſtrinxerat. . . . Et de Suetonio non miramur cui familiare fuit amare brevitatem (21). - - - - *Suetonius Tranquillus, a moſt correct and candid writer, paſſes over Antony and Vindex, being ſatisfied with this, that he had given them a touch by the by. . . . . And as to Suetonius, I am not at all ſurprized, ſince he was particularly fond of brevity.*’

I muſt not conceal that thoſe, who are willing to know the date of each event, are very much diſpleaſed with Suetonius. That hiſtorian has wholly neglected it; he does not obſerve any chronological order; and indeed it was no part of his deſign; and it is to be obſerved that he is excuſable for pitching upon a method, which excuſed him from following that order. There were hiſtories enough, which contained an exact account of the reign of the Emperors, according to the time in which every thing had been done; and therefore he did not think it proper to compoſe a work of the ſame nature, but rather choſe to diſcover the private actions of the Emperors, and to put together in one chapter what concerned their marriages, and in another chapter what concerned their education, their friendſhips, their buildings, &c. He pitched upon the moſt difficult part of Hiſtory; for it is much eaſier to collect the materials of wars or other public affairs, than to give a particular account of what paſſes in a palace, I mean of the inclinations and private actions of the monarch; what he was as a huſband, as a father, as a brother, as a maſter, as a friend, as a lover; what caprices he was ſubject to, what clothes he wore, what meals he made, &c. I am ſure that if a man ſhould undertake at this day to write the hiſtory of the Popes, Emperors, or Kings of France, &c. in imitation of Suetonius, running back to the laſt 150 years, more or leſs, as he did, he would meet with great difficulties; and if he ſucceeded as well as Suetonius, he would be admired, and looked upon as an excellent author of a ſecret hiſtory. Oh, how fit would ſuch a book be to enrich a Bookſeller!

[*E*] *Some blame him for being ſo particular in deſcribing the leud actions . . . . of Tiberius . . . . &c.*] Muretus exclaimed with great eloquence againſt Suetonius upon that account, ſo far as to ſay that the reading of that Hiſtorian is as dangerous for young people as the verſes of Catullus and Martial. I ſhall ſet down the whole paſſage of the oration he made in the college of Rome, the fourth of November 1580. ‘ At Suetonium S. Hieronymus laudat. Magnum teſtimonium, ſi laudat. Non enim ſanctitate tantùm Hieronymus, ſed & eruditione & judicio præſtitit. Quomodo igitur laudat? Eâdem libertate ſcripſiſſe eum ait Cæſarum vitas, quâ ipſi vixerunt. Non magna laus, ſi laus eſt: ſed ego laudem eſſe non puto. Quid enim laudis habet, cùm Cæſares in ſumma licentia atque impudentia vixerint, orationis turpitudine, ipſorum flagitia æquaſſe, quæque illi perpetuis tenebris operienda patrarant, ea nudis & prætextatis verbis in lucem & in aſpectum hominum protuliſſe? Itaque nihil apud Suetonium frequentius legas, quàm exoletos, & ſpintrias & cellarios, & nubentem Neroni Sporum, Doryphoro Neronem; voces etiam, quas in illis flagitiis miſerint, quaſi hæc ſcire, poſterorum intereſſet: quorum commemoratione non ſcriptorem modò, ſed ipſas chartas erubeſcere oportebat: cùm hæc interim ita ſubtiliter ac particulatim perſequitur, ut docere voluiſſe videatur. In Tacito nihil ſimile reperias. Talia aut præterit, aut ita ſignificat, ut odiſſe & abhorrere videas, non, ut illum alterum, cupidè in eis immorari. Inter Vopiſcos igitur, & Spartianos, & Lampridios,

(19) Juſtus Lipſius, Elector. *lib. ii, cap. xvii, pag. m.* 811, *Tom. i, Oper.*

(20) Franciſc. Robortellus, *in Literis ad Jo. Bapt. Campegium, Tom. i,* de Populi Romani vita & victu *præmiſſis.*

(21) Vopiſcus, in Firmo, *pag. m.* 691, *Tom. i,* Hiſtoriæ Aug. Script. *See alſo the ſame writer in* Probo, *pag.* 639, *where he places him among the Hiſtorians,* qui non tam diſerte quam vere memoriæ (*res geſtas*) tradiderunt. - - - *who have related things not ſo eloquently as truly.*

with the notes of ſome learned Critics, in the edition of Utrecht 1672 (*l*). I have not ſeen the French tranſlation of Suetonius, printed at Lyons in the year 1556, in 4to (*m*); and therefore I cannot ſay whether George de la Bouliere, who is the author of it, has been as cautious as Mr du Teil (*n*). The latter has left out whole chapters, and in many places

(*l*) Publiſhed by Mr Grævius. It was reprinted in 1691.

(*m*) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibl. Franc. *pag.* 446. La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 118, *mentions only the edition of Lyons*, 1569. (*n*) The fourth edition of his tranſlation of Suetonius, is that of Amſterdam, 1699.

‘pridios & ejuſmodi vitarum ſcriptores Suetonius emineat, illâ ſe jactet in aulâ; hoc ceteris melior, quod ætatis beneficio, meliùs quàm illi latinè loquitur: ad Taciti quidem gloriam aſpirare, aut ſe cum eo conferre ſi voluerit, omnium eruditorum convicio vapulabit. Equidem quod ad me attinet, Suetonii lectionem non minus quàm Catulli aut Martialis adoleſcentibus pernicioſam, etiam confirmatæ ætatis viris periculoſam puto (22). - - - - *But it is ſaid that St Jerom commends Suetonius. An honourable teſtimony, if he does ſo. For Jerom not only excelled in piety, but likewiſe in learning and judgment. But how does he commend him? He ſays that he writ the lives of the Cæſars with the ſame freedom as they lived. This is no great commendation, if it be any at all; for my part I do not think it is any. For ſince the Cæſars lived up to the height of looſeneſs and debauchery, what praiſe is it for any man to have equaled their crimes by the immodeſty of his deſcription, and to have ſet before the eyes of men, in bare-faced and obſcene words, their vile actions, which ſhould rather have been buried in perpetual oblivion. You find nothing more frequently mentioned in Suetonius than Catamites, and the authors of unnatural luſts; Sporus married to Nero, and Nero to Doryphorus. He does not even forget the expreſſions which they made uſe of in the middle of their crimes; as if it concerned poſterity to know theſe things, the bare mention of which ſhould have made not only the author but the paper itſelf to bluſh. Nevertheleſs he inſiſts upon them ſo minutely and particularly, as if he had a mind to teach them. We find nothing like this in Tacitus. He either paſſes over ſuch things, or he hints at them in ſuch a manner as ſhews his hatred and abhorrence, but does not eagerly dwell upon them, as the other does. Wherefore let Suetonius ſhine among the Vopiſci, the Spartiani, the Lampridii, and other writers of lives of that ſort; in this he is preferable to them, that the age in which he lived gave him an opportunity of writing a better Latin ſtile than they: but if he ſhould aſpire to the glory of Tacitus, or dare to compare himſelf with him, he would be cenſured by all learned men. I for my part look upon the reading of Suetonius to be no leſs hurtful to young people than the reading of Catullus or Martial. Nay I think it even dangerous to men of a ripe age.*’ Take notice that he oppoſes Tacitus to Suetonius, in order to ſhew that Tacitus has deſerved no blame, conſidering how cautious he is either to ſuppreſs thoſe filthy things, or to mention them only in general, and with indignation. Bodin made the ſame obſervation before Muretus, to make it appear that Tacitus is more to be commended than Suetonius, whom he otherwiſe acknowledges to be leſs blameable than Lampridius. ‘Hoc fortaſſis improbari poteſt (Suetonius) quòd fœdiſſimas quaſque principum libidines nimis ſtudioſè conſectatur quas Corn. Tacitus omiſit. Sed in eo genere longè à Lampridio ſuperatur, is enim tot portenta novarum voluptatum ab Heliogabalo invecta deſcribit, ut non magis ea narrare, quàm unicuique ad imitandum proponere videatur (23). - - - - *In this perhaps Suetonius is blame-worthy, viz. in following too cloſely all the abominable luſts of princes, which Tacitus has omitted. He is nevertheleſs far out-done by Lampridius, who deſcribes ſuch a number of monſtrous and new pleaſures brought in by Heliogabalus, that he does not more ſeem to relate them than to propoſe them for the imitation of every one.*’ But Bodin and Muretus did not conſider what difference there is between the author of an Hiſtory of the Empire, and the author of an Hiſtory of the Emperors. The former ought to touch but lightly upon the private actions of a prince; he ought to ſay but little of kings, except when they have an influence upon the general affairs of the ſtate. But thoſe, who write the hiſtory of the perſon of a monarch, ought chiefly to dwell on his private actions. Which is the reaſon why Suetonius thought himſelf more obliged than Tacitus to inſiſt upon the perſonal actions of the Emperors. Beſides, it may be affirmed that Tacitus did not take ſuch a method as the cenſurers of Suetonius aſcribe to him. He expreſſes the leudneſs of that time in very plain words, and perhaps he ſpeaks as much of it in proportion (24) as the other does. We might judge better of it, if we had all his hiſtory of Caligula. What Muretus ſays, that the public is not concerned to know the particulars of the Emperors debauchery, proves too much; for he may be anſwered that the public is not concerned to know the particulars mentioned by Tacitus concerning Agrippina, who inticed her own ſon to commit inceſt with her. What have we to do, may one ſay to Muretus, with the ‘laſciva oſcula & prænuntias flagitii blanditias, - - - - *wanton kiſſes and careſſes that were the forerunners of the crime,*’ which we read in Tacitus (25)? You muſt either condemn that Hiſtorian, or acquit Suetonius, and acknowledge that they are only more or leſs faulty. Note, that Eraſmus, whoſe authority is as good as that of Muretus, does not think that the deſcription of the leudneſs of the Emperors, whoſe hiſtory has been written by Suetonius, is unprofitable to the public. On the contrary, he believes it may be a curb to wicked princes, and that no tyrant could be at reſt, ſhould he conſider that his memory would be one day as execrable as that of Caligula and Nero is at this Day. It was for the public good that he put out an edition of Suetonius, and of the other Hiſtorians, who give us a particular account of the abominable actions of the Roman Emperors. I ſhall ſet down his own words, which repreſent his thoughts more fully and more emphatically than I can do. *Ex bonæ fidei ſcriptoribus ſuper alias innumeras, hæc præcipua capitur utilitas, quod non alia res æque, vel bonorum regum animos ad res cum laude gerendas accendit, vel Tyrannorum cupiditates cohibet ac refrenat, dum utrique cernunt horum literis ſuam vitam omnem, mox in totius orbis, imo ſeculorum omnium Theatrum producendam, & quidquid nunc vel in abdito patrant, vel aſcito fuco prætexunt, vel metu diſſimulari cogunt verius quàm ignorari, paulo poſt clariſſima in luce ſub oculis omnium traducendum, cum jam metu pariter ac ſpe libera poſteritas, nec ullo corrupta ſtudio, magno conſenſu recte factis applaudet, parique libertate his diverſa explodet exſibilabitque. Nec enim arbitror quenquam tyrannum, ſic penitus omnem hominis ſenſum exuiſſe, ut vitam ſibi jucundam ducat, ſi norit ſuum nomen apud poſteros omnium ætatum ac nationum, tam inviſum & execrabile fore, quam eſt Neronis, Caligulæ, Heliogabali, Commodi, ad quorum mentionem, ceu portentorum verius quàm principum, nemo jam non deſpuit, non abominatur, non deteſtatur* (26). What Eraſmus ſays may be confirmed by the following example. The Emperor Commodus cauſed a man, who had read the life of Caligula, written by Suetonius, to be devoured by beaſts; and he uſed him thus, becauſe he was born the ſame day with Caligula (27). From whence it may be inferred that he was more concerned for the memory of Caligula, than for that of the other Emperors defamed by that Hiſtorian. But ſince he exerciſed ſo great a cruelty upon a reader, by virtue of his concern grounded on ſuch frivolous reaſons, it is an eaſy matter to apprehend that he would not, for any thing in the world, have been uſed as Suetonius uſed Caligula; and therefore it is certain that tyrants are not willing their infamous actions ſhould be known. Such an hiſtorian as Suetonius may therefore make them uneaſy, and afraid that, ſome time or other, their memory will be as execrable as that of the Emperors, whoſe debaucheries he lays open.

Politian maintained, many years before Eraſmus, that the leud and cruel actions deſcribed by Suetonius, might inſpire the reader with love for the contrary virtues; and he alledged the conduct of the Lacedemonians, who in order to make their children hate drunkenneſs, took care to ſhew them drunken ſlaves. Read his words, wherein you will find alſo that a Muſician, the better to inſtruct his ſcholars, would have them hear very bad ſingers. *Sed neque aut obſcænitatis apud hunc quiſquam, aut crudelitatis exempla reformidet. Siquidem & Lacedæmonii (ut eſt apud*

(22) Muretus, Orat. xvii, *Vol.* ii, *pag.* 347, 348, *Edit. Lipſ.* 1672, *in* 8*vo.*

(23) Bodin Method. Hiſt. *cap.* iv, *pag. m.* 65.

(24) That is, conſidering that he wrote the Hiſtory of the Roman Empire, and that Suetonius wrote the lives of the Emperors.

(25) Tacit. Annal. *lib.* xiv, *cap.* ii.

(26) *Eraſm.* Epiſt. Dedicat. *Suetonii, Dionis Caſſii, Spartiani, Capitolini, Lampridii, &c.* He dedicated that work to Frederic, Elector of Saxony, and to Prince George, couſin to that Elector. The Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Antwerp the fifth of June 1517.

(27) Eum etiam qui Tranquilli librum vitam Caligulæ continentem legerat, feris objici juſſit, quia eundem diem natalis habuerat quem & Caligula. *Lamprid. in Commodo, cap.* x.

places enervated Suetonius's phraſes; for he was ſenſible that the French language could not bear the vivacity and ſtrength of the deſcription which that Latin Hiſtorian gives us of the Emperor's debauchery. I muſt not forget Moreri's miſtakes [*F*].

Plutarchum) ſoliti etiam ſunt per feſtos dies bene potos ſervos, atque ex eo parum ſui compotes, quos illi Εἵλωτας *vocabant, oſtendere inter convivia, atque illo pacto docere adoleſcenteis, quantum in ſe mali ebrietas contineret. Et Thebanus Giſmenias* (28) *bonos juxta maloſque tibicines diſcipulis oſtendens, Hoc modo, aiebat, canere oportet, illo non oportet. Videlicet collatæ vitiis virtutes, magis aliquanto, quam ſi ſeorſum inſpexeris, diluceſcunt* (29).

Mr de Tillemont is of Muretus's opinion. '† Voſſius quotes out of St Jerom, ſays he (30), that 'Suetonius is as looſe and infamous in his narration, 'as the princes, whoſe hiſtory he writes, were in 'their lives; wherein he contradicts the praiſes beſtowed upon him by Pliny ‡: and it may be ſaid of 'him and Lampridius, that they teach the greateſt 'crimes by relating them.' I cannot grant him all the parts of this ſentence of condemnation; for I am perſuaded that Suetonius might write after ſuch a manner, without *contradicting the praiſes beſtowed upon him by Pliny*. 'Pliny ſays, That the more he knew 'him, the more he loved him, by reaſon of his probity, honeſty, good conduct, application to ſtudy, 'and learning (31).' The particular account Suetonius gives of the Emperors debauchery is no proof that he was a leud man, or that he took delight in deſcribing leud actions, nor in general that there was any thing wanting to his probity and honeſty. It ſhews only that he was a very ingenuous and ſincere man, and that he believed an hiſtorian ought faithfully to relate all the truths he can find out: and thoſe who are never ſo little qualified to judge of the character of an author by his way of writing, will be of opinion that Suetonius was only directed by his ſincerity and natural ingenuity, and not by a deſire of amuſing or tickling his paſſions. Nay, it ought to be preſumed, that he deſigned to puniſh vice as much as an hiſtorian can puniſh it, and to caſt a blot upon the memory of thoſe monſtrous men, by tranſmitting it to future ages, attended with all the execration it deſerves, and that he thought ſuch a method might in time prevent the like brutiſhneſs. It is certain that he and Lampridius inſpire a greater averſion and horror for the princes, whoſe abominable actions they have deſcribed, than the moſt preciſe and moſt grave writers can do.. Laſtly, I muſt obſerve that Mr de Tillemont did not make a right uſe of his judgment, when he undertook to invalidate the formal teſtimony of Pliny the younger, by looſe and uncertain conſequences. Let us ſtick to the teſtimony of one of the moſt honeſt men of that time. It were in vain to ſay that he beſtowed this encomium upon Suetonius in a letter wherein he begged a favour for him. I know that in ſuch caſes it is a common thing to uſe flattery; but Pliny affirms in the ſame letter, that he and Suetonius had contracted a ſtrict friendſhip long before: It was not a lie; for the truth of it appears from ſome other letters of Pliny. This great friendſhip and familiarity between Suetonius and Pliny had not laſted long, if Suetonius had not been ſuch a Man as Pliny repreſents him to be. I add that there is no author extant that reflects in the leaſt upon Suetonius's virtue; for we muſt not mind what Domitius Calderinus, a great romancer (32), ſays. Read this paſſage; 'Siniſteriora quædam de Suetonii moribus conſectatur, Marii, neſcio cujus, teſtimonium citans. 'Nos enim adoleſcenteis ipſum meminimus audire Domitium, cum diceret habere ſe peculiarem Marii 'Ruſtici librum, quem cæteris incognitum ſecum de 'Gallia attuliſſet, qui tamen codex, ne extincto quidem illo, nunquam comparuit. Atque ego quidem 'ſtudio incogniti mihi ſcriptoris incenſus, etiam ad ipſius Domitii parentis Benaci lacus accolas acceſſi, omnemque ejus librorum ſupellectilem ſcrutatus, Marium 'certe hunc ruſticum inveni nuſquam (33). - - - - *He 'makes ſome harſh reflexions upon the morals of Suetonius, 'and quotes one Marius for his voucher: but who that 'Marius is I know not. We remember, indeed, in the 'days of our youth to have heard Domitius ſay, that he 'had a certain book of Marius Ruſticus unknown to others, 'which he had brought with him from France: but it 'never appeared, not even after his death. I for my 'part had ſuch a curioſity to ſee this unknown writer, that 'I was at the pains to go to the parents of Domitius, 'living near the Lake di Garda, and to rummage over 'his whole library, but this Marius Ruſticus was no where 'to be found.*'

I ſhall inſert in this place La Mothe de Vayer's reflexion upon Muretus's invective. 'It were to be 'wiſhed, ſays Muretus, that we had not been informed 'of ſo many debaucheries and horrid vices of Tiberius, 'Nero, and Caligula. They are ſuch obſcenities as almoſt make the paper bluſh on which Suetonius repreſents them: and, if what an antient author ſays 'be true ‡, that there is but little difference between 'thoſe who carefully deſcribe ſuch infamous things, 'and thoſe who teach them; we can hardly excuſe 'Suetonius for taking ſuch a method (34). . . . But 'becauſe I have anſwered ſuch like objections in ſome 'other ſections, I ſhall only ſay, that there will hardly be any hiſtorian free from guilt, if it be a crime 'to mention wicked actions, which make up the 'greateſt, and often the moſt conſiderable part of his 'narration. Nay, do not we read of parricides, inceſts, idolatries, and a thouſand profanations in the 'ſacred Hiſtory, among good examples and holy inſtructions (35).' It is a difficult thing to make a good anſwer to that obſervation; and I would fain know what the ſcrupulous Tillemont would have ſaid againſt it. Doubtleſs he would have alledged ſpecious things; but it might have been inferred from them, that the moſt antient Hiſtorian, and the moſt knowing, ſince he wrote by inſpiration, ſhould not have mentioned the daughters of Lot; for it may be ſaid with the ſame reaſon, that this was indirectly teaching inceſt in ſuch circumſtances as were horrible. It might alſo be inferred from the reaſons alledged by that author, that hiſtory in general ought to be condemned (36); and that the trial of the Lady de Brinvilliers ſhould not have been publiſhed at Paris; and that the relations of conſpiracies ſhould not be made public, becauſe one may learn from them the art of plotting, and avoiding the wrong meaſures, which made that of the Pazzi, and ſeveral others miſcarry.

[*F*] *I muſt not forget Moreri's miſtakes*] I. Suetonius's father was not *tribune of the third legion*, but of the *thirteenth*. II. The title of *Secretary of State* is too great for Suetonius; it is not at all likely he ever had ſuch an employment: doubtleſs his office was like that of thoſe, who are now called Secretaries of the Cabinet. Spartianus calls him *Magiſtrum Epiſtolarum* (37), according to the ſtyle of his time, if we believe the learned Gutherius, who maintains that the *Magiſterium Epiſtolarum* was not appointed till after Hadrian's empire (38). III. Moreri ſhould not have ſaid that Suetonius loſt his place *by reaſon of ſome privacies he had with the Empreſs Sabina*. That expreſſion does too clearly imply a notion of gallantry, which does not appear in the Latin words of Spartianus, the only author who informs us of Suetonius's being put out of favour. We have ſeen above (39) how he expreſſes himſelf. Moreri (40) quotes him, after having ſaid, that the Emperor Hadrian *diſcovered ſome love-intrigues of Sabina, and cauſed her to be poiſoned*. It is not true that Spartianus ſays all this; and he is ſo far from giving to underſtand that thoſe, who loſt their places, had been in love with the Empreſs, that he clearly ſhews they had treated her with contempt. Salmaſius juſtly wonders that theſe words *injuſſu ejus* have not been minded, whereby it appears that thoſe men were turned out of their offices, becauſe they had behaved themſelves too haughtily and too familiarly with the Empreſs without Hadrian's order (41). If they had been guilty of ſome love-intrigues, the Hiſtorian would not have ſaid *injuſſu ejus*; for it were a very impertinent thing to ſay, that the Emperor deprived the Præfect of the Prætorium, Suetonius, and ſeveral others, of their offices, becauſe they had ſome love-intrigues with Sabina without his order. Were it not a piece of extravagance to ſuppoſe that he gave ſuch orders upon ſome occaſions? Do not tell me that, on the other hand, it were an extravagant thing to ſuppoſe that he ordered ſometimes his miniſters to uſe Sabina uncivilly; this ſuppoſition is very well grounded. We know that he uſed his wife as if ſhe had been a ſervant-maid (42); from whence it may be eaſily inferred that he allowed his officers to uſe her harſhly and very uncivilly. But this

---

(28) He ſhould have ſaid *Iſmenias*.

(29) Politianus, ubi ſupra, *fol. b* 5.

† Voſſ. Hiſt. Lat. lib. I. c. 31. pag. 166.

(30) Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. *Tom. ii, p.* 488.

‡ Ruald. v. Plut. c. 28, pag. 51. 2.

(31) Tillemont, ibid. *pag.* 486. *Theſe are Pliny's words*, Epiſt. xcv, *lib. x.* Suetonium Tranquillum, probiſſimum, honeſtiſſimum, eruditiſſimum virum, & mores ejus ſequutus & ſtudia, jampridem, domine, in contubernium adſumſi: tantoque magis diligere cœpi, quanto hunc propius inſpexi.

(32) See above the remark [*C*], of the article CALDERINUS.

(33) Politianus, ubi ſupra.

‡ Parum abeſt à docente qui talia narrat.

(34) La Mothe le Vayer, Jugement ſur les principaux Hiſtoriens, *pag.* 230, *of the third volume of his works in* 12*mo*.

(35) Id. ibid, *pag.* 231.

(36) Compare with this what has been ſaid above, in the remark [*S*] of the article SFORZA (CATHERINE).

(37) Spartianus, in Adriano, *cap. xi, pag. m.* 102.

(38) Gutherius, de Officiis Domus Auguſtæ, *lib. iii, cap. iv, pag. m.* 438.

(39) In the remark [*B*].

(40) At the word *Sabina*.

(41) Qui impudicam familiaritatem intelligunt, næ illi multum falluntur, ne tale quicquam cogitarent, poterat per illas duas voces fieri, *injuſſu ejus*, ſi diligentius paulo attendiſſent. *Salmaſius in Spart. Adr. cap. xi, pag. m.* 102.

(42) Hujus uxor Sabina dum prope ſervilibus injuriis afficitur ad mortem voluntariam compulſa eſt. *Aurelius Victor, in Adriano.*

this permiſſion was not unlimited; he did not always permit ſuch an uſage, ſome perſons were only allowed to treat the Empreſs in that manner, and he told them how far that permiſſion might go. Thoſe who loſt their places did not keep within thoſe bounds; which is the reaſon why the Hiſtorian made uſe of the words *injuſſu ejus,* which ſhew the true cauſe of their diſgrace, and at the ſame time remove all ſuſpicion of gallantry. Salmaſius (43) perfectly unfolds this little myſtery. What he ſays againſt thoſe, who find love-intrigues in the matter, might have been confirmed by a reaſon, which he did not think of. Spartianus adds immediately after, that Sabina would have been divorced for her ill humour, if her huſband had been a private perſon. *Uxorem etiam ut moroſam & aſperam dimiſſurus (ut ipſe dicebat) ſi privatus fuiſſet* (44). He does not ſay one word of her unfaithfulneſs, and gallantry (45). From whence I conclude, that the deprived officers were only guilty of a blunt proceeding towards Sabina in her ill humour. Her vexation made her peeviſh and intolerable; but becauſe the officers of the court knew that the Emperor deſpiſed her, and did not much care ſhe ſhould be reſpected, they ſcolded at her in their turn, and went ſo far in it without the Prince's approbation, that they loſt his favour. The other particular, mentioned by Moreri, for which he quotes Spartianus, is really to be found in ſome manner in that author. *Sabina uxor non ſine fabula veneni dati ab Adriano defuncta eſt* (46), that is, Sabina died, not without a report that ſhe had been poiſoned by Hadrian. Nevertheleſs Moreri is miſtaken; for he will have it that the diſcovery of Sabina's gallantry was the cauſe of her being poiſoned; which would be very falſe, though we ſhould grant him that ſome love-intrigues were diſcovered when Suetonius was put out of favour. There were ſixteen years between the depriving of that Secretary, and the death of the Empreſs (47).

I ſhall further examine Moreri's narrative. *That diſgrace*, ſays he, *put Suetonius upon writing for the public; and he compoſed the lives of the twelve Cæſars. . . . . Pliny the younger deſired him to put off no longer the publication of that work, and told him he found it ſo perfect, that the further poliſhing of it would but ſpoil it.* There are many faults in thoſe words. IV. It cannot be proved that Suetonius's diſgrace inſpired him with the deſire of writing for the public. V. And therefore it is a great piece of raſhneſs to ſay in expreſs words, that it moved him to write the Hiſtory of the twelve Emperors; for ſince he compoſed many books, he might have writ when he was out of favour, and it cannot be concluded that he wrote preciſely a certain book. VI. No body knows what books Pliny the younger deſired him to publiſh. Why then does Moreri affirm that he deſired him to publiſh the twelve Cæſars? VII. It cannot be ſaid, without helping the letter, that *he found them perfect.* Which ſuppoſes that he declared he had read them; but this ſuppoſition does not well agree with theſe words: 'Patere, me videre titulum tuum; patere audire, deſcribi, legi, vænire volumina Tranquilli mei (48). - - - *Suffer me to ſee your title, ſuffer the books of my friend Tranquillus to be heard and talked of, to be read and ſold.*' It is true he had been ſaying what Moreri quotes, 'Perfectum opus abſolutumque eſt; nec jam ſplendeſcit lima, ſed atteritur. - - - *The work is perfectly finiſhed; nor will further poliſhing add to the beauties of it, on the contrary it will rather diminiſh them.*' But how do we know but he ſaid ſo like a friend? VIII. However it be, were it true that Suetonius did not write the lives of the twelve Cæſars till he was turned out of favour, Pliny the younger could not have complained of his ſlowneſs in publiſhing them (49); for doubtleſs he writ that letter to him under the Empire of Trajan. But Suetonius did not loſe his place till the fourth or fifth year of Hadrian's reign. IX. Inſtead of Sicco Polemon, Moreri ſhould have ſaid Sicco Polenton.

Some of theſe miſtakes of Moreri have been committed by la Mothe le Vayer, in his judgment upon the chief Hiſtorians (50). I wonder at it; for he was a much more learned man than Moreri, and had been directed in that work by Meſſieurs du Puy, and had the aſſiſtance of *four great libraries, the King's, Thuanus's, their own* (51), and that of Cardinal Mazarin. With ſuch helps he ſhould have writ an excellent book, and might even have avoided thoſe four miſtakes without them.

(43) Salmaſius, in Spart. Adr. ubi ſupra.

(44) Spart. ubi ſupra.

(45) This may ſerve to confute the fabulous ſtory publiſhed by Brantome, againſt Sabina in the firſt volume of his *Dames Galantes*, pag. 118.

(46) Spartianus, in Adr. *cap. xxiv, pag.* 204.

(47) *See* Tillemont, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 418, & *pag.* 450.

(48) Plin. Epiſt. xi, *lib. v.*

(49) Sum & ipſe in edendo hæſitator, tu mora tamen meam quoque cunctationem tarditatemque viciſti. - - - *I myſelf am tardy in publiſhing any thing, but you by your delay, have exceeded my ſlowneſs. Id. ibid.*

(50) The 2d, the 3d, the 4th, and the 5th. Moreri had them from him.

(51) La Mothe le Vayer, *Preface to his* Jugem. ſur les princip. Hiſtoriens.

SULACHA (*a*) (Simon) a Neſtorian Monk, of the order of St Pacomus, withdrew his obedience to his patriarch, and united himſelf to the Church of Rome. Thoſe who ſhook off the yoke as he did, made him their patriarch, and ſent him to Rome, where Pope Julius III, confirmed his patriarchate in 1552 (*b*). Sulacha made his confeſſion of faith at Rome, which was tranſlated into Latin by Maſius, with the letter thoſe Neſtorians wrote to Julius III, to deſire him to confirm the election of Sulacha, and to aſk his protection againſt a family, which had kept the patriarchate a long time (*c*). This was the ſubject of their diviſion: ſeveral of them could not endure that this dignity ſhould always remain in one family; and that family, which had enjoyed it above two hundred years, would not reſign it. Simon Sulacha being returned into the Eaſt, eſtabliſhed his patriarchal ſee at Caramit, a town of Meſopotamia, took the title of Patriarch of the Aſſyrians, and ordained ſeveral biſhops and archbiſhops. The Turks put him to death at the ſolicitation of the Schiſmatics. They elected for his ſucceſſor a Monk of St Pacomus, whoſe name was Hebed-Jeſu (*d*). I have mentioned him under that name, and under that of Abdiſſi: ſee thoſe articles. Father Paul (*e*) inſinuates that the Court of Rome, out of policy, made a great noiſe of that embaſſy of the Neſtorians, to ſupport her reputation in Europe by chimera's. I ſhall relate in a remark what that Hiſtorian ſays [*A*].

(*a*) See the remark [*A*], in the article HEBED-JESU.

(*b*) Petrus Strozza, de Dogmate Caldæor. apud Aubert. Miræum, Polit. Eccl. *lib. ii, cap. v.*

(*c*) *See the* Hiſtoire Critique du Levant, par le Sieur de Mony, *ch. vii.*

(*d*) Strozza, apud Miræum, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, book v, at the beginning.

[*A*] *I ſhall relate . . . . what that Hiſtorian ſays.*] We find in his work (1) that the Pope received with great magnificence the Patriarch ſent to him by all the Churches between Euphrates and the Indies; that he cauſed him to be conſecrated biſhop; that he gave him the *pallium* with his own hands in a private Conſiſtory; that he ſent him back into his country, and had him accompanied by ſome Monks who underſtood Syriac; that at Rome, and all over Italy, the only talk was about the vaſt number of Chriſtians that were in that country, and the great acquiſitions the Holy See had made in it; that people diſcourſed particularly of the great number of Churches at Muzal (2), a town which was ſaid to be the antient Aſſur, ſituate upon the Tigris, not far from Nineveh; that they reckoned the moſt famous towns under the juriſdiction of that Patriarch, ſuch as Babylon, Tauris, Arbela where Darius was overcome by Alexander, Ecbatana, called by others Seleucia and Niſibis, and ſeveral provinces of Aſſyria and Perſia; . . . . that all thoſe things were printed and read with great curioſity. There was doubtleſs more oſtentation than truth in the matter; and it was a good piece of policy to make the names of thoſe famous cities ſound ſo high.

(1) F. Paul, Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, book v, at the beginning.

(2) The Confeſſion of Faith of that Patriarch mentions 18, whereof 15 were poſſeſſed by the Neſtorians, and 3 by the Jacobites. *See* F. Paul, *ibid.*

SULPICIA, or SULPITIA, a Roman lady, daughter of Sulpicius Paterculus, and wife of Fulvius Flaccus, obtained a very great honour, when it was thought proper to ſeek out a remedy againſt the leudneſs obſerved among the women of Rome. The evil appeared ſo great that recourſe was had to the aſſiſtance of Heaven, and to thoſe religious helps which ſupply the want of human means. The books of the Sibyls were conſulted, and upon the report of the conſultors it was decreed by the ſenate that a ſtatue ſhould be conſecrated to *Venus Verticordia*, that is, *Converter of hearts* [*A*], that women and maids might be more eaſily reclaimed from their leudneſs, and become chaſte. It was ordered that a moſt virtuous woman ſhould conſecrate that ſtatue of Venus; and at firſt a hundred women were choſen from all the reſt, and then ten out of that hundred, and all of them unanimouſly nominated Sulpicia to perform that function: ſo that this lady was acknowledged to be the moſt chaſte of all (*a*). I ſhall inquire

(*a*) *Taken from* Valerius Maximus, *lib. viii, cap. xv. You will find his words in the remark* [*A*].

[*A*] *It was decreed by the Senate that a ſtatue ſhould be conſecrated to Venus Verticordia .... converter of hearts.*] This particular is to be found in ſeveral authors, but in none with ſo many circumſtances as in Valerius Maximus. *Merito*, ſays he (1), *virorum commemorationi Sulpitia, Ser. Paterculi filia, Q. Fulvii Flacci uxor, adjicitur. Quæ, cum ſenatus libris Sibyllinis per decemviros inſpectis cenſuiſſet, ut Veneris Verticordiæ ſimulachrum conſecraretur, quo facilius virginum mulierumque mentes à libidine ad pudicitiam converterentur; & ex omnibus matronis centum, ex centum autem decem ſorte ductæ, de ſanctiſſima fœmina judicium facerent, cunctis caſtitate prælata eſt.* Pliny ſays the ſame in fewer words, only he does not mention the cauſe of that conſecration, nor the epithet of Venus. *Pudiciſſima femina ſemel, matronarum ſententia, judicata eſt Sulpicia Paterculi filia, axor Fulvii Flacci: electa ex centum præceptis* (2), *quæ ſimulacrum Veneris ex Sibyllinis libris dedicaret* (3). Solinus (4) tranſcribes Pliny, as he uſes to do. Ovid ſays nothing of Sulpicia, and inſtead of a ſtatue, he pretends that a temple was built to Venus Verticordia. He does not forget the cauſe of that new devotion; he ſays in expreſs words that it was occaſioned by the loſs of chaſtity.

Roma pudicitia proavorum tempore lapſa eſt:
Cumæam, veteres, conſuluiſtis anum.
Templa jubet Veneri fieri: quibus ordine factis,
Inde Venus verſo nomina corde tenet (5).

Of old when Roman chaſtity was fled,
Our fathers, anxious for the marriage-bed,
At the Cumæan propheteſs enquir'd,
To know what offering the gods requir'd.
She bid a temple to be rear'd anon
Unto the Paphian Queen of Love: which done,
Venus did ſtrait acquire another name:
From working changes on the heart it came.

He is to blame for not having paid to Sulpicia the honour ſhe deſerved. The glory ſhe acquired then, is ſo great, that he ſhould not have been ſilent about it. The other ladies acknowledged that ſhe ſurpaſſed them in chaſtity. Such an acknowledgment is as glorious to her, as it would be for a brave man, if a hundred brave men ſhould confeſs that he had more courage than they. It is a rare thing, ſays Martial (6), to ſee any body that is willing to yield to others in point of wit. But it is ſtill more rare among ſoldiers to find any that will yield to another in point of courage: nay, compliments are very ſcarce upon that head; and in general an honeſt man will ſeldom acknowledge that he has leſs honeſty than another, and a virtuous woman that ſhe is leſs chaſte than others. Such a civility is as rare among virtuous women, as it is among gallant women to acknowledge that their rivals exceed them in beauty. However, civil words and compliments are far from being looked upon as judicial and ſolemn acknowledgments; for if the queſtion was to chuſe for an honourable function appointed by the magiſtrates, the moſt honeſt woman or the moſt honeſt man in a town, none would be willing that others ſhould take advantage of the compliments they might have made them. Every one would revoke them, and enjoy the freedom of his judgment, and would think it a very hard thing publickly to acknowledge, that he is leſs worthy of being choſen for the appointed function; and therefore Sulpicia's virtue muſt needs have been very ſhining, ſince a hundred Roman ladies voted for her upon ſuch an occaſion. But perhaps it ought to be ſuppoſed that the Senate ordered that no lady ſhould vote for herſelf. The circumſtances of this fact are not clearly deſcribed by authors. Their meaning ſeems to be that a hundred Roman ladies were firſt of all choſen by lots, and then that ten of them were likewiſe choſen in the ſame manner, and that all of them acknowledged that Sulpicia deſerved to conſecrate the ſtatue. The management of that affair ſeems to me intricate; for why did they caſt lots twice, if they had a mind that the hundred ladies ſhould vote? I had rather ſay that a hundred women of the beſt reputation were firſt of all ſet apart, and then they drew lots, that ten of them ſhould name the woman, who was to conſecrate the ſtatue, and it was ordered that none ſhould name herſelf. Thus Sulpicia by the votes of ten ladies was preferred to a hundred women of the beſt reputation in the city; and yet none did formally declare that ſhe was leſs chaſte than Sulpicia. It had been a hard thing to require ſuch an acknowledgment in ſuch a conjuncture.

WHETHER it was a proper thing to make one's application to Venus, in order to put a ſtop to leudneſs.

Perhaps it will be ſaid that the ſenate did not make a right application; for, according to the doctrine of the Heathens, Venus equally preſided over unlawful and lawful love, and ſhe had occaſioned the prodigious leudneſs they intended to put a ſtop to. This objection is of no weight: the ſenate knew very well what they did, and for this very reaſon that Venus had occaſioned ſuch a diſorder, it was neceſſary to have recourſe to her; for, according to Cato's maxim, thoſe who are the cauſe of great evils, ought to put an end to them. *Τῶν γὰρ αὐτῶν εἶναι καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ μεγάλα κακὰ καὶ παύειν. Nam eorundem eſſe & facere magna mala & comprimere* (7). The ſenate might expect that Venus being appeaſed by the conſecration of that new ſtatue, and acknowledged to be the miſtreſs of hearts, would reclaim the fair ſex, either by ceaſing to inſpire them with love, or by fixing it on lawful objects. The firſt method is not amiſs; for how many people may uſe the complaint we read in an opera?

Mon cœur auroit encor ſa premiere innocence,
S'il n'avoit jamais eu d'amour.

My heart had ſtill been innocent,
Had it not been for love.

The ſecond method is a very good one: the ſenate might have told Venus; inſpire them with love, we are not againſt it; but let their love be lawful. Reclaim them from their ill courſes; bring them back into the right way. They are like rivers that run out of their channels, and overflow the country; let thoſe waters return into their channel; this we beg of you, as you are the goddeſs *Verticordia*, --- *converter of hearts.*

I have read in Pauſanias, that Harmonia, Cadmus's wife, conſecrated three ſtatues to Venus at Thebes; the firſt to Venus *Urania*; the ſecond to Venus *Pandemos*, and the third to Venus *Apoſtrophia*. The firſt was for ſpiritual love, the ſecond for bodily love, and the third was deſigned to prevent extravagant conjunctions, ſuch as inceſt, &c. Ἔθετο δὲ τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ τὰς ἐπωνυμίας ἡ Ἁρμονία· τὴν μὲν Οὐρανίαν ἐπὶ ἔρωτι καθαρῷ, καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένῳ πόθου σωμάτων· Πάνδημον inquire into the date of this fact [*B*]; it has been too much neglected by authors.

---

(1) Valerius Maximus, *lib. viii, cap. xv, num. xii, pag. m.* 738.

(2) That is, who had been already choſen. Read *præceptis*, and not *præcipuis* as there is in moſt editions. See *Salmaſius in Solinum*, pag. 54, and Father *Harduin, in Plin.* Tom. ii, pag. 56, and 124.

(3) Plin. *lib. vii, cap. xxxv, pag. m.* 56.

(4) Solin. *cap. i, pag. m.* 12.

(5) Ovid. Faſtor. lib. iv, ver. 157.

(6) Aurum & opes & rura frequens donabit amicus: Qui velit ingenio cedere rarus erit. *Mart. Epig. xviii*, lib. viii.

(7) Plutarch. in Catone minore, *pag.* 184. *D.*

δημον δὲ, ἐπὶ ταῖς μίξεσι· τρίτην δὲ Ἀποστροφίαν, ἵνα ἐπιθυμίας τε ἀνόμου καὶ ἔργων ἀνοσίων ἀποστρέφῃ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Cognomina impoſuit Harmonia Uraniæ, purum ſignificans, & corporum cupiditate vacantem amorem: Popularis, ob* Venerios *congreſſus:* jam *vero Apoſtrophiæ* numen coli inſtituit (id eſt Averſatricis) *quo ab exlege cupiditate & inceſtis ſtupris hominum genus averteret* (8). The Romans, you ſee, might have learned of other nations to honour Venus under the title of *Verticordia*; for there is no great difference between this title and that of *Apoſtrophia:* one implies the notion of a *Converter*, and the other that of a *Diſſuader*, if I may be allowed to uſe ſuch a word.

[*B*] *I ſhall enquire into the date of this fact.*] The antient authors do continually afford new occaſions to complain of their negligence in chronology. Tho' you examine the words of Ovid, Valerius Maximus, Pliny, and Solinus, never ſo narrowly, you will find nothing in them, whereby you may know at what time the conſecration of that ſtatue of Venus was performed. That time may be known from Julius Obſequens, who mentions (9) a certain prodigy, which happened under the conſulſhip of Marcus Acilius and Caius Portius, that is, according to Sigonius's Faſti, in the year of Rome 639. The daughter of a Roman knight was thunder-ſtruck, and it was found that her tongue was gone through that part of her body not proper to be named. The Soothſayers were conſulted; their anſwer was, that the maids and the knights were threatened with infamy (10): which proved true; for three Veſtals, who had love-intrigues with ſome Roman knights, were puniſhed at the ſame time. It was then that a temple was built to Venus Verticordia (11). Note, that from the year of Rome 639, till Julius Cæſar made himſelf maſter of the commonwealth, the corruption of manners, and particularly luxury, increaſed more and more; and therefore the ſtatue conſecrated by chaſte Sulpicia, did no good. See the margin (12).

(8) Pauſan. *lib. ix, cap. xvi, pag.* 742.

(9) Julius Obſequens, *in Libro* de Prodigiis, *num.* 97, *pag.* 51.

(10) It is to be obſerved that this maid was on horſeback when ſhe was thunder-ſtruck.

(11) Tres uno tempore virgines Veſtales nobiliſſimæ, cum aliquot equitibus Romanis, inceſti pœnas ſubierunt. Ædes Veneri Verticordiæ facta. *Id. ib.*

(12) The evil grew greater and greater from the time of Cæſar, inſtead of growing leſs. See what I quote out of Seneca in the remark [*H*], of the article VAYER.

SULPITIUS (JOHN) ſirnamed *Verulanus*, becauſe, if I am not miſtaken, he was a native of *Verulum* (*a*), a town in the Campania di Roma, applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the *Belles Lettres* with good ſucceſs. He flouriſhed towards the end of the XVth century. His commentary upon Lucan's Pharſalia was pretty good for that time. He publiſhed Vegetius with two other tracts *de Re Militari* (*b*). He alſo publiſhed ſome Latin verſes *de Moribus*, and *Præludia Grammatica.* I think he ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from Sulpitius, who taught in the college of Rome, under the pontificate of Innocent VIII, and who began to reſtore the uſe of Muſic upon the ſtage [*A*], ſo that he may be looked upon as the firſt author of Opera's. He is alſo the firſt who publiſhed Vitruvius.

His

(*a*) Veroli in Italian.

(*b*) Æliani & Frontini. *See* Geſner's Bibl. *fol.* 457.

[*A*] *Who began to reſtore the uſe of Muſic upon the ſtage.*] I ingenuouſly confeſs that I ſhould be ignorant of this particular, had I not read it in a book of the Jeſuit Menetrier. I ſhall ſet down the whole paſſage (1). 'Thoſe remains of Dramatic Muſic, which had been 'preſerved in the church, ſerved to reſtore it two 'hundred years ago; and Rome, which had in a 'manner loſt it, to beſtow upon the recitation and de'clamation of actors, what the Grecians beſtowed 'upon ſinging and harmony, brought it upon the 'ſtage towards the year 1480, as I learned it from 'Sulpitius in the Epiſtle Dedicatory prefixed to his 'notes upon Vitruvius, which he preſented to Cardi'nal Riari, Great Chamberlain of the Church, and 'nephew of Pope Sixtus IV. . . . . Sulpitius praiſing 'the magnificence of that Cardinal, who had built 'ſtately palaces in and about Rome, begs of him that 'he would ſet up public theatres for Muſical repre'ſentations, of which this Sulpitius calls him the Re'ſtorer, having ſhown at Rome, a few years ago, 'what had not been in uſe there for many ages. He 'tells the Cardinal in that epiſtle, that Rome ex'pects from him a theatre for ſuch performances, be'cauſe he has already given ſuch an entertaintment 'to the people upon a moveable theatre, ſet up in a 'public place, and at other times in the caſtle of 'St Angelo for the Pope's diverſion, and in his palace 'for ſome Cardinals. *Tu enim primus Tragœdiæ 'quam nos juventutem excitandi gratiâ & AGERE '& CANTARE primi hoc ævo docuimus, (nam ejuſ'modi actionem jam multis ſæculis Roma non viderat) 'in medio foro pulpitum ad quinque pedum altitudinem 'erectum pulcherrimè exornaſti. Eamdemque poſtquàm 'in Hadriani mole Divo Innocentio ſpectante eſt acta, 'rursùs intrà tuos penates tamquam in media Circi ca'veâ toto conſeſſu, umbraculis tecto admiſſo populo, & 'pluribus tui ordinis ſpectatoribus honorificè excepiſti. 'Tu etiam primus picturatæ ſcenæ faciem, quùm Pompo'niani* (2) *comœdiam agerent noſtro ſæculo oſtendiſti: 'quare à te Theatrum novum tota urbs magnis votis 'expectat.*' Father Menetrier is miſtaken, when he ſays that this Latin paſſage is taken from the Epiſtle Dedicatory of Sulpitius's notes upon Vitruvius. Mr du Francaſtel, keeper of the Mazarine Library, has been pleaſed to inform me of ſome things relating to the book, wherein that Epiſtle Dedicatory is to be found, and thereby I know it is a Vitruvius (3) without any notes upon the text, and without any various readings. It is not paged, and has no ſignatures. Neither the time nor the place of the impreſſion, nor the Printer's name, are to be found in it. There is no date in the advertiſement to the reader, nor in the Epiſtle Dedicatory. That advertiſement contains theſe words, among other things: 'Jo. Sulpitius Lectori 'ſalutem . . . . Collatis multis id genus libris & im'primis uno noſtri Delii manu ſatis accurate per'ſcripto, eum mihi laborem aſſumpſi ut quantum per 'plurimas occupationes meas fieri poſſet, redderem 'unum imprimendorum archetypum adeò emendatum, 'ut parvus labor cuivis alteri ejuſdem rei ſtudioſo re'linqueretur. Quod ſi fidelis ut ſpero librarius fuerit '& cum his impreſſis ſcripti calamis conferentur, fa'cile fides noſtra & diligentia apparebit . . . . Primus 'hoc in ſtadio curro & ad certamen via jam liberali'ter ſtrata reliquos inter ſe excito. - - - - *John Sulpi'tius to the reader. . . . . Having collated ſeveral ma'nuſcripts of this kind, particularly that which my friend 'Delius wrote with exactneſs, I took upon me, as much 'as the multiplicity of my affairs would allow, to procure 'a copy for the preſs ſo correct, that there ſhould be little 'trouble left for any other perſon that might ſet about the 'ſame thing. If the Printer ſhould do juſtice, as I hope 'he will, when the manuſcripts ſhall be compared with 'the printed copies, my diligence and fidelity will ſoon ap'pear . . . . I am the firſt who ſtart in this courſe, 'and excite others to a mutual ſtrife, having paved the 'way for them in ſuch an ample manner.*' The Epiſtle Dedicatory begins thus: 'Raphaeli Riario Cardinali 'Sanctæque Ro. Eccleſiæ Camerario, Jo. Sulpitius fœ'licitatem. Quidquid curæ, ſtudii, vigiliarum, & operæ 'in emendando & vulgando Vitruvio poſui . . . . tuæ 'dedico amplitudini. - - - - *John Sulpitius to Cardinal 'Raphael Riari, Great Chamberlain of the Church, 'wiſhes happineſs. Whatever pains, diligence, and la'bour, I have beſtowed upon the correcting and publiſh'ing of Vitruvius . . . . I dedicate it all to your Emi'nence.*' Then follows the paſſage quoted by Father Menetrier. This edition of Vitruvius did not come out in the year 1480; for it was publiſhed under the Pontificate of Innocent VIII, who kept his ſee from the year 1484, till 1492. Here follow ſome words of the Epiſtle Dedicatory, whereby it appears that it

(1) Menetrier, des Repréſentations en Muſique, *pag.* 155, 156. *That book was printed at Paris, in* 1681.

(2) That is the ſcholars of the academy or college of Pomponius Lætus.

(3) A very ſmall folio.

His book *de Moribus* was tranſlated into French verſe by Peter Broé (*c*) a native of Tournon on the Rhone. La Croix du Maine (*d*), from whom I learn this, places the printing of that tranſlation in the year 1555, by Macé Bonhomme at Lyons, and he calls the author of the original, *John Sulpitius of S. Alban, named* Verulanus.

(*c*) Du Verdier, Bibl. Franç, *pag.* 1000, *calls him* Brohe.

(*d*) Bibl. Franç, *pag.* 388.

was written towards the laſt years of that Pontificate. ‘ Innocentius impoſito bellis fine, Prætorio ſuburbano peracto, agilitatis certaminibus & equitum concurſionibus, dotalibuſque & ſumptuariis legibus revocatis. . . . . Tum floræ campus, tum Circus Flaminius lateribus aptiſſime ſternitur . . . . de Gymnaſio noſtro evertendo & magnifice conſtruendo (quod utinam præoccupaſſes : ibi enim cotidiana omnium diſciplinarum eduntur ſpectacula) prudentiſſimi Reformatores jam iniere conſilium (4). - - - - *Pope Innocent having put an end to the war, finiſhed his country houſe, promoted games and tournaments, and repealed the dotal and ſumptuary laws . . . . Then the* Campus Floræ, *and the* Circus Flaminius, *were neatly paved with bricks. . . . . Immediately after that, the wiſe Reformers reſolved upon pulling down our academy, and building it up a-new in a magnificent manner (which I wiſh you had thought of before, becauſe there all manner of ſhows and exerciſes are daily exhibited).*’

From what has been ſaid, I conclude that Father Menetrier does not well deſcribe this work of Sulpitius ; for he ſays they are notes upon Vitruvius, publiſhed about the year 1480.

Note, that this edition of Vitruvius is little known. The reader will be convinced of it by this extract of a letter, which Mr du Francaſtel has done me the honour to write to me. I inſert it here the more willingly, becauſe I am ſure that thoſe, who love the hiſtory of books, will find it very curious. ‘ To be better informed of the matter, I have read all the Prefaces, the Epiſtles Dedicatory, and other *Prolegomena*, prefixed to the Vitruvius's of the Mazarine Library, that have been printed with and without commentaries, in Latin, Italian, and French. It is a ſurprizing thing that none of them mentions this *Jo. Sulpitius*, nor his edition, which muſt needs be the firſt. Nay, moſt Commentators and Editors pretend to be the firſt who have gone about it. Mr Perrault, who, in the Preface to his French tranſlation of Vitruvius, mentions the names of thoſe who have publiſhed, tranſlated, or commented upon that author, ſays nothing of Sulpitius. I have ſeen the editions of Jocundus, Philander, Daniel Barbarus, Ceſariano, and Caporali, beſides that of Mr Perrault, which are in our library. I have found out another thing concerning one Hiero. *Advocatus Ambroſii JCti. F.* It is in a letter from *Joannes Britannicus Brixianus*, to that *Advocatus*, wherein he ſpeaks to him thus : ‘ Feciſti tuâ induſtriâ, ſtudio, & labore, ut Vitruvius de architectura, qui jam tot ſæculis in lucem caput ſuum proferre non audebat, qui ex omni parte mancus, lacerus, mutilatum ſe ſentiebat, nunc politus, purus, integer huc & illuc geſtiat meare, omnibus carus occurrat, omnibus gratus excipiatur. - - - - *It is owing to your pains and induſtry, that Vitruvius, an Architect, who was ſo maimed and imperfect in every part, that, for many ages, he could not ſhew his head, does now come forth freſh, uncorrupted, and entire ; and is every where received with the greateſt fondneſs and approbation.* That letter is printed at Venice, in 1493. Having read the Vitruvius's, without finding any thing in them, whereby one may know who was this *Jo. Sulpitius*, I thought that if I ſhould read all the prefaces, *&c.* of Verulanus's works, that are in our library, I might diſcover ſomething in them, ſuppoſing he had made the notes in queſtion ; but it was to no purpoſe, for that author makes no mention of them in ſeven or eight books which I have ſeen (5).’

(4) I am beholden for all theſe paſſages to Mr du Francaſtel, keeper of the Mazarine library.

(5) A Letter of Mr du Francaſtel, written from Paris, the 11th of December 1699.

S U R E N A, General of the Parthians in the war againſt the Romans, commanded by Craſſus in the year of Rome 701 (*a*), *was for wealth, family, and authority, the ſecond man in the kingdom, but for courage and proweſs he was the firſt ; neither was any one ſo large ſized, or ſo well ſhaped. Whenever he travelled he had a thouſand camels to carry his baggage, two hundred chariots full of concubines, a thouſand compleatly armed men for his life-guards, and a great many more lightarmed, ſo that there were at leaſt ten thouſand of his ſervants and retinue. And the honour had long belonged to his family, that at the king's coronation he put the crown upon his head ; and when King* Orodes *had been exiled, he brought him in : it was he that took the great city of Seleucia, was the firſt man that ſcaled the walls, and with his own hand beat off the defendants ; and though at that time he was not above thirty years old, he was counted wiſe and diſcreet : wherein he had much the advantage of Craſſus, who was eaſy to be impoſed upon, firſt through his overweening confidence, and afterwards becauſe he was diſpirited and terrifyed by his calamities.* Many ſtratagems were uſed againſt the Romans, and beſides, the Parthians fought with great vigour. *Surena* (*b*) *was the talleſt and comelieſt man in the army. And the ſweetneſs of his looks, and effeminacy of his habit, could not promiſe ſo much manhood, as he really was maſter of ; for his face was painted* [*A*], *and his hair parted, after the faſhion of the Medes ; whereas the other Parthians looked more terrible, with their hair ſhaggy, after the Scythian mode.* The ſucceſs of the battle was glorious to him ;

(*a*) Plutarch. in Craſſo, *pag. m.* 556.

(*b*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 557.

[*A*] *The ſweetneſs of his looks, and effeminacy of his habit, could not promiſe ſo much manhood, as he really was maſter of ; for his face was painted.*] Generally ſpeaking, thoſe men, who pretend to be handſome, and who have recourſe to art to ſet off the luſtre of their complexion, and who often conſult their glaſs, that the ſymmetry of their hair and curls may often charm women, are not fit for war. They are meer beaux and ſparks ; the aſſemblies of ladies, feaſts, and balls, are the places where they ſignalize themſelves : the fatigue of war does not agree with them ; it requires men who are not afraid of being ſun-burnt : bravery does rather inſpire a deſire of frightning the enemy with a martial look, than of pleaſing women with a beauiſh air. But here is an exception to that general rule : Surena ſhews himſelf a valiant man in battle, he performs all the duties of a General, with all imaginable vigour and application ; and yet he paints, and is very careful of his hair ; which puts me in mind of a common topic very contrary to Cæſar's practice. It is a common maxim in war, that ſoldiers ought not to be permitted to enjoy the ſweets of a delicious life, that it is the way to enervate them and make them lazy ; and, among other inſtances, the fault of Hannibal, after the battle of Cannæ, is frequently alledged. He quartered his army in ſeveral places, where the ſoldiers uſed themſelves to a voluptuous life, and wine, baths, good cheer and women, deſtroyed that martial vigour, which had made them ſo formidable. The delights of Capua were to him what the battle of Cannæ had been to the Romans (1). ‘ In hyberna Capuam conceſſit. ibi partem majorem hyemis exercitum in tectis habuit, adverſus omnia humana mala ſæpe ac diu durantem, bonis inexpertum atque inſuetum. itaque quos nulla mali vicerat vis, perdidere nimia bona ac voluptates immodicæ : & eo impenſius, quo avidius ex inſolentia in eas ſe immerſerant. ſomnus enim & vinum, & epulæ,

(1) Titus Livius, ubi infra, *pag.* 376. Florus, *lib. ii, cap. vi.*

him; but he caſt a blot upon his glory by his perfidiouſneſs, in demanding an interview with Craſſus to conlude a treaty of peace (*c*). He was very civil to that Roman General, he gave him his word, and aſſured him there was an agreement concluded between the Parthians,

‘ & epulæ, & ſcorta balneaque, & otium conſuetudine indies blandius, ita enervaverunt corpora animoſque, ut magis deinde præteritæ eos victoriæ quàm præſentes tutarentur vires: majuſque id peccatum ducis apud peritos artium militarium haberetur, quàm quòd non ex Cannenſi acie protinus ad urbem Romam duxiſſet. illa enim cunctatio diſtuliſſe modò victoriam videri potuit: hic error vires ademiſſe ad vincendum. Itaque hercule, velut ſi cum alio exercitu à Capua exiret, nihil uſquam priſtinæ diſciplinæ tenuit. nam & redierunt plerique ſcortis impliciti: & ubi primùm ſub pellibus haberi cœpti ſunt, viaque & alius militaris labor excepit, tyronum modo corporibus animiſque deficiebant: & deinde per omne æſtivorum tempus magna pars ſine commeatibus ab ſignis dilabebantur: neque aliæ latebræ quam Capua deſertoribus erant (2). - - - *Hannibal withdrew to Capua, where he took his winter-quarters. There he lodged his ſoldiers in houſes, for the greateſt part of winter; thoſe ſoldiers who had long been enured to all manner of hardſhips, and were unacquainted with eaſe and pleaſure. But thoſe men whom no hardſhips, no miſery, could tame and ſubdue, were ſpoiled and undone by too much wealth, and immoderate pleaſures; and ſo much the rather, becauſe, not having taſted pleaſures before, they abandoned themſelves wholly to them, and plunged in voluptouſneſs and debauchery. For ſleeping on ſoft beds, wine and feaſting, whoring and bathing, idleneſs and eaſe, which by habit grew daily more pleaſant and delightful, enervated their bodies and minds to ſuch a degree, that from thence forward the reputation of their former victories defended them more than their preſent ſtrength: and men ſkilled in military affairs have judged Hannibal their General more blameable for this action, than for not leading his army directly forward to Rome, after he had won the battle at Cannæ. For that ſtay ſeemed only to defer the final victory for a time, whereas this error ſeemed to diſable him from ever obtaining it. Thus he departed from Capua, as if he had led ſome other army; ſo little did they retain of their antient diſcipline: for they not only returned from that city, moſt of them entangled and enſnared in the love of harlots, but ſo ſoon as they came again to lie abroad on the bare earth, under tents and pavilions covered with beaſts hides, to march long journies, and to reſume their military hardſhips, their bodies became as tired, and their hearts as faint, as if they had been raw ſoldiers, newly come into the field: and all the time of their ſummer abode in the camp, many of them without licence or paſport ſtraggled away and deſerted their colours; while theſe deſerters had no other haunt, but Capua.*’ The maxim grounded upon ſuch examples was neglected by Julius Cæſar; and he had no occaſion to repent that he had not followed it. He ſuffered his ſoldiers to plunge themſelves into all manner of debauchery after a great victory, and uſed to ſay that they could fight ſtoutly, even when they were perfumed. *Nonnunquam poſt magnam pugnam atque victoriam, remiſſo officiorum munere, licentiam omnem paſſim laſciviendi permittebat: jactare ſolitus,* milites ſuos etiam unguentatos bene pugnare poſſe (3).

I think our Surena was one of thoſe men, of whom I have given two examples in the article of Henry IV (4). They give up themſelves to pleaſures, and entirely abſtain from them, according to the ſeveral junctures: they are voluptuous and lazy to the higheſt degree, when there is nothing to do; and extreamly vigilant and laborious, when there is a neceſſity for it. If we believe Velleius Paterculus, Mæcenas laboured very hard, when it was neceſſary; but when there was no preſſing buſineſs, he gave up himſelf to idleneſs, and lived as deliciouſly as the moſt effeminate man can do. *C. Mæcenas, vir ubi res vigiliam exigeret, ſane exſomnis, providens atque agendi ſciens; ſimul vero aliquid ex negotio remitti poſſet, otio ac mollitiis pæne ultra feminam fluens* (5). What the ſame Hiſtorian ſays of Lucius Piſo, though it falls ſhort of that, may yet ſerve for an example of the character I here deſcribe. ‘ De quo viro hoc omnibus ſentiendum ac prædicandum eſt, eſſe mores ejus vigore ac lenitate mixtiſſimos, & vix quemquam reperiri poſſe, qui aut otium validius diligat, aut facilius ſufficiat negotio, & magis, quæ agenda ſunt, curet ſine ulla oſtentatione agendi (6). - - - *Concerning whom every one ought to think and ſay, that in his manners there is a perfect mixture of vigour and ſoftneſs, and that it is ſcarce poſſible to find any man who is either fonder of eaſe, or more capable of buſineſs, and aſſiduous without oſtentation in doing what is neceſſary to be done.*’ He ſays much the ſame thing of Sentius Saturninus. ‘ Virum multiplicem in virtutibus, navum, agilem, providum, militariumque officiorum patientem ac peritum pariter, ſed eundem, ubi negotia feciſſent locum otio, liberaliter lauteque eo abutentem; ita tamen, ut eum ſplendidum ac hilarem potius, quam luxurioſum aut deſidem diceres (7). - - - *A man endowed with many virtues, laborious, active, provident, who equally well underſtood and diſcharged military offices. Neverthele ſs as often as he had any reſpite from buſineſs, he miſpent it, yet in ſuch a manner, that you would ſay he was rather magnificent and gay, than luxurious and indolent.*’

Tacitus mentions a General (8) of the ſame temper. It was he who contributed moſt to raiſe Veſpaſian to the throne. He was too voluptuous when he had nothing to do, and very active in time of buſineſs. ‘ Luxuria, induſtria, comitate, arrogantia, malis boniſque artibus mixtus: nimiæ voluptates cum vacaret: quotiens expedierat magnæ virtutes (9). - - - - - *A man in whom there was a mixture of good and bad qualities, luxury, diligence, arrogance, and courteſy. He was too voluptuous,* &c.’ See alſo what Tacitus ſays of one Criſpus Salluſtius in the 30th chapter of the third book of his Annals. Every body knows that Demetrius was a diſſolute man to the higheſt degree; and yet in time of war that Prince gave over his pleaſures, and applied himſelf entirely to his great enterprizes. Let us ſee how Plutarch relates the matter. He ſays (10) that Antigonus being uncapable of the fatigues of the war, by reaſon of his great age and the bulk of his body, *committed the management of his greateſt affairs to the Prince, his ſon, whoſe conduct was admirably dextrous in military matters; and the old King was induced to bear with thoſe exceſſive liberties, wherein he drowned himſelf in the time of peace, becauſe he obſerved him to be the moſt temperate and abſtemious perſon in the world, in the time of war and action. . . . As for Demetrius, if he devoted himſelf to his pleaſures and luxury, he abandoned himſelf entirely to them; and if the trumpet ſounded to horſe, he was no leſs aſſiduous in the fatigues of war; he was, beyond all doubt, a very great Captain, and moſt notably dextrous, not only in his conduct, but in forming his levies, and raiſing an army, and in making all the neceſſary preparations of ſtores and magazines, the very muſcles and nerves of war, which he ever took care to provide in great abundance* (11). I ſhall add an obſervation of the ſame author, attended with a fact relating to the matter I treat of. ‘ Artaxerxes plainly proved that cowardice, and effeminacy are the effects of a baſe vile nature, guided by erroneous notions, and not of niceneſs and ſuperfluous exceſſes, as moſt men ſuppoſe. For notwithſtanding his jewels of gold, his robe of ſtate, and the reſt of his coſtly attire, worth no leſs than twelve thouſand talents, with which he was conſtantly clad, his labours and toils were no leſs than thoſe of the meaneſt perſons in his army. For he marched himſelf the firſt on foot, having his quiver ſlung over his ſhoulder, and his ſhield on his arm; he led them through craggy mountains and rugged ways; inſomuch that the ſoldiers obſerving his courage and unwearied ſtrength, took wing, and went the more ſwiftly along with him, whoſe daily march was above two hundred furlongs (12).’ I ſhall here apply an obſervation that was made upon the Athenians. An author who had deſcribed their luxury and ſoftneſs, adds, *and yet they won the battle of Marathon.* Τοιοῦτοι δὲ ὄντες τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην ἐνίκησαν. *Et ejuſmodi quum eſſent, tamen à prælio Marathonio victores diſceſſerunt* (13).

3 One

(*c*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 562, 563.

(2) *Titus Livius*, lib. xxiii, pag. m. 362. See alſo pag. 377, where Marcellus encourages his ſoldiers, repreſenting to them how the delights of Capua had enervated the ſoldiers of Hannibal.

(3) Sueton. in Cæſare, *cap. lxvii.*

Some examples of voluptuous men, and yet very laborious.

(4) Remark [*A*].

(5) Vell. Paterculus, *lib.* ii, *cap. lxxxviii.*

(6) Id. ibid. *cap. xcviii.*

(7) Id. ibid. *cap.* cv.

(8) Licinius Mucianus.

(9) Tacit. Hiſt. *lib.* i, *cap.* x.

(10) Plut. in Demetrio.

(11) Zozimus ſpeaks of Theodoſius in the like ſtrain.

(12) Plut. in Artaxerxe.

(13) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib. iv, cap.* xxii.

Parthians and the Romans, and that the only thing that remained to be done was to advance as far as the river to write it down. Craſſus had a mind to ſend for a horſe, but Surena told him that it was needleſs, ſince King Orodes gave him one. Craſſus got on

One would think that when the Antients ſuppoſe that Bacchus did wonders on the day of the battle with the giants, their deſign is to give us to underſtand that thoſe who ſeem only fit for dancing and amorous ſports, will nevertheleſs ſhew their bravery in a battle.

Tu, cùm parentis regna per arduum
Cohors Gigantum ſcanderet impia,
Rhœtum retorſiſti leonis
Unguibus, horribilique mala:
Quanquam choreis aptior, & jocis,
Ludoque dictus, non ſat idoneus
Pugnæ ferebaris: ſed idem
Pacis eras, mediuſque belli (14).

When impious giants climb'd on high,
And dar'd to ſtorm thy father's ſky,
Thy ſingle hand ſecur'd his crown:
You with a lyon's dreadful jaws,
And frightful nails retriev'd the cauſe,
Bold Rhetus quell'd and ſav'd the falling throne.
Tho' much more us'd to ſoft delight,
Unfit, unable for a fight
You once were thought, and doom'd to eaſe,
Yet when your heat and virtue roſe,
What fury ſeiz'd your haughty foes?
How equally inclin'd to wars and peace?

I will not reckon the great Scipio among the voluptuous men who minded important affairs. I ſhall only ſay, that his great cares were attended with innocent recreations. The rigid and auſtere Cato did not approve of it; but he was too ſevere in his judgment about the difference that is between an effeminate life and gaiety. However it be, he openly complained of Scipio's behaviour, who, during the preparations for the expedition of Carthage, made merry in Sicily. Cato was to be his Quæſtor; but he left him as ſoon as he perceived that his remonſtrances were not acceptable to him. He ‘returned from Sicily, and, together with Fabius, made a huge noiſe in the open ſenate againſt Scipio's laviſhing of unſpeakable ſums, and his childiſh loitering away his time in wreſtling-matches and comedies, as if he were not to make war, but holiday; ſo that he cauſed ſome of the tribunes of the people to be ſent, by commiſſion from the ſenate, to enquire into the truth of theſe allegations upon the ſpot, and, in caſe they found them true, to bring him back to Rome. But, on the contrary, Scipio ſhewed them the evident and certain promiſe of victory, in the prodigious proviſion he had made of all things neceſſary for the war; and that he only lived pleaſantly with his friends, when there was nothing elſe to do; ſhewing alſo that he was not, by his liberality to his ſoldiers, the more negligent in things of conſequence and moment (15)’ Valerius Maximus mentions this pretended remiſſneſs of Scipio, and ſays, among other things, that great ſouls launch forth with greater impetuoſity when they have been at reſt. Let us give the paſſage entire. ‘P. Scipio, cum in Sicilia augendo, trajiciendoque in Africam exercitu opportunum quærendo gradum, Carthaginis ruinam animo volveret; inter conſilia ac molitiones hujus tantæ rei operam gymnaſio dedit, pallioque & crepidis uſus eſt. Nec hac re ſegniores Pœnicis exercitibus manus intulit: ſed neſcio an ideo alacriores, quia vegeta & ſtrenua ingenia, quo plus receſſus ſumunt, hoc vehementiores impetus edunt. Crediderim etiam favorem eum ſociorum uberiorem ſe adepturum exiſtimaſſe, ſi victum eorum & ſolennes exercitationes comprobaſſet: Ad quas tum veniebat, cum multum ac diu fatigaſſet humeros, & cetera membra militari agitatione firmitatem ſuam probare coëgiſſet, conſiſtebatque in his labor ejus, in illis remiſſio laboris (16). - - - - *Publius Scipio, while he was in Sicily, conſulting how to augment his troops and tranſport them into Africa, where he meditated nothing leſs than the ruin of Carthage, did nevertheleſs, amidſt his deſigns and preparations for this great work, frequent the Academy, and make uſe of the gown and ſlippers. Nor did the Carthaginians find him at all more remiſs upon this account, but rather briſker, becauſe ſtrong and reſolute minds launch forth with ſo much the greater impetuoſity as they have had a long eaſe and reſpite. I likewiſe fancy that he expected to ingratiate himſelf the more with the Allies, by ſeeming to approve of their way of living and their ſolemn exerciſes. But he did not come to theſe, before he had once heartily fatigued his ſhoulders, and tried the ſtrength of his other members by military work. In theſe things conſiſted his labour, and in thoſe his reſt.*’ It appears from the end of this paſſage that there was no effeminacy in Scipio's conduct, and that he only mixed ſome recreation with his moſt important cares and labours. All great men are not capable of ſuch a variety; ſome deſpiſe pleaſures, and love an uninterrupted gravity; others are not equal to this ſort of variation, the chequering of great deſigns with dancing and drunkenneſs. Flaminius, one of the moſt illuſtrious perſons of antient Rome, could not apprehend how a man can be capable of ſuch a variety. Here follows what Plutarch ſays of him. ‘At another time Dinocrates the Meſſenian, having been fuddled at a merry meeting in Rome, danced there in a woman's habit, and the next day addreſſed to Titus for aſſiſtance in his deſign to get Meſſina out of the Achæan hands. I ſhall *(ſays he)* conſider of it, but cannot but wonder that you who are enterprizing deſigns of that moment, can find leiſure to revel and ſing in your cups (17).’ Montagne makes very fine obſervations upon the capacity of the ſoul, whereby a man may turn his mind ſometimes one way and ſometimes another, and is able to do things that ſeem inconſiſtent. ‘(18) I am well pleaſed to ſee a General of an army at the foot of a breach he deſigns to attack, talking freely at dinner-time with his friends; and Brutus, againſt whom and againſt the Roman liberty, heaven and earth were combined, ſtealing ſome hours in the night, as he goes the rounds, to read Polybius. Little ſouls buried under the weight of affairs, know not how to extricate themſelves; they know not how to lay them aſide, and re-aſſume them.

. . . . . ô fortes pejoraque paſſi,
Mecum ſæpe viri, nunc vino pellite curas,
Cras ingens iterabimus æquor (19).

. . . . . *Cheer, rouze your force,*
For we have often ſuffer'd worſe.
Drink briſkly round, diſpel all cloudy ſorrow,
Drink round, we'll plow the deep to-morrow.

CREECH.

He alledges many examples upon that ſubject.

It were to be wiſhed that the general rule in queſtion were not liable to ſo many exceptions; for a young man well qualified for the war, who is given to drinking, gaming, and women, has ſomething to anſwer to thoſe who endeavour to reclaim him by repreſenting to him the ill conſequences of ſuch a courſe. You will never be able to command an army, ſay they to him; ſuch an employment is inconſiſtent with an unſurmountable inclination for a voluptuous life. Why ſo? will he ſay: why ſhould not I be in time like ſo many others, who have been debauched and laborious by turns, according to the poſture of affairs? Surena painted, and was attended by many concubines. Was he a worſe General for it? How many ſuch examples does antient and modern Hiſtory afford? Montgomery, who performed ſo many noble exploits in the XVIth century, *was extremely careleſs in his office, for he loved an eaſy life and gaming*; *but when he was once got into the ſaddle, he was the moſt valiant and careful captain that ever was ſeen* (20). Many Generals avoid being ſurprized, and perform actions that require an extreme diligence, though they love drinking, and make long meals; and their enemies are often miſtaken in the conſequences they draw from it. Granvelle, Biſhop of Arras, made

(14) Horat. Od. xix, *lib. ii.*

(15) Plut. in Catone majore, *pag.* 338. *See alſo* Livy, *lib. xxix, pag. m.* 532.

(16) Valer. Maximus, *lib. iii, cap. vi, num.* 1, *pag. m.* 298, 299.

(17) Plut. in Q. Flaminio, *pag.* 378.

(18) Montagne, Eſſays, *book. iii, in the laſt chapter, pag. m.* 595.

(19) Horat. Od. vii, ver. 30, *lib. i.*

(20) Brantome in his Encomium upon the Prince of Condé, *Tom. iii,* of his Memoirs, *pag. m.* 234.

on horſeback, and ſoon after they cut off his head. This perfidiouſneſs was attended with inſults and deriſion [*B*] : but Surena did not long enjoy the pleaſure of the victory ; for the King of the Parthians grew jealous of him, and cauſed him to be put to death (*d*).

(*d*) Plut. in Craſſo, *p.* 565.

made a very imprudent anſwer, as it appeared by the event. It (21) was repreſented to the Emperor Charles V, that Duke Maurice was not to be truſted ; *but Granvelle anſwered that there was no occaſion to ſuſpect thoſe great drinkers, becauſe their heads being always clouded with thick vapours, were not clear enough to carry on a nice intrigue* (22). Maurice made it appear that he was more cunning than the Italians and Spaniards.

A voluptuous young man, who conſiders the examples I have mentioned, grows more incorrigible, and expoſes himſelf to great inconveniencies. The beſt way is to follow the rule, without truſting to exceptions.

[*B*] *This perfidiouſneſs was attended with inſults and deriſion.*] Surena ſent the head and the hand of Craſſus to the King his maſter ; ‘ but himſelf by his meſſengers ſcattered a report, That he was bringing Craſſus alive to Seleucia, and made a ridiculous proceſſion, which, by way of ſcorn, he called a triumph. For one Caius Patianus, who of all the priſoners was moſt like to Craſſus, being put into the habit of a woman like the Barbarians, and inſtructed to take the title of Craſſus, and Emperor, from thoſe who ſpoke to him, was brought ſitting upon his horſe, preceded by a parcel of trumpeters and lictors upon their camels ; the girdles and purſes of the Romans were hung at the end of the bundles of rods, and the heads of the ſlain, freſh bleeding, at the end of the axes ; after them followed the Seleucian minſtrels, making abundance of ſcurrilous and abuſive reflexions upon the effeminacy and cowardlineſs of Craſſus, with a muſical cadence : and this ſhow was ſeen by every body. But Surena calling together the Senate of Seleucia, ſhewed to them a wanton book of Ariſtides, called his Mileſiæ ; neither was this a forgery, for it was found amongſt the ſpoils of Ruſtius, and furniſhed Surena with ſufficient matter of deriſion upon the profligate manners of the Romans, who were not able even in time of war to forbear ſuch wanton writings and practices. But the Senate of Seleucia had reaſon to commend the wiſdom of Æſop, who tells us that every man carries a wallet acroſs his ſhoulder, putting into the pouch before the faults of others, and into the pouch behind his own, when they ſaw their General Surena had put the looſe book of Ariſtides into the pouch before, and into that behind a long train of Parthian luxury, which he dragged after him in ſuch a number of chariots filled with concubines, that he ſeemed to lead, as it were, an army of vipers, whoſe furious front appeared terrible, where nothing was ſeen but lances, javelins, bows, and ſteeds ; but all ended in a train of wenches, inſtruments of muſic, dancing, ſinging, and the whole night conſumed with harlots in riotous banquets (23).’

This conduct of Surena plainly ſhews that the Parthians deſerved to be called Barbarians, as they were by the Greeks and Romans ; for none but brutiſh people, who are uncapable of civility, will treat an enemy in ſuch a manner, much leſs an enemy overcome by a ſhameful treachery. Take notice that Plutarch blames that Ruſtius, who brought the leud books of Ariſtides to the army. People are not now ſo rigid ; and if Boccacio's novels, or La Fontaine's tales were found in the baggage of an officer, no notice would be taken of it. I do not think the moſt biting and the moſt burleſque news-writers would reflect upon him for it. Much leſs would they cenſure thoſe, who ſhould have a looking-glaſs among their things. But in Juvenal's time they were more ſevere in that reſpect : an Emperor was laughed at for having a looking-glaſs in the camp (24). It is true that glaſs did belong to a man who painted, and by reaſon of that circumſtance, it afforded a better occaſion for railleries and inſults. I am ſure the reader will excuſe me for mentioning this particular, ſince it concerns a Roman like Surena in that part of effeminacy, who nevertheleſs ſhowed a great courage (25) ; ſo that this is a new example to be added to thoſe, which I have mentioned (26). Juvenal does very much exclaim againſt Otho's inequality.

Nimirum ſummi ducis eſt occidere Galbam,
Et curare cutem ſummi conſtantia civis :
Bebriaci campo ſpolium affectare Palati,
Et preſſum in faciem digitis extendere panem.
Quod nec in Aſſyrio pharetrata Semiramis orbe,
Mœſta nec Actiaca fecit Cleopatra carina (27).

Galba to kill he thought a General's part,
But as a courtier us'd the niceſt art,
To keep his ſkin from tan : before the fight,
Would paint and ſet his ſoil'd complexion right :
A ſoftneſs which Semiramis ne'er knew,
When once ſhe had the field and foe in view,
Nor Egypt's Queen, when ſhe from Actium flew.

TATE.

The courage Otho expreſſed, when he killed himſelf, appeared the more admirable, becauſe he took care to paint and trick up himſelf like a woman. Read theſe words of Suetonius. ‘ Munditiarum vero pene muliebrium : vulſo corpore : galericulo capiti propter raritatem capillorum adaptato & annexo, ut nemo dignoſceret. Quin & faciem quotidie raſitare, ac pane madido linere conſuetum : idque inſtituiſſe à prima lanugine, ne barbatus umquam eſſet. Sacra etiam Iſidis ſæpe in lintea religioſaque veſte propalam celebraſſe. Per quæ factum putem ut mors ejus minime congruens vitæ, majori miraculo fuerit (28). - - - *He imitated a female nicety in his dreſs. His body was plucked quite ſmooth ; and, on account of his baldneſs, he had a perriwig, ſo well fitted to his head, and clapt on in ſuch a manner, as not to be diſtinguiſhed from his own hair. He ſhaved his face very cloſe every day, and then laid moiſt bread upon it. This he began to do, as ſoon as he had any down upon his cheeks, to prevent his ever having a beard. He was frequently wont to celebrate the holy rites of Iſis in public, having on a religious garment made of linnen. For theſe reaſons it came to paſs, in my opinion, that his death being not at all ſuitable to his life, was reckoned ſo much the more ſtrange and wonderful.*’

(21) The Duke of Alba repreſented it. See *Melvil, ubi infra.*

(22) Melvil, Memoirs, *p.* 40.

(23) Plut. in Craſſo. *p.* 564.

(24) See, above, citation (41), of the article APULEIUS.

(25) See his Life in Suetonius, and Tacitus, *Hiſt. lib. ii.*

(26) In the foregoing remark.

(27) Juven. Sat. II, ver. 104.

(28) Sueton. in Othone, *cap. ult. pag. m.* 642.

SURGIER (Francis) a Friar in the monaſtery of Sainte Croix at Paris, was puniſhed in the year 1595, for having preached in a ſeditious manner. He had ſtuffed one of his ſermons with invectives, calling Queen Elizabeth frequently by the name of Jezabel, and upbraided with the name of Sectaries the Allies of that Queen [*A*]. The parliament of Paris, having cauſed him to be put in priſon, condemned him to retract upon

[*A*] *He upbraided with the name of Sectaries the Allies of Queen Elizabeth.*] It is impoſſible to deſcribe ſufficiently the ravings of the Roman Catholic biggots, who took upon them to decry Henry IV and his ſucceſſor, for protecting the Proteſtants in Holland and Germany againſt the houſe of Auſtria. The books that were publiſhed againſt the alliance of France with the Proteſtant-States are without number, and it is certain there was a great deal of oddneſs in the conduct of that crown ; for while it laboured to extirpate the Huguenots in its own dominions, it ſupported the Proteſtants elſewhere, and enabled them not only to keep their own ground, but likewiſe to aggrandize themſelves. I have, in another place (1), taken notice of this contradiction, and I ſhall now confirm what I ſaid there by a remarkable paſſage. I find it at the end of an obſervation concerning the letters which Pope Pius V writ into France, to condemn the treaties of

(1) See the remarks [*P*] and [*R*], of the artilce FRANCIS I.

upon his knees and bare-headed theſe raſh and inconſiderate words, and to aſk pardon of God, of the king, and of juſtice. They forbade him to preach till ſuch time as the court had ordered otherwiſe, and prohibited him upon pain of death to ſpread about diſcourſes that were injurious to the princes in alliance with his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty, or to ſay any thing that tended to ſedition. This was done privately in the court of criminal cauſes, and they ſhewed ſuch indulgence to him, out of regard to his profeſſion, and to the memory of his father, who had taught the inſtitutes at Paris, and whoſe ſcholars ſeveral members of that court had been (*a*).

(*a*) *Taken from* Thuanus, *book cxiv, pag. m.* 702, *ad ann.* 1595.

of peace between the Roman Catholics and Heretics. ‘ Sed præcipue tangunt Gallorum fœdera cum Exteris ‘ Patrocinium Genev. Unde Auctor lib. *Geſta Imperiorum* (2) *per Francos*, *p.* 8. adeo excandeſcit, & ‘ ſe comprehendere poſſe negat, *quomodo cum Chriſtianiſſimi apellatione conveniat Genevæ protectio & Patrocinium ſuſceptum jam ab a. milleſimo quingenteſimo ‘ ſeptuageſimo nono, & ſemper continuatum ad hæc uſque ‘ tempora. Quod monſtrum, quod portentum, quæ Chimæra? Quæ conventio lucis ad tenebras? quæ communicatio Chriſti cum Belial; quid arcæ Dei cum ‘ Dagon, quid Sioni cum Babilone? quid ſanctitati cum ‘ impietate, quid Chriſto cum Beelzebub, quid Chriſtianiſſimis cum Geneva?* Tum Fœdus Gallorum Belgicum, de quo Idem pag. 10. *Putabam fingi vix ‘ quidquam poſſe Chriſtianiſſimi nomine indignius, nec ‘ quidquam Chriſtianiſmo exitialius, quam Genevæ tutelam & patrocinium, uti ſupra oſtenſum eſt: veruntamen poſtea conſideranti Fœdus Hollandicum, quod jam ‘ pridem Gallia ſtudioſiſſime excoluit, tanto illud pernicioſius eſſe religioni viſum eſt, quanto plures in Statibus ‘ illis Hollandicis ineſſe Genevas cernit ſentitque incredibili ſuo malo Eccleſia.* De fœdere Gallo-Suevico, ‘ pag. 16. Ab Aquilone pandetur omne malum. ‘ Reviviſcunt in uno Gothorum & Wandalorum Rege ‘ (quem nunc Sueciæ vocant) Alarici & Genſerici, ‘ qui rurſus Imperium & Eccleſiam Dei miſerrimè diripiunt, deformant, lacerant; non illi quidem à ‘ Ruffino & Eudoxia exciti, qui ambo poſtea hujus ‘ evocationis pœnas ultori Numini juſtiſſimas dederunt; ſed (quis credat?) à Gallia Chriſtianiſſima ‘ animati facto fœdere cum mortalium furioſiſſimo, ‘ conſilio, pecunia, armis adjuti (3). - - - - *But the ‘ leagues which the French have entered into with ‘ foreign Princes chiefly relate to the protection of Geneva. ‘ Upon which the author of a book called* Geſta Imperiorum per Francos *falls into a violent paſſion, and ‘ ſays that he cannot underſtand*, how the protection of ‘ Geneva, undertaken from the year 1579, and continued down without interruption to the preſent ‘ times, is conſiſtent with the title of Moſt Chriſtian. ‘ What a monſtruous thing, what an abſurdity, and ‘ what a chimera is this? For what agreement can ‘ there be between light and darkneſs? What communication can Christ have with Belial; the ‘ ark of God with Dagon, or Sion with Babylon? ‘ What has holineſs to do with impiety, Christ ‘ with Beelzebub, or the moſt Chriſtian Kings with ‘ Geneva? *Next as to the league between the French ‘ and Dutch the ſame author ſays.* I imagined that ‘ nothing could be conceived more unworthy of the ‘ title Moſt Chriſtian, nor any thing more fatal to ‘ Chriſtianity, than the protection of Geneva, as I ‘ have ſhewed above: but afterwards when I conſidered the league with the Dutch, which France has ‘ long cultivated with the utmoſt care, I took that ‘ to be ſo much the more deſtructive to religion, ‘ as the Church, to her incredible ſorrow, ſees many ‘ Geneva's ariſe out of the States of Holland. *Concerning the league between the French and Swedes, he ‘ adds. All manner of evils ſhall come from the North. ‘ For in one King of the Goths and Vandals (now called ‘ King of Sweden) the Alarics and Genſerics revive, ‘ and a ſecond time miſerably waſte, disfigure, and tear ‘ to pieces the Kingdom and Church of GOD. Nor are ‘ theſe ſtirred up by Ruffinus and Eudoxias, who both ‘ ſuffered the puniſhment of their crime by the juſt vengeance of the Deity: but (who would believe it?) ‘ they are ſet on by the moſt Chriſtian country of France, ‘ and aſſiſted with advice, arms, and money, a league ‘ being ſtruck up with the moſt furious man alive.*’

(2) I believe that there is an error of the preſs here, and that we ought to read *Impiorum*, inſtead of *Imperiorum*.

(3) Hoornbeeck, Diſput. ad Bullam Innocentii X, *pag.* 265.

SUSSANNEAU (*a*) (Hubert) was born at Soiſſons in the year 1514 [*A*]. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his Latin verſes, and publiſhed ſome Grammatical tracts (*b*), that met with a good reception. He taught Philological learning at Turin, before he had a beard (*c*). He taught it alſo at Paris. He ſtiles himſelf Doctor of Law and Phyſic.

(*a*) See citation (94) of the article ERASMUS.

(*b*) *See the* Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque, *pag.* 362.

(*c*) See the remark.

[*A*] *Was born at Soiſſons in the year* 1514.] La Croix du Maine, who ſays he was born there (1), was better informed of the place than of the time of his birth. He pretends that he flouriſhed in the year 1520; which is not true; for Suſſanneau ſays he was only twenty-four years of age, in a book publiſhed by him in 1538. He ſpeaks thus in his Poem upon the ſiege of Perone (2).

Taurinum nuper ſtudiis ignobilis oci
Juriſque & legum florebat: ubi impiger artes
Ingenuas docui, Muſarum gratus alumnis,
Tum cùm nulla genas veſtiret barba decoras:
Quæ nunc in flavo pulchrè ſedet hiſpida mento,
Ad quintum quanquàm luſtrum, mihi deficit annus *.

It appears from thoſe verſes that he taught the *Belles Lettres* at Turin. He was ſent thither when the French had made themſelves maſters of Piedmont in the year 1536. He made no long ſtay in that country: it appears from the collection of the Latin Poems, which he publiſhed in 1538, that he had already begun again his public lectures upon the Æneid at Paris. This advertiſement is to be found in the twenty-ſecond leaf.

Fixit ab Italia Luteciam reverſus.

Venit ab Italia Gallorum redditus oris
  Hubertus, ſacri maxima cura chori.
Qui cras doctiloqui repetet compendia vatis,
  Unde tibi Ænean Æneadaſque canit.

Hubertus who is dear to the Muſes is returned from Italy to France, and to-morrow reſumes his lectures on the Eneid.

He obſerves, that in order to make himſelf more capable of explaining Virgil, he had been at Rome to examine the antient monuments of that place, and had ſucked in the air of Mantua (3).

(1) La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Franç. *p.* 171.

(2) Hubert Suſſannæus, in Ludorum Libris, *fol.* 81, *Edit. Pariſ.* 1538.

* Suſſ. annos 24 natus, cum hæc ſcriberet.

(3) Mox diverſitum laute ſacra Mantua cepit, Plenaque Virgilii mens nova menta fuit. *Suſſan. Ludor. lib. ii, fol.* 22.

SUTCLIFFE (*a*) (Matthew) an Engliſhman, and a Proteſtant Divine, flouriſhed towards the latter end of the XVIth century, and beginning of the XVIIth. He publiſhed ſeveral controverſial books, ſome in Latin, and others in Engliſh, and made it his chief buſineſs to confute Cardinal Bellarmin. He alſo wrote ſomething againſt

(*a*) In Latin *Sutclivius*.

againſt the Preſbyterians. He did not put his name to a book which treats of the conformity of Popery and the Turkiſh Religion [*A*].

[*A*] *A book, which treats of the conformity of Popery and the Turkiſh religion.*] He publiſhed it at London in the year 1604. It is the confutation of a book printed at Antwerp in the year 1596 (1), and at Cologne in 1603, with this title, *Calvino-Turciſmus, id eſt, Calviniſticæ perfidiæ cum Mahumetana collatio, & dilucida utriuſque ſectæ confutatio.* There is hardly any book more violent than this Calvino-Turciſmus: it was the work of two Engliſh Catholics, who left their country: one of them was William Raynolds or Reginaldus, and the other William Gifford. The firſt died while he was compoſing it; the ſecond put the laſt hand to it, and publiſhed it (2). The latter was a Prieſt, who had ſeveral times encouraged ſome aſſaſſins to kill Queen Elizabeth (3), and who was well beloved by the Flemiſh women (4). He had fled to Liſle. William Raynolds had been formerly a miniſter (5), and expreſſed a great zeal for the Proteſtant religion. Afterwards he turned Papiſt. He was brother to John Raynolds (6), Profeſſor of Divinity at Oxford, who wrote excellent books againſt the Roman Catholics. I have mentioned in another (7) place what is reported of theſe two brothers, *viz.* that they were brought up out of their country, John in the Church of Rome, William in the Proteſtant religion, and that meeting together one day, they diſputed with ſo great force, that both of them changed their religion. I very much doubt this (8). William was Profeſſor of Divinity in the Engliſh college of Rheims, He is ſaid to be the author of a very ſeditious book, dedicated to the Duke of Mayenne, and written according to the moſt furious maxims of the league, and in a moſt violent rage againſt Henry III, and the King of Navarre. My edition is that of Antwerp, *apud Joannem Keerbergium* 1592, in 8vo. Here is the title of that book. *De juſta Reipub. Chriſtianæ in Reges impio, & Hæreticos Authoritate; juſtiſſimaque Catholicorum ad Henricum Navarræum, & quemcunque hæreticum à regno Galliæ repellendum confœderatione. G. Guilelmo Roſſæo Authore.* Sutcliffe affirms (9) that William Raynolds wrote that book. Moreri (10) ſays ſo too, and quotes Pitſeus, nay he adds that *it is one of the beſt* (11) *performances of this writer.* But others aſcribe it either to William Gifford, or to John Boucher, or to a Jeſuit, or to Genebrard (12). The ſureſt way is to aſcribe it to the author of the *Calvino-Turciſmus.* Boucher's book has another title, as you may ſee above in the remark [*B*] of the article BOUCHER.

The title of Sutcliffe's anſwer runs thus. ‘De Turco-Papiſmo, hoc eſt, de Turcarum & Papiſtarum adverſus Chriſti Eccleſiam & fidem conjuratione, eorumque in Religione & moribus conſenſione & ſimilitudine; liber unus. Eidem præterea adjuncti ſunt, de Turco-papiſtarum maledictis & calumniis, adverſus *Gulielmi Giffordi* famoſi Pontificum Rom. & Jeſuitarum ſupparaſitaſtri volumen illud contumelioſiſſimum, quod ille Calvino-Turciſmum inſcripſit, libri quatuor. In quibus non tantum hujus hominis leviſſimi, ſed etiam aliorum importuniſſimorum ſcurrarum adverſus Orthodoxam Chriſti Eccleſiam continenter latrantium, malitia & petulantia reprimitur, hominumque piorum fama ab eorum calumniis vindicatur. - - - *Of the Mahometan Popery, or a treatiſe of the Conſpiracy of the Turks and Papiſts againſt the Church and Faith of* CHRIST, *of their agreement and reſemblance in religion and morals. To which are added four books concerning the ſlanders and calumnies of the Mahometan Papiſts, in anſwer to that moſt defamatory libel, intitled,* Mahometan Calviniſme, *written by William Gifford, a notorious and vile flatterer of the Popes and Jeſuits. In which books are detected the malice and inſolence not only of this worthleſs man, but likewiſe of other buſy ſlanderers, continually railing againſt the orthodox Church of* CHRIST, *and the reputation of pious men is vindicated from their calumnies.*’

(1) Sutclivius knew not that edition.

(2) See the preface to the *Calvino-Turciſmus.*

(3) Sutcliffe, ubi infra.

(4) Sacrificus, ut aiunt, comptus & calamiſtratus, & apud mulieres Belgicas gratioſus. *Sutlivius, in* Præf. *Turco-Papiſmi.*

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) Rivetus, in Jeſuita vapulante, *cap. xi, num.* 14, *pag.* 531, *Tom. iii,* Operum.

(7) *In the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, *for July* 1685, *Art. vi, pag.* 769.

(8) This ſeems to me inconſiſtent with a letter of John Raynolds to his brother, which is to be found in Whitaker's anſwer to a book of William Raynolds.

(9) Sutcliffe, *in Præf.* Turco-Papiſmi.

(10) Upon the word *Reginaldus.*

(11) The word *beſt* has been left out in the Dutch editions.

(12) *See* Placcius, de Pſeudonym. *pag.* 249, 250, and the Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, *for June* 1684, *Art. iii, and* Deckherr de Script. Adeſpotis, *pag.* 337, 389. *Edit.* 1686.

T.

TABOR (JOHN OTTO) a famous German Civilian, was born at Bautzen (*a*) the capital of the Upper Luſatia, the third of December 1604. He went through his ſtudies in Philoſophy and Civil-Law at Leipſic; and before he was twenty years of age rendred himſelf capable of explaining to his comrades the Paratitles of Weſenbecius. He went from the univerſity of Leipſic to that of Straſburgh, and afterwards made a journey to France at the time of the taking of Rochelle. He was ſcarce returned home, when he undertook to travel into Italy, with two young gentlemen, as their governour; but there aroſe ſome obſtacles to this journey. He was admitted Doctor of Law at Straſburgh November the 10th 1631. The wars of Germany deprived him of part of his patrimony, and reduced his birth-place to aſhes, in the year 1634. Where he then diſcharged the office of advocate and ſyndic of the city. He was invited a few days after this diſaſter to ſucceed Joachim Clutenius, who had left vacant a profeſſor of Law's chair at Straſburgh. He accepted of that profeſſorſhip, and was ſoon after honoured with the chief poſt in the faculty of the Law. He continued in that city till the year 1656, though he had the offer of a great many very honourable employments from divers places; but about the end of this year he found himſelf more diſpoſed to remove. The reſtoration of the peace, the regret of having loſt a wife, with whom he had lived twenty-two years, the diſtaſte he took againſt the place where ſhe died, and ſome other diſcontents, to which perſons of great merit are uſually expoſed (*b*), brought our Tabor to the country of Mecklemburgh, to be chancellor to the Duke. He ſoon quitted this poſt, to devote himſelf intirely to his books; but before he could regain the repoſe of he ſtudy, he was obliged to go to the court of Saxony, and to that of the Emperor, about ſome affairs of that duke. He retired to Gieſſen in 1659, and was there chancellor of the univerſity, and counſellor to the Landgrave of Heſſe-Darmſtad (*c*). Several reaſons obliged him to remove again, which he did in 1667, in order to retire to Francfort, where his ſon was advocate. He was not exempt from troubles there any more than in other places. He died the twelfth of December 1674. He publiſhed at different times ſeveral books on law ſubjects, which had ſold very well: this was the reaſon that the copies were grown very ſcarce; and therefore a profeſſor of Leipſic, named Mylius, made a collection of them as exactly as he could, which he publiſhed in two volumes in folio (*d*) in the year 1688. Mr Praſchius, an antient Burgomaſter at Ratiſbon, and ſon-in-law to Tabor, printed in 1675, a little piece containing an account of the life of his father-in-law (*e*) [*A*].

(*a*) In Latin *Budiſſina*.

(*b*) Reſtituta pax, erepta conjux, & hinc innatum loci tædium, tum cauſſæ aliæ quæ inſectari ſolent magnas virtutes. *Mauſol. Jo. Otton. Taboris.*

(*c*) They give him theſe qualities in the title of the new edition of his works.

(*d*) Lipſiæ, apud Joh. Frider. Gleditſchium.

(*e*) *It is intituled Mauſoleum Jo. Ottonis Taboris, J. C.*

[*A*] *Mr Praſchius ... printed ... an account of the life of his father-in-law.*] In ſome reſpects there is no fault to be found with it for want of particulars; but in thoſe things, concerning which the public might have moſt curioſity, the author has confined himſelf to general notions, and contents himſelf with telling us, ‘Si tantas virtutes aliquo vitiorum confini olæſit, ſi in ‘vita nonnunquam vel doctrina offendit, aut juſtam ‘cauſam paulo acrius defendit, exemplo docuit illuſtri ‘nihil in humanis rebus perfectum, aut ſuperbiæ con‘ceſſum eſſe, quo maneat SOLI DEO GLORIA. - - - ‘*If he tarniſhed ſuch great virtues with a tincture of* ‘*vice, if he ſometimes offended in his life or doctrine, or* ‘*vindicated a juſt cauſe a little too warmly, he has* ‘*proved, by an eminent example, that in human af*‘*fairs there is no ſuch thing as perfection, or room for* ‘*pride, but a reſervation of all* GLORY TO GOD ‘ALONE.’ This is the concluſion of Mr Praſchius's account, from which I have taken this article.

TABOUÉ, or TABOUET (JULIAN) in Latin *Tabœtius*, would have deſerved a place among the learned of the XVIth century, if he had not ſullied by his ill actions all the merit of his eloquence, learning, and wit. He was born at Chantenai four leagues from Mans (*a*). . . . . [*A*].

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 278.

[*A*] . . . . . .] Note, that this affair of Taboüé is not to be met with in all the editions of John Papon's Arrêts. I could not find it in the Latin edition, publiſhed at Geneva, *Sumptibus Samuelis Criſpini*, in 1624, in folio, and in book XXIV, title I, page 734, you have theſe words; *Hanc ad rem notatu dignum eſt Arreſtum Tabouei, ſuprà*, tit. de author. rer. judic. *&c.* which ſhews that they who ſuppreſſed the Arrêt againſt Taboüé, forgot to expunge the paſſage in book XXIV, where reference is made to this Arrêt. Such overſights as theſe too frequently happen to thoſe who undertake the correction of a work. They ſtrike out certain things in one place, and leave elſewhere a quotation of the very ſame things. . . . . See, concerning Taboüé, the hiſtory of the Biſhops of Mans, by Antony le Courvaiſier, pag. 854, and correct his omiſſions; that of Thuanus, lib. XVII. pag. 357 (it is pag. 952 of du Rier's tranſlation); Papon eſpecially; and Menage's hiſtory Sablé.

TABOUROT (Stephen) See Accords.

TACFARINAS, General of the army in Africa againſt the Romans in the time of Tiberius, was by nation a Numidian (*a*). He ſerved at firſt amongſt the auxiliary troops of the Romans, and having deſerted, got together a band of vagabonds and robbers, and betook himſelf to making incurſions, and to plundering. Afterwards he diſciplined this band of highwaymen, and divided them into companies, according to the art of war. At length he became General of the Muzulans, a potent nation near the deſerts of Africa, and confederate with the Moors of the neighbourhood. Theſe were commanded by Mazippa, and formed a flying camp, carrying fire and ſword, and terror on all ſides; whilſt Tacfarinas, with the choiceſt of the troops, encamped after the manner of the Romans, and accuſtomed them to military diſcipline. The Cinithians, another conſiderable nation, entered in the ſame intereſts. Furius Camillus, Proconſul of Africa, informed of theſe motions, marched againſt the enemy, and put them to flight. This procured him the honour of a triumph (*b*). This happened in the year of Rome 770 (*c*). Tacfarinas renewed his robberies ſome time after, and laid ſiege to a caſtle where Decrius was commander, and defeated the garriſon which went out to engage him in the open field. Decrius performed the part of a very brave and experienced warriour: the wounds he received, by one of which he loſt an eye, did not hinder him from making head againſt the enemy till he was ſlain: his ſoldiers had betaken themſelves to flight. The Proconſul Apronius puniſhed them for their cowardice very ſeverely, for he put every tenth man to death. This had ſuch an effect, that five hundred ſoldiers, having charged the ſame troops of Tacfarinas, who were beſieging a place, routed them. After this Tacfarinas reſolved not to ſtand an engagement with the Romans; he detached his men into different places; and when he was purſued he betook himſelf to flight, and when the Romans retired, he charged them in the rear. But, having ſtopped in a camp, he was there beaten, and forced to fly into the deſarts (*d*). This was for no long time, for he quickly after appeared again in the field; and this news being brought to Rome, they ſent into Africa againſt him Junius Blæſus, uncle to Sejanus (*e*). This new Proconſul acquitted himſelf very well in his office (*f*) [*A*]; and yet Tacfarinas repaired his loſſes ſo well, that he had the boldneſs to ſend deputies to Tiberius to demand that he would aſſign him a country; otherwiſe he threatned him with a perpetual war. The Emperor was ſo provoked at this inſolence, that he gave order to Junius Blæſus to take Tacfarinas

[*A*] *Junius Blæſus, uncle to Sejanus. This new Proconſul acquitted himſelf very well in his office.*] The emperor acquainting the ſenate with Tacfarinas's new irruptions, exhorted them to make choice of a new Proconſul, very well ſkilled in war, and capable to undergo the fatigues of it (1). The ſenators referring this choice to the Emperor's care (2). This prince (3) gave them an oblique reprimand, for throwing all difficult affairs upon him, and named to them two perſons, Manius Lepidus, and Junius Blæſus, that they might chooſe one of them to ſend into Africa. Lepidus deſired that he might be excuſed from undertaking that employ; Junius ſpoke to the ſame purpoſe; but it was eaſy to perceive the difference of their language, and that Lepidus ſpoke his mind, but Blæſus did not. The reaſons which Lepidus alledged were very well underſtood, as well as that which he did not alledge, and which was the chief, namely the ſuperiority of Junius Blæſus, who was uncle to the favourite. Prudence required him not to be his competitor in this affair; and that it was better for him not to commit himſelf to the deciſion of the ſuffrages: ſo the proconſulſhip was confirmed to Blæſus, as if he had been the only perſon the emperor had named. I ſay nothing but what reſults from the words of Tacitus. 'Tum audita amborum verba, intentius excuſante ſe Lepido, cum *valitudinem corporis, ætatem liberum, nubilem filiam* obtenderet: intelligereturque etiam quod ſilebat, avunculum eſſe Sejani Blæſum, atque eo prævalidum. Reſpondit Blæſus ſpecie recuſantis, ſed neque eadem adſeveratione; & conſenſu adulantium auditus eſt (4). - - - - *Then they were both heard, Lepidus with great earneſtneſs excuſing himſelf, under pretence* of his infirm ſtate of health, the age of his children, and a daughter juſt marriageable: *what he thought proper not to mention was alſo underſtood, that Blæſus was the uncle of Sejanus, and therefore too powerful for him. Blæſus alſo made ſome ſort of excuſe, but not with that earneſtneſs; and was favoured by all the court flatterers.*' This uncle of the favourite is an example which proves, that the relations of a prime miniſter are ſometimes very worthy of thoſe offices, which are conferred upon them purely on account of their relation. He took the beſt way that could be thought of to ſubdue Tacfarinas (5), and we read in Tacitus, that the triumphal honours, which were granted him, were truly deſerved by him; tho' Tiberius declared, that he granted them in conſideration of Sejanus. *Neque multo poſt Cæſar cum Junium Blæſum Proconſulem Africæ triumphi inſignibus attolleret,* dare id ſe *dixit* honori Sejani, *cujus ille avunculus erat. Ac tamen res Blæſi dignæ decore tali fuere* (6). Note, that this emperor commanded the legions to honour Junius Blæſus with the title of *Imperator*. This title, conferred by the acclamations of the ſoldiers, was very glorious. This had been a cuſtom in the wars of the Romans, in the time of the Republic; but it grew almoſt out of uſe under Auguſtus, and was entirely aboliſhed under Tiberius; for Junius Blæſus was the laſt that was honoured with this ſalutation. This whole matter deſerves to be related in Tacitus's own words. 'Tiberius pro confecto *(Bello)* interpretatus, id quoque Blæſo tribuit, ut *Imperator* à legionibus ſalutaretur: priſco erga duces honore, qui bene geſta Republica gaudio & impetu victoris exercitus conclamabatur: erantque plures ſimul Imperatores, nec ſuper ceterorum æqualitatem. Conceſſit quibuſdam & Auguſtus id vocabulum; ac tunc Tiberius Blæſo poſtremum (7). - - - *Tiberius looking upon the war to be concluded, granted alſo to Blæſus that he ſhould be ſaluted* Imperator *by the legions: an antient honour paid to the General for his ſervices to the Common-wealth, by the acclamations of a rejoicing and victorious army: and there were ſeveral who enjoyed this title at the ſame time, nor yet did this make any difference in their rank. Auguſtus had granted this title to ſome; and Tiberius had now beſtowed it, for the laſt time, on Blæſus.*' The firſt words of this paſſage inform us, that Tiberius thought the war with Tacfarinas to be ended, altho' Blæſus returned into Italy before he had cruſhed all the ſeeds which might revive it again (8). Tiberius, thinking the buſineſs was over, recalled the ninth legion out of Africa. Tacfarinas gave out, that they were drawn off out of neceſſity to a diſtant place, becauſe ſome other nations were invading the Roman empire; and that therefore, it would be an eaſy matter to hem in thoſe Roman troops that were left, provided that all thoſe, who preferred their liberty before ſervitude, would readily re-unite their forces. He was joined and aſſiſted by a great many people, and gave a

---

(*a*) Tacit. Annal. *lib. ii, cap. lii.*

(*b*) *Taken from* Tacitus, ibid.

(*c*) It was the 17th of the Chriſtian Æra.

(*d*) Ex eod. ibid. lib. iii, cap. xx, xxi.

(*e*) Id. ibid. *cap. xxxii, xxxv.*

(*f*) Id. ibid. *cap. lxxiii.*

(1) Judicio patrum deligendum Proconſulem, gnarum militiæ, corpore validum, & bello ſuffecturum. *Tacit. Ann. lib. iii, cap. xxxii.*

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Id. ibid. *cap. xxxv.*

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) *See* Tacitus, ibid. *cap. lxxiv.*

(6) Tacit. ibid. *cap. lxxii, lxxiii.*

(7) Id. ibid. *cap. lxxiv.*

(8) Fratre ejus (*Tacfarinatis*) capto regreſſus eſt, properantius tamen quam ex utilitate ſociorum, relictis per quos reſurgeret bellum. *Id. ibid.*

Tacfarinas whatever it coſt. This war was not ended till the year of Rome 777, and it was the Proconſul Dolabella, who finiſhed it. The army of Tacfarinas was defeated; they endeavoured to take the General, but he choſe rather to loſe his life in a courageous defence than to fall alive into the hands of the Proconſul (g). The faults of the ſupplement to Moreri ſhall be obſerved below [*B*].

great deal of trouble to the new Pro-conſul, Dolabella, who, at length, totally vanquiſhed this enemy (9). He demanded the honour of a triumph, but could not obtain it; for Tiberius, out of complaiſance to Sejanus, refuſed to conſent to what might eclipſe the glory of Junius Blæſus. This refuſal added more to the glory of Dolabella, than to that of the uncle to the favourite. Tacitus took care not to ſuppreſs this remark. ‘ Dolabellæ petenti abnuit triumphalia Tiberius Sejano tribuens, ne Blæſi avunculi ejus laus obſoleſceret. Sed neque Blæſus ideo inluſtrior, & huic negatus honor gloriam intendit. Quippe minore exercitu, inſignis captivos, cædem ducis, bellique confecti famam deportarat (10). - - - *Tiberius refuſed to Dolabella the triumphal honours, which he did in complement to Sejanus, that the honours paid to his uncle Blæſus might not be impaired. But neither was Blæſus on that account the more glorious; his rival being rather ſet above him by this very refuſal. For with a ſmaller army, he had come off with the reputation of having taken many illuſtrious priſoners, killed the General, and finiſhed the war.*’ It was a great injuſtice, to refuſe to Dolabella, who had concluded this war, what had been allowed to the half-conquerors of Tacfarinas (11).

[*B*] *The faults of the Supplement to Moreri.*] He was in the wrong to ſay, I. That Tacfarinas was a ſlave. II. That *he retired into Africa.* III. That out of the robbers aſſembled by him, *he formed a powerful army of Saracens* (12). IV. That he cauſed himſelf *to be proclaimed King*. V. That *he beat the Roman army, commanded by Decius, Pro-conſul of Africa.* VI. That *he wounded him in the eye.* VII. That *he was afterwards vanquiſhed by Camillus.* VIII. And that Tacitus relates all this in his ſecond book. Here are eight capital errors, too many certainly for an article of ten lines, and which beſides is ſo defective. Tacitus ſays nothing which can induce us to believe, that Tacfarinas was a ſlave, or that he had ſerved out of Africa in the Roman army. It was in Africa that he bore arms for them, in all appearance; and by conſequence he did not retire into Africa after he had deſerted. As for this army of Saracens, I believe I am not miſtaken in my conjectures, if, I ſay, that the word *Muzulani*, which Tacitus makes uſe of, made the continuator of Moreri think that Tacitus meant the Muſulmans; and becauſe the followers of Mahomet go by that name, and have alſo been known by that of Saracens, he fancied it was indifferent to ſay an army of Saracens, or an army of Muſulmans. Tacitus does not ſpeak of a Pro-conſul named Decius, but of one Decrius, who commanded in a caſtle; the gariſon of which conſiſted of a cohort (13), which is here converted into an army of Romans, commanded by the Pro-conſul Decius. Now, ſince Decrius was killed, Moreri's continuator ſhould not have been contented to ſay, that Tacfarinas wounded him in the eye. Camillus's victory preceded this defeat of Decrius. He ſhould have cited the ſecond, third, and fourth books of Tacitus's Annals; for theſe words, *Tacitus, lib. 2.* refer you as readily to the ſecond book of his Hiſtory, as to the ſecond book of his Annals: and after all, whatever ſecond book you take, you will not find there all the things which you are told of Tacfarinas.

TACHUS, King of Egypt, in the time of Artaxerxes Ochus (*a*). The government of the Perſians was ſo odious to the Egyptians, that it was no hard matter for Tachus to cauſe an inſurrection; but he ſtood in need of the ſuccours of Greece, to maintain him in the dignity with which he was inveſted. He was not ignorant of the valour and experience of Ageſilaus, King of the Lacedemonians; and therefore took him into his ſervice. Ageſilaus, though above eighty years of age, did not refuſe it. He raiſed troops with the money which he received from Tachus, and led them into Egypt, without conſidering that he might be blamed for accepting an employ ſo inferiour to his rank and reputation. He was ſoon diſguſted at Tachus, who, inſtead of giving him the command of his whole army, left him only the command of the foreigners, giving the dignity of Admiral to Chabrias the Athenian, and retaining to himſelf the character of Generaliſſimo. Ageſilaus waited a favourable opportunity to ſhow his reſentment, which ſoon offered itſelf, and he as readily embraced it. Nectanabus, a relation of Tachus, commanded part of the army; he drew them off from their obedience to Tachus, and procured himſelf to be choſen king by the Egyptians. This made him ſend ambaſſadors to King Ageſilaus, to deſire him to joyn with him, and he failed not to make him magnificent promiſes. Tachus, on the other hand, did not forget any thing to retain him. Each of thoſe competitors ſent their deputies to Lacedæmon. Ageſilaus alſo ſent ſome thither, but much more to recommed the intereſt of Nectanabus, than that of Tachus. He received full power, to act as he ſhould think moſt expedient for the good of his own country, and he thought it more advantageous for the Lacedæmonians to abandon Tachus, than to ſupport him; and ſo he went into the ſervice of Nectanabus with the troops he commanded: which, as his hiſtorian has obſerved, deſerves to be called no better than treaſon, howſoever it may be ſcreened under the pretence of the public good. Tachus, being thus abandoned, fled where he could (*b*), and I do not believe that he is found any more in Hiſtory. Some (*c*) ſay he retired into Perſia. He muſt needs have been at a loſs for a ſafe place of refuge, if he fled to a prince, who could not but look upon him as a ring leader of rebels. Athenæus aſſigns a very different cauſe of Ageſilaus's reſentment from that which has been juſt given: but in this matter I ſhould much ſooner chuſe to truſt Plutarch than Athenæus [*A*].

[*A*] *In this matter I ſhould much ſooner chuſe to truſt to Plutarch than Athenæus.*] The latter attributes the whole to a jeſt: he would have it (1), that Tachus, bantering Ageſilaus, upon ſeeing his ſmall ſtature, ſaid to him, *A mountain has been in travail, Jupiter has been in great fears about it, it has brought forth a mouſe:* ὠδινεν ὄρος, ζεὺς δ' ἐφοβεῖτο, τὸ δ' ἔτεκεν μῦν. He adds, that Ageſilaus fell into a paſſion, and anſwered, *You ſhall one day find that I am a lion.* He was as good as his word; for an inſurrection happening againſt Tachus, he ſaw himſelf abandoned by Ageſilaus, and forced to fly into Perſia. I ſee no probability in this. Firſt, Plutarch, who gives a large account of the contempt which the Egyptians ſhewed Ageſilaus, upon obſerving his ſorry equipage and mien, and finding his indifferent taſte, by the choice he made of the preſents that were ſent him, doth not ſay, that Tachus uſed any ſuch jeſt. He does indeed ſay, that the great concourſe of people who went to the ſea-ſide to ſee this great captain, ſo much celebrated by fame, applied to him the fable of the mountain that brought forth a mouſe; but he doth not ſay, that Ageſilaus made any anſwer to it, and Tachus was not there. The ſharp ſaying, which Athenæus aſcribes to this king of Lacedæmon, would no doubt have found a place among the apophthegms, which Plutarch has left us of this prince, had it been founded upon good authority. Beſides, is it probable, that a man who had ſo much occaſion for the aſſiſtance of Ageſilaus, would be ſo imprudent as to exaſperate him by ſo ſevere a jeſt? I do not deny, but that Plutarch has obſerved, that Tachus's vanity made Ageſilaus uneaſy. Ἔπειτα τὴν ἄλλην ἀλαζονείαν καὶ κενοφροσύνην τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου βαρυνόμενος. *Deinde reliqua Ægyptii inſolentia & vanitate fatigatus* (2). But once more, this Hiſtorian would not have forgot in this place the ſtory of the mountain, and the quick repartee of Ageſilaus. I verily believe, that Athenæus's narrative ought to be reduced to this. It was told this king of the Lacedæmonians, that the Egyptians, after they had ſeen him ſo little, of whom they had formed ſo great an idea, had mentioned the mountain that brought forth a mouſe: he probably replied, *they ſhall ſoon ſee, the mouſe they ſaw on the ſea-ſhore fight like a lion.* He did not pretend to threaten Tachus, but to fill him with hopes. I have heard ſay, that ſome French Generals, being in Germany, and obſerving, that the Germans had no good opinion of ſome of their regiments, becauſe the ſoldiers were not tall, large, ſtout, and well-cloathed, encouraged them with theſe words; *You ſhall ſee theſe little, lean, and meagre ſoldiers, fall on like lions, and make thoſe great giants truckle.* However that be, one may learn by this account of Athenæus, true or falſe, a very important leſſon; which is, that princes ſhould never offend any body with railleries (3): it may ſometimes coſt them dear.

(g) Id. ibid. *lib. iv, cap. xxiii, & ſeq.*

(9) Ex eod. ibid. *lib. iv, cap. xxiii, & ſeq.*

(10) Id. ibid. *cap. xxvi.*

(11) Priores duces, ubi impetrando triumphalium inſigni ſufficere res ſuas crediderant, hoſtem omittebant. Jamque tres laureatæ in Urbe ſtatuæ, & adhuc raptabat Africam Tacfarinas. *Id. ibid. cap. xxiii.*

(12) This has been ſtruck out in the Dutch editions.

(13) Which was about 600 men.

(*a*) About the CIVth Olympiad.

(*b*) *Taken from* Plutarch, in Vita Ageſilai.

(*c*) Theopompus, & Lyceas Naucratites, *apud* Athenæum, *lib. xiv, pag.* 616.

(1) Athen. *lib. xiv, pag.* 616.

(2) Plutarch. in Vita Ageſilai, *pag.* 617.

(3) *See the* Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, *for the month of March* 1684, *pag.* 47.

TACITUS (CAIUS (*a*) CORNELIUS) a Roman Hiſtorian, who flouriſhed in the firſt century. We know nothing of his anceſtors, and probably the dignity of his family began in his own perſon. His firſt employ is ſaid to have been that of procurator to Veſpaſian in Gallia Belgica [*A*]. Being returned to Rome, he received from the Emperor Titus a more honourable poſt (*b*). He was Prætor under the empire of Domitian [*B*], and Conſul under Nerva [*C*]. But all theſe dignities gave him but very little glory, compared with that which he procured to himſelf by the performances of his pen. His Annals, and his Hiſtory [*D*] are ſomething admirable, and one of the greateſt efforts of the human mind; whether you conſider the ſingularity of the ſtyle, or attend to the beauty of the thoughts, and to that happy pencil, with which he knew how

(*a*) Others give him the prænomen of *Publius*, and are blamed for it.

(*b*) See the remark [*A*].

[*A*] *Of Procurator to Veſpaſian in Gallica Belgica.*] You will find theſe words in the life of Tacitus, compoſed by Juſtus Lipſius. ‘Initium dignitatis illi ſub ‘Veſpaſiano fuit, à quo Plinio auctore, procurator da‘tus Galliæ Belgicæ rationes principis adminiſtra‘vit. --- *The beginning of his promotion was under* ‘*Veſpaſian, by whom, as we have it from Pliny, being* ‘*made procurator in Gallia Belgica, he had the care of* ‘*that prince's revenues.*’ I ſhall cite below (1) what Pliny ſays, and we ſhall there ſee, that he makes no mention of Veſpaſian. Why then is he cited as an author who informs us, that this emperor gave Tacitus that employ? Is it becauſe Tacitus exerciſed this office under the empire of Veſpaſian? But does this give a right to aſcribe to authors what they never ſaid? However it be, there is little doubt but that Tacitus enjoyed this employ under Veſpaſian; which is grounded upon this: ‘Dignitatem noſtram à Veſpaſiano inchoatam, à ‘Tito auctam, à Domitiano longius provectam non ‘abnuerim. (2) --- *I do not deny but that my advance*‘*ment was begun by Veſpaſian, ſeconded by Titus, and* ‘*carried to a far greater height by Domitian.*’ They are Tacitus's own words. We ſhall ſee below (3) whether this opinion be well founded or not.

[*B*] *He was Prætor under the Emperor Domitian.*] Vertranius places this prætorſhip under the ninth conſulſhip of this emperor (4), but he ſhould have placed it under the 14th; for it falls in with the time in which Domitian celebrated the ſecular games: Now it is certain, that he celebrated them when he was conſul for the 14th time (5), Let us cite Tacitus. ‘Is (Do‘mitianus) quoque edidit ludos ſæculares; iiſque inten‘tius affui ſacerdotio quindecimvirali præditus, ac tum ‘prætor. Quod non jactantia refero, ſed quia collegio ‘quindecimvirum antiquitus ea cura, & magiſtratus ‘potiſſimum exſequebantur officia cærimoniarum (6). ‘--- *Domitian alſo ſolemnized the ſecular games; at* ‘*which I gave a conſtant attendance in regard to my of*‘*fice, being one of the college of prieſts, and at the ſame* ‘*time prætor. Which I do not mention out of vanity,* ‘*but becauſe antiently that college, and eſpecially that ma*‘*giſtracy had always the direction of the ceremonies.*

[*C*] .... *and Conſul under Nerva.*] He was ſubſtituted in the place of Virginius Rufus, who died in his third conſulſhip, in the year of Rome 850 (7), and he honoured him with a funeral oration. ‘Laudatus ‘eſt à conſule Cornelio Tacito, nam hic ſupremus fæ‘licitati ejus cumulus acceſſit, laudator eloquentiſſi‘mus (8). --- *His funeral oration was ſpoken by Corne*‘*lius Tacitus, his good fortune met with this finiſhing* ‘*ſtroke, a moſt eloquent Orator.*

[*D*] *His Annals and his Hiſtory.*] He wrote the Hiſtory before the Annals; for he refers us to his Hiſtory in the eleventh book of the Annals; he refers us thither, I ſay, about ſome things concerning Domitian. ‘Utriuſque Principis rationes prætermitto, ‘ſatis narratas libris quibus res Imperatoris Domi‘tiani compoſui (9). --- *I omit the purpoſes of both* ‘*thoſe Princes, having ſufficiently explained them in my* ‘*work concerning the Hiſtory of Domitian.*’ Now it is certain (10) that his Hiſtory extended from the reign of Galba incluſively to the reign of Nerva excluſively. He deſigned a particular work for the reigns of Nerva and Trajan, and that was the buſineſs he reſerved for his old age: but I believe he never was able to put his deſign in execution. ‘Quod ſi vita ‘ſuppeditet, principatum Divi Nervæ, & Imperium ‘Trajani, uberiorem ſecurioremque materiam ſenectuti ‘ſepoſui: rara temporum felicitate, ubi ſentire quæ ‘velis, & quæ ſentias dicere licet (11). --- *But if my* ‘*life will permit, I ſhall reſerve the reigns of Nerva* ‘*and Trajan, as a more copious and ſecure ſubject for* ‘*my old age; as we enjoy that rare felicity to think* ‘*what we pleaſe, and ſay what we think.*’ Theſe words ſhew, that he began his Hiſtory, after the death of the Emperor Nerva, and during the life of Trajan: and therefore he gives the title of *Divus* to the firſt, which he does not give to the ſecond. We have now but five books of his Hiſtory left, which is but a very ſmall part of it; for they do not contain above a year and an half, when the whole work ought to contain about twenty-nine years. Thoſe who number theſe five books, as the continuation of the Annals divided into ſixteen books, are to blame; for the Annals ought to be conſidered as a ſeparate work. The author compoſed them after he had finiſhed his Hiſtory (12), they began at the death of Auguſtus, and were continued to that of Nero. We have but part of them left, namely, the four firſt books, ſome pages of the fifth, all the ſixth, from the eleventh to the fifteenth, and part of the ſixteenth: The two laſt years of Nero, and part of the foregoing year are wanting. Theſe were the laſt books of the work. The five firſt books were found in Germany, by a Receiver of Leo X. He carried them to that Pope, and received a gratification of 500 crowns. ‘Corbeiæ, quod ad Viſurgim Monaſterium eſt, à quæ‘ſtore Pontificio fuere inventi, qui eos ad Leonem X. ‘detulit, ac ἀντιδώρου loco quingentos accepit aureos ‘(13). --- *At the abbey of Corwey, which is a mona*‘*ſtery on the Weſer, they were found by one of the Pope's* ‘*Receivers, who preſented them to Leo X, and received* ‘*from him a reward of* 500 *gold crowns.*’ Philip Beroaldus had orders to publiſh them (14). I remember to have heard the late Mr Faure, Doctor of Divinity of the Faculty of Paris, ſay, that Leo X having publiſhed a brief, by which he promiſed not only indulgences to thoſe who ſhould diſcover Tacitus's manuſcripts, but alſo money, and honour (15); there was a German, who ſearched all the libraries, and at laſt found

(1) In the remark [*K*].

(2) Tacitus, Hiſtor. *lib. i, cap. i.*

(3) In the remark [*K*].

(4) Lipſius, in Vita Taciti, *cenſures him for it.*

(5) It was in the year 841, of Rome, according to Lipſius, or 840, according to Calviſius.

(6) Tacitus, Annal. *lib. xi, cap. xi.*

(7) 849 according to Calviſius.

(8) Plinius, Epiſt. I, *lib. ii.*

(9) Tacitus, Annal. *lib. xi, cap. xi.*

(10) See Tacitus, at the beginning of his Hiſtory.

(11) Tacitus, Hiſt. *lib. i, cap. i.*

(12) See the proofs which Lipſius gives of it in the preface to his Commentaries on Tacitus.

(13) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *lib. i, cap. xxx, pag.* 159.

(14) They were printed at Rome, an. 1515.

(15) That is, that their names ſhould be prefixed with an elogy to what they ſhould find out.

how to paint the diſguiſes and cheats of Politicians, and the weakneſs of the paſſions. Not but that he may be cenſured for the affectation of his language, and for his inquiring into the ſecret motives of actions [*E*], and conſtruing them to be criminal; but it is a great compliment to his underſtanding, to remark the eſteem which ſeveral princes have had for his works [*F*]. A modern author has paſſed this judgment on them: *Tertullian charges him with telling us a great many falſhoods. He was not only an enemy to the true religion; but it appears from ſeveral paſſages that he had none at all. His ſtyle is certainly very obſcure; nay it is ſometimes harſh, and has not all the purity of good authors in the Latin tongue. Nevertheleſs, his art of comprizing a great deal of ſenſe in a few words; his vivacity*

found ſome books of the Annals in the monaſtery of Corwey. He went and preſented them to the Pope, who received them with great pleaſure, and aſked him what recompence he deſired. The German was content to be re-imburſed the charges he had been at in going to view thoſe libraries, and in his journey to Rome. Leo thought that was too little, and gave him more; and in order to procure him both honour and profit, he would have had him take the care of publiſhing this Tacitus. But the German excuſed himſelf, on acccount of his wanting the neceſſary abilities (16).

[*E*] *Not but that he may be cenſured for the affectation of his language, and for his enquiring into the ſecret motives of actions.*] Muretus has made three Orations (17) in anſwer to thoſe who have criticized Tacitus. Their criticiſms were too ſharp, and unjuſt in ſome reſpects: Therefore it was no hard matter for the apologiſt, who was a good Orator, and a ſubtile Rhetorician, to elude them. You may ſee in thoſe Orations what Tacitus is cenſured for. You will find the ſame thing alſo in Strada's *Proluſiones* (18). He is one of the moſt formidable enemies of Tacitus: he thereby diſpleaſed Paganinus Gaudentius (19), who not only criticized (20) many places of his Hiſtory of the Low-Countries; but alſo undertook to juſtify Tacitus. This Gaudentius was no very ſtout champion: he underſtood a little of many things, but nothing perfectly. ‘Magis literis tinctus quam imbutus .... nihil in ingenio ſolidum, cum per artes & diſciplinas peregrinaretur nulli penitus inſiſtens (21). - - - *He was rather ſuperficially than deeply learned .... his judgment was not ſolid enough to dwell long upon any thing in the courſe of his ſtudies.*’ In my opinion, Cardinal du Perron has too much deſpiſed Tacitus (22).

The book intituled, *Anonymiana, or Miſcellanies of Poetry, Oratory, and Learning*, which was printed at Paris in 1700, contains a diſcourſe which is not very much in favour of our Hiſtorian. This is the judgment the author paſſes upon his ſtyle (23): ‘Tacitus's Latin is very good, but too obſcure to expreſs what he would write. His difficult and contracted ſtyle might be eſteemed any where elſe but in a Hiſtory, where the whole ought to be clear and well eſtabliſhed; and where the diſtance of facts, their variety, their epochas, and their changes, continually controverted, render it obſcure enough in itſelf, without being made more ſo by the ſtyle....... (24) It is a miſtake to pretend, that Tacitus's way of writing is commendable: if ſome wines are eſteemed for a little bitterneſs, it is becauſe that is occaſioned by ſome good quality; but a harſh and rough way of writing will never gain reputation in a Hiſtory. It is ſo far from raiſing the mind to greater knowledge, as this learned man pretends (25), that it perplexes and diſcourages it. Will any one ſay, for example, that Cæſar would have excited more attention, if he had been more obſcure, and leſs natural? Does not he raiſe the mind to his own thoughts, which in reading his Hiſtory ought to be always the juſt bounds of ours? Whereas in an obſcure manner of writing, the mind of the reader roves where it pleaſes, when it is not tired, and forms imaginations which frequently have no exactneſs or proportion to the things. Cæſar, by his clearneſs, never gives occaſion to deſire more light in the actions he deſcribes.’ I could readily ſubſcribe to this judgment; and, in my opinion, what the author adds concerning the other affectation of Tacitus, is no leſs judicious (26). ‘(27) Tacitus was an able Politician, and a yet more judicious writer: he has drawn very juſt conſequences from the tranſactions of the reigns, of which he wrote the Hiſtory, and has formed maxims from them for the well governing of a ſtate. But if he has ſometimes aſſigned to the actions and commotions of the republic their true principles, if he has rightly unravelled their cauſes, it muſt be owned, that he has often ſupplied with too much nicety and penetration, thoſe actions which had none: ſo true is it, that men characterize themſelves in whatever they do, and that the writing of Hiſtory never is in the hands in which it ought to be, when thoſe who undertake it, being ignorant of the true cauſe of an action, aſſign to it that cauſe which they imagine to be the leaſt ſenſible, and moſt concealed from the eyes of the people. They often happen to repreſent that as a particular ſecret, in the breaſt of the Prince, which was a matter public to all the world: and this is a fault ſo familiar with Tacitus (28), that I dare venture to ſay, ſupported otherwiſe by a great many good reaſons, that it is paying him too great a compliment to take him for a very exact Hiſtorian, who has written according to rules...... (29) He has made choice of the niceſt actions, and the moſt ſuſceptible of the delicacies of art: thoſe reigns to which he has principally applied himſelf in his Hiſtory, are no ſmall proof of this. In that of Tiberius, which is without diſpute his maſter-piece, and in which he has beſt ſucceeded, he found a kind of government more adapted to the character of his genius. He loved, as I have ſaid, to unfold the intrigues of the cabinet, to aſſign their cauſes, to turn pretences into deſigns, and deceitful appearances into realities. A genius too ſubtile, who ſaw ſome myſtery in all the actions of this Prince. A ſincere deference of his deſigns to the judgment of the Senate, was ſometimes a ſnare laid for their integrity; ſometimes a nice way of becoming their maſter; and always the art of making them the accomplices of his deſigns, and of executing them without any reproach. When he puniſhed the ſeditious; it was an effect of his natural diffidence of the citizens, or ſome ſlight marks of anger ſpread among the people, to diſpoſe their minds for greater cruelties. Here the contrariety of humours of two Generals, is a ſecret method of croſſing the fortune of a competitor, and the means to leſſen him in the affection of the people. The honours conferred on thoſe that deſerved them, were genteel ways of removing a rival, or of deſtroying an enemy, and always fatal recompences. In a word, Policy has a hand in every thing, vice and virtue are there equally dangerous, and favours as fatal as diſgraces. Tiberius is never natural, he does not do the moſt ordinary actions of other men without deſign. His repoſe is never without conſequence, and his motions are always full of contrivances.’ The other things which I have read in this diſſertation of the author of the Anonymiana, are more liable, in my opinion, to be contradicted.

[*F*] *The eſteem which many Princes have had for his works.*] Pope Paul III, wore out his Tacitus by much reading of it. Coſmo de Medicis, the firſt Great Duke of Florence, accounted the reading of him his greateſt pleaſure. Muretus tells us this in finer words. ‘Paulus III P. M. quo nullum ſapientiorem ſenem noſtra vidit ætas, Tacitum ſæpè relegendo contriverat, neque ullum profanum ſcriptorem æquè libenter legebat. Coſmus Medices, qui primus Magnus Etruriæ Dux fuit, homo factus ad imperandum, qui eam, quæ vulgo fortuna dicitur, in conſilio & prudentiâ conſiſtere docuit, Taciti libros in deliciis habebat, eorumque lectione avidiſſimè fruebatur. Neque non hodie multi aut Principum, aut eorum, qui de ſummis rebus à Principibus in conſilium adhibentur, eundem ſtudioſiſſimè legunt, & quaſi pro magiſtro quodam prudentiæ habent (30). - - - - *Pope Paul III, the moſt learned man of our age, wore out his*

(16) Note, that Mr Faure ſaid, that he had read this Narrative in the preface to the firſt edition of theſe books of Tacitus. See an elogy on Mr Faure in the *Journal des Sçavans*, November 16, 1693, pag. 673, Dutch edition.

(17) The xvith, xviith, and xviiith, of the ſecond volume, in the Leipſic edition 1672.

(18) Lib. i, Proluſ. II.

(19) Profeſſor at Piſa. He was of the country of the Griſons, if I am not miſtaken.

(20) See his book, *de Candore Politico*, printed at Piſa, ann. 1646.

(21) Octav. Ferrarius, *in Proluſione cui Titulus*, Literatorum funus.

(22) See the *Perroniana* at the word *Styles*.

(23) Anonymiana, *pag*. 7.

(24) Ibid. *p*. 9.

(25) That is to ſay, La Mothe le Vayer.

(26) This is to be underſtood in general. See citation (28).

(27) Anonymiana, *pag*. 10.

(28) The author ſhould not therefore have ſaid, that he was thought a more judicious writer, than an able politician.

(29) Anonymiana, *p*. 16, & *ſeq*.

(30) Muret. Orat. XVI. *Vol*. *ii*, *pag*. 342, *Edit. Lipſ*. 1672. *See* Oration. Heinſii, *pag*. 5, *and the preface of* Arma Anſerina; *and* Paquier, Lettres, *Tom. ii*, *pag*. 442, & *ſeq*.

vivacity in painting out events; the ſagacity with which he penetrates through the darkneſs of the corrupt heart of men; the force and ſuperiority of genius, which appear throughout the whole, makes him looked upon at this day almoſt univerſally as the chief of Hiſtorians (c). There have been ſo many tranſlations of him, and ſo many comments upon him [*G*], that they alone might compoſe a tolerable library. I ſhall take notice of ſome faults in Juſtus Lipſius [*H*], la Mothe le Vayer, and Moreri [*I*]; and you will find in my remarks,

'*his Tacitus by frequently reading him, nor did he meet with ſo much pleaſure in peruſing any other profane writer. Coſmo de Medicis, who was the firſt Great Duke of Tuſcany, and formed for governing, who taught that what is commonly called Fortune, conſiſts in council and prudence, held the works of Tacitus in high eſteem, and read them with the greateſt delight. And at this very day, there are ſeveral Princes, and privy-counſellors to Princes, who read him with great application, and regard him as a ſort of Oracle in Politics.*' I ſhall ſubjoin to this Latin paſſage, one from Balzac. It is taken from a letter he wrote to d'Ablancourt, the 4th of June 1643. 'Tacitus being become your's, my ill opinion of him can ſubſiſt no longer. I cannot hate a man whom you love; and, to tell you the truth, I do believe, that he is become more agreeable, and leſs thorny, by paſſing through your hands. The beſt of all is, that you have not defiled yourſelf by meddling with dirty matters, and that among thoſe excrements of Policy, your Morality is preſerved in its purity. A Stoic Philoſopher of the laſt century, as you may call Juſtus Lipſius, had the ſame taſte for him that you have. A great General, as you may call, the Marquis of Spinola, has alſo tranſlated him into his mother tongue, though his tranſlation has not been publiſhed; and I inform you of this as a ſecret which I learned from one of his moſt intimate confidents (31).' Add to this a paſſage of Guy Patin: *Cornelius Tacitus, who is a State-breviary, or the firſt or chief maſter of the Secrets of the Cabinet, and whom Mr de Balzac calls ſomewhere,* the antient original of modern Policy, *ſays, ſpeaking of Tiberius, &c* (32). We muſt remember in this place the great zeal of Leo X: I have taken notice of it above (33).

Let us join Queen Chriſtina to the examples I have already given. Mr Chanut ſays, that ſhe made the Greek tongue only *her diverſion in ſpare hours; and that the reading of this language, and others, did not keep her from her ſerious ſtudies, ſo ſhe called, among others, Tacitus's hiſtory, ſome pages of which ſhe read conſtantly every day. This author, who exerciſes the moſt learned, was very familiar to her* (34).

[*G*] *There have been ſo many verſions of him, and ſo many comments upon him.*] Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie, who has tranſlated the ſix firſt books of the Annals into French, has prefixed to his tranſlation a critical diſcourſe, where you may find the names of a great many perſons, who have laboured on this writer. There you may ſee the judgment that is paſſed on their labours, and on Tacitus's ſtile and morals. All this is very curious. But you muſt not ſuppoſe that this French tranſlator ſpeaks in general of all thoſe who have written on Tacitus, or who have tranſlated him into other languages; he only ſpeaks of the principal ones. I wiſh Peter Andrew Canonheri had named the eleven Commentators that he points at in theſe words: 'Præter hos ſunt undecim qui Tacitum notis & commentariis illuſtrarunt (35). - - - - *Beſides theſe there are eleven who have illuſtrated Tacitus with notes and commentaries.*' He had juſt before given a long liſt of thoſe, *qui ex profeſſo de jure ſtatus conſcripſerunt.* That liſt contains eight pages in 4to. I know ſome perſons of good judgment, who make a great account of the critical commentaries on Tacitus, ſuch as is that of Juſtus Lipſius, and ſlight very much the political commentaries with which Italy has infatuated Germany: for ſince the Germans have ſeen the diſſertations of Scipione Ammirato, tranſlated into Latin by Chriſtopher Pflugius, a gentleman of Miſnia, they have been a little too much inclined to comment on Tacitus's works after that manner. Not but that one may profit by their writings, chiefly by thoſe of Boeclerus (36). That which Berneggerus compoſed on the ſame Hiſtorian, is intermixed with Literature and Politics. He has therefore intituled it, *Quæſtiones Miſcellaneæ.* The French did not bite at the hook, when John Baudouin added to his tranſlation of Tacitus (37), accompanied with notes, a tranſlation of Scipione Ammirato.

[*H*] *I ſhall take notice of ſome faults in Juſtus Lipſius.*] I. I have already obſerved (38), that he makes Pliny ſay more than he ſhould have done. II. He chuſes rather to believe, that Tacitus was the firſt of his family who enjoyed any honours, and that this family was not very illuſtrious, than to believe, that his father had any office: and nevertheleſs, in another place, he underſtands of his father, what Pliny ſays of Cornelius Tacitus, a Roman knight, and procurator of the demeſns in Gallia Belgica. Let us compare theſe two paſſages of Lipſius together. Here is the firſt. 'Pater avuſque honores geſſerint, & ad remp. acceſſerint, necne, ut re vetuſtâ & incertâ nihil adfirmem: proprius à verò abeſt, ipſum primum jus imaginis & honores in familiam non nimis illuſtrem intuliſſe. Initium dignitatis illi ſub Veſpaſiano fuit, à quo, Plinio auctore, procurator datus Galliæ Belgicæ, rationes Principis adminiſtravit, quæ dignitas equeſtri ordini diu peculiaris fuit (39). - - - - *Whether his father and grandfather were honoured with any offices, or had any employments in the common-wealth, I cannot take upon me to determine, this being a point of great antiquity and uncertainty: it is moſt probable, that the grandeur and honours of his family, not before that time over illuſtrious, were wholly owing to himſelf. His firſt advancement was under Veſpaſian, by whom, according to Pliny, he was made Procurator of Gallia Belgica, and had the care of that Prince's revenues, which was a dignity long peculiar to the equeſtrian order.*' Here is the other, which ſerves for a commentary on theſe words of Tacitus; *Dignitatem noſtram à Veſpaſiano inchoatam;* - - - *Our dignity begun by Veſpaſian.* How can this be, ſays Lipſius? 'Quomodo, quiane Procurator ſub illo Belgicæ? E Plinio id ſuſpicêre, ſed ſuſpicêre tantum, imò veriùs id ceperis de hujus patre. Intellige ergo dignitatem ejus inchoatam à Veſpaſiano, quòd ab eo laticlavius factus, & relatus in ordinem primum (40). - - - - *What, becauſe he was under him Procurator of Gallia Belgica? This account of Pliny is to be ſuſpected, nay, more than ſuſpected, for it will be more truly underſtood of his father. The meaning therefore of his dignity being begun by Veſpaſian, is, that he made him a ſenator, and ranked him in that ſupreme order.*' Lipſius will have it, in the firſt of theſe two paſſages, that Pliny ſays, that Tacitus was honoured with a commiſſion by Veſpaſian; and in the other he will have it, that this is meant of Tacitus's father. According to this laſt caſe, this Hiſtorian had for his father a knight promoted by the Emperor to honourable employments; and that which to Lipſius did not appear likely, would nevertheleſs be very true. No body can deny, but that this office of Procurator was very honourable; they attributed to it, under the Emperor Claudius, the authority of Judicature, and that without appeal (41). Conſult the learned Gutherius (42): and tho' Auguſtus had conferred this office on ſome freed-men (43). Tacitus did nevertheleſs look upon it as an appennage of knighthood; 'Utrumque avum procuratorem Cæſarum habuit *(Agricola)* quæ equeſtris nobilitas eſt (44). - - - - *Both Agricola's grandfathers were procurators under the Cæſars, which is an honour belonging to the equeſtrian order.*' III. Lipſius aſſerts, that Tacitus being grown grey-headed at the bar, devoted his old age to the writing of hiſtory. *Hiſtoriæ ſcribendæ ſenex demum vacavit, cum reliquum ætatis in foro & cauſis orandis egiſſet.* But if it be ſo, how comes it, that Tacitus declares, that he undertakes to write a hiſtory which is to extend from the death of Nero to that of Domitian; and that he reſerves for his old age the empire of Nerva and Trajan? *Quod ſi vita ſuppeditet, principatum divi Nervæ, & imperium Trajani, uberiorem ſecurioremque materiam ſenectuti ſepoſui* (45). One may here apply to Lipſius the proverb, *Sorex ſuo indicio periit,* - - - *He has betrayed himſelf.* He tells us (46), that he has very nearly made out

propius

(c) Tillemont, Hiſtory of the Emperors, *Tom. ii, Part. i, pag.* 351, *of the Bruſſels edition.*

(31) Balzac's Letter to d'Ablancourt. It is the xxiſt of book xii, and the xxiſt of the iiid book, of the iſt part of the choice Letters, p. 128, Amſterdam edition, 1656.

(32) Patin, Letter cxcvi, *pag.* 171, *Tom. ii.*

(33) In the remark [*D*].

(34) See Baillet's Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. ii, pag.* 305.

(35) Petrus Andreas Canonherius, Philoſophiæ, Medicinæ, ac Sacræ Theologiæ Doctor Romanus, in Diſſertationibus Politicis ac Diſcurſibus variis in C. Cornelii Taciti Annalium Libros, *pag.* 66, *Edit. Francof.* 1610.

(36) I have ſeen a political Commentary, which he publiſhed anno 1643, on the fifteen firſt chapters of the firſt book of Tacitus's Annals, and a like Commentary which he publiſhed, anno 1648, on the Hiſtory of the ſame author.

(37) Printed at Paris in 4to, ann. 1628.

(38) In the remark [*A*].

(39) Juſt. Lipſius in Vita Taciti *in limine* Commentar. ad Tacitum.

(40) Lipſius, in Tacit. Hiſtor. *lib. i, init. pag.* 451.

(41) Eodem anno ſæpius audita vox Principis, *parem vim rerum habendam à procuratoribus ſuis judicatarum, ac ſi ipſe ſtatuiſſet.* Ac ne fortuito prolapſus videretur, Senatus quoque conſulto cautum, plenius quam antea & uberius. *Tacitus, Annal. lib. xii, cap. lx.*

(42) Gutherius, de Officiis Domus Auguſtæ, *lib. iii, cap. xxxiii.*

(43) Dio, *lib. liii, pag.* 506.

(44) Tacit. in Vita Agricolæ, *cap. iv.*

(45) Tacit. Hiſtor. *lib. i, cap. i.*

(46) Lipſius, in Vita Taciti.

remarks, ſeveral particulars, which relate to the life of Tacitus. He married the daughter

out the year of Tacitus's nativity, which is thus: Pliny the younger, almoſt of the ſame age with Tacitus (47), was in his eighteenth year when his uncle died; that is to ſay, according to Lipſius, the ſecond year of the reign of Titus. He was therefore born in the year of Rome 816; ſo that Tacitus being a little older than he, muſt have been born the laſt year of the Emperor Claudius, or rather, the firſt year of Nero. Whereupon, I ſay, that he was therefore but forty-four years of age when Trajan aſcended the throne: and ſince nothing obliges us to put back the beginning of his work beyond the ſecond, or the third year of this prince, it manifeſtly follows, that he was not old when he began to apply himſelf to it. It is certain, ſuppoſing that he undertook this work in his forty-fifth year, that it may be much better conceived that he had time to finiſh it, and afterwards to go about his Annals, which he carried on from the beginning of Tiberius's reign, to the death of Nero. And obſerve, that in writing his Annals, he propoſed to himſelf a new enterprize when he ſhould have finiſhed them (48). Obſerve alſo, that his manner of writing required much time, every thing in it ſavours of pains, meditation, poliſhing, ſtudy, and the *feſtina lente*. And laſtly, obſerve, that the letters Pliny the younger wrote to him, either to intreat him to make mention of him, or to communicate to him ſome memoirs concerning the death of his uncle, *ſeem to be of the year* 102 *or* 103 (49); that is, of the fifth or ſixth year of Trajan. Now it is certain, that Tacitus was then writing his hiſtory; and ſince there is great likelihood that he was not far from the time when the fire of mount Veſuvius deſtroyed Pliny the Naturaliſt, in the firſt or ſecond year of Titus, we may fairly judge, that he did not long defer the beginning of his work after the inſtallation of Trajan. IV. Lipſius conjectures (50), that Tacitus's hiſtory contained twenty books. The ground he goes upon is this, that it contained an interval of twenty-one years; and that the five firſt books relate only the actions of a year and ſome months. This is a falſity in fact, and a prodigious forgetfulneſs of the rule of proportion. There are more than twenty-eight years between the death of Nero, and that of Domitian, which are the two boundaries of Tacitus's hiſtory: and no man that underſtands the Rule of Three would reaſon after this manner; If fifteen months take up five books, twenty-one years take up twenty books. Note, that the years that are loſt of the hiſtory of Tacitus, are not at all, in the main, leſs fruitful in events, than thoſe that are left. St Jerom ſays, that Tacitus compoſed the Hiſtory of the Emperors, in thirty books, from Tiberius to the death of Domitian (51). This teſtimony can be of no uſe, becauſe the Hiſtory of Tacitus does not begin at the death of Auguſtus; and there is no likelihood that this work and his Annals contained but thirty books. So that St Jerom has not well expreſſed himſelf. See the margin (52).

The greateſt part of theſe miſtakes of Juſtus Lipſius are to be found in the writings of the moſt learned men, who have ſpoken of Tacitus hiſtorically. I excuſe them: for who could believe, that ſo able a writer had committed them in a work very ſhort, and framed in ſuch a manner as to make us believe, that the author of it had very attentively weighed all his words? I do not think, that his conjecture concerning the year of Tacitus's nativity is amiſs, which ſhews a groſs errror of Francis Garaſſe, who believed, that Lucan's *Pharſalia* is later than Tacitus's Hiſtory (53). His words are theſe: The firſt objection ‘may be of thoſe who imagine, that GOD takes pleaſure in our calamities, and is delighted to ſee us expoſed to tempeſts, rebellions, and wars, as tho' we had a barbarous and revengeful GOD, who bathes himſelf in the blood of men. Such are, in ſome meaſure, the pompous objections, and atheiſtical ſentences of Tacitus and of Lucan, who was, in his time, accounted the father of Atheiſts: for they ſay in expreſs terms; *Tot Romanæ Reipublicæ cladibus manifeſtum eſt fuiſſe curæ Diis* VINDICTAM, *non fuiſſe* SALUTEM: *that is to ſay, by ſo many calamities, and by the divers diſorders which have ſhaken the Republic of Rome, it plainly appears, that the gods take care to be revenged on us, and not to ſuccour us. Theſe are the words of Tacitus, in the firſt book of his Hiſtory; and Lucan, who perhaps had it from him, as an aſp, who borrows venom from the viper, ſays, in lofty terms,*

Felix Roma quidem, civeſque habitura ſuperbos,
Si LIBERTATIS Superis tam cura fuiſſet,
Quàm VINDICTA placet, &c.

‘*Rome*, ſays he, *would be the moſt happy city in the world, if GOD took as much care of our* liberty, *as he delights in revenge* (54).’

[*I*] *In la Mothe le Vayer, and Moreri.*] The firſt of theſe two authors ſays (55), that the twelve laſt years of Nero are wanting in Tacitus's Annals. This is falſe: the two laſt years, and part of the preceding, are only wanting: this is the firſt fault. The ſecond, is to ſay, that this author's hiſtory reached *to the happy government of Trajan*. A new miſtake: it ended at the death of Domitian. III. It is not true, that, according to the conjectures of Lipſius, we have loſt ten books of Tacitus's hiſtory: for, according to his conjectures, this work comprehended twenty books; therefore, ſince there remain but five, we have loſt fifteen, according to the opinion of this Critic. IV. This author ſhould not have ſaid (56), that there are *at leaſt twenty-one years* from Galba to Nerva. This is a fault of Lipſius which I have refuted, and which Voſſius has alſo committed (57). V. *It is not to be wondered at, if Tacitus having imitated Thucydides, and both of them Demoſthenes . . . . the firſt has retained I know not what harſhneſs or auſterity, which has always been obſerved in the ſtile of thoſe two Grecians* (58). Theſe words of la Mothe le Vayer contain a prodigious anachroniſm; for Demoſthenes was much later than Thucydides. VI. *The Emperor Tacitus, in that ſupreme dignity of the world, wherein he was placed, did, nevertheleſs, about two hundred years after the death of this Hiſtorian, of whom we ſpeak, glory in the name that was common to them both, eſteeming himſelf honoured to have him for his anceſtor, and to be taken for one of his poſterity. He cauſed his ſtatue to be ſet up in all libraries, and his works to be written out ten times every year; to the end that they might paſs from hand to hand, and from age to age, as they have done even to ours* (59). This account is not exact: it ſuppoſes, that this emperor reigned a certain number of years; for otherwiſe it would be abſurd to ſay, that he cauſed ſuch or ſuch a thing to be done every year. However it is certain, that his reign laſted only about ſix months. Beſides, this account ſuppoſes the event anſwered this emperor's intentions; that is, that the books of Tacitus *did paſs from age to age down to ours*, according to the deſign of the Prince who cauſed them to be tranſcribed: and yet there remains with us but a very ſmall part of them. I do not much wonder, that the care of this emperor ſhould not have procured to us the preſervation of all the works of his anceſtor: for, conſidering the ſhort duration of his empire, I believe the execution of his orders went but a very little way. However it be, here is what he ordered (60): ‘Cornelium Tacitum, ſcriptorem hiſtoriæ Auguſtæ, quod parentem ſuum eundem diceret, in omnibus bibliothecis collocari juſſit: & ne lectorum incuria deperiret, librum per annos ſingulos decies ſcribi publicitus in evicis (61) archiis juſſit, & in bibliothecis poni. - - - - *He commanded that Cornelius Tacitus, the Hiſtorian of the Cæſars, becauſe he owned him for his anceſtor, ſhould be placed in all the libraries: and that, to prevent his works from being loſt by the negligence of his readers, they ſhould be publickly tranſcribed ten times in every year, and put up in the libraries.*’ VII. La Mothe le Vayer concludes this chapter with theſe words: ‘It is alſo well known, that Tacitus did not go about writing, till he was far advanced in years, after the empire of Nerva, and under that of Trajan, as we learn from himſelf (62).’ Here are two faults; for, in the firſt place, the Hiſtorian ſpeaks not one word of his age; and, in the ſecond place, it is very wrong to conclude that he was an old man, becauſe he compoſed his work under the empire of Trajan. See the preceding remark (63). VIII. The clamours of La Mothe le Vayer againſt two Civilians, who ſpoke ill daughter of Agricola, whoſe life he wrote. Several people believe he had a ſon, of whom Pliny relates a very extraordinary thing [*K*]. It is an idle fancy to pretend that Domitian

---

(47) See Epiſtle xx, of the 7th book of Pliny.

(48) Sed aliorum exitus, ſimul cetera illius ætatis memorabo, ſi effectis in quæ tendi, plures ad curas vitam produxero. *Tacitus, Annal. lib. iii, cap. xxiv.*

(49) Tillemont, Hiſtory of the Emperors, *Tom. ii, Part. i, pag.* 350.

(50) Lipſius, *in Præfat.* Comment. ad Hiſtor. Taciti.

(51) Hieronym. in Zachariam, *lib. v, cap. xiv, apud* Voſſium de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 159.

(52) Note, that the book which we reckon the fifth in the Hiſtory of Tacitus, is cited as the fifth by Tertullian, *in Libello de Spectaculis.*

(53) Lucan died under Nero.

(54) Garaſſe, Somme Theologique, *pag.* 440, 441.

(55) La Mothe le Vayer, Judgment on the principal Hiſtorians, *pag.* 207, *Tom. iii, Edit. in 12mo.*

(56) Ibid. *pag.* 208.

(57) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Lat. *pag.* 159.

(58) La Mothe le Vayer, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 209.

(59) Ibid. *pag.* 216.

(60) Vopiſcus, in Tacito Imperatore, *cap. x, pag. m.* 612, *Vol. ii*, Scriptorum Hiſt. Auguſtæ.

(61) This word is without doubt corrupted; the manuſcripts vary much; Caſaubon and Salmaſius have not ventured to decide any thing.

(62) La Mothe le Vayer, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 219.

(63) Numero III.

ill of Tacitus's Latin, appear to me very ill founded. He accounts thoſe two perſons, *in this their delirium, more worthy of pity, than of an anſwer* (64). He adds (65), *If ever a ridiculous judgment was paſſed, this, without doubt, is one, and I dare ſay, out of the great indignation I have againſt ſuch unreaſonable opinions, that, in all probability, the meaneſt Cook or Groom of Tacitus ſpoke better Latin than Ferretus, or Alciatus, very learned men in the Law, but very bad judges of the thing we are ſpeaking of. . . Who can forbear wondering that ſome Barbarians ſhould be found at this preſent time, ſuch as Alciatus and Ferretus, with reſpect to the antient Romans, ſo raſh as to ſay, that an author of ſo great account, did not know how to ſpeak his own native tongue? In truth, one muſt have a brazen face, and a great ſtock of aſſurance to advance ſuch propoſitions* (66). What a noiſe and buſtle is here about nothing? For, after all, the whole crime of thoſe two Civilians conſiſts in having found out in Tacitus's ſtile ſeveral thorns, and little brightneſs and purity. Here are Alciatus's words; I take them from a letter that he wrote to Paulus Jovius (67): 'Illi porrò qui rerum & locorum notitia gaudent, nec affectatas exornationes admittunt, non repoſcent à te rationem, cur lacteam Livii ubertatem non ſis aſſecutus, poſtquam & te omnino piguerit Saluſtii ſobrietatem imitari, & ſatis tibi fuerit pauculos tantum flores ex Q. Curtii pratis, ſæpius quam ex Cor. Taciti ſenticetis, arguta manu decerpſiſſe. - - - - *Beſides they who are well verſed in the knowledge of things and places, and exclude all affected ornaments, will never aſk you the reaſon, why you have not imitated the flowing copiouſneſs of Livy, ſince you could not bear copying the gravity of Salluſt, but contented yourſelf to gather, with a judicious hand, a few flowers out of the meadows of Q. Curtius, rather than from among the briars and thorns of C. Tacitus.*' Note, by the way, that Voſſius had never read this letter; for had he met with it, he would have better repreſented the author's thought: he would not have attributed to him an exceſſive prepoſſeſſion, which engaged him to affirm, that in compariſon to the hiſtory of Paul Jovius, that of Tacitus was like a field covered with brambles. 'Imo & Alciatus vir ſane egregius non dubitat affirmare dictionem ejus præ illa Paulli Jovii eſſe ſenticeta. Condonemus tale judicium tanto viro, & cogitemus ex amore Jovii proficiſci (68). *Alciatus alſo, a man truly learned, does not ſcruple to affirm, that the ſtile of Tacitus, compared with that of Paul Jovius, is a field of brambles. We muſt excuſe this judgment in ſo great a man, and aſcribe it to his friendſhip for Jovius.*' This is ſpeaking at the third hand. Alciatus's letter is not very flattering, if it be well examined. Let us proceed to Ferretus's words. 'Tanto acumine, tantoque judicio res Romanas mandavit litteris Tacitus, ut nemo certè legatur in ſuo genere illi comparandus; nam quamvis caruerit nitore, & puritate linguæ, abeunte jam Romano ſermone in peregrinas formas, atque figuras, ſuccum tamen, & ſanguinem rerum incorruptum retinuit, idemque tam multa pauciſſimis complexus eſt, ut attenti lectoris in animo aculeos relinquat, indiligentem, ac aliud cogitantem fallat, ac prætereat (69). - - - - *Tacitus wrote the Roman Hiſtory with ſo great ability and judgment, that certainly no author is to be compared with him in that way; for though he wants clearneſs and purity of ſtile, which was owing to the Roman language degenerating into foreign forms and figures, yet he preſerves the ſubſtance and eſſentials entire, and at the ſame time expreſſes ſo many things in few words, that he makes a laſting impreſſion on the attentive reader, and eludes the unattentive.*' The author, who affords me this elogy, cites (70) a paſſage of Alciatus, wherein he beſtows great encomiums upon Tacitus. Upon a thorough examination, I am perſuaded we ſhall find, that theſe two Civilians went not beyond La Mothe le Vayer himſelf (71), who did not deny, that Tacitus had retained ſomething *of the harſhneſs or auſterity of Thucydides*, and that his manner of writing was a little rugged. Would he have us find in Tacitus the model of a pure and elegant Latin ſtile? Then we muſt burn Cicero and Livy; for ſo long as we can compare them with Tacitus, the latter will neceſſarily appear to us very much corrupted. He had therefore no reaſon to fall into ſo great a paſſion againſt Alciatus and Ferretus. He ſhould not have exaggerated the clamours and invectives of Muretus (72). He neither ſpoke the truth, nor his own thoughts, when he ſaid, that the cooks and mule-drivers of the antient authors ſpoke, and underſtood the Latin tongue better, than the moſt learned among the Moderns, either ſpeak or underſtand it. *Quorum coqui & muliones multo melius quam omnes nos Latine & intelligebant & loquebantur* (73). He would have been offended at this hyperbole, if another perſon had offered to include him in it; and there is no doubt but that he believed himſelf much more maſter of the Latin tongue than the common citizens of antient Rome. He might be alſo in the right; for it is certain, that there are ſome foreigners, who without having ſeen France, ſpeak and underſtand our tongue better than ſeveral Frenchmen: And I am ſure, that Caſaubon and Salmaſius wrote better in Latin, than in their own tongue. If Mr de Tillemont (74) were to be treated at this time, as Alciatus was, there would appear a great deal of pedantry in ſuch a cenſure. Balthaſar Bonifacius, a great admirer of Tacitus, does nevertheleſs own, that his ſtile is harſh. 'Stylus magis gravis quam elegans, aſper enim parumque duriuſculus eſt, atque à Latinæ linguæ candore diſcedens (75). - - - - - - *His ſtile is rather grave than elegant, being a little harſh and rough, and degenerating from the purity of the Latin tongue.*'

As for what concerns Mr Moreri, he may be blamed, firſt, for having a little too much exalted Tacitus's birth. II. For having aſſerted, that Tacitus was very old when he began his Hiſtory under the empire of Trajan. III. And that the author himſelf obſerves it. He has avoided the over-ſights of Charles Stephens; for he has not made this Hiſtorian flouriſh from the empire of Tiberius, the year of Rome 767, till the time of Veſpaſian, *ann.* 822 (76). He does not ſay that Tacitus, an illuſtrious Orator under Hadrian, lived to the time of the Veſpaſians, and that they promoted him to dignities, and that his Hiſtory extends from Auguſtus to Hadrian (77). Lloyd and Hoffman have adopted all theſe laſt faults. I believe Charles Stephens copied them from Geſner (78), who had copied them from Volaterranus (79).

[*K*] *A ſon, of whom Pliny relates a very extraordinary thing.*] Here it is, according to Du Pinet's verſion. 'We read in the Chronicles, that at Salamis one named Euthymenes had a ſon, who in three years grew three cubits: he was very unwieldy and heavy both in motion and underſtanding, and yet he had got a downy beard, and a ſtrong voice; but as ſoon as he was three years of age, he died ſuddenly with a contraction of the nerves. I have ſeen myſelf ſomething like this, ſetting aſide that he had no hair on the privities, in the ſon of Cornelius Tacitus, a Roman knight, and receiver and treaſurer of Gallia Belgica.' I quote the old French verſion, on purpoſe to have an opportunity of obſerving, that ſome people pretend, that the tranſlator did not well underſtand his original. Theſe are the words of Pliny, in the edition of Father Hardouin. *Invenimus in monumentis Salamine Euthymenis filium, in tria cubita triennio adoleviſſe, inceſſu tardum, ſenſu hebetem, & jam puberem factum voce robuſta, abſumptum contractione membrorum ſubita, triennio circumacto. Ipſi non pridem vidimus eadem ferme omnia, præter pubertatem, in filio Cornelii Taciti Equitis Romani, Belgicæ Galliæ rationes procurantis* (80). This ſignifies, as ſome would have it, that the ſon of Euthymenes, having grown three cubits in three years, began immediately to decreaſe, and was conſumed at the end of three years. He lived therefore ſix years. I ſhall not decide on theſe two verſions: but that of du Pinet does not ſeem to me the worſt (81). I inſiſt more upon what follows. It cannot be proved from this paſſage, that our Tacitus had an employ in Gaul; for it is not true that Pliny ſpeaks of him. Let us remember, that Tacitus did not marry till after Agricola, his father-in-law, had been conſul. Here is the proof of it. 'Conſul egregiæ tum ſpei filiam juveni mihi deſpondet, ac poſt conſulatum collocavit, & ſtatim Britanniæ præpoſitus eſt (82). - - - - 'The

(64) La Mothe le Vayer, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 209.

(65) Ibid. *pag.* 210.

(66) Ibid. *pag.* 212, 213.

(67) It is prefixed to the firſt volume of the Hiſtories of Paul Jovius.

(68) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Latin. *pag.* 160.

(69) Æmil. Ferretus, in Caſtigat. ad Tacitum, *apud* Petr. Andream Canonherium, Diſcurſ. Polit. in C. Tacitum, *pag.* 2.

(70) Canonher. ibid. *pag.* 3.

(71) La Mothe le Vayer, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 209.

(72) See the 17th oration of the 2d volume of Muretus.

(73) Muret. ibid. *pag. m.* 354. *The Abbot Pichon*, Præfat. in Tacit. in uſum Delphini, *ſays in like manner, that the cenſurers of Tacitus are* rudes & barbari, præ equiſone aut colono ipſius Taciti.

(74) See his words in the text of this article.

(75) Theſe words are related as being of *Balthaſar Bonafacius* in the Prolegomena to *Tacitus in uſum Delphini.*

(76) Carol. Stephanus, in Diction. *voce* Cornelius.

(77) Id. ibid. *voce* Tacitus.

(78) Geſner, in Biblioth. *voce* Publius, *folio* 572, *verſo.*

(79) Volaterran. *lib. xx, circa init. pag. m.* 717, 718.

(80) Plin. *lib. vii, cap. xvi, pag. m.* 36, 37. *Vide* Senecam de Conſolatione ad Marciam. *cap. xxiii, pag.* 762.

(81) *See* Salmaſius in Solinum, *Tom. i, pag.* 44.

(82) Tacit. in Vita Agricolæ, *cap. ix.*

Domitian baniſhed him [*L*]; and perhaps it is another, to ſay that he lived eighty years [*M*].

‘ *The Conſul agreed to marry his daughter to me, a young* ‘ *lady of great hopes, which he accordingly did as ſoon as* ‘ *his conſulſhip was finiſhed, and was himſelf immediately after made Præfect of Britain.*’ The conſulſhip of Agricola, according to the moſt probable opinion (83), falls in with the 77th year of Jesus Christ; we muſt therefore hold, that Tacitus married in the 78th. Now Pliny died in the 79th or 80th year (84). Conſequently he could not have ſeen a ſon of Tacitus who had ſuch an extraordinary growth at three years. I do not bid you to obſerve, that he makes mention of this prodigious growth in the ſeventh book of his Natural Hiſtory, a work divided into 37 books: I have no deſign to infer from thence, that it is very probable he had ſeen this ſome years before he finiſhed that work; for it may be anſwered me, that he probably reviſed it after he had finiſhed it, and that he might every where make uſe of the time of that reviſion for the date of the whole piece. We find the ſame date in the fourth chapter of the fourteenth book, and in the ſecond chapter of the twenty-eighth book. The author in theſe two places points at the 830th year of Rome, which is the 77th of the Chriſtian Æra. This is enough to make my objection good. Beſides he ſays that he had ſeen, a long time before, this extraordinary growth, *nos pridem vidimus* (85). I know very well, that Father Hardouin has corrected theſe words, and has put *non pridem vidimus*. I ſhall let this correction of his paſs; it can do me no harm, for tho' it ſhould be ſuppoſed, that Pliny wrote this chapter of his Hiſtory a few days after he had ſeen this tall child, it is not poſſible, that this Roman knight, of whom he ſpeaks, ſhould be our Tacitus. And therefore I do confidently aſſert, that the reaſon for which this commentator reads *non pridem* inſtead of *nos pridem*, is frivolous; he goes upon the falſe ſuppoſition that Pliny means the Hiſtorian, of whom I am ſpeaking (86). He applies to him (87) the inſcription recited by Reineſius; but he ſhould have taken notice, that it was made by Cornelius Verus Tacitus (88). Now no body ever put Verus among the names of Tacitus. *He may have had for his father*, they are the words of Mr de Tillemont (89), *Cornelius Tacitus, a Roman knight, intendant of Gallia Belgica*, [*that is probably*] *Cornelius Verus Tacitus, of whom there is an inſcription found in the country of Juliers, made* † *when he was going to exerciſe a ſecond intendantſhip.* [*Thus he had been intendant of Gallia Belgica, and the Lower Germany where Juliers is.*] *This intendant had a ſon, of whom Pliny* ⸸ *the Naturaliſt relates ſomething extraordinary, in taking notice, that he was dead at that time:* [*So that this is not the Hiſtorian.*] Thoſe who from henceforward will attribute to Tacitus an employ in Gaul under Veſpaſian, will do well to look for better proofs than this paſſage of Pliny. How many learned men have been miſled by it? Lipſius (90) and Voſſius are not the only perſons. Nay, there are ſome, who might be cenſured, even though it could be reaſonably pretended, that Pliny ſpoke of our Tacitus; for they ſuppoſe he had great military preferments, and that he governed the Lower Germany in the quality of Pro-conſul. They even pretend that becoming at that time acquainted with the manners and laws of the Germans, he wrote concerning them, during his Pro-conſulſhip the work we now have. ‘ Floruit diutiſſime in militari ‘ urbanaque diſciplina & Proconſul Germaniam inferiorem obtinuit, quo tempore Germanorum mores, ‘ inſtituta, ritus, tanta diligentia perſcripſit, ut uni Tacito ſuam antiquitatem Germani acceptam ferant. ‘ - - - *He enjoyed great poſts a long time both civil and* ‘ *military, and obtained the Pro-conſulſhip of the Lower* ‘ *Germany, at which time he wrote with ſo much accuracy concerning the manners, laws, and rites of the* ‘ *Germans, that the Germans owe the account of their* ‘ *antiquity to Tacitus alone.*’ This is what Bodin ſays, in his treatiſe concerning the method of Hiſtory. Balthaſar Bonifacius (91) has tranſcribed him without any alteration. Mr Pichon meant without doubt that Tacitus was governor of Gallia Belgica. This title is too great. However it be, here is what he ſays, in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to his Tacitus In usum Delphini. ‘Hoc autem oportet eſſe Tibi Tacitum ‘ acceptiorem, quòd olim in Gallia tua, & quidem ‘ Belgica, quæ maximè rectoris impatiens, obtinuit ‘ Imperium, & quòd hic forſitan ea ipſa meditatus eſt, ‘ & uſu didicit, quæ ſcriptis mandaret ac poſteris relinqueret. - - - *But Tacitus ought to be the more acceptable to you on this account, becauſe he himſelf formerly obtained the government of this your kingdom of* ‘ *France, which of all others is a country the moſt impatient of a ruler; and becauſe it is very probable that* ‘ *in this very place he ſtudied and became maſter of thoſe* ‘ *ſubjects, which he has left explained in his writings* ‘ *for poſterity.*’

[*L*] *It is an idle fancy to pretend, that Domitian baniſhed him.*] There are ſome who are not content with aſſerting this, but even compute the duration of this exile; they make it amount to ten years, and then conclude it by the efficacy of an interceſſion that wrought upon Domitian. This exile in general is not founded on any proof; and as to the duration of it, it is invincibly refuted by the words of Tacitus, mentioned above in the remark [*B*]. They are thoſe wherein he tells us, that he exerciſed the Prætorſhip at Rome, when Domitian celebrated the ſecular games. They were celebrated in the ſeventh year of Domitian's reign, and after that time this Prince lived not quite eight years (92). We are beholden to Lipſius for having obſerved, that this miſtake owes its riſe to a vulgar cuſtom, which makes people fond of repreſenting illuſtrious men under remarkable misfortunes. This error might alſo proceed from a wrong method of reaſoning. It was concluded, that ſince Domitian ſet himſelf up as a perſecutor of good men, he did not ſpare Tacitus, who was a man of honour, and in great reputation. Theſe conſequences are too vulgar, and authors ought not to draw them. ‘ Exſulaſſe ſub ‘ Domitiano quidam tradiderunt, magis tamen ut opinor, pro more vulgi, qui magnis viris inſignes caſus adfingere amat, quàm quod ejus rei certus auctor ‘ ſit. Ego legendo non aliud comperio, quàm abfuiſſe ‘ eum aliquot annis ab urbe, idque eo ipſo tempore ‘ quo Julius Agricola ſocer ejus mortem obierit coss. ‘ Pompejo Conlega, & Cor. Priſco, non tam exſilii neceſſitate, ut arbitror, quàm tædio temporum & cupidine otii. Nam quod iidem, ut omni ex parte ‘ tam anxia diligentia conſtet, decennium in exſilio ‘ egiſſe ſcribunt, ac demum exorato Domitiano reſtitutum, Latinè ut loquar, inanis fabula eſt (93). - - - ‘ *Some have ſaid he was baniſhed by Domitian, but* ‘ *more, in my opinion, in compliance with the vulgar* ‘ *notion, which loves to aſcribe eminent misfortunes to* ‘ *eminent men, than out of any juſt authority for it. I* ‘ *could never in all my reading diſcover any thing further, than that he was abſent for ſome years from* ‘ *Rome, and that this happened at the time of Julius* ‘ *Agricola his father-in-law's death, in the conſulſhip of* ‘ *Pompeius Conlega, and Cor. Priſcus, not ſo much, I* ‘ *think, becauſe he was forced to it, as from a diſlike of* ‘ *the times, and a deſire of eaſe. For what the ſame* ‘ *authors, are ſo buſy to ſay, that his baniſhment continued* ‘ *ten years, and that at laſt he was pardoned by the favour of Domitian, is, to ſpeak plainly, an idle tale.*’ I obſerve alſo, that, though this Hiſtorian (94) has deſcribed the tyranny of Domitian in the ſtrongeſt colours, yet he has not in the leaſt inſinuated, that the ſtorm fell upon him perſonally. On the contrary, he acknowledges, that he had ſome obligations to that Prince; and is afraid that he ſhould be ſuſpected of ſuppreſſing the truth by way of gratitude (95). A man who had been baniſhed, would hardly have expreſſed himſelf after this manner.

[*M*] *And it is perhaps another, to ſay that he lived eighty years.*] The teſtimony I am going to cite is of no great weight. ‘ Vixit annos 80 ut legitur in lib. ‘ 3. Theſ. Hiſtor. (96). - - - *He lived* 80 *years, as we* ‘ *read in Theſ. Hiſtor. B.* 3.’

(83) See Tillemont, note 3, on the Hiſtory of Titus, *pag. m.* 853, 854.

(84) See ibid. note 4, *pag.* 855.

(85) Note, that Pliny, *lib. x, cap. xliii, p. m.* 435, ſhews that he began this work before the death of Agrippina.

(86) See the *Notæ & Emendationes* of Father Hardouin, on the ſeventh book of Pliny, *num.* 65, *pag.* 119.

(87) In his Commentary on thoſe words of Pliny, *pag.* 37.

(88) This would make me doubt, whether he was the father of the Hiſtorian.

(89) Tillemont, ubi ſupra, *Tom. ii, Part. i, pag.* 348.

† Rationatoris honore uſurus ſecundùm.

⸸ It appears, that this child died, aged three years, without ſtrength or ſenſe. Pliny had ſeen him a long time before, *pridem*. And ſo Tacitus his father, who had ſome children, before the year 77, in which Pliny wrote, is not the Hiſtorian, as Voſſius thinks *de Hiſt. Lat. lib. i, cap. xxx, pag.* 158.

(90) In the Life of Tacitus. But he judged better of the thing in his Commentary, *in lib. i, Hiſt. init.* See, above, citation (40).

(91) Balth. Bonifacius, de Scriptoribus Hiſtoriæ Romanæ.

(92) *See* Lipſius, in Vita Taciti.

(93) Lipſius, *ibid.*

(94) In Vita Agricolæ, *cap. ii, pag.* 44, 45.

(95) See the beginning of book I, of his Hiſtory.

(96) Canonherius, in Vita Corn. Taciti, *in limine*. Diſcurſuum Politicorum.

TAISNIER (John) in Latin *Taiſnerius*, was of Ath in Hainault (*a*). He was preceptor to the pages of Charles V, and followed this emperor in his expedition to Tunis. He read ſome Mathematical lectures at Rome and Ferrara; and after he had travelled a long time, he devoted himſelf entirely to the writing of books (*b*); but making choice of a ſubject very unworthy of a man of judgment, he loſt all his reputation (*c*). He betook himſelf to Chiromancy; and though he had gained the credit of being very ſucceſsful in it, nevertheleſs by the great bulk of his book [*A*], he tired thoſe who were deſirous to benefit themſelves by his inſtructions. Many perſons were ſo ſimple as to ſend him the picture of their hands, on purpoſe that he might tell them their fortunes (*d*). Conſult Moreri's Dictionary and Bullart's *Academie*. They ſpeak at large of our Taiſnerius; but whether with that order and exactneſs that is neceſſary, is what I ſhall examine another time. There is nothing to be found in them, concerning his being a Plagiary [*B*], of which he has been accuſed.

[*A*] *He nevertheleſs tired by the great bulk of his book.*] Conſult Jacobus Philippus Tomaſinus; there you will find theſe words: ‘Uno volumine quæcunque Chiromantiam attingerent complexus eſt. At creſcente illo in vaſtam molem factum eſt ut ſtudentium animos defatigarit quos ſibi propoſuerat erudiendos (1). - - - *He comprized in one volume every thing relating to Chiromancy. But this ſwelling to a prodigious ſize, wearied out the patience of the perſons for whoſe inſtruction he had compiled it.*’ If you would know the credit this man acquired by his Chiromantic Quackery, read this paſſage of the ſame author. ‘Divinandi munere ex manuum lineis temperamenti ſigna, & animi characteres varios colligebat, &, ſpretis geniturarum laborioſis ſupputationibus, ignaras curioſorum mentes, rerum ſuarum ſciſcitantes eventus, vaticiniis circumducebat. Jamque Viri quoque graviſſimi fide prædictionibus illius haberi cœptâ, ei typos manuum ſuarum lineis effigiatarum undiquè demandabant, & ab ejuſdem ore, ut de privatis rebus ſtatuerent, pendebant (2). - - - *By his art of Divination, he found out the ſeveral temperaments, and diſpoſitions of the mind, from the lines on the hand, and deſpiſing the tedious method of calculating nativities, he drew after him by his predictions, the ignorant minds of ſuch as were curious to know their fortunes. And now even the moſt ſerious perſons alſo, from the credit his art had obtained, ſent him from all parts the figures of their hands, with the lines marked upon them, and depended, for the conduct of their private affairs, on what he ſhould pronounce.*’

[*B*] *Concerning his being a Plagiary, of which he has been accuſed.*] It is pretended that he did not content himſelf to ſteal ſome thoughts, but that he appropriated to himſelf entire books, which others had publiſhed. Gabriel Naudæus reproaches him with this, with reſpect to a book of Bartholomew Cocles, concerning Phyſiognomy; and with reſpect to a book of Peter Peregrinus, concerning the loadſtone. He defames him, as he deſerves, for thoſe thieveries committed with ſuch aſſurance. This was not committing petty-larceny, or acting the part of a pick-pocket in the Republic of Letters; but that of a notorious highwayman, or of a corſair of Barbary: this caſe deſerved immediate puniſhment on Parnaſſus. Let us ſee after what manner Gabriel Naudæus exerciſes juſtice. ‘Inter recentiores qui artem ejuſmodi (*criſim Phyſiognomicam*) ſcriptis explicarunt, potiores ſemper habe Auguſtinum Niphum, & Camillum Baldum, eruditiſſimos Ariſtotelis commentatores: Bartholomæumque Coclitem Bononienſem cujus integrum librum convaſavit, ac in ſuum opus mathematicum tranſtulit, Joannes Taiſnerus, plagiarius inſignis, & imprudentior longe Horatii Corniculâ, cum præterea tractatum etiam de Magnete, à Petro Peregrino Gallo quondam editum, furto vendicarit. Quod equidem velut per tranſennam obſervandum eſſe duxi, ut ſuus bene de Republica literaria meritis honos aſſeratur, & ipſe Taiſnerus,

Regali conſpectus in auro nuper & oſtro,
Migret in obſcuras furaci mente tabernas (3).

- - - *Among the moderns who have wrote upon this Art (judicial Phyſiognomy) you ought to eſteem Auguſtinus Niphus; and Camillus Baldus the chief, thoſe moſt learned Commentators on Ariſtotle: as alſo Bartholomæus Cocles of Bononia, whoſe whole book was pyrated, by Johannes Taiſnerus, that notorious Plagiary, far more ridiculous than Horace's crow; having beſides this ſtolen a whole treatiſe concerning the loadſtone, written by Petrus Peregrinus, a Frenchman. Which is indeed an obſervation I thought proper to make by the way, that thoſe who have juſtly merited of the Republic of Learning may have their due honours vindicated, and that even Taiſnerus himſelf,*

Who lately ſuch a noble figure made,
With ſtolen robes, may ſeek his native ſhade.

Thomaſius was not ignorant of this public accuſation, againſt Taiſnerius; he has mentioned it in his liſt of Plagiaries (4): but he did not know, nor perhaps Naudæus neither, that in the year 1574, an Italian Mathematician, publiſhed ſevere reflexions, and a terrible invective againſt the ſame Plagiary. All that he has ſaid about it deſerves to be repeated in this place. It will furniſh us both with ſome univerſal inſtructions, relating to theſe thieves, and ſome particulars concerning the perſon we are ſpeaking of. Beſides, the book from which I have taken all this is very ſcarce. ‘Si hos non laudamus qui aliquid ab aliis ſunt mutuati, quid de manifeſtis furibus dicemus, qui vel ipſa integra aliorum volumina ſibi imprudentes adſcribunt, & quaſi ſteriles ac ſceleſti plagiarii, viventium filiorum (eſt enim haud dubiè legitima proles quicquid fecundum ingenium longo ſtudio concepit, & peperit) miſerandas infligunt piis parentibus orbitates, & ſe, ſumma cum jactantia, eorum operum authores mentiuntur, quæ magna cum infamia rapuerunt, ut fecit impuriſſimus omnium Joannes Taiſnerus Hannonius. Qui opuſculum noſtrum, demonſtrationis proportionum motuum localium contra Ariſtotelem, & alios philoſophos, jamdiu antea à nobis editum, & iterum impreſſum Venetiis anno ſalutis 1554, ita integrum ſibi deſumpſit, ut nihil præter authoris nomen immutaverit, quid enim mutaviſſet, qui nec percipere poterat, quæ in ea diſputatione continerentur? Homo vanus ab omni mathematica facultate alienus, qui meritò propter craſſiſſimam ignorantiam verebatur, ne vel aliqua Syllaba ſublata, aut addita totius tractationis inficeretur ſubſtantia. Credidit (ut opinor) me jam vita functum qui furti nunquam argui poſſe confidit, & non intellexit ſuam temeritatem, qui ſeipſum mille argumentis qualis eſſet prodidit; dum utre inflato inanior ſeſe juris doctorem, & ſimul etiam muſici ſacelli rectorem aſſeruit, quaſi jura docere ſit muſici, aut juriſperiti ſacellum regere, & dum de magnete, & motibus, tractatus emiſit, nuſquam in titulis ſe mathematicum nominavit, ſed poëtam, eo quod crediderit poëtæ, aut muſici, aut juriſperiti, eſſe de naturalibus motibus corporum diſſerere. Debebat ſaltem & in hoc mentiri infamis impoſtor, ut ſe mathematicum in titulis prædicaret, ut in præfatione ad lectorem ejuſdem uſurpati opuſculi fecit, dum ſe matheſeos publice legiſſe Ferrariæ, & alibi, trecentis, & pluribus auditoribus prædicat, cujus numeri auditorum ne ſextam quidem partem, quiſpiam vidit in Italia, in auditorio cujuſvis (etiam primi nominis) mathematici: quis inquam hos infames laudaverit in Flaviam legem committentes? ac non potius juxta Conſtantini Cæſaris ſententiam, ad Celſum Aphricæ Vicarium reſcribentis, beſtiis ſubjiciendos cenſeat (5). - - - *If thoſe who borrow from others are not to be commended for it, what ſhall we ſay of direct thieves, who either ridiculouſly aſſume to themſelves the whole works of others, and like barren and wicked Plagiaries, baſely rob the true parents of their living offſpring, (for whatſoever the ingenious mind has by long ſtudy conceived and brought forth, may undoubtedly be eſteemed a legitimate offſpring) and falſely ſet up themſelves with great*

(*a*) Valer. Andreas Deſſelius, Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 570.

(*b*) Jacobus Philippus Tomaſinus, Elog. Virorum illuſtrium, *pag.* 161, 162, *Edit. Patav.* 1630.

(*c*) Bullart, Acad. des Sciences, *Tom. ii, pag.* 288, 289.

(*d*) See the remark [*A*].

(1) Jacob. Philippus Tomaſinus, Elog. *pag.* 162.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 161.

(3) Gabriel Naudæus, Bibliographia Politica, *pag. m.* 62, 63.

(4) Thomaſius, de Plagio Literario, *pag. m.* 246.

(5) Jo. Baptiſta Benedictus, Patricius Venetus, Philoſophus, *in Præfatione Libri* de Gnomonum Umbrarumque ſolarium uſu. *This book was printed at Turin, ann.* 1574, *in folio. Voſſius ſays nothing of this author in his* de Scientiis Mathematicis. *He has been miſtaken for two perſons in the Oxford Catalogue: there he is ſpoken of firſt under the name of* Joh. Baptiſta de Benedictis, *and afterwards under that of* Joh. Baptiſta Benedictus.

‘*arrogance to be the authors of theſe works, which they have moſt infamouſly ſtolen, as was done by Johannes Taiſnerius of the country of Hainault the moſt impudent of them all. He claimed to himſelf a work of mine, containing a demonſtration of the proportions of local motions, againſt Ariſtotle and other Philoſophers, which I had long ſince publiſhed, and a ſecond edition of which was printed at Venice in the year* 1554, *and that ſo entirely, as to change no part of it, but juſt the name of the author; for what could he change, who did not ſo much as underſtand one word of that controverſy? A vain wretch, ſo throughly unacquainted in Mathematics, that he very juſtly apprehended from his groſs ignorance that the taking away or adding the leaſt ſyllable, would deſtroy the ſubſtance of the whole diſcourſe. He believed, I ſuppoſe, that I was dead, and took it for granted, that no body could convict him of the Plagiariſm, not being aware of his own raſhneſs, which betrayed him in a thouſand inſtances; while, more vainly puffed up than a blown bladder, he affirms himſelf to be a Doctor of Law, and at the ſame time alſo, a Maſter of Muſic in a Chapel, as if it were the buſineſs of a Muſician to teach law, or of a Lawyer to regulate the choir of a chapel; and while he publiſhed diſcourſes on the loadſtone, and motion, he no where in the title page calls himſelf a Mathematician, but a Poet, as believing it to belong to a Poet, or Muſician, or Lawyer, to treat of the natural motions of bodies. This infamous impoſtor ought at leaſt to have framed a lie on the title page by calling himſelf Mathematician, as he has done in his preface to the reader before that pyrated work, where he pretends to have read Mathematic Lectures at Ferrara, and elſewhere to three hundred and more auditors, the ſixth part of which number was never known in Italy to attend the audience of any Mathematician even of the greateſt name. Who, I ſay, would commend theſe notorious offenders againſt the Flavian Law? And not rather rank them below brutes, according to the judgment of the Emperor Conſtantine, writing to Celſus his Lieutenant in Africa.*’

TAKIDDIN, a Mahometan author. I ſhall mention but one thing relating to him; which is, that he ſaid, the Caliph Almamon would be infallibly puniſhed by GOD, for having diſturbed the devotion of the Muſſulmans, by the introduction of Philoſophical ſtudies (*a*). This thought has nothing ſingular in it. It has appeared in all the countries of the world and in all ages; and at this very day we find an infinite number of people complaining of Des Cartes, and other modern Philoſophers of the firſt rank, as having occaſioned the contempt which ſo many perſons expreſs for devotion, and the myſteries of Chriſtianity. This might afford matter for a large commentary [*A*].

(*a*) Fieri non poſſe quin Deus certas de Almamone pœnas ſumeret, quod ſcientiis philoſophicis introductis Mohammedanorum pietatem interpellaverit. *Sephadius, in Commentariis ad Tograi Poëma*, apud Pocockium, *Notis in Specimen Hiſtor. Arabum, pag.* 166.

[*A*] *This might afford matter for a large commentary.*] A thouſand things might be ſaid upon this ſubject, both as to the fact itſelf, and the reaſon for it. However I ſhall be ſhort, for I have already more copy than I want to make an end of this volume. As to the matter of fact, I ſhall be content with ſaying, that Philoſophers have been at all times ſuſpected of having but little religion. The antient Rhetoricians after having ſaid, that among probable propoſitions, ſome were grounded upon what generally happens, and others upon the common opinion, alledged immediately theſe two examples: Mothers love their children: Philoſophers do not believe the exiſtence of the gods. ‘Probabile eſt id quod ferè fieri ſolet, aut quod in opinione poſitum eſt. . . . . In eo genere, quod fere ſolet fieri, probabile hujuſmodi eſt: SI MATER eſt, diligit filium: SI AVARUS eſt, negligit juſjurandum. In eo autem, quod in opinione poſitum eſt, hujuſmodi ſunt probabilia: Impiis apud inferos pœnas eſſe præparatas: Eos, qui philoſophiæ dent operam, non arbitrari deos eſſe (1). - - - *That is probable which is confirmed by general experience, or which is commonly believed. Among the firſt ſort from general experience, are theſe examples following; A MOTHER loves her child; A MISER never regards an oath. Among the latter from common belief, are theſe: infernal puniſhments are prepared for the wicked; Philoſophers do not believe there are any gods.*’ Apuleius obſerves, that almoſt all the antient Philoſophers were accuſed either of denying the exiſtence of the gods, or of applying themſelves to Magic. ‘Hæc fermè communi quodam errore imperitorum philoſophis objectantur: ut partim eorum, qui corporum cauſas meras & ſimpliceis rimantur, irreligioſos putent, eoſque aiant Deos abnuere; ut Anaxagoram, & Leucippum, & Democritum, & Epicurum, cæteroſque rerum naturæ patronos: partim autem, qui providentiam mundi curioſiùs veſtigant, & impenſiùs Deos celebrant, eos verò vulgò Magos nominent: quaſi facere etiam ſciant, quæ ſciant fieri: ut olim fuere Epimenides, & Orpheus, & Pythagoras, & Oſthanes (2). - - - *Theſe things are generally by the ignorant vulgar, objected againſt the Philoſophers; that one part of them who are for enquiring into the firſt and ſimple cauſes of bodies are irreligious, and deny the being of the gods; as Anaxagoras, Leucippus, Democritus, Epicurus, and other patrons of nature: that the others who ſearch more curiouſly into the conduct of providence in the world, and worſhip the gods with greateſt zeal, are commonly ſtiled Magicians; as if they themſelves had found out how to do thoſe things, which they find to be done; as formerly Epimenides, Orpheus, Pythagoras, and Oſthanes.*’ Our Takiddin would not have delivered over to divine juſtice the great Almamon, that protector of learning, who introduced the ſtudy of Philoſophy, had he not obſerved the ill effect of that ſtudy. It had raiſed doubts in the minds of men; it had diſcovered to a great many people the fooleries of the Mahometan ſect: and by that means the public worſhip, piety, and devotion, had laboured under a ſurprizing diſcouragement. Some learned men maintain, that the Arabian Philoſophers profeſſed only Mahometiſm outwardly, and laughed at the Alcoran in reality, becauſe they found in it ſome things contrary to reaſon (3). A great many people are not to be beat out of the notion, that Des Cartes and Gaſſendus believed the real preſence in the Euchariſt, as little as the fabulous ſtories of old Greece. It is no leſs difficult to perſuade the world, that the followers of thoſe two great Philoſophers are good Catholics; and that, if they were allowed to teach publickly their principles, they would not quickly undermine all the foundations of the Romiſh religion. The Proteſtants have not a better opinion of Des Cartes's doctrine. Generally ſpeaking, the Carteſians are ſuſpected of irreligion, and their Philoſophy is thought to be very dangerous to Chriſtianity: ſo that, according to the opinion of a great many, the ſame perſons, who have removed in our age the darkneſs which the ſchoolmen had ſpread all over Europe, have increaſed the number of freethinkers, and made way for Atheiſm, or Scepticiſm, or the diſbelief of the greateſt myſteries of Chriſtianity. But irreligion is not only aſcribed to the ſtudy of Philoſophy, but alſo to Philology; for it is pretended, that Atheiſm never began to diſcover itſelf in France till the reign of Francis I, and that the firſt appearance of it in Italy, was when Philological learning was revived there. *The leſs foreign learning we have*, ſays a Catholic writer, *the greater ſubmiſſion we expreſs for the Chriſtian Faith; and the moſt learned ages, ſays Baronius, have often proved the moſt unbelieving. The Aladiniſts appeared only under the reign of Almanſor, who was the moſt learned monarch of his age; and I find no Atheiſts in France before the reign of Francis I, nor in Italy till after the taking of Conſtantinople, when Argyropilus, Theodorus Gaza, Georgius Trebizontius, with the moſt celebrated men of Greece, retired to the Dukes of Florence* (4). It is certain, that moſt of the wits and learned Philologers, who ſhined in Italy, when the *Belles Lettres* began to revive there, after the taking of Conſtantinople, had but little religion. But, on the other hand, the reſtoration of the learned languages, and polite literature, made way for the Reformation; as the Monks, and their adherents clearly foreſaw, who continually inveighed againſt Reuchlin, Eraſmus, and the other ſcourges of ignorance. Thus whilſt the Roman Catholics deplore the fatal conſequences of the ſtudy of good literature, the Proteſtants have

(1) Cicero, de Inventione, *lib. i, fol. m.* 29.

(2) Apuleius, in Apologia, *pag.* 291.

(3) Toſtatus, *in cap. xxiii.* Ex. *Quæſt. XX*, refert quod Philoſophi inter Saracenos non recipiant propter hoc Alcoranum. Idem probat Calixtus *in Diſp. de Verit. Religion. Chriſt.* ex Averroë, diſputante contra deſtructiones Algazelis, & Avicenna, *Metaph. lib. ix, cap. vii.* Annotata ad Religionem Medici, *lib. i*, §. *xxii, pag. m.* 146, in hæc verba, *Cum Philoſophia pugnantibus.*

(4) Clavigny de Sainte Honorine, Diſcernement & Uſage des Livres ſuſpects, *pag.* 82. *Note, that I do not alledge what he ſays as matter of fact.*

have all the reaſon in the world to praiſe GOD for it (5). They are not ſo much beholden to the new Philoſophy, which demonſtratively overthrows Tranſubſtantiation, and all its dependencies; becauſe the ſame weapons are made uſe of againſt the moſt eſſential doctrines. In a word, ſo unhappy is the fate of man, that the knowledge which frees him from one evil, throws him into another. Drive away ignorance and barbarity, and you put an end to ſuperſtition, and the fooliſh credulity of the people, ſo profitable to their leaders, who afterwards employ their gain only to plunge themſelves into idleneſs and debauchery: but by putting men in a capacity of diſcovering ſuch diſorders, you raiſe in them a deſire of examining every thing; and at laſt they are ſo much for enquiring and ſcanning, that they find nothing that will ſatisfy their miſerable reaſon.

However it be, I have heard ſome wiſe men ſay, that the too common affectation of charging the Philoſophers with impiety, is very imprudent: for how great a ſcandal would it be for ignorant people, if they took the pains to conſider it with due attention, to find that, according to the opinion of a great many Divines, there is but little religion among great Philoſophers; that devotion is chiefly to be found among the vulgar; and *that thoſe who have moſt carefully examined the marks of the divine authority of the holy ſcripture, are commonly leſs pious and devout than others* (6). It were much more edifying to teach, with Plutarch (7), that Philoſophy is a remedy for impiety and ſuperſtition; and, with Origen, that no man can be truly pious without Philoſophy. *Omnino nec pium erga communem omnium Dominum eſſe abſque Philoſophia quemquam cenſebat* (8). The mixture of good and evil, that is to be found in all human things, appears on this occaſion in a particular manner. The Arabian Philoſophers came to know, by their Philoſophy, that the Alcoran was a falſe Revelation; but on the contrary many Jews forſook their religion, and embraced the Pagan Philoſophy, which diſcovered to them, as they pretended, that Moſes had preſcribed them needleſs laws. ‘Multis è Judæorum gente adeo perſuaſa ‘eſt olim hæc opinio, quòd, ſub initia regni Saracenici ad Philoſophiam Ethnicam defectionem fecerint, quòd iis leges haud paucæ inutiles & ſupervacaneæ viderentur (9). - - - *This opinion was formerly ‘ſo ſtrongly maintained by a great many Jews, that about ‘the beginning of the Saracen empire, they were drawn ‘over to the Pagan Philoſophy, by their looking upon ſeveral parts of the law as uſeleſs and ſuperfluous.*’ Thus the ſame principle, which is ſometimes ſerviceable againſt error, is ſometimes prejudicial to truth.

(5) *See Mr Jurieu's Reflexions*, Apologie pour les Réformat. *pag.* 66, *& ſeq. of the firſt volume in* 4*to. upon what Maimbourg had ſaid*, Hiſt. du Calvin. *pag.* 4, *that the* courſe *taken by Francis I*, to revive learning in his kingdom . . . proved, by a miſfortune he did not foreſee, an occaſion of bringing in hereſy into his kingdom.

(6) Jurieu, *apud* Saurin, Examen de la Théolog. *pag.* 98. *See Mr Saurin's Reflexions upon this*, ibid.

(7) *See* Plutarch, de Iſide & Oſiride, *pag.* 378.

(8) St Cyran quotes that paſſage of St Gregory of *Neocæſárea, in Panegyr.* in his work againſt Father Garaſſe's *Somme Théologique*, Tom. ii, pag. 33, & 70.

(9) Joan. Spencerus, de Legibus Hebræorum, *lib.* ii, *cap. iii*, §. *i*, *ſub fin. pag.* 225, *Edit. Hag.* 1686. *He confirms this by the teſtimony of Gulielmus Pariſienſis*, Lib. de Legibus, *p.* 3, 4.

TALAUS, King of Argos, ſon of Abas or Bias, and grand-ſon of Lynceus one of the fifty ſons-in-law of Danaus, loſt his crown and his life by the plots of Amphiaraus (*a*). His ſon Adraſtus was forced to fly to Sicyon, where ſome ſay he married the daughter of King Polybius, and ſucceeded him. But others will have it, that he ſucceeded him, becauſe his mother was the only daughter of Polybius. See the article of ADRASTUS. Some tell us, that he, whom Amphiaraus dethroned and put to death, was Pronax the ſon of Talaus. See the ſcholiaſt upon the ninth Nemean Ode of Pindar, wherein we are told upon what the pretenſions of Amphiaraus were grounded: namely that Melampus having cured the daughters of Prœtus King of Argos, who were grown mad, received, as a reward, one half of the kingdom of Argos, which he divided between him and his brother Bias. But Melampus left behind him a ſon called Antiphates, who was Oïcles's father, and Amphiaraus's grand-father.

(*a*) Schol. Pindari. in Od. VIII Pyth. & IX Nem.

TAMIRAS, was ſent for from Cilicia into the iſle of Cyprus, to teach the art of the Haruſpices or of divining by looking into the entrails of the ſacrifices. The temple of Venus at Paphos was conſecrated by Cinyras; and it was ſaid, that this goddeſs, conceived and born in the ſea, had landed in that place; but application was made to this inhabitant of Cilicia for the eſtabliſhment I have been mentioning. Things had been ſo ordered, that the deſcendants of Cinyras and Tamiras were to preſide over the ceremonies; but, that the royal family might have ſome pre-eminence, the family of Tamiras quickly reſigned their ſhare to them [*A*]; ſo that from thence no other prieſt was conſulted, but of the family of Cinyras (*a*).

[*A*] *The family of Tamiras quickly reſigned their ſhare*.] Nevertheleſs, Heſychius mentions certain Prieſts of the iſle of Cyprus, called Ταμιράδαι, *Tamiradæ*. This Orthography in Heſychius's manuſcripts gave Meurſius a juſt occaſion to obſerve, that the word *Thamyras* in Tacitus, ought to be read *Tamiras* (1).

(*a*) *Ex* Tacito, Hiſt. *lib. ii*, *cap. iii*.

(1) Meurſius, in Cypro, *pag.* 50.

TANAQUIL, the wife of Tarquinius Priſcus King of Rome, was born at Tarquinii in Tuſcany. Where ſhe was married to Lucumon, the ſon of a perſon who fled thither, being expelled from Corinth his native place. Lucumon inheriting his father's whole eſtate, became a very rich man; and the family of Tanaquil being one of the nobleſt in the town, he hoped to raiſe himſelf to ſome dignities; but being a ſon of a foreigner, he met with great obſtacles (*a*). Tanaquil, being provoked by the ſlight put upon her huſband, and being unwilling to loſe the rank ſhe was born to reſolved to leave Tarquinii, in hopes of advancing herſelf in ſome other place (*b*). She therefore repreſented to her huſband that their beſt way was to go and ſettle at Rome, where men of merit, of whatſoever country they were, might hope for the nobleſt preferments. Lucumon followed her advice, and had preſage of his great fortune before he got to Rome. That preſage was explained to him by his wife [*A*], for ſhe had great ſkill that way. He took the name of Tarquinius. He gained the eſteem and affection of the

[*A*] *That preſage was explained to him by his wife.*] When they came to the Janiculum, an eagle lighted gently upon their chariot, and took off Lucumon's hat, and after having ſome time hovered over their chariot, with a great outcry, reſtored the hat very orderly to the ſame place. Tanaquil, ſitting by her huſband, embraced him, and aſſured him of very great fortune, explaining to him the circumſtances of that preſage. Upon this they entered Rome, full of high expectations. *Ad Janiculum forte ventum erat: ibi ei carpento ſedenti cum uxore, aquila ſuſpenſis demiſſa leniter alis pileum aufert: ſuperque carpentum cum magno clangore volitans, rurſus velut miniſterio divinitus miſſa, capiti apte reponit: inde ſublimis abiit. Accepiſſe id augurium læta dicitur Tanaquil; perita, ut vulgo Etruſci, cæleſtium prodigiorum mulier. Excelſa & alta ſperare complexa*

(*a*) *Taken from* Livy, *lib. i*, *pag. m.* 23.

(*b*) Cum divitiæ jam animos facerent, auxit ducta in matrimonium Tanaquil, ſummo loco nata, & quæ haud facile iis, in quibus nata erat, humiliora ſineret ea, quæ innupſiſſet. Spernentibus Etruſcis Lucumonem exule advena ortum, ferre indignitatem non potuit, oblitaque ingenitæ erga patriam caritatis, dummodo virum honoratum videret, conſilium migrandi ab Tarquiniis cepit. *Livius, ibid.*

the Romans; and inſinuated himſelf into the king's favour in ſuch a manner, that the offices he obtained from him enabled him to aſpire to the crown, and to ſucceed in his ambitious deſign. He was killed in his palace in the thirty-eighth year of his reign. Tanaquil was not diſcouraged by this ſevere blow; ſhe managed things ſo dexterouſly, that ſhe ſettled the crown upon Servius Tullius her ſon-in-law, whoſe good fortune ſhe had foretold [*B*] long before (*c*). Her memory was in veneration at Rome for ſeveral ages: her handyworks were preſerved there [*C*], and great virtues were aſcribed to her girdle

complexa virum jubet: eam alitem ea regione cæli & ejus Dei nunciam veniſſe: circa ſummum culmen hominis auſpicium feciſſe: levaſſe humano ſuperpoſitum capiti decus, ut divinitus eidem redderet. Has ſpes cogitationeſque ſecum portantes, urbem ingreſſi ſunt (1).

[*B*] *She had foretold the good fortune* of Servius Tullius.] He was born and educated in the palace of King Tarquin. One day a fire was ſeen about his head whilſt he ſlept: the great noiſe that was made at the ſight of this prodigy, obliged that Prince to go and ſee what was the matter. Some body had a mind to throw water upon the fire, but Tanaquil prevented it, and ordered that the child ſhould not be diſturbed, till he awaked of himſelf. He awaked ſoon after, and the fire was no more ſeen. Then the Queen took her huſband aſide, and told him that this child would one day ſupport the royal family in their adverſity, and that he ought to be bred up as a perſon of high expectation. This advice was followed, great care was taken of the education of that child, who became ſo accompliſhed that none was thought more worthy of being the King's ſon-in-law. He ſucceeded Tarquin accordingly (2). Some believe, that his mother was the wife of Servius Tullius, who was killed in defending his principality of Corniculum (3). They add, that this woman was with child, and that being known among the other women-ſlaves, regard was had to her quality. Tanaquil ſet her at liberty, and received her into her palace, where ſhe was delivered of a boy. This is likely enough, but not wonderful enough for all ſorts of Hiſtorians: for which reaſon ſome pretended that the birth of a King of Rome, of ſuch a mean extraction, was to have ſomething more myſterious in it. Therefore they ſuppoſed, that Ocriſia, widow of the Prince of Corniculum, was for ſome time a ſlave in Tanaquil's palace before ſhe was made free; and that while ſhe was a ſlave ſhe perceived in the chimney the figure of a man's privy parts. She acquainted the King and Queen with it. When the King ſaw this prodigy he was amazed at it: the Queen, who was as well ſkilled in preſages as the beſt Augur in Hetruria (4), told her huſband, that it was decreed by fate, that a perſon of merit more than human, ſhould be born in the palace; and that the figure, which appeared in the chimney, was to be his father, and that the woman who ſhould have to do with that figure, would be his mother. Tarquin being informed by ſome men well ſkilled in ſuch things, that Tanaquil gave a right explication of that prodigy, reſolved to make the woman, who had ſeen that member firſt, to lye with it: ſhe was therefore dreſſed up like a bride, and brought into the chamber where that figure was. They left her alone, and ſhe was enjoyed by ſome Genius, whether it was Vulcan, or the houſhold god. That figure was never ſeen afterwards. Ocriſia was got with child, and brought to bed at the uſual time (5). The ſame thing almoſt has been ſaid of Romulus's mother (6). If there had not been Annaliſts at Rome a long time before Rhetoric was taught there, I ſhould be apt to think, that the declamations which the Sophiſts put their ſcholars upon, had been converted into hiſtorical relations; for it is very likely that the young Rhetoricians were allowed to feign whatever they had a mind to, in their Panegyrical eſſays. The deſign of thoſe fictions was to diſcover whether they had any invention, and whether they were able to turn and handle a common-place with dexterity. They were therefore not blamed for their ſuppoſing a divine, miraculous, and very ſurprizing origin. But this muſt have occaſioned great abuſes, if the moſt ingenious pieces of thoſe young men had been preſerved in the archives, and looked upon, ſome ages after, as hiſtorical relations. How do we know but that moſt of the antient fables owe their original to a cuſtom of making Panegyrics upon the ancient Heroes, on their feſtival days, and preſerving thoſe pieces that appeared to be the beſt. See what will be ſaid about Martyrologies, in the article VALERIUS.

[*C*] *Her handy-works were preſerved.*] Varro, contemporary with Cicero, affirms, that he had ſeen in Sangus's temple, Tanaquil's diſtaff and ſpindle, with the wool upon it which ſhe had been ſpinning; and that they kept in the temple of Fortune, a royal robe which ſhe wrought, and Servius Tullius wore. Pliny, who relates it, adds, that this was the reaſon why the maids, who married, were followed by a perſon, who carried a diſtaff and a ſpindle, with wool and yarn upon them. He alſo ſays that this queen was the firſt who wove that ſort of garment, which was given to young lads to wear, when they put on the *Toga Virilis*, and to maids when they married. Moreri has committed a groſs miſtake: he takes the *tirones* in Pliny to mean *new ſoldiers*, inſtead of underſtanding by that word the boys, who had lately left off the gown of childhood, the *prætexta*. Here follows the whole paſſage of Pliny (7). ‘Lanam in colo & fuſo Tanaquilis, quæ ‘eadem Caïa Cæcilia (8) vocata eſt, in templo Sangi ‘duraſſe, prodente ſe, auctor eſt M. Varro: factamque ab ea togam regiam undulatam in æde Fortunæ, ‘qua Ser. Tullius fuerat uſus. Inde factum, ut nubentes virgines comitaretur colus compta, & fuſus ‘cum ſtamine. Ea prima texuit rectam tunicam, ‘quales cum toga pura tirones induuntur, novæque ‘nuptæ. - - - - *We have M. Varro's authority, that ‘the diſtaff and ſpindle of Tanaquil, who was alſo ‘called Caïa Cæcilia, was remaining in the temple ‘of Sangus, where he himſelf met with them; and ‘that there was in the temple of Fortune a royal ‘robe made by her in a waving form, which Servius ‘Tullius had made uſe of. From whence it came that ‘virgins, in their matrimonial ceremony, were attended ‘with a diſtaff full of wool, and a ſpindle of yarn. She ‘firſt of all wove the ſtrait veſt, which the young lads ‘wear with the* toga virilis, *and brides on their wedding-day.*’ I do not know why Father Hardouin prefers Plutarch's opinion to that of Varro, and Verrius. ‘Verius Plutarchus in quæſt. Rom. pag. 271. ‘uxorem ait fuiſſe *(Caïam Cæciliam)* unius è Tarquinii liberis: eidemque in templo Sanci ſtatuam priſcis ‘temporibus poſitam cum ſandaliis & fuſo, quæ domi ‘actæ vitæ induſtriæque argumento eſſent (9). - - - *Plutarch with greater truth affirms, that Caïa Cæcilia ‘was the wife of one of Tarquin's ſons: and that a ſtatue ‘had been of old erected in honour to her in the temple of ‘Sancus, with ſandals and a ſpindle, which were emblems of her induſtrious and domeſtic life.*’ It is more reaſonable to think, that this Caïa Cæcilia, whoſe ſtatue in braſs, with ſandals and ſpindle, were to be ſeen in Sancus's temple, was the wife of the firſt Tarquin, than to think ſhe was the wife of one of Tarquin's ſons. I know Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus ſuppoſes (10) that the firſt Tarquin had a ſon, who was married, and was the father of the two ſons-in-law of Servius Tullius; but neither he, nor any other Hiſtorian ſays one word concerning the merit of the woman, who married that ſon of Tarquin. And yet ſhe muſt have been very illuſtrious, if the Romans paid her the honour mentioned by Plutarch. Was ſhe the wife of one of the laſt Tarquin's ſons? The Romans could never have had ſuch a veneration for the daughter-in-law of a tyrant, whom they had expelled with his whole family, and whoſe memory was always execrable to them? Was ſhe the firſt wife of Tarquinius Superbus? I know very well ſhe was a good woman (11), but her merit is not to be compared with that of Tanaquil. She never was queen at all, ſhe died young, and therefore had not the opportunities of ſhewing her excellencies, as Tanaquil had, who lived a long time on the throne. We may therefore ſay, that the monuments preſerved in Sancus's temple, belonged to that queen, and not to the wife of one of Tarquin's ſons, and boldly affirm that Feſtus and Pliny, or rather Verrius and Varro, have been more exact than Plutarch;

(*c*) Taken from Livy, *lib.* i, *pag. m.* 23.

(1) Titus Livius, *lib.* i, *cap.* xxxiv, *pag. m.* 23. *See alſo* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, *lib.* iii, *cap.* lxx, *where the thing is more particularly related than by Livy.*

(2) Taken from Livy, *ibid.*

(3) A town of Italy, which was beſieged, taken, ranſacked, and burnt by Tarquinius Priſcus. *Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib.* iii, *cap.* lxxiii.

(4) Τὴν δὲ Τανακυλίδα τάτε ἀλλὰ σοφὴν οὖσαν, καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ μαντικὰ οὐδενὸς χεῖρον Τυῤῥηνῶν ἐπισταμένην, εἰπεῖν πρὸς αὐτόν. Taniquilem, uxorem, & alioqui ſapientem, & divinandi ſcientia nulli Etruſcorum ſecundam, dixiſſe. *Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib.* iv, *circa init. pag.* 207.

(5) *See* Plutarch, in Vita Romuli, *pag.* 18.

(6) *Taken from* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, *lib.* iv, *init.*

(7) Plin. *lib.* viii, *cap.* xlviii, *pag. m.* 228, 229.

(8) Feſtus obſerves, that Tanaquil, being at Rome, took the name of Caïa Cæcilia. Her huſband, to comply with the cuſtom of the Romans, called himſelf Lucius Tarquinius, as Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus obſerves, *lib.* iii, *cap.* lxxi.

(9) Harduinus in Plinium, *ibid.*

(10) Lib. iv, cap. iv.

(11) *Idem*, Dionyſ. Halicarn. *ibid. cap.* xxxiii, *pag.* 823, *Edit. Lat. in* 8vo. 1615.

girdle [*D*]. St Jerom obſerves, that Tarquin was not ſo well known as his wife (*d*). He adds, that the admirable virtue of that queen is too ſtrongly impreſſed on the memory of all ages, ever to be forgotten. Yet it ſeems one might infer from ſome paſſages in antient authors, that ſhe was looked upon as a woman, who had been too imperious [*E*]. It is not true that ſhe was alive when Tarquinius Superbus put his brother to death, nor that ſhe was the mother of this Tarquin [*F*]. The Hiſtorian, who ſhews

Plutarch; this may be placed among the miſtakes of the latter, which are very numerous. Perhaps it will be objected to me, that thoſe ſandals, and that ſpindle, do not ſuit with a queen ſo intriguing as Tanaquil. The deſign of thoſe monuments was to honour the memory of a woman, who ſeldom went abroad, and kept cloſe to her diſtaff: but was this Tanaquil's character? I anſwer, that ſhe was indeed an able queen, and a ſtateſwoman, and that ſhe ſhewed a great deal of conduct and reſolution upon proper occaſions; but this was no hindrance to her applying herſelf to her diſtaff and her needle, for her ordinary employments.

[*D*] *Great virtues were aſcribed to her girdle.*] If I had ſaid that it was preſerved in order to work miracles I ſhould have expreſſed myſelf wrong; for the Romans had not recourſe to this girdle as to a Moral cauſe, but as to a Phyſical one. They ſuppoſed that Tanaquil had found out excellent remedies againſt diſtempers, and that ſhe had encloſed them in her girdle. And therefore thoſe who got ſome ſcrapings of it, believed they ſhould be cured by them, not becauſe the ſoul of that queen would reward their faith, but becauſe they had ſome particles of the remedies contained in that girdle. So that no exact parallel can be made between thoſe who had recourſe to Tanaquil's ſtatue, in order to rub her girdle,, and thoſe who endeavour to obtain a piece of St Hubert's ſtole, or to have their beads touched by ſome relic. There is a great deal of credulity on both ſides. I leave it thoſe, who have leiſure, to examine whether old Rome equalled the new in this reſpect; and to aſſiſt them a little in their enquiry, I ſhall relate the words of my author. ‘ Prædia Verrius vocari ait ea remedia quæ Caja Cæcilia uxor ‘ Tarquinii Priſci inveniſſe exiſtimatur, & immiſcuiſſe ‘ zonæ ſuæ qua præcincta ſtatua ejus eſt in æde Sancti ‘ qui Deus Dius Fidius vocatur, ex qua zona periclitantes ramenta ſumunt: ea vocari ait prædia quod ‘ mala prohibeant (12). - - - - *Verrius ſays, that thoſe* ‘ *remedies are called* prædia, *which Caïa Cæcilia, the* ‘ *wife of Tarquinius Priſcus, is ſuppoſed to have found* ‘ *out, and incorporated with her girdle, which is placed* ‘ *about her ſtatue in the temple of Sancus, who is a god,* ‘ *known by the name of* Dius Fidius; *from which girdle* ‘ *thoſe who are in any danger take ſome of the ſcrapings:* ‘ *he ſays they are called* prædia, *becauſe they prevent ill* ‘ *accidents.*’ What Pliny relates of Pelops's rib, is much more miraculous. It was ſhewn as a remedy, ‘ Elide ſolebat oſtendi Pelopis coſta quam eburneam ‘ affirmabant (13). - - - - *At Elis uſed to be ſhewn Pe-* ‘ *lops's rib, which they affirmed to be ivory.*’ Here is a relic which wrought miracles among the Heathens: for Pliny had been ſaying, that certain members of ſome people have the virtue of curing diſeaſes (14), he muſt therefore mean that this part of Pelops had that faculty. So that Charles Stephens is only to be blamed, for his making no diſtinction between what he infers from Pliny's words, and what Pliny himſelf ſays. Such a diſtinction ought never to be neglected: thoſe, who take no care to obſerve it, occaſion many authors to quote, as the words of an antient writer, what is but a paraphraſe, or a conſequence drawn by ſome Modern. Theſe are Charles Stephens's words (15): ‘ Ad quem quidem humerum ‘ (16) poſt ejuſdem Pelopis mortem varia morborum ‘ ſanabantur genera, & multiplicia edebantur miracula. ‘ Plin. libro decimo nono, capite tertio. - - - - *By* ‘ *which ſhoulder, after Pelops's death, various kinds of* ‘ *diſtempers were cured, and a great many miracles per-* ‘ *formed.*’ Lloyd and Hoffman have not rectified this paſſage in the leaſt, nor even the falſe citation contained in it.

A French author, who lived in the XVIth century, tells a ſtory which he would never have been able to prove. *The Tarquins*, ſays he (17), *cauſed a ſtatue to be erected in the middle of their palace, with only ſlippers on, a diſtaff and a ſpindle, that thoſe who ſhould ſucceed their family, might imitate their aſſiduous diligence, in minding domeſtic concerns, without ſtirring abroad.* Thus you ſee how the paſſage I have cited from Pliny, concerning Tanaquil's ſtatue, has been miſrepreſented. Every body takes upon him to alter ſome circumſtance in what he quotes: by this means matters of fact are corrupted, and ſoon perverted by thoſe who cite them.

[*E*] *She was looked upon as a woman who had been too imperious.*] This is what many perſons infer from theſe words of Juvenal:

Conſulit ictericæ lento de funere matris,
Ante tamen de te TANAQUIL tua .... (18).

Your Tanaquil would from the wizzard know
Her mother's fate, but firſt when you're to go.

And from theſe words of Auſonius:

.... Tanaquil tua neſciat iſtud.
Tu contemne alios .... (19).

If from your Tanaquil the tale you hide,
You're very ſafe from all the world beſide.

This ſeems to ſignify, that the wives, who took too much upon themſelves, were called Tanaquils. It is Scaliger's opinion. ‘ Uxorem ſanctiſſimam Paulini, ‘ cujus meminit Ambroſius Epiſt. XXXXVI vocat ‘ *Tanaquilem* Auſonius, ridens ſcilicet: quia ei erat ‘ addictus Paulinus. Et, ut ex eodem loco Ambroſii ‘ cognoſcimus, videtur ſecutus uxoris conſilium Paulinus in ſeceſſu Nolano. Quare vocat eam fœminam ‘ *Tanaquilem* poëta noſter: quia illis temporibus ita ‘ ſolerent uxores vocare, quæ imperabant maritis (20). ‘ - - - - *The pious wife of Paulinus, mentioned by Am-* ‘ *broſius, Epiſt. XXXXVI, is, by Auſonius, by way of* ‘ *banter, called* Tanaquil; *becauſe Paulinus was very* ‘ *obſequious to her. And from the ſame paſſage of Am-* ‘ *broſius we find, that Paulinus followed his wife's ad-* ‘ *vice in his retirement to Nola. This was the reaſon* ‘ *of our Poets calling his wife* Tanaquil; *becauſe that* ‘ *was the name commonly given in thoſe days to wives* ‘ *who governed their huſbands.*’ He confirms it by a paſſage in Sidonius Apollinaris, wherein Chilperic's wife, who had a great aſcendant over her huſband, is called Tanaquil; ſhe is alſo compared with Agrippina. ‘ Quod principaliter medetur afflictis, temperat Lucumonem noſtrum Tanaquil ſua, & aures mariti viroſa ‘ ſuſurronum fæce completas, opportunitate falſi ſermonis eruderat, cujus ſtudio factum ſcire vos par eſt, ‘ nihil interim quieti fratrum communium apud animum communis patroni juniorum Cybiratarum venena nocuiſſe, neque quicquam (Deo propitiante) nocitura; ſi modo, quandiu præſens poteſtas Lugdunenſem Germaniam regit, noſtrum ſuumque Germanicum præſens Agrippina moderetur (21). - - - *Her* ‘ *principal care was to relieve the afflicted, and our Lu-* ‘ *cumon was ſo far governed by his Tanaquil, that ſhe* ‘ *guarded his ear againſt the venomous inſinuations of* ‘ *whiſperers, by the ſharpneſs of her diſcourſe; nor is it* ‘ *amiſs for you to know that it was owing to her, that* ‘ *the malice of the junior Cybirates was hindred from do-* ‘ *ing the brotherhood of Fryers any ill, and by the favour* ‘ *of Heaven will always be hindred; ſo long as the pre-* ‘ *ſent French government ſhall ſee the preſent Agrippina* ‘ *continue her aſcendant over her and our Germanicus.*’ Here is a prince under his wife's direction; but becauſe ſuch a direction proved advantageous to his ſubjects, it is to Tanaquil's honour. It ought to be inferred from it, that if the firſt Tarquin was governed by his wife, it was no misfortune. Another Commentator upon Auſonius obſerves, that Paulinus was not well pleaſed to have his wife compared with a queen, ambitious, and addicted to Magic (22); he would have liked better to have had her compared with Lucretia (23).

[*F*] *It is not true that ſhe was living, when .... nor that ſhe was the mother of this Tarquin.*] The two daughters of Servius Tullius and of Tarquinia, the daughter

---

(*d*) Notior eſt marito ſuo Tanaquil, illum inter multa regum nomina jam abſcondit antiquitas, hanc rara inter fœminas virtus altius ſæculorum omnium memoriæ, quàm ut excidere poſſit, infixit. *Hieronym. adverſ. Jovinian.*

(12) Sextus Pompeius Feſtus, de verborum ſignificatione, *voce* Prædia.

(13) Plinius, *lib. xxviii, cap. iv, pag. m.* 568.

(14) Quorundam partes medicæ ſunt ſicuti diximus de Pyrrhi regis pollice.

(15) In Dictionario, *voce* Pelops.

(16) Pliny ſays *coſta*, and not *humerus*; But he is the only author, who mentions the ivory rib of Pelops. All the reſt ſpeak of the ſhoulder. Humeroque Pelops inſignis eburno. *And Pelops for his ivory ſhoulder fam'd.* Virgil. Georg. lib. iii, ver. 7.

(17) Franc. Tillier, of Touraine, *in his* Philogame, *p.* 120, *Paris* 1578.

(18) Juvenal. Sat. VI, ver. 563.

(19) Auſon. Epiſt. xxiii, ver. 31.

(20) Scalig. in Auſon. Epiſt. xxiii, *pag. m.* 678.

(21) Sidon. Apollinar. Epiſt. vii, *lib. v, pag. m.* 328.

(22) Moleſte tuliſſe videtur Paulinus in Epiſtola ad Auſonium prima & ſecunda: & Lucretiæ illi pudiciſſimæ matronæ comparari maluit, quam iſti *Tanaquili*, ambitioſæ mulieri, & ſagæ. *Vinetus in Auſonium, Epiſtola xxiii, pag.* 678.

(23) Nec Tanaquil mihi, ſed Lucretia conjux. - - - *Nor is my wife a Tanaquil, but a Lucretia,* ſays he in another place.

ſhews the falſity of it, has been more ſucceſsful in confuting his predeceſſors [G] than in avoiding

daughter of Tarquinius Priſcus and of Tanaquil, were married to Lucius Tarquinius, and Aruns Tarquinius. Thoſe two brothers were not like one another in any thing, any more than their two wives: one of them was an honeſt man, and the other a profligate: one of the Tullia's was an honeſt woman, and the other worthleſs. The latter was married to the honeſt man; and the other to the profligate. The wicked Tullia propoſed to the wicked Tarquin to marry her: ſhe promiſed him to make away with her huſband, and made him promiſe her to kill his wife: and before they parted, they committed inceſt. Ἀσμένως δέχεται τὰς αἱρήσεις ὁ Ταρκύνιος, καὶ αὐτίκα δοὺς αὐτῇ πίστεις, καὶ λαβὼν τὰ πρωτόλεια τῶν ἀνοσίων γάμων, καὶ διαπραξάμενος, ἀπέρχεται. *Libenter conditionem accepit Tarquinius, moxque data & accepta fide, ac delibato inceſtarum nuptiarum fructu, abiit* (24). Aruns Tarquinius was ſoon after poiſoned by his wife, and the eldeſt Tullia by her huſband; and then the two murderers were not long without marrying together; rather without the king's oppoſition, than with his conſent, *magis non prohibente Servio quam approbante* (25). Fabius Pictor had ſaid, in his Roman Hiſtory, that Tanaquil buried Aruns Tarquinius. For which he is ſeverely cenſured by Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (26), who ſhews, that Tanaquil muſt have been at that time 115 years old. Here is the proof of it. Tarquinius Priſcus was at leaſt twenty-five years of age, when he went to ſettle at Rome (27). It is very probable his wife was twenty. Now they came to Rome the firſt year of the reign of Ancus Martius, according to ſome Hiſtorians, or the eighth, according to others. Let us take the latter opinion; for if they did not come to Rome ſooner, they did not certainly come later; ſince all the Hiſtorians are agreed, that Ancus Martius, in the ninth year of his reign, ſent Tarquin againſt the Latins, in quality of General of the horſe. Since therefore that prince reigned twenty-four years, it follows, that when he died Tarquin had attained his forty-ſecond year, or thereabouts, and Tanaquil the thirty-ſeventh year of her age. To which if you add the thirty-eight years of this Tarquin's reign, you will find that he died at eighty years of age, and that he left Tanaquil ſeventy-five years old. Now Aruns died the fortieth year of the reign of Servius Tullius, who ſucceeded this Tarquin. Ἐν ταῖς ἐνιαυσίαις ἀναγραφαῖς κατὰ τὸν τεσσαρακοστὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τῆς Τυλλίου ἀρχῆς τὸν Ἀρούνταν τετελευτηκότα παρειλήφαμεν. *In annalibus invenimus anno regis Tullii quadrageſimo defunctum Aruntem* (28). If therefore Tanaquil had been then alive, ſhe muſt have been 115 years old. Nothing can be more exact than this computation of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, nor more reaſonable than the liberty he takes of cenſuring the negligence of Fabius Pictor. Οὕτως ὀλίγον ἐστὶν ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις αὐτοῦ τὸ περὶ τὴν ἐξέτασιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀταλαίπωρον. Adeo parum laboris hic ſcriptor impendit perquirendæ veritati hiſtoricæ (29). - - - *So little pains appears in the hiſtory of this author towards the diſcovering of truth.* He proves the ſame Fabius Pictor, and ſeveral other Hiſtorians, guilty of the like careleſſneſs, who affirm, that the two Tarquins, the ſons-in-law of Servius Tullius, were the ſons of King Tarquin. This was giving relations of things without regarding the abſurdities that might follow from them. Πανταπασι γὰρ ἀπερισκέπτως καὶ ῥαθύμως οἱ συγγραφεῖς αὐτῶν ταύτην ἐξενηνόχασι τὴν ἱστορίαν, οὐδὲν ἐξητακότες τῶν ἀναιρούντων αὐτὴν ἀδυνάτων τε καὶ ἀτόπων. Omnino enim inconſiderate ac negligenter hiſtoriam hanc prodiderunt ſcriptores Latini, non excuſſis abſurdis & impoſſibilibus quibus fides ipſorum elevetur (30). - - - *For their writings have delivered this hiſtory altogether inconſiderately and raſhly, not in the leaſt examining what impoſſibilities and abſurdities lie againſt it.* Let us ſee his proofs. Since Tanaquil was ſeventy-five years old, when ſhe loſt her huſband, the youngeſt of her ſons muſt have been at that time twenty-five years of age: for women leave off child-bearing, by that time they are fifty years old. The other ſon muſt have been twenty-ſeven years of age. Would they have been ſo ſilly as to ſuffer Tanaquil to deprive them of the crown, in favour of Servius Tullius? Would ſhe have been ſo fooliſh and unnatural as to exclude them from it? All theſe abſurdities are ſtrongly repreſented by the author. He adds, that if Tarquinius Superbus had been twenty-ſeven years of age, when Tarquinius Priſcus was killed, he muſt have been above ſeventy when he dethroned his father-in-law, and above ninety-five when he was expelled from Rome, and about 110 when he left off making war in perſon with the Romans. And yet he is repreſented as a man, who was in the flower of his age, when he uſurped the throne. He commanded at the ſiege of Ardea, when the Romans dethroned him. He endeavoured, for the ſpace of fourteen years, to recover the throne, being preſent at ſeveral battles (31), and diſcharging all the functions of a General. Some Hiſtorians, being ſenſible of theſe abſurdities, have ſuppoſed, that he was not the ſon of Tanaquil, but of one Gegania, the ſecond wife of Tarquinius Priſcus. But, beſides that they have no proof for it, there being no monuments extant, wherein Gegania is mentioned, they involve themſelves in ſeveral difficulties: they muſt advance, that Tarquinius Priſcus being about eighty years of age, and having two daughters married, did, nevertheleſs, marry again, and had children by his ſecond wife. Theſe laſt objections of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus are not very ſtrong; for it might be anſwered, that Gegania was married before Tarquin was extremely old, and that ſhe would not have been the only woman that has born children by a huſband about eighty years old: and that a king, who has only daughters, is willing, tho' he be never ſo old, if he finds himſelf not quite decayed, to try whether he can get ſons. This Hiſtorian had forgot one of the ſtrongeſt objections which he could have made uſe of; he does not take notice that, according to the general tradition, Tanaquil did ſo cunningly manage matters, after Tarquin's death, that ſhe raiſed Servius Tullius to the throne. Which ſhows what is ſaid of Gegania, to be fabulous and romantic. How ſurpriſing is it after all this, that Dionyſius (32) ſhould have found out but one author (33), who ſaid that the two ſons-in-law of Tullius were not the ſons of the firſt Tarquin, but his grandſons. The opinion of this ſingle author has been adopted by that great Hiſtorian. Livy was not ſo judicious; he rather choſe to follow the croud (34), and thereby involved himſelf in a great many difficulties, injurious to his memory. See Laurentius Valla's Diſſertation upon that ſubject. One can hardly apprehend how ſo great a man as Livy ſhould commit ſo many faults, in his account of the Tarquins. The greateſt objections that can be raiſed againſt Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus is this, that Tanaquil would not have endeavoured to place her ſon-in-law, Servius Tullius, on the throne, had ſhe had two grandſons: but it may be anſwered, that they were in their cradle, and that the ſtate of affairs required a ſucceſſor, of an age that might enable him to reign vigorouſly, and by himſelf. She was obliged therefore to prefer her ſon-in-law to her grandſons.

[G] *The Hiſtorian . . . . . has been more ſucceſsful in confuting . . . . than in avoiding miſtakes himſelf.*] He fell into his own ſnare; for he aſcribes to Tanaquil a daughter, of whom it is no leſs abſurd, that ſhe ſhould be the mother, than that Lucius Turquinius, and Aruns, ſhould be her ſons. He pretends (35), that Brutus was the ſon of Tarquinia, the daughter of Tarquinius Priſcus, and of Tanaquil; and ſays, that Brutus was very young, when his father and eldeſt brother were put to death, by order of Tarquinius Superbus. Let us turn his arguments againſt himſelf. If the mother of this Brutus was Tanaquil's daughter, ſhe was twenty-five years of age, when her father was aſſaſſinated, and ſixty-nine when Tarquinius Superbus uſurped the crown. Brutus muſt then have been nineteen years of age at leaſt. It is not likely that Tarquin put to death his brother-in-law, and his nephew, the ſame year he took away Servius Tullius's life. It is probable he had the policy to leave ſome intervals between his great crimes. We may therefore ſay, that Brutus was at leaſt twenty years of age, when his father was put to death; but if he had been of that age, would he not have had an opportunity ſhewing his parts? Whoever undertakes to conceal a great courage, a noble ſoul, and a great deſign, under the outſide of a fool, muſt needs be a man of a great genius to do it conſiſtently. Brutus did admirably ſucceed in hiding thoſe things, under the falſe appearance of ſtupidity. He therefore had a great addreſs, and noble qualifications: theſe

(24) Dionyſ. Halicarn. *lib. iv, pag.* 234, *Edit. Lipſ.* 1691.

(25) Livius, *lib. i, pag.* 29.

(26) Dionyſ. Halicarn. ubi ſupra.

(27) Idem, *lib. iii, pag.* 211.

(28) Idem, *lib. iv, pag.* 234.

(29) Id. ibid.

(30) Id. ibid. *pag.* 211.

(31) According to Livy, *lib. ii, pag.* 48, he drove his horſe againſt the Roman Dictator, at the head of his army, and was wounded.

(32) Lib. iv, pag. 213.

(33) Lucius Piſo Frugi.

(34) Hic L. Tarquinius, Priſci Tarquinii regis filius neposne fuerit, parum liquet: pluribus tamen auctoribus filium crediderim. *Titus Livius, lib. i, pag. m.* 29, *A.*

(35) Dionyſ. Halicarn. *lib. iv, pag.* 264.

avoiding miſtakes himſelf.

theſe he muſt have diſcovered before his father's death; and therefore would have had the ſame fate with his eldeſt brother: the tyrant would have deſtroyed them both, for fear they ſhould revenge the death of their father. It muſt therefore be ſaid, that Brutus had not yet diſcovered his natural endowments, conſequently he was not nineteen years of age, when Tullius was dethroned. Let us allow him to be fifteen, as I have done in his article (36), according to which ſuppoſition he will appear to be born in the fifty-fourth year of his mother's life, which will deſtroy ſome of the objections of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus.

(36) See the remark [*D*] in that article.

Laurentius Valla urges againſt Livy, the argument taken from the age of Tarquin's ſons, as if that Hiſtorian had ſaid, that Brutus and they were of the ſame age: but I do not find that Livy ſays ſo, nor that it can be inferred from Brutus's going with them to Delphi. This would prove a very ſtrong argment againſt Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, who tells us, that the marriage of Tarquin and Tullia falls in the fortieth year of Servius Tullius's reign (37); from whence it follows, that Tarquin's children were but two or three years of age, when their father uſurped the throne. If therefore it was neceſſary for Brutus to be nearly of the ſame age, he muſt have been born in the 65th, or 66th year of his mother's life. I would not much inſiſt upon this proof: for tho' that Hiſtorian informs us, that Tarquin would have Brutus to be bred up with his own children, it is not allowable to charge him with having pretended that they were not a great deal younger than Brutus. Διαιτᾶσθαί τε μετὰ τῶν οἰκείων παίδων ἐπέτρεπεν, οὐ διὰ τιμὴν, ὡς ἐσκήπτετο πρὸς τοὺς πέλας, οἷα δὴ συγγενὴς, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα γέλωτα παρέχῃ τοῖς μειρακίοις, λέγων τε ἀνόητα πολλὰ, καὶ πράττων ὅμοια τοῖς κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν ἠλιθίοις. *Verſarique inter liberos ſuos patiebatur, non honoris cauſa, ut videri voluit, quaſi cognatum; ſed ut ridiculis dictis factiſque oblectamento eſſet adoleſcentibus, quemadmodum ſolent veri fatui* (38). A youth of eighteen or twenty years may be placed with Princes of ſeven or eight years of age, to be their companion; eſpecially when ſuch a familiarity, a vain piece of honour, is only deſigned for their diverſion. In reality, it muſt of neceſſity be acknowledged, that they were younger than he; for he had children old enough to engage in a conſpiracy, when (39) the eldeſt of Tarquin's ſons was not yet thirty years of age. I muſt take notice of a miſtake in theſe four propoſitions of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus: I. That if Tarquinius Superbus had been the ſon of the firſt Tarquin, he would have been twenty-ſeven years old, when the firſt Tarquin was killed. II. That Servius Tullius would have been only three years older than he. Τρισὶ μόνον ἔτεσι θατέρου πρεσβύτερος ἦν. *Triennio tantum eorum alterum antecederet* (40). III. That Servius Tullius was forty years in poſſeſſion of the crown, which was placed upon his head, after the death of the firſt Tarquin. IV. And that therefore, Tarquinius Superbus would have been above ſeventy years old, when Servius Tullius was dethroned. This is a very falſe conſequence; and rather than aſcribe it to the Hiſtorian, I ſhould chuſe to ſay, that the tranſcribers ſkipped the word τέτταρας, *quatuor*; for he could not be ignorant that Servius Tullius reigned forty-four years.

(37) Dionyſ. Halicarn. *lib. iv*, *pag.* 234.

(38) Id. ibid. *pag.* 264.

(39) The year in which Tarquin was expelled. But he was expelled the 25th year of his reign and he began to reign four years after he married Tullia; for Servius Tullius was dethroned the 44th year of his reign.

(40) Ibid. *pag.* 212.

Have you obſerved, ſaid one to me the other day, that Henry Glareanus (41), having read Valla's Diſſertation, and Dionyſius's Arguments againſt Fabius Pictor's opinion, does nevertheleſs adopt that opinion? It is upon this foot he has branched out the pedigree of the Tarquins. He makes the two ſons-in-law of Servius Tullius to be the ſons of the firſt Tarquin: he gives him alſo Brutus's mother for his daughter. I do not much wonder, that Stephen Paſquier (42) has committed the ſame fault (43), for, perhaps, he never heard of Valla's book, nor took any notice of the diſpute of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus againſt Fabius Pictor, and the other Roman Hiſtorians. I know Glareanus acknowledges, that the opinion of Dionyſius is grounded on good reaſons, *multis id ac digniſſimis aſtruens argumentis*. Generally ſpeaking, they are the ſame with thoſe made uſe of by Laurentius Valla. However, I believe, with Glareanus, that he did not ſteal them from this antient Hiſtorian: he had read the old authors: but after all, more learned men than he are not aware while they are compoſing, that ſuch or ſuch things are to be found in Plutarch, or Diodorus Siculus, *&c.* He proteſts, he knew not that Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus had made uſe of thoſe arguments, and he is much more ingenuous than Perottus and Politian in acknowledging from what authors he takes what is not his own. 'Niſi quis Dionyſium 'ab eo non lectum, atque eum ſuopte hoc ingenio ex'piſcatum contendat, quod ipſe fatetur in priore de'fenſione adverſus Benedictum Morandum quendam. 'Nam ut de Valla aliud ſuſpicer ejus candor obſtat. 'Liberè enim ac ingenuè ubique fateri ſolet, per quos 'profecerit, & unde habuerit quod ſcripſerit: ſecus certè 'atque Perottus in ſuo cornu, aut in ſuis operibus Poli'tianus, gloriolæ ac popularis auræ captatores, ut 'mihi quidem viſum eſt, etſi bonæ literæ eis multum 'debent (44). - - - - *Unleſs any one will inſiſt that he 'had never read Dionyſius, but had fiſhed this out by 'his own ingenuity, as he confeſſes in a former defence 'againſt one Benedictus Morandus. For to ſuſpect any 'thing elſe of Valla, his candor forbids. Since he freely 'and ingenuouſly every where owns the authors he is be'holden to, and from whom he borrows what he writes: 'a conduct certainly very different from that of Perottus 'and Politian in their works, who ſeem to me to be am'bitious of a little glory and popular applauſe, tho' other'wiſe the learned world is not a little indebted to them.'* I heard this perſon out patiently, and afterwards ſhewed him, that Glareanus declares plainly enough againſt Livy, and acquaints his readers, that he gives the genealogy of the Tarquins only according to the plan of that author. I farther alledged a very probable reaſon againſt thoſe, who charge Valla with Plagiariſm in this particular, *viz.* that he did not make uſe of an obſervation which might have ſtrengthned his arguments, and was to be met with in Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (45).

(41) Glareanus, in Annotationibus ad Librum I T. Livii, *pag. m.* 40.

(42) In the 7th Letter of the 9th book, *pag. m.* 546.

(43) Except that he ſays, *pag.* 548, that Brutus was Tarquin's couſin-german; wherein he is miſtaken.

(44) Glareanus, ubi ſupra.

(45) Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus ſhews, that Lucumon went to Rome the 8th year of Ancus's reign at the fartheſt; from whence it follows, that he lived 16 years at Rome before he was a king. But Valla ſays he lived there only ten years.

TANDEMUS (*a*), an Heretic, who roſe in Germany, under the Emperor Henry V, about the year 1124, and ſpread his errors particularly among the citizens of Antwerp. He was a lay-man, who had his tongue well hung, and in ſubtilty of wit, eloquence, and many other reſpects, exceeded the greateſt ſcholars of his time. He was magnificent in his apparel [*A*], kept a good table, and was attended by three thouſand armed men; by whoſe means he brought about what the charms of his language could not effect. He had infatuated his followers to ſuch a degree, that they drank the water in which he bathed himſelf, and preſerved it as a relic. One may very well wonder, though perhaps it is no wonder at all, how he could ſeduce many people with doctrines and actions ſo ſhocking as his were. He maintained, that it was no ſenſual action, but rather a ſpiritual one, to lye with a maid in her mother's preſence, and with a wife in the ſight of her huſband, and he himſelf practiſed that doctrine. He killed thoſe whom he could not convince. He aſcribed no virtue to the ſacrament of the Euchariſt, and acknowledged no diſtinction between lay-men, and thoſe who had taken orders. A

prieſt

(*a*) He is alſo called Tanchelinus.

[*A*] *He was magnificent in his apparel.*] This is a killing blow for Moreri, who ſays (1), that Tandemus revived the Hereſy of the Adamites. Theſe had for their diſtinguiſhing character the doctrine of nakedneſs: but no body obſerves, that Tandemus was for having every one to ſhew his whole body, as Adam

and

(1) At the word *Adamites*.

prieſt he happened to meet with in a boat, gave him a blow on the head, which killed him. His errors were not quickly extirpated; but at length thoſe erring people were brought back into the pale of the Church. Norbert (*b*) was the chief inſtrument of their converſion; and ſo moved both men and women that they brought back the hoſts they had kept for the ſpace of ten years in ſome holes or trunks (*c*).

(*b*) He was the founder of the order of the Premonſtratenſes.

(*c*) Prateolus, *voce* Tandemus, *ex Sigeberto.*

and Eve did theirs before the Fall. On the contrary, he loved to be richly dreſſed. ' In pretioſo habitu, ' & veſtibus deauratis incedens (2). - - - *He went in* ' *rich habits adorned with gold.*'

(2) Prateol. in Elencho Hæreſ. *voce* Tandemus.

TAPHIANS. A people ſituate towards Acarnania, the ſame with the Teleboes. See the remarks in the article TELEBOES.

TAPPERUS (RUARDUS) a native of Enchuyſen in Holland, lived in the XVIth century. He ſtudied Philoſophy and Divinity at Louvain, where he was profeſſor of Divinity thirty-nine years, and Dean of St Peter's Church about twenty-four years. He was alſo chancellor of the univerſity. He followed ſometimes the court of the Emperor Charles V, and was conſulted by that prince upon ſeveral important occaſions (*a*). Some ſay, that thoſe avocations hindered him from throughly ſtudying the doctrine of Grace [*A*], and that not having read St Auguſtin carefully, and being deſirous of keeping at too great a diſtance from the Proteſtants, he approached too near Pelagianiſm [*B*]. He was deputed to the council of Trent as the Emperor's Divine, in the year 1551 (*b*), where he diſcovered a great capacity (*c*), and immediately upon his return, he ſet up for a party-leader againſt Michael Baius (*d*), who ſtrictly adhered to St Auguſtin's doctrine on the articles of Predeſtination and Free-will. He died at Bruſſels the ſecond of March 1559, at ſeventy-one years of age [*C*], and was buried at

(*a*) Valer. Andræas, Biblioth. Belg. *pag.* 802.

(*b*) Opera Baii, *Part. ii*, *pag.* 191, *Edit.* 1696.

(*c*) Valer. Andr. Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 803.

(*d*) Opera Baii, ibid. *pag.* 207, 217.

[*A*] *Thoſe avocations hindered him from ſtudying throughly the doctrine of Grace.*] ' He would never ' have departed from the common doctrine of the uni- ' verſity (1), had not his attendance at court, and ' extraordinary occupations, deprived him of the ' time he ought to have ſpent in reading St Auguſtin, ' before he filled his head with the notions of a new ' Divinity.' This is what I find in page 48 of a book printed in 1688, with this title, *Apologie Hiſtorique de deux Cenſures de Louvain & de Douay ſur la matiere de la Grace.*

(1) That is the univerſity of Louvain.

[*B*] *Being deſirous of keeping at too great a diſtance from the Proteſtants, he approached too near Pelagianiſm.*] ' The deſire of being always, and in every thing, of a ' contrary opinion to the new Heretics, was a com- ' mon temptation at that time, which made ſome ' great men depart from tradition. Tapperus was one ' of them. . . . . Peter Soto, that learned Dominican, ' Confeſſor to Charles V . . . wrote a long and learned ' letter to Tapperus, wherein he ſhewed him, that he ' could not follow thoſe new opinions, without run- ' ning into Pelagianiſm (2).' Soto was in the right to addreſs him in theſe terms; for Tapperus taught, in expreſs words, that man is able to do many good actions by the meer ſtrength of nature, and without the aſſiſtance of Grace; *Sine Gratia ex viribus naturæ multa bona ab hominibus fieri poſſe* (3), and that the wicked and the infidels might glorify and worſhip GOD, and avoid ſin, without any other aſſiſtance than that of nature. ' *Quòd* Impii & Infideles per ſolam ' naturæ legem, ſicut Deum cognoſcere, ita eum ſo- ' lum adorare & glorificare potuerunt: & *quòd* Impius ' & Infidelis ſolis naturæ talentis naturalibuſque viribus ' relictus poſſit vitare peccata: quia, *inquit*, diſcernit ' inter multa licita atque illicita, ita pro tempore & lo- ' co poteſt non peccare, nolle fornicari, ex eo quod ' judicat illa eſſe illicita. OMNE ENIM QUOD MA- ' LUM ESSE NOVIT, ODISSE ATQUE ABOMI- ' NARI POTEST (4). - - That *the wicked, and the In-* ' *fidels, by the law of nature only, as they were able know* ' *GOD, ſo might they worſhip and glorify him*; *and* ' that *a wicked man, or an Infidel, left only to his natu-* ' *ral ſtrength and talents, might avoid ſin: becauſe*, ſays ' he, *he can diſtinguiſh between the lawfulneſs and un-* ' *lawfulneſs of a great many things, and conſequently can,* ' *at the proper times, and occaſions, avoid ſinning, reſolve* ' *againſt fornication, from his judging them to be unlaw-* ' *ful.* FOR EVERY THING WHICH HE KNOWS ' TO BE EVIL, HE MAY HATE AND ABOMI- ' NATE.' He maintained, that a man would not be guilty of ſin in not being converted, if he wanted the grace neceſſary for his converſion. ' Sic igitur deeſt ' gratia, quâ opus eſt, ut ad Deum cor converti poſ- ' ſit, NEC PECCATUM EST quòd quis non con- ' vertitur; quia non poteſt pro tunc ad Deum converti, ' & neceſſariò non convertitur, & per conſequens non ' liberè (5). - - - - *If therefore the grace be wanting,* ' *without which the heart cannot be converted towards* ' GOD, NEITHER IS IT A SIN *for one not to be* ' *converted*; *becauſe it is not in his power at that time* ' *to be converted, and he is of neceſſity not converted, and* ' *conſequently not of his own free will.*' Some other propoſitions of this nature, extracted out of Tapperus's book, may be ſeen in the new edition of Michael Baius's works, at page 218 of the ſecond part.

(2) Gery, Apologie Hiſtor. des Cenſures, *p.* 49.

(3) Ruard. Tapper. *in Art. vii*, contra Proteſtantes, *apud* Opera Mich. Baii, *Part. ii*, *p.* 218, *Edit.* 1696.

(4) Oper. Baii, ibid.

(5) Ibid.

[*C*] *He died . . . . the ſecond of March* 1559, *and at ſeventy-one years of age* (6).] It will be ſaid, perhaps, by ſome, that Moreri has here committed two miſtakes: I. In putting 1559 in the room of 1558. II. In affirming, notwithſtanding this, that Tapperus died *at his return from the council.* Would he have ſaid ſo, if he had known, that Tapperus returned from Trent to Louvain in the year 1552? He found the firſt miſtake in Valerius Andreas; but how came he not to find there alſo the correction of that miſtake? The two Latin verſes wherein the numeral letters point out the day and the year of that Doctor's deceaſe, give us the year 1558. Moreri quotes them after Valerius Andreas, and therefore ought to have concluded from them, that 1559 was a fault of the preſs. Beſides, Valerius Andreas obſerves, that Tapperus's Apotheoſis was printed in the year 1558 (7). This is what may, I think, be objected to Moreri: but I have ſomething to ſay in his vindication, as to the firſt head; for he was in the right to place Tapperus's death in the year 1559: and becauſe the nature of his work did not oblige him to make any criticiſms, he may be excuſed for keeping to the *Bibliotheca Belgica*, without entring upon the diſcuſſion of the faults. The author of that *Bibliotheque* is not exact enough, he confounds his reader, and throws him into diſagreeable perplexities. He acquaints us, that the two verſes mentioned by him, point out the year in which Tapperus died; but they point out the year 1558. I add, that the Apotheoſis of that Doctor was printed in the year 1558, how can thoſe things be reconciled with the year 1559, in which he ſays Tapperus died? Why does he not remove ſuch a difficulty? Should he not have acquainted us, that the author of thoſe two verſes began the year at Eaſter? According to this reckoning, the ſecond of March, 1558, mentioned by him, is, in effect, the ſecond of March 1559. I think Valerius Andreas knew nothing of this ſolution. Note, That the author of Tapperus's Apotheoſis (8) ſuppoſes, that Tapperus died after Charles V. It is certain that this Emperor died in September 1558: which proves, that

(6) This does not agree with his *Apotheoſis*, where it is affirmed, that he was born the 15th of February 1485.

(7) It is certain, that the Bookſeller, who printed that *Apotheoſis*, put 1558, at the end of the advertiſment to the reader.

(8) Fol. m. A5 verſo.

at Louvain (*e*). He left his eſtate to the poor, and his books to the Faculty of Divinity (*f*). I will give the catalogue of his works [*D*], and ſome extracts of that doctor's Apotheoſis [*E*]. His violent zeal againſt the Proteſtants did not prevent his declaring that

that the ſecond of March, on which Tapperus died, belongs to the following year, and that the Apotheoſis was not printed till the year 1559 (9).

[*D*] *I ſhall give the catalogue of his works.*] He publiſhed in two volumes in folio, at Louvain, 1555; *Explicationes in articulos* circa Eccleſiaſtica dogmata hoc ſæculo controverſa, *à Facultate Theologica Academiæ Lovanienſis* Caroli V. Imp. juſſu *collectos.* His *Orationes Theologicæ una cum corollario de veris calamitatum Belgii cauſis atque remediis,* were publiſhed by Lindanus at Cologn in the year 1577, in 8vo. An edition of his works in folio was printed in the ſame town, in the year 1582. The original of his treatiſe, *de Providentia Dei & Prædeſtinatione* is kept at Louvain; but it is written in ſo bad a hand that no body could ever decypher it (10).

(*E*) . . . . *And ſome extracts of his Apotheoſis.*] The edition I make uſe of is that of Baſil 1567, in 8vo. The title of it runs thus (11). *D. Ruardi Tappart Enchuſani, hæreticæ pravitatis primi & poſtremi per Belgicum inquiſitoris, Cancellarii Academiæ Lovanienſis, Apotheoſis: Gratiano vero autore: Lege lector funeſtiſſimam eccleſiaſticorum tyrannidem, qua quid profecerint demonſtrabit, niſi Deus avertat, totius tandem inferioris Germaniæ excidium: liber ante octo annos primum editus fuit, ſed ita ut omnia iſta, quæ nunc præſentibus motibus gliſcunt, tanquam in ſpeculo oſtenderit. Tuum igitur eſt collatis omnibus inter ſe, judicium facere quàm nihil autorem præſagientem fefellerit.* It is a dialogue between Tapperus, a Genius, and St Peter. We find in it, that Tapperus aſpired to the biſhopric of Louvain (12). That when he delivered, in the ſame town, a panegyric upon Maximilian King of Bohemia, that prince ſilenced him with theſe words; *I have heard what he will ſay, as well as what he has already ſaid*; that he had an extream averſion to thoſe who talked of permitting the clergy to marry, and exhorted the latter to beg of God, that he would be pleaſed to deliver them from the temptation of the fleſh by ſome dreams; or, if ſuch a remedy was not ſufficient, to be prudent, when they could not be chaſte: *Ad cœlibatum ſervandum, vitandumque conjugium ſoleo noſtris orgiis initiatos hortari ut quoties ſentirent deſiderio humanitatis intumuiſſe venas, orarent Deum, ut ab ea imbecillitate liberaret ipſos per ſomnia, & nocturnas pollutiunculas. Si ne hoc quidem prodeſſet, quod non poſſent caſtè, facerent cautè, nec admitterent ullo pacto in animos ſuos flagitioſam cogitationem de conjugio ſacerdotum:* That his firſt exploit againſt the ſectaries, was to cauſe John Vordenas to be burnt at the Hague, who maintained, that he had done well to marry, though he was a prieſt: That the city of Antwerp, for fear of loſing their trade, did not approve that the heretics ſhould be perſecuted; and that he adviſed the King of Spain to order it to be burnt, that the other towns might be terrified by ſuch a ſevere puniſhment: That he was deputed to Trent, where he ſpoke firſt as being the eldeſt of his colleagues: That the Spaniards themſelves laughed at his ſpeech: That he loſt a great many books in his return to Louvain: That, after his return, he and his colleagues cauſed all the tranſlations of the ſcripture to be condemned, except the Vulgar: That they endeavoured to deſtroy all the works of Eraſmus, but could not ſucceed in it, being thwarted by the Preſident of Brabant, and the Biſhop of Arras: That Sleidan's hiſtory proved a moſt pernicious poiſon, which every body greedily ſwallowed: That it was tranſlated into all ſorts of languages: That the emperor commended that Hiſtorian for his faithfulneſs, and was ſurprized to find in it ſo many hidden truths (13). That it could not be put into the Index of prohibited books, before it had been read over and over by every body: ‘ Tunc demum (ſi diis placet) Sleydani nomen ridiculè adjectum eſt catalogo noſtro, cum omnes (inquam) ut ungues ſuos tenerent, aut potius ſatietate nauſearent. Antè nihil impetrari potuit (14). - - - - *Then at laſt (as Heaven would have it) Sleidan's name was ridiculouſly added to our Index, when every body, I ſay, had got him by heart, or rather were grown tired with him. Before this nothing could be obtained.*' That the great care taken to get the books of the Proteſtants condemned, was not ſufficient to prevent the artifices of the Bookſellers: That by altering or leaving out the names of the authors, many dangerous books were put off, and the Inquiſitors impoſed upon; and that it fell out ſometimes, that they condemned a book, which they had before approved of. ‘ Quanquam ne ſic quidem cavere potuimus quin typographi, homines verſutiſſimi impoſuerint nobis: mutatis autorum nominibus, vel omiſſis, vel inverſis, vel etiam Græcè redditis quæ erant Latina, & è contrà: ut ſæpe coacti ſimus quæ antè approbaveramus, ea damnare poſt, vix auſi profiteri apud regem noſtram ſimplicitatem. Nam ex titulis librorum æſtimanda nobis omnia erant, cùm non vacarit perlegere quæ intus erant, quorum quædam ita etiam erant obſcura & ingenioſa (qua fraude ſemper hæretici abundarunt) ut quid ſcriberetur, non aſſequeremur. Ad quem modum turpiter nos decepit Philippi Melanchthonis libellus de Theologia Chriſtiana, qui titulo Hippophili Melangæi paſſim ſenatorum, præſidum, & noſtrorum etiam Baccalaureorum manibus tritus eſt: donec amici, qui in Germania adhuc ſynceri erant, admonuerunt, ut habita ſynodo conſuleremus lexica noſtra, fore enim ut idem eſſe Philippum & Hippophilum deprehenderemus (15) . . . Idem accidit in Cœlii Secundi de providentia libello quidem non magno, ſed peſtilentiſſimo: quem ille nebulo tum primum innoteſcens Areneum inſcripſerat. Nos enim rati eſſe poeticum, aut grammaticum figmentum, non ante olfaciebamus fucum quàm omnia exemplaria eſſent Lovanii diſtracta. Taceo de Hutteno, Calvino, Urbano Rhegio, & aliis (prò dolor) multis, quos nobis oſcitantibus neſcio quibus titulis, ex metamorphoſi opinor Ovidiana petitis, inſinuaverunt (16). - - - - *Altho' even all this care was not ſufficient to prevent the Bookſellers, who are a very cunning ſort of people, from impoſing upon us: by changing authors names, omitting, tranſpoſing, or even tranſlating into Greek what was Latin,* & vice verſa; *ſo that we were often forced to condemn what we had before approved, and ſcarce durſt own our ſimplicity before the king. For all the judgment we could be able to make, was only from the titles of the books, as we had not time enough to read their contents, and there were ſome of them ſo obſcurely and artfully contrived, the Heretics being always ready at this ſort of deceit, that we could not be certain what ſubject was treated of. We were baſely impoſed upon in this manner by Philip Melanchthon's book* de Theologia Chriſtiana, *which, under the name of* Hippophilus Melangæus, *paſſed every where currently thro' the hands of our ſenators, preſidents, and even the bachelors of our univerſity, till ſome of our orthodox friends in Germany, adviſed us to call a ſynod, in order to conſult our Lexicons, for that we ſhould find Philippus and Hippophilus to mean the ſame thing. . . . . The like impoſition happened in regard to Cœlius Secundus's book concerning Providence, not great indeed, but very pernicious: which the vile author then firſt appearing intitled Areneus. We believing it to be ſome poetical or grammatical fiction, did not diſcover the cheat, till all the copies brought to Louvain, were ſold off. I omit Hutten, Calvin, Urban Regius and others, alas too many, whoſe works they ſold under our noſes, by I know not what titles borrowed: I think from Ovid's Metamorphoſis.*' Afterwards Tapperus tells us, that he forced ſeveral ſtudents in Louvain to recant, and pay a fine: That he cauſed ſome others of them to be burnt and beheaded: That ſome women of good families were by his order buried alive (17). That he perſecuted Perſevald, a Rhetorician, who ſpoke ill of the inquiſitors: That, fearing this accuſed perſon would prove his innocence, ſince he was favoured by ſeveral people, he brought againſt him a charge of Sodomy, which deprived him of moſt of his protectors (18). That he privately condemned him to perpetual impriſonment; but, that in order to avoid the charges of maintaining this priſoner, or the odium of having let him ſtarve, he delivered him to a gentleman, who interceded for him: That afterwards he forced that gentleman to anſwer for the guilt of that interceſſion, and condemned him to forfeit his whole

---

(*e*) Valer. Andr. ibid.

(*f*) Id. ibid.

(9) It is ſaid in the title of the edition of 1567, that this work had been printed eight years before.

(10) *Taken from* Valerius Andreas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 803. *See alſo* Poſſevin, Appar. *Tom. ii, pag.* 316.

(11) You will find the title of the firſt edition at the end of this remark.

(12) Epiſcopatum Lovanienſem ſperaſti. *Apopb. circa init.* But how can this be, will ſome ſay, ſince Louvain is not an epiſcopal town? The anſwer is, that the abbots of Aſlebem, St Bernard, and Tongerlo, who oppoſed the erection of the new biſhoprics, endeavoured to reduce them to one only, which was to be at Louvain. See *Brandt*, in his Hiſtory of the Reformation, *Tom. i, p.* 239.

(13) Ipſe Cæſar delectatus lectione obſtupuerat ſecretiſſimarum (quas videbat) rerum narratione, & commendabat veritatem. *Apoth. Ruardi Tappart*, folio D verſo.

(14) Ibid.

(15) Ibid. *folio D 2 verſo.*

(16) Ibid. *fol.* 3 *verſo.*

(17) Mulieres primarias & optimis in urbe prognatas terra obruendas (ut vivæ erant) curavi. *Ibid.* fol. E verſo.

(18) Homini cæco & deformi maſculi amoris infamiam affinxi, ſtatimque ocius Euro à favore cauſæ pleroſque deterrui. *Ibid.*

that what is ſaid in the ſixth chapter of St John's Goſpel does not concern the Lord's-Supper, though the Fathers have applied the words of this Evangeliſt to that myſtery in their ſermons (*g*). This opinion of his was confuted (*h*). He eſteemed Fauſtus Regienſis to be orthodox [*F*]. Lindanus beſtowed ſingular praiſes upon him, and believes, that Tapperus was endowed with the gift of prophecy [*G*].

whole eſtate. I omit a long account of the proceedings againſt Angelus Emphlitius, a Paris divine. Fraud and violence had here an equal ſhare. It is obſerved, in the preamble to that account, that Bartholomew Latomus compared the Chriſtian Church to a bear's cub, which could not receive its true ſhape, till it had been licked for many ages: *Perinde ac ſi religionem Chriſtianam urſa aliqua peperiſſet, quam non una mater tamen lambendo detergeret atque efformaret, ſed mille quingentorum annorum ſomnia* (19). Here follows a reflexion of the author of the Apotheoſis. 'O cæci! Chriſti lex æterna eſt, nec eget maturatione temporum, ut ſtabilitatem conſequatur. Alioqui primis eccleſiæ membris magna fuiſſet injuria facta, ſi quid ad illorum inſtitutionem defuiſſet cujus percipiendi edentula iſta mundi ſenecta demum capax fuiſſet. - - - - *O ye blind! The law of Chriſt is eternal, and it wants not to be ripened by time to gain its perfections. Otherwiſe the firſt members of the Church muſt have ſuffered great hardſhip, if any had been wanting in their inſtitution, which the toothleſs old age of the world might afterwards have been capable of perceiving.*'

Let us here, by the way, take notice of the fate of controverſies. At that time the objections of the Proteſtants forced Latomus to maintain, that the beginning of Chriſtianity was a chaos, which had been diſentangled by degrees (20). The Proteſtants were continually ſaying, that things ſhould be brought to the firſt inſtitution; and that whatever was not preſcribed in the ſcripture ſhould be aboliſhed. What courſe did he take to anſwer them? He bethought himſelf of this hypotheſis, that the Church had attained to perfection only by degrees. The above-mentioned reflexion, which was the Proteſtants reply, is the foundation of a book which the Biſhop of Meaux wrote againſt them, an hundred and forty years after (21). What courſe did M. Jurieu take to anſwer him? He revived Latomus's hypotheſis (22). What an exchange is this? *Sors omnia verſat.*

Note, it is ſuppoſed, that Tapperus confeſſes he had performed the part of a midwife in a boat, without knowing what he did, and without having heard that children came into the world in that manner; believing ſtill what his mother had told him, that they came out of the parſley-bed. 'Ecce auditus vagitus eſt (ut ſit verbo venia) neſcio quo loco . . . . . . Dii talem terris avertite peſtem: ego inde prodire infantulos putaſſem? . . . . . . Mater mihi perſuaſerat apud nos è proximis arundinetis dari mulieribus (23). - - - - *Behold I heard a ſqualling (you will pardon the expreſſion) I know not from what quarter . . . . . . Ye gods avert ſo dreadful a ſcene: could I have ever believed children to come from thence . . . . My mother had perſuaded me that women had them from among the reeds.*' Note alſo, that, though he is made to confeſs, that he felt, ſince that time, the motions of luſt, and looked upon his ſervant-maids, with ſome ſort of temptation (24.) Yet he is not contradicted, when he proteſts, that he had never lain with a woman, nor even ſaluted any (25). He did not come off with being inſtrumental in the delivery of one: For at his coming out of the boat, he was ſurrounded by a great number of country women, who hurried him into a tavern, and forced him to be god-father to the child, and to pay the reckoning. He had not one penny left, when he had paid for the entertainment that was made at his coſt: 'Emunctus ſum omni pecunia: nec potui redimere ubi navem appuliſſemus quin fierem compater hominis quem nunquam vidi. Pertrahebant me in diverſorium paluſtres mulierculæ bibaciſſimæ, vocatus ſacrificus æque ſobrius . . . . . omnes certatim paſcebantur tanti compatris largitate . . . . nunquam nudior, nec ſordidior redii domum (26). - - - - *I was chouſed of all my money: nor could I get aſhore again, without becoming goſſip to the child of a man I never ſaw. I was dragged to a tavern by ſome drunken jades who belonged to the fens, the prieſt was called, who was no ſoberer . . . . . . they all fell to as if for a wager, at the coſt of my god-fatherſhip . . . . I never got home in a poorer or dirtier condition.*' His exploits againſt the Anabaptiſts are not forgotten in the Apotheoſis, nor his pernicious maxims, or methods of inquiſition. Take notice, that Valerius Andreas confeſſes, that this piece does very well diſcover Tapperus's conduct. 'Cæterum, *ſays he* (27), Apotheoſin R. Tappero ſcripſit Henr. Geldorpius, editam ann. 1558 in 4to. Verum ſannis & ſcommatibus plena genium auctoris ſui prodit: ex qua alioqui ſummi illius viri ACTA DILUCIDE PATENT. - - - - *But Henry Geldorpius wrote Tapperus's Apotheoſis, publiſhed in the year* 1558, *in* 4to. *But the ſatire and banter it is full of, ſhews the genius of its author; tho' otherwiſe that great man's* ACTIONS ARE TRULY EXPOSED *in it.*

This article being ready to be ſent to the preſs, I met with a copy of the firſt edition of the Apotheoſis. I ſhall ſet down the title of it, that it may be compared with the title of the ſecond. *Clariſſ. Theologi D. Ruardi Tappart Enchuſani, hereticæ pravitatis primarii & generalis inquiſitoris, cancellarii celeberrimæ academiæ Lovanienſis, pridem inconſolabili ſuorum luctu vita functi, apotheoſis: Gratiano vero Theologiæ Baccalaureo autore. Reperies in hoc ſcripto, lector, non parum multa ſcitu digniſſima, & paucis hactenus cognita inquiſitorum hæreticæ pravitatis conſilia atque ſecreta: quæ omnibus tandem cognoſcenda proponi, in primis intereſſe reipublicæ duximus.*

[*F*] *He believed Fauſtus Regienſis to be orthodox.*] He quoted him, 'calling him an venerable man: Whereupon, being informed by one of his brethren, that Fauſtus had been condemned, as being full of errors; he was very much ſurprized at it, and could not believe it, as Eſtius relates in a Theological diſcourſe, pronounced at Douay, in 1609. He had it from the doctor himſelf, who gave that information to Tapperus (28)' Here is another authority for it: 'Ut quantum Pelagianis faverit, neminem lateret, Fauſtùm regienſem epiſcopum, qui Semipelagianorum fuit anteſignanus, & cujus libri à ſancto Gelaſio papa in concilio Romano è Catholicorum albo deleti ſunt, paſſim commendat & inter patres adducit (29). - - - - *That all the world might know how much he favoured Pelagianiſm, he every where commends and ranks among the Fathers Fauſtus Biſhop of Reggio, who was the leader of the Semipelagians, and whoſe works were ſtruck out of the catholic liſt by St Gelaſius the Pope, in a council at Rome.*

[*G*] *Lindanus beſtowed ſingular praiſes* (30) *upon him, and believed that Tapperus was endowed with the gift of prophecy.*] Theſe are his words: 'Hoc ipſum certè tam vita, quam voce, cum apud nos mortalis ageret, magis præ ſe ferebat, diſerte tantum non prophetans, quæ modò peccatorum noſtrorum cauſa Belgici patimur, ſicuti & his ipſius orationibus perſpicuè prædixiſſe cernitur (31). - - - *This very thing moſt certainly he more evidently pointed out while he continued with us in this mortal ſtate, both by his life and doctrine, almoſt expreſsly propheſying what we in Holland have ſuffered for the ſake of our ſins, which from theſe very orations he appears to have clearly foretold.*' There was no need of being a very great prophet, to foretel, that the conduct of the Roman Catholics againſt the new religion, would occaſion great diſorders; and that a civil war would be the conſequence of their tiring out the patience of the Proteſtants.

(*g*) Poſſev. *in* Appar. *Tom. ii, pag.* 358.

(*h*) Id. ibid.

(19) Ibid. *folio E* 3.

(20) Ne vacillent argumenta Latomi quum rudem indigeſtamque molem vocat primitivam Eccleſiam. *Ibid.*

(21) *See the Preface to his* Hiſtoire des Variations.

(22) See his Paſtoral Letters, wherein he deſcribes the doctrine of the antient Fathers.

(23) Apotheoſ. *fol. G* 2.

(24) Ab eo die nunquam carui neſcio quo pruritu, nec æquis oculis aſpexi famulas meas. *Ibid.*

(25) Ibid. fol. G verſo. See below, citation (31), the paſſage of Lindanus.

(26) Ibid. *folio* G 2 *verſo.*

(27) Valer. Andr. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 803.

(28) Gery, Apol. des Cenſures, *pag.* 50.

(29) Opera Mich. Baii, *Part. ii, pag.* 218, 219.

(30) Ornamentum hujus ſæculi noſtri ſingulare . . . ſobrietatis perpetuæ exemplum, inviolatum caſtitatis & ejus virginalis ſpeculum, prudentiæ norma, eximiæ pietatis in pauperes ſpecimen, ... jejuniis frequentioribus aſſiduiſque deditus . . . . modeſtiæ regula, temperantiæ amuſſis, tolerantiæ, patientiæ, charitatis Chriſtianæ, omnis denique virtutis magiſter abſolutiſſimus. *Lindanus, ubi infra,* pag. 27.

(31) Lindanus, *in Præfat.* Orationum Theolog. Ruardi Tapperi, *pag.* 26. *He has alſo theſe words:* A Prophetarum gratia minime vacuus pleriſque piis viris crederetur: . . . . alienum à vero dixiſſe non videatur qui eum ſpiritu prophetiæ divinitus præditum fuiſſe pronunciet.

TARPA (SPURIUS METIUS, or MÆCIUS) was a Licencer, or a Critic, of the Poems, that were to be recited on the Stage. He had four colleagues, and it was neceſſary that one of them ſhould approve thoſe pieces before they were produced in public [*A*]. In order to it, the Poets were appointed to meet in the temple of Apollo Palatinus, where they read their works, and then the Critics paſſed their judgment upon them. Good judges were not always pleaſed with Tarpa's judgment, as appears from a paſſage of Cicero; which may be ſeen at the end of the laſt remark of this article. However it is true, that Horace, who was no flatterer, ſays nothing of that Critic but what is more in his favour than to his prejudice [*B*].

[*A*] *It was neceſſary that one of them ſhould approve thoſe pieces, before they were produced in public.*] This particular is to be found in one of the ſcholiaſts upon Horace, on theſe words of the tenth ſatire of the firſt book.

> .... Hæc ego ludo
> Quæ nec in æde ſonent certantia judice Tarpa,
> Nec redeant iterum atque iterum ſpectata theatris.

> *Theſe lines ſhall ne'er before the audience come,*
> *From Tarpa's judgment to receive their doom,*
> *Nor ſhall they entertain the ſtage of Rome.*

'Metius Tarpa, *ſays he*, fuit judex criticus, auditor 'aſſiduus poematum & poetarum in æde Apollinis ſeu 'Muſarum, quo convenire poetæ ſolebant ſuaque ſcripta 'recitare, quæ niſi à Tarpa aut alio critico, qui nu'mero erant quinque, probarentur, in ſcenam non de'ferebantur. - - - - *Metius Tarpa*, ſays he, *was a cri'tical judge, a conſtant hearer of the poems and poets in 'the temple of Apollo, or of the Muſes, whither the poets 'uſed to aſſemble to recite their works, which unleſs they 'were approved by Tarpa, or ſome other critic, there be'ing five in number, were not admitted on the Stage.*' This office might be compared with that of the cenſurers of books, in the countries where there is an inquiſition. It was very troubleſome, both becauſe ſo many readers were to be heard, and becauſe the cenſurers were expoſed to a double danger: For the pieces, which they rejected, made the authors very angry with them, *genus irritabile vatum* (1); and thoſe, that were approved, might not pleaſe the people, or perſons of judgment.

(1) Horat. Epiſt. ii, lib. ii, ver. 102.

[*B*] *Horace .... ſays nothing of that Critic, but what is more in his favour, than to his prejudice.*] Horace mentions him again in his *de Arte Poetica* *. And here are ſome of his words.

* Ver. 386.

> Si quid tamen olim
> Scripſeris, in Meti deſcendat judicis aures
> Et patris, & noſtras.

> *If you have wrote ſome piece in poetry,*
> *Read it to Tarpa, to your ſire, and me.*

Voſſius (2) after having obſerved, that Achilles Statius (3) confeſſes he does not remember to have read any thing concerning that Metius Tarpa any where, except in the tenth ſatire of the firſt book of Horace, ſays, that he is alſo mentioned in the tenth ſatire of the firſt book, and repeats what Horace ſays there about Tarpa. This is plainly the effect of a great abſence of mind. Voſſius remembered, that Horace mentions this Critic twice; in the tenth ſatire of the firſt book, and in his *de Arte Poetica*; But he forgot, that the paſſage known to Statius was that of the tenth ſatire; which is the reaſon why he refers him to it. I do not know whether he perceived that miſtake when the book was printed off; for, tho' there are many things in his *Addenda* which he deſires to be inſerted in the page, where Achilles Statius is mentioned, and though the paſſage concerning Metius, in Horace *de Arte Poetica*, is one of thoſe things; yet the reader is not told, that there is any correction to be made in that page. Here is the paſſage of Cicero, which I have promiſed to ſet down: 'Reliquas partes diei tu conſumebas his de'lectationibus quas tibi ipſe ad arbitrium tuum compara'ras: nobis autem erant ea perpetienda quæ ſcilicet 'Sp. Mæcius .... probaviſſet (4). - - - *The remaining 'part of the day you employed in ſuch diverſions as you 'had been pleaſed to prepare; but we were forced to 'bear thoſe which Mætius Tarpa had approved.*'

(2) Voſſius, de Imitat. & Recitat. Veterum, *pag.* 53.

(3) Notis ad Hor. Sat. X *lib. i.*

(4) Cicero, Epiſt. i, *lib. vii*, ad Famil.

TARRUNTIUS (*a*) (LUCIUS) ſirnamed *Firmanus*, becauſe he was a native of *Firmum*, a town of Italy, in the country of the Picentini, flouriſhed at the ſame time with Cicero, and was one of his friends (*b*). He was a Mathematical Philoſopher (*c*); I mean, that he pretended to a great ſkill in Judicial Aſtrology. He would be little known, had he not drawn up two Horoſcopes, mentioned by the antients, one was that of Romulus, the other that of Rome [*A*]. Thoſe Horoſcopes were retrograde, and we

(*a*) Some call him *Tarrutius*, being deceived by the Greek word Ταῤῥούτιος. *See* Salmaſius, in Solin. *pag.* 15.

(*b*) See the remark [*A*], citation (2).

(*c*) See the remark [*C*], citation (21), and the remark [*A*], citation (1).

[*A*] *One was the Horoſcope of Romulus, the other that of Rome.*] Plutarch gives the following account of it. 'Varro, who was the moſt learned of the Romans in 'hiſtory, had a particular friend named Tarrutius, 'who being both a great Philoſopher and Mathema'tician, applied himſelf out of curioſity to draw ho'roſcopes by the means of Aſtronomical tables, and 'was eſteemed the moſt eminent in his time. He 'propoſed to him to find the day and hour of the 'birth of Romulus, from the known actions of his 'life, as the ſolution of Geometrical problems is per'formed by analyſis from the *data* firſt laid down; for 'he maintained, that the ſame art which from a given 'nativity could predict the life which was to follow, 'might, and ought, with ſtronger reaſon, from a known 'life, exactly determine the nativity which had pre'ceded. Tarrutius performed what Varro requeſted. 'After having conſidered the inclinations and actions 'of Romulus, the time of his life, and manner of 'his death, and compared all theſe accidents toge'ther, he very poſitively pronounced, that he was 'conceived the firſt year of the IId Olympiad, the 'twenty-third day of the month which the Egyp'tians call *Choiak* *, about the third hour of the 'day, at which there was a total eclipſe of the ſun; 'that he was born the twenty-firſt day of the month '*Thot* †, about ſun-riſing; and that the founda'tion of Rome was laid by him the ninth day of 'the month called *Pharmouthi* ‡, between the ſecond 'and third hour; for theſe people pretend that there 'is a certain time fixed, which governs the fortune of 'cities, as well as that of men, and that by the poſition 'and different aſpect of the ſtars may be diſcovered 'the firſt moment of their foundation (1).' Cicero relates more particularly what concerns the Horoſcope of the city of Rome, and very juſtly laughs at it. 'L. quidem Tarutius Firmanus familiaris noſter, in 'primis Chaldaicis rationibus eruditus, urbis etiam 'noſtræ natalem diem repetebat ab iis Parilibus, qui'bus eam à Romulo conditam accepimus: Romam'que in jugo quum eſſet Luna, natam eſſe dicebat, 'nec ejus fata canere dubitabat. O vim maximam 'erroris, etiam ne urbis natalis dies, ad vim ſtellarum '& lunæ pertinebat? Fac in puero referre ex qua 'affectione cœli primum ſpiritum duxerit, num hoc 'in latere, aut in cæmento, ex quibus urbs effecta eſt, 'potuit valere (2)? - - - *Lucius Tarutius Firmanus, in'deed my very good friend, eminently ſkilled in the Chal'dean Aſtrology, ſearched back for the birth-day even of 'our city, from the circumſtances with which we have*

'*been*

* December.

† September.

‡ April.

(1) Plutarch, in the Life of Romulus.

(2) Cicero, de Divinat. *lib. ii*, *cap. xlvii.*

we find ſcarce any examples of them; for there are very few Aſtrologers, who pretend to find out the moment of any perſon's birth, from the conſideration of his adventures [*B*]. Tarruntius, at Varro's requeſt, took that courſe, and boldly gave his anſwer as to the hour of the birth. There is reaſon to believe that he is quoted by Pliny [*C*].

‘ *been told it was formed by Romulus: and declared ‘ that it was begun when the moon was in Libra ‘ nor did he ſcruple to predict its fortune. O the ‘ ſtrength of error, to ſuppoſe that even the birth of ‘ cities can have any relation to the influence of the moon ‘ and ſtars! if we grant that in the caſe of a child, it ‘ may be of ſome conſequence, under what diſpoſition of ‘ the Heavens it draws its firſt breath; can this have ‘ any influence over brick and mortar, the materials of ‘ a city?* ’ We may obſerve a conſiderable difference between the account of Cicero and that of Plutarch. According to Cicero, Rome was founded on the day of the Palilia, that is the 21ſt of April, and therefore Tarruntius followed the common opinion (3): but according to Plutarch, he did not follow it; for he placed the foundation of that city on the ninth day of an Egyptian month (4), which day, according to ſome learned Chronologers (5), anſwered to the fourth of October. Some (6) Chronologers conjecture, that the year which *the inhabitants of Alba, and Romulus made uſe of*, was out of order; that *the month of April correſponded with the Autumn*; and that after King Numa had given a new form to the Roman year, the feſtival of Pales, which was celebrated the twenty-firſt of April, correſponded with the Spring. According to this conjecture, it might be true at the ſame time, that Rome was founded the twenty-firſt of April, of the year of the Albans, and the ninth of an Egyptian month, which correſponded with the month of October. However, Varro would not have exactly followed his friend Tarruntius, if he had ſaid poſitively that Romulus began to build Rome the twenty-firſt of April, that is, in the Spring. Note alſo, that Plutarch does not tell us in what year the city of Rome was founded, according to Tarruntius. However, it is ſaid that this Aſtrologer fixed on the third year of the VIth Olympiad. I take this opinion to be grounded upon Tarruntius's placing the conception of Romulus in the firſt year of the IId Olympiad; and upon a ſuppoſition, that, according to the common opinion, he ſaid, that Romulus built the city of Rome at eighteen years of age. Beſides, it is ſuppoſed that Varro followed Tarruntius's opinion; which is a further reaſon why it is commonly believed, that he placed the foundation of that city in the third year of the VIth Olympiad.

I ſhall obſerve, by the way, that Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, after many Chronological computations, fixed upon the firſt year of the VIIth Olympiad for the epoch of the foundation of Rome (7). Father Labbe therefore expreſſes himſelf very ill, when he ſays (8), that *ſome aſcribe* that epoch *to Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*. An eminent Divine (9) tells us, that *he was followed* therein *by Tarruntius and Velleius Paterculus*; but that Varro had pitched upon an epoch later by two years, that is the fourth year of the VIIth Olympiad. He muſt give me leave to obſerve three or four things. I. Tarruntius wrote before Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus; for it appears from the manner in which Cicero ſpeaks of the Horoſcope of Rome that Tarruntius was then dead; and we know that Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus compoſed his Hiſtory after he had reſided twenty years at Rome (10): now he came thither ſoon after the entire defeat of Marc Antony. II. Tarruntius's opinion does not agree with that of Dionyſius; for, as we have already ſeen, he placed the foundation of Rome in the third year of the VIth Olympiad. III. Velleius Paterculus places it in the ſame year (11); and therefore does not follow the opinion of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus. IV. The moſt learned Chronologers aſcribe the ſame hypotheſis both to Varro and Tarruntius, and therefore Varro's epoch is not later by two (12) years than that of Dionyſius.

[*B*] *There are very few Aſtrologers, who pretend to find out the moment of any perſon's birth, from the conſideration of his adventures.*] I do not underſtand what reaſon Mr Dacier could have to ſay; *that it is always the ſureſt way to draw retrograde Horoſcopes; for an Aſtrologer may boldly infer from known actions the time of the conception and birth. Who will contradict him* (13)? I anſwer, that there is nothing more eaſy than to contradict him. In moſt families the birth-day of each perſon is well known; and as for men of note, one may eaſily learn their nativity, by having recourſe to the public monuments. So that a miſtaken Aſtrologer would be quickly convicted of his error; which is the reaſon why thoſe cheats will not venture upon it. They may ſafely determine at what hour a modern king was born, for they know it and may read it in Hiſtory; and therefore they are not conſulted about ſuch things. I ſhall occaſionally take notice of a miſtake of Amyot, which Mr Dacier has not avoided. Plutarch ſays there was an eclipſe of the ſun on the day that Rome began to be built. Σύνοδον ἐκλειπτικὴν ἐν αὐτῇ γενέσθαι σελήνης πρὸς ἥλιον (14). Xylander is wrong in tranſlating thoſe Greek words thus: *quo ſubiens ſolis orbem luna defecit.* Amyot has not been more ſucceſsful, *on which day*, ſays he, *there was an eclipſe of the moon.* Mr Dacier renders it, *and that there was an eclipſe of the moon.* There is no obſcurity in the original; it expreſſes a conjunction of the ſun and moon. Now that is a time when the moon cannot be eclipſed, and the only one when the ſun can be eclipſed. An obſervation ſhould have been made upon the parentheſis, immediately following the Greek words, juſt now quoted out of Plutarch. That parentheſis runs thus: (ἦν ἔτει τρίτῳ τῆς ἕκτης ὀλυμπιάδος συμπεσοῦσαν εἰδέναι καὶ Ἀντίμαχον οἴονται τὸν Τήιον ἐποποιόν,) that is, it is thought, that the Poet Antimachus, a native of the iſle of Teos, ſaw that eclipſe of the ſun, which happened in the third year of the VIth Olympiad. The whole note of Mr Dacier (15) amounts to this, that the Poet Antimachus, mentioned by Plutarch, is the *ſame, whom others will have to be a Clarian or a Colophonian, and who lived in Plato's time.* If this note was right, Plutarch muſt have been groſsly miſtaken; for how could Antimachus, cotemporary with Plato, obſerve an eclipſe ſo long before he was born? To juſtify that Hiſtorian it muſt either be ſuppoſed, that he ſpeaks of an Antimachus different from him, who was cotemporary with Plato; or that he only remarks in his parentheſis, that Antimachus, cotemporary with Plato, ſpeaks of an eclipſe, which is the ſame with that of the third year of the VIth Olympiad. It is certain this is not the ſenſe of his Greek text. Father Labbe perhaps had been more in the right to cenſure Plutarch upon this account, than upon ſome other things. He obſerves (16), after Petavius, that *not only in the month Pharmuthi, but alſo in the whole Julian year* 3961 *of the Julian period, there was no eclipſe of the ſun, that might have been obſerved in Aſia, much leſs in Italy, by that Poet Antimachus of Teos.* And then he adds: ‘ Plutarch is miſtaken in ‘ this; for having ſaid that Tarruntius affirmed that ‘ Rome was built when the ſun and moon were in ‘ conjunction, he adds, of his own head, that this ‘ new moon was a true ecliptic one.’ This cenſure is falſe in ſome reſpects; for Plutarch does not ſay, that Tarruntius affirmed that the ſun was eclipſed on the day of the foundation of Rome. Tarruntius ſays this only of the day of Romulus's conception. And therefore Petavius (17) ſhould not have affirmed, that Tarruntius ſaid ſo both with reſpect to that day, and that of the foundation of Rome.

[*C*] *There is reaſon to believe that he is quoted by Pliny.*] It is in moſt editions, ‘ L. Arruntio qui ‘ Græce de aſtris ſcripſit, Cæſare Dictatore qui item ‘ (18). - - - *Lucius Arruntius who wrote in Greek about ‘ the ſtars, Cæſar the Dictator who did the ſame.*’ Which might make one think that Pliny ſpeaks of Arruntius, a celebrated Hiſtorian; but becauſe the beſt manuſcripts have it, *L. Tauruntio*, it is eaſy to gueſs at the true reading; which is, *Lucio Tarruntio* (19). There is a quite contrary miſtake in Solinus's manuſcripts, where we find *L. Aruntius* inſtead of *L. Tarruntius* (20); for it is plain Solinus ſpeaks of the Mathematician, who drew up the Horoſcope of Rome at Varro's requeſt. ‘ Ibi Romulus manſitavit qui au‘ ſpicato fundamenta murorum jecit duodeviginti natus ‘ annos undecimo Kalendas Majas hora poſt ſecundam ‘ ante tertiam plenam: ſicut Lucius Tarruntius pro‘ didit Mathematicorum nobiliſſimus (21). - - - *There*

‘ *Romulus*

(3) See, below, citation (21), what I quote out of Solinus, who aſcribes alſo to Tarruntius the common opinion.

(4) According to Xylander, Amyot, and Mr Dacier, the month *Pharmouthi* anſwered to the month of April. But Petavius is of a different opinion. See the next citation.

(5) Petavius, in Rationario Temporum, *Part. ii, lib. iii, cap. ii, pag. m.* 157.

(6) See Father Labbe's French Chronology, *Tom. i*, in the introduction, *ch. ix, num.* 5.

(7) Dionyſ. Halic. *lib. i, pag. m.* 60.

(8) Labbe, Chronol. Françoiſe, *in the Introduction, ch. ix, num.* 5.

(9) Jaquelot, de l'Exiſtence de Dieu, *pag.* 11.

(10) Dionyſ. Halicarn. *lib. i, pag. m.* 6.

(11) Sexta Olympiade poſt duos & viginti annos quam prima conſtituta fuerat Romulus. . . . . Romam urbem Parilibus in Palatio condidit. *Vell. Paterc. lib. i, cap. viii.*

(12) He ſhould have ſaid three years.

(13) Dacier, remarks upon the Life of Romulus, *pag. m.* 178.

(14) Plutarch, in Romulo, *pag.* 24.

(15) Dacier, Remarques ſur la Vie de Romulus, *pag.* 178.

(16) Labbe, ubi ſupra, *num.* 6.

(17) *See his* Rationarium Tempor. *Part. ii, lib. iii, cap. ii, pag. m.* 159. where he refers to the 48th chapter of the ninth book of his work *de Doctrina Tempor.*

(18) Plin. *lib. i*, in Indice Autorum, *lib. xviii.*

(19) *See* Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. *pag.* 447.

(20) Voſſius, ibid. *See alſo* Salmaſ. in Solin. *pag.* 15.

(21) Solin *cap. i, pag.* 2, *Edit.* Salmaſ.

‘ *Romulus reſided, who very auſpiciouſly laid the foundation of the walls at eighteen years of age, on the eleventh of the Kalends of May, between the ſecond and third hour: as Lucius Tarruntius, the Prince of Aſtrologers, has diſcovered.*’ Note, that Pliny places our Tarruntius before Cæſar; which confirms what I have ſaid, that this Aſtrologer lived before Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus.

TARTAGLIA (NICOLAS) a native of Breſcia in Italy, lived in the XVIth century. The poverty of his parents did not prevent his becoming very illuſtrious (*a*). He diſtinguiſhed himſelf extremely by his knowledge in Mathematics, and compoſed among other works [*A*], a large treatiſe on numbers and meaſures, divided into ſix parts, which gained him a very great reputation. He taught in Milan, and frequently diſputed there with the famous Cardan [*B*], who did not find his account in it (*b*). He was afterwards called to Breſcia, and there explained Euclid, but he had ſo many reaſons to be diſſatisfied with his country, that he quitted it, and retired to Venice where he was very much eſteemed. He there met with perſons of generoſity: and received large preſents from the Senators and Ambaſſadors. Some of his books were dedicated to Henry VIII, King of England, and others to Francis Donato, Doge of Venice (*c*). He died at Venice towards the end of the year 1557, if we believe Thuanus (*d*) [*C*]. I ſhall take notice of a French tranſlation of his Arithmetic, and ſhall mention ſome encomiums beſtowed upon him by the tranſlator [*D*]. I ſhall alſo correct a miſtake in Thuanus [*E*].

(*a*) Ghilini Teatro, *Tom. ii, pag.* 200.

(*b*) Leonardo Cozzando, Libraria Breſciana, *pag.* 271.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Thuanus, *lib. xix, circa fin.*

[*A*] *He compoſed among other works.*] You will find the title of his works in Voſſius (1), Ghilini (2), Mr Teiſſier (3), and in Cozzando (4), &c. which I ſhall therefore omit. Note, that Tartaglia wrote in his mother-tongue.

[*B*] *He frequently diſputed with . . . Cardan.*] Thuanus has not expreſſed this very clearly: and his tranſlator has made it ſtill more obſcure. *Hieronymi Cardani æmulatione varias quæſtiones ingenioſè pertractavit* (5): that is to ſay, according to the tranſlation given by Mr Teiſſier, *he has, in imitation of Cardan, ingeniouſly treated a great many different queſtions* (6). This was not a bare emulation, much leſs an imitation only, but a direct quarrel. See Cozzando, at page 271 of his *Libraria Breſciana nuovamente aperta,* printed at Breſcia in the year 1685 in 12mo.

[*C*] *He died . . . . towards the end of the year* 1557, *if we believe Thuanus.*] This date is refuted by two Italian authors, Ghilini (7), and Cozzando (8), who aſſure us that he flouriſhed about the year 1560. Paulus Freherus (9), falſely charges Ghilini with ſaying that he died that year. Mr Konig (10) places his death in the year 1566.

[*D*] *I ſhall take notice of the French tranſlation of his Arithmetic, and ſhall mention ſome encomiums beſtowed upon him by the tranſlator.*] William Goſſelin has tranſlated out of Italian into French, Tartaglia's Arithmetic divided into two parts, whereof the firſt part contains ſeventeen books, and the ſecond eleven. Theſe are the two firſt parts of his great work on numbers and meaſures. This tranſlation was printed at Paris by Gilles Beys in the year 1578 (11) in 8vo, and dedicated by the author to Margaret of France, Queen of Navarre. The Epiſtle Dedicatory of the firſt part is dated from the college of Cambray in Paris the ſecond of November 1577; and that of the ſecond the twelfth of the ſame month. The firſt of thoſe two epiſtles tells us that the Queen loved Mathematics, and that on this account ſhe had *retained Mr Goſſelin*, the author's father, *as one of her houſhold.* She is exhorted to embrace *with the ſame fondneſs all the other parts of Mathematics, as ſhe had done Aſtronomy and Aſtrology.*

The tranſlator's Preface deſerves to be conſidered. He ſays that *Luke du Bourg, an Italian Fryar, and Stephen de Ville-Franche, a Frenchman, have opened a way for us* to Arithmetic; ‘ however the Italian in my ‘ opinion has greatly ſurpaſſed the Frenchman, as well ‘ in his practical rules, as in his treatiſe of irrational ‘ numbers, and of this divine Algebra; after theſe two ‘ maſters who flouriſhed much about the ſame time, ‘ have followed diſciples and ſcholars without number, ‘ who like little rivulets have all their original ‘ from theſe two fountains, but yet fall much ſhort ‘ of the depth of their ſpring heads, either for the ‘ want of capacity, or ſufficient application.’ He names ſome of the principal writers who have treated of Arithmetic, and diſtinguiſhes them by their native countries (12): but he is miſtaken in placing Tonſtal among the French, for he was an Engliſhman. He affirms that ſeveral of the moderns have decked themſelves with the ſpoils of Tartaglia; that he himſelf would not follow their example, nor *rob him of the honour due to him; that it is Tartaglia who has diſpelled our wretched ignorance, and introduced ſuch a method of practice, that the whole world cannot poſſibly produce one ſhorter and eaſier*; that he is an author, *in compariſon with whom that great Mathematician, Luke Paccioli* (13), *is no more than a wart compared with a mountain . . . .; that Friar Luke, Piſano* (14), *and Ville-Franche, have opened the door, but committed a great many errors, and falſities; and that Nicolas Tartaglia has entered, put all their inventions into form, given a colour to the groſs out-lines they drew and projected; and laſtly, made an infinite improvement of their diſcoveries, laid open their falſities, and introduced truth.* He pretends that ‘ all the ſucceeding Arithmeticians, have only ‘ tranſlated word for word the rules of the Italian ‘ authors, and principally of Tartaglia, and publiſhed ‘ them under their own name; and, what is worſe to ‘ prevent this from being diſcovered, they have inverted ‘ the whole order of our author's work, tho' ‘ they have ſtole only the moſt common things, with ‘ which they have ſtuffed their writings very confuſedly; ‘ which is the reaſon that we have at preſent in ‘ French only pieces of Arithmetic, which have their ‘ practical rules borrowed from Italian ingenuity, the ‘ order only, or rather the diſorder, is French, the obſcurity ‘ is French, the clearneſs Italian; and this was ‘ abſolutely neceſſary; for it would have been too ‘ notorious a thing to have ſeen the method, rules, ‘ examples, and brevity, of an author publiſhed under ‘ another's name: ſo that we are obliged to confeſs, ‘ to our ſhame, that the knowledge of this ſcience is ‘ hitherto ingroſſed in the hands of ſtrangers.’ He concludes with ſhewing what he has added new to this tranſlation, and which conſiſts, among other things, in the demonſtrations he has invented, or borrowed from Peter Nunes a Spaniard.

Here is an inſtance of ſincerity: he frankly confeſſes the inferiority of the French, their Plagiariſm, the ſuperiority of the Italians, *&c.* but he finds in this ſincerity, diſadvantageous to his country, his own particular advantage: he raiſed himſelf by this means above the level of others.

[*E*] *I ſhall . . . . correct a miſtake in Thuanus.*] We read at the end of the ninteenth book of that Hiſtorian theſe words: *Qui* (Tartalea) *multa in eo genere a Luca Brugenſi Monacho ſolertiſſime inventa illuſtravit, multa correxit.* That is to ſay, according to the tranſlation of Du Rier, *Tartaglia has explained a great many things which Luke of Bruges a Monk had ingeniouſly invented, and has corrected a great many of them* (15). I am inclined to believe that Thuanus had written *Burgenſi*, and that the Printer had changed the word to *Brugenſi*. This miſtake occaſioned the tranſlator to put *Luke de Bruges* in his tranſlation; and this might induce us to believe that the mathematical writings of this author have been corrected by Tartaglia. Nothing is more falſe. The author whoſe inventions he has adjuſted, was a Franciſcan Friar, called Lucas Paciolus, and a native of Borgo di S. Sepolcro, a town in Italy, called in Latin *Burgum*, or *Burgus ſancti Sepulchri*. There was printed at Venice in 1509, a collection of his mathematical works in Italian, in folio. He has tranſlated into Italian the books of Euclid (16).

---

(1) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. *pag.* 331, *ex* Poſſevini Bibl. Selecta, *lib. xv, cap. viii.*

(2) Teatro, *Part. ii, pag.* 200.

(3) Teiſſier, Addit. aux Elog. *Tom. i, p.* 119, 120, *of the ſecond edition.*

(4) Cozzando, Libraria Breſciana, *pag.* 272.

(5) Thuan. *lib. xix, in fin. pag. m.* 396.

(6) Teiſſier, Additions aux Elog. *Tom. i, pag.* 119.

(7) Ghilini, Teatro, *Part. ii, pag.* 200.

(8) Cozzando, ubi ſupra.

(9) Freher. in Theatro, *pag.* 1459.

(10) In Bibliotheca, *pag.* 792.

(11) I have ſaid in the article GOSSELIN, remark [*A*], after Du Verdier, that it was printed in the year 1577, but I here follow a copy which I have now before my eyes.

(12) He reckons among the Germans, *Januer, Stifel, Achilin, Volummie, Shebellion, & Gemme Phriſien.* Some of theſe names appear to be wrong ſpelt.

(13) This is the ſame with Friar Luke.

(14) It is Leonardus Piſanus who ſhould have been named before Friar Luke. For the latter has taken ſeveral things from the former.

(15) *See* Teiſſier, Addit. aux Eloges, *Tom. i, pag.* 120.

(16) *See* Geſner's Epitome, *pag. m.* 549.

He has publiſhed in the ſame language a volume of Arithmetic, in which he has inſerted a treatiſe of Algebra, which is partly that of Leonardus Piſanus, the firſt of the moderns who has written on Algebra, but whoſe work was in Latin, and never yet printed (17).

(17) Blancanus in Mathematicorum Chrenologia, *pag.* 59.

TASSO (TORQUATO) an Itatian Poet, one of the greateſt wits of the XVIth century. See his life written by the Abbot Decharnes. It is a very curious piece (*a*), and may be eaſily met with. I have collected a great many faults committed by ſeveral authors in ſpeaking of this Italian author; but I am obliged to reſerve them to another opportunity. You will find an abridgment of the life of this great Poet prefixed to his Moral Treatiſes, tranſlated into French by Baudouin (*b*).

(*a*) Printed at Paris in the year 1690, and reprinted in Holland. See the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans*, for December 1690, pag. 160.

(*b*) They were printed at Paris in the year 1632, in 8vo.

TAVEAU (RENATA) only daughter and heireſs of Leon Taveau, Baron of Mortemart (*a*), Lord of Luſſac &c (*b*), was married to Francis de Rochechoüart Lord of Tonnai-Charente in the XVIth century. She lived a holy life, and as ſhe was exhauſted *with a long exerciſe of prayers and penitence, ſhe fell into ſo ſtrong a trance that every body believed her dead, and ſhe was accordingly buried: one of her domeſtics having obſerved that ſhe was put in her coffin with a diamond ring of great value upon her finger, got into the vault in the night to ſteal it, and found her alive . . . . . . She lived to have children afterwards.* She had *a very great ſhare in the good graces of Catherine de Medicis* (*c*); but ſhe forfeited them by an incident which deſerves to be related [*A*]. She was mother of Renatus de Rochechoüart Baron of Mortemart, great-grandfather of the Marſhal de Vivonne [*B*].

(*a*) Anſelme, Palais d'Honneur, *pag.* 582.

(*b*) Mercure Galant, *of October* 1702, *pag.* 107.

(*c*) Ibid.

[*A*] *She forfeited* the good graces of Catherine de Medicis *by an incident which deſerves to be related.*] The firſt occaſion of her diſgrace with that Princeſs was this: happening to be one day with her in the church of St John en Greve at a ſermon of Menot, the famous Franciſcan, *ſhe laid hold of the diſpoſition which ſhe found the Queen was put into by this diſcourſe of Menot, which was extremely ſtrong and pathetical, upon the irregularities of the Great, and gave her ſome good advice upon the conduct of the ladies of her court, and upon the inclination ſhe had for* Aſtrology. *The Queen who had ſhed a great many tears at this ſermon (to the great ſurprize of the audience, becauſe it was not at all uſual to ſee her ſhed tears upon ſuch ſubjects) received her advice kindly at the time that her ſpirits were terrified with the truths this bold Franciſcan had been pronouncing; but theſe ideas of terror being by degrees diſſipated, the advice of the Lady de Mottemarr was no longer ſeaſonable, and ſhe was ſent away to Poitou (to which place ſhe was baniſhed) to beſtow it upon ſome perſons of more ſcrupulous conſciences* (1).

(1) Mercure Galant, *October* 1702, *pag.* 108, *& ſeq.*

[*B*] *She was mother of Renatus de Rochechoüart . . . . great-grandfather of the Marſhal de Vivonne.*] 'Who 'in 1570 married Jane de Saulx, daughter of Gaſ'pard, Lord of Tavannes, Marſhal of France, and of 'Frances de la Baume Montreuil, who was ſo learned, 'and ſo perfect a miſtreſs of the holy ſcriptures, that 'ſhe had the honour to convert a famous Rabbi 'whom ſhe overcame in a regular diſputation (2).' Let her therefore be placed from henceforth in the catalogue of learned women. Renatus de Rochechoüart was father of Gaſpard de Rochechoüart, Marquis de Mortemart, who married Louiſa de Maura, *a lady of great virtue and beauty* (3). She was daughter and heireſs of Charles Count de Maure (4), *and of Diana Deſcars who was eſteemed one of the fineſt wits of the XVIth century* (5). Gaſpard de Rochechoüart was father of Gabriel, in favour of whom the Marquiſate of Mortemart was erected in Duché-Pairie, and who was the firſt gentleman of the King's bed-chamber, and governor of Paris, and died in 1673, father of Marſhal Vivonne, and of Madam de Monteſpan, Madam de Thianges, and the Abbeſs of Fontevrard (6).

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 106.

(3) Idem, *pag.* 105.

(4) *Le Pere* Anſelme, Palais d' Honneur, *pag.* 584.

(5) Mercure Galant, *October* 1702, *pag.* 105.

(6) Idem, *pag.* 103, 104.

TAVERNIER (JOHN BAPTIST) Baron d'Aubonne [*A*], one of the greateſt travellers of the XVIIth century, was born at Paris in the year 1605 (*a*). His natural inclination to travel was very much increaſed by what he daily ſaw and heard in his father's houſe [*B*]. He began ſo early to gratify that paſſion, that *at twenty-two years of age he had ſeen the fineſt countries in Europe; as, France, England, the Netherlands, Germany, Swiſſerland, Poland, Hungary, and Italy* (*b*). He travelled ſix times *into Turkey, Perſia, and the Eaſt-Indies, during the ſpace of forty years, and by all the different routs it was poſſible to take* (*c*). He was making a ſeventh journey when he died at Moſcow in July 1689 (*d*). He had got a great eſtate by dealing in jewels; and yet he found himſelf in low circumſtances towards the latter end of his life, by reaſon of the miſconduct of one of his nephews, who had in the Levant the direction of a cargo made in France, amounting to two hundred twenty-two thouſand livres prime coſt; which ought to have produced above a million (*e*). It is thought he undertook his laſt journey in hopes of making up that loſs. He had collected a great many obſervations (*f*); but he had never learned either to ſpeak or write good French, and therefore the relations he has given us were drawn up by another hand [*C*]. In one of them he ſpeaks very ill

(*a*) It appears from his Print prefixed to the firſt volume of his Travels, that he was 74 years old in 1679.

(*b*) Tavernier, Preface to the firſt volume of his Travels.

(*c*) See the title of the ſame volume.

(*d*) *Mercure Galant*, for February 1690. The author is miſtaken, when he ſays that Tavernier was 89 years old in July 1689.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Some of which are meer fables, which they made him believe to impoſe upon his ſimplicity. See Doctor *Gio: Franceſco Gemelli Careri*, pag. 138, 139, of the ſecond Tome of his *Giro del Mondo*, printed at Naples in the year 1699, in 12mo.

[*A*] *Baron d'Aubonne.*] Being made noble by the King of France, he bought that Barony, ſituated in that part of the Canton of Bern called *le païs de Vaud*, near the lake of Geneva. He was obliged to part with it, either to pay his debts, or to make the neceſſary preparations for his laſt voyage into the Eaſt Indies. Mr du Queſne (1) bought it, and retired thither after the revocation of the edict of Nantes. He is ſtill in poſſeſſion of it, and reſides there, preferring that retirement to the great employments he might have pretended to by changing his religion.

(1) Eldeſt ſon to Mr du Queſne the greateſt ſeaman that ever was in France.

[*B*] *By what he daily ſaw and heard in his father's houſe.*] His father, a native of Antwerp, ſettled at Paris, where he had a great trade in Geographical maps. The curious, who bought them of him every day, uſed to diſcourſe very much of foreign countries. His hearing all thoſe diſcourſes, and ſeeing ſo many maps, increaſed in young Tavernier his inclination for travelling.

[*C*] *The relations he has given us were drawn up by another hand.*] They appeared (2) in two volumes in the year 1679, and contain his ſix voyages. After this

(2) At Paris in 4to, they have been reprinted in Holland in 12mo.

ill of the Dutch (*g*). In ſome others he ſhews himſelf a down-right Plagiary [*D*]. He was grievouſly abuſed in a book intitled *l'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld:* and it is thought he would have made his application to the Civil or Eccleſiaſtical courts of Holland, in order to have ſatisfaction for that affront, had he not conſidered that his adverſary would have ſheltred himſelf under the pretence of having done it to vindicate the country and religion. Thoſe, who approved this reaſon of his patience, wondred that he did not pay ſome author to revenge him [*E*]. Mr Chappuzeau, who was abuſed in the ſame book upon his

this he publiſhed an account of the Seraglio, and ſome particular tracts, *viz.* an account of Japan and the kingdom of Tunquin; the Hiſtory of the conduct of the Dutch in Aſia, &c (3). It is in this laſt tract that he violently inveighs againſt the Directors of the Eaſt India company: and it is but juſt to obſerve, that he declares at the very beginning, that he *does not blame the conduct of the Dutch in general* (4); on the contrary he commends them very much. *What I ſay*, adds he, *does not concern the States-General, for whom I have a due reſpect: I ſpeak only of private men, for whom I am not obliged to have any regard, ſince they have been ſo unjuſt to me upon ſeveral occaſions.* If you deſire to know who put his memoirs into order, you need only read the following words of Mr Chappuzeau (5). ‘At his return in the year 1668, having a great eſtate, he (6) thought fit to buy the Barony d'Aubonne in the Canton of Bern: to that end he came to Geneva, and lodged for ſome time in my houſe. Our friendſhip was then renewed, but upon a very heavy condition; which was, to give a form to his chaos, as you rightly call the confuſed memoirs of his ſix voyages; which he had taken partly from one Father Raphaël a Capuchin, who had been a long time at Iſpahan. For above two years, I amuſed him with hopes of taking my pen in hand for him; but at laſt loſing all manner of patience, and meeting with me at Paris, whither I went upon private occaſions; how unwilling ſoever I was for a great many reaſons to grant him his requeſt, as ſeveral of my friends can teſtify, he at laſt found means to engage me in that work by a ſuperior power. For this purpoſe he made uſe of the intereſt of the firſt Preſident de Lamoignon, who having ſpoke to the King about it, as he gave me to underſtand, told me, that his majeſty deſired to ſee Tavernier's voyages; and that, ſince he could not find any body elſe, whoſe aſſiſtance he could aſk in this work, I ſhould not put him off any longer. Mr de Lamoignon, and Mr de Baville his ſon, loved to hear him tell ſtories of his voyages; and the firſt being beſides curious of medals, had received a great many from Tavernier, as the latter often told me, which obliged him in gratitude to eſpouſe his intereſt. Thus, Sir, if you knew how much I was mortified, not to ſay put to the rack, for above a year that this wretched work laſted, by the bluntneſs of the huſband, and the ridiculous humour of the wife, doubtleſs you would not have been ſo cruel as to inſult me about a thing which I did in ſpite of myſelf, terribly againſt my will, and without any profit. This is what a great many honeſt men can ſtill witneſs. Beſides, I muſt acquaint you, Sir, that when I came to that chapter, relating to the conduct of the Dutch in Aſia, the friends to whom Mr Tavernier communicated his memoirs, which he generally truſted to his memory, and dictated to me in bad French, having nothing in writing but what he had from the Capuchin, did whatever they could to diſſuade him from harping upon that ſtring. I did the ſame, and when I ſaw that neither they nor I could prevail upon the man, whom you have well deſcribed, I told him plainly, that he might look for ſome body elſe to write down ſuch a diſcourſe. After the high encomium, I had beſtowed upon the Dutch nation, with no leſs gratitude, than juſtice, twenty years before, in the firſt volume of my *Europe vivante*, which has been printed twice in French, and tranſlated into the German language: after all theſe encomiums, I ſay, ſo ſincere and ſo well-grounded, ſhould I have been ſo baſe as to contradict myſelf, and be guilty of ſuch a ſhameful complaiſance? Upon my refuſal, therefore, which occaſioned our falling out for ſome days, and was like to have occaſioned our falling out for ever, Mr Tavernier made his application to Mr de la Chapelle, Secretary to Mr de Lamoignon before-mentioned. This Secretary undertook to write for him; and it is he, who, after my return to Geneva, wrote the third volume of Tavernier's relations, which contains the Hiſtory of Japan; and wherein, either out of imprudence or malice he introduces a Proteſtant ſpeaking the language of a Roman Catholic. I can eaſily prove that I was at Geneva with my family, and not at Paris, when that volume was written and printed.’

It will not be improper to acquaint the reader, that the Jeſuits complained of Tavernier's relations (7). See what Mr. Arnauld has ſaid to them by way of anſwer (8).

[*D*] *In ſome others he ſhews himſelf a downright Plagiary.*] Dr Hyde (9) having quoted a long paſſage of the relation of that author, informs us (10), that Tavernier took it, like a downright plagiary, out of a book printed at Lyons, in the year 1671, in 8vo, and written by a perſon who had been thirty years in Perſia. ‘Sciendum eſt Tavernierum ad inſtar Plagiarii hocce de Gavris paragraphum (& forte multa alia) deſumpſiſſe ex alio itinerario Gallico *ed. Lyons* 1671, in 8vo, cujus autor eſt P. G. D. C. i. e. *Pater Gabriel de Chinon*, qui 30 annos in Perſia tranſegit (11). - - - *It is to be obſerved that Tavernier, like an errant Plagiary, has ſtolen what he ſays of the Gavri, (and perhaps a great many other things) out of a French book of travels publiſhed at* Lyons 1671, *in* 8vo, *whoſe authors name is P. G. D. C. that is, Father* Gabriel de Chinon, *who lived* 30 *years in Perſia.*’

[*E*] *They wondred that he did not pay ſome author to revenge him.*] Although Tavernier did not write the books that came out under his name, yet he was obliged to look upon himſelf as the author, and to act accordingly in regard to thoſe who would criticize him. I mean, that regularly, and according to the laws of the commonwealth of learning, he ought to uſe no other weapon but pen againſt pen. The cenſuring of a book, is, properly ſpeaking, an action brought againſt an author before his true judges. He is ſummoned to appear before the public to be told, either that he argues wrong, or that he underſtands certain things in a wrong ſenſe. He is therefore cited before a lawful tribunal; for it belongs to the public to give judgment on ſuch ſort of accuſations, both in the firſt and laſt inſtances. He ought not therefore to appeal to other judges. This would be too plainly betraying his own weakneſs; this would be changing the order of things, and endeavouring to ſupply his want of knowledge by the favour he hopes his intriguing may procure him before the tribunal of the magiſtrates (12). But I except out of this rule thoſe authors, who are wounded in their reputation: For if a critic is not contented to cenſure a wrong verſion, a falſe principle, a wrong conſequence, an unfaithful quotation, *&c.* if he will alſo charge a blot in the family, a robbery, an adultery, a ſtate-crime, *&c.* it is very allowable to bring him before the ſecular Judges. The accuſed perſon, let him be never ſo learned, may without appearing to miſtruſt his pen, very well remove the cauſe from one tribunal to another, and declining the juriſdiction of the publick, have recourſe to the magiſtrates and the laws eſtabliſhed by ſovereigns againſt defamatory libels. I do not ſay that he is obliged to have recourſe to them; for he may be contented with the ſhort way of giving the lie, in imitation of Father Valerian (13): He may with a *mentiris impudentiſſime*, - - - *thou art a moſt impudent liar*, confound his accuſers, and fully juſtify himſelf, unleſs they make out their accuſations. So that every author, ſtruck with this thunder-bolt of honeſt Father Valerian, will be accounted a public calumniator by all equitable judges, if he does not clearly prove the ſcandalous facts he has broached againſt the honour of his neighbour. His ſilence is a full vindication of thoſe whom he accuſes, *actore non probante abſolvitur reus*, if the proſecutor brings no

proof

(*g*) See the remark [C].

(3) At Paris in 4to, in the year 1681, reprinted in Holland, in 12mo.

(4) Tavernier, Hiſtoire de la conduite des Hollandois en Aſie, *ch. i*, *pag.* 241, *of the third volume of his relations, Dutch edition.*

(5) Défenſe du Sr. Samuel Chappuzeau contre une Satire intitulée l'Eſprit de Mr Arnaud, *pag.* 7.

(6) That is to ſay, Mr Tavernier.

(7) In the the 2d volume of the *Defenſe des nouveaux Chrétiens.*

(8) At the end of the third volume of the *Morale Pratique.*

(9) Hyde, de Religione veterum Perſarum, in Appendice, *pag.* 535, *& ſeq.*

(10) Id. ibid. *pag.* 545.

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Compare what ſhall be ſaid in the remarks of the article THOMAS.

(13) See the article MAGNI, remark [C].

his account, has not been altogether ſilent [*F*].

proof, the criminal is acquitted in courſe. And therefore, as the inſult offered to Tavernier in the book intituled, *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld*, went beyond a criticiſm, and did very much ſavour of a defamatory libel, that author had a right to make his application for redreſs to the magiſtrates or conſiſtories. He was not neceſſarily obliged to it, but he might have done it without breaking the rules which an author who is criticized upon ought to obſerve. He made a noiſe (14) in the taverns and ſtreets, he threatned, and even named the very day and hour when he would apply to the Walloon conſiſtory of Rotterdam, to demand execution of the canonical laws againſt the miniſter who had diſhonoured him: but his threatnings came to nothing; he retired very peaceably, and never commenced any proſecution at all. And, to ſay the truth, it was not in his power to obtain any ſatisfaction for the inſult, whether we conſider his accuſer's great intereſt, or the pretence he might have alledged in his vindication. He would not have failed exaggerating the injurious reflexions contained in the tract concerning the conduct of the Dutch. This circumſtance would have rendered his cauſe more favourable; though judicious men know very well the difference there is between an author who reflects upon the Dutch in general, or the ſupreme power of the Seven United Provinces; and an author who blames the conduct of a handful of Dutchmen, trading in another world, two thouſand leagues from their maſters. Tavernier was only guilty of the latter (15). And accordingly the flights and ſallies of the author of *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld*, againſt that famous traveller, were ſcarce approved by any body. What was the motive of the writer of that ſatire, ſaid moſt people, who required it at his hands? Had he received a ſpecial commiſſion to write an anſwer? If he undertook to do it of his own head, why did not he take the method of oppoſing hiſtory to hiſtory, and facts to facts, inſtead of heaping up perſonal ſcandal. What is moſt ſtrange, is, that he has in a few words reflected upon the Dutch very little leſs than Tavernier, as Mr Chappuzeau has proved upon him (16). Note, that Tavernier being in Holland after the publication of his third volume, was treated there with civility and kindneſs. See what Mr Leti ſays upon it (17); the thing is curious enough. See alſo, concerning this queſtion, whether Tavernier had not a great deal of patience, the *Entretiens ſur la Cabale chimerique* (18).

But if he is excuſable for not proſecuting the author of *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld*, before the civil or eccleſiaſtical Judges, it is ſurprizing that he did not at leaſt make uſe of the weapons of an author, the pen, I mean a borrowed one; for as to himſelf he was not able to write three lines without terrible barbariſms. For ten piſtoles he might have met with one that would have revenged him with a witneſs. No book ever gave a fairer handle for cenſure than the *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld*, and the author of it might have been eaſily confounded. And yet, by an inſtance of impunity never before ſeen, and which perhaps will never be ſeen again, that work has remained without anſwer. There are a great many curious things to be ſaid upon this ſubject: I had a mind to have ſaid ſomething, or rather a great deal, upon it; but the remaining ſheets of this volume are too few in proportion for the materials of yet greater importance, which I would make uſe of, but am obliged to refer part of them till another time for want of room. I therefore ſuppreſs whatever I had collected concerning this article.

[*F*] *Mr Chappuzeau . . . . has not been altogether ſilent.*] He was defamed in a moſt terrible and cruel manner in the book entitled, *L'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld*, and yet he continued ſilent for the ſpace of ſeven years, though he had a great many good things to ſay in his own vindication, as he made appear at laſt in 1691, in a piece which he publiſhed at the Hague (19). This conſiſted of two letters addreſſed to the *Sieur Peter Jurieu the author of the libel.* He convicts him of falſhoods in ſeveral articles; and though he is pretty ſharp upon him, he does not exceed the bounds of prudence and moderation: Nay, he repreſents to him the goſpel-duties in a charitable and Chriſtian manner. In a word, one would think him a miniſter, not in the leaſt offended, ſpeaking to a layman; and not a layman offended ſpeaking to a miniſter, by whom he has been offended.

(14) *See the* Entretiens ſur la Cabale Chimerique, *pag.* 202, *& ſeq.*

(15) See, above, remark [*C*], citation (4).

(16) Chappuzeau, Défenſe, &c. *pag.* 8.

(17) In his Diſſertation prefixed to *Monarchia Univerſale del Re Luigi XIV*, printed at Amſterdam 1689.

(18) Pag. 201, & ſeq.

(19) It conſiſts of two letters which contain but ten pages in 4to, in two columns. I have ſet down above, citation (5), the title of this pamphlet.

TAULERUS (John) a famous author among the Myſtical Votaries, flouriſhed in the XIVth century. Neither the year nor the place of his birth are known: for thoſe who ſay he was born at Cologn are not able to prove it; but we know he was a native of Germany. He embraced a monaſtic life in the order of the Dominicans, and acquired a great character in Philoſophy and School-Divinity; but he applied himſelf principally to Myſtical-Divinity: and becauſe he was thought to be favoured with divine revelations, he was ſirnamed the Inlightened Divine. He had great talents for preaching, and no preacher in his time was more followed than he. He reproved with great zeal and freedom the faults of every perſon and this rendred him odious to ſome Monks, whoſe perſecutions he bore patiently and courageouſly. He ſubmitted with the ſame patience and conſtancy to the trials which it pleaſed God to bring upon him for the ſpace of two years, though they were ſo great that his very friends looked upon him with deriſion. It is thought he was thus viſited by God, in order to prevent his growing proud of the extraordinary gifts which Heaven had beſtowed upon him. The two principal towns where he preached are Cologn and Straſburgh. He died in the latter after a long ſickneſs, and was there honourably interred in the academical college, near the winter-auditory. His tomb is ſtill to be ſeen there. If his epitaph had been carefully conſulted, there would not be ſo many different opinions about the year in which he died [*A*]: it would be unanimouſly placed on the ſeventeenth of May 1361 (*a*). He wrote ſeveral books [*B*], concerning

(*a*) Taken from a public Theſis maintained at Wittemberg the 31ſt of March, 1688, intituled. *Memoria Joh. Tauleri reſtaurata*, &c. composed by *Georgius Fridericus Heupelius, Argentoratenſis.*

[*A*] *So many different opinions about the year in which he died.*] According to ſome (1) he died in the year 1355. Others (2) will have it that it was the 15th July 1379. Others (3) are of opinion that he departed this life in the year 1380.

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] He wrote them in his mother-tongue: The moſt conſiderable were tranſlated into Latin by Surius, and publiſhed at Cologn, in the year 1548, in the following order. *Hiſtoria vitæ & converſionis Joannis Tauler. Conciones de tempore. Conciones de Sanctis. De veris virtutibus, inſtitutionibuſque divinis. Epiſtolæ devotionem, divinumque amorem ſpirantes. Propheticæ de plagis noſtri temporis. Cantica quædam ſpiritualia animæ Deum impendio amantis. De novem rupibus ſive gradibus Chriſtianæ perfectionis. Speculum lucidiſſimum & exemplar Domini noſtri J. Chriſti. Convivium M. Eckardi jucundum & pium. Colloquium Theologi & Mendici. Oratio fidelis præparatoria ad mortem. Præparationes quatuor notabiles ad mortem felicem. Notabilis alia ad mortem felicem præparatio. De decem cæcitatibus, & quatuordecim divini amoris radicibus libellus.* Note, that all the works, whoſe titles I have ſet down, except the ſermons, are collections out of Taulerus, and intermixed with the writings of ſome other authors (4). Note alſo, that the work intituled, *Sermones quibus explanatio evangeliorum quæ diebus Dominicis ac feſtis ſanctorum enarrari ſolent, comprehendi-* was printed at Augſburg, in folio, in the year 1508, at Baſil

(1) *Teſte* Spondano, *ad ann.* 1355, *num.* 17, *pag. m.* 534.

(2) Hottinger. Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. *Part. iii, p.* 707.

(3) Stratemannus, Theatr. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. *pag.* 847, *apud* Georg. Frideric. Heupelium, in Memoria J. Tauleri reſtaurata, *pag. ult.*

(4) *Taken from* Father Labbe, Diſſert. de Scriptor Eccl. *Tom.* 1, *pag.* 608, 609.

concerning which there are different opinions: they are blamed by ſome Catholics, and commended by ſome Proteſtants [*C*]. It cannot be denied that he corrupts ſeveral of his readers by leading them into Fanaticiſm [*D*]. We ſhall ſee below the character which a man

Baſil in 1521 and 1522 in folio, at Francfort in 1681 in 4to, and that the Augſburg edition does not contain all the ſermons that are to be found in the other editions (5). Some will have it, that Taulerus is the author of a book intituled, *Theologia Germanica*, printed in 1518, 1519, 1520, 1528, 1681, *&c.* No body doubts that the perſon who tranſlated it into Latin, under the name of *Johannes Theophilus*, was Sebaſtian Caſtalio. Many are of opinion, that Taulerus is not the author of that book: For, ſay they, he is quoted in it, and the author ſtyles himſelf prieſt and warden of the order of the Knights of the Teutonic order, in their houſe at Francfort (6). James Thomaſius has made a collection of ſeveral encomiums beſtowed upon that book (7). But ſee particularly the Preface to the French edition (8) of *Theologia Germanica*, and the letter concerning myſtical authors at the end of that edition. You will find in the preface many particulars concerning the book tranſlated into Latin by Caſtalio, and the following paſſage may be ſeen in the letter. ‘ Taulerus wrote in old German, which is rarely to be met with. Surius made a Latin tranſlation of it, printed ſeveral times at Paris, and at Cologn, till the year 1615, which now ſerves inſtead of the original. There are many German editions of it, publiſhed both by the Roman Catholics and the Proteſtants: The Flemings have alſo printed it ſeveral times; but the old Flemiſh edition of Francfort in 1565, is altered, as well as that which M. Serrarius publiſhed at Hoorn, about forty years ago, though otherwiſe the latter contains more pieces of the author than any other. The beſt is that of Antwerp 1685: However, his inſtitutions, his letters, and his exerciſes upon the paſſion, are wanting in it; but they are to be found by themſelves, the two firſt with this title *Medulla Animæ*, of which there is an old French edition, but inferior to a new and very fine tranſlation, both of his Inſtitutions, printed at Paris in 1668, and of his Exerciſes upon the paſſion, printed in the ſame place the next year, with the Exerciſes of the pious ESCHIUS, upon the purgative, illuminative, and unitive life, thereunto ſubjoined. Father Mabillon, in the catalogue inſerted at the end of his *Traité des Etudes Monaſtiques*, places Taulerus's works among the ſpiritual books, tranſlated into French. I never ſaw his Sermons among his works, though they are the moſt conſiderable part of them: And I am ſure that this treatiſe *concerning the poor life of Jeſus Chriſt* is much leſs to be found there, ſince it is wanting in Surius's Latin tranſlation, and is only to be found in German and Flemiſh (9).

[*C*] *They are blamed by ſome Catholics, and commended by ſome Proteſtants.*] Eccius ſaid that Taulerus was a doating man, ſuſpected of hereſy, and one who ought always to have remained in obſcurity. Vocavit *Eccius* Taulerum *ſomniatorem, hæreſeos arguit, & ut prorſus lateret, & nunquam in monaſteria involaret* optavit (10). Bloſius vigorouſly oppoſed this cenſure. ‘ *Eccio* ſtrenue ſe oppoſuit *Ludovicus Bloſius* Abbas Lætienſis qui Taulerum *Catholicæ fidei integerrimum cultorem* appellavit, dixit *ea quæ ſcripſit ſana & plane divina eſſe*, optavitque in nomine domini, ut *Taulerus ubique gentium cognitus eſſet, & à pluribus diligentiſſime legeretur:* addit *minus circumſpectum* Eccium, Taulerum *nondum ſatis à ſe lectum damnaſſe* (11). - - - - *Eccius* was ſtrenuouſly oppoſed by *the Abbot Ludovicus Bloſius*, who called *Taulerus a moſt hearty maintainer of the Catholic Faith*, and ſaid, *that his writings were not only ſound but even divine*, and wiſhed in God's name, that *Taulerus were known all over the world, and moſt diligently read:* he adds, *that* Eccius *had been too haſty and condemned* Taulerus *before he had ſufficiently read him.*’ This judgment of Bloſius Poſſevin mentions and approves (12). Spondanus takes Taulerus's part, and ſays he foretold Wickliff's hereſies, and praiſes Bloſius his apologiſt. ‘ Cujus (*Tauleri*) extant ſermones, & alii tractatus unctionem divini ſpiritus referentes: prædixitque hæreſes contra Sacramenta & Dogmata Eccleſiæ Catholicæ brevi ab Wickleffo orituras. Contra cujus obtrectatores apologiam ſcripſit Ludovicus Bloſius, recentior ejuſdem Spiritus Sancti devotiſſimus diſcipulus (13). - - - - *Taulerus's ſermons are extant and other treatiſes, which ſeem as if inſpired; he alſo foretold the hereſies which Wickliff ſhould ſoon broach againſt the ſacraments, and the doctrines of the Catholic Church. His apology, in anſwer to thoſe who cenſured him, was written by Ludovicus Bloſius, a later and moſt zealous diſciple of the ſame holy Spirit.* Sixtus Senenſis highly commends the devotion of our Dominican (14). I have read in Hottinger (15), that ſome Catholics call Taulerus an Hereſiarch, and ſay that ſeveral people doubted of his ſalvation; but an apparition removed their doubts. Luther was one of thoſe, who beſtowed great encomiums upon Taulerus. ‘ Hunc doctorem, *ſays he* (16), ſcio quidem ignotum eſſe Scholis Theologorum, ideoque forte contemptibilem, ſed ego plus in eo (licet totus Germanorum vernacula ſit conſcriptus) reperi Theologiæ ſolidæ & ſynceræ quam in univerſis omnium univerſitatum Scholaſticis Doctoribus repertum eſt, aut reperiri poſſit in ſuis ſententiis. - - - - *This doctor*, ſays he, *I know is not taken notice of in the ſchools of Divinity, and therefore perhaps deſpiſed, but I have found more ſolid and ſound Divinity in him, though all his works are written only in the German language, than in all the ſcholaſtic doctors the univerſities ever produced, or than can be found in their opinions.*’ Let us ſee what he wrote to Spalatinus (17). ‘ Si te delectat puram ſolidam antiquæ ſimillimam Theologiam legere in Germanica lingua effuſam, ſermones Joh. Tauleri prædicatoriæ profeſſionis comparare tibi potes. Neque enim ego vel in Latina vel in noſtra lingua Theologiam vidi ſalubriorem, & cum evangelio conſonantiorem. - - - - *If you like to read pure ſolid Divinity, ſuch as the primitive was, expreſſed in the German tongue, you may conſult the ſermons of Joh. Taulerus, that famous preacher. Nor have I, either in the Latin or our own tongue, met with ſounder Divinity, or more agreeable to the Goſpel.*’ Luther's encomiums upon Taulerus have been prefixed more than once to the works of that myſtical Divine (18). Some affect to ſay, that Luther ſpoke of him in this manner, either before he made his attack againſt Popery, or during the firſt years of his reformation, and afterwards grew more reſerved in praiſing that writer. *Poſt illa tempora ubi B. viro datum fuit tenebras papales magis magiſque ſuperare, & negotium cum novis prophetis interceſſit in Taulero ejuſque Theologia commendandis cæpit eſſe parcior* (19). Nay, they quote a ſermon, wherein he cenſures him for a pernicious doctrine, namely, that we ought not to pray to God. ‘ Taulerus exemplo neſcio quo docere vult eſſe à precibus deſiſtendum: ſed hac doctrina nihil eſt pernicioſius: nimis enim ad intermittendas preces jam antea propenſi ſumus (20). - - - - *Taulerus, I know not by whoſe example, teacheth, that we ought to deſiſt from praying: but nothing is more pernicious than this doctrine: for we are too apt already to forget our prayers.*’ However it be, Michael Neander, Nicolas Hunnius, Dorſcheus, Quenſtedt, Spener, Arndius (21), and ſome other Lutherans, have beſtowed fine encomiums upon Taulerus; and Flacius Illyricus places him among the witneſſes of the truth (22). Let us conclude this remark with the words of a modern Myſtic. ‘ Every good man that knows him muſt needs like and approve him. Hence it is, that the wiſeſt Proteſtants, Dr Arndius, Dr Mullerus, and many others, without excepting Luther and Melancthon, have commended him no leſs than the Roman Catholics, as may be ſeen at the beginning of the German edition of his Sermons, procured by the pious Arndius, and alſo before that of all the works of this author which was publiſhed by the famous Dr Spener, and re-printed ſeveral times (23) at Francfort *.

[*D*] *It cannot be denied that he corrupts ſeveral of his readers, by leading them into Fanaticiſm.*] Beza deſpiſed him very much: Sainte Aldegonde looked upon him as an Enthuſiaſt: Voëtius took him only for a man, who, without being a downright Enthuſiaſt, ſaid many things that made way for the Enthuſiaſm of ſome ſectaries (24). Here follows a paſſage of Hoornbeeck: ‘ Fuerunt ſub Papatu, qui vel inſcii, vel imprudentes a man well ſkilled in theſe matters gives of him [*E*]. We ſhould do him wrong, did we not diſtinguiſh him from thoſe myſtical men, who have taught in Chriſtianity ſomething like the errors of the Eaſtern Philoſophers [*F*], which I have mentioned in the article of Spinoza (*b*).

---

(5) Georg. Fridericus Heupelius, in Memoria J. Tauleri reſtaurata, *fol. B.*

(6) Ex eod. *ibid.*

(7) Thomaſ. Schediaſma Hiſtor. de Philoſoph. Gentili, Gnoſticorum Hæreſi, & Theologia Myſtica, *pag.* 75, *apud eund. ibid.*

(8) Amſterdam 1700, printed by Henry Wetſtein.

(9) Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques, *pag.* 12, 13.

(10) Georg. Frid. Heupelius, *folio B verſo. He cites* Poſſevin. Apparat. Sacr. *Tom. i.*

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1355, *num.* 17.

(14) Sixtus Senenſis, *lib. iv*, Biblioth. Sanctæ, *pag.* 336, *Edit. Colon.* 1626, *apud* Heupelium, ubi ſupra, *fol. B* 2.

(15) Hottinger. ubi ſupra: *He cites* Bzovius an. Chriſ. 1355. S. 21, 22.

(16) Luther. *Tom. i, Latin. Jenenſ. pag.* 86, 6, *apud* Heupelium, *folio B verſo.*

(17) *Idem, Tom. i. Epiſt. Epiſtol. xxiii, ad Spalat. A.* 1516. *dat. pag.* 32. *fac. a, apud* Heupelium, ibid.

(18) Chriſtoph. Heinric. Loeber. in brevi Judicio Theologico de Libello Germanico. *That piece of Loeberus was printed at Iena in* 1681.

(19) Id. ibid. *fol. A* 3.

(20) Luther. in Concion. domi & publico habitis Dominica Reminiſc. *Edit. Wanckelianæ, pag.* 545, *apud* Loeberum, *ibid. folio A* 2 *verſo.*

(21) See their quotations in Heupelius, *ubi ſupra, fol. B* 3.

(22) See the ſame Heupelius, *fol. ult.*

(23) Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques, *pag.* 11.

* In 1680, and 1692, &c.

(24) See the ſame Heupelius, *fol. B* 2.

‘ viam multùm ſtraverunt Enthuſiaſticis illis, ſuâ Theologiâ *myſticâ*, quemadmodum loquuntur, & libellis pietatis, quibus terminis & phraſibus duris, myſticis & allegoricis, tum inſpirationis, tum deificationis, &c. utebantur, & ab aliis pro enthuſiaſmis ſuis habiti vel accepti poſtea fuerunt. Quales, *Johannes de Schoonhovia*, *Joh. Taulerus*, quem inter Pontificios, Eckius; inter noſtros Marnixius carpunt: defendit autem Lud. Bloſius, ſingulari pro eo apologia (25). *There were ſome under the Papacy, who either ignorantly, or imprudently, very much paved the way for thoſe Enthuſiaſts*, by their myſtical *Divinity, as it was called, and by books of piety, wherein were uſed the harſh myſtical and allegorical terms and phraſes of inſpiration, deification*, &c. *which were afterwards borrowed and received by others in their Enthuſiaſms. Such as* Johannes de Schoonhovia, Joh. Taulerus, *who has been cenſured by Eckius, among the Roman Catholics, and by St Aldegonde among us: but he is vindicated by Lud. Bloſius in a particular apology.*’ Nicolas Hunnius, and ſome other Lutherans, had the ſame opinion of Taulerus. ‘ Ex quibus & permultis ſimilibus .... proclive eſt judicium ferre, an non *Taulerus* per ſe, minimum per accidens, *Schwenckfeldianorum*, *Anabaptiſtarum*, & *Weigelianorum figmentis* anſam dederit (26). ---- *From which, and a great many others of the like kind: ... it is eaſy to judge, whether* Taulerus *of himſelf, and not at all by accident, has not given a handle to the fictions of the* Schwenckfeldians, *the* Anabaptiſts, *and the* Weigelians.’ Heupelius, ſo often quoted by me, reduces his whole diſputation to theſe two propoſitions: 1. That Taulerus deſerves to be recommended to the ſtudents in Divinity. 2. That he ought to be read with caution; for, ſays he, there are ſome falſe doctrines in his works, and ſome phraſes that ſeem to favour the Enthuſiaſts and Quietiſts. *Quod non ſolum haud pauci in eo reperiantur errores approbati, qui in ſermonibus edit. Francof.* 1621, & 1681, *diligenter ſunt annotati, ſed etiam non raro dictionibus & formulis loquendi utatur, quæ videntur* Enthuſiaſtis *nominatim* Weigelianis, & *quos non ita pridem D.* Michael de Molinos *in Italia excluſit*, Quietiſtis *favere* (27).

[*E*] *The character, which a man, well-ſkilled in theſe matters, gives of him.*] ‘ The character of that myſtical author (28), in my opinion, is this, That the ſoul, by the mortification of her paſſion, and vices, by the practice of virtue, by the denial and renunciation of herſelf, of her deſires, of her will, ſelf-love, and of her whole activity, and of all created beings, ſhould return into her internal ſtate, looking for GOD there, and finding him at laſt, who manifeſts himſelf there, by the birth of his divine Word, and the inſpiration of his holy Spirit: and that afterwards, by a laſting and continual introverſion, ſhe ſhould continue in that ſtate of interiority, in which GOD may work in her his will, his wonders, and his ſpecial direction; of which nevertheleſs that author ſpeaks but generally (29).’ Theſe are the words of the author of the new edition of the *Theologica Germanica*.

[*F*] *Something like the errors of the Eaſtern Philoſophers.*] It is ſurpriſing that theſe myſtical Chriſtians, and theſe Heathen Philoſophers, ſhould have had ſo exactly the ſame notions, that one would think they had agreed among themſelves to vent the ſame follies, ſome in the eaſt, and ſome in the weſt. What a wonderful concert there is between people who never ſaw, and never heard of one another! I am going to cite a paſſage, which will ſhew us that ſome myſtical men have taught the transformation of all things into GOD, and an *identification*, which would reduce the Creator and the creatures to a kind of nothingneſs, that is, to an eternal inaction. This is very like the Nireupan of the Siameſe (30). Theſe myſtical men ſuppoſed the doctrine of the Trinity, and aſcribed the whole action to the three Perſons, and ſo they believed that the divine Eſſence itſelf did nothing; and that when the ſoul is transformed into GOD's Eſſence, and raiſes herſelf above the three Perſons, ſhe enjoys as great a reſt as if ſhe were annihilated. Ruyſbroch ſhall be my witneſs. ‘ Itaque, *ſays he* (31), ne quis aliquo implicetur ac ſeducatur errore, diligenter falſos hoſce Prophetas, me eos depingente, animadvertat. Qui primi generis ſunt, Dei eſſentiam ſe eſſe ajunt ſupra divinitatis perſonas, adeoque ſe eſſe ocioſos, ac ſi non eſſent: quandoquidem Dei eſſentia non agit, ſed Spiritus Sanctus operatur. Putant ergo ſe ipſo Sancto Spiritu eſſe ſuperiores, & ſe neque ipſo, neque ejus gratia habere opus: dicunt enim non modo nullam creaturam, ſed nec ipſum quidem Deum quicquam eis vel conferre vel auferre poſſe. Quidam etiam ejus ſunt ſententiæ, ut animas ſuas ex Dei ſubſtantia creatas affirment, cumque mortui fuerint, rurſum ſe futuros eſſe id quod antea fuerant: perinde ut ſcyphus aquæ hauſtus ex fonte, ſi in ipſum fontem refundatur, idem eſt quod fuit prius. Ajunt præterea, ſi quis per cœlum omne pervagetur, nullum eum neque angelorum, neque animarum, neque ordinum, neque gloriæ, neque præmiorum diſcrimen diſtinctionemque reperturum; ſiquidem nihil illic, niſi ſimplicem quandam beatamque eſſentiam, omni actione vacantem, eſſe arbitrantur: Addunt his, poſt extremum judicii diem omnes omnino homines, malos æque ac bonos, & ſimul Deum ipſum, non niſi unam eandemque Dei eſſentiam, quæ in omnem æternitatem abſque ulla actione ſemper ocio vacatura ſit, eſſe futuros. Atque eam ob rem nihil neque ſcire, neque cognoſcere, neque velle, nec amare, nec cogitare, non gratias agere, non laudare, ſed nec deſiderare, nec habere volunt. Nam ſupra Deum & ſine Deo eſſe, nec in ulla re Deum quærere nec invenire, atque demum ab omnibus prorſus immunes eſſe volunt. Et hoc ipſi perfectam appellant ſpiritûs paupertatem. Verum ejuſcemodi paupertas in cœlo minimè invenitur, neque in Deo, neque in angelis, neque in ſanctis, ſed nec in hominibus bonis toto orbe terrarum. Itaque non niſi diabolica & tartarea paupertas eſt. ---- *Therefore*, ſays he, *let every every one in order to prevent their being ſeduced and led away into error, diligently attend to my deſcription of theſe falſe prophets. Thoſe of the firſt kind affirm themſelves to be the divine Eſſence, ſuperior to the perſons of the Divinity, and therefore to be unactive as if they were not in being; becauſe the Divine Eſſence is at reſt, and the Holy Ghoſt only operates. They hold themſelves therefore to be ſuperior to the Holy Ghoſt itſelf, and to be in no want either of the Holy Ghoſt, or of it's influence: for they ſay that not only no creature, but not even GOD himſelf can add to, or take from them in any reſpect. Some alſo have embraced ſuch an opinion, that they affirm their ſouls to be created out of the divine ſubſtance, and that after death they are again to return from whence they came, as a glaſs of water taken out of a fountain, if it is poured again into the fountain, is the ſame with what it was formerly. They ſay moreover, that if any one was to traverſe the whole Heavens, he would find no difference nor diſtinction among angels, ſouls, orders, glories, or rewards; for that they believe nothing to be there but a certain ſimple and happy eſſence, void of all action: they add farther, that after the day of judgment, all men univerſally, the bad as well as the good, together with GOD himſelf, will make up only one and the ſame divine Eſſence, which will enjoy an abſolute reſt and inaction to all eternity. And for this reaſon, that they will neither know, underſtand, will, love, think, return thanks for, nor praiſe, no nor ſo much as deſire, or have any thing. For they will have themſelves to be ſuperior to and independant of GOD, and in no reſpect wanting to ſeek or to find GOD, but, in ſhort, abſolutely exempt from all things. And this they call a perfect poverty of ſpirit. But this ſort of poverty is not to be met with, neither in GOD, nor in the angels, nor in the ſaints, nor even in good men, any where upon the face of the earth, therefore this poverty is only diabolical and helliſh.*’ Our Taulerus always differs from theſe doaters, and very ſolidly confutes thoſe who fancy they are only a meer paſſive inſtrument in the hand of GOD (32).

(*b*) See remark [*A*], of the article SPINOZA.

(25) Hoornbeeck, Summa Controv. *lib. vi*, *pag. m.* 408.

(26) Nicolas Hunnius, in Conſider. novæ Paracelſ. & Weigel. Theol. *apud* Heupelium, ibid. *fol. B* 3.

(27) Heupelius, *ibid.*

(28) That is, *Taulerus.*

(29) Lettre ſur les Auteurs Myſtiques, *pag.* 11, 12.

(30) See, above, the remark [*A*], of the article SOMMONA-CODOM.

(31) Ruyſbrochius, in Libro de vera Contemplat. *cap. xix*, *pag.* 445. *apud* Giſb. Voëtium, in Exercitiis Pietatis, *cap. iii*, *pag.* 86.

(32) See the paſſage of Taulerus, quoted by Voëtius, *ubi ſupra*, *pag.* 78, 79.

TAURELLUS

TAURELLUS (Nicolas) a Phyſician, and a Philoſopher, was born at Montbelliard, the twenty-ſixth of November 1547. He was admitted Maſter of Philoſophy at Tubingen in the year 1565, and when the magiſtrates of Nuremberg founded an univerſity at Altdorf, in the year 1581, they gave him the profeſſorſhip in Phyſic (a). He diſcharged it with great ability: but becauſe he departed from the opinions commonly received, he had ſome enemies, and fell out with the Divines. Thoſe of Heidelberg cried him down as an Atheiſt [*A*]. He died at Altdorf in September 1606 (b). It was a time of peſtilence; and as ſoon as he ſaw that one of his ſervant-maids had got the plague, he left his houſe in the night-time, but came home again ſoon after, and died the ſame day (c). He publiſhed ſome books which made a noiſe [*B*].

He was a little man; hence it was that a Poet, alluding to the word *Taurellus*, a diminutive of *Taurus*, beſtowed this encomium upon him, that he was *Taurellus* in body, but *Taurus* in mind, *Corpore Taurellus, Taurus es ingenio.* It is one of the verſes of an elegy, that was made in his praiſe when he was admitted to the degree of Doctor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Baſil (d).

(a) *Taken from* Melchior Adam, in Vitis Medicorum, *pag.* 403.

(b) Id. ibid.

(c) Paulus Freherus, in Theatro Virorum illuſtrium, *pag.* 1320.

(d) *Taken from* Scioppius in Scaligero Hypobol. *fol.* 196, *verſo.*

[*A*] *The Divines of Heidelberg cried him down as an Atheiſt.*] Giſbertus Voëtius tells us what was the occaſion of it. He puts the queſtion to him (1). 'Cur *Theologi Heidelbergenſes* ante annos aliquot *Nicol. Taurellum* Philoſophum non ignobilem dixerint Atheum Medicum, in *Literis* (2) *ad Deputatos Synodi Holland. ſuper libro & cauſâ Conr. Vorſtii perſcriptis?* Et an non falcem miſerint in alienam meſſem, & indignè traduxerint iſtius aliorumque ſimilium magnorum virorum inventa ad illuſtrandam & perficiendam Philoſophiam. - - - *Why did the* Heidelberg Divines, *ſome years ago call* Nicolas Taurellus, *that eminent Philoſopher, an Atheiſtical Phyſician,* in their Letters to the Deputies of the Dutch ſynod, written on the occaſion of the book and cauſe of Vorſtius? *And did they not meddle in a matter no way belonging to them, and unworthily traduce him, and other great mens inventions, towards illuſtrating and improving Philoſophy.*' And he anſwers it thus: 'Arbitror eus reſpexiſſe paradoxa non pauca quæ imprimis *Compendio Metaphyſico*, & *Triumpho Philoſophiæ* inſpargit; & ad divina ac Theologica paſſim applicat; quibus limites communes hodierno Chriſtianiſmo Theologiæ tranſiliri, & dogmata nonnulla conquaſſari, atque adeo Scepticis, Libertinis, aliiſque fanaticis & ſecundi generis Atheis cauſam nimis tradi non immerito metuendum eſt. De intentione illius viri nolumus judicare, nec cætera ejus inquirimus. Aliter etiam judicamus de ingenioſis ipſius *diſputationibus, in naturalibus* contra Piccolomineum, Cæſalpinum, alioſque phyſicos: ubi omnem libertatem Socraticam tollere nolimus: nec theologici hoc fori eſt, ſed medici, phyſici, mathematici: quomodo vice verſa, metaphyſica, pneumatologica, & theologica naturalia non tam, nedum ſolius, phyſico-medici & mathematici fori ſunt, quam theologici. Videant ergo juniores, ut cum judicio legant philoſophemata ejus, quæ naturalia tranſcendunt. - - - - - *I imagine they had an eye to the ſeveral paradoxes, which he has advanced, eſpecially in his* Compendium Metaphyſicum, *and* Triumphus Philoſophiæ; *and has every where applied to Divine and Theological ſubjects: which there is too much reaſon to fear may be made uſe of in modern Chriſtianity to break through the uſual bounds of Divinity, to ſap the foundation of ſome of it's doctrines, and conſequently to make too great conceſſions to Sceptics, Libertines, and other Fanatics, and Atheiſts of the ſecond rate. I ſhall form no judgment as to his invention, nor enquire into other particulars of him. I have a quite different opinion of him as to his ingenious* diſputations in Natural Philoſophy, *againſt Piccolominæus, Cæſalpinus, and other Naturaliſts: in which I am for allowing the freedom of Socrates: nor does this regard Divinity, but Phyſic, Natural Philoſophy, and Mathematics: as, on the contrary, Metaphyſics, Pneumatology, and Natural Theology, belong not ſo properly, much leſs ſolely, to Phyſic, Natural Philoſophy, and Mathematics, as to Divinity. Let therefore the young readers peruſe with candor his Philoſophical reflexions, which are above nature.*' Tho' that famous author would not plainly condemn the Heidelberg Divines, he gives us room to believe that they were too haſty. Such accuſations ought to be very rarely preferred. It appears, on the other hand, that he does juſtice to that profeſſor, who was certainly a man of great parts, and a ſubtile diſputant. I have quoted, in another place (3), a paſſage wherein it is ſaid, that the ſame Divine charged him with Atheiſm: but I muſt obſerve here, that the terms of the original are not ſo ſtrong: he only calls him an aſſertor of paradoxes, *Aſſertio* παραδοξολόγου *Taurelli* (4).

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſome books which made a noiſe*] A Method of Prognoſtics in Phyſic; notes upon the works of Arnaldus à Villanova: *Diſcuſſiones Phyſicæ de mundo contra Piccolomineum: Diſcuſſiones Phyſicæ & Metaphyſicæ de cælo adverſus eundem: Alpes cæſæ*, it is a book againſt Cæſalpinus: *de infiniti continui ſectione: de rerum æternitate.* I have quoted in another place (5) a book, wherein he advances a particular opinion, concerning the ſouls of beaſts. See the titles inſerted in a paſſage out of Voëtius, in the foregoing remark.

He had begun a book *de Uſiis per ſe ſubſiſtentibus*, ſome pieces whereof were printed after his death, with a new edition of the tract *de Cælo & Mundo.* Picart, his colleague, took care of that edition at Amberg, in 1611, in 8vo. It appears from theſe fragments that Taurellus underſtood very well the nature of ſubſtance, and wherein it is diſtinguiſhed from accidents. It is ſomewhat ſtrange that the liberty he took to confute Ariſtotle ſhould have expoſed him ſo much to the hatred of Divines: for he principally confuted the doctrines of Ariſtotle that are contrary to religion. This we may ſee particularly in a book of his, printed at Marpurg, in 1604, in 8vo, and intituled, *De Rerum æternitate: Nicolai Taurelli Montbelgardenſis, Med. & Phyſices in Altdorffenſi Noricorum Academia Profeſſoris, Metaphyſices Univerſalis partes quatuor. In quibus placita Ariſtotelis, Valleſii, Piccolominei, Cæſalpini, Societatis Conimbricenſis, aliorumque diſcutiuntur, examinantur atque refutantur.* He therein clearly and ſolidly confutes Ariſtotle's opinion, concerning the eternity of the world. He was certainly one of the beſt Metaphyſicians of that age.

(1) Giſb. Voëtius, Diſput. Select. *Tom. i, pag.* 200.

(2) That letter is dated from Heidelberg the 26th of Auguſt 1610. It is the 149 among thoſe publiſhed by the Remonſtrants in the edition of the year 1684.

(3) In the article of GORLÆUS.

(4) Voëtius, in Theologico-Philoſophicis Corollaris.

(5) In the article SENNERTUS.

TAUVRY (Daniel), Doctor of Phyſic, of the Faculty at Paris, was born at Laval, and there maintained a general Theſis in Philoſophy at ten years of age. He was Phyſician of the Faculty at Angers, at the age of fifteen. He compoſed ſeveral works in Anatomy, and Phyſic [*A*], and was an illuſtrious member of the Royal Academy of Sciences. He died at Paris the firſt of March 1701, at thirty-two years of age (a).

(a) Mercure Galant, *for March* 1701.

[*A*] *He compoſed ſeveral works in Anatomy and Phyſic.*] That which is intituled, *Nouvelle Anatomie raiſonnée*, was printed at Paris in 1690 in 12mo (1): it has been tranſlated into Engliſh (2). His new practice in acute Diſeaſes, and in thoſe which depend upon the fermentation of liquids, was publiſhed at Paris in 1698, in two volumes in 12mo. See the *Journal des Savans* of the fourteenth of July, 1698. In the ſame place was publiſhed, in 1699, a new edition of the *Traité des Medicamens*, which he had reviſed, corrected, and enlarged. The tenth *Journal des Savans* of the ſame year takes notice of it (3).

(1) *See the* xxxiſt Journal des Sçavans, 1690, *pag.* 548, *Dutch edition.*

(2) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *March* 1702, *pag.* 357.

(3) Pag. 189, Dutch Edition.

TECMESSA.

TECMESSA, the daughter of a Phrygian Prince [*A*], was made a priſoner when the Grecians ravaged all the countries adjacent to Troy. Ajax liked her ſo well that he made her his concubine. She forgot, by degrees, the fall of her family, and conceived ſuch an affection for Ajax, who promiſed to make her a queen (*a*), that ſhe was extremely afflicted at his death [*B*]. He had by her a ſon called Euryſaces, who reigned in Salamis, after the deceaſe of Telamon, Ajax's father. Teucer, the ſecond ſon of Telamon, had a mind to return into Salamis, after he had ſettled in the iſle of Cyprus; but Euryſaces prevented him (*b*). The Athenians had a particular veneration for Ajax and his ſon. Pauſanias ſays (*c*) that the honours, which had been decreed to them, continued even to his time, and that there was ſtill to be ſeen at Athens an altar of Euryſaces. We find in Plutarch (*d*) the privileges granted to the tribe of Æantides, and the encomiums on that tribe. I find nothing concerning the other ſon of Ajax, mentioned by Dictys Cretenſis, whom he calls Achantides (*e*). His mother's name was Glauca. He was put into Teucer's hands, as well as Euryſaces, when the Grecians took ſhipping in order to go home (*f*). Some have ſaid (*g*) that Telamon grew angry with Teucer, becauſe he did not bring back with him Tecmeſſa and Euryſaces. He embarked on board a veſſel which made more haſte than the reſt. Pauſanias obſerves (*b*) that Ajax's poſterity was not very illuſtrious, and the private life of Ajax is the reaſon he gives for it; this, I think, is a falſe reaſon [*C*], I do not believe that, Leſcaloperius had any grounds for ſaying, that Julius Cæſar compoſed a tragedy intitled, *Tecmeſſa* [*D*].

[*A*] *A daughter of a Phrygian Prince.*] Dictys Cretenſis (1) calls him Teuthrantes. He ſays, that Ajax killed him *ſolitario certamine.* Every body will tranſlate theſe words as he thinks fit, and perhaps ſome readers will underſtand them of a duel. Afterwards Ajax took, plundered, and burnt the town of that Phrygian, whoſe daughter, Tecmeſſa, was carried away, with the reſt of the booty, and adjudged to Ajax, when the booty was divided. *Poſt paucos dies expugnata atque incenſa civitate magnam vim prædæ abſtrahit, abducens Tecmeſſam filiam regis . . . . Ac deinde Ajaci ob egregia laborum facinora Teuthrantis filiam Tecmeſſam concedunt.* If we believe Horace, the captive won Ajax's heart by her beauty (2). Sophocles (3) does not agree with Dictys in every particular: for he ſays, that Tecmeſſa's father was already dead (4), when his dominions were laid waſte by Ajax: and that it was his widow, who was killed when the town was taken. Tecmeſſa ſpeaks to Ajax in theſe words:

Σὺ γάρ μου πατρίδ' ἠΐστωσας δορὶ
Καὶ μητέρ' ἀλλ' ἡ μοῖρα (5) τὸν φύσαντά με
Καθεῖλεν ᾅδου θανασίμους οἰκήτορας.

Tu enim mihi patriam vaſtaſti bello,
Matrem ſuſtuliſti, mors vero patrem
Abripuit ad manes qui apud inferos ſunt.

My country wretched by your ſword was made,
My mother murther'd, while my father's ſhade,
Far from your reach had been by death convey'd.

[*B*] *Extremely afflicted at his death.*] Sophocles and Quintus Calaber furniſh her with very moving expreſſions. The firſt ſuppoſes that ſhe uſed many entreaties to prevent his killing himſelf; that ſhe begged of him not to leave her expoſed to a thouſand misfortunes by his death, and that ſhe preſſed it by reminding him of the pleaſures he had enjoyed with her.

Ἀνδρί τοι χρεὼν
Μνήμην προσεῖναι, τερπνὸν εἴ τι που πάθοι.

Decet enim virum
Memorem eſſe, ſi quid illi ſuave accidit (6).

With ev'ry man who bears a grateful mind,
Each ſingle pleaſure muſt rememb'rance find.

The ſcholiaſt obſerves upon this, that Tecmeſſa puts Ajax in mind of what had paſſed between them in bed, and that ſhe does it modeſtly, and like a chaſte woman (7). and not ſo bluntly as Hecuba in Euripides. Ὁ δέ γε Εὐριπίδης μαστροπικώτατα εἰσάγει τὴν Ἑκάβην λέγουσαν Ποῦ τὰς φίλας δῆτ' εὐφρόνας δείξεις ἄναξ; Ἡ τῶν ἐν εὐνῇ φιλτάτων ἀσπασμάτων χάριν τίν' ἕξει παῖς ἐμή, κείνης δ' ἐγώ; *What will my daughter get by the amorous embraces ſhe will afford you in her bed?* The French ſtage is more nice than that of Athens. The moſt excellent pieces of Racine would be hiſſed at for ſuch a plainneſs.

[*C*] *This, I think, is a falſe reaſon.*] I will not object to Pauſanias, that he ſays (8) Ajax ſucceeded his grand-father by the mother's ſide, who was King of Megara (9): I would readily agree with him, that Ajax lived always in a private capacity, becauſe he died before his father Telamon: But I deny that this can be the reaſon why his deſcendants were leſs illuſtrious than thoſe of Teucer, the ſecond ſon of Telamon: Theſe latter reigned in the iſle of Cyprus till Evagoras at leaſt, and therefore ſome deſcendants of Telamon made a great figure for many ages. Why? Becauſe Teucer reigned; but becauſe Ajax did not reign, his deſcendants were not very illuſtrious. This is Pauſanias's way of arguing. I repeat it again, this is a falſe way of reaſoning; for Euryſaces, Ajax's ſon, ſucceeded to the kingdom of Salamis after the death of Telamon, juſt the ſame as if he had been a king's ſon (10.) But here is the reaſon why his deſcendants made no great figure in the world. He had a ſon called Philæus, who gave away the kingdom of Salamis in order to be made a citizen of Athens: This we find in Pauſanias (11). From that time the poſterity of Ajax, being diveſted of ſovereign authority, could not poſſibly ſhine like that of the other ſon of Telamon. They had in the perſon of Miltiades, deſcended from that ſon of Euryſaces, all the luſtre that a family, not poſſeſſed of a kingdom, can have; but after all, they did not ſway the ſcepter as Teucer's poſterity did. I muſt obſerve, that Philæus, who, according to Pauſanias, was Euryſaces's ſon, and Ajax's grand-ſon, was Ajax's ſon, according to Herodotus (12). He was, according to the ſame Hiſtorian, the ſtem of the Athenian Æacides, from whom Miltiades deſcended. Plutarch (13) will have it, that Philæus and Euryſaces, both Ajax's ſons, reſigned the property of the iſle of Salamis to the Athenians, in order to be made citizens of Athens. He adds, that Euryſaces reſided at Brauron in Attica, and Philæus at Melita (14); and that Philæus gave his name to the Philaides, a people of Attica, from whom Piſiſtratus derived his original. Stephanus Byzantius ranks the Philaides under the tribe called Ægeides (15), and ſays, that Philæus, from whom that people had their name, was the ſon of Ajax and Lyſide, the daughter of Caronus, the ſon of Lapithus.

[*D*] *Leſcaloperius . . . . . . ſays, that Julius Cæſar compoſed a tragedy intitled* Tecmeſſa.] This Jeſuit obſerves, that the Romans inſerted the vowel *u* in ſeveral Greek words; which was practiſed to the time of Julius Cæſar, who was the firſt author of a tragedy, intituled, Tecmeſſa. Theſe are his words. ‘ In Alcumena, Alcumæon, Tecumeſſa, Hercules, Æſculapius, ‘ & aliis ejuſmodi Græcis nominibus, vocalis u à priſcis Latinis interjecta eſt, non tantùm ubi carmen exigeret, ut ait ille; ſed ubique paſſim, quòd ita mos ‘ ferret, etiam in ſolutâ oratione. Atque ille mos ‘ tenuit uſque ad Julium Cæſarem, qui Tragœdiam de ‘ Tecmeſſa primus ſcripſiſſe fertur, & ita pronunciari ‘ juſſiſſe. Itaque poſt Tecmeſſam cœptum eſt dici, uti ‘ hodieque dicimus, Alcmena, & Alcmæon: verùm ‘ Hercules & Æſculapius prævaluere, & adhuc intercalariam retinent vocalem (16). - - - *In Alcumena, Al-*
‘ *cumæon*

(a) Quint. Calaber, *lib. v, ver.* 546.

(b) Juſtin. *lib. xliv, cap. iii.*

(c) Lib. i, pag. 33.

(d) Plut. in Sympoſ. *lib. i, cap. x.*

(e) Dictys, Cret. *lib. v, See hereafter the remark* [*C*].

(f) Dictys, ibid.

(g) *Apud* Servium, in Æneid. *lib. i, ver.* 619. *where inſtead of* Theomiſſam *read* Tecmeſſam, *and inſtead of* Turiſacen *read* Euryſacen.

(b) Lib. ii, pag. 71.

(1) Lib. ii.

(2) Movit Ajacem, Telamone natum,
Forma Captivæ dominum Tecmeſſæ.
The Heart of Ajax Telamon,
Was by his captive's beauty won.
Horat. Od. IV, lib. ii.

(3) In Ajace.

(4) He calls him Teleutas.

(5) Here is what the Scholiaſt ſays upon that word. Ὡς τούτου ἰδίῳ θανάτῳ τετελευτηκότος, τὸ δὲ ἀλλὰ, ἀντὶ τοῦ δέ. See Camerarius's notes upon that place.

(6) *Compare with this the words of Dido,* Si bene quid de te merui, fuit aut tibi quicquam Dulce meum. *If once I ever merited or pleas'd.* Æn. lib. iv, ver. 317.

(7) Αἰδημόνως δὲ αὐτὸν ὑπομιμνήσκει τὰ τῆς εὐνῆς.

(8) Lib. i, *pag.* 40.

(9) His name was Alcathous.

(10) Juſtin. *lib, xliv, cap. cap. iii.*

(11) Lib. i, pag. 33.

(12) Lib. vi, cap. xxxv.

(13) In Vita Solonis, *pag.* 83.

(14) It was part of Athens, where among other buildings, there was a temple of Euryſaces, according to Mr Spon, *Voyage de Grecs,* Tom. ii, pag. 442.

(15) Mr Spon, *ibid. pag.* 476, ſhews by an ancient marble inſcription, that they ought to be placed in the tribe called Oeneïdes.

(16) Leſcaloperius, Commentar. in Ciceron. de Nat Deor. *lib. iii, pag.* 624.

‘ *Alcumæon, Tecumeſſa, Hercules, Æſculapius, and other* ‘ *Greek words of that kind, the vowel u was inſerted by* ‘ *the antient Latins, not only where it was required in* ‘ *verſe, but every where throughout; becauſe it was cu-* ‘ *ſtomary, even in proſe. And this cuſtom continued down* ‘ *to Julius Cæſar, who is ſaid to be the firſt writer of* ‘ *a tragedy on Tecmeſſa, and to have directed the word* ‘ *to be ſo pronounced. Therefore after Tecmeſſa, it became* ‘ *the faſhion to pronounce, as we now do, Alcmena and* ‘ *Alcmæon: But Hercules and Æſculapius kept their ground,* ‘ *and yet retain the inter-placed vowel.*’ The Grammarian Victorinus, was contented to ſay, that Julius Cæſar began to contract thoſe words. If Leſcaloperius had read the book of one of his brethren, he would there have found the following paſſage: ‘ Scribit ‘ Victorinus, lib. 1. veteres nunquam c, & m conjun- ‘ xiſſe, uſque ad Julium Cæſarem, qui primus Alc- ‘ mæon, Alcmena, Tecmeſſa, quos prius Alcumenam, ‘ Tecumeſſam Alcumæonem ſcribebant (17). - - - - *Vi-* ‘ *ctorinus writes, that the antients never joined c and* ‘ *m together, till the time of Julius Cæſar, who firſt* ‘ *wrote Alcmæon, Alcmena, Tecmeſſa, which before were* ‘ *written Alcumæon, Alcumena, and Tecumeſſa.*’ I do not think Suetonius would have forgot this dramatic piece of Julius Cæſar, if there had been any ſuch.

(17) Martinus, del Rio Syntagmat. Tragici, Parte Ultima. *Mr du Rondel pointed out that paſſage to me.*

T E L A M O N, the ſon of Æacus and Endeis [*A*], is one of the principal heroes of fabulous Hiſtory. He had two brothers, namely Peleus and Phocus; but the latter was his brother only by the father's ſide (*a*). There aroſe ſuch a jealouſy between Phocus and the two others, that they plotted to kill him. They took their time as they were playing together at quoits. Some ſay, that Peleus killed Phocus, by throwing his quoit at his head (*b*); others ſay Telamon did it (*c*): and it is generally agreed that he who did not kill him, was nevertheleſs an accomplice in that action (*d*). Æacus thought ſo [*B*], for he drove out Peleus (*e*), as well as Telamon. The latter retired into the iſle of Salamis, where Cychreus reigned, who gave him in marriage his daughter Glauca, and made him his ſucceſſor (*f*). Others ſay, that having no children he adopted Telamon for his heir (*g*). However it is certain, that Telamon reigned in the iſle of Salamis. After the death of Glauca, he married Peribœa, the daughter of Alcathous, ſon of Pelops, and King of Megara [*C*]. From this marriage iſſued Ajax [*D*] that great

(*a*) Apollodor. *lib. iii, pag. m.* 230.

(*b*) Pauſan. *lib. ii, pag.* 72. Note, that according to Diodorus Siculus, Peleus did it inadvertently.

(*c*) Apollod. ubi ſupra, Plutarch. in Parall. *cap. xxv.*

(*d*) Apollodor. *ibid.*

(*e*) He reigned in the iſle of Ægina.

(*f*) Diodor. Sicul. *lib. vi, cap. x.*

(*g*) Apollodor. *ibid.*

[*A*] *The ſon of Æacus and Endeis.*] The children of Telamon had a divine original by ſeveral deſcents. Æacus was Jupiter's ſon. Endeis was the daughter of the centaur Chiron, ſon of Saturn. Peribœa, the wife of Telamon, and the mother of Ajax, was the daughter of Alcathous. The latter was the ſon of Pelops, whoſe father was Tantalus, the ſon of Jupiter.

[*B*] *Æacus thought ſo.*] It will not be improper to mention what Pauſanias ſays of it (1). Some time after the flight of thoſe two brothers, Telamon ſent a deputy to Æacus, to aſſure him that the murther had been committed thro' inadvertency. Æacus, returned anſwer, that he ſhould take care not to come into the iſland; but that, if he had a mind to juſtify himſelf, he might ſpeak on board a ſhip, or upon ſome bank which he ſhould erect for that end. Telamon pitched upon the laſt expedient, and erected a bank near the port, where he pleaded his cauſe; but not being judged innocent, he retired again.

[*C*] *He married Peribœa the daughter of Alcathous...... King of Megara.*] Though the account which Plutarch (2) had borrowed from Aretades, concerning Telamon, is come down to us miſerably imperfect; yet one may perceive he meant to ſay, that Telamon, having too much ſported with Peribœa, thought it proper to make his eſcape. The father of this young woman, diſcovering the affair, and thinking that one of his ſubjects had debauched her, ordered one of his guards to throw her into the ſea. The guard, moved with compaſſion, choſe rather to ſell her: The ſhip on board which ſhe was, landed at Salamis, where Telamon bought Peribœa, who was brought to bed of Ajax. A learned man (3) is of opinion, that inſtead of Εὔβοιαν, we ought to read Μέγαραν in that paſſage of Plutarch, ſince moſt authors are agreed, that Ajax's mother was the daughter of Alcathous, King of Megara. They are not ſo unanimous as to the name of that lady: Some call her Peribœa (4), and others Eribœa (5). It is plain this difference proceeds only from the fault of ſome tranſcriber, who left out, or added a letter to the name of Ajax's mother. Thoſe who tranſcribed his copy, retained that fault, which occaſioned a different reading; and afterwards authors followed the copy they had bought. The name Melibœa, which Ajax's mother yet bears in Athenæus, proceeds from the ſame cauſe. That author ſays, ſhe was married to Theſeus in due form (6). He names ſome other women, whom Theſeus took by force; he names two other wives of that prince who are mentioned by Heſiod; and at laſt he ſays, that, according to Pherecydes, he had alſo another wife called Pherebœa. Thoſe four women ought to be reduced to one; Peribœa, Eribœa, Melibœa, and Pherebœa, are four names of one and the ſame woman, which have been multiplied by the fault of the tranſcribers. If Theſeus's polygamy was not more certain, with reſpect to other women, than as to Melibœa, mentioned by Athenæus, and Pherebœa, mentioned by Pherecydes, I ſhould poſitively aſſert, that he was a Monogamiſt, even according to the rigid ſenſe of Tertullian. There is more difficulty in what follows. Ajax's mother was the lawful wife of Theſeus; but when? Was it after Telamon's death, or before ſhe married Telamon? If the firſt, it muſt be ſaid, that Theſeus ſurvived the deſtruction of Troy, which is falſe; and that he had a very extravagant deſire of marrying, ſince he pitched upon ſo old a woman, which is very improbable. It is better therefore to ſay, that he married Peribœa before her marriage with Telamon. But then, what ſhall we we do with the ſtory, mentioned by Plutarch? Inſtead of a young woman, whom Telamon thought he had debauched, we ſhould ſay that he took up only with another man's leavings, either with a widow or a divorced wife. Nothing of this quadrates with Plutarch's narrative, nor can it be ſupported from other authors. It appears by a paſſage in Pindar (7), that Telamon was married to Peribœa, when Hercules deſired him to follow him in his expedition againſt Laomedon. At this rate Theſeus muſt needs have divorced his wife ſomewhat early. However it be, we ought to remember, that Peribœa was one of the virgins, whom the Athenians were obliged to deliver to Minos (8). Theſeus was delivered to him at the ſame time, and boldly oppoſed Minos's attempt upon Peribœa's honour. This may make us believe, that Theſeus fell in love with the maid during his voyage, for ſhe was very handſome; and that he married her ſoon after. I cannot tell whether he contained himſelf till after his return; for the heroes of Greece were very dangerous fellow-travellers for a maid, they got children apace. They were very well qualified to preſerve the fair ſex from the violence of a fierce tyrant: but women ran no leſs danger in the hands of ſuch deliverers; and it was never more neceſſary than in reſpect to them to aſk this queſtion, ‘ Sed quis cuſtodiet ipſos cuſtodes ‘ (9)? - - - *But who, I pray, the guards themſelves* ‘ *ſhall guard?*’ Let us ſee how Theſeus ſpoke to Minos. ‘ Dicitur cum Theſeus Cretam ad Minoa ‘ cum ſeptem virginibus & ſex pueris veniſſet, Minoa ‘ de virginibus Periboeam quandam nomine, candore ‘ corporis inductum comprimere voluiſſe, quod cum ‘ Theſeus ſe paſſurum negaret, ut qui Neptuni filius ‘ eſſet, & valeret contra tyrannum pro virginis inco- ‘ lumitate decertare, *&c* (10). - - - *It is ſaid that when* ‘ *Theſeus was come to Crete with ſeven virgins and ſix* ‘ *youths, Minos charmed with the beauty of one of the* ‘ *virgins named Peribœa, would have debauched her,* ‘ *which Theſeus declaring he would not ſuffer, as being* ‘ *the ſon of Neptune, and able to encounter with Minos* ‘ *in defence of the maid,* &c.’ Hyginus tells us afterwards

(1) Lib. ii, pag. 72.

(2) In Parallelis, *pag* 312, *num.* 27.

(3) Meziriac, upon Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 275.

(4) Apollodor. *lib. iii*, Pauſanias, *lib. i, pag.* 15, & 40.

(5) Sophocles, in Ajace. Pindar. Iſthm. *Od. VI.* Diodor. Siculus, *lib. iv.* Hyginus, *cap. xcvii.*

(6) Νομίμως δ' αὐτὸν γῆμαι Μελίβοιαν τὴν Αἴαντος μητέρα γυναῖκα. Juſtam vero illius conjugem fuiſſe Melibœam Ajacis matrem. *Iſter*, lib. iv, *Rerum Attic.* apud *Athen.* lib. xiii, pag. 557.

(7) Iſthm. Od. VI.

(8) Pauſanias, *lib. i, pag.* 15. See alſo *pag.* 40, where he con- concludes from Peribœa's being ſent to Minos, that Megara made in former times part of the ſtate of Athens. Diodorus Siculus ſays Alcathous was an Athenian.

(9) Juven. Sat. VI, ver. 345.

(10) Hygin. Poetic. Aſtron. *lib. ii, cap. v.*

great warriour; of whom I ſpeak in its proper place. We are told of a third wife of Telamon, by whom he had a ſon named Teucer. This wife was Heſione the daughter of Laomedon King of Troy, and ſiſter of Priam (*b*). That marriage happened in this manner. Telamon followed Hercules, when Laomedon was to be puniſhed for refuſing to pay Hercules what he had promiſed him. His capital city was taken by ſtorm; and becauſe Telamon was the firſt who ſcaled the walls of Troy, Hercules preſented him with Heſione. Telamon ſignalized himſelf on ſeveral other occaſions while he attended upon that General, as in the war with the Amazons (*i*), in that with the Meropes, and in the fight with the giant Alcyoneus (*k*). He was in the expedition of the Argonauts (*l*), and if he did not go to the ſiege of Troy, probably it was only old age that prevented him. He ſent thither his two ſons. Even in Pauſanias's time they ſhewed, near the port of Salamis, the rock on which he ſat (*m*), that he might view as far as poſſible, the ſhip on which they embarked to go to the general rendezvous of the Grecian fleet (*n*). He was ſtill alive when the Grecians returned from Troy. He was doubtleſs very ſorry for the death of his ſon Ajax; but he appeared more diſpleaſed that Teucer, his other ſon, had not prevented or revenged it (*o*). He would not receive him; but repulſed him with diſgrace. It has been obſerved of him, as well as of his brother Peleus, that he had a ſon who ſurpaſſed him (*p*). See the fate of Ajax's deſcendants in the article TECMESSA, and that of TEUCER's poſterity in the article of that name.

(*b*) Apollod. Bibl. *lib. iii, pag.* 72.

(*i*) Pindar. Nem. Od. III.

(*k*) *Id. ibid.* Od. IV, & Iſthm. Od. VI.

(*l*) Apollon. & Valer. Flaccus, Argon. *paſſim.*

(*m*) Pauſan. *lib. i, pag.* 34.

(*n*) It was at Aulis in the iſle of Eubœa.

(*o*) See the article TEUCER.

(*p*) Vinceris ut Ajax Præteriit Telamonem, ut Pelea vicit Achilles. *You'll be out done, Like Telamon, and Peleus, by a ſon.* Juvenal. Sat. XIV, ver. 213.

wards how Theſeus proved his divine original. It is a curious thing: there never was ſo difficult a proof of one's nobility.

[*D*] *From this marriage iſſued Ajax.*] I think Dares Phrygius is the only author, who ſays, that Heſione, the daughter of Laomedon, was Ajax's mother, and that Ajax and Hector, by reaſon of their kindred, after they had fought ſtoutly together, were very civil, and made preſents to one another. The generality of authors are of a quite different opinion, *viz.* that Peribœa or Eribœa, was the mother of Ajax, and Heſione the mother of Teucer. I do not regard the ſuppoſition of Sophocles (11), that Ajax's mother was alive, when that unfortunate Prince killed himſelf; for a Poet does not pretend to much exactneſs in writing a Tragedy: beſides that Telamon might have been married at the ſame time both to Peribœa and Heſione. It is certain Sophocles (12) ſays, that Teucer was a baſtard, born of a woman who had been taken captive in the war. This was Heſione, as Servius informs us. ' Ejus (*Laomedontis*) filia He-
' ſione, *ſays he* (13), belli jure ſublata, comiti Tela-
' moni tradita eſt qui primus aſcenderat murum, unde
' Teucer natus eſt, nam Ajacem ex alia conſtat eſſe
' procreatum. - - - *Laomedon's daughter Heſione,* ſays
' he, *taken captive by the rights of war, was given to*
' *his companion Telamon, who firſt had ſcaled the wall,*
' *by whom he had Teucer, for it is certain he had Ajax*
' *by another.*' The ſcholiaſt upon theſe words of Homer's Iliad (14), καὶ σε νόθον περ' ἐόντα, & *te ſpurium licet exiſtentem,* ſays, that Heſione, a priſoner of war, was given to Telamon, who had Teucer by her; and that this Trojan original was the reaſon why the child bore that name.

(11) In Ajace.

(12) Ibid.

(13) In Æn. *lib. i, ver.* 619.

(14) Lib. viii, ver 284.

TELEBOÆ, a people who inhabited an iſland in the neighbourhood of Acarnania, who perhaps had been long ſince forgotten, had it not been for the great relation they indirectly bore to the birth of Hercules; but by virtue of that relation they are become known in the very loweſt forms of the ſchools. Is there any ſchool-boy who does not know that Alcmena conceived Hercules, whilſt Amphytrion, her huſband, was making war with the Teleboæ, &c? The reaſon why he made war with them, is, that Alcmena had promiſed to marry the man, who ſhould go to war with them. But in order to know why ſhe hated that people, the matter muſt be traced a little higher. Meſtor, the ſon of Perſeus, had by his marriage with Lyſidice (*a*), a daughter named Hippothoe, whom Neptune ſtole and carried away into the iſlands called Echinades (*b*), where ſhe had a ſon by him, whoſe name was Taphius [*A*]. This Taphius ſettled a colony in Taphos, and named the inhabitants Teleboæ [*B*], becauſe of the great way he thought

(*a*) The daughter of Pelops, (and of Hippodamia) Apoll. *lib. ii, pag.* 97.

(*b*) They are now called *Curzolari.* And are ſituated at the entrance of the gulph of Lepanto.

[*A*] *A ſon, whoſe name was Taphius.*] We read in the ſcholiaſt upon Apollonius (1), that the ſon of Neptune and Hippothoe, was called Pterelaus, and that he had two ſons, namely Teleboas, and Taphus, who went to Electryon and demanded of him the eſtate of their grand-mother Hippothoe; and not being able to bring him to reaſon, they had recourſe to force, and killed a great many people. By this account we get a whole generation, and therefore this account is rather to be received. It is ſhocking to find in Apollodorus, that Electryon was attacked by the great-grand-ſons of the daughter of his brother Meſtor. There is another thing in Apollodorus, concerning Taphius, which is not well cleared up. This author ſays (2), that Taphius reigned at Mycænæ with Electryon, when the ſix ſons of Pterelaus went to Electryon and demanded of him Meſtor's kingdom for their grand-father by their mother's ſide. This grand-father was Taphius himſelf, who reigned at Mycenæ with Electryon: Electryon had no other kingdom; and therefore what kingdom could they demand of him for Taphius? Obſerve carefully, that, according to the ſcholiaſt upon Apollonius (3), the whole kingdom of Perſeus was poſſeſſed in common, after his death, by his four ſons, Alcæus, Sthenelus, Meſtor, and Electryon. Agreeably to this account, no juſt claim could be made to Meſtor's kingdom, in favour of Taphius, ſince Taphius was already in poſſeſſion of it. However it be, we read in this ſcholiaſt that Taphius, the ſon of Pterelaus, called the iſle of Taphos by his name; and that his brother Teleboas gave his to the people I am ſpeaking of in this article, whoſe chief habitation was in the iſle of Taphos. This is one of their Etymologies: I have already mentioned another; the reſt may be ſeen below. It is certain, that the ſame people were indifferently called *Taphii* and *Teleboæ* (4).

[*B*] *And called the inhabitants Teleboæ.*] Stephanus Byzantinus informs us, that the country of the Teleboæ, or Telebois, was part of Acarnania, and had its name from Teleboas, being formerly called *Taphion.* Ariſtotle (5) ſays partly the ſame thing, ſince he tells us, that the Teleboæ were poſſeſſed of part of Acarnania. He ſays alſo (6), that one Lelex, a native of Leucas, had a daughter, whoſe ſon, called Teleboas, had twenty-two ſons of that ſame name. What I have juſt now been citing out of Stephanus Byzantinus, is directly contrary to Strabo (7), who affirms, that the iſles of the Taphians, one of which was called Taphos, were originally called the iſles of the Teleboæ. He adds, that Amphitryon ſubdued them, and gave them to Cephalus an Athenian fugitive, who helped him to conquer them. Some have thought, that the iſle of Cephalonia was then given to Cephalus, who called it by that name (8), and became afterwards

(1) In Argonaut. *lib. i, ver.* 747.

(2) Pag. 99.

(3) Ubi ſupra.

(4) *See* Euſtath. in Odyſſ. *lib. i.*

(5) In Acarnanum Republica, *apud* Strabon. *lib. vii, pag.* 222.

(6) In Leucadiorum Repub. *apud* Strab. ibid.

(7) Lib. x, pag. 316.

(8) Ibid. *pag.* 314.

thought he had gone (*c*). He had a ſon called Pterelaus, who was the father of ſix ſons, and one daughter. Theſe ſix ſons going to Mycenæ to demand Meſtor's kingdom, could obtain nothing from Electryon King of Mycenæ the ſon of Perſeus, and brother of Meſtor. It was for this reaſon they plundered his country. The ſons of Electryon, endeavouring to repel force by force were all killed. Their father was preparing to revenge their death, when he was killed by a very ſtrange accident (*d*). His daughter Alcmena was forced to retire to Thebes; and not being willing to leave the death of her brothers unpuniſhed [*C*], ſhe promiſed to marry the perſon, who ſhould revenge it. Amphitryon offered himſelf to do it, and aſſembling all the troops he was able, made a deſcent upon the country of the Teleboæ. He laid waſte ſome of their iſlands, but could not take Taphos; till Comætho, who fell in love with him, had plucked off the golden hair from her father Pterelaus [*D*], which made him immortal. Amphitryon did not keep thoſe conqueſts for himſelf, but left them to Cephalus and Eleus, who had aſſiſted

(*c*) Τηλεβόας ἐκάλεσεν ὅτι τηλοῦ τῆς πατρίδος ἔβη. Teleboas vocavit, ideò quod procul à patria iverit. *Apollod. ibid.*

(*d*) See the article of AMPHITRYON.

---

wards maſter of Acarnania (9). He was the firſt who tried the leap of Leucas (10). We read, that the Teleboæ were great robbers (11). See the proofs of it in Bochart's *Geographia Sacra*, book 1. chap. xxiii. and the remark [*F*] of this article. I ſhall ſet down the words of the ſcholiaſt of Apollonius on a paſſage wherein that Poet calls the ſame people *Teleboæ* and *Taphii*. It is in the 747th verſe of the firſt book. *The iſle of Taphos is one of the Echinades: it was inhabited by the Teleboæ, who before lived in Acarnania; they were great robbers* (12)*: they went into the kingdom of Argos to carry off the oxen of Electryon, father of Alcmena. There happened an engagement, in which Electryon, and his ſons were killed. Wherefore Alcmena declared that her perſon ſhould be the reward of him, who ſhould revenge Electryon; and becauſe Amphitryon undertook it, ſhe married him.* It is commonly ſaid in our Dictionaries, that Amphitryon revenged the death of Alcmena's brother. This is a fault, for ſhe loſt ſeveral brothers; and in Apollodorus it is the revenging her brothers, which ſhe demands of him who would be her huſband. In the ſcholiaſt upon Apollonius ſhe deſires the revenging her father. Some miſcopying, ſome error of the Preſs, might be the occaſion, that inſtead of *patris*, the authors whom Charles Stephens copies wrote *fratris*; and this fault ſtill continues. Here follow two Etymologies. Τηλεβόαι οὖν οἱ τάφιοι, ἤτοι ὅτι τῆλε οἰκοῦντες ἀπὸ ἄργους τὰ. βοῦς ἀπήλασαν· ἢ ἀπὸ Τηλεβόου τοῦ Πτερέλα τοῦ βασιλέως υἱοῦ (13). - - -*The Taphians therefore were called Teleboans, becauſe they were perſons living a great way off, who carried away the oxen from the Argives: or from Teleboas the ſon of King Pterelaus.* Lloyd aſcribes ſeveral things to the ſcholiaſt upon Apollonius which I do not meet with. 1. That Herodotus ſays, that Perſeus left four ſons. *He ſhould have ſaid Herodorus.* 2. That one of them was called Alarus: *he ſhould have ſaid Alcæus.* 3. That another was called Neſtor: *he ſhould have ſaid Meſtor.* 4. That Electryon was bound for a ſum of money for Hippothoe: *the ſcholiaſt ſays no ſuch thing.* 5. That Alcmena married Amphitryon, a very powerful Theban lord: *the ſcholiaſt could not call him a Theban; Amphitryon was not a Theban.* 6. That the kingdom of the Teleboæ, which was given to Cephalus, devolved to Ulyſſes by right of inheritance: *I find nothing of this in the ſcholiaſt.* See Lloyd at the word *Taphiæ*. His article is the ſame with that of Charles Stephens. It muſt not be forgot, that the Teleboæ ſettled in an iſland of Great Greece, in that iſland which Tiberius's retreat made ſo famous. This we find in Tacitus: ' Græcos ea tenuiſſe, Capreaſque Telebois habitatas fama tradit (14). - - - - ' *They ſay that the Greeks poſſeſſed that country, and that the iſland Caprea was inhabited by the Teleboans.*' Virgil ſays the ſame thing (15). And ſo do Auſonius, and Statius.

Quem generaſſe Telon Sebethide Nympha
Fertur, Teleboum Capreas cum regna teneret.

'Tis ſaid Sebethis him to Telon bore,
While he the Teleboan crown in Caprea wore.

Theſe are Virgil's words. As for Auſonius, he expreſſes himſelf thus: ' Virideſque reſultant Teleboæ ' (16). - - - *And Teleboan groves reſound.* He ſpeaks of the iſle of Caprea. And as to Statius (17) he deſcribes that iſle in this manner.

Seu tibi Bacchei vineta madentia Gauri,
Teleboumque domos, trepidis ubi dulcia nautis
Lumina noctivagæ tollit Pharus æmula lunæ.

Or where mount Gaurus fam'd for vines is ſhewn,
And Teleboan ſhores, by ſailors known,
Whoſe pharus, lanthorn, emulates the moon.

[*C*] *To leave the death of her brothers unpuniſhed.*] It has been ſhewn in the foregoing remark, that the ſingular number ought not to be uſed here, and that ſome authors, contrary to Apollodorus's account, ſay, that Electryon was killed with his ſons; ſo that Alcmena mentioned her father and not her brothers, when ſhe demanded that her future huſband ſhould be the inſtrument of her revenge.

[*D*] *From her father Pterelaus.*] Plautus ſuppoſes, that Amphitryon killed Pterelaus with his own hand (18); and that he had for his ſhare of the booty the golden cup of that Prince (19). Poets are allowed to ſuppoſe ſuch things, though they be ever ſo falſe. But as to the reſt, I do not think that the learned Mrs le Fevre had any grounds for charging Plautus with *a ſmall anachroniſm*. *It is certain*, ſays ſhe (20), *that Pterelaus was not cotemporary with Amphitryon, ſince he was the ſon of Taphius, who was the ſon of a niece of Alcæus, father of Amphitryon; and conſequently the couſin-german of Amphitryon was Pterelaus's grandmother.* This genealogy is taken out of Apollodorus: I have already ſaid, that this author is not ſo clear as the ſcholiaſt upon Apollonius. Nevertheleſs Plautus ought not to be cenſured upon this head; for ſince apollodorus ſays, that Pterelaus was alive when Amphitryon went to attack him, Plautus does not advance of his own head that thoſe two Princes lived at the ſame time; he might find it in hiſtorical monuments. It is not he therefore who is guilty of that Anachroniſm. It is much more ſurprizing, that the ſons of **Pterelaus** ſhould make war with Electryon, Amphitryon's uncle by the mother's ſide, as we read in Apollodorus.

OBSERVATIONS on the cup of Pterelaus.

Let us ſay ſomething of Pterelaus's cup. Jupiter made a preſent of it to Alcmena; and afterwards when the true Amphitryon looked for it among his things, to know whether it had been given to his wife, as ſhe affirmed, it occaſioned a very ſurprizing and diverting incident in Plautus's Comedy. This was not wholly the invention of the Poet; for ' (21) Charon of ' Lampſacus an Hiſtorian, who lived in the LXXVth ' Olympiad, that is, 478 years before Chriſt, ſaid, that ' the cup beſtowed upon Alcmena, was ſtill to be ſeen in ' his time in the Academy; that it was long, ſomewhat ' hollowed in the middle, with the edges a little turned down.' As Charon's works are loſt, I have conſulted Athenæus, who quotes him, and this is what I have met with in that author (22). He ſays Charon of Lampſacus affirmed, in his book of Frontiers, that the cup, which Jupiter preſented to Alcmena, when he put on the form of Amphitryon, was ſtill to be ſeen in his time at Lacedæmon. I do not find that Charon left a deſcription of that cup: it is Macrobius who has deſcribed it (23), building upon what Pherecydes had ſaid (24), that the veſſel which Jupiter preſented to Alcmena, was a *Carcheſium*. Athenæus tells us, that Pherecydes, and Herodorus of Heraclea ſaid ſo; and mentions Calixenus's deſcription of the *Carcheſium*. There is no room to doubt that Macrobius took from Athenæus what he ſays of it, and his words ought to be corrected by thoſe of that Greek author, as Caſaubon obſerves. Here follow Macrobius's words. ' Plautus inſuetum nomen reliquit, aitque aſſiſted him in that war. This is what we find in Apollodorus (*e*). What I have met with in other authors, that may ſerve to rectify or explain him, or to give a more diſtinct account of this matter, may be ſeen in the remarks. I ſhall there make ſome obſervations upon ſome paſſages of Plautus's Amphitryon [*E*], and upon Mrs

---

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 317.

(10) Ibid. pag. 315, 317. See the article LEUCAS.

(11) Strabo, *pag.* 316.

(12) Ἄνδρες ληστρικώτατοι τὸν τρόπον.

(13) Schol. Apollon. *in lib. i, ver.* 747. *See alſo* Euſtath. *in lib. i,* Odyſſ.

(14) Tacitus, Annal. *lib. iv, cap. lxvii.*

(15) Virgil. Æneïd. *lib. vii, ver.* 734.

(16) *Apud* Lipſium in Tacit. Annal. *lib. iv, cap. lxvii.*

(17) Silv. V, *lib. iii, ver.* 100.

(18) Ipſuſque Amphitruo Regem Pterelam ſua obtruncat manu. *Plaut. Amphitr. Act. I, Scen. I, ver.* 95.

(19) Poſt ob virtutem hero Amphitruoni eſt patera donata aurea. Qui Pterelea potitare Rex ſolitu'ſt. *Ibid. ver.* 104.

(20) Remarks upon the *Amphitryon, pag.* 251.

(21) They are Mrs le Fevre's words, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 276. If you compare them with the words of Macrobius, you will ſee whether ſhe hath rendred them well.

(22) Lib. xi, *pag.* 475.

(23) Meminit *carcheſii* Pherecydes in libris hiſtoriarum, aitque Jovem Alcmenæ precium concubitus carcheſium aureum dono dediſſe. - - - *Pherecydes in his Hiſtorical Works, mentions the* Carcheſium, *and ſays that Jupiter preſented a golden one to Alcmena, in return for her favours.* Macrobius, Saturn. lib. v, cap. xxi.

(24) *Apud* Athen. *pag.* 474.

que in fabula Amphitryone pateram datam: cum longe utriuſque poculi figura diverſa ſit: patera enim ut & ipſum nomen indicio eſt, planum ac patens eſt: carcheſium vero procerum & circa mediam partem compreſſum, anſatum mediocriter, anſis à ſummo ad infimum pertinentibus (25). - - - *Plautus in his Amphitryon expreſſes it by an improper name, and ſays the preſent was a* patera, *whereas the figure of theſe two ſorts of cups was quite different: for the* patera, *as the name itſelf imports, is ſpreading and open: but the* carcheſium *is tall, and compreſſed about the middle, moderately handled, the handles reaching from the top quite down to the bottom.*' Now ſee the text of Athenæus. Καλλίξενος ὁ Ρόδιος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας φησὶν, ὅτι ποτήριόν ἐστιν ἐπίμηκες συνηγμήνον εἰς μέσον ἐπιεικῶς, ὦτα ἔχον μέχει τοῦ πυθμένος κατήκοντα. Calixenus Rhodius tradit in ſuis libris de Alexandria, carcheſium eſſe poculum oblongum, in medio leniter compreſſum, auribus utrinque ad fundum uſque deſcendentibus. - - - *Callixenus the Rhodian in his books of Alexandria, deſcribes the* carcheſium *to be an oblong cup, moderately compreſſed about the middle, with handles on both ſides deſcending quite down to the bottom.* It is plain the adverb *mediocriter* in Macrobius, refers to *compreſſum*, and not to *anſatum*. A tranſcriber who thinks that an adverb belongs to a certain adjective, makes no difficulty to put it either before, or after that adjective. No body thinks there is any harm in writing *anſatum mediocriter*, rather than *mediocriter anſatum*. But ſometimes it is of great importance, not to take ſuch a liberty; for inſtance, when the adverb does not belong to *anſatum*.

[*E*] *Some obſervations upon ſome paſſages of Plautus's Amphitryon* (26).] I. This Poet ſuppoſes, that it was Creon King of Thebes, who made war upon the Teleboæ, to revenge the Thebans, who had been very ill uſed by them.

. . . . Victis hoſtibus legiones reveniunt domum,
Duello extincto maximo, atque internecatis hoſtibus,
Qui multa Thebano populo objecerunt acerba funera.
Id vi & virtute militum victum atque expugnatum opidum 'ſt,
Imperio atque auſpicio heri mei Amphitruonis maxime.
Præda atque agro adoreaque affecit populares ſuos,
Regique Thebano Creonti regnum ſtabilivit ſuum (27).

The conqu'ring troops return in triumph home,
The war extinguiſh'd, and the foes cut off,
Who ſlew ſo many of our Theban people.
The town was taken by the ſoldiers valour,
By my victorious lord Amphytrion's orders.
He cheer'd his men with preſents and with ſpoils,
And fix'd King Creon on the Theban throne.

This is perverting Hiſtory; for authors are agreed, that Amphitryon undertook this expedition only to puniſh the Teleboæ, who had killed Alcmena's father, or at leaſt her brothers. He could not marry Alcmena without revenging her of the Teleboæ. This was the occaſion of the war, in which Creon engaged merely out of complaiſance to Amphitryon, or in acknowledgment of ſome ſervice he had received from him (28). This hiſtorical fact might have afforded many ornaments, if the Poet had been willing to improve it. He has debaſed the rank of his hero: he repreſents him as only commanding the troops of another Prince, in a war undertaken for the intereſt of that Prince; whereas, according to Hiſtory, Amphitryon acted in chief for his own intereſts, and had with him none but auxiliary troops, whoſe commanders he rewarded with the countries he conquered. II. Plautus makes the troops take ſhipping in the port of Eubœa, which he calls Perſicus by a too licentious anticipation. But this is not the worſt: it is a great deal more ſhocking that he does not find a port more convenient for people, who were to ſail towards the iſles called Echinades. Bleſs us, what a round about courſe muſt be taken to go thither from the iſle of Eubœa! III. The lying-in of Alcmena is an ill-contrived incident, which obliges the Poet entirely to overthrow tradition. All thoſe, who have mentioned Hercules's birth, ſuppoſe, that Jupiter in the ſhape of Amphitryon, lay with Alcmena a whole night which he took care to make longer than others. Plautus ſhould have built upon this ground, and adorned and embelliſhed it; but he ſhould not have ſuppoſed a ſecond viſit. Jupiter ſhould not have returned to his poſt, under the ſame ſhape the night before the lying-in. This is not only contrary to tradition, but alſo ſhocking to the hearers and readers. It is no longer gallantry but brutality (29): a woman, ready to be delivered of two boys, is not a fit object to be produced upon the ſtage; much leſs ought the greateſt of the gods to be repreſented ſo enamoured with ſuch an object, that the uſual length of the night is not ſufficient for him to ſatisfy his paſſion. If the charms he found in the embraces of that lady made him wiſh for a ſecond interview, he ſhould not have put it off till the day before her lying in. So great a forbearance exceeds probability. This objection cannot be got over; for to ſay, that Plautus makes his play laſt nine months, would be running into greater difficulties, and appearing ignorant of theſe words of Mercury:

HODIE illa pariet filios geminos duos (30).

TO DAY *ſhall ſhe be brought to bed with twins.*

This *hodie* refers to the ſame day that he turned out Soſia in the firſt ſcene. IV. I do not approve what ſome ſay, that Alcmena's delivery without pain is too plainly contrary to what we are told by the Greeks of Juno's artifices: it is a thing, ſay they, which ought not to be ſuppoſed, without an extreme neceſſity. A Poet, who takes the death of Polyxena for the ſubject of his tragedy, may be allowed to alter a great many things in the tradition: but if he ſhould ſuppoſe, that Achilles did not deſire to have her ſacrificed to him, if he ſhould trample upon the capital facts of that Hiſtory, he would offend againſt the rules. But of what ſervice is it to Plautus to make Alcmena feel no pain?

Dum hæc aguntur, interea uxorem tuam
Neque gementem, neque plorantem noſtrum quiſquam audivimus.
Ita profecto ſine dolore peperit (31).

While theſe things paſs'd, your wife
By none of us was heard to cry or groan.
So very free from pain was ſhe delivered.

This ſeems to me a weak objection; for it was neceſſary, in order to unravel the plot, that there ſhould appear ſomething miraculous in Alcmena's delivery. Her chaſtity was to be juſtified, and a jealous huſband was to be pacified; and therefore there was a neceſſity for the Poet to intereſt Jupiter in the caſe. He was allowed therefore, nay, he was obliged, to lay aſide what was ſaid of Lucina.

Quin nunc quoque frigidus artus
Dum loquor horror habet, parſque eſt meminiſſe doloris.
Septem ego per noctes totidem cruciata diebus,
Feſſa malis tendenſque ad cœlum brachia, magno
Lucinam ad nexos partus clamore vocabam,
Illa quidem venit, ſed præcorrupta, meumque
Quæ donare caput Junoni vellet iniquæ (32).

Cold chills my limbs while I the tale purſue,
And now methinks I feel my pangs anew.

Seven

(*e*) Biblioth. *lib. ii, pag.* 97, *& ſeq.*

(25) Macrob. ubi ſupra.

(26) Confer, above, remark [*D*].

(27) Plautus, in Amphitryone, *Act. i, Scene i, ver.* 33. *Mercury had been ſaying in the prologue.* Is nunc Amphitruo præfectu'ſt legionibus. Nam cum Telebois bellum 'ſt Thebano poplo.

(28) *See* Apollodorus, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 97, *& ſeq.*

(29) See above, the article ALCMENA, remark [*D*].

(30) Act. i, Scen. ii,

(31) Act. v, Scen. I.

(32) *Alcmena, apud* Ovidium. Metamorph. *lib. ix, ver.* 290. *See alſo* Pauſanias, *lib. ix, pag.* 290.

Mrs le Fevre's notes [*F*].

Seven days and nights amidſt inceſſant throes,
Fatigu'd with ills I lay, nor knew repoſe;
When lifting high my hands, in ſhrieks I pray'd,
Implor'd the gods, and call'd Lucina's aid.
She came, but prejudic'd, to give my fate
A ſacrifice to vengeful Juno's hate.

GAY.

[*F*] *And upon Mrs le Fevre's notes* (33).] She was of opinion (34), that Plautus made uſe of the word *Nepos* to ſignify *nephew* in this paſſage of the fourth ſcene of the fourth act. ‘ Ego idem ille ſum ‘ Amphitruo, Gorgophones nepos, Imperator Thebanorum. - - - *I am that ſame Amphitryon the nephew* ‘ *of Gorgophone, commander of the Thebans.*’ I cannot readily come into this opinion. It is true, that, according to the genealogy mentioned by Apollodorus, this was the ſole degree of kindred between Gorgophone and Amphitryon (35): but, ſince Plautus has not followed Apollodorus in ſome things, we ought to ſuppoſe that he had conſulted ſome other genealogies, wherein he found that Gorgophone was Amphitryon's grand-mother. There is more ſenſe in boaſting of being the grand-ſon of an illuſtrious lady, than in boaſting of being her nephew: it is therefore probable, that the Poet took the thing in the moſt advantageous ſenſe (36). I proceed to another fact: He has ſuppoſed, that the Teleboæ deſtroyed Electryon. I ſhall quote the whole paſſage, which contains a proof of what has been ſaid above concerning the robberies of that nation.

Ego idem latrones hoſtes bello & virtute contudi.
Electryonem perdiderant, noſtræ & germanos conjugis,
Achaiam, Ætoliam, Phocidem, per freta Ionium & Ægeum, & Creticum.
Vagati, vi vortebant piratica (37).

I too have triumph'd o'er thoſe villain robbers;
Who kill'd Electryon, and my ſpouſe's brothers,
And ravaged Achaia, Ætolia, & Phocis,
Scouring the Ionian, Ægean, and Cretan ſeas
With moſt audacious pyracy.

Mrs le Fevre (38) charges him with having *altered the hiſtory in this point*; ‘ for Electryon was not killed ‘ by his enemies. It was Amphitryon himſelf who ‘ killed him by accident, as he was throwing his club ‘ at an ox.’ I confeſs, that Plautus departs from Apollodorus in this; but there are ſome authors who have ſaid, that Electryon was killed by the Teleboæ (39). I ſhall conclude with this remark: ‘ (40) I ‘ have pitched upon Amphitryon, becauſe it is one of ‘ the fineſt pieces of Plautus; and it was ſo highly ‘ eſteemed by the Antients, that in Diocleſian's reign ‘ it was ſtill acted in times of a public calamity to ‘ appeaſe Jupiter's anger. Arnobius ſays in his ſeventh ‘ book; *Ponit animos Jupiter, ſi Amphitryo fuerit actus,* ‘ *pronunciatuſque Plautinus?* - - - *What, will Jupiter be* ‘ *appeaſed, if Plautus's Amphitryon be acted?*’ I do not believe Arnobius means that the Heathens pitched upon a time of a public calamity, ſuch as an irruption of Barbarians, a plague, or a famine, to act Amphitryon: but this ſeems to me to be his meaning. He thinks it wrong that the Pagans ſhould make the ſolemnity of their public games, one of their religious performances; and that they ſhould conſecrate thoſe games to a deity. He aſks the reaſon of this conduct, and ſuppoſes the anſwer to be, that the celebration of thoſe games was a means to be reconciled with the gods, and to make them forget the offences they might have received. Whereupon he aſks, by way of reply, *Whether Jupiter ceaſes to be in an ill humour when Plautus's Amphitryon is acted?* It is certain, that the inſtitution of the public games was owing to ſome public calamity, and to a deſign of worſhiping, for the future, in a ſolemn manner, the deity whoſe anger they dreaded: but afterwards the anniverſary celebration was not confined to the time of a public calamity: thoſe games were exhibited in time of plenty, as well as in time of ſcarcity; nay, they were carried on with much greater expence of every kind during the proſperity of the State, than during it's adverſity.

TELLIER (MICHAEL LE) Chancellor of France, died the thirtieth of October 1685. See his elogium in Moreri's Dictionary. He left behind him two ſons, one of whom has been very famous all over Europe, under the name of Marquis De LOUVOIS [*A*]. The other is one of the moſt illuſtrious prelates of the Gallican Church for his learning; and for the vigour wherewith he has always maintained the rights and privileges of his dignity (*a*) and checked the attempts of the Monks in his dioceſe [*B*]. He is Archbiſhop of Rheims, and has collected one of the fineſt libraries in France. See the catalogue of it, which he publiſhed in the year 1693 (*b*). He continues to enrich it every day (*c*) with all all ſorts of books, and all the curious have a free acceſs to that noble magazine of learning (§ *α*).

(*a*) See the Memoirs publiſhed by him, about the Cardinals ſitting in parliament; and againſt the erection of Cambray into a metropolis.

(*b*) *Under the title of* Bibliotheca Telleriana, *in folio.*

(*c*) I write this in June 1701.

[*A*] *Under the name of Marquis de* LOUVOIS.] He died at Verſailles the ſixteenth of July 1691, in his fifty-firſt year. He was Miniſter and Secretary of State, and had ſeveral employments. It is impoſſible to beſtow a finer elogium on him, than by ſaying, that all Europe was perſuaded, his death would be more advantageous to the allies, than the gaining of a compleat victory, and the conqueſt of two or three towns. Mr de Barbeſieux, one of his ſons, ſucceeded him in the office of Secretary of State, and died the fifth of January, 1701. The Abbot de Louvois, another of his ſons, is a great lover of learning. He was admired, in his younger years, by the anſwers he made to the difficulties he propoſed to him about Homer, in the preſence of a great number of perſons. Read this paſſage of the continuation of the Menagiana. *The Abbot de L . . . . who, tho' ſo young, ſhews ſo great a ſkill in the Greek tongue, has been pleaſed to quote me upon that ſubject, and to praiſe me for the application of thoſe two verſes in an illuſtrious aſſembly, that was held at his houſe not long ago, in the preſence of the moſt learned men in the kingdom, who propoſed to him ſome difficulties upon Homer, which he anſwered with a wonderful preſence of mind. One of the moſt conſiderable was propoſed by the Abbot Faydit,* viz. *whether Homer had mentioned the Jews in his Iliad or his Odyſſey. He anſwered, that he had made no mention of them, and that the word* Ιουδαῖοι *was not to be found in Homer,* &c (1). You may ſee in the original what was further urged by the Abbot Faydit, and the reply made to him. See alſo Mr Couſin concerning the Philoſophical theſis maintained by that Abbé on the twenty-fourth of Auguſt, 1692 (2), and concerning the *Actus Veſperiarum*, or his diſputation in the Sorbonne before he was admitted Doctor of Divinity, on the ſeventeenth of March, 1700 (3).

I need not acquaint the reader, that the book publiſhed in Holland, in the year 1695, with this title, *Teſtament politique du Marquis de Louvois*, is a ſuppoſititious piece: but every body does not know that the author of that piece lives at Paris, and is a Roman Catholic.

[*B*] *And checked the attempts of the Monks in his dioceſe.*] I could give ſeveral inſtances of it; but I ſhall only refer the reader to what I have ſaid in the remark [*N*] of the article of FRANCIS of ASSISI, and in the remark [*M*] of the article MARIANA. See alſo the *Lettres Hiſtoriques* for July 1697.

[(§ *α*) This library was ſoon made up of the ſpoils of thoſe which ſeveral Proteſtants in Paris and Champaign were forced to leave behind them on the revocation of the edict of Nantes. To be convinced that this is it's proper epoch, we need only run over the *Bibliotheca Telleriana*,

---

(33) Confer above, remark [*D*].

(34) Notes, *pag.* 310.

(35) He ſays ſhe was the daughter of Perſeus, and that Amphitryon was the ſon of Alcæus, ſon of Perſeus.

(36) See the article GORGOPHONE, remark [*A*].

(37) Act IV, Scen. IV, ver. 54.

(38) Notes, *pag.* 311.

(39) Schol. Apollon. in Argon. *lib. i, ver.* 747.

(40) Mrs le Fever in her Preface.

(1) Suite du Menagiana, *pag.* 294, *Dutch Edit.*

(2) Journal des Sçavans, *of September* 8, 1692, *pag* 623, *Dutch Edition.*

(3) Idem, *April* 5, 1700, *pag.* 271.

Telleriana, the main part of this fine library conſiſting ſcare of any other than thoſe ſort of books, which the Proteſtants in France, whether men of letters, or only curious perſons, took care to purchaſe. Rem. Crit.]

TELMESSUS (*a*) a ſea-port town in the furtheſt part of Lycia (*b*), at the foot of a mountain of the ſame name, which makes part of Mount Cragus. That town was given to Eumenes by the Romans (*c*), when they defeated Antiochus; but the Lycians recovered it after the kingdom of Eumenes had been deſtroyed (*d*). The inhabitants of that town had naturally a prophetical ſpirit, which is the reaſon why it has been much talked of. Every body there was born a diviner [*A*]; their women and children received that gift from nature. It was to this place, Gordius went to know the meaning of a prodigy which made him uneaſy [*B*]: he had it explained to him without being obliged to go into the town; for meeting a handſome maid at the gate, he aſked her who was the beſt diviner he could apply to. The maid immediately deſired to know what he had to propoſe, and being acquainted with it, gave him the interpretation he wanted. And this was a very agreeable piece of news; for her anſwer was that the prodigy promiſed Gordius a crown. At the ſame time the propheteſs offered to marry him. He accepted the condition, as a beginning of the good fortune which was foretold him. Cicero thought that the reaſon why the inhabitants of Telmeſſus, and of the adjacent country, became ſuch great obſervers of prodigies, was becauſe they inhabited a fruitful country, which produced ſeveral extraordinary things [*C*]. But others go farther back, and tell us of one Telmeſſus a great diviner, who was the founder of that town, and whoſe relicks were in great veneration among the inhabitants. They lay under the altar of Apollo (*e*), who was his father (*f*). From hence, according to the conceits of the Pagans, muſt proceed this prophetical ſpirit, which became ſo remarkable in that place. Telmeſſus taught the art of propheſying in his life-time, and was to inſpire his votaries with it after his death. We muſt add, that his mother, the daughter of Antenor, was endowed with the ſame ſpirit. She had it from Apollo, when he lay with her, under the ſhape of a little dog (*g*). If the work of Stephanus Byzantinus was not ſo very much mangled, we ſhould find in it ſome particulars about Telmeſſus. We may conjecture from the remains of this author (*h*), that Telmeſſus founded the town I am ſpeaking of; and that he came from the country of the Hyperboreans, to the oracle of

(*a*) Ptolemy, *lib. v, cap. iii. calls it* Τελμησσός. Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag. m.* 457, *and* Stephanus Byzantinus, Τελμισσός.

(*b*) Quæ Lyciam finit urbs Telmeſſus. *Plin. lib. v, cap. xxvii. Mela, lib. i, cap. xv. Vide ibi* Iſ. Voſſium.

(*c*) Livius, *lib. xxxvii.*

(*d*) Strabo, *pag.* 458.

(*e*) Sub Apollinis arula quæ Telmeſſi apud oppidum viſitur, Telmeſſum eſſe conditum vatem, non ſcriptis conſtantibus indicatur? *Arnobius,* lib. vi, pag. 193. See *Suidas,* voce Τελμισεῖς.

(*f*) Dionyſ. in Originibus, *apud* Suidam, *ibid.*

(*g*) *Idem,* Dionyſ. *ibid.*

(*h*) In voce Γαλεῶται. It is called there Τελμισσός.

[*A*] *Every body there was born a diviner.*] I do not deſire the reader to take this on my authority, and therefore I ſhall quote a conſiderable Hiſtorian for it. Τὸν δὲ (Γόρδιον) ἐκπλαγέντα τῇ ὄψει, ἴεναι κοινώσοντα ὑπὲρ τοῦ θείου παρὰ τοὺς Τελμισσέας τοὺς μάντεις. εἶναι γὰρ τοὺς Τελμισσέας σοφοὺς τὰ θεῖα ἐξηγεῖσθαι, καὶ σφίσιν ἀπὸ γένους δεδόσθαι αὐτοῖς καὶ γυναιξὶ καὶ παισὶ τὴν μαντείαν. *Gordium ſpectaculo attonitum, Telmiſſenſes vates communicandæ rei cauſa adiiſſe, (eſſe enim Telmiſſenſes peritiſſimos prodigiorum interpretes, & vaticinandi ſcientiam ipſis pariter atque uxoribus & liberis ab ortu inſitam eſſe)* (1). Pliny (2) ſeems to ſay, that the town of Telmeſſus, which he calls moſt religious, had been one of the principal ſeats of Magic; he does not ſcruple to join it with Theſſaly in that reſpect. But there never was a country more cried down for witchcraft than Theſſaly.

> Somnia, terrores magicos, miracula, ſagas,
> Nocturnos lemures, portentaque Thessala rides?
>
> *Dreams, witchcraft, miracles, do you deſpiſe,*
> *Hobgoblins, and* Thessalian *prodigies?*

Horace, who ſpeaks thus in the ſecond epiſtle of the ſecond book, frequently uſes the like expreſſion; and it appears from Lucan (3), that Theſſala, or Theſſalis, without any addition, denoted a witch. If the thing be rightly conſidered, the paſſage of Pliny expreſſes the character of the Telmeſſians, as fully as the paſſage of Arrian. See what I ſhall quote out of Cicero hereafter.

[*B*] *It was thither Gordius went to know the meaning of a prodigy, which made him uneaſy.*] This ſtory is to be found in Juſtin (4), if we change the uſual reading, and inſtead of *vicinæ urbis,* read *Telmeſſi urbis,* or *Telmiſinæ urbis,* according to the correction of the moſt able Critics (5). The paſſage runs thus: ‘Gordius cùm in his regionibus bubus conductis araret, ‘aves eum omnis generis circumvolare cœperunt. ‘Profectus ad conſulendos augures vicinæ urbis, obviam in porta habuit virginem eximiæ pulchritudinis; percontatus eam quem potiſſimum augurem conſuleret, illa audita cauſa conſulendi, gnara artis ex ‘diſciplina parentum, *regnum ei portendi,* reſpondit, ‘polliceturque ſe & matrimonii & ſpei ſociam. Tam ‘pulchra conditio, prima regni felicitas videbatur. - - - ‘*While Gordius was plowing in this country with hired ‘oxen, birds of all kinds began to gather and fly round ‘him. Upon this, going to conſult the Augurs of a neighbouring town, he met in the gate a beautiful virgin; ‘ſhe, being aſked who was the moſt able Augur he could ‘apply to, and hearing the queſtion he had to propoſe, as ‘ſhe underſtood the art herſelf, by the inſtruction of her ‘parents, anſwered, That* a kingdom was portended to ‘him, *and promiſed to become his wife and partner of ‘his good fortune. So agreeable an offer ſeemed to be an ‘earneſt of his royalty.* What ſtrongly confirms this correction is, that Arrian (6), relating this adventure of Gordius, ſays, in expreſs terms, that Gordius applied himſelf to the diviners of the town of Telmeſſus. What follows in Arrian does not agree in all the circumſtances with Juſtin's narrative; but this is of no great moment to the matter now in queſtion. I omit not, however, to obſerve, that the tranſlator of Arrian has thruſt in *Telmiſſenſium* in a wrong place. It was not to the aſſembly of the inhabitants of Telmeſſus that the chariot carried Midas, attended by his father and mother, but to that of the Phrygians.

[*C*] *Cicero thought that the reaſon why the inhabitants of Telmeſſus . . . . became ſuch great obſervers of prodigies, was, becauſe they inhabited a country which produced ſeveral extraordinary things.*] To prove this, I ſhall ſet down two paſſages of Cicero not far from one another. The firſt runs thus: ‘Licet videre & ‘genera quædam & nationes huic ſcientiæ deditas. ‘Telmeſſus in Caria eſt, qua in urbe excellit Aruſpicum ‘diſciplina. - - - *We may ſee certain families, and nations, addicted to this ſcience. Telmeſſus in Caria is a ‘place famous for the teaching of Augury.*’ This is the other: ‘Tum Caria tota præcipueque Telmeſſenſes ‘quos ante dixi, quod agros uberrimos maximeque ‘fertiles incolunt, in quibus multa propter fœcunditatem fingi gignique poſſunt, in oſtentis animadvertendis diligentes fuerunt (7). - - - - *The whole country ‘of Caria, and particularly the Telmeſſians, whom I ‘have before-mentioned, becauſe of their inhabiting in a ‘moſt plentiful and fertile region, in which, by reaſon of ‘it's fruitfulneſs, many extraordinary things might be ‘invented and produced, were great obſervers of prodigies.*’ As Telmeſſus was ſituated on the borders of Lycia,

(1) Arrian. de Expedit. Alexandri, *lib. ii, p. m.* 85, 86.

(2) Nec poſtea quiſquam dixit quonam modo veniſſet Telmeſſum religioſiſſimam urbem, quando tranſiſſet ad Theſſalas urbes. *Plin.* lib. xxx, cap. i. *Father Hardouin, going upon the authority of good manuſcripts, reads* matres *inſtead of* urbes.

(3) *Lib. vi, ver.* 451: *vide* Harduinum in Plinium, *Tom. iv, pag.* 771.

(4) Lib. xi, cap. vii.

(5) *See* Grævius's Juſtin, *pag.* 230.

(6) Lib. ii, pag. 86.

(7) Cicero, *lib. i,* de Divinat. *cap. xli, xlii.*

of Dodona with a fellow-traveller, who founded a town, whoſe inhabitants were all divines. There is a great preſumption, that the like virtue was beſtowed upon Telmeſſus, both for him and thoſe, who ſhould build about the altar he erected by the direction of the oracle. We ought to believe that this altar was in the temple of Apollo Telmeſſus (*i*). The inhabitants of Telmeſſus had in particular a very great faith in dreams [*D*]. Ariſtander, a native of this town, and one of the moſt able diviners of his time (*k*), wrote a book upon that ſubject. Probably it was he who negociated a treaty between his country and Alexander. Arrian has mentioned this treaty in his firſt book. I do not think the town of Termeſſus ought to be confounded with that of Telmeſſus [*E*]: it is better in my opinion, to diſtinguiſh them into two towns, and to preſerve the name of Telmeſſus [*F*] to that which is ſituate on the frontiers of Lycia.

(*i*) Τελμισσὸς ἐν Καρίᾳ ἦλθεν, ἔνθα Ἀπόλλωνος Τελμισσίου ἱερόν. Telmiſſus in Cariam venit, ubi Apollinis Telmiſſii templum *Stephanus Byzant. in* Τελμισσός.

(*k*) See his article.

Lycia, it muſt be very near Caria; which is the reaſon why Cicero places it in this laſt province. Stephanus Byzantinus places it there alſo; but he adds, that Philo and Strabo place it in Lycia, and that it is a frontier town to thoſe two countries.

[*D*] *The inhabitants of Telmeſſus had very great faith in dreams.*] This we find in Tertullian, *Telmeſſenſes*, ſays he (8), *nulla ſomnia evacuant, imbecillitatem conjectationis incuſant*. The meaning of which ſeems to be, that the inhabitants of Telmeſſus believe that all dreams ſignify ſomething; that none of them is vain; and that the imperfection of our knowledge is the cauſe why we do not underſtand the ſignification of each dream.

[*E*] *I do not think the town of Termeſſus ought to be confounded with that of* Telmeſſus.] Strabo ſo plainly diſtinguiſhes them from one another, that he leaves no room for any doubt about it. His way of deſcribing the ſituation of Termeſſus (9), ſhews that it was a town of Piſidia, near the deſile, by which they went over Mount Taurus in the way to Mylias; and therefore Alexander reſolving to clear that paſſage, which was commanded by the town of Termeſſus, cauſed it to be demoliſhed. As for what relates to Telmeſſus (10), that Geographer places it at the entrance into Lycia on this ſide of the river Xanthus, and even on this ſide of Phaſelis, a ſea-town, which he places near Mount Solymus, and Termeſſus, *a town of Piſidia*, ſays he (11). I ſhall confirm this by the authority of Arrian. After he had mentioned Alexander's entring Lycia, he ſays (12), that this conqueror got the town of Telmeſſus by a treaty; that afterwards he paſſed the Xanthus; that he took the town of that name, and ſeveral others which ſurrendered to him; that he advanced towards the province of Mylias; that he ſecured the place, from whence he ſent part of his troops to Perga over the mountains, and marched with the reſt along the ſea; that he advanced as far as Sida; that he went back to Aſpendus, becauſe the inhabitants of that place had not performed their promiſe; that he forced them to ſurrender; that he went to Perga, and from thence into Phrygia; but the town of Telmeſſus, inhabited by Barbarians, who were by nation Piſidians, being in his way, he was obliged to take it; that it proved no eaſy thing, becauſe that town ſtood upon a ſteep hill, and the inhabitants had poſſeſſed themſelves of a neighbouring hill, ſo that they were maſters of the ſtreight or deſile between thoſe two hills. This is the very town, which Strabo calls Termeſſus; and it is manifeſt Arrian ſpeaks of two different towns, when he ſays (13), that his hero concluded a treaty with Telmeſſus when he entred Lycia; and (14) that he beſieged Telmeſſus as he was marching from Perga towards Phrygia. All that remains to be known, is, whether thoſe two towns ought to be called Telmeſſus, as they are in Arrian, or whether that of Lycia ought to go by the name of Telmeſſus, and that of Piſidia by the name of Termeſſus, as in Strabo, Stephanus Byzantinus, and Suidas: for the opinion of ſome learned men, who reduce them both to one town, under the name either of Termeſſus or Telmeſſus, cannot be maintained. Bochart (15), who reads Telmeſſus in Strabo for Termeſſus, may be confuted by a medal (16), which has on the one ſide ΤΕΡΜΗΣΣΕΩΝ, and on the other ΣΟΛΥΜΟΣ: which plainly ſhews, that the town of Piſidia, called Τερμεσσὸς by Strabo, is rightly named; for ſince the hill on the promontory of Termeſſus, was called Solymus, and the Termeſſians were alſo called Solymi (17), it is plain, that the people who have this great affinity with the Solymi, ought to bear the name expreſſed in the medal: but it is the name of the Termeſſians; and therefore Bochart is in the wrong to read *Telmiſſus* and *Telmiſſenſes* in that paſſage of Strabo; and thus one of his etymologies comes to nothing. He ſays that Caſaubon found in the manuſcripts Τελμήσσεως inſtead of Τερμήσσεως. Theſe ought to be corrected by the medal. He adds, that Euſtathius, quoting Strabo, writes Τελμισσὸς; but he might have found in Salmaſius, that Euſtathius ſhould not have made uſe of that name (18), and that beſides he very much miſunderſtood the paſſage he quoted (19).

[*F*] *It is better . . . . to preſerve the name of Telmeſſus.*] As there are a great many medals (20) with the inſcription ΤΕΡΜΗΣΣΕΩΝ, what remains to be known is, whether the town of Lycia, which makes the ſubject of this article, ought to be called *Termeſſus*. I am of opinion, with ſubmiſſion to better judgment, that it ought to be called *Telmeſſus*; for otherwiſe we muſt look upon as corrupted, not only the paſſages already mentioned (21) of Polybius, Arrian, Ariſtides, St Gregory Nazianzen, Cicero, and Livy, but alſo many others of Plutarch, Ælian, Lucian, Ptolemy, Stephanus Byzantinus, Pliny, Pomponius Mela, Tertullian, Arnobius, &c. All thoſe places, where Ariſtander, the Soothſayer, is ſirnamed of *Telmeſſus* would, in that caſe, be faulty. This would be going too far. It is therefore better to admit of two names; that of Termeſſus for the town of Piſidia, and that of Telmeſſus for the town of Lycia, where all the people were ſo liable to be inſpired. Correct with Salmaſius the paſſage of Arrian, wherein the town of Piſidia is called Τελμισσὸς. *Male apud Arrianum* Τελμισσὸς *vocatur quæ eſt* Τερμισσὸς (22). - - - *The town Termiſſus is very falſly in Arrian called Telmiſſus.*

(8) Tertul. de Anima, *cap. xlvi.*

(9) Strabo, *lib. xiii, ſub fin. pag.* 434, & *lib. xiv, pag.* 458.

(10) Idem, *lib. xiv, pag.* 457, 458.

(11) Τέρμισσος Πισιδικὴ πόλις. *pag.* 458. Τερμησσός ἐστι Πισιδικὴ πόλις, *pag.* 434.

(12) De Expedit. Alexandri, *lib, i, pag.* 69, & *ſeq.*

(13) Pag. 69.

(14) Pag. 75, 76.

(15) Bochart, Geograph. Sacr. *lib. i, cap. vi.*

(16) *Apud* Ezechiel. Spanhem. de Uſu & Præſt. Numiſm. *pag.* 477, 478.

(17) Τῆς γοῦν Τερμήσσεως ἄκρας ὁ ὑπερκείμενος λόφος καλεῖται Σόλυμος· καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ οἱ Τερμησσεῖς Σόλυμοι καλοῦνται. Et ſanè tumulus qui ſupra Termeſſium jacet promontorium, Solymus appellatur: ipſi Termeſſi vocantur, Solymi. *Strabo, lib. xiii, pag.* 433.

(18) Male Τελμισσὸν vocat Euſtathius. *Salm. Exercit. Plinian. p.* 784.

(19) Mira heic ſupinitas Euſtathii in Strabonis verbis referendis. *Ibid.*

(20) Spanhem. ubi ſupra.

(21) Id. ibid. *pag.* 478.

(22) Salmaſ. ubi ſupra.

TENEDOS, an iſland in the Ægean ſea, near the continent of Aſia, over againſt Troy. Some ſay (*a*) it was uninhabited, and called Leucophrys, before Tenes, the ſon of Cygnus, landed upon it. It was he therefore who firſt brought inhabitants into that iſland. He reigned over them with ſo much equity, that great honours were paid to him in his life-time, and after his death he was placed among the gods, as I ſhall relate when I come to ſpeak of him. He built a town, and it was from him the iſland was called *Tenedos* (*b*). In proceſs of time the people rather choſe to ſay, that he did not bring thither the firſt colony; but that he landed there as it were by a miracle [*A*], and that the inhabitants immediately expreſſed ſo great a reſpect for a man, who was ſo manifeſtly

(*a*) Diodorus, Siculus, *lib. vi, cap. xvii.* Servius in Æn. *lib. ii, ver.* 21.

(*b*) Quaſi Τεννέδος, *that is*, Tenni ſedes. *Stephan in* Τένεδος.

[*A*] *As it were by a miracle.*] His father being impoſed upon by his wife's calumnies, put him into a cheſt, and threw him into the ſea. I ſhall ſpeak of him hereafter (1). I do not find in the authors I have conſulted, the circumſtances of his preſervation; but I find in Muretus (2) that Neptune, Tenes's grandfather, came to the aſſiſtance of his grand-ſon; and that the cheſt, being carried to the iſle of Leucophrys, was opened by the inhabitants, who no ſooner diſcovered what it contained, but they made Tenes king, &c.

(1) In the article TENES.

(2) Variarum Lect. *lib. i, cap. xii.*

[*B*] The

feſtly protected by the gods, and afterwards ſo great an admiration of his noble qualities, that they made him their king (*c*). Thus we ſee how all nations have aſcribed ſomething marvellous to their old traditions. However it be, what is related of Tenes, could not have happened before the time of Priam, ſince Tenes loſt his life when Achilles ravaged Tenedos, during the Trojan war (*d*). That iſland was then particularly conſecrated to Apollo *Smintheus* [*B*]. It was behind that iſland the Greecks concealed their fleet, when they made a ſhew of giving over their enterprize; and it is this has made Tenedos more famous, than any thing elſe [*C*], and even to this day makes it known all over the world. Neverthleſs that iſland was remarkable upon ſeveral better accounts. The adminiſtration of juſtice was very ſevere there (*e*): the beſt origanum in the world grew there (*f*): the moſt curious earthen veſſels were made there (*g*): the grapes, and ears of corn, and figure of Ceres, that appear on its medals (*h*), teſtify that it abounded with wine and corn, as it does to this day [*D*]: and the women of that iſland were the moſt beautiful in all the world [*E*]. I ſay nothing of the ſingularity of their cray-fiſh [*F*]. It was at Tenedos, according to ſome, that Paris landed after the rape of Helen

[*B*] *The iſland was particularly conſecrated to Apollo* Smintheus.] Homer plainly intimates it, when he puts this prayer in the mouth of the Prieſt Chryſes:

Κλῦθί μευ ἀργυρότοξ᾽ ὃς χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας
Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην, Τενέδοιό τε ἶφι ἀνάσσεις
Σμινθεῦ.

Audi me argenteum arcum gerens, qui Chryſam tueris
Cillamque valde divinam, Tenedoque fortiter imperas
Smintheu (3).

O Smyntheus! ſprung from fair Latona's line,
Thou guardian power of Cilla the Divine,
Thou ſource of light, whom Tenedos adores
And whoſe bright preſence gilds thy Chryſa's ſhores.
Mr POPE.

Strabo (4) has confirmed from this paſſage what he had been ſaying, that there was a temple of Apollo Smintheus in the iſle of Tenedos. There were the like temples in ſome other neighbouring towns (5); and the common opinion is, that Apollo was worſhipped under that title, becauſe he had killed the rats, which deſtroyed the fruits of the earth. His ſtatue in the temple of Chryſa had a rat under its feet. According to the dialect of that country, *σμίνθος* ſignified a rat. Some other reaſons have been alledged, beſides thoſe which I have mentioned: See the learned collections of Cuperus upon this ſubject in his antient monuments (6).

[*C*] *This has made Tenedos more famous than any thing elſe.*] There is not a ſchool where the ſecond book of the Æneids is not got by heart; ſo that every ſcholar muſt have theſe verſes at his finger's end.

Eſt in conſpectu Tenedos notiſſima fama
Inſula, dives opum, Priami dum regna manebant,
Nunc tantum ſinus & ſtatio maleſida carinis.
Huc ſe provecti deſerto in litore condunt (7).

In ſight of Troy lies Tenedos, an iſle,
(While Fortune did on Priam's empire ſmile)
Renown'd for wealth, but ſince a faithleſs bay,
Where ſhips expos'd to wind and weather lay.
There was their fleet conceal'd.
DRYDEN.

Et jam Argiva Phalanx inſtructis navibus ibat
A Tenedo, tacitæ per amica ſilentia lunæ (8).

The Grecians had embark'd their naval pow'rs
From Tenedos, and ſought our well-known ſhores.
Safe under covert of the ſilent night . . . . .
DRYDEN.

The beginning and ending of the ſtory of the wooden horſe are more taking to ſchool-boys than any other part of that Romance, and conſequently make more laſting impreſſions.

[*D*] *As it does to this day.*] Mr Spon, who has been there, aſſures us (9), that the iſle of Tenedos *is fruitful in good wines, wherewith it ſupplies Conſtantinople, and that its Muſcadine grapes are excellent*; that there is *game in abundance, eſpecially hares and patridges.* Sir George Wheeler, his fellow-traveller, ſays (10), *it abounds with corn and wine, eſpecially of the Muſcadine kind, the greateſt part whereof is exported to Conſtantinople.* See the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary.

[*E*] *The women of that iſland were the moſt beautiful in all the world.*] One may very well wonder that a thing of this nature ſhould not be mentioned by ſeveral authors. Athenæus, who had read ſo much, and who quotes ſo many writers, would have quoted ſome other author beſides Nymphodorus, had he known of any other, who had made the ſame obſervation. However it be, theſe are his words: Καὶ Νυμφόδωρος δ᾽ ἐν τῷ τῆς Ασίας περίπλῳ, καλλίονας φησὶ γίνεσθαι γυναῖκας τῶν πανταχοῦ γυναίκων ἐν Τενέδῳ τῇ τρωϊκῇ νήσῳ. Nymphodorus autem in Aſiæ circumnavigatione Tenedias fœminas (ea Trojæ vicina inſula eſt) omnes alias ubivis terrarum mulieres pulcritudine ſuperare tradit (11). - - - *Nymphodorus in his voyage round Aſia ſays, that the moſt beautiful women in all the world are born in Tenedos, an iſland in the neighbourhood of Troy.* A witneſs who has made or deſcribed the tour of Aſia, is of great authority, and more to be credited than a hundred, who never travelled or ſtudied Geographical Hiſtory. Though Theophraſtus does not affirm what Nymphodorus advances, yet his teſtimony may be alledged; becauſe he ſays (12), that among the Barbarians there were judges appointed to inquire into the prudence and houſewifery of women, in order to declare which of them exceeded the reſt in theſe reſpects; there were likewiſe certain judges in the iſles of Tenedos and Leſbos, who did the ſame thing in relation to the beauty of women: For it was thought that the very gifts of fortune and nature ought to be honoured and reſpected. Thoſe judges of Tenedos had a very nice office. The gods themſelves refuſed it; and it had been well for Paris if he had imitated them: he paid dear for his ingenious contrivance (13), and for the poſſeſſion of Helen, whom he obtained as a reward for his ſentence. But that fabulous ſtory made no great impreſſion; for there were ſome perſons, who deſired to judge of beauty, not only in Leſbos and Tenedos, but alſo in a town of Peloponneſus, where there was every year a diſpute about beauty, and ſhe who overcame her competitors, carried the prize (14). This cuſtom continued down to Athenæus's time. Such an emulation was excuſeable in women; but it is very ſtrange that men ſhould alſo have contended for the prize of beauty (15).

[*F*] *The ſingularity of their cray-fiſh.*] Their ſhell repreſented an ax; for which reaſon, according to Plutarch (16), the inhabitants of Tenedos conſecrated an ax in the temple of Delphi. I ſhould rather think that they conſecrated it, becauſe the forms obſerved in their tribunals, which occaſioned the Proverb about the ax of Tenedos (17), induced them to pitch upon an ax for the arms of their country. It appears by their medals, that it was their conſtant ſymbol (18). Suidas mentions thoſe cray-fiſh of Tenedos, and ſays they were to be found in a brook in that part of the country

---

(*c*) *See* Diodorus Siculus, ibid.

(*d*) Plut. Quæſt. Gr. *pag.* 297. Pauſanias, *lib. x*, *pag.* 330.

(*e*) See the article TENES.

(*f*) Antiphanes, *apud* Athen. *lib. i*, *cap. xxii.* *See alſo* Julius Pollux, *lib. vi*, *cap. x*, *and* Euſtathius in Iliad. Λ.

(*g*) Plutarchus, *init. Tractat.* de vitando ære alieno, *pag.* 828, & Scholiaſt. Ariſtoph. in Nubib. *Act. IV*, *Scene III.*

(*h*) *Vide* Spanhem. Epiſt. ad Laurent. Begerum.

(3) Homer. Iliad. *lib. i*, *ver.* 37.

(4) Lib. xiii, pag. 415.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) *Ad calcem* Harpocratis, *Edit.* 1687, *pag.* 212.

(7) Æneid. lib. ii, ver. 21.

(8) Ibid. ver. 254.

(9) Spon. Voiage, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 153.

(10) Wheeler, Voyage, *p.* 103.

(11) Athen. *lib. xiii*, *pag.* 609.

(12) *Apud* Athen. *pag.* 610.

(13) He made the three goddeſſes pull off their ſhifts.

(14) Nicias, in Arcadicis, *apud* Athen. *p.* 609.

(15) Theophraſtus, *apud* Athen. *ibid*, *ſays it was practiſed at Elea.*

(16) De Pythiæ Oraculis, *pag.* 399.

(17) See hereafter the remark [*H*], and the article TENES.

(18) *Vide* Ez. Spanhem. Epiſt. ad Laur. Beger.

Helen, and with his careſſes ſoothed her uneaſineſs (*i*) [*G*]. The inhabitants of Tenedos finding themſelves too weak to preſerve their independency, ſubmitted to the city of Alexandria ſituated in Troas (*k*). They were rich in Cicero's time, as appears from his orations (*l*). Their cauſe concerning their immunities was determined at Rome with too great rigour [*H*]. Cicero protected them, but he was not ſufficiently ſeconded. That iſland is about ten leagues round, and lies not above two leagues and a half from the continent of Aſia (*m*). The Turks have a fortreſs there, *which is only a tower, with a rampart defended by about fifteen pieces of cannon. The Venetians made themſelves maſters of it, during the war of Candia; but the Turks retook it by means of a tun of Sequins, with which they corrupted the commander* (*n*). Ariſtotle wrote a book concerning the republic of the Tenedians (*o*). Zoilus compoſed a panegyric upon them, wherein he has publiſhed a great falſity, namely that the river Alpheus had its ſource in the iſle of Tenedos (*p*). That iſland was often mentioned in the Gazettes, whilſt the Venetians were in poſſeſſion of Chio, which they took in the year 1694.

(*i*) In portum Tenedon pervenit, ubi Helenam mœſtam alloquio mitigavit. *Dares Phryg. de Excid. Trojæ.*

(*k*) Pauſanias, *lib. x, pag.* 330.

(*l*) In Verrem, *lib. iii.*

(*m*) Wheeler, Voyage, *pag.* 103. Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 415, *ſays it is* 80 *Strada in compaſs, and the canal that divides it from Aſia,* 40.

(*n*) Spon, Voiage, *Tom. i, pag.* 153, *Dutch Edit.*

(*o*) Stephan. in Τένεδος.

(*p*) Strabo, *lib. vi, pag.* 187.

country called Aſſerina (19). Bochart (20) rightly obſerves it ſhould be read 'Αϛέειον, and not 'Ασσερίνα, becauſe Plutarch ſays in expreſs words, that the cray-fiſh of Tenedos, whoſe ſhell was like an ax, were to be found in a place called 'Αϛέειον. Beſides, according to Heſychius, the firſt inhabitants of that iſland were called 'Αϛέειοι, a name that might very well proceed from the place, which afforded thoſe cray-fiſh. This conjecture of Bochart, and the corrections he makes in that paſſage of Suidas, are a great deal better than all his imaginary Etymologies, ſtuffed with Hebrew, to derive the Tenedians from Phœnicia.

[*G*] *He ſoothed her uneaſineſs.*] Nothing can be more modeſt than the words of the pretended Dares Phrygius, 'alloquio mitigavit. - - - *he ſoothed with 'his converſation.*' The author, who wrote a Paraphraſe upon him in verſe (21), did not confine himſelf within ſuch narrow bounds: he has carried the thing as far as it can go, leaving nothing to be ſupplied by the imagination of the readers. It is true he leaves two ſtumbling-blocks in their way. One is, that he ſuppoſes Paris did not enjoy Helen till he had landed in the iſle of Tenedos; which is neither likely, nor conſiſtent with the Iliad, where the iſle of Cranaë, leſs diſtant than Tenedos from the place, where the rape was committed, is made the ſcene of the laſt favour (22). The ſecond difficulty is taken from the rich preſents Paris is obliged to make, in order to obtain his wiſhes. This is contrary to *decorum*, in the opinion of thoſe, who know the character of Helen: the author was ſenſible of it, and therefore he breaks out into an exclamation immediately after the verſes, wherein he deſcribes the preſents and the enjoyment (23).

Proh ſcelus! an tantis potuiſti peſſima votis
Indulſiſſe moras? expectabatque voluptas
Emptorem? O teneri miranda potentia ſexus!
Præcipitem in lucrum ſuſpendit femina luxum,
Nec niſi conducto dignatur gaudia riſu.

For ſhame! how coud'ſt thou, wretched fair, thus lay
Such cold demurrers in thy lover's way?
What, muſt he ſtay till ev'ry kiſs be bought?
To what ſtrange power will thy ſex be brought!
While thus, for lucre, you each wiſh reſtrain;
And even grudge a ſmile, except for gain.

[*H*] *Their cauſe concerning their immunities was determined at Rome, with too great rigour.*] This is what Cicero wrote about it to his brother. 'Tenediorum 'igitur libertas ſecuri Tenedia præciſa eſt, cum eos 'præter me & Bibulum & Calidium & Favonium ne'mo defenderet (24). - - - *The liberty therefore of the 'iſland of Tenedos, was cut off with the ax of Tenedos, 'ſince it met with no other patrons beſides Bibulus, Cali'dius, Favonius, and myſelf.*' The proverbial expreſſion of Cicero may be explained by Pauſanias or Stephanus Byzantinus. Τενέδιος πέλεκυς ἐπὶ τῶν ἤτοι πικρῶς ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον συντόμως ἀποκοπτόντων τὰ ζητήματα, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πράγματα. Tenedia Securis, de iis qui vel aſperè vel etiam magis conciſe abſcidunt quæſtiones & alias res (25). - - - *The ax of Tenedos is applicable to thoſe who either with much ſeverity, or little formality cut off queſtions and other matters.* Pauſanias having ſaid that Tenes cut with an ax the rope, wherewith the ſhip of his father Cygnus was faſtened, adds, Ἐπὶ τȣ́τῳ μὲν ἐς τȣ̀ς ἀρνȣμένȣς ϛερεῶς λέγεσθαι καθέϛηκεν ὡς ὁ δεῖνα ὅϛις δὴ Τεννεδίῳ πελέκει τόδε τι ἀποκόψεις. Ex eo in *Proverbii* conſuetudinem venit ut quidquid quivis præfracte negaret, id Tenedia bipenni præcidiſſe dicatur (26). - - - *From thence it became a common Proverb, whenever any thing was precipitately rejected, to ſay it was cut off with the ax of Tenedos.*

(19) In Τενέδιος ξυνήγορος.

(20) Geograph. Sacr. *Part. ii, lib. i, cap. ix.*

(21) Joſephus Iſcanus, Anglus, *who lived in the XIIIth century. See his* Dares Phrygius de bello Trojano, *lib iii, pag. m.* 52, 53.

(22) See the remark [*L*], in the article HELENA.

(23) Hæc faciles emêre toros, domuere rebelles Amplexus, pepigere fidem, non jam oſcula reddit.
Non reddenda negat Helene, ſed pectore toto Incumbens, gremium ſolvit, premit ore latentem
Furatur Venerem, jamque expirante Dione Conſcia ſecretos teſtatur purpura rores.
Proh ſcelus, &c.

(24) Cicero ad Q. fratrem, *lib. ii.*

(25) Steph. Byzant. *voce* Τένεδος.

(26) Pauſanias, *lib. x, pag.* 330.

TENES or TENNES,

TENES or **TENNES**, the ſon of Cygnus, gave his name to the iſle of Tenedos, where he landed, when his father expoſed him in a cheſt to the mercy of the ſea. Cygnus uſed him with that ſeverity, becauſe he had been too credulous in believing his wife, the ſtep-mother of Tenes [*A*]. She complained that Tenes had raviſhed her [*B*], and alledged the falſe evidence of a piper (*a*). This occaſioned the law, that was obſerved in the iſle of Tenedos, that no man of that profeſſion ſhould be admitted into

(*a*) Plutarch. Quæſt. Græc. *num.* 28, *pag.* 297, *calls him Molpus.*

[*A*] *His wife, the ſtep-mother of Tenes.*] We read in Pauſanias (1) that Cygnus, the ſon of Neptune, reigned at Colonæ in Troas, and that he had two ſons by Proclea, the daughter of Clytius, and ſiſter to Caletor, who was killed at the ſiege of Troy by Ajax, as it is mentioned in the Iliad. Thoſe two children of Cygnus were, a ſon named Tenes, and a daughter named Hemithea. After the death of their mother, Cygnus married Philonome the daughter of Craugaſus. This Philonome accuſed Tenes of having attempted to raviſh her, whereas ſhe on the contrary fell in love with Tenes, who refuſed to comply with her deſires. This therefore is an example, which may be added to thoſe of Theſeus and Conſtantine. Muretus has collected ſome others in the 12th chapter of the firſt book of his *Variæ Lectiones*. See the article FAUSTA.

[*B*] *She complained that Tenes had raviſhed her.*] I follow my author, who ſays, καταμαρτυρήσαντος αὐλητȣ̃ τινος βιάζεσθαι ταύτην. *A certain Piper witneſſing againſt him that ſhe had been raviſhed.* But as we have only ſome fragments of that work of Heraclides, which ſavour entirely of the careleſſneſs and precipitation of a writer who wants to huddle up an abridgment, there is no doubt but ſome words are wanting in this place. A wife does not uſe to complain to her huſband that ſhe has been raviſhed; ſhe is content to tell him that ſuch a thing has been deſigned. Though Stephanus Byzantinus has gone through the hands of a moſt terrible abbreviator, he does nevertheleſs inform us, that Philonome, Cygnus's wife, complained only of Tenes's ill deſign, and that the evidence of the Piper went no farther. Τὸν γὰρ αὐλητὴν ἡ Φιλονόμη πρὸς Κύκνον ἤγαγε μαρτυρȣ̃ντα ὅτι Τέννης αὐτὴν ἤθελε βιάσασθαι. *Tibicinem enim Philonome ad Cygnum duxit, qui teſtabatur Tennem voluiſſe Philonomæ vim inferre* (2). Pauſanias makes no

(1) Lib. x, pag. 329.

(2) Steph. Byzant. *in voce* Tenedus.

into the temple. Tenes, who probably was the author of that law (b), extremely proper to perpetuate the juſt hatred he had conceived againſt that falſe witneſs, ſhewed himſelf worthy of commanding by ſome other laws, which he enacted, and cauſed to be executed without any diſtinction of perſons. He condemned adulterers to be beheaded; and being aſked, what ſhould be done to his ſon, who had been guilty of that crime, he anſwered, *let the law be put in execution.* Upon this occaſion ſome medals were ſtamped [C], having on one ſide the figure of an ax, and on the other the faces of a man and a woman upon the ſame neck. This likewiſe, and what ſhall be ſaid below, was the reaſon why the ax of Tenedos became a proverb (c), to denote a great ſeverity (d). Tenes ordered another thing very remarkable, namely that there ſhould always ſtand behind the judge, a man holding an ax, in order to cut off the head of any one, who ſhould be convicted of falſity (e). Others ſay he ordered that the executioner, with his ax lifted up, ſhould ſtand behind the accuſers, in order to put immediately to death thoſe who ſhould be found guilty of a falſe accuſation [D]. Ariſtotle, ſays in general (*f*) that the King of Tenedos adminiſtring juſtice with an ax, made a quick diſpatch of thoſe, who had wronged any body. It is no wonder after this if the proverb, *he is a man of Tenedos* (g), denoted a man, whoſe looks ſtruck terror. Tenes extended his inflexibility even to his father. Cygnus having diſcovered his wife's calumny, was deſirous of repairing the injury he had done his ſon, and made a voyage to the iſle of Tenedos, to give him ſatisfaction (h). He faſtened his ſhip to a tree or a rock, but Tenes in a paſſion rudely cut the ropes with his ax. We are not told what became of Cygnus after this rough action

mention of that evidence: he will have it that Cygnus gave credit to the bare complaints of Philonome; but he obſerves that ſhe complained only of the ill deſigns of her ſon-in-law. Ψεύδεται πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα ὡς αὐτὴ μὲν οὐκ ἐθέλουσα, τὸν δὲ αὐτῇ Τεννην συγγένεσθαι θελήσαντα (3); that is, *ſhe falſely complained to her huſband*, that *Tenes attempted to lie with her againſt her will.* The Latin tranſlation of Romulus Amaſæus ſeems to me to go beyond the original, *quod ille invitam & repugnantem conſtuprare conatus eſſet.* The Latin words ſignify great endeavours; but the Greek may be underſtood only of a bare ſollicitation.

[C] *Upon this occaſion ſome medals were ſtamped.*] Mr Beger (4) has publiſhed one ſtamped at Tenedos having on one ſide two faces upon one and the ſame neck, and on the other an ax between a lyre and a bunch of grapes. Thoſe two faces repreſent a man and a woman. This author pretends, that the deſign of this medal was to denote the union, which ought to be between married people. The medal of Tenes, mentioned by the Antients (5) was not ſtamped with ſuch an intent; but rather to denote the capital puniſhment of a man and a woman, who had committed adultery, and to be a perpetual monument of the execution of the law upon Tenes's own ſon. It will be proper to ſee the anſwer a learned man gave to Mr Beger (6). What creates the greateſt difficulty, is, that there are ſome medals of Tenedos, on which one of the faces repreſents an old man, and the other a young woman; on others, the two faces repreſent young people, &c. Thoſe variations make it probable, that all theſe medals were not ſtamped agreeably to the firſt intent; but ſome for one purpoſe, and others for another: unleſs it ſhould be ſaid that as often as the law was put in execution, a new medal was ſtamped, and that the two heads upon one neck differed either as to the age or ſome other ornaments, according to the perſonal qualities of thoſe, who had been puniſhed. It would be no very great wonder if an old beard had been found in the fact with a young woman.

[D] *That the executioner, with his ax lifted up, ſhould ſtand behind the accuſers, in order to put immediately to death thoſe who were guilty of a falſe accuſation.*] Suidas affirms this: Ἐνομοθέτησε, ſays he (7), τοῖς τὰ ψευδῆ κατηγοροῦσιν ὄπισθεν παρεστάναι τὸν δήμιον πέλεκυν ἐπηρμένον ὡς ἐλεγχθέντας παραχρῆμα ἀναιρεῖσθαι. Legem tulit ut carnifex ſecurim ſublatam tenens à tergo aſtaret illis qui falſa crimina objicerent, ut convicti ex tempore occiderentur. - - - *He made a law, that the executioner, with his ax lifted up, ſhould ſtand behind thoſe who brought falſe accuſations, that as ſoon as they were convicted they might be put to death.* This puts me in mind of a maxim which has been commented upon by a French Civilian of the XVIth century. It imports, that a man, who goes about to oppoſe the prevailing religion, and which has been regularly eſtabliſhed for many ages, ought not to be heard, but upon this condition, that he ſhall be puniſhed with death, if he does not convince others, that his private opinion is more certain than the opinion of the public. *Qui antiqua, legitima, atque ordinaria ſacra audet in controverſiam adducere, eum non audiendum eſſe, niſi periculo ſui capitis, ſi non perſuadeat veriorem eſſe ſuam ſententiam* (8). Upon this occaſion he alledges a very remarkable example from Joſephus, in the ſixth chapter of the thirteenth book of his Jewiſh Antiquities. The Jews, and the Samaritans having a quarrel in the city of Alexandria about this queſtion, Whether the temple of Jeruſalem was to be preferred to that of Garizim; the cauſe was brought before the council of the King of Egypt (9), and before the caſe was argued, it was determined, that the advocates of the party caſt ſhould be condemned to death. The advocate of the Jews ſpoke firſt (10), and ſo clearly proved the juſtice of his cauſe, that he obtained ſuch a ſentence as he deſired; ſo that Sabbeus and Theodoſius, the two Advocates of the Samaritans, were condemned to loſe their lives. The ſame Civilian alledges (11) Zaleucus's law, by virtue of which, whoever propoſed any innovation, was to do it with a rope about his neck, that in caſe he ſhould not prevail to have the old cuſtoms aboliſhed, he might be hanged upon the ſpot: and he concludes with wiſhing that the ſame law were to be obſerved in France. He fancies that the factions and troubles, occaſioned by innovations in the kingdom of France, would have been prevented by that means. 'Quibus 'omnino rationibus atque conditionibus ſi nos, præ'ſertim hoc tempore uteremur, quo is demum nihil 'ſcire & illiberalis eſſe dicitur, cui non placent abſur'diſſima quæque, modò recentiſſima: non ita planè 'res incertæ eſſent ac turbulentæ, neque tam multi 'multarum patrium, factionum, opinionum auctores 'evaderent: cùm ſuo ſaltem periculo ea diſcerent 'amare, colere, pacem patriamque, leges ac magiſtra'tus, quæ odio ſanè proſequuntur (12). - - - *If we were 'to make uſe of the ſame methods and conditions at this 'time, when every perſon is eſteemed to be entirely igno'rant and unpolite, who does not reliſh the moſt abſurd 'notions, provided they are but new; we ſhould not 'have that uncertainty and confuſion in things, nor would 'ſo many ſet up for heads of parties, factions, and opi'nions: ſince from their own danger, at leaſt, they would 'learn to reſpect and reverence peace and their country, 'the laws and the magiſtrates, thoſe things for which 'they now diſcover the moſt inveterate hatred.'* It is plain he would have had the diſputes between the Romiſh prieſts and the Proteſtants determined like that of Alexandria: but was there in France in a tribunal like that of the King of Egypt? the latter was compoſed of men, who were neither Jews nor Samaritans; and therefore the contending parties might expect a deciſion without any partiality. Luther and Calvin, and their followers, could not have the ſame expectations, ſince the ſame perſons muſt have been both judges and parties. Conſequently neither Zaleucus's law, nor that of the King of Tenedos, can be extended to matters of religion.

(b) See the remark [*H*].

(c) See the remark [*H*], in the article TENEDOS.

(d) *Ex* Heraclide de Politiis.

(e) Suidas in Τενέδιος ἄνθρωπος.

(*f*) *Apud* Suidam, *in voce ſequenti.*

(g) *See Eraſmus in the Proverbs*, Tenedia bipennis. Tenedius homo. Tenedius patronus. Tenedius Tibicen.

(h) Paſanias, *lib. x, pag.* 330.

(3) Pauſanias, *lib. x, pag.* 329.

(4) Obſervat. in Numiſm. quædam, *pag.* 61.

(5) Heraclides, de Politiis, Ariſtoteles *apud* Stephanum de Urbibus, *voce* Τένεδος. Suidas, *Voce* Τενέδιος ξυνήγορος.

(6) Ez. Spanhemius, *in ipſo Opere* Begeri. *Vide etiam* Giſb. Cuperum, *ad calcem* Harpocratis, *pag.* 203, *Edit.* 1687.

(7) Suidas, in Τενέδιος ἄνθρωπος.

(8) Petrus Ærodius, Decretorum, *lib. i, pag. xviii, Edit. Pariſ.* 1573, *in* 8vo.

(9) Ptolemy Philometor.

(10) Note, that Joſephus forgot to obſerve, whether the advocates of the Samaritans pleaded their cauſe. One would think by his account, that judgment was given without hearing them. It is not likely that the King of Egypt ſhould have been guilty of that fault. Joſephus does not obſerve the laws of Hiſtory in this point.

(11) Petrus Ærodius, Decretorum, *lib. i, pag.* 20.

(12) Id. ibid.

action [*E*]; but we read that the father and the ſon were killed by Achilles, during the Trojan war: the firſt, when the Grecians landed (*i*), the ſecond, when Achilles went to ravage the iſle of Tenedos (*k*). Tenes came to the aſſiſtance of his dear ſiſter [*F*] Hemithea, who was purſued by Achilles; but he only got his death by it. This action was attended with many conſequences [*G*]. He was honoured as a god in the iſle of Tenedos [*H*]. See the article of that iſland.

(*i*) Ovidius, Metam. *lib. xii.*

(*k*) Plutarch. Quæſt. Græc. *pag.* 297.

[*E*] *We are not told what became of Cygnus.*] As I have only followed Pauſanias's narrative, I leave the account of that voyage very imperfect. It is plain, the principal deſign of that author was to deſcribe ſtatues and pictures, and that he did not always conſider whether the ſtories he mentioned, by the way, were lame or not. He makes Cygnus land in the iſle of Tenedos, and faſten his ſhip to a tree or a great ſtone, and then Tenes to come and cut the cable. This is all. He ſhould at leaſt have told us, whether the ſon permitted his father to live in Tenedos, or to go home. This adventure is better related by Conon (13), tho' we have but an abſtract of his book. Cygnus, ſays he, faſtened his ſhip, but did not land; he deſired his ſon to forget what was paſt, but he deſired it on board his ſhip. Tenes cut the cables with his hatchet to prevent his landing. We may eaſily ſee what became of Cygnus; he went home again.

[*F*] *His dear ſiſter.*] It is not without reaſon that I uſe this epithet, ſince Hemithea was ſo concerned at her brother's misfortune, that Cygnus ſhut her up in the ſame cheſt, in which he committed his ſon to the mercy of the ſea (14). What Suidas ſays of her is ſtill more in her commendation, for he tells us that ſhe voluntarily reſolved to run the ſame hazard with her brother (15). It was very reaſonable, that Tenes ſhould expoſe his life to prevent ſuch a ſiſter from being raviſhed; and yet he died in ſo juſt a cauſe; and it is pretended, that Hemithea was ſwallowed up by the earth; and that it was this only that put a ſtop to Achilles's attempts (16). The remedy was ſomewhat violent; and few people would think it more ſupportable than the evil itſelf. Hemithea was very handſome (17).

[*G*] *His death was attended with many conſequences.*] When Achilles came to know that it was Tenes whom he had killed, he was ſorry for it, and took care to get him buried. He killed a ſervant ſent him from Thetis, becauſe he had not juſtly executed Thetis's orders. She had not only ſtrictly charged her ſon to take care not to kill Tenes, but beſides ſhe had enjoined that ſervant to put Achilles in mind of her orders, when there ſhould be occaſion for it, leſt he ſhould diſobey his mother through inadvertency. Plutarch (18) gives no other reaſon for this care of Thetis, but that Tenes was beloved of Apollo: but others ſay, that he was his ſon, and that Cygnus was only his reputed father (19). Now, according to the Deſtinies, Achilles was to die as ſoon as he ſhould kill one of Apollo's ſons. As for the reſt. The inhabitants of Tenedos conceived ſo great an indignation againſt Achilles, that they ordered that no body ſhould mention his name in the temple of Tenes. They alſo prohibited all Pipers from entering into it (20). Diodorus Siculus (21) does not ſay, thoſe two prohibitions concerned the temple of Tenes, tho' he obſerves, that the inhabitants of Tenedos built a temple to him, and worſhipped him as a god. He tells us that Tenes himſelf ordered that the pipers ſhould not enter into the temple. He adds, that the temple which was re-built, when Achilles had deſtroyed the town, was that, in which it was not lawful to mention the name of Achilles. He, and Plutarch are therefore of a quite contrary opinion as to the place, which thoſe two prohibitions concerned. It is certain, that no temple was built to Tenes during his life.

[*H*] *He was honoured as a god in the iſle of Tenedos.*] I have juſt now quoted two authors who ſay ſo. Cicero may be added for a third: 'Jam vero, *ſays he* (22), in 'Græcia multos habent ex hominibus Deos, Alabandum 'Alabandi, Tenedi Tenem. --- *And now in Greece there* '*are men worſhipped as gods, Alabandus by the Alabandi,* '*and Tenes by thoſe of Tenedos.*' He was one of the deities that Verres ſtole. 'Tenedo, prætereo pecuniam quam 'eripuit, Tenem ipſum qui apud Tenedios ſanctiſſimus 'deus habetur, qui urbem illam dicitur condidiſſe, 'cujus ex nomine Tenedus nominatur, hunc, inquam, 'ipſum Tenem pulcherrimè factum, quem quondam 'in comitio vidiſtis, abſtulit magnò cum gemitu civitatis (23). --- *I paſs over his extortions at Tenedos,* '*where he ſeized even Tenes himſelf, who among that* '*people is reverenced with divine honours, and is ſaid to* '*have built that city, which is called* Tenedus, *after* '*his name, this very Tenes, I ſay, a moſt beautiful* '*ſtatue, which you have formerly ſeen in the Comitium,* '*he carried away to the great grief of the inhabitants.*' We may infer from thence, that the antient deity of Tenedos, namely, Apollo Smintheus, was, in a manner, forgotten, after Tenes was placed in the number of the gods: for it was not objected to Verres, that he had made an attempt upon the ſtatue of this Apollo; which plainly ſhews that it was not worth taking away, as that of Tenes was. Men ſeem to act in point of religion, as they do in point of friendſhip. None but the wiſe and the rational prefer old friends to new ones. The generality behave like coquets; the laſt comers are the moſt acceptable. In like manner the new ſaints makes the old ones forgotten. This has been complained of by ſome grave writers.

(13) *Apud* Photium, *p.* 437.

(14) Conon, ubi ſupra.

(15) Ἑλομένης δὲ τῆς Ἡμιθέας συγκινδυνεύειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ, ἑκατέρους κατεπόντωσιν. Cum autem Hemithea cum fratre periculum idem ſubire voluiſſet utrumque conjecit in mare.

(16) Tzetzes in Lycophr.

(17) Plutarch. Quæſt. Gr. *pag.* 297.

(18) Id. ibid.

(19) Tzetzes in in Lycophr.

(20) Plutarch, ubi ſupra.

(21) Lib. vi, cap. xvii.

(22) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, *lib. iii, cap. xv.*

(23) *Idem,* in Verrem, *lib. iii.*

TEOS, one of the twelve cities of Ionia, acknowledged Athamas for its firſt founder (*a*) [*A*]. This Athamas, the grand-ſon of another Athamas, the ſon of Æolus, conducted a colony of Orchomenians to Teos, to which, in proceſs of time, were added ſome other colonies of Athenians and Bœotians. Herodotus ſays (*b*), that Teos was in the middle of Ionia; and that this was the reaſon why Thales adviſed the Ionians to make it the ſeat of their general aſſemblies. Strabo, who places it in a peninſula, is not ſo faulty as Pliny (*c*), who calls it an iſland, for it is certain that Teos ſtood on the ſouth ſide of the iſthmus (*d*) over againſt Clazomenæ [*B*], which was on the north ſide. The inhabitants of Teos not being able to hold out any longer againſt the troops of

(*a*) Pauſanias, *lib. vii, pag.* 208. Strabo, *lib. xiv, circa init.*

(*b*) *Lib. v, cap. clxx.*

(*c*) *Lib. i, cap. xxxi.*

(*d*) Strabo, *ibid.* Pompon. Mela, *lib. i, cap. xvii,* & *ibid.* If. Voſſius.

[*A*] *This city acknowledged Athamas for it's firſt founder.*] Ortelius (1) falſly imagines that Strabo and Stephanus Byzantinus ſay, that Anacreon calls it *Athamas*, before it had the name of Teos. Thoſe two authors only ſay, that Anacreon called it Ἀθαμαντίδα, becauſe it was founded by Athamas. There ought to be a great difference made between the proper names of a town, and the epithets beſtowed upon it in Poetry; which ſhews, that Ortelius would have been guilty of a miſtake, if he had ſaid that Teos ever went by the name of Athamantis. It will appear, upon a proper examination, that he has committed three faults. 1. He confounds Athamas with Athamantis. 2. He takes an epithet for a proper name. 3. He thought the native country of Anacreon was not called Teos, when that Poet called it Athamantida. Charles Stephens has fallen into the ſame miſtakes.

[*B*] *Teos ſtood on the ſouth ſide of the iſthmus overagainſt Clazomenæ.*] Here follows a paſſage of Pomponius Mela (2), which we muſt examine. 'Super anguſtias, hinc Teos, illinc Clazomenæ, & quia terga 'jungunt confinio adnexa maris, diverſis frontibus 'diverſa maria proſpectant. ---- *On the ſtraits are ſituated Teos on this ſide, Clazomenæ on the other; which* '*two places, as the back parts of them are almoſt joined* '*by their nearneſs to the ſhore, have in their fronts the* '*different proſpect of two oppoſite ſeas.*' Pincianus makes the

(1) In Theſauro Geographico, *voce* Teos.

(2) Lib. i, cap. xvii.

of Cyrus, commanded by Harpalus, put to ſea in the LIXth Olympiad, and went to ſettle a colony at Abdera in Thrace (*e*). Suidas, ſpeaking of Anacreon, who was a native of Teos (*f*) [*C*], ſeems to ſay that it was in the reign of Darius the ſon of Hyſtaſpes that the Teians went to Abdera; for he ſays, that Anacreon retired thither, being expelled from Teos, on account of Hiſtieus's revolt. There were ſome of them who returned back again to their country in proceſs of time (*g*). This town produced not only Anacreon, but alſo the Poet Scythinus (*h*), the Hiſtorian Hecatæus (*i*), and Apellicon, who collected ſo many books. Stephanus Byzantinus mentions another town called Teos, which he places in the country of the Dirbæ in Scythia; but as this is a nation altogether unknown, and as it muſt be different from thoſe, whom he calls Dyrbæi, that paſſage is thought to be faulty.

(*e*) Herod. *lib. i, cap. clxviii*: Strabo, *lib. xiv*, *pag. m.* 443.

(*f*) See the remark [*I*], of the article ANACREON.

(*g*) Strabo, ubi ſupra.

(*h*) Stephanus, in Τέως.

(*i*) Strabo, ubi ſupra, & *lib. xiii*, *pag.* 419.

the following correction, *Quæ terga agunt, confinibus adnexa muris diverſis frontibus diverſa maria proſpectant.* Salmaſius not finding his account in it, reads thus (3), *Qua terga agunt confinio adnexæ maris, adverſis frontibus diverſa maria proſpectant.* Iſaac Voſſius always ready to find fault with that Critic, will have (4) the words to be read in this manner, *Qua terga agunt confinio adnexæ muri diverſis, &c.* He calls the reading *adverſis*, inſtead of *diverſis*, a very great miſtake; for, ſays he, if thoſe two towns had *frontes adverſas*, they would not look towards the ſea, but would face one another: ‘ Manifeſte, *Voſſius goes on*, hic tergum pro ‘ fronte, & frontem pro tergo accepit vir doctiſſimus. ‘ - - - *It is plain therefore that this learned man has* ‘ *taken the front for the back part, and the back part for* ‘ *the front*.’ Voſſius muſt needs have read the paſſage of Salmaſius very careleſsly, to raiſe ſuch an objection againſt him. How could Salmaſius take the front for the back part, ſince he expreſsly obſerves, that the Teïans had the ſea of Clazomenæ before them, as the Clazomenians had the ſea of Teos before them? He will have it, that each of thoſe two towns had the ſea before and behind; that each had behind it the ſea near which it was built, and before it the ſea on which the other town was built. And therefore, the objection of Voſſius is altogether wrong in that reſpect. The reaſon on which it is grounded is not better, namely, that thoſe two towns would have faced one another, if Salmaſius's correction was right; for Salmaſius did not pretend to deny that they faced one another; on the contrary, he ſuppoſes it, or rather expreſsly declares it (5). By that very reaſon he pretended, that each of thoſe two towns looked towards the ſea on which the other was built. Beſides, it ſeems to me, that Voſſius ſhould not have aſſerted, that Teos and Clazomenæ had the ſea only on the foreſide; and that there was a wall between them, which took up the breadth of the iſthmus. This particular wanted to be proved, and would not have been forgotten by all the antient authors, if it had been true. And therefore Pincianus's correction of *muris*, inſtead of *maris*, partly adopted by Voſſius, ought not to hinder our following Salmaſius's correction till we have a better.

[*C*] *Anacreon, who was a native of Teos.*] Moreri (6) tells us, that ſome ſay Anacreon was a native *of Teïos, a town of Paphlagonia*. One would think that Strabo and Ovid, quoted by him at the end of his article, ſhould be the authors who ſay ſo; but this exactneſs in citing is not to be expected from him. Yet it is true, Moreri did not invent that particular; he found it in theſe words of Charles Stephens (7): ‘ Teium, ‘ urbs in Paphlagonia (ut Salluſtius ſcribit) in qua ortus ‘ fuit Anacreon. - - - - *Teïum, a city in Paphlagonia,* ‘ *(as Salluſt writes) where Anacreon was born.*’ Properly ſpeaking, there is no quotation in thoſe words for what concerns the native country of Anacreon; for Salluſt ſeems to be alledged only to prove, that there was a town called Teium in Paphlagonia (8). And therefore we are never the better for what Charles Stephens ſays any more than for what we read afterwards in Moreri. Lloyd and Hofman give us no greater aſſiſtance: they left out the quotation of Salluſt in the article of Teïum, thinking, without doubt, that it was falſe; and yet it is certain, that Charles Stephens is right in that reſpect: they affirm, without quoting any author for it, that this Teïum, a town in Paphlagonia, on the Euxine ſea, was the native country of Anacreon; and they ſay, under the word Teos, that ſome make him a native of Teïum. They give us therefore no evidence that we can conſult: for which reaſon we are put to the ſearch, and by this means we find that one of the ſcholiaſts upon Horace (9) has theſe words: ‘ Teïa dicta eſt à Teïo Anacreontis poëtæ ‘ lyrici oppido, quod in Paphlagonia eſſe Salluſtius in‘ dicat, cum de ſitu Pontico loquitur. - - - - *It is called* ‘ Teïan *from* Teïum, *the native place of Anacreon, the* ‘ *Lyric Poet, which Salluſt ſays is in Paphlagonia,* ‘ *when he deſcribes the ſituation of Pontus.*’ I would not affirm, upon the authority of that paſſage, that Salluſt ſaid, that Teïum, upon the Exine ſea, was Anacreon's native country. It might be a gloſs of the ſcholiaſt, grounded upon what he had read in Salluſt, concerning the town of Paphlagonia. But, even tho' Salluſt, and other writers ſhould aſſert, that Anacreon was born in that town of the Euxine ſea, there would be no room to doubt that he was a native of Teos in Ionia.

(3) Exercitat. Plin. *pag.* 861.

(4) In Melam, *pag.* 85.

(5) Ita ut à tergo mare habeant vicinum cui adnexæ ſunt, à fronte diverſa maria proſpectant. Teos enim adverſa fronte proſpectat mare in quo ſitæ ſunt Claromenæ (*ſo ſays Salmaſius inſtead of ſaying* Clazomenæ) & ſinum Smyrnæum Illæ contra Teon reſpiciunt & ſinum cui juncta eſt Teos.

(6) At the word *Teos.*

(7) At the word *Teium.*

(8) Strabo, *lib. xii*, *pag. m.* 374, 375, mentions it, but does not ſay it was in Paphlagonia.

(9) *In hæc verba* Od. XVII, *lib. i*, Fide Teïa dices laborantes.

TERMESSUS, a town of Piſidia. See the remark [*E*], of the article TELMESSUS.

TETTI (SCIPIO), in Latin *Tettius*, a learned man of the XVIth century, was born at Naples. He came to an unfortunate end; for he was proſecuted, for having ſome ill opinions concerning the Deity, and ſent to the gallies [*A*]. He wrote a tract

de

[*A*] *He was ſent to the gallies.*] If Thuanus had not mentioned this particular, I fancy we had never known it: for the curious Nicodemo, who made ſo many inquiries concerning the Neapolitan writers, acknowledges that he knew nothing of this misfortune of Tetti, but what he had read in Thuanus, ‘ Queſto luogo ‘ del Tuano, *ſays he* (1), qui ſi e traſcritto volentieri ‘ perche oltre alla lode che ſi da al Tetti in eſſo, ſi ha ‘ una notizia anche curioſa intorno al medeſimo Tetti. ‘ - - - *Here I tranſcribe this paſſage of Thuanus with ſo* ‘ *much the more pleaſure, as it is not only in commendation* ‘ *of Tetti, but alſo becauſe it contains a curious particular* ‘ *concerning him.*’ Theſe are Thuanus's words (2): ‘ Ab eo (*Mureto*) de Scipionis Tettii Neapolitani caſu ‘ cognovit, hominis undecunque, ut ille ajebat, doctiſ‘ ſimi, qui delatus quod male de numine ſentiret, re‘ mo mancipatus fuerat, & tunc an adhuc in vivis eſſet, ‘ incertum erat. - - - *From Muretus he underſtood the* ‘ *misfortune of Scipio Tetti, the Neapolitan, a perſon* ‘ *otherwiſe, as he ſaid, extremely learned, who being* ‘ *informed againſt for ſome heterodox opinions of the Deity,* ‘ *was condemned to the gallies, and whether he was then* ‘ *alive or not was uncertain.*’ Thuanus ſpeaks of the time when he was at Rome (3), and of the frequent converſations he had with Muretus. What we read in the Thuana has a relation to this: ‘ The Inquiſition ‘ was very ſevere under the Pontificate of Sixtus V. ‘ Muretus told me, we do not know what becomes of ‘ people here. I am amazed, when I riſe in the ‘ morning, and hear that ſuch a one is not to be ‘ found, and yet none dares ſpeak of it. The Inqui‘ ſition made a quick diſpatch of them.’ There is a

ſlip

(1) Leon. Nicodemo, Addizioni alla Biblioteca Napoletana, *pag.* 228.

(2) *In* Vita ſua, *lib. i*, *pag. m.* 1172.

(3) That is, the year 1574.

A MISTAKE in the *Thuana.*

de Apollodoris, which was publiſhed at Rome by Benedictus Ægius in the year 1555 [*B*]. He was very much eſteemed by the learned [*C*].

ſlip of memory in this paſſage. Muretus died ſoon after the election of Sixtus V, in 1585, and Thuanus was in France all that year; he could not therefore learn any thing from Muretus in that Pope's reign. I believe I ſhould not be miſtaken, if I were to advance, that Thuanus remembering on the one hand what Muretus had told him concerning the executions of the Inquiſition; and knowing on the other hand, that Sixtus V was very ſevere, confounded the time in which Muretus ſpoke to him, with the time when Sixtus V was Pope. People do not uſe to be ſo exact in converſation, and the memory is not then ſo intent as to make one avoid anachroniſms.

[*B*] *He is the author of the treatiſe* de Apollodoris, *which was publiſhed at Rome by Benedictus Ægius, in the year* 1555 (4).] He added it to his edition of Apollodorus, whoſe book he tranſlated into Latin, and added notes to it, wherein he often mentions Tetti. He gives him the character of a very honeſt and learned man. 'Sic habet exemplar Scipionis Tetti Neapolitani, viri nobiliſſimi & ſummæ doctrinæ & modeſtiæ & humanitatis incredibilis (5). - - - - *Thus it is in the copy of Scipio Tetti, the Neapolitan, a perſon of conſiderable rank, and ſuperior learning, and of incredible modeſty and humanity.*' Mr Baillet makes mention of him in his *Jugemens des Savans*, part II, chap. X, *of the Prejudices of Precipitation.* 'Scipio Tetti, *ſays he*, a Neapolitan, beſtowed ſeveral years upon his ſmall tract *de Apollodoris*, before he was ſent to the gallies. It is a work only of two ſheets; but the public, which approved of it, thought that neither the ſmallneſs of the piece, nor the length of the time employed in compoſing it, nor the author's misfortune, ought to make it ſuffer in their eſteem.' Colomiés (6) thought that Tetti had only written that tract, and a catalogue of manuſcripts publiſhed by Father Labbe (7); but he ſhould have known, that the ſame Father aſcribes to him (8) *Bibliotheca ſcholaſtica inſtructiſſima Latinè, Gallicè, Italicè, Hiſpanicè, Anglicè, & Græcè*, printed at London, in the year 1618, in 8vo. Nicodemo knew nothing of it, but what he found in Father Labbe.

[*C*] *He was very much eſteemed by the learned.*] He himſelf informs us, that he had contracted friendſhips with ſeveral illuſtrious perſons. 'Teſtes, *ſays he* (9), conſciique noſtrum utriuſque laborum celeberrimi rerum antiquarum conſervatores, nedum rei litterariæ acerrimi patroni ac defenſores, Achilles Maffeus, Gentiliſque Delphinius. Teſtes amici alii literis & ingenio præſtantiſſimi Carus Hannibal, Baptiſta Sigicellus, Antonius Auguſtinus, Alexandri duo, Picolominus & Corvinus, Marcus Caſalius. Teſtes item alii quos longum eſſet enumerare. Denique & Fulvius Urſinus juvenis imprimis honeſtus & ornatus, & ſupra quam par ſit ejus ætati Latinè & Græcè eruditus. - - - - *Achilles Maffeus, and Gentilis Delphinius, thoſe eminent preſervers of Antiquity, as well as ſtrenuous patrons and defenders of learning in general, are ready to give their teſtimony to both my works. So are others of my friends, who are alſo diſtinguiſhed for their great parts and erudition; Carus Hannibal, Baptiſta Sigicellus, Antonius Auguſtinus, the two Alexanders, Picolominus, and Corvinus, and Marcus Caſalius. So are others, whom it would be tedious to enumerate. Laſtly, ſo is Fulvius Urſinus, a young gentleman of great figure and politeneſs, and learned in Latin and Greek, far beyond what is uſual at his age.*'

(4) Compare this with the citation (*b*), of the firſt article APOLLODORUS.

(5) Ægidius Spoletinus, Notis in Apollodor. *pag.* 41, *apud* Nicodemum. Bibliotheca Napoletana, *pag.* 228.

(6) Mêlang. Hiſtoriq. *pag.* 91.

(7) In Novæ Bibliothecæ MSS. Supplementis.

(8) In Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum.

(9) In Tractatu *de Apollodoris*.

TETTIX, was a native of the iſle of Crete, and went with a fleet to the Peloponneſus. He landed at the promontory called Tænarium, and there built a town. He made his reſidence near a place called Ψυχοπομπεῖον, by reaſon of the ceremonies which were performed there to appeaſe the Manes. It was hither the prieſteſs of Delphos ſent him who had killed the Poet Archilochus [*A*].

[*A*] *It was hither the prieſteſs of Delphos ſent him, who had killed the Poet Archilochus.*] Plutarch, from whom I have taken this whole article, expreſſes himſelf in this manner (1): Ἐκελεύσθη πορευθῆς ἐπὶ τὴν τȣ̃ Τέττιγος οἴκησιν ἱλάτασθαι τὴν τȣ̃ Ἀρχιλόχȣ ψυχήν. *He was ordered to go to Tettix's habitation, in order to appeaſe the ſoul of Archilochus.* According to Suidas, he was ordered to go to Tænarium, where Tettix was buried, and there to offer a propitiatory ſacrifice to the ſoul of the ſon of Teleſicles (2). Goropius Becanus (3), who conſulted no other author but Suidas, falſly imagined that Tettix was Archilochus himſelf. If he had conſulted Plutarch, he would have avoided that miſtake, nor would he have made uſe of Archilochus's words (4) againſt a man, who had abuſed him, Τέττιγα τȣ̃ πτερȣ̃ συνείληφας; Cicadam ala apprehendiſti. - - - *You have got a graſhopper by the wing.* See the remark [*C*] of the article ARCHILOCHUS.

(1) De iis qui ſerò à numine puniuntur, *pag.* 560.

(2) He was Archilochus's father.

(3) Orig. Antwerp. *lib. iv*, *apud* Schottum, Bibliothecæ Hiſpan. *pag.* 378.

(4) *Apud* Lucianum, *in* Pſeudolog.

TEUCER, the ſon of Telamon and of Heſione ſiſter of Priam (*a*), went with twelve ſhips to the ſiege of Troy (*b*), where he gave noble proofs of his courage; but he did not revenge the affront put upon his brother Ajax (*c*), nor prevent his killing himſelf (*d*). This made him ſo odious to Telamon [*A*], that he received an order from him

(*a*) See the remark [*D*] of the article TELAMON.

(*b*) Hygin. *cap. xcvii.*

(*c*) Teucer non receptus à patre Telamone ob ſegnitiam non vindicatæ fratris injuriæ, Cyprum appulſus cognomine patriæ ſuæ Salamina conſtituit. *Vell. Paterculus.* init.

(*d*) Ἐδιώχθη ἀπὸ τῆς Σαλαμῖνος ὡς μὴ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτȣ̃ Αἴαντα κωλύσας σφαγισθησόμενον ὑφ' αὐτȣ̃. Ejectum Salamine eo quod Ajacem fratrem manus ſibi illaturum minime prohibuiſſet. *Scholiaſt. Æſch. in Perſic.*

[*A*] *This made him ſo odious to Telamon* (1).] Sophocles brings in Teucer foretelling that misfortune, and foreſeeing that his father would call him baſtard (2) and coward, and even accuſe him of having deceitfully contributed to the death of his brother, in hopes of being the only heir; and that he would turn him out of his houſe. He obſerves, that Telamon never laughed, no, not in a time of mirth; and that he would, with much more reaſon, be angry and peeviſh, hearing, in his old age, of the unhappy death of his ſon. Cicero, without doubt, admired the verſes, wherein Pacuvius repreſents the reception Teucer met with from his father; for theſe are his words (3): 'Quid poteſt eſſe tam fictum quàm verſus, quàm ſcena, quàm fabulæ? Tamen in hoc genere ſæpe ipſe vidi quum ex perſona mihi ardere oculi hominis Hiſtrionis viderentur ſpondalia illa, dicentis,

Segregare abs te auſus, aut ſine illo Salamina ingredi,
Neque paternum aſpectum es veritus.

'Nunquam illum aſpectum dicebat, quin mihi Telamon iratus furere luctu filii videretur. Ut ille inflexa ad miſerabilem ſonum voce,

. . . . . Quem ætate exacta indigem
Liberum laceraſti, orbaſti, extinxiſti, neque fratris
necis,
Neque gnati ejus parvi qui tibi in tutelam eſt traditus.

'Flens ac lugens dicere videbatur? Quæ ſi ille Hiſtrio quotidie cum ageret, tamen recte agere ſine dolore non poterat, quid Pacuvium putabis in ſcribendo leni animo ac remiſſo fuiſſe?

(1) See in *Servius, in Æn.* lib. i, ver. 619, all the reaſons that are given for Telamon's anger.

(2) Agamemnon in the eighth book of the Iliad, ver 284, tells him, that Telamon had carefully bred him up, though he was a baſtard.

(3) De Oratore, *lib. ii*, *fol.* 80.

'What

him not to ſet foot in Salamina. Upon this he went to ſeek his fortune; and having landed in the iſle of Cyprus, he there built a town to which he gave the name of his father's kingdom from whence he had been excluded, I mean he called it Salamina [*B*]. When he heard of Telamon's death, he went to take poſſeſſion of his kingdom; but Euryſaces, Ajax's ſon, prevented him. This reſiſtance raiſed in him a deſire of turning adventurer: he ſailed towards the coaſts of Spain, and having landed in the place where new Carthage was built, he went as far as Gallicia, and there he ſettled. Juſtin affirms it (*e*), but it is more probable that Teucer ſettled in the iſle of Cyprus [*C*]. He built a temple to Jupiter in Salamina, and inſtituted a human ſacrifice to that deity [*D*]. That cruel ſacrifice was not aboliſhed till the time of the Emperor Hadrian. Teucer's poſterity reigned there for ſeveral ages. Pauſanias (*f*) ſays they reigned there till the time of Evagoras; but he is not exact, for they reigned there much longer [*E*]. They reigned alſo in Cilicia, as I have ſhewn in the article of Ajax, the ſon of Teucer. There is a paſſage in Pauſanias (g) which gives room to believe, that Teucer married a daughter of Cinyras. He was aſſiſted by the King of the Tyrians, to ſecure his new dominions. Virgil ſays ſo (*b*); and Servius, his commentator, does not deny that it was the opinion of ſeveral

(*e*) Juſtin. *lib. xliv, cap. iii.*

(*f*) Lib. ii, pag. 71.

(*g*) Lib. i, p. 3.

(*b*) Æn. lib. i, ver 620.

' *What is ſo full of fiction as Poetry, and repreſentations* ' *on the ſtage? Yet in ſome of theſe, I have ſeen the* ' *actors eyes all on fire at the pronouncing theſe lines;*

How durſt thou part from him, and thus without him
Return, and fearleſs view thy father's face?

' *At the expreſſing thoſe words*, thy father's face, *I never* ' *could forbear imagining I ſaw Telamon in a rage,* ' *ſtorming for the loſs of his ſon; then changing his tone to* ' *the pitiful, at theſe lines;*

Whoſe grey hairs thou in ſorrow now haſt ſteep'd,
By tearing from me thus my dear, dear ſon;
Whilſt thou, inhuman, neither mourn'ſt thy brother,
Nor tho' thy ward, weep'ſt o'er his infant child.

' *With what tears and heart-breaking did he ſeem to* ' *ſpeak them? But if the player, who daily acted this* ' *part, could not act it without ſhewing ſo great a de-* ' *gree of concern, do you think Pacuvius could be unaf-* ' *fected and unmoved at the writing of it?*'

[*B*] *I mean, he called it Salamina.*] An oracle of Apollo (4) had promiſed him that the new Salamina, to be built by him, would be no leſs famous than the other:

Certus enim promiſit Apollo
Ambiguam tellure nova Salamina futuram (5).

For by Apollo's oracle we're told,
A future Salamin ſhall match the old.

The place where Horace ſays this, is very well known, becauſe it is part of a drinking ſong.

Teucer Salamina patremque
Cum fugeret, tamen uda Lyæo
Tempora populea fertur vinxiſſe corona,
Sic triſtes affatus amicos;
Quò nos cunque feret melior fortuna parente,
Ibimus ô ſocii, comiteſque:
Nil deſperandum Teucro duce & auſpice Teucro.
. . . .
O fortes pejoraque paſſi
Mecum ſæpe viri, nunc vino pellite curas,
Cras ingens iterabimus æquor.

When Teucer from old dad and country fled,
He fill'd his glaſs, and to his comrades ſaid,
Cheer up, brave boys, a touchy ſire ne'er heed,
We'll go where kinder fortune's pleas'd to lead.
Teucer's companions no deſpair can ſeize:
. . . .
We've ſeen, brave boys, much harder times than theſe.
A fart for care, let's drink about to day,
To morrow we'll weigh anchor, and away.

Teucer does not ſay in Horace, where he would build the new Salamin; but he declares in Euripides that he would build it in the iſle of Cyprus: and all the Hiſtorians obſerve that he built it there, except Meſſala Corvinus, who is reproved for it by Meurſius. ' Itaque manifeſtus eſt error Meſſallæ Corvini, qui in ' Sidonia conditam à Teucro dicit lib. de Auguſti pro- ' genie. *Teucer qui patria profugus in Sidonia alteram* ' *Salaminam condidit* (6). - - - *Meſſala Corvinus there-* ' *fore is manifeſtly in the wrong, who ſays in his book* ' de Auguſti Progenie, *that Teucer built it in Sidonia.* ' Tucer, who being baniſhed his country, built an- ' other Salamina in Sidonia.'

[*C*] *It is more probable that Teucer ſettled in the iſle of Cyprus.*] If he had fixed his quarters in Spain, Aſclepiades of Myrlea, who taught Grammar in that country, would not have forgot to ſay ſo in his deſcription of the nations, who inhabited it, ſince he has been ſo careful to obſerve (7), that ſome of them who bore arms under Teucer, ſettled in Gallicia. His ſilence is, in this caſe, a very good proof.

[*D*] *He inſtituted a human ſacrifice to this deity.*] Tacitus, who mentions the conſtruction of that temple, ſays nothing of that ſacrifice; ' Et Jovi Salaminio ' Teucer, Telamonis patris ira profugus (8). - - - *And* ' *to Salaminian Jupiter, Teucer, who was expelled his* ' *country by his enraged father.*' It is Lactantius who informs us of this. ' Apud Cypri, *ſays he* (9), Sala- ' minem humanam hoſtiam Jovi Teucrus immolavit, ' idque ſacrificium poſteris tradidit, quod eſt nuper ' Hadriano imperante ſublatum. - - - - *At Salamin, in* ' *Cyprus, Teucer offered a human ſacrifice, to Jupiter,* ' *and enjoined it to be obſerved by poſterity; nor has* ' *it ceaſed till lately in the reign of Hadrian.*' What puzzles me moſt in this matter, is, that Porphyrius (10), who owns that men were ſacrificed in Salamin for a long time, does not ſay that any men were ſacrificed to Jupiter; and that he tells us, this cuſtom was ſuppreſſed under the reign of Diphilus, co-tempory with Seleucus the Theologian. That Prince ordered, that, for the time to come, an ox ſhould be ſacrificed inſtead of a man. This ſacrifice was offered to Agraule, the daughter of Cecrops, and of the Nymph Agraulis.

[*E*] *For they reigned there much longer.*] It appears from one of Iſocrates's orations, that it was not without interruption; for he introduces Nicocles, who, after having ſaid that Teucer, the founder of their family, had built Salamina, adds, that his father Evagoras had recovered the kingdom which had been loſt by others; and that he had ſo ordered things, that not only Salamina was no longer tyrannized by the Phœnicians, but alſo that this town had the ſame kings, to whom the kingdom did at firſt belong. Thus Teucer's poſterity were upon the throne after the death of Evagoras. It is certain that his ſon Nicocles reigned at Salamina: ſome (11) ſay, that Demonicus alſo reigned in that town, and that he was his ſon. Iſocrates inſcribes ſome orations to them. We find alſo one Nicocreon, king of Salamina, a deſcendant of Teucer (12). The learned Meurſius takes him to be the ſame man, to whom Ptolemy gave the government of Cyprus (13), in the firſt year of the CXVIIth Olympiad, ſixty-two years after the death of Evagoras (14). He has no other authority for this than a paſſage of Antoninus Liberalis. An authority which muſt in conſequence be a bad one, ſince the Greeks did not apply their Metamorphoſes to an age ſo far diſtant from the fabulous times as that of Alexander's ſucceſſors. The Nicocreon therefore mentioned by Antoninus Liberalis is not the ſame with that of Ptolemy. I omit taking notice that

4) Euripides in Helena mentions that oracle.

(5) Horat. Od. VII, lib. i, ver. 28.

(6) Meurſius, in Cypro, *pag.* 58. In the foregoing page, he corrects *Acron*, who ſays upon the VIIth Ode, of the firſt book of Horace, that one of the two Salamina's was *in Thraciæ regione*, (he ſhould have ſaid *in Atticæ regione*) and the other in the iſle of Cyprus.

(7) *Apud* Strabonem, *lib. iii, pag.* 108.

(8) Tacitus, Annal. *lib. iii.*

(9) Lact. Divin. Inſt. *lib. i, cap. xxi.*

(10) De Abſtinentia, *lib. ii.* Euſebius, de Præpar. Evang. *lib. iv, cap. xvi.* St Cyril, in Julianum, *lib. iv, quote the whole paſſage of Porphyrius, teſte* Meurſio, in Cypro, *pag.* 61.

(11) *See* Meurſius in Cypro, *pag.* 113.

(12) Antoninus Liberalis, Metamorphoſ. *cap. xxxix.*

(13) Diodorus Siculus, *lib. xix.*

(14) *See* Meurſius, in Cypro, *lib. ii, cap. xii, & xv.*

ſeveral writers. Others ſaid that Teucer made himſelf maſter of the country without any ſuch aſſiſtance. Homer makes him the beſt archer in the Græcian army (*i*).

(*i*) Τευκρός θ' ὃς ἄριςος Ἀχαιῶν Τοξοσύνῃ, ἀγαθὸς δὲ καὶ ἐν ςαδιῃ ὑσμίνῃ. Teucerque qui præſtantiſſimus Achivorum arte ſagittandi, ſtrenuus autem & in ſtataria pugna. *Homer. Iliad.* lib. xiii, ver. 313. *See alſo* lib. viii, ver. 266, & ſeq. & *Horat. Ode IX,* lib. iv.

that Nicocreon reigned before the Olympiad, mentioned by Meurſius (15), notwithſtanding which the King of Egypt might have given him the government in queſtion.

---

(15) He acted a tragedy before Alexander, *Plut. in Alexandr.* pag. 681. Iſocrates dined at his houſe, *Idem in Iſocrate.*

TEXERA (Joseph) a Portugueze Friar of the Dominican order in the XVIth century, was confeſſor to Don Antonio King of Portugal, and having followed him into France, he ſettled there and was made Almoner and Preacher to the king. He was confeſſor of Charlotte Catherine de la Trimoille Princeſs of Condé, and to the Prince of Condé her ſon. He publiſhed ſome books [*A*], and died in the year 1601 (*a*). He *declared from the pulpit, that we are bound in duty to love all men of whatſoever religion, ſect, or nation, they be, even the Caſtilians* (*b*). This diſcovered his ſtrong hatred againſt the prince (*c*) who had conquered Portugal from the unfortunate Don Antonio. One of his books was refuted by order of the King of Spain [*B*].

(*a*) Konig, Bibl. *pag.* 796.

(*b*) Traité Parænetique par un Pelerin Eſpagnol, *folio* 114, *Edit. of Aux,* 1596.

(*c*) Philip II, King of Spain.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books.*] His *Compendium de Portugalliæ ortu, regni initiis, rebuſque à regibus geſtis,* was printed at Paris in the year 1582 in 4to. This book was refuted by Duardus Nonius Leo, a Portugueſe Civilian, in reply to which Texera afterwards wrote, *Confutatio nugarum Duardi Nonii Leonis & aliorum qui Portugalliæ regnum Philippo Caſtellæ Regi jure hæreditario obveniſſe contendunt, & Antonii veri Portugalliæ Regis jus vellicare.* This work was printed in the year 1592. I find in the catalogue of Thuanus's library (1), *Joſ. Texere, Suite d'un Diſcours intitulé,* Adventure, *&c. touchant Don Sebaſtien Roy de Portugal,* 1602 in 8vo. There was printed at Paris in 1590, and at Leyden in 1592, *Joſephi Texeræ Exegeſis genealogica arboris gentilitiæ Henrici IV Gallorum Regis.* The author compoſed another work on the genealogy of the Prince of Condé in 1596, and publiſhed a ſecond edition of it enlarged, in the year 1598, in 12mo. It was intituled, *Rerum ab Henrici Borbonii Franciæ Protoprincipis majoribus geſtarum, Epitome: ejuſdemque Henrici Genealogiæ explicatio à divo Ludovico per Borbonios atque ab Imbaldo Trimollio ad utrumque dicti Henrici parentem repetitæ.* He has added to it an account of the ceremonies obſerved by the Princeſs of Condé, upon her abjuring Calviniſm before the Pope's Legate at Roüen the 28th of December 1596. He obſerves one thing which I am going to mention, becauſe it may ſerve as a ſupplement to a fact which I have related in the article BOTERO (2), and which has afforded ſome mirth to Proteſtants.

One of theſe ceremonies was, that the Princeſs being upon her knees, the Legate and Biſhops who accompanied him repeated the Pſalm *Miſerere,* and after that the Pſalm *Deus miſereatur noſtri:* they repeated them alternately, he one verſe, and they another: at every verſe the legate repeated, he ſoftly touched her ſhoulders with his wand. The Conſtable's lady who was next the Princeſs not being able to turn away her head ever ſo little by reaſon of the crowd, was hit every time by the wand over the face. The Legate perceiving it broke off the end of his wand. Almoſt every body then preſent believed this to be part of the ceremonial: Joſeph Texere was alſo of that opinion; but the Legate undeceived him. *Interea verò dum illuſtriſſimus Dominus Legatus ſuum verſiculum recitaret, ad quemlibet leviter contingebat cum virgula ſpatulas Dominæ Principiſſæ eam abſolvendo. Hîc animadvertendum eſt, quòd, cùm illuſtriſſima Domina Comeſtabilis eſſet D. Principiſſæ proxima, ita in anguſtias redacta fuerit, ut nec ſe movere loco, nec caput inclinare, aut avertere poſſet. Unde accidit, ut plus illic, quàm aliæ omnes mereretur: quia ſcilicet, cùm dicti pſalmi recitarentur antiphonatim, ut dictum eſt, ab Illuſtriſſimo D. Legato & clero præſente, & ad quemque verſiculum D. Legatus ipſam Principiſſam ſcipiunculo, vel virgula tangeret in humeris, (juxta ritum & conſtitutionem Eccleſiæ) cùm in ſpatulam ſiniſtram deflecteret, ſimul caput & vultum multis vicibus Dominæ Comeſtabilis contingebat. Quod advertens ipſe D. Legatus, abrupit punctum virgulæ verſus cuſpidem: quod ferè omnes putabamus hoc animadverſo fuiſſe partem aliquam hujuſce ceremoniæ. Sed ego reſcivi ex ore ipſius Illuſtriſſimi D. Legati veritatem rei. Hæc diximus, ne quis deinceps in eo hallucinetur ubi veritatem reſciſcat* (3). No particular can more juſtly deſerve to be ſet right than this; for it might eaſily deceive the ſpectators: they might well imagine that ſuch a circumſtance not being taken notice of in the Rubric, might ſignify ſomething of a myſtery, ſome new and very ſingular caſe. Men of ſpeculation and wit might very well vie with one another in ſaying a thouſand chimerical things upon this ſubject.

[*B*] *One of his books was refuted by order of the King of Spain.*] I have quoted a book which has been tranſlated out of Spaniſh into French by one Dralymont, who ſubjoins ſome notes to the original. This is one of his notes. ‘ A Jew whoſe name was Duard Nonnes de Leon *, ... contrary to the laws of Portugal, which ſhut the door of public honours and dignities, (that is to ſay, againſt all thoſe who deſcend from the Jews) was preferred by the Catholic King to be a privy-counſellor, in recompence for his having written againſt Joſeph Texera, a Portugueſe preaching Fryar (a perſon at this day very much renowned all over Europe, and well known to all Princes in that part of the world, as well eccleſiaſtical as temporal; and particularly in France, where the greateſt men in the kingdom, and all perſons of quality eſteem and regard him, on account of his polite converſation, his excellent morals, and extraordinary doctrine, as being one of the moſt accompliſhed maſters in the knowledge of Hiſtory, and Genealogy, that can be met with, as his writings and common converſation ſufficiently teſtify) a book by way of anſwer, which is not only ſcurrilous, but alſo full of heretical and raſh propoſitions. I am very much ſurprized at the patience of this Fryar, conſidering how deeply read and experienced he was in Hiſtory, and how converſant in affairs of ſtate, and jealous of his own reputation, that he ſhould not, ſo far as I know, put pen to paper (4), and write not only againſt the errors and falſities of that Jew, but alſo againſt his Catholic Majeſty: ſince it was he who commanded that falſe and ſcurrilous book to be written, (as his ſaid Majeſty confeſſes in the licence he gave for the printing it in the year 1590) and who authorized the ſaid Jew to publiſh a piece of the genealogy of the Kings of Portugal, tranſlated by him into Spaniſh, out of another in Latin, which he compoſed by his order: and which is the anſwer I have been juſt now mentioning (5).

(1) Pag. 336, of the 2d Part.

(2) See the remark [*C*], of the art. BOTERO, and the remark [*K*], of the article HENRY IV.

(3) Texera, de Converſione Carlotttæ Catharinæ Principiſſæ Condæi, *pag.* 26, 27.

* Duard Non. liv. des Cenſures, &c.

(4) I am ſurprized at this; for we have ſeen in the preceding remark, that a refutation of this Jew's book was publiſhed by Texera in the year 1592.

(5) Traicté Parænetique par un Pelerin Eſpagnol battu du temps & perſecuté de la fortune, *fol.* 51, *verſo,* & 52, *Edit. of Aux,* 1597. *Note this parænetical treatiſe was reprinted in the year* 1641, *under the title of* Fuora Villaco, *that is to ſay,* The liberty of Portugal, &c.

THAIS.

THAIS, a Greek courtezan, followed Alexander's army, and occaſioned the deſtruction of Perſepolis [*A*]. She was ſo well beloved by Ptolemy King of Egypt, that he married her (*a*). There is no good authority for ſaying, that Menander was one of her galants. This is what I am going to examine, in animadverting on Moreri's miſtakes [*B*]. The name of that courtezan was commonly given in comedies, and other pieces

[*A*] *She occaſioned the deſtruction of Perſepolis.*] Mr Guillet rightly obſerves that Thais formed that deſign out of a principle of ambition. *She propoſed to Alexander to burn the royal palace of Perſepolis, and plainly told him that ſhe longed to ſet fire to it firſt; that it might be ſaid in time to come all the world over, that the Athenian women, who followed Alexander into Perſia, had revenged the burning of Athens by Xerxes. Her beauty and eloquence gave ſucceſs to her ambition, and the royal palace was burnt that very night* (1).' The thing is related more at large in the following words. 'After this, as he was making preparation for a farther march after Darius, he one day reſolved to make merry, and to divert himſelf with an entertainment, where his courtiers had prevailed with him ſo far as to permit every man to bring his miſtreſs along with him, among whom, the moſt celebrated was Thais an Athenian, Ptolemy's miſtreſs, who after the deceaſe of Alexander, was King of Egypt. This Thais ſometimes cunningly praiſed Alexander, ſometimes joked with and rallied him, agreeably enough to the manner of her country, but much above her character or condition, telling him that ſhe found herſelf that day fully recompenſed for the pains ſhe had taken in following his camp all over Aſia, by the favour ſhe then enjoyed of diverting herſelf at pleaſure in the ſtately palace of the Perſian monarchs: but that ſhe ſhould be much more delighted to burn by way of ſport, and make a bonefire of the court of Xerxes, who had ſet fire to the city of Athens, by lighting it up with her own hand in his preſence, and before the face of ſo brave a Prince as Alexander: that it might be recorded to poſterity, that the women who followed Alexander's camp, had taken a ſharper revenge on the Perſians for the former ſufferings and affronts of Greece, than all his commanders could do by ſea or land. She had no ſooner made the propoſal, but ſhe was ſeconded by Alexander's courtiers, with clapping of hands, and great acclamations of joy, commending what ſhe ſaid to the ſkies, and preſſing the King to put it in execution. Alexander giving way to their perſuaſions, ſtarted from his ſeat, and with a chaplet of flowers on his head, and a lighted torch in his hand, led the way, and his courtiers followed him in the ſame manner, dancing, and making a great noiſe about the palace (2).' Diodorus Siculus obſerves (3) that Thais ſet fire to the royal palace, next to the King, and that all the houſes round it were burnt down. He calls her ἑταίραν, a word that may be rendered a courtezan. Note that, according to Plutarch nothing was burnt but the royal palace: but according to Quintus Curtius, the whole city was conſumed to aſhes, and never afterwards rebuilt. I wonder he does not mention the fineſt paſſage of Thais's ſpeech: he does not make her ſay any thing that diſcovers her ambition of having it ſaid in future ages, that ſhe and her companions had contributed more to revenge her country than their greateſt Captains. 'De die inibat convivia (*Alexander*) quibus feminæ intererant: non quidem quas violari nefas eſſet; quippe pellices licentius quam decebat cum armato vivere adſuetæ. Ex his una Thais & ipſa temulenta, *maximam apud omnes Græcorum initurum gratiam* adfirmat, *ſi regiam Perſarum juſſiſſet incendi, expectare hoc eos, quorum urbes barbari deleſſent.* Ebrio ſcorto de tanta re ferente ſententiam, unus & alter, & ipſi mero onerati, adſentiunt, rex quoque fuit avidior, quam patientior: *quin igitur ulciſcimur Græciam, & urbi faces ſubdimus.* Omnes incaluerant mero: itaque ſurgunt temulenti ad incendendam urbem; cui armati pepercerant. Primus rex ignem regiæ injecit; tum convivæ & miniſtri pelliceſque. Multa cedro ædificata erat regia: quæ celeriter igne concepto, late fudit incendium. Quod ubi exercitus, qui haud procul ab urbe tendebat, conſpexit; fortuitum ratus, ad opem ferendam concurrit. Sed ut ad veſtibulum regiæ ventum eſt; vident regem ipſum adhuc adgerentem faces. Omiſſa igitur, quam portaverant aqua, aridam materiam in incendium jacere ceperunt. Hunc exitum habuit regia totius Orientis . . . ac ne longa quidem ætate, quæ excidium ejus ſequuta eſt, reſurrexit (4). - - - *Alexander ſpent the day in feaſting, to which the women were admitted, not modeſt ones, whom it was unlawful to violate, but courtezans who uſed to live after a licentious manner in the camp. One of thoſe whoſe name was Thais, and ſhe very much in drink, cried out to the King,* that he would very greatly oblige all the Greeks if he would order the Perſian palace to be burnt; that they expected this from him, ſince their cities had been ſo ſerved by thoſe Barbarians. *This drunken courtezan thus declaring her mind on ſo important an affair, was applauded firſt by one and then another, all of them overcharged with drink; and the King too with greater warmth than prudence replied;* Well then let us revenge our country, and ſet fire to the city. *They were all inflamed with wine; and therefore roſe up to burn the city now they were in drink, which they had ſpared when they were in arms. The King firſt ſet fire to the palace, then the gueſts, the courtiers, and courtezans. Great part of the palace was built with cedar, which quickly taking fire, ſpread the flames all around. The army which was encamped not far from the city ſeeing the fire, thinking it to be accidental, came to give their aſſiſtance. But when they were advanced to the entrance into the palace, they found the King himſelf ſtill holding out his torch. So that throwing away the water they had brought, they began to heap on dry fuel to increaſe the fire. Thus fell the palace of the whole Eaſt . . . . and though it is ſo long a time ſince that deſtruction happened, it has not been rebuilt.*' Obſerve that not only it does not appear from thoſe two accounts that Thais was at that entertainment in the quality of Alexander's miſtreſs; but it appears on the contrary, that ſhe had not that character. Quintus Curtius ſays only, that ſhe was one of the concubines, who followed the army (5). Plutarch affirms in expreſs words, that ſhe was the concubine of Ptolemy, one of Alexander's captains. Yet it is a very common opinion, that ſhe was one of Alexander's miſtreſſes; but this opinion may be falſe, though it be favoured by a paſſage in Athenæus. This author ſays, that Alexander had that courtezan with him; and that after his death ſhe married Ptolemy, King of Egypt, by whom ſhe had two ſons and one daughter, called Irene, who was the wife of Eunoſtus, King of Solis (6) in the iſle of Cyprus. Ὁ δὲ μέγας Ἀλέξανδρος οὐ Θαΐδα εἶχε μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἑταίραν; περὶ ἧς φησὶ Κλείταρχος ὡς αἰτίας γενομένης τοῦ ἐμπρησθῆναι τὰ ἐν Περσεπόλει βασίλεια. αὕτη δὲ ἡ Θαῒς καὶ μετὰ τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου θάνατον, καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ ἐγαμήθη τῷ πρώτῳ βασιλεύσαντι Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐγέννησεν αὐτῷ τέκνον Λεοντίσκον καὶ Λάγον, θυγατέρα δὲ Εἰρήνην, ἣν ἔγημεν Εὔνοστος ὁ Σόλων τῶν ἐν Κύπρῳ βασιλεύς. Thais Athenienſis meretrix cum Alexandro Magno fuit, eumque præcipuè impulit, ut Cleitarchus autor eſt, ad comburendam regiam Perſepolidis. Poſt obitum Alexandri, Ptolemæo, qui primus Ægypti regnum adeptus eſt, illa nupſit, ex eoque liberos concepit, Leontiſcum, & Lagum mares: Eirenen fœminam, quæ Solonis Eunoſti regis Cypriorum uxor fuit (7). - - - *Thais the Athenian, courtezan, went along with Alexander, and is ſaid by Cleitarchus to have been the principal cauſe of his burning the palace of Perſepolis. After the death of Alexander, ſhe was married to Ptolemy, who firſt obtained the kingdom of Egypt; and had children by him, Leontiſcus and Lagus, ſons, and Eirene a daughter, who was married to Solon Eunoſtus King of Cyprus.*

[*B*] *In animadverting on Moreri's miſtakes.*] I. He ſays ſhe was a native of Alexandria, and that *going to Athens all the youth of that country flocked to her.* This falſity is confuted in the following quotation (8): 'Do not ſuffer your ſelves to be led into an error by what is ſaid in five or ſix ſorry hiſtorical Dictionaries, that Thais

(*a*) See the remark [*A*], towards the end.

(1) Guillet, Athenes ancienne & nouvelle, *pag. m.* 291.

(2) Plutarch, in the Life of Alexander, *pag.* 687, of the Francfort edition 1620.

(3) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xvii, cap. lxxii.*

(4) Q. Curtius, *lib. v, cap. vii.*

(5) This ſenſe expreſſes the whole force of Quintus Curtius's words.

(6) Thus the Greek words of Athenæus Εὔνοστος ὁ Σόλων τῶν ἐν Κύπρῳ βασιλεὺς, ought to be tranſlated, and not as Dalechampius renders them, Solonis Eunoſti regis Cypriorum. - - - *Solon Eunoſtus, King of Cyprus.*

(7) Athen. *lib. xiii, p.* 576, *D.*

(8) Guillet, Athenes ancienne, & nouvelle, *pag.* 291, 292.

pieces of Poetry, to ladies of pleaſure (*b*). It is ſaid, that Paphnutius who flouriſhed in the IVth century, converted in Alexandria, a famous courtezan, called Thaïs [*C*].

(*b*) *See* Juvenal, Sat. III, ver. 93, *where he ſays* an melior cum Thaïda ſuſtinet? *and* Martial in ſeveral places.

'Thais was a native of Alexandria. There was ſo ſhort an interval between the time when Alexander laid the foundation of that city of Egypt, and the time when he burnt Perſepolis, that Thais could not have ſeen the burning of that town, unleſs ſhe had been quickly ſnatched away among the firſt-born of Alexandria, and tranſported in her cradle: For you know that after the battle of Arbela, fought in the ſame year that Alexandria was built, In Oriente victoriis magis quàm paſſibus omnia peragrabat Alexander. - - - *In the eaſt Alexander over-ran every place rather with victories than marches.* But without refining upon Chronology, Plutarch and Athenæus ſay ſhe was born at Athens (9).' II. Moreri adds, that *the Poet Menander had made her famous by his verſes, which was the reaſon why ſhe was called Menandrean.* This is taken from Charles Stephens's Dictionary, and cannot be ſo well confuted as Guillet's paraphraſe upon it. *It was there*, ſays he (10), ſpeaking of Athens, *that Thais had an intrigue with Menander, that famous Poet, who was ſo tender-hearted, and ſo much given to love, that he committed extraordinary follies for his miſtreſſes.* I alledge againſt this what Plutarch tells us (11), that Thais was Ptolemy's concubine during Alexander's expedition, and what Athenæus obſerves, that ſhe was married to the ſame Ptolemy after the death of that conqueror. This is a plain proof, that, if ſhe had an intrigue with Menander, it was before this expedition. Nay, it is probable, that ſhe was Ptolemy's miſtreſs ſome time before the war of Aſia: it is probable, I ſay, that this great Macedonian Lord had got her from Athens, and kept her in his houſe for ſome time, before the breaking out of the war againſt Darius. Now this expedition of Alexander began when Menander was not above eight years of age (12). It is impoſſible therefore that he ſhould be in love with Thais before the Perſian war. In what time then ſhall we place this amour, ſince after the death of Alexander, ſhe married the King of Egypt, I mean the ſame Ptolemy whom ſhe had followed every where, whilſt that conqueror was ſubduing Aſia? I have another argument to alledge againſt this amour. I believe there is no better proof for it than theſe verſes of Propertius,

> Turba Menandreæ fuerat nec Thaïdos olim
> Tanta, in qua populus luſit Erichthonius (13);

> *Not ſuch a crowd Menander's Thais led,*
> *Altho' all Athens ſought her wanton bed.*

or theſe, wherein the ſame Poet has included ſome advices of a bawd,

> Non te Medeæ delectent probra ſequacis,
> Nempe tulit faſtus auſa rogare prior:
> Sed potius mundi Thaïs pretioſa Menandri,
> Cum ferit aſtutos Comica mœcha Getas (14);

> *To ſhun Medea's fondneſs he adviſed,*
> *For aſking firſt ſhe juſtly was deſpis'd,*
> *Menander's Thais ſhews a wiſer way,*
> *When ſhe cajoles her cullies in the play.*

or upon this inſcription of Martial, under Menander's Thais,

> Hæc primum juvenum laſcivos luſit amores,
> Nec Glycere, vere Thaïs amica fuit (15).

> *This play firſt draws the ſcenes of wanton loves,*
> *Thais, not Glycera, the miſtreſs proves.*

But it is certain, that Menander's Thais, mentioned by thoſe two Latin Poets, ſignifies a Comedy of Menander, intituled Thais, and not the Courtezan, who occaſioned the burning of Perſepolis. Conſult the obſervations of Gronovius the father (16). I would not be underſtood to deny, that our Thais was, in the Poet's mind, the original of the comedy that went by her name; but this does not prove, that there was any love intrigue between Menander and the Courtezan who is the ſubject of this article.

[*C*] *It is ſaid that Paphnutius . . . . . converted in Alexandria a . . . . . .* Thaïs.] Charles Stephens, and ſeveral Lexicographers after him, have mentioned this converſion: they all quote Volaterranus, who relates it in this manner. Paphnutius, ſays he (17), going *incognito* to Thaïs of Alexandria (18), was never ſatisfied that the place ſhe carried him to was private enough; and at laſt being told by her, that none but God could know what paſſed between them in the place they were in, he took from thence an occaſion to exhort her to fear God, who ſees and puniſhes the moſt private actions. She was ſo ſenſibly moved with his exhortation, that ſhe gave over her trade, and became a holy woman.

(9) They ſay ſhe was born in Attica, and not at Athens.

(10) Guillet, Athenes ancienne & nouvelle, *pag.* 292.

(11) See the foregoing remark.

(12) He was born about the third year of the CIXth Olympiad. See *Voſſius, de Poëtis Græcis*, pag. 57; and Alexander began his march the third year of the CXIth Olympiad.

(13) Propert. Eleg. VI, *lib. ii.*

(14) Id. *lib. iv*, Eleg. V.

(15) Martial. Epigr. clxxxvii, *lib. xiv.*

(16) Upon the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, in the ſecond chapter, *pag.* 25, *& ſeq.*

(17) Volaterr. *lib. xx, circa init. pag. m.* 718.

(18) Thaidis nomen nobilitatum in primis à Thaide Alexandrina. *Id. ibid.*

THALES, one of the ſeven wiſe men of Greece. Moreri ſpeaks of him at large. I add, that this Philoſopher believed, that the world was the work of God, and that God knew the moſt ſecret thoughts of men [*A*]. Some ſay, that he was married; but others affirm this to be falſe, and that he got rid of the perſecutions of his mother on this ſubject,

[*A*] *Thales believed that the world was the work of GOD, and that GOD knew the moſt ſecret thoughts of men.*] I mention this as I find it in Diogenes Laërtius, without affirming, that it was really the opinion of that Philoſopher. The three following Apophthegms are aſcribed to him among others. 1. God is the moſt antient thing of all, for he is uncreated. 2. The world is the fineſt thing of all, for it is God's work. Πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὄντων, θεός, ἀγέννητον γάρ. κάλλιστον, κόσμος. ποίημα γὰρ θεοῦ. *Antiquiſſimum eorum omnium quæ ſunt, deus; ingenitus enim. Pulcherrimum, mundus; à deo enim factus eſt* (1). 3. So far are they who commit ſin, from being able to conceal it from God, that they cannot ſo much as prevent his knowing their thoughts. Ἠρώτησέ τις αὐτὸν εἰ λήθοι θεοὺς ἄνθρωπος ἀδικῶν. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ διανοούμενος, ἔφη. *Interrogatus, lateretne deos homo male agens: Ne cogitans quidem, inquit* (2). Valerius Maximus relates the ſame thing with regard to the third ſentence. 'Mirifice etiam Thales. Nam interrogatus an facta hominum Deos fallerent: Nec cogitata, inquit. Ut non ſolùm manus, ſed etiam mentes puras habere vellemus; cùm ſecretis cogitationibus noſtris cœleſte numen adeſſe crediſſemus (3). - - - *It was an admirable ſaying of Thales, who when he was aſked, if the actions of men could eſcape the knowledge of GOD, replied, no not even their thoughts. So then we ought not only to have our hands pure, but alſo our minds; when we are ſatisfied that GOD is preſent even to our moſt ſecret thoughts.*' Valerius Maximus's interpretation of this ſaying, to wit, that it was intended to inculcate ſuch a faith in the preſence of God to our moſt ſecret thoughts, as might oblige men to preſerve their hearts pure as well as their hands, does very well agree with a paſſage of Cicero, concerning the ſame Thales. If you carefully examine the ſequel of Cicero's argument, you will find, that the ground of the maxim of this antient Grecian ſage, was the moral advantage that men might derive from it: 'Melius græci atque noſtri, qui ut augerent pietatem in deos, eaſdem illos urbes quas nos incolere voluerunt. Affert enim hæc opinio religionem utilem civitatibus. Siquidem & illud bene dictum eſt à Pythagora doctiſſimo viro, tum maxime pietatem & re-

(1) Diogenes Laërtius, *lib. i, num.* 35.

(2) Id. ibid. *num.* 36.

(3) Valerius Maximus, *lib. vii, cap. ii, num.* 8 *Ext. pag. m.* 602.

ſubject, by telling her when he was young, that *it was too ſoon*, and when he was growing old, that *it was too late* (*a*). Some will have it that he believed living and dying to be the ſame thing; and that being aſked why then he did not dye, he returned an anſwer, which others aſcribe to Pyrrho (*b*). An old woman bantered him very merrily, for going abroad with her to look at the ſtars, and falling into a ditch [*B*]. It is thought he lived above ninety years [*C*].

Thoſe,

'ligionem verſari in animis, cum rebus divinis operam daremus: & quod Thales qui ſapientiſſimus inter ſeptem fuit, homines exiſtimare oportere deos omnia cernere, deorum omnia eſſe plena: fore enim omnes caſtiores, veluti quo infans eſſet maxime religioſus (4). - - - *It was a better thought both of the Grecians and Romans, to ſuppoſe the gods to inhabit the ſame cities with themſelves, in order to promote piety towards them. For this opinion infers that religion is uſeful to cities. It was an excellent ſaying of that moſt learned Philoſopher Pythagoras,* that piety and religion were then the moſt impreſſed on our minds, when we were actually worſhipping the gods; *as alſo of Thales, who was the wiſeſt of the ſeven,* that we ought to believe the gods ſee every thing, that every thing is full of the Deity: *for by this means all men would become more virtuous, and even an infant would grow religious.*' Here I deſire you would obſerve the difference which appears between Cicero and Diogenes Laërtius. The latter ſays abſolutely, that, according to Thales, the world was animated and full of *Genii:* Τὸν κοσμὸν ἔμψυχον καὶ δαιμόνων πλήρη, *animatum mundum ac demonibus plenum* (5); but Cicero ſeems to reſtrain Thales's words; for he ſays, that, according to that Philoſopher, it was proper or neceſſary for men to believe that every thing was full of gods. Ariſtotle thought, that perhaps Thales meant only what others underſtood by aſſerting, that all Beings have one ſoul: Καὶ ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ δέ τινες αὐτὴν (ψυχὴν) μεμίχθαι φασίν. ὅθεν ἴσως καὶ Θαλῆς ᾠήθη πάντα πλήρη θεῶν εἶναι. Sunt & qui in toto univerſo permiſtam ipſam (*animam*) inquiunt eſſe. Quocirca forſitan & Thales omnia plena deorum eſſe putavit (6). - - - - *And ſome ſay that the ſoul is infuſed throughout the whole Univerſe. From whence very probably Thales derived his opinion,* That all things are full of gods. Here follow ſome other variations. Plutarch does not ſuppoſe that Thales alledged the reaſon abovementioned, why the world is the moſt beautiful of all things: he ſays, that Thales being to reſolve this queſtion, *Which is the moſt beautiful of all Beings?* Anſwered, *the world; for every thing that is regular, is part of the world.* Τί κάλλιστον; κόσμος· πᾶν γὰρ τὸ κατὰ τάξιν, τούτου μέρος ἐστί. *Quid pulcherrimum? Mundus. omnes enim ejus partes ordine aptæ ſunt* (7). As for the anſwer to the queſtion, whether GOD knows the wicked actions of men, ſome aſcribe it not to Thales, but to Pittacus. See Theon in the fifth chapter of his *Progymnaſmata*, page 69 and 77, of the Leyden edition 1626.

I obſerve all theſe variations, in order to ſhew, that the reaſons, which might be alledged againſt what I have ſaid in another place (8), *viz.* that Thales did not make uſe of the power of GOD in his ſyſtem concerning the production of things, are not very convincing. But I muſt ſpeak of this hereafter. See the remark [*D*].

[*B*] *To look at the ſtars, he fell into a ditch.*] *How can you know what paſſes in the Heavens,* ſaid that good old woman to him, *ſince you do not ſee what is juſt at your feet?* Λέγεται δ' ἀγόμενος ὑπὸ γραὸς ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας, ἵνα τὰ ἄστρα κατανοήσῃ, εἰς βόθρον ἐμπεσεῖν, καὶ αὐτῷ ἀνοιμάξαντι φάναι τὴν γραῦν, Σὺ γὰρ, ὦ Θαλῆ, τὸ ἐν ποσὶν οὐ δυνάμενος ἰδεῖν, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴει γνώσεσθαι: Fertur, quum domo exiret contemplandorum ſiderum cauſa, in ſubjectam foſſam incidiſſe, petulantique probro dictum ab anu domeſtica, Qua ratione, ô Thales, quæ in cœlis ſunt comprehenſurum te arbitraris, qui ea quæ ſunt ante pedes, videre non vales (9)? - - - *It is ſaid, that going out of his houſe in order to contemplate the ſtars, he fell into a ditch, and that an old woman jeering him, cried, O Thales, when you cannot diſcern what is at your feet, do you think to make diſcoveries in the Heavens?* This thought has been turned ſeveral ways. See the Commentaries upon the 105th emblem of Alciatus, wherein you will find the verſes which Sir Thomas More made upon an Aſtrologer, who was a cuckold. Sometimes this learned chancellor excuſes him, and ſometimes banters him, for not ſeeing in the ſtars his wife's gallantry.

Saturnus procul eſt, jamque olim cæcus, ut ajunt,
  Nec propè diſcernens à puero lapidem.
Luna verecundis formoſa incedit ocellis,
  Nec niſi virgineum virgo videre poteſt.
Jupiter Europam, Martem Venus, & Venerem Mars,
  Daphnen Sol, Herſen Mercurius recolit.
Hinc factum, Aſtrologe, eſt, tua cùm capit uxor amantes,
  Sidera ſignificent ut nihil inde tibi.

Saturn who blinks far off, is ſoon beguil'd,
As when a ſtone was giv'n him for a child,
The charming moon preſerves ſo chaſte a ſight,
She lends to no immodeſt act her light.
Jove *with* Europa, Mars *with* Venus *toys,*
Sol Daphne, Herſe Mercury *employs.*
Hence when the conjurer's wife receives her lover,
The ſtars, ſo taken up, can ne'er diſcover.

You ſee he alledges ſome reaſons why the planets cannot diſcover to that Aſtrologer his domeſtic miſfortune: but here are ſome other verſes, wherein he pretends that ſince the ſtars ſee every thing, they ought to have acquainted their votary with his wife's unlawful amours.

Aſtra tibi æthereo pandunt ſeſe omnia vati,
  Omnes & quæ ſint fata futura monent.
Omnibus aſt uxor quod ſe tua publicat, id te
  Aſtra, licet videant omnia, nulla monent.

While all the ſtars their fav'rite prophet ſhew,
Each future fact that paſſes here below.
His wife's conjunction with each amorous ſpark,
The ſtars, which all things ſee, ne'er once remark.

As there are ſome Aſtrologers every where, who are not more exempt from that misfortune, than men of other profeſſions, a French author, who was acquainted with ſome of them, has preſented them with a French tranſlation of the firſt verſes of Sir Thomas More. Theſe are his words (10). *Now if this man* (11), *intent upon a high contemplation, and pretending to great knowledge, did not ſee what was before him, you may be ſure he is not the only faulty man in this reſpect. Several Aſtrologers are like him; for, though they pretend to foretel the fate of other men, they cannot foretel their own, witneſs ſome of that Profeſſion in our time, who are extreamly jealous, and ſomething more, you know what I mean, with due reſpect to the Ladies. Upon theſe I formerly wrote the following epigram, in imitation of the Latin one of Sir Thomas More.*

Tu cognois aſtrologue eſtoilles etherees,
Dont à chacun predis futures deſtinees;
Mais de ce que ta femme eſt à pluſieurs commune,
Par les aſtres n'en peux cognoiſtre choſe aucune,
Saturne eſt trop loingtain, aveugle eſt en apres,
Le blanc d'entre le noir ne diſcernant de pres.
Ayant les yeux honteux la Lune fait ſon cours,
Puis la vierge ne veut voir laſcives amours.
Les autres affaire ont, Mars ſa Venus regarde,
Venus Mars, Jupiter à Europe prent garde.
Ainſi donc tu ne peux ta femme apercevôir,
Quand ſon amant l'embraſſe, & moins tes cornes voir.

See what I quote out of the *Menagiana* (12).

[*C*] *It is thought he lived above ninety years.*] He was born in the firſt year of the XXXVth Olympiad, and

---

(*a*) Diog. Laërt. *lib. i, num.* 26.

(*b*) See the article PYRRHO, citation (37).

(4) Cicero, de Legibus, *lib. ii, fol.* 334, *B.*

(5) Diog. Laërt. *lib. i, num.* 27.

(6) Ariſtot. de Anima, *lib. i, cap. v.*

(7) Plut. in Convivio ſeptem Sapient. *pag.* 153, *C.*

(8) In the remark [*D*], of the article ANAXAGORAS.

(9) Diog. Laërt. *lib. i, num.* 34.

(10) Du Verdier Vau Privas, Proſopographie, *Tom. i, pag.* 81.

(11) *That is,* Anaximenes, *of whom he had been ſaying,* that one day, as he was gazing upon the ſtars, he fell into a ditch.

(12) *They ſay of a man, who fell into a ditch, as he was gazing upon the ſtars,* Qui fuit Aſtrologus, nunc Geometra fuit. - - - *The Aſtrologer becomes a Geometer.* Menagiana, *pag.* 33.

Thoſe, who are not unacquainted with the doctrine of the moſt antient Philoſophers of Greece, cannot be ignorant that he aſſerted, that water was the principle of all bodies, which compoſe the Univerſe. A great many reflexions might be made on this ſuppoſition [*D*]. I ſhall cite a paſſage, which will inform us; that he made very fine diſcoveries

and died in the LVIIIth Olympiad (13). This makes at leaſt ninety two years. So that Diogenes Laërtius argues wrong when he ſays Τελευτῆσαι γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς ὀγδόης Ὀλυμπιάδος: quinquageſima QUIPPE & octava Olympiade eſſe defunctum (14); - - - FOR *that he died in the LVIIIth Olympiad*; and yet Aldobrandinus (15) approves the computation of that author, and admits the 90 years aſſigned to the life of Thales by Diogenes Laërtius. Moreri is wrong in his calculation; he would have it, that Thales, who was *born in the XXXVIth Olympiad*, died *in the 58th about the year of Rome* 209, *in the 95th year of his age.* The year of Rome 209, is the laſt of the LVIIIth Olympiad; but which way ſoever you reckon, you will never find ninety-five years in the hypotheſis of that writer.

[*D*] *He aſſerted that water was the principle of all bodies. . . . . . A great many reflexions might be made on this ſuppoſition.*] There is very good reaſon to believe, that he was not the firſt, who advanced this doctrine; and that he borrowed it from the Egyptians, or the moſt antient Greek Poets. See the diſſertation *de dogmate Thaletis, quod aqua ſit principium omnium rerum*, printed with ſome others at Hall in Saxony in the year 1700 (16). Some authors ſay, that the chaos of Heſiod is, at the bottom, the ſame principle, which Thales called water: this I can hardly believe; for the water of Thales muſt needs have been conſidered as an homogeneous thing, whereas the chaos muſt have been conſidered as an odd mixture of all ſorts of principles. Ovid gives us that notion of it, at the beginning of his Metamorphoſes (17): and when the other Poets ſpeak of a certain infernal chaos, they mean a dark and dreadful place, wholly deſtitute of the beauty that is to be ſeen in things well ordered, or altogether wanting the ſimplicity of a firſt principle.

Di, quibus imperium eſt animarum, umbræque ſilentes,
Et chaos, & Phlegethon, loca nocte tacentia late (18.)

Ye realms, yet unreveal'd to human ſight
Ye gods, who rule the regions of the night.

DRYDEN.

The Commentator Servius underſtands by the word *chaos* in theſe two verſes, the firſt principles as they were in the confuſion of the elements. But perhaps he is too ſubtil, for it is likely Virgil intended to ſpeak only of hell in general, or of part of it. Theſe words of Ovid ought to be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe:

Per ego hæc plena timoris,
Per chaos hoc ingens, vaſtique ſilentia regni
Eurydices oro, properata retexite fata (19).

Now, by the horrors which theſe realms ſurround;
By the vaſt chaos of theſe depths profound;
By the ſad ſilence which eternal reigns
O'er all the waſte of theſe wide ſtretching plains
Let me again Eurydice receive,
Let fate her quick-ſpun thread of life re-weave.

CONGREVE.

It is Orpheus who addreſſes the prayer to Pluto and Proſerpine. Conſult Mr Grævius's notes upon Heſiod (20), wherein he proves, that the word *chaos* very frequently ſignifies hell. I know that another ſenſe has been put upon the chaos, which was, according to Heſiod, the firſt of all Beings: It has been ſaid, that this chaos ſignifies the place wherein all bodies lay placed. Simplicius (21) tells us, that this was a very common interpretation. It is mentioned by Sextus Empiricus: Εἶναι γάρ φασι Χάος τὸν τόπον ἀπὸ τοῦ χωρητικὸν αὐτον εἶναι τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένων. Dicunt enim Chaos eſſe locum, eo quod comprehendat illa quæ in ipſo ſunt (22). - - - *For they ſay that chaos is* place, *becauſe of its comprehending every thing contained in it.* But, according to this ſenſe, it is impoſſible that Thales ſhould have taught the ſame doctrine with Heſiod; for water muſt neceſſarily require place no leſs than other bodies; and therefore place muſt have exiſted before water, and conſequently water could not be the firſt principle. I do not believe that Heſiod ever dreamed of what is aſcribed to him: And certainly, by the word *chaos*, he did not underſtand the ſpace or the place which contains bodies. Doubtleſs, he meant by it the ſtate of confuſion all things were in, before the earth, the ſea, the air, the heavens, *&c.* obtained their proper ſituation. He did not pretend therefore to ſpeak of ſpace, which, if it be diſtinguiſhed from matter, is neceſſarily and intirely homogeneous, and incapable of being the ſubject of the formation of any element, or any mixed body. This ſhews, that the water of Thales was not ſpace, though otherwiſe he muſt have regarded it as a whole perfectly homogeneous *in actu*, but heterogeneous *in potentia*. I make uſe of a diſtinction very famous in the ſchools of the Peripatetics; by which I mean, that, according to Thales, water conſidered in itſelf, and before the particular formation of all bodies, ought to be actually water in each of its parts, and yet capable of becoming air, fire, earth; and then a tree, metal, blood, wine, bone, *&c.* according to the ſeveral degrees of rarefaction and condenſation through which it goes. They are in the wrong who object that there would be no difference in bodies, if there was but one ſole material principle. This objection can be of no force but againſt thoſe, who ſhould ſuppoſe, that this ſole principle is immutable: But if they ſuppoſe, that it is ſuſceptible of ſeveral qualities ſucceſſively, like the *materia prima* of Ariſtotle, there is no body but may ariſe from it. The objection propoſed by Lactantius, either againſt Thales, or againſt Heraclitus, who admitted only fire for the principle of all things, is not a good one: Fire, ſays he (23), cannot be produced from water, nor can water proceed from fire. He is miſtaken: Any particular body may proceed from fire, from water, or from earth, provided there be ſome cauſes that know how to modify matter according to its alterability, or mutability. But we muſt obſerve, by the by, that neither Thales, nor Heraclitus, nor any of the ancient Philoſophers, who took only one of the four vulgar elements for the general principle of all bodies, have equalled Ariſtotle in penetration of mind: They did not conſider that not one of the four elements is matter in general, and that they are a kind of determined matter. This is the reaſon why Ariſtotle, who was more judicious than all of them, has pitched upon matter, in general, for the firſt principle of all things.

The great difficulty in Thales's Hypotheſis is, that he has not ſaid how water began to alter, and to put on the particular forms of air, fire, earth, *&c.* Was it rarified, was it condenſed by its own virtue? Did that virtue ariſe all of a ſudden in the beginning of the world, or did it always exiſt in water? One cannot apprehend how water could come by that virtue, if it had not been always in it; and how it could have been from all eternity without condenſation and rarefaction, if that virtue had been always in it. Some are of opinion, that Thales ſuppoſed GOD to be the efficient cauſe, which produced all particular bodies out of water. They alledge two paſſages of Cicero (24), and one of Lactantius (25). But as to Lactantius he is no new evidence, but a copier only of Cicero: And as to Cicero, the reaſons urged againſt him (26), are ſo ſtrong, that his teſtimony cannot be depended upon. If any ſhould alledge the words of Diogenes Laërtius, before quoted (27), I anſwer, that Plutarch does not make uſe of them, when he mentions the ſame anſwer made by Thales. If it be replied, that Plutarch and Diogenes Laërtius agree in another point, *viz.* that Thales giving a reaſon why GOD is the moſt antient of all things, alledged that GOD was not made, or had no beginning; I anſwer, that this is not a poſitive proof that he aſcribed to GOD the generation of the world. Have there not been Philoſophers, who, tho' they acknowledged on the one hand the exiſtence of the gods, yet

SEVERAL ſignifications of the word *Chaos*.

---

(13) Apollodorus, in Chronicis, *apud* Laërt. *lib. i. num.* 38.

(14) Diog. Laërt. *ibid.*

(15) In Notis ad hunc locum Laërtii.

(16) *With this title* Obſervationum ſelectarum ad Rem Litterariam ſpectantium Tomus I. *Mr Thomaſius profeſſor of the Civil-Law at Hall, was pleaſed to ſend me a copy of it; for which I expreſs my acknowledgment in this place. He has a great ſhare in the pieces which make up this collection.*

(17) See above, citation (42), of the article OVID.

(18) Virgil. Æn. *lib. vi, ver.* 265.

(19) Ovidius, Metam. lib. x, ver. 29.

(20) Pag. 115, of the Amſterdam edition 1701.

(21) Simplicius in Ariſtotel. Phyſ. *lib. iv.* See Petit, Miſcell. Obſervat. *pag.* 52.

(22) Sext. Empericus, Pyrrh. Hypotypoſ. *lib. iii, cap. xvi.*

(23) Heraclitus ex igne nata eſſe omnia dixit, Thales Mileſius ex aqua. Uterque vidit aliquid: ſed erravit tamen uterque: quod alterutrum ſi ſolum fuiſſet, neque aqua naſci ex igne potuiſſet, neque rurſus ignis ex aqua. *Lactant. lib. ii, cap. ix, pag. m.* 121.

(24) You will find them above, citations (82), and (84), of the article ANAXAGORAS.

(25) Lactant. *lib. i, cap. v, pag. m.* 14.

(26) See them in the remarks [*D*] and [*F*], of the article ANAXAGORAS.

(27) Citat. (1).

coveries in Aſtronomy, and that in particular he was ſo well pleaſed with having found out the proportion which the ſun's diameter [*E*] bears to the circle it deſcribes round the earth, that having communicated it to a perſon, who offered him any reward which he ſhould

yet denied, on the other, that the gods had made the world? If it be further replied, that Thales attributed to the gods a knowledge of the moſt ſecret thoughts of men; I anſwer, I. That it is not certain he ſaid ſo, ſince ſome writers aſcribe that ſaying to Pittacus (28): II. That he might have believed, that the gods concern themſelves with our affairs, and know our ſecret thoughts; but it does not follow from thence, that he aſcribed to them the production of the world (29), or that he did not believe, that they themſelves proceeded from water, as from their firſt cauſe and principle: III. That the true philoſophical opinions of Thales, the Naturaliſt, ought not to be looked for in the converſation of Thales, one of the ſeven wiſe men of Greece. He might have ſaid a great many things under this laſt character, which he did not ſay in his ſchool of Philoſophy. He mentioned only water, when he explained the formation of the world, as a Naturaliſt; he did not add the power of God to that of water. But when he looked upon himſelf as a Sage, whoſe ſententious diſcourſes ſhould tend to promote virtue, and would be ſpread among the people, he thought himſelf obliged to conform to Theological notions. Take notice, that the opinions of the Heathen Philoſophers were ſo incoherent, and ſo little juſt, that from their hypotheſis concerning the exiſtence of God, it did not follow, that he had a ſhare in the production and government of the world; and that, from their hypotheſis concerning his Providence, it did not follow, that he had diſentangled the chaos, or formed the univerſe. They were allowed to ſay, that the gods governed the world, tho' they had been produced and formed out of the chaos, as well as bodies. When a man believes, that human ſouls are formed of the moſt ſubtile parts of blood, he may ſay, that Jupiter, Venus, and Mercury, have been produced out of the moſt ſubtile parts of the chaos. Now, as the ſoul governs the body, which it has not made, and whereof it is but a kind of diſtilled water (30); and as we govern beaſts, and even ſome men, who are not produced by us; ſo the gods govern the world which they have not made, and which has made them of it's moſt refined parts.

I wiſh the learned men of Hall, who have ſaid ſuch fine things of the Ionic ſect (31), had ſaved me the trouble of reconciling St Auguſtin with Cicero. One of them ſays, that Thales acknowledged no divine influence in the production of the world; the other ſays the quite contrary. Thoſe gentlemen have taken no notice of the arguments above-mentioned (32); which ſeem to prove, that this founder of the Ionic ſect, was orthodox in his notion of the Deity. I wiſh they had examined that objection, for I would have made uſe of their anſwers. They poſitively affirm, that from Thales incluſively, to Anaxagoras excluſively, the Ionic ſect has been guilty of Atheiſm in the ſecond degree. To underſtand this, I muſt obſerve, that they admit of three degrees of Atheiſm (33). The firſt is to maintain, that there is no God: the ſecond is to deny, that the world was the work of God, whoſe exiſtence is acknowledged: the third is to ſay, that God has created the world by the neceſſity of his own nature, and not by any inducement of free-will. Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes, are guilty of the ſecond degree of Atheiſm, as well as Epicurus. 'Hi tres univerſi convenerunt in eo, quod principium omnium rerum ſit aliquid ſimilare, quod ortæ res fuerunt nulla Dei opera, ſolius naturæ ſponte, qui eſt gradus Atheiſmi Epicureus (ſic enim vocare liceat) quod ortæ ſint condenſando & rareſcendo. Quod Atheiſmi illos tres poſtulavi, de ſingulis probatu non difficile eſt ex Auguſtino, qui ubi, &c. (34) - - - *All three agreed in this, that the principle of all things is ſomething ſimilar, that things are produced by nature only in a ſpontaneous manner, without any interpoſition of the Deity, which is the Epicurean degree of Atheiſm, (if we may ſo call it) that they are produced by condenſation and rarefaction. This charge of Atheiſm which I have brought againſt them all three, is eaſily proved againſt every one of them in particular from St Auguſtin, who where, &c.*' Anaxagoras, Ariſtotle, and the Stoics (35), are guilty of the third degree. 'Anaxagoram & duos ejus ſocios (*Diogenem Apolloniatem & Archelaum*) tametſi à Thaletico atheiſmo, qui Deo plane nihil vult eſſe cum fabricatione rerum negotii, adeo excuſo, ut ejus comparatione religioſus ipſe, qualem & vulgo habent quidam, videri queat, atheorum tamen catalogo minime expungendum ſtatuo. Fuit autem atheiſmus ejus in eo gradu quem minimum vocavit (36). - - *Altho' I ſo far excuſe Anaxagoras and his two companions (Diogenes Apolloniates, and Archelaus) from the Atheiſm of Thales, who will not allow GOD to have any concern in forming the world, that in compariſon with him he may be eſteemed religious, as ſome have uſually ſtiled him, yet I judge him by no means to be ſtruck out of the Atheiſtical catalogue. However his Atheiſm was of that degree which I have called the leaſt.*'

[*E*] *A paſſage which will inform us, that he made very fine diſcoveries in Aſtronomy, and . . . . the proportion of the ſun's diameter.*] Apuleius furniſhes me with this paſſage. 'Thales Mileſius, *ſays he* (37), ex ſeptem illis ſapientia memoratis viris facile præcipuus: fuit enim geometricæ penes Grajos primus repertor, & naturæ rerum certiſſimus explorator, & aſtrorum peritiſſimus contemplator, maximas res parvis lineis reperit: temporum ambitus, ventorum flatus, ſtellarum meatus, tonitruum ſonora miracula, ſiderum obliqua curricula, Solis annua reverticula: idem Lunæ vel naſcentis incrementa, vel ſeneſcentis diſpendia, vel delinquentis obſtacula. Idem ſane jam proclivi ſenectute divinam rationem de Sole commentus eſt: quam equidem non didicit modo, verum etiam experiundo comprobavit: quotiens Sol magnitudine ſua circulum quem permeat metiatur. Id à ſe recens inventum Thales memoratur edocuiſſe Mandraytum Prienenſem, qui nova & inopinata cognitione impendio delectatus, optare juſſit quantam vellet mercedem ſibi pro tanto documento rependi. Satis, inquit, mihi fuerit mercedis Thales ſapiens, ſi id quod à me didiciſti, cum proferre ad quoſpiam cœperis, tibi non adſciveris; ſed ejus inventi me potius quam alium repertorem prædicaveris. - - - - *Thales, the Mileſian, the moſt eminent of the ſeven famous Sages; for he was the firſt inventor of Geometry among the Greeks, the moſt judicious inquirer into nature, and the moſt ſkillful obſerver of the ſtars: he made great diſcoveries by ſmall Geometrical lines; the regulation of times and ſeaſons, the theory of the winds, the courſe of the ſtars, the wonderful cauſes of thunder, the oblique motions of the planets, the annual revolutions of the ſun, the reaſon of the increaſe, decreaſe, and eclipſe of the moon. He alſo, in his old age, found out the moſt ſurprizing proportion with regard to the ſun; which he not only invented but confirmed alſo by experience, the proportion between the ſun's magnitude and the circle it deſcribes. Thales, as ſoon as he had found it out, is ſaid to have communicated it to Mandratus Prienenſis, who being exceedingly delighted by ſo new and unexpected a diſcovery, deſired him to aſk what reward he would have for it. The wiſe Thales replied, It will be a ſufficient reward to me, if you do not publiſh what I have taught you as a diſcovery of your own, but fairly declare that I am the inventor.*' It ſeems to me that the true ſenſe of theſe words, *quotiens ſol magnitudine ſua circulum quem permeat metiatur*, is this which I have given to them, *viz.* that Thales found out the meaſure of the ſun's diameter, and of the circle it appears to deſcribe round the earth. We are told, that he computed how many times the whole body of the ſun was to change it's ſituation to deſcribe that circle; but we are not told how many times it was. The modern Aſtronomers ſuppoſe that the ſun's diameter is about thirty minutes: from whence it follows, that, by changing it's place ſeven hundred and twenty times, according to the whole extent of it's globe, it deſcribes the whole circumference of it's circle. Some infer from thence, that it's diurnal ſwiftneſs would not be very conſiderable, if it were true that it moves in the manner ſuppoſed in Tycho Brahe's ſyſtem; that is, like an arrow ſhould aſk for it, he only deſired, that he would be ſo ingenuous as to declare, that the glory of that invention was his due (c).

---

(28) See, above, the remark [*A*].

(29) See remark [*G*], of the article JUPITER.

(30) That is according to the hypotheſis of the Heathens.

(31) *See the firſt volume of* Obſervationum ſelectarum ad Rem Litterariam ſpectantium, *printed at Hall, in the year* 1700, *pag.* 445, *& ſeq.*

(32) In the remark [*A*].

(33) Obſerv. ad Rem Litterariam, *Tom. i, pag.* 448.

(34) Ibid. *pag.* 450.

(35) Infimum (*Atheorum gradum faciunt*) quia produxerit quidem Deus, (*mundum*) ſed neceſſitate naturæ coactus, non voluntate ſua libere motus, quæ fuit Ariſtotelis & Stoicorum ſententia . . . Interim qualicunque providentiæ Divinæ confeſſione factum eſt, ut Ariſtoteles & Stoici pro non-atheis vulgo haberentur. Eſſe tamen ipſorum eandem ſortem debere cum phyſicis Ionicæ Sectæ, quos pro atheis habitos monſtrabimus, ſectarum convenientia edocebit. *Ibid. pag.* 448, 449.

(36) Ibid. *pag.* 453.

(37) Apuleius, Floridor. *pag.* m. 361.

arrow in the air, and not as the nails of a wheel. Cannot oxen, with a ſlow pace, go, in a few hours, through a ſpace ſeven or eight times greater than they are. Obſerve, in the example of Thales, how very much pleaſed the inventers of things are with the glory of a firſt diſcovery. That wiſe man of Greece was now grown old, and in high reputation. He was inſenſible as to lucre, pecuniary rewards, or any other advantage; but not as to the injuſtice of thoſe, who ſhould rob him of his diſcovery, or deprive him of the glory of it, by a diſobliging ſilence. See what Tacitus ſays, ſpeaking of Helvidius Priſcus, that the laſt thing even the wiſe man can part with, is the deſire of glory (38).

(c) See the remark [*D*].

(38) Opum contemptor, recti pervicax, conſtans adverſus metus. Erant quibus appetentior famæ videretur, quando etiam ſapientibus cupido gloriæ noviſſima exuitur. *Tacit. Hiſt. lib. iv, cap.* 5, 6.

THAMYRAS, who invented the ſcience of the Haruſpices in the iſland of Cyprus. See **TAMIRAS**.

THAMYRIS, a Poet, and one of the moſt excellent Muſicians of his time, was born at Odryſa in Thrace, whither his mother (*a*) retired to hide her ſhame. This was occaſioned by her having the imprudence to lye with a man (*b*), who would not marry her. Without doubt ſhe often deſired it of him, as ſhe found her big belly increaſe, which quickly followed their amorous commerce; but he gave no ear to it, and obliged her by this means to leave her country, which was Mount Parnaſſus [*A*]. The ſon, of whom ſhe was delivered at Odryſa, was called Thamyris, and was endowed with a great many perfections, which might have raiſed him to the higheſt pitch of glory, had not the vanity which was intermixed with them run him into a thouſand extravagancies. He trod in his father's ſteps, for he learned Muſic ſo perfectly, that the Scythians made him their king, though he was a foreigner (*c*). He had the fineſt voice of any man in his time, if we believe Plutarch, who adds, that he compoſed a Poem concerning the war of the Titans with the gods (*d*). Some other Poems are aſcribed to him; five thouſand verſes on the creation of the world, and a ſyſtem of Theology conſiſting of three thouſand verſes (*e*), which was ſtill extant when Suidas was writing his Dictionary. There is no great probability that thoſe two Poems were entirely different. He was more antient than Homer by eight degrees according to ſome, or five according to others (*f*), and he was the third, who gained the prize of ſinging at the Pythic games (*g*). He is ſaid to have been the firſt inventer of the ſin againſt nature [*B*]. The challenge which he had the aſſurance to give to the Muſes was full of ſcandalous inſolence: proud of his beauty, and of his ſkill in muſical inſtruments, he challenged them to a trial of ſkill, upon this condition, that if he got the victory, he ſhould deprive them all nine of their virginity; and that if he was overcome, he would ſubmit himſelf to their diſcretion. The Muſes, in all probability very well aſſured of ſucceſs, accepted the condition, and after their victory deprived him of his ſight, and of his ſkill in Muſic. Homer, who has mentioned this challenge of Thamyris [*C*], and the puniſhment inflicted upon him on that account, ſays nothing of his pretenſion in caſe he had been conqueror; a pretenſion like that of male partridges, when they fight in the preſence of their females (*h*); but Apollodorus, and the Scholiaſt upon Homer, are as expreſs in this particular as poſſible (*i*). Natalis Comes would have done well to cite them [*D*]. It is ſurpriſing that Lucian did not ſhow his bantering wit upon this head, and that he ſhould content himſelf with repreſenting Thamyris as an ungrateful perſon

(*a*) Her name was *Arſinoë*, according to Suidas; and *Argiope*, according to Pauſanias and Apollodorus.

(*b*) His name was Philammon, and he was a good Muſician; See *Pauſanias, lib. iv, p.* 143, *& lib. x, pag.* 322, Plut. de Muſica, *pag.* 1132.

(*c*) Conon, *apud* Photium, *num.* 186, *pag.* 428.

(*d*) Plutarch. de Muſica, *pag.* 1132. Natalis Comes, Mythol. *lib. vi, cap. xiv, ſays that Plutarch values that poem more than all the others; but it is certain he neither praiſes nor diſpraiſes it.*

(*e*) Tzetzes, Chil. VII. Hiſt. CVIII.

(*f*) Suidas.

(*g*) Pauſan. *lib. lib. x, pag.* 322.

(*h*) Tunc inter ſe dimicant mares deſiderio feminarum, victum ajunt Venerem pati. *Pliny, lib. x, cap. xxxiii.*

(*i*) See the remark [*D*].

[*A*] *Which was mount Parnaſſus.*] Others (1) ſay ſhe retired from Peloponneſus, and that Philammon, a handſome young man, who was too much beloved by her, and had received too great a ſhare of her favours, was born at Thoricum in Attica.

[*B*] *The firſt inventor of the ſin againſt nature.*] That I may not advance this without proof, I ſhall cite theſe four Greek words, Πρῶτος ἀρξάμενος ἐρᾷν ἀῤῥένων. Maſcula Venere primus uſus diſcitur (2) - - - - *He firſt, introduced the love of males.* The boy he fell in love with, was the ſame Hyacinthus, who was afterwards loved by Apollo, and killed by him accidentally with a quoit. He was the ſon of the Muſe Clio, and of Pierus the ſon of Magnes (3). This is what we find in Apollodorus; but Suidas calls the boy Hymneus, and makes him the ſon of Calliope and Magnes. I have not read in any author what Lloyd and Hofman have copied from Charles Stephens, namely, that Thamyris, the moſt beautiful of all men, fell in love with boys at firſt, and afterwards changed his courſe, and loved the Muſes. This is perverting and overturning every thing that is to be met with among the Antients.

[*C*] *Homer, who has mentioned this challenge.*] It is in the ſecond book of the Iliad, in the catalogue of the Grecian fleet, on occaſion of the town Dorion, near which he ſays, Thamyris was met by the Muſes. It is evident, by what is ſaid both before and after, that this town was not in Thrace, as Lloyd will have it, but in Pelopponneſus. Lucan, who places it in Theſſaly (4), was no better acquainted with it's ſituation. Beroaldus, who would prove from Lucan, that it was in Bœotia, has committed two faults for one (5). Diodorus Siculus, in the third book, and Dion Chryſoſtom, in his third oration *de Fuga*, have mentioned that challenge of Thamyris, and how he was puniſhed for it. Barthius has found in that oration, that Thamyris loſt his ſight, and his ſkill in Muſic, on account of his wealth (6). But this is not the author's meaning.

[*D*] *Natalis Comes would have done well to cite them.*] He has given a juſt account (7) of that adventure; but he quotes only Aſclepiades of Myrlea (8), which is a wrong way of quoting, and a remainder of the vain affectation of ſome learned men of Italy, upon the revival of learning. Some quoted a Greek author only in general; others called him by his name, but they took care not to ſay, that what they cited out of him, was only to be found quoted in ſome known authors. The ſcholaſtic Divines and Philoſophers are not ſo unfair in their quotions: they do not ſcruple to refer the reader for a paſſage of an author, whoſe works are in every body's hands, to a modern writer who quotes it. Thus Father Terillus, in his book upon the *Prima Regula Morum*, does ſeldom quote the Fathers, or Thomas Aquinas, but upon the credit of Sanches, Vaſques, and other Jeſuits, as is obſerved by the author of the fourth Denunciation of the *Philoſophical Sin*. I here give myſelf an example of ſuch quotations. However it be, Natalis Comes ſhould have told

(1) Conon, *apud* Photium, *num.* 186, *pag.* 428.

(2) Apollodor. *lib. i, pag. m.* 11. *See alſo* Suidas, *and the Scholiaſt upon* Homer, in Iliad. *lib. i, ver.* 102.

(3) Apollod. *lib. i, pag. m. x.*

(4) Quæ tetigit Phylace Pteleoſque & Dorion ira Flebile Pieridum. *Lucan. Pharſ. lib. vi, ver.* 352.

(5) Beroald. in Propert. Eleg. XXII, *lib. ii.*

(6) Barth. Comm. in Statium, *Tom. ii, pag.* 962.

(7) Nat. Comes, Mythol. *lib. vi, cap. xiv.*

(8) He is a famous author. Myrlea, a town of Bithynia, was ſince called Apamea.

perſon [*E*], who turned againſt the Muſes the talent he had received from them. Some authors have ſaid, that the puniſhment of his preſumption was put off till he ſhould arrive in the infernal regions (*k*). Pauſanias ſays, he believes that Thamyris loſt his ſight, not as Homer ſays, for having contended with the Muſes, but through ſickneſs (*l*). It is obſerved (*m*); that this Poet left off making verſes after he loſt his ſight, and that he threw his lyre into a river [*F*]: hence it is, that when he was painted blind, he was repreſented with a broken lyre (*n*). Note he invented the Muſic called Doric [*G*]. Plato has feigned, according to the principles of the Metempſychoſis, that the ſoul of Thamyris tranſmigrated into the body of a nightingale (*o*).

(*k*) Prodicus Phocæenſis, *apud* Pauſaniam, *lib. iv, pag.* 143.

(*l*) Pauſan. *ib.*

(*m*) Ibid.

(*n*) Prodicus Phocæenſis, *apud* Pauſaniam, *lib. ix, pag.* 304, & *lib. x, pag.* 347.

(*o*) Plato, de Republ. *lib. x, pag.* 765.

told us, that there are ſome authors extant, who may be conſulted as to the conditions of the challenge. Συνθέμενος, ſays Apollodorus, ἂν μὲν κρείττων εὑρεθῇ πλησιάσειν πάσαις. - - - *Making his bargain, in caſe he ſhould come off conqueror, to lie with them all.* The Scholiaſt upon Homer has the ſame expreſſion upon the paſſage of the ſecond book of the Iliads: Συνέθετο, ἂν μὲν κρείττων εὑρεθῇ πλησιάσαι πάσαις.

[*E*] *It is ſurpriſing that Lucian did not ſhew his bantering wit upon this head, and that he ſhould content himſelf with repreſenting Thamyris as an ungrateful perſon.*] Ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ κατὰ τὸν Θάμυριν, ἢ τὸν Εὔρυτον εἴη τὴν φύσιν, ὡς ταῖς μούσαις ἀντᾴδειν, παρ' ὧν εἰλήφει τὴν ᾠδήν, ἢ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐριδαίνειν, ἐναντία τοξεύων, καὶ ταῦτα, δοτῆρι ὄντι τῆς τοξικῆς. Ni ejuſdem naturæ, cujus Thamyris, vel Eurytus, ut muſis occinat, à quibus canendi normam acceperit, vel Apollinem, idque jaculationis præceptorem, jaculando provocet (9). - - - *Unleſs of the ſame diſpoſition with Thamyris, or Eurytus; the former of whom preſumed to ſing with the Muſes, who had taught him that art; the latter challenged Apollo to ſhoot, notwithſtanding he had been his maſter.* Perhaps this merry writer forgot that circumſtance, or never obſerved it in his reading. It is well he did not; for this, in all probability, is the true reaſon why he did not jeſt upon it in any of his books, by falſly and maliciouſly ſuppoſing, that the Muſes did not ſing well that day, either from a pretended cold, or one really catched in a very lucky ſeaſon, or from ſome other artifice, like thoſe made uſe of by courtiers and ambitious men when they play (10), and that therefore Thamyris, &c. But we muſt not forget, that, according to ſome authors (11), the prize annexed to the victory was not a tranſient favour, but an actual marriage to be contracted between him and the nine Muſes: this was conſequently a laſting buſineſs.

Connubio jungam ſtabili propriamque dicabo (12).

In Hymen's laſting bands I'll make her thine.

[*F*] *It is obſerved . . . that he threw his lyre into a river.*] Caſeneuve, in his French Commentary upon ſome epiſtles of Philoſtratus, ſays, that Thamyris, after his puniſhment, *threw his lyre againſt mount Parnaſſus, and that from the ſtroke of it there iſſued a brook, which was from thence called Balyra.* This is a ſtrange alteration of Pauſanias's words, which inform us (13), that at the diſtance of thirty *ſtadia* from the gate of Meſſena in Peloponneſus, there was a river called Balyra, becauſe Thamyris had thrown his lyre into it.

[*G*] *He invented the Muſic called Doric.*] He was too great a maſter in that art, to content himſelf with leaving it in the ſtate he found it, and not to be ambitious to make ſome new improvements in it. ' Lydios modulos Amphion (*invenit*) Dorios Thamyras ' Thrax: Phrygios Marſyas Phrix (14). - - - *Amphion ' invented the Lydian mood in Muſic, Thamyras the Thracian the Doric mood, and Marſyas the Phrygian ' the Phrygian mood.*'

(9) Lucian. in Reviviſcentibus, *pag.* 389, *Tom. i.*

(10) It was principally by ſuch a device as this, that Ruy Gomes gained the love of Philip II. Brantome, in his Elogy upon Philip II. See the remark [*B*], in the article of INNOCENT XI.

(11) Conon, *apud* Photium, *num.* 186, *pag.* 428.

(12) Virgil. Æn. *lib. i, ver.* 73.

(13) Pauſan. *lib. iv, pag.* 143.

(14) Pliny, *lib. vii, cap. lvi, pag. m.* 102. *See alſo* Clemens Alexandrinus, *lib. i,* Strom. *pag.* 307.

T H E O N, a Greek Sophiſt, of whom we have ſtill remaining a Rhetorical work (*a*), written with great politeneſs and judgment. His rules are clear and ſhort, and he makes a good choice of common places for the furniſhing of arguments. There is no ſubject wherein he has been more ſucceſsful, than that concerning the Divine Providence [*A*]. He paſſes a right judgment upon the beauties as well as the faults of the moſt illuſtrious Orators and Hiſtorians. I ſhall prove, by an example, his great nicety in the placing

(*a*) Intituled, Προγυμνάσματα, Progymnaſmata.

[*A*] *There is no ſubject wherein he has been more ſucceſsful than that concerning the Divine Providence.*] Read the twelfth chapter of his book, where you will find a very plentiful collection of the fineſt arguments that a Pagan could conceive; and which will convince you Theon was a man of great parts. You will there find, among other things, that mens being perſuaded that the gods continually ſee every thing they do, makes them live in great ſafety, and practiſe their duty; and that thoſe who think themſelves under the care of the gods, ſpend their lives with the greateſt pleaſure imaginable. Let us hear his own words: Εἶθ' ὅτι ἀσφαλέστατα ἂν ἔτοι, καὶ προσηκόντως τὸν βίον διάγοιεν, νομίζοντες ἔχειν ἐπισκόπους ἀεὶ πασῶν τῶν κατὰ τὸν βίον πράξεων. καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα ἡδέως ζῶσιν, οἱ ἡγούμενοι ἐπιμελητὰς ἔχειν τοὺς θεούς. *Quemadmodum & omnium tutiſſime ac diligentiſſime eos vivere conſtet, qui omnium ſuarum in vita actionum inſpectores ſe habere exiſtimant Deos. Sed & jucundiſſime ætatem agere, qui à Diis reſpici ſe credunt* (1). It is certain, that if men knew how to live according to their principles, the doctrine of GOD's preſence would be the moſt effectual means to divert them from all evil, and to make them purſue good. The moſt profligate have the power to hold their hands and refrain their tongues, when they think they are ſeen or heard by ſome perſons whom they fear or reſpect. With how much more reaſon ſhould the perſuaſion, that GOD ſees every thing, keep men conſtant to their duty (2)? It is upon this account, that the authors of pious books do ſo much inculcate the neceſſity of meditating upon GOD's preſence. From hence comes alſo the cuſtom of fixing up this ſentence even at the corners of the ſtreets, GOD SEES THEE, SINNER. It is alſo certain, that thoſe who believe themſelves under the protection of GOD, muſt enjoy an inexhauſtible fund of comfort and pleaſure. Some of the profane Poets were not ignorant of it; but they have given a juſt cauſe of ſcandal by making uſe of this maxim to obtain a miſtreſs (3).

I ſhall here take notice of one thing, that is to be met with in a book, intituled, *Pratiques de Piété pour honorer le S. Sacrament.* The author of it relates (4) ' this ſaying of Marſhal de Gaſſion. ' *If I believed ' the Real Preſence, I would ſpend my whole life in a ' church with my face proſtrate to the ground; and I ' cannot perſuade myſelf, that many Catholics believe what ' they ſay concerning that myſtery, when I conſider how ' little reſpect they expreſs at church.*' If that Marſhal had believed the Real Preſence, he would have done as others do: He would have been accuſtomed to that doctrine, and by habit he would have become inſenſible to it; that was already his caſe, as to the doctrine of GOD's preſence throughout the whole univerſe. A viſible preſence of CHRIST's humanity would, without doubt, be more efficacious than GOD's preſence; but a preſence of CHRIST's human nature, as inviſible as that of the Divine Nature, will ſoon come to the ſame thing. Thoſe who believe it are no more ſenſibly affected with it, than the Proteſtants are with the doctrine of GOD's preſence.

(1) Theo, in Progymn. *cap. xii, pag. m.* 135.

(2) *Confer quæ ſupra* in the remark [*A*], of the article THALES.

(3) *See the XVIIth Ode of the firſt book of Horace, and mind theſe words,* Di me tuentur: Dis pietas mea, Et Muſa cordi eſt. *All ſeeing gods my cauſe defend, My pray'rs accept, my muſe befriend.*

(4) *See the* Bibliotheque Univerſelle, *Tom. i, pag.* 313.

[*B*] I ſhall

placing of words [*B*]. Here is another proof of his good taſte. He would not have maxims or ſentences to appear in relievo, or like embroidery, in narrations, but to be incorporated with them in an imperceptible manner [*C*]. His book was printed at Baſil, with the Latin tranſlation of Joachim Camerarius in the year 1541: but the beſt edition is that of Leyden 1626, in 8vo. Daniel Heinſius, who publiſhed it, carefully reviſed the Latin tranſlation, and corrected it in a great many places.

[*B*] *I ſhall prove by an example his great nicety in the placing of words.*] When he recommends perſpicuity of expreſſion (5), he points out ſeveral cauſes of obſcurity which ought to be avoided. He ſays, among other things, that we ſhould never leave our readers or hearers in an uncertainty where to refer a certain part of a period; and therefore he blames this expreſſion: *Δῆμον ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος, ὅν ποτ᾽ ἀθήνη θρέψε διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ ζείδωρος ἄρουρα.* Populum præſtantis Ereckthei, Pallas quem Jove nata aluit, terra edidit alma (6).-- *The people of the great Erechtheus, whom Pallas, Jove's daughter, bred, and earth produced.* One cannot tell, ſays he, whether it be the people, or Erechtheus, whom Pallas bred, and the earth produced. He adds, that Heraclitus's books were grown very obſcure, by ſuch an order of words, ſo very frequently to be met with, whether it was owing to the author's careleſſneſs or deſign. *Παρὰ ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν, τὰ Ἡρακλείτου τοῦ φιλοσόφου βιβλία σκοτεινὰ γέγονε, κατακόρως αὐτῇ χρησαμένου, ἤτοι ἐξεπίτηδες, ἢ καὶ δι᾽ ἄγνοιαν. Ex hujuſmodi ambiguis locutionibus Heracliti philoſophi libri obſcuritatem contraxere: qui ad faſtidium illis, ſive gnarus ſive ignarus, uſus eſt* (7). Since Theon appears to have been ſo very nice with regard to ambiguous expreſſions, I am at a loſs to know where he met with any authors, who had writ in the manner he deſired; for the greateſt maſters of the Greek and Latin tongue are full of ſuch ambiguities. It is true, they are not ſo perplexing in a piece of Hiſtory or Oratory as they are in a treatiſe of Phyſics; and that therefore the Philoſopher, cenſured by Theon, was particularly obliged to avoid them. I have ſaid, in another place (8), that the French language is not ſo ſubject to this defect as the Greek and Latin: but it muſt be confeſſed, that even ſome excellent writers too much neglect, in that reſpect, the ſtrict rules of our Grammar. A new Theon would point out to them a great many faulty periods not to be juſtified.

[*C*] *But to be incorporated with them in an imperceptible manner.*] This is, without doubt, the true ſenſe of theſe words: *Ὅταν μέν τοι συνεχῶς ἐγκαταμιγνύῃ τίς, καὶ λανθάνῃ ταῦτα γνωμικά, ἐπιχαρίς πως ἡ διήγησις γίνεται.* Quæ ſententioſa quidem quamvis ſæpe inſerantur, modo ne emineant, mirifice amœnam ac venuſtam efficiunt orationem (9). - - - *When theſe maxims are frequently intermixed, and yet at the ſame time concealed, the narration becomes ſurpriſingly beautiful.* Petronius was of the ſame taſte. Read the following words of the preface to a book of Mr Corbinelli. *Thoſe, who have read Livy, will be ſurprized to find ſo many maxims in an Hiſtorian, who has but very few, or none, but of ſuch a ſort as thoſe mentioned by an antient author *, which are incorporated with the body of the diſcourſe, without having the turn or appearance of maxims.* This is giving a fine encomium on that Hiſtorian. Moral and political ſentences and reflexions, not interwoven with the thread of the diſcourſe, do not deſerve much commendation. It is no difficult thing to ſcatter them in that manner; but the inſerting them, in the very body of the narration, requires a great deal of art. They ought to appear there like a flat painting, and not like a book emboſſed in relievo.

(5) Theo, *cap. iv, pag.* 46, & *ſeq.*

(6) Id. ibid. *pag.* 47.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Remark [*C*] of the firſt article ACHILLES.

(9) Theo, *cap. iv, pag.* 63, 64.

* Curandum eſt, ne ſententiæ emineant extra corpus orationis expreſſæ, ſed intexto veſtibus colore niteant. *Petr. Satyric.*

THEOPOMPUS, an Orator and an Hiſtorian, born in the iſle of Chios (*a*), flouriſhed in the time of Philip, King of Macedonia, father of Alexander the Great [*A*]. He was the moſt famous of all the diſciples of Iſocrates (*b*), and carried the prize from all the Panegyriſts ſent for by Artemiſia to praiſe Mauſolus (*c*). There was no conſiderable town in Greece where he had not harangued with univerſal applauſe (*d*). This was one of the reaſons he advanced, to juſtify the good opinion he had of his own merit; when having very much preferred the modern Orators to thoſe of the preceding age, he inſtanced himſelf for one of the beſt of his time (*e*). After he had ſignalized himſelf as an Orator, he ſet himſelf about writing Hiſtories [*B*], and made it appear, that the ſtudy of

(*a*) Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag.* 444.

(*b*) Ἐπιφανέστατος πάντων Ἰσοκράτους μαθητῶν. Clariſſimus omnium Iſocratis diſcipulorum. *Dionyſ. Halicarn. Epiſt. ad Pompeium, ſub fin. pag. m.* 262.

(*c*) Aulus Gellius, *lib. x, cap. xviii.*

(*d*) Photius, Bibl. *Cod.* 176, *pag.* 392.

(*e*) *Id. ibid.* See the end of the laſt remark.

[*A*] *He flouriſhed in the time of Philip . . . . . father of Alexander the Great.*] The anonymous writer, who has deſcribed the Olympiads, ſays, he flouriſhed in the XCIIId. It is a miſtake, which has been followed by Suidas, and adopted by Meurſius (1) and Voſſius (2). Jonſius confutes it effectually (3). He quotes Diodorus Siculus, who has obſerved that the XLIſt, XLIId, and XLIIId books of Theopompus's Hiſtory, contained what paſſed in Sicily from the third year of the XCIIId Olympiad, to the ſecond year of the CIXth (4). Is it likely, that an author, who flouriſhed in the XCIIId Olympiad, ſhould have been alive in the CXth Olympiad (5)? Here is a more ſolid proof. Theopompus publiſhed a letter, and ſome advices he had wrote to Alexander, who did not begin to reign till the CXIth Olympiad. I paſs by ſeveral other proofs alledged by Jonſius: they might be eluded, and after all they are of no more weight than thoſe I have juſt now mentioned. We ſhall therefore take no farther notice of them, but obſerve that he might have found in Photius a much ſtronger argument than all he alledges; for, as I have ſaid in the text of this article, we read in Photius, 1. That Theopompus was but forty-five years old when Alexander cauſed him to re-eſtabliſhed at Chios. 2. That Ptolomy, King of Egypt had thoughts of putting him to death. This ſhews that he was ſo far from flouriſhing in the XCIIId Olympiad, that he was not born till towards the hundredth at the ſooneſt.

[*B*] *After he had ſignalized himſelf, as an Orator, he ſet himſelf about writing Hiſtories.*] Quintilian makes this obſervation: ' Theopompus . . . . . ut in hiſtoria ' prædictis (*Herodoto & Thucydide*) minor, ita Oratori magis ſimilis, ut qui antequam eſt ad hoc opus ' ſolicitatus, diu fuerit Orator (6). - - - *Theopompus ' . . . . . as in Hiſtory inferior to the former* (Herodotus ' and Thucydides), *ſo was he much more of the Orator, having diſtinguiſhed himſelf in that character long ' before his being perſuaded to write Hiſtory.*' Cicero does not contradict Quintilian, when he ſays, that Theopompus never pleaded any cauſes; for there were a great many Orators in Greece who never pleaded at all. In ſhort, it was Iſocrates, who adviſed Theopompus to apply himſelf to Hiſtory (7). The paſſage I have quoted out of Cicero, might make one believe, that Theopompus and Ephorus were of much the ſame genius, ſince their maſter adviſed them to apply themſelves to the ſame ſtudy; but do not let this deceive you. They had not the leaſt reſemblance; one wanted a curb, and the other a ſpur. Theopompus was too warm. Ephorus was not warm enough. This was the reaſon that Iſocrates uſed different methods with them. ' Hoc doctoris intelligentis eſt, videre quò ferat natura ' ſua quemque; & ea duce utentem ſic inſtituere, ut ' Iſocratem in acerrimo ingenio Theopompi, & leniſſimo Ephori dixiſſe traditum eſt, alteri ſe calcaria ' adhibere, alteri frænos (8).- - *This is the part of an ' able maſter to diſcover every particular genius of his ſcholars, and to teach them accordingly, as Iſocrates is reported to have ſaid with regard to the bold turn of ' Theopompus, and the mild one of Ephorus, that he would ' make uſe of the ſpur to the one, and the bridle to the ' other.*' Cicero expreſſes this in another place better ſtill for my purpoſe; for he declares, that theſe two ſcholars

(1) Meurſius de Archont. Athen. *apud* Jonſium, ubi infra.

(2) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græc. *lib. iv, cap. viii, pag.* 459.

(3) Jonſius, de Scriptor. Hiſt. Philoſ. *pag.* 45.

(4) Diodor. Siculus, *lib. xvi, cap. lxxii.*

(5) Theopompus's Hiſtory conſiſted of 58 books.

(6) Quintil. *lib. x, cap. i, pag. m.* 469.

(7) Ex clariſſima Rhetoris officina duo præſtantes ingenio Theopompus & Ephorus ab Iſocrate magiſtro impulſi ſe ad hiſtoriam contulerunt: cauſas omnino nullas attigerunt. *Cicero, de Orat. lib. ii, fol.* 73, *D.*

(8) Cicero, in Bruto, *pag.* 314.

of Eloquence is a good preparative for it [*C*]; for he acquired the reputation of an able Hiſtorian. He was beſides, very well qualified for this undertaking; for he boldly publiſhed

ſcholars were never alike. ‘ Dicebat Iſocrates . . . . . ſe calcaribus in Ephoro, contrà autem in Theopompo frenis uti ſolere: alterum enim exultantem verborum audacia reprimebat, alterum cunctantem, & quaſi verecundantem incitabat. Neque eos ſimiles effecit inter ſe, ſed tantum alteri affinxit, de altero limavit, ut id confirmaret in utroque, quod utriuſque natura pateretur (9). - - - - *Iſocrates ſaid . . . . . that he uſed to treat Ephorus with a ſpur, and Theopompus, on the contrary, with a bridle: the great forwardneſs and aſſurance of the former wanting to be repreſſed, and the great backwardneſs and modeſty of the latter to be encouraged. Nor did he make them in the leaſt alike, but only added to the one, and pruned off from the other, that he might confirm in each of them, what their reſpective genius would bear.*’ Quintilian relates the ſame fact (10). Others make a like obſervation concerning Plato, with reſpect to Ariſtotle and Xenocrates, and concerning Ariſtotle, with reſpect to Theophraſtus and Calliſthenes (11).

[*C*] *The ſtudy of Eloquence is a good preparative to write Hiſtory.*] This was Cicero's opinion; for he is thus addreſſed by Pomponius Atticus: ‘ Potes tu profecto ſatisfacere in *hiſtoria* quippe cum ſit opus, ut tibi quidem videri ſolet, unum hoc oratorium maxime (12). - - - - *You may be ſure of ſucceeding in Hiſtory, ſince it is a work, wherein you uſe to ſay Oratory is the chief ingredient.*’ Nevertheleſs, it ſeems, that a man, who has been uſed to compoſe orations, is not very well qualified to obſerve, in his expreſſions, that grave ſimplicity, which becomes the character of an Hiſtorian. It is to be feared, that his ſtile will be too lofty, and too full of metaphors. But this is a much ſtronger objection againſt thoſe, who ſay, that none can be a good Hiſtorian, without being a good Poet (13). This has been advanced by ſome very great men. However it be, Theopompus's ſtile was thought to ſavour more of an Orator, than of an Hiſtorian, and to be an imitation of that of Iſocrates. *Veterum hoc commune judicium eſt dictionem ejus oratoriæ ac imprimis Iſocraticæ ſimiliorem eſſe, quam hiſtoriæ* (14). Thoſe, who juſtify him by ſaying in general, that he came nearer the ſtrength of Demoſthenes, do not wholly remove the difficulty, for that very thing ſhews, that an oratorial eloquence prevailed in his hiſtorical writings. The beſt thing therefore that can be ſaid for him is what we find in Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus. I ſhall give it in Latin: It will inform us, that Theopompus added to the character of Iſocrates the ſtrength which his ſubject required, and that his cenſures were as ſharp as thoſe of Demoſthenes. ‘ Ea forma quæ in elocutione cernitur, maxime ad ſimilitudinem Iſocrateæ accedit. Pura enim dictio, vulgaris, ſimplex, perſpicua, ſublimis, magnifica, & ſummam pompam præ ſe fert, & quadam harmonia temperata eſt, jucunde & ſuaviter fluens. Differt autem ab elocutione Iſocratis in auſteritate & vehementia in aliquibus; nimirum cum ſe in affectus concitandos dederit, & vel maxime cum urbibus & ducibus improba conſilia & res geſtas exprobrat atque vitio dat. Multus enim eſt in iis, & à Demoſthenis acrimonia ne paululum quidem abeſt (15). - - - - *The form of his ſtile is moſt like that of Iſocrates, for his expreſſion is pure, familiar, plain, clear, ſublime, magnificent, pompous, tempered with certain harmony, very pleaſant and agreeably flowing. But it differs from that of Iſocrates, ſometimes by it's ſharpneſs and ſeverity; that is, when he deſigns to ſtir the paſſions, and eſpecially when he expoſes and laſhes the evil counſels and miſconduct of cities and generals. For he enlarges much upon theſe, and is not in the leaſt ſhort of Demoſthenes's ſeverity.*’ Cicero obſerves, that Theopompus eclipſed the glory of Philiſtus, and Thucydides, by the loftineſs of his ſtile. ‘ Ut horum conciſis ſententiis, interdum etiam non ſatis apertis cum brevitate, tum nimio acumine, officit Theopompus elatione atque altitudine orationis ſuæ, quod idem Lyſiæ Demoſthenes: ſic Catonis luminibus obſtruxit hæc poſteriorum quaſi exaggerata altius oratio (16). - - *That their conciſe, and ſometimes not over-clear periods, were out-done by Theopompus not only in brevity and perſpicuity, but alſo in loftineſs and magnificence; as Lyſias's was by Demoſthenes. So Cato's glory is eclipſed by the more improved ſtile of the Moderns.*’ But there is one thing, in which he ſhewed himſelf too much an Orator: he carefully avoided the meeting of vowels, and was extremely fond of the turn and cadence of his periods, and of the correſpondence of grammatical figures. This is a fault, for which he is reproached by Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (17); and there is without doubt ſomething very mean in ſuch an affectation, when the grandeur and majeſty of the ſubject ought to engage the whole attention of the writer. We may ſay however, as to what concerns the meeting of vowels, that he did very right in avoiding it, and that he was only to blame for diſcovering that he avoided it too ſcrupulouſly. I obſerve, that when Cicero ſays, Theopompus was blamed upon that account, he does not ſay he was blamed juſtly: nay, he ſeems to ſay, that he was blamed unjuſtly. ‘ Ut in legendo, *ſays he* (18), ſic animus in dicendo proſpiciet quid ſequatur, ne extremorum verborum cum inſequentibus primis concurſus, aut hiulcas voces efficiat, aut aſperas. Quamvis enim ſuaves, graveſve ſententiæ, tamen ſi inconditis verbis efferuntur, offendent aures, quarum eſt judicium ſuperbiſſimum. Quod quidem latina lingua ſic obſervat, nemo ut tam ruſticus ſit, qui vocaleis nolit conjungere. In quo quidam etiam Theopompum reprehendunt, quod eas literas tantopere fugerit, & ſi id magiſter ejus Iſocrates, at non Thucydides. . . . . In ea eſt crebra iſta vocum concurſio, quam magna ex parte, ut vitioſam, fugit Demoſthenes. - - - *As in reading, ſo in ſpeaking the mind ought to regard what is to follow, that the meeting of each ſubſequent word with the foregoing may produce neither too open nor too rough a ſound. For altho' the ſentences are agreeable and grave, yet if they are expreſſed in improper words, they will offend the ear, whoſe judgment is very arbitrary. Which the Latin tongue obſerves in ſuch manner, that the greateſt clown of all takes care to join his vowels right. Some alſo find fault with Theopompus on this head, for avoiding ſo ſcrupulouſly theſe openings, which if his maſter Iſocrates minded, Thucydides did not. . . . . With him the meeting of vowels is very frequent, which Demoſthenes in great meaſure has avoided as faulty.*’ Duris Samius ſpoke of Theopompus's ſtyle with great contempt; but, as Photius (19) obſerves, he was far from equalling him. Conſult Longinus in two places of his treatiſe *on the Sublime*. He commends and juſtifies him in the one, and cenſures him in the other. ‘ This may be further ſeen, ſays he (20), in a paſſage of Theopompus, which Cæcilius blames I know not why, and which I think on the contrary ought rather to be praiſed for its juſtneſs, and for being very expreſſive. *Philip*, ſays that Hiſtorian, *readily ſwallows all affronts, which the neceſſity of his affairs obliges him to ſuffer.*’ It is in the Greek *δεινὸς ὢν ὁ φίλιππος ἀναγκοφαγῆσαι πράγματα.* Tanaquillus Faber renders theſe words: *Philippus rerum neceſſitatem devorare callidus.* The other paſſage of Longinus begins thus (21): ‘ In like manner, the Hiſtorian Theopompus has given a deſcription of the King of Perſia's deſcent into Egypt, which is otherwiſe ſublime; but he has ſpoiled all by the mean expreſſions he has intermixed with it. *Is there any city, and nation in Aſia*, ſays that Hiſtorian, *but what has ſent ambaſſadors to the King?* &c.’ Longinus, having repeated the remaining part of the deſcription, adds: ‘ From the higheſt elevation he falls into the loweſt meanneſs, in the very place where he ſhould have been moſt lofty. For the buſhels, raggo's, and ſacks, which he improperly mentions in the pompous deſcription of thoſe preparations, would make one think that he is deſcribing a kitchin.’ The Jeſuit Cauſſinus who was a good judge of Rhetoric, does not approve that cenſure. Theſe are his words: ‘ Dionyſ. Longinus, mordax Criticus, eum irridet, quòd ubi dona Regi Perſarum ab Aſiaticis oblata commemorat, poſt ſtragulam veſtem, purpuram, tabernacula aurea, periſtromata, emblemata, carnes etiam victimarum ſalſas, regi oblatas ad alendum exercitum, commemoret. Debebat, inquit, iſta minuta, aut omittere, aut initio collocare, ut à minoribus ad majora aſcenderet: ſed in eo frigidus eſt, & fruſtra mordax Longinus. Erat enim fidelis hiſtorici, & prudentis, poſt opulenta principum dona, tenuiorum quoque in colendo rege ſtudia commemorare, & rem, ut geſta

‘ eſt

(9) Cicero, de Oratore, *lib. iii, fol.* 90, *C.*

(10) Quintil. *lib. ii, cap. viii, pag.* 81.

(11) Diog. Laërtius, in Xenocrate & Theophraſto.

(12) Cicero, de Legibus, *lib. i, circa init. fol. m.* 328, *C. See alſo* Cicero, in I de Oratore.

(13) *See the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, *num.* 5.

(14) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græcis, *pag.* 34.

(15) Dionyſ. Halicarn. Epiſt. ad Pompeium, *in fine, pag. m.* 264.

(16) Cicero, in Bruto, *pag. m.* 114.

(17) Quod ſi in iis in quibus ſummum ſtudium poſuit, colliſionem vocalium & numeroſas circumſcriptiones ac figuras ſimiles neglexiſſet, longe melior in elocutione ſe ipſo evaſiſſet. *Dionyſ. Halicarn. Epiſt. ad Pompeium in fine, pag. m.* 264.

(18) Cicero, in Oratore, *fol.* 124, *B.*

(19) Photius, Bibl. *num.* 176, *pag.* 393.

(20) Longin, *chap. xxviii*, juxta *Editionem Tanaq. Fabri.*

(21) *Id. ibid. cap. xxxix*, juxta *Editionem Tanaq. Fabri.*

publiſhed diſadvantageous truths, and was not ſparing of his money when an exact enquiry into matters of fact required great expences [*D*]. He is blamed for his digreſſions [*E*], and it is very likely, the cenſure paſſed upon him on that account is very reaſonable, though perhaps it is not in all reſpects ſo exact and equitable as it ſhould be, nor has the plan he laid down been conſidered with due attention. If we had his preface, perhaps we ſhould find ſomething in it, which might juſtify him in ſome meaſure; but I do not think that any thing can fully excuſe him, not even to ſuch readers as have the greateſt indulgence for Hiſtorical Epiſodes. With much more reaſon would he be condemned by thoſe Critics, who cannot bear any thing in Hiſtory that is foreign to the

‘ eſt, deſcribere. Quòd ſi tantopere petaſonem averſatur, quin Homerum, ſuum numen, reprehendit, qui tam ſimpliciter rem coquinariam à principibus obitam deſcribit: & quid hoc eſt, niſi μαγείρου. quod inſectatur in Theopompo, φαντασία eſt (22)? - - - *Longinus, a ſevere Critic, ridicules him, becauſe in ſpeaking of the preſents made to the King of Perſia by the Aſiatic nations, after the carpets, the purple robes, the gilt tents, the tapeſtry, and inlaid work, he mentions even the ſalted meats of the ſacrifices which had been preſented to the King for the maintenance of his army. Theſe low matters, ſays he, ought either to have been omitted, or to have been mentioned firſt, that there might be a natural riſing from ſmall to great: but in this Longinus appears dull, and ſevere without reaſon. For it was the duty of a faithful and prudent Hiſtorian, after the magnificent preſents of Princes to take notice alſo of the reſpect paid to the King by the meaner ſort, and to deſcribe every thing in the order it happened. But if he has ſuch an extreme averſion to the kitchin, he muſt in courſe find fault with his divine Homer, who has deſcribed with ſo much ſimplicity the cookery of Princes; and what is this but the deſcribing a kitchin which he has objected to Theopompus.*’ This ſeems to me to be the moſt plauſible thing that can be ſaid in Theopompus's vindication; but if I was to chuſe, I ſhould rather ſide with Longinus than with Father Cauſſinus. For the faithfulneſs of an Hiſtorian does not oblige him to give a particular account of all the preſents that have been made to a King. But what is alledged againſt Longinus in the laſt part of Father Cauſſinus's objection ſeems to me a home-thruſt. You cannot, ſays he, find fault with Theopompus, without blaming Homer your great deity. It is certain, that Homer has frequently touched more particularly on the kitchin than Theopompus.

[*D*] *He boldly publiſhed diſadvantageous truths, and was not ſparing of his money when an exact inquiry . . . required great expences.*] See, below, the remark [*H*]. I ſhall content myſelf here with thoſe words of Athenæus: Εἰ τις τούτοις ἀπιστεῖ, μαθέτω καὶ παρὰ Θεοπόμπου τοῦ Χίου, ἀνδρὸς φιλαλήθους καὶ πολλὰ χρήματα καταναλώσαντος εἰς τὴν περὶ τῆς ἱστορίας ἐξέτασιν ἀκριβῆ. His fidem ſi quis non adhibeat, diſcat Theopompum Chium veritatis ſtudioſum hominem, & qui hiſtorias exactâ inquiſitione, magno pecuniarum impendio, perſcrutatus eſt (23). - - - *If any perſon doubts the truth of theſe things, let him learn them alſo from Theopompus the Chian, a perſon who was a great lover of truth, and who ſpent large ſums of money in ſtrict inquiries after it.*

[*E*] *He is blamed for his digreſſions.*] The Sophiſt Theon (24) ſays they were ſo long, that it was impoſſible to read them thorough without forgetting the ſubject from which he digreſſed. It was neceſſary to recollect it, which is an unpleaſant thing to thoſe who read a work of that nature. Photius, in order to ſhew how Theopompus launched into matters foreign to his ſubject, gives us this inſtance. His hiſtory of Philip, King of Macedonia, contained fifty-eight books, which were reduced to ſixteen, by retrenching every thing that had no relation to the actions of that Prince. You will ſee this with ſome circumſtances of it in the following words: Πλείσταις μὲν οὖν παρεκβάσεσι παντοδαπῆς ἱστορίας, τοὺς ἱστορικοὺς αὐτοῦ λόγους Θεόπομπος παρατείνει. διὸ καὶ Φίλιππος ὁ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πολεμήσας, ἐξελὼν ταύτας, καὶ τὰς Φιλίππου συνταξάμενος πράξεις, αἳ σκοπός εἰσι Θεοπόμπῳ εἰς ἑκκαίδεκα βίβλους μόνας: μηδὲν παρ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ προσθεὶς ἢ ἀφελὼν, πλην (ὡς εἴρηται) τῶν παρεκτροπῶν τὰς πάσας ἀπήρτισε. Digreſſionibus itaque variæ hiſtoriæ quàmplurimis, hiſtoricos ſuos implet libros Theopompus. Quamobrem & Philippus, ille qui cum Romanis bellum geſſit, digreſſionibus hiſce ſublatis, & Philippi rebus geſtis, quas Theopompus ſcribendas potiſſimum ſuſceperat, collectis, in ſedecim eas dumtaxat libros (nihil de ſuo addens, aut præter digreſſiones, ut diximus, detrahens) redegit (25). - - - *Theopompus therefore ſpins out his various Hiſtories with numerous digreſſions. For which reaſon Philip, he who waged war with the Romans, pruning off theſe digreſſions, and collecting the actions of Philip of Macedon which Theopompus had principally undertaken to write, reduced the whole into ſixteen books only, adding nothing of his own, nor retrenching any thing, as I ſaid before, but meer digreſſions.* If you attend to the extracts, which the ſame author gives us (26) of the twelfth book of this Hiſtory of Theopompus, you need not be told how much he delighted in digreſſions. You may judge of it very eaſily from this ſmall ſpecimen. For the reſt, if any thing can make us believe, that the Roman name was ſcarce known to the Greeks in Alexander's time, it is the finding that Theopompus ſays nothing of Rome, except, that it had been taken by the Gauls (27). This city would have afforded him matter for a long digreſſion, had it been ever ſo little known at that time.

Perhaps we may juſtly fear, that Photius's account is ſomewhat fallacious. Theopompus began his Hiſtory with the reign of King Philip, and his principal deſign was to relate the actions of that Prince; but perhaps he propoſed at the ſame time to give an account of the moſt remarkable tranſactions in the other parts of the world during that reign. Conſequently in reality, and according to the intention of the author, that work muſt have been an univerſal Hiſtory of that time, and not that of Philip in particular. What was retrenched therefore, when it was reduced to ſixteen books, ought not to be looked upon as digreſſions, properly ſo called. The wars of Cyprus and of Sicily, and of many other places were retrenched, which perhaps he did not mention occaſionally, and by way of digreſſion only, but as an eſſential part of his deſign. It is impoſſible to decide the matter, ſince we have neither his Preface, nor any other part of his work to conſult. However, I believe, that Photius has carried the thing too far; and if I was to complain of Theopompus's digreſſions, I would not inſiſt, as Theon (28) does, upon his relating many things, wherein neither the King of Macedon, nor any of his ſubjects, had any concern. Can it be denied, that the main deſign of Thuanus was to write the Hiſtory of France? And yet how many things does he relate, that have no relation to the French? I ſhould therefore blame Theopompus for putting a wrong title to his work (29): but if he had acquainted his readers that he propoſed likewiſe to give the Hiſtory of other countries, I ſhould not call his account of the wars of Evagoras, and of the tyrants of Syracuſe, a digreſſion. In order to paſs a right judgment upon his Epiſodes, I would not compare them with Philip or Macedon. I would go no further than this: his twelfth book, for inſtance (30), was deſigned for the wars of Cyprus. He there goes back as far as the ſiege of Troy; he ſpeaks of Agamemnon, and Mopſus the ſoothſayer, *&c.* Does what he ſays of them carry me too far from Evagoras King of Cyprus? If it be ſo, I blame him; but I ſee no reaſon for any to complain, that Mopſus and Agamemnon carry them too far from the court of Macedon. I am of opinion, that even this reſtriction would not be ſufficient to juſtify that Hiſtorian. Without doubt, he ran too frequently into Epiſodes, wherein he was apt to nod, and forget himſelf. That fault ought to be a new reaſon for us to lament the loſs of his Hiſtory; for ſince the only deſign of his digreſſions was to explain antiquities, to relate the origin of things, and different traditions, how many curious things

(22) Cauſſin. de Eloquentia Sacra & Humana, *lib. i, cap. xx, pag. m.* 19.

(23) Athen, *lib. iii, cap. viii, pag.* 85. Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 263, *praiſes that author for the pains and charges he was at in collecting materials.*

(24) Theo, in Progymnaſmatis: *I have quoted his words in the remark* [*E*] *of the article* PHILISTUS.

(25) Photius, Bibl. *num.* 176, *pag.* 363.

(26) Id. ibid. *pag.* 390, 391.

(27) Theopompus ante quem nemo mentionem habuit (*de Romanis*) urbem duntaxat à Gallis captam dixit. *Plinius, lib. iii, cap. v, pag. m.* 324.

(28) Theo, in Progymn. *cap. iv, pag.* 44, 45.

(29) *It was intituled,* τὰ Φιλιππικά. Res Philipi.

(30) Photius, Bibl. *num.* 176. *pag.* 391.

the ſubject [*F*]. He is alſo blamed for his many fabulous ſtories, and too long ſpeeches [*G*], and for being too ſatirical [*H*]. He had a moſt terrible trick put upon

ſhould we find in it, that are now unknown to us, and which we could not have been informed of by a conciſe Hiſtory?

[*F*] *He would have been condemned by thoſe critics, who cannot bear any thing in a Hiſtory that is foreign to the ſubject.*] How could Theopompus appear before their tribunal, and expect any favour from them, when they have paſſed ſentence upon Tacitus? They lay down, in the firſt place, theſe rules (31), That in the choice of Memoirs, *an Hiſtorian ought to give himſelf up entirely to truth, and the diſtinguiſhing of facts; that he ought to renounce his own taſte, and to neglect foreign ornaments, which neither contribute to make things clearer, nor to enlarge our knowledge as to matters concealed .... that his narrations ought to be uninterrupted, his computations exact, and his reflections rare and always ſhort; that it* (32) *ought to contain the actions of a Prince, and the alterations that happened in his dominions, during his reign; that foreign digreſſions and ſtudied diſcourſes are improper for it, and ought always to be excluded.* After this they pretend (33), ‘That if ‘Tacitus were examined according to their (34) rules, ‘one would never imagine that he intended to write ‘an Hiſtory: it is eaſy to obſerve with the learned, ‘that he frequently breaks off the thread of his narration without reſuming it, to have the pleaſure of ‘deſcribing a battle, or of making a ſpeech for his ‘hero. The conſciouſneſs of his excellency in this ‘ſort of performances, makes him ſometimes quit ‘his own country (if I may ſo ſay) to make excurſions into a foreign one, purely for the pleaſure of ‘deſcribing its beauties. In which I think he appears ‘more an Orator than any thing elſe, and as if he ‘did not ſo much deſign to write a faithful Hiſtory, ‘as to exerciſe his eloquence on ſubjects which ſeemed to favour it .... (35) I am therefore of opinion, ‘that Tacitus only touched upon Hiſtory occaſionally; ‘and that his ſole deſign ..... was to exerciſe his ‘eloquence in a various manner...... (36) Indeed ‘every thing in Tacitus beſpeaks his own character, ‘and not that of Hiſtory. He relates few events; ‘he makes long and frequent digreſſions, and his ‘careleſſneſs and affectation are too apparent. He ‘acts the part of an Orator who ſeeks to applaud ‘himſelf, and who turns and manages different facts ‘to his own advantage...... (37) Even in their ‘very tents in the middle of a camp and of an army, ‘dying men make ſpeeches with the ſame exactneſs, ‘and preſence of mind, which a perſon in health ‘would be capable of ſhewing if he was to compoſe ‘them (38) in his ſtudy: ſometimes this fondneſs for ‘expatiating is ſo very predominant, that he does ‘not ſtay till a General of an army is at the head ‘of his troops to harangue them, but makes him ‘write orders like a ſchool-maſter, full of antitheſes ‘and rhetorical figures.’

I believe this judgment upon Tacitus will appear unjuſt and extravagant to good judges; and it had been well for Theopompus, if all thoſe, who criticized him, had been like the author of theſe paſſages in the *Anonimiana*. He would have been condemned without mercy, and in a very inſulting manner; but he might have anſwered, that his Judges went upon ſtrained maxims, and he might have come off by ſaying, that all Hiſtorians were involved in the ſame cenſure, as well as he, and that conſequently it was falſe and over-nice.

[*G*] *He is alſo blamed for his many fabulous ſtories, and too long ſpeeches.*] As to the fables, which Theopompus inſerted in his work, I ſhall alledge Cicero's teſtimony. ‘Intelligo te alias in hiſtoria leges ſervan‘das putare, alias in poemate: quippe quum in illa ‘ad veritatem quæque referantur, in hac ad delecta‘tionem pleraque: quamquam & apud Herodotum ‘patrem hiſtoriæ & apud Theopompum ſint innume‘rabiles fabulæ (39). - - - *I know you are of opinion* ‘*that the rules to be obſerved in Hiſtory, are quite diffe*‘*rent from thoſe to be obſerved in Poetry: ſince truth is* ‘*the end of the one, and pleaſure the end of the other:* ‘*altho' both Herodotus, the father of Hiſtory, and Theo*‘*pompus abound in fables.*’ Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus mentions two abſurd tales of that Hiſtorian. ‘Multas ineptias præ ſe fert ex quo genere illa ſunt quæ ‘de Sileno commemorat qui in Macedonia apparuit, ‘& quæ de dracone ad triremum pugna navali con‘tendente & alia nonnulla iis ſimilia (40). - - - *He is* ‘*full of idle ſtories, of which kind are his accounts of* ‘*Silenus's apparition in Macedonia, and of the dragon's* ‘*engaging in a ſea fight, and ſome others of the like* ‘*ſtamp.*’ I cannot tell whether what is ſaid of Silenus's apparition, is the ſame thing with the dialogue of Silenus and Midas. It is to be found in Ælian (41), as taken from Theopompus. This is an adventure, which appears ſo fabulous to Ælian, that he concludes the recital of it with theſe words: Καὶ ταῦτα εἴ τῳ πιστὸς ὁ Χῖος λέγων, πεπιστεύσθω. ἐμοὶ δὲ δεινὸς εἶναι δοκεῖ μυθολόγος, καὶ ἐν τούτοις, καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δέ. Hæc, ſi cui fide dignus videtur Chius, (*i. e.* Theopompus) credat. Mihi egregius fabulator tum in his, tum in aliis videtur (42). - - - *And theſe may meet with credit among ſuch as can truſt the veracity of the Chian (that is, Theopompus) who relates them. But to me he appears, both in theſe and other things, moſt notoriouſly fabulous.* It may be doubted whether Dionyſius had that dialogue in his view, for he ſpeaks only of the fables inſerted in Theopompus's Hiſtory, and Servius informs us, that Theopompus had related that ſtory in a book intituled, *Thaumaſia, Wonderful things* (43). But this doubt is not very ſtrongly founded; ſince that Hiſtorian might have repeated in his Hiſtory what he had ſaid in another book, or might have adorned his *Thaumaſia* with ſome pieces of his Hiſtory.

Note, we ought not to reckon among Theopompus's fables his Geographical miſtakes, or the falſities grounded upon ſome relations, which it was difficult for him to rectify (44): in this laſt claſs ought to be placed, the falſities vented by him concerning the Egyptians (45).

Here is a touch upon the length of his harangues: ‘But as for thoſe long ſpeeches, and tedious ha‘rangues, which Theopompus, Ephorus, and Anaxi‘menes, put into the mouths of their Captains, at ‘the head of their ſoldiers juſt ready to engage, we ‘may ſay of them with the Poet,

They're fools who thus the tongue employ,
So very near the enemy (46).

[*H*] *He is alſo blamed .... for being too ſatirical.*] Voſſius (47) quotes three authorities for it, that of Cornelius Nepos (48), Lucian, and Joſephus. The latter obſerves, that Theopompus defamed the Athenians (49). The words of the ſecond deſerve to be ſet down. He ſays, that the Hiſtorians, who inſert ſpeeches in their Hiſtories, ought to be ſparing of their praiſes and cenſures, and to remember that they are not at the bar; or otherwiſe that they will be guilty of Theopompus's fault: Τὴν αὐτὴν Θεοπόμπῳ αἰτίαν ἕξεις, φιλαπεχθημόνως κατηγοροῦντι τῶν πλείστων, καὶ διατριβὴν ποιουμένῳ τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὡς κατηγορεῖν μᾶλλον, ἢ ἱστορεῖν τὰ πεπραγμένα. Alioqui in eadem eris culpa qua Theopompus, qui plurimos odioſè nimis accuſat, & eam rem in ſtudium quoddam vertit, ut accuſet magis, quam res geſtas hiſtoriæ tradat (50). - - - - *You will commit the ſame fault with Theopompus, who was too ſatirical on ſeveral, and made it his buſineſs rather to write ſatire than Hiſtory.* Voſſius to theſe three might alſo have added the authority of Plutarch, who ſays, that Theopompus is more to be credited when he praiſes than when he cenſures. Ὧ μᾶλλον ἐπαινοῦντι πιστεύσειεν ἄν τις, ἢ ψέγοντι. *Cui celebranti credas magis quam obterenti* (51). Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus takes Theopompus's part on this head: he compares him with Phyſicians, who lance and cauterize the infected parts to the quick, but without hurting thoſe that are ſound. ‘Proinde etiam obtrectator videtur eſſe, dum ‘nonnullos debitis convitiis afficit, & facta virorum ‘illuſtrium non neceſſaria perſtringit: ſimile quiddam ‘faciens ac medici, qui corruptas corporis partes ſe‘cant & urunt, quam profundiſſime cauteria & ſectio‘nes immittentes, non tamen ſanas corporis partes & ‘bene affectas attingunt (52). - - - *He alſo ſeems given* ‘*to ſcandal, while he loads ſome with deſerved re*‘*proaches, and ſpares not the ſlips of the greateſt per*‘*ſons:*

(31) Anonimiana, *pag.* 13.

(32) This *it* relates to the word *hiſtory*, which is not to be found nearer than 5 or 6 periods before. This ſhews a great negligence of the rules of Grammar.

(33) Ibid. *pag.* 14, 15.

(34) It ſhould have been ſaid *theſe*.

(35) Anonimiana, *pag.* 22.

(36) Ibid. *p.* 23.

(37) Ibid. *p.* 24.

(38) There is here a ſoleciſm in the French original.

(39) Cicero, de Legibus, *lib. i, circa init. fol. m.* 328, *C.*

(40) Dionyſ. Halicarn. ubi ſupra, *in fine, pag. m.* 264.

(41) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib. iii, cap. xviii, pag. m.* 200. *See* Caſaubon *upon* Strabo, *lib. vii, pag. m.* 112.

(42) Id. ibid.

(43) Servius in Virgil. Eclog. VI, *ver.* 13, & 26.

(44) *See* Strabo, *lib. vii, p.* 219.

(45) *See* Diodorus Siculus, *lib. i, cap. xxxvii.*

(46) Plutarch. in Præceptis Reip. gerendæ, *p.* 803. *Amyot's tranſlation.*

(47) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Græc. *pag.* 33.

(48) Theopompus . . . & Timæus qui quidem duo maledicentiſſimi neſcio quo modo in illo uno laudando (*Alcibiade*) conſenſerunt. *Cornel. Nepos, in Alcibiade, cap. xi.*

(49) Joſephus, *lib. i*, contra Apionem.

(50) Lucianus, veræ Hiſtoriæ, *lib. i, pag. m.* 705, *Tom. i.*

(51) Plut. in Lyſandro, *ſub fin. pag.* 450, *E.*

(52) Dion. Halicarn. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 264.

upon him which was by publiſhing in his name, and in a ſtyle altogether like his, a Hiſtory which reflected upon the moſt conſiderable republics of Greece [*I*]. We have none of his books remaining, which is a great loſs [*K*]; for the character which a great Critic gives of them *(f)*, is ſufficient to make us lament the loſs of them. He ſays, that Theopompus inquired into the ſecret cauſes of actions, and into the tempers and motives of thoſe who performed them; that he was very lucky in his conjecture *(g)*, and unmaſked thoſe who concealed real vices under the appearance of virtues *(h)*: ſo that his Hiſtory was a tribunal where every man's conduct was examined with all the exactneſs aſcribed by the Poets to the infernal judges. I omit the other high encomiums beſtowed upon him by this great Critic. You will ſee in the remark [*C*], what judgment the Critics have paſſed on Theopompus's ſtyle. What has been quoted out of his works by Athenæus is enough to make the loſs of them regretted. It has been obſerved, that there were certain things no where to be found but in that author *(i)*. All that I can ſay concerning his life is only this. He fled from Chio with his father, who was convicted of favouring the intereſts of the Lacedemonians *(k)*. He was re-eſtabliſhed in his country after the death of his father, by virtue of a letter, which Alexander wrote to procure his

(f) Dionyſ. Halicarn. Epiſt. ad Pompeium, *pag.* 263, 264. *See alſo pag.* 191.

(g) Idem, *pag.* 191.

(h) Idem, *pag.* 263.

(i) Plutarch. in Ageſilao, *pag.* 614, *C.*

(k) Photius, in Biblioth. *num.* 176.

‘ *ſons: imitating in ſome meaſure the practice of Phyſicians, who uſe inciſions and cauteries on the corrupted parts of the body, and extend them to very great depths, but yet do no injury to thoſe parts of the body that are ſound and in right order.* Note, that the ſlanders of Theopompus did not ſpare the divine Plato (53): this is not to be wondered at, ſince they fell ſo ſeverely upon the perſon of Philip of Macedon. The deſcription he gave of the court of that Prince, contains more abominations (54) than were aſcribed to that of Henry III, King of France, by the anonymous writers of libels. Some will alſo have it, that after he had very much praiſed Alexander the Great, he recanted by ſome writings. ‘ Pulſus è patria quum ſupplex in Dianæ Epheſiæ templum confugiſſet multa contra Chios ſcripſit ad Alexandrum in quibus illum laudavit: ſed poſtea παλινῳδίαν cecinit. Nam dicitur in eundem poſtea ſcripſiſſe quamvis quod ſcripſit in manus hominum non videatur veniſſe (55). - - - *Being baniſhed his country, and flying for refuge into the temple of Diana at Epheſus, he wrote to Alexander, condemning the Chians, and commending him: but he afterwards recanted. For he is ſaid afterwards to have written againſt him, tho' that piece does not ſeem to have been made public.*' The ſharp ſtile of Theopompus is not ill deſcribed in the following words of Cicero: ‘ ἀνέκδοτα quæ tibi uni legantur, Theopompino genere aut etiam aſperiore multo pangentur (56). - - - - *The ſecret Hiſtory that would pleaſe you only, ſhould be written in Theopompus's ſtile, or even in a ſharper.*' That writer began to ſet up for a Critic in the very Preface of his Hiſtory, for he there cenſured the other Hiſtorians (57).

If what I have read in an Epiſtle Dedicatory be true, namely, that King Philip was very liberal to Theopompus, it muſt be acknowledged that he made an ill application of his money. ‘ Celebratur multorum literis ac libris principum quorundam benignitas in viros literatos, ut Dionyſii in Platonem, Philippi in Theopompum, Alexandri in Ariſtotelem, Severi in Oppianum (58). - - - *A great many authors take notice of the liberality of Princes to learned men, as of Dionyſius to Plato, of Philip to Theopompus, of Alexander to Ariſtotle, and of Severus to Oppian.*' I ſhould eaſily believe, that Philip made ſome preſents to Theopompus; for it is certain, Theopompus compoſed a Panegyric upon that King; and that, among other praiſes, he beſtowed this upon him, *That monarch needs only go on as he has begun, to make himſelf maſter of all Europe.* Καὶ ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν τῷ Φιλίππου ἐγκωμίῳ. ὅτι εἰ βουληθείη Φίλιππος τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἐμμεῖναι, καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης πάσης βασιλεύσει. *Et quemadmodum in Philippi Laudatione Theopompus, Philippum, ſi pergere, ut inſtituiſſet, ſuique eſſe ſimilis vellet, totius Europæ imperio mox potiturum* (59). Theon, from whom I borrow thoſe words, ſays in another place (60), that Theopompus's Panegyrics upon Philip and Alexander were ſtill extant. Thoſe two pieces without doubt made no part of his Hiſtory, but were written by him in the capacity of an Orator; and though he had been rewarded for them, he changed his note in his Hiſtory, and ſpoke ill of the ſame Prince, whom he had ſo much commended. The ſcenes varied: the Orator had acted his part; the Hiſtorian ſucceeded him and maintained his character. We ought not to imagine, that the diſcourſes of a Panegyriſt ſhould influence either his converſation, or the moral and hiſtorical books he writes. This diſtinction may be obſerved even at this day. One who on a ſolemn day, as for inſtance, when prizes are diſtributed, beſtows noble and magnificent encomiums, will not ſpare his cenſures ſitting by the fire-ſide; and even though he enjoys ſtill his penſion, he will ſay many unacceptable things, if he turns Hiſtorian. I do not ſay that every body acts in this manner. There are but too many, who prove as great flatterers under the character of an Hiſtorian, as under that of an Orator. But Theopompus and ſome others were not of this ſtamp.

(53) Id. ibid. pag. 252. Athen. *lib. xi, ſub fin. pag.* 508.

(54) *See* Athenæus, *lib. vi, pag.* 260.

(55) Corradus, in Brutum Ciceronis, *pag.* 120.

(56) Cicero, Epiſt. VI, *lib. ii,* ad Atticum, *pag. m.* 209.

(57) Dionyſ. Halicarn. *in Præfat.* Hiſt.

(58) Franciſc. Duarenus, *Epiſt. ad Margaritam Valeſiam Henrici II ſororem præfixa* Commentario in Tit. ſoluto matrimonio.

(59) Theo, in Progymn. *cap. viii, pag.* 103.

(60) Theo, ibid. *cap. ii, pag.* 19.

[*I*] *He had a moſt terrible trick put upon him, which was by publiſhing in his name, and in a ſtile . . . . . a Hiſtory, which reflected upon the moſt conſiderable republics of Greece.*] Anaximenes, his enemy, put that trick upon him. It is related by Pauſanias, who, if I am not miſtaken, is the only author that mentions it. Theſe are his words: Φαίνεται δὲ καὶ ἄνδρα ὁ Ἀναξιμένης ἐχθρὸν οὐκ ἀμαθέστατα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιφθονώτατα ἀμυνάμενος· Ἐπεφύκει μὲν αὐτὸς σοφιστὴς, καὶ σοφιστῶν λόγους μιμεῖσθαι. ὡς δέ οἱ διαφορὰ ἐς Θεόπομπον ἐγεγόνει τὸν Δαμασιστράτου, γράφει βιβλίον ἐς Ἀθηναίους, καὶ ἐπὶ Λακεδαιμονίους ὁμοῦ καὶ Θηβαίους συγγραφὴν λοίδορον. ὡς δὲ ἦν ἐς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον αὐτῷ μεμιμημένα, ἐπιγράψας τοῦ Θεοπόμπου τὸ ὄνομα τῷ βιβλίῳ, διέπεμπεν ἐς τὰς πόλεις. καὶ αὐτός τε συγγεγραφὼς ἦν, καὶ τὸ ἔχθος τὸ ἐς Θεόπομπον ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐπηύξετο. Idem etiam Anaximenes inimicum ſuum non minus vafre quam invidioſe ultus dicitur. Nam qui ingenio ſophiſta eſſet, quum ſophiſtarum orationem aptiſſime imitaretur, ſuſcepta cum Theopompo Damaſiſtrati filio ſimultate, hiſtoriam conſcripſit maledictorum in Athenienſes, Lacedæmonios, & Thebanos pleniſſimam. Ad unguem vero quum Theopompi ſtylum expreſſiſſet, ſuppoſito ejus nomine, per Græciæ civitates librum divulgandum curavit: quæ res Theopompo magnam apud omnes plane Græcos invidiam concitavit (61). - - - *But Anaximenes appears to have revenged himſelf on his enemy, not only very dextrouſly, but alſo very invidiouſly. For he was both a Sophiſt himſelf, and an excellent imitator of others. So that having a difference with Theopompus, the ſon of Damaſiſtratus, he wrote a book which was a ſevere libel upon the Athenians, the Lacedemonians, and the Thebans. And as he had imitated the ſtile of Theopompus to the greateſt exactneſs, he put Theopompus's name to it, and diſperſed it through thoſe cities. By this contrivance he raiſed a great reſentment againſt Theopompus throughout all Greece.*

[*K*] *We have none of his books remaining which is a great loſs.*] He publiſhed a great number of Orations (62), and ſeveral letters (63). He wrote one to Alexander (64), and another to the inhabitants of Chio (65), which are quoted by Athenæus. He alſo wrote ſome advices to that Prince (66). His treatiſe περὶ τῶν συληθέντων ἐκ Δελφῶν χρημάτων: *de rebus quæ ſacrilegio ex Delphis ſurreptæ ſunt* (67); and that κατὰ τῆς Πλάτωνος διατριβῆς: *de exercitationibus Platonis* (68), are quoted by the ſame author. His diſſertation περὶ εὐσεβείας, *de Pietate*, is quoted by the ſcholiaſt upon Ariſtophanes (69). Others cite his θαυμάσια, *admiranda* (70); but he acquired his reputation principally by two Hiſtories. One was that of

(61) Pauſan. *lib. vi, pag.* 496, *Edit.* 1696.

(62) Photius, in Biblioth. *num.* 170, *pag.* 392.

(63) Dionyſ. Halicarn. Epiſt. ad Pompeium, *in fine.*

(64) Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 595.

(65) Id. ibid. *pag.* 586.

(66) Idem, *lib. iii, pag.* 230.

(67) Id. *lib. xiii, pag.* 604.

(68) Id. *lib. xi, pag.* 508.

(69) Schol. Ariſt. in Aves.

(70) Apolloſſius, Hiſt. commentit. *cap. x.* Laërtius, in Epimenide & Pherecyde. Servius, ubi ſupra.

his return: he was then forty-ſix years of age. He found himſelf obliged, after the death of Alexander, to wander up and down like a fugitive; and going into Egypt, he not only found no refuge there, but would have loſt his life had not his friends interceeded for him with King Ptolemy, who deſigned to put him to death, under pretence of his being a perſon of too meddleſome a temper (*l*). He was (*m*) an eye-witneſs of ſeveral events related by him, and he inſinuated himſelf into the favour of many perſons, who were Generals of armies, or miniſters of ſtate: he procured this acceſs as a thing of great importance to the perfection of his work. He had ſome diſputes with his countryman Theocritus about the government of the town (*n*). I do not find that he deſerved the title of a Peripatetic Philoſopher which Grotius has beſtowed upon him [*L*]. I ſhall ſay nothing of the puniſhment mentioned by Ariſteus: Moreri ſpeaks ſufficiently of it. I ſhall conclude by obſerving that Theopompus was accuſed of being a plagiary [*M*].

of Greece (71) in twelve books, containing the tranſactions of ſeventeen years, beginning where Thucydides left off. It ended with the ſea-fight at Cnidus. The other was intituled Φιλιππικὰ, becauſe it was deſigned to record the reign of Philip King of Macedon. It contained fifty-eight books, whereof the ſixth, ſeventh, ninth, twentieth and thirtieth, had been loſt for a long time (72), when Photius read the reſt. He gives us ſome extracts of the twelfth, though Menophauts, an antient author, thought it was loſt. Diodorus Siculus (73), and the anonymous author, who deſcribed the Olympiads, mention the loſs of five books of Theopompus. It would be in vain to alledge againſt them, that the fifty-fifth and fifty-ſeventh books are quoted by Stephanus Byzantinus, and the fifty ſixth by Athenæus. Thoſe who raiſe this objection, would not urge it, if they knew what Photius obſerves, that almoſt all the five books, then loſt, were nearer the beginning than the end of the work (74).

Voſſius is miſtaken when he ſays, that Harpocration quotes a letter of Theopompus to Tiſamenes (75). This is not true: Harpocration quotes a dramatic piece written by Theopompus, the comic Poet, and intituled *Tiſamenes* (76).

[*L*] *The title of a peripatetic Philoſopher, beſtowed upon him by Grotius.*] The reſurrection of a dead body, ſays he, ought not to be accounted an impoſſible thing, ſince ſome learned men, Zoroaſter among the Chaldeans, and almoſt all the Stoics, and Theopompus among the Peripatetics, believed the poſſibility of it, and that it would actually happen. Conſult his text in the ſecond book of his treatiſe *de Veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ* (77). This is his note concerning Theopompus (78): *De quo Diogenes Laërtius initio libri* (79). Καὶ Θεόπομπος ἐν τῇ ὀγδοῇ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν ὃς καὶ ἀναβιώσεσθαι κατὰ τοὺς μάγους φησὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἔσεσθαι ἀθανάτους, καὶ τὰ ὄντα ταῖς αὐταῖς διακλήσεσι διαμενεῖν. Theopompus verò etiam octavo Philippicorum, qui revicturos homines ex magorum ſententia tradit, immortaleſque futuros, & omnia in ſuis iiſdem ſemper manſura nominibus. - - - *And Theopompus in the eighth book of his Philippics, who ſays that, according to the Magi, men are to riſe again, and become immortal, and that all Beings are to remain perpetually under the ſame denominations.* He ſpeaks here of Theopompus the Hiſtorian, who makes the ſubject of this article. Now I do not remember ever to have read, that he was placed in the number of Philoſophers; and I think he was too proud to become the diſciple of Ariſtotle at an age ſo far advanced. But even though this fault of Grotius could be excuſed, he would be liable to juſt cenſure upon another account. For what he quotes out of Diogenes Laërtius proves only that Theopompus mentioned in his Hiſtory the opinion of the Magi, concerning the reſurrection. Let us ſuppoſe Theopompus to have been a very illuſtrious Peripatetic, will it follow from his paſſage, alledged by Diogenes Laërtius, that a famous diſciple of the great Ariſtotle believed, that men would riſe again? Do Hiſtorians believe whatever they relate? If Mr de Cordemoi, who was a Carteſian, had inſerted in his Hiſtory of France a doctrine of the antient Druids, might it be concluded from thence, that this doctrine was believed among the Carteſians? This is certainly a very weak paſſage in the learned commentary, which Grotius added to his excellent book concerning the truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

[*M*] *Theopompus was accuſed of being a Plagiary.*] It is pretended (80), that he inſerted word for word in the eleventh book of his Φιλιππικὰ, a long paſſage out of an oration of Iſocrates; that upon other occaſions, in order to hide his robberies, he changed the ſcene and the names of the perſons; that, for inſtance, he related, that Pherecydes having drunk of the water of a well in a town of Syria, foretold an earthquake which happened three days after; and that he took that courſe becauſe he was ſenſible, that if he had mentioned that earthquake, as a thing foretold by Pythagoras, in the town of Metapontum, his Plagiariſm muſt have been diſcovered, and his readers would have known that he had it from a book of Andron (81). It is added, that he ſtole ſeveral things from Xenophon, and ſpoiled them: for reſolving to inſert in the eleventh book of his Hiſtory of Greece the conference of Pharnabazus and Ageſilaus, which Xenophon had ſo well deſcribed, he deprived it of its beauty. He would not uſe the words of the author he ſtole it from, for two reaſons, the one was with a view to conceal his theft, the other out of a deſire to ſhew how well he could flouriſh upon ſo fine a ſubject; but he came off wretchedly: his narration was languid, and remarkable only for its heavineſs and dullneſs, whereas that of Xenophon was full of vivacity. Τὰ γοῦν περὶ τῆς Φαρναβάζου πρὸς Ἀγησίλαον συνόδου ..... εἰς τὴς ἐνδεκάτην τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν μεταθεὶς ὁ Θεόπομπος, ἀργά τε καὶ ἀκίνητα πεποίηκε καὶ ἄπρακτα. λόγου γὰρ δύναμιν, καὶ διὰ τὴν κλοπὴν, ἐξεργασίαν ἐμβάλλειν, καὶ ἐπιδείκνυσθαι σπουδάζων, βραδὺς καὶ μέλλων, καὶ ἀναβαλλομένῳ ἐοικὼς φαίνεται, καὶ τὸ ἔμψυχον καὶ ἐνεργὸν τὸ Ξενοφῶντος διαφθείρων: *Nam illum ſane Pharnabazi cum Ageſilao congreſſum .... in Græcarum hiſtoriarum undecimum tranſtulit Theopompus: verum ita quidem, ut omnia ſine vi, ſine motu, habere prorſus ac jacere videantur. Dum enim is, ut plagium diſſimulet, dicendi facultatem oſtentare geſtit, & elaboratæ dictionis cultum aſſuere, tardus, cunctabundus, ac procraſtinanti ſimilis videtur, adeoque vivam illam ac ſpirantem Xenophontis efficacitatem elidit* (82). Laſtly, we are told (83) of a book intituled Ἰχνευταί, *Indagatores*, that is the *Inquiſitors*, which contained many ſuch things concerning Theopompus.

We muſt obſerve, by the by, that if Theopompus falſified what he ſtole from Andron, it affords us an example of what is ſaid, that falſhood makes a greater progreſs than truth. Many grave writers aſcribe the prediction to Pherecydes (84).

We muſt not forget, that Porphyrius accuſes him alſo of preferring himſelf to Iſocrates, and of boaſting that he had got the better of him in a trial of eloquence upon Mauſolus's tomb. Καίτοι ὑπερφρονεῖ τὸν Ισοκράτην καὶ νενικῆσθαι ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ λέγει, καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ Μαυσωλῷ ἀγῶνα, τὸν διδάσκαλον. Iſocratem interea deſpicit, eoque certamine, quod in Mauſoli honorem inſtitutum eſt, victum abs ſeſe Magiſtrum gloriatur (85). - - - *And he deſpiſed Iſocrates, and boaſted that he had conquered his maſter at his own weapons at the tomb of Mauſolus.* Photius ought to have mentioned this particular among thoſe of the ſame nature related by him. I cannot tell why he has omitted it. He ſays, Theopompus himſelf declares, that Iſocrates, Theodectus, Naucrates, and himſelf, were at that time the four greateſt Orators in Greece (86), that Iſocrates and Theodectus being poor, compoſed Orations for money, and kept ſchool for a livelihood, but that he and Naucrates, having wherewithal to live handſomely, ſpent all their leiſure time in ſtudy. Note, that the tranſlator does not well expreſs the ſenſe of theſe words: καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἂν εἴη αὐτῷ παράλογον, ἀντιποιουμένῳ τῶν πρωτείων (87). He pretends the meaning of it is, *It ought not to be thought ſtrange that I ſhould place*

myſelf

(*l*) Ὡς πολυπράγμονα ἀνελεῖν ἐθελῆσαι. Velut nimis curioſum de medio tollere voluiſſe. *Id. ibid.*

(*m*) Dionyſ. Halicarn. Epiſt. ad Pompeium, *pag.* 263.

(*n*) Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag.* 444. *See alſo* Athenæus, *book vi, pag.* 230.

(71) Anonym. in Deſcript. Olymp *apud* Voſſium, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 32.

(72) Photius, Bibl. *num.* 176, *pag.* 389.

(73) Diodorus Siculus, *lib. xvi, cap. iii.*

(74) Jonſius, de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ. *pag.* 46, *raiſes it.*

(75) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Grecis, *pag.* 31.

(76) See Mauſſac's Notes upon Harpocration, *voce* Καταλήξ.

(77) Pag. m. 64, 65.

(78) Hugo Grotius, in Annotatis *ad Librum II*, de Veritate Relig. Chriſt. *pag. m.* 381.

(79) It is at pag. 7, of the Amſterdam edition, 1692.

(80) Porphyrius, *lib. i*, τῆς Φιλολογίας ἀκροάσεως de erudito auditu, *apud* Euſebium, Præpar. Evangel. *lib. x, cap. iii, pag. m.* 464.

(81) Who collected Pythagoras's predictions in a book intituled *Tripos. Id. ibid.*

(82) Porphyrius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 465.

(83) Id. ibid. *pag.* 467.

(84) Cicero, *lib. i, ii*, de Divinat. Plinius, *lib. ii, cap. lxxix.* Apollonius Hiſt. memor. *lib. v.* Diogen. Laërt. *lib. i, num.* 116.

(85) Porphyrius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 464.

(86) Τούτους ἅμα αὐτῷ τὰ πρωτεῖα τῆς ἐν λόγοις παιδείας ἔχειν ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. Hos ſecum in dicendi facultate principatum in Græcia tenuiſſe. *Photius Bibl. num.* 176, *pag.* 392.

(87) Id. ibid.

myſelf in the firſt rank (88). Theopompus was not ſo proud; he only ſays, that he may reckon himſelf among the firſt without being guilty of raſhneſs. This is a ſufficient piece of vanity, and needs not be increaſed by an unfaithful tranſlation.

(88) Neque vero temere ſe aut præter rationem primas ſibi vindicare.

THERON (VITAL) a French Jeſuit, was born at Limoux in Languedoc in the year 1572. He turned Jeſuit in 1587. He taught Rhetoric, Philoſophy, and Moral Divinity, and profeſſed the fourth vow. He applied himſelf to preaching for the ſpace of fifty years and this he did in the moſt conſiderable towns of France. He was rector of the college of Montauban, and provincial of the province of Toulouſe (*a*). He publiſhed at ſeveral times a great many Latin verſes, that were very much eſteemed, and continued theſe compoſitions even in his old age, when it did not appear that his poetical vein was in the leaſt impaired. Balzac commended him mightily for it [*A*]. He was miſtaken as to the age he aſcribed to him [*B*]. This Jeſuit died at Toulouſe the twenty-fifth of February 1657 (*b*).

The Chevalier Theron, his nephew, captain in the regiment of Lanoy, and ſon of a counſellor in the parliament of Toulouſe (*c*), is a good French Poet. In the *Mercure Galant* (*d*) may be ſeen a ſmall poem of his compoſing.

(*a*) *Taken from* Sotuel, in Bibl. Scriptor. Societatis Jeſu, *pag.* 784.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Merc. Galant, *January* 1703, *pag.* 112.

(*d*) Ibid.

[*A*] *When it did not appear that his poetical vein was in the leaſt impaired. Balzac commended him mightily for it.*] Here follow ſome thoughts of Balzac: they are taken from a letter written by him to Father Theron, the fourth of March 1643. *The winters of Naples, full of light, and crowned with roſes, give me a lively image* of your old age. *That of Maſſiniſſa was not ſo briſk and vigorous; and the child he got at fourſcore years of age was not a production comparable to the Poem you have compoſed at ſeventy-five. This ſhews, that the fire which deſcends from Heaven, by way of Inſpiration, is not extinguiſhed by the abatement of natural heat. And if art has attained the invention of inextinguiſhable lamps, the Maſter of Art may no doubt preſerve in its full force the luminous part of our mind, and continue the ardour and vivacity of its flights. . . . . . I find myſelf obliged to contradict a wrong ſaying, which I advanced formerly as an eternal truth,* That there is no ſuch thing as a fine old age. *I beg pardon for this raſh ſaying. I was not then acquainted with your Muſe, which gives the lie to my propoſition, and demoliſhes a proverb I expected to have made current. The old age of your Muſe is not the decay, but the confirmation of her beauty. . . . . . Had I the courage of the authors of your country, I ſhould ſay a great deal more upon it: I would ſay, at leaſt, of this admirable old lady, that, at the age of Hecuba, ſhe has as many lovers as Helena had in the flower of her youth. I could name an infinite number, who burn in Paris, and ſigh on this ſide of the Loire* (1). In order to give ſome weight to thoſe encomiums, I muſt obſerve, that Balzac praiſed Father Theron very much in the letters he addreſſed to his other correſpondents. This is what he wrote to his friend Chapelain. ‘ Since you have ‘ the curioſity to know the character of Father Theron, whom I thought you had known much better ‘ than I do, I muſt tell you that he is a Poet above ‘ ſeventy-five years old. Soon after the King's birth ‘ he made two Poems in ſhort verſes, which I take ‘ to be Glyconick; and the late King, on the favourable character he had received of them, ordered ‘ Motin to tranſlate them. They are intituled, *The* ‘ *Crowns, and the Dauphins*, and have been printed ‘ at Paris in Latin and French. They are two valuable pieces, and I am ſure you will be pleaſed with ‘ them. I have ſeen ſome other things of his, wherein I have obſerved an excellent genius; but I know ‘ at the ſame time that he is lazy, and cares the leaſt ‘ of any man alive to employ his talent (2).’ Mr Baillet does not ſo much as mention this Poet.

[*B*] *Balzac . . . . . was miſtaken as to the age he aſcribed to him.*] We have juſt now ſeen, that he ſaid on the 15th of February 1641, that Father Theron was then above ſeventy-five years old. At this rate that Jeſuit muſt have been born in 1566. But this is falſe; for Alegambe and Southwell make him but fifteen years of age when he was admitted among the Jeſuits in the year 1587. Such miſtakes are commonly diſobliging; for few people like to be accounted older than they are. I do not except even thoſe who do not intend to marry. I know very well that ſome old men, who, as it was ſaid of the firſt Duke d'Epernon, have paſſed the age of dying, are as willing to make themſelves five or ſix years older than they are, as they were formerly deſirous to make themſelves younger by ſo many years. Vanity finds its account in this, ſince it is a more wonderful thing that a man of ninety or a hundred years ſhould ſtill have ſome vigour, than if he enjoyed his health pretty well at eighty or eighty-five years of age. Other old men are well pleaſed with a right computation; they are afraid that a wrong reckoning, which brings them nearer than it ought to the end of their race, will make them leſs reſpected. However it be, Balzac's miſreckoning was of another nature: it was not diſobliging, but rather in compliment to Father Theron; a preſent of ſix years inſpired a greater admiration of his Poetry; the older he was thought to be, the more he was admired for the ſprightlineſs of his verſes. However I am of opinion Balzac ſpoke as he thought.

(1) Balzac, Lettres Choiſies, *Part. ii, book. i, Letter xvii, pag. m.* 313.

(2) *Idem*, Lettres à Chapelain, *book vi, Letter v, p. m.* 283, 284. *It is dated the 15th of February* 1641.

THESMOPHORIA. So they called the feſtivals celebrated in honour of Ceres, conſidered as a Law-giver [*A*]; for there were other feſtivals conſecrated to her, as

[*A*] *Ceres conſidered as a Law-giver.*] According to the opinion of the Antients, mankind was indebted to this goddeſs for two great benefactions. She taught them ſowing and reaping, and gave them laws.

Prima Ceres unco glebam dimovit aratro:
Prima dedit fruges, alimentaque mitia terris:
Prima dedit leges. Cereris ſumus omnia munus (1).

Firſt Ceres taught the lab'ring hind to plow
The pregnant earth, and quickning ſeed to ſow.
She firſt for man did wholſome food provide,
And with juſt laws the wicked world ſupply'd:
All good from her deriv'd. . . . .

Conſult the commentators on the words of Virgil; *Mactant lectas de more bidentes Legiferæ Cereri* (2). It is therefore very probable that two ſorts of feaſts were dedicated to her, and that the Theſmophoria were principally inſtituted with regard to her character of Law-giver (3). The word itſelf lead us to this opinion; for, according to Heſychius, ϑεσμὸς ſignifies a divine law, νόμος ϑεῖος. ‘ Sacra ipſius *Theſmophoria*, ‘ id eſt, legum latio vocatur. - - - - *Her feaſt Theſmo-* ‘ *phoria, ſo called from her giving of laws.*’ Theſe are the words of Servius on the mentioned paſſage of Virgil; but this did not hinder the practice of ſome ceremonies relating to her character of inventreſs of reaping. Pauſanias (4), and one of Gruterus's inſcriptions (5) teſtify, thatone of her epithets was ϑεσμοφόρος. For the reſt, the following paſſage may ſerve as a proof of what is advanced in the text of this article; that the ſacred books were carried by virgins of unſpotted reputation

(1) Ovid. Metam. lib. v, Fab. vi, ver. 341.

(2) Virgil, Æn. lib. iv, ver. 58.

(3) *See* Caſtellanus de Feſtis Græcor. *p.* 168.

(4) Pauſan. *lib. x, pag.* 352.

(5) Gruteri, Inſcript. *pag.* 309.

as inventreſs of the products of the earth. The men were not allowed to be preſent at the Theſmophoria; and only women of the better rank, who are free, were admitted to celebrate them (*a*). They went in a proceſſion at Eleuſis, cauſing the ſacred books to be publickly carried by virgins of unſpotted reputation (*b*). This feaſt laſted three or four days, ſome ſay it continued nine, the women were not permitted to lie with their huſbands till it was over. It is pretended, that to render this abſtinence the more ſupportable, they lay upon certain leaves which had a refrigerating virtue [*B*]. But it is very ſtrange,

tation. Πάρθενοι γυναῖκες, καὶ τὸν βίον σεμναὶ, κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τελετῆς, τὰς νομίμους βίϐλους καὶ ἱερὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν κορυφῶν αὐτῶν ἀνετίθεσαν καὶ ὡσανεὶ λιτανεύουσαι ἐπήρχοντο εἰς Ἐλευσῖνα. Virgines mulieres, vitæque honeſtæ; quæ per ſolennitatis diem legales libros & ſacros vertice geſtantes, tanquam ſupplicantes Eleuſinem contendebant (6). - - - *Virgins of an upright life, during the ceremonies, carried the ſacred books of laws upon their head, and came to Ceres in a praying poſture.*

[*B*] *To render this abſtinence the more ſupportable* (7) . . . . *they lay upon certain leaves which had a refrigerating virtue.*] Ovid is ſilent as to this, and only mentions the cuſtom of their ſeparation from their huſbands.

Feſta piæ Cereris celebrabant annua matres
Illa, quibus nivea velatæ corpora veſte
Primitias frugum dant ſpicea ſerta ſuarum:
Perque novem noctes Venerem tactuſque viriles
In vetitis numerant (8).

To Ceres now drew nigh the annual feaſt,
At which the matrons in white ſtoles were dreſs'd.
Twiſted in wreaths, the bring they yellow grain,
The firſt ripe products of the grateful plain;
And nine forbidden nights from nuptial joys abſtain.

I am not at all ſurpriſed at his omiſſion of this circumſtance, becauſe it was no way pertinent to his deſign. His ſilence here therefore is of no conſequence. Of all the ſeveral authors I could alledge, I ſhall inſtance only Pliny and the Scholiaſt on Theocritus. 'Græci 'lygon vocant, alii agnon, quoniam matronæ Theſ'mophoriis Athenienſium caſtitatem cuſtodientes, his 'foliis cubitus ſibi ſternunt (9). - - - *The Greeks call it* '*Lygos, others Agnos, becauſe the matrons, in the* '*Athenian feſtival, called* Theſmophoria, *in order to* '*preſerve themſelves chaſte, uſe to lie upon thoſe leaves.*' Theſe are the words of Pliny, ſpeaking of the *vitex*, which our Botaniſts call *Agnus Caſtus*. Where, note, by the way, that they have changed an epithet into a proper name. The Greeks pretended, that thoſe who eat or drank this plant, or laid it under them in their beds, would thereby be preſerved from impurity; and therefore gave it the epithet of ἄγνος, from the word ἁγνὸς, which ſignifies *chaſte*. This word is now become the proper name of the word *vitex*, tho' not alone, but with the Latin word of the ſame ſignification. As to the ſcholiaſt on Theocritus, theſe are his words: Τὴν κονύζαν, κνύζαν εἶπεν. ἔςι φυτὸν ψυκτικώτατον. ἔνθεν καὶ ἐν τοῖς θεσμοφορίοις ὑποστρωννύουσι τὸ φυτὸν τὴν θερμότητα τὴν κατὰ τὰ Ἀφροδίσια ἐκκόπτοντες. Conyzam dixit Cnyzam. Planta refrigerandi ſumma vi pollens, quam propterea in Theſmophoriis lecto ſubſternunt, calorem ad res venereas extirpantes (10). - - - Conyza *he called* Cnyza. *It is a moſt refrigerating plant. Hence, in the Theſmophoria, they laid this plant under them to prevent venereal inclinations.* It ought to be obſerved, that he ſpeaks of *conyza* or *cunilago*, a plant of a different ſpecies from that mentioned by Pliny. And alſo upon what occaſion this remark was made; which was to explain a place in Theocritus, where a ſhepherd is introduced telling what he would do, in caſe his dear friend ſhould make a proſperous voyage to Mitylene. 'I 'will place, ſays he, a crown of flowers on my head, 'I will drink of the beſt wine, and ſtrew herbs on 'my bed up to my elbows.'

Χ' ἁ ςιϐὰς ἐσσεῖται πεπυκασμένα ἔς τ' ἐπὶ
πᾶχυν
Κνύζατ' ἀσφοδέλῳτε πολυγνάμπτῳτε σελίνῳ.

Et thorus denſatus erit ad cubitum uſque
Cnyza, aſphodelo & flexibili apio (11).

This, recited by the ſcholiaſt, was one of the herbs ſtrewed on the womens beds during the Theſmophorian rites in order to preſerve them from incontinency. It will be granted me that thoſe who by ſplendid feaſting, and ſuch other ſigns of joy on a feſtival, rejoice that their vows are accompliſhed, have no recourſe to thoſe remedies which ſtifle all amorous thoughts. It is not therefore likely that the *cunilago* had any ſuch effect; and the ſcholiaſt of Theocritus advances a thing that is contradicted by the very text on which he comments. Perhaps he would not be in the wrong to affirm, that the ſtrewing of leaves on the womens beds during the Theſmophoria, was only one of the ceremonies of that feſtival. It is no uncommon thing in great ſolemnities to ſtrew the ſtreets with flowers and leaves. Feſtoons are placed on the gates; and ſometimes the chambers participate of theſe ornaments: nor is it unlikely that the Greeks might extend this cuſtom to the beds of thoſe who celebrated the feſtival of Ceres. In proceſs of time ſome inquiſitive perſons, fond of diſcovering myſteries, at laſt imagined, that ſage antiquity had found this to be a remedy againſt incontinency. Nay, I cannot tell whether the wits and ſatiriſts were not the inventors of this ſuppoſition, which others a long time after might deliver ſeriouſly, and as a real fact. It is certain, a more diſobliging reaſon for this cuſtom could not have been advanced; nor can I imagine the Grecian women were tame enough to ſubmit to a remedy which would ſo publickly proclaim their laſciviouſneſs. Their conſent was not waited for, ſome will ſay: but I might anſwer, did Greece ever put the ſex on ſuch a foot, as to ſubject them to ſhameful cuſtoms. It is not eaſy to find in the whole map of the world, one corner of the earth, where things are eſtabliſhed on this foot; and if we would find ſuch a place, we ought not to look for it in Attica, Peloponneſus, or the iſles of the Ægean ſea. In order to make this probable, it ſhould be ſaid, that the honour of the women was not in the leaſt concerned in theſe ſtrewings of *Agnus Caſtus*. But who will believe it? Muſt not he have a very mean opinion of their virtue, who can imagine that married women could not lie alone five or ſix nights, (or put it nine, (12) if you pleaſe) without rendring themſelves unworthy by temptations, and impure proceedings, to celebrate a feſtival where chaſtity was required? I expect to be anſwered, that all countries are not alike, and that in climates leſs hot than Greece, wine or ſtrong liquors, tho' plentifully drank, would not produce the ſame venereal irritations that the meaneſt food would elſewhere occaſion; and that conſequently we ought not to judge of the ceremonies of the feaſts of Ceres by the deſires of the northern nations. But admit we do not ſtir out of Greece, I perſiſt in my opinion, that theſe motives for the uſe of *Agnus Caſtus* are not at all probable: for if the women, of their own accord had recourſe to this remedy, they muſt acknowledge a very great weakneſs, and proclaim a ſcandalous infirmity, which neither modeſty nor prudence would permit them to reveal. Prudence, I ſay, becauſe ſuch a confeſſion might cruelly diſturb and alarm their huſbands. Some might by trading be obliged to ſeveral weeks abſence. A law-ſuit might detain others as long. Several went to the wars, or engaged in foreign voyages. Thoſe who never went from home, were not always in good health; and thoſe who were could not tell how ſoon they might fall ſick. What ground was there, in all theſe caſes to rely on their wives chaſtity, who made profeſſion of their incontinency, at the Theſmophorian feaſt? This was a very auguſt feſtival, a ſolemn act of religion; the women held the principal functions of this holy ceremony. Chaſtity was neceſſary for their celebrating this ſolemnity, the ritual enjoined it. They had

---

(*a*) *See* Ariſtophanes in Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις.

(*b*) See the remark [*A*], at the end.

(6) Schol. ad Idyll. iv, Theocriti.

(7) Compare with this the remark [*B*] of the article PHASIS.

(8) Ovid. Metam. lib. x, ver. 431.

(9) Plinius, *lib. xxiv, cap. ix, pag. m.* 327. *Father Hardouin ſays on this paſſage,* Hæc totidem verbis. Dioſcor. lib. 1, cap. 135. & Galenus, lib. 6, de fac ſimp. med. pag. 148. Ælianus item, lib. 9. Hiſt. animal. cap. 26.

(10) Scholiaſt. Theocriti ad Idyll. VII. *He ſaith the ſame things on the* IVth Idyll. Κνύζα φυτὸν χορτῶδες, ᾧ αἱ Θεσμοφοριάζουσαι διὰ τὴν ἁγνείαν ςιβαδοποιοῦνται. Cnyza, planta graminis forma qua Cereris ſacra celebrantes fœminæ lectos ad ſervandam caſtitatem inſternunt.

(11) Theocrit. Idyll. VII, *pag. m.* 53, 54.

(12) Ovid, as may be ſeen above citation (8), makes this feſtival of Ceres laſt nine days.

ſtrange, generally ſpeaking, that they ſhould want ſuch a remedy; and yet more ſo that they ſhould acknowledge the neceſſity of it. The principal object of their worſhip in this feſtival, was that part which diſtinguiſhes them from men [*C*]. You may very well had therefore the moſt powerful motives to continency: the divine worſhip, conſcience, the public proſperity, the honour of Ceres, and the awfulneſs of her myſteries were all concerned in it: and nevertheleſs we are told, they owned themſelves unable to contain during the ſhort term of this feſtival. What was then to be expected from their virtue, when put to longer trials on other occaſions? It is therefore certain, that by having recourſe to *Agnus Caſtus*, they muſt have betrayed a great imprudence, in a voluntary manner, by filling their poor huſbands with jealouſies and uneaſineſſes. But what will you ſay, ſome may object, if their huſbands eſtabliſhed this cuſtom? I anſwer, that if they were the authors of it, either by way of advice, or command, it is not in the leaſt likely that the women would have ſubmitted to it either as a neceſſary, or at leaſt a very uſeful remedy; for in accepting of it, they muſt have confeſſed a natural infirmity, which would have done great injury to their honour, and rendered them ſuſpected of infidelity in the abſence or ſickneſs of their huſbands. All the huſbands who had been ſo imprudent as to propoſe or approve of this counſel, would have expoſed the reputation of their wives. The wits could not have failed to cry out, Theſe good men know how matters ſtand, a dire experience has obliged them to hunt after expedients; they never have a night's quiet, except thoſe which religion provides for them. But when they lie by whilſt the Theſmophorian rites are ſolemnized, the remembrance of what is paſt, makes them glad to rely on the virtue of *Agnus Caſtus*. I muſt repeat the obſervation I have made before. To what purpoſe would they have relied on that virtue during the feſtival? Would this have appeaſed the alarms of thoſe who were gone a long voyage, or a long journey? Would it ſatisfy the minds of the ſick? It may be affirmed, that whoever ſhould have introduced this cuſtom, would have deſerved to paſs for a diſturber of the public peace.

A hundred other reaſons convince me, that the uſe of the *Agnus Caſtus* in the beds of the women who celebrated the Theſmophorian rites, was not founded on the motive which is alledged. The ſame reaſon which led to the enjoining this remedy to married women, during that feſtival, would have occaſioned it's being preſcribed to them during the abſence or indiſpoſition of their huſbands, and to young widows and virgins all the year long. Since therefore the latter was not done, we ought not to give the leaſt credit to the former. If both of them had been practiſed in the manner I have mentioned, we ſhould find in ſome author or other, that no plant was more common than *Agnus Caſtus* all over Greece. Every perſon would have had a great many beds of them in his garden; whole foreſts had been filled with it, and expert planters employed on purpoſe to cultivate it; for the frequent ſtripping of it's leaves, would have required the greater care in keeping it alive. It would have been the firſt care of thoſe, who, in their declining years, ſhould have married women much younger than themſelves, to make large plantations of *Agnus Caſtus*, that they might continually have a decent remedy to aſſuage thoſe deſires, they could neither prevent nor ſatisfy. The leaves of this ſhrub would have been worſhipped as the tutelar god of married men, and a *Deus averruncus*, or *alexicacus*, with reſpect to cuckoldom. Some Juvenal would have congratulated Greece upon it (13): and it would have been obſerved of theſe leaves what another hath ſaid of frogs (14). But we find no appearance of any ſuch thing in the monuments of Antiquity.

Perhaps it may be objected, that the Theſmophorian rites exacted an extaordinary purity, an imagination exempt from what the Caſuiſts call *unruly thoughts*, an uninterrupted application to the excellency and ſublimities of chaſtity; which was unneceſſary at other times. All the anſwer I ſhall make to this, is, to aſk what proofs there are of this extraordinary peculiarity of the Theſmophoria. I am ſure ſuch a notion of this feſtival is only imaginary (15). I would alſo add, that neither *Agnus Caſtus*, nor *Cunilago*, nor willow-leaves (16), *&c.* are capable of inſpiring ſuch a purity, and moreover I reaſon thus: The Athenians were too ſenſible a people, to believe that a few leaves between the ſheets were ſufficient to mortify leudneſs. I will grant that there are ſome herbs, which, in length of time, may refrigerate thoſe who eat them; but as to the external application of them, I cannot tell whether it may not juſtly be ſaid of luſt as of death, ‘ Contra ‘ vim mortis non eſt medicamen in hortis. - - - *Death's* ‘ *power is not be ſubdu'd by herbs.*’ I cannot forget the anſwer of Theano, Pythagoras's daughter, who, when aſked, *How many days reſpite, after having to do with a man, were requiſite to qualify a woman to aſſiſt at the Theſmophoria?* replied, She was qualified the minute after, if ſhe had to do with her huſband, but never if with any other. *Apud Theodoretum, lib.* 12. Græcanicarum affectionum, *Pythagorica Theano, rogata quoto demum die mulieri liceret à complexu viri Theſmophoriis intereſſe*; Ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ἰδίου παραχρῆμα, ἔφη· ἀπὸ δὲ ἀλλοτρίου οὐδέποτε. *Ei quæ à proprio viro ſurrexerit, ſtatim licere reſpondit; quæ ab alieno nunquam* (17). This moral deciſion of Theano doth not in the leaſt ſavour of *rigour*. Such a lady as ſhe would not, if now alive, condemn frequenting the communion under pretence of too ſhort an interval after the conjugal duty. What may farther be inferred from her anſwer, is, that in order to a due performance of the Theſmophorian functions, a preparation of ſome days continence was thought neceſſary. But as this prolonged the time of abſtinence, it may be objected that I ought not to be ſurprized, that they ſhould have had recourſe to *Agnus Caſtus*. But this is indeed too weak an objection to make me alter my opinion. I refer the reader to what is ſaid in my laſt remark but one.

It would be unjuſt to condemn my criticiſms on this head, for equity will not permit us to ſacrifice the reputation of an infinite number of Grecian women, to all the conſequences which may be drawn from the teſtimony of Pliny and ſome others, if they have not deſerved ſuch an affront.

[*C*] *The principal object of their worſhip in this feſtival, was that part which diſtinguiſhes them from men.*] Faſoldus, who has wrote a ſmall tract on the Grecian feſtivals, cites Theodoret in relation to this circumſtance. ‘ In hoc quoque feſto *pudenda muliebria* mu‘ mulieres illæ initiatæ honore divino afficiebant. - - - ‘ *In this feſtival alſo the women who were initiated paid* ‘ *divine honours to the* pudenda muliebria.’ Theodoretus, lib. 3. Græcan. Affection. (18). He doth not cite the words of Thodoret, tho' he found them in Caſtellanus in the manner following: Καὶ τὸν κτένα τὸν γυναικεῖον (οὕτως δὲ τὸ γυναικεῖον ὀνομάζουσι μόριον) ἐν τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις, παρὰ τῶν τετελεσμένων γυναικῶν θείας τιμῆς ἀξιούμενον. Nec minus muliebrem pectinem (ſic enim pudenda mulieris vocant) in Cereris feſto, mulieres initiatæ divino honore dignum habent (19). - - - *And the* pecten muliebris *alſo*, (*ſo they called the* pudendum muliebre) *was eſteemed by the women initiated at the Theſmophoria to be worthy of divine honour*. Faſoldus alſo informs us, that at Syracuſe they carried a repreſentation of this part, formed with a ſort of meal and honey, in a proceſſion on the laſt day of the feaſt in honour of Ceres and Proſerpine. This he grounds on the authority of Athenæus, lib. 14. ‘ Athenæus, *ſays he* (20), refert muliebria pudenda, ‘ μυλλοὶ appellata, quæ ex ſeſamo & melle facta ‘ erant, ultimo die hujus feſti apud Syracuſanos, qui ‘ hæc ſacra etiam obſervarunt, Cereri & Proſerpinæ ‘ circumlata fuiſſe. - - - - *Athenæus relates, that the* ‘ pudenda muliebria, *called* μυλλοὶ, *made of flour and* ‘ *honey, on the laſt day of this feaſt, which were obſerved* ‘ *by the Syracuſians, were carried in honour of Ceres and* ‘ *Proſerpine.*’ Perhaps he hath not rendred the ſenſe of Athenæus exactly, and inſtead of the *laſt day of the feſtival*, he ought to have tranſlated it *at the great Theſmophoria*. The Greek runs thus: Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Συρακούσιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ θεσμῶν, ἐν Συρακούσαις φησὶ τοῖς παντελείοις τῶν θεσμοφορίων ἐκ σησάμου καὶ μέλιτος κατασκευάσασθαι ἐφήβαια γυναικεῖα, ἃ καλεῖσθαι κατὰ πᾶσαν Σικελίαν μυλλοὺς, well imagine the antient fathers did not ſpare the Heathens on the ſubject of ſuch ceremonies. For the reſt thoſe who celebrated this feſtival were obliged to watch the whole night [*D*].

---

(13) O ſanctas gentes quibus hæc naſcuntur in hortis Numina. *Juven. Sat. XV, ver.* 10.

(14) See the paſſage of Pliny cited in the remark [*I*], of the article DEMOCRITUS.

(15) See the following remark.

(16) Salicem habere vim perimendi ſeminis, & libidinis extinguendæ, author eſt Theophraſtus. Ælianus Ἀφροδισίου κώλυμα nuncupat. Alii ἄγνον caſtam appellant. *Homer. Odyſſ.* κ. ὠλεσίκαρπον, id eſt, ut exponit Plinius *lib.* 16, *cap.* 26, *frugiperda.* Ad quem locum Euſtathius: Διότι οἱ πίνοντες τοῦ κατ' αὐτὰς ἄνθους ὀλλύουσι τὸν καρπὸν, ἤτοι ἄγονοι γίνονται. *Caſtellanus, de Feſtis Græcorum, pag.* 171.

(17) Id. ibid.

(18) Joh. Faſoldus, in Græcorum veterum Ἱερολογία, *Dec.* XII, *num.* 1, *pag. m.* 280.

(19) Caſtell. de Feſtis Græcorum, *pag.* 173.

(20) Faſoldus, in Græc. veterum Ἱερολογία, *pag.* 280.

On

λοῦς, καὶ περιφέρεσθαι ταῖς θεαῖς (21). Dalecampius renders it thus: *Heraclides Syracuſius libro de vetuſtis & ſancitis moribus, ſcribit, apud Syracuſios in perfectis Theſmophoriis* (22), *ex ſeſamo & melle fingi pudenda muliebria, quæ per ludos & ſpectacula* (23) *circumferebantur & in tota Sicilia vocabantur Mylli.* You will find in Montagne's Eſſays a great many ſuch paſſages. I have not ſeen this in the place where he obſerves (24), *that in the greateſt part of the world this part of our bodies was deified*; that in certain places, *the chief magiſtrates were reverenced and diſtinguiſhed by this part; and that in ſeveral ceremonies, inſtituted in honour of divers deities, the repreſentation of it was carried about in pomp. The Egyptian dames, in their Bacchanalian feaſts, wore a wooden one, finely covered, about their necks, proportioned in ſize and weight to their ſtrength; beſides that, the ſtatue of their god was furniſhed with one far ſurpaſſing the other parts of his body* (25). *The married women in my neighbourhood, adjuſt the upper-part of their head-dreſs to that ſhape, in order to boaſt of the pleaſure they received from it; and when they become widows, they turn it behind, and hide it under their head-dreſſes.* It is probable that the reaſon why the part proper to the other ſex had ſuch honours paid to it in the Theſmophoria, was in remembrance of the good ſervice it had done to Ceres. This goddeſs having made a ſtrict ſearch after Proſerpine, who had been ſtollen away from her, without being able to find her, arrived very diſconſolate at Eleuſis. Here an old country-woman, named Baubo, uſed all endeavours to perſuade her to take ſome refreſhment, and to drive away melancholy. But all to no purpoſe. Ceres obſtinately refuſed every thing, and would not admit of any conſolation. Baubo changed the ſcene and endeavoured to divert the goddeſs with a new invented ſpectacle. She retired into another chamber, where ſhe tricked up a certain thing which had been long neglected, as a piece of waſte ground; after which ſhe returned to the goddeſs, to whom ſhe ſhewed her nudity, putting her body in the moſt extravagant poſtures ſhe poſſibly could (26). Ceres fixing her eyes on this object could not help laughing, and ſoon after accepted of the proffered refreſhments. I cannot deſcribe this in our language ſo naturally as an antient Father of the Church has done, whoſe words are theſe. *Rogat illa* (Baubo) *atque hortatur contra, ſicut mos eſt in hujuſmodi caſibus, ne faſtidium ſuæ humanitatis aſſumat: obſtinatiſſimè durat Ceres, & rigoris indomiti pertinaciam retinet. Quod cum ſæpius fieret, neque ullis quiret obſequiis ineluctabile propoſitum fatigari, vertit Baubo artes, & quam ſeriò non quiebat allicere, ludibriorum ſtatuit exhilarare miraculis: partem illam corporis, per quam ſecus femineum & ſubolem prodere, & nomen ſolet acquirere generi, tum longiore ab incuria liberat: facit ſumere habitum puriorem, & in ſpeciem levigari nondum duri atque ſtriculi puſionis: redit ad Deam triſtem, & inter illa communia, quibus moris eſt frangere ac temperare mærores, retegit ſe ipſam, atque omnia illa pudoris loca revelatis monſtrat inguinibus: atque pubi affigit oculos diva, & inauditi ſpecie ſolaminis paſcitur. Tum diffuſior facta per riſum, aſpernatam ſumit atque ebibit potionem: & quod diu nequivit verecundia Baubonis exprimere, propudioſi facinoris extorſit obſcænitas* (27). Hence with very good reaſon he vigorouſly attacks the Pagans on the ridiculous abſurdity of their feſtivals; what, could this object afford ſo extremely diverting to Ceres, who could at all times ſee the ſame in herſelf? ‘ Ut animum commodare alimoniis poſſint, victuique ſumendo, non ‘ ratio, non tempus, non ſermo aliquis adhibetur gra‘ vis, aut affabilitas ſeria, ſed propudioſa corporum ‘ monſtratur obſcœnitas, objectanturque partes illæ, ‘ quas pudor communis abſcondere atque naturalis ve‘ recundiæ lex jubet: quas inter aures caſtas ſine venia ‘ nefas eſt, ac ſine honoribus appellare præfatis. Quid‘ nam, quæſo, in ſpectu tali, quid in pudendis fuit ‘ verendiſque Baubonis, quod feminei ſexus Deam, & ‘ conſimili formatam membro, in admirationem con‘ verteret atque riſum? quod objectum lumini con‘ ſpectuique divino, & oblivionem miſeriarum daret, ‘ & habitum in lætiorem repentina hilaritate traduce‘ ret (28)? - - - *To induce her to eat, and take ſome ‘ refreſhment, neither reaſon, nor time, nor any grave ‘ diſcourſe, or ſerious complaiſance were made uſe of, ‘ but obſcene parts, are offered to her view, which com‘ mon decency and the natural laws of modeſty require to ‘ be concealed: which to chaſte ears without leave or ‘ due reverence, ought not ſo much as to be named. ‘ What now, I deſire to know, in ſuch a ſight as this, ‘ what in the* pudenda *of old Baubo, could move the ‘ laughter and admiration of a goddeſs formed with the ‘ ſame parts herſelf? What an object was here to de‘ light the view of a goddeſs in ſuch a manner, as to ‘ drown all thoughts of ſorrow, and introduce ſo ſudden ‘ an appearance of joy?*’ Is it not very probable that in commemoration of this adventure, divine honours were decreed to that object which had ſo opportunely diverted the goddeſs Ceres? Hence ariſes an objection againſt the aſſertion laid down in the precedent article: for, ſome will ſay, the Grecian women ought to be more than ordinarily fortified, when they not only lay alone, but were imployed in the contemplation of a ſubject ſufficiently apt to taint their imagination, and excite immodeſt thoughts. I confeſs, this may in ſome meaſure weaken my arguments; but all things well conſidered, they remain ſtill ſtrong enough to make me continue in my opinion.

[*D*] *They were . . . . . . obliged to watch the whole night.*] This might furniſh my adverſaries with another objection. The huſbands, will they ſay, conſidering, 1. That their wives were ſeparated from them, whilſt they were employed in celebrating the memory of a tickling adventure, and in worſhipping a tempting object, of which they were alſo obliged to make images in paſte (29). 2. Their watching all night; might well give ſome diſagreeable ſuſpicions. For watchings have always afforded lucky opportunities. It is therefore not unlikely, that they had recourſe to effectual preſervatives, ſuch as the leaves of *Agnus Caſtus*. Theſe difficulties are very inconſiderable; for, beſides that all men were abſolutely excluded from the Theſmophoria, which might afford a plenary ſatisfaction to the jealous and diſtruſtful huſbands, is it poſſible to believe the Grecians fooliſh enough to rely on the feeble aſſiſtance of leaves, when they doubted their wives virtue, notwithſtanding the engaging obligations laid on them by the neceſſary circumſtances of the feſtival, ſuch as the utter excluſion of men, the chaſtity enjoined, the watchings in the temple, *&c.* if it be aſked on what authority I found the text of this remark, I alledge theſe words of Arnobius (30): ‘ Vultis enim conſideremus myſteria ‘ & illa divina, quæ Theſmophoria nominantur à ‘ Græcis: quibus gente ab Attica ſancta illa pervigilia ‘ conſecrata ſunt & pannychiſmi (31) graves. - - - - ‘ *Would you have us conſider alſo thoſe divine myſteries ‘ which the Greeks call Theſmophoria; in which the ‘ Athenians celebrated thoſe holy watchings, and ſerious ‘ vigils.*’ I do not deny but ſeveral diſorders were occaſioned by theſe watchings. Plautus's *Aulularia* runs upon the marriage of a young woman who was got with child on ſuch an occaſion (32). The Romans never attempted the abolition of ſome nocturnal feaſts, till they diſcovered their irregularities. Certain Grecian cities alſo aboliſhed the ſame ceremonies: and the following words inform us how Ariſtophanes bantered thoſe devotional watchings (33): ‘ Diligentiſſime ſanciendum eſt, ut mulierum famam ‘ multorum oculis lux clara cuſtodiat, initienturque ‘ eo ritu Cereri, quo Romæ initiantur. Quo in ge‘ nere ſeveritatem majorum ſenatus vetus auctoritas de ‘ Bacchanalibus; & conſulum exercitu adhibito quæ‘ ſtio animadverſioque declarant. Atque omnia noc‘ turna, ne nos duriores fortè videamur, in media ‘ Græcia Diagondas Thebanus lege perpetua ſuſtulit. ‘ Novos verò Deos, & in his colendis nocturnas per‘ vigilationes ſic Ariſtophanes facetiſſimus poeta vete‘ ris comœdiæ vexat, ut apud eum Sabazius, & qui‘ dam alii dii de peregrinis judicati è civitate ejician‘ tur. - - - *It is moſt carefully to be enacted, that day‘ light and the public eye may guard the reputation of ‘ women; and that they be initiated to Ceres, as they*

‘ are

---

(21) Athen. *lib. xiv, pag.* 647.

(22) *The tranſlators note is,* Cereris Theſmophoria & myſteria, majora minoraque fuerunt. Vide Gyraldum.

(23) *The tranſlator's note here, is* ταῖς θέαις: alii, ταῖς θεαῖς deabus, nempe Cereri & Proſerpinæ. *He falſely ſuppoſes, that* ταῖς θέαις, *is put into the text.*

(24) Montagne, Eſſays, *lib. iii, cap. v, pag.* 128, 129.

(25) *To this may be referred what Daniel Heinſius ſaith in his anſwer to Balzac's Diſſertation on* Herodes infanticita, *pag.* 112. Quem (*Pana*) eundem cum Priapo, quem pæderaſten nec pudendum modo, ſed pudendi ſui prope partem faciunt. *Arnobius, lib. vi, pag.* 209, *ſays* genitalibus propriis inferior Priapus.

(26) Sic effata, ſinu veſtem contraxit ab imo, Objecitque oculis formatas inguinibus res: Quas cava ſuccutiens Baubo manu, nam puerilis Ollis vultus erat, plaudit, contrectat amicè. *Orpheus*, apud *Arnobium, lib. v, pag.* 175. *See* Clemens Alexandrinus, in Protrept. *pag.* 13.

(27) Arnob. *lib. v, pag.* 174, 175.

(28) Id. ibid. *pag.* 176.

(29) See, above, citation (21), the paſſage of Athenæus; but the argument grounded upon it is not very certain, for we do not find by whom theſe images were made.

(30) Arnobius, *lib. v, p.* 173.

(31) That word ſignifies to watch the whole night, as appears by the gloſſaries, *pervigilium*, παννυχισμὸς καὶ ἡ διὰ νυκτὸς ἀγρυπνία.

(32) Is adoleſcentis illius eſt avunculus. Qui illam ſtupravit noctu, Cereris vigiliis. *He is the uncle to the youth who lay with her during the vigils of Ceres.* Plaut. *in Prologo* Aululariæ.

(33) Cicero, de Legibus, *lib. ii, fol.* 335, *A.*

I ſhall obſerve, on this occaſion, a miſtake of Brantome; who has falſely aſſerted, that, accordi[illegible] to Pliny, the Veſtal virgins made uſe of *beds of leaves* to preſerve their chaſtity [*E*].

are initiated at Rome. How the cuſtoms of this kind formerly obſerved in the Bacchanalias are now approved, the debate of the Senate before the Conſuls upon this queſtion, ſufficiently decided. All nocturnal ceremonies, that we may not ſeem leſs polite than others, have been aboliſhed in the midſt of Greece by a perpetual law of Diagondas the Theban. But the moſt facetious old comic Poet Ariſtophanes bantered the new Deities, and their nocturnal worſhip in ſo ſevere a manner, that Sabazius and ſome other gods mentioned by him, were judged foreigners and expelled the city.’ Read alſo what is ſaid by a certain Journaliſt in his extract of a diſſertation of Mr Rainſſant. *The ſecular games were not only celebrated for three days, but alſo three nights together; for they aſſembled in the temples,* where they watched, prayed, and performed their ſacrifices: this was what they called *Pervigilium*; and to prevent all indecencies in theſe public aſſemblies, the youth of both ſexes aſſiſted at them under the conduct of their fathers and their mothers, or ſome of their elderly relations, who could anſwer for their deportment, as Auguſtus had decreed. *The precaution was neceſſary and the law very wiſe; love is too diligent in queſt of favourable opportunities, to forget its intereſts in theſe nocturnal aſſemblies. But it was ſomewhat late when the Emperor Auguſtus applied a remedy to it.* Præſtat ſerò quàm nunquam. Better late than never. *It is not to be doubted but before this, the three nights of the ſecular games were a very happy time for the amorous youth, and that they made the beſt uſe they could of it, ſince they knew it was impoſſible to enjoy it twice* (34). The devotional watchings of the Primitive Church were not entirely free from abuſes of this kind; for which reaſon St Jerom adviſes the young virgins when they aſſiſted at theſe rites, not to ſtir ſo much as a finger's breadth from their mothers (35). This Father had done much better to acquieſce in the juſt complaints of Vigilantius, who condemned theſe nocturnal meetings on account of the impurities there committed (36). They were at laſt obliged to ſuppreſs this devotion, as Cardinal Bellarmin acknowledges. ‘Quoniam occaſione nocturnarum vigiliarum abuſus quidem irrepere cœperant, vel potius flagitia non raro committi, placuit Eccleſiæ nocturnos conventus, & vigilias proprie dictas intermittere, ac ſolum in iiſdem diebus celebrare jejunia (37). - - - - *Becauſe on occaſion of the nocturnal watchings, abuſes had crept in, or rather horrid vices were too frequently committed, the Church was pleaſed to forbid thoſe night-meetings, and vigils properly ſo called, and to celebrate faſtings only on the ſame days.*’

Without doubt the mandate of the Archbiſhop of Paris in the year 1697, againſt the cuſtom of viſiting Mont St Valerien in the holy week, was founded on like reaſons.

[*E*] *Brantome ..... has falſely aſſerted, that, according* [illegible] *Pliny, the Veſtal virgins made uſe of beds of leaves to preſerve their chaſtity.*] Theſe are the author's words at large (38): ‘I have ſeen and read a fooliſh Italian pamphlet, which pretends to give receipts againſt concupiſcence, of which ſort it lays down thirty-[illegible] but they are ſo ridiculous, that I would not adviſe the women to the uſe of them, leſt they ſhould bring their bodies into too low a condition. This is the reaſon why I would not here tranſcribe them. [illegible] alledges one of them, which the Veſtals and Athenian Ladies formerly made uſe of during the feaſts of Ceres called *Theſmophoria*, to refrigerate and extinguiſh every ſtrong amorous deſire, that by this means they might celebrate this feſtival with the utmoſt chaſtity; this was the making beds of the leaves of *Agnus Caſtus*. But you muſt imagine that they thus mortified themſelves only during the rites; and that afterwards they threw away their beds. I have ſeen one of theſe trees at the houſe of a very fine and honourable lady in Guienne, which ſhe often ſhewed for its rarity to ſtrangers who came to viſit her, and told them the virtue of it; but I could never obſerve or hear that any of the ſex had ſtuffed the leaſt corner of their bed with its leaves, or plucked ſo much as one branch, not even the Lady herſelf, who was the proprietor of the tree and place, and conſequently could diſpoſe of it at pleaſure. See the margin (39).

THIBAUT or THEOBALDUS,

Earl of Champagne, the fifth of that name, rendred himſelf famous among other things by his paſſion for Queen Blanche [*A*], St Lewis's mother: and though he was unſucceſsful in it, as moſt Hiſtorians believe, yet he expoſed this great queen to cenſorious tongues [*B*]. Some *(a)* pretend that he diſcovered

[*A*] *His paſſion for Queen Blanche.*] Claudius Fauchet has not forgot our Earl of Champagne nor his Amours, when he treats of the antient French Poets. ‘Blanche, *ſays he* (1), who was a young, beautiful, and beſides a Spaniſh Lady, managed Thibaut ſo artfully, that he abandoned the other Barons: and, what was yet more, he diſcovered the deſign to ſeize the King in his return from Orleans to Paris. But Thibaut's Amours diſpleaſing ſeveral Lords, it happened (as I find in a certain authentic manuſcript Chronicle which I have by me) that Thibaut one day entring the hall where Queen Blanche was, Robert Earl of Artois, the King's brother, threw a ſoft cheeſe in his face, which the Earl of Champagne being affronted at, took occaſion to retire from court, in order to avoid a greater diſgrace. However the great Chronicle of France tells us, that the Earl again took up arms againſt the King; but being informed of the great preparations made againſt him, he ſent ſome of the wiſeſt of his council to deſire a peace, which was agreed to. But as the King had been at a great expence on this account, therefore the Earl was obliged to quit Montereau-fault-yonne, and Bray on the Seine, with their appurtenances to him. On this occaſion it was (ſays the great Chronicle) Queen Blanche told the Earl that he ought never to take up arms againſt the King her ſon; but ſhould remember that he came even to his own country to aſſiſt him againſt the Barons when they attacked him. The Earl earneſtly looking at the wiſe and charming Queen, and ſtruck with her great beauty, replied, By my faith, Madam, my ſoul, my body, and all my lands are at your command. Nor is there any thing that can pleaſe you which I would not freely undertake: nor will I ever by the grace of GOD, engage againſt you or your's. He departed very penſive, often reflecting on the Queen's winning looks and charming air. The tender paſſion ſoon ſeized his heart, but when he remembred that ſhe was a Lady of ſo high a rank, and ſtrict virtue, that he could never think of enjoying her, it was turned into deſpair. And becauſe deep thoughts beget melancholy; to divert them he was adviſed by ſome wiſe men, to apply himſelf to Poetry and Muſic; in which he ſucceeded ſo well, that he compoſed the moſt melodious ſongs that ever were either ſung or plaid on inſtruments, and cauſed them to be inſcribed in the halls of Provins and Troyes. And they are called the King of Navarre's ſongs.

[*B*] *He expoſed this great Queen to cenſorious tongues* (2).] Several things gave occaſion to it. Thibaut had rendered himſelf odious by his precipitate retreat from the camp at Avignon, and became more ſo on account of the ſuſpicions he lay under of having poiſoned Lewis the VIIIth; which were increaſed, when ſo good an underſtanding was obſerved betwixt him and the Queen-Dowager, that he diſcloſed to her all the deſigns of the confederate Princes; and all this at a time that ſeveral provocations had engaged him to declare himſelf as one of the chiefs of the league. This looked very like a reciprocal affection betwixt them (3). A widow without this would never come into any correſpondence with a man, who is ſuppoſed to be her huſband's murtherer. Beſides, the confederate Princes marching into Champagne, met Queen diſcovered his paſſion, before that princeſs was a widow [*C*]: and they add that Lewis the VIIIth the huſband of Blanche, was obliged to diſſemble the affront, by reaſon of the wars in which he found himſelf engaged. That the earl brought this prince conſiderable forces, and behaved himſelf very bravely; but that he could not reſolve to winter out of his own territories, and that he expreſsly declared he would return home. That the king imagining this impatience of the earl to proceed only from a deſire of ſeeing the queen, and being alſo ſenſible of the great prejudice he ſhould receive by this lord's retreat, uſed him ill, and threatned him. That Thibaut enraged at the affront, and meditating a terrible revenge cauſed the king to be poiſoned. That finding the queen had the ſame indifference for him in her widow ſtate as ſhe had before, he confederated with the princes who deſigned to remove her from the regency; and that they met with no difficulty in engaging him in that affair, becauſe he was eaſily perſuaded that the queen's indifference proceeded from the paſſion ſhe entertained for the Cardinal Legate [*D*], who had reſided for ſome time at the Court of France. That it was equally eaſy for the queen to oblige him to abandon the confederates; for ſhe only acquainted him that ſhe ſhould not be diſpleaſed to ſee him. That he had conceived great hopes of ſucceeding in his amours by this bare compliment. That he deſerted the princes of the league, and diſcovered their deſigns to the queen, at a very favourable juncture. That turning their whole

---

(34) Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, *March* 1685, *Art. II*, *pag.* 259, 260.

(35) Vigiliarum dies & ſolemnes pernoctationes ſic virguncula noſtra celebret, ut ne tranſverſum quidem unguem à matre diſcedat. *Hieronymus ad Lætam de Inſtitut. Filiæ.*

(36) *Vide* Hieronym. adverſus Vigilantium, *cap. iv. Conſult Mr* Van Dale, de Oraculis, *pag.* 232, *of the firſt edition, and pag.* 60, *of the ſecond. See alſo remark* [*D*], *in the article* VIGILANTIUS.

(37) Bellarminus, de Eccleſia triumph. *lib. iii, cap. ult.*

(38) Brantome, Dames Galantes, *Tom. ii, pag. m.* 163, 164.

(39) It is no wonder, becauſe every woman who had gathered thoſe leaves, muſt have confeſſed her infirmity.

(a) Varillas, Minorité de S. Louïs, *printed at the Hague* 1685.

(1) Des anciens Poëtes François, *book ii, pag.* 117.

(2) See other ſcandalous reports concerning this queen in the remark [*D*].

(3) The modern Hiſtorian of St Lewis, lib. ii, num. 6, pag. 51, tells us that the eaſineſs which Blanche diſcovered to be reconciled to Thibaut, tho' ſhe knew he paſſionately loved her, occaſioned ſeveral ill reports.

Blanche on the way; ſhe was going to th[illegible] aſſiſtance, and would not abandon him, [illegible] they purſued him as the poiſoner of her huſband. This conduct appeared ſo ſuſpicious, that they laughed at the offers ſhe made of puniſhing Thibaut, in caſe he was guilty. The following paſſage is taken from a modern author, who has conſulted authentic manuſcripts. *The Queen ſent a ſecond order to the Princes of the League to quit Champagne; aſſuring them, that if they had any complaint againſt Thibaut, ſhe was ready to do them juſtice. But all ſhe could obtain from them, we are told, was an inſolent and even barbarous anſwer: ‘ That they had taken up arms to do themſelves juſtice, ‘ and not to wait for it from a woman, who declared ‘ herſelf the protectreſs of her huſband's murtherer* (4).’ As for the ſongs compoſed by the Earl, moſt Hiſtorians tell us they proved the ill ſucceſs of his amours. The paſſage of Claudius Fauchet already cited, ſhews that this unfortunate galant was adviſed to divert himſelf with ſongs, and by this means to expel the melancholy which preyed upon him. Common ſenſe obliges us to believe, that if Blanche had favoured the Earl's paſſion, he would have better concealed his flame; and that the deſpair of obtaining any tender returns from the Queen, occaſioned ſuch repeated ſighs and ſo many languiſhing verſes as he recorded on the walls of his palace. We are told that it was a ſort of folly and extravagance, which a proper compaſſion in the Queen would have entirely prevented. Let us hear a modern author. ‘ Whether ‘ his preſumption equalled his love; or his paſſion ‘ degenerated into folly; or he was prepoſſeſſed that ‘ concealing would rather increaſe than cure his diſ‘ eaſe; or the Queen's virtue had at laſt thrown him ‘ into deſpair: it is certain he was ſo little ſollicitous ‘ to conceal the conſuming fire; that he affected to ‘ diſcover it by all means which the moſt wretched ‘ extravagance could ſuggeſt to a man of his quality. ‘ He compoſed ſeveral amorous ſongs, in which he ‘ diſcovered more wit than elegance: he found op‘ portunities to hand them to the Queen; they were ‘ ſet to Muſic; they were fitted to all ſorts of Inſtru‘ ments, and to keep up the idea of them when they ‘ ſhould loſe the grace of novelty, or to preſerve the ‘ memory of them when the author and the Princeſs ‘ ſhould be no more, he cauſed them to be engraved ‘ in braſs, and expoſed to the view of all the world ‘ in the galleries of his palaces at Troyes and Pro‘ vins: as if he was afraid that future ages would not ‘ be ſufficiently informed of his folly, or that the age ‘ he lived in was very barren of ſatiriſts (5).’ Varillas is here miſtaken in his Chronology; he ſuppoſes Thibaut guilty of all theſe extravagancies before the death of Lewis the VIIIth: but I choſe to rely on the Hiſtory cited by Fauchet (6), which dates all theſe ſongs after the loſs of Montereau and Bray. This agrees with the Chronology of one of our beſt Hiſtorians (7): this loſs, ſays he, did not make him wiſer; *he ſtill perſiſted in the fooliſh paſſion for the Queen which had ruined him, and retired to his caſtle of Provins to indulge his amorous extravagance, by making verſes and ſongs.* He was obliged to ſurrender theſe towns in the year 1235, according to Mezerai (8).

I ſhall conclude this remark with the words of the modern Hiſtorian of St Lewis, which are an exact recapitulation of what hath been ſaid. ‘ The author ‘ who has collected moſt of theſe ſcandalous reports, ‘ and who perpetually praiſes Blanche to a degree of ‘ exceſs, ſpeaks of theſe ſtories as meer rumours ‘ which he had picked up; adding of himſelf, tho' ‘ he was an Engliſhman, that it would be criminal ‘ to give credit to them. He alſo aſſures us, as well ‘ as another author who was born at Liege, while ‘ theſe reports were yet freſh, that they only proceed‘ ed from the animoſity of the nobles againſt the re‘ gency and the ſteddineſs of this Princeſs; and indeed ‘ every age furniſhes examples enough of this kind. ‘ Beſides, of the four authors who have related this ‘ ſtory, not one has ſo much as inſinuated that the ‘ Queen had the leaſt inclination to favour the Earl ‘ of Champagne's paſſion, if it was true that he had ‘ any for her: but one of the four poſitively avers, ‘ that Thibaut only ſcribbled his ditties on the walls ‘ of the palaces of Troyes and Provins, to charm the ‘ deſpair into which Blanche's virtue had caſt him. ‘ That if amongſt the reſt of thoſe excellent works, ‘ ſome verſes appear which ſeem liable to be wreſted ‘ to this purpoſe; it is in truth a ſtrange thing to ‘ alledge the evidence of ſuch a one as Thibaut, a ‘ Poet tranſported by a warm imagination, who may ‘ as probably entertain the public with ſuch adven‘ tures as never happened to him, as others of the ‘ ſame character tire the reader with the paſſions which ‘ they never felt (9).’

[*C*] *Some pretend that he diſcovered his paſſion before that princeſs was a widow.*] It is very likely that his paſſion did not wait for the king's death. Nor is it at all leſs probable that ſuch a vain, inconſtant, courageous prince, might have had a ſufficient command over his paſſions, to love the queen a long time, without giving any marks of it. Note, that ſhe was at leaſt forty, and perhaps older, when ſhe loſt her huſband: for ſhe was married to him in the year 1200, and he died in 1226. It is very rare for a man to ſee a fine woman of thirty years of age, without any concern, and to fall in love with her all of a ſudden when ſhe is forty, and after ſhe has had above ten children. This was the caſe of Queen Blanche in the year 1226. One of our Hiſtorians imagines that there was a great deal more vanity than love in this action of Thibaut. *The Earl of Champagne*, ſays he (10), *was the perſon who gave this advice to the queen. This young prince was touched with a ſort of gallantry for her, rather owing to the vanity of a courtier, than to the charms of a woman above forty.* He is thus far in the right, that vanity is capable of obliging a man to act the part of a lover: but he doth not in the leaſt conſider, that the earl's paſſion might have begun long before the queen was forty years old. And at that age it was much eaſier for her to keep alive a flame long ſince kindled, than to begin to kindle one.

[*D*] *The paſſion ſhe had entertained for the Cardinal Legate.*] An author whom I have often cited (11) obſerves that the Cardinal's perſon was very agreeable; that his charming mien was equalled by none; *that he had*

(4) Hiſtoire de S. Louïs, *lib. ii, num.* 21, *pag. m.* 84, *ad ann.* 1229.

(5) Varillas, Minorité de S. Louïs, *pag.* 12.

(6) See, above, the remark [*A*].

(7) Mezerai, ubi infra.

(8) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. *Tom. ii, p.* 715.

(9) Hiſtoire de S. Louïs, *lib. x, num.* 14, *pag.* 126.

(10) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. *Tom. ii, pag.* 710, *ad ann.* 1227.

(11) Varillas, Minorité de St Louïs, *pag.* 22.

whole rage againſt him, they entred into and ravaged Champagne. That the Queen-Regent aſſiſted him, and ſo compoſed the difference, that they were deprived of all pretences for an invaſion. That they ſought another way to ruin him, by accuſing him of the king's death. That the queen brought him off, obliging them to lay down their arms on condition that he ſhould immediately ſerve in the wars againſt the Infidels, accompanied with a hundred knights to be maintained at his own expence (*b*). This whole relation mentions nothing of the crown of Navarre: which obliges me to take notice in this place, that Thibaut obtained that crown in the year 1234, after the death of Sanche (*c*), who left no children. Two years after, he undertook a Cruſade againſt the Infidels, of which he was alſo the chief: but for the uſual reaſon, I mean the miſunderſtanding of the princes engaged in that enterpriſe, the expedition came to nothing. He died in the year 1253 (*d*), leaving his dominions to Thibaut his ſon. In his latter days he was engaged in ſeveral broils with his clergy, and even drew an interdict on the kingdom of Navarre for the ſpace of three years, for having baniſhed the Biſhop of Pampelona (*e*). We ſhall ſee in the remarks that he was a great Poet [*E*]. He was a man ſuſpected on ſlight grounds of the greateſt crimes. It was thought he poiſoned Philip Earl of Boulogne [*F*], uncle to St Lewis.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Father, or, according to others, uncle to Blanche of Navarre, Thibaut's mother.

(*d*) And not 1277, as La Croix du Maine ſays, *pag.* 465.

(*e*) See the Hiſtory of St Lewis by Monſ. de la Chaiſe, *lib. xi*, *num.* 4, *pag. m.* 172.

had a delicacy of wit which was extremely ſurpriſing, and that Europe never produced ſuch a compleat courtier. He adds that Blanche had a very particular eſteem for him; that ſhe conſulted him on important affairs; that ſhe ſometimes preferred his advice to that of others, and that ſhe never denied any of the little favours he aſked for his friends. There needed no more, to kindle a jealouſy in Thibaut, or to furniſh detractors with a fair pretext, to ſpread injurious reports againſt the honour of the queen-regent. This they did not fail to do; and what was yet harder the men of letters were the chief promoters of thoſe ſatires; for the ſtudents of the univerſity of Paris, *all of them of an age at that time ſo far advanced, that it would at preſent appear ſcandalous for a man of the ſame age, not to have his degree of doctor* (12), being diſguſted at the proceedings on occaſion of their quarrel with the citizens (13), left the city, *after having publiſhed licentious ſongs and verſes to blacken the reputation of the Queen-Regent, and the Pope's cardinal legate who governed her* (14).

[*E*] *He was a great Poet.*] Preſident Fauchet ſpeaks thus of him. *The Italians formerly ſo well eſteemed the ſongs of Thibaut King of Navarre, and other French poets, his cotemporaries, that they imitated them, as Dante has ſhewn, who in his Book* de Vulgari Eloquentia, *cites this king as an excellent maſter in Poetry.* (15). You will meet with ſeveral fragments of this king's poetry in Fauchet's book (16).

[*F*] *It was thought he poiſoned Philip Earl of Boulogne.*] This earl was the ſon of Philip Auguſtus, and he was the chief of the league formed againſt the Regent Blanche, ſoon after the death of Lewis the VIIIth. 'As his death was very ſudden, the 'people, always prone to calumny, were very wil'ling to aſcribe it to a violent cauſe, and by dark 'hints charged it on the queen her ſelf. But to 'attempt to vindicate her would be to injure her: and 'in reality they fell upon Thibaut in quite another 'manner, either becauſe he had been the greateſt 'gainer by it, or becauſe being perſuaded that he had 'already made a bloody eſſay on Lewis the VIIIth, 'they did not think that he would make any ſcruple 'of this ſecond murther. But the truth is, no proof 'was ever given of his being guilty of either, tho' 'the manner in which he took the death of the 'latter, was like enough to make him ſuſpected of 'having been the cauſe of it (17). Thus we ſee how Queen Blanche was made to have a ſhare in every bad action. So hard it is to have a great reputation, and not be expoſed to the malice of cenſorious tongues.

(12) Hiſt. de S. Louïs, *lib. ii*, *num.* 16, *p.* 71.

(13) Theſe quarrels began in the year 1229. See a ſhort deduction of them in the *Hiſt. de S. Louïs*, *ubi ſupra*.

(14) Mezerai, Abrége Chronol. *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 715.

(15) Fauchet, des anciens Poëtes François, *book ii*, *p.* 118.

(16) Du Verdier Vau-Privas *has inſerted in his* Bibliotheque Françoiſe, *what Fauchet ſays of Thibaut, Earl of Champagne.*

(17) Hiſt. de S. Louïs, *lib. iii*, *num.* 20, *pag.* 140.

THOMÆUS (Nicolas Leonicus) was a famous profeſſor at Padua in the XVIth century. He was a Venetian, originally of Albania (*a*). He ſtudied the Greek literature at Florence under Demetrius Chalcondylas; and was the firſt among the Latins who explained in Greek at Padua the works of Ariſtotle. He reſolved to have recourſe to the fountain-head, in order to re-eſtabliſh Philoſophy, which he found miſerably disfigured by the vain ſubtilties of the ſchoolmen, and the ſpeculations of the Arabian Commentators [*A*]. As he was a great Humaniſt, we have no reaſon to be ſurpriſed at his diſlike of the manner of philoſophizing which was practiſed at that time, nor at his courage in undertaking to explain the Greek text of Ariſtotle. His manner of living was truly philoſophical: he was fond of a ſtudious repoſe, without giving way to the commotions which emulation and ambition uſually inſpire (*b*). He was content with a moderate fortune. He lived frugally and never married [*B*]. He took the death of

(*a*) Epirota patre Venetiis genitus. *Paulus Jovius*, *Elog. cap. xci*.

(*b*) Vita ejus procul à contentione ambitioneque in ſtudioſo mollique otio verſabatur. *Jovius, ibid.* Præter virtutem bonaſque artes tota in vita nullius rei appetens. *Petrus Bembus, in Epitaphio Leon Thomæi*, apud *Chytræum Delic. Itiner. pag. m.* 152.

[*A*] *Philoſophy which he found miſerably disfigured by . . . . the ſchoolmen, and . . . . the Arabians.*] Paul Jovius happily expreſſes the ſad condition to which the ſchoolmen had reduced Philoſophy. They never enquired after truth; but ſtudied the art of raiſing objections, and anſwering them by the help of a hundred new-fangled terms, which they did not themſelves underſtand. 'Philoſophiam ex puriſſimus 'fontibus, non ex lutulentis rivulis ſalubriter haurien'dam eſſe perdocebat, exploſa penitus ſophiſtarum 'diſciplina, quæ tum inter imperitos, & barbaros 'principatum in ſcholis obtinebat, quum doctores 'excogitatis barbara ſubtilitate Dialecticorum figmen'tis, Phyſicas quæſtiones non ad veritatis lucem, ſed 'ad inanem diſputandi garrulitatem revocarent; & 'juventus in gymnaſio Arabum, & Barbarorum com'mentationes ſecuta, à recto, munitoque itinere in 'confragoſas ignorantiæ crepidines duceretur (1). '---- *He taught that philoſophy ought to be derived 'from the pure ſource itſelf, and not from the muddy 'rivulets, and that they ſhould baniſh the ſophiſtical 'learning, which then obtained the aſcendant in the 'ſchools among the ignorant, when the profeſſors by 'the invention of logical fictions, and barbarous ſub'tilties reduced all philoſophical queſtions not to the 'light of truth, but to the vain humour of diſputing, 'and the youth in the univerſity by following the com'ments of the Arabians and Barbarians were led from 'truth, and fortified in the craggy precipices of 'ignorance.*'

[*B*] *He was content with a moderate fortune . . . and never married.*] His chaſte and innocent life, is very well expreſſed in the following citation. 'Pervenit 'veneranda barbæ canitie ad ſeptuageſimum tertium 'ætatis annum (2), mediocri ſubſtantia, ipſaque civili 'frugalitate, & cælebs & felix, quod nemo vel inno'centia, & doctrinæ conſcientia, vel munditia cor'poris, vel anima nitore, beatior ætate noſtra 'fuerit (3). ---- *He arrived to the ſeventy-third 'year of his age, with a venerable aſpect, a moderate*

'fortune

(1) Paulus Jovius, in Elogiis, *cap. xci*, *pag. m.* 213.

(2) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1533, *num.* 20, *makes him live till he was* 75 *years old.*

(3) Jovius, Elogior. *cap. xci*, *pag.* 213.

of a crane which he had kept forty years for a preſage of his own approaching end [*C*]. Conſidering the age he lived to, any thing might have furniſhed him with ſuch a thought. He ſucceeded very well in Poetry (*c*). He died at Padua, in the year 1533, aged ſeventy-five years (*d*). I ſhall ſpeak of his writings in one of my remarks [*D*]. He had a brother whom Pierius Valerianus ranks amongſt the unfortunate learned men [*E*].

(*c*) Petrus Bembus, *ibid.*

(*d*) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1533, *num.* 20.

fortune, great frugality, in a ſingle and happy ſtate, ſo that no perſon in our time has been more diſtinguiſhed, either for the innocency of his life, the ſanctity of his doctrine, the neatneſs of his perſon, or the brightneſs of his mind.’

[*C*] *He took the death of a crane which he had kept forty years for a preſage of his own approaching end.*] For this the ſame Paul Jovius is alſo my authority. ‘Aluerat domi gruem, de manus ipſius ſenili oblectamento cibaria capientem, per quadraginta annos. Is ſenio tabefactus quum periiſſet, & ejus deſiderio triſte omen concepit, prædixitque nullo laceſſitus morbo, ſe non multo poſt adamati gruis fatum, maturo vitæ exitu ſecuturum. - - - - *He had kept in his houſe for forty years a crane, which in his old age he took a pleaſure to feed with his own hand. The crane happening to die of old age, he took the death of it to be ominous, and though he was in good health, foretold that without any diſtemper, he ſhould follow his favourite bird, and die, as his crane had done, of old age.*’

[*D*] *I ſhall ſpeak of his writings in one of my remarks.*] He compoſed, in imitation of the Academics, ten dialogues on curious or important ſubjects, as *de divinatione, de nominum inventione, de ludo talario, de precibus, de animorum immortalitate,* &c. He tranſlated or paraphraſed ſome tracts of Ariſtotle and Galen (4), and publiſhed a miſcellany of very fine collections, under the title of *Varia Hiſtoria,* wherein according to the cuſtom of the age he lived in, he never cited thoſe antient authors who furniſhed him with materials. As to his tranſlations Huëtius gives him the following good character. ‘Emendatus interpres, ad auctoris nutum totum ſe fingens (5). - - - - *An exact interpreter, perfectly repreſenting his author.*’ There is another obſervation to be made concerning his work intituled *de Varia Hiſtoria libri tres*, that he wrote it when young, but did not publiſh it till he was very old in the year 1531. This is what he himſelf ſays in his epiſtle dedicatory to Cuthbert Tonſtal, Biſhop of Durham. ‘Commentariolos de Varia Hiſtoria quos alias juvenis admodum multiplici cum Græcorum tum Latinorum lectione confeceram ſepoſueramque nunc edendos excudendoſve curavi: ut quando maturioris ætatis pleraque jam à me de omnimoda philoſophia exierunt opera ex academicorum peripateticorumque fontibus hauſta, hæc quoque juvenilia ſtudia noſtra ſua aliquando mercede non defraudarentur. - - - - *My commentaries on various hiſtory, which I compoſed while very young, with great pains in examining both Latin and Greek authors, and at that time laid by, I do now publiſh, that ſince the greateſt part of the works of my maturer years on all ſorts of philoſophical ſubjects, derived from the fountains of the Academics and Peripatetics have been made public, theſe ſtudies of my youth alſo may at laſt meet with their due reward.*’

OBSERVATION concerning juvenile works.

Here is an author who had the prudence not to publiſh his juvenile productions before he had acquired a great reputation by his works compoſed in his riper years. This is a very wiſe conduct; for there are few authors who do not repent the precipitation with which they hurry their firſt eſſays into the world, even before the down begins to appear on their chin. Grotius, who perhaps had the leaſt reaſon of any body, to repent of it, was in extreme confuſion on this account. This is the confeſſion he makes in a letter, wherein he praiſes Scriverius for the contrary conduct. ‘Quo rependam non habeo, ex quo tandem reſipiſcere cœpi ab ea inſania, quæ mihi cum aliis nonnullis communis fuit, ut cœca quadam innoteſcendi libidine nihil niſi infamiam meam publicarem, daremque ea mundo ſpectanda, quæ nunc ne ſolus quidem apud me ſine magno pudore & acri doloris ſenſu conſpicio. Tu vero (dicam non ut blandiar, ſed ut raram animi fortitudinem, quam, ſi poſſim, imitari velim, ſane, quod poſſum, probem atque commendem) in annos non doctrinæ tantum, ſed & ſapientiæ capaces, tibi te & publico ſervaſti; & quo nullum maturæ mentis certius eſſe ſignum poteſt, auſus es ita utilitati aliorum ſtudere, ut appareret priorem tibi hujus eſſe quam gloriæ tuæ rationem (6). - - - - *I am incapable of making any amends, ſince I have begun to recover from that madneſs which was common to me with ſome others, of publiſhing, out of a blind ambition of being known, my own diſgrace, and of preſenting thoſe pieces to the world which now I cannot read my ſelf without great confuſion and concern. While you (I do not ſpeak it out of flattery, but that your rare fortitude of mind, which ſhould be imitated by me if it were poſſible, may be approved and commended by me ſince that is poſſible) have reſerved the publication of your ſelf and works, to years, that are capable not only of learning but alſo of wiſdom: and which is the moſt certain ſign of a mature underſtanding, you have ventured to ſtudy the publick good in ſuch a manner, that it ſhould appear you had a much greater regard to this than your own glory.*’ Thoſe authors who are not quite ſo haſty run a greater riſque; becauſe the world is more inclined to excuſe the faults of writers of 15 than thoſe of 20, or 25 years of age. Theſe therefore ought to take ſpecial care of their firſt book; for if it be worth nothing they will find a thouſand difficulties to retrieve their reputation, and cure the public of their prejudices. If they with Thomæus keep their juvenile compoſures by them till they have eſtabliſhed a good reputation, they may then eaſily paſs an indifferent piece upon the world. They muſt not follow the Italian faſhion, where the lacqueys go before their maſters; but place the fineſt of their equipage in the van, to prepoſſeſs the ſpectators in favour of them, and the remainder will follow in time. They would not loſe the recompence of their firſt labours, if they believed with Thomæus that theſe ought alſo to meet with their reward. It is undeniable, that at a certain pitch of reputation, authors may put off indifferent performances with ſucceſs, which would be laughed at, if publiſhed by perſons not known. But thoſe who make an ill uſe of this prepoſſeſſion of the public are very often deceived. They collect all their papers, they go back even to their moſt trifling manuſcripts, written when they were juſt come from the univerſity; or even while they were ſtudents, and ſend them to the Printer. They at laſt diſguſt all their readers, and ſometimes are more blamed for their laſt books, than they were praiſed for their firſt.

[*E*] *He had a brother whom Pierius Valerianus ranks amongſt the unfortunate learned men.*] He would not have been at all inferior to our Thomæus, if he had lived as long: but he died young, and yet he lived long enough to ſuffer a great deal of miſery: ſhort and evil were his days. Let us relate what Valerianus ſays of him, ‘Bartolomæum Leonicum cognomento Fuſcum agnoviſtis, cujus ingenium, & abſolutiſſimam eruditionem omnes admirabamur. Is cum Patavinum bellum, & totius ejus regionis deſolationem, incendiaque devitaſſet, Romæ aliquandiu fuit, ſed, cum neque hic otium, quod ſibi propoſuerat, reperiſſet, in Caſſinatem receſſit ſolitudinem, facta illi à loci illius monachis, quieſcendi copia; ſed, dum hic ſperat ſcripta ſua luculentiſſima maturare, & immortalem ſibi gloriam comparare, paucis poſtquam illuc ſeceſſerat diebus, rapidiſſima correptus febri, cùm ægrotaſſet graviſſimè, valetudinis ejus violentia ſublatus eſt: futurus dubio procul Leonico Thomeo germano fratri non inferior, ſi fata eum diutius in vita eſſe voluiſſent (7). - - - - *You knew Bartholomew Leonicus, ſirnamed Brown, whoſe genius and compleat erudition we all admired. This man after he had eſcaped from the Paduan war, and the deſolation and the burning of all that country, made ſome ſtay at Rome, but when he could not there find the leiſure which he wanted, he retired into the ſolitude of mount Caſſin, the Monks of that place giving him a retirement; but whilſt he was in hopes of compleating his excellent writings and of gaining immortal glory, a few days after he retired thither, he was*

‘*ſuddenly*

---

(4) De animalium motione ac ingreſſu: Quæſtiones mechanicæ: Liber primus de partibus animalium: Argumenta in aliquot libros Ariſtotelis parvorum naturalium ex Michaele Epheſio fere tranſlata. *Geſner. in Bibliotheca, folio* 521. Paul Jovius ſays *Scripſit erudite & luculenter Commentarios in parva naturalia Ariſtotelis.*

(5) Huet. de claris Interpret. *pag. m.* 222. *See* Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Latin. *pag.* 677.

(6) Grotius's letter, in which he thanks Scriverius for a copy of the authors *de Re Militari*, dated June 8, 1607, in my edition it is at the beginning. To this example of Grotius, add thoſe alledged by Mr Baillet, in the firſt Tome of the *Jugemens des Sçavans*, Part. ii, ch. ix, *des Prejugez de l'age.*

(7) Pier. Valerianus, de Literatorum Infelicitate. *lib. ii, pag. m.* 84.

‘ *ſuddenly ſeized with a fever, and the violence of his* ‘ *diſtemper carried him off. Had he lived longer, he* ‘ *would have undoubtedly equalled his brother Leonicus* ‘ *Thomæus.*’

THOMAS (Paul) Sieur de Girac, ſon of Paul Thomas Sieur de Maiſonette [*A*], was a very learned man, a good neighbour, and hearty friend to Balzac. The fame of his wit and learning had never perhaps extended beyond the walls of Engoulême his native place, if he had not criticiſed the works of Voiture: but this critical piece, though a ſmall diſſertation, occaſioned a long controverſy which made a great noiſe in the world. Coſtar, Voiture's friend, had no ſooner ſeen this diſſertation, but he undertook to refute it. This deſign, which he executed very ſlowly, and with abundance of artifice, as it is ſaid, ſucceeded to his wiſh [*B*]. He publiſhed a defence of Voiture which was very much eſteemed [*C*]. Girac thought himſelf obliged to reply; and he did not make uſe of Latin, as he had done in his firſt diſſertation, but defended himſelf in French, the language in which Coſtar had publiſhed the apology for his friend. The deſign of Girac's anſwer (*a*) was not only to defend his criticiſm on Voiture's letters, but alſo to cenſure ſome faults of Coſtar. For this reaſon the latter replied in two pieces, one of which was an apology for himſelf, and the other the ſequel of his defence of Voiture. His adverſary returned to the charge, and publiſhed a large volume againſt that Sequel. The controverſy went no further; and indeed it had been carried to the greateſt extremities which the French language is capable of bearing on ſerious ſubjects. Coſtar was a rallying wit, who when he began to ſtrike, gave heavy blows. He made both Balzac and Girac feel the weight of them in his firſt defence. An author, when he is piqued, commonly imagines that he does not take ſufficient revenge, unleſs the ſtrokes he returns are heavier than thoſe he has received. Girac followed this principle in his anſwer, as did Coſtar likewiſe in his new defences; and Girac anſwering them in the ſame ſtrain, carried the invective to the higheſt pitch. To meet with books more abuſive than this reply, we muſt have recourſe either to thoſe who write in Latin, or to thoſe who have written in French not long ago in ſome towns of Holland, which I will not name. Girac had the advantage of ſtriking the firſt and the laſt blow. There was another thing which evidently proved that the victory was on his ſide, and this was Coſtar's

[*A*] *The ſon of Paul Thomas Sieur de Maiſonnette.*] Mr de Girac's father was born at Jarnac (1), but lived at Engoulême; he underſtood Hebrew very well, as appears by theſe words of Jarrige: Father Beaufés *having laſt year received from one of our miniſters a letter in Hebrew, travelled all night from Ruffec to Angoulême, to get it tranſlated and anſwered by Mr Thomas de Maiſonnette, a learned man, who is perfectly acquainted with that language. This honeſt gentleman cannot deny the truth of what I ſay* (2). Mr Colomiés (3) cites this paſſage of Jarrige, and ſays (4), that he had read Mr de Maiſonnette's poems with pleaſure, and that Balzac praiſed him in his Latin letters (5), as did alſo Nicolas Bourbon.

[*B*] *This deſign, which he executed very ſlowly, and with abundance of artifice, as it is ſaid, ſucceeded to his wiſh.*] A little after the impreſſion of Voiture's works, Balzac, who, perhaps could not ſee the good reception they met with, without chagrin, deſired Mr Girac to give him his opinion of them. Mr Girac, in complaiſance to his friend, wrote a Latin diſſertation on that ſubject, and Balzac communicated it to Coſtar, to have his ſentiment of it. Coſtar thought this a favourable opportunity of ſignalizing himſelf, and as he believed that Balzac was not diſpleaſed that ſome faults had been found in Voiture, he reſolved to make ſuch an apology for the latter, as might indirectly reflect upon the former. But in order to take the ſurer meaſures, *He at firſt excuſed himſelf as not being able to give his opinion on Girac's remarks, alledging a thouſand affairs, which deprived him of all leiſure for it. At laſt, ſome years after, and when it was leaſt expected, he ſent his defence in manuſcript to Mr Balzac, conjuring him,* that if he found any lines in it which diſpleaſed him, to blot them out, to commit them to the flames, or throw them into the water, for he abſolutely abandoned them to him. *In the mean time this book, which is nothing but a ſatire, attacking the reputation of the perſon to whom it is addreſſed, notwithſtanding all the profeſſions of loving and honouring him, was printed, and in every bodies hands, before the manuſcript reached him* (6). A paſſage in the *Menagiana* makes me doubt whether the laſt part of Girac's relation is true. I do not believe that the defence of Voiture was printed before the author ſent the manuſcript copy to Mr de Balzac. For I find this in the *Menagiana* (7): ‘ Mr de Balzac, . . . ‘ after having obliged Mr de Girac to write in Latin ‘ againſt *Voiture's Letters*, engaged alſo Mr Coſtar to ‘ undertake the defence of them, and to write againſt ‘ Girac; this was to make ſure of the praiſes of both ‘ parties. I was going through Mans in my return to ‘ Paris, when the *Defence* was finiſhed. Mr Coſtar ‘ gave me two copies of it, one to be ſent to ‘ Mr Pincheſne, Mr de Voiture's nephew, and the ‘ other, to Mr Conrart. He told me he freely ſubmitted it to all the alterations which his friends would ‘ propoſe, whether it were by adding or retrenching. ‘ One of the copies was communicated to Mr de Balzac, who ſent his corrections. In the mean while ‘ the work was printed, and his corrections not coming ‘ till the impreſſion was finiſhed, he was informed ‘ that they came too late; and the book appeared ‘ ſuch as it was, which gave him ſome uneaſineſs.’ Compare this with Mr Coſtar's account (8); and with a letter of Balzac to Conrart (9), and you will plainly ſee that Balzac received the manuſcript, before the book was printed. This will not hinder ſeveral people from believing that Balzac was impoſed upon, and that all the excuſes grounded upon Voiture's nephew, cauſing the book to be printed without Coſtar's knowledge, are but ſo many inſults. The wars of authors have their ſtratagems, as well as thoſe of princes; and it is probable that this was a ſtratagem of the pen-combatants, which was practiſed on this occaſion againſt Balzac, The impreſſion went on, and was finiſhed in ſpite of the ſtrong oppoſition he made by means of Mr Conrart (10).

[*C*] *Coſtar . . . . publiſhed a Defence of Voiture, which was very much eſteemed.*] It may be ſaid that this book made him known to the world; after this, his name was ſpread every where, and, what is much better, by means of this book, he obtained a penſion of five hundred crowns. *He could not help,* ſays Mr Girac (11), *expreſſing on all occaſions, his ſatiſfaction and joy, that he had been acquainted with me. And, indeed, in what corner of France has he not publiſhed, that* he was infinitely obliged to me for having given him an opportunity of making himſelf known to the world; and that by my means the eyes of all the learned and polite were fixed on him, and that to me he owed the glory and applauſe which he received from all parts, *and what he eſteemed yet much more,* that I have been the cauſe of his having gained five hundred crowns? *I have ſeen ſeveral of his letters, which are all in the ſame tone, and I have not met with one*

(*a*) He publiſhed it in the year 1655, and joined with it his Latin diſſertation, which had been already printed in the ſecond edition of his Defence of Voiture. I have an edition of this defence printed at Paris in the year 1664, wherein it is ſaid in the advertiſement that this was the firſt time Mr Girac's Latin Diſſertation was publiſhed. How ridiculous it is to affirm this in the year 1664!

(1) Colomeſius, Galliæ Oriental. *pag.* 183.

(2) Réponſe aux calomnies de Jaques Beaufés, *chap. ii.*

(3) Colom. Galliæ Oriental. *pag.* 184.

(4) Id. ibid. *pag.* 183.

(5) *Pag.* 208, *Edit. in 12mo.* Quanti oris & quanta ſpiritus, *ſays he,* Poëta ſit Paulus civis meus, non eſt cur pluribus exemplis apud te probare debeam. *After this he cites a paſſage out of a poem on the expedition of the Iſle of Ré.*

(6) Girac, *Préface de la* Réponſe à la Défenſe de Voiture.

(7) Pag. 166, of the firſt Dutch edition.

(8) Suite de la Defenſe, *pag.* 20, *& ſeq.*

(6) The xvth of the ivth book, dated the 15th of June 1653.

(10) Ubi ſupra.

(11) Replique à Coſtar, *pag.* 3, 4, *Dutch edition. See alſo the* Menagiana, *pag.* 368, 369.

Coſtar's uſing all his intereſt to obtain of the magiſtrates that his antagoniſt's reply ſhould be ſuppreſſed [*D*]. The reaſon he alledged that his morals were attacked is, generally ſpeaking, ſomewhat ſpecious ; nevertheleſs in this caſe it was of no force [*E*] ; for he was

of his friends who has not thanked me in his name, for having occaſioned this happy book, which his Eminence had thought worthy of his liberality *. *Theſe are his own words in his Epiſtle Dedicatory.*

[*D*] *Coſtar uſed all his intereſt to obtain of the magiſtrates, that his antagoniſt's Reply ſhould be ſuppreſſed.*] It is leſs ſhameful for a Logician to be guilty of the fault which they call *μεταϐάσις ἐις ἄλλο γένος, to ſhift, to run from the queſtion, to ramble out of the way, in order to catch at another difficulty*, than it is for a man of wit, after having for ſome time combated with his pen, to quit that weapon, and have recourſe to the arms of the civil magiſtrate. This is viſibly giving ground, quitting the field of battle, and throwing away his ſword and buckler, in order the ſooner to reach a place of refuge, and hide himſelf behind an altar. I am ſurprized that Coſtar, who was a perſon of wit and peneration, did not foreſee that his conduct would meet with this conſtruction, and be compared to that of a Gentleman who, in a quarrel, where his honour is concerned, ſhould apply himſelf to the civil magiſtrate, inſtead of having recourſe to his ſword. He anſwered, and replied to the criticiſm on Voiture, he treated his adverſary as ill as he pleaſed, he charged him with a thouſand faults, and after having taken the greateſt liberty which the Republic of Letters allowed him, he betook himſelf to the Lieutenant-Civil, to hinder his adverſary from making his defence, and uſing the ſame liberty. This was a loud injuſtice ; but the fear which ſuch a conduct betrayed was yet more apparent than the injuſtice of it. Girac was not ſilent on this head ; he ſufficiently inſulted his adverſary. 'What is become, ſays he (12), of the generous ſentiments of this bravo, who, not long ago, ſtiled himſelf a *gentleman of Pomerania, and Orondates* junior † ; who boaſted of his feats, and *of always having the ſacred laws of antient chivalry, ſo deeply engraven in his mind, that it was impoſſible for him to violate or infringe them.* If theſe frivolous and ridiculous imaginations are evaporated, and Mr Coſtar's brain is no longer troubled with ſuch viſions, does he not ſee, (to expreſs myſelf in plainer terms), to what confuſion and ſcandal a man of letters, as he is, expoſes himſelf, who, when accuſed of a thouſand inſtances of ignorance, a thouſand blunders, and a thouſand abſurdities, recurs to the civil magiſtrate, and to his intereſt, to ſuppreſs the books which convict him, inſtead of defending his opinions, or owning his errors?' He made another advantage of the great confuſion and diſorder which appeared in the conduct of his adverſary. 'This diſorder, ſays he (13), appeared very plainly through the whole courſe of his proceeding, but nothing publiſhed it more effectually, than the proteſtation he made ſo publickly ⸸, *never to read, while he lived, any thing which went under my name.* For if his hatred or contempt of me was ſo great, that he would never look on any of my books, why does he give himſelf ſo much trouble to hinder their publication? Why does he ſo loudly proteſt ‡, that in the purſuit of ſo vaſt a deſign which he propoſed, he will not be diverted by the way ; that the ſtones which I ſhall throw at him will not be able to ſtop him ; that he ſhould have a heap of them to denote his victory, and that tho' I ſhould continue to fling at him, he would not ſo much as turn his head. However, neither the ſacred obligation of an oath, nor ſuch a ſolemn proteſtation could hinder him from reading my book, nay, from bribing my Printer, in order to get all the ſheets of my book, as faſt as printed off. But, to continue his allegory, I had ſcarce taken this fatal ſling into my hand, but this intrepid, this terrible and haughty Goliah was ſo ſhamefully ſtruck with fear, that he cried out for help, and implored the aſſiſtance of the civil magiſtrate. Yet this hope will be in vain, and I deſire no other proofs of his flight and of victory, if I may ſo call the defeat of ſo cowardly an enemy, than the pains he takes to avoid me.'

[*E*] *The reaſon he alledged . . . . was nevertheleſs of no force.*] Let us hear Girac a little farther (14). 'By what authority therefore does he preſume to preſcribe authors, and act the tyrant in an empire, which hath always maintained the poſſeſſion of an entire and perfect liberty? It is, indeed, an unprecedented attempt, and worthy of the arrogance of my adverſary. For though he covered his deſign with a more ſpecious pretext, and took other meaſures to obtain that ſentence, in which he now triumphs, it is impoſing on the judge and the world, to perſuade them that he was forced to take thoſe meaſures, by the pretended calumnies caſt on his religion and morals. And he muſt ſurely be a very nice man to complain of two or three ſhort letters which I have made uſe of, when he cannot deny that he wrote them, and at the ſame time muſt own that what he himſelf has printed on theſe matters is much more ſhameful and ſcandalous. Beſides, they were in the hands of all the curious, and publickly read in every province where Mr Coſtar is known.' After having alledged ſome other reaſons to juſtify the uſe he made of theſe letters, he goes on in this manner (15) : 'It muſt therefore be, becauſe he bluſhes to ſee his fraud, inſincerity, falſe learning, and miſunderſtanding of authors detected. He is concerned to find himſelf diſturbed in that *fine, general, and long enjoyed reputation, which he fancies he poſſeſſed without any interruption*, and that *the enchantments and illuſions by which he made a bad cauſe appear good*, will no longer prove effectual. He knows very well that his fine language, the only thing that has any charm in his writings, will no longer impoſe upon the credulous. He is apprehenſive that inſtead of *lofty epithets of illuſtrious, the ornament of France, and the glory of our age*, he ſhould be taken for an ignoramus, a giddy-headed man, and a plagiary. Theſe are the genuine motives which made him take the reſolution of having recourſe to chicanery, as the laſt refuge of a deſperate cauſe, amidſt the trouble, confuſion and diſorder to which he is reduced.' Some, perhaps, may ſay, that Côſtar was not ſo unjuſt as certain perſons, to deſire that he might be allowed to write againſt his adverſary, but his adverſary not allowed to anſwer him (16). He was willing that the Lieutenant-Civil ſhould include him in the prohibition, and make an order that neither Mr Coſtar nor Mr Girac ſhould, for the future, write againſt one another : but this is ſaying very little in favour of Coſtar ; for having publiſhed all he had to ſay, he could be very little affected by a prohibition of writing any more. His advantage was to have his adverſaries hands tied up. 'Truly, ſays Mr Girac (17), it is not an eaſy matter to conceive what could oblige the Lieutenant-Civil, to order that Mr Coſtar and I ſhould not, for the future, write againſt one another ; when I had not yet began to defend myſelf (18), and my adverſary had publiſhed three large volumes, in which he had treated me in ſo opprobrious a manner, and loaded me with ſo much calumny, that I muſt of neceſſity either refute him, or ſuffer very greatly in my reputation. I muſt allow a ſchool-maſter, who ſcarce knows the firſt elements and principles of Science, to raiſe himſelf on my ruins, and procure himſelf an eſteem at my expence. So that whatever reſolution I may have taken to ſtifle my juſt complaints againſt the injury which has been done me ; I cannot help ſaying of this ſentence of the Lieutenant-Civil what an excellent perſon ** ſaid long ago of that of a certain Emperor. *This ſentence deſtroys itſelf, it confounds and overturns all things, and, under the pretext of a fallacious humanity, covers an extreme and unprecedented rigour.* It binds the hands of the accuſed, in order to deliver him up a prey to his enemies ; it robs oppreſſed innocence of what the ſevereſt laws never refuſed to the moſt guilty criminal, as it takes away all poſſible means of juſtification, by impoſing ſilence on the perſon accuſed. It forbids Mr Coſtar to ſay any thing more to me, after he has ſo long worn out my patience, and tired his own cruelty and rage with abuſing me. Was there ever a more captious, more unjuſt, or more deceitful contrivance?' I muſt obſerve to my reader, that Girac does not forget the paſſage of Tacitus concerning Cremutius Cordus. Thus he was not accuſed without proof [*F*], and that ought rather to have engaged the judges to

---

* Epiſt. Dedic. *to the* Suite de la Deff.

(12) In his firſt letter to Mr de Montauſier at the beginning of his reply, *fol.* * 3 *verſo.*

† Sequel of the defence, *pag.* 12, *l.* 366.

(13) Girac, *ibid.*

⸸ Sequel. *pag.* 424.

‡ L. 334.

(14) Girac, ubi ſupra, *fol.* * 5 *verſo.*

(15) Ibid.

(16) *See the book intituled* La Chimere de la Cabale de Rotterdam démontrée, *pag.* 65, *of the preface.*

(17) Girac, ubi ſupra.

(18) This muſt be underſtood of the *ſequel of the defence of Voiture and of Coſtar's apology.* The The lieutenant's ſentence preceded Girac's reply in this reſpect, but before this ſentence, Girac had anſwered the defence of Voiture. Wherefore he does not expreſs himſelf exactly.

** Tertullian, in his apology.

he ſhews, in the conduct of his adverſary, not only a great deal of injuſtice, but alſo a great deal of imprudence; for Tacitus obſerves, that the prohibition of a book gains it a reputation.

A REFLEXION on the conduct of authors, who procure the prohibition of the books of their adverſaries.

It is evident, that an author who employs the authority of the civil magiſtrate, for the prohibition of books written againſt him, manifeſtly betrays his defeat and inability to anſwer, while he increaſes the curioſity of the public after thoſe very books. Why then do ſo many authors recur to this method, when they have intereſt enough to make it effectual. Is it a very agreeable thing, to declare to all the world that they are not able to reſiſt an author who is their adverſary? Can ſelf-love find it's account in raiſing a deſire to read thoſe books in ſeveral people, who would otherwiſe never hear of them, and who buy them on no other account but becauſe they are informed that thoſe books are prohibited? Can ſelf-love, I ſay, which is ſo angry at the contents of them, and ſo eager to ſtifle the memory of them, find it's account in putting the public upon enquiring more curiouſly into the particulars contained in them? What charm can there be in publiſhing a ſentence of prohibition of certain books in the Gazettes? Is not this the way to proclaim to all Europe the ſhameful neceſſity a man lies under of imploring that aſſiſtance of the civil magiſtrate, which he ought only to ſeek from his pen (19)? I think it may be ſaid, in anſwer to theſe queſtions, that the authors who take ſuch meaſures, find no great ſatisfaction in them at the bottom. It is only a laſt ſhift, to which they give the moſt comfortable turn they poſſibly can. They endeavour to regain, by their own intereſt, what they have loſt by the pen of their adverſaries. They would keep the populace on their ſide; the populace, I ſay, who are always prone to judge the ſtrongeſt party in the right: they would prevent the attacks of other adverſaries; for how many perſons are there who are ſilent on the injuſtice of a man, only in proportion to the good or ill he is able to do by his intereſt? Not to ſay that they hope a great many unwary readers will conclude that a book which is prohibited, muſt be ſtuffed with falſities. It is true, that ſeveral people are guilty of this wretched reaſoning; for they do not conſider that the civil magiſtrates, even when they ſuppreſs a book for prudential reaſons, and agreeably to their regulations, do not pretend to prejudice the public againſt the facts contained in it, for they take no cognizance of them, nor do they pretend to be judges of them. This ſeems to me one of the principle motives which engages certain authors to hold the ſame conduct with Coſtar; a conduct far from being honourable, to ſay no worſe of it, and entirely ſophiſtical. Is it not a meer ſophiſtry to change the ſtate of the queſtion? Was the diſpute between Coſtar and Girac any way concerning their greater or leſs credit with the Judges of the Chatelet? Did Mr Girac, confined within his province, pretend to have more friends, or greater intereſt than his adverſary in the capital city, in order to ſollicit a proceſs? The queſtion was, whether Voiture's thoughts were right or wrong, whether he had been ſtrongly cenſured, and weakly defended, or the reverſe. What does it avail in this queſtion, to have intereſt enough with the Lieutenant-Civil to get a book ſuppreſſed?

[*F*] *He was not accuſed without proof.*] It ill becomes a paſtor, a prieſt, a miniſter, to employ his pen on ſubjects of gallantry and pleaſantry. For which reaſon Mr Coſtar, who was a prieſt, had the cure of ſouls, and was an Arch-deacon (20), forgot his character, and all the rules of decency, when he employed his wit in being waggiſh with the fair ſex, and interſperſed his letters with a great many wanton ſtories. His adverſary cruelly perſecuted him on this head; if a war ſo juſtly founded deſerves the name of perſecution. On this paſſage, in a letter of Coſtar to a maid, *Your nimble feet dance in perfection, they help you to fly top over tail, to ſhew the forked tree, and repreſent a thouſand other fine ſights.* Girac ſays (21), that when the Arch-deacon ſaw *this young lady in ſo pleaſant a poſture, he was not ſo hard-hearted as that hermit* (22), who turned the hair of ſome young girls perfectly grey, becauſe they laughed at his not daring to ſee them naked. *Mr Coſtar* (ſays he) *is too gallant a man to impoſe ſuch ſevere penances on the ladies; and if ſuch an adventure ſhould happen to him, I dare ſwear for him, he would ſooner wiſh that he had not a grey hair himſelf, than cover the heads of thoſe poor wretches with them* (23). He will not pardon this Arch-deacon for ſaying in a letter to a lady, where he repreſents himſelf at the point of death. *I cannot tell where I ſhall undergo my purgatory; it would be a moſt agreeable conſolation, if I might be permitted to undergo it in your chamber. I ſhould have ſo much pleaſure to ſee you ſo charming,* &c (24). Nor will he pardon the pity which Coſtar expreſſes for one of the Graces on account of her huſband's impotence. ‘He rails *againſt the Poets for their cruelty, and even impertinence in marrying one of the Graces to Vulcan, and another to Sleep. However,* continues he, *the firſt was not wholly diſconſolate, if what a Queen of the Amazons ſaid be true, that lame men kiſs beſt,* ἄριϛα χωλὸς οἰφεῖ. But he deplores the miſerable condition of the ſecond, *ſince Virgil has told us, that ſleep is ſoft,* & ſomno mollior herba. *What an excellent quality is this in the huſband of a goddeſs everlaſtingly young! It was a great happineſs for him that Paſithea (ſo ſhe is called) was* ſolutâ zonâ, *as were all the Graces,* & ſolutis Gratiæ Zonis, *or elſe*

Quærendum aliunde foret (*nervoſius illud*)
 Quod poſſet zonam ſolvere virgineam (25).

He will not forgive Coſtar the explication he had given of theſe words in Horace (26), *Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus Vide docentem.* I have recited it in the article SICYONE. He is charged with yet groſſer impurities, extracted from his printed works (27); he is even cenſured for a letter he wrote to his Phyſician. This indeed was not printed; but as he diſtributed copies of it every where (28), his adverſary made no ſcruple to charge him publickly with it. He had ſtill ſome remains of a fever on him, and finding two nights ſucceſſively that nature revived, he wrote this agreeable news to his Phyſician (29), deſiring to be informed whether he might rely on an old proverb, which repreſents this ſymptom as a ſign of recovery. As this letter is ſhort, and in Latin, I ſhall make no difficulty to print it at large: ‘Febris mea longè remiſſior fuit quàm fuerat hactenus, hac nocte placidiſſimè quievi, haud ſcio an uſquam melius. Sub ortum Solis (neque enim tibi & medico & amiciſſimo viro quicquam reticere æquum eſt) valida tentigine, & ſatis diuturna & non inſuavi, quod & heri acciderat, correptus ſum. Luſit animus aliquantulùm in umbra voluptatis, ſed ne de Theologo malè ſentias, dormiebam. Vides, mi colendiſſime ſeu potius mi jucundiſſime ſenex, nondum in me funeratam eſſe eam partem corporis, cui apodixin defunctoriam ſcribere paratus eram. Vetus verbum eſt, id jam jam redituræ ſanitatis argumentum indubitatum eſſe. Verum uni tibi plus credo quàm univerſis adagiis. Si commodum eſt ad me reſcribas velim hac de re quid ſentias, hoc eſt quid ſentire debeam. Ride, vale, & me ama, alioquin nec ridebo, nec valebo (30). - - - *My fever is very much abated, and I do not remember that I ever had a better night in my life than the laſt. About ſun-riſe (for I ought to conceal nothing from you, who are my Phyſician and intimate friend) I was ſeized with a ſtrong tenſion, which was of ſome continuance as well as pleaſure; and I met with the ſame ſymptom yeſterday. My mind ſported a little in the ſhadow of pleaſure, but that you may ſuſpect nothing amiſs in a Divine, I aſſure you I ſlept. You find, my worthy, or rather my merry old friend, that I have not yet buried that part of the body, for which I was preparing to write an epitaph. The old proverb makes it an undoubted ſign of returning health. But I rely more upon your opinion than all the proverbs in the world. I beg you would write to me, if you conveniently can, and let me know what you think of this matter, that is, what I ought to think of it myſelf. Laugh, farewel, and love me, otherwiſe I ſhall neither laugh, nor farewel.*’ Balzac having read this letter, wrote to Coſtar, among other things, as follows. ‘Now, that I ſee by your's to Mr le Gouſt, that you are not content with *health alone*, but pretend to *vigour*, and look rather like a ſtout wreſtler than a man who is barely well, I do not know, *&c* (31).’ It muſt be owned that theſe reproaches regarded Mr Coſtar's morals; but this was no reaſon why to licenſe than to prohibit Girac's book [*G*]. Patin has not ſpoken very exactly of this diſpute [*H*]. One cannot ſufficiently wonder at the nicety of Voiture's friends; they pretended that Girac for daring to criticiſe upon him, deſerved Military execution [*I*]. The paſſage which proves this, informs us that this author was rich. The ſame thing is affirmed in a paſſage of Balzac [*K*]. What I have ſaid concerning Mr de Girac in the

---

(19) Between author and author, the weapons ought to be equal, each ought to have recourſe to his pen alone. He may be allowed to ſay *dextra mihi Deus & ferrum quod miſſile libro*: (Virgil. Æn. lib. x, ver. 773.) If he ſays, I will have recourſe to the civil magiſtrate and to my intereſt with the gods of the earth, he is like a champion who arms himſelf againſt a naked man.

(20) Girac's Reply §. *iii*, *pag.* 15.

(21) Ibid. *pag.* 19.

(22) *He cites* Theodoret's Hiſt. Relig.

(23) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 20.

(24) Coſtar, Letter clxxxviii, *Tom. i.*

(25) Girac, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 22.

(26) Od. XIX, lib. ii.

(27) *See the* Entretiens de Coſtar & de Voiture, *pag.* 200. Girac's Reply, *pag.* 23, 24, *and the New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, pag.* 748.

(28) Girac, *pag.* 21.

(29) His name was Mr le Gouſt, a Phyſician of Niort.

(30) Girac, *ibid.*

(31) Balzac, Lettres Choiſies, *Part. ii, Lett. iii, pag.* 562, *cited by* Girac, *ibid.*

why the Chatelet ought to ſuppreſs Mr Girac's Reply, ſince it could not paſs for a libel; for the author puts his name to it, and proved his accuſations.

[*G*] *And that ought rather to have engaged the Judges to licenſe than to prohibit Girac's book.*] A critical book, which ſtrongly repreſents to a Prieſt, the ill uſe he makes of his time and wit, is no unprofitable work. On the contrary, the public good ſeems to require that there ſhould be men bold enough to cenſure thoſe Eccleſiaſtics whoſe life is not conformable to their profeſſion. Now it is leading a life very inconſiſtent with the duty of a Prieſt, who had the cure of ſouls, and was an Arch-deacon, as Mr Coſtar was, to ſet up for a wit, and to ſpend the beſt part of his time in reading books of gallantry, and writing, what they call fine things, to ladies and gentlemen. This ought to be left to the Voitures and the Sarrazins, and, in general, to thoſe who are not of a profeſſion which forbids their meddling with trifles. Or if the inclination be ſtrongly bent, and the perſon have a happy talent that way, he ought to keep in a lay-ſtation; and then he is free to make as many verſes, and write as many letters of gallantry as he pleaſes. He may jeſt and trifle in his books at diſcretion, and laugh at the ſour cenſurer who is diſpleaſed with it. But if he enters upon an eccleſiaſtical life, and takes on him the charge of ſouls, or is only in orders, he ought not to play the galant, either with his tongue, or his pen. Nay, methinks it were to be wiſhed that the rewards which the Voitures, the Sarrazins, and other fine wits, have a juſt claim to, were not aſſigned them out of the revenues of the Church, as they are very frequently (32). It was never the intention of thoſe who enriched the Church, that the eſtates which they beſtowed on her ſhould furniſh a recompence for amorous poetry, romances, or plays. Do you believe that thoſe who ſtraitned their families, to beſtow an eaſy life on ſuch as ſerve at the altar, ever deſigned to maintain wits who turn their ſtudies the ſame way as Coſtar, and employ their pens as he did? Do you believe, I ſay, that they deſigned give ſuch authors wherewithal to *keep an open table, with every thing nice and good* (33)? Upon the whole, it cannot be denied that ſuch a book, as Coſtar's Reply, was very proper to correct the abuſes, and, for the future, to prevent a clergyman's diſtributing copies of a letter, in which he acquaints his Phyſician of the reſurrection of a member, the mortification of which ought to have been one of his greateſt concerns. It appears, by Balzac's reflexion, that the author of the letter wanted to be congratulated on the return of his amorous dreams. What an exceſſive indecency was this! Had he only deſired to be praiſed for imitating Petronius in that letter, would he not have deſerved to be cenſured?

[*H*] *Patin has not ſpoken very exactly of this diſpute.*] Theſe are his words (34). ‘They are printing a ſecond tome of Mr Coſtar's letters. Mr Paul Thomas, Sieur de Girac, Counſellor of the Preſidial of Angoulême (35), and an intimate friend of Mr Balzac had a diſpute with Mr Coſtar in defence of Balzac againſt Voiture. There is ſome thing of it printed. Mr Girac has anſwered him, and ſent hither his copy. Mr Coſtar having notice of it, preſented a petition to hinder the impreſſion of the book, and obtained an order againſt the printing of it: nay what was already begun was ſeized; and yet Balzac has the better of Voiture.’ Who would not infer from theſe words that Voiture was engaged in a controverſy with Balzac, and that Girac appeared as Protector of the latter againſt the former? This is very falſe. Voiture never had any diſpute with Balzac: Balzac, after Voiture's death, critized his famous ſonnet of Urania, but this was not the ſubject of the quarrel between Coſtar and Girac. If Guy Patin was not better informed in his other news from the Republic of Letters, than this, woe be to them who rely on him. Sorel had much better intelligence: he gives an account of the affair exactly as it was (36), and does not forget to tell us that *Mr Girac's laſt reply, though the impreſſion of it was ſtopped, had lately been publiſhed* (37). *Some are of opinion*, adds he, *that Mr Girac is in the right to defend himſelf; others ſay, he ought not to have continued this quarrel after the death of Coſtar, who cannot reply.* Theſe laſt words are liable to cenſure. Sorel ſpeaks of Girac as of a man who was living in the year 1667, when he had been dead four years. He ſpeaks of his Reply as of a work juſt publiſhed; and yet there had been an edition of it (38) in the year 1660. He ought to have blamed thoſe who cenſured Girac for continuing this war after Coſtar's death. Such cenſurers were very unreaſonable, ſince Girac's reply was printed in Coſtar's life-time; and if it was not ſold, this was becauſe Coſtar had intereſt enough to hinder it. Was it therefore juſt, under pretence that he was dead, that is to ſay, that he could no longer oppreſs his adverſary by his intereſt with the Chatelet, to deprive the author of his right of publiſhing his vindication, and the Bookſeller of the means of recovering the money laid out in the impreſſion?

[*I*] *Voiture's friends .... pretended .... that Girac .... deſerved military execution.*] Coſtar informs us of it (39). ‘To ſpeak truth, a man of this humour is very liable to be beaten (I mean with the tongue and pen) for we do not live in an age ſo licentious as that, when the Roman young gentlemen walked in the ſtreets the whole day, with long rods concealed under their robes, to chaſtiſe the inſolence of thoſe who did not approve of the Poet Lucilius, if ſuch people were ſo unhappy as to fall in their way (40). Nevertheleſs Mr Girac is in danger of quartering ſome *Gens d'Armes*, if they paſs through Angoulême; and I wonder that he who is not very neglectful of his intereſt, and is very careful of his affairs, ſhould forget the Captain who told him two or three years ago: *out of reſpect to the Marquis de Montauſier I will prevent my company quartering upon you: he is a Lord to whom I owe every thing; but it is on condition that you do not pretend to write any more againſt Voiture* (41). I can hardly imagine what could make Mr Girac ſo little afraid of thoſe menaces, unleſs he fancied that being a celebrated author, he had no occaſion for the recommendation of any body, and that his book alone would prove an inviolable ſafe-guard againſt the ſoldiers.’ He afterwards alledges the regard Alexander had for Pindar's houſe, and that of Alphonſus King of Arragon for a ſeat of Cicero, and concludes with theſe words. *I know all this, and ſomething more; and yet if Mr de Girac was my friend, I would not adviſe him to depend on theſe great examples, but to take better ſecurities againſt the Captain, Protector, and Avenger of the Wits.* Can any thing be more extravagant than this Captain's pretenſion? He would have all the world approve Voiture; and no fault to be found in the works of that author, and he threatned to quarter his company upon the village of him who ſhould dare to criticize upon this fine genius. Is not this a fine way of revenging a friend? Is not this introducing a military government into the Republic of Letters, the moſt free ſtate in the world? Behold the effects of prepoſſeſſion! Voiture's relations and friends had a mind to ſet him up for the Pope of Wit, and to conſtitute him in all matters which came within that province, an infallible rule of Orthodoxy. They ought at leaſt to have been contented with the excommunications of Parnaſſus againſt thoſe who ſhould diſpute the infallibility of ſuch a Pontif. But they threatned them with the quartering of ſoldiers. A ſtrange way of converting Heretics in wit! Does not this reſemble the French dragooning?

[*K*] *The ſame thing is affirmed in a paſſage of Balzac.*] Girac anſwering his adverſary on the threats of this Captain revenger of the wits, declares, *That he had hitherto been ſo happy as to have no ſoldiers quartered in his village* (42). He was therefore Lord of a village (43). By what follows, it appears that his lands the project of this Dictionary, ſhall be one of the remarks of this article [*L*]. You will find in it the time of his death, and with what reſtriction we are to underſtand an encomium beſtowed on him on account of his knowledge in the oriental languages.

---

(32) See the article BENSERADE, remark [*E*], and the article RONSARD, remark [*O*].

(33) The *Menagiana*, pag. 90, of the firſt Dutch edition, ſays this of Mr Coſtar.

(34) In a letter dated October 25, 1658, being the lxxiv of the firſt edition, and the cxxii, of the ſecond.

(35) *This does not agree with Girac's letter to Mr de Montauſier, dated March the 1ſt, 1659. (It is at the beginning of his Reply) where he ſays.* Having all my life profeſſed my hatred of law-ſuits, and that I would, as much as poſſible, ſeek for that tranquillity and eaſe of mind, which are incompatible with the fatigues, the tricks and quirks of the bar; I heartily renounce the proſecution of injuries which I have received. *See alſo his Reply*, §. *xii*, *pag.* 93.

(36) Biblioth. Françoiſe, *ch.* *vii*, *laſt ſection.*

(37) Ibid. *pag.* 142, *edition of* 1667.

(38) At Leyden, in 8vo.

(39) Sequel of the Defence, *pag.* 40, 41.

(40) See the article LUCILIUS, remark [*P*].

(41) Girac anſwers this in §. *xii*, *pag.* 93.

(42) Replique, §. *xii*, *pag.* 93.

(43) This village was near Engoulême, *Girac*, *ib.*

The judgment of Mr Chevreau concerning theſe two celebrated combatants, Girac and Coſtar, gives all the advantage to the former [*M*]. I doubt not but that the moſt intelligent judges would agree with Chevreau, if they would take the pains to examine all the pieces of this controverſy: Thoſe who ſhould ſearch to the bottom of this diſpute, would probably find a new reaſon to paſs ſentence againſt Coſtar, for uſing Mr Balzac very ill. He is ſeverely cenſured for it in the preface to Balzac's *Entretiens.* Mr du Rondel, who from his youth has been a great admirer of Balzac, and does yet continue ſo as much as ever [*N*], was ſo incenſed at this conduct of Coſtar, that he hardly forbore writing againſt him.

lands were very well wooded. (44) *The paſſage in the* Diſſertation *which you deſire ſhould be cleared, is a piece of his Hiſtory.* Thoſe Silvæ which now employ Mr de Girac (45), *are not metaphorical, and of the ſame nature with thoſe of Statius or Politian. But in the common language, it is a wood which he has felled, and ſold for* 1500 *Piſtoles* (46). *But what will Diana and the nymphs, the Dryads and Hamadryads, Pan and the Sylvans, ſay of all this? If the whole train of petty gods could but find a Poet at their devotion, what Elegiac complaints, what Iambic imprecations would be levelled againſt another Poet, who ſo cruelly drives them from their antient abode, who wounds and murders the nymphs with the hard blows of the ax, and gives them the laſt fatal ſtroke, by felling the ſacred trees in which they inhabited?*

Non ſine Hamadriadis fato, proſtrata bipenni
Alta cadit quercus: clauſam ſub cortice Nympham
Mors eadem plantamque manet.

When the ſharp ax fells down a lofty oak,
Some Hamadryad feels the fatal ſtroke:
The nymph who lives within the bark conceal'd
Meets the ſame death to which the tree muſt yield.

[*L*] *What I have ſaid . . . . in the project of this Dictionary ſhall be one of the remarks of this article.*] I declared very freely that I thought Mr Girac was in the wrong to blame Coſtar on account of the marrow of the lions, wherewith ſeveral authors ſay that Achilles was fed: and thereupon I made the following remark. By this we do not pretend to derogate from his merit, or adjudge the victory to his adverſary. If, on the one ſide, Coſtar's thoughts ſeem more ſhining and brightned by the ſun of the capital city, as Mr Balzac would ſay, it appears, on the other ſide, that Monſieur de Girac had more learning. It was a great loſs that he died ſo young. In a word, *I very readily ſubſcribe* with Mr Colomiés (47), but with the reſtriction hereafter mentioned, *to the fine elogy which Mr de Balzac beſtows on Mr de Girac in one of his Latin letters*, and which Mr Colomiés cites (48), as well as to the praiſes which Balzac gives him in French (49), and to thoſe which Father Gaudin has beſtowed on him in the Preface to his Dictionary (50). According to that Preface Mr de Girac died the ſecond of January 1663. Mr Colomiés, ſays he, died in April following. However his death ſhould not have been wholly unknown, as it was to Sorel, when he publiſhed his *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*, in the year 1664, and when he renewed and enlarged it in 1667, where he treats (51) very fully of the controverſy betwixt Coſtar and Girac; on this head ſee alſo Guy Patin's ſeventy-fourth letter. The difference amongſt authors concerning the death of illuſtrious men is incredible. And yet this ſubject does not ſeem liable to many variations.

The reſtriction I promiſed is as follows. Mr de Balzac writing to Scipio le Gaillard (ſo Mr Coſtar (52) explains Balzac's *Scipioni jucundo*) ſays that Mr Girac underſtood Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, beyond what is poſſible to conceive. 'Habeo jam certe quicum non 'ſolum ſuaviſſimo ſermone horas conſumo, ſed etiam 'à quo recedo ſemper & melior & doctior. Paulum 'Thomam à Giraco, paternâ virtute, ſua virtute cla'riſſimum; rerum divinarum & humanarum cogni'tione inſtructum, à prima adoleſcentia: litteris La'tinis, Græcis, Hebraicis ſuprà quam credibile eſt, 'ornatum; omnibus denique & naturæ & artis præ'ſidiis ad dicendum, ad ſcribendum paratum (53).--- '*I now have one with whom I not only ſpend my hours* '*in the moſt agreeable manner, but alſo from whom I* '*always depart both wiſer and better. Paul Thomas de* '*Girac, famous both for his family's virtues and his* '*own; inſtructed from his infancy in all ſort of learning* '*both divine and human; ſkilled in Latin, Greek, and* '*Hebrew, above what can be imagined; and qualified* '*both for ſpeaking and writing with all accompliſhments* '*both natural and acquired.*' Mr Coſtar taking occaſion from this character to rally his adverſary, repreſented (54) him deeply engaged in the bulky volumes of the Latins, Greeks, Hebrews, Arabians, &c. leſs ſenſible of the beauties of modern authors, than of thoſe that appear in ſome *dead or oriental language*, and ſpending the beſt of his time on a *ſcholiaſt on Lycophron, or perhaps on Rabbi Nepthalim*; whereupon Mr Girac makes this fair confeſſion to him: *You think perhaps*, ſays he (55), *to reproach me with an odious thing, which, if it were true, I ſhould take for a great honour; but as I always act with ſincerity and truth, you may if you pleaſe be ſatisfied, that my ſtudies are ſcarce yet advanced beyond the Greek and Latin tongues; that I ſcarce underſtand the principles of the Hebrew tongue, and am intirely ignorant of the Arabic and Oriental languages, which you mention to cry me down.* This was acting like a man of honour who would not take advantage of the flatteries of his friend, to impoſe on the public; he does not deſerve to have theſe words of Horace applied to him,

Sed vereor ne cui de te plus quam tibi credas (56).

I fear, when you ſhou'd to yourſelf be known,
You'll truſt another's thoughts more than your own.

This is properly making a good uſe of this diſtich of Cato:

Cum te aliquis laudat, judex tuus eſſe memento:
Plus aliis de te quam tu tibi credere noli.

When others praiſe, you your own judge ſhould be,
Nor credit more than in yourſelf you ſee.

If Mr Colomiés had obſerved Girac's anſwer, he had not placed him in his *Gallia Orientalis*.

[*M*] *The judgment of Mr Chevreau . . . . gives all the advantage to Girac.*] The particulars of this judgment are theſe. 'I dare aver to you . . . . that there 'is a very conſiderable difference betwixt Mr de Gi'rac and Mr Coſtar: The firſt puſhes with all his 'force; and the other ſhuffles and does not parry at 'all: or, to ſpeak plainer, Mr Coſtar does his utmoſt 'to reſiſt truth and reaſon by dint of common-places; 'and contents himſelf with denying what the other 'proves. To re-aſſume the former figure. The one 'charges home and overthrows whatever reſiſts him. 'The other rallies as well as he can, and diſputes 'what he is aſſured never to obtain. The victor is 'aſtoniſhed at the weakneſs of his enemy; and the 'vanquiſhed rallies with no ill grace (57).'

[*N*] *Mr du Rondel is as much as ever an admirer of Balzac.*] This is what he wrote to me, on his reading the firſt tome of the Melanges of Vigneul Marville: 'Several other things pleaſe me in this Miſcellany '(58); but there are two or three which I do not 'like; particularly amongſt the reſt what he ſays of 'Balzac. Such a man ſhould not be mentioned with'out reſpect and veneration. Without him our lan'guage at this time would be wavering and uncer'tain; and we are obliged to him for knowing how 'to ſpeak and write. It is true that in the examples

(44) Balzac's Diſſertation *to* Dom Andr. de St Denys, *at the end of his* Socrate Chrétien, *pag.* 201, 202.

(45) *In his Diſſertation againſt Voiture, he ſays,* Quî enim ego mediis in ſilvis occupatus *ruriſque plenus & inficetiarum* judicem de homine.

(46) Balzac, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 203, *ſays,* My friend, though as great a Poet, and of as elevated a genius as *the greateſt Poets*, is at preſent employed in more earthly, and meaner thoughts. For a trifle of ſix thouſand crowns, or thereabouts, he has made no conſcience of clearing the ſhades, &c.

(47) Biblioth. Choiſie, *pag.* 9.

(48) Gallia Orientalis, *p.* 217.

(49) In a diſcourſe printed with the *Socrate Chrétien*, pag. m. 198, and the following pages.

(50) Dictionary, French and Latin, printed at Limoges, 1664.

(51) Chap. vii, laſt ſection.

(52) Continuation of the Defence of Voiture, *pag.* 77.

(53) Balzac, Epiſt. Selectat. *pag. m* 294.

(54) Coſtar's Defence of Voiture.

(55) Girac's anſwer to the defence of Voiture, *pag.* 47.

(56) Horat. lib. i, Epiſt. xvi. ver. 19.

(57) Chevreau, Oeuvres mêlées, *pag.* 350.

(58) He pointed out to me ſeveral places which he liked in that book.

‘ he has left us he ſeems to brave rather than inſtruct us. His elevation is ſo lofty, ſo nervous, ſo majeſtical, and he maintains himſelf ſo well in his height and ſphere, that he is perfectly inacceſſible; but this is not his fault at the bottom. If no body has followed him, this cannot prejudice either the uncommonneſs of his merit, the vigour of his motion, or the beauty of his flight; they rather make him the more remarkable. Let the Voitures be allowed to write prettily, naturally, and in the plain common ſtile; this ſuits very well with them, and they cannot do better. But let us not be angry with Balzac, for being exalted above mankind, by the moſt charming, moſt noble, and moſt glorious attempt that was ever made. Before him the ſublime ſtile was unknown in France, and our language was thought incapable of it. But he has plainly evinced the contrary; and becauſe in opening our eyes he has diſplayed his addreſs and courage, we cannot pardon him the diſcovering our ſtupidity and ſloth. This is the conſequence of converſing with inſenſible wretches; we awake them to our prejudice, and becauſe they cannot deſpiſe us, they will not fail to hate us (59).’

If you find here ſome lively marks of the admiration of Balzac, you may alſo obſerve the fertile effect of ſo juſt an admiration. Mr du Rondel clearly diſcovers that he is able to imitate what he ſo much values in this great model of majeſtic eloquence.

(59) Monſ. du Rondel's Letter from Maeſtricht, dated July 10, 1700.

THORIUS (RAPHAEL) a Phyſician and Latin Poet, flouriſhed in England under the reign of King James the I, (*a*). He wrote a letter which was printed *de cauſa morbi & mortis Iſaaci Caſauboni*. His elegy on Caſaubon's death was alſo publiſhed. His Poem on Tobacco is very much eſteem'd [*A*]. I am of opinion that he did not in the leaſt doubt the truth of the maxim, that water drinkers never make good verſes (*b*). Perhaps he was never ſo put to it in all his life, as when Mr de Peireſc obliged him to drink a large glaſs of water [*B*]. King James deſired to hear the ſtory, which is very diverting.

(*a*) *See* Colomeſii Opuſcula, *pag. m.* 162.

(*b*) Nulla placere diu nec vivere carmina poſſunt, Quæ ſcribuntur aquæ potoribus. *Horatius, Epiſt. xix, lib. i, ver.* 2.

[*A*] *His Poem on Tobacco is very much eſteemed.*] The Oxford catalogue, mentions an Engliſh and Latin edition of it at London 1651 in 8vo. *Hymnus Tabaci, or a Poem in honour of Tobacco.* Mr Paſch, Philoſophy Profeſſor at Kiel, cites an edition of Utrecht 1644, in 12mo, in the ſixth chapter of his treatiſe *de Inventis nov-antiquis* (1). Mr Konig ſpeaks of an edition of 1628 in 4to at Leyden (2). But this is not the firſt; for Mr de Zuylichem in the year 1625, wrote ſome verſes *in Pœtologiam Raphaelis Thorii*. You will find them at the end of *Momenta deſultoria*. With ſome Latin verſes compoſed by the ſame author and Thorius, one againſt the other by way of an amicable combat.

(1) Pag. 475, of the ſecond edition, which is that of Leipſic, 1700.

(2) Konig, Bibl. *pag.* 805.

[*B*] *Mr de Peireſc obliged him to drink a large glaſs of water.*] Mr Peireſc dining at London with ſeveral learned men, could by no means be excuſed from drinking a health which Dr Thorius drank to him. The glaſs was of a monſtrous ſize, for which reaſon Mr Peireſc excuſed himſelf a long while, and alledged a thouſand reaſons; but he was forced to drink it: Before he did it, he made this bargain that Thorius ſhould drink a health to be propoſed by him in his turn. After he had drank the wine, he filled the ſame glaſs with water, and took it off, firſt naming the health to the Doctor. Thorius had like to have ſunk, as if he had been ſtruck with thunder, but finding no way to avoid it, he fetched ſeveral profound ſighs (3), he put his mouth a thouſand times to the brim of the glaſs, and as often withdrew it. He called to his aſſiſtance all the fine ſayings of the Greek and Latin Poets, and was almoſt the whole day in emptying by repeated trials this accurſed cup. You will find this more agreeably related by Gaſſendus, in the following words. *Contigit ut in quodam virorum doctorum convivio, Doctor Thorius ipſi Peireſkio ingenti Scypho præbiberit: Ac ille quidem ſe excuſare, ob vaſtitatem pateræ; ob merum inſolitum; ob imbecillem ſtomachum; ob compotandi infrequentiam: verùm cùm nihil admitteretur, petiit, ut ſaltem ſibi liceret, poſtquàm Thorio feciſſet ſatis, ſuo arbitrio præbibere. Annuerunt omnes, ac tùm aſſumptis, quaſi adigente neceſſitate animis, fœcundum hauſit calicem, eodemque mox aquâ oppleto, Thorio intentans præbibit, totumque rurſus (tanquam injectum temperaturus merum) abſorpſit. Ille quaſi fulmine ictus, delapſuſve è nubibus, vix tandem ad ſe rediit, & quia ex condicto agebatur, neque reſilire fas erat, tam longa ſuſpiria è pectore duxit, toties admovit, removitque ora, tot intereà carmina ex omnibus Græcis, Latiniſque Poëtis profudit, ut diem penè contriverit inſtillandæ aquæ in inſuetum guttur. Atque id ipſum eſt, quod Rex cùm audiiſſet ex aliis, ex Peireſkii ore accipere voluit* (4).

(3) Some believe he was profane enough (as Poets ſometimes are in the heat of their liquor) to apply the words of the Evangeliſt, *St Matth. xxvi,* 39.

(4) Gaſſendus, in Vita Peireſkii, *lib. ii, ad ann.* 1606, Oper. *Tom. v, pag.* 263. *col.* 2.

TIBARENIANS, a people of Aſia bordering upon the Euxine Sea (*a*). They were famous for two very remarkable cuſtoms, the latter of which ſeems the conſequence of the former. They were extremely addicted to ſporting, and laughing, in which they placed their *ſummum bonum* (*b*); and as ſoon as their wives were delivered of their children the huſbands kept their beds, played the part of ſick perſons, and received from their wives all the nurſing which in other places is beſtowed on childbed women. It is plain this cuſtom was only owing to this buffooning humour, which led them to make a jeſt of every thing. Several authors ſpeak of this laſt cuſtom [*A*], which was alſo uſed in the iſle of Corſica (*c*). Lancelotti of Perugia has unjuſtly inſulted

(*a*) Stephanus Byzant. *voce* Τιβαρηνία.

(*c*) Diodor. Siculus, *lib. v, cap. xiv.*

(*b*) Ἔφορος ἐν πέμπτῳ φησὶν, ὅτι Τιβαρηνοὶ καὶ τὸ παίζειν καὶ τὸ γελᾶν εἰσιν ἐζηλωκότες καὶ μεγίϛην εὐδαιμονίαν τȣ̃το νομίζȣσι. *Ephorus, lib. v,* inquit Tibarenos ſtudio ludendi & ridendi teneri & maximam felicitatem hoc judicare. *Id. ibid. See alſo* Pomponius Mela, *lib. i, cap. xix, who ſays* Tibareni Chalybas attingunt quibus in riſu luſuque ſummum bonum eſt.

[*A*] *Several authors ſpeak of this . . . . . . cuſtom.*] I ſhall content myſelf with citing theſe verſes of Apollonius.

Σώοντο πάρεξ Τιβαρηνίδα γαῖαν.
Ἔνθ᾽ ἐπεὶ ἄρ κε τέκωνται ὑπ᾽ ἀνδράσι τέκνα
γυναῖκες,
Αὐτοὶ μὲν ϛενάχȣσιν ἐνὶ λεχέεσσι πεσόντες,
Κράατα δησάμενοι· ταὶ δ᾽ εὐκομέȣσιν ἐδωδῇ
Ἀνέρας, ἠδὲ λοετρὰ λεχώϊα τοῖσι πένονται.

Eruperunt ad Tibarenorum terram.
Ibi, cum è viris gravidæ mulieres reddiderunt fœtum,
Ipſi verſantur in gemitu, & puerperio cubant,
Capitibus circumvinctis: illæ rurſus molliter curant
eſcis
Præbitis viros, & puerpera ipſis lavacra calfactant (1).

Among the Tibarenians they retire.
Here, when the teeming wives are brought to bed,
The men cry out, and lye-in in their ſtead;
Bind up their heads, and make their wives take care
To nurſe them well, and child-bed baths prepare.

(1) Apollonius, Argonaut. *lib. ii, ver.* 1012, *pag. m.* 242.

inſulted Diodorus Siculus on this ſubject [*B*]. Theodoret obſerves that after the Tibarenians had received the Goſpel, they abrogated a cruel law which had been obſerved amongſt them, which obliged them to throw their old people head-long from a Precipice (*d*).

(*d*) Theodoretus, de Græc. Affect. *Serm. ix, pag.* 615.

Valerius Flaccus ſays the ſame thing (2), and if the teſtimony of two Poets be inſufficient, the reader may beſides find that of an Hiſtorian, in the remark [*A*] of the article NYMPHODORUS.

[*B*] *Lancelotti of Perugia unjuſtly inſulted Diodorus Siculus on this ſubject.*] He publiſhed a treatiſe intituled, *Farfalloni de gli antichi Hiſtorici*, where he abuſes ‘ Diodorus Siculus, becauſe in the fourteenth ‘ chapter of his fifth book, he affirms that the Corſican women as ſoon as delivered, quitted their beds ‘ to their huſbands who lay-in in their ſtead. And ‘ yet nothing is more common in the greateſt part of ‘ America; or elſe what is reported of Canada, and ‘ ſeveral other places, ought to be looked upon as ‘ mere cheats; which is not at all likely, conſidering ‘ the condition of thoſe who inform us concerning ‘ that part of the world, and the impoſſibility of their ‘ entering unanimouſly into any agreement to deceive ‘ us (3).’ I wonder that le Mothe le Vayer takes no notice of the Tibarenians nor of the antient Spaniards. Γεωργοῦσι γὰρ αὗται, τεκοῦσαί τε διακονοῦσι τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐκείνους ἀνθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν κατακλίνασαι. Mulieres enim agros colunt, & cum pepererunt, ſuo loco viros decumbere jubent, iiſque miniſtrant (4). - - - - *For the women till the ground, and when they are delivered of their children, nurse their huſbands, who are put to bed in their room.* Mr Colomiés believed that this merry cuſtom which formerly was obſerved in Berne, viz. *that as ſoon as a woman was delivered ſhe got up, and put her huſband to bed, who acted the ſick wife,* was derived from the Spaniards (5). He adds, that this was practiſed *by the Tartars, according to the teſtimony of Marcus Paulus Venetus, chap.* 41 *of the ſecond book of his travels.* Note, that various cauſes might engage theſe nations to obſerve this cuſtom; for it is not probable that the humour of turning human life into ridicule, in order to attain the felicity which they placed in laughter, engaged the antient Corſicans, and the American nations, to agree with the Tibarenians in this practice. I ſhould be glad to be informed what reaſons prevailed with the nations of Canada, &c. who put the huſband to bed inſtead of the woman who was delivered. Would they by this means encourage him to get more children; would they induce him to it by the hopes of a good nurſing bout? Or do they fear that if the huſband were to have the trouble of acting the nurſe, he would be the leſs willing to make his wife ſick? But perhaps it would be found very difficult to account for ſo ridiculous a cuſtom.

(2) Valer. Flaccus, Argonaut. *lib. v, ver.* 148.

(3) La Mothe le Vayer, Obſervations ſur la compoſition des Livres, *Tom. xv, of his works, pag.* 30, *Edit. of Paris,* 1681, in 12mo, *he cites the* ixth Farfalloni.

(4) Strabo, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 114.

(5) Colomiés Mêlanges Hiſtoriques, *pag.* 25.

TIBUR, a city of Italy near to, and older than, Rome, called at preſent Tivoli. It was built on the river Ania (*a*), either by the Aborigines, according to Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (*b*), or by a company of Greeks from Peloponneſus (*c*), according to ſeveral other authors. It was already in a very flouriſhing condition, when Æneas landed in Italy [*A*], if we may believe Virgil, and we find that it made a very long and vigorous reſiſtance

(*a*) Now called *Teverone.*

(*b*) Dionyſ. Halicarn. Antiq. Roman. *lib. i, cap. xvi, pag. m.* 14.

(*c*) See the remark [*A*].

[*A*] *It was in a very flouriſhing condition when Æneas landed in Italy.*] Virgil reckons it amongſt the great cities which armed againſt the Trojans.

Quinque adeò magnæ, poſitis incudibus, urbes
Tela novant, Atina potens, Tiburque ſuperbum,
Ardea, Cruſtumerique & turrigeræ Antemnæ (1).

Five cities forge their arms: th' Atinian pow'rs,
Antemnæ, Tybur with her lofty towrs,
Ardea the proud, the Cruſtumerian town.
DRYDEN.

Leandro Alberti ſo ill underſtood this place, that he ſays, Tibur was one of the cities which forged arms for Æneas. ‘ N'e fatto anche memoria, *ſays he* (2), ‘ d'eſſa città da Vergilio nel ſettimo libro annoverandola fra quelle cinque città che fabricarono l'armi ‘ ad Enea coſi,

Quinque adeo, &c.

‘ *This city is alſo recorded by Virgil, in his ſeventh book* ‘ *among thoſe which forged arms for Æneas,*

Five cities, &c.

Virgil in the ſame book mentions the names of the two Tiburtine chiefs who went to the war againſt Æneas:

Tùm gemini fratres Tiburtia mœnia linquunt,
Fratris Tiburti dictam cognomine gentem,
Catilluſque, acerque Coras, Argiva juventus (3).

Then two twin brothers from fair Tybur came,
(Which from their brother Tyburs took the name,)
Fierce Coras, and Catillus void of fear,
Young Argive champions, in the front appear.
DRYDEN.

Lloyd makes uſe of this paſſage to prove that Catillus and Coras built Tybur; but he falſifies the text, by reading *mœnia condunt* inſtead of *mœnia linquunt.* This is a way to find every where proofs for whatever we pleaſe, this is a way to make the honeſt reader believe any thing. But we ought not to look for an authority for the building of this city in theſe words of Virgil, but in thoſe of his commentator Servius. ‘ De Græcia, *ſays he* (4), tres fratres venerunt ‘ ad Italiam: Catillus, Coras, Tybur vel Tyburnus. ‘ Hi ſimul omnes unam fecere civitatem & eam de ‘ fratris majoris nomine *Tybur* appellaverunt: licet & ‘ alias fecerint ſinguli. - - - *From Greece came into Italy* ‘ *three brothers; Catillus, Coras, Tybur or Tyburnus.* ‘ *Theſe all in conjunction founded a city, and called it* Tybur *from the name of their elder brother: tho' they* ‘ *each of them ſingly built others.*’ Pliny aſcribes the fundation of this city only to one of theſe three mentioned in theſe words of Servius, he ſpeaks, I ſay, only of Tyburtus, who he pretends was the ſon of Amphiaraus. I have elſewhere (5) cited his words, which, containing ſomething very particular, I would adviſe the reader to turn to them. Others pretend that the three brothers mentioned by Servius were Amphiaraus's grandſons, and the ſons of Catillus. ‘ Tybur, ſicut Cato facit teſtimonium, à Catillo Arcade præfecto claſſis Evandri; ſicut Sextius, ab Argiva juventute. Catillus enim Amphiarai filius poſt ‘ prodigialem patris apud Thebas interitum Oeclei ‘ avi juſſu (6), cum omni fœtu ver ſacrum miſſus tres ‘ liberis in Italia procreavit, Tiburtum, Coram, Catillum, qui depulſis ex oppido Siciliæ veteribus Sicanis à nomine Tiburti fratris natu maximi urbem ‘ vocaverunt (7). - - - *Tybur, as Cato witneſſes, from* ‘ *Catillus the Arcadian Admiral of Evander's fleet; as* ‘ *Sextius from the Argive youth. For Catillus the ſon* ‘ *of Amphiaraus after the extraordinary death of his* ‘ *father at Thebes, by the command of his grandfather* ‘ *Oeclaus was ſent with all his family under a vow* ‘ *to Italy, where he begat three children, Tyburtus, Coras, and Catillus, who, expelling the antient Sicanians* ‘ *from a city of Sicily, called it Tybur from the name of* ‘ *their elder brother.*’ Salmaſius's cenſure on this paſſage of Solinus is very unjuſt. He ſtrangely exclaims againſt this author. ‘ Sanum putamus fuiſſe Solinum ‘ cum hæc ſcriberet? Quis Siciliam pro Italia ſanus ‘ dixit? . . . Scio Sicanos Italiam olim tenuiſſe. . . . ‘ Sed Italiam dictam fuiſſe Siciliam, nemo, quod ‘ ſciam, prodidit; falſiſſimum igitur, & abſurdiſſimum ‘ eſt, quod hic narrat Solinus (8). - - - *Can we believe Solinus his wits when he writes this? Who in* ‘ *his*

(1) Virgil. Æn. lib. vii, ver. 629.

(2) Leandro Alberti, Deſcritt. di tutta l'Italia, *fol.* 147, *verſo, Edit. Venet.* 1561.

(3) Virgil. ubi ſupra, *ver.* 670.

(4) Servius, in Virgil. Æn. VII, ver. 670.

(5) In the remark [*M*], of the article AMPHIARAUS.

(6) Leandro Alberti Deſcritt. d'Italia, *fol.* 147, *hath committed a fault*, per commandamento del ſuo avolo Tideo. - - - *By command of his grandfather Tydeus,* ſaith he. *His tranſlator is guilty of another in expreſſing it* hortatu Tydei patrui. - - *By the advice of his uncle Tydeus.*

(7) Solin. *cap. ii, pag. m.* 13.

(8) Salmaſ. Exercit. Plin. in Solin. *pag.* 61.

reſiſtance againſt the Roman arms (*d*), before it ſubmitted to that victorious Republic. But it was at laſt obliged to ſubmit, in the year of Rome 403 (*e*). It is pretended that this city, once ſo haughtily upbraided the Romans with it's ſervices to that republic, that its deputies could obtain no other anſwer than theſe words, *you are proud* (*f*). The inhabitants had a particular devotion for Hercules, in honour of whom they built a moſt magnificent temple [*B*]. They alſo worſhipped with no ſmall zeal the god Tiburnus

‘*his ſenſes ever called Italy Sicily. . . . . I know the Sicanians formerly inhabited Italy. . . . . But that Italy was ever called Sicily, no body, that I know of, has ever advanced; and therefore what Solinus ſays here, is moſt falſe and abſurd.*’ But preſently after he grows ſomewhat cooler, he ſuppoſes the fault is owing to ſome wretched Pedant who foiſted a gloſs into the text of this author. ‘Sed fortaſſe ita ſcripſerat: *qui depulſis veteribus Sicanis, à nomine Tiburti fratris natu maximi urbem vocaverunt*, cum ſciolus aliquis heic Sicanos legeret, ad oram videtur addidiſſe, *ex oppido Siciliæ* quia ſcilicet putaret Sicanos non alibi quam in Sicilia fuiſſe (9). - - - *But perhaps he wrote thus:* who, expelling the antient Sicanians, built a town, which they called Tybur, after the name of their elder brother, *which ſome pretender reading, ſeems to have added in the margin*, from a city of Sicily, *as thinking that there were no other Sicanians but in Sicily*.’ He did not obſerve that what he cites nine or ten lines after confounds all his criticiſm. ‘Quinimo Siculos illos veteres Tibur oppidum tenuiſſe ſcribit Dionyſius lib. 1. παρ᾽ οἷς, inquit, καὶ ἐς τόδε χρόνου, μέρος τι τῆς πόλεως ὀνομάζεται Σικελιῶν (10). - - - *For that the antient Sicilians inhabited the city of Tybur, Dionyſius writes book* 1. From whom, *ſays he*, even to this time one part of this city is called Sicilia.’ That is, part of the city Tibur is yet called *Sicilia* or *Sicilium*. Is not this a manifeſt evidence that this place was ſo called before Tiburtus and his brothers drove out the Sicanians? Why then is this trifling uſed either againſt Solinus himſelf or the preſent text of his book? Note that Catillus paſſed for the principal founder of Tibur. *Hinc Tibur Catille tuum* (11). - - - *Catillus hence your Tybur*; as Silius Italicus hath it: To which we may add theſe two verſes of Horace:

Nullam, Vare, ſacrâ vite priùs ſeveris arborem
Circa mite ſolum Tiburis, & mœnia Catili (12).

Varus, to plant the vine, ſuits beſt of all
Tybur's mild ſoil, and Catilus's wall.

For the reſt, that this city was of Greek original, is unanimouſly confirmed by an infinite number of athors.

Tibur Argeo poſitum colono
Sit meæ ſedes utinam ſenectæ (13)!

May Tibur, where Greeks built a ſeat,
In my old age be my retreat.

Ovid expreſſes it no leſs clearly:

Jam mœnia Tiburis udi
Stabant, Argolicæ quæ poſuere manus (14).

Moiſt Tybur's walls were ſtanding in thoſe da,
Which Argive hands of old were known to riſe.

See alſo Strabo (15), Martial (16), and Aemidorus cited by Stephanus Byzantinus (17).

We muſt not forget Servius's commentar on theſe words, ‘Tiburque ſuperbum *in the ſeventh ofhe Æneid*, aut nobile, *ſays he* (18), aut per tranſum tetigit illud, quod cum aliquando à Senatu auxia poſcerent Tyburtes ſub commemoratione benefiorum, hoc tantum à Senatu reſponſum acceperunt, *ſuperbi eſtis*. - - - *This epithet* proud, *either means its magnificence, or alludes obliquely to its behaviour, wh requiring on a certain occaſion ſome aſſiſtance from th Senate which it claimed as due in regard to former ſvices, all the anſwer the Senate gave was*, Ye are pud.’

[*B*] *The inhabitants had a particur devotion for Hercules, in honour of whom they built a moſt magnificent temple.*] Statius ranks Tibur amongſt the four places where this deity was principally worſhipped.

Nec mihi plus Nemee, priſcumque habitabitur Argos,
Nec Tiburna domus, Soliſque cubilia Gades (19).

Nor Nemea, nor old Argos will I own
More favourite abodes, nor Tybur's town,
Nor fartheſt Gades where the ſun goes down.

This temple of Hercules was one of thoſe repoſitories where the richeſt treaſures were ſecured. Auguſtus when he had occaſion, drew large ſums from thence as well as from the capital, the temple of Antium, and that of Lanuvium. He promiſed to pay intereſt for them. Appian who relates this, adds, that in his time very conſiderable ſacred treaſures were ſecured in thoſe places (20). The following lines witneſs that the Oracles were frequently conſulted in the temple of Tibur:

Quod ni templa darent alias Tirynthia ſortes,
Et Præneſtinæ poterant migrare ſorores (21).

If the Herculean temples ſilent were,
Præneſte's ſiſters quickly wou'd be there.

Theſe verſes are to be met with in one of Statius's Sylvæ, which was compoſed by him in compliment to Manlius Vopiſcus's country-ſeat near Tibur. The Oracle of Præneſte ſaith Statius, would gladly quit its reſidence, and remove to this charming place, if the temples of Hercules were not already occupied by other Oracles. The commentators on this place are very much puzzled. Sabellicus owns (22) that he never met with any thing relating to this Oracle of Hercules of Tibur, and is inclined to believe that this paſſage rather regards the Oracle of Albunea, a deity, worſhipped in conjunction with Hercules by the inhabitants of Tybur. To this purpoſe are cited the following words, ‘Quodque Albuna ſacras Tiberis per flumina ſortes, portarit (23): - - - *And that Albuna ſhall extend her Oracles over Tiber's ſtream:*’ but with very little reaſon; for this paſſage has no relation to an Oracle which was to be conſulted at Tybur, but to the books which a Sybil brought to Rome. Another commentator imagines that the following paſſages of Propertius affords an authentic teſtimony:

Nam quid Præneſtis dubias, ô Cynthia, ſortes,
Quid petis Aeæi mœnia Telegoni?
Curve te in Herculeum deportant eſſeda Tibur?
Appia cur toties te via ducit anum (24)?

Why to Præneſte her dark fate to know;
Why thus to Tuſculum, does Cynthia go?
Why to Herculean Tybur does ſhe ſtray?
Why thus grow old upon the Appian way?

You ſee plainly, ſays Barthius (25), that Cynthia went to Tibur to conſult the Oracle there, and was not this the Oracle of Hercules? I anſwer that Propertius does not ſay this voyage to Tibur was founded on that motive. What he obſerves about conſulting the Oracle extends no farther than the firſt verſe: Tibur is no more concerned in it, than the walls of Telegonus, that is Tuſculum. The only thing we can learn from this paſſage of Propertius, with regard to Tibur is, that this city enjoyed the epithet of *Herculeum*. This we may alſo be informed of from theſe words of Silius Italicus,

Quoſque ſub Herculeis taciturno flumine muris
Pomifera arva creant Anienicolæque Catilli (26);

And

(*d*) *See* Livy, *lib. vii.*

(*e*) *According to* Calviſius, *pag. m.* 195. *According to* Sigonius, in Faſtis, *in the year* 399.

(*f*) See the remark [*A*] at the end.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Id. ibid.

(11) Silius Italicus, *lib. viii, pag. m.* 345.

(12) Horat. Od. xviii, *lib. i.*

(13) *Id.* Od. VI, *lib. ii.*

(14) Ovidius, *lib. iv*, Faſtorum, ver. 71.

(15) Strabo, *lib. v, pag.* 165.

(16) Mart. Epig. lvii, *lib. iv.*

(17) Steph. Byzant. *voce* Τίβυρις.

(18) Servius, in Virgil. Æn. VII, ver. 630.

(19) Statius, Silva I, *lib. iii, ſub fin. pag. m.* 55.

(20) Appianus, *lib. v, de* Bell. Civilibus, *pag. m.* 399.

(21) Statius, Silva III, *lib. i, ver.* 79, *pag. m.* 15.

(22) *See* Barthius in Statium, Silva III, *lib. i, pag.* 107.

(23) Tibullus, Eleg. v, *lib. ii.*

(24) Propert. *lib. ii*, Eleg. xxxii, *pag. m.* 476.

(25) Vides clare & Tibur petiiſſe Cynthiam ad capiendas ſortes: quæ autem illæ niſi Herculeæ cum hujus præcipue numen hic jungatur. *Barth. ibid. pag.* 108.

(26) Silius Italicus, *lib. iv, pag. m.* 172.

Tiburnus [*C*]. The Romans built ſeveral country-houſes in the territories of this city [*D*]. This has alſo been cuſtomary in later ages. The inhabitants of Tibur were put to the ſword by Totila's ſoldiers, in the year 545, as Procopius informs us. The German wars ruined this city: Frederic Barbaroſſa cauſed the walls to be re-built, and enlarged it. Pope Pius II ordered a fortreſs to be built there, at the entrance of which is the following inſcription of Giovanni Antonio Campani (*g*).

Grata bonis, inviſa malis, inimica ſuperbis
  Sum tibi Tibur enim ſic Pius inſtituit (*h*).

The good to ſave, the bad and proud to bow,
Tibur, to Pius I my building owe.

Lloyd is extremely miſtaken when he ſpeaks of the mountain of Tibur, as of a place famous

And Tybur's race who fruitful regions own,
Where Anio's waves waſh the Herculean town.

and from ſeveral epigrams of another author (27). Leandro Alberti has converted this epithet into a proper name, and to compleat his miſtake, he cites Strabo as well for this, as to prove that the city of Tibur was alſo called Cataracta. 'Fu altreſi nominata queſta citta (ſecondo Strabone) Herculeum . . . 'era anche nominata Caterratta (28). - - - *This city 'was in like manner (according to Strabo) named Herculeum . . . it was alſo called Cataracta.*' When in truth Strabo only ſays that there was at Tybur a temple of Hercules, and a cataract; that is, that the river Anio fell there with a rapid force from the precipice of a hill into a valley. Τίβυρα μεν, ἧ τὸ Ἡράκλειον καὶ ὁ καταράκτης· ὃν ποιεῖ . . . . . ὁ Ἀνίων ἀφ᾽ ὕψους μεγάλου καταπίπτων εἰς φάραγγα βαθεῖαν. Tibure fanum eſt Herculis & præceps aquæ dejectus (cataractam vocant) quem facit Anio . . . . ab excelſo loco in convallem dejiciens ſeſe profundam (29). - - - - *At Tybur there was a temple of Hercules, and a cataract occaſioned by the fall of the Anio from a very high place into a deep valley.*

Note, that there was a very fine library in this temple: this is atteſted by Aulus Gellius. 'Promit 'è bibliotheca Tiburti, quæ tunc in Herculis templo 'ſatis commode inſtructa libris erat, Ariſtotelis librum (30). - - - *He borrowed a book of Ariſtotle from 'the Tybur library, which was then finely furniſhed 'with books in the temple of Hercules.*'

[*C*] *They alſo worſhipped with no ſmall zeal the god Tiburnus.*] Conſult Cluverius in the fourth chapter of the third book of his *Italia antiqua*, and the commentators on theſe words of Horace: 'Et præceps 'Anio, & Tiburni lucus (31). - - - *And Anio's cataract, and Tiburnus's grove.*'

[*D*] *The Romans built ſeveral country-houſes in the territories of this city.*] The air all about this place was fine, healthful, and extremely refreſhing: the ſoil was watered by an infinite number of rivulets and was very fertile. It is no wonder then if the Romans had in this place ſo many country-ſeats, ſo many orchards, and ſo many other conveniencies. The Emperor Auguſtus frequently retired hither. 'Ex ſeceſſibus præcipue frequentavit maritima, inſulaſque 'Campaniæ, aut proxima urbi oppida, Lanuvium, 'Præneſte, Tibur, ubi etiam in porticibus Herculis 'templi perſæpe jus dixit (32). - - - *The retirements 'he chiefly frequented, were thoſe on the ſea-coaſt, and 'the iſlands of Campania, or the towns in the neighbourhood of Rome, Lanuvium, Præneſte, and Tibur, where 'he often gave judgment in the porch of Hercules's temple.*' The Emperor Hadrian (33) built a magnificent palace there. Zenobia had a retirement in the neighbourhood of this ſtately building (34). Manlius Vopiſcus had a very fine houſe in this territory. Statius has deſcribed it very pompouſly (35). Cetronius who ſpent ſuch immenſe ſums in building, had a palace here which eclipſed the temple of Hercules.

Ædificator erat Cetronius, & modo curvo
Litore Cajetæ, ſumma nunc Tiburis arce,
Nunc Præneſtinis in montibus, alta parabat
Culmina villarum, Græcis longeque petitis
Marmoribus vincens Fortunæ, atque Herculis
  ædem (36).

Cetronius does high coſtly villas raiſe
With Grecian marble, which the ſight amaze;
Some ſtand upon Caieta's winding ſhore,
At Tibur's tow'r, and at Præneſte more.
The dome of Hercules and Fortune ſhew
To his tall fabrics like ſmall cots below.

DRYDEN.

Shall we forget Horace, who had a houſe there which he frequently reſided at, and ſo earneſtly deſired might be the fixed retreat of his old age (37)? 'Vixit plurimum in receſſu ruris ſui Sabini aut Tiburtini: domuſque ejus oſtenditur circa Tiburtini lucum (38). - - - '*He ſpent great part of his time in his Sabine or Tibur 'retirement: and his houſe is ſhewn near the grove of 'Tybur.*' He tells us that Munatius Plancus had a very beautiful houſe there (39). What I advanced in the beginning of this remark might be proved by a crowd of witneſſes, but I ſhall content myſelf with a few.

Cum Tiburtinas damnet Curiatius auras
  Inter laudatas ad Styga miſſus aquas.
Nullo fata loco poſſis excludere: cum mors
  Venerit, in medio Tibure Sardinia eſt (40).

Since againſt Tibur's air Curiatius raves,
Sent from its pleaſant ſtreams to Stygian waves.
No place can ſave you: when death leads the way,
Tybur's as fatal as Sardinia.

Theſe are verſes made upon the death of a man, who could not ſave his life by breathing the fine air of Tibur: and the following were by the ſame author addreſſed to Fauſtinus, who enjoyed the refreſhment of this place, during the heats of the dog-days.

Herculeos colles gelida vos vincite bruma,
  Nunc Tiburtinis cedite frigoribus (41).

In winter you th' Herculean hills excel
But now in their cool ſhade we chuſe to dwell.

I have already cited Silius Italicus, who calls the adjacent lands *pomifera arva, - - - fruitful in apples*; to which may be added theſe verſes of Horace.

Et præceps Anio, & Tiburni lucus, & uda
  Mobilibus pomaria rivis (42).

And Anio's Cat'ract, and Tiburnus's grove,
Where thro' moiſt orchards winding riv'lets rove.

Chriſtian Rome hath not been leſs charmed with the pleaſures of Tivoli; for Leandro Alberti relates that the Prelates of the court of Rome, antiently paſſed the ſummer in this refreſhing air (43). Cardinal Hippolyto d'Eſte, as Moreri obſerves, built a very fine palace there, with the moſt magnificent gardens in the world. Uberto Folietta publiſhed a deſcription of it which deſerves reading. See alſo the Itineraries of Italy, particularly thoſe of Andreas Schottus, and Geronimo Capugnani.

(*g*) Leandro Alberti, Deſcritt. di tutta l'Italia, *fol. m.* 248.

(*h*) Ex eodem, ibid.

(27) Martial. Epig. xiii, *lib. i*, *and* Epig. lxii, *lib. iv*, &c.

(28) Leandro Alberti, ubi ſupra.

(29) Strabo, *lib. v*, *pag.* 164.

(30) Aul. Gellius, *lib. xix*, *cap. v.*

(31) Horat. Ode VII, lib. i.

(32) Sueton. in Aug. *cap. lxxii.*

(33) See the remark [*I*], of the article HADRIAN.

(34) See the remark [C], of the article ZENOBIA.

(35) Stat. Silva III, lib. i.

(36) Juven. Sat, XIV, ver. 86.

(37) See the remark [*A*], citation (13).

(38) Sueton. in Vita Horatii.

(39) Seu te fulgentia ſignis
Caſtra tenent, ſeu denſa tenebit
Tiburis umbra tui.
Whether in ſhining camps you ſtay,
Or to your Tyber haſte away.
Horat. Od. VII. *lib. i.*

(40) Martial, Epig. lx, *lib. iv.*

(41) *Idem*, Epig. lvii, lib. iv.

(42) Horat. Od. VII, lib. i.

(43) Leandro Alberti, Deſcrittione d'Italia, *fol.* 148.

famous for the ivory found there [*E*]. He had better have been ſilent on this head, and have mentioned the fine quarries with which thoſe parts abounded [*F*]. We muſt not forget the fountain and the goddeſs Albunea [*G*], one of the moſt memorable things in the

[*E*] *Lloyd is extremely miſtaken when he ſpeaks of the mountain of Tybur as of a place famous for the ivory found there.*] He may juſtly be accuſed of two groſs faults. *Tiburtinus mons,* ſaith he, *locus ebore notiſſimus*; and immediately after he cites two verſes of Martial, one out of the twelfth epigram of the ſeventh book (44), and the other out of the twenty-eighth of the eighth book (45). He plainly means that the mountain of Tibur produced Ivory; which ſhews he was ignorant that Elephants teeth are the only ivory in the world. For what Theophraſtus (46) ſays on this head, amounts to nothing, and can by no means concern our Tiburtine mountain. This is Mr Lloyd's firſt falſity. His ſecond fault is that the firſt verſe of Martial does not mention ivory; and that the ſenſe of the ſecond is not what Mr Lloyd ſuppoſes. He could make no manner of uſe of the firſt verſe without citing the Poet's whole thought; which if he had done, all his readers would have diſcovered that he had produced a very ill proof. Let us by the way from hence infer, that it is good to diſtruſt all paſſages cited by halves under the ſpecious pretext of avoiding prolixity. Is it not better to be prolix, than to deceive our readers? This is my maxim, for which reaſon I have taken care that my citations ſhould give the author's whole thought. Here is for inſtance the whole epigram, of which Mr Lloyd has only given the firſt line; and even has not given that, as it is.

Dum Tiburtinis albeſcere collibus audit
Antiqui dentis fuſca Lycoris ebur,
Venit in Herculeos colles: quid Tiburis alti
Aura valet? parvo tempore nigra redit (47).

Swarthy Lycoris hears with great delight,
That Tibur's hills can make old ivory white:
Thither ſhe goes, to bleach in Tybur's air;
And ſoon returns, but black inſtead of fair.

Martial's thought is, that Lycoris having heard that old ivory whitened on the mountain of Tibur, went thither; but inſtead of bleaching her tawny complexion, ſhe turned black in a ſmall ſpace of time. He had made uſe of the ſame raillery before.

Tibur in Herculeum migravit nigra Lycoris
Omnia dum fieri candida credit ibi (48).

Herculean Tibur black Lycoris's ſeeks,
In hopes its bleaching pow'r might reach her cheeks.

Ramirez de Prado affirms that Pliny ſays, the cool air of Tibur gives ivory a greater degree of whiteneſs (49). He cites alſo Propertius and Silius Italicus, one of whom ſays (50).

Ramoſis Anio qua pomifer incubat arvis
Et nunquam Herculeo numine pallet ebur;

Where Anio thro' fruitful orchards flows,
And ivory its unchanged whiteneſs ſhows,
Which to th' Herculean deity it owes.

And the other (51):

Quale micat ſemperque novum eſt, quod Tiburis aura
Paſcit ebur (52).

As the pure ivory, which in Tibur's air,
Appears for ever new, for ever fair.

Thus it plainly appears that Mr Lloyd hath improperly cited the ſecond paſſage of Martial, ſince it doth not ſignify that the Tiburtine mountain furniſhed ivory; but only that the air there had the virtue to preſerve the purity and brightneſs of ivory, and even to repair them.

[*F*] *The fine quarries with which thoſe parts abounded.*] Strabo ſpeaks of them, and obſerves that they furniſhed ſtone for the greateſt part of the edifices of Rome (53). The ſtones of Tibur were in great eſteem; They were ſo hard, as to be proof againſt all heavy burdens and injuries of the weather; but the fire ſoon deſtroyed them. 'Tiburtini *(lapides)* ad reliqua fortes, vapore diſſiliunt (54). - - - *The Tiburtine ſtones bear every thing elſe, but fly with heat.*' Theſe words of Pliny will become more intelligible by comparing them with the following: 'Tiburtina vero & quæ eodem genere ſunt omnia, ſufferunt & ab oneribus & à tempeſtatibus injurias: ſed ab igni non poſſunt eſſe tuta: ſimulque ut ſunt ab eo tacta, diſſiliunt & diſſipantur, ideo quod temperatura naturali parvo ſunt humore (55). - - - *Thoſe of Tibur, and all of that kind, bear all injuries from weights and weather; but are not at all ſecure from fire: for as ſoon as they are affected with that, they ſplit and fly in pieces, becauſe of their having ſo very little moiſture in their natural temperature.*' Pliny relates as a witty repartee what Cicero ſaid to the people of Chios, who out of oſtentation ſhewed him the walls of their houſes built with ſpeckled marble. I ſhould admire them much more, ſaid Cicero, if they had been built with Tiburtine ſtone. *Primum, ut arbitror, verſicolores iſtas maculas Chiorum lapicidinæ oſtenderunt, cum exſtruerent muros, faceto in id M. Ciceronis ſale: omnibus enim oſtentabant ut magnificum. Multo, inquit, magis mirarer, ſi Tiburtino lapide feciſſetis* (56). A very learned man pretends that if theſe ſtones had been tranſported to the iſle of Chios, they would perhaps have been more eſteemed, becauſe far fetched (57). This is not unlikely: but I do not believe that Cicero's raillery was grounded upon this foundation; he ſeems rather to have meant only this: you buy your marble very cheap, your iſland produces it, do not brag therefore of the ſumptuouſneſs of your buildings. Your riches and expences would appear more magnificent, if the materials of your buildings were brought from Tibur.

[*G*] *We muſt not forget the fountain and the goddeſs Albunea.*] Let us begin this note with a paſſage of Virgil.

At rex ſollicitus monſtris, oracula Fauni
Fatidici genitoris adit, lucoſque ſub altâ
Conſulit Albuneâ: nemorum quæ maxima ſacro
Fonte ſonat, ſævumque exhalat opaca mephitin.
Hinc Italæ gentes, omniſque Oenotria tellus,
In dubiis reſponſa petunt (58).

Latinus, frighted with this dire oſtent,
For counſel to his father Faunus went.
And ſought the ſhades renown'd for prophecy,
Which near Albunea's ſulphrous fountain lye.
To thoſe the Latian, and the Sabine land
Fly, when diſtreſs'd, and thence relief demand.

I omit the remainder of this paſſage, and only obſerve that it informs us, that thoſe who conſulted this Oracle ſlept on the ſkins of their victims, and received their anſwer during their ſleep. It doth not appear certainly from theſe words of Virgil, whether the god Faunus reſided in the Albunean grove; for the laws of Grammar allow us to believe that King Latinus conſulted the Oracle of Faunus, and the ſacred Albunean groves, that is to ſay, that he informed himſelf of the pleaſure of the gods in two different places: but yet the moſt reaſonable meaning of theſe words ſeems to be, that the King conſulted the Oracle of Faunus in the ſacred Albunean grove. There is one ſmall difficulty to get over, which is, that no perſon, that I know of, informs us that there was any Oracle of the god Faunus at Tibur. This city adored Hercules as their grand Divinity: their other deities were Tiburnus and Albunea. Faunus is not mentioned. Will any one ſay that Virgil was not here concerned to accommodate his fictions to tradition? This may perhaps be more true than probable. However it be, we may obſerve that Albunea was at the ſame time the neighbourhood of Tibur.

---

(44) De Tiburtinis albeſcere collibus audit. *She hears that Tibur's hill can bleech.* Mart. Epig. xii, lib. vii.

(45) Et Tiburtino monte quod albet ebur. *The ivory whitening on Tibur's hill.* Id. *Epig. xxviii, lib. viii.*

(46) Theophraſtus auctor eſt & ebur foſſile candido & nigro colore inveniri. *Pliny, lib. xxxvi, cap. xviii.*

(47) Martial. Epig. xii, *lib. vii.*

(48) *Idem,* Epig. lxii, *lib. iv.*

(49) Lycorin irridet quæ cum ſciret ebur candidius fieri frigidiſſima Tiburis aura ut Plin. Teſtatur. *Laur. Ramirez de Prado in Mart. Epig. lxii, lib. iv.*

(50) Propert. Eleg. vii, *lib. iv, ſub fin.*

(51) Silius Italicus, *lib. xii, pag. m.* 490.

(52) Paſcit, dixit pro ſuſtentat & conſervat. *Ramir. de Prado, ubi ſupra.*

(53) Strabo, *lib. v, pag.* 164.

(54) Pliny, *lib. xxxvi, cap. xxii, pag. m.* 334.

(55) Vitruvius, *lib. ii. cap. vii.*

(56) Plinius, *lib. xxxvi, cap. vi, pag.* 287.

(57) Romæ vulgaris in eam advectus inſulam accepiſſet fortaſſis ab loci unde peteretur intercapedine pretium. *Harduin. in Plin. ibid.*

(58) Virgil. Æn. lib. vii, ver. 81.

time the name of a grove, of a fountain (59), and of a deity of the mountain of Tibur (60). She only appears under the notion of a fountain in theſe words of Horace, ‘ & domus Albuneæ reſonantis (61): - -*And Albunea's murmuring fountain:*’ In the words of Virgil before quoted, ſhe appears under the notion of a grove as well as of a fountain; but the following paſſage of Lactantius elevates her to a goddeſs: *Decimam Tiburtini, nomine Albuneam, quæ Tiburi colitur, ut dea, juxta ripas amnis Anienis: Cujus in gurgite Simulachrum ejus inventum eſſe dicitur, tenens in manu librum. Cujus ſacra Senatus in Capitolium tranſtulerit* (62). That is, Albunea was the tenth of the Sibyls and worſhipped at Tibur as a goddeſs; and her image was reported to have been found with a book in her hand in the gulph of Anio. Note that ſome are of opinion that the fountain Albunea was only another name for thoſe mineral waters called *Albula* or *Albulæ*. Strabo ſays they were cold, that they aroſe from ſeveral ſprings, and either drank or bathed in, cured ſeveral diſeaſes (63). Pliny aſcribes to them only the virtue of healing wounds (64): but Suetonius (65) does not ſpeak of them with this reſtriction. Cluverius (66), who believes them to be the fountain Albunea, may alledge this reaſon for it: this fountain according to Virgil ſtunk,

Sævumque exhalat opaca Mephitim (67).

And ſhaded o'er emits a ſulph'rous ſmell.

But according to Martial and ſeveral others this quality belonged to the mineral waters called *Albula* or *Albulæ*.

Canaque ſulfureis Albula fumat aquis (68).

And ſulph'rous ſteams riſe from pale Albula.

Therefore, *&c.* Note, that Albula was a ſmall river which diſcharged itſelf into the Anio, whoſe principal ſpring according to Cluverius was the fountain Albunea. This author believes that the image of the Tiburtine Sibyl or Albunea was reported to be found in this fountain. He adds that the antients made a deity of this ſpring, and conſecrated to it a grove, a Temple and an Oracle (69), and that it appears from an epigram of Martial that there was a grove conſecrated to the Muſes in this place (70). But the laſt is utterly falſe, and Cluverius read too haſtily the following words of Martial.

Itur ad Herculei gelidas quâ Tiburis arces,
Canaque ſulfureis Albula fumat aquis.
Rura, nemuſque ſacrum, dilectaque jugera Muſis
Signat vicina quartus ab urbe lapis:
Hic rudis æſtivas præſtabat porticus umbras,
Heu quam, &c (71).

To Tibur's airy towers where leads the way;
And ſulph'rous ſteams riſe from pale Albula:
The fourth mile ſtone points out the ſacred grove,
And pleaſant fields, ſeats which the Muſes love.
Here the rude porch yielded a ſummer ſhade,
Alas how, &c.

If he had conſidered them with the leaſt attention, he would have found that they did not in the leaſt concern Tibur but another place in the road thither, four miles from Rome. It is not even certain that there was in this place a grove conſecrated to the Muſes: it may be ſuppoſed that Martial meant nothing more, than that Regulus's lands were beloved by theſe goddeſſes (72). We ought to take notice that Martial has placed a diſtance of twenty miles betwixt Rome and Tibur (73).

(59) Sciendum ſane unum nomen eſſe fontis & ſilvæ. *Servius, in Virgil. Æn. lib. vii, ver.* 82.

(60) In Tiburtinis altiſſimis montibus. *Id. ib.*

(61) Horat. Ode VII, lib. i.

(62) Lactant. *lib. i,* Divin. Inſtitut. *cap. vi, pag. m.* 19.

(63) Strabo, *lib. v, pag.* 164.

(64) Juxta Romam Albulæ aquæ vulneribus medentur. *Plin. lib. xxxi, cap. ii, p.* 779.

(65) Sueton. in Auguſto, *cap. lxxxii.*

(66) Cluver. Ital. antiq. *lib. ii, cap. x.*

(67) Virgil. Æn. lib. vii, ver. 82.

(68) Martial. *lib. i,* Epig. xiii. *See alſo* Epig. iv, *lib. iv, and* Statius Silva iii, *lib. i, ver.* 75.

(69) That is, the Oracle of Faunus.

(70) *Sed & Camænarum ſive* Muſarum *ibidem fuiſſe* nemus *ex Martialis* Epigr. xiii, *lib. i, colligere datur.* Epitome Cluverii, per Bunonem Ital. antiq. *lib. ii, cap. x, pag.* 431.

(71) Mart. Epig. xiii, *lib. i.*

(72) So Farnaby underſtands that verſe of Martial.

(73) Mart. Epig. lvii, *lib. iv.*

TILLET (JOHN DU) in Latin *Tilius*, Protonotary, and Secretary to the king, and Regiſter to the Parliament of Paris, was born in Angoumois (*a*), and flouriſhed in the XVIth century. He applied himſelf with ſurprizing diligence to illuſtrate the Hiſtory of France; and it may be ſaid, that no body has ever yet treated this great ſubject according to the plan which he laid down. He not only propoſes to give a particular account of the wars, and general events which are to met with in the meaneſt Chroniclers; but he likewiſe inquired into (*b*) whatever related to the domains of the crown, the laws and ordinances, the antient form of government, the perſon and houſhold of the king, the officers of the crown, the grandees of the realm, the creation of their offices, ranks, duties, and undertook to explain all this by authentic records, whereof he gave catalogues which were very curious and inſtructive. He would have carried on his work much farther, if the court had furniſhed the neceſſary expences; but he complains that he was obliged to put a ſtop to it, becauſe he was not aſſiſted in the great charges which his inquiries made unavoidable [*A*.]

A ſmall

(*a*) *Engoliſmenſi agro oriundus.* Thuanus, *lib. xlvii, circa fin. pag. m.* 974. Sammarthanus, Elogior. *lib. ii, pag. m.* 80, *expreſſes himſelf thus:* Ducebant Tilii genus ſuum ab Engoliſma. La Croix du Maine *is miſtaken in ſtiling the brother of this perſon* a gentleman of Paris.

(*b*) See his own words in the remark [*A*].

[*A*] *He complains that he was obliged to put a ſtop to it, becauſe he was not aſſiſted in the great charges .... unavoidable.*] This particular, which will without doubt be agreeable to curious readers, is to be met with in the epiſtle dedicatory of his work. I ſhall cite a long paſſage of it, ſince it will acquaint us with ſeveral circumſtances of this author's undertaking. It muſt be remembred that he addreſſes himſelf to Charles IX. ‘ Having with very great labour and expence ſearched, ſince my inſtitution in my office, an infinite number of regiſters of your parliament, examined the libraries and charters of ſeveral churches in your kingdom, and, by the permiſſion of the late King, your father, (whom God abſolve) had acceſs to your treaſury of charters, and inſpected them all by his command, and upon his declaration that he would bear the charge, and recompence my aſſiſtants, (who muſt neceſſarily be very many in works of this kind), I undertook to compile in an hiſtorical form, and according to the order of reigns, all the differences of this third line now reigning with its neighbours, the domains of the crown by provinces, the laws and ordinances from the Salic law by volumes, and reigns, and, in a particular collection, what relates to the perſons and families of our kings, the antient form of government of the three eſtates, and the courſe of juſtice in the ſaid kingdom, together with the changes which have happened therein. Pliny relates, that King Alexander the Great expended eighty thouſand talents, which amount to forty eight thouſand crowns, in voyages, and other charges which were neceſſary to attain the knowledge of the properties of animals, whereof Ariſtotle by his command compoſed fifty books. The eighth part would have ſerved to compleat my ſaid works, which I began to apply my ſelf to with great diligence, and preſented to his Majeſty ſix volumes of them: four relating to the ſaid differences, one to the ſaid ordinances, and one to the perſons and families royal: but it happened to me as Mr Girard de Mountagu, Secretary and Treaſurer of the Charters to King Charles V, writes in the prefatory epiſtle to the Repertory-General, and Regiſter of the ſaid Treaſury marked A. A. that ſome of his predeceſſors in the ſaid office had begun a work relating to the ſaid Treaſury, but left it imperfect, for want of being able to bear the expence, and ſo have I been forced to do. For however, the ſaid King, and the Queen your mother declared their pleaſure, and even frequently gave their command, for the furniſhing the charges, and recompence for my aſſiſtants, and in order to perfect the ſaid works, they produced no effect, and

I was

A ſmall part only of his vaſt collections has been publiſhed [*B*]. If he acquired a great reputation by this exact knowledge of the conſtitution of the kingdom, he on the other hand amaſſed great riches [*C*], by his great aſſiduity in the particular functions of his office. The book which he publiſhed in the year 1560, concerning the king's majority, rendred him odious to the Proteſtants. They refuted it, and he reproaches one of their Hiſtorians for ſuppoſing that he never made them any reply [*D*]. They publiſhed ſome diſadvantageous things of him, as the motives to his work,

‘ I was abandoned, and even reproached by my ſaid aſſiſtants, whom I had entertained a long time, partly at my own expence, and partly fed with the hopes of the ſaid recompence. This, I ſay, in my excuſe, and to teſtify the infinite regret which I have upon being diſabled from doing that ſervice to your crown which I wiſhed, not aſcribing to others that misfortune, (if it be one), yet notwithſtanding this according to my duty I have upon my own ſole bottom, as far as I was able continued part of my undertaking. . . . . I have enlarged by one half the collection concerning the perſons and families Royal, and, if I live, I will purſue and perfect what relates to the three eſtates, and to the courſe of juſtice in your ſaid kingdom (1) ’.

[*B*] *A ſmall part only of his vaſt collections has been publiſhed.*] We have juſt now ſeen that they conſiſted of ſix volumes, and that while he was waiting for aſſiſtance to put the finiſhing hand to the five firſt, he prepared the ſixth, and dedicated it to Charles IX. It was printed under this title, *Recueil des Roys de France, leurs Couronne & Maiſon*: but I would not warrant that it had the ſame title upon the firſt publication; for Du Verdier Vau-Privas (2), and La Croix du Maine (3), mention only this Title, *Memoires & Recherches touchant pluſieurs choſes memorables pour l'intelligence de l'Eſtat & des Affaires de France.* La Croix duMaine adds that this book firſt printed *at Rouen in the year* 1577 *for Philip de Tours*, was reprinted at Paris by James du Puis, and that this ſecond edition *is much more full and correct, and was reviſed by the author's manuſcript, with ſeveral figures and pourtraits of the Kings of France, their coins, and other remarkable things which were not in the firſt edition.* After this he particulariſes the works not printed, and places in this liſt the collection *relating to the perſons and families royal*, and the *treatiſe on the King's majority*. This is a miſtake, ſince it is certain that the latter of thoſe two books had already been publiſhed in 1560, and perhaps alſo the former is the ſame with that juſt now mentioned by La Croix du Maine to have paſſed two editions. Note, that ſoon after there was publiſhed a work of du Tillet in Latin concerning the hiſtory of France: it was printed at Frankfort in the year 1579, under the Title *Commentarii de Rebus Gallicis.*

The Bookſeller who publiſhed the *Collection of the Kings of France, their crown and family*, gave hopes that the heirs of du Tillet would not ſtop there. *Now let the name*, ſays he (4), *the praiſe, and the memory of the ſaid Sieur du Tillet be perpetuated in this kingdom, let them be perpetuated every where elſe . . . . . And to the gentlemen, his ſons, in like manner, let thanks be given in the name of us all, whom they have not only obliged with the impreſſion and publication of this work: but alſo promiſe us others too of the ſame hand, and of the like matter, having a great regard and zeal for the grandeur of our nation, and the ſingular pleaſure and ſatisfaction of every one, who is deſirous to be informed in things of this kind, no leſs than their late Father. Reader, Having ſollicited and obtained from them this conſiderable promiſe for your uſe and benefit, I alſo take upon my ſelf, and engage to remind them of it continually, out of the deſire I have to procure and communicate to you, by my impreſſion, ſomething which may confirm and preſerve you in the opinion you may have already conceived of me, that I do and ſhall always make it my buſineſs to publiſh ſuch books as may prove very greatly to your advantage. Adieu.* I think that after the firſt edition of this collection, the ſons of John du Tillet furniſhed the Bookſellers ſucceſſively with the following additions. I. *A collection of the ranks of the grandees of France.* II. *An account of every family of the kings and grandees of France.* III. *A collection of the wars and treaties of peace, truces, and alliances, between the kings of France and England.* IV. *A memoir and admonition concerning the liberties of the Gallican Church.* Theſe four pieces are to be met with in my edition, which is that of Paris (5) 1618 in 4to, with a chronicle, by way of abridgment, of the kings of France, compoſed by John du Tillet, Biſhop of Meaux, brother to the Regiſter.

La Croix du Maine did not know that our John du Tillet was the author of an *Inſtitution of a Chriſtian father to his children*, which was printed at Paris in the year 1563 *in 4to*. I find in the catalogue of the Archbiſhop of Rheims's library (6), *Sommaire de l'Hiſtoire de la guerre faite contre les Albigeois, extraite du Treſor des Chartes par Jean du Tillet*, à Paris chez Robert Nivelle 1590 *in 8vo*. Mr Teiſſier obſerves that *there is alſo a book intitled* Pontificum aliquot Romanorum exempla cum Ethnicorum Principum geſtis comparata, *printed in the year* 1576, *compoſed by John Tilius* (7). He knows not which of the two brothers is the author of it. I do not know it neither: I only know that this work was printed at Amberg, in the year 1610 in 8vo.

[*C*] *If he acquired a great reputation . . . . he amaſſed . . . . great riches.*] Thuanus furniſhes me with this circumſtance, tho' he does not expreſs it in the ſame manner as I have done. I ſhall give the words of this great Hiſtorian. ‘ Qui (Jo. Tilius) cura, diligentia, & ſumma in ſuo munere aſſiduitate, non ſolum ingentes opes, ſed veram gloriam, & qua majorem nemo noſtrorum antea meruit, exacta Juris noſtri & Franco-Galliæ omnis antiquitatis cognitione ſibi comparavit (8). - - - - *John du Tillet, by his care, diligence, and extreme application in his office, not only acquired great riches, but alſo true glory, to which none of our countrymen were more entitled, by his exact knowledge of all the laws and antiquities of France.*’

[*D*] *He reproaches one of their Hiſtorians for ſuppoſing that he never made them any reply.*] Whenever we mention the diſputes of authors, we ought not to neglect obſerving what was the firſt occaſion of them, and what was the ſubject of their writings. We muſt not therefore be under any concern, if ſome readers ſhould think the following quotations too long. *Charles V had paſſed* at the wood of Vincennes in the year 1374, *an ordinance concerning the Kings of France, attaining their majority on their entering into the fourteenth year, which was approved, and publiſhed in parliament, the King being preſent, and holding his bed of juſtice, the twentieth of May, one thouſand three hundred and ſeventy five. Notwithſtanding, after the deceaſe of the ſaid King Henry II, when his eldeſt ſon King Francis II, took the crown at the age of fifteen years, five months, and twenty one days, and being alſo married, ſome deſiring to change the religion in that kingdom, reflected, by audacious writings, upon the adminiſtration of the ſaid King, and of the Queen his mother as unlawful: to whom I preſented at that time a piece intitled,* Pour la Majorite du Roy tres-Chreſtien contre les rebelles. - - - *For the majority of the moſt Chriſtian King againſt the rebels. Their Majeſties having ſeen it, and found that the authority of the ſaid King was therein aſſerted and proved, commanded that it ſhould be printed and publiſhed. I remonſtrated that it was not drawn up with any other view than for inſtruction and advice, in order that the ſaid authority might not be ſuffered to be infringed, which might be preſerved and ſecured without the printing that piece. However to inform every one of the right of the ſaid King, their ſaid Majeſties perſiſted in ordering the ſaid impreſſion. Which being finiſhed, there came out ſoon after an anſwer to it, under the title of* Legitime Conſeil, - - - Lawful Advice, *to which I replied by another piece, intitled,* Pour l'entiere Majorité du Roy tres-Chreſtien, contre le Legitime Conſeil malicieuſement intitulé par les rebelles, - - - For the full majority of the moſt Chriſtian King, in anſwer to the Lawful Advice ſo intitled by the rebels, *which put a full ſtop to them. This anſwer was paſſed over without the leaſt notice by that impoſtor in his commentaries on the ſtate of religion, and of* work, and went ſo far back as to relate the facts which they pretended were the cauſe of his averſion for Renaudie, the chief of the conſpiracy of Amboiſe [*E*]. I ſhall recite (*c*) what

---

(1) Du Tillet, Epiſtle to King Charles IX, before his collection of the Kings of France, &c.

(2) At page 758, of the *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*.

(3) Idem, *pag.* 268.

(4) In the Advertiſement to the Reader.

(5) By Peter Mettayer.

(6) At pag. 266, col. 2.

(7) Teiſſier, Addit. aux Eloges, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 345.

(8) Thuanus, *lib. xlvii*, *pag. m.* 974, *col.* 2.

of the republic publiſhed without any name. But the ſaid piece itſelf ſtill extant is ſufficient to convict him of an impudent calumny both in this and other particulars (9). The perſon he calls an impoſtor was the Preſident de la Place, who has given but a very indifferent character of him in his hiſtory. We ſhall take a ſhort view of this ſcene. La Place gives at firſt (10) a particular account of the ſeveral books and libels publiſhed againſt the houſe of Guiſe in the reign of Francis II. He ſays afterwards that they were anſwered by John du Tillet by a piece *intituled the Majority of the King* (11). He gives a very ſhort abſtract of this work, and concludes it in theſe words (12): 'And laſtly, he addreſſes himſelf to thoſe who declare that they make profeſſion of the goſpel, telling them that their aſſertion was falſe, and that what they profeſſed was rather a novel opinion, calling their preachers mutinous and ſeditious: and concluding that God would bleſs the arms that ſhould be made uſe of againſt them.' He adds, that *almoſt as ſoon as this book was publiſhed* there was an anſwer made to it, of which he gives an exact ſummary, and does not forget to enlarge upon the perſonal reflexions therein uſed. 'It was added, ſays he (13), that the author of the ſaid book, being advanced to honour and dignity by the liberality of the Kings of France, (whoſe pen ought to have been conſecrated and dedicated only to maintain equity, the ſtates, and policy of this kingdom, and the authority of juſtice) had very much forgot himſelf, by endeavouring to confirm the authority of thoſe who have never ceaſed to pervert all orders whatſoever hitherto obſerved in this kingdom, without returning any anſwer, deliberately, and with deſign, to what had been alledged, that thoſe of the houſe of Guiſe were abſolutely incapable of the places they held. And appearing as if he had no regard to this, he fell foul upon thoſe who were no way to blame, and who in proper time and place would not be backward in their own defence: but this author at laſt painted himſelf to the life in the colours of Achitophel, whom he exactly reſembled in the counſel he gave at the concluſion of his book. For as the former adviſed the purſuing the loyal party who were for ſupporting their King againſt the uſurper Abſalom: ſo the latter adviſes the putting them all to the ſword, declaring himſelf by this a rebel, and traitor, and deſiring nothing but cruelty, confuſion, and the deſtruction of the kingdom.' Here the ſcene ends: and, to ſpeak freely of it, we muſt allow it to be either too ſhort or too long. For if the Hiſtorian had a mind to ſay nothing of du Tillet's reply, he ought to have paſſed over the anſwer of the Proteſtants; and ſince he did not think proper to ſuppreſs the latter, he ought not to have ſuppreſſed the former. We ſhall ſee preſently that he is not the only perſon who has been guilty of this ſmall ſin of omiſſion, and that others have been guilty of ſomething worſe.

[*E*] *They publiſhed ſome diſadvantageous things of him, as the motives to his work, and went ſo far back as to relate the facts . . . the cauſe of his averſion for . . . the chief of the conſpiracy of Amboiſe.*] Louïs de Regnier, Sieur de la Planche, having given almoſt word for word the ſame account with the Preſident de la Place, ſtopped ſhort all at once, without ſaying one word of John du Tillet's reply. He did even much worſe; for he affirmed that this author being preſſed to reply, anſwered, that it was much better not to make any reply. 'There were ſeveral other perſons who took pen in hand in anſwer to du Tillet's book, but if I was to give an account of them all, it might give the reader too much trouble. Theſe anſwers falling into the hands of the Cardinal, he ſent for du Tillet, and his brother the Biſhop of St Brieu, and deſired them in the preſence of his moſt intimate and familiar friends to write a reply. For, ſaid he, I am afraid theſe pieces will make their way into Germany, and break the King's meaſures, ſince the princes, namely the Proteſtants with whom we would keep friendſhip, are very great readers of ſuch books: and whence once they have made an impreſſion on their heavy brains, it is not eaſy for the ſecret agents we have among them to find means to deface them. On the contrary, this greatly opens the way for the Huguenots to procure audience, in ſuch ſort that we cannot ſo readily play upon theſe princes as we could wiſh, and we are the more frequently defeated in our deſigns. It is ſaid that du Tillet excuſed himſelf very earneſtly, becauſe the ſubject was difficult, and too much cleared up by the hiſtories of France: ſo that this would be only furniſhing freſh matter for the Huguenots, to write on and over-load the Cardinal and his family with abuſe. That among thoſe deſperate perſons, there were ſome of ſurprizing parts, who had no other way of maintaining their credit, or ſupporting their cauſe, but by their writings. So far ought we to be from giving them the leaſt handle of this kind, that inſtead of writing we ought to employ againſt their perſons and effects all the ſeverities that can be contrived; in order to take from them all firm footing, and to diſcourage their writings: which was judged the beſt expedient by all the company, and that the Cardinal might write particular letters to the German princes, which would ſerve as an ample vindication againſt all calumnies that might be charged upon him, and not being publiſhed in print would not be contradicted. And this he promiſed to do as what was moſt adviſeable (14).'

The hiſtory from which I take this paſſage is a book which it would be very hard for an infinite number of perſons to meet with: the bare citing it therefore will be of little or no ſervice to them; the only true way to ſatisfy them is to relate here at full length the account we there find concerning the motives of du Tillet. It is an account full of very curious and remarkable matters. I ſhall herefore give it here, without being afraid of tiring the reader with the prolixity of the quotation.

'(15) Du Tillet, ... rummaging the antient regiſters and records of the Parliament of Paris, began to look into them; and finding ſeveral memorable pieces which had been quite forgot by our Hiſtoriographers, either through careleſſneſs or ignorance, he propoſed to make a collection of them for the ſervice of poſterity. This being intimated to the King (16), he found it would be very proper and uſeful in regard to his own intereſt, and that of the kingdom. And therefore commanded him to purſue it with diligence; and as it was a work of great expence, money was given him for the undertaking, with the promiſe of a reward. Becauſe alſo it was proper for him to be aſſiſted with regiſters and informations from the chamber of accounts, from the treaſury of charters, and other places, he had letters containing very expreſs command, to give him admittance to them, and to let him take whatever he ſhould have occaſion for. In which he uſed an extreme diligence. But having advanced the work, the king died, without du Tillet's receiving the reward he expected. And what ſurprized him more was, that after the death of the king, all his friends found themſelves eſtranged or baniſhed from the court, ſo that his place of Regiſter was in great danger by reaſon of its value, and becauſe thoſe of the houſe of Guiſe had at that time begun a method of diſtributing among their friends all the offices, and places of advantage which they could lay their hands on. Du Tillet had then only acceſs to the Conſtable, whom he made acquainted with the command he had received from the late king, and the ſervice that France ought to expect from it. In which he did not forget the pains he had taken, requeſting in recompence for thoſe and for his ſervices, that at leaſt his poſt of Regiſter to the Parliament might be continued and confirmed to him. The Conſtable, who had received ſome ſervices from du Tillet, promiſed to preſent him to the king, have him confirmed in his place, and to uſe his intereſt for him. But with reſpect to his book, not being a man of letters, he did not concern himſelf about it. It happened that as he was ſpeaking of it to the king, and du Tillet had his books lying before him on the table, the Cardinal of Lorrain came in, and caſt his eye upon them. And believing that this work would be very proper to inſtruct him in ſtate-affairs,

---

(*c*) In the remark [*E*].

(9) Du Tillet, Recueil des Roys de France, *pag. m.* 277, 278.

(10) Commentaires de l'eſtat de la Religion & Republ. *livr.* ii, *fol.* 38, *verſo.*

(11) Ibid. *fol.* 43.

(12) Ibid. *folio* 44.

(13) Ibid. *folio* 45.

(14) La Planche, Hiſtoire de François II, *pag.* 370, *& ſeq.*

(15) Ibid. *pag.* 372, *& ſeq.*

(16) The author ſpeaks of Francis I.

what they advanced: The reader may judge of it as he pleaſes. We ſhall ſee in the following article (*d*), that he was ſaid to have been a pupil of Calvin. He died at Paris on the 11th of November 1570 (*e*). His place of Regiſter to the Parliament of Paris was enjoyed by his deſcendants for above a century [*F*]. It ought not to be forgot, that he was

(*d*) In the remark [*C*].

and to compleat the deſigns he had already formed, he began to find fault with, and to caſt an odium upon this excellent undertaking of du Tillet, and even to accuſe him before his majeſty of diſloyalty, in deſigning to publiſh the ſecrets of the kingdom, and thoſe things which our kings ought with the greateſt care to conceal, that they may be inſpected only by very few perſons. The Conſtable did not inſiſt much in favour of du Tillet. For he was of opinion that learning effeminated the gentry, and made them degenerate from their predeceſſors, and even that it had engendered hereſies, and increaſed the Lutherans to ſuch a number as they were then arrived to in the kingdom, ſo that he had very little eſteem for learned men, and their books; which was the reaſon that du Tillet did not find ſo much countenance and ſupport from this quarter as he expected. However, finding himſelf thus rebuked, he alledged the command he had received from the late king, and deſired that his books might be read and examined, by which it would be found that he had not exceeded the bounds of his inſtructions. Upon this the Cardinal procured an order from the king to take theſe books to peruſe them, and to make his report to the council. This he accordingly did, and ſent them home to his houſe, where he ordered du Tillet to attend him to give him an account of what he had done, and to wait the king's pleaſure. Thus was this affair at a ſtand, and du Tillet, inſtead of receiving a recompence for his long labours, had enough to do to make all the friends he could to appeaſe the Cardinal: ſo that he was afraid of loſing his goods, eſtates, and life. The cardinal on his part having cauſed theſe books to be peruſed by ſome learned perſons whom he kept in his family, to inſtruct him in ſuch affairs as he was to propoſe to the council, to which he was then very much a ſtranger, by reaſon of his youth and want of experience, he found by their report, that theſe labours might be of great uſe and aſſiſtance to him: but that to publiſh them in print, there were things of too great importance, and which might even prejudice the rights which his family claimed to ſome duchies and lordſhips of France. However they thought he ought not to treat the author ſo roughly, but to careſs, and receive him kindly, and to procure for him the confirmation of his place. Which being done, would lay him under ſo great an obligation, that it would be eaſy to get him to ſuppreſs whatever theſe books contained in derogation to his rights. Beſides, that the gaining ſuch a ſervant to the parliament, would be no ſmall conqueſt: for by his means it would be eaſy to learn all the ſecrets of that court. All which they engaged to bring him to comply with, and to think himſelf very happy alſo in meeting with ſuch good fortune. The Cardinal approved of this advice, and knew ſo well how to put it in practice, that he gained the point he aimed at, in ſuch manner as we have before related. Du Tillet alſo eſteeming it no ſmall matter, to be received into the good graces of the Cardinal, and to have the confirmation of his office by his favour, became his affectionate ſervant: and, in order to find means to inform him of every thing with greater certainty, he recommended to him his own brother for Protonotary. By this means, as the Cardinal increaſed in favour, fortune, honours, and grandeur, the affection of this Regiſter for his ſervice increaſed in proportion; ſo that no law-ſuit was ever carried on ſo ſecretly, with regard to fine duchies, counties, or lordſhips of conſideration, but that he was advertiſed of it, ſo as to find means to recover them. The ſaid Cardinal, therefore, having afterwards attained the higheſt poſt under the reign of Francis II, whoſe hiſtory we are writing; du Tillet voluntarily took in hand the defence of the houſe of Guiſe, knowing that if any harm ſhould happen to them, his life might one day be in danger: as, on the contrary, it was to be imagined that this piece having ſtrengthened their cauſe, muſt entitle him to greater favour, as in truth the Protonotary, who had alſo found means to be employed by the Queen-mother, received for recompence the Biſhopric of S. Brieu. The court of parliament induced by the like reſpect, and willing to oblige theſe governors, gave a licence to this book *of the Majority*, uſing all their power to ſuppreſs the pieces on the other ſide, and making enquiry after the Printers who were ſuſpected of publiſhing them, in order to puniſh them as guilty of high-treaſon. Moreover, there was another conſideration which put this Regiſter upon writing againſt thoſe of the enterprize of Amboiſe, namely, the mortal enmity he bore to la Renaudie, on account of a law-ſuit between them for matters of forgery, wherein the honour of du Tillet was greatly concerned. And though he obtained a verdict in his favour (17), yet Renaudie publickly and expreſly declared, that it was by his intereſt that he had ſucceeded in all the courts of France, and in regard to his place, which gave him ſuch great opportunities of ſerving his friends: but that he hoped, that if ever juſtice ſhould be open to him, he ſhould make the iniquity of the judgments appear, and convict du Tillet of forgery, as in fact he did obtain a reverſal, and letters of rehearing ſome time before the death of King Henry. He reproached alſo du Tillet, that after he and his family had been maintained and educated in the houſe of la Renaudie, he had been ſent to Paris very young to ſollicit their law-ſuits, and there entertained ſo curiouſly and cloſely in his ſtudies, that by their favour and intereſt he was at laſt preferred to this poſt of Regiſter to the parliament; which finding himſelf poſſeſſed of, inſtead of rendering his loyal ſervice to that houſe for the favours he had received from it, he had, by forgeries all very manifeſt, procured for his brothers four or five thouſand livres a year in benefices, which were held by one of the uncles of the ſaid Renaudie: and farther, ſought all means to appropriate to himſelf the remaining part of their eſtate, becauſe he had got poſſeſſion of all the deeds and titles to it. But all this was ſuperſeded by the death of la Renaudie, who while living had kept du Tillet in the greateſt anxiety.’

(17) Compare *with this the words of Varillas*, pag. 102, *of the* Hiſtory of Francis II. La Renaudie had a long law-ſuit with John du Tillet, Regiſter in Chief to the Parliament of Paris. It was for the eccleſiaſtical benefice of Champiners in Angoumois, of ſix thouſand livres a year; and la Renaudie after having proſecuted him thro' all the ſupreme juriſdictions of the kingdom, under pretext that his adverſary had relations there, obtained at laſt an evocation to the Parliament of Dijon, where he was legally convicted of forgery. *Varillas adds that* du Tillet cauſed la Renaudie to be impriſoned, who could not prevent being condemned to death; *but that the Prince of Joinville, ſaved the life of this priſoner, and obtained* letters of rehearing, which re-eſtabliſhed him in his eſtate and reputation. *Thuanus ſays, book xxiv, pag. m.* 488, *that la Renaudie was condemned only to pay a large fine, and to be baniſhed for ſome time.*

I believe the hiſtory of the Sieur de la Planche was not printed till after the death of John du Tillet.

[*F*] *His office of Regiſter . . . . was enjoyed by his deſcendants for above a century.*] This is what we find in the True State of France, printed in 1657. *There is in the Parliament of Paris a Regiſter in chief, who is Mr du Tillet, whoſe anceſtors enjoyed this office for three hundred years paſt, which is one of the moſt profitable in all France* (18). Here is, in my opinion, an error in Chronology; for I believe that before our John du Tillet, not one of his family (19) had ever been Regiſter in chief to the Parliament of Paris. And note, that the State of France, printed in 1680 (20), names Philip-James as Regiſter at that time.

Here follows a fine encomium on the grandſon of John du Tillet. On the 29th of December, 1646, Monſieur du Tillet, *Regiſter in chief to the Parliament almoſt during ſixty years, died after a tedious diſtemper, which he underwent with very great patience. He is commended in a moſt particular manner for having given in his life-time above a million of gold in charities, alms, and liberalities, and yet not left either the name or arms of John du Tillet, Baron de Buſſiere, any way recorded on that account. He lived ſeventy-eight years and ſix days* (21) (§ *a*).

[(§ *a*) It is not true, as Mr Bayle very juſtly obſerves, that the office of Regiſter in chief to the Parliament was for 300 years ſucceſſively in the family of du Tillet, neither is it true that John du Tillet was the firſt of his family who was preferred to it. This will appear by the following extract from a memoir communicated

(18) Véri able Eſtat de la France, *pag.* 453, *Edit. of Paris* 1657.

(19) That is to to ſay, father, grandfather, &c. which is the meaning of the author whom I have cited.

(20) At page 430, of Tom. ii.

(21) Peter de St Romuald, Journal Chronol. *Tom. ii, p.* 700.

(*e*) Peter de St Romuald, Journ. Chron. *Tom. ii, pag.* 540. La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Franc. *pag.* 269, *and* Sammarth. Elogior. *lib. ii, pag. m.* 80, *mention only the month of November. Correct Moreri, who places his death in the month of December.*

was either the author or promoter of the edict (*f*) which prohibits the remitting money to Rome for the diſpatching of benefices (*g*).

(*f*) Made in September 1551.

(*g*) Thuanus, *lib. viii, pag.* 168.

---

communicated by Mr Francis Janiçon, Advocate to his Majeſty's privy-council, and Deputy-General of the Reformed Churches in Guienne.

Elias du Tillet, whoſe father was Secretary to Louiſa de Savoy, Counteſs of Angoulême, the mother of Francis I, was ennobled in April 1434, and was, in 1514, Preſident of the Accounts in Angoulême, and Vice-preſident of the Chamber of Accounts in Paris. In regard to him, Francis I gave to his ſon Seraphin du Tillet, knight, Valet de chambre to the King, the office of Regiſter in chief to the Parliament of Paris, in which he ſucceeded Nicholas Pichon his father-in-law. The Letters-patent of this grant are dated at Claye the fifth of November 1518, and he was ſworn in the fourth of February 1519, new ſtile. From that time, this office has not been out of the family. John, his brother, obtained it, on the ſeventh of September 1530; John, his ſon, the twenty-fourth of July 1552; James, his brother, on the ſecond of January 1578; John, called *the Younger*, on the fourth of March 1588; Francis, in 1638; and John-Francis, in 1674. This year the king divided the office into four parts, whereof a perſon named Philip-James had one, which he enjoyed till 1689, when John-Francis du Tillet re-entred upon it. John du Tillet, brother to the firſt John, and ſon of Elias, was made Biſhop of St Brieux, in 1553, and Biſhop of Meaux the 16th of December 1565. He died in the month of December 1570.

It appears from hence, 1. That Seraphin du Tillet was the firſt of this family who was Regiſter in chief to the Parliament of Paris. 2. That this Philip-James was not of the family of du Tillet, as this paſſage, related by Mr Bayle, implies, and as Mr Bayle himſelf appears to have believed. 3. That this Philip-James ſeems to have diſcharged this office only till ſuch time as *J. Fr. du Tillet* ſhould come of age, or be qualified to diſcharge it himſelf. Rem. Crit.]

TILLET (John du) younger brother of the foregoing, was an Eccleſiaſtic, and became a very learned man (*a*). He was a perfect maſter of languages, the antient Roman law, and Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity. He ſearched, by the permiſſion of Francis I, the moſt celebrated libraries in the kingdom, and took from thoſe libraries a great many books, which enabled him to publiſh ſeveral valuable antient pieces, both Eccleſiaſtical and Civil (*b*) [*A*], and particularly an old manuſcript, that goes under the name of Charlemagne [*B*], and which did not much pleaſe the Roman Catholics. He was preferred ſucceſſively to two biſhoprics; ſome ſay he was firſt Biſhop of Meaux, and afterwards of St Brieu (*c*), others that he was firſt Biſhop of St Brieu and afterwards of Meaux (*d*). He compoſed ſome controverſial treatiſes, and yet was ſuſpected of inclining to Calviniſm [*C*]. The public very much eſteemed a ſhort chronicle of the Kings of France (*e*), which he publiſhed in Latin (*f*), and in French (*g*), and continued from Pharamond

(*a*) Thuan. *lib. xlvii, pag. m.* 974.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Sammarthan. Elog. *lib. ii, pag.* 79.

(*d*) Thuan. *lib. xlvii, pag. m.* 974.

(*e*) Sammarthan. Elog. *lib. ii, pag. m.* 80. La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 268.

(*f*) In the year 1551.

(*g*) In the year 1553.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral valuable antient pieces, both Eccleſiaſtical and Civil.*] He printed at Paris, in 1538, ſome treatiſes of Pacianus, Biſhop of Barcelona, and in 1540 *Apoſtolorum Canones & Concilia XIII*; and in 1550, *Codicis Theodoſiani Libri priores octo emendati, & poſteriores octo integri primum*; and in 1555, *Evangelium Matthæi Hebraicè & Latinè*; and in 1567, the works of Luciferus, Biſhop of Cagliari.

[*B*] *and . . . . . an old manuſcript, which goes under the name of Charlemagne.*] He publiſhed it at Paris, in the year 1549; but no notice is taken in the title-page, either of the name of the Printer, or of the place where the book was printed, and in the preface, which he added to it, he took the fictitious name of Eliphilus. It has been thought, with a great deal of probability, that by the former part of this word *he intended to ſignify, that being animated with the ſpirit of Elias, he had a deſign to deſtroy images*; and that by the latter part he deſcribed his own name *Tilius*, for *Tilia* in Latin, is the name of a tree, which the Greeks call *Philyra* (1). It is certain that his Preface is not conformable to the principles of the Roman Catholics upon the worſhip of images; but rather to a book he publiſhed, which condemned the diviſions of the ſecond Council of Nice. This is the title under which he publiſhed it: *Opus illuſtriſſimi Caroli Magni, nutu Dei, Regis Francorum, Gallias, Germaniam, Italiamque, ſive harum finitimas Provincias, Domino opitulante, regentis, contra Synodum, quæ in partibus Græciæ pro adorandis imaginibus ſtolide ſive arroganter geſta eſt. Item: Paulini Aquileienſis Epiſcopi adverſus Felicem Urgelitanum, & Eliphandum Toletanum Epiſcopos Libellus. Quæ nunc primum in lucem reſtituuntur. Anno Salutis MDXLIX.* A ſecond edition of this book was printed at Cologn in the year 1555, and it has been inſerted by Goldaſt in the collection of Imperial Decrees *de Cultu Imaginum, on the worſhip of images*, publiſhed at Francfort in the year 1608, in 8vo. Several controverſial writers of the Romiſh communion (2) have maintained, that this is a ſuppoſititious piece, that Charlemagne was not the author of it, and that it was not compoſed in the time of that emperor, but rather by the Heretics of the XVIth century. It has been demonſtrated to them, that this notion of theirs is falſe; and that this piece was at leaſt approved and adopted by Charlemagne. See the proofs alledged by Mr Daillé, and his anſwers to the chicaneries of Bellarmin (3). Father Maimbourg ingenuouſly confeſſes that, this book was written under the Emperor Charlemagne. *It remained in obſcurity*, continues he (4), *till the year* 1549, *when a Lutheran having found it in an antient manuſcript, publiſhed it with a preface of his own, under the borrowed name of Eli Phili, in which he inveighs terribly againſt the worſhip of images. It cannot, however, be denied, that this book was the very work aſcribed to Charlemagne, as appears by the anſwers which Pope Adrian made to the objections contained in it.* He pretends, that thoſe who compoſed it *had nothing of the ſpirit of that Prince, who would not have written in that manner.* This remark has been invincibly refuted in the *Entretiens d'Eudoxe & d'Euchariſte* (5), the author of which confeſſes, *that there is room to believe that Charlemagne was the author of thoſe four books which go under his name.* I am ſurpriſed that no body has cenſured that Jeſuit, for aſſerting that they were publiſhed by a Lutheran. Could he be ignorant, that all the world has long ſince acknowledged, that the editor of them was a Biſhop?

[*C*] *He compoſed ſome controverſial treatiſes, and yet was ſuſpected of inclining to Calviniſm.*] Here follows the titles of them: A treatiſe on the Antiquity and Solemnity of the Maſs, on the Apoſtles Creed, and on the XII Articles of our Faith; at Paris, 1566, in 8vo. The Anſwer of a Biſhop to the Miniſters of the New Churches; at Paris, 1566, in 8vo (6). He publiſhed it alſo in Latin. Advice to the Gentlemen ſeduced by the Stratagems of the Miniſters of the New Churches; at Paris, 1567, in 8vo. A treatiſe on the Chriſtian Religion.

What follows is a proof of his being ſuſpected: Cardinal Perron accuſed him of having ſome ill deſign againſt the Romiſh Religion, in publiſhing the treatiſe of Charlemagne. *It is Monſieur du Tillet*, ſays he (7), *who cauſed it to be printed* ſtudio nocendi, *out of a deſign to do miſchief, rather than on any other account; and he who had been a pupil of Calvin, could have no other*

(1) Teiſſier, Addit. aux Eloges, *Tom. i, p.* 344, *ex* Voſſio de Hiſtor. Lat. *lib. ii, cap. xxx, pag.* 290.

(2) *See among others* Alanus Copus, Dial. IV, *cap. xviii, xix*; & Dial. V, *cap. xii, & ſeq.* Surius, in Admon. de Syn. Francof. *in the iiid Tome of the* Councils, *Part. i, pag.* 159.

(3) Daillé, Traité des Images, *lib. iv, ch. iii. See alſo* Mr du Pin, Biblioth. *Tom. vi, pag.* 120, *Dutch edition.*

(4) Maimbourg, Hiſt. des Iconoclaſtes, *lib. iv, pag. m.* 23.

(5) Pag. 173, Dutch edition.

(6) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franc. *pag.* 757, 758.

(7) Perroniana, *at the word* Charles-Magne.

ramond down to the year 1550. He died in the ſame month and year with his brother the Regiſter (*b*). Some ſay that LEWIS DU TILLET, Archdeacon of Angoulême was their brother [*D*].

(*b*) *That is to ſay, in the month of November,* 1570. Sammarth. Elog. *lib. ii*, *pag.* 80, *and* La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 269.

other opinion of images than this. Calvin, ſays he, in another place (8), *was very much perplexed on the ſubject of the Euchariſt. It is ſaid, that Meſſieurs du Tillet have ſtill in their hands ſome letters of his own writing on that ſubject of the Euchariſt, which diſcover more clearly the opinion he had of it, than any of his other writings. It is not to be wondered at, if theſe Meſſieurs du Tillet have been a little ſuſpected, as they had Calvin for their maſter.* It cannot be thought ſtrange, that the Preface which John du Tillet, the Biſhop, prefixed to the book of Charlemagne, ſhould render him ſuſpected; for he expreſſed himſelf in the ſtrongeſt terms againſt the abuſe of images, and did not contain himſelf within the bounds that have been fixed by ſome Catholic Doctors (9). Perhaps he wrote afterwards againſt the Huguenots, for no other reaſon but to clear himſelf of all ſuſpicion. What I have cited from the *Perroniana* proves, that his brother, the Regiſter, was not eſteemed truly orthodox, and that it was pretended he had been a diſciple of Calvin. He purged himſelf however ſo entirely, that the Proteſtants looked upon him as their perſecutor (10). And, by the way, I ſhall here correct a miſtake in the Index to the ſecond volume of the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches in the kingdom of France.* We there find under the letter T *du Tillet, the Regiſter, and his cruelty*, 7. 501; but when we conſult this page 501 of the VIIth book, we meet with nothing there which can neceſſarily be imputed to this du Tillet. We read there only that ſome Proteſtant ſoldiers, who went out of Bourges in 1563, in order to go to Orleans, took a private road, *by which ſome of them found their way very well, but the reſt loſt themſelves: among whom there were thirty or forty, who being tired, and having very little powder left to defend themſelves, were ſurpriſed and cruelly maſſacred by the perſons who were kept by John du Tillet, Regiſter to the court of Parliament of Paris, in his houſe of la Buſſiere near Chaſtillon on the Loin* (11). If the author had ſaid that du Tillet, reſiding at that time at la Buſſiere, had ordered this maſſacre, the Index of the book had been correct; but he leaves us at liberty to imagine that du Tillet might have no hand in it: for is it not allowable, in civil wars, for any one to guard his caſtles in the beſt manner he can? If the ſoldiers made uſe of commit any diſorder, the owner of the caſtle, who is often at an hundred leagues diſtance, having given no orders in particular, can never be anſwerable for it. Thoſe who make Indexes to books frequently commit miſtakes of this kind.

[*D*] *Some ſay that* LEWIS DU TILLET, *Archdeacon of Angoulême, was their brother.*] Florimond de Remond ſhall be my author. He affirms (12), that Calvin having retired into the city of Angoulême, *was entertained there for the ſpace of three years, at the expence of Lewis du Tillet, Curate of Claix, and Canon of Angoulême, whom he taught the little Greek he knew. He was brother to the Biſhop of Meaux, and to John du Tillet, Regiſter to the Parliament of Paris.* This author adds (13), that Lewis du Tillet, 'having his head full 'of the opinions which Calvin had imprinted on him, 'and being deſirous to ſee all thoſe great men who 'had declared war againſt the Catholic Church, made a 'journey into Germany (14). . . . Du Tillet on his 'return having recovered his reaſon, renounced for 'ever the doctrine of his maſter. Thus Calvin quickly 'loſt the firſt of his conqueſts; for this was the firſt 'ſoul which was ever believed to be ſeduced by him. 'He ſhews very ſtrongly the reſentment he had againſt 'this man in his Preface to the Pſalms. For it is of 'him he ſpeaks, where he mentions a certain perſon, '*who after vilely revolting, and returning back to the 'Papiſts, diſcovered him paſſing to Geneva.* He means 'du Tillet, whom he never mentions without reflexion. Du Tillet, after his return to Angoulême, 'having, by letter, bid his laſt adieu to the novel 'opinions of Calvin, and made public abjuration of 'his Hereſy, aſcended the pulpit, (for he was a man 'of learning) preached, and declamed againſt Lutheraniſm as zealouſly as he had before deſired to promote 'it. The name of Calviniſm was not yet in uſe. He 'was elected Archdeacon, which dignity he long diſputed with la Renaudie (15).' According to this account, it would be falſe that du Tillet, the Regiſter, had been the diſciple of Calvin: the *Perroniana* would confound things.

Note, that Papyrius Maſſo's brother, affirms, that Lewis de Tillet was not brother, but nephew to the Regiſter of the parliament. 'Is (*Ludovicus Tillius*) 'erat filius Heliæ in privato Conſiſtorio Regio Conſiliarii & Vicepræſidis Rationalium, Aloiſiæ è Sabaudia Franciſci primi, matris, fratriſque Joannis Tillii 'Senatus Pariſienſis exceptoris, cujus ſcripta extant '(16).' - - - Lewis du Tillet *was the ſon of Elias, 'Privy-counſellor to the King, and Vice-preſident of accounts to Louiſſa of Savoy, Francis the firſt's mother, 'and the brother of John du Tillet, Regiſter to the Parliament of Paris, whoſe writings are extant.'* He does not ſay that the Regiſter had no ſhare in the return of this diſciple of Calvin. You may obſerve, if you pleaſe, that this brother of Papyrius Maſſo got the beſt information he was able of all theſe things during his reſidence at Angoulême, where he had a canonſhip (17). Peter de St Romuald (18) obſerves, that this Canon du Tillet was named Lewis or Seraphin: he relates ſome facts advanced by Florimond de Remond, but inſtead of quoting this Florimond, he quotes Papyrius Maſſo, who has ſaid nothing of them.

I find, in the *Mercure Galant* for the month of May, 1705 (19), one SERAPHIN DU TILLET, who was lately dead, a Counſellor in the grand-chamber, and an Abbot DU TILLET, who was ſtill living; and that the mother of the late Count d'Entremont, Lieutenant-General of Breſſe, and grand-mother of the Marchioneſs de l'Hôpital, was deſcended from the Regiſter John du Tillet.

(8) Ibid. *at the word* Calvin.

(9) Mr du Pin, *for example. See page* 153, *of Tom. vi, of his* Nouvelle Bibliotheque, *Dutch edition.*

(10) See the remarks [*D*] and [*E*], of the article foregoing.

(11) Beze, Hiſt. Eccleſ. des Egliſes, *Vol. ii*, *livr. vii*, *pag.* 501.

(12) Florimond de Remond, Hiſt. de l'Héréſie, *lib. vii*, *ch. ix*, *pag. m.* 883.

(13) Id. *ch. x*, *pag.* 889, 890.

(14) See the remark [*AA*], of the article CALVIN.

(15) Thuanus, *lib. xxiv*, *pag.* 488, ſays that la Renaudie went to law for a benefice which his uncle by the mother's ſide, had in Augoumois, and to which du Tillet the Regiſter claimed a right. See, in the remark [*E*], of the preceding article, the words of la Planche, and of Varillas.

(16) Addit. to chap. iv, of the Life of Calvin. *pag.* 457. Elog. Pap. Maſſonis.

(17) Id. ibid. *pag.* 456.

(18) In Continuatione Chronici Ademari, *pag.* 297.

(19) Pag. 281.

TILLI or THILLI, a lordſhip in Brabant [*A*] which gave a title to John Count de Tilli, who was born there, and has been one of the greateſt captains of the XVIIth century. He is mentioned in Moreri's Dictionary, under the word *Tzerclas*, which was the

[*A*] *A lordſhip in Brabant.*] Gramaie informs us that it had belonged to the houſe of Warfuzé, and that Robert de Warfuzé transferred it to Gerard Marbais in the year 1389. It was afterwards poſſeſſed by John de Limilette, and then by Sanſon de Lalain, who, on the twenty-fifth of June, 1448, conferred the *Dominium altum & baſſum*, on John Serclaes, deſcended from one of the moſt noble Patrician families of Bruſſels (1). The lordſhip of Tilli was then entirely independent; but afterwards became a fiſe to the Dukes of Brabant, by virtue of the following inſtrument: 'John, Lord 'of Thilly, transfers into the hands of my Lord Duke, 'his houſe and lordſhip of Tilly, with all its rights 'and appurtenances as by him enjoyed, and our ſaid 'Lord the Duke hath again transferred the ſaid houſe 'and lordſhip, and all the lands thereto appertaining 'to the ſaid John, his heirs and ſucceſſors, to hold it 'in perpetual fief of our ſaid lord and his heirs and 'his ſucceſſors the Dukes and Ducheſſes of Brabant. 'And the ſaid John held his ſaid houſe and lordſhip 'of Thilly of our ſaid lord, and therefore did his fealty, 'and homage, and took the oath of allegiance, as cuſtomary in the court of the fiefs of Brabant. And our 'ſaid lord received his homage with a ſalvo to his 'highneſs and lordſhip, and to the rights of every 'one. Done the 16th day of May, in the year 1449 (2).' This John Serclaes was the father of James t'Serclaes, who was the father of Martin t'Serclaes father of John t'Serclaes, member of the council of war to the Emperor, who married a daughter of the Count of Friſeland (3). From

(1) Patricia imprimiſque nobili apud Bruxellam ſtirpe edito. *Le Roy, in Topographia Gallo-Brabantiæ*, pag. 99.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Ex eod. ibid.

the family name of this famous General. He had an elder brother, whoſe grandſons at this preſent time (a) make a very conſiderable figure. There are three brothers of them, all called Counts de Tilli. One is Canon of Liege; the two other bear arms. One of whom is General of the troops of Liege, and has been raiſed to the dignity of a prince by the King of Spain [*B*]. The other by his long ſervices has been advanced to the chief poſts in the Dutch army (*b*). He married a ſiſter of the Count of Reckheim, Biſhop of Coire or Chur, and Canon of Cologn and Saltzburgh, a lord who by his great merit and exalted genius ſupports the illuſtrious nobility of his houſe.

There are ſome miſtakes in Moreri's article *Tzerclas* [*C*], which is that of John Count de Tilly. I do not know whether he is not miſtaken, when he ſays that this General was made a count at the Diet of Ratisbon, in the year 1623: I ſhall only ſay, that according to Father Labbe, *John and James de* TILLI were *created Counts of the Empire by the Emperor at Vienna the 3d of September* 1622 (*c*). The Sieur Blanc obſerves that Count Werner, nephew of Count de Tilli, was wounded at the battle of Statlo in the year 1623 (*d*).

(a) That is, in the year 1696. The Gazettes are continually mentioning them.

(*b*) Lieutenant-General of Horſe, and Governor of Arnheim, in 1701. See the *Lettres Hiſtoriques*, of November 1701, pag. 607.

(*c*) Labbe, Chron. Franc. *Tom. v, pag.* 846.

(*d*) Blanc, Hiſt. de Baviere, *Tom. iv, pag.* 190.

From this marriage proceeded John t'Serclaes, created count by the Emperor Ferdinand II (4), and one of the greateſt Generals of the XVIIth century.

[*B*] *One . . . . raiſed to the dignity of a Prince by the King of Spain.*] This is the tenor of the Letters-patents, as abridged and publiſhed by the Baron le Roy. They are dated at Madrid the twenty-ſecond of December 1693. 'Charles, by 'the Grace of GOD, King of Caſtile, &c. Being in'formed, that ſeveral anceſtors of our moſt dear and 'royal Lord *Albert T'Serclaes de Thilly*, Count of 'the holy Roman empire, Gentleman of our bed'chamber, Serjeant-General of battalia in our 'armies in the Low-countries, and, at preſent, by 'our permiſſion and conſent, General of the troops 'of the Prince and Biſhop of Liege, our ally, and 'others of his family have, with the utmoſt bravery 'and reſolution, done ſeveral important ſervices to 'the Emperors, Kings, and Princes, our auguſt prede'ceſſors. As alſo that the ſaid *Albert T'Serclaes de* '*Thilly*, hath ſerved in our armies from the year one 'thouſand ſix hundred and ſixty ſix, as Captain, 'Lieutenant-Colonel, Colonel of horſe, and Serjeant'general of battalia, and that on all occaſions which 'have offered in our ſervice, he hath neither ſpared 'his life nor eſtate, of which we have received the 'utmoſt ſatisfaction which we can deſire. As well 'as of the ſervices he continues at preſent to perform 'in the quality of General of the forces of the Prince 'and Biſhop of Liege, for the common cauſe, with 'a zeal, bravery, and experience ſo well known to all 'the world. Knowing moreover, that the ſaid *Albert* '*T'Serclaes de Thilly* is deſcended from a very illuſtri'ous and antient family, which has always been ſup'ported by ſeveral great, high, and very conſiderable 'alliances, and that beſides he poſſeſſes ſeveral lands, 'lordſhips, and eſtates, ſufficient to maintain his ho'nour, as thoſe of Montigny, Farciennes, Prelle, and 'others; and being willing, for this reaſon, to raiſe, 'advance him, and diſtinguiſh with greater honours, 'rights, prerogatives, and pre-eminencies; we have 'of our certain knowledge, &c. made and created, 'and we do by theſe preſents make and create, *Albert* 'Count *de T'Serclaes de Thilly*, Prince of *T'Serclaes*, 'conſenting and granting that he may beſtow the ſaid 'title of Prince upon the ſeat and lordſhip, which he 'ſhall name, under our obedience and juriſdiction in 'our ſaid Low-countries: which ſeat and lordſhip we 'have to that end erected, and do by theſe preſents 'erect into the dignity, title, name, ſtile, and pre'eminence of *Principality of T'Serclaes*, &c (5).'

[*C*] *There are ſome faults in Moreri's Article Tzerclas.*] I. He has forgot to ſet down the ſirname of this General of the troops of the Catholic league. II. The name of the town which he took after the battle of Prague, is *Ellenbogen* and not *Elbogen*. III. It ſhould have been obſerved that Ellenbogen was a town of Bohemia. IV. The defeat of the Margrave of Baden at Wimphen did not follow, but preceded the taking of Heidelberg. V. What happened at Manſfeld near Darmſtad (6) was not a *defeat*, but only a check, and likewiſe preceded the conqueſt of Heidelberg; therefore theſe words of Moreri, *Tilli had formerly . . . . taken Heidelberg*, contain an anachoriſm. VI. Theſe words are not intelligible. *He had formerly aided the Arch-duke Leopold in the taking of Breda*. This, perhaps, is an error of the preſs, and ſhould have been *Bretta*, the Latin name of *Bretten*, a ſmall town in the Palatinate. This Arch-duke Leopald was Biſhop of Straſbourg, and joined his troops with thoſe of Count Tilli at the ſiege of Heidelberg (7). VII. Inſtead of ſaying that the *Duke of Weimar*, and the Duke of Alkenburg (8) were made priſoners at the battle of Statlo, he ought to have ſaid *Duke William Saxe-Weimar, and Frederic Duke of Saxe-Altemburgh*. For want of this particular diſtinction of names, which the Sieur Blanc has uſed (9), there ariſe many ambiguities, which are diſagreeable to the accurate reader. VIII. To ſay that there were among the priſoners *ſeveral other Princes*, is advancing an untruth; for the Sieur Blanc, who names the principal priſoners, only names theſe two who were princes. Obſerve that in the edition of France, in 1698, they gave the right title of the book of Julius Bellus *Laurea Auſtriaca*; but in that of 1699, they called it, agreeably to the Dutch editions, *Maurea* inſtead of *Laurea*.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) *Idem*, Erection de toutes les Terres, Seigneuries, & Familles titrées du Brabant, *pag.* 106.

(6) Thus it muſt be called, and not *d'Armſtad*, as Moreri has it. In the Paris edition, 1699, this fault is corrected.

(7) *See* Blanc, Hiſtory of Bavaria, *Tom. iv, pag.* 153.

(8) They have ſaid Altemburg in the Dutch editions.

(9) Hiſtory of Bavaria, *Tom. iv, pag.* 190.

TIMÆUS, a Greek Hiſtorian, the ſon of an illuſtrious father [*A*], was of Tauromenium in Sicily, and flouriſhed in the time of Agathocles, who died in the fourth year of the CXXIIId Olympiad (*a*). He wrote ſeveral books [*B*], and among others, the hiſtory

(*a*) Athen. *lib. ii, pag.* 37, & *alibi.*

[*A*] *The ſon of an illuſtrious father.*] He was the ſon of Andromachus, who was very famous for his riches and excellent qualities, and may be eſteemed the founder of one of the moſt conſiderable towns in Sicily; for he aſſembled all the fugitives of Naxus, a city which Dionyſius the tyrant had ruined, and ſettled them on a hill called Taurus. This gave riſe to Tauromenium (1). This he did in the ſecond year of the CVIth Olympiad (2). It was long before this time that Dionyſius had deſtroyed Naxus (3). Note, that Andromachus reigned with very great lenity in his new city, and ſhewed himſelf an enemy to all tyrants. He received Timoleon's troops, and animated his ſubjects to aſſiſt them, in order to deliver all Sicily from the yoke of tyranny (4).

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] Three of Syria: ſixty-eight *de Argumentis Rhetoricæ*: Ολυμπιονικὰς ἢ Χρονικὰ πραξίδια, *Olympionicas ſeu acta Chronica*. Ἰταλικὰ καὶ Σικελικὰ *libris* 8. Ἑλληνικὰ καὶ Σικελικά. In the firſt of theſe two laſt works, he gave the Hiſtory of Sicily, ſo far as it was concerned with the Roman Hiſtory; and in the other he did the ſame, ſo far as it is concerned with the Grecian Hiſtory (5). He wrote the Hiſtory of Pyrrhus, by itſelf, as we are informed by Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (6), and by theſe words of Cicero: 'Deeſſe mihi nolui quin 'te admonerem ut cogitares conjunctene malles cum 'reliquis rebus noſtra contexere, an, ut multi Græci 'fecerunt, Calliſthenes Troicum bellum, Timæus Pyr'rhi, Polybius Numantinum: qui omnes à perpetuis

(1) Diodorus Siculus, *lib. xvi, cap. vii.*

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Id. *lib. xiv, cap. xvi.*

(4) Taken from Plutarch, in the Life of Timoleon. *pag.* 240.

(5) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Græcis, *pag.* 82. *See* Suidas.

(6) Dionyſ. Hal. *lib. i, cap. vi.*

hiſtory of his own country. All theſe are loſt; we have not the leaſt remains of them. He was very much addicted to detraction [*C*], and great doubt has been made of his veracity [*D*]. His reſentments againſt Agathocles, and the affectation of purſuing him with ſo little juſtice, was highly diſguſting. He liſtened too much upon this occaſion to the

‘ ſuis hiſtoriis ea quæ dixi bella ſeparaverunt (7). - - - *I would not be ſo far wanting to myſelf, as not to adviſe you to conſider, whether you had rather incorporate the hiſtory of my affairs with that of others; or, as many Greeks have done, Calliſthenes the war of Troy, Timæus that of Pyrrhus, and Polybius that of Numantia; who have all of them ſeparated thoſe wars I have mentioned, from their general Hiſtories.*’ We have already ſeen that Timæus's Hiſtory conſiſted of two parts, and they ſay that the firſt contained eight books, without taking any notice of the number contained in the ſecond. But it is neceſſary to add, that ſeveral cite it without obſerving this diviſion; they mention in general ſuch or ſuch a book of his Hiſtories. The higheſt number, quoted by Athæneus, is the twenty-eighth (8). Diogenes Laërtius does not go beyond the eighteenth (9).

[*C*] *He was very much addicted to detraction.*] This was the reaſon why they added ſome letters to his name, in order to give him a title, which might ſignify his fondneſs for cenſure. Τίμαιος μὲν οὖν μεγίστην πρόνοιαν πεποιημένος, τῆς τῶν χρόνων ἀκριβείας, καὶ τῆς πολυπειρίας πεφροντικώς, διὰ τὰς ἀκαίρους καὶ μακρὰς ἐπιτιμήσεις εὐλόγως διαβάλλεται. καὶ διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς ἐπιτιμήσεως Ἐπιτίμαιος ὑπό τινων ὠνομάσθη. Timæus ſanè, & in temporum notatione exquiſitam adhibuit diligentiam, & ut variâ rerum cognitione abundet, ſollicitè laborat. At propter intempeſtivas, & verboſas reprehenſiones, jure etiam ipſe reprehenditur. Quare ob nimiam taxandi libidinem, & acerbitatem, Epitimæus (id eſt, taxator) à quibuſdam nominatus fuit (10). - - - *Timæus therefore applying himſelf with much induſtry to the diſtinctions of times, and ſtudying great variety of ſubjects, yet for his unſeaſonable and long cenſures is juſtly cenſured himſelf, and for his exceſſive ſeverity this way, was by ſome intituled the Cenſurer.* You ſee that the Hiſtorian who has given him this blow, does not fail to praiſe him on other accounts, I mean, for the exactneſs of his Chronology, and his general learning. All thoſe who have criticiſed on him have not been ſo juſt; one of them has only ſhewn his worſt ſide, to which purpoſe he hath employed a parentheſis. Τούτων δὲ μαρτυρία ἐστὶ τὰ γενηθέντα τότε ψηφίσματα· ἅπερ ἀγνοοῦντα φησὶν ὁ Ἀρτεμίδωρος τὸν Ταυρομενίτην Τίμαιον, καὶ ἄλλως βάσκανον ὄντα, καὶ συκοφάντην (διὸ καὶ Ἐπιτίμιον κληθῆναι) λέγειν ὡς ἐκ τῶν Περσικῶν παρακαταθηκῶν ἐποιήσαντο τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὴν ἐπισκευήν. Teſtantur hoc quæ tum facta ſunt decreta: quæ ignorantem ait Artemidorus Timæum Tauromenitam, hominem alioqui invidum & calumniatorem, ac cui propterea nomen Epitimii, id eſt reprehenſoris factum ſit ſcripſiſſe, id templum eos è depoſitis Perſarum condidiſſe (11). - - - *The truth of all this appears from the decrees at that time made, which Artemidorus ſays were unknown to Timæus the Tauromenian, a man who was full of envy and calumny, ſo as to be intituled the Cenſurer, and who aſſerts, they cauſed the temple to be built with the Perſian money intruſted with them.* In order to elucidate this paſſage, I add, that it relates to the refutation of a falſity, which our Timæus had publiſhed concerning the Epheſians. He had ſaid, that they made uſe of the Perſian treaſure depoſited in their hands, to build the temple of Diana. Here is a third cenſure which touches to the quick. Διὸ δὴ καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς μὲν εἰκότως ἂν δόξαιμεν ἀθετεῖν τοῖς ὑπὸ Τιμαίου κατὰ Δημοχάρους εἰρημένοις. ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἂν οὐκ εἰκότως τυγχάνει συγγνώμης, οὐδὲ πίστεως ὑπ' οὐδενὸς, διὰ τὸ προφανῶς ἐν ταῖς λοιδορίαις ἐκπίπτειν τοῦ καθήκοντος διὰ τὴν ἔμφυτον πικρίαν: Quocirca nunc quoque nos ea, quæ à Timæo dicta ſunt in Democharem, meritò improbare videamur. Ille autem indignus, cui à quoquam ignoſcatur, & fides habeatur, videri debet: quia apertè in maledictis ab officio diſcedit, ac deflectit propter inſitam acerbitatem (12). - - - *Therefore we alſo now may juſtly ſeem to condemn thoſe things which Timæus has thrown out againſt Demochares. For he appears neither worthy of pardon, nor of credit from any body, becauſe of his deviating ſo notoriouſly from his duty into calumny, out of his natural malicíouſneſs.* Clemens Alexandrinus gives us Timæus and Theopompus for a couple of ſatirical and fabulous Hiſtorians. Ἀλλ' ἄρα Θεοπόμπῳ μὲν καὶ Τιμαίῳ μύθους καὶ βλασφημίας συντάττουσιν. *Sed Theopompo quidem & Timæo qui fabulas & maledicta componunt* (13). Cornelius Nepos does much the ſame thing (14). Note that Athenæus obſerves, that Iſter writing againſt Timæus, called him Epitimæus (15). He was perhaps the firſt inventer of this pun. Note alſo that Ariſtotle was one of thoſe abuſed by Timæus (16), and we muſt not forget this circumſtance, *viz.* that this Hiſtorian vented all his ſpleen againſt perſons, even when they were not in the wrong. Thus he exclaimed againſt thoſe who mentioned Phalaris's Bull. He loudly proclaimed them fabulous writers; and with the utmoſt heat maintained that there was never any ſuch thing (17); when it was he himſelf who was miſtaken, for this Bull was ſtill in being in the time of Diodorus Siculus (18). It had been tranſported to Carthage, when Imilcar ſacked Agrigentum, and was reſtored to the Agrigentines two hundred and ſixty years after, when Scipio Africanus deſtroyed Carthage. Theſe particulars are related by Diodorus Siculus (19), as affording a favourable opportunity to cenſure our Timæus, and to ſhew the conjunctures wherein we ought to excuſe or not excuſe the errors of Hiſtorians. We ought to excuſe them, when the facts lie ſo obſcure that even with very great diligence they cannot be diſcovered: but we ought never to excuſe them, when either negligence, or an inclination to flatter or calumniate any perſon, carry them out of the right way. The author's words in the original will much better pleaſe thoſe who are capable of underſtanding them. It is on their account I have tranſcribed them: other readers ought not to be diſpleaſed, they may paſs them by without the trouble of reading them, and yet underſtand in general the thought of the Hiſtorian. Περὶ δὲ τούτου φιλοτιμότερον εἰπεῖν προήχθην, διό τι Τίμαιος ὁ τῶν πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ συγγραφέων πικρότατα κατηγορήσας, καὶ συγγνώμην οὐδεμίαν τοῖς ἱστοριογράφοις ἀπολιπὼν, αὐτὸς εὑρίσκεται σχεδιάζων, ἐν οἷς μάλιστα ἑαυτὸν ἀποπέφαγκεν ἀκριβολογούμενον. δεῖ γὰρ, οἶμαι, τοὺς συγγραφεῖς ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἀγνοήμασι τυγχάνειν συγγνώμης, ὡς ἂν ἀνθρώπους ὄντας, καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς παρῳχομένοις χρόνοις ἀληθείας οὔσης δυσευρέτου· τοὺς μέντοιγε κατὰ προαίρεσιν οὐ τυγχάνοντας τοῦ ἀκριβοῦς προσηκόντως κατηγορίας τυγχάνειν, ὅταν κολακεύοντές τινας ἢ δι' ἔχθραν πικρότερον προσβάλλοντες, ἀποσφάλλωνται τῆς ἀληθείας (20): Quâ de re ſtudioſius diſſere mihi libuit; quia Timæus, cum magnâ acerbitate ſcriptores ætatem ſuam antecedentes reprehendat, nullumque hiſtoricis veniæ locum relinquat; ipſe tamen, ubi diligentiſſimum veritatis ſtudium profitetur, nugari & alucinari deprehendatur. Scriptoribus enim in iis, quæ non aſſequuntur, veniam (meo quidem judicio) tribui æquum eſt, quippe, cùm homines ſint, & temporum præterlapſorum veritas difficulter è caligine eruatur. Contrà verò, qui datâ operâ exactam inquiſitionem negligunt, hos meritò accuſandos, arbitror, & quando nimirum nonnullis adulando, vel per odium virulentiùs alios impugnando, à regiâ veritatis viâ exorbitant & aberrant. - - - *I have choſen to ſpeak of this the more zealouſly; becauſe Timæus tho' he condemns moſt bitterly the writers who preceded him, and leaves no excuſe at all for Hiſtorians, yet is himſelf found defective in thoſe very things where he moſt of all values himſelf for his accuracy. For it is but reaſonable, I think, that authors ſhould be intituled to pardon in thoſe things which are unknown to them, as they are men, and as truth is difficult to be diſcovered in ages that are paſt. But, on the contrary, that thoſe ſhould be deſervedly condemned, who purpoſely are inaccurate, when in flattering ſome, or abuſing others, they deviate from truth.*

[*D*] *Great doubt has been made of his veracity.*] See the paſſage of Polybius cited in the preceding remark, and that which ſhall be quoted below (21). In ſhort read what is remaining to us of the twelfth book of Polybius.

---

(7) Cicero, Epiſt. xii, *lib. v*, ad Familiares, *pag. m.* 255.

(8) Athen. *lib. xi, cap. vi, pag.* 471.

(9) Diogen. Laërtius, in Empedocle, *lib. viii, num.* 60.

(10) Diodorus Siculus, *lib. v, circa init.*

(11) Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag.* 440.

(12) Polybius, *lib. xii, p.* 659.

(13) Clem. Alexandr. Stromat. *lib. i, init. pag. m.* 269.

(14) Theopompus . . . & Timæus qui quidem duo maledicentiſſimi. *Cornel. Nepos in Alcibiade.*

(15) Athen. *lib. vi, cap. xx, pag.* 272.

(16) *See* Diogenes Laërt. *lib. v, num. i, &* Ariſtocles *apud* Euſebium, Præpar. *lib. xv, cap. ii, pag.* 791.

(17) Diodorus Siculus, *lib. xiii, cap. xc, pag.* 543, *Edit. Lat.* 1611, *in* 8*vo.*

(18) Id. ibid.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Id. ibid. *pag.* 380. Edit. Græcæ Henrici Stephani 1559 *in folio.*

(21) In the remark [*E*].

the ſpirit of revenge [*E*]. Several other faults have been diſcovered in his Hiſtory [*F*]; but ſome excellent judges allow him to have been very learned, and very eloquent [*G*].

He

[*E*] *To purſue Agathocles with ſo little juſtice..... He liſtned too much to the ſpirit of revenge.*] Agathocles had forced him to fly out of Sicily: this indeed coſt him nothing during his life, but after his death he paid for it. Agathocles, when living, was out of the reach of Timæus's reſentment: the latter was obliged to defer his vengeance until Agathocles was in his grave. Then he diſcharged the torrent of his rage againſt him: this tyrant was not only defamed by a deſcription of his crimes and ill qualities, but alſo by fabulous calumnies. He robbed him of all the glory of his ſucceſsful enterprizes, and laid to his charge all the misfortunes which befel him, not excepting the moſt fortuitous: he repreſented him as a coward, tho' it was evident enough that this General had given a thouſand proofs of his courage and valour. If it had not been ſo, was it poſſible for him, only a potter's ſon, as he was, to have ſubdued all Sicily, and a great part of Italy and Libya? Doth not Timæus contradict himſelf? In all the reſt of his book he exalts the valour of the Syracuſans to the ſkies, and yet he pretends that Agathocles, who ſubdued them, was the greateſt of cowards. Παρ' ὅλην γὰρ τὴν γραφὴν ἐγκωμιάζων τὴν τῶν Συρακουσίων ἀνδρείαν τὸν τούτων κρατήσαντα θειλίᾳ φησὶ δίενηνοχέναι τοὺς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους. *Cum per totam hiſtoriam Syracuſanorum fortitudinem laudet illum qui ſubegit iſtos omnes mortales ignavia longe ſuperaſſe dicit* (22). He betrays therefore too plainly his paſſion and hatred. The five laſt books of his hiſtory, which treat of the actions of Agathocles, do not deſerve any praiſe. Suidas, to whom I am obliged for all this (23), allows that in all the other parts of his hiſtory, he took extraordinary care to ſpeak the truth. Οὗτος ὁ Τίμαιος τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῶν πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ συγγραφέων πικρότατα ἐξελέγξας, κατὰ μὲν ἄλλα μέρη τῆς γραφῆς πλείστην πρόνοιαν εἶχε τῆς ἀληθείας. ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀγαθοκλέους πράξεσι, τὰ πολλὰ κατέψευσται τοῦ δυνάστου, διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔχθραν: Timæus iſti qui veterum hiſtoricorum peccata graviſſime redarguit, in aliis quidem ſcripti partibus maximam veritatis curam provide geſſit. In Agathoclis vero rebus pleraque ementitus eſt in principem illum propter odium quo proſequebatur eum (24). - - - - *The very ſame Timæus who moſt ſeverely reprehends the faults of all preceding authors, in other parts of his writings ſhews the greateſt regard to truth. But in the affairs of Agathocles, he very much belies that prince, out of hatred to him.*

We find in Polybius ſome of the calumnies which Timæus diſgorged againſt Agathocles. He repreſented him in his younger days, as the moſt abandoned proſtitute to the luſt of every comer, and in all manner of ways: Γεγονέναι τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα κατὰ τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίαν κοινὸν πόρνον, ἕτοιμον τοῖς ἀκρατεστάτοις, κολοιὸν, τριόρχην, πάντων τῶν βουλομένων, τοῖς ὄπισθεν ἔμπροσθεν γεγονότα: *Agathoclem in prima ætate publicum fuiſſe proſtibulum, paſſim omnium incontinentiſſimorum libidini expoſitum, graculum, triorcham ſive buteonem qui averſus & adverſus impudicus obviiſque quibuſque pateret* (25). And he related that the wife of this prince breathed out the following complaint on the ſight of his corps; *Which way have I not enjoyed thee, and which way haſt thou not enjoyed me?* Words which Polybius charges with the utmoſt infamy. Ὅτ' ἀπέθανε τὴν γυναῖκα φησὶ κατακλειομένην αὐτὸν. οὕτω θρηνεῖν. τί δ' οὐκ ἐγώ σε; τί δ' οὐ ἐμὲ σύ; *Ubi fato functus eſſet, ejus uxorem mortuum maritum lamentantem hujuſmodi plangorem edidiſſe, quid non ego tibi? quid non tu mihi* (26); Polybius does not deny that Agathocles was the moſt impious of all men (27); but he pretends that this cannot excuſe the ſcurrilous malignity of Timæus, and that it refutes it ſelf: for it is evident, by the relation of that author, that Agathocles, without the advantages of birth or eſtate, arrived to the height of grandeur: he ſubdued all Sicily, endangered Carthage, maintained his tyranny even to his old age, and died a king. This ſhews that nature had beſtowed on him great qualifications. The Hiſtorians ought therefore not only to have recorded him for his ill actions, but alſo for thoſe which deſerved to be praiſed; and conſequently Timæus is inexcuſable, ſince he has with the utmoſt malice and ill-nature been hyberbolical, in the relation of whatever was to be blamed in Agathocles's conduct, and intirely ſuppreſſed whatever would admit of praiſe. Ὁ δὲ παρεσκοτισμένος ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας πικρίας τὰ μὲν ἐλαττώματα δυσμενικῶς καὶ μετ' αὐξήσεως ἡμῖν ἐξήγγελκε, τὰ δὲ κατορθώματα συλλήβδην παραλέλοιπε: Egregius hic ſcriptor maledicendi ſtudio occæcatus minus recte facta cum quadam animi malignitate ſolitus narrare, & ſimul omnia in majus extollere, præclara facinora ſimul cuncta prætermiſit (28). - - - - *But being blinded by his ill-nature, he has related the worſt things with malice and exaggeration, and omitted by the lump thoſe that are right.* Nothing can be more judicious than this whole diſcourſe of Polybius.

[*F*] *Several other faults have been found in his hiſtory.*] We learn from Suidas (29), that Timæus was called a rhapſodical old woman γραοσυλλέκτρια, becauſe whatever came in his way he inſerted in his hiſtory. This is the ſame thing as if they had called him *a compiler of old wives tales.* Polybius charges him with ſpeaking very ignorantly of Italy (30), and that in his deſcription of Africa, beſides being guilty of the ſame fault, he betrayed a trifling genius, a want of judgment, and a great deal of credulity with regard to obſolete traditions. Τὸν δὲ Τίμαιον εἴποι τις ἂν οὐ μόνον ἀνιστόρητον γεγονέναι περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην, ἀλλὰ καὶ παιδαριώδη καὶ τελέως ἀσυλλόγιστον καὶ ταῖς ἀρχαίαις φήμαις ἀκμὴν ἐνδεδεμένον: 'Timæum jure pronuntiet aliquis non ſolum imperitum rerum Africæ, ſed etiam puerili ingenio virum, ac prorſus infirmo judicio & qui antiquitus traditis opinionibus ſupra modum fuerit deditus (31). - - - - *But it may be ſaid that Timæus, was not only an ignorant Hiſtorian, as to the affairs of Libya, but alſo trifling, extremely injudicious, and too much addicted to old ſtories.* He blames him for writing on hearſay, and having ſhewn little judgment Περὶ τὰς ἀνακρίσεις ῥαθύμως ἀνεστράφη. *In dijudicandis iis quæ ſibi narrarentur negligens fuit* (32). This was undoubtedly the cauſe of the contradictioas which were laid to his charge (33). To theſe may be added the paſſage of Longinus, which I ſhall cite in the remark [*I*], and thoſe of Plutarch quoted hereafter: and obſerve, by the way, that he was not ſo bigotted a follower of the antient traditions, as not to refute ſome of them: but he was not very happy in his choice; ſince, for inſtance, he wrongfully rejected the tradition of Phalaris's Bull (34), and that of the colony of the Locrians (35); nor did he probably go upon a better foundation, when he denied that Zaleucus gave laws to that people (36). Nay, he denied, that there ever was ſuch a perſon as Zaleucus (37).

[*G*] *But ſome excellent judges allow him to be very learned and very eloquent.*] The paſſage of Diodorus Siculus above cited (38), may ſerve me here for a commentary; but I find my account much better in the following words of Cicero. 'Minimus natu 'horum omnium Timæus, quantum autem judicare 'poſſum longe eruditiſſimus, & rerum copia ac ſen'tentiarum varietate abundantiſſimus, & ipſa compo'ſitione verborum non impolitus magnam eloquentiam 'ad ſcribendum attulit, ſed nullum uſum foren'ſem (39). - - - - *Timæus, later than all theſe, but, as 'far as I am able to judge by far the moſt learned, 'and moſt abounding both in the copiouſneſs of his 'materials, and in the variety of his maxims, and 'not without politeneſs in the compoſition of his 'words, diſcovered a great deal of eloquence in his 'writing, but no forms of oratory.'* He had been naming Herodotus, Thucydides, Philiſtus, Theopompus, Ephorus, Xenophon, and Caliſthenes. I mention this only to ſhew what place Timæus poſſeſſed in Cicero's eſteem. All theſe great hiſtorians were inferior to him in point of knowledge, as well as in fertility of ſubject and thought. This is ſaying a great deal. He has not ranked him diſadvantageouſly with regard to his eloquence: you will apprehend this yet better by the following words. 'Genera Aſiaticæ 'dictionis duo ſunt, unum ſententioſum & argutum, 'ſententiis non tam gravibus & ſeveris quam concinnis '& venuſtis qualis in hiſtoriæ Timæus (40). - - - - *The 'Aſiatic way of ſpeaking is of two kinds, the one ſen-*

' tentious

---

(22) Suidas, ubi infra.

(23) Suidas, in Τίμαιος, *pag.* 911.

(24) Id. ibid.

(25) Polyb. *lib. xii, pag.* 659, *Edit.* 1619, in folio. *Add to this the words of Juſtin, lib. xxii, cap. i.* In Sicilia patre figulo natus (*Agathocles*) non honeſtiorem pueritiam, quam principia originis habuit. Siquidem forma, & corporis pulcritudine egregius, diu vitam ſtupri patientia exhibuit. Annos deinde pubertatis egreſſus, libidinem à viris ad feminas tranſtulit. Poſt hæc apud utrumque ſexum famoſus, vitam latrociniis mutavit.

(26) *Id. ibid.* See Juſtin. Variorum, *of Mr Grævius, lib. xxii, init. and* Suidas, in Τρίορχης.

(27) Πάντων γέγονεν ἀσεβέστατος. Fuit ille ſane omnium maximæ impius, *Polyb. lib. xii, pag.* 659.

(28) Id. ibid. *pag.* 660, *Edit.* 1619, *in folio.*

(29) Suidas, in Τίμαιος, *pag.* 911.

(30) Polybius, *lib. ii, pag.* 105.

(31) Id. *lib. xii, init. pag.* 653.

(32) Id. ibid. *pag.* 668.

(33) Athenæus, *lib. vi, p.* 272.

(34) See the remark [*C*], citation (17).

(35) Polyb. *lib. xii, pag.* 656.

(36) Cicero, Epiſt. i, *lib. vi,* ad Atticum, *pag. m.* 589.

(37) Id. *lib. ii,* de Legibus, *folio* 333, *C.*

(38) Citation (10).

(39) Cicero, de Oratore, *lib. ii, fol.* 73, *D.*

(40) *Idem, in* Bruto, *circa fin. pag. m.* 451.

He was not leſs exorbitant in his praiſes than in his invectives, which appears by the elogies he beſtowed on Timoleon [*H*]. He lived ninety-ſix years (*b*). His fortune ſeems to have been but moderate. He lived very quietly in the place of his exile (*c*); he renounced an active courſe of life, as travelling, war, and the offices of the robe (*d*). This was the cauſe that ſome were ſurprized, that he ſhould ever acquire the reputation of an able Hiſtorian (*e*). Longinus criticiſes on him for what doth not deſerve a cenſure [*I*]. But Plutarch

(*b*) Lucian. in Macrobiis, *pag.* 642, *Tom. ii.*

(*c*) *That is, at Athens, if we believe* Corradus in Brutum Ciceronis, *pag.* 115.

(*d*) Polybius, *lib. xii, p.* 670.

(*e*) Id. ibid.

'*tentious and ſprightly, not affecting gravity and ſtrictneſs in its ſentences, ſo much as neatneſs and beauty, ſuch as Timæus uſes in his hiſtory.*' But that the reader may ſee that the beſt judges of ingenious works did not better agree antiently than they do now. I ſhall cite an excellent paſſage of Plutarch (41): *Timæus the hiſtorian, aiming to exceed Thucydides in vivacity of eloquence, and to diſgrace Philiſtus as ignorant, diſagreeable, and impertinent, attempts in his hiſtory the deſcription of engagements both by ſea and land, and the eloquent ſpeeches compoſed by both of them, where indeed, begging his pardon, he approaches them no more than a man walking on foot approaches a Lydian chariot, as Pindar ſays, and diſcovers himſelf in this to have an aukward grace, and very little judgment, or, as Diphilus ſays,*

Fat, and ſtuffed out with dull Sicilian greaſe.

Cicero citing one of Timæus's thoughts as a witty ſaying, obſerves that there are ſeveral of the ſame nature in this Hiſtorian (42). But Plutarch, who attributes it to another author, repreſents it as flat and childiſh.

[*H*] *The elogies he beſtowed on Timoleon.*] He placed him above the greateſt gods (43), if we believe Suidas, who adds, that this flattery deſerved a greater puniſhment than that of Calliſthenes; for the latter only deſigned the deifying of Alexander, a prince infinitely more illuſtrious than Timoleon; but Timæus not contented with that, exalts his hero to a ſuperiority above the higheſt divinities. Suidas's reaſoning turns upon a very juſt parallel; there is on the one ſide more merit in the perſon honoured, and leſs exceſs in the honours conferred; and, on the other, the honours are greater, and the merit leſs in him who receives them. Therefore Suidas very reaſonably concludes, that if Calliſthenes was moſt juſtly puniſhed with death for his flattery, Timæus deſerved that puniſhment much more than he. I am ſurprized to read in Suidas this particular concerning Calliſthenes for ſeveral others relate that he rendered himſelf odious to Alexander, by ſpeaking too freely of him, without flattery, and particularly on the ſubject of divine honours. We may obſerve that Suidas charges Timæus with two great faults; the firſt is, the condemning too ſeverely in others the very ſame vices to which he himſelf was addicted; the ſecond, in being himſelf a wicked man, conſidering thoſe maxims which he lays down, and the opinions which he would inſinuate into his readers (44).

[*I*] *Longinus criticiſes on him for what does not deſerve cenſure.*] 'As for the cold and puerile ſtile we are ſpeaking of, Timæus abounds with it. This author is on other accounts a man of parts, ſometimes he does not come ſhort of the lofty and ſublime ſtile: he has an extenſive knowledge, and even appears judicious in his expreſſions: but he is naturally addicted to reprehend the vices of others, whilſt he is blind to his own; and beſides, ſo ſollicitous to diſplay new thoughts, that he too frequently falls in to the very loweſt puerility. I ſhall content my ſelf with giving one or two examples only; becauſe Cecilius has already cited a vaſt number. Intending to compliment Alexander the Great. *He has*, ſays he, *conquered all Aſia, in leſs time than Iſocrates employed in compoſing his panegyric.* An admirable compariſon truly between Alexander the Great and a Rhetorician. By a parity of reaſon, it will neceſſarily follow, that the Lacedemonians ought to give place to Iſocrates, ſince they were thirty years in taking the city of Meſſina, and he was but ten years in writing his panegyric (45).' That reflexion is unworthy of Longinus, and I do not know what had ſpoiled his taſte when he wrote theſe lines. A modern author, a man of great wit, judges of him in the following manner. *Longinus*, ſaith he (46), *is a caviller, and a falſe pretender to ſubtilty. Timæus had ſaid, that Alexander ſpent leſs time in the conqueſt of all Aſia, than Iſocrates in finiſhing his panegyric. Longinus cenſures him for comparing a great prince to a ſophiſt; and maintains that by the ſame reaſon, we might believe, that the Lacedemonians were leſs valiant* (47) *than Iſocrates,* ſince he was but ten years in compoſing his panegyric, when they ſpent thirty in the conqueſt of Meſſina. *What conſequence is here? did Timæus ſpeak of the valour of Iſocrates? Is it comparing an orator with a conqueror; to compare the time in which one writes, with that in which the other conquers? Tho' there is no proportion betwixt actions entirely different, does it follow, that there is none betwixt the long and ſhort ſpace of their duration? May we not ſay, that the great Guſtavus Adolphus rendered himſelf maſter of part of Germany, in leſs time than Mr Vaugelas ſpent in tranſlating Quintus Curtius, or Father Strada in finiſhing his hiſtory, or Scriverius in publiſhing his Martial* * ?

Mr Coſtar hath not obſerved all the faults of this place of Longinus: he might have added that there are ſome things which we cannot exceed or equal, without an extraordinary merit, to which we may yet be inferior, without being contemptible. A prince, who ſhould ſubdue three kingdoms in as little time as is requiſite for a Geographer to draw three maps, would undoubtedly perform a great action; but if he ſhould conquer but one province, whilſt a Geographer is drawing ten maps of the world, we cannot be allowed to infer from hence, that in conduct and expedition he is inferior to the Geographer. I mention this to make it appear, that Longinus had no reaſon to conclude, that Timæus's compariſon might beſtow more honour on Iſocrates than on the Lacedemonians; for ten years ſpent in compoſing an oration, may imply a leſs expedition than thirty, ſpent by a handful of people in the conquering of a neighbouring ſtate.

A REMARK on the deſign of compariſons.

This cenſurer of Timæus hath not conſidered the deſign of compariſons. They are intended to expreſs, in a lively manner, the greatneſs or ſmallneſs of objects. There is nothing therefore more proper to be compared to certain things, than what moſt apparently enlarges the idea of them. So to render the rapidity of Alexander's victories the more conſpicuous, they may be very well oppoſed to the ſlowneſs of a panegyriſt. Conſider, on one hand, the obſtacles of war, the great number of enemies which Alexander engaged, and the vaſt extent of land which he ſubdued; conſider on the other, the facility of writing a diſcourſe which may be recited in an hour: and it is impoſſible but that you muſt be ſtruck with the incredible ſwiftneſs of this conqueror, if you imagine that he ſpent no more years in his conqueſt than the Rhetorician in compoſing an oration. Another conqueror who had not ſubdued ſo many provinces in 30 years as Alexander in ten, would not have ſerved ſo well in this compariſon as Iſocrates; for we are naturally inclined to imagine almoſt an infinite diſproportion betwixt the labour of a Rhetorician, and that of a conqueror. We think it infinitely more eaſy to range words, than ſubdue kingdoms. We muſt allow therefore that Timæus was very happy in his choice. He took what might ſtrike the imagination of his readers in the moſt lively manner. I have read in a modern author (48), that the Duke of Candale, and Cardinal de la Valette, Generals of the French army, in the year 1637, *took Landrecies almoſt in fewer days than Charles V, formerly employed months in the not taking it, being forced, after ſix months time, ſhamefully to raiſe the ſiege.* This is without doubt a beautiful, lofty, and noble idea; but I am ſure that we ſhould be yet more ſenſibly touched with the expedition of a conqueſt, if it ſhould be ſaid, *A famous Engineer formerly ſpent as much time in drawing a plan of this place, as the General in taking it.* The precedents of the beſt authors declare as ſtrongly in favour of Timæus as theſe reaſons. The greateſt Roman Orator ſaid, that Pompey had finiſhed more wars than others had read, and

(41) Plutarch. in Nicia, *initio pag.* 523.

(42) You will find this in the remark [*C*], of the article FONTARABIA.

(43) Μείζω ποιεῖν Τιμολέοντα τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Θεῶν Timoleontem illuſtriſſimis Diis majorem facere. *Suidas, in* Τίμαιος, *pag.* 910.

(44) Suidas, ubi ſupra.

(45) Longinus, de Sublimi genere, *cap. iii.*

(46) Coſtar, Apologie, *p.* 88, 89.

(47) So it ought to be tranſlated; for there is in Greek κατ' ἀνδρείαν, *quoad titudinem.* Mr Boileau has ſkipped this in his tranſlation of Longinus, and perhaps he did it the better to hide the falſe thought of his author.

* Scaliger calls him ſomewhere in his Epſtiles, *Lentulum Martialis editorem.*

(48) Girard, Vie du Duc d'Epernon.

Plutarch has condemned him juſtly on account of his puerility with relation to a common-place,

and that travellers never went through ſo many countries in ſo little time, as he ſubdued them by his victories. 'Qui ſæpius cum hoſte conflixit quam quiſquam cum inimico concertavit: plura bella geſſit quam cæteri legerunt: plures provincias confecit quam alii concupiverunt (49)..... Quis unquam aut obeundi negocii aut conſequendi quæſtus ſtudio tam brevi tempore tot loca adire, tantos curſus conficere potuit quam celeriter Cn. Pompeio duce belli impetus navigavit (50)? ---- *Who has oftner engaged in a pitched battle, than any other perſon has done in an ordinary quarrel: waged more wars than others have read; conquered more countries than others ever coveted...... Who could ever go to ſo many places, and perform ſo many expeditions in the way of buſineſs or trade, in ſo little time, and with ſo great diſpatch, as Pompey employed in carrying on his wars?*' Is not this comparing Pompey with the meaneſt man who is but juſt able to read, and with a merchant, whoſe thirſt for gain tranſports him from place to place (51). If the compariſon betwixt Alexander and a Rhetorician ſo much blamed by Longinus is not good; ought we not to condemn this, which notwithſtanding is really admirable, and the moſt proper thing in the world to excite thoſe ideas in the mind, which the orator propoſed to excite? But to come to modern examples. I ſhall not alledge what was ſaid of Charles VIII, that he run through Italy ſwifter than a quarter-maſter with chalk in hand, and without ſtopping. I ſhall come directly to Mr Boileau, one of the greateſt maſters. He aſſigns two reaſons in excuſe for not ſinging the victories of 1672. The firſt is, that the names of the towns which the king conquered in Holland, *were harſh and barbarous, affording only ſuch whimſical ſyllables as were ſubject to no meaſure* (52). The ſecond reaſon is, that the conqueror marched too faſt for the Muſes to keep pace with him.

Encor ſi Tes exploits moins grands & moins rapides
Laiſſoient prendre courage à nos Muſes timides,
Peut-eſtre avec le temps, à force d'y rêver,
Par quelque coup de l'Art nous pourrions nous ſauver.
Mais dés qu'on veut tenter cette vaſte carriere,
Pegaſe s'effarouche & recule en arriere:
Mon Apollon s'etonne, & Nimegue eſt à Toy,
Que ma Muſe eſt encore au camp devant Orſoy (53).

Were your exploits leſs rapid, or leſs grand,
My tim'rous Muſe might take her pen in hand;
Perhaps by force of thought, and length of time,
Attempt ſome tolerable work in rhime.
But at the ſight of ſuch a vaſt career,
Pegaſus trembles, and ſtarts back with fear.
Apollo wond'ring ſees Nimeguen yield,
Before my lagging Muſe can take the field.

Mr Pelliſſon made uſe of this thought in his invocation to Pegaſus, a piece of poetry which was extreamly admired; the whole deſign of which is to expreſs that the king's conqueſts were ſo incredibly ſwift, that the Poets could not follow the rapid torrent. Since Mr Pelliſon's choice of this image, ſo many authors have uſed it, that it is become a common-place. I remember to have ſeen it in the Paris Gazette, and this was, if I am not miſtaken, when Mr de Guilleragues had the direction of that paper. He declares that he is forced to take advantage, that is, to anticipate his majeſty's victories, that he may in ſome meaſure keep pace with his rapid expeditions. Mr Pavillon, who knows how to manage a ſubject with ſo much dexterity, has very agreeably turned this thought in his ode on the taking of Namur in the year 1693. Note, that this manner of complementing the king, is very well approved by an excellent judge of the juſtneſs and delicacy of thoughts: *Perhaps you have not heard,* ſays he (54), *of another madrigal with which I am infinitely pleaſed.*

Louïs plus digne du trône
Qu'aucun Roy que l'on ait vû,
Enſeigne l'art à Bellone
De faire des impromptu.
C'eſt une choſe facile
Aux diſciples d'Apollon:
Mais ce Conquerant habile
A pluſtoſt pris une ville
Qu'ils n'ont fait une Chanſon.

Lewis more worthy of a throne,
Then any monarch we have known,
Inſtructs Bellona in his ſight,
Imprompou's with the ſword to write.
Apollo's ſcholars with their quill,
Here eaſily diſplay their ſkill;
Yet this great conqu'ror's not ſo long
About a town, as they a ſong.

All theſe thoughts are ingenious, continues Eudoxus; but the elogy here appears very viſibly, and theſe authors profeſs their deſign of praiſing, whereas he who ſaid,

Croit que l'on fait les vers comme l'on prend les villes,

Believes that Rhymes are made, as towns are won,

ſeems not to think of praiſe: he ſeems to be in an angry mood, and to think only of coming off: and by this means the praiſe, that he beſtows by the by, is ſo much the more nice. The exact conformity betwixt theſe thoughts and Longinus's parallel will not allow us to doubt that this paſſage carries in it Father Bouhours's approbation of Timæus. But to prevent all ſcruples on this head we ought to have recourſe to the expreſs words of this Jeſuit (55): 'I am not of Longinus's ſide; his criticiſm went too far in charging Timæus with puerility as to his praiſe of Alexander. He that ſhould ſay of Lewis le Grand, that he conquered the firſt time Franche-Comté in fewer days than it was poſſible to write his Panegyric, do you think he would ſay any thing ridiculous? And if, at his return from a campaign ſo ſhort and ſo glorious, it had been ſaid that thoſe who on that account were obliged to compliment his majeſty, had occaſion for more time to prepare their ſpeeches than he employed in the conqueſt: would you cenſure the thought? I do not believe I ſhould, replied Eudoxus; and yet I take Timæus's thought to be ill founded, becauſe the ſpeeches which you mention relate to the King and his conqueſts; but Iſocrates's Panegyric did not concern Alexander or his victories.' With all due deference to this Eudoxus, I believe it would have been better for him to have given his approbation without any reſerve, I agree, the Greek author's thought would have been more perfect, if Iſocrates's Oration had been a Panegyric on Alexander. This would have given it an additional beauty: but I cannot allow that the want of this circumſtance vitiates the compariſon. Without this, it ſtill retains a lively image of the rapidity of Alexander's conqueſts.

I ought not to forget that Mr Racine muſt needs be for Timæus againſt Longinus. Read this paſſage in Madam de Sevigni's letter to the Count de Buſſy, dated the 3d of November 1677. 'What you ſay of Racine and Boileau is indeed very juſt. The King ſaid to them four days ago: I am ſorry that you did not come to the laſt campaign, you would have ſeen the war, and your journey would not have been long. Racine anſwered: Sir, we had only dreſſed cloaths; we indeed beſpoke riding cloaths, but the places you attacked were taken before they were made. This compliment was very agreeably received (56).' I cannot tell whether any body has yet made uſe of a thought of Martial. It concerns the Amanuenſes, who wrote faſter than the words were dictated to them.

Currant verba licet, manus eſt velocior illis,
Nondum lingua, ſuum dextra peregit opus (57).

Before the words, the writer runs along,
And the quick hand quits diſtances the tongue.

---

(49) Cicero, pro Lege Manilia, *fol.* 104, *B.*

(50) Id. ibid. *D.*

(51) Impiger extremos curris mercator ad Indos,
Per mare pauperiem fugiens, per ſaxa, per igneis.
Horat. Epiſt. i, lib. i, ver. 45.

(52) *This puts me in mind of theſe two verſes,*
Ilion & Tenedos, Simoïſque & Xantus & Ide
Nomina ſunt ipſo pæne timenda ſono.
They are Laodamia's words, in her letter to Proteſilaus, apud Ovidium Heroid. Epiſt. xiii, ver. 53.

(53) Deſpreaux, Epitre IV, ver. 20.

(54) Bouhours, Maniere de bien penſer dans les Ouvrages d'Eſprit, *pag.* 199, 200. *Dutch edition.*

(55) Id. ibid. *pag.* 81, *Dutch edition.*

(56) Lettres du Comte de Buſſy Rabutin, *Tom. i, pag.* 226, *Dutch edition.*

(57) Martial. *lib. xiv, Epig. ccviii.*

place, very much uſed in antient Hiſtory. That is, the compiling of good or ill preſages [K]. From the character of Timeus, it is eaſy to conclude, that he was very unfit to be an Hiſtorian; and that he ought eſpecially to have avoided exerciſing his pen on the actions of Agathocles [L].

Why might we not ſay, that the arm of a Conqueror finiſhes a war with greater expedition, than the tongue of an Orator does a ſpeech?

[K] *Plutarch has condemned him juſtly on account . . . of the common-place . . . . of preſages.*] ‘He falls into the fooliſh conceits of Xenarchus in ſeveral places, as where he ſays, that he took it for an ill boding Omen for the Athenians, that the Captain Nicias, having his name derived from the word *Niké*, which ſignifies victory, ſhould oppoſe the Sicilian enterprize: and that by the mutilation of the Hermes's, that is, the images of Mercury, the gods advertiſed them, that in this war they ſhould ſuffer a great deal of miſchief from the Syracuſian General, whoſe name was Hermocrates the ſon of Hermon: and beſides, that it was probable Hercules would ſupport the Syracuſians on account of the goddeſs Proſerpina, who was the protectreſs of the city of Syracuſe, in return for the favour done him, in ſurrendring to him the infernal dog Cerberus; and on the contrary, that he would oppoſe the Athenians, becauſe they defended the Ægeſtæ, who were deſcended from the Trojans, his mortal enemies, by reaſon he deſtroyed their city, in revenge of the violated faith, and of the injury done him by King Laomedon. But perhaps his judgment was juſt as remarkable in writing theſe fine ſtories, as in cenſuring Philiſtus's ſtyle, or railing at Plato and Ariſtotle (58).’ We may here, obſerve by the way, what falſe notions the Pagans had of GOD. The Decalogue teaches us that the iniquity of the Fathers are viſited on the children no farther than to the fourth generation. And here is a Pagan Hiſtorian who imagined that the Trojans drew on their Protectors the hatred of Hercules, eight hundred years after the differences which had happened between this demi-god and a Trojan prince.

[L] *Timæus . . . . was very unfit for an Hiſtorian; and he ought eſpecially to have avoided exerciſing his pen on the actions of Agathocles.*] His favourite talent was the imprinting a ſatirical character on his writings: he naturally loved to criticize and cenſure. For this reaſon it was impoſſible that an Hiſtory written by him ſhould be good, even tho' he had poſſeſſed all the other talents neceſſary for an Hiſtorian (59). This ſatirical ſpirit prompts a writer to ſupreſs all laudable actions, and only to preſent to the reader the weak or the ill ſide of things. It exerts itſelf principally when we are repreſenting the actions of a man who has injured us. There was no Hiſtory therefore which our Timæus was ſo little capable of writing well as that of Agathocles, for he wrote it in a town, where he was in exile, having been baniſhed his own country by Agathocles. The memory of that injury was every moment before his eyes, and cried aloud for vengeance in the ears of the writer. I leave it to you to determine whether an author naturally ſatirical, could in theſe circumſtances preſerve an exact neutrality betwixt the good and ill qualities of the tyrant who had baniſhed him. Thoſe who are fond of railing, would find without doubt, if they would give themſelves the trouble of a narrow ſearch, that their ſatirical humour is the product of a choleric and arrogant temper. Now as this temper excites ſtrong deſires of revenge, even on account of the ſmalleſt offence, it is reaſonable to conclude that Timæus found in himſelf a violent paſſion to be revenged on Agathocles. For which reaſon he ought not to have mentioned him in his Hiſtory, becauſe he muſt be ſure that if he mentioned him he could not avoid violating the laws of Hiſtory. The moſt modeſt and moderate ſhould diſtruſt their own virtue, when deſcribing the actions of a perſecutor. They ought very juſtly to apprehend, that the injuries of baniſhment may raiſe thoſe clouds, which will conceal from them the true ſtate of affairs, and thereby hinder their diſcharging the duties of an Hiſtorian (60). With much more reaſon ought ſuch a man as Timæus to be apprehenſive of the illuſions of reſentment. I am of opinion that there are ſome men ſo conſiderate, that they would rather chooſe not to write at all, than to ſet up for Hiſtorians in ſuch circumſtances as expoſe them to theſe miſrepreſentations: they would not content themſelves with calming the firſt commotions of the mind, and ſtaying till time had cloſed up the wound; but they would for ever renounce writing on a ſubject which would infallibly open it again. But Timæus was not of this temper; and I dare affirm that the ſole deſire of revenging himſelf on Agathocles, would have determined him to take pen in hand immediately to compoſe a Hiſtory of Sicily. Every age can furniſh us with examples of authors, who had never thought of writing Hiſtories, if perſonal reſentments and modiſh paſſions had not been their motive. They have not patience to ſtay till their paſſion is over, which is the leaſt they ought to do; but they write from the firſt beginning of their reſentment. They ſhould remember this fine precept,

Ne frena animo permitte calenti,
Da ſpatium tenuemque moram: male cuncta miniſtrat
Impetus *. . . . .

Cool firſt, nor give your angry mind the rein,
For violence your end will ne'er obtain.

But perhaps they are afraid they ſhould not be able to write, if they ſhould ſtay till their minds are compoſed. Perhaps they fancy that anger gives them a talent which they had not before.

Si natura negat facit indignatio verſum (61).

If nature does not, anger makes us write.

Hence we find their Hiſtories to be ſo very partial, and that they add their own comments on every action which they relate. One would be apt to take them for Judges of the Inquiſition: they give ſentence on every fact; they pronounce it weak and baſe, &c. why do they not give the reader leave to form this judgment? They ought to confine themſelves to a narration which only contains the principles or the premiſſes of reaſoning; the reader would draw the concluſion himſelf, whether it tends to cenſure or to commend. It is enough therefore to repreſent facts: ſentences of this kind ought to be managed in the ſame manner as thoſe called maxims: they ought not to ſhew themſelves in *Relievo*; but ought to be incorporated in the narration, as has been already obſerved (62). There are a great many modern Hiſtories, in whoſe titles the epithet *Critical* is wanting; for the authors of them do nothing elſe but criticize, and ſometimes engage in a regular diſpute. They relate and then refute alternately.

---

(58) Plutarch. in Nicia, *pag.* 523. Note that Longinus on the Sublime, ch. iii, laughed at the reaſon taken from Hermocrates's name.

(59) Compare with this the remark [D], of the article REMOND.

(60) See the remark [B], of the article HALL (RICHARD).

* Stat. Theb. *lib.* x, *ver.* 697.

(61) Juven. Sat. I, ver. 79.

(62) In the remark [C] of the article THEON.

TIMESIUS, [*A*] was a very conſiderable man in Clazomenæ, the place of his birth. He there enjoyed ſo great an authority, that he did whatever he pleaſed ; and as the public was obliged to him for ſeveral ſervices, he did not apprehend that he ſhould become odious by his greatneſs. But he was ſatisfied to the contrary, when paſſing by a place where ſome little children were playing at cockals, he liſtened to their talk. One of them was buſied in making a cockal fly out of a hole : The thing appeared ſo very difficult, that moſt of the children believed he would not be able to do it : But he who was to play being of another opinion, *I wiſh to God*, ſaid he, *that I could make Timeſius's brains fly out, as I will do this cockal.* Timeſius no longer doubted but that he was extremely hated in the city ; and as ſoon as he came home, he told what he had heard to his wife, ordered her to pack up her things and follow him, and departed from Clazomenæ (*a*). I am ready to believe it was after this time that he undertook to conduct a colony into Thrace, and to rebuild Abdera. We have ſeen elſewhere (*b*) that his deſign did not ſucceed, and that he was driven out by the Thracians before he had regulated his new eſtabliſhment. The Teians who in the LIXth Olympiad abandoned their city, ſucceeded much better in the deſign of building Abdera. They retained ſuch a vaſt reſpect for him, that they honoured him as a hero (*c*). He experienced the truth of the anſwer, which the oracle gave, when conſulted concerning the conducting of a colony, which was ; *Look for ſwarms of bees, and you will find abundance of waſps* (*d*). The misfortune was, that inſtead of ejecting the drones like the bees in Virgil (*e*), the waſps conſtrained him to give over his enterprize.

(*a*) Plutarch. Præc. Reip. ger. *pag.* 812.

(*b*) In the article ABDERA.

(*c*) Herodot. *lib. i, cap. clxviii.*

(*d*) Plut de Amicor. multitud. *pag.* 96.

(*e*) Ignavum fucos pecus à præſepibus arcent. *Virgil. Georg. lib. iv, ver.* 168.

[*A*] *Timeſius.*] I call him by the name which Herodotus has given him, and not by that of Timeſias given him by Plutarch. I have elſewhere obſerved (1), that a very learned man has called him Tiſamenes, and probably by a typographical error has aſcribed to him the driving out the Thracians (2). Another has ſaid that he was expelled by the Teians ; I have alſo taken notice of this miſtake (3).

(1) In the article ABDERA, remark [*K*].

(2) *Ibid.* remark [*B*].

(3) *Ibid.* remark [*C*].

TIMOLEON, the General of the Corinthians, was one of the greateſt men of antient Greece. He might have been called the ſcourge of tyrants ; for his ſtrongeſt inclination and principal employment was to puniſh the uſurpers of ſovereign power, and to maintain or re-eſtabliſh liberty. If he fought againſt tyrants, it was not to rid himſelf of competitors, and to ſeize the unlawful authority of which he would deprive them. We find but too many ſuch enemies of uſurpers. As to him, all his undertakings were in favour of the people. He carried his zeal for the intereſt of his country ſo far, that he cauſed his eldeſt brother Timophanes to be killed [*A*], after having found that all his remonſtrances and intreaties were not capable of converting him. We ought to know that Timophanes ſet up for a tyrant in the city of Corinth. His death drew after it conſequences very diſagreeable to Timoleon. Some people reproached him with it as an execrable parricide, and his mother loaded him with curſes [*B*]. This threw him into

[*A*] *He cauſed his elder brother Timophanes to be killed.*] He did not ſtain his own hands with his brother's blood ; but he was however one of the real authors of his murder, which happened in the following manner. Timoleon confederated himſelf with two perſons, one of whom, named Æſchylus was Timophanes's wife's brother, the other was a Soothſayer named Satyrus (1). They all three went to the tyrant, and endeavoured to perſuade him for the laſt time to reſtore liberty to the people. He at firſt laughed at them, and afterwards grew very much enraged. Upon this Timoleon ſtepped a little aſide, covered his face and wept whilſt the other two killed Timophanes (2). This is Plutarch's relation, which generally ſpeaking agrees with that of Cornelius Nepos (3). But Diodorus Siculus ſays that Timoleon himſelf killed his brother (4). There is one difference obſervable betwixt Cornelius Nepos and Plutarch. The firſt ſays that Timoleon joined with his brother-in-law ; the other tells us that it was with Timophanes's brother-in-law. Let us expreſs this more clearly. This aſſociate, according to Plutarch, was Timophanes's wife's brother (5) ; but, according to Cornelius Nepos, he had married a ſiſter of Timophanes and of Timoleon. ' Per aruſpicem communemque affinem cui ſoror ex ' iiſdem parentibus nata, nupta erat, fratrem tyrannum interficiendum curavit (6). - - - *He procured his ' brother to be killed by a Soothſayer, and a relation in ' common to both brothers, having married their own ' ſiſter.*' Mr Moreri is here guilty of an error. Timoleon, ſays he, *conſented that Satyrus, who had married their ſiſter ſhould kill this upſtart tyrant.* He cites Diodorus Siculus, and Plutarch : the firſt does not mention him ; and the other does not ſay that Satyrus was any way related to Timoleon ; he only calls him a Soothſayer. And as to the other accomplice, he calls him Æſchylus, and makes him Timophanes's wife's brother. It is not impoſſible that this Æſchylus might have married Timophanes's ſiſter, and yet be Timophanes's wife's brother. Upon this foot Cornelius Nepos and Plutarch would both be in the right, tho' each muſt have omitted a part of his relation to that family.

[*B*] *Reproached him with it as an execrable parricide, and his mother loaded him with curſes.*] Let us take this fact in its full extent as related by Plutarch. *Thoſe who could not bear popular liberty, or who had been long accuſtomed to be near the perſons of great men and to make their court, made a ſhew of being very well pleaſed with the tyrant's death ; and yet by continually reproaching Timoleon for having committed a parricide execrable and abominable both to the gods and men, they made ſo great an impreſſion upon him, as occaſioned his repenting that he had any concern in it : and beſides being informed that his mother bore it very impatiently, and that ſhe was continually uttering againſt him the moſt terrible expreſſions and horrid maledictions, he went to her, with a deſign to comfort her : but ſhe ordered the door to be ſhut upon him and would not ſee him. Being thus overwhelmed with grief, and troubled in mind, he took a ſudden reſolution to ſtarve himſelf to death : but his friends who did not abandon him in this deſperate melancholy, continued to urge him by perſuaſions and earneſt intreaties, till they forced him to eat. After this he reſolved to retire for the remainder of his life to a country ſolitude, and to quit all concern in the government of public affairs. He at firſt led ſo rigorous a life, that he not only abſtained from ever coming to the city, but avoided all company, and did nothing elſe but wander up and down from place to place, in the moſt remote and ſolitary parts of the country he could find, and conſume himſelf with melancholy* (7). . . . . *Whether it was his regret for the death of his brother, or his being aſhamed to appear before his mother, which ſoever it was, it ſo broke his*

(1) So Theopompus calls him : but Ephorus and Timæus call him *Orthagoras.* Plut. ubi infra.

(2) Taken from Plutarch, in the Life of Timoleon, *pag.* 237.

(3) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Timoleontis. *cap. i.*

(4) Diodor. Siculus, *lib. xvi, cap. lxvi.*

(5) Ἀδελφὸν ὄντα τῆς Τιμοφάνους γυναικὸς Fratrem uxoris Timophanis. *Plut. ubi ſupra.*

(6) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Timoleontis, *cap. i.*

(7) Plutarch in the Life of Timoleon, *pag.* 238.

into a deſpairing melancholy ; he deſigned to put an end to his life ; and when at laſt his friends had engaged him to alter his reſolution, he renounced all public affairs, and confined himſelf to an obſcure ſolitude. Here he ſpent twenty years, as in all probability he would have done his whole life, if an opportunity had not offered of reſtoring Syracuſe to its liberty. This city oppreſſed by the tyranny of Dionyſius, had recourſe to the Corinthians. They reſolved to aſſiſt them, and gave Timoleon the command of the troops deſigned for that ſervice. That voyage was accompanied with very favourable omens [*C*] ; but he met with many difficulties to be ſurmounted in order to his landing in Sicily ; for Icetes the tyrant of Leontium, who had pretended to join with the Corinthians in the recovery of the liberty of Syracuſe, but at the bottom aimed at dethroning Dionyſius, for no other end, but in order to render himſelf maſter of that city, had joined with the Carthaginians, and poſſeſſed all the paſſes. He kept Dionyſius beſieged in the fortreſs of Syracuſe, having already taken the reſt of the town. Notwithſtanding theſe obſtacles, Timoleon by ſtratagem landed in Sicily, defeated Icetes's army, and in a little time after became maſter of the citadel of Syracuſe, and afterwards of the whole city. The citadel fell into his hands, by means of Dionyſius the tyrant ſurrendring it, together with his perſon into his hands (*a*) ; and he took the city by ſtorm, without having ſo much as one of his ſoldiers either killed or wounded. He cauſed the fortreſs to be raſed, in order to aſcertain to the inhabitants the duration of that liberty which he had recovered, and after having been ſucceſsful in his endeavours to re-eſtabliſh good order in this place, he applied himſelf to the reſtoring of the antient liberty of all the cities in Sicily, which then groaned under tyrants. He forced Icetes to renounce his alliance with the Carthaginians, and to content himſelf with living in a private capacity in the city of Leontium. He obliged Leptines the tyrant of Apollonia to ſurrender himſelf, and ſent him to Corinth. He obtained a ſignal victory over the Carthaginians. He puniſhed the treachery of Icetes who entred into new alliances with them [*D*]. He defeated

his ſpirit and diſheartned him, that for twenty years after he did not in the leaſt intermeddle in any honourable or public affair (8). Cornelius Nepos ſays much the ſame thing (9) : But Diodorus Siculus ſays nothing of this long melancholy of Timoleon ; but, on the contrary, gives us to underſtand, that there was only a ſmall diſtance of time between the death of Timophanes, and the expedition of Syracuſe (10). He ſays, that as ſoon as Timoleon had killed his brother there aroſe a great tumult ; one part of the inhabitants demanded juſtice on the murderer, and others requeſted that thoſe elogies ſhould be beſtowed on him, which were due to the deſtroyers of tyrants. This diſpute was referred to the deciſion of the ſenate ; the cauſe was pleaded on both ſides by the counſel for and againſt Timoleon : The judges had not pronounced their ſentence, when the Syracuſian ambaſſadors came to requeſt the aſſiſtance of the Corinthians. The ſenate ordered that Timoleon ſhould be ſent to Syracuſe, and that if he diſcharged that truſt well, he ſhould be treated as the killer of a tyrant ; but if the contrary, as a parricide. I ſhall once more cite Plutarch, to evince, by an unqueſtionable example, how much the beſt Hiſtorians can wreſt the moſt eſſential characters of a fact. Here is Diodorus Siculus, who aſſures us that the Corinthian ſenate did not intruſt Timoleon with the command of their forces, otherwiſe than under a diſagreeable condition, namely, that his criminal proceſs ſhould end in his abſolution or condemnation, according as he ſhould behave himſelf well or ill in that poſt. But Plutarch's relation is quite different : he ſays that Timoleon was elected General abſolutely, and without any condition, by the voice of the people : After which Teleclides, *who was then a perſon of the greateſt authority in the Corinthian affairs, riſing up, made a ſpeech to Timoleon, in which he exhorted him to behave himſelf like a good man and brave commander in this charge : for, ſaid he, if you do this we ſhall pronounce ſentence on you, that you have killed a tyrant ; but if you do not diſcharge this truſt well, we ſhall condemn you for murdering your brother* (11). Theſe are no trifling variations, but eſſential differences, and, to uſe a Latin phraſe, *toto cœlo diverſi* ; - - - *diametrically oppoſite.* We cannot poſſibly excuſe both theſe Hiſtorians ; one of them muſt neceſſarily have fallen into a very great miſtake.

[*C*] *With very favourable omens.*] I ſhall not mention the happy preſage he met with at Delphi : Moreri hath already done it. But here are others : *When the fleet was ready, and the forces compleatly equipped for their departure, the prieſteſſes of the goddeſs Proſerpine declared, that in their ſleep the night before, the goddeſſes Ceres and Proſerpine appeared to them in travelling dreſſes, and told them they would go with Timoleon to Sicily. On this account the Corinthians fitted out a galley, called the galley of Ceres and Proſerpine* (12).... *When Timoleon was on the main ſea, having the wind a-ſtern, in the night he thought that on a ſudden the heavens opened, and diſplayed a large quantity of bright and viſible fire, expanding itſelf over his ſhip, and appearing in the form of a burning torch, like thoſe uſed in religious ceremonies. This torch accompanied and conducted them throughout their voyage, and at laſt diſperſed and vaniſhed at a place near the coaſt of Italy, where the pilots had conſulted to land. The Soothſayers being aſked the ſignification of this preſage, anſwered, this miraculous apparition confirmed the dream of the prieſteſſes of Ceres, and that the goddeſſes favouring the enterpriſe, had ſent this light from heaven to ſhew them the way ; the iſland of Sicily being ſacred and dedicated to Proſerpine, the rape on which goddeſs was alſo ſaid to be there committed, and the ſovereignty of it given her as a nuptial gift on her wedding-day* (13). This relation of Plutarch might have been more accurate ; but nevertheleſs, all circumſtances duly weighed, it clearly enough appears that this was only a dream, and that there was no ſuch thing as a real conducting fire which went as a guide before the fleet. So that this cannot reaſonably be compared with the pillar of fire which went before the Iſraelites, or with the ſtar which led the wiſe-men to Bethlehem.

[*D*] *He puniſhed the treachery of Icetes, who entred into new alliances with the Carthaginians.*] Timoleon's glory was by this ſomewhat eclipſed ; for he permitted vengeance to be carried too far, and cruelty to be exerciſed upon thoſe perſons whom he had much better have exempted from puniſhment. Plutarch's words are theſe : ‘ A few days after, Timoleon bringing his ‘ army before Leontium, took Icetes, his ſon Eupo‘lemus, and the General of his horſe, alive, they be‘ing delivered up into his hands by their own ſoldiers. ‘ Icetes and his ſon were puniſhed with death, as tray‘tors and tyrants ; and Euthydemus, tho' a valiant ‘ man and brave warriour, met with no more mercy, ‘ for ſome reflecting expreſſion he was accuſed of ‘ having uttered againſt the Corinthians. For it was ‘ affirmed, that in a ſpeech he made to the Leontines, ‘ on occaſion of the Corinthians firſt arrival in Sicily ‘ to wage war againſt the tyrants, he ſaid, amongſt ‘ other things, that they ought not to be ſurprized ‘ or affrighted, if

Corinthian dames were goſſiping abroad *.

‘ Thus we ſee moſt men are very frequently more en‘raged at reflecting words than injurious actions ; ‘ they more patiently ſuffer a real injury than a ‘ reflection

---

(*a*) He was ſent to Corinth : but it cannot be ſaid, as it is in Moreri, that he was ſent thither, after he had been overcome by Timoleon ; for Dionyſius did not oppoſe Timoleon.

(8) Id. ibid.

(9) Hoc præclariſſimum ejus factum non pari modo probatum eſt ab omnibus. Nonnulli enim læſam ab eo pietatem putabant : & invidiâ laudem virtutis obterebant. Mater verò poſt id factum, neque domum ad ſe filium admiſit, neque aſpexit, quin eum *fratricidam impiumque* deteſtans compellaret. Quibus rebus ille adeò eſt commotus, ut nonnunquàm vitæ finem facere voluerit, atque ex ingratorum hominum conſpectu morte decedere. *Cornel. Nepos, ubi ſupra.*

(10) Diodorus Siculus, ubi ſupra.

(11) Plutarch. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 238, 239.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Id. ibid. *pag.* 239.

* It is the beginning of Euripides's Medea.

defeated Mamercus the tyrant of Catana, and purſued him to Meſſina, where the tyrant Hippo had given him ſhelter. He beſieged that place, and had the ſatisfaction to get both thoſe tyrants into his hands [*E*]. So many glorious actions did not inſpire him with the leaſt inclination for ſupreme power: But, on the contrary, he rejoiced that there were ſome perſons in Syracuſe who publickly accuſed him [*F*]. He ſpent the reſt of his life in this city [*G*], where he received all the marks of gratitude which he deſerved: He really enjoyed there all the advantages of ſupreme power [*H*], without loſing the glory of having never acted for any other end than the liberty of the people, and without

reflexion, and pardon their enemies, when they have revenged themſelves as to the fact, becauſe they can do no leſs: but provoking expreſſions ſeem to proceed from too great an exceſs of hatred and malignity. After this, Timoleon returning to Syracuſe, the Syracuſians tried, condemned, and executed the wives and daughters of Icetes and his ſon. This ſeems the harſheſt action of Timoleon's life: for if he had pleaſed he could eaſily have ſaved the lives of theſe unhappy women: but he was not at all ſollicitous about it, he entirely abandoned them to the fury of the citizens, who were reſolved to revenge on them the injuries done to Dion after he had expelled the tyrant Dionyſius: for Icetes had cauſed Dion's wife, Arete, his ſiſter Ariſtomacha, and his ſon, who was but a child, to be drowned in the ſea, as we have related in the life of Dion (14).' Plutarch's reflexion on human weakneſs, which pardons injurious actions eaſier than reflecting words, is very judicious.

[*E*] *He had the ſatisfaction to get both thoſe tyrants into his hands.*] They both came to an unhappy end. Hippo, finding Meſſina beſieged by ſea and land, embarked on board a ſhip in order to eſcape: *but he was taken before he got out of the harbour; and the Meſſinians having got him into their hands, cauſed the children to come from the ſchool to the theatre to ſee one of the fineſt ſpectacles in the world, which was the puniſhment of a tyrant, who was publickly whipt, and afterwards executed. As to Mamercus he ſurrendered himſelf to Timoleon to be tried by the Syracuſians, on condition that Timoleon ſhould not be his accuſer. He was brought to Syracuſe, where he endeavourd to pronounce a ſtudied oration which he had compoſed for that end: but finding that the people cried out, and made a great noiſe, to prevent the hearing of him, and conſequently that it was not very likely they would pardon him, run croſs the theatre, and ſtruck his head with all his force againſt one of the ſteps on which the people ſat, deſigning, by daſhing out his brains to diſpatch himſelf immediately; but he had the misfortune to miſs his aim, for he was taken up yet alive and ſuffered the ſame puniſhment which was uſually inflicted on thieves and robbers* (15). We muſt not forget that Mamercus was a Poet, and had irritated the Syracuſians by his ſatirical verſes. Let us hear Plutarch on this head (16). 'The common people of Syracuſe bore very impatiently the jeſts which their tyrants made and ſaid of them: for Mamercus, among others, valuing himſelf extremely on his talent in poetry and tragedy, having, in ſome engagements, gotten ſome advantage over the ſtrangers which were in the Syracuſian pay, gloried in his ſucceſs, and dedicating the bucklers he had taken from them in the temple of the gods, added the following galling verſes, in raillery and contempt of the conquered.

Theſe ſpacious ſhields ſhining with Tyrian dye,
And richly wrought with gold and ivory,
We by the dint of valour did obtain,
Altho' our bucklers were but ſmall and plain.

Here is a Poet not mentioned by Voſſius. Hieronymo Raguſa, the Jeſuit, does not forget him in his elogies of the antient Sicilians (17); but inſtead of referring us to Plutarch he only cites Giovanni Vintimiglia.

[*F*] *He rejoiced that there were ſome perſons in Syracuſe who publickly accuſed him.*] This ſeems to me the moſt ſhining part of his life: we ſhall relate it without retrenching any of Plutarch's words: *But ſince it is, as we may ſay, neceſſary that not only all larks which the Latins call* Caſſitæ, *ſhould have creſts on their heads, as Simonides proverbially expreſſes it; ſo in all cities governed by democracy, there will be detractors. There were two of theſe at Syracuſe, who being accuſtomed to harangue the people, impeached Timoleon, one of them named Laphyſtius, the other Demænetus. Upon the appointing a certain day by the former of theſe, for Timoleon to appear before the people to anſwer to a crime of which he pretended to convict him, the citizens mutinied, and would not allow the authority of the ſummons. But he appeaſed them by remonſtrating to them that he had run through ſo many fatigues, and expoſed himſelf to ſo many dangers, to the end that every Syracuſian might freely enjoy the full benefit and privilege of the laws. Another time Demænetus in a full aſſembly of the people having reprehended and cenſured ſeveral of his actions, during the time that he was General, Timoleon made no anſwer to it; but only told the people that he heartily thanked the gods for having granted what he had ſo often requeſted and deſired in his prayers: which was, that he might once ſee the Syracuſians enjoy the perfect freedom and privilege of ſaying whatever they pleaſed* (18). Thoſe who ſhall prefer the Latin of Cornelius Nepos, may read it here. *Huic quidam Laphyſtius homo petulans & ingratus, vadimonium cùm vellet imponere, quod* cum illo ſe lege agere *diceret, & complures concurriſſent, qui procacitatem hominis manibus coërcere conarentur: Timoleon oravit omnes,* ne id facerent, namque id ut Laphyſtio ceteriſque liceret, ſe maximos labores ſummaque adiiſſe pericula. Hanc enim ſpeciem libertatis eſſe, ſi omnibus quod quiſque vellet, legibus experiri liceret. *Idem, cùm quidam Laphyſtii ſimilis, nomine Demænetus in concione populi, de rebus geſtis ejus detrahere cœpiſſet, ac nonnulla inveheretur in Timoleonta: dixit,* nunc demum ſe voti eſſe damnatum: namque hæc à diis immortalibus ſemper precatum, ut talem libertatem reſtituerint Syracuſanis, in qua cuivis liceret, de quo vellet, impune dicere (19).

[*G*] *He ſpent the reſt of his life in Syracuſe.*] There is nothing more extraordinary than a great man, who knows how to enjoy his glory in quiet, without aſpiring after new dignities. Moſt of thoſe who arrive to a great height of reputation and an extenſive authority, imprudently aim at mounting yet higher, and by this means expoſe themſelves to ſome mortifying oppoſitions, and eſpecially in popular ſtates. Timoleon was wiſer: *He never afterwards returned to Corinth, but obliged his wife and children to come to him: he never intermeddled with thoſe troubles which afterwards aroſe among the Greeks, nor expoſed himſelf to the envy of his fellow-citizens, which moſt governours and generals have raiſed by their too great and inſatiable deſire of honours and authority. He ſpent the remainder of his days in Sicily, in the happy enjoyment of the fruits of his own labours, the greateſt of which was to ſee ſo many cities, and ſo many thouſands of men obliged to him for their happineſs* (20).

[*H*] *He really enjoyed there all the advantages of ſupreme power.*] If we may believe Cornelius Nepos, Timoleon's conduct was that of a very wiſe man; he voluntarily quitted all authority, and by this means acquired a power more ſecure than that of kings: 'Quum tantis eſſet opibus, ut etiam invitis imperare poſſet, tantum autem haberet amorem omnium Siculorum, ut nullo recuſante regnum obtineret: maluit ſe diligi, quam metui. Itaque cùm primum potuit, imperium depoſuit, & privatus Syracuſis, quod reliquum vitæ fuit, vixit. Neque verò id imperitè fecit. Nam quod ceteri reges imperio potuerunt, hic benevolentia tenuit. Nullus honos huic defuit: neque poſteà Syracuſis res ulla geſta eſt publica, de quâ prius ſit decretum, quàm Timoleontis ſententia cognita. Nullius unquam conſilium non modò antelatum, ſed ne comparatum quidem eſt. Neque id magis benevolentiâ factum eſt, quàm prudentiâ (21). - - - - *Altho' he was ſo very wealthy as to be able even to take the government by force, and alſo ſo univerſally beloved by the Sicilians, that he might have obtained it with their conſent, yet he rather choſe to be the object of their affection, than of their fear. Therefore as ſoon as* out expoſing himſelf to the envy of republican ſpirits. His funeral ſolemnities were very magnificent. I muſt not forget his acknowledging that all his great exploits were the work of the gods [*I*], a favour of fortune, a good luck, and not the effect of his own prudence

---

(14) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 252.

(15) Id. *p.* 252.

(16) Id. ibid. *pag.* 251.

(17) Mamercus quoque poëtarum Siculorum gloria effulſit. Ex Joanne Vigintimillio in Tabula Poëtarum Siculorum. *Hier. Raguza, in Elogiis Siculorum, pag.* 178.

(18) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 253.

(19) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Timoleontis, *cap. iv.*

(20) Plut. in Vita Timoleontis, *pag.* 253.]

(21) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Timoleontis, *cap. iii.*

‘*he poſſibly could, he laid down his command, and ſpent the remainder of his life at Syracuſe in a private capacity. Nor was this ill judged. For what other ſovereigns hold by power, he enjoyed by benevolence. No honour was unpaid to him: nor was any ſtep ever after taken by the Syracuſians without firſt conſulting Timoleon. The opinions of others were not only not preferred, but even not put in competition with his. Nor was this more owing to his goodneſs, than to his prudence.*’ This Hiſtorian adds, that tho’ Timoleon became blind he did not give over being ſerviceable to the public. He cauſed himſelf to be carried in a litter to the aſſembly, and gave his opinion without ſtirring out of it. We ſhall relate this a little more particularly from Plutarch. ‘It was a great pleaſure to ſee how highly he was honoured in their councils. For if the affair in debate was of ſmall conſequence, they diſpatched it themſelves without him: but if it were of importance, and required mature deliberation, they called him to their aſſiſtance: he was carried in his litter croſs the public place to the theatre, where the aſſembly of the people was held, which he alſo entred in his litter: the people unanimouſly ſaluted him, and he returned their ſalutations; and after the praiſes and benedictions of the whole aſſembly were beſtowed on him, the buſineſs in debate was propoſed to him, and he gave his opinion; which being approved by the voices and ſuffrages of the people, his ſervants carried him back a-croſs the theatre in his litter, and the citizens received him with clapping of hands and loud acclamations of joy. After which the council proceeded to diſpatch the remainder of their public affairs by themſelves (22).’

[*I*] *I muſt not forget his acknowledging that all his great exploits were the work of the gods.*] ‘And in his familiar letters written to his friends at Corinth, as well as in ſeveral ſpeeches made to the people of Syracuſe, he often ſaid, that he rendered thanks to GOD for having been pleaſed to make him the glorious inſtrument, in his gracious purpoſe of ſaving and delivering Sicily from ſlavery. And having built a temple in his houſe, he dedicated it to Fortune, and there ſacrificed to her: and, which is more, he conſecrated and dedicated his whole houſe to holy Fortune (23).’ Cornelius Nepos relates the ſame thing. ‘Nihil unquam neque inſolens, neque glorioſum, ex ore ejus exiit: qui quidem, cùm ſuas laudes audiret prædicari, nunquàm aliud dixit, quàm ſe eâ re maximas diis gratias agere atque habere, quòd, cùm Siciliam recreare conſtituiſſent, tùm ſe potiſſimùm ducem eſſe voluiſſent. Nihil enim rerum humanarum ſine deorum numine agi putabat. Itaque ſuæ domi ſacellum *αυτοματίας* conſtituerat, idque ſanctiſſimè colebat (24). - - - *Nothing that was preſuming or boaſting ever came out of his mouth: who even when he heard himſelf praiſed, never made any other reply, than that he was and ought to be extremely thankful to the gods, that when they had reſolved on the relief of Sicily, they had made choice of him to be the General. For it was his opinion that no human affairs are tranſacted without the direction of the gods. In conſequence of which he built a temple in his houſe to Fortune, and paid his devotions there with great zeal.*’

A REFLEXION on this acknowledgment of Timoleon.

This chapel which he cauſed to be built in his houſe to Fortune, and the ſtrict worſhip which he paid to this divinity, give us reaſon to believe that he ſpoke as he thought, when he attributed his happy ſucceſs not to his own prudence, but to the favour of heaven. Otherwiſe it is very probable that all thoſe who made theſe acknowledgments, had not always in view the duties of religion, I mean the gratitude with which we ought to attribute our ſucceſs to divine providence, and not to our own wiſdom. Several have talked in this manner only for a political end; either with a deſign to appeaſe the envious, or to create a greater confidence in their friends (25). Let us quote an author, who knew how to make very judicious reflexions. *The greateſt obſtacle,* ſays he (26), *which the founders of ſects and empires have met with in their deſigns, is the natural averſion all men have to ſubmit one to another, to acknowledge a ſuperiority of merit and underſtanding. It has always been a certain rule among them to exclude from all manner of pre-eminence, thoſe who diſcover any pretenſion to it, or a belief of their deſerving it. And therefore all great men have with the utmoſt care avoided ever mentioning the extraordinary qualities which they had received from the liberal hand of nature. They have always exerted them with ſo much circumſpection, that while every body elſe admired them, they themſelves only might ſeem ignorant of them.* . . . . : . . (27) *But the moſt ſucceſsful artifice they ever made uſe of to avoid irritating the pride and natural independence of men while they were inſlaving them, was, that theſe illuſtriſtrious impoſtors encouraged the people to aſcribe all their excellent and ſuperior qualifications to ſome ſecret communication which they had with the gods: by means of this addreſs whatever was great in them ceaſed to offend any perſon, becauſe it was no longer looked upon as any perſonal merit, which men are naturally averſe to acknowledge, but only as an effect of good fortune, chance, or the favour of heaven which extends itſelf equally to the worthy, and unworthy, and does not debaſe the one or the other.* . . . . (28) *It is upon this foundation that Cicero when obliged to particularize all his conduct againſt Catiline, in order to juſtify one who was accuſed of being concerned in his conſpiracy; this great Orator very well knowing that a recital ſo glorious for him, would in his own mouth rather alienate than engage the minds of his auditors; to render this the leſs odious he very artfully, in the entrance of his Oration, aſcribes all his great actions on this occaſion to a divine inſpiration.* ‘O Dii immortales (vobis enim tribuam quæ veſtra ſunt, nec vero poſſum meo tantum ingenio dare, ut tot res, tantas, tam varias, tam repentinas, in illa turbulentiſſima tempeſtate Reipub. mea ſponte diſpexerim) vos profecto animum meum tunc conſervandæ patriæ cupiditate incendiſtis, vos me ab omnibus cæteris cogitationibus ad unam ſalutem Reipub. contuliſtis, vos denique in tantis tenebris erroris & inſcientiæ clariſſimum lumen prætuliſtis menti meæ *. - - - *O ye gods,* cries he, *at firſt ſetting out with this view, Immortal gods, (for to you I will render what is intirely yours, nor can I indeed preſume ſo much on my capacity, as to believe that I could ever by myſelf have provided againſt ſo many accidents, ſo great, ſo different, and ſo unexpected, and in ſo turbulent a ſtate of the common-wealth) yes, it is you who have inſpired my ſoul with this ardent zeal for the preſervation of my country; you who have taken me from all other cares to apply me ſolely to the proſperity of the republic: it is you, in ſhort, who have introduced this ſhining light into my mind, before overſhadowed by error and ignorance.*’

If theſe reflexions of the Abbot de St Real are judicious, thoſe of Mr Coſtar are not leſs ſo, when he is enquiring into the reaſons why Sylla thought fit to aſſume the ſirname of Fortunate. He diſapproves Mr Girac’s opinion who ſays: ‘It was indeed an inſtance of moderation in ſo illuſtrious a commander to aſcribe to Fortune ſo many ſignal victories, which he might have attributed to his own valour. Nevertheleſs it was out of a conſummate prudence, and a refined policy, that he yielded to the envy which ordinarily attends thoſe who raiſe themſelves above others. The antient Sages always feared the goddeſs Nemeſis, who diverted herſelf with debaſing and deſtroying thoſe too highly exalted (29.)’ Let us ſee Coſtar’s reflexions on this paſſage of his adverſary: *As for Sylla it was not the defeat of Mithridates, which engaged him to aſſume the name of* Fortunate. † *After having oppreſſed all the enemies of his greatneſs and perſon, and becoming Dictator by dint of his own authority, he made an ample recital of all the felicities which had attended both his military and civil actions: after which he declared that, in acknowledgment of thoſe favours which heaven had heaped upon him, he had reſolved for the future to add to his other names the title of* Fortunate. ‡ *That this was out of* moderation and in order to avoid envy, *as Mr Girac believes, is what I cannot perſuade myſelf. I rather imagine that it was to give a greater aſſurance to thoſe of his party, and greater terror to thoſe who oppoſed him. In effect, we are more apprehenſive of the fortune of a great man than*

of

(22) Plut. in Vita Timoleon. *pag.* 254.

(23) Ibid. *pag.* 253.

(24) Cornel. Nepos, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 344.

(25) Plutarch. in Præceptis Reip. gerendæ, *pag.* 816, *where he expreſsly mentions Timoleon.*

(26) *The Abbot* de Saint Real, de l’Uſage de l’Hiſtoire, *Diſcours* vii, *p. m.* 223.

(27) Id. ibid. *pag.* 225.

(28) Id. ibid, *pag.* 229.

* Pro Sylla.

(29) Girac, Remarques ſur les Entretiens de Coſtar, *p.* 255.

† Plut. in Sylla.

‡ Pag. 255.

prudence (*b*). This gives me an opportunity to make ſome extracts concerning what the antients have ſaid on the influence of Fortune [*K*], and particularly to refute thoſe who affirm

of his virtue, becauſe virtue is a cauſe purely human, of which we know pretty nearly the meaſure, and extent; whereas Fortune is a divine cauſe whoſe power is unlimited, It is for this reaſon alſo, that we more readily rely on the protection of the fortunate, than on that of the virtuous; and the Lord Chancellor Bacon is of opinion, that Cæſar had not ſo effectually encouraged the Pilot frightned with the tempeſt, if he had ſaid, Fear nothing, thou carrieſt Cæſar and his virtue, *as he did by this encouraging expreſſion,* Fear nothing, thou carrieſt Cæſar and his Fortune (30). It is better in my opinion to aſcribe to Sylla both theſe motives, that alledged by Girac and oppoſed by Coſtar, as well as that advanced by the latter; for it is certain, that in the Pagan times, they very much feared the goddeſs Nemeſis, and firmly believed her an enemy to the proud. It was thought, that the General Timotheus's reverſe of Fortune was owing to his refuſing to acknowledge his obligations to his ſtars. Let us hear what Plutarch ſays on this head: *Timotheus, the Athenian, the ſon of Conon, whoſe malicious enemies attributed all his great actions to the favour of Fortune, to expreſs which they repreſented in pictures, Fortune bringing towns to him already taken in her net, whilſt he was aſleep; very warmly reſented it, and was very much incenſed againſt them on that account, urging that they robbed him of his juſt glory: on which occaſion once upon his return from a ſucceſsful war, after having given an account to the people, and publickly recited the particulars of his expedition, he added, Athenian Lords, Fortune has no hand in what I have related. The gods were ſo enraged at this ridiculous ambition of Timotheus, that he was never afterward ſucceſsful; they thwarted him in all his actions to that degree, that he became ſo odious to the people that he was at laſt baniſhed and expelled Athens* (31). To this may be added what Plutarch tells us of Sylla's affecting the contrary. The facts are curious. 'Sylla not only patiently acquieſced with thoſe who cried him up as a particular favourite of Fortune, but backed their opinion, and glorying in it as a ſpecial favour of the gods, he aſcribed the glory of all his actions to Fortune (32), either out of a ſort of vain glory, or a real imagination that the gods conducted him in all his affairs; for he himſelf informs us in his commentaries, that of the enterprizes which ſeemed to have been well concerted, thoſe that he boldly hazarded according as opportunity offered, tho' directly oppoſite to his former thoughts and reſolutions in council, were ſuch as ſucceeded beſt. Beſides when he ſaid that he was rather born for fortune than war, he ſeems to acknowledge his ſucceſſes rather owing to his fortune than to his valour. In ſhort, he appears on all occaſions entirely to ſubmit to, and own his whole dependence on Fortune; ſince he even owns it as a ſingular favour of the gods, that he preſerved ſuch an union and amity with his father-in-law Metellus, who was a perſon in equal authority with himſelf (33).' See in Plutarch (34) ſome other facts which he has extracted from the commentaries of this Roman General; and obſerve that he ſuppoſes it poſſible to aſcribe to Fortune by way of rodomontade, whatever great actions have been performed. Εἴτε κόμπῳ χρώμενος, εἴθ᾽ οὕτως ἔχων τῇ δόξῃ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον, whether, ſays he (35), Sylla ſpoke thus out of a bravado, or from his having this real opinion of providence. To me the juſtneſs of this disjunctive does not clearly appear: for if this great Captain had not really believed that GOD had favoured him, I own he might yet have ſaid ſo for ſome political reaſons already mentioned: but I cannot ſee that vanity or vain-glory could induce him to it, ſince he was not one of thoſe nonſenſical romancers, who ground their bravadoes on extravagancies, and are ſufficiently ſatisfied if they do but talk. Such a man as he could not be ignorant, that he diminiſhed the merit of his prudence and valour, in proportion as he acknowledged that Fortune was the cauſe of his victories. How therefore could he make this acknowledgment out of a principle of vanity, ſuppoſing him to be guilty of a lie? I add this, becauſe Plutarch's disjunctive ſuppoſes, that Sylla could not have ſpoke thus from a motive of vain-glory, if he had been perſuaded of the truth of what he ſaid. In my opinion therefore the Hiſtorian ought to have joined theſe two particulars, which he hath ſeparated. He ought to have ſaid that Sylla being perſuaded that providence had heaped on him its moſt ſurprizing bleſſings, affected to boaſt of it, and from thence was ſupplied with matter for his vanity; for as all things are liable to be abuſed, it is certain, that if, on the one ſide, wiſe men humble themſelves, by acknowledging that they are only the inſtruments of providence; on the other hand, haughty men pride themſelves, by imagining that GOD has been pleaſed to make uſe of them for the execution of his deſigns. They look upon themſelves as his favourites, and from that time believe themſelves above all the reſt of mankind. Conſider that St Paul himſelf had occaſion for a ſtrong check, and ſevere mortification, to prevent his being puffed up with pride, by the excellency of thoſe Revelations which GOD by his ſpecial grace had communicated to him. But to ſay ſomething in defence of Plutarch: thoſe perſons who believe nothing of what they ſay concerning Fortune, may nevertheleſs aſcribe their greateſt actions to her out of vanity and preſumption. They may govern themſelves by the general opinion; and imagine that thoſe who believe GOD to be the ſovereign director of all things, will admire and firmly rely on his favourites. A modern author pretends that a certain boaſt of Tiberius (36) *was rather political than vain. For it is of great importance for a Prince to be fortunate or to be thought ſo. And this paſſes among his ſubjects for merit and virtue* ‡, *and the more ſo as they believe their felicity depends on his. So Tiberius who perfectly underſtood all the maxims of government, loudly proclaimed the proſperity of his houſe, declaring that ſuch a fortunate incident had never before happened to a Roman Prince. From whence he thought to render himſelf more venerable to the people, by making them believe him to be the favourite of the gods* * (37).

[*K*] *What the antients have ſaid on the influence of Fortune.*] If I would here collect all that they have ſaid on this ſubject, I ſhould be obliged to write a whole book on that head. I only propoſe to glean a few ears in this ſpacious field. It may be affirmed that no hypotheſis is better eſtabliſhed in the writings of the antients, than that human induſtry and prudence have a much leſs ſhare in events, than our good or ill fortune, or in other words, an unforeſeen concourſe or diſpoſition of circumſtances not in the leaſt depending upon us. 'Sunt in his quidem virtutis opera magna, ſed majora Fortunæ. - - - *Among theſe indeed the actions of virtue are great, but thoſe of Fortune yet greater.*' Pliny ſpeaks this (38), after having related ſeveral events: but who doubts that he might have ſaid the ſame of an infinite number of other particular occurrences? He lays down a little farther the ſame maxim, tho' ſomewhat more obſcurely. 'Plurimum refert in quæ cujuſque virtus tempora inciderit. - - - *The times in which each perſon's virtue happens to appear are of very great importance.*' Tho' Quintus Curtius ſhould not expreſsly tell us (39), that Alexander's conqueſts were leſs owing to valour than to fortune; his Hiſtory alone would have ſufficiently declared it. Cornelius Nepos affirms that in the diviſion of military glory, fortune has always the greateſt ſhare: 'Jure ſuo nonnulla ab Imperatore miles, plurima vero Fortuna vindicat, ſeque his plus valuiſſe quam ducis prudentiam verè poteſt prædicare (40). - - - *The ſoldier juſtly claims ſome ſhare with the General, but fortune much more than either, ſince her aſſiſtance may truly be ſaid to be of greater conſequence than his conduct.*' Mr Spanheim (41) conjectures that theſe words are only an imitation of the following: 'Nam bellicas laudes ſolent quidam extenuare verbis, eaſque detrahere ducibus, communicare cum militibus . . . . . maximam verò partem quaſi ſuo jure Fortuna ſibi vindicat, & quidquid eſt proſpere geſtum id pene omne ducit ſuum (42). - - - *For ſome are accuſtomed to extenuate military ſucceſſes, and deprive the Generals of them ſharing them among the ſoldiers . . . . . but the greateſt part of all is claimed as it were of right by Fortune, who eſteems every thing her own which is performed with ſucceſs.*'

(*b*) Taken from Plutarch, in the life of Timoleon.

(30) Coſtar. Apolog. *pag.* 317, 318.

(31) Plut. in Vita Syllæ, *pag. m.* 454.

(32) *And yet Salluſt tells us,* Atque illi (*Sullæ*) feliciſſimo omnium ante civilem victoriam nunquam ſuper induſtriam fortuna fuit, multique dubitavere fortior an felicior eſſet. *Salluſt. de Bello Jugurth. pag. m.* 362.

(33) Plut. in Sylla, *pag.* 454.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Ibid.

(36) The wife of Druſus, the ſon of Tiberius, being delivered of two boys, Tiberius ſaid in a full ſenate, that ſince the beginning of the empire, no man of his rank had been bleſſed with the like good fortune. *Tacit. Ann. lib. ii.*

‡ Quibuſdam fortuna pro virtutibus fuit. *Hiſt.* 2.

* Cœleſtis favor, & quædam inclinatio numinum oſtenderetur. *Hiſt. iv.*

(37) Amelot de la Houſſaye *in his* Tiberius, *chap. lxxxiii, pag.* 106, *Edit.* 1683, *in* 4*to.*

(38) Plinius, *lib. vii, cap. xxviii, p. m.* 49.

(39) Fatendum eſt quum plurimum virtuti debuerit plus debuiſſe fortunæ quam ſolus omnium mortalium in poteſtate habuit. *Q. Curtius, lib. x, cap. v, num.* 35.

(40) Cornel. Nepos, in Thraſybulo, *cap. i.*

(41) Spanheim ſur les Ceſars de Julien, *p.* 428.

(42) Cicero, Orat. pro Marcello.

affirm that there is no other cauſe of proſperity than prudence, nor of adverſity than imprudence,

‘ *ſucceſs.*’ Cicero who ſpoke this to Cæſar, had no reaſon to fear that he ſhould be offended at it; for no perſon more expreſsly acknowledged the empire of Fortune than Cæſar (43). You may ſee in Mr Spanheim (44) what Livy, Diodorus Siculus, and others, have acknowledged concerning this Empire, either in expreſs words, or by declaring that we ought not to judge of perſonal merit by the ſucceſs of actions, which is entirely ſubject to Fortune, but by the means that are uſed. Scarce any one of the Poets has expreſſed himſelf ſo nervouſly on this ſubject as Juvenal.

Si fortuna volet, fies de rhetore conſul;
Si volet hæc eadem, fies de conſule rhetor.
Vintidius quid enim? quid Tullius? anne aliud quam
Sidus & occulti miranda potentia fati (45)?

'Tis fate that flings the dice; and as ſhe flings,
Of kings makes pedants, and of pedants kings.
What made Ventidius riſe, and Tullius great,
But their kind ſtars, and hidden pow'r of fate?

Juvenal alſo ſays,

Plus etenim fati valet hora benigni
Quam ſi nos Veneris commendet epiſtola Marti,
Et Samia genitrix quæ delectatur arena *.

For one luckey hour is of more conſequence to a ſoldier, than a recommendation to Mars, either from his miſtreſs or his mother.

The ſentiment of princes being here of greater force than that of a poet; I ſhall cite the anſwer of Dionyſius the younger, when he was aſked this queſtion by Philip King of Macedon: *Wherefore did you not maintain yourſelf in the kingdom which your father left you? Do not be ſurpriſed at that,* replied he, *for my father, who left me all his other effects, did not leave me his fortune by which he acquired them* (46).

I might ſubjoin to theſe quotations the thoughts of ſeveral modern authors; but ſhall content my ſelf with a paſſage in Montagne. ‘ It is commonly obſervable in human actions, that Fortune, in order to convince us of the great power ſhe bears over all things, and of the pleaſure ſhe takes in checking our preſumption, not being able to make fools wiſe, makes them fortunate in ſpite of virtue. And ſhe is moſt inclined to favour thoſe executions, where the deſign is more eſpecially her own. Hence we daily ſee the moſt ſimple among us defeat the greateſt enterprizes, both public and private. And as Sirannez the Perſian anſwered thoſe, who were very much ſurpriſed at the ill ſucceſs of his affairs, conſidering that his deſigns were ſo well laid; that he alone was maſter of his deſigns, but as to the ſucceſs that was in the breaſt of fortune: So theſe may anſwer in the ſame manner, but in a different ſenſe. The greateſt part of the affairs of the world are done of themſelves.

‘ Fata viam inveniunt.

‘ *Fate finds the way.*

‘ The event frequently authorizes a very fooliſh conduct. Our interpoſition is only a thing of courſe, and more commonly in conſideration of cuſtom and example than reaſon. When I have been aſtoniſhed at the greatneſs of an action, and upon enquiry of thoſe who have accompliſhed it, have been let into the motives and management; I have found their counſels very common, and the moſt vulgar and cuſtomary are perhaps alſo the moſt ſecure and beſt adapted to practice, if not for ſhew..... Good luck and ill luck are in my opinion two ſovereign powers. It is ridiculous to think that human prudence is able to act the ſame part as fortune will do. And his enterprize is very vain, who preſumes to ſecure both the cauſes and conſequences, and lead as it were by the hand the progreſs of his undertaking. Vain more particularly in martial councils (47).’

Notwithſtanding all the authorities juſt now cited, it is certain that ſeveral good writers have maintained that every one is the author of his own fortune, and is either miſerable or happy as he acts imprudently. Plautus has laid down this maxim.

LY. Ne opprobra, pater. Multa eveniunt homini
quæ volt quæ nevolt.
PH. Mentire edepol, gnate: atque id nunc facis
haut conſuetudine,
Nam ſapiens quidem pol ipſe fingit fortunam ſibi.
Eo ne multa quæ nevolt eveniunt niſi fictor malu'ſt (48).

LY. *Sir, blame me not. We cann't command events.*
PH. *Son, you're miſtaken: that's a vulgar error.*
A wiſe man always cuts out his own fortune.
Nothing proves croſs but from an ill contriver.

It is alſo to be found as cited from an antient poet, in a diſcourſe (49) attributed to Salluſt. ‘ Res docuit id verum eſſe quod in carminibus Appius ait fabrum eſſe ſuæ quemque Fortunæ. - - - - *Experience teaches the truth of what Appius ſays in his verſes,* That every man is the maker of his own fortune.’ Cornelius Nepos, alledges it twice in his life of Pomponius Atticus. ‘ Itaque hic fecit ut vere dictum videatur SUI CUIQUE MORES FINGUNT FORTUNAM (50)... quantum poterimus rerum exemplis lectores docebimus, ſicut ſupra ſignificavimus, SUOS CUIQUE MORES PLERUMQUE CONCILIARE FORTUNAM (51).-- *So that from this example it appears true,* That the conduct of every perſon makes his fortune.... *We ſhall convince the readers as far as we can by experience, as we have before hinted,* That every perſon's fortune is generally owing to his conduct.’ Thoſe who have exclaimed ſo much againſt Theophraſtus (52) for praiſing that maxim, that fortune and not wiſdom is the directreſs of life, have come very near to Plautus's aſſertion. And what ſhall we ſay of Juvenal, who after having, in his 7th ſatire, preached up the omnipotence of fate tells us in his 10th ſatire that all depends on prudence?

Nullum numen abeſt, ſi ſit prudentia: ſed te
Nos facimus, fortuna, deam cæloque locamus (53).

Fortune was never worſhipp'd by the wiſe:
But, ſet aloft by fools, uſurps the ſkies. DRYDEN.

Some Moderns have approved Plautus's opinion. Galeotto de gli Oddi pronounced an oration on this ſubject in the academy of the *Inſenſati* at Perugia (54). Regnier declares for the ſame opinion in one of his ſatires:

Nous ſommes du bonheur de nous meſme artiſans,
Et fabriquons nos jours ou faſcheux ou plaiſans.
La fortune eſt à nous, & n'eſt mauvaiſe ou bonne,
Que ſelon qu'on la forme ou bien qu'on ſe la
donne (55).

Proſperity's the work of our own hand,
And life is white, or black, as we command.
Fortune is but the creature of our will,
As we are pleas'd to form her, good, or ill.

Mr de Cailliere, in his book of the Fortune of perſons of quality maintains: *That our good or ill fortune depends on our conduct* (56). He declares in his Epiſtle Dedicatory, *that he deſigns to deſtroy the idols* of Fortune, *to demoliſh her temples and altars, and to rob her of the ſounder part of her adorers.* Tho' Mr de Silhon ſays, that Fortune is a fantome which *religion hath aboliſhed, and whoſe invention was not uſeleſs ſince the unhappy and imprudent attribute to her the cauſes of their miſery, and the effects of their ill conduct* (57), yet I do not reckon him as one of the favourers of Plautus's maxim; for he did not pretend, that, in order to ſucceed in our undertakings, it is ſufficient to comport ourſelves in them according to the rules of prudence, and to have a good

(43) See the article CÆSAR, remark [*H*].

(44) Spanheim ſur les Cæſars de Julien, *pag.* 428, & 255.

(45) Juven. Sat. VII, ver. 197.

* Juven. Sat. XVI, ver. 4.

(46) Ælian. Div. Hiſt. *lib. xii, cap. lx.*

(47) Montagne, Eſſays, *Tom. iv, lib. iii, ch. viii, pag.* 198, 199. *of the Hague edition* 1727.

(48) Plautus, in Trinummo, *Act ii, Sc. ii, ver.* 80, *pag. m.* 741.

(49) *Intituled* Oratio I ad Cæſarem de ordinanda Republica.

(50) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Pomp. Attici, *cap. xi.*

(51) Id. ibid. *cap. xix.*

(52) Vexatur idem Theophraſtus & libris & ſcholis omnium philoſophorum, quod in Calliſthene ſuo laudaret illam ſententiam. Vitam regit fortuna non ſapientia. *Cicero, Tuſculan. lib. v, folio* 273, *B.*

(53) Juven. Sat. X, ver. 365. *See alſo* Sat. XIV, ver 315.

(54) *See Don* Secondo Lancilotti, *in the book intituled* Chi l'indovina e ſavio, *pag.* 231.

(55) Regnier, Sat. XIV, *fol. m.* 96, *verſo.*

(56) It is the title of the firſt chapter.

(57) Silhon, Miniſtre d'Etat, *book i, ch. i, at the beginning.*

imprudence. But it ought not to be expected that I ſhould do it by inconteſtable reaſons. It

a good cauſe. He owns a proſperity and adverſity, diſpenſed by the providence of GOD, without any neceſſary regard to our intentions and meaſures. There appeared ſome time ago a very good book, intituled, *Reflexions on what is called Good or Ill Luck in Lotteries* (58). The author is undoubtedly of Plautus's opinion; or, to ſpeak plainer, he does not believe that the fortunate lots run for or againſt certain perſons with any ſort of diſtinction. It is not therefore a general opinion, that there is ſome unknown cauſe which favours or croſſes certain perſons without any regard to their good or ill qualities, or the meaſures they take to attain their ends. But we muſt own, that the greateſt number of ſuffrages is for the affirmative; however as that is no manner of proof of the truth of an opinion, I wiſh that ſome able pen would examine this ſubject to the bottom, and diſcuſs what could be ſaid on each ſide. I hope there will be ſome perſons found to undertake this taſk; in the mean time I will here offer a few reflexions.

I. I obſerve firſt of all, that we ought not to imagine that the Pagans repreſented fortune, as a being which blindly diſtributed good and evil, without knowing what ſhe did. They called her blind (59), I own; but that was not in order to deprive her abſolutely of all knowledge; it was only to ſignify that ſhe did not act with a juſt diſcernment. So we ſay a Prince is blind in the diſtribution of his favours, when he beſtows and takes them away by caprice, and without any reſpect to the merit of his ſubjects. We do not pretend to ſay, that he does good or ill to ſuch and ſuch, without knowing that he gives or takes away the reſpective place from the reſpective perſon. We only mean, that he doth not govern himſelf according to the rules of reaſon and juſtice, and that he is determined raſhly by the inſtigation of his inconſtant paſſions. This is the idea which the Heathens formed of fortune. They were all perſuaded, except a few Philoſophers, that the Divine Nature was a ſort of being divided into ſeveral individuals. They attributed to every god a large ſhare of power; but did not exempt them from the imperfections of our nature; they believed them ſuſceptible of anger and jealouſy, litterally ſpeaking; they made no ſcruple to affirm, in their moſt ſerious writings, that a malignant and ſecret envy of the gods oppoſed their proſperity (60). They more particularly attributed to the god which they called Fortune, a conduct which was inconſtant, raſh, and capricious to the laſt degree. It was for this reaſon that an infinite number of temples were built to her, and that ſhe was worſhipped in a particular manner, in order to prevent the ill effects of her caprices. They did not therefore believe that ſhe wanted either eyes, or ears, or thought. Thoſe Philoſophers who acknowledged the unity of the deity, called that divine being Fortune, when they conſidered it only as a diſtributer of good and evil things, which did not conform itſelf in the leaſt to what we call merit, conſtancy, or reaſon. But the wiſeſt of them always owned that it never acted contrary to abſolute juſtice, or without good reaſons, which it underſtood very well. After all, GOD himſelf ſays, That his ways are not our ways, and his thoughts are not our thoughts.

II. My ſecond reflexion is, that under the goſpel diſpenſation we atrribute, to earthly goods, all the defects which the Pagans aſcribed to the goddeſs Fortune. We ſay, that the poſſeſſion of them is no ſign of merit, that they are very fleeting and periſhable, and that they miſerably deceive thoſe who rely on them, &c. It is eaſy to obſerve the reaſon of this diverſity of language. The Chriſtians acknowledge only one God, and by that word they underſtand a nature infinitely perfect, which governs all things, and diſpenſes all events; but the Pagans laviſhed the name of God into an infinity of limited beings, imperfect, full of faults and vicious paſſions. For which reaſon they made no ſcruple to charge on them the irregularities of human life, when they could not diſcover the cauſe of them amongſt the free actions of men. The Chriſtians, on the contrary, impute to the creature whatever infirmity they meet with in the univerſe; they aſcribe to the nature of the benefit what the Pagans placed to the account of the benefactor.

III. I ſay, in the third place, that it can ſcarce be denied, that there are fortunate and unfortunate people, that is, according to the Pagan language, that there are ſome people who are made the ſport of fortune in the whole courſe of their affairs, whilſt there are others, whoſe way ſhe ſmooths, and takes care to ſhew them numberleſs inſtances of her favour. Merchandiſe, gaming, and the court, have always furniſhed examples of theſe two things; but nothing ſo manifeſtly confirms this as the military life. It is there Fortune rules more than any where elſe: our Timoleon, Alexander (61), Sylla, Cæſar, and ſeveral other antient warriors, have acknowledged it in the moſt authentic manner: the moderns confeſs it alſo both in their memoirs and converſations. I have been told by a perſon of quality, that the Conſtable Wrangel aſſured him, that nothing was more raſh than to hazard a battle, which was liable to be loſt by a thouſand unforeſeen accidents; tho' at the ſame time the moſt exact meaſures have been taken, which the moſt conſummate military prudence can ſuggeſt. Girard, Secretary to the Duke of Epernon, has ſhewn, in the long life he has written of that famous favourite, ſo many happy events independent on precaution, that it is hardly poſſible to deny the truth of the popular opinion concerning the fortune of ſome people. After this, ſays the Hiſtorian, we ought not to wonder if the Duke never complained of Fortune in the adverſity of his old age: on the contrary, ſome of his friends once talking on that ſubject, he told them that he ſhould be very ungrateful for the benefits with which Fortune had conſtantly favoured him for above ſixty years, if he ſhould be diſguſted at her leaving him for the ſmall time he had then to live; that he had ſcarce ever obſerved an entire life fortunate, tho' much ſhorter than his; and that in the inconſtant ſtate of human affairs, it was no ſmall advantage, that his diſgraces were reſerved to a time, when he was hardly any longer capable of reliſhing proſperity.

IV. My fourth reflexion is, that it ſeems very falſe, that what we call good fortune depends only on prudence; and that what we name ill fortune, is only the reſult of imprudence. I freely own, that the aſſertion of the author (62) above cited does not appear to me well grounded. It is not true that the winning gameſter always plays better than the loſer. It is not true that the Merchant who grows rich, always ſurpaſſes in the knowledge of trade, or induſtry, and circumſpection, thoſe who do not grow rich. No perſon is ignorant, that in thoſe games which depend on chance, there is ſomewhat which contributes more to loſing or winning, than whatever depends on the ſkill of the gameſters. There are days when a man wins large ſums: this is not owing to his playing with greater application, or with a more ignorant gameſter; but he has a good game, the very cards are dealt him which he wants, or the dice turn up according to his wiſhes. On other days he experiences the quite contrary. In the very ſame ſitting, he finds ſometimes the turn of fortune; he is lucky in the beginning, and unlucky at the end; he loſes in the laſt hour, more than he won in all the foregoing. There are men who immediately after they begin to play, perceive their good or ill luck, and finding that the day does not favour them, they are ſo wiſe as not to puſh any farther, and give out in good time. Not that they diſtruſt their addreſs and capacity, but they diſtruſt what doth not depend on their ſkill. This ſomewhat is not ſo apparent in trade; it is nevertheleſs certain, that perſons of mean capacity, and of very little judgment, ſometimes gain immenſe ſums by ſuch ſort of dealings, as thoſe of better underſtanding and greater experience would not run the hazard of engaging in. It may be affirmed in general, that thoſe who acquire the moſt riches by trade, are neither more intelligent, nor more induſtrious, than ſeveral others whoſe gain is leſs conſiderable. The latter therefore are not ſo much the favourites of Fortune as the former. Conſequently there is a good or ill fortune in human life, independent on prudence or imprudence. I do not believe the author I am at preſent examining, will deny this, ſo far as relates to play and commerce: he only had in view the fortune which people of quality may make in the ſervice of their prince. If he only intended to adviſe a gentleman to chuſe the prudent part, I have nothing to ſay againſt his opinion; but he goes much farther: he would perſuade us, that

(58) Printed at Amſterdam, 1696.

(59) Spargitque manu munera cæca pejora fovens. *Seneca.*

(60) Hinc ſive invidia Deum, ſive fato rapidiſſimus procurrentis imperii curſus parumper Gallorum Senonum incurſione ſupprimitur. *Florus, lib. i, cap. xiii.* Indignantium voces exaudiebantur tam viridem & in flore ætatis fortunæque invidia Deum ereptum eſſe rebus humanis (Alexandrum.) *Q. Curtius, lib. x, cap. v.*

(61) Rex juſſum confidere felicitati ſuæ remiſit, ſibi enim ad alia gloriam concedere Deos. *Q. Curtius, lib. vii, cap. vii.* Rex fortuna ſua & conſiliis ſuorum ſe uſurum eſſe reſpondet, nam & fortunam cui confidat & conſilium ſuadentium ne quid temere & audacter faciat ſequuturum. *Id. ibid. cap. ix.*

(62) *Mr de Cailliere in his book* de la Fortune des Gens de Qualité.

It is not poſſible in a ſubject of this nature to lead the reader to evidence, or demonſtration.

that thoſe who ſucceed, owe their advancement to their wiſe conduct only, and that thoſe who do not make their fortune, ought to impute it to their imprudence. This is what I cannot believe. I will allow him to call it wiſe conduct, whatever a man does to conform himſelf to the preſent circumſtances, as to be a braggadocio, a debauchee, a wag, a buffoon, *&c.* whenever it is the certain way to pleaſe; or to pretend to be mad, when without it he cannot eſcape imminent dangers (63). I allow every thing to be called imprudence, which is contrary to the humour of the preſent times; as to be a very honeſt man in a depraved court, where there is nothing to be got by any but raſcals. Notwithſtanding all this, I cannot help maintaining my aſſertion, that the riſe and fall of great men are not commonly the meer effects of prudence or imprudence. Chance, precarious accidents, and fortune, juſtly claim a large ſhare. Some occurrences which we neither contrived nor foreſaw, diſcover the way, and make us haſten our pace. A caprice, a jealouſy, which it was impoſſible to foreſee, ſtops us ſhort all of a ſudden, and throws us entirely out of the way.

V. The better to refute Mr de Cailliere, I muſt add here a fifth reflexion. We muſt not affirm, that all events being connected with a determinate cauſe, fortune is a chimerical being, and ſo that we are no otherwiſe fortunate or unfortunate, but as we foreſee, or do not foreſee the chain of natural cauſes and effects. To ſhew the nullity of this objection, I will ſuppoſe a fact not only very poſſible, but which may alſo be proved by ſome examples. A Prince cauſes a town to be beſieged in the middle of winter: if rain, ſnow, or ice, come upon him, he is not likely to take it; but if the weather be dry, and the cold moderate, he will take it. There follows ſeveral ſucceſſive weeks of fine weather; no rain, no ſnow: the ſiege advances daily, and the town capitulates before the froſt comes. Another Prince beſieges a place in the middle of ſummer, and is likely to take it if the ſeaſon keeps it's ordinary courſe; but if it rains hard for ſeveral days, if the nights are cold, if this occaſions ſeveral diſtempers in the camp, he will not be able to take it. There happens a reverſe of ſeaſons, the ſummer is cold and rainy, the trenches advance but ſlowly, the army grows weaker daily by the diſeaſes which this unſeaſonable weather produces, he finds himſelf forced to raiſe the ſiege. Can you poſſibly aſcribe the happy ſucceſs of the firſt ſiege to prudence, or the ill ſucceſs of the ſecond to imprudence? This would be aſſerting two abſurdities; for in the firſt caſe, there was no foreſeeing the fine weather, nor the ill weather in the latter; and conſequently there was no prudence in attempting the firſt ſiege, nor imprudence in undertaking the latter. It is therefore purely owing to good fortune that the firſt ſucceeded, as it is to be aſcribed to ill luck that the latter miſcarried. I know very well, that if men could foreſee rain and fair weather, it would have been an act of imprudence to have formed the latter ſiege. The ill ſucceſs in that caſe would have been a great fault, and not a misfortune; but human foreſight does not extend ſo far, and if we are ignorant that the ſummer will prove rainy, it is not owing to imprudence. There are a hundred fortuitous accidents, which we can no more foreſee than theſe, that are equally capable of diſappointing the beſt concerted military enterprizes. Now as ſome Generals are much more frequently perplexed with theſe croſs occurrences than others, we may reaſonably acquieſce in the popular opinion, that there are fortunate and unfortunate Generals. But we muſt not hence infer, that the fortunate are always, or almoſt always, as prudent as the unfortunate. On the contrary, we muſt believe that the latter ſometimes ſurpaſs the former both in prudence and valour (64). Conſult Forſtnerus, in his notes on a paſſage of Tacitus, wherein that Hiſtorian aſſures us, that all human affairs are a continual ſport (65). This commentator will give ſeveral illuſtrious examples, which prove that the beſt concerted deſigns in this world are confounded by an inviſible force, which human prudence cannot guard againſt: this is particularly obſervable in the conclaves (66). And as for thoſe who pretend that every perſon is the author of his own fortune, you may find them ſolidly and amply confuted in a book of Don Lancelotti (67).

Obſerve carefully what I am going to ſay. Princes commonly judge of things by the ſucceſs. A General ſtands very well in their favour who ſucceeds in a military enterprize; but if the contrary happens, he forfeits their eſteem and friendſhip. Even when they are ſenſible, that the victory was barely a piece of good fortune, and the defeat was not in the leaſt owing to any fault of the General, they are always more diſpoſed to prefer the victor than the vanquiſhed; for with them to be fortunate is a recommendatory character, as, on the other ſide, an unfortunate, tho' ſhining merit, is but a diſagreeable quality. Since therefore battles are loſt and won by unforeſeen accidents, it is clear that misfortunes happen independently on imprudence, and that ſome make their fortune independently on prudence. A lucky raſhneſs, you will tell me doth not deſerve the name of temerity; for ſince it has ſucceeded, it is a ſign that it was proper to produce it's wiſhed effect. Now wherein does prudence conſiſt? Is it not in making uſe of proper means to accompliſh our deſigns? My anſwer is, that to act prudently, we ought to know that the means we uſe are proportioned to the end. A raſh fortunate man is unacquainted with this proportion; he is hurried on by an impetuous fury; there appears nothing in his conduct but what is to be met with in that of the raſh unfortunate; and therefore the ſucceſs of the enterprize ought not to be aſcribed to prudence but to fortune. Obſerve alſo another thing; it is no manner of imprudence not to be precautioned againſt thoſe things which human capacity cannot diſcover, and conſequently if a perſon doth not ſucceed at court, or if he loſes the fortune he has already made, it is not always to be attributed to imprudence. Is it poſſible for him to diſcover all the caprices, diſguſts and jealouſies that ariſe in the mind either of a monarch, or of his miſtreſſes or favourites? Can he diſcover all the grimaces of falſe friends, obviate their calumnies, and prevent their lies and falſe reports which wound without threatening. This was the confeſſion of a great miniſter, whoſe genius was not leſs than his anthority. *In the poſt which you are in*, ſaid Cardinal Richelieu to a Captain of the guards (68), *it is eaſy for you know your friends and your enemies. No diſguiſe can conceal them from your diſcernment*; *but with reſpect to mine, in the poſt which I hold, I cannot penetrate into their ſentiments, they all ſpeak to me in the ſame language. They all make the ſame earneſt court to me, and thoſe who would ruin me, give me as great marks of amity, as thoſe who are ſincerely attached to my intereſts* (69); Regnier, in the ſatire already cited, tells us:

La faveur eſt bizarre, à traicter indocile,
Sans arreſt, inconſtante & d'humeur difficile,
Avecq' diſcretion il la faut careſſer,
L'un la per bien ſouvent pour la trop embraſſer,
Ou pour s'y fier trop, l'autre par inſolence,
Ou pour avoir trop peu ou trop de violence,
Ou pour ſe la promettre ou ſe la denier,
Enfin c'eſt un caprice étrange à manier,
Son amour eſt fragile & ſe rompt comme verre,
Et fait aux plus matois donner du nez en terre (70).

Moſt fickle is the favour of the great,
Unſteady, whimſical, and ſtrange to treat.
Men ne'er can be enough upon their guard,
Some loſe her by careſſing her too hard;
Some by dependence; *ſome by inſolence*;
Some by too much, or little violence;
Some by preſumption, ſome by ſelf-denial;
In ſhort, ſhe'll balk your ſkill on ev'ry trial.
Brittle as glaſs itſelf, ſhe's quickly broke;
Nor can the wiſeſt ward the fatal ſtroke.

VI. Let us then take it for granted, which is my ſixth reflexion, that the prudence of a man is not the ſole nor even the principal cauſe of his fortune. There

(63) Inſipiens eſto, quum tempus poſtulat, aut res: Stultitiam ſimulare loco, prudentia ſumma eſt. *Cato, Diſt. xix, lib. ii.* David, and Brutus, and ſeveral others have been the better for ſuch a conduct. See *Cornelius à Lapide in lib. i, Regum, cap. xxi.*

(64) One may ſay of ſeveral great captains, what Florus ſaid of Sertorius, *lib. iii, cap. xxii,* vir ſummæ quidem ſed calamitoſæ virtutis.

(65) Mihi quanto plura recentium ſeu veterum revolvo, tanto magis ludibria rerum mortalium cunctis in negotiis obſervantur. *Tacit. Annal. lib. iii, cap. xviii.*

(66) See the *Melanges de Vigneul Marville*, Vol. ii, pag. 330, 331, of the Dutch edition. See above citation (16), of the article ANTONIANO.

(67) *It is intituled* Chi l'indovina e Savio, overo la Prudenza humana fallaciſſima: *The author refutes in the third* Diſganno *of the ſecond book the Oration of* Galeotto de gli Oddi.

(68) Mr de Fabert, who was Marſhal of France.

(69) Hiſtoire du Maréchal de Fabert, *pag.* 53.

(70) Regnier, Satire XIV, *fol.* 96.

tion. We find at moſt only ſtrong probabilities in it; and it is no ſmall objection againſt

There are ſome fortunate people, whoſe conduct is very imprudent: and others unfortunate, tho' their conduct is prudent. The difficulty is to know what this fortune is, which favours ſome people and perſecutes others, without regard to their merit or the meaſures they take. To recur to God, is not to remove the difficulty; for acknowledging him the general cauſe of all things, it will be aſked whether he directs immediately, and by particular acts of his will, all thoſe unforeſeen occurrences which cauſe the deſigns of one man to ſucceed, and confound the enterprizes of another. If you anſwer in the affirmative you will bring all the philoſophers, eſpecially the Carteſians on your back, who will maintain that you attribute ſuch a conduct to the Supreme Being, as is inconſiſtent with an infinite agent. He ought, they will tell you, to eſtabliſh a few general laws, and by this means produce an infinite variety of events, without recurring every moment to exceptions, or particular acts, which muſt needs be miracles, tho' we ſhould not call them ſo, by reaſon they would be ſo frequent (71). You may indeed reply to them, that the occurrences favourable to the fortunate, and contrary to the unfortunate, are a natural conſequence of general laws; but they will not eaſily believe you. You will never be able to perſuade me, that chance can produce what I am about to ſay. Let an hundred tickets well ſealed be ranged in order on a table; Let ten of them be blanks, and ten of them marked with the letter A, and write a ſentence on all the reſt; then let ten men be called in, and one of them directed to take up the 1, the 15, the 21, the 37, the 44, the 68, the 80, the 83, the 90, and the 99. Let another be ordered to take the 3, the 6, the 13, the 25, the 50, the 73, the 88, the 89, the 95, and the 100. Tell me, I pray, if the firſt of theſe men draws the ten blank tickets, and the other the ten marked A, can you ever hope to perſuade me that this was the reſult of the general laws of the communication of motion? Do you not perceive your ſelf that theſe twenty tickets were placed in ſuch an order, that one half of them by a premeditated deſign, ſhould fall entirely into the hands of the firſt of theſe ten men, and the other into the hands of the ſecond? I ſay alſo, that ſuppoſing certain gameſters had always, or almoſt always the beſt cards, (72) or in general, that certain perſons are almoſt always favoured by accidental occurrences; this would require ſomething beſides the natural reſult of the communication of motion, this muſt proceed from a particular direction and determination; and I ſhould rather chooſe with ſeveral learned men to deny the diſtinction of good or ill fortune, than to explain it only by the general laws of nature. But we argue here on the hypotheſis, that there are fortunate and unfortunate people.

Cannot we recur to occaſional cauſes, I mean, to the deſires of ſome created ſpirits? Platoniſm might eaſily be brought to favour ſuch an explication; but it is oppoſed by ſtrong arguments, according to the idea which Theology gives us of the angelical nature. This teaches us that the angels are ſome of them perfectly good, and others extremely wicked, and both endowed with an almoſt unlimited knowledge, under the general direction of God. This idea cannot eaſily be reconciled to the particular train of fortunate or unfortunate occurrences. But confining our ſelves to hypotheſes purely philoſophical, we ſhall be better able to anſwer theſe objections, if we ſuppoſe for example, that the inviſible ſpirits (73) are more different from one another, than men are amongſt themſelves; that there is a great ſubordination amongſt theſe ſpirits; that there are ſome who are ſometimes good and ſometimes evil, ſometimes in a good humour, and ſometimes in an ill one; that they are fantaſtical, inconſtant, jealous, envious, that they thwart one another, that their power is very much limited in certain reſpects, and that if they can perform a thing which is very difficult, it does not hence follow that they can accompliſh a thing which is much eaſier. Do not we ſee country-women ignorant of the alphabet, who know a thouſand excellent ſecrets to cure diſeaſes? Archimedes who invented ſuch admirable engines, could he ſow? could he ſpin? However it be, there is no fortune without the direction of an intelligent cauſe, and I cannot be ſufficiently ſurprized that a learned man ſhould venture to ſay, that Fortune was neither God, nor nature, nor underſtanding, or reaſon, but a certain natural and irrational impulſe (74). ‘Licet diſputatum ſit, fortunam à natura prorſus eſſe aliam, non defuere tamen, qui aſſererent, etſi à naturæ moribus, inſtitutiſque longe plurimum fortuna abhorreat, ſitque ipſa inconſtans admodum, & lubrica, non continua, non eadem ubique, non eorundem ſemper effectrix, non ſimileis ſibi retinens progreſſiones, non diſcriminata ſervans tempora, denique improvida ſit, repentina, inordinata, temeraria, qui ſive mores, ſive impulſus, neque naturæ conveniant, neque rationi, quarum utriuſque propria ſit conſtantia, maturitas, ordo, menſura, regula, diſcriminatio item rerum, temporum effectuum, non inquam defuere, fortunam qui aſſerant, irrationalem quandam eſſe naturam, nec aliud illam denique, quam naturæ impetum quendam, hoc eſt ratione carentem agitationem naturæ quandam, in iis ipſis videlicet, quæ nec rationi ſubjiciantur naturæ, neque hominum electionibus, ac conſiliis. Impetum itaque eſſe eam cenſent, quod ſit abſque ratione, feraturque ſuopte tantum agitatu, atque impulſu, quodque ubi impetus dominetur; illic rationi nullus omnino relictus ſit locus, nulla prorſus authoritas, aut penſitatio earum quæ gerantur rerum (75). - - - - *Though it is diſputed, that fortune is intirely diſtinct from nature, yet there have been ſome who aſſert, that notwithſtanding fortune is very far from being reconcileable to the methods and laws of nature, being ſo remarkably inconſtant, fickle, unſteady, various, producing different effects, never obſerving the ſame meaſures, or any certain ſeaſons; laſtly improvident, ſudden, impetuous, raſh, which whether they be rules or impulſes, are neither agreeable to nature nor reaſon, to both of which belong conſtancy, perfection, order, meaſure, regularity, and a diſtinction of things, ſeaſons, and effects; there have been ſome, I ſay, who aſſert that fortune is a certain irrational nature, and nothing elſe but a certain impulſe of nature, that is, a certain natural agitation void of reaſon, namely in thoſe things that are neither ſubject to natural reaſon, nor to human choice or deſigns! They hold therefore that it is an impulſe, that it is exerted without reaſon, and carried by its own ſpontaneous directions and power, and that where this impulſe preſides there can be no room left for reaſon, no influence at all, nor conſideration about what is to be done.*’ Perhaps you would gladly be informed for what reaſons he deprives God and nature of the acts of Fortune: wherefore, ſince his works are ſomewhat ſcarce, I will here inſert what he has ſaid on this head. ‘Fortunam non eſſe Deum, - - - *That fortune is not God,*’ Is the title of one of his chapters: and this is what he ſays in that chapter. ‘Quomodo enim Deus erit, ſi hæc tam ſæpe, tam inconſiderate, tam etiam inique, atque ex inopinato extollit ignavos, locupletat immeritos, vexat, atque affligit, inſontes, bonos in calamitatem adducit, ac ſervitutem, pravos ſtatuit in ſolio, liberat à periculis perverſos, moderatos, & honeſtos viros laboribus periculis ærumnis, ac miſeriis conficit? Tyrannorum hæc ſunt non Dei, cujus eſt ſumma bonitas, abſoluta juſtitia, rectiſſimum judicium, æquiſſima rerum omnium diſpenſatio (76). - - - - *For how can ſhe be God, when ſhe ſo frequently, ſo inconſiderately, and ſo unjuſtly, and ſuddenly advances the lazy, inriches the undeſerving, vexes and afflicts the innocent, brings the good into calamity and ſlavery, fixes the wicked on a throne, delivers the perverſe from perils, and throws the temperate and juſt into difficulties, dangers, troubles, and miſeries? Theſe are the acts of tyrants, not of God, whoſe goodneſs is infinite, juſtice abſolute, judgment impartial, and diſpenſation of all things moſt equitable.*’ The following chapter intituled ‘Fortunam non eſſe naturam, - - - *That fortune is not nature,*’ amongſt other things contains the following words: ‘Naturam quoque non eſſe eam hæc ipſa liquido ſatis docent, quod fortuna ipſa quidem inconſtans eſt, inordinata, varia, repentina, incerta. Contra vero quid natura ipſa ordinatius, conſtantius, certius? cujus is eſt ordo, ea lex, ac regula, ut non, niſi certis, conſtitutiſque è principiis ſuo tempore, ſuis progreſſionibus, menſuriſque tum univerſa proveniant, tum etiam ſingula quarumcunque ipſa rerum, effectionum, operum author eſt & cauſa.

‘Pergit

(71) There are ſome other objections taken from morality which may be ſeen hereafter in Pontanus's words. See alſo the *Réflexions ſur le Bonheur & Malheur des Loteries*, ch. viii, pag. 92, & ſeq.

(72) Take notice of this clauſe; for even if there was no providence, but only a fortuitous effuſion of good and evil throughout the univerſe, it muſt happen that ſome men would find themſelves in happy circumſtances, and others the contrary. See the article MAHOMET II, remark [*F*].

(73) I call them ſo in oppoſition to human ſouls, which are ſpirits united to ſenſible bodies.

(74) Jovianus Pontanus, de Fortuna, *lib. i, fol. m.* 129, & *ſeq.*

(75) Id. ibid. *fol.* 150 *verſo*, & *fol.* 151.

(76) Id. ibid. *fol.* 129.

againſt the opinion I defend, that Cardinal Richelieu, whoſe abilities were ſurpriſing, would

‘ Pergit natura ordine ſuo, graditur ſuis paſſibus, ‘ diſpenſat actiones ſuas cum temporibus, viribus, ‘ opibuſque ſuis utitur cum menſura, & penſo, non ‘ fluitat, non nutat, ſtabilis eſt in officio ſuo, ſibique ‘ ſemper conſtat (77.) - - - - *That ſhe is not nature will ‘ alſo appear from hence, that fortune is inconſtant, in‘ordinate, various, ſudden, uncertain. On the con‘trary, what is more orderly, conſtant, and certain ‘ than nature? Since ſhe obſerves ſuch order, law, and ‘ rule, that not only univerſals but particulars alſo, ‘ among all the things, effects, and works, whereof ſhe ‘ is the author, are produced from certain principles, in ‘ certain ſeaſons, and by certain progreſſions, and mea‘ſures. Nature proceeds in her own method, purſues her ‘ own ſteps, diſpenſes her own acts with regard to ſea‘ſons, exerts her powers and faculties with weight ‘ and meaſure, ſhe never fluctuates, ſhe never nods, ſhe ‘ is ſteady in her duty, and always conſiſtent with her ‘ ſelf.*’ See the margin (78).

VII. My laſt reflexion is, that men uſually are exceſſive in their murmurs againſt Fortune; for very often they impute to her what they ought to charge on their own imprudence. Homer was not ignorant of this fault, for he introduces the gods complaining of this injuſtice of men. Read theſe words in Aulus Gellius (79): ‘ Propterea negat (Chryſippus) oportere ‘ ferri audirique homines aut nequam aut ignavos & ‘ nocentes & audaces; qui, cum in culpa & in male‘ficio revicti ſunt, perfugiunt ad fati neceſſitatem, tam‘quam in aliquod Fati aſylum; &, quæ peſſimè fece‘runt, ea non ſua temeritati ſed fato eſſe attribuenda ‘ dicunt. Primus autem Homerus ſapientiſſimus & an‘tiquiſſimus poetarum dixit in hiſce verſibus?

Ω πόποι, οἷον δή νυ θεὺς βροτοὶ αἰτιόωνται.
Εξ ἡμέων γὰρ φασὶ κάκ᾽ ἔμμεναι. οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοι
Σφῇσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὑπὲρ μόρον ἄλγε᾽ ἔχουσιν (80).

‘ *Therefore Chryſippus denied that there was an en‘couragement to be given to thoſe men, whether worthleſs ‘ and idle, or wicked and impudent, who, being found ‘ guilty of a fault or crime, fly immediately to the ‘ neceſſity of fate, as to ſome aſylum; and aſcribe the worſt ‘ act they can commit, not to their own ill conduct but ‘ to Fate. This was firſt obſerved by Homer, the wiſeſt ‘ as well as oldeſt of the poets, in theſe verſes.*

Perverſe mankind! whoſe wills, created free,
Charge all their woes on abſolute decree;
All to the dooming gods their guilt tranſlate,
And follies are miſcall'd the crimes of fate.
Mr POPE.

Theſe three Greek verſes are taken from the firſt book of the Odyſſey, and ſignify in Latin.

Papæ, quomodo jam Deos mortales culpant
Ex nobis enim inquiunt mala eſſe: at illi ipſi
Ob ſua ſcelera præter fatum dolores patiuntur.

La Fontaine hath ingeniouſly deſcribed the ſame injuſtice; you will find his thoughts and ſeveral others in the book which I quote (81). But may it not be pretended, that, on ſeveral occaſions, the perſon who is unhappy by his own fault, has not a leſs right to complain of fortune, than the unfortunate who has punctually diſcharged his duty? May we not ſay that this power, which we call Fortune, occaſions miſery two ways? She ſometimes permits a man to uſe all the means which prudence can ſuggeſt, and yet deprives him of the ſucceſs he ought to expect; ſhe pleaſes her ſelf with this, in order to ſhew her ſuperiority, and the inſufficiency of our reaſon and of human wiſdom. Sometimes alſo ſhe plunges men into miſery, by obſtructing their uſe of the means which might have preſerved them from it: ſhe confounds their judgment, and hurries them on to irreparable miſtakes. It was probably thus that ſhe irretrievably ruined the affair of Pompey. She had declared for Julius Cæſar, and procured him the triumph, by allowing him to act agreeably to all the qualifications of a great commander, and by eclipſing in Pompey's ſoul thoſe eminent qualities which he poſſeſſed. They did not appear at the battle of Pharſalia; Pompey there ſhewed himſelf a weak man, and an unſkilful General. Was not this eclipſe ſupernatural? Was it not the influence of ſome ſuperior force, which had deſigned to raiſe Cæſar on the ruins of his competitor? Velleius Paterculus declares that when the deſtinies are reſolved to ruin a man, they deprive him of prudence (82): ‘ Sed pro‘fecto ineluctabilis fatorum vis cujuſcunque fortunam ‘ mutare conſtituit, conſilia corrumpit... (83) ſed præ‘valebant jam fata conſiliis omnemque animi ejus (84) ‘ aciem præſtrinxerant. Quippe ita ſe res habet, ut ‘ plerumque fortunam mutaturus Deus, conſilia cor‘rumpat, efficiatque, quod miſerrimum eſt, ut quod ‘ accidit, id etiam merito accidiſſe videatur, & caſus ‘ in culpam tranſeant. - - - - *But indeed the irreſiſtible ‘ power of fate deſigns a reverſe of fortune, and corrupts ‘ their counſels: .... But now fate over-ruled their ‘ counſels, and clouded their underſtandings. For ſo it is, ‘ that when God intends a reverſe of fortune, he gene‘rally corrupts human counſels, and ſo orders it, which ‘ is the moſt miſerable circumſtance, that what happens ‘ ſhall ſeem to have happened deſervedly, and that the ‘ accident ſhall be conſtrued into a fault.*’ The ſentiment of this grave Hiſtorian was very common amongſt the Pagans; and every day we uſe this ſaying as a proverb, ‘ quos Jupiter vult perdere de‘mentat. - - - - *Thoſe whom Jupiter marks out for de‘ſtruction, he firſt deprives of their underſtanding.*’ A certain writer being to prove that it is poſſible for two authors to expreſs the ſame thought without borrowing from one another (85), cites *Philip de Commines, who without ever hearing of Paterculus's name, yet ſaid, as well as he, that when God begins to chaſtize princes, he firſt leſſens their ſenſe, and makes them avoid the counſels and company of the wiſe.* I ſhall cite an excellent paſſage of Ammianus Marcellinus: ‘ Ut ſolent manum ‘ injectantibus fatis hebetari ſenſus hominum & ob‘tundi, his illecebris ad meliorum exſpectationem ‘ erectus, egreſſuſque Antiochiâ numine lævo duc‘tante, prorſus ire tendebat de fumo, ut proverbium ‘ loquitur vetus, ad flammam (86). - - - - *As mens ſenſes ‘ uſe to be clouded and ſtupified by the controuling power ‘ of fate, being encouraged by theſe inducements to hope for ‘ better things, and going out of Antioch under the con‘duct of his evil genius, he went as the proverb ſays, ‘ out of the ſmoke into the fire.*’ A little after ſpeaking of Nemeſis, he tells us that ſhe turns men out of their way, and perverts the ends and deſigns of men: ‘ Hæc ut regina cauſarum & arbitra rerum ac diſcepta‘trix, urnam ſortium temperat, accidentium vices ‘ alternans: voluntatumque noſtrarum exorſa interdum ‘ alio, quàm quo contendebant, exitu terminans, mul‘tiplices actus permutando convolvit (87). - - - *She, as ‘ queen, arbiter and diſpoſer of cauſes and things, pre‘ſides over the turn of lots, varying accidents at her ‘ pleaſure: and terminating very often what our wills ‘ had begun, with a concluſion quite different from that ‘ to which they were directed, makes a ſtrange jumble ‘ and confuſion in things.*’ She does not always effect this by error, ſhe ſometimes makes uſe of mere ignorance. What I call error is that falſe judgment which our mind makes of things, in comparing them together, and chooſing the worſt: and I call that ignorance, when a man is in ſuch a ſtate, that the neceſſary ideas do not offer themſelves to his imagination. Now when he takes the wrong ſide, either by rejecting the proper means actually preſent to his mind, or by reaſon of the abſence of thoſe ideas, which ought to have preſented thoſe means to him, he paſſes for imprudent; but it is certain, that in the firſt caſe imprudence is more voluntary than in the ſecond, and conſequently more to be condemned. Several philoſophers aſſert, that what is called pure omiſſion is never free. Who would venture to maintain that we are maſters of our memory, and that it is a moral fault not to remember certain things upon any occaſion when we want to remember them to conduct us in our deliberations? Thoſe who acknowledge the empire of Fortune, would, I think, be unreaſonable, if they ſuppoſed that ſhe doth not influence our forgetfulneſs or omiſſions: for, on the contrary, it is by them that ſhe frequently occaſions our ill ſucceſs. She removes thoſe ideas which would naturally occur to us, and hinder our committing faults. How often has it happened that a man of judgment has very much prejudiced himſelf by the anſwers he has made to ſeveral queſtions propoſed

(77) Id. ibid.

(78) Jerome Garimberto, *who lived in the XVIth century, wrote in Italian a treatiſe* della Fortuna, *wherein he maintains in the tenth chapter of the firſt book* che la fortuna è un impeto naturale privo di ragione ne gli huomini; - - *That Fortune is a natural impulſe void of reaſon,* and in the next chapter, that a man is happy, when he is led by a natural inſtinct to a thing, which he does not foreſee, and without any ſhew of reaſon.

(79) Aulus Gellius, *lib. vi, cap. ii, pag. m.* 171.

(80) Homer. Odyſſ. lib i, ver. 32.

(81) Réflexions ſur ce que l'on apelle bonheur & Malheur en matiere de Loteries, *ch. vi, pag.* 79, *& ſeq. See alſo* Regnier, ubi ſupra, *fol.* 96 *verſo.*

(82) Velleius Paterculus, *lib. ii, cap. lvii.*

(83) Id. ibid. *cap. cxviii.*

(84) That is, of Quintilius Varus.

(85) Ogier, Apologie pour Balzac, *pag.* 34.

(86) Amm. Marcell. *lib. xiv, cap. xi, pag. m.* 55.

(87) Id. ibid. *pag.* 59.

would not allow any other cauſe of unhappineſs beſides imprudence [*L*].

propoſed to him? All thoſe to whom he relates the queſtions, aſk why he did not make ſuch an anſwer? He is immediately convinced that he ſhould have done it. He owns it; he is ſurprized that he did not think of it; he proteſts that on all other occaſions this idea muſt neceſſarily have occurred to him, ſo natural does he find it, ſo eaſy, and exactly conformable to common ſenſe. Nevertheleſs, he is convinced that he did not in the leaſt think of it, and that even the moſt confuſed notion of it never reached his thoughts. Why will you not allow him to believe that his ill fortune preſided over this forgetfulneſs, and purpoſely directed it? Our divines do not deny that providence ſometimes blinds men, with reſpect to omiſſions, as well as with regard to actual judgment. Plutarch would never allow this doctrine, for he very ſtrongly recommends to thoſe who read the poets, the rectifying of all thoſe paſſages which repreſent the gods deceiving us, and inſtigating us to evil. He particularly warns us of theſe verſes in Euripides (88), thus tranſlated by Amyot:

Les Dieux puiſſans trop plus que nous ne ſommes,
Vont abuſant nous autres povres hommes
Par pluſieurs tours de ruſe trompereſſe.

The gods, whoſe nature pow'r ſuperior knows,
By various frauds on man's weak mind impoſe.

He is ſo far from owning that a divine power influences us to chooſe the wrong way, while at the ſame time we know the right way, that he would have us aſcribe it to a brutal paſſion.

Αἶ αἶ τόδ' ἤδη θεῖον ἀνθρώποις κακὸν,
Ὅ τάν τις εἰδῇ ταγαθὸν, χρῆται δὲ μή.

θηριῶδες μὲν ὂν, καὶ ἄλογον, καὶ οἰκτρὸν, εἰδότα τὸ βέλτιον, ὑπὸ τοῦ χείρονος ἐξ ἀκρασίας καὶ μαλακίας ἄγεσθαι.

Eheu, malum mortalibus divinitus
Venit, ut bonum videant, non utantur tamen:

Immò verò belluinum, non divinum eſt hoc malum, & brutum ac miſerabile, melius videntem intemperantia & molitie ad deterius rapi (89).

Alas! From heav'n to man all ill enſues,
We ſee the good, but want the pow'r to chuſe.

So far is this from being true, that evil is beaſtly, brutiſh, and wretched, inſtead of heavenly, and it is our intemperance and folly that hurry us away to ill, while the good is full in our view. But how ſolid ſoever theſe reflexions of Plutarch may be in ſome reſpects, we ought always to remember, that our Theology, and the univerſal language of all Chriſtians, founded on all paſſages of holy writ, lay it down as a certain truth, that the blindneſs of man, his raſhneſs, folly, and cowardice, are frequently the effect of a particular providence, which inflicts them on him as a puniſhment; and that his prudence, his wiſe anſwers to queſtions, his reſolution, and his underſtanding are favours inſpired by providence, in order to his preſervation and proſperity. The heathens were not ignorant of this doctrine; for we find that Manlius declared to the Roman citizens, that if the gods prevented his ruin, it would not be by deſcending on earth, but by inſpiring the Romans with a wiſe reſolution, as they had inſpired him with that valour and courage which ſaved the Republic: 'Benè facitis quòd abominamini; dii 'prohihebunt hæc: ſed nunquam propter me de cœlo 'deſcendent: vobis dent mentem oportet, ut prohibeatis: ſicut mihi dederunt armato togatoque, ut 'vos à barbaris hoſtibus, à ſuperbis defenderem civibus '(90). - - - - *You do well in declaring your abhorrence: 'the gods will prevent theſe meaſures; but they will 'never deſcend from heaven for my ſake: let them give 'you the courage to prevent them; as they did me, both 'armed and unarmed, to preſerve you from barbarian 'enemies, and haughty fellow-citizens.*'

I cannot conclude without obſerving, that if on the one ſide, we call that ill fortune, which is ſometimes the natural conſequence of imprudence; on the other ſide, we name that good fortune, which is ſometimes the reſult of prudence. We have ſeen ſome men ſo raſh in their conduct, that there was no room to doubt but that it would end in ſome cruel mortification; they attacked and fell foul of all the world, and if the firſt engagement diſcovered them to be wrong-headed, the following were only a long train of raſh, irregular and violent ſallies. According to all rules, theſe men ought to have been ſhamefully cruſhed, and nevertheleſs we have ſeen them triumph, or at leaſt retire from the battle without any mark of diſhonour. This is a great piece of good fortune, ſay ſome. But it is certain that ſome ſtratagem, ſome refined ſtroke of policy, had a greater ſhare in this good ſucceſs than fortune. Theſe pretended raſh men had taken their meaſures long before hand, with a great deal of prudence; they had rendred themſelves neceſſary to thoſe who were capable of extricating them out of every embaraſſment. They had found the ſecret of being ſubſervient either to their private pleaſures or ambition. The circumſtances of the times favoured them; the trade of directing ſpies or ſome other ſecret ſervice was of extraordinary uſe. They were ſure of ſucceeding in their unreaſonable quarrels; they did not therefore act raſhly.

[*L*] *Cardinal Richelieu . . . . . would not allow any other cauſe of unhappineſs than imprudence.*] Mr Auberi informs us of this particular. He ſays that Cardinal Richelieu, and the Duke d'Olivarez two prime Miniſters, the one of France, the other of Spain, were rivals and antagoniſts, (91) that *their power was much of an equal duration; that they were compared to two ſtars of the firſt, or at leaſt of the ſecond, magnitude; which drew on them the eyes, the eſteem, and admiration, of all Chriſtendom.* That the *Cardinal was firſt eclipſed by a natural death, the* 4*th of December* 1642. *And that the other enjoyed the advantage of ſhining alone, not above five or ſix weeks, being diſgraced the* 17*th of January* 1643. *The motive or pretext of his diſgrace, was the ill ſucceſs which accompanied all his enterprizes. This was in effect accuſing him of imprudence. In Cardinal Richelieu's opinion, imprudent and unfortunate are but two words to expreſs the ſame thing* (92). *Thus he willingly put in practice one of his moſt conſtant maxims which was, to give it you in his own terms* (93), '*That in ſtate-affairs it is impoſſible to be 'over-cautious, or to look out for too great ſecurity. 'That a ſtateſman, if he can, ought always to have 'two ſtrings to his bow; that to ſucceed he ought not 'to take too exact meaſures, but that in order to do 'much, he ought to exert himſelf, and make preparation for doing yet more: that in a word, in all important affairs, if he did not take thoſe meaſures 'which ſeemed too extenſive in Theory, he would always 'find them too ſhort in Practice.*' It is hard to believe, that the Cardinal, on occaſion of the failure of ſucceſs in ſome of his enterprizes, never acknowledged that he had, notwithſtanding, taken all thoſe meaſures which prudence could ſuggeſt. If therefore on ſuch occaſions he thought himſelf guilty of ſome imprudence, he extended the idea of prudence beyond its true bounds; for if he believed that thoſe, who truſt a man who deceives them, are imprudent, he ſuppoſed prudence to comprehend the certainty of events which depend on free-will. But that is a palpable error. There are perſons who have given ſo many ſucceſſive proofs of their fidelity, and in ſo ſignal a manner that one may truſt them in an important affair, without the leaſt ſhadow of imprudence. And yet they diſcharge their duty very ill, they begin their treachery on this occaſion, and betray their truſt. It would be requiring a more than human knowledge from a prime Miniſter, to pretend that he has raſhly and imprudently relied on this man (94), that it is not his miſfortune but his fault if the affair has miſcarried, ſince he ought to have been aware of the inward change of this perſon. You ſee then that this queſtion is liable to ſeveral equivocations or diſputes about words. The ill fortune of an enterprize is always attended with ſome want of knowledge. If indeed you call this imprudence, and will argue in conſequence of this definition, you may fully and without reſerve maintain Cardinal Richelieu's poſition; but your definition will be falſe, and at the bottom you will agree with your adverſary.

(88) Πολλαῖσι μορφαῖς οἱ θεοὶ σοφισμάτων σφάλλουσιν ἡμᾶς κρείττονες πεφυκότες. Multis dii formis homines ſophiſmatum quod his potentia præſtant in fraudem agunt. *Euripides*, apud *Plutarchum de audiendis Poëtis*, *pag.* 20, 21.

(89) Id. ibid. *pag.* 33, *E*.

(90) Titus Livius, *lib. vi*, *pag. m.* 176.

(91) Auberi, Hiſtoire du Cardinal Mazarin. *livr. i*, *p.* 100.

(92) This is very different from the opinion of Garimberto, who maintained, *della Fortuna*, *cap. xviii*, that he who acts according to prudence, ought not to be called a fortunate man; and *cap. xix*, that no perſon is fortunate either by art, or prudence, or the favour of God, but by a natural impetuoſity raiſed in the ſoul; and *cap. iii, iv*, *lib. iv*, that fortune favours the bold, and is a friend to the preſumptuous, and very often to the raſh. See, above remark [*K*] of the article CHARLES V.

(93) *See the ſame* Auberi, Hiſt. du Cardin. de Richelieu, *livr. vii*, *cap. iv*, *pag. m.* 383.

(94) Compare what is ſaid above, remark [*K*], num. v.

TIMOMACHUS, a celebrated Painter, born at Byzantium, flouriſhed in the time of Julius Cæſar. He painted an Ajax and a Medea (*a*) which were purchaſed for eighty talents by that emperor, to be placed in the temple of Venus (*b*). The ſum is not inconſiderable, amounting according to Father Hardouin's computation to 192 thouſand French livres. Timomachus had not put the finiſhing hand to his Medea; which made it ſtill more valuable. Pliny juſtly admires this capricious taſte of men [*A*]. There are in the Anthology, ſome epigrams on this Medea, which Auſonius has tranſlated into Latin (*c*). This was not the Painter's maſter-piece; for beſides that his Iphigenia and his Oreſtes were not leſs eſteemed, his Gorgon was the picture in which he had diſcovered the greateſt art. I have collected ſome miſtakes [*B*].

(*a*) Moreri has aid very improperly, ſome pictures of a *Medea* and an *Ajax*.

(*b*) In Veneris Genetricis æde. *Plin. lib. xxxv, cap. xi.*

(*c*) Epigr. cxxi, cxxii.

[*A*] *Pliny juſtly admires this capricious taſte of men.*] If the ſketches of a great maſter ſhould be more valued than the finiſhed pieces of a mean artiſt, we ſhould not wonder at it; but that the perfect works of a great hand ſhould be leſs able to excite our admiration than his rough draughts, ſeems unreaſonable. Is pity concerned in this affair? Do we think it our duty to love theſe pieces, becauſe they have had the misfortune to loſe their author before they received his finiſhing hand? Perhaps we hunt after reaſons, which none are able to give. Let us therefore quit our ſearch; and only cite what Pliny has ſaid. ‘ Illud perquam rarum ac memoria dignum, etiam ſuprema opera artificum imperfectaſque tabulas, ſicut Irin Ariſtidis, Tyndaridas Nicomachi, Medeam Timomachi, & quam diximus Venerem Apellis, in majori admiratione eſſe quam perfecta (1). - - - *It is ſomething very uncommon, and worth recording, that the laſt works and unfiniſhed pieces of Painters, ſuch as the Iris of Ariſtides, the Tyndaridæ of Nicomachus, the Medea of Timomachus, and this Venus of Apelles, which we have juſt now mentioned, have been much more admired than thoſe that were perfect.*’

[*B*] *His Gorgon was the picture in which he had diſcovered the greateſt art. I have collected ſome faults.*] Read theſe words of Pliny, *chap.* xi. *lib.* 35. ‘ Præcipue ars ei faviſſe in Gorgone viſa eſt. - - - *His art ſeemed to have ſucceeded more particularly in his Gorgon.*’ Charles Stephens had cited the fifth book; Mr Lloyd has ſuppreſſed this quotation inſtead of rectifying it, and has added nothing to this article, but that Athenæus *lib.* 14. cites one Timomachus, who had written the Hiſtory of Cyprus. Moreri and Hofman cite no authorities. The article *Timoniachus* is left out in the laſt editions of Charles Stephens, tho' it remained in that of 1620, which was reviſed and corrected by Frederic Morel. It is ſtrange that this learned man ſhould not diſcover the change of an *m* into *ni* by a typographical error, had produced the pretended Painter Timoniachus.

(1) Plin. *lib. xxxv, cap. xi.*

TIPHERNAS (GREGORY) (*a*), a native of Tifernum in Italy (*b*), deſerves a very good place amongſt the learned humaniſts of the XVth century. He underſtood Greek, and tranſlated into Latin a part of Strabo. It is that which Guarinus Veronenſis had left untranſlated. Some tell us that Politian laid claim to the verſion of Herodian, of which Tiphernas was the real author; but this is ſcarce credible (*c*). The manner in which Tiphernas obtained the Greek profeſſorſhip in the univerſity of Paris [*A*] is very ſingular. You will meet with his Latin verſes in the *Deliciæ Poetarum Italorum* (*d*). He ſometimes bought his own proviſions, but he haggled in ſuch a ſtudied ſtile, that the peaſants did not like it [*B*].

(*a*) And not George, as Moreri has it.

(*b*) Leand. Albertus, in Deſcript. Ital. *pag. m.* 132.

(*c*) Taken from Paul Jovius, Elog. *cap. cxvii, pag. m.* 259.

(*d*) In Tom. ii, pag. 1171.

[*A*] *The Greek Profeſſorſhip in the univerſity of Paris.*] Theſe are the words of Peter Matthieu: *Emanuel Chryſolora's ſchool produced Gregory Tiphernas, who came to Paris, and preſenting himſelf to the Rector, told him,* that he came to teach the Greek authors, and demanded the recompence allotted by the holy decrees. *The Rector was a little ſurprized at the aſſurance of this ſtranger, yet commended his deſign, and with the advice of the univerſity retained him, and granted him the appointment he deſired. Hermonymus of Sparta ſucceeded him* (1). Gabriel Naudé relates the ſame thing, and makes uſe of it to prove the diſpoſition of Lewis the XI, to protect learned men. *We may judge*, ſays he (2), *by Philelphus's epiſtle cited in the preceding chapter .... how he conſtantly encouraged the Conſtantinopolitan Greeks, who came to Paris, to reſide there, and continue the courſe of their ſtudies in hopes of his liberality. Gregory Tiphernas was the firſt who made way for the reſt* (3), *who being arrived at Paris preſented himſelf to the Rector, &c.* Naudé cites *Melanchthon in oratione de Capnione, tom.* 3. Several authors mention this paſſage of Tiphernas, and amongſt the reſt Sixtinus Amama, who obſerves, that he came to Paris about the year 1470, and informed the Rector of what had been ordered by the council of Vienne: he did not forget to ſay that the univerſity of Paris was expreſsly mentioned in the decrees of that council (4).

[*B*] *He haggled in ſuch a ſtudied ſtile that the peaſants did not like it.*] Jovianus Pontanus, who was his diſciple, tells the ſtory in this manner: ‘ Gregorius Typhernas quo præceptore Græcis in literis uſus ſum adoleſcens, ad forum acceſſerat rerum venalium, dumque ruſticano cum homine non poteſt de mercimonio convenire, ſermone enim cum illo nimis compoſito utebatur, ibi ego qui rem perpendiſſem, converſus ad ruſticum, &c (5). - - - *Gregory Typhernas who taught me Greek in my youth, went one day to market to buy ſome things, but could not agree with a countryman about the price of them, becauſe he ſpoke to him in too affected a language, which perceiving I turned to the peaſant, &c.*’

(1) Peter Matthieu, Hiſtoire de Louïs XI, *livr xi, pag. m.* 734, 735.

(2) Naudé, additions to the Hiſtory of Lewis XI, *pag.* 185.

(3) One may infer from theſe words of Naudé, that he believed Tiphernas was a Greek.

(4) *See* Sixtinus Amama, in Parænefi de excitandis SS. Linguarum ſtudiis, *pag.* 197, *of his* Antibarbarus Biblicus, *Edit.* 1628.

(5) Jovian. Pontanus, de Sermone, *lib. v, cap. i, pag. m.* 1704, 1705.

TYPOTIUS (JAMES), you will find in Moreri what Mr Teſſier has already publiſhed concerning this Flemiſh Civilian (*a*). I ſhall correct ſome things in that account (*b*), and only add that Typotius was guilty of ſuch ill actions, and of writing a book in which he defamed ſo many perſons of quality in Sweden (*c*), that he narrowly eſcaped a capital puniſhment. He in particular abuſed the illuſtrious Pontus de la Gardie [*A*], whom he had accompanied in his embaſſy to Rome (*d*). The indignation of John

(*a*) Teiſſier, additions to the Elogies out of Thuanus, *Tom. ii, pag.* 3[illegible]3, *Edit.* 1696.

(*b*) See the remark [*C*].

(*c*) See the remark [*A*].

(*d*) See the Life of this Pontus, publiſhed in the year 1690, by Claudius Arrhenius Oernhielm, *pag.* 165.

[*A*] *He abuſed ..... Pontus de la Gardie.*] He accuſed him of gaining the favour of Eric King of Sweden by delivering to him the fortreſs of Wardberg which belonged to Denmark. He ſuppoſes that Pontus was in the ſervice of his Daniſh Majeſty at that time, which was in the year 1565. Mr Oernhielm refutes this accuſation by the paſſport which that King gave to la Gardie, March the 16th 1571. La Gardie being in the Swediſh ſervice was taken by the Danes in a battle in which the latter were victorious in the year 1569. He was detained in priſon till the peace was concluded on the 13th of December 1570, and ratified on the 16th of March 1571. The King of Denmark gave him a very honourable paſſport, which he would

John III, King of Sweden, againſt this author, clearly appears from his anſwer to a letter, requeſting him to releaſe Typotius from his impriſonment [*B*]. He would not grant him this favour; the priſoner was not diſcharged till after the death of that prince; and having been again received into favour for ſome time, he found the face of affairs changed (*e*), and retired to the imperial court. He did not die in the year 1604, as Thuanus relates, but ſome time before. There is ſomething elſe to be rectified in his article [*C*].

not have done if he had looked upon him as a traitor. ‘Non aliunde melius dilucet Typotiani mendacii vanitas, quâ, ut ſuperius indicavimus, nugatur, apud Ericum Sueonum Regem PONTUM captâſſe locum gratiæ, proditâ ei Wardbergenſi arce. Si ſic ſe res habuiſſet, quomodò potuiſſet Fridericus Rex, ſponte nullaque adactus neceſſitate, rerum ſibi cariſſimarum proditorem, cari dilectique ſibi Equitis nomine compellare? Quis unquam Regum, arcium, terrarum copiarumque ſuarum proditorem, dignatus eſt nomine tam honorifico, ac non potius quovis, pro atrocitate facti, proſcidit non injuſto convitio? Cur non æquam tanto facinori mercedem retulit? Cur alia omnia de ſe meritum, mancipio jam ſibi etiam traditum, non benignè tantum toto captivitatis tempore habuit Rex, ſed etiam redintegratâ cum Suecis pace, honoris gratiæque pleniſſimis literis ſecurum redire fecit in Sueciam (1)? - - - *Nothing can more evidently diſplay Typotius's falſhood, which as we have before-mentioned, he invented againſt Pontus, by affirming that he had ingratiated himſelf with Eric King of Sweden, by betraying the caſtle of Wardberg to him. If it had been ſo, how could King Frederic, of his own accord, and without any neceſſity, call one who had been a traitor in delivering up ſo valuable a place, his dearly beloved knight? What King ever honoured with ſuch an apellation, the betrayer of his fortreſſes, dominions, and forces, or rather would not have given him the character due to his treachery? Why did he not reward him according to his villany? Why when he deſerved ſo ill at his hands, and was delivered up to him, did the King not only treat him kindly during his confinement, but alſo after concluding a peace with the Swedes, gave him a paſſport full of very honourable and gracious expreſſions.*’ The author I am citing gives the very words of the paſſport, tranſlated out of the original into Latin A little before, he had told us that Typotius ſpoke very ill of Pontus de la Gardie's extraction, which, continues he, is not to be wondered at; for this writer had aſſurance enough to calumniate even the Kings of Sweden themſelves. He obſerves that this ſatirical piece had been lately reprinted by the care of ſome malicious perſons. ‘Quæ paulo liberaliore manu adduci à me oportuit, ut famoſum libellum Jacobi Typotii venenati convincerem mendacii, quo ille, ſuggerente veteri quodam congerrone Ægidio, ut ipſe fatetur, homine ignoto ac terræ filio, natalibus, vitæ famæque PONTI adſpergere voluit labem, quam fœdiſſimam conſcivit ſibi ipſi, typis committens fuco dictionis pictas livoriſque plenas calumnias. Sed quid mirum eſt, allatraſſe eum genus & famam PONTI, qui ne Regibus quidem, aut ulli Suecicæ gentis honeſto viro ſatis fuit æquus? Etenim, in monſtroſo illo ingenii fœtu, recuſo nuper à malevolis, nefandi in bonorum famam ſceleris conſciis, atque ideò nec loci nec editoris nomen proferre auſis, debacchatur in Ericum ipſum & Johannem Reges, adeò non parcit aliis viris illuſtribus ex ordine Equeſtri, quorum glorioſa ſemper fuit, ac deinceps erit apud poſteros memoria. Quin imo, in religionem, & nationem ipſam, cujus, ut Pontificius è Belgio ſacrificulus, flagrabat odio, ſtolidè nonnunquam invehitur (2). -- *This I thought myſelf obliged to particularize more fully, that I might convict Typotius's ſcandalous libel of a malicious lie, with which, upon the authority of one Giles an old companion, as he himſelf confeſſes, a man of no family or conſideration, he intended to aſperſe the life and reputation of Pontus, but has in reality drawn a much greater reflexion upon himſelf, by committing to the Preſs ſuch invidious calumnies coloured over with fine expreſſions. But what need we wonder that he ſhould carp at the fame and family of Pontus, who has never done juſtice to any gentleman of the Swediſh nation, nor even to the Kings themſelves. For in that monſtrous production of wit, lately reprinted by ſome malicious perſons, conſcious of a wicked deſign againſt the reputation of the innocent, and therefore not daring to name either the place or the publiſher, he inveighs againſt both King Eric and John, and does not ſpare other illuſtrious perſons of the Equeſtrian order, whoſe memory has and will be to lateſt poſterity always glorious. Nay he even ſometimes exclaims very fooliſhly againſt their religion and nation, to which as a Popiſh Maſs Prieſt of Flemiſh extract he bore the utmoſt hatred.*’ For this ſatirical boldneſs, adds he, and other crimes, Typotius was condemned to death, which he had certainly ſuffered if the King of Denmark had not interceded for him; but tho' the interceſſion of that Prince ſaved his life, it did not protect him from an ignominious baniſhment. *Ob quæ, aliaque * facinora, damnatus hic fuit capitis, luiſſetque factis dignum ſupplicium, niſi interceſſio Regis Daniæ interveniſſet, quæ quidem à meritâ morte illum liberavit, ſed non ab ignominioſâ ex hoc regno Relegatione* (3).

[*B*] *His anſwer to a letter requeſting him to releaſe Typotius from his impriſonment.*] Frederic II, King of Denmark had written this letter to him: The King of Sweden's anſwer runs thus (4): ‘Quo minus (5) petitioni Majeſtatis Veſtræ in hac cauſa ſatisfacere poſſimus, facit magnitudo ſcelerum, quibus caput ſuum obſtrinxerat idem Typotius, quæ ſi æquè Majeſtati Veſtræ ac nobis nota fuiſſent, ſcimus, non tantum tributuram fuiſſe Majeſtatem Veſtram ejus deſideriis ac precibus, ut pro ipſo intercedere ſuſtinuerit. Etenim is homo eſt, qui virus mendacis linguæ, ſine ullo diſcrimine, in ſummos imoſque paſſim effundit. Inde eſt, quod non tetro tantum carceri mancipandum, ſed ultimo etiam ſupplicio afficiendum eum cenſuimus, in quem ſi quid mitius in poſterum decreverimus, id clementiæ noſtræ, Majeſtatiſque Veſtræ interceſſioni, non innocentiæ ſuæ debebit. Confidimus certò, majeſtatem Veſtram hanc excuſationem noſtram, ut juſtam & idoneam approbaturam. - - - *What makes me incapable of gratifying your Majeſty's requeſt in this caſe is the greatneſs of the crimes which the ſaid Typotius has committed, and which if they were ſo well known to your Majeſty as they are to me, I am ſenſible you would not have had ſuch a regard to his prayers and intreaties as once to have interceded for him. For he is a perſon, who lets looſe the virulency of his lying tongue, againſt high and low, univerſally without any diſtinction. For this cauſe it is, that I thought him worthy not only of confinement in a loathſome priſon, but alſo of a capital puniſhment: and if I ſhould hereafter mitigate his ſentence, he will owe it to your Majeſty's interceſſion, and my clemency, not to his own innocency. I do not in the leaſt doubt, but your Majeſty will approve this excuſe as very juſt and reaſonable.*’ This letter of the King of Sweden is dated the 17th of February 1583. Note that the King of Denmark interceded for James Typotius, at the requeſt of a perſon for whom he had a particular regard, and who was his Phyſician and brother to the priſoner (6).

[*C*] *He died* .... before *the year* 1604. *There is ſomething elſe to be rectified in his article.*] Thuanus's fault in placing his death in 1604 (7), has been obſerved by Mr Mollerus in his additions to Scheffer's *Suecia Litterata* (8). There is a book printed in 1602 (9) in which we find Typotius's funeral elogy by John Jeſſenius à Jeſſen, Phyſician to the Emperor. If Mr Teiſſier had been aware of this, he had corrected Thuanus's error. Some authors ſay that Typotius died in the year 1600 (10). We find in the Preface to the ſecond tome *Symbolorum Pontificum, Regum, & Principum Octavii de Strada*, dated the 15th of March 1602, that he died after having finiſhed the explication of the ſymbols of this ſecond tome. Theſe words, *Jacobus Typotius .... in aula Suecica diu fuit, Carolo Sudermaniæ duci ac tandem Regi cum Sigiſmundo Poloniæ Rege nepote tunc diſſidenti percarus* (11), are found tranſlated thus by Mr Teiſſier: ‘James Typotius ..... reſided a long time at the court of Sweden, where he was very much regarded by the Duke of Sudermania and the King, who had

(*e*) See the remark [*C*].

(1) Claudius Arrhenius Oernhielm, in Vita Ponti de la Gardie, *pag.* 19, 20.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 11, 12.

* Meſſenius Scondiæ Illuſtratæ l. VII, ad Anno 1581. A Ponto Typotius plurimarum convictus impoſturarum & calumniarum, carceri perpetuo adjudicatur mancipaturque, inquit, unde mirum non eſt, quod in illum in primis debacchetur.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Id. ibid. *pag.* 12, 13.

(5) That is, that Typotius ſhould be releaſed out of priſon.

(6) Vix evitato, Friderici II. Danorum Regis (cui Frater ejus Matthias gratiſſimus erat atque à cura valetudinis) interceſſione. *Jo. Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Schefferi Sueciam litteratam, pag.* 443.

(7) Thuan Hiſt. *lib. cxxxi, pag. m.* 1041.

(8) Pag. 443.

(9) *It is Tom. ii,* Symbolorum Octavii Stradæ. *See Mr Mollerus,* Hypomn. ad Sueciam litteratam, *pag.* 444.

(10) Witte, in Diario Biograph. Mollerus, ubi ſupra. Valer. Andr. Biblioth. Belgic. *pag.* 432, *ſays that he died about the year* 1600.

(11) Thuan. ubi ſupr.

‘ had at that time ſome difference with Sigiſmund King of Poland his nephew (12).’ This tranſlation is faulty; the Duke of Sudermania's chriſtian name ought not to have been ſuppreſſed, nor a King of Sweden been introduced diſtinct from this Duke; for it is viſible that Thuanus ſays that Charles was Duke of Sudermania, and afterwards King of Sweden. In this he was right, but he is wrong to affirm that Typotius was long in favour with this Charles. He ſhould have ſaid that Typotius continued a long time in favour with King John the third, brother to this Duke of Sudermania, and that he fell from it afterwards in a terrible manner, having been impriſoned and condemned to death, and obtained his life only by the interceſſion of the King of Denmark. He might have added, if I am not miſtaken, that after the death of John III, he was reſtored to favour, which he enjoyed under Sigiſmund the ſon of the ſaid John; but that he had no intereſt in Sweden when the Duke of Sudermania was created King upon the excluſion of Sigiſmund King of Poland his nephew; that he kept his ground during the conteſt betwixt the uncle and nephew, and at laſt retired when Sigiſmund's party was ruined. Theſe were, I think, the viciſſitudes of Typotius's fortune. I ground my opinion on what Valerius Andreas ſays in his *Bibliotheca Belgica*, that after the death of John III, he was ſet at liberty by Sigiſmund, and pronounced the inaugural oration at his coronation before the States of the realm. ‘ Mortuo deinde Suecorum Rege Joanne, ejus filius atque in Regno ſucceſſor Sigiſmundus III, annitente etiam Daniæ Rege Chriſtierno IV, *Typotium* priſtinæ mox reſtituit libertati: eique tum impoſita eſt provincia in ipſis Regni Comitiis Stocholmiæ Orationem illam, quam Inauguralem vocant, habendi, quâ Suecorum erga Regem ſuum fidei atque benevolentiæ cauſas diſerte expoſuit. Rege autem in Regnum Poloniæ, quod ei per electionem acceſſerat, profecto, *Typotius* à Romanorum Imp. Rhodolpho II, inter Aulæ ſuæ familiares adlectus, ac Cæſarei Hiſtoriographi titulo ornatus, Pragæ diem clauſi extremum circa annum ſalutis milleſimum ſexcenteſimum (13). - - - - *Afterwards John, King of Sweden, dying, Sigiſmund III, his ſon and ſucceſſor, being alſo encouraged thereto by Chriſtian, King of Denmark, quickly reſtored Typotius to his former liberty; and alſo gave him in charge to ſpeak the inaugural oration before the aſſembly of the States at Stockholm, in which he very learnedly explained the reaſons of the loyalty and affection of the Swedes towards their King. But Sigiſmund going to Poland, where he had been elected King, Typotius was invited to court by Rodolphus II, Emperor of the Romans, and being honoured with the title of his Imperial Majeſty's Hiſtoriographer, ended his days at Prague, about the year of our Lord one thouſand ſix hundred.*’ We find in the ſame *Bibliotheque*, that his *Orationes Genethliacæ ad Annam Sueciæ & Poloniæ Reginam*, were printed at Stockholm in the year 1594. The abovementioned inaugural oration was alſo printed at the ſame place in the ſame year (14), and he informs us (15), that he publiſhed the funeral oration of King John III, who died in November 1592. It was printed at Stockholm in the year 1594 (16). This ſhews that he was in a very good ſituation in Sweden after the death of that monarch. There is one thing not eaſily reconcileable in all this, which is, that very good authors affirm (17), that the interceſſion of his Daniſh majeſty ſaved him from a capital puniſhment, but not from the infamy of being baniſhed the kingdom. Frederic II, King of Denmark, interceded for Typotius either in the year 1582, or in the beginning of 1583. If on his account the puniſhment of death was changed into baniſhment, one would think it ſhould be ſaid that the priſoner was baniſhed in 1583. And yet we have ſeen (18), that Sigiſmund, the ſucceſſor of a Prince (19), who died in 1592, gave Typotius his liberty, and that Chriſtiern IV, King of Denmark, interceded for him. I am at a loſs to reconcile theſe two relations; perhaps, after the death of King John, Sigiſmund reverſed Typotius's exile, and recalled him.

Whilſt this is printing, I have met with a confirmation of my conjectures in a German treatiſe (20), ſome pages of which, relating to Typotius, I got tranſlated. I have there found a paſſage which makes me believe that Mr Ornhielm was miſtaken in ſaying that the interceſſion of Frederic II, King of Denmark, did not prevent this perſon from being baniſhed Sweden with infamy. This paſſage is contained in a letter from Zachary Palthenius to Typotius, and printed with a treatiſe of Typotius, at Franckfort, in 1595. Palthenius affirms, 1. That John III, King of Sweden, prevented Typotius's being entirely ruined by his enemies. 2. That Sigiſmund III, King of Poland and Sweden, reſtored this priſoner to his liberty. ‘ Quæ tibi ergaſtulum, aut, ut tu loqui ſoles, Dei gratia peperit, de fortuna & legibus, cum fortuna, quam liberatio, uti videre eſt, concepit, ego faſciis involvi, prodibuntque brevi in lucem. Felix infelicitas tua, quæ tibi veræ laudis, imo ſolidæ felicitatis principium exſtitit. Abſuiſti à familiarium commercio, doleo, dolet mecum litteratorum chorus, quanquam mœroris tui vehementioris nullum ſignum in libris tuis repererim, & tu Joannis III, Regis Sueciæ humanitatem ac clementiam prædicare ſoleas, ut per quem ſtetit, ne adverſariorum malignitate caderes. Sed cum abeſſes à tuis, verſatus es cum, quæ maxime tuæ ſunt, Muſis. Reſtitutus in libertatem à Sigiſmundo III, Poloniæ & Sueciæ Rege, huic enim ſecundum Dei, cui etiam ille cedit, miſericordiam, conſuetudinem noſtram refers acceptam, profers in lucem luce digniſſimos diverſi argumenti plurimos Codices (21). - - - *Thoſe works of yours,* de Fortuna & Legibus, *which your priſon, or as you are uſed to ſay, the Divine Mercy produced, I have laid together, and ſhall very ſhortly make them public. Happy is your unhappineſs, which has proved to you the foundation of real glory, and even of ſolid happineſs. You have been ſecluded from the converſation of your friends, which was a misfortune that affected not only myſelf but all the learned world, tho' I perceived no ſign of any extraordinary affliction in your writings, and you are uſed to cry up the humanity and clemency of John III, King of Sweden, as your ſecurity againſt being made a ſacrifice to the malice of your adverſaries. But while you was abſent from your's, you was preſent with the Muſes, which are moſt entirely your's. Being reſtored to your liberty, by Sigiſmund III, King of Poland and Sweden, for to him, according to the Divine mercy, to which he himſelf is ſubject, you aſcribe the renewal of our converſation, you bring to light ſeveral pieces on different ſubjects, which mav highly deſerve to be made public.*’ Mr Tentzelius ſays, that Typotius dedicated his treatiſe *de Fortuna*, printed at Francfort in 1595, to Sigiſmund III, King of Sweden, as he did his book *de Fato*, printed in the ſame year, and at the ſame place, to Chriſtian, King of Denmark; and that he ſays at the beginning of his treatiſe *de Fortuna*, that he had received many favours from King Sigiſmund, and that he had waited the return of that monarch at Calmar, and that his enemies prevented his going to meet his majeſty at Dantzic. You may obſerve that the Preface to this book was written at Wurtſbourg in December 1595. It is very ſurpriſing that Mr Ornhielm, Hiſtoriographer of Sweden, ſhould be ignorant that this man was honourably diſcharged out of priſon, and not by an infamous ſentence of baniſhment.

Here follow ſome miſtakes of Mr Moreri. I. He ſays that Sigiſmund, King John's ſucceſſor, gave Typotius *his liberty, and employed him in ſeveral affairs of the utmoſt importance.* Mr Teiſſier (22) has made uſe of the ſame words, quoting only Valerius Andreas, who ſays nothing of this kind, nor any thing farther than that Typotius being ſet at liberty, was appointed to make the inaugural ſpeech before the States of the kingdom. II. At laſt, adds Mr Moreri, like a faithful copier of Mr Teiſſier, *Sigiſmund being elected King of Poland, Typotius retired to the court of the Emperor Rodolph II.* This means, that Sigiſmund was elected King of Poland ſome years after he ſucceeded John III, King of Sweden. Nothing is more falſe; John III died in November 1592. Sigiſmund, his ſon, was not crowned King of Sweden till 1594, and he had been elected King of Poland in 1587. The third miſtake of Mr Moreri is in having fixed Typotius's death in the year 1604.

(12) Teiſſier's Elogies, taken out of Thuanus, *Tom. ii, pag.* 353.

(13) Valer. Andreas, Biblioth. Belg. *pag.* 432.

(14) Scheffer. in Suecia litterata, *pag. m.* 274.

(15) Typot. *lib. ii*, de ſalute Reipubl. *pag.* 122, *apud* Scheff. *ibid.*

(16) Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Sueciam litteratam, *pag.* 444.

(17) Mollerus, ibid. *pag.* 443. See alſo the remark [*A*], at the end.

(18) Above, citation (13).

(19) John III, King of Sweden.

(20) Mr Tentzelius's Conferences, *month of September* 1690.

(21) Zachar. Palthenius, Epiſt. ad Typotium, *apud* Tentzelium, Monatliche Unterredungen, *September* 1690, *pag.* 861.

(22) Teiſſier, Additions aux Eloges, *Tom. ii, pag.* 354.

TYRANNION,

TYRANNION.

TYRANNION, a celebrated Grammarian in Pompey's time, was of Amiſus in the Kingdom of Pontus. He was called at firſt Theophraſtus; but by reaſon of his tormenting his ſchool-fellows, his maſter Heſtiæus gave him the name of Tyrannion [*A*]. He was a diſciple of Dionyſius Thracius at Rhodes. He fell into the hands of Lucullus, when that Roman general put Mithridates to flight, and ſeized his dominions. This captivity of Tyrannion was not diſadvantageous to him, ſince it procured him an opportunity of rendring himſelf illuſtrious at Rome, and of acquiring great riches. Theſe he applied, among other uſes, to the erecting a library of above thirty thouſand volumes (*a*). He died very old, harraſſed and worn out with the gout (*b*). Suidas is miſtaken as to the time of his death [*B*]. I muſt not forget that Murena aſked Tyrannion of Lucullus, that he might have the glory of enfranchiſing a celebrated Grammarian. The reflexions of Plutarch on this occaſion are not improper [*C*]. The pains Tyrannion took in collecting books, very much contributed to the preſervation of Ariſtotle's works. The writings of this Philoſopher met with a ſingular fate [*D*]. It deſerves

[*A*] *By reaſon of his tormenting his ſchool-fellows . . . he was called Tyrannion.*] In the verſion of Suidas we find theſe Greek words, Τυραννίων ὠνομάσθη ὃς κατατρέχων τῶν ὁμοσχόλων, thus rendred, *Tyrannio dictus eſt quod condiſcipulos excogitaret, l.* ὡς κατατρέχων. - - - *He was called Tyrannion, from his tormenting his ſchool-fellows.* It is hardly neceſſary to acquaint the reader that *excogitaret* is a typographical error, inſtead of *exagitaret*; but we may very well ſay that Mr Moreri has not ſufficiently minded the title of his book; he gives his own conjectures for the tranſlations of the authors, whom he cites at the end of his articles. If he had writ a romance inſtead of an hiſtorical Dictionary, this liberty had been excuſable. No author had informed him that *Theophraſtus becoming proud of his ſcience, and deſpiſing his equals, was named Tyrannion.*

[*B*] *Suidas is miſtaken as to the time of his death.*] How was it poſſible that Tyrannion ſhould die in the third year of the CXXth Olympiad, as we read in Suidas, ſince he was not brought to Rome till after Lucullus had put Mithridates to flight in the CLXXVIIth Olympiad? Patricius (1) conjectures that inſtead of ὀλυμπιάδι ρκ΄, Suidas ſaid ὀλυμπιάδι ρπ΄. According to this, Tyrannion died in third year of the CLXXXth Olympiad. There is ſome probability in Patricius's correction; and yet it is certain that Tyrannion taught in Cicero's houſe, in the laſt year of the CLXXXth Olympiad (2); and as he took care to put Cicero's library into order (3); it is not very likely that he was then in the infirm ſtate in which he died, according to Suidas. What I am going to ſay is infinitely more concluſive, either againſt Patricius's correction, or againſt Suidas himſelf, if he ſpoke agreeably to Patricius's conjecture. When Cæſar was in Africa, making war againſt Juba, in the year of Rome 707, which was the ſecond of the CLXXXIVth Olympiad, Cicero and Atticus promiſed to meet one day, in order to hear Tyrannion read a book of his own compoſing (4); and Atticus was reproached by his friend for having heard it read without him (5).

[*C*] *Plutarch's reflexions on this occaſion, are not improper.*] Murena, ſays he, did not at all anſwer the generoſity of Lucullus; for, in ſeeming to enfranchiſe Tyrannion, he deprived him of his liberty. It had been much more honourable to have let him remained what he was. Theſe are Plutarch's words, in his deſcription of the ſacking of Amiſus, which Lucullus not being able to prevent, he repaired that loſs as well as he was able. Τότε καὶ Τυραννίων ὁ γραμματικὸς ἑάλω. Μουρήνας δ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐξητήσατο, καὶ λαβὼν ἀπηλευθέρωσεν, ἀνελευθέρος τῇ δωρεᾷ χρησάμενος. οὐ γὰρ ἠξίου Λούκουλλος ἄνδρα διὰ παιδείαν ἐσπουδασμένον δοῦλον γενέσθαι πρότερον, εἶτα ἀπελεύθερον. ἀφαίρεσις γὰρ ἦν τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἡ τῆς δοκούσης ἐλευθερίας δόσις. ἀλλὰ Μουρήνας μὴν οὐκ ἐνταῦθα μόνον ὤφθη πολὺ τῆς τοῦ στρατηγοῦ καλοκαγαθίας ἀποδέων. Eadem tempeſtate captus eſt Tyrannio grammaticus. Hunc Murena petivit à Lucullo, quem ut accepit, manumiſit eum. Verum uſus eſt eo munere illiberaliter, nolebat enim inſigni virum eruditione Lucullus prius ſervum fieri, inde libertinum. Quippe ereptio præſentis erat illa ſimulatæ libertatis donatio. Cæterum non hic tantum oſtendit ſe Imperatore ſuo Murena honeſtate imparem (6). - - - *At that time was taken Tyrannion, the Grammarian. Murena begged him of Lucullus, and having obtained his requeſt, manumiſed him, making but an ungenteel uſe of his preſent. For Lucullus did not think it by any means proper, that a man of ſuch extraordinary learning ſhould be firſt made a ſlave, and then enfranchiſed. For the ſeeming liberty which was given him, was, in reality, the taking away that which he had even then a title to. But this was not the only inſtance which diſcovered Murena to be far inferior to his General in generoſity.*

[*D*] *Ariſtotle's works met with a ſingular fate.*] This great Philoſopher left them, together with his ſchool and his other books, to his diſciple Theophraſtus. The latter left his library to Neleus, who had been ſcholar both to him and to Ariſtotle. Neleus cauſed it to be removed to Scepſis (7), and left it to his heirs. They being ignorant and illiterate, took no other care of this library than to keep it cloſe ſhut up. Παρέδοκεν ἰδιώταις ἀνθρώποις οἳ κατάκλειστα εἶχον τὰ βιβλία οὐδ᾽ ἐπιμέλως κείμενα. *Reliquit ineruditis hominibus, qui incuriè poſitos ſub clavibus repoſuerunt* (8). And being informed how diligently the Kings of Pergamum, to whom they were ſubjects, ſought after books, they buried under ground thoſe of Neleus. A long time after this, their poſterity took them out of their priſon very much damaged by damps and vermin, and ſold, at a great price, thoſe of Ariſtotle and Theophraſtus to one Apellicon, who cauſed them to be copied: but his tranſcribers very ill ſupplied thoſe places which the worms had eaten, or the damps defaced; ſo that thoſe books did not appear without innumerable faults. After Apellicon's death, his library was carried from Athens to Rome, by Sylla. Sylla's Library-keeper permitted Tyrannion, who was a great admirer of Ariſtotle, to take the writings of that Philoſopher. The Bookſellers cauſed them to be tranſcribed, but they made uſe of ignorant people, who did not collate their copies with the originals; ſo that the miſchief became greater at Rome than it had been at Athens. Thus far Strabo hath carried this relation, let us take the ſequel of it from Plutarch and others.

Plutarch (9) ſays, that Sylla having rendered himſelf maſter of Athens, ſeized upon Apellicon's library, where were the greateſt part of Ariſtotle's and Theophraſtus's works, then very little known to the public. He adds, that it was reported, that after Sylla had tranſported them to Rome, Tyrannion, the Grammarian, got ſeveral of them into his hands; and that Andronicus Rhodius having procured copies from him, publiſhed them, and made thoſe tables or indexes which were afterwards joined to them (10). Plutarch and Strabo agree, that for a long time the Peripatetics were unacquainted with the writings of Ariſtotle and Theophraſtus, and that the ignorance of Neleus's heirs was the cauſe of it. Strabo ſays expreſsly, that the modern Peripatetics ſurpaſſed the antient, becauſe the latter having but very few of Ariſtotle's books, and thoſe few containing pieces of the leaſt conſequence (11), were not able to philoſophiſe with profound and methodical exactneſs. But after Ariſtotle's writings were diſcovered, it was much eaſier for thoſe of that ſect to reaſon according to their maſter's ſcheme; yet they were obliged to rely much upon conjectures, becauſe there was an infinite number of faults in his works. This is Strabo's obſervation (12).

Athenæus (13) has a paſſage very neceſſary to be cited. He ſays that Neleus the poſſeſſor of Ariſtotle's library, ſold it entire to Ptolomy Philadelphus, who removed

---

(*a*) Charles Stephens, Lloyd, Hofman, Moreri, ſay only three thouſand.

(*b*) Ex Suida, in Τυραννίων.

(1) Diſcuſſiones Peripateticæ. *Tom. i, lib. iv, pag.* 36.

(2) Cicero, Ep. iv, *lib. ii*, ad Q. Fratrem. *It was written in the year, that Tullia was married to Craſſipes: it was the* 697 *year of Rome.* See Fabricius in the Life of Cicero.

(3) See the remark [*G*].

(4) Epiſt. II, *lib. xii*, ad Atticum.

(5) Epiſt. VI, *ejuſd. Libri.*

(6) Plut. in Lucullo, *pag.* 504.

(7) It was the place of his birth, and a town of Troas.

(8) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 413. Salmaſius, in Tertul. de Pallio, *pag. m.* 177, *proves by this paſſage that* κατάκλειστον *ſignifies a precious thing, which is carefully preſerved. Strabo inſinuates no ſuch thing. Beſides Salmaſius ſpeaks of Apellicon's heirs, whereas he ſhould have mentioned thoſe of Neleus.*

(9) In Sylla, *pag.* 468.

(10) Add to this the paſſage out of Porphyrius, *in Vita Plotini*, which I have quoted in the article of ANDRONICUS, citation (9).

(11) Theſe were called ἐξωτερικοὶ: The others which contained a more profound doctrine, were called ἀκροαματικοί.

(12) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 413.

(13) Lib. i, p. 3.

Whether the difference between Athenæus and Strabo, has been juſtly reconciled by Patricius.

ſerves to be mentioned, eſpecially ſince it relates to ſo famous a Philoſopher. They were in

removed it to Alexandria, together with thoſe books which he had purchaſed at Rhodes and at Athens. He obſerves, in the ſame place, that one Larentius, a citizen of Rome, under Marcus Aurelius, had made a larger collection of books, than either Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, Piſiſtratus, tyrant of Athens, Euclid, Nicocrates, the Kings of Pergamus, the Poet Euripides, or Ariſtotle the Philoſopher. Here are two things in which Athenæus contradicts Strabo. The latter affirming, that Ariſtotle was the firſt who collected a library, and who taught the Kings of Egypt how to erect one. Athenæus names ſeveral perſons who collected great numbers of books before Ariſtotle. He ſays further, that Neleus ſold all this Philoſopher's books to Ptolomy Philadelphus; but Strabo aſſures us, that Neleus left them to his heirs, who concealed them. The learned Francis Patricius (14) pretends to remove this laſt difficulty, by ſuppoſing that Neleus got Ariſtole's books tranſcribed, and ſold a copy of each book to the Kings of Egypt, and kept the other for himſelf. I allow that it was no very eaſy thing for Neleus to get ſo many volumes copied; but when I conſider Ptolomy's expences on account of his library, I cannot ſee any impoſſibility in it. What will not a man do, to furniſh himſelf with what he can to ſell to a Prince who pays well? on the other ſide, it is more than probable, that one of Ariſtotle's ſcholars, as he was, might be extremely fond of keeping his library, and there was no other way to ſatisfy theſe two paſſions, than to cauſe them to be copied. Voſſius (15) imagines that Neleus ſold his whole library, Ariſtotle's works only excepted. But beſides that this exception has no foundation in the text of Athenæus, how is it probable that the King of Egypt, buying Ariſtotle's library, ſhould ſuffer the writings of this great genius to be taken out? It was principally ſuch books that he wanted. I obſerve that Ammonius ſaith, that Ptolomy very carefully bought up the works of Ariſtole, and very liberally rewarded thoſe who brought them to him (16), but he doth not mention Neleus. The liberality of this King of Egypt was the occaſion of the fathering ſome ſuppoſititious pieces upon Ariſtotle. Ὅθεν τινὲς χρηματίσασθαι βουλόμενοι ἐπιγράφοντες. συγγράμματα τῷ τοῦ φιλοσόφου ὀνόματι προσῆγον. *Quare quidam ditari inde volentes inſcripſerunt libros nomine Philoſophi eique detulerunt* (17). Thoſe of other authors were aſcribed to him, in order to ſell them the dearer. What Patricius obſerves as to the other part of the difference betwixt Strabo and Athenæus, appears to me groundleſs. He pretends that Strabo ſays, Neleus was the firſt who erected a library, and that he taught the Kings of Egypt that art (18). But it is very evident, that Strabo ſays this of Ariſtotle and not of Neleus. If it be objected that Ariſtotle died a year after Alexander, when Ptolomy Philadelphus, the firſt founder of the Alexandrian library, was not yet king, nor even a king's ſon: I anſwer, that Ariſtotle might have taught people who lived long after him, the method of erecting libraries; for to do this it was only neceſſary to know how he placed his books. This therefore deſtroys the objection of Patricius, and, without doubt, is the true ſenſe of thoſe words of Strabo; διδάξας τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ βασιλέας βιβλιοθήκης, σύνταξιν; Ægypti reges bibliothecæ ordinem docuit. - - - *He taught the Kings of Egypt the method of putting a library in order.* I know very well that Strabo is greatly miſtaken in the place, where he ſays that he knows of no body who had collected a number of books before Ariſtotle Ἀριστοτέλης . . . . . πρῶτος ὧν ἴσμεν συναγαγὼν βιβλία. *Ariſtoteles . . . . . primus omnium quos ſcimus, libros congregavit* (19). He had forgot Polycrates, Piſiſtratus, Nicocrates, and Euripides, who, according to Athenæus's obſervation, had made a great collection of books. This is a great ſlip in his memory, I own it; but it ſeems eaſier for Strabo to fall into this error, than to think that Ariſtotle was alive when Ptolomy Philadelphus ordered his library. Patricius aggravates Strabo's miſtake, when he makes him ſay that Neleus was the firſt collector of books. He muſt then have been ignorant how zealous Ariſtotle was in buying of them (20).

Rapin's account examined.

Father Rapin very agreeably relates the adventures of Ariſtotle's works; ſome fragments of which narration I deſign to cite here, becauſe they deſerve ſome reflexions. 'It is pretended that Ariſtotle could not 'prevail upon himſelf to publiſh his writings, out 'of pure reſpect for Plato; becauſe he oppoſed his 'doctrine in ſeveral places. But this conduct diſ'covered more policy than virtue; he was reſolved 'to proceed with diſcretion, becauſe mens minds 'were as yet too much prepoſſeſſed in favour of Plato's 'opinions. Hence it was that to conceal his works, 'he intruſted them to Theophraſtus, with a ſtrong 'injunction againſt their publication, which was re'ligiouſly obſerved. So that Theophraſtus, who was 'the truſtee of them, Strato, Lyco, Demetrius Pha'lereus, and Heraclides, who ſucceeded one another 'in the Lyceum, taught Ariſtotle's doctrine only by 'tradition. This tradition not being ſupported by 'any writing, in proceſs of time grew cool, and diſ'covered nothing of that warmth which appeared in 'the other ſects. . . . . . Theophraſtus, that he might 'ſtrictly obſerve his maſter's order upon his death'bed, intruſted Ariſtotle's writings to the deareſt of 'his friends and diſciples, on the ſame conditions 'with which he had received them. The name of 'this friend was Neleus. . . . . He died ſoon after; 'tho' not without informing his heirs of the value of 'the *Depoſitum* which he left them. This they ſo 'well apprehended, that being informed the King of 'Pergamum . . . . was making very diligent ſearches 'after books and writings, in order to erect a libra'ry, they buried Ariſtotle's works in a vault built on 'purpoſe, in order to ſecure them the better. This 'precious treaſure remained concealed in that place 'for about one hundred and ſixty years, from 'whence it was at laſt taken, half eaten with ver'min, and almoſt entirely deſtroyed with the damp'neſs of the place. It was at laſt taken out in order 'to be ſold at a very dear rate to a rich citizen of 'Athens, whoſe name was Apellicon. . . . . The Pro'feſſors who then taught in the Lyceum, being in'formed of this, made their court to this citizen, 'who lent them thoſe writings for ſome time. But 'he took them back again in order to ſecure them 'in his library, which he rendered very famous by 'this important *Depoſitum*. Some years after, Sylla '. . . . cauſed them to be taken away and carried to 'Rome . . . . he died quickly after, and theſe manu'ſcripts fell into the hands of a Grammarian named 'Tyrannion, who underſtood where they were from 'his intimacy with Sylla's library-keeper. Tho' this 'Grammarian was a very learned man, and had col'lected a library of above 30000 volumes, after his 'being brought to Rome by Lucullus . . . . . yet he 'did not know the value of Ariſtotle's works. But 'after his death, Andronicus Rhodius being come to 'Rome, and being perfectly acquainted with Ari'ſtotle's merit, becauſe he had been bred in the Ly'ceum, treated with Tyrannion's heirs for theſe books, 'and having them in his power, he ſo earneſtly ap'plied himſelf to examine them . . . . that he was in 'a manner their firſt reſtorer. . . . . It was this An'dronicus who firſt made Ariſtotle known at Rome, 'about the time when Cicero, by his great reputa'tion, roſe to the firſt poſts in the Republic (21).

The remarks I ſhall make on this diſcourſe, may be reduced to the following heads. I. Father Rapin doth not cite one author who ſays that Ariſtotle intruſted his writings to Theophraſtus, *with a ſtrong injunction againſt their publication.* Strabo and Plutarch, who obſerve that this Philoſopher's books remained a long time unknown, aſcribe the cauſe of it only to the ignorance of Neleus's deſcendants; and we have already cited an author (22) who aſſures us, that this Neleus ſold Ariſtotle's library to Ptolemy Philadelphus. So far is he from ſaying that Neleus preſerved theſe books according to the injunction laid on him againſt the publiſhing of them. II. Father Rapin miſrepreſents the narrative of the author whom he cites (23); for it is not remarked by Strabo that Neleus did not die *without informing his heirs of the value of the Depoſitum which he left them*; and ſo far is he from affirming that they well underſtood him, that he ſays they left thoſe books locked up and in confuſion (24). It is true that Strabo adds they buried them, when they heard the Kings of Pergamum were collecting books; this ſeems to ſignify that Neleus had forbidden his heirs to part with his library: but, in ſhort, Strabo

(14) Diſcuſſ. Paripatetic. *Tom. i, pag.* 29.

(15) De Philoſophorum Sectis, *cap. xvii, pag.* 86.

(16) Ammonius, Prolegomen. in Categorias.

(17) Ammonius, ibid.

(18) Patricius, Diſcuſſ. Peripatet. *Tom. i, pag.* 35.

(19) Strabo, ubi ſupra.

(20) A. Gellius, *lib. iii, cap. xvii.*

(21) Comparaiſon de Platon & d'Ariſtote, *pag.* 371, & *ſeq. Dutch Edit.* 1686.

(22) Athenæus, *lib. i, pag.* 3.

(23) He quotes Strabo, *lib. xiii.*

(24) Οὐδ' ἐπιμελῶς κείμενα, incuriè poſitos.

in the library of one Apellicon: I ſhall ſpeak of him below [*E*]. Sylla rendring himſelf maſter of Athens, ſeized upon this library, and ſent it to Rome. Tyrannion having found means to inſinuate himſelf into an intimacy with Sylla's library-keeper, got into his poſſeſſion all the works of Ariſtotle and Theophraſtus which he could meet with. The ſequel of this has been ſeen in the article of ANDRONICUS Rhodius, and is more amply ſpecified below. Strabo was our Tyrannion's diſciple (*c*) [*F*]; as Cicero's ſon and nephew were alſo his diſciples at Rome. Cicero made uſe of him to put his library in order (*G*). Tyrannion wrote a book which Pomponius Atticus admired [*H*].

Strabo ſays no ſuch thing, and it muſt be left to the caſuiſts of Parnaſſus to inform us, whether it is lawful for an author to aſcribe to thoſe he cites, the conſequences, reaſons, and motives of what they have ſaid, ſuch as he fancies them to be. How do we know but that Neleus's executors were afraid that their Prince ſhould not give them any thing for theſe books, and therefore thought it more proper to reſerve them for a better opportunity? III. Father Rapin applies ſolely to Ariſtotle's writings, what Strabo ſays in general of all the books which Neleus left to his heirs. IV. Strabo does not ſay one word of thoſe Profeſſors of the Lyceum who made their court to Apellicon to borrow Ariſtotle's works of him for ſome time. He does not ſay that Apellicon having lent theſe books to them for ſome time, afterwards received them back; he ſays, on the contrary, that Apellicon cauſed them to be copied, and publiſhed them full of faults. V. No author ever ſaid that Tyrannion did not know the value of Ariſtotle's works. Strabo rather inſinuates the contrary by theſe words, Φιλαριστοτέλης ὢν, *he was a zealous admirer of Ariſtotle.* VI. Nor hath any one ſaid that Andronicus Rhodius came to Rome after the death of Tyrannion, and that he bought Ariſtotle's works of his heirs: on the contrary, Plutarch affirms (25), that Andronicus Rhodius received thoſe books at the hands of Tyrannion (26). If it was true that Andronicus did not come to Rome before the time mentioned by Father Rapin, he would not have found Tully in the beginning of his fortune, but at the height of his glory, recalled from his exile to the great ſatisfaction of the Roman people. The proof of this is drawn from Tyrannion's being brought to Rome in the CLXXVIIth Olympiad, where he became illuſtrious, enriched himſelf, collected a library of above 30000 volumes, and died very old (27). This was in the third year of the CLXXXth Olympiad, according to Patricius's correction of the paſſage of Suidas. Twelve years at leaſt muſt be requiſite for Tyrannion to ſtore up ſuch a large ſhare of riches and books at Rome. Now the third year of the CLXXXth Olympiad is the very year of Cicero's being recalled (28). But beſides, I have proved that Tyrannion was alive in the CLXXXIVth Olympiad, when Cicero was at leaſt aged ſixty years.

AN Inference very glorious for Ariſtotle, but which may raiſe ſome doubt concerning his writings.

I may conclude this remark with a reflexion which I find in Voſſius (29). It is no ſmall glory to Ariſtotle, that his works being ſo long unknown, were no ſooner come out than they out-ſhone the writings of ſeveral other Philoſophers, who had enjoyed a long and uninterrupted reputation. I ſhall add on my own bottom, that by a turn of fortune, the ſect which was deſtined to prevail moſt in the ſchools, happened to be that which for ſeveral ages found it moſt difficult to lift up its head, and riſe out of its obſcurity. Laſtly, I ſay that it is much more ſurprizing, that ſo many books of Ariſtotle are preſerved, than that we have loſt ſo great a number of them. It is true, there is room to doubt whether thoſe which paſs at preſent under his name, were the genuine iſſue of his pen. Voſſius rejects the judgment of *Cælius Secundus Curio*, who owns no more of Ariſtotle's works than the Hiſtory of Animals, the treatiſe of the world, and his Rhetoric to Alexander (30). But I am ſurprized that inſtead of alledging this Curio, he does not mention Francis Patricius, who has ſo learnedly diſcuſſed what are, and what are not, the genuine works of Ariſtotle, and has rejected a very great number as ſpurious. Ramus made the ſame attempt. Here is a paſſage which will inform us that he was not the firſt. (31) *Is it not ſtrange that Francis Picus* † *who ſucceeded as well in the learning as in the principality of his uncle, this great Picus, the phœnix of his age, has laboured by a long train of reaſons to demonſtrate that it is utterly uncertain, whether Ariſtotle compoſed any one of all thoſe books which are at preſent contained in the catalogue of his works: which was however confirmed afterwards by Nizolius* ⸸, *and ſo well examined by Patricius* ‡, *that after having given proofs of his ſurprizing diligence in enquiring into the truth of this propoſition, he concludes at laſt, that of all the books aſcribed to this genius of nature, only four, and thoſe very ſmall and inconſiderable, with reſpect to the worth of the reſt, are handed down to us free from ſuſpicion or controverſy, namely his Mechanics, and three others which he wrote againſt Zeno, Gorgias, and Xenophanes: when, on the contrary, Ammonius teſtifies in his commentary on the Categories, that in the magnificent library of Alexandria, they found forty books of Analytics, which all bore Ariſtotle's name, tho' he only compoſed four of them, the two firſt of which anſwer the nine cited by Diogenes Laërtius. This is to be imputed, as Galen obſerves* *, *to the emulation there was between the Kings of Pergamum and Alexandria, in liberally rewarding thoſe who brought them a book of any good author, and eſpecially of Ariſtotle, the better to adorn their libraries: before which time none of the antient books had ever been falſely intituled. This I would ſhew more at large, if it had not already been done by Patricius* **. See Gaſſendus (32).

[*E*] *One Apellicon, I ſhall ſpeak of him below.*] I have ſaid nothing of him in his place, but referred the reader hither: it is therefore juſt that I ſhould ſay ſomething of him in this remark. APELLICON was of Teos, but ſettled at Athens, and was there made a citizen. He was very rich and of a troubleſome temper. He applied himſelf to Philoſophy, and embraced the Peripatetic ſect (33); but he made it appear that his talent lay more in purchaſing the works of the Philoſophers, than in acquiring any knowledge of their opinions. Φιλόβιβλος μᾶλλον, ἢ φιλόσοφος. *Librorum amore tenebatur majore quam Philoſophiæ ſtudio* (34). He bought Ariſtotle's, and ſeveral other numerous libraries. He ſpared no coſt to buy rare books, and found out an expedient to rob the archives of the original decrees which had been antiently publiſhed at Athens. If there were in other cities any original pieces valuable for their antiquity, or very little known to the public, by reaſon of their being kept concealed, he took ſo much care to recover them, that he got all papers of this nature into his hands. The Athenians having diſcovered this robbery, had probably puniſhed Apellicon with death, if he had not made his eſcape. His friends ſoon occaſioned his being recalled. He engaged himſelf in the cabal of Athenion, a Peripatetic Philoſopher, who was become very powerful by a popular ſedition during the war betwixt the Romans and Mithridates. The confuſions then reigning in Athens, contributed on the one hand to the elevation of Apellicon, and on the other to diſcover that he was utterly unfit for command. Athenion ſent him commander to the iſle of Delos; but Apellicon obſerved military diſcipline ſo ill, and took ſo little care to prevent being ſurprized by the enemy, that the Romans made a deſcent into the iſle, without being perceived by him, and ſlew the garriſon while aſleep. Apellicon had the good fortune to ſave himſelf (35). He died a little before Sylla made himſelf maſter of Athens (36). I have already ſaid what he did with regard to the writings of Ariſtotle, and what became of his library. He was an author; he is cited (37) as a defender of Ariſtotle againſt the calumnious reports raiſed againſt him on account of this Philoſopher's intimacy with Hermias.

[*F*] *Strabo was our Tyrannion's diſciple.*] I have cited the place where Strabo relates this particular: but it is falſe, that he was his diſciple in his own country, and that he was his countryman. Pompa who advances theſe two errors, hath miſtaken Amiſus, Tyrannion's native country, for Amaſia the country of this famous Geographer (38).

[*G*] *Cicero made uſe of him to put his library in order.*] This is what he writes to his friend Pomponius Atticus

---

(*c*) Strabo, *lib. xii, pag.* 377.

(25) Παρ' αὐτοῦ (Τυραννίωνος) τὸν ῥόδιον Ἀνδρόνικον εὐπορήσαντα τῶν ἀντιγράφων. A quo (*Tyrannione*) accepiſſe Andronicum Rhodium exemplaria. *Plut. in Sylla, pag.* 468, *B.*

(26) Add to theſe remarks concerning Father Rapin, what has been ſaid in the article of ANDRONICUS Rhodius.

(27) Ex Suida.

(28) *See* Calviſius, *ad ann. mundi* 3893.

(29) Voſſius, de Philoſoph. Sectis, *pag.* 88.

(30) *Id. ibid. pag.* 87, where he obſerves that of theſe three works, the two laſt are not Ariſtotle's.

(31) Naudé Apologie des grans Hommes, *ch. vi, pag.* 101, 102, 103.

† Lib. 4. Examin. vanit. Doctrinæ Gentium.

⸸ Lib. 4. cap. 6. de recta ratione philoſophandi.

‡ Diſcuſſion. Peripat. tomi i. lib. 3.

* Comment. in lib. Hippoc. de natura humana.

** Diſcuſſ. Peripat. tom. 1. lib. 3.

(32) Gaſſend, Exercit. adverſ. Ariſtotelæos, *lib. i, cap. iv.*

(33) Athenæus, *lib. v, pag.* 214.

(34) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 419.

(35) Athen. ubi ſupra.

(36) Strabo, *ibid.* The taking of Athens falls on the CLXXIIId Olympiad, about the year of Rome 666.

(37) Ariſtocles Peripateticus, *apud* Euſebium Præp. *lib. xv, cap. ii, pag.* 793.

(38) Pompa in Ciceron. Epiſt. VI, *lib. ii,* ad Atticum, *in Edit. Græviana.*

Atticus. ‘ Perbelle feceris ſi ad nos veneris: offendes ‘ deſignationem Tyrannionis mirificam in librorum ‘ meorum Bibliotheca, quorum reliquiæ multo me‘ liores ſunt quam putaram. Etiam vellem mihi mit‘ tas de tuis librariolis duos aliquos, quibus Tyrannio ‘ utatur glutinatoribus, ad cætera adminiſtris (39). - - - ‘ *You will do well to make me a viſit: the admirable ‘ method of Tyrannion in ordering my library, is worth ‘ your ſeeing; I find the remains of it make a better ‘ figure than I could have imagined. I muſt alſo beg ‘ the favour of you to ſend me any two of your Book‘ binders, who may be aſſiſting to Tyrannion in adjuſting ‘ the covers, and other purpoſes.*’ He owns in another epiſtle (40) that the two perſons whom Atticus ſent him did wonders: ‘ Poſtea verò quam Tyrannio mihi ‘ libros diſpoſuit, mens addita videtur meis ædibus: ‘ qua quidem in re mirifica opera Dionyſii & Meno‘ phili tui fuit. - - - *But after Tyrannion had metho‘ dized my books, my houſe ſeemed as if it was animat‘ ed; in which your Dionyſius and Menophilus were won‘ derfully aſſiſting.*’

[*H*] *He wrote a book which Pomponius Atticus admired* (41).] Some believe it was a treatiſe of Proſody. They ground their conjecture on theſe words of Cicero: *Quid ex iſta acuta & gravi refertur ad τέλος* (42): Another paſſage (43) ſeems to import that Tyrannion pretended to Geography.

(39) Epiſt. IV, *lib. iv.* He wrote it ſoon after he returned from his baniſhment. Confer *Epiſt. IV, V,* lib. iii, *ad Q. fratrem.*

(40) Epiſt. VIII, *lib. iv,* ad Atticum.

(41) *Vide* Epiſt. VI, *lib. xii*, ad Atticum.

(42) Ibid.

(43) Epiſt. VI, *lib. ii*, ad Atticum,

TYRANNION, ſo called, becauſe he was the diſciple of the preceding [*A*], was firſt named Diocles. He was of Phœnicia. In the war betwixt Octavius and Mark Anthony he was taken priſoner, and bought by one of the emperor's freed men (*a*). He was afterwards given to Terentia, who enfranchiſed him. After this Tyrannion ſet up a ſchool in Rome, and compoſed ſixty-eight books. One of them was written to prove, that the Latin tongue was deſcended from the Greek (*b*). This Terentia had been Cicero's wife [*B*].

(*a*) His Name was Dymas.

(*b*) Ex Suida.

[*A*] *Becauſe he was the diſciple of the preceding.*] I do not know where Lloyd, Hoffman, and Moreri, have found that he aſſumed his uncle Tyrannion's name; for Suidas whom they cite, ſays no ſuch thing, and I cannot find it in the Paris edition of Charles Stephens 1620, nor in that of Geneva 1662.

[*B*] *This Terentia had been Cicero's wife.*] Though Suidas has not diſtinguiſhed the times, Moreri ought not to confound them. He ought not to ſay that Damas bought Tyrannion, nor that he gave him to Terence, Cicero's wife. He who bought the ſlave was called Dymas, and no body ſaid that it was he who preſented him to this woman. He ought to have named her Terentia and not Terence: and to prevent miſtakes, he ought not to have uſed an expreſſion which ſignifies that Cicero was then alive. He had been dead a long time: Terentia was neither his wife nor his widow; for he had divorced her ſeveral years before his death.

TIRAQUELLUS (Andrew) in French *Tiraqueau*, one of the moſt learned men of the XVIth century, was born at Fontenai-le Comte, a town of Poitou (*a*). I have but little to add to what Teiſſier and Moreri have already ſaid of him (*b*). I ſhall only ſay, that it is not at all probable he had ſo many children as ſome authors beſtow on him. They make the number amount to forty-five, and tell us that if he had drank wine, he had been yet much more fruitful, as well in the productions of his pen, as in thoſe of his bed [*A*]. He died very old in the year 1558 [*B*], Some have been much

(*a*) Ghilini, Teatro, *Tom. ii. pag.* 18, *ſays he was born at* Fontanablau Terra del diſtretto di Poictiers. - - - *Fontainebleau, an eſtate in the diſtrict of Poictiers.*

(*b*) Moreri has committed two faults, which I correct in the remark [*B*].

[*A*] *They make the number of his children amount to forty-five, and tell us, &c.*] Not long ſince, I read in a Theſis *de aquæ calidæ potu*, maintained at Helmſtad, under Henry Meibomius, in the year 1689, that tho' Tiraquellus drank only water, he was father of forty-five children, and author of as many books, on which occaſion theſe four verſes are mentioned:

Fœcundus facundus aquæ Tiraquellus amator
Terquindecim librorum & liberûm parens,
Qui niſi reſtinxiſſet aquis abſtemius ignes,
Impleſſet orbem prole animi atque corporis.

Learn'd Tiraquellus, tho' to water true,
Yet forty-five both books and children knew;
And had his fire not been by water chill'd,
His double offspring muſt the world have fill'd.

I dare aver, that the fact is ſtretched too far (§α). Thuanus could not have been ignorant of a thing ſo remarkable as this, and would undoubtedly have mentioned it, if he had believed it true: but he contents himſelf with ſaying that Tiraquellus beſtowed a book and a child on the public every year (1). Some other writers have particularized the number; but confine themſelves to thirty. *Tiraquellus was no leſs fruitful in the production of the children of his mind than of thoſe of his body; for in thirty years not one paſſed in which he did not give the world a book and a ſon, and if on the one ſide he extended his name and family by a large number of children, all excellent perſons, which he had by a virtuous wife, he acquired full as large a ſhare of glory by the great number of books with which he enriched the public; but what increaſes the wonder is, that he was thus fruitful tho' he drank only water* (2). Mr Teiſſier, who cites *Frey, admir. Galliæ*, confines himſelf alſo to thirty (3). Nor can we reach ſo far as forty-five if we regulate ourſelves by the common obſervation of thoſe authors who mention this; they aver that Tiraquellus had but one wife, and that all his children were lawfully begotten. I am not ſurprized that this fecundity ſhould appear more wonderful to thoſe who reflect that this learned man drank only water: but this perhaps might even contribute to his prolific virtue. His natural heat would perhaps have been inflamed to an exceſſive degree by the uſe of rich wines, and in this exceſs he had been leſs fit for generation; for we are told of barren marriages, by reaſon of the too great ſalacity of the parties (4). However it be, Tiraquellus's wife had no reaſon to fear the attacks of the wits, as ſhe might have done if ſhe had been but ſeldom pregnant. Her huſband was fond of his ſtudies to an exceſſive degree; his works loudly proclaim that he ſpent whole days among his books. His writings diſcover a prodigious reading, labour, and reſearches, which require a ſtrong application. When a man is known to ſpend the day in this manner, he is ſuppoſed to have exhauſted himſelf, and to require a great deal of reſt in the night; for

Quod caret alterna requie durabile non eſt,
Hæc reparat vires feſſaque membra novat (5).

Our living to alternate reſt is due,
This can loſt ſtrength, and wearied limbs renew.

It is imagined that his ſpirits are waſted with ſtudying, writing, and reading, and that he endeavours to obtain freſh ſupplies by a ſound ſleep, inſtead of undergoing new fatigues. On this account his wife is rallied in company, ſhe is pitied, and bantered with very unacceptable complements of condolence: but if ſhe can ſhew a houſe-full of children ſhe is ſheltered from theſe jeſts. As all things have two faces, it is certain that a married author buried all day amongſt his books and papers, may paſs either for an eaſy or troubleſome

[(§α) *Mr Bayle might have cited in this place, Beza's epigram, on Tiraquellus:* Eſt tibi natorum quæ computat agmina conjux, Eſt tibi quæ natos bibliotheca parit, &c. *Your wife with ſholes of lovely children teems, In books your ſtudy no leſs fruitful ſeems. &c.* Rem. Crit.]

(1) Æque ingenii ut corporis numeroſa fecundus prole, cum ſingulis annis ſingulos libros ac liberos reipublicæ daret. *Thuan.* lib. xxi, pag. 432, ad ann. 1558. *Sammarthanus, in Elog.* pag. m. 33, ſays in general *cum numeroſam ſobolem ex honeſtiſſima uxore ſuſceperit.*

(2) Pierre de St Romuald, Abrége du Thréſor. Chronolog. *Tom. iii, pag. m.* 324, *ad ann.* 1558.

(3) Teiſſier, in the additions to the Elogies, *Tom. i, pag.* 154.

(4) See, above, the remark [*H*] of the article HERLICIUS.

(5) Ovid. in Epiſt. Heroïd. *Epiſt. iv, ver.* 89.

much more guilty of Plagiariſm towards him than ever he was towards others [C]. I have elſewhere (c) cited a paſſage, where it is obſerved that he inſerted ſeveral obſcenities in one of his books.

troubleſome huſband. This is juſt according to the wife he happens to marry. If ſhe is a coquet and looſe, he is a very eaſy huſband; for whilſt he ſtudies twelve ho[illegible]or more every day, ſhe has free liberty to diſpoſe [illegible]er perſon agreeably to her inclinations. But if ſhe would do her duty, he is not in all reſpects a good huſband, he ſometimes obliges her to wiſh herſelf a book (6), he goes to bed quite haraſſed with ſtudy, and his head full of a chapter which he could not finiſh. The inconveniencies of this diſpoſition of body and mind are viſible to every body. Note that every thing has its exceptions: in reading the lives of learned men, we may obſerve a great many of them who had large families. The reaſon is that ſome conſtitutions are ſo ſtrong and hearty, that they are ſufficient for every thing.

Obſerve, that in order to juſtify thoſe who aver that Tiraquellus had forty-five lawful children, tho' married but once, we cannot ſuppoſe of him, what the Menagiana relates of one Blunet (7), who *had by his wife one and twenty chi[illegible]en at ſeven ſucceſſive births* (8), three at each time; for if this learned Civilian's wife had very often brought him two or three at a time, it would have been the principal circumſtance which authors would have obſerved. But not one of them has mentioned any thing like it; on the contrary, they have told us that Tiraquellus produced every year a book and a child. *Singulis annis ſingulos liberos reipublicæ daret* (9).

[B] *He died very old in the year* 1558.) Sammarthanus obſerves two or three times almoſt in the ſame page, that Tiraquellus attained to a very great age; but he does not ſpecify the number of years: if he knew it, he is to blame, for not intimating it to his readers. I will not affirm that he did not know it, for it is his cuſtom to neglect dates. He certainly knew that Tiraquellus died in 1558, and yet he has not ſaid ſo; he makes uſe of a long periphraſis to expreſs the time of Tiraquellus's death. 'Obiit, *ſays he* (10), 'planè ſenex haud multò ante quàm inter Henricum 'ſecundum & Philippum Hiſpaniæ Regem poſt varias 'bellorum offenſiones de pace tandem per utriuſque 'legatos ageretur - - - - *He died a very old man, not 'long before the embaſſadors on both ſides, after various 'hoſtilities, concluded a peace between Henry II, and 'Philip King of Spain.*' Mr Bullart makes uſe of theſe words of Sammarthanus, and explains them with reſpect to the time he believes they point at; but he has not ſucceeded it. 'Having attained to a venerable 'and decrepit old age, he piouſly exchanged earth for 'heaven at the end of the year 1559, juſt at the time 'when Europe ſaw the charming hopes of peace begin 'to appear again after a bloody war, which divided 'its moſt potent monarchs (11)'. A rare explanation! The treaty of Cateau in Cambreſis, which gave peace to Europe, was concluded the 3d of April 1559. The world therefore could not be in hopes of this peace at the end of that year. Hence, doubtleſs, Mr Moreri was led into the miſtake he has committed in placing this Civilian's death in 1559. He has been guilty of another fault which Mr Bullart might have helped him to avoid. He ſaith Michael de l'Hôpital wrote a poem *in honour of the Tiraquelli*, he ought to have ſaid with Bullart *in honour of Tiraquellus*'s writings (12). To ſpeak exactly he ought to have ſaid that Michael de l'Hôpital addreſſed one of his poems to Tiraquellus. For the reſt, Ghilini is yet more miſtaken than Mr Bullart, with reſpect to the circumſtances which Sammarthanus made uſe of: Ghilini, I ſay (13), believed that the year 1556 did but by a few days precede the peace of Cateau, betwixt Philip II and Henry II. It is a blunder, and falſity to aſſert as he doth (14), that the 23d of December 1556, was the day on which Tiraquellus died.

[C] *Some have been much more guilty of plagariſm towards him, than ever he was towards others.*] He accuſes Bartholomew Chaſſanæus of having ſtolen from his book *de legibus connubialibus* above ſix hundred pages entire, without making any alterations (15). *In hunc furti nomine vehementiſſime invehitur Tiraquellus cum* (16) *alibi tum in tractatu de utroque retractu* (17), *ubi dicit eum pluſquam ſexcentas paginas integras ne vocabulo quidem mutato ex legibus ſuis connubialibus in tractatum ſuum de gloria mundi tranſcripſiſſe.* Chaſſanæus had accuſed Tiraquellus of having ſtolen ſeveral things from Cælius Rhodiginus. Againſt this charge he juſtified himſelf, and accuſed Chaſſanæus in his turn. His accuſation is better grounded than that of his adverſary (18).

(c) Citation (14), of the ſecond article SANCHEZ.

(6) See Vol. ii, of the *Chevræana*, pag. 115, Dutch Edit.

(7) A mean citizen of Paris.

(8) Menagiana, pag. 327, *of the firſt Dutch edition. It is further ſaid that he debauched his maid*, who at nine months end was delivered of three boys.

(9) Thuan. *lib. xxi, ad ann.* 1158, *pag.* 432.

(10) Sammarthanus, Elog. *lib. i, pag. m.* 35.

(11) Bullart, Academie des Sciences, *Tom i, pag.* 220.

(12) Bullart, ibid.

(13) Ghilini, Teatro, *Tom, ii, pag.* 18.

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) Jacobus Thomaſius de Plagio Literario, *num.* 385, *pag. m.* 169. *He quotes* Speckh. Cent. I. qu. 88. n. 10. p. 376.

(16) Thomaſius quotes here ſeveral paſſages out of Tiraquellus, *in Leges Connubiales.*

(17) Thomaſius, quotes here, §. 1. gl. 9. num. 76, circa fin.

(18) *See* Thomaſius de Plagio Literario, *num.* 563, 564, *pag.* 249.

TIRESIAS, one of the moſt celebrated Soothſayers of antiquity, was the ſon of Everes (a), and of the nymph Chariclo, and derived his original from Udæus, one of thoſe (b) who proceeded from the ſerpent's teeth ſown in the earth by Cadmus. He was blind, for which ſeveral reaſons were aſſigned. Some ſaid that the gods, unwilling that he ſhould reveal to mortals what they deſired to conceal from them, ſtruck him blind. Pherecydes aſcribed it only to the anger of Minerva [A]. He ſaid that this goddeſs was ſo incenſed that ſhe had been ſeen naked by Tireſias, that ſhe put out his eyes. She was earneſtly ſollicited by Chariclo her favourite, and Tireſias's mother, to reſtore that unhappy man to his ſight. But not being able to do her that favour, ſhe endeavoured to make him ſome amends by perfecting his hearing to ſuch a degree, that he underſtood the language of all birds [B]. She alſo gave him a ſtaff, with which he could guide himſelf

[A] *Pherecydes aſcribed it only to the anger of Minerva.*] It will be very proper to compare this place of Apollodorus with a hymn of Callimachus (1), which ſays that Minerva having been ſeen by Tireſias, while ſhe was bathing her ſelf in company with Chariclo in the fountain Hippocrene, had no ſooner declared that he ſhould ſee no more, than he loſt his eyes. Chariclo was very much afflicted at this misfortune of her ſon. Minerva to comfort her, aſſured her, that it was an irrevocable law of the deſtinies, that all thoſe who ſaw a deity without her permiſſion, ſhould be ſeverely chaſtized (2); that a time would come when ſhe would be eſteemed a happy woman, for her ſons eſcaping with the loſs of his eyes. Minerva farther added out of her great affection for Chariclo, that ſhe would render Tireſias the moſt excellent ſoothſayer in the world; that ſhe would perfectly inſtruct him in the preſages taken from the flight of birds; that ſhe would give him a ſtaff which ſhould ſerve him inſtead of a guide; that ſhe would confer on him a long life; and that he ſhould be the only man, who after his death ſhould be eminent for his knowledge in hell, where Pluto ſhould particularly honour him.

[B] *To underſtand the language of all birds.*] Ἅπασαν ὀρνίθων φωνὴν ποιῆσαι συνιέναι: *Omnem avium vocem feciſſe ut intelligeret.* Methinks this favour of Minerva will not be underſtood in its full extent, if it be ſaid only that ſhe communicated to Tireſias a perfect knowledge of all the preſages which depend on the ſinging of birds: we muſt proceed further, and ſuppoſe that they meant that birds communicate their thoughts to one another by their notes, as men do by words; and that Tireſias received of Minerva the gift of underſtanding and interpreting this language of birds. It is thus, Porphyry underſtood the matter (3); for imagining that brutes have not only the faculty of reaſoning, but alſo that of ſpeaking to one another, he has ſaid, that Apollonius Tyanæus, Melampus, Tireſias, and Thales, underſtood and diſtinguiſhed the various languages made uſe of

(a) Moreri calls him wrong *Iverus.*

(b) They were called Σπαρτοὶ.

(1) Εἰς λουτρὰ τῆς Παλλάδος. In lavacrum Palladis.

(2) See an inſtance of it in the text of the article ADONIS, citation (g).

(3) Porphyr. *lib. iii,* de Abſtinent. *See the article* PEREIRA, *citat.* (32).

himſelf as ſafely as when he had his eyes. Heſiod tells the ſtory otherwiſe; he ſays that Tireſias having found two ſerpents copulating, he ſtruck them with his ſtaff (c) [C], and was immediately turned into a woman; that at the expiration of a certain time (d) he again found the ſame animals in the ſame ſituation, and reſumed the form of a man. Now as he had taſted the pleaſures of both ſexes (e), he was choſen judge of a diſpute which aroſe betwixt Jupiter and Juno, on the queſtion, whether women had a larger ſhare than men in the venereal pleaſure. Jupiter affirmed it, Juno denied it. Tireſias decided againſt the goddeſs Juno [D]; who was on that occaſion ſo enrag[illegible] that ſhe blinded

by animals. With regard to Melampus we are told (4) that ſome ſerpents having licked his ears whilſt he ſlept, were the cauſe, that when he awaked he underſtood what the birds ſaid as they flew over his head; and that afterwards he declared to men the future events he learned that way. ‘ Qui credit iſta & Melampodi ‘ profecto aures lambendo dediſſe intellectum avium ‘ ſermonis dracones non abnuet. - - - - *He who believes* ‘ *theſe things, will not deny the poſſibility of Melampus's being taught to underſtand the language of birds by* ‘ *ſerpents licking his ears.*’ Theſe are Pliny's words (5), who immediately after adds that Democritus mentions the names of certain birds, whoſe blood mingled together would produce a ſerpent, which would inſtruct thoſe who eat it to underſtand the converſation of birds. *Vel quæ Democritus tradit nominando aves, quarum confuſo ſanguine ſerpens gignatur, quem quiſquis ederit intellecturus ſit alitum colloquia.* The Jews and ſeveral Mahometans maintain (6) that Solomon underſtood this language (7). To return to Tireſias, I obſerve that if we will take Apollodorus's expreſſion to ſignify only, that Tireſias perfectly underſtood that ſort of divination, which was properly called Augury, (or divining by birds) we ſhall find in Ælian (8) that Tireſias became principally famous on this account. Barthius imagines that this is quite contrary to Statius (9); but that conjecture is only founded on the falſe ſuppoſition that this Poet has introduced Tireſias deſpiſing auguries. I ſay this ſuppoſition is falſe, to prove which, againſt Barthius, I need only quote page 1069, of his own ſecond tome on Statius, where he acknowledges that Tireſias declares, that the other ways of ſounding the intentions of the gods, had not afforded him ſuch a profound knowledge of futurity, as what he had acquired by the invocation of the Manes. Is it deſpiſing a thing, not to acknowledge it for the very beſt of all?

[C] *Struck them with his ſtaff.*] Others ſay, that he trode upon them: ‘ In monte Cyllenio Tireſias ‘ dracones coeuntes calcaſſe dicitur: ob id in mulieris ‘ formam verſus, ut Ovidius refert. Deinde monitus ‘ ſortibus in eundem locum rediit, & in figuram priſtinam (10). - - - - *On mount Cyllene Tireſias is ſaid to* ‘ *have trod upon ſerpents copulating; on which account* ‘ *he was turned into the form of a woman, as Ovid* ‘ *relates. Afterwards, by advice of the oracle he re-* ‘ *turned to the ſame place, and reſumed his former ſtate.*’ Before Lutatius ſaid this, Hyginus had told us, ‘ In monte Cyllenio Tireſias Everis filius paſtor dra- ‘ cones venerantes dicitur baculo percuſſiſſe, alias cal- ‘ caſſe, ob id in mulieris figuram eſt converſus: ‘ Poſtea monitus à ſortibus in eodem loco, dracones ‘ cum calcaſſet, redit in priſtinam ſpeciem (11). - - - ‘ *On the mountain Cyllene, Tireſias a ſhepherd, the ſon* ‘ *of Everes, is ſaid to have ſtruck with his ſtaff, other-* ‘ *wiſe to have trod upon, ſerpents in copulation, and* ‘ *for that reaſon to have been transformed into a woman:* ‘ *Afterwards being adviſed by the oracle he trod upon* ‘ *ſerpents in the ſame place, and reſumed his former* ‘ *figure.*’ The commentators are very much puzzled about thoſe words, *alias calcaſſe*; but why ſhould not *alias* be taken for an adverb, after which there is no need of imagining that a gloſs hath ſlipt out of the margin into the text. Hyginus might very well mention both, in order to comprehend both traditions: but if nothing be wanting in the two mentioned paſſages, we may juſtly be ſurprized that theſe authors ſhould omit ſome eſſential circumſtances. The firſt forgot that Tireſias met a ſecond time the ſerpents copulating, and renewed his firſt blow; he forgot, I ſay, that theſe two circumſtances were neceſſary, in order to reſtore him to his manhood; he pretends that he was only obliged to return to the place. The other forgets the firſt of theſe two things. Ovid (12) with all his prolixity likewiſe forgets it. Heſiod in Apollodorus hath omitted the laſt of theſe two circumſtances; he has not told us that Tireſias ſtruck the ſecond time. Phlegon and Fulgentius are the perſons who have remembered them both. But, on the other ſide, Phlegon hath his peculiar variations; he will have it, that Tireſias ſtruck one of the ſerpents the firſt time, and the other the ſecond; but does not allow him to have ſtruck them both each time (13). Euſtathius, and the ſcholiaſt on Homer (14), as alſo Tzetzes on Lycophron, ſay, that the firſt time Tireſias killed the female and became a woman, and afterwards killing the male he was changed to a man again; and that this happened on mount Cithæron (15), and not on mount Cyllene (16).

[D] *Tireſias decided againſt the goddeſs Juno.*] We are told that the better to give a judicial air to this deciſion, he took into his hand the balance with which juſtice is painted. He conſidered at firſt as a ſum total the pleaſure in diſpute, then he made the diviſion, and aſſigned to each ſex its lot or quota in weight and meaſure; and pronounced that the whole being divided into ten parts the woman had nine, and the man one.

Οἴην μὲν μοίρην δέκα μοιρῶν τέρπεται ἀνήρ.
Τὰς δὲ δέκ' ἐμπίπλησι γυνὴ τέρπουσα νόημα.

Parte una è denis mas partibus oblectatur;
At mulier ſolidum coitus capit ipſa decuncem.

One part of pleaſure is the ſhare of men,
Women enjoy the other nine in ten.

Apollodorus, who cites theſe two verſes (17), ſaid juſt before, if we follow the preſent miſerable ſtate of his Greek text, that the pleaſure being divided into nineteen parts the man enjoys nine, and the woman the other ten (18); at which Juno was ſo incenſed, that ſhe deprived him of his ſight. Two things ſhew that this place is corrupted; the firſt is, that nothing can be more flat or inſipid, and more remote from the deſign of the inventers of this chimerical diſpute, than to repreſent Juno as condemned for ſo inconſiderable a difference. I ſay nothing of the ſevere puniſhment which ſhe inflicted on her judge, for a ſentence ſo little diſtant from truth; for I ſhould be anſwered that her character is choleric, haughty, and revengeful (19), and that on this occaſion her reſentment exceeded the bounds of reaſon.

Gravius Saturnia juſto
Nec pro materia fertur doluiſſe, ſuique
Judicis æterna damnavit lumina nocte (20).

Juno too angry for a crime ſo light,
Condemn'd her judge to everlaſting night.

The other reaſon is, that Apollodorus would be utterly void of judgment, if after having related the ſubſtance of the deciſion one way, he ſhould ſoon after make appear by citing the words of the ſentence, that he had miſerably falſified it. If this blow may be warded off by ſaying that we have only a ſmall abridgment of Apollodorus, what ſhall we urge againſt ſo many other authors, who follow not his text, as we have it at preſent, but the two Greek verſes he has cited, as the expreſs ſentence? Phlegon (21) and Lutatius (22) admit exactly the proportion expreſſed in theſe verſes. The Scholiaſt on Homer (23) cites theſe two lines with a very inconſiderable alteration. Euſtathius (24) quotes ſome words of them. Lucian (25) does not much differ from them at the bottom. Fulgentius differs ſtill leſs (26); and the Scholiaſt on Juvenal leſs yet (27), explaining a place where this Poet ſays, that thoſe women who were moſt fond of manly occupations, and moſt avoided thoſe of their ſex, would not become men: the reaſon he aſſigns for it, blinded him [*E*]: But amends was made him by the gift of prophecy [*F*], which Jupiter

---

(c) See in the remark [C], how this fable is variouſly reported.

(d) Ovid is the only author, that I know of who ſpecifies the time: he makes it ſeven years.

(e) Venus huic erat utraque nota. *Ovid. Metam. lib. iii, ver.* 323.

(4) Apollodor, Biblioth. *lib. i, pag.* 46.

(5) Plin. *lib. x, cap.* 49.

(6) *Vide* Pfeiffer. Theol. Judaicæ atque Mohamm. *p.* 307, 308.

(7) Bonaventure Baron, *in the firſt Tome of the* Scotus defenſus, *mentions a Franciſcan Monk, who underſtood the converſations of animals, and by that means foretold things to come.*

(8) Animal. Hiſt. *lib. viii, cap. v. See alſo* Euripides, in Phœnic. ver. 846.

(9) Barthius, in Statium, *Tom. ii, pag.* 1065, 1149.

(10) Lutatius, in Stat. Thebaid. *lib. ii.*

(11) Hygin. *cap. lxxv.*

(12) Metamorphoſ. *lib. iii.*

(13) Phlegon, de Rebus mirabil. *cap. iv.*

(14) In Odyſſ. K, ver. 494.

(15) In Bœotia.

(16) In Arcadia.

(17) Apoll. Bibl. *pag.* 193.

(18) Δεκαεννέα μοιρῶν παρὰ τὰς συνουσιας οὐσῶν, τὰς μὲν ἐννέα ἄνδρας ἥδεσθαι τὰς δὲ δέκα, γυναῖκας. De novem ac decem quæ inter coëundum voluptatis partes capiuntur, novem mares ac mulieres decem ſentire. *Id, ibid. pag.* 191.

(19) Es germana Jovis Saturnique altera proles, Irarum tantos volvis ſub pectore fluctus. *Can Saturn's iſſue and Heaven's other heir, Such endleſs anger in her boſom bear?* Æneid. lib. xii, ver 830.

(20) Ovid. Metam. lib. iii, ver 333.

(21) Phleg. de Rebus mirabil. *cap. iv.*

(22) In Statium, *apud* Barthium, *Tom. ii, p.* 318.

(23) In Odyſſ. K, ver. 494. *Vide* Munckerum in Hygin. *pag.* 128.

(24) In eumd. loc. Odyſſ.

(25) In Amoribus, *where he ſays that according to Tireſias.* Ἡ θήλεια τέρψις ὅλη μοίρα πλεονεκτεῖ τὴν ἄῤῥενα, muliebris delectatio tota parte maſculam ſuperat. - - - *The woman's pleaſure exceeds the man's, by one part.*

(26) Tireſias dixit tres uncias habere virum amoris, & novem feminam. - - - *Tireſias ſaid the man had three parts, the woman nine.* Fulgent. Mythol. lib. ii, cap. viii.

(27) Una uncia libidinis eſt in maſculis, undecim in feminis. - - - *The men have one part, the women eleven.* Scholiaſt. Juven. in Sat. VI, ver. 253.

it, is the too unequal diviſion of the venereal pleaſure.

> Quæ fugit à ſexu, viros amat, hæc tamen ipſa
> Vir nollet fieri; nam quantula noſtra voluptas!
>
> *Inur'd to arms, and her own ſex to fly,*
> *Yet to be wholly man ſhe would diſclaim,*
> *To quit her ten-fold pleaſure at the game,*
> *For frothy praiſes, and an empty name.*
>
> DRYDEN.

I ought not to forget that Barthius ſeems to me very happy in his correction of the text of Apollodorus in pag. 319, and 1066, of the ſecond volume on Statius.

Some may aſk whether this pretended judgment of Tireſias, is ſupported by natural or moral reaſons. As for the reaſons deducible from nature, I refer them to the Phyſicians; who, in all probability, will find it very difficult to give a clear deciſion of this queſtion. And as for moral reaſons, I do not believe any ſtronger can be alledged, than that it is agreeable to a wiſe and bounteous providence, ſuch as that of God, to make compenſations, and to multiply the female pleaſure in proportion to the whole train of loathings, inconveniencies, and pain, which the women endure from their conception to their delivery. On this foot, the ſhare of pleaſure ought to be prodigiouſly unequal in favour of that ſex: but beſides that the law of compenſations would be attended with conſequences that muſt lead too far; it may be ſaid that God has thouſands and thouſands of ways of compenſation beſides this, ſo that nothing can be determined about any of theſe ways in particular. But the beſt morality of this fable is never to mention this pretended hiſtory of Tireſias, without adding, that it is falſe, as well in fact as reaſon. The neceſſity of this addition Brantome will confirm to you. ‘I knew, ſays he (28), a young lady, of a very good and great family, who was ruined and became a whore, by having heard her ſchool-maſter relate the ſtory or rather fable of Tireſias, who having experienced both ſexes, was choſen by Jupiter and Juno, to decide a diſpute betwixt them, whether the male or female enjoyed moſt pleaſure in the act of copulation. The judge decided againſt Juno, that the woman enjoyed by far the greateſt pleaſure: the goddeſs enraged at the ſentence againſt her ſtruck the poor judge blind. It is not to be wondered at, if this girl was tempted by ſuch a ſtory: For as ſhe had often heard her companions, or other women ſay that the men ſo ardently purſued that pleaſure, and took ſo great delight in it, and that the women, according to Tireſias's verdict, took a great deal more, ſhe therefore muſt needs try it. Such leſſons are, indeed, very proper for girls! Are there no other for them? But their maſters will anſwer, that they will know every thing, and if in the courſe of their reading, hiſtories or fables occur, which want explanation, (or explain themſelves) they muſt explain them, and muſt not ſkip them, or turn to the next page. How many ſtudious girls have been undone by reading this very ſtory, that of Biblis and Caunus, and ſuch like, in Ovid's Metamorphoſis?’

As there are ſome who have objected, that I was in the wrong to ſuppoſe that this queſtion ſhould be referred to Phyſicians, it is neceſſary I ſhould ſhew them that it has been in reality debated and diſcuſſed already in Phyſical treatiſes. I can juſtify this with ſo much the more liberty, becauſe my whole quotation will be either in Italian or Latin: *Queſto ſuo donare naſce dalla ſfrenata ſua libidine, e dal prendere maggior piacere nel atto venereo, che gli huomini non pigliano, e non ſentono: Come prova Avicenna nel libro nono, e venteſimoprimo de gli animali, & Hali Abbate nel ſeſto libro della ſua Teorica in queſto propoſito diſſe* Duplicia eſt in fæmina concubitus voluptas, quia præter ſeminis motum, & orificii vulvæ in ſuggendo quoque naſcitur oblectatio, vulva ipſa diverſimode mota; *il che conferma anco Galeno nel quarto libro* de morbis, & ſymptomatis. *E lo dimoſtra il giuditio di Tireſia, ſecondo i Poeti. . . . . . E lo confermò anco Pietro Aponenſe ſopra il decimo quinto problema d'Ariſtotile; benche Polibio in quel ſuo libro de genitura provi il contrario, facendo due voluttà: voluttà intenſiva, & eſtenſiva, voluttà intenſiva chiamando l'ultima, & eſtrema nel mandare fuora il ſeme genitale, & in queſta vuole, che ſi diletta più l huomo: eſtenſiva intende quella, la quale ſi piglia innanzi l'emiſſione nel maneggiarſi: & in queſta vuole ſi diletta più la donna, onde Gorreo Pariſino medico dottiſſimo nelle annotationi al libro di Polibio ſcriſſe le ſeguenti parole à favor delle Donne:* Tametſi maribus ſemen calidius acrius copioſiuſque ineſt, motuque ipſi majore quam fæminæ in coitu concutiuntur, pluſque multò caloris, & ſpiritus obtinent, quamobrem ex his major eſſe maris quam fœminæ videri poſſit. Verum in fœmina alia privatim conſiderare oportet, quæ inter præcipuas, & potiſſimas voluptatis venereæ cauſſas eſſe poſſunt. Si quidem ejus uterus magno virili Seminis deſiderio tenetur, ipſumque mirum in modum appetit, & attrahendo, ſugendo, concipiendoque impenſiſſimè delectatur, eſt enim ea in re uterus ventriculo ſimilis, ſicut enim iſte ſuavibus cibis, potibuſque gaudet, eoſque avidiſſimè amplectitur; ita ille ſemen amat, habetque gratiſſimum. *Mario Equicola nel quarto libro* de natura amoris. *Dice, che ſe ciò foſſe vero, che le donne haveſſero maggior piacere che gl'huomini non hanno nell' atto venereo ſempre le femine ricercherebbono i maſchi, del che (dice egli) ſi vede tutto il contrario* (29).

[*E*] *She was ſo enraged that ſhe blinded him.*] Apollodorus does not acquaint us in what manner: but Hyginus informs us that ſhe did it with her own hand, *Juno irata manu averſa eum excæcavit* (30). - - - - - *Juno in a paſſion ſtruck out his eyes with the back of her hand.* Phlegon's expreſſion may very well be interpreted, that ſhe did it with her bodkin, *κατανύξαι αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. She pricked out his eyes.* The ſcholiaſt on Statius adds, that ſhe cut off his hands; *illa irata manus ejus præcidit & excæcavit*; - - - *ſhe in her fury cut off his hands, and blinded him.* But he being the only author who ſays this, it is probable this place is corrupted. Barthius corrects it thus; *manus ei ſuperjecit & excæcavit*; - - - *ſhe laid her hands upon him, and blinded him*; and confirms this conjecture from Apollodorus, who ſpeaking of the puniſhment inflicted by Minerva on Tireſias, ſays ſhe did it with her own hands; *τὴν δὲ ταῖς χερσὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ καταλαβομένην πηρὸν ποιῆσαι* (31); *She laid hold of his eyes with her hands, in order to blind him.*

[*F*] *Amends was made him by the gift of prophecy.*] He acquieſced in this exchange; it does not appear that he regretted the loſs of his eyes: he is never introduced deploring his deſtiny; this had not been conſiſtent with decency, after the great knowledge which his mind was ſuppoſed to have received. ‘Augurem Tireſiam quem ſapientem fingunt Poëtæ nunquam inducunt deplorantem cæcitatem ſuam. At vero Polyphemum Homerus cum immanem ferumque finxiſſet, cum ariete etiam colloquentem facit, ejuſque laudare fortunas quod quo vellet ingredi poſſet, & quæ vellet attingeret. Rectè hoc quidem, nihilo enim erat ipſe cyclops quàm aries ille prudentior (32). - - - - - *Tireſias, the Soothſayer, who is deſcribed as a wiſe man by the Poets, is never introduced by them as deploring his blindneſs. But Homer having deſcribed Polyphemus as cruel and fierce, introduces him converſing with a ram, and envying it's lot, in being able to run and ſkip wherever it pleaſed. And in this he was conſiſtent, for the Cyclops himſelf was in no reſpect wiſer than the ram.*’ Let the Cyclops, let ignorant men believe that the loſs of bodily ſight, is the loſs of the joys of this world. It is true, that all the unthinking crew are not agreed on this principle, witneſs the two begging rogues mentioned in the XIXth Serée of Bouchet. They were at a church-door, *and could not agree what was the joy of this world; for the blind man cried out*, Beſtow your alms on a poor man, who has loſt the joys of this world: *The other raſcal, who by a faulcon-ſhot had loſt what ſhould have been in his codpiece, told him he lied, and averred that it was he who had loſt the joy of this world.*

We are told of a Princeſs who would have put it out of diſpute by condemning the firſt of theſe beggars. The ſtory runs thus: ‘A Princeſs of great virtue, who remained a virgin all her life, loſt her ſight in her piter beſtowed on him. He acquired a great reputation by his divining ſcience [*G*], notwithſtanding which he was ignorant that the water of the fountain Tilphuſa would prove fatal to him; for having fled with his countrymen [*H*] in the time of the ſecond Theban war, he drank of this water and died. This is what we find in Apollodorus concerning him (*f*). We ſee in Strabo (*g*), that the Thebans at that time fled for refuge to the mountain Tilphuſa, that at the foot of this mountain there was a fountain of the ſame name, and that Tireſias's tomb was there alſo. Pauſanias (*b*) agrees with Strabo concerning the place where Tireſias's tomb was ſituated. This was, I confeſs, not very far diſtant from Alalcomenium; but yet Moreri is very much miſtaken, when he ſays (*i*) that Alalcomenium *was remarkable for Tireſias's tomb*. We have given, in its proper place, the article of MANTO, the worthy daughter of this great Diviner, to whom ſhe ſerved as a guide, and was the ſtaff of his old age (*k*); for it muſt not be forgot that he lived very

---

(28) Brantome, Mémoirs des Dames Galantes, *Tom. ii, p.* 45.

(29) Giuſeppe Paſſi *of the academy of the* Signori Riccovrati di Padoua, & Informi di Ravenna, *in the* 33*d and* 34*th pages of a book called* i Donneſchi Difetti, *Printed at Venice* 1618, in 4to, it is the fourth edition.

(30) Hygin. *cap. lxxv.* Vigenere *upon* Philoſtratus, *pag.* 50, *of Tom. ii, in* 4*to, renders it,* Junon indigné de cela lui donna une arrieremain dont il demeura aveugle.

(31) Barth. in Stat. *Tom. ii, pag.* 318. *See alſo* Munckerus in Hygin. *pag.* 128.

(32) Cicero, Tuſculan. V. *circa fin.*

'her old age: being in that condition, a poor blind 'man was led to her coach-ſide, and cried out to her, 'My good lady, have pity on a poor man who has 'loſt the joys of this world: the Princeſs hearing this, 'aſked one of her women, *What is the matter with 'that man, is he then an eunuch?* No, madam, re'plied the waiting-woman, it is becauſe he is blind, '*alas, poor man! He is in the right*, ſaid the Princeſs, '*indeed I did not think of that*. The natural ſimplicity 'of this good Princeſs's queſtion pleaſantly enough diſco'vered her opinion concerning the joys of this 'world (33).' It is very probable that Malherbe would have decided the diſpute conformably to the opinion of the beggar, who had loſt by a faulcon-ſhot, *&c*. For, his weakneſs, in that reſpect, made him inconſolable, and he would rather have choſen to be in a condition to reap the ladies favours, than to obtain the higheſt dignities of the king his maſter (34). By the pathetic air of his complaints (35) one would be apt to judge that he had been more than once in the ſame diſagreeable condition of the pretended hermit, who, in vain, had the charming Angelica at his mercy.

Già reſupina ne l'arena giace
A tutte voglie del Vecchio rapace.

Egli l'abbraccia, & à piacer la tocca.
Et ella dorme; è non puè fare iſchermo;
Hor le bacia il bel petto, hora la bocca:
Non è chi'l veggia in quel loco aſpro & ermo,
Ma ne l'incontro il ſuo deſtrier trabocca,
Ch'al deſio non riſponde il corpo infermo,
Era mal'atto, perche havea tropp'anni.
Et potrà peggio, quanto più l'affanni.

Tutte le vie, tutti li modi tenta:
Ma quel pigro rozzon non però ſalta.
Indarno il fren gli ſcote, è lo tormenta,
E non può far, che tenga la teſta alta (36).

Racan, Malherbe's good and faithful ſcholar, had alſo his maſter's taſte; he would not have parted with the remainder of his vigour for all the triumphs of the greateſt conqueror's, nor for all the policy of prime miniſters. *I am not at all ſurprized*, ſays he, in a letter wrote to Balzac (37), *that N. hath adventured to cenſure your eloquence, ſince Mr de Malherbe has had the impudence to accuſe me of frigidity, when he himſelf is nothing but meer ice, and his laſt miſtreſs died of age, the laſt hard winter: In boaſting of the miracles of his youth, he plays a ſure game, there being none living who can give him the lie; as to my own part, I would not exchange the remainder of mine for the victories of the Prince of Orange, or the wiſdom of Cardinal Richelieu, and ſhould be very ſorry to change conditions with my accuſer*. Malherbe's raillery ran thus: 'As for paſto'rals, his caſe ſucceeds the beſt in the world, but 'certainly as to what relates to the ſhepherdeſſes it 'could not go worſe. This affair requires a ſort of 'application of which his lazineſs is incapable. If he 'attacks a place it is in ſuch a manner as to make it 'believed, that it would be only an incumbrance to 'him if he had it; and if he takes it, he ſo ſlightly 'keeps it that it muſt be ſuppoſed a woman has been 'very much ſurprized who has broke her faſt for ſuch 'a wretched morſel (38).' Malherbe does not here ſpeak of himſelf in the third perſon, as I once imagined: he ſpeaks of his diſciple Racan, and it is on this account, that Racan juſtifies himſelf, and inſults the other in the paſſage juſt now cited. But be it as it will, here is a couple of mean, carnal men, to whom Minerva could not have made amends, if inſtead of blinding them, as ſhe did Tireſias, ſhe had made them eunuchs.

I conclude with the thought of a Philoſopher, but a Philoſopher who was of a ſect more reprobate and heretical in their notions of pleaſure, than that of Epicurus. He had loſt his eyes, and hearing the good women deplore his condition, he aſked them, whether nocturnal enjoyments were not to be accounted pleaſures. *Illud Antipatri Cyrenaici eſt quidem paulo obſcœnius, ſed non abſurda ſententia eſt. Cujus cæcitatem quum mulierculæ lamentarentur, quid agitis, inquit? an vobis nulla videtur voluptas eſſe nocturna* (39)?

[*G*] *He acquired a great reputation by his divining ſcience.*] This appears by ſeveral paſſages in Sophocles, and other antient authors. He was the only ſage in Hell (40), if we believe Homer (41).

Τῷ καὶ τεθνειῶτι νόον πόρε Περσεφόνεια
Οἴῳ πεπνύσθαι. τοὶ δὲ, σκιαὶ ἀΐσσȣσιν.

Huic etiam mortuo mentem tribuit Proſerpina
Solus ut ſaperet, reliqui verò umbræ circumvolitant.

Among the other flutt'ring ſhades below,
He only had Hell's favourite gift, to know.
Mr POPE.

He was honoured as a god after his death (42). Yet I cannot find, in the ninth book of Strabo, what Charles Stephens, Lloyd, Moreri, and Hofman quote from it, *viz*. that the inhabitants of Thebes paid divine honours to Tireſias, interred near Tilphuſa. I find only in Pauſanias (43) that they had in their city a place called Tireſias's obſervatory, οἰωνοσκοπεῖον Τειρεσίȣ, (which probably was the place from whence he contemplated the auguries) and an honorary tomb, or *Cenotaphium*: for the Thebans owned that he died near Haliartus (44); and conſequently that they had not his tomb amongſt them. The Hiſtorian has furniſhed them with a very odd argument; but it does not much concern us. Thoſe gentlemen who have cited Strabo, would have found their account much better in Didorus Siculus; who informs us that the Thebans celebrated a pompous funeral to Tireſias, and paid him divine honours (45).

[*H*] *Having fled with his country-men.*] Mr Moreri has very much miſtaken his original Charles Stephens, when he ſays, that Tireſias *being in exile* near the fountain Tilphuſa, *died there*. Charles Stephens's Latin runs thus; 'Juxta fontem ejuſdem nominis, ubi pro'fugus diem ſuum obiit: - - - *Near a fountain of the 'ſame name, whither having fled, he died.*' Which is taken from Strabo, ὑφ' ᾧ Τιλφωσσα κρήνη καὶ τὸ τȣ̃ Τειρεσίȣ μνῆμα ἐκεῖ τελευτήσαντος κατὰ τὴν φυγὴν, *ſub quo fons eſt Tilphoſa, & monumentum Teireſiæ qui extorris ibi mortem obiit*. If Mr Moreri had been acquainted with the hiſtory of Tireſias, he would not have rendred the word *profugus* by that of *exile*. From hence we may infer, that tranſlators are liable to commit ſtrange blunders, when they do not underſtand their ſubject; for they may, indeed, know three or four ſignifications of the ſame word, but this does not hinder them from chuſing that which by no means agrees with this or that place. I obſerve a conſiderable difference betwixt Strabo and Pauſanias. The firſt

---

(*f*) Biblioth. *lib. iii, pag.* 191, 197, *Edit. Salmur.* 1661.

(*g*) Lib. ix, pag. m. 285. See alſo pag. 283.

(*b*) Lib. ix, pag. m. 307.

(*i*) In the article of ALALCOMENIUM; for he forgot it in that of Tireſias: he places that monument right, and quotes Strabo.

(*k*) O noſtræ regimen vireſque ſenectæ. *Stat. Theb. lib. iv, ver.* 536.

(33) Mr de Cailliere, *of the French Academy*, Recueil des bons Contes & des bons Mots, *pag.* 132, *Dutch Edit.* 1693.

(34) See the article MALHERBE, remark [*B*].

(35) See his Letter to Balzac, in the collection of new Letters, printed at Paris, 1642, *pag.* 65.

(36) Arioſto, Orlando furioſo, *Canto Ottavo, Stanza xlviii, & ſeq.*

(37) Racan, Letter to Balzac, *in Tom. ii*, of the Collection of new Letters, printed at Paris, by Touſſaint Quinet, in 1634, *pag.* 295, *& ſeq.*

(38) Malherbe, Letter to Balzac, *pag.* 61, of the Collection of new Letters, printed at Paris in 1642.

(39) Cicero, Tuſcul. *lib. v, fol.* 278, *B.*

(40) See what what has been quoted out of Callimachus, in the remark [*A*].

(41) Odyſſ. K. *ver.* 494.

(42) Clem. Alexandr. I Stromat.

(43) Lib. ix, pag. 294, 295.

(44) That town was not far from the mountain Tilphuſa.

(45) Θάψαντες λαμπρῶς οἱ Καδμεῖοι τιμαῖς ἰσοθέοις ἐτίμησαν. *In the tranſlation printed at Baſil, in* 1548, *lib. v, cap. vi, p.* 124. Quem ſui cives magna cum pompa ſepelivere, Deorum ſibi honores tribuentes, *there is* ſibi, *inſtead of* ipſi.

very long [*I*]. Some beſtow on him another daughter called Hiſtoris (*l*), who by an ingenious ſtratagem deceived the goddeſs Lucina, and was the occaſion that Alcmena, whoſe labour had been prolonged by that goddeſs, was happily delivered. There has been handed about a certain book under Tireſias's name, by an impoſture which has been practiſed a thouſand times. This book treated of the preſages of frankincenſe, *de thuris ſignis.* It is twice cited by the ſcholiaſt on Statius (*m*). Tireſias dealt in all ſorts of predictions; he made uſe of Pyromancy (*n*), Capnomancy, Necromancy, *&c.* The latter, which conſiſted in calling upon the dead, pleaſed him more than the reſt (*o*); this he exerciſed very imperiouſly [*K*], and would not ſuffer the ghoſts to be tardy in appearing. As he was blind, Manto his daughter was obliged to inform him of the phenomena of fire, and ſmoak, *&c.* (*p*). Lucian in his treatiſe of Aſtrology obſerves, that Tireſias taught that the planets have not all the ſame virtue, nor the ſame ſex.

firſt makes Tireſias die in his flight without falling into the power of his enemies: the ſecond, on the contrary, depending on the Grecian hiſtories, ſays (46), that thoſe of Argos having taken the city of Thebes, were carrying Tireſias with the reſt of their booty, to the temple of Delphi, but that he died in the way, by drinking of the fountain of Tilphuſa. Diodorus Siculus (47) relates the fact in the ſame manner as Strabo. An author (48), whoſe memory I honour, ſaith, that Tireſias, in his latter days, retired to the mountain called Tilphoſſa, to end his life in repoſe, and remote from the tumults of the city. He does not cite any authority; but I make no doubt he had met with it in ſome celebrated writer. We muſt, however, ſay, that this retreat of Tireſias was not at all voluntary.

[*I*] *He lived very long.*] Hyginus, Phlegon, and Lutatius, agree in ſaying that Jupiter repaired Tireſias's loſs of ſight, by granting him, together with the knowledge of futurity, a life ſeven times as long as that of others *ſeptem ætates* (49). Agatharcides mentions but five ages; Lucian ſix: but, according to Tzetzes, ſome have made Tireſias eleven times the age of man (50).

[*K*] *This he exerciſed very imperiouſly.*] Seneca makes him uſe menacing words.

Carmenque magicum volvit, & rabido MINAX
Decantat ore, quicquid aut placat leves,
Aut cogit umbras (51).

His furious voice the Magic charm repeats,
While trembling ghoſts obey his awful threats.

Statius introduces him armed with threats and reproaches.

Atque hic Tireſias nondum adventantibus umbris
Teſtor ait, Divos quibus hunc ſacravimus ignem,
Jam nequeo tolerare moram. Caſſuſne ſacerdos
Audior, an rabido jubeat ſi Theſſala cantu
Ibitis, & Scythicis quoties armata venenis
Colchis aget, trepido pallebunt tartara motu?
Noſtri cura minor? . . . .

. . . .

Ne tenues annos nubemque hanc frontis opacæ
Spernite ne, moneo, & nobis ſævire facultas,
Scimus enim & quidquid dici noſcique timetis (52).

And here Tireſias, while the ghoſts delay'd,
Ye gods whoſe ſacred fires now blaze, he ſaid,
I cannot bear this loit'ring. Do I ſeem
An unſkill'd Prieſt? or at the witch's ſcream,
Muſt you obey, while her Theſſalian charms,
And Colchic pois'nous drugs all Hell alarms?
And ſhall you fear me leſs? . . . .

. . . .

You had not beſt, I friendly now adviſe,
My weaker years, and periſh'd ſight deſpiſe;
I too can make you tremble when I will,
And fly obſequious to my Magic ſkill.

See in Lucan (53) a long train of threats uttered by the Theſſalian witch againſt the infernal gods. This ſtile was very common in the magical rites. A Pagan Philoſopher ridicules them with a great deal of reaſon. Πολλῷ δὲ τούτων ἀλογώτερον, τὸ μὴ δαίμονι, εἰ τύχοι, ἢ ψυχῇ τεθνηκότος, αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἡλίῳ, ἢ Σελήνῃ, ἢ τινι, τῶν κατ' οὐρανὸν ἀνθρώπων τῷ τυχόντι ὑποχείριον, ἀπειλὰς προσφέροντα ἐκφοβεῖν, ψευδόμενον ἵν' ἐκεῖνοι ἀληθεύσωσι. Quodque omnium abſurdiſſimum eſt, non jam vulgari cuipiam Dæmoni, aut defuncti animæ, ſed ipſimet Soli ſyderum principi, Lunæ, reliquiſque Diis cœleſtibus, homo cuivis e Populi fæce obnoxius minas intentat, atque ut eos ad vera dicenda compellat, falſum vanumque terrorem oſtendit (54). - - - *But what is moſt abſurd in all this is, that not only a common dæmon, ſuppoſe, or a departed ſpirit, but even the majeſty of the ſun, or the moon, or ſome other of the celeſtial gods ſhall be frighted with threats by any vulgar wretch, and by falſe terrors compelled to ſpeak truth.* This puts me in mind of our popular ſtories concerning Magic: I do not mean the moſt common ſort of ſtories, but thoſe which ſeem to be eminent above the reſt. It is pretended that there are ſome Magicians who exerciſe a ſort of command even to compulſion, over thoſe ſpirits which they raiſe up. As abſurd as this may ſeem, it may be thought poſſible, if we ſhould once allow that certain covenants or treaties are entered into betwixt men and evil angels: for there being doubtleſs a ſubordination amongſt theſe ſpirits, there may be ſome dæmons who reign abſolute over ſeveral others; cannot one of theſe ſuperior dæmons promiſe his Magicians that he will ſubject to them all the ſpirits under his command? Cannot he promiſe them to threaten thoſe with his diſpleaſure who ſhould prove ungovernable? Thuanus, who was preſent at a dialogue betwixt the Sieur de Calignon and a famous Magician, relates that the Magician did not deny his commerce with dæmons, but affirmed that his Magic tended only to the doing good to mankind, and that there was a very great difference between Sorcerers and Magicians. A Magician, ſaid he, has no correſpondence with any other than the aërial and celeſtial ſpirits, who are good and beneficent, and teach him a thouſand very profitable ſecrets, and beſides he commands thoſe ſpirits. But a Sorcerer is a vile ſlave to terreſtrial ſpirits naturally malignant and enemies to mankind. He added that there were ſchools of Magic in Spain, and that there had been alſo very flouriſhing ones in Germany, which were moſt of them diſperſed ſince Luther had divulged his Hereſies. ‘ Tam preclaræ artis ſcholas toto terrarum orbe ac profeſſores ſparſos, & adhuc in Hiſpania Toleti, Cordubæ, Granatæ, aliiſque ſocis frequentari, fuiſſe olim & in Germania celeberrimas, ſed magna ex parte defeciſſe, poſtquam Lutherus ſeminato hæreſis ſuæ fermento, tot ſectatores habere cepit (55). - - - *That there are ſchools of ſo famous an art, and profeſſors diſperſed over the whole earth, and ſtill frequented in Spain, at Toledo, Corduba, Granada, and other places, as there were alſo ſome very much celebrated in former times in Germany, but are now moſt of them deſerted, ſince Luther, by ſpreading the leaven, of his Hereſy began to draw after him ſo many followers.*’ He did not confeſs to his judges all that he owned to the Sieur Calignon; but this did not prevent the Parliament of Paris condemning him to death upon the evidence produced againſt him. The thing is in my opinion remarkable enough to deſerve being laid before my readers in Thuanus's own words (56): ‘ Magiam quam profitebatur Bellomontius, dæmonum, qui numinis divini particula ſunt, cum hominibus conciliatricem artem præclaram eſſe ad beneficium inventam non ad maleficium, quo Sortiarii qui vocantur vulgo utuntur, ipſi malorum ſpirituum vilia mancipia in

---

(*l*) Pauſan. *lib. ix, pag.* 290.

(*m*) *See* Barthius, in Stat. *Tom. ii, pag.* 1106, *and Tom. iii, pag.* 673.

(*n*) Ille coronatos jamdudum amplectitur ignes, Fatidicum ſorbens vultu flagrante vaporem. *Stat. Theb. lib. x, ver.* 598. See alſo *Seneca, in Oedipo, Act. ii, Scen. ii.*

(*o*) See the end of the remark [*B*].

(*p*) Stat. Theb. *lib. x, ver.* 598; *and* Senec. in Oedipo, *Act. ii, Scen. ii.*

(46) Pauſan. *lib. ix, p.* 307.

(47) Diod. Sicul. *lib. v, cap. vi.*

(48) Petrus Muſſardus (*de quo vide* Deckherrum de Scriptor. Adeſpot. *pag.* 397, *Edit.* 1686) Hiſt. Deor. fatidicorum, *pag.* 87.

(49) Some render it ſeven ages.

(50) *See* Munckerus, in Hygin. *pag.* 128.

(51) Seneca, in Oedipo, *Act. iii, Sc. i.*

(52) Statius, Theb. *lib. iv, ver* 500.

(53) Pharſal. *lib. vi, ver.* 732, *& ſeq.*

(54) Porphyrius, *apud* Euſebium, Præparat. Evangel. *lib. v, cap. x, pag.* 198, *A.*

(55) Thuanus, ubi infra, *pag.* 1234. See the remark [*H*], of the article PONTIUS.

(56) Thuanus, de Vita ſua, *lib. vi, pag.* 1233, 1234.

He was the inventer of Auſpices (*q*). He was worſhipped as a god at Orchomenus; his oracle was famous there for ſeveral ages, but ſilenced at laſt after a plague had rendred that city deſolate (*r*). Perhaps all the directors of the oracle periſhed by the contagion: or perhaps they believed that a god who ſuffered the inhabitants of Orchomenus to be deſtroyed by the plague, was not capable of predicting future events. I take no notice of ſupernatural reaſons.

(*q*) Auſpicia avium Tireſias Thebanus (invenit.) *Plinius, lib. vii, cap.* 56. *pag.* 102.

(*r*) Plut. de Oracul. defectu, *pag.* 434.

crassam ignorantiam demerſi, & veneno ac diris faſcinationibus eorum arbitrio perniciem humano generi machinantes, cum contra magi ipſis dæmonibus imperent, & eorum conſortio ac familiaritate arcana naturæ vulgo ignota nec libris prodita cognoſcere, futura rimari, mala declinare, pericula antevertere, amiſſa recuperare, corpora citerius quam humana ratione fieri poſſit, de loco in locum transferre, diſſidenteis componere, patres cum filiis, uxores cum maritis, & amicitiam cum iis quibus debet conciliare diſcant, denique ſibi rem cum aeriis ſpiritibus & cœlo participantibus eſſe, qui natura benefici nihil niſi juvare ſciunt, cum terreſtres & ſubterranea incolentes, qui Sortiariis imperant, ſint maligni & nocere tantum noverint: tam præclaræ artis ſcholas, &c (57). - - - *Beaumont pretended that the Magic he profeſſed was the art of maintaining a commerce between ſpirits (who are a particle of the Deity) and men, invented for good and not for miſchief, which laſt is the end propoſed by thoſe called Sorcerers, themſelves being the vile drudges of evil ſpirits, and plunged into the moſt groſs ignorance, and with poiſon and dreadful enchantments by their direction contriving deſtruction to mankind; when, on the contrary, Magicians command the ſpirits themſelves, and by their commerce and acquaintance are able to find out the ſecrets of nature which are unknown to the vulgar, and not to be met with in books, to forſee futurities, to ſhun evils, to prevent dangers, to recover loſſes, to tranſport the body from place to place quicker than is poſſible by human means, to pacify enemies, to reconcile fathers with their children, huſbands with their wives, and re-eſtabliſh friendſhip where neceſſary; laſtly, that theſe have only to do with aërial ſpirits, and ſuch as partake of Heaven, who being naturally beneficent, know only how to do good, while the terreſtrial and ſubterraneous ones, who have the Sorcerers under ſubjection, are malignant, and know only how to do miſchief: that there were ſchools of ſo famous an art, &c.*’ See the remainder of this paſſage in citation (55) of this article. Let us conclude with Cicero's words, who informs us that Tireſias was none of thoſe vulgar Diviners who make a trade of their impoſtures, and exerciſe them only for bread. ‘Ante hos Amphiaraus & Tireſias non humiles & obſcuri, neque eorum ſimiles, ut apud Ennium eſt, *qui ſui quæſtus cauſa fictas ſuſcitant ſententias*, ſed clari & præſtantes viri qui avibus & ſignis admoniti futura dicebant, quorum de altero etiam apud inferos Homerus ait ſolum ſapere, cæteros umbrarum modo vagari (58). - - - *Before theſe were Amphiaraus and Tireſias not mean and obſcure, nor like thoſe mentioned by Ennius,* who returned forged anſwers for gain, *but famous and eminent men, who by the help of birds and ſigns foretold things future, of one of whom even in Hell Homer ſays he was the only wiſe ghoſt, that the others only wandered about like ſhades.*’

(57) Id. ibid.

(58) Cicero, *lib.* 1, de Divinat. *fol. m.* 310, C.

TISSANDIER (N).

Author of a book no otherwiſe known to me than by a letter of Balzac. He died very old in the year 1628 [*A*]. La Croix du Maine does not mention him, and I do not think Du Verdier Vau-Privas, has taken any more notice of him [*B*].

[*A*] *He died very old in the year* 1628.] See the letter written the ſame year by Balzac to one Mr Tiſſandier (1). He comforts him on the death of his uncle, who was as old as the Hereſy and older than the League; for he had publiſhed a book to forewarn France of the conception of this monſter, when the Cardinal de Lorrain conceived it. I need not tell you theſe are Balzac's expreſſions.

(1) It is the 18th of the eighth book in the folio edition.

[*B*] *And I do not think Du Verdier Vau-Privas has taken any more notice of him.*] I expreſs myſelf in this manner, becauſe I had not time to examine page by page whether Tiſſandier were to be met with in this writer's *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*. The authors are there ranged according to their Chriſtian names, and without ſubjoining a table of ſirnames. Theſe are two inexcuſable faults when they meet together. The firſt is ſupportable when it is alone, as it is in La Croix du Maine; but not to repair this by a table of ſirnames is only mocking the world.

TITIUS (CAIUS)

a Latin Poet and Orator, was a Roman knight. He carried Eloquence as far as it was poſſible for one who did not underſtand Greek [*A*]. His orations abounded with ſubtilties, examples, and politeneſs, ſo that they ſeemed to be compoſed in the Attic ſtile. This ſubtilty of thought did not ſucceed on the ſtage, when he employed it in his tragedies, as he had done in his pleadings. It was not lofty enough to ſupport the gravity of the tragic character (*a*). When the Conſul Fannius propoſed his law againſt luxurious feaſting, Titius harangued the people to repreſent the utility of that law. We ſhall ſee in the remarks whether this fact will ſerve to diſcover the time when the *Lex Fannia* was made [*B*]. The oration made by Titius at that time demonſtrates

(*a*) Cicero in Bruto, *pag. m.* 280.

[*A*] *He carried Eloquence as far as it was poſſible for one who did not underſtand Greek.*] Cicero, the beſt judge in the world, gives him this character. ‘Ejuſdem fere temporis fuit eques Romanus C. Titius: qui meo judicio eo perveniſſe videtur, quò potuit fere Latinus orator ſine Græcis literis, & ſine multo uſu pervenire. Hujus orationes tantum argutiarum, tantum exemplorum, tantum urbanitatis habent, ut pene Attico ſtylo ſcriptæ eſſe videantur. Eaſdem argutias in tragœdias ſatis ille quidem acute, ſed parum tragice tranſtulit (1). - - - *About the ſame time flouriſhed C. Titius a Roman knight: who in my judgment ſeems to have arrived to as great a height as it is poſſible for a Latin Orator to reach, without a knowledge of the Greek tongue, and great experience. His Orations were ſo full of ſubtilties, examples, and politeneſs, that they ſeemed to be written in the Attic ſtile. He introduced the ſame ſubtilties into tragedies, with ingenuity enough, but very little becoming tragic compoſitions.*’

(1) Cicero in Bruto, *pag. m.* 280.

[*B*] *The time when the* Lex Fannia *was made.*] I have in another place (2) examined Glandorp's opinion and found it ill grounded. This author believed (3), that he who propoſed this law was not Caius Fannius the father, Conſul in the year of Rome 592, but Caius Fannius the ſon, Conſul in the year of Rome 632. For this he offers but one proof taken from a paſſage of Aulus Gellius, which is of no force. He might have alledged ſomething more ſpecious, if he had quoted Macrobius, who acquaints us that Titius contemporary with Lucilius adviſed the people to eſtabliſh the *Lex Fannia* (4). It is certain that Lucilius was born in the beginning of the VIIth century of Rome: this agrees wonderfully with Glandorp's hypotheſis;

(2) In the ſecond article FANNIUS, remark [*B*].

(3) Onomaſtic. *pag.* 333.

(4) Id oſtendunt tum multi alii, tum etiam C. Titius, vir ætatis Lucilianæ, in oratione qua legem Fanniam ſuaſit. *Macrob. Saturnal. lib.* ii, *cap.* xii.

ſtrates that drunkenneſs was arrived at its higheſt pitch [*C*]. The miſtake of an interpreter of Horace [*D*], is inſupportable: he has confounded our Titius with a Titius who

pothesis; for according to that Lucilius was about thirty years old, when the *Lex Fannia* was made. Conſequently the Orator who adviſed this law muſt be Lucilius's cotemporary. But if you place the paſſing of that law in the year 593, this Orator and Lucilius could not be cotemporaries; for the former muſt have been an old man when the other was but juſt a youth, and conſequently Macrobius furniſhes a very plauſible proof for Glandorp. This may be ſtrengthned by theſe words of Cicero, ‘ Ejuſdem fere temporis fuit Eques Romanus C. Titius; - - - *About the ſame time flouriſhed Caius Titius a Roman knight*.’ For he had juſt ſpoke of three or four Orators who flouriſhed towards the year of Rome 660. Titius muſt have lived very near their time, if he recommended the *Lex Fannia* in the year 632. But there muſt have been a great diſtance of time between him and them, if this law was paſſed in 593. Notwithſtanding all theſe reaſons I perſiſt in my opinion declared in the articles FANNIUS. That paſſage in Pliny (5) which points out the preciſe interval of eleven years betwixt the *Lex Fannia* and the third Punic war, is more valid than ten citations, where it is only ſaid in general, *ejuſdem ætatis, ejuſdem ferme temporis*. Theſe looſe expreſſions, *he lived almoſt cotemporary with another, or in the ſame age with another*, will admit of ſome latitude, may be lengthned or ſhortned, and ſavour of a man who does not pretend to be very nice in his Chronology, and who ſpeaks only according to the confuſed ideas of his memory. But when an author makes uſe of a determinate number, when he names exactly eleven years; it is a ſign that he took pains, that he ſearched farther into the matter, and conſequently Pliny's teſtimony is here of very great weight to fix the *Lex Fannia* in the year 593, ſince the year 604 was the firſt year of the third Punic war. If theſe reaſons are not admitted, what ſhall we ſay, when we conſider that according to Macrobius the *Lex Fannia* was enacted in the year 588, and neverthelefs he advances that Titius and Lucilius lived at the ſame time, or in the ſame century (6)? I argue thus; either Macrobius was perfectly well acquainted with the age of Lucilius, or he was not: In the firſt caſe, we ſhall be obliged to conclude according to him, that an Orator who recommended a law in 588, and a Poet born twelve years after, lived at the ſame time, and ſo his words do not at all confirm Glandorp's opinion: In the ſecond caſe they confirm it yet leſs; for no Chronological proofs can be drawn from a man, who ſpeaks at random and without pretending to exactneſs. As for Cero's *ejuſdem fere temporis*, it is a phraſe which does not hinder us from believing that Titius made his harangue in the year 593. Obſerve that Afranius imitated Titius (7). I do not offer this as a neceſſary and demonſtrative proof that he was younger, but only as a ſign that he was ſo. Now Afranius was cotemporary with Terence (8), who died in the year 594 (9). Thus Cicero has here furniſhed us with a ſtrong proof againſt Glandorp. Let us therefore ſay that our Titius flouriſhed about the year of Rome 590.

[*C*] *That drunkenneſs was then at its higheſt pitch.*] The Judges drank ſo much wine before they went to the bench, that they were neceſſitated to piſs plentifully in every corner. After having heard the ſtate of the caſe, they cauſed the witneſſes to be called, and in the mean time went to the chamber-pot: being returned they gathered the votes; and could ſcarce refrain from ſleeping. Going to council they uſed to ſay, why ſhould we torment ourſelves with theſe fools, let us rather take a bottle and get ſome tid-bit to eat. Thoſe who underſtand Latin will be much better pleaſed with Titius's own words, than with the abridgment I have given of them. ‘ Ludunt alea, ſtudioſe unguentis delibuti, ſcortis ſtipati, ubi horæ decem ſunt; jubent puerum vocari ut comitium eat percunctatum quid in foro geſtum ſit, qui ſuaſerint, qui diſſuaſerint, quot tribus juſſerint, quot vetuerint. Inde ad comitium vadunt, ne litem ſuam faciant: dum eunt, nulla eſt in angiporto amphora, quam non impleant, quippe qui veſicam plenam vini habeant. Veniunt in comitium triſtes, jubent dicere, quorum negotium eſt, dicunt: judex teſtes poſcit: ipſus it minctum: ubi redit, ait ſe omnia audiviſſe, tabulas poſcit, literas inſpicit. vix præ vino ſuſtinet palpebras. eunti in conſilium ibi hæc oratio: Quid mihi negotii eſt cum iſtis nugacibus: quam potius potamus mulſum mixtum vino Græco, edimus turdum pinguem, bonumque piſcem lupum germanum, qui inter duos pontes captus fuit (10)? - - - *They play at dice, being perfumed with fine ointments, and attended by their whores, when the tenth hour is come; they ſend a man to the court, to inquire what has been voted in the Forum, who ſpoke for and who againſt, how many tribes gave their affirmative, and how many their negative. From thence they proceed to court, for fear they ſhould have ſome accuſation againſt themſelves; as they go along, there is never a piſſing-place in the whole ſtreet, which they do not fill, their bladders being charged with liquor. They come into court in ill humour, order the parties to proceed. The caſe is ſtated. The Judge calls for the witneſſes: he himſelf goes out to piſs: when he returns, he declares he has heard the whole, he demands the tables, looks into the writings, ſcarce can keep his eyes open, going to counſel there makes this ſpeech; Why ſhould one trouble himſelf with theſe triflers; how much better is it for us to ſit down to ſome Muſcadel and Greek wine, to eat a fine fat Thruſh, or a delicate Sturgeon, catched between two bridges?*’ Macrobius who hath preſerved this curious fragment of this Oration of Titius, had cited another paſſage of the ſame in chapter IX, for we ought not to doubt that *Cincius in ſuaſione legis Fanniæ*, in chapter IX, is a miſtake of the tranſcribers, who by degrees changed *Titius* into *Cincius*. This other paſſage informs us, that they uſed at Rome to cook ſeveral other animals together in a Hog's-belly, and that they called this a Trojan hog, in alluſion to the Trojan horſe which was filled with ſoldiers (11). Theſe exceſſes wanted to be ſuppreſſed; Luxury was then become ſo enormous, that ſeveral children of good families proſtituted and ſold themſelves in order to gratify their palate with delicious meats: drunkenneſs was become ſo common, that the citizens went drunk to the aſſemblies, where the public affairs were debated. This is what we are informed of by Sammonicus Serenus. ‘ Lex Fannia ſanctiſſimi Auguſti, ingenti omnium ordinum conſenſu pervenit ad populum. Neque eam prætores aut tribuni, ut pleraſque alias, ſed ex omni bonorum conſilio & ſententia ipſi conſules pertulerunt, cum reſpublica ex luxuria conviviorum majora quam credi poteſt, detrimenta pateretur. Siquidem eo res redierat, ut gula illecti plerique ingenui pueri pudicitiam & libertatem ſuam venditarent; plerique ex plebe Romana vino madidi in comitium venirent, & ebrii de reipublicæ ſalute conſulerent (12). - - - *The* Lex Fannia *propoſed under the moſt ſacred Emperor Auguſtus, was given to the people with the univerſal conſent of all orders. Nor did the Prætors or Tribunes carry it through, as they uſually do moſt others, but the conſuls themſelves by the general advice and concurrence; ſince the common-wealth received more damage than can be imagined, from the luxury of entertainments. For the thing was come to ſuch a paſs, that to gratify their palate, a great many ſons of conſiderable families ſold both their chaſtity and liberty; crowds of the Plebeians came drunk to the aſſemblies, and in that condition gave their opinions concerning the ſafety of the republic.*’ The ſucceeding ages which have ſeen at Rome the moſt horrid vices, have not ſeen drunkenneſs to reign there: at preſent it is a vice not known in that country; but as for the antient Romans, they lived like our true northern nations. See the drunkenneſs of the deputies of a ſynod in the remark [*A*] of the article BERENGARIUS. For the reſt, I am ſurprized that Corradus, who was ſo conſummate in the Hiſtory of particular perſons, knew our Titius only by this paſſage of Cicero: he was ignorant of thoſe of Macrobius. ‘ C. Titius, *ſays he in page* 282 *of his commentary on Cicero's* Brutus, de quo ſcriptum nihil nos præterea vidimus. - - - - *Caius Titius, of whom we have never met with any farther account.*’

[*D*] *The miſtake of an interpreter of Horace.*] It is Corradus who takes notice of this blunder without telling us whoſe it is. ‘ Unde videtur interpres Horatii

(5) Plin. *lib. x, cap. l.*

(6) C. Titius, vir ætatis Lucilianæ.

(7) Quem ſtudebat imitari L. Afranius poëta, homo perargutus in fabulis quidem etiam, ut ſcitis, diſertus. *Cicero, in Bruto, pag.* 280.

(8) Dulces Latini leporis facetiæ per Cæcilium, Terentiumque, & Afranium, ſub pari ætate nituerunt. *Paterculus, lib. i, cap. xxvii.*

(9) Sueton. in Vita Terentii.

(10) *Apud* Macrobium, *lib. ii,* Saturnal. *cap. xii, pag. m.* 366.

(11) In ſuaſione legis Fanniæ objecit ſæculo ſuo quod porcum Trojanum menſis inferant: quem illi ideo ſic vocabant, quaſi aliis incluſis animalibus gravidum, ut ille Trojanus equus gravidus armatus fuit. *Macrob. ibid. cap. ix, pag.* 356.

(12) Sammonicus Serenus, *apud* Macrobium, Saturnal. *cap. xiii, pag.* 367.

who lived in the time of Auguſtus.

'ratii deceptus, qui putavit eundem Titium fuiſſe 'pindarici fontis qui non expalluit hauſtus, & eum 'qui ſcripſit tragœdias, quum hic multo ante floruerit, & ille tempore Auguſti vixerit: quamquam ille 'potuit etiam utrumque præſtare. - - - *From whence 'Horace's Commentator ſeems to be miſtaken, who thought 'that Titius who was not afraid to take a draught of 'the Pindaric fountain, was one and the ſame with him 'who wrote Tragedies, ſince the latter lived long before, 'but the former in Auguſtus's time: altho' he himſelf 'was able to excel them both.*' Corradus ſeems to doubt whether Horace's Titius was at the ſame time a compoſer of Odes and Tragedies, though there does not appear much foundation for doubt, when we read theſe ſix verſes of the third epiſtle of the firſt book of Horace:

Quid Titius Romana brevi venturus in ora?
Pindarici fontis qui non expalluit hauſtus,
Faſtidire lacus, & rivos auſus apertos.
Ut valet? ut meminit noſtri? fidibuſne latinis
Thebanos aptare modos ſtudet auſpice muſa?
An tragica deſævit & ampullatur in arte?

And what doth Titius, he of growing fame,
Who doth not fear to drink of Pindar's ſtream?
Who ſcorns known ſprings and lakes, that glorious he,
And is he well, and doth he think of me?
Doth he the Muſe propitious nobly ſing,
And fit to Roman harps the Theban ſtring?
Or is he writing plays and treads the ſtage,
In murd'ring verſe, and ſwells with tragic rage?
CREECH.

The antient ſcholiaſt on Horace aſſures us that he here means Titius Septimius, who had written both Lyric verſes and tragedies, and whoſe tomb was to be ſeen below Aricia. Mr Dacier, after ſeveral others, pretends that this Titius was the ſame Septimius, to whom Horace addreſſed the ſixth Ode of his ſecond book, and for whom he wrote the ninth epiſtle of his firſt book. This may be; but ſince he gives no reaſon for it, and two reaſons ſeem to oppoſe this opinion, I ſhall remain a Sceptic on this ſubject. The ſixth Ode of the ſecond book contains twenty-four verſes, not one word of which inſinuates, that Septimius was a Poet; whereas all that concerns Titius in the third epiſtle of the firſt book relates to him as a Poet only. This is my firſt reaſon. The ſecond is, that Titius, in Horace's third epiſtle, is one of the wits who accompanied Tiberius, and compoſed a ſociety of learned men in his court: whereas in the ninth epiſtle, Septimius is one who deſires Horace to introduce him to Tiberius. I can ſay nothing in particular againſt another notion of Mr Dacier: he would have Horace's Septimius, and the Septimius who ſo ardently loved Acme in the forty-ſixth epigram of Catullus, to be the ſame perſon (13).

(13) Dacier, upon the ſixth Ode of the ſecond book of Horace.

TORELLI (POMPONIO) Count of Montechiarugolo, lived in the XVIth century. He was ſon of a daughter of John Francis Picus, Count of Mirandola, and a member of the academy of the *Innomati* at Parma, and had there the epithet of *il Perduto* (*a*). He wrote a book intituled *Trattato del Debito del Cavalliero*, a *Treatiſe on the Duty of a Knight*, in which he gives very uſeful inſtructions to thoſe who have already attained the honour of knighthood. He choſe this ſubject, becauſe he had a ſon who was a Knight of Malta. He loſt him while his book was in the preſs, as he informs us in the Epiſtle Dedicatory, dated at Parma the 15th of February 1596. He was vaſſal to the Duke of Parma Ranuccio Farneſe, to whom he dedicated his treatiſe. He frequently cites the Poets both antient and modern, and always in Italian verſe. His morality is good, and he enters into ſo particular a detail, that he gives even (*b*) rules concerning what the Italians call *motteggiare* (*c*). He is ſo zealous for his religion, that he cannot acknowledge him for a true knight, who is out of the Popiſh communion (*d*), and inſiſts upon a knight's abandoning the ſervice of his prince who is excommunicated by the Pope (*e*). He is of opinion that a Heretic is almoſt always guilty of ſome enormous crime, and he cites thereupon Pius V [*A*]. The difference which he puts between the antient and modern Poets requires ſome limitation [*B*].

(*a*) Pomponio Torelli, del Debito del Cavalliero, *folio* 143, *edition of Venice*, 1596, *in* 8*vo*.

(*b*) Id. ibid. *folio* 128, *verſo*.

(*c*) That is, witty ſayings.

(*d*) Ibid. *fol.* 25.

(*e*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *He is of opinion that a Heretic is almoſt always guilty of ſome enormous crime, and he cites thereupon Pius* V.] There are ſome perſecutors who do not carry their prejudices to ſo high a degree of injuſtice: for they acknowledge that there are ſome Arch-Heretics whoſe morals have been unexceptionable. Our Torelli is more rigid. *Gli Heretici*, ſays he, (1) *Cavallieri eſſe non ponno* . . . . in the printed copy to the words *Gli idolatri* excluſively. *Solea dire Pio* V. *di ſantiſſima* . . . . in the printed copy to the word (2) *Ma* excluſively.

[*B*] *The difference which he puts between the antient and modern Poets requires ſome limitation.*] Our Poetry, ſays he, is more modeſt than either the Greek or the Latin; our Poets who write love-verſes imitate Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, only in ſuch things as are exempt from laſciviouſneſs and obſcenity. *Nella Lirica* (poeſia) & *Italiana*, & *Franceſe*, & *Spagnuola ſi vede, che molto* . . . . in the printed copy to the words (3) *Non vollero gli* excluſ. As for Porta whom he reckons among the Poets who avoid obſcenities, he is however very much decried on that account (4); but this is not my principal obſervation; I have a much more conſiderable thing to object. There were in the XVIth century, and even in the XVIIth, ſeveral famous Poets who wrote as wantonly as the antients (5); and conſequently Torelli's propoſition ought not to be underſtood without ſome limitations.

(1) Torelli, del Debito del Cavalliero, *fol.* 21, *verſo*.

(2) Id. ibid. *folio* 25.

(3) Torelli, *fol.* 155, *verſo*.

(4) See his article remark . . . .

(5) See the remark [*D*], of the article MOLSA, and the *explanation concerning obſcenities*, num. ii, iii.

TORI or **THORI** (JEFFERY) *The King's Printer, and ſworn Bookſeller to the Univerſity of Paris* (*a*) in the XVIth century, was of Bourges. He contributed greatly to the bringing the printing types to perfection (*b*); for he wrote a book intituled, *Le Champ Fleury, contenant l'Art & Science de la proportion des lettres Attiques, ou Antiques, & vulgairement appellées lettres Romaines, proportionées ſelon le corps & viſage humain* (*c*). - - - - *The flowery field, containing the Art and Science of the proportion of Attic or antique letters, commonly called the Roman letters, according to the human body and face.* He himſelf printed it at *Paris in the year* 1592 *in* 4to, *and afterwards in* 8vo (*d*). Claudius Garamont, who *made punchions and prepared the moulds for the Roman capitals* (*e*) was his diſciple (*f*).

We

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franç. *pag.* 124.

(*b*) *See* La Caille, *at page* 76, *of the* Hiſtoire de l'Imprimerie.

(*c*) La Croix du Maine, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) *Id. ibid. But* du Verdier, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 445, *affirms that the book was printed by Giles Gourmont, in the year* 1529, *in fol.*

(*e*) La Caille, Hiſt. de l'Imprimerie, *pag.* 76.

(*f*) Id. *pag.* 99.

We ſhall ſee below the titles of the other works of Jeffery Tori [*A*]. He had been *ſchoolmaſter in the College of Bourgogne at Paris* (*g*), and had taught Philoſophy with applauſe (*h*). He died in the year 1550 (*i*). Some called him *the maſter of the broken pot, which was the ſign of his houſe* (*k*). Others ſay that his mark was a *broken pot filled with all ſorts of inſtruments*, and that *he added this motto round it*, Non plus (*l*). Francis I. gave him a licence *to print the Horæ, or Primer, in conſideration of the ornaments and flouriſhes which he made uſe of* (*m*).

(*g*) La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Franç, *pag.* 124. (*h*) La Caille, Hiſt. de l'Imprimerie, *pag.* 100. (*i*) Id. *pag.* 99. (*k*) La Croix du Maine, ubi ſupra. (*l*) La Caille, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 98.

(*m*) *Ibid.* Note, that the Sieur la Caille ſays that this licence is dated on the 28th of September 1584. This cannot be true, ſince Francis I died in the year 1547.

[*A*] *The titles of the other works of Jeffery Tori.*] He tranſlated into French *the Hieroglyphics of Orus Apollo: Plutarch's Morals, printed at Lyons* (1) *by William Bowle: the Table of Cebes, and Thirty Dialogues of Lucian, printed at Paris by John Petit in the year* 1529*: John Baptiſt Egnatius's Summary of Chronicles, printed at Paris by himſelf, in the year* 1529 (2), and by Charles l'Angelier in the year 1543 in 8vo (3). ‘He procured an edition of *Antoninus*'s *Itinerary*, in red and black, by HENRY STEPHENS in 1512, with a Preface and Advertiſement of his own . . . . . He is alſo the Author of a book intituled, *Ædiloquium, ſeu Digeſta* (4) *partibus ædium urbanarum & ruſticarum ſuis quæque locis adſcribenda.* Alſo *Epitaphia ſeptem de Amorum aliquot paſſionibus*, printed by SIMON COLINÆUS in 8vo, in 1530 (5).’ Mr Catherinot obſerves that there was printed in 1530, *Diſtiques Latins de Geofroy Tori de Bourges, ſur les Maiſons de Ville & de Campagne avec pluſieurs Tombeaux in vieux Latin* (6).

(1) According to Du Verdier Vau Privas, it was at Paris, in 8vo, in the year 1530.

(2) *Taken from* La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 125.

(3) Du Verdier, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 445.

(4) It ſhould be *Diſticha.*

(5) La Caille, Hiſt. de l'Imprimerie, *pag.* 98.

(6) Catherinot, Annales Typographiques de Bourges, *pag.* 3.

TORQUATO (ANTONY) a famous Aſtrologer of the XVth century, was born at Ferrara. He gave Matthias King of Hungary a prediction in the year 1480, which was very fatal to Chriſtendom; for he threatned with an entire ruin the Ottoman empire after a fixed time, which cauſed the Hungarians to engage in a war (*a*) that ruined them (*b*). Some of the events he had foretold proved true; but the principal proved chimerical [*A*]. This hath not diſguſted people againſt uttering or believing ſuch prognoſtics. They have been ſo often reiterated, that I forgive an Italian Politician for believing that the Turks ſuborned this ſort of people to publiſh theſe predictions [*B*] in order to lull the Chriſtians aſleep. However, I believe that theſe Infidels did not bethink themſelves

(*a*) See the remark [*A*].

(*b*) *See* Leunclavius, in Hiſtoriæ Muſulmanæ Appendice.

[*A*] *The principal proved chimerical.*] The ſubſtance of this prediction was: The Turks ſhall make war upon the Chriſtians, and loſe great numbers of their troops (1). They will firſt attack the Venetians, and do them great miſchief: After which they will make peace with that republic, and take Belgrade, and Rhodes, and lay Hungary waſte. At laſt making many threats, ſacking Hungary, and attacking the Roman empire, they will fall under the power of the Hungarians, about the year 1594, or 1595. But before this they will enter into Apulia, they will diſturb and afflict Sicily, Italy, the coaſts of France and Spain. Soon after which their emperor ſhall be killed in a battle; their monarchy ſhall be deſtroyed under the 13th or 14th of their chiefs; they ſhall not exceed that number, nor the year 1596. The Chriſtians ſhall then become maſters of that vaſt empire (2). Read the reflexion made on this by a Doctor of Divinity of the Faculty of Paris. ‘Non eſt vel hujus loci, vel mei otii Hiſtorias retexere, quibus multa quæ hic exprimuntur, eveniſſe intelligamus, ſatis ſit expendiſſe corollarium hujus prædictionis quàm varium ſit, quàm falſum, quàm ridiculum, de Imperio Turcico funditus everſo, ad annum Chriſti 1596, cum hoc anno 1608, tam florens & potens, magno quidem Chriſtiani nominis malo, cernamus, quàm antea extiterit, nec ulla parte, aut hiare, aut nutare, aut inclinare, tanti Imperii moles perſpiciatur: nec in quarto decimo Imperatore Oſmanida ſeriem Sultanorum & Principum ſuorum defeciſſe videamus, cùm Sultanus Muhamet Cham, tertius hujus nominis, ſit decimus quintus Oſmanidarum Principum, à primò illo Oſmano Sultano. Magnò certè conſtitit Hungaris hæc prædictio, cui cùm ſtolidè inniterentur, motumque maximum ſub Sultano Soleimanno in Hungaria excitaſſent, ab eo magna clade affecti, ſuæ credulitatis veſanæ pœnas non minimas dederunt, quemadmodum narrat Leunclavius hiſtor. Muſulmanæ lib. 18. (3). - - - - *This is not a proper place, nor have I leiſure to recollect paſſages of Hiſtory, by which it might appear that many things came to paſs which are expreſſed in this prediction: Let it ſuffice to examine the corollary of it, and obſerve how various, how falſe and ridiculous it is, that the Turkiſh empire ſhould be utterly deſtroyed about the year* 1596*: Whereas in this preſent year* 1608, *we behold it as flouriſhing and potent as ever, to the great detriment of the Chriſtian name: Nor is there any part of that vaſt empire which ſeems to be either in a disjointed, or tottering, or declining condition; and we ſee the ſeries of their ſultans and princes continued down without failing in the fourteenth emperor deſcended from Oſman: The Sultan Mahomet Cham, the third of that name, being the fifteenth prince deſcended from the firſt Sultan Oſman. This prediction coſt the Hungarians very dear; for having fooliſhly relied upon it, and raiſed a great commotion in Hungary under the Sultan Soliman, they were overthrown by him, and ſeverely chaſtiſed for their mad credulity; as Leunclavius relates in his Hiſtory of the Turks.*

[*B*] *I forgive an Italian Politician, for believing that the Turks ſuborned ſome people to publiſh theſe predictions.*] What this Italian Politician ſaith on this head ſeems to me worth copying. But we ought to remember that when this was written, the Turks were more potent than they have been ſince the ſiege of Vienna, in the year 1683. ‘Molte preditioni d'Aſtrologi, oltre à molte profetie, ſecondo, che ſi dice, vi ſono, & ſe ne leggono ogni di, con le quali vien minacciata la, diſtruttione del Regno, & Imperio Turcheſco, & ogni tanti anni pare, che ſi vadano rinovando cotali credenze, ſenza vederſene l'effetto. Hora io m'auviſo, che non darebbe molto lontano dal ſegno, uno, che diceſſe ciò eſſer' intentione de' medeſimi Turchi, ò di qualche Chriſtiano rinegato; per addormentar gli animi de Prencipi Chriſtiani, con queſto ſonnifero, & rendergli negligenti, à penſar d'offendergli, con la ſperanza di dover veder, che il tempo debba eſſer quello, che trionfi di così fatto nemico: & non è dubbio, che Prencipi Cattolici, ricercati à colligarſi contro il Turco, hanno dato per riſpoſta, che egli era meglio ſtar à veder quel che partorirebbe il tempo, parendo impoſſibile, che ſignoria così violenta, debba eſſer di lunga durata. Et per non parere di dire coſe del tutto à vento, certo è, che per accelerar la morte di qualche Imperadore Romano, ſi ſerviva alcuno di ſparger voci, che le ſtelle promettevano il principato à tal' uno, che eſſi conoſcevano atto à dover, con ſi fatto preteſto, inſurgere contro al dominante, & accelerar' à ſe ſteſſi la ſucceſſione, con l'acceleratione della morte di lui. Onde al contrario potrebbe pur eſſere, che tra Turchi per diuturnar' il loro Imperio, ſi diffamaſſero queſte decerie, della ſua piccola durata, per indurre altri ad aſpettar, che illo pronoſtico ſi verifichi, ſenza venir' all' atto d'offenderlo, armata mano; Il che ſarebbe un ſottile, ma non impoſſibile ſtratagemma (4). - - - - *We daily read many predictions of Aſtrologers and many prophecies, which threaten the deſtruction of the Turkiſh empire: and we ſee theſe prophecies and predictions renewed from year to year, without ever being accompliſhed. Now I think that a man would not be far from the truth, who ſhould ſay* ‘*that*

(1) Turci magna ſtrage ſuorum in Chriſtianos arma movebunt. *See* Fileſacus, de Idolatria magica, *fol.* 33, *verſo.*

(2) *See* Fileſacus, ibid, & *fol.* 34, ex Leunclavio in Hiſtoriæ Muſulmanæ Appendice, *poſt Epiſtolas.*

(3) Fileſac. ibid. *fol.* 34.

(4) Bonifatio Vannozzi, della ſuppellettile de gli Auvertimenti Politici, *Volume primo*, *pag.* 97, *Bologna*, 1609.

themſelves of this ſtratagem. There would be no great craft in it, for nothing more animates men to arm againſt a monarch, than a belief that it is written in the deſtinies that he ſhall be very ſoon deſtroyed.

‘ *that they were intended by the Turks themſelves, or by ſome Chriſtian renegado, as a ſoporific, to lay aſleep the minds of Chriſtian princes, and make them remiſs in attacking the Turks, in hopes that at the time predicted they ſhould triumph over ſuch an enemy. There is no queſtion but that the Catholic princes being required to enter into a league againſt the Turks, have anſwered, that it was better to wait for what time ſhould bring forth, it appearing impoſſible that ſo unnatural a government could be of long continuance. And that I may not be thought to ſpeak at random, this is certain, that in order to haſten the death of a Roman Emperor, a certain perſon ſet about a report that the ſtars promiſed the empire to ſuch a one, who was ready under ſuch a pretence to raiſe inſurrections againſt the emperor and haſten the ſucceſſion to himſelf, by haſtning the emperor's death. Thus, on the contrary, it might be true, that the Turks to perpetuate their empire, ſpread about theſe ſurmiſes concerning the ſhort continuance of it, in order to induce the Chriſtians to wait for the accompliſhment of that prognoſtic, and not to attack them with an armed force. This would be a ſubtle, but not an impoſſible ſtratagem.*’ This may ſerve as a ſupplement to the remark [*GG*] of the article MAHOMET. I daily diſcover freſh matter to enlarge it, as it generally conſiſts of groſs errors. Here is an inſtance of it. A Father of the Oratory relates, that on certain days of the year, the Turks ſolemnly curſe the Chriſtians. They read in their moſques a prophecy of the deſtruction of the Ottoman empire by the Francs, after it has continued ten ages (5). During the reading of this prophecy the women cry diſmally, and ſweep the altars with their diſhevelled hair. They imagine that this ceremony will avert the impending fate with which they are threatned. This Father of the Oratory doth not aſfirm this of his own knowledge, but on the credit of one of his friends. *Vias Maſſilienſis Poëta (ſi mihi creditur) valdè bonus*, ſays he (6), *mihi olim cùm Maſſiliæ Rhetoricen profiterer multùm familiaris, in ſuis ad Sylvas* (7) *notis, morem refert Turcarum cùm illi Chriſtianos, quos perditè oderunt, ultrò ſtatis diebus deteſtantur. Habent, inquit ille, Turcæ inter ſuos faſtos prophetiam, per id tantum tempus, M. ſcilicet annos, Ottomanorum permanſurum, mox ſubvertendum à Francis. Legitur illa quotannis ſüis in Moſquetis, ut illius omnis terrore ultrò Chriſtianis adverſentur. Lugent interim ululantes fœminæ, ſparſiſque comis infanda verrunt altaria: ſicque huic malo fato procurare credunt, dum tam funeſto vaticinio perterrentur.*

(5) This prediction does not concern the Turkiſh empire, but the Mahometan religion. If it concerned the Turks, they would be a little too haſty; their monarchy would be very far from its deſtruction.

(6) Petrus Berthaldus, Libro ſingulari de Ara, *cap. xv, pag.* 181, 182, *Edit. Nannetenſis*, 1636.

(7) They are Statius's *Silvæ*, upon which Vias, a Poet of Provence, praiſed by Gaſſendus, *in Vita Peireſkii*, made ſome notes.

TORTELLIUS (John). See ARETIN (John.)

TOUCHET (Mary), miſtreſs to Charles IX, King of France, was a native of Orleans. What is affirmed by ſo many authors is not true; *viz.* That ſhe was an Apothecary's daughter [*A*]. Charles IX had children by her *(a)*, and afterwards ſhe was married to a perſon of quality. I believe ſhe was not married to him till after the death of that monarch [*B*]. She had two daughters lawfully begotten, who followed her example; one was concubine to Henry IV, and the other to the Marſhal de Baſſompierre

(*a*) See the remark [*F*].

[*A*] *It is not true that ſhe was an Apothecary's daughter.*] She is obliged to Brantome for this origin, whom I ſhall cite below. Papyrius Maſſo ſeems to make her of a meaner deſcent, for one would think by what he ſays, that ſhe was a Perfumer's daughter (1), *Amavit Mariam Tochetiam Aurelianenſis Unguentarii* (2) *filiam.* Others ſay, ſhe was a Scrivener's daughter; but it is certain that ſhe was better deſcended, as Mr le Laboureur ſhews. ‘ John Touchet, her father, ſaith he (3), took the title of Sieur de Beauvais and du Quillart, Counſellor to the king, and Lieutenant-particular of the bailiwic and preſidial court of Orleans. He was the ſon of Peter Touchet, a citizen of Orleans, and grandſon of John Touchet, Advocate and Counſellor at Orleans, in the year 1492, whoſe father was Regnaut Touchet, a Merchant of the town of Parthai en Beauſſe. And all that could be ſaid againſt this lady's birth was, that her mother was Mary Mathy, the natural daughter of Orable Mathy, a Dutchman, and one of the king's Phyſicians, who to obtain this alliance, gave two thouſand crowns with her, which was then a conſiderable ſum.’

An error about the family of Madame de la Valiere.

Men commonly fall into two ſorts of extremes concerning thoſe whom providence hath very much exalted above their birth. Some by fabulous genealogies furniſh them with anceſtors of the firſt quality; others debaſe them to a much meaner extraction than their true one; either to indulge envy and calumny, or to repreſent the aggrandizing of their fortune as ſomething ſtupendious and more proper for exclamations. The Hiſtorian of the *Amours du Palais Roial*, hath degraded the nobility of Madam de la Valiere, in making her a mean citizen of Tours. Yet (4) ſhe was of a family related to that of Beauvau-le-Rivau, one of the moſt noble of the country; and about an hundred years ago, one Lord de la Valiere married a lady who had been maid of honour to Queen Louïſe, conſort to Henry III. Which doubtleſs he had never done, if he had not been a gentleman. We ſhall ſhew in their places, that ſlanders of this nature were raiſed againſt Albert de Gondi, firſt Duke of Rets, againſt Cardinal de Pellevé, the Conſtable de Luynes, Cardinal Mazarine, &c.

[*B*] *That ſhe did not marry him till after the death of Charles* IX.] Mezerai knew very well that Mary Touchet's father was Lieutenant-particular of the preſidial of Orleans; but I ſomewhat doubt what he adds, that Charles IX married this miſtreſs to *Francis Balzac d'Entragues, governor of Orleans* (5). I paſs over in ſilence that this Francis Balzac was not governor of Orleans, till ſeveral intrigues had occaſioned the Chancellor de Chiverni's loſing that government in the year 1588, before which he was only lieutenant of that city (6); I ſay only that his marriage with Mary Touchet, ſeems to be poſterior to the death of Charles IX. And this is all I can ſay at preſent, not being in a place where I can conſult the genealogy of this houſe, nor having yet in my poſſeſſion ſuch books as are capable of affording an entire certainty. But conſidering on one ſide what Papyrius Maſſo ſays, that King Charles, on his death-bed, durſt not himſelf recommend his miſtreſs to the queen his mother, but did it by the mediation of Charles de Gondi (7); and on the other ſide, what Mr le Laboureur tells us (8). *That we ought not to be ſurprized, that Mary Touchet found ſo good a match after ſo great a figure ſhe had made at court, where ſhe maintained her rank as well as any of the ladies of the firſt quality* (9). Conſidering, I ſay, theſe two things, I cannot think ſhe was married to the Lord d'Entragues in the life time of Charles IX. For if ſo, it would have been unneceſſary for that prince to cauſe her to be recommended to Catherine de Medicis, (ſuch an huſband being a ſufficient protector) and one could not apprehend why Mr le Laboureur offers ſo many reaſons why we ſhould not be ſurprized at the marriage of Francis de Balzac with Mary Touchet, without mentioning the chief, which muſt have been the great favours beſtowed by a living king upon his miſtreſs's huſband. This author obſerves, that ſhe *was equally incomparable for wit and beauty*, and that the anagram made on her name, *Maria Touchet, Je charme tout, (I charm all)* was very juſt. He ſaith alſo that Mr d'Entragues

became

(1) Papyr. Maſſo, in Vita Caroli IX.

(2) Parhaps this word ought to be rendred an Apothecary, as le Laboureur renders it.

(3) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Mem. de Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 656.

(4) Mr de Marolles, abbot of Villeloin, in the catalogue of his writings, *pag.* 8.

(5) Mezer. Ab. Chronolog. *Tom. v, pag.* 184.

(6) Thuan. Hiſt. *lib. xcii.*

(7) Brantome relates the thing ſomewhat differently. Being a dying, ſays he, he ordered Mr de la Tour to remember him to her (his miſtreſs) and never durſt ſpeak of her to the queen his mother.

(8) Le Laboureur, ubi ſupra.

(9) He had ſaid, *pag.* 70. That ſhe had no leſs ambition and dexterity than the Ducheſs of Etampes, and the Ducheſs of Valentinois, and that ſhe maintained her rank ſo well, that all the glory, and all the artifices of Queen Catherine, could not put her out of countenance.

pierre [*C*]. The reaſon ſhe ſtabbed a page, according to ſome authors, is ſomewhat curious [*D*]. What ſhe ſaid, as ſhe viewed the picture of the princeſs, whom Charles IX was

became ſo enamoured of her, that he was called in deriſion, *d'Entragues Touchet, Duke of Orleans*, in a libel intituled, *The king's edict diſguiſed* (10), *written in the year* 1586, *againſt certain ſparks called Bourbons, and ſome ſtupid ſots, and German drunkards.*

[*C*] *One was concubine to Henry IV, and the other to the Marſhal de Baſſompierre.*] If the fact which I relate in the remark [*D*] is true, Henry IV might have been deceived; for perhaps the girl that was raviſhed might be the very lady d'Entragues, who ſo much valued the preſent of her virginity to this prince. A particular relation of her ſubtilties and cajoling is to be ſeen in Sulli's Memoirs, and Perefixe's Hiſtory. The hundred thouſand crowns with which the king preſented her, were not a ſhower of gold ſufficient to introduce him into her lap, and put an end to her artifices by which ſhe diſputed the ground. He muſt at laſt be forced to promiſe her marriage, to remove the difficulties and oppoſitions of the father and mother, which the daughter ſeaſonably cauſed to intervene, and which ſhe declared were not to be ſurmounted, unleſs theſe good people were brought over to ſuch a nice point, by this promiſe ſatisfying their conſciences towards God, and ſheltering their honour from the malicious world. This fair one ſo artfully repreſented to her lover (11), *That he ought not to make any difficulty to ſatisfy their deſire, ſince it was only that he ſhould give her a ſmall bit of paper* (12) *in exchange for what to her was the moſt valuable thing in the world; that he obliged himſelf under his hand to marry her within a year, provided, within the compaſs of that time ſhe brought him a male-child.* If the adventure mentioned by St Romuald, was meant of this lady, what vaſt expences and earneſt purſuits was a great monarch put to, in order to enjoy a page's leavings!

Mr de Roſni, the moſt zealous man in the world for the true intereſts of this prince, was not contented with tearing this promiſe of marriage when the king ſhewed it him; but he endeavoured to cure that prince, by urging to him more ſuſpicions concerning the lady's virtue, than he ſeemed to entertain of it. It is true, that monarch told this favourite, that he fatigued himſelf *in queſt of a maidenhead, which perhaps he ſhould not find.* But the other talked much more ſuſpiciouſly of her honour. 'If you remember, ſays he, what ' you have formerly ſaid to me concerning this lady ' and her brother, in the Ducheſs's time, how freely ' you then talked of them, and the commands which ' you obliged me to carry to that baggage, (for ſo ' you then called the houſe and family of Mr and Madam d'Antragues) to leave Paris, you will be apt to ' doubt more than at preſent you do, whether you ' will ever find what you expect.' See Sulli's Memoirs, pag, 248, and 253, tome 2. of the Dutch edition, 1652 in 12mo.

However, from all this we learn, that this lady was more tender of her daughter's honour than ſhe had been of her own. The puniſhment of the page (13), if true, is a proof of it, for ſhe would not probably have been guilty of a murder on that account, if ſhe had been treated in the ſame manner before. We may further obſerve how conſcientious a mother ſhe was, and how cautious with reſpect to the world, when her daughter was concerned, but ſhe had not been ſo in her own caſe with regard to Charles IX. Yet her care was ineffectual: for as ſhe trod in the ſteps of her grand-mother (14), ſo did her daughters in her's. One of them (15) furniſhed a natural race to Henry IV, as the other did to Marſhal Baſſompierre. Let us hear the marſhal himſelf on this head. 'I ' returned to Paris, ſays he (16), to ſee my miſtreſs ' (17) in the Coutellerie-ſtreet, where her lodging was, in which I had a private paſſage to ' the third ſtory which her mother did not rent; ' and ſhe came to me by a private ſtair-caſe of the ' wardrobe when her mother was aſleep.' A little after he hints ſomewhat from whence one might infer, that Henry IV would have made no conſcience of enjoying both ſiſters, which is that his prince was his rival. He informs us of another thing which confirms my laſt remark concerning Mary Touchet. 'By ' misfortune, ſaith he, the mother had notice of it, ' and kept the ſtricter guard. One morning, going ' to ſpit, and lifting up the curtain of her bed, ſhe ' ſaw that of her daughter's uncovered, and obſerving ' that ſhe was miſſing, ſhe roſe very ſoftly, and went ' up into the wardrobe, where ſhe diſcovered that the ' door of our private ſtair-caſe was open, which ſhe ' thought had been nailed up. This made her ſhriek ' out, and her daughter at her voice immediately ' ran to her. I in the mean time ſhut the door, and ' marched off in pain to know the event of this affair, which was that her mother beat her, and cauſed ' the door of the chamber, in the third ſtory, where ' we were in the night, to be broke open, which ' ſhe was ſurprized to find hung with velvet, and ' ſplendidly furniſhed with candleſticks and other utenſils of ſilver, as well as all other rich furniture. Then ' all our converſation was broke off; but I accommodated the matter with her mother, by means of a ' young gentlewoman named d'Azi (18), at whoſe ' houſe I ſaw her, and aſked her a thouſand pardons, ' proteſting that nothing had paſſed beyond kiſſing, ' which ſhe pretended to believe (19).' He was not long deprived of this lady's converſation, for after ſome months Madam d'Entragues being gone to court, he ſays (20), he *paſſed his time very well with her daughter, and with others alſo.* The young lady proved with child four years after, and being turned out of doors by her mother, *ſhe deſired her lover to give her a promiſe of marriage to appeaſe her mother, offering at the ſame time all the counter-promiſes which he could deſire, urging that ſhe begged this only, that ſhe might lie-in quietly, and enjoy the benefit of her mother's aſſiſtance* (21). She obtained her requeſt, and was ſo good natured as not to fail in her counter-promiſe.

There goes a ſtory which I ſhall here relate. That Marſhal taking the air in a coach with the Queen, when there was a great number of coaches in the ring, it happened that Madam d'Entragues's coach was obliged to ſtop for ſome time very near that of the Queen, by reaſon of the crowd. The Queen looking upon the Marſhal, *There is*, ſaid ſhe, *Madam de Baſſompierre.* That is only her nick-name, replied he, loud enough to be heard by his old miſtreſs: upon which ſhe cried out, *You are a fool, Baſſompierre: Not enough to marry your ladyſhip*, replied he; and then the coaches began to move. As this Marſhal had a vaſt number of amours, I cannot tell whether this other ſtory in Mr Menage relates to another, or the ſame miſtreſs: 'Marſhal Baſſompierre's coach being entangled with that ' of a lady whom he had loved, and on whom he ' had ſpent vaſt ſums, ſhe ſaid aloud; Is it you, Marſhal, from whom I have plucked ſo many feathers? ' It is true, Madam, replied he, but they were only ' the feathers of my tail, and my flight is not thereby ' hindred (22).'

[*D*] *The reaſon why ſhe ſtabbed a page, is ſomewhat curious.*] I ſhall here repeat, without the leaſt alteration, what I have ſaid in the project of this Dictionary. Dom Peter de St Romauld agrees in chronology with de Mezarai, as to the marriage of Mary Touchet (23); for he places it in 1572. His Printer was a perfect murtherer of proper names, after the example of ſeveral of his brethren. The paſſage contains an action ſo particular, that it deſerves to be ſet down entire. '(24) It was about that time (25) that ' Francis de Baſſac, Lord of Entragues-Marcouſte (26), ' governor of Orleans, married, for his ſecond wife, ' Mary Touchet, an Apothecary's daughter in that ' city, equally remarkable for wit and beauty, by ' whom King Charles IX had had a ſon, afterwards ' called the Count d'Auvergne. An action as ſtrange as ' bold is told of her, which ſhe did to one of her ' huſband's pages, who had raviſhed one of her ' daughters, very young and beautiful, in a ſummer-houſe in the garden, inſtigated by a mad fit of love. ' This wretch ſhe ſtabbed upon the ſtop, depriving ' him of life, who had robbed her daughter of her ' honour.' I wiſh that this honeſt Monk, who hath heaped up ſo many events of all ſorts, but not without being liable to ſome ſuſpicion, had told us where he had this; for I would not adviſe the reader to believe him upon his bare word.

[*E*] *What*

(10) By way of alluſion to the Duke of Guiſe.

(11) Perefixe, Vie de Henri IV, *in the year* 1600, *wherein he is miſtaken by one year; for it was in the ſummer, of the year* 1599, *that the king enjoyed her. See* Baſſompierre's Journal, *Tom. i, pag.* 58.

(12) It muſt be obſerved that ſhe gave her word to the king, never to make uſe of that promiſe, there being beſides no official ſufficient to ſummon ſuch a monarch to appear, and that it ſhould be with *all the conditions ſhe knew were deſired by him.* Memoires de Sulli, *Tom. ii, pag.* 247, 248, *Dutch Edit.* 1652, *in 12mo.*

(13) See the remark [*D*].

(14) I have ſaid above remark [*A*], that Mary Touchet's mother was a baſtard.

(15) Catherine Henrietta de Balzac, Marchioneſs of Verneuil, who died in 1633, being in her 54th year, according to Father Anſelme; from hence it would follow, that Mr de Perefixe ſhould have allowed her more than 18 years, in the year 1600.

(16) Journal of his Life, *Tom. i, pag.* 152.

(17) Mary de Balzac, whom he only calls d'Entragues, by whom he had the Biſhop of Xaintes, who died in 1676.

(18) Perhaps the ſame, whom he calls d' Achy, *pag.* 173, proper names being very much confounded in this Journal.

(19) Journal de Baſſompierre, ibid. *pag.* 157, *ad ann.* 1606.

(20) Ibid. *pag.* 165.

(21) Ibid. *pag.* 261.

(22) Suite du Menagiana, *pag.* 374, *Dutch Edit.*

(23) See the remark [*F*], towards the end.

(24) Pierre de St Romuald, *abridgment of the iiid Tome of his* Thréſor Chronol. & Hiſtor. *pag. m.* 348, *ad ann.* 1572.

(25) That is, the Paris Maſſacre.

(26) It ſhould be Balzac, Lord of Entragues and Marcouſſis.

was to marry, deſerves to be known [*E*]. I take this occaſion to obſerve, that thoſe who tell us that this king was no lover of women, have not looked narrowly into the matter [*F*]. It ought not to be thought ſtrange that I ſhould beſtow ſome articles on ſuch

[*E*] *What ſhe ſaid, as ſhe viewed the picture of the Princeſs . . . deſerves to be known.*] She eagerly aimed at the poſſeſſion of King Charles's heart, to the prejudice of his conſort. She was very curious, when the treaty of marriage with Elizabeth of Auſtria was on foot, in examining the picture of that princeſs, and *having very well conſidered it, ſhe only ſaid, I am not afraid of her.* Inſinuating by that, as Brantome ſaith (27), *that ſhe preſumed ſo much on her perſon and beauty, that ſhe believed the king could not leave her.* Papyrius Maſſo tells us, that when ſhe examined the picture, and ſaid, ſmiling, *I am not afraid of that German lady,* the queen was then arrived (28); but it is not at all probable that Mary Touchet ſhould have ſtaid ſo long before ſhe ſaw the Queen's picture; and Brantome's relation ſeems therefore more likely, with regard to the circumſtance of time. Gabrielle d'Etrée ſoon ſaw the pictures of the Infanta of Spain, and of Mary de Medicis, when there was a report of their marriage with Henry IV; they pretend ſhe ſaid, that ſhe had no apprehenſion of the brown Spaniard, but very much feared the Florentine (29). We have this from an Hiſtorian, who affirmeth that he heard it himſelf. *I remember*, ſaith he (30), *that the King having intruſted to my keeping the pictures of theſe two Princeſſes, permitted me to ſhew them to the Ducheſs, and obſerve what ſhe would ſay; which was, I am not afraid of that black woman, but the other gives me ſome apprehenſions.*

[*F*] *Thoſe who tell us that this king was no lover of women, have not looked narrowly into the matter.*] Thoſe Hiſtorians who have moſt freely ſpoken of his ill qualities, ſay that he was not very irregular with regard to women. Some had endeavoured to throw him into debaucheries, both as to women and wine; *but once perceiving that wine diſturbed his reaſon, ſo much that it made him commit ſeveral violences, he abſtained from it the whole remainder of his life: and as for women, being ill ſerved by one of thoſe about his mother's perſon, he took an averſion to the ſex, and ſcarce ever was intimate with any of them again.* So Mr Mezerai expreſſes himſelf (31), without obſerving the rule of the Grammarian, who cenſured the placing of the expreſſions in Voiture's famous ſonnet, where the laſt imported much leſs than the firſt, *I bleſs my torment, and content to die, dare not complain of her tyranny* (32). Brantome ſays, that this Prince did not at firſt appear very fond of the fair ſex, and that the reproaches of the ladies animated him. ‘ I remember, *ſaith he* (33), that in his briſkeſt age of ſeventeen or eighteen years, being once violently tormented with the tooth-ach, and the Phyſician's remedies proving ineffectual, a great lady at court, and who belonged to him, gave him a receipt, which ſhe had often experienced herſelf, and found very good; but it did him no good, and next day ſhe aſking him how he found himſelf; he anſwered, not well at all; and ſhe replied, *I am not ſurprized at it, Sir, ſince you neither love, nor truſt the women, but prefer hunting and dogs to all of us. Whence*, ſaid he, *have you that opinion of me, that I love the exerciſe of hunting better than your's? By G . . ., if you provoke me once, I ſhall join you ſo cloſe, that I ſhall throw you all on your backs one after another.* He was not as good as his word with regard to ALL, but he attacked ſome of them, rather on account of his reputation, than to gratify his laſciviouſneſs, and that very cooly too, and choſe for his miſtreſs a lady of a very good family, and whom I ſhall not name. She was a very beautiful, diſcreet, and virtuous lady, whom he treated with all poſſible honour and reſpect, and more, ſaid he, to form an agreeable air than for any other end; nothing, ſaid he, contributing more to poliſh a young man, than a love fixed on a fine and noble ſubject. He always loved this virtuous lady to his death, even when he had his Queen Elizabeth, a very agreeable and charming Princeſs. He alſo was very fond of Mary Jacoſſie, otherwiſe called TOUCHET, an Apothecary's daughter of Orleans, and a moſt beautiful creature, by whom he had the Grand-Prior, at preſent called the Count d'Auvergne:’ Here are three miſtreſſes (34), beſides a wife: for we ought not to confound her that Mr Mezerai ſaith ſerved the king ill, with her whom Brantome would not name, and whom this prince loved as long as he lived. When therefore we conſider that he died before he was quite twenty-four years of age, and after a long ſickneſs, and that hiſtory lays to him two natural ſons (35): I cannot ſee on what that averſion is grounded, which Mr Mezerai aſcribes to him. What would he have him do more? He wanted, it ſeems, a great deal to fix the character of debauchery on the lives of people. It is, indeed, true, that in compariſon of the horrible corruption of the court of France at that time, Charles IX might paſs for a ſort of a moderate man in that reſpect. This Hiſtorian mentions but one ſon of Charles IX by Mary Touchet, and tells us that he was born in 1572, and that he was firſt Grand-Prior of France, then Count d'Auvergne and Lauraguais, and afterwards Duke of Angoulême (36), and Count de Pontieu. Father Anſelme diſſents from this chronology, and ſays he was born (37) at the caſtle of Fayet in Dauphiné, near Montmelian, the 28th of April 1573. I cannot clearly account to my reader why this lady ſhould be ſent ſo far from the court, and her own country, to lie-in. This was not her firſt child; the high rank of the father took off the diſgrace, and nothing could engage her to affect privacy, as when upon ſuch an occaſion, a journey may ſeem neceſſary to conceal the thing, and to diſcharge the burthen unknown to the world.

If what Brantome relates, without believing it, was true, we ought not to entertain a great opinion of Mezerai's Memoirs, as to the averſion which he aſcribes to that Prince. *Some ſay* (they are Brantome's words) *that during his illneſs he ran to the Queen, and ſo heated himſelf that he ſhortned his days, which gave occaſion to the ſaying, that Venus killed him with Diana, which I cannot believe, for this was never talked of at court amongſt thoſe that were moſt worthy of credit, for I was there.* What he ſaith of Venus and Diana, is an alluſion to the two verſes which he had already cited, and were a kind of epitaph on Charles IX.

Pour aimer trop Diane & Cytherée auſſi,
L'une & l'autre m'ont mis en ce tombeau icy.

Too much I Venus and Diana ſought,
And therefore to my grave by them am brought.

PAPYRIUS Maſſo ill tranſlated by le Laboureur. Varillas criticiſed.

Papyrius Maſſo, who wrote an abridgment of this prince's life a year after his death, relates an event, perhaps, no truer than this, but at leaſt more probable. He ſaith the king, in his long illneſs, once went to ſee his miſtreſs Mary Touchet, and it was conjectured, that by diverting himſelf with her at an improper time, or to exceſs, he increaſed his diſtemper and haſtened his death. *Sane Rex ipſe inter moras longiſſimi morbi ſemel ad eam divertit, ſuſpicioque eſt auctum morbum ex importuno aut immodico coitu & acceleratum vitæ finem* (38). Mr le Laboureur (39) hath ill tranſlated theſe words thus: *Alſo the king, once, during his tedious diſtemper, going to ſee her, it is taken for certain, that on account of not being in a condition to approach her, or being guilty of ſome exceſs, his diſeaſe increaſed, and this viſit haſtened his days.* Not to take notice that he delivers that as a certainty, which amounts only to a ſuſpicion in the Latin, I am apt to think that there are ſcarce any readers who by theſe words, *on account of not being in a condition*, would not imagine ſomething elſe than the Hiſtorian intended to ſay; ſome accident like that which Mr Rabutin imitates out of Petronius (40). Mr Varillas has not failed to adopt this paſſage of Papyrius Maſſo. ‘ The king was dangerouſly ill, *ſaith he* (41), and thoſe who knew him intimately, whiſpered two cauſes of it. The firſt was his haſty journey from Paris to Orleans to viſit the beautiful Mary Touchet, his miſtreſs; and the ſecond the poiſon which they pretended was given him ſuch women as theſe are [G].

---

(27) Brant. Diſcours ſur Charles IX.

(28) Inſpecta Iſabellæ Reginæ, quæ recens in Galliam venerat, pictura, riſiſſe dicitur, addito verbo nihil me terret Germana.

(29) Du Pleix, Hiſt. de Henri IV, *pag.* 262.

(30) D'Aubigné, *Tom. iii, p.* 637.

(31) Mezerai, Abrégé Chron. *Tom. v, pag.* 183.

(32) See the pieces at the end of Balzac's *Socrate Chretien.*

(33) Brantome, ubi ſupra.

(34) Le Laboureur, additions to Caſtelnau's Memoires, *Tom. ii*, mentions a letter, where it is ſaid that Charles IX was in love with the wife of the Sieur de la Tour. See the laſt paragraph but one of this remak.

(35) *Father* Anſelme, Hiſt. Généalog. de France, *pag.* 146, *does not ſay whether they had both the ſame mother: But Papyrius Maſſo mentions two, whom he had by Mary Touchet.*

(36) The laſt Dukes of Angouleme are deſcended from him. He died at Paris the 24th of September, 1650.

(37) Hiſt. Généalog. *p.* 175.

(38) Papyr. Maſſo, in Vita Caroli IX.

(39) Addit. à Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 879.

(40) *In the* Hiſtoire amoureuſe des Gaules. Ovid, Amor. *lib. iii*, Eleg. vii, *deſcribes ſuch an accident at large.*

(41) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, *Tom. ii, pag.* 365, *Dutch Edit.* 1684.

‘ him by his ſteward (42) la Tour, younger brother ‘ to the Marſhal de Rets and the Biſhop of Paris. The ‘ extraordinary vigour of this prince ſeemed to ſurmount his ſickneſs, and the apprehenſion which la ‘ Tour had conceived of the report ſpread concerning ‘ him, threw him into a phrenzy, which occaſioned ‘ his death ſoon after.’ Mr Varillas only cites Papyrius Maſſo.

(42) Brantome makes him maſter of the Wardrobe: Papyrius Maſſo calls him *Carolum Gondiam Cubicularium.* The Journal of Henry III, makes him maſter of the Wardrobe, and places his death on the 15th of June 1574, and attributes it to another cauſe.

This gives me occaſion to make ſome remarks; for, I. The author to whom Mr Varillas refers us, doth not ſay that Charles IX was obliged to take a journey to Orleans to ſee Mary Touchet; and there is very little reaſon to believe that ſhe ſhould keep ſo far from the king, ſince ſhe was his public miſtreſs, and had had children by him. In the ſecond place, it is falſe that Maſſo charges this poiſoning on la Tour; on the contrary, he makes him die of a diſtemper occaſioned by his grief, for having loſt, with Charles IX, the hopes of a vaſt fortune. I do not deny that la Tour was accuſed of this wicked act by others; but he ought then to have referred us ſomewhere elſe than to Papyrius Maſſo's elogy. Mr le Laboureur hath inſerted, in his additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, page 462 of the ſecond tome, a ſatirical letter, in which Catherine de Medicis is reproached for having cauſed Charles IX to be poiſoned by the Sieur de la Tour, and afterwards la Tour by another. ‘ Your majeſty ‘ contrived it ſo, *ſays the author of this letter*, that the ‘ late Sieur de la Tour was made to underſtand, either by ‘ you, or by your appointment, that the late king ‘ your ſon deſigned to kill him, that he might the ‘ more eaſily enjoy his wife; which the ſaid la Tour ‘ was readily induced to believe, becauſe he very well ‘ knew that the late king paſſionately loved her, and ‘ was, on that account, without difficulty, engaged ‘ to poiſon his ſaid majeſty, *&c.*’ This letter is dated at Lauſanne, the third month of the fourth year after the treachery, *(that is, the Paris maſſacre)* and is ſigned *Grandchamp*, who was a gentleman of Nivernois, who had been ambaſſador at Conſtantinople, and engaged in the intrigues of la Mole and Coconnas. In the third place, it is impoſſible to gueſs, from Mr Varillas's words, whether la Tour died before or after the king; but we ſhould be more apt to conclude it was before than after: nevertheleſs he died after this prince, either of regret, or poiſon, or fear, or ſome other way.

Here is a particular which is not diſhonourable to Charles IX. ‘ That prince one day walking in the ‘ Tuilleries, and ſeeing a charming fine woman, ſtark-‘ naked, ſwim over the river from the Louvre to St ‘ Germains, ſtopped to obſerve her; but whilſt his ‘ eyes, as well as thoſe of the reſt of the court, were fixed ‘ on the beautiful object, ſhe dived out of ſight, and ‘ at laſt riſing to the ſurface of the water, as ſwift as ‘ lightning, flew aſhoar, began to wring her hair and ‘ do what Antipater ſays of Venus:

Voy n'agueres Venus hors de la mer ſortant,
Ouvrage d'Apelles, entre ſes mains tenant
Ses moettes cheveux; elle faict de ſa treſſe
Humide l'eſpraignant, ſortir l'eſcume eſpaiſſe.

Fair Venus, whom Apelles drew,
Ariſing from the ſeas,
Her wat'ry locks holds in her hands,
And thence thick foam does ſqueeze.

‘ After which ſhe retired, carrying with her the eyes ‘ and hearts of all the company. Nevertheleſs though ‘ the thing was diverting enough, it appeared ſo odd ‘ and ſtrange to the king, that he was not heard to ‘ ſay one word in her praiſe, tho' he heard the greateſt ‘ part of his retinue, and even the moſt reſerved, ‘ loudly expreſs their admiration (43).

(43) Peter de Lancre, Counſellor of the Parliament of Bourdeaux, *Tableau de l'inconſtance & inſtabilité de toutes choſes, fol.* 52, *verſo.*

[G] *It ought not to be thought ſtrange that I ſhould beſtow ſome articles on ſuch women as theſe are.*] The beginning of this article in my Project contains theſe words: ‘ Dictionaries ought not to omit perſons of ‘ this claſs: the figure which they make in the ‘ world, is high enough to place them there, and ‘ doubtleſs ſuch a work as Mr Colomiés promiſed (44) ‘ and deſigned to intitle, *Cupid on the throne, or the* ‘ *Hiſtory of the Amours of our Kings ſince Dagobert,* ‘ would be very curious.’ Since the impreſſion of the Project, a book has appeared which carries the ſubject higher than Colomiés deſigned it, and begins with Pharamond. I ſhould rather chooſe Colomiés's performance than this. Colomiés would have ſaid nothing but what he had taken from ſome book, he would have conſulted ſcarce books, and always have named his vouchers. But this anonymous author who hath given us the Hiſtory of the galantries of the Kings of France, from the beginning of the monarchy to Lewis XIV, hath cited no authors, and has not at all prevented our ſuſpecting his book as a Romance. The firſt edition is better than the following ones: it is more natural and leſs clogged, and looks more like a Hiſtory. I happened one day to praiſe it upon that account before the Bookſeller who printed it. But he very freely anſwered that he had found by the ſale of the book that it was the greateſt fault in the work, and that it would be ſupplied in the ſecond edition. The public did not find (ſaid he) a ſufficient number of intrigues and ſurprizing adventures in that piece, we ſhall inſert enough of them to ſatisfy the reader. After this I diſtruſted that performance more than before. There are ſeveral things in it concerning Mary Touchet which I have refuted, or have not related, not being ſure that they are not the author's invention; as I judge concerning the dozen of cut-purſes whom he has introduced, that the King might ſee the love-letter which his miſtreſs had received from another galant, the Biſhop of Valence's brother (45).

(44) Colomiés, Gallia Orient. *pag.* 67.

(45) *See the* Intrigues Galantes de la Cour de France, *Tom. i, pag.* 234, *Dutch Edit.* 1695.

TOULOUSE, a city of France on the river Garonne, being one of the largeſt and moſt antient cities of the weſt, and the ſeat of the ſecond parliament of the kingdom, deſerves a very long article; but Mr Moreri and the Author of his Supplement having deſcribed it at large, I ſhall not dwell upon it. I ſhall only ſay that its conſuls bear the title of Capitouls, and become noble by virtue of their office. Mr de la Faille publiſhed an excellent diſſertation on this ſubject (*a*), when a ſearch was made after the falſe pretenders to nobility (*b*). The world impatiently expects the continuation of the Annals of Toulouſe, which that illuſtrious Writer hath compoſed (*c*). This city which hath always abounded with learned men (*d*), and does ſtill as much as ever (*e*), did very well deſerve the eſtabliſhment [*A*] of the Academy of the *Belles Lettres* erected there.

(*a*) You may ſee the ſubſtance of it in a quarto book of Mr Giles de la Roque concerning nobility.

(*b*) That is about the year 1666.

(*c*) Mr de Beauval ſpoke of the firſt volume of thoſe Annals, September 1688, *pag.* 3, *& ſeq.* See alſo the *Journal des Sçavans*, of the 19th of April, 1688. (*d*) *See* Balzac, in the laſt page of his *Oeuvres diverſes*, and *Sorberiana*, at the word *Toulouſe*. (*e*) The Paris ſtage and the French academy may witneſs it.

[*A*] *The eſtabliſhment of the Academy of the* Belles Lettres *erected there.*] Mr de Baſville (1), who in the Provinces over which he has been appointed intendant has ſhewn himſelf a ſon worthy of his illuſtrious father the Preſident de Lamoignon, whilſt his brother the Advocate-General (2) ſhews himſelf worthy of the ſame honour in the parliament of Paris, contributed very much to this new eſtabliſhment. He reſolved *to change the Floral Games of Toulouſe into an Academy of the* Belles Lettres (3). The ſociety of the Floral Games alarmed at this deſign, publiſhed ſome memoirs to engage the city to let things remain in their preſent poſture. Theſe memoirs were refuted; the uſeleſſneſs of thoſe games was ſhewn, *and the neceſſity of eſtabliſhing an Academy for the Belles Lettres in Toulouſe was urged, that the happy genius's which that city produces might be furniſhed with an opportunity of perfecting themſelves in eloquence.* It was aſſerted that *that city*

(1) Intendant of Languedoc.

(2) I wrote this in 1696, ſince which time this Advocate-General is become Preſident *au Mortier*, in the Parliament of Paris.

(3) See the *Journal des Sçavans*, of the 14th of September 1693, *pag.* 666, *Dutch Edit.*

might furniſh a great many ſubjects to imitate the Academiſts of the other cities of the realm, *and a long liſt of excellent genius's which Toulouſe has produced was collected* (4). To know whether theſe reaſons were effectual we need only read the following paſſage extracted out of one of Mr Couſin's Journals. ‘ The FloralGames of Toulouſe have been at laſt erected into an Academy, the letters patents for that purpoſe were ſealed at the end of the laſt year. This ſociety is compoſed of thirty five perſons eminently diſtinguiſhed for their merit and learning. They will diſtribute two prizes annually, out of the rents of the Floral Games,which are conſiderable (5).

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary I have been informed by the *Journal des Savans* of the 11th of June 1696, that it was not long after the eſtabliſhment of the French Academy that Mr Pelliſſon, *who was then at Toulouſe, formed a ſcheme of a ſociety deſigned to the ſame end; which yet was not brought to perfection till the year* 1688, *when ſome learned men began to meet at the houſe of Mr Carriere, chief Juſtice and Preſident of the preſidial court of that city, which they continued to do till the year* 1694, *when they removed to Mr de Mondran, a gentleman whoſe houſe was more conveniently ſituate* (6). *That thoſe who deſire to know who were the perſons that compoſed this ſociety, and what their exerciſes were, may be informed of it by reading the anſwer of Mr deMartel,one of the members and the worthy ſecretary of this ſociety, which he cauſed to be printed at Montauban in* 1692, *to take off the diſadvantageous impreſſions which the author of a Memoir againſt this eſtabliſhment endeavoured to make, under the pretence of defending the Floral Games. That the gentlemen who aſſiſt at theſe* Academical Conferences, *frequently compoſe in verſe and proſe, pieces in honour of the King and on other important ſubjects; ſeveral of which have been printed and met with a general applauſe. Their zeal went conſiderably farther in the year one thouſand ſix hundred and ninety four, when they beſtowed a prize of a gold medal amounting to the value of twelve piſtoles* (7). All this and ſeveral other particulars much redounding to the glory of theſe gentlemen, are mentioned in an extract of a letter from Toulouſe, publiſhed by Mr Couſin author of the *Journal des Savans*. I have received from that city a long manuſcript memoir, the ſubſtance whereof I ſhould very willingly inſert here, if the Printer could give me time to write for and receive the information which I want. But as I did not examine this memoir till two days before I ſent this article to the Preſs, I cannot wait for that information: I am therefore obliged to confine myſelf to a few extracts, by which the reader may eaſily perceive that the Academy erected at Toulouſe, is diſtinct from the ſociety in which the academical conferences mentioned in the *Journal des Savans* of the 11th of June 1696, were held.

Theſe conferences began in two different places at Toulouſe in 1640, at Mr de Malepeires (8), and at Mr de Campunaut's (9): but theſe two ſocieties united at Mr de Garrigis's counſellor of the preſidial court, and choſe for their director Mr de la Garde, *who had rendered himſelf equally famous for his Latin Poetry, and his excellent diſcoveries in natural Philoſophy; for he wrote againſt Ariſtotle's forms and accidents before Gaſſendus's works appeared.* Mr Donneville, Preſident au Mortier, re-eſtabliſhed theſe literary exerciſes in a much more conſpicuous manner in the year 1667. Mr de Nolet, Treaſurer of France, ſome time after eſtabliſhed regular conferences in his own houſe under the direction of Mr Bayle (10) Doctor of Phyſic; and Mr Regis made excellent diſcourſes in theſe conferences on Des Cartes's ſyſtem. Another ſociety was afterwards formed in the college de Foix, and they began to erect an Academy of Wits. The ſociety of the Floral Games did not reliſh this project, and an anonymous author wrote a tract to prove it impracticable. Mr Martel a member of the Academy of the *Ricovrati* at Padua, refuted him in a book (11), the extract of which is extant in the *Journal des Savans* of the 14th of September 1693. He in conjunction with Mr de Carriere (12) and Mr de Malepeire formed regular conferences which continued to the year 1698. ‘ Mr Pelliſſon, who with Mr de Malepeire had formerly laid the foundation of ſuch literary exerciſes at Toulouſe, could not ſee this happy re-eſtabliſhment, without looking on it in ſome meaſure as his own work, ſince he had formed the firſt plan of it, and ſince the illuſtrious magiſtrate, whom he had formerly aſſociated in the firſt conferences, had ſo large a ſhare and was ſo much concerned in the reviving of them. This great man continually bent on the improvement of polite learning, ſuggeſted to the authors of theſe new exerciſes the erection of their ſociety into an Academy of the *Belles Lettres*, to be firmly eſtabliſhed at Toulouſe. He offered his intereſt, flattering himſelf with reaſon that he was able to procure the ſame advantage for Toulouſe, which he had formerly obtained, even in a conjuncture leſs favourable, in behalf of Soiſſons. To further this deſign he engaged the Prince du Mayne,Governor of Languedoc, to be their protector, who preſented a petition to the King, ſupplicating his Majeſty to approve the project and execution of that deſign. It was in acknowledgment of ſo ſignal a favour that Mr Richebourg, a member of this ſociety, had the honour to addreſs an ingenious fable to this Prince. . . . . This piece of Poetry alarmed ſome of the gentlemen of the Floral Games . . . . and then their ſociety, favoured by ſeveral illuſtrious magiſtrates who were members of it, fearing the new Academy would be erected on the ruins of theirs, which had the management of a conſiderable fund, took the moſt proper meaſures to get it eſtabliſhed by letters patents under the protection of the Chancellors of France. They preſerved as much as poſſible the name and cuſtoms it had, in order to follow the footſteps of its antient eſtabliſhment: for beſides that by their ſtatutes theſe gentlemen are reſtrained from printing any thing in the name of the ſociety, or returning any thanks on their reception, of the four prizes diſtributed, three, and even one of the moſt conſiderable, are appointed for Poetry. The gentlemen of the academical conferences redoubled their zeal to perfect their ſtudies; and as they had particularly in view eloquence, antiquities, and all that relates to the *Belles Lettres*, they choſe Terence's Comedies and Quintilian, for the ſubject of their conferences. Mr de Mondran, Treaſurer of France, who had an houſe very conveniently ſituated in the middle of the city, offered it to them for the performance of their exerciſes.’

The author of the memoir from whence I have extracted all this, concludes with ſaying *that thoſe conferences, which would not have been interrupted on any other account than the death of ſeveral worthy members, may, it is hoped, be revived in a juncture ſo favourable to the ſciences as the general peace which prevails throughout Europe* (13).

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 668.

(5) Journal des Sçavans, *of the ſeventh of February*, 1695, *pag.* 108, *Dutch Edit.* where this is ſaid to have been taken out of a letter written from Montauban the 12th of December 1695. It ſhould be 1694; and obſerve that theſe words *laſt year* relate not to the date of the letter, but to that of the Journal.

(6) Journal des Sçavans, 1696, *pag.* 426, *Dutch Edit.*

(7) Ibid. *pag.* 427.

(8) Now Dean of the Preſidial.

(9) Father of Mr Campunaut, Regius Profeſſor of the Civil-Law.

(10) He is Profeſſor of Philoſophy. See citation (132), of the article RORARIUS.

(11) Printed at Montauban, in 1692.

(12) Now Chief Juſtice.

(13) This was written in the beginning of the year 1700.

TRABEA (QUINTUS) a Comic Poet, ſome of whoſe verſes are cited by Cicero *(a)*. The piece which he intituled *Ergaſtulum*, is cited by Nonnius Marcellus *(b)*. Aulus Gellius informs us that Vulcatius Sedigitus gave him the eighth place among the ten Comic Poets of antient Rome (*c*). Muretus's fraudulent impoſition on the great Scaliger [*A*], which

(*a*) Cicero, Tuſcul. *lib. iv, fol. m.* 270, *B. See alſo lib. ii,* de Finibus, *fol.* 219, *D.*

(*b*) Noninus Marcell. *Voce* Rarenter, *pag. m.* 515.

(*c*) Aulus Gellius, *lib. xv, cap. xxiii.*

[*A*] *Muret's fraudulent impoſition on the great Scaliger.*] I ſhall collect ſeveral paſſages relating to this fact. ‘ Scaliger at the age of eighteen valued himſelf on diſcerning the different manners of writing of all ages. Muretus to intrap him, made ſome verſes which he ſhewed him, pretending that he had received them from Germany, and that they were tranſcribed from an old manuſcript. Scaliger after having attentively read them, aſſured him without heſitation that Trabea an antient comic Poet was the author of them: and continuing in the ſame opinion that his conjecture was infallible, he afterwards cited theſe verſes as written by this antient Poet in his commentary on Varro, Muretus laughed at it heartily, without the leaſt reſerve (1).’ Coſtar having expreſſed himſelf thus, in his apology, did

(1) Coſtar, Apolog. *pag.* 303, 304.

which made him cite ſome verſes of Trabea's which were of a much later date, deſerves

did afterwards more particularly explain in a letter the circumſtances of that fact. ‘ Theſe verſes of Muretus, falſely aſcribed to the antient comic Poet ‘ Trabea, deſerve indeed your impatient deſire to ſee ‘ them. As I have the honour to know you, I dare ‘ ſay that you will learn them by heart; for they ‘ elegantly expreſs a moral and frequently uſeful reflexion.

Here, ſi querelis, ejulatu, fletibus,
Medicina fieret miſeriis Mortalium,
Auro parandæ lacrumæ contrà forent.
Nunc hæc ad minuenda mala non magis valent,
Quàm nænia Præficæ ad excitandos Mortuos.
Res turbidæ conſilium, non fletum expetunt.

Were moans, or cries, or tears, a cure
For all thoſe ills which men endure,
Then tears for money ſhould be bought,
And would by every one be ſought.
Now, Maſter, theſe ſtand us in ſtead
No more than ſongs to raiſe the dead.
Advice is needful in diſtreſs,
Whining affords us no redreſs.

‘ Scaliger cited theſe verſes in his commentary on ‘ *Varro de Re Ruſtica*, page 211 of Henry Stephens's ‘ edition. Producam autem, *ſaith he*, locum ve‘teris Comici Trabeæ ex Fabula Harpace, ubi hoc ‘ loquendi genus uſurpatur, &c (2). (*He is ſpeaking of* ‘ *the phraſe*, auro contrà) Quis enim tam averſus à ‘ Muſis, tamque humanitatis expers, qui horum ver‘ſuum publicatione offendatur, &c. - - - *I ſhall quote* ‘ *a paſſage from the play Harpace of the antient comic* ‘ *Poet Trabea, where this manner of ſpeaking is* ‘ *uſed*, &c. *for who is ſuch an enemy to the Muſes,* ‘ *and ſo void of humanity, as to be offended with the* ‘ *publication of theſe verſes*. Muretus bragged of ‘ having deceived that great man who thought him‘ſelf infallible, and Scaliger ſenſibly touched by ‘ this cheat, revenged himſelf by the following di‘ſtich.

Qui rigidæ *flammas* evaſerat ante Toloſæ
Muretus, *fumos* vendidit ille mihi.

Muretus, who had from the flames *'ſcap'd free,*
Of rig'rous Tholouſe, ſold the ſmoke *to me.*

‘ You underſtand what he means by the *flames of* ‘ *the ſevere Toulouſe*, and have not forgot that Muretus ‘ was accuſed before the parliament of that city of a ‘ crime, which is puniſhed by fire. You will be ‘ glad to know too that Scaliger ſuppreſſed theſe ‘ verſes of Muretus in the ſecond edition of his com‘mentary (3).

Mr Borremans ſhould not have ſaid that this ſnare was laid for Julius Cæſar Scaliger (4). What is ſaid of this pretended paſſage of Trabea, being an epigram, is as groundleſs. ‘ Joſeph. Scaliger, cui ille (*Muretus*) ‘ verba dederat, atque epigramma recens a ſe compo‘ſitum pro vetere obtruſerat, &c (5). - - - *Joſeph* ‘ *Scaliger, on whom Muret had impoſed, and obtruded* ‘ *a modern epigram written by himſelf, for an antient* ‘ *one*, &c.' It was a paſſage in a ſcene of a comedy. See Mr Menage in the 83d chapter of the *Anti-Baillet*, where you will find ſeveral curious things concerning this fact, but not the whole paſſage of Scaliger. I cannot believe that Menage purpoſely omitted it. I ſuſpect that he had not by him the commentary on Varro; for if he had known that it contains another ſnare into which this great Critic fell, I am apt to think he had freely cited it. I have not that edition of Scaliger's commentary, but on the credit of Scriverius I ſhall venture to affirm that immediately after the words cited by Coſtar are the following (6). ‘ Quod ſi hi placent, non grava‘bor, & alios ejuſdem notæ, ſed alius Poetæ, adhi‘bere, qui tanquam ſuperiorum gemini & germani ‘ ſunt. Sunt autem Accii, veteris ac graviſſimi Tra‘gici, ex Oenomao:

Nam ſi lamentis allevaretur dolor,
Longoque fletu minueretur miſeria,
Tum turpe lacrumis indulgere non foret,
Fractaque voce Divûm obteſtare fidem,
Tabifica donec pectore exceſſet lues.
Nunc hæ neque hilum de dolore detrahunt,
Potiuſque cumulum miſeriis adjiciunt mali,
Et indecoram mentis mollitiem arguunt.

‘ Qui verſus hactenus latuerunt, eoſque nunc primum ‘ in vulgus publicamus, quorum priores Trabeæ mihi ‘ ad verbum è Philemone (*vel Menandro, ſecundùm* ‘ *alios*) mutuati videntur: qui eandem ſententiam ‘ extulit: Εἰ τὰ δάκρυ' ἡμῖν, &c. Hæc illuſtris he‘ros, qui poſteaquam dolum perſenſit, præ indigna‘tione hoc diſtichon, quod mihi de manu in manum ‘ vivus videnſque olim tradidit, ex tempore luſit:

Qui rigidæ flammas evaſerat ante Toloſæ,
Falſidico fumos vendidit ore mihi.

‘ Virum diſertum deſignans, cujus nomini heic parco. ‘ Heroe (æterno, heu, doctorum omnium dolore) de‘functo, incidi in Poſthuma quædam ſcripta M. A. ‘ M. C. R. (7) & inter poemata repperi hæc.

AFFICTA TRABEÆ.

Here, ſi querelis, ejulatu, fletibus, &c.

‘ prorſus eadem cum iis quæ ſupra recitavi. Illud ‘ alterum ex Acti Oenomao fragmentum nuſquam ‘ comparet: præterquam in Ritterſhuſii ad Oppianum ‘ Commentario: ubi Trabeæ & Actii hos verſus, ele‘gantes & memoria digniſſimos (ut ipſe vocat) pro‘ducit, tranſcriptos & mutuatos ex Notis Scaligeri. ‘ - - - *But if theſe are agreeable, I ſhall add ſome others* ‘ *of the ſame ſort, but done by another Poet, which are,* ‘ *as it were, the twins and brothers of the former.* ‘ *They are thoſe of Accius, an antient and very worthy* ‘ *tragic Poet, from the Oenomaus:*

Could lamentations eaſe our grief,
Or many tears give us relief,
No ſhame 't would be for us to moan,
And in our prayers to ſigh and groan,
'Till GOD ſhould ſend us a delivery
From waſting plague or other miſery.
But now we know all this is vain,
And rather adds unto our pain.
And thoſe that are that way inclin'd
Shew a baſe effeminate mind.

‘ *Which verſes have been hitherto unknown, and are* ‘ *now firſt publiſhed by me; the former, done by Tra*‘*bea, ſeem to me to be borrowed* verbatim *from Phile*‘*mon (or according to others, Menander): who expreſ*‘*ſed the ſame ſentiment:* If tears to us, &c. *Thus* ‘ *ſpeaks that illuſtrious man, who, when he perceived* ‘ *the trick that was put upon him, out of revenge made* ‘ *the following diſtich extempore, which he himſelf for*‘*merly delivered to me,*

He from the flames of harſh Tholouſe got free,
And with a lie, he ſold the ſmoke to me.

‘ *Meaning a certain learned man, whoſe name I here* ‘ *forbear mentioning. That illuſtrious perſon being dead* ‘ *(to the ſorrow of all learned men) I happened to meet* ‘ *with ſome poſthumous writings of M. A. M. C. R.* ‘ *(Marc Antony Muretus a Citizen of Rome) and* ‘ *amongſt the Poems found the following.*

FALSELY ASCRIBED TO TRABEA.

Were moans, or cries, or tears, a cure, &c.

‘ *Exactly the ſame as I have above recited. The other* ‘ *fragment out of Accius's Oenomaus is no where to be* ‘ *found but in Ritterſhuſius's commentary on Oppianus:* ‘ *wherein he quotes thoſe verſes of Trabea and Accius,* ‘ *which* ſerves to be mentioned here. The ſame miſtake is to be found in the Lexicon of Buchnerus (*d*).

---

(2) *Theſe are the words that are wanting here:* tum propter ſententiæ elegantiam, tum etiam quia vulgo nondum noti ſunt. *Scaliger gives afterwards the ſix pretended verſes of Trabea.*

(3) Coſtar, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 419, *in his ſecond letter to Mr de Heurles.*

(4) Borremans, Var. Lect. *cap.* iii, *pag. x.*

(5) Nicius Erythr. Pinac. I, *pag.* 12.

(6) Scriverius, Animadv. in Pervigilium Veneris, *pag.* 466, 467. *Tractatus cui Titulus* Baudii Amores.

(7) Thoſe five letters ſignify, *Marci Antonii Mureti Civis Romani.*

(*d*) *Voce* Præfica, *fol.* 1128. *See* Muretus's Poems, *pag.* 50, *Edit. Lipſ.* 1672.

‘ *which he calls elegant and moſt worthy of remembrance, and which he tranſcribed and borrowed from the annotations of Scaliger.*’ I have not concluded this citation with Scaliger's words, but choſe to continue it by citing thoſe which Scriverius adds to them, becauſe they afford matter for two critical remarks. In the firſt place you ſee that Scaliger's diſtich is otherwiſe expreſſed than Mr Baillet after Nicius Erythræus has quoted it (8), and otherwiſe than Mr Menage cites it (9) from the *collection of Scaliger's Poems publiſhed by Scriverius from Scaliger's originals.* In the ſecond place we plainly ſee that Scriverius was ignorant that the pretended verſes of Accius were any where elſe to be found than in Scaliger and Ritterſhuſius his copyer. But we ſhall immediately ſee that they were inſerted in an edition of Muretus's Poems publiſhed two years after Scaliger had publiſhed his commentary on Varro. Here is the proof of it (10): ‘ Muretus cauſed them to be printed in his collection of Poems of Aldus's edition in 1575, with this note: Cùm veteris Comici Græci Philemonis ſententiam à Plutarcho & à Stobæo acceptam, animi cauſâ exprimere tentaſſem, & dicendi genere, & numero, veterum Latinorum ſimillimo: Placuit etiam experiri, nunquid eandem comicè explicare poſſem. Viſum eſt utrumque non infeliciter ſucceſſiſſe. Per jocum itaque prioribus verſibus Accii, poſterioribus Trabeæ nomen aſcripſi, ut experirer aliorum judicia, & viderem num quis in eis ineſſet vetuſtatis ſapor. Nemo repertus eſt qui non ea pro veteribus acceperit. Unus etiam, & eruditione & judicio acerrimo præditus, repertus eſt, qui ea à me accepta pro veteribus publicaret. Ne quis igitur ampliùs fallatur, & rem totam detegendam, & carmina ipſa hic ſubjicienda duxi.

Affi&ta Accio.
Nam ſi lamentis, &c.
Affi&ta Trabeæ.
HERE, *ſi querelis, &c.*

‘ - - - - *As I had attemptetd for my diverſion to expreſs a reflexion of Philemon, an old Greek Comic Poet, and adopted by Plutarch and Stobæus, in ſtile and verſe like the antient Romans; I thought fit likewiſe to try, whether I could explain it in a comic ſtile. In both which I imagined I ſucceeded pretty well. And therefore out of pleaſantry I aſcribed the former verſes to Accius, and the latter to Trabea, that I might know the opinions of others, and ſee whether they ſavoured of antiquity. Every body took them to be antient. There was likewiſe a man of great learning and penetration, who having received them from me, publiſhed them as ſuch. But that none may be further deceived, I thought proper to diſcover the whole matter, and ſubjoin here the verſes themſelves.*

Falſely aſcribed to Accius.
Could lamentations, &c.
Falſely aſcribed to Trabea.
Were moans, &c.

Theſe words of Muretus detect a miſtake contained in the paſſage which is in the beginning of this remark. Mr Coſtar imagined that Scaliger ventured to find a father for the Latin verſes communicated to him; Mr Coſtar, I ſay, fancied that this great critic, not content to receive them as a fragment of an antient author, peremptorily decided that it was a part of a certain dramatic piece of Trabea. But Muretus ſhews that the fact was not ſo, but that he himſelf produced theſe lines as the verſes of that antient Poet. Scaliger was only deceived by giving credit to Muretus's words. As for the reſt, he clearly ſaw they were an imitation of ſome Greek verſes in Plutarch (11), which in Amyot's verſion run thus:

Si nos mal-heurs les larmes gueriſſoyent,
Et ſi nos maux incontinent ceſſoyent
Que l'on auroit larmoyé tendrement,
Au poids de l'or payees cherement
En un mal-heur les larmes devroyent eſtre:
Mais maintenant les afaires, mon maiſtre,
N'y penſent point, & n'y jettent point l'œil:
Ains ſoit, ou non, que tu pleures en dueil,
Par ne lairront d'aller la meſme voye.
Qu'eſt-il beſoin donc que noſtre æil larmoye?
Qu'y gagnons-nous? Rien: mais douleur produit,
Comme arbres font, des larmes pour ſon fruit.

If our miſfortunes tears could cure
And make our woes to ceaſe,
Then we ſhould purchaſe tears with gold,
To give us a releaſe.
But now, O maſter, in diſtreſs
No help from thence e'er came,
For, whether did you mourn or not,
It ſtill will be the ſame.
Why then ſhould we lament and cry?
What do we thereby gain?
Nothing: but e'en as fruit from trees,
So tears proceed from pain.

WRONG judgments in attributing books to ſuch or ſuch an author.

Scaliger was more excuſable on this occaſion than when he took the oration *de duplici concordia*, for a performance of Juſtus Lipſius (12), for nothing better reſembles the verſes of the antients than thoſe of the pretended Trabea (13). But the oration falſly attributed to Juſtus Lipſius (14), is not like any of that writer's works. The Poet Apollonius Collatius hath nothing in him which looks like antiquity, and yet Scaliger and ſeveral other very good critics have taken him for an antient Poet (15). Add to this Mr Colomiés words. ‘ I have heard Mr Voſſius ſay, that Boxhornius corrected and commented on a ſatire *de Lite*, which he believed to be antient, but was written by the Chancellor de l'Hoſpital. This to my great ſatisfaction I afterward found true. Pricæus an Engliſh Critic is guilty of the ſame fault in his commentary on Apuleius's Apology, page 54 (16).’ A Madrigal of Menage paſſed for Taſſo's: It is in the CXXXIIId chapter of the Antibaillet, and *the Hiſtory of this Innocent Cheat* is inſerted in the ſame Author's *Meſcolanze*. Muretus complains that he was wrongfully accuſed of being the author of ſome letters and poems (17). Compare with this the remarks [*M*] and [*Y*] of the article ERASMUS.

(8) Baillet Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, *numb.* 1333, *cites it thus:* Qui flammas rigidæ vitaverat ante Toloſæ Rumetus, fumos vendidit illi mihi.

(9) Menage, Anti-Baillet, *chap. lxxxiii, cites it thus:* Qui rigidæ flammis evaſerat ante Toloſæ, Rumetus, fumos vendidit ille mihi.

(10) Menage, ibid. *Note that he cites all thoſe verſes of Muretus.*

(11) Plut. de Conſol. ad Apollon. *pag.* 105.

(12) See the Scaligerana at the word *Lipſius.*

(13) See Bongars, letter cxix, to Camerarius.

(14) See the remark [*I*], of the article GOLDAST.

(15) *See* Barthius in Claudian. *pag.* 795, *Edit. in* 4*to.* *See alſo the article* COLLATIUS.

(16) Colomiés, Opuſ. *pag. m.* 123.

(17) Muret. Epiſt. I, *lib.* i.

TRAERBACH, a ſmall town in the Palatinate, with a caſtle ſituated on a rock, is the chief place of a Bayliwick in the county of Spanheim. It ſtands on the river Moſelle, over-againſt Mont-Royal, between Triers and Coblentz. The Spaniards put a garriſon in it in the year 1632. The Swedes took it in 1635 and delivered it to the French. But by the treaty of Munſter it was reſtored to it's former poſſeſſors. The French ſeized on it ſome time after the peace of Nimeguen, and fortified it with Mont-Royal. Both thoſe places were reſtored by the treaty of Ryſwick in the year 1697, upon condition they ſhould be diſmantled (*a*). The French, under the command of Count Tallard, became maſters of Traerbach, after a ſiege of ſome days in November 1702. The

(*a*) Extracted from the Dutch Gazette of Leyden, of the ninth of January 1705.

The allies retook it in December 1704, and met with more reſiſtance than they had expected [*A*]

[*A*] *The allies . . . . met with more reſiſtance than they had expected.*] They inveſted it on the third of November 1704, and began to cannonade it the ſixteenth or ſeventeenth of the ſame month. The Baron de Troſgné, a Brigadier in the Dutch army, and director of the attacks, boaſted that he would carry the place in five or ſix days, as it was ſaid in all the Gazettes. However, the caſtle ſtill held out the tenth of December, when the baron was killed by a muſquet ſhot, and did not capitulate till the eighteenth. The Governor of Traerbach and the Major were killed during the ſiege. A very honourable capitulation was granted to the garriſon.

TRAJAN, a Roman Emperor . . . .

. . . .

Moſt learned men of the Romiſh communion now refute the ſtory which was ſo much cried up, that the ſoul of this Emperor was delivered from hell by the prayers of Pope Gregory [*A*].

[*A*] *The ſtory which was ſo much cried up, that the ſoul of this Emperor was delivered from hell by the prayers of Pope Gregory.*] Paul and John Diaconus, who wrote the life of St Gregory, give an account of that affair (1). It is *moreover aſſerted by St John of Damaſcus* (2). The ſtory is related in this manner. ‘St Gregory paſſing Trajan's ſquare, which that prince cauſed to be adorned with ſtately edifices, where the principal actions of his life were repreſented, ſtopped particularly to conſider a baſſo relievo, which deſcribed the favour he did to a poor widow *. This emperor marching at the head of his army, and being obliged to uſe great diſpatch, a very old and poor widow came to beſeech him with tears in her eyes, to revenge the death of her ſon who had been murdered. Trajan promiſed her that when he returned from his expedition he would do her juſtice. *But, Sir,* ſays the widow, *if you ſhould be killed in the battle, of whom may I expect it afterwards?* Of my ſucceſſor, anſwered Trajan. *What will it ſignify to you, Great Emperor,* replied the woman, *that any other than yourſelf render me juſtice? Is it not better that you ſhould do this good action yourſelf, than leave another to do it?* It is ſaid, that the emperor being then moved at the tears of that poor mother, and perſwaded by her reaſons, alighted from his horſe, commanded thoſe who were accuſed of the murder of the widow's ſon to be brought before him, and took an exact cognizance of the whole affair: and tho' the principal officers of his army urged him very much, yet he would not continue his march till he had determined it. He ordered a conſiderable ſum of money to be paid to the widow, but ſpared the lives of the criminals. St Gregory, add they, touched with this action of juſtice and charity, prayed to God with many tears and groans, to take pity on that emperor. Being gone from thence to pray at St Peter's tomb, he there ſhed again a great many tears, and remained long in prayer on the ſame ſubject. Soon after he knew he had not prayed in vain: for falling into a ſleep, rather extatical than natural, God revealed to him that his prayers had been heard. But at the ſame time commanded him never to pray more for perſons that die unbaptized (3).’ John Diaconus, who *believed this ſtory* to be true (4), and ſaid that it *was read in the Engliſh churches* (5), owns however *that it was not received by the Romans, and that it had appeared to them improbable* (6). ‘It ought indeed to be rejected as a fable, that could find credit no where but with the Anglo-Saxons, who were as yet ignorant and uninſtructed in the Chriſtian religion: for John Diaconus evidently ſhews that it derived its original from them. I am ſurpriſed that learned men, who have been employed in collecting the acts of the ſaints, far from rejecting it, have made a † note to authorize and ſupport it: I fancy the reaſon why they judged ſo favourably of it was, becauſe they believed that the antient life of St Gregory, which they publiſhed as the performance of an anonymous author, was written by a cotemporary Hiſtorian, as they expreſsly declare ‡. But that anonymous author is at the ſame time called Paul Diaconus, and that cotemporary Hiſtorian is of the IXth century, younger than St Gregory by about 250 years, as I have proved in the Advertiſement. Cardinal Baronius ‡ has very amply refuted this ſtory in the 8th tome of his Annals, and after him Cardinal Bellarmin, not to mention ſeveral learned Critics of our own time, who have ſhewn the abſurdity and dangerous conſequences of it. But as that does not hinder people from making uſe of it every day, to authorize a very pernicious doctrine, and to teach that the interceſſion of the holy Virgin ſaves thoſe that belong to her, and that wear her livery, even tho' they die in mortal ſin; I believe, thoſe who love true piety will be glad to find this falſity refuted by St Gregory himſelf, and by what he ſays in his Dialogues (7).’

Sammarthanus recites afterwards divers paſſages of the XLIVth chapter of the fourth book of thoſe Dialogues, and ſhews thereby that St Gregory did not believe it poſſible to deliver a damned ſoul. He refutes likewiſe ſome anſwers that might be made in favour of the contrary opinion. See alſo page 409 of his work. He does not think it worth while to confute in particular another ſtory which is added to the former. It is reported, that this Pope felt continual pains in his feet and ſtomach, as a puniſhment of the ſin he had committed in praying for an emperor that was damned. Father Theophilus Raynauld ranks this amongſt the calumnies which have been publiſhed againſt great men (8). He quotes Toſtatus, who in the LVII queſtion on the IVth Book of the Kings affirms, that St Gregory then committed a mortal ſin. He ſays, that Alphonſus Ciacconius wrote a treatiſe to prove, that this ſtory of Trajan's deliverance was true: and adds that Rutilius Benzonius maintained the ſame thing in his *Speculum Epiſcoporum*, but that Melchior Canus, and Soto, had very well conjectured the falſity of that ſtory, and that Baronius, Bellarmin and Suarez, and ſeveral other moderns had clearly demonſtrated it to be a fable. All the ſubtilties invented to reconcile this pretended deliverance of Trajan with the irreverſibleneſs of God's decrees againſt perſons who are damned, he looks upon as meer cavilling: and rejects the reflexion of John Diaconus, that thoſe pains were inflicted on St Gregory, as an antidote againſt the pride wherewith he might have been puffed up, after ſo great an exploit as releaſing Trajan's ſoul from the pit of hell. *Hoc ſane fundamento everſo . . . . . præciduntur tricæ variæ ab antiquis Theologis Scholaſticis excogitatæ, ad exponendum quo modo ſalva decretorum divinorum veritate de abyſſo nunquam ſeneſcente, (id eſt, ut ipſe D. Gregorius XXXIV. mor. c.* 13. *expoſuit, de nulla unquam in inferno redemptione) potuerit vir ſanctus, exorare Trajani a Tartaro ereptionem: quibuſdam dicentibus, Trajanum precibus ſancti Gregorii ad vitam revocatum egiſſe penitentiam; quod habet S. Thomas in* 4. *diſtinct.* 45. *quæſt.* 2. *art.* 5. *ad* 5. *Aliis aſſerentibus, ſuſpenſam fuiſſe Trajani condemnationem, & D. Gregorii oratione impeditam; ut videre eſt apud D. Thomam in* 1. *diſtinct.* 43. *quæſt.* 2. *art.* 2. *ad quintum & quæſt.* 6. *de veritat. artic.* 6. *ad quartum. Nihil horum neceſſarium eſt, ſuppoſita narrationis prædictæ falſitate, quæ item revicta, concidit quod ait Joannes Diaconus, ægritudines de quibus diximus, immiſſas eſſe Sancto Gregorio, ne ob eam Trajani ereptionem exoratam, tumeret animo* (9).

(1) Dionyſius de Sammarth. Hiſtoire de St Gregoire, *pag.* 283.

(2) Ibid. *pag.* 284; but he obſerves that the learned doubt whether the ſermon concerning the dead, where this is aſſerted, and which is found amongſt the works of Joannes Damaſcenus, was written by him or not.

* No author that has writ the Roman Hiſtory, has related this fact, which was however very remarkable. Trajan's panegyriſts do not mention it neither.

(3) Ibid. *pag.* 283.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 284.

(5) Ibid. *pag.* 283.

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 284.

† Bollandus, on the laſt chapter, of the Life of St Gregory, by Paul Diaconus.

‡ Auctore anonymo ſed ſynchrono, *ſay they.*

‡ Ad an. 604, num. 36, & ſeq. L. 2. de Purgat. c. 8.

(7) Dionyſius de Sammarth. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 284, 285.

(8) Theoph. Raynaud. Hoplotheca, §. *ii, Serie iii, cap. xxiv, pag. m.* 435.

(9) Id. ibid.

TRAPPE, an abbey ſituate in a very ſolitary place [*A*], on the frontiers of Perche in the dioceſe of Seez, is become very famous ſince the Abbot de Rancé hath reformed it. He held it in commendam above 25 years, but in 1662, he procured an agreement, *by virtue of which the Monks of the ſtrict Obſervance entered and took poſſeſſion of the monaſtery. And the better to encourage their eſtabliſhment, he quitted to them the ſeat of Nuiſement which he enjoyed as Abbot in commendam* (*a*). The following year he obtained of the king *a permiſſion to become regular abbot of this abbey. He took the regular habit, and was admitted novice in the monaſtery of our Lady of Perſeigne, of the ſtrict Obſervance of the Ciſtertian order on the 13th of June 1663, being then aged 37 years and five months* (*b*). --- *On the 26th of June following having received his patent from Rome, impowering him to hold the abbey of la Trappe, as a regular abbot, he made his profeſſion in the abbey of Perſeigne* (*c*). --- *The 3d of July following he received the abbatial benediction* (*d*) --- *in the monaſtery of St Martin of Seez*, and went to his abbey the 14th day of the ſame month (*e*). By his natural eloquence and example he prevailed on his Monks to ſubmit to the primitive auſterities of their rule. *There was not one of them but would follow his abbot's ſteps, and in imitation of him abſtain from drinking of wine, eating of eggs and fiſh, and apply himſelf to manual labour for three hours every day* (*f*). This abbey was fallen into great remiſſneſs of diſcipline. It was founded in the year 1140 [*B*].

(*a*) Deſcription de l'Abbaye de la Trappe, *pag.* 13, 14, *Paris edition*, 1682. *It is a lettter of Mr Felibien, to the Ducheſs of Liancour, as it appears from the* Journal des Sçavans, *of the 28th of November*, 1695, *pag. m.* 699.

(*b*) Felibien, ibid. *pag.* 15, 16.

(*c*) Felibien, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 19.

(*d*) By the hands of Mr Patrick Plunket, Biſhop of Armagh, in Ireland.

(*e*) Ibid. *p.* 20.

(*f*) Ibid. *p.* 22.

[*A*] ‘ *Abbey in a very ſolitary place.*] This abbey is ſituated in a large valley. The wood and the hills which ſurround it, are diſpoſed as if deſigned to hide it from the reſt of the world. They encloſe arable lands, plantations of fruit-trees, paſture grounds and nine ponds which encompaſs the abbey, and render it ſo difficult of acceſs, that it is very hard to come at it without a guide. There was heretofore a road from Mortagne to Paris behind the walls of the garden; but tho' it was in the wood, and above five hundred paces from the encloſure, and tho' it was not poſſible to remove it farther without a vaſt expence, yet the Abbot turned it another way, in order to render the place round the monaſtery more ſolitary. And indeed nothing is more ſo than this deſert: For tho' there are ſeveral towns and large villages at three leagues diſtance round it, yet to people who are there it ſeems to be a lonely and foreign country. Silence reigns throughout; and if any noiſe is heard, it is only the ruſtling of trees ſhaken by the wind, or the brooks running through the pebbles. This abbey diſcovers itſelf at going out of the foreſt of Perche, when one is coming from the ſouth; and tho' the traveller thinks himſelf very near, he finds it almoſt a mile before he reaches it: But having at laſt deſcended the hill, croſſed the heath, and gone on a little way amongſt hedges and through ſhady paths he comes to the firſt court, where the receiver's apartment is. It is ſeparated from thoſe of the Monks by a ſtrong palliſado of pales and thorns, which the Abbot cauſed to be made after he retired thither (1).

[*B*] *It was fallen into great remiſſneſs of diſcipline. It was founded in the year* 1140.] I ſhall continue to uſe the ſame authors words who furniſhed me with the preceding remark. ‘ The abbey of our Lady de la Maiſon-Dieu de la Trappe, (for ſo it is called) was founded by Rotrou Earl of Perche, in the year 1140, and conſecrated under the name of the bleſſed Virgin in 1214, by Robert Archbiſhop of Roüen, Ralph Biſhop of Evreux, and Sylveſter Biſhop of Séez. It felt for a long time the decay of the Ciſtercian order, and was fallen into the ſame irregularities, in which every body knows ſeveral monaſteries of that order continue to this day, ſince the remiſſneſs introduced two hundred years ago, having not yet embraced the ſtrict Obſervance of the rule re-eſtabliſhed in France, by the late Cardinal de la Rochefoucault, when Mr Armand John Bouthillier de Rancé, Doctor of Divinity, chief Almoner to the late Duke of Orleans, and Abbot in commendam of this abbey above twenty-five years, by his great care and frequent exhortations, brought the Monks of this abbey to conſent, and to requeſt that it might be put into the hands of the Fathers of the ſtrict Obſervance of the Ciſtercian order, to re-eſtabliſh the primitive and exact practice of the diſcipline. The Abbot de Barbarie of the ſtrict Obſervance, and viſitor of the province, being come thither, at the requeſt of the Abbot de Rance, with a commiſſion from the Abbot de Prieres, Vicar-General, made an agreement between the Abbot and the old Monks of la Trappe the 17th of Auguſt 1662, which was ratified in the Parliament of Paris the 16th of February 1663. By virtue of which the Monks of the ſtrict Obſervance entred and took poſſeſſion of the monaſtery (2).

(1) Felibien, Deſcription de l'Abbaye de la Trappe, *pag.* 6, *& ſeq. printed at Paris in* 1671, *and the ſecond time in* 1682.

(2) Felibien, ibid. *pag.* 11, *& ſeq.*

TREBATIUS (Caius) ſirnamed Teſta (*a*), was a very great Civilian. He had a vaſt memory (*b*), and tho' he profeſſed himſelf an Epicurean (*c*), he was a man of incomparable probity (*d*). During the war with the Gauls he was received into Julius Cæſar's favour by the recommendation of Cicero, and, if he would, might have enjoyed the profit of a Tribune's poſt without the exerciſe of that office [*A*]. Perhaps he would not have acquitted himſelf very well in it; for Cicero ſeems ſometimes a little to reproach his

(*a*) Cicero, Epiſt. xiii & xxi, *lib. vii*, ad Famil.

(*b*) See the remark [*A*].

(*c*) Id. ibid. *Epiſt. xii.*

(*d*) See the remark [*A*].

[*A*] *He was received into Julius Cæſar's favour by the recommendation of Cicero .... and if he would, might have enjoyed ....* &c.] Cicero recommended him in the following terms: ‘ Hunc, mi Cæſar, ſic velim omni tua comitate complectare, ut omnia quæ per me poſſis adduci ut in meos conferre velis, in unum hunc conferas: de quo tibi homine hæc ſpondeo non illo vetere verbo meo, quod, cum ad te de Milone ſcripſiſſem, jure luſiſti: ſed more Romano, quo modo homines non inepti loquuntur: probiorem hominem, meliorem virum, prudentiorem eſſe neminem. Accedit etiam, quod familiam ducit, in jure civili ſingularis memoria, ſumma ſcientia. Huic ego neque tribunatum, neque præfecturam, neque ullius beneficii certum nomen peto: benevolentiam tuam & liberalitatem peto: neque impedio, quo minus, ſi tibi ita placuerit, etiam hiſce eum ornes gloriolæ inſignibus. Totum denique hominem tibi ita trado de manu (ut aiunt) in manum tuam iſtam, & victoria & fide præſtantem (1). ---- *I beg of you, my dear Cæſar, to receive this gentleman with all poſſible kindneſs, and to beſtow on him alone all the favours my intereſt with you can procure for my friends: I will anſwer for him, not in that old ſaying which I uſed, when I wrote to you concerning Milo, and which you juſtly laughed at: but in the Roman way, as wiſe men ſpeak, that there is not a better, honeſter or more prudent man living. Beſides, he excels in the knowledge of the Civil Law; is endowed with a vaſt memory, and great learning. I do not aſk for him the tribuneſhip, lieutenancy, or any particular poſt; I only intreat he may have your favour and friendſhip; and if you thought fit, I ſhould not be againſt his enjoying thoſe titles of honours. In fine, I deliver him entirely out of my own hand (as they ſay) into that of your's, excelling in victory and faithfulneſs.*’ This recommendation had great effect, for Trebatius might, if he pleaſed, have been an honorary tribune, and enjoyed the profits of that high office:

(1) Cicero, Epiſt. v, *lib vii*, ad Familiar. *pag. m.* 375, 376. *Note, that in the firſt letter of the tenth book to Atticus, he uſes theſe words*, Trebatii boni viri & civis verbis te gaudeo eſſe delectatum. --- *I am glad you was pleaſed with what was ſaid to you by Trebatius, an excellent man, and good citizen.*

his want of bravery (*e*); and doubtleſs it was only his learned converſation which endeared him to Cæſar and his friends. Several of the letters he received from Cicero are yet extant. Thoſe who ſay that he engaged in Pompey's party, are very much miſtaken [*B*]. He was always firm to Julius Cæſar, and perſuaded Cicero to be of that ſide. He maintained his reputation ſo well after Julius Cæſar's death, that Auguſtus being in doubt concerning the validity of codicils, authorized the uſe of them by the advice and perſuaſive reaſons of Trebatius [*C*], after having conſulted the moſt able Civilians. Several are of opinion, that whenever we find in the Pandects (*f*) the ſayings of the Antients brought in, it ought chiefly to be underſtood of Trebatius, and his diſciple Labeo. The character of a learned man given to Trebatius by Horace, ſeems in my mind to ſignify a great deal in that place (*g*). This Civilian formed himſelf under Cornelius Maximus (*h*). He publiſhed ſeveral books [*D*]. He was ſometimes miſtaken in affirming, that certain things had never been conſidered [*E*].

(*e*) *See* Bertrand, de Juriſperitis, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 248; *and* Cicero, Epiſt. x, *lib. vii*, ad Famil.

(*f*) Bertrand, ibid. *pag.* 249.

(*g*) Horat. Sat. I, lib. ii, ver. 78.

(*h*) Pomponius, de origine Juris, *lib. iii, cap. xi, num.* 45.

fice: ‘Ex tuis literis cognovi præproperam quandam feſtinationem tuam, & ſimul ſum admiratus cur tribunatus commoda, demto præſertim labore militiæ contemſeris (2). - - - - *By your letter I find you have been ſomewhat too precipitate, and withal I wonder that you refuſed the profits of the tribuneſhip, eſpecially as you were exempted from the trouble of the ſervice.*’ Cicero foreſaw that he himſelf would prove the greateſt obſtacle to his fortune (3). He is not the only perſon of that turn: How many men are there who would have riſen, if they had had but patience enough, or if they had been importunate, or very aſſuming?

(2) *Idem*, Epiſt. viii, *ejuſd. Libri.*

(3) Tibi unum timendum ſit ne ipſe tibi defuiſſe videare. - - - *One thing you ought to take care of, which is not to be wanting to yourſelf.* Idem, Epiſt. vii, *ejuſd. Libri.*

[*B*] *Thoſe who ſay that he engaged in Pompey's party, are very much miſtaken*] Zazius advanced this falſity, and was refuted by Rutilius, as William Grotius obſerves: ‘Cum bellum civile incrudeſceret partes Cæſaris ſemper bona fide ſecutus eſt, ipſumque Ciceronem monere non deſtitit, ut vel ei ſe conjungeret, vel in Græciam proficiſceretur *, Ut mirum videri poſſit Zaſium ſcribere, Trebatium Pompejanarum fuiſſe partium, & Ciceronis interventu in gratiam receptum: ſed hæc jam Rutilius diluit (4) *When the civil war broke out, he always faithfully adhered to Cæſar's party, and conſtantly adviſed Cicero either to ſide with Cæſar, or to go into Greece. So it is ſtrange that Zazius ſhould write that he was on Pompey's ſide, and received into favour by the recommendation of Cicero: but this has been already confuted by Rutilius.*’ Suetonius relates, 1. That Trebatius adviſed Julius Cæſar to riſe when the ſenators went to him in the temple of Venus: 2. That Cæſar diſapproving his counſel, ſhewed him ſome coldneſs (5). This ſhows that our Civilian was a favourite of Julius Cæſar.

* Plut. in vita Cic.

(4) Guilel. Grotius, de Vitis Juriſconſ. *pag.* 78.

(5) Admonentem C. Trebatium ut aſſurgeret minus familiari vultu reſpexiſſe. *Sueton. in Julio, cap. lxxviii.*

[*C*] *Auguſtus, being in doubt concerning the validity of codicils, authorized the uſe of them by the advice . . . . of Trebatius.*] Bertrandus's words are, ‘Cæterum Juſtinianus in §. 1. de jure codicil. in Inſtitut. refert, Auguſtum, cum de codicillorum viribus dubitaret, qui antea in uſu non fuerant, convocaſſe ſapientes viros, inter quos Trebatium, cujus tunc maxima auctoritas erat, & quæſiſſe, an non abſonans à juris ratione codicillorum uſus eſſet, recipique poſſit: Trebatium id ſuaſiſſe Auguſto, quod diceret, utiliſſimum ac neceſſarium civibus eſſe, propter magnas & longas peregrinationes quæ apud veteres fuiſſent; ubi ſi quis teſtamentum facere non poſſet, tamen codicillos poſſet (6). - - - - - - *Juſtinian relates, that Auguſtus, doubting of the validity of codicils, which had not been formerly in uſe, conſulted ſome able Civilians, amongſt whom was Trebatius, a man of great reputation at that time, and aſked whether the practice of codicils was not contrary to law, and whether it might be authorized: That Trebatius adviſed Auguſtus to authorize it, ſaying that it was very uſeful and neceſſary to the Roman citizens, on account of their great and long journies into foreign countries, where one might make codicils, if he could not make a will.*’ Mr Menage rejects the thought of Heinſius, who pretends to prove, that Trebatius's opinions are moſt times condemned in the Pandects: ‘Longe plura ſunt, *ſaith Mr Menage* (7), in quibus Trebatii ſententiam ſequuntur cæteri Juris interpretes, & omnino falſa eſt Heinſiana Sententia. - - - - *There are many more things in which the opinion of Trebatius is followed by the other Civilians, and the opinion of Heinſius is entirely falſe.*’ It is certain that Trebatius's authority was very great for ſeveral ages. Which Ammianus Marcellinus's words plainly teſtify: ‘Hi ut altius videantur jura callere TREBATIUM loquuntur & Caſcellium, & Alfenum, & Auruncorum Sicanorumque jam diu leges ignotas cum Evandri matre abhinc ſeculis obrutas multis (8). - - - - *That they may ſeem to underſtand the Law more profoundly, they talk of* TREBATIUS, *Caſcellius, and Alfenus, and the laws of the Arunci and Sicani which have been long ſince forgot, and buried in oblivion with the mother of Evander.*’

(6) Bertrandus, de Juriſperitis, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 250.

(7) Menagius, Juris Civilis Amœnit. *cap. xiv, pag. m.* 79.

(8) Amm. Marcell. *lib. xxx, cap. iv, pag. m.* 594.

[*D*]. *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] An antient ſcholiaſt (9) aſſerts, that Aulus (10) Trebatius a Roman Knight, and Civilian, compoſed ſeveral tracts on the Civil-law, and nine books concerning religions. This account is not very exact, for Macrobius (11), hath cited the 10th book of that work of Trebatius. And theſe words of Bertrandus are yet leſs exact: ‘Certum eſt Trebatium ſcripſiſſe de religionibus lib. duos (12.) - - - - *It is certain that Trebatius wrote two books concerning religions.*’

(9) Vetus Scholiaſtes Horatii in Sat. I, *lib. ii.*

(10) He ſhould have ſaid *Caïus.*

(11) Macrob. Saturn. *lib. iii, cap. iii, pag. m.* 388.

(12) Bertrand. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 252, 253.

[*E*] *In affirming that certain things had never been conſidered.*] Cicero once convicted him of falſity. I ſhall cite the paſſage at large, to inform the reader that Trebatius entertained his friends very handſomely. ‘Illuſeras heri inter ſcyphos, quod dixeram, controverſiam eſſe, poſſetne heres, quod furtum antea factum eſſet, furti recte agere. Itaque, etſi domum bene potus ſeroque redieram, tamen id caput, ubi hæc controverſia eſt, notavi, & deſcriptum tibi miſi: ut ſcires, id, quod tu neminem ſenſiſſe dicebas Sex. Ælium, M. Manilium, M. Brutum ſenſiſſe (13). - - - *Laſt night, in our cups, you laughed at me for ſaying that it was a queſtion, whether an heir could laid an indictment for a theft, which had been committed before he was made heir: and therefore tho' I had drank pretty freely, and it was late before I returned home, yet I took down in writing the chapter where this controverſy is handled, and have ſent it to you, that you may ſee that Sex. Ælius, M. Manilius, and M. Brutus had thought of that caſe, which you imagined had eſcaped all other Civilians.*’ Thoſe who quote this epiſtle of Cicero, to make it appear that Trebatius reduced the precepts of his ſect into practice, and that he lived like an Epicurean libertine, reaſon very ill. Doth not Cicero, ſo oppoſite to Epicurus, own that he had drank very freely that night? And is it reaſonable thence to infer any thing againſt his morals? It is therefore certain, that this paſſage doth not hinder Trebatius from being a proof that the impious opinions of the Epicureans were compatible with the practice of moral virtues; for, as I have already ſaid, Trebatius was a man of great probity. Bertrandus draws another conſequence from this epiſtle of Cicero: he pretends that it proves that Trebatius attempting to paſs for the inventer of his anſwers, magiſterially affirmed that no author had ever ſaid any ſuch thing: ‘Tantam autem Trebatius in reſpondendo vanam oſtentationem, inanemque gloriolam habebat, ut ſæpiſſime quæ plerique ante eum dixerant, neminem præter eum ſenſiſſe audacter profiteretur (14). - - - *Trebatius was ſo ridiculouſly vain and oſtentatious in his anſwers, that he would often confidently maintain, that no body beſides himſelf knew a thing, tho' it had been ſaid by a great many before him.*’

(13) Cicero, Epiſt. xxii, *lib. vii*, ad Famil.

(14) Bertrandus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 251, 252.

TRISTAN L'HERMITE (LEWIS) was the inſtrument of the revenges and cruelties of Lewis XI (*a*). He was Provoſt-Marſhal, or, according to others, Great Provoſt of the king's houſhold. ‘He became ſo odious to all good men, that they were afraid to name him. . . . . He was not content to obey the barbarous commands of depriving thoſe of their lives who had not been convicted of any crime; but executed thoſe orders with a precipitation not excuſable in the moſt ſavage monſters of cruelty. This made him take ſometimes the innocent for the guilty; and in order to repair the fault committed by his miſtake, he was obliged to kill two perſons inſtead of one (*b*).’

He had been knighted by Charles VII, after the ſiege of Fronſac (*c*). His ſon PETER L'HERMITE was the father of JOHN L'HERMITE, who once ſhewed Thevet, the Coſmographer, in the houſe of Mortaigne, ſeveral *antient deeds*, *importing the relation betwixt the lords of that houſe and the antient Romans* (*d*). I take notice of this only as an inſtance of the folly of thoſe traditions which are preſerved in antient families. Thuanus wonders that Philip de Comines hath not mentioned this Triſtan, who left, ſays he, a great eſtate behind him, part of which was the *principality of Mortaing in Gaſcony*. . . . *poſſibly it was he who impriſoned Philip de Commines*, *in a cage* (*e*).

(*a*) See the remark [Q], of the article LEWIS XI.

(*b*) Varillas, Hiſt. de Louïs XI, *livr. x*, *pag.* 331. *Dutch Edit.*

(*c*) Matthieu, Hiſt. de Louïs, XI, *livr. xi*, *pag. m.* 751.

(*d*) Thevet, Coſmographie Univerſelle, *livr. xiv*, *fol.* 517.

(*e*) Thuana, *pag. m.* 37, 38.

TRISTAN L'HERMITE (FRANCIS) Gentleman in ordinary to the Duke of Orleans, and one of the beſt Poets of the XVIIth century, *pretended to be deſcended* from the Grand Provoſt of Lewis XI (*a*). He was *born at the caſtle of* Souliers (*b*), in the province of la Marche. *He was brought up page of honour to Scævola de Sainte Marthe* (*c*). His tragedy intituled Mariamne paſſed for an excellent piece (*d*) [*A*]. He was admitted into the French academy, in the place of Mr Colomby about the year 1649. After which he lived about ſix or ſeven years.

‘He died very piouſly at the palace of Guiſe, without ſuffering his friends to viſit him, and forgot them all to think of God (*e*).’ What is ſaid of his poverty, doth not ſeem true in all particulars [*B*], and would be no proof of the

(*a*) Chevræana, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 29. *Dutch Edit.*

(*b*) Pelliſſon, Hiſt. de l'Acad. Franç. *pag. m.* 339. *I think it ſhould be* Soliers.

(*c*) Chevræana, ubi ſupra. (*d*) *See* Mr Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1488, *and* Mr Pelliſſon, Hiſt. de l'Academie Françoiſe, *pag. m.* 359, *where we may ſee the catalogue of his works.* (*e*) Chevræana, ibid.

[*A*] *His tragedy, intituled, Mariamne, paſſed for an excellent piece.*] The Abbot Marolles obſerves, that *this play was that with which the incomparable Mondori, the beſt actor of his time, ended* (1). This is a little equivocal. He ſhould have ſaid, that this famous player loſt his life by the efforts he was obliged to make, to repreſent the paſſions which the author had deſcribed. In the *Parnaſſe Reformé*, an actor is introduced, ſaying to Triſtan, *I believe you would have us act nothing elſe but Mariamne, and kill a Mondory every week in your ſervice* (2).

(1) Marolles, Mémoir, *Part. ii*, *pag.* 242.

(2) Parn. Réformé, *pag. m.* 106.

[*B*] *What is ſaid of his poverty doth not ſeem true in all particulars.*] Let us hear what Mr Menage ſaid of it (3). ‘Mr Quinaut was a ſervant to Mr Triſtan. The Duke of Montauſieur ſaid, that when he died, he left him his poetical vein, and would willingly have left him his cloak too if he had had one: on which Mr de Montmor made this epigram, which is cited by Mr de Furetiere:

(3) Menagiana, *pag.* 146, 147, *of the ſecond Dutch Edit.*

Elie, ainſi qu'il eſt écrit
De ſon manteau joint à ſon double eſprit,
Récompenſa ſon ſerviteur fidele.
Triſtan eût ſuivi ce modele;
Mais Triſtan qu'on mit au Tombeau
Plus pauvre que n'eſt un Prophete,
En laiſſant à Quinaut ſon eſprit de Poëte,
Ne put lui laiſſer de manteau.

Elijah, to reward Eliſha's merit,
Left him his mantle and his double ſpirit.
Triſtan to do the like in vain had try'd:
Poorer than any prophet, when he died,
He left his friend his wit . . . but not a cloak beſide.

Mr Furetiere, whom Mr Menage cites, doth not aſcribe this rallery to Mr de Montauſier, but to Mr Bourdelot. It is no ſmall happineſs for Mr Quinaut, ſays he (4), ‘to have been ſervant to the illuſtrious Mr Triſtan, under whom he ſerved his apprenticeſhip in Poetry. Which one day drew on him the compliment of a great prince †, who, at the end of one of his plays congratulated him, by comparing him and his maſter, to Eliſha and Elijah. As Elijah, *ſaid he*, when taken up to Heaven, by giving Eliſha his mantle, left him the ſpirit of prophecy; ſo Triſtan, at his death, tranſmitted to Quinaut his poetical genius. Mr Bourdelot, who was preſent, obſerved that the ſimile was lame in this reſpect; for Triſtan had never a mantle or cloak: which occaſioned this epigram, that was then made to preſerve the memory of this parallel.

(4) Furetiere, troiſiéme Factum, *pag.* 22, *Dutch. Edit.*

† The Duke of Guiſe.

Elie, ainſi qu'il eſt écrit, *&c.*

Elijah left, as it is writ, &c.

I doubt not but Triſtan's wretched condition was here exaggerated, and I cannot perſuade myſelf that his poverty was like that of the famous Poet with whom Boileau begins his ſatires:

Damon ce grand Auteur, dont la Muſe fertile
Amuſa ſi long temps, & la cour & la ville:
Mais qui n'étant vetu que de ſimple bureau,
Paſſe l'été ſans linge, & l'hiver ſans manteau (5),

(5) Deſpreaux, Sat. I, *at the beginning.*

Damon, a mighty author, who had long
Amus'd the court and city with his ſong,
Aſham'd to ſee himſelf ſo meanly dreſt,
For drugget was at once his worſt and beſt,
That in hot weather he had ſcarce a ſhirt
To ſhift him, and his linnen ſtood with dirt;
And, what wou'd any man of wit provoke,
At Chriſtmas to be ſeen without a cloak.

I dare engage that ſome perſons, yet alive, might certify that they have ſeen Triſtan with a cloak, or at leaſt that they know ſome who have ſeen him with one in cold weather or rain. I am willing to believe that it was not a new, or a very valuable one, but, in ſhort, it was a cloak (6). A wit, diſpoſed to divert himſelf with the poverty of the Poets, chiefly turns on theſe two topics, *viz.* their being ill cloathed, and ill lodged; and this ſort of rallery moſt times exceeds the bounds of truth. Coſtar was puzzled when obliged to account for theſe words. ‘Arioſto and Taſſo have erected very rich palaces, not to ſpeak of that of Love, in Marino's Adonis; and yet they hired chambers to lodge in: this is not what we call *ædificare caſas*; *building cottages*. Theſe, Sir, are the people who, as you ſay, would delay building

(6) Add that it was without doubt rather his own cloak, tho' perhaps bought in a Broker's ſhop, than a borrowed or hired one.

the injuſtice of the age, nor any argument of the ſterility of the ſervices done to the Muſes

‘ building till the ſtones will ſucceſſively come of their own accord, and place themſelves one upon another (7).’ But his adverſary diſcovered his falſities and and their origin; he obſerved that Coſtar was not much concerned for truth, provided he could pleaſe his fancy. The whole criticiſm which falls ſeverely on him, runs thus: ‘ I own that Taſſo was poor, yet he did not live in lodgings; he had his apartments in the palace of the Dukes of Ferrara, and other princes, in whoſe court he reſided. And as to what concerns Arioſto, he was rich enough, and ſo far from being reduced to live in lodgings, that he built a very covenient houſe, where he generally reſided, as he himſelf aſſures us in theſe verſes which he cauſed to be engraved on it.

Parva, ſed apta mihi, ſed nulli obnoxia, ſed non
Sordida, parta meo ſed tamen ære domus.

This is a ſmall, but neat convenient houſe,
To none obnoxious, built at my expence.

‘ Battiſta Pigna, who wrote his life, ſaith, that he delighted much in building, and that his moſt common employment was, continually to alter or improve ſomething or other in his houſe. *Ma dilletando ſi molto d'edificare, &c. Intorno à queſta ſua caſa non ſi contentando mai d'una coſa fatta, facea ſpeſſo rifarla dicendo d'eſſere ancora tale nel far verſi, eſſendo che molto li mutava e rimutava.* If you deſire another witneſs, Paulus Jovius ſays, in his Elogies, Receptus inde eſt ab Alfonſo Principe tanquam horarum omnium amicus & ſodalis, cujus benigna manu urbanam domum extruxit peramœnâ hortorum ubertate, frugi menſæ quotidianos ſumptus adæquantem. - - - - *He was received by the Prince Alphonſus as a friend and companion at all hours, by whoſe liberality he built a city-houſe, and had a pleaſant fruitful garden to it, ſuited to his moderate circumſtances.* But you are not much concerned for the truth of what you ſay; you are afraid that things *would be ridiculous if too true.* All is well, if the matter doth not fail you, and you can fill the page. You ſay every thing that occurs to your fancy (8).’ Coſtar was not ſo ſtuned with this heavy blow as not to think of ſome ſhifts; but indeed they are meer cavils. *It is true,* ſaith he (9), *that Taſſo for a long time had an apartment in the ducal palace of Ferrara: but when he wrote his heroic poem Rinaldo, at Padua, or when he was employed in the diſpoſition of the deſign and matter of his* Gieruſalemme liberata; *did not he live in lodgings? and doth not he, in one of his letters, complain of their inconveniencies? As for Arioſto, we ſhall find him, in his ſatires, complaining of his extreme poverty* (10.) . . . . . *At laſt Alfonſo's liberalities enabled him to build a houſe. But Battiſta Pigna teſtifies, that it was at a very ſmall expence,* poca ſpeſa. *And a certain perſon telling him, that ſuch a ſmall building did not very well agree with ſo many towring and magnificent palaces, which he had erected in his writings;* he anſwered, *That building with words, and building with ſtones were not the ſame things:* Egli dandogli queſta feſtevole riſpoſta, che porvi le pietre & porvi le parole non è il medeſimo. *I would aſk Mr Girac, if it is not probable, that Arioſto lodged in a hired room, whilſt the builders were at work; and much more before he was able to employ them* (11)*?* Coſtar ſubjoins ſeveral examples. He ſaith that Terence had *not ſo much as one hired houſe; that Vitellius when he left Rome to go into Germany **, where, ſoon after, the Roman legions created him Emperor, left his wife and children in a hired room; that Malherbe never lived otherwiſe; and that his excellent verſes did not bring him in enough to build even a poor cottage which he could call his own* (12). Every one muſt needs ſee that this way of anſwering is but a wretched apology; for, not to inſiſt on every particular, could we not ſay that Arioſto, while the workmen were employed in building his houſe, rented another; a practice very common amongſt a vaſt number of very rich people? Are Terence, Vitellius, or Malherbe, concerned in this diſpute, or does the queſtion run upon this, *viz.* Whether it was ſhameful (13) for Taſſo and Arioſto to live in lodgings? The queſtion is only about the matter of fact itſelf. Coſtar could not maintain what he advanced; he is therefore conquered. The ſame fate would probably fall on thoſe who ſhould be obliged to bring proofs that Triſtan l'Hermite had not ſo much as a cloak.

Men are too much pleaſed with exaggerations in this ſort of rallery; they imagine that without exceeding the bounds of truth, they cannot give a ſufficient poignancy to their thoughts. I am going to cite a Rondeau, which ſuppoſes ſome Poets not able ſo much as to hire a lodging. This is a hint from the fable of Amphion's lyre, which had ſuch a virtue, that without the help of any other architect, it was able to build a city.

Le (14) beau ſecret pour elever le corps
D'un grand Logis! Tels Ouvriers ſont morts;
Il n'en eſt plus; à leur douce harmonie
Les gros moëlons venoient de compagnie,
Et s'arrangeoient comme par des reſſorts.
  A peu de frais, & ſans aucuns efforts,
Pareilles gens édifioient alors,
La ſeule voix au Luth eſtant unie;
    Le beau ſecret!
  Ah! pour baſtir, ſi les charmans accords,
Si les bons Vers, tenoient lieu de tréſors,
Que de Palais de ſplendeur infinie!
Nos Amphions ſont en chambre garnie;
S'ils n'y ſont pas, c'eſt qu'ils couchent dehors:
    Le beau ſecret (15)!

O happy art, a houſe to raiſe!
Such builders live not in our days,
At the ſweet muſic of whoſe ſong
Huge ſtones ſpontaneous mov'd along,
And form'd a habitable pile,
Without the maſter's charge or toil.
'Twas but to ſing and touch the lyre,
The houſe was built to their deſire.
    O happy art!
Ah! were it now, as erſt of old!
Wou'd verſes paſs inſtead of gold;
What ſplendid palaces wou'd riſe,
What domes poetic brave the ſkies!
But our Amphions live alone
In hired lodgings . . . or in none.
    O happy art!

You ſee Mr Benſerade thought it impoſſible to rally agreeably without taking his ſubject a note higher than thoſe who touched it before him. He believed it too vulgar to lodge the Poets in a hired room very near the garret. This is, doubtleſs, the deſtiny of ſome, as well as it was the hard fate of the Grammarian Orbilius, who, as Suetonius informs us, taught at Rome, with much more reputation than profit, and he himſelf complained, in one of his books, that the poverty which attended his old age, obliged him to lodge in a garret (16). This complaint ſeems better grounded than the confeſſion which Martial makes of being lodged in the third ſtory.

Et ſcalis habito tribus, ſed altis (17).

And in a room three ſtories high was lodg'd.

Mr Gombauld was rallied for having no better lodging. ‘ Mr Boitard, Preſident of the Chamber of Accounts at Montpelier, was very much pleaſed with jeſting upon Mr de Gombauld. Once in rallery he cauſed a bill to be clapped on his door, importing, *That if any perſon had found a Bruges ſattin bag, in which are Mr de Gombaud's thoughts, if they will be pleaſed to bring them to the ſcutcheon of Ancezune, in the* Ruë des Noyers, *four pair of ſtairs,* ubi ponunt ova columbæ (18), - - where the pigeons lay their eggs, *they ſhall be very well re-warded* (19).’ Some are of opinion, that Juvenal did not mean, that the beſt Roman Poets were juſt ready to turn Bakers, or Bagnio keepers, but that the true ſenſe of his words is, that they deſigned to lodge at ſome Bagnio-keeper's or

---

(7) Entretiens de Voiture & de Coſtar, *p.* 329.

(8) Girac, Remarques ſur les Entretiens de Coſtar, *pag.* 263, 264.

(9) Coſtar, Apologie *pag.* 330.

(10) Coſtar quotes in this place ſeveral verſes of Arioſto, that witneſs his poverty; but as has been ſeen above, in remark [*E*] of the article BENSERADE, the complaints of Poets are not always a proof of their being poor.

(11) Id. ibid. *pag.* 331.

** Uxore & liberis quos Romæ relinquebat *meritorio cœnaculo* abditis, *&c. Suet. in Vitell. cap.* 7.

(12) Coſtar, Apol. *pag.* 332.

(13) Coſtar ſuppoſes without any reaſon for it, that people fancied he *tarniſhed the reputation of Taſſo and Arioſto.*

(14) Benſerade, Métamorph. d'Ovide miſes en Rondeaux.

(15) *This puts me in mind of Father Garaſſe's words, in his* Doctrine Curieuſe, *p.* 63: ‘ *They are of the opinion of the paraſite mentioned by the old Comic Poet Cæcilius, that the greateſt torment a paraſite can be put to, is* Affligere eum domicænio, - - *to condemn him to ſup at home,* ſi tamen lares habet.’

(16) Docuit majore fama quam emolumento. Namque jam perſenex pauperem ſe & habitare ſub tegulis quodam ſcripto fatetur. *Sueton. de illuſtr. Grammat. cap. ix.*

(17) Mart. Epigramm. cxviii, *lib. i. See alſo* Epigramm. cix. *of the ſame book, where he ſays,* At mea Vipſanas ſpectant cœnacula laurus.

(18) *It is an alluſion to theſe words of* Juven. Sat. iii, ver. 201.
Quem tegula ſola tuetur
A pluvia, molles ubi reddunt ova columbæ.

(19) Suite du Menagiana, *pag.* 176. *Dutch Edit.*

Muſes [C]. He had a brother *who applied himſelf to the writing of genealogies*, and who publiſhed an *Hiſtory of Touraine* (*f*), and is, if I am not miſtaken, the ſame John Baptiſt TRISTAN

Baker's, that they might warm themſelves for nothing. However it be, thoſe lines of Juvenal give a lively deſcription of their deplorable condition ?

> Cum jam celebres, notique poëtæ
> Balneolum Gabiis, Romæ conducere furnos
> Tentarent : nec fœdum alii, nec turpe putarent
> Præcones fieri, cum, deſertis Aganippes
> Vallibus, eſuriens migraret in atria Cleio (20).

> *But now the celebrated wits for need*
> *Hire bagnios, to the crier's trade ſucceed,*
> *Or get their own by baking others bread !*
> *Or, by the porter's lodge, with beggars wait*
> *For greaſy fragments at the great man's gate.*
> DRYDEN.

But Mr Benſerade goes yet much further ; he ſays, ſome Poets paſs the whole night in the ſtreet, and lie under no other canopy than that of Heaven, being more miſerable than foxes, who have holes, and the birds of the air who have neſts (21).

It is ſo true, that the thing aimed at by this ſort of rallery, is to ſhew, that Poets have no houſes of their own, that a certain ingenious man delighted in ſuppoſing, that a Poet having once bought a houſe, a poetical parliament was called to conſider of this great novelty, and the greateſt Poets urging, they never lived otherwiſe than in lodgings, he was immediately obliged to ſell his houſe. This ſtory in Latin runs thus : ' Memini me olim legiſſe elegantem ingenii luſum, ſuperiore ætate excuſum, cum inſcriptione : *Poëta domum emit*. Argumentum libelli eſt, neſcio quis poëta, qui cum propriam domum emiſſet, res ea tanquam novi & peſſimi Exempli, ad Poëtarum Senatum delata, acerbe judicata eſt. *Præſes* Senatûs *Eobanus Heſſus* conſtitutus, cui aſſederunt, *Celtes*, *Huttenus*, *Bebelius*, *Braſſicanus*, alii. Cum Sententias dicerent, nemo ex omnibus fuit, qui vel Mecœnatum gratia, vel ingenii felicitate tantum profecerit, ut ædes proprias vel hæreditate vel emptione poſſederit ; omnes rei familiaris incurii, in conducto ſe vixiſſe & faſſi ſunt & gloriati. Juſſus igitur eſt quàm primum ædes revendere, *pecuniam* vero in *ſympoſium* conferre quo immanem hanc culpam elueret, & ubique habitare ac *ſine curis vivere poëtice diſceret*. Hæc illi (22). - - - - *I remember I read formerly an elegant piece of wit, printed in the laſt century, and intituled*, A Poet bought a houſe. *The ſubſtance of it is this ; A certain Poet having purchaſed an houſe of his own, the matter was laid before the parliament of Poets, as being an unheard of and very bad precedent, and a ſevere ſentence was pronounced upon it. Eobanus Heſſus was choſen ſpeaker, and Celtes, Huttenus, Bebelius, Braſſicanus, and others, were members. When they came to give their votes, it appeared there was not one ſingle perſon, who through the favour of patrons, or an happy wit, was worth ſo much as to be maſter of an houſe either by inheritance or purchaſe : all of them neglecting their private fortunes, owned, and bragged that they lived in lodgings. The Poet was therefore ordered forthwith to ſell his houſe, and to buy wine with the money for their entertainment, and that he ſhould learn to lodge and live always without care like a Poet.*'

The jeſts made on our Triſtan l'Hermit were chiefly levelled at the meanneſs of his cloaths. It was he whom Mr Gueret choſe to be an apologiſt for ſhabby Poets : for ſomebody having ſaid, *that their uncombed hair, their dirty linnen, and the ridiculous figure which their ragged cloaths made, would force a ſmile from the graveſt men* (23) ; Triſtan bluntly replied (24), ' You trouble your head about a trifle . . . . let the Poets live as they pleaſe : do not you know they cannot abide conſtraint ? And what is it to you, that they are all ill cloathed, if their verſe be lofty and magnificent ? Do not deceive yourſelf, this great negligence is the ſource of their fineſt poems : they are thus unconcerned at worldly things, to make their court to the Muſes with the greateſt aſſiduity ; and when their eyes appear to you ſtaring or diſtracted, their imagination is buſied in queſt of thoſe ſurpriſing wonders which raviſh you. Would to God our dramatic Poets were only guilty of this fault, I could eaſily pardon them. But, contrary to thoſe you ſpeak of, they are magnificently dreſſed, they look great by their rich apparel, and their poems are languid, and without method.

[*C*] . . . . *and would be no proof of the injuſtice of the age, nor any argument of the ſterility of the ſervices done to the Muſes.*] If any one ſhould ever think of reducing all the liſts of poor learned men, which we find in ſeveral places (25), into an univerſal catalogue, it would ſwell to a very large book ; and the Poets would here take up more room than all other authors, if we either regard their accounts of themſelves, or the truth of the fact. I think I have already cited theſe verſes of Regnier :

> Or avecq' tout cecy le poinct qui me conſole,
> C'eſt que la pauvreté comme moi les affole,
> Et que la grace à Dieu, Phœbus & ſon troupeau
> Nous n'euſmes ſur le dos jamais un bon manteau,
> &c (26).

> *This is my comfort with my ſcanty ſtore,*
> *They grow the fonder of me, 'cauſe I'm poor ;*
> *And, thanks to heav'n, to Phæbus and the Nine,*
> *I ne'er had a warm cloak, nor place to dine*, &c.

A little lower he ſaith :

> Pour moy, ſi mon habit, par tout cicatricé
> Ne me rendoit du peuple & des grands meſpriſé
> Je prendrois patience, &c.

> *As for my ſelf, if tatter'd coat and veſt,*
> *Of high and low did not make me the jeſt,*
> *I could be patient*, &c.

The epitaph on Malherbe written by Gombauld, diſcovers the poverty of both of them :

> L'Apollon de nos jours, Malherbe, icy repoſe ;
> Il a vêcu long-temps ſans beaucoup de ſupport :
> En quel ſiecle ? paſſant ! je n'en dis autre choſe,
> Il eſt mort pauvre, & moy je vis comme il eſt mort (27).

> *Here lies Malherbe, th' Apollo of our time,*
> *Long while he liv'd with little to ſupport him.*
> *In what age ? Paſſenger, I ſay no more,*
> *He died, I live, alike, both very poor.*

It would be very eaſy to make a collection of pieces of Poetry of the like nature, which would fill ſeveral ſheets. The general concluſion is that the age is very ungrateful and unjuſt to ſuffer ſo many men to be afflicted with poverty, who deſerve ſo well to be rewarded, and to enjoy the conveniencies of life. But it is certain that thoſe who talk thus are very often in the wrong ; for there are ſeveral Poets, whoſe poverty is only to be aſcribed to their too great neglect of their domeſtic affairs, and not knowing how to huſband the favours which they receive. Thoſe who apply themſelves wholly to the Muſes, can ſcarce think of any thing elſe, and find ſo many charming engagements in the compoſition of a Poem, that they cannot take off their thoughts, even when their domeſtic intereſt requires them to be employed in ſomething elſe, than the compoſing an Ode. ' The pleaſure Poetry affords is very great, and . . . . . the hours paſs away very faſt which are employed that way. But does not this wonderful pleaſure which Poets take in their performances, divert them from their affairs, prejudice their fortune, and eſtrange them from the uſual conduct of other men ? For rather than not finiſh a ſonnet well begun, a Poet will ſuffer his friend to depart without bidding him adieu, abandon the ſollicitation of his law-ſuit, and neglect the care of his health : as it happened to the Cavalier Marino, who burnt his leg as he was writing ſome ſtanzas of his Adonis. This poetic

' abſence

(*f*) Marolles, Denombrement des Auteurs.

(20) Juven. Sat. vii, ver. 3.

(21) St Matthew viii. 20.

(22) Joh. Valentinus Andreas, Epiſt. ccii, *pag.* 242.

(23) Gueret, Parnaſſe Réformé, *pag.* 101.

(24) Ibid. *pag.* 102, 103.

(25) *You will find one in Weitzius's notes upon theſe words of Petronius :* Neſcio quo modo bonæ mentis ſoror eſt paupertas. *Thoſe notes are to be found in the edition of Petronius, publiſhed by Lotichius, at Francfort*, 1629, *in* 4*to*.

(26) Regnier, Sat. ii, *fol. m.* 5 *verſo*.

(27) *See the* Diverſitez Curieuſes, *Part.* x, *pag.* 35, *Dutch Edit.*

TRISTAN L'HERMITE de Soliers, who in the year 1661, publiſhed *the Cabinet of Lewis XI, containing ſeveral fragments, letters, and ſecret intrigues concerning the reign of that monarch; and ſeveral other curious pieces, never before publiſhed. Collected from ſeveral archives and repoſitories* (g).

(g) At Paris. It is a book in 12mo, of 122 pages.

'abſence is not hurtful when ſome misfortune has happened; for it does in ſome meaſure take off the ſenſe of it: but it is prejudicial, when it throws men into ſad accidents, like that of Marino. On indifferent ſubjects it is innocent and even diverting,

Si lors que tu luy parles,
Il te laiſſe au Roy Jehan, & s'en court au Roy Charles.

If when to him you talk,
He from one ſubject to another roves.

'The elevated imagination of a Poet is no diſagreeable object, when at leiſure hours we ſee it take its flight, and ſoar up towards every thing that can afford it ſome thoughts. And if ſometimes the beauty or the boldneſs of thoſe pictures which he draws, divert us; yet the Poet's ill fortune is always to be lamented, becauſe his moſt preſſing affairs ſcarce ever prevail over his abſence of mind (28).' There are ſeveral other cauſes of the ill poſture of their affairs, which are indeed ſhameful; ſome are poor notwithſtanding the liberalities of a Mæcenas, becauſe they are prodigal and voluptuous; others loſe at play all the money which their poetical productions bring in. Our Triſtan ruined himſelf by this. See what Mr Chevreau ſays of it. 'We may judge of his genius by his Mariamna. We were intimate friends; and when he deſired me to inform him of the fate of the laſt verſes which he made for the Queen (29). I anſwered him that the perſon who ſhewed them to her majeſty, did not chuſe a time when the Queen was in a gay humour. But if ſhe had made him a preſent, he would have made but a very indifferent uſe of it: gaming was his predominant paſſion; and he loſt all he could play for. At ſeveral times he received of the Duke of St Aignan a thouſand piſtoles, out of which he could not ſpare enough to buy a good ſuit of cloaths (30).' Could he then juſtly complain of the hardneſs of the age? If he was not rich in proportion to his condition, it was his own fault, and only to be charged on his ill conduct. He is reported to have written his own epitaph in theſe ſix verſes.

(28) Sorbiere, Letter lxxvii, *pag.* 559, 560.

(29) That is Chriſtina, Queen of Sweden.

(30) Chevræana, *Tom. i, pag.* 29. *Dutch Edit.*

Ebloüi de l'éclat de la ſplendeur mondaine,
Je me flatay tousjours de l'eſperance vaine;
Faiſant le chien couchant auprés d'un grand Seigneur,
Je me vis tousjours pauvre, & tâchay de paroiſtre;
Je veſcus dans la peine attendant le bonheur,
Et mourus ſur un coffre en attendant mon Maiſtre (31).

Smit with the dazling ſplendor of the world,
I fed my wiſhes with expectance vain,
Servilely crouching at a great lord's feet.
Still poor, I labour'd ſtill to ſeem in want;
I lived in pain, expecting happineſs,
And in the ſervice of my maſter died.

(31) *See the* Diverſitez Curieuſes, ubi ſupra, *Tom. ii, pag.* 341, *Dutch Edit.*

Mr Chevreau mentions another Poet, who ruined himſelf by his pleaſures, *viz.* Colletet. 'In his Poems we find this verſe.

J'ay des maiſons aux champs, j'ay des maiſons en ville.

City and country houſes I enjoy.

'But theſe houſes muſt have been *in partibus infidelium, imaginary.* He was naturally libidinous, and to tempt him, it was not neceſſary to be either fair or young. That he might not get a ſcandalous name among his neighbours, and not being able to live without a female ſervant, he married her, and ſhe was no ſooner dead than he got another, whom he alſo did not fail to make his wife (32)..... Thoſe who deſigned to take an inventory of his goods, aſſured me that he ſaved them that trouble, and left his ſon the name of Colletet only for an inheritance (33).'

It would be almoſt as difficult to enrich certain authors, as to fill the Danaides tub. They are with reſpect to their expences what others are with reſpect to ſecrets (34); money ſlips from them a thouſand ſeveral ways.

(32) Chevræana, ibid. *pag.* 30.

(33) Ibid. *pag.* 31.

(34) Plenus rimarum ſum, hac atque illac perfluo. *Terent. Eunuch. Act. i, Sc. ii.*

TRISTAN DE SAINT AMANT (JOHN) an Antiquary and Medalliſt in the XVIIth century, author of a work in three volumes in folio, intituled *Commentaires Hiſtoriques* (*a*), was the ſon of Charles Triſtan, auditor of accompts at Paris (*b*). Father Sirmond and he wrote againſt each other (*c*).

(*a*) *See what judgment Mr de Spanheim gives of him,* De uſu & præſt. Numiſm. *p.* 774, & *Epiſt. iii,* ad Morellium, *p.* 148.
(*b*) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, *of the 22d of Auguſt,* 1689, *pag.* 584. *Dutch Edit.* (*c*) *See* Baillet's Anti, *Tom. ii, p.* 264.

TRONCHIN (THEODORE) a Miniſter, and Profeſſor of Divinity, born April 17, 1582, at Geneva, where his father was a refugee on account of religion [*A*]. He was deſigned to be a ſcholar by the advice of his godfather Theodorus Beza, and he made an extraordinary progreſs in his ſtudies. The teſtimonials given him in the year 1600, when he went to viſit foreign univerſities, gave him the character of a young man of very great hopes. He confirmed this character among all the learned men to whom he was pupil, or with whom he contracted any acquaintance in his travels [*B*]. He returned to Geneva in 1606, and gave ſuch ſignal proofs of his learning, that he was

[*A*] *Geneva where his father was a refugee on account of religion.*] He was of Troyes in Champagne, and quitted France in 1572, on account of the maſſacre, which he eſcaped by the kind offices of a Prieſt his friend and neighbour, who hid him in his houſe. He deſigned to retire into Germany, and to have only paſſed through Geneva, where he nevertheleſs ſtaid by the advice of a friend. He obtained the freedom of that city, and not long after was admitted into the council of two hundred, in acknowledgment of ſeveral ſervices done to the Republic, during the war it was then engaged in with the Duke of Savoy (1).

(1) Taken from an imparted Memoir.

[*B*] *In his travels.*] Leaving Geneva in 1600, he ſtudied at Baſil under John Nicolas Stupanus, Amandus Polanus, and Antony Walæus. He returned to Geneva in 1602, and departed thence in 1604, to go to Heidelberg, where he improved by the lectures of David Pareus Profeſſor of Divinity, and by thoſe of Æmilius Portus Greek Profeſſor. He ſpent ſome time at Francfort to ſee Gruterus, who had rendered himſelf famous by his collection of inſcriptions. In 1605, he went to the univerſity of Franeker, to hear Sibrand Lubbertus. He ſtaid a conſiderable time at Leyden, under the Profeſſors Gomarus, Trelcatius, Bertius, and Arminius:

was the ſame year made Hebrew profeſſor. In 1607, he married Theodora Rocca, a woman of an extraordinary merit in all reſpects, ſiſter to the firſt ſyndic of the Republic, and grand-daughter to the wife of Theodorus Beza, at whoſe houſe ſhe was brought up, and whoſe god-daughter ſhe was (a). He was choſen miniſter in December 1608, and created rector of the academy in 1610. He was deſired in 1614, beſides his *Hebrew* lectures to read in Divinity, one of the profeſſors being then ſick; and when a profeſſorſhip of Divinity became vacant in 1618, he ſucceeded to it, and was thereby diſcharged from his Hebrew profeſſorſhip. The ſame year he received orders from the paſtors and profeſſors of Geneva to anſwer the Jeſuit Coton, who had writ againſt the French verſion of the bible, a book intituled *Geneve plagiaire*. He acquitted himſelf of this commiſſion by a tract intituled *Coton plagiaire*, a work which was very much eſteemed by the public. At the ſame time he and Mr Diodati were deputed by the church of Geneva to the famous ſynod of Dort (b), where he diſcovered his profound knowledge in Theology, and a moderation which was very much praiſed. In this great conjuncture he acquired the reputation of an extraordinary prudence. He had leave to go to the Duke of Rohan for ſome months in 1632 [C], and perfectly anſwered that lord's expectation, who teſtified afterwards a very great eſteem and particular affection for him. He was very grateful, and honoured the memory of that duke by an oration which he pronounced a few days after the funeral of that great man in 1638. He continued to acquire great eſteem in the exerciſe of all his employments, and by a very extenſive correſpondence in the reformed countries, where he obtained the friendſhip of the moſt learned men, as well as of ſeveral great lords and princes. He compoſed orations and Latin poems with great facility (c): His converſation was very inſtructive and agreeable; for he had added to the ſtudy of Divinity, and of ſeveral languages, the knowledge of the Civil-Law, and of ſeveral other ſciences, and that of ſacred and profane hiſtory, eſpecially of the two laſt centuries, of which he knew an infinite number of particulars. He was one of thoſe men, who are more fond of deſerving reputation, than of hunting after it, and he might if he had pleaſed have publiſhed very excellent books, as Mr Meſtrezat (d) aſſured us. He was choſen by the paſtors in 1655, to confer with and aſſiſt John Dury, in the project of uniting the Lutherans and the Reformed, on which he wrote ſeveral tracts. He arrived to an happy old age free from diſeaſes, and died very eaſily, after a fever which had continued ſome days, on the 19th of November 1657. He had juſt before received the viſit of the paſtors and profeſſors in a body, who in their moving diſcourſe to him gave him all the marks of a tender affection. It was obſerved that he ſurvived all the foreign divines who aſſiſted at the ſynod of Dort. He was a frank ſincere man, zealous for religion, and the ſervice of the churches, a great enemy to the vices of men, tho' very tender of their perſons. His advice was greatly regarded both for the civil government, and in the two eccleſiaſtical bodies; and alſo by ſtrangers, a great number of whom conſulted him. Amongſt other children he left LEWIS TRONCHIN, who was miniſter (e) of the church of Lyons, and four years after was elected to ſucceed his father both as miniſter and profeſſor of Divinity (f). This worthy ſon ſtill enjoys (g) that poſt with the reputation of one of the ableſt Divines of this age. All thoſe who are acquainted with the juſtneſs and penetration of his genius paſſionately deſire that he would at laſt become an author, and are very ſorry that he puts ſo ſlight a value on that title*.

(a) It is therefore a thing ſomewhat ſingular, that both the huſband and the wife ſhould have had ſuch an illuſtrious godfather.

(b) The Republic of the United Provinces, had deſired of that of Geneva, two of their Divines.

(c) I have mentioned his funeral oration upon Simon Goulart, in the diſſertation concerning Junius Brutus.

(d) The Paris miniſter.

(e) He was admitted miniſter in 1651.

(f) Taken from a Memoir, ſent from Geneva.

(g) I write this in 1701.

* He died at Geneva, the eighth of September 1705, being 76 years old. See his Elogy in the inaugural ſpeech of Mr Turretin, his ſucceſſor in the profeſſorſhip of Divinity.

Arminius: under the laſt of which he publickly maintained a theſis in Divinity. He alſo frequented Merula and Baudius, and very often viſited Joſeph Scaliger and Heinſius, who ſhewed a great eſteem and affection for him. *He was loved and praiſed by all for his virtue and learning.* At the Hague he ſaw Hugo Grotius, *who gave him ſixteen verſes which he had compoſed, and told him that he did it to put him in mind of his love for him, and of his eſteem for his learning.* He ſaw at London Aaron Cappel; at Oxford Druſius (2), and John Reynolds; at Cambridge Richard Thompſon and ſeveral others. He was very much eſteemed at Paris by Montigni and Du Moulin miniſters, and by Caſaubon *who beſtowed great elogies on his learning and piety.* He afterwards made the tour of France, *and viſited at Blois, Nicolas Vignier the great Hiſtorian; at Samur Philip Birgan, a Breton called thither by Du Pleſſis and the academical Senate to be Profeſſor of the Oriental tongues. He ſpent ſome months in* 1606, *at Montauban, where the Divinity Profeſſor Sonius ſhewed a particular eſteem for him, and at Montelimar where the famous Daniel Chamier diſcovered a tender affection for him* (3).

[C] *He had leave to go to the Duke of Rohan for ſome months in* 1632.] This Duke was then Ambaſſador extraordinary from the King of France and General of his armies in the country of the Griſons. He ſent a gentleman to Geneva with letters to the government, and the Paſtors, to deſire them to ſend him a miniſter to reſide with him, with whom he might adviſe on thoſe things which might tend to the good of the Reformed Churches in that country, that were ill treated by the Spaniards. Theodorus Tronchin was ſent to him only for ſome months. The neceſſities of the Academy could not allow of his long ſtay. The term being expired, it was prolonged for two months at the inſtance of the Duke of Rohan. *The churches of the Griſons preſerved a great veneration for his perſon, and very gratefully acknowledged the good offices he had done them* (4).

(2) I keep to my Memoir, without inquiring who this Druſius was. Apply this throughout whenever there is occaſion.

(3) Taken from the ſame Memoir.

(4) Ibid.

TRUBERUS

TRUBERUS (PRIMUS) was born in Sclavonia in the year 1508 (*a*). He was the firſt who taught the art of writing in the Sclavonian tongue (*b*), and he tranſlated into that language the New Teſtament, the Catechiſm, the Augſburg confeſſion, and ſome tracts of Melanchthon : which was the cauſe that Lutheraniſm ſpread not only in Carniola and Carinthia, but alſo in the dominions of the great Turk (*c*). He died in the year 1586 (*d*), and left a ſon named **FELICIAN TRUBERUS**, who was miniſter at Laubach in Carniola, and had been educated at Tubingen in the college where the Duke of Wirtemberg maintained at his own charge a certain number of ſtudents (*e*).

(*a*) Konig. Bibl. *pag.* 810.

(*e*) Hailbrunnerus, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* Comment. in Jeremiam.

(*b*) Primus linguam Sclavonicam in literas referre docuit. *Phil. Hailbrunnerus*, Epiſt. Dedic. *Comment. in Jeremiam.* Primus excogitavit artem ſcribendi lingua Vandalica. *Konig. Biblioth. pag.* 810. (*c*) Konig. ibid. (*d*) Id. ibid.

TULENUS, a learned man in the reign of Henry II, had been preceptor to the Cardinal, and to the Admiral de Chatilion (*a*). He was affected with a ſort of folly which did not prejudice his reaſon and judgment in any thing elſe but his amorous paſſion for a certain princeſs, which miſerably diſtracted him. Of which Paſquier, an eye-witneſs, relates ſome circumſtances [*A*].

(*a*) Paſquier's Letters, *book xix, pag.* 541, 542, *book xxii, pag.* 791.

[*A*] *Of which Paſquier, an eye-witneſs, relates ſome circumſtances.*] Propoſing ſome objections againſt the common opinion of Phyſicians, that the judgment, imagination, and memory, are three faculties which are lodged in three ſeparate ventricles of the brain, he ſaith that the diſtinction of the three ventricles is inſufficient, and that the ventricle of judgment, and that of memory ought to be ſubdivided as often as either of them acts differently in us. And to prove theſe different operations, he obſerves that in the reign of Francis I, *One Villemanoche reſided at court, whoſe judgment never appeared touched on any other account than his expecting to marry ladies of great quality* (1) ; *and after him*, continues he, ‘ Tulenus a learned man . . . . . whoſe judgment was entire in every thing elſe but a paſſion, which he had ridiculouſly vowed to one of the firſt Princeſſes of France, who was dead. With this perſon I once diverted myſelf at my own table, when ſeveral men of honour, who were ſtrangers, and not in the leaſt acquainted with him were preſent. He entertained us till the middle of our dinner with an infinite variety of learned and judicious diſcourſe, to the admiration of all who heard him. At laſt believing I had ſufficiently prejudiced the company in his favour, and that it was now time to make the good old man play another part, I took occaſion ſeemingly by accident to ſpeak of this Princeſs ; after which quitting his amble he immediately began to trot, relating an incoherent crowd of follies, concerning the good and ill treatment he had met with from her. The company amazed from whence this ſudden change proceeded, could not tell what to think of him, he having before talked ſo wittily and learnedly. But after he was gone, I at large acquainted them with the reaſon of the alteration of his brain. Beſides what I have related, it was obſerved of him, that the judging part being wounded on this ſubject, had alſo affected the imaginative ſo much, that at the firſt ſight of any young lady whom he met with, he was perſuaded it was his Julia, (as he called his pretended miſtreſs in Latin, and Jolivette in French) and guided by this fooliſh imagination, he ſometimes walked in his gown and ſquare-cap as far as Fontaine-Bleau, perſuading himſelf that ſhe hid herſelf there. I relate nothing concerning him but what I have ſeen or heard of him (2).’ This example confirms what we have ſeen in another place (3), that ſome perſons loſe common ſenſe with regard to ſome things, who nevertheleſs by the reſt of their conduct plainly convince us that their ſenſe, knowledge, and reaſon are entire and in a flouriſhing condition (4).

(1) Paſquier's Letters, *book, xix, pag.* 541.

(2) Paſquier repeats the ſame thing much in the ſame words in the xxiid book, pag. 791. But he ſays there that Tulenus *was crazy in two reſpects, in aiming at the biſhopric of Cambray, and in his love* for that great Princeſs. See Sorel's remarks upon the *Berger extravagant*, *pag.* 176, 177.

(3) Above, towards the end of remark [*E*], of the article MARESTS (JOHN DES).

(4) *See* Fromond de Anima, *lib. iv, cap. iv.*

TULLIA, Cicero's daughter, is ſo often mentioned in that great man's epiſtles, that her hiſtory deſerves to be enquired into. She was born the 5th of Auguſt (*a*), but the year is unknown to us. Some very learned men believe that ſhe was married to her firſt huſband in the year 689 (*b*). His name was Caius Piſo [*A*]. He was a man of ſtrict honour, he intereſted himſelf with the utmoſt concern in the affairs of his father-in-law [*B*], and wanted neither capacity nor eloquence. It is thought he died during Cicero's exile, which was in 696. **TULLIA** was a ſecond time married to Furius Craſſipes the following year [*C*]. It is not known how ſhe was ſeparated from this huſband ; whether he died, or whether ſhe was divorced from him : we are only told that in 703 ſhe was married to Publius Cornelius Dolabella. This third marriage was contracted during Cicero's abſence, when he was governor of Cilicia. Thoſe friends whom

(*a*) Cicero, Orat. pro Sextio, & Epiſt. i, *lib. iv*, ad Atticum.

(*b*) See the remark [*A*].

[*A*] *His name was Caius Piſo.*] This is not to be doubted of, if we conſider theſe words : ‘ Tulliolam C. Piſoni L. F. Frugi deſpondimus. - - - - *I have given my daughter Tullia in marriage to Caius Piſo.*’ So Tully concludes the third epiſtle of his firſt book to Atticus. It is thought to have been written in the conſulſhip of Lucius Julius Cæſar, and Caius Martius Figulus, in the year 689 (1) ; but no reaſon is alledged for that date, and I find no hint in the letter itſelf to countenance it. Caſaubon believes it was written before the year 686, and that Tullia was not above twelve years old at moſt when ſhe was married to Caius Piſo (2).

[*B*] *He intereſted himſelf with the utmoſt concern in the affairs of his father-in-law.*] Cicero could never ſufficiently praiſe him. ‘ Vexabatur, *ſaith he* (3), uxor mea : liberi ad necem quærebantur : gener, & Piſo gener à Piſonis Conſulis pedibus ſupplex rejiciebatur. - - - *My wife was harraſſed, my children perſecuted to death, and the humble petitions of my dear ſon-in-law Piſo rejected by the conſul Piſo.*’ In one of his Orations (4) he ſpeaks thus : ‘ Alter fuit propugnator mearum fortunarum & defenſor aſſiduus, ſumma virtute & pietate C. Piſo gener, qui minas inimicorum meorum, qui inimicitias affinis mei propinqui ſui Conſulis, qui Pontum & Bithyniam Quæſtor pro mea ſalute neglexit. - - - *C. Piſo, my ſon-in-law, a man of great honour and probity, vigorouſly ſupported my intereſt ; he deſpiſed the threats of my enemies, and the hatred of the Conſul, who was allied to me and related to him : and when he was Quæſtor, he neglected Pontus and Bithynia upon my account.*’ The like paſſages are to be found in his epiſtles. See the elogy which he beſtows on him with reſpect to his eloquence and virtue in his treatiſe *de Claris Oratoribus* (5).

[*C*] *Tullia was a ſecond time married to Furius Craſſipes the following year.*] See Cicero's epiſtles to his brother, book the ſecond, epiſtle 4 and 7. Ludovicus Vives hath (6) reduced theſe two ſons-in-law of Cicero to one : he ſuppoſes that Tullia was but twice married, the firſt time to Piſo Frugi Craſſipes, and the ſecond

(1) Corradus, in Quæſtura, *pag. m.* 83, *and after him* Sagittarius, in Vita Tulliæ, *num.* 5, & 11.

(2) See Cicero, Grevius's edition, Epiſt. ad Attic. *Tom. i, pag.* 33. And in Manutius's Commentary, *pag.* 18.

(3) Orat. pro Sextio, *pag. m.* 71.

(4) Poſt reditum in Senatu. *See alſo his ſpeech* Poſt reditum ad Quirites.

(5) Pag. m. 398.

(6) In Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, *lib. xix, cap. iv.*

whom he deſired to inform him whether Dolabella was in good circumſtances [*D*], acquitted themſelves very ill of that commiſſion; and he afterwards repented that ever he had conſented to that match, before he could himſelf enquire into Dolabella's affairs, which were not in a very good poſture. He was a young man who lived irregularly [*E*]; but knew ſo well how to cajole the mother and the daughter (*c*) [*F*], that they winked at his debaucheries, and looked on him as a good match. He gave his father-in-law very

ſecond to Cornelius Dolabella, and that ſhe died in child-bed in the houſe of the latter. We ſhall refute this below (7).

[*D*] *To inform him whether Dolabella was in good circumſtances.*] I only advance this as a conjecture which I borrow from the learned Manutius: it is very probable and founded on ſome expreſſions of Cicero. He tells Atticus: ‘Tullia mea venit ad me pridie Idus Jun. deque tua erga ſe obſervantia benevolentiaque mihi plurima expoſuit, literaſque reddidit trinas: ego autem ex ipſius virtute, humanitate, pietate non modò eam voluptatem non cepi, quam capere ex ſingulari filia debui; ſed etiam incredibili ſum dolore affectus, tale ingenium in tam miſera fortuna verſari, idque accidere nullo ipſius delicto, ſumma culpa mea (8). - - - *My daughter Tullia came to me the 12th of June, and acquainted me with the reſpect and civility you had ſhewn her, and delivered to me three letters: but I am ſo far from conceiving pleaſure, as I ought, on account of her extraordinary virtue, good nature, and piety, that I am overwhelmed with ſorrow, becauſe thoſe excellent qualities are attended with unhappy circumſtances of life, and that through no fault of her own, but mine.*’ Let us now ſee how the two laſt words are paraphraſed by Manutius. ‘Mea enim negligentia factum eſt, ut Dolabellæ nuberet: quem ego probare generum non debui, niſi prius omnia perſcrutatus, non ſolum quod ad mores, ſed etiam quod ad facultates attineret: quod ſi feciſſem, ejus ære alieno perſpecto, nunquam paſſus eſſem, ut homini in tanta rei domeſticæ difficultate conſtituto filia mea collocaretur; ſed commiſi, ut me abſente res per amicos ageretur, quibus in Ciliciam proficiſcens ita mandavi (9), ut, quoniam ego tam longe abſuturus eram, de Tulliæ meæ matrimonio agerent ipſi quod probaſſent. in quo meam negligentiam agnoſco, tantam enim rem aliis committere non debui, ſed in reditum meum integram reſervare. - - - *For it was owing to my negligence that ſhe was married to Dolabella: whom I ſhould not have approved of for a ſon-in-law, until I had firſt enquired into every thing, not only with reſpect to his morals, but likewiſe with regard to his circumſtances: which had I done, and found that he was plunged in debt, I would never have ſuffered my daughter to be married to a man labouring under ſuch difficulties: but I agreed that the affair ſhould be managed by friends in my abſence; to whom I gave a power, as I was going into Cilicia, and was to be abſent ſo long, to do whatever they thought proper in the marriage of my daughter Tullia; wherein I acknowledge my fault, for I ought not to have truſted a matter of that importance to others, but to have deferred it entirely till my return.*’ This author confirms his paraphraſe in the following manner: ‘Cur autem hoc à Cicerone putem ſignificari, facit Epiſtola ad Terentiam his verbis ſcripta: *Tullia noſtra venit ad me pridie idus Jun. cujus ſumma virtute & ſingulari humanitate graviore etiam ſum dolore affectus, noſtra factum eſſe negligentia, ut longe alia in fortuna eſſet, atque ejus pietas ac dignitas poſtulabat.* Dixit autem, *Tale ingenium in tam miſera fortuna verſari,* hoc ſenſu; quod Tullia virum haberet tam perditum, tam flagitioſum, tam multa in tribunatu nefarie molientem: ſiquidem in tribunatu iniquas leges ferre Dolabella conatus eſt, maxime debitorum cauſa, è quibus ipſe unus erat (10). - - - *I am inclined to think that this is Cicero's meaning, from the following epiſtle to Terentia:* My Tullia came to me the 12th of June, whoſe great virtue and ſingular good nature gives me the greater trouble, as it was through my negligence that ſhe did not meet with a fortune ſuitable to her piety and merit. *The reaſon why he ſays,* Thoſe excellent qualities were attended with unhappy circumſtances of life, was, *becauſe Tullia had a debauched and profligate huſband, who excited tumults in Rome whilſt he was Tribune of the people: for Dolabella in his tribuneſhip endeavoured to enact unjuſt laws, eſpecially in behalf of debtors, whereof he himſelf was one.*’

[*E*] *He was a young man who lived irregularly.*] Cœlius hinted it to Cicero, when he congratulated him on that marriage: I ſhall cite his own words becauſe they contain the very compliment we ſhould make at preſent in a like caſe. He excuſes what was paſt on account of his youth, and though he durſt not venture to aſſure him, that all the failings of that age were mended, yet he hoped the marrying ſuch an accompliſhed lady, the daughter of ſuch a father, would certainly compleat the cure. ‘Gratulor tibi affinitate viri medius fidius optimi. Nam hoc ego de illo exiſtimo. Cetera porro quibus adhuc ille ſibi parum utilis fuit, & ætate jam ſunt decurſa, & conſuetudine atque autoritate tua & pudore Tulliæ, ſi qua reſtabunt, confido celeriter ſublatum iri. Non eſt enim pugnax in vitiis, neque hebes ad id quod melius ſit intelligendum (11). - - - *I congratulate you upon your affinity with a man, that is in truth an excellent perſon: for ſuch is my opinion of him. As to thoſe follies he may have been guilty of to his own prejudice, they are now cured with age; or if any ſtill remain, I dare ſay he will be reclaimed by your company and authority, and by the virtue of Tullia. For he is not obſtinate in his failings, and he has ſenſe enough to know how to behave better.*’ Obſerve what Cœlius ſays, that age had already cured the vicious inclinations of Dolabella. This inclines me to believe that Appian was miſtaken when he affirmed (12) that Dolabella was not above twenty-five years of age when Cæſar was killed. He muſt then have been but eighteen or nineteen when he married Tullia. Was it then reaſonable to ſay that the vicious courſe of his youth was paſt? But here are yet other difficulties againſt Appian. The commentators on Cicero will have the following words to be meant of Dolabella: ‘Illud verò mihi permirum accidit, tantam temeritatem fuiſſe in eo adoleſcente, cujus ego ſalutem duobus capitis judiciis ſumma contentione defendi, ut tuis inimicitiis ſuſcipiendis oblivіſceretur patroni omnium fortunarum ac rationum ſuarum: præſertim cum tu omnibus vel ornamentis vel præſidiis redundares, illi (ut leviſſime dicam) multa deeſſent. cujus ſermo ſtultus & puerilis erat jam antea ad me a M. Cœlio, familiari noſtro, perſcriptus: de quo item ſermone multa ſcripta ſunt abs te. Ego autem citius cum eo qui tuas inimicitias ſuſcepiſſet, veterem conjunctionem diremiſſem quam novam conciliaſſem. - - - - *I am very much ſurprized that that young man, whoſe life with great difficulty I ſaved, when he was twice indicted for capital crimes, ſhould be ſo indiſcreet as to become your enemy and forget the patron and guardian of all his fortune: eſpecially conſidering the vaſt honours and powerful intereſt you enjoy, whilſt he (to ſpeak moderately) is in great want. Our friend M. Cœlius had before informed me by a letter of his ſilly and childiſh diſcourſe, concerning which you have likewiſe writ much. I had rather break off an old acquaintance with one that is your avowed enemy than contract a new one.*’ Cicero wrote this in 703, when he was in Cilicia, before Dolabella was his ſon-in-law. The epiſtle, of which theſe words are part, was written to a perſon whom Dolabella had accuſed (13). It ſeems therefore that they cannot be meant of any body elſe beſides Dolabella. But it would be very ſtrange, that before the age of eighteen a perſon ſhould be twice arraigned for capital crimes. Beſides I find that Tullia was not Dolabella's firſt wife. He had one who left him when he accuſed Appius (14).

[*F*] *He knew ſo well how to cajole the mother and the daughter.*] This we may infer from theſe words of Cicero to Atticus (15). ‘Ego, dum in provincia omnibus rebus Appium orno, ſubito ſum factus accuſatoris ejus ſocer. id quidem, inquis, dii approbent, ita velim: teque ita cupere certo ſcio. ſed

‘crede

(*c*) I mean Terentia, Cicero's wife, and Tullia their daughter.

(7) In the remark [*N*].

(8) Epiſt. xvii, *lib. xi.*

(9) *This appears from theſe words of Cicero.* In quo unum vereor ne tu parum perſpicias ea quæ geſta ſunt ab aliis eſſe geſta, quibus ego ita mandaram, ut cum tam longe abſuturus eſſem ad me ne referrent, agerent quod probaſſent. - - - - *Wherein I am afraid you do not attend to one thing, viz. that what was done, was done by others, to whom I gave a commiſſion, as I was to be abſent a long time, to manage in that affair as they ſhould think fit, without referring it to me.* Epiſt. xii, *lib. iii, ad* Familiares, *wherein he excuſes himſelf for having married Tullia to Dolabella, the accuſer of Appius, to whom he writes.*

(10) Manutius quotes Dion in this place.

(11) See Cicero's xiiith Epiſtle of the viiith book *ad Familiares.*

(12) Appian. *lib. iv,* de Bello Civili.

(13) To Appius Pulcher. That letter is the xth of the iiid book *ad Familiares.*

(14) Inter poſtulationem & nominis delationem uxor à Dolabella diſceſſit. *Epiſt. vi,* lib. viii, *Cicer. ad Familiares.*

(15) Epiſt. vi, *lib. vi.*

very great uneaſineſs [*G*], by the tumults which he excited in Rome when he was tribune of the people. He endeavoured to eſtabliſh a law very prejudicial to creditors; for he pretended that debtors ſhould not be forced to the payment of their debts, either by perſonal impriſonment or ſeizure of their effects. Mark Antony was obliged (*d*) to bring ſome troops into the city, who fell upon the favourers of Dolabella, of which they killed eight hundred [*H*]. Poor Tullia was unhappy in her laſt huſband; and it is not to be doubted that her journey to Brunduſium [*I*] to ſpeak with her father, proceeded amongſt other reaſons from the neceſſity of conſulting him how to behave her ſelf towards ſo troubleſome a huſband. She was divorced from him [*K*], and yet Cicero always treated Dolabella

crede mihi, nihil minus putaram ego, qui de Ti. Nerone, qui mecum egerat, certos homines ad mulieres miſeram, qui Romam venerunt factis ſponſalibus. ſed hoc ſpero melius. mulieres quidem valde intelligo delectari OBSEQUIO ET COMITATE adoleſcentis, cætera non ἐξακανθίζειν. - - - *Whilſt I am heaping favours on Appius in the province, I am on a ſudden become father-in-law to his accuſer: you wiſh it may prove fortunate, you ſay: I wiſh ſo too; and I am certain you heartily deſire it. But believe me, there is nothing I leſs expected; for I had ſent ſome perſons to my wife and daughter concerning Ti. Nero, who had made propoſals to me; but before they came to Rome, the match was concluded. I hope it will be for the better. I underſtand the women were wonderfully charmed WITH THE COMPLAISANCE AND CIVILITY of the young man, but did not examine into other matters.*' Terentia and Tullia were ſo charmed with the complaiſance and civility of this young man that they pardoned his faults, and did not enquire into his life. The ſame thing frequently happens in our time. A young debauchee who renders himſelf agreeable by his deportment, and by acting the well-bred man, will ſo inſinuate himſelf into the favour of both mothers and daughters, that they will not conſider whether he has waſted his whole eſtate; he will exclude his rivals though more deſerving than he, if they are not of the ſame obliging and complaiſant behaviour. *Let us have him, he pleaſes our eyes.* This undoubtedly utterly ruined the affairs of the other ſuitor to Tullia, who was not Titus Nero, but Tiberius Nero: probably the ſame who married Livia, and was father to the Emperor Tiberius. Some authors believe that Dolabella by his flatteries and obliging civilities ſo touched Tullia's heart, that ſhe eaſily excuſed his almoſt dwarfiſh ſhape: for it is to him that Tully's jeſt is applied, *Who has faſtned my ſon-in-law to his ſword* (16)? Their conjecture may be a little helped by Macrobius, who calls Lentulus the ſon-in-law, whom Cicero rallied in that manner (17). This ſirname agrees better with Dolabella than with Piſo and Furius; for the Lentuli were a branch of the Cornelian family, and perhaps the Dolabella's were of the branch of the Lentuli. See below a paſſage of Aſconius Pedianus.

[*G*] *He gave Cicero very great uneaſineſs.*] Not to repeat what I have ſaid in the article of Dolabella concerning the new laws which he propoſed in favour of debtors, I ſhall content myſelf with citing one or two proofs of his father-in-law's uneaſineſs. ' O dii, *ſaith he in a letter to Atticus* (18), generum ne noſtrum potiſſimum, ut hoc, vel tabulas novas. Quod me audis, *ſaith he in an another letter* (19), fractiorem eſſe animo, quid putas, cum videas acceſſiſſe ad ſuperiores ægritudines præclaras generi actiones? - - - *Can you wonder to hear I am dejected in mind, when you ſee the glorious actions of my ſon-in-law are added to my former troubles.*'

[*H*] *Of which they killed eight hundred.*] We ſhould have had the particulars of this action, if Livy had come to us entire; for in the ſummary of his 113th book we find: ' Quum ſeditiones Romæ à P. Dolabella tribuno plebis legem ferente de novis tabulis excitatæ eſſent, & ex ea cauſſa plebs tumultuaretur, inductis à M. Antonio Magiſtro equitum in urbem militibus octingenti è plebe cæſi ſunt. - - - *When ſeditions were excited at Rome by P. Dolabella, Tribune of the people, who enacted a new law concerning creditors, and on that account the people mutinied, Mark Anthony, Maſter of the Horſe, having brought ſome troops into the city, eight hundred of the people were ſlain.*' All Hiſtorians repreſent the city at that time in a diſmal condition. It is true that the inhabitants of Rome were ſo accuſtomed to bloodſhed in their ſtreets, and in the aſſemblies of the people, by the animoſity of contrary factions, that they were leſs ſurprized than we at this time ſhould be, to ſee their city filled with guards continually ready to fall on one another.

[*I*] *Her journey to Brunduſium.*] Her miſerable condition which ſhe laid open to her father, overwhelmed him with grief; in ſo much, that this interview which on another occaſion would have afforded this tender father the greateſt pleaſure, turned into an inſupportable affliction: this appears from the words above cited in the remark [*D*], citation 8, and thoſe in a letter written to his wife Terentia. ' Tullia noſtra venit ad me pridie Idus Junii: cujus ſumma virtute, & ſingulari humanitate, graviore etiam ſum dolore affectus, noſtra factum eſſe negligentia, ut longe alia in fortuna eſſet, atque ejus pietas, ac dignitas poſtulabat (20). - - - *My daughter Tullia came to me the 12th of June; whoſe great virtue and extraordinary good nature gives me the greater trouble, as it was through my negligence that ſhe did not meet with a fate ſuitable to her piety and merit.*' Cicero did not detain his daughter long there, he ſent her home; her preſence not being able to leſſen their mutual affliction. ' Tulliam autem non videbam eſſe cauſam cur diutius mecum tanto in communi mœrore retinerem: itaque matri eam, cum primum per ipſam liceret, eram remiſſurus. - - - *But I ſaw no reaſon to keep Tullia with me longer in our mutual great affliction: and therefore I ſent her back to her mother as ſoon as ſhe could go.*' This he writes to his friend Atticus in the ſeventeenth epiſtle of his eleventh book.

[*K*] *She was divorced from him.*] This is not to be doubted of if we conſider Sulpicius's hint in his conſolatory letter on her death. Amongſt other reaſons he offers this, *viz.* that in the unhappy poſture of affairs, nothing could engage Tullia to deſire to live, ſeeing her father could not have found a good huſband for her. This ſuppoſes that ſhe was perfectly diſengaged from the conjugal bonds. ' Quoties in eam cogitationem neceſſe eſt & tu veneris, & nos ſæpe incidimus, hiſce temporibus non peſſime cum iis eſſe actum quibus ſine dolore licitum eſt mortem cum vita commutare? Quid autem fuit quod illam hoc tempore ad vivendum magnopere invitare poſſet? quæ res? quæ ſpes? quod animi ſolatium? Ut cum aliquo adoleſcente primario conjuncta ætatem gereret? Licitum eſt tibi (credo) pro tua dignitate ex hac juventute generum diligere, cujus fidei liberos tuos te tuto committere putares (21). - - - - *How often muſt you have thought, as I have frequently done, that in ſuch a ſituation of affairs, thoſe had no reaſon to complain who were permitted without pain to exchange life for death? What was there that could much induce Tullia to deſire to live? What thing? What hope? What pleaſure of mind? Could ſhe have ſpent her days in marriage with any young man of the firſt rank? It was in your power (I believe) conſidering your dignity, to choſe a ſon-in-law from amongſt that youth, had you thought a good one could have been found.*' If this proof was inſufficient I would offer thoſe places in Cicero's letters concerning the reſtitution of her portion. ' Teneor tamen dum à Dolabellæ procuratoribus exigam primam penſionem (22). - - - *I am detained till I receive the firſt payment from Dolabella's agents.*' Some think that Dolabella deſigning to divorce Tullia, preſſed the eſtabliſhment of the new law, that he might not be obliged to refund her fortune to Cicero (23). It is ſurprizing that Aſconius Pedianus was ſo ill informed of the fate of Tullia, as to affirm that after Piſo's death ſhe married Lentulus, and died in child-bed at his houſe (24). Which are two or three miſtakes.

[*L*] *Cicero*

(*d*) He was at that time General of the Horſe, under the ſecond dictatorſhip of Julius Cæſar, the year after the battle of Pharſalia.

(16) Adeo placuit Tulliæ novi ſponſi comitas, ut minori ejus ſtatura non offenderetur. Notus eſt Ciceronis jocus, *Quis generum meum alligavit gladio?* Caſpar Sagittarius, in Vita Tulliæ, *num.* 30.

(17) M. Cicero cum Lentulum generum ſuum exiguæ naturæ hominem longo gladio accinctum vidiſſet, *Quis*, inquit, *generum meum ad gladium alligavit?* Macrob. Saturnal. *lib. ii, cap. iii.*

(18) The xxiiid of the xith book.

(19) The xiith of the ſame book.

(20) Cicero, Epiſt. xi, *lib. xiv*, ad Familiar.

(21) Epiſt. v, *lib. iv*, Ciceron. ad Familiares, *pag. m.* 192.

(22) Epiſt. xviii, *lib. vi*, ad Familiares, *written whilſt Cæſar was in Spain: againſt Pompey's ſons.*

(23) See Cicero, Grævius's edition, *Tom. ii*, Epiſt. ad Attic. *pag.* 270.

(24) Cicero filiam poſt mortem Piſonis generi P. Lentulo collocavit apud quem illa ex partu deceſſit. *Aſcon. Pedian. in Orat. Ciceron. contra L. Piſonem, pag.* 157.

Dolabella as tenderly as poſſibly he could [*L*], till after the murder of Trebonius, he fell on

[*L*] *Cicero always treated Dolabella as tenderly as poſſibly he could.*] He doubtleſs had a greater ſhare of capacity than reſolution, and he ſaw Pompey's party running into ruin more and more by the continual victories of Julius Cæſar. He probably feared that the conqueror would at laſt ceaſe to ſhew his clemency, and would make away with ſuch as had a republican ſpirit, and were men endowed with parts ſufficient to oppoſe him. He knew that Dolabella was in very great credit with Cæſar: after which it is needleſs to aſk why Cicero diſſembled his reſentment againſt his ſon-in-law. His kind treatment of him kept him within the compaſs of friendſhip; for Dolabella ſtood Cicero's friend at Julius Cæſar's court, in oppoſition to thoſe who endeavoured to render him odious, and a little after the death of Tullia he deſired to be acquainted with the poſture of his affairs. ‘Quod ſcribis prælia te mea cauſſa ſuſtinere non tam id laboro, ut ſi qui mihi obtrectent à te refutentur, quam intelligi cupio quod certe intelligitur me à te amari (25).--*As to what you write, that you ſtand ſevere brunts on my account; I am not ſo ſollicitous to have thoſe refuted by you who aſperſe me, as to have it known that you love me.*’ For which reaſon Cicero wrote to him a very obliging letter (26) in the midſt of the affliction with which he was loaded. We have a convincing proof of their mutual intimacy, in Cicero's firſt Philippic, even when Julius Cæſar was killed, there he repreſents to Dolabella how glorious his action was of throwing down the column which the mutineers had erected, to animate the people againſt Cæſar's murtherers. All honeſt men complimented and thanked Cicero, they thinking him Dolabella's director in that affair. ‘Te intuens, Dolabella, qui es mihi cariſſimus, non poſſum de utriuſque veſtrum errore reticere . . . Dicerem Dolabella, qui recte factorum fructus eſſet, niſi te præter ceteros pauliſper eſſe expertum viderem. Quem potes recordari in vita tibi illuxiſſe diem lætiorem, quam cum expiato foro, diſſipato concurſu impiorum, principibus ſceleris pœna affectis, urbe incendio & cædis metu liberata te domum recepiſti? cujus ordinis, cujus generis, cujus denique fortunæ ſtudia tum laudi, & gratulationi tuæ ſe non obtulerunt? quin mihi etiam, quo auctore te in iis rebus uti arbitrabantur, & gratias boni viri agebant, & tuo nomine gratulabantur. Recordare, quæſo, Dolabella, conſenſum illum theatri, cum omnes, earum rerum obliti, propter quas tibi fuerant offenſi, ſignificarunt ſe novo beneficio memoriam veteris doloris abjeciſſe (27). - - - - *My dear Dolabella, conſidering the great affection I have for you, I cannot forbear mentioning the fault of both of you . . . I would tell you, Dolabella, the benefit of good actions, if I did not ſee that you have a little experienced it above others. Do you remember a day in your whole life, wherein you had greater pleaſure, than when you retired home after you had purged the Forum, diſperſed the impious mob, puniſhed the ring-leaders, and freed the city from the fear of burning and maſſacre? Did not people of all ranks, degrees, and conditions come to applaud and congratulate you upon it? I myſelf, who was thought to have adviſed you in thoſe matters, received the thanks of honeſt men, and was complimented on your account. Pray, my dear Dolabella, think on that unanimous approbation of the theatre, when all of them, forgetting thoſe things which had incenſed them againſt you, declared that this new favour had quite extinguiſhed their former reſentment.*’ This long paſſage doth not expreſsly tell what was done againſt the column; but Cicero a little before had given ſuch an exact account of it (28), that what I have ſaid hardly admits of a ſcruple. I ſhall take this occaſion to obſerve that this column is the ſame which Suetonius ſpeaks of. ‘Poſtea, *ſaith he* (29), ſolidam columnam prope 20 pedum lapidis Numidici in foro ſtatuit (*plebs*) ſcripſitque PARENTI PATRIÆ. Apud eandem longo tempore ſacrificare, vota ſuſcipere, controverſias quaſdam interpoſito per Cæſarem jurejurando diſtrahere perſeveravit. - - - - *Afterwards the populace erected in the Forum a marble column almoſt twenty foot high, with this inſcription,* TO THE FATHER OF HIS COUNTRY. *They continued a long time to offer ſacrifices before it, to make vows, and determine differences, by adminiſtring an oath wherein they ſwore by Cæſar.*’ This *longo tempore, long time*, is a miſtake, which clearly proves that Suetonius had not read the firſt Philippic, or at leaſt did not remember it; for that oration informs us, that the column was deſtroyed before the firſt of June. Cicero's letters tell us, that it was pulled down before the firſt of May (30). Now Cæſar was killed the fifteenth of the preceding March. But to return to the good correſpondence betwixt Cicero and Dolabella: nothing could be more endearing than the letter which Cicero wrote to him on account of that column. ‘Cum te ſemper tantum dilexerim quantum tu intelligere potuiſti, tum his tuis factis ſic incenſus ſum, ut nihil unquam in amore fuerit ardentius (31). *As I always had a great affection for you, theſe your actions have ſo inflamed my love, that nothing ever exceeded it.*’ He doth not forget to acquaint him that he himſelf paſſed for the author of this good advice; and the turn of his thought is admirable. ‘Etſi contentus eram, mi Dolabella, tua gloria, ſatiſque ex ea magnam lætitiam voluptatemque capiebam, tamen non poſſum non confiteri, cumulari me maximo gaudio, quod vulgo hominum opinio ſocium me adſcribat tuis laudibus. Neminem conveni, convenio autem quotidie plurimos . . . . . quin omnes, cum te ſummis laudibus ad cœlum extulerunt, mihi continuo maximas gratias agant. Negant enim ſe dubitare, quin tu meis præceptis & conſiliis abtemperans præſtantiſſimum te civem & ſingularem conſulem præbeas. Quibus ego quamquam veriſſime poſſum reſpondere te quæ facias tuo judicio & tua ſponte facere, nec cujuſquam egere conſilio: tamen neque plane aſſentior, ne imminuam tuam laudem, ſi omnis à meis conſiliis profecta videatur: neque valde nego, ſum enim avidior etiam quam ſatis eſt gloriæ. . . . A te autem peto, ut me hanc quaſi falſam hæreditatem alienæ gloriæ ſinas cernere, meque aliqua ex parte, in ſocietatem tuarum laudum venire patiare: quamquam, mi Dolabella, (hæc enim jocatus ſum) libentius omneis meas, ſi modo ſunt aliquæ meæ laudes, ad te transfuderim, quam aliquam partem exhauſerim ex tuis (32). - - - *Tho' I was contented, my Dolabella, with your glory, and received ſufficient pleaſure and ſatisfaction from it; yet I muſt own it was a vaſt addition to my joy, that people generally thought me intitled to a ſhare in your honour. Every body I meet with, (and I daily meet with great numbers . . .) whenever they extol you to the ſkies, continually thank me at the ſame time. For they ſay, they do not queſtion, but that by following my directions and and counſels you ſhew yourſelf to be an excellent citizen, and an extraordinary Conſul. Tho' I might truly anſwer them, that what you do, proceeds entirely from your own judgment and inclination, and that you do not want the advice of any body: yet I neither concur with them altogether, leſt I ſhould leſſen your merit, if it were thought to flow entirely from my counſels: nor do I very much contradict them, for I am more covetous of glory than I ought to be. . . . . But I beg of you to allow me to uſurp another's glory: and ſuffer me, in ſome meaſure, to be a partner in your reputation: tho', my dear Dolabella, (for I ſpoke in jeſt) I had rather transfer to you all my fame, if I had any, than to diminiſh your's in the leaſt.*’ He ſeems to be tranſported when he ſpeaks of this action to his friend Atticus. See Epiſt. xv and xvi of the xivth book, and the firſt letter of the xiith book *ad Familiares*. I have ſomewhere read that he deſigned to go to Syria Dolabella's lieutenant, if Hirtius and Panſa, who were to be Conſuls the next year, had not diſſuaded him. He let Dolabella go without him, and embarked for Athens, after having promiſed to return when Hirtius and Panſa ſhould enter on the conſulſhip. Contrary winds retarded his voyage, and he received ſome advices from his friends, which engaged him to return ſpeedily to Rome. The day after his arrival the ſenate was aſſembled, but he did not appear there, at which Mark Antony was offended. This is what we find in Amyot's tranſlation of Plutarch's life of Cicero. One might convict Plutarch of a miſtake, if the phraſe which he makes uſe of (33), and Amyot tranſlates, *he let Dolabella go*, was not equivocal: but as it may barely ſignify, *he thought no more of Dorabella, he left him*, this criticiſm only affects the tranſlator. He was in the wrong to think that Dolabella departed from Rome before Cicero; for the firſt Philippic was pronounced

(25) Epiſt. xi, *lib. ix*, ad Familiares.

(26) The xith of the ixth book, *ad Familiares*.

(27) Philipp. I, *pag. m.* 690, 691.

(28) Taliſque everſio illius exſecratæ columnæ. *Ibid.* pag. 674. *I have cited the whole paſſage in the article* DOLABELLA, citation (18).

(29) In Cæſar. *cap. lxxxv.*

(30) Epiſt. xv, *lib. xiv*, ad Atticum.

(31) Cicero, Epiſt. xiv, *lib. ix*, ad Famil. *pag. m.* 32.

(32) Id. ibid. *pag.* 30.

(33) Δολοβέλλαν μὲν εἴασε χαίρειν. Dolabellam miſſum fecit. *Plutarch. in Cicer. p.* 882, *E.*

on him with his whole ſtock of rhetorical figures (e) [*M*]. Tullia died in the year 708 [*N*]. Her father remained inconſolable for ſome time [*O*]: his friends uſed all their

pronounced in Dolabella's preſence, after Cicero's return. This obliges me to repeat what I have ſeveral times ſaid, that it is extremely difficult to tranſlate well; for tho we may take the expreſſions of the original in the moſt probable ſenſe, that doth not always ſecure us againſt miſtakes; and the knowledge of a thouſand particular events is neceſſary to direct us to expreſs the true ſenſe. For inſtance, if Amyot had remembred that Dolabella was preſent in the ſenate as conſul, when Cicero ſpoke his firſt Philippic; if he had remembred that Cicero, in that oration, urged his reaſons for departing from Rome, and the motives of his return, he would not have tranſlated thoſe words of Plutarch, *he let Dolabella go*. After all, I do not diſpute the fact; I ſee no reaſon againſt my believing that Cicero deſigned to follow Dolabella into Syria. This is a freſh proof of the text of this remark.

[*M*] *Till after the murther of Trebonius he fell on him with his whole ſtock of rhetorical of figures.*] He had reaſon to cenſure very ſeverely ſuch enormous perfidy and cruelty; but he ſhould have taken care not to contradict himſelf, and expoſe his reputation too much. He had proteſted a great value for Dolabella in ſeveral letters, and afterwards in his Philippics he declared that he never had any merit, and had been always a wicked wretch. 'Dolabella quidem tam 'fuit immemor humanitatis, quamquam ejus NUNQUAM particeps fuerit, ut ſuam inſatiabilem cru'delitatem exercuerit non ſolum in vivo, ſed etiam in 'mortuo, ac in ejus corpore lacerando atque vexan'do cum animum ſatiare non poſſet oculos paverit 'ſuos (34). - - - *Dolabella was ſo void of humanity, 'tho' indeed he never had any, that he not only exerciſed 'his exceſſive cruelty on him when alive, but likewiſe 'when dead, and when he could not ſatiate his mind, he 'fed his eyes in tearing and mangling his corpſe.*' He makes him equal to Mark Antony in all ſorts of vice. 'Duo hæc capita nata ſunt poſt homines natos teter'rima & ſpurciſſima Dolabella & Antonius. . . . Ecce 'tibi geminum in ſcelere par, inuſitatum, inauditum, 'ferum, barbarum. Itaque, quorum ſummum quon'dam inter ipſos odium, bellumque meminiſtis, eoſ'dem poſtea ſingulari inter ſe conſenſu, & amore de'vinxit impuriſſimæ naturæ & turpiſſimæ vitæ ſimili'tudo (35). - - - - *Dolabella and Antonius are two of 'the moſt cruel and infamous wretches that ever lived. '. . . They are a couple not to be parallelled in wicked'neſs, cruelty, and barbarity. And therefore the ſimilitude 'of their moſt impure natures and flagitious lives has 'united them in mind, and affection, tho' you remember 'they formerly were at great variance, and mortally hated 'one another.*' What could he ſay more? And when he affirms, that to compare Trebonius with Dolabella were to treat the former very unjuſtly, he expreſſes himſelf thus, for the paſſage deſerves to be tranſcribed: 'Nam cæteris quidem vitæ partibus quis eſt qui poſſit 'ſine Trebonii maxima contumelia conferre vitam 'Trebonii cum Dolabellæ? alterius conſilium, in'genium, humanitatem, innocentiam, magnitudi'nem animi in patria liberanda quis ignorat? alteri à 'puero pro deliciis crudelitas fuit; deinde ea libidi'num turpitudo, ut in hoc ſit ſemper ipſe lætatus, 'quod ea faceret, quæ ſibi objici ne ab inimico qui'dem poſſent verecundo: & hic, dii immortales, ali'quando fuit meus, occulta enim erant vitia non in'quirenti. Neque nunc fortaſſe alienus ab eo eſſem, 'niſi ille vobis, niſi mœnibus patriæ, niſi huic urbi, 'niſi diis penatibus, niſi aris, & focis omnium noſtrum, 'niſi denique naturæ, & humanitati inventus eſſet ini'micus. - - - - *For in other reſpects, who can compare 'Trebonius with Dolabella, without doing great injuſtice 'to Trebonius? Every body knows the wiſdom, the tem'per, the humanity, the innocence, and heroic ſpirit of 'the former in delivering his country: but the latter 'delighted in cruelty from his cradle; and is guilty of 'ſuch abominable luſt, that he was always pleaſed to 'think, that he could not be upbraided with it even 'by an enemy who was modeſt: and this very man, O 'heavens! was formerly my ſon-in-law; for as I did 'not enquire into his life, his vices were concealed from 'me. And, perhaps, I ſhould not appear againſt him 'now, were he not found to be an enemy to you, to his 'country, to his city, to his domeſtic gods, to the religion 'and liberty of us all, and laſtly, to nature and humanity.*'

[*N*] *Tullia died in the year* 708.] Cæſar was then in Spain engaged againſt Pompey's ſons. The conſolatory letter which he wrote to Cicero on this occaſion was dated from Hiſpalis (36). Which is a ſtrong proof of my text: that which Plutarch furniſhes me with, is not ſatisfactory: it is not clear enough, nor free from ſome errors. This Hiſtorian having ſpoken of the divorce of Terentia, adds (37), that Cicero afterwards married a young woman, and that Tullia died in child-bed not long after this match. She died, continues he, at Lentulus's houſe, to whom ſhe was married after the death of Piſo, her firſt huſband. To prove from this, that Tullia died in 708, one thing ought to be ſuppoſed, which Plutarch doth not mention, *viz.* that Cicero married his ſecond wife in 708 (38). And as for the reſt, it plainly appears, that Plutarch did not well conſult Tully's Epiſtles, for he would there have been informed, that Tullia's ſecond huſband's name was Furius Craſſipes, and that ſhe died divorced from her third huſband who was Dolabella. A modern author (39), in order to prove that Tullia did not die in child-bed, and that ſhe was with child when divorced by Dolabella, alledges the following paſſage of Cicero; 'Tullia mea peperit XIV. 'Kal. Jun. puerum ἑπταμηνιαῖον, quod ηὐτόκησεν 'gaudebam; quod quidem eſt natum perimbecillum 'eſt (40). - - - *On the* 19*th of May my daughter Tullia 'was brought to bed of a boy in the ſeventh month: I 'was glad ſhe was ſafely delivered; but the child is 'very weak.*' He ought to have known that Cicero wrote this before the battle of Pharſalia, and that conſequently theſe words are of no uſe to prove that Tullia did not die in labour, and that ſhe was divorced when big with child. What he ſhould have alledged I find in another letter written during the laſt war which Cæſar made in Spain. The words are: 'Me 'Romæ tenuit omnino Tulliæ meæ partus; ſed cum 'ea, quemadmodum ſpero, ſatis firma ſit, teneor ta'men dum à Dolabellæ procuratoribus exigam pri'mam penſionem (41). - - - *The lying-in of my daughter 'Tullia detained me at Rome; but tho' ſhe be now, as 'I hope, pretty well, yet I ſtay till I receive the firſt 'payment from Dolabella's agents.*' Let us favour Plutarch and Aſconius Pedianus as much as we pleaſe, we ſhall yet be forced to accuſe them of having expreſſed themſelves ill. Cicero, whoſe credit in this caſe outweighs that of an hundred Hiſtorians, informs us, that Tullia was pretty well after her delivery: ſo that the beſt ſuppoſition we can make in favour of Plutarch and Aſconius Pedianus, is that Tullia, before ſhe was perfectly recovered, was ſurprized by ſome diſtemper incident to child-bed-women, of which ſhe died.

[*O*] *Cicero was inconſolable for ſome time.*] If we believe Plutarch (42), the Philoſophers flocked from all parts to Cicero's aſſiſtance. They doubtleſs brought him the choiceſt of their troops, I mean the moſt excellent moral reflexions which their topics, or common places, could furniſh. But it ſignified nothing, company was inſupportable to Cicero, he confined himſelf in a ſolitude, where he found more conſolation, than in the diſcourſes of his friends, or his books. 'Quod 'me ab hoc mœrore recreari vis, facis ut omnia: ſed 'me mihi non defuiſſe, tu teſtis es. Nihil enim 'de mœrore minuendo ſcriptum ab ullo eſt, quod ego 'non domi tuæ legerim. Sed omnem conſolationem 'vincit dolor (43). . . . . (44) Ne diſceſſiſſem qui'dem è conſpectu tuo niſi me plane nihil ulla res 'adjuvaret . . . . mihi adhuc nihil prius fuit hac 'ſolitudine . . . . me ſcriptio & litteræ non leniunt 'ſed obturbant (45). - - - *The pains you take to divert 'me from this grief, is a new proof of your friendſhip: 'but you can bear me witneſs that I have not been want'ing to myſelf: for I read at your houſe whatever has 'been written to leſſen one's ſorrow; yet my grief exceeds 'all conſolation . . . . I would not have left you, if 'any thing could have given me eaſe . . . . this ſoli'tude was preferable to every thing elſe. . . . Reading 'and writing do not comfort, but diſturb me.*' He proteſts, in another epiſtle (46), that ſolitude ſeemed to him the moſt ſupportable thing in the world. 'Nunc 'omnia reſpuo, nec quicquam habeo tolerabilius quam 'ſolitudinem. - - - *Now I reject every thing, and find 'nothing ſo tolerable as ſolitude.*' To be ſenſible of the diſorder their endeavours to comfort him: he himſelf wrote a book on that ſubject [*P*], and deſigned

---

(e) See the article DOLABELLA.

(34) Philippica XI, *pag.* 827, *Edit. Græv.*

(35) Idem, *in eadem* Oratione, *init.*

(36) Now called *Seville.* See the xxth letter of the xiiith book to Atticus.

(37) Plut. in Cicerone, *p.* 881, 882.

(38) Fabricius, ſuppoſes it *in vita Ciceronis*, pag. m. 193.

(39) Caſpar Sagittarius, in Vita Tulliæ, *num.* 54.

(40) Epiſt. xviii, *lib. x*, ad Attic.

(41) Epiſt. xviii, *lib. vi*, ad Famil.

(42) In Cicer. *pag.* 882, *A.*

(43) Cicero, Epiſt. xiv, ad Attic. *lib. xii.*

(44) *Ibid.* Epiſt. XVI.

(45) *He ſays much the ſame thing in lett. xiv, lib. xii,* Totos dies ſcribo, non quo proficiam quid, ſed tantiſper impedior, non equidem ſatis (vis enim urget) ſed relaxor tamen. *He endeavoured to relieve his mind by reading and writing.*

(46) The xviiith of the ſame book.

diſorder into which his affliction had plunged him, we need only conſider his frank confeſſion, that he ſunk under his grief, and at the ſame time reflect on the oſtentation with which he brags of his courage. He willingly boaſted that he was inconſolable, but would by no means endure the reproaches of too much weakneſs. Sentiments utterly incompatible. ‘Quod me ipſe per literas conſolatus ſum non pœnitet me quantum profecerim. Mœrorem minui, dolorem nec potui, nec ſi poſſem, vellem (47). - - - *I do not repent my having endeavoured to comfort myſelf by reading. I have leſſened my affliction, but I neither could nor would get rid of my grief.*’ Here is a man who neither could, nor would abate his grief. ‘In hac ſolitudine careo omnium colloquio; cumque mane me in ſilvam abſtruſi denſam & aſperam, non exeo inde ante veſperum, ſecundum te nil eſt mihi amicius ſolitudine, in ea mihi omnis ſermo eſt cum litteris, eum tamen interpellat fletus: cui repugno quoad poſſum, ſed adhuc pares non ſumus (48). - - - *In this ſolitude I am without any company and converſation; in the morning I hide myſelf in the thickeſt and moſt obſcure part of the wood, and continue there till night: next to you there is nothing ſo agreeable to me as ſolitude: all my converſation in it is with books; but it is interrupted with tears, which I endeavour to refrain from as much as poſſible, but hitherto I have not been able to do it.*’ He hid himſelf in the obſcureſt place of a wood from morning till night, and could not refrain from tears. Doth not he almoſt own that he had loſt his ſenſes? ‘In conſolationis libro quem in medio (NON ENIM SAPIENTES ERAMUS) mœrore & dolore conſcripſimus (49). - - - *In the book on Conſolation which I wrote* (FOR I WAS NOT IN MY SENSES) *in the heighth of my grief and ſorrow.*’ Doth not he confeſs that he had ſhamefully ſurrendered his arms to fortune (50)? But let us ſee, on the other ſide, how he glories in his courage (51). ‘Quod ſcribis te vereri, ne & gratia & auctoritas noſtra hoc meo mœrore minuatur: ego, quid homines aut reprehendant, aut poſtulent, neſcio; ne doleam? qui poteſt? ne jaceam? quis unquam minus? dum tua me domus levabat, quis à me excluſus? quis venit, qui offenderetur? Aſturam (52) ſum à te profectus, legere iſti læti, qui me reprehendunt, tam multa non poſſunt, quam ego ſcripſi, quam bene, nihil ad rem, ſed genus ſcribendi id fuit, quod nemo abjecto animo facere poſſet. - - - - *You write to me, that you are afraid my intereſt and authority will ſuffer by my immoderate grief; for my part I know not what men find fault with, or what they would have: would they have me not to grieve? how is it poſſible? would they have me not to give way to grief? who ever gave way to it leſs than I? Whilſt I was at your houſe, did I not always ſee company? Did ever any come that was offended with me? From your houſe I went to Aſtura. Thoſe merry people, that find fault with me, are not able to read ſo much as I wrote there: how well I did it, is nothing to the purpoſe; but it was that ſort of writing which cannot come from a dejected mind.*’ To thoſe at Rome who took it ill that he hid himſelf ſo long, he declared that his employments were not thoſe of a man quite overwhelmed with ſorrow. ‘Ne me quidem contemno: meoque judicio multo ſtare malo, quam omnium reliquorum, neque tamen progredior longius, quam mihi doctiſſimi homines concedunt: quorum ſcripta omnia, quæcumque ſunt in eam ſententiam, non legi ſolum, quod ipſum erat fortis ægroti, accipere medicinam; ſed in mea etiam ſcripta transtuli; quod certe afflicti, & fracti animi non fuit (53). - - - *I do not think the worſe of myſelf for it; and, in this caſe, I had much rather acquieſce in my own judgment than that of all others; and yet I do not exceed the bounds that very learned men allow me: all whoſe writings on this ſubject I have not only read, like a ſtrong patient, by way of medicine, but alſo tranſcribed them in my own writings, which certainly is not a ſign of a dejected and broken ſpirit.*’ See the marginal note (45) above, which makes it appear that writing of books afforded him ſcarce any relief againſt his grief, but only a little ſtupified the part affected. Is this an effect of fortitude?

It muſt be owned that his affliction is the moſt convincing proof which he gave of his tender affection for Tullia; but if he had died before her, we ſhould not have wanted proofs of his extraordinary affection to her. All his expreſſions, when he ſpeaks of her in his epiſtles, are ſo many evidences of it; ‘Deliciæ, deliciolæ, mea anima, lux, deſiderium. - - - *My darling, my delight, my ſoul, my life, my love.*’ It is very probable that Tullia was endowed with a thouſand good qualities, and was one of the moſt charming ladies of her time, ſince ſhe ſo deeply engaged the affection of ſuch a father. Mr Sagittarius (54) conjectures, that ſhe was inſtructed in polite learning. He had not advanced this as a bare conjecture only, if he had met with the paſſage hereafter cited of out Lactantius (55). If Plutarch is to be believed (56), one of the cauſes of Terentia's divorce was, that ſhe would not allow her daughter a ſufficient equipage to go to adviſe with her father at Brunduſium. He adds, that Cicero's ſecond wife was divorced, becauſe ſhe rejoiced at Tullia's death. There is no reaſon to diſpute the truth of this with Plutarch, under pretence that Cicero's epiſtles to Atticus inform us, that this ſecond wife lived a pretty long time with her huſband after Tullia's death (57). This objection, I ſay, would be ill grounded, becauſe it is certain the divorce had been effected the ſummer after Tullia's death (58).

Cicero's extraordinary affection for his daughter, inſpired his enemies with ſuch a boldneſs as to report that he loved her inceſtuouſly: So true it is, that there is nothing ſo pure from which a ſatirical genius cannot extract a filthy poiſon. Thoſe careſſes which proximity of blood authorizes amongſt relations of different ſexes, are expoſed to ſiniſter interpretations when they are more than ordinary. How doth calumny envenom things! See in the margin (59) what the declaimer, who aſſumed the name of Salluſt, ſaith, and remember that Donatus, an antient interpreter of Virgil, believed that this verſe of the Æneid,

Hic thalamos invaſit natæ vetitoſque hymenæos (60).

He with his daughter inceſt did commit.

ought to be underſtood of Cicero. But Servius rejects this opinion (61).

[*P*] *He himſelf wrote a book on that ſubject.*] I have cited ſome paſſages in the preceding remark that hint at this tract. It is great pity that it is loſt. But it is not Sigonius's fault that the public doth not at preſent believe it is yet extant: he wrote a tract *de Conſolatione*, and endeavoured to make it paſs for Cicero's. The judicious Critics (62), prevented the deceit immediately. Sigonius, tho' he publiſhed ſome diſſertations againſt them, did not gain his point. Cicero, on this occaſion, ſeemed like thoſe who eat nothing with pleaſure, which they themſelves have not a hand in cooking of. All the conſolatory arguments which his friends offered either in converſation or by writing, were ineffectual. It was his book *de Conſolatione* only which in ſome meaſure abated his grief: ‘Quid ego de conſolatione dicam, quæ mihi quidem ipſi ſane aliquantum medetur; ceteris item multum illam profuturam puto (63). - - - *What ſhall I ſay of my book* de Conſolatione, *which indeed gives ſome relief to myſelf, and I believe will be of great ſervice to others.*’ He obſerves, that in the greateſt of his grief, he began the preparation of this antidote. ‘In conſolationis libro quem in medio (non enim ſapientes eramus) mœrore & dolore conſcripſimus, quodque vetat Chryſippus ad recentes quaſi tumores animi remedium adhibere, id nos fecimus, naturæque vim attulimus, ut magnitudini medicinæ doloris magnitudo concederet (64). - - - - *In the book of Conſolation, which I wrote in the heighth of my grief and ſorrow, (for I was not in my right ſenſes) and becauſe Chryſippus forbids to apply a remedy to the freſh wounds of the mind, I have given ſuch ſtrength to nature, that the force of affliction yields to the force of the medicine.*’ This tract abounded with hiſtorical paſſages and inſtances, as St Jerom (65), and St Auguſtin inform us. ‘Quis enim ſufficit quantovis eloquentiæ flumine vitæ hujus miſerias explicare, quam lamentatus eſt Cicero in conſolatione de morte filiæ, ſicut potuit (66)? - - - *What man, with the greateſt eloquence, can diſplay the miſeries of this life, which Cicero bewailed as well as*

‘ *be*

---

(47) Epiſt. xxviii, *ejuſd. Libri.*

(48) Epiſt. xv, *ejuſd. Libri.*

(49) Tuſcul. Queſt.

(50) Lactantio teſte affirmavit *ſe tum a fortuna victum turpiter.* Sagittar. ubi ſupra, *num.* 57, *and before him* Corradus, in Quæſtura, *pag. m.* 294.

(51) Epiſt. xl, *lib. xii*, ad Atticum.

(52) A country-houſe, whither he retired after he had left Atticus.

(53) Epiſt. xxi, *lib. xii.*

(54) Ubi ſupra, *num.* 10.

(55) In the remark [*Q*], citation (74).

(56) In Cicer. *pag.* 882.

(57) Sed etiamſi non negaverimus Ciceroni non admodum bene conveniſſe cum uxore nova, multo tamen poſt obitum Tulliæ cum Cicerone vixiſſe, ex Epiſtolis ad Atticum liquet. *Sagittarius, in Vita Tulliæ, num.* 70.

(58) See the xxxivth letter of the xiiith book to Atticus.

(59) Verum, ut opinor, ſplendor domeſticus tibi animos attollit, uxor ſacrilega, ac perjuriis delibuta, filia matris pellex, tibi jucundior atque obſequentior quam parenti par eſt. - - - *But in my opinion you are puffed up with pride, on account of your domeſtic ſplendor, your ſacrilegious and perjured wife, and your daughter debauched by her mother, who is more agreeable and obſequious to you than ſhe ought to be to a father.*

(60) Æn. lib. vi, ver. 623.

(61) Servius in hunc locum Æneïdos. *See* Schottus, in Cicerone vindicato, *cap. xii, pag. m.* 90.

(62) Lipſius, Guillielmus, &c.

(63) De Divinat. *lib. ii, init.*

(64) Cicero, in Tuſcul. *apud* Corradum, in Quæſtura, *pag.* 294.

(65) In Epitaphio Nepotiani.

(66) Auguſtin. de Civit. Dei, *lib. xix, cap. iv.*

deſigned to build a temple to the deceaſed, and even to make an apotheoſis for her [*Q*]. His enemies were ſo baſe as to accuſe him of loving Tullia inceſtuouſly (*f*). Plutarch is miſtaken in ſome parts of her ſtory. He did not know that ſhe had had three huſbands (*g*). Mr Moreri who had Gaſpar Sagittarius's diſſertation on the hiſtory of Tullia (*b*), did not know how to make the moſt advantageous uſe of it; he has ſcarce extracted any thing of conſequence; only a ſtory related by Cœlius Rhodiginus, which Mr Sagittarius has juſtly baniſhed to the fabulous lands. The project of a temple is by Mr Moreri converted into a real one, furniſhed with a magnificent Mauſoleum. See the

(*f*) See the latter end of the remark [*O*].

(*g*) See the four firſt remarks.

(*b*) He quotes it; but the Printers have put a comma after Gaſpar, which made many readers believe that he had quoted two writers, Gaſpar and Sagittarius.

' *he could in this book of Conſolation.*' We ſhall produce below an obſervation of Lactantius.

[*Q*] *And even to make an apotheoſis for her.*] He ſeveral times communicated his deſign to Atticus: but we ſhall at preſent content ourſelves with two or three paſſages. ' Habeo nonnullos ex iis, quos nunc lectito, ' auctores, qui dicant, fieri id oportere, quod ſæpe ' tecum egi, & quod à te approbari volo. de fano illo ' dico; de quo tantum, quantum me amas, velim ' cogites; equidem neque de genere dubito; placet ' enim mihi Cluatii: neque de re; ſtatutum eſt enim; ' de loco nonnunquam. velim igitur cogites. ego, ' quantum his temporibus tam eruditis fieri poterit, ' profecto illam conſecrabo omni genere monumentorum, ab omnium ingeniis ſcriptorum, & Græcorum ' & Latinorum: quæ res forſitan ſit refricatura vulnus ' meum. ſed jam quaſi voto quodam, & promiſſo me ' teneri puto (67). - - - *Some of thoſe authors, whom I ' am now reading, ſay that I ought to do what I have ' often conſulted you about, and which I ſhould be glad ' you approved of. I mean with regard to the temple: ' and I intreat you, as you love me, to conſider of it. Indeed I am in no manner of doubt concerning the kind of ' it, for that of Cluatius pleaſes me; nor as to the thing ' itſelf, for I am fully determined; but I am ſometimes ' in doubt with reſpect to the place. And therefore I ' beg you would think of it. I am reſolved to eternize ' her memory, as much as it is poſſible in an age ſo learned as this is, by monuments of all kinds from the ingenious writings of Greeks and Latins. Which perhaps ' will make my wounds to bleed afreſh, but now I think ' myſelf bound as it were by a vow and promiſe.*' The following paſſage more clearly ſhews, that he was engaged by a vow to build a temple, and that he believed it was irreligious not to put that deſign in execution. Lactantius will inform us below concerning this engagement. ' Si iſta minus confici poſſunt, effice ' quidvis. Ego me majore religione quam quiſquam ' fuit ullius voti, obſtrictum puto (68). - - - *If thoſe ' things cannot be effected, do any thing. For I think ' myſelf more ſtrictly bound than ever any one was by a ' vow.*' A monument, a mauſoleum, or whatever had the name or likeneſs of a ſepulchre, could not ſatisfy him. ' Fanum fieri volo; neque hoc mihi erui ' poteſt: ſepulchri ſimilitudinem effugere non tam ' propter pœnam legis ſtudeo, quam ut maxime aſſequar ἀποθέωσιν: quod poteram, ſi in ipſa villa facerem. ſed, ut ſæpe locuti ſumus, commutationes ' dominorum reformido. in agro ubicumque fecero, ' mihi videor aſſequi poſſe, ut poſteritas habeat religionem (69). - - - *I would by all means have a temple ' built; nothing can diſſuade me from it. I endeavour ' to avoid the likeneſs of a tomb, not ſo much becauſe of ' the penalty of the law, as that I may obtain an apotheoſis: which I might do, were it to be in the village itſelf; but as I have often ſaid, I fear the change ' of proprietors. Wherever I do it in the country, I think ' poſterity might be brought to reſpect it from a ſenſe of ' religion.*' He gives his imaginations a very proper name. ' Hæ meæ tibi ineptiæ, fateor enim, ferendæ ' ſunt (70). - - - *Theſe my follies, for I own they are ' ſuch, you muſt pardon.*' If Mr Moreri had but given himſelf the trouble of conſidering with attention, what he pillaged from the moderns; would he have told us, *That Cicero cauſed a temple to be built, in which he incloſed Tullia's aſhes, in a ſtately* Mauſoleum? Might he not have ſeen in the author whom he cites in the laſt paſſage quoted by me, which ſays that Cicero deſigning an apotheoſis, avoided all that could be thought to look like a tomb? This was not on account of the expence, as he clearly explains himſelf: ' Ante quam a te proxime diſceſſi, numquam mihi ' venit in mentem, quo plus inſumtum in monumentum eſſet, quam neſcio quid, quod lege conceditur, ' tantundem populo dandum eſſe, quod non magnopere moveret, niſi neſcio quomodo, ἀλόγως fortaſſe, ' nollem illud ullo nomine, niſi fani, appellari. quod ' ſi volumus, vereor ne aſſequi non poſſimus, niſi mutato loco (71). - - - *Before I parted with you lately, ' it never came into my thoughts that it would coſt ' more to build a monument, than what by law is to ' be given to the people, which would not trouble me ' much, were I not unwilling (perhaps without reaſon) ' that it ſhould be called by any other name than that of ' a temple; and I am afraid, it could not be effected ' but by changing the place.*' According to Cicero's principles, nothing was more abſurd or impious, than to pay divine honours to thoſe perſons on whoſe tombs funeral rites were celebrated; and it was for this reaſon that he ſays he would not have given his ſuffrage to the decree of the Senate, which ordered ſupplications to be made to Julius Cæſar: ' An me ' cenſetis, patres conſcripti, quod vos inviti ſecuti ' eſtis decreturum fuiſſe ut parentalia cum ſupplicationibus miſcerentur? ut inexpiabiles religiones in ' Rempublicam? ut decernerentur ſupplicationes mortuo? . . . . Fuerit ille L. Brutus . . . . adduci tamen ' non poſſem ut quemquam mortuum conjungerem ' cum deorum immortalium religione, ut cujus ſepulchrum uſquam exſtet ubi parentetur, ei publicè ſupplicetur (72). - - - *Do you think, illuſtrious ſenators, ' that I would have given my ſuffrage to a decree, ' which you have unwillingly obeyed, that funeral rites ' ſhould be mingled with ſupplications? that divine honours ſhould be paid to the dead perſon, which is an ' impiety not to be atoned for? . . . . Were it L. Brutus ' . . . . yet I could not be prevailed on to render to any ' dead perſon the honours due to the immortal gods, to ' make public ſupplications to him, upon whoſe tomb funeral obſequies are celebrated.*' If Mr Moreri had written conſiderately, he had avoided another miſtake. He aſſures us that Cicero actually cauſed a temple to be built: of which there appears no footſteps in his letters. Cicero appears very earneſt and warm on this deſign, I own; we find him even threatning his good friend, for not being forward enough, and prefixing a ſet time when the work ſhould be finiſhed: but it doth not appear by any of his letters, that the building of that temple was ever perfected, or even begun. Is not this a proof that his project came to nothing, and that either time, which aſſwages grief, made him ſenſible that his deſign was ridiculous, or that unforeſeen accidents, or other affairs had diverted the execution of his Apotheoſis.

(67) Cicero, Ep. xviii, *lib. xii*, ad Attic.

(68) *Ibid.* Epiſt. xliii.

(69) *Ibid.* Epiſt. xxxvi.

(70) Id. ibid.

(71) *Ibid.* Epiſt. xxxv.

(72) Cicero, Philipp. I.

A PASSAGE of Lactantius.

Lactantius ſeveral times cites the book *de Conſolatione*: by which it appears that Tully did not in the leaſt ſcruple to ſacrifice the honour and glory of his gods to his ridiculous fancy of deifying his daughter: to juſtify which, he ſhewed that the gods publickly adored in Rome, were formerly men. This inſtance affords a natural image of the empire of the paſſions. They ſpare nothing in heaven or earth, when bent on their juſtification (73). Lactantius's expreſſions are very beautiful, and the more deſerve our tranſcribing, becauſe they contain a fragment of a book which is loſt, and the promiſe which Cicero publickly made his daughter, that he would place her among the gods. ' M. Tullius . . . . in eo libro quo ſeipſum de morte ' filiæ conſolatus eſt, non dubitavit dicere, Deos, qui ' publicè colerentur, homines fuiſſe. Quod ipſius teſtimonium eo debet graviſſimum judicari, quòd & ' augurale habuit Sacerdotium, & eoſdem ſe colere, ' venerarique teſtatur. Itaque intra paucos verſiculos ' duas res nobis dedit. Nam dum imaginem filiæ ' eodem ſe modo conſecraturum eſſe profiteretur, quo ' illi à veteribus ſunt conſecrati, & illos mortuos eſſe ' docuit, & originem vanæ ſuperſtitionis oſtendit. ' Cum verò (inquit) & mares, & feminas complures ' ex hominibus in Deorum numero eſſe videamus, & ' eorum in urbibus, atque agris auguſtiſſima delubra veneremur, aſſentiamur eorum ſapientiæ, quorum ' ingeniis, & inventis omnes vitam legibus, & inſtitutis

(73) We have ſeen of late a famous miniſter, who endeavoured to find in the Prophets of the Old Teſtament, all the faults that were objected againſt the falſe Prophets of Dauphiné, whom he obliged himſelf to defend as true Prophets.

the remark [*Q*]. Cicero's words in the exordium of his book *de Conſolatione*, where he advanced, that men come into the world only to ſuffer the puniſhment of their ſins [*R*], will

‘ tutis excultam, conſtitutamque habemus. Quod ſi ullum unquam animal conſecrandum fuit, illud profectò fuit. Si Cadmi, aut Amphitryonis progenies, aut Tyndari in cœlum tollenda fama fuit, huic idem honos certe dicandus eſt, quod quidem faciam, teque omnium optimam, doctiſſimamque approbantibus Diis immortalibus ipſis in eorum cœtu locatam ad opinionem omnium mortalium conſecrabo (74). - - - *Cicero, in that book which he wrote to comfort himſelf for the loſs of his daughter, made no ſcruple to ſay, that the gods, who were publickly worſhipped, had been formerly men. Which teſtimony is of the greater weight, as he enjoyed the augural prieſthood, and declares that he himſelf worſhipped and adored thoſe gods. And therefore in a few words he informs us of two things. For when he tells us, that he will conſecrate the image of his daughter in the ſame manner, as thoſe were conſecrated by the antients, he ſhews that they are dead, and acquaints us with the origin of vain ſuperſtition. BUT, (ſays he) ſince we find a great many both men and women ranked amongſt the gods, and ſince we reverence their magnificent temples in cities and in the country, let us ſubmit to the wiſdom of thoſe, to whoſe abilities and inventions we owe a well regulated and civilized life. Now if ever any living creature deſerved to be deified, ſhe certainly did ſo. If the offſpring of Cadmus, or Amphitryon, or Tyndarus, deſerved to be tranſlated by Fame into heaven, the ſame honour ought ſurely to be paid to her; which indeed I ſhall do, and ſhall place thee, my moſt excellent and moſt learned daughter, in the number of the immortal gods, with their own approbation and that of all mankind.*’ I might ſtop here, but the reſt of this paſſage affording a reflexion, I ſhall ſubjoin it: *Fortaſſe dicat aliquis præ nimio luctu deliraſſe Ciceronem. Atqui omnis illa oratio & doctrina, & exemplis, & ipſo loquendi genere perfecta non ægri, ſed conſtantis animi ac judicii fuit. Et hæc ipſa ſententia nullum præfert indicium doloris. Neque enim puto, illum tam variè, tam copioſè, tam ornatè ſcribere potuiſſe, niſi luctum ejus & ratio ipſa, & conſolatio amicorum, & temporis longitudo mitigaſſet* (75). Lactantius propoſes as an objection: that perhaps Cicero raved when he wrote that book, and the greatneſs of his affliction had affected his brain. But I maintain, replies Lactantius, that his book *de Conſolatione* is ſo fine, that it could only be compoſed by a perſon who was in his perfect ſenſes, and whoſe grief had been ſoftened by reaſon, the conſolation of his friends, or time. He was obliged to turn the argument upon this, in order to render Cicero an unqueſtionable evidence. But if he had deſigned to prove the inſufficiency of Philoſophy to comfort a man in affliction, he would then have alledged this very book of Cicero, as the performance of a man who confeſſed himſelf ſhamefully born down by grief for the loſs of his daughter (76). To what cauſe is this conduct to be aſcribed? Is it owing to inadvertence, or ſome rhetorical artifice, that things are thus made uſe of to contrary purpoſes.

[*R*] *Cicero . . . . ſays that men come into the world only to ſuffer the puniſhment of their ſins.*] He could not paint his grief by more ſignal characters, than by ſaying, that human life is a puniſhment, and cenſuring thoſe of a contrary opinion. ‘ Quid Ciceroni faciemus? qui cum in principio conſolationis ſuæ dixiſſet luendorum ſcelerum cauſa naſci homines, iteravit id ipſum poſtea, quaſi objurgans eum qui vitam pœnam non eſſe putet (77). - - - *What ſhall we ſay of Cicero, who, tho' in the beginning of his book on Conſolation he had ſaid that men were born to ſuffer for their ſins, yet repeats it again, cenſuring thoſe who think life is not a puniſhment.*’ Lactantius ought not to be blamed for cenſuring this aſſertion of Cicero (78); for it is certain that it betrays an ignorance of the reaſon why GOD placed us in the world: but as this reaſon was above the reach of natural light, and is only well known by the evangelical revelation, we ought not to be much ſurprized that Cicero, hurried on by grief, and oppreſſed by affliction, ſtretched the platonical hypotheſis. Plato's Philoſophy taught, That the ſoul of man did exiſt before it was incloſed in a human body, and that this anterior ſtate had been much more glorious and happy than that of man. Hence ſome pretended Philoſophers advanced, that the ſoul had never changed its condition, if it had not deſerved chaſtiſement; and they concluded, that it was confined to the body as its priſon, in order to inflict on it its deſerved puniſhment. ‘ Quæ ignorantia effecit ut quoſdam dicere non puderet, idcirco nos eſſe natos ut ſcelerum pœnas lueremus, quo quid delirius dici poſſit non invenio. Ubi enim, vel quæ ſcelera potuimus admittere, qui omnino non fuimus (79). - - - *From this ignorance it came to paſs, that ſome were not aſhamed to affirm that we were born to ſuffer the puniſhment of our ſins, than which nothing can be more ridiculous. For where or what crimes could we commit, who had no manner of exiſtence.*’ Cicero adopted this hypotheſis (80), but Lactantius looks upon it as the moſt ſenſeleſs of all extravagancies. And yet it is certain that this tenet differs from the doctrine of original ſin in its circumſtances only; for ſince the Chriſtian Faith inſtructs us, that Adam ſinned for himſelf and all his poſterity, it follows, 1. That all ſouls, in the eye of GOD, are involved in guilt even before they exiſt. 2. That they are united to the body only by an act of puniſhment, ſince by their being united to the body, they incur the penalty of eternal damnation, to which they are juſtly ſentenced, and it is by no other means than remiſſion and grace that ſome are ſaved; wherefore the ſcripture ſaith, that all men are born *children of wrath* (81). Lactantius ought therefore to have refuted Tully's hypotheſis more dexterouſly, and that by proofs which only affect thoſe particulars in which it differs from that of original ſin. If he had well conſidered Arnobius's ſecond book, he would have found it was no eaſy matter to refute Cicero by philoſophical arguments; for I do not ſee what reply the Platoniſts might offer to Arnobius's reaſons, I mean thoſe objections which he offered againſt the aſſertion, that immortal ſpirits in their own nature innocent, happy, abounding in knowledge, either voluntarily deſcended into human bodies, or were ſent thither by providence. He makes a long enumeration of the follies, crimes, and miſeries of mankind, and concludes that it was inconſiſtent with the goodneſs and juſtice of GOD, that ſuch ſpirits ſhould be united to human bodies. Into which he takes it to be exactly the ſame thing to command or ſuffer them to deſcend. ‘ Atque ita perficitur, *ſays he* (82), ut nihil interſit omnino voluntariè venerint, an illius obtemperaverint juſſioni: cùm non prohibendo quòd oportuerat prohiberi, ceſſatione crimen fecerit proprium, & retentionis diſſimulatione permiſerit prius. Sed procul hæc abeat ſceleratæ opinionis immanitas, ut Deus credatur omnipotens, magnarum & inviſibilium rerum ſator & conditor, procreator, tam mobiles animas genuiſſe gravitatis ac ponderis conſtantiæque nullius, in vitia labiles, in peccatorum genera univerſa declives: cumque eas tales atque hujuſmodi ſciret, in corpora ire juſſiſſe, quorum inductæ carceribus ſub procellis agerent tempeſtatibuſque quotidie fortunæ, & modo turpia facerent, modo paterentur obſcœna: naufragiis, ruinis, incendiorum conflagrationibus ut perirent. Pauperies alias, alias ut mendicitas premeret, ut ferarum paterentur aliæ laniatus, muſcularum aliæ ut interirent veneno, claudæ ut incederent aliæ, ut aliæ lumen amitterent, ut articulis ſederent aliæ colligatis, morbis denique objectarentur ut cunctis, quos infelix & miſeranda mortalitas diverſarum ſuſtinet dilaceratione pœnarum: tum deinde oblitæ unius eſſe ſe fontis, unius genitoris & capitis, germanitatis convellerent atque abrumperent jura: urbes ſuas everterent, popularentur hoſtiliter terras, ſervos de liberis facerent, inſultarent virginibus, & matrimoniis alienis, odiſſent invicem ſeſe, aliorum gaudiis & felicitatibus inviderent: tum deinde ſe omnes maledicerent, carperent, & ſævorum dentium mordacitate laniarent. Sed procul hæc abeat, ut eadem rurſus frequentiuſque dicamus, tam immanis, & ſcelerata perſuaſio, ut ille ſalus rerum Deus, omnium virtutum caput, benignitatis & columen; atque ut eum laudibus extollamus humanis, ſapientiſſimus, juſtus, perfecta omnia faciens, & integritatis ſuæ conſervantia manſiones, aut aliquid fecerit claudum, & quod minus eſſet à

‘ recto,

(74) Lactant. Divin. Inſtit. *lib. i, cap.* 15, *pag. m.* 48.

(75) Ibid.

(76) See, above, the remark [*O*], citat. (59).

(77) Lactant. Divin. Inſtit. *lib. iii, cap. xviii, pag. m.* 197.

(78) Recte ergo profatus eſt errore ac miſerabili veritatis ignorantia ſe teneri. - - - - *And therefore he very rightly ſaid he was detained in error, and in miſerable ignorance of the truth.* Id. ibid.

(79) Id. ibid. *pag.* 196.

(80) See, above, citation (80), of the article OVID.

(81) Eph. ii. 3.

(82) Arnobius, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 74, 75.

will admit of a good reflexion.

‘ recto, aut ulli rei fuerit miſeriarum aut diſcriminum cauſa, aut ipſos actus quibus vita tranſigitur & celebratur humana, ordinaverit, juſſerit, & à ſua fluere conſtitutione præceperit. Minora hæc illo ſunt, & magnitudinis ejus deſtruentia poteſtatem: tantumque eſt longè ut iſtarum auctor rerum eſſe credatur, ut in ſacrilegæ crimen impietatis occurrat quiſquis ab eo conceperit hominem eſſe prognatum, rem infelicem & miſeram, qui eſſe ſe doleat, qui conditionem ſuam deteſtetur & lugea: qui nulla alia de cauſa ſeſe intelligat procreatum, quàm ne materiam non haberent per quam diffunderent ſe mala, & eſſent miſeri ſemper, quorum cruciatibus paſceretur neſcio qua vis latens, & humanitati adverſa crudelitas. - - - *And ſo it is the ſame thing whether the ſouls came into their bodies entirely of their own accord, or in obedience to GOD's command: ſince by not preventing what ought to have been prevented, he permitted and became the author of ſin. But far be it from us to entertain ſuch an impious thought, as if almighty GOD, the maker of all things viſible and inviſible, ſhould create ſouls ſo fickle and inconſtant, prone to vice and all manner of ſin: and that when he knew them to be ſuch, ſhould command them to enter into bodies, that being therein incloſed they might be continually toſſed up and down with the ſtorms and tempeſts of fortune, and ſometimes act and ſometimes ſuffer vile and abominable things: that they might periſh by ſhipwrecks, ruins, and fires: that ſome might be oppreſſed with poverty, and others reduced to beggary; ſome torn to pieces by wild beaſts, and others poiſoned by inſects; ſome lame, others blind, and others again not able to ſtir a joint; in fine, that they might be expoſed to all the diſeaſes and torments of wretched mortality. And then, forgetting that they all flow from the ſame fountain, and are all deſcended from the ſame father, ſhould diſſolve and break the ties of fleſh and blood, demoliſh cities, waſte lands, inſlave the free, raviſh virgins and matrons, hate one another, and envy one another's joy and felicity: that they ſhould cenſure, revile and maliciouſly ſlander one another. But as I ſaid before, far be it from us to entertain ſuch a monſtrous and wicked opinion, as if GOD, the Saviour of the world, the fountain of all virtue, the author of all good, and (that we may extol him as we are able) who is moſt wiſe and juſt, and makes all things perfect, and preſerves them in their integrity, I ſay, as if GOD ſhould make any thing defective or imperfect, or be the cauſe of miſery and danger, or decree, ordain, and appoint the actions of human life. Thoſe things are beneath him, and derogate from the power of his greatneſs: and it is ſo far from being right to believe him the author of thoſe things, that whoever imagines man was created by him miſerable and wretched; he who is ſorry that he exiſts, who deteſts and bewails his condition; who thinks he was made for no other purpoſe but to undergo a multitude of evils, and to be always miſerable, and by torments to feed the cruelty of ſome inviſible power, an enemy to mankind, I ſay, ſuch an one is guilty of the higheſt impiety.*’ To cenſure this doctrine of Arnobius as an ill one, would be too great a piece of moderation, it ought to be called abominable; for it overthrows the foundations of Chriſtianity, and is not much better than the doctrine of the Manichees. Cicero might have found in it as lively a deſcription of human miſery as he could have made; but he might have anſwered that objection by his hypotheſis of the pre-exiſtence of ſin, which however falſe it was, might yet inſpire patience. For he might very well ſay to himſelf, *My daughter's death hath overwhelmed me, and plunged me into deſpair; but about two hundred years ago or more, I committed ſome crimes which deſerve this puniſhment. I hereby expiate them. I ſuffer for them in this organized priſon, in which my ſoul was confined when I was born: It is juſt that I ſhould be unhappy, ſince I ſinned ſo long ago.* If Pſyche's father had reaſoned in this manner, he would not have anſwered, as the author of that play, makes him anſwer to that common place of conſolation, that the gods have the right to take away thoſe children which they have given.

Ah, cherche un meilleur fondement
Aux conſolations que ton cœur me preſente,
Et de la fauſſeté de ce raiſonnement
Ne fais point un accablement
A cette douleur ſi cuiſante,
Dont je ſouffre ici le tourment.
Crois tu là me donner une raiſon puiſſante
Pour ne me plaindre point de cet arrêt des Cieux?
Et dans le procedé des Dieux,
Dont tu veux que je me contente,
Une rigueur aſſaſſinante
Ne paroît-elle pas aux yeux?
Voi l'état où ces Dieux me forcent à te (83) rendre,
Et l'autre où te receut mon cœur infortuné:
Tu connoitras par là qu'ils me viennent reprendre
Bien plus que ce qu'ils m'ont donné.
Je receus d'eux en toi, ma Fille,
Un preſent que mon cœur ne leur demandoit pas;
J'y trouvois alors peu d'appas,
Et leur en vis ſans joye accroître ma famille.
Mais mon cœur ainſi que mes yeux
S'eſt fait de ce preſent une douce habitude:
J'ai mis quinze ans de ſoins, de veilles, & d'étude,
A me le rendre precieux:
Je l'ay paré de l'aimable richeſſe
De mille brillantes vertus,
En lui j'ai renfermé par des ſoins aſſidus
Tous les plus beaux treſors que fournit la ſageſſe,
A lui j'ai de mon ame attaché la tendreſſe,
J'en ai fait de ce cœur le charme & l'allegreſſe,
La conſolation de mes ſens abbatus,
Le doux eſpoir de ma vieilleſſe.
Ils m'ôtent tout cela, ces Dieux,
Et tu veux que je n'aye acun ſujet de plainte
Sur cet affreux arrêt dont je ſouffre l'atteinte?
Ah! leur pouvoir ſe jouë avec trop de rigueur
Des tendreſſes de nôtre cœur:
Pour m'ôter leur preſent, leur falloit-il attendre
Que j'en euſſe fait tout mon bien?
Ou plûtôt, s'ils avoient deſſein de le reprendre,
N'eût-il pas été mieux de ne me donner rien (84)?

Oh! ſeek ſome better ground of conſolation.
Think you, this weakly-pleaded Sophiſtry
Ought to reſtrain my juſt complaint of Heav'n?
Let thy grown age be weigh'd againſt thy infancy,
And thou wilt ſee the gods take much more from me
Than what they gave. I, child, receiv'd in thee
A preſent which I did not aſk from Heav'n:
Then with a cold and unrejoicing heart
I ſaw my family's increaſe, but now
A fifteen years endearing habitude
Has made that preſent precious to my eyes,
The ſubject of my late and early care,
Now ornamented with the richeſt treaſures
Of wiſdom and a thouſand brillant virtues.
It mov'd my tender ſoul with fond delight,
The charm and entertainment of my heart,
Staff of my life, my age's ſoothing hope,
And my diminiſh'd ſenſes conſolation.
All this they take from me, theſe gods take from me.
And wouldſt thou have me unrepining ſit,
And bear this harſh decree without a murmur?
They too ſeverely ſport with our fond hearts.
If they were minded to reſume their gift,
Why ſtaid they till I ſet my ſoul upon't?
Or rather . . . . why beſtow'd their gifts upon me?

However, I think that Cicero would much better have reliſhed Arnobius's diſcourſe, which doth not extenuate the miſeries of life, than that of Lactantius, which doth extenuate them. ‘ Quid ego dicemus, niſi errare illos, qui aut mortem appetunt tanquam bonum, aut vitam fugiunt tanquam malum? Niſi quod ſunt iniquiſſimi, qui pauciora mala non penſant bonis pluribus? Nam cum omnem vitam per exquiſitas, & varias traducant voluptates, mori cupiunt,

(83) A father is brought in ſpeaking to his daughter, whom the gods deſigned ſhortly to take away from him

(84) Moliere, *Tragedie de Pſiché, Act. ii, Scene i.*

‘ ſi quid fortè his amaritudinis ſupervenerit: & ſic habent, tanquam illis numquam fuerit benè, ſi aliquando fuerit male. Damnant igitur vitam omnem, plenamque nihil aliud, quàm malis opinantur. Hinc nata eſt inepta illa ſententia, hanc eſſe mortem, quam nos vitam putemus, illam vitam, quam nos pro morte timeamus. Ita primum bonum eſſe non naſci, ſecundum, citius mori. Quæ ut majoris ſit authoritatis, Sileno attribuitur. Cicero in conſolatione: NON naſci (inquit) longe optimum nec in hos ſcopulos incidere vitæ: Proximum autem ſi natus ſis, quam primum mori, & tanquam ex incendio effugere fortunæ. Crediſiſſe illum vaniſſimo dicto exinde apparet, quòd adjecit aliquid de ſuo, ut ornaret (85). - - *What ſhall we ſay then, but that thoſe err who either wiſh for death as a good, or decline life as an evil? But that they are moſt unjuſt, who do not weigh the greater good againſt the leſſer evil? For tho' they ſpend their whole life in variety of exquiſite pleaſures, yet if any thing diſagreeable happens to them, they deſire to die: and, they behave, as if it had never been well with them, when any thing happens to fall out ill. They therefore condemn all life, and think it only full of evil. Hence that fooliſh ſaying, that what we eſteem life is death, and what we dread as death is life. And alſo, that not to be born is the chief good, and the next to that is to die ſoon. Which ſaying, that it may be of greater weight, is aſcribed to Silenus. Cicero, in his book* de Conſolatione, *ſays, it is the greateſt degree of happineſs never to be born, nor to fall upon theſe rocks of life; and the next to that, if one is born, to die very ſoon, and to eſcape out of the fire of fortune. It is evident he believed that moſt ridiculous ſaying, becauſe he added ſomething of his own by way of embelliſhment.*’ By this we ſee that Cicero, in his book *de Conſolatione*, put a great value on this ſentence of Silenus: *The higheſt pitch of happineſs, is never to be born; and next to that, to eſcape very quickly out of this life as out of an houſe on fire.*

He mentions this ſentence in one of his books which are ſtill extant, and adds ſome verſes, which import, that we ought to mourn at the birth, and rejoice at the death of men. ‘ Fertur etiam de Sileno fabella quædam: qui cùm à Mida captus eſſet, hoc ei muneris pro ſua miſſione dediſſe ſcribitur: Docuiſſe regem, NON NASCI HOMINI LONGE optimum eſſe: Proximum autem, quam primùm mori: Qua eſt ſententia in Creſphonte uſus Euripides.

Nam nos decebat cœtus celebrantis domum,
Lugere, ubi eſſet aliquis in lucem editus,
Humanæ vitæ varia reputantis mala:
At, qui labores morte finiſſet gravis,
Hunc omneis amicos laude & lætitia exequi (86).

‘ *There goes a ſtory of Silenus, that when he was taken priſoner by King Midas, he gave him, by way of recompence for his liberty, the following ſentence, That it was the greateſt bleſſing* NEVER TO BE BORN, *and the next to that, to die ſoon. Which ſaying Euripides made uſe of in his Creſphontes.*

We at the birth of man ſhould mourn,
For many woes his life attend;
But at his death we ſhould rejoice,
Becauſe to them it puts end.

Plutarch has the original Greek of theſe verſes (87).

Lactantius ſuppoſes one thing which Cicero would have denied him: That the good things of this life ſurpaſs the evil. I am ſure that the diſmal ſtate to which Cicero was reduced by the loſs of Tullia, appeared to him ſuch a weighty preſſure that he would very willingly have quitted all the luſtre of his glory, to be delivered from this inſupportable anxiety. I believe alſo that he would not have returned into the world, on condition of paſſing through the various ſtates that he had gone through (88). We have already ſeen (89) what he made Cato ſay: He thought as much of himſelf. He had nevertheleſs a large ſhare of fortune's favour; his eloquence was admired; he was raiſed to the firſt dignities of the Republic; he acquired a glorious reputation: but, if I am not miſtaken, he would have ſwore that all the pleaſures of his life, weighed againſt the pain and uneaſineſs which he had endured, or did then feel, would not have been as an ounce to a pound. I ſhall elſewhere (90) touch on this diſpute: whether the good things of this life ſurmount the evil. Authors are divided on this ſubject, ſome declare for the affirmative, others for the negative.

(85) Lactant. ubi ſupra, *lib. iii, cap. xviii, pag.* 198.

(86) Cicero, Tuſcul. I, *ſub. fin. fol. m.* 253, *verſo.* See the remark [*D*] of the article XENOPHANES, towards the end.

(87) Plut. de audiend. Poëtis, *ſub fin. pag.* 36.

(88) Compare with this what ſhall be ſaid in the remark [*F*], of the article VAYER.

(89) In the remark [*R*] of the article PORCIUS.

(90) In the article XENOPHANES, remark [*D*]. See the article PERICLES,

TUPPIUS (LAURENCE) a Civilian, was born in Pomerania, and lived in the XVIth century. He tranſlated into Latin a German book, which the princes of the Augſburg confeſſion cauſed to be written, to juſtify them for not ſubmitting to the council of Trent [*A*]. The epiſtle dedicatory to this Latin verſion is dated from Straſbourg the 31ſt

[*A*] *A German book which the princes of the Augſbourg confeſſion cauſed to be written . . . . concerning the council of Trent.*] They had at firſt preſented their grievances in the aſſembly of Naumbourg, when Pope Pius IV, and the Emperor Ferdinand exhorted them, either to come in perſon, or ſend their deputies to the council. They afterwards laid them before the Diet of Francfort, at the time of the coronation of the ſame Emperor. That memorial contained the reaſons, for which they rejected the deciſions of the council of Trent: but, the better to ſhew the equitableneſs of thoſe reaſons, they appointed a certain number of Divines and political Counſellors to compoſe a work, wherein thoſe ſame grievances were enlarged, illuſtrated, and juſtified. You need only read the advertiſement which is on the back of the title page of Tuppius's tranſlation. ‘ Hæc Gravamina PRO DEFENSIONE SINCERÆ ET ORTHODOXÆ RELIGIONIS, propoſita primùm in Naoburgico conventu Principum; deinde repetita, atque oblata Majeſtati Cæſareæ in Imperii conventu publico, qui ob Electionem & Coronationem Inclyti Regis Rom. habitus fuit Francofurti: tandem ſummorum quorundam Imperii Ordinum mandatu & voluntate, à delictis ad hoc Eccleſiarum ſuarum Doctoribus, & Conſiliariis politicis, uberiore explicatione ſingulorum Capitum, ex ſacrarum litterarum teſtimoniis, Patrum ſcriptis, Theologorum ſcholaſticorum Commentariis, ac Canonum interpretibus, aliiſque ſcriptoribus compluribus; ad eum uſum jampridem diligentia ſingulari collectis, illuſtrata ſunt: & hoc ſcripto, quod ad poſteritatem de horum Ordinum erga Religionem & Rempublicam ſtudio extet, comprehenſa. - - - - *Theſe grievances,* IN DEFENCE OF THE PURE AND ORTHODOX RELIGION, *were firſt laid before the aſſembly of the Princes at Naumbourg, and afterwards preſented to his Imperial Majeſty by the Diet of the empire, held at Francfort for the election and coronation of the illuſtrious King of the Romans; and at laſt by the order and command of ſome of the chief Princes of the empire, are illuſtrated by certain Divines of their own churches, and by political counſellors, appointed for that purpoſe; each head being more fully explained from the teſtimonies of holy Scripture, the writings of the Fathers, the commentaries of ſchool Divines, and interpreters of the canons, and ſeveral other writers, which have been very carefully collected to that end: and contained in this work, to be a monument to poſterity, of the love thoſe Princes have to Religion and the Republic.*’ The title of the book is this: ‘ Concilii Tridentini reſtitutioni ſeu continuationi à Pio IV Pontifice anno 1562, indictæ, decretiſque tunc editis, oppoſita Gravamina: quibus & cauſæ neceſſariæ & graviſſimæ exponuntur, quare Electores, Principes, Ordines Imperii, Auguſtanam Confeſſionem amplexi, Concilium illud neque agnoſcere neque adire voluerint. - - - *Grievances oppoſed to the continuation of the council of Trent, appointed by Pope Pius IV in the year* 1562, *and to the decrees then paſſed: wherein are explained the neceſſary and important cauſes, why the Electors, Princes, and States of the empire, embracing the Auſbourg confeſſion, would neither acknowledge nor go to that council.*’ We have ſeen above (1) a citation from this work: it relates

(1) In the paſſage of Mr Heidegger (who had, or might have, copied Berneggerus) recited in remark [*H*], of the article LEO X.

31ſt of March 1565. The work was reprinted in the year 1597 in 8vo.

lates to the Atheiſm of Leo X: but it is ſomewhat ſtrange that no authority is quoted on that head, and that in a book of this nature facts ſhould be advanced which are only known by uncertain reports. However, the work in general is not to be cenſured for want of quotations. It contains a great number of them, and they are very good in themſelves: tho' indeed they are to be found in a great many other books. The obſervations on the tax of the Apoſtolic Chancery have not been ſpared (2), which are concluded with a long detail of the articles of that tax. That detail might paſs for an edition of *Taxa Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ*: and Hunnius looked upon it as ſuch, when he inſerted it in the Preface to his book *de Indulgentiis*, printed at Francfort in the year 1599, in 8vo: but obſerve, that as to the form, and even as to divers points of the matter, this edition is different from ſeveral others I have ſeen, and which I have mentioned elſewhere (3). I had conjectured (4), that du Pinet had followed the edition inſerted in the book of the Proteſtant Princes of Germany; which conjecture is very well founded, as I have ſince verified.

(2) See pag. 79, and 89, of the edition of 1597.

(3) In the remark [*B*] of the article BANCK, and in the remark [*B*] of the article PINET.

(4) See remark [*B*], of the article BANCK.

TURLUPINS, A ſect of impudent and ſcandalous heretics of the XIVth century, who taught that when man was arrived at a certain degree of perfection, he was freed from the yoke of the divine law: and contrary to the doctrine of the Stoics, who made the liberty of their wiſe man conſiſt in being free from paſſions, they placed this liberty in being no longer ſubject to the precepts of eternal wiſdom. They did not believe they ought to pray to God any otherwiſe than mentally; but what was yet more ſhocking in their ſect, was that they went naked [*A*], and according to the example of the Cynics, or rather of brutes, they performed the work of the fleſh at noon-day, in view of all the world (*a*). They pretended that we ought not to be aſhamed of any part which nature has beſtowed on us. Notwithſtanding theſe profane extravagancies they affected a very ſpiritual and devout air, the better to inſinuate themſelves into the womens favour, and allure them into the ſnare of their unchaſte deſires (*b*). For this is the rock of all thoſe ſects who aim at diſtinguiſhing themſelves by paradoxes in morality: examine to the bottom the viſions of the pretenders to new light, and of the Quietiſts, &c, you will find if any thing can unmaſk them, it is ſomewhat relating to venereal pleaſure; this is the weak part of the place, where the enemy makes the aſſault; it is a worm which never dies, and a fire which never goes out. Theſe Heretics appeared in France, in the reign of Charles V (*c*). They chiefly appeared in Savoy and Dauphiné. Great care was taken to purge the world of them [*B*]. It is not eaſy to diſcover the true cauſe of their name. Vignier (*d*) derives it from their living in places expoſed to the wolves. They affected to call themſelves the FRATERNITY OF THE POOR, as du Tillet (*e*) and Gaguin (*f*) have obſerved.

(*a*) Cynicorum Philoſophorum more omnia verenda publicitus nudata geſtabant, & in publico velut jumenta coïbant, inſtar canum in nuditate & exercitio membrorum pudendorum degentes. *Gerſon, apud Prateolum.*

(*b*) Gerſon, *apud eundem.*

(*c*) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronologie, *Tom. iii, pag. m.* 227, *Dutch Edit.*

(*d*) Ad ann. 1159.

(*e*) Chronique des Rois de France, *ſous Charles V.*

(*f*) In the Life of Charles V.

[*A*] *They went naked.*] We cannot ſufficiently wonder that ſuch a whimſical fancy ſhould be ſo often renewed amongſt Chriſtians. Paganiſm affords us only the ſect of Cynics, who fell into this impudent practice; and it muſt alſo be obſerved that this ſect was not numerous, and that the greateſt part of the Cynics did not diſcover their nudity, or do what is conſequent upon it, as it was ſaid of Diogenes. The Indian Gymnoſophiſts were not naked in thoſe parts which the Adamites, Turlupins, Picards, and ſeveral Anabaptiſts diſcovered. We ought then to grant, that in that reſpect the Chriſtians have been more irregular than the Pagans. We ſhall not be ſurprized at this, when we obſerve that a goſpel principle, of which the Pagans were ignorant, is liable to this abuſe: I mean, that the ſecond Adam came to repair the evil which the firſt had introduced into the world. From hence a Fanatic ventures to conclude, that thoſe who are once partakers of the benefits of the covenant of grace, are perfectly reſtored to the ſtate of Adam and Eve. I own that Fanaticiſm muſt be carried to an high pitch, and the doſe muſt be very large, which is able to overcome the impreſſions of modeſty which nature and a Chriſtian education have ſtamped on us; but what is not the infinite combination of our paſſions, imaginations, animal ſpirits, *&c.* capable of doing? I have, in another place (1), ſpoken of ſome antient Anchorets, who ſcrupled to ſee their own nudity. The Pagans afford us no ſuch example that I know of; they were only very careful of hiding it from the eyes of others. This was obſerved not only amongſt the women (2), but alſo amongſt ſome very debauched men (3). And therefore Petronius did not ſtretch too far when he ſaid, 'Quam ne ad cognitionem quidem admittere ſeverioris notæ homines ſolent. - - - - '*To which knowledge they do not admit men even of a grave diſpoſition.*'

[*B*] *Great care was taken to purge the world of them.*] The following words afford us a ſpecimen of that diligence (4): *To Brother James de More, of the Preaching Order, Inquiſitor of the Sodomites in the province of France, as a gift beſtowed on him by the King's Letters-Patents, the ſecond of February* 1373, *for and in compenſation of ſeveral pains, miſſions, and expences which he had been at, ſuffered and ſuſtained in purſuit of the male and female Turlupins, whom he found and took in the ſaid province, and who, by his diligence, have been puniſhed for their errors and falſities, the ſum of fifty francs, which are worth ten Paris livres.* Gaguin obſerves, in his Life of Charles V, that *the books and cloaths of the Turlupins were burnt in the hog-market at Paris, without the gate of St Honoré; that Joan Dabentonne, and another perſon with her, being the chief preachers of that ſect, were alſo burnt; but the latter,* ſays he, *whom I do not name, dying in priſon, before ſentence, his corpſe was kept fifteen days in a heap of lime, to keep it from putrifying, after which it was burnt at the time appointed for execution.* Du Tillet ſays alſo, that under Charles V, *the ſuperſtitious religion of the Turlupins, who had called their ſect the* Fraternity of the poor, *was condemned and aboliſhed, and their ceremonies, books, and cloaths, condemned and burnt.* But how do theſe cloaths which were burnt agree with the report of thoſe, who tell us that they went naked? We muſt ſuppoſe the nakedneſs of all theſe ſorts of Fanatics to have been limited with regard to times, or places, or with regard to certain members. We have ſeen that the Adamites did not ſtrip themſelves any where but in the ſtoves where they met, and that the Picards condemned above all, thoſe who did not ſhew their privy-parts. The cold and rain would not permit them to go always naked: it is not at all probable that they durſt regularly and continually appear naked in thoſe cities in which they were not the moſt powerful; and it ſeems that the Turlupins in particular diſcovered only the parts which diſtinguiſh the ſexes. 'Turelupini Cynicorum ſectam ſuſcitantes de nuditate 'PUDENDORUM, & publico coïtu (5). - - - '*The Turlupins revived the ſect of the Cynics as to the nakedneſs of the privy-parts, and coition in public.*' My citations out of Gerſon amounts to the ſame thing. Therefore they had cloaths notwithſtanding their impudence; and probably before perſons not yet initiated, or thoſe godly women whom they intended to draw into their nets, they did not immediately ſhew their privy-parts.

(1) In the remark [*F*], of the article ADAMITES.

(2) See the article OLYMPIAS, remark [*I*].

(3) See the ſame article, *ibid.*

(4) Ex computo Nicolai *Mauregart*, Burgenſis Pariſienſis de Auxiliis Præpoſituræ Pariſienſ. an. 1374, *apud* Du Cange Gloſſar. *voce* Turlupini.

(5) Genebrard Chronic.

TURPIN, a fabulous Hiſtorian of the actions of Charlemagne and of Roland. No body at preſent takes him for Turpin, promoted to the archbiſhopric of Rheims by Charlemagne, nor gives any credit to his relations; but ſome believe him to be near as antient as that Archbiſhop [*A*]. Others rather incline to fix him in the XIIth century [*B*]. If it were true that ſome Popes or Councils declared his book authentic [*C*], it would be a clear proof of a groſs ignorance, or of an egregious impoſture.

Mr Allard

[*A*] *Some believe him to be near as antient as that Archbiſhop.*] Papyrius Maſſo places him a little after the reign of Charles the Bald; but ſpeaks of him as of a wretched author, who miſpent his leiſure hours in compoſing a romance for the uſe of children. See the following remark.

We find a curious obſervation in Mr Catel. This author having mentioned ſome lies *of Tilpin or Turpin, Archbiſhop of Rheims*, adds: ‘ Theſe fables written by Tilpin are very antient; for this book is to be ſeen in manuſcript in a very antique letter, and in old French, in ſeveral libraries: they are followed by many old authors, as by Matthew Paris, who wrote the Hiſtory of England; Dante, an antient Italian Poet; Chalcondylas, in his Hiſtory of the Turks; Petrus Venetus, in his catalogue of Saints, who wrote the life of Roland, and others, which he partly extracted from the ſaid Tilpin, and Godfrey of Viterbo, in his Hiſtory called Pantheon, who improving thoſe fables, relates how Charlemagne went to Jeruſalem to viſit the holy places, where the myſteries of our redemption were accompliſhed. But moſt of what theſe Hiſtorians have written is fabulous, for Tilpin himſelf, in the Preface of his Hiſtory inſcribed to Leopard, Dean of Aix-la-Chapelle, ſaith, 'that Charlemagne's Spaniſh wars are not mentioned in the antient chronicles of St Denys, of which he might be very well informed, being a Monk of the Order of St Denys. And beſides, it is very hard to believe that Archbiſhop Tilpin ſhould be the author of this romance, which contains the Hiſtory of Charlemagne, in which the death of that Prince is mentioned, which happened in the year 814, and yet Tilpin died in 813, as Trithemius with a great deal of probability obſerves; for Uvulpſarius, who ſucceeded him in his biſhopric, held a council in 814, as Flodoard in the third book of his Hiſtory of Rheims informs us (1).’

[*B*] *Others rather incline to fix him in the XIIth century.*] Oihenart wonders that Papyrius Maſſo ſhould place him much higher. ‘ Hanc *(de rebus Caroli Magni prodigioſam Hiſtoriam)* neſcio quo argumento, Papyrius Maſſonus (etſi authorem imperitiæ & mendacii damnet) è vetuſtate commendat. Dum, non multò poſt Caroli Calvi imperium, ab homine otioſo in juventutis gratiam ſcriptam fuiſſe videri pronunciat (2). - - - *Papyrius Maſſo recommends this wonderful hiſtory of the actions of Charlemagne, on account of it's antiquity, but upon what authority I know not; tho' at the ſame time he accuſes the author of ignorance and lying. For, he ſays, it ſeems to have been written not long after the reign of Charles the Bald, by one that miſpent his time, for the uſe of children.*’ Here is the reaſon which induced Ohienart to believe that Turpin lived in the XIIth century, and was a Spaniard. Mr des Cordes, Canon of Limoges, had lent him a manuſcript of this hiſtory, to which was prefixed a preface, written by a Prior a little before the year 1200 (3). This preface imports, that the Prior had lately recovered that manuſcript, which was brought him out of Spain, and which he took for Archbiſhop Turpin's hiſtory, to whoſe interceſſion he devoutly recommends himſelf. I believe his own words may not be unacceptable here: ‘ Gaufredus Prior Voſienſis, ſacro Martialis conventui & univerſo Clero Lemovicini climatis gaudiis ſempiternis perfuri. Egregios invicti Regis Caroli triumphos ac præcelſi Comitis Rotholandi prædicandos agones in Iſpania geſtos nuper ad nos ex Eſperiâ delatos gratanter excepi & ingenti ſtudio corrigens ſcribere feci, maximè quod apud nos iſta latuerant hactenus, niſi quæ joculatores in ſuis præferebant cantilenis. Quia verò ſcriptura ipſa Scriptorum vitio depravata ac pene deleta fuerat non ſine magno ſtudio decorando correxi, non ſuperflua ſubtrahens, ſed quæ neceſſaria aderant, addens, ne quis me putet reprehendere inclitæ laudis Turpinum qui ſe infraſcripta ſcripſiſſe fatetur. Ego tanti Pontificis oratibus mihi à judice pio dari veniam opto (4). - - - *Gaufredus, Prior of Voville, to the convent of St Martial, and to all the Clergy of the country of Limouſin, wiſheth eternal happineſs. The glorious exploits of the invincible King Charles, and the noble feats of the excellent Count Roland, performed in Spain, were lately brought me out of that kingdom, which I received with joy, and cauſed to be tranſcribed, being firſt corrected with great care; eſpecially as thoſe things had been hitherto unknown to us, except what has been vented in ballads. But becauſe the writing was very incorrect and almoſt blotted out and defaced, through the fault of the tranſcribers, the correcting coſt me a great deal of trouble: I did not throw out ſuperfluities, but added what was neceſſary, leſt I ſhould be thought to find fault with the renowned Turpin, who confeſſes that he wrote the following hiſtory. To the interceſſion of ſo worthy a Prelate, I recommend myſelf.*’

[*C*] *That ſome Popes or Councils declared his book authentic.*] Voſſius having obſerved that this hiſtory in the manuſcript of it in Bennet-college library at Cambridge, is intituled, *Liber Turpini Archiepiſcopi Rhemenſis quomodo Carolus Rex Francorum adquiſivit Hiſpaniam*, adds, that Pope Calixtus declared it authentic (5). He doth not ſay this on his own authority, but on the credit of Thomas James, which he ſuppoſes grounded on the title of the book, or ſome note written in the manuſcript. *Hunc librum dicit Papa Calixtus eſſe authenticum, ut adjungit Thomas James: Ut puto ex MSi operis inſcriptione ſive nota ei addita* (6). Voſſius did not know the foundation of James's aſſertion; he did not remember a certain place in the *Faſciculus temporum*. The thing is this: Mr du Pleſſis Mornai ſpeaking of ſome canons of a council held at Rheims in 1119, adds this reflexion; ‘ And obſerve by what ſpirit thoſe biſhops were influenced, who in the ſame council declared authentic the hiſtory of Charlemagne by Archbiſhop Turpin, which is moſt fabulous and ridiculous, and as ſuch condemned and exploded by Baronius himſelf (7).’ Coëffeteau anſwered him thus: *He cites in the margin his trifling chronicler* Faſciculus temporum, *who doth not ſay one word of this ſynod; and the fraud proceeds from hence, that ſpeaking of Calixtus he ſaith,* He wrote a little book of the miracles of St James: He alſo made a ſtatute concerning the hiſtory of Charles, compiled by bleſſed Turpin, Archbiſhop of Rheims. *Well, reader, is it not a pretty concluſion? Calixtus made a ſtatute concerning the hiſtory of Charles, written by the Archbiſhop of Rheims*; ergo *the council of Rheims, where he preſided, declared this book authentic. Certainly they had ſomething elſe to do than amuſe themſelves with theſe fables. But after all where did his wretched chronicler find that Calixtus made this ſtatute? What likelihood is there that he ſhould ſo much as trouble himſelf with this Romance* (8)? Gretſer the Jeſuit anſwering the ſame book of du Pleſſis, doth not know whether what is related concerning this authentickneſs of Turpin ought to be reckoned fabulous. Perhaps, ſaith he, we ſhould not be in the wrong to deny all this, for the acts of the council, nor the commentary of Heſſo the Scholaſtic do not mention it at all (9). The *Faſciculus Temporum* only hints it in an indefinite manner: ‘ Statuit etiam (*Calixtus*) Hiſtoriam Caroli deſcriptam à beato Turpino Remenſi Archiepiſcopo. - - - - *He made a ſtatute concerning the Hiſtory of Charles, written by the bleſſed Turpin, Archbiſhop of Rheims.*’ He doth not tell us the name of this ſtatute, where or when it was made: But let us grant, adds Gretſer, that Calixtus approved this book; what advantage accrues thereby to the myſtery of iniquity? This Hiſtory of Turpin is not ſo full of lies, but that the Proteſtants have publiſhed it amongſt the antient Hiſtories: ‘ At demus Calixtum Hiſtoriam Turpini ſtatuiſſe, hoc eſt, confirmaſſe, quid utilitatis inde ad Myſterium Pleſſæum redit? Quæ tam fabuloſa non eſt, ut abſterreat ipſos etiam

‘ Sectarios,

---

(1) Catel, Mémoires de l'Hiſtoire du Languedoc *pag.* 545.

(2) Arnoldus Oihenartus, Notitia utriuſque Vaſconiæ, *pag.* 397.

(3) Mihi præfatio hiſtoriæ illi, à Gaufredo Priore Voſienſi, qui paulo ante annum 1200 ſcribebat, in exemplari manuſcripto, cujus copiam fecit Joannes Cordeſius Canonicus Lemovic. præfixa, plane perſuadet hoc opus, recens tempore Gaufredi vulgatum, Hiſpani hominis illo ipſo ſæculo xii viventis, abortum eſſe. *Id. ib.*

(4) *Apud* Oihenartum, ibid.

(5) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Latinis, *lib. ii, cap. xxxii, pag. m.* 299.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 279. *He quotes* Faſciculus temporum an. 1119.

(8) Coëffeteau, Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 754.

(9) Neque enim in Actis quidquam hujus apparet, ut nec in Commentario Heſſonis Scholaſtici, qui res geſtas hujus Concilii ex profeſſo literis mandavit. *Gretſer. in Examine Myſterii Pleſſæani. pag.* 375.

Mr Allard affirms that *the romance of the Archbiſhop Turpin of the year* 1092, was compoſed *at Vienna by a Monk of St Andrew (a).*

(a) Allard, Bibl. de Dauphiné, *at the end.*

‘ Sectarios, quò minus eam cum aliis veterùm monumentis publicent. Teſtis Juſtus Reuberus, qui à ſuo Tomo Antiquorum Scriptorum Turpinum excludere, turpe duxit (10). - - - - *But ſuppoſe Calixtus made a ſtatute, that is, confirmed the Hiſtory of Turpin, what advantage accrues from thence to the myſtery of du Pleſſis? That hiſtory is not ſo fabulous but the Sectaries publiſh it with other antient Hiſtories. Witneſs Juſtus Reuberus, who would not exclude Tupin from his volume of ancient writers*’ This laſt part of the Jeſuit's anſwer is pitiful; for if it be a ſhameful thing, as it is no doubt, for a council to approve a book ſtuffed with impertinent fables, du Pleſſis's reflexion is very judicious. Beſides, is it to prove ſtrongly that a hiſtory is good, to ſay that a Huguenot or Lutheran compiler hath publiſhed it amongſt other books? Is it not ſometimes a ſufficient Reaſon for the inſerting a book in a collection that it hath ſome antiquity? And after all becauſe a man is orthodox, is he neceſſarily happy in the choice of authors, who beſt deſerve to be placed in a collection of Hiſtorians? Gretſer had done very well to have kept to his firſt anſwer: He ought to have been ſatisfied that the words of the *Faſciculus temporum* prove nothing. Mr Rivet is of the ſame opinion; he replies for M. du Pleſſis in the following manner (11). *It is of no importance whether Calixtus confirmed this hiſtory of Turpin in a Council, or whether he did it alone by virtue of his authority. It is undeniable that the Carthuſian, who collected the* Faſciculus, *expreſſed himſelf thus,* ſtatuit hiſtoriam Caroli, deſcriptam a B. Turpino, Rhemenſi Archiepiſcopo. *Here* Coëffeteau *inſults* du Pleſſis, *after having falſely tranſlated*; he made a ſtatute concerning the Hiſtory of Charles *inſtead of* he decreed, *that is,* eſtabliſhed *or* confirmed *the Hiſtory of Charles. He may learn at his leiſure from any little* Grammarian *the difference betwixt* Statuere Hiſtoriam *and* Statuere de Hiſtoria. *If this Chronicler is miſtaken, if he ſaith this without mentioning any author, we are not to blame. We return to the Papiſts what they give us. For my part I am inclined to believe that he is miſtaken, and that inſtead of Calixtus's ſtatutes* for the eſtabliſhment of Archbiſhop Turpin, *he miſtook and thought it concerned the confirmation of Archbiſhop Turpin's hiſtory.*

(10) Id. ibid.

(11) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'iniquite, *Tom. ii, pag.* 238.

TURREL or TURREAU, (Peter) in Latin *Turellus*, a Philoſopher and Aſtrologer (*a*), and rector of the college of Dijon his native place (*b*), lived in the reigns of Lewis XII and Francis I. See what I have ſaid of him in the remarks [*B*] and [*C*] of the article CASTELLAN. I add that he is author of a ſmall book intituled *The Period, that is, the end of the world, containing the diſpoſition of terreſtrial things, by the virtue and influence of the celeſtial bodies.* This piece was printed at Lyons in the year 1531. There is likewiſe another book written by him, which was printed at the ſame place, and is intituled, *Fatal preciſion by the ſtars and diſpoſition of the ſame on the region of Jupiter now called Burgundy for the year* 1529, *and for ſeveral years following (c).* James Tahureau in his dialogues very much ridicules this *Period or end of the world.* Longolius *exceedingly commends* Peter Turrellus in his oration pronounced and printed at Poictiers in the year 1510, *touching the praiſe of the French compared with the Romans.* Peter de Saint Julien, fol. 13 and 14 of his Hiſtory of the Burgundians, ſpeaks of a Chorographical table of Burgundy, and of an Hiſtory of Burgundy written by this Turrel (*d*). If we will believe Paradin, this Aſtrologer had foretold to the Queen-regent the misfortune of the battle of Pavia a little before it happened (*e*). We muſt not miſtake him for that Turrel who wrote againſt the Franco-Gallia of Francis Hotman [*A*].

(a) Du Verdier Vau Privas, Biblioth. Franç. *pag.* 1065.

(b) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franç. *pag.* 417.

(c) Extracted from Du Verdier Vau Privas, ubi ſupra.

(d) Extracted from La Croix du Maine, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 515.

(e) Paradin, Hiſt. de noſtre temps, *pag. m.* 132.

[*A*] *We muſt not miſtake him for that Turrel who wrote againſt the* Franco-Gallia *of Francis Hotman.*] We have named two authors (1), who refuted this piece. Here is a third. *Petri Turelli, Campani, & in ſupremo Galliarum Senatu Advocati, contra Othomanni Franco-Galliam Libellus, Pariſiis apud Michael de Roigny* 1576, *in 8vo.* This treatiſe was dedicated to Chriſtopher Thuanus, firſt Preſident in the Parliament of Paris, and is dated the 12th of September 1575. ‘ The author proves in it, that as to kingdoms, hereditary governments are preferable to elective ones. He touches a little on the deſign of the Salique law, and the famous queſtion whether women may be called to ſucceed to the crown of France (2) ’

(1) Papyrius Maſſon, and Anthony Matharellus. See, remark [*I*] of the article HOTMAN.

(2) Taken from a manuſcript Memoir, communicated by Mr Lancelot.

TURRETIN (Francis), a Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity at Geneva his native country [*A*], was born on the 17th of October 1623. Having ſtudied at Geneva, Leyden, Paris, Saumur, Montauban, and Nimes with great ſucceſs, he was admitted to the holy miniſtry in 1648, and officiated at the ſame time in the French and Italian churches at Geneva. Two years after he was offered the Philoſophy profeſſorſhip, which he refuſed; but he complied with a call to the church of Lyons (*a*). He was recalled to Geneva at a year's end, that city wanting him for their Theological lectures, on which he entred in the year 1653. He was deputed to Holland in 1661, to requeſt a pecuniary aſſiſtance which the city of Geneva then wanted. In that journey he met with all the ſucceſs which he could promiſe himſelf, and got ſo great a reputation, that the Walloon churches of the Hague and Leyden earneſtly invited him to their miniſtry, and the univerſity at the latter of theſe places earneſtly intreated his ſtay. After his return, he re-aſſumed the exerciſe of his office, in which he continued till his death with very great application. He died the 28th of September 1687, with the moſt edifying marks of an ardent love for God (*b*). He was a man of a great deal of merit; he was

(a) To ſucceed Aaron Morus, brother to Mr Morus.

(b) Taken from his Funeral Oration pronounced at Geneva by Mr Pictet, the third of November 1687.

[*A*] *At Geneva his native country.*] Francis Turretin his grandfather, of an antient and noble family of Lucca, having left Italy on account of his religion, reſided ſome years at Antwerp, and had a great intimacy with the famous St Aldegonde. He afterwards went to Zurich, and at laſt fixed at Geneva, where he had a ſon named Benedict Turretin, who was an illuſtrious Profeſſor of Divinity in that city, and very well known by his writings (1): This was the father of our Francis Turretin. All which the reader may find in the funeral oration of the latter pronounced by Mr Pictet, his nephew, a very eloquent piece and worthy of its author, who is a Miniſter and Profeſſor at Geneva, and author, beſides other works, of a book intituled, *Morale Chretienne*, in ſeveral volumes in 12mo, and of a *Theologia Chriſtiana* in 8vo.

(1) *He wrote among other books,* Défenſe des Verſions de Geneve contre le Pere Coton. *That work contains two volumes in 4to. He publiſhed alſo ſome French ſermons, intituled,* Profit des chatimens. *He had been miniſter of the church of Nimes,*

was eloquent, judicious, laborious, learned, and zealous for orthodoxy. All which appears by the books he hath publiſhed [*B*]. He left a ſon endowed with extraordinary parts [*C*].

[*B*] *By the books he hath publiſhed.*] Beſides his ſermons dedicated to the Ducheſs of Scomberg, he wrote an anſwer to a tract publiſhed by a Canon of Aneci, to expoſe the Proteſtants amongſt other topics, on that of the obedience of ſubjects to lawful princes. He alſo anſwered the Biſhop of Lucca's letter to the families of Geneva, originally deſcended from his dioceſe, to exhort them to the profeſſion of the Catholic faith which their anceſtors had abandoned. But what will chiefly immortalize him is his *Inſtitutio Theologiæ Elencticæ* in three volumes in 4to (2), and his theſes *de Satisfactione Chriſti* againſt the Socinians, and *de neceſſaria ſeceſſione ab Eccleſia Romana.*

[*C*] *He left a ſon endowed with extraordinary parts.*] I have cited ſomewhere (3) the learned theſes which he maintained at Leyden in 1692. The Carteſian Philoſophy, in which he was ſo perfectly inſtructed by Mr Chouët (4), does very much ſet off his great knowledge of Divinity. A Profeſſorſhip of Sacred Hiſtory in the academy of Geneva was erected on his account, which he very worthily diſcharges, as well as the office of miniſter.

(2) See the encomium beſtowed upon it in the Dutch edition, 1696. It has been abridged for the uſe of ſtudents. The name of the author of that abridgment, which was printed the ſecond time at Amſterdam, 1695, is Leonard Rijſſenius.

(3) In the article NICOLLE, citation (13).

(4) This illuſtrious profeſſor, the ornament of Geneva, his country, has been long ſince taken from his profeſſorſhip, and admitted into the government of the Republic.

TUSCUS (BALERUS) paſſed (as we are told) for the author of a book condemned by the Inquiſition in 1622, and intituled *Tela Catholica contra judicia erronea*, he paſſed, I ſay, for the author of this treatiſe, becauſe it was thought that the ſtile diſcovered it to be written by him (*a*). Friar *Angel of the Purification*, Hiſtoriographer of the order of the barefooted Carmelites, made uſe of this inſtance to authorize his ſuſpicion that Conrad Janningus, the Jeſuit, was the author of a letter from the Emperor to his Catholic Majeſty diſperſed in the year 1696, and alledged alſo that by this conformity of ſtile St Jerom found that John of Jeruſalem was the author of a certain letter (*b*). We ſhall ſee, below, his miſtake [*A*]. It is certain that the letter diſperſed under the Emperor's name was really written by his Imperial Majeſty.

(*a*) Lambert. Batavus, in Arte nautica Catholica, *lib. ii, cap. ix, apud* Papebroch. Elucidat. Hiſt. *pag.* 149.

(*b*) Hieron. Epiſt. xv, *apud eund.* ibid.

[*A*] *We ſhall ſee, below, his miſtake.*] Father Papebroch, who hath inſerted in one of his books, the complaint this Carmelite Hiſtoriographer brought before the Tribunal of the Inquiſition, ſays, that the Imperial Ambaſſador at Madrid, demanded that the author of this injurious complaint againſt the Emperor ſhould be puniſhed, and that it was reported that this Carmelite eſcaped the puniſhment only by diſowning the accuſation. Obſerve, that this accuſer attempting to prove that the letter, which he pretended to be ſuppoſititious, was Janningus's ſtile, cited, as the works of that Jeſuit, two tracts which were written by Sebaſtian de Sancto Paulo a Carmelite Monk (1). Was not this effectually to prove the conformity of ſtile? Father Papebroch adds (2) that he has not found the name of Balerus Tuſcus in any catalogue of books condemned by the Inquiſition, and ſuſpects that this Balerus having prefixed his name to a book, wherein the private regulations of the Eaſt-India company were blamed, the Dutch Miniſters cenſured him, and that the author, without naming himſelf, oppoſed that cenſure by his *Tela Catholica*, which were alſo condemned. He alſo conjectures that Lambertus Batavus was captain of a ſhip in the Dutch ſervice, and conſequently a Proteſtant, and that his book taught the art of ſailing in all parts of the world. At laſt he ſaith, that the moſt expert in affairs of this nature, could not hitherto diſcover any thing concerning this book at Amſterdam. *Ipſo* (libro) *necdum reperto, licet ab ejuſdem rerum peritiſſimis Amſtelodami quæſitus ſit* (3). I never met with any perſon who had heard of this book, nor have I found the title of it in any catalogue.

(1) Daniel Papebrochius, Elucidat. Hiſtorica actorum in Controverſia Carmelitica, *pag.* 150. *See alſo the firſt part of his anſwer, Art. xi, num.* 240, 241.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 153.

(3) Id. ibid.

V.

VAYER (Francis de la Mothe le) a Pariſian, Counſellor of State in ordinary, and Preceptor to the Duke of Anjou, only brother of King Lewis XIV, was a very learned man. He was admitted into the French Academy on the 14th of February 1639 [*A*]. He had more reading and learning than the greateſt part of that ſociety, but moſt of them wrote more elegantly than he: for his ſtile was not very polite; and though he had made leſs uſe of his memory and of his reading of the Latin authors than he did, he would yet have come far ſhort of perfection in language. He was a man of a regular conduct, very like that of the antient ſages: a true philoſopher in his manners, who deſpiſed even lawful pleaſures, and was paſſionately fond of a ſtudious life, and of reading and compoſing of books. This regularity, auſterity, and wiſdom, did not prevent his being ſuſpected of having no religion [*B*]. It is likely that this ſuſpicion was grounded on ſome dialogues which he wrote, and which appeared under the name of Oraſius Tubero (*a*), and on his diſcovering generally in his works too great a prepoſſeſſion in favour of Scepticiſm or the Pyrrhonian principles. It is certain there is a great deal of looſeneſs in the dialogues of Oraſius Tubero; but he that ſhould conclude from thence that the author had no religion, would render himſelf guilty of a very raſh judgment: for there is a vaſt difference betwixt writing freely what may be objected againſt faith, and believing it to be really true. Several people believe that theſe dialogues hindered his preferment to the place (deſigned for him) of preceptor to his majeſty [*C*]. This is not very probable, ſince if the Queen or Cardinal Mazarin had been affected by this reaſon, they would not have intruſted the king's

(*a*) Thoſe names, and thoſe of *Tubertus Ocella*, under which he diſguiſed himſelf upon ſome occaſions, allude to the ſignification of la Mothe le Vayer, or Voyer.

[*A*] *He was admitted into the French Academy the 14th of February* 1639.] Mr Eſprit and he were admitted into it on the ſame day (1). Mr Balzac writ on this ſubject to his friend Mr Chapelain thus: *I rejoice at the Academy's new acquiſition of the Philoſopher * * * *, who indeed is a fine gentleman, and doth not want wit, tho' he for the moſt part makes uſe of that of others* (2). I obſerve here by the way, that Moreri, when he ſaith that la Mothe le Vayer *was one of the firſt admitted into the French Academy*, is miſtaken. For that cannot be ſaid of a man elected in the place of a dead Academic (3).

[*B*] *He was ſuſpected of having no religion.*] Patin ſhall be my voucher. 'Mr de la Mothe le Vayer was lately called to court, and made Preceptor to the Duke of Anjou, the King's brother. He is about ſixty years old, of a middle ſtature, as much a Stoic as any man in world; he is one who would be praiſed himſelf but never praiſes any body, fantaſtical and capricious, ſuſpected to be guilty of that ſort of wit with which Diagoras and Protagoras were tainted (4).' Patin wrote this letter the 13th of July 1649.

[*C*] *Several people believe that theſe dialogues hindered his preferment to the place* (*deſigned for him*) *of preceptor to his majeſty.*] The learned Naudé informs me of ſome things which contradict that opinion. He tells us: 'I have alſo been always perſwaded, that the choice of men was one of the moſt difficult things at court. But I was throughly convinced of it when the queſtion was put who ſhould be preceptor to the king; for the intention of the queen and the miniſters being to commit that charge to one of the ableſt, moſt famous, and eſteemed, perſons in France, they firſt caſt their eyes on Mr de la Motte le Vayer, as on him whom Cardinal Richelieu had deſigned for that poſt, induced thereto, as well by the excellent book which he had written concerning the education of the Dauphin, as on account of the reputation he had acquired by his many other writings of being the French Plutarch. But the queen having reſolved not to beſtow that place on a married man, they were neceſſarily obliged to think of another; who was Mr Aubert, Abbot of St Remy, principal of the College of Laon, Canon of that city, and Regius Profeſſor of the Greek tongue, of whoſe polite manners, probity, learning, and facility of expreſſing himſelf with accuracy in Latin and French, no man can doubt *modo caput habeat extra cucurbitum*, who is not a blockhead. But neither he, nor Mr Gaſſendi, the only oracle in our age of Philoſophy, Mathematics, and Aſtronomy, and of whatever is excellent in the moſt ſublime ſciences; nor alſo Mr Rigaud, tho' the Coriphæus of our Humaniſts, and of a capacity univerſally known to extend to all other ſciences, after having been put to the trial without knowing any thing of it, did ſtand it ſo well as the *Abbot de Beaumont*, Doctor of Divinity, and at preſent the worthy Biſhop of Rodez, who was alſo preferred to another of the brighteſt ornaments of the Clergy, becauſe not being inferior to any of the preceding, he had ſome other qualities, which turned the balance on his ſide (5).' The reaſon which I have advanced (6) againſt thoſe who pretend that the dialogues of Oraſius Tubero were the occaſion of our le Vayer's being excluded from this charge, ſeems to me demonſtrative; for tho' it is uſual to take a greater care of a young king's education, than of his brother's, yet they would never give a preceptor to a king's brother, whom they would not have intruſted with the king's education, for fear the preceptor ſhould infect him with impious principles. If there had been no other reaſon, la Mothe le Vayer had been choſen preceptor to Lewis XIV, notwithſtanding his dialogues, as well as to the Duke of Anjou: For ſince it was judged that ſo wiſe a man would carefully avoid inſtilling the Libertiniſm of Oraſius Tubero into the young duke, it was more reaſonable to conclude that he never durſt preſume to inſpire it into the young monarch. Cardinal Mazarin was too well acquainted with mankind not to know that a Philoſopher, who, by I know not what train of arguments, is led to Pyrrhoniſm in religion, is a man of a quite different character from a man who becomes impious out of brutality and debauchery. Such a Philoſopher, in all particulars like la Mothe le Vayer, would be very uneaſy, that perſons liable to make an ill uſe of his opinions ſhould ever imbibe them (7).

(1) Pelliſſon, Hiſt. de l'Acad. Françoiſe, *pag.* m. 228.

(2) Balzac's firſt letter of the ivth book to Chapelain, *pag.* 149, 150, Dutch Edit, 1661. That letter is dated the fourth of January 1639.

(3) *See* Pelliſſon, ubi ſupra.

(4) Patin, Letter xxii, *pag.* 97, 98, *of Vol. i.*

(5) Naudé Dialogue de Maſcurat, *pag.* 375.

(6) In the text of this article.

(7) Compare with this the remark [*F*] of the article DES BARREAUX.

king's only brother to his care. The world was ſurpriſed that ſo wiſe a man ſhould write ſo very freely on obſcene ſubjects [*D*], but they were equitable enough at the ſame time not to draw any concluſion from thence to the prejudice of his morals: ſo true it is that

He would always be ſo diſcreet as to keep them from youth, and much more from a prince whoſe ſolid piety may extremely contribute to the public happineſs.

What Moreri ſays that la Mothe le Vayer was Preceptor to his majeſty for the ſpace of one year, is affirmed by Mr Pelliſſon (7*). And we find in another writer (7**) that la Mothe le Vayer began to exerciſe that function in May 1652, and that he was choſen by the Queen-mother herſelf being already Preceptor to the King's brother. Though Mr Pelliſſon mentions only one year, it cannot be inferred from thence, that this function laſted no longer. We can only infer from it that it had laſted but one year, when he ſpoke of it, that is, when he publiſhed his Hiſtory of the French Academy in 1653. However it be, this confirms what I have ſaid againſt thoſe, who believed that la Mothe le Vayer was excluded from that place on account of the dialogues of Oraſius Tubero.

[*D*] *He wrote very freely on obſcene ſubjects.*] There are ſome very wanton thoughts, and very ſmutty expreſſions in the dialogues of Oraſius Tubero: but perhaps they are nothing if compared with the third (8) and fourth (9) days of the *Hexameron ruſtique.* His other books contain nothing like this, though in certain places by way of quotation or otherwiſe he expreſſes himſelf ſomewhat cynically. He ſeems to have apologized for himſelf two ways. I. By making it appear (10) that Seneca, Dion Chryſoſtome, and St Auguſtin have inſerted in their works ſome things ſo obſcene and ſo filthy, that there is ſcarce any body but is offended at it; and yet *the firſt is acknowledged the moſt auſtere moraliſt of the Romans, the ſecond . . . . the wonder of his age, and the third for one of the chief Doctors of the Church* (11). II. By eſtabliſhing as a maxim (12), *That a man's books are no evidence of his inclinations, and that it is impoſſible to form a right judgment of the morals of any man by his writings.* Let us ſee what he offers in confirmation of this maxim (13), *If we are obliged to condemn all thoſe authors who have choſen very obſcene ſubjects for their theme, not only Auſonius's Cento, and the Hendecaſyllabic verſes of Pliny the younger, would defame them to perpetuity; but Plato himſelf and Xenophon, would be put to a great deal of trouble to excuſe the liberty which they have allowed themſelves in their compoſitions. We might further add, that generally this would occaſion the moſt extravagant judgments in the world on all authors.*

Accius eſſet atrox, conviva Terentius eſſet,
Eſſent pugnaces, qui fera bella canunt †.

Terence a glutton, Accius would be fierce,
And ſoldiers thoſe, who bloody wars rehearſe.

The falſhood of this way of arguing formerly influenced Timæus to aſſert ‡ that Homer and Ariſtotle were great gluttons, the laſt having frequently treated of the ſeaſoning of eatables, and the firſt frequently uſed the word διαιτρεύειν, *which implies to diſtribute meats. And if ſuch conſequences are juſt, as Virgil muſt of neceſſity paſs for a ſoldier, and Dioſcorides for an infamous poiſoner; ſo the pious meditations of Aretin will prove his ſanctity, and the fine ſentences of Seneca concerning poverty will make us believe him neceſſitous, notwithſtanding the ſeven millions of gold in caſh, and the eight hundred thouſand livres annual eſtate which he is ſaid to have enjoyed* (14).

Reflexions on the conſequences that may be drawn from a man's writings to his morals.

La Mothe le Vayer's maxim generally conſidered is very true: the judgment to be paſſed on a man's morals from his writings would be falſe on a thouſand occaſions. Salluſt is an example which may be added to the former. What he ſays, 'againſt the corruption and diſorders of his age could not be better expreſſed by any other; but he ſhould have left that to Cato, or to ſome other perſons of a rigid virtue, who were zealous for the antient diſcipline: and in my opinion a declamation againſt luxury and leudneſs is not leſs incongruous in the Hiſtory of Salluſt, who was reprimanded for debauchery by the Cenſor in a full ſenate, and twice accuſed of adultery before the Prætor (15), than an invective againſt the ambition of ruling would be in Cæſar's Commentaries (16).' See how Cicero rallies Clodius's oration againſt the negligence of the Romans in their divine ſervice (17). The world hath always been, and is at preſent full of perſons who declaim againſt vice, and are themſelves very immoral; who are grave and ſevere in their books, and very looſe in their conduct. We ſhould therefore be finely deceived, if we judged of their morals by their writings. But may we juſtly ſay by the rule of contraries, that there are ſome perſons whoſe morals are ſtricter than their writings? Yes, I believe we may: but it more rarely happens that an author allows himſelf a large liberty in his writings, and but a little in his manners, than that he indulges himſelf with a large ſcope in his manners, and takes but a very little freedom in his books. The reaſon of this difference is very obvious; for he that can perform the moſt, can alſo perform the leaſt, but he who is capable of performing the leaſt cannot perform the moſt. What is more eaſy than to declaim in verſe or proſe againſt the irregularities of the age, and what is more difficult than to avoid ſharing ſome part of them? A wiſe man therefore doth the hardeſt taſk; it is not then very difficult for him to inſtruct by the productions of his pen, for this is infinitely eaſier than that. But it doth not follow that a man who can write very edifying and religious books, clean and free from all immorality, can live as regular. This is infinitely harder than the other.

To come more directly to the point. Catullus and Ovid, whoſe verſes were ſo impure, lived as they wrote. Their debaucheries with women were exceſſive. The ſame may be affirmed of the French Poets who compoſed the *Parnaſſe Satyrique,* and of ſeveral Italian Poets whoſe Poems are very filthy. And this ſentence is very true.

Raro moribus exprimit Catonem
Quiſquis verſibus exprimit Catullum.

Cato's life he rarely follows,
Who in verſe writes like Catullus.

But by allowing all this we do not thereby ruin la Mothe le Vayer's apology; for there is a vaſt difference betwixt theſe two things: 1. The relating debaucheries committed by ones ſelf, praiſing, and applauding them, and exhorting the readers to an imitation: and, 2. the relating gallant adventures in terms a little too briſk and natural, enlivening the recital, though one condemns or diſapproves thoſe actions; and diſcuſſing a point of doctrine (18), or a mythological reflexion by phraſes which repreſent impurities. The firſt of theſe is utterly inexcuſable, and infamous, and ought to be ſeverely puniſhed. But the ſecond is perhaps only a piece of wit, and naturally affords no reaſon to make any inferences prejudicial to the author's morals. It is this that ſaves le Vayer.

I ſhall obſerve, by the way, that we ought not univerſally to condemn all thoſe Poets as unchaſte in their lives whoſe verſes are immodeſt. Catullus doth not deſerve to be comprehended in the apology which he made for them: he too much exceeds all bounds in moſt of his Poems, and even in the very epigram in which he pretends to juſtify himſelf. There is enough in it to condemn him.

Pædicabo ego vos, & inrumabo
Aureli pathice, & cinæde Furi;
Qui me ex verſiculis meis putatis
Quod ſint molliculi, parum pudicum,
Nam caſtum eſſe decet pium poëtam
Ipſum. Verſiculos nihil neceſſe eſt:
Qui tum denique habent ſalem, ac leporem,
Si ſunt molliculi, ac parum pudici,
Et quod pruriat incitare poſſunt.
Non dico pueris, ſed his piloſis,
Qui duros nequeunt movere lumbos (19).

(7*) Pelliſſon, Hiſtory of the French Academy, *pag. m.* 352.

(7**) Pierre de Saint Romuald, *in* Continuatione Chronici Ademari, *pag.* 534, 535.

(8) Wherein he treats of the privy-parts of men and women.

(9) He tells us there, that by the Nymphs cave, Homer meant the privy-parts of Penelope.

(10) Hexameron Ruſtique, *pag.* 43, *& ſeq. Compare with this, what is ſaid in the article* SANCHEZ, (THOMAS), *remark* [*C*].

(11) Ibid. *pag.* 42.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 41.

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 99.

† Ovid. 1 Triſt.

‡ Ex Pol. in Exc. Conſt.

(14) *See in* Meibomius, in Vita Mæcenatis, *cap.* xxii, *pag.* 132, 133, *a collection of ſeveral paſſages relating to the oppoſition between Seneca's morals and his writings.*

(15) Compare with this, citation (13) of the article METELLA.

(16) *Father* le Moine, Diſcours de l'Hiſtoire, *pag.* 185.

(17) Cicero, in Orat. de Haruſpicum reſponſis.

(18) See in the article LUCRETIUS, remark [*G*], what has been ſaid in his vindication.

(19) Catullus, Epig. xvi.

that the publick is not always raſh, blind, and unjuſt in their judgments! this ſubject affords a favourable opportunity of anſwering a queſtion, lately propoſed to a learned Journaliſt,

Aurelius, thou Catamite
And Furius, thou Sodomite,
I'll —— you, for that you ſay
I am immodeſt and too gay,
Becauſe my verſe is delicate,
Soft, tender, and effeminate.
The Poet ſhould himſelf be pure,
Not ſo his verſes, to be ſure.
Thoſe only pleaſant are and witty
Which are ſoft and ſomewhat ſmutty,
And into people can inſpire
A ſtrong libidinous deſire.
Not boys but men I write to pleaſe
Who cannot move their loins with eaſe.

Ovid, Martial, and ſeveral others ought likewiſe to be excluded the benefit of this juſtification, though they proteſt their innocence, and the purity of their lives in the midſt of all the impurities of their Muſe (20). Beroaldus hath in vain endeavoured to excuſe them, and made himſelf ridiculous when he ſaid that if thoſe books ought to be condemned which contain criminal gallantries; the canonical ſcriptures ought to be treated in like manner: ‘ Si ſcripta omnia quibus amores, ‘ res amatoriæ continentur ſunt cum ſuis ſcriptoribus ‘ repudienda, repudientur Canonicæ ſcripturæ, hoc ‘ eſt inſtrumenti veteris luculenta illa volumina, quibus nihil ſacratius, nihil religioſius, nihil myſticum ‘ magis æſtimatur (21). - - - - *If all writings wherein ‘ amours and gallantries are contained, ought to be condemned, then the holy ſcriptures ſhould alſo be rejected, ‘ that is thoſe writings of the Old Teſtament, than which ‘ nothing is reckoned more ſacred, religious, or myſtical.*’ This is wretched arguing, and doth not at all affect the reaſon for which theſe Poets are condemned (22). But if the aforementioned do not deſerve the benefit I ſpeak of, there are yet ſeveral who deſerve to be included in it. Their laſcivious Poems were only flights of wit: the contagion of theſe impure ideas did not infect their minds: they made thoſe verſes to diſplay their ingenious thoughts; they could not reſiſt the temptation of expreſſing themſelves in ſuch a manner as would make their genius applauded: they were willing to accommodate themſelves to the taſte of a vaſt number of readers, who find in it an agreeable tartneſs, and charms with which they are raviſhed. They had indeed done very well to have reſiſted this temptation, ‘ Tanti non erat eſſe te diſertum. - - - *It was not of ſo great concern to be ‘ thought witty.*’ But they were only words; their morals preſerved their integrity, and what an emperor ſaid of Voconius is applicable to them,

Laſcivus verſu, mente pudicus erat (23).

In verſe laſcivious, but in heart was chaſt.

This he would never have ventured to ſay, adds Apuleius, if too licentious verſes were a proof of laſciviouſneſs (24). Auſonius having occaſion to prevent the ſuſpicions which might be formed againſt his wiſdom on account of his *cento nuptialis*, alledges ſeveral perſons irreproachable in their conduct, who had taken great liberties in their verſe (25): ‘ Sed quum legeris, ‘ adeſto mihi, adverſum eos, qui ut Juvenalis ait, *Curios ſimulant, & Bacchanalia vivunt*, ne forte mores ‘ meos ſpectent, de carmine.

Laſciva eſt nobis pagina, vita proba:

‘ Ut Plinius dicit. Meminerint autem, quippe eruditi, probatiſſimo viro Plinio in poëmatis laſciviam, ‘ in moribus conſtitiſſe cenſuram: prurire opuſculum ‘ Sulpicii, nec frontem caperare: eſſe Apulejum in ‘ vita Philoſophum, in epigrammatis amatorem, in ‘ præceptis omnibus extare ſeveritatem, in epiſtolis ad ‘ Cærelliam ſubeſſe petulantiam (26). - - - *But when ‘ you read, defend me againſt thoſe, who, as Juvenal ‘ ſays,* Like ſaints do look and like the devils live, ‘ *leſt they judge of my practice by my verſe,*

My page laſcivious but my life is chaſt,

‘ *As Pliny ſays. Learned men will remember, that ‘ Pliny a virtuous perſon was wanton in his Poems and ‘ rigid in his Morals: that Sulpicius wrote laſciviouſly ‘ and was not aſhamed of it: that Apuleius was in life ‘ a Philoſopher, in epigrams amorous, in all his precepts ſevere, and in his epiſtles to Cærelia wanton.*’ He beſides mentions Plato, Annianus, Lævius, Evenus, Menander (27), and Virgil. Note, that a reader ought not to judge of Poets by himſelf; I mean that he ought not to think that that piece of Poetry which in reading hath an ill effect upon his mind, made the like impreſſion on the Poet who wrote it. Some of them accuſtom themſelves to theſe thoughts, and are touched with nothing but the poetical beauties with which they are cloathed. Conſtitution and habit have created in them the ſame inſenſibility, which Marigni aſcribes to a Governor of the Spaniſh Netherlands with regard to the fine ladies of the court of Bruſſels. *The Arch-duke,* ſaith he (28), *ſeconded by his ſole virtue reſiſts the powerful charms of all the beauties of which I ſpeak. . . . . He looks on them as fires which dart refulgent light, but do not inflame him.*

Comme dans un jardin rempli de fleurs nouvelles,
Dont l'éclat fait des yeux le plus noble plaiſir,
Un Sage curieux regarde les plus belles;
 Mais ſans ſonger à les cueillir.

As in a garden of new flowers
 Whoſe beauty ſtrikes the eye,
A vertuoſo does not gather,
 But only them ſurvey.

This Prince looks on all theſe miracles juſt as he does on the pictures of his gallery, and though the Queen of the North (29) *lay ſix weeks not above four ſteps from his apartment, as if he had drank of Merlin's enchanted fountain, the paſſion which often diſturbs the reaſon of the braveſt heroes, does not at all affect his* (30).

Dorme vicina à lui la donna bella,
Fuſſe altro, fuſſe l'acqua di Merlino
Non e quel ch'eſſer ſuole il Paladino.

You ſee ſome Poets make amorous verſes, in which they expreſs themſelves wantonly, though age hath rendered them as cold as ice. Ought not what they ſay to paſs for a flight of wit? Read Pontanus's hendecaſyllabic verſes, written to a lady who ſhewed her breaſt, and ſelected from ſeveral other verſes leſs modeſt.

Prædico tege candidas papillas,
Nec quæras rabiem ciere amantum,
Me quem frigida congelat ſenecta,
Irritas male, calfaciſque, quare
Prædico tege candidas papillas,
Et pectus ſtrophio tegente vela.
Nam quid lacteolos ſinus, & ipſas
Præ te fers ſine linteo papillas?
An vis dicere baſia papillas?
Et pectus nitidum ſuaviare?
Vis num dicere, tange, tange, tracta?
Te ne incedere nudulis papillis?
Nudo pectore te ne deambulare?
Hoc eſt ad Venerem vocare amantes.
Quare contege candidas papillas,
Et pectus ſtrophio decente veſti,
Aut, ſenex licet, involabo in illas,
Ut poſſim juvenis tibi videri (31).

Thy fair neck hide, take my advice,
 Seek not to blow a lover's fire,
For tho' with age I'm cold as ice,
 You make me burn with fierce deſire.

(20) Crede mihi mores diſtant à carmine noſtro: Vita verecunda eſt, muſa jocoſa mihi. *Ovidius*. lib. ii, *Triſtium*, ver. 353. Innocuos cenſura poteſt permittere luſus: Laſciva eſt nobis pagina, vita proba. *Martialis, Epig. v, lib. i.*

(21) Philippus Beroaldus, Orat. habita in principio Enarrationis Propertii, continente laudes Amoris.

(22) Conſult Raderus upon Martial, *Epig. v, lib. i.*

(23) Hadrianus, *apud* Apulejum Apolog. *pag. m.* 281.

(24) Quod nunquam ita dixiſſet, ſi forent lepidiora carmina argumentum impudicitiæ habenda. *Apul. ibid.*

(25) Auſon. in Centone nuptiali, *ſub fin. pag. m.* 515, 516. *See the article* AUSONIUS, remark [F].

(26) See the article APULEIUS, citation (64).

(27) Quid ipſum Menandrum? quid Comicos omnes; quibus ſevera vita eſt, & læta materia. *Auſon. ibid.*

(28) Marigny, in his letters printed in the year 1658.

(29) That is, Chriſtina Queen of Sweden.

(30) See concerning the devotion of that Archduke, a book intituled, *Mémoires de Hollande*, printed at Paris in 1678.

(31) Jovianus Pontanus, Hendecaſyll. *lib. i, fol.* 187, *verſo, Edit. Venet.* 1513.

Journaliſt, concerning John della Caſa, and his deteſtable Capitolo del Forno [*E*]. La Mothe le Vayer is a great inſtance of the ſmall portion of happineſs we taſte in this life; for

With handkerchief I beg you'd hide
Your pretty bubbies ſoft and fair,
Wherefore, pray, ſhould you take a pride
In going with them wholly bare.
Do you by that intend to ſay,
My naked breaſt come feel and kiſs,
And with my milk white boſom play,
For nothing I will take amiſs.
To walk out with uncover'd breaſt,
A powerful motive prove it muſt,
For lovers, wanton and unchaſt,
To come and gratify their luſt.
A gorget then do you apply,
Therewith thy ſnowy bubbies cover,
Or elſe, tho' old, on them I'll fly,
Like any youthful eager lover.

There are ſome authors who are more ſcrupulous in the choice of modeſt expreſſions, for fear that any licentious expreſſions ſhould confirm the bad report which runs concerning their morals. Others on the contrary emboldened by their virtuous life and the good opinion which the world hath entertained of their wiſdom, *morum fiducia*, are not ſo ſollicitous in this particular, and allow themſelves too large a ſcope in order to divert their readers. Probably Mr de la Mothe le Vayer was of this number: he very well knew that he could alledge for his excuſe in caſe of neceſſity (32), ‘ Verba mea arguuntur, adeo factorum ‘ innocens ſum (33).--- *They find fault with my words, ‘ becauſe they have nothing to ſay to my actions.*’ Let us conclude with conſidering the ſtupendious diverſity of tempers and characters obſervable amongſt men. There are ſome who ſcruple to ſay, what they make no ſcruple to do: others dare not do what they freely venture to ſay. ‘ (34) A certain writer obſerves that ‘ thoſe who diſcover ſo much zeal in leaving out ſuch ‘ places in the Claſſics as offend chaſtity, are not al‘ways ſo ſober as thoſe antient authors.

Nimirum Criticus facere id quàm ſcribere mavult,
Quod mavult vates ſcribere quàm facere (35).

For Critics would much rather act than write,
What Poets would much rather write than act.

[*E*] *Concerning John della Caſa, and his deteſtable* Capitolo del Forno.] I have already ſaid that ſeveral Italian Poets ought not to be admitted to juſtify the obſcenities of their Poems by this rule,

Laſciva eſt nobis pagina, vita proba.

Tho' my page laſcivious be,
I lead a life of probity.

I ſhall ſay nothing in particular againſt Calcagnini (36), but Molza, Mauro, John della Caſa, &c. deſerve a ſentence of condemnation. Not but that the judgment paſſed on the laſt by incompetent judges, who have not read him, is too ſevere; and as we ought to do juſtice to every body, I am obliged to declare that they have wronged him in imputing to him a book *de Laudibus Sodomiæ*. This pretended Poem is nothing but the *Capitolo del Forno*, where, under the allegory of an oven, John della Caſa deſcribes the leud intercourſe betwixt men and women. Allegories of this ſort were then in faſhion; one borrowed the metaphor of a fig, another of a bean (37). What is moſt horrible in John della Caſa is that having obſerved that certain leud youths began to deſpiſe the common oven, he adds that for his part he was not ſo nice, and that he ſeldom baked any where elſe. Which was to own that ſometimes at leaſt he committed the unnatural ſin.

Tennero il Forno già le Donne ſole.
Oggi mi par che certi Garzonacci
L'abbian mandato poco men ch' al Sole.
Spazzinlo a poſta lor, neſſun non vacci.
Dicon pur ch' egli è umido e mal netto.
E ſono ben cagion quelle ſue ſtracci.
Io per me rade volte altrove il metto:
Con tutto che'l mio pan ſia piccolino,
E'l forno delle Donne un po grandetto.
Benche chi ſa queſto meſtier divino,
Sà ben trovar dove l'anno naſcoſto
Colà dirieto un certo fornellino (38).

Mr Menage cites this paſſage of the *Capitolo del Forno* in a French book which he publiſhed at the Hague in 1688. This ought to be obſerved, to prevent ſome cavillers ſaying, that I alledge things which no body before knew, and which ought to be kept unknown. Let us now come to the queſtion which occaſions this remark.

A certain perſon wrote from Utrecht to Mr Baſnage de Beauval (39), that he had read in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for the month of July 1685, That John della Caſa being reflected upon in a ſatire, made an anſwer in Latin verſes, where he *denied the fact*, affirming, *That he never pretended to praiſe any thing beſides the enjoyment of women. But I would fain ſee thoſe Latin verſes*, adds that anonymous perſon of Utrecht, *not being able to imagine that the Archbiſhop of Benevento was capable of denying the fact with ſo much impudence; for it is not long ſince I ſaw and read this infamous Italian piece, intituled,* Capitolo di M. Giovanni della Caſa ſopra del Forno: *and moſt certainly it is not concerning the uſe of women as women, that he intended to ſpeak.* Since Daniel Francus's book, where the Latin verſes of that Archbiſhop are recited, is ſo hard to be met with (40), I here inform the reader, that he may read them in Mr Menage's *Anti-Baillet* (41). It is beyond diſpute that Caſa denied he had ever praiſed the ſin againſt nature.

. . . . . Obſcœni nihil
Scripſiſſe me ſcitote: namque tunc quoque
Feſtiva nos à turpibus ſecrevimus,
A mollibuſque impura. Cumque verſibus
Laudavimus Furnum, haud mares laudavimus:
Quod ille ait per maximam calumniam:
Sed feminas plane: ut videre Carmine
Ex ipſo adhuc poteſtis.

. . . . . Nothing obſcene
Dropt from my pen, from ſmutty what is gay
I ſeparated, and from ſoft impure.
And when in verſe an oven I extoll'd,
Not men, as he moſt ſlanderouſly aſſerts,
But women I extoll'd, as you may ſee
By the poem itſelf.

You ſee he appeals to the poem itſelf for which he was accuſed. *Moſt certainly*, are we told in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans*, *it is not concerning the uſe of women as women that he ſpeaks*. But we may anſwer, that moſt certainly his *Capitolo* concerns only that uſe. It is true, that he inſerted in his poem the obſervation which I have cited, that certain leud youths were diſguſted at that uſe, and hunted after the other, in which he very ſeldom imitated them. He doth not praiſe thoſe leud youths, nor himſelf for ſometimes imitating them; wherefore he cannot be juſtly accuſed of praiſing that abominable crime. But the Poem and it's author are nevertheleſs execrable; for tho' the epithet of *Meſtier divino, divine practice*, falls on the venereal exerciſe in general (42), and not on ſodomy in particular, the libertiniſm and profanation is ſuch as cannot be ſufficiently deteſted. ‘ Some (43) excuſe him by

Laſciva eſt nobis pagina, vita proba eſt,

Tho' my page laſcivious be,
I lead a life of probity. And by
Laſcivus verſu, mente pudicus erat.
In verſe laſcivious, but in heart was chaſt.

‘ And

(32) Except his younger years. See the remark [*F*], citat. (53).

(33) Cremutius Cordus, *apud* Tacitum Ann. *lib. iv, cap. xxxiv.*

(34) Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres, *October* 1686, *Art. iii, of the Catalogue of new books, pag.* 1222.

(35) In the remark [*A*], of the article VIRGIL, I ſhall quote Pliny the younger, who alledged many examples, &c. in his vindication.

(36) Among his Latin Poems, printed with thoſe of John Baptiſt Pigna and Lewis Arioſto, at Venice 1553, in 8vo, there are ſome very obſcene.

(37) See the article MOLZA, remark [*D*].

(38) John de la Caſa, *apud* Menage, Anti-Baillet, *cap. cxix.*

(39) *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *May* 1696, *pag.* 427.

(40) Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Sçavans. *ibid.*

(41) Anti-Baillet, ubi ſupra.

(42) Mr Menage, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 105, *has theſe words:* ‘ Benche chi ſa queſto meſtier divino, *ought to be underſtood, according to ſound Grammar, of the love of women, and not of boys. See what goes before and what follows.*’

(43) Menage, ibid.

for whatever reaſon he might ſeem to have to be contented with his ſtate, he would not have returned into the world [*F*], on condition of being obliged to act the ſame part which

‘ And indeed it is very probable that Caſa here calumniates himſelf, in imitation of ſeveral other Poets (44) .... But of all the excuſes alledged for Caſa, on account of this *Capitolo del Forno*, the beſt, in my opinion is, that he ſaith he repaired this fault by a virtuous life.’

. . . . Moribus,
Induſtriâ, pudore, continentiâ,
Laſciviam nos Carminis correximus
Illius: emendavimuſque ſeriis
Jocos.

My wanton verſe which gave offence,
And all thoſe jokes which I have vended,
Now by a life of innocence
And ſerious thoughts I have amended.

Theſe verſes are part of the Latin poem which that curious perſon of Utrecht deſired to ſee. There are alſo others in it wherein John della Caſa confeſſes his fault, but too faintly, and endeavours to excuſe himſelf on account of his youth, and by the cuſtom of good Poets, though on all other accounts, virtuous men.

Annis ab hinc triginta, & amplius, ſcio
Nonnulla me, fortaſſe non caſtiſſimis
Luſiſſe verſibus: quod ætas tunc mea
Rerum me adegit inſcia, & ſemper jocis
Licentiùs gaviſa, conceſſu omnium,
Juventa: quod fecere & alii item boni.

'Tis thirty years ago, and more
Since I ſome verſes did compoſe
Perhaps obſcene; good men before
Have done the like; my youth jocoſe
Impell'd me, which, as all agree,
Is thoughtleſs, and loves liberty.

The only excuſe is that which Menage likes beſt. Let us obſerve by the by, that there are few ſubjects, where the boldneſs of authors in copying one another, without ever conſulting the original, is more viſible, than in this. Mr Menage hath cited ſeveral who accuſed Caſa, but he hath forgotten a very great number; and I wonder he did not know this place of a book which has been read by every body. *John de la Caſa, Archbiſhop of Benevento, wrote a book in praiſe of Sodomy, calling it a divine work, and ſaying that he found a great deal of pleaſure in it, and uſed no other ſort of venery* (45). Obſerve, that the famous Mr Magliabechi having deteſted the infamous paſſages of the *Capitolo del Forno*, points out ſeveral other Italian Poets whoſe works are equally horrible, or even more execrable than this; of which the Proteſtants have nevertheleſs taken no notice: whence he concludes, that Vergerio's perſonal hatred againſt Caſa, was the ſource of their complaints ſo often copied. ‘ Io non intendo di far qui l'Apologiſta del Caſa: troppo chiare ſono l'infamità che ſi leggono in quel ſuo ſporco Capitolo, *&c.* Contuttocio, come ò detto, fu ſua gran diſgrazzia l'aver per nemico il Vergerio. Ognun vede le orribili infamita nel medeſimo genere che ſi trovano nel Berni nel Capitolo a M. Antonio da Bibbiena, e nell' altro Capitolo ſopra un Garzone, ed in mille altri luoghi: in Curzio da Marignolle: nel Ruſſoli; in Marco Lamberti: nel Perſiani: ed in cento e mille altri noſtri Poëti Fiorentini; per tralaſciare altri quaſi infiniti di altre patrie (46). --- *I do not intend here to vindicate Caſa; the infamous things we find in his abominable* Capitolo, &c. *are but too evident. However, as I ſaid before, it was his great misfortune to have Vergerio for his enemy. Every body ſees the horrible obſcenities of the ſame kind in the* Berni, *in the* Capitolo *of M. Antonio da Bibbiena, and in the other* Capitolo Sopra un Garzone, *and in a thouſand other pieces: in* Curzio da Marignolle; *in* Ruſſoli; *in* Marco Lamberti; *in* Perſiani; *and in a world of other Florentine Poets, not to mention almoſt infinite numbers of Poets of other places.*’ The Poets were not the only perſons who let looſe at this rate; but proſe was alſo made uſe of by ſome leud authors of that country: witneſs the oration of Heliogabalus, compoſed by Leonard Aretinus (47). All theſe authors are very much to blame, and ſo much the more inexcuſable, becauſe they knew the weakneſs of their readers. They were not of a country where nature is proof againſt temptations, but where it is eaſily heated; for which reaſon Poggius envied the Swiſs, the honeſty and ſincerity which he obſerved amongſt them. He could not ſufficiently admire the Baths at Baden, where men and women, boys and girls, were bathing promiſcuouſly, without raiſing any ill ſuſpicions. ‘ Poggius Florentinus de Thermis Badenſibus Helveticorum admirabundus ſcripſit ad Leonh. Aretinum (48), in iis pueros puellaſque viros & fœminas ſimul conſpici: ſæpe fœminas nudas nudo viro obviam ire, nulla inhoneſti ſuſpicione: maſculos campeſtribus ſeu femoralibus, fœminas linteis indui veſtibus, crurum tenus à latere ſciſſis: neque collum, neque brachia, neque lacertos tegere, &c. Et addit poſtea: *Cernunt viri uxores tractari, cernunt alteri colloqui. Eſt quidem illis ſolatium, nihil his commoventur, nihil admirantur: omnia* BONA MENTE *fieri putant, neque eſt ex iis, qui Zelotypus eſſet, ô mores noſtris* (Italicis) *diſſimiles, qui ſemper res in deteriorem partem excipimus; qui uſque adeo calumniis delectamur & obtrectationibus, ut, ſi quid videmus per ullam conjecturam, ſtatim pro manifeſto crimine atteſtemur. Invideo, imo noſtras execror animi perverſitates, &c* (49). --- *Poggius, the Florentine, admired the Baths at Baden in Switzerland, and wrote to Leonard Aretin, that boys and girls, men and women, bathed promiſcuouſly in them: that men and women often met one another naked, without raiſing ill ſuſpicions. That the men wore drawers, and the women linnen ſhifts, open in the ſides as far as the knees; that they went with their necks, ſhoulders and arms bare,* &c. *And afterwards he adds:* The huſbands behold their wives handed by, and holding diſcourſe with other men. They are not at all moved, nor ſurprized at ſuch things, but are even pleaſed with them. They think every thing is done with an HONEST INTENTION, and there is not a jealous perſon amongſt them. O how unlike are thoſe manners to ours in Italy, who always take things in the worſt ſenſe, and who are ſo pleaſed with calumny and ſlander, that if we imagine or conjecture any thing, we immediately atteſt it as a manifeſt crime. I envy the Swiſs, but I abhor the perverſe turn of our minds, *&c.*’

[*F*] *He would not have returned into the world.*] His words are (50); ‘ Life alone ſeems to me ſo indifferent, to ſay nothing farther to it's diſadvantage, that far from ever deſiring to renew the race, if put to my choice, I would not change the few remaining calamitous days in an age ſo far advanced as mine is, for the numerous years, expected by an infinite number of young perſons, all whoſe pleaſures I well know. I could really ſwear to this as well as Cardan, if I did not think it more to the purpoſe to cite his own expreſſions, to which I ſubſcribe, tho', according to his manner of writing, they are more judicious than elegant: ‘ Nos, per Deum, fortunam noſtram exiguam, atque in ætate ſenili, cum ditiſſimo juvene, ſed imperito, non commutaremus. --- *By G --- I would not exchange my ſmall fortune, even in my old age, for the largeſt poſſeſſions of an unexperienced youth.*’ I ſuppoſe, with great probability, a thing, which he hath not exactly expreſſed; which is, that the race of life which he would not begin again, would be the ſame which he had almoſt finiſhed. From whence I conclude, that there is ſcarce any part which to a man of judgment ſeems worth repeating on the ſtage of the world; for that which was allotted to la Mothe le Vayer, was the moſt deſirable that could be imagined in his rank. He wanted nothing that was agreeable, if we may judge of it by the out-which providence had impoſed on him. He was extreamly afflicted at the loſs of his only ſon (b), his grief diſordered him ſo much that he married again [G], tho' he was above ſeventy-five years of age, and had no reaſon to deplore the loſs of his firſt wife. The paſſage where he acquaints us with this laſt particular, is very favourable to thoſe who aſſert, that the conjugal vow of fidelity is not

---

(44) Mr Menage quotes here the verſes of Catullus, which you have ſeen above, in the remark [*D*], citation (19).

(45) Sainte Aldegonde, Tableau des Differens, *Part. v, Tom. ii, ch. vi.*

(46) Magliabechi, letter to Mr Bigot, in the *Anti-Baillet*, at the end of chap. cxx.

(47) Exſtat in monumentis Deſiderii Eraſmi Roterodami ex recenſione editis, oratio invitatoria Heliogabali Romanorum Imperatoris, habita in concione ad meretrices, quam à Leonhardo Aretino compoſitam plerique credunt. *Sacra Eleuſinia, patefacta, pag.* 21. *See the article* PINEAU, *citation* (3), *touching theſe* Sacra Eleuſinia.

(48) That letter is the ccccxxvth, among thoſe of Æneas Silvius.

(49) Matthias Berneggerus, Quæſtion. Miſcellan. xc, *ex* Taciti Germania.

(50) La Mothe le Vayer, Letter cxxxiv, *p.* 204. *of Vol. xii.*

(b) He died in 1664.

ſide. La Mothe le Vayer was born in the metropolis of his country, an advantage which all learned men, and ſeveral others, would beſtow on themſelves, if in their gift. He was very well educated by a learned Father (51), whoſe merit and employments (52) rendered him conſiderable. He was loved and conſidered by the two Cardinals, who governed France ſucceſſively : ſplendid titles and honourable poſts he did not want ; for he was Counſellor of ſtate in ordinary, and Preceptor to the King's only brother. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf gloriouſly amongſt the authors, and deſerved a place in the French academy. The great number of books which he publiſhed, met with a very great demand. They were ſeveral times reprinted ſeparately, and afterwards collected together. He was as rich as his condition required. He was a little inclined to forbidden pleaſures during the heat of the beginning of his youth (53), but he ſoon extricated himſelf, and afterwards conſtantly led a pure life, which made him be looked on as a rigid follower of the moſt perfect morality (54), inſomuch that he acquired a very particular eſteem on that account. It is a greater perfection to be always wiſe than to become ſo by way of amendment; but the converſion to wiſdom is more difficult than the keeping in her paths without ever turning out of the way. There was therefore in this particular of la Mothe le Vayer's life ſomething very agreeable. This made him remember the violence which he made uſe of to renounce the pleaſures which he was very well acquainted with : a violence greater, might he ſay to himſelf, than to abſtain from thoſe pleaſures which one hath never taſted. Beſides, was it not agreeable to find in his lot the ſucceſſive enjoyment of the pleaſures of the body and ſoul ? This was more likely to tempt him to accept of the repetition of his condition, than if he had been deprived of the pleaſures of youth. Yet neither this, nor all the other allurements of this author's life, tho' ſo charming, could engage him to deſire the repetition of it. This is a proof that it was intermixed with croſſes, of which we were ignorant, which turned the ſcale on the ſide of evil. But if misfortune fell in upon ſo many advantages ; if it poiſoned them with a loathſome bitterneſs, ſo as to make him deſpiſe life as a burthenſome honour, which he would not accept, if he had the power of refuſal : What can we think of the condition of ſo many perſons, who ſeem to us to be deſtitute of almoſt all the cauſes of human happineſs, and expoſed to a thouſand misfortunes ? A great many aſſert, that except ſome brutal wretches, no old man would return into the world on condition to be obliged to act the ſame part over again. We are, indeed, unwilling to die, we would always live, we flatter ourſelves that things will mend ; but the remembrance of what is paſt, the good and evil things of this world being duly balanced together, does not permit us to deſire to run again in the ſame career. The Antients feigned, that the ſouls that were to return into the world, paſſed through the river of oblivion, as if without that there were reaſon to fear they ſhould grow reſtive. On this head, ſee the New Letters againſt Maimbourg (55).

[G] *He afflicted himſelf extremely at the loſs of his only ſon, his grief diſordered him ſo much that he married again.*] To this purpoſe, Guy Patin furniſhes me with two neceſſary paſſages. 'We have here an honeſt gentleman under very great affliction. It is Mr de la Mothe le Vayer, a celebrated author, and formerly preceptor to the Duke of Orleans, aged ſeventy-eight years. He had an only ſon about thirty-five years old, who fell ill of a continual fever, to whom Dr Eſprit, Dr Brayer, and Dr Bodineau, have given emetic wine three times, and ſent him to the place from whence there is no return (56).' This is extracted from a letter, dated the 26th of September 1664. Three months after Patin wrote another letter, in which are the following words : *Mr de la Mothe le Vayer, to comfort himſelf for the death of his only ſon, is this day married, being ſeventy-eight years old, to the daughter of M. de la Haye, formerly ambaſſador at Conſtantinople, who is at leaſt forty. She ſtaid long enough to be a Sibyl.* 'Non invenit vatem, ſed virum, ſed vetulum (57). - - - *She found not a prophet, but an huſband, and that an old one.*' Obſerve, that Patin makes him ſeventy-eight years old in the year 1664. This doth not agree with what he ſays in another letter (58), that in 1649, he was aged about ſixty years. Mr de Vize's Noveliſts makes it a round number ; they aſſure us that he married when eighty years of age. The death of Mr Godeau *gave occaſion to ſpeak of that of Mr de la Mothe le Vayer, who hath thereby left a ſecond vacancy in the French academy. He was a very learned man, richly ſtored with polite learning, and hath left the public fifteen or ſixteen volumes of his works, by which he acquired a vaſt reputation. He had been preceptor to the King's only brother, and at the age of fourſcore, married Madam de la Haye. After which he lived ſeveral years. Thus the Noveliſts diſcourſed about it, and as they ſaid nothing but what is true, I have nothing farther to add on this ſubject* (59). The author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* ſticks at ſeventy-eight years. I ſhall cite what he ſays ſomewhat at large, becauſe, beſides other particulars, we are thereby informed, that this marriage was a weakneſs which the Philoſophers will never forgive him. Mr Petit *diſcharges his indignation on ſome learned men, who imagine that the deſcription of the Nymphs cave, denotes the characteriſtic part of women* (60). *He ſaith, that after the war which they have declared againſt the ſciences, and human reaſon, nothing could ſtop their fury from atttempting the ruin of polite learning by beſpattering Homer. It is eaſy to perceive that this is levelled at the fourth day of the* Hexameron ruſtique *of la Mothe le Vayer, a famous Pyrrhoniſt. Indeed it had been better if, in his old age, he had not printed ſuch a book as this, in which, notwithſtanding his caution in ſeveral places, it cannot be denied that there are too many impure thoughts. But this is not the only thing which is cenſured in the laſt years of this venerable old man, whoſe virtue had ſo ſucceſsfully conducted him in the paths of the antient ſages : he married again at ſeventy-eight years of age ; a weakneſs which the Philoſophers will never forgive him* (61). Becauſe all learned readers will deſire to ſee this indignation of Mr Petit, as it is vented in the original, and perhaps may not have his work *de Sibylla*, I ſhall here cite his words : 'Sed & propudioſa quorumdam interpretamenta exploduntur, qui iſta imagine antri Nympharum uterum & pudendum muliebre ænigmatice ab Homero deſignatum cenſent : quibus cum opponitur duarum ejus antri portarum deſcriptio, eo amentiæ & furoris procedunt, ut ad adverſæ & averſæ ſeu poſticæ veneris flagitioſa divortia confugere non erubeſcant. Adeo impudentes ut non vereantur poëtarum omnium principem, literarum parentem, ingeniorum fontem, ad hæc transferre nefanda. Nempe hoc illis ad extremam vecordiam reſtabat, ut qui rationi humanæ & ſcientiis bellum indixiſſent, literas quoque omnes, infamato earum principe, quantum in ipſis eſſet, perderent (62). - - - *But likewiſe the ſhameful interpretations of ſome are exploded, who, by the image of the Nymphs Cave, fancy that Homer figuratively meant the womb and privy-parts of women. And when the deſcription of the two gates of the cave is objected to them, ſo great is their folly and madneſs, that they are not aſhamed to recur to the flagitious diſtinction of natural and unnatural venery. They are ſo impudent, that they are not afraid to lay thoſe impious things upon the prince of Poets, the parent of learning, and the fountain of wit. For after they had declared war againſt human reaſon and the ſciences, nothing remained for their fury to do, but to attempt the ruin of all learning, by defaming the prince of it.*' For the reſt, la Mothe le Vayer's ſon was reckoned amongſt the learned Abbots ; it is to him that it is thought Mr Boileau inſcribed his 4th ſatire. In the year 1656 he publiſhed a French tranſlation of Florus, and dedicated it to the Duke of Anjou, the King's only brother. He ſaith, that not much better obſerved than that of Celibacy [*H*]. The reflexions he made in an

---

(51) *See* La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 84, *who calls him* Felix de la Mothe le Vayer.

(52) Moreri ſays he was Counſellor to the King, and Subſtitute to the Attorney-General in the Parliament of Paris.

(53) *See the* Hexameron Ruſtique, *pag.* 97, 98.

(54) Virtutis veræ cuſtos rigiduſque ſatelles. *Horatius, Epiſt. i*, lib. i, ver. 17. We have ſeen that Patin calls him a Soic.

(55) New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm. *pag.* 722, 719 *bis*, & 768.

(56) Patin's Letter cccxxvi, *pag.* 656, *of Vol. ii.*

(57) *Idem*, Letter cccxli, *pag.* 10, *of Tom. iii. It is dated the* 30th *of December*, 1664.

(58) See the paſſage of Patin, cited in the remark [*B*].

(59) Mercure Galant, *for the year* 1672, *Tom. ii, pag.* 38, 39. *Dutch Edit.*

(60) The author of a treatiſe of Anatomy, intituled, *Sacra Eleuſinia patefacta*, explains in the ſame manner the cave of Atalanta. See *Ælian. Var. Hiſt.* lib. xiii, cap. i.

(61) Nouv. de la République des Lettres, *October*, 1686, *pag.* 1118, 1119.

(62) Petrus Petitus, de Sibylla, *lib. ii, cap. x, in fine, pag.* 234.

another

that he publiſhed this Florus from the tranſlations which the young prince had made. This verſion is accompanied with a learned and curious commentary, where Coëffeteau's tranſlation is very much cenſured. See the elogies which the Abbot of Villeloin beſtows on the father and the ſon (63).

[*H*] *The paſſage . . . . where he acquaints us* that he had no reaſon to deplore the loſs of his firſt wife (64), *is very favourable to thoſe who aſſert*, &c. . . .] Firſt of all I ought to acquaint the reader that he never charges his wife with any amours: He only owns that he was perhaps as ſenſible of the incommodities of marriage as any body. In a letter to a friend who had informed him that a certain perſon was ſeparated from his wife, on account of adultery, he expreſſes himſelf thus. ‘ Do not expect that I ſhould offer you a panegyric on a condition of life, whoſe inconveniencies I am perhaps not leſs acquainted with than thoſe who are moſt weary of them. I have always taken that ſleep into which God caſt our firſt father before he preſented him with a wife, not only for a caution to diſtruſt our own ſight, as a very bad counſellor in this affair; but for a moral inſtruction, that no man would probably take upon himſelf that incumbrance, if the eyes of his mind were open enough to foreſee the inconveniencies to which he ſubjects himſelf, who engages in ſo dangerous a ſociety. And I never read the firſt verſe of the tenth book of Ovid's Metamorphoſis, where he arrays the god Hymen in a ſaffron coloured robe,

. . . . *Croceo velatus amictu*,

‘ without fancying that the Poet thereby deſigned to expreſs what is ſo eſſential in marriage. The cares of a family which you take upon yourſelf, the ſeveral blows of fortune which you render yourſelf liable to, the inevitable jealouſy which you will have of your wife, on account of the charms you find in her, and the fear of being touched in your honour, are they not ſufficient cauſes of jaundice? And is it not a miraculous thing, if a conſtitution, even the moſt ſanguine or gay, be not by this means icterical? But after all we ought to acquieſce in our deſtiny, and ſubmit to what the wiſeſt legiſlators have on this occaſion ordered for the beſt. We cannot change their decrees, and we may render ourſelves yet more miſerable, by taking a courſe much more dangerous than that already preſcribed to us (65). By theſe laſt words he gives us to underſtand that the inconveniencies of marriage do not render that ſtate the moſt miſerable of all conditions of life; this he had plainly told us in the foregoing pages. *I am very much miſtaken, if this man doth not find the remedy which he deſigns to apply to his misfortune, worſe than the evil which he believes to be inſupportable; and if at length he doth not find that in ſeveral reſpects concubinage is ſomething more intolerable than marriage itſelf. For it does not ſeem ſufficient to ſay only with the antients,*

Tam malum eſt foris amica, quàm malum eſt uxor domi *.

A miſtreſs abroad is as great an evil as a wife at home.

. . . . He is ridiculous, if he expects a greater intimacy in libertiniſm, and imagines that he ſhall be more ardently and ſincerely loved in a ſtate where the fires are barely artificial. You, as well as I, have known ſeveral men more haraſſed in extricating themſelves from ſuch a licentious life as he deſigns, than they could be by all the diſgraces of an unfortunate marriage (66). All this is worthy of the wiſdom and genius of this great author. But I proceed to what he ſays more eſſentially proper for the commentary on my text.

‘ I will not penetrate ſo far as you into the ſecrets of this marriage. It is enough that I tell you that without being a very great prophet, one might long ſince have foretold this adventure. No man ever diſcovered a more fooliſh paſſion for his wife, he made love to her with all the extravagancies of a lecher. But this is a great defect in a wiſe man, who ought to avoid all ſuch behaviour; *Adulter eſt uxoris amator acrior*. - - - - *He is an adulterer that too violently loves his wife*, and this is, according to Laberius, to make a cocquet of one's own wife. And truly it cannot be denied, that the wife I ſpeak of has hitherto behaved herſelf in ſuch a manner, that one may very well believe part of the coquetries her huſband accuſes her of, without doing her much wrong, or without being too credulous. And yet what does he charge her with beſides living according to the mode? Indeed our manners in that reſpect are at preſent arrived at a very ſtrange period; and the proſtitution of the ſex, even by thoſe whoſe honour ſo abſolutely depends on their conduct, is what is not to be accounted for by reaſon, nor could any thing but ſeeing it every day make us believe it poſſible **. Eo prolapſi mores jam ſunt, ut nemo ad ſuſpicanda adulteria nimium credulus videri poſſit. - - - - *The age is now ſo corrupt, that none can be thought too credulous in ſuſpecting adulteries.* And the Latin grammar by its rules never rendered (*Cornu*) *Horn* ſo indeclinable, as our ſenſeleſs deportment in this reſpect hath at preſent rendered it inevitable by a pleaſant ſynonymy (67).’ Do not believe that la Mothe le Vayer is the only author who thunders out ſuch terrible and ſatirical ſentences: A vaſt number of other writers pronounce the ſame judgment. It would be too tedious to enumerate them, ſee only ſome of the neweſt books, thoſe which terminate in *ana* (68), and thoſe that go by the name of ſtories, letters, memoirs, comedies, novels, &c. They repreſent leudneſs like Deucalion's deluge which overſpread the whole earth, and as a diſtemper which marriage rather heightens than reſtrains.

They induce us to conclude that the time which Seneca mentions is returned upon us, the time I ſay when the multitude of adultreſſes took off the ſhamefulneſs of that crime, when conjugal fidelity was a proof of uglineſs, and an huſband was taken for no other uſe than to excite the love of a gallant. Seneca's deſcription is ſo nervous, that I chooſe rather to tranſcribe it than tranſlate it faintly. ‘ Non expedit notum omnibus fieri, quàm multi ingrati ſint, pudorem enim rei tollet multitudo peccantium: & deſinet probri loco, commune maledictum. Numquid jam ulla repudio erubeſcit, poſtquam illuſtres quædam ac nobiles fœminæ non conſulum numero, ſed maritorum annos ſuos computant? & exeunt matrimonii cauſſa, nubunt repudii? Tam diu iſtud timebatur, quamdiu rarum erat, quia verò nulla ſine divortio acta ſunt; quod ſæpe audiebant, facere didicerunt. Numquid jam ullus adulterii pudor eſt, poſtquam eò ventum eſt, ut nulla virum habeat, niſi ut adulterum irritet? argumentum eſt deformitatis, pudicitia. Quam invenies tam miſeram, tam ſordidam, ut illi ſatis ſit unum adulterorum par? niſi ſingulis diviſit horas, & non ſufficit dies omnibus? niſi ad alium geſtata eſt, apud alium manſit? Infrunita & antiqua eſt, quæ neſciat, matrimonium vocari unius adulterium . . . . horum delictorum jam evanuit pudor, poſtquam res latius evagata eſt (69). - - - - *It is not fit that the world ſhould know, how many ungrateful perſons there are: For the multitude of offenders would take away the ſhame of the offence, and a common reproach would ceaſe to be a diſgrace. Is there any woman now a-days that bluſhes at a divorce, ſince ſome illuſtrious and noble ladies, compute their years not by the number of the conſuls but of their huſbands, from whom they depart in order to be married, and are married in order to be divorced? A divorce was ſo long dreaded as it was uncommon; but ſince there are now few or no marriages without it, people learn to practiſe what they often hear. Is any one now aſhamed of adultery, ſince the age is become ſo corrupt, that no woman takes an huſband but to be a cloak for adultery? Chaſtity is an argument of uglineſs. What woman is ſo wretched, ſo ſordid, as to be contented with one couple of adulterers? Unleſs ſhe has one for every hour of the day, and the day is not ſufficient for all? Unleſs ſhe viſits at one place and dines at another? She muſt be a doating old woman that does not know, that the keeping company with one man only is called marriage. . . . The ſhame of thoſe crimes is now vaniſhed, ſince they are become univerſally known.*’

The champions of monaſtical vows boaſt of no ſmall advantage to their cauſe by this; as if they

could

(63) Marolles, Memoires, *pag.* 394.

(64) You will ſee in the remark [*B*], of the article CRITO (JAMES) who ſhe was.

(65) La Mothe le Vayer, letter lxxxvi, *pag.* 224, & *ſeq. of Vol. xi.*

* Laberius.

(66) Id. ibid. *pag.* 223, 224.

** Sen. Cont.

(67) Id. ibid. *pag.* 222, 223.

(68) *As* Menagiana, Harliquiniana, Furetieriana, Saintevremoniana.

(69) Seneca, de Benefic. *lib. iii, cap. xvi, pag. m.* 53. *Vide etiam, ibid. lib. i, cap. ix.*

another place of his books give us room to imagine that he was experimentally acquainted with the ill ſide of marriage, the broils of the day, and the manner of compoſing them at

could not be confuted by this reaſon, *viz.* that incontinency, which naturally prompts to marriage, and is generally the cauſe of it, ought to be left at full liberty to take its courſe. It is not at all tamed by it, ſay they; and it may as effectually be reſtrained by the vow of celibacy, as by the ſolemn one of conjugal fidelity. Theſe are two ſorts of vows, one of which ought to be obſerved as inviolably as the other; and if one is not better kept than the other, as practice plainly ſhews, of what advantage would the abrogation of monaſtical rules be? The Monks and Nuns are charged with thouſands and thouſands of leud actions. Terrible liſts are made of baſtards and abortions, and ſuch other diſorders proceeding from the celibacy of Eccleſiaſtics (70). But if thoſe perſons obliged to continency by their vow of a ſingle life, were at their liberty in the world, would not they fall into worſe uncleanneſs? Turn your eyes to what authors relate of the abortive births at Paris (71). Under the covert of marriage, exempt from the fear of conſequences, to what leudneſs do not they abandon themſelves? And if thoſe who have reaſon to fear the anxiety which the fox was reduced to, I mean the neceſſity of being confined, till their bellies grow as flat as they were before, will notwithſtanding venture it; can we expect any better from thoſe who on the like occaſion lie under no neceſſity to hide themſelves, marriage veiling their fault from the eyes of the world? But you may ſay what you pleaſe, you champions of monaſtical vows, you will never be able to convince me, with all the proofs which you are pleaſed to cite out of la Mothe le Vayer and an hundred other authors, that the conjugal vow of fidelity is not better obſerved than that of celibacy, and that marriage is not an effectual remedy againſt the incontinence of a very great number of perſons. We ought not to ſtretch too far what was ſaid by a very good man, equally recommendable for his father's glory, and his own virtue. In one of the beſt pieces of Chriſtian morality that we have, intituled, *Of the Peace and Contentment of the Mind*, a ſerious, grave, and religious book, he ſaith, that the huſband whoſe wife is falſe ought *to practiſe the great remedy againſt irremediable evils, which is patience, and that the good company of ſo many honeſt men, who are in the ſame condition, helps to bear it, and he needs not think it more ſtrange than to wear a faſhionable hat* (72). Once more, this expreſſion ought not to be urged too far; for the number of thoſe, who follow the mode in their dreſs, ſurpaſſes the number of thoſe whom this wiſe Divine endeavours to comfort.

What I have ſaid above concerning the fox will be more intelligible, when I have related to thoſe gentlemen what I have read concerning the pernicious effects of thoſe vows, which they would juſtify. It is a ſtory, the ground of which I could never yet meet with in the eccleſiaſtical annals: I have engaged ſome people in queſt of it. In the mean while all that hath yet reached my knowledge is, that about the year 1537, the Counteſs of Guaſtala, by the advice of Baptiſt de Crema, a Jacobin Monk, founded a fraternity *of the Victory over one's ſelf againſt the fleſh . . . . To gain this victory, a certain lady named Julia, put a young fellow into bed with a young girl, and laid a crucifix as a barrier betwixt them, to the end that they ſhould not kick one another, as we generally clap bars or poles between horſes: And this was the trial* (73). This fraternity multiplied prodigiouſly. *Such ladies*, ſays my author (74), *go very often to ſeveral of the neighbouring towns, to viſit their Prieſts and ſpiritual Fathers, for they have their neſts in ſeveral towns. But it often happens to them as to a certain famiſhed fox, who entering into a chamber by a little hole, eat ſo greedily, and ſtuffed his belly ſo full, that he became ſo ſwolen that he could not get out again: So it happens frequently to theſe good ladies, when they enter the chambers of their fathers confeſſors, their bellies begin to ſwell to that degree that they are obliged to ſtay there, and not ſtir a foot till the fruit is ripe, becauſe their repaſt proved too large: Which proceeds from their gormandizing, becauſe their hunger is as great as that of the fox.* See what Horace ſays,

Forte per anguſtam tenuis vulpecula rimam
Repſerat in cameram frumenti, paſtaque rurſus
Ire foras pleno tendebat corpore fruſtra.
Cui muſtela procul, ſi vis (ait) effugere iſtinc,
Macra cavum repetes arctum, quem macra ſubiſti (75).

A hungry fox, when pinch'd for want of meat,
Crept thro' a little hole to heaps of wheat,
And there well fill'd he would return again
Thro' the ſame chink; he ſtrove, but ſtrove in vain:
When lo the weeſel cry'd *abſurd deſign,*
Fox, you were thin and lean when you got in,
And if you would get out be quite as thin.

CREECH.

He aſſures us, that at Venice, and in ſeveral other places, theſe libertine Guaſtalians were expelled (76).

Let us return to la Mothe le Vayer. He judiciouſly obſerves, that this divorced woman was ruined by her huſband's fault; who loved her too laſciviouſly. Brantome for the ſame reaſon charges the ill lives of ſeveral wives to their huſband's account (77). Generally ſpeaking we may affirm, that the mens part in all theſe diſorders is infinitely greater than the womens. They are the inſtigators, ſollicitors and ſeducers. This an author of the XVIth century hath very handſomely ſhewn in juſtification of the fair ſex. *We very ſeldom ſee*, ſaith he (78), *women guilty of pride, cruelty, murder, drunkenneſs, gluttony, ſacrilege, robbery, or generally tainted with all ſorts of vices as men are: But, on the contrary, they are for the moſt part humble, civil, ſober, chaſte, diſcreet, and charitable; their hearts are tender and humane; and if there are any, as it may be alledged againſt me, who are vicious, I aver and maintain, that they are moſt commonly induced and inticed to it by men, without whoſe inticements few or none of this ſort would be found. And to ſpeak plainer, for a ſmall number of ill women the greateſt part of the men are ſtark naught. And if any perſon is pleaſed to contradict me, I aſk him what the men would be, if they were continually enticed, excited and ſollicited to evil, vice and ſin, by the women, as the women are by them, conſidering that of their own accord without any inſtigation they are ſo corrupt and vicious? Who ought to be eſteemed moſt excuſable, ſhe who at the inticement of another loſes her virtue, or he that uſes his utmoſt endeavours to extinguiſh it, which we ſee confirmed by daily experience? And therefore I am not a little ſurprized at the thoughtleſs ſparks, who inceſſantly cenſure the women for the very vice which is not near ſo common amongſt that ſex as amongſt their own. And if the women (as they ſay) were ſubject to luxury and incontinence, (which I utterly deny) ought they not to think full as abominable and deteſtable, or rather more, the infinite load of other vices and imperfections which they may find amongſt themſelves, the leaſt of which deſerves as much to be blamed as that? I cannot imagine whence ſuch an error ſhould proceed, unleſs from a deſire of contemning others to juſtify themſelves; which will not avail them with regard to me; for I know that they are almoſt all ſo generally addicted to the ſame vice (beſides others) that there is not a wretch though ever ſo mean amongſt them that doth not deſire to gratify his luſt with all, or as many women as pleaſe him: So that if their modeſty and chaſtity did not ſtop the torrent of vice, there would be no more continence amongſt mankind than amongſt brutes* (79). *But we ſee they are ſollicited without intermiſſion, and with much leſs trouble than men they might enjoy their fill of pleaſure, notwithſtanding which they very ſeldom fall into this fault, which though ſo much blamed in them, is become almoſt a virtue in the men. Is it then leſs diſpleaſing to God in one ſex than in the other? It is indeed very ſtrange that they ſhould be ſo ſeverely cenſured, for what theſe fools glory in, conſidering alſo that the ſin is commmitted on the female ſide with ſome colour of excuſe, whilſt the other have really none.* What hath been lately ſaid concerning the weakneſs of men, and the ſtrength of women, in a book intituled, *Moliere Comedien aux champs Eliſées* (80), is the beſt thing in that book; and doubtleſs he that wrote the ſatire againſt huſbands, at night, *&c.* [*I*]. He lived ſeveral years after his ſecond marriage, and died in the year 1672 (*c*) I ſhall ſpeak of the editions of his works [*K*].

---

(70) *See the book intituled*, Le Cabinet du Roi de France, dans lequel il y a trois perles precieuſes d'ineſtimable valeur. *It was inſcribed to Henry III, the firſt of November* 1581. *The reader is there frequently referred to another book intituled*, La Polygamie ſacrée. *Theſe two books are full of horrid things; but there ſeems to be ſome exaggeration in them.*

(71) See the article PATIN, remarks [*C*], and [*F*].

(72) *Peter du Moulin, the ſon*, Traité de la Paix de l'Ame, *livr. iii, ch. xiv, pag.* 382, *Paris* 1673.

(73) Hiſtoire de la Mappemonde Papiſtique, *pag.* 81, *Edit.* 1567, *in 4to.*

(74) Ibid. *pag.* 82.

(75) Horace, Epiſt. vii, lib. i, ver. 29.

(76) *I cannot tell whether the following paſſage of a letter of Lucretia Gonzaga, pag.* 134, *may be applied to the members of that fraternity.* Havete ridette tutte quelle pia cevolezze che io vi narrai occorſe tra le Guaſtalline, & lui. - - - *You laughed at thoſe comical things which I told you happened between the Guaſtalians and him.* Hortenſio Lando is meant by the word *him*.

(77) Brantome, Mémoires des Dames Galantes, *Tom. i, pag.* 54, 55.

(78) Claudius de Taillemont, Lyonnois, *in his* Diſcours des Champs Faez, à l'honneur & exaltation des Dames, *printed at Lyons* 1553, *in 8vo.*

(79) Compare this with what is ſaid in the article LAMPONIANO, citation (18).

(80) Printed in 1696. See Scene vi, of Act iii, *pag.* 157, *& ſeq.* of the Amſterſtam edition. You will find the ſame things in the ivth part of the *Diverſitez Curieuſes*, pag. 68, & ſeq. Dutch Edit.

The

(*c*) Morcri ſays in 1671. Mr Witte is very much miſtaken in his *Diarium Biographicum*, where he places the death of this author, in the year 1664.

bands, in anſwer to Mr Boileau's ſatire againſt women, had a more fruitful ſubject than Mr Boileau.

[*I*] *We have room to imagine that he was experimentally acquainted with the ill ſide of marriage, the broils of the day, and manner of compoſing them at night,* &c.] See a letter which he wrote to a perſon who deſired his advice concerning marriage. He firſt of all makes an enumeration of ſome imperfections which the antients attributed to women, after which he adds (81). ' But the want of capacity, and a ' ſufficient number of other defects, with which thoſe ' of our days abound more than ever, would not per- ' haps be ſo conſiderable, if we had the remedies ' which the antients practiſed againſt the moſt incor- ' rigible. For beſides divorces, which were allowed ' them if they found their wives but in a ſmall fault, ' on four occaſions they had a right to take away ' their lives, and the women ran as great a riſk by ' drinking of wine, or uſing of falſe keys, as by im- ' poſing of children on the huſband, or committing ' adultery . . . . (82). But as our laws are very far ' from any ſuch ſtrict ſeverity, we find that their in- ' dulgence favours the debauchery and depravation of ' women to that degree, that being at preſent reſtrain- ' ed by no ſort of fear, I ſee nothing which we ' ought reaſonably to hope for from the moſt pru- ' dent of them,

(81) La Mothe le Vayer, letter xlv, *pag.* 357. *of Vol. x.*

(82) Id. ibid. *pag.* 358, 359.

Paucæ adeò Cereris vittas contingere dignæ †.

On Ceres' feaſt reſtrain'd from their delight,
Few matrons there but curſe the tedious night.

DRYDEN.

† Juven. Sat. vi, ver. 50.

' And if we ought to except ſome few who are ' touched with a ſenſe of honour, how can you be ' free from the reſt of their infirmities, which the ' greateſt Philoſophers, nor the moſt potent Emperors ' have not been able to correct? Philip of Macedon ǂ ' proteſted, that he did not know a humour ſo mar- ' tial as that of his wife Olympias, who inceſſantly ' made war againſt him. Their gaming, the exceſſes ' in their feaſting, and the reſt of their profuſions, at ' preſent exceed thoſe of the moſt debauched of our ' ſex, and quickly make an huſband ſenſible of the ' truth of the Italian proverb, *ſpoſa di ſpeſa, noce che* ' *nuoce*. Nor are you yet to expect that the noiſy ' uneaſineſs of the day will exempt you from the du- ' ties of the night. There is no peace or reſt to be ' hoped for, if it doth not proceed from that ſide,

ǂ Dio. Chryſ. or. 2.

Sed lateri ne parce tuo, pax omnis in illo eſt ‡.

But no endearments no careſſes ſpare,
Enjoyment pacifies the angry fair.

‡ Ovid. l. 2. ver. 413, de art. am.

' And you will find the greateſt part of them like ' the fountain of Hammon ** extremely cold by day, ' but very hot by night.' When a married man talks at this rate, he gives very good reaſon to believe, 1. That he has often undergone ſuch a trial. 2. That this made him ſo well acquainted with the ſeal, which ought to be affixed to thoſe reconciliations. 3. That he was very well verſed in the diſtinction betwixt the groundleſs quarrels, which are like the ill humour of a creditor ill paid, and thoſe which reſult from a peeviſh temper.

** Diod. Sic. l. 17.

[*K*] *I ſhall ſpeak of the editions of his works.*] His ſon collected them into a body in 1653, and dedicated them to Cardinal Mazarin. This edition in folio being followed by a ſecond, he publiſhed a third, *larger and more correct than the two former* (83), and dedicated it to the king in 1662. After this edition another came out in fifteen volumes in 12mo, which comprehends more tracts than the laſt in folio, which was in three volumes. Thoſe three volumes in folio contain but the twelve firſt tomes of that in 12mo. The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth, being the tracts which the author publiſhed in the year 1667, 1668, and 1669. There is no ſmall advantage to be made of reading this writer, and we have no French author who approaches nearer to Plutarch than he. We find beautiful thoughts, and ſolid arguments interwoven and diſperſed through his works. Wit and learning go hand in hand. His wit would doubtleſs appear more conſpicuouſly if it went alone; for the authorities and citations very often obſcure it: but in ſome places it ſhines moſt by the happy application of a foreign thought. This author, amongſt his other various ſorts of reading, applied himſelf to that of voyages. In which each perſon hath generally his particular end. Mr Daillé (84) read them only to diſcover the difference betwixt the Apoſtles converting the antient Pagans, and the Popiſh Miſſionaries converting the new ones. Our Vayer had another aim, he only looked for arguments for Pyrrhoniſm. The prodigious diverſity which he met with betwixt the manners and cuſtoms of different nations charmed him: he could not conceal the ſatisfaction with which he digeſted theſe materials, nor did he hide the conſequences which he would have us to draw from thence, *viz.* that we ought not to be ſo deciſive as to condemn as ill and unreaſonable, whatever we do not find agreeable to our opinions and cuſtoms. I cannot tell whether he believed with Cardan, that Opinion is the queen of mankind (85), but I believe that he might have made as good an oration about the empire of Opinion as that of Schuppius, (86) and an excellent commentary on theſe three verſes of Sophocles.

(83) Epiſtle Dedicatory of the third edition.

(84) See his life, written by his ſon.

(85) Æſtimatio & Opinio rerum humanarum Reginæ ſunt. *Cardanus, lib. iii, de Utilit.* apud *Naudæum, Coups d'Etat, pag. m.* 92.

(86) *Chriſtopher Pellerus quotes it ſometimes in his* Politicus ſceleratus impugnatus. *See there pag.* 55, 56, *&* 219.

Παῦσαι, καταρκεῖ τοῦ δὲ κεκλῆσθαι πατρὸς
Εἴπερ πέφυκά γ' εἰδὲ μὴ, μείων βλάβη.
Τὸ γὰρ νομισθὲν τῆς ἀληθείας κρατεῖ.

Pauſa: ſat eſt me hoc patre natum dicier,
Natus tamen ſi ſum: ſin autem, obeſt parum.
Nam veritate potentior eſt opinio

Pauſa, it is ſufficient that I am ſaid to be deſcended of this Father; it is no matter whether I really am ſo or not: for opinion prevails over truth.

His treatiſe concerning *the Education of the Dauphin* (87) and that of the Pagan Philoſophy, are the beſt which he hath written. That of the Hiſtorians is good: but as Mr Baillet very judiciouſly obſerves, it did not coſt him much pains (88). I have obſerved in it ſeveral other faults beſides thoſe which I have mentioned in the articles of Suetonius and Tacitus. *No body is ignorant that his laſt works are much inferior to thoſe compoſed in the flower and vigour of his age.* Theſe are the words of Mr Baillet (89).

(87) *See* Sorberiana, *pag.* 223, *Dutch Edit.*

(88) Baillet, Jugemens des Sçavans, *Tom. ii, ch. v, Art.* 186.

(89) Id. ibid. *Tom. i, Part. ii, ch. ix.*

Mr de Vigneul Marville pretends that la Mothe le Vayer's works *are only a collection of what he liked beſt in the courſe of his reading*; *that formerly ſuch ſort of rhapſodies were read, but are not reliſhed at preſent* (90). There is too much harſhneſs and ſeverity in this ſentence: all unbyaſſed perſons have always made a vaſt difference betwixt la Mothe le Vayer's writings, and rhapſodies. He was not an author who heaped up paſſages like the compilers of a *Florilegium* or a *Polyanthea*. He contented himſelf to confirm his thoughts by thoſe of the moſt excellent authors of Antiquity, or to uſe his learning in order to give new hints by the applications he made, or the conſequences he drew. This is not what is called a rhapſody. He ſays an infinite number of things which were purely his own, and which he intermixed with a great deal of ſpirit and wit; and tho' he hath interſperſed ſeveral borrowed thoughts, which are not choſen with ſufficient diſcernment, it is nevertheleſs true that from thence ariſes a work, the reading of which is highly advantageous, and which continues to pleaſe ſome very good judges. Mr de Vigneul Marville believes that he hath done a great honour to France by ſaying that la Mothe le Vayer's *rhapſodies are not adapted to our preſent taſte*, and that the readers no longer loſe their time in reading them; but it is to be feared that he will hereby confirm

(90) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges d'Hiſt. & de Littér. *Tom. ii, pag.* 300, *Dutch Edit.*

‘The French Academy considered him as one of their beſt members; but the world looked on him as a capricious humouriſt, who lived according to his fancy, and as a Sceptic Philoſopher. His phyſiognomy and dreſs made every body that ſaw him judge him an extraordinary man. He walked always with his head erect, and his eyes fixed on the ſigns of the ſtreet.’ *Before I was told who he was*, continues the writer from whom I have extracted this paſſage, *I took him for an Aſtrologer, or a ſearcher after ſecrets and the philoſophers ſtone* (*d*). This ſerves only to confirm what we have ſeen above (*e*).

He had ſome couſins, whoſe deſcendants make a very good figure in the Law (*f*).

(*d*) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges d'Hiſt. & de Litterat. *Tom. ii, pag.* 301, *Dutch Edit.*

(*e*) That is, that he was a Philoſopher, who minded only the inward part, and deſpiſed the vanities of human life.

(*f*) See the *Mercure Galant*, for March 1682, *pag.* 166, *& ſeq.*

confirm ſeveral foreigners in the judgment which they make, that France, too much diſguſted with all that ſavours of learning, only employs herſelf in refining her language, and in giving a happy turn to the deſcriptions and characters of men. The beſt writings of the firſt Academiſts are not leſs ſlighted than thoſe of la Mothe la Vayer (91); and yet it is agreed on all hands that the French Academy was never better filled than in it's beginning.

(91) I made this obſervation to ſhew that if la Mothe le Vayer is not read as he was formerly, it proceeds from a general diſguſt at moſt things that have loſt the grace of novelty.

VAL (GEFFREY DU) See VALLEE.

VAL (JOHN DU) a Phyſician at Iſſoudun, his native place, tranſlated into French the Antidotary or Diſpenſary of John-James Wecker, Phyſician at Baſil, and added to it ſeveral things of his own. This book was printed at Geneva in 4to in 1609. The new edition of Vander-Linden, *de Scriptoribus Medicis*, doth not mention him, any more than it doth **JAMES DU VAL**, a Phyſician of Evreux, who publiſhed (*a*) a book in French, treating *of hermaphrodites and the delivery of women* in 1612 (*b*). He had before printed (*c*) a book concerning the *medicinal ſpring about Rouën*, and (*d*) a *new method of curing Catarrhs* (*e*).

(*a*) At Roüen, in 8vo.

(*b*) I have this from Mr Drelincourt.

(*c*) At Roüen, 1603, in 12mo.

(*d*) Ibid. 1611, in 8vo.

(*e*) I have this from Mr Bourdelot.

VALDES (JOHN) in Latin *Valdeſius*, flouriſhed at Rome under Pope Julius II. He was a young well proportioned handſome polite Spaniard. His learning, induſtry, and the friendſhip of ſeveral great perſons procured him very great riches. He fell in love with a Senator's daughter, not leſs virtuous than beautiful; and finding that the only way to gratify his paſſion was honourable love, he courted her for marriage, and carried the matter even to the ſigning of the contract. A little after which it was diſcovered that it was not poſſible to advance ſo far as the nuptial ſolemnity, by reaſon of his engagement in the eccleſiaſtical life. This very much angred the father of the betrothed lady, and obliged him to complain to Cardinal Leonard de la Rovere, who commanded in Rome in the abſence of Julius II. That Cardinal cauſed Valdes to be impriſoned in the caſtle of St Angelo. The priſoner ſeeing himſelf charged with a crime, promiſed to renounce his prieſthood if the Pope would permit him, and marry the betrothed lady, even tho' ſhe had no fortune. Upon which he was diſcharged under bail; but whilſt they were endeavouring to obtain the diſpenſation, he was ſo embarraſſed betwixt the deſire of keeping his benefices, and that of enjoying a wife, that he could not diſengage himſelf from this labyrinth, otherwiſe than by throwing himſelf headlong from the top of his houſe [*A*]. By which he broke all his bones, and died immediately very much lamented by the whole city. His miſtreſs being informed of this deſperate act, would

[*A*] *He could not diſengage himſelf from this labyrinth otherwiſe than by throwing himſelf from the top of his houſe.*] His ſtruggles with two different paſſions, was very fierce: on the one ſide he found himſelf unable to quit the charms reſulting from the large revenue of his benefices, and on the other he deſpaired of reſiſting the violence of his love, if he could find means to annul his contract. If I keep my benefices, ſaid he to himſelf, I ſhall never enjoy the perſon I love, and I do not find myſelf able to endure that privation. If I enjoy this perſon, I ſhall loſe my preferments, and I do not believe I can any more bear this loſs than the other. This plunged him into a deep melancholy, which was aggravated by his reflecting on the prejudice he did his miſtreſs. He knew that by breaking off the promiſed marriage, he at once ruined the reputation and fortune of a very virtuous lady. For he doubtleſs imagined that ſhe would find no more a ſuitable match. The ſcrupulous niceneſs of the Italians is ſuch that they cannot eaſily digeſt the privacies which they ſuppoſe one after a contract of marriage may have and actually has taken. Nay, in the very countries, where people are not ſo nice, ſome men would never marry a lady who hath ſeveral times hearkened to the declarations of love from a young ſpark admitted by her relations; for they ſuppoſe that the more ſhe became ſenſible of her parents conſent, the leſſer bounds ſhe ſet to the careſſes of the young man, and that ſhe abandoned the out-ſide of the place. What would they not think if the matter broke off betwixt the contract and the wedding-day? However it was, our Valdes thought he ſhould ruin the reputation of this fair one, if he ſhould annul the marriage-contract; he was touched with a compaſſion for her; he was aſhamed to uſe her ſo ill; and theſe two paſſions joining with others ſo cruelly tormented him, that to free himſelf from this ſlavery he reſolved to end his life. Early in the morning then he went to the turret on the top of his houſe, and threw himſelf into the ſtreet. ‘Valdeſius neque libenter ſacerdotiis, quæ opulenta erant, abdicare cogitat, neque perferre ſe amorem, etiam ſi impunè liceat, ulterius ſperat. Igitur cum id conſilii ſe cepiſſe videret, quod non facilè poterat explicare, graviore ob id dolore affectus, quòd pudiciſſimæ feminæ famam, & fortunam omnem everterat, ſi repudii nuntium remiſiſſet, magnis excruciatus ſollicitudinibus, miſericordiaque & pudore confectus, ut erat æſtivus dies, turriculam quandam ad proſpectum ſuper ædium culmen excitatam diſcinctus adhuc aſcendit, quaſi matutinalem auram ſtrictiorem animi gratia capturus, ſervuloque mox negotii certi nomine ablegato nullam aliam rationem nactus, qua ſe turbulentiſſimis miſeriis explicaret, & dulciſſimæ ſponſæ famæ nominique proſpiceret,

would have killed her ſelf; wherefore they were obliged to keep a watchful eye over her to prevent any attempts of that nature. You expect to hear that time and another ſighing lover comforted her, but you are miſtaken; for as ſoon as her grief admitted of a little ſolace, ſhe turned nun (*a*).

(*a*) *Taken from* Pierius Valerianus, in Litteratorum Infelicitate, *lib. i, pag.* 44, 45.

‘ſpiceret, ex editiſſimo eo loco in viam mediam ſeſe præcipitem dedit, quo ita totis oſſibus colliſo, & ſtatim exanimato, Alterii filia re percepta, ipſa quoque ſponſi deſiderio ſibimet manum inferre tentavit, ſed diligenti familiarium obſervatione prohibita, cuſtoditaque, poſteaquam tempore dolor aliquantulum mitigatus eſt, maritalem peroſa vitam perpetuo victura cœlibatu veſtalem induit (1). - - - *Valdes could not think of reſigning his rich benefices, nor did he believe he could be able to reſiſt the violence of his love, even tho' the contract were annulled. Therefore, when he ſaw he was involved in difficulties, from which he could not extricate himſelf, being the more concerned becauſe he ſhould ruin the character and fortune of a very virtuous lady by breaking off the match, and being agitated between compaſſion and ſhame, and cruelly tormented with anxious thoughts, he went up one ſummer's morning, before he was dreſſed, to the turret on the top of his houſe, as if to take a little freſh air, having ſent out his ſervant under pretence of ſome buſineſs; and finding no other way to free himſelf from this inſuportable miſery, and to ſave the reputation of his dear miſtreſs, he threw himſelf headlong from that high place into the middle of the way, whereby he broke all his bones, and died upon the ſpot. The daughter of Altieri hearing of it, attempted to kill herſelf for the loſs of her lover, but was prevented, and carefully watched by her friends. Afterwards, when her grief was a little aſſwaged by time, ſhe conceived an averſion to a married ſtate, and reſolving to lead always a ſingle life, went into a convent.*’ The author does not mention whether this unhappy man was interred in a church, or whether the judges exerciſed the rigour of the law on his corpſe. He only tells us that the whole city deplored his death (2).

(1) Pierius Valerianus, de Literat. Infelicit. *lib. i, pag.* 45.

(2) Valdeſius totius Romæ luctu deploratus eſt. *Id. ibid.*

VALDES (John) one of the firſt founders of Lutheraniſm in the kingdom of Naples, was a Civilian (*a*), and a Spaniſh gentleman, on whom Charles the Vth conferred the honour of knighthood (*b*). It is believed (*c*) that in his travels to Germany he was tinctured with the opinions which were preached there againſt the Church of Rome; and that having carried to Naples the books of Luther, Bucer, and the Anabaptiſts, he made uſe of them to get proſelytes. It is certain that he communicated his opinions to ſeveral perſons, who privately aſſembled to ſerve God according to theſe new inſtructions. Some women of quality frequented theſe aſſemblies [*A*]. Some Monks of extraordinary merit, and among others Peter Martyr Vermilius (*d*), and Bernardinus Ochinus (*e*) reſorted alſo thither. The Inquiſition diſcovered it, and by the application of their uſual violent remedies ſuppreſſed this beginning of reformation. Valdes's diſciples were not all equally ſtedfaſt: ſome ſtuck to the new doctrines and retired into Proteſtant countries; but the greateſt part yielded and betrayed their conſciences [*B*]. He lived unmarried and very chaſtly, and died at Naples, about 1540 (*f*). He attacked the Church of Rome on ſome points only [*C*], and it is pretended that on the doctrine of the Trinity, he neither agreed with the Proteſtants, nor the Roman Catholics. The Unitarians have placed

(*a*) *See the* Bibliotheca Anti-trinitariorum, *p.* 2.

(*b*) *Nobili genere natus in Hiſpania & dignitate equeſtri ornatus à Carolo Cæſare.* Melchior Adam in Vita Petri Martyris, *pag.* 31.

(*c*) *See the* Bibl. Anti-trinitariorum, *pag.* 2; & Spondanus *ad ann.* 1547, *num.* 21, 22.

(*d*) See the remark [*A*].

(*e*) Spondanus, ubi ſupra, *num.* 22.

(*f*) Celius Secundus Curio, *preface to Valdes's Conſiderations.*

[*A*] *He communicated his opinions to ſeveral perſons, who privately aſſembled to ſerve* GOD . . . . *ſome women of quality frequented theſe aſſemblies.*] A paſſage in Peter Martyr's life informs us of this more particularly. We have there a very fine elogy on our Valdes, the founder of this dawning Church. ‘Qui (*Joannes Valdeſius*) poſteaquam à Deo veræ religionis agnitione donatus eſt, vitam ſuam in Italia, & præcipuè Neapoli egit, quo loco doctrina & ſanctiſſimo vitæ exemplo, quamplurimos, præſertim nobiles, Chriſto lucrifecit, ac fuit eo tempore non ſpernenda Eccleſia piorum hominum in urbe Neapolitana. Nam in illo cœtu multi viri erant nobiles & docti; multæ etiam excellenti virtute fœminæ: inter quas ut alias illuſtres & vere heroinas omittamus, ſilentio tamen præterire non debemus nobiliſſimam heroinam *Izabellam Manricham*, quæ poſtea Christi nomine à patria exulavit. In hoc cœtu piorum fuit ibidem Christi nomine exul *Galeazzius Caracciolus* Marchio Vici, & alii magni viri poſt exules, quos omnes nominare non neceſſe eſt. Quamvis autem hujus Eccleſiæ prima laus debeatur Valdeſio: nihilominus tamen Martyris quoque virtus commemoranda eſt (1). - - - *John Valdes, after* GOD *had beſtowed on him the knowledge of the true religion, ſpent his days in Italy, and chiefly in Naples, where, by his doctrine and holineſs of life, he gained many to* CHRIST, *eſpecially ſeveral of the nobility, and at that time there was a conſiderable church of pious men in the city of Naples. For in that aſſembly there were many noble and learned men, and likewiſe many women of extraordinary virtue; amongſt whom, not to mention other illuſtrious and truly great ladies, I muſt not paſs over in ſilence the moſt excellent Lady Iſabella Manriguez, who afterwards was baniſhed her country for the name of* CHRIST. *Among thoſe pious men, Galeazzo Caracciolo, Marquis of Vico, was alſo baniſhed for the ſake of* CHRIST; *and after that, other great men, all whom it is needleſs to mention. Tho' the chief honour of this Church be due to Valdes: yet we ought not to forget the great merit of Martyr.*’ See the remark [*F*].

(1) Melch. Adam. in Vita Theolog. Exter. *pag.* 31.

[*B*] *The greateſt part yielded, and betrayed their conſciences.*] Nicolas Balbani, miniſter of the Italian Church at Geneva, informs us of this: his words, according to Mr Minutoli's verſion, are: ‘The greateſt danger that threatened him (2) proceeded from the ſame perſon from whom he had received the beginning of his knowledge; for the number of the diſciples of this Valdes, of whom we have already ſpoken, and who were the only company that Galeazzo frequented after he became acquainted with them, being extreamly increaſed in Naples, moſt of them not advancing farther in point of religion than to eſtabliſh the means of Juſtification by Jesus Christ, and to condemn ſome of the groſſeſt Popiſh ſuperſtitions, without abſtaining, on that account, from frequenting the churches, and aſſiſting at the Maſs, and partaking with the reſt of the Papiſts in ſeveral idolatries; it was to be feared that Galeazzo would make no greater progreſs than thoſe gentlemen, whoſe good intentions miſcarried when they came to be perſecuted and impriſoned, and they were conſtrained to abjure their principles, after which ſome were put to death on pretence of relapſing to their former errors, and amongſt them was Caſerta himſelf, who had been the inſtrument of Galeazzo's converſion (3).

(2) That is, Galeazzo Caracciolo Marquis of Vico.

(3) Vie de Galeace Caracciolo, *pag.* 47, 48.

[*C*] *He attacked the Church of Rome on ſome points only*] Add to the paſſage I have juſt now cited the following words of the ſame book: ‘There was then at Naples . . . . a certain Spaniſh gentleman whoſe name was John Valdes, who having ſome knowledge of, and being even ſenſibly touched with the truth of the goſpel, eſpecially in the point of Juſtification, had the happineſs to ſow ſome ſeeds thereof amongſt the nobility he converſed with, and began in that manner to draw ſome gentlemen out of their ignorance, undeceiving them concerning the merit of good works, and the righteouſneſs of men, as well as concerning ſeveral ſuperſtitions (4).’ Compare this with what I have cited from Thuanus, in the

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 10, 11.

placed him in the number of their authors [*D*]. He wrote ſome books [*E*], of which the

the article Flaminius, and obſerve, that Flaminius was one of thoſe who with Valdes confirmed Peter Martyr Vermilius in his new opinions (5).

[*D*] *On the doctrine of the Trinity he did not agree . . . The Unitarians have placed him in the number of their authors.*] See the following paſſage of the Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum: ‘ *Ab eo* (Johanne Valdeſio) *Bernardinus Ochinus ſententiam ſuam contra receptam de Trinitate opinionem imbibiſſe perhibetur. Floruit a.* 1542 *De eo miniſtri eccleſiarum conſentientium in Sarmatia & Tranſylvania lib.* 1. *cap.* 3. *de falſa & vera unius Dei Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti cognitione, hæc ſcribunt:* De Joanne etiam Valdeſio, genere & pietate clariſſimo, quid dicendum? Qui ſcriptis publicis ſuæ eruditionis ſpecimina nobis relinquens, ſcribit, ſe de Deo ejuſque Filio nihil aliud ſcire, quam quod unus ſit Deus altiſſimus Chriſti Pater: & unicus Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus ejus filius, qui conceptus eſt de Spiritu Sancto in utero virginis, unus & amborum Spiritus (6). - - - - *Bernardinus Ochinus, is ſaid to have taken from John Valdes his ſentiments againſt the received opinion concerning the Trinity. He flouriſhed in the year* 1542. *The miniſters of the united churches in Poland and Tranſylvania, in the book concerning the falſe and true knowledge of one* GOD, *Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, write thus concerning him: As to John Valdes, a man eminent for his birth and piety, what ſhall we ſay? In the books he publiſhed he gives evident proofs of his learning, and writes that he knows no more concerning* GOD *and his Son, than that there is one Almighty* GOD *the Father of* CHRIST, *and our only Lord* JESUS CHRIST *his Son, who was conceived of the Holy Ghoſt in the womb of the Virgin, and one Spirit of both.*’ This may perphaps be confirmed by Balbani's words: *The Devil ſtill continued to forge ſhackles for* Galeazzo Caracciolo; *for fear he ſhould eſcape, he again endeavoured to pervert his mind, by the efforts which he obliged certain perſons to make, to draw him over to a pernicious party. Theſe were a band of Anabaptiſts and abominable Arians, who were unhappily ſpread in Naples and other parts of the kingdom; they promiſed themſelves to find in Galeazzo (thinking the ſtarting of a new opinion enough to gain a novice) the man whom they wanted to be their powerful ſupport and defence, and the patron of their cabal: Wherefore they left no means which they thought proper unattempted to engage him on their ſide, and taint him with their hereſy* (7). The author further adds, that this gentleman vigorouſly repulſed their efforts. Obſerve that he makes a diſtinction betwixt theſe Perſons, and Valdes's diſciples (8): But we may venture to ſay, that his acknowledging that a party of Antitrinitarians appeared in the kingdom of Naples, renders more probable what Sandius (9) affirms concerning Valdes's hereſy. I have read a thing in Beza's letters which deſerves a place here. A Miniſter of the French church at Embden, was accuſed amongſt other things of having got tranſlated and printed in the Dutch language, without the knowledge of his colleagues, Valdes's Conſiderations, full of blaſphemies againſt the word of God (10), and of having left out the notes which were added to the Lyons edition. Beſides other reaſons in his defence, he urged the two following; that the book was not full of blaſphemies, and that it ought not to be leſs permitted at Embden, to praiſe the piety of Valdes than at Baſil, Zurich, and Geneva. He was anſwered, that book had done a great deal of miſchief to the flock of Chriſt at Naples, and that Ochinus had there imbibed the errors which had ruined him; and that if any good men had beſtowed elogies on thoſe Conſiderations of Valdes, they would change their opinion as ſoon as they had examined them. It was added, that the Bookſeller at Lyons, who printed them, was very ſorry and aſked pardon for it, after Calvin and ſome others had informed him of his fault. Read all theſe particulars in the following Latin words of Beza: ‘ Scimus ex idoneorum hominum teſtimonio, quantum naſcenti Neapolitanæ Eccleſiæ liber ille detrimenti attulerit: Scimus etiam quod fuerit de illo judicium D. Joannis Calvini: Scimus & illud, Ochinum infelicis memoriæ virum ex illis lacunis ſuas illas prophanas ſpeculationes hauſiſſe, & ita tandem ſenſim à verbo Dei abductum in ultimum illum exitium ſeſe præcipitaſſe, in quo miſer interiit: ac proinde librum illum a ſpiritu Anabaptiſtico multis locis non multùm diſſidentem, id eſt, à verbo Dei ad inanes quaſdam ſpeculationes, quas falſo Spiritum appellant, homines abducentem, vel nunquam editum, vel ſtatim ſepultum fuiſſe magnopere cuperemus. . . . . Cæterum quinam illi ſint probati judicii homines qui ſcriptum illud (perſonam enim ipſam Valdeſii non attingimus) ut pium & religioſum libris etiam editis commendarint, nos quidem ignoramus, neque dubitamus quin ſi boni viri ſunt, re diligentiùs perſpecta ſententiam mutent, quod & Lugdunenſi Typographo viro bono evenit, ut qui, quamvis additis illis notis meritò ſe poſſet excuſare, admonitus tamen à fratribus, & nominatim quidem à D. Calvino, culpam deprecari quàm excuſare maluit (11). - - - - - *We know from unqueſtionable evidence, what miſchief that book has done to the infant church of Naples: What opinion Mr John Calvin entertained of it: and that Ochinus, of unhappy memory, drew his groſs errors from that corrupt fountain, and ſo by degrees forſaking the word of* GOD, *he run into that pernicious hereſy wherein he died: for which reaſons we heartily wiſh, that book which differs not much from the Anabaptiſtical ſpirit, that is, it leads men from the word of* GOD *to vain ſpeculations which they falſely call the ſpirit, had never been publiſhed, or immediately buried in oblivion. . . . . But who thoſe judicious men are, who in printed books have commended that piece (for as to the perſon of Valdes I ſay nothing) as pious and religious, I confeſs I do not know, and I do not queſtion but if they are good men, they will change their opinion as ſoon as they have carefully examined the matter; which the Printer at Lyons, a man of probity did; for though he might have juſtly excuſed himſelf on account of the notes that were added, yet being admoniſhed by the brethren, and particularly by Mr Calvin, he choſe rather to deprecate than to vindicate his fault.*’

[*E*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] Of which Sandius gives us the following catalogue. *Dialogi Charon & Mercurius impreſſi Italicè. Conſiderationes piæ & doctæ. In Pſalmos aliquot. In Evangelium Matthæi. In Evangelium Johannis. Commentarius in epiſtolam Pauli ad Romanos. a.* 1556. *Commentario breve, ò declaracion compendioſa, y familiar, ſobre la primera epiſtola de ſan Pablo à los Corinthios, muy util para todos los amadores de la piedad Chriſtiana* (12). He obſerves that the Spaniſh Inquiſition hath inſerted Valdes's commentary on the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, in their index of prohibited books, both with and without the author's name. He was in the right to make this obſervation, for that it is ſo expreſſed in the index is very true (13). Don Nicholas Antonio obſerves the ſame thing (14); but he doth not ſeem to know who Valdes was. *Joannes de Valdes quidam,* ſaith he, *ſcripſit commentario breve ò declaracion,* &c. - - - - *One John de Valdes wrote Commentario breve ò declaracion,* &c. He adds that du Verdier Vau-Privas ſays, that Claudius de Kerquiſinen a Pariſian, tranſlated the hundred and ten divine Conſiderations *Johannis Valdeſii* out of Spaniſh into French. Du Verdier calls this author *Jean de Valdeſſo,* and ſaith, that the French tranſlation of theſe divine Conſiderations was printed *at Lyons in 8vo. by Charles Peſnot, and at Paris in 16mo, by Mathurin Prevoſt* 1565 (15). So he ſays under the word *Claudius de Kequiſinen.* But under the word *Jean de Valdeſſo, Secretary to the King of Naples* (16), he only ſpeaks of one hundred Conſiderations, and refers us to *Claudius de Kerquiſine.* By which we may obſerve that he had no regard to uniformity, either in proper names or the titles of books. He adds that *Charon and Mercury, dialogues of the ſame Valdeſſo, were tranſlated into French by an unknown author.* This confirms the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum,* and the epitome of that of Geſner, where our John Valdes is called *Secretarius Regis Neapolitani,* Secretary to the King of Naples, and declared to be the author of the dialogues *Charon and Mercurius.* Let us ſay, by the by, that they deceive us, when they make uſe of the plural number with reſpect to the book wherein Charon and Mercury are the interlocutors. It is but one dialogue; which I own is followed by another, but in this the perſons are Lactantius and an Archdeacon. The whole title of the book runs thus.

Due

---

(5) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra.

(6) Biblioth. Antitrinit. *p.* 2.

(7) Balbani, Vie de Galeace Caracciolo, *pag.* 45, 46.

(8) Ibid. *p.* 47.

(9) *He is the author of the* Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum.

(10) Multis erroribus atque etiam blaſphemiis adverſus ſacrum Dei verbum ſcatentes. *Beza, Epiſt. IV, pag.* 200, *Tom. iii,* Operum.

(11) Theod. Beza, *ibid.*

(12) Biblioth. Antitrinit. *pag. ii, See alſo the* Epitome *of* Geſnerus's Bibliotheca, *pag. m.* 506.

(13) *See the* Index Librorum prohibitorum & expurgandorum, *pag.* 736, *of the edition of* 1667, *at the word* Juan Valdeſio.

(14) Nicol. Antonio, Biblioth. Scriptorum Hiſpaniæ, *Tom. i, pag.* 606.

(15) Du Verdier, Bibliotheque Françoiſe, *pag.* 182.

(16) Id. ibid. *pag.* 759.

the moſt eſteemed is intituled *one hundred and ten Conſiderations.* I ſhall mention below by whoſe care it was printed [*F*].

Due Dialoghi, l'uno di Mercurio & Caronte: nel quale, oltre molte coſe belle, gratioſe, & di buona dottrina, ſi raconta quel che accade nella guerra dopò l'anno MDXXI. L'altro di Lactantio & di uno Archidiacono, nel quale puntalmente ſi trattano le coſe avenute in Roma nell' anno MDXXVII. Di Spagnuolo in Italiano con molta accuratezza & tradotti & reviſti. In Vinegia con gratia & privilegio per anni Dieci. The date of the impreſſion is not ſpecified; The book contains 148 leaves in octavo. As for the reſt Mr Konig miſleads us (17), when he refers us to Pierius Valerianus with reſpect to John Valdes, who wrote a commentary on the epiſtle of St Paul to the Romans, printed in 1556. For Pierius's Valdes is another man. I find nothing concerning our Valdes in the Oxford catalogue; but under the name of *John de* VAL D'ESSO, or *Valdeſſo*, you find *one hundred and ten divine Conſiderations*, printed at Lyons in 8vo, 1563. You will alſo find there the ſame book printed in Italian at Baſil in 1550 in 8vo, and in Engliſh at Oxford, in 1638, in 4to.

(17) Konig. Bibl. vet. & nova, *pag.* 826.

[*F*] *By whoſe care it was printed.*] The French edition which I here make uſe of, is that of Paris 1565, in 16mo, intituled *Dent & dix Conſideracions divines de Jan de Val d'Eſſo. Traduites premierement, d'Eſpaignol en langue Italienne, & de nouveau miſes en François, par C. K. P.* The Preface is written by Celius Secundus Curio, who was the editor of the Italian edition at Baſil in 1550. He repreſents it as an excellent work, and after a great many elogies, goes on in the following words. 'But we are obliged for 'this great and heavenly treaſure, to Mr Peter Paul 'Vergerius, as the inſtrument of divine providence 'to occaſion the printing and the publiſhing of it, 'that it may be ſeen and poſſeſſed by every perſon. 'For leaving Italy, and quitting a falſe and pretended 'biſhopric to join and apply himſelf to the true apoſtleſhip, to which he was called by Chriſt, he brought with 'him ſeveral excellent compoſitions. He did as every 'body uſes do, when, by ſome ſad diſaſter, his houſe 'is on fire, or the town where he lives in danger 'of being plundered by ſoldiers; for in ſuch a diſtreſs 'he endeavours to ſave himſelf with the moſt valuable things he has. In like manner our Vergier '(18), having nothing dearer to him in this world 'than the glory of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, he carried 'off with him thoſe compoſitions which tended to 'illuſtrate and enlarge it. He neglected the earthly 'riches, and carefully preſerved the heavenly and divine treaſures: Amongſt which this little piece was 'one of the moſt valuable which could be imagined 'or coveted. After which, very well knowing that all 'things in their own nature excellent, raiſe their value and eſteem, by being communicated and diſtributed to ſeveral perſons, he left me theſe hundred 'and ten Conſiderations that I ſhould publiſh them: 'which I have done, as you ſee with the utmoſt diligence that I have been capable of. Theſe Conſiderations, as ſeveral can teſtify, were originally written by the author in Spaniſh, but afterwards tranſlated into Italian, by a perſon of great piety and 'virtue; though through inadvertence, ſeveral Spaniſh idioms, have ſlipt into the verſion. And beſides he has purpoſely retained ſome few words of 'the author's mother tongue, becauſe John de Val 'd'Eſſo the author, was a Spaniard, of a noble and 'antient family, raiſed to an honourable ſtate, being 'at firſt a gentleman, knighted by Charles V, but 'after that a more honourable and magnificent Knight 'of JESUS CHRIST. After CHRIST was revealed to him, he did not long follow the court, 'but lived in Italy, and reſided at Naples. Where 'by the engaging charms of his doctrine, and the 'holineſs of his life, he gained many diſciples to 'CHRIST, eſpecially a good number of gentlemen 'and knights, and women of quality who deſerved 'all ſorts of praiſe. He was ſo mild and charitable, 'that he made himſelf debtor to every perſon for 'the great talents with which he was entruſted, and 'accommodated himſelf to perſons of the meaneſt 'condition, and became all things to all men, in 'order to gain them to CHRIST. Not only this, 'but he ſerved as an inſtrument to convey the light 'of the goſpel to ſome of the moſt famous preachers 'in Italy. This is what I know, by having particularly converſed with them..... And beſides he 'left ſeveral other excellent pieces behind him, which 'by means of the above mentioned Vergerius, we hope 'in time will be communicated to us.

(18) His article will be ſeen hereafter under the word VERGERIUS.

VALDES (JAMES) (*a*) author of a book, in which he endeavours to prove that the kings of Spain ought to have the precedency of all Chriſtian princes [*A*]. He was born in Aſturia in the XVIth century, and run through the courſe of his ſtudies at Valladolid, where he exerciſed the profeſſion of an Advocate, and taught the Canon-Law for

(*a*) Nicolas Antonio, Biblioth. Scriptorum Hiſpaniæ, *Tom. i, pag.* 247, *calls him* Didacus.

[*A*] *He is author of a book in which he endeavours to prove, that the kings of Spain ought to have the precedency of all Chriſtian princes.*] This was publiſhed at Granada in 1602, in folio, and dedicated to Philip III King of Spain, and it was reprinted at Francfort in 4to, in 1626. The title is *Prærogativa Hiſpaniæ, hoc eſt, de dignitate & præeminentia regum regnorumque Hiſpaniæ, & honoratiori loco ac titulo eis eorumque legatis à Conciliis, nec non Romana ſede jure debito, tractatus eximius, Reges Catholicos Chriſtianiſſimis aliiſque jure, regnis, ſede ac titulo potiores extitiſſe adhuc* (1) *liquido demonſtrans* (§ α). The author had choſen this for the ſubject of an oration, which he pronounced in the Univerſity of Valladolid, in the preſence of King Philip II. Which was ſo applauded, and that monarch was ſo well pleaſed with it, that he ordered him to write a tract on that ſubject. This occaſioned the book (2), wherein Valdes pretends to the ſame fate with Ægidius Romanus, who having argued on the queſtion *de Regno* in the ſchools, in the preſence of Philip IV, King of France, received orders from that prince to prepare an entire treatiſe *de Regimine Principis. Mihi evenit id, quod olim Ægidio Romano accidiſſe Paulus Æmilius in Philippo IV auctor eſt, quod cum in Scholis publicam de regno coram Philippo Pulchro queſtionem habuiſſet, tandem ejus regis imperio, opus de regimine principis edidit* (3). If Valdes hath not more faithfully cited other authors, I look upon his book to be one of the worſt in the world; for it is falſe that Ægidius Romanus diſputed on the theſis *de Regno*, in preſence of Philip IV. It is falſe that he received any order to write a book on that ſubject after the pretended diſputation. But the thing is this. That prince engaged him to publiſh a tract *de Regimine Principum*, and afterwards commanded him to make a ſpeech to him in the name of the whole univerſity, at his return from his coronation. Paulus Æmilius's words are: 'Philippus pulcher 'jam inde à prima adoleſcentia Ægidium Romanum 'theologum obſervarat, authorque fuerat ut de regimine principum monumenta quæ extant conſcriberet, ederetque. Eundem Lutetiam à Rhemenſibus 'ſacris regreſſus, quod Sacræ Scholæ univerſique Muſæi oratione novos excipi Reges ſolemne ſit, dicere 'juſſit (4). - - - - *Philip the Fair had from his very 'youth an eſteem for Ægidius Romanus, a Divine, 'and made him write and publiſh a book which is 'now extant* de Regimine Principum. *When he 'returned to Paris, from his coronation at Rheims, 'he ordered him to make a ſpeech, as is uſual on 'that occaſion, in the name of the whole univerſity.'* It is true that the ſubject of this oration was *de Regno:* Paulus Æmilius recites it, but it is of his own compoſure. Ægidius Romanus could not expreſs himſelf otherwiſe than in the crabbed ſcholaſtic ſtile; he could not uſe the ſelected words and neat Latin which that Hiſtorian lends him. As for the reſt, the French authors have not been ſilent concerning this Spaniard's pretenſions: They have publiſhed books to convince him of his miſtake. See the *Memoirs concerning the precedence of the Kings of France before the Kings of Spain, by T. Godefroy, Advocate in Parliament,*

(1) I tranſcribe this from the Francfort edition, where the word *extare* or *eſſe* ſeems to be wanting.

(2) Jacobus Valdeſius, *in Epiſt. Dedicat.*

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) Paulus Æmylius, *lib. viii, initio pag. m.* 162, *ad ann.* 1286.

for twenty years. After which he was promoted to the office of counſellor in the council of Granada. His *Additiones ad Roderici Suarez lecturas variorum Jurium* were printed at Valladolid in 1590 (*b*).

Parliament, printed in 1612, but above all, the book of Mr Bulteau (5) printed at Paris 1679. The *Journal des Sçavans* of Feb. 11, in the ſame year, gave an extract of it.

[(§ *a*) That book was probably an anſwer for the King of Spain to the pretenſions of France, maintained in France by two pieces publiſhed about the year 1577, a little before the ſitting of the firſt Eſtates at Blois. They are both to be found in the *Memoires de la Ligue*. Tom. IV. pag. 709. & *ſeq.* of the edition of 1598. REM. CRIT.]

(*b*) *Taken from* Nicolas Antonio, Biblioth. Scrip. Hiſp. *Tom. i*, *pag.* 247.

(5) Secretary to the King. He is very well verſed in Hiſtory, and has a very fine library.

VALERIA,

VALERIA, Siſter to the Orator Hortenſius [*A*], by a very curious way came to be Sylla's wife. She was a woman of great beauty and quality, but lived in a kind of celibacy, for ſhe had lately been divorced from her huſband. Sylla having juſt loſt his wife, was preſent at a great combat of gladiators: the women ſat then promiſcuouſly with the men. Valeria going to ſit next to Sylla, ſoftly put her hand to his robe when ſhe was behind him, and pinched off a little of the wool. He looking on her with ſurprize; *It is nothing, my Lord*, ſaid ſhe, *I would only enjoy a little of your good fortune as well as others.* Theſe expreſſions, very far from diſpleaſing Sylla, inſpired him with ſome agreeable emotions. He preſently diſcovered that he was touched; he ſent to inform himſelf of the name, quality, and reputation, of the lady. After which nothing but glances [*B*] and mutual ſmiles paſſed between them, which at laſt ended in a promiſe of marriage [*C*]. The Hiſtorian (*a*), from whom we have this adventure, blames Sylla only; others think, that without wronging his judgment, he might alſo have cenſured Valeria [*D*]. Which he doth not in the leaſt; but he obſerves that her huſband was ſo far from regarding her alone, that he kept actreſſes and women-dancers in his houſe. He left her pregnant of a daughter, called *Poſthumia*, from her being born after the death of her father.

(*a*) Plutarchus, in Sylla, *pag.* 474.

[*A*] *Siſter to the Orator Hortenſius.*] Doubtleſs ſhe was only his ſiſter by the mother's ſide, and we ſhould ſay that Hortenſius's mother was married to a man of the antient family *Valeria*. But on the other ſide, we know that Hortenſius had a ſiſter, who was the mother of Valerius Meſſala (1), Conſul in the year of Rome 701. It muſt therefore be ſaid, that his mother and ſiſter married into the ſame family. I have not found any author, who hath informed me whether Valerius Meſſala's mother had the ſame father with Hortenſius, or whether ſhe was the ſame who married Sylla.

[*B*] *Nothing but glances.*] If any one is ignorant that the Greek language abounds with very ſignificant terms to expreſs the mute language of love, let him only conſider the words which I cite. Ἐκ δὲ τούτων, ῥίψεις ὀμμάτων ὑπ᾽ ἀλλήλους ἐγένοντο, καὶ παρεπιστροφαὶ συνηχεῖς προσώπων καὶ μειδιαμάτων διαδόσεις. Hinc oculorum invicem annictus, aſſiduæ ac leves in ſe mutuo vultus converſiones, riſus adjectiones (2). - - - *Hereupon followed glances, ſmiles, and continual turnings of their heads to one another.*

[*C*] *Which at laſt ended in a promiſe of marriage.*] Plutarch hath not exactly ſpecified whether the propoſals of marriage, and the acceptation of it, happened the ſame day at their going from the Shew. It is probable that that affair was not long a doing, and that after they had tired their eyes with making love by ſigns, while the gladiators were engaged, they broke ſilence as they were leaving the Amphitheatre. Sylla quickly took fire, and the lady was not coy: it is therefore very likely that ſhe did not put him to the trouble of aſking twice, and that as ſoon as ſhe had a glimpſe of hopes to participate of Sylla's fortunate ſtar, not by barely touching of his robe, or keeping a little of the wool of it, but by a conjugal union, ſhe abandoned herſelf to that good fortune. This was to take opportunity by the fore-lock. From glances they proceeded to converſation, and from converſation to conjugal enjoyments; all this within a day, though Plutarch doth not tell us ſo in expreſs terms.

[*D*] *He might alſo have cenſured Valeria.*] *She perhaps*, ſaith he, according to Amyot's verſion, *does not deſerve any cenſure for her carriage on this occaſion; but tho' ſhe was the moſt honeſt and virtuous woman in the world, the occaſion of Sylla's marrying her, was neither honourable nor proper, becauſe he was ſtruck on a ſudden by an affected look and expreſſion, as if he had been a young boy, and thoſe paſſions which are moved by theſe trifles, are commonly the groſſeſt and moſt ſcandalous.* Methinks I hear Brantome relate the adventures of his gallant women, after having given them the elogies of good and virtuous ladies. If a tranſlator ſhould give himſelf never ſo little liberty, he might make Plutarch ſpeak more reaſonably than he doth in Amyot's tranſlation: he might make him ſay, that tho' Sylla ſhould have met with a virtuous woman, yet he would be to blame to marry her from ſuch a principle of love as this which determined him.

(1) Valer. Maximus, *lib. v*, *cap. ix.*

(2) Plutarchus, in Vita Syllæ, *pag.* 474.

VALERIUS (AUGUSTIN)

VALERIUS (AUGUSTIN) Biſhop of Verona, and a Cardinal, flouriſhed towards the end of the XVIth century. He was born at Venice, and there he taught Moral Philoſophy. He perfectly underſtood the Latin tongue, which he ſpoke readily and elegantly; but could not without difficulty expreſs himſelf in his native language. His morals were very edifying, and he diſcharged the duties of a Biſhop like a good paſtor. He was created Cardinal by Gregory the XIIIth. His grief to ſee his country lie under the excommunication of Paul V, threw him into a diſtemper, of which he died (*a*). Beſides ſeveral other books, he compoſed an holy Rhetoric, where he informs us of a very curious particular relating to the Martyrologies [*A*].

(*a*) *Taken from* Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. I, *pag.* 170, 171.

[*A*] *He informs us of a very curious particular relating to the Martyrologies.*] In the *Mercure Galant* of December 1695, there is a letter inſerted, which to me ſeems excellent (1). I cannot tell how the public judges of it; but I imagine that I am not the only perſon who reliſhes it. There is in it a judicious and modeſt cenſure on a piece of Loredano (2), which had then been juſt tranſlated into French. The author ſeems to me to treat him too gently, contenting himſelf with ſaying, *That he hath apparently trifled with his ſubject, and without any reſpect to the holy ſource from whence he drew it, has only painted it in the gayeſt colours of his eloquence, and adorned it with the moſt agreeable incidents which his imagination could ſuggeſt.* He adds, that Lope de Vega uſed the ſame liberty in his paſtoral, where he treats of the ſhepherds coming to the manger at Bethlehem, and that

(1) You will find it in the *Recueil de Pieces curieuſes*, printed at the Hague for Moetjens. See *Tom. v*, *p.* 14.

(2) The life of Adam. See the remark [*L*], of the article EVE.

he has ſeen a manuſcript in folio, *written by a poor young man on the dialogue betwixt our Lord and his diſciples, as they were going to Emmaus.* After this he relates, *That Cardinal Valerio, Biſhop of Verona, in his book, intituled,* de Rhetorica Chriſtiana, *informs us, that one of the cauſes of the falſe legends of the martyrs was the cuſtom formerly obſerved in ſeveral monaſteries, to exerciſe the young Monks, by Latin exerciſes propoſed to them on the martyrdom of ſome ſaint, which giving them the liberty of introducing the tyrants and the perſecuted ſaints, as acting and ſpeaking, in ſuch a manner as appeared to them the moſt probable, at the ſame time gave them room to compoſe on theſe ſubjects a ſort of hiſtories, rather filled with ornaments and inventions than truth; but tho' they did not deſerve much regard, yet thoſe which ſeemed moſt ingenious and beſt compoſed, were laid up. So that after a long ſeries of years, they, together with other manuſcripts* (3), *being found in the libraries of the monaſteries, it was very difficult to diſtinguiſh theſe exerciſes of wit from the genuine hiſtories of the ſaints there alſo preſerved. It is to be confeſſed that thoſe pious writers are very excuſable, they having no other deſign than to exerciſe themſelves on holy ſubjects, could not foreſee the erroneous conſequences, which, in proceſs of time, proceeded from thence; ſo that if poſterity is thereby deceived, it is rather owing to their own want of diſcernment than a proof of the ill intention of thoſe writers. It would be hard to have the ſame regard for the famous Simeon Metaphraſtes, a Greek author, of the IXth century, who firſt gave us the lives of the ſaints for every day of the month through the whole year; ſince it is viſible they were not written for that purpoſe, but in a very ſerious manner, tho' at the ſame time amplified and ſtuffed with ſeveral imaginary events, as Bellarmin himſelf teſtifies, who plainly tells us, that Metaphraſtes writ ſeveral of the lives, as they might be, and not as they really were* (4). *But it is no wonder that ſuch a thing ſhould have been done by ſome Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians, through a pious zeal to honour the ſaints, and to render their lives agreeable to the people, commonly more inclined to admire thoſe they reverence than to imitate them; ſeeing this liberty crept into the very tranſlation of ſome books of the Bible; as we are informed by St Jerome, in his Preface to that of Eſther, that the Vulgar edition of that book of Holy Writ, commonly read in his time, was ſtuffed with ſeveral additions, which I cannot better expreſs than in the words of that Father.* 'Quem librum, *ſaith he, ſpeaking of the book of Eſther,* Editio vulgata lacinoſis hinc inde verborum finibus trahit, addens ea quæ ex tempore dici potuerant, & audiri, ſicut ſolitum eſt ſcholaribus diſciplinis ſumpto themate, excogitare quibus verbis uti potuit qui injuriam paſſus, vel qui injuriam fecit. - - - *Which book in the vulgar edition here and there is patched with forgeries, ſuch things being inſerted in it as might have been ſaid and heard extempore, as it is uſual when a theme is given in ſchools, to invent what might have been ſpoken by one that ſuffered or committed an injury.*'

Thoſe who would ſee a vaſt number of curious and judicious obſervations on this head, need only read Mr Baillet's diſcourſe of the lives of the ſaints. Of which Mr de Beauval has given us a very good extract in his Journal for January 1701, from page 37, to 56.

(3) See the article TANAQUIL, at the end of the remark [*B*].

(4) Compare this with the article LAMBERT, citation (10).

VALLA (LAWRENCE) One of the moſt learned men of the XVth century, was born at Rome in 1415 [*A*]. He very vigorouſly attacked the barbarity under which the Latin tongue had groaned for ſeveral ages, and wrote ſome books in which he collected the elegancies of that language ſo little in uſe in the works of the ſchool-men and Civilians. But when he came to write an hiſtory, he ſhewed that he was more capable of pointing out how others ought to write, than of practiſing his own rules [*B*]. He was a great lover of criticiſm and contradiction, in both which he allowed himſelf a liberty which drew on him a great many enemies [*C*]. He had the courage to confute a falſe tradition

[*A*] *He was born . . . . in* 1415.] The proof of this I draw from his epitaph, where we find he died the firſt of Auguſt 1465, and that he lived fifty years. The words of this inſcription in the church of St John of Lateran are: 'Laurentio Vallæ harum ædium ſacrarum Canonico, Alphonſi Regis & Pontificis maximi Secretario, Apoſtolicoque ſcriptori, qui ſua ætate omnes eloquentia ſuperavit, Catharina mater filio pientiſſimo poſuit. Vixit annos L. obiit anno Domini MCCCC.LXV. Calendis Auguſti. - - - *This monument was erected by Catherine, in memory of her moſt pious ſon Laurence Valla, who was canon of this church, ſecretary to King Alphonſus and the Pope, and an apoſtolic writer, who excelled all of his time in eloquence. He died on the firſt of Auguſt* 1465, *aged fifty years.*' According to Voſſius (1), this diſtich follows the epitaph.

Laurens Valla jacet, Romanæ gloria linguæ,
Primus enim docuit qua decet arte loqui.

Here Laurence Valla lies within this tomb,
Who was the glory of the Latin tongue;
For, he it's beauties firſt made us to know,
And th' art of ſpeaking well he firſt did ſhow.

I believe he is miſtaken; theſe verſes were indeed written as a ſort of epitaph, by Franchinus of Coſenza (2), but it is no proof that they were engraved upon the tomb of the deceaſed. Paul Jovius does not ſay they were. Several perſons are miſtaken concerning the age of Laurentius Valla, and the year of his death. Some aſſure us that he ſignalized himſelf in the council of Conſtance, in 1420. 'Claruit in Concilio Conſtantienſi perſonaliter ſub Sigiſmundo Imperatore anno Domini 1420 (3). - - *He diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the council of Conſtance under the Emperor Sigiſmund, in the year* 1420.' Here are two errors, for that council began in 1414, and ended in 1418. And we have ſeen that Laurence Valla was fifty years of age in 1465. So that he was but three years old when that council ended. Geſner hath committed the ſame fault (4); he hath made him flouriſh in 1410 (5). The learned Huetius hath alſo adopted this opinion; for when he introduces Caſaubon ſpeaking towards the latter end of the reign of Henry IV, he makes him ſay (6), that two hundred years before Laurentius Valla tranſlated Herodotus. His death is placed in 1457, by Paul Jovius (7), in 1467 by Spondanus (8), and in 1495 by Moreri.

[*B*] *He very vigorouſly attacked the barbarity . . . . But . . . - he ſhewed that he was more capable of directing others than practiſing his own rules.*] Paul Jovius furniſheth me with a proof of theſe two things. 'Indignatus tandiu corrumpi ſeculum leguleorum & ſophiſtarum immani conſpiratione, optimaſque artes inculta ſermonis barbarie defœdari, Elegantiarum libros edidit, traditis Romanæ elocutionis præceptis ex accurata veterum ſcriptorum obſervatione, quibus juventus æmulandi ſtudio ad detergendas corruptarum literarum ſordes accenderetur . . . . . apud *Alphonſum regem* de avitis bellis in Hiſpania, atque Sicilia geſtis hiſtoria perſcripta eſt, ſed eo ſtyli charactere, ut ejus minime videri poſſit, qui cæteris elegantiarum præcepta tradiderit (9). - - - *Being much concerned that the age ſhould be ſo long corrupted thro' the vile conſpiracy of pettifoggers and ſchool-men, and that the beſt arts ſhould be defiled with groſs barbariſms, he publiſhed ſome books containing the elegancies of the Latin tongue, and laid down ſome rules for ſpeaking that language, from an accurate obſervation of antient writers; that thereby he might excite the emulation of youth to purify learning from it's droſs . . . . . Whilſt he was at the court of King Alphonſus, he wrote an hiſtory of the wars, carried on by that prince's anceſtors in Spain and Sicily, but in ſuch a ſtile, that no body would think it done by one, who had given rules for writing elegantly.*'

[*C*] *Which drew on him a great many enemies*] Here is another paſſage of Paul Jovius: 'Fuit Valla ingenio maxime libero, ob idque mordaci, contentioſoque,

(1) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Latinis, *lib. iii, cap. vii, pag.* 580. *Moreri has tranſcribed this fault.*

(2) Paulus Jovius, in Elog. *cap. xiii, p.* 37.

(3) Trithemius, de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.

(4) Geſner. in Bibl. *fol.* 477.

(5) *And not in the year* 1510, *as* Hankius, de Scriptor. Rerum Romanarum, *Tom. ii, Part. i, cap. xi, pag.* 118, *ſays he did.*

(6) I have ſet down his words, in the remark [*K*].

(7) Jovius, in Elog. *cap. xiii, pag.* 37; Boiſſard. in Iconibus, *num. xiii, apud* Hankium, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 117; Aub. le Mire, in Auctario de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt. *p.* 275; Zeillerus, in Hiſt. *Part. ii, pag.* 154, *agree with Paul Jovius.*

(8) Spondan. in Annal. *ad ann.* 1467, *num* 13, *which he grounds upon Paul Jovius, who only mentions the year* 1457.

(9) Paul. Jovius, ubi ſupra, *p.* 36.

tradition, which greatly pleaſed the court of Rome; it was the pretended donation of Conſtantine. He left his country either by the Pope's orders, or becauſe he had rendred himſelf the object of the hatred of too many perſons (*a*), and retired to the court of Alphonſus King of Naples, that great protector of learned men, who deſired to learn Latin of him at 50 years of age (*b*). If he had confined himſelf to criticiſe on the Humaniſts, he had eſcaped ſeveral reflexions publiſhed againſt him with a great deal of animoſity, which he returned in the ſame ſtile; but he did not ſtop here, he carried his cenſures yet higher, he fell on the eccleſiaſtics, and ſpoke very boldly of certain things which they approved, and he diſliked [*D*]. Theſe adverſaries were much more formidable than thoſe who diſputed with him on points of literature only; they were not leſs able to revile, and beſides could dart upon him the thunders of the Inquiſition, and deliver him up

to

(*a*) *Ex civitate patria ſeu juſſu Pontificis .... ſeu ſponte migrabat.* Hankius de Romanarum Rerum Scriptor. *lib. ii, Part i, pag.* 116. Orthuinus Gratius, in Faſciculo Rerum expetendarum, *ſays, he was expelled from Rome.*

(*b*) Cui jam quinquagenario Latinas literas anno Chriſtiano circiter 1443 tradebat. *Hank. ibid.*

‘ſoque, utpote qui aliena ſatirico dente facilè perſtringeret, & lites in literis, quaſi id opus eſſet, adverſus ignorantes acerrimas ſereret. Extant enim Invectivarum, & recriminationum aliquot libri, eruditè falſeque perſcripti; quibus dum læſi nominis famam tueretur, Facium Ligurem, Panhormitam, Pogium, & Raudenſem jugulaſſe videri poteſt (10). - - - *Valla allowed himſelf great liberties, and was of a ſatirical and contentious diſpoſition; for he would bitterly inveigh againſt the writings of others, and maintain violent diſputes in learning againſt the ignorant, as if it were a matter of great importance. Several books of invectives and recriminations, containing much learning and wit, are extant, wherein, whilſt he endeavours to defend his wounded reputation, he ſeems to murder that of Facius, Panhormita, Pogius, and Raudenſis.*’ I ſhall ſpecify the titles of ſome of his works, which will be ſufficient to prove him one of the greateſt dueliſts of the Republic of Letters, and that we may juſtly compare his life to that of a gladiator. *Antidoti in Pogium Florentinum libri* 4. *in quibus promiſcue & mores ac vitam hominis & impuram dictionem notat. Apologus & actus Scenicus in eundem. Adverſus eundem libellus ſive dialogus ſecundus. In Antonium Raudenſem annotationum libellus. In Benedictum Morandum Bononienſem libri duo ſive confutatio prior & poſterior. In Bartolemæum Facium Ligurem & Anton. Panhormitam recriminationum libri* 4. He never forgave his adverſaries one word or phraſe that ſavoured of barbariſm; which gave occaſion to the fiction after his death, that he rendered himſelf ſo formidable in Hell, that Pluto dared not preſume to ſpeak Latin. To which it was added, that Jupiter would have given him a place in Heaven, if he had not been afraid of introducing a Critic of his words. Spondanus cites the four verſes, which contain this ill-natured jeſt: ‘Acerrimâ mordacitate ſuâ & aliorum doctorum virorum veterum recentiorumque ſatyricâ perſtrictione infamis. Ut non illepidè quidam in illum mortuum, apud Trithemium * ſic luſerit.

(10) Id. ibid.

* Trith. de Script. Eccl.

Nunc poſtquam manes defunctus Valla petivit,
Non audet Pluto verba Latina loqui.
Jupiter hunc cœli dignatus parte fuiſſet,
Cenſorem linguæ ſed timet eſſe ſuæ (11) (§ *α*)

‘*He became infamous by his bitter invectives and ſatirical reflexions on learned men, both antient and modern: ſo that it was wittily ſaid of him after his death, as we find it in Trithemius:*

Since Valla's dead, and into Hell convey'd,
To ſpeak in Latin Pluto is afraid;
Jove dreads a Critic of his words in Heav'n,
Or elſe to him a place he would have giv'n.

(11) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1467, *num.* 13, *p.* 114.

Cato, the cenſor, was rallied almoſt in the ſame manner.

Πυῤῥὸν, πανδακέτην, γλαυκόμματον, οὐδὲ θανόντα
Πόρκιον εἰς ἀΐδην Φερσεφόνη δέχεται.

Ruffum, mordacem, glaucum, ne quidem exanimatum
Porcium in infernum Perſephone recipit (12).

Red-hair'd Portias, and gray-ey'd,
'Gainſt every body who inveigh'd,
Tho' dead, from hell Pluto drives back,
Fearing the thunder of his clack.

(12) Plut. in Catone majore, *init. pag.* 336.

Another epitaph on our Valla was,

Ohe ut Valla ſilet ſolitus qui parcere nulli eſt!
Si quæris quid agat, nunc quoque mordet humum (13).

Tho' Valla, who us'd none to ſpare,
Mute in his grave is found,
If you ſhou'd aſk what he does there,
Ev'n now he bites the ground.

(13) Volaterranus, Comm. Urban. *lib. xxi, pag. m.* 774.

Several have believed that in writing of books, his end was not the inſtruction of his readers, but to cenſure both the living and the dead. He fell upon Ariſtotle, Cicero, Virgil, and paid no reſpects to any beſides Epicurus (14). The latter was a fit man at that time to be praiſed by thoſe, who loved to be ſingular. All the world cried out againſt him, and abhorred him; which perhaps was the reaſon that rendered him admirable to Valla's eyes. This thought is not in Pontanus, whom I here cite: ‘Qui cum Laurentio familiarius vixerunt, affirmant illum eo nequaquam conſilio in Grammaticis ſcripſiſſe, ac dialecticis, quo doceret, diſciplinaſque ab ignoratione vindicaret, atque à ſorde, verùm ut malediceret, obloquendoque detraheret de fama atque autoritate rerum ſcriptoribus; tum illis qui exemplo ſunt ad ſcribendum aliis propter antiquitatem majeſtatemque dicendi, ac præcipiendi, tum illis ipſis, qui tunc viverent, qui ne dubitaverit ipſe quidem dicere, profiterique palàm, habere ſe quoque in Chriſtum ſpicula (15). *Thoſe who were intimate with Valla, ſay, that he did not write Grammar or Logic to inſtruct his readers, or reſcue learning from ignorance and error, but to cenſure and leſſen the reputation of other writers, both ſuch as deſerve to be imitated for antiquity and majeſty of ſtile, and thoſe who were cotemporary with himſelf: and that he did not ſcruple to declare openly, that he had arrows in his quiver againſt Chriſt himſelf.*’ This learned man, notwithſtanding, did not want defenders: read the writings of Floridus Sabinus, and Eraſmus's Epiſtle to Chriſtopher Fiſher in 1505 (16), occaſioned by Valla's Notes on the New Teſtament, which he found in a library, and which he publiſhed. See alſo the third letter of the ſeventh book of Eraſmus's Epiſtles.

(14) Ciceronem vellicabat, Ariſtotelem carpebat, Virgilio ſubſannabat... maximis quibuſque ringeret autoribus uni tantum Epicuro aſſurgeret. *Jovianus Pontanus, de Sermone, lib. i, pag. m.* 1572.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) It is the viith of book iv.

[(§ *α*) This epigram, which we find likewiſe in a letter of Goudanus to Eraſmus, is there aſcribed to Pogius. See the *Memoires de Litterature*, Tom. ii. pag. 50. Part i. REM. CRIT.]

[*D*] *He fell on the Eccleſiaſtics, and ſpoke very boldly of certain things ... which he diſliked*] It is agreed that his cenſure was not only perſonal, but alſo real in ſome reſpects; for he cenſured the faults of the Eccleſiaſtics, and ſome of their opinions. ‘Ipſos etiam ſui ſæculi Theologos ſeu ignorantia ſupina ſeu inveterata perſuaſione vanis opinionibus indormientes, ad veri ſenſum acutiore ſtilo excitare nihil veritus eſt ... quod in publicis Scriptis quaſdam Eccleſiæ Romanæ traditiones erroris damnaviſſet, aliis ipſe gravis cenſor, hæreticæ pravitatis cenſores ſibi graviſſimos ſentiebat (17). - - - *He was not afraid to uſe a ſharpe ſtile to excite the Clergy of his own time to a ſenſe of the truth, who, through groſs ignorance, or inveterate prejudice, entertained ridiculous opinions .... As he was a ſevere Critic on others, ſo he found others ſevere on him, as being an Heretic, becauſe he had condemned ſome traditions of the Roman Church as erroneous.*’ He was told, that unleſs he was weary of his life, he ought to refrain from cenſuring the Eccleſiaſtics, and writing ſuch tracts as his refutation of Conſtantine's donation. Two

(17) Hankius, ubi ſupra.

things

to the penal laws of the ſecular power. They proſecuted him ſo violently that he had been burnt alive, if King Alfonſus had not moderated their rigour (*c*). They were then obliged to content themſelves with whipping him round the Jacobins cloiſter. He returned to Rome, where he found ſo good patrons that they obtained for him the Pope's favour, and leave to teach, beſides a penſion (*d*). He died there on the 1ſt of Auguſt 1465, as appears by the epitaph (*e*) which his mother cauſed to be engraven in the church of St John de Lateran of which he had been canon. I ſhall give you the ſubſtance of a long relation which I have met with of his quarrels with the inquiſitors [*E*]. We find beſides that he had drawn on himſelf the violent enmity of a Civilian, whom he had gravelled in a diſputation. He was provoked to this diſpute by an air of contempt, which doubtleſs increaſed the rage of the aggreſſor. He is blamed for being a little too vain; for he

things raiſed him enemies, he had galled the ſacred heads by cenſuring both their morals and opinions. ‘Et ſanè à Franciſco Philelpho etiam commonitus eſt ſatyra luculenta, ut niſi vitæ ſuæ fatur ſit, abſtinere velit à perſtringendis ſacri ordinis viris, ac ſimilibus ſcribendis, uti illa adverſus donationem Conſtantinam. Satyra ea exſtat Hecatoſtichorum lib. ii. ſat. iv (18). *And, indeed, he was admoniſhed by Francis Philelphus in a fine ſatire, to forbear cenſuring the Clergy, as he valued his life, and writing ſuch tracts as his refutation of Conſtantine's donation. That ſatire is in* Hecatoſtichorum, lib. ii. ſat. iv.’ Several people take one of theſe two things for the true cauſe of the perſecution which he ſuffered, and the other for the pretence. His perſonal ſatires irritated the inquiſitors, who, in order to be revenged on him, endeavoured to convict him of Hereſy. The better to ſatisfy their reſentment they accuſed Laurentius Valla of Hereſy in ſeveral points of great conſequence, ſuch as the Myſtery of the Trinity, the Doctrine of Free-will, and Vows of Celibacy, *&c.* It is affirmed, that he was condemned to be burnt, the execution of which ſentence he eſcaped only by the favour of the King of Naples; that he was obliged publickly to abjure the aſſertions for which he had been condemned, and beſides, to ſuffer the chaſtiſement of the laſh in the Jacobins monaſtery. Spondanus's words, in the year 1447, are: ‘Eodem tempore *Laurentius Valla* Romanus, elegantis quidem pro ſæculo, ſed pro quolibet tempore virulentiſſimæ linguæ homo; Neapoli exiſtens, cùm quaſdam propoſitiones hæreticas aſſeruiſſet, delatus ad Inquiſitores, & in carcerem truſus, damnatuſque pro hæretico, beneficio Alfonſi Regis pœnam ignis evaſit; propoſitionibus tamen publicè ejuratis, virgis, privatim per clauſtra monaſterii Prædicatorum manibus revinctis cæſus (19). - - - *At the ſame time Laurentius Valla, a man learned indeed for that age, but of a moſt virulent tongue, for any age whatſoever, having advanced ſome heretical propoſitions, was brought before the Inquiſitors, thrown into priſon, and condemned to be burnt as an Heretic, but by favour of King Alphonſus he eſcaped the execution of that ſentence: however, having publickly abjured thoſe propoſitions, he was privately whipped round the cloiſters of the Jacobine monaſtery, with his hands tied behind him.*’ He adds, that Poggius inſinuates that Laurentius Valla had erred on thoſe articles, which I have mentioned above (20). This is very remarkable. Spondanus doth not cite the propoſitions which Laurentius Valla was obliged to retract; he doth not even ſay that they contained Hereſies relating to the Trinity, Free-will, *&c.* he ſaith only that one of Laurentius Valla's enemies inſinuates it. This may make us think that Valla's doctrine was miſrepreſented by captious and malicious extracts, that it was charged as erroneous, tho' not really ſo. Obſerve, that notwithſtanding all the miſchievous efforts of the Neapolitan Inquiſitors, he lived honourably at Rome; he there obtained permiſſion to teach; he enjoyed a penſion, and the Pope's eſteem. This confirms the opinion of thoſe who conjecture he was no Heretic, but that it was reſolved he ſhould be chaſtiſed for having cenſured the Clergy. See the following remark.

[*E*] *I ſhall give the ſubſtance of a . . . relation which I have met with of his quarrels with the Inquiſitors.*] The author whom I cite mentions theſe quarrels, after having related a diſpute which Laurentius Valla had on a point of law. A Civilian cenſured him very ſeverely: You are, ſaid he, a Shoemaker, you go beyond your laſt, you do not content yourſelf with the ſtudy of Philology, you thruſt your ſickle into other peoples harveſt, and pretend to underſtand the Roman Law (21). Explain me then that place of the Code, ſhewing him the famous puzzling Law, *Quinque pedum Præſcriptione* (22). Valla replied, that nothing could be more unjuſt than to pretend that he was abſolutely ignorant of the Roman Law, if he did not explain a paſſage which ſcarce any perſon had yet underſtood; that he ought not to propoſe this difficulty to thoſe who only believe they have ſome knowledge of the antient Law, but unto ſuch as pretend to underſtand every part of it. *Quid improbius quam velle damnare me, ut nihil juris intelligentem, quia locum aut nulli, aut vix ulli intellectum non expoſuerim? Debuiſſe illum proponi non ei qui aliquid juris ſe intelligere diceret, ſed ei qui omnia* (23). He nevertheleſs, by the explication of the queſtion, diſcovered that he very well underſtood the Roman Law; after which, in his turn, he propoſed a queſtion to the Civilian, and ſilenced him. This aggreſſor finding himſelf gravelled by the queſtions put to him concerning the right of preſcriptions eſtabliſhed in the XII tables, withdrew in a rage, and from that time conceived ſuch a mortal hatred againſt Valla that he attempted his life. *Aliâ è Jure quæſtione petita adverſarium ad ſilentium adegit. Nam cum de Jure Uſucapionum ex duodecim tabulis nonnihil rogaret, in eas anguſtias eundem illum ſuum adverſarium adduxit, ut hic in conclave, velut furens ſe receperit, atque ex eo tempore homo vindictæ cupidiſſimus, odio pluſquam Vatiniano Vallam fuerit proſequutus, vitæque ejus inſidiatus* (24). This is the firſt part of Boxhornius's relation, the ſecond follows.

As the ſcience of the Divines is more holy and more neceſſary, continues he, and their authority greater, Valla could not attack their follies without expoſing himſelf to the greateſt dangers. *Ut Theologorum & ſanctior magiſque neceſſaria diſciplina eſt, & auctoritas major, ita cum eorum quoque ignorantia & putidiſſimis ineptiis commiſſus, vitam ac omnes fortunas ſuas in ultimum pene diſcrimen adduxit* (25). He was preſent at a Lent ſermon, preached by a Franciſcan (26) at Naples, he was one of the auditory, I ſay, when the Monk took for his text the Apoſtles Creed. And having obſerved the preacher to affirm that St Peter ſaid, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*, that St Andrew added, *Creator of Heaven and Earth*, and that the other Apoſtles furniſhed the reſt of the articles in their turn; after the ſermon was ended, he aſked Angelillus Campanus (27), whether there were any authors who related that the Creed was compoſed in this manner? Campanus anſwered, that he had never met with it in any book, and that this Monk was the only perſon whom he ever heard aver that St Jerom was born at Rome. They made him a viſit, and aſked him where he had read that this holy Father was a Roman. Several affirm it, replied he, but who denies it? Valla laughed at this incongruity (28), for it is he that affirms, who ought to produce his evidence, and eſpecially when required; and others are not to name thoſe who deny it. Yet he did not fail to obſerve to the preacher, that St Jerom makes himſelf a native of a town in Dalmatia. ‘Hieronymus ipſe non ſe Romanum dicit, ſed Pannonium aut Dalmatam ex oppido Stridone (29). - - - *Jerom himſelf does not ſay he was born at Rome, but at Stridon in Pannonia, or Dalmatia.*’ Some, anſwered the Monk, ſay he was a Roman, and others, that he was a Dalmatian. There were two faults in this anſwer. Could any witneſs worth hearing be oppoſed to St Jerom himſelf? And after all, ought he not to have named his evidence? Valla finding the ignorance and obſtinacy of the man left that ſubject (30), and proceeded to the queſtion concerning the Creed. What ground

---

(*c*) See the remark [*D*].

(*d*) Ibi quorundam patronorum ope ſic faventem ſibi reddebat Pontificem ut ab eo non tantum docendi poteſtatem ſed ſtipendium quoque conſequeretur. *Id. ibid.*

(*e*) See the remark [*A*].

(18) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Lat. *pag.* 580.

(19) Spondan. *ad. ann.* 1447, *num.* 10, *pag. m.* 3.

(20) Quod prolixiùs narrant Poggius ſecundâ in eum invectivâ, errâſſe innuit in articulis Perſonæ in Deo, Trinitatis, Liberi Arbitrii, & Virginitatis ſanctimonialium. *Id. ib.*

(21) Vallam aliquando acerbe increpuit quod, ut ſutor ultra crepidam, humaniorum literarum cultu haud contentus falcem mitteret in meſſem alienam, & Juris Romani peritiam aliquam ſibi arrogaret. *Boxhornius, Hiſtor. Univerſ. pag.* 953, *Edit.* 1652.

(22) Quem (*locum*) obſcuriſſimum, & à nemine ejus ætatis Juriſconſultorum intellectum, imo depoſitum eſſe conſtabat. *Id. ib. pag.* 954. *See the article* ABELARD, *remark* [*AA*].

(23) Boxhorn. Hiſt. Univerſ. *pag.* 953.

(24) Id. ibid.

(25) Id. ibid.

(26) *His name was* Antonius Betontinus.

(27) He was Secretary to the King.

(28) Primum hominis ſtultitiam riſu Valla excepit quaſi alius deberet oſtendere qui negaret, & non ipſe qui hoc affirmaverat, & quis traderet rogabatur. *Id. ib.*

(29) Id. ibid.

(30) Cognitæ hominis imperitia & improbitate, ultra noluit inſtare. *Id. ib. pag.* 955.

he made too great a ſhew of his wit and learning, which he diſplayed with more pride and oſtentation in the converſation of learned men, than in his works [*F*]. This is the character of thoſe who aim at being paid on the ſpot, and are willing to be the witneſſes of the admiration they aſpire after. He embraced Epicurus's opinion with reſpect to the ſovereign good [*G*], but ſo rectified as to render it agreeable to the principles of Chriſtianity. He was an exceſſive admirer of Quintilian, and affected to deſpiſe Ariſtotle [*H*]. It is ſaid that at table he once let fall this expreſſion, that he had arrows in his quiver againſt

ground have you, ſaid he, to aſſert that the Apoſtles formed it by pieces ? The Doctors of the Church, anſwered the Monk, have informed me ſo. Name them, replied he, cite them. I have already anſwered you, ſaid he, and then growing very angry, he ſaid, that Valla was an impious man, and an enemy to the Chriſtian religion (31). Some days after he defamed him in a ſermon, and continued to inveigh againſt him ſo outrageouſly, that King Alphonſus was obliged to ſtop the torrent of his calumnies. Valla thinking he was challenged to diſpute with him, affixed to the great church all the propoſitions which he found cenſured, and offered to maintain them againſt all opponents. To this ſight he invited ſeveral ſpectators, and even the king's ſon. He prepared a very ſpacious hall : every body was very attentive on the iſſue of this affair, but Valla's enemies would hazard nothing : in order to ſtrengthen themſelves, they made intereſt at court that Valla might be forbidden to proceed any farther. He obeyed, but inſulted his adverſaries by a Latin diſtich, which he affixed to the door of the hall.

Rex pacis, miſerans ſternendas Marte phalanges
 Victoris cupidum continuit gladium.

The king foreſeeing, what ſlaughter would be made,
The victor's eager ſword in pity ſtaid.

After this they became ſo incenſed that they uſed their utmoſt endeavours either to have him condemned to death, or a perpetual impriſonment. They cited him before the Archbiſhop's Vicar-general. He appeared, and was ſurprized to ſee a numerous croud of Monks ; for he never once ſuſpected that this intrigue was of that importance. He was aſked whether he did not believe that the Creed was compiled by the Apoſtles ? No, ſaid he, but by the Council of Nice, I ground myſelf on very ſtrong reaſons. The Inquiſitor, who interrogated him, declared, that the anſwer was heretical. Some letters were produced, in which Valla corrected ſome errors, which by the negligence of the copiers had crept into the Pope's decrees, and it was urged againſt him, that this inſolence deſerved burning. He perceived the danger, and proteſted that on all theſe heads he believed as the Church believed. They preſſed him to condemn and retract his writings ; but he deſired that firſt they would pleaſe to ſhew wherein he was miſtaken, otherwiſe they would plainly make it appear that they did not aim at the correction of his heart, but only at that of his tongue. ‘ Cur non potius vos docetis eſſe revocanda ? an mavultis oris mei quam animi emendationem ? quo enim pacto ego emendor, niſi id quod ore fateor, animo etiam ſentiam ? Et quomodo ex animo ſentiam niſi ſententiam, quam ut veriſſimam hactenus tueor, vos falſi convincatis (32) ? - - - *Why do not you rather ſhew me what ought to be retracted ? Do you deſire the correction of my tongue more than of my heart ? For how can I amend, unleſs I believe in my heart what I profeſs with my mouth ? And how can I believe in my heart, unleſs you prove to be falſe what I have hitherto maintained to be true ?* ’ A Biſhop then laid hold on him, and cried out, Wicked wretch that thou art, thy pride muſt be immediately abated (33). Valla repeated as before, *I believe all that the Church believes.* He was afterwards aſked what he thought of the ten Categories. What, replied he, do they belong to matters of Faith as the ten Commandments of the Divine Law ? Why, replied they, ſhould they not belong to Religion ? Are you ignorant that the Logical Doctrine, *ſenſus diviſus, ſenſus compoſitus*, ſerves to explain the moſt important controverſies in Theology (34) ? To ſhorten the diſpute, anſwered Valla, I declare, that though our holy Mother the Church knows nothing of the matter, yet I believe all that ſhe believes concerning it. *Age, inquit Valla, rem compendii faciamus : etſi iſta mater Eccleſia ignoret, tamen idem de illis credo quod mater Eccleſia.* They would have proceeded ; but the king having ſent people to protect Valla, they ſtopped there.

I find two faults in this long relation of Boxhornius : one is, that he refers all theſe things to the year 1411, which is before the birth of Valla ; the other, that he cites no author.

[*F*] *He diſplayed with more pride . . . in the converſation . . . . than in his works.*] Jovianus Pontanus makes this obſervation after having very much praiſed the modeſty of Pomponius Lætus. ‘ Contra vero, *continues he* (35), Laurentius Vallenſis, multæ vir doctrinæ, ingeniique in primis acuti, popularibus in congreſſibus, ac literatorum circulis oſtentandæ diſciplinæ judicatus eſt fuiſſe ſtudioſior, ne dicam parum modeſtus, ut in iis circulis multo appareret diligentior, quam in libris ipſis, quos ſcriptos reliquit. Cumque non pauca in Dialecticis adinveniſſet adverſus horum temporum artis ejus magiſtros, eo ſeſe efferebat, palàm ut diceret, nullam eſſe Logicam præter Laurentianam. - - - *On the other hand, Laurentius Valla, a man of great learning and penetration, when he was in public aſſemblies, and in company with learned men, was thought to be too forward, not to ſay that he wanted modeſty, in ſhewing his learning, ſo that in thoſe companies he diſplayed it more than in his books. And when he had found out ſeveral things in Logic againſt the maſters of that art in thoſe times, he was ſo vain as to ſay in public, that there was no Logic but the Laurentian.*’

[*G*] *He embraced Epicurus's opinion, with reſpect to the ſovereign good.*] See his book *de voluptate & vero bono*, which was put into the Index as a book the reading of which is prohibited. See alſo the book, which he calls *Apologia pro ſe & contra calumniatores ad Eugenium quartum Pont. Maximum.* You will there find that he chiefly juſtifies what he had taught, that pleaſure is the ſovereign good. ‘ Defendit ſe ſuaque ſcripta, & PRÆCIPUE quod voluptatem ſtatuerit ſummum bonum, Virtutes ancillas eſſe voluptatis, Prudentiam non à malitia, Nihil amari propter aliud, nec etiam propter ſe, Præſcientiam Dei non obſtare arbitrii libertati : Symbolum non factum eſſe ab apoſtolis per particulas (36). - - *He defended himſelf and his writings, and* PARTICULARLY *what he had taught, that pleaſure is the chief good, that the virtues were the handmaids of pleaſure, that prudence differed not from malice, that nothing was loved either for it's own ſake, or that of another, that* GOD's *preſcience was no obſtacle to free-will, and that the Apoſtles did not compoſe the Creed by pieces.*’

[*H*] *He was an exceſſive admirer of Quintilian, and affected to deſpiſe Ariſtotle.*] Voſſius furniſhes me with the comment I want on this head. I borrow it from that place where he attemps to prove that Ariſtotle is the greateſt maſter of Rhetoric that we can imitate. ‘ Neque nos, *adds he* (37) aut Auſonii judicium movet, qui Latinorum tantùm rationem habuit : aut Vallenſis (quamvis viri non minùs de Rep. literariâ meriti, quàm Camillus olim de Romanâ) elogium terret : quia ille, nec in Fabio laudando modum invênit, nec in Ariſtotele, Tullio, Priſciano, (& quo non, ſi unum Fabium demas) ? inſectando, ſæpe habeat cauſſam. - - - *I am not moved at the judgment of Auſonius, which only regards the Latins : nor does the encomiums of Valla (tho' a man who deſerved no leſs of the Republic of Letters, than Camillus formerly did that of Rome) terrify me ; becauſe he obſerved no bounds in extolling Quintilian, and frequently, without cauſe, cenſured Ariſtotle, Cicero, Priſcian, and every body elſe except Quintilian.*’ The following words are remarkable : ‘ Videtur autem vir ille nimis quantum liberaliter Quinctilianum ſuſtuliſſe laudibus, quod videret Georgium Trapezuntium perpetuum eſſe in hoc inceſſendo. Nam & lib. iv. Antidoti ſcribit,

(31) Vehementer in Vallam velut impium hominem & Chriſtianæ rei Eccleſiæque hoſtem exorſus eſt ſtomachari. *Id. ibid.*

(32) Id. ibid.

(33) Tum Aleſanus Epiſcopus ejuſdem Ordinis (*Prædicatorum*) manus ei injecit *& tibi*, inquit, *homo ſceleſtiſſime ſuperbia hic deponenda eſt.* Id. ib.

(34) Quidni, *inquit, Aleſanus*, ad fidem iſta pertineant ? An ignoras ex illo dogmate Dialecticorum de ſenſu diviſo & compoſito graviſſimas in Theologia controverſias explicari, *Id. ibid.*

(35) Jov. Pontanus, de Sermone, *lib. vi, cap. iv, pag.* 1737.

(36) Geſner. in Bibl. *fol.* 478.

(37) Voſſius, de Rhetoricæ natura ac conſtitutione, *pag.* 48.

againſt the Meſſiah himſelf [*I*]. He did not underſtand Greek well enough to undertake, as he did, the tranſlation of Thucydides, Herodotus, and Homer's Iliad: theſe verſions are not good [*K*], but his notes on the New Teſtament are not amiſs. See what Mr Simon ſaith of them (*f*). He was much more learned in Latin than in Greek, as his book of Elegancies compared with his verſions of Thucydides, &c. proves: He is falſely accuſed of having ſtolen it [*L*]. Ludovicus Vives praiſes him for a thing which deſerves to be known [*M*]. Mr Varillas hath committed ſeveral errors [*N*].

ſcribit, ea de cauſsâ ſibi ſemeſtri integro cum Trapezuntio fuiſſe contentionem; neque in gratiam cum eo rediiſſe, niſi cùm is publicè docendi provinciam deſineret. - - - *But he ſeems to have loaded Quintilian with ſuch immoderate praiſes, becauſe he found Georgius Trapezuntius continually attacked him. For in the fourth book of his Preſervative he writes, that upon that account he maintained a diſpute with Trapezuntius for ſix months together: and was never reconciled to him, till he laid down his office of teaching in public.*' I believe, with Voſſius, that the ſpirit of contradiction hurried Laurentius Valla to this exceſs of admiration of Quintilian: he had an adverſary who continually declaimed againſt this Rhetorician, he wanted no other reaſon to eſpouſe the contrary party. In his Logic he depreſſes as much as he could the authority of Ariſtotle.

[*I*] *It is ſaid that he once let fall this expreſſion; that he had arrows in his quiver againſt the Meſſiah himſelf.*] We are told that he uttered this blaſphemy to Antonius Panormita. This was doubtleſs whiſpered in his ear (38), and not ſpoke ſo loud that all at the table could hear it. Panormita trembled with horror, and would no more ſpeak to him. ‘Taceo, *ſaith Voſſius* (39), quòd neque in Chriſtum (horrendum!) ſpicula ſibi deeſſe dicebat; ut quidem ſcripſit Jovianus Pontanus †: & ante eum Poggius ſecundâ in Vallam Invectivâ ‡, ubi exprobrat, quod hoc in convivio dixerit Antonio Panormitæ: qui propterea exhorruerit, & alloquio ulteriùs dignum negarit. - - - *I paſs by his expreſſion, that he had arrows (O horrible!) againſt* CHRIST *himſelf: as Jovianus Pontanus writes, and before him Poggius, in his ſecond Invective againſt Valla, where he upbraids him with having ſaid this to Antonius Panormita, who trembled with horror, and would talk no more to him.*' Spondanus (40) has not forgot this, after having told us that this Critic ſpared neither St Auguſtin, St Jerom, nor Boëtius. We may add, that he had no mercy on Thomas Aquinas. ‘His ſtile is too free, cenſuring too ſeverely the faults of Remigius, Thomas Aquinas, and ſome other writers, who preſumed to comment on St Paul (according to him) without any knowledge of the Greek tongue. He rejects as an idle tale what is commonly ſaid of that Apoſtle appearing to Thomas Aquinas, and aſſuring him that no man ſo well underſtood his Epiſtles as himſelf. If this had been true, ſaith he, he had not failed to give him notice of his faults,' ‡ *Peream niſi id commentitium: Nam cur eum Paulus non admonuit erratorum ſuorum* (41)? He ſeveral times injudiciouſly reprehended the Popes, as when he accuſed Celeſtin IV of being a Neſtorian. Father Theophilus Raynaud loads him with invectives on this account (42).

[*K*] *Theſe verſions are not good.*] Let us ſee what Huetius ſuppoſes that Caſaubon thought of them. ‘Annis ab hinc ducentis Herodotum & Thucydidem Latinis literis exponebat Laurentius Valla, in eâ bene & eleganter dicendi copiâ, quam totis voluminibus explicavit, inelegans tamen, & pene barbarus; Græcis ad hoc literis leviter tinctus, ad auctorum ſententias parùm attentus, oſcitans ſæpe, & alias res agens, fidem apud eruditos decoxit (43). - - - *About two hundred years ago, Laurentius Valla tranſlated Herodotus and Thucydides into Latin: but tho' the originals are writ ſo elegantly, yet his verſion is inelegant and almoſt barbarous. He was little acquainted with the Greek, unattentive to the ſenſe of his authors, often negligent and careleſs, and thereby loſt his credit with the learned.*'

[*L*] *As his book of Elegancies .... proves: He is falſely accuſed of having ſtolen it.*] This book hath been printed a great many times. He ſays in the epiſtle dedicatory that it was publiſhed, without his order or conſent. This epiſtle dedicatory was inſcribed to Tortellius, Chamberlain to Nicolas V. It is without any date, notwithſtanding which one may ſee that it was written in that Pope's time. In thoſe days it was very difficult to collect ſo many obſervations: It required a vaſt ſtudy, and a ſtrong genius. The great ſucceſs of this book vexed the author's enemies, and moved them to ſay that he appeared in borrowed feathers, and that the piece was really a production of Aſconius Pedianus. This calumny, which at the bottom very much redounded to Valla's glory, met with no credit. Voſſius was very much in the right to call it impudent: ‘Admodum perfrictæ frontis fuiſſe neceſſe eſt, qui, cùm Laurentii Vallenſis Elegantiarum libros in honore eſſe dolerent, in vulgus ſparſere, eos jam olim in Germania fuiſſe repertos, quodque ſcripti eſſent literis fugientibus ac fatiſcentibus vix certis cognitum indiciis tandem fuiſſe, Aſconii Pediani eſſe opus: cujus calumniæ meminit Mariangelus Accurſius in diatribarum ſuarum defenſione, cui *Teſtudo* nomen fecit (44). - - - - *Thoſe men muſt have been very impudent, who, being vexed that Valla's book of Elegancies was eſteemed, gave out, that it had been found long before in Germany, and that becauſe it was not writ in a fair hand, it was at laſt with difficulty diſcovered to be the performance of Aſconius Pedianus; which calumny is mentioned by Mariangelus Accurſius in the defence of his diſſertations intituled* Teſtudo.

[*M*] *Ludovicus Vives praiſes him for a thing, which deſerves to be known.*] Notwithſtanding Valla's great diligence in diſcovering the propriety of terms, and teaching it his readers, yet he ſpared his pains when he met with an obſcene word, and ſeemed rather to deſire that its meaning ſhould remain unknown. This Vives with a great deal of reaſon approves. ‘Bene Laurentius Valla de verbo quodam obſcœno, ignorari malo quam me docente ſciri (45). - - - - *Laurentius Valla ſaid well concerning an obſcene word, I had rather it ſhould remain unknown than be made known by my means.*'

[*N*] *Mr Varillas hath committed ſeveral errors.*] I. He ſaith (46) that Laurence Valla, *finding no longer any body to cenſure in the court of Rome, went to that of Naples.* This is a double miſtake, he hath ill tranſlated his original, and advanced a thing, that has but little truth in it. The Latin which Varillas tranſlates, ſignifies that Laurentius Valla finding nothing at the Pope's court which pleaſed him, went to that of Alphonſus King of Naples (47). Is this to ſay, *that he found no longer any body to cenſure in the court of Rome?* Doth not this rather inſinuate the contrary, that there remained yet a great many to cenſure? For when every thing in a court diſpleaſes, the ſubject of cenſure is not exhauſted. We may take it for granted that a perſon of Valla's humour could never leave Rome for want of objects on which to employ his cenſure, becauſe all that could be ſaid againſt that court had already been ſaid. II. *Valla did not offer to write the hiſtory of the moſt illuſtrious events of Naples:* But he wrote the Hiſtory of Ferdinand King of Caſtile and Arragon, the Father of Alphonſus King of Naples. Here are two faults more; Paul Jovius's Latin ill tranſlated (48), and a falſity in the fact itſelf. III. There is a great deal of exceſs in the judgment Varillas paſſes againſt that book of Valla. *He wrote it .... with ſo little ſucceſs, they are his own words, that his adverſaries had room enough to reproach his falling into all the faults which he had cenſured in others.* He commits a third time the two errors, which I have mentioned. Paul Jovius's Latin (49) ſaith no ſuch thing, and it is utterly falſe that Laurentius Valla in writing this book, was guilty of all the barbariſms with which he charges other authors. IV. No body believes, though Mr Varillas's aſſures it, that Laurentius Valla exiled himſelf from the court of Naples, becauſe this work was ſlighted. He had other and more ſevere diſgraces (50), which forced him to leave that court. V. It is very ridiculous to imagine that this learned man's mother made his epitaph. It is true we find theſe words in the inſcription on his tomb, *Catharina mater filio pientiſſimo*

(*f*) *In chap. xxxiv, of the* Critical Hiſtory of the Commentators on the New Teſtament.

(38) *Yet Pontanus ſays, as we have already ſeen*, profiterique PALAM habere ſe quoque in Chriſtum ſpicula.

(39) Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

† Lib. I. de ſermone.

‡ Fol. 87. edit. anni 1513.

(40) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1447, *num.* 10.

‡ Laur. Vall. Not. in Epiſt. I. ad Cor. cap. ix, ver. 13.

(41) Simon, Hiſtoire Critique des Commentateurs du Nouveau Teſtament. *chap. xxxiv, pag.* 485.

(42) Theophil. Raynaudus, in Hoploth. §. *ii, Serie i, cap. v, pag. m.* 16, 17.

(43) Huetius, de claris Interpretibus, *pag. m.* 218.

(44) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Latinis, *lib. i, cap. xxvii, pag.* 144. *He quotes the* Teſtudo *of Mariangelus Accurſius.*

(45) Lud. Vives de tradendis Diſciplinis, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 287.

(46) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, *pag.* 166.

(47) Quod nihil in aula Pontificis ſibi placeret Neapolim ad Alfonſum regem ſe contulit. *Jovius, ubi ſupra, p.* 36.

(48) Apud quem (*Alfonſum regem*) de avitis bellis in Hiſpania atque Sicilia geſtis hiſtoria perſcripta eſt. *Id. ib.*

(49) Eo ſtyli charactere ut ejus minime videri poſſit qui cæteris elegantiarum præcepta tradiderit. *Id. ibid.*

(50) See, above, the remark [*D*].

poſuit; but according to the ſtyle of epitaphs, this imports no more, than that his mother cauſed his tomb to be erected. And allowing this falſe principle of Varillas, we may eaſily believe that ſeveral perſons who never underſtood one Latin word; have written very fine epitaphs in that language; for we find a great many under which we read *mæſtiſſima conjux* or *mater*, or *filia poſuit*, or *mæſtiſſimi filii poſuerunt*. VI. As one fault often introduces another, Mr Varillas falls into a freſh miſtake; for believing that Laurentius Valla's mother made her ſon's epitaph, he avers that *no body would ſave her that trouble*. VII. As to what he ſaith of Valla, that he gave an ill example *in the commonwealth of learning, by publiſhing firſt* (51) *intire books of invectives and recriminations*, I refer him to Mr de Larroque, who hath ſhewed him (52) that St Gregory Nazianzen, and St Hilary publiſhed invectives, the one againſt the Emperor Julian, and the other againſt the Emperor Conſtantius. We may yet go higher, for though there is room to doubt whether Salluſt's invective againſt Cicero, and that of Cicero againſt Salluſt, are really the performance of thoſe authors whoſe names they bear, yet it is certain that they are older than Conſtantine's time. It cannot be ſaid that Varillas intended only to ſpeak of Chriſtian writers; for the republic of letters of which he is ſpeaking doth not exclude Pagan authors. But if we ſhould have the complaiſance to confine ourſelves to the limits of Chriſtianity, we ſhould yet find other examples beſides thoſe mentioned by Mr Larroque. Have we not two works full of invectives, written by Ruffinus againſt St Jerom (53)? I elſewhere (54) mention an invective written in the very age of Laurentius Valla, but before he thought of writing his. And Petrarch who preceded him one hundred years, did not he write invectives againſt a Phyſician? VIII. It is not true that Laurentius Valla *praiſed no Grammarian of his time beſides* Candidus December (55). This is to be guilty of the ſame fault a fourth time; for the fact is utterly falſe, and he hath very ill tranſlated his original (56). Paul Jovius's words tend to the praiſe of December without excluding any other Grammarian.

(51) A groſs fault in diction; for thoſe words may be taken in this ſenſe, amongſt the intire books of Invectives, the firſt in rank was publiſhed by Laurentius Valla.

(52) Larroque, *preface to the* Nouvelles Accuſations contre Mr Varillas.

(53) They are commonly printed in the ninth volume of St Jerom's works.

(54) In the remark [*B*], of the article VERGERIUS.

(55) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 167.

(56) Candidus December . . . Laurentii Vallæ teſtimonio exactiſſimæ cenſuræ Grammaticus. *Paulus Jovius, in Elog. cap. xv, pag.* 39.

VALLA (GEORGE) a native of Piacenza. He was a phyſician and profeſſor of polite learning at Venice, and flouriſhed after the middle of the XVth century *(a)*. He was very well acquainted with the Greek and Latin tongues, and wrote ſeveral books of Phyſic and Literature [*A*]. He ſo irritated the Duke of Milan by his too impetuous zeal for the Trivulcian faction that the Duke perſecuted him, even to that degree as to cauſe him to be impriſoned at Venice *(b)*. He endured the moſt grievous hardſhips in this confinement; but being tried was acquitted, and his poſt reſtored to him. He did not long enjoy it, a ſudden death hurrying him out of the world ſoon after. He was juſt going out of his apartment in order to read his lecture; nothing ſtopped him but a natural neceſſity to go to the neceſſary houſe, where he expired in the ſame manner as Arius the Hereſiarch. His ſcholars waited a long while in the auditory, and were ſeized with great ſorrow [*B*], when acquainted with the reaſon why he did not come. He was that day to continue his explication of a paſſage in Cicero's *Tuſculanæ Quæſtiones*, which concerns the immortality of the ſoul *(c)*. Pierius Valerianus, who informs me of this particular,

(a) Claruit ſub Friderico III. juxta Trittemium verò ſub Maximiliano Venetiis A.C. 1494. Juſtus in Chronol. Medic. *Merklinus, in Lindenio renovato, pag.* 342. Konig places him in the year 1528. *Mr Baillet, Jugemens des Sçavans, num.* 909, ſuppoſes that he was alive in 1541.

(b) Pierius Valerianus, de Literatorum Infelicitate, *lib. i, pag. m.* 27.

(c) *Taken from* Pierius Valerianus, *ibid.*

[*A*] *He wrote ſeveral books of Phyſic and Literature.*] The titles of ſome of them are: *De tuenda ſanitate per victum, & quæ ſecundum cujuſque naturam in victu ſequenda aut fugienda ſunt. De humani corporis partibus. De differentiis pulſuum. De corporis commodis & incommodis. Univerſæ medicinæ ex Græcis potiſſimum contractæ libri ſeptem.* It is obſerved in *Lindenius renovatus*, that the laſt tract is a part of that intituled *expetenda & fugienda* (1). We may add that our Valla tranſlated out of Greek Rhazis *de Peſtilentia*, Pſellus *de victus ratione*, Alexander Aphrodiſienſis *de febrium cauſis & differentiis*, Nemeſius *de Natura hominis* (2), and ſome others (3). It is to be obſerved that Huetius calls him a very bad tranſlator (4). The books of Literature compoſed by Valla, are either treatiſes of Grammar and Rhetoric, or commentaries on ſome books of Tully, on Horace's Art of Poetry, on Juvenal, *&c.* He alſo commented on the ſecond book of Pliny: That work was printed at Venice in 1502, in 4to (§ *α*) and muſt needs be very ſcarce ſince Father Hardouin could not meet with it (5). But we muſt not forget his book *de expetendis & fugiendis rebus:* It is a ſort of Encyclopedia or body of all ſciences, of which Paul Jovius ſpeaks ſomewhat contemptibly; for doubtleſs the words which I am going to cite relate to this collection. 'Diſciplinas, literaſque omnes, uno ingenti volumine 'complexus, multa potius didiciſſe, quàm in eo celeri 'tranſcurſu perdiſcenda poſteris reliquiſſe videtur. 'Quandoquidem coacervantis omnia, indefeſſeque ſcribentis, requiſitus ille Romanæ elocutionis ſpiritus 'omnino defuerit, quo uno voluminum vita præclarè 'alitur, longiſſiméque producitur (6). - - - - *By comprizing all arts and ſciences in one large volume, he 'ſeems rather to have learned much himſelf, than to 'have left much to be learned by poſterity, in ſuch an 'haſty and precipitate manner. For whilſt he was collecting and writing every thing with indefatigable pains, 'he wanted that neceſſary ſpirit of Roman elocution, by 'which alone the life of books is ſuſtained and prolonged.*' John Peter Valla, the author's ſon, cauſed it to be printed, and very humbly acknowledged that the work was not perfect: he makes ſeveral excuſes to the reader (7) that death had prevented his father's putting his laſt hand to it. This work is divided into forty-nine books or ſeven weeks. It was very much criticized by Sorel (8). Geſner obſerves that George Valla borrowed ſeveral things from the Greeks without owning it. 'Nos ſane obſervavimus Georgium Vallam à 'Græcis permulta diſſimulanter eſſe mutuatum, & non 'pauca perperam in Latinum ſermonem tranſtuliſſe (9). '- - - *I have obſerved that George Valla borrowed very 'much from the Greeks without owning it, and tranſlated 'ſeveral things into Latin very wretchedly.*' He then deſerves to be put into the liſt of Plagiaries.

[(§ *α*) A copy of this edition paſſed through my hands at an auction, a little above a year ago: and John Peter Valla, the ſon of George, cauſed the ſame book to be reprinted in Folio, likewiſe at Venice, and alſo in 1502 by Simon Bevilaqua, with other works of his father, and particularly his *Commentationes in Ptolomæi Quadripartitum*, not mentioned by Mr Bayle. As for the reſt, two copies of this edition are in the King's library at Berlin. REM. CRIT.]

[*B*] *His ſcholars . . . . . were ſeized with great ſorrow.*] The following citation is longer than the text requires, but I ſhall ſtill venture to inſert it to ſhew what eſteem Valla's ſcholars had for him. 'Haud ita 'multo poſt cùm mane ſummo paratus eſſet conferre 'ſe ad auditorium, ubi tunc Tuſculanas Ciceronis 'quæſtiones prælegebat, deque animæ immortalitate 'vehementiſſimè, doctiſſimèque quotidie diſſerebat, 'dum interim corpori vacaturus excrementa cibi dejecit, animam etiam morte ſubitaria exhalavit. Nos 'qui quotidie ad admirandam hominis doctrinam ſub 'matutinum crepuſculum conveniebamus, non prius 'tali nos doctore defraudatos intelleximus, quam hora 'profitendi fruſtra elapſa certos, qui moræ cauſam 'ſciſcitarentur, domum ejus delegavimus, qui redeuntes gymnaſium noſtrum præter omnium ſpem, 'quia, nullum malæ valetudinis incommodum præceſſerat voce illa erudita ſpoliatum, atque orbatum 'renunciaverunt (10). - - - *Not long after, as he was 'ready to go one morning early to his auditory, where 'he then explained Cicero's Tuſculan queſtions, and with 'great learning and force of argument read lectures every 'day on the immortality of the ſoul, he went aſide to 'eaſe nature, and in the mean time died ſuddenly. We 'who came every morning betimes to attend his admirable leſſons knew nothing of our great loſs, till the 'hour*

(1) Extant operis ſui expetendorum & fugiendorum libri 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. *Mercklinus, in Lindenio renovato, pag.* 342.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) *See* Geſnerus's Bibliotheca, *fol.* 273.

(4) Nec felicius Georgio Vallæ labor ille ſucceſſit, nam & à Græcis diſſentit ſæpe, & quæ aſſequitur non raro pervertit. *Huetius, de claris Interpretibus*, pag. m. 221. See, below, Geſnerus's words.

(5) *Vide* Harduini *Præfation. in* Plinium.

(6) Paulus Jovius, in Elog. *cap. cxiii, p.* 256.

(7) In Epiſtola nuncupatoria. *See* Geſner, in Biblioth. *fol*, 273.

(8) Sorel, de la Perfection de l'Homme, *pag.* 289, 290.

(9) Geſn. ubi ſupra.

(10) Pierius Valerianus, de Literator. Infelicit. *lib. i, p.* 27, 28.

cular, makes very judicious reflections on this kind of death [C].

‘ *hour of teaching being elapſed, we ſent ſome perſons to* ‘ *his houſe to inquire the reaſon of his not coming; and* ‘ *upon their return they acquainted us with the melancholy news of his death, which was a great ſurprize* ‘ *to us all, becauſe he had had no manner of illneſs* ‘ *before.*’

[C] *Pierius Valerianus . . . . . makes very judicious reflexions on this kind of death.*] He firſt obſerves that ſome may think George Valla's dying without any ſickneſs to be a great happineſs. He afterwards ſaith that according to the Chriſtian doctrine, ſudden death ought to be looked on as a misfortune. He then obſerves that according to Philoſophy this accident and all others, which do not depend on us, ought not to paſs for evils. Finally, he would have us believe that Valla's manner of death was a happineſs, ſince it was not preceded by pains and uneaſineſs. *Erunt qui genus hoc mortis inter mortalium felicitates enumerabunt, quippe nullo dolore prævio, nulloque mortis metu ſtatim exanimari. Nos tamen ex Chriſtianæ pietatis inſtitutis miſerrimum hoc exiſtimamus, ex Philoſophiæ verò præceptis, neque quidem calamitates alias, quæ alterius, non noſtri juris ſunt, mala exiſtimo; ſed erit ſuper hoc alias diſſerendi locus. At fuerit felix Valla, quia cruciatu nullo, nulliuſque rei anxius è vita migravit: nobis certè ejus diſcipulis calamitoſa fuit hominis mors, quibus eruditionis ſuæ tam triſte deſiderium reliquit* (11). All this is very juſt; for the tormenting pains of a diſeaſe of fifteen days, and the languiſhing weakneſs of a long diſtemper, reduce a man to a miſerable ſtate naturally ſpeaking. He is incapable of enjoying either forbidden or lawful pleaſures; he ſuffers in body and mind; his members render him ſenſible of ſeveral uneaſineſſes; his reaſon is enfeebled; he is peeviſh, he is afraid of death, and cannot think of the approach of this King of terrors without horror. A ſudden death ſpares all this, and ought therefore to paſs for a great happineſs, unleſs we reflect on the goſpel-principles. Wherefore Pierius Valerianus very judiciouſly inſerted this exception. Chriſtianity teaches us that a ſinner ſhall not enter into the kingdom of heaven without repentance: and experience convinces us that all men are ſinners. According to theſe principles we ought to look upon ſudden death as a very great evil, ſeeing the dead perſon hath not had ſufficient time to humble himſelf before GOD, and implore his mercy through the merits of JESUS CHRIST. Now a man, who preſents himſelf an impenitent ſinner before the throne of GOD, can expect nothing but eternal damnation. This is the Chriſtian doctrine. It is in vain to alledge that a man predeſtinated to ſalvation, cannot die impenitent, ſuppoſe his death never ſo ſudden; and that a reprobate cannot die penitent though his death is preceded by a tedious ſickneſs: it is in vain, I ſay, to alledge this; for this reflexion will not ſatisfy the ſcruples of thoſe who reaſon in this manner, *viz.* a man predeſtinated to ſalvation always reconciles himſelf to GOD before his death; thoſe who die ſuddenly have no time to reconcile themſelves to GOD; they are not therefore predeſtinated to ſalvation. I own it would be raſh to aſſert the minor of this ſyllogiſm as a certain truth; but after all it is the moſt ſpecious argument againſt the advantage which ſeveral pretend to find in a ſudden death. They do not fail to obſerve that diſeaſes are very often great obſtacles to repentance, either becauſe they deprive us of our ſenſes and judgment, or becauſe they ſo much enfeeble our reaſon, and memory, that we are not very well qualified to reflect on the goſpel truths, or to make a good uſe of the exhortations of a Divine, or in fine, becauſe when they prove long and lingering they occaſion complaints and murmurs. This diſpoſition leads directly to impenitence, and hardneſs of heart, and ſometimes to impiety itſelf. Though we ſhould agree to all this, yet we may very juſtly aſſert that diſeaſes moſt commonly produce a better effect. So that to pronounce George Valla's death happy, it ought not to be conſidered according to the Chriſtian principles, but looked on with the eyes of Auguſtus. In the judgment of that Emperor, that was the happy death which was preceded by no pain; he deſired ſuch a death for himſelf and his friends. He found herein what good men find in the death of the juſt, that is, the object of his wiſhes. He obtained almoſt what he deſired. ‘ Sortitus exitum facilem & qualem ſemper optaverat. Nam fere quoties audiſſet cito ac nullo cruciatu defunctum quempiam ſibi & ſuis ἐυθανασίαν ſimilem (hoc enim & verbo uti ſolebat) precabatur (12). - - - *He obtained an eaſy death, and ſuch as he had always wiſhed for. For whenever he heard that any one died ſuddenly, and without pain, he prayed that ſuch a good and eaſy death (which was the expreſſion he commonly uſed) might happen to himſelf and his friends.*’ Cæſar, whoſe ſon he was by adoption, was of the ſame opinion. He deſpiſed the lazy death of Cyrus mentioned by Xenophon, and nothing ſeemed to him preferable to leaving the world unexpectedly. ‘ Illud plane inter omnes fere conſtitit, talem ei mortem pene ex ſententia obtigiſſe. Nam & quondam cum apud Xenophontem legiſſet, Cyrum ultima valetudine mandaſſe quædam de funere ſuo, aſpernatus tam lentum mortis genus, ſubitam ſibi celeremque optaverat. Et pridie quam occideretur in ſermone nato ſuper cœnam, apud M. Lepidum, quiſnam eſſet finis vitæ commodiſſimus, repentinum inopinatumque prætulerat (13). - - - *All agree, that his death was ſuch as he had deſired. For when he read in Xenophon that Cyrus, in his laſt illneſs, gave directions concerning his funeral, he deſpiſed ſuch a lingering death, and wiſhed for a quick and ſudden one. And the day before he was killed, as he was at dinner with M. Lepidus, a queſtion being ſtarted, what ſort of death is moſt eligible, he declared that he preferred that which is ſudden and unexpected.*’ Heſiod reckons it amongſt the prerogatives of the golden age that men then died in the arms of ſleep. One of our Critics has blamed Ovid for omitting this privilege in his deſcription of the felicities of that age. Mr Menage remembered this cenſure, when he ſaid that his father died in that manner. His words are: ‘ At verò cum dormiturus caput in cervical inclinaſſet, ecce tibi confeſtim exanimatus eſt. Dictum eſt ſenis Aſcræi, aurea ætate mortales quaſi domitos ſomno interiiſſe: quam rem optimam, ut hoc te obiter doceam; neque enim te docendi occaſionem ullam prætermittere debere mihi videor; in optimi illius ſæculi deſcriptione omittere Pelignum Vatem non debuiſſe, rectè à Julio Scaligero animadverſum. Eo igitur modo placido & quieto parens meus fato functus eſt (14). - - - *But as he laid his head upon the pillow in order to ſleep, he immediately expired. Heſiod ſays, that in the golden age men died as if overwhelmed with ſleep: which happineſs, by the way, for I ought to omit no opportunity of inſtructing you, is not mentioned by Ovid in the deſcription of that golden age, as Julius Scaliger rightly obſerves. It was in that calm and quiet manner my father died.*’ You ſee plainly that his taſte and that of Scaliger the father (15) were agreeable to that of Auguſtus. They would willingly have applied to them who died thus, the proverb, *Le bien leur vient en dormant,* - - - *Happineſs comes to them in their ſleep.* See the remark [F] of the article REGIUS.

(11) Id. ibid. *pag.* 28.

(12) Sueton. in Auguſto, *cap.* c.

(13) Sueton. in Cæſare, *cap.* lxxxvii.

(14) Ægidius Menagius, in Vita Guillelmi Menagii, *pag.* 76, 77.

(15) In his remark upon the paſſage quoted by me, Menage ſpeaks thus: *Theſe are the words of Julius Scaliger, in the eighth chapter of the fifth book* de Poetica. Omiſit autem illud Heſiodi, longè optimum in hac ætate, Θνῇσκον δ' ὡς ὕπνῳ δεδμημένοι. *The paſſage of Heſiod is in his* Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι.

VALLA (NICOLAS) Doctor of the Civil-Law, and Canon of St Peter's Church at Rome, lived in the XVth century. He undertook to tranſlate Homer's Iliad into Latin verſe, but death prevented his compleating that work (*a*). What he had already tranſlated was printed after his death in the year 1474, and reprinted in 1541 [*A*]. We

(*a*) *See* Voſſius, de Poët. Lat. *pag.* 80.

[*A*] *What he had already tranſlated was printed in the year 1474, and reprinted in 1541.*] The firſt of theſe editions was made at Rome, and was neither known to Geſner or his abridgers, it contains the iiid, ivth, vth, xiiith (1), xviiith, xxth, xxiid, xxiiid and xxivth books of the Iliad, and a ſmall portion of the xixth. To the ſecond edition were added Joſeph Iſcan's ſix books *de Bello Trojano*, and the tranſlation of four books of Homer (2) in Latin verſe by Opſopœus (3).

(1) *Except above two hundred verſes at the end. See* Voſſius, de Poët. Lat. *pag.* 80.

(2) *Viz.* the 1ſt, 2d, 9th, and 10th, of the Iliad. *Voſſius, ibid.*

(3) *Taken from* Voſſius, ibid.

We have alſo his Latin verſion of a poem of Heſiod *(b)*, and two letters in Elegiac verſe. He died very young [*B*] in 1473 *(c)*. His father LÆLIUS VALLA *(d)*, Doctor of Law, was Conſiſtorial Advocate *(e)*.

(*b*) That which is intituled Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι, *Opera & Dies.* This tranſlation is in Epic verſe, and was dedicated to Pius II. See *Geſnerus*, in Biblioth. *fol.* 524. (*c*) Konig, Biblioth. *pag.* 828, *where he obſerves that his epitaph is to be found at pag.* 117, *of* Fabricius's Roma. (*d*) *Or* de Valle. (*e*) Voſſius, *ibid.*

[*B*] *He died very young.*] This Voſſius doth not mention, but we find it in Pierius Valerianus. ‘Inter Romanos autem, *ſaith he* (4), paucis antè annis non ignobilis fuit Nicolaus Valla, ſummæ juvenis eruditionis, Græcis, Latiniſque literis apprimè doctus, qui quidem adoleſcens admodum ad Homeri ſublimitatem eleganti Latini carminis facilitate cæperat aſpirare. Is tamen nondum alterum à vigeſimo egreſſus annum fati quadam inclementia eruditorum omnium ſpei ſurreptus eſt. - - - *A few years ago Nicolas Valla was in great reputation at Rome, being a young man of great learning, and perfectly ſkilled in Greek and Latin. When he was but a lad, he attempted to imitate Homer's ſublimity in elegant and fluent Latin verſe. Before he was quite twenty-one years of age he was ſnatched away by cruel fate to the ſorrow of all learned men.*’ What occaſions ſome difficulty is that Valerianus, who wrote in Clement the ſeventh's time (5), ſaith, that a few years before Valla died at the age of twenty-one. If we go to the rigour of exactneſs, this doth not very well ſuit a perſon, who dedicated a Poem to Pius II. Obſerve that I here conſider the particular ways, by which Valerianus commonly expreſſes himſelf in the tract which I cite.

(4) Pierius Valer. de Litterat. Infel. *lib. ii, pag.* 55.

(5) *See his Tract* de Litterat. Infelicitate, *init. & pag.* 11.

VALLA (NICOLAS) in French *du Val*, Counſellor in the Parliament of Paris *(a)*, and afterwards in the Parliament of Rennes, is the author of a Civil-Law book [*A*] which is pretty much eſteemed. He flouriſhed in the XVth century. He mentions his ſon-in-law James Capel, who was Counſellor in the parliament of Bretagne *(b)*. Konig, confounds him with Nicholas Valla, who is the ſubject of the preceding article *(c)*. It is not improbable that our du Val was the Counſellor of the parliament of Paris, who was ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm in the famous *Mercuriale* of 1559, and by flight avoided the danger which threatned him *(d)*. Thuanus calls him Nicolaus Valla *(e)*.

(*a*) *See* Paſquier, Recherch. de la France, *livr. ix, ch. xxxix, pag. m.* 902.

(*b*) Nicolaus Valla, de Rebus dubiis, *Tract. viii, circa fin. pag. m.* 136. (*c*) Konig. Biblioth. *pag.* 828, *where he aſcribes to Nicolas Valla, the tranſlator of Heſiod, who died at Rome in* 1473, *the treatiſe* de Rebus dubiis. (*d*) Thuan. *lib. xxii, pag. m.* 453. (*e*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 452.

[*A*] *He is author of a Civil Law-book.*] The title of it is: *De Rebus dubiis & quæſtionibus in jure controverſis Tractatus XX.* I make uſe of the fifth edition at Arnheim, 1638, in 4to.

VALLE (ROLANDUS à) an Italian Civilian, lived in the XVIth century. He was not born at Caſalmaggiore in the Milaneze, as ſome have believed, but at Caſal in Montferrat [*A*]. He wrote many books, whereof ſeveral editions have been printed in Italy, France, and Germany [*B*]. His Latin ſtile is very mean, and has nothing of that politeneſs which was already introduced among the Civilians.

[*A*] *He was not born at Caſalmaggiore in the Milaneze, as ſome have believed, but at Caſal in Montferrat.*] Quenſtedt, who is not ignorant that he was *Patritius Caſalenſis, Eques & Primarius Montisferrati Senator,* - - - *A nobleman of Caſal, knight, and chief ſenator of Montferrat*; (theſe are the titles he takes at the beginning of his works) imagines falſely that he was of Caſalmaggiore, and places him amongſt thoſe illuſtrious men whom the Milaneze has produced (1). I ſhall here give a convincing proof of his error, and which, by the way, will inform us of the miſerable condition that Montferrat was reduced to by the war in 1551. ‘Practicus Papien . . . . dicit ſe hanc quæſtionem habuiſſe IN PATRIA MEA MONTISFERRATI, (quæ hodierna die, quæ eſt dies 27 Septemb. Anni 1551, eſt multùm infœliciſſima propter bellorum tumultus, tot tantaſque hoſpitationes militum, quæ adeo intolerabiles ſunt quod coguntur nedum pauperes, verum etiam & nobiles & divites omnem ſubſtantiam viliſſimo pretio vendere, ac derelinquere patriam, & in externas Provincias ſe conferre) qui movetur (2). - - - *Practicus Papien* . . . . *ſays that he treated this queſtion,* IN MY COUNTRY OF MONTFERRAT, *which at this day, that is the 27th of September* 1551, *is by far the moſt miſerable of all countries, becauſe of the confuſion of war, and the frequent and heavy quartering of ſoldiers, which is ſo intolerable, that not only the poor, but the noble and rich are forced to ſell all their ſubſtance for a meer trifle, and to leave their native country, and go into foreign parts.*’

(1) Quenſtedt, de Patriis Viror. illuſtrium, *pag.* 295.

(2) Roland, à Valle, in Tractatu de lucro dotis, *Quæſt. xxvi, pag.* 96, *Edit. Colon.* 1599.

[*B*] *He wrote many books, whereof ſeveral editions had been printed, in Italy . . . . and Germany.*] His treatiſe *De lucro dotis*, printed at Venice, in the year 1567, and 1584, was reprinted at Cologn, in 1559, in 8vo; as alſo his treatiſe *de Inventarii Confectione*, which had been publiſhed at Venice in 8vo, in the year 1573, and 1584. His Counſels *quibus graves præcipuæ Juris Controverſiæ, de Jure in Regnis, Principatibus, Ducatibus, Comitatibus, Marchionatibus, & Feudis acquirendo vel amittendo deciduntur, &c.* contain four volumes in folio in the Venice edition, 1592. They have been already printed in the ſame city ſeparately, and the two firſt had been reprinted at Lyons in the year 1566, and with the third, in the year 1580 (3).

(3) *See the* Epitome de la Bibl. de Geſn. *pag. m.* 736, *and the Oxford Catalogue, pag.* 220.

VALLÉE (GODFREY DE LA) a native of Orleans publiſhed a book at Paris intituled *Erre Geru, le fleau de la Foy bigarrée.* It is full of blaſphemies and impieties againſt JESUS CHRIST. This author was burnt at Paris for his hereſy in the year 1574. He was commonly called *handſome Vallée (a)*. This is what we find in *la Croix du Maine's Bibliotheque Françoiſe.* Others ſay he was burnt for atheiſm at Paris in 1571, and that he wrote a book intituled *The art of believing nothing (b)*. Maldonatus made a falſe reflexion on a paſſage which he pretends to be in that book [*A*]. I wonder that

(*a*) *Taken from* La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 125. *Renatus de la Barre, at the beginning of his Notes upon* Novatianus de Trinitate, *ſays that man was called* Bellum Vallenſem. *That is,* handſome Vallée.

(*b*) Maldonatus in Matth. *cap. xxvi, pag. m.* 572, *in the margin. Others ſay it was in the year* 1572.

[*A*] *Maldonatus made a falſe reflexion on a paſſage which he pretends to be in that book.*] This Jeſuit's words are: ‘Nonnulli progreſſi ſunt longius, ut nihil crederent, quorum unus cum libellum quendam his annis de arte nihil credendi compoſuiſſet, nihil in eo niſi hoc unum verum dixit, oportere prius Calviniſtam fieri qui atheus eſſe volet. Fuerat ille antea Calviniſta, fuit poſtea atheus, & unicuique in ſua arte credendum eſt. Veriſſima ſententia: nam quiſquis Calviniſta eſt, ſi ea quam ingreſſus eſt incredulitatis

that ſo few authors have mentioned that Atheiſt, and that moſt of thoſe who have taken notice of him have grounded what they ſay on the evidence of this Spaniſh Jeſuit.

‘ dulitatis via ire pergat, ad nihil credendum perve‘ niat neceſſe eſt (1). - - - *Some have proceeded ſo far* ‘ *as to believe nothing, one of whom having within* ‘ *theſe few years written a ſmall book concerning the* ‘ *Art of believing nothing, has not ſaid one word of* ‘ *truth in it except this, that whoever would be an* ‘ *Atheiſt, ought firſt to be a Calviniſt. He had before* ‘ *been a Calviniſt, and afterwards turned Atheiſt, and* ‘ *every one is to be believed in his own profeſſion. It is* ‘ *a very true ſaying : for whoever is a Calviniſt, if he* ‘ *goes on in the ſame way of incredulity which he has be*‘ *gun, muſt at laſt come to believe nothing*.’ It is incredible how many Jeſuits and other controverſial writers amongſt the Romaniſts, have copied this paſſage of Maldonatus. Several of them have at the ſame time corrupted it ; for they ſuppoſe that Godfrey de la Vallée in his book endeavoured to prove at large, that whoſoever would be an Atheiſt ought firſt to be a Calviniſt (2). Maldonatus never ſaid that this aſſertion was amply handled in the little book *de Arte nihil credendi*. His copiers have not trodden in his footſteps in reaſoning on that head. They ſuppoſe this Atheiſt to have ſaid ſo becauſe he believed the Calviniſtical ſect to be ſo abominable, that all thoſe who took a near view of it would rather chuſe to profeſs no religion than that. *Cur autem dixit eum, qui atheus eſſe volet, oportere prius Calviniſtam fieri ; niſi quod putaret, tam fœdam ac profligatam eſſe Calvini ſectam, ut qui eam prope aſpexiſſet, mallet nullam, quàm talem ſectam profiteri* (3) ? Theſe are the words of the Jeſuit Becanus. He adds, that the fruits of Calviniſm are more pernicious than thoſe of Atheiſm, and that tho' the Atheiſts do not believe a Providence, yet they in many particulars obſerve the rules of virtue. They are not guilty either of robbery or murder ; they abhor a lie, they keep their word, they abominate unjuſt wars, and love peace : but, on the contrary, Calvin's diſciples are inſtructed not to regard lying, perjury, adultery, and ſacrilege ; for they believe that GOD hath impoſed on them a neceſſity of committing them, and that the Elect cannot periſh whatever they are guilty of. *Si ex fructu doctrina cognoſcenda eſt ; pejores fructus Calvini, quàm Atheorum Doctrina parit. Hi tametſi negent Deum aliquem orbi præſidere, honeſtatem tamen, & rectæ rationis ductum ac directionem in multis ſequuntur, & multa rectè agunt, quæ laudari poſſunt. Cavent furta, homicidia, rapinas, à mendacio abhorrent ; juramenti religionem colunt ; ſervant fidem alteri promiſſam ; bellum injuſtum deteſtantur ; pacem ac tranquillitatem amant. At contra docentur à Calvino diſcipuli, parvi pendere mendacia, perjuria, adulteria, rapinas, libidines, ſacrilegia. Unde hoc ? Quia Deus, inquiunt, æterna ſua prædeſtinatione neceſſitatem, &c* (4). This objection of Becanus is too ridiculous to ſtand in need of any caution againſt it. For which reaſon I ſhall content myſelf with barely ſaying that he had appeared leſs ridiculous, if he had exactly followed his original. I do not pretend that in arguing as Maldonatus hath done, he would have reaſoned juſtly ; I only ſay his objection had been leſs abſurd. Maldonatus's reflexion runs thus : that Calviniſm having once ſhook off the yoke of tradition with regard to the Real Preſence, under pretence that it is an opinion clogged with a thouſand difficulties contrary to ſenſe and reaſon, hath put all ſorts of Heretics in the way of rejecting all myſteries ; and that ſome of the moſt ſubtle and incredulous Calviniſts have made uſe of the ſame arguments to deny the Trinity, which they had formerly uſed againſt Tranſubſtantiation (5). Some, adds he, advance farther, even ſo far as to believe nothing, and the road they have got into muſt neceſſarily lead them ſo far. He goes on thus : what I have obſerved is not deſigned to injure the Calviniſts, but to ſhew them the precipice that is at their journey's end, that a view of this imminent danger may divert them from the way of perdition. Two things in this common-place of Maldonatus deſerve to be cenſured ; for, in the firſt place, to grant that preferring the light of reaſon to the authority of thoſe councils, which have determined the Real Preſence, leads to Atheiſm, is giving too great an advantage to Libertines and Free-thinkers. Is it not avowing that the doctrine of the exiſtence of GOD is not leſs contrary to common ſenſe than that of Tranſubſtantiation ? Is it not aſſerting that to believe this exiſtence, we ought blindly to ſacrifice the cleareſt light of Philoſophy to the authority of tradition ; as we ought to ſacrifice it to the ſame authority, in order to believe the Romiſh opinion concerning the Euchariſt ? But what can be more pernicious to religion than ſuch an avowal ? It is therefore very neceſſary to limit this objection. He ought only to have ſaid that ſuch a breach being made in the deciſions of the councils by denying the Real Preſence, may grow ſo wide, as to extend to other incomprehenſible opinions of the Church of Rome. 2. Maldonatus was ignorant of the principles of thoſe whom he calls Calviniſts. They are ſo far from teaching, that we ought to reject a doctrine becauſe our reaſon cannot comprehend it, or is capable of offering almoſt invincible arguments againſt it, that they are the firſt who aſſert, and are always ready to maintain, that nothing can be more pernicious, than to regulate ourſelves by reaſon in the choice of ſome particular doctrines. This is what they inceſſantly alledge againſt the Socinians, always urging the neceſſity of ſubjecting our underſtanding to the obedience of faith. So that tho' the opinion which this Spaniſh Jeſuit attacks, was as dangerous as he repreſents it : yet what he advances againſt the Calviniſts by endeavouring to take an advantage of la Vallée's book againſt them, would be abſolutely unjuſt. In ſuch a critical work as this, it is neceſſary that not only errors in fact, but alſo the ill uſe of true facts ſhould be handled in this manner.

(1) Maldonat. in Evangel. Matthæi, *cap. xxvi, pag. m.* 572.

(2) In ſuo libro *de Arte nihil credendi*, fuſe contendit eum qui Atheus futurus eſt, Calviniſtam prius eſſe debere. *Henricus Fitz Simon, Brittanom.* pag. 107.

(3) Martinus Becanus, Opuſculorum Theologicorum, *Tom. i, pag. m.* 175.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Multos jam Calviniſtas videmus qui ingenioſiores & magis increduli, id eſt magis Calviniſtæ cæteris erant, eò jam perveniſſe, ut qua ratione hoc prius myſterium (*Euchariſtiæ*) non credebant, nunc Trinitatis myſterium non credant, cæteroſque Calviniſtas ſicut Calviniſtæ nos tanquam nimis ſimplices & credulos rideant. *Maldonatus, ibid.*

VANDER-LINDEN (JOHN ANTONIDES) Profeſſor of Phyſic at Leyden, was not the firſt learned man of his family. Some of his anceſtors diſtinguiſhed themſelves in the republic of letters, as we are informed by his funeral oration, where we find a very exact genealogy of his family [*A*]. He was born at Enckhuyſen (*a*) on the 13th of January, 1609. He was ſent to the univerſity of Leyden in the year 1625, to ſtudy Philoſophy ; and afterwards wholly applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Phyſic. From Leyden,

(*a*) It is a town in North-Holland.

[*A*] *We find a very exact genealogy of his family*] It reaches as high as his *abavus*, or his great-grandfather's father, who was Hen. REGNIER, a burgher of Harderwick, whoſe houſe being burnt in the conflagration which conſumed that town, he removed to Naerden (1). There his ſon ANTONY was preferred to be maſter of a claſs, chanter in the choir, and ſecretary to that city : he was a ſtrict Papiſt, but orthodox in a point which, according to Cocceius, is of the higheſt importance to Chriſtianity (2), I mean the right which the children of GOD obtain in JESUS CHRIST by faith, as being made one body with him by his Spirit. Antony left a ſon named Henry, born in 1546, who acquainted himſelf throughly with the learned languages, and with a Chriſtian conſtancy ſuffered a great many afflictions for the Reformed religion. He was very young when he firſt approved of the Reformation, and applied himſelf to the inſtruction of the perſecuted Proteſtants, and even of little children. Being in a boat where the paſſengers refuſed to make room for a young gentlewoman of Guelderland, each urging they could not croud themſelves any cloſer ; he, notwithſtanding, by preſſing, made room for her to ſit (3). He diſcovered ſuch a ſolid piety in this lady, that he fell in love with her, and, with the conſent of her relations, married her. She was the faithful companion of his travels

(1) It is the chief town of Goyland, on the borders of the provinces of Guelderland, and Utrecht.

(2) Sacris Papiſticis diu immixtus, niſi quod de juſtitia Dei, h. e. jure filiorum Dei, quod in Chriſto per fidem, per Spiritum ipſius unum corpus cum ſemper habuerit ipſo facti obtinemus (qui religionis Chriſtianæ apex eſt) integram ſententiam. *Cocceius, in Orat. funebri.*

(3) Eam Virginem primum in navi cum eam recepiſſet in multitudine, ut ſolet arctius ſedere renuente, ob pietatem amavit & conjugem optavit, ac deinde à parentibus impetravit. *Ibid.*

Leyden he went to Franeker, in order to continue his ſtudies there in the year 1629, where he took his degree of Doctor of Phyſic ſome months after. His father, who had practiſed Phyſic at Amſterdam ever ſince the year 1625, called him home in order to inſtruct him in the method of practice, and died in 1633. Our Vander-linden continued in the exerciſe of that Faculty, of which he acquitted himſelf with ſo much reputation, that in the year 1639 he was invited to be profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Franeker. He very worthily filled that place for almoſt twelve years. He read lectures on the theorical and practical parts, on Anatomy and Botanics, and it was to his care that the enlargement of the univerſity garden, and the building of an houſe there were owing. The library was not leſs indebted to him; for whilſt he had the direction of it, he ſupplied it with a great many books, by an addreſs which engaged the nobility to that good work. The univerſity of Utrecht offered him a profeſſor's place in 1649, which he refuſed; but two years after he accepted of that which was offered him by the curators of the univerſity of Leyden. He worthily diſcharged all theſe functions till his death, which happened on the 5th of March 1664 (*b*). He was author of ſeveral books [*B*], and editor of others [*C*]. His employment remained vacant till May 1668, when Mr Drelincourt was called to ſucceed him. See Guy Patin's 501ſt letter, in the 464th page

(*b*) Taken from his funeral Oration, pronounced by John Cocceius, profeſſor of Divinity.

travels and dangers. He loſt his father, father-in-law, his relations and friends at the Spaniſh maſſacre at Naerden in 1572. After this fatal accident, he exerciſed the miniſterial function at Enckhuyſen, till the year 1585, when he was invited to be profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker. He was the firſt who read lectures in that univerſity, and it was he who pronounced that inaugural oration of the univerſity, *Quam Academiam ipſe initiavit oratione prima & lectione* (4). Hence, by the way, we are informed, when that univerſity was founded. He continued in this profeſſorſhip till he died, which was in 1614. He left ſeveral children. Antony, the eldeſt, was a learned man; whoſe great knowledge of claſſic learning engaged the magiſtrates of Enckhuyſen to make him rector of their college. He was beſides, a good Muſician, and a good Organiſt; he was no novice in Theology; but what he excelled in was Phyſic, of which he commenced Doctor at Franeker in the year 1608, and practiſed it with great ſucceſs and reputation, firſt at Enckhuyſen, and afterwards at Amſterdam (5). I have already ſaid (6) that he died in 1633, and that the Leyden profeſſor, John Antonides Vander-Linden was his ſon. Cocceius enlarges very much on the maternal relations of the deceaſed: herein doubtleſs he is too particular; but in general the funeral orations in the northern univerſities art of this ſort. I believe the word *Antonides* was formed in imitation of the patronymical names of the antient Poets. Tho' I own that there are ſome families in Holland of the name of Antonides. Yet probably it was at firſt no more than a patronymical name.

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] The titles of them are: *Univerſæ Medicinæ Compendium, quinque centuriis ſub Clypeo Clariſſ. viri D. Menelai Winſhemii Med. Doct. & in illuſtri Friſiorum Academia ejuſdem Facultatis & Anatomes Profeſſoris, publico examini decem Diſputationibus propoſitum. Addita eſt centuria inauguralis poſitionum Medico-practicarum de virulentia venerea, ibidem propoſita & defenſa ad diem* 18 *Octobris* 1630. Theſe are properly the Theſes on Phyſic which he maintained in order to be admitted Doctor in 1630. *Medulla Medicinæ partibus quatuor comprehenſa.* Printed at Franeker 1642, in 8vo. *Medicina Phyſiologica novâ curatâque methodo ex optimis quibuſque Auctoribus contracta, & propriis obſervationibus locupletata.* At Amſterdam 1653, in 4to. *Selecta Medica & ad ea exercitationes Batavicæ.* At Leyden in 1656, in 4to. But this book more properly falls under the following remark than under this, it being a collection of ſeveral pieces of Hippocrates, and other antient authors. *Diſſertatio de Lacte*, this is amongſt Deuſingius's diſſertations, publiſhed at Groningen 1655, in 12mo. *De Hemicrania menſtrua, hiſtoria & conſilium.* Printed at Leyden 1660, and 1668, in 4to. *Meletemata Medicinæ Hippocraticæ.* At Leyden 1660, and at Francfort 1672, in 4to. *Hippocrates de circuitu ſanguinis.* At Leyden 1661, in 4to. *De Scriptis Medicis Libri duo, quibus præmittitur Manuductio ad Medicinam.* This piece was three times printed at Amſterdam by John Blaeu, in 1637, 1651, and 1662, in 8vo. It is a catalogue of books written on Phyſic. The author improved it at every edition; and after his death Merklinus, a German, very conſiderably enlarged it, and publiſhed it in a large volume in 4to, intituled *Lindenius renovatus*. It is printed at Nuremberg 1686. It is from this edition that I have taken the catalogue of Vander-Linden's books, which I have inſerted in this remark.

This book of Vander-Linden, *de Scriptis Medicis*, hath had the fate of all works of this nature; tho' they be very much corrected, and enlarged in every new edition, yet they remain imperfect ſtill. See Voglerus's cenſure on this book of Vander-Linden (7). How large ſo ever the additions of Merklinus are, we are yet far from finding in his edition all thoſe authors who have writ books on Phyſic. This I will prove by an example: there are in it five authors named MARTIN, and yet BERNARDIN MARTIN, born at Paris on the 8th of January 1629, is omitted. He was the ſon of Samuel Martin, Apothecary to Mary de Medicis, Queen of France, and publiſhed a treatiſe of the uſe of Milk, and another upon the breeding of Teeth, both which were very well received and approved by the Faculty of Paris (8). He alſo wrote a relation of his travels in Spain, Portugal, Holland, and Germany, &c. which contains ſome very remarkable things. The late Prince of Condé deſired his attendance on his perſon in 1669. Martin, from that time to the death of that great prince, diſcharged his function very well, and received ſeveral marks of his highneſs's affection. The preſent Prince of Condé (9), only ſon of the late Prince, had him always in his houſe (10). Since Merklinus's edition often contains an abridgment of the lives of the writers on Phyſic, this may, on ſeveral accounts, be ſerviceable to thoſe who ſhall make additions to the *Lindenius Renovatus*.

[*C*] *He was editor of others.*] Let us continue our extracts from the book juſt now cited (11). *Adriani Spigelii Opera quæ extant omnia, recenſuit & cum addita præfatione edidit*, at Amſterdam 1645, in folio. *Hier. Cardani, de utilitate ex adverſis capienda libros iv. ſerio emendatos edidit*, at Franeker, 1648, in 8vo. *Cornel. Celſi de Medicina libros octo recognovit & edidit*, at Leyden, 1657, and 1665, in 12mo. *Hippocratis Coi Opera omnia Græcè & Latinèduobus voluminibus comprehenſa, & ad omnes alias editiones accommodata, edidit*, at Leyden 1665, in 8vo. This edition of Hippocrates was not entirely finiſhed when Vander-Linden died. He beſtowed a great deal of care on it. The *Journal des Sçavans* ſpoke of it thus: 'This 'new edition . . . . hath the advantage of anſwering 'all the former, by the help of the figures in the 'margin, which ſhew in what page and place every 'thing is to be found. So that it is preferable to all 'other editions, and remedies the confuſion intro'duced by their diverſity, when a paſſage was to be 'looked for. It is alſo the moſt correct of them all, 'for Mr Vander-Linden having carefully compared 'all the old editions with ſeveral manuſcripts, hath 'reſtored a great number of places, not before cor'rected even Foëſius's edition. The Latin verſion he 'hath choſen is that of Cornarius, becauſe it is the 'oldeſt, and that which is commonly uſed. Death 'ſurprized him a little before this edition was finiſhed, 'which prevented his publiſhing the remarks he de'ſigned to make on Hippocrates (12).' Cocceius touches on this laſt particular: 'Scio τὸν μακαρίτην

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) He wrote ſeveral books about Phyſic, and other ſciences. His ſon has given a catalogue of the books of Phyſic, in his tract *de Scriptis Medicis*: I do not think that they have been printed. He left ſeveral others imperfect.

(6) In the text of this article.

(7) Voglerus Introduct. in Notitiam bonorum Scriptorum, *pag. m.* 48.

(8) They have been printed at Paris for Denys Thierry.

(9) I w[illegible] this in the year 1696.

(10) Taken from a Memoir imparted to the Bookſeller.

(11) Lindenius renovatus.

(12) Journal des Sçavans, *of the* 22*d of February* 1666.

page of the third tome; and obſerve that Guy Patin who was a friend to Vander-Linden, hath frequently mentioned him in his letters [*D*].

‘multa de variis locis Medicorum principis eſſe meditatum, & magnam ſibi ſupellectilem collegiſſe obſervationum ad hunc auctorem illuſtrandum utilium, quas non potuiſſe ab ipſo edi dolendum eſt (13). - - - *I know he deſigned to write notes on ſeveral places of Hippocrates the prince of Phyſicians, and had collected great ſtore of materials for that purpoſe, but death prevented him from publiſhing them.*’

[*D*] *Guy Patin . . . . hath frequently mentioned him in his letters.*] I ſhall only cite one paſſage (14). ‘I know nothing new concerning Vander-Linden's Hippocrates. This author died at Leyden, aged fifty-three years (15) of a fever and defluxion on his lungs, after having taken antimony, and without having been blooded. What pity it is, he ſhould write ſo many books, underſtand ſo much Latin and Greek, and die of a fever and ſuffocating catarrh without being blooded.

VAQUERIE (JOHN DE LA) Firſt Preſident in the Parliament of Paris, in the reign of Lewis XI, had been Penſionary of the city of Arras (*a*). He was deputed by that city in 1476, when they were obliged to anſwer the deputies of that prince, who demanded the ſubmiſſion of the inhabitants to him, as their lawful ſovereign, after the death of the Duke of Burgundy. The king's deputies declared that his majeſty pretended to have Arras and Artois *by way of confiſcation*, and that if the citizens did not open the gates, *it would be in danger of being taken by force*. La Vaquerie replied, that *the county of Artois belonged to the Princeſs of Burgundy, daughter of Duke Charles, on whom it devolved in a direct line, from Margaret, Counteſs of Flanders, the conſort of Philip the firſt Duke of Burgundy; and he ſupplicated his majeſty, that he would be pleaſed to obſerve the truce betwixt him and the late Duke Charles* (*b*). This anſwer was to no purpoſe, Arras was obliged to ſubmit to the yoke of France. There has been much talk of a remonſtrance made by La Vaquerie to the ſame king [*A*]. Nor is the anſwer much leſs talked of which he made when they endeavoured to engage the parliament to interpoſe their authority in the choice of a regent of the realm [*B*]. Chancellor de l'Hoſpital ſaid one

[*A*] *There has been much talk of a remonſtrance made by la Vaquerie to the ſame king.*] I ſhall here make uſe of John Bodin's words. ‘Lewis XI had terribly threatened the court of parliament, for refuſing to publiſh, ratify, and regiſter, ſeveral juſt edicts: the preſident Lavacrie, accompanied with a great number of counſellors, in ſcarlet robes, went to offer their complaints and remonſtrances on account of thoſe menaces. The king obſerving the gravity, ſtatelineſs, and dignity, of thoſe gentlemen, who were reſolved to quit their poſts rather than ratify the edicts ſent to them; was ſurprized, and dreading the authority of the parliament, cauſed the ſaid edicts to be annulled in their preſence, deſiring them to continue in the adminiſtration of juſtice, and ſwore to them that he would never ſend any edict to them which was not juſt and reaſonable. This action was of very great importance in order to keep that king within the juſt bounds of reaſon, who had always exerciſed an abſolute power; and when he was only Dauphin, he ſent for the preſidents of that court, and told them that they ſhould raze out the clauſe DE EXPRESSO MANDATO, *BY EXPRESS ORDER*, which the court had inſerted into the ratification of the privileges granted to the count du Maine, otherwiſe he would not leave Paris till it was done, and that he would ſurrender the commiſſion which the king had given him. The court ordered that thoſe words ſhould be blotted out, but that what was blotted out might plainly appear, the regiſter was ordered to be kept, as it is at preſent, in purſuance of that order, with the date of the xxviiith of July MCCCCXLII (1).’ The Latin edition of this book of Bodin contains a circumſtance which I muſt not omit. It is, that the king commanded the parliament to ratify his edicts on pain of death, and that the firſt preſident at the head of that ſenate declared to the king, that they had rather die than obey. ‘Rex ſua juſſa ingeminans minas adjecit, capitis etiam indicta pœna niſi curia paruiſſet. Lanacrius (2) præſes re intellecta regem adiit corona judicum purpuratorum ſtipatus, non ut culpam deprecaretur, ſed ut mortem precaretur, cum diceret ſe ſuoſque collegas mortem malle quam legis propoſitæ promulgationem pati (3). - - - *The king reiterated his orders, and even threatned the parliament with death if they did not obey. Upon which the preſident Lavacrie, accompanied with a great number of counſellors, in their ſcarlet robes, went to the king, not to excuſe their fault, but to deſire to be put to death, for he ſaid, that he and his colleagues choſe rather to ſuffer death than ratify the propoſed edicts.*’

It was not a needleſs thing to relate in this place what was done by that prince in the year 1442 (4). This enhanceth the merit of la Vaquerie; for it is much more glorious to ſhew one's courage in reſiſting an imperious perſon, than to make uſe of it in oppoſition to thoſe who have never diſcovered any obſtinate reſoluteneſs in the maintenance of arbitrary power. Tho' Bodin forgot to mention the year when this firſt preſident made this reſolute and undaunted declaration, it is certain that we are informed, by another proof, how abſolutely this monarch reſolved to be obeyed. Paſquier relates (5), *That in the year one thouſand four hundred ſixty five, the ſame Lewis being king, cauſed his grant to the Count de Charolois, to be forcibly publiſhed by his Chancellor in full court; and notwithſtanding the Proteſtations made againſt it by the greateſt part of the counſellors, he would have endorſed on the inſtrument*, ‘Regiſtrata, Audito Procuratore Regis, & non contradicente. - - *Regiſtered, the King's Attorney-General being firſt heard, and not oppoſing it.*’ La Vaquerie was ſtill Penſionary of the city of Arras, in the year 1476. And therefore he was not firſt preſident of the parliament of Paris, till long after Lewis XI had exacted this form of regiſtring. Obſerve carefully Paſquier's words (6): ‘Such proteſtations have been very frequent in this court; and ſeveral edicts have this clauſe, *De expreſſo & expreſſiſſimo mandato Regis, pluribus vicibus reiterato.* -- *By the expreſs and moſt expreſs order of the king, ſeveral times reiterated.* Which clauſe, as it is added for a good end, ſo ſeveral people could wiſh (perhaps not without cauſe) that this honourable ſociety would ſometimes be more flexible, according as the public neceſſity requires.’ This confirms what I have ſaid above (7) concerning the evils which the parliaments have frequently occaſioned by their refuſing to regiſter edicts, or by the clauſes which they added to the ratification of them. Paſquier had not talked in this manner, if he had not known that the ſtiffneſs of thoſe ſovereign courts had been ſometimes prejudicial to the ſtate. Let us alſo confirm, by an obſervation of Bodin, a particular which I have mentioned in another place (8). ‘Now the words DE EXPRESSO MANDATO, *& expreſſiſſimo mandato*, and ſometimes *multis vicibus iterato*, which are frequently found in the regiſters of ſovereign courts, about the publication of edicts, occaſion ſuch edicts to be neglected, or ſoon after forgotten and ſlighted by the connivance of magiſtrates (9).’ There is no greater encouragement to diſobedience, than to ſuffer the tranſgreſſors of an edict to hope for impunity: but this is in effect what the parliaments did, when they diſgraced the princes edicts in ſuch manner.

[*B*] *The anſwer . . . . which he offered when the attempt was made to engage the parliament . . . . In the choice* one day in a ſpeech, ‘ That the poverty of the Preſident de la Vaquerie was much more ‘ commendable than the riches of a Chancellor of Burgundy, to whom his maſter ſaid, ‘ Rolin, ’tis too much (*c*).’

---

(13) Cocceius, ubi ſupra.

(14) Patin, Lett. cccx, *pag. m.* 610, *of vol. ii.*

(15) It ſhould be 55.

(*a*) That office is much the ſame with that of Syndic. See the ſecond edition of Furetiere's Dictionary, at the word *Penſionaire.*

(*b*) *Taken from* Philip de Comines, *book v, chap. xi, pag. m.* 298.

(1) Bodin, de la République, *livr. iii, chap. iv, pag. m.* 417. *See alſo* Matthieu, Hiſtoir. de Louïs XI, *livr. xi, pag. m.* 668.

(2) It ſhould be *Lavaquerius.*

(3) Bodinus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 454. *Edit.* 1601.

(4) Paſquier, Recherches, *livr. ii, chap. iv, pag. m.* 61, *gives a larger account of it than Bodin.*

(5) Paſquier, ib.

(6) Id. ibid. *pag.* 62.

(7) See the remark [*K*], of the article of Chancellor de l'HOSPITAL.

(8) Above, in the ſame remark.

(9) Bodin, ubi ſupra, *p.* 418.

(*c*) Le Bret, de la Souveraineté du Roi, *livr. ii, ch. v, pag.* 182, 183.

choice of a regent of the realm.] After the death of Lewis XI, the Counteſs de Beaujeu, his eldeſt daughter, had the adminiſtration of the government, during the minority of Charles VIII. The Duke of Orleans, who deſired to diſpoſſeſs her of the regency, applied to the parliament of Paris; but Mr de la Vaquerie, *firſt Preſident, declared to him, that affairs of that nature did not fall under their cognizance* (10). The author of the book, intituled, *The Miniſtry of Cardinal de Richelieu* relates it thus: ‘ The parliaments are ‘ not leſs obliged by the laws of juſtice than by thoſe ‘ of prudence, never to differ from the king in affairs ‘ of ſtate: I ſay they are obliged to it by juſtice, be‘ cauſe it is to uſurp a power which doth not belong ‘ to them, to attempt to judge of ſuch things, they ‘ being only created by the king, to adminiſter juſtice ‘ to the people; as the Preſident de la Vaquerie told ‘ the Chancellor of the Duke of Orleans, who for‘ merly deſired the parliament, on the part of his ‘ maſter, to preſs the king to come to Paris and make ‘ uſe of their counſel in the moſt important af‘ fairs (11).’

(10) Le Grain, Hiſt. de Louïs XIII, *pag.* 4.

(11) Hiſtoire du Miniſtere du Cardinal de Richelieu, *Part. ii, pag.* 219, *Dutch Edit. ann* 1631.

VAUBRUN (THE MARQUIS OF). See BAUTRU (NICOLAS).

VAUMORIERE (PETER DORTIGUE SIEUR DE) *of noble extraction in the city of Apt in Provence* (*a*), lived in the XVIIth century. He ſettled at Paris, and there publiſhed ſome Romances which did him honour [*A*]. *He wrote politely in verſe and proſe* (*b*). He was Sub-director to the Academy of the Abbot d'Aubignac [*B*], compoſed of perſons of merit and learning. He collected a great number of harangues on all kinds of ſubjects, and publiſhed them at Paris in 1688 in 4to, with a treatiſe on the Art of writing ſuch Pieces. The Journaliſts ſpoke advantageouſly of it (*c*). He was at variance with Fortune [*C*], if we may believe Richelet. The letters he publiſhed *on all kind of ſubjects, with directions on the manner of writing them*, were well received by the public. The firſt edition was finiſhed on the 12th of November 1689, and the ſecond on the laſt of September 1694. I have ſeen a third in two volumes in 12mo, to which are *added ſeveral precepts and ſome letters*, it bears the date of the year 1695. The Elogy of Mr de Vaumoriere is prefixed to it, and contains a very particular account of the good qualities of his mind and ſoul; but nothing is ſaid either of his country, or fortune, or time of his birth, *&c.* He was dead when that elogy was made.

(*a*) Rocolles, Introduction à l'Hiſtoire, *Tom. ii, pag.* 339, *Paris Edit.* 1664.

(*b*) *The abbot* de Marolles, Denombrement des Auteurs, *pag.* 441.

(*c*) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, *of the ſecond of February* 1688, *pag.* 268, *Dutch Edit. and* l'Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *March* 1688, *pag.* 388.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome Romances which did him honour.*] He wrote the great Scipio, and finiſhed the laſt work of Mr de la Calprenede, I mean the Pharamond. The author being prevented by death had only carried it to the ſeventh tome: Mr de Vaumoriere continued it to the end. He declared in the preface to the twelfth volume, which is the laſt, that ſome had wronged him in ſaying that he had made uſe of Mr de la Calprenede's memoirs, who, added he, never made any for himſelf. The Journal des Savans was at that time pretty ſparing in the commendation of authors, and criticiſed them freely: but, however, it ſpoke of the firſt tome of the continuation of Pharamond in advantageous terms. *There is reaſon to hope from what appears of the eighth volume which Mr de Vaumoriere has compoſed, that the death of him whoſe footſteps he follows will not be long regretted. He has throughly entered into the ſpirit of that author. He preſerves to the heroes and heroines the ſame ſentiments, and the ſame characters, which he had given them: and in his ſtile he has aſſumed that grand and lofty air which was peculiar to him. It may even be ſaid without wounding the memory of that illuſtrious deceaſed perſon, that the diſcourſe of Mr de Vaumoriere is ſmoother and more correct than his: and that he knows better how to check the ſallies of the ſublime* (1). Mr Gueret does not judge of this firſt tome of the continuation with the ſame indulgence: but as for the reſt he is liberal of his encomiums on the ſubſtitute of la Calprenede. *I am not diſſatisfied with his labour*, he makes Pharamond ſay: *I wiſh only he had not made an entire volume of the hiſtory of Conſtantine; it languiſhes a little too much: and were it not for the beauty of his language which keeps up the attention of his reader, it would be tedious. He was well appriſed of it himſelf; for he has corrected that fault in the following tomes: and what I reckon a good omen for all the reſt, he ſtill gathers ſtrength as he goes forward, and now treads firm and ſure in the ſteps of his illuſtrious predeceſſor* (2). When ſmall Romances were in vogue, Mr de Vaumoriere conformed to that taſte; he wrote ſome which might be read from beginning to end in leſs than two hours. Such was that which he intituled, *Diane de France*, and which was printed in the year 1674, if I remember right. He wrote alſo *La Galanterie des Anciens*; *Adelaïde de Champagne*: *Agiatis*: *L'Art de plaire dans la converſation.*

[*B*] *He was ſub-director to the Academy of the Abbot d'Aubignac.*] You will ſee it by the liſt, which the *Mercure Galant* has given of thoſe who compoſed it (3). You will alſo find there ſome circumſtances concerning this Academy, and amongſt others that it had been *broke after* the nomination of the Abbot de Villeſerain *to the biſhopric of Senés*. Another book informs me that they met at the houſe of that Abbot. I ſhall recite the paſſage, becauſe it is curious. It is Henrietta Silvia de Moliere who ſpeaks: ‘ Every ‘ thing I heard ſeemed to me to be a coach that came ‘ to carry me away: and I was in an houſe where I ‘ frequently had ſuch kind of frights; it was the *Ho‘ tel de Hollande*. The Abbot de Villeſerain lived over ‘ againſt it, and the aſſembly of Wits, which after‘ wards met at his houſe, was projected at that time. ‘ I ſaw nothing but people of a ſtern countenance ‘ ſtopping at his gate, and paſſing along my ſtreet, ‘ and I took them for ſo many people ſent from the ‘ devout ladies (4).’

[*C*] *He was at variance with Fortune.*] Thoſe are the words of the Sieur Richelet in the index of one of his books (5). The words he uſes in the body of the book at the place to which the index refers, are ſtill more emphatical. Mr Conrart *was exceedingly pleaſed that people ſaid he underſtood perſons of merit, and that he did them good offices like a gentleman. If in this age the favourites of fortune were of that temper, Caſſandra, Vaumoriere, and many other unhappy wretches would not run poſt to beggary* (6). I believe he had a grudge againſt him; for in another book he ſpeaks thus: ‘ The Continuator of Pharamond who has ‘ been in priſon theſe three weeks is juſt ſet at li‘ berty (7).’

(1) Journal des Sçavans, *of the* 23*d of February*, 1665, *pag.* 156, 157, *Dutch Edit.*

(2) Gueret, Parnaſſe Réformé, *pag.* 174, 175.

(3) *Mercure Galant*, of the year 1672, *Tom. i, pag.* 81, *Dutch Edit.*

(4) Vie de Henriette Sylvie de Moliere, *Part. iv, pag.* 99, *Dutch Edit.* 1674.

(5) *Intituled*, Les plus belles Lettres des meilleurs Auteurs François.

(6) Richelet, Lettres, &c. *pag. xiv, Dutch Edit.* 1694.

(7) Idem, Remarques ſur ſon Dictionaire, *pag.* 33, *at the word* Elargir, *Geneva edition* 1680.

VEDELIUS (Nicolas) a noted reformed Divine, who lived in the XVIIth century. He was born in the Palatinate, and was profeſſor of Philoſophy for twelve years at Geneva, and miniſter of the church in the ſame city for ten years (*a*). He was invited to Deventer in 1630, in order to be Divinity and Hebrew Profeſſor; having accepted the invitation, he commenced Doctor of Divinity at Baſil, in his journey from Geneva to Deventer, on the 24th of June the ſame year (*b*). He acquitted himſelf very well of his duty, and diſcovered a great zeal againſt the Arminians [*A*]. He exerciſed proviſionally the function of Profeſſor of Philoſophy in 1634 (*c*). He removed from Deventer, and became Divinity Profeſſor at Franeker, about the year 1638 (*d*). This was his laſt ſtation; for he died at Franeker in 1642. He was ſorry that death did not permit him to publiſh the anſwer, which he had prepared to his adverſaries [*B*], concerning the power of the magiſtrate in Eccleſiaſtical affairs [*C*]. I ſhall give a catalogue of his works [*D*]. I have in another place (*e*) ſpoken of his quarrel with Barleus.

The Programma, which I have quoted, ſuppoſes he was only twelve years profeſſor at Geneva; and yet he himſelf in the inaugural oration, which he pronounced at Franeker on the 25th of November 1639, ſays he had been profeſſor at Geneva and Deventer twenty-three years. Therefore as he had been at Deventer only ſince the year 1630, he muſt have been at Geneva fourteen years. His ſon NICOLAS VEDELIUS died miniſter of the French church at Heuſden towards the beginning of the year 1705.

[*A*] *He diſcovered a great zeal againſt the Arminians.*] He publiſhed a book in 1631, intituled *De Arcanis Arminianiſmi*, in which he maintains that explicitly and profeſſedly, they endeavour to introduce a ſubtile ſort of Atheiſm into the Church; and that though they do not premeditately attempt to bring in a groſs Atheiſm, they open a great and wide gate for its admittance. The beginning of one of his chapters runs thus: ‘ Propoſuimus hactenus doctrinam Remonſtrantium, qua omnis generis hæreſes & ſectas in Eccleſiam Dei, adeoque Libertiniſmum hoc eſt Atheiſmum ſubtilem EX PROFESSO introducere conantur (1). - - - - *I have hitherto laid open the doctrine of the Remonſtrants, whereby they* profeſſedly *attempt to introduce ſects and hereſies of all kinds, and conſequently Libertiniſm, that is ſubtile Atheiſm, into the church of GOD.*’ A little after he hath theſe words: ‘ Scopus meus non eſt gravare Remonſtrantes accuſatione ea, ac ſi Atheiſmum craſſum introducere data opera ſeu ex profeſſo molirentur. Nequaquam vero, prout eodem cap. primo monui. Sed tantum oſtenſurus ſum, præter alia effecta peſtilentiſſima quæ nova ipſorum Theologia & Religio producit; etiam feneſtram & portam aperiri ea Atheiſmo craſſo patentiſſimam atque ampliſſimam (2). - - - *It is not my deſign, as I have already ſaid, to load the Remonſtrants with this accuſation, as if they induſtriouſly or profeſſedly attempted to introduce groſs Atheiſm. But I was only to ſhew, that beſides other moſt pernicious effects which their new Theology or Religion produces, a very large window or gate was thereby opened to groſs Atheiſm.*’ He adds that he has no other deſign than to convert the Remonſtrants by ſhewing them the danger which attends their doctrine. *Quo nimirum unuſquiſque eo magis ab ea ſibi caveat: & ipſi Theologi Remonſt. lucri fiant, qui etiam noſter in hoc labore ſcopus eſt* (3). We have ſeen ſomething like this in Maldonatus's Commentaries (4). The Arminians furiouſly inveighed againſt him in a book intituled *Vedelius Rhapſodus*. He replied in the fourth part of his work printed in 1634. The ſecond and third part were publiſhed in the year 1633.

[*B*] *He was concerned that death did not permit him to publiſh the anſwer which he had prepared to his adverſaries.*] This circumſtance you will find in one of Voſſius's letters. You will there ſee alſo that in caſe this reply of Vedelius had been printed, they would have left out all the violent and injurious expreſſions diſperſed in that book by way of return to his antagoniſt. ‘ Vedelius Theologiæ apud Franekeranos Profeſſor, dum in Friſia ſum, fatis conceſſit. Moribundum cruciabat, quod terris eriperetur, priuſquam potuiſſet Revio & Triglandio reſpondere. Horum uterque acerbe ſatis ſcripſit adverſus ſcriptum ejus de Conſtantini Epiſcopatu; quo Magiſtratus jura circa res Eccleſiæ defendit. Collegæ defuncti mihi Franekeræ ajebant, fortaſſe reſponſum ſic etiam edendum; ſed deletis, quæ ut par pari redderet hoſtimentum, virulentius chartis illeviſſet adverſus Revium (5). - - - - *Vedelius, Profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker, died whilſt I was in Frieſland. He was extremely concerned that death prevented him from anſwering Revius and Triglandius. Both of them wrote very ſharply againſt his treatiſe of Conſtantine's Epiſcopacy; wherein he maintains the power of the civil magiſtrate in eccleſiaſtical affairs. The colleagues of the deceaſed told me at Franeker, that the anſwer would perhaps be publiſhed, but that thoſe virulent things he had ſaid in it againſt Revius would be left out.*’

[*C*] *Concerning the power of the magiſtrate in Eccleſiaſtical affairs.*] Several diſputes aroſe concerning this queſtion in Holland after the ſynod of Dort; for ſome Divines endeavoured to withdraw the eccleſiaſtical authority from the ſovereign, and others would confer on the magiſtrate all eccleſiaſtical authority. At leaſt thus each party interpreted the other's intention and doctrine. Vedelius engaged in this diſpute, and in the beginning of the year 1638, publiſhed a *Diſputatio Theologica de Magiſtratu adverſus Bellarmini librum de Laicis*, where he extended the magiſtrates power much farther than others would have it. Some time after knowing that they were preparing to refute him, he publiſhed (6) a ſecond edition of his diſputation, to which he added ſeveral explanations. The whole title of this piece is, *De Epiſcopatu Conſtantini magni, ſeu de poteſtate Magiſtratuum Reformatorum circa res Eccleſiaſticas, diſſertatio repetita cum reſponſione ad interrogata quædam.* He foreſaw that he ſhould irritate his adverſaries, and draw on himſelf a great deal of abuſive language (7); but for all this he had courage enough to enter the liſts. His foreſight was juſt, and it was not neceſſary to be a great prophet in order to predict an event of that nature. He was attacked in his life-time and after his death. Several Zealand miniſters cauſed him to be refuted, when he was dead, making uſe of the pen of a miniſter of Middleburg (8). His friends in Frieſland defended him, and treated the Zealand miniſters with the utmoſt contempt. See the book intituled, *Grallæ ſeu vere puerilis cothurnus ſapientiæ, quo ſe jactat apud imperitos Guillelmus Apollonii, &c* (9). Apollonius anſwered: they replied by a book whoſe title is comical enough (10).

[*D*] *A catalogue of his works.*] I have already mentioned three: the reſt are, *Notæ in Epiſtolas Ignatii.* Thoſe notes are partly critical and partly controverſial, and are joined with the epiſtles of S. Ignatius which he cauſed to be printed at Geneva in the year 1623 in 4to. *Commentarius de tempore utriuſque Epiſcopatus, S. Petri, Antiocheni & Romani*, at Geneva 1624. *Rationale Theologicum, ſeu de neceſſitate & vero uſu principiorum rationis ac Philoſophiæ in Controverſiis Theologicis*; at the ſame place 1628. *A Remedy againſt Apoſtacy* in French, printed alſo there in the ſame year. *Panacea Apoſtaſiæ*, at the ſame place 1628. This is a tranſlation of the former. *S. Hilary, or an antidote againſt ſorrow*, in French, at Geneva 1630. *S. Hilarius, ſeu Antidotum contra triſtitiam pro ſancta Hilaritate*, at Leyden 1632, it is a tranſlation of the former. *De prudentia veteris Eccleſiæ*, at Amſterdam 1633. *De Deo Synagogæ contra Caſp. Barlæum* at Harderwick 1632. *Opuſcula Theologica* at Franeker 1641 in 12mo.

(*a*) *See the* Programma *mention'd by Revius, in his* Hiſtory of Deventer, *pag.* 686.

(*b*) Revius, in Hiſtoria Daventrienſi, *ibid.*

(*c*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 694.

(*d*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 713.

(*e*) In the remark [*D*], of the article BARLEUS.

(1) Vedelius, de Arcanis Arminianiſmi, *lib. ii, cap. x, pag. m.* 242. *Edit.* 1631, *in* 8*vo, and pag.* 86, *Edit.* 1632, *in* 4*to.*

(2) Ibid. *pag.* 243.

(3) Ibid.

(4) See the article VALLE'E, remark [*A*], about the middle.

(5) Voſſius, Epiſt. ccccclxiii, *pag. m.* 409. *col.* 2. *It is dated the* 24*th of October* 1642. *It is among thoſe of the Arminians, pag.* 821, *of the edition in folio.*

(6) In the year 1641.

(7) Jam prævideo temerariis & ſuperbis ingeniis nihil magis in votis fore, quam ut ſpretis ſalutaribus pacis & concordiæ conſiliis ac monitis in me involent, & virus ſuum contra me evomant. *Nicol. Vedeli*, Præf. *de Epiſcopatu Conſtantini.*

(8) *Called* Gulielmus Apollonius.

(9) It was printed at Franeker, in the year 1646.

(10) Grallator furens de novo in ſcenam productus, cum pantomimo ſuo bombomachide Vliſſingano. *At Franeker* 1647.

VEGIUS (MAPHÆUS) Born at Lodi in the Milaneſe in 1407, was a famous Orator, and the greateſt Latin Poet that had been ſeen for ſeveral ages (*a*). He went through his claſſical learning at Milan, from whence he removed to Pavia to ſtudy the Civil Law ; but the plague ſoon obliged him to return to Lodi, where he applied himſelf entirely to polite learning, and particularly to poetry, and began to write books very early [*A*]. Going to Rome he made himſelf beloved and eſteemed by Pope Martin the Vth, who made him Secretary of the Briefs. He diſcharged that office ſo faithfully that he was raiſed to a more conſiderable poſt by the ſame Pope ; which was that of Datary. At the ſame time he beſtowed on him a canonry in the church of St Peter (*b*). He was ſo throughly contented with theſe preferments that he refuſed a rich biſhopric. The reſpect which Eugenius IV, and Nicholas V, had for him, obliged them to continue him in the poſt of Datary. He was very much eſteemed by Panormitanus, and Æneas Sylvius, and ſhewed a great devotion for St Auguſtin [*B*]. His morals were very exemplary. He died at Rome in 1459 (*c*). Among thoſe authors who mention him, I find ſcarce any, who do not paſs over in ſilence the fineſt paſſage of his life ; for they do not tell us any thing of the alteration of his taſte. The poetical fictions were at firſt his greateſt delight (*d*) ; he thought of nothing but of making of verſes, and placing the Pagan divinities in them. Virgil was one of his great gods. David's Pſalms ſeemed to him but old womens ſongs, and he mortally hated the profeſſion of a prieſt. But at laſt he was diſguſted at the profane beauties of poetry ; the pſalms of David appeared to him admirable, and he was touched with an extream pleaſure in the ſacerdotal functions, and employed himſelf in the inſtruction of the nuns [*C*]. I ſhall ſpeak of his books [*D*].

I could

(*a*) Jovius Elog. *cap. cvii, pag. m.* 250.

(*b*) Moreri ſays he was canon of Lateran.

(*c*) *Taken from* Ghilini, Teatro d'Huomini Letterati, *Part. ii, pag.* 188.

(*d*) See the remark [*C*].

[*A*] *He began to write books very early.*] At the age of ſixteen, if we believe Ghilini ; and we muſt believe him (1) though his authority in this caſe ought to be of little weight ; for it is certain that he is tainted with the Enthuſiaſm of a Panegyriſt, and that he has not well adjuſted the parts of his narrative. Doth he write judiciouſly when he relates, 1. That Vegius being arrived at the higheſt perfection in all ſorts of human literature, went to Pavia in order to ſtudy the Civil and Canon Law (2) ? 2. That having ſcarce began to ſtudy there, he was obliged to leave the town on account of the Plague ? 3. That he returned into his own country, where he applied himſelf again to the ſtudy of polite learning, and to writing, being ſcarce yet ſixteen years old (3) ? Doth not this relation imply that Vegius underſtood perfectly all the parts of literature before he was ſixteen ? This hyperbole is abſurd. He died before he nearly approached that perfection ; how then was he arrived at it in his younger years ?

[*B*] *He ſhewed a great devotion for St Auguſtin.*] He built a chapel in the church dedicated to that Saint at Rome on the right hand of the great altar, and having cauſed the bones of St Auguſtin to be put into a very fine ſhrine with thoſe of his mother Monica, he removed them from Oſtia to this chapel. He wrote Poems in honour of thoſe two ſaints, which he alſo very much praiſed in the preface of his book, *de educatione puerorum & claris eorum moribus.* In that work he confirms his precepts concerning the education of children by as many proper inſtances as he could poſſibly find in the life of St Auguſtin and his mother Monica. ‘ In præfatione poſtquam D. Auguſtini & matris ipſius Monicæ laudes pluribus prædicavit, ſubjungit : Enitemur oſtendere omnem bene educandorum filiorum rationem, & convenientiſſimis ſubinde etiam ſanctiſſimiſque tam parentis Monicæ quam filii Auguſtini exemplis, ſingula quibus idoneè ea applicari potuerint confirmare ſtudebimus (4). - - - *In the preface, after he had much commended St Auguſtin and his mother Monica, he adds, We will endeavour to ſhew the whole method of educating children well, and confirm every thing by applying moſt ſuitable and holy examples in the life of Monica and her ſon Auguſtin.*’

[*C*] *But at laſt he was diſguſted at the profane beauties of Poetry ; the pſalms of David appeared to him admirable,* &c.] Such excellent converſions, ſuch holy metamorphoſes, are ſo rare that they ſhould not have been forgotten by thoſe who mention this writer. Moſt Poets retain till death their paſſion for the beauties of profane Poetry. Vegius is an exception to this general rule, his confeſſion runs thus. ‘ Priora recolens tempora, *ſaith he,* quibus inhiabam quotidiè condendis carminibus, nihil præter Muſas & Poetarum luſus pulchrum ducens, mirari non ſatis poſſum, adeo IMMUTARI affectus meos, adeò vim animo meo [ut ita dixerim] fieri potuiſſe, ut à dulcibus prurientibuſque fabulis, ad ſtudia ſeveriora converſus ſim, & qui decantandis ingentibus rerum geſtis, confictiſque tot incertorum Deorum numinibus, ardentius inſtabam, nunc ad exhortandas ſorores, ad docendas virgunculas deſcenderim, ut pro Ovidiis & Flaccis, nunc Auguſtinos & Hieronymos, pro Virgilio, quem alterum in terris Deum eſſe arbitrabar, nunc David fideliorem Vatem colam, ſuſcipiam amplectarque, & ejus mihi carmina, quæ tanquam anilia deliramenta ſordebant, nunc mira adſpergant animum ſuavitate, atque [unde magis etiam obſtupeſcam] quod tantopere deteſtabar exhorrebamque inſtar mortis, nunc ſacerdotio dulcius nihil putem (5). - - - *When I reflect on former times, when I was conſtantly intent on making verſes, and took no delight but in the Muſes and poetical fictions, I am amazed to find ſuch an alteration in my temper, and my mind ſo forcibly turned* [*if I may ſay ſo*] *from ſweet and agreeable amuſements to grave and ſevere ſtudies ; and that I, who uſed to be ſo earneſt in celebrating the glorious exploits, and fabulous excellencies of ſo many unknown gods, ſhould now deſcend to inſtruct ſiſters and teach nuns ; that inſtead of an Ovid and Horace, I ſhould now admire an Auguſtin and Jerom, and inſtead of a Virgil whom I looked on as another god upon earth, I ſhould now adore and careſs a David, a more faithful Poet ; and that his pſalms, which formerly ſeemed to me like old womens tales, ſhould now affect my mind with wonderful pleaſure ; and* [*what ſurprizes me moſt of all*] *that I ſhould eſteem nothing ſo delightful as the prieſthood, which before I deteſted and abhorred like death.*’

[*D*] *I ſhall ſpeak of his books.*] Some of them are in proſe, others in verſe, ſome are printed, others not. The Poem for which he is moſt famous is his ſupplement to the Æneid ; he imagined that Virgil had not concluded that work. He reſolved therefore to add a thirteenth book which is uſually printed with the twelfth of that Roman Poet. His performance hath been cenſured (6). His dialogue *de Felicitate & Miſeria* for ſome time paſſed for a piece of Lucian (7). It was printed with the book *de Educatione Puerorum,* the *Philalethes,* and the *Diſceptatio inter terram, ſolem, & aurum.* All theſe tracts are in proſe. Ghilini falſely believes that the ſeven books *de Perſeverantia Religionis ad Sorores,* were never printed. They were printed at Paris in the year 1511 (8) with ſome of thoſe pieces whoſe titles I have mentioned. They were inſerted in the great *Bibliotheca Patrum.* His Poem on the frauds of the peaſants muſt needs be very curious. You will find in Ghilini the titles of a great many pieces of this author, which were never printed. Paul Jovius hath not forgot to praiſe him on account of ſome monuments of the application of his pen to ſacred ſubjects, which he left behind him. ‘ Ne quid ad cumulatam eruditionem vero Chriſtiano deeſſet,

‘ quædam

(1) *See the notes on the* Naudæana, *pag.* 194, 195.

(2) Dopò eſſer egli a ſomma perfezione arrivato in ogni genere di lettere humane andò à Pavia. *Ghilini, Teatro, Part. ii, pag.* 188.

(3) Diedeſi nell' età di ſedici anni appena a ſcrivere. *Id. ibid.*

(4) Geſner, in Bibl. *fol.* 491, *ſpeaking of Vegius's treatiſe,* de Educatione Puerorum, *printed at Baſil with other ſuch ſmall books in the year* 1541.

(5) Vegius de Perſeverantia Religionis, *in Tom. xxvi,* Bibl. Max. *fol.* 689, *apud* Spizelium, in Literato feliciſſimo, *pag.* 162.

(6) *See* Mr Baillet. Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1222, *Tom. iv, pag.* 13, 14, *Edit.* 1725, *in* 4*to.*

(7) Ghilini, ubi ſupra.

(8) See the catalogue of the Bodleian Library, *pag.* 224.

I could make a large ſupplement to his article, if I would copy the notes on the *Naudæana* : but it is ſufficient to refer the reader to them. It is a book eaſy to be had.

‘ quædam etiam in ſacris literis ſynceræ interpretationis gloſſemata reliquit, aureumque præſertim libellum de rebus antiquis memorabilibus Baſilicæ ſancti Petri, in quo donaria, ſepulcraque Pontificum referuntur (9). - - - *That nothing might be wanting to perfect the learning of a true Chriſtian, he left ſome pious annotations on the holy ſcriptures, and a very valuable book on the memorable antiquities of St Peter's church, wherein he gives an account of the offerings and ſepulchres of the Popes.*’

VELSERUS (MARK) Conſul of Augſburg [*A*], his native city, was a learned Civilian and a famous author. He was born on the 20th of June 1558, of a very ancient family [*B*], which had poſſeſſed vaſt riches [*C*]. He was carefully educated ; and

[*A*] *Conſul of Augsburg.*] I cannot tell whether theſe words *Duumvir Reipublicæ Auguſtanæ*, which we read on the print of our Velſerus, can be better rendred. It were to be wiſhed that ſome body would publiſh a Dictionary of modern offices, a taſk very worthy of a learned man. Such a work would be very ſerviceable to tranſlators, and readers ; for inſtance, it would inform us what we ought to underſtand by *Duumvir Auguſtanus*, a title always given to Marcus Velſerus. *Conſul of Augsburg* is not a right tranſlation ; for the conſular dignity of the Romans did not reſemble that of thoſe, who are called *Duumvirs of Augsburg*. On this occaſion I obſerve that one of the moſt conſiderable poſts of Holland, I mean that of *Penſionary*, is very improperly ſo called. Its name is derived from an accident entirely foreign (1), which gives no manner of idea either of the rights or functions (2) of the perſon, who is poſſeſſed of it. What I have ſaid of the conſulſhip of Velſerus, I ſay alſo of his prætorſhip. I am perſuaded that a prætor of Augſburg doth not at all reſemble the old Roman Prætors ; and yet we can ſcarce avoid giving the Roman names to modern offices, when we either write in Latin, or tranſlate any modern books out of that language. I do not know whether *Duumvir* and *Prætor* are not the ſame thing at Augſburg. However there are offices in that city inferior to that of *Duumvir*, which modern writers expreſs by the word *Conſulſhip* (3).

[*B*] *He was of a very antient family.*] Some will have it to be deſcended from Beliſarius, the famous General of the Emperor Juſtinian. It is ſaid that FRANCIS BELISARIUS about the year 564, married Antonia, Pompey's daughter, and couſin to the ſiſter of the Emperor Anaſtaſius I. He left two ſons, PETER, and CHARLES, the firſt of whom married Mary Colonna, and died without iſſue at Milan ; the other, in order to live ſecure from the incurſions of the Barbarians, retired into the country of Vallais, and had a caſtle in the territory of Sion (4), which he left to his deſcendants (5). Such is the genealogy of a citizen of Augſburg ! But what is very ſurprizing is, that we are told that authentic proofs to make good all this, are ready to be produced. For, ſay they, JOHN BARTHOLOMEW VELSERUS, Counſellor to the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria, and Canon of Straſburgh, wrote a letter to that Emperor in 1336, when the Diet was aſſembled at Spire, to ſupplicate him earneſtly, to affix his ſignet by way of approbation to the German tranſlation of a book, which Cardinal Stephen Colonna the Pope's Vicar had written concerning the genealogy of the Velſeri. This Emperor had himſelf ordered the writing of this book ; and the author therein produced an exact ſeries of proofs founded on publick acts and deeds, from 545, to JOHN VELSERUS the brother of John Bartholomew. *Pro vetuſtiſſima familiæ ſuæ gloria ac dignitate non rogans ſolum, verum etiam obſecrans, ut Germanicam libelli verſionem ſigillo annuli ſui confirmaret, quem auctoritate ac juſſu ipſius Imperatoris Stephanus Colonna, Summi Pontificis tunc Vicarius & Cardinalis, ex omnibus inſtrumentis, tabulis, literiſque publicis ab A. C.* 545, *uſque ad* Johannem Velſerum, *Joh. Bartholomæi fratrem germanum, omni cura & diligentia complexus eſt* (6). This book had been tranſlated into Latin at Rome in 1327, by the ſame John Bartholomew. We are told that EMANUEL VELSERUS Canon of Baſil in 1071, writing to his brother OCTAVIAN, mentioned CHARLES BELISARIUS, who with his wife Paula de gli Urſini retired from Rome into Vallais in 620. ‘ Agitata inibi mentione de ‘ *Carolo Beliſario*, qui una cum conjuge *Paula Urſina* ‘ Valleſiam verſus ad Rheni fontes A. C. 620 ex urbe ‘ Roma ob ſæviſſimos & violentiſſimos in omnem nobilitatem Longobardos, exemplo aliorum egreſſus ‘ eſt (7). - - - - *Charles Beliſarius is mentioned in it, ‘ who after the example of others retired from Rome ‘ with his wife Paula de gli Urſini to the country of ‘ Vallais near the head of the Rhine in the year* 620, ‘ *becauſe the Longobards were moſt violent and cruel to ‘ all the nobility.*’ This OCTAVIAN VELSERUS already mentioned was the firſt of the family, that has been Patrician of Augſburg. He was alſo Captain in that city, Director of the military affairs, and beſides Counſellor to Conrad Duke of Franconia. He died in 1074 (8). JAMES VELSERUS was the firſt of the family who ſettled at Nuremberg, whither he came in 1493. He married and died there in 1544, being the father of ſix ſons and eleven daughters. The alliances of the Velſeri have been very illuſtrious, in Switzerland, and ſeveral provinces of the empire : but the greateſt honour which they received on this account was doubtleſs the marriage of PHILIPPINA VELSERUS with Ferdinand Archduke of Auſtria, ſon of the Emperor Ferdinand I, and brother to the Emperor Maximilian II. That Prince fell deſperately in love with Philippina in the time of the Diet at Augſburg in 1548, and married her privately (9). She lived with him as his lawful wife till his death, above twenty-four years (10). She was a very handſome woman, and endowed beſides with a rich ſtore of good qualities. She was daughter to FRANCIS VELSERUS, Baron of Zinnenberg ; and ſiſter to CHARLES VELSERUS, Governor of the marquiſate of Burgaw (11). She died at Inſpruck on the 24th of April 1580, and left two ſons, whom their father Ferdinand could never entitle to ſucceed him. He was obliged to content himſelf with the marquiſate of Burgaw for the elder ; and the younger being an Eccleſiaſtic, became a Cardinal (12). Arnoldus cites an author (13) who affirms that Andrew, the eldeſt ſon of Ferdinand and of Philippina Velſerus, was a Cardinal, and that Charles his younger brother Marquis of Burgaw, married Sybilla ſiſter to John-William Duke of Cleves. Theſe two brothers died without iſſue. It is ſaid that Charlemagne gave three flowers-de-luce for arms to PHILIP VALISERUS, who behaved himſelf very bravely in the war of Lombardy. They add (14) that he was honoured with ſeveral other prerogatives, and that Otho the Great confirmed all thoſe privileges in favour of JULIUS VELSERUS grandſon of Philip Valiſerus, whom he made his counſellor in the council of war in 950, and a knight in 971 (15). Charles V ranked this family amongſt the *immediate noblemen*, whoſe cauſes are cognizable before the Emperor only (16). The Archduke Ferdinand made CHARLES VELSERUS, Philippina's brother, a free baron (17).

Obſerve that Julius Velſerus ſaved the Emperor Otho's life in a battle againſt the Huns, and that he died of a continual fever in the camp at the age of 96, in the Emperor Henry the IId's Time (18). The author whom I cite ſpeaks of ſeveral Velſerus's, who ſignalized either their valour in the army, or their prudence in the magiſtracy.

[*C*] .... *and which had poſſeſſed vaſt riches.*] Melchior Adam relates that Francis I, being by a treaty of peace obliged to pay twelve tons of gold to Charles V, the Fuggers and Velſers promiſed to advance that great ſum of money (19). Martin Cruſius ſaith that in the year 1528, BARTHOLOMEW VELSER and his partners armed ſeveral ſhips in Spain, and ſent them into America, where they diſcovered a very rich country, on the frontiers of Peru, called Venezvela,

(9) Jovius, Elog. *cap. cvii, pag. m.* 250.

(1) From his receiving a yearly penſion from the public.

(2) They are very well explained in Furetiere's Dictionary corrected by Mr de Beauval.

(3) *This appears from Raderus, who dedicated his Martial* Nobiliſſimis & ampliſſimis *VVV.* Dominis Velſeris, MARCO *Duumviro, Urbis Præfecto,* MATTHÆO *Ædili,* PAULO *Conſuli, Matthæi FFF. Antonii NNN. Patriciis Auguſtanis, B.R. natis.*

(4) Sepultus in agro Sedunenſi ubi arcem Valeriam cum ſuis longe poſſedit. *Arnoldus, in Diſſertatione de Marci Velſeri vita, genere, & morte, pag.* 6.

(5) *They have been called* Valliſii, *or* Walliſeri, & Velſeri, *Ibid. pag.* 5.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid. *pag.* 6.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Martinus Cruſius, *Part. iii,* Annal. Suevic. *lib. xii, fol.* 773, *apud* Arnold. *ibid. pag.* 12.

(10) Jacob. Mentius, *apud* Arnold. ibid.

(11) Arnold. ibid.

(12) *See* Thuanus, *lib. lxxi, ſub. fin.*

(13) Didacus de Lequile, *Concionator & Hiſtoriographus Aulicus.*

(14) Arnoldus, *pag.* 20.

(15) Ibid. *pag.* 21, 22.

(16) Ibid. *pag.* 22. See alſo *pag.* 10.

(17) Ibid. *pag.* 20.

(18) Ibid. *p.* 32.

(19) A rei nummariæ nervis apprime inſtructam, vel hoc docet quod cum Carolus V pace cum Gallo facta, tranſegiſſet ut duodecim auri tonnas Rex Imperatori dependeret, Fuggari ac Velſeri tantam pecuniæ vim bipartito ſe repræſentaturos promiſerunt. *Melch. Adam in Vit. Juriſconſultor. pag.* 480. He quotes *Melanchth. Tom. ii, explic. evangel.*

and being a lover of the *Belles Lettres*, he was, when very young, ſent to Rome to ſtudy under Antony Muretus (*a*). He was there in the year 1575. With the ſtudy of Antiquities he intermixed that of the Italian tongue, in which he became ſo great a proficient, that he wrote that language like a Florentine [*D*]. Returning home he applied himſelf to the Bar in the year 1589. He obtained the ſenatorial dignity in 1592. He was preferred to the little council in the year 1594, and elected Prætor in 1600. He diſcharged all theſe offices with a great deal of honour, and was an ornament to his country. He was both a lover and a protector of learning and learned men. He publiſhed ſeveral good books [*E*], and afforded helps to ſeveral
authors

nezvela, of which they made themſelves maſters, and kept it twenty-eight years, according to the treaty which they concluded with Charles V. But a difference aroſe betwixt the farmers of Elizabeth King Philip's Queen, and George of Spire, who governed that country in the name of the Velſers. At firſt they diſputed only about tolls, and then about the limits, and at laſt it was pretended that thoſe Germans ought not to poſſeſs any part of Venezvela. The cauſe was pleaded in Spain, and they were diſpoſſeſſed of all they held in Venezvela, by virtue of the ſentence pronounced in Spain in the year 1555. The firſt Governor whom the Velſers eſtabliſhed there was Ambroſe Dalfinger, born at Ulm, whom the Spaniards killed; but Charles V cauſed the authors of this murther to be puniſhed (20). Arnoldus is very angry becauſe Jerom Benzo calls the Velſers (to whom the Emperor engaged the country of Valentiola) (21) merchants. ‘Vano iſtius judicio & Reges & Principes magnarii negotiatores erunt, & delicatarum mercium inſtitores. Hercules tuam fidem! . . . . *In his fooliſh judgment forſooth! Kings and princes are great merchants, and dealers in choice commodities.*’ Thus Arnoldus exclaims againſt the word *Merchant*. He abridges what Herrera hath ſaid concerning the exploits of thoſe Governors, whom the Velſers ſent to that country.

[*D*] *He wrote Italian like a Florentine.*] The teſtimony of an Italian to this purpoſe is cited by Mr Arnoldus (22). ‘Mirari poſthac deſinant qui linguæ Italicæ nitorem in Marco attoniti ſtupent; Orlandus enim Peſcetti in reſponſione ſua ad Anticruſcam Benii Florentinam (23), illius puritatem ſimul ac elegantiam exoſculatur, dum ait: *Se'l Cavalier Guariſii* (24), *Uomo pur Ferrareſe, prega come nelle ſue lettere ſi vede, il Cavalier Salviati che purghi il ſuo Paſtor Fido da Lombardiſmi, e dell' Illuſtriſſimo Sig. Marco Velſero Duumviro della Rep. Auguſtana e chiariſſimo lume della Germania ſcrive all' Eccellentiſſimo Sig. Chiocco, che le ſue lettere gli paiono dettate da Uomo nato ed allevato in Firenze.* Immo judicium Velſeri de lingua Italica mille aliis præfert cenſoribus: *quando ogn' altra vi mancaſſe, quella del Sig. Marco Velſero addietro mentovato, mi varebbe per mille, il quale in una lettera ſcritta all' Eccellentiſſimo Sig. Chiocco, dice che nel legger le coſe del Caſa ſente tanto diletto, che non vorebbe che aveſſer mai fine.* (25) . . . *Thoſe who are ſurprized at the purity of Marcus Velſerus's Italian, will ceaſe to wonder, when they know that Orlandus Peſcetti, in his anſwer to the Florentine Anticruſca del Beni, admires both its purity and elegance, when he ſays:* Guarini, though a Ferrareſe deſires Salviati, as we may ſee in his letters, to purge his Paſtor Fido of Lombardiſms, and writes to the moſt excellent Sig. Chiocco concerning the illuſtrious Marcus Velſerus, that his letters appeared to him to be writ by one that was born and bredat Florence. *Nay, he prefers the judgment of Velſerus on the Italian tongue to that of a thouſand other critics:* Tho' every other ſhould fail you, that of Marcus Velſerus before mentioned, in my opinion, would be worth a thouſand, who in a letter to the moſt excellent Chiocco, ſays, that in reading il Caſa he felt ſuch a pleaſure. that he wiſhed that book had no end.’ You will find in Arnoldus, the elogy which Nicolas Manaſſes beſtowed upon Velſerus, in dedicating to him a book of Lewis de Roy (26), which Hercules Catus had tranſlated from the French into Italian. I ſhall not tranſcribe this, but another elogy which ſeems of more weight. Galileo declaring his reaſon why he made uſe of the Italian language, in his three letters to Velſerus *de Maculis Solaribus*, expreſſes himſelf thus: ‘Mà in oltre ci hò avuto un altro mio particolar intereſſe, ed è il non privarmi delle riſpoſte di V. S. in tal lingua vedute da me e dagl' Amici miei con molto maggior diletto, è meravigilia che ſe foſſero ſcritte del piu purgato ſtile Latine, e parci nel legger lettere di locuzzione tanto propria che Firenze eſtenda i ſuoi confini, anzi il recinto delle ſue mura, ſino in Auguſta (27). - - - - *But beſides I had another particular intereſt in view*, viz. *That I might not be deprived of your anſwers in the Italian tongue, which my friends and I read with much more pleaſure and admiration, than if they had been writ in the pureſt Latin ſtile; and in reading letters of ſuch propriety and elegance, it ſeemed to us that Florence extended its confines, nay the very circuit of its walls as far as Augsburg.*’

[*E*] *He publiſhed ſeveral good books.*] His firſt work, according to Melchior Adam, was that which he publiſhed at Venice in the year 1594. The bare title diſcovers the uncommon learning of the author; it runs thus. ‘Rerum Auguſtanarum Vindelicarum libri octo, quibus à prima Rhætorum ac Vindelicorum origine ad annum uſque 552. à nato Chriſto nobiliſſimæ gentis hiſtoria & antiquitates traduntur, ac antiqua monumenta tam quæ Auguſtæ, quam quæ in agro Auguſtano, quin & quæ alibi extant ad res Auguſtanas ſpectantia, æri inciſa & notis illuſtrata exhibentur. - - - - *Eight books of the affairs of Augsburg, containing the hiſtory and antiquities of that noble country from the firſt original of the Rheti and Vindelicii, to the year of Chriſt* 552, *with cuts of the antient monuments in the city and country of Augsburg or elſewhere, relating to the affairs of Augsburg, illuſtrated with notes.*’ Melchior Adam had reaſon to call this an happy prelude (28). Velſerus conſecrated the firſt fruits of his labours to the glory of his country. ‘In Italiam progreſſus edidit antiquitates Auguſtanas, felix famæ ſurgentis auſpicium & pium. - - - - *Going into Italy he publiſhed the Antiquities of Augsburg, which was an happy and pious omen of his riſing fame.*’ In the year 1602, he publiſhed at Augſburg, *Rerum Boicarum libri quinque, hiſtoriam à gentis origine ad Carolum Magnum complexi* (29). He afterwards publiſhed at ſeveral times the lives of ſome Martyrs of Augſburg, that of St Uldaric, Biſhop of that city, and of St Severinus and Apollonius of Tyre. As for the antient Itinerary, which Peutinger poſſeſſed, whence it was called *Tabula Peutingeriana*, he publiſhed it at Venice in the year 1591 (30). Moſt of thoſe pieces are illuſtrated with Velſerus's commentaries. All the works of this author have been collected into a body, and reprinted in folio at Nuremberg in 1682. Chriſtopher Arnoldus, Profeſſor at Nuremberg, had the care of this edition, and adorned it with preliminary diſcourſes, in which he informs us of a great many particulars, concerning the family of the Velſers in general, and the life of ~~Mark~~ Velſerus in particular; together with the judgment which the learned have paſſed on his works, and the funeral elogies with which they honoured him. And as he kept a great correſpondence with the learned of Italy, and of ſeveral other countries, the editor hath collected ſeveral of his Latin and Italian letters which he hath added to this edition.

OPINIONS concerning the author of the *Squittinio della Liberta Veneta.*

Velſerus paſſed for the author of the *Squittinio della Liberta Veneta*, which was printed about the year 1612. Gaſſendus having obſerved that ſeveral authors aſcribed that book to Mr de Peireſc, adds that they were miſtaken, and that it is very probable Velſerus compoſed it. He grounds this conjecture on Velſerus's great learning and ſingular affection to the houſe of Auſtria: ‘Non diſquiro quidem an auctor hujuſce libri fuerit Antonius Albizius, nobilis ille Florentinus, qui Chriſtianorum Principum Stemmata ediderat ante duos annos, ut nonnullis perſuaſum eſt; an, ut videtur veriſimilius, inſignis ille Marcus Velſerus, cujus ſæpius meminimus, ob conſummatam eruditionem, propenſionemque ſingularem erga domum Auſtriacam (31). - - - - *I ſhall not examine*
‘ *whether*

(*a*) Bonciarius, *lib. ix*, Epiſt. xii, *apud* Arnoldum, de Marci Velſeri vita, genere, & obitu, *p.* 42.

(20) Cruſius, *Part. iii*, Annal. Suevicor. *lib. xi*, *cap. iii*, *iv*, *apud* Arnoldum, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 24.

(21) Valentiola ditiſſimæ provinciæ oppidum, quam Cæſar anno 1528 Velzaris mercatoribus Germanis oppignoravit. *Benzo*, *lib. i*, *Hiſtoriæ novi Orbis*, *cap. xxv*, apud *Arnold. ibid. pag.* 25.

(22) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 43, 44.

(23) Nella Riſpoſta all' Anticr. del Beni, *cart.* 16.

(24) It ſhould be *Guarini*, and it is probably an error of the preſs.

(25) Riſpoſt. *cart.* 112, 113.

(26) Concerning the viciſſitude of human affairs.

(27) Lettera terza, *cart.* 103, 104, *apud* Arnoldum, *p.* 44.

(28) It ought to be remembred that Velſerus had publiſhed a little book in 1591. See, below, citation (30).

(29) In Vitis Juriſconſult. *pag.* 480.

(30) He ſays ſo himſelf in his xcvith letter, *ad Italos*, pag. 879.

(31) Gaſſendus in Vita Peireſkii, *lib. iii*, *ad ann.* 1612. *pag. m.* 279.

authors [*F*]; and no man ever had more friends than he in the republic of letters. He would never ſuffer himſelf to be drawn [*G*]; but his picture was taken unknown to

‘ *whether the author of this book was Antony Albizius, that noble Florentine, who publiſhed above two years ago the genealogies of Chriſtian princes, as ſome believe; or, which is more likely, whether it was the illuſtrious Marcus Velſerus, whom we have often mentioned on account of his conſummate learning, and ſingular attachment to the houſe of Auſtria.*’ Mr Arnoldus (32) declares that he knows nothing of this affair, and blames their temerity who pronounce ſo deciſively concerning a fact ſo uncertain as this is. He cites Ernſtius (33), Rhodius (34), Scavenius (35), Placcius (36), who affirm that Velſerus was the author of this book. He owns that Octavius Ferrarius wrote to him that Scioppius had frequently aſſured him, that Velſerus was the author of the Squittinio. ‘ M. Velſeri ſcripta eo plauſu à ſtudioſis excipientur, quem ingens viri fama & celebre nomen meretur. Nollem tamen illis inſeri Venetæ Reip. Scrutinium, cujus illum auctorem fuiſſe ſæpe mihi Scioppius firmavit (37). - - - *The writings of Velſerus will be received by the learned with that applauſe, which his great fame and reputation deſerve. But yet I would not inſert amonſt them the* Squittinio della Liberta Veneta, *of which Scioppius has often aſſured me he was the author.*’ The authority of Scioppius in this caſe ſeems to me to be of great weight, for beſides that he was generally very well acquainted with all things of this nature, he enjoyed a large ſhare of Velſerus's friendſhip, and kept a very ſtrict epiſtolary correſpondence with him (38). Mr Arnoldus was not ignorant that the author of the book, intituled, *The Conſpiracy of the Spaniards againſt the Republic of Venice*, attributes the *Squittinio* to the Marquis of Bedemar; but he hath not rightly choſen the paſſage of that piece, which moſt clearly aſcribes the *Squittinio* to the Marquis. His proof is grounded upon theſe words: *The other point was, that in all affairs which he was to negotiate concerning the right and prerogatives of the Republic, he ſhould make uſe of the Memoirs of the* Squittinio della Liberta Veneta, *to which the Marquis of Bedemar refers in ſeveral places of this inſtruction, and that in terms which tho' ſomewhat modeſt, yet diſcover plainly enough* HIS PATERNAL LOVE FOR THIS LIBEL. The Abbot de St Real, author of the Relation of this Conſpiracy, ſaith this in the laſt page but one; and in the thirty-fifth, thirty-ſixth, and thirty-ſeventh, he had related the hiſtory of the *Squittinio*, and how the Marquis of Bedemar had conceived and executed the deſign of this work. From whence, and not from the laſt page ſave one, Mr Arnoldus ought to have drawn his neceſſary proofs. But this is a very little fault compared with that which I am going to obſerve. He pretends that the relator of that conſpiracy is very much miſtaken, when he ſuppoſes that the Marquis of Bedemar, in his inſtruction to the ambaſſador, who was to ſucceed him, very much recommended the reading of the *Squittinio*. This is falſe, ſaith Mr Arnoldus, for the Marquis decried this piece, as a work abounding with falſhoods. The entire paſſage of the Profeſſor of Nuremberg runs thus: ‘ Verum quam falſus etiam hic auctor fuerit ex inſtructione ſecreta ab Alfonzo della Cueva Hiſpanico apud Venetos legato ſucceſſori ſuo Lud. Bravo data, cuivis uni ad oculum ſtatim apparet, prout Laur. Bank eamdem cum Scrutinio evulgavit (39). *E perche in tempo mio fu divulgato un libretto intitulato* Squitinio della Liberta de Veneziani, *opretta veramente degna d'eſſer letta.* Deinde omnem iſti derogat fidem, ob multas fallacias veritati inimicas quæ inibi occurrunt, ac vivos magiſtros mortuis longe præferendos cenſet. *Queſto ancora vorrei che ſi trovaſſe appreſſo di lei, ſcoprendoſi per la lettura di quello molte fallacie introdotte da gli hiſtorici moderni, che traſcurando la pura verita contenuta nelle Chroniche antiche, hanno dato ad intendere à poſteri tutto quello che gli e parſo à propoſito per ſtabilire la loro liberta. Ne minor profetto ſara che Voſtra Excellenza potra trarne da libri vivi, che s'hara cavato da Volumi morti: vuoglio dire che l'informatione à bocca di perſone prattiche ſolite à frequentar la caſa noſtra, &c.* Sed quid pluribus verbis opus eſt? Mentis acies ſe ipſam intuens nonnunquam hebeſcit. - - - - *But it is obvious to every one, how much this author was miſtaken, about the ſecret inſtruction given by Alphonſus della Cueva, the Spaniſh ambaſſador at Venice, to his ſucceſſor Lewis Bravo, as Laur. Bank has publiſhed it with the* Squittinio. And becauſe in my time a ſmall book was publiſhed, intituled, *Squittinio della liberta de Veneziani*, a piece truly worthy to be read. *Afterwards he entirely deſtroys the credit of it, becauſe of the many falſhoods that occur in it, and thinks that living inſtructors are much preferable to dead ones.* I wiſh your Excellency had this by you, for by reading it you will diſcover many impoſtures introduced by modern Hiſtorians; who, neglecting the naked truth contained in antient chronicles, have repreſented to poſterity whatever ſeemed to them proper to eſtabliſh their liberty. It will be no leſs advantageous, if your Excellency can draw from living books, what you have drawn from dead volumes: I mean that an information by word of mouth from ſkillful perſons who uſed to frequent our houſe, &c. *But what occaſion is there for many words? The edge of the mind turning on it's ſelf is ſometimes blunted.*’

The reflexion contained in theſe laſt words, ſeems to be made only to be turned againſt it's author; for it is plain that Mr Arnoldus is dazzled with too bright a light. The paſſage, which he cites out of the inſtruction, clearly ſhews that the *Squittinio* ought to be conſulted by the ambaſſador, becauſe by reading it he might be informed of ſeveral impoſtures of ſeveral modern Hiſtorians. Therefore far from ſaying that it is filled with lies, Bedemar recommends it as a corrective of the falſities of others. What is moſt blameable in the Abbot de St Real, is, perhaps, that he too warmly engages in the affirmative, in aſcribing the *Squittinio* to Alphonſo de la Cueva. This hath occaſioned others to declare too deciſively on this head (40). He had, indeed, better have ſuſpended his judgment: and we have here an inſtance which proves that ſome books which make a great noiſe, are falſly aſcribed to various perſons, without ever diſcovering the true author (41). A French Hiſtorian, who wrote when the *Squittinio* appeared, makes no ſcruple to aſcribe it to our Velſerus, whoſe name he ſpells very ill. *The ſecond*, ſaith he (42), *is a treatiſe compoſed by one Vulſer*, concerning the liberty of Venice.

[*F*] *And afforded helps to ſeveral authors.*] No body contributed more than he to the large collection of inſcriptions, which Gruterus publiſhed. See the elogy of Velſerus in Gruterus's preface. Melchior Adam gives (43) us a long liſt of ſeveral antient books, the publication of which was procured by Velſerus. Mr Arnoldus enlarges (44) on the detail of the ſervices, which this learned man did to ſeveral authors, and doth not forget the two manuſcripts of Anaſtaſius, which he ſent to the Jeſuits of Mentz, after having borrowed them out of the Palatine Library, by the intereſt of Marquard Freherus. The ſtory of Pope Joan was in thoſe manuſcripts Nor doth he forget to obſerve that Velſerus was ſecurity for one thouſand Florins, in order to procure for Conrad Ritterſhuſius a manuſcript of the Epiſtles of Iſidorus Peluſiota out of the Duke of Bavaria's library, which could not be obtained but under ſuch ſecurity (45). But the generoſity of this action would not ſufficiently appear, if we did not know that Velſerus paid that ſum without pretending any obligation from Ritterſhuſius, for he did not ſo much as give him notice of it.

[*G*] *He would never ſuffer himſelf to be drawn.*] We are informed of this in Peireſkius's life. There was a great and amicable Epiſtolary Commerce betwixt theſe two learned men; but Peireſkius could never obtain this friend's picture. He was obliged to have recourſe to a ſtratagem, which he practiſed more than once: he payed a Painter to watch an opportunity of placing himſelf in a convenient place, where, unſeen, he could eaſily have a full view of Velſerus. ‘ Hoc uno ipſi durus fuit (*Velſerus*) quod ſui effigiem conſtantiſſime denegavit, pro eo quo omnibus aliis ardentiſſime flagitantibus denegaverat inſtituto. Et Peireſkius tamen ut alios nonnullos, ſic illum neſcientem pingi procuravit, conducto artifice qui ipſius vultum è clandeſtino loco ſpectaret. Sic obtinuit quod illi Occo ſperare nefas prædixerat, cum id abs Velſero tuliſſet reſponſum, Cato major poſteros volebat quærere cur ſibi ſtatua nulla poſita: Mi-

THE Abbot de St Real, unjuſtly cenſured.

---

(32) In Præfat.

(33) *Lib. ii.* Obſervat. variar. *cap. xxxvi.*

(34) In Auctor. Suppoſit. *pag.* 20, 21.

(35) In Catalogo, *num. lx, in calce Libri* Placcii.

(36) De Anonymis, *cap. xv, pag.* 116.

(37) Ferrarius, Epiſt. ad Arnold. *in Præfat.* Operum Velſeri.

(38) See the remark [*G*], of the article BONGARS.

(39) Bizzar. Polit. *num.* 14, 15, *pag.* 85, *& ſeq.*

(40) *See the* Nouv. de la République des Lettres, *for May*, 1684, *pag.* 316, *of the ſecond edition.*

(41) *See the* Cabale chimérique, *pag.* 214, *of the ſecond edition.*

(42) Le Grain, Decade de Louïs XIII, *livr. x, pag.* 449. *The author of the* Veritez Françoiſes, *printed in the year* 1643, *ſays pag.* 318, *that Vulſer publiſhed his treatiſe of the Liberty of Venice.*

(43) In Vitis Juriſconſult. *pag.* 482.

(44) De vita .... Marci Velſeri, *pag.* 58, *& ſeq.*

(45) Georg. Ritterſhuſius, in Vita Conradi patris, Salviano *præmiſſa, apud* Arnold. *pag.* 59.

to him. He died on the 13th of June 1614, and left no children by his marriage. He had ſeveral brothers, diſtinguiſhed as well by their great merit as by their conſiderable poſts (*b*). See his life prefixed to the new edition of his works, for which we are beholden to the care of Chriſtopher Arnoldus Profeſſor at Nuremberg. An author obſerves that Velſerus left his domeſtic affairs in an ill poſture (*c*), at which I am not at all ſurpriſed. When a man conſecrates himſelf as he did to the ſervice of the learned, and a general correſpondence with authors, it is extreamly difficult for him to avoid expences, and neglecting his private affairs. One Roſerius cenſured him, to whom he did not vouchſafe the honour of an anſwer. Scaliger and others adviſed him thus to deſpiſe his adverſary. Cluverius, who cenſured him in ſome particulars, deſerved an anſwer; but Velſerus had been dead a year before Cluverius's book came out (*d*). Pignorius wrote a very good epitaph on him, which is to be ſeen in the church of the Jacobins at Augſburg, and in John Tonjola's (*e*) appendix to the *Baſilea ſepulta retecta continuata* (*f*).

(*b*) See *Schottus*, in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to *Photius*, and the remark [*A*], in the margin.

(*c*) Eximitur rebus humanis... memoria nominis ſui relicta immortali, perturbatis nonnihil ſuis facultatibus. *Melchior Adam. in Vitis Juriſconſult. pag.* 481.

(*d*) Arnold. de Velſeri vita, &c. *pag.* 54.

(*e*) Miniſter of the Italian church of Baſil.

(*f*) Printed at Baſil in the year 1661. That work was begun by John Groſſius, and carried as far as the year 1619.

'hi contra, quantum video cavendum ne quis aliquando miretur, ſi non & indignetur, qua ambitione conſortio magnorum virorum, quorum imagines ſe colligere Fabricius oſtendit, irrepſerim (46). . . . *This was the only thing in which Velſerus was not complaiſant to him, that he obſtinately refuſed to let him have his picture, as he had conſtantly denied it to all other perſons who earneſtly begged it of him. However, Peireſkius found means to have him drawn without his knowledge, as he had ſome others, by hiring a Painter for that purpoſe, who, without being ſeen, had a full view of his face. And thus he obtained what Occo had told him it was in vain to hope for, when he received this anſwer from Velſerus: Cato, the elder, would have poſterity to enquire, why a ſtatue had not been erected for him; but I, on the other hand, as far as I can ſee, muſt take care that none hereafter may wonder, or perhaps reſent, that I ſhould ambitiouſly obtrude myſelf into the company of great men, of whoſe pictures Peireſc deſigns to make a collection.*' This ſhews that Velſerus was not more complaiſant to others than to Mr de Peireſc, and that he very modeſtly excuſed himſelf to him. I cannot tell whether the picture of Velſerus in the library of Milan, was copied from that drawn for Mr de Peireſc; or whether it was taken by the ſame ſtratagem that Mr de Peireſc uſed: But I know that the picture of this illuſtrious German was placed in that Library. Boſca informs us of this, when he mentions the interview of Olgiati and Velſerus. 'Et quidem nos cùm pictam tabulam quæ expreſſam ipſius imaginem refert, in Ambroſiano Muſeo ſpectamus, gravitatem eam ex oculis conjicimus, & ex oris ipſius majeſtate vim literaturæ ac conſilii in adminiſtranda Vindelicorum provincia deprehendimus (47). - - - *And indeed when we behold his picture, which is perfectly like him, in the Ambroſian library, we may ſee gravity in his looks, and diſcover, by the majeſty of his countenance, his great learning and wiſdom in governing the province of Augſburg.*'

(46) Gaſſendus, in Vita Peireſkii, *lib. i, ad ann.* 1602, *pag. m.* 254.

(47) Petrus Paulus Boſca, Bibliothecarius ex Sodalitio Sacerdotum oblatorum, de origine & ſtatu Biblioth. Ambroſianæ, *pag.* 21, *apud* Arnold, *pag.* 48.

VELSIUS (JUSTUS) in Dutch *Welſens* was born at the Hague. He received the degree of Doctor of Phyſic at Louvain in the year 1542, and ſometimes gave public lectures in the room of Peter Nannius his good friend, and profeſſor in the college of the three languages. He was ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm, and fled from Louvain to avoid the Inquiſition, and retired to Straſburgh. He wrote a book intituled Κρίσις, *ſive veræ Chriſtianæque Philoſophiæ comprobatoris atque æmuli & ſophiſtæ per comparationem Deſcriptio*, which was condemned by the divines of Louvain in the year 1554. Being come to Cologn, and having declared that he had left Straſburgh on account of religion, he was honoured with a profeſſorſhip in Philoſophy, and in Philology (*a*). The chief of his works is a commentary on the picture of Cebes. He was a man of learning but very inconſtant in point of religion [*A*]. He was ſucceſsful in the practice of Phyſic, and excelled in Botanics (*b*). He is very much praiſed by Nigidius in ſome Latin verſes, which Paul Freherus has cited (*c*), and which ſhew that he ſtaid but a little time at Marpurg, where he taught publickly.

(*a*) *Extracted from* Valerius Andreas, Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 605, 606.

(*b*) Merckl. in Lindenio renovato, *pag.* 727.

(*c*) Freh. in Theatro, *pag.* 1247.

[*A*] *He was a man . . . . very inconſtant in point of religion.*] The fear of the Inquiſition made him leave Louvain, where he found he was ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm, and obliged him to go to Straſburgh, the aſylum of Proteſtants (1). Nevertheleſs he wrote a book there which was not favourable to them, and by the very title of it declared war againſt them. The title runs thus: 'Juſti Velſii Hagani in Cebetis Thebani Tabulam Commentariorum Libri ſex totius moralis Philoſophiæ Theſaurus. In quibus nonnulla per occaſionem tum de Studiorum, Artium, & Scientiarum abuſu & corruptela: tum contra ea quæ noſtra hac ætate in Religione exorta ſunt falſa & abſurda dogmata, ad Catholicæ & orthodoxæ veritatis propugnationem & defenſionem diſſeruntur. - - - *Six books of commentaries on the picture of Cebes the Theban, being a treaſure of all moral Philoſophy. In which ſome things are treated occaſionally, both concerning the abuſe and corruption of ſtudies, arts, and ſciences: and againſt thoſe falſe and abſurd doctrines in religion, which have been broached in our time, in defence of the Catholic and Orthodox truth, by Juſtus Velſius of the Hague.*' This work was printed at Lyons in the year 1551, in 4to: the Epiſtle Dedicatory to Antony Perrenot, Biſhop of Arras, is dated at Straſburgh on the firſt day of the year 1550, and ſhews that the author very much condemned the new ſects. However, what he advanced to attack the Proteſtants on the doctrine of Juſtification, did not pleaſe the Spaniſh inquiſitors: for they give notice, in their Index, to read it with caution (2). They put Juſtus Velſius in the firſt claſs of the authors *damnatæ memoriæ, the authors condemned.* They deſire this cenſure may be applied to all the works of Velſius, which they permit to be read, and they abſolutely and for ever condemn his *Epiſtola ad Imperatorem & Electores, & ad Judices terræ, &c.* and his *Criſis Chriſtianæ Philoſophiæ.*

Hoſpinian obſerves (3), that in the year 1556, Calvin being gone to Francfort for ſome important reaſons, publickly diſputed with Juſtus Velſius on Free-will. The diviſions of the church of Francfort were the cauſe of Calvin's journey, as we learn by his letters (4), and by his life (5). It is not to be doubted but that Velſius then lived in the communion of Proteſtants, but with ſome peculiar opinions of his own. This is the more probable, as we know he wrote a confeſſion of faith, which was printed, and which is looked upon as a proof of the diviſions that reigned among the ſects ſeparated from Popery (6).

(1) Deflexit ad Argentinenſes ubi azylum hæretici habebant. *Valer. Andr. Bibliotb. Belgic. pag.* 605.

(2) Index Librorum prohib. *pag. m.* 677.

(3) Hoſpin. Hiſtor. Sacram. *Tom. ii, p.* 422.

(4) Calvini, Epiſt. ccxxiii, *& ſeq.*

(5) Beza, in Vita Calvini, *ad ann.* 1556.

(6) *See* Braunius, in Defenſione Cathol. Tremonenſium, *pag.* 51, 52.

VERDIER (N. Du) Hiſtoriographer of France, author of ſeveral books [*A*], which as they are not excellent, are not inferior to ſeveral which have ſupplied their authors with bread. Notwithſtanding he had the misfortune not to be able to ſubſiſt on the fruits of his pen, tho' very fertile: as I am informed by a very long parentheſis of John Baptiſt de Rocolles [*B*], Hiſtoriographer of France, and of Brandenburg, which I have inſerted in a remark. We may learn from it at what time Du Verdier lived.

[*A*] *Author of ſeveral books.*] Beſides others, he had publiſhed abridgments of the Hiſtory of England, France, Spain, and of the Turks, *&c.* The abridgment of the Hiſtory of France was printed at Paris for the third time, in the year 1655, in two volumes in 12mo.

[*B*] *As I am informed by a very long parentheſis of John Baptiſt de Rocolles.*] The author whom I cite having related the death of Baſſa Geduc Acomat, according to the narrative of the Turkiſh Pandects, extracted from the Italian of the Secretary of Sigiſmund Malateſta Prince of Rimini, adds, immediately after: ‘But poor du Verdier, who wrote in a conciſe but elegant ſtile, an abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Turks, relates it after ſeveral others. (I call this celebrated writer poor, becauſe whilſt I write this, he and his poor wife are in the hoſpital of the Salt-Peter-Houſe at Paris, where they have been for ſeven or eight years paſt, where I have viſited him, and found true what fame had long ſince divulged concerning his great probity: this made me deplore the fate of ſeveral learned men in this flouriſhing age, in which virtue and merit ought to be more valued.’) This author ſaith, *&c* (1).

(1) Rocolles, Vie du Sultan Gemes, *printed at Leyden in* 1683, *pag.* 132, 133.

VERGERIUS (Peter-Paul) One of the learned men of the XVth century, was born at Capo d'Iſtria (*a*) on the gulph of Venice. He was a good Philoſopher, and ſo happily intermixed polite learning with the Law, that he was eſteemed the moſt eloquent Civilian of his time (*b*). He learned Greek under Emanuel Chryſoloras at Venice (*c*), and the Canon Law under Francis de Zabarellis at Florence (*d*). He was very much reſpected by Prince Carrari Lord of Padua, who choſe him preceptor to his children (*e*). He was not leſs conſidered by the Emperor Sigiſmund, at whoſe court in Hungary he died (*f*), and whom he accompanied to the council of Conſtance, if I am not miſtaken [*A*]. He wrote ſeveral books [*B*].

(*a*) In Latin *Juſtinopolis.*

(*e*) Leand. Albert. Deſcript. Ital. *pag. m.* 777.

(*f*) Volaterr. *lib. iv*, *pag.* 133.

(*b*) Juriſconſultorum ſuo tempore eloquentiſſimus, ſive mavis dicere eloquentium Juriſconſultiſſimus, ſimul & philoſophus fuit. *Volaterr. lib. xxi*, *pag. m.* 773. (*c*) Paul. Jovius, Elog. *cap. cxi*, *pag. m.* 254. (*d*) Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpret. *lib. iii*, *cap. xxviii*, *pag. m.* 444.

[*A*] *He had accompanied the Emperor Sigiſmond to the council of Conſtance, if I am not miſtaken.*] I make uſe of this reſerve, becauſe the expreſſions of thoſe, who inform us that he appeared with a great deal of luſtre in that council, *claruit in Concilio Conſtantienſi* (1), do not prove that he was a domeſtic to the Emperor. Perhaps the proof he gave of his merit during the holding of that council, determined Sigiſmund to take him into his ſervice.

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] The Hiſtory of the Princes of Carrari, and that of the Princes of Mantua. An Elogy of St Jerom. A treatiſe *de Republica Veneta*, printed at Rome in 1526 (2). An Invective againſt Malateſta, who cauſed Virgil's ſtatue at Mantua to be taken down (3). A letter *de vita & obitu Franciſci Zabarellæ Cardinalis Florentini* (4). The Life of Petrarch. A treatiſe *de ingenuis moribus ac liberalibus ſtudiis*, which was printed at Venice in 1502, with ſome other ſmall tracts of the like nature, *cum commentariis Joannis Bonardi Veronenſis & aliis aliorum de puerorum educatione opuſculis* (5), and re-printed at Baſil in the year 1541, *cum L. Vitruvii Roſcii de docendi ſtudendique modo, & claris peurorum moribus libello* (6). This was read in the ſchools, when Paul Jovius was a young ſcholar (7). Add to this, that he was the firſt who tranſlated *Arrianus de rebus geſtis Alexandri Magni* (8). But this verſion being deſigned for the uſe of the Emperor Sigiſmund, who was not very learned, he therefore made uſe of very barbarous Latin, as Bartholomew Flaccius obſerves (9). We may here, by the way, obſerve a miſtake of Leander Albertus; he clearly inſinuates that Marius Æquicola is the firſt, who mentioned that Charles Malateſta cauſed Virgil's ſtatue to be thrown into the river. ‘Quamquam, *ſaith he* (10). à Mario Æquicola in commentariis lingua vernacula de Mantuanis principibus conſcriptis injuria hercle carpatur, ac ſi ſtatuam Virgilii poëtæ in flumen abjici juſſerit: Etenim (11) ipſo auctori huic rei Æquicolæ fides tribuitur exigua, modicæ nimirum opinionis ſcriptori. - - - - *Tho' he be unjuſtly cenſured by Marius Equicola in his Italian Memoirs concerning the Princes of Mantua, as if he had ordered the ſtatue of the Poet Virgil to be thrown into the river: for Equicola, who ſays this, being an author of no eſteem, is very little credited.*’ It is certain that our Vergerio lived before this Equicola.

I deſire it may be obſerved that Voſſius, when he wrote his book concerning the Latin Hiſtorians, remembred very well, that our Vergerius was author of the invective againſt Charles Malateſta; but he had forgot it when he compoſed his treatiſe of the Latin Poets: for he there declares that he did not know whether this invective was written by Guarini of Verona, or one of his diſciples. ‘Statuam Mantuæ conſtitutam Maroni ante hos annos ducentos Carolus de Malateſtis, tanquam quæ nihil ad religionem Chriſtianam pertineret, dejici curavit. Habeoque orationem Manuſcriptam adverſus Carolum iis temporibus ſuper hoc exaratam, ſatis ſanè acerbam: Et tamen auctor ait, acerbiùs ſe ſcripturum fuiſſe, ſi tutum fuiſſet in eos ſcribere, qui poſſent proſcribere. Nomen auctoris non apponitur: Sed permiſta legitur orationibus, libelliſque Guarini, ac diſcipulorum, qui auctore magiſtro hujuſmodi oneris aliquid ſuſcipere ſolerent. Ut videri poſſit ſcripta ab ipſo Guarino Veronenſi, clariſſimo ſui temporis viro, vel ſaltem diſcipulorum aliquo (12). - - - - *Charles Malateſta, above two hundred years ago, ordered Virgil's ſtatue, at Mantua, to be taken down, as being a thing foreign to the Chriſtian religion. And I have by me a pretty ſmart invective in manuſcript, which was then written againſt Malateſta on that account: and yet the author ſays he would have written more ſharply, had it been ſafe to write againſt thoſe, who had power to baniſh. The author's name is not put to it: but it is inſerted amongſt the orations and tracts of Guarini and his diſciples, who, by his order uſed to undertake ſomething of this nature. So that it may probably have been written by Guarini of Verona, or at leaſt by one of his diſciples.*’

(1) Andreas Divus, *Præfat. in Iliada Homeri à ſe verſam.*

(2) Geſner. in Biblioth. *fol.* 551, *verſo.*

(3) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Lat. *pag.* 553.

(4) Panzirol. de claris Leg. Interpret. *lib. iii*, *cap. xxviii*, *pag. m.* 444.

(5) Voſſius, ubi ſupra. *pag.* 552.

(6) Geſn. ubi ſupra, *fol.* 552.

(7) Jovius, in Elog. *cap. cxi*, *pag.* 254.

(8) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 552.

(9) In Præfat. ſuper ſua Tranſlat. eorundem Librorum apud *Geſn. ubi ſupra.*

(10) Leand. Albert. in Deſcript. Ital. *pag.* 455.

(11) I ſet down thoſe words with the errors of the preſs in Albertus.

(12) Voſſius, de Poëtis Latin. *pag.* 27.

VERGERIUS (Peter-Paul) of the ſame city (*a*) and family with the foregoing (*b*), flouriſhed in the XVIth century. He ſtudied the Civil Law, and took his degree of Doctor in Law; but he made himſelf more famous by his embaſſies, and by eccleſiaſtical affairs, than by his learning in the Civil Law. He was ſent Nuncio into Germany to the King of the Romans (*c*) by Clement VII, in the year 1530, and had orders to uſe all

(*a*) Fra-Paolo, Iſtor. del Concilio, *lib. i*, *pag. m.* 80.

(*b*) See what Andrew Divus tells him, in dedicating to him his Latin tranſlation of the Iliad. You will find his words in Geſner's *Bibliotheca*, *fol.* 552, and in *Voſſius*, *de Hiſt. Lat. pag.* 553. (*c*) Ferdinand, brother to the Emperor Charles V.

all poſſible means to hinder the aſſembling of a national council. He ſupported the intereſt of Popery with a great deal of vigour and addreſs, and oppoſed the progreſs of the Lutherans as much as he could. He was re-called by Paul III, who deſired to be thoroughly informed of the diſpoſitions of Germany, and was ſent thither again in the year 1535, with orders to promiſe the holding of a council, and with ſome other inſtructions. On this head he conferred with ſeveral Proteſtant princes, and with Luther himſelf at Wittemberg [*A*]. He gave to the Pope an account of his negotiation the following year, and was immediately ordered to Naples to treat with Charles V. He was raiſed to the epiſcopal dignity in the ſame year 1536 (*d*), and in conjunction with eight other commiſſioners he drew up the papal indiction or promulgation of a council. He returned into Germany in the year 1541, to aſſiſt at the aſſembly of Worms: he appeared

(*d*) Tunc primum factus Epiſcopus Modruſienſis, ac non multo poſt Juſtinopolitanus. *Melch. Adam, ubi infra, pag.* 118.

[*A*] *He conferred with Luther himſelf at Wittemberg.*] Father Paul and Pallavicini relate this very differently. The firſt aſſures us that the Pope ordered *Vergerius to treat with Luther, and the chief of his party, and to endeavour to regain them by promiſes and careſſes* (1), and that this Nuncio *went to Luther at Wittemberg, and treated him very obligingly, according to his orders* (2). He recites the diſcourſe the Nuncio made, and Luther's anſwer. He ſhews the magnificent promiſes and moſt engaging behaviour of the former in his diſcourſe. But Luther's anſwer is full of an holy contempt of all thoſe advantageous offers: he diſcovers an admirable firmneſs and reſolution. Pallavicini relates this ſtory in a quite other manner, and accuſes Father Paul of having ſtuffed his hiſtory with more lies than Homer had invented concerning the Trojan war. He complains that Father Paul diſgraces the Pope by repreſenting him as making ſuch ſhameful advances, and that he beſtows ſo much piety, wiſdom, and greatneſs of ſoul on a Heretic. He maintains that Vergerio unexpectedly ſaw Luther. This Nuncio, ſaith he, being obliged to paſs through Wittemberg, was there very honourably received. The commander of that town waited at his table during his ſupper, and came to him next morning to do him the ſame ſervice at his breakfaſt, bringing with him two doctors, Martin Luther and John Bugenhage, and telling him that the court and univerſity were both abſent (3), and that he could find no other perſons but theſe two, who were able to converſe with him in an intelligible language, and keep him company; and he begged of him to converſe with them whilſt he breakfaſted. The Nuncio could not deny it, he found that Luther expreſſed himſelf barbarouſly in Latin; he ſuffered him to ſay ſeveral things without anſwering ſcarce one word, and took him for a very haughty, malicious, and imprudent man, whoſe manners were very unpolite. *Have you heard any thing in Italy, concerning the character I have there of being a drunken German* (4)? was one of the queſtions which Luther aſked Vergerius. He ſaid ſeveral things of the ſame nature, which the Nuncio mentioned in his letter to the Pope's ſecretary, in which he did not forget to deſcribe Luther's habit and manners. This is the ſubſtance of Pallavicini's relation (5), which he took from Vergerius's letter written to the Pope's ſecretary on the 12th of November 1535, and he concludes from hence, that Father Paul is miſtaken when he affirms that the Pope gave Vergerio order to make large promiſes to Martin Luther. This inference is inconteſtable, and there is no other way left to bring off Father Paul than to prove the falſity of the Nuncio's letter; for if it be owned to be authentic, it plainly appears that the Pope did not order Vergerio to gain Luther by endearing perſuaſions and hopes of honours; for if he had, Vergerio, by this relation of his diſcourſe with Luther, which he ſent in his letter to the Pope's ſecretary, had rendered himſelf as ridiculous as any of the moſt ſenſeleſs wretches that are ſhut up in a mad-houſe.

Perhaps it may be ſaid, that it is at leaſt true that Vergerius held, of his own head, this diſcourſe with Luther, which Father Paul relates, from whence it will naturally follow, that Luther's anſwer, related by the ſame author, is not a pure invention. I wiſh, at leaſt, that Father Paul's fidelity on this laſt head could be juſtified; but I cannot ſee how: for in the firſt place, according to Father Maimbourg's remark, *Theſe fine diſcourſes of Father Paul are not found in the writers of thoſe times; not even in Sleidan, who ſaith only in one word, that Vergerio ſaw Luther at Wittemberg* (6). In the ſecond place, the curious and indefatigable Seckendorf, who met with a relation of the interview betwixt the Nuncio and Luther, ſays nothing concerning the Nuncio's promiſes (7); and this relation being made by a very good friend to Luther, it is not credible that he ſhould forget the moſt conſiderable paſſage in this narration, I mean, the Nuncio's advantageous offers, and the heroic and entirely apoſtolical contempt of them which Luther ſhewed. And therefore the ſilence of the relation, is a demonſtrative proof againſt Father Paul. It ought not to be objected that the author of this relation informs us, that he has omitted ſeveral particulars; for ſince what he relates is leſs important and honourable than Father Paul's fine diſcourſes, he would doubtleſs have inſerted them into his narrative, rather than any of the reſt, if they had really been ſpoken. He hath not omitted Luther's jeſting anſwer to his Barber, and would he then have forgot an anſwer more worthy of St Paul than of a Doctor of the XVIth century? Luther, before he made a viſit to Vergerio, cauſed himſelf to be ſhaved very early in the morning. At which the Barber was very much ſurprized. Do not wonder at this, replies the Reformer (8), I have been ſent for to talk with the Nuncio of the holy Father, and I would not be ſeen in a ſlovenly manner; and ſhaving will make me appear younger, and I ſhall the more terrify my adverſaries with a fear of my living the longer. The author of the Relation does not forget even this particular. Obſerve, that this account very plainly inſinuates, that this interview was not unexpected on the Nuncio's ſide, and that it expreſly ſays, that they talked much concerning the holding of a council. From whence we may infer that Vergerio did not write an exact account of all the particulars of this converſation with the Pope's ſecretary: ſo that one of Pallavicini's reaſons is very weak; he ſaith, the Nuncio dared not diſguiſe the truth, ſince the contents of his dialogue with Luther before a whole table full of auditors, might be ſent to the Pope by other hands (9). Obſerve alſo that Spondanus relates, that Paul III charged his Nuncio, Peter-Paul Vergerius, to treat Martin Luther in a very engaging manner, and to make him a great many promiſes (10). Once more, this is inconſiſtent with the Nuncio's letter, and perhaps we ſhould not be in the wrong to ſubſcribe to the judgment of a Jeſuit in this particular. *I believe*, ſaith he (11), *that the moſt certain thing that can be ſaid upon this, is, that Father Paul diverted himſelf at the expence of truth, by making theſe two perſons ſpeak as he pleaſed, to whom, as it appears, he was no enemy.*

Will it be objected, that the order to tempt Luther by magnificent promiſes, was a ſecret whiſpered in the ear, that only Vergerio and the Pope were acquainted with, and therefore it was not mentioned in the long letter written to the Pope's ſecretary by Vergerio, which Father Pallavicini cites? This is the laſt ſhift of a cavilling man, which may be eaſily forced; for if this particular inſtruction of the Nuncio was only whiſpered in his ear by the Pope; if the Nuncio durſt not write any thing to the Pope's ſecretary, which ſhould hint that his Holineſs had given him ſuch an inſtruction, how came Father Paul by this large account of the Nuncio's offers? Had he ſeen Vergerio's letters, which were to be read by the Pope only? This is what he ſhould inform us of, and till we know it, we have reaſon to believe Vergerio's diſpatches, that are ſtill in the archives, and to affirm that the Pope burnt all thoſe letters which were written for his peruſal only; which is a new reaſon to aſk how they then reached the hands of this Servite at Venice. And when all is ſaid, may we not object to Father Paul the ſilence of the Relation which Mr Seckendorf found amongſt the Wittemberg manuſcripts?

[*B*] *This*

(1) Father Paul, Hiſt. *of the council of Trent. lib. i, p. m.* 69.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 70.

(3) The profeſſors had removed elſewhere by reaſon of the plague.

(4) La prima coſa che diſſe vedendomi taciturno fù, ſe in Italia io haveva inteſo alcuna coſa della ſua fama d'eſſer Tedeſco imbriaco. *Vergerius, Epiſt. ad Secretarium Papæ*, apud *Pallavic. Iſtor. del Concilio, lib. iii, cap. xviii, num.* 9.

(5) Pallavicin. ibid. *num.* 6, *& ſeq.*

(6) Maimbourg. Hiſt. du Lutheriſme, *Tom. i, livr. iii, pag.* 229, *Dutch Edit.*

(7) Seckendorf. Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. iii, pag.* 95.

(8) Jocabundus dixit: ſe ad ſanctiſſimi Patris Nuncium vocatum eſſe, nec incultum accedere velle; ita fore, ut pro juniori haberetur, & longioris vitæ metu adverſarios terreret. *Seckendorf, Hiſt. Luther. lib. iii, pag.* 95, *col.* 1.

(9) Pallavic. ubi ſupra, *num.* 10, *pag. m.* 352.

(10) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1535, *num.* 10.

(11) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 230.

appeared there as a perſon employed by the King of France; but this is ſaid to have been only a feint [*B*], and that he took that character in order to render himſelf the more ſerviceable to the court of Rome. He publiſhed an oration on the Unity of the Church, chiefly to prove that a particular council ought not to be held. Being returned to Rome, he found that ſome perſons had ſo far rendered him ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm, that the Pope hearkening to their calumnies, had given over his deſign of making him a Cardinal (*e*). This news threw him into a conſternation, and he reſolved to juſtify himſelf. For this purpoſe he retired into his own country, and there began a controverſial book againſt the German apoſtates. He examined their books, he weighed the force of their objections, he attentively conſidered the ways of refuting them; but this diligent ſtudy only ſerved to convince him, that they were in the right. From that time he renounced all hopes of a cardinal's hat, and went to his brother (*f*), who was Biſhop of Pola, to whom he declared the condition he was in; he aſked his advice, and without any regard to the compaſſion he had excited in him, he exhorted him to conſult the ſcripture, and above all with reſpect to the doctrine of Juſtification. The Biſhop of Pola having followed his counſel, was convinced of the truth of the Proteſtant doctrine, and agreed with his brother to teach the truth for the future. They executed their deſign; but the Monks perceiving it, alarmed the Inquiſition, and made a great ſtir about it. One of the Inquiſitors prodigiouſly harraſſed the citizens of Pola and of Capo d'Iſtria [*C*]; inſomuch that our Vergerius, not believing himſelf ſafe, retired to Mantua, to Cardinal Hercules de Gonzaga: there he did not long find a ſecure retreat; for John della Caſa, the Pope's

(*e*) See the remark [*D*].

(*f*) John Baptiſt Vergerius.

[*B*] *This is ſaid to have been only a feint.*] Sleidan and, after him, Melchior Adam affirm it. 'Erat etiam 'hoc in conventu (*Wormatienſi*) Petrus Paulus Vergerius, epiſcopus Juſtinopolitanus, verbo quidem, tanquam Galliæ regis cauſa, ſed revera miſſus à pontifice, qui ſuis rebus illum inſervire magis poſſe putabat, ſi quidem alieno nomine ibi verſaretur (12). '- - - *Peter-Paul Vergerius, Biſhop of Capo d'Iſtria, was alſo preſent at this aſſembly of Worms, in the name of the King of France, as it was indeed pretended, but in truth was ſent thither by the Pope, who thought he might be more ſerviceable to him under a foreign character.*' Father Paul affirms the ſame thing, *The Biſhop of Capo d'Iſtria*, ſaith he (13), *was preſent at this conference, not as the Pope's miniſter, though really ſent by Paul as a man very well verſed in the knowledge of that country, but in the name of France, that he might be leſs ſuſpected by the Germans, and more capable of ſerving the Pope under a foreign character.* He adds, 'that ſeveral perſons there made it their buſineſs to prolong that affair, to which they were induced by the Nuncio Campegio, and the ſecret practices of Vergerio.' Cardinal Pallavicini, according to his cuſtom, here complains of the malignity of Father Paul; he accuſes him of falſely charging the Pope with a ſpirit of fraud; and to convict him of falſity, he tells us that Vergerio had been long ſuſpected at the court of Rome. Cardinal Alexander's letters had produced this effect; he had informed the Pope that Vergerio ſpoke diſadvantageouſly of the Holy See, and held correſpondence with Luther's diſciples. It was believed at Rome, that this Biſhop's continuance in Germany was a ſign of the venom of hereſy which he had ſwallowed, wherefore they endeavoured to oblige him to reſidence, and made it a requeſt to the Emperor, that a Prelate ſo much ſuſpected as he, ſhould be obliged to live far from the Empire, and not aſſiſt at the conferences concerning religion. If this be true, we may ſuppoſe that he aſſumed the character of Envoy of France, without any colluſion of the Pope. Pallavicini's words and proofs run thus (14). 'Il qual racconto è sì falſo, che molto prima 'il Cardinal Aleandro haveva ammonito * ſegretiſſimamente il Pontefice, come il Vergerio parlava con poco onore della Sede Apoſtolica, minacciava contra di eſſa, e teneva amicizia con Luterani; del che allegò per teſtimonii il Nunzio Morone, e quel di Vinezia. Ed inconformità d'una tale opinione formata di lui, nel quale traſparivano i ſemi di quelle ſerpi ch'egli covava nell' animo, e che poi uſcirono nelle ſcritture e nell' azioni: era il ſenſo che havevaſi à queſto tempo in Roma della ſua dimora in Germania: Tantoche gli s'era anch'eſibito lo ſgravamento della penſione per indurlo alla reſidenza nel Veſcovado. E tuttociò fè ſignificare il Pontefice ** all' Imperadore dal Nunzio Poggi, affinche l'autorità Ceſarea (quando ciò foſſe poſſibile) il teneſſe lungi da quelle Provincie, e da que' trattati. - - - '*This account is ſo falſe, that Cardinal Alexander had long before privately acquainted the Pope, that Vergerio ſpoke diſhonourably of the Apoſtolic ſee, threw out menaces againſt it, and maintained a friendſhip with the Lutherans: for which he alledged the teſtimonies of the Nuncio Morone, and of the Nuncio to Venice. Accordingly it was believed at Rome, that his continuance in Germany manifeſted the ſeeds of that poiſon which were ſown in his mind, and afterwards ſprung forth in his writings and actions: ſo that the taking away of the penſion was intimated to him, in order to induce him to reſide in his biſhopric. And moreover the Pope ordered the Nuncio Poggi to deſire the Emperor to uſe his authority (as ſoon as poſſible) to keep him at a diſtance from the empire, and from ſuch conferences.*' Obſerve that the Cardinal doth not deny what Father Paul ſays concerning Vergerio's conduct: he doth not deny the artifices of this miniſter of the King of France, which were ſo conformed to the court of Rome. He ſaith nothing on that head, but tells us that Vergerio was a man of a lively and bold genius, and of the humour of certain perſons who cannot live without being in the management of public buſineſs, and who fancy that it cannot be carried on without them. *Huomo quanto vivace, tanto audace, e frà la condizione di coloro che nè poſſano vivere ſenza maneggiar negozii, nè penſano che i negozii poſſano maneggiarſi ſenza di loro* (15). As for the reſt, what Sleidan ſaith, that Vergerio at his return from the Diet of Worms, had been created Cardinal, if ſome perſons had not altered the Pope's mind, he calls (16) it a fable, and maintains that in 1539 the Pope was diſpleaſed with that biſhop.

[*C*] *One of the Inquiſitors prodigiouſly haraſſed the citizens of Pola, and of Capo d'Iſtria.*] We can never too often repreſent the villany and injuſtice annexed to the profeſſion of Inquiſitor. Wherefore I ſhall here give a ſhort account of that man's conduct, who exerciſed that office in the dioceſes of the two Vergerio's. His name was Annibal Griſon. He entered the houſes of the inhabitants to ſearch for ſuſpicious books; he excommunicated thoſe who did not detect the perſons that appeared to them ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm; he promiſed to mitigate the puniſhment of thoſe who ſhould renounce their hereſy, and apply to him to aſk pardon; but he threatned thoſe with fire, who did not prevent their accuſers by an humble confeſſion of their crime. He denounced his threats from door to door, and ſpread terror every where. Some accuſed themſelves: he ſeverely cenſured thoſe, who had read the Bible in the vulgar language, and forbad their continuance in that crime. Soon after nothing was ſeen but accuſations, every one engaged in them without regard to the laws of conſanguinity or gratitude. The wife did not ſpare her huſband, the ſon his father, nor the client his patron; ſeveral perſons were brought into trouble for trifles, ſuch, for example, who had only ventured to ſpeak againſt the bigottry of others

(12) Sleidanus, *lib. xiii, fol. m.* 318, *verſo.*

(13) Father Paul's Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, *book i, pag. m.* 87.

(14) Pallavicin. ubi ſupra, *lib. iv, cap. xii, num.* 11, *pag. m.* 433, 434. *See alſo ch. xiii, num. iii, of the vith book, pag.* 635.

* Lettera del Card. Aleandro al Cervino, a 12 di Marzo 1539, della quale il Cervino accuſa la ricevuta in una all' Aleandri ſotto i 28 dell' iſteſſo.

** Lettere del Card. Farneſe al Poggi dell' ultimo di Febraio 1541.

(15) Id. ibid.

(16) Idem, *lib. vi, cap. xiii, num.* 3.

Pope's legate at Venice, made ſo many inſtances to the Cardinal, to oblige him to rid himſelf of ſuch a gueſt, that Vergerius found it very proper to leave Mantua. He went to Trent in order to purge himſelf before the council [*D*]. The Pope would very willingly have ſeized him, but being loth to give occaſion to any complaints that the aſſembly was not free, he wrote to his legates to forbid this Biſhop taking his place there, and that they ſhould order him to depart. Some reaſons that were given for that prohibition are pitiful [*E*]. Vergerius retired to Venice, where he took care not to conform to

others. *Deinde promiſcua multitudo, timore perculſis animis, deferebant quoſque certatim, nulla neque propinquitatis neque neceſſitudinis aut beneficiorum habita ratione:* non parenti filius, non uxor marito, non cliens patrono parcebat. *Delationes autem erant plerunque de rebus frivolis; ut quiſque forte aliquid ob ſuperſtitionem in aliquo reprehenderat* (17). On a ſolemn day this Inquiſitor celebrated Maſs in the cathedral of Capo d'Iſtria, and told the people: of late years you have lain under many calamities; your olive-trees as well as your corn-fields and vineyards have been barren; your cattle have been afflicted with diſtempers. Your Biſhop and other Heretics have expoſed you to theſe evils. Do not expect any relief, unleſs you ſuppreſs thoſe Heretics, and what have you now to do but to fall upon and ſtone them immediately? *Hoc tempore, & hiſce aliquot annis, multæ vos premunt calamitates: quæ nunc oleas, nunc ſegetes, modò vineas, modò pecudes, aliaſque facultates graviter affligunt: his verò malis cauſam præbet Epiſcopus veſter & hæreticorum turba reliqua: nec eſt quod levationem ullam ſperetis, niſi coërceantur: proximum autem eſt, ut impetu facto lapidentur* (18). You will find all this in Sleidan's Hiſtory (19). Obſerve, that Vergerius had ſo much prudence as not to truſt himſelf to the mercy of a populace thus animated by a furious perſecutor. *He made his eſcape*, as Father Paul obſerves, *from the fury of the people of his dioceſe, which the Inquiſitor Hannibal Griſon had irritated againſt him by charging him with being a Lutheran, and the cauſe of the ſterility of the earth* (20). I cannot tell whether this Hannibal had ever read the writings of the Fathers, wherein we find the ridiculous reproaches of the Pagans, that the followers of JESUS CHRIST were the cauſe of all the calamities which befel the people (21). I do not know whether he had read this excellent paſſage of Tertullian: ‘At è contrario illis nomen factionis accommodandum eſt, qui in odium bonorum & proborum conſpirant, qui adverſum ſanguinem innocentium conclamant, prætexentes ſanè ad odii defenſionem, illam quoque vanitatem, quòd exiſtiment omnis publicæ cladis, omnis popularis incommodi Chriſtianos eſſe cauſam. Si Tyberis aſcendit in mœnia, ſi Nilus non aſcendit in arva, ſi cœlum ſtetit, ſi terra movit, ſi fames, ſi lues, ſtatim Chriſtianos ad leonem (22). - - - *But, on the contrary, the name of faction ought to be given to thoſe who concur in their enmity againſt good and upright men, and thirſt for the blood of the innocent: alledging fooliſhly in their own vindication, that the Chriſtians are the cauſe of all public calamities, and of every public misfortune. If the Tyber overflows its banks, or the Nile does not cover the lands, if there is a drought, an earthquake, famine or peſtilence, the Chriſtians muſt immediately be thrown to the lions.*' But I am perſuaded that though the Inquiſitor had perfectly known all this, it would not have hindred him from ſaying, when proviſions were dear, or there was a mortality amongſt the cattle, that the Heretics were the cauſe of it. Such a man conſults his falſe zeal more than reaſon, and conſequently may very well be ſo blind as not to ſee the abſurdity of caſting the ſame reproaches on Lutheraniſm which the Pagans did upon the primitive Chriſtians, and which all Proteſtants may return on Papiſts in the countries where they are ſtrongeſt. But which is more, though ſuch a man had been ſenſible of this abſurdity, yet he was bad enough to have uſed it, becauſe he thought nothing would enrage the people againſt the Lutherans, and make them ſtone them more than this. Is it aſtoniſhing that a Monk ſhould uſe this contrivance? Do not we ſee that as ſoon as the Chriſtians were able to perſecute, they reproached the Heathens with the ſame things which the Heathens had imputed to them, that is to ſay, with being the cauſe that they had not good crops, and that the ſeaſons changed their natural courſe. I do not cite a private inconſiderable author to prove this, but a very authentic piece and imperial authority. Read what follows, ‘An diutiùs perferimus mutari temporum vices, iratâ cœli temperie? quæ, Paganorum exacerbata perfidiâ, neſcit naturæ libramenta ſervare. Unde enim ver ſolitam gratiam abjuravit? unde æſtas meſſe jejunâ, laborioſum Agricolam in ſpe deſtituit ariſtarum? unde hyemis intemperata ferocitas, ubertatem terrarum penetrabili frigore ſterilitatis læſione damnavit? niſi quod ad impietatis vindictam tranſit lege ſuâ naturæ decretum (23). - - - *Shall we any longer ſuffer the ſeaſons to be inverted; or the courſe of nature changed through the perfidy of Pagans? Whence is it that the ſpring denies its uſual delights? that the ſummer deprives the laborious huſbandman of his expected crop? or that the rigorous winter by its penetrating cold deſtroys the fruitfulneſs of the earth? but becauſe nature, to be revenged on impiety, departs from its common courſe.*' Mr Van Dale hath made ſome very good reflexions on this head (24). When we conſider theſe prepoſterous judgments, it is not eaſy to refrain from ſaying that there are certain faults which cling faſt to ſects, not as they are ſects, but as they are predominant. Hence it is that the ſame communions alter their ſentiments and maxims, as they acquire or loſe ſuperiority. The maxim, new honours new manners, holds very true here, and we may very well invert the ſenſe of that of Cornelius Nepos (25), without falſifying it.

[*D*] *He went to Trent in order to purge himſelf before the council.*] Melchior Adam ought to be blamed for not mentioning the year in which Vergerio went to Trent. He hath taken from Sleidan all that he hath ſaid concerning the converſion of this biſhop; but though that author ſucceſſively relates theſe things under the year 1548, we ought not to believe that Vergerio was at Trent in that year. He was there according to Father Paul in 1546. ‘He believed that the moſt honourable and commodious way of juſtifying himſelf was at the council. But the Legates would not admit him into the congregation, becauſe he had not cleared himſelf to the Pope, to whom they earneſtly preſſed him to go; and if they had not been afraid of raiſing a report againſt the liberty of the council, they had not contented themſelves with bare exhortations. So that Vergerio, after ſome days ſtay, departed from Trent, intending to return to his biſhopric, where he hoped the troubles were appeaſed. But when he was at Venice, the Nuncio † forbad his return thither, having received orders from Rome to proſecute him, which obliged him to quit Italy within a few months, either induced to it by reſentment, or fear, or ſome other motive (26).' I cite this paſſage, as well becauſe it contains ſome facts not touched on by Sleidan, as becauſe Father Paul's Chronology wants a little correction. What he tells us of Vergerio's leaving Italy in 1546 is not true. He did not quit that country till after having ſeen the miſerable end of Spira at Padua, who died in 1548 (27). If we will add to this Pallavicini's cenſures, we muſt ſay that Vergerio finding himſelf cited at Rome, where he had been accuſed as ſuſpected of hereſy, went to Trent (28), where he expected a ſafe refuge, and hoped to enjoy his right of ſitting amongſt the Biſhops as judge of that faith which he was charged with having deſerted. But being excluded from this right, he obtained, by the interceſſion of the Legates, a diſpenſation from appearing at Rome; and his caſe was committed to the Nuncio and Patriarch of Venice, according to his requeſt: but being ſenſible that he could not juſtify himſelf, he retired to the Proteſtants.

[*E*] *Some reaſons that were given for that prohibition are pitiful.*] ‘Vergerius intending to retire from the council, to the deſires of John della Caſa, who adviſed him to go to Rome. A few days after he was forbid in the Pope's name to return to his biſhopric. He went to Padua, and there became a witneſs of the deplorable death of Francis Spira. This example of deſpair, to which thoſe expoſe themſelves, who hold the truth in unrighteouſneſs, made him reſolve to undergo a voluntary exile, that he might be thereby enabled to make an open profeſſion of the pure religion. He went to the Griſons, and was a miniſter amongſt them for ſome years, as well as in the Valteline: after which, he was invited to Tubingen by the Duke of Wirtemberg, where he died on the 4th of October 1565. He publiſhed ſeveral books which proved very prejudicial to the Romiſh communion [*F*].

---

(17) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. Exter. *pag.* 119.

(18) Id. ibid. *ex* Sleidano, ubi infra.

(19) Sleidan, *livr. xxi, fol. m.* 589, *ad ann.* 1548.

(20) Fra-Paolo, ubi ſupra, *lib. ii, pag.* 141.

(21) *See* Origen contra Celſum, *lib. iii, & in* Matthæum, *cap. xxiv*; Arnobius, *lib. i*; St Cyprian, *lib.* ad Demetrianum, *and among his letters the lxxvth*; Oroſius, *lib. vii, cap. xxxvii*; St Auguſtin, de Civit. Dei, *paſſim*; *&c.*

(22) Tertul. Apologet. *cap. xl.*

(23) Novella III Theodoſii de Judæis, Samaritanis, & Hæreticis.

(24) Van Dale, de Oraculis, *pag.* 21, 22.

(25) *He ſays* Sui cuique mores fingunt fortunam. - - - *A man's manners make his fortune. See, above, citation* (50), *of the article* TIMOLEON. *But it may be ſaid with as much reaſon,* ſua cuique fortuna fingit mores. - - *A man's fortune makes his manners.*

† John della Caſa, Archbiſhop of Benevento, who was Secretary of State under Paul IV.

(26) Fra-Paolo, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 141.

(27) Sleidan. *lib. xxi, fol. m.* 588.

(28) Pallav. Iſtor. del Concilio, *lib. vi, cap. xiii, num. iii. He quotes the letters written by the legates to Cardinal Ardinghelli, the 27th of February* 1546, *and to cardinal Farneze, the ſecond and the ſixth of March in the ſame year.*

Before

‘ council, went to Cervinus (29), and aſked him for what reaſons he was rejected out of the company of the other Biſhops in the council. Cervinus then anſwered: becauſe I have heard that you denied the truth of the Legends of St George and St Chriſtopher. It is true, replied Vergerio, I did, and do yet deny them; but I ground that denial on the authority of Pope Paul III, who commanded them both to be left out of the Breviary. And in the Preface to that book, he ſaith that he had commanded that all thoſe Legends ſhould be left out which are not true. Cervinus being at a ſtand, could think of no other anſwer than this: thoſe perſons ought not to paſs for good men, who ſeem to agree with the Lutherans in any particular whatſoever, and therefore do you retire from our council (30).’ Thoſe who believe it utterly improbable, that Vergerio's deſpiſing thoſe Legends could be the only reaſon which the Legate urged, will be at leaſt ſatisfied with the Hiſtorian, when he owns that at laſt the Legate quitted that reaſon and alledged another. But they will never pardon Chemnitius for ſaying, That Vergerius ran the riſque of his life by venturing to declare, that he did not approve all that was contained in the Legend of St George. ‘ Nota eſt Vergerii hiſtoria, qui cum in Tridentina ſynodo Georgii legendam, quam Gelaſius diſtinctio. 15. diſerte autoribus hæreticis tribuit, ſibi non per omnia probari oſtenderet, in diſcrimen dignitatis, imo vitæ & capitis adductus fuit (31). - - - *The ſtory of Vergerius is well known, who having declared at the Council of Trent that he did not approve all that was contained in the Legend of St George, which Pope Gelaſius expreſsly aſcribes to heretical authors, ran the riſque not only of his dignity but of his life.*’ It muſt be allowed that this account is not exact, and that at leaſt there plainly appears in it the ſophiſm ‘ à non ſufficienti enumeratione partium. - - - *A defective enumeration of parts.*’ He reduces ſeveral reaſons to that, which in all likelihood was looked upon as the moſt inconſiderable.

What I am going to ſay is not one of the circumſtances which concern the text of this remark. Crepinus affirms (32), that ſeveral Biſhops being informed that Cervinus, contrary to the opinion of his two colleagues and of ſome cardinals, perſiſted in his refuſal to admit Vergerius into the council, reſolved to write upon it to the Pope: *Jerom Vida of Cremona, Biſhop of Alba, an excellent Poet, had already drawn up the letters as well in the name of himſelf as of others* (33), but this Legate's ſevere advertiſement hindered his ſending them to the Pope.

[*F*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books which proved very prejudicial to the Romiſh communion.*] As he was well acquainted with the intrigues carried on in Italy, and the moſt ſecret abuſes committed in that country, he was better able than another to render Popery odious. Beſides he ſcarce wrote any but ſmall tracts, which could eaſily be diſperſed throughout Europe, and choſe ſuch ſubjects as were ſuſceptible of a particular turn which very ſenſibly touched the readers. You will find in the catalogue of his writings (34), *Relatio de perſecutione facta contra Evangelium in urbe Juſtinopolitana. Contra librum cui nomen* Floſculi ſancti Franciſci. *Contra librum cui titulus* Roſarium. *Contra librum cui titulus* Miracula Virginis. *De libro cui titulus* Lux fidei. *De libro cui titulus* Floſculi Bibliæ. *De ſtatuis ac imaginibus. De coronatione Julii Papæ III, quid ſperandum ex papatu Julii III, de literis Othonis Cardinalis Auguſtani ſcriptis de creatione Julii III. Quatuor Literæ ſub nomine Bonini de Boninis* (35). *De ſtatu Romanæ Curiæ. De nugis & fabulis Papæ Gregorii I. De Idolo Lauretano* (36). *Scholia in orationem Cardinalis Poli ad Cæſarem qua illum ad arma contra eos qui Evangelio nomen dederunt, inſtigat. Nova editio libri Ceremoniarum Romanæ Eccleſiæ cum præfatione & ſcholiis. Quot modis vir pius qui in Italia degat ſæpe Deum & Chriſtum negare compellitur.* I omit ſeveral others, whoſe titles may be found in the epitome of Geſner, and in Verheiden (37); but I ſhall take notice of that piece of his intituled, *Epitome libri cui titulus*, Anatomia Miſſæ *ab Antonio de Adamo.* I never ſaw this abridgment of the anatomy of the Maſs, and cannot tell whether thoſe who mention it, write well the name of the author of this anatomy; for I find in the Latin edition of this work, that the author's name was *Antonius ab Æda.* A paſſage in the Preface runs thus: ‘ Quoniam igitur Anatomiæ cognitio non ſolum medicis chirurgiſque, verum etiam aliis ſummopere commendatur: eam ob cauſam, Anthonium ab Ædam Italum imitatus, hanc miſſæ ac miſſalis Anatomiam Gallicè, ut ab omnibus percipi poſſet facilius, in lucem edere ſtatui. - - - *Since therefore the knowledge of Anatomy is very much recommended not only to Phyſicians and Surgeons, but alſo to others: for that reaſon, in imitation of* Antonius ab Æda, *an Italian author, I reſolved to publiſh this Anatomy of the Maſs and Miſſal in French, that it might be the more eaſily underſtood by all.*’ Theſe words inform us that this piece was firſt publiſhed in Italian and then in French. It was tranſlated into Latin in the year 1561. The title of the Latin verſion is: *Miſſæ ac Miſſalis Anatomia. Hoc eſt dilucida ac familiaris ad minutiſſimas uſque particulas Miſſæ ac Miſſalis enucleatio. Nunc primum (ut ea res purioris fidei cultoribus ſcitu neceſſaria, ad alias quoque nationes deveniret) è Gallica lingua Latine verſa anno Domini M. D. LXI.* This book contains one hundred and ſeventy-two pages in octavo, beſides an errata of fifteen pages. The place where it was printed is not expreſſed. The perſon who made the errata ſays that a very urgent occaſion obliged him to it. It was, ſaith he, to prevent the artifices of the devil; for he ſuppoſes that Satan, to ruin the effects of this book, had made uſe of two very malicious frauds; the firſt of which was before, the ſecond during the time of the impreſſion. The firſt was, that the manuſcript was thrown into the mire, and reduced to a miſerable ſtate. The ſecond was, that the Printers committed a great many faults. So that to defeat this double machination of Satan, he was obliged to reviſe the work very carefully, and to make a long liſt of the errors of the Preſs. I know very well that ſome may ſuſpect me of impoſing on my readers; wherefore I cannot help citing part of the prologue to the errata. ‘ Maledictus Sathan, ut totam MISSÆ (execrandæ filiæ ſuæ) Tragœdiam in hoc inſtituit, & gubernavit hactenus, quò Chriſti meritum prorſus in hominum pectoribus extingueret, ac mendaciorum tenebras pro veritatis luce obtruderet: ita jam quoque, dum hic ipſe libellus excuderetur, rurſum artes ſuas egregiè adhibuiſſe videtur, dum tot eum mendis conſpurcari (ut multis in locis non modò nullam ſententiam, ſed inverſam plane colligere liceat) curavit, quò ejus lectionem vel prorſus è manibus piorum excuteret: vel mendarum tedio ita lecturos afficeret, ut ad finem uſque lectionem deducere non niſi ſumma cum nauſea poſſent. Idem verò etiam antea quam ad Typographum libellus perveniret, alia via aggreſſus, eum in lacunam alicubi projectum ita deturparat, ut non paucis foliis in itinere, antequam afferretur, ex cœno ac humore illo jam corruptis ac putridis, ſcriptura etiam paſſim ita obliterata fuerit, ita multis in locis lacerata omnia, ut non modo non legi rectè, ſed ne aperiri quidem alicubi abſque detrimento, ac folia à ſe mutuò ſeparari potuerint. Huic itaque Sathanæ fraudulentiæ occurrere ſtudens, libellum jam typis abſolutum denuò percurrere, atque errata, quamlibet multa, tamen ea (nam in nullo unquam libro, vel centuplo hoc quidem majore, tot eſſe unquam commiſſa puto) hic ſubnotare, quo cuivis lectionem

‘ ſibi,

---

(29) He was one of the Legates, and afterwards Pope Marcellus II.

(30) Crepin, Eſtat de l'Egliſe, *pag. m.* 570.

(31) Chemnitius, Exam. Concilii Trident. *Part. iii, pag.* 576, *Edit. Francof.* 1609, *in fol.*

(32) Crepin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 569.

(33) Id. ibid.

(34) Note, that ſeveral of them were only Italian tranſlations.

(35) Here is a pſeudonymous work not mentioned by Placcius. Mr Baillet in his liſt of pſeudonymous writers, pulls off this maſk as well as that of Athanaſius, under which Vergerio appeared ſometimes.

(36) This book was tranſlated out of Italian into French in the year 1556, by PAUL VERGERIUS, the author's nephew.

(37) Verheid. in Effigiebus præſtant. aliquot Virorum, *pag.* 154, 155.

Before he left Italy he loſt his brother, who died by poiſon, as was ſuſpected (*g*). The account I have given, and which I have extracted from Melchior Adam, is defective in many

---

(*g*) *Taken from* Melchior Adam, in Vitis Theologorum Exterorum, *pag.* 116, *& ſeq.*

‘ ſibi emendare in promptu eſſet, operæ pretium duxi. - - - *As that accurſed ſpirit Satan firſt framed, and has hitherto managed the whole Tragedy of the* MASS *(his execrable daughter) that he might utterly extinguiſh the merit of* CHRIST *in the hearts of men, and obtrude the darkneſs of lies for the light of the truth: ſo likewiſe during the impreſſion of this book, he ſeems again to have imployed his arts, in contriving to have it ſtuffed with errors (for in many places it is not only unintelligible, but the ſenſe is plainly perverted) that pious perſons might be entirely diſguſted from reading it, or elſe quite tired out before they get through it. And even before this treatiſe was brought to the Printer, the ſame evil ſpirit made uſe of another ſtratagem; for he ſo ordered it that the manuſcript fell into the mire, by which means not a few of the leaves were marred and ſpoiled, the writing was often defaced, and many plaees ſo torn that it could not be read well, nor could it even be opened or the leaves ſeparated from one another without damage: and therefore to defeat the fraudulent intention of the devil, I thought fit to reviſe the book after it was printed, and for the benefit of the reader to ſubjoin an Errata, though numerous, and indeed I believe there never was a book, though an hundred times bigger than this, ſo full of faults.*’ Obſerve that the Corrector hath ſtumbled at the very threſhold, for he reckons the firſt fault to be the word *Gallicè* in the paſſage of the Preface cited above. He would have it read *Latinè*; his correction is ill grounded: is it not indiſputable that a perſon who tranſlates a Preface into Latin, in which it is ſaid, *for good reaſon a French tranſlation was made*, ought to make uſe of the word *Gallicè*, and not *Latinè?* See however the remark [*Q*]. We muſt alſo obſerve that du Moulin, who called one of his books the *Anatomy of the Maſs*, is not the inventor of that title. Nor by the way did he invent that of *the Buckler of Faith*; for I have a book printed at Avignon by Francis Tachet 1549 (38), and intitled *the Buckler of Faith, by way of dialogue, extracted from the holy Scripture, the holy Fathers, and moſt antient Doctors of the Church.* Of which, Nicolas Grenier, Canon of St Victor, is the author.

Thuanus hath ſpoken amply enough of Vergerius's book, which he publiſhed againſt the proclaiming of the council in the time of Pius IV in the year 1561. Vergerius was then at Augſburg. We ſhall find how ſevere this tract was, if we examine theſe words of Thuanus (39): ‘ Contra diploma illud Paulus Vergerius Juſtinopolitanus quondam Epiſcopus, & magnis legationibus ſub Pontificibus defunctus, qui paulo ante (40) ab iis defecerat, cum Auguſtæ Vindelicorum eſſet, ſcripto edito acriter invectus eſt, & Curiæ R. faſtum, pompas, luxum, ambitionem, ſordeis, corruptos mores, quos perſpectos ſe habere dicebat, multis & acerbis verbis deteſtatus, poſtremo addit Concilium à Pontifice indictum non ut oportuit ad ſtabiliendam Chriſti doctrinam, ſed ad firmanda infirmæ carnis divinis mandatis adverſantis commenta, non ad purgandum ovile dominicum, ſed ad diſſeminandos hominum inveteratos errores; denique non ad Chriſtianam libertatem, ſed ad miſerarum animarum ſervitutem & oppreſſionem inſtitutum eſſe: quippe in quo juxta ceremonialis, &c. - - - *Paul Vergerius, who had been formerly Biſhop of Capo d'Iſtria, and had diſcharged ſeveral important embaſſies for the Popes, having a little before deſerted them when he was at Augsburg, inveighed ſeverely againſt that bull; and having declared in many ſharp expreſſions his abhorrence of the pride, pomp, luxury, ambition, avarice, and corruption of the court of Rome, which he ſaid he was perfectly acquainted with, he adds, that the council was called by the Pope, not as it ought to have been to eſtabliſh the doctrine of Chriſt, but to confirm the inventions of carnal men, enemies to the law of* GOD, *not to purge the ſheepfold of the Lord, but to ſpread the inveterate errors of men: and laſtly, not for the ſake of Chriſtian liberty, but to enſlave and oppreſs unhappy ſouls; for, &c.*’ Spondanus ſays (41), that Father Paul made very great uſe of the libels compoſed by Vergerius, who, ſaith he, made all the acts of the Council of Trent, the ſubjects of his ſermons: he diligently collected all the diſputations of that aſſembly; he communicated them to other miniſters; he wrote books concerning them, and diſperſed his calumnies on the whole conduct of the council (42). I am ſurprized not to find in the Epitome of Geſner, what Vergerius wrote againſt his countryman and violent perſecutor Mutius. I find only, *ad Papam Julium III qui librum Mutii approbavit.* This Mutius was an aſſiſtant to Annibal Griſon in the function of Inquiſitor at Capo d'Iſtria, and publiſhed an invective againſt our Prelate. ‘ Huic *(Annibali Griſonio)* adjunctus Hieronymus Mutius qui & Vergerianam ſcripſit invectivam poſtea, nec id modo, ſed evulgato quoque libello Germaniam, odio religionis, maledicentiſſime traducit (43). - - - - *To this Annibal Griſon was aſſociated Jerom Mutius, who afterwards wrote an invective againſt Vergerius, and likewiſe publiſhed a book wherein he moſt maliciouſly traduces Germany out of hatred to the Proteſtant religion.*’ But the following words ſeem to hint that Vergerius and Mutius wrote letters againſt each other: ‘ Finalmente accorgendoſi il Vergerio che'l ſuo delitto non haveva difeſa, ſi ricoverò fra' Grigioni eretici, e di là mandò fuori contra la Religione, contra il Concilio, e contra'l Papa libri tanto indotti quanto audaci; e che non piaceranno ſe non à que' palati sì pravi che con eſſi il fele, come già la manna, fà uficio di tutti i più dilicati ſapori. Ed intorno à queſt' huomo ed alle ſue azioni baſti di leggere oltre agli altri le Vergeriane e le lettere cattoliche del Muzio ſuo compatriota (44). - - - *At laſt Vergerius perceiving he could not juſtify himſelf, retired to the heretical Griſons, and there put out books both unlearned and impudent againſt religion, the Council and the Pope: and which pleaſed none but people of a depraved taſte, to whom gall, as manna was formerly, is of all things the moſt delicious. With regard to this man and his actions, you may read the letters of Vegerius and of his Catholic countryman Mutius.*’ I have given this whole paſſage of Pallavicini, to ſhew that I had reaſon to ſay that Vergerius's works cruelly galled the court of Rome and its devotees. They affected to ſpeak of them with contempt and to repreſent them as performances wherein confidence, paſſion, and ignorance were notorious. This affectation is not diſadvantageous to his works. See Staniſlaus Hoſius's Epiſtle Dedicatory of the *Propugnatio veræ, Chriſtianæ, Catholicæque doctrinæ* (45). Our Vergerius is there treated very violently; Hoſius, among other things, complains that he had the aſſurance to dedicate a book of Brentius to his Poliſh Majeſty, and to challenge Lipomannus (46) to a diſputation on all the doctrines contained in that book, which diſputation ſhould be decided by that monarch. This is not all, he complains of ſome tracts which he had diſperſed amongſt the people, during the laſt diet at Warſaw, Tracts, ſaith he, full of impudence and falſities: ‘ Ego verò, quòd illius tam eminet, tamque projecta eſt audacia, minùs miror, quem & frontem pridem omnem perdidiſſe, & ab omni Dei metu prorſus remotum eſſe, vel ea ſola ſcripta ſatis indicant, quæ in proximis hiſce Varſchavienſibus Comitiis in vulgus ſpargi curavit. Illud non poſſum non mirari, quòd inveniuntur nihilominùs, qui non ſine quadam animorum aſſenſione commenta legant ejus hominis: qui ſic ad omnem levitatem incubuiſſe videtur, nihil ut caverit diligentiùs, quàm ne quid uſquàm veri ſcriberet (47). - - - *But I the leſs wonder at his matchleſs impudence, ſince thoſe writings alone which he diſperſed among the people, during the laſt Diet at Warſaw, ſufficiently ſhew that he had long before loſt all ſhame, and had no fear of* GOD. *And I cannot but wonder how ſome people can read his forgeries with a kind of approbation: for he ſeems to have been ſo much given to lying, that his greateſt care was to exclude all truth from his writings.*’ Add to this the paſſage I ſhall cite below (48) from Cardinal Pallavicini.

I conclude with a reflexion which ſeems to me to deſerve a place here. I am certain that in Vergerio's time

(38) This is not the firſt edition, for it is ſaid in the title, that the book was reviſed and inlarged by the author. La Croix du Maine mentions only the edition in 2 volumes, which came out at Paris in 1566, and 1567. It is true that a little after he ſays that the ſecond volume was printed in 1565. This is not very exact.

(39) Thuanus, *lib. xxviii, pag. m.* 570, *col.* 2, *ad ann.* 1561.

(40) Thuanus is miſtaken in that: Vergerius had profeſſed himſelf a Proteſtant above twelve years before.

(41) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1545, *num.* 13.

(42) Actis Concilii omnibus detrahens. *Id. ib.*

(43) Sleidanus, *lib. xxi, fol.* 589.

(44) Pallavic. ubi ſupra, *lib. vi, cap. xiii, num.* 3, *pag. m.* 636.

(45) It is dated the 15th of October 1557.

(46) He was then Nuncio in Poland.

(47) *Hoſius* in Epiſt. dedicatoria ad Sigiſmundum Auguſtum Poloniæ Regem.

(48) In the remark [*K*].

many particulars. We do not find there the ſervice which Vergerius did to Henry II [G] nor his conferences in Alſatia with the Apoſtolical Nuncio [H]. We are not informed by it that he bought a collection of reliques for an Elector of Saxony [I], &c. He was the cauſe that the Capitolo del Forno (b) expoſed its author to many invectives, which obliged

time few books were read more than his. They were very ſatirical, they contained a vaſt many perſonal particularities which eaſily paſſed for true, becauſe it was very well known what opportunity he had to be throughly informed of them, having been ſo long engaged in public employments by the court of Rome. Yet theſe pieces ſo much eſteemed when new, could not maintain their reputation. They were favourites with whom fortune did not long continue, they quickly loſt their credit, and became ſo neglected, that ſcarce any books are at preſent harder to find. We ſcarce meet with one piece of Vergerius in the catalogues of the moſt numerous libraries. It was in vain that an edition of his works was publiſhed at Tubingen in 1563 (49). So many ſmall tracts reduced into one volume, are not leſs loſt than if they had continued in their former diſperſed condition: ſcarce any of them more ſenſibly affects my curioſity than his critic on Leander Alberti (50), and on the letters of Claudius Ptolomæus (51).

[G] *The ſervice which Vergerius did to Henry II.*] Before I come to the proof, I ſhall cite a paſſage of Father Paul (52). ‘The Pope by his letter invited the Catholic Swiſs to come to the council . . . . and Jerom Franco, his Nuncio, inceſſantly ſollicited them on his part, and made preſſing inſtances, which were ſupported by the good offices of the Emperor. But the moſt Chriſtian King diſſuaded them by his ambaſſador Morlot; and Paul Vergerio † perfectly acquainted with the ſecrets and artifices of the court of Rome, gave that miniſter ſo good inſtructions, beſides the book he wrote on that ſubject ‡, that at the Diet then held at Baden, the Catholic and Evangelic Cantons unanimouſly reſolved, not to ſend any perſon to Trent: And the Griſons ſuffering themſelves to be perſuaded by Vergerio, that the Pope was contriving ſomething againſt them, recalled Thomas Plante, Biſhop of Coire.’ Theſe words do not prove that the King of France employed Vergerius: Ambaſſadors frequently conceal from their maſters the name and character of thoſe perſons whoſe aſſiſtance or advice they make uſe of; ſo that it may be pretended, that Morlot made uſe of Vergerio without ever mentioning any thing of it to Henry II. But an Annaliſt, a French Biſhop, owns that that Prince was well informed of Vergerius's intrigues, and made uſe of his aſſiſtance to obtain his ends, which were to vex the Pope and the Emperor. ‘Rex . . . . . ut Pontifici & Cæſari ægrè faceret, cum Helvetiis, quos Pontifex hortatus fuerat ad Synodum ſuos dirigere legatos, egit ne tam Catholici quàm Sacramentarii, nec item Rheti mitterent, & qui jam miſſi fuiſſent revocarentur: in his, quod turpius fuit, induſtriâ uſus Petri-Pauli Vergerii Epiſcopi olim Juſtinopolitani, qui ad hæreticos delapſus inter Rhætos agebat (53). - - - *The King . . . . in order to vex the Pope and the Emperor, treated with the Swiſs, whom the Pope had invited to come to the council, that neither the Catholic nor Proteſtant Cantons, nor likewiſe the Griſons might ſend any, and that thoſe who had been already ſent might be recalled: and, which is more ſcandalous, to obtain thoſe ends he made uſe of the aſſiſtance of Peter-Paul Vergerius formerly Biſhop of Capo d'Iſtria, who revolting to the Heretics then lived in the country of the Griſons.*’ Spondanus juſtly ſays that it was very ſcandalous for Henry II to employ a Proteſtant miniſter, who had formerly been a biſhop. If Vergerius had been in France, that Prince would have cauſed him to be burnt, and yet he careſſes him in a foreign country, employs him againſt the Pope, and makes uſe of his craft and artifice to overthrow the council, and probably rewards him for all theſe good actions. Doth not this plainly diſcover the genius of ſovereign Princes? Their conduct towards Heretics is not of a piece, they perſecute them in one place, and encourage them in another. Their conduct is void of all principles, or rather is uniformly directed by the maxim, that all things ought to be ſacrificed to the temporal glory of the ſtate, which requires that a jealous neighbour ſhould be croſſed by all poſſible means, on all occaſions.

[H] *His conferences in Alſatia with the Apoſtolical Nuncio.*] This happened in the year 1561. He was then in the Duchy of Wirtemberg: he firſt ſpoke with the Nuncio Delfino at Zabara (54), and afterwards at Straſburgh, and the neighbouring places, ſometimes alone, and at other times in company with John Sturmius: when he was with the Nuncio alone he talked more freely (55), but when in company with Sturmius, he was very reſerved both in the choice and turn of his words. On the one ſide he diſcovered an ardent deſire to return into Italy, and on the other he broke out into ſlanders againſt thoſe who had perſecuted him, and even againſt the Pope himſelf. He chiefly accuſed John della Caſa of having forced him to turn Proteſtant. The Nuncio exhorted him to reunite himſelf to the Church, and to recommend himſelf to the Legates (56) his old patrons. Vergerius acknowledged his infinite obligations to them, but utterly rejected the propoſal of making a recantation. He wrote two letters to the Cardinal of Mantua, one of the Legates, and gave them to the Nuncio Delfino, who ſent them to Rome before they were tranſmitted to the Cardinal. In theſe Vergerius teſtified a great zeal for his country, and for the peace of the Church; he offered his endeavours towards this great work, and ſaid he might give ſome advantageous overtures if he could ſpeak with that Legate. He did not ſhew any deſign of repenting of his errors, he only requeſted a ſafe conduct both from the council, and his Imperial Majeſty. The Nuncio paſſionately deſired the recovery of this loſt ſheep. He believed that in all Germany, there were not two perſons whoſe converſion was of ſo great importance as that of Vergerius. Not but that he took him to be an ignorant man, but becauſe he found his pen very pernicious to the Holy See. ‘Il Delfino era cupidiſſimo di ricuperarlo: imperòche quantunque, ſecondo ch'egli ſcriveva; il Vergerio niente affatto ſapeſſe; onde mentr'era ſoggiornato in Elvezia havea ſolo ſpeſa l'induſtria nel traſportare i libri eretici in Italiano; ciò non oſtante riputava, in tutta Alemagna non eſſer due Teſte il cui acquiſto foſſe ſtato di pregio uguale à quel di coſtui: tanto riuſciva la ſua penna à diſervigio della Sede Apoſtolica per una certa ſua eloquenza popolare, e audacemente maledica de' più invidiati Perſonaggi (57). - - - *Delfino was very deſirous to regain him: for though, as he ſaid, Vergerius was groſsly ignorant, and therefore whilſt he lived in Swiſſerland ſpent his time only in tranſlating heretical books into Italian: yet he believed there were not two perſons in all Germany, whoſe converſion would be equivalent to that of Vergerius: ſo ſucceſsful was his pen againſt the Holy See, on account of a certain popular eloquence he employed in ſlandering the moſt eminent men.*’ The Cardinal of Mantua, to whom the Pope abſolutely referred the management of this intrigue, did not think it proper to anſwer Vergerius. He thought that a letter from a Legate would render Vergerius too vain, and that he would make uſe of it to perſuade the Proteſtants, that he was eſteemed in the Church of Rome as a perſon of great merit, whoſe converſion they were willing to purchaſe with a large reward. The Cardinal cautioned the Nuncio to have a particular regard to this: Such an advice was neceſſary, for the Nuncio had made uſe of Vergerio's ambition in order to gain him by the offer of a glorious recompence. The Pope was extraordinary well pleaſed with this conduct of the Legate. The Nuncio at laſt declared that Vergerio's impudence and arrogance increaſed daily, and he received orders to ſee him no more. The Legate would have had Vergerius come to the Council of Trent, not alone, but accompanied by John Sturmius, and Jerom Zanchius, and that new expedients ſhould be taken by their means to confer with the Sectaries; but the Pope diſapproved all thoſe propoſals. This is what I find in the Hiſtorian here cited (58).

[I] *He bought a collection of reliques for an Elector of Saxony.*] This was the Elector Frederic, ſirnamed *the Wiſe*. He collected as many reliques as he poſſibly could (59). He begged ſome of Francis I, and Margaret

(b) See the remark [M].

(49) *It is in quarto. See* Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. iii, pag.* 601, *col.* 2.

(50) *In Geſner's epitome the title is* contra Leandrum Albertum Monachum Dominicanum, ejuſque mendacia quæ ille ſcripſit in libro cui titulus, *Deſcriptio Italiæ*.

(51) *The title ibid. is* De Epiſtolis Italice ſcriptis à Claudio Ptolemæo.

(52) Fra-Paolo, ubi ſupra, *lib. iv, pag.* 327, *ad ann.* 1551.

† He was then miniſter in the country of the Griſons: he turned Proteſtant becauſe he had miſſed a cardinal's hat.

‡ Thuanus ſpeaks of it in the 28th book of his Hiſtory, Ann. 1561. Mr Amelot is miſtaken for the book mentioned by Thuanus, was written againſt the indiction of the council in the time of Pius IV. I have quoted his words above, citat. (39 .Father Paul mentions that book of Vergerio in the fifth book, *pag. m.* 419.

(53) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1551, *num.* 18, *pag.* 537.

(54) So it is in Pallavicini: perhaps it ſhould be *Zaberna, Saverne*.

(55) Take notice that all this is extracted out of Pallavicini.

(56) The Cardinal of Trent, and the Cardinal of Mantua.

(57) Pallavic. ubi ſupra, *lib. xv, cap. x, num.* 13, *pag. m.* 644, 645.

(58) Cardinal Pallavicini.

(59) Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. i, pag.* 223.

obliged John della Caſa to write a ſmall tract, that has been publiſhed in 1688, wherein Vergerius is cruelly treated [*K*]. Prudence will not allow us to believe what an enemy publiſhes of another without proof, and therefore we ought at leaſt to ſuſpend our judg-

ment

garet of Auſtria, Governeſs of the Low-Countries, and obtained them. He had ſeveral ſent from Mantua, Colmar, Baſil, and the monaſtery of Ilmene (60). A German Monk (61) was collecting ſome for him in Italy, and employed our Vergerius, who had delivered this collection into the Elector's hands if he had not fallen ſick in his journey. James Vergerius, his brother, who accompanied him, and who, as well as he, had ſerved the German Monk, was alſo ſtopped by a like occaſion: He alſo fell ſick by the way (62). I believe that Peter-Paul hoped, as a reward, to be made a profeſſor in the univerſity of Wittemberg: for he had been recommended as a learned young man, who deſired a maintenance that would enable him to finiſh his ſtudies under the profeſſors of that univerſity. Here are the words of this Monk's letter from Venice to Spalatin, the 29th of October, 1521. ‘ Intendit ipſe Petrus Paulus, frater Jacobi, ‘ permanere & complere in Wittemberga ſtudium ſuum, ‘ ſi potuerit & ſit beneplacitum Principis noſtri. Rogavit quoque me, ut tibi ſupplex fierem pro eo, & ‘ certe credo, magni honoris & utilitatis eſſet illi Univerſitati; habet enim nobiliſſimum ingenium & memoriam, ut experientia videre licet, reputaturque ‘ præcipuus de humanitate & jure, inter juvenes ſtudii ‘ Patavini. Rogo propterea T. Dom. ſuſcipe eum, & ‘ commenda eum Principi Ser. ut filium, & primo in ‘ Univerſitate, ut inveniat locum legendi, vivendi, & ‘ proficiendi (63). - - - *Peter-Paul himſelf, the brother* ‘ *of James, deſigns to continue and to finiſh his ſtudies at* ‘ *Wittemberg, if he can, and if it be the good pleaſure* ‘ *of our Prince. He deſired me to intercede with you in* ‘ *his behalf, and I really think it would be a great honour and advantage to that univerſity: for he has* ‘ *given proofs of his excellent genius and memory, and he* ‘ *is reckoned to outdo all the young ſtudents at Padua in* ‘ *Philology and Law. I beg therefore you would take* ‘ *him under your care, and recommend him heartily to his* ‘ *moſt ſerene Highneſs, that he may have a maintenance* ‘ *to enable him to proſecute his ſtudies in the univerſity.*’ Spalatin anſwered, that he could promiſe nothing to the two Vergerio's; and as for the reliques which had already been received, and the payment of which the Monk ſollicited; he anſwered that he would ſend them back again, the price of them being fallen ſince Luther's Reformation, and that doubtleſs they would be more eſteemed, and ſell better in Italy than in Germany: ‘ Reliquias nobis miſſas, una cum cruce, re‘cipies omnes, à te, quanticunque poteris, venden‘das; credibile enim eſt, iſtic quam hic majoris eſſe ‘ tum pretii tum honoris. Hic enim vel vulgus ita ‘ reſipuit, ut verbo Dei edoctum ſatis ſibi eſſe putet, ‘ ut & revera eſt, fide & fiducia erga Deum & chari‘tate erga proximum (64). - - - - *You ſhall have back* ‘ *again all the reliques you ſent us, together with the croſs,* ‘ *that you may ſell them for as much as you can get; for* ‘ *I believe they are more eſteemed, and will ſell better* ‘ *there than here. For even the common people here are ſo* ‘ *much altered, that being inſtructed from the word of* ‘ *GOD, they think it ſufficient, as it really is, to have* ‘ *faith and truſt in GOD, and charity towards their* ‘ *neighbour.*’ The perſon who wrote this letter had told the Elector, his maſter, that it had been very well if the diſpute concerning Indulgences had began ſooner, for it had ſaved him a great deal of care and money (65).

[*K*] *Wherein Vergerius is cruelly treated.*] When I mentioned his books, I did not ſpeak of that, intituled, *Contra Catalogum Joannis della Caſa Sodomiæ Patronum.* He beſtowed the epithet of Apologiſt for Sodomy on John della Caſa on account of his *Capitolo del Forno.* He ſo defamed him throughout Germany, that this author thought himſelf obliged to addreſs a Poem to the Germans, to remove thoſe ſiniſter impreſſions which our author had made on them againſt him. I have elſewhere (66) obſerved the miſtake of a Modern, who was of opinion that Caſa wrote this poem by way of anſwer to the invectives of Naogeorgus. It is certain that it was only aimed at Vergerius. I have alſo ſaid ſomewhere (67), that the reaſon why John della Caſa was ſo defamed, when ſeveral Italian Poets remained undiſturbed, whoſe poems were more deteſtable than his, was, that he perſecuted Vergerius at Venice, which other Poets did not. But let us here ſpeak of the ſmall tract, which Mr Menage printed in 1688, at the end of his Anti-Baillet. It is a piece written in very good Latin, which Mr Menage received from the celebrated Magliabechi, and in which Caſa reviles Peter-Paul Vergerius at a ſtrange rate. He accuſes him of long and violent quarrels with his brother John Baptiſt, Biſhop of Pola; of perjury to avoid the payment of his debts, and of killing his wife, in order to advance himſelf to benefices; he charges him with having intreated Cardinal de Tournon to carry him into France, and with having offered to write concerning Germany and the Swiſs, and concerning religion, whatever ſhould be preſcribed him. Obſerve that Vergerius was then in the Griſon's country. This Cardinal, who at firſt took him for a Butcher, at laſt knowing who was, very ſeverely reprimanded him, and took no notice of his offers to repent. ‘ Qui cùm ‘ te ſqualidum, ſordidum, pannis obſitum, conſpicatus, ‘ viſuſque ſibi videre lanionem aliquem eſſet; quæ‘ſivit de te qui tu eſſes: atque ubi Vergerium eſſe ‘ dixiſti, multis, homo graviſſimus, te verbis malè ac‘cepit (68). - - - *When he ſaw you in a naſty and tattered* ‘ *condition, and thought you was a Butcher, he aſked you* ‘ *who you was; and upon your telling him that you was* ‘ *Vergerius, he ſeverely reproved you.*’ This ſmal tract informs us (69), that Vergerius, in his younger days, profeſſed Poetry; that he was afterwards admitted advocate; that he practiſed as ſuch; but in pleading, he rendered himſelf inſupſuportable to the Judges, to the litigants, and in general to the whole court, by his falſities, calumnies, and prevarications: ‘ Linguâ atque audaciâ fretus, cauſſas agere te velle dixiſti: ſed cùm, quoties diceres, ‘ toties malediceres, mentireris, pejerares, calumniare‘ris, pravaricarere, neque litigatores tibi, jam neque ‘ corona, neque Judices, fidem habebant; nemoque fer‘re te, ac ne aſpicere quidem poterat (70). -- *Truſting to* ‘ *your tongue and impudence, you ſaid you would be an ad*‘*vocate; but as in pleading you were always guilty of* ‘ *reviling, lying, perjury, calumny, and prevarication,* ‘ *neither the Litigants, nor the Bar, nor the Judges gave* ‘ *credit to you: no body could endure you, no body could* ‘ *bear the ſight of you.*’ That getting no money, and being a widower, (thanks to the poiſon he had given his wife,) he caſt his eye on ſpiritual benefices, and went to Rome, where his brother Antony recommended him to Clement VII, and obtained for him the Nunciature of Germany. He adds, that Francis Spiera (71), whom he repreſented to the world, as a man inſpired, one day put him into an extreme confuſion by calling him bankrupt, poiſoner, and heretic (72). To conclude; he accuſes him of flying to the Griſons, in order to ſhelter himſelf from the purſuit of his creditors (73). The Leipſic Journaliſts, in their extract of the Anti-Baillet, exactly quote moſt of the accuſations againſt Vergerio; but they ſuppoſe that Mutius had praiſed him, and that Caſa refuted that elogy: *Mutii laudes Vergerio tributas*, p. 377 *evertit Caſa* (74). This they ground on theſe words of Caſa, *de* MUTIO *verò affirmare tibi hoc poſſum non tibi illum honorem cum de te ſcripſit, habuiſſe, ſed patriæ veſtræ.* Which import that Mutius had not done Vergerius the honour to refute him, if he had not had a particular regard to the country which produced them both. And he was ſo far from praiſing Vergerius, that he publiſhed moſt injurious invectives againſt him.

Two things are to be further obſerved concerning this tract of John della Caſa. He makes two exceptions againſt the infamies with which Vergerio had charged Paul III. The firſt is, that thoſe crimes which he imputed to that Pope were of ſuch a nature, that they could never come to his knowledge: the ſecond is taken from the enmity bewixt Paul III and him: ‘ Obſecro te quid tu tibi voluiſti, aut quicumque ille ‘ fuit, qui de PAULI III vita ſcripſit? Putaſtine ‘ quemquam fore qui tibi de tot tantiſque criminibus ‘ ac ſceleribus crederet? Quî tu iſthæc ſcire potuiſti? ‘ Preſertim cùm tam multa ſint inteſtina ac domeſtica, ‘ de quibus vix unus aut alter ex intimis familiaribus ‘ etiamſi maximè vera ſint, ſuſpicari aliquid ſignis

‘ quibuſdam

---

(60) It was in Thuringia.

(61) Called Burcardi. He was of the family of the barons of Schenck.

(62) *Taken from* Seckendorf, ibid.

(63) Seckendorf, ubi ſupra.

(64) *Id. ibid.* quoting a letter of Spalatin, to the Monk Burcard, dated the 28th of July 1522.

(65) Id. ibid.

(66) In the article ORICELLARIUS, remark [*D*].

(67) In the article MOLZA, remark [*D*]; and in the article VAYER, remark [*E*].

(68) Anti-Baillet, *Tom. vii, pag.* 253, *in the edition of* Jugemens des Sav. *by Baillet of* 1725, *in* 4*to*.

(69) Ibid. *pag.* 256.

(70) Ibid.

(71) He does not name him, but doubleſs he means him.

(72) Anti-Baillet, *Tom. vii, pag.* 257.

(73) Ibid.

(74) Acta Eruditor. *Lipſ.* 1689, *pag.* 497.

ment concerning the infamous crimes charged on our Vergerius; but I muſt confeſs that ſome Proteſtants own that he was inconſtant, deceitful, and ignorant in Theology [*L*].

In

quibuſdam poſſit, quî igitur tu hæc alienus, ac prope alienigena, tantopere affirmas, præſertim ſolus? Quis ad te detulit? Qui teſtes affuerunt? Quæ proferuntur literæ? Ubi tu interfuiſti (75)? - - - *Pray, what did you mean, you, or whoever it was that wrote the life of Paul III? Did you think any body would believe you when you charged him with ſo many and ſo heinous crimes? How came you to the knowledge of thoſe things? Eſpecially as many of them are of a domeſtic and private nature, concerning which hardly one or two intimate acquaintances, even tho' they were moſt true, could have any ground to ſuſpect any thing, how then dare you ſo confidently affirm them for truth, who are averſe, and almoſt a ſtranger to him, and eſpecially as you are the only one that does ſo? Who informed you? What witneſſes were preſent? What letters are produced? Where was you at that time?*' A little after he expreſſes himſelf thus concerning his invectives againſt Peter-Lewis Farneſe, and Julius III. ‘A te requirunt Itali homines ſuperiora illa ſcilicet quibus teſtibus, atque adeo quibus indiciis id compereris? Cur id, quod tibi non magis quàm cæteris omnibus compertum ſit, ſolus affirmes (76)? . . . . Eadem tibi de Julio III reſpondeant, deque iis literis quas tu de Conclavi miſſas, ad te delatas ais. Negant tibi quicquam credi oportere à quoquam: vanitatis, levitatis, mendacii, te convictum defendunt. Profer igitur eas literas: Manum, ſignum, proba (77). - - - *The Italians will aſk you the above queſtions,* viz. *By what witneſſes, and by what evidences did you diſcover it! Why do you alone affirm, what is not better known to you than to others? . . . . They may anſwer you in the ſame manner as to Julius III, and as to thoſe letters which you ſay were brought you from the Conclave. They may ſay that none ought to give credit to you in any thing: They maintain that you are convicted of vanity, levity and falſhood. Produce then thoſe letters; prove the hand and ſeal.*' Theſe are preſſing and really very juſt queſtions: for juſtice requires that an author who publiſhes the moſt ſecret tranſactions of a monarch's palace, and relates a thouſand infamous crimes committed in it's moſt dark receſſes with an uncommon aſſurance; I ſay juſtice obliges ſuch a writer to inform us how he came to the knowledge of theſe events; he ought to produce and name his authorities; he muſt have either original letters or authentic copies: in a word, he muſt have good proofs for what he advances. If it be objected, that it is not poſſible to give good proofs for facts of that nature; I anſwer, that a man ought not therefore to accuſe one of ſuch facts in public: he ought to back what he ſays at leaſt with the authority of his name, I mean the title of the book ought to declare it's author. But if it be found that the author, who names himſelf, may juſtly be charged with credulity or with malice, or that he is a declared enemy to the perſon defamed, it is then certain that his evidence deſerves but little credit. I think, I have obſerved more than once, that the authors of libels do not at all conſider what I have juſt offered: nor, which is worſe, are their readers more careful herein than they. I am not fond of patronizing Caſa's applications, I content myſelf with obſerving that he pretends Vergerius was too ill a man, and too much an enemy to Paul III to deſerve that any regard ſhould be had to his evidence againſt this Pope. Do not you know, ſaith he, that perſons of the moſt exact probity are not admitted as witneſſes in a cauſe wherein their enemies are concerned (78)? On this occaſion he relates the enmity betwixt Paul III and Vergerius, and ſaith that he greatly wrongs the Germans, in thinking them capable of giving any credit to his libels. ‘Magnam tu Germanis hominibus contumeliam facis quòd idoneos arbitreris eſſe, apud quos tam impudenter mentiare, quoſque uſquè adeo contemnas, imperitoſque rerum putes, ut tibi de tuo inimico tam ineptè, tamquè apertè mentienti fidem habeant. Si literas, ſi teſtes, ſi tormenta atque equuleum, ſi omnia probationum genera proferres, nemo tibi tamen venefico atque uxoricidæ crederet; de tot tantiſque præſertim rebus. Tu innuenti modò tibi fidem haberi exiſtimas (79). - - - *You offer a great affront to the Germans, when you think them perſons fit to be impoſed upon by your impudent lies, when you entertain ſo contemptible an opinion of them, and ſuppoſe them ſimple enough to believe your groſs and notorious falſhoods concerning your enemy. Could you produce letters, witneſſes, racks, and trials of all ſorts, yet none would believe a poiſoner and a murderer of his wife: eſpecially as to ſo many and ſuch heinous crimes. And do you think then you are to be credited on your bare word?*'

This is the firſt of my two obſervations: the other will ſerve to prove that a ſatiriſt can put a criminal interpretation upon the moſt pious actions. We have already ſeen (80) that Vergerius, deſigning to refute Lutheraniſm, applied himſelf to the ſtudy of that controverſy, which convinced him that the Romiſh was a falſe Church; we have ſeen that his brother was of the ſame opinion, and that they both reſolved to apply themſelves to the inſtruction of their dioceſe. The artful John della Caſa gives a quite different turn to their conduct. He ſaith that Vergerius having drained thoſe ſprings which ſupplied the extravagant expence of his luxurious table, applied himſelf to dogmatizing in private, and chiefly to ſeduce ſome rich women, and, under the ſpecious pretext of inſtructing them in the pure religion, adds he, he emptied the purſes of a great many people: ‘Gula ſcilicet creverat, & luxus atque ſuperbia: Quæ quorundam hominum, qui malè te noverant, benignitate ſuſtentata aliquandiu ſunt: Sed ubi exhauſta eſt; nec enim tu parvo contentus eſſe poteras; convertiſti te ad alium quæſtum: Homines quoſdam non nimiùm ſapientes, ſuperſtitioſos, ruſticanos, ſtultaſque aliquot mulieres locupletes aggreſſus es: Sevocaſti: Docere eos te poſſe arcana quædam de religione dixiſti: Nam quæ adhuc tradita illis eſſent ab aliis, perperam eſſe tradita: Mutari ea oportere atque corrigi perſuades imprudentibus ac fatuis quibuſdam. Interea; merces magiſtri ſcilicet magna; peſſundati multi à te ſunt, atque ad ſummam inopiam redierunt (81). - - - *For your gluttony, luxury, and pride, had increaſed, which for ſome time were ſupported by the liberality of thoſe, who were not well acquainted with you. But when that ſource was dried up, for a little was not ſufficient to content you, you fell upon another method of getting money: you applied yourſelf to ſome ſimple ſuperſtitious and ignorant people, and to ſome fooliſh rich women: you ſeduced them, and pretended to inſtruct them in the true religion: for what they had been taught by others, you affirmed to be falſe, and ſo perſuaded them of the neceſſity of a reformation. In the mean time, the wages of the inſtructor being large, many were ruined by you, and reduced to extreme poverty.*' How many Catholics are there who believe this on the ſingle teſtimony of Caſa, Vergerio's declared enemy. This is a very great injuſtice. Perhaps ſome indifferent perſons may credit part of what he ſays: they know that a private deſign to reform a dioceſe might probably draw the purſe-ſtrings of ſome well-meaning perſons; for it is eaſy to make it appear, that for the advancement of ſo good a work, ſuch and ſuch expences are neceſſary. By this means a man becomes (without being accountable) the truſtee, with whom ſeveral alms and ſubſidies, which the zeal of the firſt brethren furniſhes, are depoſited.

[*L*] *There are ſome Proteſtants who own that he was inconſtant, deceitful, and ignorant in Theology.*] Mr Seckendorf ſhall be my evidence. *Verſatile ingenium* Vergerio *tribuitur*, ſaith he (82), *nec ſuſpicione caruit quod conciliationem religionis quovis modo moliretur, & tandem ad vetera ſacra redire cogitaret.* That is, that Vergerius was ſuſpected of a deſign to unite the religions even at the expence of truth, and at laſt of intending to return to Popery. It is pretended (83), that he made uſe of ſome deceit in the letters which he ſent to Paris, when he deſired to be one of the deputies whom the Duke of Wirtemberg ſent into France in the year 1561. He did not obtain this honour, either becauſe that Prince had no confidence in him, or becauſe he was not thought to be ſufficiently verſed in Theological ſubjects. James Andreas forgetting the injury he had received of him, pronounced his funeral oration, and praiſed him for profeſſing the truth, and diſcovering ſeveral wicked intrigues of the court of Rome; but he charged him with not having perfectly underſtood

(75) Anti-Baillet, *Tom. vii*, *pag.* 252.

(76) Ibid. *pag.* 255.

(77) Ibid.

(78) Vel caſtiſſimi atque integerrimi viri . . . à teſtimonio dicendo removeri ſolent (inimicitia.) *Ibid. pag.* 252.

(79) Ibid.

(80) In the text of this article.

(81) Ib. *p.* 257.

(82) Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. iii*, *p.* 601.

(83) Joh. Val. Andreas, in Vita avi ſui Jacobi Andreæ, *pag.* 130, *apud* Seckendorf, ibid.

In the authors which I have conſulted concerning him, I do not find any mention of his journey to France after he was made a Biſhop: I am informed of this part of his life only by a collection of letters printed at Venice in 1558. In that collection there are ſome of his letters which acquaint us that he admired the piety and excellent qualities of the Queen of Navarre, ſiſter to Francis I, and began to diſreliſh his courſe of life, and to think of reſiding in his biſhopric [*M*]. There is alſo *(i)* one written by his brother AURELIUS VERGERIUS *(k)* to Julia Gonzaga. I have not much to object againſt Moreri on this article [*N*].

I perceived too late, that the words which I quoted from the preface to a book aſcribed to him, are capable of another ſenſe than what I gave them. I ſhall ſet down that

ſtood religious controverſies (84). Surius ſays that Gablerus, Profeſſor of Phyſic, was preſent at the death of Vergerio, and made ſome obſervations, which determined him to turn Catholic (85). ‘Adfuerat is Petro Paulo Vergerio è corpore migranti apud quem mira quædam viderat quæ illi animum videbantur perfregiſſe, ut non modo Catholicus ſed pientiſſimus quoque Catholicus fieret (86). - - - *He was preſent at the death of Peter-Paul Vergerius, and obſerved ſome wonderful things, which ſeemed to affect his mind prodigiouſly, ſo that he became not only a Catholic but a very pious one.*’ Obſerve, that Surius is no claſſical author in point of Hiſtory. Much more ought we to diſtruſt thoſe who magnify this ſtory. They aſſure us, that the horrible death of Vergerius cauſed ſeveral Proteſtants to return into the boſom of the Church. Here follows the moderate expreſſions of of thoſe authors: ‘Petrus Paulus Vergerius, infamis Apoſtata ob horrendam mortem qua defunctus eſt, multis attonitis vicinarum civitatum hominibus ſalutare præbuit documentum, ut plerique ſeſe collegerint, & ad pacem ac unitatem Eccleſiæ reverſi fuerint, fruſtra frementibus lupis infernalibus (87). - - - *Peter-Paul Vergerius, an infamous Apoſtate, by his horrible death, gave a ſalutary warning to many perſons of the neighbourhood that were aſtoniſhed at it, ſo that ſeveral returned to the peace and unity of the Church, the infernal wolves in vain raging on that account.*

By a letter of Hubert Languet written from Paris on the ninth of October 1561, we learn that the Duke of Wirtemberg had ſent into France our Vergerius, who was the moſt proper man in the world to imbroil things, Languet thought it ſtrange that this Prince ſhould be deſirous to put ubiquity and other fancies of Brentius among the doctrines of the French Reformation. ‘Miror etiam Virtembergenſem nobis velle obtrudere ubiquitatem & alias nugas Brentii, nec religionis apud nos infantiam conſiderare, quæ non ſit obruenda iſtis ſpinoſis & futilibus diſputationibus, quas ne quidem intelligunt qui eas proponunt, ſed omni indulgentia fovenda, & tanquam lactis potu alenda, donec magis in Chriſto adoleſcat. Præterea huc miſit Vergerium, hominem quo nullus eſt magis idoneus ad res turbandas (88). - - - *I am ſurprized that the Duke of Wirtemberg ſhould be deſirous to obtrude upon us Ubiquity and the other ridiculous fancies of Brentius, and that he does not conſider the infant ſtate of religion amongſt us, which ought not to be oppreſſed with ſuch knotty and vain diſputations, which even thoſe that propoſe them do not underſtand, but ſhould with all tenderneſs be nurſed up, and, as it were, fed with milk till it grow up and be ſtrong in* CHRIST. *Beſides, he has ſent Vergerius hither, the fitteſt man in the world to embroil affairs.*’ Languet wrote another letter eight days after, and ſays that Vergerius was not yet come to the French court, but that it was reported he would be ſent quickly, or at leaſt that he endeavoured it. I wiſh, ſays he, he would ſtay at home (89).

[*M*] *That he admired the piety . . . . . of the Queen of Navarre . . . . . and that he began to diſreliſh his courſe of life, and to think of reſiding in his biſhopric.*] See what he wrote to Lewis Alamanni the day after he had converſed with that Princeſs: ‘Ne la Signora Marcheſa di Peſcara, ne la Signoria voſtra, che ſapete tanto ben tutti due in vive voci, e tanto bene ne i ſcritti voſtri dir cio, che volete, ne il Cardinal noſtro Illuſtriſſ. ne tutta Roma, predicandomi l'altezza & la bellezza dell' animo, & dell'ingegno, & il fervor dello ſpirito acceſo in Chriſto, & la carita ardente della ſereniſſima Regina di Navara, me ne havete ſaputo dire tanto, quanto io nel vero ho trovato hieri, che ſua maeſtà degno di fare, che io udiſſi un pezzo quelle ſue rare voci, il qual giorno mi ha portato una letitia inenarrabile, & ſenza dubbio la maggiore, che io habbi havuto gia molto tempo (90). - - - *Neither the Marchioneſs of Peſcara, nor you, who both know ſo well to expreſs whatever you pleaſe either in converſation or in writing, nor his eminency our Cardinal, nor all Rome, ſpeaking of the greatneſs and excellency of mind and temper, and fervent zeal in* CHRIST, *and ardent charity of the moſt ſerene Queen of Navarre, I ſay, you have not been able to tell me ſo much as in truth I found yeſterday, when her Majeſty was pleaſed to let me hear ſome of her excellent diſcourſe; which day has given me unſpeakable joy, and undoubtedly the greateſt I have had this long time.*’ The reſt of the letter turns on the pious ſentiments, which the great knowledge of that Queen excited in the heart of that Prelate. He was in France when he wrote a letter to Ottonello Vida, in which he deplores the progreſs of Lutheraniſm, and the little care that was taken of the LORD's vineyard. He declares that having weighed theſe words of the goſpel, *What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world, and loſe his own ſoul*, againſt all thoſe reaſons which encouraged him with hopes of making his fortune, he found the ſcale turn on the ſide of the words of JESUS CHRIST. Wherefore, ſaith he, it will be beſt for me, for the future to apply myſelf to the culture of that portion which is allotted me. ‘Perciò dico, che ſarà meglio, ch'io venga à coltivare quelle poche viti, ch'io ſu quel confine Tedeſco, & veder di circondarle con un buon ſiepe, & tenerle difeſe, per poterne coglier qualche frutto da offerire a Dio; che ſtare fuori, & otioſo ad aſpettare, che altri ſi riſolvino a voler mettere in lavoro tutta la vigna inſieme (91). - - - *Therefore I ſay it will be better for me to come, and cultivate thoſe few vines which I have on the confines of Germany, to ſurround them with a good hedge and defend them, that I may be able to gather from them ſome fruit to offer unto* GOD: *than to be idle and wait, till others reſolve to undertake the care of the whole vineyard together.*’ Vida's anſwer (92) to confirm him in this reſolution is very pertinent and excellent.

[*N*] *I have not much to object againſt Moreri on this article.*] I. The two articles of Verger (Peter-Paul) are tranſpoſed; for he places the Biſhop of Capo d'Iſtria before Emanuel Chryſoloras's diſciple. As for the laſt he refers us to the *authors of the following article*, that is, to thoſe which he cites after having amply ſpoken of *John Verger de Haurane Abbot of St Cyran*. This abſurdity has been left out in the Dutch edition of Moreri (93). II. What Moreri (94) affirms, that Paul III intended to make Vergerio a Cardinal, is contradicted by Pallavicini (95). III. What he adds, *that he took along with him one of his brothers, who was alſo a Biſhop*, is diſproved by Sleidan, who affirms, that before the Biſhop of Capo d'Iſtria left Italy, the Biſhop of Pola was dead. ‘Antequam ex Italia decederet, jam erat mortuus ejus frater Epiſcopus Polæ ſuſpitioque fuit veneno ſublatum eſſe (96). - - - - *Before he left Italy, his brother the Biſhop of Pola was dead, and was ſuſpected to have been poiſoned.*’ IV. To what end doth he cite Paul Jovius, Volaterranus, Jacobus de Bergamo, Voſſius, &c. to confirm what he had ſaid concerning the Biſhop of Capo d'Iſtria, of which they make no manner of mention, and which could not be known to ſome of them. V. What is the meaning of theſe words, *for the ſecond conſult Spondanus?* They ſeem to direct us to ſome places wherein mention is made of John-Baptiſt Vergerius Biſhop of Pola: but that would be a falſe direction, and is not

---

(i) At folio 124, of book i.

(k) *He was a learned man. See* Seckendorf, ubi ſupra, *in Supplem. Indicis* 1, *num.* 80.

(84) Seckendorf, ibid.

(85) Surius, *in the edition of the year* 1567, *ſays only what I mention; but in that of the year* 1574, *pag.* 733, *he adds this,* Sanè aiunt viri graves, hunc apoſtatam Vergerium ſub mortem teterrimos exhalaſſe fœtores, ac bovis inſtar horrendos edidiſſe boatus: & alia quædam, quæ ſpero quandoquè certiùs prodituros eos, qui morienti adfuêre. Mihi necdum licuit omnia exactè cognoſcere. - - - *Some worthy perſons affirm, that this apoſtate Vergerius at his death, ſent forth moſt offenſive ſtinks, and uttered dreadful bellowings like an ox: and they relate ſeveral other things, which I hope thoſe who were preſent at his death, will give a more certain account of. For I have not been able as yet to get an exact information of every thing.*

(86) Surius, Comment. Rerum in Orbe geſt. *ad ann.* 1567, *pag. ult. Edit.* 1567.

(87) Jo. Paulus Windeck, Prognoſtic. futuri ſtatus, *pag.* 113. *He quotes* Ederus.

(88) Languet. Epiſt. lvii, *lib. ii, pag.* 143.

(89) Dicitur mittendus brevi, aut ſaltem hoc agere ut mittatur. Cuperem eum manere domi. *Idem, Epiſt.* lx, *pag.* 151.

(90) Lettere volgari di diverſi nobiliſſimi Huomini, *lib. i. fol.* 81. *See alſo fol.* 101, *what he wrote to the marchioneſs of Peſcara.*

(91) Ibid. *fol.* 82 *verſo, & fol.* 83.

(92) *You will find it,* ibid. *fol.* 83, *& ſeq.*

(93) There it is *the preceding,* inſtead of *the following.*

(94) *He ſays ſo after* Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1548, *num.* 23.

(95) See the end of the remark [*D*].

(96) Sleid. *lib. xxi, fol.* 590.

that other ſenſe, tho' at laſt I find it is not the true one [*O*]. It concerns the book, intituled *The anatomy of the Maſs.* AURELIUS VERGERIUS, brother to him of whom we ſpeak, was knight of Malta, and was employed in ſome negotiations in which he acquired much glory (*l*). LEWIS VERGERIUS, his nephew, fled to Baſil on account of his religion. He wrote ſome letters in the year 1549, which were inſerted in the Coſmography of Munſter (*m*).

(*l*) Munſter, in Coſmographia, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 694.

(*m*) Pag. m. 693, 914.

not Moreri's meaning. It muſt be a typographical blunder.

[*O*] *I ſhall ſet down that other ſenſe, though at laſt I find it is not the true one.*] Let us repeat here the words inſerted in the remark [*F*]. ‘ Quoniam igitur Anatomiæ cognitio non ſolum medicis, chirurgiſque, verum etiam aliis ſummopere commendatur: eam ob cauſam, Anthonium ab Ædam Italum imitatus, hanc Miſſæ ac Miſſalis Anatomiam Gallicè, ut ab omnibus percipi poſſet facilius in lucem edere ſtatui. - - - *Since then the knowledge of Anatomy is very much recommended, not only to Phyſicians and Surgeons, but alſo to others: for that reaſon, in imitation of Anthony ab Ædam, an Italian author, I reſolved to publiſh this Anatomy of the Maſs and Miſſal in French, that it might be the more eaſily underſtood by every body.*’ I took the meaning of thoſe words to be, that he intended to copy or tranſlate *Antonius ab Ædam*, an Italian author: and I ſuppoſed they were the verſion of the Preface to the French edition: and upon that foot I thought the Corrector ſhould not have advertiſed that it ought to be read *Latinè* and not *Gallicè*: but afterwards I perceived that it might perhaps be more reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that thoſe were the words of the Latin tranſlator, and that he conſidered *Anthonius ab Ædam*, as the Italian tranſlator of the book, and not as the author: from whence it would follow that the work had been firſt compoſed in French. This ſuppoſition appeared to me altogether probable: but having at laſt recovered the French edition, I am intirely convinced that my firſt conjectures are the beſt. The Epiſtle Dedicatory to this edition informs me, that the Anatomy of the Maſs was firſt publiſhed in Italian, and that the Marquis del Vico deſired ſomebody to tranſlate it into French. This ſomebody having complied with his deſire, dedicated his tranſlation to the ſame Marquis, and cauſed it to be printed at Geneva for John Creſpin. His Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Geneva the eleventh of May 1555, and ſubſcribed C. D. J. It is followed with a pretty long Preface, wherein the tranſlator ſets forth why *this excellent Italian perſon called Anthony d'Adam* (97) (*who ſome time ago throughly canvaſſed the abominations of the Maſs and Miſſal, which he diſtinctly pointed out) thought fit to give this title of Anatomy to a book which he wrote upon them, the better to expreſs briefly what he had written* (98). This tranſlator took ſome liberties, and owned it in the following manner: ‘ As for the reſt, I ſhall make no long apology, for not confining myſelf ſo much as to tranſlate this book *verbatim* from the Italian, without adding or leaving out any thing. For that was not my intention, when I undertook to tranſlate this Anatomy. I perſuaded myſelf that the readers would not take it amiſs, if I endeavoured to accommodate myſelf to the capacity of thoſe, who are not at all inſtructed in the knowledge of the truth, juſt as the other did, in writing for the ignorant of his own nation. For I have ſometimes explained more fully what he had expreſſed in a few words (99).’

Obſerve that this Anatomy was refuted by a Doctor of Paris, and that ſome aſcribe it to Calvin. ‘ Scripſit Calvinus in contemptum Miſſæ librum quem inſcribit Anatomen Miſſæ, in quo totam Miſſam membratim diſſecat, ac medicorum more & philoſophorum in ſuas partes reſolvit ac egregiè irridet, ſubſannat, ac traducit. Hanc Anatomen confutavit Jacobus Faber Molinenſis Doctor Theologus Pariſienſis. Liber impreſſus eſt Pariſiis Anno 1563: Libri inſcriptio eſt talis; Pro ſacroſancto Miſſæ ſacrificio adverſus impiam Miſſæ & Miſſalis Anatomen, diſſectorum Laniorum, Miſoliturgorum Calvinianæ familiæ perditè excogitatam Hyperaſpiſtes, &c (100). - - - *Calvin wrote a book in contempt of the Maſs, which he intitled the Anatomy of the Maſs, wherein he diſſects the whole Maſs by pieces, and after the manner of Phyſicians and Philoſophers reſolves it into its parts, and ridicules, derides and traduces it egregiouſly. This Anatomy was confuted by James Le Fevre of Moulins, a Doctor of Divinity at Paris. The book was printed at Paris in the year 1563: and is intitled, A Defence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Maſs, againſt the impious Anatomy of the Maſs and Miſſal, wickedly contrived by thoſe butchering diſſectors and liturgy-haters, the Calviniſts, &c.*

(97) The Latin tranſlation ought then to have called him *Antonium ab Adamo*, or *ab Ada*, and not *ab Ædam.* He does not ſay, it is a typographical error.

(98) Preface to the Anatomy of the Maſs, *p. m.* 13. I uſe an edition of the year 1562, in 16mo. The Printer's name (John Martin) is put to it, but not the place where it was printed.

(99) Ibid. *pag.* 29, 30.

(100) Cornelius Schultingius Bibl, Cathol. *Tom. iv. pag.* 227.

VERGERIUS

VERGERIUS (ANGELUS) born in the iſle of Candia (*a*), tranſlated out of Greek into Latin the tract *de Fluviorum & Montium Nominibus*, aſcribed to Plutarch. He wrote the Greek letters ſo exquiſitely, that his writing was made uſe of as an original, or pattern, by thoſe who engraved the types of that language, for the royal impreſſions in the reign of Francis I (*b*) [*A*]. He was ſtill living in Charles the IXth's time [*B*]. He

(*a*) See the remark [*A*].

(*b*) Mr Chevillier, Origine de l'Imprimerie, *pag.* 259, *ſpeaks of* thoſe fine Letters, that were caſt in the matrices, which Francis I. cauſed to be made with a royal magnificence. *See the remark* [*CC*], *of the article* FRANCIS I.

[*A*] *He wrote the Greek letters ſo exquiſitely, that his writing was made uſe of as a pattern . . . . . for the royal impreſſions in the reign of Francis I.*] This I find in the *variæ lectiones* of Rutgerſius. ‘ Duos, *ſaith he* (1), (*interpretes*) mihi videre contigit, Italum unum, Natalem de Comitibus, alterum Cretenſem, Angelum Vergerium eum qui tam eleganter Græcè pinxit, ut ejus manus pro archetypo iis fuerit, quorum opera in ſculpendis regiis characteribus Rex Franciſcus uſus eſt. - - - *I happened to be acquainted with two tranſlators, one Natalis Comes, an Italian, the other Angelus Vergerius, a Candian, who wrote the Greek character ſo finely, that his writing ſerved for a pattern to thoſe, who were employed in caſting types in the reign of Francis I.*’ The two tranſlations mentioned here are thoſe of the little book *de Fluviorum & Montium Nominibus.*

(1) Jo. Rutgerſius, Var. Lect. *lib. iii, cap. xii, pag.* 235, 236.

[*B*] *He was ſtill living in Charles the IXth's time.*] I have no other proof of this but the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Poems of Jan Antoine de Baïf. Which is inſcribed to that monarch, and beſides other things contains the following lines.

Charle Etiene premier, diſciple de Lazare
Le docte Bonamy, de mode non barbare
M'aprint à prononcer le langage Romain:
Ange Vergece Grec, à la gentile main
Pour l'écriture Gréque, Ecrivain ordinére
De vos Granpere & Pere & le VOSTRE, ut ſalére
Pour à l'accent des Grecs ma parole dreſſer,
Et ma main ſur le trac de ſa lettre adreſſer.

Charles Stephens, who was diſciple
To Lazarus, the learned Bonamy,
Taught me to read the Latin tongue with grace.
Angelus Vergerius, a Grecian born,
Who wrote that language finely, and who was
To your grand-father, father, and your ſelf
Writer in ordinary, was engaged
To form my tongue to th' accent of the Greeks,
And after his own copy to lead my hand.

He is too violently cenſured by a Dutch Critic [*C*]. NICOLAS VERGERIUS [*D*], his ſon, was a learned man, and made ſome verſes on the death of Hadrian Turnebus.

You will alſo find another place below (2), where this Candiot's name is written Vergece as well as here. Which makes me apt to ſuſpect that inſtead of calling him Vergerius in Latin, he ought to be called Vergecius.

[*C*] *He is too violently cenſured by a Dutch Critic.*] We have ſeen in the remark [*A*], that Natalis Comes, and our Vergerius tranſlated into Latin the tract περὶ ποταμῶν καὶ ὀρῶν ἐπωνυμίας. Theſe words are to be found in it (3): Κάδμος τὸν κρηνοφύλακα δράκοντα τοξεύσας, καὶ εὑρὼν ὥσπερ πεφαρμακευμένον φόβου τὸ ὕδωρ, περιήρχετο τὴν χώραν ζητῶν πηγήν. They are thus expreſſed in Latin by Natalis Comes: ‘Ubi Cadmus ſerpentem fontis cuſtodem jaculis confodiſſet, inveniſſetque aquam quaſi ob timorem veneno infectam, regionem luſtravit fontem inquirens. - - - *After Cadmus had killed with darts the ſerpent, which guarded the fountain, and found the water, as he apprehended, infected with poiſon, he went all over the country looking for a ſpring.*’ Vergerius's verſion runs thus: ‘Cum Cadmus fontis cuſtodem draconem jaculis confeciſſet, & aquam ejus veneno infectam cerneret, eam abhorrens circuivit regionem ad inveſtigandum fontem. - - - *When Cadmus had pierced with darts the dragon that guarded the fountain, and ſaw that the water was infected with poiſon, he dreaded it, and went about the country to ſearch for a ſpring.*’ Rutgerſius's judgment of theſe two verſions is: I believe, ſaith he (4), that Vergerius was drunk when he talked in this manner; and it is not to be wondered that Natalis Comes hath ill tranſlated a corrupted place, for he did moſt times ſpoil even ſuch places as were correct. This cenſure is ſo unjuſt with regard to Vergerius that it is leſs capable of hurting his memory than that of Rutgerſius. For his tranſlation is not only better than that of Natalis Comes, though this Critic mentions the latter much more tenderly than the former, but is the beſt which could poſſibly be made, ſuppoſing the Greek text not corrupted. The learned Mauſſac underſtood this place juſt as Vergerius did, and thus tranſlates it: ‘Cum Cadmus ſagittis confixiſſet draconem qui fontem cuſtodiebat, VERITUS ne aqua veneno infecta eſſet, circuivit regionem alium fontem quo ſitim levaret, quærens. - - - *When Cadmus had pierced with arrows the dragon that guarded the fountain, fearing leſt the water ſhould be infected with poiſon, he went about the country in queſt of other water to quench his thirſt.*’ So that Vergerius's fault lies only in not having conjectured as Rutgerſius hath (5), that inſtead of φόβου the reading ought to be ἐκ φόνου, hoc eſt, è ſanguine ſive tabo, - - - *with the blood or gore.* Mauſſac did not think of it neither; wherefore I wonder that Rutgerſius did not cenſure his verſion, which makes me believe he knew nothing of it. Though according to the time of its publication, he might have ſeen it (6); but how many printed books are there which remain unknown, even to the moſt learned? Mr Mauſſac had never heard of any verſion of this tract when he undertook to tranſlate it (7), and afterwards he ſaw indeed the verſion of Natalis Comes and Turnebus, but not that of Vergerius. An hundred examples of this nature might be alledged.

[*D*] NICOLAS VERGERIUS . . . . . *made ſome verſes on the death of Hadrian Turnebus.*] This you find in theſe words of Thuanus. ‘Ei (*Hadriano Turnebo*) Joan. Auratus. . . . . . Nicolaus denique Vergerius, Angeli illius Cretenſis elegantiorum Græcæ linguæ characterum ad omnem admirationem & oculorum jucunditatem formatoris F. . . . . & alii epitaphiis carminibus parentarunt (8). - - - *John Auratus . . . . . And laſtly Nicolas Vergerius the ſon of Angelus the Candian, who wrote the Greek character ſo exquiſitely, that it was wonderfully beautiful . . . . and others made ſome verſes on the death of Hadrian Turnebus.*’ He was born in Candia, from whence he went into France about the year 1540. This I infer from two paſſages of John Antony de Baïf, one of which informs me, that the ſame John Antony was committed to the tutorſhip of Tuſan, and the other that he contracted at Tuſan's houſe a friendſhip with Nicolas Vergerius, then lately come from Candia (9).

Amy qu'en la prime jeuneſſe
J'acointay chez le bon Tuſan,
Voicy cinq fois le cinquieme an
Tout nouveau venu de la Grece.

. . . .

Bien jeune tu vis eſcumer
Deſſous toy la ronſlante mer
Tiré de l'iſle ta naiſſance
Qui vit de Jupiter l'enfance (10).

When in my youth to good Tuſanus' care
I was committed, I contracted there
With him juſt come from Greece a friendſhip faſt,
Since which, now five and twenty years are paſt.

. . . .

You was but young and in your tender age,
When you beheld the ſea beneath you rage.
The very iſle, which Jove an infant ſaw,
Is that in which, you firſt your breath did draw.

Theſe lines are taken from the *Contretrene à Nicolas Vergece Candiot*, in which you will find the following elogy on his Muſe,

Fee, ces mignardiſes laiſſe,
Je ne puis entendre à tes jeux;
Lachons un peu couver nos feux,
A fin que m'acquite à Vergece,
Qui m'a mis en ſoucy plaiſant,
M'étrenant d'un mignard preſant
Que la Muſe avec la Charite
Ont ourdi de fleurons d'eſlite.
Ces beaux vers en langue Latine
Confits au miel Catullien,
Vers de bon heur, meritent bien
Que beuſſe de l'eau Cabaline (11).

My Fairy, theſe careſſes ceaſe,
Your toying I cannot approve,
Let us not now indulge to love,
That I from debt may get releaſe.
Vergece's gift, which is moſt rare,
Has put me in a pleaſing care,
'Tis by the Graces and the Muſes
Adorn'd with ev'ry beauty curious.
Verſe of ſuch ſublime a nature,
That he in Latin did compoſe,
Which with Catullian honey flows,
Merit Hyppocrene's water.

John Antony de Baïf, before he finiſhes this Poem, takes notice of his own poverty, and of that of his friend.

Pauvreté mes eſpaulles preſſe,
Me foule & jamais ne me laiſſe.
Je ſuis pauvre, & tu n'es pas riche:
Vien-t'en me voir, Amy treſdoux:
Embraſſons-nous, conſolons-nous:
Le ciel ne fera touſiours chiche
Envers nous du bien qui des mains
De fortune vient aux humains:
Or vivons une vie eſtroitte
En pauvreté, mais ſans ſouffrette (12).

Poverty my ſhoulder preſſes,
And to haunt me never ceaſes,
I am poor, you don't abound,
Come to ſee me, deareſt friend,
Let's embrace, and put an end
To grief. For Heav'n will not be found
Still ſparing to us of its gifts:
Fortune's fickle and often ſhifts:
Tho' we live in poverty
Yet let us ſtill contented be.

---

(2) In the remark [*D*].

(3) In the ſecond chapter, where the river Iſmenus is mentioned.

(4) Equidem Vergerium cum hæc ſcriberet ſobrium fuiſſe non puto. Nam in Natali mirandum non eſt ſi corrupta non recte tranſtulit cum illi pene fatale fuerit, *male vertendo*, ut ille ait, etiam *ex Græcis bonis Latina facere non bona*. Rutgerſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 236.

(5) Ibid. *p.* 235.

(6) *The book* de Fluviorum ac Montium Nominibus, *tranſlated into Latin by Philip James de Mauſſac, was printed at Toulouſe in 1615, and that of Rutgerſius, at Leyden, 1618.*

(7) See his preface.

(8) Thuanus, *lib. xxxviii, pag.* 769, *ad ann.* 1565.

(9) John Antony de Baif, epiſtle to the king, prefixed to his Poems, printed at Paris, in the year 1573, in 8vo.

(10) John Antony de Baif's Poems, *fol. m.* 119.

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Id. ibid. *fol. m.* 119, *verſo.*

VERON (John) a French Proteſtant lived in the XVIth century. He publiſhed in Engliſh divers books of controverſy, and amongſt others one on Purgatory (*a*).

(*a*) *See the* Calvino Turciſmus,, *lib. iv, cap. viii, pag. m.* 834.

VERONA, a city of Italy, which ſome writers ſay, was built, and others that it was only rebuilt by the Gauls. Pompey's father led a Roman colony thither (*a*). It was ſacked by Attila, and ſucceſſively poſſeſſed by Odoacar King of the Heruli, Theodoric King of the Goths, and his ſucceſſors down to Totila, by the Lombards, by Charlemagne, and his poſterity; but when his deſcendants loſt the empire, ſeveral lords made themſelves ſovereigns of ſeveral cities of Italy. This ſort of government continued till Otho I re-united to the empire ſeveral States, which had been alienated from it. Amongſt theſe Verona was one, but it obtained the power of electing its own magiſtrates: So that it was properly an independant republic, under the name of an imperial city. In this ſtate it continued till Actiolinus ſeized the ſovereign power, which he could not obtain but by great bloodſhed. He enjoyed his tyrannical power thirty-three years, and died in the year 1269. After him the Veroneſe elected Martin della Scala their General, whoſe conduct they ſo well approved, that five years after they created him perpetual Dictator. His deſcendants governed Verona with great reputation, and were created princes by the Emperor in the year 1310. They rendered themſelves formidable by their conqueſts, and were driven out of Verona in 1387, by John Galeazzo Duke of Milan. They re-entered it in 1404, but did not keep poſſeſſion long, for the Venetians ſeized the city in 1409 (*b*), and have ſo carefully kept it, that they enjoy it to this day. It is not known whether any of the illuſtrious family della Scala remained, who left any children. Julius Cæſar Scaliger, one of the moſt learned men of the XVIth century, pretended to be deſcended from this houſe. But that honourable deſcent is diſputed; and few at preſent believe his pretenſion to be well grounded. Some are of opinion, that the letters of naturalization which he obtained in France, contradict his claim, ſince he there bears only the character of a Phyſician born at Verona (*c*). The public doubtleſs will be very glad to ſee thoſe letters of naturalization here [*A*] wherefore I inſert them.

(*a*) *Taken from* Cluverius, in Italia antiqua, *lib. i, cap. xvi.*

(*b*) *Taken from Leander Alberti's* Deſcript. Italiæ, *pag.* 716, *& ſeq. He made uſe of the antiquities of Verona, publiſhed by Torellus Sarayna.*

(*c*) *See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, *February* 1686, *pag. m.* 164, *&* Menagiana, *pag.* 25, *of the firſt Dutch edition. Primeroſe, a Phyſician quoted in Riolan's* Curieuſes Recherches ſur les Echoles de Medecine, *affirms that the Phyſicians of Bourdeaux refuſed to admit Julius Cæſar Scaliger into that town, unleſs he underwent an examination; which Scaliger being unwilling to ſubmit to, for fear of expoſing his reputation in a quodlibetical diſputation, he retired to Agen.*

[*A*] *The public will doubtleſs be very glad to ſee thoſe letters of naturalization.*] Mr Baluze, one of thoſe extraordinary men, who are born for the good of the Republic of Letters, and who beſides the productions with which they enrich it, are pleaſed to furniſh other authors with all ſorts of aſſiſtance, did me the favour to ſend me what follows.

An extract of an original regiſter of Francis I, which is in the Repoſitory of Records at Paris.

'Francis, &c. We give to underſtand, &c. that we have received the humble ſupplication of our dear and well beloved Julius Cæſar de l'Eſcalle de Bordoms, Doctor of Phyſic, native of the city of Verona in Italy, ſetting forth that about four years paſt, or thereabouts, he came into this our kingdom to the city of Agen in Agenois, with intention and full reſolution to end the remainder of his days there; in which city, and the country about it, the ſaid ſuppliant has purchaſed an houſe, and ſeveral other poſſeſſions. But becauſe he is a ſtranger and not a native of our realm, he is in doubt whether the poſſeſſions which he may have purchaſed, or hopes to purchaſe, likewiſe the inheritances which may devolve on him hereafter from his relations or others, may not be claimed, as belonging to us by eſcheat or otherwiſe, and our officers may not accordingly give him ſome trouble or hinderance, if he be not qualified and diſpenſed with on that account, and humbly requeſting us to impart to him our favour and liberality. Wherefore we, theſe things conſidered, generouſly inclined to grant the ſupplication and requeſt of the ſaid ſuppliant, given and granted, give and grant leave and licence; willing by our eſpecial grace, full power and royal authority, by theſe preſents, that he be freely permitted to inhabit, and dwell in our ſaid realm, and in it hold and poſſeſs all ſuch eſtates moveables or immoveables, which he hath already acquired, or ſhall for the future lawfully acquire; and likewiſe that he may ſucceed to all thoſe goods and inheritances which in our ſaid realm, territories, lands, and lordſhips, ſhall devolve on or belong to him by good and juſt title, and that he may diſpoſe of them by his laſt will, as his proper goods and inheritance; and that his heirs or others to whom he may diſpoſe of them, may be enabled to ſucceed and take poſſeſſion of and enjoy the ſaid goods, and in general that he ſhall enjoy entirely all the honours, privileges, prerogatives, franchiſes, liberties, and rights which are cuſtomarily enjoyed by the originary natives of this our kingdom, and that he ſhall be held and accounted our ſubject, in all caſes as a native of our realm; and therefore we have qualified and diſpenſed, and do qualify and diſpenſe him, of our ſaid grace by theſe preſents, he paying us a moderate ſum for once only. We give in command by theſe ſame preſents to our truſty and beloved officers of our accounts and treaſurers at Paris, baillies, ſeneſchals, and to all our other juſticiaries and officers, and to their lieutenants for the preſent and for the future, and to every one of them whom it may concern, and we will that the grace, licence, habitation, and all the effects by theſe preſents granted, be by them ſuffered and permitted to the ſuppliant to enjoy and uſe, fully and peaceably without giving or ſuffering to fall on him any arreſt, diſturbance, or hindrance, in what manner ſoever on any occaſion, &c. For ſuch is, &c. Notwithſtanding all ſtatutes, ordinances againſt ſtrangers, and any other ordinances, &c. Given at *Paris* in the month of March in the year of Grace, one thouſand five hundred and twenty-eight, and the fifteenth of our reign. Thus ſigned. By the King, *Gedoyn. Viſa. Contentor. des Landes.*'

I expected from Mr Baluze a memoir which I have not received concerning Du Pin (1), Biſhop of Rieux. The Biſhop of Rieux (2), one of the moſt learned and illuſtrious Prelates of France was to ſend it to him.

(1) Joannes PINUS, his article is to be ſeen above.

(2) His family, which is that of Bertier, has afforded many eminent men. His father, firſt Preſident in the Parliament of Toulouſe, was called Mr de Montrave. He was a man of great merit. See *Balzac, Lettres Choiſies*, pag. 270, Dutch edition.

VERSORIS, (PETER DE) Lord of Fontenai le Viſconte, of Marilli, and part of Montoger, and head of the council of the Dukes of Guiſe (*a*) in the XVIth century, was an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, and one of the moſt famous and illuſtrious of his profeſſion. He was born at Paris on the 16th of February 1528 (*b*), of a noble family, and one that had been conſiderable for a long time (*c*) [*A*]. *He was deſigned by his father to be an officer in a ſovereign court; but having extravagantly ſpent, whilſt he was young, the money that was laid aſide for that uſe, he endeavoured to repair that fault by hard labour, whereby .... he became one of the chief advocates of his time: he was ſo much maſter of all the things which were neceſſary to him, that he hardly uſed any books* (*d*). He pleaded for the Jeſuits in the year 1564, in the famous trial which they had with the univerſity of Paris; and, to ſpeak properly, he gained the cauſe. He was deputed to the ſtates of Blois in the year 1576, and ſpoke in the name of the third ſtate. He was as good a chamber counſellor as a pleader (*e*). *He was very zealous for his clients, particularly for the houſe of Guiſe .... And he died with grief in leſs than four or five hours*, on the 25th of December 1588, *after he had heard that the Duke of Guiſe* [*B*] *had been killed at Blois* (*f*). It is ſaid, that this duke took his advice only in his domeſtic affairs, but not in the cabals of ſtate (*g*). We ſhall ſee below wherein his talents lay [*C*].

Mornac

(*a*) Manuſcript Memoir.

(*b*) Opuſcul. de Loiſel, *p.* 556.

(*c*) Manuſcript Memoir.

(*d*) Opuſcul. de Loiſel, *p.* 751.

(*e*) See the remark [*C*].

(*f*) Loiſel, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 527.

(*g*) See the remark [*B*].

[*A*] *Of a noble family, and one that had been conſiderable for a long time.*] The proof of this is given by Mr Joly in his notes on the alphabetical Index of the Advocates, printed with divers pieces of Antony Loiſel, in the year 1652. ‘Mr Peter Verſoris, ſays he (1), Advocate in Parliament, was ſprung from a noble family, which came originally from gentlemen in Normandy about Falaize, as he himſelf obſerved in his genealogy which he wrote with his own hand, during the leiſure which the contagious diſtemper that raged in the year 1582, afforded him in his retirement in his houſe of Clichy la Garenne near Paris. Their name was le Tourneur, which they have ſince changed into Verſoris. John le Tourneur called Verſoris, coming to Paris about the eighth year of Charles VII, was one of the firſt Doctors of the Univerſity, and writ ſeveral books in Latin, ſome of which, as this genealogy obſerves, are to be ſeen in the library of the Minimes, at Nigeon. He changed his French name le Tourneur into the Latin one Verſoris, as men of letters were wont then to do. He took his nephew with him, made him a Lawyer, and married him to Jane Fournier, of a good family, and nearly related to the Lieutenant-Civil Charmolüe. From this marriage are deſcended all the Verſoris's, who have moſt of them exerciſed the function of Advocate with great reputation both in the Palace and the Chatelet.’ There is ſomething wanting in this relation of Mr Joly, we do not find by it that the nephew whom JOHN LE TOURNEUR had with him, was called FREDERIC LE TOURNEUR, and that in imitation of his uncle, he called himſelf Verſoris. He left one ſon, WILLIAM VERSORIS, who was Lord of Garge, and a famous Advocate; and father of our PETER VERSORIS (2). It is without doubt the ſame William Verſoris, we find in the liſt *of the Advocates pleading in the court of parliament in the year* 1524 (3), and who *died at five and twenty, after he had been married five times, as Mr Peter Verſoris obſerves in the genealogy which he made of that family in the year* 1582 (4). Mr Blanchard mentions this family in his catalogue of the Counſellors of the Parliament of Paris.

[*B*] *He died of grief .... after he heard that the Duke of Guiſe had been killed at Blois.*] Mr Joly relates it thus. ‘Peter Verſoris (5) was head of the Duke of Guiſe's Council, kept his ſeals, and was very affectionate to his family, though he had no communication, or any thing to do but with his domeſtic affairs; ſo that on the very day of the Barricadoes in the year 1588, he came in his coach in the morning to the Hôtel de Guiſe, to ſpeak with him as he uſed to do, not knowing any thing of what had paſſed, and returned again to his own houſe without ſeeing him, the Duke of Guiſe having then more urgent buſineſs on his hands. He died the ſame year on Chriſtmas-day in the morning, having heard at his collation the night before, the news of what was tranſacted at Blois, for which he was very much concerned, deploring the misfortunes into which he ſaw they were going to fall, and ſpoke theſe words with grief, *That thoſe princes* (meaning Meſſieurs de Guiſe) *were very well beloved, and that if the king had not prevented it, he would have been much embaraſſed*. However he was perfectly compoſed, and went to bed, deſigning to communicate at the midnight maſs, having already been confeſſed; but finding himſelf ill, he could not go: Mr de Verthamon, Counſellor in Parliament, his ſon-in-law, and his daughters, coming to ſee him, at their return about five a-clock in the morning, found him dead in his bed. The eldeſt of his ſons, Frederic Verſoris was then young, and was admitted into the court as a Counſellor a long time after. His two ſons-in-law Mr Rancher, Maſter of the Requeſts, and Mr de Verthamon, alſo Counſellor in Parliament, followed the King's perſon and intereſt during all thoſe commotions, as well in the ſtates of Blois, as in the parliament ſitting at Tours.

[*C*] *We ſhall ſee .... wherein his talents lay.*] Antony Loiſel made a ſort of parallel between John le Maitre and Peter Verſoris. The firſt, ſays he (6), *was really a very able Advocate, well verſed in points of law, cuſtoms and practice, very prudent and deliberate in his cauſes, which he made appear as well at the Bar as in the adminiſtration of his places. After he had reſigned that of Preſident to Mr de Sillery, he deſired to live and die privately in his own houſe, where he was conſulted without going to the Bar, and often employed in arbitrations.* After this he adds, ‘that it was not quite the ſame with Mr Peter Verſoris; for altho' they went to him, it was chiefly to mend ſome faults which happen ſometimes in preparing a caſe for a hearing; for he was really full of fine and ſubtle inventions, and underſtood the affairs of the Bar ſo well, that tho' he had in a manner quitted it, yet the Bar never quitted him, for his houſe was frequented as much as the Bar; that he kept not only his days, his mornings and afternoons, but his hours alſo, which he ſo managed that there were always people attending at the great-hall, whilſt he gave his advice in the little one. And as he was much ſollicited in his latter years for advice, ſo he had been employed in his younger days more than any body elſe for pleading, as one who ſpoke with a ſprightly ready and natural eloquence †, and with a great facility and wonderful art of perſwaſion, which was the reaſon of his being employed in the greateſt and fineſt cauſes of his time, as that of the Jeſuits ⸸, which we pleaded together, he for them ‡, and I for the Univerſity of Paris, of which I ſhall ſay nothing, becauſe ſince both pleas are printed, every body may paſs a judgment on them. Only this I ſhall ſay, that having read his ſome years ſince, I did not think it near ſo good as when we pleaded; which proceeds from the grace, the force, and the weight that is given to a diſcourſe by the voice, and way of delivery, eſpecially by his, which was fine and agreeable, in compariſon to what a meer, dull, mute, and inanimate reading is. It is true he had one fault, which was generally pronouncing A for E and E for A, and thoſe who knew what he quoted out of claſſic authors, might perceive that he was not well verſed in them; but take him altogether he was a great Advocate.

[*D*] *I ſhall*

---

(1) Opuſcules d'Antoine Loiſel, *pag.* 751.

(2) From a manuſcript Memoir.

(3) *It is in pag.* 574, 575, *of the* Opuſcules de Loiſel.

(4) Opuſcul. de Loiſel, *p.* 750.

(5) Ibid. *pag.* 751, 752.

(6) Ib. *p.* 526.

† *Mr du Vair compares him with Mr Mangot, at the beginning of his treatiſe of the French eloquence.* We have heard, *ſays he*, Mr Mangot and Mr Verſoris at the ſame time: But one of them was rather a ſubtile Civilian, who eaſily explained himſelf with a cloſe and a ſharp voice, than a great Orator. The other did not want a full and free expreſſion, or a great and nice judgment; but having employed all his thoughts about cauſes, he did not go ſo far as his natural parts, if they had been cultivated by care and art, would have carried him.

⸸ Paſquier in the firſt letter of the xxiſt book to Mr Sammarthanus relates at large how he was engaged in that cauſe, and all that paſſed in it.

‡ *Mr Peter Verſoris*, ſays he, *at the end of that letter, pag.* 675, a great Advocate pleaded againſt me for the Jeſuits, being aſſiſted by the Memoirs which Caigord the Jeſuit furniſhed him, who was a native of Auvergne, one of the fineſt ſollicitors the Palace ever ſaw, and as ſuch I have heard him commended by the late Cardinal of Lorrain.

Mornac made an encomium upon him in his *Feriæ forenſes* (*b*), I ſhall ſpeak of his iſſue [*D*].

(*b*) Ibid. *pag.* 752.

[*D*] *I ſhall ſpeak of his iſſue.*] He married Margaret Coignet, by whom he had two ſons and two daughters, FREDERIC, JAMES, CATHERINE, and MARY. The latter was wife of Francis de Vertamont, Counſellor in the Parliament of Paris, and died in Auguſt 1625. Catherine was married the 5th of September 1580, to Antony Rancher Seigneur de la Foucaudiere, Counſellor in the Parliament, Maſter of the Requeſts, and afterwards Preſident in the Parliament of Paris.

FREDERIC DE VERSORIS, Counſellor in the Parliament, February 19, 1601, left among other children FRANCIS FREDERIC Lord of Fontenai le Vicomte, (who left only one daughter) and LEWIS Lord of Marſilli, Lieutenant of the guards, who left only two daughters. They died without iſſue. The youngeſt was married the 10th of September 1689, to her ſecond couſin, and died on the 6th of November 1691.

JAMES DE VERSORIS, the other ſon of our Advocate, was Lord of Coulommiers, Counſellor and Secretary to the King, and Father of PETER DE VERSORIS, Lord of Coulommiers, Beauvoir, and Malmuſſe, the King's Steward in ordinary. This Peter de Verſoris left five children, three daughters who are Nuns, and two ſons, Charles and Peter, CHARLES DE VERSORIS, Lord and Patron of Agi and Beauvoir, was married firſt to his ſecond couſin, daughter of LEWIS DE VERSORIS, Lieutenant of the guards; and afterwards on the third of March 1695, to Genevieve Bourgoin, by whom he has no children. PETER DE VERSORIS, Lord of Beauvoir, married Mademoiſelle Tonnelier at Orleans the 22d of February 1700 (7).

(7) Taken from a manuſcript Memoir.

VESPASIAN (TITUS FLAVIUS) ſon of an honeſt Publican [*A*], and grandſon of a collector, who had been captain of a company of one hundred men in Pompey's party (*a*), and who having eſcaped from the battle of Pharſalia, roſe to the higheſt dignity on earth, being created Emperor of Rome, in the year of Chriſt 69. He was born in a village of the country of the Sabini, near Reate (*b*), on the 17th of November, in the year of Rome 761 (*c*). He was brought up in the country by Tertulla his grandmother by his father's ſide, and preſerved ſo great a reſpect for her memory, that at great ſolemnities he always drank in her goblet (*d*). He paſſed gradually through all the dignities of the empire. He was made tribune of the ſoldiers in Thrace, on account of his ſervices. Crete and the province of Cyrene fell to his lot when he was Quæſtor. He was refuſed the office of Ædile the firſt time he ſtood for it. He obtained it afterwards, but was the laſt of the ſix Ædiles, and even could not arrive at that place without ſome difficulty. He was a more ſucceſsful candidate for the Prætorſhip; he obtained the firſt rank the very firſt time he ſtood for it. He made uſe of a great many arts to gain Caligula's favour, and ſtood very well with Narciſſus under the Emperor Claudius. By the intereſt of which favourite he was ſent into Germany at the head of a legion. He was afterwards ſent into Britain (*e*), where he fought the enemy thirty times, ſubdued two potent nations, above twenty towns, and the iſle of Wight. In

(*a*) Sueton. in Veſpaſ. *cap. i. See the remark* [*A*] *citat.* (1).

(*b*) Id. ib. *cap. ii.*

(*c*) It is ninth year of Chriſt.

(*d*) Aviæ memoram tantopere dilexit, ut ſollennibus ac feſtis diebus pocillo quoque ejus argenteo potare perſeveraverit. *Id. ib.*

(*e*) Now called England.

[*A*] *Son of an honeſt Publican.*] That is to ſay, of a Publican who was a virtuous man, and behaved himſelf generouſly in his employ, and ſo juſtly withal, that the cities gave a public and laſting teſtimony of his probity. 'Hujus (1) filius cognomine 'Sabinus . . . . publicum quadrageſima in Aſia egit. 'Manebantque imagines à civitatibus ei poſitæ ſub 'hoc titulo, ΚΑΛΩ͂Σ ΤΕΛΩΝΗ΄ΣΑΝΤΙ. Poſtea 'fœnus apud Helvetios exercuit, ibique diem obiit, 'ſuperſtitibus uxore Veſpaſia Polla, & duobus ex ea 'liberis: quorum major Sabinus ad præfecturam ur'bis, minor Veſpaſianus ad principatum uſque pro'ceſſit. - - - - *This man's ſon, ſirnamed Sabinus . . . .* '*was a public tax-gatherer in Aſia, and had ſtatues* '*raiſed to him by the cities with this inſcription,* TO THE 'HONEST PUBLICAN. *He was afterwards an* '*uſurer, in Switzerland, where he died, leaving behind* '*him his wife Veſpaſia Polla, and two children by her.* '*The elder, Sabinus, came to be made Governor of the city,* '*but the younger, Veſpaſian, was preferred to the dignity* '*of Emperor.*' Satirical men cannot here come in with their gloſs on this text, they cannot object that Veſpaſian's father was an honeſt Publican in the ſame ſenſe that one of thoſe who was crucified with JESUS CHRIST, is called the good Thief. The latter did not deſerve that character *in ſenſu compoſito*, as the Logicians ſpeak, but only *in ſenſu diviſo*. He was not good and a thief at the ſame time, but from a thief he became a good man. The ſame may be ſaid of Zacheus: He was not an honeſt man when he gathered the public impoſts: He became ſo by acts of reſtitution and repentance (2). This cannot be ſaid of our Emperor's father; for he united the character of an honeſt man with that of a Publican, ſo much decried in the Goſpel, and profane authors. Nay, the Satiriſts, who cannot deny this, would ſtretch things too far, if they ſhould make uſe of the application of this thought, *theſe two words are very much ſurprized to find themſelves together, for in all likelihood they never met before.* I have formerly touched on this (3), in obſerving that a great extent of learning is very rarely accompanied with a great modeſty. Nevertheleſs we meet with ſome examples in which they are united: Some Farmers of the revenues are alſo honeſt men, tho' it ought to be owned that from all antiquity theſe two qualities have been ſeparated. The opportunities they have of gaining, procures them riches, which are liberally expended on whatever luxury inſpires; but to defray theſe extravagant expences, new and more exorbitant extortions are neceſſary. Julian the Apoſtate knew very well that the Financiers love luxury. 'Evenerat iiſdem diebus, '(*they are Ammianus Marcellinus's words*) (4), ut ad 'demendum Imperatoris capillum tonſor venire præ'ceptus, introiret quidam ambitioſe veſtitus. Quo viſo 'Julianus obſtupuit: *Ego*, inquit, *non Rationalem juſ*'*ſi, ſed tonſorem acciri.* - - - - *It happened much about* '*the ſame time that a Barber being ſent for to ſhave* '*Julian, there came in a man very finely dreſſed, at* '*which the Emperor was aſtoniſhed: I gave orders,* '*ſaid he, to call a Barber, and not a Receiver of the* '*revenues.*' This is the venom which poiſons the minds of thoſe concerned in the the management of the Treaſury. See ſeveral remarks againſt them in the firſt part of la Mothe le Vayer's *Proſe Chagrine* (5).

We may obſerve that Veſpaſian's maternal anceſtors were more illuſtrious than the paternal; for Veſpaſia Polla, his mother, was a Senator's ſiſter, and daughter of Veſpaſianus Pollio, who went through conſiderable offices in the army. 'Polla Nurſiæ honeſto genere 'orta, patrem habuit Veſpaſianum Pollionem, ter 'Tribunum militum, præfectumque caſtrorum, fra'tremque Senatorem prætoriæ dignitatis (6). - - - - - - '*Polla was born at Nurſia of a good family. Her fa*'*ther was Veſpaſianus Pollio, who had been three times* '*a Tribune in the army, and Quarter-Maſter-General.* '*Her brother was a Senator who had alſo enjoyed the* '*Prætorian dignity.*' Several monuments of this family were obſerved at a place called Veſpaſiæ, on the top of a mountain ſix miles from Nurſia, in the road to Spoleto, which diſcovered its ancient luſtre. *Ubi*

(1) Sueton. in Veſpaſ. *cap. i, That is of* Titus Flavius Petro Municeps Reatinus bello civili Pompejanarum partium centurio . . . deinde . . . coactiones argentarias factitavit, *Id. ib.*

(2) See St Luke's Goſpel ch. xix.

(3) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *for June* 1685, *Art.* 2, *at the end.*

(4) Ammian. Marcellinus, *lib.* *xxii, cap. iv, pag. m.* 300.

(5) Pag. 327, of Tom. ix, Edit. in 12mo. See alſo Tom. i, pag. 70, & ſeq.

(6) Sueton, ubi ſupra, *cap.* i.

In recompence of which he obtained the triumphal ornaments, two prieſthoods, and the conſulſhip. He lived in a ſort of retirement whilſt Agrippina continued in favour, who hated all Narciſſus's friends. Returning to public employments, he became Proconſul of Africa, which poſt he very honourably diſcharged [*B*], without enriching himſelf. He accompanied Nero in his travels through Greece; but not having the complaiſance to applaud that emperor's ſinging [*C*], he was utterly diſgraced, and concealed himſelf in an obſcure town. He did not believe himſelf ſafe there, he feared the fatal effects of Nero's rage, when he received the news that the government of a province, and the command of an army were beſtowed on him. No perſon was found ſo proper as he to reduce the Jewiſh nation, which had preſumed to revolt. This expedition in which Titus his ſon ſerved him as Lieutenant-General, gained him great glory, and opened his way to the throne. He began to hope for that exalted ſtation during the civil war betwixt Otho and Vitellius (*f*). Several preſages which promiſed him a moſt eminent fortune, were very powerful engagements to his reſolution of ſeizing the imperial authority; for beſides the impreſſion which they made upon himſelf, they ſupplied his friends with a good opportunity of animating him to this enterprize. Tacitus (*g*) and Suetonius (*h*) who have related the preſages, have not omitted the anſwer made him on mount Carmel. It was given by the true God, if we may believe the Carmelites, who build on the authority of theſe two hiſtorians, the chimerical antiquity of their order, and the pretended ſucceſſion of the diſciples of the prophet Elias continued to the beginning of their inſtitution [*D*].

Veſpaſian

(Veſpaſiis) *Veſpaſiorum complura monumenta exſtant, magnum indicium ſplendoris familiæ & vetuſtatis* (7). Now ſince Veſpaſian's elder brother took the ſirname of *Sabinus*, we muſt conclude that in that age, the younger brothers ſometimes took a ſirname borrowed from their mothers family, and terminated like thoſe which indicated adoption.

[*B*] *He very honourably diſcharged the Proconſulſhip of Africa.*] We have here a proof of what I ſaid above (8), that Suetonius was not prompted by a ſatirical genius to ſpeak ill of people. He here beſtows encomiums on Veſpaſian which are very contrary to the teſtimony of Tacitus; this ſhews that he had throughly examined what had been ſaid for and againſt Veſpaſian's conduct, and having found the ill reports concerning him falſe, he rejected them, in order to do that Proconſul the juſtice which was due to him. An Hiſtorian ill-natured and ſatirical does not act in that manner. 'Exin ſortitus Africam, integerrime, nec ſine magna dignatione adminiſtravit: 'Niſi quod Adrumeti ſeditione quadam, rapa in eum 'jacta ſunt. Rediit certe nihilo opulentior, ut qui prope 'labefactata jam fide, omnia prædia fratri obligarit (9). - - - *Afterwards the province of Africa falling 'to his ſhare, he governed it with great integrity, and 'was greatly reſpected; excepting only that in a ſedition 'at Adrumetum he had turneps thrown at him. It is 'very certain that he came back no richer than he went; 'for his credit was ſo ſunk that he was under a neceſſity 'of mortgaging his whole eſtate to his brother.*' You ſee that Suetonius doth not conceal the inſurrection of the inhabitants of Adrumetum, nor that they threw turneps at Veſpaſian. He is then ſo much the more to be credited in the elogies he beſtows upon him, and we may reaſonably believe that Tacitus was neither juſt nor exact enough, when he tells us only that Veſpaſian was decried, and drew on himſelf the public hatred during this Proconſulſhip. 'Integrum illic ac 'favorabilem Proconſulatum Vitellius; famoſum invi'ſumque Veſpaſianus egerat (10). - - - - - *Vitellius be'haved in his Proconſulſhip there with integrity, and ſo 'as to be liked; but Veſpaſian in his was decried and 'hated.*'

[*C*] *Not having the complaiſance to applaud Nero's ſinging.*] This Prince's paſſion for Muſic was a ridiculous extravagance. The principal cauſe of his travelling in Greece was his ardent deſire of ſignalizing himſelf in the Muſical diſputes in ſeveral cities of that country, and to bear away the prize (11). Suetonius relates upon this ſubject a great many circumſtances which are very ſurprizing (12). He ſaith amongſt other things that no perſon was allowed to retire from the theatre whilſt Nero was ſinging, and that ſome women were forced to be delivered there, and that the gates of the cities being ſhut, ſome perſons were ſo fatigued and tired with hearing and praiſing this Prince, that they ſecretly eſcaped over the walls, or feigned themſelves dead, that they might be carried out of the town under pretence of being buried. *Cantante eo, ne neceſſaria quidem cauſa excedere theatro licitum erat. Itaque & enixæ quædam in ſpectaculis dicuntur, & multi tædio audiendi laudandique, clauſis oppidorum portis, aut furtim deſiluiſſe de muro, aut morte ſimulata funere elati* (13). It is eaſy to conceive that Nero was extremely incenſed againſt Veſpaſian, who very often went out of the theatre, or fell aſleep whilſt his maſter was ſinging. *Peregrinatione Achaica inter comites Neronis, cum cantante eo, aut diſcederet ſæpius, aut præſens obdormiſceret, graviſſimam contraxit offenſam: prohibituſque non contubernio modo, ſed etiam publica ſalutatione, ſeceſſit in parvam ac deviam civitatem, quoad latenti, etiamque extrema metuenti, provincia cum exercitu oblata eſt* (14). Some will aſk why Suetonius ſaith here, that Veſpaſian frequently retired from the theatre? Hath he not elſewhere (15) affirmed that no perſon was permitted to go out of the theatre on any pretext whatſoever? I anſwer, that indeed he did not very well remember to render all the parts of his relations exactly conſiſtent; but to juſtify him in ſome ſort, we may ſuppoſe that the prohibition of leaving the theatre was a conſequence of the liberty of not ſtaying till the ſpectacle was ended, which ſeveral had taken. Veſpaſian, before the prohibition, was one of thoſe who laid the leaſt conſtraint upon himſelf; by which he began to diſpleaſe that Prince, and his diſgrace was compleated after the prohibition. He indeed obeyed, but fell aſleep on the theatre. I cannot think of a better way of reconciling theſe two places of Suetonius. It may perhaps be imagined that he confounded the times, I would ſay that inſtead of applying this to the year of the Muſical victories which Nero obtained at Rome, he placed it in the year of his victories amongſt the Greeks. We are informed by Tacitus that it was at Rome that Veſpaſian fell into diſgrace for ſleeping at the Muſical diſputes of the Emperor. 'Fere'bantque Veſpaſianum, tamquam ſomno conniveret, 'a Phœbo liberto increpitum, ægreque meliorum pre'cibus obtectum: mox imminentem perniciem majore 'fato effugiſſe (16). - - - - *And they ſaid that Veſpaſian 'was reproved for ſleeping by the freed man Phœbus, 'and that he was with great difficulty ſaved through the 'interceſſion of the better ſort of people. It was ſoon 'after believed that he had eſcaped the preſent danger, 'being reſerved for a higher deſtiny.*' Mr de Tillemont thinks that Veſpaſian twice committed this crime of ſleeping at Nero's Muſic; firſt at Rome, and afterwards in Greece (17). This is not very probable: a courtier who hath once run the riſque of his life, would take more care to avoid a relapſe, eſpecially, when it may be eaſily done.

[*D*] *The anſwer made him on mount Carmel. . . : . . The Carmelites who build . . . . . the chimerical antiquity of their . . . . inſtitution.*] Tacitus's words are: 'Eſt 'Judæam inter Syriamque Carmelus, ita vocant mon'tem, deumque: nec ſimulacrum deo, aut templum, '(ſic tradidere majores) ara tantum & reverentia. Illic 'ſacrificanti Veſpaſiano, cum ſpes occultas verſaret 'animo, Baſilides ſacerdos, inſpectis idemtidem extis, '*Quidquid eſt*, inquit, *Veſpaſiane quod paras, ſeu domum 'exſtruere, ſeu prolatare agros, ſive ampliare ſervitia,*

'datur

(*f*) *Taken from* Suetonius, ubi ſupra, *cap. ii, & ſeq.*

(*g*) Tacit. Hiſt. *lib. ii, cap. lxxviii.*

(*h*) Sueton, in Veſpaſiano, *cap. v.*

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) In the remark [*D*], of the article SUETONIUS.

(9) Sueton. ubi ſupra, *cap. iv.*

(10) Tacit. Hiſt. *lib. ii, cap. xcvii,*

(11) Sueton. in Nerone, *cap. xxii, See alſo* Tacitus, Ann. *lib. xvi, cap. iv, v.*

(12) Suet. ibid. *cap. xxiii, & ſeq.*

(13) Id. ibid. *cap. xxiii.*

(14) *Idem*, in Veſpaſiano, *cap. iv.*

(15) See, above, citation (13).

(16) Tacit. Annal. *lib. xvi, cap. v, ad ann. Romæ* 818, *Chriſti* 65.

(17) Tillemont. Hiſt. des Emper. *Tom. ii, p. m.* 6.

Veſpaſian tho' animated by preſages, and the ſollicitations of his friends, heſitated for ſome time, and the concurrence of ſeveral fortuitous events (*i*), and the moſt preſſing reaſons of Mucianus (*k*) were wanting to change his uncertain thoughts into a fixed reſolution of declaring himſelf emperor. It is very probable that the lies, which were artfully ſpread about contributed very conſiderably to the ſucceſs of his enterprize [*E*]. He was the firſt who grew better, after he had aſcended the throne (*l*); and it would be unjuſt not to own that he remedied ſeveral evils, and did ſome very good actions. The deſire of amaſſing treaſures was his great vice, which he took no great care to hide; yet there is reaſon to believe that he contrived it ſo, that part of his extortions were imputed to his concubine

(*i*) Id. ibid. *cap. vi.*

(*k*) *You will find them in* Tacitus ubi ſupra, *cap. lxxvi, lxxvii.*

(*l*) Ambigua de Veſpaſiano fama: ſoluſque omnium ante ſe principum in melius mutatus eſt. *Tacit. ibid. lib. i, cap. l.*

datur tibi magna ſedes, ingentes termini, multum hominum. Has ambages & ſtatim exceperat fama, & tunc aperiebat, nec quidquam magis in ore vulgi; crebriores apud ipſum ſermones: quanto ſperantibus plura dicuntur (18). - - - *Between Judea and Syria lies Carmel: that is the name which they give both to the mountain and to the god. The god has no temple nor image, (for ſuch is the religion of the country handed down from father to ſon) he has no more than an altar and reverence paid to him. While Veſpaſian was ſacrificing there, and revolving in his mind his ſecret hopes, the prieſt Baſilides, every now and then looking upon the entrails, ſpoke to him in this manner*: Veſpaſian, whatever your deſigns be, whether to build a houſe, to extend your lands, or to increaſe the number of your ſlaves, a great ſeat is provided for you, large bounds, and a vaſt multitude of men. *Fame preſently took up this dark oracle, and even then explained it; nor was any thing more talked of by the vulgar. To himſelf it was ſtill more frequently mentioned; for the more people hope the more they are entertained with the like diſcourſes.*’ I thought I ought not to ſuppreſs the laſt words of this citation, for they contain an excellent inſtruction, or rather a lively image of the deceits and illuſions of ambition. The people diſcourſed of thoſe preſages, but thoſe who approached Veſpaſian talked more of them ſtill; for the more ſuch diſcourſes create any hopes, the more frequently are they repeated. I proceed now to Suetonius: ‘ Apud Judæam Carmeli Dei oraculum conſulentem, ita confirmavere ſortes, ut quidquid cogitaret volveretque animo, quantumlibet magnum, id eſſe proventurum pollicerentur (19). - - - - - *When he conſulted the oracle of the god Carmel in Judea, he was encouraged by this anſwer,* viz. *that the meditation and purpoſe of his heart, however great it was, ſhould be accompliſhed.*’ Thoſe who weigh the circumſtances of theſe two Hiſtorians words, and underſtand the religion which God delivered to the Jews, will without any difficulty be convinced, that the oracle conſulted by Veſpaſian upon that mountain, was a deity full as falſe as that at Delphi. Nevertheleſs the Carmelites maintain, that this was the oracle of the ſame God who was worſhipped at Jeruſalem. Hermenigildus à Sancto Paulo, a Spaniſh Monk, refuted this opinion, and ſhewed the Paganiſm of the god Carmelus mentioned by Tacitus and Suetonius: but Laurence Angelus Eſpin, a Carmelite, could not bear this truth; he publiſhed a tract at Saragoſſa in anſwer to it, with the pompous and inſulting title of *Ruina Idoli Carmelitici quod ſomniavit Reverendiſſi. P. Fr. Hermenigildus à S. Paulo.* This bold writer did not maintain his preſuming character; he was ſilenced by the Marquis of Agropoli, who printed a piece at Seville in the year 1678, in which he with a great deal of ſolidity and learning proves, that his good friend, Father Hermenigildus à S. Paulo, had the right ſide of the diſpute: the Carmelites reſolved to do him an ill turn for it, and to gratify their reſentment with the more addreſs, they proſecuted the Marquis for denying the pretended Haubert of Seville. ‘ Eodem aſtu contra Marchionem mihi conſentientem procedunt; eamdem quidem pretendentes cauſam, reapſe verò ſtomachantes quòd ſuum Laurentium Eſpin conatum Carmelo vindicare pro ætate Veſpaſiani decorem indebitum, fecerit obmuteſcere (20). - - - *The ſame ſtratagem is employed againſt the Marquis, for thinking as I do. They do indeed pretend the ſame reaſon; but the truth is, they are angry with him for having put to ſilence their Advocate Laurence Eſpin, who claims an unjuſt honour for Carmel in the time of Veſpaſian.*’ They brought him into the Inquiſition, as an accomplice of Papebroch, a French writer, and hired, ſaid they, to write againſt Spain. They pretended that he had betrayed Spain, and that his crime was downright treaſon. *Neque ſcimus,* inquiunt, *utrum major ſit audacia quod homo Francus* (qualem me fingunt) *eo ſtylo utatur contra ſcriptores Hiſpanos, quam quod Agropolitanus Marchio homo mere laicus, ſcriptis ſuis ignorantia plenis, patriæ honorem prodat, favens auctori Franco, quem novit conductum ut ſcribat contra Hiſpaniam . . . . . quod grave Marchionis illius delictum eſt, perduellionis etiam crimine exaggeratum, adeoque facit eum ſacro Tribunali delatabilem, ſicut eum delatamus in præſentiarum, una cum Papebrochio, ut eorundem peccatorum complicem* (21). This is what they did in the year 1691. By which we ſee that the moſt eminent characters are no ſecurity againſt Monkiſh perſecutions; for a man can ſcarce have more titles of honour than this Marquis: I can only give part of them, for I am ſtopped by an *Et cætera* from citing the whole. *Gaſpar de Mendoza, Ibannes de Segovia & Peralta, Eques Ordinis de Alcantara, Marchio de Mondexar, Comes Tendiliæ, & utroque titulo ex Primatibus Hiſpaniæ; nec non Marchio de Valhermoſa & Agropoli, Dominus Provinciæ de Almoguera, Toparcha Oppidorum Corpæ, Meci, Fuentonobiliæ, Loranciæ, Aunionis, Vianæ, &c.* Obſerve that his book was printed in Spaniſh at Seville, and tranſlated into Latin by Father Papebroch, a Jeſuit of Antwerp, and not a Frenchman as theſe accuſers moſt ignorantly pretend. This Latin tranſlation was printed at Antwerp in the year 1698. See the Utrecht Journaliſts (22).

Beſides other reaſons which this Marquis uſes, he refutes the Carmelites by an argument drawn from the perſon of Veſpaſian; for he cites (23) ſeveral authors who are of opinion that this Emperor was the boar of the foreſt, of which David ſpoke by a prophetic ſpirit (24). He ſaith that he is called *Cæſor piorum* - - - *the murderer of the ſaints* in the Sibyl's verſes, and that he and his ſon Titus are the types of Antichriſt according to Malvenda. What probability then, concludes he, is there that the true God ſhould honour ſuch a man as he with his anſwers? He ſolidly refutes Marcellus Donatus (25), who was of that opinion.

[*E*] *It is very probable, that the lies . . . contributed very conſiderably to the ſucceſs of his enterprize.*] Copies of a letter from the Emperor Otho to Veſpaſian were diſperſed, by which the latter was conſtituted that Emperor's avenger, not to ſay that Otho therein expreſſed an ardent deſire that Veſpaſian would relieve the Republic. A report was alſo induſtriouſly ſpread that Vitellius had reſolved to remove the German legions to Syria, and thoſe of Syria to Germany. *Plurimum cœptis contulerunt, jactatum exemplar epiſtolæ, veræ ſive falſæ, defuncti Othonis ad Veſpaſianum, extrema obteſtatione ultionem mandantis, & ut Reip. ſubveniret, optantis, ſimul rumor diſſipatus, deſtinaſſe Vitellium victorem permutare hiberna legionum, & Germanicas transferre in Orientem ad ſecuriorem mollioremque militiam* (26). Theſe two particulars which doubtleſs were forged by the enemies of Vitellius, very much conduced to Veſpaſian's intereſt. The pretended letter of Otho paſſed for a ſort of laſt-will, which afforded Veſpaſian a lawful pretence. The Syrian legions charmed with their pleaſant quarters in ſo agreeable a climate, and forming to themſelves a terrible idea of the German ice and ſnow, were eaſily gained to the Emperor's party, who would prevent the change of their winter quarters. The Syrians alſo uſed to theſe legions, had been very ſorry to part with them for others ordered thither from a barbarous country (27). This encouraged them to favour Veſpaſian. This is the fate of revolutions: they require the aſſiſtance of a thouſand

(18) Tacit. Hiſt. *lib. ii, cap. lxxviii.*

(19) Sueton. in Veſpaſ. *cap. v.*

(20) Dan. Papebrochius, *Præf.* ad Examen Divinitatis quam in Carmelo Veſpaſianus conſuluit.

(21) Id. ibid.

(22) In the months of September and October 1698, *pag.* 730, & *ſeq.*

(23) Exam. Divinitatis, *Art. xxv.*

(24) Pſalm. lxxix, ver. 15.

(25) Marc. Donatus, Schol. in Hiſtor. Roman.

(26) Sueton. ubi ſupra, *cap. vi.*

(27) *See* Tacitus, ubi ſupra, *cap. lxxix.*

concubine Cænis [*F*]. This was a poor way of clearing himſelf; for even thoſe who believed that he knew not that ſhe ſold all places, would have accounted this ignorance as a moſt ſhameful fault. He was the firſt who had a tax on urine (*m*). I have ſaid ſomething elſewhere (*n*) concerning ſome miraculous cures of which he paſſed for the author. He died on the 24th of June, in the year 79, after a reign of ten years wanting ſix days, aged a little above ſixty nine years. It ought not to be forgotten that he behaved with great moderation towards thoſe who had offended him (*o*), and beſtowed many preſents and many favours on ingenious men, and thoſe who cultivated the liberal arts (*p*). He never was aſhamed of the meanneſs of his firſt condition, but ridiculed the vain efforts of ſome Genealogiſts who would make him to be deſcended from one of Hercules's companions [*G*]. He was too fond of raillery, which he carried even to a great degree of buffoonry, and made no ſcruple of uſing the moſt obſcene expreſſions. He very frequently

thouſand forged writings and falſe alarms to affect the minds of the people. Without that, two in a thouſand will never ſucceed.

[*F*] *He contrived it ſo that part of his extortions were imputed to his concubine Cænis.*] Xiphilin in abridging Dion Caſſius left out ſeveral things that were doubtleſs of great importance: but if I miſtake not, he hath not done ſo in thoſe facts which concern this concubine: I am apt to think he hath kept the whole. His abridgment acquaints us when ſhe died (28). We there find that Veſpaſian loved her tenderly, and was indebted to her for the great power he acquired, and the vaſt treaſures he amaſſed. She ſold all the offices in the law, in the army, and thoſe which related to religion, beſides the very deciſions of Veſpaſian himſelf. Under that Emperor no body loſt his life for being rich; but many ſaved it with the help of their purſes. Cænis received all thoſe ſums, and he was ſuſpected, not without reaſon, to be privy to it. The Hiſtorian offers two reaſons which obliged him to mention this woman: firſt, ſhe was very faithful; and in the ſecond place, ſhe had a very extraordinary memory: Ἐμνημόνευσα δὲ αὐτῆς ὅτι τε πιστοτάτη ἦν καὶ ὅτι μνήμης ἄειστα ἐπεφύκει. *Cujus propterea mentionem feci quod maxima fide & excellenti memoria fuit* (29): For proof of which, he quotes the anſwer which ſhe returned to Antonia, her miſtreſs (30), who had obliged her to write ſome ſecret paſſage relating to Sejanus, to be communicated to Tiberius, and who had ordered it to be immediately blotted out, to prevent all inconveniencies from the diſcovery, *It is in vain*, replied ſhe, *that you give me that order, for this, and all other things which you ſpeak of to me, are ſo firmly fixed in my memory, that they cannot be blotted out* (31). I admire this in her, ſaith the Hiſtorian. Τοῦτο τε οὖν αὐτῆς ἐθαύμασα. *Id igitur in ea admiratus ſum* (32). It muſt be owned that ſuch an anſwer deſerved a place in this author; but it muſt at the ſame time be allowed that it was not pertinent. It could only have been juſt, if Antonia had deſired that all ideas of this letter might be blotted out. But this was not what ſhe deſired, her intention was only to prevent all external evidences of her ſecret, and that no diſcovery ſhould be confirmed by proofs: ſhe did not diſtruſt Cænis, nor was ſhe apprehenſive of accuſations purely verbal, and deſtitute of the ſtrong ſupports of written teſtimonies. To what purpoſe then was it to ſay, that blotting out the letter was no effectual way to prevent the inconvenience againſt which Antonia's precaution was levelled? Cænis's happy memory did not give Antonia any uneaſineſs, when ſhe knew the writing was not in being. Obſerve, that Cænis was made free by this lady, and was her Secretary. Veſpaſian kept her in his houſe before he married, ſent her away when he married, and took her again after the death of his wife, and treated her almoſt like a wife. *Poſt uxoris exceſſum, Cænidem Antoniæ libertam, & a manu dilectam quondam ſibi, revocavit in contubernium: habuitque etiam Imperator pene juſtæ uxoris loco* (33). After her death he took ſeveral concubines (34), which ſhewed that he thought no other ſufficient to ſupply her place, and that he had recourſe to ſeveral to compenſate the loſs he ſuffered in this one miſtreſs. It is obſerved as an evidence of Domitian's pride or incivility, that Cænis at her return from a journey offering to kiſs him according to cuſtom, he preſented her his hand to kiſs (35).

[*G*] *He ridiculed the vain efforts of ſome Genealogiſts, who would make him to be deſcended from one of Hercules's companions.*] Moſt of theſe people are prodigiouſly impudent (36); and when a favourite or miniſter gives them the leaſt encouragement, they preſent him with whatever pedigree he pleaſes. A Superintendant of the Finances needs only chooſe, and if he is diſpoſed liberally to reward thoſe genealogy makers, he ſhall deſcend, if he pleaſe, from the ancient Trojans.

> Tunc licet à Pico numeres genus, altaque ſi te
> Nomina delectant, omnem Titanida pugnam
> Inter majores ipſumque Promethea ponas:
> De quocunque voles proavum tibi ſumito libro (37).

> *Then trace your birth from Picus, if you pleaſe:*
> *If he's too modern, and your pride aſpire*
> *To ſeek the author of your being higher,*
> *Chuſe any Titan who the gods withſtood,*
> *To be the founder of your antient blood,*
> *Prometheus, and that race before the flood,*
> *Or any other ſtory you can find*
> *From Heralds, or in Poets, to your mind.*
>
> DRYDEN.

‘Pegnafiel Contreras of Granada, ... not content to particularize .... one hundred and eighteen ſucceſſions from Adam to Philip III, hath deduced one hundred and twenty-one from the ſame original to the Duke of Lerma, on whoſe account this fine piece was written. To accompliſh this, the author, as others have done, rakes up the ruins of old Troy, where he finds (even before its deſtruction) two brothers Illus and Aſaracus, from the firſt of whom he makes the King of Spain to be deſcended, and from the other his Excellency; who by this means being a very diſtant relation to his Catholic Majeſty, he hath obliged him with a much nearer affinity by his maternal line, which he hath alſo drawn. And becauſe it would not be proper to leave a Duke ſo highly deſcended without ſome ſovereignties in his family, he makes Æneas one of his anceſtors. ..... A little after Æneas he crowds in Brutus, who is ſaid to have given his name to Great Britain (38).’ The number of cheats and bubbles was not leſs in former times than at preſent. If Veſpaſian had pleaſed, the Genealogical ſtem of the houſe of Flavia had been ſo drawn, that the greateſt names in old Rome had infallibly been inſerted in the male or female line. He would have ſeen in it,

> .... Stanteis in curribus Æmilianos,
> Et Curios jam dimidios, humeroſque minorem
> Corvinum, & Galbam auriculis naſoque carentem?
> ....
> Fumoſos equitum cum dictatore magiſtros (39).

> *The brave Æmilii, as in triumph plac'd,*
> *The virtuous Curii, half by time defac'd;*
> *Corvinus, with a mouldring noſe that bears*
> *Injurious ſcars, the ſad effects of years,*
> *And Galba grinning without noſe or ears.*
> ....
> *Old Captains and Dictators of their race.*
>
> DRYDEN.

He

(*m*) Sueton. ibid. *cap. xxiii.*

(*n*) *In the* Nouvelles de la Republique, des Lettres, *June* 1686, *Art. i, p.* 630.

(*o*) Sueton. ibid. *cap. xiii, & ſeq.*

(*p*) Id. ibid. *cap. xviii.*

(28) Xiphilin. Veſpaſiano, *pag. m.* 221.

(29) Id. ibid.

(30) Mother of the Emperor Claudius. See the remark [*C*], of the article ANTONIA, the elder.

(31) Xiphil. ubi ſupra.

(32) Id. ibid.

(33) Sueton. in Veſpaſ. *cap. iii.*

(34) Id. ibid. *cap. xxi.*

(35) Cænidi patris concubinæ ex Iſtria reverſæ oſculumque ut aſſuerat offerenti manum præbuit. *Idem*, in Domit. *cap. xii.*

(36) Compare, above, remark [*C*], of the article PINET.

(37) Juven. Sat. VIII, ver. 131.

(38) La Mothe le Vayer, Diſcours de l'Hiſt. *Tom. ii, pag.* 160, 161.

(39) Juvenal. Sat. VIII, ver. 3.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

frequently made uſe of this turn of thought to elude the juſt reproaches to which his avarice and the rigour of his exactions expoſed him [*H*].

He would therein have found Murranus who was killed in Æneas's time, from whom the moſt ancient Latin kings were deſcended.

> Murranum hic, atavos & avorum antiqua ſonantem
> Nomina, per regeſque, actum genus omnem Latinos,
> Præcipitem ſcopulo, atque ingentis turbine ſaxi
> Excutit (40).

> *Murranus, boaſting of his blood, that ſprings*
> *From a long royal race of Latian kings,*
> *Is by the Trojan from his chariot thrown,*
> *Cruſh'd with the weight of an unwieldy ſtone.*
> DRYDEN.

Some laboured to prove that the founders of the city of Reate, and a certain hero whoſe monument was in a ſtreet of Rome, and who had accompanied Hercules, were alſo the founders of the family of Veſpaſian; but this Emperor was the firſt who laughed at their endeavours, he never concealed the meanneſs of his extraction, but frequently ſpoke of it himſelf. *Mediocritatem priſtinam neque diſſimulavit umquam, ac frequenter etiam præ ſe tulit. Quin & conantes quoſdam originem Flavii generis ad conditores Reatinos, comitemque Herculis, cujus monumentum exſtat via Salaria, referre, irriſit ultro* (41). It is not ſtrange that ſuch a Genealogical labour ſhould be undertaken to flatter an Emperor, ſince more than this was done for a perſon who was only Quæſtor to Auguſtus. I ſpeak of one Quintus Vitellius, to whom it was proved by a book written expreſsly to that end (42), that his anceſtors had reigned over all Latium, and that they owed their original to Faunus King of the Aborigines, and to Vitellia, who had been worſhipped in ſeveral places as a goddeſs. Notwithſtanding which, according to ſeveral other authors, the Vitellii ſprung from a Freedman, or even from a Cobler (43). It is incredible how many families boaſted of an elder date than the famous ſiege of Troy. The Glabrio's pretended to be deſcended from Æneas (44). The pious Paula ſo celebrated in St Jerom's works, gave out that ſhe iſſued from Agamemnon; and that Genealogy was mentioned in her epitaph written by St Jerom:

> Scipio quam genuit, Pauli fudere parentes
> Gracchorum Soboles, Agamemnonis inclyta proles
> Hoc jacet in tumulo (45).

> *Here lies intomb'd within this place*
> *A lady of great Scipio's race;*
> *She from the Pauli and the Gracchi ſprings,*
> *And from old Agamemnon, King of Kings.*

Synesius, Biſhop of Cyrene in the beginning of the Vth century, ſaid he was deſcended from Hercules, and maintained that the archives of Cyrene contained ſufficient proofs of this extraction (46). The obſervation of theſe things is not uſeleſs; for it ſhews, that our age doth not go beyond the moſt venerable antiquity in this ſort of chimeras (47). Our age affords us an example which runs parallel with that of Veſpaſian. Read Naudé's words: 'Cardinal Mazarin, *ſaith he* (48), above five years ago in the preſence of ſeveral perſons of honour and probity, from whom I have it, ridiculed a certain flatterer, who would trace the original of the family and arms of Mazarini, from the old Roman Conſuls *T. Geganius Macerinus, M. Geganius Macerinus II, Proculus Geganius Macerinus, M. Geganius Macerinus III*, which the antient chronicle of *Haloander*, *Panvinius* in his *Faſti*, and the Roman Hiſtorians mention, in the years *à Regiſugio* XVIII. *& ab urbe condita* CCCVII. CCCXIV. *&* CCCXVII: And that almoſt at the ſame time he threatned a certain Prieſt of Avignon named Thomas Bonnet, to ſend him to the Baſtille, if, contrary to the ſtrict charge which had been ſeveral times repeated to him, he publiſhed a Genealogy or Hiſtory *di Caſa Mazirini*, becauſe he ſaid wonderful things of it without any proof, and without ſhewing by ſome authentic records the affinity of many illuſtrious families he ſpoke of.'

[*H*] *He was too fond of raillery . . . made no ſcruple of uſing the moſt obſcene expreſſions . . . to elude the reproaches to which . . . his exactions expoſed him.*] Being accuſtomed to this in his private condition, it would have been very difficult for him to have abſtained from it on the throne, for the itch of jeſting is the moſt incurable that can poſſibly infect any body. However, it is infinitely below the character of a great monarch to debaſe himſelf by low jokes as Veſpaſian did. 'Super cœnam autem, & ſemper alias comiſſimus, multa joco tranſigebat. Erat enim dicacitatis plurimæ, & ſic ſcurrilis ac ſordidæ, ut ne prætextatis quidem verbis abſtineret. Et tamen nonnulla ejus facetiſſima exſtant, in quibus & hoc: Menſtrium Florum, conſularem, admonitus ab eo *plauſtra* potius quam *ploſtra* dicenda, die poſtero *Flaurum* ſalutavit. Expugnatus autem à quadam, quaſi amore ſui deperiret, cum productæ pro concubitu ſeſtertia quadraginta donaſſet: admonente diſpenſatore quemadmodum ſummam rationibus vellet referri, *Veſpaſiano*, inquit, *adamato* (49). . . . . Maxime tamen dicacitatem in deformibus lucris affectabat, ut invidiam aliqua cavillatione dilueret, transferretque ad ſales (50). - - - - *At ſupper, and indeed at all other times, he was very free in his converſation, and delighted much in jokes. For he was above meaſure fond of raillery, and that too of ſuch a low and ſcurrilous kind, that he did not even ſcruple to make uſe of obſcene words. Nevertheleſs, ſome humorous ſayings of his are ſtill preſerved, and among the reſt this: Being once at a time admoniſhed by Menſtrius Florus, a conſular perſon, that he ſhould rather ſay* plauſtra *than* ploſtra, *the next day he ſaluted him by the name of* Flaurus. *At another time having yielded to a lady, who pretended to be deſperately in love with him, after he had gratified her paſſion, and made her a preſent of forty ſeſtertia, his ſteward aſking him how he would have that ſum placed in his accounts; Set it down*, ſaid he, to the dearly-beloved Veſpaſian. . . . *Above all, he affected to be witty on thoſe occaſions when he made profits out of low and ſordid things; and in order to avoid the ſhame of ſuch gains, he turned the matter into a jeſt.*' Did he believe theſe railleries would make people inſenſible of the oppreſſion of his exorbitant exactions?

(40) Virgil. Æneid. *lib. xii, ver.* 529.

(41) Sueton. ubi ſupra, *cap. xii.*

(42) Sueton. in Vitellio, *cap. i.*

(43) Id. ibid. *cap. ii.*

(44) Herodian. *lib. ii, cap. iii, pag. m.* 70.

(45) Hieronym. Epiſt. ad Euſtochium Virginem, *pag. m.* 514.

(46) See Balzac's Diſſertations at the end of the *Socrate Chrétien, pag.* 63, 64.

(47) See la Bruyere's Characters in the chapter intituled *de quelques uſages, pag. m.* 599. See alſo, remark [*H*], of the article BZOVIUS.

(48) Naudé Dialogue de Maſcurat, *pag.* 26, 27. *That book was written in* 1649.

(49) Sueton. in Veſpaſ. *cap. xxii.*

(50) Id. ibid. *cap. xxiii.*

VIGERIUS (MARK)

VIGERIUS (MARK) Cardinal of the title of St Mary on the other ſide the Tyber, was of Savona. He was taken from a monaſtery of Franciſcans, and created Cardinal by Julius II. He was afterwards made Biſhop of Præneſte, and Archprieſt of the Vatican church. He had taught Theology at Padua and Rome. He died on the 18th of June 1516, aged ſeventy years, and was buried without an epitaph at St Mary's beyond the Tyber (*a*). He wrote ſeveral books, one of which was to prove that JESUS CHRIST's tunic ought to give place to Longinus's ſpear [*A*].

[*A*] *He wrote ſeveral books, one of which was to prove that JESUS CHRIST's tunic ought to give place to Longinus's ſpear.*] The occaſion of this work is ſingular. Bajazet, Emperor of the Turks, having two very precious reliques, *viz.* the ſeamleſs coat of our Saviour, and the ſpear which pierced his heart, preſented the latter to the Pope, and kept the former for himſelf (1). On this occaſion a great diſpute aroſe in Italy, whether the preſent made to the Pope was better than that which the Grand Seignior reſerved for himſelf. They carefully examined whether a Turkiſh Prince had a good taſte in point of reliques. Our Vigerius was ordered to make it appear, that the Sultan was no nice judge in things of this

(*a*) Taken from the *Athenæum Romanum*, of the Jeſuit Auguſtin Oldoini, *pag.* 481.

(1) See the article of INNOCENT VIII, remark [*F*].

this kind, ſince the ſeamleſs tunic ought to give the precedence to the lance. In effect, the ſpear penetrated to the heart, and was tinctured with the very vital blood ; but the tunic only touched the external parts. Bartholinus mentions this diſpute. *Inſedit hæc opinio*, ſaith he (2), Marco Vigerio *Epiſcopo Præneſtino & Cardinali Senogallienſi in Controverſia quam juſſu æqualium ſuorum de præſtantia & dignitate lanceæ Longini Pontifici Romano à Turcarum Imperatore miſſæ, præ tunica inconſutili, quam ipſe* Bajazetes *ſibi reſervarat, olim ipſe conſcripſit, poſt à* Simone Begnio *Modruſienſi Epiſcopo per prælum Aſcenſianum typis divulgatum.* Tractatu quarto fol. 10. *primas lanceæ defert, quia* non extrema ſolum, ut tunica, ſed ſanctiſſimi corporis medium attigit & nobiliſſima ; vel forte loca cordis ; & ipſum attigit cor ; ad quæ in morte Chriſti omnis vigor vitalis humoris, in exhauſto corpore reliqui, ut ad arcem muniendam, & ad proprium domicilium ſe contulerat : qua forte de cauſa ſanguis defluxit & aqua per lanceam. *Poſtea paucis interjectis:* Ferrum autem aqua perfuſum eſt ; quam de fonte intimi cordis eduxit, & de micanti mucrone rubens & ſanguinolentum ſpiculum regio ſacerdotalique ſanguine cruentatum extitit.

Calvin had not heard of this preſent of Bajazet, for he takes no notice of it in that place where he obſerves that the iron point of that lance was actually in four different places, if we believe the Papiſts (3). He did not forget that the Turks boaſt of having the tunic. His words are (4), ‘ Concerning the ſeamleſs garment for which lots were caſt, becauſe it was thought very proper to excite the devotion of the ignorant, there are ſeveral of them. For at Argentueil near Paris, there is one ; and another at Triers. And if the Bull of St Salvador in Spain ſpeaks truth, the Chriſtians, by their inconſiderate zeal, have done worſe than the Infidel ſoldiers. For theſe not daring to tear it in pieces, caſt lots for it : But the Chriſtians have divided it in order to adore it. Beſides, what anſwer will they make to the Turk, who laughs at their folly, and pretends it is in his poſſeſſion ? But we need not make them quarrel with the Turk ; let them end the debate amongſt themſelves. In the mean while we ſhall be excuſed from believing what is ſaid by the one as well as the other ſide, that we may not favour one party more than the other, without being well apprized of the matter. For that would be contrary to all reaſon.’

Oldoini mentions the following books of our Vigerius : *Apologiam contra Piſanum Conciliabulum ſcripſit, & libellum unum decachordum Chriſtianum prænotatum, & alterum de ferro lanceæ, & Chriſti indumentis, eorumque dignitate* (5). I omit the liſt of books not printed (6).

(2) Thomas Bartholinus, Diſſertat. de latere Chriſti, *pag.* 21, 22.

(3) Calvin. Inventaire des Reliques, *p. m.* 29.

(4) Id. ibid. *pag.* 31, 32.

(5) Auguſt. Oldoinus, in Athenæo Romano, *pag.* 481.

(6) *It is in* Oldoini, ibid.

VIGILANTIUS, Rector of a pariſh in the dioceſe of Barcelona in Spain, was by nation a Gaul [*A*], and lived about the beginning of the Vth century. He compoſed ſome books, in which he diſcovered a zeal for religion ; but ſuffering himſelf to

[*A*] *He was by nation a Gaul.*] Gennadius aſſerts it in expreſs terms (1) ; but he is thought to be miſtaken by ſome who ground their opinion on St Jerom, who gives Vigilantius the epithet of Calaguritanus. ‘ Fuit ipſe natione Hiſpanus, patriâ Calaguritanus, ut idem S. Hieronymus tradit, ex quo Gennadius redarguitur (2). - - - *He was a Spaniard by nation, of the city of Catahorra, as St Jerom relates, by which Gennadius is proved to be in an error.*’ But I ſhould rather chuſe to juſtify Gennadius from St Jerom's words ; for an author, who mentions ſeveral monſters, and ſaith particularly that Geryon was born in Spain ; *triformem Geryonem Hiſpaniæ prodiderunt* (3), - - - *Spain produced Geryon, that monſter, with three ſhapes*, and adds, that Gaul alone never had any monſters, and that it had always abounded with great and eloquent men, but that all of a ſudden Vigilantius aroſe, and fought againſt the Spirit of our Lord ; a writer, I ſay, who places his periods in this manner, would he have us believe that this Heretic was born in Spain, and not in Gaul ? It is certain that if a perſon deſigned to ſignify that Vigilantius was a Gaul and not a Spaniard, he would expreſs himſelf like St Jerom. *Cacum deſcribit Virgilius, triformem Geryonem Hiſpaniæ prodiderunt. Sola Gallia monſtra non habuit, ſed viris ſemper fortiſſimis, & eloquentiſſimis abundavit. Exortus eſt ſubito Vigilantius, ſeu verius Dormitantius, qui immundo ſpiritu pugnet contra Chriſti ſpiritum* (4). Another paſſage of St Jerom more expreſsly points out Vigilantius's country, and that ſo exactly, that no room is left to doubt that he makes him a native of the country which is at preſent called *Cominge*. ‘ Nimirum reſpondet generi ſuo *(Vigilantius)* ut qui de latronum & convenarum natus eſt ſemine : quos Cn. Pompeius, edomitâ Hiſpaniâ, & ad triumphum redire feſtinans de Pyrenæi jugis depoſuit, & in unum oppidum congregavit ; unde & convenarum urbs nomen accepit. Huc uſque latrocinetur contra eccleſiam Dei, & de Vectonibus, Arrebacis, Celtiberiſque deſcendens incurſet Galliarum Eccleſias, portetque nequaquam vexillum Chriſti, ſed inſigne Diaboli. Fecit hoc idem Pompeius, etiam in orientis partibus ; ut Cilicibus & Iſauris piratis, latronibuſque ſuperatis, ſui nominis inter Ciliciam & Iſauriam conderet civitatem. Sed hæc urbs hodie ſervat ſcita majorum, & nullus IN EA ORTUS eſt Dormitantius. Galliæ VERNACULUM HOSTEM ſuſtinent, & hominem moti capitis, atque Hippocratis vinculis alligandum, ſedentem cernunt in Eccleſia (5). - - - *Vigilantius behaves in a manner quite ſuitable to his pedigree ; ſince he is deſcended from a mixed breed of robbers ; whom Cneius Pompey, having ſubdued Spain, and returning with all ſpeed to his triumph, brought down from the tops of the Pyrenean mountains, and placed them together in one city, which from thence took it's name* (Comminges). *Hitherto therefore has Vigilantius, like a robber, harraſſed the Church of* GOD ; *and deſcending from the Vectons, the Arrebaci, and the Celtiberi, made incurſions upon the Churches of Gaul, carrying with him not the ſtandard of Chriſt, but the enſign of the Devil. Pompey did the ſame thing in the Eaſt ; for when he had ſubdued the Cilician and Iſaurian pirates and robbers, he built a city between Cilicia and Iſauria, and called it after his own name. But the inhabitants of this city ſtill adhere to the maxims of their forefathers, and no* Dormitantius, [*that is a name derived from ſlumbering*, as Vigilantius *is from watching*] *has ever* APPEARED AMONG THEM. *But Gaul entertains a* HOME-BRED ENEMY, *and beholds ſitting in the church a man of a diſturbed brain, who deſerves to be bound with the fetters of Hippocrates.*’ But it will be aſked why then does he uſe the epithet *Calaguritanus*, in ſuch a manner as diſcovers that he took that word in the ſame ſenſe as if he would have expreſſed Quintilian's country (6) ? For an anſwer to this difficulty, I refer you to the learned Mr de Marca, who, I believe, has abſolutely removed it in a diſſertation which I have not read, nor do any otherwiſe know than by the following words of the Abbot de la Roque : ‘ As it is no diſhonour for a man to be of a country which hath produced ill men, and an Hiſtorian is always obliged to ſpeak truth, Mr de Marca, in a diſcourſe which he wrote concerning the country of Vigilantius, which this monſter hath diſhonoured by his errors, corrects the blunder which almoſt all Hiſtorians have committed concerning this Heretic, by proving that his birth-place was not *Calaguris*, a city in Spain, but *Calaguri*, a village near the city of St Bertrand in the dioceſe of Cominge. This is what Baronius was ignorant of, and which they may certainly correct in Moreri's new Dictionary (7).’ I ſhall paſs over Hadrian Valeſius's obſervations againſt St Jerom, that learned Critic ſhews (8) that this Father contradicts himſelf, ſince the ſituation of the places will not allow that the ſame perſon ſhould be deſcended from the Vectons (9), the Arabaci, the Celtiberi, and thoſe robbers whom Pompey gathered into a body. Father Pagi promiſes to anſwer, in favour of St Jerom, the objections of Valeſius (10), and ſaith beforehand that inſtead of *Vectonibus*, it ought not to be read *Veronibus* (11), but *Vaſconibus*. This correction will not remove the difficulties as to the *Arebacis Celtiberiſque*. This is only by the way.

Obſerve that James Valdes, the Civilian, conjectures that the epithet *Calaguritanus* might be taken from ſome

(1) Vigilantius preſbyter natione Gallus. *Gennadius, de Script. Eccleſ. cap. xxxv.*

(2) Baronius, *ad ann.* 406, *num.* 40.

(3) Hieronym. Epiſt. adv. Vigilant. *pag. m.* 548.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Id. ibid. *pag.* 551.

(6) Id. ibid. *pag.* 549.

(7) Journal des Sçavans, *of the* 31*ſt of March* 1681, *pag.* 120, *Dutch edition, in the abſtract of Mr de Marca's* Opuſcula, *publiſhed the firſt time in* 1681.

(8) Hadrian. Valeſius, Notit. Galliar. *p.* 157.

(9) Or Vettons.

(10) Pagi, letter to the Abbot Nicaiſe of the firſt of October, 1696. It was firſt printed in 4to, and then in the *Nouvelles, de la Rép. des Lettres*, for July 1699.

(11) It is Valeſius's conjecture, *ubi ſupra*.

to be ſeduced by the love of praiſe, and preſuming too much on his ſtrength, and having acquired more politeneſs of ſtile [*B*], than knowledge in the ſcripture, he explained ill one of the viſions of the Prophet Daniel, and vented ſome other trifles, which they placed in the catalogue of hereſies (*a*). St Jerom refuted him (*b*). This is what Gennadius ſaith of him ; from whence we may conjecture that he did not altogether approve the vehemence with which St Jerom wrote againſt Vigilantius ; for one would think, by what St Jerom ſays of that prieſt, that he was the moſt accurſed heretic that ever was [*C*]. The Proteſtants judge otherwiſe of it, they are perſuaded that Vigilantius very juſtly condemned vows of celibacy, the uſe of wax-candles at the ſepulchres of the martyrs, the honour paid to ſaints, prayers for the dead, and nocturnal aſſemblies for devotion, &c. Several diſorders were committed in thoſe aſſemblies, and at laſt it was

ſome town in Gaul ; for he will not allow Vigilantius to be a Spaniard : ‘ Gallus, *ſaith he* (12), à Gennadio de ſcript. Eccleſ. dicitur, & quamvis Calagurritanus à B. Hieronymo nuncietur *in princ. adverſus Vigilantium*, & à Varonio 5. *tom. anno* 406. & Pampilonenſem dicat Mariana *de reb. Hiſp. lib.* 4. *c.* 20. tamen non Hiſpanum appellant, ſed potius videntur Gallum nunciare, cum tunc monſtra Galliæ naſci hæreticorum dixerint, & potuit eſſe Calagurritanum aliud oppidum Galliæ, vel ibi preſbyterum fuiſſe, ut Barcinonæ, non tamen natum. - - - *Gennadius ſays that he was a Gaul*; *and tho' St Jerom and Baronius give him the epithet of* Calaguritanus, *and Mariana that of Pampilonenſis, yet they do not call him a Spaniard, but ſeem rather to ſay that he was a Gaul, by ſaying that Gaul did then produce monſters of Hereſy. Beſides, there may poſſibly have been another town in Gaul, which bore that name of Calaguris, or he may have been a Preſbyter there as he was at Barcelona, without being born in any of theſe cities.*’ In another place he alledges St Jerom declaring that Spain never produced any Heretic beſides Priſcillian. *Regio enim Hiſpana ut B. Hieronymus c.* 17. *in Eſaiam, inquit, monſtra hæreticorum non generavit & unum partum Priſcilliani ut abortivum & impium pia mater procul à ſe abdicavit, pariterque ablegavit* (13).

[*B*] *More politeneſs of ſtile.*] For ſo with Mr du Pin (14) we may tranſlate the *lingua politus* of Gennadius. I obſerve this to the end that we may more clearly ſee the difference betwixt St Jerom and Gennadius. The former ſaith that Vigilantius wrote very ill : ‘ Miſeruntque libros per fratrem Siſinium quos inter crapulam ſtertens evomuit. . . . . Eſt quidem imperitus & verbis & ſcientia, & ſermone inconditus, ne vera quidem poteſt defendere (15). - - - - *They ſent books by Siſinius, which he had ſpewed out in his drunken fits. . . . . He is a man truly ignorant both of ſtile and matter, and ſo diſagreeable in his diſcourſe that he could not even defend a good cauſe.*’ Gennadius, who knew what character St Jerom had given him, yet doth not ſcruple to acknowledge the polite language of Vigilantius. He meant, doubtleſs, not that this Heretic ſpoke elegantly, and wrote barbarouſly, but that there appeared a politeneſs in his writings. He then judges quite otherwiſe of him than St Jerom, and ought more to be credited ; for when an adverſary refutes a man with that bitterneſs, which clearly appears in St Jerom, it is hardly poſſible for him to own that he writes well ; he chiefly aims to expoſe him, in all reſpects, to the readers contempt.

[*C*] *One would think, by what St Jerom ſays of this Prieſt, that he was the moſt accurſed Heretic that ever was.*] St Jerom calls him Samaritan and Jew, a filthy wretch, whoſe tongue ought to be cut out, and a furious monſter that ought to be bound. *Ais, Vigilantium, qui* κατ᾽ ἀντιφρασιν *hoc vocatur nomine, nam Dormitantius rectiùs diceretur, os fœtidum rurſum aperire, & putorem ſpurciſſimum contra ſanctorum martyrum proferre reliquias* ; *& nos, qui eas ſuſpicimus, appellare cinerarios & idololatras, qui mortuorum hominum oſſa veneremur. O infelicem hominem, & omni lacrymarum fonte plangendum, qui hæc dicens, non ſe intelligat eſſe Samaritanum, & Judæum* (16), ... *O præcidendam linguam à medicis, immò inſanum curandum caput : ut qui loqui neſcit, diſcat aliquando reticere. Ego vidi hoc aliquando portentum, teſtimoniis ſcripturarum, quaſi vinculis Hippocratis, volui ligare furioſum : ſed abiit, exceſſit, evaſit, erupit, & inter Hadriæ fluctus, Cotiique regis alpes in nos declamando clamavit. Quidquid enim amens loquitur, vociferatio & clamor eſt appellandus* (17). He calls Vigilantius's words a moſt filthy drunken vomit (18). He ſaith, in another place, that the conduct of his followers is not ſo much their own action, as that of the Devils which dwell in them. *Quales nuper ſub Magiſtro cerebroſo in Gallia pullularunt, qui baſilicas martyrum declinantes, nos qui ibi orationes ex more celebramus, quaſi immundos fugiunt. Hoc autem non tam illi faciunt quam habitantes in eis dæmones, fortitudinem & flagella ſancti cineris fugientes* (19). He ſaith ſo particularly of Vigilantius, *Sentio, ſentio, infeliciſſime mortalium, quid doleas, quid timeas. Spiritus iſte immundus, qui hæc te cogit ſcribere, ſæpè hoc viliſſimo tortus eſt pulvere, immò hodiéque torquetur : & qui in te plagas diſſimulat, in ceteris confitetur* (20). Obſerve that Vigilantius's dioceſan acquieſced in his doctrine : this St Jerom diſliked, and would have had this earthen veſſel broken with an iron rod. *Miror ſanctum Epiſcopum, in cujus parochiâ eſſe preſbyter dicitur acquieſcere furori ejus, & non virgâ Apoſtolicâ, virgaque ferrea confringere vas inutile, & tradere in intertium carnis, ut ſpiritus ſalvus fiat* (21). If theſe invectives are very exorbitant, I do not think that St Jerom's deſcription of Vigilantius's opinions is leſs ſo. I believe he was treated with the ſame injuſtice as the Proteſtants are treated. He diſapproved the religious honour paid to relics, and therefore he was accuſed of abhorring the memory and the dead bones of the martyrs, and avoiding their ſepulchres, as places filled with carrion. But who is ignorant of the difference betwixt hating an object, and refuſing to pay religious worſhip to it ? I cannot believe that Vigilantius's opinions concerning celibacy, were what they are repreſented. Undoubtedly he contented himſelf with aſſerting that marriage ought not to be forbidden to Eccleſiaſtics, and that they ought not to engage in vows of continence. To render this doctrine odious, it was given out that he condemned and deteſted celibacy, and looked on thoſe as incapable of the Prieſthood who had no wife. This falſe gloſs was yet further improved ; it was affirmed, that, according to Vigilantius, inconteſtable proofs of a conſummated and fruitful marriage, ought to be given to qualify a perſon for ordination, and that no man ought to preſent himſelf to be ordained without being attended by a wife big with child, or who carried one in her arms. There is no appearance that he either taught or cauſed to be practiſed ſuch fooleries as theſe. What judgment then would you have us form of the ſincerity of St Jerom, or of thoſe accuſers who informed him concerning this Heretic ? Conſider very well the words of that holy doctor. ‘ Proh nefas, Epiſcopos ſui ſceleris dicitur habere conſortes *(Vigilantius)* ; ſi tamen Epiſcopi nominandi ſunt, qui non ordinant diaconos, niſi priùs uxores duxerint, nulli cœlibi credentes pudicitiam, imò oſtendentes quàm ſanctè vivant, qui malè de omnibus ſuſpicantur. Et niſi prægnantes uxores viderint Clericorum, infanteſque de ulnis matrum vagientes, Chriſti ſacramenta non tribuunt (22). - - - *O ſhame ! They ſay Vigilantius has Biſhops who are accomplices of his crime* ; *if, indeed, ſuch perſons deſerve the name of Biſhops, who refuſe to ordain Deacons, unleſs they be firſt married* ; *believing that no ſingle man can be chaſte, and plainly ſhewing what holy lives they themſelves lead who have ſuch a bad opinion of every body elſe. And unleſs a Clergyman can produce his wife big with child, or having one or two in her arms, theſe people will not give him the ſacraments of* C H R I S T.’ He repeats the ſame thing at the end of his book. *Tota nocte vigilabo, & ſociis illius, immò diſcipulis, vel magiſtris, qui niſi tumentes uteros viderint feminarum, maritos earum Chriſti miniſterio arbitrantur indignos* (23). If theſe tales had been ſtretched a little farther, Vigilantius would have been accuſed of a diſcipline which revived the *jus trium liberorum*, -- *the privilege of thoſe who had three children*, in favour of the Eccleſiaſtics, I mean which allowed exemptions and privileges to the Clergy

---

(*a*) Expoſuit pravo ingenio ſecundum viſionem Danielis, & alia locutus eſt frivola quæ in catalogo hæreticorum neceſſario ponuntur. *Gennadius, de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt. cap. xxxv.*

(*b*) *Taken from* Gennadius, ibid.

(12) Jacobus Valdeſius de Dignitate Hiſpaniæ, *cap. ix, num.* 17, *pag. m.* 204.

(13) Id. ibid. *cap. xix, num.* 72, *pag.* 398.

(14) Du Pin, Bibl. des Auteurs Eccleſ. *Tom. iii, pag.* 158, *Dutch Edit.*

(15) Hieron. adverſ. Vigilant. *pag. m.* 550.

(16) Hieron. Epiſt. ad Riparium, *pag. m.* 543.

(17) Ibid. *pag.* 545.

(18) Eructaret immundiſſimam crapulam. *Ibid. Compare with this what is above in citat.* (5).

(19) *Idem.* in Iſaiam, *cap. lxxv. Apud* Baron. *ad ann.* 406, *num.* 43.

(20) *Idem*, Epiſt. adv. Vigilant. *pag.* 558, 559.

interetum

(21) *Idem*, Epiſt. ad Riparium, *pag.* 545.

(22) Hieron. adv. Vigilant. *pag. m.* 549.

(23) Id. ib. *pag.* 564.

was thought neceſſary to do as Vigilantius adviſed [*D*]; to ſuppreſs thoſe aſſemblies, and to give another form to that ſort of devotion. The ardour which St Jerom ſhewed, was perhaps intermixed with ſome perſonal reſentment; for Vigilantius had traduced him as a favourer of Origen, and this was at the inſtigation of Ruffinus [*E*]. He had diſcovered ſeveral marks of eſteem for Vigilantius, whom Paulinus had recommended to him (*c*). This was when Vigilantius made a voyage to Jeruſalem. An earthquake which happened whilſt he was in the Holy Land, ſo much affrighted him, that he immediately run ſtark naked to a church for ſhelter [*F*]. Leaving this country he took a view of Egypt (*d*), and when he returned into the weſt, he ſowed his opinions amongſt the Gauls.

Clergy whoſe wives were fruitful. They would have aſſerted, that the laws of his diſcipline aſſigned the beſt biſhoprics and benefices not to the moſt virtuous and learned, but to thoſe who had moſt children. They would have ſaid that he ſubjected thoſe Clergymen to canonical penalties, who could not ſhew any heirs of their bodies. They would have maintained that even with regard to the laity, all the antient rules of Paganiſm were revived, which annexed a ſort of real damage and ſcandal to celibacy. They would have publiſhed a hundred more extravagancies of this nature.

[*D*] *Several ſins were committed in thoſe aſſemblies, and at laſt it was found neceſſary to do as Vigilantius adviſed.*] In thoſe times it was cuſtomary to paſs whole nights in the churches on occaſion of the celebration of certain feſtivals. The youth applied theſe opportunities to amorous ends, and ſeveral women were hereby debauched, which had not been poſſible if they had ſtaid at home. It is then certain that Vigilantius juſtly condemned thoſe nocturnal aſſemblies, which afforded ſo many tempting opportunities to ſin. See what I have ſaid in the remark [*D*] of the article THESMOPHORIA. St Jerom doth not deny that theſe meetings were attended with ſeveral diſorders, but he aſſerts that this ought not to interrupt the frequency of their celebration: he alledges that thoſe who perverted theſe opportunities to ſinful purpoſes, would without them find means to defile themſelves; that people are more careful to take hold of occaſions which very ſeldom offer themſelves; and that the Eaſter-eves were not exempt from this leudneſs, and conſequently ought to be aboliſhed, if his adverſary's reaſons were juſt. But that after all, tho' wicked men abuſe good things, it does not follow that the uſe of them ought to be aboliſhed. His words are: *Error autem & culpa juvenum, viliſſimarumque mulierum, qui per noctem ſæpè deprehenditur, non eſt religioſis hominibus imputandus; quia & in vigiliis Paſchæ tale quid fieri plerumque convincitur: & tamen paucorum culpa non præjudicat religioni; qui & abſque vigiliis poſſunt errare vel in ſuis, vel in alienis domibus. Apoſtolorum fidem Judæ proditio non deſtruxit. Et noſtras ergo vigilias malæ aliorum vigiliæ non deſtruent: quin potiùs pudicitiæ vigilare cogantur, qui libidini dormiunt. Quod enim feciſſe bonum eſt, non poteſt malum eſſe, ſi frequenter fiat: aut, ſi aliqua culpa vitanda eſt, non ex eo, quod ſæpè, ſed ex eo, quod fit aliquando, culpabile eſt. Non vigilemus itaque diebus Paſchæ; ne expectata diu adulterorum deſideria compleantur; ne occaſionem peccandi uxor inveniat, ne maritali non poſſit recludi clave. Ardentius appetitur, quidquid eſt rarius* (24). It would be very eaſy to ſhew the ſophiſtry in every one of St Jerom's arguments, but it is ſufficient for me to ſay that the event refuted him, and juſtified Vigilantius; for theſe nocturnal aſſemblies were at laſt aboliſhed, to put a ſtop to the impurities there committed (25). The reader may here remember the mandate which the Archbiſhop of Paris publiſhed in the year 1697, to remedy a like abuſe. Let us occaſionally obſerve that the aſſemblies of the Faithful in the churches of the martyrs were expoſed to another inconvenience; the Chriſtians brought with them wherewithal to make good chear, and made themſelves drunk. This abuſe prevailed ſtill in Africa in St Auguſtin's time (26); but that cuſtom had been then aboliſhed in ſeveral places: men are ſo corrupt that even the exerciſe of devotion itſelf is perverted to an occaſion of evil.

[*E*] *Vigilantius had traduced him as a favourer of Origen, and this was at the inſtigation of Ruffinus.*] The proofs of all this are to be found in Baronius: You will there ſee that Ruffinus being at Jeruſalem, inſtigated Vigilantius againſt St Jerom (27). You will there find that after Vigilantius's departure from Paleſtine, he traduced St Jerom in all places. ‘ Dimiſiſti Ægyptum & cunctas provincias reliquiſti in quibus ſectam tuam libera plerique fronte defendunt, & elegiſti me ad inſectandum qui omnia contra Eccleſiam dogmata reprehendo, & publica voce condemno (28). - - - - *You have left Egypt and all the other provinces where your ſect is openly embraced by moſt people; and you have choſen to perſecute me, who diſapprove and publickly condemn all ſuch doctrines as are contrary to the tenets of the church.*' You will there find that this ſect of Vigilantius has no relation to the particular opinions, which he did afterwards publiſh in Gaul, but to the calumnies he diſperſed againſt St Jerom, whom he accuſed of Origeniſm, to impute to him an inconſiſtent conduct (29), and a way of proceeding very common among zealots, who condemn in their neighbour what they are themſelves guilty of. You will there beſides find that this holy Father denies that he accuſed Vigilantius of Hereſy. ‘ Unde adverſus Ruffinum, illum in ſe concitantem, ipſemet Hieronymus hæc ait *: *In Vigilantii nomine quid ſomnies, neſcio. Ubi enim eum ſcripſi hæreticâ apud Alexandriam communione maculatum: Da librum, profer epiſtolam; nuſquam omnino reperies*; & inferiùs; *Ego in Vigilantio tibi reſpondi. Eadem enim accuſabat, quæ tu poſtea & amicus laudas, & inimicus accuſas.* Nimirùm quòd ille diceret ſanctum Hieronymum Origenis errores ſectari; nam ſubdit: *Scio à quo illius contra me rabies concitata ſit, novi cuniculos tuos.* Hæc Sanctus Hieronymus. Agebat enim id aſtutè Ruffinus, ut eſſet qui Origenis hæreſis accuſaret Hieronymum, qui ipſum Ruffinum & alios omnes Origeniſtas ejuſdem Origenis errorum inſimularet; ipſumque talionis pœnam ſubire cogeret, ut quem in Origeniſtas ipſe gladium exacuerat, in ſua ſe præcordia convertiſſe non ignoraret (30). - - - - - *Wherefore St Jerom himſelf makes this anſwer to Ruffinus, who had ſtirred up Vigilantius againſt him.* As touching Vigilantius, *ſays he*, I do not know what you dream of. For where did I write that he was ſtained with an Heretical communion at Alexandria: Shew the book, produce the letter; you will no where find any ſuch thing; *and a little after*, In anſwering Vigilantius I have anſwered you. For he accuſed me of the ſame things, which you afterwards praiſed as a friend, and now blame as an enemy. *This relates to his ſaying, that St Jerom followed the errors of Origen; for he ſubjoins:* I know by whom his rage has been ſtirred up againſt me, I am acquainted with your undermining arts. *Thus St Jerom. For Ruffinus cunningly endeavoured to get St Jerom accuſed of Origin's Hereſy, becauſe he had charged Ruffinus and all the other followers of Origen with the ſame errors. He did this by way of retaliation, and to make him ſenſible that he had turned upon himſelf the ſword which he had whetted againſt others.*' I have cited (31) a paſſage in which St Jerom complains, that Vigilantius had traduced him between the Adriatic ſea and the Alps. From all which let us conclude, that it was poſſible a perſonal reſentment might enflame the zeal which he ſhewed for the truth.

[*F*] *He immediately run ſtark-naked into a church for ſhelter.*] St Jerom reproaches him with this fear, and the diſcovery of his nakedneſs to the eyes of the faithful. ‘ In hac provincia cùm ſubitus terræ motus, noctis medio omnes de ſomno excitaſſet, tu prudentiſſimus & ſapientiſſimus mortalium, nudus orabas, & reſerebas nobis Adam & Evam de paradiſo. Et illi quidem apertis oculis erubuerunt, nudos ſe eſſe cernentes, & verenda texerunt arborum foliis; tu & tunicâ, & fide nudus, ſubitoque timore perterritus, & aliquid habens nocturnæ crapulæ, ſanctorum oculis obſcœnam partem corporis ingerebas, ut tuam

‘ indicares

(c) See the laſt remark.

(d) Hieron. Epiſt. lxxv.

(24) Id. ibid. *pag.* 557, 558.

(25) See the article THESMOPHORIA, citat. (37).

(26) See the lxivth Epiſtle of St Auguſtin. He ſays, chap. xxvii, of the viiith book, *de Civitate Dei*, that the wiſeſt people did not carry their ſuppers to the churches of the Martyrs. See alſo the ſecond chapter of the ſixth book of his Confeſſions, and St Ambroſe, *lib. de Helia & Jejunio, cap. xvii.*

(27) Baronius, *ad ann* 406, *num.* 41, *ex* Hieronymi Apologia II.

(28) Hieronym. Epiſt. lxxv, *apud* Baron. *ibid, num.* 42.

(29) St Jerome very much inveighed againſt the Origeniſts.

* Hieron. Apolog. 2.

(30) Baronius, ubi ſupra.

(31) In the remark [*C*], citation (17).

Gauls. His ſect was of no very long continuance; the irruption of the barbarous nations quaſhed it; the irruption, I mean, which the Barbarians made not long after into that country, and of which the errors of this heretic were the cauſe, if we believe the Eccleſiaſtical Annaliſt [*G*]. I have only two faults to charge Mr Moreri with [*H*].

‘ indicares prudentiam (32). - - - - *In that province when an earthquake had awaked every body at midnight, you, that you might prove yourſelf to be the wiſeſt of all men, were ſeen to pray ſtark-naked, and reſembled Adam and Eve in Paradiſe. But they, when their eyes were opened, bluſhed to ſee themſelves naked, and covered their ſhame with the leaves of a tree; whereas you, ſtripped of your cloaths and faith, ſtruck with a ſudden fear, and having not quite ſlept out your debauch over night, expoſed your obſcene parts to the eyes of the faithful, that you might thereby ſhew your prudence.*’ Obſerve, that he continually, as well as here, accuſes him of being a drunkard.

[*G*] *The errors of this Heretic were the cauſe, if we believe the Eccleſiaſtical Annaliſt.*] I mean Baronius. He and an hundred other famous writers have made it a common place to aſſign Hereſies as the cauſe of the heavy ſtrokes of Divine Juſtice; I mean thoſe ſtrokes which indifferently fall upon the followers of error, and the oppoſers of it: for example, the misfortunes with which Gaul was oppreſſed, gave no more quarter to the orthodox than to the diſciples of Vigilantius. All parties pleaſe themſelves with this common-place, without remembring that the Pagans made uſe of it againſt the primitive Chriſtians (33). However we ſhall cite Baronius's words: they inform us that St Jerom's books did not ſilence the followers of Vigilantius: it was neceſſary that God ſhould make uſe of other means to repreſs this Hereſy. ‘ Porrò quod poſthac ſiluerit infamis hæreſis, nec amplius ad multa ſæcula audita fuerit: haud ſcias brevem illam Hieronymi ſcriptionem eſſe veritam, ut caput tollere amplius auſa non fuerit. Non enim ea eſt natura hæreticorum, ut victi cedere ſciant, & dent manus ratione convicti: ſed proſtrati licèt, pertinaciori audaciâ ſurgant, reſtituantque acriora certamina. Sed unde accidit ut ſileret? audi: * *Terribilis Deus in conſiliis ſuper filios hominum*, vocavit gentes ab extremis terræ: immiſitque in Gallias, in eamque potiſſimum partem graſſari ſivit, in qua hæreſis nefanda plantata eſt: adeo ut ſub barbarico gladio magis de vita tuenda contendere, quàm de dogmatibus licuerit diſputare. Creduntur autem è barbaris illi eſſe ſublati, quorum nulla umquam fuit poſteà vox audita. Ecce tibi quod ſoleant vehere ſecum, vel poſt ſe ducere hæreſes, clades nimirùm provinciarum; quod multis exemplis ſæpe omnibus ſæculis, & hoc ipſo infeliciùs contigit demonſtrari (34). - - - - *If you ask how that infamous Hereſy came to be ſuppreſſed, and not to be heard of again for many ages, know that it was not the ſhort confutation of St Jerom which frightned it from lifting up its head any more. For ſuch is the nature of Heretics, that they will not yield when they are overcome, nor ſubmit to the conviction of reaſon; but after they are thrown down, they will riſe again with greater preſumption and obſtinacy, and renew a ſharper engagement. How then came it to be ſuppreſſed?* The Lord who is a great God, and a great King above all gods, *called in the nations from the extremities of the earth, and ſuffered them to ravage Gaul, chieſly that part of it where this abominable Hereſy had taken root, ſo that now it was more neceſſary for them to defend their lives from the ſword of the Barbarians, than to diſpute about the articles of Faith. It is believed that they were entirely deſtroyed by the Barbarians, ſo that their voice was never heard afterwards. Theſe are the uſual attendants or conſequences of Hereſies,* viz. *the ruin and devaſtation of provinces. Many examples are to be found of this in all ages, but in none more than in the preſent.*’ Could not Vigilantius's friends aſſert, that the Gauls were thus afflicted, becauſe they did not embrace the truths which he declared to them? What anſwer could an adverſary make to them? He would be obliged to come to this theſis? *I am in the right, and you are in the wrong.* But will not every one make uſe of this language? Has not one as much right as another to beg the queſtion, if ſuch a thing be once allowed? Nothing is then more frivolous than Baronius's reflexions.

[*H*] *I have only two faults to charge Mr Moreri with.*] The firſt is, that he ſaith that *St Paulinus entertained* Vigilantius *when ſick at Barcelona.* He here miſtakes the place. For St Paulinus's words as cited by Baronius are (35): ‘ Vigilantius quoque noſter in Campania, & antequam ad nos veniret, & poſtquam pervenit vi febrium laboravit, & ægritudini noſtræ qui & ipſe ſociale membrum erat, ſalativo (36) dolore compaſſus eſt. - - - - *Our friend Vigilantius had a fever in Campania, both before and after his coming to me. Thus did he ſympathize with me in my ſickneſs by a ſocial affliction.*’ We do not find there, that St Paulinus *entertained* Vigilantius: we are only informed that they were both ſick at the ſame time. I am neverthel eſs willing to believe that St Paulinus received him with great reſpect and kindneſs. His goodneſs, civility, and piety, perſuade me to it; and beſides, he had a great eſteem for Vigilantius, and had been very intimate with him at Barcelona (37). He recommended him to St Jerom; and his letter proved effectual, as appears by theſe words of the anſwer, ‘ S. Vigilantium Preſbyterum qua aviditate ſuſceperim, melius eſt ut ipſius verbis quàm meis diſcas literis (38). - - - - *It is better that you ſhould be informed by his own words, than by my letter of the fondneſs with which I received the Preſbyter Vigilantius.*’ St Jerom gave credit to the teſtimonial in favour of Vigilantius, contained in the letter of recommendation. But ſome time after writing againſt him, he ſaid that he repented of the credit he had given to Paulinus's teſtimonial. We ſhall cite this paſſage ſomewhat at length: ‘ Credidi ſancti preſbyteri Paulini Epiſtolis, & illius ſuper nomine tuo non putavi errare judicium. Et licet ſtatim acceptâ epiſtolâ, ἀσυναρτητον ſermonem tuum intelligerem: tamen ruſticitatem & ſimplicitatem magis in te arbitrabar, quam vecordiam. Nec reprehendo ſanctum virum: maluit enim apud me diſſimulare quod noverat, quàm portitorem clientulum ſuis litteris accuſare. Sed memetipſum arguo, qui alterius potiùs acquievi quàm meo judicio; & oculis aliud cernentibus, aliud ſchedulæ credidi, quam videbam (39). - - - - *I gave credit to the letter of the holy Preſbyter Paulinus, and had no notion of his being miſtaken in the character which he gave of you. And although immediately after the receipt of his letter I perceived the confuſion and incoherency of your diſcourſe, I nevertheleſs did not ſo much impute it to the badneſs of your heart as to a clowniſh ſimplicity. Neither did I find fault with the holy man for rather chuſing to paſs by what he knew than to accuſe his client the bearer. But I am angry with myſelf for having truſted leſs to my own judgment than to that of another, and for having believed a letter rather than my own eyes.*’ Moreri's ſecond fault is ſaying that Vigilantius *called the miracles wrought at the tombs of the holy martyrs, illuſions.* This is calumniating Vigilantius, and I admire that Baronius hath advanced ſuch a calumny, ſince he needed only to conſider the words he cites of St Jerom, to be informed that it was falſe. ‘ Idem nebulo reſpuens ſanctorum reliquias addebat illud horrendum dictu, ſigna apud eas fieri ſolita, dæmonum eſſe præſtigias (40). - - - - *That villain, rejecting the reliques of the ſaints, adds this horrible expreſſion,* viz. *that the miracles uſually wrought by them were diabolical illuſions.*’ This is Baronius's enormous accuſation levelled at this Heretic, and ſee how he proves it, ‘ Niſi forte in morem Gentilium, impiorumque Porphyrii & Eunomii has præſtigias dæmonum eſſe confingas (41). - - - - *Unleſs perhaps after the example of the Heathens, and of ſuch wicked fellows as Porphyrius and Eunomius, you pretend that they were diabolical illuſions.*’ It is clear that theſe words of St Jerom ſhew that Vigilantius did not call the miracles wrought at the tombs of the martyrs, diabolical deluſions. St Jerom would not have expreſſed himſelf as he did, if he had found either in the book of his adverſary, or in the letters againſt him, what Baronius imputes to this pretended Hereſiarch. He would have refuted it as a poſitive opinion of Vigilantius, and not as a ſubterfuge to which he ſuppoſed he might have recourſe. When one anticipates an objection, when one ſpeaks thus to one's adverſary, *perhaps you will alledge ſuch a thing, how do I know that you will not affirm as the Heathens did, &c.* it is certain that the adverſary hath ſaid no ſuch thing. Obſerve, that Baronius's calumny is to be found in many authors. Lindanus had already advanced it. I cite him to ſhew his want of judgment. ‘ Porphyrius, Eunomius, Euſtathius, Vigilantius, aliique Hagiomaſtiges ſanctorum miracula ajebant eſſe dæmonum præſtigias (42). - - - - *Porphyrius, Eunomius, Euſtathius, Vigilantius, and other defamers of holy things ſaid that the miracles of the ſaints were diabolical illuſions.*’ Prateolus adopts this whole paſſage (43), as doth the Jeſuit Gaulterius (44) upon the authority of Prateolus. But what more ſurprizes me is, to ſee that Mr Godeau has aſſerted this calumny (45). Mr Moreri took it from him.

---

(32) Hieron. adverſ. Vigilant. *pag. m.* 559.

(33) See the article VERGERIUS, remark [*E*].

* Pſalm. xcv.

(34) Baronius, ubi ſupra, *num.* 52, *pag. m.* 330.

(35) Paulinus, Epiſt. i. ad Severum, *apud* Baron. ubi ſupra, *num.* 40, *p.* 324.

(36) In ſome manuſcripts it is *ſocio.*

(37) Baronius, ubi ſupra.

(38) *Hieronym.* Epiſt. xiii, *apud* Baron. *ibid.*

(39) *Idem*, Epiſt. lxxv, *apud eumd.* Baronium, ibid. *num.* 41, *pag.* 324, 325.

(40) Baronius, ibid. *num.* 50, *pag.* 329.

(41) Hieron. adv. Vigilant. *apud* Baron. ib.

(42) Lindanus, in Dubitantii Dialogo II, *pag. m.* 207.

(43) Prateolus, in Elencho Hæreſ. *pag. m.* 512.

(44) In Tabula Chronograph. *pag. m.* 372.

(45) Godeau, Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe, *ad ann.* 406.

VILLAMARINI, (ISABELLA) wife of the prince of Salerno. See the remark *B* in the article CAPYCIUS.

VILLAREAL (EMANUEL FERNANDES) the Plagiary author of a book, which procured him a penſion from Cardinal Richelieu, was burnt at Liſbon for Judaiſm [*A*]. He had been Conſul for the Portugueſe nation at Roüen; and wrote a book againſt Caramuel whilſt he was in that poſt.

[*A*] *The Plagiary author .... was burnt .... for Judaiſm.*] All theſe particulars I learn from Mr Le Laboureur: he relates them immediately after an obſervation which he had made againſt the Genealogiſts, who publiſhed, that Cardinal Richelieu was deſcended from the marriage of Guyonne de Laval with Frances du Pleſſis. He proves it a falſity, and *conſequently*, adds he (1), *the whole book ought to be ſuppreſſed, which was written in Spaniſh by a Portugueſe named Ville-Real, afterwards burnt for Judaiſm at Liſbon; a famous Plagiary, who copied it from du Cheſne, in order to make Cardinal Richelieu deſcend by the alliance of Laval, from the Kings of Caſtile and Portugal, for which ſervice he enjoyed a good penſion.* I wonder that Don Nicolas Antonio ſaith nothing concerning the tragical death of this author; he only gives the titles of the two pieces mentioned in the text of this article, and obſerves that they were written whilſt the author was Conſul for the Portugueſe merchants at Roüen (2). The firſt of theſe books is intituled, *El Politico Chriſtiano, ò Diſcorſo Politico de la Vida y Acciones del Cardinal de Richelieu* (3): and the other, *Anti-Caramuel* (4), *ò Defenſa del Manifeſto del Reino de Portugal.* See the *Anti*'s of Mr Baillet (5).

(1) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Mémoires de Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 303.

(2) Nicol. Antonius, Bibl. Scriptor. Hiſp. *Tom. i, pag.* 267.

(3) It was tranſlated into French and printed at Paris in 1643, in 4to. *Id. ibid.*

(4) It was printed at Paris, in 1643. Id. ib.

(5) *In Tom. vi, in the edition of the* Jugemens des Sçavans, *of Baillet, in* 1725, *Art.* cxvii. §. i, *in* 4to.

VILLAVICENTIUS (LAWRENCE) a Monk of the order of St Auguſtin, and preacher to Philip II, King of Spain, was born at Xerez in Andaluſia. He continued a long time in the Low-Countries, and took his degree of Doctor of Divinity at Louvain, before he was called to the court, in order to be preacher to the King of Spain (*a*). In the year 1561 he made his laſt viſit of the province of the Lower Germany, of which he was Vicar-General (*b*). We have already ſpoken (*c*) of ſome of his writings, which coſt him only the trouble of ſtriking out of the works of other authors, what did not ſavour enough of Catholiciſm. We are not certain that he had even ſuch a ſhare as this, in all the other works attributed to him. He flouriſhed until the year 1581 (*d*).

(*a*) Andr. Schottus, Bibl. Hiſpan. *pag.* 265.

(*b*) Elſſius, Encomiaſtic. Auguſtin. *pag.* 426.

(*c*) In the remark [*C*], of the article HYPERIUS.

(*d*) Elſſius, ubi ſupra.

VILLEGAIGNON (NICHOLAS DURAND DE) a Knight of Malta, a native of Provins in Brie (*a*), ſerved a long time in the gallies, and was in ſeveral naval expeditions, ſo that having beſides ſome learning [*A*], he rendered himſelf conſiderable as a perſon of merit, and was promoted to the vice-admiralty of Bretagne, in the reign of Henry II (*b*). He quarrelled with the governor of the caſtle of Breſt, and fearing the conſequences of this difference (*c*), he thought of an enterprize, which frequently ſerves for an epiſode in controverſial books, and which has not been forgot by Mr Maimbourg [*B*]. He reſolved to eſtabliſh a colony in Braſil, and knowing that Admiral de Colligni favoured the Reformed religion, he gave him to underſtand that his deſign was to advance the kingdom of God in that country, and procure a refuge

a refuge

(*a*) Theod. de Beze, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. *livr. ii, pag.* 158.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *Having beſides ſome learning.*] ‘ This is pretty rare in perſons of his condition, he was very ‘ well verſed in polite literature, as appears by the ‘ fine deſcription he wrote in Latin of the unfortunate ‘ Algerine expedition, in which he was wounded, in ‘ the ſervice of Charles V who was then at peace ‘ with France (1).’ Mr Maimbourg adds in the margin, that this deſcription is inſerted in the ſecond tome of the hiſtorical pieces which Schardius hath collected. He might have told us that it was printed by itſelf at Straſbourg in the year 1542, in 8vo (2). His treatiſe *de Bello Melitenſi & ejus eventu Francis impoſito*, was printed at Paris by Robert Stephens in the year 1553, in 4to. La Croix du Maine ſaith that the ſame piece was printed in French, in the ſame place and year, by Charles Stephens (3). I ſhall ſay ſomething below concerning Villegaignon's controverſial works. John de Leri tells us: That *he never heard a man talk better concerning religion, and a Chriſtian Reformation than he did then* (4).

[*B*] *Which has not been forgot by Mr Maimbourg.*] What he ſays of it in the ſecond book of his Hiſtory of Calviniſm, hath been followed by the Continuator of Moreri. I might then have a very particular right to examine it, but I muſt own that the Continuator hath taken nothing which I deſire to contradict. I ſhall only obſerve, 1. That in the Dutch editions they have been in the wrong to change the date of 1557 into 1558, concerning the arrival of the Genevois at the iſle of Colligni. 2. That Moreri had no reaſon to ſay that Villegaignon did not return into the Romiſh communion till after he came back into France. But to come to Mr Maimbourg: his firſt falſity is ſaying *that there was alſo a diviſion betwixt the Proteſtants, and even amongſt the miniſters themſelves* (5); *for*, adds he, *ſome would have the Lord's Supper adminiſtred in the Romiſh way, as Jeſus Chriſt had inſtituted it, with unleavened bread; and others affirmed that it ought to be celebrated in the Greek manner with leavened bread. The former were for retaining the ceremonies of the Catholic church, and the other rejecting them as ſuperſtitious.* He cites the eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches, and that alone confounds him; for we find there that it was only Villegaignon and a Student of Sorbonne who raiſed the diſpute. ‘ A perſon named John Contat, a Student of Sorbonne, ſecretly aſpiring after I know not ‘ what epiſcopal dignity as fantaſtical as Villegaignon's ‘ kingdom, came on the day appointed for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and aſked where the ſacerdotal habits were, and began to diſpute concerning unleavened bread, which he ſaid was neceſſary, ‘ as well as to mix water with the wine, and other ‘ ſuch like objections he raiſed. Nevertheleſs the Sa-

‘ crament

(1) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calviniſme, *livr. ii, pag.* 100, *Dutch Edit.*

(2) Du Verdier, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 909.

(3) La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 342.

(4) Jean de Leri, Hiſt. d'un Voiage fait au Breſil. *ch. vi, pag. m.* 58.

(5) Maimb. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 103.

a refuge for the faithful who were perſecuted in France. The Admiral with his accuſtomed prudence concealed this excellent motive from Henry II, and only repreſenting this enterprize on the ſide of the advantages it might bring to his kingdom, obtained two large ſhips well equipped for Villegaignon; beſides the ſum of ten thouſand livres (*d*). This knight embarked on the 15th of July 1555 (*e*), and in the month of November following arrived at the mouth of the river Ganabara, in the 23d degree of ſouth latitude (*f*). He endeavoured to ſettle his colony in the Continent, but ſeveral reaſons engaged him to retire into an iſle (*g*), which he called Colligni in honour of the Admiral (*h*). He appeared extraordinary zealous for the Reformed religion (*i*), for moſt of thoſe who followed him were Proteſtants, and were only induced to make this voyage by the hopes which he had given them of promoting the work of God, and procuring for them that liberty of conſcience which Henry II deprived them of. He wrote to the Church of Geneva by the returning ſhips, to deſire ſome miniſters and other perſons, who might ſucceſsfully labour in the inſtruction of the ſavages (*k*). His letter being read, they firſt of all *gave thanks to God for the amplification of Chriſt's kingdom in ſuch a diſtant country*, and afterwards choſe two miniſters, Peter Richier, and William Chartier, who with ſome other perſons proper for his intentions were ſent to him (*l*). They departed from Geneva on the 10th of September 1556 (*m*), and embarked at Honfleur on the 19th of November of the ſame year (*n*), and landed in the iſland of Colligni on the 10th of March 1557 (*o*). Richier preached the ſame day, and Villegaignon heard him with marks of an extraordinary zeal (*p*). Some days after, the ſacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated, and he was obſerved to communicate very devoutly, after he had recited two long prayers, ſo fervent that no miniſter could have dictated better (*q*). It was ſoon perceived that all this was meer oſtentation, and that he only deſired to act the controverſiſt; for he and one Cointa who had ſtudied in the Sorbonne, fell a diſputing concerning the Real Preſence. They maintained that though Tranſubſtantiation and Conſubſtantiation were abſurd doctrines, it was nevertheleſs true, that the body of JESUS CHRIST was included in the ſigns of the Euchariſt (*r*). It was agreed that this diſpute ſhould be referred to the deciſion of the German and French churches, and that Chartier the miniſter ſhould be ſent into Europe to conſult them (*s*). Villegaignon promiſed to ſubmit to their

(*d*) Id. ibid. *pag*. 159.

(*e*) *Id. ibid.* but according to Leri's relation, *pag. m.* 3, it was in May.

(*f*) *Jean de Leri*, Hiſtoire d'un Voiage fait au Breſil, *pag*. 4.

(*g*) *Idem*, in the preface.

(*h*) Beza, ubi ſupra. Leri, *ch. vii*, *pag*. 88.

(*i*) Leri, *ch. i*, *pag*. 2, *&* *ſeq.*

(*k*) Id. ibid. *pag*. 4.

(*l*) Ibid. *p*. 5.

(*m*) Ibid. *p*. 7.

(*n*) Ibid. *p*. 8.

(*o*) Ibid. *ch. vi*, *pag*. 55.

(*p*) See the article RICHER.

(*q*) You will find them entire in Leri, *pag*. 60, *&* *ſeq.*

(*r*) Id. ibid. *pag*. 67.

(*s*) Beza, ubi ſupra, *p*. 160.

‘ crament was adminiſtred according to the plain ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt, and as it is adminiſtred in the Reformed Churches of France: but the difference ſtill increaſed, and came to ſuch a pitch that as Richer was baptizing a child and condemning what ſupperſtition has added to the primitive inſtitution. Villegaignon openly gave the lye to the miniſter, proteſting that he would come no more to his ſermons, nor adhere to the Calviniſtical ſect, as he called it (6).’ The ſecond falſity is ſaying that the miniſter Richer aſſerted *againſt the Calviniſts, that Jeſus Chriſt ought not to be either adored or prayed to, and that the Lord's Supper or Euchariſt, in what manner ſoever we there receive the body of Jeſus Chriſt, doth not at all conduce to the good of the communicants* (7). I have elſewhere (8) mentioned the particular opinions imputed to this miniſter. It is eaſy to perceive that he only taught that Jeſus Chriſt's humanity, being a creature, ought neither to be adored nor prayed to; but this doth not ſignify that Jeſus Chriſt, both GOD and man, ought not to be adored, and prayed to (9). If Peter Richer had embraced the opinions which Mr Maimbourg charges on him, Calvin would have cauſed him to be ignominiouſly depoſed: nay I know not but that he would have been forced to undergo a more rigorous puniſhment; for he would have been looked upon as a wretched Anti-Trinitarian; but we know he was reſpected as a worthy miniſter of the goſpel after his return from Braſil (10). Obſerve that the Jeſuit Gaulterius doth not charge him with this monſtrous opinion concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper which Maimbourg ſpeaks of. The third falſity is his ſaying *that continuing to preach his blaſphemies* Villegaignon gave him the lie (11). The author whom he cites, ſaith expreſsly (12) that the lie which was given, only regarded the miniſter's condemnation of thoſe ſuperſtitions which the Papiſts have added to baptiſm (13).

The miniſter who anſwered Maimbourg, ſhould have cenſured this part of his Hiſtory of Calviniſm in the above manner; but inſtead of doing ſo, he hath amuſed himſelf with obſerving (14), 1. That Admiral de Colligni pitched upon Villegaignon in order to ſend him to prepare a retreat in America for the Proteſtants. 2. That Villegaignon promiſed to grant them liberty of conſcience. 3. That after having kept his word for ſome time, *he hanged, drowned, and threw into the ſea all thoſe who would not follow his Apoſtacy.* 4. *That he confined the reſt to a moving priſon, which was an old rotten ſhip, without proviſions and arms, to which he ſent as many of the Reformed as he could ſtow there.* The firſt of theſe four things is contradicted by Beza, and John de Leri, who aſſure us that Villegaignon was the firſt that made this overture to the Admiral. They alſo affirm that he promiſed to endeavour, to the utmoſt of his power, the advancement of the kingdom of GOD in that country, and that he publickly declared himſelf a good Proteſtant. This confutes the ſecond particular, which ſuppoſes Villegaignon to be a Catholic who promiſes to tolerate the Proteſtants. The third is a lie, which as juſtly at leaſt deſerves to be condemned as thoſe of Maimbourg; for it appears by John de Leri's relation, 1. That Villegaignon puniſhed with death only three Proteſtants, who returned into his iſland after the departure of the Genevois (15). 2. That he either durſt not or could not hinder the miniſters from preaching (16), nor uſe any authority with reſpect to the Genevois (17). 3. That if he was cruel or barbarous, it was either towards the ſavages or his domeſtics, or thoſe who violated his laws; religion had no hand in this (18). The fourth is no leſs falſe than the foregoing, ſince John de Leri owns (19), that he and the others who returned into France in this old ſhip, treated with the maſter thereof (20) for the expences of their paſſage, without Villegaignon's interpoſing in the leaſt, and that when they were out of his iſland and juriſdiction. Compare with this the remark [*D*] towards the end. Beſides, this adverſary of Maimbourg hath ill gloſſed this paſſage: *he eaſily rid himſelf of all the Proteſtants, who would not follow his example.* This is plainly enough to confeſs, ſaith he, that he was their cruel executioner. But we ſhall ſee hereafter (21) that John de Leri acknowledges, that during the time the Genevois ſtaid in the iſle of Colligni, no Frenchman was put to death, and that after their departure, Villegaignon cauſed only three Proteſtants to be put to death (22). Theſe were part of thoſe five, who after they had embarked with Richer, John de Leri, *&c.* choſe rather to return to Braſil than continue their voyage. But ſince Villegaignon ſpared the lives of the two others, it ſeems probable either that theſe three did not ſuffer death barely for their religion, or that the remaining two apoſtatized, which no author that I know of has mentioned. Let no body ſay that I ſet up for a defender of Villegaignon;

(6) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *livr. ii*, *pag*. 160.

(7) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra.

(8) In the remark [*C*], of the article RICHER.

(9) See the paſſage I have quoted from Mr Saurin, in the remark [*C*], of the article RICHER.

(10) See the remark [*A*], of his article.

(11) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag*. 104.

(12) Beza, ubi ſupra.

(13) That is, their mixing ſalt and oil with water. See *John de Leri*, *ubi ſupra*, *pag*. 73.

(14) Jurieu, Apolog. pour la Reformat. *Tom*, *i*, *pag*. 552.

(15) See the remark [*E*].

(16) Leri, ubi ſupra, *pag*. 82.

(17) See the remark [*D*].

(18) Leri, ibid. *pag*. 77, *&* *ſeq.* *item pag*. 85.

(19) Id. ibid. *ch. vi*, *pag*. 84, *&* *ch. xxi*, *pag*. 339.

(20) He was not a native of Bretagne, as Beza ſays, *ubi ſupra*, *pag*. 160, he was born at Havre de Grace.

(21) In the remark [*H*], at the end.

(22) See the remark [*E*].

their deciſion, and particularly to the opinion of John Calvin, for whom he pretended a great reſpect (t) [C]. He contrived new cavils, when the adminiſtration of the ſacrament came on the ſecond time, and at the expiration of ſome days, publickly declared that he had changed his opinion (u), and without expecting the anſwer *which he had ſent Chartier the miniſter to France in queſt of, he declared that Calvin was a wicked heretic* (x). From that time they gave the ſacrament by night unknown to him, and ſome told him that they would no longer depend on him (y). They were thoſe who had agreed at Geneva to follow the two miniſters. He was not ſtrong enough to force them to obey his orders, and therefore contented himſelf with commanding them to leave his iſland. They could with impunity have diſobeyed him, but they thought it more proper to return [D]. And accordingly they embarked on the 4th of January 1558 (z), and arrived at Port Blavet on the 26th of May following (aa). The horrible miſery and ſcarcity of proviſions which they underwent during this voyage is deſcribed by John de Leri, who, being one of them, publiſhed a relation of it. Villegaignon, who as ſome writers ſay, was the cauſe of this famine, was guilty of a much more villanous deſign againſt them, which they happily eſcaped [E]. He himſelf ſome time after returned into France, without providing for the defence of his fort Colligni (bb), which the Portugueze ſeized, and tranſported

gnon; have not I related whatever John de Leri hath ſaid againſt him? But the laws of Hiſtory will by no means ſuffer me to be ſilent concerning falſities publiſhed againſt any perſon whatſoever.

For the reſt, if the ſubject were not too ſerious and melancholy, could one read without laughing, that a man cauſed ALL thoſe to be put to death who would not follow the example of his apoſtacy, and put the reſt on board of a veſſel? Who ſays *all*, excepts no body. To make ſenſe of theſe words, *the reſt* ſhould have *followed his Apoſtacy*, than which nothing is more falſe; as the ſequel of this author's diſcourſe ſufficiently proves. Hence we may conclude that this author wrote with a great deal of precipitation, and for the moſt part without knowing what he ſaid.

[C] *Particularly to the opinion of John Calvin, for whom he pretended a great reſpect.*] Calvin wrote a letter to him by the two miniſters who were ſent to him. Villegaignon anſwered him in Latin, *and not only informed him at large of his condition in general, but particularly making uſe of Brazil ink he wrote to him with his own hand what follows.* 'I add the advice which you have given me by your letters, uſing my utmoſt endeavours not to depart from it in the leaſt. For indeed I am fully perſuaded, that no way can be more holy, juſt, and perfect. Wherefore we have cauſed your letters to be read in the aſſembly of our council, and after that to be regiſtred, in order that if we ſhould ever turn out of the right way, we may be reclaimed by the reading of them (23).' John de Leri adds: *Nicolas Carmeau who was the bearer of theſe letters ..... taking his leave of us told me, that Villegaignon had commanded him to ſay by word of mouth to Calvin, that he begged of him to believe that to perpetuate the memory of the advice he had given him, he would cauſe it to be engraven on copper* (24). 'I have frequently heard him, ſays John de Leri (25), repeat theſe words: Mr Calvin is one of the moſt learned men ſince the time of the Apoſtles; nor have I read any Doctor, who, in my opinion, hath more purely explained the holy ſcripture.' *Theodore Beza obſerves that Villegaignon cauſed thoſe letters which came from Geneva to be regiſtred in the rolls of his imaginary kingdom* (26). He is miſtaken in the date of Villegaignon's anſwer, which he fixes on the laſt of February 1557, inſtead of the laſt of March (27); and ſince he had juſt told us, that the Genevois arrived on the 7th of March 1557, it was eaſy for him to ſee that the anſwer to the letters which they brought with them could not be dated on the laſt of February 1557. I only obſerve this in order to give a ſpecimen of the errors into which the greateſt authors and the beſt correctors ſometimes fall by reaſon of the many things they have to diſtract their attention. Thoſe of the lower rank are not ſo ſubject to them; nevertheleſs I am very much afraid that ſome ſuch will be found in this Dictionary.

[D] *They could with impunity have diſobeyed him but they thought it more proper to return.*] The Genevois having ſignified to him that ſince he rejected the goſpel, *they were not willing to continue any longer in his ſervice*, he cauſed *the two goblets of meal of roots*, which was daily diſtributed to them, to be withheld (28). *They were very glad of this refuſal, becauſe it entirely rid them of any ſubjection to him. If he had been ſtrongeſt, and if part of his people, and even ſome of the chief, had not taken their part*, he would have endeavoured without doubt to ſubdue them by force. He deſigned one day to put John de Leri and another in irons, under pretence that, notwithſtanding his order, they went out of the iſland without his leave. He pretended to be ignorant that his lieutenant had granted them liberty to make this voyage. *They plainly declared that they would not ſuffer it, after which he grew milder* (29). The chief of their reaſons was that they had intimated to him, *that ſince he had broken his promiſe of maintaining the exerciſe of the Evangelical religion, they would no longer depend on him. ..... The chief of his people being of our religion*, ſaith John de Leri (30), *and conſequently diſſatiſfied with him on account of his Apoſtacy; if we had not been apprehenſive that the Admiral, who under the King's authority (as I ſaid in the beginning) had ſent him, and was as yet ignorant of his carriage, might have taken it ill, ſome of us would very fain have thrown him into the ſea, that his fleſh and brawny ſhoulders might have ſerved as food for the fiſhes.* About the end of October, he told them that he would no longer bear with them, and commanded them to depart his iſland (31). *It is indeed true*, adds John de Leri (32), *That if we had pleaſed we were able to have driven him out himſelf. But as well to deprive him of any juſt reaſon of complaint againſt us, as becauſe France and other nations, knowing that we came hither only to enjoy the free uſe of the goſpel, we would not caſt any ſcandal upon it, we choſe rather to obey Villegaignon, and depart without any farther conteſt.*

From all this we may conclude, that a certain author whom I have already cenſured, was not very well informed, when he tells us that Villegaignon *ſhut them up in a floating priſon, and that they preferred embarking in a ſorry veſſel on the moſt treacherous of the four elements, to ſtaying any longer expoſed to the fury of this mercileſs tyger, who was more faithleſs than the ſea* (33).

[E] *Villegaignon, who as ſome writers ſay, was the cauſe of this famine, was guilty of a much more villanous deſign againſt them which they happily eſcaped.*] Theodore Beza aſſures us that he ſo managed it, that the maſter of the veſſel *had not one fourth part of the proviſions neceſſary for his voyage, hoping by this means that they would die of want and hunger, before they arrived in France* (34). Mr Jurieu affirms the ſame thing (35): but John de Leri ſays nothing of it; he was however as well acquainted with this affair as any perſon, and much better than any other not concerned in it, and he was not likely to ſpare Villegaignon. As for the other perfidiouſneſs, let us ſee how he relates it: 'Villegaignon not only ſent us our licence to depart, ſigned by himſelf; but alſo wrote to the maſter of the ſhip, to let him know that he ſhould make no difficulty of carrying us on his account: For, ſaid he, (fraudulently) as I was very glad of their arrival, hoping to have met with what I aimed at; in like manner ſince we cannot agree together, I am content that they return. So that under this fair pretext he had contrived a moſt villanous piece of treachery; for having given the maſter of the veſſel a little cheſt, covered with an oil-cloth in the ſea faſhion, and filled with letters to ſeveral perſons, tranſported the artillery to Liſbon. At his return he engaged in a vehement paper war againſt the Proteſtants. They on the other ſide wrote againſt him in ſuch a manner as did not much turn to his advantage [*F*]. He died in the month of December 1571 (*cc*), *in a Malteſe Commandory, called Beauvais, and ſituated in the province of Gaſtinois, near St John de Nemours, and managed his own affairs ſo ill, as well during his ſickneſs as before, and had ſo little affection for his relations*, that they reaped no advantage from his eſtate, neither in his life nor after his death (*dd*). Some of his adverſaries have owned that he did not defile himſelf with any of the female ſavages of America [*G*]: an elogy which ſeveral other governors in the like ſituation have no pretence to. I ſhall obſerve ſome faults in Thevet [*H*]. The

---

(t) Leri, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 68.

(u) Id. ibid. *pag.* 73.

(x) Id. ibid. *pag.* 76.

(y) Ibid. *pag.* 82.

(z) Beza, ubi ſupra, *ch. xxi*, *pag.* 341.

(aa) Ibid. *ch. xxii*, *pag.* 373.

(bb) Taffin, Etat de l'Egliſe, *pag. m.* 580, *ad ann.* 1558.

(23) Leri, ubi ſupra, *ch. vi*, *pag.* 68.

(24) Id. ibid. *pag.* 69.

(25) Id. ib. *pag.* 68.

(26) Beza, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 159.

(27) Leri, ubi ſupra, *p.* 69.

(28) Ibid. *p.* 80.

(29) Ibid. *pag.* 81.

(30) Id. ibid. *pag.* 82.

(31) Ib. *p.* 83.

(32) Ib. *p.* 84.

(33) Jurieu, ubi ſupra, *p.* 555.

(34) Beza, ubi ſupra, *p.* 160.

(35) Jurieu, ubi ſupra.

‘ perſons, he had amongſt them put in a formal proceſs or accuſation againſt us, and without our knowledge, recommended to the firſt Judge to whoſe hands it ſhould come in France, with direction to ſtop and burn us as Heretics, which he ſaid we were (36).’ The Divine providence turned this infamous treachery to the advantage of thoſe good men: for their leader *being acquainted with ſeveral of the Juſticiary officers of Bretagne, who were favourably inclined to the religion which we profeſſed, gave them the cheſt which contained the letters and accuſation, who after they ſaw the contents of it were ſo far from treating us according to Villegaignon's deſire, that, on the contrary, they entertained us as well as they poſſibly could, and kindly offered to ſupply the wants of thoſe of our company who were neceſſitous, and lent money to our conductor, and ſeveral others* (37). Here I ought to take notice of the three Proteſtant martyrs whom Villegaignon put to death. Five of the Genevois after the firſt danger of ſhipwreck choſe rather to return to Braſil in a bark which was given them, than to ſtay in the veſſel. With a great deal of difficulty they regained the coaſt of America, and Villegaignon cauſed three of them to be drowned on account of their religion (38). Some very credible eye-witneſſes of this fact, put in writing the confeſſion of theſe ſufferers, and the whole proceedings of Villegaignon (39). That piece was ſent by John de Leri *the ſame year* 1558, to John Creſpin a Printer, who inſerted it in his fifth book of Martyrs (40).

[*F*] *He engaged . . . . . in a paper war . . . . againſt the Proteſtants. They on the other ſide wrote againſt him in ſuch a manner as did not much turn to his advantage.*] Du Verdier Vau-Privas gives me the following catalogue: *An anſwer to the Remonſtrances made to the Queen-mother*, printed at Paris in the year 1561, in 4to. *The controverted propoſitions betwixt the Chevalier de Villegaignon, and John Calvin, concerning the truth of the holy Euchariſt*, Paris 1562, in 4to. *The Chevalier de Villegaignon's anſwer to John Calvin's reſolution concerning the Sacraments*, Paris 1562. *An anſwer to the libels and calumnies publiſhed againſt him:* at Paris, and afterwards at Lyons in the year 1561. *De Cœnæ controverſiæ Phil. Melanchth. judicio:* at Paris 1561 in 4to. *Liber ad articulos Calvinianos:* at Venice 1565. *De conſecratione myſtici Sacramenti, & duplici Chriſti oblatione adverſus Vannium Lutherologiæ Profeſſorem: de Judaici Paſchatis implemento adverſus Calvinologos: de poculo ſanguinis Chriſti, & introitu in ſancta ſanctorum adverſus Bezam:* at Paris 1569 (41). *His adverſaries of the oppoſite religion*, continues du Verdier, *wrote defamatory libels againſt him, of which were La Suffiſance de Maiſtre Colas Durand. Alſo Eſpouſſette de ſes armoiries, and ſeveral others.* See the article RICHER.

I have ſeen only three of his books, *viz. Ad Articulos Calvinianæ, de Sacramento Euchariſtiæ, traditionis ab ejus miniſtris in Francia Antarctica evulgatæ Reſponſiones, per Nicolaum Villagagnonem Equitem Rhodium, ad Eccleſiam Chriſtianam:* printed at Paris, by Andrew Wechel, 1560, in 4to. *De cœnæ controverſiæ Philippi Melanchtonis judicio:* printed at Paris, by the ſame Wechel, 1561, in 4to. *The Chevalier de Villegaignon's Paraphraſe on Mr Calvin's Reſolution concerning the Sacraments:* printed at Paris, by Wechel, in 1561, in 4to. All theſe three books are extraordinarily well printed.

[*G*] *His adverſaries have owned, that he did not defile himſelf with any of the female ſavages.*] ‘(42) Not to conceal any more what redounds to his praiſe than what tends to his diſcredit, I ſhall, by the way, inform you, that certain Normans, who eſcaped ſhipwreck, long before he came into that country, living very impiouſly, and committing all manner of leudneſs with the female ſavages, (by whom I knew ſome that had children four or five years old) in order to ſuppreſs this abuſe and prevent it for the future, among thoſe who lived in our iſland and fort, Villegaignon, with advice of his council, made a law, that no profeſſed Chriſtian ſhould co-habit with the female ſavages on pain of death. But if any of them were converted and baptized, the marrying of them was hereby freely permitted. . . . . (43). As this law was doubly founded on the word of GOD, it was alſo ſo well obſerved, that Villegaignon's people and ours religiouſly and ſtrictly abſtained from any ſuch pollution; and tho' ſince my return I heard that he was guilty of a leudneſs of that nature, I bear him witneſs that he was not ſuſpected to be ſo whilſt I was there. And further, he ſo ſtrictly obſerved this ordinance, that it was not without the moſt preſſing inſtances of ſeveral of his chief favourites, that he ſo far mitigated the puniſhment of an interpreter, who had committed this crime with a female ſavage whom he had formerly debauched, as only to puniſh him with the chain, and condemn him to ſlavery; for Villegaignon would have had him hanged. And, as far as I know of him, he was very ſtrict in this particular, as well with regard to himſelf as others, and was really to be recommended for it.’ I have cited this long paſſage to have an occaſion of making two remarks. The firſt is, that we ought to be very cautious how we give credit to ill reports of men. How many are there who believe what hath been ſaid of Villegaignon's impurities, and nevertheleſs he is acquitted of them by the evidence of a perſon, who, very far from ſparing him, would have been fond of uttering all the diſadvantageous truths againſt him. My ſecond obſervation is, that there is no paſſion more incorrigible or brutal than that of uncleanneſs. All Chriſtians know that the law of GOD forbids their commerce with infidel women: and they are educated in principles which inſpire horror at the thoughts of ſuch a commerce. Human laws, which puniſh this crime, fortify the impreſſions of education. And yet to what degrees of impurity hath the laſciviouſneſs of the Chriſtians, who diſcovered the new world, tranſported them? Could the ſhocking deformity and barbarity of the ſavages, reſtrain men from this crime, prohibited, as it alſo is, by divine and human laws? Let us go no farther than John de Leri's relation. Are we not there informed that ſome Normans eſcaping a ſhipwreck, gave themſelves over to this vice, and obliged Villegaignon to make a law in order to puniſh this crime with death, which, nevertheleſs, was not ſufficient to curb the luſt of an interpreter. If we conſult other relations we ſhall find the ſame puniſhment was requiſite to hinder men from defiling themſelves with certain amphibious animals, which in ſome ſort reſemble women. A horrible depravation, an incorrigible paſſion, which hurries men on to the commiſſion of the ſin againſt nature, and beſtiality (44); and, perhaps, to a laſcivious commerce with dead bodies. Herodotus informs us (45), that after it was diſcovered in Egypt, that one of the embalmers of dead bodies, had defiled himſelf with a woman a little while after her death; they kept the corpſes of beautiful women three or four days before they truſted them in the hands of thoſe men. Τοῦτο δὲ ποιεῦσι οὕτω τοῦδε εἵνεκα, ἵνα μή σφι οἱ ταριχευταὶ μισγωνται τῇσι γυναιξί. λαμφθῆναι γάρ τινα φασὶ μισγόμενον νεκρῷ προσφάτῳ γυναικὸς κατεῖπαι δὲ τὸν ὁμότεχνον. *Ea de cauſſa facientes, ne cum feminis iſti ſalinarii concumbant. Deprehenſum enim quemdam aiunt coëuntem cum recenti cadavere muliebri, delatumque ab ejuſdem artificii ſocio* (46).

[*H*] *I ſhall obſerve ſome faults in Thevet.*] Let us firſt of all lay down this foundation. In the year

(*cc*) Saint Romuald Journal Chronol. *Tom. i, pag.* 442.

(*dd*) Leri, ubi ſupra, *pag. penult.*

(36) Leri, *chap. xxi, pag.* 340.

(37) Idem, *ch. xxii, pag.* 377.

(38) Idem, *chap. xxi, pag.* 346.

(39) Idem, *chap. xxii, pag.* 379.

(40) Ibid. *pag.* 380. *See alſo* Beza, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 161.

(41) Du Verdier, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 909.

(42) Jean de Leri, *ch. vi, p.* 71.

(43) Ibid. *pag.* 72.

(44) See the advice given by Æſop, in *Phædrus, Fab. xlii, pag. m.* 49.

(45) Herodot. *lib. ii, cap. lxxxix.*

(46) Id. ibid.

The addition which I have to make to this article is curious, as it concerns two exploits of Villegaignon in the year 1560, the one in war, and the other in controverſy, both which did him little honour [*I*]. I likewiſe add that a writer who deſpiſed him promiſed a thing, which, as far as I can learn, he has not performed [*K*]. It was to publiſh very ſoon memoirs of the life of Villegaignon, and of his principal relations *(ee)*.

(*ee*) La Popeliniere, Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires, *pag.* 451.

1558, a book was printed, intituled, *des Singularitez de l'Amerique*, digeſted into order by Mr de la Porte, according to the Memoirs of Brother Andrew Thevet. He ſays there (47), that Thevet arrived at Cape de Frie on the 10th of November 1555, and four days after at the river of Ganabara, from whence he departed on the 31ſt of January following, in order to go for France. From which it follows that he tells an untruth, when he avers in the XXIſt book of his Coſmography, printed in 1575 (48), that the factiouſneſs of four miniſters of the new religion, *the chief of which* was called Richier, raiſed a ſedition, which brought ſome of the mutineers to capital puniſhment, that the reſt, and namely Richier, eſcaped, and that *the ſavages, irritated by this tragedy*, deſigned to put the remainder to death. He reckons himſelf amongſt thoſe who were in this danger: *We narrowly eſcaped their revenging it on us*, ſaith he. He tells, in another place (49), that he quitted the enterprize of converting the ſavages, as well becauſe *he was not well verſed in their language*, as on account *that the Calviniſt miniſters undertook this charge, envying my deſign*, ſays he. Theſe two paſſages ſhew that he pretends to have been there whilſt the Geneva miniſters were there. But it is a notorious falſity. For they did not arrive there till March 1557, and he left that place on the 31ſt of January 1556. He himſelf refutes thoſe who would have us believe that he made a ſecond voyage. Obſerve his own words: *I very much wonder what excited Calvin to tax me in his Apology, printed at Geneva, with being one of the principal abetters of the death of thoſe ſaid miniſters whom the Sieur de Villegaignon cauſed to be thrown into the ſea, ſince that was done three years or thereabouts after my return into France, as appears by my book of the Rarities*, &c. *which is a ſufficient evidence in point of time, beſides ſeveral other of my writings.* He confeſſes therefore that from the 31ſt of January 1556, to the time that Villegaignon cauſed ſome Heretics to be drowned, he was abſent from that country. Conſequently he was not there, during the ſtay of the Genevois, which was from March 1557, till towards the end of the year. His own words diſcover therefore that he was, and was not there. Not to take notice of his other falſities, it is not true that thoſe whom Villegaignon cauſed to be drowned were miniſters, nor that there were above two miniſters ſent from Geneva, or any other place. I ſhall only obſerve, the better to convict him of his impoſtures, that the ſedition he ſpeaks of preceded the arrival of Peter Richier, and that no miniſter before Richier had ſeen Villegaignon in his iſle of Colligni. The proof of all which is drawn from the letter which the ſaid Villegaignon wrote to Calvin on the 31ſt of March 1557: in which he declares (50) that Richier and his brethren *found him reduced to that extremity, that he was obliged alternatively to perform the offices of magiſtrate and miniſter, which*, adds he, *put me in great anguiſh; for the example of King Uzziah was ſufficient to deter me from this practice.* He there relates the conſpiracy formed againſt him, and how the authors of it were diſcovered and puniſhed.

(47) *See* John de Leri's *Preface: he quotes the 1ſt, 24th, 25th, and 60th chapters of thoſe* Singularitez.

(48) Thevet, Coſmographie Univerſelle, *livr. xxi, fol.* 909.

(49) Id. ibid. *ch. viii, fol.* 925.

(50) Villegaignon's letter to Calvin, *apud* John de Leri, *in Præfat.*

John de Leri (51) preſſed thoſe arguments againſt Thevet, and maintaintained that while the miniſters and their companions of Geneva continued at Colligni, there was neither any ſedition, nor conſpiracy, nor any Frenchman killed there. To confound times is a great fault, but to make uſe of theſe confuſions to calumniate the innocent is yet a much greater. Both which Thevet is guilty of.

(51) Leri in his preface.

[*I*] *Two exploits in the year* 1560 . . . . *both which did him little honour.*] I ſhall borrow this narrative from a Proteſtant Hiſtorian, who ſpeaking of the perſecutions exerciſed by the Houſe of Guiſe againſt the Proteſtants in the reign of Francis II, has the following words: 'Villegaignon . . . . believing that he 'had found a proper opportunity to be revenged on 'thoſe who had publiſhed an account of his cruelties 'committed in America under the reign of Henry, 'trumped up in the middle of this tumult, whilſt he 'accompanied the Grand Prior, brother to the aforeſaid Meſſieurs de Guiſe (52), a fantaſtical naval war, 'as if the matter had been to reſiſt a great and powerful army, and by ſuch means to render the river 'Loire of ſo little uſe, that the water thereof ſhould 'not even be ſufficient for drink to the enemy's horſes. 'This work, begun at a great expence, was found 'ſo ridiculous that it redounded wholly to their ſhame 'and confuſion. Villegaignon ſeeing how the matter 'was, that he might not continue idle, undertook a 'journey to Tours, to diſpute with Simon Broſſier, 'the Miniſter of Loudun, who had formerly been his 'ſchool-fellow, and was then a priſoner in the hands 'of the Archbiſhop of the family of Breſay, another 'apoſtate. To this purpoſe he had letters from the 'King and Cardinal: but he executed this ſcheme as 'ill as the former; ſo that not being able to explain 'his arguments by word of mouth, he reduced them 'into writing, particularly the diſpute upon the Lord's 'Supper. Broſſier anſwered him in ſuch a manner as 'gave full ſatisfaction to the learned. Among other 'things, he remonſtrated to him that he did not argue 'like a Sorbonniſt, much leſs like a Divine, but reſembled more the Academics, and ſuch people, who 'having no knowledge of GOD, diſpute about things 'unknown to men. That if he had a mind to follow 'the true method of diſputing by the Scriptures, (as 'all the antient Divines had done, and even ſeveral 'Heretics, however preſumptuous they were) he was 'ready to give him ſatisfaction, and yet that he might 'not go away without an anſwer, he confuted his 'whole doctrine by arguments taken from Scripture. 'Laſt of all, he prayed him to correct that vice in 'writing of which he was guilty, *viz.* of becoming 'perplexed and obſcure, that he might not ſeem to be 'at a nonplus, when he could alledge no ſolid reaſon 'for his opinion (53).'

(52) That is to ſay the Duke of Guiſe, and the Cardinal of Lorraine.

(53) La Planche, Hiſtoire de François II, *pag.* 229, 230.

[*K*] *A writer, who deſpiſed him, promiſed a thing, which, as far I can learn, he has not performed.*] His words are as follows: 'Nicolas Durand, born in Provence, and ſirnamed Villegangnon, was more famous 'by the writings of the Proteſtants than for any 'thing elſe. They writ ſeveral pieces, wherein they 'bitterly inveighed againſt him for the wrong he 'had done them in that part of America called Brazil. 'He has left ſome books which diſcover him to be a 'bad Divine, and a poor warrior; notwithſtanding 'he aſſumed the name of Knight of Malta. He writ 'a book on the expedition of the Emperor Charles V 'againſt Algier in Africa; and in another, which he 'dedicates to the ſame Prince, he vindicates the French 'from what was laid to their charge concerning the 'event of the Malteſe war. I ſhall ſhortly publiſh 'ſome Memoirs which I have *of his life and of his* '*principal relations* (54).' La Popelinere, from whom I take this paſſage, is in the wrong to call him a native of Provence. The cauſe of this error might very well be, that ſome author having not regularly formed the letters of the word *Provins*, the Compoſitor to the preſs put down *Provens*, and the Corrector changed it into *Provence*. La Popliniere having juſt read that Villegaignon was of Provence, did thereupon ſtile him a native of that country.

(54) La Popeliniere, Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires, *livr. viii, pag.* 450, 451.

VILLENA, a Marquiſate on the confines of New Caſtile [*A*], and of the kingdoms of Murcia and Valencia, did belong to Don John Emanuel, *the moſt potent* lord

in

[*A*] *Villena, a Marquiſate on the confines of New Caſtile.*] Mr Baudrand ſaith that Villena, the chief place of the territory of that name, *caput agri cognominis*, is in the kingdom of Murcia (1): but having juſt now conſulted a map of Sanſon, printed in 1663, I there find Villena placed in New Caſtile. Mr du Puy,

in

(1) Baudr. Geograph. *Tom. ii, pag.* 383.

in Spain, next to the king (*a*) in the XIVth century. He had a daughter, who, in the year 1350, married Don Henry Count de Tranſtamara, natural ſon of Don Alfonſo XI, King of Caſtile (*b*). The Count becoming King of Caſtile by the depoſition of Don Pedro the Cruel, in the year 1366 (*c*), gave the Marquiſate of Villena to Don Alfonſo of Arragon, Count of Denia, and couſin to the King of Arragon (*d*). This new Marquis of Villena grew very great. King John I, being deſirous to make a Conſtable in his kingdom of Caſtile, as there was one in France, and another in Arragon, created that dignity in the year 1382, and conferred it on this Marquis (*e*). And by his laſt will, in caſe he ſhould die during the minority of his ſon, the government of the young King and of the kingdom, was intruſted to this Conſtable in conjunction with ſome other lords (*f*). He died in the year 1390, and his ſon Don Henry III, being ſcarce eleven years of age (*g*), guardians were to be choſen for him, and a council was requiſite to be appointed in order to govern the realm. Several difficulties aroſe from the King's will, on account of which it was not obſerved; nevertheleſs our Marquis of Villena was one of thoſe to whom the regency was intruſted (*h*). He was then in Arragon (*i*), and becauſe he adhered to the malecontents, and demanded the execution of the deceaſed King's teſtament, he was deprived of the office of Conſtable of Caſtile (*k*). He aſked it again of King Henry III, at Illeſca, in the year 1393, the firſt time he had the honour to congratulate him (*l*); and was promiſed it, provided he would accompany the King to Caſtile; but excuſing himſelf from this, he never recovered that dignity (*m*), but received alſo other ill treatments [*B*]. He was created Duke of Gandia by the King of Arragon in the year 1399 (*n*), and had two ſons (*o*), who married two aunts (*p*) of Don Henry III, King of Caſtile. One of the ſons was the father of a Marquis of VILLENA, who was a lover of learning, and paſſed for an egregious Magician [*C*]. This Marquiſate in the year 1445, was given to John Pacheco the favourite of Prince Henry, ſon of John II, King of Caſtile (*q*). The ſon of this Pacheco having endeavoured to make the kingdom of Caſtile devolve on the Portugueze by the marriage of the King of Portugal with the pretended daughter of King Henry IV, thereby expoſed himſelf to great

(*a*) Mayerne Turquet, Hiſt. d'Eſpagne, *livr. xv, pag.* 647.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 691.

(*d*) Mariana, de Rebus Hiſpaniæ, *lib. xvii, cap. vii, pag. m.* 109.

(*e*) Idem, *lib. xviii, cap. v, pag.* 143.

(*f*) Mayerne Turquet, *livr. xvii, pag.* 765.

(*g*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 764.

(*h*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 766.

(*i*) Mariana, ubi ſupra, *lib. xviii, cap. xv, pag.* 165.

(*k*) Mayerne Turquet, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 770.

(*l*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 785, 786.

(*m*) Mariana, *lib. xix, cap. iv, pag.* 180.

(*n*) *Ibid. cap. ix, pag.* 190. Note, that perhaps this paſſage of Mariana ought to be underſtood of the ſon, and not of the father.

(*o*) Idem, *cap. viii, pag.* 188.

(*p*) They were two natural daughters of Don Henry II.

(*q*) Mariana, *lib. xxii, cap. iv, p.* 294.

---

in his Hiſtory of the Favourites relates, that in the reign of John II, King of Caſtile, and while *Alvaro de Luna* was in great favour, the Prince Don Henry of Arragon, in the year 1420, married *the Infanta Catherine ſiſter* to that *king, on whom was beſtowed the* Marquiſate of Villena, *which was erected into a Dutchy* (2). I believe this erection became null, becauſe I find in the ſame Mr du Puy that Pacheco, the favourite of Don Henry, ſon of John the ſecond, was made Marquis of Villena about the year 1445 (3). Mariana, and other Hiſtorians, do not give this Pacheco, or his ſon, any other title than that of Marquis of Villena.

[*B*] *He received alſo other ill treatments.*] I ſhall ſet down the words of Mayerne Turquet. 'The Marquis 'having cleared himſelf to the king of whatſoever was 'alledged againſt him, and advanced ſeveral excuſes 'why he did not come to court, requeſted the reſtau'ration of his office of Conſtable of Caſtile, of which 'he had been deprived by his Majeſty's guardians, in 'order to make room for D. Pedro, Count of Tran'ſtamara, in prejudice of his honour and dignity: to 'which the King made a tender and gracious anſwer, aſ'ſuring him that he would take all juſt and equitable care 'of his affairs: after which he deſired him to go with 'him into Old Caſtile, from which the Marquis excuſed 'himſelf, alledging that he was not come thither with 'a proper equipage to ſerve his Majeſty as he deſired, 'but, if he pleaſed to enable him, he would very wil'lingly ſerve him. He then returned to his ſeat ſomewhat 'diſguſted at King Henry, who took no care of the 'reſtauration of his office of Conſtable of Caſtile, but 'ſome time afterwards, by advice of the Archbiſhop 'of Toledo, deprived him of the title of Marquis of 'Villena, by reaſon it ſeemed unſafe and diſadvan'tageous to the ſtate of Caſtile, that a Marquiſate bor'dering on a foreign realm, ſhould remain in the 'hands of a gentleman who was ſo engaged, and 'nearly allied to the king and kingdom of Arragon 'as the Marquis D. Alfonſo was (4).'

[*C*] *He had two ſons who married . . . . one of them was . . . . father of the Marquis of* VILLENA *an egregious Magician.*] One of the two ſons of the Marquis of Villena was called Alfonſo, and the other Peter. Their wives portions were paid to the Engliſh to ranſom their father, and in order to releaſe Alfonſo who was hoſtage on that account. This Alfonſo cauſed himſelf to be divorced, not being able to ſuffer the public leudneſs of his wife (5). His brother Peter was killed in a battle. The king, Don Henry, taking the wives of theſe brothers under his protection, and reſenting their refuſal of reſtoring their portions, ſeized all their lands except the caſtles of Villena and Almanſa, which being fortified both by their ſituation and an Arragoneſe garriſon, held out againſt him (6). Peter of Arragon, the Marquis of Villena's ſon, left a ſon known by the name of Henry de VILLENA, who applied himſelf much to learning, and wrote ſome very learned books, tho' in an unpoliſhed ſtile: *Petrus ad Aliubarrotam ceciderat, ejus Henrici pater, cui à Villena cognomentum fuit, eruditionis tantum ſtudium, ut magica etiam ſacra, carminaque caluiſſe fama ſit. Extant ingenii monimenta: In quibus multa reconditaque eruditio eſt, elegantiæ parum quippe affectatæ, ſed horridæ, & cum Hiſpana lingua Latinam miſcentis* (7). He died at Madrid in the year 1434, having born with conſtancy, even to his old age, the injuries of Fortune, ſuch as the loſs of his eſtate and dignity (8). It was believed that his too great zeal after knowledge, engaged him in the ſtudy of Magic: his books, by the king's order, were ſubmitted to the examination of Brother Lopez de Barrientos, a Dominican, who was preceptor to the Prince of Aſturias, and the greateſt part of them were burnt. This diſpleaſed ſeveral perſons who were of opinion, that a library which had been collected at ſuch a great expence, might, without any danger, have been preſerved for the uſe of the learned. The Dominican publiſhed a defence of his conduct alledging the King's pleaſure for his apology. Mariana relates this fact in beautiful expreſſions: *Henricus Villena Madriti, ubi Rex erat, extinctus eſt, amiſſas opes, atque ampliſſimos honores ablatos, injuriamque fortunæ honeſtis ſolatiis ad extremam ſenectutem toleravit, tanto eruditionis ſtudio, ut ne à magicis quidem ſacris abſtinuiſſe feratur. Libri juſſu Regis Lupo Barriento Dominicano, Henricique Principis magiſtro examinandi ſunt traditi, quorum parte combuſta, multorum vituperationem incurrit, libros exiſtimantium magno comparatos, eruditorum uſibus ſine periculo noxaque ſervari debuiſſe. Regiam ille de ſcripto concepta defenſione, voluntatem excuſavit, cui repugnare fas non eſſet* (9). Mayerne Turquet ſuppoſes that only the magical manuſcripts of the Marquis's own compoſure were burnt, and farther he ſays, that even all of them were not committed to the flames (10). But had he taken the trouble to examine Mariana, he would have been more exact, and would have informed

(2) Peter du Puy, Hiſtoire des Favoris, *pag. m.* 146. *Du Chaintreau ſays the ſame thing in his Hiſtory of D. John II, King of Caſtile, pag.* 19, *of the* Paris *edition*, 1640.

(3) Id. ibid. *pag.* 229.

(4) Mayerne Turquet, Hiſt. d'Eſpagne, *livr. xvii, pag.* 786.

(5) Alfonſi conjugium diremptum ob male tectas uxoris libidines. *Mariana, ubi infra.*

(6) *Taken from* Mariana, *lib. xix, cap, viii, pag.* 188.

(7) Id. ibid.

(8) Mariana, *lib. xx, cap. vi, pag.* 221, *ſays that to make way for his being made great maſter of the order of* Calatrava *he divorced his wife Mary Albornos, who was very rich, and yielded to king Don Henry the marquiſate of Villena and other lands, and that the Knights of the Order created another Great Maſter, who was confirmed by the Pope about the year* 1413, *after a conteſtation that laſted ſix years.* Henricus, *adds Mariana,* in tantis litteris tantaque eruditione parum ſibi ſapuiſſe viſus eſt: repetitoque conjugio egenus vitæ reliquum exegit. - - *Henry, notwithſtanding all his learning and knowledge, ſeems not to have judged very wiſely for himſelf; and having married a ſecond time, he paſſed the remainder of his days in poverty.*

(9) Mariana, *lib. xxi, cap. vii, pag.* 264.

(10) A prince who made an ill uſe of his learning, applying himſelf to the deteſtable art of Magic, about which he wrote ſeveral tracts, which were moſt of them burnt by the King's order, and by virtue of the cenſure of Brother Lopez de Barrientos, who was then preceptor to Don Henry, Prince of Auſtrias. *Mayerne Turquet, Hiſt. d'Eſpagne, livr. xix, p.* 859, *ad ann.* 1434.

great troubles. His own vaſſals of the Marquiſate of Villena favoured the troops of Ferdinand, King of Arragon: the caſtle of Villena was taken, *and by that means the Marquiſate was re-united to the crown in the year* 1475, *with a promiſe never to alienate it* (r).

(r) Mayerne Turquet, *livr.* xxii, *pag.* 1019.

ed us that almoſt the whole library of this Lord was burnt. How abſurd is it to pretend that part of the magical books were ſpared? It is ſcarce poſſible to commit only one fault. This Hiſtorian having miſtaken the queſtion, hath improperly made uſe of a reſtrictive clauſe: and as he could not go on in his wrong poſition without being inconſiſtent with himſelf, he has committed a double error. There goes a pleaſant ſtory in Spain relating to this Marquis, of which I am informed by peruſing the relation of the differences betwixt Don John of Auſtria, and the Jeſuit Nitard. This Jeſuit publiſhed a manifeſto, to which an anſwer was made wherein the author feigns, 'That the Marquis of Villena accompanied by Don Pedro the Cruel, and the ghoſt of Pedro Hernandes, three perſons very well known, were come from the other world on purpoſe to refute him with the greater liberty (11).' I need not ſay any thing of the ſpeech aſcribed to Don Pedro: I ſhall only ſet down the beginning of what the ſecond actor ſays. 'The other old man taking up the diſcourſe told him, for my part, my Lord, I am the Marquis of Villena, who rendred myſelf famous in the world by Aſtrology, and the invention of the bottle, into which it is reported I cauſed myſelf to be put piece-meal, in order to diſcover the events of future ages through the glaſs, and what ſhould happen at this preſent time; and indeed it is ſo, for it was impoſſible that a man of my quality and humour ſhould forbear cauſing himſelf to be cut in pieces to ſee the preſent events, the ſubverſion of this monarchy by a private man...... It is true I cauſed myſelf to be cut to pieces, I cannot conceal it, to ſee a man born in Germany, where the laws are ſo different from ours, become the arbitrator of our faith. I cauſed myſelf to be cut to pieces, out of curioſity to ſee a Queen, who ſhould have governed Spain according to our laws, chooſe for her Director, &c (12).'

(11) A relation of the differences which happened in Spain betwixt Don John of Auſtria, and Cardinal Nitard, *Tom. i, pag.* 97, *Dutch edition*, 1677.

(12) Ib. *p.* 160.

VINAY (Alexander de), miniſter of the Reformed Church of Annonai, publiſhed a book in the year 1626 [*A*], and in the Epiſtle Dedicatory he obſerved that a famous prelate (*a*) about thirty years before had wrote that the town of Annonai *was older in Hereſy than Geneva* (*b*).

(*a*) Peter de Villars, Archbiſhop of Vienne, *Tom. ii*, of his *Opuſc. Epiſt. Clem. VIII.*

(*b*) Compare what is ſaid in the remark [*D*], of the article RICHER.

[*A*] *He publiſhed a book in the year* 1626.] It was printed at Geneva, contains 634 pages in 8vo, and is intituled, *The acts of the conference held at Annonay, from the* 10th *of December* 1625, *to the* 25th *of February* 1626, *betwixt Alexander de Vinay miniſter of the goſpel, and John Francis Martinecourt, a Jeſuit, concerning the opinion of the Fathers, on the ſufficiency of the ſcripture, and on the Euchariſt: To which is added, a continuation of both articles, and a treatiſe of Purgatory by the ſaid Vinay.* I could not find this Jeſuit in Alegambe's *Bibliotheque*, which makes me think that he gave no counter-relation of this diſpute. Yet it was cuſtomary for each party to publiſh the acts of theſe conferences, and to attribute the victory to his own ſide.

VIRET (Peter) a Proteſtant miniſter, was born at Orbe (*a*) a ſmall town in the canton of Berne in the year 1511. He ſtudied at Paris where he became acquainted with Farel, whoſe fellow-labourer he was afterwards in the eſtabliſhment of the Reformation in ſome towns of Switzerland (*b*). He went with him to Geneva in the year 1534, and ſtrenuouſly ſeconded him in whatever was requiſite for the abolition of Popery (*c*). The city of Lauſanne having embraced the Reformation in the year 1536, Peter Viret was called to exerciſe the miniſterial function there. He diſcharged it ſo well, that he acquired the love and eſteem of the inhabitants. This appeared by the difficulty they made of lending him to the Church of Geneva for ſix months, when the abſence of Calvin made that Church ardently deſire the preſence of Viret (*d*). To make this the more intelligible, I ought to mention that Calvin being reſolved to return to Geneva, from whence he had been baniſhed (*e*), could not come back at the deſired time, being engaged to go to the conferences at Ratiſbon (*f*). During this time Viret very ſucceſsfully ſerved the Church of Geneva (*g*). Calvin being re-united to his flock, paſſionately deſired Viret for his colleague (*h*), but had not that ſatisfaction. Viret was recalled to Lauſanne, where he admirably well diſcharged all the duties of his office, until the Proteſtants of France by their entreaties obtained him for the Church of Lyons (*i*) [*A*]. Which

(*a*) In the Païs de Vaud.

(*b*) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. Exter. *pag.* 120, 121.

(*c*) Spanhemius, in Geneva reſtituta, *pag.* 65.

(*d*) Leti, Hiſtoria Genevrina, *Tom. iii, pag.* 70.

(*e*) In the year 1538.

(*f*) In the year 1541.

(*g*) Leti, ubi ſupra, *Tom. ii, pag.* 70. *See alſo* Beza, in Vita Calvini, *ad ann.* 1541.

(*h*) See the remark [*E*].

(*i*) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 121.

[*A*] *The Proteſtants of France by their intreaties obtained him for the church of Lyons.*] Melchior Adam hath here left a gap, which ought to be ſupplied. He did not know that Viret ſerved the church of Niſmes, and afterwards that of Montpellier, before he went to be miniſter of Lyons. Of all which we are informed by Viret himſelf in an Epiſtle Dedicatory, dated from Lyons the 7th of December 1563. He there acquaints us, *That two years before that, he fell into a diſeaſe, which brought him ſo low, that he thought he had nothing to expect but the grave ..... that* GOD *had, as it were, plucked him by the hair of the head from amongſt the people, with whom he had paſſed the greateſt part of his life* (1)...... I know very well, *adds he*, that my Lords, and alſo my brothers and companions, and the whole Church of which God had appointed me miniſter, would not eaſily have conſented to my departure, and ſent me away, if they had not ſeen and known the neceſſity which the Lord was pleaſed to put upon me, and choſen rather that I ſhould ſerve in another place for the edification of the Church as weak as I am, than make an unprofitable ſtay amongſt them, without being able to ſerve either one Church or the other, as I deſired to do...... This is the method by which the Lord drew me from that Church which I had reaſon to love, as if he had taken me by the hand, in order to lead me faint and trembling with weakneſs and half dead, and bring me to you (2), who are the firſt in Languedoc, with whom I reſided after my departure from Geneva.' He very much praiſes his good reception at Niſmes, *though I looked*, continues he, *like a dry ſkeleton covered with ſkin, who had brought my bones to be buried there: inſomuch that even thoſe who were not of our religion, but very contrary to it, pitied me, crying out, wherefore doth this poor man come into this country? Doth he come for any thing elſe than to die in it? Nay, I have heard that the firſt time I aſcended the pulpit, ſeveral ſeeing me in that condition, feared that I ſhould faint before I had finiſhed the ſermon.*

Here are ſome things which I cannot comprehend nor explain; and perhaps Viret did not deſire they ſhould be manifeſt. He ſaith that he could no longer ſerve his old Church, which was the only reaſon why his ſuperiors gave him leave to depart. That reaſon could

(1) Viret, Epiſtle Dedicatory of the firſt volume of his *Inſtruction Chreſtienne.*

(2) He directs his ſpeech to the Reformed church of Niſmes.

which he ſerved very faithfully in the midſt of a thouſand difficulties, it being in the time of civil-wars, and the Plague *(k)*. He was obliged to quit Lyons when Charles IX, by an Edict explanatory of the peace concluded in March 1563, prohibited his Proteſtant ſubjects the having any miniſters born out of the realm *(l)*. Viret then retired to Orange, from whence the Queen of Navarre ſent for him to Bern *(m)*. He made a good uſe of his talents there till ſuch time as he died in the year 1571 [*B*]. He was a little man, and of a weak conſtitution *(n)*, which was yet impaired by the blows he received from a Prieſt, and the poiſon which was put into his victuals [*C*]; but he had a great ſhare

(k) Id. ib.

(l) The true and compleat Hiſtory of the Troubles, *book i, fol.* 6, *verſo, ad ann.* 1564.

(m) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra.

(n) Id. ibid.

could not be the ſtate to which his diſtemper had reduced him; for notwithſtanding that, he was able to ſerve the church of Niſmes. We might conjecture that this church was ſmaller than that of Lauſanne or Geneva, and that the ſame perſon who was not ſtrong enough to preach in a large church, might yet be able to perform that function to a ſmall auditory. But this conjecture is ſcarce ſatisfactory (3).

His Epiſtle Dedicatory to the ſecond tome of his *Chriſtian Inſtruction*, is a proof that he was afterwards miniſter of the church of Montpellier. This epiſtle is dated at Lyons the 12th of December 1563, and addreſſed to that church as a grateful acknowledgment of the favours he had received from them during the exerciſe of his miniſterial function there; and he takes notice of it as a happineſs that ſeveral of the Phyſicians and Surgeons of Montpellier were Proteſtants. Amongſt others, he mentions the Phyſic Profeſſors, *Rondellet*, *Saporta*, and their aſſociates, *Joubert*, *Feynes*, *Trial*; and *Michael Herouart* a *famous Surgeon*. I inſert this particular, becauſe it is unknown to ſeveral who are very well acquainted with the merit of thoſe illuſtrious Profeſſors.

In the eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches of France (4), we find a very excellent letter of Viret written from Niſmes on the 15th of January 1562 (5), to the miniſters of Languedoc *aſſembled in the colloquy of Montpellier*, in which he exhorts them to comply with the deſire of the court. By both the Epiſtles Dedicatory which I have cited, it appears that he was no trumpet of ſedition; but rather a man of a peaceable and moderate temper, who always diſſuaded the people from violence and popular commotions, to the utmoſt of his power. The ſame Hiſtory informs us (6), that he went to Montpellier *to recover his health, and began the exerciſe of his miniſtry there, the edict of January having been publiſhed on the 7th of February* 1562. Paſquier is certainly miſtaken when he ſaith that Viret preached at Paris towards the end of the year 1561 (7).

[*B*] *He made a good uſe of his talents* in Bern, *till ſuch time as he died in the year* 1571.] He taught at Orthez, as Melchior Adam obſerves (8). Some ſay he died there (9), but Moreri and ſeveral others affirm that he died at Pau: and very few authors there are who tell us, that he was for ſome time impriſoned in that country. D'Aubigné is the only one who informs me of it. He ſaith *that the Governor of a town which the Proteſtants took by aſſault in* 1569, *was diſcharged from his impriſonment on promiſe that he ſhould ranſom Peter Viret a miniſter, who was priſoner in Bern* (10). What is certainly to be depended on, is that this miniſter ended his days in the territories of the Queen of Navarre, and conſequently there is a falſity in the following words of Mr Ancillon. *Viret . . . . . taught for ſome time at Ortez, from whence he returned to Lauſanne, where he publiſhed books enough to make up a ſmall library* (11). Moſt of his works were publiſhed before he went into Bern, and therefore Mr Ancillon would be miſtaken, though he were in the right as to Viret's return to Lauſanne.

[*C*] *By the blows which he received from a Prieſt, and the poiſon which was put into his victuals.*] He was ſo violently beaten by a Prieſt, who treacherouſly attacked him, that he was left for dead on the ſpot (12). In the punning ages, they would have ſaid, that this Prieſt did not know how to form any other argument than thoſe in *Ferio*, and in *Barbara*. If he was unjuſt in having recourſe to ſuch means to prevent innovations, he was not leſs imprudent in giving over beating before he was ſure that the miniſter could never eſcape with life. On ſuch occaſions the maxim, ‘ Nunquam tentabis ut non perficias, - - - *Nothing* ‘ *ought to be attempted which cannot be accompliſhed,*’ ought to be well remembred. The ſame conſequences were drawn againſt the Church of Rome, from an unfiniſhed aſſaſſination, which would have been inferred from a compleated one. All thoſe who were capable of going by this rule, *a cauſe muſt be very bad, whoſe defenders murder thoſe who attack it*, drew the ſame concluſions from their miniſters being confuted by the blows of a cudgel or the fiſt. Wherefore the Prieſt who beat Viret, did as much miſchief to his cauſe by raiſing prejudices againſt it as if he had killed him; and by not killing him he left his cauſe expoſed to great dangers. For Viret armed with reſentment more vigorouſly endeavoured the deſtruction of Popery, and took very effectual meaſures to that purpoſe. He ſought out the abſurdities of their errors, and compiled in French, ſeveral diverting books filled with ralleries on that head. Books of this ſort are of all others the moſt dangerous that can be publiſhed (13); ſo that if we conſider it only on the ſide of intereſt, the Swiſs Prieſt would have done very well not to have reckoned Viret dead, without unqueſtionable proofs. The certificate of two Surgeons perhaps would not have been too much.

But to come to the poiſon. Some ſay, it was given to Viret by a ſervant of a Canon of Geneva (14); others charge this crime on a woman ſuborned for that end by the Canons. However it be, the life of this good miniſter was endangered by it, and it is ſaid that this ill action compleated the ruin of the Roman Catholic cauſe at Geneva. And indeed at a critical time when both parties were almoſt equally ſtrong, nothing could more contribute to turn the balance in favour of the Reformed. A people wavering in their opinions, and full of ſuſpicions, will ſcarce ever find fault with this argument, *viz.* if theſe people maintained the cauſe of GOD, they would never make uſe of infamous ways in order to deſtroy their adverſaries. The author whom I am going to quote, adds, that there was a current report, that the Prieſts had reſolved to cauſe all the Reformed to be killed at once by poiſoning the bread which they uſed at the Lord's Supper. I am fully perſuaded that a report of this nature, ſpread all over the city, whether it were true or falſe, might have a more forcible effect on the minds of a great many people, than a hundred demonſtrative reaſons.
‘ Cum præterea venefica quædam, è *Breſſæ* comitatu
‘ vicino oriunda, quæ nigros ſuccos verbi divini Mini-
‘ ſtris tollendis miſcuerat, *P. Vireti* lethali morbo in
‘ ſcelere deprehenſa, ſed ad id flagitii à Canonicis con-
‘ ductam, fateretur, mirum quantum omnium animi à
‘ nefandarum artium inſtitoribus fuerint averſi, præ-
‘ ſertim cùm in vulgus innoteſceret, à ſacrificulis
‘ deliberatum de inficiendis ſymbolis ſacris, Cænæ
‘ Dominicæ celebrandæ deſtinatis, quò Evangelici
‘ omnes facili operâ in ſacratiſſimo ſuæ Religionis
‘ actu, ad generum Cereris non ſiccâ morte vel de-
‘ ſcenderent, vel deducerentur. Cujus flagitii, quod
‘ ne Thetis quidem ipſa univerſis ſuis undis abluerit,
‘ ſola cogitatio ingenti horrore & indignatione omnium
‘ animos confudit. Experimentis id genus aliis com-
‘ pluribus compertum omnes Clericorum machinas ad
‘ ſubruendam Evangelii inſtaurati ſtructuram compa-
‘ ratas, occulta Dei directione in ſummum ejus incre-
‘ mentum ceſſiſſe (15). *Moreover a certain Sorcereſs, born*
‘ *in the neighbouring county of Breſſe, had made up a*
‘ *poiſon, by which ſhe deſigned to cut off the Miniſters of*
‘ *the word of God: but when ſhe was detected in this*
‘ *crime by the dangerous diſeaſe with which the poiſon*
‘ *infected Peter Viret; and when ſhe confeſſed that the*
‘ *Canons had prompted and encouraged her to it, it can*
‘ *hardly be imagined how much the authors of theſe wicked*
‘ *arts were abhorred, eſpecially when it came to be known*
‘ *among the common people that the Prieſts intended to poi-*
‘ *ſon the holy ſymbols appointed for the celebration of the*

(3) See, the remark [*FF*], of the article CALVIN.

(4) In the fifth book, *pag.* 886, & *ſeq.*

(5) It is 1557, in Beza's Hiſtory of the Reformed churches of France, which is an error of the preſs.

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 888.

(7) Paſquier's Letters, *book iv*, *pag.* 201.

(8) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theolog. exter. *pag.* 121.

(9) Paulus Freherus, in Theatro, *pag.* 225.

(10) D'Aubigné, Hiſt. Univerſelle, *Tom. i, lib. v, ch. xii, pag. m.* 412, *ad ann.* 1569.

(11) Ancillon, Vie de Farel, *pag.* 217.

(12) Partim vulnera in agro Paterniacenſi à ſacrificulo ipſum per inſidias invadente inflicta uſque adeo gravia, ut jacentem pro mortuo reliquerit. *Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra.*

(13) See, above, the remark [*G*], of the article SAINTE-ALDEGONDE.

(14) Fuit corpuſculo per ſe imbecillo: quod naturæ vitium vehementer auxerunt partim venenum ipſi à Genevenſis cujuſdam Canonici ſervo propinatum, partim vulnera, &c. *Id. ibid. Theſe words and thoſe of the foregoing quotation, are taken from Beza,* in Iconibus.

(15) Fridericus Spanhemius, in Geneva Reſtituta, *pag.* 74, 75.

ſhare of learning, accompanied with a charming eloquence. He publiſhed a vaſt number of books [*D*]. He was pretty well ſkilled in the knowledge of the Pagan authors. This appears by a book (*o*) he publiſhed at Geneva in the year 1560, intituled, *Of True and Falſe Religion, concerning lawful and unlawful vows and oaths, and eſpecially the vows of*

‘ *ſacrament, and to deſtroy all the Proteſtants when engaged in the moſt ſacred act of their religion. The very thoughts of this vile and execrable deſign ſtruck the minds of all men with the greateſt horror and indignation. By ſeveral inſtances of this kind it appeared, that all the machinations deviſed by the Prieſts for the overthrow of the Church, did, by the ſecret direction of the Almighty* G O D, *greatly conduce to the increaſe and eſtabliſhment of it.*’ The concluſion of this paſſage is very judicious; the ill conduct of the Romiſh Clergy hath been a very ſucceſsful inſtrument for the increaſe of the Proteſtants. The Church of Rome could not have been attacked at a more favourable opportunity: her clergy were very ignorant, and very vicious, and, on the contrary, thoſe who preached up a reformation, were moſt of them eloquent and learned, and more or leſs acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek tongues; by virtue of which they got the better of the Prieſts in almoſt all diſputes. The Prieſts were not able to hold up againſt diſputants, who threatened them with the original languages of Holy Writ, and who eaſily made it appear that the religious practices, to which the people were ſubjected, were not preſcribed by the Scripture. Two or three ſermons of theſe miniſters in ſome pariſhes, ſerved to convert half the inhabitants. And what ſhould hinder it? Would the Romaniſts have offered reaſon againſt reaſon? But was it poſſible for a Prieſt or an ignorant Monk to ſucceed againſt Viret, or Farel? Not in the leaſt. They were then obliged to have recourſe to violent meaſures, to poiſoning, aſſaſſination, and other deteſtable means, which fully confirmed that a cauſe which defended itſelf in this manner was not of GOD.

Mr Leti informs us, that the name of the woman who poiſoned Viret was Mary Navau; that ſhe was born at Bourg in Breſſe; that at the ſollicitation of ſome Eccleſiaſtics, who promiſed her a good reward, ſhe fled to Geneva on pretence of being perſecuted for her religion; and acting the devout part, ſhe very effectually inſinuated herſelf into the good opinion of Farel, Viret, and Saunier, the three Geneva Miniſters; by which means ſhe found an opportunity of poiſoning the diſh of ſoop when Farel's two colleagues dined with him; that Farel and Saunier diſliking this ſoop did not eat of it, as Viret did, who was very well pleaſed with it, and immediately found the effects of the poiſon; that this woman was impriſoned on ſuſpicion, and that without being put to the torture, ſhe accuſed a Canon, and having confeſſed the whole crime, was hanged on the twenty-ſecond of April 1535; and that the Canon, out of reſpect to his family, was only baniſhed (16).

[*D*] *He publiſhed a vaſt number of books* (17).] I have already ſaid that he expoſed the ridiculous abſurdities of the adverſe party, and put on an air of humour and raillery. He examined their Ritual and Ceremonial; in a word, he engaged the Church of Rome rather on the practices ſhe permits in her Prieſts and Monks, than on her deciſions in her œcumenical councils. This was attacking her weakeſt ſide, for in our days thoſe who laboured with the greateſt addreſs to defend her (18), have requeſted us to diſtinguiſh betwixt what the councils preſcribe as an article of faith, and what is not obligatory, or is perhaps an abuſe. I ſhall here cite a long paſſage of Verheiden. ‘Sic ut Eccleſia Lugdunenſis frequentiſſima, aliæque vicinarum regionum, ob egregiam operam quam præſtitit in proſeminando Dei Verbo, hunc virum maxime coluerint, ſcriptaque tempori tum ingeniis riſu Papiſmum excipientibus ſummâ voluptate perlegerint. Is autem Viretus erat, qui Myſticam illam Papiſtaram Theologiam cognitam habebat: quam variis libris explicans lectori riſum ſæpe movet, propter mira illa miracula & ridicula quæ continet. Ethnicam præterea Theologiam cùm ex prophanis Scriptoribus hauſiſſet, eandem cum Papiſtarum Sacris ita contulit, tamquam hæc Romana Sacra Parellela eſſent Veterumque Romanorum horrendâ Idololatriâ plenis reſponderent. Fortè inter ſinceriores Theologos nullus fuit, qui myſticum illud Romani Jovis Regnum ita aperuit & perluſtravit atque hic Viretus, quod vel uno illo Centone (ut alia multa mittam) de Theatrica Miſſæ Saltatione, ex veteribus Poëtis conſarcinato, probari poteſt: qui lectorem, præcipuè in Poëtis verſatum, novo genere voluptatis (ut apud Belgas decantatum illud Apiarium Romanum) perfundit & recreat (19). - - - - *So that the church of Lyons, and others in the neighbourhood, had the greateſt veneration for this man, on account of his extraordinary diligence in propagating the word of* GOD; *and it was with the higheſt degree of pleaſure that they read his books, which were adapted to the humour of the times, people being then very much diſpoſed to laugh at Popery. Now Viret was a man who throughly underſtood the myſtical Divinity of the Papiſts, and in ſuch a height does he ſet it forth in the various books which he has written that he often moves the reader's laughter at the wonderful and ridiculous miracles contained in it. As he had likewiſe learned the Heathen Theology from prophane writers, he compared it with the Popiſh ceremonies in ſuch a manner as if thoſe were juſt parallel, and fully came up to the abominable idolatry of the antient Romans. Among all the true Divines, perhaps, no man has explained and revealed the myſtical kingdom of the Romiſh Jupiter ſo well as Viret; which might be very eaſily proved from that one poem of his, which he patched up and collected from the antient Poets* (*not to mention many more of his reflexions upon the theatrical ceremony of the maſs*). *This piece* (*like the* Apiarium Romanum, *ſo much talked of in Holland*) *will give a new pleaſure to the reader, eſpecially if he is much converſant with the Poets.*’

For the reſt, we ought not to imagine that all this author's works are of the character I have mentioned, nor that amongſt thoſe which are, any of them are tainted with buffoonry. He always obſerved a wiſe moderation. Take notice, that he did not confine himſelf to ſuperſtitions only, a very fit ſubject for rallery, but very ſeriouſly, and, with all due gravity, attacked the unbelievers. To this purpoſe I ſhall cite a long paſſage in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the ſecond tome of his Chriſtian Inſtruction, where we are informed that the multitude of unbelievers determined him to turn his arms againſt Deiſm. ‘There are ſeveral who indeed profeſs to believe that there is ſome Deity or God, as the Turks and Jews do: but as for JESUS CHRIST, and all thoſe things which the doctrine of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles teſtifies concerning him, they take them for fables and dreams. . . . It is much more, or at leaſt as difficult to deal with theſe people as with the Turks. For they entertain ſome opinions concerning religion, which are more extravagant than thoſe of the Turks, or any other Infidels. I hear that ſome of this band call themſelves Deiſts, a new word in oppoſition to that of Atheiſts. For the word Atheiſt ſignifies one that is without GOD, ſo they would hereby ſignify, that they are not without GOD, becauſe they believe that there is one, whom they even acknowledge for creator of Heaven and Earth, as well as the Turks: but as for JESUS CHRIST, they do not know who he is, nor do they believe in him or his doctrine.’ *Theſe Deiſts of whom we ſpeak*, adds Viret, *ridicule all* ‘*religion*, ‘tho' they accommodate themſelves to the religion of thoſe with whom they are obliged to live, out of complaiſance or fear: ſome among them have a kind of notion of the immortality of the ſoul; others agree with the Epicureans on that as well as on the Divine providence with regard to mankind: they think he doth not intermeddle with human affairs, and that they are either governed by fortune, or by the prudence and folly of men, according as things happen. I am ſtruck with horror, when I think that there are ſuch monſters among thoſe who bear the name of Chriſtians. But my horror is redoubled, when I conſider that ſeveral of thoſe who make profeſſion of learning and human Philoſophy, and even are frequently eſteemed the moſt learned, moſt acute and ſubtil genius's, are not only infected with this execrable Atheiſm, but alſo profeſs it, teach it, and poiſon ſeveral perſons with this venom. Wherefore we live in a time when we

AT what time the Deiſts began to be talked of.

(*o*) It is a book in 8vo, of 864 pages.

(16) *Taken from* Leti's Hiſtoria Genevrina, *Tom. ii, pag.* 541, 542.

(17) You will find the catalogue of them, in Geſner's Epit. *in Melchior Adam, ubi ſupra*, pag. 122, and in *Verbeiden, ubi infra*, pag. 120, 121.

(18) *The Biſhop of Condom in his*, Expoſition de la Doctrine Catholique.

(19) Verheiden, *in* Præſt. Theolog. Effigiebus, *pag.* 119, 120.

of perpetual continence, anathema, and execration, the ſacrifices of human victims, and excommunication in all Religions. Item, *Of the Jewiſh, Pagan, Turkiſh, and Popiſh Monkery, and the corporal as well as ſpiritual ſacrifices to Moloch.* His article in Moreri is confuſed, and falſe in ſeveral places [*E*].

I will mention a thing which I have read ſince the ſecond edition came out. It is that Viret employed the authority of the Papiſts to curb ſome dangerous ſects that were formed among the Proteſtants at Lyons. The author who tells me this draws a proof from it againſt Toleration, and in favour of the maxim *Compelle intrare, - - - - Compel them to come in* [*F*].

are in danger of having more difficulty in contending with theſe monſters, than with the ſuperſtitious and idolators, if GOD doth not, which I hope he will, prevent it. For amongſt the preſent differences in religion, ſeveral very much abuſe the liberty given them of chuſing which of the two contending religions they will adhere to. For ſeveral are of neither, and indeed live without any religion. And if thoſe who have no good opinion of any religion, would content themſelves to periſh alone in their error and Atheiſm, without infecting or corrupting others by their wicked diſcourſes and examples, and leading them into the ſame perdition with themſelves, this evil would not be ſo deplorable as it is. For this reaſon, in reviſing my Chriſtian Inſtruction, formerly printed, I have very much enlarged it, eſpecially on the head of the creation of the world, and the Divine providence towards all creatures, and particularly man, for two reaſons: Firſt, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt frequently in holy writ, propoſes this viſible world, as the great book of nature, and of true natural Theology, and all the creatures as preachers, and univerſal witneſſes of GOD their creator, and of his works and glory . . . . The other reaſon, which moved me to treat of theſe ſubjects ſo amply, is the preſent Atheiſm and it's profeſſors: of which I have already ſpoken (20).'

[*E*] *His article in Moreri is confuſed and falſe in ſeveral places.*] I. It is falſe that Viret and Farel joinedwith Calvin in order to preach up their new doctrines at Geneva, and drive out the Catholics in year 1535. Calvin did not go to Geneva till 1536. II. *Moreri ſays, that when Calvin departed for the conference at Worms, Viret was called to preach at Geneva,* whereby he gives us clearly to underſtand, that Calvin ſet out from Geneva. But that is falſe. He had been at Straſburgh two or three years, when he went to thoſe conferences. III. It is ridiculous to beſtow the title of *preference* on Viret's vocation, for the people of Geneva had recourſe to Viret only, becauſe they could not oblige Calvin to return home before the holding of the Conferences. This ſhews us that Moreri was perſuaded that Calvin went from Geneva at that time; for his meaning is, that this miniſter was very ſorry that he was deputed to the conferences, and that, during his abſence, Viret ſhould perform the miniſterial function. IV. It is very falſe that Calvin *teſtified a diſpleaſure at* the calling of Viret. V. It is very falſe *that he managed it ſo well that they ſent back his competitor.* VI. It is very falſe *that the people of Lauſanne had much ado to receive Viret* (21). Calvin was ſo far from being deſirous that his pretended competitor ſhould be ſent back to Lauſanne, that on the contrary he made preſſing efforts to retain him at Geneva. Melchior Adam, one of the authors whom Moreri cites, clearly teſtifies it (22). The ſame is atteſted by Theodorus Beza (23), and we have a litteral proof of this under Calvin's own hand, for thus he wrote to Farel: 'Quod bene vertat Deus, hic retentus ſum ut volebas: ſupereſt ut Viretum quoque mecum retineam, quem à me avelli nullo modo patiar. Tuæ quoque omniumque fratrum partes me hic adjuvare, niſi vultis me fruſtra excruciari, ac ſine commodo eſſe miſerrimum (24). - - - *What you deſired is come to paſs, I am kept here: God grant it may be for ſome good end. It remains that I ſhould likewiſe keep Viret, whom I will by no means ſuffer to be taken from me. In bringing this about, it behoves you, and all the bretheren to aſſiſt me, unleſs you would have me to undergo a great deal of uneaſineſs and trouble to no manner of purpoſe nor advantage.*' I ſhall, by the way, obſerve a miſtake of Mr Hoſman. He ſaith, that Viret being Miniſter at Lauſanne in the year 1535, was called to Geneva: than which nothing is more falſe. He was Miniſter at Geneva in the year 1534, and before he was at Lauſanne.

[*F*] *He employed the authority of the Papiſts to curb ſome . . . . ſects . . . . The author who tells me this draws a proof from it . . . . in favour of the maxim . . . . Compel them to come in.*] 'The firſt edict of pacification was no ſooner publiſhed in France than inſtantly there ſprung up a ſect of Arians at Lyons, which had been long hatched there, and in other places, by a German and an Italian, who were the heads of it. For this reaſon Mr Peter Viret, then a Miniſter of Lyons, was preſſed to have recourſe to Mr Buatier, great Vicar of the Archbiſhop of that city, in order to quench that growing fire, which threatened a great conflagration, if it ſhould be allowed time to gather ſtrength. And indeed, the Poſtellians, the Trinitarians, or Servetiſts, and others, even the Atheiſts and Deiſts, were ready to ſhew themſelves; all of them pretending that they ought to enjoy the benefit of the edict, which in general provided, that no man ſhould be moleſted for the ſake of his conſcience. It is likewiſe ſaid that all the forementioned ſectaries, and others, boaſted that their faith was grounded on texts or reaſons, as pertinently drawn from Scripture as any which the Calviniſts could alledge to prove their opinions: to ſuch a heighth of impudence does a preſumptuous aſſertion come when it invades the place of truth. Such was the extremity to which the deſire of liberty of conſcience had almoſt reduced us. Such was the prodigious confuſion in which religion was very near ſwallowed up; and in this manner was the different variety of opinions ready to extinguiſh the faith of ſeveral, and to raiſe doubts that could not be ſolved in the minds of believers. Theſe reaſons induced me to believe that we ought to be very humble in our opinions, and wholly ſubmit them to the determinations of the holy, apoſtolical, and Roman Catholic church (25). . . . . I ſay, that we ought to give up our ſenſes and our human underſtandings, in order to believe through faith what, by reaſon of our infirmity, we cannot otherwiſe comprehend. We ought alſo to obey our ſuperiors, according to the Scripture; without ſeeking to find them guilty of faults, which are not ſubject to our correction: . . . But if ſome men are ſo hard to work upon, that they will obſtinately perſiſt in deſpiſing and ſeparating themſelves from the true Church, in that caſe we ſhould follow the advice of the Prophet (26), who ſays; *Coge eos intrare,- - - compel them to come in.*' Compare with this what I have quoted from the ſame author in the article STELLINGI.

---

(20) Viret, Epiſtle Dedicatory of the ſecond volume of his Chriſtian Inſtruction. It was printed in 1563.

(21) They could hardly be prevailed upon to ſend him to Geneva for half a year.

(22) Reverſus Calvinus omnem quidem movit lapidem ut ne Vireto ſpoliaretur, quo ſublato eccleſiam ſalvam retinere ſe poſſe negabat: ſed Viretus apud ſuos *Lauſanenſes* agere maluit. *Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra. pag.* 121. *See alſo, pag.* 73.

(23) Beza, in Vita Calvini, *ad ann.* 1541.

(24) Calvin. Epiſt. l. *pag. m.* 109, 110. That letter is dated on the 16th of September, 1543. but this date ſeems to be falſe; it ſhould be 1541, for it were an abſurd thing that Calvin writing to a miniſter of Neufchatel, ſhould tell him as a piece of news that he was returned to Geneva, two years after his arrival.

(25) Pierre de St Julien, Meſlanges Paradoxales, *pag.* 202, 203, 204, *and ſpeaks in the following manner before, pag.* 189, 190. 'A liberty of conſcience cannot be granted, but an infinite number of ſects (the greateſt part of them abominable) will ſtrait appear, and claim the ſame privilege: as it happened at Lyons, when it was provided by the edict of Pacification that no perſon ſhould be diſturbed for his conſcience ſake: inſtantly a German ſtarted up with a new tribe of Arians, a great deal worſe than the firſt. They thought to ſhelter themſelves under the ſame edict: for which reaſon the Vicar-General to the Archbiſhop of Lyons, and Mr Peter Viret, Superintendent of the pretended Calviniſtical church in that city, were obliged to unite their ſtrength, in order to give a check to theſe Arians, who made liberty of conſcience a cloak for their wickedneſs.'

(26) He ſhould have ſaid of Jeſus Chriſt in the *Goſpel according to St Luke,* ch. xiv, ver. 23.

VIRGIL, in Latin *Publius Virgilius Maro*, the moſt excellent of all the antient Roman Poets, flouriſhed in Auguſtus's time. He was born on the fifteenth of October, in the year of Rome 683, in a village (*a*) not far from Mantua. He ſpent his firſt years at Cremona (*b*); after which he made ſome ſtay at Milan, and then went to Naples, where he ſtudied with the greateſt diligence the Latin and Greek Literature, as he did afterwards the Mathematics and Phyſic. Some authors ſay, that he was far from being chaſte in his youth; others, on the contrary, aſſure us that he was ſo modeſt, ſo reſerved, and regular in his words and deportment, that the inhabitants of Naples gave him

---

(*a*) *Called* Andes. *See* Donatus, in Vita Virgilii.

(*b*) Initio ætatis, id eſt uſque ad ſeptimum annum, Cremonæ egit. *Donatus, ibid. Du Verdièr Vau-Privas, Proſopogr.* Tom. i, pag. 766, and ſeveral others ſay that he ſtudied at Cremona, when he was 17 years old.

him a ſirname, derived from Virginity [*A*]. This affords me matter for a long remark,

[*A*] *A ſirname derived from Virginity.*] The life of Virgil, aſcribed to Donatus, informs us, that he was very ſober, but that he was reported to be inclined to the unnatural ſin; that equitable perſons gave no credit to this rumour, and believed he had no other affection for youth, than what reſulted from his intention of inſtructing them (1); that his lying with Plotia Hieria was talked of, but that he frequently ſaid that he always refuſed the ſhare in that miſtreſs which Varius offered him. *Vulgatum eſt conſueviſſe eum cum Plotia Hieria. Sed Aſconius Pedianus affirmat ipſum poſtea minoribus natu narrare ſolitum, & invitatum quidem ſe à vario ad communionem mulieris, verum ſe pertinaciſſime recuſaſſe* (2). The following words are very remarkable, for they affirm, not as a report, but as a certain truth, that the inhabitants of Naples gave him the ſirname of Virginal, by reaſon of the purity of his words and manners. *Cetera ſane vita & ore & animo tam probum fuiſſe* CONSTAT, *ut Neapoli Parthenias vulgo appellaretur.* Here follows a manifeſt proof of his modeſty. He preferred living retired in the country, to reſiding at Rome, where he was admired. He ſeldom went thither, and ſo little affected appearing there, that when he obſerved that he was followed and ſhewed, he ran into the firſt houſe he found open. *Si quando Romæ, quò rariſſime commeabat, viſeretur in publico, ſectantes demonſtranteſque ſe ſubterfugere ſolitum in proximum tectum* (3). What is certain, is, that in his youth he wrote ſome laſcivious verſes. This is not to be doubted, ſince Pliny (4), who had likewiſe done ſo, juſtifies himſelf by many great examples, and namely by that of Virgil. ‘Nec vero moleſte fero hanc eſſe de moribus meis exiſtimationem, ut qui neſciunt talia doctiſſimos, graviſſimos, ſanctiſſimos homines ſcriptitaſſe, me ſcribere mirentur. Ab illis autem quibus notum eſt quos quantoſque auctores ſequar facile impetrari poſſe confido ut . . . . An ego verear . . . . ne me non ſatis deceat quod decuit M. Tullium, Caïum Calvum. . . . Neronem tranſeo, quamvis ſciam, non corrumpi in deterius, quæ aliquando etiam à malis; ſed honeſta manere, quæ ſæpius à bonis fiunt. Inter quos vel præcipue numerandus eſt P. Virgilius, Corn. Nepos, & prius Ennius, Acciuſque, non quidem hi Senatores, ſed ſanctitas morum non diſtat ordinibus (5). - - - - *I am not concerned that ſuch people ſhould have a bad opinion of my morals, and wonder at my writing theſe things, who do not know that very learned, grave, and virtuous men have done ſo before me. But from ſuch as know what great examples I follow, I am confident that I ſhall obtain . . . . Have I any reaſon to be afraid . . . . leſt that ſhould not become me which became Cicero, Caius Calvus, ... I paſs by Nero, tho' I am ſenſible that things are not the worſe for being ſometimes practiſed even by bad men; but that ſuch things muſt be reckoned honeſt which are frequently practiſed by the good and virtuous. In this number we ought chiefly to reckon Virgil, Cornelius Nepos, and before their time Ennius and Accius. Theſe, indeed, were no ſenators: but an uprightneſs of manners is alike valuable in all ranks.*’ The writer of this Poet's life makes him the author of the *Priapeia*, and ſome learned men (6) will have this piece, which is ſtill extant under this name, to be really Virgil's: but it is more reaſonable to believe that it is a collection of poems written by ſeveral authors. We have ſeen, above, that Auſonius alledges Virgil's example in his juſtification (7); but it is a little ſurprizing that he only mentions ſome paſſages of his Georgics, and Æneis; for thoſe places are but little to his purpoſe: ‘Quid etiam Partheniam dictum cauſa pudoris? qui octavo Æneïdos, quum deſcriberet coitum Veneris atque Vulcani, αἰσχροσεμνίαν decenter immiſcuit. Quid in tertio Georgicorum de ſummiſſis in gregem maritis, nonne obſcenam ſignificationem honeſta verborum tranſlatione velavit? Et ſi quid in noſtro joco aliquorum hominum ſeveritas veſtita condemnat, de Virgilio accerſitum ſciat (8). - - - *What ſhall we ſay of Virgil, ſirnamed Parthenias, on account of his modeſty? Doth not he, in his eighth Æneis, deſcribe the conjugal embraces of Venus and Vulcan, with a kind decency and reſerve? And in the third book of his Georgics, where he talks of* Maritis ſummiſſis in gregem, *does not he couch an obſcene meaning under decent expreſſions? Wherefore if any man ſhall cenſure my jocoſe way of writing out of a pretended ſeverity, let him know that I have Virgil for my pattern.*’ He had better have imitated Pliny the younger, who doubtleſs aimed at ſome particular ſmall poems, in which Virgil expreſſed himſelf too licentiouſly on wanton ſubjects. The paſſage of the Æneis which Auſonius points out, contains nothing too bold for thoſe times: thoſe who cenſured it deſerve rather the title of Cavillers than of Critics: and it is very obſervable, that part of thoſe who did not entirely approve it, beſtowed great elogies on the Poet, as Aulus Gellius informs us. ‘Annianus poëta & plerique cum eo ejuſdem Muſæ viri ſummis aſſiduiſque laudibus hos Virgilii verſus ferebant; quibus Volcanum & Venerem junctos mixtoſque jure conjugii, rem lege naturæ operiendam, verecunda quadam tralatione verborum quum oſtenderet demonſtraretque, protexit: ſic enim ſcripſit:

. . . . Ea verba locutus
Optatos dedit amplexus; placidumque petivit
Conjugis infuſus gremio per membra ſoporem.

Minus autem difficile eſſe arbitrabantur in iſtiuſmodi re dicenda verbis uti uno atque altero brevi tenuique eam ſigno demonſtrantibus. . . . . . Tot verò & tam evidentibus ac tamen non prætextatis, ſed puris honeſtiſque verbis venerandum illud concubii pudici ſecretum neminem quemquam alium dixiſſe (9). - - - *The Poet Annianus, and ſeveral others with him, beſtow the greateſt praiſes on theſe verſes of Virgil, wherein he deſcribes Venus and Vulcan in the height of conjugal familiarity; a thing which the light of nature forbids to be expoſed, and which for that reaſon he vails under a modeſt and diſcreet metaphor, at the ſame time that he gives a ſtrong and lively repreſentation of it; for in this manner does he write:*

Trembling he ſpoke, and eager of her charms,
He ſnatch'd the willing goddeſs to his arms;
'Till in her lap infus'd he lay poſſeſs'd
Of full deſire, and ſunk to pleaſing reſt.
DRYDEN.

They thought it leſs difficult in a thing of this kind to make uſe of one or two words which give a ſhort and ſlight hint of it. . . . . . But that no man beſides himſelf had ever told the venerable ſecrets of the marriage-bed in ſo many words, which were ſo clear, and at the ſame time ſo pure and chaſte without the leaſt mixture of obſcenity.’ Let us ſee how he hath cenſured a more rigid Critic. ‘Annæus Cornutus, homo ſanè pleraque alia non indoctus neque imprudens, in ſecundo tamen librorum, quos de figuris ſententiarum compoſuit, egregiam totius iſtius verecundiæ laudem inſulſa nimis & odioſa ſcrutatione violavit. Nam quum genus hoc figuræ probaſſet, & ſatis circumſpectè factos eſſe verſus dixiſſet; *membra* tamen, inquit, paulò incautiùs nominavit (10). - - - *Annæus Cornutus, a man who in moſt other things wanted neither learning nor ſenſe, has nevertheleſs in his ſecond book on the figures of ſpeech, ſought to diminiſh the noble praiſe that is due to the modeſty of this paſſage, by an inſipid and odious ſcrutiny. For whereas he had approved this kind of figure, and owned that the verſes were wrote with great circumſpection, he adds notwithſtanding that the word* membra *was introduced ſomewhat too raſhly.*’ To which may be added likewiſe the following, ‘Quod Annæus Cornutus verſus Virgilii, quibus Veneris & Vulcani concubitum pudice operteque dixit, reprehenſione ſpurca & odioſa inquinavit *. - - - *That Annæus Cornutus has with an unclean and odious cenſure defiled that paſſage of Virgil, where he chaſtly and covertly deſcribes the conjugal familiarities of Venus and Vulcan.*’ The gravity and modeſty which reign throughout the Æneis are indeed admirable. Was it poſſible for any body to have uſed fewer words than Virgil has done, on the cave where Æneas and Dido conſummated their marriage? His Bucolics are not ſo modeſt; he there relates very criminal paſſions, but that is no proof that he was tainted with them. The paſſion for boys was not leſs common in the Pagan remark, and an opportunity of refuting an obſervation, which we find in the *Anti-Baillet*

---

(1) Cibi vinique minimi: fama eſt eum libidinis pronioris in pueros fuiſſe. Sed boni ita eum pueros amaſſe putaverunt, ut Socrates Alcibiadem. *Donatus, in Vita Virgilii.*

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) That is, Pliny the younger.

(5) Plinius, Epiſt. iii, *lib. v.*

(6) Joannes Maria Catanæus is one of them. See his Commentary upon Pliny the younger, *pag.* 290.

(7) In the article VAYER, citation (25).

(8) Auſonius, in Centone nuptiali, *ſub finem, pag. m.* 519.

(9) Aulus Gellius, *lib. ix, cap. x.*

(10) Id. ibid.

* Id. ibid.

Pagan times than that for girls, ſo that a writer of Eclogues might make his ſhepherds talk according to this curſed faſhion, as we at preſent make the heroes and heroines of Romances ſpeak; that is to ſay, without its being a ſign that he related his own adventures, or approved the paſſions he mentioned. Our beſt French Romances have been compoſed for a long time by maids or married women. Would it be reaſonable to ſay that they write the Hiſtory of their own amours, or that they approve their heroines ſuffering themſelves to be ſo ſenſibly affected with the paſſion of love (11)? Is it not certain that they may write theſe books only to diſcover their wit, and their art of painting the paſſions, and repreſenting characters? We may ſuppoſe the ſame thing in favour of Virgil, ſince on other accounts we have reaſon to believe that he was endowed with a great ſhare of virtue. I own that there went ſeveral ſtories not much to his reputation; but thoſe who relate them repreſent them only as rumors (12), whilſt they aſſure us as a certain truth that his modeſty and probity were extraordinary. Beſides the ſtories already related, we are told (13) that Varus the tragic Poet married a very learned woman, who lay with Virgil, and to whom he gave a tragedy of his compoſure, which ſhe made her huſband believe was her own, and that Varus recited it as his own performance. It is farther added that Virgil obſcurely hints this adventure in three verſes of his third Eclogue:

An mihi cantando victus non redderet ille,
Quem mea carminibus meruiſſet fiſtula, caprum?
Si neſcis, meus ille caper fuit.

An honeſt man may freely take his own;
The goat was mine, by ſinging fairly won.
A ſolemn match was made, he loſt the prize:
Aſk Damon, aſk, if he the debt denies.

DRYDEN.

But Servius rejects this as a thing which no author had mentioned, and which was repugnant to the nature of paſtoral Poetry. *Superfluam volunt eſſe allegoriam, dicentes rem nuſquam lectam de Virgilio. . . . . . Melius ſimpliciter accipimus: refutandæ enim ſunt allegoriæ in bucolico certamine: niſi, ut ſupra diximus, ex aliqua agrorum perditorum neceſſitate deſcendunt* (14). And it plainly enough appears to be a vain imagination of ſome perverſe genius's, who hunt after allegories and myſteries every where, and are never pleaſed with any thing which is natural. The moſt forcible objection againſt Virgil would be to repreſent him as the author of ſome *Priapeia*. But that reaſon alone is of no great weight againſt his manners; for as there are men of honour and virtue, who read obſcene books without any ill deſign, ſo there are ſuch who may compoſe laſcivious verſes without corrupting their mind. It is reported that St Chryſoſtome frequently read Ariſtophanes, and it is certain that St Jerom often read Plautus. See the remark [*B*] in the article LONGUS, and the Epiſtle Dedicatory to Scioppius's notes in *Priapeia*. Will any one preſume to rank Joſeph Scaliger, Janus Douza, Daniel Heinſius, and the Preſident Mainard amongſt the debauchees, and urge as reaſons for it that the firſt wrote notes on the Priapeia and Catullus; that the ſecond very curiouſly commented on Petronius (15); that the third publiſhed ſome laſcivious verſes; and that the fourth wrote a Priapeia (16)? When we believe it impoſſible for another to touch upon ſuch things without being infected, we too plainly diſcover the weak efforts which we find ourſelves capable of making againſt the like objects. ‘In iis, quæ turpicula & laſciviuſcula ſunt, ille qui, ut ait Ariſtoteles, bonâ inſtitutione præmunitus eſt, offendere nequit. Adeò ut, molliculos iſtos, qui vel una tali & altera lectione verberantur, & ad nequitiam abducuntur, ſua ſibi culpa & in Venerem putredine, perire videas. Haud ſecus, ac ſi terribili objecta re timidus expaveſcat, fortis non adficiatur (17). - - - - *As for thoſe things which are ſomewhat obſcene and laſcivious, the man who, as Ariſtotle ſays, is forearmed with a good education, cannot offend. So that theſe effeminate creatures who are ſtruck and hurried on to leudneſs by reading one or two things of this kind, periſh, as you ſee, through their own fault and laſcivious diſpoſition: juſt like a coward who is frightened out of his ſenſes at the ſight of a terrible object, while a brave man is not at all moved.*’ This makes me remember a thought of Moliere. His Tartuffe, being juſt ready to hear a young woman ſpeak, pulls out a handkerchief, and ſays;

. . . . Ah! mon Dieu, je vous prie,
Avant que de parler, prenez-moy ce mouchoir.
. . . .
Couvrez ce ſein, que je ne ſaurois voir.
Par de pareils objets les ames ſont bleſſées,
Et cela fait venir de coupables penſées.

. . . . Let me beſeech you e'er you ſpeak,
Firſt take this handkerchief, and hide from me
That youthful boſom which I cannot ſee.
Such objects ſet the very ſoul on fire,
And raiſe in us a culpable deſire.

But obſerve the young woman's anſwer:

Vous êtes donc bien tendre à la tentation;
Et la chair, ſur vos ſens, fait grande impreſſion?
Certes, je ne ſai pas quelle chaleur vous monte:
Mais à convoiter, moy, je ne ſuis point ſi promte;
Et je vous verrois nû du haut juſques en bas,
Que toute voſtre peau ne me tenteroit pas (18).

Strongly your ſenſe obeys the carnal lure,
And you are eaſy to be tempted ſure.
The meaning of ſuch heat I cannot find,
To which myſelf ſo little am inclin'd:
For I could view your naked ſkin all o'er,
Yet ſtill remain untempted as before.

There may be ſome Poets, Caſuiſts, and Critics, hardened in the ſame manner againſt thoſe dangerous objects, which others cannot read with impunity. Lipſius proteſts that the reading of Petronius affected only his mind, and left no more traces in his heart, than a boat does on a river. ‘Vidiſtin' quidquam venuſtius, argutius (*Petronio*) poſt natas Muſas? Non ego: abeſſet tantùm nuda illa nequitia; quâ tamen nihil offendor. joci me delectant, urbanitas capit: cetera nec in animo nec in moribus meis magis labem relinquunt, quàm olim in flumine veſtigium, cymba. Ut vina appoſita vinoſum movent; invinium, ut antiqui loquebantur, non movent: ſic iſta animum jam antè improbum fortaſſe incitent; caſto & caſtigato non adhærent (19). - - - *Have you ever ſeen any thing from the birth of the Muſes to this time more elegant and witty than Petronius? For my part I have not; excepting only his barefaced obſcenity, which nevertheleſs does not ſhock me. I am delighted with his humour, charmed with his politeneſs: and as for the other things they leave no more any ſtain upon my mind or manners than a boat leaves a trace upon a river long after it has paſſed. For as wine tranſports the drunkard when it is ſet before him, but does not at all affect the ſober man; ſo theſe things may poſſibly inflame a mind that was vitious before, but they make no durable impreſſion upon one that is chaſte and well-diſciplined.*’ If this be true, I dare aver that he might have made verſes or proſe narratives according to the model of this Romance, and preſerved his mind pure and untainted. Be pleaſed to apply this, *poſitis ponendis*, to the poetical amuſements of Virgil, which ſerved as an apology for Pliny the younger.

I ought not to forget the Biſhop of Avranches's ingenious conjecture concerning the name of Parthenias given to Virgil. Having obſerved that this appellation was perhaps beſtowed on him, becauſe it was believed of him as well as of Homer, that he was born of a virgin, he adds, that it is more probable that the name of Virgilius was confounded with that of Virginius; that is, in effect to ſay that the inhabitants

---

(11) Note, that I do not pretend to deny that ſome of thoſe women who write romances have had amorous intrigues.

(12) See, above, the beginning of this remark.

(13) Ajunt hoc, Varus tragœdiarum ſcriptor habuit uxorem literatiſſimam, cum qua Virgilius adulterium ſolebat admittere: cui etiam dedit ſcriptam tragœdiam, quam illa marito dedit tanquam à ſe ſcriptam. Hanc recitavit pro ſua Varus: quam rem Virgilius dicit per allegoriam. Nam tragœdiæ præmium caper fuerat. *Servius, in Virgil. Ecl. iii, ver.* 20.

(14) Id. ibid.

(15) Douza præter quod Petronium in omni lingua Latina ut ſermone cultiſſimum, ſic rebus turpiſſimum illuſtravit, tum etiam verborum laſcivia ſuperare eumdem ſtuduit, & non infeliciter, ut opinor, adſecutus eſt. - - - *Douza, beſides commenting upon Petronius, the moſt elegant writer in the Latin tongue as to his ſtyle, and the moſt obſcene as to his ſubjects, has likewiſe endeavoured to ſurpaſs him in wanton expreſſions, and in my opinion he has not ſucceeded ill.* Scioppius, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* Priapeior. *See alſo what he ſays in his notes upon the Prologue.*

(16) Menagiana, *p.* 32, *of the firſt Dutch edition.*

(17) Scioppius, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* Priapeior. *pag.* 3.

(18) Moliere, *in his* Impoſteur, *Act. iii, Scene ii, Tom. iii, of the Amſterdam edition* 1725.

(19) Lipſius, Epiſtolic. Quæſtion. *lib iii, Epiſt. ii*, ad Petr. Pithœum.

bitants

Baillet [*B*]. Thoſe who tell us that his Eclogues were admired by Cicero, are miſtaken [*C*]. He was not envious of other mens glory, and diſcovered ſuch a large ſhare of good nature and

bitants of Naples being neither acquainted with the Etymology, nor meaning of the word Virgilius, and very well knowing the import of Virginius, imagined that this Poet's name was Virginius, a word which anſwers to the Greek word Parthenias. *Cur Virgilius Neapolitanis dictus ſit Parthenias, cauſam hanc eſſe ſuſpicari quis poſſit ; non quod virginali eſſet modeſtia, ut vulgo fertur, ſed quod virgine natum, perinde ut Homerum, credi voluerint. Probabile ſane hoc eſt ; ſed ne quid diſſimulem, longe eſt probabilius ac ſimillimum veri, ſic dictum eſſe à Græcis, pro eo quod Romana lingua appellatum eum putabant Virginium, non Virgilium, cum ignorarent nominis hujus ſignificationem & originem, à virgulis, hoc eſt, ramis ſeu ſurculis, petitam ; unde & virgeta Ciceronis dicuntur arborum ſeminaria ; prioris vero nominis vim notionemque probe callerent* (20).

Mr Des Maizeaux (21) hath been pleaſed to communicate to me ſome obſervations on the article of Virgil, amongſt which there are ſome wherein he confutes this whole paſſage of Huetius, and gives a contrary account of the ſirname Parthenias. I had willingly made uſe of his conjectures, if I had not thought that I ought to ſtay for the new obſervations, which I know he hath ſent me, and I have not yet received.

[*B*] *An opportunity of refuting an obſervation which we find in the Anti-Baillet.*] Mr Menage pretends that there are numerous obſcenities in Virgil. 'His Eclogues, ſaith he (22), are full of unnatural love.

Novimus & qui te, tranſverſa tuentibus hircis, &c.
Formoſum Paſtor Corydon ardebat Alexin.

We know who did your buſineſs . . . .
And what the goats obſerv'd with leering eyes, &c.
Young Corydon, th' unhappy ſhepherd ſwain
The fair Alexis lov'd . . . .

DRYDEN.

'He loved this Alexis, as Apuleius informs us in the following paſſage of his apology : 'Quanto modeſtiùs tandem Mantuanus Poëta, qui itidem ut ego, puerum amici Pollionis Bucolico ludicro laudans, & abſtinens nominum, ſeſe quidem Corydonem, puerum verò Alexin vocat. - - - *How much greater is the modeſty of Virgil, who writing in the ſtrain that I do, and praiſing his friend Pollio's minion in one of his paſtorals, forbears to mention their true names, but calls himſelf Corydon and the boy Alexis.* But Apuleius miſtook when he ſaid that Alexis was Pollio's minion : he was Mecænas's darling, as we are informed from the fifty-ſixth epigram of the eighth book of Martial.' Mr Menage had no reaſon to infer from this paſſage of Apuleius that Virgil was in love with Alexis ; for, on the contrary, from thence I ſhall prove that he was not, and that ſo much of his Eclogue as relates to this particular was a meer piece of wit. Apuleius's accuſers beſides other crimes objected againſt him ſeveral amorous verſes on boys, whom he diſguiſed under feigned names. He replies (23) that it was cuſtomary with the Poets to alter the name of the beloved object : which he proves by ſeveral examples, and diſlikes the conduct of Lucilius, who did not make uſe of that diſguiſe (24). To this conduct he oppoſes Virgil's modeſty, who, ſays he, praiſing, as I have done, his friend's minion, made uſe of fictitious names, *&c.* If he had pretended that this Eclogue of Virgil expreſſed the real amorous ſentiments of its author, he had directly owned that he was guilty of the ſame crime, and inſtead of refuting his accuſers, would have acknowledged the juſtice of their accuſation. But nothing can be more abſurd than to ſuppoſe him guilty of this blunder. Let us then ſay that he declares that this Eclogue of Virgil was only a witty amuſement, in which his affections were not in the leaſt engaged. And it is what he ſays with reſpect to the Poems for which he was proſecuted. He is ſurprized that any perſon ſhould preſume to ſummon him before the Judges on this occaſion. Making verſes, ſays he, by way of diverſion, is no indication of manners. The guilty do not uſually boaſt of their crimes ; but thoſe who publiſh Amours, are not engaged in them, otherwiſe than by way of ſport ; they are only poetical fictions. 'Sed ſumme ego ineptus, qui hæc etiam in judicio ? an vos potius calumnioſi, qui etiam hæc in accuſatione ? quaſi ullum ſpecimen morum ſit, verſibus ludere. Catullum ita reſpondentem malevolis non legiſtis ?

Nam caſtum eſſe decet pium poetam
Ipſum, verſiculos nihil neceſſe eſt.

'Divus Hadrianus, cum Voconii amici ſui poëtæ tumulum verſibus muneraretur, ita ſcripſit :

Laſcivus verſu, mente pudicus eras.

'Quod nunquam ita dixiſſet, ſi forent lepidiora carmina argumentum impudicitiæ habenda. . . . . Cujus (*Platonis*) verſus, quos nunc percenſui, tanto ſanctiores ſunt quanto apertiores : tanto pudicius compoſiti, quanto ſimplicius profeſſi. Namque hæc & id genus omnia diſſimulare & occultare, peccantis : profiteri & promulgare, ludentis eſt. Quippe natura, vox innocentiæ, ſilentium maleficio diſtributa (25). - - - *But is it not fooliſh in me to take notice of ſuch things before a court of judicature ? Or rather are not you ſlanderers for mentioning them in the indictment ? As if forſooth writing verſes for diverſion were any indication of one's morals. Have you not read the anſwer which Catullus made to his malicious detractors.*

The Poet in his morals ſhould be chaſt,
But in his verſe he need not . . . . .

'*The Emperor Hadrian, when he compoſed an epitaph for his friend Voconius the Poet, made uſe of this expreſſion ;*

Chaſt in your mind, but wanton in your verſe.

'*He never would have ſaid ſo, if merry and jocoſe verſes were to be looked upon as an argument of unchaſtity. . . . . Plato's verſes, which I have juſt mentioned, are ſo much the more virtuous and pure for their being extremely plain ; and the greater the ſimplicity is which they expreſs the more chaſt is the compoſition. For to hide and diſſemble things of this kind is the mark of an offender ; but to profeſs and publiſh them is an argument of a ſporting mind ; ſince nature in her diſtributions gives ſpeech to innocence and ſilence to villany.*' Theſe maxims of Apuleius are diſputable, and it may reaſonably be ſaid, that he ought to have reſtrained them, and that they are very liable to exception ; but what I aſſert againſt the author of the Anti-Baillet, that Apuleius's words clearly ſignify that Virgil did not ſing his own amours, is beyond contradiction.

[*C*] *Thoſe who tell us that his Eclogues were admired by Cicero, are miſtaken.*] Donatus's words are (26) : 'Bucolica eo ſucceſſu edidit, ut in ſcena quoque per cantores crebra pronunciatione recitarentur. At cum Cicero quoſdam verſus audiiſſet, & ſtatim acri judicio intellexiſſet non communi vena editos, juſſit ab initio totam eclogam recitari : quam cum accurate pernotâſſet, in fine ait : *Magnæ ſpes altera Romæ*, quaſi ipſe linguæ Latinæ ſpes prima fuiſſet, & Maro futurus eſſet ſecunda. Quæ verba poſtea Æneïdi ipſe inſeruit. - - - *His paſtorals were ſo well received by the public, that they were frequently ſung on the ſtage. Now when Cicero had heard ſome of the verſes, preſently diſcovering by his acute penetration, that the author was no ordinary genius, he ordered the whole Eclogue to be rehearſed from the beginning : which having ſtrictly attended to, he ſaid at the concluſion :* The other hope of mighty Rome ; *as if he himſelf were the firſt hope of the Latin tongue, and Virgil would be the ſecond. Theſe words were afterwards inſerted in the Æneis.*' Here is an error in Chronology ; for it is certain that Virgil did not write his Eclogues, till after the Triumvirate of Octavius, Marc Antony, and Lepidus, during which, as it is well known, Cicero was cruelly maſſacred. I

do

(20) Petrus Daniel Huetius, Alnetan. Quæſt. *lib. ii, cap.* 15. *pag.* 239, *Edit. Lipſ.* 1692.

(21) Of whom mention is made above, in the article RAMUS, at the end of the remark [*O*].

(22) Menage, Anti-Baillet, *Part. i, Art. lxi.*

(23) Apuleius, in Apologia, *pag. m.* 279.

(24) C. Lucillium, quamquam ſit Iambicus, tamen improbarim, quod Gentium & Macedonem pueros directis nominibus carmine ſuo proſtituerit. *d. ibid.*

(25) Id. ibid, *pag.* 280.

(26) I ſay this without pretending to depart from the opinion of thoſe who deny that Donatus is the true author of Virgil's life that goes by his name.

and civility, that the other Poets, who continually envied one another, almoſt unanimouſly agreed in their great value and love for him [*D*]. Thoſe who ſay that a ſecret jealouſy was the reaſon that he never mentioned Homer, and preferred a leſs known Poet before him, are guilty of a great abſurdity [*E*]. He was none of thoſe authors who are eaſily

do not claim this diſcovery as mine; Father Vavaſſeur long ſince refuted the compilers of Virgil's life on this head (27). He alſo refuted Servius, who tells us that the ſixth Eclogue being recited by the author himſelf was received with great applauſe, and afterwards ſung on the ſtage by the Courteſan Cytheris or Lycoris, and that Cicero one of the audience was ſurprized to a very great degree, and aſked who was the author of it, *&c* (28).

Claudius du Verdier took notice of this fault of Servius, in a book (29) which he publiſhed in the year 1586. Peter Ramus had before confuted the ſame error, which Father Vavaſſeur confutes. ‘Hoc Donatus ‘affirmat, ſed chronologia repugnat: quatuor enim ‘aut quinque annis antea jam Cicero triumvirali pro‘ſcriptione perierat. - - - *This Donatus affirms, but it* ‘*is repugnant to Chronology: for Cicero had loſt his life* ‘*four or five years before that by the proſcription of the* ‘*Triumviri.*’ Theſe are Peter Ramus's words in his life of Virgil, before his *Lectiones* on the Bucolics. To which words he very properly adds a paſſage of a dialogue aſcribed to Tacitus; which ſhews that all the people roſe up, at the recital of ſome verſes of our Virgil on the theatre, and that this excellent Poet being accidentally there was ſaluted and honoured like the Emperor himſelf: ‘Malo ſecurum & ſecretum ‘VIRGILII ſeceſſum, in quo tamen neque apud ‘divum Auguſtum gratia caruit, neque apud populum ‘Romanum notitia. Teſtes Auguſti epiſtolæ, teſtis ‘ipſe populus, qui auditis in theatro verſibus Virgilii, ‘ſurrexit univerſus, & forte præſentem ſpectantemque ‘Virgilium veneratus eſt, ſic quaſi Auguſtum (30). ‘- - - *I prefer the private and ſafe retirement of Virgil,* ‘*in which notwithſtanding he neither wanted a ſhare* ‘*in the favour of Auguſtus, nor in the eſteem of the Ro*‘*man people. Witneſs the letters of Auguſtus, witneſs* ‘*the people themſelves, who having heard ſome verſes* ‘*of Virgil recited on the ſtage, roſe up,* &c.’

[*D*] *The other Poets ..... almoſt unanimouſly agreed in their great value and love for him.*] This is a great elogy, which commands my admiration for Virgil more than the beauty of his works, or the excellency of his Muſe. He exceeded all the Poets, and yet they loved him. Certainly nothing can be more extraordinary than this; and if the author who relates it had not prepared the way by deſcribing Virgil's amiable character, he never could have prevailed on us to believe it. He repreſents him endowed with a great deal of goodneſs, he ſays that he was extreamly careful to cultivate the acquaintance of honeſt and learned men, and to acknowledge their merit, without either envying or blaming any perſon. All he had was at the ſervice of his friends: a fine thought in the writings of other men pleaſed him as much as if he had been the author of it; and he was never concerned at being robbed of the glory of his performances, or that another claimed them for his, and reaped the advantage of them. This is his picture drawn by Aſconius Pedianus. *Refert etiam Pedianus* (31) *benignum, cultoremque omnium bonorum atque eruditorum fuiſſe, & uſque adeo invidiæ expertem, ut ſi quid erudite dictum inſpiceret alterius, non minus gauderet, ac ſi ſuum fuiſſet: neminem vituperare, laudare bonos: ea humanitate eſſe, ut, niſi perverſus maxime, quiſque illum non diligeret modo, ſed amaret. Nihil proprii habere videbatur. Ejus bibliotheca non minus aliis doctis patebat, ac ſibi: illudque Euripidis antiquum ſæpe uſurpabat,* τὰ τῶν φίλων κοινά. *hoc eſt,* communia amicorum eſſe omnia. ..... *Gloriæ vero adeo contemtor fuit: cum quidam verſus quoſdam ſibi adſcriberent, eaque re docti haberentur, non modo ægrè non ferebat, immo voluptuoſum id illi erat* (32). Does not this prepare us to find a great probability in the following words of the ſame author: ‘Quare coævos ‘omnes Poëtas ita adjunctos habuit, ut cum inter ſe ‘plurimum invidia arderent, illum una omnes colerent? - - - *For which reaſon he lived ſo well with* ‘*all his contemporary Poets, that whilſt they burnt with* ‘*envy at one another, they all unanimouſly agreed in* ‘*their great value and love for him.*’ Perhaps it may be aſked why the text of this remark is not conform to thoſe Latin words; I having inſerted the exception *almoſt*, which is not in the Latin. To this I anſwer that I had juſt reaſon to make uſe of that limitation, ſince immediately after I find in my author, that the Poets Anſer and Cornificius were Virgil's enemies. It is he then who is to be blamed for having twice ſucceſſively ſaid *omnes*, - - - *all*, inſtead of *fere omnes*, - - - *almoſt all.* And he is the more blameable, ſince he could not but know that Virgil had more than two enemies. Bavius and Mævius hated him, ſo that here are four Poets againſt him.

Qui Bavium non odit amet tua carmina Mævi (33).

Who hates not living Bavius, let him be
(Dead Mævius) damn'd to love thy works and thee.

DRYDEN.

An anonymous author is ſaid to have cenſured his Eclogues (34), and Carbilius Pictor his Æneis; beſides we are told that one Herennius collected his faults, and Perilius Fauſtinus his Plagiariſms (35). And it ought indeed to be owned that this great Poet was expoſed to the Criticiſms of his cotemporaries, ſince Aſconius Pedianus wrote a book in his defence (36). And if he had not been thus expoſed, it ought to be regiſtred amongſt the greateſt wonders that ever were; *Urit enim fulgore ſuo qui,* &c (37).

[*E*] *Thoſe who ſay that a ſecret jealouſy was the reaſon that he never mentioned Homer ... are guilty of a great abſurdity.*] Virgil ſuppoſes, in his deſcription of Æneas's deſcent into Hell, that the Sibyl deſirous to know where Anchiſes was, enquired of Muſæus, the moſt illuſtrious of all the Poets, and of all the choice men, who had an apartment in the retreat of the bleſſed.

Hîc manus, ob patriam pugnando vulnera paſſi;
Quique ſacerdotes caſti, dùm vita manebat,
Quique pii vates, & Phœbo digna locuti,
Inventas aut qui vitam excoluêre per artes,
Quique ſui memores alios fecêre merendo:
Omnibus his niveâ cinguntur tempora vittâ.
Quos circumfuſos ſic eſt effata Sibylla:
(Muſæm ante omnes: medium nam plurima turba
Hunc habet, atque humeris exſtantem ſuſpicit altis.)
Dicite felices animæ, tuque optime vates,
Quæ regio Anchiſen, quis habet locus (38)?

Which Mr Dryden renders thus:

Here patriots live, who for their country's good,
In fighting fields, were prodigal of blood;
Prieſts of unblemiſh'd lives here make abode;
And Poets worthy their inſpiring God:
And ſearching wits of more mechanic parts,
Who grac'd their age with new invented arts.
Thoſe who to worth their bounty did extend;
And thoſe who knew that bounty to commend;
The heads of thoſe with holy fillets bound;
And all their temples were with garlands crown'd.
To theſe the Sibyl thus her ſpeech addreſs'd:
And firſt to him ſurrounded by the reſt;
Tow'ring his height, and ample was his breaſt;
Say happy ſouls, divine Muſæus ſay,
Where lives Anchiſes, and where lies our way
To find the Heroe .....

DRYDEN.

The French tranſlator of Virgil makes the following judicious remark: ‘Some Commentators aſk why Vir‘gil does Muſæus the honour to place him in the ‘Elyſian fields, and to addreſs the Sibyl's words to ‘him, rather than to Homer. I once ſaw a company ‘of very learned men, almoſt unanimouſly agree, that ‘Virgil ought indeed to have beſtowed this honour on ‘Homer, but that his jealouſy of him prevented it. ‘I did not at that time reflect on it, and yet nothing

is

---

(27) Vavaſſor, de ludicra Dictione, *pag.* 172, *& ſeq.*

(28) Servius, in Eclogam, VI, *ver.* 11.

(29) *Intituled* in Auctores pene omnes, antiquos potiſſimum, cenſio.

(30) Tacit. de Orator. *cap. xiii*,

(31) In libro quem contra obtrectatores Virgilii ſcripſit. *Donat. in Vita Virgilii.*

(32) Donat. ubi ſupra.

(33) *See* Servius *upon the ninetieth verſe of the third Eclogue.*

(34) Prolatis Bucolicis innominatus quidam reſcripſit Antibucolica, duas modo eclogas, ſed inſulſiſſime παρῳδήσας. Donatus, ubi ſupra.

(35) Id. ibid.

(36) Id. ibid.

(37) Horat. Epiſt. i, lib. ii, ver. 13.

(38) Virgil. Æneïd. lib. vi, ver. 660.

eaſily pleaſed with their own productions; he poliſhed and reviſed his verſes with an extreme ſeverity [*F*]; and we are told that his Æneis, which we look upon as a finiſhed piece, was very ſhort of perfection in his opinion, and that he earneſtly deſired it might be burnt, becauſe he had not been able to put the laſt hand to it [*G*]. He deſigned to beſtow a retirement of three years in poliſhing it (*c*); after which he intended to apply the remainder of his life ſolely to Philoſophical ſtudies; but he died in the mean while at Brunduſium on the 22d of September 734 [*H*]. His corps purſuant to his order was tranſported to Naples (*d*). The Emperor was infinitely pleaſed with his poems

(*c*) Donatus, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

‘ is more ridiculous than this, and the anſwer to this objection is obvious; which is, that Virgil would have been guilty of a horrible fault in giving this commiſſion to Homer in Æneas's life-time, ſince he was not born till a long time after. Wherefore to anſwer the Sibyl, this wiſe Poet has choſen Muſæus who being Orpheus's diſciple was much antienter than Homer, for he lived about the time of the Trojan war itſelf. It is ſcarce credible that Scaliger the Father ſhould be ſo much miſtaken as he is, when he takes Muſæus, the author of the ſmall poem of Leander and Hero, who, as many learned men believe, was later than Virgil himſelf, for this antient Muſæus; and that he ſhould alledge, to ſhew how much this Poet was ſuperior to Homer, that it was for that reaſon that Virgil preferred him to Homer in the honour which he did him in the Elyſian fields, without ever thinking how impertinent it would have been to place Homer in hell before the death of Æneas, Ulyſſes, and ſo many heroes, whoſe adventures and exploits he ſung. If Homer had lived during the Trojan war, he had never choſen it for the ſubject of his poem; and he muſt have diſpatched his Iliad and Odyſſey very haſtily in ſeven years, in order to be ready to hold this dialogue with the Sibyl. But it is plainly proved that he did not live till long after; and as no reaſon obliged Virgil to be guilty of this error in Chronology, and it being impoſſible for him to be ignorant of it, he therefore avoided ſuch a groſs fault: which would be, in a word, to make Homer die before he was born. I believe, on the contrary, that if he could handſomely have mentioned him, he would very willingly have done him that honour, nothing appearing in his character, as I have obſerved in my Preface, unworthy of a generous mind (39).’

The learned Turnebus (40), who mentions this objection againſt Virgil, hath made no anſwer to it; whence it ought to be concluded, that the moſt learned men do not always think of what ſhould moſt naturally and neceſſarily occur to them when they are writing on a ſubject.

[*F*] *He reviſed his verſes with an extreme ſeverity.*] He ſpent three years on his Eclogues; ſeven on his Georgics, and eleven or twelve on his Æneis (41). In compoſing the ſecond of theſe three works, he dictated ſeveral of theſe verſes in the morning, and ſpent the reſt of the day in correcting them, that is to ſay, in reducing them to a ſmall number. He compared himſelf to a ſhe-bear, which licks her cubs into ſhape. *Cum Georgica ſcriberet, traditur quotidie meditatos mane plurimos verſus dictare ſolitum, ac per totum diem retractando ad pauciſſimos redigere, non abſurde carmen ſe urſæ more parere dicentem, & lambendo demum effingere* (42). Aulus Gellius informs us of the ſame thing. ‘ Amici familiareſque P. Vergilii in his, quæ de ingenio moribuſque ejus memoriæ tradiderunt, dicĕre eum ſolitum ferunt, parere ſe verſus more atque ritu urſino: namque, ut illa beſtia fetum ederet ineffigiatum informemque, lambendoque id poſteà, quod ita ediſſet, conformaret & fingeret; proinde ingenii quoque ſui partus recentes rudi eſſe facie & imperfecta: ſed deinceps tractando colendoque reddere iis ſe oris & vultus lineamenta. Hoc virum judicii ſubtiliſſimi ingenue atque vere dixiſſe res, inquit, judicium facit: nam, quæ reliquit perfecta expolitaque, quibuſque impoſuit cenſus atque delectus ſui ſupremam manum, omni poëticæ venuſtatis laude florent: ſed quæ procraſtinata ſunt ab eo ut poſt recenſerentur, & abſolvi, quoniam mors præverterat, nequiverunt, nequaquam poëtarum elegantiſſimi nomine atque judicio digna ſunt (43). - - - *The friends and acquaintances of Virgil, among other things which they have delivered down to us concerning his genius and manners, take notice of an expreſſion which he frequently made uſe of,* viz. *that he brought forth verſes as a ſhe-bear brings forth her young; for as that beaſt is delivered of a ſhapeleſs cub, which ſhe afterwards reduces into a proper form by licking, ſo the productions of his mind at their firſt appearance had a rude and unfiniſhed aſpect; and that it was an after-poliſhing which gave them their true lineaments and features. Experience itſelf ſhews that there was a great deal of candour and truth in the confeſſion of this exquiſite judge; ſince thoſe things, to which he gave the finiſhing ſtroke, are ſet off and enriched with all the beauties of poetry; whereas thoſe that he left to be reviſed afterwards, and which he could not finiſh, becauſe death prevented him, are by no means worthy of the name and judgment of a man who is deſervedly eſteemed the moſt elegant of all Poets.*’

[*G*] *We are told . . . . that he earneſtly deſired* his Æneis *might be burnt, becauſe he had not been able to put the laſt hand to it.*] This is affirmed in his life aſcribed to Donatus. See below remark [*L*] (44). This life contains a great many falſities, wherefore it would be very excuſable to call this a lie (45), if other authors had not mentioned it alſo; but ſince Pliny, Aulus Gellius, and Macrobius have ſaid it, we may ſafely allow the fact, without any danger of paſſing for too credulous. Pliny's words are: ‘ Divus Auguſtus carmina Virgilii cremari contra teſtamenti ejus verecundiam vetuit: majuſque ita vati teſtimonium contigit quam ſi ipſe ſua probaviſſet (46). - - - *The Emperor Auguſtus forbade that the poems of Virgil ſhould be burnt, as he had out of modeſty ordered in his laſt will; which is a higher commendation to the Poet than if he himſelf had approved of his own works.*’ Aulus Gellius immediately after the words, cited in the preceding remark, goes on thus: ‘ Itaque cum morbo oppreſſus adventare mortem videret; petivit oravitque à ſuis amiciſſimis impenſe, ut Æneïda, quam nondum ſatis elimaſſet, adolerent (47). - - - *Therefore when the violence of his diſtemper increaſed, and he foreſaw that death was near, he earneſtly beſought his moſt intimate friends, that they would burn the Æneis, becauſe he had not ſufficiently poliſhed it.*’ See Macrobius in the twenty-fourth chapter of the firſt book of his *Saturnalia.*

[*H*] *He died . . . . at Brunduſium on the twenty-ſecond of September* 734.] Father la Rue ſaith it was in the year 735, and that he was born in 684. I have followed their chronology, who have placed his birth in 683, and his death in 734. They agree with Father la Rue in the conſulſhips of Virgil's birth and death, but not in the years of thoſe conſulſhips. The like variations run through almoſt all parts of the antient *Conſular Faſti*. This diverſity is of no great conſequence here. They all make Virgil live the ſame number of years. The following variation is of another nature. Pliny ſeems to have placed his death in the year 740. ‘ Hæc, *ſaith he* (48), Virgilii vatis ætate incognita à cujus obitu XC aguntur anni. - - - *Theſe things were unknown in the time of Virgil, who died ninety years ago.*’ When Pliny wrote the Epiſtle Dedicatory to his work, Titus had been but ſix times Conſul; he therefore wrote it before the year 832, which was that of the ſeventh Conſulate of Titus (49); and it is very probable that he wrote it in 830, under the ſixth Conſulate of this ſon of Veſpaſian, and that having reviſed his work, he inſerted that date throughout. Now he reckons but ninety years from the death of Virgil, which therefore ſhould be placed in the year 740. Obſerve, that on ſuch occaſions, he generally aims at an exact ſupputation, not contenting himſelf with an even number. Notwithſtanding which I believe that in this place he made uſe of an even number, or rather that he compiled the fourteenth book of his Natural Hiſtory in the year 825 (50), when, in a litteral ſenſe, it was ninety years ſince Virgil's death. In reviſing his work he propoſed to reduce all the particular dates which he had uſed to that of his

(39) Segrais, remarks upon the ſixth book of the Æneis, *p.* 164, & *ſeq. Amſterd.* 1700.

(40) Turneb. Adverſar. *lib. xxviii, cap. xxxvi, pag. m.* 631, *col.* 1.

(41) Donat. ubi ſupra.

(42) Id. ibid.

(43) Aulus Gellius, *lib. xvii, cap. x, pag. m.* 459.

(44) Number IV.

(45) Corradus does it. See Virgil's life written by Father la Rue, and prefixed to the Commentary, *in uſum Delphini.*

(46) Plinius, *lib. vii, cap. xxx, p. m.* 53.

(47) Aulus Gellius, ubi ſupra.

(48) Plinius, *lib. xiv, cap.* 1, *pag. m.* 114.

(49) Others ſay it was the 831ſt. Thoſe, for example, who place the death of Virgil in the year 734.

(50) I ſuppoſe here that the year in which Virgil died, is not the 734th, as I have put it in the text of this article, but the year 735.

poems (*e*). Nothing is more ridiculous than the ſtories of his Magic, and the pretended wonders which he ſhewed the Neapolitans [*I*]. The verſions of, and the commentaries on,

his reviſal, but probably forgot to alter the date of the fourteenth book, and left the number XC. Thoſe who have corrected their own writings will bear witneſs, that notwithſtanding all their attention ſeveral things have eſcaped them, which obſtruct the perfect uniformity of a large book (51).

But tho' we ſhould ſuppoſe that there were really but ninety years betwixt the death of Virgil and Titus's ſixth conſulate; and that thoſe who fix his death in the year of Rome 735, ought to ſtand corrected by this paſſage of Pliny, where it is determined to the year 740, we could not help diſcovering a groſs error in Triſtan's commentaries. This Antiquarian imagines (52) that at the time of Caius Cæſar's expedition againſt the Parthians, *Virgil intimates that he finiſhed his Georgicks ; for it is our* Caïus Cæſar, *whom he certainly mentions in theſe verſes towards the end of the laſt book of that work,*

> Hæc ſuper arvorum cultu, pecorumque canebam,
> Et ſuper arboribus : Cæſar dum magnus ad altum
> Fulminat Euphratem bello, victorque volentes
> Per populos dat jura, viamque affectat Olympo.

> *Thus have I ſung of fields, and flocks, and trees,*
> *And of the waxen work of lab'ring bees ;*
> *While mighty Cæſar thundring from afar,*
> *Seeks on Euphrates banks the ſpoils of war :*
> *With conqu'ring arms aſſerts his country's cauſe,*
> *With arts of peace the willing people draws :*
> *On the glad earth the golden age renews,*
> *And his great father's path to Heav'n purſues.*
> DRYDEN.

and not Auguſtus, *as it hath been hitherto thought : for it ought to be conſidered, that Auguſtus was not in this war, but Caïus his nephew* (53), *and adopted ſon, who forced* Phraates, *King of the Parthians, to reſign Armenia to the Romans.* If this author had been at the trouble of looking into chronological tables, he would have found that the conſulate under which Virgil's death is placed, is too far diſtant from the time of Caïus Cæſar's expedition, to countenance any ſuppoſition that this great Poet was compoſing his Georgics during the ſaid Caïus Cæſar's war with the Parthians. His expedition happened in, or about, the year of Rome 752. If after that Virgil had wrote his Æneis, he muſt then have lived at leaſt till the year 763. This doth not want a refutation. I ſhall only ſay that Father Noris alledges the common opinion concerning Virgil's dying in 735, againſt Triſtan (54).

[*I*] *The ſtories of his Magic, and the pretended wonders which he ſhewed the Neapolitans.*] I think it was in the year 1625, that a book was publiſhed under the title of, *A new Judgment concerning what hath been ſaid and written for and againſt the book of the curious doctrine of the wits of this age.* Virgil is there accuſed *of having been a celebrated enchanter, and necromancer, as well as having performed innumerable wonders by the aſſiſtance of his Magic* (55). This was *tranſcribed verbatim* from the book which the Sieur de Lancre publiſhed againſt the *diſbelief of Sorcery.* This induced Mr Naudé to write *an apology for all thoſe great perſonages, who were falſely ſuſpected of Magic.* He upbraids Bodin and de Lancre, who put Virgil into the number of Magicians, with *the unreaſonableneſs of their copying this falſity from the moſt ſcandalous and dirty writings of certain authors, who were the very ſink and ſediment of the moſt barbarous writers* (56) . . . . . *This phœnix of Latin poetry,* continues he, *is not accuſed of that Magic and poetical fury, which, by the perfection of his works, charmed all the politeſt wits . . . . but of the ſuperſtitious and criminal Magic, of which this ornament of Parnaſſus would never have been ſuſpected, by a leſs degree of impudence than that unbounded one of theſe muſhrooms and fabuliſts, for which I cannot tell whether they or the two modern authors, and ſome others,* quos fama obſcura recondit, *are more blameable ; ſince thoſe laſt are ſo ridiculouſly credulous as to admit ſuch cheats as legal evidences of a calumny, which turns much more to their prejudice than to that of Virgil . . . . There is indeed reaſon to wonder at thoſe, who at preſent make uſe of the lies and fabulous inventions of ſeven or eight ſlaves to barbariſm, and the opinions of the populace, in order to draw this Poet's name in their catalogue of Magicians, and relate a thouſand ſtories, which, if true, would only cauſe him to be eſteemed one of the moſt expert that ever was in that art* (57). After which he retracts what he had ſaid (58), *that we were beholden for all thoſe fables to Helinandus the Monk.* He took it on Geſner's authority, that this Monk flouriſhed in the year 1069 : but being convinced *that he lived about the year* 1209 (59), *I am,* adds he (60), *obliged to confeſs ingenuouſly that I was miſtaken, and that the firſt author of all theſe idle fancies, was, in my opinion, that Gervaſius, who, as Theodoric à Niem † ſaith, was Chancellor to the Emperor Otho III* (61), *to whom he preſented his book, intituled,* Ocia Imperatoris, *which is really ſo ſtuffed with abſurdities and fables, as I remember to have already obſerved, that I can hardly perſuade myſelf that he was in his ſenſes when he wrote it.* This author relates (62) ; ‘ That Virgil made a copper fly, which, for the ſpace of eight years, remained on one of the gates of Naples, to which he had fixed it, and prevented any fly entring the city ; where he alſo built ſhambles, in which fleſh never ſtank or putrified ; that on one of the gates of the ſaid city he placed two large ſtone ſtatues, one of which he called *merry* and *beautiful,* and the other *melancholy* and *hideous* ; that theſe ſtatues were of that virtue, that any perſon entring the town by the ſide where the firſt ſtood, was bleſſed with a happy ſucceſs in all his affairs, whilſt he who came in on the ſide of the gate where the other was fixed, found himſelf unfortunate, and that every thing croſſed his intention ; that he cauſed a braſs ſtatue with a trumpet in its mouth to be erected on a high mountain near the city of Naples, which ſounded ſo loud when the north wind blew, that the fire and ſmoak of Vulcan's forges, which are at preſent to be ſeen near Pozzuolo, were driven towards the ſea, without doing any damage to the inhabitants ; that it was he who cauſed the baths of *Calatura di petra bagno & adjuto di l'homo,* to be made, with the beautiful inſcriptions in gold letters, which were after broken and defaced by the Phyſicians of Salerno, who were diſpleaſed that by them the people were inſtructed what diſeaſe each bath would cure ; that he prevented any perſon being injured in the wonderful grotto cut out in mount Pauſilippo to ſerve as a way to Naples ; and laſtly that he made a public fire, at which every perſon was free to warm himſelf, near which he placed a braſs archer with his arrow fixed, and his bow bent, and this inſcription, *whoever ſtrikes me, I let fly my arrow* ; that it afterwards happened that a madman ſtruck the archer, who did not fail to ſhoot his arrow directly into the fire, which immediately went out.’ Let us now take a view of the tranſcribers and improvers of theſe ridiculous fables. ‘ All theſe abſurdities were firſt tranſcribed from this author by Helinandus a Monk of Freſmont, in his Univerſal Chronicle ‡, and afterwards by Alexander Neckam an Engliſh Benedictin Monk, who relates ſome of the fore-mentioned ſtories in his book of the nature and property of things ; beſides which, he adds, that Naples being afflicted with an infinite number of contagious horſe-leeches, was delivered from that plague inſtantly, upon Virgil's throwing a golden horſe-leech into a well ; and that he had encompaſſed his houſe and garden, in which it never rained, with an immoveable air, that ſerved inſtead of a wall, and that he there built a bridge of braſs, by means of which he tranſported himſelf whether he pleaſed ; that he alſo built a miraculous Belfry, which, though of ſtone, moved in juſt proportion to the vibrations of the incloſed bell ; that he made the ſtatues, called the *Salvation of Rome,* which were watched night and day by the Prieſts, becauſe as ſoon as any nation deſigned to revolt, and to take up arms againſt the Roman Empire, the ſtatue which by its mark repreſented that nation, and was adored by it, immediately moved itſelf, and thereby rung a ſmall bell which hung about its neck, and pointed with its finger to the rebellious

---

(*e*) See the remark [*L*], numb. IV.

(51) See, above, the remark [*K*], of the article Tacitus, towards the middle.

(52) Triſtan, Comment. Hiſt. *Tom.* i, *pag.* 137.

(53) Triſtan ſhould have ſaid his grand-ſon. He did not conſider that the word *nepos* ſpoken of Caius with reſpect to Auguſtus, does not ſignify *nephew.*

(54) Noris Cenotaph. Piſan. *pag.* 249.

(55) *See the preface to the* Apologia des grans Hommes accuſez de Magie.

(56) Naudé, Apologie des grans Hommes, *ch.* xxi, *pag.* 607, Paris 1625, *in* 8vo.

(57) Id. ibid. *pag.* 609.

(58) In the firſt chapter, *pag.* 27.

(59) He ſays, pag. 611, that he has read in the lives of the Virtuous Monks of Ciſteaux, that Vincentius Bellovacenſis, in his *Speculum,* makes him live in 1209.

(60) Naudé, ib. *pag.* 611.

† Lib. 2. de ſchiſmate, cap. 19, 20.

(61) It ſhould be Otho IV.

(62) Naudé, ib. & *pag. ſeq.*

‡ Lib. 16.

on, his works are numberleſs (*d*). Thoſe who have diſguiſed them in burleſque verſe [*K*], have

---

(*d*) See the liſt of them prefixed to the Commentary which the Abbot de Marolles added to his tranſlation of Virgil. Mr de Segrais, who died in 1701, had promiſed a tranſlation of the Georgics, which was expected with great impatience; as his performance upon the Æneis, had been very much eſteemed. It is a verſion in verſe with a very fine Preface, and very curious Notes. A ſecond edition of it, corrected by the author, and printed in Holland, came out in the year 1700.

‘ nation, ſo that its name might be ſeen written, which the Prieſt carried to the Emperor, who immediately prepared an army in order to ſubdue and reduce it to reaſon. This is likewiſe taken notice of by an anonymous author, who above one hundred and twenty years ago, collected the lives of the Philoſophers and Poets; for when he comes to Virgil, he poſitively tells us, ‡ Hic Philoſophia naturali præditus etiam Necromanticus fuit, & mira quadam arte hæc feciſſe narratur: - - - *He was an adept in Natural Philoſophy, and likewiſe a Necromancer; for he is ſaid to have performed all theſe things by ſome wonderful art*. After which, he recites the above-mentioned ſtories, which were afterwards copied *verbatim* from the Latin of this anonymous writer, by Symphorian Champier *, and Albert of Eib, who was ſo weak as to inſert them in the ſecond part of his *Margarita Poëtica*, under the title of ſentences and authorities excerpted from Diogenes Laërtius, and yet not content with this, hath enlarged them with the ſtory of a Roman Courtezan, who having hung up Virgil in a baſket in the middle of a tower; he in revenge ſo extinguiſhed all the fires in Rome, that it was impoſſible to light any of them, any otherwiſe than by kindling them at the privy parts of this female derider; and beſides the fire being ſo incommunicable, that no one could light at another's fire, every perſon was obliged to ſee and viſit her: and this fine ſtory was ſcarce publiſhed but one Gratian du Pont thought it worthy of being inſerted in his controverſies betwixt the female and male ſexes, printed at Toulouſe in the year 1534, as a very manifeſt proof of the malice and malignity of women: his verſes ſhall conclude this long deduction of follies.

‡ Cap. 103.

* Lib. de claris Medicinæ Scriptorib. tract. 2.

Que dirons nous du bon homme Virgile,
Que tu pendis ſi vray que l'Evangile,
Dans ta corbeille jadis en ta feneſtre,
Donc tant marry fut qu'eſtoit poſſible eſtre.
A luy qui eſtoit homme de grand honneur,
Ne fis tu pas un tres-grand deſhonneur?
Helas ſi feis, car c'eſtoit dedans Rome,
Que là pendu demeura le pauvre homme,
Par ta cautelle & ta deception,
Un jour qu'on fit groſſe proceſſion
Parmy la ville, donc dudit perſonnage,
Qui ne s'en rit ne fut eſtimé ſage (63).

(63) Naudé, ubi ſupra, *ch. xxi*, *pag.* 614, *& ſeq.*

What ſhall we ſay of Virgil, who
Was in a baſket ſlung by you,
And pendant from your window ſeen,
Which gave the honeſt man the ſpleen.
Did you not foul diſhonour fix
On this great Poet by your tricks?
Moſt certainly you did, ſince he
Was by your fraud conſtrain'd to be
A hanging ſpectacle in Rome
Unto the gazing vulgar, come
To ſee a huge proceſſion paſs,
Where he that laugh'd not was eſteem'd an aſs.

Naudé doth not trouble himſelf with refuting theſe fooleries, but takes ſome notice that in the life of Virgil, aſcribed to Tiberius Donatus, St Jerom's maſter, it is ſaid that this great Poet's father was firſt ſervant, and then ſon-in-law to a certain Magus (64). He anſwers, that according to Delrio and La Cerda, this life *ſuch as we now have it*, was not written *by that antient Donatus*. What we find there concerning Virgil's father, adds he (65), is ſufficient to ſhew that *the piece is ſuppoſititious.* This is a ſtrange blunder; for it is taking the word *Magus*, which the beſt Critics correct by *Magius* or *Majus*, for a Magician. The authority of Johannes Sariſberienſis, who *mentions this brazen fly which drove all the flies out of Naples*, does not ſeem of any great weight. Toſtatus †† who places Virgil amongſt the practiſers of Necromancy, is not a witneſs of any credit, ſince he grounds what he ſaith on the Monk Helinandus's Chronicle. *But ſince the authors*, continues Naudé (66), ‘ who have ſpoke of Virgil's Magic, are ſo numerous, that it is impoſſible to treat of them particularly one after another, without loſing a great deal of time, and admitting abundance of tautologies, I ought to imitate the Civilians, who take authorities *per ſaturam*, and making but one article of all the reſt, to ſhew, that though Le Loyer ⸸⸸ mentions his eccho ‡‡, Paracelſus his magical images and figures **, Helmoldus his repreſentation of the city of Naples which he ſhut up in a glaſs bottle, Sibyllus † and the author of the book intituled, *The image of the world*, the head which he made in order to be informed of future events ⸸; Petrarch and Theodoric à Niem ‡ the Grotto at Naples which he cauſed to be cut out at the requeſt of Auguſtus; * Vigenere his alphabet; †† Trithemius his book of tables and calculations, to diſcover the genius of all perſons, and laſtly, thoſe who have viſited the Duke of Florence's cabinet, a mirrour ſaid to be that which this great Poet made uſe of in Catoptromancy: yet all theſe authorities are too modern, abſurd, or ill grounded, to turn the ſcale againſt the ſilence of all the authors who lived during the ſpace of a thouſand years, and who would be greatly to blame, not to have mentioned or obſerved any of all thoſe wonders, if there had really been any ſuch, ſince they have taken notice of a great many particulars of leſs moment.’ I paſs by ſome reaſons which he alledges, and what he obſerves as a fable, *That all the Sodomites in the world died on the night of JESUS CHRIST's nativity, and that as the famous Civilian ⸸⸸ Salicetus aſſures us, Virgil was one of them* (67). But I ought not to omit what follows. ‘ As for the preceding authorities, it ought not to be imagined that Petrarch, Theodoric à Niem, Vigenere, and Trithemius, were ſo fooliſh, as ſcandalouſly to proſtitute their credit and reputation to the cenſure of thoſe that are not eaſily impoſed on by ſuch fables; for it is certain that whatever they have ſaid, was in order to refute them, and give us to underſtand that they were not ſo eaſy and credulous as the other authors, whom I have cited, who can never atone for the fault which they have committed, in ſuffering themſelves to be miſled by the ſcandalous and weak influences of hear-ſays, ſtreet-ballads, and the vulgar opinion of the inhabitants of Naples, and the circumjacent places, who always aſcribed every thing to Virgil's Magic, which ſeemed ſomewhat extraordinary or ſurprizing, and for which they could not find another cauſe; as it is very eaſy to judge from the wonderful grotto hewn out of the mountain Pauſilippo near the city of Naples, which Strabo (who according to Athenæus, lived in the time of Scipio, and the taking of Carthage, or, according to Patricius, in Auguſtus's and Tiberius's time) mentions as very antient; notwithſtanding which, the peaſants thereabouts affirm, that it was hewn out by Virgil at the preſſing inſtances of Auguſtus, becauſe the top of the mountain under which it is cut, was ſo peſtered with ſerpents and dragons, that he muſt be a very bold man who ventured to croſs it (68).’ In fine, He inquires (69) into the firſt cauſe of this ſuſpicion, and believes he hath found it in the mathematical learning which Virgil acquired. ‘ This is what confirmed all the weak and credulous in this erroneous opinion, which they had already entertained of him by reaſon of his *Pharmaceutria*, - - *the Sorcereſs*, or eighth Eclogue, where, ſays Apuleius, he hath learnedly repreſented, Vittas molleis & verbenas pingues, & thura maſcula, & licia diſcolora, - - - *The ſoft fillets, the fat vervains, the male incenſe, and threads of different colours*, and whatever belongs to Magic; ſo that he could not avoid being ſuſpected of the practice of it, by thoſe who were hindered by their ignorance

(64) Ibid. *pag.* 621.

(65) Ibid. *pag.* 622.

†† Comment. in epiſt. D. Hieron. ad Paulinum.

(66) Naudé, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 626.

⸸⸸ Livr. 1. des ſpectres ch. 6.

‡‡ Tom. 1. oper. tract. de imaginibus cap. 11.

** Lib. 4. Hiſt. Slavor. cap. 19.

† Peregrin. quæſt. decade 3. c. 2. quæſtiunc. 3.

⸸ In itinerario.

‡ Lib. 2. de ſchiſmat. cap. 19.

* Pag. 330. *of his chiffres.*

†† Antipal. l. 1. cap. 3.

⸸⸸ Apud Emanuel. de Moura, lib. de Enſalm. ſect. iii. c. 4. numb. 12.

(67) Naudé, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 628, 629.

(68) Id. ibid. *pag.* 629.

(69) Ibid. *pag.* 631.

have raiſed the choler of ſome learned men; and it muſt be confeſſed that it is not altogether without reaſon. The commentary *in uſum Delphini*, by Father de la Rue, the Jeſuit, is a very good one. There is prefixed to it a life of this Poet, digeſted according to the order of the conſulſhips, and adorned with very judicious remarks. I ſhall cenſure ſome faults in Mr Moreri [*L*]. I have avoided mentioning a certain poplar, called Virgil's tree; which, according to the cuſtom of the country, was planted when his

'ignorance and the barbarity of their age, from knowing that it was tranſlated *verbatim* from Theocritus (70).'

Gaffarel endeavours to defend the authority of Gervaſius Tilberienſis, and to anſwer Naudæus (71); but his endeavours are very ridiculous.

[*K*] *Thoſe who have diſguiſed them in burleſque verſe.*] Scarron hath ſucceeded herein much better than all the reſt; but the majeſty of this Poem deſerves more reſpect than to be ſo daringly prophaned. Vavaſſor the Jeſuit complained of it, and obſerved that Italy firſt made way for this liberty: 'Vide, Balzaci, de iſtorum hominum conſiliis, & inſtituta ratione quid ſentiam, quidve primum venerit in mentem, cum perſonatos aliquot ejuſmodi, & ementitos Virgilios, neque enim hanc ab uno duntaxat contumeliam paſſus eſt, in manus ſumpſi. Mihi viſi ſunt, qui nobiliſſimum & clariſſimum poëtam fœditate interpretationis ſuæ turpârunt, eodem illum modo tractare voluiſſe, quo Didonem tractavit prius, adeoque vices innocentis & calamitoſæ reginæ ulciſci. Ut is enim Didonem Æneæ turpiter indigneque proſtituit, neque ullam rationem habuit vel temporis, cum ab Ænea Dido diſtaret ipſis trecentis annis; vel famæ & exiſtimationis publicæ, quod eadem omnes ætatis ſuæ feminas pudicitiæ laude anteiret: ita iſti nulla ingenuæ artis præſtantia, nulla principis poetæ dignitate deterriti ſunt, quo minus puram & caſtam poëſim, corruptam & adulteratam extruderent in publicum, diffamarent malis dictis ſuis, eique quantum poſſent, petulanter illuderent (72). . . . . Quamquam hic ego noſtris hominibus non habeo quid præcipue ſuccenſeam, cum nihil in iſto genere per ſe ac primi, ſed exemplo & imitatione peccarint. Sicut nec ipſi præter ceteros ſuccenſere mihi debent, ſi commune factum, & aliorum potius, quam Gallorum, reprehendo. Fecerunt videlicet flagitium antea & Joannes Baptiſta Lallius, cujus Æneis traveſtita mihi caſu nuper occurrit, & alii, ut audio, recentes Itali ſcriptores (73). - - - - *Hear, Balzac, what my ſentiments are concerning the deſigns and proceedings of theſe men, and what my firſt reflexions were on ſeeing ſome falſe and counterfeit Virgils of this kind; for he has ſuffered the like indignity from more than one perſon. It appeared to me that they who had disfigured this noble and renowned Poet by their vile conſtructions, had reſolved to treat him in the ſame manner as he himſelf treated Dido, and thus to revenge the quarrel of that innocent and unfortunate Queen. For as Virgil proſtituted Dido to Æneas in a baſe and unworthy manner, without having the leaſt regard either to the diſtance of time betwixt them which was three hundred years, or to her fame and character in the world, which allowed her to have been the moſt virtuous woman of her age; ſo theſe men were neither deterred by the noble excellency of the art, nor by the dignity of the Prince of Poets, from corrupting and adulterating, and, in that manner, publiſhing to the world his pure and chaſte Poetry, from diſgracing him with their ſcandalous expreſſions, and from putting the higheſt affront upon him, which it was poſſible for them to do. . . . . Though I have no reaſon to be chiefly offended at my countrymen, ſince they were not the firſt to tranſgreſs, but were led into it by imitating the example of others. Neither have they any reaſon to be particularly angry with me, ſince I only find fault with a general offence, which concerns other nations more than it does them. The crime was committed before by John Baptiſta Lallius, whoſe Æneids burleſqued, I accidentally ſaw not long ago, and by ſome other late Italian authors, as I am informed.*'

[*L*] *I ſhall cenſure ſome faults in Mr Moreri.*] I. His manner of placing his words in this ſentence, *the two firſt works were written in favour of Mæcenas and Pollio*, would make one believe, that his Bucolics were compoſed in favour of Mæcenas, and his Georgics in favour of Pollio. But he either deſigned, or ought to have ſaid the contrary. And if he had poſtponed Mæcenas to Pollio, he had yet been guilty of expreſſing himſelf wrong; for a perſon who ſhould ſay that Virgil's Eclogues and Georgics *were written in favour of Pollio and Mæcenas*, would ſpeak illogically (74), and contrary to the laws of our Grammar. This ſentence ſignifies that each of thoſe pieces was written for Pollio and Mæcenas. But that is falſe. In the Dutch editions this paſſage is altered thus: *The two firſt works are full of the praiſes of Mæcenas and Pollio.* But this doth not mend the two faults which I have noted, and introduces a third, ſince it is certain that Mæcenas is not praiſed in the Eclogues, and that he is mentioned in very few places of the Georgics, and always very ſuccinctly, and ſometimes without any praiſe. Nevertheleſs it might be ſaid, that this Poem was compoſed in his favour, becauſe it is dedicated to him; and it is to him that the author addreſſes himſelf in the firſt and laſt book, and in ſeveral other places. I do not deny but that Pollio is praiſed in the Eclogues; but as ſeveral others have a good ſhare in the commendations, what Donatus diſtributes amongſt four perſons (75), ſhould not have been beſtowed upon one; and I ſhould rather have ſaid, as he doth, that they were compoſed by the encouragement of Pollio (76). I ſaid in my firſt edition of this book, that Donatus making Virgil to be twelve years in compiling the Æneis, Mr Moreri ſhould not have ſaid *eleven years*: but at this time I renounce my former cenſure, for ſeveral editions have it *annis undecim*, and not *annis duodecim* as mine hath, which is the Virgil *Variorum* printed at Leyden in 1680 (77). II. Virgil did not die going to *meet Auguſtus as he returned from his eaſtern journey.* He went into Greece and Aſia in ſearch of a retirement, in order to be at leiſure to poliſh his Æneis; and in this journey, he met Auguſtus at Athens; Auguſtus, I ſay, who was returning from the eaſt. This determined him to return into Italy with the Emperor: but the diſeaſe which ſeized him in a journey, which out of curioſity he undertook to Megara, increaſing upon him in his paſſage, he arrived at Brunduſium in ſuch an ill ſtate of health that he died in a few days. Thus the ſtory is told in his life. III. Since according to Moreri, he was born in the year of Rome 684, and died in 735, he could not poſſibly live fifty-two years. This fault of Moreri is alſo in the life of Virgil. The day, and the conſulſhips of his birth and death are noted in it. Thoſe two intervals do not quite make up fifty-one years, and Donatus nevertheleſs ſuppoſes that Virgil went into Greece at the age of fifty-two years. IV. Theſe words: *As he was dying, he ordered that his Æneis ſhould be burned, but Auguſtus preſerved that admirable Poem, and commanded Tucca and Varius to correct it*, are very fallacious, and it is very neceſſary they ſhould be rectified. The fact is thus. Virgil finding that his diſtemper increaſed, earneſtly aſked for his manuſcripts in order to commit his Æneis to the flames; and becauſe no body was ſo complaiſant as to bring them, he ordered by his laſt-will, that they ſhould be burned as an imperfect work. Tucca and Varius repreſented to him, that Auguſtus would not permit it. Whereupon Virgil bequeathed his writings to them on condition that they ſhould add nothing to them, and ſhould, if they found any unfiniſhed verſes, leave them in the ſame condition. *Cum gravari morbo ſeſe ſentiret, ſcrinia ſæpe & magna inſtantia petivit, crematurus Æneida: quibus negatis, teſtamento comburi juſſit, ut rem inemendatam imperfectamque. Verùm Tucca & Varius monuerunt, id Auguſtum non permiſſurum. Tunc eidem Vario, ac ſimul Tuccæ, ſcripta ſub ea conditione legavit, ne quid adderent quod à ſe editum non eſſet, & verſus etiam imperfectos, ſi qui erant, relinquerent* (78). So that Auguſtus was no farther the cauſe of the preſerving of this Poem, than that the author deſiſted from his reſolution, being told, that this Prince would not ſuffer the execution of it. It redounds to the glory of

(70) Ibid.

(71) Gaffarel, Curioſitez inoüies, *ch. vii, num.* 13, *pag. m.* 169, & *ſeq.*

(72) Franc. Vavaſſor. De ludicra Dictione, *pag.* 180.

(73) Id. ibid. *pag.* 182.

(74) Logic teaches us that in all compounded and copulative propoſitions, all the attributes ought to agree with the ſubject. See the Art of Thinking, *Part. ii, ch. ix*, where they have nevertheleſs, forgot to ſet forth ſuch an example as this.

(75) Cum res Romanas inchoaſſet, offenſus, materia & nominum aſperitate, ad Bucolica tranſiit: maxime ut Aſinium Pollionem, Alphenum, Varium, & Cornelium Gallum celebraret; quia in diſtributione agrorum, qui poſt Phillippenſem victoriam veteranis, triumvirorum juſſu, trans Padum dividebantur, indemnem ſe præſtitiſſent. - - - *When he had begun to treat of the Roman Hiſtory, he was ſo diſpleaſed with the ſubject and the harſhneſs of the names that he laid aſide that deſign, and took to writing Paſtorals; chiefly that he might have an opportunity of praiſing Aſinius Pollio, Alphenus, Varius, and Cornelius Gallus; becauſe in the diſtribution of the lands on the other ſide of the Po, which were ſhared among the Veteran ſoldiers by the command of the Triumviri, after the victory at Philipi, they had ſaved his lands.* Donatus, ubi ſupra.

(76) Bucolica triennio Aſinii Pollionis ſuaſu perfecit. - - - *He compleated his Paſtorals in the ſpace of three years, by the advice of Aſinius Pollio.* Id. ib.

(77) *Duodecim* is to be found in ſeveral other editions.

(78) Donat. ubi ſupra.

his mother was delivered of him, and was obſerved to grow ſo faſt, that in a few years it equalled poplars much older. Such women as were with child or newly brought to bed made it an object of religion *(f)*.

Among Caligula's follies, we may undoubtedly reckon his contempt and hatred of Virgil; whoſe writings and effigies he endeavoured to remove out of all libraries *(g)*: he had the confidence to ſay that Virgil had neither wit nor learning *(h)*. The Emperor Alexander Severus judged quite otherwiſe; he called him the Plato of the Poets, and placed his picture with that of Cicero in the Temple, in which he had placed Achilles and other great men *(i)*. Cæcilius the Grammarian was the firſt who read lectures on the poems of Virgil, whoſe cotemporary he was *(k)*.

(f) Acceſſit aliud præſagium: ſiquidem virga populea, more regionis in puerperiis eodem ſtatim loco depacta, ita brevi coaluit, ut multo ante ſatas populos adæquarit. Quæ arbor Virgilii ex eo dicta atque conſecrata eſt; ſumma gravidarum & fetarum religione, ſuſcipientium ibi & ſolventium vota. *Donatus, ubi ſupra, initio.*

(g) Sueton. in Calig. *cap. xxxiv.* *(h)* Nullius ingenii minimæque doctrinæ. *Id. ibid.* *(i)* Lampridius, in Alex. Severo, *cap. xxxi, pag. m.* 936. *(k)* Sueton. de Illuſtr. Gramm. *cap. xvi.*

---

of this great monarch, that he diſcovered himſelf ſeriouſly intereſted in it, and that he obliged Varius to the punctual performance of the condition under which the manuſcript was left to him (79). What ſhall I ſay concerning thoſe verſes, which this Emperor wrote on Virgil's intention to burn this excellent piece? We have but a ſmall fragment of them (80). What ſhall I ſay farther of the ardour with which, during the moſt difficult expeditions, he deſired that this author would ſend him even the firſt lineaments of his Poem? 'Auguſtus cum tum forte expeditione Cantabrica abeſſet, & ſupplicibus atque minacibus per jocum literis efflagitaret, ut ſibi de Æneide, ut ipſius verba ſunt, vel prima carminis hypographa, vel quodlibet colon mitteret, negavit ſe facturum Virgilius: cui tamen multo poſt, perfecta demum materia, treis omnino libros recitavit: Secundum videlicet, quartum, & ſextum (81). - - - *Auguſtus who at that time happened to be employed abroad in the expedition againſt the Cantabri, often begged of Virgil by his letters (which were ſometimes writ in ſupplicant and ſometimes in a threatning ſtile by way of joke) that he would ſend him, as his expreſſion was, the firſt lineaments of his Poem, or if it were no more than a line. Virgil refuſed to do this. But a good while after, when the work was finiſhed, he recited three whole books to him,* viz. *the ſecond, fourth, and ſixth.*' I have elſewhere (82) ſpoken of the effect which the recital of his ſixth book produced. It was very great by reaſon of the beauty of the verſes, and of the art of reading which the author was perfect maſter of. Here are the words which inform us that he read his Georgics to Auguſtus: 'Georgica, reverſo ab Actiaca victoria Auguſto, atque reficiendarum virium cauſa Atellæ commoranti, per continuum quatriduum legit, ſuſcipiente Mæcenate legendi vicem, quoties interpellaretur ipſe vocis offenſione. Pronunciabat autem maxima cum ſuavitate, & lenociniis miris. Seneca tradidit, Julium Montanum poëtam ſolitum dicere, involaturum ſe quædam Virgilio, ſi vocem poſſet, & os, & hypocriſim: eoſdem enim verſus eo pronunciante, bene ſonare: ſine illo, inareſcere, quaſi mutos (83). - - - *He was four days imployed in reading the Georgics to Auguſtus, after his return from the battle of Actium, while he remained at Atella for the recovery of his ſtrength. Mæcenas relieved him in the taſk of reading as often as his voice failed him. Now there was a very great ſweetneſs and wonderful charm in his pronunciation. Seneca relates that Julius Montanus the Poet was uſed to ſay that if he could violently ſeize upon any thing belonging to Virgil, it ſhould be his voice, his countenance, and his action: for that the ſame verſes which ſounded well by his pronunciation, did without that ſeem dry and inſipid.*' It is impoſſible to do a greater ſervice to a piece of Poetry, than to read it well: it removes ſeveral faults (84), and no Poem is ſo good but an ill reader may ſpoil it. To this may be referred this epigram of Martial:

Quem recitas meus eſt, ô Fidentine, libellus;
Sed male cum recitas, incipit eſſe tuus (85).

The book thou read'ſt was, Fidentinus, mine,
But when thou read'ſt it ill, then mak'ſt it thine.

When an author reads his Play to the Actors to whom he is about to ſell it, woe be to him, if he doth not read it well. This is what Mr Chappuzeau obſerves in his French Theatre. Virgil was therefore very happy, having the talent both of making charming verſes, and of reading them well. Mr Corneille reſembled him but in one of theſe excellencies (86). I return to Moreri. His Vth fault is his ſaying that Auguſtus ordered, *that whatever was ſuperfluous in the Æneis, ſhould be ſtruck out without adding any thing to it.* Is this rightly to underſtand Donatus's *ſummatim emendavit?* To correct a book in ſome places, and with reſpect to ſome things, doth it ſignify only to ſtrike out of it what is ſuperfluous? May it not ſignify that ſome words are inſerted in the place of others? VI. Moreri's Virgil, *a Roman, and a comic Poet*, is a ſign that he was a blind tranſcriber. He had read in Voſſius, *Trajani temporibus fuit Virgilius Romanus, Poëta Comicus* (87), and miſtruſting nothing he imagined this to be the real name of this Poet; but if he had conſulted the originals, he would have found that Pliny, the younger, cited by Voſſius, ſpeaks of one Verginius or Virginius, and not of one Virgilius. Beſides, Romanus ought not to be tranſlated as an epithet denoting his country, but as the name of his family. Huetius hath obſerved this miſtake of Voſſius in Gyraldus, and Glandorpius: *Hæc autem nomina duo ſæpe confundi indicat Virginii Romani Poetæ Comici Plinio in Epiſtolis memorati nomen, qui à Lilio Giraldo, Glandorpio, & Voſſio Virgilius appellatur* (88). Mr Couſin miſtakes this paſſage of the Biſhop of Avranches. *We ought not to be ſurprized,* ſaith he (89), *that theſe two names have been confounded, ſince ſeveral learned men of theſe laſt ages have called a certain comic Poet, Virginius Romanus, whom Pliny calls Virgilius Romanus in his Epiſtles.* I cannot conclude without obſerving, that when Pliny the younger is commending Virginius Romanus, he informs us that the ſame diſeaſe was obſervable at Rome, which reigns amongſt our modern wits; for he declares that he was none of thoſe who deſpiſed the preſent time, and admired only the Antients. 'Sum ex iis, qui mirer antiquos: non tamen, ut quidam, temporum noſtrorum ingenia deſpicio. Neque enim quaſi laſſa & effœta natura, ut nihil jam laudabile pariat. Atque adeo nuper audii Verginium Romanum paucis legentem comœdiam, ad exemplar veteris comœdiæ ſcriptam, tam bene, ut eſſe quandoque poſſit exemplar (90). - - - *I am one of thoſe who admire the antients, but without deſpiſing the moderns, as ſome people do. For nature is not ſo weary and worn out, but that ſhe can ſtill produce ſomething praiſe-worthy. As a proof of this I lately heard Verginius Romanus reading a Comedy to ſome few perſons, which is written after the manner of the Antients, and ſo well done that it might ſerve for a pattern.*'

The paſſage above quoted (91) concerning the reading of the Georgics to Auguſtus, wants ſome correction. That Prince after the battle of Actium, in the year of Rome 724 returned into Italy, and met the Senate at Brunduſium, where he ſtaid twenty-ſeven days according to Suetonius, or thirty according to Dion Caſſius, and then went into Aſia, where he ſpent all the winter in making preparations for his expedition to Egypt. It is not then true, that at his return from the war of Actium, our Poet's Georgics were read to him at Atella (92). If he heard them read at this place, it was after the Egyptian war, and not when he returned to Italy, after the battle of Actium (93). I borrow this remark from Father la Rue. I could alledge another reaſon, which is, that Virgil obſerves at the end of his Georgics, that he compoſed this work during Auguſtus's Oriental war; but it may be objected againſt me, that this Poem having coſt Virgil ſeven years labour (94), nothing hinders but part of it might be read to Auguſtus before he went to attack his enemy on the banks of the Nile.

(79) Nihil igitur auctore Auguſto Varius addidit, quod & Maro præceperat, ſed ſummatim emendavit, ut qui verſus etiam imperfectos, ſi qui erant, reliquerit. *Id. ibid.*

(80) It is in the Life of Virgil.

(81) Id. ibid.

(82) In the firſt article OCTAVIA, remark [*C*].

(83) Donatus, ubi ſupra.

(84) *See* Pliny, Epiſt. xv, *lib. iii.*

(85) Martial. *lib. i, Epig. xxxix.*

(86) *See the* Menagiana, *pag.* 303, 304, *of the firſt Dutch edition.*

(87) Voſſius, de Poëtis, Latinis, *pag.* 51.

(88) Petrus Daniel Huetius, Alnet. Quæſt. *lib. ii, cap. xv, pag.* 239, *Edit. Lipſ.* 1692.

(89) Journal des Sçavans, *Sept.* 11, 1690, *pag.* 642, *Dutch Edit.*

(90) Plinius, Epiſt. xxi, *lib. vi, pag.* 319. *Edit. Cellarii Lipſiæ* 1693.

(91) Citat. (83).

(92) A town of Campania.

(93) Taken from Virgil's Life written by Father la Rue, and prefixed to Virgil, *in uſum Delphini.* Mr Des Maizeaux informed me that this Jeſuit had made that obſervation.

(94) Georgica ſeptennio Neapoli . . . . confecit. *Donat. ubi ſupra.*

VIRGIL.

VIRGIL, Biſhop of Saltzburg in the VIIIth century. Mr Moreri mentions him, but omits a particular which deſerves to be related. He hath ſaid nothing of the perſecutions which this prelate ſuffered for believing that there was ſuch a thing as Antipodes [*A*]. The Court of Rome is reproached on that head, which the flatterers of the Popes endeavour to elude as much as poſſible; but they cannot help our concluding from thence, the groſs ignorance of that age.

[*A*] *He hath ſaid nothing of the perſecutions . . . . . for believing that there was ſuch a thing as Antipodes.*] He had hardly divulged this doctrine, but he was accuſed of maintaining that there was another world, and other men under us, another ſun, and another moon. Boniface, Archbiſhop of Mentz, immediately took fire at it, and charged his opinions with impiety. He cenſured Virgil publickly, and as the Pope's Legate cauſed him to be admoniſhed, that he ſhould no more corrupt the purity of the Chriſtian doctrine by ſuch idle fancies. *Hoc ita acceptum eſt, quaſi Virgilius alium mundum, alios ſub terrâ homines, alium denique ſolem, atque aliam lunam eſſe aſſereret. Bonifacius hæc velut impia, & Philoſophiæ divinæ repugnantia refutat, Virgilium publicè, privatim arguit, ad recantandum has nænias provocat, efflagitatque jure ſuo ut Legatus Germaniæ, ne ille hujuſmodi deliramentis ſinceram & ſimplicem Chriſti ſapientiam polluat atque contaminet* (1). Virgil incenſed at this affront, complained to Utilo Duke of Bavaria, by whom he was very much beloved, and irritated him againſt Boniface, who ſent his complaints to the Court of Rome, and wrote to the Pope in ſuch terms as rendred Virgil's faith ſuſpected. The Pope ſent ſome deputies to the Duke of Bavaria, and wrote to him, that if Virgil was a Prieſt, his intention was that he ſhould be degraded from his prieſthood, and ſent to Rome to give an account of his conduct. *Ipſe* (Zacharias Pontifex Maximus) *Legatos cum mandatis & litteris ad Utilonem ire jubet, partes ſuas Bonifacio commendat. Virgilium Philoſophum (ſi Sacerdos ſit,* inquit, *neſcio) ab templo Dei & Eccleſiâ depellito, Sacerdotio in Concilio abdicato, ſi illam perverſam doctrinam fuerit confeſſus. . . . . . Inſuper regulo Boiorum denunciatum eſt, ut Virgilium Romam mittat, ubi Virgilius rationem reddat, ac à Pontifice Rom. examine comprobetur* (2). This is all that we know of this affair; we do not find that it went any farther by the Annals: wherefore the raſh careleſſneſs of thoſe, who tell us that Pope Zachary excommunicated and depoſed a Biſhop (3) for preſuming to aſſert that the earth is round, and inhabited in all parts of its circumference, is inexcuſable. Kepler, a Roman Catholic author, is one of theſe: *Fuit quidem Virgilius Epiſcopus Saliſburgenſis ab officio dejectus, quod* antipodas eſſe, *eſſet auſus aſſerere* (4). Origanus, a Proteſtant, ſaith the ſame thing: *Qui ſane Virgilium noſtrum communi calculo damnarunt, à ſacerdotio, templo & Eccleſia depulerunt* (5). But though we do not find that the Pope's menaces were executed, that cannot hinder us from concluding that they are injurious to his memory, and much more ſo to that of Boniface. It is certain, that Zachary ordered that Virgil ſhould be ſent to him as a perſon accuſed of dangerous errors: *Nos ſcribentes prædicto Duci* (Utiloni) *evocatorias de prænominato Virgilio mittimus litteras, ut nobis præſentatus & ſubtili indagatione requiſitus, ſi erroneus fuerit inventus, canonicis decretis condemnetur: qui enim ſeminant dolores, metunt eos.* Theſe words are taken out of his letter to Boniface (6); in which are alſo theſe following. *De perverſâ doctrinâ, quam contra Dominum & animam ſuam locutus eſt (quod ſcilicet alius mundus, & alii homines ſub terrâ ſint, aliuſque ſol & luna) ſi convictus fuerit ita confiteri, hunc, accito Concilio, ab Eccleſiâ pelle, Sacerdotii honore privatum.* From hence it appears, that he ordered him to be excommunicated and degraded from his prieſthood, if by his confeſſion he was convicted of having taught that there was another world, and other men under the earth, another ſun and another moon. I am not ignorant that the doctrine for which he would have this Biſhop to be condemned, was not the bare hypotheſis of the Antipodes; for it doth not ſuppoſe any different ſtars from thoſe which appear in our horizon: but yet this doctrine of the Antipodes plainly appears to be one of thoſe, which he judged worthy of the moſt rigorous puniſhments of the Canon Law. Was not this a prodigious ignorance? was it not an enormous abuſe of the Power of the Keys? I am willing to believe that Boniface impoſed upon him, and that he falſely repreſented Virgil's opinions. They had for ſome time been embroiled in a quarrel in which the jealouſy of learning and authority had engaged them; which made Boniface take a wrong view of Virgil's opinions. And who knows whether he did not give a malicious turn to the fact, by annexing ſeveral conſequences, which he thought proper to excite fears (7)? Some will have it that he ſuffered himſelf to be deceived by falſe reports, and that he judged of Virgil's ſentiments, from whatever was ſaid of them by ignorant relaters, who could not comprehend them. This is the learned Velſerus's charitable conjecture. 'Quod quidam conjecere, *ſays he* (8), 'non abnuerim: Virgilium de terræ ſpecie acutiùs, 'quàm pro vulgi captu, diſputaſſe, globoſam eſſe, & 'vivere è contrariâ parte, qui adverſis veſtigiis contra 'noſtra veſtigia, quos antipodas vocemus. Hos perinde ac nos ſole & lunâ luſtrari. Ea ignoratione 'audientium perperâm accepta detortaque, longè alio 'ſenſu ad Bonifacium perlata, offenſionum præbuiſſe 'ſementem. - - - *I cannot but approve the conjecture of 'ſome,* viz. *that Virgil treated of the figure of the earth 'in a manner that was too ſubtile for the comprehenſion 'of the vulgar, when he aſſerted that it was round, 'and that there were inhabitants on the other ſide of 'it directly oppoſite to us, to whom we give the name 'of Antipodes; and that theſe were viſited by the ſun 'and moon no leſs than we. This through the ignorance 'of the hearers being ill underſtood, and repreſented in a 'quite different light to Boniface, gave the firſt grounds 'of offence.*' But this doth not at all excuſe this Archbiſhop: his ignorance, his precipitation, his temerity in accuſing the innocent at the court of Rome, are undeniable facts. Velſerus having found no traces of the conſequence of this affair, believes that Virgil ſo explained his opinions, that he ſhewed them to be reaſonable, and that he was reconciled with his accuſer (9). 'Diſceptationis exitum non comperio. 'Fit veriſimile, aut purgaſſe ſe Virgilium Pontifici, 'ſive coram, ſive per litteras: aut cognitis invidiorum 'utrimque fraudibus . . . . . ultrò, quod inter bonos 'ſolet, in gratiam eſſe reditum. Sanè Bonifacius toto 'deinde ſeptennio (10) ſuperfuit, neque iſtius tamen 'diſſenſionis prætereà veſtigium apparet. - - - *I do not 'find what the iſſue of this debate was. It is probable 'either that Virgil cleared himſelf to the Pope by his 'letters or by word of mouth, or elſe that having diſ'covered the malignity of thoſe who fomented the diſcord '. . . . . they were like honeſt men reconciled to one 'another. Certain it is, that Boniface lived ſeven 'years longer, and that no footſtep of this quarrel ap'pears during all that time.*' I deſire it may be obſerved, that Velſerus doth his utmoſt to ſalve the honour of the Pope and of thoſe two ſaints (11); however he dares not venture ſo far as to affirm that their reconciliation was compleated. He declares that he did not know the iſſue of this quarrel, but that he thought it probable that Virgil made his peace with Zachary and his accuſer. It is not unlikely, ſaith he, that the malignity of thoſe who fomented the diſcord by falſe reports, was detected. Conjectures are allowable in dubious caſes; therefore we have nothing to object againſt Velſerus: but it is unreaſonable to ſet up for a deciding man in ſuch things, and therefore we have reaſon to complain of an Hiſtorian of Savoy who avers that *by the prudence of the Pope, and the wiſdom of Utilo, the authors of the calumny were diſcovered, and that thoſe holy men incapable of hatred, contracted a more ſtrict friendſhip than before* (12). This Hiſtorian is not the only one who hath acted in this manner: a great many authors have done the ſame thing; they have converted the conjectures which they read, into affirmations; they are like thoſe prating News-mongers, who an hour after they have read in the Gazette, that preparations are making for ſome ſiege, or for the paſſage of a river, report that the place is inveſted, and the army is already encamped on the other ſide of the river. The Hiſtorians of the ignorant ages were perhaps bolder in this particular than thoſe of our times, and if that be true, how many lies are we obliged to believe? and how ſtrongly do they fortify hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm, which daily increaſes (13)?

---

(1) Aventinus, Annal. Boiorum, *lib. iii.*

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) It appears from Aventinus's Narrative, that he was not yet a Biſhop.

(4) Keplerus, *Epiſt. ante lib. iv.* Epitom.

(5) Origanus, Epiſt. ad Elect. Brandenb.

(6) *See* Baronius, *Tom. ix, ad ann.* 748.

(7) As his teaching that all men are not deſcended from Adam, that Chriſt did not die for all men, *&c.*

(8) Marcus Velſerus, *lib. v,* Rerum Boicarum.

(9) *Idem,* Velſerus, *ibid.*

(10) From this you may infer that this diſpute happened in the year 748, for the death of Boniface, is placed in the year 755.

(11) So Boniface and Virgil are ſtiled.

(12) Blanc, Hiſt. de Baviere, *Tom. i, pag.* 323.

(13) I have juſt now read two Diſſertations of Father Daniel, wherein moſt of the things that are related of the Kings of France before Clovis, are ſaid to be falſe.

VIRGIL, or VERGIL (POLYDORE) was born at Urbino in Italy in the XVth century. He did not want either parts or learning. I take his firſt book to be a collection of proverbs which he publiſhed in the year 1498: before which time none of the Moderns publiſhed any thing of that nature; wherefore he boaſted of having preceded Eraſmus, whom he reproached in a very unhandſome manner [*A*]. His ſecond work, which treats of the Inventors of Things, was publiſhed in the year 1499 [*B*]. He was ſent to England in the beginning of the XVIth century (*a*), to collect the Papal tribute, called Peter-Pence. He recommended himſelf ſo well there, and liked the country to ſuch a degree, that having obtained the dignity of Archdeacon of the cathedral church of Wells (*b*), he reſolved to paſs the remainder of his life in England, and quitted his office of collector of the Peter-Pence. He undertook a great taſk, in the performance of which he laboured ſeveral years. It was the Hiſtory of England. He dedicated it to Henry VIII, in the year 1533. This book is not much valued by the Engliſh [*C*]. He put his laſt hand to his treatiſe of Prodigies in the year 1526 [*D*]. He was no very rigid Papiſt

(*a*) See the remark [*I*].

(*b*) See the remark [*E*].

[*A*] *He boaſted of having preceded Eraſmus, whom he reproached in a very unhandſome manner.*] I find in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to his treatiſe *de Inventoribus Rerum*, that he declares, that both with reſpect to that ſubject, as well as to the Proverbs, he had beaten the path for all other authors. *Non inficior ...... quin poſſit quiſpiam de hac re, velut de proverbiis, quorum libellum proximo anno Guidoni Principi, Urbini Duci inſcripſimus, copioſius tradere. Verum quicunque hoc vel illud poſthac ingredietur iter, quia nos primi ſtadium cucurrimus, is fortaſſe noſtra veſtigia ſequi non gravabitur* (1). If you read Eraſmus's epiſtles, you will there be informed that Polydore Virgil had ſaid ſeveral harſh things to him in the Preface to a new edition of his Proverbs: he accuſed him of vanity and envy (2); he called him a Plagiary (3), and took it very ill that his book was not mentioned in the Preface to Eraſmus's firſt edition. He charged him with attempting to rob him of his due honour. *Ubinam eſt iſta veritas quam in præfatione ſcribis procul eminere? quaque fretus boni conſulis quod ego callidus diſſimulator conatus ſim in gloriæ tuæ poſſeſſionem irrepere* (4)? Eraſmus juſtified himſelf very well in a letter he wrote to him in December 1521 (5). See alſo his twelfth letter of the firſt book, page 50. He did an action too glorious to be omitted, and ſo exemplary, that it ought to be propoſed to the imitation of all authors. The Bookſeller at Baſil deſigning to reprint Polydore Virgil's book, reſolved to ſuppreſs the Preface, becauſe it reflected on Eraſmus. But this great man would not conſent to it, but ordered him not to leave out any part of it, whatever the import of it was: *Vel hinc colligas licet, quàm non fuerimus iniqui tuo libro.* Frobenium, *ut dictum eſt, abhorrentem ab editione perpuli. Præfationem tuam, quâ me ſuggillas, ad me miſerant, velut execrandam. Remiſi juſſique, ut bonâ fide, ſicut abs te fuerat deſcripta, excuderetur: deleverunt mentionem* Lei, *quam tu de illo ſanè quam honorificam facis. Juſſi ut reponerent. Utrum hæc ſunt faventis an non* (6)? Two years after he adviſed the author himſelf to correct it, that there might be no appearance of any jealouſy betwixt them. *Mihi videris conſulte facturus, ſi primam illam præfationem totam retexas. Primum faciet hoc ad operis commendationem ob novitatem. Deinde faciet ad opinionem utriuſque noſtrum, quod inſunt in illa priore quædam, quibus ego quidem non offendor, ſed tamen ſuſpitionem præbent eruditis alicujus inter nos æmulationis* (7). In my edition of this treatiſe of Proverbs there is nothing againſt Eraſmus (8). This trifling quarrel did not break off their friendſhip. See Eraſmus's letter to him in the year 1526 (9). Obſerve that Polydore Virgil had formerly made him a preſent to buy a horſe (10). As alſo that he dedicated to him his tranſlation of a piece of St Chryſoſtom in the year 1528 (11).

[*B*] *His ſecond work ... was publiſhed in* 1499.] We ſhall here make uſe of a diſtinction which Voſſius has not uſed: he ſaith that this tract of Polydore Virgil contains eight books, which were firſt printed in the year 1499 (12). But this account is not exact. For the author publiſhed but three books at firſt, whereof the Epiſtle Dedicatory was dated in that year. He added five more in 1517, and dedicated them (13) to John Matthew Virgil, his brother, profeſſor of Philoſophy at Padua. So that Sir Thomas-Pope Blount is miſtaken when he ſaith that theſe eight books were printed at Straſburgh in 4to, in the year 1509 (14). Mr Moreri hath committed the ſame error as Voſſius.

[*C*] *This book is not much eſteemed by the Engliſh.*] Sir Henry Savil ſays of it; 'Polydorus, ut homo Italus, & in rebus noſtris Hoſpes, & (quod caput eſt) neque in Republicâ verſatus, nec magni alioqui, vel judicii, vel ingenii; pauca ex multis delibans, & falſa plerumque pro veris amplexus, Hiſtoriam nobis reliquit, cùm cætera mendoſam, tum exiliter ſanè, & jejune conſcriptam (15). - - - *Polydore, as being an Italian, and a ſtranger to our affairs, and (which is the chief thing) being neither acquainted with public buſineſs, nor otherwiſe a man of any great parts or judgment, touches upon a few things among many, and, generally ſpeaking, embraces falſhoods for truths. By this means he hath left us a hiſtory which, beſides being faulty in every other reſpect, is written in a manner that is both dry and barren.*' Another Engliſh writer calls him a malicious detracter: 'Nominis Britannici gloriam non ſolum obfuſcare, ſed etiam Britannos ipſos mendaciſſimis ſuis calumniis infamare totis viribus conatur (16). - - - *He hath endeavoured, as much as poſſible, not only to diminiſh the glory of the Britiſh name, but alſo to defame the Britons themſelves by his lying reproaches.*' But there is a complaint againſt him of a different nature: Paul Jovius obſerves that the French and Scots charged Polydore Virgil with flattering the Engliſh to an exceſſive degree, 'Conſcripſit Hiſtorias rerum Britannicarum, ea fide ut Scotis, & Gallis ſæpe reclamantibus, alieno potius arbitrio, quam ſuo intexuiſſe multa in gratiam gentis exiſtimetur, quòd in recenſendis minorum Ducum nominibus, tanquam gloriæ avidis plurimum indulſerit (17). - - - *He wrote the Hiſtory of England with ſuch particularity, that the Scotch and French pretend, he has inſerted many things in favour of the Engliſh nation, more to pleaſe others than in compliance with his own judgment. They alledge, as a proof of this, the great pains he takes in reckoning up the names of inconſiderable captains, as if they had been very deſirous of glory.*' John Leland hath cenſured ſeveral faults of Polydore Virgil, as Voſſius obſerves (18).

[*D*] *His treatiſe of Prodigies.*] It is compoſed of ſeveral dialogues, wherein he ſtrongly oppoſes the art of Divining. A ſmall part of the preface, dated at London 1526, runs thus: 'Cujus (*Chriſti*) ipſe quoque doctrina inſtructus confidenter veni in certamen cum ariolis, auguribus, haruſpicibus, vatibus, ſortilegis, quos partim divinis, partim naturalibus debilitatos imo atque adeo devictos rationibus, jacere cum ſuis peſtiferis artibus, videre jam licebit (19). - - - *Armed with the doctrine of CHRIST, I have confidently entered the liſts with the ſooth-ſayers, wizards, and fortune-tellers; whom, together with their pernicious arts, you may now ſee weakened, or rather entirely deſtroyed, by reaſons partly natural and partly theological.*' This is therefore a work of a very different nature from that of Julius Obſequens, which was enlarged by Lycoſthenes. We are told of an

---

(1) Polyd. Virgilius, *Epiſt. Dedic. Libri* de Inventor. Rerum. *It is dated from Urbino, the fifth of Auguſt.* 1499.

(2) Inclementius eſt etiam quod hujus argumenti primum apud Latinos tractati laudem ſic tibi vendicas, ut mihi coneris cenodoxias ſimul & livoris ſuſpicionem impingere. *Eraſm. Epiſt. iii, lib. xvii, pag.* 748. *We ſhall ſee in the remark* [*L*], *the very words of Polydore Virgil.*

(3) Priuſquam hac præfatione inſimulares ... livoris ſimul & plagii. *Id. ibid. pag.* 749.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) That which I have juſt now quoted.

(6) Eraſm. ubi ſupra.

(7) *Idem, Epiſt. xlv, lib. xx, pag.* 1007.

(8) It is of Baſil, 1541, in 8vo, from the fourth reviſal of the author.

(9) It is the xxvth of the xxiſt book.

(10) *Idem, Epiſt. xxv, lib. xxi, pag.* 1093.

(11) Idem opuſculum (*Chryſoſtomi Monachum*) in Anglia vertit Virgilius Polydorus ſatis feliciter, mihi dicatum. Excuſum eſt autem Lutetiæ. *Idem, Epiſt. xiv, lib. xxv, pag.* 1354.

(12) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Latinis, *pag.* 678.

(13) That Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated at London the 5th of December 1517.

(14) Pope Blount, Cenſ. Author. *p.* 452.

(15) Henricus Savilius, *Præfat. ad* Rerum Anglicar. Scriptores, *apud* Pope Blount, Cenſ. Author. *pag.* 451.

(16) Humfred. Lhuyd. in Deſcript. Angliæ, *apud* Pope Blount, *ibid. pag.* 452.

(17) Paulus Jovius, Elog. *cap. cxxxv, pag.* 279.

(18) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 679.

(19) Polyd. Virgilius, *Præfat. ad Franciſcum Mariam Urbini Ducem.*

Papiſt in all particulars [*E*]; he was not at all diſguſted at England on account of the change of religion which was brought about in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. He did not deſire to leave that kingdom in the year 1550, on any other account than that his age required a warmer and more ſouthern climate. He obtained leave to depart, and was permitted to receive the revenue of his benefices during

an edition at London, in 1526 (20): but Geſner knew nothing of it; for he mentions only that of Baſil, printed by Bebelius, in 1531. I have the Baſil edition in 1545, 8vo, *per* Mich. Iſingrinum. To it are prefixed three other tracts of Polydore Virgil (21); the Epiſtle Dedicatory, written by him, is dated at London in 1543,

[*E*] *He was no very rigid Papiſt in all particulars.*] He approved the marriage of the Clergy, and condemned image-worſhip. I ſhall here cite at large what John Bale ſaith of him; it furniſhes me with a proof which I promiſed (22). 'Ob inſignem in omni bonarum literarum genere eruditionem, Wellenſis Eccleſiæ Archidiaconus (23) poſtmodum factus, priori officio Pontifici reſignato, conſtituit Romam non repetere, ſed deinceps in noſtrâ permanere Inſulâ. Et licet in pleriſque ſcriptis ſuis veræ Religioni ſuperſtitionem prætulerit, piè nihilominus Chriſtianorum Miniſtrorum conjugia defendebat, pièque ſtatuarum cultum damnabat, cum quibuſdam aliis Romanenſium Rabbinorum impoſturis. Quòd antiquitati Britannicæ in Anglorum Hiſtoriâ, quàm par eſt, iniquior ſit, ex veterum illius Gentis Chronicorum & Hiſtoriarum ignoratione provenit. Quòd prætereà Reges aliquot ab impietate pios, & alios è diverſo ab ipsâ æquitate iniquos etiam promulgaverit, communi ante agnitam veritatem per Dei verbum, errori ac cæcitati imputandum eſſe judico . . . . Erat certè Polydorus ob erudita illa de Rerum Inventoribus, Sacrorum Ritibus & Prodigiis Opuſcula, ab ipſis etiam piis ſuſpiciendus (24). - - - *Being made Archdeacon of Wells, on account of his remarkable ſkill in all the different kinds of learning, he reſigned his former benefice to the Pope, and reſolved not to return any more to Rome, but to paſs the remainder of his life in our iſland. And tho' in moſt of his writings, he preferred ſuperſtition to the true religion, he nevertheleſs piouſly ſtood for the marriage of Chriſtian miniſters, and zealouſly condemned the worſhip of images, together with ſome other impoſitions of the Romiſh Rabbies. As to his being ſomewhat injurious to the antiquity of Britain, in his Hiſtory of England, it proceeded from his not knowing the antient chronicles and hiſtories of that nation. And as to his calling ſome kings pious from their impious conduct, and others again unjuſt from their equitable actions, I think it ſhould be imputed to the general error and blindneſs which prevailed before truth came to be diſcovered by the word GOD . . . Certain it is that Polydore deſerves to be admired even by good and religious men, for his learned works,* de Rerum Inventoribus, Sacrorum Ritibus & Prodigiis.' The treatiſe *de Inventoribus Rerum* contains ſeveral things which the Inquiſition diſliked; wherefore it approved of no edition but that which Gregory XIII cauſed to be printed at Rome in the year 1576, which was purged of all thoſe paſſages which diſpleaſed the inquiſitors. And as for the other editions, they ordered the blotting out of ſeveral paſſages (25). The Spaniſh Index expreſsly commands the expunging of Polydore Virgil's reflexion on St Peter's not permitting the Centurion to kiſs his feet. And indeed it contains a very ſharp cenſure on the pride of the Eccleſiaſtics; the words are: 'Pater manſuetudinis plenus id fieri non eſt paſſus, qui elevans eum ſibi ad pedes jacentem, dixit: Surge, & ego ipſe homo ſum. O vocem memorabilem, atque ſalutarem, ſi bene multi hodie ſeſe quoque homines tantum eſſe perpenderent, qui propterea quòd ſacerdotio præditi ſint, planè ſe reliquorum mortalium, longè poſt hominum memoriam imperioſiſſimos dominos præbent, non communes patres, uti fieri deberet (26). - - - *St Peter, full of meekneſs, would not ſuffer the Centurion to do it, but raiſing him up while he lay at his feet; Riſe,* ſaid he, *for I myſelf am a man. O how remarkable an expreſſion is this, and how full of wholſome morality, if it was now a-days duly attended to by thoſe who, forgetting that they are men, do, becauſe they are inveſted with the prieſtly office, behave like the moſt imperious of all maſters, and not like common fathers, as they ought to be.*' But this author did not take the ſame liberty with reſpect to the Popes; for, on the contrary, he juſtifies and commends the cuſtom of kiſſing their feet. And yet ſome writers cite him as diſapproving it. '*Non poſſum, quin addam, quæ hac de re occurrunt apud* Polydorum Virgilium, *hominem Papiſtam,* de Rerum Invent. lib. IV. cap. 13. Romani Pontifices, *inquit*, deoſculandos pedes exhibendi morem à Chriſto ſe accepiſſe contendunt. At Chriſtus non Magdalenæ oſculandos pedes obtulit; ſed ſponte peccata fatentem, & ſuam miſericordiam non ſolo amplexu genuum, ut ethnici, ſed etiam oſculo pedum implorantem, ejus conſolandæ causâ admiſit: hoc ipſum honoris genus alioquin non minus repudiaturus, etſi ſibi re verâ debitum, quam appellationem Magiſtri boni. Sic quoque Petrus Cornelium centurionem ad genua procidentem manu ſua ſublevavit, SURGE, inquit, HOMO SUM TIBI SIMILIS: tantum abfuit ut oſculandos pedes exhibuerit. Decipimur ſpecie recti, & ſæpe cum Caligula pedes protendimus, dum Chriſti humilitatem vel ſpernimus, vel fucato conſervandæ Apoſtolicæ autoritatis titulo exornare laboramus (27). - - - *I cannot help adding what we find upon this ſubject in Polydore Virgil, tho' a Popiſh writer. He ſays, in his book* de Rerum Invent. *that the Popes pretend to derive from CHRIST the cuſtom of preſenting their feet to be kiſſed. But CHRIST, ſays he, did not offer his feet to Mary Magdalen in order that ſhe ſhould kiſs them; but while ſhe made a voluntary confeſſion of her ſins, and implored his mercy, not only by embracing his knees after the manner of the Heathens, but alſo by kiſſing his feet, he ſuffered it for her conſolation: in any other caſe he would have been no leſs for rejecting this kind of honour than he was for refuſing the title of Good Maſter. Thus alſo did Peter take up the Centurion, when he fell at his feet:* Stand up, *ſaid he, for* I myſelf am a man: *ſo far was he from offering him his feet to kiſs. We are cheated by the appearance of right, and we often ſtretch out our feet with Caligula, while we either deſpiſe the humility of CHRIST, or ſtudy to ſet it off with the ſpecious pretence of keeping up the Apoſtolical authority.*' It is a Remonſtrant Miniſter who cites Polydore Virgil's words in this manner, and that too after having aſſured us in his preface, that excepting only twice or thrice, he hath always examined the paſſages which he cites. This paſſage of Polydore Virgil muſt then be one of the two or three which he has not examined, for there is an enormous difference betwixt what he really ſays, and what this miniſter aſcribes to him. Conſult Mr Crenius (28), who hath very ſmartly ſet forth this miſtake, and compared the two places together, that juſt now cited, and as it really is in Polydore Virgil in the Straſburgh edition, printed in 1606, in 8vo. I have conſulted my edition which is that of Lyons *apud hæredes Seb. Gryphii* 1558, in 8vo, and I find that the words exactly agree with thoſe alledged by Mr Crenius. I have alſo conſulted the French verſion of Polydore Virgil, publiſhed by Francis de Belleforeſt at Paris in 1582, and I find that he made uſe of an original which was exactly the ſame with my Latin one. I cannot therefore be ſufficiently ſurprized at the prodigious depravations which are crept into the quotations of this paſſage.

I ſhall quote an author who aſſures us that Polydore Virgil died in the year 1562, and that, in Lippomanus's judgment, the treatiſe *de Inventoribus Rerum* is a wretched book. 'Mors etiam Polydori Virgilii contigit Suaſſæ †, ubi natus erat. Multa ſcripſit, ſed non omnes docti ea exiſtimant. Imperitiſſimum vocat eum & vanitatis redarguit doctiſſimus Lindanus ‡, atque hominis hujus ſcripto, quod de rerum inventoribus finxit, nihil extare noſtrâ ætate in lucem editum, pluribus, quod ſcateat magis, aut futilibus perfluat conjecturis (29). - - - *Polydore Virgil died at Urbino, where he was born. He wrote a great deal; but his writings are not all eſteemed by the learned. Lindanus calls him a moſt ignorant author, and accuſes*

'*him*

---

(20) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 678.

(21) De Patientia & ejus fructu Libri ii; de Vita perfecta Liber I, de Veritate & Mendacio Lib. i.

(22) In the margin of the text of this article.

(23) *Theſe words of* Paul Jovius, ubi ſupra, Is ab Henrico Rege fortunis adauctus flamenque Londini creatus, *are fallacious; they ſeem to imply that he was Canon of London.*

(24) Joan. Balæus, de Scriptor. Britann. *Centur.* XIII, *apud* Pope Blount, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 451.

(25) *See the* Index librorum prohibit. & expurg. *pag.* 850, *& ſeq. Edit.* 1667, *in folio.*

(26) Polyd. Vergilius de Inventor. Rerum, *lib. iv, cap. xiii, pag. m.* 290.

(27) Anton. Borremanſ. Variar. Lect. *pag.* 267.

(28) Crenius Animadv. Philol. & Hiſt. *Part. i, pag.* 62, *& ſeq.*

† It is the town of Urbino in the Marca d'Ancona.

‡ Panop. Evang. ſer. c. 98.

(29) Petrus à Sancto Romualdo, in Continuatione Chronici Ademari, *pag.* 326.

during his abſence [F]. It is ſaid he died at Urbino (c) in the year 1555. He is accuſed of having burnt ſeveral manuſcripts in order to prevent the diſcovery of the faults of his hiſtory of England [G]. It was printed ſeveral times [H], which ſhews that the world was more eaſily impoſed on in that age than they are at preſent, or elſe more addicted to ſtudy; ſince an impreſſion of the beſt Hiſtorians in folio will hardly go off at this time.

Since the ſecond edition of this Dictionary, I have been informed of the following particulars. Polydore Virgil was ſo ſucceſsful in his firſt eſſay, which was his collection of proverbs, that there were three or four impreſſions of it in a very ſhort time. This good fortune encouraged him to ſet about a more difficult enterpriſe, which was to write a treatiſe upon the Inventors of Things. I have ſaid before that he publiſhed it in the year 1499. After that he was ſent into England by Pope Alexander VI, and being deſired by Henry VII to compoſe a hiſtory of that country, he ſet his hand to it in the year 1505 [I]. He himſelf gives an account of theſe things in an Epiſtle Dedicatory which he

‘ *him likewiſe of vanity. He ſays, that in our time nothing has been publiſhed which abounds more in trifling conjectures than his treatiſe* de Inventoribus Rerum.’ It is certain that he did not pleaſe the bigots.

[F] *He did not deſire to leave that kingdom in the year* 1550, *on any other account than that of his age . . . . He obtained leave to depart.*] This I take from the Hiſtory of the Reformation of England: ‘Polydore Virgil, after having lived almoſt forty years in England, aſked leave to go and end his days, a little nearer the ſun, he being very old. Which was granted him, on the ſecond of June, and in conſideration of the ſervices, which it was thought he had done to the public, by his hiſtory, he was allowed, during his abſcence, to hold the Archdeaconry of Wells and the Prebend of Nonninton (30).’ Mr de Larrey relates the ſame thing (31), but adds a marginal note, by which we are informed that Harmer (32) *ſaith it was in* 1551, *that* Polydore Virgil retired, and then he adds: ‘Perhaps ſome regard was had to his moderate behaviour, in the Reformation which Henry VIII began, and Edward had carried on. For as much an Italian as he was, he did not engage with any of the defenders of the ſee of Rome, but ſubſcribed the reſolutions which were taken in the aſſemblies of the Clergy in favour of the king's ſupremacy (33).’ As for the reſt, I ſhall ſhew hereafter (34) why it could not be ſaid, that in the year 1550, he had only lived near forty years in England.

[G] *He is accuſed of having burnt ſeveral manuſcripts in order to prevent the diſcovery of the faults of his Hiſtory of England.*] To this purpoſe read the following ſhort account: ‘Quem (*Polydorum*) ne aliquando intelligerentur errores, fama percrebuit, atque etiam cognitum & compertum certò eſt, tot hiſtorias noſtras vetuſtas & Manuſcriptas immani ſcelere igni commendaſſe, quot ne plauſtrum quidem poſſet capere atque ſuſtinere, arbitratus, ut credo, ſe ejus generis omnes ſolùm habuiſſe, aut veritus ſibi vitio dari, quòd ſecutus legem jampridem librorum veterum caſtigatoribus datam (ut ipſe de ſe ait in præfatione in Gildam) nonnulla reſecuerit, quæ Scriptores prodiderunt. Superſunt tamen Deo volente quamplurimi omnis generis, & illis Polydori multò pleniores & perfectiores (35). - - - *It was reported, nay it was found to be certainly true that this Polydore, to prevent the diſcovery of his errors, had moſt ſcandalouſly burnt a greater number of our old hiſtories in manuſcript than would have filled and loaded a waggon. He imagined, I ſuppoſe, that he had got them all into his hands, or perhaps he was afraid of being cenſured, for that having followed the rule which the correctors of old books have long obſerved, (as he ſays of himſelf, in his Preface againſt Gilda) he had retrenched many things which he found in theſe authors. Nevertheleſs it has pleaſed* GOD *that there ſhould ſtill remain a great many books of all kinds, which are more full and perfect than thoſe of Polydore.*’ La Popeliniere tells the ſame ſtory; which I ſhall give you in his own words without leaving out any of them, for if I ſhould leave out any, they would be ſuch as ought to be known. ‘Polydore Virgil, a native of Urbino in Italy, was ſent for, and appointed by Henry VIII (36), to ſet the Engliſh Hiſtory in a true light, which he digeſted into twenty-ſix books. They are more valuable, becauſe the Engliſh have ſcarce any ancient authors left to have recourſe to in caſe of doubts or ignorance with reſpect to any conſiderable event, (for after having finiſhed that work he cauſed all thoſe to be burnt which by the king's authority and the aſſiſtance of his friends he could poſſibly come at) than for the ſtile, truth, care, or judiciouſneſs of his performance. Our Frenchmen tell us the ſame thing of P. Æmilius, his neighbour and co-temporary, and of ſeveral others, who, greedy of equal fame with Plato and Ariſtotle, burnt, as they did, ſeveral books after having extracted the quinteſſence of them, in order to make up books, which they afterwards publiſhed under their own names (37).’

[H] *It was printed ſeveral times.*] I have already ſaid that the date of the Epiſtle Dedicatory is of the year 1533 (38). And I doubt not but the edition mentioned by Geſner, I mean that printed at Baſil by Bebelius, in 1534, in folio, is the firſt edition. The author reviſed his work, and corrected ſeveral places in the ſecond edition, which was in 1536. I make uſe of that of *Baſil apud Mich. Iſingrinium*, in 1556, in folio, which contains but twenty-ſix books. But I find in the epitome of Geſner (39), that this hiſtory in twenty-ſeven books *ab auctore recogniti ad amuſſim expoſiti*, was printed by Iſingrinius, and afterward by Thomas Guerin in folio, in 1570. I wiſh the year of Iſingrinius's edition had been mentioned, and I cannot believe that it contains twenty-ſeven books, ſince that which Thyſius publiſhed at Leyden in 1649 (40) contains no more than twenty-ſix; and doubtleſs Thyſius followed the beſt and moſt compleat of all the foregoing editions. However it be, the twenty-ſix books of this Hiſtory ended with the death of Henry VII. Therefore I cannot well underſtand the author who accuſes our Virgil of having falſified the relation of affairs concerning the reign of Henry VIII, in order to inſinuate himſelf into the favour of Queen Mary, when it is certain that he left England before there was any probability that Mary would come to the crown. It is alſo certain that his Hiſtory, printed at Baſil (41) a year after his death, contains but twenty-ſix books, which reach no farther than the death of Henry VII. And therefore the following paſſage is ſomewhat obſcure to me. ‘Maxime erravit Polydorus in deſcribendis temporibus Henrici VIII. Nam præter quod linguæ noſtratis prorſus ignarus, plurima eorum temporum neſcire habuit neceſſe: plurima etiam, ut Mariæ Reginæ gratiam promptius demereri poſſet, ſcripſiſſe, non ſine cauſa perhibetur. Priorum verò temporum, eadem non eſt ſuſpicio (42). - - - *Polydore has chiefly miſtaken in deſcribing the reign of Henry VIII. For beſides that, he was an entire ſtranger to our language, there were many particulars relating to thoſe times of which he muſt have been ignorant. It is likewiſe not without cauſe reported that he writ many things with a view to inſinuate himſelf into Queen Mary's favour. But in the preceding reigns there is no room for this ſuſpicion.*’ Beſides it is probable that Polydore Virgil did not ſtay ſo long at London, being during that time employed in preparing his Hiſtory of England without learning Engliſh. At the worſt it was leſs difficult for him to be acquainted with the reign of Henry VIII, than with thoſe of the preceding kings. For what reaſon therefore do they ſuppoſe that he knew leſs of this reign than of the others?

[I] *After that he was ſent into England by Pope Alexander VI, and being deſired by Henry VII to compoſe a hiſtory of that country, he ſet his hand to it in the year 1505.*] All theſe facts are related, with divers particulars, in the following words. ‘Placuit is (*Commentariolus*

(c) Thevet, Elog. des Hommes illuſtres, *Tom. vii, pag.* 309, 310. *See the remark* [E], *towards the end.*

(30) Burnet, Hiſtory of the Reformation of England, *Part. ii, book i, ad ann.* 1550, *pag.* 374.

(31) De Larrey, Hiſt. d'Anglet. *Tom. i, pag.* 682, *ad ann.* 1550.

(32) In an Engliſh book againſt Dr Burnet's Hiſtory of the Reformation.

(33) De Larry, ibid. *pag.* 683.

(34) In the remark [I].

(35) Joh. Caius, de Antiquit. Cantab. *lib. i, pag.* 52, *apud* Pope Blount, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 451, 452.

(36) He was not ſent for out of Italy by Henry VIII, but the Pope ſent him into England to collect what went by the name of Peter-Pence.

(37) La Popeliniere, Hiſt. des Hiſtoires, *livr. ix, pag.* 485.

(38) In the month of Auguſt.

(39) Pag. 703.

(40) It is in 8vo.

(41) It is the edition of 1556.

(42) Whear, de Meth. leg. Hiſt. §. xxx, *apud* Pope Blount, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 451.

he writes to JOHN MATTHEW VERGIL, his brother [*K*]. He likewiſe ſays there that ANTONY VERGIL, his great grand-father, was very well verſed in Phyſic and Aſtrology, and had taught Philoſophy at Paris. For the reſt, as the reproachful things he ſaid of Eraſmus are contained in an Epiſtle Dedicatory which has been left out of moſt of the editions, I ſhall quote them below [*L*].

‘ *riolus de Proverbiis*) ſua præſertim novitate uſque adeo, delectavitque uſque adeo, ut brevi mox terque quaterque (ſicuti Poëta ait) fuerit formis excuſus. Hac levi aura (fateor ingenue) evectus, tum majus aggreſſus opus, de rerum inventoribus, negocium ſuſcepi, naviterque minus menſibus novem, confeci. Sic Polydorus ego primus apud Latinos, utriuſque rei argumentum attentavi, id quod in præfationibus unius & alterius operis affatim docuimus. Veni poſthæc miſſu Alexandri ſexti Romani pontificis in Britanniam quæ nunc Anglia eſt, ut quæſturam pontificiam apud Anglos gererem. Ubi ne bonum ocium tererem, rogatu Henrici ejus appellationis ſeptimi Regis præſtantiſſimi, res ejus populi geſtas ſcripſi, in hiſtoriæque ſtilum redegi. Quod hercle opus duodecim annos ſub literatoria incude laboratum, obſtante fato, nondum abſolvere licuit (43). - - - *This little book of Proverbs was ſo well liked, particularly for the newneſs of the thing, that it preſently underwent three or four editions. I freely own that I was encouraged by this ſlight ſucceſs to undertake a work of a more difficult nature, I mean my treatiſe on the Inventors of Things, which I finiſhed, with great application, in leſs than nine months. Thus I Polydore was the firſt among the Latin writers, who ventured to write upon both theſe ſubjects, as I have ſhewed at large in my preface to each. I was afterwards ſent into England by Pope Alexander VI, to collect the Papal tribute in that country. That I might not be idle, I undertook, at the deſire of Henry VII, to write the Hiſtory of England. But though I have been twelve years employed about this work, I have not yet been able to finiſh it.*’ This paſſage is found prefixed to his book *de Inventoribus Rerum*, printed at Baſil in the year 1521, *in folio*, and it is in this manner that the author ſpeaks to his brother. His letter is dated from London on the fifth of December 1517, and is to be ſeen at the beginning of the fourth book of the ſame treatiſe in ſeveral other editions; but the paſſage I have quoted is wanting, which is one of my reaſons for inſerting it here. It will likewiſe be the more acceptable, as it affords a proof, that if Polydore Virgil ſtaid in England till the year 1550, or 1551, he was there in all near fifty years (44).

[*K*] JOHN MATTHEW VERGIL, *his brother.*] He was a learned man both in Greek and Latin. He practiſed Phyſic in Ferrara, there taught Logic publickly, and after that was Profeſſor of Philoſophy in the univerſity of Padua (45). Before the age of thirty, he was a good Philoſopher, a good Phyſician, and a good Orator, and was beſides a man of the ſtricteſt probity. It is his brother who gives him this character in the Epiſtle Dedicatory which I have already mentioned: *Tibi negocium damus & juvandi tuo labore ſtudioſos, & nomini familiæ noſtræ conſulendi, cui propè uni ſeculi noſtri contigit ante ſextum ætatis luſtrum, cum tanta morum probitate, eſſe philoſopho, medico, ac oratori perfecto. Ex qua doctrinarum ſcintilla, tota jam Italia lucem maximam maturiſſime erupturam auguratur* (46). Theſe words are wanting in moſt of the editions.

[*L*] *The reproachful things he ſaid of Eraſmus . . . I ſhall quote them below.*] They are in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his treatiſe upon Proverbs, printed at Baſil for John Froben in the year 1521, *in folio*. This Epiſtle is inſcribed to a Secretary of Henry VIII, and dated at London on the fifth of June 1519. ‘ Ita Polydorus tuus apud Latinos primus hujuſce rei argumentum attentavit: & quicquid id laudis fuit, jam pridem citra cujuſcunque injuriam, jure ſibi optimo vindicavit. At poſt aliquot annos quàm ita de proverbiis commentariolum ædideram, ecce tibi, ſucceſſorem habui noſtrum Eraſmum, id quod ob ſingularem hominis doctrinam pergratum fuit, & ſi ille ceu ejuſmodi commentarioli noſtri minime ſciens, utrumque decus, inventæ ſcilicet rei atque auctæ ad ſe trahere eſt conatus, quem tamen vix potuit ignorare, ſi unquam ſuum ipſius Adagiorum opus Argentorati, quod eſt ſuæ Germaniæ oppidum, apud Matthiam Schurerium formulis excuſum vidit: vidit haut dubio procul, cum illud poſtmodum bis térve adauxerit. Quippe in ejus operis fronte Matthias atteſtatur ſe paulo ante noſtra adagia in apertum protuliſſe. Ipſi etiam eum cum aliquando apud nos pranderet per jocum, noſtri hujus inſtituti æmulatorem appellavimus. Ita ille rei ſuæ intentus nuper in noviſſima paræmiarum ſuarum editione, eſt palàm profeſſus, primum ſe apud Latinos id genus argumenti attentaſſe, ut cui tum non venit in mentem noſtri libelli imaginis. Etenim penè incredibile eſt Eraſmum tot titulis redundantem, velle cuiquam tam modicæ inventionis gloriolam invidere. Quanquam ſunt nonnulli ſagaciores, qui adfirment eum idcirco illud diſſimulaſſe, ut qui præter adagiorum multitudinem nihilo plus præſtiterat, ne videretur eſſe imitatus, atque ſic primas ferret partes. Ego tamen (quia veritas procul eminet) totum iſtud æqui bonique faciens, tantum apud te, qui utriuſque noſtrum es ex æquo amantiſſimus, teſtatum eſſe volui quo nihil ex eo offenſionis poſthac eſſem habiturus. Nam (ut Martialis ait) qui velit ingenio cedere, rarus erit. Cæterum ſum gaviſus (uti dixi) tali ſucceſſore (47). - - - *Thus your Polydore was the firſt among the Latin authors who attempted to write upon this ſubject: and whatever praiſe was due from ſuch an undertaking, he has long ago ſecured it to himſelf, without wronging any man. But a few years after I had publiſhed my ſmall treatiſe on Proverbs, a ſucceſſor appeared: and who ſhould that be but our friend Eraſmus? This was very agreeable to me, on account of his ſingular learning, notwithſtanding that he claimed the honour both of the invention and improvements that were made upon it, as if he had known nothing at all of my treatiſe: which is neverthele ſſcarce poſſible, if he ever ſaw his own book of Proverbs, printed at Straſburg in Germany for Matthew Schurerius: and that he ſaw it is certain ſince he enlarged it twice or thrice afterwards. For in his advertiſement prefixed to that book, the ſaid Matthew declares, that he had publiſhed my Proverbs a little before. Likewiſe at a certain time when Eraſmus did me the favour to dine with me, I told him, by way of joke, that he was my rival in this undertaking. But he was ſo intent upon the affair, that when he publiſhed the laſt edition of his Proverbs not long ago, he openly pretended to be the firſt Latin writer who had treated on that ſubject. In all likelihood he had no thought nor remembrance of my little book at that time: for it is ſcarce credible that Eraſmus, who has ſo many things to value himſelf upon, would envy another perſon the ſmall glory of ſuch an ordinary invention: altho' ſome very judicious men affirm that he diſſembled his knowledge of it for this reaſon, leſt he ſhould ſeem to have imitated another, and not to have deſerved the firſt praiſe, as he was ſenſible that he had done nothing more than collected a multitude of Proverbs. But I (becauſe the truth is very well known) taking all this in good part, thought fit only to proteſt to you, who are alike a friend to us both, that it ſhall never give me any trouble for the time to come. For, as Martial ſays,* The man who yields the prize of wit is rare. *But, as I ſaid before, I was pleaſed with ſuch a worthy ſucceſſor.*’ Compare with this what has been quoted in the remark [*A*].

(43) Polyd. Vergilius, *Epiſt. Dedicat. Librorum* de Inventoribus Rerum, *ad Joan. Matthæum fratrem, Edit. Baſil.* 1521 *in folio.*

(44) Correct therefore what has been quoted in the remark [*F*].

(45) Polyd. Virgilii, ubi ſupra.

(46) Id. ibid.

(47) Id. ibid. *Epiſt. Libri* Adagiorum *ad Ricardum Pacæum.*

VITELLIO, or VITELLO, author of a treatiſe of Optics, which is pretty much eſteemed, lived after the middle of the XIIIth century [*A*]. Some authors ſay that

[*A*] *He lived after the middle of the XIIIth century.*] This appears by his dedicating his book to Friar William de Morbeta, who wrote a treatiſe of Geomancy in the year 1269. This date was expreſſed by the that he was born in Germany, but others make him a Polander [*B*]. It is very probable that he compoſed his book in Italy [*C*]. The edition which Frederic Riſnerus procured in the year 1572, is incomparably better than that of Nuremberg in 1535. We ſhall ſee below the praiſes which he beſtowed on the labours of Vitellio [*D*]. Mr Konig knew of no other edition than that of Nuremberg, which he believed to be publiſhed by the author himſelf (*a*).

the author himſelf, as Frederic Riſnerus, who had read that treatiſe in manuſcript, informs us (1). Whence we ought to conclude that Tanſtetter (2) miſtook in placing Vitellio in the Xth century. Eraſmus Reinhold, Gauric, Peucer, Blancanus, Voſſius, &c. agree in placing him after the middle of the XIIIth.

[*B*] *Some authors ſay that he was born in Germany . . . . others make him a Polander.*] The laſt opinion is the moſt eligible, for in the ſeventy-fourth theorem of the tenth book of Vitellio we find theſe words: *In noſtra terra, ſcilicet Poloniæ habitabili, &c* (3). - - - *In our country*, viz. *Poland, &c.* In the title of his book, the ſirname of *filius Polonorum & Thuringorum*, is given to him; which, according to Riſnerus (4) ſignifies, that his father was a Polander, or a Thuringian, or that his mother was a Thuringian, or a Polander. Regiomontanus, in his Preface to Alphragan expreſſes himſelf thus, *Vitellio autem noſter Thuringus* (5), which is intimating that Thuringia was Vitellio's country.

[*C*] *It is very probable that he compoſed his book in Italy.*] See the proofs of this fact which Riſnerus hath collected. ‘ Quædam ſunt in Opticis notæ Vitellonem in Italiam veniſſe, Italiæque bibliothecis ‘ adjutum fuiſſe. Etenim Vitello ipſe de ſe teſtis eſt ‘ lib. 10. theor. 42. ſe primum omnium in Italia ad ‘ Cubalum (qui locus eſt inter Paduam & Vincentiam) ‘ contemplatione aquæ tenuiſſimæ ac limpidiſſimæ ad ‘ Opticas artes incenſum atque inflammatum eſſe: harum enim formarum intuitu (ait) & mirabili tranſmutatione primùm nos amor hujus ſtudii allexit: & ‘ lib. 10. theor. 67. ubi ſcribit ex Iride, quàm in ‘ aqua è ſcopulo Viterbio proximo vehementius præcipitata ſæpenumero vidiſſet, pleraſque iridis affectiones & proprietates ſibi animadverſas & obſervatas ‘ eſſe: illud (inquit) nobis principium cogitationis ‘ fuit, ut præſenti negotio ſtudium applicaremus. At ‘ quòd Vitello in Italia, quòd Romæ tum cæteris liberalibus honeſtiſque ſtudiis, tum verò Opticis operam ‘ navarit, majus fortaſſe argumentum videatur, quod ‘ Guilielmo de Morbeta (qui tum Romani Pontificis ‘ pœnitentiarium, ut appellant, Romæ agebat) ſuaſore ‘ & hortatore, ut ipſe in procœmio teſtatur, optica ‘ primum conſcribenda ſuſceperit, eidemque abſoluta ‘ poſtea nuncuparit (6). - - - - *There are ſome things in ‘ Vitellio's Optics, which ſeem to denote that he went ‘ to Italy, and was aſſiſted by the libraries of that country. For he ſays concerning himſelf, that he was firſt ‘ of all inflamed with a deſire of ſtudying Optics, by ſeeing at Cubalo in Italy (which is a place ſituate between Padua and Vicenza) ſome water that was extremely thin and clear; for, ſays he, by viewing the ‘ form of it, and the wonderful changes it underwent, I ‘ firſt conceived a ſtrong inclination for that ſtudy: and ‘ elſewhere in the ſame book he ſays, that he had obſerved and collected moſt of the properties of the rainbow, from that rainbow which he had often ſeen ‘ formed in the water falling impetuouſly down from a ‘ rock hard by Viterbe; that, ſays he, made me firſt ‘ think of purſuing the preſent ſtudy. As to Vitellio's having applied himſelf in Italy, and at Rome, to the ‘ liberal arts, and particularly to the ſtudy of Optics, ‘ what he himſelf ſays in his preface may perhaps ſeem ‘ a ſtronger proof of this. He there acquaints us that it ‘ was by the advice and earneſt exhortation of William ‘ de Morbeta (who was then the Pope's penitentiary at ‘ Rome) that he firſt undertook to write his Optics, and ‘ afterwards dedicated them to him, when they were ‘ finiſhed.*’

[*D*] *The praiſes which Riſnerus beſtowed on the labours of Vitellio.*] The paſſage which I am about to tranſcribe informs us that Vitellio wrote other books beſides his Optics: ‘ Quid & quantum viribus ingenii ‘ perfecerit, præclara ejus monimenta ſempiterno teſtimonio erunt: non ſolùm in Phyſiologicis, quæ citat lib. 5. theor. 18. & lib. 10. theor. 80. in libris ‘ de ordine entium: de elementatis concluſionibus, qui ‘ nominantur in præfatione, & lib. 1. theor. 28. in ‘ libris de ſcientia motuum cœleſtium, quæ allegat ‘ lib. 10. theor. 53. ſed multò maximè in decem libris Opticis: quos ut ex Alhazeno imprimis, deinde è Græcorum authorum fontibus hauſerit, certè ‘ mirandis acceſſionibus amplificavit. Alhazeni, Euclidis, Ptolemæi axiomata, hypotheſes, theoremata ‘ omnia collegit; id laboris infiniti fuit. Sed ex Apollonio, Theodoſio, Menelao, Theone, Pappo, ‘ Proclo, & aliis firmamenta permultarum demonſtrationum ſingulari judicio repetivit: ſingulari ordine ‘ maximè naturali per ſua genera, ſpecieſque Opticam, Catoptricam, Meſopticam diſpoſuit, artemque ‘ totam mirabiliter abſolvit. Quid plura? Si artis ‘ opifex atque author habendus ſit, qui arti formam, ‘ animamque dedit: Vitello jure optimo Opticæ artis ‘ autor habeatur (7). - - - - *What and how much he ‘ has been able to accompliſh by the ſtrength of his genius will appear by theſe eternal monuments which he ‘ has left behind him, not only in Phyſiological matters, ‘ but above all in his ten books of Optics, which as he ‘ took firſt from Alhazenus, and then from the Greek authors, ſo hath he enlarged them with wonderful additions of his own. He collected all the axioms, hypotheſes, and theorems of Alhazenus, Euclid, and Ptolomy; which was a work of infinite labour. He likewiſe, with great judgment, borrowed the grounds of ‘ many demonſtrations from Apollonius, Theodoſius, Menelaus, Theon, Pappus, Proclus, and others: he has ‘ ranged Optics, Catoptrics, and Miſoptics, in a ſingular ‘ and moſt natural method, according to the different kind ‘ and ſpecies of each. In ſhort, he has given an admirable ſyſtem of the whole art. What need is there for ‘ any more words? If the man who gives life and form ‘ to an art is to be looked upon as the author and finiſher ‘ of that art, then Vitellio ought juſtly to be eſteemed the ‘ author of Optics.*’ It appears by this that Vitellio's glory was not that of invention, but that of digeſting borrowed matters.

(*a*) Vitellio Opticam edi curavit, Norimb. An. 1535. *Konig. Bibl. pag*, 850.

(1) Federicus Riſnerus, *Præfat. in* Vitellonis Opticam, *pag. m.* 163 *Præfationis* Epiſtol. & Orationum Petri Rami.

(2) *In Epiſtolâ* Opticis Vitellonis *præpoſitâ*.

(3) *See* Riſnerus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 162.

(4) Ibid.

(5) *See* Riſnerus, ibid. *pag.* 163.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Riſnerus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 164.

VIVIANI (VINCENTIO) a noble Florentine, diſciple of Galileo, and a great Mathematician, who in the year 1659 publiſhed a book in folio intituled, *De maximis & minimis Geometrica Divinatio in quintum Conicorum Apollonii Pergæi*. His opinions in point of religion were very bad; for he believed *the neceſſity of all things, the nullity of evil, and the participation of the univerſal ſoul*, as he owned to Mr Monconys (*a*).

Conſult the *Italia regnante* of Mr Leti, page 411 of the third part.

The firſt work he undertook was his Divination upon Ariſteus, the Cotemporary of Euclid, and author of *five books of problems* de locis ſolidis, *the bare propoſitions of which were collected by Pappus of Alexandria*. Theſe books are entirely loſt. Mr Viviani interrupting his ‘ Divination on Ariſteus, ſet himſelf to reſtore the fifth book of the Conic ‘ ſections of Apollonius (*b*). While he laboured at this, the famous Borelli . . . . . ‘ found in the library of the Great Duke of Tuſcany, an Arabian manuſcript with a Latin ‘ inſcription which ſignified that they were the eight books (*c*) of Apollonius's Conic ‘ ſections . . . . . He carried this manuſcript to Rome, to tranſlate it with the aſſiſtance ‘ of a famous profeſſor of the Eaſtern Languages (*d*). Mr Viviani being not willing to loſe

(*a*) Monconys, Voiage, *Part. i, pag.* 130, *ad ann.* 1646, *Lyons*, 1665.

(*b*) He had compoſed eight books on this ſubject. The propoſitions contained in them were collected by Pappus. But of theſe books there remained only the firſt four. *Fontenelle, ubi infra, citat. (f).*

(*c*) Nevertheleſs the eighth book was entirely wanting.

(*d*) See, the remark [*B*], of the article APOLLONIUS Pergeus, and the remark [*D*], of the article ECHELENSIS.

‘loſe the fruit of his labour demanded a certificate that he knew nothing at all of the Arabic tongue, and that he was an utter ſtranger to that manuſcript. He would not even ſuffer Borelli to write any thing to him which concerned his book. At laſt he finiſhed it, and it appeared that he had more than divined or conjectured, and that he was ſuperior to Apollonius himſelf. He was obliged to interrupt his labours for the ſervice of his prince in an affair of very great importance [*A*].’ He had a penſion given him by the King of France, and *thereupon he reſolved to finiſh his Divination upon Ariſteus, which he propoſed to dedicate to* that Prince. *He was honoured by Ferdinand II, Great Duke of Tuſcany with the title of firſt Mathematician to his highneſs a title ſo much the more glorious for him as it had been conferred on Galileo. He gave the ſolution of three Geometrical problems, which had been propoſed to all the Mathematicians of Europe, and dedicated that piece to the memory of Mr Chapellain . . . . . under the title of* Enodatio Problematum, &c. *He himſelf propoſed the problem of the* ſquarable arch, *which Mr Leibniz and the Marquis de l'Hoſpital ſolved by the differential method.* He was choſen in the year 1699 to fill a place among the eight foreigners who are fellows of the royal Academy of Sciences. This new favour re-animated his zeal; and he publiſhed three books of his Divination on Ariſteus (*e*) [*B*], which he dedicated to the King of France. *He laid out the fortune he had acquired by the bounties* of that Prince *in building a houſe at Florence which for a private perſon may be called magnificent. There he gave an honourable place to the buſt of Galileo, to which he added ſeveral inſcriptions to the glory of that great Mathematician, ſtriving by all poſſible means to ſignalize his gratitude towards his illuſtrious maſter: and in this he may be ſaid to have followed the inclination of his heart, which was naturally full of goodneſs.* He died in the month of September 1703, aged fourſcore and one years (*f*).

[*A*] *He was obliged to interrupt his works for the ſervice of his Prince in an affair of very great importance.*] ‘To prevent the inundations of the Tyber it was a long time . . . ſince they thought of diverting the courſe of one of thoſe rivers which fall into it, particularly the river *Chiana* (called by the Latins *Clanis*) as being that which contributes moſt towards theſe inundations. They were ready to execute this deſign under Tiberius, when the neighbouring colonies being heard upon that affair, the Florentines repreſented that by turning the courſe of that river into the Arno both their city and their country would be laid under water. Regard was had to theſe remonſtrances . . . and in order to put a ſtop to theſe floods they contented themſelves with building a wall, in which there was an opening, ſo calculated that it would receive no more than a certain quantity of water which could not do any damage. There are ſtill ſome traces of this work to be ſeen. Under Alexander VII, the conteſt was renewed between the Romans and the Florentines, touching the project that was in hand for diverting the courſe of the river *Chiana*. Deputies were appointed on each ſide. His Holineſs pitched upon Cardinal Carpegna with Mr Caſſini, and the Great Duke nominated Michelozi the Senator, with Mr Viviani. While theſe two gentlemen, Caſſini and Viviani, were jointly employed in the affair that was committed to them, they had an opportunity of making ſeveral obſervations upon Natural Hiſtory, and among other things upon the inſects which prick the oak, and thereby produce what goes under the name of a gall-nut. The plans which they drew up for preventing the floods, occaſioned by the ſudden overflowings of the *Chiana*, were not executed, as it generally happens in all thoſe things which are undertaken for the public ſervice (1).’

[*B*] *He publiſhed three books of his Divination on Ariſteus.*] This book was printed at Florence in the year 1701. It contains 128 pages, *in folio*, and is intituled, *De locis ſolidis ſecunda Divinatio Geometrica in quinque Libros injuria temporum amiſſos Ariſtæi ſenioris Geometræ*. This is a ſecond edition enlarged: the firſt edition was printed at Florence in the year 1673 (2).

(*e*) *See the* Mémoires de Trevoux, *February* 1703, *pag.* 142, *of the Amſterdam edition.*

(*f*) *Taken from* Mr de Fontenelle, *in the* Elogy of Mr Viviani, *Extracts of which are to be found in the* Mémoires de Trevoux, *June* 1704, *pag.* 1007 *& ſeq, of the edition of France.*

(1) *Taken from the* Memoires de Trevoux, *June* 1704, *pag.* 1010, 1011, *in the Extracts of the elogy which Mr de Fontenelle made on Mr Viviani, before an aſſembly of the Royal Academy of Sciences, on the* 11*th of April* 1704.

(2) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, *of the* 12*th of March* 1703, *pag.* 162, *of the Paris edition, and the* Memoires de Trevoux, *Febr.* 1703, *pag.* 142, *of the Amſterdam edition.*

ULEFELD, or ULFELD (JAMES)

ULEFELD, or ULFELD (JAMES) a Daniſh gentleman, and a ſenator of that kingdom, was ſent ambaſſador to the court of Muſcovy in the year 1578, by Frederic II, King of Denmark. He wrote a relation of his voyage, and gave it to a Bookſeller at Leyden to print, who ſo neglected it, that it fell into the hands of a Grocer, and would have undoubtedly ſerved to wrap up ſugar, &c. if Goldaſt had not bought it. He cauſed it to be printed at Francfort in the year 1608, with the title of *Hodæporicum Ruthenicum Jacobi, Nobilis Dani*, and in 1627, with the ſame title and the addition of *Ulfeldii*, after *Jacobi* [*A*]. This James Ulfeld publiſhed (*a*) a Daniſh tranſlation of David Chytræus's treatiſe of the four laſt things, Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell. He alſo wrote the hiſtory of ſome of the kings of Denmark, but it was never printed (*b*). Goldaſt acknowledges (*c*) that he was not very elegant, but he ſaith that he judged of things with great prudence.

[*A*] *With the ſame title, and the addition of* Ulfeldii *after* Jacobi.] He did not know the author's name, till after the firſt edition, when Claudius Chriſtopher Lyſchander, a Daniſh Divine, acquainted him that the author of this voyage to Muſcovy was of the noble family of Ulfeld; that he was very learned, rich, and a Senator of the kingdom; but that he fell into diſgrace for treating of ſome affairs without the King's conſent; that his two ſons MAGNUS and JAMES were in a flouriſhing condition, and that James, who was a Senator, was ambaſſador at the Hague in the year 1608 (1). I believe this is the ſame who was promoted to the dignity of Chancellor of Denmark, in the year 1610, and died on the twenty-fifth of June 1630 (2). I alſo believe that the Count Ulfeld, of whom I ſpeak in the following article, was the ſon of this Chancellor. Obſerve that the ſame Lyſchander in another letter (3) informs Goldaſt, that the two ſons of the author of the *Hodæporicum Ruthenicum* had ſeen the book. Whence I conclude that the author was not then alive.

Obſerve, that Mr Konig is much in the wrong concerning our James Ulfeld. He makes him the author of an embaſſy to Poland, written in the year 1627 (4). Here are no leſs than two miſtakes; for James was dead at the time of the publication of the firſt edition in 1608, and his book is not a relation of an embaſſy to Poland. But as he on one hand aſcribes a relation to him which he did not write, on the other he robs him of the *Hodæporicum Ruthenicum*, to beſtow it on an imaginary perſon called *James Danus* (5), I mean, that Mr Konig miſtakes *Danus, a Dane*, which here is

---

(*a*) At Cophenhagen, in the year 1591, and in the year 1593.

(*b*) *Taken from* Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Albertum Bartholin. de Scriptis Danorum, *pag.* 255, 256.

(*c*) *In Epiſt. Dedicat. apud* Mollerum, ibid. *pag.* 255.

(1) Taken from the ccxixth letter of the collection of Letters written to Goldaſt, and printed in the year 1688.

(2) *See* Mollerus, Hypomn. ad Alb. Barthol. de Script. Dan. *pag.* 255.

(3) It is the cclxth of the above mentioned collection.

(4) Konig. Bibl. *pag.* 851.

(5) Konig. ibid. *pag.* 235.

is a national epithet given to the writer of this *Hodæporicum* by Goldaſt, for the ſirname of an author. Mr Mollerus hath noted almoſt all theſe miſtakes of Mr Konig (6).

(6) Mollerus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 255.

ULEFELD, or ULFELD (Cornifids, or Corfits) grand-ſon to the foregoing (*a*), was one of the greateſt genius's of the XVIIth century; and if he had not tarniſhed his reputation by the want of fidelity to his ſovereign, he might juſtly have been reckoned amongſt the greateſt men. Chriſtian IV, King of Denmark, made him *Viceroy of Norway, High-Steward of his realms, and heaped on him all the marks of kindneſs that a favourite could hope for* (*b*) [*A*]. He choſe him for his ſon-in-law, by marrying him to Eleanor his natural daughter [*B*]. This ſon-in-law of the king was his Embaſſador-Extraordinary in France in the year 1647. Frederic III, the ſon and ſucceſſor of Chriſtian IV, could not bear the ſpirit and conduct of Count Ulefeld; he obſerved too much ambition in him, and it was ſcarce poſſible for the king to avoid reſenting the vigorous zeal of the Count for maintaining the privileges of the nobility at his acceſſion to the throne [*C*]. However that be, the High-Steward was ſent Embaſſador to Holland in the year 1649, in order to make a treaty there concerning the paſſage of the Sound (*c*); and his negotiation not happening to pleaſe at home, he grew diſguſted, and kept his chamber above ſix months on pretence of ſickneſs [*D*]. He was accuſed in the year 1651 of having attempted to poiſon the king (*d*) [*E*]; but the woman who accuſed

(*a*) Obſerve that I do not affirm it; I only believe it.

(*b*) Sorbiere's Relation of England, *pag.* 147.

(*c*) Sorbiere, ibid. *pag.* 149.

(*d*) Parival's Hiſt. du Siecle de Fer, *Tom. i, pag.* 490.

[*A*] *Chriſtian IV . . . heaped on him all the marks of kindneſs that a favourite could hope for.*] The Hiſtorical Novel which I ſhall hereafter cite, informs me that he became the favourite of Chriſtian IV, not only on account of his own merit, but likewiſe by the intereſt of his father, who was Great Chancellor, and governed the kingdom. This High-Chancellor was *deſcended from one of the firſt and moſt ancient families of the realm, and the only one that was honoured with the dignity of Count by a grant from the Emperor.* Cornifix Ulfeld was the tenth ſon: the manner how he came to be known by his father, who thought for a long time that he was loſt, is romantic. See the Hiſtorical Novel. I cannot tell whether it is poſſible to reconcile what has been juſt now ſaid concerning the dignity of Count, with a little Latin book (1) which ſays, that Cornifix Ulfeld, flying for refuge to Chriſtina Queen of Sweden, and having lent her great ſums of money, acquired her protection and favour, and the title of Count.

[*B*] . . . . *And married him to Eleanor, his natural daughter.*] 'The King after the death of the Queen 'fell in love with a beautiful lady, whoſe name was 'Chriſtina, of the antient family of Monch, and not 'being able to obtain any favour from her, married 'her with all the formalities requiſite to a lawful marriage, in the preſence of the court and Senate; but 'one clauſe of the contract was, that the children 'which ſhould proceed from this marriage ſhould 'not be Princes, but obliged to content themſelves 'with the quality of Counts of Sleſwic and Holſtein, of which dignity they ſhould bear the name 'and arms (2).' This Prince attempted to divorce her for certain things ſhe had done out of jealouſy: the cauſe lay before the Senate. Annibal Seeſted pleaded the King's cauſe; and the Count of Ulfeld pleaded for the Queen, and carried the cauſe (3). The Latin book which I have cited ſays that ſhe was actually divorced, and that the King afterwards grew in love with the bed-chamber lady (4) to his divorced Queen (5), and had a ſon and a daughter by her. The ſon called Ulricus Chriſtian Guldenleeuw bore arms under the King of Spain, and did wonders at Copenhagen when it was beſieged by the Swedes. The daughter was married to Claudius Alfeld, a gentleman of Holſtein. The ſame book informs us that the reaſon why the King hated his wife, and loved her bed-chamber lady, was becauſe ſhe diſcovered to him that the Queen deſigned to poiſon him: which was revenged on this accuſer after her death; for Count Ulefeld would not permit the celebration of her funeral, but ſent her out of town at night to be buried in the burying place of the poor. She ſurvived the King but few days, dying with melancholy (6), as it is reported.

[*C*] *For maintaining the privileges of the nobility.*] An author whom I have cited (7) ſaith, that the mildneſs of Chriſtian IV, 'and the charms of peace, made 'the nobility and the people neglect many privileges 'which they propoſed to re-eſtabliſh in full force, 'when' they elected Frederic III, and that then the High-Steward *was obliged by his poſt . . . to ſtand up for the nobility of the kingdom*; for he repreſented them, and had a negative voice in council: *ſo that as nothing could paſs without his conſent, the ſtile of the placarts ran, and the ordinances were notified as made by the King and the High-Steward.* He adds (8) as a conjecture, that beſides the intereſt, which Count Ulefeld 'had in ſupporting the privileges of that body, he 'alſo conſidered thoſe of his own family, and the 'enmity betwixt the children of the royal family, by 'reaſon of the inequality of their rank, and of the 'jealouſy which the late King's paſſion for the Counteſs Eleanor had ſown.' The author of the Hiſtorical Novel, notwithſtanding the part of a Panegyriſt and Apologiſt which he all along acts, ſtill owns, that the Count, at his wife's perſuaſion, had ſome thoughts of cauſing himſelf to be elected King after the death of Chriſtian IV, and that he made ſome attempts that way: but finding his meaſures broken, *he dexterouſly turned the courſe of affairs, and promoted the election of Prince Frederic on ſuch conditions as allowed him to ſhare the authority with him, under pretext of preſerving the privileges of the nobility, of which, as High-Steward, he was chief.*

[*D*] *He kept his chamber above ſix months, on pretence of ſickneſs.*] Sorbiere calls this a blunder; for *at court,* ſaith he (9), *no man ought ever to quit an advantageous poſt, nor retire on any pretext whatſoever; he ought not to loſe the train of affairs, nor uſe people to go on without him, much leſs give them the advantage of his abſence.* But his blaming this conduct, did not hinder him from taking his part ſo zealouſly, that his Daniſh Majeſty's Embaſſador complained of it at the court of France: the conſequence of which was that Sorbiere was baniſhed to Nantes. This author had formerly dedicated a book (10) to Count Ulefeld, for which he had doubtleſs received a good reward; which engaged him to inſert in his voyage an epiſode in juſtification of this Lord. He was not well informed of all the particulars of this cauſe; the detention of the Count in the iſland of Bornholm, and the liberty granted him to go and live in the iſle of Funen, were unknown to Sorbiere.

[*E*] *He was accuſed of having attempted to poiſon the King.*] The author of the Hiſtorical Novel, pretends that a woman, named Diana, was ſuborned to declare that the Count and Counteſs of Ulefeld had ſollicited her to poiſon the King, the Queen, and all the royal family; and that the Count ſo judiciouſly defended himſelf in full council, that Diana and Captain Weller, who had introduced her, were fully convicted of bearing falſe witneſs, and condemned, ſhe to be beheaded, and he to perpetual baniſhment; which ſentences were executed. If this relation be compared with that of a modern Hiſtorian (11), who tells us, *That one Colonel Valter was alſo ſuſpected, who having defended his innocence, cauſed the ſaid Count Ulefelt to be ſummoned; but inſtead of appearing before his Majeſty, he privily retired with his wife, and went into Holland, and from thence afterwards into Sweden:* If, I ſay, ſuch a compariſon be made, it will appear that the Hiſtorian gives a very indiſtinct account of the affair. He ſeems to affirm, that the Count and the Colonel

(1) *It is intituled* Machinationum Cornificii Ulefeldii ſuccincta Narratio.

(2) *An Hiſtorical Novel, intituled* Le Comte d'Ulfeld, *Printed at Paris in* 1677.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Her name was Wibicha.

(5) Fuit hæc Chriſtinæ cujus ſupra meminimus à cubiculis; quumque Regi revelaſſet ipſi à Domina ſua venenum parari, Rex illam, REPUDIATA Chriſtina ejus loco amavit.

(6) Ex Machinat. ſuccinctâ Narrat.

(7) Sorbiere, Relat. d'Angleterre, *pag. m.* 149.

(8) Id. ibid. *pag.* 150.

(9) Id. ibid. *pag.* 151.

(10) The French tranſlation of Hobbes's treatiſe *de Cive, in* 1649.

(11) Parival, *Tom. i, p.* 490.

accuſed him [*F*] not being able to make good her accuſation, was beheaded. That did not hinder his ſecretly retiring with his wife and children out of the kingdom, and going to Sweden, where he was extraordinary well received by Queen Chriſtina [*G*]. He diſcovered a great deal of zeal for the ſervice of Sweden, which would not have been criminal, if he had not endeavoured to ſerve it to the prejudice of his country. His counſels were wonderfully advantageous to Charles Guſtavus [*H*]; and it is inexpreſſible how effectually the politic intrigues which he carried on, advanced that prince's conqueſts in Denmark. He was one of his commiſſioners at the treaty of Rotſchild, as he would have been afterwards at Copenhagen, if the French Ambaſſador had not entreated that king to name another [*I*]. At laſt he fell into diſgrace with the Swedes [*K*]; who impriſoned him.

He

Colonel were both ſuſpected of the ſame crime; but that is not true. The Hiſtorical Novel doth not ſay that the Count firſt retired into Holland; it ſays that he would have gone into Poland, but that being informed at Dantzic that the King of Poland refuſed him his leave, he went into Sweden. The Latin book makes him firſt retire to Amſterdam, and afterwards to Sweden, and adds, that at Stralſund, he publiſhed an apology for his conduct; and that after the abdication of Chriſtina, he went to live in Pomerania.

[*F*] *The woman who accuſed him.*] Her name was Dina; ſhe was a beautiful woman, and by profeſſion a lady of pleaſure, for ſhe declared before the Judges, that ſhe had had a child by Count Ulefeld. The little Latin tract relates theſe particulars, not as Parival does, but in the following manner. Dina uſed to wait on the Count by means of a private ſtair-caſe, and lay with him unknown to the Counteſs. Early one morning the Counteſs entred her huſband's chamber, and ſhewed him a poiſon which Sperlingius, a Phyſician, had prepared. ‘In quam conſilio Ottonis Sperlingii, Med. D. in perniciem Regis Daniæ Friderici III, tentati veneficii ſuſpicionem Corfitz Ulfelt, Magiſter Palatii Regii quoque venit, de quo *Relatio Hafnienſis* Anno 1651, publicata videri poteſt, nec non ejuſdem (*Ulfeldi*) *Apologia* Relationi oppoſita, Annoque ſequenti 1652 Stralſundiæ in 12mo edita, cui cauſas ſubjungit quæ neceſſitatem ſibi impoſuerunt & adegerunt, ut ad tempus Dania excederet (12). - - - *Which ſuſpicion*, viz. *of having attempted to poiſon Frederic III, King of Denmark, by the advice and aid of Otto Sperlingius, Doctor of Phyſic, did likewiſe fall upon Gorfitz Ulfeld, High-Steward: concerning which, ſee the account publiſhed at Copenhagen in the year* 1651; *as alſo the apology of the ſaid Ulfeld in anſwer to that relation. It was publiſhed in the following year*, 1652, *at Straelſundt, in* 12*mo*; *and to this apology he ſubjoins the reaſons which obliged him to leave Denmark for a time.*’ They mutually concerted the means to give it to the King. Dina heard all this diſcourſe, being hid very cloſe in the bed, in order to avoid being ſurprized by the Counteſs. She imparted this ſtory to a Colonel (13), on whom ſhe beſtowed her favours. This Colonel made his court with it to the King, his maſter, who cauſed Dina to be brought before him, from whom he heard all the particulars. The Judges examined her, before whom ſhe owned the ſame thing, and particularly confeſſed that ſhe had a child by the Count; but when the thing came before the Council of ſtate, where the Count defended his own cauſe, Dina retracted all ſhe had ſaid, was declared guilty of calumny, and condemned to loſe her head; which was afterwards placed upon a pole without the city (14). It is highly probable that ſhe was ſuborned; for muſt not the Count have been exceſſively ſtupid, to have talked of ſuch a dangerous affair when he knew it was in the hearing of a whore? This is indeed the prerogative of ſovereigns: they give ſerious attention to the depoſitions of a whore, when their lives are concerned; and it is even true, that theſe ſort of creatures have ſometimes revealed conſpiracies (15). It is juſt that monarchs ſhould enjoy this prerogative, for the public good is preferable to the obſervation of formalities; and conſequently we ought not to be ſhocked at the ſight of twenty or thirty conſpirators cut into quarters on the evidence of their accomplices, tho' the accuſers loaded with riches and rewards, are ſometimes greater criminals than the accuſed, and have, by numerous artifices, engaged the latter in the conſpiracy. The whore, ſay ſome, ought to be puniſhed, but the bawd who informed againſt her ought to have ſome ſhare in her puniſhment. I anſwer, that this maxim ſhould not be extended to privileged caſes, ſuch as the puniſhing of ſtate crimes. ‘Salus Populi ſuprema Lex eſto. - - - *Let the ſafety of the people be the ſupreme law.*’

[*G*] *He was extraordinarily well received by Queen Chriſtina.*] To this purpoſe Mr de Wicquefort relates two remarkable ſtories. I ſhall content myſelf with mentioning one of them: it is an artifice by which that Queen ſo far impoſed on the Daniſh Ambaſſador, as to gain an opportunity for Ulefeld to ſay all that he could for his juſtification in his preſence (16): but the other ſtory I ſhall relate without curtailing it. *The Daniſh ambaſſador, to prove that Ulefeld was unworthy of Chriſtina's protection, one day told that Queen that the High-Steward had converted to his own uſe the ſum of five and twenty thouſand crowns, which the King, his maſter, had ordered to be remitted to him, that he might therewith ſupply the King of England in his neceſſity. The Queen ſaid, that if the High-Steward aſſured her, that he had cauſed that ſum to be paid to the King of England, ſhe would believe it; and that if the latter denied it, ſhe would ſay he lied; and that if a dozen of ſuch kings as he ſhould affirm it, ſhe would ſay they all twelve lied. And ſince the King of Denmark would not re-eſtabliſh the High-Steward in the poſſeſſion of his eſtate, ſhe would give him ſo much that he ſhould not repent his loſs in Denmark. The Daniſh Ambaſſador boldly replied, that her Majeſty might, if ſhe pleaſed, give him the half of her realm without the King his maſter's ſaying any thing againſt it; but that* would not hinder his taking Ulefeld for the moſt infamous and perfidious of all men. *This happened in the year* 1654 (17). Mr de Wicquefort doth not cite his author; but I find he took this from Mr Chanut's Memoirs, where theſe two ſtories are told with more circumſtances neceſſary to be known, than in Mr de Wicquefort's book. We are informed of ſeveral other particulars relating to Count Ulefeld in thoſe Memoirs (18).

[*H*] *His counſels were wonderfully advantageous to Charles Guſtavus.*] See pag. 98, 99. of the Chevalier de Terlon's Memoirs; ſee alſo pag. 151, where you will find theſe remarkable words. ‘Count Ulefeld, who knew the humour of the nation, adviſed the King of Sweden religiouſly to preſerve the people of Schonen in the privileges which they enjoyed under the King of Denmark. This was a good advice, and perhaps if it had been followed this ſecond war had been more ſucceſsful.’ Terlon had before told us, that the King of Sweden was very angry when he heard that theſe privileges were violated: ‘But that the diſpleaſure which he ſhewed did him no ſervice at Copenhagen, where it was only taken for a bait to induce them to ſurrender that city.’

[*I*] *If the French Ambaſſador had not entreated that King to name another.*] The relation of this ſtory, with a few more circumſtances, will not be diſagreeable. ‘The Marſhal and Duke of Grammont, and Mr de Lyonne, who were then at Francfort, your Majeſty's Ambaſſadors Extraordinary, and Plenipotentiaries for the election of the Emperor, wrote to me to diſſuade the King of Sweden from nominating Count Ulefeld for the negotiations of Copenhagen, as he had been for thoſe of Roſchild: to which this prince was pleaſed to conſent, when I ſpoke to him of it, and would not give the King of Denmark the uneaſineſs of ſeeing one of his diſaffected ſubjects treat for his enemies in the very city of his reſidence, and brave his ſovereign in his misfortune; what I ſaid to the King of Sweden engaged him to ſubſtitute the Sieur Coyet inſtead of the Count (19).’

[*K*] *At laſt he fell into diſgrace with the Swedes.*] Some authors report (20), *That the Swedes, to rid themſelves of Count Ulefeld, whoſe great abilities they*

(12) Paſchius de novis inventis, *pag.* 484.

(13) George Walther.

(14) Ex Machinat. ſuccincta Relat.

(15) Fulvia, for inſtance, who diſcovered that of Catiline, *apud Salluſtium.* See the article FULVIA, remark [*D*].

(16) De l'Ambaſſadeur & de ſes Fonctions, *Tom. ii, pag.* 141. *See* Chanut's Memoirs, *Tom. iii, from pag.* 342, *to pag.* 349, *Dutch edition. The author of the Hiſtorical Novel, relates this quite otherwiſe, and to the Ambaſſador's confuſion.*

(17) Wicquefort, ibid, *pag.* 171. *See* Chanut's Mémoirs, *Tom. iii. from pag.* 292, *to pag.* 295.

(18) *See Tom. iii, pag.* 74, 97, 98, 100, 240, 364.

(19) Mémoirs de Terlon, *pag.* 112.

(20) *See* Parival, *Tom. iii, pag.* 206, *but it ſhould be pag.* 210.

He would have recovered his liberty in a glorious manner, if he had not been ſo impatient, and given credit to ſome reports that the Swedes deſigned to bring him to his tryal (*e*). Theſe were falſe reports; for they had given their word to the French Ambaſſador that he ſhould be ſet at liberty. The Ambaſſador had written about it, becauſe the King of Denmark demanded that Count, *as being included in the treaty* (*f*). The impreſſions which this falſe report wrought on the mind of the priſoner, made him try ſeveral expedients to deceive his guards, in which he ſucceeded [*L*]; for he eſcaped out of the priſon of Malmoe, and went to Copenhagen, without having obtained the remiſſion of all that he had done againſt his prince. His Counteſs came thither ſome time after, when Frederic III, who had very cunningly diſſembled his deſign of ſecuring their perſons, cauſed them both to be arreſted, and ſent them to the iſle of Bornholm; but out of his clemency, he permitted them to live in the iſland of Funen, after the receipt of a letter which the Count wrote to him (*g*). In it he acknowledged his crimes, and only implored the mercy of his ſovereign, to whom for the future he promiſed abſolute ſubmiſſion. Some time after he was permitted to travel out of the kingdom; he went to the Spaw-waters (*h*), from thence to Paris *incognito*, and afterwards to Bruges, where he reſolved to winter with his family; but he was obliged ſecretly to quit that place. His ſon killed Colonel Wolf [*M*]: his wife, who retired to London, and quitted that city privately, was ſeized at

feared, and withal not being able to recompenſe his good ſervices, accuſed him of treaſon, in order to ſeize his great riches. The author, who ſpeaks thus, had been ſaying that the Swedes had condemned this Count to a perpetual impriſonment; and therefore he muſt needs have been ignorant of his being included in the treaty of peace; ſee the text of this article. Now amongſt the things taken from him by the King of Sweden, we muſt not forget the library which formerly belonged to Sepheldt, a Daniſh Senator (21). The King of Sweden found it in the caſtle of Reinſtedt, of which this Senator, who was Count Ulefeld's mortal enemy, was governor, and preſented it to the Count, who at the entreaty of the Chevalier de Terlon, was willing to reſtore it to the Senator for ſix thouſand crows. The Senator *would not give that ſum, tho' his library was valued at fifty thouſand crowns, on account of the great number of very rare manuſcripts and curioſities which it contained. On his refuſal, Count Ulefeld cauſed it to be removed to Schonen, and after his confinement it was ſeized by the King of Sweden and tranſported to Stockholm.*

A LIBRARY ſeized upon.

[*L*] *In which he ſucceeded.*] The circumſtances of this fact being very ſingular, I ſhall be particular in the relation of it. 'Count Ulefeld was a man of 'great abilities, and very much conſidered in Den'mark, and he was very ſenſible of it, ſince he ven'tured to go to Copenhagen, without knowing before'hand whether his ſovereign would be pleaſed with 'it. The priſoner, from the day of his confinement, 'ſo naturally acted the mute, and ſeemed ſo inſenſible 'of all the injuries done him, that it was impoſſible 'to draw one word from him, when they queſtioned 'him in order to bring him to his trial; and the 'methods he took to deceive his guards, who were 'always near the bed in which he pretended to be 'ſick, are almoſt incredible. And yet he himſelf 'made the cloaths in which he eſcaped to Copenha'gen, which was his ruin; for if, purſuant to what 'I cauſed to be ſaid to him, he had relied on the 'goodneſs of the King of Sweden for his liberty, he 'had avoided the diſgrace which fell on him; and 'his eſtate in Sweden had not been confiſcated, as 'well as that which belonged to him in Denmark 'was afterwards (22).' The Hiſtorical Novel aſſures us; 1. That by the treaty of Rotſchild, the Count obtained a general amneſty, and was to be re-inſtated in his places and eſtate. 2. That the King of Sweden having granted him leave to defend himſelf publickly before the Senate at Malmoe, and his indiſpoſition not permitting him to appear, his Counteſs Eleonora pleaded for him ſo ſtrenuouſly, and with ſo much eloquence (23), that the Judges pronounced ſentence of abſolution. 3. That the King of Sweden confirmed this ſentence, and that Annibal Seeſted, the Count's ſecret enemy, made him afraid of a more cloſe confinement, and adviſed him to endeavour by all means to eſcape. I ought not to omit that according to the ſmall Latin book, the Count's diſgrace happened after the death of Charles Guſtavus. It was after that King's death that the Count, with ſome Senators of Malmoe, endeavoured to reſtore Schonen to the Danes. The ſame book alſo ſaith, that he feigned himſelf affected with a palſy in the tongue during his confinement. *In cuſtodiam traditus eſt in qua quamdiu fuit, hemiplexiæ morbum & vitiatam loquelam raro patientiæ exemplo ſimulaſſe dicitur* (24). This confirms what the Chevalier de Terlon relates, and what follows confirms another particular, of which he informs us. 'Jam 'in eo fuit (*Ulefeldius*) intercedente apud Regem Sueciæ 'Chriſtianiſſimi Regis legato, ſi unicum tantum octi'duum diutius in cuſtodia ſe continuiſſet, ut libertati 'reſtitueretur. Quin literæ quarum beneficio dimitten'dus eſſet à Regina matre Hedviga Eleonora filii tu'trice ac proceribus regni ſubſcriptæ eodem quo eva'ſerat momento, & hinc paulo ſerius allatæ circumfe'rebantur (25). - - - *The affairs of Ulefeld were already* '*at ſuch a paſs through the interceſſion of the French Am*'*baſſador with the King of Sweden, that if he had but* '*ſtaid eight days longer in priſon, he would have been* '*ſet at liberty. Nay the very letter upon which he was* '*to be releaſed, was ſigned by the Queen-mother Hedviga* '*Eleonora, as guardian to her ſon, and by the Peers of* '*the realm, at the ſame hour in which he made his* '*eſcape; ſo that it was but a little too late in coming.*

I ſhall clear this up as much as poſſible by Mr Puffendorf's account of the affair. He informs us that the ſtratagem which Annibal Seeſted made uſe of to prevent the Count's re-eſtabliſhment in Sweden, and enjoyment of his eſtate, was to perſuade the King of Denmark, his maſter, who was ſending him into Sweden, to give him orders to recommend the Count's caſe to the Senators. He imagined that ſuch a thing would render him the more ſuſpected, becauſe he was accuſed of a traiterous plot in favour of the King of Denmark; ſo that no better means could have been thought of to make him appear guilty, than the interceſſion of that King. This ſtratagem of Seeſted fell to the ground. The Swedes took no notice of it, and as they were not willing to examine things rigorouſly after the war was ended, and after the King's death, they declared Ulefeld acquitted. Then his enemy had recourſe to another ſtratagem; he went to Count Brahe, and deſired that the Senate's ſentence of abſolution might not be publiſhed, but put into his hands in order to endear himſelf to his brother-in-law (26). But as ſoon as he had the ſentence in his poſſeſſion, he made the Chevalier de Terlon (27) and Mr Sidney (28) believe, that the Senate of Sweden had condemned Ulefeld, and entreated them to give him immediately notice of it, that he might think of ſome means to make his eſcape. The letters which they wrote to him produced the effect that Seeſted expected. The priſoner eſcaped and went to Copenhagen, where he loſt that liberty which he had juſt recovered (29). Mr Seeſted ſeems to me to have run a bold riſque; for if theſe two Ambaſſadors, whom he deceived, had mentioned what he told them, the Swediſh Senators would have known his malicious frauds, and made a noiſe about it: and conſequently he would have loſt his reputation. Obſerve, that it is impoſſible to reconcile the relations of the Chevalier de Terlon and Mr Puffendorf: one of them is certainly falſe.

[*M*] *Colonel Wolf.*] A modern Hiſtorian (30), whom I have already cited, ſaith, that Colonel Wolf being

---

(*e*) Mémoires du Chevalier de Terlon, *pag.* 301, *Dutch edition. See the remark* [*K*].

(*f*) Mémoires de Terlon, ibid.

(*g*) That letter is dated the 27th of October, 1661, and is to be found entire in Parival, *Tom. iii, pag.* 580.

(*h*) Sorbiere, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 153.

(21) Memoires du Chev. de Terlon. *pag.* 105, 106.

(22) Mémoires du Chevalier de Terlon, *pag.* 303. He had ſaid pag. 99, that the Count had a vaſt eſtate, a great intereſt with the nobility, and above all had an infinite deal of wit, and that he was one of the ableſt men in the kingdom.

(23) Her ſpeech may be ſeen in the Hiſtorical Novel.

(24) Machinat. ſuccinct. Narrat. *pag.* 28.

(25) Ibid. *p.* 30.

(26) Count Ulefeld.

(27) The French Ambaſſador.

(28) The Engliſh Ambaſſador.

(29) Taken from Puffendorf, in the life of Charles Guſtavus, *lib. vi, num.* 52. *See the* Acta Eruditorum, 1697, *pag.* 190.

(30) Parival, *Tom. iii, pag.* 584.

at Dover, and carried to Copenhagen, where they pretended to have diſcovered a horrible conſpiracy, which he had formed againſt his prince [*N*]. And accordingly ſentence paſſed againſt him at Copenhagen, on the twenty-fourth of July 1663, by which, as convicted of high treaſon, he was condemned to death. The ſentence was executed in effigie. They made a waxen figure repreſenting him, which was carried on a ſledge to the public place; where the executioner cut off his hand and his head, and divided the body into four quarters, which were carried to the four corners of the city (*i*). The Count received notice of this at Bruges, and departed the next day for Baſil [*O*], *where he lived four or five months unknown, and almoſt always ſick* (*k*). He left that place, being informed that ſearch was made after him in order to take him; and tho' very ill, at night he went into a ſmall bark on the Rhine, in order to go to Briſac; but had ſcarce advanced two leagues before the piercing cold killed him. He was ſixty years of age or thereabouts, and left three ſons, the eldeſt of whom turned Roman Catholic, and lived with the Queen of Sweden. The ſecond was a Knight of Malta; and the third, who was one of the handſomeſt and moſt learned gentlemen in Europe, lived in England. I have extracted the account of theſe laſt facts from an hiſtorical novel, intituled, *Le Comte d'Ulfeld*, printed at Paris in the year 1677, and dedicated to the Duke of Montauſier, by an author who calls himſelf *Rouſſeau de la Valette.* I might have extracted a thouſand curious things from it; but I was afraid of confounding hiſtory with romance [*P*]. I have nevertheleſs made uſe of that book in my remarks. For the reſt, this Count is frequently mentioned in Charles Ogier's travels [*Q*].

(*i*) Parival, *Tom. iii.*

(*k*) See the book cited at the end of this article.

The

being in a coach with his wife, Count Ulefeld's ſon came up to him, and ſaluted him very courteouſly, *and ſtabbed him to the heart with a dagger at the inſtant that he was telling his wife,* who it was that had accoſted them. The aſſaſſin was ſo fortunate as to eſcape. *The Colonel being governor of the iſle of Bornholm,* had not ſo ſtrictly guarded Count Ulefeld, but he found an opportunity to get away; but he was ſeized juſt as he was embarking, and cloſely confined to a priſon, very much below a man of his quality (31); and no compaſſionate regard was had to him, for fear he ſhould once more eſcape. This was the cauſe of the hatred which the Count and his family had conceived againſt the Colonel.

[*N*] *A horrid conſpiracy . . . againſt his Prince.*] It has been ſaid that the Elector of Brandenburg acquainted King Frederic III, that Count Ulefeld had wrote to him, *That if he would lend him a vigorous aſſiſting hand, he would dethrone the King and his heirs, and cauſe the crown to devolve on his head. For,* ſaid he, *I have ſo many of the Clergy and Laity, who will declare on my ſide, that it will render this enterpriſe eaſy* (32). The ſentence of death pronounced againſt him, mentions their having proofs of this; but this Elector is not therein named.

[*O*] *Departed for Baſil.*] According to the ſmall Latin tract, he there pretended to be governor to three Dutch gentlemen, and was not known till one of his ſons had a quarrel with a Captain of Zurich. He had his three ſons and a daughter with him. His lady was in priſon at Copenhagen. When he found himſelf diſcovered he embarked on the Rhine alone, and died in the boat in February 1664, not far from Newburg. The watermen carried him to a convent near that place, whither his ſons came with the utmoſt expedition, in order to ſave the jewels he had about him, and cauſed him to be buried under a tree in the middle of a field.

[*P*] *Of confounding Hiſtory with Romance.*] Though the author of the Hiſtorical Novel aſſures us, *That all there is very true, and that he hath written nothing but what he had from the information of the moſt able and diſintereſted perſons of that country.* I cannot help believing that there are ſome romantic embelliſhments in that work. The Counteſs Eleonora owned that *the account of her life ſavoured very much of a romance* (33): He who heard her ſay this, having related ſomething of that Hiſtory, adds, that this, *with ſome epiſodes, might be a very fit ſubject for a romance* (34). Doubtleſs, the author of the Hiſtorical Novel wrote according to that idea. I will not throughly examine the facts, which this author always turns to the advantage of his hero, and ſometimes ſo ſeverely againſt the perſon of King Frederic (35), that he, a thouſand times more than Sorbiere, deſerved the complaints of the Daniſh Embaſſador at the court of France: but I may probably be allowed to take for a romantic thought, *that ſeverity ſufficient to make the boldeſt man tremble,* with which the Count was looked on when he made his firſt declaration of love to the Counteſs Eleonora, to whom, ſaith the author, *the name of love appeared ſo ſhocking, that ſhe formed a diſmal idea of it.* I do not make the ſame judgment of the Count's exclamation, when, born down with misfortune, he cried out, *O GOD! when wilt thou ceaſe to afflict me?* Nature is too viſible here, this looks like a true Hiſtory, whilſt the other looks like invention only. The propoſal of an under-match, or of a diſhonourable love, might have occaſioned this terrible menacing ſeverity; but the Count, a perſon richly endowed with all the perfections of body and mind, and one of the beſt matches the Counteſs could ever hope for, courted her with a view to marriage. Whence then could proceed this thundering ſeverity which our author mentions but from a romantic humour? where, and where only, *a declaration of love is followed by an immediate reſentment, which appears by our bluſhes* (it is thus that Moliere makes a preciſe lady ſpeak) *and which, for a time, baniſhes the lover from our preſence. But at laſt he finds means to pacify us, and inſenſibly enures us to the diſcourſe of his tender paſſion, and extorts from us the conſent which we have much ado to give* (36).

[*Q*] *The Count is frequently mentioned in Charles Ogier's travels.*] Charles Ogier, the worthy brother of that great preacher Francis Ogier, travelled to Denmark and Sweden with the Count d'Avaux, Ambaſſador from Lewis XIII. They left Paris on the eleventh of July in 1634. The relation of this voyage is very curious, and well written. Among other things we find in it that Count Ulefeld being contracted to the daughter of the King, his maſter, and being afflicted with an ulcer in his thigh, made a very great ſcruple of approaching a lady of the blood-royal before he was cured. Wherefore he took a journey into France in order to put himſelf into the hands of an able Chirurgeon, to whom Mr d'Avaux recommended him. 'Ulfeldius crure laborabat inſanabiliter, ex ſententia ſcilicet omnium ſuæ nationis Medicorum, qui tamen anno poſtea, cùm ſe ex conſilio Legati noſtri Lutetiam contuliſſet, ab eximio Chirurgo P. Judæo ſanatus eſt. Alter mihi videbatur ille Philoctetes, adeo acutis interdum doloribus cruciabatur; alioquin, cùm per benigniorum temporum intervalla, vis mali paululum reſederat, innitebatur baculo. Cæterùm tanta hominis virtus ac dignitas fuit, ut dilectiſſimam illi Rex Daniæ Filiam Leonoram deſponderit: at ille tam eximiæ puellæ thalamis crus putridum inferre reveritus, antequam nuptiæ celebrarentur, operæ pretium duxit, ſi ſe laborioſæ curationis carnificinæ, ac periculis devoveret (37). - - - *Ulfeld had an ulcer in his thigh, which was deemed incurable by all the Phyſicians of his country. Nevertheleſs as he went next year to Paris by the advice of our Ambaſſador, he was there cured by that excellent Chirurgeon P. Judæus. Such was the acuteneſs of the pains which he now and then ſuffered, that he ſeemed to me like another Philoctetes: at other*

' *times*

---

(31) The Hiſtorical Novel gives a diſmal deſcription of the count's ill treatment, even before he had attempted to make his eſcape.

(32) Pariv. ubi ſupra.

(33) Relat. de Sorbiere, *p.* 146.

(34) Ibid. pag. 153.

(35) In the Memoirs of the Chevalier de Terlon, ſome encomiums are beſtowed upon that Prince, which are directly contrary to the ſlanders of the Hiſtorical Novel.

(36) *Moliere, in his* Précieuſes ridicules, *Act. i, Sc. iv.*

(37) Carol. Ogerius, in Intinere Danico, *pag.* 67, *Edit. Pariſ.* 1656, *in* 8vo.

The Counteſs, his widow, died on the ſixteenth of March 1698. She could make verſes, and ſhe has left a piece, which perhaps will be printed. It is the life of ſome illuſtrious women (*l*).

(*k*) *Taken from* Sebaſtian Kortholt, *pag.* 2. de Puellis Poetriis, *Edit.* 1700.

‘ *times when the violence of the diſtemper abated, and he felt ſome intervals of eaſe, he uſed to walk about with the help of a ſtick. But ſo great was the virtue and merit of the man, that the King of Denmark contracted his well-beloved daughter Eleonora to him: nevertheleſs he was aſhamed to carry a ſore leg to ſuch a fine lady's bed, and for that reaſon before the marriage was celebrated, he thought proper to ſubmit himſelf to all the painful and dangerous operations of a difficult cure.*’ This was very well done.

ULYSSES, one of the moſt celebrated Generals of the Grecian army at the ſiege of Troy. Dr Drelincourt (*a*) hath imparted to me ſo many excellent memoirs concerning this hero of the Odyſſey [*A*], that I am extremely ſorry I cannot here give them that extenſive place which they deſerve. And it being better to ſay nothing on great ſubjects, than to ſpeak of them by halves (*b*), I have deferred this article to another time, and am ſorry this learned man himſelf could not enrich the public with this excellent portraicture of Ulyſſes, as he hath already obliged the world with that of Achilles, of which we have ſeen three editions.

(*a*) Profeſſor of Phyſic at Leyden.

(*b*) De Carthagine ſilere melius puto quam parum dicere. *Salluſtius, de Bello Jugurthino.*

[*A*] *So many excellent Memoirs concerning this hero of the Odyſſey.*] He hath collected whatever hath been ſaid for or againſt the Prince of Ithaca, and hath very methodically digeſted it. It is a mixture of erudition and criticiſms, which would ſurprize even thoſe who are beſt verſed in the antient Greek and Latin authors. Copiouſneſs and exactneſs, ſagacity and method, memory and judgment, ſhine ſo brightly in this work, that it is impoſſible to determine which of theſe excellencies appear in the greateſt luſtre.

ULM, in Latin *Ulma*, an Imperial city, and the capital of the Circle of Suabia, is ſituated upon the Danube, where it begins to be navigable for boats. That name was given to it *becauſe of the vaſt number of elms which grow in its neighbourhood. It is a rich, populous, and trading city, regularly fortified, and embelliſhed with a great many fountains:* it's ſtone bridge over the Danube is *extremely beautiful* . . . . . *It was formerly no more than a market-town, which Charlemaign had given to the abbey of Reichenaw, and which Lotharius II afterwards entirely demoliſhed. But the inhabitants of the country ſettling there again, redeemed at laſt from the abbey of Reichenaw, by paying a very conſiderable ſum of money, their liberty and their independence, and cauſed themſelves to be matriculated among the Imperial cities* (*a*) . . . . . . *The Roman Catholics there are not very numerous, and have only two churches, the Proteſtants having taken poſſeſſion of all the reſt. The ſenate is compoſed of forty-one perſons, of whom the two elders, together with the five firſt, make the Privy-Council, into which the Roman Catholics are not admitted* (*b*). The Elector of Bavaria ſurprized this town on the eighth of September 1702, by a ſtratagem that was admirably well executed (*c*). ‘ The citizens having put themſelves under arms, and being divided into eighteen companies of two hundred men each, marched on with their colours, and the very women of the city run there like ſo many prieſteſſes of Bacchus, making weapons of every thing that came in their way; but notwithſtanding all this’ the Bavarian troops ſtill maintained the poſts they had taken (*d*). The Imperialiſts under the command of General Thungen beſieged that place in the month of September 1704. The garriſon, after a ſhort and very feeble reſiſtance, capitulated on the eleventh of the ſaid month, and obtained terms that were in all reſpects favourable and glorious to them. The Dutch Gazeteers, deceived by the news-mongers of the Imperial cities, who generally upon all occaſions are very great liars, gave out that after the garriſon was come forth in an honourable manner, they were made priſoners of war, and that by way of repriſals for what had been done ſome weeks before by the Duke of Vendome to the garriſon of Verceil in Italy. The falſity of this piece of news came ſoon to be known; and in truth the two caſes were not parallel, ſince the garriſon of Verceil was treated, not contrary to the tenor of the capitulation as the ſame Gazeteers publiſhed, though they afterwards retracted it (*e*), but preciſely according to the articles of the capitulation as it was ſigned by both parties.

(*a*) Heiſs, Hiſtory of the Empire, *Tom. ii, pag. m.* 456.

(*b*) Id. ibid. *See alſo the* Mercure Galant, *of September* 1702, *pag.* 392, in the *Extract of a letter from an officer in the army of the Elector of Bavaria.*

(*c*) *See the letter which is in the ſame volume of the* Mercure Galant, *pag.* 395, & *ſeq.*

(*d*) Ibid. *pag.* 402.

(*e*) *See the* Nouvelles des Cours de l'Europe, *for the month of Auguſt* 1704, *pag.* 150, & *ſeq*, & *pag.* 163, & *ſeq.*

VOLKELIUS (**JOHN**) a Socinian Miniſter (*a*) born at Grimma in Miſnia, was one of the moſt learned men of that ſect. Some letters which Socinus wrote to him are publiſhed, the firſt of which is dated the third of April 1593 (*b*). He wrote one to him in the year 1596, upon Volkelius's intimating that he did not think Socinus had fully refuted Francis David's arguments (*c*). He publiſhed in the year 1613 an anſwer (*d*), and a reply (*e*), to Smiglecius; but his principal work is that *De vera Religione*, of which a great many copies were burnt at Amſterdam by order of the magiſtrates, on the twentieth of January 1642 [*A*]. I have ſomething to offer concerning this fact, which is not exactly repreſented

(*a*) Eccleſiæ Philippovienſis, poſt Smiglenſis Paſtor. *Bibl. Antitrinit. p.* 96.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Hoornbeek, Apparatu ad Controverſ. Socinian. *pag.* 65.

(*d*) *Intituled,* Nodi Gordii à Martino Smiglecio nexi Diſſolutio.

(*e*) *Intituled* Reſponſio ad vanam refutationem diſſolutionis Nodi Gordii.

[*A*] *That* de Vera Religione, *of which a great number of copies were burnt . . . in* 1642.] It was printed at Racovia in the year 1630, after the author's death. The ſect judging it proper that this book ſhould contain a complete ſyſtem of the Socinian doctrine, and finding it defective in ſome particulars, appointed Crellius to add as a ſupplement, a treatiſe of GOD and of the Divine Attributes. Crellius executed this commiſſion; what he wrote made the firſt part of the work, and is the firſt of the ſix books which compoſe it. Several are of opinion that Socinianiſm hath not produced any thing more dangerous than this volume, and for that reaſon doubtleſs it was, that being reprinted at Amſterdam it was thought very neceſſary represented in the book intitled *La Religion des Hollandois.*

neceſſary to uſe it with all the ſeverity of the law. The Scout of Amſterdam ſeized 450 copies which he found in the Bookſeller's hands; and prevailed with the Judges to confiſcate them, and fine the Bookſeller (1); eight days after which they were publickly burnt (2). Curcellæus having written this news to Ruarus on the eighth of February 1642, informed him on the twelfth of April following, that the new Schepens had annulled the ſentence of their predeceſſors (3), and ordered it to be taken out of the regiſters; inſomuch, that the Bookſeller who had not yet paid his fine, came off with the loſs of his books only. Notwithſtanding this, he was ſo terrified thereby, that it was thought he would not eaſily be induced to publiſh any book of that nature again (4). Curcellæus paſſionately deſired that ſome able perſon would write againſt theſe proceedings of the Schepens of Amſterdam. 'Utinam veſtrum aliquis præceps Scabinorum noſtrorum judicium vellet expendere, & iſtos librorum incendiarios peccati ſui coarguere. Si quem noveris ei rei idoneum, urge ut aggrediatur (5). - - - *I wiſh that ſome one among you would ſtrictly examine the raſh judgment of our Schepens, and cenſure thoſe burners of books for the fault they have committed. If you know any perſon fit for that taſk, preſs him to undertake it.*'

The two letters of this Remonſtrant miniſter, written openly and in confidence to Ruarus, ſhew the falſity of Mr Stoupp's conjecture. Read what follows, I cite it from the copy which Mr Des Maizeaux (6) has been pleaſed to ſend me, and not as it was in my firſt edition, where I inſerted this paſſage exactly as Mr Arnauld publiſhed it in the forty-ſixth page of the ſecond part of his Apology for the Catholics. He hath curtailed and altered ſeveral places, and yet makes uſe of the Italic character, without taking notice of any deficiency: this is not like an exact author. 'The Socinian books were very ſcarce till a few years paſt. Thoſe which were publiſhed, were printed in very diſtant places, and in ſmall numbers, ſo that they could not be got but at a very dear rate, and moſt of them were not to be come at on any terms. The States-General by their goodneſs and ſpecial favour, and a very particular tenderneſs of conſcience, remedied this inconveniency. To ſatisfy the Socinians, and thoſe who were willing to embrace their opinions, they gave leave that they ſhould print at Amſterdam, four of their principal authors, *viz.* Socinus, Crellius, Slichtingius, and Wolzogenius. This collection of Socinian writers in eight volumes *in folio*, is at preſent publickly ſold at Amſterdam for a hundred gilders. It is but a very few years ſince an inconſiderable part of theſe books would have coſt two hundred piſtoles, whereas all of them may be had at preſent for leſs than ten. It is indeed true that ſome time ſince a Socinian book was burnt at Amſterdam, doubtleſs (7) at the requeſt of Bleau himſelf who printed it. A few days after this execution he publickly expoſed the ſame book to ſale; and to recommend it to the buyer, and enhance the price, inſerted in the title page, that it was the ſame book which by order of the States, had been burnt by the hands of the common executioner (8).'

Several particulars of this paſſage deſerve to be cenſured. In the firſt place, Mr Stoupp ought to have known that the States-General do not meddle with the government of Amſterdam; it does not belong to them to permit or prohibit any thing to the Bookſellers in the province of Holland. II. It is not true either that the States-General, or the States of Holland, permitted the printing of Socinian books. The works of the four principal Divines, whereof Mr Stoupp ſpeaks, were privately printed; of which ſee the particulars in the Apology for the religion of the Dutch (9). III. It is utterly falſe that William Bleau ſollicited the burning of this Socinian book: Curcellæus's two letters clearly prove that the Sieurs Blaew were very ſorry for the burning of Volkelius's book; I ſhall borrow ſome freſh evidences of this truth, from the author who refuted Mr Stoupp. (10) 'It was not *William*, but *John Bleau* who printed it. But how impertinent it is to conjecture that this *Bleau* entreated the magiſtrates to burn this book? If only a dozen copies had been burnt, it might be ſaid, that your narrow ſuſpicious ſoul had ſome excuſable pretext for this malicious conjecture: but you ought to know that the officer who had orders to burn this book, ſeized Mr Bleau at a friend's houſe, where he then was, and cauſed him to be guarded by ſome of his men, whilſt he went directly to the ware-houſe, where he found all the copies, and cauſed them to be immediately burnt (11). Half a day was entirely ſpent only in throwing the books into the fire, till the flames had conſumed the whole number, which redounded to the great damage of Mr Bleau, beſides, he was fined two thouſand gilders (12). *By this you may judge if it was Bleau who ſollicited the burning of this book*, and whether he could have any great advantage by it.' IV. It is falſe, that *a few days*, or any time *after this public execution*, the ſame Bookſeller *publickly ſold this book of Volkelius*, and that he *inſerted in the title, that it was the ſame book which had been condemned publickly to be burnt by the hands of the common executioner*. The perſon that furniſhed Mr Stoupp with memoirs confounded the fact, and the whole foundation of this fable was; Volkelius's book was printed in Dutch at Rotterdam in the year 1649, and it was mentioned in the title that the Schepens had ordered it to be burnt in Holland in 1642 (13). The apologiſt for the religion of the Dutch obſerves that one Colom, and not the Sieurs Bleau, put this in the title; but that this tranſlation *was likewiſe prohibited by the States* (14). Mareſius obſerves, that this additional clauſe in the title was a bait which the ſecret emiſſaries of the Socinians laid, to promote the ſale of the book: *Quantum præſidii in eo reponant clancularii teterrimæ Hæreſeos emiſſarii & promotores, palam fecerunt ante biennium, illo in Belgicum idioma tranſlato, & quò ad ejus lectionem magis invitarentur homines præpoſterè curioſi, quibus ſolemne niti in vetitum ſemper cupereque negata, præfixo hoc Elogio, quod opus illud eſſet*, in Hollant by Schepen vonniſſe gedoempt, openbaerlijck geexecuteert, en met vyer verbrant anno 1642, in Januario (15). The Synods of Holland did not forget this addition to the title, in the remonſtrance which I have mentioned in another place (16): they complained that ſeveral books were tranſlated into Dutch; and in the laſt place they quoted Volkelius. 'Denique Crellius de Deo & ejus attributis & Volkelii quinque libri de vera religione: & ad irridendum zelum piorum judicum pro Deo, perverſoſque homines eo magis alliciendum, in frontiſpicio poſuerunt in Hollandia ſententia Scabinorum eum librum damnatum & publice combuſtum eſſe anno 1642, menſe Januario- - - *Laſtly, Crellius's book* de Deo & ejus Attributis, *and Volkelius's five books* de Vera Religione: *and to ridicule the zeal of pious judges in the cauſe of GOD, and thereby to entice the more men of perverſe diſpoſitions, they took care to have it inſerted in the title page, that by the ſentence of the Schepen in Holland the ſaid book had been publickly condemned and burnt in the month of January in the year 1642.*'

It is certain that this book of Volkelius was never printed by itſelf in Latin, after the burning it in the year 1642. But it was printed entire in the *Hydra Socinianiſmi expugnata*, publiſhed at Groningen by Samuel Mareſius (17). This orthodox profeſſor intending to refute the Socinian ſyſtem, was reſolved to leave no room to ſuſpect that he had weakened his adverſary's arguments. Therefore he publiſhed them at large without any omiſſion, and ſubjoined his refutation in the ſame pages. By this means his readers had a fair opportunity of comparing Hereſy and Orthodoxy, without there being any room left to complain that Hereſy was not there expreſſed in full force and vigour. It muſt be owned this is the moſt frank and ingenuous way of anſwering an adverſary. It ſhews that the author relies on the goodneſs of his cauſe, and the ſtrength of his pen: it prevents all ſuſpicions of artifice; and we indeed have reaſon to be ſuſpicious on this head in many thouſands of caſes; for it happens but too often that an author unfairly repreſents the arguments which he deſigns to confute. He makes as if he had not perceived what he thinks he is not able to refute; and when he cannot avoid mentioning ſome particulars, he omits ſome eſſential terms. In a word, ſuppoſe as long as you pleaſe that a controverſiſt acts fairly, you will never be able to perſuade the world, that looſe paſſages which he cites out of the piece he refutes, are an impartial repreſen-

(1) In 1200 Gilders.

(2) Steph. Curcellæus Epiſtola ad Ruarum. *It is the lxxxvith of the firſt century of Ruarus's letters, p.* 407.

(3) See the lxxxviith letter of the firſt century of Ruarus's letters, *pag.* 408, 409.

(4) Ita illo conſternati caſu (Cæſii, *that is, the* Sieurs Blaew) ut non facile poſthac ejuſmodi ſint libros excuſuri. *Idem, pag.* 409.

(5) Ibid. *pag.* 408.

(6) Of whom mention is made above, in citat. (21), of the article VIRGIL. See alſo the *Nouvel. de la Rep. des Lettres*, for Auguſt 1701, *pag.* 151, *& ſeq.*

(7) The Italian tranſlator of Mr Stoupp's book has committed here a great fault by ſuppreſſing the words, which import that the author had only a ſuſpicion. *A forza di ſuppliche*, ſays he, *dello ſteſſo Guiglielmo Bleau.*

(8) Stoupp, Religion des Hollandois, *letter iv, dated the 13th of May* 1673.

(9) Jean Brun, Apologie pour la Religion des Hollandois, *pag.* 216, *& ſeq.*

(10) Id. ibid. *pag.* 218.

(11) Curcellæus ſays there was an interval of eight days.

(12) Curcellæus ſays only 1200.

(13) Bibl. Antitrinit. *pag.* 96.

(14) Jean Brun, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 219.

(15) Samuel Mareſius, *Præfat.* Hydræ Socinianiſmi expugnatæ, *Tom. i, printed at Groningen in* 1651.

(16) In the article SOCINUS (FAUSTUS) remark [*L*].

(17) The firſt Tome was publiſhed in 1651, the ſecond, in 1654, and the third, which is the laſt, in 1662.

tation of the ſtrength of the work, which commonly conſiſts in the connexion of it's parts. Wherefore Mareſius took the moſt proper meaſures in the world by inſerting in his anſwer the whole book which was burned. He ſilenced the heretical boaſters, and deprived them for the pretext of reproaching the true Church with mean ſhifts, or inſulting the orthodox, as men who not daring to look their enemies in the face, and knowing themſelves unable to make head againſt them, implored the aſſiſtance of the ſecular power, to burn by a ſentence of the magiſtrates a book whoſe objections they could not overthrow. Some ſatirical wits have ventured to ſay, that this Profeſſor took this method only in compliance to the Bookſeller, who poſitively inſiſted upon it, from an opinion that the text of Volkelius would make any refutation whatſoever ſell. This is a malicious falſity. And it is infinitely more reaſonable to acquieſce in the reaſons which the author himſelf alledges. 'Mihi autem, *ſaith he* (18), vitio verti non debet quod textum integrum libri nefarii curarim recudendum. Cum enim ſupprimi per hominum curioſitatem & malitiam nequeat, nec in eo voti ſui compos extiterit Ampliſſ. Magiſtratus Amſtellodamenſis, malui illum integrum ſiſtere Lectori, ne crederer ſuffurari velle victoriam, quod nolebat Alexander, & datâ operâ delumbare atque extenuare Adverſarii mei argumenta; Ubi Lector *ipſam Beſtiam ſua verba reſonantem* audierit, (ut hîc adhibeam dictum Æſchinis de oratione Demoſthenis in ſe habita, relatum Hieronymo *Epiſt. ad Paul. de lib. Divino cap.* 2.) & ſimul noſtras ad illam cenſuras & Annotationes ἀλεξικάκȣς expenderit, faciliùs de totius Cauſæ natura & merito judicabit. Oppoſita ſibi mutuò appoſita magis eluceſcunt. Et ſicut vinum dulcius eſt quod prope mandragoras creſcit, & ſuavius olent lilia & roſæ quæ juxta cæpas & allia carpuntur, ſic ex hac antitheſi plus accedet ſuaveolentiæ illi veritatis Cauſæ quam ſuſcepi propugnandam. Ita vident Lectores nihil nos metuere nobis ab iſtorum hominum ſtrophis & cavillationibus, quandoquidem eas integras, omnibuſque ſuis veſtitas coloribus, proponimus & expendimus, confiſi bonitati noſtræ cauſæ, & quod eorum *Sententias prodidiſſe ſuperaſſe eſt*, ut loquitur Hieronymus *ad Cteſiph*. - - - *It ought not to be charged upon me as a fault that I have taken care to publiſh the entire text of a wicked book. For as it could not be ſuppreſſed, by reaſon of the curioſity or malice of mankind, and ſince the magiſtrates of Amſterdam could not ſucceed in that deſign, I rather choſe to preſent it entire to the reader; that it might not ſeem as if I deſired to ſteal a victory* (*which Alexander ſcorned to do*), *or took pains to weaken and extenuate my adverſary's arguments. But when the reader ſhall hear* the beaſt himſelf bellowing out his own words, (*if I may be allowed to apply here what Æſchines ſaid touching a ſpeech which Demoſthenes had pronounced againſt him, as the thing is related by St Jerom*) *and ſhall at the ſame time weigh the cenſures that we paſs upon him and our wholſome remarks, he will be the better able to judge of the merit and nature of the whole cauſe. Oppoſite things are the more clearly diſcerned for being ſet by one another. For as that wine is ſweeter which grows near mandrakes, and as thoſe lilies and roſes have a more fragrant ſmell which are gathered in the neighbourhood of of onions and garlick, ſo this oppoſition will give an additional flavour to the cauſe of truth, which I have undertaken to defend. Thus the reader will perceive that we are not in the leaſt afraid of the quirks and and cavils of thoſe men, ſince we repreſent and conſider them entire and dreſſed in their own colours; truſting to the goodneſs of our cauſe, and for that, as St Jerom ſays to Cteſiphon,* in order to confute their opinions, it is ſufficient to ſhew them as they are.' He adds, that he herein imitated Francis Junius (19), Sibrandus Lubbertus (20), Paul Tarnovius (21), John Junius (22), Alſtedius (23), and Biſterfeldius, ſon-in-law to Alſteidus (24). He repreſents in his Preface to the ſecond tome, that he would not be ſorry if the magiſtrates ſhould make uſe of an anſwer different from his, that is, burn the Socinian ſyſtem. And as he praiſes the pious zeal of the Engliſh, who condemned the Catechiſm of this ſect to the flames (25); ſo he complains of the toleration which Cromwell allowed theſe Heretics. He bewails with tears of blood the confuſion of England, which was become their metropolis (26), and that a Catechiſm, containing all their blaſphemies, was ſuffered to be printed at London. 'Modò enim ex Anglia allatus eſt Anglicâ linguâ conſcriptus Catechiſmus duplex, major & minor, Londini publice excuſus hoc anno 1654, apud *Ja. Cottrel* pro *Rich. Moone, ad inſigne ſeptem ſtellarum, in Cœmeterio Paulino*, authore *Johanne Beddle*, ſive *Biddello*, Magiſtro Artium Oxonienſi, editus, uti præ ſe fert, in eorum gratiam qui merè Chriſtiani nullique ſectæ addicti eſſe volunt, (quamvis nequeant ſe tales profiteri, quin eo ipſo ſectam ſpecialem ab aliis omnibus diſcretam conſtituant,) & omnes Socinianiſmi impietates ac blaſphemias continet, eructat, propugnat (27). - - - *There are juſt come from England two Catechiſms*, viz. *a larger and a ſmaller one, written in the Engliſh language, and publickly printed at London this very year* 1654, *by* James Cotterel *for* Richard Moone, *at the* ſeven Stars *in* Paul's Church-yard. *The author is one John Biddle, a Maſter of Arts, of the univerſity of Oxford. He pretends that they are compoſed for their ſakes, who would be mere Chriſtians, and not of this or that ſect* (*although they cannot profeſs themſelves to be ſuch, without ſetting up a particular ſect of their own, diſtinct from all others*). *Theſe Catechiſms contain, propagate, and defend, all the impieties and blaſphemies of the Socinians.* Having anſwered Volkelius's book paragraph by paragraph, he might have laughed at thoſe ſectaries, if they had alledged againſt him the reflexions which Arnobius made on the requeſt of the idolaters, that the Senate would prohibit ſome books of Cicero (28), in which the vanity of their falſe gods was demonſtrated. Refute them, ſaith Arnobius, if they contain any impieties, for to forbid the reading of them, is not to maintain the cauſe of the gods, but to be afraid of the evidence of truth. *Cum ſciam eſſe non paucos qui averſentur & fugiant libros de hoc ejus,* (Ciceronis) *nec in aurim velint admittere lectionem opinionum ſuarum præſumpta vincentem? cumque alios audiam muſſitare indignanter, & dicere: oportere ſtatui per Senatum, aboleantur ut hæc ſcripta, quibus Chriſtiana relligio comprobetur, & vetuſtatis opprimatur actoritas? Quinimo ſi fiditis exploratum vos dicere quicquam de Diis veſtris, erroris convincite Ciceronem, temeraria & impia dictitare refellitote, redarguite, comprobate. Nam intercipere ſcripta, & publicatam velle ſubmergere lectionem, non eſt Deos defendere, ſed veritatis teſtificationem timere.* (29). It is certain that Socinus took advantage of his adverſaries forbidding the reading of his writings (30).

It muſt not be forgot that the Engliſh complained of Mareſius's accuſing their nation, of favouring Socianiſm, and of their country's becoming it's metropolis. Read the following paſſage of John Owen, Doctor of Divinity and Vice-Chancellor of the univerſity of Oxford: 'Ille (*Mareſius*) univerſam gentem noſtram, ejuſque Gubernatores Socinianiſmi accuſat, & qui viri mos eſt, horrendos clamores excitat, affirmans hæreſin ibi ſedem Metropoliticam fixiſſe, &c. De temeritate hujus cenſuræ & de ſtupenda ejus ignorantia in ſtatu rerum apud nos geſtarum, quas tamen referre, judicare, & condemnare præſumit, ſcripſi ad ipſum epiſtolam (31). - - - *This* Mareſius *accuſes our whole nation, and thoſe who govern it, of Socianiniſm, and, as the manner of the man is, he raiſes a horid clamour, affirming that Hereſy has fixed her metropolitan ſee here. But I have written a letter, wherein I repreſent to him the raſhneſs of this cenſure, and his ſtupid ignorance of our affairs, which he nevertheleſs preſumes to relate, judge of, and condemn.*' Mr Daillé made uſe of this complaint of Dr Owen, when he writ againſt Mareſius. Mareſius anſwered, that he never received this doctor's letter, and that he was very well pleaſed to hear that things were not in that ſtate in England that they had been (32). This he tells us in a Preface written in April 1658. But it is to be obſerved, that the Preface to the ſecond tome of the *Anti-Volkelius* is dated the 12th of Auguſt 1654.

(18) Mareſius, *Præfat. Vol. i.* Hydræ Socinianiſmi expugnatæ, *fol.* * 2.

(19) *In his* Defenſio Catholica.

(20) In the refutation of Fauſtus Socinus's book *De Chriſto Servatore.*

(21) In the refutation of the ſame Socinus's book *contra Bellarminum & Wiekium.*

(22) In the refutation of the ſame Socinus's *Prælectiones.*

(23) In the refutation of the *Cathechiſm of Racovia.*

(24) In the refutation of Crellius's book *de uno Deo & patre.*

(25) *Quem* (Catechiſmum Rakovienſem) *olim Anglia ex ſanct, & pio zelo publice cremavit,* Mareſ. *Præf. Tom. ii. The word* olim *makes me think, that he does not mean the act of the parliament, which condemned that book to be burnt in* 1653, *See* Micrelius's continuation, *pag.* 929.

(26) Sociniana peſtis . . . videtur nunc in vicina Anglia ſedem ſibi metropolitanam fixiſſe. *Mareſius.* Præf. Tom. ii, *Hydræ Socinianiſmi.*

(27) Id. ibid.

(28) Doubtleſs Cicero's books *de Natura Deorum.*

(29) Arnobius, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 103.

(30) *See the* Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres, *for July* 1685, *Art. ix.*

(31) Joan. Owenus *in* Vindiciis Evangel. contra Socin. *Anglice. Præfat. pag.* 4. *apud* Dallæum in Vindiciis Apologiæ, *pag.* 434.

(32) Mareſius in Prolegom. Epicriſis Theologicæ.

VOLSIUS (PAUL) Abbot of the monaſtery of Haugſhofen (*a*), of the order of the Benedictins near Schleſtad in Alſatia, lived in the XVIth century. He had a great deal of merit, and was highly praiſed by Eraſmus (*b*) who dedicated to him in the year 1518 the new edition of his *Enchiridion Militis Chriſtiani.* At length he accompliſhed his

(*a*) Eraſmus expreſſes this word in Latin by Hugonis Curia, - - *Hugh's Court.*

(*b*) See the xxxvth letter of the firſt book of Eraſmus, *pag. m.* 81.

his deſign of throwing aſide the Monkiſh habit, and renouncing Popery (*c*). He embraced the ſect of the Anabaptiſts; but being converted by Calvin about the year 1539, he was Miniſter of the Church of Straſburg to the day of his death (*d*).

(*c*) See the xxxiiid letter of xiith book of Eraſmus, and the xliiid of the xviiith.

(*d*) Beza, Preface to the Commentary of Calvin upon Joſhua, *pag. m.* 11.

VORSTIUS (CONRAD) was born at Cologn on the nineteenth of July 1569. His father who was a Dyer, had not yet left the Church of Rome; wherefore he cauſed him to be baptized at his pariſh church. Soon after he privately joined with the Proteſtant Church, to which he brought over his wife. They had ten children, and deſigned this Conrad for a ſcholar. He learned Grammar, and a little Rhetoric at the village of Bedberdyk, where he ſtaid five years, after which he went to Duſſeldorp in the year 1583, where he continued his ſchool ſtudies, till 1586. He ſpent the following year at Cologn in Saint Laurence's College, where he learned ſeveral things. Two reaſons prevented his taking the degree of Bachelor of Philoſophy [*A*], and interrupted his ſtudies. The poverty of the family induced them to breed him a merchant. He ſpent two years in learning what might be uſeful to him in trade, as Arithmetic, the French and Italian languages. Afterwards he returned to his ſtudies, and was ſent to Herborn in the year 1589. Where Piſcator had read Divinity three years. Vorſtius ſtudied under him with great ſucceſs, and applied himſelf to the inſtruction of ſome children of quality. With ſome of theſe he went to Heidelberg in March 1593, where he was created Doctor of Divinity in July 1594. A year after he went to viſit the academies of Swiſſerland [*B*], and that of Geneva. He read Theological lectures in the latter, at the inſtigation of Theodore Beza, and acquitted himſelf ſo well that he was offered a profeſſor's chair there; which he would not accept, ſome reaſons inducing him to return home, for he was offered to be Divinity Profeſſor at Steinfurt (*a*). The letter of invitation was delivered to him at Geneva in February 1596. He accepted that preferment, and diſcharged the functions of it in a manner which made him very famous, and courted by other academies [*C*]. In the year 1605, beſides his profeſſorſhip, he was made Miniſter of Steinfurt: and as if thoſe two places had not been ſufficient to employ him, he had other preferments beſtowed on him, whereby, as it was but reaſonable, his ſalary was increaſed (*b*). He was invited to Leyden to ſucceed Arminius in the year 1610, and after a year's conſideration

(*a*) At that time the Count of Bentheim founded an illuſtrious ſchool in that town.

(*b*) Aliis quoque muneribus à generoſo Dn. Comite (*Bentheimenſi*) auctus eſt. Cum duobus enim Conſiliariis & Miniſtro aulico cognitioni ac judiciis cauſarum & quæſtionum matrimonialium præfectus eſt; tum examini novitiorum Miniſtrorum, denique Synodis & viſitationibus Eccleſiarum. In quorum onerum ſolatium extraordinarium ei ſtipendium conſtitutum. - - - *He had likewiſe other places conferred upon him by the generous Count of Bentheim. For he together with two counſellors and a court-miniſter was appointed to preſide at the trial and deciſion of matrimonial cauſes and diſputes, and at the examination of young clergymen, and laſtly, in ſynods, and at the viſitation of churches. And as a recompence for theſe painful imployments, he was allowed an extraordinary ſalary.* Marcus Gualter. ubi infra, *citat.* (*c*).

[*A*] *Two reaſons prevented his taking the degree of Batchelor of Philoſophy.*] One was, that he would not betray his conſcience, by ſwearing that he would ſubmit to the deciſions of the Council of Trent, the other was, that they deſigned to withdraw him from his ſtudies in order to breed him a Merchant, by reaſon of the ill poſture of the affairs of his family. *Inſtabat tempus promotionis ejuſdem ad Baccalaureatum, & magiſterium philoſophiæ, ſed quæ fieri non poterat niſi pro more ſolemniter juraret in decreta Concilii Tridentini: itaque honorem illum licet ejus potiri poſſet & forte vellet, tamen cum & conſcientiæ propter illud juramentum obſtaret, & jam parentum res magis ac magis inclinarent, repudiavit, & deliberatum eſt de ſtudiis ipſius abrumpendis, ipſoque mercaturæ addicendo* (1).

[*B*] *He went to viſit the academies of Swiſſerland.*] He twice maintained public theſes at Baſil (2); 1. *De Sacramentis.* 2. *De Cauſis ſalutis.* He was preparing a third diſputation againſt Socinus, *de Chriſto Servatore*; but haſtening his journey he did not finiſh this piece. He left the original with Grynæus, and received it back again when he returned by Baſil. The firſt work aſcribed to him is a collection of theſe ſort of theſes containing above twenty, defended at ſeveral times, beginning with the year 1594. He places firſt in this collection, his theſis *de Sancta Trinitate, hoc eſt, de Deo Patre, Filio, & Spiritu ſancto*, and the theſis *de Perſona & Officio Chriſti*; which he ſome time after made uſe of as an apology againſt thoſe who accuſed him of *ſocinianiſing* in theſe two points; for to ſtop the mouth of calumniators, he reprinted theſe two theſes apart in 1612. *Quas poſtmodum Apologiæ vicem eſſe voluit, cum maligne quidam Tribunitii ſtentores ipſum traducere inciperent, quaſi hæretice de duobus illis capitibus ſentientem aut docentem. Ideoque anno* 1612 *denuo & ſeorſim excudi curavit, ad os calumniæ obturandum* (3). We ſhall find by the following remarks that he was ſoon ſuſpected of that Hereſy.

[*C*] *He diſcharged his functions in a manner which made him courted by other Academies.*] Mr du Pleſſis Mornai, and the Church of Samur, wrote to him in July 1602, and deſired him to accept the Theological profeſſor's chair in the Academy which they had newly erected in that place. Vorſtius gave no poſitive anſwer: but the Count of Bentheim being reſolved at any rate to keep him, anſwered Mr du Pleſſis, and the affair ſtopped there. In the year 1606, Maurice Landgrave of Heſſe offered Voſtius the place of Divinity profeſſor at Marpurg (4); and after having ſeveral times written to him, he ſent a coach and a trumpet for him, that the Profeſſor might make his journey in a manner that ſhould be both convenient and honourable. *Miſſo præter diverſas literas ſingularis honoris cauſa tubicine & rheda qua illuc veheretur* (5). The Count of Bentheim would not give leave for his departure; Vorſtius's relations deſired him not to remove; ſo that this invitation proved as ineffectual as that of Saulmur. If the call to Leyden had ſucceeded no better, it is very probable that Vorſtius had died with an orthodox character; for it ought to be obſerved that the ſuſpicions raiſed againſt him before the year 1599, were ſufficiently quaſhed by his conduct in the Palatinate. And, in effect, Mr du Pleſſis Mornai would not have deſired to have him at Saumur, if he had not been throughly convinced of his innocence: nor could he be ignorant of what was done at Heidelberg. The Count of Bentheim being informed that his Divine was ſuſpected, deſired to have that affair cleared up; and therefore he ordered Vorſtius to go immediately and purge himſelf of that accuſation at the univerſity which had created him doctor, and convince them of his orthodoxy. Vorſtius accordingly went to Heidelberg, where he gave an account of his faith, and returned home perfectly juſtified (6). The faculty of Divinity admitted him *ad oſculum pacis*, - - - *to the kiſs of peace*, and gave him *teſſeram hoſpitalitatis*, - - - - *the token of hoſpitality*, having told him that he was to blame for advancing certain aſſertions which favoured the Socinians, and having made him promiſe, that for the future he would abſtain from the uſe of any ſuſpicious expreſſions. He was alſo obliged to proteſt that he abhorred Socinus's opinions, and that he was very ſorry that the heat of youth had drawn him into expreſſions which ſeemed to favour that Heretic, and ſhock the doctrine of the Reformed Churches. *Teſtetur etiam ſibi dolere quod impetu juvenili abreptus nonnulla ſcripſerit & ſparſerit quæ Socini erroribus favere, doctrinæque Eccleſiarum reformatarum, in quam juravit in ſua promotione ad Doctoratum, adverſari videbantur* (7). This happened on the twenty-ſixth of September 1599. The inſtrument drawn up on that occaſion is to be found in the life of David Pareus: where you will find likewiſe the following relation, which will not be diſagreeable to thoſe who are fond of being acquainted with a great many particulars concerning conſideration he accepted that employment [*D*], and with his family removed to Leyden, carrying with him the moſt authentic teſtimonials of orthodoxy [*E*], and of a good as well as prudent conduct ; but he met with inſurmountable difficulties. The miniſters who maintained the old doctrine of Calvin in oppoſition to the Arminians, were perſuaded that if Vorſtius, who was not of their opinion, ſhould be profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, he would do an irreparable injury to their cauſe. Wherefore they warmly repreſented the

---

(1) Marcus Gualtherus in Oratione de vita & obitu Conradi Vorſtii.

(2) *See* Marcus Gualtherus, ibid. *I cannot note the pages; for the Printer has not numbered them.*

(3) Id. ibid. *pag. I* 3.

(4) Ibid. *pag. E* 3.

(5) Ib. verſo.

(6) *See* Vorſtius's letter to the Divines of Heidelberg, *among thoſe of the Arminians, p.* 46, *of the edition in folio.*

(7) *Vide* David. Parei Vitam, *pag. m.* 59.

concerning the lives of learned men. ‘ Non ita pridem ſupremos in S. Theologia honores, ſive Doctoratum Facultas Theologica contulerat Viro Clariſſimo Domino CONRADO VORSTIO Colonienſi, qui poſtea à D. PAREO ob ſingularem eruditionem, diſputandi acumen, & docendi σαφήνειαν, commendatus fuit ad Profeſſionem Theologicam in nova Schola Steinfurtenſi, Illuſtri & Generoſo Comiti D. ARNOLDO, Comiti in Bentheim, *&c.* In qua cum aliquandiu Orthodoxam doctrinam cum magna laude propoſuiſſet, abreptus tandem ingenii ἀγχινοία, aut καινοτομία docendi, animum applicuit ad lectionem nefarii libri FAUSTI SOCINI de Servatore: immo & authoris amicitiam affectavit ac coluit. Hinc cothurnos corrumpendi receptam doctrinam, de lytro & ſatisfactione JESU-CHRISTI, ſubdole excogitavit, quos & Diſputationibus tam publicis quam privatis in Schola habitis λάθρα tanquam ὕπουλον venenum nonnunquam inſperſit, ac juventutem non parum turbavit. Sed fraus diu latere non potuit ſagaciores Theologos, qui fermentum illud odorati, magno conatu & zelo hominem monuerunt, ut reſipiſceret : juxta illud : *Retundat me juſtus : benignitas erit : & corripiat me : unguentum erit præſtantiſſimum.* Quin & ipſe Generoſus Dn. Comes, admonitus à viris gravibus, Doctorem ſuum ſerio hortatus fuit, ut in gratiam rediret cum Eccleſiis & fratribus, quos ſua καινοδοξία magno totius Eccleſiæ ſcandalo non ceſſaret offendere : nec ante ad munus docendi in ſua ſchola rediret, quàm Teſtimonium Ὀρθοδοξίας auferret, ab iis præſertim, qui publicam docendi facultatem in Academiis ei fuiſſent largiti (8). - - - - *Not long before the faculty of Divinity had conferred the higheſt honours,* viz. *the degree of Doctor on the famous* CONRAD VORSTIUS *of Cologn. He was afterwards on account of his ſingular erudition, acuteneſs in diſputing, and perſpicuity in teaching, recommended by* DAVID PAREUS *to that noble Lord* ARNOLD *Count of Bentheim, in order that he ſhould make him Profeſſor of Divinity in the illuſtrious ſchool newly erected at Steinfurt. For ſome time that he taught there he was in high reputation for his orthodoxy, but at laſt being hurried away by the ſubtlety of his genius, or by a deſire of teaching a new doctrine, he fell a reading that impious book of* FAUSTUS SOCINUS de Servatore: *nay he did more, for he courted and cultivated the author's friendſhip. From that time he cunningly bethought himſelf of the means to corrupt the received doctrine concerning the propitiatory ſatiſfaction of* JESUS CHRIST, *and both in his private and public diſputations he did now and then mix the hidden poiſon, and not a little corrupt the youthly ſtudents. This fraud could not long eſcape the notice of judicious Divines, who diſcovering the leaven did with great zeal and earneſtneſs admoniſh him to repent : according to that ſaying*; Let the righteous man ſmite me ; it ſhall be a kindneſs : let him reprove me ; it ſhall be as a moſt precious ointment. *Nay the noble Count abovementioned, being informed of it by ſome conſiderable perſons, did ſeriouſly adviſe his Divine to return into favour with the churches and his brethren, whom he did not ceaſe to offend with his new opinions to the great ſcandal of the whole church. He likewiſe exhorted him not to reſume his office of teaching till ſuch time as he had obtained a teſtimonial of orthodoxy, particularly from thoſe perſons who had conferred on him the privilege of teaching publickly in academies.*’

[*D*] *After one year's conſideration he accepted that employment.*] Nothing was wanting in this invitation : it had been approved by the States of Holland, and by Prince Maurice, who alſo ordered the deputies, one of which was his own miniſter, to preſs Vorſtius to the utmoſt, to come and ſerve the univerſity of Leyden. *Adeo quidem benigne, ut illuſtriſſ. Princeps reverendum virum D. Joannem Wtenbogardum* (it was his miniſter) *una cum viro clariſſ. Dn. Nicolao Zeyſtio Syndico Leydenſi, cum mandatis mitteret, ut hortaretur quantum poſſet Dominum Vorſtium, ne petitionem ac vocationem hanc Ordinum & Curatorum fruſtraneam eſſe vellet* (9). But I believe without the earneſt and preſſing ſollicitations of the Arminians, Vorſtius had never embarked in that boiſterous ſea. He was beloved and honoured at Steinfurt, he there enjoyed a perfect eaſe, and had a very great reputation, and as the ſtate of the controverſies betwixt Arminius and Gomarus then was, he doubtleſs foreſaw the many oppoſitions which he was like to meet with in Holland. They tempted him, if I am not miſtaken, with the glory of ſupporting a party, which the death of Arminius had weakened. To this were added the motives drawn from conſcience : it was repreſented to him that he would one day be obliged to anſwer for the ill uſe of his talents, if the love of eaſe made him loſe ſuch a favourable opportunity of eſtabliſhing the truth where it had already taken root. However that be, it was his ill ſtars made him leave the county of Bentheim, and remove to Holland, where being toſſed betwixt a thouſand ſhoals and rocks, he at laſt was miſerably ſhipwracked, and loſt both his reputation and fortune, being branded with diſhonour both by the ſecular and eccleſiaſtical tribunals. This was a good argument againſt Arminianiſm ; this was what would oblige one to acknowledge the fatality of events. His panegyriſt affords me this thought. ‘ Vir optimus, *ſaith he* (10), jam litium Theologicarum quæ in Belgio inter Eccleſiaſticos exortæ erant, gnarus & ob eas non temere tam duram provinciam capiendam ratus, non quidem prorſus quod offerebatur repudiavit, ſed toto nihilominus pene anno aſſenſum ſuſpendit. Idque eo magis quod tenſo ac tenaci quodam germaniſſimæ benevolentiæ vinculo alligatus à ſuis ægerrime avelli poſſet, certatim contra adnitentibus omnibus ut decus illud ſcholæ novellæ retineretur : ſed currebant jam propinqua viri FATA, quæ ipſum quoque communi & immeritæ cladi involvendum DESTINAVERANT.’ If Vorſtius had continued quiet at Steinfurt, the errors of his treatiſe *de Deo* had not ſignified much, and he had eaſily recovered that falſe ſtep : but the queſtion being whither he ſhould teach Theology at Leyden or not, that is, whether one growing party ſhould ſupplant the other, nothing was pardoned in him ; his treatiſe *de Deo* grew worſe than the Alcoran. This parallel is not of my invention ; I find it in the author juſt now cited. ‘ Reipſa comperimus, *ſaith he* (11), vehementius & acerbius librum iſtum oppugnaſſe quam unquam quiſquam Chriſtianorum Mahumedis Alcoranum, aut recutitorum Talmudica deliria invaſit. Neque unquam Lucianus, Porphyrius, Julianus, Libanius aut quiſquis ſimili in Chriſtianos maledicentia fuit, tam crude & barbare exceptus à veteribus ſcriptoribus, qui tamen etiam habebant acetum in pectore, atque hic Noſter ab infrunitis adverſariis ſuis male multatus ob ſerium & ſolidum illud ſcriptum. - - - *In effect, we found that this book was more violently attacked than ever the Alcoran of Mahomet, or the nonſenſical notions in the Jewiſh Talmud had been by any Chriſtian. Nor were Lucian, Porphyry, Julian, Libanius, and the like ſcurrilous writers againſt Chriſtianity, ſo cruelly and barbarouſly handled by the Fathers, who by the by did not want their own ſhare of gall, as this Vorſtius has been ill treated by his injudicious adverſaries, on account of that grave and ſolid performance.*’ We ſhall ſee in the remark [*C*] the prejudice which the Arminians did their cauſe by calling in Vorſtius.

[*E*] *The moſt authentic teſtimonials of orthodoxy.*] In his Hiſtory we have the teſtimonial which the Counts of Bentheim gave him, and that with which the illuſtrious ſchool of Steinfurt preſented him. I ſhall only cite a very ſmall part of the elogies which thoſe teſtimonials beſtow upon him (12). ‘ Poſt exceſſum nominati pientiſſimi Domini parentis noſtri hactenus fidelem ipſius operam, vitam irreprehenſibilem, Chriſtianam & puram doctrinam atque inſtitutionem, & inde conſecutam propagationem & ædificationem Eccleſiæ & Scholæ reipſa experti ſumus. - - - *After the*

(8) Philipp. Pareus, in Vita David. Parei, *pag. m.* 55, 56.

(9) Gualther. ubi ſupra, *fol. E* 3 *verſo.*

(10) Idem, *pag. ſequenti.*

(11) Ibid. *fol. M* 2.

(12) Ibid. *fol. F.*

the danger; they accuſed him of an infinite number of Hereſies; they ſtrengthened themſelves with the concurrence of foreign univerſities, from which they obtained evidences againſt his doctrine; they alarmed the religious zeal of King James [*F*], and engaged him to recommend to the Republic of Holland the excluſion of ſuch a Heretic. There were ſeveral proceedings againſt him [*G*], which grew to ſuch a warmth, that Vorſtius was obliged proviſionally to renounce the exerciſe of his employment, and leave Leyden, in

‘ *deceaſe of our moſt religious father abovementioned, we* ‘ *have hitherto had experience of this man's faithful la*‘ *bour, blameleſs life, and pure and Chriſtian doctrine;* ‘ *the conſequence of which has been the propagation and* ‘ *edification of the Church and illuſtrious ſchool.*’ This is taken from the teſtimonials of the Counts; as the following is from that of the illuſtrious ſchool. ‘ Pub‘ lice & ſancte teſtamur .... Conradum Vorſtium .... ‘ ita ſe probaſſe ut .... in hac Republica inculpatum ‘ ſanctumque curſum ſexdecim circiter annorum conti‘ nuorum cum in Eccleſia docendo, tum in ſchola ſa‘ cras literas interpretando, publice privatimque diſ‘ putando, juventutem in orthodoxa religione eru‘ diendo ita peregiſſe, ut pietate erga Deum, probi‘ tate & delectione erga proximum nihil prius, nihil‘ que antiquius habuerit. Et ut paucis multa compre‘ hendamus, vitam Deo piiſque omnibus placentem, ‘ orthodoxo Theologo & Profeſſore dignam egerit. ‘ ---- *We ſolemnly and religiouſly teſtify, that Conrad* ‘ *Vorſtius ſpent about ſixteen years among us in ſuch a* ‘ *holy and blameleſs manner, whether we conſider his* ‘ *teaching in the church, or his explaining the ſcripture in* ‘ *the illuſtrious ſchool, or his public and private diſputes,* ‘ *or his inſtructing the youth in the orthodox religion,* ‘ *that he appeared to have had nothing more at heart* ‘ *than piety towards GOD, probity, and love towards* ‘ *his neighbour. And, to ſum up many things in a few* ‘ *words, he has led a life acceptable to GOD and good* ‘ *men, and ſuch as became an orthodox Divine and* ‘ *Profeſſor.*’ He obtained the like teſtimonials from the council of the city, and from the Conſiſtory, which the Hiſtorian doth not produce; but contents himſelf for brevity's ſake with ſaying that they contain the ſame thing in ſubſtance. *Adderem hic totidem præterea alia, unum Senatus oppidani, alterum Conſiſtorii* (*uti nunc vocant*) *Steinfurtenſis, niſi & plane idem prioribus iſtis dicerent, & mihi brevitatis ſtudium aurem velleret.* It ought to be obſerved that Vorſtius obtained all theſe teſtimonials after the printing of his tract *de Deo*, which raiſed ſuch a cry in Holland againſt his impieties, blaſphemies, and Atheiſm. ‘ Ab his Theo‘ nibus prope nihil aliud audire cogeretur quam in‘ numeras & uno libro non dicendas calumnias, dic‘ teria, convicia, ſcommata, punctiones, nempe de ‘ ejus impietate, blaſphemiis, mendaciis, perjurio, de ‘ ſtupore, inſcitia, & præcipue de hæreſibus (ſi DEO ‘ placet) Pelagianis, Arianis, Socinianis, Serveti, En‘ jedini, Oſtorodi, Papiſticis, & ..... Turcicis, Ju‘ daicis, Paganis, Atheis (13). ---- *From theſe ſlan*‘ *derers he was forced to hear innumerable calumnies,* ‘ *and ſuch as a ſingle book could not contain, invectives,* ‘ *reproaches, taunts, and revilings, concerning his im*‘ *piety, blaſphemies, lies, perjury, ſtupidity, ignorance,* ‘ *and particularly his hereſies forſooth of Pelagius, Arian,* ‘ *Socinus, Servetus, Enjedinus, Oſtorodus, and of the* ‘ *Papiſts, ... Turks, Jews, Pagans, and Atheiſts.*’ I ſay once more, that if he had contented himſelf with the academy of Steinfurt for his whole life, it is highly probable that he had died with the reputation of an orthodox Divine.

[*F*] *They alarmed the religious zeal of King James.*] Theſe were the wars that fitted him: He intereſted himſelf more vigorouſly in this war, than in that of the King of Bohemia, his ſon-in-law, and courageouſly cauſed Vorſtius's book to be burnt. I mean that *de Deo*; of which ſeveral copies were ſacrificed to the flames in London, Oxford, and Cambridge. The King was hunting when the book was brought to him: and he run through it ſo diligently, that in the ſpace of an hour he diſpatched away a catalogue of hereſies, which he had found in that piece, to his Reſident at the Hague; and ordered him to notify to the States, how much he deteſted thoſe hereſies, and thoſe who would tolerate them. The States anſwered, that if Vorſtius was guilty of the errors charged on him they would not keep him. This anſwer was not ſatisfactory to his Britiſh Majeſty. He wrote a letter dated the ſixth of October 1611, to the States, earneſtly exhorting them to baniſh that man, though at the ſame time he ſhould deny the errors laid to his charge; for if he owned, and was convicted of them, his Majeſty did not doubt in the leaſt, but that he ought to be burnt (14). He declares, that if vigorous attempts are not made in order *to extirpate this growing Atheiſm, he will publickly proteſt againſt thoſe abominations, and ſeparate himſelf from the union of ſuch falſe and heretical churches*, and as defender of the Faith, he will *exhort all other Reformed Churches to take a general reſolution, in order to extinguiſh, and ſend back to hell thoſe abominable hereſies lately ſprung up*, and particularly he will forbid any of his ſubjects *to frequent ſuch an infectious place as the univerſity of Leyden.* Vorſtius was inſtalled at Leyden before the letter of King James was delivered to the States. Wherefore the Engliſh Envoy, when he preſented it, made a very vehement ſpeech againſt his inſtallation, and threatned the United-Provinces with the enmity of the King, his maſter, if they tolerated Vorſtius. He was anſwered, that this Profeſſor had received orders to deſiſt from the exerciſe of his function, till he had anſwered the accuſations againſt him: and that this affair would be examined before the States of Holland in February next. The Ambaſſador very little ſatisfied with this anſwer, made another ſpeech to proteſt againſt thoſe proceedings, and threatned the States not only with the enmity, but alſo with the pen of King James (15). He was anſwered as before, and told that the States were certain that his Majeſty would be content with the proceedings of the States of Holland. Notwithſtanding this anſwer that Prince publiſhed a book, in which he gave the world an account of his conduct, and the reaſons of it, and very zealouſly argued againſt Vorſtius; Vorſtius publiſhed a ſhort anſwer to the extracts which that monarch had communicated to the States out of the book *de Deo.* This he dedicated to the States, on the fifteenth of December 1611. It is written with all due deference and reſpect to King James.

SPONDANUS's error.

All theſe dates ſerve to convict Spondanus of an error, who relates under the year 1610 (16), that King James incenſed at the protection which the States-General granted Vorſtius, whoſe books he had cauſed to be burned, threatned that if they did not baniſh him, he would expoſe them all the world over as ſupporters of apoſtates, and convert his alliance with them into immortal hatred; and that the States ſurprized at theſe menaces, though with great regret, permitted Vorſtius to depart. Spondanus adds, that Vorſtius was honoured like an apoſtle in the ſeveral places where he lived, after the States had ſent him away. This author is not guilty of meer anachroniſms; for after the States of Holland had diſmiſſed Vorſtius, he concealed himſelf and was expoſed to a thouſand dangers and ignominies (17).

[*G*] *There were ſeveral proceedings againſt him.*] Mark Gualtherus has maimed his narration here; he has omitted ſome facts, which ought to have been an eſſential part in the hiſtory of his heroe. He ought to have told us that the Gomariſts having oppoſed the invitation of Vorſtius, the States of Holland ordered them to produce their reaſons for it. Accordingly there were ſix Contra-remonſtrant Miniſters, who in the famous conference of the Hague (18) propoſed their grievances againſt Vorſtius on the twenty-ninth of April 1611. They accuſed him of ſeveral Socinian doctrines, and maintained that his book *de Deo*, ſavoured more of an Atheiſt than of a Divine. The States ordered them to make good their accuſations againſt Vorſtius to his face in their preſence, and Vorſtius to defend his own cauſe. This was done in preſence of ſix Miniſters whom each party had deputed, and of the Curators of the univerſity of Leyden: and after Vorſtius had been heard, the States determined that there was no reaſon why his call to the Profeſſorſhip ſhould not take place in it's full extent (19). So that though the Contra-remonſtrant Miniſters rejected his

(13) Ibid. *fol.* *M* 3.

(14) But if this wretched Vorſtius ſhould deny or uſe any equivocation about the blaſphemous points of Hereſy and Atheiſm which he has already publiſhed, it might perhaps move you to ſpare his perſon, and not to burn him, tho' no Heretic did ever deſerve it more than he, which we leave to your Chriſtian prudence. But on account of any vindication or denial of his to ſuffer him to live and dogmatize among you, is ſo abominable a thing that we are ſure it will never enter into the thoughts of any of you. *King James's Letter* in the *Mercure Franç. Tom. ii, pag.* 460, *Edit. of Cologn.*

(15) He will make it appear by the manifeſto's he intends to publiſh how much he abhors and deteſts the Atheiſm and Hereſies of Vorſtius, and all thoſe who maintain them. In the *Mercure François, ibid. pag.* 468.

(16) Num. 121

(17) See the remark [*K*].

(18) Compoſed of ſix Calviniſts, and as many Arminian miniſters.

(19) *See the book intituled*, Pacificatorium diſſecti Belgii, per Salomonem Theodotum, *pag.* 61, *& ſeq.*

in order to expect elſewhere a definitive ſentence concerning this diſpute. He retired to Tergou about May 1612, where he lived quiet [*H*] till the year 1619, when he was forced to leave Holland: for the Synod of Dort having declared him unworthy of the Profeſſor's chair [*I*], the States of the Province deprived him of that employment, and condemned him to a perpetual baniſhment. I do not certainly know where he went; but

anſwers, Vorſtius had triumphed, if an unhappy accident had not come in the way: this is the ſecond thing the Hiſtorian ought to have related. Some of Vorſtius's diſciples publiſhed, in Frieſland, a ſmall tract *de officio Chriſtiani hominis*, containing ſeveral Antitrinitarian doctrines. This tract was publickly burnt: Some of thoſe who cauſed it to be printed were diſcovered, and ſome letters were found upon them which were publiſhed, containing a great many encomiums on Vorſtius, and ſeveral ſuſpicious things relating to ſeveral other Divines. Thoſe who publiſhed theſe letters added a warning to all Reformed Churches to give them an alarm. They canvaſſed all Vorſtius's books, what he had dictated, and his manuſcripts, in order to find matter to charge him with. The States of Frieſland informed thoſe of Holland and the Curators of the univerſity of Leyden of all this. It was therefore neceſſary that Vorſtius ſhould ſolemnly clear himſelf, and declare, that though he had wrote ſometimes to the Poliſh Socinians, he was very far from being of their opinion; and that whatever he did was only to inform himſelf better of their opinions, and that he did the ſame thing with reſpect to the Jeſuits, to whom he never ſcrupled to write. He delivered the profeſſion of his faith ſigned by himſelf, concerning the myſtery of the Trinity, and the divinity of CHRIST; and on the twenty-ſecond of May 1612, he pronounced an apologetical oration before the States of Holland (20). We ſhall ſee, below, that all this engaged him to publiſh ſeveral books.

[*H*] *He lived quiet at Tergou.*] This appears by the teſtimonial of the magiſtrates of that city, dated on the 20th of July 1619, which certifies, that for the ſpace of ſeven years and three months that he lived there, he behaved himſelf like an honeſt and good man (21). His Hiſtorian producing this certificate, obſerves, that the magiſtrates who gave it, were of the modern eſtabliſhment, that is, very averſe to the Arminians. Let us here obſerve two faults of which Paul Freherus is guilty. He ſaith (22), that Vorſtius being removed to Holland, and finding the troubles there increaſe every day, gave over acting as Profeſſor, and retired to Steinſurt, till the magiſtrates decided the difference. This is his firſt error; for Tergou, and not Steinfurt, was the place of retreat which he choſe. Freherus adds, that becauſe Vorſtius ſucceeded Arminius, he had great diſputes with Gomarus. This is another miſtake; for it implies, that beſides, and after the differences which obliged Vorſtius to retire, he had ſome particular quarrels with Gomarus. But this is falſe in two reſpects: for he had no difference with Gomarus, who retired into Zeland, becauſe he would not have him for his colleague (23); and if there had been any diſputes betwixt them, they muſt doubtleſs have been the ſame which forced him to retire to Tergou.

[*I*] *The Synod of Dort having declared him unworthy of the Profeſſor's chair.*] His Hiſtorian odiouſly exaggerates this circumſtance; he tells us, that they condemned Vorſtius without any regard to his petition to be heard, before he was ſentenced. And there is ſo much rancour and ill language in this part of his hiſtory, that I am not willing to ſoil my paper with it; and ſhall cite only what is a meer narrative, or what is ſo cloſely connected with it, that to omit it would make all the reſt obſcure. And if I cite any diſagreeable expreſſions, they ſhall be thoſe which have the leaſt harſhneſs. ‘Procurante . . . Bogermanno effectum eſt ut Vorſtius abſens inaudituſque condemnatus & profeſſoris titulo ac honore indignus declaratus ſit . . . . ut cujus doctrina in Eccleſiis & Scholis reformatis nequaquam toleranda, ſed cum deteſtatione penitus eliminanda atque extirpanda eſſet. Non obſtante quod tam ſerio rogatu per literas ambierit ut Synodus ipſum audire, errorum ac hæreſum (quas clamabant) legitimè ac liquidè ex verbo Dei convincere, & Chriſtiana lenitate rectiora docere vellet. Cujus equidem judicii ac ſententiæ damnatoriæ, quam nihil aliud quàm craſſa invidia conflavit, & Vorſtii ad cœtum iſtum epiſtolæ ſatis ſeriæ & prolixæ, ſi vel minimam adhuc honeſti ſanguinis guttam habent, ſacro ſancti ſcilicet Concilii illius togatos patres æternum pudere debet. Maxime cum tam probas colloquii conditiones, itemque alia pro veritate adverſus hæreticos præſtanda offerret. Sed viri hujus linguam ac legitimam cum eo diſputationem pejus iſti lucifugæ formidabant, quam ſullo ululam. - - - - *At the ſollicitation . . . of Bogermannus, Vorſtius being abſent and unheard was condemned, and declared unworthy of the title and dignity of Profeſſor . . . as a man whoſe doctrine was by no means to be tolerated in the Reformed churches and ſchools, but deſerved to be rooted up and caſt out with abhorrence. This was done to him notwithſtanding his having earneſtly begged in his letters that the Synod would hear him, convict him of thoſe errors and hereſies, which they raiſed ſuch a clamour about, fairly and clearly from the word of GOD, and ſet him right with ſuch meekneſs as became Chriſtians. If they have the leaſt ſpark of honeſty left, the reverend Fathers of that moſt holy Council ought ever to bluſh when they reflect upon their judgment and ſentence of condemnation, proceeding from nothing elſe but rank envy, and upon the long and ſerious epiſtles which Vorſtius ſent to their aſſembly: eſpecially ſince he offered ſuch reaſonable conditions for a conference, and to come into other meaſures that were neceſſary for the ſupport of truth againſt Heretics. But theſe ſons of darkneſs feared this man's tongue, and the having a fair diſpute with him, more than an owl dreads the light.*’ Thus Vorſtius's friends accounted it a glorious thing for him that the Synod would not hear his defence: they pretended that the Synod was terribly afraid of his great ability, of the force of his eloquence, and of the weight of his reaſons; in ſhort, that they feared to be overcome in a diſpute. But now let us ſee what this Hiſtorian ſaith concerning the ſentence of the States of the Province. ‘Poſt hunc ſacri fulminis fragorem, alia Vorſtium & immitior tempeſtas, quod neceſſum erat, excepit. Mox enim à promulgata Flaminum ſententia in ſuffragium eunt Senatus populi Belgarum, & de capite innoxii Vorſtii ſtatuunt in hunc modum. *Juxta ſententiam venerandæ Synodi Dordracenæ Vorſtius functionibus ſuis in Academia Leydenſi movetur, ſalariumque ſuum deinceps ibidem ei procedere vetatur. Præterea Hollandia & Weſtfriſia ei interdicitur, illaque intra ſex ſeptimanas excedere jubetur, & in eam non redire ſub pœna arbitraria illi, ut perturbatori publicæ pacis, irroganda. Scilicet quia judicatum eſſet ejus in iſto tractu commorationem Reip. damnoſam eſſe. - - - After the violent crack of this ſacred thunderbolt, another and a more ſevere ſtorm muſt neceſſarily fall upon Vorſtius. For immediately after the ſentence of the worthy Clergy was publiſhed, the States of Holland came to a reſolution, and paſſed judgment upon the innocent Vorſtius in the following manner:* According to the ſentence of the venerable Synod of Dort, Vorſtius is removed from his office in the univerſity of Leyden, and thenceforward deprived of his ſalary. He is likewiſe baniſhed out of Holland and Weſt-Frieſland, and ordered to depart from the former within ſix weeks, and not to return to it under the penalty of undergoing, as a diſturber of the public peace, what puniſhment ſhall be thought proper to be inflicted upon him; and that becauſe his further ſtay in this country is judged detrimental to the Commonwealth.’

Some perſons having told me, that I ought to cite the expreſs terms of the ſynodical condemnation of Vorſtius, I ſhall here inſert part of it. ‘The High and Mighty States-General, having by their noble and honourable Deputies, enjoined this Synod to declare ſummarily their opinion concerning the Theology or Doctrine contained in the writings of Conrad Vorſtius, Doctor of Divinity; and likewiſe whether it may be ſafely taught, to the edification and advantage of the Reformed Churches, or whether the toleration of it can conſiſt with true piety: this venerable Synod, after having, in the fear of GOD, well and duly conſidered and examined all things, hath, and doth unanimouſly by theſe preſents

(20) *Ex eodem* Pacificatorio Belgii diſſecti, *pag.* 64, & *ſeq.*

(21) Seſe in omni converſatione & actionibus geſſerit honeſte, probe, modeſte, & ad exemplum, nec; aicquam nos aliud quod ad mores & vitam ejus attinet obſervaverimus vel audiverimus. *Apud* Marcum Gualtherum.

(22) Theatr. Virorum illuſtrium, *pag.* 363.

(23) See the Life of Gomarus among thoſe of the Profeſſors of Groningen, *pag.* 77.

but he continued concealed for the ſpace of two years, and his life was more than once in danger [*K*], there being ſeveral perſons who, tranſported by a furious zeal, thought that a man of his character ought not to be ſuffered to live. At laſt a Duke of Holſtein having received the ſcattered remnants of the Arminians, and aſſigned them a place in his dominions, in order to build a town, Vorſtius found ſome ſecurity and repoſe: for he retired into that country in June 1622. But he fell ſick ſhortly after, and died at Tonningen on the twenty-ninth of September following. He diſcovered very ſignal marks of a pious reſignation to the Divine will in his laſt moments; and we are told that he was always very devout, and very fervent in prayer (*c*) [*L*]. His corps was carried to Friderichſtadt,

‘ preſents declare, that the ſaid Conrad Vorſtius, in his laſt writings, namely in that concerning God and his Attributes, beſides defending the errors of the five articles of the Remonſtrants, which are rejected by this Synod, hath partly called in queſtion not only one or two articles of the Chriſtian and Reformed religion, but alſo doubts of ſeveral of the principal of them, for example, the following; that of the Trinity (24) . . . . and that he partly affirms and lays down ſeveral aſſertions, which are wholly and diametrically oppoſite to the truth which God hath revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures, and to the confeſſions of all the Reformed Churches. . . . . Beſides, in ſeveral places he has dangerouſly enervated and weakened the chief and ſtrongeſt arguments, which the venerable Fathers, as well as the modern Divines of the Reformed Church, have juſtly drawn from the word of God, and made uſe of to eſtabliſh and maintain the orthodox doctrine, eſpecially of the eternal Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, without either producing or ſubſtituting any others in their room to prove more powerfully, and ſupport the doctrine which he oppoſes. That he induſtriouſly advances, and to the utmoſt of his power urges ſeveral ſophiſms, and vain arguments, which intangle and obſcure truth, without ever endeavouring to reſolve them, but leaves them as they are, that they may the more eaſily be fixed in the minds of the readers; whence clearly appears his ſubtile deſign of preparing the way, and clandeſtinely opening a gate, in order to inſtil the wicked and impious Hereſies of Socinus and others; and conſequently to ſeduce and deceive the world, under the ſpecious pretext of a ſearch after truth. That in vain, and to no effect, he has hitherto diſguiſed and varniſhed his opinions, with ſeveral impertinent diſtinctions, frivolous excuſes, miſerable ſubterfuges, deceitful and fraudulent diſſimulations and gloſſes. Wherefore the prepoſterous and inordinate liberty which he makes uſe of to diſpute and queſtion the moſt important articles of the Chriſtian religion; and the wavering, dubious, and uncertain way of inſtruction which he practiſes, are very dangerous and pernicious to the Church, and by no means fitting and agreeable to ſuch ſacred and ſublime ſubjects, and conſequently unworthy of an orthodox Profeſſor (25) . . . . And declares the ſaid Conrad Vorſtius . . . . . utterly unworthy of the employment and title of Profeſſor or Doctor in the Reformed Churches. Finally, this ſynodical aſſembly ſeriouſly and earneſtly petitions the High and Mighty States-General, that, by virtue of their ſovereign authority, they would be pleaſed to remove from the Reformed Churches, that ſcandalous and common ſtumbling-block, and to take care for the future, that the Churches of the Low-Countries may not be polluted and defiled with ſuch pernicious principles, hereſies, and blaſphemies, and to that end uſe all neceſſary prudence and caution entirely to ſuppreſs all the writings of the ſaid Vorſtius, and of thoſe who are tainted with the ſame leaven (26).’ Vorſtius wrote a very well turned anſwer to this ſynodical ſentence: It is printed at large in the book which I cite (27).

[*K*] *His life was more than once in danger.*] Several perſons made it their buſineſs to find out his lodgings, in order to diſcover them to his enemies. Wherefore he was frequently forced to change his habitation, and to be continually provided with a ladder at his window, in caſe they ſhould attempt to break open his door; and ſometimes that precaution proved inſufficient to ſecure him, by reaſon that the houſe was wholly ſurrounded with armed men; which frighted ſeveral people from harbouring him. I will not warrant the truth of all this: but I relate it from Gualtherus's words, which are: *Utut quietem & ſecuritatem aliquam in iſto ſuo latibulo ſperaret, tamen fieri non potuit quin ſingulis pene diebus & noctibus centenis mortibus enecaretur, cum turpiſſimi proditores* (genus * hominum publico exitio repertum) *jugem operam darent uti virum latitantem inveſtigare, extrahere, in manus perſecutorum tradere, & nefario indicii præmio exhilarari poſſent. Quoties iſtic domum mutaſſe, quoties noctes in ſomnes ex metu jamjam irruentium duxiſſe, quoties ſcalas feneſtris foris applicatas ad ſubitum effugium habuiſſe putatis? Quoties in extrema conſternatione arbitramini conſtitutum fuiſſe, cum non raro omnes eum domibus ſuis recipere negarent periculi timore? Cum Thraſones martii & anticam & poſticam cum ſclopetis oneratis obſervarent ædium quibus tegi putaretur? In tantis anguſtiis biennium circiter aſſumpſit* (28). It was then that he had much reaſon to wiſh for the epitaph, which a Poet that was one of his friends, ſuppoſed that he deſired ſeveral years before.

At vos poſteritas tumulo hæc inſcribite verba,
  Poſthuma fortunæ ſigna futura meæ.
Nulla Reformata mihi pars dilectior unquam,
  Nulla Reformata pars minus æqua mihi (29).

The Proteſtants above all ſects I lov'd,
No ſect to me leſs equitable prov'd.
This epitaph let after-ages ſee
Inſcrib'd upon my tomb, for it ſhall be
A ſign to them, when I ſhall be no more,
Of what my fortune was . . . . .

We may make a remarkable obſervation on the ill effects of a religious zeal, *viz.* It takes away all remorſe of crimes, and diſables a man from making uſe of the ſole way of obtaining pardon of God for his ſins, which is only to be expected by repentance. Thoſe who deſigned to beat, rob, or aſſaſſinate Vorſtius, to throw him into a dungeon, or load him with invectives, thought they did a very good action, and an acceptable ſervice to God: they were not therefore touched with any remorſe, and thereby induced to apply to the Divine Mercy; and conſequently died in their impenitence. This is a precipice which ought to be fully conſidered by every one who makes it his buſineſs to inflame the minds of the populace againſt erroneous Divines.

[*L*] *And very fervent in prayer.*] His Panegyriſt ſays very ſurprizing things concerning his patience, in the midſt of the invectives, which were ſhowered on his head. ‘ Poſſem, auditores, ad ſingulas iſtas patientiæ ſeu ſpecies ſeu proprietates viva exempla proferre, maximè ad devoratas cum patientia nulli linguæ dicenda oſorum, zelotarum, hoſtium inſolentias, dicteria, ſcommata, convicia, calumnias quas à prima vigore ἀκμῇ ſacri furoris Corybantum in Belgio ab aliquot annis libenter & bono ex aſſuetudine ſtomacho concoxit, propter conſcientiam & cœleſtem veritatem, tam à devotis illis religioſi ordinis capitibus, quàm à promiſcua populi fece, & quibuſdam thraſonibus qui ſe Martis pullos & Bellonæ filios, feſtivo, Hercules, elogio ornare ſolent, poſſem, inquam, hujus rei viva & vera & admiranda exempla vobis referre, niſi me tempus, &c (30). - - - *I could, my hearers, alledge lively examples to illuſtrate all the different kinds and qualities of his patience, particularly as to his bearing, with unſpeakable temper, the inſolence of his*

‘ *bigotted*

(*c*) *Taken from the Oration* de Vita & obitu Conradi Vorſtii, *pronounced at Frederichſtadt by Mark Gualtherus, and printed in* 1624, *in* 4*to*.

(24) Acts of the ſynod of Dort, *Seſſion clii, pag.* 588, tranſlated by Richard John de Nerée, printed at Leyden, 1624, in 4to.

(25) Ibid. *pag.* 589.

(26) Ibid. *pag.* 590.

(27) Epiſtolæ Eccleſiaſticæ & Theologicæ præſtantium ac eruditorum Virorum, *pag.* 588. *& ſeq. Edit.* 1684. *It is the ſame book which I call ſometimes barely* the Letters of the Arminians.

* Tacit.

(28) Gualtherus, ubi ſupra, *p. N.*

(29) *Theſe four verſes are the concluſion of an Epigram containing eight Diſtichs at the end of an Elogy upon Vorſtius, in the book intituled,* Illuſtrium Hollandiæ & Weſt-Friſiæ Ordinum alma Academia Leidenſis, *printed at Leyden in the year* 1614. *The ſix foregoing verſes are:*

Nunc fratrum in me verſa cohors, & prodiga zeli
  Æmula civili prælia Marte gerit.
Nec calamo ſtant bella virum: depoſcitur ipſis
  Victima, & inſontis ſupplicium fidei.
Sed mediis erecta malis mens conſcia recti,
  Freta Deo, nulli ſuccubat invidiæ.

My brethren now my perſecutors are,
And zealouſly promote a civil war;
Nor yet contented with a paper ſtrife,
They for my guiltleſs faith, demand my life.
But he, that his own innocency knows,
Still reſts untroubled in the midſt of woes,
In God his pious confidence doth place,
And neither yields to envy nor diſgrace.

(30) Gualtherus, ubi ſupra.

Friderichstadt, the new city of the Arminians, where he had an honourable burial. He had publiſhed ſeveral books [*M*], as well againſt the Roman Catholics as againſt his Proteſtant adverſaries. The diſputes raiſed againſt him, were doubtleſs intermixed with a great deal of paſſion; but after all, thoſe who ſuſpected him to be ſtrongly inclined to Socinianiſm, were not much in the wrong [*N*]; and perhaps he had made a public profeſſion of that doctrine, if he had not followed the maxim which the Roman Catholics alledge

‘ *biggotted enemies, their reproaches, taunts, railings, and calumnies, which, proceeding from the freſh and holy fury of the mad Prieſts in Holland, he has, for ſome years, been accuſtomed to digeſt, for the ſake of truth and a good conſcience; being treated in this manner not only by theſe devout ringleaders of the Clergy, but alſo by the promiſcuous rabble, and by certain bullies, who are uſed with a mighty pretty ſort of vanity, forſooth, to ſtile themſelves the ſons of Mars and Bellona: I ſay, I could alledge lively, true, and wonderful examples of all this, if it were not that the time*, &c.’ He adds, that he was often found on his knees in the exerciſe of prayer. *Quam multos eſſe eos putatis qui illum inter precandum humi in genua abjectum, & in conclavi alicubi ſolum de improviſo non ſemel oppreſſerunt?* There is no Chriſtian virtue, in which he is not repreſented to excel; but above all we are told he made a pious end: to which purpoſe conſult not only our Gualtherus, but alſo a letter which the author of Vorſtius's funeral oration (31), wrote to one of his friends, which is amongſt thoſe of the Arminians, pag. 684, of the edition in folio.

[*M*] *He had publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Of theſe I have already mentioned two, one of which is a collection of ſeveral Theological theſes, and the other the famous and pernicious tract, *de Deo, ſeu diſputationes decem de natura & attributis Dei, diverſo tempore Steinfurti publicè habitæ* (32). Before this book appeared, he publiſhed his *Idea ſeu brevis Synopſis totius ſacræ Theologiæ*: A book of prayers in the German language: his diſputations *de cauſis deſerendi Romani Papatus*: his *Index Errorum Eccleſiæ Romanæ, ſubjecto cuique capiti Antidoto*: his German treatiſe of Indulgences: his *Teſſaradecas Anti-Piſtoriana, ſeu Reſponſi ad Librum Johannis Piſtorii de quatuordecim articulis in Religione controverſis*: his Apology *pro Eccleſiis orthodoxis contra Jeſuitas*, and his *Antapodixes de tribus primis fidei articulis, ſive contrariæ Demonſtrationes tres quibus totidem Jeſuiticæ Apodixes à B, D. adverſus Apologiam emiſſæ confutantur*. In the year 1610 came out his *Anti-Bellarminus contractus, ſeu brevis Refutatio quatuor tomorum Bellarmini*. His other works were written after his removal to Holland, and relate to the Arminian diſputes, or rather to his book *de Deo*. Many writers appeared againſt him, whom he oppoſed, as well as he could for ſome time: but he was at laſt forced to give way to number, and he grew weary of continually repeating the ſame things. The Frieſlanders were his moſt violent enemies, as Bogerman, Miniſter of Leeuwarden, and Sibrandus Lubbertus, Divinity Profeſſor at Franeker. Againſt the latter he wrote *Catalogus Errorum Sibrandi: Paræneſis ad Sibrandum*: & *Scholia alexicaca ad Commentarios Sibrandi*. I do not mention his *Exegeſis Apologetica pro Tractatu de eodem*, which he publiſhed in 1611; nor his *Prodromus adverſus criminationes quorundam fratrum*; nor the *Plenius Reſponſum ad eaſdem illas* criminationes: but I ſhall ſay ſomething of his diſpute with Piſcator. It contains, 1. *Paraſceve ad amicam Collationem cum Joanne Piſcatore, ſuper notis hujus ad loca quædam ex illius Tractatu de Deo & Exegeſi apologetica pridem excerpta.* 2. *Amica Collatio cum eodem Piſcatore.* 3. *Amica Duplicatio una cum Appendice ſive Paralipomenis ad tripartitam Reſponſionem apologeticam Piſcatoris.* 4. *Examen Tractatus Piſcatoris de divina Prædeſtinatione.* He did not make any anſwer to Sopingius a Frieſland Miniſter, nor to Brokerus, a Miniſter in North-Holland; but he took other meaſures with Matthew Slade, an Engliſhman, who fell upon him with a terrible fury. He printed an anſwer to him at Tergou, in the year 1615. This Slade was Rector of the public ſchool at Amſterdam, and took pen in hand in defence of his ſovereign the King of England, who deſired the States to baniſh Vorſtius. It was impoſſible for any book to be written more angrily, one only excepted, which indeed was more outragious, and publiſhed by another of that Prince's ſubjects; I mean George Egliſem, a Scotch Phyſician who lived at the Hague, and wrote *Criſis & Hypocriſis Vorſtiani Reſponſi*, where, in a juridical manner, he accuſed him to the States of Atheiſm, Paganiſm, Judaiſm, Turciſm, Hereſy, Schiſm, and Ignorance (33). He ſent him ſeveral challenges to appear and defend himſelf; and addreſſing himſelf to the States, he tells them that he requeſts and expects a ſtrict examination to be made, and that either Vorſtius or his accuſers ſhould be puniſhed (34). This was to come cloſe to the point, and nothing can be more juſt, than ſuch an alternative: and neverthelеſs nothing is more rare than to ſee calumniators on the ſcore of Hereſy and impiety, brought to condign puniſhment. It is thought ſufficient to abſolve the innocent, and inſtead of puniſhing the accuſer according to *Lex Talionis*, he is ſometimes thanked for his great zeal, or at moſt admoniſhed that he ought not to have gone ſo faſt. However, this Phyſician made very fair propoſals, but he was ſure that he ran no riſk, how abſurd and contradictory ſoever his accuſation might be found: for King James's menaces to the Republic of the United-Provinces, if they protected Vorſtius, entirely rid his accuſers of all manner of fear. It is not therefore ſurprizing that Vorſtius ſuffered the challenges of this Scotchman to fall to the ground; he might eaſily have confounded him in three words. It had been ſufficient for him to have barely ſaid, *You accuſe me of Atheiſm; but according to your own words my doctrine is Judaical, Mahometan, and Heretical; and the light itſelf is not more clear, than it is that the Jews, Mahometans, and Heretics, are not Atheiſts; whence it plainly follows, by the expreſs terms of your accuſation, that I am innocent of Atheiſm; and if you make good your charge of Hereſy, I ought to be deprived of the profeſſor's chair, but the* Lex Talionis *directs that you ſhould be put to death.* But the Scotchman would have laughed at an anſwer of this nature, and without being aſhamed of his calumnies, have relied on his impunity, and conſequently would have fully triumphed if they had only convicted his adverſary of Hereſy. There are ſeveral poſthumous works of Vorſtius, ſome commentaries on the ſcripture, &c. See the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum* (35).

[*N*] *Thoſe who ſuſpected him to be very ſtrongly inclined to Socinianiſm were not much in the wrong.*] The Socinians offered him a profeſſorſhip of Divinity in the year 1601, and deputed Jerom Moſcorovius to treat with him on that affair (36). This I own is no convincing proof of his Socinianiſm, and his apology on this point may be ſeen in a letter to Uyttenbogard (37). But what can be alledged againſt Sandius, who aſſures us (38), that having for ſome time been in doubt whether he ſhould rank Vorſtius among the Unitarians, he was no longer in ſuſpence after he had ſeen the confeſſion ſigned by Vorſtius on his death-bed: ‘ In qua, *ſaith he*, haud obſcure prodit quæ ejus de Deo ac Chriſto Domino fuerit ſententia. - - - - *In which he plainly enough diſcovers his opinion concerning* GOD *and the Lord* CHRIST.’ He adds, that when Vorſtius publiſhed the treatiſe of Fauſtus Socinus *de Auctoritate Sacræ Scripturæ*, he prefixed to it a preface of his own, and he aſcribes to him the book intituled *Compendiolum Doctrinæ Socinianorum*, which Cloppenburg refuted, and aſcribed to Oſtorodus and Voidovius. But none of theſe evidences are of any force except his own confeſſion of faith, written and ſigned by himſelf on his death-bed.

It muſt indeed be owned that a writing of this nature very ſtrongly confirms the ſuſpicions which had ſo long prevailed concerning him: but yet this doth not deprive us of the liberty of conjecturing, that the oppoſitions and diſgraces which he ſuffered, might compleat what a too inquiſitive and innovating genius had began. I mean, that perhaps the accuſing him of being a Socinian, and treating him ill on that account, made him turn one in good earneſt; and that he would have been cured of theſe particular whims, if he had found an honourable repoſe in the Reformed Church.

(31) This Oration was made in Dutch by John Grevius. See the Letters of the Arminians, *pag.* 684.

(32) Printed at Steinfurt, in 1610.

(33) *See the* Pacificatorium Belgii diſſecti, *p.* 72.

(34) *Super his aliiſque ita Ordines affatur:* Rigidiſſimum examen rurſus expeto & expecto. Aut enim Vorſtius à me aliiſque pene omnibus Atheïſmi accuſatus plectendus eſt, aut accuſatores tum pœnam temere litigantium, tum calumniatorum mulctam paſſuri, aut perenni dedecore afficiendi. *See the ſame book pag.* 73.

(35) Pag. 98, 99. See alſo the remark [*P*], of the article SOCINUS (FAUSTUS.)

(36) Sandius, in Biblioth. Antitrinitar. *pag.* 98. *Says that the Poliſh brethren reſolved in the year* 1600. in Synodo Lublinenſi, *vocare Vorſtium* ad gymnaſium Luclavicianum regendum.

(37) It is the DCXXIIId, in the folio edition of the letters of the Arminians, *pag.* 927.

(38) Bibl. Antitrinitar. *p.* 98.

alledge againſt the Reformers; viz. That when we are convinced the Church wants reforming, we ought to continue in the communion of it, the more ſucceſsfully to eradicate its errors. He very much prejudiced the Arminian party (*d*) [*O*]. The Engliſh deputies at the Synod of Dort were the principal promoters of the proſcription of this profeſſor [*P*]. Their

Church. For nothing in the world ſo naturally diſguſts a man againſt orthodoxy, as being perſecuted by orthodox men. And I am of opinion that what but too commonly happens in caſes of friendſhip and fidelity, is alſo very frequent in the caſe of Hereſy. We teach people to be falſe when we ſuſpect them to be ſo. ‘ Fidelem ſi putaveris facies. Nam multi fallere docuerunt dum timent falli, & aliis jus peccandi ſuſpicando fecerunt (39). - - - *Eſteem a man faithful and you ſhall make him ſo. For many have taught others to deceive while they were afraid of being deceived, and have given them a right to tranſgreſs by ſuſpecting them.*’ A jealous huſband often draws on himſelf the diſgrace which he might have prevented by a conduct free from ſuſpicion. And thus it fares with clamorous people, who when any difficulties are propoſed to them, or any perſon happens to differ from the common opinion, cannot ſee it without raiſing virulent ſuſpicions againſt that perſon, and endeavouring to render him ſuſpected by the whole world; and thus they are the cauſe of his becoming what indeed he never was. Several cauſes produce this change: it would be more advantageous and leſs ſcandalous not to proceed to a rupture. Yet there are ſome junctures wherein clamours againſt ſuſpected perſons prove very ſerviceable to a cauſe. It is when under the ſpecious diſguiſe of friendſhip, and aſſiſted by a great reputation, they endeavour to pervert every body. How difficult is it to lay down good rules, when the very ſame conduct proves ſometimes pernicious, and ſometimes advantageous!

[*O*] *He very much prejudiced the Arminian party.*] The obtaining of Vorſtius to ſucceed Arminius in the Profeſſor's chair, at Leyden, was believed to be a maſter-ſtroke of that party, and yet, on the contrary, nothing redounded more to the advantage of the enemies of the Remonſtrants. Vorſtius gave them ſuch a handle by his new way of dogmatizing on the Divine Attributes, and made it ſo eaſy to raiſe public ſuſpicions againſt him, that his adverſaries were not at much trouble to render him odious. After this it was not difficult for perſons who wanted neither zeal, nor tongues, nor pens, to caſt on the whole Arminian party, all the odium raiſed againſt the new Profeſſor; for that end, they had no more to do but urge the preſſing inſtances made by Arminius's friends to get this man to Leyden. Thus Divine Providence is daily pleaſed to confound human prudence: what we toil at the moſt indefatigably, as the moſt ſubſtantial of all our hopes, moſt frequently proves our ruin. We ought to obſerve, that when Arminius's friends caſt their eyes on the Profeſſor of Steinfurt, they believed him entirely clear of the Socinian Hereſy (40): but was it eaſy to convince prepoſſeſſed perſons, or to hinder the very ſame people from urging the contrary? I am of opinion that what I have ſeveral times heard repeated is probable enough; to wit, that Arminius and the Divines of his opinion would have done a great ſervice to their cauſe, if they had kept a profound ſilence. Their five articles are of an inſinuating nature; and the Calviniſts as well as the Lutherans would inſenſibly have grown Arminians, if nature only had been left to work. The antient Church was not of St Auguſtin's opinion. That Father was the occaſion of its embracing that doctrine, which is at preſent called Calviniſm; but it inſenſibly returned to its priſtine ſtate. And if the doctrine of Predeſtination and its conſequences are vigorouſly maintained by thoſe of the Reformed party, it is becauſe diſputes have occaſioned two factions, and a ſchiſm which is yet in being. The Church of England, which looked upon her ſelf as a ſeparate body, and diſingaged from that wherein this ſchiſm was formed, was not prepoſſeſſed with the flaming zeal raiſed by this diſpute in the minds of the Contra-remonſtrants; whence it is that by ſlow degrees they have inclined to mitigated hypotheſes, which are very different from Calviniſm: the ſame would have happened in Holland, if Arminius had not formed a party. This is what I have frequently heard from very judicious men; I do not pretend to examine whether they are in the right or not.

I ſhall only obſerve, that it would be a great miſtake to aſſert that the Arminian diſputes have not raiſed ſeveral troubles among the Engliſh Divines; for the time hath been, when thoſe who were ſuſpected to be of that ſide ſuffered perſecution in that kingdom (41). Mr Des Maizeaux (42) has communicated to me ſeveral curious particulars on this head, which he has extracted from ſome Engliſh books, and perhaps I ſhall publiſh them in the Supplement to this Dictionary. We ought not then to imagine that the Church of England hath been exempt from conteſts on the ſubject of Grace; no, ſhe hath had her ſhare in that controverſy, and even before the Synod of Dort. But two things muſt indeed be owned, one of which is, that before that time the Engliſh Divines enjoyed a greater liberty of rejecting Calvin's hypotheſis concerning Predeſtination, and the extinction of Free-will, than thoſe of other countries: the other is, that ſince the re-eſtabliſhment of Epiſcopacy, under Charles II, the controverſies on theſe points have made little noiſe in Great Britain; nor were there any great quarrels concerning them, and it is to the favourable opportunity which this calm afforded, that the growing and ſpreading of Arminius's hypotheſis is to be aſcribed. Thoſe who reliſhed his opinions, did not diſturb others, and this ſort of moderation leſſened their zeal for the Synod of Dort. The following citation will confirm the former of theſe obſervations, and inform us what was ſaid at Oxford on a ſolemn occaſion, by a Profeſſor of Divinity in the preſence of a numerous aſſembly: ‘ Quæ ſit in Anglia Calvini auctoritas, dicam. Anno 1608 Menſe Julio, in publicis comitiis, ut vocant, quæ quotannis ſemel in florentiſſimi iſtius regni Academiis, quibus neſcio an in toto terrarum orbe poſſint eſſe antiquiores, & Collegiorum numero, amplitudine, & ſtructuræ magnificentiâ præſtantiores, habentur, ac tum ſolennis in omnibus facultatibus promotio celebratur, quæ res ibi maximè viſu digna eſt: Oxoniæ, Doctor Olandus, Theologus, & Promotor tum deſignatus, hoc de Calvino judicium teſtimoniumque ex altâ cathedrâ, in mille hominum præſentia, proferebat: *Calvinus vir fuit doctus, ſed non ſcripſit in omnibus Catholicè:* item paulo poſt: *Calvini ſententia de Deo peccati authore neque defendi, neque excuſari poteſt: quia ille apertè Catholicorum nudam permiſſionem deridet, & efficacis Dei voluntatis cum peccato concurſum introducit* (43). - - - - *I ſhall ſhew what authority Calvin has in England. In the month of July* 1608, *at a public aſſembly, which is held once every year in the univerſities of this flouriſhing kingdom, (and I know not whether any other univerſities in the world can be ſaid to ſurpaſs theſe, either for their antiquity, or for the number, largeneſs, and ſtately ſtructure of their colleges) on which occaſion there is a ſolemn promotion made in all the Faculties, which is a thing that greatly deſerves to be ſeen. Dr Holland, an Oxford Divine, who at that time was named to the office of Proctor, pronounced the following cenſure upon Calvin from the chair in the preſence of a thouſand hearers.* Calvin was a learned man, but he did not in all his writings preſerve the ſpirit of an orthodox Catholic: *and a little after:* Calvin's notion of GOD, as being the author of ſin, is neither to be defended nor excuſed; becauſe he openly derides the bare permiſſion of the Catholics, and introduces the effectual will of GOD as concurring with ſin.’

[*P*] *The Engliſh deputies at the Synod of Dort, were the principal promoters of the proſcription of Vorſtius.*] Here are ſome particulars on this ſubject. A report being ſpread that this Profeſſor would be ſummoned to appear before the Synod, one of the Engliſh deputies immediately wrote to King James's Ambaſſador at the Hague, and earneſtly preſſed him to make uſe of his intereſt with the Prince of Orange, and Count William, that this proceeding might not retard the proſcription of Vorſtius. He ſuggeſted to him the expedient that was to be made uſe of to that purpoſe,

(*d*) See his letter to Pareus, among thoſe of the Arminians, *pag.* 302, *Edit. in folio.*

(39) Seneca, Epiſt. iii.

(40) This appears from the letter which Uyttenbogard wrote to him on the 24th of June 1611. See the clxivth letter of the Arminians in the edition of 1684.

(41) See, above, the remark [*D*], of the article FORBES (WILLIAM).

(42) Of whom mention is made above, in the article RAMUS, near the end of the remark [*O*], and in the article VIRGIL, citat. (21).

(43) Petrus Cudſemius de deſperata Calvini Cauſa, *pag.* 125, 126.

Their maſter's glory and the reputation of his learning were concerned in it.

poſe, which was to adviſe thoſe two Princes not to ſuffer the Synod to engage in the diſcuſſion of any points with that Divine, or receive any explications of his opinions from him. This would have occaſioned the loſs of too much time. The Engliſh Deputy wiſhes that the aſſembly would declare that all the members of it had read Vorſtius's book, and condemned it, and that nothing remained for him but to retract his opinions, and aſk pardon of God and his Church there aſſembled. He alſo farther adviſed, that in caſe Vorſtius retracted, and aſked ſuch a pardon, he ſhould be acknowledged for a brother; but otherwiſe the Synodical aſſembly ſhould puniſh him at pleaſure. This Deputy alſo wiſhes that the Synod would publickly excommunicate Vorſtius; and all theſe particulars he recommended to King James's Ambaſſador. Having but imperfectly expreſſed the contents of the letter, I ſhall ſubjoin the expreſs words of the book which ſerves me for an original. *Spargitur hic rumor de Vorſtio citando, & Feſtus Hommius heſterna veſpera mihi dixit, ſe ea de re tecum fuiſſe loquutum. Si citatur, tua apud Principem Arauſionenſem & Comitem Gulielmum gratia nobis in ejus cauſa opus erit, alioqui non minus diu, quam Remonſtrantes, Synodum detineret. Spero te, Vir Illuſtris, illis hoc conſilium daturum; ſi Vorſtius tempus petit tradendi apologiam ac elucidationem de duris loquendi modis in ipſius libro de Deo, ac velit rationibus convinci, ſuorumque argumentorum confutatione, quod brevi fieri non poterit, ne Synodus de iis rebus cum illo loquatur: ſed ut plane dicat, omnes, qui ſunt in Synodo, legiſſe ipſius librum, ac multa in eo inveniſſe, quæ proxime ad blaſphemiam accedunt, & ſine dubio Eccleſiam Reformatam valde offendunt: explicationem rerum, quas nemo in quæſtionem vocat, non eſſe ſatisfactionem: itaque ſe omnino cupere, ut illas retractet & palinodiam canat, Deumque veniam roget, & Eccleſiam Dei ibi congregatam, cui eo libro ſcandalum dederat. Si hoc facit, eum noſtrum fecimus; ſin minus, Synodus hominem pro libitu caſtiget. Velim eum aliis in exemplum palam à Synodo excommunicari. Harum aliarumque rerum curam tibi potiſſimum committimus, ut rite dirigantur* (44). The preſident of the Synod having aſked the Engliſh Deputies whether they approved that Vorſtius ſhould be cited to appear in the aſſembly, and what the King of England's pleaſure was in that point; they anſwered that they muſt conſult his Ambaſſador, and that they thought it would look very ill to condemn a man without hearing him: they added that, to avoid delays, Vorſtius ought not to be permitted to defend himſelf, or explain his blaſphemous propoſitions; and that he ought not to be anſwered any otherwiſe than by yes or no, nor aſked any queſtion but whether he was ready to abjure (45). Afterwards when the opinions were aſked concerning the ſentence to be paſſed upon Vorſtius, they declared him unworthy of the name and office of an orthodox Profeſſor, deſired that his book *de Deo* ſhould be burnt, and read the decree which condemned that work to the flames in England. *Se itaque non modo ipſum Vorſtium Orthodoxi Profeſſoris munere ac nomine indignum judicare, ſed etiam perſuadere, ne hujuſmodi ejus libri in bibliopoliis proſtare permittantur: Denique rogare, ut in exemplum, & in ſancti, Dei cauſa, zeli teſtimonium, Vorſtii de Deo tractatus ſummi Magiſtratus juſſu, aut Synodi decreto eadem munito, palam ſolenniterque flammis abſumatur: ſimulque hujuſmodi infamis holocauſti ſpecimen, à Britannis coram Synodo legitur authenticum, Procancellarii Cantabrigienſis ſigillo munitum, decretum* XXI *Septembris* CIↃ IↃ XI. *Cujus vi, etiam Sereniſſimi Regis noſtri judicio præeunte, publice flammis ultricibus expurgatus eſt liber prædictus: ejuſdemque decreti Cantabrigienſis exemplar inter Synodi acta relatum* (46). From this and ſeveral other places the continual correſpondence betwixt the Synod and the court plainly appears. The Arminians loudly complained of this ſympathy betwixt the two empires, the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, and of this concord betwixt the Royalty and the Prieſthood, againſt which they frequently ſay that as large a book might be written as that of Mr de Marca (47). But how can it be helped? Such is the condition of human affairs, that without the concurrence of the two powers, it is ſcarce poſſible to ſucceed in ſuch matters (48). This redounds to the advantage of a good cauſe in certain countries, and prejudices it in others. No help for it!

(44) G. Balcanquallus Epiſt. ad Dudleium Carletonum. *It is the cccxliid among the* Epiſtolæ Eccleſiaſticæ & Theologicæ *Printed at Amſterdam, in folio, in the year* 1684, *pag.* 560.

(45) Non permittendum Vorſtio, ut vel defendat, vel explicet blaſphemas ſuas ſententias, ſed reſpondendum ipſi per ita vel non; rogandumque, an paratus ſit heterodoxias abjurare. *Idem ad eundem, Epiſt. cccxlvii, ubi ſupra, pag.* 566, *col.* 2.

(46) Idem ad eundem, Epiſt. cccl, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 575, *col.* 2.

(47) *Mr de Marca wrote a book* de Concordia Imperii & Sacerdotii.

(48) Alterius ſic Altera poſcit opem res & conjurat amice. *Horat. de Arte Poët. ver.* 410.

V O R S T I U S (William-Henry) ſon to the foregoing, was miniſter of the Arminian congregation at Warmond in Holland. He wrote ſome books which have been printed *(a)* [*A*]. Mr Chevreau cites him on a very curious particular *(b)*.

(*a*) Ex Biblioth. Antitrinit. *pag.* 143.

(*b*) *In Tom. ii, of the* Chevreana, *pag.* 106, *of the Dutch edition.*

[*A*] *He wrote ſome books which have been printed.*] The following account is given of them in the *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum. Diſceptatio de Verbo vel Sermone Dei, cujus creberrima fit mentio apud Paraphraſtas Chaldæos, Jonathan, Onkelos, & Thargum Hieroſolymitanum. Irenopoli apud hæredes Jacobi Laringhii,* 1643, 8vo. *Idem Belgicè. a.* 1649, 4to. *Tranſtulit & Notis illuſtravit Maimonidis conſtitutiones de Fundamentis Legis. Editæ eæ ſunt Amſtel. apud Blavios, a.* 1638, 4to. *Item Chronologiam ſacram profanam Rab. David Ganz. & Pirke ſeu capitula R. Elieſer. Edita hæc ſunt Lugd. Bat.* 1644, 4to (1). I take the book intituled *Bilibra veritatis,* which was printed in 1700, to be written by our William Henry Vorſtius. In the Leipſic Journal (2) it is aſcribed to him, and it is obſerved that it was refuted by the Biſhop of Bath and Wells, and more fully ſtill by Mr Edzard Profeſſor at Hamburgh. See the remark [*A*] of the article RITTANGELIUS, and Mr Bernard's *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (3).

(1) Bibl. Antitrin. *pag.* 143.

(2) Menſe Decemb. 1700, *pag.* 542.

(3) For the month of Auguſt 1699, pag. 214, and for September 1699, pag. 359. See the *Journal de Trevoux*, for the month of March 1702, pag. 33, of the edition of Trevoux, where it is ſaid that the ivth letter of Mr Nye is againſt the *Bilibra* of William Vorſtius.

V O S S I U S. The learned men of this name, afford me ſuch an ample field of matter, that the few ſheets which I have left, will not allow me room to digeſt it. Wherefore I refer it to another time, together with the memoir communicated to me, which contains a confutation of what is ſaid againſt Iſaac Voſſius in Moreri's Dictionary.

U R C E U S (Antony Codrus) one of the moſt learned, and moſt unfortunate men of the XVth century, was an Italian [*A*]. He was ſo ſenſibly afflicted with the loſs of his manuſcripts, that he not only uttered execrable blaſphemies, but alſo like a ſavage retired to the woods, and all human ſociety became inſupportable to him [*B*]. It is reported that in

[*A*] *He was an Italian.*] Of Ravenna, if we may believe Pierius Valerianus (1); but Geſner (2) citing Bartholomew of Bologna, ſays he was born in the year 1446, at Herberia a little town in the territory of Reggio, ſeven miles diſtant from Modena.

[*B*] *He uttered execrable blaſphemies . . . . . he retired . . . . . and all human ſociety became inſupportable to him.*] He loſt what he had prepared for the Preſs in the following manner. He lived at Forli, in an apartment of the palace. His chamber was ſo dark as to require a candle at noon-day. And happening to go out and leave it burning, his papers took fire, and his library was reduced to aſhes. As ſoon as he heard this ill news he run in a diſtracted manner to the palace, and ſtopping at his chamber door cried out, Jesus Christ, What great crime have I been guilty

(1) I ſhall cite his words in the remark [*D*].

(2) Geſner, in Biblioth. *fol.* 55, *verſo.*

in his laſt moments he acknowledged his ſin, and devoutly implored the mercy of God [*C*]. Some ſay that he was killed by aſſaſſins [*D*]. His works, printed at Baſil in 1540, conſiſt of orations, letters, and poems. His life is to be ſeen there written by Bartholomew Blanchinus of Bologna. He had entertained doubts concerning the immortality of the ſoul [*E*].

According to Leander Albertus (*a*), he died at Bologna, when he was ſeventy years of age, and was buried there in the cloyſter *di Santo Salvatore* in the tomb which he had cauſed to be prepared for himſelf with this ſhort epitaph, *Codrus eram* ; - - - *I was Codrus.* Now ſince he was born in the year 1446 (*b*), we muſt conclude that he died in the year 1516.

(*a*) Leand. Albert. Deſcritt. d'Italia, *fol. m.* 364, *verſo.*

(*b*) See the remark [*A*].

guilty of? Which of your followers have I ever offended, that you treat me ſo cruelly? Mind well what I am going to ſay, I ſpeak deliberately and with a compoſed mind. If by chance I addreſs myſelf to you when at the point of death, do not hear me, for I have reſolved to paſs my eternity in hell. *Quodnam ego tantum ſcelus concepi Chriſte, quem ego tuorum unquam læſi, ut ita inexpiabili in me odio debaccheris? Audi ea* (pergebat ad quoddam converſus ſimulachrum) *quæ Tibi mentis compos & ex animo dicam. Si forte cum ad ultimum vitæ finem pervenero ſupplex accedam ad Te opem oratum, neve audias neve inter tuos accipias oro; cum infernis diis in æternum vitam agere decrevi* (3). Thoſe who heard theſe blaſphemies endeavoured to comfort him, but in vain: he left the town and run to a foreſt. *Adeo inſuper ira & indignatio hominem oppreſſerat, ut extra portam urbis egreſſus, amentiæ frenos non ante impoſuerit, quam in vaſtum ſeſe nemus proripuiſſet, ingentique cum moleſtia ibi totos dies tranſegiſſet* (4).

(3) Spizelius, in Felice Literato, *pag.* 12. *He cites* Barthol. Bononienſis in Vita Codri.

(4) Idem, Spizelius, ibid. *pag.* 13.

[*C*] *It is reported . . . . . that he devoutly implored the mercy of GOD.*] The author whom I cite mentions our Urcæus's prayer. ‘ Ultima tandem aliquando appropinquante horâ miſer ille oculis ac manibus ad cœlum ſublatis; *Qui cœlum incolis,* (exclamavit) *fer quæſo opem peccatori, noli me, qui tuum in ſinum confugio ſupplicem rejicere. Si unquam peccantem hominem voti reum feciſti, ſic mihi extrema oranti dextram ab alto porrigas oro* (5). - - - *This unhappy man when his laſt hour drew near, lifted up his eyes and his hands to heaven, crying out*; O thou who dwelleſt in heaven, help a ſinner, I beſeech thee, and do not reject me while I thus fly in a ſupplicant manner to thy boſom. If ever thou didſt hear a miſerable ſinner, ſtretch out, I beſeech thee, thy right hand to me from on high, now that I am making my laſt prayer.’ After having uttered theſe words, he ſaw a tall man, with a torch in each hand, and trembling all over his body. Aſtoniſhed at this viſion he ſprung out of his bed, and aſked the apparition what he did there at ſuch an unſeaſonable hour, and conjured him not to do him any miſchief. ‘ Ad hunc modum ſe animamque ſuam Deo commendans, quendam conſpexit ingentis ſtaturæ virum, capite raſo, barba ad terram uſque promiſſa, ardentibus oculis, faces utraque geſtantem manu, ac toto corpore tremebundum, quo viſo in hæc à pavore dictata verba erupit: *Quiſnam tu es, qui ſolus furiali habitu ea noctis parte, quâ mortales ſomno premuntur, deambulas, noli ad me qui DEI amicus ſum infeſtus accedere, effare quid quæras, quo ire pergas?* Hæc cum dixiſſet, è ſtrato proſiluit, quaſi illum in ſe irruentem vitaturus (6). - - - *Whilſt Urceus was in this manner recommending himſelf to GOD, he beheld a man of a huge ſtature, with his head ſhaven, his beard reaching down to the ground, his eyes flaming, holding a torch in either hand, and trembling all over his body. Upon the ſight of this apparition, he broke forth into the following expreſſions.* Whoever thou art, who thus walkeſt alone in ſuch a dreadful ſhape, and at this midnight time when mortals are oppreſſed with ſleep, do not approach to hurt me who am the friend of God. Speak what thou wanteſt, and whether thou wouldſt go? *Having ſaid this, he ſprung out of his bed, as if he would avoid the ſpectre which was ruſhing upon him.*’ My author breaks off here; he did not know whether Urceus periſhed upon this occaſion or not (7)? This makes me ſuſpect that he as well as myſelf wanted the book of Bartholomew of Bologna, and only quoted ſeveral ſcraps of it which others had quoted before him; for it is not at all probable that our Codrus's hiſtorian ſhould leave his reader in ſuſpence concerning the conſequences of this accident. But be it as it will, Spizelius ſwayed by a charitable principle judges very favourably of the ſtate of this learned man's ſoul, in conſideration of his laſt exhortation to his diſciples. He recites it, and it ſpeaks a man who had a true ſenſe of the fear of God, and of the vanity of the world.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Utrum extremum hoc evaſerit periculum, & poſt tantam tempeſtatem in perpetuæ felicitatis portum ſit delatus, dicere non habemus, *Id. ibid. p.* 14.

[*D*] *Some ſay that he was killed by aſſaſſins.*] Pierius Valerianus who hath not forgot him in his catalogue of unfortunate learned men, expreſſes himſelf thus concerning him: ‘ Codrus autem Urceus Ravenas multæ, variæque doctrinæ vir, eruditiſſimis pleriſque ſcriptis, quæ nunc edita ſunt, omnibus innotuit. Is quoque ſanguinaria peremptus eſt morte, ab adverſæ factionis latronibus fœdiſſimè trucidatus (8). - - - *Urceus Codrus was a man of great and various erudition, as appeared to all the world by his many learned performances which are now publiſhed. He too was killed in a baſe and bloody manner by the aſſaſſins of the contrary faction.*’

(8) Pierius Valerianus de Litteratorum Infelicitate, *lib. i, pag.* 21, 22.

[*E*] *He had entertained doubts concerning the immortality of the ſoul.*] His friends aſked him what he thought of it, he replied that he did not know what would become of him after death, or whether the ſoul exiſts after this life or not. But he was not in doubt concerning the doctrines commonly aſſerted about hell, but poſitively affirmed that they were meer tales invented to terrify mankind. Spizelius mentions alſo this particular. ‘ Cum ejuſdem, *ſaith he* (9), de animæ mortalitate opinionis peſtilens ſidus olim infelicem illum *Codrum Urceum* [cujus tragœdiam ſupra memoravimus] afflaſſet, parum abfuit, quin & ipſe in atheiſmi voraginem fuerit præcipitatus. Rogantibus enim amicis, quid de *immortalitate animæ* ſentiret? neſcire ſe reſpondebat, quid poſt mortem de ſe futurum eſſet, viveretne animus, ſive anima, an interiret una cum corpore, quæque de inferis homines prædicarent, anilia quædam terriculamenta eſſe dicebat: hinc ipſi amariſſimo epigrammate poſt fata etiam fuit exprobratum, quod non rectè de Chriſto, inferis, animarumque immortalitate ſentiendo, latentis atheiſmi ſui haud obſcura documenta dediſſet. - - - *The peſtilential influence of that ſame opinion concerning the mortality of the ſoul had infected the miſerable* Codrus Urceus [*whoſe tragical end we have mentioned above*] *to ſuch a degree that he wanted but little of falling into the gulf of Atheiſm. For when his friends aſked him what he thought of the immortality of the ſoul, he anſwered,* &c. . . . . . *This gave occaſion to a moſt bitter epigram being written upon him after his death, wherein it was reproachfully inſinuated, as if by his erroneous opinions concerning CHRIST, Hell, and the Immortality of the Soul, he had given manifeſt proofs of his lurking Atheiſm.*’

(9) Spizelius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 174, 175. *He cites* Barth. Bononienſ. in *Codri Urcei* Vita.

URGULANIA, a Roman lady, favourite of the Empreſs Livia. Her intereſt with that Empreſs rendered her extremely inſolent, inſomuch that ſhe refuſed to appear before the Senate in order to give evidence (*a*): The Prætor waited on her to interrogate her, and a greater deference was paid to her than to the Veſtal Virgins [*A*], who were obliged

(*a*) Tacitus, Annal. *lib. ii, cap. xxxiv.*

[*A*] *A greater deference was paid to her than to the Veſtal Virgins.*] I ſhall quote Tacitus, ‘ Urgulaniæ potentia adeo nimia civitati erat, ut teſtis in cauſſa quadam quæ apud Senatum tractabatur, venire obliged to come to the bar, when they gave teſtimony. But Urgulania's great intereſt and haughty demeanor did not prevent Lucius Piſo's ſuing her for debt in the year of Rome 769, ſhe refuſed to appear, and retired to the Emperor's Palace. But Piſo could not be perſuaded to ſtop his proceedings by the remonſtrances of his relations, nor by all the complaints of Livia, that it was a violation of the reſpect due to her; and Tiberius would no farther interpoſe in this proceſs, than by promiſing his mother to ſollicit the judges in favour of Urgulania, ſo that the ſuit was no otherwiſe ended than by Livia's cauſing Piſo to be paid the ſum which Urgulania owed him. She was ſtill living in the year 777, when her grand-ſon Plautius Silvanus the Prætor was accuſed of the murther of his wife; for we find in Tacitus (b) that there being no hopes that the criminal ſhould eſcape condemnation, ſhe ſent him a dagger, which being unable to uſe, he cauſed his veins to be opened.

(b) Idem, *lib. iv, cap. xxii.*

'nire dedignaretur; miſſus eſt prætor qui domi interrogaret, cum Virgines Veſtales in foro & judicio audiri, quotiens teſtimonium dicerent, vetus mos fuerit (1). - - - *The power of Urgulania was grown ſo exceſſive, that being ſummoned to appear as a witneſs in a cauſe depending before the ſenate, ſhe ſcornfully refuſed to come. Upon this a Prætor was ſent to examine her at home, whereas by an old cuſtom even the Veſtal Virgins were obliged to appear in the Forum, and in the courts of judicature, when they had any evidence to give in.*' Mr du Boulai had no reaſon to take Urgulania for a Veſtal. *The Veſtal Urgulania*, ſays he, *did a thing unprecedented by deſpiſing the ſummons of the ſenate, to give evidence in a cauſe depending before them*; *and that court was obliged to ſend the Prætor to her houſe to examine her. As Cornelius Tacitus (whoſe words are worth reciting) informs us lib.* 2 (2). He afterwards cites the paſſage which I have quoted above: if he had read it with due attention, he would have been ſatisfied that Urgulania was no Veſtal; he would, I ſay, have been convinced of it without having any occaſion to conſult the other paſſage of Tacitus, which ſhews that ſhe was the grandmother of a Roman Prætor, who was accuſed of killing his ſecond wife. This ſuppoſes an old age worthy that Hiſtorian's obſervation, (for the very earlieſt time that a Veſtal Virgin was permitted to marry was at the age of thirty-ſeven) and doth not very well agree with Mr du Boulai's obſervation *that few Veſtals married* after thirty years obſervance of their vow, *and thoſe that did proved very unhappy* (3). A favourite, who had as great an intereſt as Urgulania, who ſhould have been married after having been a Veſtal, would have been an illuſtrious inſtance of good fortune. I can eaſily believe that this author never ſaw the paſſage of Tacitus any where elſe than in Tiraquellus's commentaries on *Alexander ab Alexandro* (4), where being ſeparated from the thread of the narration it may make one believe that Urgulania was a Veſtal Virgin.

(1) Tacit. Annal, *lib. ii, cap. xxxiv.*

URGULANIA, falſely taken for a Veſtal Virgin by du Boulai.

(2) Du Boulai, Threſor des Antiquitez Romaines, *p.* 316.

(3) Du Boulai, ibid. *pag.* 308.

(4) In Libr. V. Genial. Dier. *cap. xii, pag.* 109, *Edit. Lugd. Batavor.* 1673, *where inſtead of* Cornelius Tacitus, *there is* Cornel. Celſus.

URGULANILLA, grand-daughter of the preceding lady [*A*], was married to the Emperor Claudius before he became Emperor (*a*). He had two children by her [*B*], and divorced her becauſe ſhe had made herſelf infamous by her leudneſs, and was alſo ſuſpected of murther (*b*).

(*a*) Sueton. in Claudio, *cap. xxvi.*

(*b*) Ob libidinum probra & homicidii ſuſpicionem. *Id. ibid.*

[*A*] *Grand-daughter of the preceding lady.*] This is the opinion of Reineſius, a perſon who ſtudied the Roman families better than any man in the world. He ſaith that Urgulania, Livia's favourite, was the wife of Marcus Plautius, the ſon of Aulus Plautius, who was tribune of the people in the year of Rome 698. That Marcus Plautius Silvanus the ſon of Marcus Plautius and Urgulania was conſul in the year 752, and honoured with the triumphal ornaments in 762. That Plautius Silvanus the ſon of that conſul was Prætor of Rome in the year 777, and that he had a ſiſter who was our Urgulanilla, and two brothers, *viz.* Publius Plautius Pulcher, and Titus Plautius Silvanus Ælianus, who was conſul in 799, and afterwards again in Veſpaſian's time (1). There is yet extant a very long inſcription (2) expreſſing the offices and actions of this Titus Plautius, and particularly his conſulſhip in Veſpaſian's reign: notwithſtanding which Lipſius (3) has been ſo inadvertent as to apply this inſcription to that Plautius Silvanus who killed himſelf in the year of Rome 777, and was Urgulania's grandſon. It is obſervable that in my edition of Lipſius's Tacitus (4), the text hath it *Urgulania*, and it is *Virgulania* in the commentary, and the commentator obſerves that the ſirname *Virgulanias* was appropriated to the Plautian family, which he proves by an inſcription, and by Suetonius's authority, who, ſaith he, calls one of the Emperor Claudius's wives Plautia Virgulanilla. But all the authors who produce this inſcription, expreſs the name to be Urgulanius: whence then can it proceed that Lipſius alledges it to prove his Virgulanius? I believe I may venture to ſay that the Printers are entirely innocent of this blunder, and that Lipſius not perfectly remembring the word Urgulania thought that Tacitus ſaid Virgulania, and continued this firſt error throughout. He had done much better, not to have written proper names without book, but to have kept the original before his eyes. And if we who are authors would always be ſo prudent as to diſtruſt our memory, and only rely on an exact view, our writings would be more accurate.

Our Urgulanilla perhaps owed her name to its being a diminutive of that of Urgulania her grandmother.

[*B*] *He had two children by her.*] A ſon and a daughter. The ſon was named Druſus, and died before the age of fourteen, by a very odd accident: for throwing up a pear into the air in order to catch it in his mouth, it fell in and choaked him. He was contracted to one of Sejanus's daughters, notwithſtanding which the ſame Sejanus was reported to have cauſed him to be killed (5). So true it is that many more crimes are imputed to favourites than they are really guilty of. Suetonius rejects this impertinent accuſation (6). Claudia, the daughter of Claudius and Urgulanilla, was born before the expiration of five months after her mother's divorce: and the late huſband acknowledged her at firſt, but not long after his mind altered, and he cauſed her to be expoſed naked at her mother's door; on pretence that Boter his freed-man was the true father of this child. Mr Chevreau miſtook Suetonius's words, *quamvis ante quintum menſem divortii natam*, in believing they ſignified *though ſhe was born five months before their divorce* (7). He ſeems to intend a criticiſm on Reineſius, for ſaying that Plautia Urgulanilla, was Claudius's firſt wife (8), but indeed here is no room for cenſure; for Lepida and Medullina were only contracted, but not married to Claudius. Wherefore Mr Chevreau deſerves to be blamed for not obſerving Suetonius's diſtinction. He beſtows ſix wives on that Emperor, whereas Suetonius allows him but four, and two contracted ladies, *quatuor uxores & duas ſponſas* (9).

(1) Reineſius, Epiſt. xxvii ad Rupertum, *pag.* 106.

(2) *It is to be found in* Glandorp. Onom. *pag.* 683; *and in* Rijck in Tacitum, *pag.* 440.

(3) Lipſ. in Tacit. Annal. *lib. iv, pag. m.* 200.

(4) That of Geneva, 1619, in 8vo.

(5) Sueton. in Claudio, *cap. xxvii.*

(6) Quo magis miror fuiſſe qui traderent fraude à Sejano necatum. *Id. ibid.*

(7) Chevreau, Hiſt. du Monde, *Tom. ii, pag.* 170, *Dutch Edit.* 1687, & *pag.* 202, 203, *Dutch Edit.* 1698.

(8) Reineſ. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 109.

(9) Sueton. ubi ſupra, *cap. xxvi.*

URRACA.

URRACA, daughter and heireſs of Alfonſo VI King of Leon and Caſtile was firſt married to Raymund of Burgundy whoſe widow ſhe became in the year 1100 (*a*). She was afterwards married to Don Alfonſo King of Arragon and Navarre in the year 1106 (*b*). This marriage proved the cauſe of the re-union of almoſt all the Chriſtian kingdoms of Spain under one ſovereign; for after the death (*c*) of Don Alfonſo VI, King of Leon, Caſtile, and Toledo, &c. theſe realms fell into the hands of Don Alfonſo King of Arragon and Navarre; they devolved on him I ſay by virtue of his marrying Urraca. The Lords of Caſtile had been againſt that marriage; wherefore the King did not go to claim his Queen's ſucceſſion, without a good number of troops in order to reduce the Caſtilians to reaſon in caſe of neceſſity (*d*). The preparatives for his journey and other things retarded his taking poſſeſſion; but in the interim he increaſed the ſplendor and magnificence of his court, and connived at the ſcandalous conduct of Urraca [*A*]. He went along with her to Caſtile, and met with no manner of reſiſtance (*e*); nevertheleſs he acted like a man who very well knew how to provide againſt all events [*B*], and was ſoon obliged to remedy the ill effects of his Queen's ambition, who would have ruined a great lord as a puniſhment for having given the title of King of Caſtile to her huſband (*f*). She grew ſo diſſolute that he was forced to confine her to the *fortreſs of Caſtellar*; from whence ſhe finding ways to eſcape, retired into Caſtile, and endeavoured to annul her marriage. The Archbiſhop of Toledo, and ſeveral other prelates aſſiſted her in that attempt, for which they were ſeverely puniſhed by the King. The great Lords and the States of Caſtile oppoſed this divorce, and by ſubmiſſive means brought Urraca to the King her huſband in Arragon, who *graciouſly received her; but as ſhe continued her vicious courſe of life, and daily more and more forgot her own honour and the honour of her houſe*, he at laſt cauſed her to be *conveyed to Soria, and baniſhed her for ever from his company* (*g*). It was then that her adherents applied more vigorouſly than ever to diſſolve the marriage. She alledged not only the common excuſe on the like occaſions, that ſhe was married againſt her conſent, but that her near relation to Don Alfonſo rendered her marriage with him unlawful (*h*). Application was made to the Pope, who committed this affair to Don *Diego Gelmirio, Biſhop of Compoſtella* (*i*). It terminated in a diſſolution of the marriage. Some Hiſtorians praiſe Alfonſo for that having put away Urraca, he at the ſame time renounced all authority over the kingdom of Caſtile; but they plainly contradict themſelves [*C*], by relating ſeveral facts, which make it appear that he did his utmoſt to keep that authority.

[*A*] *He increaſed the ſplendor and magnificence of his court, and connived at the ſcandalous conduct of Urraca.*] Both theſe things were natural conſequences of the inheritance which this Princeſs brought with her. Two or three kingdoms left her by her father were very well worth the concealing a reſentment at her ill deportment. Mariana's words plainly ſignify that the tide of Urraca's leudneſs run very high. 'Præterea varia Aragonii regni negotia diſtinebant *(Alfonſum)* ne novam & ampliſſimam cerneret hæreditatem. Cuncta tamen ad novi imperii decorem compoſita, dilatæ voluptates, diſſimulatæ Reginæ libidines: quæ non ſine ſugillatione majeſtatis nimium in levitatem atque turpitudinem incubuerat (1). - - - *Beſides various affairs relating to the kingdom of Arragon hindered Alfonſo from taking poſſeſſion of this new and ample inheritance. Nevertheleſs every thing was ordered in ſuch a manner as became the dignity of a new kingdom. Alfonſo poſtponed his pleaſures, and winked at the unchaſtity of his Queen, who to the ſhame of Majeſty ſhewed too great an inclination for levity and leudneſs.*'

[*B*] *He acted like a man who very well knew how to provide againſt all events.*] 'As ſoon as ever he had ſet foot in Caſtile he began to conſider what might happen, if his Queen ſhould die without iſſue by him; wherefore he put the principal places and ſtrongeſt forts into the hands of Navarreſe and Arragonian Governors and Captains, to the end that if he ſhould be obliged to quit the kingdoms of Caſtile, Leon, Toledo, and their dependencies, he might in ſome meaſure keep thoſe people in awe, and evacuate them on honourable and advantageous terms: this practice ſomewhat diſguſted the Caſtilian Lords. He alſo knew his wife Urraca to be proud, ungrateful, inconſtant, and libidinous; wherefore like a conſiderate man he fortified himſelf againſt whatever events time might produce. This woman, on a trivial occaſion, conceived a moſt inveterate hatred againſt the Count D. Pedro Anſures, Lord of Valladolid, who had educated her, as well as preſerved and protected her dominions after the death of her father; it was only becauſe in the letters he wrote to the King her huſband, and to her, deſiring them to come and take poſſeſſion of their heritage, he gave her huſband the title of King of Caſtile. For this reaſon ſhe undertook to deprive him of his eſtate at Valladolid and other places; but the King immediately re-eſtabliſhed him, and the better to ſecure him from the rage of this woman, he ſent him to Arragon, with Donna Elo his wife, intruſting to them the government of the young Count of Urgel his nephew (2).'

[*C*] *Some Hiſtorians praiſe Alfonſo for that having put away Urraca, he at the ſame time renounced .... but they plainly contradict themſelves.*] Theſe two contradictory aſſertions follow one another in the Hiſtory of Mayerne. Don Alfonſo, ſaith he (3), 'baniſhed Urraca for ever from his converſation: notwithſtanding which he retained ſeveral ſtrong places in Caſtile, without being much deſirous of the government or adminiſtration of that kingdom. It is certain that this King's ſpirit was very great, and he plainly ſhewed that he put a higher value on virtue and honour, than on worldly goods, by giving up ſuch ample territories as thoſe of Caſtile, Leon, Toledo, and others which Urraca brought him.' This Hiſtorian in the ſame page begins to relate Don Alfonſo's reſentment againſt thoſe who had reſtored to Urraca the towns and fortreſſes which he had in Caſtile. This reſentment we find in the ſame Hiſtory to be one of the motives, which engaged him to make war againſt the Caſtilians. It appears from Mayerne's words, that Urraca's leudneſs is aſſigned as another cauſe of the war: 'From that time Donna Urraca continued her immoralities; for re-aſſuming her former deſign of a divorce, ſhe obtained it by the authority of Pope Paſchal..... So that finding herſelf without any check, and no reſtraint laid upon her luſt, ſhe looſely indulged it to an exorbitant degree. She gave up herſelf to a familiar and unchaſt converſation with Count Gomez de Candeſpina, who formerly pretended to be her huſband, and had by her a ſon, of whom ſhe was delivered clandeſtinely, whence he was named Don Fernando Hurtado, or a clandeſtine child; from whom the houſe of the Hurtado's, an illuſtrious family in Spain is ſaid to be deſcended. Though ſome doubt the truth of this, yet it is certain that the Count Don Gomez, in a ſhort time had the ſole government of the kingdom, and entirely diſpoſed of the affairs of war and peace at his arbitrary will and pleaſure, and enjoyed the

---

(*a*) Mayerne Turquet, Hiſt. d'Eſpagne, *livr. viii, pag. m.* 331.

(*b*) Mariana de Rebus Hiſp. *lib. x, cap. vii, pag. m.* 418.

(*c*) In the year 1108.

(*d*) Mariana, ubi ſupra, *cap. viii, pag.* 419.

(*e*) Mayerne, ubi ſupra, *lib. ix, pag.* 335.

(*f*) See the remark [*B*].

(*g*) *Taken from* Mayerne, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 340.

(*h*) Id. ibid.

(*i*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 341.

(1) Mariana de Rebus Hiſpaniæ, *lib. x, cap. viii, pag. m.* 419.

(2) Mayerne Turquet, Hiſt. d'Eſpagne, *livr. ix, pag.* 336.

(3) Id. ibid. *pag.* 340.

authority. He fought battles to maintain it, and his enemies were obliged to force him to reſtore the places which he detained (*k*), even after the Caſtilians had elected Alphonſus Raymund of Burgundy, Urraca's ſon by her firſt huſband, for their king in the year 1322 (*l*). They made this choice when they found that the Queen continued to give up her ſelf to the moſt ſcandalous amours, and alſo countenanced the tyrannical government of her favourite (*m*). Her own ſon was obliged to declare war againſt her, and to beſiege her in the Caſtle of Leon; out of which difficulties ſhe no otherwiſe extricated herſelf than by a promiſe to renounce her dominions, and reduce her ſelf to a private life with a penſion ſuitable to her dignity (*n*). The year of her death is not certainly known; ſome ſay that ſhe died about the year 1125 (*o*), in child-bed lying-in of a baſtard; others tell us that her death was the puniſhment of a ſacrilegious crime [*D*]. She had a ſiſter who might very well have diſputed with her the pre-eminence in leudneſs [*E*], and brought a load

‘ the ſame privacies with the Queen, as if he had ‘ really been her huſband; notwithſtanding which ‘ Don Pedro de Lara another gallant . . . . . ſo far inſinuated himſelf into the Queen's favour, that he ‘ ſoon became one of her darling minions, of whom ‘ Count Gomez proved very jealous. The diſſolute ‘ and laſcivious deportment of Donna Urraca, was ſo ‘ univerſally and publickly known, that King Alſonſo ‘ excited by a juſt indignation, as well on that account as by reaſon of the above-mentioned divorce, ‘ reſolved to enter Caſtile with a great army, and put ‘ all to fire and ſword that he met in his way, being ‘ irritated as well by the leudneſs of the Queen as ‘ by the baſe puſillanimity of the Caſtilians, who ‘ tamely obeyed her: he bore them a grudge, becauſe ‘ they had reſtored to her the places which he had ‘ intruſted to their keeping. The Queen's two amorous darlings Don Gomez and Don Pedro took the ‘ field againſt him with the forces of Caſtile and Leon, ‘ and meeting the royal army, compoſed of Navarreſe and Arragonians, they came to a cloſe engagement near Candeſpina, not far from Sepulveda. ‘ Don Pedro who led the van was firſt attacked (4),’ and immediately fled *and retired to the Queen at Burgos, carrying the news of the defeat which he was not at leiſure to ſee* (5). Don Gomez her other paramour was killed in the field of battle. The victorious Alſonſo penetrated as far as Galicia, *making a mercileſs ſlaughter and devaſtation wherever his army paſſed* (6). He obtained a ſecond victory betwixt the towns of Leon and Aſtorga, and forced Alfonſo Raimund, Urraca's ſon, to ſave himſelf by flight into Portugal. The Queen being depoſed, the King her ſon *reſolved to recover the Caſtilian fortreſſes, which his father-in-law Don Alſonſo King of Navarre kept from him* (7). Accordingly he raiſed a great army: Alfonſo did the like, *and entred the kingdom of Caſtile, when the Prelates of both kingdoms foreſeeing the great calamities which were inevitable, if theſe two potent Princes ſhould once make war, earneſtly endeavoured to negotiate a peace betwixt them; and their attempts were ſo ſucceſsful as to engage the new King of Caſtile, to addreſs himſelf by way of requeſt to the King of Navarre and Aragon, in order to obtain his cities and caſtles* (8). By this means he obtained part of his demands; but Alfonſo would not reſtore the countries ſituated betwixt *Villorado and Calaorra, nor the provinces of Guipuſcoa and Alava:* &c. Pretending that they ought to be re-united to Navarre, and that they were uſurped by Don Alfonſo VI King of Caſtile.

Does it become an Hiſtorian who relates all theſe particulars to aſſert that Urraca's huſband would not detain the patrimony of the wife he had divorced? Does not a man confute himſelf when he writes in this manner? What follows is another error of the like nature. An author whom I here cite, blames Don Alfonſo for divorcing Urraca, ‘ and by that ‘ means depriving himſelf of the poſſeſſion of three ‘ kingdoms. For though the hiſtory of Spain praiſes ‘ him for having preferred his honour to thoſe three ‘ great realms, I cannot help thinking that if on ‘ one ſide this be taken for a generous action, on ‘ the other it muſt paſs for very weak and impolitic, ‘ as was that of Lewis VII King of France, who lived ‘ at the ſame time, and who by divorcing his wife ‘ Eleonora, ſowed the ſeeds of a perpetual war in his ‘ kingdom (9).’ This compariſon betwixt Don Alfonſo and Lewis VII is not juſt; for the French King entirely diſpoſſeſſed himſelf of the territories of his divorced Queen, and exactly followed Marcus Aurelius's maxims (10): but Don Alfonſo did not at all follow the ſame rule, and is on that account cenſured by one of the beſt Spaniſh Hiſtorians (11): ‘ Alfonſus Aragonius eo nuncio (12) perculſus repudio facto, ‘ Reginam Soria dimittit, in cujus urbis arce cuſtodiæ ‘ rurſus mancipata erat: imperandi tamen dulcedine ‘ illectus, dotalem ditionem non deponit. Id iniquum ‘ eſſe omnibus videbatur. - - - *Struck with that news,* ‘ *Alſonſo King of Arragon, divorced his Queen, and ſent* ‘ *her away from Soria, the caſtle of which town had* ‘ *been a ſecond priſon to her. Nevertheleſs he was ſo* ‘ *charmed with the ſweets of empire that he would not* ‘ *reſign the dominions which ſhe brought him. This to* ‘ *every body ſeemed an unjuſt action.*’

[*D*] *Some ſay that ſhe died . . . . . in child-bed lying-in of a baſtard; others tell us that her death was the puniſhment of a ſacrilegious crime.*] ‘ She took up ‘ her reſidence in St Vincent's church, being very ‘ ſtrictly guarded: notwithſtanding which it is reported that ſhe one day went to the church, dedicated to St Iſidore of Leon, in order to ſeize the ‘ treaſures, which her father and grand-father had ‘ given to that place, and that as ſhe was carrying ‘ off her prey, being juſt going out, and having advanced one foot out of the church, her intrails burſt ‘ out: a juſt puniſhment for the adulteries of which ‘ ſhe had been guilty, and the murders which they ‘ occaſioned, to the injury and diſhonour of the royal ‘ families, and all the Chriſtian part of Spain, as well ‘ as for her ſacrilege. Others ſay that ſhe died in ‘ the caſtle of Saldania in the delivery of a clandeſtine ‘ child (13).’ Mariana mentions both theſe opinions, and owns that this Queen will be the eternal ignominy of Spain: *Pudicitiam ſane dum vixit haud ſatis honeſte habuit. in Saldaniæ arce ex partu extinctam ferunt. æternum Hiſpaniæ dedecus. alii Legione affirmant, cum theſauros D. Iſidori expilaſſet, quos auferre neſas erat, in ipſo templi limine ruptis viſceribus, manifeſta numinis vindicta expiraſſe* (14).

[*E*] *She had a ſiſter who might have diſputed with her the pre-eminence in leudneſs.*] It was Thereſa the baſtard daughter of Don Alfonſo VI, who married her to a French lord in acknowledgment of the ſervices he had done him in his wars againſt the Moors. This lord according to ſome writers was Henry of Lorrain, but others call him Henry of Burgundy. And the latter are divided whether he was deſcended from the Dukes or the Earls of Burgundy. Some ſay that (15) he was ſon to Henry Duke of Burgundy, and grand-ſon to Robert of France, the firſt of that name Duke of Burgundy, and that he was conſequently a Prince of the royal blood of France; and others ſay that he was (16) the Earl of Burgundy's ſon, and brother to Pope Calixtus II. However it was, this valiant lord rendered himſelf ſo conſiderable, that Don Alfonſo VI King of Caſtile marrying him to his daughter Thereſa, *gave him thoſe parts of Portugal which he had conquered from the Moors, with the title of Hereditary Count, for him and his legitimate ſucceſſors, proceeding from this marriage and alſo promiſed to add to thoſe lordſhips the conqueſts which he ſhould for the future make on the Moors, with the ſame ſucceſſive and hereditary right . . . . on condition that he and his heirs ſhould acknowledge the Kings of Leon for their ſovereign lords, and hold the ſaid lands of them in fealty and homage* (17). Thereſa was a widow in the year 1112, and mother of three children, one ſon and two daughters (18). *Soon after ſhe married for her ſecond huſband . . . . . Bermund Paez de Tranſtamara* (19), and after ſhe had lived ſome time with him, ſhe left him, *excited thereto by a prevailing luſt, or ſome other* damnable

---

(*k*) See the remark [*C*].

(*l*) Mayerne, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 342.

(*m*) Id. ibid.

(*n*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 344.

(*o*) Septimo decimo circiter anno à morte patris. *Mariana, ubi ſupra, cap. viii, pag.* 425. *But ch. xiv, p.* 433. *he affirms that ſhe died in the year* 1126.

(4) Id. ibid. *pag.* 341.

(5) Id. ibid.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Id. ibid. *pag.* 344.

(8) Id. ibid. *pag.* 345.

(9) Campion, Hommes illuſtres, *Tom. i, pag.* 129, 130. *Edit. of Roüen* 1657.

(10) See, above, the remark [*A*], of the article LEWIS VII.

(11) Mariana, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 421.

(12) *Viz.* that Alphonſus Raymund, ſon of Urraca had been crowned at Compoſtella.

(13) Mayerne, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 347. Campion, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 136, 137, *has tranſcribed this almoſt word for word.*

(14) Mariana, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 423.

(15) *See Father* Anſelme, Hiſt. de la Maiſon Roiale, *pag.* 454, 483, 484, *and the citations* (34), (35), *in this remark.*

(16) *See* Louïs Gollut's Memoires Hiſtoriques de la Franche Comté, *pag.* 305, 306.

(17) Mayerne, ubi ſupra, *lib. viii, pag.* 322.

(18) Idem, *lib. ix, pag.* 339.

(19) Id. ibid.

load of evils on Portugal. After this, I am ſurprized that the name of Urraca ſhould ever be given to the Infanta's of Caſtile, and I do not wonder that the French Ambaſſadors, who were ſent *to bring into France one of the daughters of* Don Alfonſo IX, *whom he had promiſed to their maſter, choſe the leſs beautiful, whoſe name was Blanche, and could not bear the very mention of her ſiſter, becauſe named Urraca* (*p*). They undoubtedly looked on that name as

---

(*p*) La Mothe le Vayer, letter xxxiii, *pag.* 265, *of Vol. x. He quotes* Ant. Herrera, *Tom. ii, lib. xv, cap. xvi. See the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, *num.* 32.

damnable occaſion (20), and married Don Fernando Paez de Tranſtamara, brother to the huſband ſhe left. On the other ſide, *Don Bermund being thus left, as if he deſigned to emulate his counteſs's inceſt, married her eldeſt daughter Donna Thereſa Henriquez, ſiſter to Don Alfonſo Henriquez. Theſe ſcandalous inter-marriages were contracted between Chriſtians, in the infant houſe of Portugal . . . . . . But the young Earl Alfonſo Henriquez being extremely afflicted at theſe exorbitances, and beſides finding himſelf deſpiſed, rejected, and diſgraced, and that the adulterous and inceſtuous Don Fernand aſſumed the title of Count of Portugal, on account of his wife, he raiſed an army againſt him* (21) *. . . . . Purſuing him as a tyrant and inceſtuous adulterer ; and their forces engaged near Guymaranes, where Alfonſo was beaten, by his falling too raſhly on the enemy . . . . . . Having afterwards recruited, and rallied their forces, they fought a ſecond battle, which proved more ſucceſful to Don Alfonſo : for Don Fernando's army was utterly routed, he and the Counteſs, Don Alfonſo's mother, were taken and confined to a ſtrong priſon : . . . . . And this was the fruit which theſe two leud ſiſters, daughters of King Alfonſo VI, reaped in reward of their luſt, and almoſt at the ſame time* (22). Thereſa was treated very ſeverely by Count Alfonſo Henriquez her ſon. ‘ She found a way to diſcover her ſufferings to Don Alfonſo Raimund King of Caſtile, her nephew, and deſired him to eſpouſe her cauſe, and deliver her from her harſh confinement, in reward of which ſhe offered to ſettle the county of Portugal on him. King Alfonſo deſirous to re-unite that country to his territories, came in perſon with an army, in order to deliver this lady, perfectly forgetting that the Earl had aſſiſted him in his wars, againſt his mother Donna Urraca, Queen of Caſtile and Leon (23) ; but he was beaten and wounded in the foot.’ *After he was cured*, he re-entered Portugal, and beſieged the city of Guimaranes, in which Count Alfonſo Henriquez had ſhut himſelf up. ‘ This ſiege proved very tedious, and if the attacks were briſk on one ſide, the defence was brave on the other ; inſomuch that they were grown weary of it, when Egas Nunnez came out of the town, having firſt obtained a ſafe conduct, and made propoſals of peace which was concluded on condition that the Count of Portugal ſhould be obliged to come into Alfonſo's kingdom and take an oath of allegiance to him as his ſovereign. Thus the king drew off his army, and marched back to Toledo, without remembring his aunt's intereſt, on whoſe account he undertook the expedition, either being ſtruck with horror at her deteſtable courſe of life, or having perhaps engaged in this enterpriſe by ambition only (24).’

(20) Campion, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 134, *expreſſes it thus :* who (*Bermund Paës*) not ſatisfying her according to her mind, that mad and leud woman left him to marry his brother Ferdinando Paës de Tranſtamara.

(21) Mayerne, ubi ſupra.

(22) Id. ibid. *pag.* 343.

(23) Id. ibid. *pag.* 347.

(24) Campion, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 135, 136.

This might be the ſubject of many reflexions ; but I ſhall offer only a few. The firſt is,

I. That moſt authors who write lives, chuſe for their ſubjects only illuſtrious perſons ; and if ſome of them intermix ill men with the good, it is becauſe they are reſolved to give a perfect hiſtory of an entire order or claſs of men. I know no author who has attempted to write the lives of great criminals only. There is no want of encomiums on illuſtrious women ; libraries ſwarm with them ; but I queſtion whether there ever yet appeared a particular collection of thoſe women who were a ſcandal to their ſex and country. It is a copious ſubject which deſerves an author's pains, and it might be handled in Plutarch's manner : I mean, that as this famous writer choſe the moſt illuſtrious Romans and the moſt illuſtrious Grecians in order to parallel them ; in like manner the queens and princeſſes of different nations might be compared together. I have mentioned in another place (25), the compariſon which the Engliſh made betwixt Mary Stuart Queen of Scots, and Joan Queen of Naples. Many ſuch parallels might eaſily be made. Our Urraca might be compared to the heireſs of Guienne, or Margaret de Valois, wiſe of Henry IV. But the moſt exact parallel that could be found for her, would be that of her ſiſter Thereſa. They were both very leud ; the tyranny which both their paramours exerciſed, was owing to them, as well as a thouſand civil and foreign hoſtilities thereby occaſioned, and they were both degraded and poiſoned by their own ſons.

(25) In the remark [*K*], of the article NAPLES, (JOAN I, Queen of).

II. This confirms what I have already ſaid of the diſorders which thoſe countries are expoſed to, where the Salique Law doth not take place, and concerning the pernicious conſequences of the leud inclinations of a female ſovereign (26). Urraca could not bear that her ſubjects ſhould acknowledge her huſband's authority : that ſhe had her gallants was obvious to the whole world : the huſband was obliged to put a ſtop to this inordinate licentiouſneſs ; this he could not do without making room for factions, and this occaſioned a war. The Caſtilians diſguſted at him and their Urraca's gallant, turned to the riſing-ſun, and ſtirred up the ſon to dethrone his own mother ; and he readily complied with their inclination. This ſhews of what importance it is for a Queen to avoid at leaſt all public impurities ; for if ſhe once grows ſhameleſs, no bounds can reſtrain her. She will place her affection on deſpicable objects ; ſhe will not have any regard to merit in her choice, nor value any thing beſides the beauty and vigour of a young giddy-headed fellow, who will abuſe her credit, and occaſion a hundred pretexts for a civil war ; and beſides, become ſo inſolent as to uſe his miſtreſs ill, and render his aſſaſſination neceſſary (27). She will not conſider the regular example which ſhe owes to her children, when a premature or untimely ſucceſſion may raiſe them to the throne. In one word, it is a chain of ignominy and confuſion.

(26) See, remark [*G*], of the article NAPLES, (JOAN II, Queen of).

(27) See the remark [*X*], of the article ELIZABETH.

III. It is an aggravation of Urraca's crimes, that ſhe not only took no care to ſave appearances, but alſo that ſhe was married to an illuſtrious Monarch. He was ſir-named *El Bataillador*, - - - - *the Battle-Fighter* (28), becauſe he had fought twenty-nine battles, and been victorious in all of them, two only excepted. He was King of Arragon and Navarre, by a right independant of Urraca, which rendered his condition equal to that of this Queen. Notwithſtanding all this he did not eſcape the matrimonial diſgrace. So true it is that the perſonal bravery of a huſband is not ſufficient to avert that ſtorm (29).

(28) Gollut, Mémoires de la Franche-Comté, *pag.* 341.

(29) See, above, the remark [*B*], of the article BAUTRU (WILLIAM).

IV. Laſtly, I obſerve that Don Alfonſo Raimund, King of Caſtile, who had dethroned his mother Urraca, and kept her in priſon, did nevertheleſs engage in a war in favour of his aunt the Counteſs of Portugal, who was treated in the ſame manner by Don Alfonſo Henriquez her ſon. This aunt promiſed the King of Caſtile to declare him her heir to the prejudice of her ſon. ‘ Doloris illa impatientia Alfonſum Caſtellæ Regem eo nomine ſeptimum, ut propinquæ, miſeræ & captivæ matri opem ferat, per litteras obteſtatur adverſus impios filii conatus. Navatæ operæ mercedem, Portugaliæ principatum pollicetur Alfonſo filio, pro eo ac par erat, abdicato. Annuit ille ſive ambitione dominandi corruptus, ſive materteræ calamitatem miſeratus : validoque exercitu conflato in Portugaliæ fines irruit (30). - - - - - *Being not able to bear her grief, ſhe wrote a letter to Alfonſo VII King of Caſtile, beſeeching him that he would ſuccour his miſerable relation, and deliver a captive mother from the wicked attempts of her own ſon. She promiſed him as a reward the principality of Portugal, by excluding, her ſon Alfonſo as he deſerved. The King of Caſtile conſented to it, either from an ambitious deſire of extending his dominions, or out of pity to his aunt's diſtreſs : and having raiſed a great army he invaded Portugal.*’ This was ſufficient to invite him into Portugal with ſword in hand, and it is very probable, that amongſt other pretexts, he urged that of his aunt being diſpoſſeſſed and oppreſſed by an unnatural ſon : for where are the men who are aſhamed to condemn in another what they do themſelves ? Don Alfonſo Henriquez might very juſtly have vindicated himſelf by an argument

(30) Mariana, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 433.

as a ſcandalous and moſt unſavory one, after the vicious life of the Queen who is the ſubject of this article.

ment *ad hominem*, and returned an anſwer like that, which it is ſuppoſed Lamech's wives returned to Adam (31).

Obſerve, that Mr Lequien de la Neufville doth not ſay any thing poſitive of this Tereſa's amours. His words do not in the leaſt hinder her being thought a chaſt lady; for this looſe and general expreſſion *ſhe thought of nothing but dying more holily than ſhe had lived* (32), does not denote any gallantry. The conduct of a woman may be very oppoſite to holineſs, without being ſtained with any laſcivious crimes. He poſitively aſſures us, that Alfonſo, King of Caſtile, *took the field . . . . . . on pretence of delivering* that Princeſs (33). He places himſelf among thoſe who did not believe her to be a baſtard (34), and ſaith that Theodorus Godefroy evidently proves, that Don Henry her huſband, was great-grandſon to *Robert the devout, King of France* (35). Father Anſelme, who eſpouſes the ſame opinion, refers us to Godefroy's tract concerning the original of the Kings of Portugal, printed in the year 1624. I have not this edition, but if it affords no ſtronger proofs than that printed in 1612, which I have juſt now examined, I dare venture to ſay, that learned Hiſtoriographer doth not *evidently* prove this genealogical aſſertion.

(31) See the article LAMECH, remark [*E*].

(32) Lequien de la Neufville, Hiſt. Générale de Portugal, *Tom. i, pag.* 84, *Edit. of Paris*, 700.

(33) Id. ibid. *pag.* 81.

(34) Ibid. *pag.* 71.

(35) Ibid. *pag.* 70.

URSINUS (*a*) (ZACHARY) one of the moſt celebrated Reformed Divines of the XVIth century, was born at Breſlaw, the capital city of Sileſia, on the eighteenth of July (*b*) 1534. He had already made a conſiderable progreſs for his age, when he was ſent to Wittemberg in the year 1550 [*A*]. There he ſtudied ſeven years; and his father not being rich, he was aſſiſted by public and private gratuities, and he had alſo recourſe to tutorſhip. He ſo cloſely followed his ſtudies, that at Wittemberg he acquired a great knowledge, as well in Poetry [*B*] and the languages, as in Philoſophy and Divinity. Melanchthon, the ornament of that univerſity, conceived a very particular eſteem and affection for him. Urſinus accompanied him in the year 1557, to the conference of Worms, from whence he went to Geneva, and afterwards to Paris, where he ſtayed ſome time in order to learn French, and perfect himſelf in the Hebrew under the learned John Mercerus. He had ſcarce returned to Melanchthon at Wittemberg, when he received letters from the magiſtrates of Breſlaw in September 1558, containing an offer of the Maſterſhip of their ſchool. He accepted it, and ſo worthily acquitted himſelf in that poſt, that he might have continued in it as long as he pleaſed, if it had not been for the perſecution which the miniſters raiſed againſt him, as ſoon as they diſcovered that he was not a perfect Lutheran. In effect, when he explained Melanchthon's book *De examine ordinandorum ad Miniſterium*, he treated the ſubject *de Cæna Domini* in ſuch a manner, that he gave occaſion to the Demagogues (ſo the author of his life calls them (*c*)) to term him *Sacramentarian*. He juſtified himſelf by writing down his ſentiments concerning Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper: but this attempt for the reſtoration of peace proving ineffectual, Urſinus who hated quarrels of this ſort, choſe rather to go away than to be embroiled in them; accordingly he obtained an honourable diſmiſſion of the magiſtrates, and it being impoſſible for him to retire to his dear maſter Melanchthon, who had been lately dead in April 1560, he went to Zurich, where Martyr, Bullinger, Simler, Geſner, and ſeveral other great men received him with the greateſt kindneſs. He was ſoon drawn from thence by the univerſity of Heidelberg, which then wanted a learned man. He reached that city in September 1561, and was ſettled in the *Collegium Sapientiæ*, to inſtruct the ſtudents who had their education there. He alſo attempted to preach [*C*], but finding himſelf ſcarce fit for the exerciſe of that function, he quitted all thoughts of it. The want of that talent, was fully made up by his

(*a*) This name is a tranſlation of the German word *Bear*, which was the name of his family, and is the ſame as the Latin word *Urſus*.

(*b*) Freherus ſays the 29th of June, tho' he follows the ſame author as I do. Bucholcer ſays alſo the 29th of June.

(*c*) Ibi ſtatim *Urſinus* Sacramentarius à Demagogis proclamatus, & adverſarios expertus eſt quos prius amicos & fautores habuerat. *Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. pag.* 531.

[*A*] *He was ſent to Wittemberg in the year* 1550,] Melchior Adam is guilty of two contradictions in the ſame page (1). The firſt is, that Urſinus was ſent to the univerſity of Wittemberg at the age of ſixteen; the ſecond, that he entred Wittemberg on the firſt of May 1552. One of theſe particulars muſt neceſſarily be falſe, ſince the ſame author informs us, that Urſinus was born on the eighteenth of July in 1534. I reject the ſecond, tho' the author hath not expreſſed the year 1552 in numbers, but in words at length. *Ingreſſus eſt* Wittembergam *anno quinquageſimo ſecundo, Kalendis Maii.* The reaſon why I reject it, is becauſe he tells us alſo in the ſame page, that Urſinus having ſtudied above two years at Wittemberg, left it on account of the Plague, and went firſt to Torga whither Melanchthon was then retired, and afterwards to Breſlaw, carrying with him an advantageous teſtimonial from Melanchthon. Melchior Adam cites at large this teſtimonial dated on St James's day in the year 1552. He alſo mentions another, wherein the ſame Melanchthon on the firſt of October 1557, poſitively ſaith that Urſinus had been about ſeven years at Wittemberg. I have therefore reaſon to place his going thither in the year 1550, and to have more regard to the evidences that Melchior Adam hath furniſhed me with againſt himſelf than to his own text. We may very well infer from hence, that he did not much examine what he compiled. He hath confounded Urſinus's ſecond journey with the firſt; and Freherus, without either examining or rectifying any thing, barely ſaith that Urſinus went to Wittemberg in 1552. He cites the epitaph wrong, the year LXXXII is inſerted inſtead of LXXXIII, and the XIth of March inſtead of the VIth. At this rate how can one rely upon the printed copies of inſcriptions?

[*B*] *He acquired a great knowledge . . . . in Poetry.*] Urſinus, in his younger years, muſt needs have diſtinguiſhed himſelf in that particular; for I obſerve, that Melanchthon in his two teſtimonials, ſeems chiefly to value him on that head; and to confirm the praiſes which he beſtows on him in the firſt, he calls in as an evidence his Greek and Latin verſes that were publiſhed. *Cùm extent Latina & Græca Carmina Zachariæ Urſini Uratiſlavienſis eruditè ſcripta, prudentes & docti viri lectis illis ſuo judicio probabunt ingenium, ſtudia, & voluntatem ejus*, &c (2). Urſinus was then but eighteen years of age. He publiſhed, in 1560, a collection of epigrams, which he dedicated to John Friſius, in whoſe houſe he lodged at Zurich.

[*C*] *He alſo attempted to preach.*] Thuanus was miſinformed when he ſaid that the Proteſtants of the dioceſe of Cologn, aſſembled in the year 1582, to hear Zachary Urſinus, a preacher whom Prince John Caſimir had ſent them (3). Urſinus gave over preaching after a few eſſays, with which he himſelf was not pleaſed. Nor did he ſtir from Neuſtadt after he was eſtabliſhed there: beſides which, he was ſo broken and infirm in 1582, that he was by no means capable of exerciſing that function. It was John Stibelius who

(1) It is 529th of the volume containing the Lives of the German Divines.

(2) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. German. *pag.* 540.

(3) Thuan. Hiſt. *lib. lxxvi.*

his qualifications for a profeſſor; for he had a lively genius, a rich ſtock of knowledge, and a happy dexterity in clearing up matters. Wherefore keeping the preferment he had already, he was, beſides, made Profeſſor of the Common-places. In order to this the ſtatutes of the univerſity rendred it neceſſary for him to commence Doctor of Divinity; which he did ſolemnly on the twenty-fifth of Auguſt in the year 1562, and continued in the diſcharge of this poſt till 1568. He compoſed the Chatechiſm of the Palatinate, and by order of the Elector Palatine Frederic III, wrote an apology for it againſt the clamours which Flacius Illyricus, Heſhuſius, and ſome other rigid Lutherans publiſhed in 1563, on account of that work. The Elector finding himſelf not only expoſed to the complaints of the Lutheran Divines, but alſo to thoſe of ſome Princes, as if he had eſtabliſhed a doctrine concerning the Euchariſt, condemned by the Augſburg Confeſſion, was for that reaſon obliged to order an expoſition of the true doctrine concerning the ſacraments to be printed: this piece was written by our Urſinus, who, the following year (*d*), aſſiſted at the conference at Maulbrun, where he vigorouſly oppoſed the doctrine of Ubiquity. He afterwards wrote on that ſubject, and againſt ſeveral other Lutheran opinions. The plan and the ſtatutes which he drew up for that Elector in order to the eſtabliſhment of ſome ſchools, and ſeveral other ſervices, raiſed him ſo high in his eſteem, that ſeeing him reſolved to accept of the Divinity profeſſor's chair at Lauſanne in the year 1571, he wrote a long letter to him with his own hand, urging ſeveral reaſons to diſſuade him from it. The death of that Prince happening in 1577, occaſioned a great revolution in the Palatinate; for Prince Lewis, his eldeſt ſon, who ſucceeded him, would not ſuffer any miniſter there that was not a Lutheran. Urſinus, and the ſtudents whom he educated in the *Collegium Sapientiæ*, were obliged to depart (*e*). He retired to Neuſtadt, to be profeſſor of Divinity in the illuſtrious ſchool which Prince Caſimir the ſon of Frederic III, erected there at that time. He began his lectures there on the twenty-ſixth of May 1578. He alſo taught Logic in his chamber, publiſhed ſome books; and was preparing for the compoſition of ſeveral others, when his health, which had been impaired by ſeveral great indiſpoſitions ariſing from his incredible application to ſtudy, at laſt entirely ſunk under the weight of a tedious diſtemper, of which he died at Neuſtadt on the ſixth of March 1583, in the fourty-ninth year of his age. His works were collected after his death, as well by the care of his only ſon, who was a miniſter, as by the care of David Pareus and Quirinus Reuterus, his diſciples. To the laſt of theſe we owe their publication in three volumes. Urſinus was laborious [*D*], modeſt, paſſionate (*f*). As for readineſs in anſwering objections, he did not think he ought to aim at it; but he ſo contrived the matter, that if an explanation of any thing was ever demanded of him, it was done in writing at the end of his lecture, and he anſwered it the next day (*g*).

We have elſewhere (*b*) ſeen how fatiguing he found the direction of a college.

who went to the dioceſe of Cologn with Prince John Caſimir, as his Miniſter. Philip Pareus, his nephew (4), has obſerved this miſtake of Thuanus, and informs us at the ſame time, that this John Stibelius was afterwards Chaplain to the court of Heidelberg, and Counſellor to the Prince, and that he died in the year 1595, being the firſt Miniſter at Creutznac. It was probably the authority of Thuanus, which moved John Lætus, to repreſent Urſinus as one of the reformers of the Electorate of Cologne (5). Hofman following Lætus, makes him labour in this part of the Lord's vineyard. I ſay, *following Lætus*; for beſides, that he refers to him, he could not herein have been miſled by Moreri, who hath not ſaid any thing of Urſinus, (miſplaced under the name of Zachary,) unleſs that he was a Sileſian, and a Profeſſor at Heidelberg, who left behind him a great many books. He cites Geſner's *Bibliotheque*, which ſaith nothing of this author. He ought to have quoted the Epitome of that *Bibliotheque*. Several authors have committed the ſame miſtake.

[*D*] *Urſinus was laborious.*] To be convinced of this we need only conſider the inſcription which he had put upon the door of his ſtudy: it runs thus:

Amice, quiſquis huc venis
Aut agito paucis, aut abi,
Aut me laborantem adjuva (6).

Friend, whoſoe'er you be
That come to viſit me
Make quick diſpatch, and go away,
Or labour with me if you ſtay.

This was the reaſon that he paſſed for an ill-conditioned man (7).

Note, that Aldus Manutius, before him made uſe of a like inſcription. 'Nothing was more uneaſy to 'him than unprofitable viſits, which obliged him to 'loſe his time . . . to ſecure himſelf from which, in 'a civil manner, he cauſed to be writ over his cloſet 'door the following words: 'Quiſquis es, rogat te 'Aldus etiam atque etiam, ut ſi quid eſt quod à ſe 'velis, perpaucis agas, deinde actutùm abeas, niſi tan'quam Hercules veneris ſuppoſiturus humeros: ſemper 'enim erit quod & tu agas, & quotquot huc attule'rint pedes. - - - - *Whoſoever you are, Aldus earneſtly* '*begs of you that if you have any buſineſs with him, you* '*would diſpatch it in a few words, and then leave him* '*immediately, unleſs you come to his aſſiſtance, like Her*'*cules to relieve Atlas: for there will always be work* '*enough for you, and for as many as ſhall enter here.*' 'Theſe words that learned Greek Profeſſor, and af'terwards Printer at Baſil, John Oporinus, borrowed 'from him, and put them alſo on the door of his 'ſtudy (8).'

URSINUS (John) a French Phyſician, who flouriſhed in the XVIth century, wrote ſome Medicinal tracts in Latin verſe [*A*], and a Commentary on Cato's diſtichs (*a*). He

[*A*] *He wrote ſeveral Medicinal tracts in Latin verſe.*] He therefore deſerves, what he hath not, a place in the catalogue of poetical Phyſicians, publiſhed by Bartholinus. His *Proſopopœia Animalium aliquot*, is a poem in hexameter and pentameter verſe, in which he mentions ſeveral particulars, concerning the nature and quality of animals, more eſpecially as they belong to Phyſic. This book was printed at Vienne in

---

(*d*) That is in the year 1564.

(*e*) See, above, the text of the article PAREUS (David), after the citation (*d*).

(*f*) Fuit tamen ὀξύχολος, ut fit in ejuſmodi ingeniis. *Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, p.* 531.

(*g*) Taken from Melchior Adam, who wrote Urſinus's life from the Funeral Oration, which Francis Junius, Profeſſor of Divinity at Neuſtadt, ſpoke there, and from another Oration of Quirinus Reuterus.

(*b*) In the remark [*D*], of the article PAREUS (David).

(4) In Vita David. Parei, *pag. m.* 29. *He calls Thuanus*, Auguſtinus, *inſtead of Auguſtus.*

(5) Compend, Hiſtor. *pag. m.* 488.

(6) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra.

(7) See what Junius ſays concerning this in Urſinus's Funeral Oration.

(8) Chevillier, Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris, *pag.* 234, *He quotes James Zwinger, in the* Theatrum Vitæ humanæ, *at Baſil*, 1604, *pag.* 3713.

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

He is highly extolled by Stephen Royboſius Tulinus [*B*].

Dauphiné, in the year 1541, in 4to, with the *Scholia* of James Olivier, a Phyſician. And in the ſame city and year was printed his *Elegiæ de Peſte eaque medicinæ parte quæ in victus ratione conſiſtit* (1).

(1) Epit. Bibl. Geſneri, *p.* 509.

[*B*] *He is highly extolled by Stephen Roybosius Tulinus.*] His words cited by Reineſius, run thus. ‘Is eſt etenim, quo cum ſi congreſſus fueris, nihil ignotum homini eſſe putes. Mirus Poëta, eximius & bene fortunatus Medicus, Philoſophus ſummus, Orator facundus. Quorum documentum locupletiſſimum præſtant quæ de re medica carmine ſcripſit, eruditiſſima Comm. in Catonis libellum, ethologus elegans de moribus & alia plura quæ ſub ejus nomine circumferuntur (2). - - - *He is ſuch a man, that if you were to converſe with him, you would think he knew every thing. He is an admirable Poet, an excellent and ſucceſsful Phyſician, a Philoſopher of the firſt rank, and an eloquent Orator. All this fully appears from his learned diſſertations upon Phyſic, in verſe, his Commentary upon Cato's Diſtichs, his elegant treatiſe of Morality, and ſeveral other pieces which are publiſhed under his name.*’

(2) Reineſius, Epiſt. xli ad Daumium, *pag.* 118.

URSUS (Nicolas Raimarus) author of ſome Aſtronomical tracts, was born at Henſtede in Dithmarſen (*a*). He was a Swineherd in his youth, and did not begin to learn to read before the age of eighteen, when he diligently ſpent all his ſpare hours from keeping the hogs, in learning to read and write. After which, he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the learned languages; and being endowed with a ſtrong genius, ſoon made a conſiderable progreſs in the Latin and Greek tongues. He alſo learned French, the Mathematics, Aſtronomy (*b*), and the other parts of Philoſophy, moſt of them without the aſſiſtance of any maſter [*A*]. Afterwards, leaving his own country, he gained his ſubſiſtence by the inſtruction of youth: it was the buſineſs he followed in Denmark, in the year 1584, and on the frontiers of Pomerania and Poland in 1585. In this laſt place, he invented a new Aſtronomical ſyſtem, not very different from that of Tycho Brahe. He communicated it in the following year to the Landgrave of Heſſe, whence there aroſe a violent conteſt betwixt him and Tycho Brahe [*B*], in which our Raimarus diſcovered that he ſtill retained the manners of his primitive occupation; for he fell into ſuch a brutiſh paſſion againſt Tycho, that he expoſed himſelf to a criminal proceſs [*C*]. He read private Mathematical lectures at Straſburgh in the year 1588, and in 1589, and alſo

(*a*) Part of the Duchy of Holſtein.

(*b*) Juſtus Burgius, Engineer to Philip and Maurice, Landgraves of Heſſe, taught him Mathematics and Aſtronomy.

[*A*] *He learned . . . . . without the aſſiſtance of any maſter.*] It was his good luck to make but one leap from the plough to the Republic of Letters, and he was not like others, obliged to ſerve an apprenticeſhip in the ſchools. *Aliaſque ſcientias Philoſophicas, brevi, & pleraſque quidem* αὐτοδίδακτος, *ſibi reddidit familiares.* Scholas *enim, ut ipſe in Libro* (1) *paulo ante laudato,* Ruſticum *ſe vocans* Dithmarſum, *teſtatur*, uti ſus hortum percurrit, & vix à limine ſalutavit, ſed à Stiva illico, ſingulari quodam fato ac genio, in Remp. literariam irrupit (2). This is an undeniable proof of great parts. His works afford ſeveral marks of his haſty ſtudies; and his learning was as ill digeſted as his ſtile was incorrect: ‘Homo certe fuit admodum ingenioſus, & in Antiquorum etiam lectione verſatus, ſed doctrinæ indigeſtæ, Styli haud ſatis caſtigati, & vere, quod Naſonis de Ennio eſt Judicium, *Ingenio maximus, Arte rudis* (3). - - - *He was without doubt a very ingenious man, and well verſed in the Antients; but his learning was indigeſted, and his ſtile ſomewhat incorrect; and the character which Ovid gives Ennius might truly be applied to him,*

> ‘*A noble genius unimprov'd by art.*

(1) De Syſtemate mundano.

(2) Mollerus, Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, *pag.* 629.

(3) Id. ibid.

[*B*] *There aroſe a violent conteſt betwixt him and Tycho Brahe.*] Tycho Brahe accuſed him of Plagiariſm. Urſus, ſaid he, coming with his maſter into my ſtudy, ſaw the ſcheme of my ſyſtem on a piece of paper, and not long after arrogated the invention to himſelf: *Cum menſe Septembri verſaretur apud ipſum nobilis vir Ericus Langius, quidam illius famulus nomine Nicolaus Raymarus, Dithmarſus, delineatam hypotheſin quapiam in charta obiter vidit, ac ſibi quaſi à ſe in angulo Poloniæ quodam excogitatam arrogans, illam ut ſuam biennio poſt apud Landgravium venditavit; ubi & impudenter in Tychonem deblaterans repreſſus à Rothmanno fuit* (4). Upon this charge, Urſus, in a book he publiſhed at Prague *de Aſtronomicis Hypotheſibus*, outrageouſly abuſed Tycho Brahe, who was touched to the quick with this ill uſage. Gaſſendus gives us the particulars of this ſtory. ‘Quia ſuperiore anno Raimarus Urſus, ille Dithmarſus, Librum Pragæ ediderat de Aſtronomicis Hypotheſibus, in quo Rothmannum quidem, & Roëſlinum variis probris onerat, ſed Tychonem innumeris, occaſione eorum, quæ de ſe in Epiſtolis ejus legerat: ideò, cùm ejuſmodi Liber ad Tychonis manus recens perveniſſet, iſthæc occaſione ipſius literis inſeruit, *Vidiſti proculdubio Plagiarii mei, impuri illius Urſi, maledicentiſſimum ſcriptum, in quo præter alia innumera convitia, meo, & meorum honori non parcit. Ego quidem refutatione illum indignum cenſeo, cum omneis modeſtiæ limites, imò honeſtatis longè tranſcenderit: efficiam tamen, ut non impunè ferat* (5). - - - - *Raimarus Urſus, a native of Dithmarſen, had publiſhed the year before at Prague a book* de Aſtronomicis Hypotheſibus, *wherein he throws out various reproaches upon Rothmannus and Roëſlinus, but chiefly upon Tycho Brahe, on account of what he had ſaid of him in his letters. For that reaſon Tycho, ſoon after the book had come to his hands, took occaſion to inſert the following words in a letter.* You have ſeen, no doubt, the ſcurrilous writing of my dirty Plagiary, Urſus, wherein, beſides innumerable other reproaches, he does not even ſpare the honour of me and my family. I for my part do not think him worthy of a confutation, ſince he has far exceeded all the bounds of modeſty, and even of honeſty: I will nevertheleſs take care to make him ſuffer for it.’ Theſe are Tycho's words in a letter to Longomontanus. But more on this head in the following remark.

(4) Gaſſendus, in Vita Tychon. *lib. ii, pag. m.* 411, *ad ann.* 1584. *See alſo lib. iii, pag.* 428.

(5) Gaſſend. ibid. *lib. v, pag.* 451, *ad ann.* 1597.

[*C*] *He expoſed himſelf to a criminal proceſs.*] In Tycho Brahe's Funeral Oration, we are told that a man of ſenſe and learning, but utterly void of religion or virtue, was not content to arrogate the Aſtronomical inventions of this great man to himſelf, but alſo barbarouſly injured his reputation with black calumnies. The Orator adds, that if his death had not put a ſtop to the proſecution commenced againſt him upon that account, he had been ſeverely puniſhed. This is ſaid of our Raimarus. *Ante annos pauculos, quidam ingenioſus, & doctus, ſed abſque religione, & virtute homo, tetricum, & famoſum contra præſtantiſſimum hunc Virum divulgavit ſcriptum, quale in hoc genere non vidit antiquitas, nec fortaſſis ſpectatura eſt unquam poſteritas. Non ſat fuerat infamatori illi plagium committere litterarum, &* Tychonis *Hypotheſin, Uraniburgi repertam, falſariè pro proprio invento venditare, niſi etiam Virum aviti generis, ſummæ eruditionis, inculpatiſſimæ vitæ, cum tota ipſius honeſtiſſima familia, ſexcentis contumeliis, & totidem mendaciis, apud alios, ſi non deformatum, ſuſpectum ſaltem reddidiſſet. Et profectò jure actum cùm hoc fuiſſet, velut etiam jam agi cœptum fuerat, niſi mors feram illam ſingulari beneficio affeciſſet, & pœnæ ſubduxiſſet commeritiſſimæ* (6). Gaſſendus quotes a fragment of a letter, by which it appears, that Tycho Brahe deſigned to proſecute his adverſary. His own words, which inform us that Raimarus Urſus eſcaped from Prague, run thus: ‘Cæterum de fera iſta Dithmarſica, nimis effera, & bruta, ut aliqua ſubjungam, licet indigna ſit, cujus recordetur,

(6) Joann. Jeſſenius, in Orat. funebri Tychon. Brahei, *apud* Gaſſendum *in Appendice* Vitæ Tychonis, *pag.* 483.

alſo publiſhed a book. After that he was called by his Imperial Majeſty, to teach the Mathematics at Prague. But he ſilently retired from that town to avoid the preſence of Tycho Brahe, in the year 1598, and died ſome time after (*c*). He was entirely unknown to Voſſius: I ſhall ſet down the titles of his works [*D*].

(*c*) *Taken from John Mollerus's book, intituled,* Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, *printed at Hamburgh in the year* 1691, *p.* 628, 629, *Part. iv. He quotes for moſt of thoſe things* Ant. Heimreichius, in Catalogo Autorum Chronico Dithmarſico præfixo.

‘ recordetur, ſcias iſtam ante aliquot ſeptimanas, prout nuper reſcivi, Pragâ ſe ſubduxiſſe, ſive malè ſibi conſcia, & quòd juſtas pœnas per leges formidaret; ſive quid aliud ſinu ſuo latenter more ſuo ruminans. Sed inveſtiganda tamen ſuo tempore per otium, atque in jus pertrahenda, & punienda, quod etiam optimi quique Pragæ ſuadent (7). - - - - - *As for this wild beaſt of Dithmarſen, who is indeed too ſavage and brutal, though he does not deſerve to be mentioned, yet I would have you to know that, as I have been lately informed, he left Prague ſome weeks ago; being either diſturbed by an evil conſcience, and dreading the juſt vengeance of the law, or elſe hatching, as his manner is, ſome new projects in his head. But care ſhall be taken to find him out ſome time or other, that he may be brought to juſtice and condign puniſhment; for ſo the beſt people of Prague adviſe me to do.*’ To make the character of this *quondam* ſwineherd better known, I add that he had raiſed a report, that Rothmannus was dead of a ſcandalous diſtemper (8). Rothmannus appeared very zealous for Tycho Brahe, when he ſaw that Urſus calumniated him at the court of Heſſe: from that time they became utter enemies, and treated each other with the utmoſt violence. The following words were written by Rothmannus in the year 1586. ‘ Plura ſcriberem præſertim de impuro nebulone Nicolao Raymaro Urſo Dithmarſo, qui ſuperiori hyeme apud tuam Excellentiam typographicam literarum collectionem & ordinationem, ut opinor, exercuit (9). *I ſhould ſay more of that ſorry fellow Nicolas Raimarus Urſus of Dithmarſen, who laſt winter, if I am not miſtaken, followed the buſineſs of collecting and diſpoſing the letters for the preſs at your Excellency's court.*’ *Fuerat ille quoque Rothmanno ea propter infenſus, quod Caſſellis tranſiens & Tychonem convitiis proſcindens repreſſus ab eo vehementer fuiſſet* (10).

(7) Tycho Brahe, Epiſt. ad Longomontanum, apud Gaſſend. in Vita Tychon. *lib. v, pag.* 455.

(8) Rumorem ſparſerat fuiſſe ipſum pudendis neſcio quibus morbis pridem infectum, & tandem confectum. *Gaſſend. ibid.*

(9) Gaſſend. ibid.

(10) Id. ibid.

[*D*] *I ſhall ſet down the titles of his works.*] He publiſhed his *fundamentum Aſtronomicum* in the year 1589, at Straſburgh, at the expence of his pupils. His book *de Aſtronomicis Hypotheſibus ſeu de Syſtemate mundi* was printed at Prague in the year 1597, as was alſo *Aſtronomicarum Hypotheſium à ſe inventarum Vindicatio & Defenſio: item Problemata totius proceſſus Aſtronomicæ obſervationis ſeu rationis obſervandi* τὰ φαινόμενα (11). The Oxford catalogue mentions our Raimarus's *Tetragoniſmus Circuli expeditiori ſtructura productus per Pet. Crugerum*, printed at Leipſic 1607 in 4to. Mr Konig (12) aſcribes to him a book *de Doctrina ſinuum & triangulorum*, printed in 1588. Mr Mollerus (13) ſays that he never ſaw the book *de Civitatibus in Dithmarſia Hanſeaticis*, printed at Leipſic in the year 1563, and aſcribed to Raimarus Urſus by Albert Bartholinus and Lipenius. He doubts whether any ſuch work was ever publiſhed, by reaſon that there is not one town in the whole province of Dithmarſen which ever engaged in the Hanſeatic confederacy: ‘ Impoſitum illis eſſe à catalogis, quos frequenter exſcribunt, proletariis, conjecto (14). - - - *I conjecture that they have been impoſed upon by the catalogues which are often wretchedly drawn up and tranſcribed.*’ I do not know whether he carefully obſerved Bartholin's words, which run thus: *Nicolau. Reimers. De Civitatibus Henſaticis in Dithmarſia, Gæodeſia Rantzoviana,* Leipſic 1583 in 4to (15). Who can certainly conclude from hence that he ſpeaks of our Raimarus Urſus? Is it not more probable that he did not mean him? He was no Dane, nor author in Denmark; and therefore it is not probable that Bartholin ſhould put him into his catalogue. Nor is it true that Bartholin ſays that this book was printed at Leipſic in the year 1563.

(11) Mollerus, ubi ſupra, *Part. iv, pag.* 628.

(12) Bibliotheca vet. & nova, *at the word* Urſus. *He ſpeaks of him as of another writer under the word* Reimarus, *and he mentions one Nicolas Reimarus, who writ* Theatrum temporis, *in fol.*

(13) Iſagoge, *&c. pag.* 517.

(14) Ibid. *pag.* 628.

(15) Alb. Bartholinus, de Scriptis Danorum, *pag.* 109.

USHER (Henry) Archbiſhop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland in the beginning of the XVIIth century, ſpent a great deal of time in the compoſition of a book againſt Cardinal Bellarmin; but we are told that his wife forced the ſheets from him, and threw them into the fire, on pretence that the match was not equal betwixt a man burdened with children, and domeſtic affairs, and a perſon diſingaged from all worldly concerns. The author who relates this, and who may very well be ſuſpected, adds that Todd Biſhop of Down (*a*) being diſguſted at his wife, and deſirous to put her away, petitioned this Archbiſhop for a letter of divorce, but could not obtain it [*A*]. He conjectures that the ſole reaſon of this prelate's refuſal was the fear of diſpleaſing his wife, who would have been very uneaſy at any thing which tended to introduce the diſannulling of marriages, by reaſon ſhe might her ſelf at ſome time or other be in danger of falling under the like inconvenience. The reader may believe as much or as little of this as he pleaſes. I will not anſwer for the truth of it, and indeed I relate it for no other reaſon than to make way for the examination of a falſe ſuggeſtion of Father Garaſſe [*B*]. Obſerve

(*a*) In the Province of Ulſter.

[*A*] *The author who relates this, and who may very well be ſuſpected, adds,* &c. . . . . .] Henry Fitz Simon, an Iriſh Jeſuit, relates the matter thus: *Toddus pſeudo-Epiſcopus Dunenſis in Ibernia, ſuæ conjugis ſeu verius ſcorti pertæſus . . . . . eam voluit repudiare. Acceſſit primò ſymmiſtam ſuum (ut loquuntur) totius Iberniæ Primatem,* Henricum Uſsherum; *libellum ab eo repudii acriter efflagitans. Nimirum fruſtrà, apud virum integerrimum ſcilicet, & apprimè uxoris (quæ illi viribus ſuis quam tenuiſſimis impar onus exantlanti, nempe multorum annorum elucubrationes contra Bellarminum, extorſit, tradiditque Vulcano, quod iniqua futura eſſet, ut ajebat, concertatio, inter hominem prolibus & domeſticis curis gravatum, & hominem omnis ſæcularis ſolicitudinis expertem) imperio, ac voluntati, obnoxium. Diſplicuiſſet autem matronæ gravi (abdominis centum pondio) divortii Miniſtralis cauſaria prætenſio, per quam ipſa fortè brevi, technis id generis Miniſtralibus, conjugali toro diſcluderetur* (1).

(1) Henric. Fitz Simon Britannomach. Miniſtrorum, *lib. iii, cap.* vi, *pag.* 348.

[*B*] *For the examination of a falſe ſuggeſtion of Father Garaſſe.*] That author's ſtile is ſo well known that the burleſque expreſſions in the following quotation will not appear very ſurpriſing. ‘ The miniſters (ſaith he) as Humphredus tells us in the ſecond part of his Jeſuitiſm, accuſe the Jeſuits of Magic by reaſon of their learning. No wonder (ſay they) that the Jeſuits are learned ſince they are all Magicians, and learn all they know by diabolical aſſiſtance (2). . . . . . Let them remember the ſtory of an eminent Roman citizen, who was accuſed by his enemies that he made uſe of Sorcery to attract the fat and ſubſtance of the adjoining lands, by reaſon that he had always a much richer crop than any of his neighbours: a day being appointed, he brought before the court his oxen in good caſe, his ploughs in good repair, and his children well fed, and offered no other defence to the Judges than, *Gentlemen, theſe are the charms I make uſe of, Hæc ſunt veneficia mea Quirites,* nor can I further produce my ſweats, my waking nights, and toilſome days. I ſay the ſame thing to the Calviniſt and Lutheran miniſters; the Jeſuits are not embarraſſed with the family cares of the miniſters, they are not clogged with the long train of a wife and a whole neſt of miniſterial brats; their nocturnal reſt is not broken with the cries of ten or a dozen chits, nor are they interrupted in

(2) Garaſſe, Recherche des Recherches d'Eſtienne Paſquier, *pag.* 973, 974.

Obſerve that whilſt this Henry Uſher was only Archdeacon of Dublin, he was twice deputed to Queen Elizabeth, firſt on an affair relating to St Patrick's Church (*b*), and afterwards

(*b*) The Cathedral of Dublin.

the day-time with the cares of maintaining fifteen or ſixteen craving famiſhed children; any more than they are diverted by uſury, luxury, and pleaſures. *Hæc ſunt eorum veneficia.* Theſe are their magical charms, of which I would willingly prepare an amulet to hang about the miniſters necks. I remember to have read in Conſtantine Baſſus's Geoponics in the fourteenth book page 380, that an honeſt countryman wiſhed to be informed of a charm to prevent the cats, rats, and ſnakes ever infeſting his pigeon houſe, and was anſwered by an anonymous author, that he knew a very effectual one to keep out the cats and rats. I. Said he, carefully ſhut your pigeon-houſe door. II. Open the windows as little as you can. III. Keep your walls tight and whole. IV. Stop up the chinks of the door, and I will engage neither cat nor rat ſhall enter your pigeon houſe. Accordingly I can oblige the Calviniſt miniſters with a good charm, that they may be as learned as the Jeſuits. 1. Let them diſcharge themſelves of their wives, and the brawls of a family. 2. Let them ſpend leſs time in combing their hair, tricking themſelves up, and ſetting their ſtarched bands and ruffs. 3. Let them more ſeriouſly apply themſelves to the ſtudy of the goſpel than of Rabelais; which advice is particularly directed to the miniſter Du Moulin. 4. Let not Chamier, Pother, Bonnet, Bonvouloir, and other miniſters fill themſelves with ſuch loads of wine and meat, in order to keep their minds more free and unclogged. . . . . . 5. If they take and make uſe of this amulet, and are endowed with as good capacities as the Jeſuits, I promiſe that they will become as learned as they (3).'

Before I make any reflexions on this paſſage, I ſhall look back to the original of the ſtory of the Roman citizen, who was accuſed of fertilizing his land by Sorcery. It is related by Pliny. ‘C. Furius Creſinus, *ſays he* (4), è ſervitute liberatus, cum in parvo admodum agello largiores multo fructus perciperet, quam ex ampliſſimis vicinitas, in invidia magna erat, ceu fruges alienas pelliceret veneficiis. Quamobrem a Sp. Albino curuli die dicta, metuens damnationem, cum in ſuffragium tribus oporteret ire, inſtrumentum ruſticum omne in forum attulit, & adduxit filiam validam, atque (ut ait Piſo) bene curatam ac veſtitam, ferramenta egregie facta, graves ligones, vomeres ponderoſos, boves ſaturos. Poſtea dixit: Veneficia mea, Quirites, hæc ſunt: nec poſſum vobis oſtendere, aut in forum adducere lucubrationes meas, vigiliaſque, & ſudores. Omnium ſententiis abſolutus itaque eſt. - - - *Caius Furius Creſinus having recovered his liberty, was much envyed becauſe he reaped far more plentiful crops from a ſmall field than his neighbours did from very large ones, and it was given out that he attracted other peoples corn to himſelf by charms. Being therefore ſummoned to appear by the Ædile Spurius Albinus, and doubting the iſſue of the trial, when the votes of the tribes were to be called, he produced all his inſtruments of huſbandry in the Forum, and brought his daughter there in a vigorous ſtate of health, and (as Piſo ſays) well fed and cloathed, likewiſe his iron-tools extremely well faſhioned, his heavy ſpades, his ponderous plough-ſhares, and his oxen in good caſe. Afterwards addreſſing himſelf to the people, theſe, ſaid he, are the charms I make uſe of; nor can I further produce and ſhew you my ſweats, my waking nights, and my toilſome days. Upon this he was acquitted by the unanimous conſent of the people.*' He doth not mention the time when this happened; but in general we may gueſs at it, becauſe it is very well known that Spurius Albinus here mentioned was Conſul in the year of Rome 568.

Take notice, by the by, that the antient Romans were ſo fully perſuaded that ſome Magic charms could remove the fruits of the earth from one place to another, that the laws of the twelve tables eſtabliſhed a great puniſhment againſt thoſe pretended enchanters. Mr Gravina, who to his polite literature has added the knowledge of the law, very juſtly laughs at this childiſh error. ‘Sequitur, *ſays he* (5), frugum incantatio; cum enim veteres illi omnium bonarum artium & diſciplinarum rudes putarent fruges carminibus magicis vel averti poſſe vel traduci (ut enim Tibullus ait,

Carmen vicinis fruges traducit ab agris.)

ideo Decemviri pro ſua puerili ac ridicula ſuperſtitione ſanxerunt, ut qui fruges *excantaſſit*, ſive Carminibus magicis creſcere prohibuerit, aut ſegetem alienam pellexerit, Cereri ſacer eſſet. - - - *Next follows the incantation of corn. The Antients, being very ignorant of the Arts and Sciences, imagined that corn might be either blaſted or tranſported from one place to another by magical charms (for as Tibullus ſays,*

By charms the corn is from the neighb'ring fields
Mov'd and tranſplanted.) . . . . . .

for this reaſon it was that the Decemvirs *in their childiſh and ridiculous ſuperſtition made a law, that whoſoever ſhould enchant the corn, that is, hinder it from growing by magical charms, or remove it from his neighbour's field into his own, ſhould be devoted to Ceres.*'

WHETHER ſingle men ſtudy better and write more good books than married men.

The reflexions which I deſign to make on Garaſſe's words will not concern his calumnies or comical hyperboles; I leave them to himſelf, and fix only on that which may in general confirm the maxim or principle of the wife of Henry Uſher, Primate of Ireland. That woman ſuppoſed that an author who had children was not able to hold up againſt a Monk. This maxim indeed appears ſomewhat probable in theory, but is falſe in practice; for it is eaſy to prove by numerous examples, that ſeveral perſons who have been clogged with the cares of a family have been very great authors, whether we conſider the quality or the quantity of their productions. If Garaſſe had writ judiciouſly, he would not have brought into play, Peter du Moulin and Daniel Chamier, two miniſters who were very fit examples to overthrow what he deſigned to eſtabliſh. They were both married and had children, and yet they wrote a great many good books, and glorioufly diſputed *viva voce*, and in their writings, with the beſt controverſiſts of the Romiſh party. The examples of ſeveral other miniſters might be added to theſe two. It may in general be affirmed that the maxim of the Primate's wife is ſo often contradicted and refuted by experience, that it ought by no means to paſs into a rule. For whatever is liable to ſo many exceptions doth not deſerve that name, and whoever would draw up a rule or aphoriſm upon ſuch a point, muſt neceſſarily make uſe of this limitation, *all other things being equal, an author diſengaged from all domeſtic affairs will exceed one clogged with a wife and children.* But who can ſuppoſe this equality, or where is it to be found? Compare an unmarried and a married writer together as long as you pleaſe, and if you find that the one hath not leſs wit, judgment or memory than the other, you will yet perceive that they are not perfectly alike in other particulars. The married man may prove more ſtudious and robuſt, and thereby make up for the diſtractions occaſioned by a thouſand petty domeſtic cares. He applies himſelf to ſtudy with more ardor after he hath diſpatched the affairs of his family; the ſtrength of his conſtitution and head allow him to ſtudy till midnight, and by that means to retrieve the loſt hours of the day. He is obliged to go abroad twice or thrice in the morning, and as often in the afternoon, but he returns to his ſtudy as ſoon as he can, and ſtudies with the greater ardency, becauſe he knows that he hath been and ſhall be interrupted. Four or five hours of ſuch a cloſe ſtudy are very well worth ſeven or eight of the common languid and lifeleſs labours of thoſe people, who have abundance of leiſure. They ſtudy at their eaſe, without hurrying or fatiguing themſelves, and reſt from time to time; nor are they ſo ſollicitous to avoid the idle ſpending of ſome hours: beſides, if they did not reſt themſelves, their way of going on may aptly be compared to that of a meſſenger, who without ever halting continually moves on his dull pace, but doth not reach the inn where he puts up at night ſooner than he, who after frequently ſtopping, mends his pace and ſets up a run.

(3) Id. ibid. *pag.* 976, & *ſeq.*

(4) Plinius, *lib. xviii, cap. vi, pag. m.* 448. Note, that in chapter iv, of the xivth book, pag. m. 126, he ſays, that the Grammarian Palæmon, whoſe vineyards were very fruitful, was ſuſpected of witchcraft: *litteris ejus altioribus contra id pigra vicinitate ſibi patrocinante.* His neighbours excuſed their lazineſs upon that account.

(5) J. Vincentius Gravina, in Specimine priſci Juris, *pag.* 53, Opuſculorum, *Editionis Romanæ*, 1696, in 12mo.

afterwards for the foundation of the univerſity of Dublin. In both theſe commiſſions he was ſucceſsful (*c*).

(c) *Taken from the life of James Uſher*, in Collectione Bateſiana, *pag.* 735.

The latter is a lively image of the ſtudies of an active author, whoſe domeſtic cares frequently divert him from them.

Though ſome authors, who are free from avocations of this nature, ſtudy very hard, you will find on the other ſide that they want the natural endowments which others have, their frail conſtitution forcing them to ſtop. They find themſelves exhauſted, and are neceſſitated to keep from their ſtudies till a long repoſe hath recruited their loſt ſpirits. If they do not lie under this inconveniency, there are others which fall in their way, perhaps the want of books. A thouſand real obſtacles may be ſuppoſed which break in upon the equality, and compenſate the diſadvantage of interruptions: wherefore Garaſſe and Henry Uſher's wife advanced a very uncertain maxim. It is nevertheleſs true, that it may be ſaid of ſome authors, that *they would have made a greater figure if they had lived ſingle*, or that *they would not have publiſhed ſo many excellent books, if they had been embarraſſed with a family.* We may alſo aſſert, that ſeveral perſons buried in obſcurity had become very learned, if they had lived without a wife, miſtreſs, children, law-ſuits, &c.

Obſerve that the Monks have not ſo much leiſure as is imagined; the choir and breviary robs the ſtudious of a great deal of time; and if any of them diſtinguiſhes himſelf by learning or piety, he is loaded with confeſſions. He cannot exempt himſelf from the direction of conſciences, which frequently draws him from his ſtudy; he is obliged to give audience to a thouſand devout women, whoſe ſcruples often are very ridiculous and very odd. Bellarmin had not ſo much time as the Archbiſhop of Armagh's lady imagined. I find in a tract publiſhed in the year 1625, that 'Cardinal 'Bellarmin, of pious memory, frequently ſaid to the 'moſt illuſtrious Cardinal de la Roche-foucault, *Mon'ſignore veramente ci ſono troppo Chriſtiani al mondo.* 'I aſſure you that I am crowded with people and vi'ſits; and muſt own that I think there are too many 'Chriſtians in the world (6).'

(6) Francis de Fontaine, (*it is a fictitious name which the Jeſuit Stephen Binet took. See* Alegambe, *p.* 426) *preacher to the king*, Reſponſe aux Demandes d'un grand Prelat touchant la Hierarchie de l'Egliſe, & la juſte Défenſe des Privilegiez & des Religieux, *p.* 204, 205.

USHER (JAMES), nephew to the former, and Archbiſhop of Armagh, was one of the moſt illuſtrious prelates of the XVIIth century, as well with regard to his great piety and other virtues, as his profound learning. He was born at Dublin on the fourth of January 1580, and was taught to read by two aunts, though they were born blind: this is very particular. He made ſuch an expeditious progreſs in the ſciences, that at the age of eighteen he was able to diſpute with a famous Jeſuit, who, like a Goliath, challenged the Proteſtants [*A*]. He was ordained prieſt in the year 1601, though under the age preſcribed by the canons. He was choſen Divinity Profeſſor at Dublin about the year 1607, and exerciſed that employment for the ſpace of thirteen years. He choſe Bellarmin's controverſies for the ſubject of his lectures. He was conſecrated Biſhop of Meath in the year 1620, and Archbiſhop of Armagh in 1624 (*a*). He very vigorouſly oppoſed the deſign of the Lord Falkland, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, to permit the Papiſts

(*a*) *Taken from his life*, in Collectione Bateſiana.

[*A*] *At the age of eighteen he was able to diſpute with a famous Jeſuit . . . . . who challenged the Proteſtants.*] This Jeſuit was the ſame Henry-Fitz Simon, whom I have cited in the preceding article. He was kept priſoner in the caſtle of Dublin, but his confinement did not hinder his challenging all the Proteſtant Clergy to diſpute with him, and his fiercely engaging to maintain what they took for the weakeſt part of the Romiſh religion, and to attack what they thought the ſtrongeſt part of the Proteſtant doctrine. *Donec ego*, ſaith he (1), *cauſæ bonitate ſuffultus, defendere quicquid inter nos infirmiſſimum, vel impugnare quicquid inter ipſos tutiſſimum reputant, in me reciperem.* James Uſher, whilſt yet beardleſs, had the courage to enter the liſts with this old experienced ſtager, and we are aſſured that he vanquiſhed him. 'Cum Henrico Simonido Jeſuita, 'poſcente ſibi dari adverſarios in caſtro Dublinenſi de 'arce cauſæ ſuæ (ſcil. Antichriſto) ſæpius ita conflixit, 'imberbis juvenis cum veterano milite, ut & provacationis eum ſuæ pœniteret, & ſatis antagoniſtarum 'in uno hoc octodenario tyrone experiretur. Ipſum 'audite Jeſuitam in præfatione libri ſui quem de 'Britannomachia miniſtrorum placuit inſcribere. *Pro'diit quidem ſemel*, (*inquit*) *octodenarius præcocis ſapien'tiæ juvenis, de abſtruſiſſimis rebus Theologicis, cum ad'huc Philoſophica ſtudia non eſſet emenſus, nec ephebis 'egreſſus, diſputandi avidus, &c.* Quem poſtea cum 'adoleverat *Acatholicorum doctiſſimum* idem ille pro'nunciabat, amplum ſane & inſolitum ex id genus ad'verſarii ore teſtimonium (2). - - - *When the Jeſuit 'Henry-Fitz Simon demanded that his adverſaries ſhould 'meet him in the caſtle of Dublin, this beardleſs youth 'entring the liſts with an old champion, had ſeveral diſ'putes with him touching the main point of his cauſe,* 'viz. *Antichriſt. The Jeſuit was ſo handled that he 'heartily repented his challenge, and found antagoniſts 'enough in this one youth, who was only eighteen years of 'age. Hear what he himſelf owns in the Preface to his 'book which he has thought fit to intitule,* de Britanno'machia Miniſtrorum. Once, indeed, *ſays he*, there 'came forth a youth, not above eighteen years old, 'but of a forward underſtanding, who ſhewed a great 'eagerneſs to diſpute upon the moſt abſtruſe points of 'Divinity, tho' he has not as yet finiſhed his Philo'ſophical ſtudies, nor was arrived at the age of a man, '&c. *When he was grown up, the ſame Jeſuit de'clared him to be the moſt learned of all the Proteſtants, 'which was truly a high and uncommon teſtimony from 'the mouth of ſuch an adverſary.*' Pray obſerve the *et cetera* at the end of the citation out of the Jeſuit's Preface, and do not imagine that ſome words were omitted becauſe they were foreign to the ſubject; for they were only ſuppreſſed becauſe they are inconſiſtent with what was ſaid juſt before. The whole paſſage of Fitz Simon runs thus: *Sed neque in ſpecula eminentem videre, neque in caſtris, clauſtriſque Stentoria ut agnoſcunt voce provocantem, exaudire voluerunt. Prodiit quidem ſemel in ſumma vocis vultuſque trepidatione, octodenarius præcocis ſapientiæ (non tamen malæ, ut videbatur indolis) juvenis, neſcio an auræ popularis cupidior, ſaltem de abſtruſiſſimis rebus Theologicis cum adhuc pholoſophica ſtudia non eſſet emenſus, nec Ephebis egreſſus, diſputandi avidus. Hunc autem juſſi ſuorum calculos adferre, quibus pugil ſeu agoniſta idoneus renunciaretur, & vel cum ipſo diſputationem me initurum. Sed ſicut ipſi eum minime tanto honore dignati ſunt, ità me viciſſim ſua deinceps præſentia dignatus ipſe non fuit* (3). The Jeſuit aſſures us that he aſked this ſcholar, who trembling came to diſpute with him, *Are you authorized by your ſuperiors?* and that he offered, if he was, to enter the liſts with him; but the young man not being honoured with any ſuch commiſſion could produce no credentials, and never came again. Nevertheleſs it is aſſured in the life of Uſher, which I have already cited, that he frequently diſputed with this Jeſuit, and got the better of him. We read in another life of this Archbiſhop, that he engaged in this diſputation with the conſent of the whole univerſity, and that at the ſecond conference he overthrew and ſo ſilenced his antagoniſt, that, after that time, he never was bold enough to engage again, tho' provoked to it: *Communi Academiæ conſenſu placuit Uſſerium, qui tum non niſi Artium Baccalaureus* 18 *aut* 19 *ætatis annum agebat, cum ipſo committere: qui utut ab initio ab antagoniſta ſuo fere pro puero ac deſpectui haberetur, poſt unum tamen alterumque colloquium adeo præ fidentiam ejus perdomuit, ut ad incitas ſe, certe ad ſilentium*

(1) Henr. Fitz. Simon, *Epiſt. dedicat.* Britannomach. Miniſtrorum.

(2) Vita Jacobi Uſſerii, in Collectione Bateſiana, *pag.* 737.

(3) Fitz Simon, *in Præfat.* Britannom. *pag.* 14.

Papiſts the public exerciſe of their religion [*B*], provided they would pay the neceſſary ſums for the ſubſiſtence of the forces. He went to England in the year 1640, and never returned to Ireland, being hindred by the civil wars, which reduced him to a melancholy condition. He died at Rygate in Surrey on the twenty-firſt of March 1655. His wife, the daughter of Luke Challoner, Doctor of Divinity, died eighteen months before him, having been married to him the ſpace of forty years; he had one daughter who was married to Timothy Tyrrel Eſq; Governor of Cardiff in Wales. This article would have been much longer, and would have contained more particulars concerning the merit and the works of this great man, if I had not known that there is in Moreri, and yet more at large in the ſecond volume of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* (*b*), a good abridgment of his life.

(*b*) From pag. 219, to pag. 244, in the extract of Uſher's letters, to which his life written by Mr Parr, has been prefixed. Another life of Uſher came out ſince, as you may ſee in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, for January 1701, pag. 77.

lentium redactum mox agnoſceret, nec ulterius confligere, ne provocatus quidem auderet (4). Either the Jeſuit's relation, or that of the author of Uſher's life muſt of neceſſity contain ſome falſities.

[*B*] *He oppoſed the deſign of the Lord Falkland . . . . to permit the Papiſts the public exerciſe of their religion.*] The Lord Falkland propoſed this to the parliament of Ireland in the year 1626. Archbiſhop Uſher, who knew how fatal this would be to Ireland, aſſembled all the Biſhops of his province, and drew up a declaration, which they all ſigned. It imported, that conſidering the falſity of the doctrine and worſhip of the Papiſts, it would be a great ſin to permit the exerciſe of ſuch a religion. The writing which they ſigned was read in the pulpit, and put a ſtop to the toleration which the Lord Lieutenant deſigned to procure. All this is related in ſtronger terms, and more particularly, in this Latin paſſage: ‘Reverendiſſimus Primas facile perſpiciens ea res quam fatalis Hiberniæ futura eſſet, omnes ditionis ſuæ Epiſcopos convocavit, qui ejuſmodi indulgentiæ impietatem, ſubſcriptis nominibus, unanimi conſenſu in hanc fere ſententiam teſtati ſunt. Quod quum Papiſtarum religio ſuperſtitioſa eſſet ac idololatrica, fides erronea ac hæretica, Eccleſia utriuſque reſpectu Apoſtatica, liberum iis religionis ſuæ exercitium liberamque fidei ſuæ ac doctrinæ profeſſionem indulgere grave peccatum foret; tum quod hac ratione omnium Papiſmi ſuperſtitionum, idololatriarum, hæreſium, ac uno verbo abominationum ejus omnium, quin & perditionis omnium, quotquot in illius apoſtaſiæ diluvio perirent, culpa & reatu nos (aiunt) involveret, tum vero etiam quoniam hoc facere pecuniæ gratia nil aliud foret quam religionem vænum exponere, imo & animas pretio prodere quas ſalvator noſter Jeſus Chriſtus precioſo ſuo ſanguine redimere non dubitavit. Deum propterea veritatis comprecantes, ut vellet omnes, qui cum imperio erant, zelo Dei gloriæ & veræ religionis propagandæ ſtudio imbuere & contra Papiſmum, Superſtitionem, ac Idololatriam omnem fortes eos reddere, zelo affectos, & animo quam maxime obfirmatos. Epiſcopi duodecim omnino erant qui huic proteſtationi ſubſcripſerunt; quam Downhamus Derrienſis Epiſcopus, cum poſtea coram Falklandio & concilio prædicaret, media concione publice recitavit; quin & Reverendiſſimus Primas eandem proximo die Dominico coram eiſdem inter concionandum comprobavit; una innuens quam gravis ira Dei ob talem animorum propenſionem ei genti impenderet. Unde tandem effectum eſt ut ad alia conſilia deflecterent (5). - - - *The moſt reverend Primate, eaſily perceiving how fatal ſuch a thing would be to Ireland, aſſembled all his Suffragans, who, with an unanimous conſent, drew up and ſigned a remonſtrance, wherein they declared how impious it would be to grant an indulgence of that nature, in words to the following purpoſe. That whereas the religion of the Papiſts was ſuperſtitious and idolatrous, their faith erroneous and heretical, and their Church in both reſpects guilty of apoſtacy, it would be a great ſin to indulge them in the free exerciſe of their religion, and in the free profeſſion of their faith and doctrine; both becauſe ſuch a thing would (as they ſaid) involve us in the guilt of all the ſuperſtitions, idolatries, hereſies, and, in one word, abominations of Popery; nay, what is more, make us acceſſary to the ruin of all ſuch as ſhould periſh in the flood of that apoſtacy, and likewiſe becauſe to do this for the ſake of money would be in effect ſetting religion to ſale, and even betraying for hire the ſouls which our Saviour JESUS CHRIST has been pleaſed to redeem with his precious blood. Wherefore they prayed the GOD of truth, that he would endow all ſuch as were in power with a zeal for the glory of GOD and the propagation of religion, and that he would fortify them againſt all Popery, ſuperſtition and idolatry, inſpiring them with zeal and reſolution. There were twelve Biſhops who ſubſcribed this remonſtrance, which Downham, Biſhop of Londonderry, when ſome time after he preached before the Lord Falkland, and the Council, took occaſion to read in the middle of his ſermon: nay, the reverend Archbiſhop himſelf did, the next Lord's-day, preaching before the ſame perſons, approve of the remonſtrances, inſinuating at the ſame time that the dreadful vengeance of GOD threatened that nation for entertaining ſuch a deſign; whence it came to paſs that other reſolutions were taken.*’ It is obſervable that Archbiſhop Uſher and his dioceſans acted according to the moſt rigid principles of the enemies to Toleration; for they did not, like moderate men of that party, ground their declaration on political reaſons, but only on the nature of worſhip in the Romiſh communion, without ſo much as ever mentioning it's perſecuting ſpirit, the ſole reaſon urged by the very favourers of Toleration for not tolerating the Papiſts.

(4) Acta Erudit. Lipſ. 1687, *pag.* 115, *in the Extract of Uſher's Life, written by Mr Parr. Note that* Saldenus de Libris, *pag.* 368, *relying, as I think, upon this paſſage of the* Acta Eruditorum, *does ſo far exaggerate the thing as to affirm that the Jeſuit himſelf owned that he was nonpluſſed.* Faſtidioſam viri præ fidentiam ita perdomuit, ut ad novum provocatus conflictum, declinavit, eum non tantum, ſed & ad ἐχεμυθίαν redactum ſe eſſe ipſe confeſſus ſit.

(5) Bateſ. Vita Uſſerii, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 742.

USSON, in Latin *Ucio*, or *Uxo* (*a*), a ſmall town in Auvergne a league diſtant from the river Allier (*b*), and ſix leagues from Clermont, formerly depended on the county of Brive (*c*). The caſtle of Uſſon is *very ſtrong by reaſon of its ſituation on a high rock naturally cut into round pillars* (*d*). Nothing hath made this place ſo famous as the long reſidence of Margaret de Valois wife of Henry IV. She lived there ſeveral years, not in order to do penance for her paſt leudneſs [*A*], but to plunge her ſelf deeper and deeper

(*a*) Hadr. Valeſius, Notit. Galliar. *pag.* 588.

(*b*) Baudrand, Geograph. *Tom. ii, pag.* 363.

(*c*) Valeſ. ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Coulon, Rivieres de France, *Part. i, pag.* 265.

[*A*] *For her paſt leudneſs.*] I have elſewhere (1) mentioned ſome part of her leud practices, taken from a book which introduces Henry IV, relating the ill conduct of his wife. The reſt of the narrative runs thus: ‘(2) Time . . . . provided her with ſeveral ſervants; la Molle, one of them, had cauſe to repent it, for under pretence of being concerned in a conſpiracy with which the Marſhals de Montmorency and de Coſſé were charged, he left his head at St Jean en Greve, in company with that of Coconas, where they did not grow muſty, nor were long expoſed to public view; for the night following, my good wife, and Madam de Nevers, her companion, Coconas's faithful miſtreſs, cauſed them to be taken down, and carrying them off in their coaches, buried them with their own hands in St Martin's chapel under Montmartre: and this death of la Molle drew ſhowers of tears from his miſtreſs, who ſighed and ſung her paſſionate grief for him under the name of Hyacinthus, notwithſtanding the frequent and nocturnal conſolations of Saint Luc, who afterwards came often *incognito* and diſguiſed to Nerac, till Buſſy made her forget the loſs, which has been made up to her, tho' he was reported to be more valiant and ſtout amongſt the men than amongſt the women (3), by reaſon of a ſort of cholic, which generally ſeized him at midnight. She being diſguſted, excited her appetite with variety of

(1) In the remark [*D*], of the third article NAVARRE.

(2) Divorce Satyrique, *pag. m.* 191.

(3) Add this to the examples, quoted above, in the remark [*B*], of the article HENRY IV.

deeper in her impurities [B]. Notwithſtanding which ſhe hath met with ſome panegyriſts, who compared this caſtle, conſidered as the place of her reſidence, to the mountain where JESUS CHRIST was transfigured. *To the end that her conſolation might be perfect,* ſaith one of them (e), *ſhe deſired to ſee the court of Henry the Great . . . . . . and to leave her dear Uſſon, which had kept her for the ſpace of twenty years, during which time ſhe rendered*

'of ſauces, and took up with Mr de Mayenne, a jolly bulky fellow, as voluptuous as herſelf; after which they remained very good friends on all occaſions, tho' not without a quarrel, which laſted for ſome time on account of a letter written to Mrs Vitry, in which he promiſed to prefer the ſun to the moon. . . . To her former lovers ſucceeded at ſeveral times, (for their great number will excuſe my miſplacing them) that good fellow the Viſcount de Turenne, whom like the reſt ſhe ſoon diſmiſſed, finding him diſproportionate in ſome part or other: ſhe compared him to empty clouds which have nothing but a bare ſuperficial appearance. The melancholy lover being in deſpair, after a farewel, accompanied with many tears, was going to ruin himſelf in ſome diſtant region, if I, who knew the ſecret, and for the good of the churches, pretended ignorance of it, had not expreſsly enjoined my chaſte wife to recal him: which ſhe did very much againſt her will, proudly wiſhing that ſome blockhead might break his neck on her account. But theſe fools are grown ſcarce ſince they are laughed at; for to eat one's hat-feather in a rage, like la Bole, and to throw an ink-bottle in a paſſion at the ladies eyes, as Clermont d'Amboiſe did, are ſilly frenzies and jealouſies, which were but too common amongſt us, and which I knew and clearly ſaw, conſenting to my own diſhonour, and giving them, by my patience, the courage and opportunity of offending. She knows it very well, as do ſeveral of you who have aſſiſted her in her diverſions; nor was I ſo blind in an affair ſo apparent as not to perceive, as well as others, that Clermont frequently kiſſed her in her petticoat only, at her chamber-door, when in the evening I either by playing or walking in the hall with my nobility, gave him an opportunity to get into her bed . . . (4) Her beauty drew to me crouds of gentlemen, and her good nature retained them: nor was there any well-born ſpark or handſome fellow, who once in his life had not been an humble ſervant to the Queen of Navarre, who never denied any, but like the poors box, received the offerings of all comers.' Add to this the paſſage cited from the ſame book in the article of this Queen (5).

[B] *To plunge herſelf deeper and deeper in her impurities.*] The paſſages juſt cited or pointed at, carry our Margaret no farther than Auvergne. Let us go on and hear the author who introduces Henry IV ſpeaking. '(6) The King her brother hearing of her flight . . . ſaid aloud in preſence of all thoſe who then ſaw him at dinner, the Gaſcoon ſparks being inſufficient to ſatiate the Queen of Navarre, ſhe is gone in queſt of the mule-drivers and tinkers of Auvergne . . . . This profligate woman being arrived at Carlat, where ſhe long continued, not only without canopy or bed of ſtate, but even without a ſufficient number of ſhifts for every day, began to caſt her eyes about, and to conſider to which of her domeſtics ſhe ſhould proſtitute her honour; and not to be idle, ſhe pitched upon her cook, being tired with waiting for Duras, whom ſhe had ſent to the King of Spain for money, tho' her confident fearing ſhe might deprive her of her own lover, continually inculcated the conſtancy and merit of the abſent gentleman. But her inſatiate deſire, like the ravenous appetite of a blood-hound, which enfeebles one that is not continually ſatisfied, could not bear this delay, nor that of Saint Vincent, who was gone home to avoid expences, ſhe took up with the wretched Aubiac, as being the beſt tricked up of all her domeſtics, whom ſhe raiſed from her ſtables to her chamber, and cauſed him to ride her, till her belly became plump and ſwelled like a foot-ball, and, in due time, diſgorged a boy, by the help of a Midwife, whom this ſpark's mother, out of pure love to her ſon, brought thither, and by the aſſiſtance of du May, the Phyſician, who, beſides the exerciſe of his profeſſion in curing her of an impoſthume in her backſide, ſerved her alſo in conveying this young prince Lyſander, wretchedly ſwaddled, to his nurſe in the neighbouring village of Eſcoubiac: this was done ſo ſoon after his birth, that the cold he endured by the way utterly prevented his ever hearing or ſpeaking: theſe imperfections deprived him of the love and care of his own mother, who forgetting the pleaſure of the conception, for a long time ſuffered him to keep geeſe in Gaſcogne, where Mrs d'Aubiac, his grandmother, (as long as ſhe lived) kept him from ſtarving, and after her, Geſilax de Firmaçon, her ſon-in-law, who at preſent ſhews this pledge of the crown, as a great rarity to all thoſe who come to ſee him at Birac, where he keeps him for a penſion of two hundred crowns, which Goute Raquette has for ſome time been employed to go to Uſſon and Paris in queſt of . . . . (7) Aubiac, a ſorry groom, red haired, and more ſpeckled than a trout, when he conſulted his glaſs, could never have promiſed himſelf to be one day found in bed with a daughter of France, as he was at Carlat, by Madam de Marie (8), who hit on this noble adventure by a too early good morrow to the Queen according to her cuſtom, which officious compliment ſhe yet paid for with the death of her huſband, whom this virtuous Princeſs, perfectly acquainted with the potions of her mother's country, cauſed to be poiſoned in hopes that being delivered from this obſtacle, and aſſiſted by the ſoldiers whom Romes, d'Aubiac's couſin, had raiſed in Gaſcogne, ſhe ſhould make her ſelf abſolute miſtreſs of the place, and ungratefully wreſt it out of their hands who had generouſly received and protected her . . . . (9). The guard being re-inforced, and her Gaſcogne auxiliaries diſcovered, ſhe was familiarly adviſed to leave that place, and take another lodging: which (being throughly terrified) ſhe did at that inſtant, departing with the ſame precipitancy and confuſion, with which ſhe came thither, and after travelling ſome days ſhe reached Ivoi, the palace of the Queen, her mother; where ſhe was ſcarce arrived, but by the King's command ſhe was, by the Marquis de Canillac, beſieged, and taken with her paramour, who was found meanly hid under ſeveral ordures without either beard or hair, his miſtreſs having ſo diſguiſed him with her own ſciſſars in order to ſave him . . . Canillac . . . . (10) preferring a paltry pleaſure to the faith which he owed to his maſter, danced after the pipe, and ſuffered himſelf to be carried away by the artifices of his priſoner, and forgetting his duty, as well as quitting all pretenſions to the making of his fortune, he became enamoured of the Queen, and ſo very jealous that he ſacrificed poor Aubiac to his ſuſpicions, cauſing his indictment to be drawn up by Lugoly, and afterwards had him hanged at Aigueperſe, at which time, inſtead of conſidering his ſalvation, and the ſtate of his ſoul, he kiſſed a blue velvet muff which he had yet remaining of the benefactions of his lady . . . . Canillac having rather executed his jealouſy than my vengeance on this criminal, did not fail to caſt glances at her, and the little gentleman began to grow extraordinary careful of his dreſs, inſomuch, that in a little time, from as great a ſloven as my ſelf, he was as nicely ſet out as an amorous country beau: but at length what did his dreſs avail him? His inconſtant fair one, whoſe levity he propoſed to keep under lock and key, encloſed within the impregnable fortreſs of Uſſon, would become miſtreſs, and indulge her appetite to the higheſt with its uſual variety: to compaſs this, knowing by experience the power of voluptuous deſires, ſhe feigns to return love for love; and yields to the importunity of ſeveral addreſſes, after which ſhe ſo wrought on, and influenced, her guardian, that at laſt by her artificial careſſes ſhe obtained her liberty, by endearing promiſes that the favours which hitherto ſhe ſeemed to grant but ſparingly, and by force, ſhould be prodigally beſtowed out of choice, when ſhe came

'to

(e) Hilarion de Coſte, Elog. des Dames illuſtres, *Tom. ii, pag.* 306.

(4) Divorce Satyrique, *p.* 194.

(5) Citat. (76), of the third article NAVARRE.

(6) Divorce Sat. *pag.* 198.

(7) Ibid. *pag.* 200.

(8) The author means the ſame keeper of the caſtle, whom he calls Marze, *pag.* 197.

(9) Divorce Satyrique, *pag.* 201, 202.

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 203.

rendered that ſtrong caſtle of Auvergne a Tabor by her devotion, a Libanus by her ſolitude, an Olympus by her exerciſes, a Parnaſſus by her Muſes, and a Caucaſus on account of her afflictions. It would have ſavoured much leſs of calumny to have compared that place with the iſland of Caprea, Tiberius's retirement, than it ſavours of flattery to compare it to a place of devotion, and a *Holy Temple of God*, as another panegyriſt does [C]. If this lady's leudneſs were only mentioned in the *Divorce Satyrique*, or in ſome other libel, we

'to be free and abſolute miſtreſs of Uſſon. She deluded her ſpark in that manner; for the garriſon had ſcarce voided the place, before ſhe filled it with her own creatures, whilſt the eaſy Marquis retired to St Cirque to gather his apples; and ſhe proved ſo ungrateful to this ſervant of her's, that ſhe could not endure even the bare naming of him: being heartened by ſeveral men ſent to her from Orleans, and who ſoon after were like to treat her according to her wiſhes, ſhe then reſolved to follow her own will, and eſtabliſh an empire of pleaſure within this rock, where ſecurely encloſed by three walls, and all the great gates being walled up, God, and all France know what delicious games were played and practiſed there for the ſpace of twenty years. Aretin's Nanna and his holy woman are nothing to it. It is indeed true that inſtead of the gallants, who formerly uſed to ſweeten her life, ſhe was obliged for want of better to make uſe of her domeſtics, Secretaries, Muſicians, and mongrels of the nobility, whom ſhe drew to her by preſents, whoſe families and names unknown to their very neighbours, are unworthy of my remembrance, except only the famous Pominy, the ſon of a Tinker in Auvergne, who being taken from the cathedral church, where he was one of the ſinging boys, and being diſtinguiſhed from his equals by a fine voice, was preferred to this Queen's Muſic, and at laſt from the chapel to the chamber, and from the chamber to the cloſet, becoming her Secretary . . . . (11). It was upon his account that the bedſteads of her ladies at Uſſon, were raiſed ſo high, that ſhe might ſee under them without ſtooping, and not be obliged to crawl on all four in ſearch of him, as ſhe was wont to do to the great prejudice of her back parts. It was he whom ſhe often groped for behind the hangings, expecting to find him there, and it was in too eager queſt of him that ſhe frequently hurt her face, by running it againſt the walls and doors.'

I omit whatever concerns the amours which the author pretends (12) ſhe was engaged in at Paris, after ſhe left Uſſon. But it will not be improper to ſee here a paſſage of Hilarion de Coſte, which, as to ſeveral facts, may ſerve for a confirmation of the narrative we find in the *Divorce Satirique*. 'She left Agen in the habit of a plain citizen's wife, riding on horſeback behind Lignerac, on whom ſhe beſtowed the name of Knight of the Fine Flower, and fled the whole night, enduring a fatigue which tried her courage at the peril of her health. De Marſes came to meet her on the frontiers, accompanied with one hundred gentlemen, and lodging her at his manſion-houſe of Carlat, returned to Agen in order to ſecure her jewels, and the ſcattered remains of her retinue: and after the expiration of eighteen months, his death occaſioned her leaving that place, and taking up her ſtation at Yboi, a palace belonging to the Queen, her mother, where ſhe was arreſted. The thunder of the King's rage, threatning her every where, ſpared the ſacred lilies, which ſurrounded her head, but put one of her ſervants to an ignominious death at Aigueperſe. The Marquis de Canillac conveyed her to, and impriſoned her at, Uſſon; but ſoon after this nobly deſcended Lord became the captive of his priſoner: he thought he had triumphed over her, and the bare ſight of her hands, whiter than ivory, vanquiſhed him; after which he lived on nothing elſe but the favour of the victorious eyes of his charming captive. But the King's threats, the fear of death, the apprehenſion of deſtroying his fortune, and of the ruin of his houſe, made deeper impreſſions in his mind than any other conſideration, and forced him to uſe rigorous and ſevere commands againſt her. The protection of God, her own prudence and addreſs, together with the ſeaſonable aſſiſtance of the Duke of Guiſe, ſo happily ſnatched her from the ſhadows of death, that at the very inſtant when ſhe expected to die a captive, ſhe found her ſelf ſecure to reign free in that ſtrong place, from whence ſhe diſlodged them, who had fixed her there, and convinced them that virtue and valour make no diſtinction of ſexes (13).' You may ſee that this Monk owns whatever he thinks he may own without being obliged to blame her.

[C] *Compare the caſtle of Uſſon . . . . to a holy temple of* GOD, *as another panegyriſt does.*] This author was John Darnalt, the King's Attorney in the preſidial of Agen. Some parts of his elogy on this Queen run thus: 'It is very true, *ſaith he* (14), that her Majeſty, ſince ſhe is in that place (15), moſt ſtrictly obſerves a very laudable cuſtom. After having moderately recreated her ſelf with the exerciſe of the Muſes, ſhe ſpends the greateſt part of her time retired in her chapel, offering up zealous and fervent prayers to God, and communicating once or twice every week: is not this, *ſtellis inſedere & concilio Jovis? - - - To ſit upon the ſtars, and in the council of Jove?* Oh Phœnix! who by extending your wings, elevate the eyes of your underſtanding to the great bright cœleſtial ſtar, by the light of which you ſee, live, and revive in it. Phœnix! who are daily born again out of your own aſhes, flaming and conſuming your ſelf in the Divine love. Great Princeſs and Queen, who have neither motion, life, nor light, but that which you receive from this primitive light. You live a life different from that of mankind. We read that the bright and noble ſouls of the Elyſian fields, before they made their laſt flight

Illuc, unde negant redire quemquam,

To that ſame place whence none returns,

to the ſeat of perfect bliſs, and eternal joy and delight,

Fortunatorum nemorum, ſedeſque beatas,

The happy groves and manſions of the bleſs'd,

were for a time purified in a clear air, and freed from all manner of corruption. So this moſt noble royal ſoul retired to the Elyſian caſtle of Huſſon, and before her entrance into the glory of the heavens, was willing to make neighbouring approaches to them, and began to take her flight that way: having learned the exerciſe of the contemplative life, and how to ſeparate her bleſſed ſoul, from her moſt perfect body, in order to die well. For according to Plato *τὸ μελέτημα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐστὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος* *. It is the ſtudy of a wiſe man to diſentangle and ſeparate the ſoul from the body. She is Jupiter's divine eagle, which contemplates and looks with a fixed eye, from an exalted place near the heavens, at the ſolar rays of the Divine goodneſs and providence . . . . (16). Thou rock of Huſſon, the honour and wonder of Auvergne, whoſe ſnow melts by the eyes, or more properly by the rays of this almoſt adorable terreſtrial deity! Rock, on which the light perpetually ſhines, where the day never fails, but the rays of the royal preſence are perpetually reſplendant, and illuminate that place and the circumjacent region! . . . (17) Fair ſtar of Europe, which is fixed at, and never ſtirs from Huſſon! Huſſon the royal reſidence of the laſt race . . . . of Valois . . . (18) Pious and religious habitation, thou holy temple of God, which ſerveſt not as an inviolable ſanctuary, or aſyle of refuge, but like righteous Noah's ark, has afforded her Majeſty a retreat from the inundations and ravages of France . . . . (19) I cannot yet leave Huſſon, that mountain crowned with this royal caſtle, that holy hermitage, and devout monaſtery where her Majeſty ſequeſters her

ſelf

(11) Ibid. *pag.* 205.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 210, *& ſeq.*

(13) Hilar. de Coſte, Elog. des Dames illuſtr. *Tom.* ii, *pag.* 301, 302.

(14) John Darnalt, Antiquitez d'Agen, *chap.* xxii, *fol.* 124, *verſo.*

(15) That is, in Uſſon Caſtle.

* In Phædone.

(16) Id. ibid. *fol.* 125, *verſo.*

(17) Id. ibid. *fol.* 126.

(18) Id. ibid. *verſo.*

(19) Id. ibid. *fol.* 127.

we might juſtly ſuſpect the truth of it; but ſince celebrated Hiſtorians are not ſilent on this head [*D*], we ought to believe the truth of the fact. Scipio Du Pleix is the perſon that

‘ ſelf to ſtudy and meditation which only tends to the end of ends, and the moſt perfect end. Thou rock art an evidence of the voluntary, moſt laudable and religious ſolitude of this princeſs; a place which for the tranſcendent harmony of its Muſic, and the melodious ſongs of the fineſt voices in France, ſeems the only terreſtrial paradiſe, and here her Majeſty taſtes that contentment and eaſe of mind, which the bleſſed enjoy in the other world.’

Obſerve that Mr de Perefixe is in the wrong to ſay, that Margaret *voluntarily ſhut up her ſelf* in the caſtle of Uſſon (20).

[*D*] *Celebrated Hiſtorians are not ſilent on this head.*] I have mentioned in another place of this Dictio- (21) what d'Aubigné ſays, not in a ſatire, but in his Univerſal Hiſtory, I have alſo quoted a paſſage out of Mezerai (22), and the reader has been told (23) that Varillas relates the ſame things. But I ſhall further quote a more credible Hiſtorian in this particular, by reaſon he was devoted to Catherine de Medicis, and conſequently not at all inclined to excuſe the conduct of the King of Navarre. I mean Davila, who acknowledges that this Prince did in a manner divorce his conſort, by reaſon of her ſcandalous reputation of unchaſtity. And he alſo owns that in her retreat ſhe led a looſe life: ‘ Movevalo grandemente il riſpetto della Reina Margherita ſua moglie, perche havendola per la fama delle ſue impudicitie, come repudiata, & eſſendoſi lei ritirata in Overnia a certi ſuoi caſtelli a vivere con libertà molto licentioſa, vedeva neceſſariemente, ò convenire riceverla di nuovo all' unione del ſuo matrimonio, ò non poter mai ſtare in ſincera amicitia, & in intera confidenza con la ſuocera, e co'l cognato (24). - - - - *The conſideration of Margaret, his Queen, had great weight with him, becauſe having in a manner divorced her on account of her ſcandalous leudneſs, and ſhe being retired to ſome of her own caſtles in Auvergne, in order to live very licentiouſly, he ſaw that he ſhould either be obliged to take her back again, or elſe that he never could maintain a ſincere friendſhip, and an entire confidence with his mother and brother-in-law.*’ He repeats almoſt the ſame thing in another place of his book: ‘ La quale (*Reina Margherita*) havendo abbandonata ſe ſteſſa a vita licentioſa per reſpetto de' riſſentimenti del marito, ſi era fuggita da lui, ma pervenuta per ordine ſuo, e per commiſſione del Rè ſuo fratello, ella fù poſta nel caſtello di Carlat in Overnia come prigione, e di là dopò qualche tempo traſferita ad Uſſone nella medeſima Provincia ſotto alla cuſtodia del Marcheſe di Canigliac; il quale come ſi diceva, fatto prigione della ſua prigioniera l'haveva ripoſta in liberta, onde ella trattenendoſi in alcune ſue caſtella pur in Overnia, e continuando l'iſteſſo modo di vite, era di grandiſſimo oſtacolo alle conventioni, che trà il marito, & il fratello poteſſero contrattarſi (25). - - - - Queen Margaret *having given her ſelf up to a licentious life, and dreading her huſband's reſentment, had run away from him, but being arrived in Auvergne, ſhe was by his order, and by a commiſſion from the King, her brother, confined to the caſtle of Carlat, and from thence ſhe was ſome time after tranſported to Uſſon in the ſame province, under the cuſtody of the Marquis de Canillac. He, as it was reported, being captivated with the charms of his priſoner, ſet her at liberty; after which ſhe lived in ſome of her own caſtles in Auvergne, and continuing the ſame courſe of life ſhe was a very great obſtacle to any agreement that might have been made between her huſband and brother.*’

There are ſome faults in this relation of Davila. I. It is not true that Queen Margaret retired to Auvergne in order to live licentiouſly. She lived every where in the ſame manner, and ſhe would have found her account better at Agen from whence ſhe fled, than in Auvergne whither ſhe retired. The truth is, that the fear of being ſeized at Agen was the cauſe of her departure thence (26), and if ſhe ſheltered her ſelf rather in Auverge than in any other place, it was not owing to her free choice, but pure neceſſity. Lignerac, her conductor, had no other place proper for refuge (27). II. It is not true that ſhe retired into ſome caſtles belonging to her. III. Nor is it true that ſhe was impriſoned at Carlat by order of her huſband, and by a commiſſion from Henry III. Her conductor's brother, purſuant to her own deſire, received her (28). It may be that afterwards the governor of the place received orders to be anſwerable for his gueſt, and ſecure her (29); but this doth not excuſe Davila. IV. It is falſe, that being ſet at liberty by the Marquis de Canillac, ſhe retired to one of her own ſeats. V. One of theſe paſſages of Davila is refuted by the other; for if ſhe retired to her ſeat when ſhe broke with her huſband, as we are told in the firſt paſſage, what is affirmed in the ſecond, that ſhe did not retreat thither till after ſhe was ſet at liberty by the Marquis de Canillac, is not true. Mr de Beauvais Nangis (30) hath cenſured only this laſt of Davila's errors, and hath given his approbation to all the reſt. But theſe ſmall miſtakes are no juſt reaſons againſt our believing this famous Hiſtorian, when he tells us that Henry III and Catherine de Medicis reſolved to annul the King of Navarre's marriage, and abandon Margaret as unworthy of being acknowledged of their blood. ‘ Deliberarono finalmente, che non era da tener più conto della perſona di Margherita, reſaſi da ſe ſteſſa poco degna d'eſſer da loro riconoſciuta, nè per ſorella, nè per figliuola, e che, poiche la diſpenſa difettoſa ottenuta dal Pontefice al tempo del ſuo matrimonio, porgeva cauſa, e preteſto a poterlo diſciogliere, ſi doueſſe fare queſto divortio, e dar per moglie al Rè di Navarra Chriſtiana figliuola del Duca di Loreno (31). - - - *At laſt they concluded that no further regard was to be had to the perſon of Margaret, ſhe having rendered herſelf unworthy to be acknowledged by them either as a ſiſter or daughter;* and *that ſince there was a flaw in the diſpenſation obtained from the Pope at the time of her marriage, this divorce ſhould be made, and the King of Navarre ſhould marry Chriſtian daughter to the Duke of Lorrain.*’ The Ambaſſador Buſbequius, whoſe authority is as good as that of an Hiſtorian, in a letter written from Paris to his Imperial Majeſty, dated the twenty-ſeventh of Auguſt, in the year 1583, expreſſes himſelf thus: ‘ Rex ſororem ſuam, Reginam Navarræ, palàm multis audientibus graviter increpuit, quòd vitam degeret turpem, & flagitiis contaminatam. Commemorat memoriter mœchorum introductiones, quibus illa conſueviſſet. Etiam puerum ſine mariti opera natum objectavit, eaque omnia ſuis temporibus, & reliquis rebus ita notata, ut ipſe interfuiſſe videretur, & Reginam ea magis confiteri puderet, quàm confutare poſſet. Finis orationis fuit, ut eam ſtatim Lutetiâ migrare juberet, urbemque ſuâ contagione liberaret. Sic, illa, collectis raptim ſarcinis, die ſequenti, non modò ſine ullo proſequentium officio, ſed ſine juſto etiam famulitio, Lutetiâ exceſſit (32). - - - - *The King ſeverely rebuked his ſiſter, the Queen of Navarre, before a great deal of company, on account of her leud and infamous way of life. He put her in mind of the intrigues which ſhe had carried on with her adulterers. He likewiſe upbraided her with having had a boy by one of them. All theſe things he ſet forth in ſuch a particular manner, both as to their times and circumſtances, that he ſeemed to have been an eye-witneſs of them, and the Queen was rather aſhamed to own than able to anſwer the charge. He concluded his diſcourſe with ordering her to leave Paris immediately, and to rid the city of her infection. Upon this ſhe packed up her things in a hurry, and the very next day went out of Paris, being not only deſtitute of all ſuch attendance as follow out of reſpect and ceremony, but wanting even a proper number of ſervants.*’ You ſee here that Henry III not only particularized the circumſtances of his ſiſter's adulteries, but alſo charged her with being delivered of a baſtard. This author adds, that after this reprimand, Chanvalon, a very handſome young gentleman, who paſſed for one of Margaret's favourite gallants (33) retired into Germany. He had loſt the favour of the Duke of Alençon (34), on account of ſome letters which he wrote from Antwerp, but according to others for bragging of the favours of a great lady. Read Varillas's words: *The Lord, who, above all others in the kingdom, made the moſt regular court to Queen Margaret, was James de Harlay-Chanvalon, who had formerly followed the Duke of Anjou into Flanders, where* he that has given the moſt particular account of it [*E*]: for this he was blamed, and juſtified himſelf: I ſhall examine whether the Marſhal de Baſſompierre's anger is juſt [*F*]. However that be, we may ſay that the makers of elogies are much leſs to be excuſed, ſince

---

(20) Perefixe, Hiſtoire d'Henri le Grand, *ad ann.* 1599, *pag. m.* 301.

(21) In the third article NAVARRE, citation (*q*). See alſo d'Aubigné, *Tom. iii, pag.* 641.

(22) Ibid. citation (47).

(23) Ibid. citation (48).

(24) Davila, *lib. vii, pag. m.* 379, *ad ann.* 1585.

(25) Idem, *lib. viii, pag.* 432, *ad ann.* 1586.

(26) *Brant. Dames illuſtres.* See his words in citation (74), of the third article NAVARRE.

(27) See citation (76), ibid. and citation (14), in the preceding page.

(28) Ibid.

(29) Conſult Brantome, in his diſcourſe on that Queen, *pag.* 421, *Edit.* 1699, & d'Aubigné, *in Tom. iii*, of his Hiſtory, *book v, chap. iv, pag.* 641, where he ſeems to contradict what he advances in the *Divorce Satyr.*

(30) In his remarks upon Davila, *pag.* 144, 149.

(31) Davila, *lib. viii, pag.* 432, *ad ann.* 1586.

(32) Buſbequius, Epiſt. xxiii ad Rudolphum II, Imperatorem, *pag. m.* 517.

(33) Chanvallonius juvenis eſt dubiæ nobilitatis, ſuavitate morum, ætatis flore, & formæ venuſtate præſtans, habitus inter primos ejus Reginæ procos. *Id. ibid. pag.* 518.

(34) Id. ibid.

he gave proofs of his valour on ſeveral occaſions. This Duke frequently received him at his table: but he not being ſo diſcreet as he ſhould have been, one day dropped ſome boaſting expreſſions concerning the good fortune which his beauty and good mien had obtained from one of the greateſt ladies of the court of France. The Duke of Anjou hearing him, baniſhed him from his table, and even from the Low-Countries; and it was but one year ſince Chanvalon was returned from thence. Being not very welcome to the King, becauſe the favourites did not look kindly upon thoſe who had declared for the Duke of Anjou; he applied himſelf to the ſervice of the Queen of Navarre, from which the favourites took occaſion to publiſh that love was the ſole cauſe of it: and as nothing could be ſaid of the King's ſiſter ſo ſcandalous but he believed it; he gave ſo much credit to this report that he baniſhed Chanvalon from her, without taking care to cover this with ſome pretence, that it might not reflect upon her. It alſo appears that the King publickly complained to his ſiſter of her way of living with Chanvalon (35). But now let us turn our eyes to the relation of Du Pleix the Hiſtorian: and we ſhall find amongſt other particulars, that Queen Margaret had a child by Chanvalon.

[*E*] *Scipio Du Pleix is the perſon that has given the moſt particular account of it.*] I ſhall collect together what this author hath diſperſed in ſeveral places: and begin with theſe words, *The King of Navarre . . . . . made love to the* maids of Queen Margaret his wife, *which ſhe ſuffered the more patiently, by reaſon her huſband did not controul her own actions: though ſhe complains in her Memoirs, that her maids had done her ill offices with reſpect to him. But this ſhe ſays in order to cover the ſins which ſhe had been guilty of againſt the laws of marriage. Written words cannot bluſh; but I ſhould bluſh whilſt writing, if I ſhould ſet down what I have heard her ſay ſeriouſly about it. She was certainly a Princeſs enriched with excellent and perfectly royal endowments; but ſhe had alſo great weakneſſes, as well as ſome ill habits. Perhaps I may ſpeak of it more largely and more properly in the reign of Henry the Great, when my ſubject will oblige me more particularly to it, though with regret, having had the honour to belong to her houſhold for ſix years, and to be always favourably treated by that illuſtrious Princeſs* (36). What follows ſtrikes with horror: ‘Henry III . . . . treated his ſiſters with fraternal tenderneſs, but at laſt hated Margaret Queen of Navarre, as well becauſe ſhe did not live well with her huſband, as by reaſon ſhe was a continual accomplice in all the conſpiracies of the Duke of Alençon. Notwithſtanding this he always ſhewed himſelf more indulgent to pardon than ſevere to puniſh them, till Margaret (either in jeſt or earneſt) let fall an inceſtuous expreſſion to Queen Louïſe his Majeſty's wife. For this good King finding himſelf touched in a particular, which moſt ſenſibly affects generous ſouls, never after looked favourably on that brother, or that incorrigible ſiſter. The perfectly chaſte and virtuous Princeſs Louïſe hearing this infamous diſcourſe of her ſiſter-in-law, ſuddainly ſtopped her mouth, by very modeſtly ſaying, as though ſhe did not take it ſeriouſly, *pray, ſiſter, rally more agreeably*. But yet dreading the artifices of her malice, ſhe related the immodeſty of her ſiſter to the King, which very ſenſibly incenſed him againſt her and his brother, and he loved Louïſe the more tenderly for it (37).’ When Du-Pleix tells the reaſons which Henry IV, had to ſue for a diſſolution of his marriage, he expreſſes himſelf thus (38): ‘The VI nullity was founded on the manners of Queen Margaret, which were equally inſupportable and manifeſt to the whole world; yet he did not urge this in order to obtain her conſent to the diſſolution and annulling of their marriage. But the Pope and the ſacred Conſiſtory being ſufficiently informed of it, did highly commend the goodneſs of the King, who being able to convict, and cauſe her juſtly to be puniſhed, (as ſome of his council adviſed) choſe rather to procure the liberty of a ſecond marriage another way.’ What follows is a very good ſupplement to the expoſition of this ſixth nullity: ‘Henry the Great was twice married: firſt to Margaret of France, a match which ſeemed very advantageous to the poſture of his affairs, if it had been as agreeable to him as honourable. For he knew ſhe had elſewhere fixed her amorous affection, and had no paſſion for him. . . . . . Notwithſtanding this he loved her, and bore with thoſe actions in her, which when known, are inſupportable to all huſbands. He had no iſſue by her; but during her elopement ſhe had two ſons: one by the Sieur de Chanvalon, who is yet alive, and is a Capuchin Fryer that goes by the name of Father Ange: the other, who is dead, ſhe had by the Sieur d'Aubiac, I knew them both. The notoriouſneſs of the thing obliges me againſt my will to mention this: it is, beſides, a ſhining proof of the goodneſs of this moſt illuſtrious monarch; who from hence could have drawn an invincible reaſon to have rid himſelf of her by the hands of juſtice, according to the advice of ſeveral of his council: but he choſe rather to break the marriage without any effuſion of blood, by the evident nullities above mentioned (39).’

I omit what he ſaith that ſhe entertained *a more than fraternal correſpondence with the Duke of Alençon her brother* (40).

[*F*] . . . . . *For which he was blamed, and juſtified himſelf: we ſhall examine whether the Marſhal de Baſſompierre's anger is juſt.*] Du Pleix ſpeaking of Queen Margaret's return to the court, doth not treat her in an obliging manner, and yet owns, *that ſhe was pleaſed that he ſhould have the honour to be one of her ſervants in ordinary in quality of maſter of the requeſts, with a handſome ſalary* (41); *and notwithſtanding*, adds he, *that ſhe was very much addicted to changing, I always was very well with her: which being known to ſeveral perſons, ſome were ſurprized that I ſpoke boldly of her irregularities in the reign of Henry III, as I ſhall do alſo in this I am now writing. But for my part, it is more ſurprizing to me that any man of judgment could not diſcern that what I have done was grounded upon juſt and proper conſiderations, without its being neceſſary for me to expreſs them. I ſhall place her elogy after her death, and I ſhall with truth ſay ſome ſtrange and ſurpriſing things.* He accordingly diſcharged his promiſe, when he came to mention the death of Margaret, under the year 1615. Some paſſages of his diſcourſe run thus (42): ‘All the world repreſenting her as a goddeſs, ſhe in a manner fancied her ſelf to be ſo; and during her whole life was very much pleaſed with the name of *Venus Urania*, or the *Celeſtial Venus*, as well to intimate that ſhe partook of the divinity as to diſtinguiſh her love from that of the vulgar. For in order to keep it up, ſhe formed her ſelf upon different rules from thoſe common to other women: affecting above all to make it the exerciſe of her mind rather than of her body, and her common expreſſion was: *would you ceaſe to love, poſſeſs the beloved object*. I could from this compoſe a more excellent and ſurprizing romance than any written in former ages: but I am engaged in a more ſerious employment . . . . . . The perſecution and menaces of her brother (43); the terrible apprehenſions ſhe conceived, that her crimes would oblige her huſband to attempt upon her life, and the ſolitude in which ſhe lived for twenty years, ſo diſcompoſed her mind, that ſhe grew extremely miſtruſtful of every body: ſo that her continual vexations and fears made her hypocondriac.’ In the *Divorce Satyrique* Henry IV is brought in ſpeaking thus: ‘*Though I pity her, I cannot ſometimes forbear laughing at the extravagant jealouſies, and mad tranſports that are told of her amours, which frequently prompt her to ſlight what ſhe ſees, and to believe what is falſe; looking ſometimes for her ruffians in every part of the houſe, though ſhe knows they are ſomewhere elſe; and ſometimes when ſhe ſees and hears them, ſhe fancies they are other men in their ſhape, who deſign to deceive and do her miſchief . . . . . She has brought her ſelf to that paſs, that ſhe cannot abide that any body ſhould cough, laugh, or ſpeak with a low voice in her preſence: ſhe is grown ſo ſuſpicious and miſtruſtful, that ſhe thinks every body ſpeaks of her actions* (44). This weakneſs at firſt appeared only by certain

(35) Varillas, Hiſt. de Henri III. *livr. vii*, *p. m.* 231, 232.

(36) Du Pleix, Hiſt. de Henri III, *ad ann.* 1578, *pag.* 70.

(37) Id. ibid. *ſub fin. pag.* 202, 203.

(38) Id. Hiſt. de Henri IV, *ad ann.* 1599, *pag.* 264.

(39) Id. ibid. *ad ann.* 1599, *pag.* 411, 412.

(40) Id. Hiſt. de Henri III, *pag.* 23.

(41) Id. Hiſt. de Henri IV, *ad ann.* 1605, *pag.* 368.

(42) Id. Hiſt. de Louïs XIII, *pag.* 53.

(43) That is, Henry III.

(44) Divorce Satyrique, *pag.* 208, 210.

ſince they have entirely ſuppreſſed the odious paſſages of the life of this Queen, in order to crown her with the moſt magnificent praiſes, that can be beſtowed on the moſt illuſtrious

things which fell under the cognizance of her domeſtics; but after her laſt journey to Court, it was but too much divulged, ſhe her ſelf diſcovering it to every body . . . . . (45) She having as many amorous addreſſes made to her as he (46) made to other women, they agreed very ill. She hath endeavoured to throw all the infamy upon that great King in her memoirs, which are publiſhed, therefore I have been obliged to repreſent her as bearing her own ſhare of it in this Hiſtory. For I am not here writing Panegyrics on Princes and Princeſſes, but a true Hiſtory, which ought to expreſs their virtues, and not conceal their vices, to the end that their ſucceſſors, by a fear of the like ſtain in their memory, may be excited to imitate their praiſe worthy actions, and avoid their faults. Beſides, for political reaſons it was requiſite to obſerve, that her baſtards were born during her divorce and ſeparation from the King; becauſe they might otherwiſe paſs for legitimate: ſince his Majeſty never would puniſh the Monk as an impoſtor, who for ſo long a time hath been, and is produced as Queen Margeret's ſon. I am neceſſitated to declare this for the ſatisfaction of thoſe, who have charged this important ſtory with detraction.' After this he ſets forth ſeveral encomiums on this Queen.

(45) Du Pleix, ubi ſupra, *p.* 54.

(46) That is, the King of Navarre.

The Marſhal de Baſſompierre hath made the following obſervation on that paſſage, which charges her with having had two baſtards: 'Infamous Viper, who by thy calumnies haſt torn the entrails of her that gave thee life! Thou worm, which gnaweſt the ſame fleſh that begot thee! Thou mad dog, who biteſt they own maſter, what moved thee to injure a poor Princeſs after her death, who cheriſhed thee during her life? Is it the intereſt of the late King, who, to his own prejudice, choſe rather to retard the diſannulling his marriage with her, than utter one ſingle word to her diſadvantage, and tho' the good of the State hindred him from keeping her any longer as his wife, yet he always honoured her as Queen, loved her as his ſiſter, beſtowed large penſions on her, and made her immenſe preſents? Is it truth which obliges thee to it, thou who haſt given the title of a Hiſtory to this book filled with fables, and ſtuffed with calumnies and ſcurrilities? What a ſcandal haſt thou caſt upon France, by publiſhing to the whole world, and leaving recorded to poſterity, ſuch infamous ſtories of one of the moſt noble Princeſſes of the royal blood, which perhaps are falſe, or, at moſt, were only known to very few? Is a private man allowed, under the name of an Hiſtorian, to publiſh the faults of another, to ſpot and defame the royal race, and defile the memory of the dead? If any attempt had been made to force thee, tho' but lightly to ſcandalize that poor Princeſs, (who kept thee from ſtarving) thou ſhouldeſt rather have ſuffered martyrdom than yielded to it; whereas, on the contrary, without any conſtraint or the leaſt invitation, thou haſt hunted after, and adviſed even improper and unreaſonable opportunities to ſay ſuch execrable things of her, that no Chriſtian can utter without ſin, or hear without horror. No, no, there are wheels and executioners to puniſh thee ſeverely in this world, and a divine juſtice in the other, to inflict eternal torments upon thee for thy infinite crimes (47).' Laying aſide abuſive reflexions, we find ſcare any thing elſe in this ſentence of condemnation, but that Du Pleix ought not to have defamed a Princeſs, whoſe domeſtic he had been, nor publiſhed adventures, known to few, which diſhonoured the royal family. It is perfectly unneceſſary for me to examine the laſt of theſe objections. Du Pleix himſelf hath ſatisfactorily anſwered it in one of the paſſages which I have already cited; and it doth not appear that Baſſompierre ever refuted that part of his defence. Wherefore let us only conſider the firſt objection.

(47) Baſſompierre, Obſervat. ſur Du Pleix, *pag.* 173, *& ſeq.* *See alſo pag.* 210, *& ſeq.*

Considerations upon the duties of an Hiſtorian.

All that are acquainted with the laws of Hiſtory, will agree, that every Hiſtorian, who deſigns faithfully to diſcharge his function, ought entirely to diſpoſſeſs himſelf of the ſpirit of flattery and calumny, and put on as much as poſſible, ſuch a Stoical temper, as is out of the reach of any diſturbance from paſſion. Inſenſible to every thing elſe, he ought only to be concerned for the intereſt of truth, to which his duty obliges him to ſacrifice the reſentment of an injury, the remembrance of a favour, and even the love of his country. He ought to forget that he was born in a certain country, that he was bred up in the communion of a certain Church, that he is indebted for the making his fortune to ſuch and ſuch perſons, and that ſuch or ſuch perſons are his relations or friends. An Hiſtorian as ſuch, like Melchiſedec, is without father, without mother, and without pedigree. If he be aſked, *Of what country you are?* He ought to anſwer, *I am neither a Frenchman, nor a German, nor an Engliſhman, nor a Spaniard, &c. I am an inhabitant of the world, neither engaged in the ſervice of the Emperor, nor of the King of France, but only in that of truth: ſhe is my ſole Queen, and I have taken no oath of allegiance to any beſides her* (48): *I am her ſworn knight, and the collar of the order which I wear, is the ſame ornament worn by the chief-juſtice, and the high-prieſt of the Egyptians.* Ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἄγαλμα περὶ τὸν αὐχένα ἐκ σαπφείρου λίθου, καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο ἄγαλμα Ἀλήθεια. Circa collum imaginem ex ſapphiro gemma confectam geſtabat: quæ vocabatur VERITAS (49). - - - - *He carried about his neck an image made of ſapphire ſtone, and the image was called* TRUTH. So far as he yeilds to the love of his country, ſo far does he deviate from the rules of hiſtory, and by how much he ſheweth himſelf a good ſubject, by ſo much he becomes a bad Hiſtorian.

(48) Tuus ô regina quid optes
Explorare labor, mihi juſſa capeſſere fas eſt.
- - - *'Tis yours, O Queen! to will*
The work which duty bids me to fulfil.
DRYDEN. Virgil. Æn. lib. i, ver. 76.

(49) Ælian. Var. Hiſtor. *lib. xiv, cap. xxxiv.*

Dum patriam laudat, damnat dum Poggius hoſtem;
Nec malus eſt civis, nec bonus hiſtoricus (50).

While Poggius doth his country-men extol,
And blame their enemies with all his ſoul;
He's no ill ſubject, that I muſt confeſs,
But he's a bad Hiſtorian ne'ertheleſs.

(50) Sannazar. *apud* Jovium, Elog. *cap. x, pag. m.* 31.

So that the cruel reproaches, which Mr de Baſſompierre grounds on the ſalaries and poſts which Du Pleix enjoyed under Queen Margaret, are unjuſt; for Du Pleix the Hiſtoriographer was not bound to diſcharge the obligations of Du Pleix this Queen's domeſtic. It was neither proper for him as an Hiſtorian, to acknowledge a good office, nor to revenge an injury: his ſole obligation was to repreſent things as they really where, without miſrepreſenting them either in favour of his friends, or to the prejudice of his enemies. He had the ſame ſtrict engagements to truth, as the Judges have to juſtice; and therefore ſince it would be highly unreaſonable to reproach a Counſellor of parliament with ingratitude for having made his benefactor loſe a bad cauſe, we ſhould be equally in the wrong to complain of Du Pleix, on pretence that he hath publiſhed defamatory truths of a Princeſs under whom he was employed. It is to betray an ignorance of the true bounds of things, to maintain, that gratitude ſhould extend even to the diſpoſal of thoſe things which are none of our own; I mean, that to acquit ourſelves of our obligations, we may make uſe of what belongs to others. If you will acknowledge the good offices done you, do it at your own expence, and not at that of your neighbour. Such a one is the cauſe of your growing rich, that you enjoy the poſt of Maſter of the Requeſts, or Preſident, &c. Aſſiſt him with your purſe in his indigence, but be not an inſtrument to make him carry an unjuſt cauſe; for if you make him carry it, your gratitude is a downright robbery, and a violation of the moſt eſſential duties. You are the miniſter of juſtice, and nothing can permit your violation of it; you ought not, as a Judge, to acknowledge the benefits, which you formerly received as ſteward or tutor. The application of all this to an Hiſtoriographer, who is a public miniſter of truth, is not very difficult.

If during the proſecution of a criminal indictment againſt Margaret de Valois, Du Pleix had refuſed to give evidence againſt her, and had endured the torture rather than reveal the adulteries of this lady, whoſe domeſtic he was, he would have deſerved high praiſe; and his ſilence in that caſe had been an hundred times more commendable than an ingenuous confeſſion: but in writing the Hiſtory of France, he was diſengaged illuſtrious princeſſes. She was thus praiſed by reaſon of her liberalities to the monaſteries [G], the moſt ſure and infallible means to cover a *multitude of ſins* (f). For the reſt, if ſhe diverted her ſelf very agreeably at the caſtle of Uſſon, ſhe alſo ſuffered ſeveral troubles there. ‘From the terraſs of that caſtle, ſhe ſaw her friends cut in pieces, and the Count de Randan, their chief, a lord of the houſe of Rochefoucaud killed on the ſame day

gaged from all domeſtic obligations, and might publickly declare what he ought not to have done to the commiſſioners appointed to draw up an indictment. I own that he defamed a Princeſs of the royal blood; but if out of fear of caſting ſome ſcandal on the royal family, he had been obliged to ſilence, it muſt thence be concluded alſo, that an Hiſtorian ought never to mention any of the rebellions and conſpiracies of the Princes of the royal blood; and for inſtance, the Spaniſh Hiſtorians ought never to have ſpoken of the combinations of Don Carlos, nor of the puniſhment which was the conſequence of them. But as this is abſurd, it follows that Mr de Baſſompierre hath unjuſtly cenſured the conduct of Du Pleix. His other obſervations are much better; for it cannot be denied that he hath detected an almoſt infinite number of her ill actions. If I am anſwered, that the rebellions of Princes are notorious facts, and conſequently ought not to be ſilently paſſed over by an Hiſtorian; I reply, that Queen Margaret's amours were, in their kind, as publickly known as the frequent relapſes of the Duke of Orleans (51). All the court was perfectly informed of the reprimand which ſhe received from the king her brother, who, amongſt other things, charged her with having a baſtard. All the Ambaſſadors knew it, and undoubtedly they wrote the news to their reſpective maſters, as well as the Emperor's Ambaſſador did (52). All France was acquainted with the affront which the ſame king cauſed to be offered to Margaret in a public road; and the conſequences of this affront were blazed abroad by the complaints of the King of Navarre. In a word, to ſay in an hiſtory what Du Pleix hath publiſhed concerning the intrigues of the Queen of Navarre, was not to reveal any ſecret practices. And you may, if you pleaſe, obſerve, that certain reaſons of ſtate, which he mentions (53), obliged him to ſpeak of them: which is a good juſtification. I deſire you would alſo obſerve that ſeveral have cenſured his inſerting theſe events in his work, but have not affirmed, that they were meer lies. See the margin (54). On the contrary, they never ventured farther than to ſay that the veil of diſcretion ought to have been drawn over them. Wherefore ſince he had no occaſion to juſtify himſelf on any other account than taking the liberty of publiſhing truths of this nature, and ſince after that juſtification, he left all theſe paſſages in his works, ſo that they were not only printed but re-printed with the royal licence; we may conclude, that theſe facts ought to paſs as undoubted truths; for if they were calumnies, the author would have been obliged to retract and leave them out in the ſecond edition.

We may ſay that he hath contributed more than any body elſe to fix the certainty of theſe facts. The Sieur d'Aubigné's ſatires did not amount to a ſufficient and authentic evidence; but when they appear confirmed by the public atteſtation of an Hiſtorian, who was a domeſtic ſervant to this Queen, there is no longer any room for doubting. What defect can you ſuppoſe in them? The Hiſtorian lived at the time of the events, and was ſervant to this Princeſs: he hath not deprived her of the glory which ſhe deſerved on other accounts; he was not blamed for calumniating, but for not ſparing her; and never retracted or ſuppreſſed, in a new edition, what he had ſaid in the firſt. So that the ſilence of a thouſand and a thouſand authors, and the elogies beſtowed on her memory may, at pleaſure, be alledged, but can never ſhake this matter of fact; for we ought to take notice that even her flatterers never preſumed to affirm that ſhe was an example of chaſtity, but contented themſelves with ſilence on this head. If they had affirmed that ſhe was always very chaſte, they would have formed a ſort of faction and ſchiſm in the hiſtorical world, and fomented in it that Pyrrhoniſm which is already but too general on other accounts: a diſorder which chiefly owes it's propagation to the different accounts of things at the very time of the events (55). A lie is ſuppoſed to be always poſterior to the truth; but this is not certain with reſpect to relations; for it but too frequently happens that the falſe precede the true; and that the true and falſe ſtart at the very ſame inſtant, and ſo run through future ages under the auſpicious authority of traditions that are alike old. Obſerve what Tacitus ſaith on occaſion of a very remarkable event, which at firſt was variouſly repreſented. ‘Is finis fuit ulciſcenda Germanici morte, non modo apud illos homines qui tum agebant, etiam ſecutis temporibus vario rumore jactata. adeo maxima quæque ambigua ſunt, dum alii quoquo modo audita pro compertis habent, alii vera in contrarium vertunt. & gliſcit utrumque poſteritate (56). - - - *This was the end of revenging the death of Germanicus, an affair ambiguouſly related, not by thoſe only who then lived and intereſted themſelves in it, but likewiſe in following times, ſo dark and intricate are all the higheſt tranſactions; while ſome hold for certain facts the moſt precarious hearſays, others turn fact into falſhood, and both are ſwallowed and improved by the credulity of poſterity.*’

It was foretold, that truth would not be ſtifled by the artifices of mercenary pens and tongues. ‘Thoſe, who in hopes of her liberality, praiſe her in their ſermons, dedicate books to, or write elogies on her, do in vain beſtow on her qualities to which ſhe hath no pretence; for true tradition, which in ſpite of them ſhall be immemorially preſerved from father to ſon, will plainly prove them liars, and as full of avarice and flattery, as ſhe is an enemy to virtue (57).’ This prediction is verified by the event, for which we are not a little indebted to Du Pleix.

[G] *She was thus praiſed by reaſon of her liberalities to the monaſteries.*] Hilarion de Coſte, a Minime Friar, ſpeaks thus of the charities of this Princeſs: ‘At the four moſt ſolemn feſtivals, and on her birth-day, ſhe gave, with her own hand, one hundred gold crowns, and as many loaves to an hundred poor people. She annually maintained one hundred and eleven perſons, and forty Engliſh, Scotch, and Iriſh Prieſts, beſides the alms ſhe daily diſtributed at her palace, and going from maſs, as well to ſtrangers, as to the modeſt uncraving poor. She alſo contributed ſeveral ſums to the building of divers churches and monaſteries. She built and founded the Jeſuits college at Agen, and the convent of the Reformed Auguſtins near her palace, in the ſuburbs of St Germain des Prez at Paris. There is no order of mendicant Friars that has not partaken of her annual bounty; amongſt others, the Carmelites, Auguſtins, Franciſcans, Jacobins, the Jeſuits of St Lewis, the Ave-Maria Nuns, the Bernardins, the Capuchins, Recollects, and Minimes of Nigeon. In the latter years of her life, building all her hopes on GOD, ſhe daily heard three maſſes, one high and two low (§ *a*); ſhe communicated three times every week, on Thurſday, Friday, and Sunday; every Saturday ſhe viſited the low chapel of our Lady in St Victor's church; and the hoſpitals in the holy week, and never gave leſs than three or four thouſand blankets, beſides frequently a conſiderable ſum for the marriage of poor girls (58).’ Scipio Du Pleix relates the ſame (59), but he adds a reflexion which makes a vaſt difference betwixt his narrative and that of the Minime. ‘If ſhe, *ſaith he* (60), ſuffered herſelf to be drawn away by ſome ſenſuality in her youth, amongſt ſo many pernicious opportunities as happen in the lives of princes, and the allurements of the court, yet having renounced them in order to return to GOD, and having redeemed her ſins, by large charities, who can doubt but that the prayers of ſo many religious perſons, and the bleſſings of the people have opened the heavens for her ſoul, and made way for her reception after her death amongſt the bleſſed angels, conſidering withal that more eſpecially towards the end of her days, ſhe prepared and diſpoſed herſelf for it with a truly Chriſtian contrition and reſolution.’ The Minime took great care not to intermix his relations with any thing of this nature; we find nothing

(f) See, above, the remark [I], of the article GREGORY I.

(51) Brother to Lewis XIII.

(52) See, above, citation (34).

(53) See, above, citation (46).

(54) Baſſompierre, *pag.* 149, of the Journal of his Life, ſays that, in 1606, Queen Margaret loſt the Sieur Sulliendat her lover, who had been killed by a gentleman called Charmond.

(55) See, below, my Diſſertation concerning Defamatory Libels, paragraph viii.

(56) Tacit. Annal. *lib.* iii, *cap.* xix.

(57) Divorce Satyrique, *p.* 212.

(58) Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 308, 309. *See alſo* Paſquier, *pag. m.* 761, *of Tom.* ii *of his letters.*

(59) Du Pleix, Hiſt. de Louis XIII, *pag.* 54, 55.

(60) Id. ibid. *pag.* 55.

‘ day that the King her huſband triumphed over his enemies at Yvry: and though this ‘ place fears nothing but Heaven, it being impoſſible for any thing but the ſun to enter ‘ it by force, and its triple encloſure deſpiſes the efforts of the aſſailants, as a high rock ‘ contemns the billows and ſurges; yet want got into it and obliged her, in order to ‘ avoid its outrages, to pawn her jewels at Venice, to melt down her plate, and to have ‘ nothing free but the air, hoping but very little, and fearing every thing: for all round ‘ about her was in flame and confuſion (g).’ I ſhall conclude with this paſſage of Brantome:

(g) Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 302.

nothing there which tends to inſinuate that Margaret had occaſion to buy off the ſins of her youth by ſo many alms; and omiſſions like this are indeed unſufferable. Generally ſpeaking, we cannot complain of his placing her amongſt the illuſtrious ladies; but his ranking her equally and without any diſtinction, with thoſe whoſe virtue always remained untainted, is what cannot be excuſed. He ought at leaſt to have divided his work into three claſſes, one for the ladies of perpetual and unſpotted virtue, one for thoſe unjuſtly ſlandered, and another for thoſe whoſe good qualities compenſated their vices, and who, in their wiſe old age, expiated the ſins of their youth. No body would have been offended at ſeeing Margaret in this laſt claſs, nor have taken it amiſs that the Monks out of gratitude for her alms, ſhould make her ſhine amongſt the illuſtrious penitents, and celebrate her wiſdom, learning, and the reſt of her good qualities. We ought to do juſtice to every body, and even to beſtow thoſe praiſes upon courtezans, which they deſerve when they have diſtinguiſhed themſelves by ſome virtues, of which there are examples to be found (61). We are not ignorant of the nullity of her alms, by reaſon they were given at the expence of others and the ruin of her creditors. *Have you ever obſerved any of her lovers,* (Henry IV introduced ſpeaking) *a few excepted, grow rich by her liberality? But you ſee the priſons full of thoſe whom ſhe hath empoveriſhed . . . . I know very well that at my expence ſhe gives the tenth of all her rents and penſions quarterly to monaſteries and convents: but then ſhe withholds the ſalary of her domeſtics,* (*whoſe caſe I very much commiſerate*) *and of thoſe who for the whole year have furniſhed her with their proviſions as well as their labour* (62). If any one ſhould ſcruple to give credit to this paſſage on pretext that it is taken out of a defamatory libel, he needs only conſult the hiſtory of Henry the Great, written by Mr de Perefixe, who died Archbiſhop of Paris. There he will find that the palace which Queen Margaret built near the *Pre-aux-Clercs, was ſold to pay her debts . . . . that ſhe was liberal to prodigality, very pompous and magnificent; but knew not what it was to pay her debts. ‘ This is undoubtedly one of the greateſt faults in a prince, by reaſon ‘ that nothing is ſo diametrically oppoſite to juſtice, of ‘ which he ought to be the protector and pattern* (63).’ This teſtimony agrees with that of Mezerai (64), and yet one would be apt to excuſe the panegyriſts who have ſo extolled this Queen's alms, if like Du-Pleix they had regulated the whole matter of fact; and one would not exact from them a rigorous ſearch into the circumſtances of her liberalities to the poor and the monaſteries.

[(§ α) It is ſhe that is drawn in the following epigram, book iii. chap. 21 of Feneſte:

Commune, qui te communies
Ainſi qu'en amours en hoſties;
Qui communies tous les jours
En hoſties comme en amours:
A quoi ces Dieux que tu conſommes
Et en tous temps & en tous lieux?
Toi, qui ne t'es peu ſouler d'hommes,
Te penſes tu crever de Dieux?

Harlot, that haſt an equal ſhare
Of love and ſacramental fare;
To whom each day a feaſt doth prove
Both of the ſacrament and love:
Say to what end do you devour
So many gods at every hour?
Is it that you, who never can
Once get your belly-full of man,
Such is your appetite accurſt,
Reſolve with eating gods to burſt? REM. CRIT.]

(61) *See chap. xxv, of book iii,* Miſcellanearum Obſervationum, *written by Peter Petit, a Paris Phyſician, and printed at Utrecht in* 1682.

(62) Divorce Satyrique, *p.* 213.

(63) Perefixe, Hiſtoire de Henry le Grand, *ad ann.* 1599, *pag. m.* 301.

(64) See, above, the remark [*O*], of the third article NAVARRE.

I ſay again, that the Minime Hilarion de Coſte ought to have obſerved in his book, what Robert d'Arbriſſel did in his monaſteries, one of which was appointed for women of good reputation, and the other for thoſe who had quitted their ill courſes (65). That mixture is very ſcandalous which in the ſame book preſents us with the elogies of Anne of Bretagne, and Iſabella Clara Eugenia, together with thoſe of Bona Sforza and our Margaret de Valois. I add that it is a medley which encourages thoſe to give up themſelves to vice, whom an ambition of being one day placed amongſt the illuſtrious ladies, might, perhaps, keep in the right way. Nothing is more pernicious than equally to extol and honour looſe and virtuous women (66). This Minime had been leſs to blame, if his praiſes had been reduced to the particular deſcription of any ſingle action; but he hath couched them ſo as to take in the hiſtorical ſeries of the Queen's whole life. He mentioned whatever he found excellent, and forgot nothing but what was ill. I make this reflexion only to ſhew that I never pretended that all thoſe, who have mentioned either the learning or charities of Queen Margaret, ought alſo to have taken notice of her faults. This never entred into my thoughts, nor do I in the leaſt diſlike Stephen Paſquier's contenting himſelf with hinting what he condemned in general (67), and particularly enlarging on what he admired in her; for he did not attempt a hiſtory or an hiſtorical elogy. See what he ſaith of the meals of this Princeſs. ‘ Tho' dinners and ſuppers are chiefly de‘ſigned for the nouriſhment of the body, yet ſhe more ‘ highly valuing the aliment of the mind, has com‘monly four men near her, to whom ſhe firſt propoſes ‘ what propoſition ſhe pleaſes for their examination, ‘ frequently overthrowing their arguments and never ‘ reſenting their criticiſms, provided they be grounded ‘ on good and ſolid reaſons. Thus ſhe nouriſhes her ‘ mind and feeds her body with all ſobriety, and after ‘ theſe learned men have ended their diſcourſe, not to ‘ abate any part of her royalty, then follows a band ‘ of violins, after that a conſort of vocal Muſic, and ‘ laſtly of lutes, which play ſucceſſively in emulation ‘ of each other (68).’

A CONSIDERATION upon the effect of many old devout women, who have been leud in their youth.

Give me leave to obſerve by the by that this Queen, and all other ladies who imitate her, perhaps do more harm to the world, by their frequent communions and extreme aſſiduity in convents and churches, than if they continued in their ſcandalous courſe, and grew old in impenitence. They are immortalized by an hundred artful elogies, which never mention any of their former ſins. Is not this to cauſe thoſe who live in impurity to hope for an unſpotted fame, and expect to be loaded with honour, provided in their decayed and deformed age they turned devout? And why ſhould they not hope for this glory after ſo many examples before their eyes? For it is the common courſe of looſe women to turn devout when no longer able to charm (69). They are then very conſtant at ſermon and maſs, and very liberal to convents; whence it is believed they ſhall open the gates of Paradiſe, which had been ſhut againſt them, and conſequently young ladies may flatter themſelves that their debaucheries will not deprive them either of human glory, which the applauſes of Monks procure for the dead, or of eternal happineſs. What is more pernicious than this ſecurity? What can poſſibly let looſe the reins of corrupt nature to a greater degree? The ladies would be terrified at the apprehenſions of an infamous character in future ages, and the torments of Hell, if they ſaw that all or almoſt all the women of pleaſure continue hardned in their crimes till death. This fear would prove a bridle, and a powerful leſſon of wiſdom, and by this means the damnation of ſome few would prove a remedy againſt incontinence, and the means of the ſalvation of a great number. If in every age there were but one leud woman, that turned devout in her old days, ſhe alone would no more inſpire

(65) See, above, citation (10), of the article FONTEVRAUD.

(66) See, above, the remark [*M*], of the article LEWIS XII.

(67) If I ſhould tell you that this Queen has no faults, I ſhould be a ſilly man; for tho' God has been pleaſed to make her a great Princeſs, ſhe is made up of the ſame pieces as all of us are. And conſequently we muſt not pretend that ſhe ſhould be perfect, which no man or woman can be; but we muſt only conſider her leſſer imperfections. *Paſquier, Letters, Tom. ii, pag.* 759.

(68) Id. ibid. *pag.* 761, 762.

(69) See, above, citation (25), of the article GUEBRIANT.

a ſpirit

Brantome: *the caſtle of Uſſon is a very ſtrong or rather impregnable place, which that cunning and crafty King Lewis XI, partly made ſo on purpoſe to lodge his priſoners, and keep them much ſecurer there than at Loches, Bois de Vincennes, or Luſignan* (*b*).

(*b*) Brantome, Mémoires des Dames illuſtres, *pag. m.* 241.

a ſpirit of ſecurity, than the good thief (70), ſhe could only remove deſpair. But when the number of theſe Magdalens (71) mounts high, they univerſally occaſion confidence and boldneſs, ſo that one may ſay, that indirectly and contrary to their intention they are the firmeſt pillars of the Empire of Venus, even when they themſelves are retired out of it. What glorious arms would they afford the preachers and confeſſors, if being become the laughing-ſtock and execration of the whole town, when grown grey under Venus's yoak, and following their old trade, with all the ridiculous impertinences which attend the conjunction of wrinkles and coquettery, they ſhould at laſt die blaſpheming or in deſpair; ſo that their rejection of the ſacraments ſhould cauſe their corpſe to be dragged on a hurdle to lie unburied! Such a diſmal ſpectacle would fill them with horror. Little Father Andrew would have frequently taken occaſion from thence to cry out in his ſermon, *the ſame fate attends you.*

A famous author, in a letter dated the twenty-third of June 1678, ſaith, that the diſeaſe of which Madam M**** died, had brought her to repentance, and that ſhe was *one of thoſe mentioned in the Goſpel, who were as well payed for the laſt hour, as thoſe who engaged in the morning* (72). Father Bourdaloue ſays (73), that this lady diſcovered a great ſhare of Chriſtian reſolution at her death. This edifies the public, but yet lays a ſnare for ſinners. Note, that we are taught by ſome that thoſe have a greater intereſt in the favour of GOD, who extricate themſelves out of great ſins, than if they had never fallen into them. This is another ſnare. The Biſhop of Meaux ſets this in a proper light, after having obſerved (74) that *when we ſee in the Goſpel* † *the loſt ſheep preferred by the good ſhepherd to all the reſt of the flock, when we read of the happy return of the prodigal ſon, and the tranſports of a tender father, which rejoice the whole family; we are tempted to believe that repentance is preferred to innocence itſelf, and that the returning prodigal receives greater favours than the eldeſt ſon who never ſtrayed from his father's houſe.* See the remainder in the author himſelf.

(70) Unus eſt ne deſperes, ſolus eſt ne confidas, -- *There is one, leſt you ſhould deſpair, there is only one leſt you ſhould be too confident*, ſays a Father of the Church ſpeaking of the good thief.

(71) I mean ſuch women as are falſe or true converts.

(72) Buſſi Rabutin, *letter cvi, of Tom. i, pag.* 257, *Dutch Edit.*

(73) Ibid. *letter cvii, pag.* 258.

(74) *Biſhop of Meaux*, Oraiſon funebre de la Reine Marie Thereſe, *p.* 66. *Dutch Edit.*

† Luke xv. 4, 20.

UTINO (LEONARD DE) a Jacobin Monk, flouriſhed in the XVth century, and was a great preacher. His ſermons on the ſaints were one of the earlieſt productions of the preſs, being printed in the year 1446 *(a)* (α). His other works were printed before the end of the ſame century [*A*]. It was probably he, who complained that the confeſſions which the women made at the confeſſion chair, were defective in ſome things [*B*].

(*a*) Olearius, in Abaco, *apud* Konig Biblioth. vet. & nova, *pag.* 467, 859.

[(α) It is generally agreed upon that printing was not uſed, in the manner that it now is, before the year 1457. Thus what is ſaid here may very well be a miſtake either in Olearius, or at leaſt in Konig; and we have much more reaſon to affirm, with Mr le Duchat, in note 10, on chap. 19 of the firſt book of Rabelais, that firſt edition of Leonard de Utino's ſermons is of Venice, 1473. REM. CRIT.]

[*A*] *His other works were printed before the end of the ſame century.*] His treatiſe of common-places was printed at Ulm in the year 1478. His Lent and Dominical ſermons were printed at Lyons in 1495. See the epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque, pag. 543.

[*B*] *That the confeſſions, which the women made at the confeſſion-chair, were defective.*] James Olivier, Licentiate of the Civil and Canon Law, ſays, that *the learned de Utino obſerves* that womens confeſſions 'are 'commonly deficient in three particulars, which they 'very ſeldom or never confeſs; the profuſeneſs and 'vanity of cloaths, believing it to be due to their 'ſex; leudneſs in thought or deed, according to the 'nature of the ſin or it's circumſtances, either by 'ſhame or cuſtom; and immoderate loquacity, which 'is not free from mortal or venial ſin, of which an 'account muſt be given before GOD, even of idle 'words (1).' I do not aſſert this for a truth, but only ſay that it is very probable that the author here cited is the Monk I am ſpeaking of.

(1) James Olivier, Alphabet de l'Imperfection & Malice des Femmes, *letter G, pag.* 97, *Edit. of Rouën* 1658.

VULCANIUS *(a)* (BONAVENTURA) was born at Bruges on the thirtieth of June 1538. He made ſuch expeditious advances in polite literature, that at the age of twenty-one Cardinal Francis de Mendoza (*b*), choſe him, by reaſon of his learning, to be his Secretary and Library-keeper, and gave him ſeveral authorities of the Greek Fathers to tranſlate into Latin. He returned from Spain to the Low-Countries, after an abſence of eleven years, and finding his country embroiled in confuſions, he went to Cologn, and from thence to Baſil and Geneva, publiſhing in each of theſe cities a book of his compoſure. Being returned home he was choſen Profeſſor of the Greek tongue in the univerſity of Leyden in the year 1578, and three years after began the exerciſe of that employment. He continued in it for the ſpace of thirty-two years (*c*), and died at Leyden on the ninth of October 1614 [*A*], after having publiſhed ſeveral books (*d*), which diſcovered his erudition. He had promiſed an edition of all St Cyril's works [*B*]. His

(*a*) The name of his family was *Smet*, which ſignifies a Smith, the trade of Vulcan according to the Poets.

(*b*) He was Biſhop of Burgos.

(*c*) *Taken from* Meurſius, Athenæ Batavæ, *pag.* 103, *& ſeq.*

(*d*) You will find the titles of ſome of them in Moreri, and all of them in Meurſius, ibid. *pag.* 107, 108, *or in Valerius Andreas*, Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 116, 117.

[*A*] *He died at Leyden on the 9th of October* 1614.] I am obliged to the *Athenæ Belgicæ* (1) for the particular day of this date, which I believe right (2), tho' the date of the year which follows it is falſe, for it is not true that Vulcanius died in 1610, as it is ſaid there. Mr Konig adopts this error. Meurſius, Valerius Andreas, and Moreri after them, are miſtaken in placing the death of Vulcanius in 1615. Ghilini, who hath only paraphraſed, and ill tranſlated Swertius, hath exceeded the fault of his original, by making it 1600 inſtead of 1610, and yet he tells us, that Vulcanius, born, according to him, and according to truth, on the 30th of June in 1538, lived above ſeventy years (3). This is not the ſole blunder he is guilty of: he tells us beſides (4), that Cardinal Francis de Mendoza was Biſhop of Bruges, and that Vulcanius having been profeſſor of the Greek tongue in Flanders for three years, went to Lyons, and obtained the ſame employment in that univerſity, which he exerciſed for thirty-two years, to the great ſatisfaction of the French (5). It is not neceſſary to tell the reader, that inſtead of Burgos, a city of Spain, he hath put Bruges, a city of Flanders; and that inſtead of Leyden, he hath clapt in Lyons, where there never was an univerſity. He did not underſtand theſe words of Swertius: 'Lugduno Batavorum iter faceret, à 'Curatoribus Academiæ Profeſſor linguæ Grecæ de'ſignatus eſt anno Domini MDLXXVIII. Triennio 'demum poſt Lugdunum venit, & Profeſſionem ſuſce'pit (6). --- *When he was going through Leyden, he 'was named by the Curators of the univerſity to be pro'feſſor of the Greek tongue, in the year* 1578. *He came 'to Leyden three years after, and accepted of that Profeſ'ſorſhip.*' Since he is miſtaken in ſuch particulars as theſe, we ought to believe that on an hundred more dangerous occaſions he hath corrupted the authors whom he paraphraſed.

[*B*] *He had promiſed an edition of all St Cyril's works.*] Of this Scultetus gives a curious account, ſpeaking of the learned men he viſited at Leyden, in the

(1) Swert. Ath. Belg. *pag.* 162.

(2) Mr Drelincourt, a Phyſician at Leyden, and a worthy ſon of the Profeſſor, has been pleaſed at my requeſt to make ſeveral inquiries concerning the time of Vulcanius's death, and has found in the Records of the town-houſe that he was buried in St Peter's Church, October 13, 1614.

(3) Ghilini Teatro, *Part. ii*, *pag.* 49.

(4) Id. ibid. *pag.* 48.

(5) Con intera ſodisfazione de' Franceſi. *Ibid.*

(6) Swert. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 161.

His funeral Oration raiſed the murmurs of ſome Critics [C]. Ghilini hath committed a great many faults (e).

the year 1612. ‘Quem (*Bonaventuram Vulcanium*) ſenem admodum ſellæ affixum, & manibus pedibuſque captum inveni. Promiſerat ille triginta quatuor annis antè, editionem omnium operum Græcorum Cyrilli hactenus à multis deſideratam: hanc cùm fruſta hactenus ſingulis propemodum nundinis expectaſſem, & jam coram hominis ætatem valetudinemque perditam conſiderarem, petii ab eo, ut Cyrillum Græcum fidei meæ concrederet: me non ſolùm operam daturum, ut ex ipſius voto ille in vulgus exiret, ſed etiam de Codicis precio ipſi ſatisfacturum: At ille gratiis pro officio actis, tantum adhuc virium ſibi ſupereſſe ajebat, ut ipſemet promiſſo ſe exſolvere poſſit; uſque adeò verum eſt, Neminem eſſe tam ſenem, qui, non dico diem, ſed annos ſupervivere ſe poſſe, ſperet. Quanquam erat non nemo in Angliâ, qui Bonaventuram de tanti theſauri poſſeſſione magnificè potiùs ſe jactaſſe, quàm verè gloriatum fuiſſe, affirmaret (7). - - - - *I found the good old man,* Bonaventura Vulcanius, *confined to his chair, having neither the uſe of his hands nor feet. He had promiſed thirty years before an edition of all St Cyril's works, which has hitherto been wiſhed for by many. I expected to ſee it publiſhed almoſt every Fair. But finding myſelf diſappointed hitherto, and conſidering the age and ſickly condition of the man, I begged of him that he would truſt me with the Greek copy; and that I not only would take care to have it publiſhed according to his mind, but likewiſe would ſatisfy him as to the price of the manuſcript. He thanked me for the offer, but told me that he had ſtill ſtrength enough left to perform his promiſe himſelf; ſo true it is that there is no man ſo old who does not expect that he may live not only a day but years longer. It was neverthleſs affirmed by ſomebody in England, that Vulcanius bragged of his poſſeſſing ſo great a treaſure with more vanity than truth.*’ Obſerve that Vulcanius began to tranſlate St Cyril, to aſſiſt Cardinal de Mendoza, who was writing a tract *de Naturali noſtra per dignam Euchariſtiæ ſumptionem cum Chriſto unione* (8).

[C] *His funeral oration raiſed the murmurs of ſome Critics.*] They found fault with Cunæus who made it, for not mentioning that the deceaſed, when dying, recommended himſelf to the merits of JESUS CHRIST, and ſuch like things. Cunæus juſtified himſelf by declaring that he could not have ſaid ſo without incurring the guilt of an officious lie. It is very well known, added he, that the good old man fell into a paſſion againſt thoſe who exhorted him to prepare for death, and that he never was obſerved to comfort himſelf by the maxims of piety. I ſhall inſert Cunæus's whole letter; it was never printed, and it will not be unacceptable to the reader. A friend of mine tranſcribed it from the original, and did me the favour to communicate his tranſcript to me. I know who hath the original.

‘Ampliſſimo Viro Rumoldo Hogerbetio Petrus
‘Cunæus S. D.

‘Vir Ampliſſime. Ante dies aliquot rogatu Mag. Rectoris, & Senatus Academici laudavi Bonaventuram Vulcanium funebri oratione, in qua reprehendi quædam audio ab ineptis. Et jam perlatus Hagam rumor eſt. Ego non decrevi orationem publicare, neque enim tanti eſt. Sed tamen animi cauſa ſcripſi brevem diſſertatiunculam quam legi à vobis cupio, uti intelligatis quam frigida & febriculoſa ſint, quæ illi culpavere. Præcipuæ illud exagitatum eſt de Lipſio & Eraſmo. De Lipſio crimen dilui ſatis ſolide: Eraſmum autem ita defendi ut ſub illius perſona cauſam ipſe meam egerim. Etiam illud culpavere quod de Chriſti meritis locutus non ſum. Sed multæ cauſſæ fuere cur hæc & alia multa omiſerim. Novimus nos, novere cæteri Vulcanium qui familiariter cum illo vixerunt. Sane quoties aliquis hominem extrema ſenectute ad mortis meditationem hortaretur, vehementer iraſcebatur ille. Sermones vero de Chriſto aut de pietate, adeo nunquam ex ſene audivimus, ut ſæpe mirati ſimus quibus ille cogitationibus feſſam ætatem ſolatus fuerit. Itaque laudo in funere ea quæ cunctis eruditis literatiſque communia. Cætera omiſi, ne viderer ſcenæ inſervire. Sermones de Chriſto non ſunt gladii Delphici qui omnibus aptari poſſint. Et profecto qui hæc indignantur relegandi ſunt ad D. Henſii orationes quibus nobiliſſ. Douzam & Scaligerum laudavit. Eadem enim illi objici poſſunt atque etiam objecta fuerunt. Vale Ampliſſime Senator. Lugdun. Batav. Kal. Nov. CIƆ IƆCXIV.

‘*Peter Cunæus, to the honourable Rumoldus*
‘*Hogerbetius.*

‘*Honourable Sir,*

‘*At the deſire of the Rector, and the academical Senate, I pronounced, ſome days ago, a funeral oration in praiſe of Bonaventura Vulcanius. I hear that ſome things in it are cenſured by idle people, and the rumour is already got as far as the Hague. I never deſigned to publiſh the oration, nor do I think it worth while. But for my own amuſement I have writ a ſhort diſſertation, which I ſhould be glad you would read, that you may fully underſtand how groundleſs and inſipid their exceptions are. They have chiefly dwelt upon what I ſaid of Lipſius and Eraſmus. As to Lipſius, they allow that the charge againſt him is anſwered with ſolidity enough; but they pretend that I have vindicated Eraſmus in ſuch a manner as to plead my own cauſe in his perſon. They likewiſe blamed me for not mentioning the merits of CHRIST. But there were many reaſons for my omitting theſe and many other things. We knew Vulcanius very well, ſo did the reſt of his familiar friends. Certain it is, that in his extreme old age, when any body exhorted him to prepare for death, he fell into a violent paſſion: and we were ſo far from ever hearing him diſcourſe of CHRIST, or Religion, that we often wondered with what thoughts he comforted himſelf in his old age. For theſe reaſons I praiſe him in the funeral oration for ſuch things as are common to all learned men; paſſing over the reſt, leſt I ſhould ſeem to have had nothing elſe in view, but to ſuit myſelf to a preſent occaſion. Diſcourſes about CHRIST are not Delphic ſwords, which can be fitted up for any body. To conclude, thoſe who are diſpleaſed with theſe things, ſhould be adviſed to read the orations of Daniel Heinſius, wherein he praiſes Scaliger and Douza. For the ſame things may be and have been objected to him. Moſt noble Senator, adieu. Leyden, Nov. 1. 1614.*’

If any one objects that I ought not to have revealed this great fault of Vulcanius, he muſt be ignorant that the public hath long ſince been informed of it; to which purpoſe ſee what we find in the *Scaligerana*: *Vulcanius's religion is that of dice and cards; he knows not what religion he is of, nor is he acquainted with the difference of religions . . . . Vulcanius pretends to be one of our communion, but he doth not know what religion is* (9).

(e) See the remark [A].

(7) Abrah. Scultetus, Narrat. Hiſtor. *pag.* 55.

(8) Meurſ. Athenæ, Bat. *pag.* 103.

(9) Scaligerana, *voce* Vulcanius, *pag. m.* 255.

W.

WART (BERNARD) a Dominican Friar, *Doctor and Profeſſor of Divinity in the ſchools of Thomas Aquinas of Poictiers*, publiſhed (*a*) in the year 1650 a book intituled *The Heretic overcome and put into his grave* (*b*). It is an anſwer to the Motives of Converſion publiſhed by Giles Goffart who had turned Huguenot. The Jacobin inſerted them entire in his anſwer. Neither of theſe two books is of any value.

(*a*) At Poictiers.

(*b*) It is a book in 4to, of 230 pages.

WECHEL (CHRISTIAN) a famous Printer at Paris before the middle of the XVIth century. He was ſo correct in his editions, that the errata of a book in folio did not ſometimes contain above two faults (*a*). Thoſe who tell us that he firſt began to print in Greek in the year 1538, are miſtaken [*A*]. There are ſome Hebrew books which he printed in the year 1533 (*b*). By the catalogue of the books which came from his preſs before the year 1548, it appears that he was a diligent man, and that he printed a great many. This catalogue is at the beginning of the thirteenth book of Geſner's Pandects, with a very obliging Epiſtle Dedicatory. I mean by this that Geſner dedicated his thirteenth book to him. He was proſecuted in the year 1534, for ſelling a book of Eraſmus *De eſu interdicto carnium*, which was cenſured by the Faculty of Divines (*c*). Some authors ſay that he became poor, by a particular curſe of God, which fell on him, for printing an impious book [*B*]. ANDREW WECHEL, his ſon, was alſo a very ſkillful

(*a*) There are only two faults in the errata of Francis Burana's (a Veroneſe) Commentary *in priora reſolutoria Ariſtotelis*, printed by Wechel in folio, in the year 1539. *See* Chevillier, Origine de l'Imprimerie, *pag.* 141, 142.

(*b*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 296.

(*c*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 353.

[*A*] *Thoſe who tell us that he firſt began to print in Greek, in the year* 1538, *are miſtaken.*] I had mentioned this epoch when I cited the 256th page of Mr Chevillier's tract of the origine of printing at Paris; but I have been informed by Mr Van Dale, that he has ſome Greek books printed at Paris, by Chriſtian Wechel in the years 1530 and 1531. Of this number are Hermogenes περὶ εὑρέσεων τόμοι τέσσαρες in 4to, and Lucian's Dialogues of the Gods. Theſe two books are in Greek only, and came out in the year 1530. Of this number are alſo the ſame Hermogenes περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος, & περὶ ἰδέων τόμοι δύο, printed in Greek alone in 1531. I here return thanks to Mr Van Dale for diſcovering to me Mr Chevillier's miſtake.

[*B*] *Some authors ſay that he became poor . . . . for printing an impious book.*] Here is my evidence. ' In the year 1530, after the diſmal and prodigious leudneſſes related by our Hiſtorians, and Dr Cochleus, in ſeveral places, aroſe this abortive child of hell, who wrote a book againſt the Divine Juſtice, in favour of infants dying without Baptiſm, of which GOD be thanked, there is no more at preſent remaining than the bare title in Geſner's *Bibliotheque*; and ſeveral have wiſely obſerved, that the ruin of Chriſtian Wechel and his labours fell out as a puniſhment for his preſſes and characters, being employed in ſuch an infamous work. It was this wretched anonymous author, who under the borrowed name of Antony Cornelius, traced out the firſt lineaments of this Atheiſtical monſter, which by little and little, like a venomous ſerpent, is grown up, and by intricate meanders hath crawled in amongſt us (1).' That the reader may know more exactly what this book was, I am obliged to recite what Father Garaſſe ſaith of it in another place of the ſame book. ' *The ſecond objection is not couched in ſuch elegant terms as the firſt, but it is incomparably worſe and more impious than that of Symmachus, and is taken out of that curſed anonymous author, who took the name of Antonius Cornelius, and compoſed a Latin diſcourſe againſt the diſtributive juſtice of the Creator, eſpouſing the cauſe of infants deceaſed before Baptiſm, and pleading* pro *and* con, *with texts and formal allegations of the law, by which he condemned the Divine Juſtice, and called its proceeding unjuſt, wicked, and inhuman* . . . . Time, the laſt and moſt incorruptible judge of our performances, hath diſcovered the impiety of this wretched book; for Chriſtian Wechel who printed it, ſaw his riches moulder away before his eyes, without being able to ſtop the courſe of his ruin; and GOD be thanked, the book is ſo vaniſhed, that there is not a ſingle copy to be found in libraries, and at preſent, nothing but the title is left of that infamous and abominable work (2).'

Several things make me doubt of the principal parts of this ſtory. I. Father Garaſſe cites no authority, and affirms a fact which is falſe, *viz.* That the title of this impious book is preſerved in Geſner's *Bibliotheque*. It is certain that there is no ſuch perſon mentioned there as Antony Cornelius, and that he whom we find in the epitome of that work of Geſner, is not mentioned as the author of the tract, of which I am ſpeaking. II. If Chriſtian Wechel had printed a book of this nature in 1530, had he been left undiſturbed? Would he not have been more proſecuted for this attempt, than for ſelling a book of Eraſmus, which had no greater blemiſh than that of being cenſured as a ſuſpicious piece (3)? Would this Printer have been ſuffered to make any figure in Paris from the year 1530, to 1548 at leaſt? I expreſs my ſelf with this reſtriction, becauſe I have not been able to carry him farther than that year, in which I find that Conrad Geſner dedicated a book to him (4), and repreſents him as a moſt thriving Printer in the city of Paris. III. Andrew Wechel, his ſon, ſo diſtinguiſhed himſelf amongſt the Bookſellers and Printers of Paris, that it is not at all probable that his father's eſtate was ſo miſerably impaired. IV. Laſtly, it is not perfectly agreed what that accurſed book which ruined him was; for ſome ſay it was that *de tribus Impoſtoribus*, a chimerical book which was never in being, if we may believe thoſe who are beſt able to give an account of things of this kind (5). ' Chriſtus Dominus . . . *impoſtor* atque adeo mendax & planus audivit non modò à Celſo . . . ſed etiam ab impio & immemorando homine, imo Dæmone corporato, cujus opus *de tribus Magnis Impoſtoribus, Moſe, Chriſto, Mahumete*, exitiale fuiſſe Wechelo, inſigni alias Typographo, ſed ejus libri peſtifero attactu funditus everſo, referunt qui legerunt, digni fide teſtes. Mihi inceſtare oculos tam infandæ ſcriptionis lectione, ad ingens ſcelus videtur pertinere (6). - - - *The Lord Jeſus Chriſt was called an impoſtor, and conſequently a liar*

(1) Garaſſe, Somme Theologique, *pag.* 19.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 298.

(3) Cum libellum Eraſmi de eſu carnium, ab Academia Pariſienſi tanquam ſuſpectum reprobatum, Chriſtianus Wechelus vendendum expoſuiſſet. *Chevillier, Orig. de l'Imprimerie, pag.* 353.

(4) The 13th book of his *Pandects*.

(5) See the article ARETIN (PETER), remark [*G*].

(6) Theophilus Raynaud. Hoplotheca, *Sect.* ii, *Serie* ii, *cap.* xiv, *pag.* 259, 260.

ſkilful Printer [*C*]. He retired from Paris to Francfort (*d*); ſome writers ſay, that it was

---

(*d*) Baillet, Jugemens des Sçavans, *ſur les Imprimeurs.* Art. xviii.

‘ *a liar and cheat, not only by Celſus . . . but likewiſe* ‘ *by that wicked and infamous writer, or rather that* ‘ *devil incarnate whoſe book* Of the three great impoſtors, Moſes, Chriſt, and Mahomet, *proved fatal to* ‘ *Wechel, who, being in other reſpects a famous Printer,* ‘ *was utterly ruined by meddling with that peſtilential* ‘ *book, as it is affirmed by credible witneſſes who have* ‘ *peruſed it. As for my part, I ſhould look upon it as a* ‘ *very great crime to pollute my eyes with the reading of* ‘ *ſuch an abominable performance.*’ By theſe four remarks I do not pretend to deny the whole narrative of Father Garaſſe; I only call in queſtion Wechel's ſuffering ſuch terrible effects of the Divine wrath, for having printed a book in the year 1530, and do not believe that the diſſertation concerning the puniſhment of infants, was ſo impious as he repreſents it. As for the reſt, I agree with him, that there was a book intituled, *Querela infantium in limbo clauſorum adverſus divinum judicium, ab Ant. Cornelio* (7) *J. U. Lic.* If we rely upon the title, it was printed at Paris by Chriſtian Wechel, in the year 1531, in 4to. There are two copies (8) of it in the Archbiſhop of Rheims's library. Without having read this tract, I conjecture that it is not impious, and that it is like that of *Bartolus à Saxoferrato*, and that of *Jacobus de Ancharana*. The firſt of theſe Civilians is author of a piece intituled, *Proceſſus Sathanæ contra D. Virginem coram Judice Jeſu:* and the other of a treatiſe called *Proceſſus Luciferi contra Jeſum coram Judice Salomone.* They introduce the devil entering an action, obſerving the formalities of the bar, and conſequently urging all his reaſons. Is it poſſible to repreſent him ſpeaking without making him utter impieties? And yet theſe two books are not impious. Every thing ends in the confuſion of the plaintiff.

(7) *See* Bibliotheca Telleriana, *pag.* 167. *He is there called* Cornellius, *pag.* 422, *and in the Index.*

(8) What Garaſſe affirms is not therefore true, that it is wholly loſt.

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary I have read the book in queſtion (9). The entire title of it runs thus: *Exactiſſima infantium in limbo clauſorum Querela adverſus divinum judicium apud æquum judicem propoſita. Apologia divini judicii contra Querelam Infantium. Infantium ad Apologiam divini judicii Reſponſio. Æqui Judicis ſuper hac re Sententia. Autore Antonio Cornellio Juris utriuſque Licentiato Doctiſſ. Lutetiæ apud Chriſtianum Wechelum in via Jacobæa ſub ſcuto Baſilienſi, anno MDXXXI. menſe Januario.* This tract, containing about ſeventy pages in 4to, was dedicated by the author to Antony du Bourg, Lieutenant-Civil at Paris (10), and Preſident of the Council of Louiſe of Savoy, mother of Francis I (11). The Epiſtle Dedicatory is very ſhort, and precedes a Preface which is a little longer, and dated at Paris on the ſecond of January 1531. Antony Cornellius acknowledges his great obligations to the perſon to whom he dedicates his book, and that he undertook that performance at the requeſt of one of his friends, who knew that he had dreamed that the infants detained in limbo, complain of being diſinherited contrary to the diſpoſition of the law *Plautius*, which enacts *neminem ex facto alterius exhæredari poſſe.* - - - *That no perſon can be diſinherited for the fault of another.* He declares that their complaints are ill-grounded (12). Where is then the impiety? Doth it conſiſt in his citing ſome paſſages of the Scripture, and of the Civil and Canon-Laws which favour the infants cauſe? But does he not alſo alledge ſome that are contrary to them? and at laſt, after their reply, doth he not bring in the following definitive ſentence? ‘ Penſitatis diligentiſſime in utramque partem legibus, ‘ cenſeo infantes injuſte de divino judicio queri per tex. ‘ in c. regenerante de conſec. diſti. iiii fallit dicit lex. ‘ & fallitur qui parvulos non baptiſatos prædicat in ‘ condemnatione non futuros, cum dicat Apoſtolus ob ‘ unius delictum omnes homines damnari. - - - *Having* ‘ *attentively conſidered the laws on either ſide, I am of* ‘ *opinion that children have no reaſon to complain of the* ‘ *Divine Juſtice. The law, ſays he, deceives one; and* ‘ *I am of opinion that he is deceived who affirms, that* ‘ *little children, not baptized, are not liable to be* ‘ *damned, ſince the Apoſtle expreſsly ſays, that by the of-* ‘ *fence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.*’

(9) Mr Bourdelot did me the favour to ſend it me from Paris.

(10) Antonio Borg Judici civili apud Pariſienſes.

(11) Præſes ſacri Conſiſtorii illuſtriſſ. D. Lodovicæ Galliarum gubernatricis.

(12) Non quod dubitem pueros illos juſta pœna condemnatos. *Antonius Cornelius*, in Præfat.

A Reflexion upon the complaints of ſome perſons, againſt thoſe who repreſent the objections of the Libertines with all their force.

Thus we ſee with what temerity Father Garaſſe mentions Antony Cornellius's book. Who can be ſufficiently ſurprized at his blunder? Perhaps ſome may reply to me that the infants objections are carried too far, and that it makes the faith of their Advocate ſuſpected. I ſhould not vouchſafe an anſwer to this ſcruple, if I did not well know that it is in the mouths of an infinite number of people, and objected againſt thoſe, who, without any diſguiſe, fairly repreſent the arguments of Heretics, or Libertines. Give me leave to anſwer thoſe gentlemen with this queſtion: If you were obliged to examine ſome of the controverſies in agitation betwixt the Chriſtians and the Infidels, would you, to the utmoſt of your knowledge, repreſent whatever the laſt could urge with the greateſt force in favour of their opinions? Or would you deſignedly weaken their arguments, that your readers might meet with nothing to render the victory dubious? You will undoubtedly anſwer me, that you would do the firſt of theſe two things, and that the ſecond is a fraud utterly unworthy of a man of honour, and much leſs excuſable in a ſervant of God. Wherefore then are you ſurprized to ſee the objections of the Infidels repreſented with all the force which natural reaſon gives them? You ſay you would do it your ſelf, if you were to refute them, and you agree, that ſwerving from this rule is to incur the guilt of an ignominious fraud. Learn then not to take all thoſe for prevaricators, who fairly ſhew the beautiful ſide of their adverſaries cauſe; and if they are obliged to confeſs that nothing but the Scripture can furniſh arms againſt certain objections of the Infidels, and that they recur to it as to the immovable foundation of their faith, be very well contented with their conduct; for otherwiſe the world will be apt to diſtruſt you, and to ſuppoſe that you endeavour to triumph by the aſſiſtance of a train of military ſtratagems, which are inconſiſtent with the Goſpel.

I have lately diſcovered one of the cauſes, which induce a great many people to ſuſpect thoſe of Libertiniſm, who propoſe the objections of the Libertines in their full force. A very honeſt and truly religious man ſaid to me a few days ago, mentioning ſome writers, whoſe zeal for the good cauſe is known to the whole world; you do not find in their books that the enemies of truth offer any thing conſiderable; the objections of the Infidels are propoſed there in few words, and they are amply and victoriouſly refuted: but in ſuch and ſuch writers who do not paſs for great zealots, they are very prolix and more ſpecious than the anſwer. I made uſe of the ſame queſtion as above. Did thoſe zealous writers know all that appears in the leſs zealous authors, or were they ignorant of it? If the latter, they are not to be praiſed for their ſilence, nor for their victory. But if the firſt, they deſerve a ſevere cenſure, as being guilty of a pious fraud, which truth ought never to ſtand in need of; and I am very ſure they would not dare to own that they have paſſed by the leaſt particular, which could repreſent in a beautiful light their enemies objections. Wherein then doth their zeal ſurpaſs the leſs devout writer, whom you was ſpeaking of? They ſaid all they could in favour of their adverſary before they anſwered him; hath the leſs zealous author done more?

We have ſeen ſome other miſtakes of Garaſſe in the article CORNELLIUS.

[*C*] Andrew Wechel, *his ſon, was alſo a very ſkilful Printer.*] I have read in the Hiſtory of Printing (13), firſt, *That he was obliged to retire to Francfort, under the protection of the Count of Hanaw, on account of his religion about the year* 1573. In the ſecond place, *That his ſon John, who was married to one of the daughters of Jerom Drouart* (14), *Bookſeller at Paris, going to Francfort with his father, carried with him half the impreſſion of* Polybii opera Gr. Lat. cum notis Caſauboni, *in folio, in* 1609; *which is the reaſon why ſome copies of Polybius are to be ſeen with his name to them, though it be the ſame edition with that of Paris.* Thirdly, That Andrew Wechel died at Francfort towards the year 1600. In the fourth place, that *his ſon John printed books in the ſaid city of Francfort in the year* 1583, *and afterwards* Diodori Siculi Biblioth. Hiſtoriæ Gr. Lat. *in* 1604, *and other books which procured him the reputation of one of the moſt able Printers and Bookſellers of his time.* On the firſt of theſe four things I obſerve, that Francfort being a Republic, not in the leaſt depending on the Counts of Hanaw, it is not at all likely that Andrew Wechel

(13) Written by John de la Caille, and printed at Paris in the year 1689.

(14) The author ſays, pag. 208, that it is an error, and that this Jerom was never married.

was after the Paris maſſacre (*e*). See the remark [*B*].

(e) Id. ibid.

ſhould, in that city, have put himſelf under the protection of thoſe Counts. Perhaps the time is here confounded; at leaſt it is very certain that Wechel's heirs kept Printing-houſes at Hanaw, towards the beginning of the XVIIth century; and it was then that they put themſelves under the protection of the Count of Hanaw. On the ſecond head I obſerve, that Caſaubon was not yet fifteen years old, when John Wechel retired with his father to Francfort, towards the year 1573. Wherefore it is impoſſible that this Printer ſhould have carried with him half the impreſſion of Caſaubon's *Polybius*. On the third I obſerve, that Andrew Wechel died on the firſt of November 1581, as may be inferred from the Preface which John Opſopæus, his corrector, prefixed to the commentaries of Peter Ramus on ſome of Cicero's orations, printed at Francfort *apud hæredes Andreæ Wecheli*, in the year 1582. Laſtly, I ſay on the fourth head, that his heirs who continued to print, were Claudius Marni, and John Aubri: which plainly ſhews, that John Wechel was not what the author of the Hiſtory of Printing repreſents him. The edition of Diodorus Siculus in 1604, was printed by Claudius Marni, and the ſons of John Aubri.

Obſerve, that Opſopæus, ſpeaking of the heirs of Andrew Wechel, mentions only Claudius Marni, and John Aubri, the ſons-in-law of that Printer (15); which obliges me to renounce the opinion I once was of, that John Wechel was the ſon of Andrew. A letter of Frederic Sylburgius, dated on the twentieth of June 1587 (16), informs me, that he did no longer lodge in the houſe of John Wechel, but with John Aubri. After this man's death, the names of his ſons appeared in the titles of books, joined with that of Claudius Marni, with whom they had ſeveral diſputes. ‘ Aubriani rationes reddi ſibi à Marnio volunt, & hæ‘ reditatem prorſus dividi; adeo ut aliquoties officina ‘ claudi debuerit, quum alias inter has occupationes ‘ ad calculos ſedere quiete nequeant (17). - - - - *The ‘ Aubri's will have Marni to ſettle his accounts with ‘ them, and require that the entire inheritance ſhould be ‘ divided. For this reaſon they have been obliged ſome‘ times to ſhut up their ſhop, becauſe their buſineſs did not ‘ give them ſufficient time to ſettle their accounts.*’ It is certain, that what they call *typi Wecheliani, typographia Wecheliana*, were in the hands of the Marni's and the Aubri's. During that time John Wechel printed ſeparately. I have, amongſt other books printed by him, the Paraphraſe and Scholia of Monlorius *in Ariſtotelis analyticorum priorum, ſeu de ratiocinatione libros duos*, together with the ſame Monlorius's tract *De Entelechia, & de Univerſis, Francofurti in officina typographica Joannis Wecheli* 1593.

(15) Opſopæus, Præf. Commentar. Petri Rami in Orat. Ciceronis. *Note, that Opſopæus wrote that preface ſoon after Andrew Wechel's death.*

(16) *It is in the collection of* Marquardi Gudii & doctorum Virorum ad eum Epiſtolæ, *&c. which the illuſtrious Mr Grævius publiſhed at Utrecht in* 1696, *by the care of Mr Burman, worthy ſon of the late Mr Burman, Profeſſor of Divinity at Utrecht. See pag.* 338, *of that collection.*

(17) Gothofredus Jungermannus, Epiſt. ad Scip. Gentilem, *pag.* 361, 362, *of the collection* Marquardi Gudii &c. Epiſtolæ.

There is a groſs error in the French tranſlation of Bongars's letters; there we find the following words: *I have wrote to one of Wechel's men to take great care of them*, which anſwer to this Latin, *Commendavi eas Aubrio Wecheliano* (18). - - - *I have recommended them to the care of Aubrius Wechelianus*; and theſe, *I have ordered one of Wechel's men to ſend you the tract which you deſire*, for *Libellum de Murrhinis juſſu meo mittet ad te Marnius Wechelianus* (19). - - - *I have ordered Marnius Wechelianus to ſend you the tract* de Murrhinis. Bongars wrote this in the year 1597, and his tranſlator hath made him ſpeak as if Wechel had been alive then, not knowing that the original expreſſed the names of his ſons-in-law.

(18) Bongarſ. Epiſt. clxiii, *pag. m.* 580.

(19) Idem, Epiſt. clxi, *pag.* 575.

As for the reſt, I have very good reaſons to believe, that Andrew Wechel left France before the maſſacre. I find in Melchior Adam, that Laurence Zincgref was very uneaſy at Paris in the year 1569, on account of money remitted to him, which was ſeized in Wechel's hands, He adds that Wechel was baniſhed the kingdom, that all his effects were confiſcated, and that his books being the greateſt part of them Proteſtant, were ſeized and carried away from his ſhop, in order to be publickly burnt. ‘ Multa ‘ hoc in itinere perpeſſus eſt indigna (*Zincgrefius*) tum ‘ propter alia incommoda, tum propter rei pecuniariæ ‘ penuriam: cum inter peregrinos agens à patre nihil ‘ acciperet: & illa, quæ ex principis liberalitate, nec ‘ non ſecretò à matre tranſmiſſa fuerant, interciperen‘ tur apud *Wechelium*, Bibliopolam notiſſimum; quippe ‘ cujus bona omnia confiſcata fuerant, ipſo regni limi‘ tibus proſcripto, reliquiſque ut plurimum Proteſtan‘ tium libris ab officinâ illius, Lutetiæ publicè com‘ buſtis (20). - - - Zincgref *endured great hardſhips in ‘ this journey, on account of ſeveral inconveniencies, and ‘ eſpecially for want of money. He received no ſupplies ‘ from his father though he was in a foreign country; ‘ and what ſums were remitted to him by the generoſity of ‘ the Prince, and privately by his mother, were ſeized in ‘ the hands of Wechel, a very noted Bookſeller, &c.* . . . Zincgref agreed with the Wechels to take in payment ſome of the books which they had ſaved from the Inquiſition (21). He afterwards received ſome other money from home, and went to Orleans, where he was admitted Doctor of the Civil-Law, in the year 1570 (22). Theſe things happened before the Paris maſſacre.

(20) Melch. Adam. in Vit. Juriſconſ. *pag.* 431.

(21) Cum Wechelianis tranſigere, proque pecuniâ ſibi debita libros nonnullos, quos clam adhuc illi ſervarant, ac confiſcatoribus Regiis ſubduxerant, ſumere coactus fuit. *Id. ibid.*

(22) Id. ibib. *pag.* 432.

Notwithſtanding all this, it is moſt certain that Andrew Wechel was at Paris on that cruel day. He fled into Germany in the year 1569, when thoſe troubles were brought on him which Melchior Adam relates, in which he had periſhed if the Preſident de Harlai had not done him good ſervice (23). He returned to Paris, and re-eſtabliſhed his Printing-houſe there, in the beginning of June 1571 (24). He himſelf relates (25) the danger which he run in the night of the maſſacre, and how he was ſaved by Hubert Languet, who lodged in his houſe. He teſtifies his gratitude to him in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of Albert Krantzius's Vandalia.

(23) Languet. Epiſt. xlii ad Camerarium Patrem, *pag. m.* 80.

(24) Idem, Epiſt. lvii, ad eundem, *pag.* 104.

(25) *In the Epiſtle Dedicatory of* Albert Krantzius's Vandalia, *printed at Francfort* 1575.

WEIDNERUS (Paul) a Jewiſh Phyſician in the XVIth century, was invited from Udine a city in Italy, to practiſe Phyſic in Carinthia, where he ſtayed ſix years, receiving a very handſome penſion from the public. During this time he conceived ſome doubts concerning his religion, which obliged him to compare the Old and the New Teſtament together, and diligently to examine the expoſitions of the rabbins; and being convinced by this courſe of reading that Jesus Christ is the Meſſias, he reſolved to embrace openly the Chriſtian Faith. He wavered for about the ſpace of one year after this full conviction (*a*), and carefully concealed his thoughts, not being ignorant of the dangers to which he ſhould expoſe himſelf [*A*], if he let the Jews know the ſtate of

(*a*) Quamvis nihil dubitarem de fide Chriſtiana & certiſſima. *Weidnerus, ubi infra.*

[*A*] *Not being ignorant of the dangers to which he ſhould expoſe himſelf.*] To be firmly perſuaded that a religion is true, to reſolve to profeſs it, and ſuffer a great many conflicts of mind before the execution of ſuch a reſolution, are not incompatible things. Wherefore we ought not to charge Weidnerus's narrative with inſincerity. There are very few deſigns, the execution of which meets with more obſtacles than that of the change of religion; for not to mention other hindrances, do not we know that we ſhall thereby anger the perſons whom we love and reſpect moſt? Do not we know that we ſhall become odious and infamous to our relations? I ſay infamous, for all nations are uſed to fix an infamous idea on any man's forſaking his religion. They are not contented with calling him a deſerter, an apoſtate, but he muſt alſo be called a renegado (1). They affirm, that his revolt is an ignominious blemiſh to his family, and I have ſeen a devout woman who ſaid very ſeriouſly, that ſhe had rather ſee her ſiſters common whores, than go to maſs. Theſe hideous notions are neceſſary to the temporal good of a communion, and this is the reaſon why they are fomented. A Caſuiſt will not think it ill for a father to turn his ſons out of doors if they apoſtatize, or that in the like caſe, one brother ſhould never ſee the other, and a man ſhould abhor his wife, or a woman leave her huſband. The Proteſtants charge this ſort of perſecution on the Catholics, who alſo on their

(1) That name was uſed among the Proteſtants in ſome towns of France, to denote thoſe who turned Papiſts.

of his ſoul; but at laſt the intereſt of his ſalvation prevailed over the conſiderations of the fleſh; and leaving Carinthia, he removed to Vienna, where together with his wife and four children he was baptiſed in St Stephen's Church, on the twenty-firſt of Auguſt 1558. He was made Hebrew Profeſſor in the univerſity of Vienna, and publiſhed ſomething concerning the motives of his converſion, and to refute Judaiſm *(b)*.

(*b*) Taken from the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Emperor Ferdinand, prefixed to his book *De locis præcipuis Fidei Chriſtianæ*, printed at Vienna, in the year 1559. See John Henichius, Profeſſor of Divinity at Rinthel, *de Veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ*, *pag.* 360, *&* *ſeq.*

their ſide, reproach the Proteſtants with it (2). Be that as it will, it is certain that this cuſtom very frequently ſerves as a ſcare-crow to thoſe who are perſuaded, that they ought to quit the church in which they have been educated. Here follows a paſſage of Mr Arnauld on this head. *The deſign of changing ones religion carries with it ſomething aſtoniſhing*, ſaith he (3), *and even thoſe who are fully reſolved to execute it, can hardly bring themſelves to do ſo . . . . . I know that a young lady, the daughter of a very zealous Huguenot concealed for ſeven years from her father that ſhe was a Catholic; and during that whole ſpace of time, ſhe accompanied him to the ſermon and ſervice only abſtaining from the ſacrament, out of fear that he ſhould die for grief at the news of it. She cauſed me to be conſulted in this caſe, and being informed that I did not approve of this diſſimulation, ſhe reſolved, though with a great deal of difficulty, to diſcover her ſelf . . . . . . There may be alſo ſome, as it was in St Auguſtin's time, who are throughly convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion, but cannot break the bonds of cuſtom which drags them to the Proteſtant aſſemblies, nor expoſe themſelves to the reproach which they fear from their relations and friends, on account of their change, unleſs ſome other human conſideration, contrary to thoſe which I have mentioned, counterballances them, and hindering the impreſſion which they made on their minds, enables them to follow more eaſily the truth of which they are convinced.* There are ſome communities, which believe themſelves ſo much diſgraced by the apoſtacy of a Monk of merit, and are ſo afraid that it ſhould prove a fatal ſcandal to the faith of the weak, as well as too great a ſubject of triumph to the contrary party, that they would leave no means unattempted againſt any perſon who diſcovers the leaſt deſign to deſert them. The Jews are of the ſame diſpoſition. Would they not have murthered Spinoza (4)? And did they not attempt to deſtroy our Weidnerus after his converſion? Porro, *ſaith he* (5), ‘ſimulatque res celari amplius non potuit, protinus à meis ſecundum carnem non mediocria propter fidei Chriſtianæ ſuſpicionem exſpectare pericula cogebar, quæ proh dolor! in hunc uſque diem mihi intentari video & experior. - - - - - *Beſides, when the thing could be no longer concealed, I was immediately forced to dread no ſmall miſchief from my brethren according to the fleſh, on account of their ſuſpecting me to be a Chriſtian; and to my great grief I both ſee and know by experience that I am expoſed to the ſame dangers ſtill.*’ Let us not forget a very terrible ſort of perſecution againſt thoſe, who change their religion. They are loaded with defamatory libels (6); their whole lives are ſtrictly examined; and if any blemiſhes can be found they are repreſented to the public with all ſorts of artifice in the moſt hyperbolical manner. The leaſt ſlips of youth are never forgiven them. If they have written any private letters in confidence to their friends, which may injure their reputation, they are publiſhed. In a word, for the intereſt of the cauſe, and to diſcredit the authority of the change, no ſcruple is made to turn into great crimes, thoſe very things which would never have deprived them of the eſteem and affection of any one perſon in the world, provided they had not changed their religion. See the remark [*C*] of the article SPONDANUS (JOHN).

(2) *See Mr Brueys's book, intituled*, Réponſe aux Plaintes des Proteſtans: *it is mentioned in the* Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, *for Auguſt* 1686, *Art.* 1. *See pag.* 879, *of thoſe* Nouvelles.

(3) Arnauld, Apologie pour les Catholiques, *Part.* ii, *ch.* xii, *pag.* 240, 241.

(4) See the text of the article SPINOZA, between the citations (*b*) and (*c*).

(5) *Weidnerus*, Epiſt. Dedicat. ad Ferdinandum.

(6) Confer with this the words of Peter CHARRON, which I have quoted in his article, remark [*P*].

WEILE (*a*) (**FREDERIC RAGSTAT DE**) a German Rabbi was an early convert to Chriſtianity; for he was no more than three and twenty years of age when he publiſhed a book againſt the Jews. A little before that he had abjured their religion, and had been baptiſed in the Proteſtant church at Cleves. He was named Frederic after the Elector of Brandenburgh (*b*). The book I ſpeak of was printed at Amſterdam in the year 1671 in 12mo, and contains one hundred and fifty pages. The title of it is *Theatrum lucidum exhibens verum Meſſiam dominum noſtrum* JESUM-CHRISTUM, *ejuſque honorem defendens contra accuſationes Judæorum*, ſeu Rabbinorum, *in genere*, *ſpeciatim* R. LIBMAN NITZACHON. We find there ſome very extraordinary particulars touching the impoſtures of the falſe Meſſiah Sabbathi Tzebhi, who had made a great deal of noiſe in Turkey a little while before. Mr Lendt has related them, and beſtowed praiſes on our de Weile (*c*), who was Miniſter at Spiik near Gorcum in Holland. He baptized a Portugueſe Jew (*d*) there on the tenth of February 1686 [*A*]. The Flemiſh ſermon which he preached upon that occaſion, on the ſixth verſe of the ſecond Pſalm, was printed at the Hague ſoon after in 8vo.

(*a*) *And not* Welle, *as in Konig's* Bibliotheca.

(*b*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory, of the *Theatrum lucidum.*

(*c*) Jo. à Lendt, de Pſeudo Meſſiis, *pag.* 63.

(*d*) Whoſe name was Aaron Gabay Faro, and to whom in baptiſm they gave the name of John Rodriguez.

[*A*] *He baptized a Portugueſe Jew . . . . . .*] The writings of Mr de Weile, and particularly the Flemiſh book which he publiſhed in the year 1683 (1), made a great impreſſion upon that Jew, ſo that he found himſelf diſpoſed to embrace the Chriſtian Faith, and deſired to confer with the author in order to get more and more light. Mr de Weile, who had at different times been deceived by two Jews, did at firſt reject the propoſals of this, but at laſt he hearkened to them and made him a Proſelyte. We find a narrative of the affair prefixed to a ſermon which was preached at Spiik by the ſaid miniſter, on the day that this Portugueſe was baptized.

(1) He ſhews there that Jeſus Chriſt is the Meſſiah, and expreſsly confutes Abarbinel, and Iſaac Ben Abraham, and Lipman Nitzachon: The ſecond edition of this book was printed at the Hague in the year 1684, and contains 709 pages in 8vo.

WERT (**JOHN DE**) one of the great warriors of the XVIIth century, was born in a village of the province of Guelderland, called Wert. We may ſee by this that he was a man of no family, ſince he was only known by the name of his village. . . . He was taken priſoner at the battle of Rhinfeld [*A*]. . . . . . .

For

[*A*] *He was taken priſoner at the battle of Rhinfeld.*] They carried him to Paris, and put him in ‘the caſtle of Vincennes, and as ſoon as he had given his parole, they were very glad to leave him at his entire liberty. He went to make his court to the King who received him moſt graciouſly. He was regaled by the moſt conſiderable noblemen, and went to ſee all the public ſhews. While he ſtaid at Vincennes he had a magnificent table kept for him, and the ladies of the firſt quality in Paris made it a diverſion to go and ſee him eat. He ſaid a thouſand handſome things to all of them; though his compliments did always ſavour ſomewhat of the German and ſoldier . . . . . He was an admirable drinker, and no leſs famous

For the reſt, his name did not only make a noiſe in the public news-papers, but reſounded alſo in ſongs: ſeveral were handed about of which he was the burthen, and theſe latter times have reckoned them ſo pretty that they have been revived oftener than once [*B*].

‘ famous for uſing tobacco. He ſmoked, took ſnuff, ‘ and pigtail. He was accompanied by ſeveral German ‘ officers, who had every one the ſame talents (1).’

[*B*] *Several ſongs were handed about of which he was the burthen, ... they have been revived oftener than once.*] Mr Menage (2) to prove that *the word* Tudeſque *is elegantly made uſe of in familiar converſation to denote a German* (3) quotes *Mr de Montpléſir* who has ſaid *in one of his ſongs,*

Faut-il ſe lever ſi matin,
Dit le Comte de Fieſque.
On ne dort non plus qu'un Lutin
Avecque ce Tudeſque.
Maugré-bieu de la nation:
Le Diable emporte Gaſſion,
Et Jean de Vert.

'Sblood! muſt we then ſo early riſe,
Said the Count de Fieſque,
Gobblins as well might ſhut their eyes,
As I with this Tudeſque.
A pox upon the Nation. May
The Devil take and run away
With Gaſſion and John de Vert.

Several verſes were compoſed to the ſame tune in the year 1690. Every body ſung them. Many more have been publiſhed ſince (4). I have ſeen in the *Mercure Galant* for the month of April 1702, a ballad, from which I ſhall quote two things: the one will confirm what I have ſaid in another place (5), viz. that drunkenneſs becomes faſhionable among women: the other will ſhew us whether Mr Chevreau, in the paſſages which I have quoted elſewhere (6), had reaſon to ſay that there prevails at this time a chaſtity of converſation unknown to our anceſtors.

A ſe barbouïller de Tabac
Trouvoit-on de la gloire,
Se piquoit-on d'un eſtomac
Qui fut ſi propre à boire.
Certaines Dames de ce temps
L'emportent pour ces beaux talens
Sur Jean de Vert, ſur Jean de Vert (7) . . . .
. . . .
. . . .
. . . .
Dans les cercles les mieux choiſis
Fort peu je vous aſſure
Imitent par leurs tours polis
Saraſin ou Voiture.
Je quitterois tous les vivans
Pour tels defunts l'honneur du tems
De Jean de Vert, de Jean de Vert . . . . .

Comme l'on ſe retire loin
De la galanterie
On ſuit en ſa place avec ſoin
La poliſſonnerie.
On dit des bons mots plus groſſiers
Que les Goujats des officiers
De Jean de Vert, de Jean de Vert (8) . . . . .

Was it a ſtriſe who ſhould be moſt
Dawb'd o'er with ſnuff like Tinkers:
And did our honeſt fathers boaſt
Of being ſturdy drinkers?
There are ſome ladies in our days
Who claim in both a higher praiſe
Than John de Vert, than John de Vert.
. . . .
. . . .
. . . .
In the beſt choſen circles you,
After ſtrict ſearch, will find,
Like Saraſin and Voiture few,
Of manners ſo refin'd.
I'd change the living all away
For ſuch dead men as grac'd the day
Of John de Vert, of John de Vert. . . .

The farther ſtill that we remove
From gallantry and wit,
The more we carefully improve
In waggery and ſmut.
Our dirty jokes would have offended
The very lackeys that attended
The officers of John de Vert. . . . .

Mademoiſelle l'Heritier tells us in the following quotation what the original of thoſe ſongs was. She ſays (9) that John de Vert having made himſelf maſter of *ſeveral places in Picardy* (10) carried *terror to the very gates of Amiens by the parties which he ſent out. That terror diffuſed itſelf as far as Paris, and as people are ever apt to magnify objects the bare name of John de Vert ſtruck with terror, and became ſo dreadful, that the ſound of it was ſufficient to frighten children.* When this General was taken priſoner at the battle of Rhinfeld (11) *the people of Paris, upon hearing the news of it, diſcovered ſuch tranſports of joy that it would be difficult to deſcribe them. The Muſe of the Pont Neuf celebrated her joy to a trumpet-tune which was then in vogue: ſhe ſet forth the triumph of the French, and ſaid that they had beat the Germans and John de Vert. She related how they had taken a great many colours, a great many ſtandards, and John de Vert, that they had taken ſuch a number of priſoners and John de Vert. In ſhort, all the couplets of this Savoyard's* (12) *ſong, which were very numerous, ended with this burden,* and John de Vert. *As there was a certain ruſtick ingenuity in theſe ſongs, which at the ſame time had ſomething chearful in it, the court and city rung with them, and John de Vert and his ſongs were ſo much in faſhion that nothing elſe was talked of* (13) . . . . That valiant ‘ General, ‘ whoſe name had made ſo great a noiſe, left in ‘ France an everlaſting remembrance of his captivity, ‘ and they called the time in which it happened, the ‘ time of John de Vert. The trumpet tune which I ‘ mentioned a little before was called the tune of ‘ John de Vert . . . . . Several men of wit both in ‘ the court and city did in imitation of the Pont Neuf ‘ make divers pretty ſongs to that tune, which had ‘ all a relation to John de Vert. In ſhort he has ‘ made not only himſelf but his tune immortal, ſince ‘ from his time to this there have not paſſed ten ‘ years together wherein ſome agreeable ſongs have ‘ not been compoſed to that tune (14).’

WESALIA (JOHN DE) a Doctor of Divinity in the XVth century, was very ill treated by the Inquiſition in Germany, for having taught ſome doctrines which diſguſted the Catholics. It is pretended that his converſation with ſome Jews diſordered his head, and occaſioned his falling into ſeveral extravagancies [*A*]. He was a famous preacher,

[*A*] *His converſation with ſome Jews diſordered his head, and occaſioned his falling into ſeveral extravagances.*] The plague having obliged him to leave Mentz, he retired to Worms, where he converſed with the Jews; as a Rabbi, converted to Chriſtianity, informed Orthuinus Gratius. This Rabbi was Victor de Carben, who embraced the Chriſtian Faith in the year 1515, being forty-two years of age, and became a prieſt, and lived to the age of ninety-two (1). He wrote ſome tracts in honour of the Bleſſed Virgin and the Church, which preacher, which the Monks, eſpecially the Thomiſts, did not love, and accordingly they were the principal authors of the perſecutions which he ſuffered. They accuſed him for certain propoſitions which they had heard him deliver in the pulpit; and obliged the Archbiſhop of Mentz to proceed againſt him (*a*). That prelate being unwilling to expoſe himſelf once more to the indignation of the Court of Rome [*B*], convoked an aſſembly of Doctors in the year 1479. John de Weſalia, who was then a priſoner in the convent of the Cordeliers at Mentz, was interrogated by John Elten the Inquiſitor, who was preſident of the aſſembly. He anſwered in the negative, to moſt of the queſtions put to him, and ſeemed a little to evade ſome others. Wherefore on the next day, the Inquiſitor declared with a great deal of eloquence [*C*], that he ought to be interrogated once more. His anſwers were much the ſame with thoſe of the fore-going day; but he had the confuſion to be convicted out of his own writings [*D*], of having taught principles which he had denied in anſwering the Inquiſitor. He ſubmitted to the puniſhment impoſed on him, which was to retract before all the people. His books were burnt; but ſome Doctors thought that this venerable old man was uſed too ſeverely, and that monkiſh paſſion had a great ſhare in this affair (*b*) [*E*]. He was confined to perpetual

---

(1) *Mademoiſelle* l'Héritiere, *in the* Mercure Galant, *for the month of May* 1702, *pag.* 77, *& ſeq.*

(2) Menage, Obſervat. ſur la Langue Françoiſe, *Tom. ii, pag.* 310.

(3) He confutes Father Bouhours, who has obſerved in the 349th page of his Remarks, that *Tudeſque* is only uſed by the French to ſignify the language of the old Germans. *ibid.*

(4) We find a ſong to this tune in a book which was printed in the year 1695, with this title, *Le Porte feuille de Mr L. D. F.*

(5) In the remark [*F*], of the article LYCURGUS.

(6) See the Explanation on Obſcenities, remark [*A*].

(7) Romance de Madle. l'Heritier, *in the* Mercure Galant, *for the month of April* 1702, *pag.* 298.

(8) Ibid. *pag.* 298, 299.

(9) Mercure Galant, *for the month of May* 1702, *pag.* 74.

(10) In the year 1636.

(11) In the year 1638.

(12) Concerning this man, ſee the remark [C], of the article DASSOUCI.

(13) Mercure Galant, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 76, *& ſeq.*

(14) Ibid. *p.* 81.

(1) Orthuinus Gratius, in Faſciculo rerum expetend. & fugiendar. *pag.* 325, *Edit. Londin.* 1690.

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(*b*) *Taken from a relation of that trial, inſerted by Orthuinus Gratius, in the* Faſciculus Rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum, *pag.* 325, *& ſeq. Edit. Londinenſ.* 1690.

which Orthuinus Gratius turned into Latin. *Is Victor quum achillicè adhuc valeret, mihi ſæpius retulit prætactum Johannem Weſalienſem è Moguntia ob peſtis metum Wormaciam ſe contuliſſe, atque ibidem cum Judæis Chriſti inimicis frequentem habuiſſe converſationem, eumque ab illis deceptum in putidam errorum ſentinam corruiſſe* (2). There is no manner of appearance of truth in this ſtory; for the doctrines, for which John de Weſalia was condemned by the Inquiſition did not at all ſavour of Judaiſm.

[*B*] *The Archbiſhop of Mentz . . . . . being unwilling to expoſe himſelf once more to the indignation of the Court of Rome.*] The liberty which he had taken of condemning the avarice of that court had been fatal to him, and was the cauſe that not only he was deprived of his archbiſhopric, but Mentz was deſtroyed. The following paſſage expreſſes his name and family; ‘ Reverendiſſimus præſul Moguntinus Dietherus Iſenburgius miſit litteras ad Univerſitatem Heidelbergenſem & Colonienſem inſtigantibus, imo cogentibus Thomiſtis quibuſdam: veritus ne denuo ab epiſcopatu ejiceretur juſſu Romani Pontificis, quod commeruerat ante levibus verbis Romanorum in vendendis palliis notata avaritia. Et minabantur ei Romani præſulis iram, quam pridem non tam ipſe fuerat expertus, quàm tota Moguntia & capta & direpta, ac à victoribus nullum non contumeliarum genus paſſa. Unde ferunt Pium Pontificem ad Moguntiæ mentionem ſemper ingemuiſſe, quod jus ſuum tam inſigni damno vindicaſſet (3): - - - - - *The moſt reverend Archbiſhop of Mentz, Dietherus Iſenburgius ſent letters to the univerſities of Heidelberg and Cologn, being incited, or rather forced, thereto by certain Thomiſts, and fearing leſt he ſhould be again thruſt out of his biſhopric by the Pope's orders, as he had been before on account of ſome ſlight reproaches which he had thrown upon the avarice of the Court of Rome in the ſale of preferments. They threatened him with the Pope's indignation, which had formerly fallen not only upon himſelf but upon the whole city of Mentz; for it was taken and plundered, and ſuffered all manner of indignities from the conqueror. Hence it is ſaid that Pope Pius always ſighed when he heard the name of that city mentioned, becauſe he had aſſerted his right in ſuch a deſtructive way.*’ We ought not to be ſurprized that the agents of the Inquiſition, are ſo greedy of rendring people ſuſpected and amplifying things by malicious interpretations; for thoſe who find themſelves ſuſpected, are afraid of loſing their poſts if they have any, and break out into a thouſand violences, in order to take off the ill impreſſions that have been given of them. The inquiſitors do very well know that their odious ſlanders will produce this effect; wherefore they never make any ſcruple of calumny. To how many people may juſtly be applied this ſaying of Horace, *you deſign to ſilence envy by forſaking virtue* (4).

[*C*] *On the next day, the Inquiſitor declared with a great deal of eloquence.*] Thoſe who read his ſpeech on that occaſion, need not be advertiſed that I here ſpeak ironically. ‘ Adducto Johanne de Weſalia, dixit Inquiſitor: Tria jam futura in hoc actu. Primum quia M. Johannes heſterna die non ſatis reſolutus ad certos reſponderit articulos, iterum ſibi illos proponendos eſſe, ut luculenter & clare, plus maſticando, reſponderet: deinde ad quoſdam alios articulos heri non auditos quid ſentiat, reſpondere deberet: tertio relegi debere omnes articulos principaliores cum reſponſionibus, ut audiatur ſi adhuc in illis velit perſiſtere aut ab illis reſilire (5). - - - - - - *John de Weſalia being brought before the Inquiſitor, the Inquiſitor ſaid that three things were to be done at that ſitting. Firſt, becauſe the ſaid John had not given direct and poſitive anſwers the day before to certain articles, they ſhould be propoſed to him again, that he might anſwer diſtinctly and clearly, by pondering more than he had yet done: next, that he ſhould be obliged to declare his ſentiments upon ſome other points, which had not been mentioned the preceding day: and thirdly, that all the principal articles, together with his anſwers, ſhould be read over, to ſee whether he ſtill adhered to them or was willing to depart from them.*

[*D*] *He had the confuſion to be convicted out of his own writings.*] This poor man, broken by age and diſeaſes, was not able to expreſs his thoughts before ſuch a dreadful tribunal, and perhaps did not remember all that he had written. The Inquiſitors clearly foreſaw his negative plea; and for that reaſon they were not content with binding him by the moſt ſolemn oaths, but firſt of all they ſeized on all his papers. ‘ Mandavit eidem Johanni (*Inquiſitor*) ſub pœna obedientiæ, in virtue Sancti Spiritus, ſub pœna excommunicationis latæ ſententiæ (à quo nemo habeat ipſum abſolvere niſi ſolus Papa, vel ipſe Inquiſitor, niſi in articulo mortis) ut diceret plane verba veritatis ſuper interrogandis de ſua fide, ſine ambagibus, ſine verborum ſophiſticatione (6). - - - - - - *The Inquiſitor charged the ſaid Weſalia, by his vow of Obedience, in the name of the Holy Ghoſt, and under pain of excommunication (from which no man ſhould abſolve him beſides the Pope and the Inquiſitor himſelf, unleſs at the point of death) that he would plainly ſpeak the truth in theſe things upon which he was to be interrogated, without any ſhuffling or equivocation.*’ ‘ Concluſum quod M. N. Weſalia jusjurandum facere deberet, quod præſentare & tradere vellet omnes tractatus, opera, ſcripta ſua qualiacunque quæ condidiſſet, ut per proprios ſermones vinceretur . . . . . . Adjungebatur quod doctores Heidelbergenſes cum tribus aliis, ſcilicet Macario, decano Sancti Victoris, & quodam alio perſpicerent tractatus ejus, errores excerperent dearticularent (7). - - - - - *It was concluded that an oath ſhould be adminiſtred to Weſalia, by which he ſhould oblige himſelf to preſent and deliver up all his treatiſes, works, and compoſitions whatſoever, that he might be convicted by his own words. . . . . . . It was added that the Profeſſors of Heidelberg, together with three more, viz. Macarius, the Dean of St Victor, and a certain other perſon, ſhould examine his treatiſes, extract the errors, and digeſt them into articles.*’ It was therefore very eaſy to convict him on thoſe points which he improperly denied: ‘ Dum certas propoſitiones negaſſet ſe ſcripſiſſe, tractatus ſui propria manu conſcripti ei præſentabantur, quam revera literam eſſe ſuam non valuit negare (8). - - - - - *When he denied that he writ certain propoſitions, they produced to him treatiſes written with his own hand, which he was not able to deny.*’

[*E*] *Some doctors thought that he was uſed too ſeverely, and that monkiſh paſſion had a great ſhare in this affair.*] This is teſtified by the anonymous author of the verbal proceſs; who was preſent during the whole proceedings. ‘ Dempto ſolo articulo, *ſaith he* (9), de proceſ-

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) *Auctor* Examinis Magiſtralis ac Theologicalis Joh. de Weſalia, *apud* Orthuinum Gratium in Faſciculo Rerum expetend. *pag.* 327.

(4) Invidiam placare paras virtute relicta. *Horat. Sat. iii, lib. ii, ver.* 13.

(5) *Auctor* Examinis Magiſtral. *apud* Orth. Gratium, *pag.* 330.

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 328.

(7) Idem, Auctor Examinis, *apud eumdem, pag.* 327.

(8) Id. ibid. *pag.* 330.

(9) Id. ibid. *pag.* 332.

perpetual penance in a monaſtery of the Auguſtins, where he died ſoon after (*c*). The Proteſtants have placed him in their liſt of the witneſſes of truth; which I am not ſurprized at, for he was condemned for ſeveral doctrines which they have ſince taught. What Coëffeteau offers in anſwer to this, hath no manner of ſolidity [*F*]. Weſalia taught at Erford (*d*). Conſult the article WESTPHALUS (JOHN).

(*c*) Trithemius, in Chronico Sponheimenſi, *ad ann.* 1479, *apud* Coëffeteau, Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 1213.

(*d*) Wimpfelingus, *apud* Wolfium, Lect. memorab. *Tom. i, pag.* 875, *ad ann.* 1464.

‘ ſione Spiritus Sancti in aliis videtur non ita gravi cenſura fuiſſe caſtigandus, ſi induciæ datæ fuiſſent, ſi conſultores ei fuiſſent adhibiti, ſi non omnes uno ſolo dempto, fuiſſent de via realium. Et niſi forſitan impetus quidam irrepſiſſet in religioſos triumphandi de ſeculari, & præſertim de eo qui illorum Thomam peculiariter non coluerat, forſitan poterat cum eo mitius, humanius, & clementius benigniuſque actum & proceſſum fuiſſe. Deum teſtor qui omnia novit hunc proceſſum qui cum eo ſervatus fuit uſque ad revocationem & librorum ſuorum exuſtionem, vehementiſſime diſplicuiſſe Magiſtro Engelino de Brunſuico, maximo Theologo, & Magiſtro Joanni Keiſerſbergio, duobus utique viris cum doctis, tum integris. Præcipue Magiſtro Engelino viſum fuit nimis præcipitanter cum tanto viro actum eſſe. Immo non verebatur aſſerere multos articulos ejus, & majorem partem poſſe ſuſtineri. Nec obticuit de ſimultate Thomiſtarum contra Modernos, & de gaudio triumphandi religioſorum contra ſeculares. - - - - - - *Setting aſide one article touching the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, he ſeems in other things not to have deſerved ſuch a ſevere cenſure, if they would have given him ſome reſpite, and allowed him perſons to conſult with; and if they had not all except one been Realiſts. Perhaps too, if the Monks had not been violently ſet upon running down a ſecular man, eſpecially one that had never ſhewn any particular reverence for their great St Thomas, they would have proceeded againſt him in a more mild, human, merciful, and good-natured way! I call GOD, who knoweth all things, to witneſs, that this proceſs which was carried on againſt him, till ſuch time as his books were called in and burnt, did highly diſpleaſe Dr Engelin of Brunſwic, a great Divine, and Dr Keiſſerſberg, two men that were famous both for their learning and integrity. Dr Engelin particularly was of opinion, that they had proceeded too raſhly with ſo great a man. Nay he did not ſcruple to affirm, that many of his articles, if not the greateſt part of them, might be defended. Neither was he ſilent concerning the ill will which the Thomiſts bear the Moderns, and the pleaſure which the Monks take in triumphing over ſecular Prieſts.*’ He adds, that the Devil ſowed the tares of diviſion betwixt the Divines and Philoſophers, and ſo alienated their minds, that if any perſon denied the reality of the Univerſalia, he was immediately thought to have ſinned againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and to be guilty of a mortal ſin againſt GOD, Chriſtianity, Juſtice, and the State. Can this blindneſs proceed from any other cauſe but the devil, who, in order to divert us from all that is good, engages us in vain ſpeculations, which neither inſpire us with devotion towards GOD, nor charity towards our neighbour? *Unde hæc cæcitas mentis niſi à diabolo? qui ne utiliora, ne honeſtiora, ne moribus, virtutibus, & ſaluti animarum conducentia diſcamus, phantaſias noſtras illudit, & trahit ad res minus ſalutares, & ad gelidas harum intentionem ſpeculationes quibus neque ad Deum devoti reddimur, neque ad proximi dilectionem inflammamur* (10). This reflexion is very juſt, and ſufficient to mortify not only the Realiſts and Nominaliſts, but alſo other factions.

[*F*] *What Coëffeteau offers in anſwer to this hath no manner of ſolidity.*] Du Pleſſis Mornai did not forget to ſay that (11) *John de Veſalia, Doctor and preacher at Worms, was accuſed before the Inquiſitors of having maintained the following propoſitions, viz. That the prelates had no authority to inſtitute new laws in the Church, but to perſuade the faithful to obſerve the Goſpel precepts, &c* (12). Coëffeteau having in a different manner repreſented the opinions of this man, ſuch, ſaith he (13), *as the Proteſtants themſelves relate them*, exclaims thus (14), ‘Theſe are the extravagancies of the Preacher of Worms, of which du Pleſſis hath left out thoſe he found contrary, as well to his own, as the Catholic doctrine; namely the article of the proceeding of the holy Spirit from the perſon of the Son as well as the Father, which the Latin Church always hath aſſerted againſt the Greek. And it is certain that thoſe whom du Pleſſis alledges, who ſupported him againſt the Thomiſts, owned that he erred in this article; and as to moſt of the other points, he denied that he had aſſerted ſome, and endeavoured to explain others. But afterwards he publickly recanted in the church-yard at Mentz, in preſence of the Archbiſhop, and ſeveral eminent doctors of the univerſities of Mentz, Cologn, and Heidelberg; and, according to Trithemius, his books and writings were committed to the flames, and he in perpetual penance confined in an Auguſtin monaſtery, where he died ſoon after. Thus it appears what the Saumur witneſſes are. In the mean time the reader will remember, that the Proteſtant author, from whom we have cited the heads of his doctrine, hath couched them as he thought fit, in order to make them look leſs odious and more plauſible. Trithemius adds, that he aſſerted *that there was not, nor ever had been any ſuch thing as original ſin, and that children were not conceived in original ſin.* He alſo recites the other articles quite differently from the Proteſtant, who hath perverted the Abbot of Urſperg's chronicle, from whence thoſe who furniſhed du Pleſſis with them, made their extracts.’ Rivetus replied in favour of du Pleſſis, that it is true that John de Weſalia *agreed with the Greek Church on the article of the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt* (15); but that in his other propoſitions to the number of 23, *he was taxed with the ſame errors with which the Proteſtants are charged, and this according to the enumeration, and relation not of a Proteſtant, as Coëffeteau falſely aſſerts, but of a bigoted Papiſt* (16) *who uſes the following expreſſions*, impios Waldenſes, impiorem Weſalienſem, impiiſſimum Wiclefum, - - - *The impious Waldenſes, the more impious de Weſalia, and the moſt impious Wickliff, to ſhew that he did not at all ſavour of Proteſtantiſm, and ſpeaking of this poor old man he reproaches him with childiſh dotage.* In general, Rivetus is in the right, for John de Weſalia's propoſitions, cited by du Pleſſis, are in a book of Orthuinus Gratius, a very good Papiſt; but he was in the wrong to charge Coëffeteau with pretending here that Orthuinus was a Proteſtant. Coëffeteau did not cite the *Faſciculus Rerum expetendarum*, but only the continuator of the Abbot of Urſperg. It is at *pag.* 1188, and 1189, that he ſays that the author of the *Faſciculus Rerum expetendarum* was a Proteſtant and a Lutheran. Rivetus had a great deal of reaſon to correct him here (17).

Obſerve, by the way, that the author of the *Préjugez légitimes contre le Papiſme* hath been cenſured for alledging the Abbot of Urſperg's continuator in evidence. He hath been told that *it is very well known, that the publiſher of that work was Cratomelius of Schleſtad, one of Melanchthon's diſciples* (18). I believe the cenſurer meant Crato Mylius, for that is the name of the Bookſeller who publiſhed in the year 1537, the Abbot of Urſperg's Chronicle, corrected and continued by Gaſpar Hedion, Miniſter of Straſburgh. See the Epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheque* (19), and the firſt tome of the *Obſervationes ſelectæ*, printed at Hall in the year 1700 (20).

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 333.

(11) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 598.

(12) You will find the other propoſitions of that Doctor, in the *Myſtere d'Iniquité*, *pag.* 598.

(13) Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 1214.

(14) Ibid. *pag.* 1215.

(15) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *Part. ii*, *pag.* 631.

(16) That is to ſay Orthuinus Gratius. See what he ſaith of John de Weſalia above, remark [*A*].

(17) Rivet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 611.

(18) Critique des Préjugez, *pag.* 256.

(19) *At the word* Gaſpar Hedio.

(20) At page 307.

WESSELUS

WESSELUS (John) one of the moſt learned men of the XVth century, was born at Groningen about the year 1419 [*A*]; and having loſt his father (*a*) and mother in his infancy, was educated by the care of a good lady, who having but one ſon cauſed him to ſtudy with him. She ſent them both to Zwol, where there was a college, which was more eſteemed than that of Groningen. It was a ſociety of regular Prieſts of St Jerom, where youth were inſtructed. All thoſe that were educated there were ſhaven like Prieſts and wore the religious habit; but when they quitted the college they were free to wear what habit they pleaſed. So that though Weſſelus wore the cowl whilſt he ſtudied at Zwol, yet there is no reaſon to infer from thence that he was a Monk, ſince it is certain that he never engaged in a Monaſtical life [*B*]. It is indeed true, that early in his youth he had ſome thoughts which tended that way, but he refrained them as ſoon as he perceived that ſort of life charged with ſome ſhocking ſuperſtitions, and at laſt the inclination wore off. As his great natural parts were attended with an incredible application to ſtudy, he made a conſiderable progreſs in learning at Zwol, and even publickly inſtructed others there. He left that city in order to continue his ſtudies at Cologn, where he improved to ſuch a degree of learning, as not only rendred him highly admired, but ſuſpected of Heterodoxy. He conſulted the originals, and there found matter for difficulties and arguments which puzzled and ſurprized his maſters. He was by no means ſatisfied with their anſwers, that Ariſtole, St Thomas, and the Seraphic Doctor, &c. had ſaid this or that (*b*); and becauſe he applied himſelf much to the ſtudy of the Platonic Philoſophy, he thereby fell into a contempt of that of Ariſtole, which rendred him very diſagreeable to the Scholaſtic Profeſſors. He frequently croſſed the Rhine, to go to the monaſtery of Duytz (*c*) in order to read the works of the Abbot Rupert, of whom he was a great admirer. He was adviſed to go to Heidelberg, to read Divinity lectures there, and followed that advice; but the directors of the univerſity alledged that he was unqualified for the Divinity Profeſſor's chair, becauſe he was not yet promoted to the degree of Doctor [*C*]; and when he requeſted to be ſo, he was anſwered that the canons did not allow the admiſſion of Laymen to that degree. So that being reſolved againſt the taking of orders, he contented himſelf

(*a*) He was a Baker.

(*b*) See the remark [*D*], citation (12).

(*c*) Situated over againſt Cologn. *Rupert*, who is called *Abbas Tuitienſis*, was Abbot of that monaſtery.

[*A*] *He was born at Groningen about the year* 1419.] Others place his birth about the year 1400 (1): but it is probable that they are miſtaken, ſince two authors of Frieſland ſay that he died in 1489, at ſeventy years of age (2). If we believe Geldenhaur, he lived above ninety years, and his ſight remained ſo good to the laſt, that he never made uſe of ſpectacles either to write or read: *Geldenhaurius nonageſimum eum annum ſuperâſſe narrat, integro viſu & auditu, ita ut nunquam ſpecillis uſus ſit, minutiſſimaſque literas & commodè legeret, & pulchrè ipſe pingeret* (3). Hardenbergius doth not confirm this, but on the contrary ſaith, that Weſſelus, having never had good eyes, they grew ſo weak in his old age, that the continual blunders occaſioned by his bad ſight, in reading the Scripture before the Monks, rendered him the jeſt of his auditors. *At quod ad viſum, Hardenbergius luſcitioſum eum fuiſſe, & ſenio quoque caligare oculos cœpiſſe tradit, ut cum ſemper die Cœnæ Dominicæ in Cœtu Fratrum veſperi pro collatione, ut illi vocant, legeret ſermonem Domini in Cœnâ habitum à cap. Joh.* 13 *uſque ad* 18. *frequenter à textu aberrans à Monachis rideretur* (4). As for the age attributed to him by Geldenhaur, it is thus refuted: ‘ Quod verò ad ætatem, Suffridus Petri & Regnerus Prædinius, quibus ut Friſiis & in Urbe hac verſatis rectius conſtare potuit, unde ſeptuaginta annos vixiſſe affirmant, natum 1419, mortuum 1489 (5). - - - *As for his age, Suffridus Petri and Regnerus Prædinius, who were natives of Frieſland, and lived in this city, had an opportunity of knowing it much better. Now they affirm that he lived ſeventy years, being born in the year* 1419, *and dying in* 1489.’ The regiſters of the church where Weſſelus was buried expreſs the year of his death, but not that of his age: which if they had mentioned we ſhould have been more certain of Geldenhaur's, or Suffridus's error. ‘ Sepultus Groningæ, in Monaſterio, quod Spiritualium Virginum dicitur, in ipſo templi choro, non longè à ſummo altari. In libro memoriali templi illius hæc leguntur: *Anno Domini* 1489 *obiit Venerabilis Magiſter Weſſelus Hermanni, egregius Doctor Sacræ Theologiæ, & in Latinâ, & Græcâ, & Hebræâ linguis multùm eruditus, & in tota Philoſophia quaſi univerſalis* (6). - - - - *He was buried at Groningen in the convent which is called the Convent of the Spiritual Virgins, in the choir of the church, not far from the great altar. In the regiſters of that church we find the following words:* In the year of our Lord 1489, died the venerable Maſter Weſſelus Hermanni; an excellent Divine, very well verſed in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew tongues, and in a manner thoroughly acquainted with all the parts of Philoſophy.’

(1) *As* Hardenbergius, Seckendorf, Altingius, *&c. See* Seckendorf's Hiſtory of Lutheraniſm, *lib. i, pag.* 226.

(2) Vita Weſſeli, *in Libro cui Titulus* Effigies & Vitæ Profeſſorum Academiæ Groningæ & Omlandiæ, *pag.* 12, 13, & 24.

(3) Ibid. *pag.* 24.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Ibid.

[*B*] *It is certain that he never engaged in a monaſtical life.*] This is affirmed, and frequently repeated in the tract from whence I have taken this article: ‘ Cucullum monaſticum ſive Franciſcanorum ſive alius ordinis nunquam induit. . . . Rogatus quare non ſaltem primam tonſuram adſumeret? dixit ſe non metuere patibulum quanto quidem tempore mentis maneret compos (7). - - - *It is certain that he never put on the cowl of the Franciſcan, nor of any other order. . . . Being aſked why he did not at leaſt take the firſt tonſure, he replied that he did not fear the gallows ſo long as he kept in his right wits.*’ Nay, we are there aſſured that he conſtantly reſiſted the importunities of the General of the Franciſcans, who preſſed him to aſſume the habit of that order: ‘ Is cùm eſſet eruditus & eruditorum fautor, ad ſe attraxit Weſſelum, tùm ut in diſputationibus, quarum avidiſſimus erat, & quotidiano exercitio ejus opera uteretur; tum verò ut ſui ordinis monachum eum poſtea faceret; à quo tamen Weſſelus abhorrebat. Sed uſus præſenti fortunâ in familiam ſe ipſius dedit (8). - - - *As he was a learned man himſelf, and a favourer of the learned, he took Weſſelus into his houſe, that he might uſe his aſſiſtance in diſputes, of which he was extremely fond, and in his daily ſtudies; and likewiſe that he might afterwards make him a Monk of his order. Weſſelus had an averſion to that: but, embracing the favourable opportunity, he was glad to be admitted into his family.*’ Notwithſtanding this a learned man pretends, that Weſſelus was a Franciſcan, in the following words. *Wherefore Lewis XI commanded John Boucart, Biſhop of Avranches, to take care of this reform; he being aſſiſted by a Franciſcan, whoſe name was Weſelus Gransfortius of Groningen, who by his voyages in the Levant, had acquired a perfect acquaintance with Ariſtotle, and all the good Greek authors in each ſcience, aſſembled all the principal heads and members of the univerſity, and, with their concurrence and good advice, drew up and publiſhed an edict againſt the Nominaliſts, which we ſhall inſert entire at the end of this chapter, as a monument not yet printed, very much to the honour of our Lewis XI* (9).

(7) Ibid. *pag.* 13, 14.

(8) Ibid. *pag.* 17.

[*C*] *Becauſe he was not yet promoted to the degree of Doctor.*] This objection furniſhes us with an invincible argument to confute ſome writers, who have ſaid, that our Weſſelus acquired ſuch a treaſure of erudition in the univerſity of Cologn, that he was made Doctor of Divinity, Law, and Phyſic, there. *Geldenhaurius refert magno & aſſiduo & vix credibili labore hoc eum adſecutum*

(9) Naudé, in his additions to the Hiſtory of Lewis XI, *pag.* 193.

himſelf with reading Philoſophical lectures : after which he returned to Cologn, from whence he went to Louvain, and having ſpent ſome time in hearing the lectures of the Theological Profeſſors there, he went to Paris. The Philoſophical controverſies being then very hot betwixt the Realiſts, Formaliſts, and Nominaliſts ; he endeavoured to convert the principal champions of the Formaliſts, by bringing them over to the ſect of the Realiſts ; and afterwards, he himſelf went over to the Formaliſts, and not finding that ſect more in the right than the other, he embraced the opinions of the Nominaliſts. Some authors ſay, that he travelled to Greece and the Levant [*D*], the better to learn the Greek and Hebrew languages. However that be, the reputation which he acquired, procured him the particular eſteem of Francis della Rovere, General of the Minor Fryers. He adhered to him, and if he was thereby obliged to ſee ſeveral blamable actions, amongſt

tum eſſe, ut non ſolum Theologicæ Majeſtatis lauream mereretur, ſed etiam Jureconſultis & Medicis Doctoribus annumeraretur : adeoque ſummis in omnibus Facultatibus titulis fuit ornatus ; ut vulgò quidem perhibetur. Mihi tamen vix veriſimile videtur. Si enim jam tum triplici laureâ inſignitus fuiſſet Weſſelus, quæ ratio fuerit, quod poſtea admiſſus non fuerit ab Heidelbergenſibus, nullam aliam ob cauſſam, quam quod titulo Doctoris deſtitueretur. Pro exaggeranda ergo Weſſeli viri incomparabilis eruditione hanc de tribus titulis fabulam, & plura alia, jactatam jam olim fuiſſe credo (10).

[*D*] *That he travelled into Greece and the Levant.*] We have ſeen above that Naudæus affirms it. Others pretend that the name of *Baſilius*, given him by ſeveral authors, was beſtowed upon him by Beſſarion. They tell us that Beſſarion having been acquainted with our Weſſelus in Greece, at firſt by changing the U into B called him *Bæſſelus*, and afterwards *Baſilius*. The author already cited rejects theſe traditions, and doubts whether Weſſelus ever was in Greece. His words are : ‘ Hardenbergius pro Weſſelo Baſilium dictum ait, quod elegantiorum hominum auribus Weſſeli nomen nimis durum & veluti barbarum videretur : vel quod alterum quodammodo Baſilium magnum judicarent ; vel quod Beſſarion Cardinalis Græcus, quo ibi amiciſſimo uſus, ſuum B per noſtrum B quam V exprimere maluerit, atque pro Weſſelo Bæſſelum, ac mox Baſilium cœperit vocare. Quamvis vix videatur veriſimile aut in Græcia unquam fuiſſe Weſſelum, aut in ea familiariter uſum fuiſſe Beſſarione : cùm enim hic teſte Jovio jam anno 1434 in Italia vixerit, atque anno 1439 ab Eugenio Papa creatus ſit Cardinalis, debuerit Weſſelus ante annum XV ætatis in Græciam ad Beſſarionem abiiſſe : quod à vero abhorret (11). - - - - *Hardenbergius ſays, that he was called Baſilius inſtead of Weſſelus, becauſe this latter name ſeemed too harſh, and in a manner barbarous to polite ears ; or becauſe they looked upon him to be in ſome ſort another great Baſilius ; or becauſe the Greek Cardinal Beſſarion, who treated him with great friendſhip there, rather choſe to expreſs his country B by our B than V, and ſo inſtead of Weſſelus, began to call him Bæſſelus, and preſently after Baſilius. But after all, it neither ſeems probable that Weſſelus was ever in Greece, nor that he contracted a friendſhip with Beſſarion there ; for ſince, according to Jovius, the latter lived in Italy as early as the year* 1434, *and was made a Cardinal by Pope Eugenius in* 1439, *it follows that Weſſelus muſt have gone to Beſſarion in Greece before he was fifteen years of age ; which is utterly falſe.*’ A little farther he brings in Weſſelus boaſting of his travels in Greece. ‘ In diſputationibus Theologicis magnos titulos Doctorum contemnebat, ſolis Divinis literis firmiter adhærens. Quare ſiquis fortè inter diſputandum, ut fieri ſolet, ei objiceret, hoc dicit Doctor Sanctus ; hoc Seraphicus &c. ipſe reſpondere ſolebat ; Thomas fuit Doctor, quid tum poſtea ? Et ego Doctor ſum. Thomas vix latinè intellexit, & unilinguis fuit. Ego trium principalium linguarum mediocrem peritiam aſſecutus ſum. Thomas vix umbram Ariſtotelicam vidit : Ego Ariſtotelem Græcum IN IPSA GRÆCIA DIDICI (12). - - - - *In Theological diſputes he deſpiſed the great titles of Doctors, ſtrictly adhering to the holy ſcriptures alone. Wherefore if any one in a diſputation objected to him as it uſually happens. This, ſaith the holy Doctor, this the Seraphical Doctor, &c. he generally made anſwer ; Thomas was a Doctor, what then ? I alſo am a Doctor. Thomas ſcarce underſtood Latin, and but one learned language ; whereas I have acquired a tolerable knowledge in the three principal tongues. Thomas ſcarce ſaw the ſhadow of Ariſtotle ; whereas I* IN GREECE IT SELF HAVE STUDIED *Ariſtotle in his original Greek.*’ But in the ſame page looks upon this voyage as a fiction : ‘ Poſtea in Græciam abiiſſe creditur ; at ſi quis cogitet eo tempore non ſolùm literas in Græcia jacuiſſe, ſed totam quoque regionem bello arſiſſe, & hoc confictum fuiſſe cognoſcet. Ita de Petro de Aliaco quoque relatum eſt, quod Græcè exactè ſciret, per decennium in Græcia vixiſſe ; quamvis certum ſit nunquam Italiâ exceſſiſſe (13). - - - - *It is thought that he went into Greece afterwards : but if any one conſiders that not only learning was then at a low paſs in Greece, but likewiſe that the whole country was engaged in a bloody war, he will know that this is alſo a fiction. In the ſame manner was it reported of Peter de Aliaco that he was a great maſter of the Greek tongue, and lived ten years in Greece ; whereas it is certain that he never went out of Italy.*’ Let us alſo ſee what he obſerves on Weſſelus's anſwer to a ſcholar, who put a queſtion to him : *Stay till I return from Egypt a ſecond time, then your difficulty ſhall be ſolved.* My author imagines that by Egypt he myſtically meant Rome. ‘ In Ægyptum quoque profectus creditur Weſſelus noſter, perſuaſus omnes libros Solomonis, & totam illam glorioſam Bibliothecam Judæorum ibi adhuc ſervari : ſed reverſus ſolebat dicere ; *fruſtra perfectionem abſolvi. Judæi enim totam bibliothecam ſuam perdere maluerunt, quam legere quod confiteri noluerunt.* Quamvis ego ratione habitâ belli, quo eo tempore totus Oriens flagrabat, exiſtimarim Weſſelum nunquam profectionem in Ægyptum inſtituiſſe, ſed intellexiſſe Egyptum myſticam, ſive Romanam, juxta ſtylum Sp. Sancti, atque Cantero ſignificare voluiſſe, ſe nunquam Romam rediturum eſſe. Joannes Canterus, quem ipſe inſtituerat, & præter alia artem Raimundi Lullii eum docuerat, aliquando curioſiorem quæſtionem ei propoſuit : ad quem Weſſelus : *Expecta donec ſecundò ex Ægypto rediero : tunc reſpondebo tibi* ; deridens curioſitatem Canteri (14). - - - *It is likewiſe believed that our Weſſelus went into Egypt, being perſuaded that all the books of Solomon, and the glorious library of the Jews there were ſtill preſerved entire. But he uſed to ſay after his return* ; that his journey had been undertaken to no purpoſe : for that the Jews had rather choſen to deſtroy their whole library, than read what they were unwilling to confeſs. *Nevertheleſs, conſidering the war which at that time raged over the whole Eaſt, I am apt to think that Weſſelus never undertook a journey to Egypt, but that he meant the Myſtical or Roman Egypt, according to the ſtile of the Holy Ghoſt, and only intimated to Canterus that he never would return to Rome. John Canterus, his diſciple, whom beſides other things he had taught the art of Raymond Lullius, did, at a certain time, propoſe a queſtion to him of ſomewhat too curious a nature ; upon which Weſſelus ſaid :* Stay till I return from Egypt a ſecond time, and then I will anſwer you ; *thereby ridiculing the curioſity of Canterus.*’ All this ſhews that the life of Weſſelus is little known, and that ſeveral falſities are reported concerning this illuſtrious man. A Modern author aſſures us that Weſſelus went to the river Euphrates on purpoſe to ſee Ezekiel's tomb, and the antient library of the Jews ; an evident ſign of the contagious evil which perpetuates falſities. Let us hear this Modern (15) : ‘ Though Rabbi Benjamin maintains, that the Prophet Ezekiel's tomb on the river Euphrates, and the library of the firſt and ſecond temple were to be ſeen in his time ; nevertheleſs, the Sieur Weſſel of Groningen, and many other great men, who went to that country on purpoſe to ſee that tomb, and that library,

(10) Vita Weſſeli, *pag.* 14.

(11) Ibid. *pag.* 12.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 14, 15.

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 15.

(14) Ibid. *pag.* 22, 23.

(15) Gallois Traité des plus belles Bibliotheques, *pag.* 14, 15, *Paris Edition*, 1680. *See alſo* Lomeier, de Bibliothecis, *pag.* 34, *Edit.* 1680.

amongſt other motives he was induced to it by the hopes of going to Baſil at the time of the Council [*E*], where he did not doubt but his maſter would be preſent. His hopes were not vain, for he ſaw that council, and made himſelf known to the learned men; he was alſo conſulted, and admired in ſome public diſputes. He returned to Paris with Francis della Rovere, his patron, and ſome authors ſay he was perſecuted there and even baniſhed [*F*]. His Mæcenas being elected Pope under the name of Sixtus IV, continued his favour to him, and offered him all ſorts of preferments; but he only aſked a copy of the Bible in Hebrew and Greek, which he obtained [*G*]. He left Rome and returned into

‘ library, have unanimouſly reported, that it was a dream of the Rabbins, and that neither of them were to be found. I went thither in vain, ſays the Sieur Weſſel (16), ſince the Jews have rather choſen to loſe all their books, than to read what they will not confeſs.’

[*E*] *By the hopes of going to Baſil at the time of the Council.*] The author whom I have abridged in the text of this article, ought to be cenſured here. He ſaith that Weſſelus having intrigued for the Formaliſts in their diſputes with the Realiſts and Nominaliſts, at laſt ſided with the Nominaliſts. Theſe things happened, continues he, at the time of the Council of Baſil, when Weſſelus was already become a domeſtic to Pope Nicolas V, by the recommendation of Francis della Rovere, General of the Franciſcans, who was afterwards Sixtus IV, and who founded the Vatican Library. ‘ Erant hæc ſub id tempus, quo Concilium Baſileenſe celebrabatur. Ipſe autem jam pervenerat propter celeberrimam famam & incredibilem eruditionem in omni genere diſciplinarum & artium in familiam Nicolai V, Pontificis Maximi, operâ Franciſci à Ruvere, Generalis miniſtri Fratrum Minorum, qui poſtea Papa creatus Sixtus IV vocatus eſt, primuſque fundamenta jecit celebratiſſimæ illius Bibliothecæ, quæ à loco vulgo Vaticana vocatur . . . (17) . . . . in qua *(familia Fr. à Ruvere)* multa digna & indigna, quædam etiam pia, ſed pleraque impia vidit & expertus eſt. Obduruit tamen, ut per illum in notitiam omnium doctorum Virorum magis magiſque perveniret, & liberis ſine periculo diſputare poſſet, ſimulque nanciſci liberam occaſionem admonendi hominis de vitandis idololatricis ſuperſtitionibus & apertis obſcœnitatibus monaſticis; maximè verò, ut via aperiretur, quâ pervenire poſſet in Synodum Baſileenſem, in quam ſciebat Franciſcum, utpote totius Ordinis Supremum, vocatum iri, quod & contigit. Nam paulò poſt eo profectus eſt, & operâ Domini ſui in Doctiſſimi cujuſque notitiam pervenit, & ad multa conſilia adhibitus eſt, & publicè aliquoties auditus diſputare cum ſumma omnium admiratione (18). - - - - *Theſe things happened at the time that the Council of Baſil was held. Weſſelus, on account of his great reputation and incredible learning in all the different arts and ſciences, was already in Pope Nicholas Vth's family, by the recommendation of Francis della Rovere, General of the minor Friars, who was afterwards created Pope, under the name of Sixtus IV, and was the firſt who laid the foundation of that moſt famous library, which, from the place, is commonly called the Vatican . . . . In which family* (of Francis della Rovere) *he was an eye-witneſs to many good and many bad actions, to ſome piety, but to a great deal of wickedneſs. Notwithſtanding he continued there, that by his means he might become more and more acquainted with all the learned men, and be more at liberty to diſpute without running any riſque, and at the ſame time have opportunities of freely admoniſhing his patron to ſhun the idolatrous ſuperſtitions and public obſcenities of the Friars; but, above all, that he might find means to go to the Council of Baſil, in which he knew that Francis, as General of the whole order, would aſſiſt. The thing fell out as he deſired: for in a ſhort time after he went thither, and by the recommendation of his maſter became acquainted with the moſt learned men, he was often conſulted, and ſometimes heard to diſpute with univerſal applauſe.*’ There are ſeveral miſtakes in theſe words. I. The Council of Baſil began in the year 1431, and ended, properly ſpeaking, in 1443: and therefore ſince the author, whom I am cenſuring, ſuppoſes 1419 to be the year of Weſſelus's birth, he cannot, with any colour of reaſon ſay, that this Doctor was very much admired at Baſil during the ſeſſion of that Council. Obſerve, that according to him, Weſſelus's journey to Baſil was poſterior to his long reſidence at Cologn, to his journey to Heidelberg, to his return to Cologn, to his journey to Louvain, as well as to Paris, to all his intrigues in favour of the Formaliſts againſt the Realiſts, and laſtly to his adhering to the ſect of the Nominaliſts. If you ſuppoſe that our Weſſelus was not at Baſil before the laſt year of the Council, it were ſtill true that he had done what I have juſt now mentioned before the age of twenty-four years; which cannot be ſaid without a great abſurdity, and nothing can be more falſe. II. Nicolas V was not elected Pope before the year 1447, and conſequently was not in the Pontifical chair, during the ſeſſion of the Council of Baſil. That Pope is ſaid to be the founder of the Vatican Library (19). It is true, that others aſcribe that glory to Sixtus IV. Both may be in the right in ſeveral reſpects, therefore I do not charge what our author ſays on that head as a fault. III. It is falſe that Francis della Rovere ſat in the Council of Baſil as General of the Franciſcans. He was born in the year 1414. He run through his courſe of ſtudy by the age of twenty-two, and taught afterwards publickly for ſeveral years before he was made aſſiſtant to the General of his order, who was ſucceeded by three Generals before Francis della Rovere attained that dignity (20). Hence it plainly appears that it is impoſſible he ſhould have been poſſeſſed of that poſt during the Ceſſion of the Council of Baſil, the concluſion of which happened in the year 1441, or, as others will have it, in 1443.

[*F*] *Some ſay that he was perſecuted at Paris, and even baniſhed.*] This particular is very uncertain: Hardenbergius declares that he never heard it mentioned by any of thoſe who had been acquainted with Weſſelus. ‘ Cum Domino ſuo Franciſco, Generali miniſtro, reverſus eſt Lutetiam ubi multa expertus eſt, multa etiam paſſus, ita ut quidam ſcribant, illum Scholâ aut Urbe pulſum eſſe propter reprehenſas ſuperſtitiones: quod tamen Hardenburgius à nemine unquam ſibi auditum eorum ait, qui cum illo domeſticè verſati ſunt. Et certum eſt, illum plus minùs ſedecim annos Pariſiis verſatum eſſe, & cum Domino ſuo, jam in Papam electo, unà Romam profectum. Unde non videtur veriſimile, Papam & eundem Monachum & quidem Minoritanum monachum, paſſurum eum fuiſſe, ſi à Schola Theologica Pariſienſi proſcriptus fuiſſet antea. Fieri potuit, quod poſtea illuc reverſus pulſus ſit (21). - - - - *He returned with his maſter Francis, General of the Friars minors, to Paris, where he ſuffered ſeveral hardſhips. Some even ſay that he was baniſhed the ſchool or city, for having cenſured certain ſuperſtitions. But Hardenburgius declares that he never heard it mentioned by any of thoſe who moſt frequented his houſe. Certain it is that he lived ſixteen years at Paris, and went to Rome with his maſter upon his being choſen Pope: whence it does not ſeem probable that a Pope, who had been not only a Friar, but a Friar minor, would have ſuffered him, if it had been true, that was baniſhed from the Divinity-ſchool at Paris before. Poſſibly ſuch a thing may have happened to him after his return.*’ Obſerve, that the edict of Lewis XI againſt the Nominaliſts is dated on the firſt of March 1473 (22). Wherefore if it was true that Weſſelus had been aſſiſtant to John Bouchart, Biſhop of Avranches in the preliminaries of that edict (23), he would have been a very conſiderable man in France, even during the Papacy of Sixtus IV.

[*G*] *He only aſked a copy of the Bible . . . which he obtained.*] The Pope thought this was a very ſilly requeſt; Why do not you rather aſk a miter, or ſomething like it, ſaid he? Becauſe I have no need of any ſuch thing, anſwered Weſſelus. He choſe the good part, but he expoſed himſelf to the ralleries of the worldlings. *Reſpondit Sixtus; Hæc nobis curæ erunt, tu pro te aliquid pete. Rogo ergo, inquit Weſſelus, ut mihi detis ex Bibliotheca Vaticana Græca & Hebræa Biblia. Ea, inquit Sixtus, tibi dabuntur: Sed tu ſtulte, quare non petis Epiſcopatum aliquem aut ſimile quidpiam? Reſpondit Weſſelus, quia iis non indigeo. Hæc ipſa Ebræa*

(16) This word *Sieur*, ſhews that the author was very ill acquainted with our Weſſelus.

(17) What is wanting here is to be found above in citation (8).

(18) Vita Weſſeli, *pag.* 17.

(19) *See Father Jacob*, Traité des Bibliotheques, *pag.* 84. Lomeier, de Bibliothecis, *pag.* 194, *& ſeq.*

(20) Taken from a manuſcript Memoir imparted by a perſon, whom I cauſed to be conſulted.

(21) Vita Weſſeli, *inter* Vitas Profeſſ. Groning. *pag.* 17.

(22) *See* Naudé, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 223.

(23) See Naudé's words in the remark [*B*].

into his native country, where he got the affection and eſteem of all men. He died at Groningen on the fourth of October 1489. He was perplexed with ſome doubts concerning the Chriſtian religion during his laſt ſickneſs, but at length they entirely vaniſhed away (*d*) [*H*]. It is beyond queſtion that his opinions were in ſeveral particulars contrary to thoſe of Rome [*I*]; and he has been juſtly called Luther's fore-runner, I muſt not forget in this place that he is cited under different names [*K*]. Part of his writings

(*d*) Taken from his Life among thoſe of the Profeſſors of Groningen, *pag.* 12, *& ſeq.*

Biblia diu hæſerunt Groningæ, apud virgines Spirituales, eorumque adhuc hodie quædam fragmina ſuperſunt (24). Others ſay that it was Nicolas V, of whom he aſked this preſent. ‘ Tantò eum promovendarum litterarum Hebraicarum ſtudio flagraſſe accepimus, ut, cùm Romam profectus Nicolao Pontifici gratiſſimus eſſet, iſque ampliſſima *Weſſelo* munera offerret, his omnibus repudiatis unicum modò petierit & obtinuerit, Biblia Hebræa MSS. ſibi ut liceret è Bibliotheca Vaticana in Belgium aſportare (25). - - - *He had ſuch a prodigious deſire to promote the Hebrew tongue, as we have been informed, that when he went to Rome, and was in high favour with Pope Nicholas, who offerred him very conſiderable preſents, he refuſed every thing elſe, and only begged that he might be allowed to carry from the Vatican Library to Holland, a manuſcript of the Hebrew Bible, which he obtained.*’

[*H*] *He was perplexed with ſome doubts concerning the Chriſtian religion . . . . but at length they entirely vaniſhed.*] Doubts of this kind more rarely occur in a death-bed than in the vigour of youth. Wherefore for the rarity of the thing I ſhall ſet down the whole narrative. ‘ Illapſum in morbum, qui etiam vitæ ipſi finem attulit, cum amicus quidam inviſeret, utque valeret interrogaret: Reſpondit, *ſe pro ſua ætate & morbi moleſtia utcunque valere; ſed unum admodum moleſtum ſibi eſſe, quod variis cogitationibus & argumentationibus circumactus de veritate Chriſtianæ religionis ſubdubitare inciperet.* Obſtupeſcebat ille, ac hortari ægrum cepit, ut omnes cogitationes ſuas in Chriſtum Servatorem unicum rejiceret. Sed cùm hujuſmodi admonitionem ei moleſtiorem eſſe ſenſiſſet, triſtis tum abiit. Atque poſt unam vel alteram horam reverſum ad ſe cùm Weſſelus vidiſſet, alacri animo, & quantum valetudo ſinebat exſultans dixit; *Gratias ago Deo, omnes illæ vanæ diſputationes abierunt: & nihil ſcio, niſi Jeſum & hunc crucifixum.* Et in hac confeſſione animam DEO reddidit (26). - - - *In his laſt ſickneſs, when a friend, who came to ſee him, aſked him how he did, he anſwered,* That conſidering his age, and the nature of his illneſs, he was pretty well; but that one thing gave him great uneaſineſs; which was, that being perplexed with various reflexions and reaſonings, he began to call in queſtion the truth of the Chriſtian religion. *His friend was aſtoniſhed at this, and exhorted him to turn all his thoughts towards the only Saviour JESUS CHRIST. But when he found that ſuch an admonition diſpleaſed him, he went away with concern. About two hours after, when Weſſelus ſaw that he was come back, he ſaid, with a chearful mind, and with as much joy as his weakly condition would ſuffer him to expreſs;* I thank GOD that all my vain doubts are vaniſhed: and now I know nothing but CHRIST, and him crucified; and, with this confeſſion, he expired.’

[*I*] *His opinions were contrary to thoſe of Rome.*] See the *Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis*, and conſult alſo *le Myſtere d'Iniquité*, where you will find theſe words: ‘ At the ſame time, tho' ſomewhat younger, lived Dr Weſſelus of Groningen, called *the light of their world*, who in one of his letters diſcovers, that after the Inquiſitors had condemned John de Weſſalia, he expected they ſhould fall upon him, and ſaith, that at Paris and Rome, he defended his opinions againſt ſeveral articles of the Church of Rome; and that ſome even of the court had approved of them: and it is plainly to be collected from his writings, that they were very little different from the confeſſion of the Vaudois. Likewiſe in his book concerning ſubjects and ſuperiors, he aſſerts that the Pope may err, and that when he doth ſo he ought to be reſiſted; that by his Simony and ill adminiſtration, he clearly enough diſcovers that he neither regards GOD, nor the ſalvation of his church; that his commands are no farther obligatory than they are conſiſtent with the word of GOD; that his excommunications are leſs to be feared than thoſe of any good and learned men: whence it was that the Council of Conſtance regarded John Gerſon more than John XXIII; and good men long before that regarded St Bernard more than Pope Eugenius. His works are ſeverally printed at Leipſic, Antwerp, and Baſil, (27).’ It is obſerved in his life that he had been overwhelmed by the tempeſt which bore down John de Weſalia, in the year 1479, if David of Burgundy, Biſhop of Utrecht, his good patron, had not ſupported him. *Quibus* (fratribus prædicatorii ordinis hæreticæ pravitatis inquiſitoribus) *non minus quam coævus & amicus Joannes Weſalienſis jam anno* 1479, *ſuccubuiſſet, niſi Epiſcopi Ultrajectini Davidis de Burgundia (cui non quidem Medicus erat Weſſelus, ut multi perperam tradiderunt, ſed dilectus Cliens) autoritas eum protexiſſet* (28). To all theſe may be added the words of Luther, which I have cited in the article of SIXTUS IV (29), and Mr Seckendorf's extracts of Weſſelus's works (30).

[*K*] *He is cited under different names.*] In the collection of the Groningen Profeſſors, his life begins thus: ‘ Weſſelus Groningenſis . . . . diverſis aliàs & nominibus inſignitus, & elogiis celebratus. In Chronici Urſpergenſis Paralipomenis *Magiſter Joannes Weſſelus Groningenſis* nominatur. In libro memoriali templi Groningani quo ſepultus *Weſſelus Hermanni*, Pelantino (qui ad annos plures fuit Archiater Davidis Burgundi Epiſcopi Ultrajectini) *Weſſelus Goſvoert*, Alberto Hardenbergio *Goeſvort*, Geldenhaurio *Gansfortius* vocatur. Rodolphus Agricola in epiſtolis ad Reuchlinum, aliique, *Baſilium* vel Baſilium Phriſium eum indigitant. Quarum appellationum diverſitas, Friſicorum nominum non ignaro, facilè agnoſcetur, quo fonte promanârit. Nempè Joannis nomen ei proprium ex ſacro Baptiſmate videtur, Hermanni à patris, Weſſeli ab avi nominibus adſcitum, quod poſtremum in Græcia, (ut vulgo creditur) aut potius ſupra ſeculum Græcorum linguâ imbutus, ad ejus ſonum vel ipſe inflexit, vel detortum ab aliis admiſit, ut Baſilius diceretur (31) . . . . *Goſvoerti* autem ſeu *Goeſeforti*, aut *Ganſefortii* cognomen, dialecto illud Weſtphalicâ, hoc Germanicâ anſerum vadum ſonans (Weſtphalis enim Goos vel Goes eſt, quæ Germanis olim teſte Plinio 10. 22. hodieque Ganſa) ſuſpicari liceat inde ei obveniſſe, quod majores fortè ex vicina Weſtphalia (ut multæ aliæ honeſtæ hujus Urbis familiæ) huc commigrâſſent, quum illud nomen villæ non procul Harena, hodieque maneat. Cæteræ appellationes Patriam teſtentur. - - - *Weſſelus of Groningen . . . . had ſeveral names given him, and various encomiums. In the* Paralipomena *of the chronicle of Urſperg, he is called* John Weſſelus of Groningen. *In the regiſter of that church, where he lies buried, he is named* Weſſelus Hermanni. *By Pelantinus (who was for ſeveral years Phyſician to David of Burgundy, Biſhop of Utrecht) he is called* Weſſelus Goſvoert, Goeſvort, *by Albertus Hardenbergius, and* Gransfortius *by Geldenharius. Rodolphus Agricola, in his letter to Reuchlinus, and other authors, call him* Baſilius, *or* Baſilius Phriſius. *Such perſons as are not unacquainted with the Frieſland names will readily perceive whence theſe different appellations proceed. John was his chriſtian name. He was called Hermanni after his father, and Weſſelus after his grandfather. This laſt name was changed into that of Baſilius when he was in Greece, (as it is commonly believed) or rather becauſe he was an extraordinary maſter of that language, he was willing his name ſhould have a Greek ſound; for which reaſon he either made that alteration himſelf, or allowed of it when made by others . . . . As for the ſirname* Goſvoert *or* Goeſefort, *and the ſirname* Ganſefortius, *the one in the Weſtphalian, and the other in the German dialect, ſignifying the ford of the Geeſe, (for the Weſtphalians call* Goos *or* Goes *what the Germans of old, according to Pliny* 10. 2. *and even to this day, call* Gans) *they were probably owing to this, that his forefathers came hither from the neighbouring Weſtphalia (as many other honeſt families of this city have done); and where there is a village near Harena, which ſtill retains that name. His other appellations denote his country.*’

(24) Vita Weſſeli, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 18. *This is mentioned as a thing which Weſſelus had frequently related.*

(25) Valer. Andreas, Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 849.

(26) Vita Weſſeli, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 24.

(27) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 569. *See alſo pag.* 572, 573.

(28) Vita Weſſeli, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 21, 22.

(29) Citat. (20).

(30) Seckend. Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib.* 1, *pag.* 226, *& ſeq.*

(31) What is wanting here is to be ſeen in citation (20), of the article SIXTUS IV.

writings are loſt [*L*].

[*L*] *Part of the writings are loſt.*] He made a great many collections out of the works of the Abbot Rupert, and of ſeveral others, to which he added his own reflexions. Theſe rhapſodies ſwelled to ſuch an unweildy bulk under his pen, that he called them *Mare magnum*, - - *the great Sea*. Several of them were preſerved in the monaſtery of mount Saint Agnes, but the ſending of the manuſcript to ſome learned men of Holland and Zealand, occaſioned the entire loſs of it (32). After the death of Weſſelus the Monks and ſome other perſons burnt all the manuſcripts which they found in his cloſet (33). Whatever eſcaped the flames was printed at Groningen in the year 1614, and at Amſterdam in 1617 (34). Valerius Andreas quotes theſe two editions, but inſtead of telling us that the firſt was at Groningen, he ſaith it was at Arnheim (35). But poſſibly he might find *Arnhemii* in the title of his copy without the book being ever printed there, by reaſon it is cuſtomary amongſt Bookſellers to allow a correſpondent, who buys of them a certain number of copies, to inſert his name in the title-page as well as he who printed them. It is probable that the Groningen Bookſeller allowed that of Arnheim this liberty. This cuſtom very frequently impoſes on the Bibliographers, and occaſions their unneceſſary multiplication of editions.

I ought not to forget that ſeveral tracts of our Weſſelus appeared in print before the compleat edition of his works, in the year 1614. Some were publiſhed at Leipſic in 1522, with the title of *Farrago Rerum Theologicarum*, and a Preface by Martin Luther. It was reprinted at Baſil in 1523, by Adam Petri, *&c.*

WESTPHALUS (JOHN) an imaginary perſon, who Moreri tells us was *ſo named becauſe born in Weſtphalia*. He adds, that he was a Lutheran Heretic, ‘who about the year 1533, began to preach abominable errors; particularly that the Scripture doth not ſay that the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Son; that the Church hath erred, and ſeveral other impoſtures worthy of Hell, from whence they proceeded.’ He cites *Prateolus* v. Veſt. *Gautier* in Chron. But we ſhall prove all this to be chimerical [*A*]. Not but that there was one JOHN DE WESTPHALIA; but he was a Printer, who ſettled at Louvain in the year 1475 [*B*].

[*A*] *We ſhall prove all this to be chimerical.*] I cannot accuſe Moreri of having cited Prateolus falſely; for that writer doth indeed affirm (1) that John Weſtphalus, *ſeu de Weſtphalia ſuperiore*, a German, and a Doctor of Divinity, was very much infected with the Hereſy of Martin Luther, and that his books were burnt at Mentz in the time of Charles VI and of Pope Clement VII, about the year 1533. He mentions ſeventeen erroneous tenets of the ſame man, and then concludes with theſe words: ‘Hi ergo ſunt articuli, qui (authore Bernardo de Luxemburgo ſacrarum literarum profeſſore, Ordinis Prædicatorii, in ſuo Catalogo hæreticorum) per fratrem Gerardum de Elthen inquiſitorem fidei, & patrem Jacobum Sprenger, doctores itidem ſacræ paginæ, ejuſdem Ordinis Prædicatorii, conventus Colonienſis, ex Joannis de Weſtphalia libris excerpti ſunt. - - - *Theſe are therefore the articles which (according to Bernard of Luxemburg, profeſſor of Divinity, and of the order of the Dominicans, in his catalogue of Heretics) were extracted from John Weſtphalus's books, by Friar Gerard of Elthem, Inquiſitor of the Faith, and Father James Sprenger, likewiſe Doctors of Divinity, and of the ſame order of Dominicans in the convent of Cologn.*’ He directs us to the book whence he had this; which is the catalogue of Heretics, compiled by brother Bernard of Luxemburg, a Dominican Monk. Upon conſulting this catalogue I found that Prateolus hath changed *Joannes de Weſalia*, into *Joannes de Weſtphalia*; for it is to *Joannes de Weſalia ſuperiore* (2), that Bernard of Luxemburg aſcribes the ſeventeen Hereſies which Prateolus charges on *Joannes Weſtphalus, ſeu de Weſtphalia ſuperiore*. I cannot apprehend what ground Prateolus, or thoſe who have copied him, had for ſo many alterations as they have made in names and times. The Dominican Monk obſerves, that John de Weſalia's books were burnt at Mentz during the reign of the Emperor Frederic III (3), and mentions this fact ſix years at leaſt before the year 1533 (4).

Moreri hath not been leſs faithful in his citation of Father Gaultier; for it is certain that this Jeſuit (5) placed Johannes Weſtphalus amongſt the Heretics of the XVIth century, and made him a Lutheran, juridically convicted of ſeveral errors, by his own confeſſion, about the year 1533. He cites *Prateolus ex Bernardo Lutzemburgo*. Thus we ſee how theſe authors copy one another without taking the pains to look back ſo much as two ſteps. This Jeſuit ſtops at Prateolus, without conſulting the author whom Prateolus cites.

Moreri hath, of his own head, ventured to ſay, that his pretended John Weſtphalus was ſo named from his being of Weſtphalia. The two authors whom he cites have not made this obſervation, and I am ſure that he found it no where. Prateolus groundleſsly believed that Weſtphalia was divided into higher and lower. For the reſt, we ought not to be ſurprized that Moreri fell into this ſnare, ſince Theophilus Raynaud, though a man of ſo much reading, alſo fell into it before him. He tells us on the authority of Prateolus, that John Weſtphalus, the Lutheran, was the only perſon that ever doubted that JESUS CHRIST was nailed to the Croſs. *De hac* (clavifixione) *nemo dubitavit, præter unum quendam haud dubie cum ea effutiret, hilariorem, è Lutheri caula, Joannem Weſtphalum, ut ex eo refert Prateolus eo verbo artic. damnato* 17 (6). In which words are two faults: 1. John Weſtphalus is an imaginary perſon. 2. Suppoſe that he really had exiſted, and been a Lutheran, he would not have been either the only or the firſt man who raiſed this doubt; for it was one of the things objected againſt John de Weſalia, in his proſecution for Hereſy in the year 1479. ‘Item prædicavit publice in Ser. de paſſione Chriſti, crucifixerunt eum, quis ſcit an funiculis ipſum alligaverunt, aut clavis crucifixerunt. - - - - - - *He likewiſe ſtarted this doubt in a ſermon which he preached publickly upon the paſſion of Chriſt, they crucified him, who knows whether they faſtened him with cords, or nailed him to the croſs?*’ They are Bernard of Luxemburgh's words (7): and in the *Examen Magiſtrale Doctoris Joannis de Weſalia*, inſerted in the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum* of Orthuinus Gratius, we find the following words: ‘Viceſimo quinto (*interrogatus*) an prædicaverit publice populo dubium eſſe an Chriſtus fuiſſet funibus Cruci alligatus, aut clavis affixus. Fatetur ſe dixiſſe, quod non habeatur in Evangelio paſſionis an clavis ſit affixus, an funibus: Credit tamen quod clavis (8). - - - - *In the twenty-fifth place, being aſked if he had affirmed in a public ſermon that it was doubtful whether Chriſt was faſtened to the croſs with cords or with nails; he confeſſes that he ſaid there was no mention made in the Goſpels whether he was faſtened with nails or cords, but he believes it was with nails.*’

[*B*] *A Printer who ſettled at Louvain in the year* 1475.] Let us examine theſe words of Gabriel Naudé: *the firſt that I know of, who printed* in the Low-Countries *was Joannes de Weſtphalia, who ſettled at Louvain in the year* 1475, *and began the exerciſe of this art on Ariſtotle's Ethics* (9). Revius's Hiſtory of Deventer is not ſufficient to confute this; for tho' we find there that Richard Pafroed, or Pafraed, a native of Cologn, and Printer at Deventer, publiſhed there the *Doctrinale altum, ſeu liber parabolarum Alani metrice deſcriptus* in the year 1449 (10), one cannot believe it, conſidering that this book is the twelfth in Revius's catalogue of the books printed by Pafroed. The two firſt are without any date: the third is dated

in

(32) Vita Weſſeli, *pag.* 15.

(33) Ibid. *pag.* 27.

(34) *Ibid.* Conſult alſo Geſner's Bibliotheque.

(35) Val. Andr. Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 849.

(1) In Catalogo Hæreſ. *voce* Joannes Weſtphalus, *p. m.* 236.

(2) This ſhews that he was born at Weſel, between Coblentz and Mentz, and not at Weſel in the Duchy of Cleves.

(3) Joannes de Weſalia ſuperiore, Doctor Theologiæ prædicans ſæcularis in diverſis locis, Bohemis communicans condemnatus fuit, & ejus libri combuſti fuerunt Moguntiæ ſub Friderico Imperatore tertio. *Bernardus Lutzemburgus, in Catal. Hæreticorum.*

(4) I expreſs myſelf thus, becauſe I have only ſeen the third edition of his book, which is that of the year 1527. I believe he ſpeaks of John de Weſalia in the foregoing editions; but I am not ſure of it.

(5) In Tabula Chronographica, *pag. m.* 757.

(6) Theoph. Raynaud de Stigmat. §. *i*, *cap. v*, *pag. m* 108.

(7) In Catalogo Hæreticorum.

(8) Faſcic. rerum expetend. & fugiendar. *p.* 330.

(9) Naudé, Additions to the Hiſtory of Lewis XI, *pag.* 309.

(10) Revius, Hiſtor. Daventrienſ. *pag.* 144.

in the year 1477, the fourth, which is the Golden Legend, in 1479, and the following to the eleventh are dated from 1480 to 1494. How then is it probable that the twelfth ſhould be of the year 1449? It is doubtleſs a typographical error.

WESTPHALUS (Joachim) a Lutheran Miniſter in the XVIth century, was born at Hamburgh [*A*] in the year 1510. He was maſter of the ſecond claſs in St John's college of that city; after which he was miniſter of St Catherine's church there from the year 1541, to the year 1571 [*B*]. From that time to the ſixteenth of January 1574, which was the day of his death, he was ſuperintendant of the churches. There was a great diſcord between the Miniſters of Hamburgh, ſome of them being moderate, and the others rigid Lutherans; Weſtphalus was the moſt zealous of the latter party *(a)*. He was violent even to brutality [*C*]. The Lutherans themſelves own that he ſhewed too great an animoſity [*D*]. Calvin, when he wrote againſt Weſtphalus, pretty well adapted his ſtyle to that of his adverſary *(b)*; but it is ſaid that he did not reproach him with the character of a drunkard [*E*]. Beza was ſurprized, and not without reaſon,

(*a*) Ex Mollero, Iſag. ad Hiſtor. Cherſoneſ. Cimbr. *p.* 579. Zelotarum Hamburgenſium Primicerius, *ſays he, pag.* 577.

(*b*) See the remark [*E*].

[*A*] *He was born at Hamburgh.*] Thoſe who ſay that he was called Weſtphalus becauſe a native of Weſtphalia, are miſtaken. Mr Moreri is guilty of that error; which he copied from Mr Teiſſier, (1), who had it from a German Lutheran. I mean Quenſtedt, as appears by his citation (2). Mr Mollerus when he cenſures Mr Teiſſer for this fault, ſpares Quenſtedt (3).

[*B*] *From the year* 1541 *to the year* 1571.] Mr Seckendorf (4) tells us that Weſtphalus was invited from Wittemberg to Hamburgh in the year 1542, in order to ſucceed Kempius in the paſtoral office of St Catherine's church, and that afterwards he ſucceeded Æpinus in the office of ſuperintendant. In my opinion more credit is due to Mr Mollerus (5) who places the beginning of his miniſtry in 1541, and of his ſuperintendency in 1571. How could he then ſucceed Æpinus, who died in 1553 (6)?

[*C*] *He was violent even to brutality.*] The Divines of the Confeſſion of Geneva beſtowed that encomium upon him, one of them ſaith that he was fitter to keep beaſts of burthen, than to adminiſter the ſacraments. ‘ *H. Bullingerus* hominem *illum vocat* vere Weſtphalum, id eſt, craſſum. *Theod. autem Bibliander*, hominem ineptum & importunum, qui rectius in agris farragines jumentis colligeret ac miſceret, quam ſacroſancta myſteria unionis ac fidei Chriſtianæ, & ſalutis humanæ ſacramenta tractaret (7). - - - - - Bullinger *calls him a true* Weſtphalian, *that is, ſtupid.* Theod. Bibliander *gives him the character of a fooliſh aud impertinent fellow, that was more fit to look out for provender in the fields and to mix it up for beaſts of burthen, than to meddle with the ſacraments of ſalvation aud the holy myſteries of the Chriſtian union and faith.*’ Bibliander alludes to a book which Weſtphalus publiſhed in 1552, intituled, *Farrago confuſanearum & inter ſe diſſidentium de S. Cæna opinionum, ex Sacramentariorum libris congeſta.* It is thought that this book kindled again the Sacramentarian war, which ſeemed extinct after the death of Luther (8). ‘ Belli Euchariſtici Lutheri obitu ſopiti acrius denuo inſtaurandi claſſicum A. 1552. ipſum ceciniſſe, edita adverſus Calvinum *Farragine confuſanearum &c.* è Pontificiis * Laur. Surius, ex Calvinianis † J. Sleidanus, ⸸ J. Sturmius, ‡ Caſp. Peucerus, ** Lud. Lavaterus, & †† Rud. Hoſpinianus uno ore clamitant. - - - - - *Among the Papiſts Laur. Surius, and among the Calviniſts J. Sleidan, J. Sturmius, Caſp. Peucerus, Lewis Lavaterus, and Rud. Hoſpinianus, cry out with one voice that this was the man who ſounded the charge, and kindled up a-freſh with greater violence the Sacramentarian war, (which had been extinct ever ſince the death of Luther) by publiſhing againſt Calvin his* Farrago confuſanearum &c.’ The author whom I quote (9), relates what Altingius and Hoornbeeck have ſaid of Weſtphalus. ‘ *Ab Henr. Altingo* Lutheranis, *accenſetur* immoderatis, furioſis & blaſphemis, *ab Hoornbekio autem animi inflati & αὐτογνώμονος* inſimulatur. - - - - - *By Henry Alting he is reckoned among* the zealous, furious, and blaſphemous Lutherans, *by Hoornbeck he is accuſed of being ſelf-conceited and tenacious of his own opinions.*’

[*D*] *The Lutherans themſelves own that he ſhewed too great an animoſity.*] I ſhall again quore Mollerus (10). ‘ Theologus celebris quidem, ſed *famam* ⸸⸸ Joach. Vagetio Judice, *per magni nominis Adverſarios, quos Scriptis provocabat, adeptus.* Zelus illius, & ſumma, in impugnandis Calvinianis, Crypto-Calvinianis, Synergiſtis, Adiaphoriſtis, Majoriſtis, atque Heterodoxis aliis, vehementia, Theologis etiam aliquot *γνησίως* Lutheranis, & in his Sim. Sulcero. Prof. Baſileenſi ‡, in exceſſu viſa peccare, plurimis in Germania certaminibus ſacris vel anſam præbuit, vel fomitem ſuppeditavit. - - - - - - *He was a* famous *Divine, but he acquired his reputation, in the opinion of Joachim Vagetius*, by the renowned adverſaries whom he provoked by his writings. *His zeal and great animoſity in attacking the profeſſed Calviniſts, and ſuch as were ſo in their hearts, the Synergiſts, Adiaphoriſts, Majoriſts, and other hetorodox ſects, nay even ſome Divines that were ſincere Lutherans, and among theſe Simon Sulcerus, profeſſor at Baſil, ſeemed to err in the exceſs, and either gave a handle to many religious contentions in Germany, or added fewel to them.*’

[*E*] *That he did not reproach him with the character of a drunkard.*] The proof which I am going to alledge of this, informs us, that Weſtphalus accuſed Calvin of gluttony. ‘ Uſus eſt aliquoties Calvinus, carnalem edendi modum oppugnans ab abſurdo, vocabulis voracitatis & ingurgitationis. Quid tu ad hæc Weſtphale? *Admodum,* inquis *religioſe & reverenter loquitur Calvinus, ex crudo ſuo ſtomacho eructans voracitatem & ingurgitationem.* Nempe Calvinum bene noſti, ut video: quem tota hæc civitas teſtari poteſt tam parvam ſui rationem habere in cibo & potu, ut in eo interdum amicis non leviter peccare videatur. Quum te de temulentia reprehenſum à Calvino ægrè patereris, reſpondit Calvinus id quod res eſt, ſeſe de ſpiritus temulentia loquutum: & cur ad iſtam verborum aſperitatem adactus eſſet copioſè declaravit (11). - - - - - - *Calvin, expoſing the carnal way of eating, did ſometimes make uſe of the words voraciouſneſs and gluttony. What conſtruction did you, Weſtphalus, put upon this?* Calvin, *ſaid you,* ſpeaks in a moſt religious and reverend manner, while he belches up voraciouſneſs and gluttony from his crude ſtomach. *This indeed ſhews that you know Calvin well, of whom all this city can atteſt, that he is ſo negligent of himſelf, as to his eating and drinking, that ſometimes his friends think him highly blamable in that reſpect. When you took it ill that Calvin ſhould accuſe you of drunkenneſs, Calvin made anſwer, as the thing really was, that he meant a drunkenneſs of ſpirit, and ſet forth at large what had obliged him to make uſe of theſe harſh words.*’ But let us ſee what anſwer Calvin himſelf made, and at the ſame time let us give the Hiſtory of this quarrel.

There was, for ſome time, a miſunderſtanding betwixt the Church of Zurich and Calvin, about the Doctrine of the Euchariſt; but it ceaſed in the year 1549, and both ſides agreed on a treaty of peace, which contained twenty-ſix articles, and was called *Conſenſio mutua in Re Sacramentaria* (12). The rigid Lutherans were offended at this agreement, and publiſhed ſeveral libels againſt it: and it was on this occaſion that Weſtphalus wrote the book, the title of which I have mentioned in the remark [*C*]. Calvin thought himſelf obliged to ſilence all theſe clamours, by publiſhing an expoſition of his agreement. This he did in the year 1554, by a little tract in which he fell very ſeverely upon Weſtphalus, without naming him. But he had not the ſame regard for him two years after, when he refuted (13) that adverſary's anſwer, nor in 1557, when he inſcribed another treatiſe to him; for he named him in both theſe books. Afterwards he gave him up to his obſtinacy, and threatned to do ſo in the title of the laſt book (14). But now let us examine

(1) Additions to the Elogies extracted out of Thuanus, *Part i, pag.* 454.

(2) *He quotes* Quenſt. de Patr. illuſtr. Viror.

(3) Moller. Iſagoge ad Hiſtor. Cherſoneſ. Cimbricæ, *Part. iii, pag.* 579.

(4) Hiſtor. Lutheran. *lib. i, p.* 245, *litera i.*

(5) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 579.

(6) Id. ibid.

(7) Id. ibid. *pag.* 581. He quotes the livth and xxiiid letters of Gabbema's Collection. Upon examination, I find his quotation to be right.

(8) Mollerus, ibid. *pag.* 580.

* In Comm. hiſtorico ad an. 1552, *p.* 604.

† Lib. 26. Comm. de ſtatu relig. & reip. p. m. 780.

⸸ In Anti-Pappo ſecundo, pag. 128, 129, 180. & in Anti-Pappo tertio, pag. 241, 242.

‡ In Narrat. hiſtorica Controv. Sacramentariæ, apud Schluſſelb. l. 2. Theol. Calv. p. m. 192, 193.

** In Hiſt. Sacram. pag. 119.

†† In Dedic. Concordiæ diſcordis.

(9) Moller. ibid. *pag.* 581.

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 579.

⸸⸸ In Præcidaneis de orbe habitabili, *pag.* 263.

‡ In Epiſt. ad Joh. Marbachium A. 1558, ſcripta *v. Joh. Fechtii* ſupplem. H. E. Sec. XVI. P. II. n. 63. pag. 82.

(11) Beza, de Cœna Domini, contra Weſtphalum, *Oper. Tom. i, pag.* 257.

(12) See the volume of Calvin's Tracts, *pag. m.* 752.

(13) *That Refutation is intituled,* Secunda Defenſio piæ & orthodoxæ de Sacramentis fidei, adverſus Joachimi Weſtphali calumnias.

(14) Ultima Admonitio Joannis Calvini ad Joachimum Weſtphalum, cui niſi obtemperet, eo modo poſthac habendus erit, quo pertinaces hæreticos haberi jubet Paulus.

reaſon, that Weſtphalus ſhould publiſh that Calvin's mother had been a Prieſt's concubine [*F*]. He fully refuted this calumny. What is ſaid by ſome that this Lutheran Doctor was the inventor of the Ubiquitarian opinion, is not true [*G*]. In order to judge of his character, it is ſufficient to remember, that he ridiculed all the Proteſtant martyrs who did not believe Conſubſtantiation [*H*]. The arguments, which he once uſed againſt the

examine the grounds of the complaint concerning drunkenneſs. ‘ Indocti & temulenti homines dum Sacramentarium bellum inſtaurant, primis librorum paginis audacter jactant pro tota Saxonia & vicinis regionibus ſe pugnare. - - - - - *Theſe unlearned and drunken men, while they revive the Sacramentarian war, boldly pretend in the firſt pages of their books that they fight the cauſe of all Saxony and of the neighbouring countries.*’ This period (15) of Calvin induced Weſtphalus to complain, that he in particular, and the Germans in general, were charged with drunkenneſs: to which Calvin anſwered, that he did not in the leaſt ſpeak of a drunkenneſs occaſioned by wine, but of another metaphorical drunkenneſs mentioned by the Prophet Iſaiah. ‘ Quia fortè veritus eſt, ne ſi ſolus ipſe læſus foret, paucos inveniret privati doloris ſocios, totam gentem ſuam ad commune prælium incitat, ac ſi Germanis omnibus vulgatum temulentiæ probrum à me objectum foret. Si ita eſſet, ne ipſe quidem mihi vellem ignoſci. Sed notanda eſt quam mox addit probatio. Crimine hoc, inquit, ſemel atque iterum me perſtringit. Quaſi verò ſi bibulus eſt, ſine compotoribus inebriari nequeat. Quamquam ne hîc de nihilo anxius ſit, ſciat non indictum fuiſſe prælium ſuis poculis, ſcias de alia temulentia me loquutum eſſe, quam Propheta Iſaias dicit non eſſe à vino (16). - - - - - - *Perhaps becauſe he was afraid leſt, if he were the only perſon hurt, he ſhould find few people to ſympathize with him, he ſtirs up his whole nation to a common war, as if I forſooth, had upbraided all the Germans with the trite reproach of drunkenneſs. Were that the caſe I ſhould not even deſire to be forgiven. But what he ſubjoins as a proof of this is ſomewhat remarkable. He upbraids me, ſays he, with this vice ſeveral times. As if a man who is that way inclined could not get drunk without having his pot-companions. Neverthel eſs that he may not be diſturbed about nothing here, I would have him to know once for all that I did not declare war againſt his cups: I meant another kind of drunkenneſs, which, as the Prophet Iſaiah ſaith, does not proceed from wine.*’ He renewed the ſame apology at the end of his laſt advertiſement. ‘ Weſtphalum alicubi hominem temulentum vocare contigerat, non ut bibacitatem illi objicerem, ſicuti interpretatus ſum: ſed qualiter Propheta ebrios eſſe dicit, & non à vino, qui ſtupore percuſſi, aut vertigine correpti, à ſana mente exciderunt. Quod privatim de uno homine dictum eſt, ad totam Gentem trahi cææ profecto temulentiæ eſt (17). - - - - - *I happened ſomewhere to call Weſtphalus a drunken man, not that I wanted to upbraid him with a tippling diſpoſition, as I explained myſelf before; but in the ſenſe that the Prophet Iſaiah calls drunk, though not with wine, ſuch people who being ſtruck with ſtupidity and dizzineſs have loſt their right underſtanding. Now to apply to a whole nation what is particularly ſaid of one man is certainly the blind effect of drunkenneſs.*’ I am apt to think that this explanation did not ſatisfy Weſtphalus; and indeed it leaves room for great ſuſpicions: beſides, it is very viſible that Calvin expreſſes himſelf in ſuch words, as ſhew that he was not ſorry it ſhould be believed that he juſtly charged this vice on his adverſary, though he proteſts that he meant another vice. He doth not deny the having treated him roughly, but he affirms that his vehemency is reaſonable, and juſtifies himſelf by the example of GOD. *Sicubi vehementius in eum invehar, pro veſtra prudentia & æquitate, quibus me ſtimulis adegerit expendite . . . . . Quid mihi hic reſiduum fuit, niſi ut malo nodo aptarem durum cuneum, ne ſibi in ſua vecordia nimis placeret? Equidem ſi homines iſtos mollire poſſe ſpes eſſet, non recuſarem demiſſus ac ſupplex Eccleſiæ pacem redimere. Sed quo feratur ipſorum violentia, omnibus ſatis notum eſt. Itaque meam in iſta duritie tractanda auſteritatem,* * *Dei quoque exemplum excuſat, qui ſe pronuntiat non modo inclementius acturum cum præfractis, ſed contra eos præfractum fore* (18). That is, ‘ if in ſome places I have dealt too roughly with him and expreſſed my ſelf in too ſharp terms, be pleaſed according to your prudence and equitable diſcretion to conſider what ſharp weapons he hath pointed againſt me, to conſtrain me to it . . . . . . What could I do, in this caſe, but act according to the proverb, which preſcribes a ſevere driver for a head-ſtrong aſs, that he might not grow too fond of his fury? Indeed if there were any hopes of mollifying theſe men, I would not refuſe to make humble ſupplications to them, in order to redeem the peace of the Church. But it appears to all men what their extravagant impetuoſity aims at. So that if I have been very ſevere in handling ſuch a ſtrange obſtinate people, I am excuſed by the example of GOD himſelf, who declares not only that he will treat the froward without tenderneſs, but ſhew himſelf froward to them.’

[*F*] *He publiſhed that Calvin's mother had been a Prieſt's concubine.*] A little after the words of Theodorus Beza, which I have already cited, we find theſe. ‘ Quid amplius? *Ingerit*, inquis, *Calvinus voces auribus & oculis, meretricibus convenientes: quas fortaſſe didicit à matre ſua Pontificii ſacrificuli concubina.* Itane verò nugator? honeſtiſſimam matronam jam olim defunctam, & ejus viri matrem, cui quantum debeat Chriſtiana Eccleſia tot ſuſcepti labores teſtantur, & gratioribus futuris poſteris (ut confido) teſtabuntur, tuis verè meretriciis probris afficere maluiſti quam animo tuo morem non gerere? Sed continebo ipſe me, & quid nos potius quam quid te deceat, ſpectabo. Calvinum & honeſto loco & integerrimæ famæ parentibus natum, & in nobiliſſima familia à pueritia educatum ſi teſtibus probare oporteret, nos non unum aliquem teſtem, ſed integram civitatem Noviodunenſem citare poſſumus. Itaque de hoc refutando convitio minime laboramus. - - - - - - *What next?* Calvin, *ſay you*, preſents to our eyes and ears words that are fit for leud women to make uſe of; poſſibly having learned them from his mother who was once a Popiſh Prieſt's concubine. *Say you ſo, Mr Trifler? Is it thus that, rather than not gratify your own humour, you throw your looſe reproaches upon a moſt virtuous woman who is long ago deceaſed, and who was the mother of that man, to whom the Chriſtian Church is under ſo great obligations, as his many works teſtify, and as they will teſtify to poſterity, which, I hope, will be more grateful than the preſent age has been? But I will contain myſelf, and conſider more what is becoming for me to ſay than for you to hear. If it were neceſſary to prove by witneſſes that Calvin was born of creditable and blameleſs parents, and that he was brought up from his youth in a very noble family, not one witneſs alone, but the whole city of Noyon might be called upon to atteſt it. We ſhall therefore take no pains to refute this calumny.*’

[*G*] *What is ſaid . . . . . that he was the inventer of the Ubiquitarian opinion is not true.*] George Hornius affirms it, but Mr Mollerus refutes it by the teſtimony of Hoſpinian, who acknowledges that Weſtphalus and Heſhuſius, otherwiſe good Lutherans, oppoſed the new opinion concerning the Ubiquity which Brentius and Smidelin advanced (19). The Biſhop of Meaux is therefore miſtaken when in his *Hiſtoire des Variations* (20) under the year 1558 he ſaith, that *the great diſpute at that time amongſt the Lutherans was concerning the Ubiquity, which Weſtphalus, James Andrew Smidelin, David Chytræus, and others, eſtabliſhed with all their might.*

[*H*] *He ridiculed all the Proteſtant martyrs who did not believe Conſubſtantiation.*] Beza laſhes him on this account with the utmoſt ſeverity. ‘ Ut tuam pietatem orbi teſteris, in martyres jocaris qui apud Gallos & alias gentes quotidie crudeliſſimam & ignominioſiſſimam mortem perpetiuntur. Extant enim eorum aliquot confeſſiones, quæ tibi non ſatisfaciunt. Atque ut tibi non ſatisfaciant, an ideo digni erant quibus etiam mortuis inſultares? Nam certè pro Chriſti nomine ingreſſi ſunt flammas, quas haud ſatis ſcio an tu vel uno digito velles attingere. Quòd ſi negotium the miniſters of the confeſſion of Geneva were very ridiculous [*I*].

---

(15) *It is at pag.* 756, *of the volume of his Tracts.*

(16) Calvin. II Defenſ. de Sacramentis, *pag.* 768. Tractat. Theolog.

(17) Idem, Admonit. ultima, *pag.* 839, *ejuſd. Vol.*

* Pſal. xviii.

(18) Idem, II Defenſione, *circa init. pag. m.* 765. *See alſo the beginning of the* ultima Admonitio, *where he ſays,* Quia cum duro & præfracto capite negotium erat, an non liceret malum nodum duro cuneo retundere?

(19) Georgius Hornius (*Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. m.* 496.) in eum itidem debacchaturus more ſuo impegit, & primum Ubiquitatis auctorem fuiſſe nugatur ipſe Hoſpiniano (*in Dedic. Concordiæ diſcordis*) invito, qui *novum Brentii & Smidelini de Ubiquitate delirium, à Weſtphalo atque Heſhuſio, inter Lutheranos ipſos,* ait, *eſſe impugnatum.* Mollerus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 581.

(20) *Livr. viii, num.* 37.

I have not yet taken notice that he is reproached with having commended as a very Chriſtian action the harſh refuſal of a Toleration in Germany to the Proteſtants that were baniſhed out of England [*K*].

‘ Cœnæ Domini nonniſi ex parte cognoverunt (demus enim id Weſtphalo, ac ne nobis quidem ſingula eorum dicta ac facta ſatisfaciunt) an idcirco non fuerunt victimæ Deo gratæ, quum ad extremum uſque halitum omnes idolomanias ſint execrati, & Chriſtum ut verum Filium Dei & unicum noſtrum per fidem μεσίτην ſint amplexi (21). --- *To give a proof of your piety to the world, you ridicule the martyrs, who, both in France and other countries, are daily ſuffering the moſt cruel and ignominious deaths. You are not pleaſed with ſome of their confeſſions. But what then? Is that a reaſon why you ſhould inſult them even after they are dead? It was certainly for the ſake of* CHRIST *that they gave their bodies up to the flames, which I doubt whether you would venture to touch with one finger. Let us ſuppoſe that they did not thoroughly underſtand the article of the* LORD’s *Supper (for we are willing to grant ſo much to Weſtphalus, ſince we ourſelves do not approve of all that they ſay and do) ſhould it therefore be ſaid that they were not acceptable victims in the ſight of* GOD; *ſince, to their laſt breath, they abominated all idolatrous extravagances, and embraced* CHRIST *as the true Son of* GOD, *and our only Mediator through faith.*’ Compare the article HUTTERUS with this (22).

[*I*] *The arguments which he uſed . . . . were very ridiculous.*] Laſcus and Micronius, Miniſters of the Flemiſh Church at London, being forced to leave that country, endeavoured to eſtabliſh themſelves and their flock in the territories of the King of Denmark (23), but the Lutherans oppoſed it, and even for ſome time refuſed an amicable conference with them, ſaying, that it was wholly unneceſſary, ſince neither the King nor they had any ſcruples concerning the truth of the doctrine eſtabliſhed in Denmark. But at laſt they condeſcended to a conference, and urged that the Calviniſts rejected plain texts of Scripture; for, ſaid they, what can be clearer than theſe words, *this is my body?* Beſides this they told them, you follow neither Luther nor the Saxon Churches, and are condemned by the confeſſion of Augſbourg; in a word, you teach a doctrine which is not agreeable to the prevailing opinion in Denmark. They were anſwered, that the word of GOD, and not what Luther taught, or the kingdom of Denmark approved of, was the rule of faith. This, and ſeveral other ſuch like anſwers, proved uſeleſs to the Flemiſh Refugees, and they were conſtrained to retire out of the kingdom in the midſt of winter (24). Micronius ſome time after conferred, at Hamburgh, with Joachim Weſtphalus, who immediately urged the conſent of the Saxon Churches asan invincible argument. They, ſaid he, have condemned Zwinglius’s opinion; it is therefore falſe, and ought to be rejected. Micronius replied, that if the truth of an opinion ought to be determined by the conſent of the Churches, the Papal cauſe would be triumphant. Weſtphalus anſwered, that the Saxon Churches were the Church of GOD; and when the other urged that the true Church was not confined to any certain place, and that there was no Church but what might err, as was allowed by Luther, he affirmed that the import of Luther’s words was not that the Church of JESUS CHRIST might be miſtaken, but that the Popiſh Church might. Micronius always inſiſted upon this maxim, *That the Holy Scripture is the ſole rule of Faith*; which did not prevent Weſtphalus’s anſwering him: it would follow from your arguments, that his Daniſh Majeſty, and the Senate of our city, who have decreed againſt you, are guilty of a great fault: conſider that you are condemned by a Diet of Augſbourg (25). *Si dubia adhuc eſſet noſtra doctrina, graviter peccaſſet ſenatus noſter, & ſereniſſimus Daniæ Rex, qui adverſum vos decreta tulerunt . . . . Contra veſtram doctrinam Comitiis Auguſtanis pronunciatum eſt* (26). Micronius did not fail to reply, that by ſuch arguments as theſe Popery would every where gain its cauſe (27). We have here a proof of the natural inclination of all parties, to make uſe of the compendious way of authority, and convert their adverſaries errors into ſtate-crimes. Dare you charge the magiſtracy of Hamburgh, and the King of Denmark, who have condemned you, with injuſtice? If Weſtphalus had remembred that there are great numbers of Papiſts in the world, and had he but uſed his reaſon a little, would he have talked at this rate?

[*K*] *He is reproached with having commended . . . . the harſh refuſal of a Toleration in Germany to the Calviniſts that were baniſhed out of England.*] I have already mentioned (28) the treatment which they met with; but I add, that the deſcription which they gave of it may be ſeen not only in the books of Utenhovius, Laſco, and Micronius, but likewiſe in the anſwers that were made to our Weſtphalus, in the year 1555, and afterwards (29). They likewiſe quote (30) the firſt letter of Theodore Beza, and page 40 *Inſtitutionis Sacramentariæ* of Lavaterus: but the following paſſage will ſhew us that nothing was more diſagreeable in this perſecution than to ſee it publickly commended, and upon that we are referred to a book of Weſtphalus. ‘ Non meminerunt illi fratres, quidnam ſit illud paſtorale μετριοπαθεῖν καὶ συμπαθεῖν de quo Apoſt. ad Hebr. cap. 5. 2. Qui in tanta cœli inclementiâ, inter tot hoſtes, noſtros palantes majores indigniſſimè ſuis finibus ejecerunt, & ne quidem illud Jacobi c. 2. v. 16. (quod vel in ipſos reprobos cadit) illis apprecabantur *Abite cum pace, caleſcite, & ſaturamini*, vix ac ne vix quidem illis dantes τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος & crudeliter iis invidentes τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τῆς ψυχῆς. Sed hoc imprimis noſtris diſplicuit, iſtius ἀναισθεσίας auctores & ſibi hac in re fuiſſe gratulatos & reperiſſe poſtmodum qui illud factum tanquam præclarum, Deo gratum, Regibus & Magiſtratibus dignum, publicè auſi fuerunt defendere; & impetrarunt à Rege Daniæ & aliis, ut ne noſtri, odioſè dicti *Sacramentarii*, in Dania, Hamburgi, & in aliis maritimis urbibus, vel hoſpitio exciperuntur. Vidi lib. *Weſtphali* de Cœnâ Domini ex Auguſtino, ad an. 1555 (31). --- *Theſe brethren did not remember what is the duty of a Paſtor, which requires him to be mild and compaſſionate, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks in his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, chap. v. ver. 2. I ſay they did not remember it, ſince they did in ſo unworthy and ſhameful a manner oblige our wandering fathers to leave their territories, notwithſtanding the great inclemency of the weather, and their being encompaſſed with ſo many enemies. Nor did they ſo much as wiſh them what is mentioned by James, chap. ii. ver.* 16. (*which is ſaid even of wicked men*) Depart in peace, be you warmed, and filled. *Scarcely, or rather not all, would they ſupply them with the neceſſaries of the body, and moſt cruelly denied them the neceſſaries of the ſoul. But the moſt diſagreeable thing to our fathers was, that the authors of this inhumanity did not only congratulate themſelves upon what they had done, but likewiſe found perſons who durſt publickly defend it as an action commendable in itſelf, acceptable to* GOD, *and worthy of Kings and Magiſtrates: and they obtained of the King of Denmark, and others, that it ſhould be made unlawful for any one in Denmark, Hamburgh, and other ſea-coaſt towns, to give the leaſt entertainment or ſhelter to thoſe of our perſuaſion, whom by an odious name they called* Sacramentarians. *See Weſtphalus’s book,* de Cœna Domini, *&c.*’ The perſon who ſpeaks in this manner, was a Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity at Breda, in the year 1651, when he cauſed the book, of which I have ſpoken elſewhere (32), to be reprinted with ſome notes of his own.

(21) Beza, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 215.

(22) In the remark [*B*].

(23) *You will find in* Hoſpinian. Hiſt. Sacram. *Part. ii, fol.* 224, *& ſeq. the occaſion and the conſequences of it. Mr Samuel Andreas, Profeſſor of Divinity at Marpurg, ſpeaks of it in his* Epiſtola Gratulatoria & Apologetica, *printed in* 1690, *againſt the* Dania Orthodoxa, fidelis, & pacifica *of Mr Maſius, Profeſſor of Divity at Copenhagen.*

(24) See the Acts of the Conference of Coldingen, publiſhed by John Utenhovius, elder of the church of the Flemiſh Refugees. Voſſius relates all this out of them in a letter to Grotius, which is his xxiiid letter.

(25) Taken from the ſame letter of Voſſius, *pag.* 50.

(26) Voſſius, ibid. *col.* 2.

(27) Similibus argumentis facile omnes vicerit Papa. *ibid.*

(28) In the remark [*I*], of this article.

(29) Et eorum qui docte & acriter reſponderunt nimium ſuit affectibus indulgenti Joachimo Weſtphalo anno 1555 & deinceps. *Lud. Ger. à Reneſſe, ubi infra.*

(30) Id. ibid.

(31) Ludov. Gerardus à Reneſſe, Not. in Apologet. Reformat. in Belgio Eccleſ. Epiſt. *pag.* 86.

(32) In the remark [*E*], of the article HEMMINGIUS.

WICELIUS (George) a pretty good Divine of the XVIth century, was born at Fuld in the year 1501. He entred young into a monaſtery (a), but was not there long, before he not only renounced the monaſtical life, but the Roman Catholic Religion, and turned Lutheran. He had not the gift of perſeverance, for he returned to the Romiſh communion. He was not able to digeſt the diviſions which he ſaw ſpringing up amongſt the Reformers, and the particular perſecutions raiſed againſt him: but what ſide ſoever he was of, he never believed that marriage ought to be forbidden to Prieſts (b). We may therefore eaſily imagine that he married whilſt he was a Proteſtant; but it is falſe that he had ſucceſſively ſeveral wives [A]. He contented himſelf with his firſt marriage, though he was perſuaded that it was impoſſible to live or die well in celibacy (c); and it ſeems, that even when a Lutheran, he diſliked Bigamy. He embraced the Proteſtant Religion at the age of thirty, or thirty-one years [B], and became Miniſter of a Church, from which he ſays that he was forced by a cruel perſecution. Juſtus Jonas was one of his moſt violent antagoniſts, but Luther, on the contrary, wrote in his favour, and diſſipated the ſtorms raiſed againſt him by his being accuſed of ſome ſtate crimes (d). It is ſaid that his return into the pale of the Romiſh Church, procured him but very ſlowly the rank he deſerved. He was expoſed to ſeveral diſgraces before he could be made even a pariſh Prieſt; but at laſt he became counſellor to the Emperors Ferdinand and Maximilian. His principal character was that of being earneſtly deſirous of a reunion among Chriſtians; to accompliſh which, he would willingly have aboliſhed ſeveral things practiſed in the Church of Rome [C], though, after his return to that Church, he continued in her boſom till his death. Caſſander, the reconciler, took his conciliating ſpirit from our Wicelius. Maſius, Ferus the Franciſcan, and Biſhop Julius Pflug who had been for the Interim, were alſo his particular friends. By this we may judge of his inclinations; but much better by his writings, his *Via Regia*, his *Methodus Concordiæ*, &c. He wrote a prodigious number of Books, moſt of which were in the German language; and being afterwards tranſlated into Latin, they were printed ſeveral times. He died at Mentz in the year 1573, and was buried in St Ignatius's church. He left one ſon, named (as well as himſelf) George, who publiſhed ſome books: therefore to avoid confuſion, the father is diſtinguiſhed by the addition *Major*, or *Senior*. This is what I thought my ſelf obliged to extract out of the life of Wicelius (e), which is inſerted in the appendix to the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum* (f). From thence I have taken the body of this article and the citations, without any correction, referring criticiſms to the remarks. The author of this life was a very learned man; but give me leave to ſay that he might and ought to have been much more exact in the writing of it.

[A] *It is falſe that he had ſucceſſively ſeveral wives.*] His life inſerted in the ſecond tome of the *Faſciculus Rerum expetendarum*, confutes Cornelius Loos, who ſaid that Wicelius having loſt his firſt wife, married a ſecond, then a third, and after that others, as it is reported. *Adoleſcens Monaſticen amplectitur, à quo vitæ inſtituto mox reſiluit, uxorem duxit, qua defuncta, alteram, & hac, tertiam, & (ut ferunt) plures.* Serarius accuſes him of having left the Lutherans on account of their diviſions, and of having retained ſome of their opinions, but more eſpecially thoſe relating to marriage; that in order to remain a married Prieſt, he endeavoured to obtain orders from a Biſhop of the Greek Church; that being willing to ſerve two maſters, he was true to neither of them; that he was diſobedient to the Canons of the Latin Church, by uniting marriage to the Prieſthood, and to thoſe of the Greek communion, by marrying more than once. *Georgium Wicelium lego primis adoleſcentiæ annis ad monaſticum ſeſe ſtatum applicuiſſe: ſed poſtea carnis Lutherique philtris dementatum uxorem quæſiiſſe; magnoque apud Lutheranos, propter aliquam eruditionis, linguarumque peritiæ opinionem, loco fuiſſe. Ab illis tamen cùm nova, neque cum Eccleſiaſticæ antiquitatis norma ſatis conſentanea fingi ac refingi quotidie cerneret, variiſque illos & acerbis inter ſe opinionibus diſſidere, pedem retulit; ſed ita ut proprii neſcio quâ cerebri pertinacia ei quam par eſſet diutius glutinatiuſque adhæſerit, in uxoria præſertim re: cui ſervire ſimulque ſacerdos eſſe cum vellet, dicitur Græcum neſcio ubi Epiſcopum, ut ab eo conſecraretur, quæſiiſſe. Sicque cum quodam veluti probro & riſu Græcus audiebat Sacerdos. At ſellis ſedere duabus dum voluit, utraque decidit. Neque enim Latinus ſacerdos bonus fuit, qui ad nuptias tranſiit: neque ſacerdos Græcus bonus, quid ad ſecundas & tertias, imò, ut quidam ferunt, etiam ad plures: Sed prole parum felici, ut Moguntiæ eſt notum* (1).

[B] *He embraced the Proteſtant religion at the age of thirty or thirty-one years.*] Paul Freherus, in his *Theatrum*, contradicts Thomas James in this particular; for we find there, that Wicelius went to ſtudy at Wittemberg, about the year 1521, that afterwards he became the leader of the rebels in Thuringia; that he was taken and condemned to die, but that he was pardoned by the interceſſion of Pontanus, Chancellor of Saxony; that Luther ſettled him as Miniſter in a village called Nimeck, near Wittemberg; that in the year 1531 he was impriſoned by order of the Elector John Frederic, and by the advice of Melanchthon, on account of his attacking the Divinity of JESUS CHRIST; that not long after, he was baniſhed the Elector's territories; that he retired to Leipſic, where Duke George protected him; that ſome time after he turned Papiſt (2), and in the year 1534, wrote againſt Luther's book *de bonis Operibus*; that after the death of that Duke, he was driven from Leipſic, ſpent the remainder of his life at Mentz and Cologn, turning a bitter enemy to the Lutherans, and that he died in 1563. As to the laſt particulars, Freherus's *Theatrum* wants correction; for the Appendix to the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum*, affords inconteſtable proofs, that Wicelius would have yielded to the Lutherans ſeveral things for the ſake of peace, and that he was ſtill alive in the year 1564. What is yet more, one of his tracts inſerted in this Appendix, pag. 750, is dated on the tenth of Auguſt 1575; and yet page 787, Cornelius Loos is allowed to be in the right, in placing the death of Wicelius in 1573. Molanus (3) and Serarius (4) place his death in the ſame year 1573.

[C] *Several things practiſed in the Church of Rome.*] A ſpecimen of it extracted out of his books, may be ſeen in the Appendix to the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum* ſubjoined to his life.

See alſo the ſecond volume of John Wolfius's *Lectiones Memorabiles* (5). Wicelius's Letters, printed at Leipſic in 1537, contain as many invectives againſt the Canoniſts and Scholaſtic Divines, as againſt the Lutherans. There is juſt reaſon to wonder that the Inquiſition did not fulminate againſt theſe works (6): this confirms what has been ſaid of them, that their conduct is not uniform (7).

(a) Cornelius Loos, in Catal. illuſtr. Germaniæ Scriptor.

(b) *See his* Via Regia, *apud* Wolfium, Lect. Memor. *Tom. ii, pag.* 376.

(c) Uxorem in primo ſtatim fervore ſchiſmatis duxi, perſuaſus neminem poſſe neque pie vivere, neque bene mori, citra uxorem. *Wicel. Conf. Reſponſ. Jonicæ, pag.* 63.

(d) Juſtus Jonas excitavit Principes adverſus eum, ſeditionario facto conjectus eſt in lacum, neque longe fuit à laqueo præfocatore: ſed Lutherus pro eo ſcripſit.

(e) Thomas James is the author of it.

(f) Printed at London in 1690.

(1) Nic. Serarius, in Moguntia, *lib. i, cap. xl, apud* Miræum de Scriptor. Sæculi xvi, *p.* 23.

(2) Molanus, ubi infra, *ſaith, that he returned to the Romiſh Communion, in* 1532.

(3) Molanus, in Bibliotheca Sacra, MS. *apud* Miræum de Scriptor. Sæculi xvi, *pag.* 23.

(4) Serarius, ubi ſupra, *apud* Miræum, ibid.

(5) From pag. 354, to 393.

(6) *See* Rivetus, *pag.* 976, *of Tom. iii, of his Works.*

(7) *See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, *Sep.* 1685, *p.* 1053, *& alibi paſſim.*

WICKHAM (William) Biſhop of Wincheſter, was born at Wickham in the county of Southampton in the year 1324. He went through his claſſical learning at Wincheſter, and beſides, he learned the elements of Geometry, Arithmetic, and Logic, as well as the French tongue: he was afterwards ſent to Oxford, where he cloſely attended the lectures of Lewis Carleton, profeſſor of Mathematics, and of William Dorach, profeſſor of the Civil-Law. He ſtaid near ſix years in that univerſity, and behaved himſelf ſo well that he was very much eſteemed by the moſt famous Doctors. He would have ſtaid longer if his patron Nicolas Wedal (*a*), upon his being made Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Southampton by King Edward III, had not obliged him to come and live with him, in order to make him his Counſellor and Secretary. He could not have choſen a fitter perſon for that employment; for no man in thoſe days either wrote or ſpoke more politely than our Wickham. From thence it came to paſs that three years after Edington Biſhop of Wincheſter, and Lord Treaſurer of England, choſe him for his Secretary. King Edward having ſeen him in that prelate's palace, could not help owning that he diſcovered a majeſtic air in him, upon which, receiving a great character of him from Nicolas Wedal, and Biſhop Edington, he engaged him in his ſervice. Encouraged by this, Wickham made his court to that great monarch with the utmoſt aſſiduity, and with equal addreſs acquitted himſelf of the affairs entruſted to him: beſides, he anſwered ſo pertinently to ſeveral political queſtions which the King put to him, that the idea of his merit which that Prince had conceived, daily increaſed. ‘ Quo ‘ ejus ingenium altius exploraret multas illi illuſtres quæſtiones quæ ſtatum ac ſummam ‘ rerum continerent, ut de bello ſuſcipiendo vel deponendo, de conditionibus pacis ‘ ineundæ, de ærariis rationibus amplificandis, de induſtria proponere ſolebat, quibus ‘ *Wicamus* extempore ita ornate & prudenter tum verbis tum ſententiis reſpondiſſe fertur, ‘ ut Rex præſenti ejus ingenio & peracutis reſponſis mirifice oblectaretur (*b*). - - - - - *In* ‘ *order to make a further trial of his capacity, the King uſed to propoſe many remarkable* ‘ *queſtions to him concerning the ſtate and management of affairs, the neceſſary meaſures for* ‘ *beginning or ending a war, the conditions upon which a peace was to be concluded, and the* ‘ *ways and means of increaſing the revenues: to all which queſtions* Wickham *anſwered* ‘ *extempore (as it is reported) with ſo much elegance and diſcretion, both in words and ſentiments, that his Majeſty was wonderfully delighted with his ready wit and ſmart anſwers.*’ As he underſtood Geometry and Architecture, he was made ſurveyor of the King's buildings, to which poſt was joined that of Chief-Juſtice in Eyre. It was he who had the direction of the builing of Windſor Caſtle, Edward was born in that place, and had at one time the King of France, and the King of Scotland priſoners there. Being therefore deſirous to erect a magnificent monument of his victories, he preferred this to all other places: he cauſed all the ancient buildings to be demoliſhed, and ordered a new and moſt magnificent ſtructure to be erected. Wickham, who had the whole management of this, accquitted himſelf in a glorious manner, and took up but three years to finiſh the whole. His enemies gave ſo malicious a turn to an inſcription which he put upon that palace [*A*], that they expoſed him to the King's diſpleaſure; but he ſoon diſpelled that

(*a*) He was Lord of the village of Wickham.

(*b*) Hiſt. deſcript. Vitæ Wicami, *pag.* 22.

[*A*] *So malicious a turn to an inſcription which he put upon that palace.*] The words were, *This made Wickham*, which admitting of the double interpretation of *Wickham made this*, or *this made Wickham*, his enemies interpreted it in the firſt ſenſe, and poſſeſſed the King, that the ſurveyor of that edifice inſolently arrogated the glory of it to himſelf. *Non deerant quidam invidi & malevoli qui Regi in aures inſuſurrarent* Wicamum *tam magnificæ ſtructuræ honorem ſibi arroganter vendicaſſe, adeoque in nomen ſuum in interiori quodam pariete arcis* Windeſoriæ *inſculptum regalis ædificii titulum nominatim trajeciſſe* (1). The King being very much incenſed, charged Wickham with that crime, but was ſoon appeaſed, and laughed at it when he heard his defence. Wickham anſwered, with a ſmiling air, that his accuſers muſt either be very malicious, or very ignorant of Grammar, ſince the true ſenſe of the inſcription was this: *I am the creature of this palace, it is that which hath procured me the favour of my Prince, and raiſed me from a low to a high ſtate.* It is proper to inſert the Hiſtorian's own expreſſions here: *Cum autem Rex ſtomacharetur & iracunde* Wicamo *crimen objiceret, quod delatum erat, ille vultu non triſti aut conſternato, ſed hilari ac jucundo reſpondit, aut ſtultum hominem inſcitia Grammaticæ, aut calumniatorem malitioſa caſuum inverſione illam criminationem inſtituiſſe. Neque enim Rex ſereniſſime* (*inquit*) *ego hanc Arcem, ſed hæc Arx me quantus quantus ſum effecit, hoc eſt me in laude ac gratia apud tuam majeſtatem poſuit, atque ab humili conditione ad tantas fortunas & dignitates evexit. Quod reſponſum tam facetum ac* Wicamo *dignum* (*erat enim verum ſpecimen humanitatis, venuſtatis, ac leporis*) *non ſolum omnem iracundiæ acerbitatem Regi abſterſit, verum etiam lætitiam in ejus animo tum commotionem ſuavem jucunditatis in corpore excitavit* (2). I would not ſwear that Wickham had no eye to the equivocal ſenſe of this inſcription. But that King Edward's anger, expreſſed on this occaſion, may not paſs for an uncommon weakneſs, I ſhall mention ſome particulars concerning the nicety and jealouſy which ſovereign Princes have diſcovered in parallel caſes.

Facts concerning inſcriptions.

The magnificence of Pericles in the conſtruction of public edifices at Athens is very well known. ‘ Now ‘ when the Orators, who ſided with Thucydides, and ‘ were of his party, were at one time inveighing (as ‘ their cuſtom was) againſt Pericles, as one who ſquandered away the public ſtock in idle expences, and ‘ made havock of the ſtate-revenues, he ſtarting up ‘ in the open aſſembly, put the queſtion to the ‘ people, whether they thought that what he had ‘ laid out was too much; and they ſaying, *Too much* ‘ *of all conſcience. Well then*, ſaid he, *ſince it is ſo,* ‘ *let not the coſt and charge go upon your account, but* ‘ *upon mine, provided the inſcription upon the temples and* ‘ *other public buildings be only in my name.* When they ‘ heard him ſay this, whether it was out of a ſurpriſe to ſee the greatneſs of his ſpirit, or becauſe ‘ they would not yield to him the glory of having ‘ erected ſo magnificent and ſumptuous buildings, they ‘ cried aloud, bidding him ſpend on, and take what ‘ he thought fit out of the public purſe, and ſpare no ‘ coſt, 'till all were finiſhed (3).’

When Pauſanias, King of the Lacedemonians, conſecrated a golden tripod to the temple of Delphi, he cauſed to be inſcribed on it, that under his conduct the Perſians were beaten at the battle of Platæa. The Lacedemonians not being able to ſuffer this vanity, cauſed the inſcription to be raſed, and the name of the towns which had furniſhed the victorious troops to be inſerted inſtead of it, as we are informed by Cornelius

(1) Hiſtorica Deſcriptio (*See the whole title at the end of the text of this article, in the margin, citation* (*f*), *pag.* 27, 28.

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 28.

(3) Plutarch in the Life of Pericles.

that ſtorm, and made it contribute to the increaſe of his intereſt with that Prince. Having entred into Holy Orders, he was immediately preſented to ſeveral rich benefices by the liberality of that monarch, who not thinking theſe donatives ſufficient, made him Principal Secretary of State, and Keeper of the Privy-Seal. Whilſt he continued in theſe poſts, and with the greateſt conduct diſcharged all his offices, he was promoted to the See of Wincheſter in the room of Biſhop Edington, in the year 1367. Not long after he was made Lord High-Chancellor, and afterwards Preſident of the Privy-Council. In a word, he had ſuch a large ſhare of the King's favour, that they applied to him what St John ſays of the Eternal Word [*B*]. In order to diſcharge the duties impoſed on him both by his ſpiritual and temporal dignities and poſts, he applied himſelf on one ſide to regulate his manners, according to the ſtricteſt diſcipline, and to eſtabliſh in his dioceſe a Clergy which led an exemplary life, and were able to inſtruct their pariſhioners [*C*]; and on the other ſide he omitted nothing that might contribute to the exact and impartial adminiſtration of juſtice. In the year 1371, when he foreſaw that the great ſeal would be taken from him, he prevented the diſhonour, and ſurrendred it to the King. That Prince returning to England after a very ſucceſsful war with France, found his treaſury very much exhauſted. The Duke of Lancaſter, one of his ſons, at the head of ſeveral of the nobility complained of the Eccleſiaſtics, who at that time had the greateſt part of the civil offices in the kingdom; they repreſented to the King that it was not the clergy's buſineſs to intermeddle with temporal affairs, and that it was more proper thoſe places ſhould be filled by the laity, who would diſcharge them with

Cornelius Nepos. *Quâ victoriâ elatus plurima miſcere cœpit, & majora concupiſcere. Sed primum in eo eſt reprehenſus, quod ex prœda tripodem aureum Delphis poſuiſſet, epigrammate ſcripto, in quo erat hæc ſententia: SUO DUCTU BARBAROS, APUD PLATÆEAS ESSE DELETOS, EJUSQUE VICTORIÆ ERGO APOLLINI DONUM DEDISSE. Hos verſus Lacedæmonii exſculpſerunt, neque aliud ſcripſerunt, quàm nomina earum civitatum, quarum auxilio Perſæ erant victi* (4). Alexander, proud as he was, and jealous leſt any body elſe ſhould ſhare in his glory, made uſe of an inſcription which admitted the Greeks to a part of the honour of the triumph. Κοινούμενος δὲ τὴν νίκην τοῖς Ἕλλησιν . . . . κοινῇ τοῖς ἄλλοις λαφύροις ἐκέλευσεν ἐπιγράψαι φιλοτιμοτάτην ἐπιγραφὴν, ἈΛΈΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ Ὁ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ ΚΑῚ ΟἹ ἝΛΛΗΝΕΣ, ΠΛῊΝ ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΊΩΝ, ἈΠῸ ΤΩ͂Ν ΒΑΡΒΆΡΩΝ ΤΩ͂Ν ΤῊΝ ἈΣΊΑΝ ΚΑΤΟΙΚΟΥΝΤΩΝ. Participans autem Græcis victoriam . . . cæteris manubiis in communi glorioſiſſimum titulum inſcribi juſſit, ALEXANDER PHILIPPI ET GRÆCI, PRÆTER LACEDÆMONIOS, DE BARBARIS ASIATICIS (5). - - - - *That the Grecians might partake of the fruits of his victory . . . . upon all the reſt of the ſpoils he ordered this glorious inſcription to be written*, ALEXANDER, THE SON OF PHILIP, AND ALL THE GRECIANS, EXCEPT THE LACEDEMONIANS, WON THESE FROM THE BARBARIANS WHO INHABIT ASIA. This was after the battle of Granicus; when he had occaſion for their further aſſiſtance, and conſequently was afraid to irritate them by omitting their names in the monuments of his victories, and hoped to endear them to him by mentioning them (6). He deſired to appropriate the whole inſcription of the temple of Diana to himſelf, and offered to defray the expence of the whole edifice; but the inhabitants of Epheſus would not conſent to it, and not daring directly to refuſe him this honour, they had recourſe to a flattering ſhift, which extricated them out of this affair. They told him that it was not proper for one god to raiſe monuments to another. *Scripſit Epheſiis*, ſe omnes ſumptus qui in id ædificium facti eſſent, reſtituturum; quique porro requirerentur, præbiturum de ſuo, ita tamen ut ipſius nomen inſtaurato operi inſcriberetur. *Idque deprecati ſunt Epheſii. quo tempore, quia Alexandro petenti aliquid denegare arduum erat, legatus eorum ad adulationem confugit, qua maxime expugnabilem norat, dixitque* dedecere culmen ipſius, ſi diis aliquid conſecraret, quum ipſe deus eſſet. nam eum honorem ab hominibus haberi potiori naturæ. *Ea gloriæ contentio inter maximum regem, & unam civitatem fuit. obtinuerunt Epheſii; & maluerunt ingenti pecunia carere, quam inſtaurati templi titulo regi cedere* (7). The Thebans, I believe, were not in ſuch a perplexity, when a courtezan offered to rebuild their walls on the ſame condition. I am ſure they abſolutely rejected the offer, if what Athenæus ſays be true. Ἐπλούτει δὲ σφόδρα ἡ Φρύνη καὶ ὑπισχνεῖτο τειχιεῖν τὰς Θήβας, ἐὰν ἐπιγράψωσι Θηβαῖοι, ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΜΕΝ ΚΑΤΕΣΚΑΨΕΝ, ΑΝΕΣΤΗΣΕ ΔΕ ΦΡΥΝΗ Η ΕΤΑΙΡΑ, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Καλλίστρατος ἐν τῷ περὶ ἑταιρῶν. Phryne uſque adeo dives erat, ut Thebarum mœnia extructuram ſe polliceretur, ſi adſcriberetur, ALEXANDRUM DIRUISSE, PHRYNEN VERO SCORTUM REFECISSE, ut ait Calliſtratus libro de Scortis (8). - - - - *Phryne the courtezan was ſo rich, that ſhe promiſed to build the walls of Thebes, upon condition that the Thebans would make the following inſcription*, ALEXANDER DEMOLISHED THESE WALLS, BUT PHRYNE THE COURTEZAN REBUILT THEM. *So ſays Calliſtratus in his book* Of Courtezans. But before I conclude, I ſhall relate a ſtratagem full as good as that of Wickham. The architect who built Pharus, engraved his own name on a ſtone, and that of the King on the lime which covered it. The trick was not diſcovered during his life, nor was he conſequently expoſed to any manner of danger on that account, no perſon being able to accuſe him to the King as a robber of his glory; but he expected after the expiration of ſeveral years that the name written in the lime would crumble away, and none would remain viſible beſides his own, which he had fixed in a much more durable ſubſtance than lime. The following citation acquaints us with the name of this Architect. Οἰκοδομήσας ἐν τὸ ἔργον, ἔνδοθεν μενὸς κατὰ τῶν λίθων τὸ αὐτοῦ ὄνομα ἐπέγραψεν. ἐπιχρίσας δὲ τιτάνῳ, καὶ ἐπικαλύψας, ἐπέγραψε τοὔνομα τοῦ τότε βασιλεύοντος, εἰδὼς ὅπερ καὶ ἐγένετο, πάνυ ὀλίγου χρόνου συνεκπεσούμενα μενὸς τῷ χρίσματι τὰ γράμματα, ἐκφανησόμενον δὲ, Σώστρατος Δεξιφάνους κνίδιος, θεοῖς σωτῆρσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν πλωϊζομένων. Poſtquam igitur hoc opus exædificaſſet, intus in ſaxis ſuum nomen inſcripſit: quo calce illita occultato, nomen ejus qui tum regnavit, ſuperinſcripſit, ratus, id quod etiam evenit, fore ut brevi admodum, literæ illæ cum illita calce caderent: hoc verò appareret: Soſtratus Cnidius, Dexiphanis filius, Diis ſervatoribus pro ſalute navigantium (9). - - - - - *When therefore he had finiſhed the building, he engraved his own name*, &c. . . . *expecting, as it really happened, that after a ſhort time theſe letters would crumble away with the lime, and that then the following inſcription would appear*: Soſtratus Cnidius, the ſon of Dexiphanes, erected this to the gods preſervers, in behalf of ſeafaring men.

[*B*] *They applied to him what St John ſays of the Eternal Word.*] The author I here cite (10) quotes a paſſage of Froiſſard which runs thus; *At that time reigned a certain Prieſt called William of Wickham, and this William of Wickham was ſo much in favour with the King of England, that all things were done by him, and without him nothing was done.* Compare this with the words of St John (11), and you will find no great difference.

[*C*] *A Clergy which led an examplary life, and were able to inſtruct . . . . .*] It is not ſufficient for them to be either learned or good men. Both theſe qualities ought to be united. But in the age we are ſpeaking of, it was much eaſier to find Prieſts who were neither learned nor pious, than to find any that were either the one or the other; and though the ignorance of with more fidelity and decency. The King being perſuaded that if he ſlighted theſe complaints, he ſhould diſoblige a potent faction, and that if he removed the Eccleſiaſtics from the civil offices, he ſhould draw vaſt ſums from thoſe whom he ſhould call to an account, reſolved on the alteration. Wherefore our Wickham very ſeaſonably reſigned the ſeal, and deſired leave to retire to his dioceſe, which he did not obtain before the year 1374. The laymen being promoted to the public offices, diſcharged them ſo ill that the court was forced to re-inſtate the Eccleſiaſtics. The Duke of Lancaſter was removed from the helm, but returned to the adminiſtration, when the death of the Prince of Wales had thrown the King into a languiſhing and mortal diſeaſe. Being now in power, he vehemently declared againſt the Clergy, and left no means unattempted to ruin our Wickham. He cauſed him to be accuſed of diſloyalty and extortion, and forced him to appear at the King's-Bench, as being the court impowered by law to take cognizance of this affair. He provided judges to condemn him, without allowing him the neceſſary time to digeſt his papers in order to his defence. Not content with depriving him of his temporalities, he adviſed King Edward to baniſh him; but that Prince though enfeebled in body and mind, refuſed it. He remembred that Wickham was found innocent of all manner of extortion five years before, when all the Eccleſiaſtics were obliged to give an account of their adminiſtration of the treaſury. Wherefore he ſuſpected the juſtice of the ſentence which condemned him, and gave encouraging hopes to thoſe deputed by the Biſhops to him in order to requeſt the annulling of this ſentence; and at the ſame time ſuſpecting the Duke of Lancaſter to be guilty of ſome ſiniſter deſign [*D*], he declared Prince Richard his grand-ſon (*c*) his ſucceſſor, and reſtored to Wickham whatever the Duke of Lancaſter had deprived him of. He died not long after (*d*). King Richard who ſucceeded him was but eleven years old, which rendred it very eaſy for the Duke of Lancaſter, Preſident of the Council, to revive the accuſations againſt our Biſhop of Wincheſter. They were accordingly reduced to ſeven heads, and maintained with very great aſſurance before the Council by the accuſers, but the accuſed ſo ſtrenuouſly refuted them that he was declared innocent. From that time, his noble deſire of applying the riches which providence had beſtowed on him, to very good uſes, increaſed more than ever; and not being able to think of a more uſeful appointment, than that which furniſhed youth with the means of learning the ſciences, he founded two magnificent colleges, the one at Oxford, and the other at Wincheſter [*E*]. Whilſt he was taking care of whatever could contribute to the compleating theſe two noble eſtabliſhments, he was recalled to court, and by a ſort of force obliged to accept of the dignity of Lord High Chancellor in the year 1389. He diſcharged that office for three years ſo well, that he rendred the nation happy; and this was

---

(4) Cornelius Nepos, in Pauſania, *cap. i.*

(5) Plut. in Alexandro, *pag.* 673. *C.*

(6) *See* Freinſhemius, Supplem. in Q. Curtium, *lib. ii, cap. v.*

(7) Freinſhemius, Supplem. in Q. Curtium, *lib. ii, cap. vi, num.* 33. *He quotes Pauſanias, lib. vii, and Strabo, lib. xiv. I have found no ſuch thing in Pauſanias, but only in Strabo, lib. xiv, pag. m.* 441.

(8) Athenæus, *lib. xiii, pag.* 591, *D.*

(9) Lucianus de conſcribenda Hiſtoria, *ſub fin. pag. m.* 706, *Tom. i.*

(10) *The author of the* Hiſtorica Deſcriptio, *pag.* 32.

(11) All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. *John i.* 3.

(*c*) He was the ſon of the Prince of Wales.

(*d*) In the year 1377.

of thoſe times was prodigious. yet there were more who were able to inſtruct than thoſe who led a good life: and therefore this care of our Wickham muſt have proved a buſineſs of no ſmall fatigue, ſince he ordered, in an eſpecial manner, that all Deacons and Prieſts ſhould be obliged to be free from drunkenneſs and leudneſs. ‘ Ante omnia tam Diaconos quam qui ‘ ſupra eos collocati ſunt preſbyteros ac ſacerdotes ab ‘ infami illa ebrietatis & libidinis macula omnino im‘munes eſſe voluit. Nam quum ipſi ſal terræ, lux ‘ mundi, ac diſpenſatores myſteriorum Dei crebro in ‘ ſcripturis uſurpentur, nimis indignum eſſe dicebat eos ‘ vinolentia deformari vel cubilibus & immunditie in‘quinari, à qua turpitudinis labe & ignominia omnes ‘ etiam ex populo (quos Laicos vocant) melioris notæ ‘ abhorrerent (12). - - - *Above all he required that as* ‘ *well the Deacons as the Preſbyters and Prieſts, that* ‘ *were in a rank above them, ſhould keep themſelves entirely free from the foul ſtains of drunkenneſs and un*‘*cleanneſs. For whereas in the Scripture they are fre*‘*quently called the ſalt of the earth, the light of the* ‘ *world, and the diſpenſers of the myſteries of* G O D, *he* ‘ *ſaid that it was a thing very unbecoming their charac*‘*ters to be guilty of drunkenneſs, or luſt and uncleanneſs*; ‘ *eſpecially ſince even the better ſort of people among the* ‘ *Laity abſtained from theſe filthy vices.*’ This is not the leaſt glorious part of his adminiſtration.

(12) Hiſtor. Deſcriptio, *pag.* 34.

[*D*] *Edward . . . ſuſpecting the Duke of Lancaſter to be guilty of ſome ſiniſter deſign*] It was thought that the Duke intended to uſurp the crown (13), and this ſuſpicion was grounded on the ſecret meaſures which he took with ſome members of the Parliament, in order to engage the Engliſh in imitation of the French, to enact a law for the excluſion of women from ſucceeding to the crown of the realm. But this rendered him odious, and very much diſturbed King Edward now grown more ſuſpicious than ever (14), and made him reſolve to declare his grandſon for his ſucceſſor. This is my author's account. But perhaps it may be aſked what the Duke of Lancaſter aimed at, ſince the eſtabliſhment of the Salique law could not prevent the grand-ſons from ſucceeding, and conſequently he could not get any thing by its eſtabliſhment; he ſtood in need of a law that ſhould prefer the uncles to the nephews. It may be replied that not daring to endeavour directly at the excluſion of Richard his eldeſt brother's ſon, he began with the project of an innovation, wherein he could not be ſuſpected to have an intereſted view: but if he could have gained his end, (*viz.*) the eſtabliſhment of the Salique law, he would have found room for other innovations, and would have requeſted a law in preference of the rights of uncles to thoſe of nephews. Mr Varillac imagines that he deſigned to abrogate the law for the ſucceſſion of grand-children, and that on that account he was an encourager of Wickliff (15); but Mr de Larroque agreeably and ſolidly refutes this thought (16).

(13) Vehementiſſima regni appetendi ſuſpicione & invidia laborabat. *Ibid. pag.* 53.

(14) Qui in ſenili ætate credulus & ſuſpicionibus paulo indulgentior eſſe cœpit . . . poſt hujuſmodi ſcrupulum injectum paulo alienior deinceps à filio *Lancaſtrio* pater nonnullis videbatur. *Ibid. pag.* 54.

(15) Varillas, Hiſtoire du Wicleſianiſme, *pag.* 11, & *ſeq.*

(16) Larroque, nouvelles Accuſations contre Varillas, *pag.* 11, & *ſeq.*

[*E*] *He founded two magnificent colleges, the one at Oxford, and the other at Wincheſter.*] He had long given very ſignal proofs of a zealous inclination to relieve the neceſſitous. Hoſpitality, one of the virtues, which, according to St Paul (17), ought to ſhine in the life of a Biſhop, was remarkably exemplified in him. He lodged in his houſe twenty-four poor people, and maintained them there all his life. He received all ſtrangers with great humanity; and ſeven years before the foundation of the abovementioned colleges, he began to ſettle an annual penſion on fifty hopeful youths, whom he ſent to ſtudy at Oxford (18). Theſe were his preludes. After which, having obtained Letters-Patents to build a college in that city, he laid the firſt ſtone of it very early in the morning on the fifth of March, in 1379, and deſigned it for one hundred perſons, beſides ſervants, fifty ſcholars were to be entertained there, in order to be inſtructed in the ſciences, and a grave and learned man to govern the college with the title of Warden. He added ten Chaplains, three Clerks, and ſixteen Choriſters. This edifice being finiſhed in ſeven years, he himſelf placed thoſe hundred perſons (19) in it at three of the clock in the morning, on the fourteenth of April 1386. The firſt thing they did after their entrance was by a ſolemn public prayer to implore the bleſſing of God (20). The following year he founded another college in

(17) Tit. i. 8.

(18) *Taken from* Hiſtorica Deſcriptio, *pag.* 35, 36.

(19) He choſe them himſelf.

(20) Taken from the ſame book, *pag.* 101, 102.

was the reaſon why, without the moſt preſſing inſtances, he could not obtain the King's leave to retire, when he ſaw the fatal troubles that were ready to break out, which induced him to deſire a retreat in order to ſhelter himſelf from the ſtorm. Being then returned to his church, he finiſhed the building of his college at Wincheſter, and there built that ſumptuous cathedral, which equalled, or wanted but little of equalling, that of St Paul in London. Beſides this he very liberally diſburſed ſeveral ſums to the great advantage of the public, and the poor; all which could not yet prevent his being expoſed to imminent dangers in the year 1397, when he and ſome others were accuſed of high-treaſon in full parliament (*e*), but he was very honourably acquitted. From that time to his death he lived quietly in his dioceſe, and was wholly intent upon diſcharging all the duties of a good prelate. Nay he was there pretty ſecure from all thoſe commotions which violently ſhook England. He died in the eighty-firſt year of his age in the year 1404. Several ſcandalous reports were ſpread againſt him; amongſt other things it was ſaid that he revealed a ſecret declared in confeſſion concerning a ſuppoſititious ſon [*F*], and that he made preſents and promiſes to King Edward's miſtreſs, in order to obtain the reſtitution of his epiſcopal temporalities (*f*) [*G*]. We ought not to forget that he

(*e*) Omnes illos ſimul ac conjunctim proditionis ac læſæ majeſtatis reos fecit, perinde ac ſi illi Regem regio imperio ac omnium rerum dominatu deſpoliare ſtatuiſſent. *Hiſtorica Deſcript. Vitæ Wickami, p.* 109.

(*f*) *Taken from a book, intituled,* Hiſtorica Deſcriptio complectens Vitam ac Res geſtas beatiſſimi viri Gulielmi Wicami quondam Vintonienſis Epiſcopi, *&c. printed at Oxford in the year* 1690, *in* 4*to.*

in the ſuburbs of Wincheſter, near the Epiſcopal palace. He laid the firſt ſtone of this on the twenty-ſixth of March, in 1387. He deſigned it for one hundred and five perſons beſides ſervants. Theſe perſons were, a Head or Warden, ten Prieſts, ſeventy ſcholars, an upper and under School-maſter, three Chaplains, three Clerks, and ſixteen Choriſters (21). All theſe entered the firſt time at three in the morning, on the twenty-eighth of March 1393 (22). The ſtatutes of theſe two colleges are ſo excellent, that they ſerved as a model for all thoſe, who for the ſpace of two hundred years made the like foundations in Oxford and Cambridge (23). I muſt not omit that Wickham provided that this college at Wincheſter ſhould be a nurſery for that which he founded at Oxford; for he ordered that all the places vacant in the laſt ſhould be ſupplied by a draught from the former: which is religiouſly obſerved to this very day. My author expreſſes this part of the ſtatutes in very ſignificant words: *Quod Collegio ſuo* Oxonienſi *quaſi fons & ſeminarium inſerviret, ex cujus* (*ut ita dicam*) *utero junior alia ſoboles quotannis naſceretur, & in alterum Collegium decreſcentium loco veluti ad Patres literarum ac Senatores immigraret. Eſt enim hoc illius Collegii* Oxonienſis *proprium & peculiare, ejuſque ſtatutis ſancitum ut cum cætera Collegia* Oxonienſia *in demortuorum aut diſcedentium locum ex ſcholis quibuſcunque aſcititios cooptare ſoleant, ſolum hoc non niſi naturales ex ſeminario ſuo* Vintonienſi *velut ex ſua & propria ſtirpe ſuccreſcentes eligat, & electos ad ſe tanquam ad novam Coloniam ſuo tempore & loco deducat* (24). Obſerve that his laſt teſtament and codicil were very memorable proofs of his charity and liberality (25).

[*F*] *It was ſaid that he revealed a ſecret declared in confeſſion, concerning a ſuppoſititious ſon.*] This is the third of the five calumnies which my author undertakes to refute. The two firſt are that Wickham's learning was even below a moderate degree, and that he had been a ſervant. Our author refutes this by ſeveral remarks which it is not neceſſary to tranſcribe here; thoſe who are curious to ſee them may conſult the original, to which I refer them (26). But as for the third calumny I ſhall give the ſubſtance of the Apology: in order to which let us begin with the accuſation. It is pretended that the Duke of Lancaſter's hatred to Wickham was grounded on his divulging that that Duke was not the ſon of Edward III. They add, that Philippa, King Edward's Queen, revealed in confeſſion to our Biſhop of Wincheſter, that John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaſter, was the ſon of a German, and that ſhe had fraudulently impoſed him on the King, her huſband, inſtead of a female infant ſhe had by him. They farther ſay, that ſhe intreated this Prelate to reveal it to the nobility of the realm, in caſe the Duke, this ſuppoſed ſon of King Edward, ſhould aſpire to the crown, or prepare to ſucceed to the true Princes of the blood according to the laws. Hence ſome have taken occaſion to charge this Biſhop with a notorious ſacrilege, I mean the non-obſervation of the Canon-Law, which forbids the divulging any ſecrets delivered in confeſſion. His Apologiſt juſtifies him. I. By the ſhining virtue of the Queen. II. By the good underſtanding always preſerved betwixt the King and Queen. III. By the impunity of Wickham. IV. By his reconciliation to the Duke of Lancaſter. V. By the ſilence of Hiſtorians, and public records on this head. It is impoſſible, ſaith our author, that ſuch a virtuous Princeſs ſhould have killed her own daughter (27), in order the better to cover an abominable fraud. A King of ſuch a great ſpirit would not have left ſo villanous an action of his wife unpuniſhed: nor could he be ignorant of it, ſince it is pretended that it was revealed to the nobility of the realm. And if he had not believed it, he would have treated Wickham as the moſt infamous detractors deſerve; the whole royal family being diſhonoured by a report ſo injurious to the Queen, the ſlanderer would have been duly puniſhed. But the Duke of Lancaſter, hereby diſgraced more than all the reſt, would have brought him to juſtice, and never have been reconciled to him; and yet it is certain that after King Richard had reconciled them, they continued very well together till the Duke's death (28), that is about twenty-one years. Obſerve alſo that this ſtory is no where to be found except in the compilation of a Monk: 'Recte Harpisfieldus in hiſtoria illud de ſuppoſito Reginæ partu tanquam fictum & commentum rejicit, ac nullibi niſi in Monacho *Albanenſi* reperiri ſcribit (29). - - - - *Harpsfield, in his Hiſtory, very juſtly rejects as a fiction what is ſaid of the Queen's ſuppoſititious ſon, and affirms that it is no where mentioned but by a Monk of St Albans.*'

[*G*] . . . . *And that he made preſents and promiſes to King Edward's miſtreſs, in order to obtain the reſtitution of his Epiſcopal temporalities.*] This is the fourth calumny: our author indeed refutes it, but by arguments very far ſhort of the ſtrength of thoſe which he alledges againſt the third. The expreſs terms of the accuſation run thus: 'Regi jam ægroto, ipſaque ſenectute confecto ſemper aderat atque miniſtrabat quædam fœmina *Alicia Pierce*, quæ Regi languido & infirmo obſecuta majorem quam ipſe dux (30) cum Rege iniit gratiam: hanc præſenti mercede & uberiori promiſſa ſpe *Wicamus* adduxit ut à Rege reſtitui ſibi ablata Epiſcopatus jura tam quæ ante percepta & in fiſco reſervata eſſent, quam omnia prædia procuraret, quod illa invito duce, continuo impetravit (31). - - - *The King being now ſick and worn out with age, a certain woman, whoſe name was Alice Pierce, always attended and ſerved him. She, by humouring him in his weak and languiſhing condition, got more into his favour than the Duke himſelf. Wickham prevailed upon her by a preſent he made her, and the promiſe of another much greater, to ſollicit the King to reſtore the temporalities of his biſhopric which had been taken from him, as well thoſe which he had enjoyed before, and which were ſequeſtered in the Exchequer, as all the lands belonging to it. This ſhe immediately obtained for him in ſpite of the Duke.*' He refutes this. I. By the hatred which this immodeſt woman bore to the Biſhops. II. By the very ſmall confidence which the corruption of her manners could allow any perſon to have in her. III. By her ſtrict friendſhip with Wickham's enemies. IV. By the expreſs terms of the Letters-Patents granted to this Prelate for his re-eſtabliſhment, which contain the reaſons of it, and declare the conſent of the Duke of Lancaſter, of all the nobility, and all the King's council: they are ſubſcribed at the bottom in this manner, *per ipſum Regem & conſilium, - - - by the King and his council.* The Apologiſt's exclamation ought not to be forgotten. 'O inſignes calumniatores, & chartarum publicarum malicioſos

(21) Ibid. *pag.* 102, 103.

(22) Ibid. *pag.* 104.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Ibid. *pag.* 102.

(25) Ibid. *pag.* 112, 113.

(26) Ibid. *pag.* 116, *& ſeq.*

(27) Si primo hujus calumniæ auctori credimus, ea quem non peperit, aluit, quam peperit, occidit. - - - *If we believe the author of this calumny, ſhe killed her own child, and brought up another's.* Ibid. *pag.* 123.

(28) Ibid. *pag.* 121.

(29) Ibid. *pag.* 124.

(30) That is, the Duke of Lancaſter.

(31) Ibid. *pag.* 125, ex Acwortho in Vita Sadburei.

he was employed in the expulsion of Wickliff [*H*].

‘ licioſos interpretes, qui quod inſtrumenta Regalia ‘ per ſanctum Senatum fieri aſſerunt, id per impurum ‘ ſcortum factitatum prædicant. Num ſcortum & con‘ ſilium iſtis idem ſonat (32)? - - - *O notorious calum‘ niators, and malicious interpreters of the public records, ‘ who pretend, That to be the action of a ſtrumpet which ‘ the royal acts aſſert to have been done by the ſacred ‘ council. Do the names, council and ſtrumpet, ſignify the ‘ ſame thing with them?*’ He thinks it very ſtrange, that, notwithſtanding this declaration of King Edward, ‘ ſe liberalitate Epiſcopi ex promiſſione in difficultati‘ bus ſuis atque Regni adductum fuiſſe ut ea bona re‘ ſtitueret, - - - *that he had engaged himſelf by a pro‘ miſe to reſtore theſe temporalities, being induced to it by ‘ the liberal aſſiſtance which the Biſhop gave him in the ‘ ſtraits that he and his kingdom were reduced to,*’ any ſhould preſume to aſſign, as the cauſe of this reſtiſtution, the good offices of a courtezan, purchaſed with money. V. Laſtly, he urges that King Richard, after the flight of Alice Pierce (33), confirmed this reſtitution by the advice of his council, in which were preſent the Duke of Lancaſter, the Prelates, Earls, and Barons. I am inclined to believe, that this calumny, of which we have juſt now ſeen the refutation, is falſe; but I do not find that it is refuted by very ſtrong reaſons. Thouſands of inſtances prove theſe two things: firſt, that thoſe who are perſecuted by a King's miſtreſs, will apply to her to be re-eſtabliſhed, and endeavour to gain her by dint of money and promiſes, without ever diſtruſting her on a ſuppoſition that a profeſſed whore muſt be capable of all ſorts of perfidy; ſecondly, that an act of Replevy, obtained by the intereſt of a miſtreſs, runs in the ſame ſtile, with that obtained by lawful means. A King, who grants any thing at the ſollicitation of his miſtreſs, may eaſily engage his council to approve it; and if he doth not do it, his miſtreſs her ſelf will be able to gain the chief Counſellors: and then the moſt favourable and glorious clauſes are inſerted in the Letters-Patents, and no part of the uſual form is omitted. To this may be added, that there have been ſome perſons unjuſtly oppreſſed, who have been reſtored by no other means but by buying the good offices of a miſtreſs. Nor ought we to be ſurprized, that after the diſgrace of ſuch a woman a confirmation of the Patent was obtained: for that is not at all extraordinary. So that the arguments of our author do not ſeem to me to be very ſtrong. But it would indeed have been enough to have laid it upon the authors of this calumny to prove it. What is very certain, is, that King Edward's miſtreſs could do every thing with him at that time, and that her power ended only with the life of that Prince. This *King was unexpectedly ſurprized by the loſs of his ſpeech all at once, ſo that he had only time to expreſs ſome pious ſentiments, (to which he was exhorted by a Prieſt) by his geſture and eyes. This did not happen by reaſon that he was not long and dangerouſly ill; but the famous Alice Peers, too really his miſtreſs, had ſo poſſeſſed him, that no perſon could have acceſs to ſpeak to him before he himſelf was ſpeechleſs. Then this diſſolute harpy, having in haſte tore off the diamond rings which he wore on his finger, withdrew, and left him in the hands of a Chaplain, who could only draw ſome ſigns of penitence from him; which indeed, tho' late, when ſincere are good; but are rarely ſincere when ſo late* (34).

(32) Ibid. *pag.* 126.

(33) Quum jam *Alicia Peers* ſe in fugam cum ſua peſte ac pernicie convertiſſet. *Ibid.*

(34) *Father* D'Orleans, Hiſt. des Revolutions d'Angleterre, *livr. v, pag.* 68, 69, *Tom. ii.*

I ſhall by the by ſay, that the fifth calumny, refuted in the above-cited book (35), is, that Wickham was baniſhed, and continued three years in exile, according to ſome, and ſeven entire years, according to others. But this is utterly falſe, for he never lay under any ſentence of baniſhment. I add farther, that he was never deprived of his biſhopric, ſo that the ſee of Wincheſter was never vacant from 1367 to 1404. Whence it neceſſarily follows that Wickliff was refuſed this biſhopric in 1367, if what is pretended by Varillas (36) were true, *viz.* that his not being able to obtain that biſhopric ſo diſguſted him, that it inſpired him with a deſign of ſetting up for a Hereſiarch; but if he was not able to obtain it that year, one of the reaſons by which Mr de Larroque (37) refutes Varillas concerning the conſequences of this pretended refuſal, will become yet more ſpecious.

(35) Hiſtor. Deſcript. *pag.* 127, 128.

(36) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *p.* 2.

(37) Larroque, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 13, *& ſeq.*

[*H*] *He was employed in the expulſion of Wickliff.*] My author touches only accidentally on this particular, when he is proving that our Biſhop of Wincheſter was more learned than his detractors imagined. ‘ Quid animi fuiſſe putas *Richardo* Regi quum *Wica‘ mum* anno Regni ſui ſeptimo una cum *Courtneo Can‘ tuarienſi* Archiepiſcopo *Oxonium* contra virum acer‘ rimum *Johannem Wicklefum* mitteret? An mediocris ‘ eruditionis & ingenii eſſe oportebat, qui (quod ille ‘ ibi præſtitit) diſſentientes in religione opiniones con‘ ciliaret, & tam celebrem & acutum virum ſuſpectæ ‘ fidei redargueret & ex Academiæ finibus extermina‘ ret (38)? - - - - - *What do you think was King Ri‘ chard's motive for ſending Wickham in the ſeventh year ‘ of his reign, together with Courtney Archbiſhop of Can‘ terbury, to Oxford, againſt that ſubtle and acute man ‘ John Wickliff? Is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe that he was ‘ only a man of inconſiderable parts and erudition, who ‘ reconciled the differences of opinion in religious matters, ‘ and convicted the great Wickliff of being a Heretic, ‘ and expelled him from the bounds of the univerſity?* Obſerve here a remarkable particular of which the Jeſuit Maimbourg (39), Mr Varillas, nay, even Mr de Larroque, as well as ſeveral others, have made no manner of mention; *viz.* that the Archbiſhop of Canterbury was in perſon at Oxford with the Biſhop of Wincheſter, in the year 1383, or 1384 (40), in order to expel Wickliff from that univerſity.

(38) Hiſtorica Deſcriptio, *pag.* 117. *The Records of Lambeth are quoted.*

(39) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du grand Schiſme d'Occident, *Tom. i, pag.* 177, *& ſeq. Dutch Edit.*

(40) The ſeventh year of Richard is partly in 1383, and partly in 1384.

WIDA (*a*) (HERMAN DE) ſon to William de Wida Count of the empire, was made Archbiſhop of Cologn in the year 1515 (*b*). Long after he was elected Biſhop of Paderbon, and perſecuted the Proteſtants of that place [*A*]. In the year 1536 he held a council,

---

(*a*) It is more commonly written ſo in Germany, than *Weda*, or *Weida*. See *Seckendorf, Hiſt. Luther. lib. iii, pag.* 435.

(*b*) Seckendorf, ibid. Theod. de Beza, in Iconibus, *ſays it was in the year* 1510.

[*A*] *He perſecuted the Proteſtants of Paderborn.*] As a commentary upon this I ſhall cite Father Maimbourg's words. ‘ After * the death of Eric of Brun‘ ſwic, Biſhop of Paderborn, Wida being elected by ‘ the Canons of that church to ſucceed him, with a ‘ deſign that he ſhould oppoſe the Lutherans who ‘ began to eſtabliſh themſelves there, he performed it ‘ ſo well, that being aſſiſted by his friends, who, to‘ gether with ſeveral good troops, accompanied him, ‘ he made himſelf maſter of that city, drove out all ‘ the preachers he found in it, utterly aboliſhed Lu‘ theraniſm there, and prohibited any perſons profeſ‘ ſing it on pain of death (1).’ Mr Seckendorf obſerves, that our Herman was excited to this rigour by the Canons, and by his reſentment againſt the inſolence of the populace (2), and that, notwithſtanding this, he gave ſome proofs of moderation. For he did not moleſt two Miniſters who had eſcaped out of priſon, and pardoned ſixteen citizens who were condemned to death. To this mercy, the interceſſion of their relations, and the executioner's refuſing to behead them, contributed very much. ‘ Civibus Paderbornenſibus ‘ XVI ad mortem condemnatis gratiam fecit, precibus ‘ ſupplicum & adſtantium, immo & carnificis facto ſin‘ gulari, motus: Hic enim gladium, quo productos ‘ in forum decollare juſſus erat, judicibus publice tra‘ didit, negans, ſe innocentium cruore manus pollu‘ turum eſſe (3). - - - - *He pardoned ſixteen citizens of ‘ Paderborn who had been condemned to death, being ‘ moved by the prayers and intreaties of thoſe who were ‘ ſtanding by, and even by a very ſingular action of the ‘ executioner; for the ſword with which the executioner ‘ was ordered to behead thoſe who were brought forth ‘ into the market-place, he publickly delivered to the ‘ judges, and ſaid, that he would not ſtain himſelf with ‘ the blood of the innocent.*’

* Chytræus, ad ann. 1532.

(1) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Lutheraniſme, *livr. iii, pag.* 264, *Dutch Edit.*

(2) Irritatus plebis Paderbornenſis petulantia & à Canonicis ſtimulatus. *Seckendorf. Hiſt. Luther. lib. iii, pag.* 435.

(3) Id. ibid. *He refers us to* Chytræus, *lib. ix, fol.* 278, *& lib. xiii, fol.* 392, *& ſeq.*

[*B*] *He*

a council, the regulations of which were very much approved [*B*]; for being a very good man, whoſe life was exemplary, he paſſionately deſired the eſtabliſhment of good order in his dioceſe. He not only endeavoured to reſtore a good diſcipline there, but alſo intended a reformation of doctrine, and having conſulted Melanchthon, and had ſeveral ſecret conferences with Bucer, he cauſed the latter to preach at Bonn, and engaged the former to come thither ſome time after [*C*]. The majority of the canons of Cologn oppoſed this enterprize, and not being able to gain any advantage by the books which they

[*B*] *He held a council, the regulations of which were very much approved.*] Let us again cite Maimbourg. ‘ Being apprehenſive that the Lutherans already ſpread ‘ in the * neighbouring provinces, would inſenſibly ‘ introduce the venom of their Hereſy into his electo- ‘ rate, he, in conjunction with his ſuffragans, held a ‘ council at Cologn, where he made the moſt excel- ‘ lent Canons that could be deſired for the mainte- ‘ nance of religion in it's purity, the re-eſtabliſhment ‘ of Eccleſiaſtical diſcipline in it's vigour, and the re- ‘ gulation of the duties and morals of all true Chri- ‘ ſtians in every ſtation (4).’ Cardinal Sadolet very much commended this Council of Cologn, but thought it ſomewhat ſtrange that purgatory was not mentioned in it. See his letter to Herman (5). For the reſt, this Archbiſhop was not much afraid that the Lutherans ſhould introduce the venom of their Hereſy into the electorate of Cologn: Father Maimbourg was ignorant of his real ſentiments: read Mr Seckendorf, and you will find that this Prelate was already at that juncture more than half a Lutheran. ‘ *Hermannum* ‘ jam tum meliora intendiſſe, ex epiſtola M. S. *Joh.* ‘ *Lumpii*, Doct. Colon. quæ inter *Heckelianas* extat, ‘ & d. 6. Oct. hoc anno data eſt, apparet. Scribit enim: ‘ *Archiepiſcopus nondum audet, quæ ſentit, prodere, ob* ‘ *Monachorum & Theologorum ſuperſtitioſa ſupercilia,* ‘ *quibus adhuc, inſipidum eſt, quod ex eorum non prodit* ‘ *culina, ſperatur tamen finis.* Addit: *Minoritanum,* ‘ *qui Præſuli à confeſſione & ſacra concione eſt, cucullum* ‘ *ferre adhuc, ſed aliud ſentire: in templo majori concio-* ‘ *nari aliquem puram Evangelii doctrinam, advolanti-* ‘ *bus ex vicinis oppidulis, etiam ex Haſſiaca ditione pro-* ‘ *cul diſſita, tot millibus ut eos vix capiat Templum* (6). ‘ - - - *It appears by a manuſcript letter of* John Lumpius, ‘ *Doctor at Cologn, (which letter is to be found among* ‘ *the* Heckelianæ, *dated the ſixth of October that year)* ‘ *that the Archbiſhop had even then better ſentiments.* ‘ The Archbiſhop, *ſays Lumpius,* dares not yet declare ‘ his ſentiments, for fear of the ſuperſtitious frowns of ‘ the Monks and Divines, who ſtill look upon every ‘ thing as inſipid which does not come out of their ‘ own kitchen. Nevertheleſs an end of this is to be ‘ hoped for. He adds, that the minor Friar, who was ‘ Father Confeſſor and Preacher to the Archbiſhop, ‘ ſtill wore the cowl, but that his opinion was ‘ changed; that in the great church there was one ‘ preached the pure doctrine of the Goſpel; and that ‘ ſo many thouſands of people crowded thither from ‘ the neighbouring villages, and even from the remote ‘ dominions of Heſſe, that the church could hardly ‘ contain them.’

[*C*] *Having conſulted Melanchthon, and had ſeveral ſecret conferences with Bucer, he cauſed the latter to preach . . . and engaged the other to come . . . . ſome time after.*] He deputed Peter Medman to Melanchthon in the year 1539, and wiſhed he would come to him immediately, but his journey was deferred to the year 1543. Bucer being ſent for by this Archbiſhop, came to him towards the end of 1541, and after ſeveral conferences which were very well reliſhed by that Prelate, he went back to Straſbourg, from whence he returned to Herman the following year, and preached publickly at Bonn. He alſo informed the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Heſſe, that this Prelate had very good deſigns; but that he wanted encouragement, by reaſon of his age which made him act timorouſly and ſlowly. Thoſe Princes did not fail to write to him in order to confirm him in his Chriſtian intentions. He thanked them, and informed them that he had no other aim than the glory of GOD, and the happineſs of his neighbours. He had before entreated the Elector of Saxony to ſend Melanchthon to him; who accordingly ſet forwards on his journey about the end of April 1543, and, in conjunction with Bucer, drew up a project of Reformation, which the Archbiſhop cauſed to be read to him, and he himſelf carefully examined it (7). Some particulars, which did not ſavour much of Proteſtantiſm, were overlooked in this project to pleaſe him; which obliged Luther to complain of Melanchthon's and Bucer's connivance. The Elector of Saxony was not better pleaſed with this conduct, tho' the Landgrave told him, it was not to be expected that the work could be perfected all at once (8). We ought to know that the Archbiſhop was deſirous to retain all the ceremonies which were not impious, and that each order ſhould preſerve it's privileges: he did not pretend to aboliſh Epiſcopacy. ‘ Propoſitum ſci- ‘ licet erat *Hermanno* ut ex *Melanchthonis* literis colligi ‘ poteſt, *Chytræus* etiam *Lib.* 16. *fol.* 460. apertius ‘ tradit, ceremonias veteres omnes, quotquot ſine im- ‘ pietate ſervari poſſent, una cum collegiorum digni- ‘ tate, libertate, prærogativis & juribus omnibus, re- ‘ tinere, ut moderatæ & piæ ordinationis Eccleſiæ Ca- ‘ thedralis exemplum eſſe poſſet: ſed eventus oſtendit, ‘ in rebus tantopere corruptis modum difficillime in- ‘ veniri; quapropter omnis iſta cautio inutilis fuit, ‘ &, retenta illa pompa, doctrinæ puritati incrementa ‘ omnia ſubtracta fuerunt (9). - - - Herman *propoſed, as* ‘ *may be gathered from* Melanchthon's *letters, and as* ‘ Chytræus *more plainly affirms, to retain all the old* ‘ *ceremonies which were not impious, together with the* ‘ *dignity, freedom, and all the rights and privileges of* ‘ *of the colleges; that there might be an example of a* ‘ *moderate and pious adminiſtration in his Epiſ-* ‘ *copal church. But the event ſhewed that, when things* ‘ *are ſo far corrupted, it is very difficult to find a me-* ‘ *dium; for which reaſon all this caution proved uſeleſs,* ‘ *and the retaining of that pomp put an entire end to the* ‘ *increaſe of the purity of doctrine.*’ The project of Reformation which he publiſhed, did not at all mention either Luther, or the Pope (10), and he took care to expreſs himſelf ſo cautiouſly concerning the LORD's Supper, that the Zuinglian's could agree to it (11). Luther was very well pleaſed that his name was not mentioned (12), becauſe he was well aſſured it might have deterred people; but he condemned the other parts of this cautious conduct, and became ſo violently enraged againſt Melanchthon, that, perhaps, he had never been reconciled to him, if the latter had not laid the fault on Bucer, and if the Elector of Saxony had not laboured to prevent an open rupture betwixt them. ‘ Non latuit *Melanchthonem* indignatio Lutheri, immo ‘ tantopere eum afflixit, ut de deſerenda Wittenberga ‘ cogitaret, ſi Luthero inviſus eſſet, aut quod futurum ‘ eſſe dicebatur, publice ab illo refutaretur. Sed pia ‘ Electoris Saxoniæ providentia & induſtria *Pontani* ‘ placatus eſt Lutherus, & Melanchthonis excuſatio- ‘ nem accepit, dicentis, ſe neque caput illud reforma- ‘ tionis Colonienſis de ſacra Cœna compoſuiſſe, neque ‘ *Bucerum* celaſſe, quæ in eo deſideraret, hunc tamen ‘ admonitionis ſuæ nullam habuiſſe rationem. Sic ira ‘ Lutheri vehementius in *Bucerum* verſa eſt (13). . . . ‘ Melanchthon *was not ignorant of Luther's indignation;* ‘ *nay, he was ſo much concerned at it, that he reſolved to* ‘ *leave Wittemberg, if he ſhould prove obnoxious to Luther,* ‘ *or in caſe (for ſuch a thing was talked of) he ſhould be* ‘ *publickly confuted by him. But by the pious care of the* ‘ *Elector of Saxony, and by* Pontanus's *means, Luther was* ‘ *appeaſed, and admitted the excuſe of Melanchthon, who* ‘ *ſaid that it was not he who compoſed the article of Re-* ‘ *formation at Cologn touching the LORD's Supper, and* ‘ *that he had freely told Bucer what he thought was want-* ‘ *ing in it, but that he had ſhewn no regard to his ad-* ‘ *monition. Thus the edge of Luther's indignation was* ‘ *turned againſt* Bucer.’

This project of Reformation was printed at Buſſhoven, if we believe the Preface, and that is all we can know of it; the time of the impreſſion not being mentioned. A ſecond edition appeared at Bonn, in 1543, printed by Laurence Mylius, or *von der Muhlen.* And a third was printed the following year. Theſe three impreſſions were in the German language. But the Latin edition, printed at Bonn, in 1545, by the ſame Mylius, is intituled, *Noſtra Hermanni, ex gratia Dei Archiepiſcopi* they publiſhed, they had recourſe to the Pope and the Emperor. The former excommunicated and depoſed the Archbiſhop, and was ſo effectually ſeconded by Charles V, that our prelate was forced to renounce his dignity in the year 1547 [*D*]. He retired to his paternal eſtate (*c*), where he died on the thirteenth of Auguſt 1552, being eighty years old (*d*). His ſcheme of reformation was more like that of England, than that of Germany

---

* Concil. Colon. I. t. 14. Concil. edit. Pariſ.

(4) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra.

(5) It is in the xivth book of Sadolet's letters, *pag.* 559, *Edit. Lugd.* 1554, in 8vo.

(6) Seckendorf, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 138, 139.

(7) *Taken from* Seckendorf, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 436.

(8) Non ſatis placebat illa diſſimulatio Electori monito licet a Landgravio quod non omnia ſub initium exacte conſtitui poſſent. *Id. ibid. pag.* 437, *num.* 8.

(9) Id. ibid.

(10) Hermanno ea placuit lenitas qua etiam cavit ne in toto ſcripto aliquid contra Pontificem nominatim ſpargeretur. *Id. ibid. pag.* 448, *d.*

(11) Id. ibid.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Id. ibid.

(*c*) See the remark [*D*].

(*d*) Chytræus, in Saxoniâ, *ad ann.* 1552, *in fine.*

Archiepiſcopi Colonienſis & Principis Electoris, ſimplex ac pia Deliberatio, qua ratione chriſtiana, & in verbo Dei fundata, Reformatio doctrina, adminiſtrationis divinorum Sacramentorum, ceremoniarum, totiuſque curæ animarum, & aliorum miniſteriorum Eccleſiaſticorum, apud eos, qui noſtræ paſtorali curæ commendati ſunt, tantiſper inſtituenda ſit, donec Dominus dederit conſtitui meliorem, vel per liberam & chriſtianam Synodum, ſive generalem ſive nationalem, vel per Ordines Imperii Nationis Germanicæ in Spiritu ſancto congregatos The copies of the firſt edition were kept, as it were locked up (14) for ſome time, and perhaps the publication had been longer deferred, if all thoſe that were concerned in it had been as phlegmatic as Herman. The chapter of Cologn no ſooner diſcovered that the copies were ſpread on all ſides, but they cauſed to be publiſhed in German and Latin, a book, intituled, *Antididagma, ſeu Chriſtianæ & Catholicæ Religionis per Rever. & Illuſt. Dominos Canonicos Metropolitanæ Eccleſiæ Colonienſis Propugnatio, adverſus Librum quendam univerſis Ordinibus ſeu ſtatibus Diocæſis ejuſdem nuper Bonnæ titulo Reformationis exhibitum, ac poſtea mutatis quibuſdam, Conſultoriæ Deliberationis nomine impreſſum* (15). At the end of the *Antididagma* is a grave and moderate diſcourſe of twelve pages only, intituled, *Sententia delectorum per venerabile capitulum Eccleſiæ Colonienſis de vocatione Martini Buceri.* Theſe were not the only books that were publiſhed on each ſide: Mr Seckendorf informs us (16), that a book appeared under the title of *Judicium deputatorum Univerſitatis & ſecundarii Cleri Colonienſis de doctrina & vocatione Martini Buceri,* which was aſcribed to Everard Billicus, a Carmelite, and ſo ſtuffed with ſcurrilous boffooneries, that the Canons of Cologn would not licenſe it; wherefore the firſt title, *Judicium Cleri & Academiæ,* was ſtruck out, and the other made uſe of, as we find in one of Melanchthon's letters. ' Coloniæ liber editus eſt, non ' tam contra Bucerum, quam contra univerſam do' ctrinam Eccleſiarum noſtrarum, & contra noſtros ' Principes. Poeta operis eſt Carmelita ille bene ſagi' natus, & Bacchi ac Veneris ſacerdos. Titulum operi ' fecerant: *Judicium Cleri & Academiæ.* Cum autem ' ſaniores in Collegio quidam Comites vidiſſent, ſcrip' tum dignius eſſe ſcurris, quam Clero, juſſerunt mu' tari titulum, ac teſtati ſunt, id opus non probari ſuo ' Collegio. Addita eſt ergo tituli correctio, pro ' *Clero* jubent legi *Clerum ſecundarium,* nothos vide' licet Cleros intelligunt. Petulantiſſime convitiatur ' doctrinæ & Luthero, & in loco de conjugio ſpurcitie ' & obſcœnitate verborum utitur, quam vix in lenone ' ferrent aures mediocrium hominum. Convitia ex ' Plauti fabulis lecta ſunt, quibus fortaſſe Carmelita ille ' magis delectatur, quam Pſalmis (17). - - - - *A book ' was publiſhed at Cologn, not ſo much againſt Bucer, ' as againſt the whole doctrine of our Churches, and ' againſt our Princes. The author is that high-fed Carme' lite, who may very well be taken for the Prieſt of Bac' chus and Venus. The book was originally called,* The ' Judgment of the Clergy and the Univerſity. *But ' when ſome of the more judicious Fellows of the college ' had obſerved that it was a piece more worthy of buf' foons than Clergymen; they ordered the title to be ' changed, and publickly declared, that their college did by ' no means approve of the book. For this reaſon they cor' rected the title, and inſtead of the word* Clergy, *they ' ordered to be put in,* Under Clergy. *The author rails ' in a moſt ſaucy manner at Luther and his doctrine, and ' in that place where he ſpeaks of marriage, he makes ' uſe of ſuch filthy and obſcene words as the ears of ordi' nary men could hardly bear from profligate fellows. ' Unſeemly jeſts are picked out of Plautus's comedies, ' which, perhaps, that Carmelite liked better than the ' Pſalms.'* Gaſpar Gennep tranſlated this tract into German (18); and Melanchthon publiſhed a refutation of it. The appeal which the Chapter of Cologn brought in before the Pope, may paſs for a controverſial tract (19): the Archbiſhop cauſed it to be refuted. The Chapter publiſhed a *Programma* in German, on the eighteenth of November 1544; and the Archbiſhop anſwered it on the thirteenth of December, the ſame year (20). In all probability, the prodigious ſuperſtition of the city of Cologn, was one of the obſtacles which ſtifled Herman's deſign. That city ſo vaſtly abounds with monaſteries, reliques, and images, that it may be called the Teutonic Rome. *Manſit aut reſtituta eſt, de qua* Melanchthon *quæſtus fuit, populi ſuperſtitio,* Coloniæ *potiſſimum* Agrippinæ, *Clero, templis, ſacellis, ſtatuis, reliquiis, plus, quam ulla in Germania civitas, repletæ, ita ut* Romam Teutonicam *eſſe dicant* (21).

(14) *Taken from* Seckendorf, ibid. *pag.* 443.

(15) The Latin edition I make uſe of is that of Louvain, printed for Servatius Zaſſenus 1544, in 8vo.

(16) Seckend. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 438.

(17) Melanch. Epiſt. ad Crucigerum. *It is the lxxvth of the iiid book. It was written at Bonn, in* 1543.

(18) Seckend. ubi ſupra.

(19) *See* Seckendorf, ibid. *pag.* 442.

(20) Id. ibid.

(21) Id. ibid. *pag.* 448.

[*D*] *He was obliged to renounce his dignity in the year* 1547.] He was promiſed aſſiſtance, that he might oppoſe force againſt force, but he choſe rather to ſubmit, in order to ſave his faithful ſubjects from the devaſtations of war. Read what follows, and you will find there the character of a good man: ' Conſtantiam ' profitebantur Ordines, & res ad vim ſpectabat: ſed ' bonus ſenex Comitibus *Manderſcheidio* & *Nuenario,* ' nobilitatis in Archiepiſcopatu facile primis, ita ſua' dentibus obtemperans, tum miſericordia Populi ſui ' motus, & ne bello vaſtaretur provincia, ultro ceſ' ſit, fidemque & jusjurandum omnibus remiſit. Obiit ' poſt annos ſex Idibus Auguſti anno 1552, in patria ' ſua, &, ut *Sleidanus* loquitur, qualem expetivit, fi' nem habuit. Nam, aut Evangelii propagare do' ctrinam, & recte conſtituere ſuæ ditionis Eccleſias, ' aut privato ſibi vivere licere, non ſemel optaverat: ' Et ab amicis aliquando monitus, *quantum invidiæ ſibi ' conflaret ex iſta religionis mutatione,* reſpondere ſole' bat: *nihil eſſe, quod inopinanti poſſet accidere, ſeque jam ' pridem in omnem caſum obfirmaſſe mentem* (22). - - - ' *His ſubjects profeſſed their reſolution to ſtand by him, ' and it looked as if violence would have enſued. But the ' good old man complying with the advice of the Counts* ' Manderſcheid *and* Nuenarius, *who were the chief ' noblemen in the Archbiſhopric, and moved with compaſ' ſion for his people, whom he was willing to ſave from ' the devaſtations of war, ſubmitted of his own accord, ' and abſolved them all from their oath of fidelity. He ' died ſix years after, on the thirteenth of Auguſt* 1552, ' *in his own country; and, as Sleidan ſays, his end was ' ſuitable to his deſire. For he had been oftener than once ' heard to wiſh that he might rather have it in his ' power to propagate the doctrine of the Goſpel, and to ' ſettle the Churches upon a right footing in his dominions, ' or elſe that he might live a private man: and ſometimes ' when his friends adviſed him* to conſider how much ' hatred he would draw upon himſelf by this change ' of religion, *he uſed to anſwer,* that nothing which ' ſhould happen to him could ſurprize him un' awares, for that he had prepared himſelf againſt all ' events.' Eraſmus would have admired this conduct, he being ſo charmed with a ſaying of Otho, that he thought it very well deſerved the Roman empire. Otho finding that he could not diſpute the empire without prolonging the war, choſe rather to die than occaſion it's continuation. *Cum inter ethnicos etiam hoc animo repertus ſit Otho, ut potius duxerit ſpontanea morte vitam abrumpere, quam imperium tot hominum vita mercari, vir vel ob hoc ipſum dignus imperio, ſi fortuna virtuti faveret* (23). This thought hath ſomething in it ſo heroic, that it is pity ſuch an effeminate perſon as Otho ſhould diſcover ſo much greatneſs of mind. But, as we have ſhewn elſewhere (24), his body and his mind were not of the ſame temper (25). The former was drowned in effeminacy, but the latter retained a large vigour; I ſpeak of that vigour which forms itſelf on the ideas of equity. He always abhorred civil wars, and never would have attempted to ſet up againſt Galba, if he had not believed that affair would terminate without any effuſion of blood. *Othonem etiam privatum uſque adeo deteſtatum civilia arma, ut memorante quodam inter epulas de Caſſii Brutique exitu cohorruerit: nec concurſurum cum Galba fuiſſe, niſi confideret ſine bello rem tranſigi poſſe* (26). When he reſolved to kill himſelf, he had a ſufficient number of forces to have continued the war with juſt hopes of ſucceſs; but becauſe it would have coſt the lives

(22) Id. ibid. *See alſo* Beza, in Iconibus. Non modo, *ſays he,* conſcientiam tuam liberaſti, ſed teipſum quoque memorabili ſeculis omnibus exemplo ſuperaſti, quum ultro vi majori cedens, paternis bonis contentus, placide Chriſtianéque vivere, quàm licet immerito ereptam dignitatem tuorum ſubditorum ſanguine tutari maluſti.

(23) Eraſm. *Epiſt. Dedic.* Suetonii Dionis Caſſii, *&c.*

(24) In the remark [*B*], of the article SUETONIUS: towards the end.

(25) Non erat Othonis mollis & corpori ſimilis animus. *Tacit. Hiſt. lib.* i, *cap.* xxii.

(26) Sueton. in Othone, *cap.* x.

Germany (*e*). Though it cannot be denied, that this Archbiſhop was rather a good man than a learned man, it may yet be ſaid, that he was not ignorant [*E*]. The error committed in the ſupplement to Moreri's Dictionary is one of the moſt enormous that can be ſeen any where [*F*]. In the Paris edition of Moreri of 1699 (*f*) our Herman's article runs in Maimbourg's words.

I ſhall add ſomething to the remark (*g*) concerning the prodigious miſtake in the ſupplement to Moreri's Dictionary [*G*].

(*e*) See the remark [*C*].

(*f*) Under the word *Weiden*.

(*g*) It is the remark [*F*].

lives of great numbers of men, he concluded that it would be buying the preſervation of a crown at too dear a rate. This was what Eraſmus thought ſo excellent. He had read it in Tacitus and Suetonius. ‘ Hunc inquit, (*Otho*) animum, hanc virtutem veſtram ‘ ultra periculis objicere, nimis grande vitæ meæ pre‘ tium puto . . . . Civile bellum à Vitellio cœpit; & ‘ ut de principatu certaremus armis, initium illic fuit: ‘ ne pluſquam ſemel certemus, penes me exemplum ‘ erit, hinc Othonem poſteritas æſtimet . . . . An ‘ ego tantum Romanæ pubis, tot egregios exercitus, ‘ ſterni rurſus, & Reip. eripi patiar (27). - - - *I ſhould ‘ think that I bought my life at too dear a rate, if I ſhould ‘ expoſe this ſpirit and this invincible courage of your's to ‘ any farther dangers. . . . . The civil war was begun ‘ by Vitellius; and to him it is owing that we have ‘ fought once for the ſovereign power: but it ſhall be my ‘ part to prevent our fighting more than once. From ‘ this let poſterity form their character of Otho. . . . . ‘ Shall I ſuffer the Republic to be deprived of ſuch a ‘ number of young citizens, and of ſo many brave armies, ‘ by offering them up to a ſecond havock?*’ Eraſmus would not have failed to approve the pacific modeſty of our Herman, had he lived to that time; but I do not think he would have ſaid, that it was leſs ſurprizing in a Biſhop than in a Pagan.

[*E*] *Tho' he was rather a good than a learned man . . . . . he was not ignorant.*] Here is another paſſage of Father Maimbourg: ‘ He was † very ignorant, and ‘ and utterly unacquainted with what a Prelate ought ‘ know, even to that degree, that he had not Latin ‘ enough to enable him to ſay maſs and read his Breviary. ‘ In effect, when the Landgrave of Heſſe, who ‡ took ‘ him into his protection after he was perverted, one ‘ day told the Emperor, that the only crime of ‘ that Archbiſhop was his attempting to reform his ‘ church: *Alas*, anſwered that Prince, *what can that ‘ poor man reform, who hardly underſtands a little ‘ Latin? He never could ſay above three maſſes in his ‘ life, two of which I have heard, and am witneſs that ‘ he could not read even the introit.* All thoſe excel‘ lent Canons of his Council, which are ſo well ex‘ preſſed, were not made by him who knew nothing ‘ of the matter, but by the celebrated Dr Gropperus, ‘ Archdeacon of the church of Cologn, who drew ‘ them up, and put them in the condition we now ‘ ſee them in (28).’ It is certain that Sleidan (29) recites this diſcourſe betwixt the Emperor and the Landgrave; but he adds, that the Landgrave replied, that this Archbiſhop had very carefully read the German books, and underſtood religion very well. *Sed diligenter evolvit libros Germanicos, ait ille, & quod certo novi religionem intelligit.* Melanchthon informs us, that this Prelate diſcovered a great deal of knowledge, when the model of the Reformation was examined in his preſence: ‘ Legi ſibi totum librum juſſit, ‘ attentiſſime audivit, multa de pleriſque locis graviter ‘ diſſeruit, quædam ſup judicio recte mutavit, inter‘ dum noſtras ſententias, re diſputata, ſuæ opinioni ‘ prætulit. Huic labori dies ſex tribuit, ac quotidie ‘ matutinas horas quatuor continuas. Miratus ſum ‘ Senis aſſiduitatem & diligentiam, ac animadverti ‘ ſerio hanc rem tantam ab eo agi; quod, quantum ‘ referat, intelligis. Et has controverſias, pene ut ‘ artifex, dijudicat (30). - - - - *He ordered the whole ‘ book to be read to him, heard it with great attention, ‘ and made many ſolid reflexions upon the moſt part of it. ‘ Some proper alterations he made according to his own judg‘ ment, and ſometimes after the matter had been argued, ‘ he preferred our opinion to his own. He allotted ſix ‘ days to this work, four hours at a time every morning. ‘ I was amazed at the old man's aſſiduity and diligence, ‘ and obſerved that he was very earneſt in this important ‘ affair. Of what conſequence that is you know very ‘ well. He reaſons upon theſe controverſies, as if he was ‘ perfectly maſter of the ſubject.*’

[*F*] *The error committed in the ſupplement to Moreri's Dictionary is one of the moſt enormous that can be ſeen any where.*] ‘ It was by expreſs order of Herman, ‘ that Cardinal John Gropper was ſtrangled with his ‘ hatband for endeavouring to oppoſe this new religion,’ are the words of the ſupplement (31). It would be very difficult to form probable conjectures concerning this horrible falſity, if the author had not cited Beza; but when we conſult the place he points at, we find what was the occaſion of his miſtake, and then our ſurprize continues, and, what is more, increaſes. Beza compares our Herman to JESUS CHRIST, and John Gropper to Judas. He pretends that Gropper betrayed his maſter, and obtained for a recompence, a ſtring which ſtrangled him, that is to ſay, a Cardinal's hat. *Tu vero haud ſecus quam olim à Juda Chriſtus à tuo Joanne Groppero proditus quum eſſes, retulit quidem hic quoque proditor ſtipendium peccati mortem Cardinalitii Galeri vinculis ſtrangulatus* (32). It would be infinitely more excuſable to ſay with Father Maimbourg, that Beza *childiſhly aiming at wit, made a wretched dull jeſt* (33), than to find in thoſe words an execrable crime of the Archbiſhop of Cologn.

[G] *I ſhall add ſomething . . . . . concerning the . . . . miſtake in the ſupplement to Moreri's Dictionary.*] Florimond de Remond furniſhes me with this addition. He ſays that Theodore Beza, not ſatisfied with employing this alluſion to Judas in proſe, has likewiſe thought fit *to expreſs it in rhyme:*

Voy d'un autre coſté ce malheureux Groper,
Qui ſon Seigneur trompant, ſon cœur laiſſe attraper,
Eſtranglé d'un cordon d'un chapeau deteſtable.
De la grace divine Herman eſt le teſmoing
A celuy qui du Ciel plus que du monde a ſoing,
Groper monſtre de Dieu la vengeance effroyable.

See wretched Gropper on the other hand,
Seduc'd and ſtrangled with an impious band,
His maſter he betrays. While Herman ſhall
Remain an evidence of grace to all
Who heav'n before vain earthly things deſire,
Lo! Gropper ſtands a monument of ire.

‘ A ſilly fool,’ adds he, ‘ taking Beza's words in their ‘ literal ſignification, wanted to perſuade me, that ‘ Groper had made a halter of his hat-band, and ‘ ſtrangled himſelf with his own hands: whereas ‘ Beza only means that his ſtrong inclination for a ‘ Cardinal's hat had taken away his ſpeech from him, ‘ which he would otherwiſe have employed in the ‘ defence of Lutheraniſm (34).’ Who could have imagined that ſuch a plain metaphor as this would occaſion ſuch groundleſs and ridiculous fancies.

(27) Tacit. Hiſt. lib. ii, cap. xlvii. *Theſe are Suetonius's words, ubi ſupra, cap. ix.* Moriendi imperium cepit: ut multi nec fruſtra opinantur, magis pudore, ne tanto rerum hominumque periculo dominationem ſibi aſſerere perſeveraret, quam deſperatione ulla, aut diffidentia copiarum.

† Rouer. Pont. Suri Comm. Sleid. l. 1.

‡ Sleid. l. 17.

(28) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 265.

(29) Lib. xvii, pag. m. 438, verſo.

(30) Melanchthon, Epiſtola ccciv, lib. iv. *It was written from Erford. to Camerarius, the 11th of Auguſt* 1543.

(31) At the word *Herman*, *pag*. 670. This article is not in Moreri's Dictionary of the Dutch edition. Note, that Moreri, calls this Archbiſhop, *Herman de Meurs*, which is wrong.

(32) Beza, in Iconibus.

(33) Maimb. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 268.

(34) Flor. de Remond. Hiſt. de l'Hereſ. *livr. iii, ch. ix, num.* 4, *pag.* 321.

WILHEM (DAVID LE-LEU DE)

WILHEM (DAVID LE-LEU DE) Counſellor in the council of the Princes of Orange, and in that of Brabant, deſerves to be placed amongſt the illuſtrious men of the XVIIth century. He was deſcended from a very noble and antient family [*A*], and born

[*A*] *He was deſcended from a very noble and antient family*] It held an honourable place amongſt the nobility of Artois, and Cambreſis ever ſince the year 1096, being, beſides other eſtates, then poſſeſſed of the lordſhips and ſeats of Bantœux, Bantouſel, Wilhem, Chantemerle, Froidebize, and Aveſnes lez Gobert, &c. as appears by a deciſion of the council of Brabant at Bruſſels, on the fifth of July 1678. GEORGE LE-born at Hamburgh on the fiſteenth of May, 1588. His mother, who joined to nobility of blood [*B*] great piety, and great zeal for the Proteſtant religion, educated him with a particular care; ſhe ſent him to ſtudy at Stade, at ten years of age, under the direction of very good tutors: and after he had improved, at Hanaw, by the lectures of John George Crobius, and John Rodolphus Lavaterus, ſhe carried him to the univerſity of Franeker. He ſtaid there three years, and in 1611 went from thence to Leyden, where he made great advances in Philoſophy, the Civil-Law, and the Oriental languages, &c. After that, he went to France, and made ſome ſtay in the Academy of Saumur, and afterwards in 1613, he went to lodge at Thouars, in the houſe of the learned Andrew Rivetus, who ſhewed him all the marks of a very particular eſteem [*C*], on account, amongſt other excellencies, of the Theological learning he had acquired. He improved himſelf very much by his Levantine voyages to Grand Cairo, Jeruſalem, Alexandria, &c. in the years, 1617, 1618, 1619. He was very intimate with Cyril Lucaris, and frequently conferred with him concerning the differences betwixt the Greek and Latin Churches. He received ſeveral letters from that famous Patriarch (*a*), which very well deſerve printing; and his heirs promiſe accordingly to publiſh them to gratify the curioſity of the learned. After his return from this long voyage, he reſided ſome years with his brother at Amſterdam [*D*]; but his earneſt deſire of a more perfect knowledge of the Oriental tongues, and an inclination for the Levant, engaged him to make a ſecond voyage thither in the year 1625. It is certain, that he travelled like a man of parts, that is to ſay, he made excellent and curious obſervations, acquiring beſides an accurate knowledge of the Arabic, Perſic, and Chaldaic tongues (*b*). He was met in thoſe countries by the learned Golius, who had been recommended to him [*E*], and they contracted a cordial and intimate friendſhip which laſted as long as their lives. Being returned to Holland about the year 1631, he inſinuated himſelf ſo far into the eſteem of Frederic-Henry, Prince

LEU DE WILHEM, the father of him who is the ſubject of this article, left Tournay at the beginning of the troubles concerning religion, being himſelf, together with his five brothers, out-lawed for having buried their mother without obſerving the ceremonies required by the Romiſh communion. It appears by an authentic act of the twenty-ſecond of December 1565, that their eſtates were confiſcated; but they endeavoured to releaſe themſelves from this act, after the year 1576, by virtue of the pacification of Ghent. JAMES LE-LEU DE WILHEM, one of the ſix brothers, took refuge in England, and firſt married Margaret de Zegre, and for his ſecond wife Mary de Duyts. By his firſt wife, beſides other Children, he had TIMOTHY LE-LEU DE WILHEM, born at London the twenty-ſixth of November 1568, and Lord of Borgerie Finges lez-Courtrai. By the ſecond, he had beſides others, MICHAEL LE-LEU DE WILHEM, born the twenty-ſeventh of September 1587, who died Counſellor and Schepen of the Hague, and who had married at Delft on the twenty-fifth of May 1614, Anne de Rechtere Niece to the Secretary Adrian Duyck: his ſiſter (1) was married to Sir Dudley Carlton (2), King James's Ambaſſador in Holland (3).

[*B*] *His mother, who joined to nobility of blood.*] Her name was Gilliette van Opalſens: ſhe was the daughter of John van Opalſens Eſq; and of Joan l'Empereur d'Oppyck, ſiſter to John l'Empereur d'Oppyck, Lord of Malerit, &c. (4), who was deputed to the Ducheſs of Parma, Governeſs of the Low-Countries, by the city of Tournay, in conjunction with the confederate nobility. His ſon Antony l'Empereur d'Oppyck was the father of CONSTATIN L'EMPEREUR, born at Bremen in 1591, Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, and Counſellor to Prince Maurice, a perſon very well verſed in the Oriental tongues, as he hath ſhewn by ſeveral books. He was twice married, firſt to Levina de Witt, daughter of the Lord of Roſenburgh, Counſellor of Amſterdam. Secondly, to Catherine Thyſius of Kynogen. He died in the year 1648, leaving only one daughter Sarah l'Empereur d'Oppyck, who was married to Mark du Tour, gentleman to the Prince of Orange, Father to the King of England. He died Counſellor in the Court of Brabant. But after this digreſſion juſtly due to the merit of Conſtantin l'Empereur, I return to the mother of our David Wilhem. She was at Paris on St Bartholomew's day, and was ſaved from the maſſacre as it were, by a miracle; her huſband was then at Rouen, and was alſo ſaved. Her father, John Van Opalſens, had the ſame good fortune ſome years before. He was condemned to death for his religion, the ſentence was pronounced; but he eſcaped out of the priſon of Tournay by the connivance of the goaler, and fled into England.

[*C*] *Andrew Rivetus who ſhewed him all the marks of a particular eſteem.*] To know the mutual friendſhip, which they contracted, and the peculiar eſteem Rivetus had for him, we need only caſt our eye on the Epiſtle Dedicatory to his commentary on the decalogue (5). It alſo gives a very great character of the virtue, learning, piety, and other excellent qualities of David Wilhem.

[*D*] *With his brother.*] That is, with PAUL LE-LEU DE WILHEM, the Father of DAVID LE-LEU DE WILHEM, ſtill living (6), who is Preſident of the Schepens, and receiver of the city of Amſterdam. His wife is Hillegonda Van Beuningen, ſiſter to the late Mr Conrad Van Beuningen, ſo well known by his embaſſies.

[*E*] *The learned Golius, who had been recommended to him.*] I have ſeen the original of the letter which Rivetus wrote to Mr de Wilhem (7) on the twenty-ninth of October 1625, and from thence I have extracted theſe words: 'Servo adhuc tibi literas itineris 'tui Hieroſolymitani, & eas quas à Patriarcha Alex'andrino acceptas mihi communicaſti quas vel tibi, 'vel ei qui tuo nomine eas petet, reſtituam cùm vo'lueris. Commendatione mea apud te non opus habet 'Clariſſ. Golius, vir in rara eruditione, rara pietate '& modeſtia præditus, noſtro defuncto Erpenio inti'mus, & mihi tam proprio nomine quam tali neceſ'ſitudine chariſſimus, &c. - - - - - *I ſtill keep for you, the 'letters which you received in your journey to Jeruſalem, 'together with thoſe of the Patriarch of Alexandria, 'which you were ſo good as to communicate to me. I 'ſhall reſtore them, as ſoon as you will, either to yourſelf, 'or to any one that you ſhall commiſſion to receive them. 'Mr Golius, a man of rare erudition, ſingular piety, 'and great modeſty, does not ſtand in need of my recom'mendation to you. He was intimately acquainted with 'our deceaſed friend Erpenius, for whoſe ſake, and no 'leſs for his own, he is exceedingly dear to me, &c.*' This informs us that Rivetus was, at that time, the depoſitory of the Patriarch Cyril's letters to Mr de Wilhem. He has acquainted the public with the correſpondence which his friend kept up with Cyril; as appears by theſe words we find in the Epiſtle Dedicatory which I have already quoted. 'Ex iis (*re'gionibus*) etiam ex ipſa Ægypto, quæ tabernaculo 'Dei inſervirent abſtuliſti non pauca, aliis liberaliter 'communicaturus, ad communem utilitatem. Inter 'quæ non minima ſunt, quæ ex intimâ illâ admiſſione 'cum Reverendiſſ. Cyrillo tum Patriarcha Alexan'drino, hauſiſti; cujus communicationis fructus, & 'ſedulitatis tuæ in eo de rebus noſtris plenius infor'mando utilitatem, ringentibus adverſariis, etiamnum 'colligimus & percipimus, poſtquam evectus eſt ad 'ſummam inter Orientales Chriſtianos dignitatem.

'Quæ

(*a*) See the remark [*E*].

(*b*) Beſides the learned languages, which he underſtood to perfection, he could eaſily ſpeak moſt languages that are now ſpoken in Europe, and Aſia.

(1) I follow word by word the Memoir imparted to the Bookſeller.

(2) Who had by her a daughter, that is ſtill living (in 1696.) She is the widow of the Lord Ferers, and mother of the Counteſs of Arran, widow of a ſon of the Duke of Hamilton, mother of an only daughter, who is a very rich heireſs.

(3) *Taken from a Memoir imparted to the Bookſeller.* Idem dic de pleriſque infra Memorandis.

(4) He married the heireſs of the houſe of Aigremont, Lady de Malerit, *&c.*

(5) Ad Ampliſſimum præſtantiſſimum pietate & multiplici eruditione virum D. Davidem de Wilhem. - - - *To the honourable, pious and learned David de Wilhem.*

(6) I write this in the year 1696.

(7) Who was then at Aleppo.

Prince of Orange, that he was made a Counſellor in his Highneſs's council at the Hague. He married a ſiſter of the celebrated Mr de Zuylichem (c), a lady of great parts. He had ſome children by her [*F*], as we ſhall ſee below. The States-General having made very conſiderable conqueſts in the province of Brabant, by the victorious arms of Prince Frederic-Henry, augmented the council of that province in the year 1634, beſtowed a counſellor's place on our Mr DE WILHEM, and made him Superintendant of that country in 1640. As he loved and underſtood the ſciences and the liberal arts, the great buſineſs in which ſo many poſts engaged him, never hindered his ſtudying hard, and keeping up an extenſive correſpondence with the Learned [*G*]. He took pleaſure in protecting and ſerving them on all occaſions at the court and elſewhere. He had a very fine library, furniſhed with the moſt excellent books in all faculties, beſides a large number of very curious manuſcripts (d) in Arabic, Perſic, Chaldaic, &c. The preſent of mummies, manuſcripts, and ſuch other rarities, which he made to the univerſity of Leyden [*H*], is ſtill preſerved there as an ornament. He died of the Stone on the twenty-ſeventh of January 1658, having faithfully, and with great application, ſerved three Princes of Orange, namely Frederic-Henry, William II, and William-Henry, at preſent King of England (e).

(c) See his article.

(d) *This may be confirmed by a paſſage of Frederic Spanheim,* Vindic. Exercit. de Grat. univerſali, *Part. i, pag.* 67, *wherein he ſays that* David de Wilhem è tenebris eruit tractatum de tribus quæſtionibus, compoſitum à Lupo Servato Abbate Ordinis Benedicti, Rabani diſcipulo, qui vixit octavo ſeculo, & *mihi communicavit.*

(e) Taken from a Memoir imparted to the Bookſeller.

‘ Quæ argumento ſunt, quantæ fuerit in te propagandæ veræ Religionis cura, etiam inter remotiſſimos à nobis (8). - - - - - - *From theſe countries, as well as from Egypt itſelf, you brought away many things, that were to be of no ſmall uſe to the Church of God, and you intend generouſly to communicate them to others, for the public advantage. Among theſe what you learnt from your intimate familiarity with the moſt Reverend Cyril, then Patriarch of Alexandria, is not the leaſt conſiderable: and even now ſince he had been raiſed to the higheſt dignity among the eaſtern Chriſtians, we reap the fruits, and, notwithſtanding the malicious ſcoffs of our adverſaries, feel the benefit of your correſpondence with him, and of the pains you took to inform him more particularly concerning our affairs. All theſe are proofs of your great diligence in propagating the true religion even among thoſe people who are the moſt remote from us.*’

(8) Andreas Rivetus, *Epiſt. Dedicator.* Commentar. in Decalog. *Oper. Tom. i, pag.* 1223.

[*F*] *A lady of great parts. He had ſome children by her.*] Her name was Conſtantia Huygens, and ſhe was very well read. Mr Des Cartes highly eſteemed her, and readily, nay with great deference, deſired to know her opinion on the new Philoſophical ideas which he had invented. She ſurvived her huſband about ten years, and died on the firſt of December 1667, very much regretted by all the judicious people of the Hague. Mr de Wilhem left behind him three daughters and one ſon, MAURICE LE-LEU DE WILHEM, at preſent Dean of the Council and Feodal Court of Brabant, ſetting at the Hague (9), who is a gentleman of great honour, enriched with a very great ſtock of learning and merit; and whoſe converſation is moſt entertaining. I ſpeak by experience, he being one of the firſt acquaintance which I had the honour to make at my arrival in Holland. After he had compleated his ſtudies, he travelled in Italy, France. Germany, Hungary, Sweden, and ſeveral other places, where he gained the eſteem of all eminent perſons. He accompanied Mr de Zuylichem his uncle to Orange in the year 1665, when that principality was reſtored with all the neceſſary formalities to its lawful ſovereign. He was then received a Doctor of Law with great applauſe (10). He hath been always very curious, not only in the antiquities of his own country, but the Roman alſo. His ſtrong inclination for theſe made him interrupt his ſtudy of the practical part of the law in 1670, in order to travel a ſecond time in a more advanced age; and having ſtaid ſome months at Paris, he ſet forward for Italy with Don Franciſco Brancaccio (11), nephew to the Cardinal of that name, and in company with Meſſieurs de Grancei, the ſons of the Marſhal. He ſtayed a whole year at Rome, in order to ſearch into whatever was remarkable in that famous city. Being returned into Holland, he diligently applied himſelf to inquire into the law of nations, and the intereſts of the Princes and ſtates of Europe. His genius led him to it, and his acquaintance with ſeveral languages furniſhed him with great helps for that ſtudy. In November 1671, he went into Sweden with his Excellency Mr de Haren, Ambaſſador from the United Provinces, and was choſen (12) by the States-General to take care of their affairs at that court, when that Ambaſſador was upon the point of his return. A few days after, the ſame States beſtowed on him the place of Counſellor in the Court of Brabant, in the room of Mr Fagel, promoted to be their Regiſter. Having acquired a very conſiderable acquaintance at the Court of Sweden, and ſtanding very well with the Chancellor de la Gardie, and the other Senators of that kingdom, the States of Holland reſolved in June 1673, to ſend him to that court, with the character of Deputy-Extraordinary of the United Provinces. The following year he was twice nominated to the office of Counſellor at the Court of Holland, firſt on the part of the towns and afterwards on the part of the nobility. In 1683, he married the eldeſt daughter of Mr Timmers, Burgomaſter of Rotterdam, who has been Director of the India company, and ſeveral times Deputy to the Admiralty of the Maes (13) (§ α).

(9) He was made Preſident of it in the month of September 1703.

(10) See Mr Chambrun's Relation, printed at Orange in 1666, *pag.* 161.

(11) He had been a Captain of Horſe in the ſervice of the King of Spain, in the Low-Countries.

(12) By a reſolution taken on the 26th of Auguſt 1672.

(13) Taken (as to matters of fact) from a Memoir imparted to the Bookſeller.

(§ α) He has by her a fine family of children, viz. DAVID LE-LEU DE WILHEM, Lord of Barlicum, of Middelrode, &c. Counſellor in the Council and Feodal Court of Brabant, by the voluntary demiſſion of his father Lord of Woelwyk, who had been a long time Dean and fifteen years Preſident of that court: PAUL-SEBASTIAN, and CONSTANTIN, LE-LEU DE WILHEM, who have taken their degrees in law in the univerſity of Leyden; and MARY-CONSTANCE LE-LEU DE WILHEM, married to Mr William Paedt's Counſellor of the city of Leyden †.

† Taken from a Memoir communicated to the Bookſeller, in the year 1719.

[*G*] *An extenſive correſpondence with the learned.*] And above all, with Salmaſius, Heurnius, Rivetus, Des Cartes, Heinſius, Voſſius, Junius, Manaſſeh-Ben Iſrael, who dedicated to him his treatiſe *de Creatione* (14). The letters which he received from them and ſeveral other illuſtrious men, lie in heaps amongſt the papers of his ſon Mr de Wilhem, who, if he had but leiſure to ſelect them, would find great numbers of which he might make a conſiderable preſent to the Republic of Letters. He would likewiſe find there pieces in manuſcript like that which has been ſeen above (15).

(14) That Epiſtle Dedicatory deſerves to be conſulted: It may ſerve for a proof to this article.

(15) Remark [*L*], of the article BORE.

[*H*] *The preſent . . . . which he made to the univerſity of Leyden.*] Here is a public teſtimony of it: ‘ Id mihi ſilentio non eſt prætereundum, quod ergà hanc noſtram Academiam, ſtudiorum tuorum olim promotricem, matrem proinde tuam, liberalem admodum te præbueris: factum eſt enim id curâ tuâ & ære tuo, ut Theatrum in eâ Anatomicum, tot raris & pretioſi σκειμηλίοις, exterorum omnium qui illud inviſunt animos in admirationem rapiat; inter quæ eminent duo condita cadavera (Mumias vocant) antiquiſſima, quæ in Ægypto eruta, & à te redempta, integerrima, te mittente, ad nos pervenerunt (16). - - *I muſt not forget to mention your generoſity to our univerſity, which formerly gave you your education, and is conſequently your mother: to your care and expence we owe it that the Anatomical theatre, by the many rare and curious things contained in it, excites the wonder of all foreigners who come to ſee it. Among the reſt, there are two very antient mummies, which being found out in Egypt, and purchaſed by you, came very ſafe and and entire from you to us.*’

(16) Rivetus, ubi ſupra.

WIMPINA (CONRAD), Divinity Profeſſor at Francfort on the Oder in the XVIth century, was born at Buchen *(a)*. He acquired a great reputation by his public as well as private lectures at Leipſic, in Philoſophy, Divinity, and Poetry, &c. He had great crowds of auditors, and at the ſame time raiſed the envy of ſeveral people. Theſe not being able to obſcure his glory, by the ſophiſtical ſubtilties which they propoſed to him, and to which he learnedly anſwered, had recourſe to calumnies and libels. He was obliged to appear at the tribunal of the Archbiſhop of Magdeburg, Primate of Germany, where he triumphed over his enemies. He was in a ſplendid manner promoted to the degree of Doctor of Divinity : a Cardinal-Legate, to whom he made a ſpeech in St Paul's church at Leipſic, and who admired his eloquence, cauſed that degree to be conferred on him. Wimpina was preſented by the whole faculty of Divinity. The reputation of this doctor advanced ſo high, that the Marquiſſes of Brandenburgh deſigning to found an univerſity at Francfort on the Oder, made him offers of a very conſiderable ſalary to be Profeſſor there. He accepted the propoſal, and went thither to lay (*b*) the foundation of that new univerſity, where he became rector of two colleges, and firſt Profeſſor of Divinity. He publiſhed ſeveral books *(c)* [*A*]. He was one of Luther's antagoniſts [*B*], and paſſed for the real author of the Theſes which appeared under the name of the Dominican John Tezelius againſt this reformer *(d)*.

(*a*) It is a ſmall town of Odenwald, in the Dioceſe of Wurtſburg.

(*b*) In the year 1506.

(*c*) Taken from the book publiſhed by Joachim-John Maderus at Helmſtad 1660, and written by an anonymous author with the title of *Scriptorum inſignium . . . Centuria.*

(*d*) Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. i, pag.* 25. *num.* 1.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] The anonymous author of the catalogue of illuſtrious men, publiſhed by Joachim-John Maderus (1), mentions ſeveral books written by Wimpina before the year 1514; but he makes no diſtinction between thoſe already printed, and thoſe which were not. However the catalogue of them runs as follows : *Editio proprietatum logicalium in commentatione non vulgari libri IV. De erroribus Philoſophorum in fide Chriſtiana. De nobilitate cæleſtis corporis. De eo an animati cæli poſſint dici. De nobilitate animarum cæli. De fato opus inſigne & præclarum. Palillogia de Theologico faſtidio. Panegyrici de Chriſti mirabilitate ac ſublimitate. Apologeticus in ſacræ Theologiæ defenſionem. Apologia ſecunda contra obtrectationem Theologiæ. Apologia tertia ad Mellerſtatinas offenſiones & denigrationes S. Theologiæ. Apologia quarta contra Laconiſmum Mellerſtat. pro defenſione Theologiæ. Apologia quinta pro repreſſione errorum Mellerſtat. Cribratio in tergiverſationes Martini Mellerſtat. De ortu, progreſſu, & fructu S. Theologiæ. Super ſententias libri IV. Præcepta coagmentandi rhetoricè orationes. Opus quodlibeticæ diſputationis mirum & varium. Orationes & Carmina.* I do not in the leaſt doubt but this Martin Mellerſtat, againſt whom Wimpina ſo often drew his pen, was the ſame Martin Melrſtat of whom our anonymous author ſpeaks particularly under number thirty-one, and of whoſe works he inſerts a catalogue, amongſt which we find no mark of his controverſity with Wimpina. This Martin Melrſtat bore the name of his country which is ſituated, in Franconia, and taught the Philoſophy of the Thomiſts at Leipſic, for the ſpace of twenty years, with great reputation ; after which, he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Phyſic, and being admitted Doctor in that ſcience, became ſo famous, that Frederic, Elector of Saxony, choſe him for his Phyſician (2).

As for the reſt, Wimpina's book *de Divinatione* is one of his principal works ; but he is charged with ſtealing it from Picus Mirandula (3). Here therefore is another author to be added to Thomaſius's catalogue of Plagiaries. This tract *de Divinatione* was printed with ſeveral others of Wimpina, at Cologn in the year 1531, in folio. And three tomes of the ſaid author were publiſhed at Francfort on the Oder, in 1528, *de Sectis, Erroribus, ac Schiſmatis*, together with the treatiſes *de Prædeſtinatione & de Fortuna*, in folio.

[*B*] *He was one of Luther's antagoniſts.*] He was one of the four Divines of Brandenburg, who, in the year 1530, refuted the articles of faith which Luther had publiſhed, and which ſerved for a foundation to the Augſbourg Confeſſion. He was one of thoſe Divines whom the Catholic Princes brought to the Diet that year (4). They choſe the moſt able diſputants (5) ; and finding that the firſt conferences betwixt the deputies on both ſides, did not make way for an accommodation, and ſupecting that the multitude of diſputants, on each ſide, kept them at a diſtance from the ways of peace, they reduced the whole number of Divines to three of each ſide only. Thoſe of the Romiſh party were Eccius, Wimpina, and Cochlæus (6) : whence we may conclude that Mr Konig is miſtaken in placing Conrad Wimpina's death in the year 1529.

(1) At Helmſtadt in the year 1660, in 4to.

(2) Ex Centuria Scriptor. inſignium, *in lucem edita à* Joach. Joh. Madero.

(3) Toto clam opere ex Pico plurima. *Mart. del Rio, Diſq. Magic. lib. iv, cap. ii, Quæſt. vii, §. ii, pag. m.* 247.

(4) Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. ii, pag.* 152.

(5) Adducti erant à variis principibus in Comitia pugnaciſſimi ex adverſariis Lutheri. *Seckendorf. ibid. pag.* 171, *num.* 1.

(6) Id. ib. *pag.* 177, *num.* 16.

WINDECK (JOHN-PAUL) Doctor of Divinity, a German by nation *(a)*, and Canon of the Collegiate Church of Marchdorff, publiſhed at Cologn in the year 1603 a book wherein he pretended to prove by forty-two demonſtrative reaſons, that the Proteſtant religion would ſoon be deſtroyed [*A*]. His motive for undertaking this work, was that a Lutheran not long before had publiſhed a book concerning the preſages of the approaching ruin of Popery [*B*]. The event has ſhewn that theſe two authors were both equally

(*a*) He was born in Alſace, as he ſays himſelf in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the *Prognoſticon.*

[*A*] *He publiſhed a book wherein he pretended to prove . . . . . that the Proteſtant religion would ſoon be deſtroyed.*] It is a book in 4to of 423 pages. The whole title of it runs thus : *Prognoſticon futuri ſtatus Eccleſiæ, oppoſitum inſulſi cujuſdam per Sueviam Lutherologi libro ; ab hinc bimeſtri edito, de ſignis ruituri Papatus, aliiſque ſectariorum jactabundis mendaciis. in quo duabus & quadraginta rationibus Apodicticis demonſtratur, Lutheranorum, Calvinianorum, aliaſque ſectas, contra Romano-Catholicam Eccleſiam longè latèque ac dirè graſſantes, brevî eſſe perituras : illam verò ſtabili conſtantia permanſuram. Eiſdem totidem etiam Cauſæ continentur, cur ad unicum Ovile redire debeant ſectarii, & in eodem permanere Catholici. Item Chriſtiana Deliberatio, de optimo Religionis ſtatu continendo, ſeu quibus remediis, à Catholicorum provinciis ſectæ omnes arceri, aut ubi nidificârunt, funditùs evelli queant.* The author dedicated this book to Maximilian of Auſtria, Grand Maſter of the Teutonic Order.

[*B*] *A Lutheran, not long before-hand, had publiſhed a book concerning the preſages of the approaching ruin of Popery* (1).] He was not the only one that had diſperſed the like prophecies. Windeck remembred ſeveral other prognoſticators. *Demiratus ſum effrontem Pſeudo-Evangelicorum impudentiam : è quorum caterva multos ejuſmodi fanatica, prodigioſæque vanitatis vaticinia, in vulgus ſparſiſſe memineram* (2). He takes notice that Luther often boaſted of his being the man appointed to deſtroy the Church of Rome, and that, according to Peucer, this had actually come to paſs. *Per doctrinam Lutheri Pontificatum Romanum corruiſſe* (3). He adds, that there hardly paſſes a year without ſome Engliſh prognoſtication, that ſuch a Pope ſhould die, and that no body ſhall ſucceed him. He does not forget the Calviniſts of France, who, as he ſays, hand about the prediction of one Peter Clement, a Huguenot, who was burnt at Paris forty years before, whereupon they alledge an inſcription found amidſt a heap of rubbiſh. ‘ Calviniſtæ in Galliis . . . . ſplendidè nugantur de vaticinio cujuſdam Petri Clementis Hugonotæ, ante ‘ XL annos Pariſiis combuſti. Aiunt enim in ultima ‘ obſidione Pariſienſi, cùm tormentis muri quaterentur, inter rudera lapidem inventum, cui artificiosè ‘ vaticinium hoc fuerit inſculptum : *Pontificem Roman.* ‘ *exterminandum,*

(1) De Signis brevi interituri Papatus. *See Windeck's Epiſtle Dedicatory.*

(2) Windeck. Epiſt. Dedicat. *folio* (:) 2 *verſo.*

(3) Id. ibid. *fol.* (:) 3 : *he quotes book v*, Chron. Carion.

equally mad [C]. Windeck added to his book a ſecond part wherein he propoſes to the Sectaries forty-two motives for their reuniting to the Church of Rome. He ends with a Chriſtian conſultation upon the means of extirpating the ſects. He adopts the moſt rigid principles of the enemies to Toleration, and he reaſons ſometimes *ad hominem*, that is to ſay, he alledges the Penal Laws eſtabliſhed againſt the Roman Catholics in ſeveral Proteſtant ſtates, and the perſecutions which ſome of the new ſects ſuffered from the reſt. He does not forget the hardſhips which the fugitives of England ſuffered from the Lutherans, as I have obſerved elſewhere (*b*). He publiſhed at Cologn in the year 1604 a book *de Theologia Juriſconſultorum*. His treatiſe on the Electors was printed in 1616 (*c*). The Proteſtants made uſe of his maxims as a handle to throw the blame of the wars in Germany upon the Court of Vienna; but it was ſaid in anſwer to them, that this Author had done no more than followed his own private notions, and that he never had

‘ *exterminandum, & ejus Doctrinam radicitus eradicandam: viciſſim verò Calviniſmum ubique recipiendum, & regnaturum eſſe* (4). - - - *The Calviniſts in France . . . . talk mightily about the prediction of one Peter Clement, a Huguenot, who was burnt at Paris forty years ago. For they ſay that in the laſt ſiege of Paris while the canons played upon the walls, a ſtone was found amidſt the rubbiſh, with this prophecy artfully engraved on it:* That the Pope of Rome was to be deſtroyed, and his doctrine utterly extirpated: on the other hand, that Calviniſm was to be received, and to prevail in all places.’ He concludes that all this proceeds from a peeviſh jealouſy, which makes people greatly expect what they vainly wiſh for (5).

[C] *The event has ſhewn that theſe two authors were both equally mad.*] The Roman Catholics and Proteſtants have continued ever ſince that time to the preſent year 1704, almoſt in the ſame condition in which they were then. I do not know what were the reaſons that made the Lutheran Miniſter prognoſticate the downfal of Popery: they could not be otherwiſe than falſe, ſince the event has belied them; but without conſulting experience I can affirm, that Windeck's reaſons are extreamly weak.

Among other things, he grounded his predictions upon the diviſions among the Proteſtants, of which he gives an odious deſcription, and particularly (6) he relates what happened to Hunnius, who had preached at Ratiſbon, in the year 1594, with extreme warmth againſt thoſe who accuſed the Reformed of quarrelling among themſelves. It is a groſs calumny, ſaid he, for I and my colleagues, in the univerſity of Wittemberg, keep up a good harmony both among ourſelves and elſewhere. Scarce was he returned to his lodgings when he received an order from the adminiſtrator of Saxony, to make a ſpeedy return to Wittemberg, to the end that he might remedy the Theological diſſenſions which Samuel Huber had raiſed concerning the doctrine of Predeſtination. This is a weak motive for preſaging the near ruin of the Proteſtants; for ſince the quarrels which had diſturbed them from their very birth had not been able to prevent their arriving to ſuch a remarkable pitch of greatneſs (7), there was no juſt reaſon for being ſure that they would hinder them from ſupporting themſelves. Windeck ought to have been perſuaded that all their ſects would forget their mutual differences, and act in concert againſt Popery, when their common intereſt ſhould require it. The Lutheran and Anabaptiſt, the Socinian and Quaker, the Epiſcopalian and Puritan, the Calviniſt and Independant, the Arminian and Browniſt, join their forces together as often as the queſtion turns upon ſecuring themſelves againſt Popiſh machinations. We have ſeen an example of it in England, when King James II was driven out of his dominions, in the year 1688.

This prognoſticator likewiſe grounds his aſſertion upon the care Providence has taken that Hereſies ſhould be of a ſhort continuance. He gives ſeveral inſtances of this; but how came he not to conſider that the Greek Church ſubſiſts ſtill, notwithſtanding it be ſuch a long time ſince it broke with that Church on which he beſtows the name of Catholic. Was he ignorant that Hereſies (8) anathematiſed by the firſt general Councils, had preſerved a ſteady and extenſive footing to the age in which he wrote? beſides that, he ſhould have conſidered that it had been a much eaſier thing to extirpate the Albigenſes, and ſuch other little ſects as were incloſed within the narrow bounds of one country, than it would be to deſtroy the Proteſtants, who are diſperſed in ſeveral warlike nations, and ſupported by ſeveral Princes. It would have been a chimerical fancy to think of extirpating them otherwiſe than by an open war. Now it is folly to depend upon the good ſucceſs of a war (9). Fortune ſports with prudence and valour, and ſhifts the victory from one ſide to the other, at a time when ſuch a thing is leaſt expected (10): it equally fruſtrates our hopes and fears, it ſupplies the weak ſide with unforeſeen reſources; and when theſe laſt ſee themſelves in their turn capable to obtain the moſt compleat triumph, new misfortunes happen to them, which revive the courage of the enemy. This is what people felt, to their ſad experience, in the war of Germany, from the year 1618, to the peace of Munſter. In a word, if thoſe who pretend to gueſs what the event will be of ſuch or ſuch a war, are generally deceived from month to month (11), what can we think of thoſe who flatter themſelves with the hopes that a war which is not yet begun will prove the ruin of ſeveral nations? Experience ſhould have taught Windeck that he was a raſh prognoſticator. Did not he know that the Roman Catholic Princes had ſuccoured the Proteſtants (12)? And was it poſſible for him to doubt but that, conſidering the ſituation of affairs in Europe, the ſame thing would happen upon all ſuch occaſions? He had, in a peculiar manner, foretold the total ruin of the Heretics in the United Provinces, and promiſed that great exploit to the Houſe of Auſtria. ‘ Auſtria propago, acerrima Catholicæ fidei propugnatrix, ſeſe ceu murum opponit pro Domo Dei, ad profligandos immanes ejus hoſtes, Turcas & Hæreticos; adeò ut ſpes certa nos foveat, faventi potenti Numine, Heroicis veſtris facinoribus utroſque tandem ac præſertim infelices ſectarios in Belgio radicitus evulſum iri. Quod hoc Opuſculo, proxima fœtura apud me nato, evincere conor (13). - - - - *The Houſe of Auſtria, the zealous defender of the Catholic faith, ſtands faſt, like a bulwark, for the Houſe of GOD againſt it's fierce enemies the Turks and Heretics: which gives us ſure ground to hope, that by your heroic exploits and the powerful aſſiſtance of the Deity, both theſe, particularly the unhappy ſectaries in Holland, ſhall be utterly extirpated; as I endeavour to prove in the ſecond edition of this treatiſe.*’ Ignorant fool that he was, did he not know that France protected the Dutch. Had he ſeen into futurity, he muſt have known that this crown would continue to be the chief inſtrument of their riſe, and a very powerful obſtacle to the Houſe of Auſtria; and that the Houſe of Auſtria, in her turn, would become their ſtrongeſt bulwark, and ſave them from the ruin which ſhould threaten them from France. It is certain that the Houſe of Auſtria was one of the principal cauſes of their preſervation in the war of 1672 (14); for France did not abandon her conqueſts till ſuch time as the Emperor and Spain declared war againſt her in favour of that Republic. Spain ſtood in the breach to cover the Dutch, and choſe to become the ſeat of the war, in order to eaſe them of it; and beſides, it was Spain that paid the coſt. The United Provinces recovered all that had been taken from them; but Spain loſt Franche-Comté, and ſeveral towns in the Low-Countries.

It would be eaſy to ſhew the invalidity of all the other reaſons of this prognoſticator. He could not have found ſo many as forty-two if he had not divided one and the ſame into ſeveral branches, and if, to multiply his numbers, he had not turned the ſame common-place into ſeveral ſhapes, in order to preſent it in different views. It is proper to obſerve, that he has grounded ſeveral of them upon falſe facts, or upon facts which he proves very ill.

[D] The

(*b*) In the remark [*I*], of the article WESTPHALUS.

(*c*) Konig. Bibl. *pag.* 870.

(4) Id. ibid.

(5) Ita deploratiſſimi iſti homunciones improbo livore tabeſcentes quod vaniſſime optant, ſtulte ſperant & augurantur. *Id. ibid. verſo.*

(6) Windeck, Prognoſt. *pag.* 27, 28.

(7) See the remark [*C*], of the article MORLIN.

(8) Thoſe of the Neſtorians, Eutychians, &c.

(9) *See* Bernegerus, in Tuba Pacis, *pag.* 6, *& ſeq*, *&* 19, *& ſeq.*

(10) Quondam etiam victis redit in præcordia vertus,
Victoreſque cadunt Danai. . . .
Not only Trojans fall but in their turn,
The vanquiſh'd triumph and the victors mourn.
DRYDEN.
Virgil, Æneïd. lib. ii, ver. 367.

(11) *See the* Réponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial, *pag.* 151, *& ſeq.*

(12) See the remark [*R*], of the article ELIZABETH; the remark [*P*], of the article FRANCIS I; and the remark [*R*], of the article HENRY II.

(13) Windeck, in Epiſt. Dedicat. *fol.* (:) (:) 2 *verſo.*

(14) *Theſe are the words of a famous Proteſtant Profeſſor at Hall in Saxony:* Certe niſi imperator noſter atque Hiſpanus tum (*anno* 1672) advolaſſent jam pridem ſub Gallorum jugo gemeret priſtinam fruſtra requirens libertatem, Belgium. - - - *It is certain that unleſs the Emperor and the King of Spain had ſuddenly interpoſed, then (in the year 1672) Holland had been long ago ſubjected to the French yoke, and might have wiſhed for her antient liberty in vain.* Jo. Franciſc. Buddæus, *Select. Juris Nat. & Gent. pag.* 623.

had any place in the Emperor's councils [*D*].

[*D*] *The Proteſtants made uſe of his maxims as a handle . . . . but it was ſaid in anſwer to them that,* &c. . . . .] The author of the *Cancellaria Bavarico-Anhaltina* (15) had maintained that the Proteſtant league had not hitherto been able to alledge any particular whereby it could appear that the Roman Catholics had formed deſigns againſt the States which adhered to the confeſſion of Augſbourg. He was anſwered, that the project formed againſt all the Proteſtants in general, was ſufficiently diſcovered by Paul Windeck's book. *Quis in Proteſtantes omnes Generalis* . . . . . . In the printed book from *Cancellar. Anhault. Appendix*, pag. 1. as far as (16) *Ut* excluſ.

(15) See, remark [*C*], of the article KELLER.

(16) Pleſſius, in Reſponſ. ad præcipua Capita Cancellariæ Bavarico-Anhaltinæ, *init.*

It was replied that Windeck and Scioppius were private men, whoſe opinions and writings were of no authority. *Duos neſcio cujus Martii Spiritus* . . . . . . in the printed book from pag. 2. as far as (17) *Quid enim* excluſ.

The Proteſtant author replied, that the Roman Catholics alledged the very fragments of letters to convict the Proteſtants, and that there was much more reaſon for reproaching them with the books of Windeck, who had an eccleſiaſtical poſt, and with thoſe of Sciοppius, who was Counſellor to his Imperial Majeſty (18).

(17) Appendix Cancellariæ, *pag.* 2.

(18) *See* Reſponſio Apologet. ad Fab. Hercynianum, *pag*, 12, 13.

WITTICHIUS (CHRISTOPHER) Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, made himſelf famous among other things by introducing the Carteſian Philoſophy into the ſchools of Divinity. He was born in Sileſia on the ſeventh of October 1625. His father, who had been originally a Lutheran, turned Calviniſt at the Duke of Brieg's Court, and was Miniſter there in quality of Vice-Superintendant of the whole country of Brieg. His ſon, of whom we ſpeak here, was ſent to ſtudy the Civil-Law at Bremen in the year 1642; but he ſoon quitted that ſtudy and applied himſelf to Divinity in which he made great progreſs, as well at Bremen as at Groningen, and Leyden. The firſt poſt he enjoyed in the univerſities was given him in the year 1651. He was made Mathematical Profeſſor in ordinary at Herborn in the county of Naſſaw, with leave to give private lectures to ſtudents of Divinity. He found that poſt ſo little to his liking, that he ſoon quitted it, and went to teach in the college of Duiſburgh in the Duchy of Cleves, where he likewiſe diſcharged the office of Miniſter from the year 1653. As that college was erected into an univerſity in the year 1655, Wittichius received there the degree of Doctor in Philoſophy and Divinity, and went from thence to Nimeguen to be Profeſſor of Divinity, in which poſt he continued ſixteen years. The books which he had publiſhed, and which turned in a manner all upon ſubjects that were partly Theological and partly Philoſophical in the Carteſian way, procured him a great number of opponents: but that only ſerved to make him the better known; ſo that he was judged worthy to teach Divinity at Leyden, the principal univerſity of the United Provinces in the Low-Countries. He entered upon that office in the month of November 1671, and continued in it to his death, having a very numerous auditory, to which not only the clearneſs of his ideas contributed, but likewiſe his attachment to the doctrine of Des Cartes and Cocceius, which is indeed the leaſt in favour with the great and powerful in Holland, but is moſt to the reliſh of young people, and of thoſe who ſet up for men of wit. Wittichius died the ninteenth of May 1687. His principal books are theſe, *Conſenſus veritatis in Scriptura divina & infallibili revelatæ cum veritate philoſophica à Carteſio detecta. Theologia Pacifica. Exercitationes Theologicæ. Cauſa Spiritus Sancti. Commentarius in Epiſtolam ad Romanos.* After his death, his brother, an advocate at Aix la Chapelle, publiſhed the *Anti-Spinoza*, and ſome notes upon the meditations of Mr Des Cartes (*a*).

(*a*) Gronovius, in Orat. funebr. Chriſt. Wittichii.

WOUWER (JOHN DE) one of the learned men of the XVIth century, and author of ſome books [*A*], was of Hamburgh, and the ſon of a Refugee in Germany on account of Religion (*a*). He was born on the tenth of March 1574, and having gone through his Claſſical ſtudies in his native country, he was ſent to Leyden in 1592, where he ſpent five years in an intimate familiarity with the moſt learned men, and even with the great Scaliger. From thence he went to France where he acquired the friendſhip of Claudius Puteanus, Francis Pithæus, and ſeveral other great men. He afterwards ſpent two years in Italy, and received a great many civilities there from ſome Prelates and ſome Cardinals. He had even acceſs to the Pope, who ſhewed great affection to him, and offered him a very honourable penſion. Being returned to Germany, he accepted the poſt of Counſellor to the Count of Eaſt-Frieſland, and was his envoy at the Hague in the treaty for the Pacification of Embden, as he was afterwards at the court of John Adolphus, Duke of Holſtein. That Duke was ſo pleaſed with him at the firſt converſation, that he obliged him to bind himſelf by an oath, to engage in his ſervice. He was firſt honoured with the place of his counſellor, and then advanced to the government of Gottorp. But after he had continued three years in that office, he fell into a diſeaſe which waſted him by ſlow degrees, and of which he died on the thirtieth of March 1612, to the extreme regret of his maſter, who cauſed him to be pompouſly interred

(*a*) See the remark [*C*].

[*A*] *Author of ſome books.*] He publiſhed, with notes, the works of Sidonius Apollinaris, Petronius, Firmicus *de errore profanarum Religionum*, Minutius Fælix, and Apuleius; beſides ſeveral notes on Tertullian, a treatiſe *de Polymathia*, a diſſertation *de cognitione veterum novi orbis. Dies æſtiva ſeu de Umbra.* A panegyric interred in the great church at Sleſwic (*b*). He held an epiſtolary correſpondence with the moſt learned men of Holland, and of ſeveral other countries [*B*]. He neither wanted learning, nor other good qualifications; but we are told that his faults were not leſs than his virtues (*c*). Being born a Proteſtant he embraced the Romiſh religion in Italy [*C*]; or at leaſt it was reported ſo. He is ranked amongſt the Plagiaries [*D*]. He was too fond of flattery, as appears by his teſtamentary legacy to thoſe who ſhould write on Chriſtian IV, King of Denmark. We have alſo two centuries of his Latin letters, and a *Syntagma de Græca & Latina Bibliorum Interpretatione* (1).

[*B*] *He held an epiſtolary correſpondence with the moſt learned men . . . . of ſeveral . . . . countries.*] This appears by the collection of his letters printed with his *Syntagma de Græca & Latina Bibliorum Interpretatione.* See Mr Morhof's opinion of them. ‘ Variæ ‘ hîc inſtitutæ ſunt de multis rebus literariis conſulta‘ tiones & judicia : nam multa, quæ agitabantur illo ‘ tempore inter viros literatos, his in epiſtolis recen‘ ſentur. Scriptæ illæ ſunt ad illuſtres ejus temporis ‘ viros, Scaligerum, Meurſium, Heinſium, Gruterum, ‘ Scriverium & plures alios, cum quibus non niſi eru‘ dita tractari poterant. Epiſtolas ejus multas ineditas ‘ ſervat illuſtris Gudius, latitant & aliquæ inter MSta ‘ Bibliothecæ Hamburgenſis (2). - - - *Several literary* ‘ *conſultations and deciſions are found here ; for many of* ‘ *the diſputes which then employed the learned, are men*‘ *tioned in theſe letters. They are written to the famous* ‘ *men of that age, Scaliger, Meurſius, Heinſius, Grute*‘ *rus, Scriverius, and ſeveral others, with whom he* ‘ *could only correſpond upon learned ſubjects. Many of* ‘ *his letters remain unpubliſhed in the hands of the famous* ‘ *Gudius, and ſome of them lie concealed amongſt the* ‘ *the manuſcripts of the Hamburgh library.*’

[*C*] *Being born a Proteſtant he embraced the Romiſh religion in Italy.*] Nicholas Wouwer, his father, a perſon deſcended from an antient and noble family (3), left his country on account of the perſecution of the Proteſtants there, and ſettled at Humburgh : a manifeſt proof that the perſon who is the ſubject of this article was born a Proteſtant. Baudius s letters inform us that he changed his religion. ’ Illud pro certo habe‘ tur, eum Romæ publicitus religionem abjuraſſe, nullo ‘ metu qui in virum conſtantem cadere poſſit, ſed con‘ temptu & inſcitia pietatis, vel (quod his potentius ‘ eſt apud mentes præcipiti ambitione afflatas) ſpe con‘ ſequendæ alicujus opimæ largitionis. Sed, ut audio, ‘ eſca elapſa eſt, ſolum hamum retinuit (4). - - - *It is* ‘ *believed, for certain, that he publickly abjured his re*‘ *ligion at Rome, not from any motive of fear that could* ‘ *work upon a reſolute man, but from a contempt and ig*‘ *norance of piety, or (which has ſtill a greater influence* ‘ *upon minds that are hurried away by ambition) from* ‘ *the hopes of obtaining ſome large reward. But, as far* ‘ *as I hear, the bait ſlipt off and he retained nothing but* ‘ *the book.*’ In the ſecond tome of the *Faſciculus Rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum* (5), there is a letter from one Francis Broccard (6), in which our John Wouwer (7) is ranked amongſt the learned men who having apoſtatized, favoured the deſigns of the Inquiſition at Rome. But read the letter which he wrote to Baudius, and you will there find him denying this abjuration of his religion ; and only owning that he diſliked ſeveral things in the Reformation of Luther and Calvin. ‘ Non ego profecto eos, qui religionem ‘ reformandam ſuſceperunt, multa, quæ fortaſſe diſ‘ ſuenda erant, pio ſed improvido zelo tota reſcidiſſe, ‘ hoc me ſerio improbare aperte fateor : neque illa ‘ ſententia heri aut hodie mihi nata, ſed ex illo tem‘ pore quo aliquem veri guſtum ſenſus communis mi‘ hi ſuggeſſit, hoc ſi omnes in me improbant, ne iraſ‘ cor quidem. Mihi vero ita ſentire liberum erit, & ‘ oſtendere ſuam cuique ſponſam eſſe pulchram (8). - - ‘ *I do not, indeed, deny, that thoſe who undertook the* ‘ *Reformation of religion, did, with a pious but unwary* ‘ *zeal, cut off at once many things which, perhaps, it* ‘ *would have been much better to have unript by degrees.* ‘ *This, I freely own, was a method which I ſeriouſly diſ*‘ *approved of : neither did I conceive this opinion to day or* ‘ *yeſterday, but ever ſince common ſenſe taught me to have* ‘ *the leaſt reliſh for truth. If all the world ſhould cenſure* ‘ *me for this, it will not offend me. But I ſhall ſtill be* ‘ *at liberty to think ſo, and to ſhew that every one reckons* ‘ *his own bride the handſomeſt.*’

[*D*] *He is ranked amongſt the Plagiaries.*] The learned Mauſſac, after having told us that ſince Caſaubon could not finiſh his book of the ſtudies of the Antients, he would one day treat of that ſubject himſelf if he had leiſure, adds that Wouwer interfered with Caſaubon, without publiſhing any thing but what he had taken from that Critic. It is ſuppoſed that Wouwer appropriated this rich treaſure to himſelf when he was at Montpellier with Caſaubon. *De Iſaaco Caſaubono loquor, in cujus meſſem falcem injecit Joannes Wouer vir certe ingenii non vulgaris, ſed qui opus imperfectum reliquit, quamvis omne quod edidit à Caſaubono habuerit, dum una cum eo agebat Monſpelii* (9). The book out of which I cite theſe words was printed at Toulouſe, in the year 1615 ; that of Wouwer which Mauſſac means, is intituled, *de Polymathia Tractatio*, and was printed in 1603 (10). Several reports, to the diſadvantage of Wouwer, had been ſpread about before Mauſſac publiſhed this accuſation. Wouwer proteſted his innocence, in a letter which he wrote in the year 1605 (11). And Baudius, to whom it was addreſſed, writ to him in anſwer, that thoſe rumors were vaniſhed, and that he ought not to aſcribe their riſe to Caſaubon. *Refrixit jam ſermo leviſſimorum hominum, qui Polymathiam tuam Plagii ſuſpicione infamabant. Caſaubonus vir melior & candidior eſt, quam ut hujus culpæ inſimulandus eſſe videatur* (12). He ſent him beſides a fragment of a letter of Caſaubon, by which it appears, that without ever complaining of any theft, that learned Critic very much commended Wouwer's book. See alſo what Baudius wrote to the brothers Puteani the ſame year (13) ; but above all ſee Thomaſius's Preface to the new edition of the treatiſe *de Polymathia*, which ſtrenuouſly refutes Mr Mauſſac. Mr Morhof mentions this particular, and cites Schoockius, who ſays that this reproach of Mauſſac proceeded from envy, and that Voſſius was guilty of ſtealing from Wouwer. *Ex invidiâ profectum hoc Mauſſaci judicium Martinus Schockius* Confutatione Fab. Hamel. p. 2. c. 4. *exiſtimat. Ex ipſo autem Wouwerio multa cepiſſe, ſuppreſſo ejus nomine, Voſſium etiam Schockius loco laudato, & Joannes Jonſſius*, lib. 1. deſcrip. Hiſt. Phil. c. 10. p. 49. *teſtatur* (14). Scaliger affirmed the ſame thing in converſation which Mauſſac did in print (15). He generally called Wouwer a great Plagiary, and retailer of traſh. Notwithſtanding this he highly compliments him in his letters (16).

Lindenbroch was enraged againſt him. He accuſes him of a thouſand plagiariſms, particularly in his little book *de Umbra* (17). He tells us, that Wouwer finding that tract among Gulielmius's papers, only altered the form of it, and interwove ſome Latin verſes which were made by another hand. ‘ Lindenbrogium ‘ neſcio quomodo is ſemper infenſum habuit : ſuper‘ ſunt enim Lindenbrogii tum in Bibliothecâ Ham‘ burgenſi, tum in Gudianâ, Epiſtolæ, quibus illi ‘ acerbè inſultat. Vocat illum hominem cum latrante ‘ nomine (à baubando). Multa in illo plagia notat, ‘ ac in aliquâ epiſtolâ hæc de illo habet, ejus de Um‘ brâ Tractatum inter plagia recenſens : *Quem noviſſi*‘ *mè edidit librum tenebricoſum umbratilis ille, inter* ‘ *doctiſſimi optimique viri Jani Gulielmi ſchedas repertum* ‘ *ajunt : in quo id tamen præſtitit, quod aliam illi veſtem* ‘ *induit, & ſuo more turpavit. Nam & carmina, quæ* ‘ *paſſim intermixta, non adulteri hujus fuerunt, ſed Scho*‘ *læ Schleſwicenſis Rectoris, viri eruditi & probi, qui* ‘ *etiam nunc vivit, & id aperte fatetur.* Epiſtola hæc ‘ ſcripta eſt Hamburgi an. 1613. Gravis hæc in illum ‘ virum injuria eſt, & neſcio quid acerbitatis ſapit. In ‘ aliis epiſtolis paſſim in eum invehitur, ac plura ejus ‘ plagia notat (18). - - - - *Lindenbroch was, I know* ‘ *not for what reaſon, always an enemy to Wouwer : for* ‘ *there are extant, both in the library of Hamburgh,* ‘ *and that of Gudius, ſome letters written by Linden*‘ *broch, in which he bitterly inſults him. He calls him* ‘ *the man with the barking name (Wower). He takes* ‘ *notice of many of his plagiariſms, and in one of his let*‘ *ters writes thus of him, reckoning his book* de Umbra ‘ *among plagiary pieces.* It is reported that the book ‘ *de Tenebris*, which that cloudy author has lately ‘ publiſhed, was found among the papers of the learn-

---

(*b*) *Taken from* Henningus Witte, in Memoria Woweriana, *pag.* 79, & *ſeq. of the* Memoriæ Philoſophorum.

(*c*) See the remark [*E*].

(1) *Taken from* Henningus Witte, Memor. Philoſoph. *pag.* 81, 82.

(2) Morhofius, Polyhiſt. *lib. i, cap. xxiv, pag.* 304. *He ſays that edition was publiſhed at Hamburgh, in* 1608. *But how can this be reconciled with what Mr Witte ſays,* ubi ſupra, *pag.* 82, *that Elmenhorſt publiſhed that* Syntagma, *in the year* 1618.

(3) Illuſtri Baronum ſtirpe oriundus. *Id. ibid. cap. i, pag.* 7.

(4) Baudius, Epiſt. lxix, *centuriæ i, pag. m.* 101. *It is dated the* 18*th of February* 1603.

(5) *Page* 875.

(6) See concerning this man, the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes, *Tom. i, pag.* 374, & *ſeq.*

(7) *He is there called wrong* Johannes Wourenius Amburgenſis.

(8) Joh. Wouwer, Epiſtola ad Baudium, *pag.* 110. *It is the lxxiid, of the firſt century of Baudius's letters.*

(9) Philippus Jacobus Mauſſacus, Notis in Plutarchum de Fluviis, *p.* 149.

(10) *The edition I make uſe of is of that year,* ex Bibliopolio Frobeniano. Thomaſius de Plagio Literario, *p.* 261, *mentions only that of Hamburgh* 1604.

(11) The viith of the ſecond century of Baudius's Letters, in the Leyden edition, 1650.

(12) Baudius, Epiſt. ix, *Centur. ii, pag.* 165.

(13) Monui vos jampridem diſſipatum fuiſſe rumorem de Wouwerio noſtro quaſi plagio domeſtico ſublegerit potiſſimam partem ſuæ Polymathiæ. *Baudius, Epiſt. iii, Cent. ii, pag.* 155.

(14) Morhofius, Polyh. *lib. i, cap. i, pag.* 7.

(15) See the *Scaligerana*, at the word *Wouwerius.*

(16) See Scaliger's Letters, particularly that which I have mentioned above, citation (1), of the article ELMENHORST.

(17) *It is intituled* Dies æſtiva, ſive de Umbra Paegnion. *It was printed in* 1610. *My edition is that of Oxford* 1636, in 12mo.

(18) Morhof. ubi ſupra, *cap. xxiv, p.* 304.

write a panegyric on him, after his death [*E*]. The letters which Baudius wrote to him, are an inſtance of the little ſincerity to be met with in the compliments uſually made to authors [*F*]. Some writers confound our John Wouwer with another

‘ed and excellent Janus Gulielmus; and that the pretended author did no more than alter the form of it, and ſpoil it after his own faſhion. The verſes, which are interſperſed in it every where, are not the compoſure of this Plagiary, but of the rector of the ſchool of Sleſwic, a man of learning and probity, who is ſtill living, and publickly owns them. *This letter is dated at Hamburgh, in the year* 1613: *It is highly injurious to him, and betrays very much rancour againſt him. In the reſt of his letters, he every where inveighs againſt him, and points out many of his plagiariſms.*’

[*E*] *He was too fond of flattery, as appears by his . . . legacy,* &c. . . . .] This teſtamentary promiſe took effect; for in hopes of the promiſed ſum ſeveral Panegyriſts ſtarted up, who extolled Wouwer above the ſkies. But if we had his life written by Lindenbroch, we ſhould find a great many particulars different from their relations. ‘Felicior & aliis Eruditis, & ipſo Principe ſuo, Johan. Adolpho, nullos, uti ſupra † monuimus, Encomiaſtas Poſthumos nacto, fuit *Joh. Wowerius*, Miniſter Aulæ Gottorp. Primarius. Biographias enim, & Sermones Panegyricos, memoriæ illius ſacros, publicarunt Gev. Elmenhorſtius, Ad. Olearius, Nic. Johann. Cruſius, aliique complures, *ſpe* potius *Nummi doloſi* (Præmii ſc. LX. Joachimicorum, quod cuilibet, Laudationem ſibi poſthumam ſcripturo, in Tabulis ultimæ Voluntatis Wowerius deſtinavit,) ipſis *affulgente* invitati, quam ſincero in virum Virtutibus pariter atque Vitiis magnum ducti affectu. Alio haud dubie fine, ut Animo ſc. ſuo, in Wouwerium ob ſtudiorum Æmulationem iniquiori, morem gereret, Vitæ illius Hiſtoriam ⸸ ſcribere in Animo habuit Frid. Lindebrogius, Civis ipſius, quo rigidiorem Vitiorum ejus Cenſorem hactenus obſervavi neminem (19). - - - - - - *John Wouwer, prime Miniſter of the Court of Gottorp, was more fortunate than other learned men, and even than his own Prince John Adolphus who, as we ſaid before, had no encomiums written upon him after his death. But to Wouwer's memory, deſcriptions of his life, and Panegyrical diſcourſes were dedicated and publiſhed by Elmenhorſt, Olearius, Cruſius, and ſeveral others. Theſe authors were rather prevailed upon by the bewitching temptation of money, (for Wouwer in his laſt will, had ordered a reward of ſixty Joachims to any one that ſhould write an encomium upon him after his death) than moved with a ſincere regard to the man himſelf, who was equally remarkable for his virtues and vices. Lindenbroch, his countryman, and the moſt rigid cenſor of his vices that I have ſeen, intended to write his life. But certainly it was with a quite different view, viz. that he might gratify his own humour, for he was ſomewhat prejudiced againſt Vonwer on account of a mutual emulation in their ſtudies.*’ The author from whom I have borrowed theſe words, obſerves elſewhere that Wouwer was a little vain, and frequently talked of himſelf (20). Baudius alſo obſerved a great preſumption in him. Read the following lines: ‘De Wouwerio eadem ad nos fama pervenit, eum id ætatis hominem admiratione doctrinæ (vide & ride ludibria judiciorum) cooptatum in collegium Senatorum ſacræ Cæſareæ Majeſtatis, ſed certiſſimo argumento perſuadeor rem ita ſe non habere (21), quod cum à reditu ſuo bis terve ſcripſerit ad Scaligerum, ad Scriverium, ad Franciſcum Douſam etiam, cum perhonorifica noſtri mentione, tamen ubique miſerabiliter inſectatur fortunæ ſuæ malignitatem, nec homo ſui oſtentator magnificus, quidquam de ſuperbo illo titulo adjicit, quem proculdubio non fuit omiſſurus, niſi prorſus ab ingenio deſciſcere vellet. Detepuit jam mucro iracundiæ noſtræ adverſus eum, quod ex pluribus indiciis apparet eum non tam nocendi animo, quam ſui extollendi vanitate ſolitum detrahere famæ & meritis laudibus amicorum. Dempto certe hoc vitio, multa habet ingenii naturæque dona, quibus ſupra vulgus ſapit, & illuſtrium virorum amicitiam meretur (22). - - - - - - *The ſame report concerning Wouwer reached me, viz. that on account of his being ſo much admired for his learning, (behold, and laugh at the ridiculous judgments of men) he was at ſuch an age, made one of his Imperial Majeſty's Counſellors. But I have a very certain proof for believing, that it was not ſo: for whereas after his return he wrote two or three letters to Scaliger, Scriverius, and Francis Douſa, in which he makes very honourable mention of me, he does at the ſame time moſt piteouſly complain of his own ill fortune, and takes no notice at all of that proud title, which certainly a man of his vanity and oſtentation would never have omitted, unleſs you can ſuppoſe that he acted in a manner that was quite contrary to his natural diſpoſition. Nevertheleſs the edge of my reſentment is taken off, ſince I have found by ſeveral manifeſt proofs, that in detracting from the reputation of his friends and from their due praiſes he is not ſo much influenced by the deſire of hurting them as by the vanity of extolling himſelf. Setting that vice aſide, we muſt own he has many qualities and endowments which ſet him above the vulgar, and give him a title to the friendſhip of great and learned men.*’

[*F*] *Of the little ſincerity to be met with in the compliments uſually made to authors.*] Wouwer publiſhed a panegyric on Chriſtian IV King of Denmark in the year 1603. Baudius writing to the author loads him with praiſes, but in a letter to another he ſpeaks of this work as of a preformance full of faults. What follows will prove the truth of theſe two particulars: *In Dominici Baudii* ἀλλοπροσαλλȣ Epiſtola ad Wowerium ‡ *haud parem obſerves* ἐλευθεροστομίαν. *Illic* ‘enim non tantum *Generoſos* Wouverii *impetus, & ardua felicis Ingenii tentamenta, laudem apud Doctos, Amorem apud Honeſtos, admirationem apud peritos Rerum Æſtimatores,* cenſet *mereri,* ſed Ironice etiam eundem laudat, quod, *vividarum & Erectarum mentium* exemplo, *Eloquentiam* ſuam in Panegyrico *Præceptiunculis Magiſtellorum non circumſcribat, ſed, Artium repagula fidenter perrumpens, libero curſu feratur. In Epiſtola* contra *ad Corn. Mylium* * Scaligero ὁμόψηφος, majori, quam ille, παῤῥεσία, quid in Oratione hac deſideret, ſignificat: *Affectavit Wowerius,* inquit, *in Panegyrico ſublime & floridum ſimul genus dicendi. Laudandus ob generoſum conatum, etſi interdum langueſcit, & pellucet nimis Æmulatio Antiquorum. Multa ſunt, quæ non Ignavo Lectori placere poſſunt. Si currum interdum non bene moderatur, magnis tamen excidit auſis. Generoſiores Animi, dum vitant humum, ſæpe nubes & inania captant. Ætas & poſteræ curæ, limabunt, & depaſcent luxuriem agnatam melioribus Ingeniis* (23). - - - - *Dominic Baudius, in his letter to Wouwer, does not uſe the ſame freedom of ſpeech; for there he not only allows that Wouwer*'s noble flights, and the courageous attempts of his happy genius deſerves the praiſe of the learned, the eſteem of honeſt men, and the admiration of the judicious, *but he likewiſe ironically commends him, for that* after the *example* of lively and daring minds he ſcorns to circumſcribe *his eloquence in panegyrics* by the narrow rules of little maſters, but boldly breaking through the barriers of art roams at large. *On the contrary, in his letter to Cornelius Mylius, he is of the ſame opinion with Scaliger, and, with more freedom than he, declares what he thinks faulty in that oration.* Wouwer, *ſays he*, in his panegyric, affected both the ſublime and the florid ſtile. He is to be commended for his noble attempt, tho' ſome times he flags, and diſcovers an affected imitation of the Antients. There are many things in it which may pleaſe an attentive reader. If ſometimes he does not govern his chariot well, it muſt nevertheleſs be owned that he fails in a bold undertaking. Generous minds, while they avoid being low and mean, are often loſt in the clouds, and run into bombaſt. But age and new application will poliſh and correct the luxuriancy that is peculiar to the beſt genius's.’ Wouwer himſelf knew the defects of his performance, and made a great many excuſes on account of the hurry he wrote it in, and deſired that the world would not judge of his ability by this eſſay. Obſerve, that this panegyric was compoſed on occaſion of the homage which the city of Hamburgh paid to his Daniſh Majeſty; but as ſomething had eſcaped the author's pen which might redound to the prejudice of the liberties of another of the ſame name, who ſtudied under Lipſius, of whom I ſhall ſpeak in one of the remarks [G].

---

† P. I. c. 13. §. 3. pag. 198, 199.

⸸ Promiſit eam A. 1613. in Epiſt. quadam MSta, cujus Autographum Gudius ὁ μακαρίτης aſſervabat. Conf. Morhofii, *Polyhiſt. lib. i, cap. xxiv, pag.* 304.

(19) Joh. Mollerus, Iſagoge ad Hiſtoriam Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ, *Part. ii, pag.* 209, 210.

(20) Satis alias arrogans & περιαυτόλογος. Id. ibid. *Part. i, pag.* 188.

(21) *Wouwer, in a letter of a later date written to Baudius affirms the truth of it:* Me Conſiliarium Cæſaris electum vera fama fuit. *See Baudius's Letters, num. lxxxiii Cent. i.*

(22) Baudius, Epiſt. lxix, *Cent. i, pag. m.* 100, 101, *this letter is dated on the 18th of February* 1603.

‡ Cent. iii. Ep. iii, pag. 490, 491.

* Cent. i. n. 66, pag. 157.

(23) Joh. Mollerus, ubi ſupra, *Part. i, pag.* 187, 188. *His edition of Baudius's Letters, does not agree with mine.*

of that city. The Senate prohibited the ſale of it, till the firſt pages were corrected (24).

[G] *Some writers confound our John Wouwer with another of the ſame name . . . . of whom I ſhall ſpeak in a remark.*] This other JOHN WOUWER (25) was born in the year 1576, at Antwerp, where he began his ſtudies under the Jeſuits, and afterwards went to Louvain, and lived with Lipſius, who had ſuch an affection and high eſteem for him, that he appointed him one of the executors of his laſt will, and recommended the care of his manuſcripts to him alone. This Wouwer having ſpent three years in travelling into France, Spain, and Italy, was no ſooner returned but he was promoted to the dignity of a Counſellor in his own country, and aftewards became a member of the Council of Finances and the Council of War. The Infanta Iſabella Clara Eugenia deputed him to Philip IV, King of Spain, who dignified him with the honour of knighthood. He publiſhed ſome books, and died on the twenty-third of September 1635. The world expected from him the publication of two hundred letters, written to Lipſius (26). Father Schottus confounds this Wouwer with that of Hamburgh, as Mr Morhof obſerves. 'Duo monenda nobis ſunt, *ſaith he* (27), in quibus erratum à viris doctis eſt. Primum eſt, quod duo confundantur ejus nominis, Antwerpianus & Hamburgenſis Polymathiæ Autor. Andreas Schottus hunc Belgam facit in *notis ad Proverbia Græca p.* 68. ſed falſo. Lipſius in Epiſtolâ 8 Kal. Novembr. 1599. ad Antwerpianum illum ſcriptâ (28), utrumque probè diſtinguit: *Janus Wouwerius*, inquit, *cognominis tuus, ſi non Gentilis, quam bona tecum fœderatio! Optimum par, nec vel Dii dederint magis ex uſu aut voto. Modeſtiam & probitatem in eo adoleſcente ſemper amavi, & ut vidi primùm (Hamburgi id fuit, ante annos novem) unà laudatum illam indolem ivi. Vivat, creſcat, & lampada à nobis in hoc curſu jam feſſis accipiat: me libenter & judicia tradente.* - - - - *We are to obſerve two things here, concerning which learned men have been in a miſtake. The firſt is, that two of the ſame name are confounded, viz. the Wouwer of Antwerp, and the Wouwer of Hamburgh, who was the author of the* Polymathia. *Andrew Scotus calls the latter Dutchman, in his notes on the Greek proverbs, but he is wrong. Lipſius, in his letter to the Wouwer of Antwerp, dated the 25th of October 1599, diſtinguiſhes them very well.* Your nameſake, John Wouwer, *ſays he*, if he is not your countryman, yet how well may he be confederated with you! An excellent couple, than which it is impoſſible to wiſh for a better or more uſeful. For my own part, I was always in love with the modeſty and virtue of that young man, and the firſt time that I ſaw him, (which was at Hamburgh nine years ago) I could not help launching forth in praiſe of his genius. Let him live and proſper, and take our places, and relieve us who are already worn out in this career. As for me, I ſurrender very willingly.' Konig (29) is guilty of the ſame miſtake, for when he is ſpeaking of our Wouwer, he cites Swertius (30), who mentions only the other. Mr Mollerus hath collected ſeveral miſtakes on this head (31).

---

(24) *See* Mollerus, ubi ſupra.

(25) *Or rather* Vandan Wouwere, *according to* Valerius Andreas, Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 587.

(26) *Taken from* Valerius Andreas, ubi ſupra.

(27) Morhof, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 7. *See alſo* Colomies *cap. ii*, Κειμηλ. Liter.

(28) *It is the xliſt, of the firſt century* ad Belgas.

(29) Konig, Bibl. vet. & *nova*, *pag.* 875.

(30) *Page.* 487, *and the book he means, is* Athenæ Belgicæ.

(31) Johannes Mollerus de Scriptoribus Homonymis, *pag.* 733, & *ſeq.*

X.

XENOCRATES, one of the moſt illuſtrious Philoſophers of Antient Greece, was born at Chalcedon (*a*), and very early placed himſelf under the direction of Plato, to whom he always gave great proofs of his reſpect and fidelity [*A*]. He ſtudied under this great maſter, at the ſame time with Ariſtotle, but was not endowed with the ſame parts; he wanted a ſpur, and the other a bridle (*b*). This was Plato's judgment of them, who farther added, that in ſetting them together he matched a horſe with an aſs (*c*). But if his ſlow capacity rendered him far inferior to Ariſtotle (*d*), he very much ſurpaſſed him in Practical Philoſophy: the purity of his manners had in it ſomething extraordinary; his gravity, ſeverity, or rather auſterity, were of ſuch a nature, that a Divine who at preſent ſhould reſemble him would infallibly paſs for a Janſeniſt or a Rigoriſt. He had acquired ſuch an abſolute command of his paſſions, that a moſt beautiful courtezan, who laid that ſhe would ſubdue his virtue, loſt her wager [*B*], though ſhe had the liberty to lie by him, which afforded her an opportunity of uſing all her artifices to allure him to enjoy her. This is a triumph as remarkable as that of St Aldhelme (*e*), and ſome other canonized Saints who have eſcaped untainted from the like temptations, as we are told. Chaſtity was not the ſole virtue of this Philoſopher; all the other parts of temperance ſhone in his conduct [*C*]. He

(*a*) Diog. Laërt. *lib. iv, num. vi.*

(*b*) Compare with this, what is ſaid above, in the remark [*B*], of the article THEOPOMPUS.

(*c*) Ex Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) See, above, the remark [*C*], of the article FRANCIS of Aſſiſe.

[*A*] *He always gave great proofs of his reſpect and fidelity to Plato.*] He accompanied him in his voyage to Sicily, and was with him at the court of Syracuſe. (1) Dionyſius, the tyrant, one day in diſcourſe with Plato, telling him, *ſome body will cut off your head*; no man ſhall do it, replied Xenocrates, before he hath cut off mine (2). Obſerve that the tyrant's expreſſion imported the ſame thing, as if he had ſaid, *I will cut off your head* (3): which gives a greater idea of the generoſity of Xenocrates. We have ſeen above (4), what is reported of his zeal for Plato's honour, when he was injuriouſly treated by Ariſtotle. I add, that he very patiently bore Plato's reprimands; and when he was excited to defend himſelf, he made no other anſwer than this, *he treats me ſo for my advantage.* Ξενοκράτης (5) ὁ Χαλκηδόνιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος. εἰς τὸ ἄχαρι (6) σκωπτόμενος, οὐδέπω ἠγανάκτει φησίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸν παροξύνοντα αὐτὸν, ὑπὲρ τούτου, ἵνα τι ἀποκρίνηται τῷ Πλάτωνι, ὅδε καὶ πάνυ ἐμφρόνως καταςιγάζων τὸν ἄνδρα, ἔφατο· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἐμοὶ συμφέρει. *Xenocrates Chalcedonius, quum à Platone propter mores inurbanos reprehenderetur, nunquam indignatione irave commotus eſt: ſed & illi, qui ipſum ad reſpondendum Platoni inſtigaret, Hoc, inquit, mihi bonum atque commodum eſt: & prudentiſſime homini ſilentium impoſuit.* But inſtead of this we are told the quite contrary by a Latin writer: where we find, 1. That Plato was told that Xenocrates had ſpoken ill of him. 2. That Plato would not believe it. 3. That the informer, with an audacious air, aſked why he did not believe it? 4. That Plato anſwered, it is not to be believed that a perſon, whom I love ſo well, ſhould not love me alſo. 5. That the informer offered to ſwear it. 6. That Plato would not ſuffer it to go ſo far, but ended the diſpute by the following words; *Xenocrates would never have ſaid that, had he not believed that it was for my advantage* (7). *Poſtremò cùm ad jusjurandum inimicitias ſerentis malignitas confugiſſet; ne de perjurio ejus diſputaret, affirmavit nunquam Xenocratem illa dicturum fuiſſe, niſi ea dici expedire ſibi judicaſſet* (8). This ſtory in Valerius Maximus ſeems to me to be but that which we find in Ælian, maimed and reverſed, and it confirms the text of this remark.

[*B*] *A moſt beautiful courtezan, who laid that ſhe would ſubdue his virtue, loſt her wager.*] I mention this elſewhere (9); but I add here what Valerius Maximus ſaith: 'Phryne nobile Athenis ſcortum juxta 'eum (*Xenocratem*) vino gravem in pervigilio accubuit, pignore cum quibuſdam juvenibus poſito, an 'temperantiam ejus corrumpere poſſet: Quam nec 'tactu, nec ſermone aſpernatus, quoad voluerat in 'ſinu ſuo morari, irritam propoſiti dimiſit. Factum 'ſapientia imbuti animi abſtinens; ſed meretriculæ 'quoque dictum perquam facetum, Deridentibus enim 'ſe adoleſcentibus, quia tam formoſa, tamque elegans 'poti ſenis animum illecebris pellicere non potuiſſet, 'pactumque victoriæ pretium flagitantibus: de homine ſe cum iis, non de ſtatua pignus poſuiſſe, 'reſpondit. Poteſtne hæc Xenocratis continentia à 'quoquam magis vere, magiſque proprie demonſtrari, 'quam ab ipſa meretricula expreſſa eſt? Phryne pulchritudine ſua, nulla ex parte conſtantiſſimam ejus 'abſtinentiam labefecit (10). - - - *Phryne, a famous 'courtezan at Athens, lay down by Xenocrates in a night-'revel, when he had drank a great deal of wine. She had 'laid a wager with ſome young men that ſhe would de-'bauch him. He declined not her careſſes, and ſuffered 'her to embrace him as long as ſhe pleaſed; but he diſap-'pointed her expectation. As this was a proof of his 'abſtinence and wiſdom, ſo what the courtezan ſaid upon 'it was very witty; for when the young men laughed at 'her, becauſe with all her beauty and charms ſhe had 'not been able to raiſe the paſſion of an old man warmed 'with wine, and deſired her to pay her bet, ſhe an-'ſwered, that ſhe had laid a wager about a man, and 'not about a ſtatue. Could any thing more truly and 'properly deſcribe the continence of Xenocrates than this 'expreſſion of the courtezan. Phryne, beautiful as ſhe 'was, could not make the leaſt impreſſion upon his conſtant 'chaſtity.*' You ſee this author ſuppoſes ſeveral particulars which raiſe the glory of the victory: it was entire tho' all the circumſtances favoured the enemy. He will have it that the courtezan took hold of an opportunity when Xenocrates had drank plentifully; and adds, that the Philoſopher did not refuſe the careſſes of her hands and voice, and that Phryne had leave to ſtay with him as long as ſhe pleaſed.

[*C*] *All the other parts of temperance ſhone in his conduct.*] His having drank plentifully when Phryne tempted him may be objected againſt this. They may likewiſe object againſt it the ſtory of Athenæus, who relates that Xenocrates won the crown of gold, which the Syracuſan tyrant promiſed to the perſon that ſhould firſt drink off a certain meaſure of wine (11). It will be ſaid that a man, who gets the prize appointed for the greateſt drinker in the court of a drunken Prince, is not ſober. But Xenocrates carried off this prize; therefore he was not ſober. Conſider this expreſſion of Diogenes Laërtius: Χρυσῷ ςεφάνῳ τιμηθέντα ἐπ' ἄθλῳ πολυποσίας, *Corona aurea donatum in* PRÆMIUM LARGIORIS COMPOTATIONIS (12).

2 Remember

(1) Diog. Laërt. *lib. iv, num.* 6.

(2) Id. ibid. *num.* 11.

(3) *See* Kuhnius's Notes, in Diog. Laërt. *ad. lib. iv, num.* 11.

(4) In the remark [*E*], of the article ARISTOTLE.

(5) Ælian. Var. Hiſtor. *lib. xiv, cap. ix.*

(6) *See* Plutarch, in Vita Marii, *init. pag.* 407.

(7) Valer. Maximus, *lib. iv, cap. i, num.* 2, *in Ext. pag. m.* 351.

(8) Id. ibid.

(9) In the remark [*R*], of the article LAIS.

(10) Val. Max. *lib. iv, cap. iii, in Ext. num.* 3, *pag.* 376.

(11) Athenæus, *lib. x, pag.* 437. *He quotes the Hiſtorian Timæus.*

(12) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 8.

He loved neither pleaſures, riches, nor praiſes (*f*). He never could be corrupted by preſents [*D*], and he acquired ſuch a great reputation with regard to ſincerity and probity, that he was the ſole perſon whom the magiſtrates of Athens exempted from confirming

Remember alſo that Ælian inſerts Xenocrates in that chapter, where he gives us a catalogue of thoſe who loved drinking, and could drink a great deal (13). The firſt in this liſt is the Syracuſian tyrant, who promiſed a golden crown to him who could drink moſt, and Xenocrates won the prize. Προὔκειτο ἆθλον τῷ πιόντι πλέον ϛέφανος χρυσοῦς· καὶ ἐνίκησε Ξενοκράτης ὁ Χαλκηδόνιος; *Præmium ordinatum eſt ei, qui* PLUS BIBISSET, *aurea corona, quam meritus eſt Xenocrates Chalcedonius* (14). Thus you have the objection fortified with all neceſſary proofs. It would be in vain to anſwer that Xenocrates was admired on this occaſion (15), for the Hiſtorian who ſaith ſo adds another particular, which is really laudable, I mean, that the victor did not keep this golden crown, but placed it on a ſtatue of Mercury, as he was going home. He uſed, on other days, to crown that ſtatue with flowers, but that evening he fixed on it a golden crown. This was a proof of a diſintereſted mind; this was ſhewing that for the honour of the gods he could as eaſily part with what was moſt precious as with a noſegay. If the objectors ſhould be ſo opinionative as to affirm that Athenæus's meaning is, that Xenocrates was admired both on this account, and becauſe he drank more than the reſt, they would be but ſmall gainers: for every thing that is admired is not a good moral quality: ſeveral things are admired by reaſon of their ſingularity, and upon this foot a Philoſopher might be admired for carrying off the prize from all the drinkers of Syracuſe. He ſhould have been vanquiſhed; he ought to have avoided ſuch an engagement; and if he had been temperate he had never entred theſe liſts. Let us then ſee whether we can think of any other way of juſtification.

It muſt be owned that ſome very ſober people, may be of ſuch a conſtitution as to drink a great deal without loſing their reaſon. Socrates, whoſe ſobriety and auſterity of life are inconteſtable, did not love *drinking, and yet when he was forced to it by company, no body could hold out againſt him; and what was admirable in him, was, that he never was indiſpoſed on theſe occaſions, and that there was no difference betwixt Socrates faſting, and Socrates at his departure from a feaſt and merry-making* (16). If ſuch a man on ſome extraordinary occaſion as that feſtival, which was celebrated at Syracuſe, when Dionyſius the tyrant promiſed the golden crown to the drinker, makes a trial of his ſtrength, and wins the prize, it ought not to be concluded from thence that he is intemperate. He does not thereby loſe the character of a ſober man: this virtue ought to be conſidered in the ſame manner with other habitual qualities. They conſtitute a character which is not loſt by any ſingle act of the oppoſite quality. Mr Daillé made this remark when he was charged with calling Mr Cottiby *an extravagant viſionary*. ‘Sometimes the ‘want of attention, *replied he* (17), and frequently an ex‘ceſs of paſſion, ſtarts a fooliſh or extravagant notion ‘in the mind of a wiſe man. But you do not therefore ‘call him a fool. If you believe Horace, the excel‘lent Homer nods ſometimes. Will you from thence ‘accuſe Horace of railing at that incomparable author, ‘whom he elſewhere ſo highly eſteems and admires? ‘Will you ſay that he calls him *a ſluggiſh, dull, and* ‘*ſtupid Poet?* No. For theſe names, as well as thoſe ‘of *detractor*, and *viſionary* are only beſtowed on ſuch ‘as are habituated to theſe vices, and not on thoſe ‘from whom ſuch actions barely eſcape, and that very ‘ſeldom, either through human weakneſs, or by the ‘force of ſome extraordinary cauſe: *One ſwallow does* ‘*not make the ſpring*, as the Philoſopher * hath it on ‘a like occaſion.’ This is ſufficient to juſtify what I have affirmed concerning Xenocrates.

I ſhall ſay by the bye, that two very learned Critics (18) are of opinion, that he was not at Syracuſe when he carried this prize, and even was at Athens when he won it. I own, indeed, that their opinion is probable, tho' to me it ſeems leſs ſo, than that which I have followed. It is undeniable that Xenocrates was at the court of Dionyſius, and that he was then very young. Is it not therefore more likely that he ſhould indulge himſelf to drink on that occaſion, than in the city where he ſtood upon the foot of a thorough auſtere Philoſopher?

What more authentic proof can we have of his great ſobriety than the proverb of the Antients, *Xenocrates's cheeſe*, which they made uſe of to expreſs that a thing laſted a long time? The author of this particular (19) adds, 1. That when he had pierced a caſk, it was ſo long before it was empty that the wine quite loſt it's virtue. 2. That Xenocrates ſeveral times threw away his proviſions by reaſon they grew ruſty or muſty; which would not have happened to a leſs frugal perſon.

[*D*] *He never could be corrupted by preſents.*] The Macedonian court uſed theſe means to corrupt a great many perſons in the neighbouring Republics, and ſuch perſons who refuſed their preſents did thereby ſufficiently declare that they never intended to take any meaſures prejudicial to the intereſt of their country. Xenocrates took this courſe. He refuſed King Philip's preſents; whence that Prince deſpairing to gain him, treated him uncivilly, and did not admit him to the conferences which he held with the other Ambaſſadors of the Republic of Athens, whom he had ſoftened by his generoſity, by feaſting and cajolling. But Xenocrates continued inflexible, and preſerving his integrity inviolable, never appeared at the audience and feaſts as his colleagues did. They complained that he did no ſervice in his embaſſy, for which he was very near being fined: but he diſcovered the whole ſecret, and warned the Athenians to have a watchful eye upon the public good, ſince the other Ambaſſadors were corrupted by preſents. This procured him double honour (20). He would not receive the money which Antipater ſent him (21), and when he accepted a ſmall part of the ſum which Alexander's Ambaſſadors brought him, it was only that he might not ſhew any contempt for that great Monarch. ‘Xenocrates quum ‘legati ab Alexandro quinquaginta ei talenta attuliſ‘ſent, quæ erat pecunia temporibus illis Athenis præ‘ſertim maxima, adduxit legatos ad cœnam in Aca‘demiam. Iis appoſuit tantum quod ſatis eſſet, nullo ‘apparatu. Quum poſtridie rogarent eum, cui nu‘merari juberet, quid vos heſterna inquit cœnula non ‘intellexiſtis me pecunia non egere? Quos quum tri‘ſtiores vidiſſet, xxx minas accepit, ne aſpernari re‘gis liberalitatem videretur (22). - - - *Xenocrates, when* ‘*Alexander's Ambaſſadors brought him fifty talents,* ‘*which in thoſe days was a very conſiderable ſum, eſpe*‘*cially at Athens, carried them to ſup with him in the* ‘*Academy, where he ſet before them no more than was* ‘*juſt ſufficient, and that too in the plaineſt manner. The* ‘*next day, when they aſked him, into whoſe hands he* ‘*would order the money to be paid: Could you not ſee,* ‘ſaid he, *by laſt night's ſupper, that I have no need of* ‘*money? But upon obſerving them troubled at this,* ‘*he accepted of thirty* minæ, *purely that he might not* ‘*ſeem to deſpiſe the King's generoſity.*’ Obſerve, in this Latin paſſage, the conſequence he draws from the mean ſupper with which he treated Alexander's Envoys. Doth not this, ſaid he, give you to underſtand that I have no need of money? Another Hiſtorian tells us (23), that having accepted part of the preſent, he ſent back the reſt to Alexander, He hath more need of it than I, ſaid he, for he ſubſiſts a greater number of men. This is excellent morality; it points out the true ſource of avarice, and of the contempt of riches. Let us obſerve that Valerius Maximus, who could not be ignorant of what Cicero relates, hath left out a circumſtance, which was not convenient for his purpoſe. He aimed at a jingle of antitheſes and parallels: he reſolved to connect the triumph over Phryne to that over Alexander's money. Having told us that Xenocrates, in Phryne's judgment, was a ſtatue; he takes it to be very witty to ſay that this Philoſopher was no leſs a ſtatue, with regard to the charms of gold, than thoſe of a courteſan (24); and to add, that a great Prince would have bought the friendſhip of a Philoſopher, but the Philoſopher would not ſell it to that great Prince (25). All theſe witty turns would have been ſpoiled, if it had been ſaid that Xenocrates took part of the preſent. Wherefore he ſuppreſſed this circumſtance.

(*f*) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 11.

(13) Φιλοπόται τινὲς καὶ πολυπόται. De quibuſdam qui & libenter & multum bibebant. *This is the title of the xliſt chapter of the iid book of* Ælian.

(14) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib. ii, cap. xli.*

(15) Ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἐθαυμάσθη. Quamobrem in admiratione ſumma fuit. *Athen. ubi ſupra.*

(16) Charpentier, Vie de Socrate, *pag. m.* 100.

(17) Daillé, Replique à Adam, & à Cottiby, *Part. iii, ch. iii, pag. m.* 157.

* Ariſt. en ſes Mor. à Nicom. *lib. i, cap. vii, towards the end.*

(18) Kuhnius in Diog. Laërt. *lib. iv, num.* 8. Perizonius, in Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib. ii, cap. xli, but obſerve that Mr Perizonius is not ſo poſitive in this opinion as the other.*

(19) Stobæus, de continen. & ſobr. *Serm. xv, fol. m.* 69.

(20) Ex Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 8, 9.

(21) Id. ibid. *num.* 8.

(22) Cicero, Tuſcul. Quæſt. *lib. v, fol. m.* 277, *B.*

(23) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 8.

(24) Quid rex Alexander? an divitiis eum quatere potuit? ab illo quoque ſtatuam & quidem æque fruſtra tentatam putes. *Valer. Maxim. lib. iv, cap. iii, num.* 3, *in Ext.*

(25) Ita rex philoſophi amicitiam emere voluit: Philoſophus regi ſuam vendere noluit. *Id. ibid.*

confirming his evidence with an oath [*E*]. A diſcourſe, which he made about temperance, ſo moved the moſt diſſolute debauchee of that time, that he took an immediate reſolution to renounce voluptuouſneſs, and apply himſelf to wiſdom [*F*]. This converſion was ſteady; for the convert, afterwards, became a very grave Philoſopher. This great alteration ought not to be attributed to the charms of eloquence, but rather to the auſtere gravity of Xenocrates. There was nothing charming, or graceful in his behaviour; but a ſolid gravity and ſeverity were inſeparable from his manners; whence it was that Plato frequently adviſed him to ſacrifice to the Graces (*g*). This want of politeneſs ſet off the glory which he had acquired by his auſterity (*h*). It is not to be wondered that with this dry genius, he ſhould have been ſo ſtrongly inclined to the Mathematics, that he would not admit any ſcholars who were ignorant of that ſcience (*i*). We ought more to admire that with this great character of rigid ſeverity, he

(*h*) Audivi . . . illum, (*Scipionem Naſicam*) qui T. Gracchi conatus perditos vindicavit, nullam comitatem habuiſſe ſermonis: ne Xenocratem quidem, ſeveriſſimum philoſophorum, ob eamque rem ipſam & magnum & clarum fuiſſe. - - - - *I have heard . . . . that Scipio Naſica, who puniſhed the wicked attempts of Tiberius Gracchus, had no ſort of Politeneſs in his converſation. I have heard the ſame thing of Xenocrates, the ſevereſt of all the Philoſophers, and that for this very reaſon he was eſteemed great and famous.* Cicero, de Officiis, *lib. i, cap. xxx, pag. m.* 120, 121.

(*g*) Id. ibid. *num.* 6.

(*i*) Laërt. ibid. *num.* 10.

Such is the exact fidelity of this, and ſeveral other writers; they enlarge or curtail facts as they find it convenient, in order to adjuſt them to their own conceits.

Father Abraham cites a paſſage of Themiſtius, where this action of Xenocrates is aſcribed to Xenophanes (26). He ſhould have corrected that miſtake.

[*E*] *He was the ſole perſon whom the magiſtrates of Athens exempted from . . . . an oath.*] He could not have a greater honour done him than this. Valerius Maximus is very judicious on this head: ‘Quantum porro honoris Athenis Xenocrati ſapientia pariter ac ſanctitate claro tributum eſt? Qui cum teſtimonium dicere coactus ad aram acceſſiſſet, ut more civitatis juraret, omnia ſe vere retuliſſe; univerſi judices conſurrexerunt, proclamaruntque ne jusjurandum diceret: Quodque ſibimetipſis poſtmodum dicendæ ſententiæ loco remiſſuri non erant, ſinceritati ejus concedendum exiſtimarunt (27). - - - - *How great an honour was done at Athens to Xenocrates, a man equally famous for his wiſdom and virtue? Who when he was obliged to give in his evidence, and came up to the altar, in order to confirm what he had ſaid with an oath, as the cuſtom of the city was, all the Judges roſe up, and told him not to ſwear. Thus what they themſelves did not deſire to be excuſed from, when afterwards they gave judgment, they diſpenſed with in him, as thinking it was due to his ſincerity.*’ Cicero mentions this in one of his epiſtles to Atticus (28).

[*F*] *A diſcourſe on temperance . . . . made one take an immediate reſolution to renounce voluptuouſneſs, and apply himſelf to wiſdom.*] If the ſermon of a Capuchin ſhould at this time cauſe ſuch an alteration, the world would acknowledge it to be a particular operation of the Holy Ghoſt, and admire the influence of Grace, which, according to the Janſeniſts, would be ſelf-efficacious to the higheſt degree; for the perſon who was prevailed upon by this diſcourſe, to change his courſe of life, was not an ordinary voluptuous man, but a ring-leader in that kind, who gloried in his debaucheries: his wife alſo accuſed him before a court of juſtice for neglecting her, and brutally debauching with boys; ſhe brought the indictment againſt him called, *Malæ Tractationis.* Φυγεῖν δὲ τὸν Πολέμωνα καὶ δίκην κακώσεως, ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς, ὡς μειρακίοις συνόντα. *Et in judicium vocatum Polemonem ab uxore nequitiæ inſimulatum, quod adoleſcentibus congrederetur* (29). He was not aſhamed to ſhew his exceſſive drunkenneſs in the moſt public place of Athens, being accompanied with a ſinging-woman, and ſeveral players on inſtruments. He was drunk almoſt every time that he appeared in the ſtreets (30), and his leudneſs was not leſs than his drunkenneſs. He went always well provided with money, and even concealed it in ſeveral parts of the city, that he might be ſupplied at all times, and in all places, with ſufficient ſums for his expences, in order to gratify his vicious appetite (31). In ſhort, he was the moſt famous debauchee in Athens. One day when he had drank plentifully, and run, as uſual, through the ſtreets with his cuſtomary equipage, and leud companions (32), he entred the auditory of Xenocrates, with a deſign to ridicule him, and to play ſome inſolent tricks.. When all the audience took offence at his behaviour, Xenocrates was not in the leaſt diſcompoſed (33), but more vigorouſly purſued the diſcourſe which he had begun concerning temperance. Some authors ſay, that he was not treating that ſubject, but leaving that which he was upon, he turned the diſcourſe to this virtue; on which head he ſpoke ſo excellently and gravely, that all of a ſudden he created an affection for modeſty and wiſdom in the mind of this hardened ſinner (34). Polemo, (for that was the name of this drunkard) from that very moment became a diſciple of virtue, and an exact imitator of the gravity of Xenocrates (35), whom he ſucceeded in his profeſſor's chair. He gave over his drinking wine, and drank nothing but water (36). The Latin deſcription of his converſion, which I ſhall tranſcribe here, is pretty enough: ‘Perditæ luxuriæ Athenis adoleſcens Polemo, neque illecebris tantummodo, ſed etiam ipſa infamia gaudens; cum è convivio non poſt occaſum ſolis, ſed poſt ortum ſurrexiſſet, domumque repetens, Xenocratis Philoſophi patentem Januam vidiſſet: vino gravis, unguentis delibutus, ſertis capite redimito, pellucida veſte amictus, refertam turba doctorum hominum ſcholam ejus intravit: Nec contentus tam deformi introitu, conſedit etiam, ut clariſſimum eloquium, & prudentiſſima præcepta temulentiæ laſciviis eluderet. Ortâ deinde, ut par erat, omnium indignatione; Xenocrates vultum in eodem habitu continuit, omiſſiſque de quibus diſſerebat, de modeſtia ac temperantia loqui cœpit. Cujus gravitate ſermonis reſipiſcere coactus Polemo, primum coronam capite detractam projecit, paulò poſt brachium intra pallium reduxit, procedente tempore oris convivalis hilaritatem depoſuit; ad ultimum, totam luxuriam exuit, uniuſque orationis ſaluberrima medicina ſanatus, ex infami ganeone maximus philoſophus evaſit. Peregrinatus eſt hujus animus in nequitia, non habitavit (37). - - - *Polemo, a young man at Athens, of a very debauched life, who not only loved pleaſures, but alſo gloried in his wickedneſs, one day, as he was returning home from a feaſt, not at night, but in the morning, ſaw Xenocrates the Philoſopher's door open: upon which, drunk as he was, perfumed, having a garland of flowers on his head, and covered with a very thin robe, he entered his ſchool, which was crowded with learned men: and not contented with ſuch an indecent intruſion, he ſat down on purpoſe to ridicule his eloquence, and his moſt judicious precepts, with the wanton flights of drunkenneſs. While all that were preſent expreſſed a proper indignation at this, Xenocrates alone did not alter his countenance, but, quitting the ſubject he was upon, he began to ſpeak of modeſty and temperance. The gravity of his diſcourſe was ſuch that it wrought a ſudden repentance in Polemo; and firſt he ſtripped off the garland from his head, next he pulled back his arm under his gown, and afterwards he laid aſide the cheerfulneſs of his looks; at laſt he renounced his luxury, and being cured by the wholſome medicine of one diſcourſe, of an infamous rake that he was, he became a very great Philoſopher. This man was a ſojourner in the territories of vice, not an inhabitant.*’ To this may be added the following lines of Horace.

. . . . Faciaſne, quod olim
Mutatus Polemon? ponas inſignia morbi
Faſciolas, cubital, focalia: potus ut ille
Dicitur ex collo furtim carpſiſſe coronas,
Poſtquam eſt impranſi correptus voce magiſtri (38).

. . . . . *For let me aſk thee this,*

(26) *See* Abraham's Commentary, in Orat. Ciceron. pro Sextio, *p.* 181.

(27) Valer. Max. *lib. ii, cap. ult. in fine. pag. m.* 234.

(28) *The xvth, of the firſt book. See alſo the ſame author,* in Orat. pro Balbo, *pag.* 657, *where he mentions the thing without naming Xenocrates.*

(29) Diog. Laërt. Ibid. *num.* 16.

(30) Lucian, in bis accuſato, *pag. m.* 321, 323, *Tom. ii.*

(31) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 16.

(32) Origen. ubi infra.

(33) Id. ibid.

(34) Valer. Maxim. ubi infra.

(35) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 17, & *ſeq.* Origen. contra Celſum, *lib. iii, pag.* 152.

(36) Athen. *lib. ii, cap. vi, pag.* 44.

(37) Valer. Maximus, *lib. vi, cap. ix, num.* 1, *in Ext. pag.* 581, 582.

(38) Horat. Sat. III, lib. ii, ver. 253.

he had a heart very ſuſceptible of compaſſion, not only towards his neighbour, but alſo towards animals. Of which it is affirmed he gave ſeveral proofs (k), and particularly this: he hid a ſparrow which flung herſelf upon him in her flight from a ſparrow-hawk, and releaſed her when the danger was over (l). He recommended to Polyſperchon a man whom he ſcarce knew, and who proved unworthy of his recommendation; which was the cauſe of his being cautioned to examine the character of people better another time (m). This miſtake ſhews his indulgent nature. He wrote ſeveral books which are loſt (n). He did not want leiſure to write, for he loſt ſcarce any time in viſits: he was very fond of cloſe retirement; he thought much, and was ſeldom ſeen in the ſtreets, and when he appeared there, the debauched youth turned out of the way to avoid meeting him [G]. He was the head of the academy for twenty-five years (o); in the ſecond year of the CXth Olympiad, he had ſucceeded Speuſippus whom Plato had choſen for his ſucceſſor. It is ſurprizing that a Philoſopher of ſo much merit ſhould receive ſuch ill treatment from the Athenians as to be ſold by them, becauſe he could not pay the capitation impoſed upon ſtrangers. Demetrius Phalereus did a very generous action upon that occaſion. He bought Xenocrates, immediately ſet him at liberty, and payed the debt to the Athenians (p) [H]. This Philoſopher's Theology was very contemptible [I], as we ſhall ſee

(k) *See* Ælian, *in lib. xiii.* Var. Hiſtor. *ch. xxxi, which is intituled,* ὅτι Ξενοκράτης φιλοικτίρμων ἦν, quod Xenocrates fuerit miſericors.

(l) Ælian, ibid.

(m) Plut. de vitioſo pudore, *pag.* 533.

(n) Diog. Laërt. *lib. iv, num.* 11, *& ſeq.*

(o) Id. ibid. *num.* 14.

(p) Id. Laërt. ibid.

Canſt thou, like Polemon reclaim'd, remove
Thy foppiſh dreſs, thoſe ſymptoms of thy love,
As he, when drunk, with garlands round his head,
Chanc'd once to hear the ſober Stoic read,
Aſham'd, he took his garlands off, began
Another courſe, and grew a ſober man?

CREECH.

Obſerve, that Plutarch aſſures us, that one look of Xenocrates was ſufficient to convert Polemo (39).

[G] *He thought much, and was ſeldom ſeen in the ſtreets; and when he appeared there, the debauched youth turned out of the way to avoid meeting him.*] Let us cite Diogenes Laërtius: Πολλάκις ἑαυτῷ τῆς ἡμέρας διεμελέτα, καὶ ὥραν μίαν φασὶν ἀπένεμε σιωπῇ. *Sæpe interdiu meditationi inſerviebat, atque unam ſilentio diſtribuebat horam* (40). The French tranſlator (41) hath rendred theſe Greek words thus: *He was ſo well pleaſed with a ſolitary life, that he ſpent the whole day in meditation; but commonly he allowed himſelf but one hour for relaxation.* This verſion ſeems to me to be good, tho' he doth not literaly follow the original. The Latin tranſlation is more literal, and leſs judicious; for it diſtinguiſhes betwixt the time when a Philoſopher meditates, and the time when he doth not ſpeak. What a diſtinction is this? Are thoſe who meditate obliged to ſpeak? Are they not commonly in a profound ſilence? But we ſhall ſee another place wherein the French tranſlator is groſsly miſtaken (42). Διῆγέ τε ἐν Ἀκαδεμίᾳ τὰ πλεῖστα· καὶ εἴποτε μέλλοι ἐς ἄστυ ἀνιέναι, φασὶ τοὺς θορυβώδεις πάντας καὶ προυνίκους ὑποστέλλειν αὐτοῦ τῇ παρόδῳ. *Vixit autem ut plurimum in Academia. Si quando verò ad urbem profecturus eſſet turbas omnes tumultuoſorum ac impudicorum ipſi tranſituro de via decedere ſolitas, ſunt qui tradant* (43). That is, according to Mr Fougerolles, *he ſpent the greateſt part of his life in the Academy, without ſcarce ever going out; but if by chance he went thence into the city, it is reported that ſome of the rabble followed him, and diſturbed him with their impudence and clamours.* This is perverting the Greek author's thought, and robbing Xenocrates of one of the brighteſt parts of his glory. The debauchees dreaded the ſight of ſuch a venerable man, and durſt not appear before a perſon of ſuch rigid morals. Is not this a great encomium on Xenocrates? Doth it not ſurpaſs what is ſaid of Cato, with reſpect to the Floral Games (44)? Add to this, that paſſage of Plutarch concerning the power of a bare look of this Philoſopher (45), and concerning what engaged the Athenians to depute him into Macedonia (46).

I muſt not forget what Plutarch ſaith, that Xenocrates did not come out of the Academy but once in a year, which he did to honour the feaſt (47), that is, to be preſent at the new tragedies which were acted during the feaſt of Bacchus.

[H] *They ſold him .... Demetrius Phalereus bought him .... immediately ſet him at liberty, and paid the debt to the Athenians.*] We find all theſe particulars in Diogenes Laërtius (48), and I am ſurprized that Plutarch doth not mention them, ſince he ſpeaks of an adventure ſomewhat like this. 'But we are told that Lycurgus, the Orator, one day ſeeing the farmers and 'receivers of taxes carrying Xenocrates, the Philoſopher, to priſon, for not paying a certain impoſt laid on 'ſtrangers inhabiting the city of Athens, wreſted him 'out of their hands; and beſides, ſo vigorouſly proſecuted them, that he obliged them to pay a fine for 'the injury done to a perſon of his merit; and that 'afterwards, the Philoſopher meeting Lycurgus's 'children in the city, told them: I have rewarded 'your father for the ſervice which he did me, for he 'is extolled every where for what he hath done to 'me (49).' This paſſage of Plutarch cannot prejudice antient Athens, for the ſeverities of the collectors of impoſts are not to be charged on a whole nation. They are a ſort of people who act upon maxims of their own, and ſuch as are not approved of, but rather deteſted: they are inexorable people, who have no regard to parts, virtue, or learning. There is no other way to get out of their hands, than paying down the money. And ſince the action of Lycurgus was applauded, this ſhews that the Athenians in general ought to be cleared upon this occaſion. But as the ſtory is told by Diogenes Laërtius, that nation cannot be acquitted. What! to permit that a Xenocrates, the honour and ornament of the Academy, ſhould be ſo poor as not to be able to pay the tax levied on ſtrangers, is a juſt reaſon of reproach; but to ſuffer him to loſe his liberty, becauſe he was poor to become a ſlave, and to be ſold by auction, like a Cappadocian, is an infamous ſcandal to the Athenians. Was no body ſo generous as to lend or give him the ſmall ſum, which this tax-gatherer demanded? They ſuffered him to run the utmoſt riſk of ſlavery, and to be actually ſold. How could they be ſure that he ſhould not be bought by ſome Slave-merchant, who might ſell him again to a Miller? As good luck would have it, an honeſt man, and a lover of learning, bought him, and ſet him at liberty. But he would have done much better, had he prevented his being ſold, by preſenting him with what would have ſatisfied the collectors. See what has been ſaid upon a parallel caſe (50).

Let us take notice of another paſſage related by Plutarch. 'Phocion .... perceiving that Xenocrates 'paid a certain tribute to the Republic, which was 'paid by all foreign inhabitants of Athens, would 'have procured him the freedom of that city, and en'rolled him amongſt the number of the citizens; but 'Xenocrates refuſed it, ſaying, that he would not have 'any ſhare in that freedom of citizens, to prevent 'which, he had been ſent Ambaſſador (51).' To unſtand this well, you muſt conſult the paſſage which I ſhall cite below (52), relating to the conditions which Antipater impoſed on the Athenians, when Phocion, Xenocrates, and ſome others, were ſent to him as Ambaſſadors from Athens.

[I] *This Philoſopher's Theology was very contemptible.*] He acknowledged no other gods than the ſeven planets, and the heaven of the fixed ſtars. This made eight Deities; each planet being a god, and all the ſtars together making but one. See how Cicero rejects this doctrine: 'Nec verò ejus (*Ariſtotelis*) condiſci'pulus Xenocrates in hoc genere prudentior eſt, cujus 'in libris, qui ſunt de naturâ Deorum, nulla ſpecies 'divina deſcribitur. Deos enim octo eſſe dicit: 'quinque eos, qui in ſtellis vagis nominantur: 'unum

(39) Plut. de Diſcrim. Adul. & Amici, *p.* 71.

(40) Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra, *num.* 11.

(41) Francis de Fougerolles, Doctor of Phyſic.

(42) *His miſtake is the ſame with that of Oliverius, in* Valer. Maximum, ubi ſupra, *where he ſays,* ſi quando ad urbem proficiſcebatur (*Xenocrates*) turba omnis impudicorum ejus tranſitum obſervabat, ejus inquietandi gratia.

(43) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 6.

(44) See, above, citation (8), of the firſt article FLORA.

(45) See the end of the foregoing remark.

(46) See, the remark [*L*], citation (67).

(47) Plut. de Exilio, *pag.* 603.

(48) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 14.

(49) Plut. in Vita Flaminii, *pag.* 375, 376. *He relates the ſame thing in the lives of the ten Orators, p.* 842.

(50) Above, in the article TYRANNION, remark [*C*].

(51) Plut. in Vita Phocion. *pag.* 755.

(52) In the remark [*L*], citation (67).

ſee below. He lived to the age of eighty-four, if we believe Lucian *(q)*. Others ſay he died in his eighty-ſecond year, having, through inadvertency, hit his forehead againſt a kettle in the night-time *(r)*. Some authors pretend that he lived one hundred and three years [*K*]. He had a ſhare in the friendſhip and eſteem of Alexander the Great *(s)*, and at

---

(q) Lucian. in Macrobiis, *pag. m.* 640, *Tom. ii, Oper.*

(r) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 14, 15.

(s) See, remark [*D*].

‘ unum, qui ex omnibus ſideribus, quæ infixa cœlo ſunt, ex diſperſis quaſi membris ſimplex ſit putandus Deus: ſeptimum ſolem adjungit, octavumque lunam, qui quo ſenſu beati eſſe poſſint, intelligi non poteſt (53). - - - *Nor was Xenocrates, Ariſtotle's condiſciple, more judicious in this reſpect: In his books of the nature of the gods, there is no account of a divine ſpecies. For he ſays there are eight gods, five of whom inhabit the planets, and bear their names; and one is compoſed of all the fixed ſtars, and is to be reckoned a pure and ſimple god, tho' made up of ſo many diſperſed members. He adds the ſun as the ſeventh, and the moon as the eighth. In what ſenſe theſe gods can be happy, it is impoſſible to underſtand.*' This opinion of Xenocrates will be found abſurd, not only if examined by the light of Revelation, but, even compared with the light of Nature; for without the aſſiſtance of the Bible, we conceive diſtinctly, that the idea of GOD is neither that of a ſpecies, nor of a genus, and conſequently cannot comprehend any thing under it but an individual Being. It is therefore acting againſt reaſon, to admit more than one Deity. It is another fault againſt reaſon, to acknowledge any gods compoſed of matter; this neceſſarily ſubjects them to imperfection, limits them with regard to place and power, and, in a word, diſtinguiſhes them from the moſt infirm creatures, barely by the difference of more or leſs. How great was the inconſiſtence of our Philoſopher? How unconſequentially he argues? He would have the moon a diſtinct deity from all the reſt; he ſaid the ſame thing of every planet, but not of each of the fixed ſtars, to which he allowed no other advantage than that of being parts of a Deity. The objection urged againſt him in the Latin paſſage which I have cited, is juſt, tho' perhaps he might have eluded it, by aſſerting that a planet is a god, in the ſame manner as Socrates is a reaſonable creature. He is not reaſonable as compoſed of fleſh and bone, *&c.* but as poſſeſſed of a ſoul which knows and reaſons. The ſun, for example, is not a deity, conſidered as compoſed of that luminous matter which imparts it's rays and heat to the earth; but as the ſeat of an intelligent power, which moves that vaſt body. What hinders this power from the enjoyment of pleaſure and felicity? This is what he might have anſwered to the objection; but it is a very ill reſolution of the point: for this intelligent power not being numerically the ſame with that of the other planets, will be fixed and centred in the ſun by a natural neceſſity; and conſequently, will depend on the matter of the ſun, and follow it's ſtate and alterations, like thoſe ſlaves called *ſerviglebæ*, or *glebæ aſcriptii*; - - - *ſlaves who were bought and ſold with the land.* We cannot conceive any real happineſs in ſuch a dependance. The doctrine of the ſoul of the world is not ſo repugnant to right reaſon as this is; it doth not divide the Deity into ſeveral individuums really ſeparated from each other.

(53) Cicero de Natura Deorum, *lib. i, cap. xiii.*

A Confutation of thoſe, who ſaid that each planet was a god.

Here is, I think, a contradiction in Xenocrates's doctrine. He took the planets to be gods, he therefore ſuppoſed the matter of them to be an eſſential part of the gods; for it would be abſurd to affirm, that Socrates is a man, and that the body of Socrates is not eſſential to that man. But, on the other ſide, Xenocrates admitted a diſtinction betwixt the gods and certain *genii*, which ſuppoſes that he did not believe matter to be a part of the ſubſtance of the gods. Was this arguing conſiſtently? Let us cite Plutarch, who obſerves (54), that *Pythagoras, Plato, Xenocrates, and Chryſippus, according to the opinions of the antient Divines, acknowledged that there were ſome great dæmons*, who were neither gods nor men, and who ‘ were ſtronger and more robuſt than men, and highly ſurmounted our nature in power; but had not the pure and unmixed Divinity, but were agents compounded of the corporeal and ſpiritual nature, capable of pleaſure and pain, and of other paſſions and affections which accompany thoſe mutations, diſcompoſing ſome more, others leſs; for there is a diverſity in vice and virtue, amongſt demons, as well as amongſt men . . . . . (55) Plato attributes to the olympic and celeſtial gods whatever is right and odd; and whatever is left and even, to the demons: and Xenocrates held, that the unfortunate days, and feaſts, wherein fighting, ſtriking of the ſtomach, faſting or any ſcandalous or baſe cuſtom obtains, do not appertain to the good gods, or good demons; but that there are in the air ſome great and mighty beings, but malicious and ill-natured, who find ſuch things done on their account pleaſant to them, and when they have obtained them, they ceaſe to do any more evil to the perſons.' A commentator on Cicero, hath made a note on this opinion of Xenocrates. He ſaith that the evil angels may be well pleaſed with the obſcene diſcourſes of men, and that if any thing was capable to appeaſe them, it were thoſe diſcourſes; but that faſts, macerations, and flagellations, with which the penitents labour to expiate their faults, infinitely diſpleaſe thoſe unfortunate *genii*: *Longe fallitur Xenocrates, cùm miſeros illos Genios mortalium planctu, verberibus, jejuniis, aliiſque id genus corporis afflictationibus delectari putat: nihil enim perinde averſantur, atque oderunt, ut voluntaria, & ſancta ejuſmodi ſupplicia, quibus debita flagitiis exolvitur pœna, ac Divinæ Nemeſis placatur. At ſi quo modo leniri poſſent hoſtes crudeliſſimi, non dubium quin malè ominoſis obſcœniſque vocibus, quæ impuriſſimorum Geniorum pollutas ad aures jucundiſſimæ ſemper accidunt, ſinerent ſe mulceri* (56). I do not know where the French tranſlator of Diogenes Laërtius took the following words: ‘ Xenocrates . . . . . compared the nature of triangles with that of intelligences: for, ſaid he, the Divine Nature is like an equilateral triangle, the nature of man like a triangle, whoſe ſides are all unequal; and that of demons, like a triangle, with one ſide unequal, and the other two equal (57).'

(54) Plut. de Iſide & Oſiride, *pag.* 360.

(55) Id. ibid. *pag.* 361.

(56) Leſcaloperius, in Ciceron, de Nat. Deor. *lib. i, pag.* 57, *col.* 1.

(57) Fougerolles, Additions to the life of Xenocrates, in Diogenes Laërtius, *pag.* 260. Note that he adds, ‘ he calculated the number of ſyllables, which the Greek letters can make by their combinations and tranſpoſitions, which amounts to 100200000, I do not know where the tranſlator had read this.

I omit Xenocrates's aſſertion, that the ſoul is a ſelf-moving number (58). Several illuſtrious perſons approved of this definition (59); but I cannot tell whether we can any way underſtand it at this time: for, I believe, the Greeks annexed to the word *ἀριθμὸς*, an idea which we do not fix to the word *number*; and that from thence may ariſe the obſcurity which we find in this definition of the ſoul.

Let us obſerve that the Dominican Doctor who wrote a letter to Father le Comte, concerning the Chineſe ceremonies, was not well informed of the doctrine of Xenocrates; for after having ſpoken of the Philoſophers who admitted no more *than one GOD, whom they acknowledged to be the principle and author of all beings, a ſpirit diffuſed throughout, who governed all things* . . . . A pure ſpirit, the love and enjoyment of which rendred man happy; he adds, that ‘ Xenocrates, Heraclides, and Theophraſtus, Ariſtotle's diſciples, had the ſame ſentiments of the Deity (60).' And yet theſe are the three Philoſophers whom Cicero ranks together (61), when he refutes the erroneous opinions concerning the nature of GOD. I would fain know why they are all three put together as orthodox in this Doctor's letter. Remember that the two former were not Ariſtotle's diſciples.

(58) Plut. de procreat. Animæ, *p.* 1012.

(59) Id. ibid.

(60) Lettre d'un Docteur de l'Ordre de S. Dominique, ſur les Cérémonies Chinoiſes, *p.* 17. Cologne, 1700.

(61) Cicero, ubi ſupra.

[*K*] . . . . *pretend that he lived one hundred and three years.*] Meurſius maintained this opinion. His reaſons are theſe: Xenocrates was born in the firſt year of XCIſt Olympiad. He began to teach in the ſecond year of the CXth Olympiad, and taught twenty-five years; he muſt therefore have died in the ſecond year of the CXVIth Olympiad, at the age of one hundred and two (62). This is Meurſius's concluſion in the ninth chapter of the third book of the Athenian Archontes. But in the twelfth chapter of the fourth book, he computes his life at one hundred and three years, and founds his calculation on the ſame facts. He is in the right to conclude, that Xenocrates died in third year of the CXVIth Olympiad, and reckons better than he did before; but betwixt that year and the firſt of the XCIſt Olympiad, he ought to have found

(62) Meurſius, de Arch. Athen. *lib. iii, cap. ix, pag.* 113, 114.

at his requeſt wrote a treatiſe of the art of reigning (*t*). He was ſent Ambaſſador more than once [*L*]. It muſt not be forgotten, that, according to his opinion, the true Philoſophers are the only perſons who do chearfully, and of their own accord, what others are moved to do by the fear of the Laws (*u*), and that caſting an eye on one's neighbour's houſe, is as great a ſin as ſetting foot into it (*x*). This laſt thought condemns the coveting of another's goods, and a prying humour. He had a good maxim for the education of children [*M*]. He is praiſed for not being diſcouraged in the courſe of his ſtudies by the ſlowneſs of his capacity [*N*].

found no more than one hundred and two years. Let us come to the main point. I think we ought not to rely, as he hath done, on the authority of the anonymous author, who deſcribed the Olympiads, and placed the birth of Xenocrates in the firſt year of the XCIſt Olympiad. I have two reaſons for believing that he is miſtaken. The firſt is, that Xenocrates was very young when he became Plato's diſciple (63). But Plato being advanced in years when he began to teach, it could not be poſſible for Xenocrates to enter his ſchool very young, if he was born in the firſt year of the XCIſt Olympiad, for he would not have been above twelve years younger than Plato. In the ſecond place, I obſerve that he was deputed to Antipater, in the ſecond year of the CXIVth Olympiad (64): at that time he muſt have been ninety-three years of age, according to the computation of the anonymous author. But it is not eaſy to imagine, that the authors who mentioned this embaſſy, ſhould have taken no notice of the extraordinary age of the Ambaſſador.

[*L*] *He was ſent Ambaſſador more than once.*] I have already ſaid (65), that he was one of the Ambaſſadors whom the Republic of Athens ſent to King Philip, the father of Alexander the Great. 'Being alſo ſent on an embaſſy to Antipater, for the deliverance of the priſoners of war taken at the battle of Lamia, he was by that Prince invited to ſupper, to whom he anſwered in the following words:

O Circe *, _thy allurements tempt in vain_
The man whoſe virtue prudent thoughts ſuſtain;
For who can come with pleaſure to a feaſt,
Before he ſee his captive friends releas'd.

'Intimating by theſe words, that he would never eat till he obtained his requeſt, meaning the liberty of his captive citizens and friends. The King perceiving the addreſs of the man, freely condeſcended to his ſuit, and immediately ſet the priſoners free (66).' Antipater was not ſo juſt in the following juncture. He exacted from the Athenians that they *ſhould ſend him full power to act as he ſhould think fit, and refer the conditions of the treaty* of peace to his pleaſure. 'They ſent to him Phocion, with other Ambaſſadors, and amongſt the reſt Xenocrates the Philoſopher, whoſe reputation for prudence and wiſdom was ſo great and univerſal, that they ſaid, no man could be ſo arrogant, ſo cruel, or paſſionate, but that the mien and aſpect of Xenocrates would ſoften him, and even inſpire him with reverence and reſpect. Notwithſtanding this, ſuch was the malignity of the nature of Antipater, who was an enemy to virtue, that the contrary happened: for at firſt when he embraced all the reſt of his companions, he paſſed by Xenocrates, not vouchſafing to take any notice of him: upon this occaſion Xenocrates ſaid, Antipater may well be aſhamed to ſee me a witneſs of the ill-uſage he would give the Athenians. Afterwards when he began to ſpeak, Antipater had not patience to hear him, but thwarted and interrupted him on every ſubject, and at laſt enjoined him ſilence: but when Phocion had declared the purport of their embaſſy, he replied, that he would make a peace and alliance with the Athenians, provided they would deliver up to him Demoſthenes and Hyperides, and govern their Republic, according to the antient form of government inſtituted by their anceſtors; according to which, none but people of fortune were admitted into public employments, *&c.* . . . All the Ambaſſadors, except Xenocrates, were content with, and accepted, theſe conditions as mild and indulgent, but Xenocrates ſaid, that if the Athenians were ſlaves, Antipater treated them mildly enough; but if a free people he treated them too harſhly (67).'

Some will think, perhaps, that Antipater uſed Xenocrates ſo roughly, in order to revenge the incivility with which this Philoſopher had received him. We are told (68), that going to Athens he made a viſit to Xenocrates, who would not vouchſafe to interrupt his lecture, and made him no anſwer before he had finiſhed it. But as every body knew that this Philoſopher affected not to appear a courtier, and that the eſteem which the world had for him was founded on his Philoſophical gravity, it is not at all probable that Antipater ſhould have taken it amiſs that he was received in ſuch a manner.

[*M*] *He had a good maxim for the education of children.*] 'He was of opinion, that children rather ought to have a defence fitted to their ears, than fencers, or prize-fighters; becauſe the ears only of the latter ſuffered by the blows, but the morals of the former were hurt and corrupted by words. Not that he thereby recommended deafneſs, or forbad that they ſhould be ſuffered to hear at all; but he adviſed them not to liſten to wicked diſcourſe, that debauchery might be kept out, till better principles (like ſo many guardians appointed by Philoſophy) had taken charge of that part, which is ſo liable to be drawn aſide and corrupted by diſcourſe (69).' Plutarch greatly approves of this advice (70).

[*N*] *He is praiſed for not being diſcouraged in the courſe of his ſtudies by the ſlowneſs of his capacity.*] Plutarch made uſe of this example to encourage thoſe of ſlow parts. 'Let us bear with patience the jeſts of thoſe who are, or who fancy they are, more lively and quick of apprehenſion than we. This courſe was taken by Cleanthes and Xenocrates, who being ſomewhat duller than their ſchool-fellows, did not however give over learning nor deſpond; but prevented the jeſts of others, by comparing themſelves to narrow-mouthed veſſels and copper-plates; becauſe, though they received learning with difficulty, yet they retained it ſurely (71).' One of theſe two compariſons hath been employed in one of Moliere's Comedies (72).

(*t*) Plut. adv. Colot. *circa fin. pag.* 1126.

(*u*) Plut. de Virtute morali, *pag.* 446.

(*x*) Plut. de Curioſit. *pag.* 521. *See alſo* Ælian. Var. Hiſtor. *lib. xiv, cap. xlii.*

(63) Ἐκ νέȣ Πλάτωνος ἤκȣσε. A primis ferme annis Platonis auditor fuit. *Diogen. Laërt. lib. iv, num. vi.*

(64) See the following remark.

(65) In remark [*D*].

* Some verſes of Homer in the xth book of the Odyſſey.

(66) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 9, 10.

(67) Plut. in Vita Phocion. *pag.* 753.

(68) Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra, *num.* 11.

(69) Plut. de auditione, *init. pag.* 38.

(70) Compare with this what is above in remark [*G*], of the article LYCURGUS.

(71) Plut. de auditione, *pag.* 47.

(72) See, above, remark [*E*], of the article ERASMUS.

XENOPHANES, a Greek Philoſopher, born at Colophon, was a diſciple of Archelaus, as ſome ſay (*a*). According to this account, he ſhould have been cotemporary with Socrates (*b*). Others will have it that he learned of himſelf all that he knew (*c*), and lived at the ſame time with Anaximander (*d*). According to this account, he muſt have flouriſhed before Socrates, and about the LXth Olympiad, as Diogenes Laërtius affirms (*e*). He lived very long; for ſome verſes are cited in which he declares, 1. That his ſtudies had been applauded in Greece ſixty-ſeven years: 2. That he began to meet with applauſe at the age of twenty-five (*f*) [*A*]. He wrote ſeveral poems on Philoſophical

[*A*] *He lived very long; for ſome verſes are cited,* &c.] It appears by thoſe verſes that he was ninety-two years old when he made them; and as we have no reaſon for believing that he died in a ſhort time after, we may hence the more certainly know the error of Lucian, who allows him to have lived no longer than ninety-one years (1). Cenſorinus beſtows on him above one hundred years (2). Scaliger is inclined

---

(*a*) Diogen. Laërtius, *lib. ix, num.* 18.

(*b*) He was a diſciple of Archelaus.

(*c*) Diog. Laert. ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) Id. ibid. *num.* 20. *See remark* [*A*].

(*f*) Laërtius, ibid. *num.* 19.

(1) Lucianus, in Macrobiis, *pag. m.* 640, *Tom. ii, Oper.*

(2) *See* Scaliger, in Euſeb. *pag. m.* 96.

Philoſophical ſubjects: beſides two thouſand on the foundation of Colophon (*g*), and on that of the Colony of Elea (*h*). His opinion concerning the nature of God, is very little different from Spinoziſm [*B*]. He wrote ſome verſes againſt Homer and Heſiod (*i*), on the idle ſtories which they ſung of the gods. He held a maxim which entirely overturned

(*g*) Idem, ibid. *num.* 20. *Note, that Moreri reduces all the verſes of Xenophanes to that number. Athenæus often quotes verſes of that Philoſopher.* (*h*) A town in Italy. (*i*) Diog. Laërtius, ibid. *num.* 18. *See* Sext. Empiricus adv. Math. *pag.* 57, 341.

clined to believe that he lived at leaſt one hundred and four years (3). From this long life we may reconcile thoſe who make him flouriſh in the LVIth Olympiad (4), or the LXth (5); and thoſe who place him under the XLth Olympiad (6); for we may ſuppoſe that the latter do not point out the time when he flouriſhed, but that of his birth. Obſerve, that even on this ſuppoſition, it is not poſſible to reconcile them with thoſe, who tell us that he lived till the time when the Perſians were driven out of Greece. We have ſtill ſome verſes where it is pretended that he mentions their flight. Athenæus quotes them (7). If you underſtand by this the time when they loſt the battle of Marathon, it was in the LXXIId Olympiad. If you underſtand the battle of Salamis, or that of Platæa, it was the LXXVth Olympiad. Suppoſe in the next place, not with Caſaubon, that he made theſe verſes fifteen or twenty years after the defeat of the Perſians (8), but the very year of that great event, and you will find it impoſſible for him to have been born in the XLth Olympiad, ſince in that caſe it muſt be ſaid that he lived at leaſt 126 years. What ſhall we then think of a paſſage of Clemens Alexandrinus, which informs us that he was born in the XLth Olympiad, and lived to the time of Darius? Τῆς Ελεατικῆς ἀγωγῆς, Ξενοφάνης ὁ Κολοφώνιος κατάρχει. ὅν φησι Τίμαιος κατὰ Ἱέρωνα τὸν Σικελίας δυνάστην, καὶ Επίχαρμον τὸν ποιητὴν, γεγονέναι. Απολλόδωρος δὲ, κατὰ τὴν τεσσαρακοστὴν Ολυμπιάδα γενόμενον, παρατετακέναι ἄχει τῶν Δαρείου τε καὶ Κύρου χρόνων: Eleaticæ diſciplinæ princeps fuit Xenophanes Colophonius, quem dicit Timæus fuiſſe tempore Hieronis, qui in Sicilia obtinuit dominatum, & Epicharmi Poetæ. Apollodorus autem eum, cùm natus eſſet quadrageſimâ Olympiade, perveniſſe uſque ad tempora Darii & Cyri (9). - - - *Xenophanes of Colophon was the head of the Eleatic Philoſophy: Timæus affirms, that he lived in the time of Hiero, who reigned in Sicily, and of the Poet Epicharmus. But Apollodorus ſays that he was born in the XLth Olympiad, and lived down to the times of Darius and Cyrus.* Muſt we believe that an error crept into the Greek text, and that inſtead of Δαρείου we ought to read Κροίσου? My anſwer is, there is no neceſſity to ſuppoſe it. For a life of one hundred years, which is allowed to Xenophanes, is ſufficient to fill up the ſpace betwixt the XLth Olympiad and the LXVth, which was the beginning of Darius's reign. I do not deny that it is a little ſtrange to ſee, that ſo good an author as Apollodorus, ſhould ſay that Xenophanes lived to the time of Darius and Cyrus. It would have been much more regular to have ſaid *to the time of Cyrus and Darius*, as Mr Menage obſerves (10). Beſides, it is certain that in pointing out the times, the Antients uſually joined Crœſus and Cyrus together, which ſerves to ſupport the correction I have mentioned; but at the bottom there is neither any abſurdity nor any falſity in Apollodorus's opinion, that Xenophanes lived from the XLth Olympiad till the time of Darius. Yet I ſhould rather chooſe to place his birth much lower, ſince, according to Timæus (11), he flouriſhed in the time of Hiero, who did not begin to reign before the LXXVIth Olympiad. I ſhall obſerve by the way, that I take their opinion to be ill founded, who ſay that he was a Diſciple of Archelaus. This is Lucian's opinion (12).

[*B*] *His opinion concerning the nature of God, is very little different from Spinoziſm.*] If we had all his works, we ſhould be much better able to give a preciſe and diſtinct account of his ſyſtem: and if we knew his opinions only by ſome ſmall and very obſcure fragments cited by Cicero, it were impoſſible to avoid confuſion: ‘ Xenophanes qui mente adjuncta ‘ omne præterea quod eſſet infinitum Deum voluit eſſe, ‘ de ipſa mente item reprehenditur ut cæteri: de infi‘nitate autem vehementius, in qua nihil neque ſentiens ‘ neque conjunctum eſſe poteſt (13). - - - - *Xenophanes,* ‘ *who was of opinion that God is all that is infinite united* ‘ *with a mind, is likewiſe refuted with the reſt, as to that* ‘ *mind. But he is yet more abſurd with regard to infinity,* ‘ *in which there can be nothing that has any ſenſation or con*‘*junction.*’ Theſe words of Cicero ſhew that Xenophanes taught that the intellect is God, and that all that is infinite is God. As for the firſt part of this doctrine, Cicero forbears the repetition of what he had ſaid before to refute thoſe who held the Divinity of the intellect; he ſuppoſes that the ſame refutation falls alſo upon this firſt point of the opinion of Xenophanes. With regard to the ſecond part, he advances what he thinks capable of refuting it; for he obſerves, that infinity, as it contains nothing that has any ſenſation or conjunction, cannot be God. I ſhall not examine the weak ſide of this argument, it being wholly unneceſſary: Every body will clearly apprehend that ſince there is ſomething cogitative, connected with finite extenſion, as in man, ſuch things alſo are not incompatible with an infinite extent. I might eaſily believe that Cicero did not apprehend the opinion he mentions; he divides it into two parts, when perhaps it ought not to be divided. It is more probable that Xenophanes meant, that God was nothing but the infinity of nature, accompanied with an intellect. ‘ Xenophanem notum eſt om‘ne infinitum cum mente, Deum tradere (14). - - - - ‘ *It is known that Xenophanes affirmed that God was all* ‘ *that is infinite, accompanied with a mind.*’ It would be a very ſtrange doctrine to aſſert, on one hand, that every infinite is God; and, on the other, that the human intellect is God: this would be multiplying the Deity in a diſcordant manner, and erring inconſiſtently. I very well know that the antient Philoſophers do not appear to us exact, in the fragments we have of their opinions concerning the principles of all things: but what particularly obliges me to believe that Xenophanes did not make that diviſion aſcribed to him, is, that even according to the teſtimony of Cicero, he taught that there was but one ſole Being, and that this Being was immutable, eternal, and the true God: (15) *Xenophanes paulo etiam antiquior unum eſſe omnia, neque id eſſe mutabile & id eſſe verum Deum, neque natum uſquam quicquam & ſempiternum conglobata figura* (16). This is more diſtinct than what Ariſtotle relates of Xenophanes's opinion. Ξενοφάνης δὲ πρῶτος τούτων ἑνίσας (ὁ γὰρ Παρμενίδης τούτου λέγεται μαθητὴς) οὐδὲν διεσαφήνισεν, οὐδὲ τῆς φύσεως τούτων οὐδετέρας ἔοικε θίγειν. ἀλλ᾽ εἰς τὸν ὅλον οὐρανὸν ἀποβλέψας, τὸ ἓν εἶναί φησι τὸν θεόν. *Xenophanes autem, quanquam prior iſtis, unum poſuerat, (nam Parmenides ejus auditor fuiſſe dicitur) nihil tamen clarum dixit, & neutrius horum naturam attigiſſe videtur: ſed ad totum cœlum reſpiciens, ipſum unum ait eſſe Deum* (17). Theſe words of Ariſtotle inform us, that Xenophanes took up with confuſed notions, and that he did not examine in particular whether unity belonged to the Deity, with reſpect to the intellect, or with reſpect to matter, and that he aſſerted in general, *what is One is God.* Others ſay he maintained that nature had no beginning, and ſhall have no end, and that ſhe is always like her ſelf; but that he ſpoke of the gods in the plural number. Οὔτε γένεσιν, οὔτε φθορὰν ἀπολείπει· ἀλλ᾽ εἶναι λέγει τὸ πᾶν ἀεὶ ὅμοιον. *Nullum penitus vel ortum vel interitum relinquit, ſui ſemper ſimile hoc univerſum eſſe ratus* (18). It is true he rejected the common opinion, that the gods ſtood in need of, and gave commands to one another (19). Dependance ſeemed to him incompatible with the Divine Nature. He added, that the gods ſaw and heard in general, but not particularly this or that thing. Thus I would underſtand theſe words of Euſebius, ἀκούειν δὲ καὶ ὁρᾷν καθόλου καὶ μὴ κατὰ μέρος, *in univerſum audire ac cernere, non verò per partes* (20). This ſavours of Spinoziſm; for Spinoza affirmed that God, as a ſubſtance, is barely endued with thought in general, and that the particular knowledge of every object does not unite in one ſole mind, in order to repreſent all things to the ſubſtance of God. I own it may be pretended that Xenophanes

(3) Scaliger, ibid.

(4) Euſeb. in Chron. *pag. m.* 127.

(5) Id. ibid. *pag.* 128. Diogen. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 20.

(6) Sext. Empir. adverſ. Mathem. *pag.* 51.

(7) Athen. *lib. ii, cap. xiii, pag.* 54.

(8) Caſaub. in Athen. *pag.* 110.

(9) Clem. Alexandr. Strom. *lib. i, p.* 301, C.

(10) Menag. in Diog. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 20.

(11) See, above, citat. (9).

(12) Lucian. ubi ſupra.

(13) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, *lib. i, cap. xi.*

(14) Theſe words of Minucius Felix, *pag. m.* 151, favour my opinion. Some Philoſophers deprived God of an intellect. See the article SPINOZA, remark [*A*].

(15) Cicero, Academic. Quæſtion. *lib. ii, cap. xxxvii.*

(16) *Conſult* Sextus Empericus, Pyrrhon. Hypotyp. *lib. i, cap. xxxiii.*

(17) Ariſtoteles, Metaphyſ. *lib. i, cap. v, pag. m.* 648, *E. Note, that another tract of Ariſtotle, which I quote in the remark* [*K*], *informs us much better of the whole ſyſtem of Xenophanes.*

(18) Euſeb. de Præparat. Evangel. *lib. i, cap. viii, pag.* 23, *ex* Plutarchi Stromatis.

(19) Euſeb. ibid.

(20) Ibid.

turned the Pagan religion; viz. that it is not leſs impious to aſſert that the gods were born than to affirm that they die, ſince in either caſe it would be equally true that their exiſtence is not eternal (*k*). This maxim is very true and not at all contrary to the doctrine

(*k*) Οἷον Ξενοφάνης ἔλεγεν ὅτι ὁμοίως ἀσεβȣ̃σιν οἱ γενέσθαι φασκοντες τȣ̀ς θεȣ̀ς τοῖς ἀποθανεῖν λέγȣσιν. ἀμφοτέρως γὰρ συμβαίνει μὴ εἶναι ϖοτε τȣ̀ς θεȣ́ς. Ut Xenophanes dicebat ſimiliter eſſe impios qui naſci affirmant Deos, & qui mori dicunt. Utroque enim modo contingit, ut non ſint aliquando Dii. *Ariſtot. Rhetor. lib. ii, cap. xxiii, pag.* 446, *B.*

nophanes meant, that by a ſingle act of the mind God ſees all things, and not every one of them by a particular idea. He might explain himſelf if he was to return into the world: he would not be a little puzzled to remove the difficulties propoſed to him concerning his contradictions, and inconſiſtencies. He admitted an infinity of invariable worlds, and four elements of all things (21). But to what purpoſe is this infinity of worlds, ſince he taught that all things were but one being, and that this ſole and only being was God? Was not this ſpeaking of the world, like the people who call America the new world, and who give the name of world to mankind, and in France even to a great Lord's footmen, *&c* (22). He aſſerted that God was of a round figure, and yet made him infinite (23). He ſaid that God did not in any thing reſemble man, and that he heard and ſaw all things without reſpiration (24). A fine exception indeed! Was it neceſſary to expreſs it? If the Deity hath nothing common with men, is it not evident, that he has no lungs and doth not breathe? Why did he not alſo at the ſame time except the eyes, the ears, and the face, *&c.* as well as the act of reſpiration? Xenophanes ſpoke more properly in the verſes which Clemens Alexandrinus cites (25), for he ſaid no more there than that God is not like man either in body or ſoul; and that if brutes could paint, they would repreſent the Deity in the ſhape of their own ſpecies. He continually returned to his unity. Σύμπαντά τε εἶναι, νȣ̃ν καὶ φρόνησεν, καὶ ἀΐδιον, ſimulque (*Deum*) eſſe OMNIA, mentem, prudentiam, æternitatem (26). *That God is* ALL, *a mind, prudence, eternity.* The whole Eleatic ſect alſo believed the unity of all things (27), and the immobility of all things (28). And perhaps I ſhould not be miſtaken, if I ſhould venture to ſay, that from thence aroſe the doctrine ſo much extolled by the Sceptics, I mean, that our ſenſes deceive us, and that we ought not to rely on their evidence. For when it was objected againſt thoſe Philoſophers that new generations continually happen in the world; which ſuppoſes that there are two principles, one active and the other paſſive, or at leaſt that the ſole ſubſtance of nature is not immutable; they found no better expedient to ſolve this difficulty, than to deny that there was any generation. They were therefore obliged to aſſert, that nature continues always the ſame, and that the alterations which we believe ſhe undergoes are nothing but meer illuſions of our ſenſes, and meer appearances. Euſebius informs us that Parmenides taught, that the univerſe being eternal and immovable, and one ſole being, remained always the ſame with regard to the reality of things, and that the generations were only founded on a falſe judgment of the ſenſes (29): Ἀΐδιον μὲν γὰρ τὸ ϖᾶν, καὶ ἀκίνητον ἀποφαίνεται, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν ϖραγμάτων ἀλήθειαν. εἶναι γὰρ αὐτὸ μόνον. μȣνογενές τε καὶ ἀτρεμὲς, ἠδ᾽ ἀγένητον. γένεσιν δὲ τῶν καθ᾽ ὑπόληψιν ψευδῆ δοκȣ́ντων εἶναι. καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας. *Etenim ſempiternum eſſe orbem hunc univerſum, omnique motu carere; ipſiuſque naturæ veritatem omnino conſtare defendit* (30); *ſingularem enim illum & unigenam, ſtabilem ac quietum, nec certo aliquo tempore generatum eſſe: Generationem porro ad ea rejicit, quæ falſa quadam opinione putentur eſſe, adeoque ſenſus omnes communione veritatis excludit.* Let us alſo conſult the ſame Euſebius, if we would ſee thoſe Philoſophers driven from this ſubterfuge. Ariſtotle clearly evinced to theſe defenders of immutability, or ingenerability, that the refuge which they had choſen betrayed them; for ſince they durſt not deny the mutation of appearances, that is, that we do feel the earth at one time cold, and hot at another, it follows that nature is not immovable; and that ſhe muſt of neceſſity change in the ſubject which produces, or receives our ſenſations. Perception is paſſive, and therefore the alteration of it ſuppoſes an efficient cauſe and a paſſive principle: and thus your unity of all things is overturned. Beſides, this alteration is incompatible with your pretended immobility, or incorruptibility. Ὥςε ϖρῶτον εἴη ἂν τὸ λεγόμενον ἕτερον. . . . . ἔπειτα δὲ ἓν τὸ ὂν ȣ̓κ ἔςαι καὶ μὴν ȣ̓δὲ ἀκίνητον. ἡ γὰρ αἴσθησίς ἐςι κίνησις. *Habemus ergo primum id eſſe, quod diverſum vocatur . . . . deinde quicquid eſt, non eſſe, quid unum. Adde ne immobile quidem illud eſſe, cum ipſa ſentiendi ratio motus quidam ſit* (31). I ſhall return again to this ſubject in the remark [*K*].

I ſhall obſerve by the way that there is a great deal of probability that the author of the *Art of Thinking* cenſures Ariſtotle unjuſtly in favour of Parmenides. 'It were to be wiſhed, ſaith he (32), that Ariſtotle, who took care to acquaint us of this ſophiſm (33), had taken as great care to avoid it. For it is too evident that he hath attacked ſeveral antient Philoſophers, by citing their opinions not very fairly. He refutes Parmenides and Meliſſus, for having admitted but one principle of all things, as if they had meant the principle of which they are compoſed, whereas they meant, the ſole and only principle from which all things derive their original, which is GOD.' The author of the *Art of Thinking* does Parmenides and Meliſſus more honour than they deſerve. He repreſents their opinions concerning the origin of created beings as orthodox; and yet they are as impious as thoſe of Spinoza, or very nearly ſo: theſe Philoſophers acknowledged no difference betwixt the principle of which all things are compoſed, and that which produced them. They admitted but one ſole Being, and pretended that all things were eternal. This is what is imputed to them in Euſebius, as we have ſeen above. Ariſtotle doth not charge them with all this in every reſpect: he owns that Permenides teaching on one ſide that in reality there is but one Being; and, on the other ſide, that according to appearance, there are ſeveral Beings, accommodated himſelf to appearance, and ſuppoſed two other principles, which are heat and cold, fire and earth: Ἀναγκαζόμενος δ᾽ ἀκολȣθεῖν τοῖς φαινομένοις, καὶ τὸ ἓν μὲν κατὰ λόγον, ϖλείω δὲ κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν ὑπολαμβάνων εἶναι, δύο τὰς αἰτίας, καὶ δύο τὰς ἀρχὰς τίθησι ϖάλιν, θερμὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν, οἷον ϖῦρ καὶ γῆν λέγων. Τȣ́των δὲ τὸ μὲν, &c. *Coactus vero illa, quæ apparent, ſequi, & unum ratione, plura verò ſecundum ſenſum putans eſſe, duas cauſas rurſum, ac duo principia ponit, calidum, & frigidum, velut ignem & terram dicens. Horum autem alterum, &c* (34). It is hard to apprehend by what turn of thought, ſuch a great number of the antient Philoſophers could believe that there is but one ſubſtance in the univerſe (35). But it is very eaſy to apprehend that this being granted, they were then obliged to aſſert that the univerſe perpetually continues in the ſame ſtate: for a being which neceſſarily exiſts, and which alone is all things, muſt of neceſſity be perfectly immovable. No external cauſe can change it, nor can it alter itſelf. It hath, independently on it's own will, both it's exiſtence and all the attributes of it's nature. Whatever it hath once, it ought to poſſeſs continually; for what had no beginning is not liable to deſtruction. This alſo proves that it cannot acquire any thing new, ſince the production of one new quality would be the deſtruction of ſome other (36). Thus far the ſyſtem of Xenophanes and Parmenides was well ſupported. But as experience convinced them that changes do happen in nature, ſuch as muſt be internal and effectual with regard to our thoughts, even tho' ſuch changes were ſuppoſed to be meer illuſions of the ſenſes, theſe Philoſophers ſhould have acknowledged that they had built upon a falſe ſuppoſition, and ſhould have admitted two principles, one active and the other paſſive. This being granted, we may believe that the active principle remains always in the ſame ſtate amidſt the continual variations of nature (37). It's uniform and invariable action impreſſed on different ſubjects, muſt neceſſarily produce all the viciſſitudes in the world. Do not we ſee that the motion of the air, without altering in itſelf, produces different effects,

(21) Diog. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 19.

(22) See Furetiere's Dictionary at the word *Monde*.

(23) Diog. Laërt. ibid.

(24) Id. ibid.

(25) Clem. Alexandr. Strom. *lib. v, pag.* 601, & *ex eo* Euſebius, ubi ſupra, *lib. xiii, cap. xiii, gap.* 678, 679.

(26) Laërt. ubi ſupra. *See alſo* Euſebius, ibid. *lib. xiv, cap. xiv, p.* 725, *B.*

(27 Euſeb. ibid.

(28) Idem, *lib. xiv, cap. xvii.*

(29) Euſebius, ubi ſupra, *lib. i, cap. viii, pag.* 23. C, *ex* Plutarcho.

(30) *This paſſage ſeems to be ill tranſlated: I had rather ſay:* motu carere ſecundum rerum veritatem, *or* ſecundum id quod revera eſt: *and perhaps* καὶ *after* ἀποφαίνεται, *ſhould be left out, ſince it is certain the author means that motion does not really exiſt, but only according to appearance or the deluſion of the ſenſes.*

(31) Euſeb. de ubi ſupra, *lib. xiv, cap. xvii, pag.* 756, *D. ex lib. viii,* Ariſtotelis de Philoſophia.

(32) Art. de penſer, *Part. iii, ch. xviii, pag. m.* 316.

(33) That is, the ſophiſm called *ignoratio elenchi*, to prove a different thing from that in queſtion.

(34) Ariſtoteles, Metaphyſicæ, *lib. i, cap. v, pag.* 648. *F. See alſo cap. iii.*

(35) I think they were led into ſuch an opinion by this ſuppoſition, that ſince nothing can be produced out of nothing, whatever exiſts has a neceſſary exiſtence, and is therefore eternal and infinite, and that infinite can be but one.

(36) From hence we may draw a ſtrong proof that our ſouls and matter are not uncreated beings. See the remark [*K*].

(37) Stabiliſque manens dat cuncta moveri. *Boët, Conſolat. Philoſ. lib. iii, Metro ix.*

doctrine of the Incarnation. He believed that the Moon is an inhabited country [*C*], and that it is impoſſible to predict future events (*l*); and if the conjecture of a learned Critic is well grounded, he aſſerted that there is in nature more good than evil [*D*]. He would

effects, according as it meets with a wind-mill, a ſhip, ſcattered ſtraw, or a heap of leaves, *&c?*

[*C*] *He believed that the Moon is an inhabited country.*] Cicero informs us of this; and he is not the only author, who aſcribes this opinion to him. ‘Habitari ait Xenophanes in Luna, eamque eſſe terram multarum urbium & montium (38). --- *Xenophanes ſays that the moon is inhabited, and a country having ſeveral towns and mountains in it.*’ Lactantius greatly ridicules this opinion, and repreſents Xenophanes believing, not that the ſurface of the moon was inhabited, but that it contained within it's boſom an earth, peopled with a race of men. He juſtly blames him for having aſſerted that this planet is eighteen times bigger than the earth: ‘Xenophanes dicentibus mathematicis orbem lunæ duodeviginti partibus majorem eſſe, quam terram, ſtultiſſime credidit: & quod huic levitati fuit conſentaneum, dixit, intra concavum lunæ ſinum eſſe aliam terram, & ibi aliud genus hominum ſimili modo vivere, quo nos in hac terra vivimus. Habent igitur illi lunatici homines alteram lunam, quæ illis nocturnum lumen exhibeat, ſicut hæc exhibet nobis. Et fortaſſe noſter hic orbis alterius inferioris terræ luna ſit (39). ---- *Xenophanes was fooliſh enough to believe the Mathematicians, when they ſaid that the moon's orb is eighteen times greater than the earth: and, what was conſiſtent with this credulity, he ſaid that the moon contained in it's boſom another earth, inhabited by a race of men, who live in the ſame manner, as we do here. So theſe men in the moon have another moon to enlighten them in the night, as theirs enlightens us, and, perhaps, this globe of ours is a moon to that other earth.*’ I would not engage that he has rightly underſtood this Philoſopher's opinion; but ſeveral very great men of theſe latter ages would laugh at him for making a jeſt of it. This opinion of Xenophanes does him honour: it is the opinion of ſeveral famous Mathematicians. See what Dr Wilkins, Biſhop of Cheſter (40), ſaith on this head. His treatiſe of the *World in the Moon* was tranſlated into French, by the Sieur de la Montagne, and printed at Rouën, in the year 1656, in 8vo. See alſo Mr Huygen's *Coſmotheoros.* Mr Baſnage de Bauval gave us an extract of it in his Journal for the month of May 1698. For the reſt, the opinions of Xenophanes, concerning the motion of the ſun and moon, and concerning the cauſe of eclipſes, are very pitiful. He ſays that ‘the ſun is eclipſed, by being extinguiſhed, and that it recovers it's light next morning when it riſes: he gives an account of an eclipſe of the ſun, which continued for a whole month, and alſo of a total eclipſe ſo that the day ſeemed to be night . . . that there are ſeveral ſuns and ſeveral moons, according to the various climates of the earth, and at a certain time the orb of the ſun falls upon ſome part of the world which is not inhabited; and thus moving as in a vacuum, it undergoes an eclipſe. The ſame perſon affirms, that the ſun moves ſtrait forward *in infinitum*, but appears to us to move orbicularly by reaſon of it's great diſtance (41).’

[*D*] *He aſſerted that there is in nature more good than evil.*] Diogenes Laërtius reckons among the chief opinions of Xenophanes τὰ πολλὰ ἥττω νοῦ εἶναι, that moſt things are worſe than, or inferior to, the mind (42). It ſeems unworthy of a Philoſopher to ſpeak thus; for the meaneſt peaſant knows very well, and no body needs be taught, that the mind of man is better than metals, water, or air, *&c.* We therefore ought to believe that Xenophanes meant ſomething greater. The following is the conjecture of Meric Caſaubon. He pretends that this Philoſopher taught that the Divine mind, which made the world, endeavoured to endow all creatures with a ſtate of perfection; but that having met with ſtrong obſtacles in matter, he could not always compaſs his deſigns; and therefore, on ſome occaſions, he was forced to produce evil things (43). This is ſaying, that in this conflict he was ſometimes vanquiſhed, but oftener vanquiſher; that the greateſt part of things were ſubmitted to the deſires and power of the Divine mind, and conſequently ἥττω νοῦ εἶναι, doth not mean worſe than the mind, but ſubjected to it, and the matter of it's triumph. Caſaubon confirms his conjecture by a paſſage in Plato, where it is ſaid, that neceſſity and the mind concurred in the production of the world, and that neceſſity was perſuaded to conſent that things for the moſt part ſhould be governed for the beſt (44). Μεμιγμένη γὰρ οὖν ἡ τοῦδε κόσμου τοῦ γένεσις, ἐξ ἀνάγκης τε καὶ νοῦ συστάσεως ἐγενήθη· νοῦ δὲ ἀνάγκης ἄρχοντος, τῷ πείθειν αὐτὴν τῶν γιγνομένων τὰ πλεῖστα ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιστον ἄγειν, ταύτῃ κατὰ ταῦτα διʼ ἀνάγκης (45) ἡττωμένης ὑπὸ πειθοῦς ἔμφρονος, οὕτω κατʼ ἀρχὰς ξυνίστατο τόδε τὸ πᾶν. *Mundi enim hujus generatio ex neceſſitatis mentiſque coitu mixta eſt. Nam cùm mens neceſſitati dominaretur, propterea quòd perſuadendo eam ad optimos ut plurimum rerum eventus induceret, ipſaque hac ratione cedens ſapienti perſuaſioni pareret, mundi hujus exordia conſtiterunt.* Cauſabon obſerves (46) that Homer, on a particular occaſion, having ſaid that evil exceeds good, it was converted into a general maxim (47); as if, univerſally ſpeaking, the miſeries of human life overbalanced the happineſs of it. The ſame Critic obſerves, that thoſe who ſpoke of this ſubject with the greateſt modeſty, excuſed Providence on account of the fatal neceſſity which conſtrained it to open a gate to ſeveral evils. ‘Qui parciſſime loquebantur Deum excuſabant qui Bonus non niſi bona in operibus ſuis & omni adminiſtratione ſua propoſuiſſet, ſed materiæ obluctantis vel deficientis *neceſſitate* coactus, etiam malis non paucis invitus locum reliquiſſet. --- *Thoſe who ſpoke of this ſubject with the greateſt modeſty, excuſed GOD, who, as a good Being, had propoſed nothing but what was good, both in his works and providence; but that, being forced by the neceſſity of the matter which reſiſted or was deficient, he had unwillingly left room for ſeveral evils.*’ He adds, that Euripides hath ſtrenuouſly refuted the common opinion, that evil ſurpaſſes good, and he cites the beginning of that confutation.

Ἔλεξε γάρ τις ὡς τὰ χείρονα
Πλείω βροτοῖσιν ἐστὶ τῶν ἀμεινόνων.
Ἐγὼ δὴ τούτοις ἀντίαν γνώμην ἔχω
Πλείω τὰ χρεστὰ τῶν κακῶν εἶναι βροτοῖς.

Some ſay that there is in nature more evil than good: but I hold a contrary opinion to others, viz. *there is in nature more good than evil.*

The ſubſequent words of Euripides ſeemed to Caſaubon to be written by an inſpired pen (48). Pliny differs from this Poet's opinion; for tho' he doth not ſay that it plainly appears nature behaves to us rather like a cruel ſtep-mother, than a tender indulgent parent, yet he intimates that he is of ſuch an opinion: ‘Principium jure tribuetur homini cujus cauſa videtur cuncta alia genuiſſe natura; magnâ ſæva mercede contra tanta ſua munera: non ſit ut ſatis æſtimare parens melior homini, an triſtior noverca fuerit (49). --- *The chief place will be juſtly allowed to man, for whoſe ſake nature ſeems to have produced all other things. Great are the bounties of nature, and purchaſed with many evils, and purchaſed with many afflictions: ſo that it is hard to judge, whether ſhe acts the part of a tender and indulgent parent, or that of a cruel ſtep-mother to mankind.*’ She ſets the preſents ſhe makes us, ſaith he, at the price of a thouſand afflictions. To this purpoſe he gives a long deſcription of human infirmities, and oppoſes them to the advantages of animals; nor doth he forget the vices in which men exceed the brutes: ‘Uni animantium luctus eſt datus, uni luxuria, & quidem innumerabilibus modis, ac per ſingula membra: uni ambitio, uni avaritia, uni immenſa vivendi cupido, uni ſuperſtitio, uni ſepulturæ cura, atquæ etiam poſt ſe de futuro. Nulli vita fragilior, nulli rerum omnium libido major, nulli pavor confuſior, nulli rabies acrior. Dentque cetera animantia in ſuo genere probe degunt: congregari videmus, & ſtare contra diſſimilia: Leonum feritas inter ſe non dimicat: ſerpentium morſus non petit ſerpentes: ne maris quidem belluæ ac piſces, niſi in diverſa genera, ſæviunt. At hercules homini plurima ex homine ‘ ſunt

---

(*l*) Cicero, de Divinat. *lib. i, init.*

(38) Cicero, Academ. Quæſt. *lib. ii, cap. xxxix.*

(39) Lactant. *lib. iii, cap. xxii, pag. m.* 207.

(40) He married a ſiſter of Cromwell, by whom he had a daughter, who was married to Dr Tillotſon, Archbiſhop of Canterbury.

(41) Plut. de Placitis Philoſoph. *lib. ii, cap. xxiv, pag.* 901.

(42) Plurima deteriora mente eſſe. *Diogen. Laërt. ubi ſupra, num.* 19.

(43) Meric. Caſaubon. *in hæc verba* Diogen. Laërtii.

(44) Plato, in Timæo, *pag. m.* 1058, *D.*

(45) Meric. Caſaubon reads τῆς ἀνάγκης.

(46) Mericus Caſaubonus, ubi ſupra.

(47) Τὰ χερείονα νικᾶν.

(48) Cætera quæ bene multa talia, quæ θεόπνευστον pectus ſpirare videantur. *Mericus Caſaubon. ibid.*

(49) Plinius, *lib. vii, init. p. m.* 3.

would not be ſingular in this opinion: but it is probable that he was of a very different ſentiment; and if the queſtion was only about evil morally conſidered [*E*], I do not believe he would find one opponent. Every body owns that good and honeſt men are very rare, and

ſunt mala (50). - - - *Of all animals man alone is ſubject to ſorrow, to luxury, and that in numberleſs reſpects, and through all his ſenſes: man alone is addicted to ambition, to avarice, and an immoderate and exceſſive deſire of life: he alone is concerned for his burial, and even for what ſhall happen after his death. No animal is more frail, none more luſtful, none more liable to conſternation, none more furious. In fine, other animals live friendly with their reſpective ſpecies. We ſee them flock and herd together, and only oppoſe others of a different kind. A lion, however furious, does not attack a lion. A ſerpent does not ſting a ſerpent. Nor do the ſea-monſters and fiſhes deſtroy any but thoſe of a different kind from themſelves. But men bring numberleſs evils upon each other.*' He doth not forget the reflexion which ſeveral people have made, that it would be beſt for a man not to be born, or to die quickly (51). He affirms, in another book, that the greateſt bleſſing that GOD has beſtowed upon men amongſt ſo many pains and troubles of life, is the power of killing themſelves: *Nec ſibi poteſt* (Deus) *mortem conſciſcere, ſi velit, quod homini dedit optimum in tantis vitæ pœnis* (52). He had enumerated ſeveral of the follies of Paganiſm, and concluded, that of all theſe things there is but one certain, which is, that all things are uncertain, and that man is the moſt miſerable and vaineſt part of the whole creation: Quæ ſingula improvidam mortalitatem involvunt, ſolum ut inter iſta certum ſit, nihil eſſe certi, NEC MISERIUS QUIDQUAM HOMINE, AUT SUPERBIUS. Ceteris quippe animantium ſola victus cura eſt, in quo ſponte naturæ benignitas ſufficit: uno quidem vel præferendo cunctis bonis, quod de gloria, de pecunia, ambitione, ſuperque de morte non cogitant (53). - - - *All theſe things diſcover the weakneſs of our underſtanding; ſo that this alone is certain, that nothing is certain, and that* MAN IS OF ALL ANIMALS THE MOST VAIN AND MISERABLE. *For other living creatures take no care for their food, which is abundantly ſupplied to them by the voluntary produce of nature. But this advantage of theirs is greater than all the reſt, that they have no thoughts of glory, riches, ambition, or even death.*'

Plautus hath ſo naturally expreſſed an opinion contrary to Euripides's maxim, that I think myſelf obliged to tranſcribe his words:

Satin' parva res eſt voluptatum in vitâ,
Atque in ætate agundâ,
Præquàm quod moleſtum'ſt! ita cuique comparatum
Eſt in ætate hominum.
Ita Dîs eſt placitum, voluptatem ut mœror comes conſequatur:
Quin incommodi plus malique ilico adſit, boni ſi obtigit quid (54).

How few are the pleaſures in every age of life, when compared with the troubles of it: This is the fate of all men, and the will of the gods, that pain and ſorrow ſhould accompany our pleaſures. But let me immediately have more pain, and more ſorrow, if it is attended with any pleaſure.

Diphilus, the Poet, thought that fortune obliges us to drink a liquor compoſed of three evils, and only one good.

Ὥσπερ κυαθίζουσ' ἐνίοθ' ἡμῖν ἡ τύχη,
Ἓν ἀγαθὸν ἐπιχέασα τρί' ἐπαντλεῖ κακά.

Fortuna nobis, tanquam cyathos exſiccantibus,
Si unum bonum infundat, tria mala affundit (55).

[*E*] *If the queſtion was only about evil morally conſidered.*] Many things might be obſerved upon the queſtion, Whether Euripides is rather to be believed than Pliny, and ſo many other great men, who have maintained that the evils of human life ſurpaſſes the good things of it. Let us conſider this ſubject a little, and ſay in the firſt place that if the diſpute is only about vicious evil, it will ſoon be decided in favour of Pliny. For where is the man who dares maintain that the virtuous actions, compared with the crimes of mankind, are in proportion as ten to ten thouſand? In the ſecond place, if the diſpute is about painful evil, Euripides will have ſeveral adherents. As to the ſecond point, I ſhall refer it to the following remark, and offer ſomething there on the firſt.

How deteſtable ſoever the opinion of two principles hath conſtantly appeared to all Chriſtians (56), they have neverthele ſs acknowledged a ſubaltern principle of moral evil. Divines teach us that a great number of angels having ſinned, made a party in the univerſe againſt GOD. For brevity ſake this party is denoted by the name of Devil, and he is acknowledged as the cauſe of the fall of the firſt man, and as the perpetual tempter and ſeducer of mankind. The Devil having declared war againſt GOD from the moment of his fall, hath always continued in his rebellion, and there was never any peace or truce. He continually applies himſelf to uſurp the rights of his Creator, and debauch his ſubjects, in order to make them rebels and engage them to ſerve under his banner againſt their common maſter. He ſucceeded in his firſt hoſtilities with regard to man: In the Garden of Eden he attacked the mother of all living, and vanquiſhed her; immediately after he attacked the firſt man, and defeated him. Thus he became maſter of mankind. GOD did not abandon this prey to him, but delivered them out of their bondage, and recovered them out of that ſtate of reprobation by virtue of the ſatisfaction which the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity undertook to pay to his juſtice. This ſecond Perſon engaged to become man, and to act as a Mediator between GOD and mankind, and as a Redeemer of Adam and his poſterity. He took upon him to combat the Devil's party; ſo that he was the head of GOD's party, againſt the Devil, who was the head of the rebellious creatures. The deſign was not to conquer all the poſterity of Adam; for they were all, by birth, in the power of the Devil, but to preſerve, or recover the country which had been conquered. The deſign of JESUS CHRIST, the Mediator, and Son of GOD, was to recover it; that of the Devil was to hold it. The victory of the Mediator conſiſted in leading men into the paths of truth and virtue; that of the devil in ſeducing them into the road of error and vice. So that in order to know whether moral good equals moral evil among men, we need only compare the victories of the Devil with thoſe of JESUS CHRIST. Now in hiſtory we find but very few triumphs of JESUS CHRIST: *Apparent rari nantes in gurgite vaſto* (57); and we every where meet with the triumphs of the Devil. The war between theſe two parties is a continual, or almoſt continual, train of ſucceſſes on the Devil's ſide; and if the rebellious party made annals of their exploits, there is not one day in the year, but what would be there marked with ſome ample ſubject for bonfires, ſongs of triumph, and ſuch other ſigns of victory. The Annaliſt would have no occaſion for hyperboles and flattery, to ſhew the ſuperiority of that faction. Sacred hiſtory tells us of but one good in Adam's family (58), and reduces to one good man the family of that good man, and ſo on in the other generations to Noah, in whoſe family we find three ſons whom God ſaved from the deluge with their father, mother, and wives. Thus at the end of ſixteen hundred fifty-ſix years, all mankind, except one family of eight perſons, were ſo deeply engaged in the intereſt of the Devil, that the enormity of their crimes rendered it neceſſary to extirpate them. The deluge, that terrible monument of the juſtice of God, is a lofty monument of the Devil's victories; and ſo much the rather as that general puniſhment did not deprive him of his prey: the ſouls of thoſe who periſhed in the deluge went to hell: This is the Devil's aim and intention, and therefore his triumph. Error and vice, ſoon after the deluge, lifted up their heads in Noah's family: his deſcendants plunged themſelves into idolatry, and all manner of debaucheries; that is to ſay, the Devil preſerved his uſurped power over them. There was no more than a handful of people, confined in Judæa, that eſcaped him with reſpect to Orthodoxy; nay, it muſt be owned, that among that people the ſucceſs of the good party was very variable, and that nothing is more common than men who depart from the rules of virtue. But, without doubt, Xenophanes intended to ſpeak of Phyſical evil; and his ſenſe was, that

---

(50) Id. ibid. *pag.* 5. Compare with this the paſſage of Arnobius, cited in the article TULLIA, citation (82).

(51) Multi extitere qui non naſci optimum cenſerent aut quam ocyſſime aboleri. *Id. ibid. pag.* 4. *See, above, the article* TULLIA, *citat.* (86). *See this ſentence in Greek verſes in Sextus Empiricus.* Pyrrhon. Hypotyp. *lib. iii, cap. xxiv, pag.* 157.

(52) Plin. *lib. ii, cap. vii, pag. m.* 146.

(53) Id. ibid.

(54) Plaut. in Amphitr. *Act. ii, Sc. ii, init. pag. m.* 25.

(55) Diphilus, *apud* Stobæum.

(56) For the Marcionites, the Manichees, *&c.* do not deſerve to be called Chriſtians.

(57) Virgil. Æn. lib. i, ver. 118.

(58) Compare with this remark [*G*], of the article OROSIUS

ble, with reſpect to Orthodoxy, ſince that very nation ſuffered it ſelf to be ſeduced to idolatry from time to time; inſomuch, that their conduct was a continued ſhifting between true and falſe worſhip. But as for vice it never ſuffered a real *interregnum* amongſt the Jews, any more than in other countries: and conſequently the Devil continually kept a footing in the ſmall conqueſts which the good party recovered. There happened a happy revolution at the birth of Jeſus Chriſt: his miracles, his goſpel, and his Apoſtles, made glorious conqueſts. Then it was that the empire of the Devil received a very great check, and a conſiderable part of the earth was wreſted out of his hands; but he was not ſo driven out that he did not preſerve ſeveral correſpondents, and a great many creatures there; he maintained himſelf there by the abominable Hereſies which he ſowed: vices were never entirely driven out of it, and ſoon after entred into it again, as it were, in triumph. Errors, ſchiſms, diſputes, and cabals, introduced themſelves, together with the fatal train of infamous paſſions, which generally accompany them. The Hereſies, ſuperſtitions, violences, frauds, extorſions, and impurities, which have appeared all over the Chriſtian world for ſeveral ages, are things which I ſhould only be able to deſcribe imperfectly, though I was maſter of more eloquence than Cicero. What Virgil ſaid is true in the moſt literal ſenſe.

> Non, mihi ſi linguæ centum ſint, oraque centum,
> Ferrea vox, omnes ſcelerum comprendere formas,
> . . . . poſſim (59).
>
> *Had I a hundred mouths, a hundred tongues,*
> *And throats of braſs, inſpired with iron lungs,*
> *I could not half thoſe horrid crimes repeat:*
>
> DRYDEN.

Thus whilſt the Devil reigned uninterrupted without the limits of Chriſtendom, he ſo ſucceſsfully diſputed the ground in Chriſtendom, that the progreſs of his arms was beyond compariſon greater than that of truth and virtue. A ſtop was put to this progreſs, and he was forced to give ground in the XVIth century; but what he loſt on one ſide he regained on the other; and what he does not effect by lies, he brings to paſs by the corruption of manners. There is no azylum, no fortreſs where he does not make men feel the effects of his power in this reſpect. Leave the world, ſhut your ſelf up in a monaſtery; he will follow you, he will bring into it intrigues, envy, factions, or, if he can do no worſe, leudneſs; this laſt reſource is almoſt infallible; *Diaboli virtus in lumbis eſt*, - - - *The power of the devil lies in the loins*, ſaith St Jerom (60). A modern author affirms, *That in thoſe places where Popery is yet predominant, there is no true piety . . . and that Italy and Spain are places where there is ſcarce any more true virtue than in Turkey* (61). He ſaith in another book (62), *That it is a notorious and acknowledged truth, that all the convents of Spain and Portugal are places of proſtitution; and that when chance draws the curtain, to give us an opportunity of ſeeing what paſſes in the French monaſteries, we diſcover that they take a little more care of external appearances, but at the bottom are as leud as others.* He ſpares the Proteſtants a little more; but yet he ſays (63) that corruption runs very high amongſt them, and is become ſo general, that it is not only amongſt the Reformed in France, but alſo thoſe of England, the northern kingdoms, and the provinces of Germany; that the Princes and Sovereigns of thoſe places think of nothing but their political intereſts; that the people are void of piety, and the paſtors remiſs; that a prodigious indifference for religion reigns every where, generally ſpeaking; that Princes take no care of the truth (64); that the women of England are debauched to the laſt degree, and that the Proteſtant countries in Germany, are plunged into ſuch a debauchery, as debaſes them, and makes them brutiſh. You may ſay, if you pleaſe, that this author's deſcriptions are overſtrained; but it will neverthleſs be true, that there prevails among Chriſtians a deplorable corruption of manners.

Theſe two things require our reflexion. War reigns at leaſt for as long a time as peace amongſt the Chriſtians: I confine my ſelf to Chriſtianity, becauſe it is unneceſſary for me to ſpeak of the Infidel nations; they are continually in the ſervice of the Devil, and ſubject to his empire; and the uſurper reigns there unmoleſted. It is undeniable that war is the Devil's time, or, if I may ſo expreſs my ſelf, his turn of reigning; for without mentioning the violences and debaucheries committed in it, every ſoldier is obliged to profeſs that he will ſuffer no injuries; he muſt either quit the employment, or revenge an affront: but this is manifeſtly denying our allegiance to the empire of Jeſus Chriſt, and deſerting to the enemy. Times of peace do not ſeem ſo favourable to the empire of the Devil, and yet they are very much ſo; for as people grow rich, they grow more voluptuous, and plunge themſelves deeper in luxury and voluptuouſneſs.

> Nunc patimur longæ pacis mala, ſævior armis
> Luxuria incubuit, victumque ulciſcitur orbem (65).
>
> *We ſuffer all th' invet'rate ills of peace,*
> *And waſtful riot; whoſe deſtructive charms*
> *Revenge the vanquiſh'd world of our victorious arms.*
>
> DRYDEN.

My other remark is more deciſive. The Papiſts and Proteſtants agree, that very few people eſcape damnation. They allow none to be ſaved but only the Orthodox who lead good lives, and repent of their ſins at the point of death. They do not indeed deny but that habitual ſinners may be ſaved upon a ſincere deathbed repentance, but withal they maintain, that nothing is more rare than ſuch a repentance. According to which it is plain, that for one man ſaved, there are perhaps a million damned. Now the war which the Devil wages with God, is about the conqueſt of ſouls; and therefore it is certain that the victory is on the Devil's ſide: he gains all the damned, and loſes only the very few ſouls who were predeſtinated to be ſaved. He is therefore *victor prælio, & victor bello.* - - - *victorious in the battle, and victorious in the war.* For having inſpired men with an infinitely greater number of wicked actions, than Jeſus Chriſt has inſpired them with good ones, he has been ſuperior in the battle; and as he makes almoſt all men die in impenitence, he keeps all he had conquered (66). Death puts an end to the war. Chriſt doth not combat in order to releaſe the dead from the power of the Devil. We muſt therefore ſay that this war ends in the Devil's advantage, what he claimed is yielded and abandoned to him. I know he will ſuffer eternal puniſhment for his victories: But this, far from obſcuring my poſition, that moral evil is greater than moral good, ſerves to make it more indiſputable: For the Devils amidſt the flames will eternally curſe, and make all the damned eternally curſe the name of God. There will therefore be more creatures who will hate, than who will love God. Beſides, in this remark, the queſtion is properly about the ſtate of things in this life.

I have an Italian book intituled *Monarchia del noſtro Signor Gieſu Chriſto*, printed at Venice 1573, and written by *Giovann' Antonio Panthera Parentino.* The author of this book gives the hiſtory of the battles of Lucifer with Jeſus Chriſt, from the beginning of the world down to the times of Mahometaniſm. He paſſes ſlightly over ſome of the attempts in which Lucifer ſucceeded; but gives a full account of every attempt in which he failed; ſuch as the Deſign of deſtroying the poſterity of Abraham in Egypt, his enterpriſes againſt David, againſt the Maccabees, againſt Jeſus Chriſt, *&c.* This is like a man who ſeeing people gaming, ſhould only take an account of the loſſes (67): it would appear by ſuch a computation that he who had won the moſt had loſt all his money. This is an image of the conduct of ſeveral Hiſtorians. Their nation appears always victorious: for they relate only thoſe events which were proſperous.

(59) Virgil. Æneid. lib. vi, ver. 625.

(60) Montagne, Eſſais, *livr. iii, chap. v, pag. m.* 134.

(61) Jurieu, Vrai Syſteme de l'Egliſe, *pag. m.* 262.

(62) Eſprit de Mr Arnauld, *Tom. ii, pag.* 592.

(63) *See the Abbot Richard,* Critique des Prejugez de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 234. *He quotes the* Avis aux Proteſtans de l'Europe. *This* Avis, *is prefixed to the* Prejugez légitimes contre le Papiſme.

(64) Id. ibid. *pag.* 258, *quoting the ſame* Avis aux Proteſtans.

(65) Juvenal, Sat. VI, ver. 291.

(66) That is to ſay, all he conquered when he made the firſt man fall, whereby all his poſterity became ſlaves to the Devil.

(67) Mr Fouquet in the firſt tome of the continuation of his Defence, uſes this thought with regard to thoſe, who only computed what he had expended, but not what he had received.

that the ſweets of life do not equal the bitter potions which it obliges us to ſwallow [*F*]. Several

Obſerve, that all I have been ſaying is every day preached, and that without any deſign of derogating from the almighty power of Jeſus Chriſt. No more is meant by it than (what is alſo my opinion) that man is naturally ſo prone to evil, that except the ſmall number of the elect, all other men live and die in the ſervice of the evil ſpirit, and render the paternal love of God to remedy their wickedneſs, or bring them to repentance, of no effect.

[*F*] *His ſenſe was that the ſweets of life do not equal the bitter potions which it obliges us to ſwallow.*] Thoſe who hold the contrary opinion, chiefly inſiſt upon a parallel betwixt diſeaſes and health. There are very few perſons, whatever age they be of, but can reckon up, incomparably more days of health than of ſickneſs; and there are a great many, who, in the ſpace of twenty years, have not been afflicted with diſeaſes that will take up in all fifteen days. But this compariſon is fallacious (68); for health conſidered alone is rather an indolence than a ſenſe of pleaſure; it is rather a bare exemption from evil, than a good, whilſt ſickneſs is worſe than a privation of pleaſure: it is a poſitive ſtate which plunges the mind into a ſenſe of ſuffering, and loads the patient with pain. Somebody (69) judiciouſly ſays, that *when health is alone, it is a good which is not much perceived, and ſometimes only ſerves to make us the more ardently deſire all the other pleaſures which we cannot have.* Let us make uſe of a compariſon taken from the ſchoolmen: they ſay that *rare*, i. e. porous, bodies contain but very little matter under a great extent; and that *denſe* bodies contain a great quantity of matter in a ſmall compaſs (70). According to this principle we muſt ſay, that there is more matter in three feet of water than in two thouſand five hundred feet of air; this is a lively image of ſickneſs and health. Sickneſs reſembles the *denſe* bodies, and health the *rare*. Health laſts many years ſucceſſively, and yet contains but a ſmall portion of happineſs. Sickneſs continues but a few days, and yet comprehends a vaſt load of miſery. If we had a ſcale adapted to weigh both a diſeaſe of fifteen days, and the health of fifteen years, we ſhould obſerve the ſame difference that we find in the balance betwixt a bag of feathers and a piece of lead. In one ſcale we ſhould ſee a body which takes up a great deal of room, and in the other, one which lies in a very ſmall compaſs; and yet one of them is not heavier than the other. Let us then beware of the illuſion which the extenſion of health may draw us into, when it is parallelled with ſickneſs. But you will ſay that health is conſiderable, not only by reaſon it exempts us from a very great evil, but alſo by the liberty it affords us, to enjoy a thouſand lively and very ſenſible pleaſures. I grant all this, but it ought to be farther conſidered, that there being two ſorts of evils to which we are ſubject, it only ſecures us from one, and leaves us wholly expoſed to the other. We are ſubject to pain and ſorrow, two ſuch terrible afflictions, that it is not to be decided which is moſt dreadful. The moſt vigorous health doth not ſecure us from grief. For grief flows in upon us through a thouſand channels, and is of the nature of *denſe* bodies: it comprizes a great deal of matter in a very ſmall compaſs; evil is heaped up, crowded and preſſed cloſe in it. One hour's grief contains more evil, than there is good in ſix or ſeven pleaſant days. The other day I was told of a man who killed himſelf, after an anxious melancholy of three or four weeks. Every night he had laid his ſword under his bolſter, in hopes that he ſhould have courage enough to end his life, when darkneſs ſhould increaſe his grief: but his reſolution failed for ſeveral nights ſucceſſively. At laſt, not being able to reſiſt his uneaſineſs, he cut the veins of his arm. I affirm, that all the pleaſures which this man had enjoyed in thirty years, would not equal the evils which tormented him the laſt month of his life, if both were weighed in the balance. Look back to my parallel of *denſe* and *rare* bodies, and remember this, that the good things of this life are a leſs good, than the evil things are an evil. Evils are generally more pure and unmixt than good things; the lively ſenſe of pleaſure doth not continue long, it immediately grows flat and dull, and is followed with a diſguſt.

Πάντων μὲν κόρος ἐστὶ καὶ ὕπνου, καὶ φιλότητος
Μολπῆς τε γλυκερῆς, καὶ ἀμύμονος ὀρχηθμοῖο.

Omnium quidem ſatietas eſt, & ſomni & amoris
Cantuſque dulcis & egregiæ ſaltationis (71).

The beſt of things beyond their meaſure cloy;
Sleep's balmy bleſſing, love's endearing joy;
The feaſt, the dance . . . . .
Mr POPE.

What appeared to us a great good when we did not poſſeſs it, ſcarce affects us in the enjoyment: ſo that we acquire, with a thouſand troubles, and a thouſand uneaſineſſes, what we poſſeſs with no more than a moderate pleaſure; and very often the fear of loſing the good we enjoy, ſurpaſſes all the pleaſures of the fruition of it.

There has been pointed out to me a very fine paſſage of Pliny, and a very proper one to confirm the thoughts which I have juſt now offered. ‘Si verum ‘facere judicium volumus, ac repudiata omni fortunæ ‘ambitione decernere, mortalium nemo eſt felix (72). ‘Abunde igitur, atque indulgenter fortuna decidit ‘cum eo, qui jure dici non infelix poteſt. Quippe ‘ut alia non ſint, certe, ne laſſeſcat fortuna, metus ‘eſt: quo ſemel recepto, ſolida felicitas non eſt. Quid ‘quod nemo mortalium omnibus horis ſapit? utinamque ‘falſum hoc, & non a vate dictum quam plurimi ‘judicent! Vana mortalitas, & ad circumſcribendum ‘ſeipſam ingenioſa, computat more Thraciæ gentis, ‘quæ calculos colore diſtinctos, pro experimento ‘cujuſque diei in urnam condit, ac ſupremo die ſeparatos ‘dinumerat, atque ita de quoque pronunciat. ‘Quid quod iſte calculi candore illo laudatus dies, originem ‘mali habuit? Quam multos accepta afflixere ‘imperia; quam multos bona perdidere, & ultimis ‘merſere ſuppliciis? iſta nimirum bona, ſi cui inter ‘illa hora in gaudio fuit. Ita eſt profecto, alius de ‘alio judicat dies, & tamen ſupremus de omnibus: ‘ideoque nullis credendum eſt. Quid quod bona ma‘lis paria non ſunt, etiam pari numero: nec lætitia ‘ulla minimo mœrore penſanda? Heu vana & imprudens ‘diligentia! numerus dierum comparatur: ubi ‘quæritur pondus (73). - - - *If we would make a true ‘judgment of things, without being biaſſed by the allurements ‘of fortune, we muſt determine that no man is ‘happy. Fortune is bounteous and indulgent to the man ‘who may juſtly be ſaid not to be unhappy. For as to ‘thoſe who are called happy, their condition is always ‘attended with a fear leſt fortune ſhould change and forſake ‘them: and where this fear takes place, there can ‘be no ſolid happineſs. What ſhall we ſay of this obſervation, ‘that no man is wiſe at all times? I wiſh this ‘was falſe, and that a great many people did not juſtly ‘account it an oracle. Man is vain, and ingenious in ‘circumſcribing himſelf, and computes his happineſs after ‘the manner of the Thracians, who every day put into ‘an urn either a black or a white peeble, to denote the ‘good or bad fortune of that day: at laſt they ſeparated ‘theſe peebles, and upon comparing the two numbers ‘together, they formed their judgment of the whole of ‘their lives. Shall that very day which is diſtinguiſhed ‘by the white peeble give riſe to evil? How many ‘have been afflicted by the power which they have accepted? ‘How many undone and reduced to the greateſt ‘miſery by good things, and the ſame good things which ‘were the cauſe of their former rejoicing. Thus it ‘actually happens, one day judges of another, and the ‘laſt judges of all the reſt; ſo that no particular day can ‘be relied upon. What ſhall we ſay of this obſervation, ‘that the good things of this life are not equal to the ‘evil, not even in number? And that the leaſt affliction ‘is not to be compenſated by any joy? Alas! how vain ‘and imprudently diligent is man, who compares his fortunate ‘with his unfortunate days by their number, when ‘the queſtion is concerning the weight and nature of ‘them.*’ I have found another paſſage which gives a lively deſcription of the ill ſide of felicities, I ſpeak of thoſe common to all men, I mean corporeal pleaſures. ‘Quid autem de corporis voluptatibus loquar, ‘quarum appetentia quidem plena eſt anxietatis, ſatietas ‘verò pœnitentiæ? Quantos illæ morbos, quam ‘intolerabileis dolores, quaſi quendam fructum nequi‘tiæ

---

(68) See the article PERICLES, remark [*K*].

(69) I think it is Madam de Scuderi.

(70) Rarum eſt quod ſub magna dimenſione parum continet materiæ: denſum quod ſub parva dimenſione multum continet materiæ.

(71) Homer, Iliad. lib. xiii, ver. 636. *See, above, a like thought of Pindar, in citation* (4), *of the laſt article* BERENICE.

(72) Euripides, in Medea, ver. 1228, & 1230, *pag.* 327, *ſays the ſame thing.*

(73) Plinius, *lib. vii, cap. xl, pag. m.* 62. Mr du Rondel has acquainted me of this paſſage.

Several people are perſuaded of the truth of this, and do not want plauſible reaſons for it,

'tiæ fruentium ſolent referre corporibus! . . . Triſteis 'verò eſſe voluptatum exitus, quiſquis reminiſci libi'dinum ſuarum volet, intelliget . . . .

Habet omnis hoc voluptas,
Stimulis agit fruenteis,
Apiumque par volantum,
Ubi grata mella fudit,
Fugit, & nimis tenaci
Ferit icta corda morſu (74).

'*What need I ſpeak of bodily pleaſures, the purſuit of which is full of anxiety, and the enjoyment followed by diſguſt and repentance. How great diſeaſes, how intolerable pains do they bring upon the body, as the fruits of wickedneſs. . . . But that the iſſue of pleaſures is diſagreeable and painful, whoever reflects on his own luſts, muſt eaſily underſtand . . . .*

If pleaſures e'er invade the heart
They ſtimulate through every part:
But when th' enjoyers happy made,
And when their grateful honey's ſhed,
Their ſweet allurements ſoon decay,
They leave a ſting and flie away.

Thus Boëtius introduces Philoſophy ſpeaking to him. It appears by this diſcourſe, that if anxiety precedes the enjoyment of pleaſures, diſguſt and repentance follow cloſe after it. A vaſt number of authors obſerve this unhappy concomitance, or, to ſpeak more intelligibly, this connexion of pleaſure and uneaſineſs. The two following were cited in my firſt edition:

. . . . uſque adeo nulli eſt ſincera voluptas,
Sollicitique aliquid lætis intervenit (75).

But mortal bliſs will never come ſincere;
Pleaſure may lead, but pain brings up the rear.

TATE.

. . . . medio de fonte leporum
Surgit amari aliquid, quod in ipſis floribus angat *.

. . . *for ſtill ſome bitter thought deſtroys*
His fanſy'd mirth, and poiſons all his joys.

CREECH.

And now I add a third, who is Antiphanes.

Ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ δέ γε τȣ́τῳ, ἔνθα τὸ
Ἡδὺ ἔνεϛι, πλησίον πȣ καὶ τὸ λυπηρὸν. αἱ γὰρ ἡδοναὶ
Οὐκ ἐπὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐμπορεύονται, ἀλλ' ἀκολȣθȣ͂σ' αὐταῖς
Λύπαι καὶ πόνοι.

Id eſt,

At in eodem ipſo, in quo
Jucunditas ineſt, prope ſanè & moleſtia præſto eſt.
Voluptates enim
Non ipſæ ſolæ ingrediuntur, ſed earum comites ſunt
Dolores ac labores.

Wherever pleaſures and delights are preſent, pain and ſorrow are at hand. For pleaſures never come alone, pain and toil are their conſtant attendants.

Let us alſo obſerve this circumſtance. We are not only in fear of loſing what we poſſeſs, but alſo vexed to ſee other people equal or ſurpaſs us, and that others will ſoon be able to come up to us, and afterwards get before us. Obſerve, that in order to prove that good is not ſo perfectly good, as evil is evil, I have made no uſe of this argument, that it rarely happens that a good uſe is made of the favours of fortune, it rarely happens that they do not lead us to great miſeries, and become not a grace, but a ſnare (76); I ſay, I have omitted this reaſon, becauſe I do not here conſider the cauſes and occaſions of good and evil, but good and evil in themſelves. For the reſt, it would be departing from the ſtate of the queſtion to ſay, that man afflicts himſelf without cauſe. For it is not our buſineſs here to know whether his grief is reaſonable, or the effect of his weakneſs; but the queſtion is, to know whether he grieves. This very thing, that a man vexes himſelf without reaſon, and makes himſelf unhappy by his own fault, is an evil.

We muſt own with Seneca, conſidering the multitude of good things which nature has imparted to us, and the inexhauſtible induſtry with which the wit of man diverſifies pleaſures, and diſcovers the ſources of them; that God, not contented to provide barely for our neceſſities, hath beſides furniſhed us wherewithal to live deliciouſly. 'Unde hæc innumerabilia oculos, 'aureis, animum mulcentia? unde illa luxuriam quoque inſtruens copia? Neque enim neceſſitatibus tantummodo noſtris proviſum eſt: uſque in delicias amamur. Tot arbuſta, non uno modo frugifera, tot herbæ ſalutares, tot varietates ciborum, per totum annum digeſtæ, ut inerti quoque fortuita terræ alimenta præberent. Jam animalia omnis generis, alia in ſicco ſolidoque, alia in humido innaſcentia, alia per ſublime dimiſſa: ut omnis rerum naturæ pars tributum aliquod nobis conferre (77) . . . Unde iſta palatum tuum ſaporibus exquiſitis ultra ſatietatem laceſſentia? unde hæc irritamenta jam laſſæ voluptatis? unde iſta quies, in qua putreſcis, ac marces? Nonne ſi gratus es, dices,

- - - - Deus nobis hæc otia fecit (78).

'*Whence proceed theſe numberleſs delights for the entertainment of our eyes, our ears, and mind? Whence that abundance which ſupplies even our luxury? For care is taken not only for our neceſſities, but alſo for our pleaſures, and the gratifying of all our ſenſes and appetites. So many pleaſant trees, fruitful in various manners, ſo many wholſome herbs, and ſuch a variety of meats, in every ſeaſon of the year, that the caſual produce of the earth might ſupply a lazy man with food for his maintenance. Whence all thoſe animals, ſome bred on the earth, ſome in the waters, and others deſcending from the heavens, that every part of nature might be tributary to man? . . . Whence thoſe things which by their exquiſite taſtes, and delicious ſavours, provoke your appetite even after it is ſatiated? Whence thoſe things which awaken your pleaſures when decayed? Whence that quiet and eaſe in which you rot and moulder away? Will you not ſay, if you are thankful, that you owe all this to the bounty of Heaven?*' All that Seneca ſaith in this part of his book *de Beneficiis* is very true; but, on the other ſide, doth not Pliny (79) aſſure us that nature makes us buy her preſents at the price of ſo many ſufferings, that it is dubious whether ſhe deſerves moſt, the name of a parent, or of a ſtep-mother? To reconcile theſe two authors, we ought to conſider what the Scripture teaches us concerning the œconomy of GOD, as a father, and as judge of mankind. Thoſe two relations require that man ſhould feel good and evil: but the queſtion is, whether evil exceeds good? and upon this head I am apt to think that we can go no farther than opinions and conjectures. Several people ſay, that moſt perſons, when a little advanced in years, grow like la Mothe le Vayer, who would have refuſed to paſs again through the ſame good and evil which he had felt in his life (80). If it be ſo, we muſt believe that, upon the whole, every one finds the pleaſures which he has enjoyed, has been unequal to the uneaſineſſes and pains with which he has been afflicted. I do not alledge that no body is content with his condition, for this is no proof that every man believes himſelf leſs happy than unhappy. Theſe verſes of Horace contain a moſt certain fact:

Quî fit, Mæcenas, ut nemo, quam ſibi ſortem
Seu ratio dederit, ſeu ſors objecerit, illâ
Contentus vivat? laudet diverſa ſequentes (81)?

Whence comes, my Lord, this general diſcontent?
Why do all loath the ſtate that chance hath ſent,

---

(74) Boëtius, de Conſol. Philoſoph. *lib. iii, Proſa vii, pag. m.* 61.

(75) Ovidius, Metam. lib. vii, ver. 453.

* Lucret. lib. iv, ver. 1127.

(76) Munera iſta fortunæ putatis? inſidiæ ſunt. Quiſquis noſtrum tutam agere vitam volet, quantum plurimum poteſt iſta viſcata beneficia devitet, in quibus hoc quoque miſerrimi fallimur, habere nos putamus, habemur. *Seneca, Epiſt. viii.*

(77) Seneca, de Beneficiis, *lib. iv, cap. v.* Compare what has been ſaid above of Cicero, in citation (90), of the article PERICLES.

(78) Seneca, ibid. *cap. vi.*

(79) I have cited his words in remark [*D*], citation (49). See the words of Socrates, in remark [*G*].

(80) See remark [*F*], in the article VAYER, and what has been ſaid of Cicero, in the article TULLIA, remark [*R*].

(81) Horat. lib. i, initio Sat. I.

it, as we ſhall ſee below. Even thoſe who acknowledge that nature hath furniſhed mankind

Or their own choice procur'd? but fondly bleſs
Their neighbour's lots, and praiſe what they poſſeſs?
CREECH.

Four inconveniencies mixed with twenty conveniencies, would make a man wiſh for another condition, I mean ſuch a one as is not charged with any inconvenience, or at leaſt where he ſhould find but one or two of them to forty conveniencies. On the other ſide, it muſt not be alledged againſt me, what Lactantius ſaith (82), that men are ſo nice, that they complain of the leaſt evil, as if it abſorbed all the good things they have enjoyed: for it is to no purpoſe to conſider here what the abſolute quantity of good and evil diſpenſed to man, may be in it ſelf; we are only to conſider their relative quality; or, to expreſs myſelf more clearly, we ought to conſider nothing but the feeling of the mind. A very great good in itſelf, which raiſes but a very moderate pleaſure, ought not to paſs for more than a moderate good; but an evil, tho' very little in itſelf, which gives an uneaſineſs, grief, or pain, that are inſupportable, ought to paſs for a very great evil: ſo that to denote a man leſs happy than unhappy, it is ſufficient that he is afflicted with three evils for thirty felicities which he enjoys, if thoſe three evils, as little in themſelves as you pleaſe, give him more diſturbance than the thirty felicities, as great in their own nature as you pleaſe, afford him pleaſure. The government of a province is in itſelf a much greater good than a ribbon; and yet if a Duke and Peer ſhould feel more joy in receiving a ribbon from his miſtreſs, than in obtaining the government of a province from his King; I affirm that a ribbon would be a greater good to him than the authority of a governor. For the ſame reaſon it would be a greater evil for him to be deprived of this ribbon, than to be deprived of his poſt, if he ſhould be more grieved at the loſs of the ribbon than at that of his poſt. On this account no man is able to judge aright, either of the miſery or happineſs of his neighbour (83). We do not know what another feels, we only know the outward cauſes of evil and good: now theſe cauſes are not always proportioned to their effects; thoſe which ſeem to us very ſmall, frequently produce a lively ſenſe; and thoſe which appear to us great, very often occaſion but a faint one. The following words of Tacitus are really an oracle: ' Neque mala vel bona quæ vulgus ' putet: multos qui conflictari adverſis videantur, ' beatos, ac pleroſque quamquam magnas per opes ' miſerrimos, ſi illi gravem fortunam conſtanter tole' rent, hi proſpera inconſultè utantur (84). - - - *Neither* ' *are theſe things good or evil which the vulgar deems to* ' *be ſuch. Many who ſtruggle with adverſities, are* ' *happy, if they bear their afflictions with reſolution, and* ' *moſt of thoſe who abound in riches are very miſerable,* ' *if they make an imprudent uſe of their proſperity.*' We muſt only extend the ſignification of the word, *inconſultè*, ſo that it may comprehend the diſpoſition of the temper which makes us poſſeſs the favours of fortune with uneaſineſs or without joy.

All this ſhews that none can determine poſitively whether his neighbour's deſtiny be drawn out of Homer's two veſſels (85), in ſuch a manner, that the doſe of good be as large, or perhaps larger than that of evil. All that can be ſaid with full certainty, is, that no man's fate was ever drawn wholly out of the good veſſel. I ſhall cite an excellent paſſage of Pauſanias on this ſubject; it is the reflexion which he made upon hearing that one Aglaus was happy during the courſe of his life. Ὃν δὲ ἤκουσα ἐν Ψωφῖδι ἐπὶ Ἀγλαῷ λόγον ἀνδρὶ Ψωφιδίῳ κατὰ Κροῖσον τὸν Λυδὸν, ὡς ὁ Ἀγλαὸς τὸν χρόνον τοῦ βίου πάντα γένοιτο εὐδαίμων, οὔ με ἔπειθεν ὁ λόγος. Ἀλλὰ ἀνθρώπων μὲν τῶν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ κακὰ ἄν τις ἐλάσσονα ἀναδέξαιτο, καθὰ καὶ ναῦς ἧσσον ἂν χειμασθεὶν νεὼς ἄλλης· ἄνδρα δὲ συμφορῶν ἀεὶ στάντα ἐκτὸς ἢ τὰ πάντα οὐρίῳ ναῦν χρησαμένην πνεύματι, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως δυνησόμεθα ἐξευρεῖν. Ἐπεὶ καὶ Ὅμηρος κατακείμενον παρὰ τῷ Διῒ ἀγαθῶν πίθον, τὸν δὲ ἕτερον κακῶν ἐποίησεν· ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐν Δηλφοῖς θεοῦ δεδιδαγμένος, ὃς αὐτὸν ποτὲ Ὅμηρον κακοδαίμονά τε προσεῖπε καὶ ὄλβιον, ὡς φύντα ἐπὶ ἀμφοτέροις ὁμοίως (86). Quod vero Pſophide audivi Aglaum Pſophidium, ſicuti & Crœſum (87) Lydorum regem, vitam omni ſuæ ætatis tempore beatam egiſſe, id ego ut credam non facile adducor. Nam ut hominum quis levioribus multo, quam alius quiſquam qui iiſdem vixerit temporibus, incommodis affectus, non difficilimè fortaſſe reperiatur, uti navis adverſis tempeſtatibus minus agitata: ſic propemodum neminem unquam crediderim perpetuò moleſtiarum & calamitatum immunem fuiſſe: quando neque ulla navis memorari poſſit, quæ ſemper ſecundiſſimis uſa fuerit tempeſtatibus. Nam & Homerus *id ſenſiſſe videtur, quo loco duo*, bonorum unum, alterum malorum, dolia apud Jovem ſtatuit. id enim ille ex Delphico Apolline didicerat; qui ipſum & miſerum ſimul, & beatum dixerat, utpote ad utramque vitæ ſortem genitum. - - - *What I have heard at Pſophis, concerning Aglaus, a man of that city, who lived in the time of Crœſus, King of Lydia, that this Aglaus was happy through the whole courſe of his life, ſeemed to me incredible. One man indeed may meet with fewer afflictions than other men, as one ſhip may ſuffer leſs in a ſtorm than another. But that any man ſhould be continually free from troubles and diſtreſſes, is as incredible, and contrary to experience, as that ever there was a ſhip which always enjoyed favourable winds. Homer ſays that there lies by Jupiter an urn containing good things; but he places by him another containing evil things. This he learned from Apollo of Delphos, who pronounced, that Homer himſelf was both an unhappy and a happy man, and was born both to a good and a bad fate.* As this Aglaus was living in Crœſus's time, it is no wonder that Solon omitted him, when he named to that Monarch three men who to him ſeemed happy (88), for he believed that to deſerve ſuch a title, one ought to be ſheltered from the inconſtancy of fortune, and that, during this life no man is ſecure from this inconſtancy. If Solon had affirmed that thoſe three men, never felt either grief or pain, he had been miſtaken (89), and had contradicted that profound good ſenſe which made him look for inſtances of happineſs, not at the court of Crœſus, but amongſt men of an ordinary condition.

It is certain that thoſe who would find perſons, who have felt more happineſs than uneaſineſs, will rather meet with them among the peaſants, or the meaneſt tradeſmen, than amongſt Kings and Princes (90). Read theſe words of a great man: ' Do you believe then ' that afflictions and the moſt deadly pains do not ' hide themſelves under the purple, or that a kingdom ' is an univerſal remedy againſt all evils, balm that ' aſſuages them, or a charm which enchants them? ' Whereas, by the courſe of Divine providence, which ' knows how to counterpoiſe the moſt exalted condi' tions, this grandeur which we at a diſtance admire, ' as ſomething more than human, affects leſs thoſe ' who are born in it, or confounds itſelf in it's own ' plenty; and, on the contrary, in grandeur, afflictions ' are more deeply felt; their blow is ſo much the ' heavier on great men, as they are leſs prepared to ' bear it (91).' Theſe are the two ſources of the unhappineſs of Princes: their being continually accuſtomed to the advantages of their condition, renders them inſenſible as to good, and very ſenſible of evil. Let them receive one piece of bad news, and three of good, they ſcarce feel the happineſs of the latter, but are touched to the quick with the misfortune of the former. Can they then want uneaſineſſes? Are their proſperities not thwarted by ſome ill fortune? Read all that Guſtavus Adolphus did in Germany, and you will there find a ſuperiority of fortune, which has very few examples; yet you will obſerve ſo great a mixture of diſadvantageous events, that you will eaſily believe him to have run through a great deal of uneaſineſs (92). Nay, ſuppoſe the victories gained in ſome provinces, do not concur with the loſſes ſuſtained in others, you will have reaſon to believe that the joy is not pure and unmixed. An hundred anxious reflexions diſturb it. People will imagine that the attack was made too ſoon or too late; too many men were loſt, and all advantage was not taken of the diſorder of the vanquiſhed, but they were permitted to recover from their fright; and they believe that by a different conduct the victory had been more compleat. How many Generals are there who have very uneaſy nights after entire victories? They are ſenſible that they are beholden for them to ſome lucky chance, to the

PRINCES and great men are not ſo happy as other people.

---

(82) I have quoted his words in the article TULLIA, citat. (83).

(83) Felicitas cui præcipua fuerit homini non eſt humani judicii: cum proſperitatem ipſam alius alio modo & ſuopte ingenio quiſque terminet. *Plin. lib. vii, cap. xl, pag. m.* 62.

(84) Tacitus, Annal. *lib. vi, cap. xxii.*

(85) See the article MANICHEES, remark [C].

(86) Pauſanias, *lib. viii, pag.* 256.

(87) This is not well tranſlated by Romulus Amaſæus. It ſhould be, *tempore Crœſi.* This fault has not been mended in the Leipſic edition, 1696.

(88) Plutarch. in Solone, *pag.* 93.

(89) See, above, in citation (86), the words of Pauſanias.

(90) *See* Horace, Epodon Ode II.

(91) James Benignus Boſſuet, *Biſhop of Meaux*, Oraiſon funebre de Marie Tereſe d'Auſtriche, Reine de France, *pag.* 78, 79. *Dutch edition.*

(92) He was obliged to publiſh ſome Manifeſto's againſt thoſe who blamed him for not preventing the taking of Magdeburg.

kind with an infinite number of agreeable conveniencies, and appointed all other things for

fault of the enemy, and ſometimes even to their own faults. They are ſenſible they have not done all that might have been done. They are apprehenſive of the comments of the experienced, and of the malicious reflexions of their enemies. In a word, they cannot bear a good teſtimony to themſelves, nor interternally applaud the elogies beſtowed upon them. This diſturbs and racks them. Whilſt their conſciences are ſometimes aſleep, with regard to the law of God, they are touched to the very quick with reſpect to the tranſgreſſion of ſome laws in the art of war, and the non-obſervance of ſome rules which an expert General would have followed. Obſerve, that the moſt fortunate Princes, either in gaining of battles, or conquering of towns, are thoſe, whom the defeat of an army, or the raiſing of a ſiege, afflict the moſt ſenſibly. A long train of adverſities hardens others; but theſe grow almoſt inſenſible as to good ſucceſs, and extremely ſenſible of the leaſt diſgraces. Auguſtus is an example of this. On a thouſand occaſions he obtained the moſt important and glorious advantages over his enemies that he could have wiſhed, and ſcarce experienced any of the effects of bad fortune: but the loſs of three legions ſo prodigiouſly afflicted him, that the pain, we may ſay, he ſuffered on this account, was greater than the pleaſure which he had felt by ten victories. Read what follows: 'Graves ignominias cladeſque, *ſaith Suetonius, after having made a long enumeration of the ſucceſſes of this Emperor*, duas omnino, nec alibi quam in Germania, accepit, Lollianam, & Varianam: Sed Lollianam majoris infamiæ quam detrimenti: Varianam pæne exitiabilem, tribus legionibus, cum duce, legatiſque, & auxiliis omnibus cæſis. Hæc nuntiata, excubias per urbem indixit, ne quis tumultus exiſteret: & Præſidibus provinciarum propagavit imperium, ut & à peritis & aſſuetis ſocii continerentur. Vovit & magnos ludos Jovi Opt. Max. SI REMPUBLICAM IN MELIOREM STATUM VERTISSET: quod factum Cimbrico Marſicoque bello erat. Adeo namque conſternatum ferunt, ut per continuos menſes barba capilloque ſummiſſo, caput interdum foribus illideret, vociferans; *Quintili Vare, legiones redde*: diemque cladis quotannis mœſtum habuerit ac lugubrem (93). - - - *Auguſtus met only with two diſgraces, viz. the overthrow of Lollius and that of Varus, both in Germany. The former was attended with more infamy than loſs. The latter was almoſt fatal, for in it were ſlain three legions, with their General, the Ambaſſadors, and all their auxilliaries. Upon the arrival of this news, Auguſtus ſet a guard in ſeveral parts of the city, to prevent tumults, and enlarged the authority of the governors of the provinces, that they might keep the allies from making commotions. He likewiſe made a vow of inſtituting ſolemn games to Jupiter,* IF HE BROUGHT THE REPUBLIC INTO A BETTER CONDITION: *This was done in the war with the Cimbrians, and the Marſi. It is reported that Auguſtus was ſo much affected with this diſgrace, that having, for ſeveral months, neglected his beard and hair, he would ſometimes knock his head againſt the wall, and cry out,* Varus, reſtore my legions; *and he annually held the day of that overthrow as a day of ſadneſs and mourning.*' I cannot better prove, than by the example of Auguſtus, that we ought not to look for happy people upon the throne; for, if any monarch was ever fortune's favourite, it was Auguſtus; and yet the liſt of his griefs (94) is ſo large, that no one will deny, that at leaſt he felt as much evil as good. See what I obſerve concerning Charles V (95), Queen Elizabeth (96), Lewis XI (97), and Lewis XIII (98). Mr Silhon ſaith judiciouſly, that *the whole lives of the Emperors, Ferdinand, Charles V, and Philip II, were nothing but a mixture of good and evil; that in them we ſee proſperities without number, and misfortunes without meaſure; wounds covered with laurels, and triumphs adorned with mourning . . . . Look upon Ferdinand, proud of the reduction of the kingdom of Granada, and of obtaining the title of Catholic: ſee him triumphing in the conqueſt of Naples, and over the fortune of France: behold, a caprice gives him Navarre, and chance guides him to the diſcovery of an unknown world, and new riches . . . But let us conſider the other ſide of his life, and turn the tables. We ſhall ſee a prince ill treated by fortune, and a diadem broken by her blows. We ſhall ſee a father burying his only ſon, and ſolemnizing the funeral of his eldeſt daughter. A huſband loſing a wife, who had been his glory, and more the companion of his fatigues than of his bed. A maſter forſaken by his ſervants and creatures: An old man driven from his houſe, and a father-in-law deſpoiled and ſtripped by his own ſon-in-law* (99). Add to this, that he could not bear the reputation of a great Captain. And this jealouſy was not the leaſt of his uneaſineſſes. See in the original what Mr Silhon ſaith of Charles V (100), and Philip II. And ſee what Plutarch relates of a great Prince who was eſteemed happy (101).

The Abbot Regnier had great reaſon to ſay (102),

Qu'ont ils d'ordinaire,
Qu'ont ills au deſſus
Du deſtin vulgaire
Ceux qu'un ſort proſpére
Eleve le plus?
Une montre vaine
De grandeur humaine,
Qui marche avec eux,
Des dehors pompeux,
Brillants agréables,
Des ſoins devorants,
Des beins apparents,
Des maux véritables.
Les grands en un mot
N'ont pas le bon Lot.

The man whom fortune raiſes high
In pow'r, or wealth, or dignity,
Say what has he above the fate
Of other men in humble ſtate?
What but a pageant outſide ſhow
Of human grandeur does he know?
Devouring cares, apparent bliſs,
Not one degree of happineſs:
Whilſt anxious thoughts, and miſery
Lie hid beneath the pageantry.
In ſhort, the truly happy ſtate
Is not the portion of the great.

The following words of the Count de Buſſi ſtruck me the firſt time that I read them: 'When you and I ſhall no longer have upon our hands the expence of the war for our children, we ſhall meet with other troubles in time of peace; for, in ſhort, we muſt have ſome. Hear our friend Comines talking on this ſubject of the croſſes of human life. *No creature is exempt from trouble, all eat their bread in pain and ſorrow; our Lord promiſed it when he made man, and hath faithfully performed it to all ſorts of people* (103).' If Philip de Comines had been aſked, *Do you believe that Kings have a larger ſhare in the execution of this promiſe of our Lord than other men?* I am throughly perſuaded that he would have anſwered, *Yes, I believe it* (104).

What I have been ſaying of Kings, may, in proportion, be ſaid of all thoſe whom providence raiſes to eminent poſts, and who ſhare in any kind of grandeur. Their lot is a mixture, in which evil is for the moſt part predominant. Great knowledge and a ſublime genius do not exempt men from this fatality. No, look rather amongſt the moſt ignorant rabble, than among illuſtrious learned men for happineſs: the glory that ſurrounds authors and celebrated orators, doth not ſecure them from a thouſand troubles. It expoſes them to envy two ſeveral ways, which are very inconvenient. They have rivals who perſecute them, and are jealous, in their turn, of the praiſes which others deſerve; a Typographical error gives them more diſturbance, than four letters full of elogies can afford them pleaſure. The glory which they have acquired diminiſhes the pleaſure they take in being praiſed, and increaſes their uneaſineſs for the want of praiſe, for cenſure, ſharing of fame, &c. Beſides, the more learning they have, the more they know for their uſe, conſider man in another reſpect as an unhappy being [G]. That kind of neceſſity to which ſo many people are reduced, of ſeeking a remedy for their uneaſineſs among

---

(93) Suetonius, in Auguſto, *cap.* 23.

(94) You will find it in Pliny, *lib. vii, cap. xlv.*

(95) In the remark [*L*], of his article.

(96) In the remark [*S*], of her article.

(97) In the remark [*T*], of his article.

(98) In the remark [*B*], of his article.

(99) Silhon, Miniſtre d'Etat, *livr. ii, Diſcours iii, pag.* 135, *Dutch edition.*

(100) He is in the wrong to call him Ferdinand's nephew. He was deceived by ſome Latin book, wherein he found that Charles V, was *nepos*, that is, grandſon to Ferdinand.

(101) *It is Agamemnon. See Plutarch,* de tranquillitate animi, *pag.* 466, 471. *Read the whole Diſſertation of la Mothe le Vayer, upon Proſperity, in the eighth volume of his Works.*

(102) In a piece of Poetry, prefixed to Mr Leti's *Critique ſur les Loteries.*

(103) Buſſi Rabutin's xviith letter of the firſt Part, pag. 281, Dutch edition.

(104) See the laſt chapter, and the concluſion of his Memoirs.

---

that their works are imperfect. If they guard againſt the weakneſs of prejudices, and the irregularities of a hundred mean paſſions, and are willing to conform their language and conduct to this temper of mind, they become odious, and muſt renounce all external advantages. If they externally conform to the depraved taſte of the world, they reproach themſelves a hundred times a day with this ignominious hypocriſy, and thereby diſturb their quiet. There are very few who, like Democritus, can know the extravagance of humours, and divert themſelves with it: that Philoſopher was maſter of this talent. Read Hippocrates's letter to Damagetes, and add to it the paraphraſe upon it which an author of the XVIth century (105) publiſhed. He elegantly and particularly unfolds what the Greek author had ſaid in general. He diverted himſelf with this cenſure, one may perceive that he was vexed, and that if he had been aſked,

> Quelle humeur ſombre
> Fais tu voir à contretems ?
>
> *What puts you ſo much out of humour ?*

He might have ſaid

> C'eſt que je ne ſuis point du nombre
> Des Auteurs qui ſont contens (106).
>
> *I am not a contented author.*

Pauſanias (107) mentions the oracle which was delivered to Homer, *You are happy and unhappy*. Apollo could not anſwer better.

It is time to put an end to theſe common-places. Give me leave then to conclude with four remarks. The firſt is, that if we conſider mankind in general, it ſeems that Xenophanes might have ſaid, that pain and grief prevail over pleaſure. II. That there are ſome private perſons, who we may preſume, taſte in this life much more good than evil. III. That there are others of whom we may believe, that they have a much larger ſhare of evil than good. IV. That my ſecond propoſition is more eſpecially probable, with reſpect to thoſe who die before their declining age; and that the third appears chiefly certain in thoſe who arrive to a decrepit old age. When Racan ſaid,

> Que pour eux ſeulement les Dieux ont fait la gloire,
> Et pour nous les plaiſirs (108).
>
> *For them alone the gods have glory made,*
> *And for us pleaſures.*

Doubtleſs he conſidered only the flower of our age; it is then that pleaſures are predominant; and that good turns the ſcale (109): it is then that the Pagan Nemeſis makes advances, and gives credit: ſhe is then willing that accounts ſhould be ſettled without any deduction; but ſhe reimburſes her ſelf in old age.

> Multa ſenem circumveniunt incommoda, vel quòd
> Quærit, & inventis miſer abſtinet, ac timet uti:
> Vel quòd res omnes timide gelideque miniſtrat,
> Dilator ſpe longus, iners, aviduſque futuri:
> Difficilis, querulus, laudator temporis acti
> Se puero, cenſor caſtigatorque minorum.
> Multa ferunt anni venientes commoda ſecum,
> Multa recedentes adimunt (110).
>
> *An old man's character is hit with eaſe*
> *For he is peeviſh, and all one diſeaſe:*
> *Still covetous, and ſtill he gripes for more,*
> *And yet he fears to uſe his preſent ſtore:*
> *Slow, long in hope, ſtill eager to live on,*
> *And fond of no man's judgment but his own:*
> *On youth's gay frolics peeviſhly ſevere,*
> *And oh! when he was young, what times they were!*
>
> *The flow of life brings in a wealthy ſtore,*
> *The ebb draws back whate'er was brought before,*
> *And leaves a barren ſand and naked ſhore.*
>
> Creech.

This Poet hath not ſaid all, nor was it neceſſary for him to touch on the diſadvantage of old age which Juvenal diſplays.

> Ut vigeant ſenſus animi, ducenda tamen ſunt
> Funera natorum, rogus aſpiciendus amatæ
> Conjugis, & fratris, plenæque ſororibus urnæ.
> Hæc data pœna diu viventibus, ut renovata
> Semper clade domus, multis in luctibus, inque
> Perpetuo mœrore, & nigra veſte ſeneſcant (111).
>
> *Well, yet ſuppoſe his ſenſes were his own,*
> *He lives to be chief mourner for his ſon:*
> *Before his face his wife and brother burns,*
> *He numbers all his kindred in their urns.*
> *Theſe are the fines he pays for living long,*
> *And dragging tedious age in his own wrong:*
> *Griefs always green, a houſhold ſtill in tears,*
> *Sad pomps: a threſhold throng'd with daily biers*
> *And liveries of black for length of years.*
>
> Dryden.

Add to this that paſſage of Virgil:

> Optima quæque dies miſeris mortalibus ævi
> Prima fugit: ſubeunt morbi, triſtiſque ſenectus;
> Et labor, & duræ rapit inclementia mortis (112).
>
> *In youth alone unhappy mortals live;*
> *But ah! the mighty bliſs is fugitive.*
> *Diſcolour'd ſickneſs, anxious labour come,*
> *And age and death's inexorable doom.*
>
> Dryden.

Obſerve, that Racan advanced a maxim which contradicts the greateſt of the antient Poets, for ſee what Homer ſaith:

> Ὡς γὰρ ἐπλεκώσαντο θεοὶ δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι,
> Ζώειν ἀχνυμένους· αὐτοὶ δέ τ᾽ ἀκηδέες εἰσί.
>
> Sic enim fato tribuunt dii miſeris mortalibus,
> Ut vivant triſtes: ipſi vero ſine curis ſunt (113).
>
> . . . . *man is born to bear,*
> *Such is, alas! the gods ſevere decree*
> *They, only they are bleſs'd, and only free.*
>
> Mr Pope.

[G] *Even thoſe who believe that nature . . . appointed all other things for their uſe, conſider man . . . as an unhappy being.*] Have we not ſeen, above (114), that Pliny, after a prologue which allows the ſuperiority to our ſpecies, places it in a worſe condition than all other animals, with regard to diſadvantages? Could Seneca, who ſo well repreſents the favours which God beſtows on men (115), have denied Pliny's obſervation? Could Socrates, who ſo advantageouſly deſcribed the prerogatives of human nature, have denied them? ‘ Thou thinkeſt,’ ſaid he to a diſciple who denied Providence, ‘ that the gods take no care ‘ of man, they who have allowed him alone the privilege of going erect, which is of great advantage ‘ to him in diſcovering things at a diſtance, in conſidering things above at his eaſe, and avoiding many ‘ inconveniencies. In the next place, all animals ‘ which walk have indeed feet; but they ſerve them ‘ for no other uſe than barely to walk. Whereas the ‘ gods, beſides this, have given hands to man, which ‘ render him the happieſt animal in the world. All ‘ animals have tongues; but there is none beſides that ‘ of man, that can form words, to explain his ‘ thoughts, and communicate them to others. And ‘ to

(105) Alardus Amſtelredamus. *This paraphraſe upon the Epiſtle of Hippocrates was compoſed in the abbey of Egmond in Holland, in the year* 1526. *The edition I make uſe of was printed* Salingiaci apud Joannem Soterem, 1539, in 8vo.

(106) Theſe verſes are in one of Quinaut's Operas. I only change the word *Amans* into that of *Auteurs*.

(107) See his own words above, in citation (86).

(108) See his letter to Balzac, in the ſecond tome of the *Recueil de Lettres nouvelles*, printed at Paris in 1634, pag. 300.

(109) This is not contrary to that paſſage of the Pſalmiſt: *Even the flower of this life is ſuch; that we are always in pain and ſorrow*: for Moſes only repreſented the ſtate of the Jews at that time.

(110) Horat. de Arte Poëtica, ver. 169.

(111) Juvenal. Sat. X, ver. 240.

(112) Virgil. Georgic. lib. iii, ver. 66.

(113) Homer. Iliad. lib. xxiv, ver. 525.

(114) Remark [D], at the beginning.

(115) See, above, citations (77), (78).

among forbidden pleaſures, is no ſmall part of the ſeverity of their fate [*H*]. However, we may here alledge the authority of Ariſtotle; for that great genius, who philoſophized with ſo much application, and penetration, acknowledged that there was in nature more evil than good, and that therefore Empedocles diſliked the hypotheſis of the unity of a principle, and firſt ſuppoſed two principles, one of good, the other of evil [*I*]. The Holy Scripture ſo emphatically repreſents the miſeries of this life (*m*), that it is ſufficient to afford a demonſtrative argument on this controverſy. I wonder Rabbi Maimonides, a man of great learning and judgment, and a good Philoſopher, could think that he had fully refuted the doctrine I mention [*K*]. It is not improbable that Xenophanes believed the

‘ to ſhew that the gods have provided even for our pleaſures, they have not determined the ſeaſon for the amours of men, who may continually enjoy, till their extreme old age, a pleaſure which the brutes taſte only at a certain ſeaſon of the year. Laſtly, not content to beſtow ſo many advantages on the body of man, they have endowed him with a ſoul, tranſcendently excellent, and ſurpaſſing all others. For which, amongſt the ſouls of other animals hath any knowledge of the eſſence of the gods, the works of whoſe creation are ſo ſtupendous? Is there any other ſpecies, beſides that of man, that ſerves and adores them? What animal like him can defend it ſelf from hunger, thirſt, cold, and heat? Which of them like us can diſcover remedies againſt diſeaſes, or exerciſe his ſtrength? Which of them is ſo capable of learning, or ſo perfectly retains the things which he hath ſeen, heard, or known? In a word, it is clear that man is a god in compariſon with other living ſpecies, conſidering the advantages of body and mind, which he naturally hath over them (116).’ It is very likely that after this beautiful deſcription, he would have owned the deplorable condition of man, if he had been deſired to examine the matter throughly.

[*H*] *Of ſeeking a remedy for their uneaſineſs among forbidden pleaſures.*] Is not this removing a Phyſical evil by a moral one? Is not ſuch a remedy worſe than the diſeaſe? And is not the man very miſerable, who can have recourſe to no other remedy than this? It is very certain that a great many people find no other. Domeſtic brawls, and the ſight of an ill management at home force men out of doors to gaming, or to drinking at the tavern. Without that they cannot drive away their melancholy; and that is the ſole diverſion which they oppoſe againſt uneaſineſs. Some even get drunk on purpoſe to avoid uneaſy thoughts at night, the time when they are moſt troubleſome. They have found that ſuch thoughts keep them from ſleeping, and make them too cruelly attentive to their miſery. Therefore by wine they procure themſelves a perfect drouzineſs. This is ſo much gained from ill fortune; this is ſecuring the moſt formidable part of the whole day. Generally ſpeaking, women cannot make uſe of this antidote to anxiety, and therefore their condition is more deplorable than that of men. Whence Medea declares in Euripides, that a woman ill married is in ſuch a miſerable condition, that it is better for her to die than continue in it; ſhe cannot, like the men, go abroad in queſt of neceſſary conſolations.

Κἂν μὲν τάδ᾽ ἡμῖν ἐκπονουμέναισιν εὖ
Πόσις ξυνοικῇ, μὴ βίᾳ φέρων ζυγὸν,
Ζηλωτὸς αἰών εἰ δὲ μὴ, θανεῖν χρεών.
‘ *Ἀνὴρ δ᾽ ὅταν τοῖς ἔνδον ἄχθηται ξυνὼν,*
‘ *Ἔξω μολὼν ἔπαυσε καρδίας χόλον,*
‘ *Ἢ πρὸς φίλων τιν᾽, ἢ πρὸς ἥλικα τραπείς.*
‘ *Ἡμῖν δ᾽ ἀνάγκη πρὸς μίαν ψυχὴν βλέπειν.*

Et ſi nobis hæc quidem peragentibus bene
Cohabitaverit maritus, non violentum *nobis* imponens jugum,
Beata eſt vita: ſin minus, ſatius eſt mori.
‘ Vir vero cum dolet propter res domeſticas,
‘ Foras egreſſus ſedat cordis bilem,
‘ Converſus aut ad aliquem amicum, aut coætaneum,
‘ Sed nos oportet ſpectare ad unam animam (117).

. . . . . *If, when*
The careful conſort rules her houſhould well,
Her huſband governs with a gentle ſway,
And courts her lov'd embrace; what home-felt joy,
What inward comforts ſeize her raptur'd breaſt!
But if, he, ſcornful, ſlights her converſe ſweet,
'Tis better for her far to die than live.
Man when oppreſs'd with black domeſtic cares,
Ranges abroad to ſeek relief, and meets
The healing comforts of a faithful friend,
Or fellowſhip of ſome companion dear.
But helpleſs, hapleſs, woman, when denied
Thoſe tender joys which from her huſband's love
She juſtly claims, muſt ſeek it no where elſe.

[*I*] *Ariſtotle . . . acknowledged that there was in nature more evil than good, and that therefore Empedocles . . . firſt ſuppoſed two principles, one of good, the other of evil.*] Before I cite his words, I muſt obſerve, that he takes the liberty of unravelling Empedocles's opinion, and explaining it according to the ſpirit, rather than the letter of it; but after all he takes for granted, that good is the cauſe of all good, and evil the cauſe of all evil. The two principles of Empedocles, were amity and diſcord: *Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τἀναντία τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἐνόντα ἐφαίνετο ἐν τῇ φύσει, καὶ οὐ μόνον τάξις, καὶ τὸ καλὸν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀταξία, καὶ τὸ αἰσχρὸν, καὶ πλείω τὰ κακὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τὰ φαῦλα τῶν καλῶν. οὕτως ἄλλός τις φιλίαν εἰσήνεγκε, καὶ τὸ νεῖκος, ἑκάτερον ἑκατέρων αἴτιον τούτων. εἰ γάρ τις ἀκαλουθοίη, καὶ λαμβάνοι πρὸς τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἃ ψελλίζεται λέγων Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, εὑρήσει τὴν μὲν φιλίαν εἶναι τῶν ἀγαθῶν, τὸ δὲ νεῖκος τῶν κακῶν. ὥστ᾽ εἴτις φαίη τρόπον τινὰ καὶ λέγειν, καὶ πρῶτον λέγειν τὸ κακὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀρχὰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα. τάχ᾽ ἂν λέγοι καλῶς. εἴπερ τὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἁπάντων αἴτιον, αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθόν ἐστι, καὶ τῶν κακῶν, τὸ κακόν.* Cùm autem contraria quoque bonis ineſſe naturæ apparerent, nec ſolùm ordo, & pulchrum, verùm etiam inordinatio, & turpe, pluraque mala, quàm bona, & turpia quàm pulchra, ideò alius quidam amicitiam introduxit, & contentionem, utrunque utriuſque horum cauſam. Si quis enim ſequatur, & ſecundùm ſententiam accipiat, non ſecundùm ea, quæ balbutiens Empedocles dicit, inveniet amicitiam quidem bonorum cauſam eſſe, contentionem verò malorum. Quare ſi quis dicat quodam modo dicere, & primum Empedoclem dicere malum, & bonum eſſe principia, fortaſſe bene inquiet: ſiquidem bonorum omnium cauſa, ipſum bonum, ac malorum, ipſum malum eſt (118). - - - *As there appear in nature things which are contrary and oppoſite to good ones, and we obſerve not only order and beauty, but alſo diſorder and deformity, and more things evil than good, more things deformed than beautiful; ſo there muſt be two diſtinct principles, one the cauſe of amity, and the other of diſcord. For if you take the ſenſe and ſpirit of this opinion, and not the inaccurate expreſſions of Empedocles, it will appear that amity is the cauſe of good, and diſcord of evil. Therefore, if any one ſhould ſay that Empedocles affirmed, in ſome reſpect, and was the firſt who affirmed that there are two principles, one good, the other evil, perhaps he would be in the right: for the principle of all good things is a good principle, and that of all evil things, is an evil one.* Obſerve that he elſewhere (119) cenſures this opinion of Empedocles, and that he did not believe that there was any eternal principle of evil; for he affirms (120), that there is nothing but good in the eternal Beings.

[*K*] *I wonder Rabbi Maimonides . . . . could think that he had fully refuted the doctrine I mention.*] He confeſſes that the Heathens, and even ſome of the Rabbins, made declamations on the ſuperiority of evil, and he treats them as ridiculous and ſenſeleſs men. ‘ Sæpiſſime, *ſaith he* (121), ſolent in cordibus hominum imperitorum iſtiuſmodi cogitationes exſurgere, ac ſi longè plura eſſent in mundo Mala quam Bona: ‘ ita

---

(*m*) See particularly the book of Job, and that of the Pſalms in ſeveral places.

(116) Xenophon. de memorab. Socrat. *lib. i.*

(117) Euripid. in Medea, ver. 241, *pag. m.* 276.

(118) Ariſtoteles, Metaphyſ. *lib. i, cap. iv, pag. m.* 646.

(119) Id. ibid. *lib. xii, cap. x, pag.* 745.

(120) Id. ibid. *lib. ix, cap. ix, pag.* 717.

(121) Moſes Maimonides in More Nevochim, *Part. iii, cap. xii, pag. m.* 354, 355.

the incomprehenſibility of all things [*L*]. He gave the Egyptians good advice, when he ſaw them lamenting in the celebration of their feſtivals: *if the objects of your worſhip*, ſaid he (*n*), *are gods, do not weep: if they are men, offer no ſacrifices to them.*

Others

ita ut in multis poëmatis & cantilenis Gentilium hæc & ſimilia reperiantur; *Miraculi inſtar eſſe, quando in Tempore boni aliquid invenitur: Mala autem eſſe multa & perpetua.* Atque hic error non ſolùm in Vulgo obtinuit, verùm etiam apud eos, qui Sapientes haberi volunt, & apud ipſum *Alraſi* in libro illo celebri, quem *Sepher Elohuth* h. e. *Theoſophiam* nominavit, in quo multa ex deliriis & ſtoliditatibus ſuis congeſſit, è quibus & iſtud eſt, quòd plura exiſtant Mala quàm Bona; eò quòd, ſi comparationem inſtituas inter recreationes & voluptates Hominis, quas tempore tranquillitatis percipit, cum doloribus, cruciatibus, perturbationibus, defectibus, curis, ſollicitudinibus, & afflictionibus, deprehendatur, vitam Hominis illorum bonorum reſpectu, eſſe Vindictam magnam & Malum magnum. - - - *There ariſe very frequently in the minds of ignorant men ſuch thoughts as this, that there is far more evil than good in the world*; *and accordingly in the poems and ſongs of the Heathens, we very often meet with theſe and the like expreſſions*; It is as it were a miracle, if good things continue for any time: but evil things are numerous and laſting. *This error prevailed not only among the vulgar, but even among thoſe who deſired to be thought wiſe men, and was held by Alraſi himſelf, as appears from that famous book of his called* The wiſdom of God, *where he has collected together a great many of his own delirious and fooliſh conceits, and this among others, that there is in the world more evil than good, becauſe if you compare the recreations and pleaſures of any man, ſuch as he enjoys in times of health and peace, with his pains, torments, diſorders, wants, cares, anxieties, and afflictions, it will appear that his life, compared with theſe good things, is a great puniſhment, and a great evil.*’ He ſays that the cauſe of their extravagant error is (22), that they fancy nature was made only for them, and do not mind that which has no reference to their perſons, from whence they infer that if any thing goes ill with them, all is amiſs in the univerſe. He adds, that if we would conſider the ſmallneſs of man, with reſpect to the univerſe, we ſhould be ſoon convinced that the ſuperiority of evil has no place among the angels or the celeſtial bodies, nor among the elements and the mixt inanimate beings, nor among ſeveral ſorts of animals. This obſervation of Maimonides doth not come home to the queſtion; for thoſe whom he refutes mean nothing elſe but that among men evil ſurpaſſes good. What doth it avail then in order to convince them of their error, to ſay that evil doth not ſurpaſs good in the reſt of nature? All inanimate bodies are incapable of good and evil; they muſt not therefore be put into the account when this queſtion is in diſpute: and there is no body but may maintain, that all in which we place the order, beauty, and perfection of the celeſtial bodies, *&c*, being changed, it would be no evil with reſpect to the univerſe, though man, or ſome other particular creatures, ſhould ſuffer damage by it. If the ſun and the planets, had the ſame variation as the ſhips, which go and come between Marſeilles and Naples, ſometimes in fewer and ſometimes in more days, without any fixed rule, could not one pretend, that, with reſpect to the univerſe, it is not an evil, an imperfection and a diſorder?

After this Maimonides ſays that the evils of mankind may be reduced to three claſſes: the firſt comprehends thoſe which proceed from man's having a body: the ſecond, thoſe which proceed from the machinations of men againſt each other: the third are thoſe which a man brings on himſelf by his own fault. He makes fine remarks on all this, but they are foreign to the queſtion; for the diſpute is not about the cauſe of man's unhappineſs, but whether this be matter of fact, that the evils which he ſuffers ſurpaſs the good things he enjoys. It ſignifies nothing to tell us that we our ſelves are the cauſe of our misfortunes, that we often afflict our ſelves without any reaſon; and that the pleaſures of life are numberleſs, and ſometimes very long; for all this is incapable of ſolving the difficulty. A grain of evil, as I may ſay, ſpoils an hundred pound of good (123); a little piece of iron hot in the ſeventh degree, burns more than an hundred feet hot in the fourth degree. No evil is ſmall when it is felt and conſidered as a great one, and nothing troubles an uneaſy man more than to know, that he has no reaſon to be uneaſy. ‘There is, *ſays Mr de St Evremond*, a ſort of uneaſineſs of which I cannot imagine the cauſe; and as one does not know how to find the true reaſon of it, I think it very difficult to allay, or to avoid it . . . . Uneaſineſſes of this kind are common to all men: they are ſuch as make us fall out with our ſelves, and ſhewing us that we have no reaſon to be uneaſy, force us, in ſpite of ſelf-love, to confeſs, that we are unjuſt and unreaſonable to our ſelves (124).’

[*L*] *Xenophanes believed the incomprehenſibility of all things.*] Let us begin this remark with a paſſage of Diogenes Laërtius: Φησὶ δὲ Σωτίων πρῶτον αυτὸν εἰπεῖν ἀκατάληπτα εἶναι τὰ πάντα, πλανώμενος, that is, *Sotion, who ſays that Xenophanes maintained that all things are incomprehenſible, is miſtaken* (125). We cannot judge by theſe words whether Diogenes Laërtius denied that Xenophanes held the incomprehenſibility of all things; for he might not deny it, and yet charge Sotion with an error. This accuſation would be juſt, if before Xenocrates others taught that all the objects of our mind are beyond our comprehenſion. There are a thouſand ſuch places in Diogenes Laërtius; they do him but little honour: for an exact genius would avoid theſe ambiguities and obſcurities. I conjecture he intended to ſay that Xenophanes did not teach the incomprehenſibility of all things (126); but at the ſame time I think he is to blame to ſpeak thus of this Philoſopher. All appearances engage us to believe that Xenophanes taught, that we could not comprehend any thing in the nature of things. Plutarch charges him with ſaying, that our ſenſes and reaſon are fallacious faculties. Ἀποφαίνεται δὲ καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ψευδεῖς, καὶ καθόλου σὺν αὐταῖς, καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν λόγον διαβάλλει. *Senſus fallaces eſſe contendit, unaque cum illis ipſam quoque rationem in omnibus criminatur* (127). Others will have it that he denied the evidence of the ſenſes in order to conclude that nothing ought to be relied upon but reaſon, and they tell us that he was the firſt author of this doctrine. Οἴονται δεῖν τὰς μὲν αἰσθήσεις καὶ τὰς φαντασίας καταβάλλειν, αὐτῷ δὲ μόνον τῷ λόγῳ πιστεύειν. Τοιαῦτα γάρ τινα πρότερον μὲν Ξενοφάνης, καὶ Παρμενίδης . . . . . . ἔλεγον. *Senſus viſaque omnia funditus repudianda, rationi uni fidem habendam opinantur. Ac primum quidem Xenophanes, & Parmenides . . . . . in ea ſunt doctrina verſati* (128). I believe Plutarch repreſents the ſyſtem of Xenophanes more faithfully than Ariſtocles. I believe Xenophanes relied no more upon reaſon than upon his ſenſes. This is what induces me to think ſo. He was the firſt who taught that whatever has been made is corruptible. Πρῶτος ἀπεφήνατο ὅτι πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον φθαρτόν ἐστὶ. *Primus definivit omne quod fiat corruptioni obnoxium eſſe* (129). He alſo taught that all things were but one ſole being, that there was neither generation nor corruption; and that this ſole being continued always the ſame, and could not be ſubject to any change (130). Ὅθεν ἠξίουν οὗτοί γε τὸ ὂν ἓν εἶναι, καὶ τὸ μὴ ὂν ἕτερον εἶναι, μηδὲ γεννᾶσθαί τι, μηδὲ φθείρεσθαι, μηδὲ κινεῖσθαι τὸ παράπαν. *Hi quicquid eſſet, unum duntaxat eſſe: quod ab eo diverſum eſſet, id non eſſe: generari nihil: nihil corrumpi, moveri omnino nihil ſtatuebant* (131). But the following is a more exact account of the principles of Xenophanes, in their natural connexion. Firſt of all he affirmed (132) that nothing is made out of nothing, that is, to remove all ambiguity, that a thing which has not always exiſted can never exiſt. From thence he concluded that whatever is, hath always exiſted: but, added he, what hath always exiſted is eternal; what is eternal is infinite; what is infinite, is but one, for if it contained ſeveral beings, one would terminate the other, and it would not therefore be infinite. Beſides, ſaid he, what is but one, is throughout like it ſelf; for if it comprehended any difference, it would

---

(*n*) Plutarchus de Superſtit. *in fine, pag.* 171.

(122) Cauſa erroris fatui illius Hominis & omnium ipſius ſociorum eſt quod, *&c. Id. ibid. pag.* 355.

(123) The ſea water, whoſe bitterneſs is intolerable, contains 40, or 42, times more ſweet particles than ſalt ones.

(124) Saint Evremond in his diſcourſe of vexations and diſpleaſures. I quote him from the extract of an anonymous writer, who criticiſed that author, pag. 137; for my edition, (Tom. iv, pag. 45) which is the Dutch one, in 1693, contains but part of what that Critic mentions. [(§ *a*) This piece was falſely aſcribed to Mr de St Evremond. Rem. Crit.]

(125) Diog. Laërtius, *lib. ix, num.* 20.

(126) See, below, in citation (142), the paſſage of Sextus Empiricus.

(127) Plutarch. in Stromatis, *apud* Euſebium Præparat. Evangel. *lib. i, cap. viii, pag.* 23, *B.*

(128) Ariſtocles, de Philoſophia, *lib. viii, apud* Euſebium, ubi ſupra, *lib. xiv, cap. xvii, pag.* 756, *B.*

(129) Diogen. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 19.

(130) *See* Plato, in Sophiſta, *pag. m.* 170, C.

(131) Ariſtocles, *apud* Euſebium, ubi ſupra.

(132) *See Ariſtotle's Treatiſe*, de Xenophane, Zenone, & Gorgia, *init. in the firſt tome of his works, pag.* 939; *Edit. of Geneva,* 1605.

Others ſay (*o*) that he made uſe of this thought, when the Eleates deſired to know of him whether they ought to ſacrifice to Leucothea, and ſhed tears for her or not. I muſt

(*o*) Ariſtot. Rhetoric. *lib. ii, cap. xxiii, pag. m.* 447, *C.*

---

not be one, but ſeveral beings. Laſtly, this ſole, eternal and infinite being, ought to be immovable, and immutable; for if it could change its place, there would be ſomething beyond it, it would not therefore be infinite: and if it could ſuffer any alteration without changing of place, ſomething that did not always exiſt would begin to be produced, and ſomething which had always exiſted would ceaſe to be. But that is impoſſible; for every thing which not having eternally exiſted ſhould begin to exiſt, muſt be produced out of nothing, and every thing which never had a beginning hath a neceſſary exiſtence; and therefore cannot ever ceaſe to be. Theſe were his principles, if we believe Ariſtotle (133). I do not doubt but they appeared evident to him, and that he was perſuaded they were a gradation of conſequences neceſſarily drawn from an inconteſtable principle. The orthodox Divines would deny him, that nothing can have a beginning; but would grant him that the being which never had a beginning is one only, infinite, immovable, and immutable, and that no being, whoſe exiſtence is neceſſary, can be deſtroyed. They teach, and with reaſon, that God is not ſubject to any alteration? for if any change ſhould happen to him, he would acquire, and loſe ſomething. What he ſhould acquire would be either diſtinct from his ſubſtance, or a mode identical with his ſubſtance. If it was a diſtinct being, God could not be a ſimple being; and, what is worſe, would be compoſed of an increated nature, and, created one (134). If it was a mode identical with his ſubſtance, God could not produce it without producing himſelf: but as he exiſts independently of his own will, and did not give himſelf his exiſtence at the beginning, it follows that he can never do it. Beſides, nothing that neceſſarily exiſts can ever ceaſe to be: from whence it muſt of neceſſity follow, that God never can loſe what he once had. Now what is called a modification, or *ens inhærens in alio*, is of ſuch a nature that it cannot be produced but by the ruin of another modality; juſt as a new figure is neceſſarily the deſtruction of the old one. Wherefore if God acquired ſomething new, he muſt neceſſarily loſe ſome other thing; for this new acquiſition would not be a ſubſtance, but an accident, or an *ens inhærens in alio.* Since therefore nothing which neceſſarily exiſts can ceaſe to exiſt, it follows that God can never acquire any thing new. Thus the immutability of God is ſupported by evident notions. Xenophanes added to his maxims the following one, viz. that nothing is made out of nothing; now every accident produced a new, and diſtinct from the divine ſubſtance, would be produced out of nothing. He was therefore obliged to deny that the eternal being could acquire any new mode diſtinct from its own ſubſtance. But he found himſelf very much perplexed when the continual generations in nature were objected to him. They prove both that the univerſe is not one ſole being, and that it contains ſomething mutable, ſince it actually changes. In order to remove this objection, he excepted againſt the evidence of the ſenſes; he urged that they deceive us, that it is not true that there happen any generations in nature, and that they are but falſe appearances. But he was doubtleſs anſwered, that the appearances of the ſenſes would not change at all, if our mind continued always the ſame, and if the beings without us did not change; and therefore at leaſt, what in us is the paſſive ſubject of perceptions, which you call the fallacies of the ſenſes, muſt be mutable and variable: Therefore what you aſſert that there is no change in the univerſe, is not true. I cannot ſee that he could make any other reply than this; our reaſon is as fallacious as our ſenſes, and every thing is incomprehenſible to reaſon. For if when it is grounded even on evidence, which is her *ne plus ultra*, ſhe doth not hit on truth, it is a ſign that truth is a thing incomprehenſible, and impenetrable. Now relying upon evident notions, I had aſſerted that nothing is made out of nothing; whence it neceſſarily follows that nothing can begin, and that every thing that once exiſts, exiſts always, which evidently proves the immobility, and immutability of all things; I had, I ſay, clearly comprehended this, and yet the experience of my ſenſations and paſſions, convinces me that I am mutable: I had not therefore comprehended any thing with certainty, I have not therefore a faculty adequately proportioned to truth. Thus we may ſuppoſe he reaſoned, and thence we might conclude that the ſect of the Acataleptic (135), and that of the Sceptics, owed their birth ſolely to the principle of the immutable unity of all things maintained by Xenophanes. I do not affirm, that he was in the right in the conſequences juſt mentioned. The only reaſon why I alledge this, is to ſhew that I do not contradict the writer of this Philoſopher's life without juſt reaſons (136). Firſt I have on my ſide the evidence of Sotion (137), Cicero (138), Plutarch (139), and ſome verſes of Xenophanes (140) which were not unknown to Diogenes Laërtius (141). In the ſecond place I may affirm that Xenophanes held ſome principles, which, as I have juſt now given ſeveral proofs of it, neceſſarily engaged him to aſſert the incomprehenſibility of all things. Let us here cite the verſes in which he declares his opinion.

> Καὶ τὸ μὲν οὖν σαφὲς οὔτις ἀνὴρ ἴδεν, οὐδέ τις ἔσται
> Εἰδὼς ἀμφὶ θεῶν τε, καὶ ὅσσα λέγω περι πάντων.
> Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα τύχοι τετελεσμένον εἰπὼν
> Αὐτὸς ὅμως οὐκ οἶδε, δόκος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται.

> *Nullus aperte vir ſcit, ſed neque vir ſciet unquam*
> *De Diis & cunctis à me quæ dicta fuerunt.*
> *Namque licet ſit perfectum quod dixerit ille,*
> *Ille tamen neſcit, cunctis & opinio in his eſt* (142).

We ſee plainly in theſe words, that Xenophanes declared it impoſſible for any perſon to arrive at the clear and certain knowledge of the truth; and that even if a man ſhould meet with the truth, yet he cannot know that he has met with it: he adds, that there is nothing but opinions within our reach. Sextus Empiricus (143) ranks him amongſt thoſe, who deny a *criterium veritatis*, a rule or meaſure of truth. I own that he diſagrees (144) with thoſe, who place him among the Acataleptics; but withal he aſcribes to him the opinion, that we do not comprehend things to that degree of certainty which amounts to ſcience, and that our determinations never go beyond likelihood and probability. Is not this at bottom to aſſert Acatalepticiſm, or the incomprehenſible nature of things? Φαίνεται μὴ πᾶσαν κατάληψιν ἀναιρεῖν ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐπιστημονικὴν τε καὶ ἀδιάπτωτον. ἀπολείπειν δὲ τὴν δοξαστήν. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐμφαίνει τὸ, δόκος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τέτυκται. ὥστε κριτήριον γίνεσθαι κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν δοξαστὸν λόγον τουτέστι τὸν τοῦ εἰκότος, ἀλλὰ μὴ τὸν τοῦ παγίου ἐχόμενον. *Videtur non omnem tollere comprehenſionem, ſed eam quæ eſt ex ſcientia, & quæ non poteſt aberrare. Relinquit ergo opinabilem, hoc enim indicat illud cunctis & opinio in his eſt: quo ſit ut ex ejus ſententia id quod judicat ſit ratio opinabilis, hoc eſt ratio ejus quod eſt probabile, non autem ea quæ ſequitur id quod eſt firmum ac ſtabile* (145). So that I do not think Mr Menage was much in the right to ſay, that Sextus Empiricus in this place favours Diogenes Laërtius againſt Sotion (146). And I am the more confirmed in this becauſe that learned commentator ſays juſt before, that Cicero and Origen are favourable to Sotion (147): 'Sotioni 'adſtipulatur Cicero in Lucullo: *Parmenides, Xeno-'phanes, minus bonis quamquam verſibus, ſed tamen illis 'verſibus, increpant eorum arrogantiam quaſi irati, qui, 'cum ſciri nihil poſſit, audeant ſe ſcire dicere.* Item 'Origenes in Philoſophicis: Οὗτος ἔφη πρῶτος 'ἀκαταληψίαν εἶναι πάντων, εἰπὼν οὕτως, Εἰ γὰρ 'καὶ τὰ μάλιστα τύχοι τετελεσμένον εἰπὼν, 'Αὐτὸς ὅμως οὐκ οἶδε, δόκος δ' ἐπι πᾶσι τέ-'τυκται. *Cicero in his Lucullus favours the opinion 'of Sotion. Parmenides and Xenophanes* in theſe verſes, 'however indifferent, reprehend and ſeem to be angry 'with thoſe men, who, though we can know nothing, 'are however ſo bold as to pretend to know the truth. '*And likewiſe Origen, in his Philoſophics, favours the 'ſame*

(133) Ubi ſupra.

(134) When a being is diſtinct from another, it is not a part of it; and therefore a being diſtinct from any other being is made out of nothing, and conſequently created.

(135) Thoſe, who taught the incomprehenſibility.

(136) See what I have ſaid of Diogenes Laërtius at the beginning of this remark.

(137) See, above, citation (125).

(138) See, below, citat. (147).

(139) See, citation (127).

(140) See, in citation (142), the paſſage of Sextus Empiricus.

(141) He cites the beginning of them *in Vita Pyrrhonis, lib. ix, num.* 72.

(142) Xenophanes, *apud* Sextum Empiricum adverſus Mathematicos, *pag.* 146, 157, 280. *See alſo* Plutarch, de audiend. Poët. *pag.* 17, *E.*

(143) Ibid. *pag.* 146.

(144) Ibid. & *pag.* 156, 157.

(145) Id. ibid. *pag.* 157.

(146) Menagius, in Diogen. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 20.

(147) Menagius, ibid.

muſt not forget that he was baniſhed his country, that he retired to Sicily (*p*), and lived at Zancle (*q*), and Catana, that he founded the Eleatic ſect (*r*), that Parmenides was his diſciple,

'*ſame opinion.* Xenophanes was the firſt who affirmed that all things are incomprehenſible; ſaying that though a man ſhould meet with truth, yet he cannot know if that be the truth which he has met with, and that there is nothing but opinions within our reach.' As for the particular queſtion whether this Philoſopher was the firſt, who held the incomprehenſibility of all things, as Sotion affirms, there is more reaſon to continue in ſuſpence, ſince Plato ſaith that before Xenophanes others had believed the unity of all things (148); an opinion which ſeems to me the broad way to incomprehenſibility. Nothing is more curious, than the verſes of Timon recited by Sextus Empiricus (149). I do not know why the interpreters have not tranſlated that paſſage into Latin.

The reaſons which led Xenophanes to the unity of all things, are probably the ſame with thoſe of Meliſſus and Parmenides, according to Ariſtotle's account (150). They ſeem very ſubtile, though, according to the manner of great Genius's, Ariſtotle hath deſcribed them a little obſcurely, becauſe he affected brevity. Thoſe arguments are doubtleſs Sophiſms, as well as thoſe which may be read above (151), nevertheleſs they might have impoſed upon the readers, and I do not know whether Ariſtotle hath always well refuted thoſe two ancient Philoſophers. Conſult the Jeſuits of Coimbra (152), who have repreſented one of the reaſons of Meliſſus and Ariſtotle's anſwer in their full force; and you will find that nothing can be weaker than this anſwer, and that Meliſſus is not guilty of falſe argumentation in this propoſition, *if every thing, that was made, hath a principle, that which never was made hath no principle.* This Ariſtotle aſſures us is a manifeſt Paralogiſm. Ὅτι μὲν ἓν παραλογίζεται Μέλισσος, δῆλον· οἴεται γὰρ εἰληφέναι, εἰ τὸ γενόμενον ἀρχὴν ἔχει ἅπαν, ὅτε καί τό μὴ γενόμενον οὐκ ἔχει. *Captioſè itaque Meliſſum ratiocinari manifeſtum eſt: ſumpſiſſe enim arbitratur, ſi quidquid ortum eſt principium habeat: id non habere, quod ortum non eſt* (153). But, added Meliſſus, nothing has been made, for if any thing had been made, it would have been produced either out of nothing, or from ſomething elſe: if out of another thing, it muſt neceſſarily have pre-exiſted, which ruins your ſuppoſition: if out of nothing, then ſomething might be made out of nothing which is falſe (154). This is a demonſtrative argument againſt Ariſtotle, who denied creation properly ſo called. And as for his diſtinction betwixt a principle of ſubſtance, and a principle of forms and qualities; it is inſignificant in the hypotheſis of the impoſſibility of the creation: for every ſubſtance which never began, and neceſſarily exiſts, muſt be immutable. It would be therefore in vain for you to ſeek after the principles of generations and corruptions; for there would be none, if all things were uncreated, as they are according to Ariſtotle, who never oppoſed the axiom, *ex nihilo nihil fit* - - - - *nothing is made out of nothing.* But after owning that this objection of Meliſſus, which it is impoſſible to ſolve any other way than by the Orthodox Chriſtian hypotheſis concerning the creation, ſurpaſſed all Ariſtotle's ſtrength, it muſt be acknowledged that the other ſubtilties of Meliſſus and Parmenides were leſs puzzling to him, and when applied to experience, that is, to the variety of things which the univerſe expoſes to our view, they could not appear any thing better than puerilities.

I obſerve by the way, that the Jeſuit, who commented on Cicero *de Natura Deorum*, takes Xenophanes's part againſt Ariſtotle ſomewhat raſhly. 'Dubio procul, *ſaith he* (155), exciderit illi *(Velleio)* convitium illud quod in Xenophanem contorquet Ariſtoteles lib. primo Metaphyſicorum, capite quinto, ubi & obſcurum illius, vel ingenium, vel dicendi genus notat, & hominem quaſi agreſtem magnâ quadam negligentiâ deſpectat, & ab toto Philoſophorum ſenatu relegandum cenſet. Eam tamen Xenophani de Deo ſententiam aſcribit quæ minimè agreſte ingenium ſapiat: nempe τὸ ἓν εἶναι τὸν Θεόν. i. *id quod eſt unum, eſſe Deum:* vel ut Theophraſtus habet apud Lilium: *unum, & univerſum, & omne eſſe Deum.* - - - - *Certainly Velleius dropped that reproach which Ariſtotle threw upon Xenophanes, in his book of Metaphyſics, where he takes notice of his being a man of a low genius, or of mean elocution, and ſhews a great neglect and contempt of him, as being a ruſtic, who deſerved to be baniſhed the company of Philoſophers. But he aſcribes to Xenophanes an opinion concerning God, which does not at all ſavour of a low and ruſtic genius,* viz. *that what is one is God; or, as Theophraſtus has it, that unity, the univerſe, and all things are God.*' This Father is very much to blame for aſcribing to Xenophanes a reaſonable opinion concerning the nature of God: the ſentiments of that Philoſopher on this head are abominably impious, and amount to a more dangerous Spinoziſm than that which I have refuted in the article of SPINOZA: for Spinoza's hypotheſis carries its antidote along with it, by the mutability or continual corruptibility which he attributes to the divine nature with reſpect to modalities. This corruptibility is contrary to common ſenſe, and at once ſhocks thoſe of mean parts and thoſe of the greateſt capacities: but the immutability in all reſpects attributed to the infinite and eternal Being by Xenophanes, is a principle of the pureſt Theology; wherefore it is more liable to ſeduce us in favour of the reſt of his hypotheſis. On the other ſide, the pernicious fall of this Philoſopher may prove more contagious than Spinoziſm. For not being able to maintain the poſt to which his reaſon had led him, he fell into a precipice; and found fault with his reaſon which had perplexed him, and thrown him into nets which he could not break: he accuſed it of being incapable of comprehending any thing. Several others would be reduced to the like extremities, if they had not recourſe to an aſſiſtant ſuperior to reaſon. But the Jeſuit whom I refute is not wholly to blame: he had juſt reaſon to cenſure Ariſtotle's contempt of Xenophanes's genius; for though a true greatneſs of mind and a ſolid force of argumentation would not ſuffer a man to ſink at this rate, yet it is true that a mean capacity, can never fly ſo high as Xenophanes, nor fall like him. He argued more conſequentially than Ariſtotle, who denying a creation, admitted an Eternal matter, ſucceſſively ſuſceptible of an infinity of forms. If the elephants need not fear theſe cobwebs, much leſs need the flies. It is not a meanneſs of capacity which makes men doubt (156), that they are not arrived at a juſt certainty (157); it rather fills with confidence, than inſpires them with diffidence. Ἀμαθία μὲν θράσος, λογισμὸς δὲ ὄκνον φέρει. Imperitia audaciam, ratiocinatio vero metum affert (158). - - - *Ignorance begets boldneſs, but reaſoning begets fear*; and we may very well ſay that the Acataleptics, *Faciunt næ intelligendo ut nihil intelligant* (159). They fall into the doctrine of incomprehenſibility not by an utter ignorance of things, but by knowing them much better than the greateſt part of the world; though they do not know them according to the juſt repreſentation of them. Beſides, there are ſome who direct their hypotheſis to the glory of God, as if from a ſenſe of our own weakneſs, and of the infinity of God, we ought not to aſpire to that knowledge which is a portion of the Divine nature. We have ſpoken before of a Poet, who ſaid that the gods reſerved glory for themſelves, and pleaſures for us; but theſe tell us, that God keeps knowledge to himſelf, and beſtows opinions on us. Diogenes Laërtius reckons Plato among the Sceptics, for ſaying, Τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεοῖς καὶ θεῶν παισὶν ἐγχωρεῖν, τὸν δὲ εἰκότα λόγον ζητεῖν: Se veritatem quidem Diis Deorumque filiis relinquere, id autem quod ſit veriſimile indagare (160). - - - - - *That he left truth to the gods, and to their offspring, and only inquired after what is probable.* This, puts me in mind of a thought of Plutarch, which ſeems to me very excellent. 'Wiſe men ought to pray to the gods for all good things, but what we ought chiefly to deſire of them: is the knowledge of them in as great a degree as is proper for us; becauſe there is no gift either greater for man to receive, or more magnificent and worthy of the gods to beſtow, than the knowledge of the truth. For God gives to men all other things which they want,

---

(*p*) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 18.

(*q*) The ſame town with *Meſſena*, now *Meſſina*.

(*r*) Cicero, Acad. Quæſt. *lib. iv.* Clem. Alex. Strom. *lib. i, pag.* 301.

(148) Plato, in Sophiſta, *pag.* 170.

(149) Sextus Empiricus, Pyrrhon. Hypotypoſ. *lib. i, cap. xxxiii, pag.* 46, *Edit. Genev.* 1621.

(150) Ariſtoteles, Phyſicor. *lib. i, cap. iii.*

(151) In the article STILPO, remark [*H*].

(152) Conimbricenſes, in the paraphraſe upon the third chapter of the firſt book of Ariſtotle's Phyſics.

(153) Ariſtot. ubi ſupra.

(154) *See the* Conimbricenſes, ubi ſupra.

(155) Leſcalopier, in Cicer. de Nat. Deorum, *lib. i, num.* 28, *pag.* 44.

(156) Socrates, Zeno of Elea, Arceſilaus, Carneades, and ſuch like impugners of certainty, were ſome of the greateſt genius's of antiquity.

(157) Qui plura novit, eum majora ſequuntur dubia. - - - *The more a man knows, the more matter he finds for doubting.* Naudé, Addit. à la Vie de Louïs XI, *pag.* 38, *quotes theſe words, as being Ariſtotle's* in Rhetor. *but others quote them as thoſe of Æneas Sylvius.*

(158) Thucydid. *lib. ii, pag. m.* 126, *A.*

(159) Terence ſays this upon another occaſion, in his prologue to the Andria.

(160) Pyrrhone, *lib. ix, num.* 72.

diſciple, and that the complained of poverty [*M*]. The anſwer he gave a man with whom he refuſed to play at dice, is very worthy of a Philoſopher. This perſon calling him a coward; yes, replied he, I am extremely ſo, with reſpect to ſhameful actions (*s*).

(*s*) Ὡμολογεῖ καὶ πάνυ δειλὸς εἶναι πρὸς τὰ αἰσχρὰ καὶ ἄτολμος. Faſſus eſt ad res inhoneſtas ſe timidiſſimum etiam eſſe. *Plutarchus, de vitioſo Pudore, pag.* 530.

'want, but hath reſerved this for himſelf, and makes uſe of it: he is not at all happy in the poſſeſſion of vaſt quantities of Gold, nor powerful by holding the thunder and lightning in his hand, but rather by his wiſdom and knowledge; and this is one of the beſt and wiſeſt things which Homer ſaid, ſpeaking of Jupiter and Neptune:'

Ἦ μὰν ἀμφοτέροισιν ὁμὸν γένος ἠδ' ἴα πάτρη,
Ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς πρότερος γεγόνει καὶ πλείονα ᾔδη.

Eſt ambobus idem ſane genus & patria una,
Sed Jupiter natu prior erat, pluraque noverat (161).

Both of one line, both of one country boaſt;
But royal Jove's the eldeſt, and knows moſt.

'He affirms that the preference and the precedence of Jupiter was more venerable and worthy, becauſe he was more wiſe and intelligent. And as for me, I am of opinion, that the beatitude and felicity of eternal life, which Jupiter enjoys, conſiſts in that he is ignorant of nothing, and that of all things which ever were, none eſcapes him: I believe that an immortality deprived of the knowledge of all things which exiſt and have exiſted, would not be a life, but a ſpace of time only. So that we may ſay, that the deſire of underſtanding truth is a deſire of the Deity, eſpecially the truth of the nature of the gods: the ſtudy and acquiſition of which ſcience, is, as it were, the entring, or being initiated into a religion, and a more holy work than a vow of chaſtity, or cloiſtering one's ſelf within a temple (162).' Add to this, that the Chriſtians, with reſpect to whatever conſtitutes the character of ſpeculative Chriſtianity, make public profeſſion of the incomprehenſibility of things, and look upon thoſe as owls and Turks, who refuſe to believe what ſurpaſſes the extent of their underſtanding. Such is the myſtery of the Trinity, which, as Mr Nicolle owns (163), 'confounds reaſon, and prompts it to revolt. If there be any viſible difficulties, they are thoſe which are contained in that myſtery, that three perſons really diſtinct have only one and the ſame eſſence, and this eſſence being the ſame thing in each perſon with the relations that diſtinguiſh them, may be communicated without the communication of the relations which diſtinguiſh the perſons. If human reaſon conſults herſelf, ſhe will revolt againſt all thoſe inconceivable truths. If ſhe pretends to make uſe of her own light to penetrate into them, it will only furniſh her with arms againſt them. Wherefore in order to believe them, ſhe ought to blind herſelf, to ſtifle all her ratiocinations and perceptions, and to depreſs and ſink herſelf under the weight of Divine authority.' The Socinians themſelves in ſome reſpects are Acataleptics; they cannot ſay, with any ſincerity, that it is an incomprehenſile thing, that a ſelf-exiſtent nature ſhould be mutable. Wherefore, in ſome reſpects, their raſhneſs ſurpaſſes that of Xenophanes. The latter, at laſt, thought fit to ſay, that he did not comprehend either that an eternal nature is mutable, or that it is immutable; but as to the former, they decide that it is mutable: whence it follows that a being which neceſſarily, and from all eternity exiſts, is liable to deſtruction (164); which is the moſt contrary opinion in the world to our clear and diſtinct ideas.

I cannot conclude without obſerving two things: one is, that the evidence of Xenophanes's principles, with reſpect to the immutability of what is eternal, is as conſpicuous as the cleareſt ideas of our mind; ſo that it being inconteſtable, on the other hand, by what paſſes within us, that there are alterations and changes, the beſt courſe that our reaſon can take, is to aſſert, that all things had a beginning, GOD alone excepted. This is the doctrine of the creation; for to pretend to explain the generations of nature, by ſuppoſing ſeveral eternal principles, the action and reaction of which diverſifies what would remain uniform, if nothing external intervened, is to avoid one inconvenience, and fall into a much greater. My ſecond obſervation is, that the evidence of Xenophanes's principles furniſhes us with an excellent demonſtration againſt Spinoza; for if whatever had no beginning is immutable, Spinoza's God is incapable of any change: he is not therefore the immanent cauſe of all the alterations in the univerſe (165). An immanent cauſe produces ſomething in itſelf: that thing is either a mode identified with the ſubſtance which it modifies, or elſe an abſolute quality, and really diſtinct from it's ſubject of inheſion. If an identified mode, GOD cannot produce it; for ſince the Divine ſubſtance neceſſarily exiſts, it cannot depend on any efficient cauſe. If it is a diſtinct quality, GOD can therefore create beings diſtinct from himſelf; and then there is no longer room for Spinoza's hypotheſis. Add to this, that the production of one mode or accident (166), is the deſtruction of another. Whence it follows, that if GOD was the immanent cauſe of the changes of nature, ſome eternal modalities would have periſhed: for Spinoza cannot, without contradicting himſelf, affirm that what he calls GOD, had not always modalities. Examine his diſtinction betwixt *Natura naturans* and *Natura naturata*, and you will find a heap of contradictions in it.

[*M*] *He complained of poverty.*] *I am ſo poor,* ſaid he once to (167) Hiero King of Syracuſe, *that I am not able to maintain two ſervants. How,* replied Hiero, *Homer, whom you commonly blame and cenſure, tho' dead, maintains above ten thouſand.*

(161) Homer. Iliad. lib. xiii, ver. 354.

(162) Plutarch, at the beginning of his treatiſe concerning Iſis and Oſiris.

(163) Nicolle, Perpetuité de la Foi, *pag.* 118, 119, *Edit.* 1666.

(164) They ſay that God beſtowed upon matter what form he pleaſed, when he made the world. He therefore deſtroyed the eternal form of matter. Whether this form was a mode, or a diſtinct accident, is of no importance to me: It was a real being, which ceaſed to be, tho' it had no beginning, and no efficient cauſe.

(165) Note, that if the Fathers had believed what the miniſter, who wrote the Paſtoral Letters, imputes to them conconcerning the generation of the Word, their opinion concerning the immutability of God, had been almoſt as impious as that of Spinoza. See *Janua cœlorum reſerata, pag.* 128, & *ſeq.*

(166) I mean ſuch an accident as is *ens inhærens in alio.*

(167) Plut. in Apophth. *pag.* 175.

XYLANDER (WILLIAM) was born at Augſburg on the twenty-ſixth of December 1532. The inclination he had for the ſciences would have been fruitleſs, by reaſon of his father's poverty, if he had not met with a patron (*a*), by whoſe means he was maintained at the public expence, till ſuch time as he had made progreſs enough to enter into the colleges where the city (*b*) furniſhed a ſubſiſtence to a certain number of ſtudents. He afterwards ſtudied in the univerſity of Tubingen, and then in that of Baſil [*A*]: and having given proofs of his learning, he was called to Heidelberg to ſucceed

(*a*) Wolffgangus Relingerus nobilis patricius Auguſtanus. *Melch. Adam, in Vitis Philoſophorum, pag.* 289.

(*b*) That of Augſburg. Moreri was in the wrong to ſay after Mr Teiſſier, *Addit. aux Eloges, Tom. i, pag.* 448, that the Magiſtrates of Straſburg maintained him at the univerſities.

[*A*] *And afterwards in that of Baſil*] Melchior Adam affirms, that he there ſolemnly received the degree of Maſter of Arts, in the year 1556 (1). I ſuſpect this date; for how is it probable that a man who had ſtudied with ſo great application, and ſo many fine talents, ſhould have received this little degree only at the twenty-fourth year of his age? Add to this, that he made his Latin verſion of Dion Caſſius in the year 1557. He was already ſo learned, that he only ſpent ſeven months in writing that work, for the truth of which he appeals to the perſon to whom it is dedicated. It was dedicated to his Mecenas, John-Henry Herwart, Senator of Augſburg, at whoſe houſe he had been maintained for ſome time, and who had encouraged him to make that verſion, 'Tu, Patrone optime, cum me in familia tua aliquandiu commode & liberaliter habitum, autoritate, hortatu, officiis inſuper & beneficiis eò adduxeris ut optimum Rom. hiſtoriæ conditorem Dionem Caſſium de Græco Latinum facerem, &c (2). - - - *As you, my worthy patron, after having for ſome time kindly and liberally maintained me in your own family, have, by your authority, exhortations,*

(1) Melchior Adam. in Vitis Philoſophorum, *pag.* 289.

(2) Xyland. *Epiſt. Dedicat.* Dion. Caſſii.

ſucceed Mycillus (c) who died Profeſſor of the Greek Tongue in the year 1558. Not long before that time Xylander had publiſhed at Baſil his Latin verſion of Dion Caſſius (d). He acquaints us in his epiſtle dedicatory that indigence had made him undergo ſeveral uneaſineſſes [B]. In the year 1559 he gave a Latin verſion of the book of Marcus Aurelius; and becauſe a great many errors had crept into it (e), he cauſed it to be reprinted more correctly in the year 1568, with the Latin verſion of ſome Greek writers [C].

‘*exhortations, and even by your good offices and favours, prevailed upon me to tranſlate from the Greek into Latin, that excellent writer of the Roman Hiſtory, Dion Caſſius,* &c.’ This Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated at Baſil, November the firſt, 1557: the impreſſion was finiſhed by Oporinus in the month of March 1558. Xiphilin was joined with Dion Caſſius, but Xylander did not tranſlate that book, and contented himſelf with giving a tranſlation of it which had been done by William le Blanc, a native of Albi (3), and with correcting ſome paſſages in it. His notes on Dion Caſſius and Xiphilin are good enough to perſuade us that in the year 1556 the univerſity of Baſil would have honoured him with a higher degree than that of Maſter of Arts.

[B] *He acquaints us . . . . . that indigence had made him undergo ſeveral uneaſineſſes.*] This muſt ſurely be his meaning in theſe words: ‘Ego cum ab ineunte ætate bonas literas flagranti amore eſſem perſecutus, earumque cauſa adverſiſſima & acerbiſſima quæque perpeſſus, &c (4). - - - *As I have had the moſt paſſionate deſire after learning ever ſince my earlieſt years, and for the ſake of that, have ſuffered the greateſt hardſhips and vexations.*’ He ranks himſelf amongſt thoſe whom poverty obliges to cultivate learning: ‘Meæ conditionis hominum, quorum honeſtos conatus in hoc genere anguſtia vitæ ſuſtentandæ & paupertas quaſi inſtigat. - - - *Men in my condition, whoſe commendable endeavours toward the improvement of learning are owing to their indigence, and as it were prompted by poverty.*’ See eſpecially the elogy which he placed at the end of the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his Dion Caſſius. There he owns that, when he was eighteen years of age, he ſtudied for the ſake of glory; but that at the age of twenty-five, the low ſtate of his fortune obliged him to ſtudy for the ſake of a ſubſiſtence.

Te mala pauperies, pulcriſque graviſſima ceptis,
Conatu indignor plus potuiſſe meo.

. . . .
. . . .

Utcumque excidimus præclaris protinus auſis
Jam quærant, quibus hoc fata dedere decus
Et mea cum fortuna ſolo me afflixerit, atque
Abjectum cogat ſerpere præter humum.

. . . .
. . . .

Ergo, divinis quantumvis æger inhærens
Artibus, & ſtudiis deditus ingenuis:
Et TOLERARE QUEAM VICTUM, & ſuſtenter honeſte
Non aſpernandi fruge laboris alor.

Accurſed want, thou deadly foe
To brave attempts, my greateſt woe,
Whilſt eager after fame I preſs,
Why doſt thou ſtill oppoſe my bliſs?
Tho' fortune far below the great
Has plac'd me, and in humble ſtate,
Yet fir'd with love of ev'ry art
That lights the mind, or mends the heart,
I've in this bold attempt prevail'd,
Or, like Prometheus, nobly fail'd.
Tho' poor, yet arts are my delight,
Arts my employ both day and night:
Theirs are my labours: they relieve
My wants, and by their bounty I ſhall live.

[C] *With the Latin verſion of ſome Greek writers.*] That is, of Antony Liberalis, of Phlegon *de mirabilibus & longævis, & de Olympiis*, of Apollonius *Hiſtoriæ memorabiles*, and of Antigonus *mirabilium Narrationum Congeries*. All this, with Marcus Aurelius, makes a pretty large octavo: the Greek and Latin are in it, but each by itſelf. The few notes which Xylander added are neither conſiderable, nor contemptible.

(c) Taken from Melchior Adam, ubi ſupra.

(d) See the remark [A].

(e) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory, to the Baſil edition 1568.

(3) It was dedicated to Cardinal d'Armagnac, at Rome in the month of February 1550.

(4) Xylander, ubi ſupra.

Z.

ZABARELLA, or DE ZABARELLIS (Francis) Archbiſhop of Florence, and a Cardinal, was one of the moſt celebrated Canoniſts of his age. He was born at Padua, in the year 1339 (*a*). He ſtudied the Canon-Law at Bologna, and taught it at Padua with great applauſe. That city was then ſubject to Francis Carrari: it was attacked by the Venetians in the year 1406, and deputed Zabarella to the King of France to deſire his aſſiſtance, which he not obtaining, Padua was obliged to ſubmit to the Republic of Venice. The act of their ſubmiſſion was very ſolemn: Zabarella, at the head of fourteen other deputies, delivered the banner of Padua to the Senate in the great place at Venice, and made an eloquent ſpeech on that occaſion [*A*]. Some time after he went to Florence to teach the Canon-Law, and was there ſo loved and eſteemed, that the Archiepiſcopal ſee becoming vacant, he was choſen to fill it: but this election proved ineffectual, for the Pope being more diligent, had already beſtowed it on another. Zabarella being invited to Rome by Boniface IX, ſtayed there ſome time, and gave his opinion on an important queſtion propoſed to him, concerning the methods of putting a ſtop to the ſchiſm. He afterwards returned to Padua, and was honoured with ſeveral deputations. He wiſely refuſed the biſhopric of that city which was offered to him, becauſe he would not expoſe himſelf to the indignation of the Senate, which had nominated another to that dignity. Pope John XXIII, reſolving to ſtrengthen his party with learned men, made him come to his court, and gave him the Archbiſhopric of Florence. He did not confine his liberality to that alone, but created him Cardinal (*b*) in the year 1411. He ſent him on an embaſſy (*c*) with another Cardinal (*d*), and with Emanuel Chryſoloras, to the court of the Emperor Sigiſmund, who demanded a council, as well on account of the hereſies in Bohemia, as of the Anti-Popes. This Pope ordered his Ambaſſadors to chuſe ſuch a town for the holding of the council as might be in his intereſt. It is ſaid that he gave them in writing the names of thoſe towns which he liked, but at the moment of their departure, tore the paper on which he had written them [*B*], and gave them full powers on that head. For this reaſon they left it to the choice of his Imperial Majeſty. The city of Conſtance was pitched upon. Francis Zabarella diſtinguiſhed himſelf at the council held there, and adviſed the depoſing of Pope John XXIII, who was charged with forty notorious crimes. If the right of election had been left to the Cardinals, it is highly probable that Zabarella would have ſucceeded the depoſed Pope; but they were obliged to divide this right between themſelves and the other members of that council [*C*]. It was divided into five claſſes, each of which nominated ſix Perſons, who,

(*a*) His epitaph imports that he died at the age of 78 years, in 1417.

(*b*) He made him Cardinal Deacon (and not Cardinal Prieſt, as Geſner aſſerts in his *Biblioth. fol.* 261.) by the title of St Coſmus and St Damianus.

(*c*) In the year 1413.

(*d*) It was Antony de Chalant. See *Spondanus, ad ann.* 1413, *num.* 5.

[*A*] *And made an eloquent ſpeech.*] He was not only a learned Civilian, but alſo a good Orator (1). He pronounced an eloquent oration on the fourth of July 1397, on the nuptials of Nicolas d'Eſte with Giliola, the daughter of Francis Carrari, the ſecond of that name, Lord of Padua. Seven years after he made a ſpeech to the Lady Belflora, who was married to the ſon of the ſame Carrari, when ſhe made her entry into Padua, and was received under a canopy; I ſay, he made a ſpeech to her, in the name of the univerſity (2). He alſo made the funeral orations of Francis Carrari, and Arcuanus Buzacharinus (3).

[*B*] *At the moment of their departure he tore the paper on which he had written them.*] Panzirolus, whom I have faithfully followed in the text of this article, aſcribes this alteration of the Pope to a ſudden inſpiration (4). But that we may ſee this affair in it's full extent, which is too briefly related by him, I will cite a French author. (5). ‘It never appeared more clearly than on this occaſion, that the providence of God at once frequently overthrows all the deſigns of human prudence, in order to accompliſh it's own. This Pope, as Leonard Aretin, his ſecretary and confident, aſſures us, had, in appearance, given full power to his Legates to agree with the Emperor on theſe two points (6), as they ſhould think proper; but becauſe on the other hand he would not be at the Emperor's diſcretion in a city where that Prince was maſter, he had noted, in a private paper, certain cities of Italy, and expreſsly charged them not to agree to any other; and yet when he diſmiſſed them, as he was exhorting them faithfully to acquit themſelves of their duty, and was juſt going to deliver them this paper, which he held in his hand, all of a ſudden he changed his mind; and after having expreſſed himſelf in their praiſe, with great tranſports of tenderneſs and affection, proteſting that he had a full and entire confidence in their fidelity; he told them, that, contrary to his former reſolution, he would not limit their power, he ſhewed them the writing, and immediately tore it before their eyes. But, he was not long without altering his mind a ſecond time; for, underſtanding that his Legates had at laſt conſented, in compliance with Sigiſmund's deſire, that a general Council ſhould be ſummoned to aſſemble on the firſt of November, the following year, at Conſtance, a city of Germany, ſubject to the Emperor; he was like to go diſtracted, and a thouſand times curſed his fortune, or rather imprudence, in changing his reſolution ſo eaſily, and delivering himſelf up, as it were, bound hand and foot to a Prince, who would always have it in his power to put in excution whatever it ſhould pleaſe the Council to order againſt him. But he was obliged to diſſemble his reſentments, for fear of rendring himſelf ſuſpected, *&c.*’

[*C*] *Zabarella would have ſucceeded the depoſed Pope, but,* &c.] Panzirolus's relation is not very exact; for it

(1) *See* Thomaſin, Elog. *Part. i, pag.* 3.

(2) *Taken from* Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpretibus, *lib. iii, cap. xxviii, pag. m.* 443.

(3) Tomaſin. Elog. *Part. i, pag.* 10.

(4) Quod divino impulſu factum eſſe videtur. *Panzir. ibid. pag.* 445.

(5) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du grand Schiſme d'Occident, *livr. iv, pag.* 106, *Dutch edition. He quotes Saint Antoninus, Archbiſhop of Florence, Part. iii, Tit. xxii.*

(6) That is the time and place of he council.

who, in conjunction with the Cardinals, elected Otho Colonna Pope, who took the name of Martin V. This happened in the year 1417. Zabarella died at Conſtance (e) on the fifth of November, in the ſame year (f). His funeral was celebrated with great magnificence; the Emperor and all the council were preſent at it: the funeral oration was pronounced by Poggius; the corps was carried to Padua, and interred in the cathedral church on the left ſide of the altar of the Holy Virgin. Our Zabarella wrote a great many books [*D*], and deſerved the eſteem of the public, as much by his virtuous life [*E*], as by his learning. He appointed for his heir BARTHOLOMEW ZABARELLA his nephew (g), of whom I ſhall ſpeak in a remark [*F*]. I muſt not forget that he had among other diſciples Peter Paul Vergerio, who wrote an excellent and very exact letter, on the life and death of his profeſſor (h).

(e) *And not in his own country, as Forſterus affirms*, Hiſt. Juris Civil. Rom. *lib. iii, cap. xxxi, pag. m.* 515.

(f) Therefore he did not flouriſh in the year 1418, as Geſner affirms in *Bibl. fol.* 261.

(g) *Taken from* Panzirolus, de claris Legum Interpretibus, *lib. iii, cap. xxviii, pag. m.* 443, *& ſeq.*

(h) Panzirol. ibid. *pag.* 444. *Mr Teiſſier ſays nothing of it in the* Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum.

---

it tends to perſuade us, that Zabarella was living when they entred into the conclave to elect a Pope. This is falſe. The electors entred on the eighth of November (7), and Zabarella, according to Panzirolus, died on the fifth, others ſay on the ſixth of that month (8). So I find that Tomaſinus conforms himſelf better to the circumſtances of time: Zabarella, according to him, would have arrived at the Papal dignity, by the unanimous conſent of the electors, if death had not tranſported him to heaven. He alſo tells us that this Cardinal ſupplied the Pope's place in the Council. *Concilio convocato Pontificis vices geſſit. Unde omnium conſenſu ſummus Pontifex dictitatus, re quoque ipſa deſignatus, fuiſſet, ni Deus Opt. Max. ipſum in Cœlum, ibi ſatius Eccleſiæ ſuæ profuturum evexiſſet* (9). Panzirolus miſled Doujat, who aſſures us that Zabarella died after the election of Martin VI (10).

[*D*] *He wrote a great many books.*] Six volumes of commentaries on the Decretals and Clementines. One volume of Counſels. A volume of Orations and Letters. A treatiſe *de Horis canonicis. De Felicitate libri tres. Variæ Legum Repetitiones. Opuſcula de Artibus liberalibus. De natura rerum diverſarum. Commentarii in naturalem & moralem Philoſophiam. Hiſtoria ſui temporis. Acta in Conciliis Piſano & Conſtantienſi. In vetus & novum Teſtamentum. De Schiſmate* (11). This laſt treatiſe does not pleaſe the court of Rome. The Proteſtants have publiſhed it ſeveral times (12) with other pieces of the ſame nature, in which the juriſdiction of Princes is maintained without ſubjecting it to the power of the Popes. Read the following words of Bellarmin: 'Occaſione longiſſimi ſchiſmatis ſcripſit etiam librum de ſchiſmate, in quo ſunt aliqua corrigenda: quare in indice librorum prohibitorum, liber ejus de ſchiſmate cum præfationibus, Argentinæ impreſſus ab hæreticis, prohibitus eſt, donec corrigatur (13). - - - *On occaſion of the long ſchiſm, he alſo wrote a book on ſchiſm: There are ſome things in this book to be corrected: for this reaſon in the catalogue of prohibited books, Zabarella's treatiſe on ſchiſm with the prefaces to it, printed by the Heretics at Straſburgh, is prohibited till it is corrected.*' Obſerve, that Zabarella is cited under the name of Cardinal without any addition (14).

[*E*] *He deſerved the eſteem of the public .... by his virtuous life.*] He not only ſlept but little, and was extremely careful not to loſe any time, but was endowed with a particular probity and chaſtity: being an enemy to luxury, his domeſtic affairs were managed with the utmoſt frugality, in order to diffuſe his wealth abroad amongſt the poor. He never connived at his neighbour's faults, but always exhorted his friends and diſciples to a virtuous life. 'Somni parciſſimus, & ne quàm temporis jacturam faceret, valde ſollicitus. Vir recti animi, ſuaviſſimæ conſuetudinis, & integerrimæ, caſtiſſimæque vitæ fuit, familiares & diſcipulos ad bonos mores hortari ſolitus ab ipſis non ſecus ac pater diligebatur. Domi parcus, foris fortunas inter pauperes dividebat (15). - - - *He ſlept very little, and was extremely careful not to loſe any time. He was an upright man, his behaviour was moſt engaging, and his whole life moſt chaſte and unblamable: he uſed to exhort his friends and diſciples to lead a virtuous life, and was loved by them like a father. In his domeſtic affairs he was exceeding frugal, but diffuſed his wealth abroad among the poor.*' One of the things which made him thought worthy of the biſhopric of Padua, was, I believe, his charity to the poor, when he was Arch-prieſt of the cathedral church (16). I have mentioned (17) the reaſon which induced him to refuſe that Biſhopric. That refuſal acquired him the admiration of the Paduans, and obliged them to reſign to him a very rich abbey which had belonged to ſome Monks. This he held but a very ſhort time; he ſoon reſtored it to its antient poſſeſſors; they accepted it with the utmoſt gratitude, which they perpetuated as much as poſſible; for to this day his ſacerdotal veſtments are preſerved in their monaſtery: and his arms are ſet up there in ſeveral places (18). It was on account of his holy life, as well as learning, that he was choſe Archbiſhop of Florence, when he was only Profeſſor of the Canon Law (19).

I have alſo given (20) the reaſon why this choice was ineffectual at that time.

[*F*] BARTHOLOMEW ZABARELLA, *of whom I ſhall ſpeak in a remark.*] He was the ſon of ANDREW ZABARELLA, brother to our Francis; and profeſſed the Canon-Law at Padua with great applauſe. He was afterwards called to Rome, where he diſcovered a great deal of learning, as well in his diſputations as conſultations. He was firſt raiſed to the Archbiſhopric of Spalato, and then advanced to that of Florence, and at laſt to the dignity of Referendary of the Church by Pope Eugenius IV. It is thought he had riſen yet higher, if he had not died before he arrived at old age, in the year 1445. His body was carried to Padua, and interred in his uncle's tomb (21). I am ſurprized that his name doth not appear in the epitaph of our Francis, and that inſtead of it we ſee *Joannes Jacobi viri clariſſimi Filius id monumenti ponendum curavit. - - - This monument was erected by John the ſon of James, who was an illuſtrious man.* Panzirolus and Tomaſin give the whole epitaph; the latter obſerves, that the author of the *Patavina Felicitas*, and Swertius (22), have given it with ſome faults. The ſame thing may alſo be charged on Panzirolus; for in his book we read *Obiit Conſtantiæ* MCCCCVIII, which ought to have been MCCCCXVII. An infinite number of tranſcribers and Printers of inſcriptions are guilty of the like negligence. But to return to our Bartholomew. He died at the age of forty-ſix years, on the twelfth of Auguſt 1445, being then on the embaſſy with which Eugenius IV honoured him to the Kings of Spain and France. It is affirmed that the Pope had declared his deſign to make him a Cardinal (23).

(7) *See* Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *lib. vi, p.* 264.

(8) Conſtantiæ extinctus eſt anno cIↄ. cccc. xvii. viii. Idus Novembris. *Tomaſin. ubi ſupra, pag.* 5. *Freberus, in Theatro, pag.* 17, has not rightly tranſcribed this; for he ſays *extinctus eſt Idib. Nov.*

(9) Tomaſin. Elog. *Part. i, pag.* 5.

(10) Doujat. Prænot. Canonic. *pag.* 609.

(11) Ex Tomaſino, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 9. *See alſo* Oldoini in Athenæo Romano, *pag.* 258.

(12) For inſtance at Baſil, by John Oporinus, in 1565, in folio. I make uſe of that edition.

(13) Bellarm. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt. *pag. m.* 384.

(14) Tomaſ. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 5.

(15) Panzirolus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 445.

(16) In Cathedrali Patavina Eccleſia Archipreſbyteratus honore inſignitus pauperum incommodis mira ſubveniebat liberalitate. *Tomaſin. ubi ſupra, pag.* 4.

(17) In the text of this article.

(18) Tomaſin. ubi ſupra.

(19) Florentiam vocatus jus Canonicum explanavit ibique ob vitæ SANCTIMONIAM ac doctrinæ præſtantiam ab illius Reip. proceribus ad Archiepiſcopatus dignitatem conclamatus eſt. *Tomaſin. ubi ſupra, pag.* 3.

(20) In the text of this article.

(21) Panzir. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 446, 447.

(22) In Deliciis Orbis.

(23) *Taken from* Riccobonus, in Deſcriptione Gymnaſii Patavini, *apud* Freherum, in Theatro, *pag.* 19.

ZABARELLA (JAMES) one of the greateſt Philoſophers of the XVIth century, was born at Padua on the fifth of September 1533. Having learned Rhetoric and the Greek tongue under very learned profeſſors (a), he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Logic, and to that of the Mathematics, in both which he made great progreſs. He extremely delighted in Aſtrology, and amuſed himſelf in drawing a great many Horoſcopes, and it is reported, that he many times made true predictions. He acquired a profound knowledge of Ariſtotle's Phyſics and Ethics; ſo it is no wonder that the univerſity of Padua made him one of its profeſſors, in the year 1564. He taught Logic there

(a) John Faſeolus, and Francis Robortellus.

there for the ſpace of fifteen years, and afterwards Philoſophy to the time of his death. He publiſhed ſeveral commentaries on Ariſtotle, which ſhewed that his genius was capable of clearing the greateſt difficulties, and comprehending the moſt obſcure queſtions [*A*]. Having been frequently deputed to Venice on important affairs, he harangued the Senate with great ſucceſs. He refuſed the offers of Sigiſmund King of Poland, who invited him into his kingdom. He died at Padua in October 1589, and and was buried in St Antony's church, where his funeral oration was pronounced by Riccobonus. He had bore the title of Count Palatine [*B*]. He had by his marriage with Elizabeth Cavacia, ſix ſons and three daughters [*C*], and calculated the nativities of each of them. I know not how he ſucceeded in theſe calculations, nor for inſtance, whether he fore-told that the Senate of Venice ſhould give him a thouſand crowns, for the marriage of his youngeſt daughter (*b*). Authors differ in certain particulars concerning him, which ought not to be matter of diſpute. Some ſay he was a handſome man, others, that he was ugly [*D*]. Some aſſert, that he had a very lively, quick, and ready wit; others, that he could not ſolve the objections of his diſciples without aſking time to conſider them [*E*]. He is accuſed of holding ſome impious opinions

(*b*) *Taken from* James Philip Tomaſin, *Part. i.* Elogior. *pag.* 136, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral commentaries on Ariſtotle, which ſhewed*, &c.] He publiſhed ſome Logical treatiſes in the year 1578. In theſe he treated copiouſly of method; and it was believed, eſpecially in Germany, that on Logic he was the beſt guide that could be had (1). The following encomium is beſtowed on the commentary which he publiſhed in the year 1582. ‘ Anno 82. edidit illa admirabilia commentaria in ‘ poſt. Annal. Ariſtotelis quibus omnibus Græcis, ‘ Arabibus, Latinis palmam in hoc divino Ariſtote‘ lici ingenii opere illuſtrando præripuit (2). - - - - *In* ‘ *the year* 1582, *he publiſhed his admirable commentary* ‘ *on Ariſtotle's Analytics, in which he has illuſtrated that* ‘ *divine work, worthy of the genius of Ariſtotle, far be*‘ *yond all the Grecian, Arabian, and Latin commenta*‘ *tors.*’ Francis Piccolomini, his colleague, and rival, attacked him on the doctrine of Method. Zabarella publiſhed his reply in the year 1584. Imperialis obſerves, that Zabarella was inferior to Francis Piccolomini, in the faculty of diſcourſing (3); but when he took pen in hand, exceeded him in the force of argument: when he had occaſion to ruin his adverſaries hypotheſis, he brought a multitude of arguments which cruſhed them: when he was obliged to maintain his own opinions, he did it with great ſkill and ſucceſs. He ſcarce had his equal, either for overthrowing the adverſe ſide, or defending his own. ‘ Neminem facile quis dixerit æquare Zabarellæ Scrip‘ torum venuſtatem atque elegantiam, quibus accedit ‘ incredibile argumentandi robur & opinionum firmi‘ tas, quo nomine vix alius in evertendis aliorum pla‘ citis uberior, in aſtruendis propriis fœlicior unquam ‘ eſt habitus (4). - - - *It may well be ſaid that no au*‘ *thor ever wrote with more beauty and elegance than* ‘ *Zabarella. Add to this his incredible force of reaſon*‘ *ing, and his great talent in ſupporting his opinions. In* ‘ *this reſpect ſcarce any writer has been eſteemed more co*‘ *pious in confuting the opinions of his adverſaries, or* ‘ *more ſucceſsful in maintaining his own.*’ His book *De Rebus naturalibus Libri XXX, quibus Quæſtiones, quæ ab Ariſtotelis Interpretibus hodie tractari ſolent, accurate diſcutiuntur*, was printed in the year 1589. He dedicated it to Pope Sixtus V: the Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated at Padua, on the firſt of October, the ſame year. He had before publiſhed a ſmall ſpecimen of it in 1586, and dedicated it to that Pope's nephew. His commentaries on the three books of Ariſtotle *de Anima*, did not appear till after his death. His ſon Francis Zabarella publiſhed them in the year 1604.

[*B*] *The title of Count Palatine.*] One JAMES ZABARELLA obtained the title from the Emperor Maximilian: his ſon JULIUS was continued in this quality by the Emperor Ferdinand I, who, beſides, entailed the honour on the eldeſt ſons of the family. Accordingly Julius Zabarella, his ſon, bore that title, and tranſmitted it to our James, his eldeſt ſon (5).

[*C*] *Six ſons and three daughters.*] The eldeſt was called JULIUS, and was a good Mathematician. You will find in Moreri that *he gave himſelf up to debauchery with women, to that exceſs, that he contracted a great weakneſs in his nerves, which confined him to his bed for five years before his death* (6). Mr Moreri makes him author of ſeveral books, of the *moſt conſiderable* of which he mentions the titles; but he is miſtaken, for all thoſe pieces were written by James Zabarella, and not by Julius, his ſon.

[*D*] *Some ſay he was a handſome man, others, that he was ugly.*] His effigies in Tomaſin repreſents his air to be very agreeable, and admirably confirms theſe words *Vultu ſpectabilis* (7): - - - *of a graceful aſpect:* But in Imperialis, the print of him expreſſes a gloomy, ſurly, and mean look, and very effectually proves the truth of theſe words, ‘ Nec ſubhæſitantis linguæ nota ‘ vel TETRICA forte ORIS SPECIES ullas unquam ſuæ ‘ gloriæ maculas aſpergere potuerunt (8). - - - *Nor* ‘ *could a ſtammering he had in his ſpeech, nor ſomething* ‘ *ſour which he had in his looks ever blemiſh his glory.*’ Is it poſſible, that in things expoſed to every body's view, authors ſhould differ as much as white and black, as well in the ſtrokes of their pens, as in thoſe of the Painter's pencil? If the queſtion was about the inclinations of the mind, I ſhould not be ſurprized at this diverſity of relations, for it is eaſy to fall into contrary determinations, with reſpect to thoſe inviſible objects, which only diſcover themſelves by equivocal indications; but the queſtion relates to the face: ought it not to be out of diſpute whether his face was handſome or ugly?

[*E*] *Some aſſert that he had a very lively . . . . wit . . . . that he could not ſolve the objections*, &c. . . . .] This is another ſubject on which Hiſtorians ought not to oppoſe one another. They ought to agree on the queſtion, whether Zabarella's genius acted in a quick or ſlow manner. He was Profeſſor about twenty-five years in one of the moſt famous univerſities of Europe. This gave him a thouſand opportunities of publickly diſcovering whether, when a difficulty was propoſed, he wanted time to conſider of it, or could ſolve it immediately. Why then ſhould Tomaſini expreſs himſelf in this manner: ‘ Nactus eſt Mercurium ‘ feliciter ſtantem, quam ob cauſſam CELERES ingenii ‘ motus, & ad quævis excogitanda FACILES ET EX‘ PEDITOS, habuit in omni vita (9): - - - *He is hap*‘ *pily gifted with a ready wit, and accordingly his genius* ‘ *has during all his life been* QUICK, EASY, *and* PE‘ NETRATING:’ and Imperialis, on the contrary, tells us? ‘ Carpebant in te plurimi memoriæ labem, ‘ & quendam in agendis TORPOREM, quibus ad pri‘ vata vel publica negotia minus reddebaris idoneus: ‘ SEGNIOREM te pariter quam ferret ingenii claritas ‘ in quæſtionibus inopinate ſolvendis prædicabant, cum ‘ te Scholarium Theſibus nonniſi per INTERPOSITAS ‘ HORAS reſpondere ſolitum dicerent (10)? - - - *Many* ‘ *people blamed you for your want of memory, and for a* ‘ *certain* SLUGGISHNESS *in acting, both which defects* ‘ *diſqualified you for public and private affairs. They* ‘ *likewiſe ſaid, that in ſolving difficulties, you was* ‘ SLOWER *than was conſiſtent with a clear genius;* ‘ *and that you did not anſwer the theſes of your ſtudents,* ‘ *till you had taken* AN INTERVAL OF SOME HOURS ‘ *to conſider of them?*’ Some pages after he obſerves, that Zabarella ſtuttered, and that his words and deportment were rough and unpoliſhed. ‘ In eo præſti‘ tit Jacobo Zabarellæ Collegæ ſuo (*Franciſcus Piccolo*‘ *mineus*) quod ipſe facilitate quadam dicendi præditus ‘ juncta comitati morum ac eximiæ humanitati, alter ‘ ſermone durior, blæſus, incomptus, civilibus in ſtu‘ diis inops potius quam redundans (11). - - - - *Francis* ‘ *Piccolomini had the advantage of his colleague James* ‘ *Zabarella in this, that the former had a certain fa*‘ *cility of expreſſing his thoughts, together with a mild,* ‘ *a humane, and winning behaviour; whereas the*

‘ *expreſſions*

---

(1) Keckerman. Præcognit. Logicor. *Tract. ii, cap. v, pag. m.* 184. *See alſo* Tomaſin. Elog. *Part. i, pag.* 137.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) See the remark [*E*].

(4) Imperialis, in Muſæo Hiſtor. *pag.* 115.

(5) Ex Tomaſino, Elogior. *Part. i, pag.* 139.

(6) Moreri had this from Mr Teiſſier's addition to the Elogies, *Tom. ii, p.* 124.

(7) Tomaſ. ubi ſupra, *p.* 138.

(8) Joh. Imperialis, in Muſæo Hiſtor. *p.* 117.

(9) Tomaſ. ib.

(10) Imperial. ubi ſupra.

(11) Id. ibid, *pag.* 115.

opinions [*F*], as not believing the immortality of the ſoul; but he is praiſed for having led an exemplary life (*c*). I ſhall ſpeak of the treatiſe in which he maintained

‘*expreſſions of the latter were harſh, blunt, and unpoliſhed, and he was rather deficient than officious in paying civilities and doing kindneſſes.*’

[*F*] *He is accuſed of holding ſome impious opinions.*] On this head Mr Moreri is faulty. *He is accuſed by Imperialis,* ſaith he (12), *of having oppoſed the doctrine of the immortality of the ſoul, and of having given ſeveral marks of impiety and Atheiſm in his writings.* The laſt part of this accuſation is not in Imperialis; and if the firſt is, it is not expreſſed as a thing affirmed by that author, but rather as a very uncertain rumour, which he in ſome ſort refutes. His words run thus (13): ‘Præterea impenſius te aliquanto impugnaſſe immortalitatem animæ, deterrimam Alexandreorum ſententiam palam profeſſum: quos tamen, de te rumores ut forte ab exulceratis animis excitos, ita vel eluſit poſteritas, vel admirabilis ac prope divina tuarum virtutum fama compenſavit (14): præaltæ ſiquidem mentis lumen in ſcriptis diffuſum tuis, nullam debet luem temporis nullamque livoris noxam vereri. - - - - *Beſides, they ſaid that you too warmly attacked the immortality of the ſoul, and openly profeſſed the abominable tenet of the Alexandrians: but theſe rumours concerning you, as they were, perhaps, raiſed by invidious perſons, ſo they have either been neglected by poſterity, or deſtroyed by the admirable and almoſt divine fame of your virtues: and that exalted underſtanding which ſhines through your writings ought to fear no injury, either from time or envy.*’ This calumny, if I am not miſtaken, was only grounded upon this. There reigned in Italy, and chiefly at Padua, for above an age, a famous diſpute about this queſtion, whether it was poſſible to prove the immortality of the ſoul from Ariſtotle's principles. Some Profeſſors who were looked upon as favourers of Alexander Aphrodiſienſis defended the negative. Others maintainted the affirmative. Pomponatius, our Zabarella, Cremoninus, *&c.* took the firſt ſide, whence a great number of ſuch perſons as are incapable of uſing diſtinctions when they are moſt neceſſary, peremptorily charged theſe Philoſophers with teaching the mortality of the ſoul. This is the Sophiſm, *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*: - - - *From a particular caſe to draw a general inference.* In a word, this is an injuſtice and wickedneſs which ſociety ought not to tolerate: for there is a prodigious difference betwixt abſolutely affirming that the ſoul is mortal, and maintaining that, according to the hypotheſis of ſuch a Philoſopher, it is impoſſible to prove that it is not mortal. See the article of POMPONATIUS. The Inquiſitors acted on a principle of equity towards Zabarella; for they contented themſelves with his declaration, that by the power of the Divine grace, he was fully perſuaded of the truth of the orthodox opinion, tho' natural reaſon, and Ariſtotle's principles ſeemed incapable of forming in him this excellent perſuaſion. He publiſhed a book, in which he maintained, that the exiſtence of a firſt mover ſeparate from the bodies which compoſe the univerſe, could be no otherwiſe proved than by ſuppoſing the eternity of motion. This was declaring, that a Chriſtian Philoſopher cannot produce any proofs of the exiſtence of a firſt mover, whoſe nature is ſpiritual; for it is a doctrine of the Chriſtian faith, that motion is not eternal. Zabarella aſſerted, that in order to believe this exiſtence, which no natural reaſon can demonſtrate, the grace of the Holy Ghoſt was neceſſary. The holy office found nothing unreaſonable in this aſſertion, and gave their approbation to this Philoſopher's book. This emboldened Berigardus to take the liberty of maintaining the ſame opinion. It is true he did not do it ſo bluntly; for he introduced an Interlocutor oppoſing this theſis. Let us cite a pretty long paſſage out of his preface: ‘Denique ut conſtet ea que dicuntur in noſtris Circulis permiſſa jam fuiſſe à S. Officio, libet pauca ſubjicere, maximè ne cui durum videatur quòd introduco Ariſtæum defendentem ſententiam Jacobi Zabarellæ viri in hoc Lyceo celeberrimi. Hæc ſententia libro de inventione æterni motoris approbato ſæpius à S. Officio, docet unicum medium philoſopho naturali ad demonſtrandum dari primum motorem à materia abjunctum eſſe motus æternitatem, quæ quia non datur, ut fide divina certi ſumus, ſequitur primum motorem demonſtrari non poſſe naturaliter, ſed ad hoc opus eſſe Dei contactu peculiari. Neque propterea Zabarella putat eam quam vocat demonſtrationem primi motoris ex motu æterno, eſſe veram demonſtrationem, utpote cujus medium falſum eſt, ſed loquitur ex falſis principiis Ariſtotelis, nempe ſi verus eſſet motus æternus, inde ſolùm oſtendi poſſe primum motorem. Hanc Zabarellæ opinionem jam permiſſam ſi tuerer, id fortaſſe tutò facere poſſem; verùm contrariam exiſtimo magis eſſe conſentaneam pietati, propterea illi oppono Charilaum qui Circ. II. & XVIII. contendit Deum verum cognoſci poſſe naturaliter, & licet rationes ille ſeorſum acceptæ non videantur ſufficere ad convincendos pertinaces Epicuræos, ut concludit ultimis verbis, omnibus tamen ſimul inſtructis, ait intellectum rectè diſpoſitum poſſe elevari ad hanc cognitionem naturaliter, ſed abſque merito gratiæ & gloriæ, ut ſic inexcuſabiles verè dicantur à Divo Paulo qui contemptis his rationibus ad falſas & irreligioſas opiniones delapſi ſunt. Zabarellam tamen ſequi videtur Campanella cap. 9. n. 2. ubi ait religionem veram (ac proinde Deum) citra fidem cognoſci non poſſe: quin etiam apud Philoſophos plus valere fidem quàm rationem (15). - - - *To make it appear that what is advanced in the following work has already been permitted by the holy office; let us add a few things, eſpecially leſt it ſhould ſeem ſtrange to any perſon that I introduce Ariſtæus defending the opinion of James Zabarella, a famous man of this univerſity. You will find this opinion in his book on the Inveſtigation of the firſt Mover, a book that hath been often approved by the holy office, in which it is aſſerted, that a Natural Philoſopher can demonſtrate the being of a firſt Mover ſeparate from matter, upon no other ſuppoſition than that motion is eternal; and as we know, by revelation, that motion is not eternal, it follows, that the being of a firſt Mover cannot be demonſtrated by natural reaſon, and that the ſupernatural aſſiſtance of GOD is neceſſary for that purpoſe. Nor does Zabarella therefore think that what he calls a demonſtration of the being of a firſt Mover, is a real demonſtration; as the ſuppoſition upon which it is built, is falſe; but he argues from the principles of Ariſtotle, that if motion was eternal, from thence only would it follow that there is a firſt Mover. As this opinion of Zabarella has already been permitted, I might poſſibly defend it with ſafety. But I think the contrary opinion is more agreeable to piety; wherefore to oppoſe it I bring in Charilaus, who maintains, that we may know the true GOD by the light of nature: and tho' natural reaſons taken ſingly ſeem too weak to convince an obſtinate Epicurean, as Charilaus concludes, yet when taken altogether, he ſays, a well diſpoſed underſtanding may, by the light of nature, riſe to the knowledge of the true GOD, tho' without meriting thereby the grace of GOD and eternal felicity; ſo that they may truly be ſaid, by St Paul, to be inexcuſable, who deſpiſing the light of nature, turn aſide to falſe and ungodly opinions. However this opinion of Zabarella ſeems to be followed by Campanella, when he ſays that the true religion (and therefore GOD) cannot be known without the help of revelation; but that revelation is even to Philoſophers more valuable than reaſon.*’

A REFLEXION upon the conſequences from the eternity, or the beginning of motion, with reſpect to the exiſtence of God.

Till I can come at this book of Zabarella, which is very hard to be met with in this country (16), I ſhall make one reflexion. I am not ſatisfied with my conjectures on this Philoſopher's way of reaſoning. He aſſerted (17), that the conſequence is right from the eternity of motion, to the exiſtence of a firſt ſpiritual Mover, but that a motion which had a beginning is no manner of proof that there is a firſt Mover diſtinct from matter. In order to reaſon upon this matter, it is neceſſary to ſuppoſe it impoſſible that a material principle ſhould act eternally (18), tho' it may be capable of acting for ſeveral ages. But I do not ſee on what this aſſertion can be grounded; for if Zabarella grants me that a material principle could produce motion, which, according to Moſes's hypotheſis, did not begin till ſix days before Adam, he muſt believe that this

---

(*c*) Quibus omnibus (*filiis & filiabus*) .... facem prætulit incorruptæ gloriæ, & virtutis veræ, ſuo cunctis exemplo prælucens. *Tomaſ. ibid. pag.* 138.

(12) Theſe words of Moreri are taken from Mr Teiſſier, *ubi ſupra.*

(13) Imperial. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 117.

(14) Compare Tomaſin's words at the end of the text of this article.

(15) Claudius Berigardus, in proœmio Circuli Piſani, *pag.* 5, 6.

(16) The ſchoolmen are ſo much deſpiſed in this country, that one would be aſhamed to buy their books, or even to enquire whether they are to be found in a library.

(17) Thus Berigardus makes him reaſon.

(18) Berigardus, in *Circulo i, pag.* 5, *advances this propoſition,* Nulla virtus materiata æternum motum ciere poteſt.

tained that the proof of a God drawn from the exiſtence of a firſt mover, is defective, unleſs we ſuppoſe motion to be eternal [*G*]. I ſhall occaſionally ſay that there

this principle having been at reſt from all eternity, was at laſt moved by itſelf, and that it ſhall once return to reſt, ſince it's materiality will never ſuffer it to do any thing eternal. But who doth not ſee the abſurdity of this hypotheſis? Every one clearly apprehends. 1. That all bodies which have been at reſt from all eternity, would for ever continue ſo, unleſs they were put in motion by ſome external power. 2. That all bodies which might begin to move, and had continued in motion as long as the world has laſted, according to the Scripture, might alſo perſevere eternally in that ſtate. 3. That all bodies which might begin to move one hundred ages ago, might have began twenty thouſand years, an hundred thouſand years, *&c*, ſooner; for there is no more reaſon to fix the beginning of motion to one hour rather than another, unleſs we have recourſe to the good pleaſure of a ſpiritual cauſe: but if a body might have began to move before any term aſſigned, it would follow that it might have been always in motion, and conſequently motion might have been eternal without being produced by a cauſe diſtinct from matter. What I have juſt been ſaying ſhews, that we may very reaſonably conclude, the exiſtence of a firſt ſpiritual Mover, from this, that the motion of matter had a beginning, and that we could not make this concluſion, if we ſhould once grant, that a motion which began might proceed from a material cauſe. Conſequently I do not find that Zabarella reaſoned well on this head.

Beſides, it ſeems to me much eaſier to prove, that there is a firſt Mover diſtinct from matter, if we ſuppoſe motion to have had a beginning, than if we ſuppoſe it eternal. Let us ſuppoſe it had a beginning, and it will neceſſarily follow, either that all bodies began to exiſt, or that having exiſted from all eternity, they continued during an eternity in a ſtate of reſt. If all bodies began to exiſt, they muſt neceſſarily have been produced by a ſpiritual cauſe; and this is the firſt Mover which we are in queſt of; for the ſpiritual principle, author of the exiſtence of all bodies, will alſo be the principle of their motion. If all bodies are eternal, and yet their motion is not eternal, it follows that they have not in themſelves the motive virtue; for if they had, they would have moved eternally. That motive virtue therefore does not reſide in matter, it is therefore in a ſpiritual ſubject; and this again is the firſt Mover which we are in queſt of. If it be the efficient cauſe of bodies (19), ſo much the better, for with much more reaſon will it be the efficient cauſe of motion. If it is not their efficient cauſe, if matter exiſts by itſelf, yet it will be the cauſe of their motion, ſince it is viſible that a nature which hath been at reſt during an eternity, does not begin to move itſelf, but muſt be drawn out of this ſtate of reſt by an external principle. On the other ſide, if we ſuppoſe that motion is eternal, it will be more difficult to maintain that it proceeds from an immaterial cauſe; for it may be urged, that the ſame neceſſity whereby matter hath eternally exiſted without having been created (20), hath made it move eternally without the help of an external principle, or ſpiritual mover. I cannot therefore comprehend the manner of arguing which Zabarella took; for whatever I conjecture on this head, tends to make me believe, rather that he diverted himſelf by broaching a paradox, than that he ſuffered himſelf to be ſeduced by ſpecious reaſons. Was he afraid that it ſhould be urged againſt him that a ſpiritual Mover would not have left matter in a ſtate of inactivity through all eternity, and that therefore the beginning of motion is a proof that the firſt Mover is not a ſpiritual being? But this objection is ſtronger againſt thoſe who ſhould maintain the materiality of the firſt Mover. Is it not more difficult to comprehend that a corporeal cauſe ſhould act with liberty, and begin it's actions at pleaſure, than to comprehend the ſame thing of a ſpiritual nature?

[*G*] *I ſhall ſpeak of the treatiſe in which he maintained, that the proof of a* GOD, *drawn from the exiſtence of a firſt Mover, is defective, unleſs we ſuppoſe motion to be eternal.*] All the former part of this article, and what is contained in the remark [*H*], was written in the month of March 1697. I read it over again in Auguſt 1701, in order to ſend it to the preſs; and whilſt I was peruſing it, I remembred that for two or three years paſt I had Zabarella's works by me. I therefore believed that I ought to examine what he ſaith, and compare with that the conjectures which I had made when I had no other guide than a citation of Berigardus. This examination made it appear to me, that my conjectures do not come home to the point, and that the ſtate of the queſtion is different from what I imagined. Notwithſtanding, I have publiſhed them without any alteration; they may afford matter of reflexion, and, at all events, they may ſerve as a proof of my ingenuity, and make it appear that I uſe no manner of artifice. There are a great many authors who, on the like occaſions, would have corrected their manuſcript, and yet would ſay, *This is what we conjectured before we ſaw the book, and after we have read it, we have found our conjectures exactly conform to it.* But I will act with more ſincerity, I am willing that the reader ſhould know the difference between what I thought of Zabarella's book before, and what I ought to ſay of it after I have read it. Accordingly I ſhall give a ſhort analyſis of that treatiſe.

It is intituled, *De Inventione æterni Motoris*, and contains but eight pages and a half in my edition (21). The author's firſt theſis is, that it is impoſſible to diſcover any otherwiſe than by motion that there is an immaterial ſubſtance; but he proteſts that he confines himſelf to the knowledge which may be acquired by the light of nature, and that he excepts revelation. ‘Hæc præmiſſa proteſtatione, nos hac de re ſecundum principia philoſophiæ Ariſt. eſſe loquuturos, & illam tantum ſubſtantiarum à materia abjunctarum notitiam, quam via naturali adipiſcimur, conſideraturos, omiſſa penitus earundem cognitione, quam revelatione divina & lumine ſupernaturali accepimus; veriſſimam illam quidem, ſed Ariſt. cujus dicta interpretanda ſuſcepimus, prorſus abſconditam (22). - - - *I firſt declare that I am to ſpeak on this ſubject only according to the principles of Ariſtotle, and to conſider that knowledge of ſubſtances abſtracted from matter, which we attain by reaſon and the light of nature, ſetting aſide entirely that knowledge of them which we have received from Divine revelation, and by ſupernatural light, which knowledge is indeed moſt true, but was utterly hidden to Ariſtotle, whoſe principles I have undertaken to explain.*’ He embraces the opinion of Averroës, who rejected the other proofs which Avicenna pretended to find in Ariſtotle's books, theſe for inſtance: there is one being dependant on another, therefore there is a firſt being which doth not depend on any thing whatſoever; for otherwiſe we ſhould be obliged to admit a progreſs *in infinitum*. But this firſt being is GOD, therefore, *&c.* there is one perfection and one goodneſs greater than another; there is therefore a ſupreme perfection and goodneſs. But the being which hath this perfection and this goodneſs is GOD, wherefore there is a GOD. Averroës anſwers, that all this proves only the exiſtence of a nature independent of, and more perfect than, others, but not it's immateriality. He adds, that the antient Philoſophers, who admitted nothing but matter, would ſay that this independent and moſt perfect nature, is nothing elſe but Heaven (23). Zabarella concludes, that in order to come naturally to the notion of an immaterial ſubſtance, we ought to argue thus: Heaven hath an inceſſant motion; every thing which moves is moved by another; whatever is corporeal is movable, and there is no progreſs *in infinitum* betwixt the movers and the things moved; wherefore there is a firſt mover diſtinct from matter.

He afterwards enquires whether motion, whatever it be, affords a proof of the exiſtence of ſuch a mover, and declares for the negative; for he concludes, that nothing but the eternity of motion can prove the exiſtence of a Mover ſeparate from matter. He examines the opinion of thoſe who pretend that Ariſtotle maintained (24), that even motion, which had a beginning, is able to lead us to the knowledge of a firſt ſpiritual Mover. This Philoſopher, ſay they, argued thus: Whatever moves, is moved by another, and there is no ſuch thing, as a progreſs *in infinitum*; wherefore there

(19) Note, that ſeveral great Orthodox Philoſophers maintain that a creature may be eternal.

(20) I ſuppoſe that Zabarella argued againſt ſome men, who did not believe the creation.

(21) *It is that of* Francfort ſumptibus hæredum Lazari Zetzneri, 1618, in 4to.

(22) Jacobus Zabarella, de Rebus naturalibus, *pag. m.* 253.

(23) Quare illi philoſophi, quorum mentionem facit Plato in Sophiſta, qui præter res corporeas & ſenſiles nil aliud exiſtere concedebant, dicerent illud ſummum & optimum, & perfectiſſimum, non eſſe niſi Cœlum, nec ullum præter illud dari alium Deum. *Id. ibid. pag.* 254.

(24) *In lib. viii.* Phyſic. auſcultationis.

there are more ambiguities than are imagined in the controverſy concerning the eternity

there is a firſt Mover, which is immovable, and conſequently incorporeal, for if he were a body, he muſt of neceſſity be movable. Zabarella anſwers, that this argument of Ariſtotle can only lead us to the exiſtence of a Mover that is immovable in no other than a general ſenſe, which may comprize the ſouls of beaſts. Thoſe ſouls, continues he, are immovable ſo far as they are not movable in themſelves, but only by accident. But tho' they are accidentally movable, they are called the firſt movers, according to the order eſſential to moving things. *Si hunc Ariſtotelis diſcurſum conſideremus, maniſeſtum eſt, per eum nos non duci ad alium motorem immobilem, quam late acceptum, qui animas quoque animalium mortalium complectatur ; immobiles enim ſunt, quatenus non ſunt per ſe mobiles, quum incorporeæ ſint, ſed tamen ſunt per accidens mobiles : neque per id fit, quin dicantur motores primi juxta ordinem moventium eſſentialem* (25). He adds, that thoſe whom he oppoſes being very ſenſible of the lameneſs of this argument, have ſupplied the defect of it, in this manner : Heaven moves ; it is therefore moved by ſomething elſe ; therefore there is a firſt immovable Mover. But is this Mover eternal, or not ? If it is, we have what we enquire for : the motion of Heaven, be it what it will, be it but of two days, leads us to the exiſtence of a God. But if this Mover is not eternal, it will one day periſh, wherefore there is ſomething, which will deſtroy it ; it is not therefore the firſt Mover, we muſt therefore deny it that quality, and transfer it to another being, who ſhall deſtroy that pretended firſt Mover. Yet we were come ſo far as the firſt Mover, and we argued on that hypotheſis : what abſurdity more ridiculous than to offer in anſwer what is contradictory to a ſuppoſition, of the truth of which the contending parties are agreed ? But that thing, which ſhall occaſion ſooner or later the deſtruction of that, which we have conſidered as the firſt immovable Mover, muſt it not be the firſt Mover ? And to be ſo, ought it not to be in ſuch a ſtation as nothing can be above it, which is able to produce any alteration in it ? It is therefore eternal, it is therefore what we were to find by following the track of Ariſtotle's argument. Let us hear Zabarella's anſwer which turns ſolely on the ſolution of the following dilemma : The firſt Mover is or is not eternal ; if it is, we have gained our point : if it is not, there is then another Mover which can deſtroy it, there is therefore a Mover ſuperior to this firſt Mover. But this is abſurd, and contrary to the ſuppoſition to which both parties agreed. He anſwers (26), that the firſt Mover which his adverſaries have hit on is not eternal, but of the ſame nature with the ſoul of brutes, that it is the form of Heaven, and that Heaven being compoſed of four elements oppoſite to each other, had a beginning, and ſhall have an end, in like manner with other parts of the world ; that from the deſtruction of Heaven will neceſſarily reſult the deſtruction of it's moving ſoul (27) ; that it ſhall not periſh by the act of a firſt Mover ; and that therefore tho' it ſhall be deſtroyed it doth not follow from thence that there is a ſuperior agent or efficient cauſe above it ; it is ſufficient that it be united to a body naturally corruptible, for the corruption of that body neceſſarily draws on the corruption of it's form or of the ſoul, which in it performed the functions of a firſt Mover. *Quando igitur hi dicunt, ſi primus motor univerſi eſt corruptibilis, ergo non eſt primus, negandum eſt conſequens : ad probationem autem, quum dicunt, corrumpetur à motore priore, hoc quoque eſt negandum ; non enim ex eo quod eſt corruptibilis, requiritur motor prior, à quo corrumpatur, ſed quum ſit incorporeus, & forma corporis, ſatis cauſa eſt ad ipſum interimendum corruptibilitas corporis, cujus eſt forma ; corpus autem ipſum, quum ſit elementare, à ſuo contrario lædi & interimi poteſt* (28). Wherefore, concludes he, motion in general proves no more, than the exiſtence of a firſt Mover immovable in the ſame manner as the ſouls of brutes, are immovable and nothing but an eternal motion can prove an eternal Mover. *Ex motu igitur abſolute accepto abſque conſideratione æternitatis nil aliud oſtenditur, quam dari primum motorem univerſi immobilem eo modo, quo animæ animalium brutorum ſunt immobiles, hoc eſt, non per ſe mobilem : quod autem nec per ſe, nec per accidens mobilis ſit, proinde à materia abjunctus : & impartibilis, & infatigabilis, & ſempiternus, id ea ratione non oſtenditur ; quapropter nullum aliud philoſopho naturali medium relinquitur ad demonſtrandum primum motorem æternum, niſi motus æternus ; quando enim ſumimus motum univerſi unum & eundem numero æternum eſſe, ſtatim inferimus, eum ab uno tantum motore totum produci ; quare neceſſe eſt, motorem illum eſſe infatigabilem, & ſempiternum* (29).

It would not be eaſy for the Peripatetics to refute Zabarella's reaſons : for he argues *ad hominem* againſt them ; he makes his advantage of their doctrine of ſubſtantial forms, and the motive and primitive virtue of the ſouls of animals. Moſt of the antient Philoſophers believed that ſelf-motion was the eſſential character of the ſoul (30). Πᾶν γὰρ σῶμα, ſays Plato, ᾧ μὲν ἔξωθεν τὸ κινεῖσθαι, ἄψυχον· ᾧ δὲ ἔνδοθεν αὐτὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἔμψυχον. *Omne enim corpus cui motus extrinſecus incidit inanime eſt. Cui vero intus ex ſeipſo ineſt animatum* *. The Moderns, who have juſtly rejected theſe principles, might confute him without any difficulty, and find nothing intricate in his objections. Obſerve, by the by, how pernicious and dangerous the conſequences may prove of the Ariſtotelian hypotheſis about the internal activity of forms diſtinct from matter. It is a principle which admits of almoſt an infinite number of firſt Movers, from whence it is eaſy to proceed ſo far as to reject a firſt univerſal Mover, or to aſſert that he is ſubject to death. The ſoul of each man and each brute is, in it's kind, a firſt mover. It moves itſelf, and imprints motion on the body, of which it is the form. We may, in proportion, find the ſame principle in inanimate bodies. The form of heavy bodies hath no need of any external Mover to preſs them towards the center, nor that of light bodies to drive them from it ; but is itſelf their firſt Mover in this reſpect. Now if this Ariſtotelian hypotheſis be once admitted, an univerſal Mover of the Heavens will be no longer neceſſary, every planet will be moved by it's form, the heavens and fixed ſtars will be moved by theirs, and none of theſe movers will be accounted incorruptible, but will be liable to the common deſtiny of forms, which cannot ſubſiſt after the diſſolution of the matter united to them (31). Zabarella very clearly apprehending this conſequence, aſſerted that the ſoul of the Heavens would one day periſh, ſince the matter of the Heavens was compoſed of principles which claſh with each other. It is ſo evident that matter is changeable, that the antient Philoſophers who believed that the *genii* were not entirely ſeparated from matter, believed them mortal, not excepting the greateſt of them all. An evidence of this is Plutarch's ſtory, *The great Pan is dead* (32). If Zarabella has been able to penetrate into the conſequences of the common doctrine of the ſchools, he was not leſs in the right, when he aſſerted that in order to find a firſt eternal Mover, it was neceſſary to ſtop at one only cauſe which produced all motion. It is an advantage which we meet with in the Carteſian Philoſophy ; it aſcribes to God all the moving and immediate power of the univerſe, and doth not divide it betwixt the Creator and the creatures. The multitude of Movers may inſenſibly lead to the moſt dangerous atheiſm, and from hence doubtleſs proceeds the atheiſm of the Chineſe Philoſophers (33). They firſt of all believed a ſuperior, immaterial and infinite Deity ; but attributing great natural powers to bodies, and chiefly to the celeſtial, they, by little and little, forgot the immaterial Divinity, and ſtopped at material principles. The viſible and material Heaven is at preſent their great God (34).

Facts which prove that the Orthodox are allowed to diſpute on the arguments for the exiſtence of a God.

For the reſt, we ought not to be ſurprized that the Italian Inquiſition permitted Zabarella to follow Averroës, in rejecting ſome proofs of the exiſtence of a God. This ſort of liberty is very great every where ; and provided a man owns that this exiſtence may be proved by other means, they give him leave to cenſure this or that particular proof. The Carteſians are not more annoyed on any head, than on Mr Des Cartes's demonſtration of the exiſtence of God. He was obliged to anſwer a vaſt number of objections. And we every day ſee the moſt orthodox people renewing this diſpute. Mr Werenfels, Profeſſor at Baſil, maintained, in a printed tract, that this argument of Des Cartes is a meer paralogiſm. Mr Swicer, Profeſſor at Zurich, anſwered eternity of the world [*H*].

---

(25) Id. ibid. *pag.* 255.

(26) Id. ibid. *pag.* 256.

(27) Dicam itaque, ex interitu Cœli neceſſario fieri ut anima quoque motrix intereat, quia licet hæc contrarium non habeat, tamen ex ſubjecti corporis interitu ex neceſſitate deficeret, quum ſit forma materialis, quales ſunt animæ animalium ; animam humanam ſemper excipio. *Id. ibid.*

(28) Id. ibid.

(29) Id. ibid. *pag.* 257.

(30) *See* Ariſtotle de Anima, *lib.* i, *cap.* ii.

* Plato, in Phædro, *pag. m.* 1221, *D.*

(31) See, above, the compariſon made in remark [*I*], of the article XENOCRATES, between the gods of Xenocrates, and the ſlaves called *Servigleba*.

(32) Plut. de Oracul. defectu, *pag.* 419. *See alſo the remark* [*I*], *in the article* CHRYSIPPUS.

(33) See the remark [*X*], in the article SPINOZA.

(34) See ſeveral proofs of this in the apology for the Dominicans, printed at Cologn in 1699, *pag.* 79, & *ſeq.* See alſo the article SPINOZA, remark [*X*].

anſwered him; as did alſo Mr Jaquelot, a Miniſter at the Hague, whoſe anſwer is inſerted in the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned (35) Mr Brillon, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, ſaw this anſwer, but not being ſatisfied with it, he publiſhed (36) a memoir to prove that Des Cartes's argument was a ſophiſm, and not a demonſtration. Father Francis Lami, a Benedictine Monk, refuted this memoir (37). Mr Jaquelot replied for himſelf (38). Mr l'Herminier, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, has lately publiſhed a book, in which he not only rejects Des Cartes's *demonſtrations concerning the exiſtence of* G O D, but alſo moſt others. 'Of 'five offered by St Thomas, which are alſo commonly 'made uſe of by Philoſophers and Divines, this Doctor 'rejects four, and allows only one of them to be valid 'againſt the Atheiſts, for he looks upon it as a para'logiſm to prove the Deity by any of the following 'reaſons. That all that exiſts cannot be contingent, 'and that there muſt be ſome being which neceſſarily 'exiſts of itſelf. That we cannot admit an infinite 'number of cauſes mutually ſubordinate, and that it is 'abſolutely neceſſary to acknowledge a firſt cauſe on 'which all others are dependent. That matter can'not move itſelf, but that a firſt incorporeal Mover 'muſt neceſſarily exiſt, from which it mediately or 'immediately received it's moving impulſe. That in 'thoſe beings which exiſt, there appearing ſeveral de'grees of perfection, as goodneſs, beauty, power, &c. 'there muſt undoubtedly exiſt a Being infinitely per'fect, with reſpect to which they may be ſaid to be 'leſs or more perfect in proportion to their approach'ing more or leſs to it's perfection. After having 'ranked theſe four demonſtrations among the ſo'phiſms, the fifth which Mr l'Herminier looks upon 'as a real demonſtration of the exiſtence of God, is 'that drawn from the ſtructure of the univerſe and the 'manner of its ſubſiſting in ſuch an excellent order of all 'it's parts, and with ſuch a conſtant regularity of their 'motions (39).' This is what we find in the journal of Trevoux, in the extract of Mr l'Herminier's book (40). It is long ſince a very famous ſchool-man (41) declared, that all the proofs which reaſon can afford of the exiſtence of God are only probable. This Doctor of the Sorbonne does not go ſo far.

[*H*] *There are more ambiguities than are imagined in the controverſy concerning the eternity of the world.*] All Chriſtians (42) are agreed, that nothing beſides God hath eternally exiſted; but ſeveral aſſert that he might have actually created the world as ſoon as he formed the decree in order to it's production; from whence they conclude, that the world might have exiſted from all eternity, ſince the decree for it's production is undoubtedly eternal. Several alſo affirm that it is impoſſible for a creature to be eternal. Each of theſe parties is ſtronger in objections than ſolutions. But this diſpute which is rendred ſo tedious and difficult, would ſoon ceaſe, if the diſputants of each ſide would but explain themſelves clearly, and remove the ambiguities about eternity. The queſtion ought to be put thus: *Is it poſſible that* G O D *and his creatures may have always exiſted together.* And then one would not ſo boldly take the negative ſide; for this term, the eternity of the world, a term which ſtartles ſo many people, would not here make ſuch an impreſſion on the mind. And the better to remove this ſtumbling-block, it ſhould be ſaid that a creature which had always co-exiſted with God would not be eternal, for which this reaſon ought immediately to be alledged, that the duration of creatures is ſucceſſive, and that eternity is a ſimple duration which eſſentially excludes the time paſt, and the time to come. By this eſſential difference betwixt the duration of God, and that of the creatures, we ſhould put an end to almoſt all the diſpute, and each party would find their account in it. We ſhould grant to thoſe who deny that a creature can be eternal, that they are in the right, and ſhould not deny that it is poſſible for God and the creature to have always exiſted together, ſince it is certain that a cauſe doth not comprehend in it's idea a priority of time with reſpect to it's effect, and that this is eſpecially true with reſpect to an omnipotent cauſe which needs only will in order to produce actually whatever it pleaſes. Mr Poiret hath very clearly apprehended the ambiguities which perplex this controverſy, and render it in a manner a diſpute about words. He judiciouſly obſerves that it is not true that the creatures would be eternal, if their exiſtence had no beginning, and tells us that thoſe who affirm it have a wrong notion of eternity. 'Aſſerentibus (Platoni ut ajunt & Ariſtoteli) 'mundum exiſtentiæ initio carere, fuit objectum, ſi id 'ita ſe haberet, mundum igitur æternum fore. Ecce, 'homines iſti ſibi imaginantur Æternitatem, quaſi 'eſſet infinitorum momentorum ordo principio atque 'fine carens, quæ vera æternitatis ignorantia eſt. 'Falſum eſt, mundum ſtatui æternum ſi dicatur vel 'ſemper exſtitiſſe, vel non poſſe affirmari in eo eſſe ali'quod momentum quod ab alio non fuerit præceſſum: 'quamvis enim hoc eſſet, nihilominus mundus tem'porarius eſſet & dependens; neque hoc quicquam 'Dei Æternitati aut Potentiæ detraheret (43). - - - '*It was objected to thoſe (Plato and Ariſtotle, as it is 'ſaid) who maintained, that the world is without a 'beginning; that if it was ſo, the world would be eter'nal. They who made this objection muſt have imagined 'that eternity is an order of ſucceſſion of infinite moments 'of time, without beginning or end: but this ſhews that 'they know not what eternity is. It is falſe that the 'world would be accounted eternal, if we ſay either that it 'always exiſted, or that there is not any moment of it's 'time which is not preceded by another: for even if this 'was ſo, the world would only be temporary and de'pendent, neither would this derogate from the eternity, or 'the power of* G O D.' Obſerve by the by that this author doth three things. We have juſt now ſeen the firſt, which is the falſe conſequence that the world would be eternal if it never began. In the ſecond place he owns that the arguments commonly alledged againſt thoſe who ſay that the world had no beginning are weak. He excuſes thoſe who not having the light of revelation, did not believe the beginning of the univerſe. He tells us that when he was writing that chapter he was perſuaded it was not poſſible to find any good reaſons againſt thoſe of that opinion, tho' he had long ſearched after better proofs than all thoſe which he had read, and which appeared weak to him. *Poſtquam aliorum quæ occurrerunt rationes infirmas deprehenderem, alias diu in mente mea quæſieram, putavi ſepoſita revelatione non poſſe ex lumine naturæ demonſtrari Mundum ſic eſſe, ut prius non fuerit* (44). 3. At laſt he brings a proof which offered itſelf to his mind whilſt he was writing, he brings it, I ſay, againſt theſe people. But obſerve, that an objection was made to him (45), to which he gave an anſwer (46), which doth not take off the force of it.

Here are other quibbles which prevail in this diſpute. Thoſe who ſay that the creatures did not always co-exiſt with God, are obliged to own that God exiſted before them. There was therefore ſuch a thing as *before*, when God exiſted alone; it is not therefore true that the duration of God is an indiviſible point: Time therefore preceded the exiſtence of the creatures. Theſe conſequences make thoſe gentlemen fall into a contradiction. For if the duration of God is indiviſible, and without either time paſt or time to come, it follows that time and the creatures began together, and if ſo, how can we ſay that God exiſted before the exiſtence of the creatures? That phraſe is improper and contradictory. And the following are no leſs ſo, *God might have created the world ſooner or later than he did create it; he might have done it one hundred thouſand years ſooner*, &c.

They do not attend to this, that by making eternity one indiviſible inſtant, the hypotheſis of the beginning of the creatures is weakened. How do you prove that the world did not always exiſt? Is it not from the argument, that there was an infinite nature which exiſted while the world did not exiſt? But can the duration of that nature ſet bounds to that of the world? Can it hinder the duration of the world from extending its ſelf beyond all the particular beginnings which you would aſſign for it? You ſay that the creatures want only a point of indiviſible duration to be without a beginning; for, according to you, they were only preceded by the duration of God, which is an indiviſible inſtant. You will be anſwered, that they did not therefore begin, for if a ſtick wanted only one point (I mean a Mathematical point) to be four feet long, it would certainly have the whole extent of four feet. This is an inſtance that may be founded on the common definition of the duration of God (47), a definition much

---

(35) For May 1700, *pag.* 199, & *ſeq.*

(36) In the ſecond *Journal des Sçavans*, for the year 1701.

(37) See the Journal of Trevoux, for January and February 1701, *pag.* 104, & *ſeq. Dutch Edit.*

(38) *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *for May* 1701, *pag.* 226, & *ſeq.*

(39) Journal of Trevoux, for May and June, 1701, *pag.* 317, *Dutch Edit.*

(40) *It is intituled*, Summa Theologiæ ad uſum Scholæ accommodata.

(41) Gabriel Biel in Magiſtrum Sententiarum, *Diſtinct. ii, Quæſt. x, Art. iii.*

(42) Except ſome Heretics, who acknowledge the eternity of matter.

(43) Petrus Poiret, Cogitat. Rationales de Deo, Anima, & Malo, *lib. iii, cap. xvi, num. ix, pag.* 438, Edit. 1685.

(44) Id. ibid. *pag.* 439.

(45) You will find it in page 674, 675, of this book of Mr Poiret.

(46) You will find it in p. 678, of the ſame book.

(47) *It is taken from Boëtius, who ſays, lib. v,* de Conſol. Philoſ. *Proſa vi, pag. m.* 135, *that eternity is* interminabilis vitæ tota ſimul & perfecta poſſeſſio.

much more incomprehenſible than the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; for if it is impoſſible to conceive that all the members of a man ſhould be contained diſtinct from each other within the compaſs of a Mathematical point; how ſhall we conceive that a duration without beginning or end, and which co-exiſts with the ſucceſſive duration of all creatures, is comprized in an indiviſible inſtant (48)?

This hypotheſis raiſes another difficulty in favour of thoſe who aſſert that the creatures had no beginning. If the decree of the creation doth not comprehend a particular moment, it never exiſted without the creatures; for it ought to be underſtood under this phraſe, *I will that the world exiſt*. It is viſible that by virtue of ſuch a decree the world muſt have exiſted at the ſame time with this act of the will of God. But ſince this act had no beginning, neither had the world any. Let us ſuppoſe then that the decree was conceived thus; *I will that the world exiſt in ſuch a moment*. But how can we ſuppoſe that, if the duration of God is an indiviſible point? Can this or that moment be choſen rather than any other in ſuch a duration? It ſeems therefore, that if the duration of God is not ſucceſſive, the world could not have a beginning. This objection was propoſed to Mr Poiret in the year 1679 (49). He returned an anſwer (50) which no ways removes the difficulty, and even takes away all means of doing it; for he ſuppoſeth that it is not poſſible there ſhould be any moments before the exiſtence of the creatures: nay, he ſeems to ſuppoſe that the decree of the creation was only made at the very moment that the creatures exiſted. Let us cite his words: ‘Nec poterat exiſtere mundus, nec momenta ulla, ſine alio decreto, nempe eo cùm dixit Deus, *Volo mundum exiſtere*; & tunc, (ut ait Scriptura,) *dixit, & facta ſunt*, tunc exſtitit extemplo mundus: Et hoc fuit primum ejus momentum, & ante hoc nullum fuit de facto poſſibile momentum; eſtque contradicens concipere ante mundum plura momenta ex quibus unum eligatur ad exiſtentiam primam mundi, cæteris partim ſine mundo prælapſis: nam momentum eſt modus creaturæ quà exiſtentis (51). - - - - *Neither could the world, or any moment of time exiſt, without another decree, namely that when God ſaid*, I will that the world exiſt, *and then (as it is in the Scripture)* he ſpoke and the things were made: *then the world immediately came into being. This was the firſt moment of its exiſtence; and before this, there was no poſſible moment. And it is contradictory to conceive, that before the firſt exiſtence of the world, there were ſeveral moments of time, and that one of them was ſingled out for the firſt moment of it's exiſtence, while the reſt paſſed away without any world: for time is a mode of a creature, conſidered as exiſting.*’ For my part, I make a quite different ſuppoſition, and believe it ſolves the difficulty. I ſuppoſe that among the poſſible beings which God knew, before (52) he made the decrees of the creation, we ought to reckon a ſucceſſive duration without beginning or end; and whoſe parts are as diſtinct from one another, as thoſe of a poſſible extenſion, which God likewiſe knew before his decrees, as a Being infinite, according to the three dimenſions. He left in the ſtate of the things poſſible, part of this infinite duration, and made decrees for the exiſtence of the other. He choſe ſuch a moment as he thought fit in this ideal duration for the firſt which ſhould exiſt, and fixed to it the act, by which he decreed the creation of the world. This is the reaſon why the eternity of that act doth not prove the eternity of the world. Thus we ſee again, that the indiviſibility of the real duration of God, doth not prove that the world did not begin. We have alſo in this ideal or poſſible duration, the true meaſure of time. Others look for it in vain, in the motion of the Heavens. Others yet more chimerically aſſert, that time is an *Ens rationis*, a manner of conceiving things, and that without motion, or the thought of man, there would be no ſuch thing as time. A groſs abſurdity: for tho' all created ſpirits ſhould periſh, tho' all bodies ſhould ceaſe to move, there would ſtill be a ſucceſſive fixed and regular duration in the world, which would correſpond to the moments of the poſſible duration known to God, and according to which he would preſerve every thing more or leſs, for ſo many years. An extenſion which is at reſt, requires no leſs to be created every moment of it's duration, than an extenſion which moves. The conſervation of creatures is always a continual creation, whether they move, or reſt in the ſame ſituation. The true meaſure of the abſolute quantity of things, either with reſpect to extenſion or time, is only to be found in the ideas of God. Man knows nothing of it; he is only acquainted with relative magnitude or littleneſs. The ſame ſpace of time appears to him ſhort or long, according as he paſſes it with pleaſure or pain. The very hour which ſeems ſhort to one, appears long to another.

(48) The Schoolmen take great pains to make this intelligible. See among others Caramuel, in his *Philoſophia rationalis & realis*, *lib. vii.*

(49) *It is at pag.* 675, 676, *of his* Cogitat. rationales de Deo, *&c.*

(50) Ibid. *pag.* 680.

(51) Poiret, ibid. *pag.* 680.

(52) This word ought to be underſtood according to our way of apprehending things, and what is called in the ſchools, priority of nature, *ſignum rationis.*

ZAHURIS, is the common name beſtowed on a certain ſort of men in Spain, who, as it is pretended *(a)*, are ſo ſharp ſighted, as to ſee veins of water, metals, treaſures, and dead bodies under ground. Their eyes are very red. Martin Del Rio tells us that when he was at Madrid in the year 1575, he ſaw a little boy of this ſort. It is remarkable that though this author is very ready to impute extraordinary effects to the devils, yet he doth not believe that the Zahuris diſcover ſubterraneous waters and metals by any magical contract, but believes that the vapours diſcover the water to them, and that they know the mines by the herbs which grow in thoſe places. But as for treaſures and dead bodies, he ſaith the Devil ſheweth them to them; ſince they can mark out what treaſures and corps they ſee, and are able to do it only on Tueſdays and Fridays. He doth not argue very conſiſtently on what is related of theſe people [*A*]; and all thoſe who cite him do it not much to their honour [*B*]: either they do not underſtand Latin, or they rely on falſified quotations. Gutierrius, a Spaniſh Phyſician, laughs at what is ſaid of the Zahuris [*C*].

(*a*) Del Rio Diſquiſit. Magic. *Tom. i, lib. i, cap. iii, Quæſt. iv.*

[*A*] *Del Rio doth not argue very conſiſtently, on what is related of theſe people.*] For if it be once granted that the Zahuris ſee dead bodies and treaſures, there is no reaſon to pretend that they do not ſee veins of water, and gold and ſilver mines. Why then doth del Rio grant the one, and deny the other? For he denies it, when he ſays that they know by the vapours and herbs, what lies hidden in a certain place of the earth. A knowledge which is acquired after this manner, is not what we call ſeeing. To argue conſiſtently on this head, he ought to deny the facts, or explain them all by the ſame Hypotheſis; for if the Devil is the cauſe of the two laſt, he may very well be ſo of the two former.

[*B*] *All thoſe who cite him, do it not much to their honour.*] One of thoſe who wrote concerning the wand of Peter Aymar, alledges Martin del Rio, as an author who on the ſubject of the Zahuris, goes no further than natural cauſes (1). But this is viſibly falſe, ſince of the four performances of theſe people, he aſcribes two to the Devil. Here follows what that author makes him ſay: *Del Rio relates that there are certain men in Spain, called Zahuris, by reaſon of their ſharp ſight. He ſaith that he ſaw one of them at Madrid, in the year* 1575, *and that thoſe Zahuris were reputed to ſee through the thick ſurface of the earth, ſprings of water, treaſures, and metallic mines; and tho' theſe effects ſeemed very ſurprizing, he informs us that he explained them naturally, and that ſeveral Philoſophers alſo referred them to natural cauſes.* I. He doth not ſay that thoſe people are called Zahuris from their ſharp ſight (2). II. This author does not mention the ſeeing of buried bodies. III. Del Rio doth not ſay that he naturally explained thoſe three effects; he ſaith, that with reſpect to the two firſt, he perſiſts in the natural explanation which he had given elſewhere (3); but he attributes the other to the Devil.

[*C*] *Gutierrius . . . . . laughs at what is ſaid of the Zahuris.*] He calls them *Zahories*, and ſo much the more blames the popular credulity in this reſpect, be-

(1) *See the* Mercure Galant, *for the month of February*, 1693, *pag.* 235.

(2) Norunt Hiſpaniæ genus hominum quod vocant Zahuris, nos *Lynceos* poſſumus nuncupare. *Mart. del Rio, Diſq. Magic. lib. i, cap. iii, Quæſt. iv, pag.* 35.

(3) Commentar. in Medeam Senecæ, *ver.* 231.

cauſe they ſuppoſe theſe people to be born on Good-Friday, and that they enjoy this miraculous privilege by virtue of their birth-day. ‘ Eo magis iſti damnandi, quia ex ſuperſtitioſa hominum opinione admittantur putantes tali prærogativa hos impoſtores donari, quia nati fuerint die illa ſacra, humano generi ſemper fauſta ac felici, in qua celebratur apud Catholicos memoria Paſſionis Domini Jeſu-Chriſti, feria inquam ſexta Judæorum perfidia crucifixi, & quemadmodum tunc terra commota atque monumentis apertis latitantia, ac ſepulta corpora apparuerunt hominibus illa die, ſic altera in qua recolitur felix illa memoria ſi natalis alicui hominum fuerit, illam virtutem videndi potentiæ tribuit, aut donat quæ ad interanea terrarum pertingere poſſit: Vide quam futile ac irreligioſum commentum (4). - - - - *The Zahuris are ſo much the more to be condemned and exploded, as they are admitted only by the opinion of ſuperſtitious men, who imagine that theſe impoſtors are gifted with ſuch a virtue, becauſe they were born on that ſacred day, ever bleſſed and happy to mankind, on which the Catholics commemorate the paſſion of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; the ſixth day of the week, I ſay, on which he was crucified by the perfidy of the Jews: for, as the earth was then ſhaken, and the graves of the dead opened, many hidden and buried bodies, did on that day appear to men, ſo they think that the day on which this is commemorated, if it chances to be the birth-day of any perſon, imparts to him that virtue of ſeeing things which are in the bowels of the earth. What a ſilly and chimerical fancy is this!*’

(4) Joan. Lazarus Gutierrius Sepulbedenſis, *in Academia Pinciana Medicinæ publicus Profeſſor*, Opuſculo de Faſcino, *Dubio vi, num.* 16, *pag.* 143.

ZANCHIUS, or ZANCHUS (Basil) one of the learned men of the XVIth century, was of Bergamo. He took the habit of a regular Canon, and applied with an extreme ardour, not only to the ſtudy of Philoſophy and Theology, but alſo to that of the *Belles Lettres*. The works we have of his are proofs of his erudition [*A*]. He acquired ſuch an extenſive knowledge, that he was thought worthy to be keeper of the Vatican library. He diſcharged that poſt with the greateſt reputation, and to the ſatisfaction of the learned. He died very piouſly at Rome in the year 1560 (*a*). This I take from Ghilini's *Teatro*. I am ſorry that I cannot find in it the circumſtances of a particular which I have read elſewhere, I mean that Zanchius being perſecuted and oppreſſed in a cruel manner, ended his days in miſery [*B*]. He was couſin to Zanchius (*b*) who is the ſubject of the next article, and had two brothers who were regular Canons as well as himſelf (*c*).

(*a*) *Taken from* Ghilini, Teatro, *Part. i, pag.* 26, 27.

(*b*) Hieron. Zanchius, Epiſtol. *lib. ii, pag.* 445.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

[*A*] *The works we have of his are proofs of his erudition.*] Ghilini repreſents him as a man who had thoroughly ſtudied the Latin tongue, and had thereby acquired as much glory, as the moſt excellent Profeſſors of that language. *S'affaticò molto nell' acquiſto della lingua Latina, dalla quale ne conſeguì la maggior gloria, che dar ſi poſſi al più eſquiſito profeſſore di così neceſſaria favella* (1). He improved, adds he, the Dictionary of Marius Galezinus. I believe he ſhould have ſaid that of Marius Nizolius. ‘ Aſſaiſſimo li devono tutti i ſtudioſi, e devono anco in gran parte riconoſcere dal ſuo infaticabile intelletto la perfezione del frutuoſo Dizionario de Mario Galeſino, il quale fu aumentato, e ridotto al termine, che hoggidi ſi vede; che hà per titolo *Verborum latinorum ex variis auctoribus, lib. i.* Vanno anco attorno con molta commendazione del ſuo nome queſte altre opere. *Dictionarium Poeticum, & Epitheta veterum Poetarum: de horto ſophiæ libri duo carmine conſcripti: Adnotationes in divinos libros: Quæſtiones in libros Regum, & Paralipomenon: Poematum libri octo* (2). - - - - *All men of letters are greatly indebted to him, and ought to own that the uſeful Dictionary of Marius Galezinus, which he enlarged and brought into the form in which it now appears, was perfected in a great meaſure by his indefatigable labour. It is intituled* Verborum latinorum ex variis auctoribus, lib. i. *There are likewiſe in the hands of the learned, theſe other works of his, which are greatly to his reputation.* Dictionarium Poeticum, &c.’ Add to this theſe words of Giraldus (3). Eſt & Petrus Zanchus Bergamas, qui mutato vitæ inſtituto à Sodalibus *Bazilius* vocitatus eſt: vivit adhuc, à prima ejus adoleſcentia mihi cognitus Romæ in ſtudiis bonarum literarum verſatus, nec minus in ſacris bene eruditus: plurima ad hanc diem tum ſoluta oratione, tum pedeſtri & carmine perſcripſit, inter quæ Romæ publicata in manus peritorum vagantur duo libri verſu heroico elaborati ad Petr. Bembum Card. qui inſcribuntur *Hortus Sophiæ*, & præterea alia ſimul impreſſa: extat & laborioſum opus, *Sylva vocabulorum* ex optimis auctoribus linguæ Latinæ, item Nizolii ex Cicerone Paralipomena. - - - - *Peter Zanchius of Bergamo, having changed his way of life, was by his companions called Baſil: he is ſtill living, I was acquainted with him at Rome, when he was very young; he has diligently ſtudied the* Belles Lettres, *and is alſo very learned in Divinity: he writes even till this day, a great many good things, both in proſe and verſe. There are in the hands of the curious, two books of his written in heroic verſe, inſcribed to Cardinal Peter Bembus, and intituled* Hortus Sapientiæ, *together with other pieces printed at Rome. He has alſo publiſhed a laborious work, intituled,* Sylva vocabulorum, *a collection of words taken from the beſt Latin authors, and likewiſe Nizolius's Paralipomena, from Cicero.*’

[*B*] *Zanchius . . . . oppreſſed in a cruel manner, ended his days in miſery.*] Paul Manutius deplores his ſad fate in a letter to Gambara an intimate friend of the deceaſed. ‘ Baſilii Zanchi, *ſaith he* (4), poetæ ſummi, hominiſque non vulgariter eruditi, miſerabilis & indigniſſimus interitus hilaritatem mihi prorſus omnem eripuit. quem, enim donare ſummis præmiis ob excellentem virtutem; decorare honoribus ob ſingularem integritatem, atque innocentiam æquum fuit; eum tam ignominioſe vexatum, tam acerbè, tam crudeliter extinctum, quis non ferat iniquiſſimè? equidem, ut audivi, etiam dolore tuo vehementer dolui. nam & vixiſtis unà ſemper conjunctiſſimè, alter alteri egregiè carus. - - - - *The miſerable and underſerved death of Baſil Zanchius, has been a great affliction to me. He was a great Poet, and a man of uncommon learning. Who would not be deeply concerned, that a man who merited the greateſt rewards for his extraordinary virtue, and the greateſt honours for his ſingular integrity and innocence, ſhould be perſecuted and oppreſſed with ſo much cruelty and ignominy, and end his days in miſery? Indeed, when I heard of it, I greatly mourned on account of the grief it would give you: for you and Zanchius have lived together in the firmeſt union, and with the greateſt mutual friendſhip.*’ What follows in this Epiſtle of Manutius, is to be found above (5), look there for the elogies which he beſtows on our Baſil's verſes.

(1) Ghilini, Teatro, *Tom. i, pag.* 26.

(2) Id. ibid.

(3) Lilius Gregor. Gyrald. de Poëtis ſuor. temporum, *Dial. ii, pag.* 569, *Tom. ii, Oper. Edit.* 1696.

(4) Paulus Manutius, Epiſt. xxviii, *lib. iv, pag. m.* 226.

(5) In the remark [*B*], of the article GAMBARA.

ZANCHIUS (Jerom) one of the moſt celebrated Proteſtant Divines, was born at Alzano in Italy [*A*] on the ſecond of February 1516. He entred into the congregation

[*A*] *He was born at Alzano in Italy.*] The difference which Mr Teiſſier (1) has diſcovered betwixt Melchior Adam and Thuanus, is really no difference. The former, ſaith he, writes that Zanchius was a native of Alzano, but Thuanus and Verheiden ſay he was born at Bergamo. I own theſe two laſt authors give him the epithet of Bergomas; but ſince it is not leſs proper to thoſe born in the Bergamaſco, than to thoſe that are born in the city of Bergamo, it is by no means juſt to impute to Thuanus and Verheiden the limited ſenſe which is aſcribed to them. We may very well ſuppoſe that they deſigned to ſay in general, that Zanchius was born in the province of Bergamo; and ſo, Melchior Adam differs from them

(1) Teſſier, Addit. aux Eloges, *Tom. ii, pag.* 160.

congregation of the regular Canons of Lateran, at the age of fifteen, and continued there about nineteen years. He at firſt applied to the ſtudy of Philoſophy and of ſchool Divinity; but after having heard Peter Martyr's Lectures at Lucca, on the Epiſtle of St Paul to the Romans, and the Pſalms, he engaged himſelf in the more profitable ſtudy of the Scripture and Fathers. Every body knows that Peter Martyr, who was a Canon of the ſame congregation, communicated the Proteſtant doctrines to ſeveral of his brethren before he threw off the monkiſh habit. The impreſſions which he made on them were ſo ſtrong, that in the ſpace of one year, eighteen of the fraternity imitated him in abjuring Popery. Our Zanchius was one of them. He left Italy in the year 1550, and ſtayed ſome time amongſt the Griſons, and afterwards at Geneva, whence he deſigned to go to London, being invited thither by Peter Martyr, who intended to procure him a place of Divinity Profeſſor in England. But being intreated by the directors of the univerſity of Straſburgh, to fill the vacant place of the deceaſed Gaſpar Hedion, Divinity Profeſſor there, he accepted that employment in the year 1553, and exerciſed it almoſt eleven years, reading now and then ſome lectures on Ariſtotle. The univerſity required him to ſign the Augſbourg confeſſion, but did not obtain it without ſome limitations which the directors agreed to. He was admitted one of the Canons of St Thomas in the year 1555. He was a lover of peace [*B*], and hated Theological civil wars; which nevertheleſs he could not avoid. He was accuſed of ſome errors, he defended himſelf, and this affair was carried on ſo warmly, that it was reduced to the terms either of his voluntarily retiring, or of the directors diſmiſſing him. He did not find his account in this alternative; wherefore he ſtirred very much to maintain his poſt. A thouſand expedients were ſought after, and at laſt they fell upon that of obliging him to ſign a formulary. He ſigned it with ſome reſtrictions [*C*]: but that did not hinder his adverſaries from triumphing, nor from ſpreading the news of their victory every where. He deſigned to retrieve himſelf, and new propoſals of accommodation were begun, when a favourable opportunity afforded him a handſome pretext to extricate himſelf out of this labyrinth. The church of Chiavenna, in the country of the Griſons invited him to be their miniſter, and he accepted that vocation. He ſurrendred his canonry,

them no otherwiſe, than in expreſſing the native place of this great Divine more particularly: He calls it *Alzanum* (2), and ſaith that it is ſituated in the valley of Seri (3). Now it is certain, that *Alzanum*, and this valley belong to the Bergamaſco (4). Mr Teiſſier is again miſtaken when he ſays that Alzano is *a little town four leagues diſtant from Venice*. If inſtead of four leagues he had put forty, he needed not have feared ſaying too much. Melchior Adam deceived him: he had read ſomewhere that our Jerom's father having received the news of his father's death, quitted his ſtudies of the Civil-Law, and married. The care which he was obliged to take of his ſiſters, made him ſenſible that he would do much better to apply to his domeſtic affairs, than to follow the bar; nay, he left the city, and removed to Alzano, which was four miles diſtant (5); This he did like a good œconomiſt (6), that is, as I think, to live at leſs expence. This is what Melchior Adam found in ſome book (7). Upon this he falls to conjecturing, but is not happy in it; he ſays (8) in a marginal note, that in his opinion the city which Zanchius's father left was Venice. If he had been a good Geographer, he would never have entertained that thought, but would have known that the diſtance betwixt Alzano and Venice, is above forty leagues. His conjecture is turned into a downright affirmation by Mr Teiſſier, who beſides, tranſlates *quartum lapidem*, by four leagues, though in the Latin ſtyle, they contain only four thouſand paces. I take Bergamo, to be the city, from whence Zanchius's father departed, for reaſons of œconomy. Quenſtedt hath committed two groſs faults: he ſays page 276 (9), that Jerom Zanchius was born at Alzano, in the valley of Seri, four miles from Venice; but in page 302, he makes him a native of the city of Bergamo.

[*B*] *Zanchius was a lover of peace.*] He was according to Melchior Adam (10), ' litium fugitans, ' concordiæ amans .... Modeſtiæ ſingularis, pacis ' Eccleſiarum ſtudioſiſſimus (11). ---- *He ſhunned contention, loved concord, was a man of extraordinary* ' *modeſty; and ſtudied to promote peace in the churches.*' Others ſay (12), that very few ſurpaſſed him in learning, piety, and modeſty. See the remarks in which I examine the narrative of Thuanus and Moreri.

[*C*] *Obliged him to ſign a formulary. He ſigned it with ſome reſtrictions.*] We muſt know that there ſoon happened ſome broils betwixt him and John Marbachius, Miniſter, and Divinity-Profeſſor at Straſburgh. They differed on the doctrine of Predeſtination, and its dependencies; but the fire lay hid under the aſhes till the year 1561, when Zanchius induced the magiſtrates to ſuppreſs a book of Tilemannus Heſhuſius, which had been reprinted at Straſburgh, but had the name of Magdeburg in the title as the place where it was printed. This book treated of the Real Preſence *in, cum, ſub pane, --- in, with, and under the bread*, and had a preface which was injurious to Frederic III, Elector Palatine, to Melanchthon, and ſeveral other excellent Divines. The author of this preface, accuſed of Hereſy and Atheiſm, all thoſe who did not approve his opinion concerning the Real Preſence and Oral Manducation. Zanchius cauſed this book to be ſuppreſſed, not on account of its doctrine, which he left to the judgment of the Church, but for the calumnies of the preface. This diſpleaſed Marbachius, and the other zealous aſſerters of Lutheraniſm, and put them upon trying all ways to remove Zanchius. For this purpoſe they canvaſſed all his lectures, and the manuſcripts he had dictated, and when they had extracted from them whatever they could, they accuſed him of Heterodoxy, with regard to Predeſtination and Perſeverance, *&c.* The affair was vigorouſly debated; Zanchius conſulted the Divines of ſeveral places of Germany, and offered a verbal conference with his adverſaries. This propoſal was rejected, and in the mean time they declaimed againſt him before the people, with great animoſity (13). At laſt, the affair came to an arbitration; and the following perſons were prevailed on to come to Straſburgh; from Tubingen, James Andreas; from Deux Ponts, Cuman Flinſbach; and from Baſil, Simon Sulcerus, and Ulric Coccius; the arbitrators declared that there was no Hereſy in Zanchius's opinions; but drew up articles which he ſigned in this manner, on the twenty-eighth of March 1563. *Hanc doctrinæ formulam ut piam agnoſco, ita etiam recipio* (14); that is, *in as much as I acknowledge this formulary of doctrine to be pious, ſo I receive it*; or, *I acknowledge that this formulary of doctrine is pious, and ſo I receive it.* The Latin words will bear both theſe ſenſes, and I would not anſwer for Zanchius that he was not ſenſible of this ambiguity, and that he did not intend to take advantage of it ſome time or other. Be that as it will, his adverſaries were yet more artful; they ſo dexterouſly ſlipped ſome ambiguities into the articles of the formulary, that they could explain every thing to their advantage: accordingly they did not fail to interpret every

(2) Melch. Adam. in Vit. Theol. Exter. *pag.* 148.

(3) In valle Seriana, *Id. ibid.*

(4) *See* Leander Albertus, Deſcript. Ital. *pag. m.* 638.

(5) Ad quartum inde diſtans lapidem. *Melchior Adam. ibid*

(6) Quod rebus ſuis conſultius fore judicaret. *Id. ibid.*

(7) He might have found it in the ſecond book of Zanchius's Letters, *p.* 444.

(8) Id. ibid.

(9) *Of his book* de Patriis illuſtrium Virorum.

(10) In Vitis Theolog. Exter. *pag.* 149.

(11) Idem, *pag.* 152.

(12) Sanderſon, de Obligat. conſcient. *Prælect. ii, apud* Pope Blount, Cenſ. Author. *pag.* 541.

(13) Clamoſis ad populum concionibus traduceretur. *Henricus Alting. Theol. Hiſtor. pag.* 298, 299.

(14) *Taken from* Henry Altingius, ibid. *pag.* 299.

canonry, deſired leave to depart, and retired from Straſburgh in November 1563. From that time to the year 1568, he was very ſerviceable to the church of Chiavenna; and met with ſome croſſes there alſo (*a*). He was offered a Divinity Profeſſor's chair at Heidelberg, which he accepted; and began the exerciſe of that function in February 1568. He was promoted to the degree of Doctor the ſame year, in the preſence of Frederic III, Elector Palatine: at the ſollicitation of that Prince, he wrote a large book againſt the Antitrinitarians; and after the death of that Elector, refuſed the invitations of the univerſity of Leyden, and of the church of Antwerp, chuſing rather to ſtay at the college of Neuſtad, where John Caſimir, Count Palatine, had got together the profeſſors, whom the new Elector, a great favourer of Lutheraniſm, had obliged to leave Heidelberg. Upon the death of this Elector, the adminiſtration of the Palatinate fell into the hands of the ſame John Caſimir, who re-inſtated the profeſſors in their former poſts; but Zanchius, by reaſon of his great age, was declared *emeritus*. He died at Heidelberg on the nineteenth of November 1590. He loſt his ſight ſome time before his death (*b*). It doth not appear by Melchior Adam's life of him, that he was ever married; but according to Thuanus, he left a numerous iſſue [*D*]. He compoſed ſeveral books, which doubtleſs are as good as thoſe of more modern Divines, and yet no body reads them: they are ſold almoſt for nothing in the auctions of libraries; and the Grocers more eagerly take advantage of the low price of them, than the ſtudents in Divinity, or the miniſters. The fate of the works of other Divines, who made ſuch a figure in the XVIth century, is very like this. We may juſtly cenſure Thuanus in ſome particulars [*E*], and

every thing to his prejudice; thus revived the quarrel, but he left them and went to the Griſons (15). Thus Henry Altingius relates the affair. We may add to his narrative ſome particulars which he omits, and Melchior Adam furniſhes us with. The accuſations charged againſt Zanchius turned not only on the doctrines of Predeſtination, and of the perſeverance of the ſaints; but alſo on the Euchariſt, Ubiquity, Images, Antichriſt, and the end of the world. The chapter of St Thomas, of which he was a Canon, tried ſeveral ways of accommodation; afterwards the diſpute was laid before the Council of Thirteen. He went himſelf to conſult the churches and univerſities of Germany, and publiſhed the deciſions which he obtained from them. He deliberated ſome time about ſigning the formulary drawn up by the four arbitrators, and excuſed himſelf out of fear of ſcandalizing the pious ſouls, and confirming erring men in their opinions. At laſt, being reſolved to ſubſcribe it for the ſake of peace, and becauſe he thought it would be of no prejudice to his opinion, he armed himſelf with a precaution in his manner of ſigning it, and meaſured the artifices of his enemies by his own candor (16). This we have from Melchior Adam; but for my part, I confeſs, I cannot diſcover this candor; for Zanchius's ſubſcription is ſo ambiguous, and ſo liable to ſhifts and ſubterfuges, that it doth not appear he drew it up in that manner, without a further proſpect. Is it not owned that he choſe this phraſe, rather than another, out of precaution (17)? If there was any artifice in this, it was of no ſervice to its author, nor did it contribute to eſtabliſh peace. 'Sed 'ne ſic quidem *benè coiit gratia:* cùm ſtatim poſt adverſarii de victoria jactitare, triumphare, & laureatas in Saxoniam, atque alias regiones literas miſſitare (18). - - - *But neither did this eſtabliſh unity 'and peace: for immediately after his adverſaries vainly 'boaſted of their victory, and ſent many triumphant letters concerning it into Saxony, and other parts.*'

Thus far I had written without ever thinking of conſulting Hoſpinian's Sacramental Hiſtory. I have now conſulted it, and have found in it a long relation of this diſpute. I ſee there (19) that one of Zanchius's good friends broke with him, and took advantage of a letter which he had communicated to him. I ſee that (20) Marbachius and his adherents forbore ſpeaking to him, and ſo much as ſaluting him after the diſgrace of Heſhuſius's book. But what ſerves moſt to prove the certainty of my conjectures, is, that I there ſee that Zanchius, in his mind, put a very particular ſenſe upon the expreſſions of his ſubſcription. His mental reſervation was this: 'Hanc doctrinæ formulam recipio quatenus illam piam eſſe 'judico (21). - - - *I receive this formulary of doctrine, 'ſo far as I believe it to be pious.*' His adverſaries ſent copies of what he had ſigned to all parts, without ever mentioning the terms of his ſubſcription (22); they feared their triumph would not appear conſiderable enough to thoſe who were capable of examining the equivocal words of Zanchius.

If we may rely on a letter which he wrote to David Chaillet, on the firſt of November 1563 (23), they made uſe of many frauds. This letter deſerves to be read; he there makes his apology, and labours to prove that he did nothing againſt his conſcience.

[*D*] *According to Thuanus, he left a numerous iſſue*] His words are: 'Scripſit multa . . . quorum partem, 'dum vixit, in lucem dedit, partem filii, quos PLURES reliquit, poſt mortem ejus publicarunt (24). '*He wrote ſeveral things . . . ſome of which he publiſhed during his life, and others his ſons, of whom 'there were* MANY, *publiſhed after his death.*' This is ſomewhat hyperbolical; for the Epiſtle Dedicatory to Zanchius's letters ſigned by his heirs, mentions the names of only two ſons, and that of his ſon-in-law. Here follows what I find concerning his marriages. His firſt wife was a daughter of *Cælius ſecundus Curio*, by whom he had a daughter who did not live long. He afterwards married the ſiſter of a gentleman, named Laurence Lumagius: the two twins of whom ſhe was delivered in the year of her nuptials died ſoon after. The daughter who was born in the following year died at three years old. This is what Jerom Zanchius wrote to Lælius Zanchius, on the ſecond of April 1565 (25). He there tells him that he had then two daughters.

[*E*] *We may juſtly cenſure Thuanus in ſome particulars.*] I. Peter Martyr left Italy in the year 1542, and Zanchius in 1550, wherefore the following words of Thuanus are not exact: 'Hieronymus Zanchius '. . . . paulo poſt Petri Martyris . . . diſceſſum ob 'eandem cauſſam Argentinam conceſſit (26). - - - *Jerom Zanchius, a little after the departure of Peter 'Martyr, removed to Straſburgh, on the ſame account.*' II. They are faulty in another particular; for Zanchius did not go to Straſburgh till after having reſided about nine months in the country of the Griſons, and as long at Geneva (27). III. *Vermilio in Angliam evocato Anno* 54. *in munere ſucceſſit.* This Latin may ſignify that Peter Martyr went into England in the year 1554. But this is falſe, he went thither in 1547. However, not to take the expreſſion in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, let us grant Thuanus that the year he mentions concerns only the inſtallation of Zanchius; yet we may juſtly cenſure him, ſince it is certain that Zanchius was inſtalled in 1553, not in Martyr's, but Hedion's place. 'Succeſſit ei (*Caſpari Hedioni*) in 'profeſſione *Hieronymus Zanchius* Italus (28). - - - '*Caſpar Hedion was ſucceeded in his profeſſorſhip by 'Jerom Zanchius, an Italian.*' 'Cum anno *quinquageſimo tertio*, in demortui *Caſparis Hedionis* locum 'Theologus, qui in ſchola ſacras literas doceret, eſſet 'ſufficiendus: ab ampliſſimo illius Reipubl. magiſtratu '& ſcholarchis decretum eſt, Italum quendam, Martyri non abſimilem, vocandum. Itum ergo primùm 'eſt

---

(*a*) Fructuoſe quidem ſed non abſque cruce. *Melch. Adam. in Vit. Theol. Exter. p.* 151.

(*b*) *Taken from* Melchior Adam, ibid. *pag.* 148, *& ſeq.*

(15) Quoniam in articulis involuta doctrina, adverſariis omnia pro ſe interpretantibus denuo erupit controverſia: quæ priuſquam componeretur Zanchius diſceſſit Clavennam ad Eccleſiæ miniſterium evocatus. *Id. ibid. pag.* 299.

(16) Perſuaſus tamen concordiæ cauſa, cum ſine præjudicio doctrinæ ſuæ id factum iri intelligeret, his verbis, ut ſibi caveret, ſubſcripſit: *Hanc doctrinæ formulam, ut piam agnoſco; ita etiam recipio*; & ſubſcripſit quidem aliorum calliditatem ſua ſimplicitate menſus. *Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, pag.* 150.

(17) See the foregoing quotation.

(18) See the foregoing quotation.

(19) Hoſpin. Hiſtoriæ Sacrament. *Part. ii, pag.* 536.

(20) Id. ibid.

(21) Id. ibid. *pag.* 543.

(22) Id. ibid.

(23) It is in the ſecond book of Zanchius's Letters, *pag.* 81, *& ſeq.*

(24) Thuan. *lib. xcix, pag.* 379.

(25) That letter is in the ſecond book of Zanchius's Letters, *pag.* 444, *& ſeq.*

(26) Thuanus, Hiſt. *lib. xcix, pag.* 379, *ad ann.* 1590.

(27) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 149.

(28) Melch. Adam. in Vit. Theol. German. *pag.* 242.

and Moreri alſo [*F*]; for the proofs which they bring of Zanchius's moderation, are not good: though it is really certain, that few miniſters have been ſo moderate as he was. He did not believe the Pope to be Antichriſt, and highly condemned the prepoſſeſſion which he thought he obſerved in the writings of ſeveral Proteſtants (*c*). His conference with the Pope's Nuncio in the year 1561 is very curious. Pallavicini ſpeaks of it at large, in the tenth chapter of the fifteenth book of his Hiſtory of the Council of Trent. As for the reſt, there are ſeveral authors named ZANCHIUS, as appears by the ſcene of the writers of the Bergamaſco publiſhed in the year 1664 (*d*). Among others

‘eſt à *Cœlio Secundo Curione*, cui ea cura ab Argentoratenſibus demandata, ad comitem illum *Martinengum*: &, cum hic Eccleſiam Genevæ plantatam deſtituere nollet ad iſtum *Zanchium*: quem deinde Argentoratum ipſi etiam Scholarchæ, miſſis benevolentiæ plenis literis invitarunt (29). - - - - *When in the year* 1553 *a Divine who might teach Divinity in the ſchools was to be choſen, in the room of the deceaſed Caſpar Hedion, the magiſtrates and the directors of the univerſity of Straſburgh reſolved to invite a certain Italian, whoſe principles were very little different from thoſe of Peter Martyr. Accordingly the Straſburghers appointed Cœlius Secundus Curio to go to Count Martinengo: but he refuſing to leave the church which was planted at Geneva; Curio went to Zanchius, and the directors of the univerſity ſent very obliging letters to him, to invite him to come to Straſburgh.*’ It is true, that the letter (30) written to him by James Sturmius, in the name of the directors of the univerſity of Straſburgh, offered him the ſame employment, and the ſame ſalary which Peter Martyr had enjoyed; but that doth not import that he ſucceeded him, properly ſpeaking. IV. He left Chiavenna only to be a Profeſſor of Divinity at Heidelberg; Thuanus is therefore to blame to aſſign him a poſt at Baſil betwixt his leaving Chiavenna, and his being called to the Palatinate (31). V. He is yet more miſtaken when he ſays that he did not go to the Palatinate till the year 1578, he went thither ten years before. VI. He ſhould not have omitted that Zanchius went thither to teach Divinity at Heidelberg, and that he continued to do ſo in that univerſity, till the troubles which aroſe againſt the Calviniſt doctors, after the death of the Elector Frederic III. He ought not, I ſay, to have directly ſent him from Baſil to Neuſtad, for he did not teach in this laſt city till after he had been a Profeſſor eight years at Heidelberg. To theſe ſix errors in fact, let us add one conſiſting in a falſe reaſoning. VII. ‘A great moderation was obſerved in his writings, and he always diſcovered his ſincere deſire to terminate all the differences occaſioned by religion: FOR at the age of ſeventy years, he dedicated his Confeſſion of Faith to Ulyſſes Martinengo, a noble Venetian, Count of Barco, and publiſhed it as well in his own name as that of his family, for that was the title it bore. Now in this confeſſion he proteſts that he had not abſolutely, and in all particulars renounced the Church of Rome and all her doctrines, but only thoſe which are not conform to the writings of the Apoſtles, and to the doctrine which ſhe her ſelf had formerly taught, and which was believed by the primitive and pure Church: and that when he left the Romiſh communion, it was with a deſign to return to that Church, in caſe, ſhe ſhould correct her errors, and re-aſſume her antient form: that he deſired with all his heart, that this happy change might one day happen; for what can a pious man more ardently wiſh for, than to live to the laſt of his days in the Church, in which he had the advantage to be regenerated by baptiſm, provided by the communion held with her he does not offend God (32).’ Luther, Calvin, and that James Andreas, whom Thuanus immediately mentions as a Divine much more exaſperated againſt the Romiſh Church and the Pope (33), would all very ſincerely have ſigned this confeſſion of Zanchius; wherefore it is not a good proof that Zanchius differed from other Miniſters.

[*F*] . . . . . *and Moreri alſo.*] I. When he ſaith that Zanchius was an *Apoſtate Monk of London*, it is not his fault, but that of his Dictionary. The Printers have put *de Londres* (*of London*), inſtead of *de l'Ordre* (*of the order*), and I obſerve this to ſhew to what errors they expoſe the readers: for how many readers have believed from hence, that Zanchius ſtole out of a monaſtery at London, when he turned Proteſtant? II. He was not a hermit of the Order of St Auguſtin, as Moreri affirms; thoſe who are ſo called are different from the regular Canons. Suppoſe both have St Auguſtin for the author of their rule, yet we ought to obſerve a diſtinction when we ſpeak of them. III. He had copied from Mr Teiſſier (34) the pretended difference betwixt Melchior Adam and Thuanus concerning the birth-place of Zanchius. IV. And the pretended diſtance of four leagues betwixt Venice and that place. V. He ſhould have called it Alzano and not Azano. VI. He ſays, after Thuanus, that Zanchius went directly to Straſburgh. VII. And he hath increaſed the error of his pretended ſucceeding to Peter Martyr; for a man may ſay, without being guilty of above one falſity, that Zanchius was called to Straſburgh to ſupply the place which Peter Martyr had left void, but one cannot, without redoubling the blunder, affirm that he *publickly profeſſed Hereſy at Straſburgh in Martyr's place.* Is the public profeſſion of a doctrine made in another's place? VIII. He ſhould not have copied Thuanus with regard to Zanchius's pretended abode at Baſil. IX. Much leſs ſhould he have imputed to him the ſaying that this Miniſter taught at Spire. For he doth not ſay ſo, his *Neapolis Nemetum* is Neuſtad, a city continually mentioned in the Gazettes for theſe ſeven or eight years paſt (35). Thuanus's tranſlator was to blame to call it Spire. Mr Teiſſier may then, if he pleaſes, allow us to diſapprove the following period of his additions, *Zanchius never taught at Baſil, or Spire, as Thuanus believed* (36). X. Heidelberg was not the laſt place where Zanchius taught, as Moreri affirms. He was declared *emeritus*, when his colleagues, the Profeſſors of Neuſtad, were re-eſtabliſhed in Heidelberg. If he died in the laſt-mentioned city, it was by accident; he had made a journey thither to ſee his old friends (37). XI. To prove that Zanchius had more moderation than all other Proteſtants, to prove it, I ſay, by the above-cited words of Thuanus, is an illuſion. XII. To conjecture that Father Labbe went upon the authority of the ſame words, when he ſaid that Zanchius *was the moſt ſubtile of his communion*, is a thought which does very little honour to that Jeſuit, and which appears ill-grounded when we conſult the original. To allow no capacity and ſubtilty to our adverſaries but in proportion to the regard they have for us, or to the moderation with which they ſpeak of our cauſe, is not to act according to reaſon, but to be blinded with prejudices. However the place where Father Labbe beſtows this encomium on Zanchius, affords us a more probable conjecture than that of Moreri. This Jeſuit cites a paſſage where Zanchius ſpeaks very ill of the Proteſtant writers. Whence it might more probably be inferred that it was rather this Miniſter's reſentment againſt his brethren than his modeſty towards the Church of Rome that occaſioned the praiſes which Father Labbe beſtowed on him. Perhaps it were better to ſay that Father Labbe had no regard to any thing but the parts of Zanchius, which, doubtleſs, were very ſubtile. But to enable the reader to judge the better of it, I ſhall ſet down the whole paſſage. It clearly diſcovers the temper of an author, whoſe anger was not intermitting, but continual. ‘Quid de cæteris Lutheri & Calvini Miniſtris dicam, qui dum Conciliorum, Patrum, ſcriptorum antiquorum opuſcula interdum volvunt apertiſſimam hæreſeon ſuarum damnationem legunt, numquid non diſſimulant, numquid non tergiverſantur, nunquid non argutantur? Audi domeſticum teſtem Hieronymum Zanchium omnium Sacramentariorum ſubtiliſſimum: *Legi librum* (Pſeudo-Evangelici neſcio cujus) *ſed non ſine ſtomacho perlegi; cùm nimirum viderem qualiſnam ſit ſcribendi ratio, quâ in Eccleſiis ex Evangelio reformatis* (eo nomine Lutheri, Calvini, ſimiliumque ſectas appellat) *permulti, ne dicam plerique omnes, utuntur: qui tamen Paſtores, qui Doctores, qui Columnæ Eccleſiæ videri*

‘ *volunt.*

(*c*) See the quotation out of Father Labbe, in the remark [*F*].

(*d*) Donatus Calvus is the author of it: It is intituled *Scena Letteraria de Scrittori Bergamaſchi*.

(29) Idem, in Vit. Theol. Exter. *pag.* 149.

(30) It is the firſt of the ſecond book of Zanchius's Letters.

(31) Poſtea Clavennæ, in Rætia, dein Baſileæ uſque ad annum 78 ac poſtremo Neapoli Nemetum docuit. *Thuan. ubi ſupra.*

(32) Id. ibid.

(33) Amarior eo Romanæ Eccleſiæ & Pontificii nominis oppugnator Jacobus Andreanus. *Id. ibid.*

(34) See the remark [*A*].

(35) I write this in July 1697.

(36) Teiſſier, Additions aux Eloges, *Tom.* i, *pag.* 161.

(37) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 152.

others there was one JEROM ZANCHIUS, who publiſh ſome Law-books. He was ſecond couſin to our Divine *(e)*. It will not be an unacceptable thing to the reader, if I ſay here that our Jerom had a ſervant named Frederic Sylburgius, who became a very learned man. He kept him four years *(f)*, and then recommended him to Lælius Zanchius, that he might procure him a place at Padua *(g)*. His letter of recommendation is dated on the ſecond of April 1565.

(e) Zanch. Epiſtol. *lib. ii, pag.* 444.

(f) Id. ibid.

(g) Id. ibid. *pag.* 448.

volunt. Statum cauſæ ne intelligant, de induſtria ſæpe numero tenebris involvimus: quæ ſunt manifeſta, impudenter negamus: quæ falſa, ſine fronte aſſeveramus: quæ apertè impia, tamquam prima fidei principia obtrudimus: quæ orthodoxa, hæreſeos damnamus: ſcripturas ad noſtra ſomnia pro libidine torquemus: Patres jactamus, cùm nihilminus quàm illorum doctrinam ſequi velimus: Sophiſticari, calumniari, conviciari, nobis eſt familiare; modò cauſam noſtram, ſive bonam ſive malam, quo jure, quaque injuria tueamur: reliqua omnia ſuſque deque facimus. Hæc ille τὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης, ut de Epimenide Cretenſi dixit Apoſtolus Paulus cap 1. Epiſtolæ ad Titum, ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής (38). - - - *What ſhall I ſay of the other Miniſters of the Lutheran and Calviniſtical ſects, who while they ſometimes turn over the ſmaller works of the Councils, Fathers, and antient writers, read the cleareſt condemnation of their own Hereſies. What diſſimulation, tergiverſation, and ſhifting are they not guilty of. Hear the words of one of their own witneſſes, Jerom Zanchius, the moſt ſubtile of all the ſacramentarians.* I have read the book *(written by I know not what Heretic)*: but I could not peruſe it without ſome indignation, when I obſerved what manner of writing prevails in the Churches reformed according to the word of GOD, *(thus he calls the ſects of Calvin, Luther, and the like)* and is uſed by a great many, not to ſay almoſt all the Proteſtants; uſed by men who would be thought paſtors, and doctors, and pillars of the church. To confound and perplex the ſtate of the queſtion we frequently involve our ſelves in darkneſs. The moſt manifeſt truths we impudently deny. Things which are falſe we affirm with effrontery. The moſt obvious impieties we intrude upon the people as the fundamentals of faith. Orthodox doctrines we condemn as heretical. The Scriptures we wreſt at pleaſure, in order to accommodate them to our own dreams. We boaſt of the Fathers, whilſt there is nothing we mind leſs than their doctrines. Sophiſtry, calumny, and abuſe, are familar to us. If we do but maintain our cauſe, be it good or bad, no matter by what means: all other things are ſet at nought to ſerve that purpoſe. Theſe are the words of one of themſelves, even a Prophet of their own, *As the Apoſtle Paul (chapter firſt of his Epiſtle to Titus) ſaid of Epimenides the Cretan.* This witneſs is true.’

(38) Philippus Labbe, Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſiaſt. *Tom. i, p.* 807, 808. *Note, that he quotes none of Zanchius's tracts, which ſhews that he did not go to the fountain head, but relied upon the quotation of another man.*

ZARLINO (JOSEPH) a native of Chioggia *(a)* Preſident and Director of the chapel of the Seigneury of Venice, was one of the moſt excellent Muſicians of the XVIth century. He compoſed ſome airs which were ſung and applauded at Venice, at the time that rejoicings were made in that city, for the victory of Lepanto, in the year 1571. He publiſhed ſeveral books which maintained and ſpread his reputation *(b)* [*A*]. He died at Venice on the fourteenth of February 1599, at the age of fifty-nine years *(c)*.

(a) An Epiſcopal city, in one of the iſles of the gulf of Venice, in Latin *Clodia*, whence comes the Latin firname *Clodienſis*, given to Zarlino.

(b) *Taken from* Mambrino Roſeo, Iſtor. del Mondo, *ad ann.* 1571, *pag. m.* 44.

(c) Thuan. *lib.* 122, *in fine.*

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books which . . : . ſpread his reputation.*] The catalogue of Thuanus's library (1) mentions two books of Zarlino, in folio; one intituled, *Dimoſtrationi Harmoniche*, printed at Venice in the year 1571, and afterwards, with additions, in 1573; the other printed in the ſame city, in the year 1588, and intituled, *Supplementi Muſicali*. The Oxford catalogue mentions *tutte le Opere* of Zarlino, in four volumes, printed at Venice in the year 1589, in folio, and beſides that, a Latin treatiſe, *De vera anni forma ſeu de recta ejus emendatione*, printed at Venice in the year 1580, in 4to. John Albert Bannius has highly commended the writings of this Muſician. ‘Joſephus Zarlinus Clodienſis, *ſays he* (2), Theoria inſtructiſſimus . . . doctiſſimis inſtitutionibus, demonſtrationibus, ac ſupplementis, linguâ Italicâ editis (apud Venetos, anno 1580.) Muſicam præ cæteris felicius tradidit, & abſolvit. Prolixior nonnihil eſt, ſed eruditione compenſat faſtidium: ex quo verior Muſicæ eruditio haurienda. Ejus Compendium in Tabulas redegit Joannes Maria Artuſius Bononienſis, Italico etiam idiomate: quibus breviter, clare & perſpicue rem ſtudioſis proponit. Scripſerunt & alii; qui an Zarlinum æquent, neſcio: ſaltem non ſuperant. . . . Unus ergo inſtar omnium erit, ſine quo nec veterum ſententiæ expedire poterunt, nec perfecta hujus diſciplinæ notitia facile obtinebitur. Ad perfectionem tamen Muſicæ modernæ non accedit (3). . . . Unum Zarlinum præ cæteris commendavi; non quòd aliorum ſcripta nullius momenti ſint; cum multa præclara eruditaque dogmata contineant: ſed unum Zarlinum coryphæum dixi. Cum enim Muſica ab Authoribus deſcripta, in pleriſque defectum patiatur, magno ſtudio, induſtria, ac lectione varia ſupplendum; unum aliquem commendare nequeo, ex quo hauriant ſtudioſi (pauci etiam totam Muſicam Theoricam ac Practicam ſimul intellexerunt & excuſſerunt) præter Zarlinum. Is, inquam, præ cæteris doctius, feliciuſque, & propemodum ſolus, rem executus, meo judicio, videtur. Ordinariæ Praxi deſervire præcipue poteſt Zarlini Compendium à Joannæ Maria Artuſio Bononienſi, optima methodo doctiſſime confectum (4). - - - *Joſeph Zarlino of Chioggia was a great maſter of the theory of Muſic. . . . In his learned inſtitutions, demonſtrations, and ſupplements, publiſhed in Italian at Venice,* 1580, *he has explained and improved that ſcience, with much greater ſucceſs than any other author. He is ſomewhat prolix. But his learning makes amends for that prolixity. His writings contain the true knowledge of Muſic. John-Maria Artuſius Bononienſis reduced his compendium into tables, which he wrote likewiſe in Italian. In theſe tables he ſets forth the ſcience of Muſic, in a ſhort, clear, and perſpicuous manner. There are others who have written on Muſic; whether they equal Zarlino or not, I do not know, at leaſt they do not ſurpaſs him. . . . So that Zarlino alone will ſerve inſtead of all the reſt: without him the opinions of the Antients cannot be underſtood, nor a perfect knowledge of this ſcience be eaſily attained. But he does not come up to the perfection of the modern Muſic. I have commended Zarlino above all the reſt, not becauſe the writings of other men on this ſubject are of no value; for they contain many excellent and learned inſtructions, but I have called Zarlino the beſt writer on this ſubject. For moſt authors having given but an imperfect account of Muſic, and as this defect muſt be ſupplied by great ſtudy, induſtry, and various reading, I cannot recommend any one of them to thoſe who ſtudy this art, except Zarlino. Beſide few of them have at the ſame time thoroughly examined and underſtood both the theoretical and practical Muſic. Zarlino, in my opinion, has written on this ſubject with more learning and ſucceſs than all the reſt: and he is almoſt the only author who has ſucceeded in it. His Compendium, as it is drawn up by John-Maria Artuſius Bononienſis in an excellent method, and with great learning, may be chiefly ſerviceable in the common practice of Muſic.*’

(1) Pag. 55, of the ſecond part.

(2) Joh. Alb. Bannius, Diſſertat. de Muſica, *pag. m.* 675. Collection. de Sudiis inſtituendis, *Edit. Amſterd.* 1645.

(3) Id. ibid. *pag.* 676.

(4) Id. ibid. *pag.* 685, 686.

ZENOBIA, one of the moſt illuſtrious women that ever ſwayed a ſcepter, pretended to be deſcended from the Ptolomies and Cleopatras (*a*). She was married to Odenatus, a Saracen Prince (*b*), and contributed very much to the great victories which he obtained over the Perſians [*A*], and which preſerved the eaſt to the Romans, when after the taking of Valerian it was very probable that Sapor would have wreſted all that country from them. Accordingly ſhe was honoured with the title of Auguſta (*c*), when Gallienus in grateful acknowledgment of the ſervices of Odenatus made him Emperor in the year of Chriſt 264. After the death of her huſband ſhe held the ſupreme power, and reigned in a very courageous and glorious manner. Her ſons, by reaſon of their youth, enjoyed only the imperial name and honours (*d*). She did not only preſerve the countries ſubject to Odenatus; but alſo conquered Egypt, and was preparing for farther conqueſts when the Emperor Aurelian made war againſt her (*e*). She loſt two battles (*f*), and was forced to ſhut her ſelf up in the city of Palmyra, where Aurelian beſieged her. She defended her ſelf very bravely; but ſeeing that in all probability the Emperor would take the city, ſhe ſecretly went out of it. Aurelian being informed of this cauſed her to be ſo diligently purſued, that ſhe was overtaken juſt as ſhe was in the ferry going to paſs the Euphrates (*g*). This happened in the year 272. The Emperor ſaved her life, and after making her an ornament of his triumph [*B*], preſented her with a country ſeat near Rome, where ſhe quietly paſſed the remainder of her days [*C*]. It is reported that upon her evidence Aurelian put many perſons to death (*h*). She was beautiful, chaſte, learned, valiant, and temperate, though on ſome occaſions out of policy ſhe would drink great quantities of wine [*D*]. If to theſe excellent qualities ſhe could have added that of a good mother-in-law, ſhe might have been

[*A*] *She contributed very much to the great victories which he obtained over the Perſians.*] This is teſtified by Aurelian in a letter which he wrote to the Senate. ‘Audio P. C. mihi objici quod non virile munus impleverim, Zenobiam triumphando. Næ illi qui me reprehendunt ſatis laudarent, ſi ſcirent qualis illa eſt mulier, quam prudens in conſiliis, quam conſtans in diſpoſitionibus, quam erga milites gravis, quam larga quum neceſſitas poſtulet, quam triſtis quum ſeveritas poſcat. Poſſum dicere illius eſſe quod Odenatus Perſas vicit, ac fugato Sapore Cteſiphontem uſque pervenit. Poſſum aſſerere, tanto apud Orientales & Ægyptiorum populos timori mulierem fuiſſe, ut ſe non Arabes, non Sarraceni, non Armeni commoverent (1). - - - *Conſcript Fathers, I hear it is objected to me, that I did not act a manly part in triumphing over Zenobia. Truly they who cenſure me would greatly commend me, did they know what kind of a woman Zenobia is, how prudent in her deſigns, how conſtant in her reſolutions, with what dignity ſhe behaved towards her army, how bountiful ſhe is upon the neceſſary occaſions, and how auſtere when ſeverity requires it. I can aſcribe it to her, that Odenatus overcame the Perſians, and having put Sapor to flight, reached as far as Cteſiphon. I can affirm that ſhe was ſo formidable to the Eaſtern people, and the Egyptians, that both the Arabians, the Saracens, and Arminians lay quiet.*’

[*B*] *Aurelian . . . . made her an ornament of his triumph.*] The letter which ſhe wrote to the Emperor Aurelian, in anſwer to that which he had written to her, to ſummon her to ſurrender, ſhews that ſhe deſigned to follow the example of Cleopatra, who choſe rather to put an end to her life than to live without reigning (2); but ſhe changed her reſolution, and ſubmitting to neceſſity, adorned Aurelian's triumph. There ſhe appeared ſo overloaded with jewels, that tho' very ſtrong, ſhe was ſcarce able to ſupport the weight of them. It is true, we muſt make a great allowance for the golden fetters which were faſtened to her feet, and the golden chains which bound her hands. ‘Ducta eſt igitur per triumphum ea ſpecie ut nihil pompabilius populo Rom. videretur. Jam primum ornata gemmis ingentibus, ita ut ornamentorum onere laboraret. Fertur enim mulier fortiſſima ſæpiſſime reſtitiſſe quum diceret ſe gemmarum onera ferre non poſſe. Vincti erant præterea pedes auro, manus etiam catenis aureis: nec collo aureum vinculum deerat, quod ſcurra Perſicus præferebat (3). - - *Zenobia was led in triumph with ſo much ſplendor that never any thing appeared more pompous to the people of Rome. She was adorned with exceeding large jewels, and laboured under the weight of her ornaments. For though ſhe was a very ſtrong woman, yet it is reported that ſhe ſtopped very often, and declared that ſhe could not bear the weight of the jewels. Beſides there were golden fetters faſtened to her feet, and her hands were bound with chains of the ſame metal. There was likewiſe a golden collar for her neck, which a Perſian buffoon carried before her.*’

Father Pagi affirms that Zenobia was lead in triumph in the year 274, two years after ſhe fell into Aurelian's hands; and refutes ſome very learned Chronologiſts, who have miſplaced the years of theſe two events. See his *Diſſertatio Hypatica* towards the end.

[*C*] *A country-ſeat, where ſhe quietly paſſed the remainder of her days.*] Let us continue to cite Trebellius Pollio. ‘Huic ab Aureliano vivere conceſſum eſt. Ferturque vixiſſe cum liberis, matronæ jam more Romanæ, data ſibi poſſeſſione in Tiburti, quæ hodieque Zenobia dicitur, non longe ab Adriani palatio, atque ab eo loco cui nomen eſt Conche. - - - *Aurelian ſaved Zenobia's life. And it is reported that ſhe lived with her children, like a Roman matron, having received a ſeat in the Tiburtine-country: That ſeat ſtill bears the name of Zenobia, and is not far diſtant from Adrian's palace, and the palace called* Conche.’

[*D*] *She was beautiful, chaſte, learned, valiant, and temperate, tho', on ſome occaſions, out of policy, ſhe would drink.*] Pollio having ſpoken of the exerciſes of hunting, which enured Odenatus to the greateſt fatigues, adds, that Zenobia had acquired the ſame hardineſs, and, according to the report of ſeveral people, was more vigorous than her huſband. ‘Non aliter etiam conjuge aſſueta, quæ multorum ſententia fortior marito fuiſſe perhibetur: mulierum omnium nobiliſſima Orientalium fœminarum, & (ut Cornelius Capitolinus aſſerit) ſpecioſiſſima (4). - - - *She was no leſs inured to fatigues than her huſband; and, in the opinion of many people, was much ſtronger than he: ſhe was the nobleſt of her ſex, and, (as Cornelius Capitolinus affirms) the moſt beautiful of all the women of the Eaſt.*’ This laſt word would afford me a good proof, if it were certain that the author, who is cited, made uſe of it. But the manuſcripts vary; ſome have it *expeditiſſima*, inſtead of *ſpecioſiſſima*: wherefore we ought not to depend upon it: let us look for other evidences. The following deſcription repreſents her of a deep brown complexion, but withal very charming, and as having the fineſt teeth in the world. ‘Fuit vultu ſubaquilo, fuſci coloris, oculis ſupra modum vigentibus, nigris, ſpiritus divini, venuſtatis incredibilis: tantus candor in dentibus, ut margaritas eam plerique putarent habere, non dentes (5). - - - *She was of a dark brown complexion, had eyes exceeding ſprightly, black, and divinely bright; ſhe was incredibly beautiful: her teeth were ſo white, that many people thought ſhe had pearls ſet inſtead of teeth.*’ ‘Her chaſtity was ſo extraordinary, that ſhe made uſe of the liberty, which marriage allowed her, no farther than was neceſſary for the procreation of of children.’ (6) *Cujus ea caſtitas fuiſſe dicitur, ut ne virum ſuum quidem ſciret, niſi tentatis conceptionibus. Nam quum ſemel concubuiſſet, expectatis menſtruis continebat ſe, ſi prægnans eſſet; ſin minus, iterum poteſtatem quærendis*

(*a*) Trebellius Pollio, in triginta Tyrannis, *pag. m.* 328.

(*b*) Procopius, *pag.* 97. Trebellius Pollio, ibid. *pag.* 298, *calls him* Princeps Palmyrenorum.

(*c*) *See* Tillemont, Hiſt. des Empereurs, *Tom. iii, pag.* 976.

(*d*) Trebell. Pollio, ibid. *pag.* 325.

(*e*) Zoſimus, *lib. i.*

(*f*) *See* Vopiſcus, in Aureliano. *Moreri quotes* in Annal. *that leads into a miſtake; Vopiſcus wrote no Annals.*

(*g*) Palmyra, built by Solomon, was a day's journey diſtant from this river.

(*h*) Tillemont, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 1066. *He quotes* Suidas, in Α'υρελ. *pag.* 494.

(1) Trebellius Pollio, in triginta Tyrannis, *p.* 329, *Vol. II.* Hiſt. Auguſtæ Scriptor. *Edit. Lugd. Bat.* 1671.

(2) Deditionem meam petis, quaſi neſcias Cleopatram reginam perire maluiſſe, quam in qualibet vivere dignitate. *Vopiſcus, in Aureliano, p.* 481.

(3) Trebellius Pollio, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 336.

(4) Id. ibid. *pag.* 299.

(5) Id. ibid. *pag.* 333.

(6) Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. *Tom. iii, pag. m.* 1041.

been placed among the moſt accompliſhed perſons; but ſhe was ſo far from having ſuch a quality, that ſhe was ſuſpected of having conſented to the aſſaſſination of her huſband in the year 267, from a reſentment of the tenderneſs which he ſhewed to his ſon Herod [*E*], whom he had by another wife.

She engaged in diſputes concerning religion, and protected Paulus Samoſatenus [*F*], who had been condemned by the council of Antioch: and her protection prevented

quærendis liberis dabat (7). This is what ſome rigid Caſuiſts would impoſe upon all married people. And thoſe who write for polygamy apply this morality to their pernicious deſign; for they pretend that a man ſhould abſtain from his wife during her pregnancy, and that if he cannot, he ought to have another who is not with child. A learned commentator on Tully's Offices obſerves, that if the age he lived in produced ſuch women as Zenobia, there would be leſs danger in marriage for ſtudious men, or thoſe of a weak conſtitution; a ſort of men, adds he, who have reaſon to fear either diſhonour, continual janglings, or an immature death, with the ſquandring of their eſtates. His maxims are ſomewhat ſevere, read what follows. ‘Cum . . . . ſacræ literæ omnes vagas libidines deteſtentur: in ipſo etiam matrimonio hic finis ab ipſa natura deſtinatus, diligenter conſideretur, & (quantum vel naturæ imbecillitas, vel conjugii ſervitus ſinit) ſervetur ne homo infra beſtias ſeſe abjiciat: quarum pleræque non niſi certo anni tempore ad procreationem incitantur: & femellæ pleræque, concepto fœtu, marem non admittunt. Eadem etiam Zenobiæ Palmyrenorum reginæ continentia celebratur, quæ cum ſe gravidam ſenſiſſet, Odenatum maritum in thalamum ſuum non admiſit. Digna (ut quidam exclamat) quæ ſine omni dolore pareret: cum in matrimonio non voluptatem, ſed procreationem ſobolis ſpectaret. Cujuſmodi matronas ſi noſtra ætas ferret, etiam ſtudioſi homines, & non firmiſſima præditi valetudine, minore periculo uxores ducerent: quibus nunc aut infamia, aut rixæ perpetuæ aut immaturus obitus cum detrimentis rei familiaris ſunt metuenda. Ridentur hæc ſcilicet à laſcivis hominibus, & in luſtris ac ganeis magis verſatis, quàm in Theologia & Philoſophia: quibus nos hæc non præſcribimus. Indulgeant illi genio: ſed probus adoleſcens hominem ſe eſſe, non pecudem meminerit. Quòd ſi verum eſt, quod ἀνώνυμος Ptolemæi ſcribit interpres, Ægyptios ſingulis menſibus ſemel tantum conſuetudine uxorem uſos; quò infantis concepti momentum deprehenderent: quid Chriſtianis facere par eſt propter Deum, ſummam & continentiam & abſtinentiam flagitantem (8). - - - - *As the holy Scriptures diſcover the greateſt deteſtation for all manner of luſts, ſo in matrimony the end of procreation, which nature it ſelf hath appointed, ought to be carefully attended to, and as far as the frailty of the fleſh, and the demands of a matrimonial life will permit, we ought to confine our ſelves to the anſwering of that end alone, leſt man ſhould become worſe than the beaſts: for moſt animals are not incited to procreation, but at a certain ſeaſon of the year, and moſt of the females do not admit the male animal, after they have conceived. Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra, is celebrated for the like continence, for from the time that ſhe knew ſhe had conceived, ſhe refuſed to admit her huſband into her bed. Behold, a woman, (as ſome perſon ſays in admiration of her) who deſerved to bear children without any pain, ſince, in matrimony, ſhe had no regard to her pleaſures, but only to the procreation of children. If the age we live in produced women of this kind, how many men of learning, and of weak conſtitutions, might venture upon marriage without any danger, who are now in fears, either of diſhonour, or of perpetual wranglings, or an untimely death, with the diſſipation of their fortunes? Wanton men will laugh at all this, men who are more intimate in brothels, than converſant with Divinity and Philoſophy. But I do not write for ſuch perſons. Let them indulge their paſſions; but let the virtuous youth remember that he is a man, and not a brute. If what an anonymous interpreter of Ptolomy wrote, be true,* viz. *that the Egyptians cohabited with their wives only once every month, for the ſake of knowing the moment when their children were conceived, what doth it become the Chriſtians to do for the ſake of God, who exacts the greateſt continence, and the greateſt abſtinence.*’ It would be to no purpoſe to urge againſt Zenobia, that ſhe had but very few maids in her ſervice (9); for the reſt of her domeſticks were eunuchs, advanced in years: ſuch ſervants were much fitter to attend a warlike Queen, than a number of chamber-maids. As for her learning it is ſufficient to ſay that Longinus inſtructed her; that ſhe ſpoke the Egyptian tongue in perfection, and underſtood the Hiſtory of Egypt, and the eaſtern Hiſtory ſo well, that ſhe made an abridgment of it. She read the Roman Hiſtory in Greek, and underſtood Latin, but durſt not ſpeak it. *Ipſa Latini ſermonis non uſque quaque ignara, ſed ut loqueretur pudore cohibita: loquebatur & Ægyptiace ad perfectum modum. Hiſtoriæ Alexandrinæ atque Orientalis ita perita ut eam epitomaſſe dicatur: Latinam autem Græce legerat* (10). I was willing to excuſe her with reſpect to drinking; by urging that ſhe drank glaſs for glaſs with her Generals and ſtrangers, only to attack them, or bring them over to her ſide; but I own my ſuppoſition is very arbitrary, and the expreſſion of the Hiſtorian (11) ſignifies that ſhe overcame the Perſians and Arminians in drinking. It is true he ſays ſhe was otherwiſe ſober.

[*E*] *She was ſuſpected of having conſented to the aſſaſſination of her huſband, from a reſentment of the tenderneſs which he ſhewed to his ſon Herod.*] The Hiſtorian having repreſented the exceſſive complaiſance of Odenatus to Herod, his ſon, by another marriage, adds, that Zenobia being animated with all the ſpirit of a ſtep-mother againſt this young man, increaſed his father's love to him. This ſeems to hint that Odenatus had no great affection for Zenobia; for if he had loved her very tenderly, he would have favoured Herod leſs, than the children he had by her; and not have looked upon Zenobia's hatred as a great motive to redouble his tenderneſs for Herod. *Erat circa illum* (Herodem) *Zenobia novercali animo: qua re commendabiliorem patri eum fecerat* (12). This author a little farther, ſpeaking of Mæonius the murtherer of Odenatus, ſays: ‘Hic conſobrinus Odenati fuit: nec ulla re alia ductus niſi damnabili invidia, imperatorem optimum interemit, quum ei nihil aliud objiceretur præter filii Herodis delicias. Dicitur autem primum cum Zenobia conſenſiſſe, quæ ferre non poterat ut privignus ejus Herodes priore loco quam filii, ejus Herennianus & Timolaus, principes dicerentur (13). - - - - *This man, who was Odenatus's ſiſter's ſon, prompted by nothing but an abominable envy, murdered that excellent Emperor, though he was charged with no other fault but the tenderneſs he bore to his ſon Herod. Mæonius was ſaid to have beforehand agreed with Zenobia, who could not bear that her ſtep-ſon Herod ſhonld take place of her two ſons Herennianus and Timolaus.*’ Judge from hence what perſons of no virtue are capable of doing, ſince Zenobia, endued with ſo many excellent qualities, ſacrificed her huſband to an ambitious tenderneſs for her children, and to the chagrin of a mother-in-law which continually preyed upon her.

[*F*] *She protected Paulus Samoſatenus.*] I can ſcarce believe that the reaſon why ſhe favoured him, was that which you are going to ſee in the words I extract from page 1040, of the third volume of Mr de Tillemont's Hiſtory of the Emperors. ‘* S. Athanaſius ſaith that ſhe was a Jew, [by religion without doubt] ** which Abulpharagius after him tells us: † but at leaſt ſhe followed many of the Jewiſh opinions; and ſhe is ſaid to have been the cauſe why Paulus Samoſatenus, Biſhop of Antioch, ⸸ of whom ſhe was protectreſs, ‡ fell into the Hereſy of Artemon, whoſe opinions concerning JESUS CHRIST, very nearly reſembled thoſe of the ſynagogue.’ To perſuade the world that ſhe was of the Jewiſh religion, another ſort of evidence ought to be produced. It is eaſy to conceive, that a Pagan Princeſs ſhould take pleaſure in ſtopping the courſe of a ſynodical decree, if it be ever ſo little intimated to her that the condemned perſon is worthy of her protection, and even that the fomenting diviſions amongſt Chriſtians tends prevented his being driven from his church. He was not driven from it till after this princeſs had been overcome by Aurelian. See Father Pagi's *Diſſertatio Hypatica* towards the end.

---

(7) Treb. Pollio, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 330.

(8) Hieron. Wolfius, Commentar. in Ciceron. de Offic. *lib. i, pag. m.* 72, 73.

(9) In miniſterio Eunuchos gravioris ætatis habuit, puellas nimis raras. *Trebell. Pollio, ubi ſupra, pag.* 335.

(10) Id. ibid.

(11) Bibit ſæpe cum ducibus, quum eſſet alias ſobria. Bibit etiam cum Perſis atque Armeniis ut eos vinceret. *Id. ibid.*

(12) Id. ibid. *pag.* 301.

(13) Ibid.

* Ath. ſolit. pag. 857. *d.*

** Abulf. pag. 81.

† Thdrt. hær. l. 2. pag. 222. *c.*

⸸ Ath. pag. 857. *d.*

‡ Thdrt. pag. 222. *c.*

to the advantage of Paganiſm. Some learned men believe that Paul Samoſatenus was not condemned by the council of Antioch till after the fall of Zenobia; but Father Pagi hath ſolidly refuted them (14).

(14) Pagi, Diſſert. Hypat. *pag.* 357, *& ſeq.*

ZENO of Elea, one of the moſt eminent Philoſophers of antiquity, flouriſhed in the LXXIXth Olympiad (*a*). He was the diſciple of Parmenides, and even according to ſome authors, his adopted ſon (*b*). He was a very handſome man. And ſome writers pretend that he was loved by his tutor to an unlawful degree [*A*]. Moreri informs us that he was the inventor of Logic [*B*]. He ſhould have acquainted us alſo that he attempted to reſtore the liberty of his country, when labouring under the oppreſſion of a tyrant, and that when the enterprize was diſcovered he ſuffered the moſt cruel torments with an extraordinary reſolution. This affair is related with a thouſand

(*a*) Diogen. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 29, *pag.* 566, *Edit. Wetſtein.* 1692.

(*b*) Id. ibid. *num.* 25.

[*A*] *He was a very handſome man. Some writers pretend that he was loved by his tutor to an unlawful degree.*] I mention elſewhere (1) that Apuleius was reproached with being handſome, and with dreſſing too well for a Philoſopher. To which, among other things, he anſwered, that beauty had not always been ſeparated from perſons of his profeſſion, and proved his aſſertion by the inſtances of Pythagoras, and Zeno of Elea. ' (2) Præterea, licere etiam Philoſophis eſſe vultu liberali. Pythagoram, qui primùm ſeſe Philoſophum nuncupârit, eum ſui ſæculi excellentiſſimâ formâ fuiſſe: item Zenonem illum antiquum Veliâ (3) oriundum, qui primus omnium dictionem ſolertiſſimo artificio ambifariam diſſolverit, eum quoque Zenonem longè decoriſſimum fuiſſe, ut Plato autumat. - - - - *Beſides, Philoſophers may be allowed to be handſome as well as other men. Pythagoras, the firſt who took the name of a Philoſopher, was the handſomeſt man of his age: and that antient Zeno of Elea, the firſt who explained, with great art and ſubtilty, thoſe expreſſions which bear a double meaning, that Zeno was alſo an exceeding handſome man, as Plato teſtifies.*' Plato's citation is right, but there are certain particulars in this paſſage of his which every body doth not approve, and I take him to be juſtly cenſured for it. His words run thus: Ἔφη δὲ δὴ ὁ Ἀντιφῶν, λέγειν τὸν Πυθόδωρον ὅτι ἀφίκοντό ποτε εἰς Παναθήναια τὰ μεγάλα Ζήνων τε καὶ Παρμενίδης· τὸν μὲν οὖν Παρμενίδην, εὖ μάλα ἤδη πρεσβύτην εἶναι, σφόδρα πολιὸν, καλὸν δὲ καὶ ἀγαθὸν τὴν ὄψιν, περὶ ἔτη μάλιστα πέντε καὶ ἑξήκοντα. Ζήνωνα δὲ, ἐγγὺς ἐτῶν τετταράκοντα τότε εἶναι, εὐμήκη δὲ, καὶ χαρίεντα ἰδεῖν· καὶ λέγεσθαι αὐτὸν παιδικὰ τοῦ Παρμενίδου γεγονέναι. Dicebat ergo Antiphon, Pythodorum narraſſe, Zenonem atque Parmenidem veniſſe quondam ad magnorum Panathenæorum celebritatem: & Parmenidem jam ſenem, atque canum, aſpectu decorum fuiſſe, annos ferme quinque & ſexaginta ætatis agentem; Zenonem verò annos penè quadraginta natum; procero inſuper & grato corporis habitu: dicebatur autem in deliciis Parmenidi fuiſſe (4). - - - *Antiphon ſaid, that Pythagoras related that Parmenides and Zeno once came to the grand feſtival of Minerva; that the former was already pretty far advanced in years, was grey-haired, and of a beautiful, comely, aſpect, being then about ſixty-five years old; but that the latter, being then about the fortieth year of his age, was tall and handſome; and it is ſaid, that Zeno ſerved Parmenides in his pleaſures.* Athenæus blames Plato for having unneceſſarily blemiſhed the manners of theſe two Philoſophers. Thoſe who deſire to ſee his own words may be ſatisfied by the following citation. Παρμενίδῃ μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐλθεῖν εἰς λόγους τοῦ Πλάτωνος Σωκράτην, μόλις ἡ ἡλικία συγχωρεῖ· οὐχ ὡς καὶ τοιούτους εἰπεῖν ἢ ἀκοῦσαι λύγους τὸ δὲ πάντων σχετλιώτατον, καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν οὐδεμιᾶς κατεπειγούσης χρείας, ὅτι παιδικὰ γεγόνοι τοῦ Παρμενίδου Ζήνων ὁ πολίτης αὐτοῦ. Parmenidem certè cum Socrate Platonis confabulatum fuiſſe ætas vix permittat, nedum hos vel illos ſermones ediſſeruiſſe, aut audiviſſe. Quod autem indigniſſimum eſt, nullâ compulſus neceſſitate ſcribere is non erubuit Parmenidi Zenonem civem ſuum in amoribus & delitiis fuiſſe (5). - - - *That the Socrates of Plato ſhould have converſed with Parmenides, or that ſuch converſation ſhould have paſſed between them is what their reſpective ages will hardly permit. But for Plato to affirm, without the leaſt neceſſity, that Zeno ſerved Parmenides in his pleaſures, was highly unbecoming.*

(1) In the article of APULEIUS, remark [*H*].

(2) Apuleius, Apolog. *pag. m.* 275, 276.

(3) *See* Menage in Diogenem Laërt. *lib ix, num.* 28, *where he ſhews that Velia is the ſame town of Italy with Elea.*

(4) Plato, in Parmenide, *pag. m.* 1110, *A.*

(5) Athenæus, *lib. xi, pag.* 505, *F.*

[*B*] *He was the inventer of Logic.*] Ariſtotle allows him that honour, as Sextus Empiricus (6), and Diogenes Laërtius (7) obſerve. But Zeno's Logic ſeems deſigned to perplex every thing, and not to clear a ſubject: he uſed it only to diſpute againſt all comers, and ſilence his adverſaries, whether they were right or wrong. Plutarch gives us this idea of him. Διήκουσε δὲ Περικλῆς καὶ Ζήνωνος τοῦ Ἐλεάτου, πραγματευομένου περὶ φύσιν ὡς Παρμενίδης· ἐλεγκτικὴν δέ τινα, καὶ δι᾽ ἐναντιολογίας εἰς ἀπορίαν κατακλείουσαν ἐξασκήσαντος ἕξιν· ὥσπερ καὶ Τίμων ὁ Φλιάσιος εἴρηκε διὰ τούτων.

Ἀμφοτερογλώσσου τε μέγα σθένος οὐκ ἀπάτηλον
Ζήνωνος, πάντων ἐπιλήπτορος.

Audivit Pericles Zenonem quoque Eleatem, de natura, Parmenidis more, philoſophantem: qui impugnans quemlibet, uſum paraverat quemdam refutandi, qui deduceret ad perplexitatem. Quod Phliaſius Timon affirmat quoque, his verbis.

Omnia peſtringens, Zeno diſceptat, utraque
Et parte invictus, ſed non fallax (8).

These verſes of Timon appear leſs mutilated in Diogenes Laërtius; I copy them from the Amſterdam edition.

Ἀμφοτερογλώσσου τε μέγα σθένος οὐκ ἀλαπαδνὸν
Ζήνωνος πάντων ἐπιλέπτορος, ἠδὲ Μελίσσου,
Πολλῶν φαντασμῶν ἐπάνω, παύρων γε μὲν εἴσω (9).

Expreſſitque Plato vires utriuſque periti
Linguæ Zenonis, jurgatoriſque Meliſſi,
Phantaſias, qui aluit paucas, multaſque ſubegit (10).

Theſe verſes repreſent a man who criticiſed every thing, overthrew ſeveral opinions, and kept very few for himſelf. If he was not the Palamedes mentioned by Plato, he perfectly reſembled him. This Palamedes argued ſo ſubtilly, that he rendred the *pro* and *con* probable to his auditors: he ſhewed them that the very ſame things were like and unlike, that they were but one thing and different things, and that they reſted and moved at the ſame time. Τὸν οὖν Ἐλεατικὸν Παλαμήδην λέγοντα οὐκ ἴσμεν τέχνῃ, ὥστε δοκεῖν φαίνεσθαι τοῖς ἀκούουσι τὰ αὐτὰ ὅμοια καὶ ἀνόμοια, καὶ ἓν καὶ πολλὰ, μένοντά τε αὖ καὶ φερόμενα. *Enimvero Eleatem Palamedem artificio ſuo efficere ſolitum accepimus, ut eadem audientibus ſimilia & diſſimilia, unum & multa, manentia & fluentia viderentur* (11). Diogenes Laërtius (12) ſaith that Zeno was called the Palamedes of Elea, in Plato's Sophiſt: but Mr Menage charges him with two errors. He ſhews that this Palamedes is not mentioned in that work of Plato, but in the dialogue intituled *Phædrus*; after which he proves, by the evidence of Quintilian, that this Palamedes was Alcidamas the Rhetorician. 'Quæ non de Zenone Eleate, verum de Alcidamante intelligenda ſunt, ſi fides Quintiliano. Ita enim ille 'libro

(6) Sextus Empiricus adverſus Mathematic. *pag.* 139.

(7) Diog. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 25.

(8) Plutarch. in Pericle, *pag.* 154. *The tranſlation of theſe words may be ſeen below in the remark* [*E*], *citation* (44).

(9) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra.

(10) This tranſlation was thus made from a copy, in which the Greek had, Ζήνωνός τε Πλάτων ἐπιλήπτορος, inſtead of Ζήνωνος πάντων ἐπιλήπτορος.

(11) Plato, in Phædro, *pag.* 1231.

(12) Diog. Laërt. *lib. ix, num* 15.

thouſand variations [C], as I ſhall ſhew in the remarks. I have only two faults to charge

‘ libro III. inſtitut. Oratoriarum capite I. ubi de Scriptoribus Artis Rhetoricæ: *Et Hippias Eleus, & quem Palamedem Plato appellat, Alcidamas Eleates* (13). - - - - *Theſe things are not to be underſtood of Zeno Eleates, but of Alcidamas, if we rely on Quintilian. For theſe are the words of Quintilian in his Inſtitutions, ſpeaking of the writers on the art of Rhetoric:* And Hippias Eleus, and Alcidamas Eleates, whom Plato calls Palamedes.’

[C] *This affair is related with a thouſand variations.*] The Elean tyrant, whom he deſigned to deſtroy, was Nearchus, according to ſome, and Diomedon, according to other writers (14). Plutarch calls him Demylus, as we ſhall ſee hereafter: Tertullian names him Dionyſius, and doubtleſs by a miſtake in Chronology (15) takes him for the Syracuſan tyrant, who ſo frequently occurs to us in authors, under the name of Dionyſius: ‘ Zeno Eleates, *ſaith he, towards the end of his apology,* conſultus à Dionyſio, quidnam Philoſophia præſtaret, cum reſpondiſſet, *contemptum mortis*, impaſſibilis flagellis Tyranni objectus, ſententiam ſuam ad mortem uſque ſignabat. - - - - *Zeno of Elea being aſked by Dionyſius what Philoſophy was good for, anſwered,* to make a man deſpiſe death: *whereupon the cruel tyrant having ordered him to be ſcourged, Zeno confirmed the truth of his anſwer even to death.*’ Here is one teſtimony of the admirable conſtancy of this Philoſopher. I believe Tertullian placed the ſcene of all this (16) not at Elea, as he ought to have done, but at Syracuſe. Others lay the ſcene in the iſle of Cyprus, and are beſides miſtaken, both in the perſon tortured, and in the tyrant. ‘ Ducebatur intrepidus (*Euſebius*) temporum iniquitati inſultans, imitatus Zenonem illum veterem Stoicum qui ut mentiretur quædam laceratus diutius, avulſam ſedibus linguam ſuam cum cruento ſputamine in oculos interrogantis Cyprii Regis impegit (17). - - - *Euſebius was ſtill undaunted as he went to the place of execution, and continued to laſh the iniquities of the times, imitating the antient Stoic Philoſopher Zeno, who being interrogated by the King of Cyprus, and kept longer in torture that he might be forced to invent lies, plucked out his tongue, and threw it with the bloody ſpittle in the tyrant's face.*’ Valeſius's note on this paſſage of Marcellinus, will diſcover the errors of this Hiſtorian, and if you conſult Mr Menage (18), you will find a very happy conjecture concerning the occaſion of theſe miſtakes. Zeno's action it ſelf is differently reported. Some ſay, that being required to declare his accomplices, he affirmed that all the tyrant's friends had a hand in the conſpiracy. This he did, in order to repreſent him as a perſon abandoned by all the world. After this general declaration he named ſome particular perſons, and told the tyrant that he wanted to ſpeak with him in his ear. The tyrant approaching, Zeno fixed his teeth ſo deep in his ear, and kept his hold ſo faſt, that nothingbut ſtabbing him with pricks could force him to let go. Εἶτα περί τινων εἰπὼν ἔχειν τινὰ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ οὖς· καὶ δακὼν, οὐκ ἀνῆκεν ἕως ἂν ἀπεκεντήθη, ταὐτὸν Ἀριστογείτονι τῷ τυραννοκτόνῳ παθών. *Deinde cùm de quibuſdam dixiſſet, quiddam ſibi ad aurem loqui velle, eam mordicus apprehenſam non ante dimiſit quàm ſtimulis foderetur, idem agens quod Ariſtogiton tyrannicida* (19). Others ſay that he did bite off the tyrant's noſe (20). And ſome affirm, that having declared his accomplices (21), and called the uſurper the plague of his country (22), he addreſſed himſelf to the ſtanders-by, telling them that he was aſtoniſhed at their cowardice, if the fear of being treated like him could oblige them to continue in ſlavery: after which, biting off his own tongue, he threw it into the tyrant's face (23); and that this ſo animated the citizens that they immediately ſtoned the uſurper of their liberty. This is what Diogenes Laërtius tells us. Plutarch obſerves, that Zeno, in biting off his tongue, and throwing it in a tyrant's face, practiſed his maſter's maxim, that great men dread diſhonour, but that none but children, women, and cowards dread pain. Ζήνων τοίνυν ὁ Παρμενίδου γνώριμος, ἐπιθέμενος Δημύλῳ τῷ τυράννῳ, καὶ δυστυχήσας περὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν, ἐν πυρὶ τὸν Παρμενίδου λόγον, ὥσπερ χρυσὸν ἀκήρατον καὶ δόκιμον παρέσχε. καὶ ἀπέδειξεν ἔργοις, ὅτι τὸ αἰσχρὸν ἀνδρὶ μεγάλῳ φοβερόν ἐστιν. ἀλγηδόνα δὲ, παῖδες, καὶ γύναια, καὶ γυναίων ψυχὰς ἔχοντες ἄνδρες, δεδίασι. τὴν γὰρ γλῶτταν αὐτοῦ διατρώγων, τῷ τυράννῳ προσέπτυσεν. *Zeno Parmenidis diſcipulus, Demylo tyranno inſidiatus, re infeliciter geſta, doctrinam Parmenidis, velut aurum in igne, illæſam ac probam facto oſtendit. Scilicet turpitudinem magno viro metuendam eſſe: dolorem a pueris & mulierculis, ac viris animum muliebrem gerentibus timeri. Linguam enim ſuam dentibus amputatam, in tyrannum expuit* (24). Hermippus ſays (25) that Zeno was pounded in a mortar.

Valerius Maximus could not fail to mention the conſtancy of this Philoſopher; but he is guilty of ſome faults: for inſtead of aſcribing to Zeno of Elea what relates to the tyrant Nearchus, he aſcribes it to another perſon; and beſides ſuppoſes, that Zeno deſigning to deliver the Agrigentines from the tyranny of Phalaris, did, and ſuffered, what others relate with reſpect to the tyrant of Elea. ‘ Qui (*Zeno Eleates*) cum eſſet in diſpicienda rerum natura maximæ prudentiæ, inque excitandis ad vigorem juvenum animis promptiſſimus, præceptorum fidem exemplo virtutis ſuæ publicavit. Patriam enim egreſſus, in qua frui ſecura libertate poterat, Agrigentum miſerabili ſervitute obrutum petiit, tanta fiducia ingenii ac morum ſuorum fretus, ut ſperaverit, & Tyranno & Phalaridi veſanæ mentis feritatem à ſe diripi poſſe. Poſtquam deinde apud illum plus conſuetudinem dominationis, quam conſilii ſalubritatem valere animadvertit; nobiliſſimos ejus civitatis adoleſcentes cupiditate liberandæ patriæ inflammavit. Cujus rei cum indicium ad tyrannum manaſſet, convocato in forum populo, torquere eum vario cruciatus genere cœpit: ſubinde quærens, quoſnam conſilii participes haberet: At ille nec eorum quempiam nominavit, ſed proximum quemque, ac fideliſſimum tyranno ſuſpectum reddidit: increpitanſque Agrigentinis ignaviam ac timiditatem, effecit ut ſubito mentis impulſu concitati, Phalarim lapidibus proſternerent. Senis ergo unius eculeo impoſiti, non ſupplex vox, nec miſerabilis ejulatus; ſed fortis cohortatio totius urbis animum, fortunamque mutavit (26). - - - *Zeno of Elea, as he had a great knowledge of the nature of things, and a very ready talent in animating and giving vigour to the minds of youth, ſo he openly confirmed the truth of his precepts by the example of his own virtue. For having left his native country, where he might have ſecurely lived in liberty, he went to Agrigentum, which was then groaning under miſerable ſervitude; relying with ſo much confidence on his own genius and virtuous life, that he hoped to ſubdue the ſtubbornneſs, and tame the outrageous cruelty of the tyrant Phalaris. When he afterwards found that the habit of tyrannizing was ſo prevailing with Phalaris, that the wholſome advice he beſtowed on him had no influence, he inſpired the nobleſt of the youth of Agrigentum with the deſire of ſhaking off his yoke, and ſetting their country at liberty. The tyrant having notice of this, ſummoned the people to the Forum, and began to put Zeno to torture in various manners, inquiring in the intervals who were his accomplices. Zeno named none of them, but rendered one of thoſe ſuſpected who were ſtanding by Phalaris, and were the moſt faithful to him; and by often upbraiding the Agrigentines for their cowardice and fear, he animated them to that degree, that, being rouzed, as it were, by a ſudden impulſe of mind, they ſtoned the tyrant. Thus, it was not the ſupplications of an old man upon the rack, nor his lamentable wailings, but his vigorous exhortations, which changed the temper and fortune of a whole city.*’ After which he relates what follows. ‘ Ejuſdem nominis philoſophus, cùm à Nearcho tyranno, de cujus nece conſilium inierat, torqueretur, ſupplicii pariter atque indicandorum conſciorum gratia; doloris victor, ſed ultionis cupidus, eſſe dixit quod eum ſecreto audire admodum expediret: laxatoque eculeo, poſtquam inſidiis opportunum tempus animadvertit, aurem ejus morſu corripuit, nec ante dimiſit quam & ipſe vita, & ille corporis parte privaretur (27). - - - - *A Philoſopher of the ſame name, who had entered into a confederacy againſt the life of the tyrant Nearchus, was by his command put to the torture, both for his puniſhment, and in order to diſcover the reſt of his confederates. Being victorious over the pain he endured, but deſirous of revenge, he ſaid that he had an affair to communicate to Nearchus, which it was of* ‘ great charge on Mr Moreri [*D*]. For the reſt, the opinions of Zeno Eleates, were very near the ſame with thoſe of Xenophanes and Parmenides concerning the Unity, Incomprehenſibility, and immutability of all things. I cannot believe he aſſerted that there is nothing in the univerſe [*E*]; for how could he pretend that he, who maintained that principle, did not exiſt? How could he, who aimed at nothing but by his arguments

---

(13) Menagius, in Diog. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 25, *pag.* 403, *col.* 2.

(14) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 26.

(15) Antiquior Zeno Eleates Dionyſio Tyranno centum quinquaginta annis circiter. *Menag. ibid. pag.* 404.

(16) I mean that he thought the whole matter happened at Syracuſe.

(17) Ammian. Marcellin. *lib. xiv, cap. ix, pag.* 46.

(18) Menag. ubi ſupra, *num.* 26.

(19) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 26, *pag.* 565. ex Heraclide in Satyri Epitome.

(20) Laërt. ibid. *num.* 27, ex Demetrio in Æquivocis.

(21) Id. ibid. ex Antiſth. in Succeſſionibus.

(22) Μετὰ τὸ μηνῦσαι τοὺς φίλους ἐρωτηθῆναι πρὸς τοῦ τυράννου εἴ τις ἄλλος εἴη· τὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν σὺ ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἀλητήριος. Illum quum amicos indicaſſet, rogatum à Tyranno eſſetne alius quiſpiam, dixiſſe, Tu civitatis pernicies, *Id. ibid. This will be better underſtood, if it be read in Seneca, at the end of this remark.*

(23) Compare what is ſaid in the article PYTHAGORAS, citat. (85).

(24) Plut. adverſus Colotem, *circa fin. pag.* 1126. *Vide etiam* de Garrulit. *pag.* 505.

(25) *Apud* Diogenem Laërtium, *lib. ix, num.* 27.

(26) Valer. Maximus, *lib. iii, cap. iii, num.* 2, *in Exter. pag. m.* 280.

(27) Id. ibid. *num.* 3.

pro

great importance that he alone ſhould hear; and the torture being abated for that purpoſe, when he found a proper opportunity for executing his deſign, he fixed his teeth ſo deep in the tyrant's ear, that he did not let him go, till he had loſt his life, and the tyrant a part of his body.’ Oliverius, who commented on Valerius Maximus, finds but one fault in this: he doth not blame Valerius Maximus for any thing but ſaying that Zeno, the chief of the Stoics, was put to death for endeavouring to deſtroy a tyrant. This cenſure is unjuſt; and it will be in vain to ſay that the ſame Zeno voluntarily killed himſelf at the age of ninety years (28), that will not convict Valerius Maximus of any error, ſince he doth not ſay that one of his two Zeno's was the head of the Stoics. Doth not Diogenes Laërtius ſay that there were eight Zeno's (29). It is not therefore neceſſary that he, who is diſtinguiſhed from Zeno of Elea, ſhould be the founder of the Stoics. Henry Valeſius blames Valerius Maximus for making two Zeno's of one Zeno of Elea (30). One of our beſt Critics made the ſame obſervation, and beſides pointed out what might have miſled this antient author (31). He obſerves that John Vorſtius, making the ſame critical remark expoſed himſelf to cenſure, by making Nearchus tyrant of the Liparitans. Vorſtius grounded this opinion on Zeno's being examined concerning the arms, which, by his means, were brought to the iſle of Lipara. He imagined that this Philoſopher, after having delivered the Agrigentines from the tyranny of Phalaris, retired to this iſle, and endeavoured to free it from the tyranny of Nearchus. But Mr Perizonius clearly proves (32) that it was the city of Elea which Zeno attempted to free from the tyranny of Nearchus. But to go further than this; I ſhall take the liberty to obſerve that theſe learned men let the greateſt fault of Valerius Maximus paſs uncenſured. It lies in making Zeno of Elea enter into a plot againſt Phalaris: Chronology will by no means allow this. Let us ſuppoſe that Euſebius is miſtaken in placing the twenty-eight years of Phalaris's tyranny betwixt the ſecond year of the XXXIſt Olympiad, and the ſecond of the XXXVIIIth. And let us prefer his placing this tyrant at the end of the LIIId Olympiad after an uſurpation for ſixteen years. Let us even ſuppoſe with ſeveral learned men (33) that Phalaris ſeized the ſovereign authority in Agrigentum about the LIId Olympiad, and that he held it ſixteen years according to ſome, or twenty eight according to others; it will nevertheleſs appear that he was dead before our Zeno was of age to undertake what Valerius Maximus relates of him. We have ſeen above (34), that Parmenides was about ſixty-five years old when Zeno was but forty. But Parmenides flouriſhed in the LXXXth Olympiad (35): judge then whether Zeno could make any figure in the fifty-ninth. But to deal plainly, I find ſome perplexity in the time when Parmenides is ſaid to have flouriſhed: for ſince Pericles, who died in the LXXXVIIth Olympiad, was Zeno's diſciple, the flouriſhing time of Zeno ought to be placed about the ſeventy-ſixth (36), and that of Parmenides, his maſter, a little higher (37). This is ſufficient for my purpoſe. I ſhould have examined all this more exactly, if I had given the article of Phalaris. I was ready to begin it, when I was informed that a worthy nephew of the moſt illuſtrious Mr Boyle had publiſhed the life of that tyrant. I inquired for that piece every where, but could not find it, and therefore I laid aſide that article; I referred it till ſuch time as I might have the advantage of that author's obſervations, and I do not yet know any more of his book (38) but what is extracted out of it by the journaliſts. However, we may believe that Valerius Maximus did not mention two Zeno's, without ſome ſort of reflexion. He muſt have known that Nearchus lived after Phalaris; ſo that being miſtaken in making the Zeno of Elea (39) cotemporary with Phalaris, he could not perſuade himſelf that the ſame Zeno who deſigned to expel Nearchus, was he who contrived a plot againſt the tyrant of Agrigentum.

Obſerve, that ſeveral Critics will have it, that Seneca meant our Zeno of Elea, when he ſaid, ‘Notus eſt ille tyrannicida, qui imperfecto opere comprehenſus, & ab Hippia tortus, ut conſcios indicaret, circumſtantes amicos tyranni nominavit, quibus quam maxime caram ſalutem ejus ſciebat. Et cum ille ſingulos, ut nominati erant, occidi juſſiſſet, interrogavit: Ecquis ſupereſſet? Tu, inquit, ſolus: neminem enim alium, cui carus eſſes, reliqui. Effecit ira, ut tyrannus tyrannicidæ manus commodaret, & præſidia ſua gladio ſuo cæderet (40). - - - - - *That tyrannicide is well known, who being apprehended, before he could execute his deſign, and being put to the torture by Hippias, in order to diſcover his accomplices, named the tyrant's friends who were ſtanding by, and to whom he knew the life and ſafety of Hippias was the deareſt. When the latter had cauſed each of them to be ſlain, in order as they were named, he aſked if there were any remaining:* you alone, *replied the other,* for I have left no other perſon to whom you are dear. *Such was the tyrant's anger, that he lent his hands to the tyrannicide, and ſlew his protectors with his own ſword.*’ But for all Muretus and Juſtus Lipſius, I am apt to think, that Seneca meant one of thoſe whom Hippias the ſon of Piſiſtratus, cauſed to be tortured. And though Seneca relates what others aſcribe to Zeno of Elea, yet I do not believe that he had him in his eye. It is his cuſtom, and that of ſeveral other authors, to apply to ſome perſons, what has been ſaid of others.

[*D*] *I have only two faults to charge on Mr Moreri.*] The firſt is his quoting Diogenes in the ninth book *de Hiſt. Græc. & de Sect. Philoſ.* Now it is not true that Diogenes wrote books on the Greek Hiſtory, or concerning the Greek Hiſtorians, nor that his book is intituled *de Sectis Philoſophorum.* It is intituled *de Vitis, Dogmatis, & Apophthegmatis clarorum Philoſophorum, Libri X.* His ſecond fault is ſaying that Diogenes *ſpeaks of ſeven other Zeno's, whoſe lives he hath not given us.* For one of them is Zeno of Cittium, the head of the Stoics, whoſe life Diogenes hath written at large.

[*E*] *I cannot believe he aſſerted that there is nothing in the univerſe,*] I therefore ſuſpect Seneca, who aſcribes to him this opinion. Juſtus Lipſius alſo diſtruſts the truth of it. ‘Audi, quantum mali faciat nimia ſubtilitas, & quàm infeſta veritati ſit. Protagoras ait, de omni re in utramque partem diſputari poſſe, ex æquo, & de hac ipſa, an omnis res in utramque partem diſputabilis ſit. Nauſiphanes ait, ex his quæ videntur eſſe, nihil magis eſſe, quàm non eſſe. Parmenides ait, ex his quæ videntur, nihil eſſe in univerſum. Zeno Eleates omnia negotia de negotio dejecit, ait nihil eſſe. Circa eadem ferè Pyrrhonii verſantur, & Megarici, & Eretrici, & Academici, qui novam induxerunt ſcientiam, nihil ſcire. Hæc omnia in illum ſupervacuum ſtudiorum liberalium gregem conjice. Illi mihi non profuturam ſcientiam tradunt, hi ſpem omnis ſcientiæ eripiunt: ſatius eſt ſupervacua ſcire, quàm nihil. Illi non præferunt lumen, per quod acies dirigatur ad verum: hi oculos mihi effodiunt. Si Protagoræ credo, nihil in rerum natura eſt, niſi dubium: ſi Nauſiphani, hoc unum certum eſt, nihil eſſe certi: ſi Parmenidi, nihil eſt præter unum: ſi Zenoni, ne unum quidem. Quid ergo nos ſumus? quid iſta quæ nos circumſtant, alunt, ſuſtinent? Tota rerum natura umbra eſt, aut inanis, aut fallax. Non facile dixerim, utrum magis iraſcar illis, qui nos nihil ſcire voluerunt: an illis, qui ne hoc quidem nobis reliquerunt, nihil ſcire (41). - - - - - - *Hear how great evil proceeds from too much ſubtilty, and how obnoxious it is to truth. Protagoras ſays, that a man may diſpute upon any ſubject whatever, and may take either ſide of diſpute with equal advantage; nay, that he may diſpute upon this, whether any ſubject whatever is diſputable on either ſide. Nauſiphanes affirms, that the things which appear to be, nothing is more apparent than that they are not. Parmenides, that of theſe things which are ſeen, nothing exiſts.*

(28) Oliverius ſays ſo.

(29) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 29. Jonſius, de Scriptor. Hiſtor. Philoſ. *pag.* 116, *reckons* 15 *Zeno's.*

(30) Ex uno Zenone Eleate duos perperam facit. *Henricus Valeſius, Notis in Amm. Marcellin. lib. xiv, cap. ix, pag.* 46.

(31) Ut modo duorum Fabiorum res geſtas uni eum adſignaſſe contra Pighium probavimus, ita contraria plane culpa unius Philoſophi facta, in duos ejuſdem nominis diviſit, *lib. iii, cap. iii.* Nam quum retuliſſet, quam patientiam Eleates Zeno præſtitiſſet, &c. *Jacobus Perizonius, Animadv. Hiſtoric. pag.* 85.

(32) Mr Perizonius *cites* Cicero, de Nat. Deor. *lib. iii, and* Diogenes Laërtius.

(33) Car. Boyle, *apud* Acta Eruditor. Lipſienſ. 1696, *pag.* 102, 103. *In the Abſtract of Phalaris's Letters, printed at Oxford in* 1695.

(34) Citat. (4).

(35) Chron. Euſebii.

(36) Jonſius, de Script. Hiſt. Phil. *pag.* 116, *places him in the LXXVIIIth Olympiad.*

(37) In the edition of Diogenes Laërtius, of 1692, he is placed in the LXIXth Olympiad.

(38) I write this in the year 1696.

(39) Nay, he ſuppoſes that he was very old at the time of the plot.

(40) Seneca, de Ira, *lib. ii, cap. xxiii, pag. m.* 541. *See the Commentators upon it.*

(41) Seneca, Epiſt. lxxxviii, *pag. m.* 361.

pro and *con* to perplex all thoſe with whom he diſputed (*c*), and confound them ſo, that they ſhould not know which way to turn themſelves, be guilty of ſuch a palpable inconſiſtency? Did not he ſee that it was eaſy to ſilence him, by aſking whether nothingneſs could reaſon? He argued ſtrenuouſly againſt the exiſtence of motion. Some of his objections on that head are preſerved in Ariſtotle's works [*F*], but it is probable that

exiſts. Zeno of Elea throws down every thing, and maintains that there is nothing. Much the ſame opinions are held by the Pyrrhonians, the Megaricians, Eretricians, and Academics, who have introduced a new ſcience, viz. that we know nothing. You muſt throw aſide all theſe tenets into the claſs of ſuperfluous learning. The former ſay that knowledge will be of no uſe to me; the latter take away all my hopes of attaining knowledge: it is better to have an uſeleſs knowledge than none at all. The former do not give me any light for the attaining of truth: the latter put out my eyes. If I believe Protagoras, every thing in nature is doubtful; if Nauſiphanes, this alone is certain, that nothing is certain; if Parmenides, there is in nature but one Being; if Zeno, there is not even one Being. What are we then? What are thoſe things which ſurround us, nouriſh and ſupport us? All nature is a ſhadow, or nothing, or an illuſion. I can hardly tell whether I am more angry with thoſe who pretend that we know nothing, or thoſe who will not even allow that we know nothing.' I have cited thoſe words of Seneca ſomewhat at large, in order to diſplay all the degrees of Scepticiſm, amongſt which there is none ſo extravagant as our Zeno's notion. If he really maintained ſuch a paradox as this, either he meant to divert himſelf, or he did not underſtand the word *nothing* in the ſame ſenſe as others do, or he was raving. But we do not find the leaſt ſymptom of madneſs in the reſt of his opinions. Wherefore we ought rather to ſolve it by taking it for a witty conceit, or a particular notion of the word *nothing*. Let us paſs the ſame judgment on Gorgias Leontinus's book, in which he maintained three aſſertions (42): firſt, that there is nothing; ſecondly, that if there is any Being, man cannot comprehend it; thirdly, that though man could comprehend it, he could not expreſs it. Let us ſee Juſtus Lipſius's reflexion on that paſſage of Seneca: ‘Sententia eſt, Zeno Eleates moleſtiâ nos liberavit, & omni inquiſitione: nam ait, Nihil eſſe. Sed hæc mira, & eximiè fatua aut ſapiens ſententia, nec mihi nunc capienda. An ad contemptum rerum retulit, Nihil hæc (non tamen Nihil) eſſe? velim, & ſic laudem, non ſolum tolerem. Si aliter, & de ipſa exiſtentia; elleboro hæc egent. Ceterùm Zeno Eleates nuſquam tale, apud Laërtium quidem, ubi Dogmata ejus diverſa, ſed nec alibi commemini legiſſe. Viderit Seneca (43). - - - - - - *Zeno of Elea freed us from all trouble and all inquiry; for he ſaid that there is nothing. But either this is a very ſurpriſing and fooliſh ſaying, or it is a very wiſe one, and ſuch as I cannot comprehend. Did he uſe it in contempt of things, and mean that the things of this life were (not nothing, but) naught? I aſſent, and not only allow but commend it. If otherwiſe, and he ſpoke of the exiſtence of things, he was ſurely mad. For the reſt, Zeno of Elea ſays no ſuch thing in Diogenes Laërtius, who has related ſeveral of his opinions, nor do I remember to have read this any where elſe. Let Seneca anſwer for it.*' What Plutarch relates of Zeno's character will doubtleſs be objected againſt me: Pericles, ſays he (44), *was alſo a hearer and diſciple of Zeno Eleates, who taught Natural Philoſophy, like Parmenides. This Zeno oppoſed every thing, and had got a certain habit of objecting and refuting, by which he perplexed his adverſaries, and reduced them to a nonplus: as Timon the Phliaſian teſtifies in theſe verſes.*

Zeno with wondrous art could every thing diſpute,
And every thing could critic and confute,
Would either ſide the queſtion take, nor fail
Defending or oppoſing to prevail.

It will be objected againſt me, I ſay, that a Philoſopher of this humour, was capable of quibbling to ſuch a degree, as to maintain that every thing is nothing. I anſwer, that it is not probable that ſo ſubtile a diſputant would have run into ſuch extremities, out of which it ſeems impoſſible for him to have extricated himſelf.

But however incredible this may appear, let us ſay that the conſequences of Pyrrhoniſm may have engaged people to aſſert a great many extravagant things, and let us moderate a little the aſſeverations we have read (45). Let us alſo ſay, that perhaps our Zeno maintained that there was nothing, only in arguing on thoſe principles which he attacked. It may be that from an argument *ad hominem*, they concluded that he poſitively and abſolutely taught that poſition, though he advanced it only as a doctrine which reſulted from ſome hypotheſis, the falſity of which he had undertaken to prove. We know that he argued thus: if there is one Being, it is indiviſible, for unity cannot be divided; now that which is indiviſible is nothing, for that cannot be accounted among Beings which is of ſuch a nature, that being added to another, it will not increaſe it, and being taken from another, doth not diminiſh it: and therefore there is no Being. This argument is mentioned by Ariſtotle, who ſays it is ridiculous (46). Let us omit the Greek, and ſet down rather Fonſeca's paraphraſe, from which we learn that Zeno thus attacked a doctrine of Plato: ‘Poſterior ratio, quam affert (*Ariſtoteles*) pro opinione naturalium contra Platonem, erat Zenonis Eleatæ, Parmenidis diſcipuli, qui hunc in modum argumentabatur. Ipſum unum ſeparatum ſi datur, eſt omnino indiviſibile, ergo nihil eſt; unde ſequitur; non tantum illud, non eſſe ſubſtantiam rerum, ſed neque omnino quicquam, quod ad eas pertineat. Conſequentiam verò ex eo firmam putabat Zeno, quia nihil eſſe credebat, niſi quod aliquam magnitudinem haberet: quam ob Cauſam, ſæpe utebatur hoc quaſi Principio, *Quod nec additum facit majus, nec detractum reddit minus, nihil eſt*. Quocirca dicebat nihil eſſe, quod omni ex parte eſſet ens, niſi Corpus, quando quidem ſolum Corpus additum ſecundum quamcumque dimenſionem facit majus. Siquidem linea addita non facit majus, niſi ſecundum longitudinem; nec Superficies, niſi ſecundum longitudinem & latitudinem. Unde ſequebatur Unitatem abſtractam, qualem ponebat Plato, itemque Punctum, nihil omnino eſſe, quia nequeant rem ullam majorem facere (47). - - - - - - *The laſt argument which Ariſtotle alledges in favour of the opinion of the Naturaliſts againſt Plato, was that of Zeno Eleates, the diſciple of Parmenides: he argued thus: if there is one ſeparate Being it is indiviſible, therefore it is nothing, from whence it follows that it is not only not the ſubſtance of things but alſo nothing belonging to them. Zeno imagined this conſequence was juſt, becauſe he believed there was nothing but what had ſome magnitude. Accordingly he often uſed this as a principle.* That which being added to another thing, does not increaſe it, or being taken from another thing, does not diminiſh it, is nothing. *He therefore ſaid that there was nothing which in every reſpect was a Being, except body; ſince body alone, if added to another, makes a greater, according to its dimenſion: for a line added to a line makes not a greater but in length; nor doth a ſurface added to a ſurface make a greater but in length and breadth. Hence it follows that an abſtract unity, ſuch as Plato ſuppoſed, and likewiſe that a point, are nothing, becauſe they cannot make any thing greater.*'

[*F*] *Some of his objections* againſt the exiſtence of motion, *are preſerved in Ariſtotle's works.*] read Ariſtotle's Phyſics (48), where you will find four objections made by Zeno examined.

The firſt is (49). If an arrow, which tends towards a certain place, ſhould move, it would move and reſt at the ſame time. But that is a contradiction; therefore it doth not move. The conſequence of the major is proved thus. The arrow is every moment in a ſpace equal to it ſelf. It is then at reſt; for a thing is not in a ſpace when it leaves it: wherefore there is no moment in which it moves; and if it moved in ſome moments, it would be at once in motion and at reſt. To underſtand this objection the better, we muſt take notice of two principles which cannot be denied: one is, that a body cannot be in two places at

---

(*c*) See Plutarch's words, towards the end of the remark [*E*].

(42) *See* Sextus Empiricus adv. Mathemat. *lib. vii, cap. ii.*

(43) Lipſius, Manuduct. ad Stoic. Philoſ. *lib. ii, Diſſ. iv, ſub fin. pag. m.* 693, *Tom. iv, Oper.*

(44) Plut. in Vita Periclis, *pag.* 154. *The words of the original may be ſeen above, in citation* (8).

(45) See, below, the explanation on the Pyrrhonians, citat. (3).

(46) Ariſtot. Metaphyſ. *lib. iii, cap. iv.*

(47) Fonſeca in Ariſtotelis Metaphyſ. ibid. *pag. m.* 473, 474.

(48) In the ninth chapter of the ſixth book.

(49) I reckon it the firſt, becauſe Ariſtotle propoſes and anſwers it at the beginning of the chapter; but afterwards he places it in the third rank.

that he alledged ſeveral others, which perhaps were the ſame with thoſe I ſhall mention below

THAT time is not diviſible *in infinitum.*

at once; the other, that two parts of time cannot exiſt together. The firſt of theſe two principles is ſo evident, even without making uſe of any attention, that I need not explain it: but as the other requires a little more reflexion, in order to be underſtood, and comprehends the whole force of the objection, I will render it more obvious by an inſtance. I ſay then that what ſuits Monday and Tueſday with reſpect to ſucceſſion, ſuits every portion of time whatſoever. Since then it is impoſſible for Monday and Tueſday to exiſt together, and that of neceſſity Monday muſt ceaſe to be before Tueſday begins to be, there is no part of time whatſoever, which can co-exiſt with another; each muſt exiſt alone; each muſt begin to be, when the precedent ceaſeth to be; and each muſt ceaſe to be before the following can begin to exiſt. From whence it follows, that time is not diviſible *in infinitum*, and that the ſucceſſive duration of things is compoſed of moments, properly ſo called, each of which is ſimple and indiviſible, perfectly diſtinct from time paſt and future, and contains no more than the preſent time. Thoſe who deny this conſequence, muſt be given up to their ſtupidity, or their want of ſincerity, or the inſurmountable power of their prejudices. But if you once grant that the preſent time is indiviſible, you will be unavoidably obliged to admit Zeno's objection. You cannot find an inſtant when the arrow leaves its place; for if you find one, it will be at the ſame time in that place, and yet not there. Ariſtotle contents himſelf with anſwering, that Zeno very falſly ſuppoſes the indiviſibility of moments. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐστι ψεῦδος· οὐ γάρ σύγκειται ὁ χρόνος ἐκ τῶν νῦν ὄντων ἀδιαιρέτων, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἄλλο μέγεθος οὐδέν. *Hoc verò eſt falſum, cùm tempus ex momentis individuis non conſtet, ut neque alia ulla magnitudo* (50).

(50) Ariſtoteles, Phyſic. *lib. vi, cap. ix.*

Zeno's ſecond objection was this. If there be motion, what moves muſt paſs from one place to another; for all motion comprehends two extremities, *terminum à quo*, and *terminum ad quem*, the place from whence it departs, and that to which it comes. But theſe two extremities are ſeparated by ſpaces which contain an infinity of parts, ſince matter is diviſible *in infinitum*; it is therefore impoſſible for the body that is moved to proceed from one extremity to the other. The intermediate ſpace is compoſed of an infinity of parts, through which it ought to run ſucceſſively, one after the other, without ever being able to touch that which is before at the ſame time that it touches that which is behind: ſo that to run through one foot of matter, I mean, to reach from the beginning of the firſt inch to the end of the twelfth inch, an infinite time would be neceſſary; for the ſpaces, which it is ſucceſſively obliged to run through, betwixt the two extremities, being infinite in number, it is plain that they cannot be run through in leſs than an infinity of moments; unleſs it were pretended that the body which moves is in ſeveral places at the ſame time, which is falſe and impoſſible. To this Ariſtotle makes a wretched anſwer: he ſaith that a foot of matter being no otherwiſe than virtually infinite or infinite in power, may very well be run through in a finite time. I ſet down his anſwer with the perſpicuity which the Conimbrian commentaries have given it. 'Huic rationi ſatisfactum ab ſe jam ante Ariſtoteles ait, videlicet cum hoc libro docuit infinitum ſectione, quod non actu, ſed poteſtate infinitum eſt, tempore finito decurri poſſe. Enimvero cùm tempus continuum ſit, parique modo infinitum, eodem infinitatis jure, eiſdemque partium diviſionibus ſibi mutuò reſpondebunt tempus & magnitudo. Nec contra naturam talis infiniti eſt hoc modo pertranſiri (51). - - - *Ariſtotle ſays that he has already anſwered this objection, having ſhewn in this book, that a body infinite in diviſion, that is, not actually, but virtually ſo, may be run over in a finite time. For as time hath a continuity of parts, which are infinite in the ſame manner as the parts of body are infinite, time and body will anſwer to one another by the ſame laws of infinity, and in the ſame diviſion of their parts. Nor is it againſt the nature of ſuch infinite that body ſhould be thus run over.*' You have here two particulars: I. That each part of time is diviſible *in infinitum*; which is invincibly refuted above. II. That a body is only virtually infinite. Which ſignifies that the infinity of a foot of matter, conſiſts in this, that it may be divided without end into ſmaller parts, but not in its actually undergoing that diviſion. To urge this, is to impoſe on the world; for if matter is diviſible *in infinitum*, it actually contains an infinite number of parts, and is not therefore an infinite in power, but an infinite which really and actually exiſts. The continuity of parts doth not hinder their actual diſtinction; conſequently their actual infinity doth not depend on the diviſion; but it ſubſiſts equally in a cloſe quantity, and in that which is called *diſcrete*. But if we ſhould grant this infinity in power, which by the actual diviſion of its parts, would become an actual infinite, we ſhould not loſe any ground, for motion hath the ſame virtue as diviſion. It touches one part of the ſpace without touching the other, and touches them all one after another; is not this actually to diſtinguiſh them? Is not this to do the very ſame thing which a Geometrician performs on a table, when he draws lines which mark out all the half inches? He doth not break the table into half inches, but makes a diviſion which expreſſes the actual diſtinction of parts: and I do not believe that Ariſtotle would have denied, that if an infinity of lines was drawn on an inch of matter, it would introduce a diviſion which ſhould reduce that to an actual infinity, which, according to him, was only virtually ſo. Bnt what would be done, with reſpect to the eyes, by drawing lines on an inch of matter, is certainly done with reſpect to the underſtanding by motion. This may be confirmed by what the Geometricians ſay concerning the production of lines and ſurfaces. 'Mathematici ut nobis inculcent veram lineæ intelligentiam, imaginantur punctum . . . . . è loco in locum moveri: cum enim punctum ſit prorſus individuum relinquetur ex iſto motu imaginario veſtigium quoddam longum expers latitudinis . . . . . . Mathematici ut nobis ſuperficiem ob oculos ponant, monent ut intelligamus lineam aliquam in tranſverſum moveri, veſtigium enim relictum &c (52). - - - *The Mathematicians, in order to give us a clear idea of a line, imagine a point . . . . to move from one place to another, for as a point is indiviſible, that imaginary motion would leave a certain long trace without any breadth. . . . . . The Mathematicians in order to repreſent to us a ſurface, deſire us to imagine any line moving acroſs from one place to another, and the trace which that motion leaves, is a ſurface.*' We conceive that a body which moves by ſucceſſively touching the parts of ſpace, doth determine them as effectually as the chalk in the hand. But beſides, when it may be ſaid that the diviſion of an infinite is ended, is there not then an actual infinite? Do not Ariſtotle and his followers aſſert, that an hour contains an infinity of parts? Wherefore when it is paſt, it muſt be owned that an infinity of parts have actually exiſted one after another. Is this a virtual, and not an actual, infinity? Let us then ſay that this diſtinction is null, and that Zeno's objection remains in full force. An hour, a year, or an age, &c. are each a finite time: A foot of matter is an infinite ſpace; and therefore there is no body in motion that can ever reach from the beginning of a foot to the end of it. We ſhall ſee in the following remark, whether this objection may be eluded, by ſuppoſing that the parts of a foot of matter are not infinite. Let us content our ſelves in this place with obſerving, that the ſubterfuge of the infinity of the parts of time is of no ſervice; for if there were in an hour an infinity of parts, it could never either begin or end. All its parts muſt exiſt ſeparately; any two of them never do, nor can exiſt together: they muſt then be comprized between a firſt and laſt unity, which is incompatible with an infinite number.

(51) Conimbricenſes, in Ariſtot. Phyſic. *lib. vi, cap. ix, pag. m.* 147, 148.

(52) Clavius in Euclid. *lib. i, num.* 2, & 5.

The third objection was the famous argument called Achilles (53). Zeno of Elea was the inventer of it, if we believe Diogenes Laërtius, who tells us nevertheleſs that Phavorinus aſcribed it to Parmenides, and to ſeveral others. Οὗτος καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα πρῶτος λόγον ἠρώτησε· Φαβωρῖνος δέ φησι Παρμενίδην, καὶ ἄλλους συχνούς. *Hic & Achillea primus oratione argumentatus eſt; quamvis Phavorinus Parmenidem & alios complures profert* (54). This objection hath the ſame foundation with the ſecond, but it is more adapted to the declamatory ſtile. It tends to ſhew that the ſwifteſt body in motion purſuing the ſloweſt, can never reach it. Γίνεται δὲ παρὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ διχοτομίᾳ

(53) See, the article ACHILLES, remark [*L*].

(54) Diogen. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 19.

below [G], ſome of which are againſt the exiſtence of extenſion, and ſeem much ſtronger than

χοτομία. ἐν ἀμφοτέροις γὰρ συμβαίνει μὴ ἀφικνεῖσθαι πρὸς τὸ πέρας, διαιρουμένου πῶς τοῦ μεγέθους. ἀλλὰ πρόσκειται ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ τάχιστον τετραγῳδημένον ἐν τῷ διώκειν τὸ βραδύτερον. ὥστ ἀνάγκη καὶ τὴν λύσιν εἶναι τὴν αὐτήν. *Ob idem autem evenit atque in diviſione in dimidia. Nam in utraque accidit, ut ad finem non perveniatur, quoquo modo magnitudine diviſa. Sed in hac additur ne illud quidem, quod celerrimum eſt, (quod tragicè prolatum eſt) id quod tardiſſimum eſt attingere perſequendo. Quamobrem ſolutio eadem ſit neceſſe eſt* (55). Suppoſe a tortoiſe to be twenty paces before Achilles, and limit the ſwiftneſs of the hero in proportion to that of the tortoiſe as one to twenty. Whilſt he advances twenty paces, the tortoiſe advances one: ſhe will then be before him ſtill. Whilſt he proceeds to the twenty-firſt pace, ſhe will gain the twentieth part of the twenty-ſecond, and while he gains this twentieth part, ſhe will go through the twentieth part of the twenty-firſt part, and ſo on. Ariſtotle refers us to what he ſays in anſwer to the ſecond objection: and we may refer him to our reply. See alſo what ſhall be ſaid in the following remark, concerning the difficulty of explaining wherein conſiſts the ſwiftneſs of motion.

I proceed to the fourth objection, which ſhews the contradictions of motion. Suppoſe a table of four ells, and take alſo two bodies of the ſame meaſure, one of wood, and the other of ſtone (56). Let the table be immovably fixed, and bear the piece of wood according to the length of two ells weſtward, and ſuppoſe the piece of ſtone placed to the eaſt, and only to touch the edge of the table. Suppoſe it to move on the table weſtward, and that in half an hour it goes the length of two ells; it will become contiguous to the piece of wood. Suppoſe that they touch one another only by their edges, and in ſuch a manner, that the motion of the one towards the weſt doth not hinder the motion of the other to the eaſt. At the moment of their contiguity, let the piece of wood begin to tend towards the eaſt, whilſt the other continues to tend towards the weſt; let them move with equal velocity. In half an hour the piece of ſtone will finiſh it's courſe over all the table; and ſo it will move through a ſpace of four ells, the whole length of the table, in an hour. But the piece of wood will run through the ſame ſpace of four ells in half an hour, by reaſon that it touched the whole extent of the piece of ſtone by the edges: therefore it is true that two bodies moving with an equal ſwiftneſs go through the ſame ſpace, one in half an hour, and the other in an hour: and therefore an hour and half an hour are equal times; which is contradictory. Ariſtotle ſaith, that this is a ſophiſm, ſince one of thoſe moving bodies is conſidered in reference to a ſpace which continues at reſt, meaning the table, and the other with reſpect to a ſpace in motion, meaning the piece of ſtone. I own he is in the right to obſerve that difference, but this doth not remove the difficulty; for a thing, which ſeems incomprehenſible, remains ſtill to be explained, that is, that a piece of wood ſhould at the ſame time move four ells on it's ſouth-ſide, and but two on it's inferior ſurface. But I ſhall illuſtrate this with a clearer inſtance. Suppoſe two books in folio of equal length, as two feet each. Place them on a table one before the other; move them at the ſame time one above the other, one towards the eaſt, and the other towards the weſt, till the eaſtern edge of the one, and the weſtern edge of the other touch one another: and you will find that the edges by which they did touch one another, are now four feet diſtant from each other; and yet each of the books hath moved but the ſpace of two feet. You may ſtrengthen the objection by ſuppoſing whatſoever body you pleaſe in motion, in the midſt of ſeveral others, which are moving ſeveral ways, and in various degrees of ſwiftneſs; you will find that the ſame body will in the ſame time run through ſeveral ſorts of ſpace, double, triple, &c. to one another: conſider well of it, and you will find that this is only explicable by Arithmetical calculations, which are only the idea of our mind; but that thing doth not ſeem practicable in the bodies themſelves (57). For we ought to remember theſe three eſſential properties of motion. 1. It is impoſſible for a body in motion to touch the ſame part of a ſpace twice ſucceſſively. 2. It never can touch two of them at once. 3. It never can touch the third before the ſecond, nor the fourth before the third, &c. He who can Phyſically reconcile theſe three particulars with the diſtance of four feet betwixt two bodies, which have run through no more than the ſpace of two feet (58), muſt be no ignorant perſon. Obſerve, that theſe three properties are as neceſſarily requiſite to a body which goes over ſpaces, whoſe motion is contrary to it's own, as to one which paſſes through ſpaces where it meets with no reſiſtance.

[G] *The ſame I ſhall mention below.*] I am apt to think that thoſe who would revive Zeno's opinion, ought to argue thus.

OBJECTIONS againſt the exiſtence of extenſion.

I. There is no extenſion, therefore there is no motion. The conſequence is good, for what hath no extenſion fills no ſpace, and what fills no ſpace cannot poſſibly paſs from one place to another, and conſequently move. This is inconteſtable: the difficulty is then to prove that there is no extenſion. Zeno might have argued thus: Extenſion cannot be compoſed either of Mathematical points, or of atoms, or of parts diviſible *in infinitum*; therefore it's exiſtence is impoſſible. The conſequence ſeems certain, by reaſon it is impoſſible to conceive more than theſe three modes of compoſition in extenſion; wherefore the antecedent alone remains to be proved. A few words ſhall ſuffice as to Mathematical points; for a man of the meaneſt capacity may apprehend with the utmoſt evidence, if he is but a little attentive, that ſeveral nothingneſſes of extenſion joined together will never make an extenſion (59). Conſult the firſt body of ſcholaſtical Philoſophy that comes to hand, and you will there find the moſt convincing reaſons, ſupported by many Geometrical demonſtrations, againſt the exiſtence of theſe points (60). Wherefore to ſay no more on that head, let us take it to be impoſſible, or at leaſt inconceivable, that matter ſhould be compoſed of them. Nor is it leſs impoſſible or inconceivable that it ſhould be compoſed of the Epicurean atoms, that is, of extended and indiviſible corpuſcles; for every extenſion, how ſmall ſoever, hath a right and left ſide, an upper and lower ſide: therefore it is a conjunction of diſtinct bodies; and I may deny of the right ſide what I affirm of the left, for theſe two ſides are not in the ſame place: a body cannot be in two places at once; and conſequently every extenſion which fills ſeveral parts of ſpace contains ſeveral bodies. I know beſides, and the Atomiſts do not deny it, that becauſe two atoms are two beings, they are ſeparable from one another: whence I conclude, with the utmoſt certainty, that ſince the right ſide of an atom is not the ſame being with the left ſide, it is ſeparable from the left; and therefore the indiviſibility of an atom is meerly chimerical. Whence it follows that if there be an extenſion, it's parts are diviſible *in infinitum*. But on the other ſide, if they cannot be diviſible *in infinitum*, we ought to conclude the exiſtence of extenſion impoſſible, or at leaſt incomprehenſible.

The diviſibility *in infinitum* is an opinion embraced by Ariſtotle, and almoſt all the profeſſors of Philoſophy, in all univerſities for ſeveral ages. Not that they underſtand it, or can anſwer the objections it is liable to; but becauſe having clearly apprehended the impoſſibility of either Mathematical or Phyſical points, they found no other courſe but this to take. Beſides, this opinion affords great conveniencies: for when their diſtinctions are exhauſted, without being able to render this doctrine comprehenſible, they ſhelter themſelves in the nature of the ſubject, and alledge, that our underſtandings being limited, none ought to be ſurprized that they cannot reſolve what relates to infinity, and that it is eſſential to ſuch a continuity to be liable to ſuch difficulties as are inſurmountable by human reaſon. Obſerve that thoſe who eſpouſe the hypotheſis of atoms, do not do it, becauſe they comprehend that an extended body may be ſimple, but becauſe they believe the two other hypotheſes to be impoſſible. We may ſay the ſame thing of thoſe who admit of Mathematical points. In general, all thoſe who argue on extenſion, are determined in their choice of an hypotheſis no otherwiſe than by the following principle: *If there are but three ways of explaining a ſubject, the truth of the third neceſſarily reſults from the falſity of the other two.* Whence, they do not believe themſelves miſtaken in the choice of

(55) Ariſtot. ubi ſupra.

(56) Another matter would be as proper, wood and ſtone being here uſed only for an inſtance.

(57) The ſame difficulties may be raiſed from the ſmall wheels of a coach, running over as much ground as the great ones, in the ſame number of rotations about their center. The ſame thing may be ſaid of a very ſmall wheel and a very large one fixed to one and the ſame axis.

(58) For inſtance, the two folio books above mentioned.

(59) See the Art of Thinking, *Part. iv, ch. i, pag. m.* 392, and the remark [*D*], of the following article towards the end.

(60) See among others, a book of Libertus Fromondus, Profeſſor at Louvain, intituled *Labyrinthus ſeu de compoſitione continui.* It is a much ſtronger book than the anſwer which James Chevreuil (in Latin *Capreolus*) Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Paris, made in the year 1630, to two queſtions of Cardinal de Richelieu, *de demonſtratione magnitudinis in puncto*, &c.

than all the reaſons which the Carteſians can alledge. I mean ſome Carteſians, who publickly

of the third, when they are clearly convinced that the two others are impoſſible; and accordingly the impenetrable difficulties of the third do not ſtop them in the leaſt: they comfort themſelves with this conſideration that they may be retorted, or with a perſuaſion that after all this hypotheſis is true, becauſe the other two are not ſo. The ſubtle Arriaga having propoſed an unanſwerable objection, declares that he will not therefore change his opinion; for, ſaith he, other ſects cannot reſolve it better. ‘Video hæc adhuc urgeri argumento ſupra facto, quod à nemine vidi ſolutum, ſed nec illud ſolvere præſumo: cùm autem commune ſit omnibus ſententiis de continui compoſitione, non eſt cur propter illud aliquis à propria ſententia diſcedat (61). . . . . Quòd autem alia in ſententia Ariſtotelis difficilia valdè ſint, & quæ à nobis ſolvi non poſſint, non cogit nos hanc ſententiam deſerere: materiæ enim difficultas eſt talis, ut ubique aliqua nobis inexplicabilia occurrant. Malo autem apertè fateri me ignorare ſolutionem aliquorum argumentorum, quàm eam dare quæ forte à nemine intelligatur (62). - - - *I ſee theſe objections are ſtill urged in the foregoing argument: I have met with no perſon who could ſolve them; neither do I preſume to do it. But as all opinions concerning the compoſition of continuity are liable to unanſwerable objections, a man has no reaſon, upon that account, to depart from his own opinion. . . . Tho' there are other great difficulties in this opinion of Ariſtotle, and ſuch as we cannot ſolve, yet that doth not oblige us to renounce it: for ſo many difficulties occur on that ſubject, that ſome things are inexplicable to us every where. But I would rather own that I know not how to ſolve an objection, than to give ſuch a ſolution of it, as, perhaps, no body could underſtand.*’

A Zenoniſt might tell thoſe who chuſe one of theſe three hypotheſes; you do not argue right, you make uſe of this disjunctive ſyllogiſm.

Matter is compoſed either of Mathematical points, or Phyſical points, or of parts diviſible *in infinitum*.

But it is not compoſed of . . . nor of (63) . . .

Therefore it is compoſed of . . . . The fault of your argumentation lies not in the form, but in the matter: you ought to lay aſide your disjunctive ſyllogiſm, and make uſe of this hypothetical one.

If extenſion exiſted, it would be compoſed either of Mathematical points, or of Phyſical points, or of parts diviſible *in infinitum*.

But it is not compoſed either of Mathematical points, or of Phyſical points, or of parts diviſible *in infinitum*.

Therefore it doth not exiſt.

There is no fault in the form of this ſyllogiſm; the ſophiſm *à non ſufficienti enumeratione partium* is not in the major; the conſequence is therefore neceſſary, provided the minor be true. To be clearly ſatisfied of the truth of the minor, we need only conſider the arguments which thoſe three ſects alledge one againſt another, and compare them with their reſpective anſwers. When each of thoſe three ſects makes the attack, it overthrows, ſubdues, and triumphs; but when it is on the defenſive, it is utterly overthrown and confounded in it's turn. To be convinced of their weakneſs, it is enough to remember that the ſtrongeſt of them, that which beſt diſputes the ground, is the hypotheſis of the diviſibility *in infinitum*. The ſchool-men have armed it *cap-à-pee* with all the diſtinctions which their great leiſure would allow them to invent: But all this only ſerves to afford their ſcholars matter for talk upon a public diſputation, that their relations may not ſuffer the diſgrace of ſeeing them mute. A father or a brother go away better ſatisfied, when the ſcholar diſtinguiſhes betwixt a *categorematical* infinite, and a *ſyncategorematical* one, betwixt the parts *communicantes, & non communicantes, proportional* and *aliquot*, than if he had anſwered nothing. It was therefore neceſſary for the Profeſſors to invent ſome jargon; but all the pains which they have taken, will never be able to obſcure this notion which is as clear and evident as the ſun: *An infinite number of parts of extenſion, each of which is extended, and diſtinct from all others, as well with reſpect to it's entity, as with reſpect to the ſpace it fills, cannot be contained in a ſpace one hundred thouſand millions of times leſs than the hundred thouſandth part of a barley corn.*

Diviſibility *in infinitum* would hinder all manner of contiguity.

Here is another difficulty. An extended ſubſtance, if it did exiſt, muſt neceſſarily admit of an immediate contact of it's parts. According to the hypotheſis of a vacuum, ſeveral bodies would be ſeparated from all others, but ſeveral others muſt immediately touch. Ariſtotle, who denied this hypotheſis, is obliged to own that there is no part of extenſion which doth not immediately touch ſome other parts in all it's exterior points. This is incompatible with the diviſibility *in infinitum*; for if there be no body but what contains an infinity of parts, it is evident that each particular part of extenſion is ſeparated from all others by an infinity of parts, and that the immediate contact of two parts is impoſſible. But when a thing cannot have whatever is abſolutely neceſſary to it's exiſtence, it is certain that it's exiſtence is impoſſible: wherefore the exiſtence of extenſion neceſſarily requiring the immediate contact of it's parts, and that immediate contact being impoſſible in an extenſion diviſible *in infinitum*, it is evident that the exiſtence of ſuch an extenſion is impoſſible, and that this extenſion barely exiſts in the mind. What the Mathematicians acknowledge with reſpect to lines and ſuperficies, with which they demonſtrate ſo many excellent things, muſt be owned to be true with reſpect to bodies. They honeſtly own (64) that length and breadth without depth, are things which cannot exiſt any where but in our imagination. Let us ſay the ſame thing of the three dimenſions. They cannot ſubſiſt any where but in our minds; they cannot exiſt any other way than ideally. Our mind is a kind of ground, where a hundred thouſand objects of different colours, figures, and ſituation unite: for from an eminence we may ſee at once a vaſt plain covered with houſes, trees, and flocks, &c. Whilſt it is ſo far from truth, that all theſe things can poſſibly be ranged in this plain, that there are not two which can find room there; each would require an infinite ſpace, ſince it contains an infinity of extended bodies. There ſhould be infinite intervals left round each one, by reaſon that there is an infinity of bodies betwixt each part, and every other part (65). Let it not be ſaid that GOD can do every thing; for if the moſt religious Divines venture to ſay, that in a right line of twelve inches, he cannot render the firſt and third inches immediately contiguous, I may very well ſay that he cannot make two parts of extenſion immediately touch one another, when an infinity of other parts ſeparate them from one another. Let us therefore ſay that the contact of the parts of matter is only ideal; and that the extremities of ſeveral bodies no where unite but in our mind.

Diviſibility *in infinitum* would occaſion the penetration of dimenſions.

I ſhall now make a quite contrary objection. The penetration of dimenſions is impoſſible, and yet it would be inevitable, if extenſion ſhould exiſt; therefore the exiſtence of extenſion is impoſſible. Put a cannon bullet upon a table, a bullet, I ſay, covered over with ſome liquid colour, make it roll upon the table, and it will trace out a line by its motion: you will then have two ſtrong proofs of the immediate contact of the bullet and table. The weight of the bullet will ſhew you that it immediately touches the table; for if it did not touch it in this manner, it would remain ſuſpended in the air, and your eyes will, beſides, convince you of this contact by the track which the bullet hath left. Now I maintain that this contact is a penetration of dimenſions properly ſo called. That part of the bullet which touches the table is a determinate body, and really diſtinct from the other parts of the bullet which do not touch the table. I affirm the ſame thing of that part of the table touched by the bullet. Theſe two parts touched are each of them infinitely diviſible in length, breadth, and profundity; they muſt therefore mutually touch one another according to their profundity, and conſequently they penetrate one another. This is every day objected to the Peripatetics in their public diſputes: they defend themſelves by a jargon of diſtinctions, proper for no other uſe than preventing the diſpleaſure of a ſcholar's relations, if they ſhould ſee him ſilenced; and as for the farther uſe of theſe diſtinctions they have never ſerved to any other purpoſe than to make it appear that the objection is unanſwerable. Here is

(61) Arriaga, Diſput. XVI, Phyſ. §. *xi*, *num.* 241, *pag. m.* 433.

(62) Id. ibid. §. *xii*, *num.* 256, *pag. m.* 435.

(63) For brevity ſake, I do not expreſs the rejection or the admiſſion: for according to the laws of Logic, one may proceed here from the rejection of the two parts whatſoever to the admiſſion of the third.

(64) Compare with this what is ſaid towards the end of the remark [*D*], in the following article.

(65) This ought to be underſtood with the clauſe *diſtributive ſumpta*.

publickly aſſert, even in countries where the Inquiſition prevails, that it is impoſſible to know

is therefore a very ſingular thing: if extenſion exiſted, it would not be poſſible for its parts to touch one another, and it would be impoſſible that they ſhould not penetrate one another. Are not theſe moſt evident contradictions in the exiſtence of extenſion?

THE means of ſuſpenſion made uſe of againſt the exiſtence of extenſion.

Add to this, that all the *ways of ſuſpenſion* which deſtroy the reality of corporeal qualities, overthrows the reality of extenſion. Since the ſame bodies are ſweet to ſome men, and bitter to others, it may reaſonably be inferred that they are neither ſweet nor bitter in their own nature, and abſolutely ſpeaking. The modern Philoſophers, though they are no Sceptics, have ſo well apprehended the foundation of the epoch with relation to ſounds, odours, heat, and cold, hardneſs, and ſoftneſs, ponderoſity, and lightneſs, ſavours, and colours, &c. that they teach that all theſe qualities are perceptions of our mind, and do not exiſt in the objects of our ſenſes. Why ſhould we not ſay the ſame thing of extenſion? If a being, void of colour, yet appears to us under a colour determined as to its ſpecies, figure, and ſituation, why cannot a being, without any extenſion, be viſible to us, under an appearance of determinate extenſion, ſhaped, and ſituate in a certain manner? Obſerve alſo, that the ſame body appears to us little or great, round or ſquare, according to the place from whence we view it: and certainly, a body which ſeems to us very little, appears very great to a fly. It is not therefore by their proper, real, or abſolute extenſion that objects preſent themſelves to our mind: whence we may conclude, that in themſelves they are not extended. Would you at this day argue thus: *Since certain bodies appear ſweet to one man, ſowre to another, and bitter to another*, &c. *I muſt affirm, that in general they are ſavoury, though I do not know the ſavour proper to them, abſolutely, and in themſelves?* All the modern Philoſophers would explode you. Why then would you venture to ſay, *ſince certain bodies appear great to this animal, middle ſized to that, and very little to a third, I muſt affirm, that in general they are extended, though I do not know their abſolute extenſion?* Let us ſee what a celebrated Dogmatiſt acknowledges (66): 'It is clearly diſcernible by the ſenſes, that ſuch a body is larger than another; but we cannot certainly know what is the true and natural ſize of each body; to comprehend which we need only conſider, that if all mankind had never ſeen external objects any otherwiſe than through magnifying glaſſes, it is certain that they would not have formed any other idea of bodies, and all the meaſures of body, than according to the ſize in which they had appeared to them through thoſe glaſſes. But our eyes themſelves are optic glaſſes, and we do not know exactly whether they diminiſh or increaſe the objects which we ſee, and whether thoſe artificial glaſſes, which, as we believe, diminiſh or increaſe them, do not on the contrary reſtore them to their true magnitude; wherefore we do not certainly know the abſolute and natural magnitude of each body. Neither do we know whether they appear of the ſame ſize in our eyes as in thoſe of other men: for though two perſons meaſure them, and agree that a certain body, for inſtance, is but five feet; yet what the one conceives to be a foot, differs perhaps from what the other takes to be ſo; for the one conceives what his eyes report to him, as doth the other alſo; but perhaps the eyes of the one do not report the ſame thing which the eyes of the other repreſent, becauſe the optic glaſſes are differently made.' Father Mallebranche (67), and Father Lami (68), a Benedictine Monk, will give you an excellent account of all theſe particulars, which is capable of carrying my objection to a very great degree of ſtrength.

GEOMETRICAL demonſtrations alledged againſt the exiſtence of extenſion.

My laſt difficulty ſhall be grounded on the geometrical demonſtrations ſo ſubtilly diſplayed, to prove that matter is diviſible *in infinitum*. I maintain they ſerve for no other uſe than to make it appear, that extenſion doth not exiſt any where but in our minds. In the firſt place I obſerve, that ſome of theſe demonſtrations are employed againſt thoſe who affirm that matter is compoſed of Mathematical points. It is objected to them, that the ſides of a ſquare would be equal to the diagonal, and that amongſt concentrical circles, the leaſt would be equal to the largeſt. This conſequence is proved by making it appear that the right lines which may be drawn from one of the ſides of a ſquare to another will fill the diagonal, and that all the right lines which may be drawn from the circumference of the largeſt circle, will find room in the ſmalleſt circumference. Theſe objections are not ſtronger againſt bodies being compoſed of points, than againſt their being diviſible *in infinitum*; for if the parts of a certain extenſion are not more numerous in the diagonal line, than in the ſides, nor in the circumference of the largeſt circle, than in that of the ſmalleſt concentrical circle, it is clear that the ſides of the ſquare equal the diagonal, and that the ſmalleſt concentrical circle equals the greateſt. But all the right lines which can be drawn from one ſide of a ſquare to another, and from the circumference of the largeſt circle to the center, are equal to each other: they ought then to be conſidered as *aliquot* parts; that is, as parts of a certain magnitude, and of the ſame denomination. Now it is certain that two extenſions, whereof the *aliquot* parts and of the ſame denomination, as *inch*, *foot*, *pace*, are in equal number, do not exceed one another: it is therefore certain that the ſides of the ſquare would be as large as the diagonal line, if the diagonal line cannot be interſected by more right lines than the ſides. The ſame thing may be ſaid of two concentrical circles. In the ſecond place I affirm, that it being very true that if circles did exiſt, as many right lines might be drawn from the circumference to the center, as there are parts in the circumference, it follows that the exiſtence of a circle is impoſſible. I am perſuaded it will be allowed me that every being which cannot exiſt, without containing properties which cannot exiſt, is impoſſible: but a round extenſion cannot exiſt, without having a center, in which there meet as many right lines as there are parts in the circumference; and it is certain that ſuch a center cannot exiſt: it muſt then be owned that the exiſtence of this round extenſion is impoſſible. But that ſuch a center cannot exiſt, I ſhall clearly prove. Let us ſuppoſe a round extenſion, whoſe circumference is four feet; it then contains forty-eight inches, each of which contains twelves lines; the circumference will then contain five hundred and ſeventy-ſix lines; which is the number of the right lines that may be drawn from the circumference to the center. Let us trace a circle very near the center; it may be ſo ſmall that it will not contain above fifty lines; it cannot then give paſſage to five hundred and ſeventy-ſix right lines; therefore it will be impoſſible for theſe five hundred and ſeventy-ſix right lines begun to be drawn from the circumference of this round extenſion to reach the center: and yet if this extenſion exiſts, theſe five hundred and ſeventy-ſix lines muſt of neceſſity reach the center. What remains then to be ſaid, but only that this extenſion cannot exiſt, and that accordingly all the properties of circles and ſquares, &c. are founded on lines without breadth, which cannot exiſt otherwiſe than *ideally*? Obſerve, that our reaſon and our eyes are equally deceived in this caſe. Our reaſon clearly conceives; I. That the concentrical circle neareſt the center is leſs than the circle which encompaſſes it: II. That the diagonal of a ſquare is larger than the ſide. Our eyes ſee this without compaſſes, and more clearly with compaſſes; and yet the Mathematicians teach us, that as many right lines may be drawn from the circumference to the center as there are points in the circumference, and that from one ſide of a ſquare to the other as many right lines may be drawn as there are points in the ſide. And beſides, our eyes ſhew us that there is not in the circumference of the ſmall concentrical circle any one point, which is not a part of a right line, drawn from the circumference of the great circle, and that the diagonal of the ſquare contains no one point that is not a part of a right line drawn from one of the ſides of the ſquare to another. Whence then can it proceed that this diagonal is greater than the ſides?

This is what relates to the firſt proof, which I ſuppoſe Zeno might have made uſe of to refute the exiſtence of motion. It is founded on the impoſſibility of the exiſtence of extenſion. We ſhall ſee, below (69), another

another

(66) Nicolle, Art de penſer, *Part. iv, ch. i, pag. m.* 387, 388. *See alſo* Rohault, Traité de Phyſique, *Part. i, chap. xxvii, num.* 6, *pag. m.* 293, *where he mentions the various appearances of the ſame colours; he knew it by experience.*

(67) Mallebranche, Recherche de la Vérité, *livr. i, ch. vi, & ſeq.*

(68) Lami, Connoiſſance de ſoi-même, *Tom. ii, pag.* 112, *& ſeq.*

(69) In the remark [*I*].

know that there are bodies, any otherwiſe than by faith: our ſenſes deceive us, ſay they, with reſpect to the qualities of matter, wherefore we ought to diſtruſt their evidence concerning the three dimenſions. It is not neceſſary, add they, that any bodies ſhould exiſt; for God can without that communicate to our mind whatever it feels, and whatever it

another reaſon for the ſame impoſſibility. I am willing to believe that what he might have ſaid in the laſt place, by making uſe of Geometrical demonſtrations, is eaſy to be refuted by the ſame means; but I am ſtrongly convinced that the arguments taken from the Mathematics (70) to prove the diviſibility *in infinitum*, prove too much: for either they prove nothing, or they prove an infinity of *aliquot* parts.

II. Zeno's ſecond objection might have been this. Granting that there is an extenſion which is not merely ideal, but really exiſts (71), yet I ſay that it is immovable, motion is not eſſential to it, nor contained in the idea of it, and ſeveral bodies are ſometimes in a ſtate of reſt. Motion is therefore an accident. But is it diſtinct from matter? If it be diſtinct, of what muſt it be produced? Doubtleſs of nothing; and when it ceaſes to be, it will be reduced to nothing. But do not you know that nothing is made out of nothing, and that nothing returns to nothing (72): Beſides, muſt not motion neceſſarily be diffuſed on, and through, the body that is moved? The former will therefore be as much extended as the latter, and of the ſame figure; there will therefore be two equal extenſions in the ſame ſpace, and conſequently a penetration of dimenſions. But when three or four cauſes move one body, muſt not each of them produce its motion? Muſt not theſe three or four motions be penetrated together, both with the body, and amongſt themſelves? How then can each produce its effect? A veſſel moved by the winds, tide, and rowers, deſcribes a line which partakes more or leſs of theſe three actions, according as one of them is ſtronger than the others. Will you venture to affirm that inſenſible entities penetrated amongſt themſelves, and with the whole veſſel, will have ſuch a regard for one another as not to thwart themſelves? If you ſay that motion is a mode which is not diſtinct from matter, you muſt then allow that whatever produces it, creates matter; for without producing of matter, it is impoſſible to produce a being which is the ſame thing with matter. But would it not be abſurd to aſſert, that the wind which moves the veſſel, produces a veſſel? It doth not appear that theſe objections can be any otherwiſe anſwered than by ſuppoſing with the Carteſians, that God is the ſole and immediate cauſe of motion.

III. Here is another objection. It is impoſſible to affirm what motion is; for if you ſay that it is to paſs from one place to another (73); you explain one obſcurity by a greater, *obſcurum per obſcurius*. I immediately aſk what you mean by the word *place?* Do you mean a ſpace diſtinct from bodies? If ſo, you will involve your ſelf in a labyrinth from which you will never be able to get out (74). Do you mean by it the ſituation of a body, among ſome others which ſurround it? But in this caſe you will define motion in ſuch a manner, that it will a thouſand and a thouſand times ſuit with bodies that are at reſt. It is certain that hitherto the true definition of motion hath not been found. That of Ariſtotle is abſurd, and that of Des Cartes is wretched. Mr Rohault, after much pains in endeavouring to find one which might rectify that of Des Cartes, produces a deſcription which may agree with bodies, of which we conceive very diſtinctly, that they do not move at all (75); wherefore Mr Regis thought himſelf obliged to reject it (76). But that which he hath given is not capable of diſtinguiſhing motion from reſt (77). God, the only mover, according to the Carteſians, muſt do with reſpect to a houſe, the ſame thing as with reſpect to the air, which flies from it in a high wind: he muſt create the air every moment with new local relations, with reſpect to that houſe: and he muſt alſo every moment create that houſe with new local relations with reſpect to that air. And certainly according to the principles of theſe gentlemen, no body is at reſt, if an inch of matter is in motion. All then that they can ſay centers in explaining apparent motion, that is, explaining thoſe circumſtances which make us judge that one body moves, and another doth not. But all this is uſeleſs labour; every one is capable of judging of appearances. The queſtion is to explain the very nature of things which exiſt independently of our minds; and ſince in that reſpect motion is inexplicable, one had as good ſay that it doth not exiſt but in our minds.

IV. I ſhall now offer an objection very much ſtronger than the foregoing. If motion can never begin, it doth not exiſt; but it is impoſſible for it ever to begin; therefore, &c. I prove the minor thus. It is impoſſible for a body to be in two places at once: but it could never begin to move without being in an infinity of places at once; for though it advance ever ſo ſlowly, it would touch a part diviſible *in infinitum*, and which conſequently correſponds with infinite parts of ſpace; therefore, &c. Beſides, it is certain that an infinite number of parts doth not contain any which is firſt; and yet a body in motion can never touch the ſecond before the firſt: for motion is a being eſſentially ſucceſſive, of which two parts cannot exiſt together: wherefore motion can never begin, if matter is diviſible *in infinitum*, as doubtleſs it is if it exiſts. The ſame reaſon demonſtrates that a body in motion, rolling on a ſloping table, could never fall off the ſaid table; for before it falls, it muſt of neceſſity touch the laſt part of the table. And how will it touch that, ſince all thoſe parts which you will pretend to be the laſt, contain an infinity of parts, and an infinite number hath no part which can be laſt? This objection obliged ſome ſcholaſtic Philoſophers to ſuppoſe, that nature hath intermixed Mathematical points with the parts diviſible *in infinitum*, to the end that they may ſerve to connect them, and compoſe the extremities of bodies. They thought by that means to anſwer alſo the objection of the penetrative contact of two ſurfaces: but this evaſion is ſo abſurd, that it doth not deſerve to be refuted.

V. I ſhall not much inſiſt on the impoſſibility of circular motion, though that would ſupply me with a ſtrong objection. I ſay only in one word, that if there was a circular motion, there would be a whole diameter at reſt (78), whilſt all the remainder of the globe moved very ſwiftly. But conceive this if you can in matter. The Chevalier de Meré did not forget this objection in his letter to Mr Paſcal (79).

VI. Laſtly, I ſay that if motion exiſted, it would be equal in all bodies; there would be no Achilles's nor tortoiſes; the hound would never reach the hare. Zeno objected this (80); but it ſeems he went only upon the diviſibility of matter *in infinitum*; and perhaps, ſome will ſay, he would have ſet aſide that objection, if he had dealt with adverſaries who admitted either Mathematical points or atoms. I anſwer, that this objection equally ſtrikes at all the three ſyſtems: for ſuppoſe a road compoſed of indiviſible particles; place the tortoiſe in it one hundred points before Achilles, and if ſhe goes on, he will never reach her: Achilles will go but one point every moment, ſince if he went two he would be in two places at the ſame time. The tortoiſe will advance one point each moment: which is the leaſt ſhe can do, nothing being leſs than a point (81). The true reaſon of the ſwiftneſs of motion is inexplicable: the moſt happy thought on this head is, that no motion is continued, and that all thoſe bodies which ſeem to us to move, ſtop by intervals. That which moves ten times faſter than another, reſts ten times to the others hundred. But however well contrived this ſubterfuge appears, it is of no uſe; it is confuted by ſeveral ſolid reaſons which you may ſee in all the bodies of Philoſophy (82). I content my ſelf with that which is drawn from the motion of a wheel. You may make a wheel of ſo large a diameter that the part of the ſpokes the fartheſt diſtant from the center will move one hundred times ſwifter than the part fixed in the nave. And yet the ſpokes remain always ſtrait: an evident proof that the lower part doth not reſt, whilſt the upper moves. The diviſibility *in infinitum* of the particles of time, rejected above (83) as viſibly falſe and contradictory, is

(70) There are very fine ones in the Art of Thinking, *Part. iv, ch. i, pag.* 392. See alſo Rohault's Phyſics, *Part. i, chap. ix.*

(71) *Take this for a* dato non conceſſo.

(72) *Zeno might have ſaid it boldly, for all the ancient Philoſophers admitted this maxim of Lucretius,* Res.... non poſſe creari De nihilo, neque item genitas ad nil revocari... *Lucret. lib. i, ver.* 266.

(73) Migratio de loco in locum.

(74) See the remark [*I*].

(75) Motion, ſays he, *Phyſ. Part. i, ch. x, num.* 3, *pag. m.* 62, conſiſts in the ſucceſſive application of all the external parts of a body to the ſeveral parts of the bodies that are immediately near it.

(76) *See his* Phyſics, *book i, Part. i, ch. i, pag.* 42, *of Tom. ii, at Lyons,* 1691, *in* 12*mo.*

(77) Motion, ſays he, *ibid. pag.* 43, is the ſucceſſive active application of all the external parts of a body, to ſeveral parts of the bodies, which immediately touch it.

(78) To wit the axis.

(79) I ſhall ſpeak of this letter, in the remark [*D*], of the following article.

(80) See the third objection of the foregoing remark.

(81) As it is plain that the atoms of Epicurus are diviſible *in infinitum,* ſince they have the three dimenſions, and that no body can deny this as to the ſpace they fill up, I have not applied this objection to them.

(82) See *Arriaga, Diſp. xvi, Phyſic. §. xi.* He follows the hypotheſis of the *morulæ*, or interruptions of motion: he anſwers the objections very ill, and owns that of the wheel to be unanſwerable: Oviedo in his body of Philoſophy, *Tom. i, pag.* 357, & *ſeq.* ſtrives mightily to reſolve it, and believes he has found out a new ſolution of it. *Gordiani nodi nova ſolutio,* ſays he.

(83) In the remark [*F*], firſt objection.

it knows; and conſequently the proofs of the exiſtence of matter which reaſon affords us, are not evident enough to form a good demonſtration on this point [*H*]. As for the objections which may be grounded on the diſtinction of a Plenum and a Vacuum, and which

is of no force againſt this ſixth argument. You will find ſome other very ſubtile objections in Sextus Empiricus (84).

WHAT uſe ought to be made of the foregoing diſpute.

Thus, or in a manner very like it, we may ſuppoſe our Zeno of Elea to have argued againſt motion. I will not affirm that his reaſons perſuaded him that nothing moved; he might be of another opinion, tho' he believed that none could refute them, nor elude their force. If I ſhould judge of him by my ſelf, I ſhould affirm that he as well as other men believed the motion of matter; for though I find my ſelf very incapable of ſolving all the difficulties which we have juſt now ſeen, and though the Philoſophical anſwers which may be made to them do not ſeem to me very ſolid, yet that doth not hinder me from following the common opinion. Nay, I am perſuaded that the propoſing of theſe arguments may be of great uſe with reſpect to religion: and I ſay here with regard to the difficulties of motion, what Mr Nicolle ſaid of thoſe of the diviſibility *in infinitum*. ‘The advantage which may be drawn from theſe ſpeculations is not meerly to acquire this ſort of knowledge, which in it ſelf is very barren; but to learn to know the limits of our underſtanding, and to force it however unwilling to own that ſome things exiſt, though it is not capable of comprehending them: for which reaſon it is proper to fatigue the intellect with theſe ſubtilties, in order to ſubdue its preſumption, and deprive it of the aſſurance of ever oppoſing its faint light to the truths which the church propoſes, under pretext that it cannot comprehend them: for ſince all the force of human underſtanding cannot comprehend the ſmalleſt atom of matter, and is obliged to own that it clearly ſees that ſuch an atom is infinitely diviſible, without being able to conceive how that can be: is it not plain that the man acts againſt reaſon, who refuſes to believe the wonderful effects of God's omnipotence, which is of it ſelf incomprehenſible, becauſe our minds cannot comprehend theſe effects (85).’

[*H*] *The proofs of the exiſtence of matter which reaſon affords us, are not evident enough to form a good demonſtration on this point.*] There are two Philoſophical axioms which teach us, one that nature does nothing in vain (86); the other, that things are done in vain by more means which might have been as commodiouſly done by fewer (87). By theſe two axioms the Carteſians, whom I am ſpeaking of, may maintain that no ſuch thing as matter exiſts; for whether it doth or doth not exiſt, GOD could equally communicate to us all the thoughts which we have. To ſay that our ſenſes aſſure us, with the utmoſt evidence, that matter exiſts, is not proving it. Our ſenſes deceive us with reſpect to all the corporeal qualities, not excepting the magnitude, figure, and motion of bodies (88), and when we believe them, we are perſuaded that out of our mind there exiſts a great number of colours, ſavours, and other beings, which we call hardneſs, fluidity, cold, heat, &c. yet it is not true that any ſuch thing exiſts out of our mind. Why then ſhould we rely on our ſenſes with reſpect to extenſion? It may very well be reduced to appearance in like manner with colours. Father Mallebranche having given all theſe reaſons to doubt of the exiſtence of bodies, concludes thus: ‘It is therefore abſolutely neceſſary, in order to be poſitively aſſured of the extraneous exiſtence of bodies, to know GOD, who makes us ſenſible of them, and to know that being infinitely perfect he cannot deceive us. For if the intelligence which gives us the ideas of all things, would, if I may ſo ſay, divert itſelf by repreſenting bodies to us as actually exiſting, tho' there were none; it is evident that this would be no very difficult thing to it (89)’ He adds, that Mr Des Cartes could find no other immovable foundation, than this reaſon, that GOD would deceive us, if there were no bodies; but he owns that this reaſon cannot paſs for demonſtration. *To be fully convinced of the exiſtence of bodies*, ſaith he (90), *it muſt be demonſtrated to us not only that there is a God, and that God is no deceiver, but alſo that God hath aſſured us that he hath really created bodies: and this I do not find proved in Mr Des Cartes's works. God ſpeaks to the mind, and obliges it to believe only two ways, by evidence and by faith. I grant that faith obliges us to believe that there are bodies; but as for evidence, it is certain that it is not full, and that we are not invincibly induced to believe the exiſtence of any thing elſe beſides God and our own ſoul.* Obſerve that when he affirms, that God doth not invincibly induce us by evidence to believe that bodies exiſt, his deſign is to teach us that the error in which we ſhould be in this reſpect, ought not to be charged on God. This is rejecting Mr Des Cartes's proof, and ſaying that God would be no deceiver, even tho' not one body ſhould exiſt in the nature of things.

Michael Angelo Fardella, a Sicilian, publiſhed a book of Logic at Venice in the year 1696, in which he aſſerts the ſame principles with Father Mallebranche; as appears by the following extract of his book. He (91) *particularly labours to prove, that it is very poſſible that objects ſhould not be conform to their ideas. He ſays, he very clearly conceives that the Author of nature might ſo diſpoſe our ſenſes that they might repreſent to us thoſe objects as exiſtent, which really do not exiſt. Yet* (92) *when he defines the ſenſations in the ſecond part, pag.* 96. *he ſays, that they ariſe in the mind from the impreſſion which outward bodies make on the extremity of the nerves. When it is objected to him, that if the evidence of the ſenſes is not infallible,* JESUS CHRIST *impoſed on the Apoſtles, when to convince them that he had a real body, he ſaid*, Palpate & videte, quia ſpiritus carnem & oſſa non habet, - - - *Handle me, and ſee, for a ſpirit hath not fleſh and bones; he anſwers, that the ways of arguing, which the Scripture moſt commonly makes uſe of, are rather drawn from a Logic accommodated to the capacity of the vulgar, than from a real Logic: whence he concludes, that* JESUS CHRIST, *in order to perſuade the Apoſtles that he was no phantom, but a real man, made uſe of that ſort of reaſoning which was beſt adapted to vulgar intellects, and by which men uſe to ſatisfy themſelves of the exiſtence of things. He adds, that* GOD *is not oliged to teach us infallibly that bodies exiſt, and that if we have more than a moral certainty of it, we owe it only to faith.* Father Mallebranche's reaſonings are certainly very ſtrong, but I may venture to ſay, that they are much weaker than thoſe we have ſeen above (93). I ſhould be glad to know how Mr Arnauld would have refuted this, no perſon being more capable than he to find out a ſolution. By his examination of Father Mallebranche's opinion, he hath diſcovered that he underſtood the art of attacking the foundation. He hath ſtruck at the baſis of his adverſary's doctrine; for he hath ſhewn, that if there are no bodies, we are *forced to admit ſome things in God which are utterly contrary to the Divine Nature, as that of being deceitful, or ſubject to other imperfections, which the light of reaſon evidently makes appear to us, cannot be in God* (94). He makes uſe of eight arguments, which Father Mallebrance calls *good proofs but very bad demonſtrations* (95). *I believe*, continues he, *that matter exiſts, but I believe it as well* proved *and ill* demonſtrated. *Nay, I believe it as* demonſtrated, *but preſuppoſing faith.* He propoſes an objection which he grounds on the wicked and impious thoughts of the mind (96), and anſwers, ‘That it is certain that the body doth not immediately act upon the mind, and therefore that God alone immediately puts into the mind all the good and evil thoughts, as it is he alone who moves the arm of an aſſaſſin, or impious wretch, as well as the hand of the alms-giver, and that the only thing which God doth not do is the ſin, that is, he does not cauſe the conſent of the will. It is true, God doth not inſtil into the mind of man vain and ill thoughts any otherwiſe than conſequentially to the laws of the union of the ſoul and body, and to ſin which hath changed this union into a dependance. But how will Mr Arnauld *demonſtrate*, I mean really *demonſtrate* that he did not commit ſome ſin ten or twenty thouſand years ago; and that it is not for the puniſhment of that ſin that he is afflicted with theſe uneaſy thoughts, by which God chaſtiſes him, and deſigns to make him deſerve his recompence, by oppoſing what he calls the motions of concupiſcence? Will Mr Arnauld demonſtrate, that God who could per-

‘ mit

---

(84) Sextus Empiricus, Pyrrhon. hypotyp. *lib. iii, cap. viii.*

(85) Nicolle, Art de penſer, *Part. iv, ch. i, pag. m.* 394, 395. Compare what has been ſaid in the article PYRRHO, remark [*C*].

(86) Natura nihil fruſtra facit.

(87) Fruſtra fit per plura quod æque commode fieri poteſt per pauciora.

(88) Mallebranche, ubi infra, *pag.* 70. *See, above, citations* (66), (67).

(89) Mallebranche, Eclairciſſemens ſur le I Livre de la Recherche de la Vérité, *pag.* 64, *Paris* 1678.

(90) Id. ibid. *pag.* 68, 69.

(91) Journal des Sçavans, *of the 30th of July* 1696, *pag.* 551, 552, *Dutch Edit.*

(92) The author of the Journal is miſtaken here. He is in the wrong to pretend that Mr Fardella contradicts himſelf: It is no contradiction to ſay that there are bodies, and that it were poſſible there ſhould be none, and yet that we ſhould have the ſame ſenſations we have now. The author of the Journal might have made a better objection, which is, that ſuppoſing Chriſt accommodated himſelf to the popular Logic, it cannot be proved by the Scripture that there are bodies. How then can one be ſure by faith, that there are bodies.

(93) In the remark [*G*], where the firſt objection is propoſed.

(94) Arnauld, Traité des vraies & des fauſſes Idées, *pag.* 324.

(95) Mallebranche, Réponſe au Livre des vraies & des fauſſes Idées, *pag.* 321.

(96) Id. ibid. *pag.* 325.

which might prove very puzzling to the modern Philoſophers, I think it is very likely that he did not forget them [*I*]. Not being cotemporary with Diogenes the Cynic it was not his lecture that was refuted by walking. Every body admires the method which that Diogenes made uſe of to confound the arguments of the Philoſopher whom he heard

‘ mit ſin and all it's conſequences, which, by the natural laws, he hath eſtabliſhed, oblige him to put into the mind ſo many filthy thoughts and impious inclinations, could not permit that he himſelf ſhould have ſinned twenty thouſand years ago? Will he demonſtrate that God could not without the help of a body give him diſturbing thoughts; and that in conſequence of the laws of the union of the ſoul and body, which he foreſaw, and which he can follow without having formed any one body? But let him argue as much as he will, I ſhall eaſily break the chain of his demonſtrations, by telling him that God may have had deſigns which he hath not imparted to him (97).’ Mr Arnauld offers a great many things in his reply, and particularly this, that there are in Father Mallebranche's anſwer *ſome extravagant propoſitions, which, ſtrictly taken, tend to the eſtabliſhment of a very dangerous Pyrrhoniſm* (98). His proof may be ſeen in the following paſſage (99): ‘ I beg of him to tell me, what he meant, when he granted that this propoſition might be taken for an evident principle: *God is no deceiver, and it is not poſſible that he ſhould take pleaſure in deceiving me.* Doth he pretend that the evidence of this principle is abſolute, or doth he think it reſtrained by this condition, *if I ſhould not have committed ſome ſin ten or twelve thouſand years ago*, for the puniſhment of which God might take pleaſure in deceiving me? If he anſwers that it is abſolute, what he ſaith of the ſin I might have committed ten or twenty thouſand years ago is foreign to the purpoſe. And if he ſaith that this principle is not abſolute, but reſtrained by that condition, nothing can be eaſier than to ſhew him, that it cannot be aſſerted without overthrowing both the Divine faith, and all human ſciences. For he affirms, that not only the Divine faith, but whatever we know by ratiocination, is grounded on this principle, *That God is no deceiver* .... (100) But this principle, that God is not a deceiver, will be utterly uſeleſs, if he who makes uſe of it was obliged to prove that he hath not committed ſome ſin ten or twenty thouſand years ago. I will ſay no more: The conſequences of this chicanery are ſo horrible and impious, that it is even dangerous to dwell too long upon them . . . (101) Is it neceſſary that *God ſhould impart all his deſigns to us*, that we may be aſſured he doth not intend to deceive us? If ſo, none can be certain of it: and thus there will be no Divine faith, no human ſciences, according to the author himſelf, as I have juſt ſhewn.’

It was requiſite, for ſeveral reaſons, that I ſhould recite ſome paſſages of the diſpute of theſe two illuſtrious authors, and that, in general, I ſhould inſert in this remark what I find in that diſpute. For in the firſt place I was obliged to prove, that there are ſtronger objections than thoſe of Father Mallebranche. In effect, if it was true that the actual exiſtence of matter implies contradictions and impoſſibilities, as (102) has been ſet forth above (103), it would be abſolutely neceſſary to recur to faith in order to be convinced of the exiſtence of bodies. Mr Arnauld, who hath found other refuges, would be obliged to have recourſe to that only. In the ſecond place, the article of Zeno of Elea, required a large account of the difficulties which this Philoſopher might have propoſed againſt the hypotheſis of motion. 3. It is of uſe to know that a Father of the Oratory, as illuſtrious for his piety, as for his Philoſophical learning, has aſſerted, that nothing but faith can truly convince us of the exiſtence of bodies. Neither the Sorbonne nor any other tribunal ever gave him any trouble on this occaſion. The Inquiſitors of Italy never diſturbed Mr Fardella, who aſſerted the ſame thing in a printed book. This ought to teach my readers, that they muſt not be ſurprized when I ſometimes ſhew them, that with reſpect to the moſt myſterious evangelical ſubjects reaſon puts us to a ſtand, and that then we ought to be fully ſatisfied with the light of faith. 4. Laſtly, a great part of the things, which I have inſerted in this remark, may ſerve as a ſupplement to another place in this Dictionary (104).

[*I*] *I think it is very likely that he did not forget the objections which may be grounded on the diſtinction of a Plenum and a Vacuum.*] Meliſſus, who ſtudied under the ſame maſter with him (105), denied motion, and made uſe of this proof: If motion exiſts, there muſt of neceſſity be a vacuum (106), but there is no vacuum, therefore, *&c.* This ſhews that in Zeno's time there was a great Philoſopher, who did not believe motion and a plenum to be conſiſtent together. Wherefore ſince Zeno denied a vacuum (107), I cannot perſuade my ſelf that he did not make uſe of the ſame proof with Meliſſus, againſt thoſe who admitted motion. He made it his buſineſs to oppoſe them, and uſed ſeveral arguments for that purpoſe. Would he have forgot the argument which the aſſerters of a vacuum have ſo often employed? He might have turned it otherwiſe than they, but not leſs ſpeciouſly. If there was no vacuum, ſaid they, there would be no motion; but motion exiſts, therefore there is a vacuum. He would have argued on the contrary foot, agreeing with them in this principle, that motion cannot exiſt in a full ſpace; for, from this poſition, common to them and himſelf, he might have drawn a conſequence diametrically oppoſite to theirs. His ſyllogiſm ought to have run thus: if there was any motion, there would be a vacuum; but there is no vacuum, therefore there is no motion. Obſerve, that when I ſay his manner of arguing would not have been leſs ſpecious than theirs; I mean this only with reſpect to Philoſophers very capable of comprehending the reaſons againſt a vacuum; for I know very well that to the vulgar it is almoſt as ſtrange a paradox to deny a vacuum, as to deny motion. Anaxagoras found the vulgar ſo poſſeſſed with the exiſtence of a vacuum, that he had recourſe to ſome trivial experiments to deſtroy this falſe prejudice. Ariſtotle (108) in the chapter where he mentions this, alledges ſome of the arguments which were made uſe of to prove a vacuum. They are not of any force, and he refutes them pretty well in the following chapter. Gaſſendus hath given all poſſible force to the experiments and arguments which favour the hypotheſis of Epicurus concerning a vacuum (109); but he hath ſaid nothing really convincing, and the weakneſs of it is fully expoſed in the *Art of Thinking* (110), However, I believe our Zeno rendered himſelf formidable on this topic: ſuch a ſubtile and vehement Logician as he, could very dexterouſly perplex this ſubject, and it is not probable that he neglected it.

But if he had known what ſeveral excellent Mathematicians (111) ſay in this age, he might have made vaſt ravages, and given himſelf airs of triumph. They aſſert that a vacuum is abſolutely neceſſary, and that without it the motion of the planets, and the conſequences thereof are things inexplicable and impoſſible. I have heard a great Mathematician (who hath reaped great advantages from the works and converſation of Sir Iſaac Newton) ſay, that it is no longer a problem *whether motion be poſſible, ſuppoſing a plenum*; that the falſity and impoſſibility of that propoſition hath been not only proved, but Mathematically demonſtrated, and that henceforth to deny a vacuum will be to deny a point ſupported by the utmoſt evidence. He maintained that vacuity takes up incomparably more room than matter in the moſt ponderous bodies; and ſo that in the air, for inſtance, there are not more corpuſcles than there are great cities on the earth. Thus we are doubtleſs highly obliged to the Mathematics: they demonſtrate the exiſtence of what is contrary to the moſt evident notions of our intellect; for if there be any nature with whoſe eſſential properties we are clearly acquainted, it is extenſion: we have a clear and diſtinct idea of it, which informs us that the eſſence of extenſion conſiſts in the three dimenſions, and that its inſeparable attributes and properties are diviſibility, mobility, and impenetrability. If theſe ideas are falſe, deceitful, chimerical, and illuſory, is there a notion in our mind which we ought not to take for a vain phantom, or matter of diſtruſt? Can the demonſtrations which prove a vacuum remove our diſtruſt? Are they more evident than the idea which ſhews us that a foot

ARGUMENTS againſt a Vacuum.

---

(97) Id. ibid.

(98) Arnauld, Défenſe contre la Réponſe au Livre des vraies & des fauſſes Idées, *pag.* 577, 578.

(99) Id. ibid. *pag.* 590, 591.

(100) Id. ibid. *pag.* 592.

(101) Id. ibid.

(102) That is, if according to the light of reaſon, it ſhould ſeem to imply ſome contradictions and impoſſibilities.

(103) In the firſt objection of the remark [*G*].

(104) To remark [*B*], of the article PYRRHO.

(105) *That is, under Parmenides. See* Diogenes Laërtius, *lib. ix, num.* 24, 25.

(106) Ariſtotel. Phyſ. *lib. iv, cap. vii, Textu lxi.*

(107) Diogen. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 29.

(108) Ariſtotel. ubi ſupra, *Textu li.*

(109) Gaſſend. Phyſ. §. *i*, *lib. ii, cap. iii, Oper. Tom. i, pag.* 192, *& ſeq.*

(110) Art. de penſer, *Part. iii, ch. xviii, num.* 4. *pag. m.* 329, *& ſeq.*

(111) Mr Huygens, Sir Iſaac Newton, *&c.*

heard endeavouring to prove that there was no motion. He walked about in the auditory, thinking that was ſufficient to ſhew the falſity of all the Profeſſor had been ſaying;

a foot of extenſion may change its place, and cannot be in the ſame place with another foot of extenſion? Let us ſearch as much as we pleaſe into all the receſſes of our mind, we ſhall never find there any idea of an unmovable, indiviſible, and penetrable extenſion. And yet if there is a vacuum, there muſt exiſt an extenſion, eſſentially endued with theſe three attributes. It is no ſmall difficulty, to be forced to admit the exiſtence of a nature of which we have no idea, and is beſides repugnant to the cleareſt ideas of our mind. But there are a great many other inconveniencies which attend this. Is this vacuum, or immovable, indiviſible, and penetrable extenſion, a ſubſtance, or a mode? It muſt be one of the two, for the adequate diviſion of being, comprehends but theſe two members. If it be a mode, they muſt then define its ſubſtance: but that is what they can never do. If it be a ſubſtance, I aſk whether it be created or uncreated? If created, it may periſh, while the matter, from which it is really diſtinct, may not ceaſe to be. But it is abſurd, and contradictory, that a vacuum, or a ſpace diſtinct from bodies, ſhould be deſtroyed, and yet that bodies ſhould be diſtant from each other, as they may be after the deſtruction of the vacuum. If this ſpace diſtinct from bodies is an uncreated ſubſtance, it will follow either that it is God, or that God is not the only ſubſtance which neceſſarily exiſts. Which part ſoever you take of this alternative, you ſhall find your ſelf confounded: the laſt is a formal, and the other at leaſt a material impiety; for all extenſion is compoſed of diſtinct parts, and conſequently ſeparable from each other; whence it reſults, that if God was extended, he would not be a ſimple, immutable, and properly infinite, Being, but a collection of beings, *ens per aggregationem*, each of which would be finite, though all of them together would be unlimited. He would be like the material world, which, in the Carteſian hypotheſis, is an infinite extenſion. And as to thoſe who ſhould pretend that God may be extended without being material or corporeal, and alledge, as an argument, his ſimplicity, you will find them ſolidly refuted in one of Mr Arnauld's books, I ſhall cite only theſe words from it: 'So far is the ſimplicity of 'God from allowing us room to think that he may 'be extended, that all Divines have acknowledged 'after St Thomas, that it is a neceſſary conſequence of 'the ſimplicity of God not to be capable of being ex'tended (112).' Will they ſay with the ſchoolmen, that ſpace is, at moſt, no more than a privation of body; that it hath no reality, and that, properly ſpeaking, a vacuum is nothing: but this is ſuch an unreaſonable aſſertion, that all the modern Philoſophers who declare for a vacuum, have laid it aſide, however convenient it was in other reſpects. Gaſſendus carefully avoided having recourſe to ſuch an abſurd hypotheſis (113); but choſe rather to plunge himſelf into the moſt hideous abyſs of conjecturing, that all beings are not either ſubſtances or accidents, and that all ſubſtances are not either ſpirits or bodies; and of placing the extenſion of ſpace amongſt the beings which are neither corporeal nor ſpiritual, neither ſubſtances nor accidents. Mr Locke, believing that he could not define what a vacuum is, hath yet given us clearly to underſtand that he took it for a poſitive being (114). He was too knowing not to diſcern that nothingneſs cannot be extended in length, breadth, and depth. Mr Hartſoeker hath very well apprehended this truth. *There is no vacuum in nature*, ſaith he (115), *this ought to be admitted without any difficulty, becauſe it is utterly contradictory to conceive a meer nothingneſs, with all the properties which can only agree to a real Being.* But if it is contradictory that nothingneſs ſhould be endued with extenſion, or any other quality (116), it is not leſs contradictory, that extenſion ſhould be a ſimple being, ſince it contains ſome things, of which we may truly deny what we may truly affirm of ſome others which it includes. The ſpace filled up by the ſun is not the ſame ſpace taken up by the moon; for if the ſun and the moon filled the ſame ſpace, thoſe two luminaries would be in the ſame place, and penetrated with one another, ſince two things cannot be penetrated with a third, without being penetrated among themſelves (117). It is moſt evident that the ſun and moon are not in the ſame place. It may then be truly ſaid of the ſpace of the ſun, that it is penetrated with the ſun, and it may as truly be denied of the ſpace penetrated with the moon: here are then two portions of ſpace really diſtinct from one another, ſince they receive two contradictory denominations, of being penetrated, and not being penetrated with the ſun. This fully confutes thoſe who venture to aſſert, that ſpace is nothing but the immenſity of God; and it is certain that the divine immenſity could not be the place of bodies, without giving room to conclude that it is compoſed of as many parts really diſtinct, as there are bodies in the world. It will be in vain for you to alledge that infinity hath no parts, this muſt neceſſarily be falſe in all infinite numbers, ſince a number eſſentially includes ſeveral unities: nor will you have more reaſon to tell us, that incorporeal extenſion is wholly contained in its ſpace, and alſo wholly contained in each part of its ſpace (118); for not only we have no idea of it, and it thwarts all our ideas of extenſion, but beſides it will prove that all bodies take up the ſame place, ſince each could not take up its own, if the Divine extenſion was entirely penetrated with each body, numerically the ſame with the ſun, and with the earth. You will find in Mr Arnauld a ſolid refutation of thoſe who ſay that God is diffuſed throughout infinite ſpaces (119).

By this ſpecimen of the difficulties which may be raiſed againſt a vacuum, my readers may eaſily apprehend, that our Zeno would, at this preſent time, be much more formidable than he was in his own age. It is no longer to be doubted, would he ſay, that if all is full, motion is impoſſible. This impoſſibility hath been Mathematically proved. He would be far from diſputing againſt thoſe demonſtrations, but admit them as inconteſtable; he would ſolely apply himſelf to prove the impoſſibility of a vacuum, and would reduce his adverſaries to an abſurdity. He would confute them on whatſoever ſide they turned; he would plunge them into perplexities by his dilemmas; he would make them loſe ground wherever they retired; and if he did not ſilence them, he would at leaſt force them to confeſs, that they neither underſtand nor comprehend what they ſay. *If any one aſk me* (they are Mr Locke's words) (123), *what this ſpace, I ſpeak of, is? I will tell him when he tells me what his extenſion is. . . . . They aſk whether* this ſpace *be body or ſpirit? To which I anſwer by another queſtion, Who told you that there can be only bodies and minds. If it be aſked, (as uſually it is) Whether this ſpace, void of body, be ſubſtance or accident, I ſhall readily anſwer, I know not: nor ſhall I be aſhamed to own my ignorance, till they, who aſk that queſtion, ſhew me a clear, diſtinct idea of* ſubſtance (121). Since ſuch a great Metaphyſician as Mr Locke, after having ſo well ſtudied this ſubject, is not able to anſwer the queſtions of the Carteſians, otherwiſe than by aſking other queſtions which he thinks yet more obſcure and perplexed than theirs, we may judge that the objections which Zeno might propoſe, could not be anſwered; and we may certainly conjecture that he would ſpeak thus to his adverſaries: You ſhelter your ſelves in the hypotheſis of a vacuum when you are driven from that of motion and a *plenum*; but you cannot hold out in this hypotheſis, the impoſſibility of it is demonſtrated. Learn ſome better way to come off by: for by that which you have already choſen you avoid one precipice, and throw your ſelves into another. Follow me, I will ſhew you a better way: do not conclude, from the impoſſibility of motion in a *plenum*, that there is a vacuum, but rather conclude, from the impoſſibility of a vacuum, that there is no motion, I mean real motion, but at moſt an appearance of motion, or an ideal and intellectual motion. The Antients were ſo perplexed in their diſputes about a vacuum, that ſome maintained that a vacuum and place were the matter of bodies. *Φασὶ τινες εἶναι τὸ κενὸν τὴν τῶν σωμάτων ὕλην, οἵπερ καὶ τόπον τὸ ἀυτὸ τοῦτο λέγοντες, quidam vacuum eſſe corporum materiam dicunt, qui quidem & locum hoc idem aſſerunt eſſe* (122).

From what has been ſaid, let us deduce a few corollaries.

I. The firſt is, That Zeno's diſpute could not be wholly uſeleſs: for if he miſſed his main deſign, which ſaying; but it is certain that an anſwer of that nature is more ſophiſtical than our Zeno's arguments [*K*]. I do not believe, what ſome affirm of him (*d*), that he taught that matter is compoſed of Mathematical points: I ſhould rather think he aſſerted that it could not be compoſed of them (*e*). I muſt not forget that he was leſs firm and reſolute in ſuffering detraction, than in ſuffering the tortures exerciſed on his body. He was very

---

(112) Arnauld, Défenſe contre la Réponſe au Livre des vraies & des fauſſes Idées, *pag.* 360.

(113) Gaſſend. ubi ſupra, *cap. i, pag.* 182.

(114) Lock's Eſſay concerning human underſtanding, *book ii, ch. xiii, pag. m.* 188, 189.

(115) Hartſoeker, Principes de Phyſique, *pag.* 4.

(116) Non entis nulla ſunt accidentia, *is a notion as evident as any other.*

(117) Quæ penetrantur cum uno tertio penetrantur inter ſe.

(118) Tota in toto & tota in ſingulis partibus. *This is what the ſchool-men ſay of the preſence of the ſoul in the human body, and of the preſence of Angels in certain places.*

(119) Arnauld, Letters viii, ix, to Father Malebranche. *See particularly pag.* 171, *& ſeq. & pag.* 210, *& ſeq. See alſo a book of* Peter Petit, *a Phyſician of Paris, intituled* de extenſione animæ & rerum incorporearum natura, *and Mr* de la *Chambre's anſwer to it, which he publiſhed at Paris in the year* 1666, *in* 4to, *with this title,* Defenſe de l'extenſion & des parties libres de l'ame. *All the reaſons he alledges to ſhew that extenſion and ſpirituality may exiſt together, are ſo weak, that they only ſerve to ſhew the falſity of his aſſertion.*

(120) Locke, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 188.

(121) Id. ibid. *pag.* 189.

(122) Ariſtot. Phyſ. *lib. iv, cap. vii.*

(*d*) See below, citation (135).

(*e*) See Ariſtotel. Metaphyſ. *lib. iii, cap. iv.*

which was to prove that there is no motion, he would, however, have the advantage of ſtrengthening his hypotheſis of the *acatalepſia*, or incomprehenſibility of all things. The demonſtrations of our modern Mathematicians, to prove a vacuum, have convinced them that motion in a *plenum* is not comprehenſible. They have therefore admitted the ſuppoſition of a vacuum, not becauſe they did not find it ſurrounded with ſeveral inconceivable and inexplicable difficulties; but being obliged to chuſe one out of two incomprehenſible ſyſtems, they preferred that which leaſt ſhocked them. They choſe rather to ſatisfy themſelves on the Mechanical, than the Metaphyſical part, and even ſlighted the Phyſical difficulties which annoyed them; this, for inſtance, it is not poſſible to give a reaſon for the reſiſtance of air and water, if there be but ſuch a ſmall quantity of matter, and ſo much vacuity in thoſe two parts of the world. Other Mathematicians (123) deny a vacuum ſtill, not but that they are ſenſible of the difficulties which obliged others to admit it; but they are more ſenſibly touched with the diſmal perplexities they find in that ſuppoſition; they do not think it reaſonable, on account of thoſe difficulties, to renounce the cleareſt ideas which we have of the nature of extenſion. Obſerve, that ſome Philoſophers of the firſt rank (124), do not believe that we know either what extenſion or ſubſtance is; they cannot talk otherwiſe as long as they believe a vacuum. This affords no ſmall occaſion of triumph to Zeno and all other Acataleptics: for while it is diſputed whether we know, or are ignorant of the nature of ſubſtance and matter, it is a ſign that we comprehend nothing, and that we can never be ſure that we hit the mark, or that the objects of our mind reſemble the ideas we have of them.

(123) Mr Leibniz, and Mr de Volder, a famous Profeſſor of Philoſophy and Mathematics in the univerſity of Leyden.

(124) See, above, in citat. (120), Mr Locke's words.

The ſyſtem of Spinoza is incompatible with a vacuum.

II. I ſhall obſerve by the way, that the hypotheſis of a vacuum is the moſt proper in the world to overthrow Spinoza's ſyſtem. For if there are two different extenſions, the one ſimple, indiviſible, and penetrable, the other compounded, diviſible, and impenetrable; there muſt be more than one ſubſtance in the univerſe. This is the more eaſy to be inferred, by reaſon that the impenetrable ſubſtance would not be a perfect continuity, but a collection of corpuſcles entirely ſeparated from each other, and ſurrounded by a large incorporeal ſpace. The Spinoziſts would not deny that each of theſe corpuſcles is a particular ſubſtance diſtinct from that of all others. And thus by their own axioms, they muſt renounce their ſyſtem, if they own that there is a vacuum.

A new proof againſt the real exiſtence of extenſion.

III. The laſt conſequence which I would draw, is that the diſputes concerning a vacuum, have afforded a plauſible reaſon to deny the real exiſtence of any other than an ideal extenſion. They have perceived, in arguing againſt the Carteſians, who deny the poſſibility of a vacuum, that extenſion is a being which cannot be limited. It muſt then follow that there is no ſuch thing as body in nature, or that there is an infinity of bodies. One of them cannot be deſtroyed without annihilating all the reſt, nor can the ſmalleſt be preſerved without preſerving them all. Yet we know, by evident ideas, that when two things are really diſtinct, one of them may be preſerved or deſtroyed without the preſervation or deſtruction of the other; for as whatever is really diſtinct from a thing is accidental to it, and as each thing is capable of being preſerved without that which is accidental to it, it follows that the body *A*, really diſtinct from the body *B*, may continue in being, without the body *B* ſubſiſting, and that the preſervation of the body *A*, doth not at all infer the preſervation of the body *B*. Συμβεβηκός ἐστιν ὃ γίνεται καὶ ἀπογίνεται χωρὶς τῆς τοῦ ὑποκειμένου φθορᾶς. *Accidens eſt quod adeſt atque abeſt ſine ſubjecti interitu* (125). If this be true of accidents, which are the modes of a ſubſtance, as Porphyrius underſtands it here, it is truer ſtill of an accidental ſubſtance with reſpect to others, as it is diſtinct from their eſſential attributes. Take notice that the ſchool-men raiſe a great difficulty here on pretence that blackneſs cannot be ſeparated from an Ethiopian. Wherefore they recur to the diſtinction between a mental and a real ſeparation. This is a meer illuſion; for the ſubject of the blackneſs of an Ethiopian is matter, which would not be deſtroyed, if the body of that man was calcined. This conſequence which appears ſo clear and conſiſtent with evident notions, cannot however agree with the ſubject of which we ſpeak; and you cannot ſuppoſe, that all the bodies included in a chamber ſhould periſh, and the four walls be preſerved; for in this caſe there will remain the ſame diſtance betwixt them as before; but this diſtance, ſay the Carteſians, is nothing but a body. Their doctrine then ſeems to infringe the ſovereign liberty of the Creator, and his due unlimited power over all his works. He ought to enjoy a full right of creating few or many, according to his good pleaſure, and of preſerving or deſtroying this or that, as it ſeems good to him. The Carteſians may anſwer, that he may deſtroy each body in particular, provided he make another of the ſame magnitude; but is not this ſetting bounds to his liberty? Is not this impoſing on him a ſort of ſlavery, which neceſſarily obliges him to create a new body every time that he pleaſeth to deſtroy another? Theſe are difficulties which cannot be anſwered on the ſuppoſition that extenſion and body are the ſame thing; but they may all be retorted againſt thoſe who propoſe them to Des Cartes, if at the ſame time they acknowledge a *ſpacial* extenſion really exiſtent and diſtinct from matter. This extenſion cannot be finite, one part cannot be deſtroyed without the production of another, &c. But if the nature of penetrable or impenetrable extenſion draws along with it ſuch a large train of incoveniencies, the ſhorteſt way is to aſſert that it hath no other exiſtence than in our mind.

(125) Porphyr. Iſag. *cap. v.*

[*K*] *An anſwer like that of Diogenes is more ſophiſtical than our Zeno's arguments.*] Πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα ὅτι κίνησις οὐκ ἔστιν ἀναστὰς περιεπάτει. Dicente ſibi quodam non eſſe motum, exurgens ambulabat (126). --- *When a certain perſon told him that there was no motion, he aroſe and walked.* This is all we find on this head in Diogenes Laërtius. You ſee he relates the fact with great ſimplicity: but the Moderns have a little amplified it. 'Vulgo etiam fertur Diogenes, 'cum negari à Zenone motum localem audiſſet, illico 'ſurrexiſſe, & itu redituque aliquoties magnâ feſtina'tione replicata inambulaſſe, & rogatus, quis eum 'ſubitò enthuſiaſmus perculiſſet, reſpondiſſe: *Zenonem 'refello* (127.) -- *It is alſo commonly reported that Diogenes, 'hearing Zeno deny local motion, immediately ſtarted up, 'and walked up and down ſeveral times with great 'ſpeed; and being aſked what ſudden enthuſiaſm had 'ſeized him, he replied,* I am refuting Zeno.' They have named the Philoſopher who denied motion, they have embelliſhed the circumſtances of the practical anſwer, they have made it a ſubject of declamations for young Rhetoricians. I am ſurprized that Sextus Empiricus ſhould not vouchſafe to name the perſon, who thus refuted the objections againſt the exiſtence of motion. What he ſaith more particular is, that a Cynic made uſe of this way of refuting thoſe objections: Ταῦτά τοι καὶ ἐρωτηθεὶς Φιλόσοφος, τὸν κατὰ τῆς κινήσεως λόγον, σιωπῶν περιεπάτησεν. Ideoque cùm propoſita eſſet Philoſopho oratio motum negans, tacitus ambulare cœpit (128). --- *This Philoſopher hearing a diſcourſe againſt motion, made no anſwer, but walked about.* In another place he expreſſes himſelf thus: Διὸ καὶ τῶν Κυνικῶν τις ἐρωτηθεὶς κατὰ τῆς κινήσεως λόγον, οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο, ἀνέστη δὲ καὶ ἐβάδισεν. ἔργῳ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας παραστάς, ὅτι ὑπαρκτή ἐστιν ἡ κίνησις. Ideoque quidem ex Cynicis, cùm ei propoſita eſſet contra motum oratio, nihil reſpondit; ſed ſurgens ambulare cœpit, opere & actu oſtendens exiſtere motum (129). --- *One of the Cynics, hearing a diſcourſe againſt motion, made no anſwer; but aroſe, and began to walk; ſhewing, by experience, and in fact, that there is motion.* It is better not to name the perſon, than to affirm that Diogenes, the

(126) Diog. Laërt. *lib. vi, num.* 39.

(127) Libertus Fromondus, de compoſitione continui, *pag.* 6.

(128) Sextus Empiricus Pyrrhon. Hypotypoſ. *lib. ii, cap. xxii, pag.* 104.

(129 Id. ibid. *lib. iii, cap. viii, pag.* 124.

very angry with a man who abuſed him; and when the world was ſurprized at his indignation,

the Cynic, and Zeno of Elea were the actors. This chronological error is inexcuſable (130): the Jeſuits of Coimbria have aſcribed it to Simplicius without refuting it. And, in this particular, they fell in with the vulgar error. ‘ Certè, *ſay they* (131), hæc Zeno‘ nis tam abſurda opinio nullo melius quàm experien‘ tiæ ipſius argumento refellitur. Quod Diogenes Cy‘ nicus fecit, ut refert Simplicius hoc in libro commen‘ to 53. & lib. 8. comment. 25. Nam cùm Zenonis ‘ rationes aliquando audiſſet, ſurrexit, nec aliter quàm ‘ coram ambulando reſpondit. - - - *Certainly this abſurd* ‘ *opinion of Zeno could not be refuted by a better argument,* ‘ *than that of experience itſelf. This was done by Diogenes* ‘ *the Cynic, as Sulpitius relates. For having once heard* ‘ *Zeno arguing againſt motion, he aroſe, and made him no* ‘ *other anſwer, but by walking before him.*’ They have avoided the other vulgar error; they do not believe that Zeno, who denied motion, and whoſe arguments Ariſtotle examined, was the founder of the Stoics; they have expreſsly named him Zeno of Elea (132). The paſſage which follows is full of faults: ‘ Continuum ex partibus indiviſibilibus conſtare contra ‘ Ariſtotelem conſtanter defendebat Zeno Stoicorum ‘ Princeps, quem ducem ſunt ſequuti ex Philoſophis De‘ mocritus, & Leucippus. Ex Theologis Antiquis May. ‘ *in* 2. *diſt*. 2. *quæſt*. 5. Gerardus apud Tantaletum hoc ‘ lib. quæſt. 1. & Ægidius diſcipulus D. Thom. lib. 1. ‘ de generat. quæſt. 8. citatus à Veracrux 6. Phyſic. ‘ ſpeculat. 1. (133). - - *Zeno, the chief of the Stoic Philo*‘ *ſophers, conſtantly maintained againſt Ariſtotle, that* ‘ *matter was made up of indiviſible parts. In this opi*‘ *nion he was followed by the Philoſophers Democritus* ‘ *and Leucippus, and by the antient Divines,* Mayx, ‘ Gerardus, and Ægidius the diſciple of St Thomas.’ There is no room to doubt that the author in this paſſage deſigned to ſpeak of the ſame Zeno, whom Ariſtotle refuted in the ninth chapter of the ſixth book of his Phyſics. But it doth not appear that Zeno of Elea taught that matter was compoſed of indiviſible parts. He contented himſelf with taking advantage of the contrary doctrine, to ſhew the impoſſibility of motion. Nay, he aſſerted, that an indiviſible body did not differ from nothingneſs (134); and I ſhall make it appear below, that he did not admit of any compoſition in the univerſe. Notwithſtanding, he is looked upon as the author of the ſect which maintained, that matter is compoſed of Mathematical points (135). It would be more reaſonable to aſcribe this opinion to Pythagoras and Plato, as Derodon hath done, relying, with regard to Pythagoras, on the teſtimony of Sextus Empiricus, and, with relation to Plato, on that of Ariſtotle (136). But what a blunder is it to make the founder of the Stoics to be the guide of Democritus and Leucippus! Leucippus preceded Democritus, and both of them preceded the head of the Stoics by ſeveral Olympiads. Beſides, their atoms formed a ſyſtem very different from that which is attributed to the Zenoniſts about the compoſition of matter.

However it be, the anſwer of Diogenes the Cynic to the Philoſopher who denied motion, is the ſophiſm which the Logicians call *ignoratio Elenchi*. Diogenes ſwerved from the ſtate of the queſtion; for the Philoſopher did not deny apparent motion; he did not deny that it appeared to men that there is ſuch a thing as motion; but he aſſerted that nothing did really move, and proved it by very ſubtile and perplexing reaſons. See what Sextus Empiricus ſays of the Sceptics: *Ὅσον μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς Φαινομένοις δοκεῖν εἶναι κίνησιν, ὅσον δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ Φιλσόφῳ λόγῳ μὴ ὑπάρχειν.* Quantum ad apparentia quidem videri eſſe motum, ſed quatenus quis Philoſophicam rationem ſequatur non eſſe (137). - - - *In appearance there is motion, but, according to Philoſophy, there is none.* What does it then make againſt this aſſertion, to walk, or cut a caper? Is it proving any thing beſides the appearance of motion? and was that the ſubject in diſpute? Did the Philoſopher deny that appearance? Not in the leaſt; he was not fool enough to deny ocular Phænomena, but he aſſerted that the evidence of the ſenſes ought to be ſacrificed to ratiocination. Conſult Ariſtotle; he will inform you that ſeveral antient Philoſophers, who having found reaſons for abſolutely denying the plurality of parts, the diviſibility, and mobility of the world, afterwards made no account of the teſtimony of the ſenſes. *Ἐκ μὲν οὖν τούτων τῶν λόγων, ὑπερβάντες τὴν αἴσθησιν καὶ παριδόντες αὐτὴν, ὡς τῷ λόγῳ δέον ἀκολουθεῖν, εἶναι φασι τὸ πᾶν ἓν, καὶ ἀκίνητον, καὶ ἄπειρον ἔνιοι. Ob haſce igitur rationes nonnulli ſenſum prætereuntes, deſpicienteſque quaſi rationem ſequi ducem oporteat, univerſum ipſum, unum & immobile & infinitum eſſe aſſerunt* (138) Parmenides and Meliſſus are the antient Philoſophers of whom he ſpeaks. It muſt be believed that Zeno of Elea retained the ſubſtance of the doctrine of Parmenides, his maſter. Plutarch having ſaid, that Parmenides admitted the eternity and immutability of all things, adds, that Zeno of Elea did not particularize any thing, but ſeemed to float in uncertainty. *Ἴδιον μὲν οὐδὲν ἐξέθετο, διηπόρησε δὲ περὶ τούτων ἐπὶ πλεῖον. Nihil hoc in genere ſingulare vulgavit, ſed ancipiti fere dubitationis æſtu fluctuavit* (139). But others declare (140), that with Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Meliſſus, he taught the unity and incorruptibility of all things, and the imperfection of the evidence of the ſenſes. He was not humble enough to continue in his maſter's principles without any alteration: we ſee his innovations in a book (141) aſcribed to Ariſtotle. They do not hinder his believing that there was no generation: ſo that by a neceſſary conſequence of his principles, he was obliged to deny the motion, diviſibility, compoſition of matter, *&c.* We have already ſeen in the article XENOPHANES, at the laſt paragraph of the remark [*B*], that the author of the Art of Thinking, hath cenſured Ariſtotle, in favour of Parmenides and Meliſſus. And attempts have long ſince been made to give their opinion a favourable ſenſe, and a great air of conformity to the principle of the orthodox, concerning the nature of GOD. But, in all appearance, Ariſtotle doth not deſerve cenſure here; for he very well apprehended, and exactly related what they taught, and conſequently we muſt believe their ſyſtem to be a ſort of Spinoziſm. There is no room for imagining (142) that they expreſſed themſelves by riddles or emblems; for the particular doctrine of the unity and immutability of all things was a conſequence of ſeveral clear and evident principles. See above the article XENOPHANES, towards the beginning of remark [*L*]. So that it was in good earneſt, and as a ſyſtematical doctrine, and not as a witty conceit, that they denied motion, and aſſerted that it's exiſtence was barely mental. Here follow the names of ſome apologiſts for thoſe Philoſophers (143): ‘ Si prædicti Philoſophi ſuum ‘ illud dogma ad hujus tam reconditæ veritatis intelli‘ gentiam retulere (144), non modo reprehendendi ‘ non ſunt, ſed magnopere etiam commendandi. Certe ‘ Parmenidem defendit, atque interpretatur Simplicius, ‘ hoc in libro ad textum 6. Beſſario, 2. Libro con‘ tra Calumniatorem Platonis, capite 3. & Nicolaus ‘ Cuſa, in lib. de filiatione Dei. Lege etiam pro ‘ eadem re Eugubinum, lib. 3. de perenni Philoſo‘ phia cap. 6. & 7. & F. Mirandulam lib. 6. de ‘ examine vanitatis, cap. 1. - - - *If the above-mentioned* ‘ *Philoſophers, in that opinion of theirs, had regard to* ‘ *this hidden truth,* (viz. *That all things are contained in* ‘ *the Divine goodneſs in an unmeaſurable degree, and ſolely,* ‘ *as every number is uniformly contained in the unity, and* ‘ *as all lines joining together in one center from which* ‘ *they proceeded, are contained in that point*) *they are not* ‘ *only not to be cenſured, but they deſerve highly to be* ‘ *praiſed. Certainly Simplicius, in that book, defends and* ‘ *explains the opinion of Parmenides; Beſſario, in his* ‘ *ſecond book againſt the calumniator of Plato, and Nicolas* ‘ *Cuſa, in his book on the Filiation of* GOD, *do the ſame* ‘ *thing. Read alſo on this ſubject Eugubinus's eternal* ‘ *Philoſophy, and Mirandula's examination of Vanity.*’

The reſult of all this is, that Diogenes's anſwer was ſophiſtical, tho' it was proper to gain the applauſe of the company; it was a ſcoffing anſwer, but I believe alſo that the Philoſopher whom it concerned did only deſpiſe it. Perhaps he heartily laughed at it; being a thouſand times happier than the ſophiſt Diodorus, who was not in a laughing humour, when his lectures againſt the exiſtence of motion, were attacked by a malicious irony. Having put his ſhoulder out of joint, he applied to Herophilus, the Phyſician, to have it ſet: How, ſaid the doctor? Your ſhoulder diſlocated! that cannot be; for it is neither removed out of the place where it was, nor where

(130) Diogenes the Cynic lived a long time after Zeno of Elea.

(131) Conimbricenſes in Phyſ. Ariſtot. *lib. vi, cap. ii, pag. m.* 218.

(132) Ibid. *in cap. viii, pag.* 145.

(133) Franciſcus de Oviedo, Phyſic. *Controverſ. xvii, pag.* 334, *col.* 1.

(134) Ariſt. Metaph. *lib. iii, cap. iv.*

(135) Arriaga, and many other Spaniſh ſchoolmen, call thoſe men Zenoniſts who hold that matter is compoſed of indiviſible and unextended parts. A very different opinion from that of the Atomiſts.

(136) Derodon, Diſput. de Atomis, *pag.* 4, 5. *He quotes* Sextus Empiricus, *lib. ix*, adv. Mathem. & Ariſtot. *lib. i*, de Generat. *Text. vii.*

(137) Sext. Empir. Pyrrh. Hypotyp. *lib. iii, cap. viii, pag.* 104.

(138) Ariſtotel. de Generat. & Corrupt. *lib. i, cap. viii, pag. m.* 395.

(139) Plut. in Stromatis, apud Euſebium Præpar. Evang. *lib. i, cap. viii, pag.* 23.

(140) Ariſtocles, de Philoſophia, *lib. viii*, apud Euſebium, ibid. *lib. xiv, cap. xvii, pag.* 755.

(141) *Intituled*, de Xenophane, Zenone, & Gorgia.

(142) Yet this is what the Jeſuits of Coimbra do, *in Phyſ. Ariſtot. lib. i, cap. vii, pag. m.* 92.

(143) Conimbricenſes, ibid. *See the ſame alſo, in lib. i*, de Generat. *cap. viii.*

(144) *That is to ſay, that* In divina bonitate ſunt omnia immenſurate & unice, ſicut in monade omnis numerus uniformiter eſt, & in centro omnes lineæ ad ſe ipſæ & ad unum initium, à quo proceſſere, conjunctæ & copulatæ continentur.

indignation, he anſwered *if I was inſenſible of calumny, I ſhould be likewiſe inſenſible of praiſe* (*f*). This anſwer is unworthy of a Philoſopher.

where it was not. This was one of the ſophiſt's reaſons againſt motion. If a body moves, ſaid he, it muſt move either in the place where it is, or in the place where it is not. But it doth not move either in the place where it is, (for if it is there, it doth nor depart) or in the place where it is not, for it can neither act nor ſuffer where it is not. Therefore, &c. Diodorus being then very little diſpoſed to reliſh this Logic, intreated Herophilus not to remember his diſcourſes, but to give him the neceſſary remedy (145).

ZENO, an Epicurean Philoſopher, a native of Sidon, glorioſly maintained the honour of his ſect; for he acquired a great reputation (*a*). Amongſt other diſciples he had Cicero and Pomponius Atticus [*A*], whence we may judge of the time when he lived. Voſſius is miſtaken on that head [*B*]. Zeno is repreſented as a Philoſopher who

[*A*] *Among other diſciples he had Cicero and Pomponius Atticus.*] Mr Menage's words are: ‘Zenonem Sidonium & Cicero & Atticus Athenis audiverunt, ut indicat ipſe Cicero libro II. & V. de finibus, & lib. III. Tuſcul. Quæſt. & libro I. Academ. - - - *Both Cicero and Atticus heard at Athens the lectures of Zeno the Sidonian, as Cicero himſelf intimates in his ſecond and fifth book* de Finibus, *and in his third book of Tuſculan Queſtions, and in his firſt book of Academical Queſtions.*’ I found the paſſage in the third book of the *Tuſculanæ Queſtiones*, and as it contains one of our Zeno's opinions, I ſhall ſet it down. ‘Solent iſti negare nos intelligere quid dicat Epicurus. Hoc dicit, & hoc ille græculus me audiente Athenis ſenex Zeno iſtorum acutiſſimus contendere, & magna voce dicere ſolebat, eum eſſe beatum, qui præſentibus voluptatibus frueretur, confideretque ſe fruiturum aut in omni, aut in magna parte vitæ, dolore non interveniente: aut ſi interveniret, ſi ſummus foret, futurum brevem: ſi productior, plus habiturum jucundi quam mali. Hæc cogitantem fore beatum, præſertim ſi & ante præceptis bonis contentus eſſet, nec mortem, nec deos extimeſceret. Habes formam Epicuri vitæ beatæ verbis Zenonis expreſſam, nihil ut poſſit negari (1). - - - *Theſe people are wont to deny that we underſtand the meaning of Epicurus. This is what he means, and it is what the old man Zeno the Greek, the moſt acute of all the Epicurean Philoſophers, uſed to maintain and ſolemnly affirm, when I heard his lectures at Athens,* viz. *That the man is happy who enjoys the preſent pleaſures, and who is confident that he ſhall continue to enjoy them during all, or the greateſt part of, his life, without any intermiſſion of pain; or if pain ſhould intervene, and be acute, that it ſhall be but of ſhort continuance, or otherwiſe that it ſhall have more good than evil in it; that the man who lives in theſe thoughts ſhall be happy, eſpecially if he is furniſhed with good precepts, and is not afraid either of death, or of the gods. Here you have a deſcription of Epicurus's happy life, expreſſed in the words of Zeno; ſo that no part of it can be denied.*’ I have alſo found the paſſage in the firſt book of the Academical Queſtions: it is as follows: ‘Carneades nullius philoſophiæ partis ignarus, & ut cognovi ex iis qui illum audierant, maximeque ex Epicureo Zenone (2) qui quum ab eo plurimum diſſentiret, unum tamen præter cæteros mirabatur, incredibili quadam fuit facilitate (3). - - - *Carneades was ſkilled in all the parts of Philoſophy, and had an incredible facility in imparting his knowledge; as I have been informed by thoſe who have heard his lectures, and eſpecially by Zeno the Epicurean, who tho' he differed greatly from Carneades in his opinions, yet was a greater admirer of him than of any other Philoſopher.*’ I have not found the paſſage in the ſecond book *de Finibus* (4), but I have found this in the firſt book. ‘Hic mihi Phædrum, inquam, mentitum, aut Zenonem putas, quorum utrumque audivi, quum mihi nihil ſanè præter ſedulitatem probarent. Omnes mihi Epicuri ſententiæ ſatis notæ ſunt, atque eos quos nominavi cum Attico noſtro, frequentur audivi, quum miraretur ille quidem utrumque, Phædrum autem etiam amaret, quotidieque inter nos, ea quæ audiebamus, conferebamus: neque erat unquam controverſia quid ego intelligerem, ſed quid probarem (5). - - - *In this matter, either Phædrus, or Zeno, you think, have impoſed upon me. I attended the lectures of both theſe Philoſophers: but indeed they recommend nothing to me beſides application and diligence. All the opinions of Epicurus are well known to me, and I, and our friend Atticus have frequently heard the lectures of theſe two Philoſophers. He was an admirer of them both, and had even a great affection for Phædrus. We uſed daily to confer together on what we heard, nor did ever any diſpute ariſe concerning what I underſtood, but what I approved.*’ Let us add to theſe three paſſages, that wherein the Pontif Cotta, Cicero's cotemporary, acknowledges himſelf to have been a diſciple of this famous Epicurean: ‘Zenonem, quem Philo noſter coryphæum appellare Epicureorum ſolebat, quum Athenis eſſem, audiebam frequenter, & quidem ipſo autore Philone, credo ut facilius judicarem, quàm illa bene refellerentur, quum à principe Epicureorum accepiſſem quemadmodum dicerentur. Non igitur ille ut plerique, ſed iſto modo ut tu, diſtincte, graviter, ornate. Sed quod in illo mihi uſu ſæpe venit, idem modo quum te audirem acciderat, ut moleſte ferrem tantum ingenium (bona venia me audies) in tam leves, ne dicam in tam ineptas ſententias incidiſſe (6). *When I was at Athens, I frequently heard the lectures of Zeno, whom our friend Philo uſed to call the chief of the Epicureans. And, indeed, it was Philo who adviſed me to attend theſe lectures, in order, I believe, that I might be the better able to judge whether theſe opinions were well refuted, when I ſhould have heard them in the words of the chief of the Epicureans. Zeno did not expreſs himſelf like moſt of his ſect. His expreſſions were, like your's, diſtinct, weighty, and eloquent. But what often happened to me with regard to him, the ſame thing occurred when I heard you, I was grieved that ſo great a genius ſhould have fallen (permit me to ſay it) into ſuch ſlight, if not fooliſh and idle opinions.*’ Mr Menage hath not, like Gaſſendus, referred us to one of Cicero's letters to Atticus, to find the great friendſhip which theſe two illuſtrious Romans had for our Zeno. ‘Quando Cicero & ipſum audivit & de eodem ad Atticum ſcribens: *Zenonem*, inquit, *tam diligo quam tu* (7). - - - *Cicero, who was a diſciple of Zeno, writes thus of him to Atticus,* I love Zeno as much as you do.’ Gaſſendus ſeems to me to be miſtaken. This letter of Cicero was written in the year of Rome 702. What probability is there that Zeno was living at that time, ſince he was very old when Cicero was preſent at his lectures in the year of Rome 674 (8)? Is it probable, if he was then living, that we ſhould not find ſome particular concerning his great age, in the Epiſtle of Cicero, cited by Gaſſendus, nor in the preceding letter, where he mentions the ſame man? Obſerve, that in the beſt editions, for inſtance, that of Mr Grævius, this Philoſopher is not called Zeno but Xeno. Manutius's conjecture on this head is incomparably better than that of Corradus. According to Corradus the Epicurean Philoſopher is meant there (9); but, according to Manutius, Cicero ſpeaks of an agent of Pomponius Atticus (10). Obſerve, that it is believed by ſeveral authors, that Lucretius was a diſciple of our Zeno (11), and ſee what I have remarked (12) againſt the memoir, wherein the Baron des Coutures was cenſured for having advanced that *Zeno was the honour of the Epicurean ſect.*

[*B*] *Voſſius is miſtaken on this head.*] He ſaith (13), 1. That Zeno, the Sidonian, a Philoſopher of the Epicurean ſect, was a diſciple of Apollodorus. 2. That this Apollodorus was one of Epicurus's diſciples. He cites Diogenes Laërtius to prove both theſe facts, and is miſtaken in the laſt; for Diogenes Laërtius only ſaith that Apollodorus, ſirnamed κηποτύραννος *horti tyrannus*, was an illuſtrious aſſertor of the Epicurean doctrine (14). If he had conſidered the paſſages which inform us that Cicero, Cotta, and Pomponius Atticus, were auditors of Zeno, he would not have made one of Epicurus's diſciples his maſter; for ſince Epicurus

(*f*) Diog. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 29, *pag.* 566.

(145) Sextus Empiricus, ubi ſupra, *lib. ii, cap. xxii.*

(*a*) See the remark [*A*], citation (6).

(1) Cicero, Tuſcul. Quæſt. *lib. iii, cap. xvii.*

(2) There is in my edition *ex Epicuro & Zenone*, which is a fault.

(3) Idem. Acad. Quæſt. *lib. i, in fine.*

(4) Fabricius, in Vita Ciceronis, *ad ann.* 674, *quotes alſo the ſecond book,* de Finibus.

(5) Cicero, *lib. i,* de Finibus, *cap. v.*

(6) Idem, de Nat. Deorum, *lib. i, cap. xxi.*

(7) Gaſſendus, de Vita & Moribus Epicuri, *lib. ii, cap. vi, pag. m.* 187: *He quotes* Cicero, *lib. i,* de Nat. Deor. (*but 'tis not ſaid there that Cicero was an auditor of Zeno, for 'tis Cotta who ſpeaks*) & *lib. v, Epiſt. xi.*

(8) Zenonem Athenis Cicero & Atticus A. U. DCLXXIV. Olymp. CLXXV, ſenem audiverint. *Jonſius de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ. pag.* 183.

(9) Corradus in Ciceronis Epiſt. xi, Libri v, ad Atticum, *pag.* 497, *Edit. Græv.*

(10) Manutius in x Epiſtolam Ciceronis ad Attic. *lib. v, pag.* 151, *Edit. Græv. See the ſame* Cicero, *Epiſt. xxxvii, lib. xiii,* ad Atticum, & *ibi* Manutium, *alioſque comment.*

(11) See the remark [*M*], in the article LUCRETIUS.

(12) Ibid.

(13) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græcis, *lib. i, cap. xvi, pag.* 105, & *lib. iv, cap. x, pag.* 466.

(14) Diog. Laërt. *lib. x, num.* 25.

who treated his adverſaries with a great deal of contempt, and very harſhly [*C*]. There is ſcarce any greater proof of his boldneſs than the book which he wrote againſt the Mathematics [*D*]; a work which is loſt, as well as that written by Poſſidonius to confute

Epicurus died in the ſecond year of the CXXVIIth Olympiad, and Cicero heard Zeno in the 674th year of Rome, that is, the firſt year of the CLXXVth Olympiad, it is impoſſible that Zeno ſhould have been inſtructed by an auditor of Epicurus. There are above one hundred and ninety years betwixt the death of Epicurus, and the year when Cicero heard Zeno's lectures. See Jonſius (15), who hath taken notice of this miſtake of Voſſius. Mr Menage has adopted it (16).

[*C*] *He treated his adverſaries with a great deal of contempt, and very harſhly.*] Cotta attempting to prove that the Epicureans were ſlanderous, alledges our Zeno. ‘(17) Zeno quidem non eos ſolum qui tum erant Apollodorum, Syllum, cæteroſque figebat maledictis, ſed Socratem ipſum parentem philoſophiæ latino verbo utens ſcurram Atticum fuiſſe dicebat (18), Chryſippum nunquam niſi Cheſippum (19) vocabat. *Zeno not only railed againſt Apollodorus, Syllus, and the other Philoſophers of that time, but he ſaid that Socrates himſelf, the parent of Philoſophy, was an Athenian buffoon, and he always called Chryſippus, Cheſippus* [*that is a ſhitten fellow*].’

[*D*] *The book which he wrote againſt the Mathematics.*] We are informed of this by Proclus (20), who adds that Poſſidonius refuted it. Mr Menage cites ſome of Proclus's words: *Eum* (Zenonem) *integro volumine refutavit Poſidonius Apameenſis; alias Rhodius; teſte Proclo libro III. ad* 1. *Euclidis.* Ζήνων, *inquit,* ὁ Σιδώνιος, τῆς Ἐπικούρου μετέχων αἱρέσεως, πρὸς ὃν καὶ ὁ Ποσειδώνιος ὅλον γέγραφε βιβλίον, δεικνὺς σαθρὰν αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐπίνοιαν (21). Huetius having told us that Epicurus rejected Geometry, and the other parts of the Mathematics, becauſe he believed, that they, being founded on falſe principles, could not be true, adds, that Zeno attacked them another way. This was by alledging that in order to render them certain, ſome things ſhould have been added to their principles which were not joined to them. *Alia via adverſus Geometriam graſſabatur Zeno Epicureus, imperfecta ejus eſſe docens initia, unde nihil effici poſſet, niſi alia quædam adjicerentur, quæ in iis prætermiſſa ſunt: quam ejus ſententiam toto libro confutare conatus eſt Poſidonius* (22). The Mathematics are the moſt evident and certain of all human ſciences, and yet they have met with oppoſers. If our Zeno had been a great Metaphyſician, and followed different principles from thoſe of Epicurus, he might have compoſed a book not very eaſy to be refuted, and cut out more work for the Geometricians than they imagine. All ſciences have their weak ſide; nor are the Mathematics free from that defect. Indeed very few people are able to oppoſe them well, becauſe to ſucceed in this engagement it is requiſite not only to be a good Philoſopher, but alſo a very profound Mathematician. But thoſe endued with the latter quality are ſo raviſhed with the certainty and evidence of their inquiries, that they never think of examining whether there be any illuſion in them, or whether the firſt foundation be well eſtabliſhed. They rarely think of ſuſpecting any deficiency in them. But what is very certain is that ſeveral diſputes prevail amongſt the moſt famous Mathematicians. They refute one another, and anſwers and replies multiply among them as well as among other learned men. We obſerve this among the Moderns, and it is certain that the Antients were not more unanimous (23). It is a proof that there are in this road ſeveral dark paths, and that a man may wander and loſe the track of truth. This muſt of neceſſity be the lot of one ſide or the other, ſince one affirms what the other denies. It may be urged that this is the fault of the Artificer, but not of the art, and that all thoſe diſputes proceed from ſome Mathematicians miſtaking that for a demonſtration which is not ſo; but that very thing ſhews that there are ſome obſcurities in this ſcience. Beſides, the ſame thing may be urged, with reſpect to the diſputes of other learned men. It may be ſaid, that if they cloſely followed the rules of Logic, they would avoid the wrong conſequences, and falſe aſſertions which miſlead them. Nevertheleſs we muſt confeſs, that there are many Philoſophical ſubjects, concerning which the beſt Logicians are incapable of coming to a certainty, by reaſon of the want of evidence in the object; but the object of the Mathematics is free from this inconvenience. Be it ſo; yet there is in this object a very great and irreparable defect; for it is a meer chimera which cannot poſſibly exiſt. Mathematical points, and conſequently the lines and ſurfaces, globes and axes, of the Geometricians are fictions which never can have a being: they are therefore inferior to thoſe of the Poets; for the latter commonly contain nothing that is impoſſible, but have at leaſt probability and poſſibility. Gaſſendus made an ingenious obſervation. He ſays that the Mathematicians, and eſpecially the Geometricians, have eſtabliſhed their empire in the land of abſtractions and ideas, where they walk at their eaſe; but that when they get into the country of realities, they ſoon meet with an invincible reſiſtance. ‘Mathematici, imprimiſque Geometræ, quantitatem abſtrahentes à materia, quoddam quaſi regnum ſibi ex ea fecerunt quamliberrimum; quippe nullo facto à materiæ craſſitie, pertinaciaque impedimento. Quare & ſuppoſuere imprimis in ea ſic abſtracta ejuſcemodi dimenſiones, ut punctum, quod foret prorſùs immune partibus fluendo lineam, longitudinemve latitudinis expertem crearet, &c. . . . Atque iſtæ quidem ſuppoſitiones ſunt, ex quibus Mathematici intra puræ, abſtractæve Geometriæ cancellos, & quaſi regnum conſiſtentes ſuas illas præclaras Demonſtrationes texunt (24). . . . Uno igitur verbo Mathematici ſunt, qui in ſuo illo abſtractionis regno ea indiviſibilia ſupponunt, quæ ſine partibus, ſine longitudine, ſine latitudine ſint, ac eam multitudinem, diviſionemque partium, quæ ad finem nunquam perveniat; non item verò Phyſici, quibus in regno materiæ verſantibus tale nihil licet (25). - - - *The Mathematicians, and eſpecially the Geometricians, by abſtracting quantity from matter, have erected for themſelves a ſort of empire, where they enjoy the greateſt liberty, as they never meet with any obſtacle from the groſſneſs and ſtubbornneſs of matter. Accordingly they have, in the firſt place, ſuppoſed that in quantity thus abſtracted, there are ſuch dimenſions as a point, which hath no parts, and a line, or length without breadth, generated by the flowing of a point, &c. . . . Such are the ſuppoſitions, by virtue of which the Mathematicians retire within the limits of pure and abſtract Geometry, and as it were into a ſeparate kingdom, where they compoſe their famous demonſtrations. . . . In a word, it is the Mathematicians, who in this their empire of abſtractions, ſuppoſe thoſe things to be indiviſible, which are without parts, without length, or breadth, and that where there is a diviſion of parts, it may be carried on* in infinitum. *It is not thus with the natural Philoſophers, who having to do with the material world, and living, as it were, in the empire of matter, cannot take ſuch liberty.*’ He gives an inſtance of the vanity of their pretended demonſtrations, in two ſubtile Mathematicians who attempted to prove that a finite and an infinite quantity are equal. *Nuper Viri præclari* Cavalerius, *&* Torricellius *oſtenderunt de acuto quodam ſolido infinitè longo & cuipiam tamen parallelepipedo, cylindrove finito æquali* (26). Others prove that there are infinite quantities bounded on each ſide (27). If they find evidence in demonſtrations of that kind, ought it not to be ſuſpected, ſince after all, it doth not over-balance the evidence with which common ſenſe informs us, that what is finite can never be equal with what is infinite, and that infinity as infinity cannot have any bounds? I add, that it is not true, that evidence can accompany thoſe gentlemen in all their ſpeculations. For proof of this I ſhall quote an author who is very well acquainted with their ſubtilties. ‘It were to be wiſhed, *ſaith he* (28), that the analyſis of infinitely ſmall quantities, which is pretended to be ſo admirably fertile, ſhould carry in its demonſtrations that evidence which is, and of right ought to be expected in Geometry. But when they argue *on the infinite, on the infinite of infinite, on the infinite of infinite of infinite, and ſo on, without ever finding terms to ſtop them,* and when they apply to finite magnitudes, *theſe infinites of infinites,* thoſe whom they would either inſtruct or convince, have

‘ not

---

(15) Jonſius, ubi ſupra, *pag,* 184.

(16) Menage in Laërt. *lib. vii, num.* 35, *pag.* 279.

(17) Cicero, de Nat. Deorum, *lib. i, cap. xxxiv, pag.* 135, *Edit. Leſcaloperii.*

(18) *See* Lactant. Divin. Inſtitut. *lib. iii, cap. xix, pag. m.* 201.

(19) Ἀπὸ τοῦ χέζειν, quod eſt *alvum exonerare.*

(20) Proclus, *pag.* 55, *apud* Barrow, Lect. V Mathem. *pag.* 76.

(21) Menag. in Laërt. *lib. vii, num.* 35, *pag.* 279, *col.* 1.

(22) Huetius, Demonſtr. Evangel. *Præfat. num.* 3, *pag.* 6, *Edit. Lipſ.* 1694.

(23) *See* Huetius, ubi ſupra, *Axiom. iv, pag.* 28, 29.

(24) Gaſſend. Phyſ. §. *i, lib. iii, cap. v, pag.* 264, *Oper. Tom. i.*

(25) Id. ibid. *pag.* 265.

(26) Id. ibid. *pag.* 264.

(27) *See the twelfth chapter of Father Maignan's Phyſics, pag. m.* 295, *and the twelfth propoſition, which runs thus,* Infinitum categorematicum eſſe poteſt, quamvis clauſum intrinſecis terminis etiam in eo genere in quo eſt infinitum.

(28) Journal de Trevoux, *for May and June,* 1701, *Art. xxxiii, pag.* 423, *Dutch Edit.*

confute it. There are ſome who more regret the loſs of theſe two books, than that of twenty

‘not always the penetration requiſite to ſee clearly into ſuch profound abyſſes . . . (29) Thoſe who are accuſtomed to the old ways of reaſoning in Geometry, do not eaſily quit them to follow ſuch abſtracted methods; they chooſe rather not to go ſo far than to engage in the new paths of *the infinite of infinite of infinite*, where one doth not always ſee very clearly about one, and where it is eaſy to go aſtray without perceiving it. For it is not ſufficient, in Geometry, to conclude, we muſt evidently ſee that the concluſion is juſt.’

EXTRACTS from a letter, written by the Chevalier de Meré, to Mr Paſcal.

It is a pretty good prejudice againſt the Mathematics, that Mr Paſcal deſpiſed them even before he gave himſelf up to devotion. He had been paſſionately fond of the Mathematics, and had made extraordinary progreſs in them. He was, beſides, endued with a very ſolid judgment, and very few people were capable of knowing the value of things better than he. It was not by his converſion to the only thing neceſſary, that he became diſguſted at theſe ſciences which had ſo charmed him. It was the examination of the thing it ſelf; and the reflexion he made on the diſcourſe of a layman, which cured him of his prepoſſeſſion. It would be fooliſh to imagine that the Chevalier de Meré attacked him with pious reflexions. He undoubtedly made uſe of no other than Philoſophical conſiderations: Let us ſee the effect of them, and cite the beginning of a letter from him to Mr Paſcal. ‘Do you remember you told me once that you were no longer ſo fully perſuaded of the excellency of the Mathematics. And now you write to me that I have wholly undeceived you, and diſcovered to you ſome things which you had never ſeen, if you had not known me. But yet, Sir, I do not know whether you are ſo much obliged to me as you think. For you ſtill retain a habit, which you have got from that ſcience, *viz.* of not determining on any thing whatſoever, otherwiſe than by your demonſtrations, which moſt frequently are falſe. The tedious ratiocinations drawn from line to line perplex you in a more ſublime knowledge which never deceives . . . . but you will continually remain in thoſe errors into which the falſe demonſtrations of Geometry have plunged you, and I do not believe you entirely cured of the Mathematics, as long as you affirm that the little bodies, concerning which we diſputed the other day, may be divided *in infinitum* (30).’ The Chevalier de Meré makes him afterwards ſeveral objections on the diviſibility of matter *in infinitum*. Some of them are pretty good, and others very bad, and look rather like pleaſantry than ratiocination; it is truly ſurpriſing that the ſame letter ſhould be mixed with ſo many unequal things. The author, nevertheleſs, boaſts of a prodigious ability in the ſciences of which we are ſpeaking. *You know*, ſaith he (31), *that I have diſcovered in the Mathematics ſuch extraordinary things, that the moſt learned of the Antients never mentioned them, and the beſt Mathematicians of Europe have been ſurprized at them: you have written on my inventions as well as Mr Huygens, Mr de Fermac* (32), *and ſo many others who have admired them. You muſt judge from thence that I do not adviſe any perſon to deſpiſe this ſcience, which, to ſpeak truth, is really uſeful, provided we do not too much apply our ſelves to it; for commonly what is ſo curiouſly ſought after in it appears to me uſeleſs; and the time beſtowed upon that inquiry might be better employed. Methinks alſo that the reaſons which we find in this ſcience, though ever ſo little obſcure, or oppoſite to ſenſe, ought to render the conſequences drawn from them very ſuſpicious, eſpecially, as I have already hinted, when they relate to infinity.* Obſerve, it is highly proper that thoſe, who endeavour to ſhew the weak ſide of the Mathematics, ſhould convince the public that they underſtand them, that they have ſtudied them, that they acknowledge the uſefulneſs of them, and that they have no deſign to rob them of their juſt value. The learned Biſhop of Avranches, above cited, hath acted according to this rule (33), after having ſaid ſeveral excellent things concerning the uncertainties and illuſions of that ſcience (34).

Another paſſage of the Chevalier de Meré's letter runs thus: ‘I put you in mind that beſides this natural world, which falls under the cognizance of ourſenſes, there is another inviſible, and that it is in the latter that you may attain to the moſt ſublime knowledge. Thoſe who only conſider the material world, commonly judge very ill, and always groſly, like Des Cartes, whom you ſo highly eſteem, who did not know the ſpace of places otherwiſe than by the bodies which fill them . . . . . . But without undertaking to convince him of this error, know that it is in this inviſible world, of an infinite extenſion, that we are enabled to diſcover the reaſons, and principles of things, moſt hidden truths, the fitneſs, exactneſs, and proportion, and the true originals and perfect idea's of all that we ſearch (35).’ This is the concluſion of his letter to Mr Paſcal: I beg leave to ſay that I do not apprehend what he drives at; for his expreſſions are ſo looſe and indefinite, that one may draw concluſions from them, which would be quite contrary to what he muſt have thought and repreſented. His deſign was to cure Mr Paſcal entirely of the fondneſs he had for the Mathematics: he therefore intended to point out to him another object than that of this ſcience, to point it out to him, I ſay, as the ſource and ſeat of thoſe truths after which we aſpire; and yet he deſcribes to him an object which very nearly reſembles that of the Mathematics: For they do not conſider *this world which falls under the cognizance of our ſenſes*, but *that inviſible world, of an infinite extenſion*, where we may *diſcover the fitneſs, proportion, &c.* I believe he intended to recommend the Philoſophy of ideas, the moſt ſubtile Metaphyſics, which only tend to the contemplation of ſpirits, and the intelligible world which is in the mind of GOD: but the characteriſtics, which diſtinguiſh that ſcience from the Mathematics, have not been conſidered by him; nor did he remember that the Mathematics have this principal property of conſidering extenſion as ſeparated from matter and every ſenſible quality. Extenſion, or intelligible matter, is their object as ſenſible matter is that of Phyſics (36). Their excellency, according to the Ancients, conſiſts in diſengaging us from periſhable corporeal things, and raiſing us to thoſe which are ſpiritual, immutable, and eternal. Thence it proceeded that Plato diſliked the conduct of ſome Mathematicians who attempted to verify on matter their ſpeculative propoſitions (37). I ſhall here tranſcribe a moſt excellent paſſage of Plutarch, which turns on a ſaying of Plato, that GOD is continually employed in Geometrical exerciſes (38). ‘This ſaying . . . . intimates . . . . what he himſelf has often mentioned, when he praiſed Geometry as a ſcience that takes men off from ſenſible objects, and fixes their thoughts on ſuch as are intellectual and eternal, the contemplation of which is the end of all Philoſophy, as the viewing of myſteries is the end of myſtical religion: for of all the miſchiefs which ariſe to us from that ſympathy in pain and pleaſure which faſtens the ſoul to the body, this is the greateſt, that it renders ſenſible things more evident to us than intellectual, and forces the underſtanding to judge, rather according to paſſion than reaſon: for man being accuſtomed by his feeling of pain or pleaſure, to regard the mutable and uncertain nature of bodies as a thing actually ſubſiſting, grows blind, and loſes the knowlege of that which really ſubſiſts, and deſtroys that inſtrument and light of the ſoul, which is worth a thouſand bodily eyes, and by which alone the Deity can be diſcerned. Now in all the other Mathematical ſciences, as in plain and ſmooth mirrours, the images and marks of the truth of intellectual objects appear, but Geometry chiefly, as being the parent of all the reſt, withdraws, and, as it were, purifies and ſets looſe the underſtanding from the thoughts of ſenſible objects: and therefore Plato himſelf reprehended Eudoxus, Archytas, and Menechmus, for endeavouring to reduce the doubling of the cube to Mechanical operations, as if it was impoſſible to find out two lines which could be demonſtrated to be mean proportionals. For he objected to them that all that was good in Geometry would be loſt and corrupted, if it was made to fall back again to ſenſible things, inſtead of riſing higher and contemplating thoſe immaterial and immortal images, to which GOD was always attentive, and of which he was alſo the cauſe (39).’ Several paſſages of Ariſtotle (40) inform us, that quantity, as diſengaged

(29) Ibid. *pag.* 430.

(30) Lettres de Mr le Chevalier de Meré, *num.* 19, *pag.* 60, *Dutch Edit.*

(31) Id. ibid. *pag.* 63.

(32) It ſhould be Fermat.

(33) Huetius, ubi ſupra, *Axiom. iv, num.* 3, *pag.* 31.

(34) Ibid. *num.* 2, *pag.* 28, & *ſeq.* See alſo from page 14, to page 19.

(35) Chevalier de Meré, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 68, 69.

(36) Hæc eſt illa quantitas, quæ dici ſolet materia intelligibilis ad differentiam materiæ ſenſibilis quæ ad Phyſicum ſpectat; illa enim ab hac per intellectum ſeparatur, ac ſolo intellectu percipitur. *Blancanus, de natura Mathematicarum, pag.* 6.

(37) Plutarch. in Marcello, *pag.* 305.

(38) Τὸν θεὸν ἀεὶ γεωμετρεῖν. Deum ſemper geometriam tractare. *Plut. Sympoſ. lib. viii, cap. ii, pag.* 718. Note, that the Moderns, who doubt of the exiſtence of bodies, might make uſe of this maxim, and ſay, that the action of God upon our minds, whereby he communicates to us the ideas of extenſion, and thoſe of numbers, and motion, and of the relations of ſwiftneſs to ſpace and duration, &c. is only a Geometrical work.

(39) Id. ibid.

(40) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathematicis, *pag.* 4, & *ſeq.* quotes them.

from

twenty or thirty dramatical pieces, or that of the beſt Hiſtorians of antiquity.

from whatever falls under the ſenſes, is the object of the Mathematics. And the greateſt part of the Mathematicians own, that this object exiſts no where but in the mind. Dr Barrow diſapproves the granting this (41). His cenſure falls expreſsly on the Jeſuit Blancanus and on Voſſius; but it is certain that Blancanus was in the right, and ought not to have been cenſured for any thing beſides aſſerting the poſſibility of the exiſtence of the globe and triangle &c. of the Geometricians: ‘ Ultimò dici poteſt: hæc entia eſſe ‘ poſſibilia, quis enim neget Angelum, aut Deum ea ‘ poſſe efficere (42)? - - - - - *In the laſt place it may* ‘ *be ſaid that theſe are poſſible Beings; for what man* ‘ *will pretend that an Angel, or that GOD cannot pro-* ‘ *duce them?*’ There is no need of a long diſcourſe to ſhew it impoſſible that this globe, or that triangle, &c. ſhould really exiſt; we need only remember that ſuch a globe placed on a plane, would only touch it in one indiviſible point, and that rolling on the plane, it would touch it always in a ſingle point. From whence it will reſult, that it muſt be wholly compoſed of unextended parts; but that is impoſſible, and manifeſtly includes this contradiction, that an extenſion would exiſt and not be extended. It would exiſt according to the ſuppoſition, and it would not be extended, ſince it would not be at all diſtinct from a being not extended. All Philoſophers agree that the material cauſe is not diſtinct from its effect; wherefore what would be compoſed of unextended parts, would not be diſtinct from them: but whatever is the ſame thing with an unextended being, is neceſſarily an unextended thing. Our Divines, when they teach that the world was produced out of nothing, do not mean that it is compoſed of nothing: the word *nothing* doth not ſignify the material cauſe of the world, *materiam ex qua*; but the ſtate antecedent to the creation of the world, which they call *terminum à quo*, and they acknowledge that taking the word *nothing* in the firſt ſenſe, it is abſolutely impoſſible that the world ſhould have been made of it. Now it is not more extravagant to aſſert, that the world was made of nothing as of its material cauſe, than to affirm that a foot of extenſion is compoſed of unextended parts (43). It is not therefore poſſible that either an Angel, or GOD himſelf, ſhould ever produce the triangle, the plane, the circle, the globe, &c. of the Geometricians; and therefore Blancanus deſerved on this head to be cenſured.

I leave my readers to determine whether my cenſure of the laſt paſſage of the Chevalier de Meré is well grounded.

(41) Iſaac Barrow, Lect. V, *pag.* 85.

(42) Blancanus, ubi ſupra, *p.* 7.

(43) Compare with this what has been ſaid above, at the beginning of the remark [*G*], in the foregoing article.

ZEUXIS, a very famous Painter, flouriſhed four hundred years before CHRIST, towards the XCVth Olympiad [*A*]. What we know of his country is a little confuſed

[*A*] *He flouriſhed* . . . . *towards the XCVth Olympiad.*] Mr Moreri is guilty of a fault in ſaying only that Zeuxis lived in the LXXVIIIth Olympiad (1); for he ought to have known that Pliny, who exactly ſpecified the time when this Painter lived (2), namely in the fourth year of the XCVth Olympiad (3), refutes thoſe who have placed it in the LXXXIXth. I am ſurprized that Scaliger hath not obſerved this in his note on the place of Euſebius, which makes Zeuxis to flouriſh in the LXXVIIIth Olympiad. Euſebius deſerved to be cenſured; ſince it is undeniable, without contradicting almoſt all thoſe who ſpeak of Zeuxis, that he was very intimately known to Archelaus King of Macedon. But there were two of the name of Archelaus, and the firſt not having begun his reign, according to Euſebius's chronolgy, before the beginning of the LXXXVIIth Olympiad, Zeuxis muſt be arrived at a very remarkable old age, if the time of his flouriſhing fell on the LXXVIIIth Olympiad, and if neverthele ſs he painted at Archelaus's court. I own theſe things are not incompatible; but let that be as it will Euſebius was too forward; he ought to have referred Zeuxis to the reign of this Macedonian King. I ſhall obſerve by the way, that the manner in which the Ancients place the chronology of illuſtrious men, may tend to confuſion. The year of their birth and that of their death ought to be ſpecified, and not the time when they flouriſhed; for that is indefinite and uncertain, it is early or late in a man's life, according to tempers and opportunities: ſome are at the higheſt pitch of their reputation at the age of thirty. Others do not reach it till ſixty. This makes me recollect the proof which Pliny uſes againſt thoſe who place Zeuxis in the LXXXIXth Olympiad. He refutes them by this reaſon, that it is an Olympiad wherein we muſt neceſſarily place the Painter who taught Zeuxis. This reaſon may paſs, conſidering the time when Zeuxis appears in Pliny: but if we change in the text the LXXXIXth Olympiad into the LXXIXth, as Father Hardouin hath done on the authority of the mannuſcripts, Pliny's reaſoning will hardly appear juſt; he will refute thoſe, who ſay that Painter flouriſhed in the LXXIXth Olympiad, he will refute them, I ſay, by ſhewing that to be the time where the maſter of Zeuxis ought to be placed. But why muſt this time be aſſigned to him? Becauſe Zeuxis did not ſignalize himſelf before the end of the XCVth Olympiad. This is a weak reaſon. Muſt not a Painter grow famous till ſixty years after his apprenticeſhip? I would therefore prefer the common reading of Pliny to that of the manuſcripts in the king's library. I do not impute to ſo learned a man as Father Hardouin, what I am going to ſay; his Printers muſt have left out ſome numbers. He pretends that Suidas agrees with Pliny on the time of Zeuxis, ſince Suidas, relying on Ariſtotle, places the birth of this Painter in the LXXXVIth Olympiad, and makes him flouriſh in the time of Iſocrates. A little after he refutes the vulgar reading of Pliny, concerning the LXXXIXth Olympiad, by reaſon that it is evident even from what he had juſt before cited out of Suidas, that Zeuxis died in the LXXXIXth Olympiad. I am ſure that if my eyes do not deceive me, Father Hardouin's Printers have confounded the numeral letters of the original.

As for the reſt I would not depend too much on the time ſpecified by Pliny; it ſeems to me to be wrong. ‘ Ab hoc (*Apollodoro*) artis fores apertas Zeuxis He- ‘ racleotes intravit, Olympiadis nonageſimæ quintæ ‘ anno quarto, audentemque jam aliquid penicillum ‘ (de hoc enim adhuc loquimur) ad magnam gloriam ‘ perduxit, à quibuſdam falſo in octogeſima nona ‘ Olympiade poſitus, cum fuiſſe neceſſe eſt Demophi- ‘ lum Himeræum, & Neſeam Thaſium, quoniam ‘ utrius eorum diſcipulus fuerit, ambigitur (4). - - - - ‘ *Apollodorus having diſcovered the firſt rudiments of this* ‘ *art, Zeuxis of Heraclea improved it in the fourth year* ‘ *of the XCVth Olympiad, and from that infancy of glory* ‘ *in which it then was, brought it to the higheſt perfection.* ‘ *Some authors falſly place him in the LXXXIXth Olym-* ‘ *piad: whereas Demophilus Himeræus, and Neſeas* ‘ *Thaſius, muſt have flouriſhed at that time, it being* ‘ *doubted of which of theſe two Painters he was the* ‘ *diſciple.*’ There is no need of being very nice about the time of the reputation of a great man, and it were eaſy to prove, from this author's own words, that he had been more exact, if he had marked the chronology ſomewhat more generally. For what doth he mean by this fourth year of the XCVth Olympiad? Does he mean that before this year Zeuxis lived in obſcurity, and did not begin to make himſelf known till then? But this is not a proper way of ſpecifying the time when any perſon flouriſhed; it ought to be ſpecified with reſpect to a reputation of ſome continuance; and if Pliny had done otherwiſe with regard to Zeuxis, he would have been very much miſtaken. In effect, he informs us that this Painter did not give his pieces for nothing, till after he was exceeding rich. But when he gave them away Archelaus was living; for the preſent of his Pan to Archelaus is one of the examples of his liberality related by Pliny. He had therefore acquired vaſt riches and a great ruputation by painting before the death of the laſt Archelaus, that is, before the end of the XCIVth Olympiad (5); and

(1) Mr Hofman has committed the ſame fault.

(2) Mr Felibien, *pag.* 56, *of his* I Entretien ſur les Vies & ſur les Ouvrages des Peintres, *places Zeuxis in the XCVth Olympiad; but the Printer has committed a fault in making this Olympiad anſwer to the year of the world,* 583. *It ſhould be* 3583. Voſſius, de IV Art. popul. *places him alſo in the XCVth Olympiad.*

(3) I do not mean with the utmoſt exactneſs. See the following citation.

(4) Plin. *lib.* xxxv, *cap.* ix, *pag. m.* 198, 199.

(5) Euſebius places the death of Archelaus, in the third year of the XCIVth Olympiad.

confuſed [*B*]. Painting was then in the firſt degree of its luſtre: From that beginning of reputation to which Apollodorus had brought it, he raiſed it to a great perfection. Some authors tell us, that it was he who invented the manner of diſpoſing lights and ſhadows (*a*) [C]; and it is agreed on all hands that he excelled in the art of colouring. Ariſtole (*b*) found fault with his pictures for not expreſſing the manners or paſſions; yet Pliny obſerves the contrary, with regard to his picture of Penelope, *in which*, ſaith he, *Zeuxis ſeems to have painted her manners* (*c*). He acquired immenſe riches (*d*); and once made a ſhew of them during the celebration of the Olympic games, where he appeared in a cloak embroidered with gold letters expreſſing his name. After he became ſo rich, he would no longer ſell his works; but gave them away, and ſaid very frankly, that he could not ſet a price on them equal to their value. Before this time he made people pay for the ſight of them; and none were admitted to ſee his Helen but for ready money; whence in rallery the Wits called that picture, *Helen the Courtezan* (*e*). He made no ſcruple of placing under her protraicture the three verſes of the Iliad, where Homer relates that honeſt Priam, and the venerable old men of his council, agreed that the Greeks and Trojans were not to blame for expoſing themſelves during ſo long a time to ſo many evils for the ſake of Helen, whoſe beauty equalled that of the goddeſſes (*f*). I cannot well determine whether this Helen of Zeuxis was the ſame which was at Rome in Pliny's time, or that which he drew for the inhabitants of Crotona, to be placed in Juno's temple (*g*). It will not be improper to relate here what Zeuxis required from the Crotonians with reſpect to that picture. They had by great ſums of money prevailed on him to come to them, in order to get many of his paintings, with which they intended to adorn their temple; and when he acquainted them that he intended to draw the picture of Helen [*D*], they were very well pleaſed, becauſe they knew his principal excellence lay in painting of women. He then aſked them what beautiful virgins they had in their city, and they conducted him to the place where young lads learned their exerciſes.

and conſequently Pliny would have been ſtrangely miſtaken, if he had placed the beginning of his reputation in the fourth year of the XCVth Olympiad. For my part, I believe that a medium ought to be taken betwixt Euſebius and Pliny, the rather becauſe we read in Plutarch (6), that this great Painter flouriſhed when Pericles cauſed a great number of public edifices to be built, and made Phidias the ſurveyor of them. But without alledging that Pliny (7) places Phidias in the LXXXIVth Olympiad, it is certain that Pericles cauſed theſe edifices to be built ſeveral years before his death, which happened in the LXXXVIIth Olympiad. Wherefore it doth not appear that Pliny had a great deal of reaſon to refute thoſe who placed Zeuxis in the LXXXIXth Olympiad, and to make him then but a young diſciple.

[*B*] *What we know of his country is a little confuſed.*] For though the teſtimony of Tzetzes (8), who makes him a native of Epheſus, ſhould not make us doubt that he was born at Heraclea, ſince Cicero (9), Pliny (10), and Ælian (11) agree, in affirming it; it is not a little perplexing to chooſe out of ſuch a great number of cities which had the name of Heraclea, that where Zeuxis was born. Some conjecture that it was Heraclea, near Crotona in Italy (12).

[*C*] *Some authors tell us, that it was he who invented the manner of diſpoſing lights and ſhadows* (13)]. The glory of invention being that on which men ſet the higheſt value, Moreri ſhould have informed his reader of that paſſage in Quintilian. Whereas he aſſures us, that *the art of ſhading*, in the fine pieces of Zeuxis, *was beyond any price*. Thus on one ſide he forgets the principal part, and on the other he ſtretches the thing too far. He forgot to tell us, that Zeuxis was the inventer of the mixture of lights and ſhadows in pictures; and, without any ground, he ſaith, that it was the art of ſhadowing which rendred Zeuxis's pieces ineſtimable. His miſtake happened thus. He had read in an author (14) from whom he took ſeveral things, *that it was obſerved of Zeuxis that though his pieces, wherein the art of ſhading appeared firſt of all, were beyond any price, which reduced him to the neceſſity of giving them gratis*; *yet he was guilty of the fault of repreſenting the heads larger than they really were, as he did alſo moſt of the members* (15): *In this Quintilian* (16) *obſerves that he did no more than imitate Homer, whoſe beautiful ladies are robuſt, and in good caſe:* Moreri, I ſay, had read this, and did not know how to make uſe of it. He ought to have extracted out of it what was blamed in the works of Zeuxis; but above all, he ſhould have taken this obſervation that the art of ſhading was the invention of this Painter. At leaſt, after having left it out, he ſhould not have connected the words that go before it with thoſe that come after; for by this means he hath falſified the paſſage of la Mothe le Vayer, which wanted to be mended inſtead of being falſified. What makes me ſay ſo, is, that this famous writer lays down for a certainty, that the true reaſon why Zeuxis diſcontinued the ſelling of his pieces, was becauſe it was not poſſible for any perſon to pay the true value of them. This is taking that Painter's words too literally (17), he probably did not think as he ſpoke: and if he had really believed it, he had been the moſt extravagant braggadocio in the world; and conſequently his rodomontade ſhould not be alledged as a juſt reaſon. It is very probable that the pieces which he preſented after his being very rich, were not better than thoſe which he formerly ſold; for it is not cuſtomary to finiſh what one has a mind to give gratis, more than what one deſigns to ſell at a dear rate. To which purpoſe I remember it is commonly ſaid, that an Abbot's ſermons are better whilſt he is aſpiring after a biſhopric than after he hath obtained it. And therefore if Zeuxis's reaſon had been true, he ſhould have left off ſelling his works ſooner than he did. I was ſurprized not to find Quintilian's obſervations amongſt thoſe which Felibien hath given us concerning Zeuxis. Mr Hofman hath tranſlated Moreri's expreſſion ſomewhat ambiguouſly; for the words, *Donare opera ſua*, INTER QUÆ UMBRÆ EMINEBANT, *inſtituit*, as he has turned them, ſeem to ſignify, that there was one of Zeuxis's pieces in which he had painted the ſhadows, which picture was the moſt excellent of his works. Beſides, the word *eminebant* doth not ſeem deſigned for *umbræ* in the Painters ſtile; for no places appear to have leſs relievo in painting, than thoſe expreſſed by ſhadows (18).

[*D*] *To draw the picture of Helen.*] It is an inexcuſable omiſſion in Charles Stephens, in Lloyd, Moreri, and Hofman, to have ſaid nothing of the picture of Helen, but that Zeuxis painted it, tho' the Antients have related ſo many remarkable particulars concerning it. Charles Stephens hath only cited Pliny, who ſpoke of it by the by; he ſhould have quoted Cicero and Ælian, who have touched on the circumſtances. Lloyd and Hofman only cite, properly ſpeaking, in the ſame manner as Charles Stephens: for tho' they refer us to Cicero, it is plain that it is with regard to Zeuxis in general, and not with reſpect to Helen's picture; this, I ſay, is plain, becauſe they refer us alſo to Plutarch, in the life of Pericles, where he doth not treat of this picture. By the Printer's errors we find Cicero cited in Mr Lloyd's Dictionary thus; 2. *de Juvent.* and in that of Mr Hofman alſo, *lib.* 2. *de Juventut.* inſtead of *lib.* 2. *de Invent.* which is enough to make ſeveral

(*a*) Luminum umbrarumque inveniſſe rationem traditur. *Quintil. lib. xii, cap. x.*

(*b*) De Poët. *cap. vi.*

(*c*) Plin. *lib. xxxv, cap. ix, pag. m.* 199.

(*d*) Id. ibid.

(*e*) Ælian, *lib. iv, cap. xii.*

(*f*) Valerius Maximus, *lib. iii, cap. vii.*

(*g*) The ſame author ſays, that Zeuxis's Marſyas bound up, was to be ſeen in the temple of Concord. *Zeuxidis manus vidi*, ſays Petronius, *nondum vetuſtatis injuria victas.*

(6) In the Life of Pericles.

(7) Lib. xxxiv, cap. viii.

(8) Chiliad. VIII, Hiſtor. cxcvi.

(9) Lib. ii, de Inventione.

(10) Piin. *lib. xxxv, cap. ix.*

(11) Var. Hiſt. *lib. iv, cap. xii & lib. xiv, cap. xvii, & xlvii.*

(12) Harduin. in Plin. *Tom. v, pag.* 199. Jacob. Prouſt in Cicer. *lib. ii*, in Invent. Note, that the Antients, who were contented to call him Heracleotes, have done worſe than if we ſhould now-a-days denote a man's native country, by ſaying that he was born at Clermont.

(13) See Plutarch's paſſage concerning Apollodorus, in the remark [*G*].

(14) La Mothe le Vayer, Letter ix, *in the tenth volume of the Edit. in* 12mo. *pag.* 76.

(15) *Pliny not quoted by La Mothe le Vayer, informs us of it, lib. xxxv, cap. ix.* Deprehenditur tamen Zeuxis grandior in capitibus articuliſque: *This laſt word he ſhould have tranſlated* joints *and not* members.

(16) La Mothe le Vayer quotes *lib. xii, Inſt. cap. xviii, but it ſhould be cap. x.*

(17) Poſtea donare opera ſua inſtituit, quòd ea nullo ſatis digno pretio permutari poſſe diceret. *Plin. ubi ſupra.*

(18) *See* Voſſius de Graphice, *pag.* 69.

exerciſes. This gave him the moſt favourable opportunity poſſible of ſeeing if they were beautiful, and well ſhaped throughout; for they were ſtark naked; and he appearing very well pleaſed, they gave him to underſtand, that he might judge thereby whether they had beautiful virgins in their city, ſince they had the ſiſters of thoſe young lads whom he moſt admired. He then deſired to ſee the moſt beautiful, and the council of the city having ordered all the virgins to come together to the ſame place, that Zeuxis might have his free choice, he ſelected five; and by taking from each of them what was moſt charming in her, he formed the picture of Helen. Theſe five maids were highly extolled by the Poets on account of their beauty which had obtained the approbation of the man who was the beſt judge of it (*b*) [*E*], and accordingly their names did not fail of being conſecrated to poſterity: however I do not believe there is now any trace of theſe names. Cicero, who informs us of all theſe particulars, hath left his reader to gueſs, that the Painter deſired to ſee thoſe five young beauties ſtark naked: but Pliny expreſsly affirms it; nay he ſays that before Zeuxis choſe theſe five, he had ſeen all the Crotonian virgins in that condition (*i*). It is true he affirms, that Zeuxis painted for the Agrigentines, and not for the Crotoniates, and doth not name the picture: excepting this, it is plain he relates the ſame ſtory with Cicero. I muſt not forget that Zeuxis diſputing the prize of Painting with Parrhaſius loſt it (*k*) [*F*], in the following manner. Zeuxis had painted ſome grapes ſo extremely well, that the birds flew down to peck at them. And Parrhaſius painted a curtain ſo artfully, that Zeuxis taking it for a real one, drawn before his antagoniſt's work, aſked with the utmoſt confidence, why they did not immediately draw that curtain in order to ſhew what Parrhaſius had done. Having found

ſeveral readers believe that Cicero wrote *de Juventute* as well as *de Senectute*. Voſſius (19) hath cenſured Bulengerus, for ſaying in his book of Painting, that it was Venus and not Helen whom Zeuxis painted, from the five living originals placed before him: but in correcting this fault, Voſſius himſelf hath committed another; he ſays that Pliny mentions as expreſsly as Cicero, that Zeuxis painted Helen. But it is not true that Pliny mentions it; he ſpeaks in general of a picture. Obſerve, that Cœlius Rhodiginus, ſpeaking of the picture of Helen, the courtezan, has committed a groſs ſoleciſm (20). *Zeuxin*, ſaith he, *pictura nobilem, inter cætera ejus artificii, haud parum multa quæ circumferuntur, & hominum deſideria vix explent, Helenam quandoque ab eo expictam ferunt, cui tantum ſanè attribuerit, ut non temere nec quemlibet, ac (ut Græci dicunt)* ὡς ἔτυχε, *ſpectatum admitteret, ni* ῥητόν ἀργύειον, *id eſt propoſitam pecuniæ quantitatem erogaſſet.* The like faults in language have eſcaped the beſt authors.

[*E*] *Theſe five maids were highly extolled . . . . on account of their beauty, which had obtained the approbation of the man who was the beſt judge of it.*] One might very well doubt whether the five maids whom Zeuxis choſe, were each of them handſomer than thoſe whom he did not chuſe. The reaſon of this ſcruple is, that he deſigned only to unite in one body, the particular beauties which he found ſeparated in thoſe five maids: to which purpoſe there was no neceſſity that they ſhould be all very beautiful; it was ſufficient that ſome of them had the beauties which the others wanted. But who can deny that there are ſome women of indifferent beauty, who if you only compare one ſingle part with the ſame in another, will, in that, ſurpaſs the greateſt beauties. Wherefore it doth not appear that Cicero, or the Poets of whom he ſpeaks, were neceſſarily in the right to prefer thoſe five Crotonian maids, choſen by the Painter of Helen, to thoſe who were paſſed by. Perhaps the Painter rejected ſome, who wanted very little to render them perfect beauties; but who were not at all for his purpoſe, becauſe he found the ſame beauties they were endued with, in a more eminent degree in one of the five: after which it was enough for another of the five, tho' but indifferently handſome, to have that very ſmall thing which was wanting in thoſe whom he refuſed. The queſtion, as every body ſees, is not important, it may be laid aſide; and if any perſon ſhould aſſert that Zeuxis choſe the fineſt five of them all, not by reaſon of it's being neceſſary to his deſign, but to enjoy a more agreeable ſight, I will not oppoſe him. One of the chief grounds of this ſtory is what is commonly ſaid, that nothing in the world is perfect. And this holds true eſpecially in relation to beauty. I appeal to the criticiſms which handſome women paſs upon one another, and yet they do not ſee every thing, as Zeuxis did, being, without doubt, reſolved not to follow the method of which Horace ſpeaks in his ſecond ſatire of the firſt book.

. . . . Ne corporis optima lynceis
Contemplere oculis, Hypſea cæcior, illa
Quæ mala ſunt ſpectes. O crus! O bracchia! verum
Depygis, naſuta, brevi latere ac pede longo eſt (21).

Be not too eagle-ey'd to view a grace;
And blind, as Hypſea is, to ſpy a fault;
For ſuch as judge by faults are often caught.
How neat her arm! her leg! 'tis true, but ſtay,
Her waſte is ſhort, noſe long, her feet are ſplay.

CREECH.

The truth is, this Painter had no need of any thing, beſides his own imagination, to draw the picture of a compleat beauty; for it is certain that our ideas go beyond nature. ‘ Ego ſic ſtatuo, nihil eſſe in ullo genere tam pulchrum quo non pulchrius id ſit unde illud ut ex ore aliquo quaſi imago exprimatur, quod neque oculis, neque auribus, neque ullo ſenſu percipi poteſt, cogitatione tantum & mente complectimur . . . . . Nec verò ille artifex (*Phidias*) quum faceret Jovis formam aut Minervæ, contemplabatur aliquem è quo ſimilitudinem duceret, ſed ipſius in mente inſidebat ſpecies pulchritudinis eximia quædam, quam intuens, in eaque defixus, ad illius ſimilitudinem artem & manum dirigebat (22). - - - - *In my opinion, there is not any thing, of whatever kind, ſo beautiful as that idea from which it is expreſſed, and of which it is only, as it were, an image or repreſentation; an idea which is not the object of the eyes, or ears, or of any other of the ſenſes, but of our thoughts alone, and can only be perceived in the mind . . . . Phidias, when he made the ſtatue of Jupiter, or that of Minerva, did not ſet up for his pattern any particular perſon: but he had in his mind a certain noble and exalted idea of beauty, which he regarded ſtedfaſtly, and attentively followed as the model of his work.*’ It would not be more impoſſible to find men as accompliſhed as the heroes of romances, than it would be to find as beautiful women as the heroines of the ſame fabulous country. This is ſo true, that when authors would in few words repreſent any one perfectly beautiful, they content themſelves with ſaying, that the perſon ſurpaſſes the ideas of Poets and of Painters (23).

[*F*] *Zeuxis diſputing the prize of Painting with Parrhaſius, loſt it.*] The fact relating to the birds which Zeuxis deceived by his painted grapes, is commonly related after a very confuſed manner. But if Pliny was well conſulted, authors would not fall into that confuſion; for they would there ſee that Zeuxis drew two ſeveral pictures which related to this fact, and that each had it's particular adventure. I do not take notice

---

(*b*) Quarum nomina multi poetæ memoriæ tradiderunt, quod ejus eſſent judicio probatæ qui veriſſimum pulcritudinis habere judicium debuiſſet. *Cicer. lib. ii*, de Invent.

(*i*) Tantus diligentia ut Agragantinis facturus tabulam quam in templo Junonis Laciniæ publicè dicarent, inſpexerit virgines eorum nudas & quinque elegerit, ut quod in quaque laudatiſſimum eſſet pictura redderet. *Plin. lib. xxxv, cap. ix.*

(*k*) Id. ibid. *cap. x.*

(19) De Graphice, *pag.* 69, *in libro* de IV Artib. popular.

(20) Cœlius Rhodiginus, Antiq. Lect. *lib. xix, cap. xxvii, pag. m.* 1086.

(21) *See how Robert and Antony Chevalier d'Agneaux, natives of Vire, in Normandy, have tranſlated theſe lines. Nothing can be more lively.*
Tout ainſi ce qu'en ſoy.
Le corps a de plus beau,
D'ieux Lynceens ne voy:
Regarde plus qu'Hypſée aveugle, les parties.
Qui plus laides y ſont.
Eſbahy tu t'eſcries;
O la greve, o les bras, mais long nés & courts flancs,
Et greſle cuiſſe ell' a avecques les piés grands.

(22) Cicero, in Oratore, *init.*

(23) Lateri applicat meo mulierem omnibus ſimulacris emendatiorem. *Petronius.*
Spondebatque ducem celſi nitor igneus oris,
Membrorumque modus qualem nec carmina fingunt
Semideïs.
Claudian. de Laudib. Stilicon. lib. i.

found his miſtake, he confeſſed himſelf outdone, ſince he had only deceived birds, whereas Parrhaſius had impoſed on the very maſters of the art. Another time he painted a boy loaded with grapes, and the birds flew alſo to this picture; this diſpleaſed him, and he ingenuouſly owned that his work was not ſufficiently finiſhed, ſince if the boy had been as naturally expreſſed as the grapes, the birds would have been afraid of him. We are told that he wiped out the grapes and only kept the figure, in which he had leaſt ſucceeded (*l*). Archelaus King of Macedon employed Zeuxis to adorn his palace with paintings; on this occaſion we have in Ælian a fine reflexion of Socrates (*m*). One of this Painter's beſt pieces was a Hercules ſtrangling ſome dragons in his cradle in the ſight of his affrighted mother: but he himſelf preferred his Athlet, or wreſtler, before all the reſt, and under it placed a verſe which afterwards became famous (*n*) [*G*]. It is not

(*l*) Senec. Controv. v, *lib. v.*

(*m*) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib. xiv, cap. xvii.*

(*n*) Adeo ſibi in illo (*Athleta*) placuit ut verſum ſubſcriberet celebrem ex eo, inviſurum aliquem facilius quàm imitaturum. *Plin. ubi ſupra.*

---

notice of what ſeveral authors relate, that Zeuxis himſelf attempted to draw Parrhaſius's curtain; for Pliny doth not tell the ſtory ſo: but this is an alteration of circumſtances too inconſiderable to ſay any thing more of it. There is much more reaſon to think it ſtrange, that Moreri's Dictionary ſhould ſay nothing of the challenge or wager of theſe two Painters, and that Lloyd and Hofman have given but a very ſmall hint of it. As for what relates to the other piece, wherein the boy carried grapes, Mr Moreri hath mentioned it in a manner which is not much to his honour, ſince he hath omitted the principal circumſtances, not having given the leaſt hint of the judgment which Zeuxis himſelf made of this piece; Mr Hofman hath not forgot this, but he makes uſe of a phraſe which he ought entirely to have ſuppreſſed; *eadem ingenuitate*, ſaith he, *proceſſit* (Zeuxis) *iratus operi ac dixit*. Theſe words are Pliny's, and are extraordinary proper in the original, where they relate to the ſtory of the wager, that is to ſay, to Pliny's narrative, with what ingenuity Zeuxis owned that he was outdone. But when, in an article where there is nothing of this ingenuity, they tell us that Zeuxis acknowledged with the ſame ingenuity, *&c.* they throw us into impenetrable obſcurities, and we can only conjecture, that the author gives us an imperfect paſſage. Moſt abbreviators are ſubject to this fault (24). Mr Hofman is on this head much more excuſable than Mr Lloyd; for the latter having retained the phraſe, *eadem ingenuitate proceſſit*, which he found in Charles Stephens, might eaſily think that it concerned a particular to which the reader of Charles Stephens was referred. But Mr Lloyd hath ſuppreſſed this reference, and by this means hath increaſed the obſcurity of his article. Not that I pretend wholly to excuſe Charles Stephens, for his *ut in Parrhaſio ſupra vidimus*, could not give him a right to make uſe of theſe words, *eadem ingenuitate proceſſit*, becauſe he had not been ſpeaking of the ſucceſs of the wager. The article of Zeuxis is much better in Calepin (25), than in all the Dictionaries which I have juſt mentioned. But I have not found any author who hath worſe expreſſed the diſpute betwixt theſe two Painters, than he who makes the greateſt figure in the commentary *variorum* on Valerius Maximus (26). He affirms that Parrhaſius painted ſome birds on a cloth, ſo very naturally, that Zeuxis fearing the judgment of the birds, with a modeſt ingenuity gave up the cauſe. I am very much miſtaken if his phraſe, *Zeuxis alitum judicium timens* is not a corruption of Pliny's words, *Zeuxis alitum judicio tumens*; and if ſo, what greater inſtance can there be of the alterations made in thoughts of authors?

Let us remember that Lancelotti of Perugia, takes all that is ſaid of theſe two pictures to be fabulous. He doth not believe that the birds pecked at Zeuxis's vine, nor that Zeuxis miſtook for a real curtain that of Parrhaſius. It is thus that he clears himſelf of the objection, which this affords to thoſe who have a mean opinion of the Moderns; he denies the fact; a very convenient way of ſolving difficulties. 'Oh, Zeuſi con l'uva dipinta, dite voi, traſſe gli uccelli à beccarla, il che non habbiamo d'alcuno de' noſtri mentovati di ſopra. Già io hò dato dentro con un libro di Farfalloni contra gli antichi Hiſtorici, & hocci rotto, come ſuol dire il Volgo, un paio di ſcarpe, intendinla come vogliono i preſenti o' poſteri bell' *Ingegni*, e però non temo, che ſono millanterie della Grecia, e Farfalloni di Plinio, e quello dell'uva, e quelli de gli animali, che deſſero ſegno di riconoſcere altri della loro ſpecie fatti di colore per naturali (27). - - - *But Zeuxis, you will ſay, painted grapes ſo well that he inticed the birds to fly down, and peck at them: and this is not related of any of the Moderns. I have already publiſhed a book, wherein I expoſe the idle ſtories of the antient Hiſtorians .... Let the preſent, or ſucceeding, Virtuoſo's underſtand this as they pleaſe, yet I doubt not but that the ſtory of the grapes, and that of the animals, who miſtook a picture for living creatures of their own ſpecies, are nothing but the vain boaſts of Greece, and the idle ſtories of Pliny.*' Mr Perrault, full as zealous for the Moderns as Lancelotti, hath hit upon a more ſolid anſwer; for he alledges the like performances of a freſh date, which alſo prove that the nicety of painting doth not conſiſt in that. His words are (28): *It is ſaid that Zeuxis repreſented ſome grapes ſo naturally, that the birds flew down to peck at them. But what is ſurprizing in this? A great many birds have killed themſelves againſt the Heaven of Ruel's perſpective, by attempting to paſs beyond it, without any perſon being ſurprized at it, and even this has not been much inſiſted upon in praiſing of that perſpective .... (29) Some time ſince, going by the Engliſh nuns, I was an eye-witneſs of an adventure full as honourable to the art of painting, as the ſtory of Zeuxis's grapes, and much more diverting. A new painted picture was ſet to dry in Mr le Brun's yard, the door of which was open; in the fore-part of the piece a great thiſtle was perfectly well repreſented. An honeſt country-woman went by with her aſs, which ſeeing the thiſtle, ſuddenly ran into the yard, threw down the woman, who in vain ſtrove to hold him in by his halter, and if a couple of luſty young fellows had not each of them beſtowed on him fifteen or twenty blows with a cudgel to force him to retire, he had eaten the thiſtle, I mean, that it being newly painted, he would have licked off all the painting with his tongue .... Pliny alſo relates, that Parrhaſius ſo naturally counterfeited a curtain, that Zeuxis himſelf was deceived by it. The like deceptions happen every day, whilſt the pieces which deceive are not at all eſteemed. Cooks have a hundred times laid hold of partridges and capons naturally repreſented, in order to ſpit them; and what followed? The company laughed, and the picture remained in the kitchen.*

[*G*] *Under it he placed a verſe, which afterwards became famous.*] If we believe Plutarch (30), this verſe was placed under the pieces of Apollodorus. He doth not ſay that Apollodorus himſelf put it there, as Voſſius (31), and Father Hardouin (32) affirm; he ſaith, in general, that it was written on the works of Apollodorus, *οὗ τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπιγέγραπται, Μωμήσεταί τις μᾶλλον ἢ μιμήσεται.* Cujus operibus inſcriptum fuit, Facilius hæc culpabit quis quàm imitabitur. - - - *It was inſcribed on the works of Apollodorus,* It is eaſier to blame this picture than to imitate it. This is not the only thing Plutarch aſcribes to Apollodorus, inſtead of attributing it to Zeuxis, as others do; he will have it alſo that Apollodorus invented ſhadows in Painting, *ἀνθρώπων πρῶτος ἐξευρὼν φθορὰν καὶ ἀπόχρωσιν σκιᾶς. Primus hominum invenit colorum temperationem diverſorum & umbræ coloribus exprimendæ rationem.* The whole paſſage runs thus: *Apollodorus, the firſt inventer of the tempering of colours, and of the art of expreſſing ſhadows, was an Athenian, on whoſe works was written,*

One may more eaſily blame, than imitate this picture.

A French Poet (33) ſhewing the like aſſurance, ſaith of his Franciade in the following verſes,

Un lit ce livre pour apprendre,
L'autre le lit comme envieux:
Il eſt bien aiſé de reprendre,
Mais mal aiſé de faire mieux.

(24) *Some inſtances of it may be ſeen in Gronovius's book* de pernicie Judæ. *See the* Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres, 1684, *for May, Art. vi.*

(25) The quotation out of Pliny, ought to be mended. It ſhould be *lib. liii*, inſtead of *xxxv*. Charles Stephens, and Father Cantel, in his *Valerius Maximus, in uſum Delph.* quote, *lib. lv.*

(26) *His name is Oliverius. See* Valerius Maximus Variorum, *of Leyden*, 1655, *pag.* 314.

(27) Secondo Lanceloti da Perugia Abbate Olivetano, l'Hoggidi *Part. ii, Diſinganno, xv, pag.* 308.

(28) Perrault, Parallèle des Anciens & des Modernes, *Tom. i, pag.* 136, *Dutch Edit.*

(29) Id. ibid. *pag.* 137.

(30) Plut. de Gloria Athenienſ. *pag.* 346.

(31) De Graphice, *pag.* 79.

(32) In Plin. *Tom. v, pag.* 200.

(33) Ronſard: ſee his Life.

Some

not improbable that he highly valued his Alcmena (*o*), ſince he preſented it to the Agrigentines. He did not value himſelf on quickly finiſhing his works [*H*]. It is ſaid that having painted an old woman, he fell into ſuch an exceſſive fit of laughter at the ſight of that picture, that he died of it. This is what Verrius Flaccus relates (*p*) [*I*]. There is in Lucian a deſcription of a picture of Zeuxis which deſerves to be read: that picture repreſented a female centaur. I had collected ſeveral particulars for this article, which I ſuppreſs, on account of the publication of Junius *de Pictura Veterum* (*q*) [*K*]. I ſhall here inſert a remark which was in the additions to my project: it relates to a book of Carlo Dati [*L*]. I ſhall not forget the firſt remark which I made in the article Zeuxis of my project. It points out ſome general defects in Moreri's Dictionary [*M*].

(*o*) Mr Felibien, *pag.* 56, ſays *Athalanta* inſtead of *Alcmena*.

(*p*) At the word *Pictor*.

(*q*) It was printed ſince my Project in the year 1694.

Some read my book to learn, ſome to condemn,
'Tis harder to write better than to blame.

[*H*] *He did not value himſelf on quickly finiſhing his works.*] Plutarch relates that Zeuxis being informed that Agatarchus boaſted of painting with eaſe and great diſpatch, ſaid, that as for his own part, he valued himſelf upon his ſlow performance, becauſe that was the way to make his works of a long duration (34). The ſame Plutarch, in another book (35), relates the ſtory, as if Zeuxis owned to ſome people who blamed his ſlowneſs, *That it is true he was long in painting his pieces, but they were deſigned for a long time.* All writers make him anſwer, *that he painted for eternity:* and thus this thought has lately been applied to the Dictionary of the French Academy, in the preface to that of Furetiere. It is the buſineſs of thoſe, who amplify the boaſting of this Painter, to ſee what authority they have for it.

[*I*] *This is what Verrius Flaccus relates.*] He adds two verſes which allude to this adventure,

Nam quid modi facturus riſu denique,
Ni pictor fieri vult qui riſu mortuus eſt?

He ſets no bounds to his immod'rate laughter,
Thinking who laughs to death muſt be a Painter.

But if it be true that Zeuxis died in this manner, how is it poſſible that ſo few authors ſhould mention it? Was there any thing ſo remarkable in all his liſe as this extraordinary death? However, among the many Antients who have mentioned Zeuxis, only Verrius Flaccus informs us of this uncommon particular. And that by chance, and ſo improperly, that he is reprimanded by his abbreviator Pompeius Feſtus, for inſerting ſuch a thing in a work wherein he deſigned to treat of the ſignification of words. I wiſh we had the paſſage of Verrius Flaccus entire: what remains of it, was in the moſt deplorable condition in the world, before Joſeph Scaliger applied his divining criticiſms to it. Had Moreri and Hofman known this, they would doubtleſs have mentioned it, as they ſhould have done, and then they had given us the two Latin verſes a little more intelligible. Honeſt Raviſius Textor (36) hath not inſerted our Painter in his catalogue of thoſe who died of laughing; which is doubtleſs an involuntary omiſſion.

Obſerve, that Simon Majolus, Biſhop of Voltura-ra, is very much miſtaken in relation to this fact. 'Zeuxis Pictor, *ſaith he* (37), deformiſſimam ſpectans 'quandam picturam ſolutus in riſum expiravit. Ver'rius alter pictor quod Anum quandam deformiſſimam 'pinxiſſet eandem mortem in riſum ſolutus obiit, Rho'digino teſte lib. 4. cap. 18. - - - *The Painter Zeuxis, 'at the ſight of a very deformed picture, fell into ſuch 'an exceſſive fit of laughter, that he died of it. Ver'rius, another Painter, having drawn a moſt deformed 'old woman, fell into the like fit of laughter, and alſo 'died of it, as Rhodiginus teſtifies.*' There is a very conſiderable omiſſion in what he ſaith of Zeuxis, and a very great miſtake in the reſt: for this pretended Painter Verrius, who died of laughter, is a chimerical perſon: beſides, Rhodiginus is very ill cited. See the margin (38); you will admire the metamorphoſis of the thoughts tranſcribed by ſome compilers, which is ſometimes as ſurpriſing as thoſe of Ovid.

[*K*] *On account of the publication of Junius* de Pictura Veterum.] I had rather refer to the excellent and learned collections of Junius, than heap up things which are to be found there. I take this opportunity to obſerve, that this work of Junius, printed at Rotterdam by Reinier Leers, would, perhaps, have yet lain hid in ſome ſtudy, if the Abbot Nicaiſe (39) had not made a thouſand efforts to procure the edition of it. They forgot to acquaint the public of this in the preface. This excellent work is dedicated to the Abbot BIGNON, one of the moſt illuſtrious protectors which the ſciences at preſent have, and who by his wit, eloquence, and extenſive learning, worthily maintains the glory of the name which he bears. Read that Epiſtle Dedicatory (40).

[*L*] *It relates to a book of Carlo Dati.*] Here is the laſt piece of the additions to my Project: 'Since the 'Printing of this article I have met with a book, 'which would have ſaved me a great deal of labour, 'if I had had it ſooner. It is the life of Zeuxis, 'written in Italian by Carlo Dati, and printed at 'Florence in 1667, together with thoſe of Parrha'ſius, Apelles, and Protogenes. The author hath 'collected whatever he found relating to thoſe four 'Painters in the works of the Antients, and hath 'very exactly connected the whole; beſides, he hath 'added to each life, ſeveral remarks, full of very 'fine and curious erudition. Thoſe which relate to 'the life of Zeuxis would afford me a great deal of 'matter, if I was not in the laſt page of my Project. 'I ſhall only obſerve that they have informed me of 'a particular of which Voſſius was ignorant; that is, 'that Bullingerus was not the firſt who ſaid that 'Zeuxis painted Venus and not Helen, from the liv'ing originals which he ſelected out of the beautiful 'maids of the city. Volaterranus, and John della 'Caſa, before him, miſtook the one for the other; 'and what is more, Lipſius hath ſomewhere ſaid '(41), that it was Juno and not Helen that Zeuxis 'painted. I obſerve by the way, that Carlo Dati 'hath cenſured Pliny without good reaſons. He be'lieves, that becauſe the temple of Juno Lacinia was 'near Crotona in Calabria, the Agrigentines did not 'employ Zeuxis to paint a piece in order to be 'conſecrated in that temple. But were not the temple 'of Delphi, and that of Jupiter Olympius filled with 'the gifts of all ſorts of people, as at preſent our Lady 'of Loretto is filled with *Ex Voto*'s from all Catholic 'countries?'

When I publiſhed what you have juſt read, I did not know that Taſſoni fell into the ſame error with Juſtus Lipſius. 'Queſti fu colui, *ſaith he* (42), *ſpeak'ing of Zeuxis,* che chiamato da gli Agrigentini, ò 'come hanno altri voluto da i Protoniati (43), à fare 'il ritratto di Giunone, il copiò dalle fatezze piu 'belle di cinque vergine da loro elette fra un numero 'infinito, che ne vide d'ignude. - - - *Zeuxis was the 'Painter, who, being deſired by the Agrigentines, or, as 'others will have it, by the Crotoniati, to draw the 'picture of Juno, copied it from the moſt beautiful fea'tures and ſhapes of five of their naked virgins, who 'had been ſingled out from an infinite number of others.*' The Italian is not leſs liable to ambiguities than the dead languages: if a Frenchman ſhould place his words as they are in Taſſoni, one would think, with reaſon, that he ſaid that Zeuxis ſaw naked an infinite number of virgins, and that out of this great number, the inhabitants of Agrigentum choſe five to ſerve as an original for this Painter. But the circumſtances of this picture ſhould not be related after this manner.

[*M*] *Some general defects in Moreri's Dictionary.*] I ſhall ſet down another piece of my Project, tranſcribed from pag. 387. 'I do not pretend to pro'poſe this article as a perfect model: the world will 'do me ſufficient juſtice, if they find it exempt from 'ſome faults which prevail in Moreri. That au'thor's manner of citing books, is certainly a great

(34) Plut. in Vita Periclis, *pag.* 159.

(35) *Idem*, de Multitudine Amicorum, *pag.* 94.

(36) *See his* Officina, *or* Theatrum Hiſtoricum, *lib. ii, cap. lxxxvii.*

(37) Simon Majolus, Dierum Canicularium, *Colloq. iv, pag.* 165. *Edit. Romanæ*, 1597.

(38) Zeuxin pictorem riſu emortuum prodidit Verrius, dum anum à ſe pictam ridet affluentius. - - - *Verrius relates that Zeuxis died of laughter, at the picture which he had drawn of an old woman.* Cœlius Rhodiginus, *lib. iv, cap. xviii, pag. m.* 207.

(39) Concerning his good offices to authors, and his zeal for the promoting of learning, ſee Mr Nicole's preface againſt the Quietiſts.

(40) It is very well written, and aſcribed to Father de la Baune.

(41) Lipſ. Monit. Polit. *lib. i, cap. i.*

(42) Aleſſandro Taſſoni, Penſieri diverſi, *lib. x, cap. xix, pag.* 414.

(43) It is doubtleſs an error of the preſs inſtead of *Crotoniati*.

‘fault; he heaps up all his quotations at the end of each article, without letting us know that ſuch a thing was ſaid by this, and ſuch a thing by that author; he therefore gives his reader a great deal of trouble, ſince he is ſometimes obliged to knock at five or ſix doors before he can find the perſon with whom he would ſpeak. This is a predominant fault in ſeveral other books, the conſequences of which were well known to a very able and judicious writer, who hath lately given us the Hiſtory of the Roman Emperors (44). To this I add, that Mr Moreri advances a thouſand things, which we either do not find at all in his citations, or which he confirms by no evidence, or which are curtailed by the omiſſion of certain circumſtances, which are the moſt material parts of a fact, and afford the greater pleaſure. To conclude, I ſay, he doth not always repreſent perſons by what is moſt remarkable in them. And I think thoſe faults will not be diſcovered in my article of Zeuxis.’

(44) Mr de Tillemont. The firſt volume of his book was printed at Paris, in 1690. (See Mr de Beauval's Journal, for the month of June 1691.) His manner of citing in that work, is extremely exact.

ZIA, or ZEA, an iſland of the Archipelago, one of the Cyclades, was antiently called Ceos, or Cea. It is ten thouſand paces from the promontory of Attica, formerly called *Sunium* (*a*), and at preſent *Capo delle Colonne*. It was antiently part of Eubœa, but the ſea ſeparated it, and afterwards waſhed away almoſt one fourth part of its length, which was five hundred ſtadia, or ſixty two thouſand five hundred paces (*b*) [*A*]. In Strabo's time, the four cities which had been in the iſle of Cea, were reduced to two, one of which was called Julis, and the other Carthæa (*c*). One of the two ruined cities bore the name of Careſſus, and the other that of Pæeeſſa. There was in the neighbourhood of theſe two laſt towns a temple dedicated to Apollo Smintheus; and betwixt the ruins of Pæeeſſa and this temple, was that of Minerva Nedufia, which Neſtor conſecrated after his return from Troy (*d*). I have elſewhere mentioned (*e*) the names of ſome illuſtrious perſonages born in the iſle of Cea, and (*f*) whatever relates to it with reſpect to Ariſtæus the inventer of honey. I muſt add here, that a woman of this iſland invented the art of ſpinning the production of the ſilk-worms, and of weaving it into ſtuffs [*B*]; and that it was the cuſtom of the inhabitants to poiſon themſelves as ſoon as they were arrived at a certain age [*C*]. The port of Zia is one *of the ſecureſt harbours in the Mediterranean, beſides*, the ſhips there *take in freſh water, biſket and wood* (*g*). The iſland

pays

(*a*) Plinius, *lib. iv, cap. xii, pag. m.* 453.

(*b*) Id. ibid.

(*c*) Strabo, *lib. x, pag.* 335. *See alſo* Pliny, ibid.

(*d*) Strabo, ibid.

(*e*) In the article Julis.

(*f*) Above, in the firſt article of ARISTÆUS.

(*g*) Guillet, Athenes ancienne & nouvelle, *pag. m.* 85.

[*A*] *It's length was five hundred ſtadia, or ſixty-two thouſand five hundred paces.*] Pliny affirms it: Mr Baudrand is therefore miſtaken in aſſerting, on the teſtimony of this author, that the circuit of the iſle of Cea was formerly ſixty thouſand paces (1), There is a great difference betwixt the circuit and the length of an iſland; however, he ought to have followed the account of his author without any diminution. He adds, that at preſent the circuit of this iſland is ſcarce forty thouſand paces, the ſea having ſwallowed up a part of it.

[*B*] *A woman of this iſland invented the art of ſpinning the production of the ſilk-worms, and of weaving it into ſtuffs.*] Pliny and Solinus affirm it. ‘Ex hac (*inſula*) profectam delicatiorem feminis veſtem, auctor eſt Varro (2). - - - - *Varro relates that the fine garment worn by the women, came from this iſland.*’ ‘Ceos quæ ut Varro teſtis eſt, ſubtilioris veſtis amicula arte lanificæ ſcientiæ prima in ornamentum fœminarum dedit (3). - - - *Ceos, which as Varro teſtifies, firſt produced, by the art of manufacturing wool, the fine garments which the women wear for ornament.*’ What follows is more exact. ‘Telas araneorum modo texunt (*bombyces*) ad veſtem luxumque feminarum, quæ bombycina appellatur. Prima eas redordiri, rurſuſque texere invenit in Ceo Mulier Pamphila, Latoi filia, non fraudanda gloria excogitatæ rationis, ut denudet feminas veſtis (4). - - - - *The ſilk-worms ſpin webs in like manner as ſpiders: theſe webs ſerve for the luxurious apparel of the women, which are called ſilken garments. The art of firſt ſpinning, and afterwards weaving, theſe webs was invented in the iſle of Ceos, by a woman named Pamphila, the daughter of Latous: ſhe muſt not be deprived of the glory of having invented this garment, which makes the womens ſhapes appear to greater advantage.*’ Ariſtotle (5) furniſhed Pliny with this particular. Salmaſius pretends that Ariſtotle's words ought to be underſtood of the iſle of Cos, and that Pliny is miſtaken in underſtanding them of the iſle of Ceos (6). His pretenſion is not utterly groundleſs, but it is not inconteſtable.

[*C*] *It was the cuſtom of the inhabitants to poiſon themſelves as ſoon as they arrived at a certain age.*] It is pretended that they were obliged to this by a law. Strabo, on this ſubject, cites two verſes of Menander, and believes that the perſons who had paſſed the age of ſixty, were obliged to conform to that law, that a ſufficient ſtore of proviſions might be left for the reſt of the inhabitants. Παρὰ τούτοις δὲ δοκεῖ τεθῆναί ποτε νόμος, οὗ μέμνηται καὶ Μένανδρος:

Καλὸν τὸ Κείων νόμιμόν ἐστι Φανία
Ὁ μὴ δυνάμενος ζῆν καλῶς, οὐ ζῇ κακῶς

Προσέταττε γὰρ ὡς ἔοικεν ὁ νόμος τοὺς ὑπὲρ ἑξήκοντα ἔτη γεγονότας κονεάζεσθαι, τοῦ διαρκεῖν τοῖς ἄλλοις τὴν τροφήν. *i. e.* Apud hos lex poſita aliquando videtur, cujus meminit etiam Menander:

Optimum Ciorum inſtitutum eſt Phania
Qui non poteſt vivere bene, non vivat male.

Jubebat enim, ut videtur, lex, eos qui ſexaginta annos exceſſiſſent, cicutam bibere, ut aliis victus ſufficere (7). - - - - *There ſeems to have been once a law among this people, which Menander mentions,*

Brave edict of the Cean commonweal,
Let not the man live ill, who can't live well.

It therefore ſeems that this law enjoined that thoſe who exceeded ſixty years ſhould drink hemlock juice, to the end that a ſufficient quantity of proviſions might be left for the reſt of the inhabitants. He alſo ſays it was reported that the inhabitants of this iſle being beſieged by thoſe of Athens made a decree, by which they condemned to death all the old men whereupon the Athenians retired. The Greek word κονεάζεσθαι in Strabo ought to be changed into κωνειάζεσθαι which ſignifies to drink the juice of hemlock. This is Caſaubon's conjecture (8), which he confirms by two paſſages, one out of Heraclides, and the other out of Ælian. The firſt of theſe authors ſaith that the air of the iſle of Cea is ſo good, that men, but more eſpecially women, might live there to a great age; but that they do not make any advantage of this favour of nature, and before they ſuffer the infirmities of a frail old age, they diſpatch themſelves out of the world ſome by the uſe of poppy, and others by that of hemlock. Οὔσης δὲ ὑγιεινῆς τῆς νήσου, καὶ εὐγήρων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν, οὐ περιμένουσι γηραιοὶ τελευτὴν, ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἀσθενῆσαι, ἢ πηρωθῆναί τι, οἱ μὲν μήκωνι, οἱ δὲ κωνείῳ ἑαυτοὺς ἐξάγουσι. *Quum ſalubri cœlo fruatur hæc inſula, & extremam ſenectam attingere ibi hominibus detur, præſertim fœminis, non expectant tamen provectæ ætatis qui ſunt, fatum ſuum, ſed illud antevertunt priuſquam vel imbecillitas accedat, vel parte aliqua manci fiant, ita ut hi quidem papavere, illi verò cicuta ſibi ipſis vitam eripiant* (9). As for Ælian, he affirms that thoſe who by reaſon of a decrepit age found themſelves incapable of

doing

(1) Baudrand, Geograph. *Tom. i, pag.* 251.

(2) Plinius, *lib. iv, cap. xii, pag. m.* 453.

(3) Solin. *cap. vii, pag. m.* 23.

(4) Plin. *lib. xi, cap. xxii, pag.* 515.

(5) Ariſtot. Hiſt. Animal. *lib. v, cap. xix, pag. m.* 649.

(6) Salmaſ. in Solin. *pag.* 144.

(7) Strabo, *lib. x, pag.* 335.

(8) Caſaub. Comment. in hunc locum Strabonis, *pag. m.* 165.

(9) Heraclides, de Politiis, *pag. m.* 20. *Note that* Berkelius, in Stephanum Byzantinum, *pag.* 421, *falſely ſuppoſes, that Heraclides ſaid that women were particularly obliged to execute the law.*

pays to the Turk *ſeventeen hundred piaſtres for the Caraſch, and two thouſand five hundred by way of tenth* (*b*). The Biſhop of Thermia paſſes half the year in this iſland (*i*): it hath at preſent a large city and a ruined caſtle. Conſult Moreri's Dictionary at the word Zea. He ſhould have referred the reader to this word, rather than to that of Cea, when he ſet down the word Zia.

doing ſervice to the public, aſſembled together at a feſtival and drunk the juice of hemlock. Νόμος ἐϛὶ Κείων, οἱ πάνυ παρ' αὐτοῖς γεγηρακότες, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ ξένια παρακαλοῦντες ἑαυτούς, ἢ ἐπί τινα ἑορταϛικὴν θυσίαν ἀνελθόντες, καὶ ϛεφανωσάμενοι, πίνουσι κώνειον, ὅταν ἑαυτοῖς συνειδῶσιν, ὅτι πρὸς τὰ ἔργα τὰ τῇ πατρίδι λυσιτελοῦντα ἄχρηϛοί εἰσιν, ὑποληρούσης ἤδη τι αὐτοῖς καὶ τῆς γνώμης διά τὸν χρόνον. *Conſuetudo eſt apud Ceos, ut ii, qui ſenio plane confecti ſunt, tanquam ad convivium ſe mutuo invitent, aut ad quoddam ſolenne ſacrificium conveniant, & coronati cicutam bibant: quum ſibi ipſis conſcii ſunt, ſe ad promovenda commoda patriæ inutiles amplius eſſe, animo jam ob ætatem delirare incipiente* (10). Pinedo (11), Kuhnius (12), and Berkelius (13), approve of Caſaubon's correction, and there is no room to doubt of it's being a good one. Scaliger (14) citing the paſſage of Strabo reads κωνιάζεσθαι, and not κονεάζεσθαι. Here is another of Caſaubon's conjectures: he believes that Stephanus Byzantinus (15), who relates the ſame particular with Strabo, but inſtead of telling us that the old men drank hemlock juice, ſaith that they fought duels together, ἀγωνίζεσθαι, *in certamine dimicare*, made uſe of a copy of Strabo where the reading was κονίεσθαι or κονίζεσθαι *in arenam deſcendere*, and not κωνιάζεσθαι. Berkelius rejects this conjecture on pretence that it is contrary to the practice of the old men of Ceos, and to the teſtimony of Hiſtorians (16); but he did not in the leaſt apprehend Caſaubon's thought; he fancied that Caſaubon ſuppoſed that this word might be that of Strabo, whereas he ſhould have known that Caſaubon ſuppoſed the copy of Stephanus Byzantinus to be corrupted. Mr Kuhnius offers another conjecture, which is that the reading in Strabo was ἀκονίζεσθαι to drink aconite or wolf-bane (17): the change of that word into ἀγωνίζεσθαι might very eaſily happen. Pighius had before him told us that the text of Stephanus ought to be corrected in that manner (18).

We muſt now examine whether this practice of the old men of Cea was founded on a decree of the ſtate or barely on one of thoſe cuſtoms, which being once linked with the notions of a greatneſs of ſoul, are almoſt as ſtrictly obſerved as the legal decrees. We have ſeen that Strabo was of opinion that there was an edict, which obliged them to kill themſelves after having paſſed the age of ſixty years. But very probably he is miſtaken, for ſince the air of this iſle was very heathful, and the inhabitants lived very long (19), the common-wealth would have been deprived of ſeveral robuſt ſubjects, who were ſtill capable of ſerving their country, had they been forced by the authority of the laws to poiſon themſelves at the age of ſixty one years. And obſerve that the expreſſions of Heraclides inſinuate rather a voluntary cuſtom than an obligatory law. Obſerve alſo that Ælian's words very clearly ſpecify decrepit perſons, and not thoſe who had attained the age of ſixty-one. All this tends to refute the opinion of Strabo. If it was true, we could at leaſt prove that this edict was not in force in the iſle of Cea in Tiberius's time. The proof which Valerius Maximus hath given us of it, will let us into the true ſtate of the caſe. Wherefore it will be proper here to conſider the circumſtances of that writer's narrative: they will make it appear that the public authority did not interpoſe any farther than to permit thoſe who were weary of living to poiſon themſelves, but not to command thoſe who had paſſed a certain age to do it. Valerius Maximus before he gives an account of what he ſaw in the iſle of Cea, relates that at Marſeilles a poiſoning liquor was kept by the public, and given to thoſe who offered ſatisfactory reaſons to the Senate why they deſired to rid themſelves of their lives. The Senate examined their reaſons with a certain temperament, which neither indulged a paſſionate and raſh inclination to die, nor oppoſed a reaſonable deſire of death, whether they wanted to deliver themſelves from the perſecutions of ill fortune, or would not run the riſk of being forſaken by proſperity. This was the rule of the Senate, they forced no body to poiſon himſelf, but granted a permiſſion to do it when they judged it proper: none could kill himſelf in the due form, and *canonicamente*, without being authorized by the ſovereign. *Venenum cicuta temperatum in ea civitate publicè cuſtoditur, quod datur ei, qui cauſas Sexcentis (id enim Senatus ejus nomen eſt) exhibuit, propter quas mors ſit illi expetenda: Cognitione virili benevolentia temperata, quæ nec egredi vita temere patitur, & ſapienter excedere cupienti celerem fati viam præbet; ut vel adverſa, vel proſpera nimis uſis fortuna (utraque enim finiendi ſpiritus, illa ne perſeveret, hæc ne deſtituat, rationem præbet) comprobato exitu terminetur* (20). The author adds, that in his opinion this practice at Marſeilles was borrowed from Greece (21); for I have obſerved, ſaith he, that it is alſo in uſe in the iſle of Cea. Upon this he relates that going into Aſia with Sextus Pompeius, and paſſing through the city of Julis, he was preſent at the death of a lady aged above ninety years. She had declared to her ſuperiors the reaſons which induced her to depart this life, after that, ſhe kept her ſelf ready to drink the poiſon; and as ſhe thought that Pompey's preſence would add a great luſtre to the ceremony, ſhe cauſed him to be moſt humbly ſupplicated to be preſent. He granted the favour, and with the moſt preſſing inſtances eloquently exhorted her to conſent to live, but all in vain. She thanked him for his kindneſs, and prayed that he might be rewarded not ſo much by the gods whom ſhe was going to, as by thoſe whom ſhe quitted (22). She declared that ſhe had been always favoured by fortune, and would not expoſe her ſelf to the reverſe of it. *Ceterum ipſa hilarem Fortunæ vultum ſemper experta, ne aviditate lucis triſtem intueri cogar; reliquias ſpiritus mei proſpero fine, duas filias & ſeptem nepotum gregem ſuperſtitem relictura, permuto* (23). She left two daughters and ſeven grand children, and having exhorted them to a mutual agreement and concord, &c. with an undaunted courage ſhe took the glaſs which contained the poiſon, and after recommending her ſelf to Mercury to obtain a happy and ſucceſsful paſſage, ſhe greedily drank off the mortal liquor. *Cohortata deinde ad concordiam ſuos, diſtributo eis patrimonio, & cultu ſuo ſacriſque domeſticis majori filiæ traditis; poculum, in quo venenum temparatum erat, conſtanti dextra arripuit. Tum defuſis Mercurio delibamentis, & invocato numine ejus, ut ſe placido itinere in meliorem ſedis infernæ deduceret partem; cupido hauſtu mortiferam traxit potionem* (24). I omit the reſt of the relation; and would not have cited ſo much, had it not been very rare to find in the heathen writers, the manner of their recommending themſelves to the gods at the point of death. I do not remember to have ever obſerved that they aſked the pardon of their ſins. Nor do we ſee that this lady of the iſle of Cea put up ſuch a petition.

Let us obſerve by the way that the heathens admired leſs thoſe, who killed themſelves in their misfortunes, than thoſe who did ſo, when they were under proſperous circumſtances, and only in order to eſcape the inconſtancies of fate. A man was no ſooner prepoſſeſſed with the maxims of the Stoicks, but he looked upon thoſe as cowards who were fond of life during bodily infirmities or diſgraceful misfortunes. In ſuch caſes death was accounted the only remedy which one ought to have recourſe to without murmuring or complaining, and it was pretended that none, but thoſe who loved life, would accuſe the gods and men. Otho when dying made uſe of this maxim. ‘ Plura ‘ de extremis loqui, pars ignaviæ eſt: præcipuum ‘ deſtinationis meæ documentum habete, quod de ‘ nemine queror; nam incuſare deos vel homines, ‘ ejus eſt, qui vivere velit (25). - - - - - *To ſay much of ‘ death is an indication of cowardice. I die with this ‘ reſolution, to complain of no body: for to accuſe the ‘ gods, or men, is the part of a man who deſires to ‘ live.*’

(*b*) Spon, Voiage, *Tom. i, pag.* 149, *Dutch Edition.*

(*i*) Baudrand, Geogr. *Tom.* i, *pag.* 251.

(10) Ælian. Var. Hiſtor. *lib. iii, cap. xxxvii.*

(11) In Steph. Byzant. *pag.* 332.

(12) In Ælian. ubi ſupra.

(13) In Steph. Byzant. *p.* 421.

(14) Scaliger. in Varronem de Ling. Lat. *lib. vi, p. m.* 118.

(15) Steph. Byzant. *voce* Ἴουλις.

(16) Hæc quanquam ſpecioſa videntur, minime approbanda judico, cum antiquo ritui & Hiſtoriæ plane ſint contraria. *Berkel. ubi ſupra, pag.* 421.

(17) Kuhnius in Ælian. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 233.

(18) Pighius in Valerium Maximum, *lib. ii, cap, vi.*

(19) See the quotation out of Heraclides, above, num. (9).

(20) Valer. Maximus, *lib. ii, cap. vi, num.* 7, *in Ext. pag. m.* 180.

(21) E Græcia tralatam inde exiſtimo, quod illam ETIAM in inſula Ceo ſervari animadverti. *Id. ibid. num.* 8.

(22) Tibi quidem, inquit, Sex. Pompei Dii magis, quos relinquo, quam quos peto, gratias referant: quia nec hortator vitæ meæ, nec mortis ſpectator eſſe faſtidiſti. *Id. ib. pag.* 181.

(23) Id. ibid.

(24) Id. ibid.

(25) Tacit. Hiſt. *lib. ii, cap. xlvii.*

ZIEGLER (JAMES) profeſſor of Divinity, a Mathematician and Coſmographer, flouriſhed in the XVIth century. He was born at Landſhut in Bavaria [*A*]. He is ſaid to have been a Mathematical profeſſor in the univerſity of Upſal (*a*). Paul Jovius thought him a Swede, probably becauſe Ziegler wrote ſome books concerning that country [*B*]. But that proof will be ſcarce ſufficient to thoſe who ſhould only ſay that he reſided there ſome time; for he declares himſelf that he compoſed his book concerning Scandinavia from memoirs communicated to him while he was at Rome [*C*]. The Biſhop of Paſſau (*b*), a very learned prelate, was his Mecenas, and erected a tomb to him in his epiſcopal city (*c*). Ziegler had retired to this prelate's court, when the terror of the Ottoman armies obliged him to leave Vienna where he had taught a long time (*d*). He died in Auguſt 1549, and not in 1559, as Moreri ſays. The reading of ſome of his books hath been prohibited by the Inquiſition; and that of others premitted only on condition that ſome things be corrected in them, and that the note of condemned author be always placed by the word Ziegler (*e*). Some Proteſtant authors acknowledge him as their brother (*f*). In the year 1523, he was ſtrongly inclined to turn Proteſtant, as appears by a book which he wrote at Rome in favour of Eraſmus againſt James Stunica

(*a*) Schefferus, in Suecia Literata, *pag. m.* 273. *He quotes* Meſſenius in Sueopentap. *cap. vi.*

(*b*) His name was Wolfgang, and he was of the houſe of the Counts of Salm.

(*c*) Gaſpar Bruſchius, de Laureaca & Patavio Germanico, *lib. ii, pag.* 273, 274, & *in* Epitaphio Jacobi Ziegleri, ibid. *pag.* 322.

(*d*) Thuan. *lib. vi, pag. m.* 118.

(*e*) *See the* Index Librorum prohibitorum, *pag.* 546, *Edition* 1667.

(*f*) *See* Mollerus Hypomn. ad Sueciam Literatam, *pag.* 441.

[*A*] *He was born at Landſhut in Bavaria.*] And not at Landau, as we are told in the French tranſlation of Thuanus cited by Mr Teiſſier (1). The ſame thing is aſſerted with an additional error in Moreri's Dictionary; for it is there ſpecified that James Ziegler *was born at Landau in the Lower Alſatia.* The Dutch editions, and that of Paris (2), have corrupted this place inſtead of correcting it; for they have changed *the Lower Alſatia* into *the Lower Germany.* Thuanus called him *Lindavus* (3), which rather ſignifies that Ziegler was of Lindau than of Landau. However that be, we ought to believe that when Geſner (4), and ſeveral others call him *Landavum Bavarum,* they mean that he was born at Landſhut. Paul Jovius is miſtaken in making him a Swede. I ſhall give his own words in the following remark. His error was followed by ſome authors, as Mr Mollerus obſerves in his additions to John Scheffer's *Suecia Literata* page 441. The learned Mr Schurtzfleiſch (5), does not follow Jovius, but he affirms that our Ziegler was originally a Swede. I do not know any more than Mr Mollerus whether he is in the right.

[*B*] *Paul Jovius thought him a Swede, probably becauſe he wrote ſome books concerning that country.*] He quotes with great encomiums what Ziegler wrote concerning the cruelty of King Chriſtian II. 'Quis eò Latinas 'literas, quò Romana arma penetrare nequierint, 'perveniſſe non miretur? Hic enim in terra Gothica 'natus, ac educatus, adeò exactè, puriter & facundè, 'Chriſtierni Daniæ, atque Norvegiæ Regis immanitatem, neque ipſi ſanguinario Tyranno diu lætam, 'neque demum Diis ultoribus neglectam perſcripſit, 'ut eruditis gentibus pudori eſſe poſſit; quòd Latinæ 'facundiæ fruges, ſub Cimmerio cælo penè felicius 'ac uberius, quam ſub hac benigniore, ac temperatiore plaga proveniant (6). - - - - - - *Is it not 'very ſurpriſing, that the Latin tongue ſhould reach that 'country, whether the Roman arms could never penetrate. For James Ziegler, born and educated in a 'Gothic land, has with ſo much accuracy, purity, and 'elegance, deſcribed the cruelties of Chriſtian King of 'Denmark and Norway, in which the blood thirſty 'tyrant did not long triumph, nor at laſt eſcape the 'avenging hand of Heaven, that learned nations may 'well be aſhamed that Roman eloquence, planted in a 'northern ſoil, ſhould thrive and proſper better than in 'this more benign and temperate climate.*' Schefferus obſerves that this book of Ziegler was printed at Straſburg by Wendelin Rhiel in the year 1536 (7). Geſner ſaith the ſame thing, but obſerves that it was printed with ſome other books of the ſame author, and with a deſcription of the Holy Land written by Wolffgang of Weiſſenburg: 'Terræ ſanctæ, quam 'Palæſtinam nominant, Syriæ, Arabiæ, Ægypti, & 'Schondiæ doctiſſima deſcriptio, unà cum ſingulis 'tabulis earundem regionum topographicis. Item, 'Holmiæ planè regiæ urbis calamitoſiſſima clades ab 'eodem deſcripta: cujus libri & hic titulus eſt: 'Chriſtierni ſecundi regis Danmarchiæ crudelitas perpetrata in proceres Sueciæ & populum Holmenſem. 'Volumen impreſſum Argentorati apud Wend. Rihelium, 1536 in folio cum alia deſcriptione Terræ 'ſanctæ juxta ordinem alphabeti, ad ſcripturam proxime directa, authore Wolffgango Weiſſenburgio (8). '- - - - - *A learned deſcription of the Holy Land, called 'Paleſtine, of Syria, Arabia, Egypt, and Scandinavia, 'together with Topographical maps, of each of theſe 'countries. Likewiſe the calamitous overthrow of the 'royal city of Stockholm, deſcribed by the ſame author, 'in a book intituled; The cruelties perpetrated by Chriſtian 'II King of Denmark, on the Nobles of Sweden, and 'the inhabitants of Stockholm. This volume is printed 'at Straſburg by Wend. Rhiel in the year* 1536, *in 'folio, together with another deſcription of the Holy Land 'in alphabetical order, deſigned for the underſtanding of 'the Bible, by Wolffgang Weiſſenburg.*' This Hiſtory of the cruelties of Chriſtian is inſerted in the ſecond tome of the *Scriptores hiſtoriæ Germanicæ,* printed at Baſil by the care of Schardius in the year 1574. It was joined by Wolfius, with Ziegler's Scandinavia, to Albertus Krantzius's *Hiſtoria Regnorum Septentrionalium,* of the Francfort edition in 1583. The index *Librorum prohibitorum* (9) informs us that the deſcription of the Holy Land, &c. was printed at Straſburg *apud Petrum Olipionem* in the year 1532. Geſner knew not of this edition.

[*C*] *He declares . . . . . . that he compoſed his book concerning Scandinavia, from memoirs communicated to him while he was at Rome.*] I ſhall ſet down a piece of his preface, extracted out of Geſner's Bibliotheque in the 368th leaf. 'Ego qui de locis Septentrionalibus, veteri hiſtoriæ incognitis, commentarium 'æditurus ſum, atque ita ut illa loca rebus his, unde 'regiones beatæ dicuntur, affluentia ſim oſtenſurus, 'ut hæc plena fide apud auditorem reponam, neceſſario 'quoque præfabor quibus auctoribus conſtet ſuſceptum 'opus. Romæ dum eſſem, fuerunt in urbe continuo 'tempore, duo archiepiſcopi Nidroſienſes regni Norduegiæ, prior quidem gente Danus, &c. Poſt hujus mortem ſubſtitutus ei Olavus Romam venit, quem 'frequenter conveni, & didicit reliqua Norduegiæ, 'quanta tradi ab uno potuerunt. Gothiam vero, 'Sueciamque, & Finlandiam, ſupraque has ad Boream 'Laponiam extenſam, ſed etiam Gronlandiæ Cherſoneſum & inſulam Tylen accepi à reverendis epiſcopis, Joanne Magno Upſalienſi, & Petro Aoroſienſi Gothis, tunc in urbe privatis amicis, & 'mecum conjunctiſſime converſatis. Et quidem Upſalienſis in commentario Schondiæ ſcribendæ antea 'fuerat, permiſeratque id cenſuræ noſtræ, &c. '- - - - - - *As I am going to publiſh a book concerning the 'northern countries, which were unknown to antient 'hiſtorians, and to make it appear that thoſe parts 'abound in ſuch things as denominate a country happy; 'in order to gain credit with my readers, I ſhall give 'a prefatory account of my vouchers. While I was at 'Rome, there lived in that city two Archbiſhops of 'Drontheim in the Kingdom of Norway, one a Dane '&c. After his death his ſucceſſor Alaus coming to 'Rome, I frequently viſited him, and learned of him 'the other matters concerning Norway, as much as 'could be related by one ſingle perſon. What concerns 'Gothland, Sweden, and Finland, and Lapland lying 'to the north of theſe countries, and alſo of Groenland, and the iſland of Iceland, I had from two 'reverend Prelates both born at Goth land, who lived 'at Rome in private friendſhip and great intimacy with 'me. And indeed the Biſhop of Upſal, one of them, had 'been formerly imployed in writing a book concerning 'Schoonen, and had ſubmitted it to my amendments &c.*'

(1) Teiſſier, Addit aux Eloges, *Tom. i, pag.* 20, *Edit.* 1696.

(2) In the year 1699.

(3) Thuan. *lib. vi, pag.* 118, *Edit. Francof.* 1625.

(4) Geſner. in Biblioth. *fol.* 367.

(5) *Page* 34, *of his Diſſertation* de Rebus Sueo-Gothicis, *apud* Mollerum Hypomn. ad Sueciam Literatam, *pag.* 441.

(6) Paulus Jovius, Elog. *cap. cxxxviii, pag. m.* 281.

(7) Scheffer. in Suecia Literata, *pag.* 273, *Edit.* 1699.

(8) Geſner. in Bibl. *fol.* 367, *verſo.*

(9) Page 546, of the edition 1667.

Stunica [*D*], and which was printed at Baſil by John Froben in the ſame year. What he wrote on Aſtronomy is not amiſs [*E*]. There are ſeveral other authors called **Ziegler**; ſome of whom are in Mr Konig, but not **Jerom Ziegler** profeſſor of Poetry at Ingolſtad in the XVIth century. He publiſhed Aventinus's Annals, as I have ſaid (*g*), and wrote ſeveral dramatic poems which are publiſhed (*b*).

[*D*] *A book which he wrote at Rome in favour of Eraſmus.*] The title of it is, 'Libellus Jacobi Ziegleri Landavi Bavari adverſus Jacobi Stunicæ maledicentiam, pro Germania. *The Printer Frobenius ſaith of it:* Commodum à Roma miſſus eſt Libellus Jacobi Ziegleri Landavi Bavari, quo promittit perpetuam rerum geſtarum ſeriem ex quatuor Evangeliis contextam, & obiter Stunicam pro ipſius dignitate tractat . . . . . Videtur hic Landavus homo multæ reconditæque lectionis, ingenio feſtivo, magno judicio, ſtilo non neglecto, denique toto pectore Germanam ſpirans indolem. - - - - - - *The book of James Ziegler of Landſhut in Bavaria was ſent from Rome, at a very ſeaſonable time: in this book he promiſes to give a continued Hiſtory from the four Evangeliſts*; *and he occaſionally takes to taſk Stunica, in a manner ſuitable to his deſerts. This Bavarian ſeems to be a man of extenſive and curious learning, of a facetious humour, and of great judgment: he ſeems not to be wanting in ſtile, and to have all the accompliſhments of a German.*'

[*E*] *What he wrote on Aſtronomy is not amiſs.*] At Baſil in the year 1536, was publiſhed in 4to his book, *de conſtructione ſolidæ Sphæræ, cum Scholiis in Opuſculum Procli de Sphæra, & de canonica per Sphæram operatione, & de hemicyclio Beroſi* memorato à Vitruvio (10). *Adjunctis Arati phænomenis Græcis, cum Commentariis Theonis.* His Commentary on the ſecond book of Pliny; *quo difficultates Plinianæ, præſertim Aſtronomicæ, omnes tolluntur: item Organum quo catholica ſyderum, ut apud Plinium eſt, mira arte docetur*, was printed at Baſil in 1531. Of this James Milichius ſpeaks honourably in the Preface to a book which he publiſhed on that ſubject in the year 1534, in 4to (11). 'Extant, *ſaith he* (12), in hunc librum (*ſecundum Plinii*) Cigleri hominis docti, Commentarii, erudite & ſubtiliter ſcripti, ſed neque integrum librum interpretantur, & à ſcholarum conſuetudine nonnihil recedunt. Quare ſpero eum boni conſulturum eſſe, quòd Amicis morem geſſi, qui mihi autores fuerunt, ut hæc ad utilitatem juventutis collecta ederem. Adeo enim nihil de ipſius exiſtimatione detraho, ut libenter profitear, me ab ipſo ſæpe adjutum eſſe. - - - - *There are extant on this ſecond book of Pliny the Commentaries of the learned Ziegler, which are written with great erudition and acuteneſs, but they do not explain the whole book, and depart a little from the uſages of ſchools. I hope therefore he will take it in good part that I comply with my friends, who have adviſed me to publiſh this commentary for the uſe of youth. And ſo far am I from derogating from the merit of Ziegler, that I willingly own I have been frequently aſſiſted by him.*'

ZOROASTER, King of the Bactrians, was vanquiſhed by Ninus, and paſſed for the inventer of Magic [*A*]. Euſebius places this victory of Ninus in the ſeventh year of Abraham, and ſeveral authors make Zoroaſter much antienter. There are alſo ſome who

[*A*] *He was vanquiſhed by Ninus, and paſſed for the inventer of Magic.*] The following words of Juſtin inform us that this was the laſt victory of this conqueror, and that Zoroaſter philoſophized very judiciouſly on the principles of the univerſe, and the motion of the ſtars. *Poſtremum illi* (Nino) *bellum cum Zoroaſtre rege Bactrianorum fuit, qui primus dicitur artes magicas inveniſſe, & mundi principia, ſiderumque motus diligentiſſime ſpectaſſe. Hoc occiſo, & ipſe deceſſit* (1). Some (2) aſcribe to Semiramis the glory of having vanquiſhed Zoroaſter. They doubtleſs mean ſomewhat more than what we read in Diodorus Siculus (3), *viz.* that being gone to her huſband at the ſiege of Bactra, ſhe adviſed and made an attack, which ended in the reduction of the city. After which Ninus married her. I believe they mean that one of the wars which ſhe glorioully terminated after the death of that great monarch, was that in which Zoroaſter loſt his dominions. An Hiſtorian (4), cited by Syncellus, treats of the birth of Semiramis and of that Magician, after having related the actions of Ninus (5). It is therefore to Semiramis rather than Ninus, that he aſcribes the victory of which we are ſpeaking, and I cannot tell whether to confirm this, we might not take advantage of the following Latin Verſes.

Perſarum ſtatuit Babylona Semiramis urbem,
. . . .
. . . .
Juſſit & imperio ſurgere Bactra caput (6).

. . . . *Semiramis*
Rais'd Babylon, the Perſian town, ...
. . . .
. . . . *and bad*
The Bactrian city riſe her empire's head.

Mr Stanley (7) ſaith, that Zoroaſter, according to Euſebius, was cotemporary with Semiramis; but it is certain, that, according to Euſebius, he was vanquiſhed by King Ninus. If what Arnobius ſaith be true, that magical ſecrets were uſed on both ſides in this war betwixt the Aſſyrians and Bactrians, it will be difficult to believe that Zoroaſter was the inventer of that art; for it muſt be ſuppoſed that theſe ſecrets quickly paſſed into Chaldæa, and that they grew to ſuch a great perfection in a very ſhort time, that Ninus's Magicians were able to conteſt with, and overcome, the inventer. I do not lay this down as an impoſſibility. But Arnobius's words runs thus: 'Ut inter Aſſyrios & Bactrianos Nino quondam Zoroaſtreque ductoribus non tantum ferro dimicaretur & viribus, verum etiam magicis & Chaldæorum ex reconditis diſciplinis, invidia noſtra hæc fuit (8). - - - - *Antiently the Aſſyrians and Bactrians, the former under the conduct of Ninus, and the latter under that of Zoroaſter, fought againſt each other, not only with armed men, but alſo by the help of Magical arts, and the ſecret diſcipline of the Chaldeans.*' Ammianus Marcellinus will have it, that Zoroaſter was only the augmenter of the Magical ſecrets of the Chaldeans (9). Some authors inform us that Azonaces was Zoroaſter's inſtructer, and conſequently Azonaces muſt be conſidered as the inventer of Magic: 'Hermippus qui de tota ea arte diligentiſſime ſcripſit, & vicies centum millia verſuum à Zoroaſtre condita, indicibus quoque voluminum ejus poſitis explanavit, præceptorem, à quo inſtitutum diceret, tradidit Azonacem, ipſum vero quinque millibus annorum ante Trojanum bellum fuiſſe (10). - - - *Hermippus, who hath written with great care on every thing relating to this art, and explained twenty thouſand verſes compoſed by Zoroaſter, relates that Azonaces was the perſon who initiated him in this art, and that he lived five thouſand years before the Trojan war.*' St Auguſtin (11) and Oroſius (12) have followed the tradition mentioned by Juſtin. Apuleius, in his catalogue of the moſt famous Magicians of antiquity places Zoroaſter in the firſt rank, and makes him the moſt antient of all. 'Si quamlibet medicum emolumentum probaveritis, ego ille ſim Carinondas, vel Damigeron, vel Moſes, vel Jannes, vel Apollonius, vel ipſe Dardanus, vel quicumque alius POST Zoroaſtrem & Hoſtanem inter Magos celebratus eſt (13). - - - - *If you will prove that it is of any advantage, then let me paſs for Carinondas, or Damigeron, or Moſes, or Jannes, or Apollonius, or Dardanus himſelf, or for any other celebrated Magus* SINCE THE TIME *of Zoroaſter and Hoſtanes.*'

Obſerve, that Diodorus Siculus (14), who very amply relates the war betwixt Ninus and the Bactrians, calls the

---

(*g*) Remark [*C*], of the article AVENTINUS.

(*b*) See the Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque, *pag. m.* 355.

(10) Lib. ix, cap. ix.

(11) Father Harduin, *Præf. in Plinium*, mentions that edition. I have not ſeen it, nor that of the year 1538, *Halæ Suevorum*, in 4to, mentioned by Geſner; but I have ſeen that of Francfort 1543, in 4to, and that of Leipſic, *typis Wœgelianis*, 1573, in 4to.

(12) Jacobus Milichius *Præfat.* Commentarii in II Librum Plinii, *fol. A* 5, *Edit. Lipſ.* 1573.

(1) Juſtin. *lib. i, cap. i.*

(2) Theo, in Progym. *cap. ix, pag. m.* 112.

(3) Diodor. Sicul. *lib. ii, cap. vi.*

(4) Called Cephalion. He lived under Hadrian. See *Marſham, ubi infra.*

(5) Syncellus, *pag.* 167, *apud* Marſham. Chron. Can. *ad Sæcul. ix, pag. m.* 144.

(6) Propert. Eleg. X, *libr. iii.*

(7) Thomas Stanleius, Hiſt. Philoſ. Orientalis, *lib. i, cap. iii, pag.* 10, *ex verſione* Jo. Clerici.

(8) Arnob. *lib. i, pag. m.* 5.

(9) Cujus (*Magiæ*) ſcientiæ ſeculis priſcis multa ex Chaldæorum arcanis Bactrianus addidit Zoroaſtres. *Amm. Marcell. lib. xxiii, cap. vi, pag. m.* 374.

(10) Plinius, *lib. xxx, cap. i, pag. m.* 725.

(11) Magicarum artium fuiſſe perhibetur inventor (Zoroaſtres). *Auguſtin. de Civitat. Dei, lib. xxi, cap. xiv.*

(12) Oroſius, *lib. i, cap. iv.*

(13) Apuleius, Apolog. *pag. m.* 331.

(14) Diodor. Sicul. *lib. ii, cap. iv, & ſeq.*

who make him of a much later date: all authors are full of variations on this part of the Hiſtory of this famous perſon [*B*], and ſcarce agree better on the reſt. My readers therefore ought not to expect here any thing beſides a heap of uncertainties, and an odd medly

the king of the latter not Zoroaſtres but Oxyartes, nor doth he mention any Magic. Yet he relates what he had read in Cteſias, an Hiſtorian ſufficiently inclined to ſpread ſuch ſtories (15). Voſſius (16) and Henry Valeſius pretend that Juſtin ſays that Zoroaſter defended himſelf againſt Ninus, not only by force of arms, but alſo by that of Magic. But Juſtin hath no ſuch thing. The ſame Voſſius affirms, that Juſtin's relation was taken from the firſt book of Cteſias, as Arnobius aſſerts, But this is a new falſity. Arnobius's words are very confuſed (17), and this fact doth not appear there.

[*B*] *All authors are full of variations concerning the time of Zoroaſter.*] We have ſeen that he was made cotemporary with King Ninus, who, according to Euſebius, died about eight hundred twenty-five years before the taking of Troy. We have alſo ſeen (18) that Zoroaſter, according to the opinion of Hermippus, preceded the Trojan War five thouſand years. Hermodorus, the Platoniſt, followed the ſame chronology with Hermippus (19), and Plutarch mentions it as being the moſt commonly believed (20): but, according to Suidas, the interval betwixt Zoroaſter and the Trojan war was but five hundred years. Some very great authors have ſaid that Zoroaſter lived ſix thouſand years before the death of Plato: 'Eudoxus, qui inter ſapientiæ ſectas clariſſimam, utiliſſimamque eam (*Magicam artem*) intelligi voluit, Zoroaſtrem hunc ſex millibus annorum ante Platonis mortem fuiſſe prodidit. Sic & Ariſtoteles (21). --- *Eudoxus, who would have the art of Magic to be accounted the nobleſt and moſt uſeful of all the branches of knowledge, relates that this Zoroaſter lived ſix thouſand years before Plato's death. The ſame thing is affirmed by Ariſtotle.*' Others, as Xanthus, the Lydian (22), do not make him above ſix hundred years more antient than Xerxes's expedition. Others ſay that he muſt be looked upon as the ſame with a Pamphylian, whoſe name was Er, and who was the ſon of Armenius, and being riſen again twelve days after his death, related what he had ſeen in the other world (23). His narrations ſeem to prove that he had read Homer's Iliad, and are at leaſt a demonſtrative proof that he lived after the ſiege of Troy. You will find them in Plato in the tenth book of his Republic (24). It is Clemens Alexandrinus who ſuppoſes that this man was the ſame with Zoroaſter, which he proves by this, that the latter declares himſelf the ſon of Armenius, and a Pamphylian by birth (25), and divinely inſtructed in ſeveral things in Hell (26). But ſince Arnobius obſerves that this Pamphylian, the ſon of Armenius, was the favourite of Cyrus, we have here a tradition according to which Zoroaſter appeared in the world much later than it is believed. *Armenius Zoſtriani nepos, & familiaris Pamphilus Cyri* (27), are the words of Arnobius. Valeſius obſerves that *Armenius* is there taken for *filius Armenii* (28); the word *Cyri* ſeems to him ſuſpicious, he rather inclined to have it *Nini*, becauſe, ſaith he, the perſon ſpoken of is one Zoroaſter mentioned in Cteſias's firſt book. But Cteſias did not begin to ſpeak of the King of Perſia till his ſeventh book; and his ſix preceding books were employed in relating the actions of the Aſſyrians and Medes. I anſwer, it is not at all certain that Arnobius pretends that Cteſias ſpoke of this ſon of Armenius. Obſerve, that ſeveral Critics pretend that *Oſtanis*, or *Hoſtanis*, ſhould be read inſtead of *Zoſtriani*; but they are not aware that they impute a very groſs anachroniſm to Arnobius, for Oſtanes having followed Xerxes in the expedition to Greece (29), it is not poſſible that he ſhould have been grand-father to a friend of Cyrus.

Agathias, who lived in the reign of Juſtinian, informs, that according to the Perſians of that time, Zoroaſter, and Hyſtaſpes were cotemporary. But they did not ſay whether this Hyſtaſpes was the father of Darius, or any other. Sir John Marſham poſitively decides, that it ought to be underſtood of Darius's father (30), and grounds his opinion on this, that one of the elogies engraved on his tomb, make him the inſtructer of the Magi; and that the ſame Hiſtorian who affirms that Hyſtaſpes excelled in Magic, ſtyles him the father of Darius (31): 'Deinde (*poſt Zoroaſtrem*) Hyſtaſpes Rex prudentiſſimus Darii pater. Qui cum ſuperioris Indiæ ſecreta fidentius penetraret, ad nemoroſam quamdam venerat ſolitudinem, cujus tranquillis ſilentiis præcelſa Brachmanorum ingenia potiuntur: eorumque monitu rationes mundani motûs & ſiderum, puroſque ſacrorum ritus quantum colligere potuit eruditus, ex his quæ didicit, aliqua ſenſibus Magorum infudit: quæ illi cum diſciplinis præſentiendi futura, per ſuam quiſque progeniem, poſteris ætatibus tradunt. Ex eo per ſæcula multa ad præſens unà eademque proſapiâ multitudo creata, Deorum cultibus dedicatur (32). --- *After the time of Zoroaſter, reigned Hyſtaſpes, a very prudent king, and the father of Darius. This prince having boldly penetrated into the moſt remote parts of the upper India, came at laſt to a ſolitary foreſt, where there dwelt a ſilent and awful tranquillity which the Brachmans enjoy. In this ſolitude theſe ſublime genius's inſtructed him in the knowledge of the motion of the earth, and that of the ſtars; and from them he learned as much as he could acquire concerning the pureſt rites of religion. Part of this knowledge he communicated to the Magi, which, together with the art of predicting future events, they delivered down to poſterity, each in his own family. The great number of men who have ſprung from theſe families, ever ſince that age down to the preſent, have all been ſet apart for cultivating the worſhip of the gods.*' Ammianus Mercellinus was in the wrong to ſay, that this father of Darius was a king, and perhaps he committed this fault upon having read in general, that one King Hyſtaſpes was a great Magician, and believed that there was no other Hyſtaſpes than the father of Darius. But it is beyond diſpute, that a certain Hyſtaſpes elder than the foundation of Rome, and a great prophet, is mentioned by authors. 'Hydaſpes quoque, qui fuit Medorum rex antiquiſſimus, à quo amnis quoque nomen accipit qui nunc Hydaſpes dicitur, admirabilis omnium, ſub interpretatione vaticinantis pueri ad memoriam poſteris tradidit, ſublatum iri ex orbe imperium, nomenque Romanum; multo ante præfatus, quam illa Trojana gens conderetur (33). --- *Hydaſpes alſo, the moſt antient King of the Medes, and from whom the river Hydaſpes derives it's name, is the moſt admirable of them all: for under the interpretation of the prophecy of a boy, he informed poſterity that the Roman empire, and even the Roman name, ſhould be utterly deſtroyed; and this he predicted a long time before the eſtabliſhment of that colony of Trojans.*' It ought to be read *Hyſtaſpes* and not *Hydaſpes* in this paſſage of Lactantius. Thus ſome good Critics have corrected two places, where Juſtin Martyr mentions this Pagan prophet; one of them informs us that he predicted the conflagration of all periſhable things; and in the other, he obſerves, that the reading of his writings was prohibited on pain of death, becauſe they diſcoverd the truths which the Pagans perſecuted (34). Κατ' ἐνέργειαν δὲ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων, θάνατος ὡρίσθε κατὰ τῶν τὰς Ὑστάσπου, ἢ Σιβύλλης, ἢ τῶν προφητῶν βίβλους ἀναγινωσκόντων, ὅπως διὰ τοῦ φόβου ἀποστρέψωσιν ἐντυγχάνοντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῶν καλῶν γνῶσιν λαβεῖν, αὐτοῖς δὲ δουλεύοντας κατέχωσιν. ὅπερ εἰς τέλος οὐκ ἴσχυσαν πρᾶξαι. Operâ autem & inſtinctu malorum dæmonum mortis ſupplicium adverſus librorum Hydaſpis aut Sibyllæ aut prophetarum lectores conſtitutum eſt: ut per timorem homines ab illis, quò minùs ſcripta ea legentes rerum bonarum notitiam percipiant, ſed in ſervitute eorum retineantur, abſterreantur (35). -- *For by the powerful influence of the evil ſpirits, it was decreed, that whoever ſhould read the books of Hydaſpis, of the Sibyl, or of the Prophets, ſhould be put to death: This decree was made in order to deter men from reading thoſe books which might lead them to the knowledge of the truth, and in order to keep them in ſubjection to thoſe evil ſpirits.* I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that theſe books (36), as well as thoſe of the Sibyls, were the pious forgeries of ſome Chriſtians. Sir John Marſham might have made uſe of another proof, and form his argument thus: Clemens Alexandrinus ſaith, that Zoroaſter was the ſame with the Pamphilian, ſon of Armenius; but, according to Arnobius, this Pamphilian was a friend of Cyrus, and we find in Herodotus a diſcourſe of Cyrus and Hyſtaſpes, medly of ſtories. We are told (a) that Zoroaſter laughed on the very day he was born, that he is the only perſon to whom this happened; and that the palpitation of his brain was ſo ſtrong, that it repulſed any hand laid upon his head, which was a preſage of his knowledge. It is added (b), that he paſſed twenty years in the deſerts, and that he there eat nothing but a kind of cheeſe which never grew old (c); that the love of wiſdom and juſtice obliged him to retire to a mountain to live there in ſolitude; that when he deſcended from thence there fell a celeſtial fire upon it which perpetually burned; that the King of Perſia accompanied with the greateſt lords of his court approached it in order to put up prayers to God; that Zoroaſter came out of theſe flames without being damaged; that he comforted and encouraged the Perſians, and offered ſacrifices as if God had accompanied him to that place; that afterwards he did not live indifferently with all ſorts of men, but only with thoſe born for truth, and who were capable of the knowledge of God, which kind of people the Perſians called Magi; (d) that he wiſhed to be ſtruck with thunder, and conſumed by fire from Heaven, and that he ordered the Perſians to collect his bones after he was burnt in this manner, and to keep and venerate them as a pledge of the preſervation of their monarchy; that they really paid a great veneration to his relics, but that in proceſs of time having neglected them, their monarchy fell to ruin. The chronicle of Alexandria adds, that after having held this diſcourſe with them, he invoked Orion, and was conſumed by a celeſtial fire. Some writers ſay (e); that Mizraim the ſon of Ham was inſtructed in Magic by his father, and (f) that he was burned alive by the Demon whom he too frequently importuned (g); that the Perſians adored him as a favourite of GOD, and a ſaint whom a thunderbolt ſerved as a vehicle to mount up to Heaven, and as a living ſtar, whence it came, that after his death he was called Zoroaſter. Gregorius Turonenſis relates very near the ſame thing of Cuſh, the eldeſt ſon of Ham [C]. Others will have it that Ham himſelf was the Zoroaſter of the eaſtern nations, and the inventer of Magic (h). Mr Bochart very well refutes this falſity (i). Cedrenus obſerves that Zoroaſter, who became ſo famous an Aſtronomer among the Perſians, was deſcended from Belus. This imports that he was deſcended from Nimrod. Some authors have taken him for Nimrod himſelf (k); others for Aſſur or Japhet. *All the ancient Perſians believe Zoroaſter ancienter than Moſes*, nay ſome Magi *affirm that he is the ſame with Abraham, and frequently call him Ibrahim Zerdaſcht, as much as to ſay, Abraham the friend of fire* (l). The eaſtern Chriſtians ſay that Zoroaſter *began to flouriſh in* the reign of Cambyſes, *and that he was a native of the Province of Media; but others make him an Aſſyrian, and pretend that he was a diſciple of the Prophet Elijah* (m) . . . . . . *Ben Schubnah* ſaith, *that he was a diſciple of Ezra, and that*

---

(15) Henr. Valeſ. in Amm. Marcell. *lib.* *xxiii*, *pag.* *m.* 374.

(16) Voſſius, de Orig. Idolol. *lib.* *i*, *cap.* *v*, *pag.* *m.* 33.

(17) Arnob. *lib.* *i*, *pag.* *m.* 31.

(18) In the foregoing remark, citat. (10).

(19) *Apud* Diogen. Laërt. in Procem. *num.* 2.

(20) Plut. de Iſide, *pag.* 369.

(21) Plinius, ubi ſupra.

(22) *Apud* Diog. Laërt. ibid.

(23) Plato, de Republ. *lib.* *x*, *pag.* 361.

(24) Pag. 361, & ſeq.

(25) Clem. Alexandr. Strom. *lib.* *v*, *pag.* 599.

(26) Compare what has been ſaid of PYTHAGORAS, remark [*F*], of his article.

(27) Arnob. *lib.* *i*, *pag.* 31.

(28) Henr. Valeſius, ubi ſupra.

(29) Plin. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 726.

(30) Marſham. Chron. Can. *ad Sæcul. ix*, *pag.* *m.* 145.

(31) Porphyr. περὶ ἀποχῆς, *lib.* *iv*, *num.* 15, *apud* Marſham, ibid. Valeſius, ubi ſupra, *pretends that this elogy was engraved upon Darius's tomb, and not on that of Hyſtaſpes.*

(32) Amm. Marcellin. *lib.* *xxiii*, *pag.* *m.* 374.

(33) Lactant. *lib.* *vii*, *cap.* *xv*, *pag.* *m.* 492. *In the xviiith chapter of the ſame book he quotes a paſſage of that Hydaſpes.*

(34) Juſtin. Apolog. II, *p.* 66.

(35) Id. ibid. pag. 82.

(36) *See in what manner* Clemens Alexand. Strom. *lib.* *vi*, *pag.* 636, *D ſpeaks of them.*

Hyſtaſpes, the father of Darius; wherefore it is true that Zoroaſter and this Hyſtaſpes lived at the ſame time (37). Valeſius the younger affirms (38), that according to the teſtimony of Agathias, ſome ſaid that Hyſtaſpes, the doctor of the Magi, was much more antient than Darius's father. It is certain that Agathias doth not ſay this, but on the contrary complains, that the Perſians did not ſay whether their Hyſtaſpes was the father of Darius, or not. I mention this only to ſhew that the citations of the moſt judicious authors frequently deceive us, and conſequently that prudence obliges us to examine quotations, by whomſoever alledged. I here repeat this obſervation, though I remember to have made it in other places.

I ſhould never have done, if I ſhould cenſure all the miſtakes of our authors, and mention all their variations, with relation to the chronology of Zoroaſter. But what farther confirms Sir John Marſham's opinion is this. It is affirmed that Pythagoras was Zoroaſter's diſciple, under the reign of Cambyſes, the ſon of Cyrus. I have elſewhere cited (39) the words of Apuleius, which inform us of the fact. Some underſtand them as if Pythagoras, having been made a ſlave in Egypt, was tranſported into Perſia. Others will have him tranſported into Babylon, and there inſtructed by Zoroaſter the Babylonian, whom they diſtinguiſh from the Perſian. ‘Hiſce (*quinque Zoroaſtris*) addi poteſt *Sextus Zoroaſter*, ſic enim ab † *Apuleio* vocatur, qui Babylone vixit, quo tempore Pythagoras captivus à Cambyſe eo deductus eſt. Idem ſcriptor eum vocat, *omnis divini arcanum antiſtitem*, eoque magiſtro præcipuè uſum eſſe Pythagoram dicit. Videtur idem eſſe ac *Zabratus*, à quo *Diogenes* ‡ affirmat Pythagoram purgatum eſſe omnibus priſtinæ vitæ ſordibus, & edoctum, quarum rerum probos expertes eſſe oporteret, uti & Phyſicam. Idem quoque erit *Nazaratas* Aſſyrius, quem *Alexander*, in libro de Pythagoricis Symbolis, affirmat magiſtrum fuiſſe Pythagoræ. Hunc eundem Suidas vocat *Zarem*, Cyrillus *Zaranem*, Plutarchus *Zaratam* (40). - - - *To theſe five Zoroaſters we may add a ſixth mentioned by Apuleius. This Zoroaſter lived in Babylon, at the time when Pythagoras was brought thither a captive by Cambyſes. The ſame writer calls him* the chief interpreter of all divine myſteries, *and ſays, that Pythagoras was inſtructed principally by him. He ſeems to be the ſame with Zabratus, by whom, as Diogenes affirms, Pythagoras was purged from all the filth of his former life, and inſtructed in what good men ought to know, and in Natural Philoſophy. He is alſo the ſame with Nazaratas the Aſſyrian, whom Alexander, in his book concerning the Pythagorical ſymbols, affirms to have taught Pythagoras. The ſame perſon Suidas calls* Zares, *Cyrillus* Zaranes, *and Plutarch* Zarates.’ Theſe words are taken out of Mr Stanley's book: I do not know what he means when he obſerves that Apuleius makes uſe of the expreſſion *Sextus Zoroaſter*, which I do not find in the book he cites. Nor am I more certain on what he grounds his aſſertion, that Pythagoras was brought priſoner to Babylon by King Cambyſes. The words of Apuleius plainly import that he was ſent into Egypt with the priſoners of that prince (41). In order to underſtand this perfectly well, Herodotus ſhould be conſulted (42), who relates, that Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, intending to put to death ſome perſons which he ſuſpected to be hatching a rebellion, entreated Cambyſes to aſk ſome troops of him; which Cambyſes accordingly deſiring, Polycratres ſent him into Egypt forty ſail of ſhips, in which he embarked theſe perſons, and prayed him not to let them return. Apuleius meant, no doubt, that ſome pretend, that Pythagoras was one of thoſe who were then delivered by Polycrates to Cambyſes. He doth not ſpeak of the tranſportation of Pythagoras, either to Perſia or to Babylon.

[C] *Gregorius Turonenſis relates very near the ſame thing of Cuſh the eldeſt ſon of Ham.*] ‘The eldeſt ſon of Ham, *ſaith he* (43), was named Cuſh. The latter was the firſt inventer of the art of Magic by the ſuggeſtion of the devil, and withal the firſt beginner of idolatry He was the firſt who, moved by a diabolical ſuggeſtion, made a ſmall ſtatue to be adored:

(a) Riſiſſe eodem die, quo genitus eſſet, unum hominem accepimus Zoroaſtrem. Eidem cerebrum ita palpitaſſe, ut impoſitam repelleret manum, futuræ præſagio ſcientiæ. *Plin. lib. vii, cap. xvi, pag. m.* 35.

(b) Id. *lib. xi, cap.* 42, *pag.* 592.

(c) Dio Chryſoſt. Orat. Boriſthenica.

(d) Cedrenus, and Suidas.

(e) Clemens Recognitionum, *lib. iv, apud* Bochart. Geog. Sacræ, *lib. iv, cap. i, pag. m.* 231.

(f) Id. ib. *apud* Huetium, Demonſtr. Evang. *Propoſ. iv, cap. v, pag. m.* 156.

(g) Id. ibid. apud eumd. ibid. *pag.* 152.

(h) See, above, remark [*B*], of the article CHAM.

(i) Bochart. ubi ſupra, *pag. m.* 231, *& ſeq.*

(k) *See* Huetius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 150.

(l) Herbelot, Bibl. Orientale, *pag.* 931.

(m) Id. ibid. ex Abulpharagio.

(37) Herodot. *lib. i, cap. ccix.*

(38) Hadrian. Valeſius in Ammian. Marcellin. ubi ſupra.

(39) Above, citation (25), of the article PYTHAGORAS.

† In Floridis.

‡ Porphyr. Vit. Pythagoræ.

(40) Thomas Stanleius, Hiſtor. Philoſophiæ Orientalis, *lib. i, cap. ii, p.* 8, 9.

(41) Inter captivos Cambyſæ regis, Ægyptum cum adveheretur (Pythagoras.) *Apul. Flor. pag. m.* 351.

(42) Herodot. *lib. iii, cap. xliv.*

(43) Gregor. Turon. Hiſt. Francorum, *lib. i, cap. v.*

that this Prophet laid his curſe on him, on account of his maintaining ſome opinions very oppoſite to the Jewiſh law; that he became leprous by way of puniſhment for his impiety, and that being expelled Jeruſalem on that account, he retired to Perſia, where he ſet up a new religion (*n*). Some have taken him for the Prophet Ezekiel (*o*), and it cannot be denied that they ground their aſſertion on the agreement of numerous particulars which belong to the one, and are related of the other (*p*). George Hornius imagines that Zoroaſter is the falſe Prophet Balaam (*q*). Huetius ſhews that he was the Moſes of the Jews, and mentions an infinite number of particulars, in which the account we have of Moſes agrees with the Pagan ſtories of Zoroaſter (*r*). There are ſcarce any people who do not believe that there were ſeveral Zoroaſters, as well as ſeveral Jupiters and Hercules's. See Dr Thomas Stanley's treatiſe which Mr le Clerc hath tranſlated into Latin (*s*); and you will there find (*t*) a Chaldean, a Bactrian, a Perſian, a Pamphilian, a Proconneſian, and a Babylonian Zoroaſter (*u*). They are in the wrong who believe that Zoroaſter taught a diabolical Magic; for his Magic was only the ſtudy of the Divine nature, and of religious worſhip, as Plato expreſsly declares [*D*]. But though it is eaſy to clear him from this accuſation, it is difficult to excuſe him with regard to the doctrine of two principles, ſo ſtrong is the preſumption that he actually taught that there are two co-eternal cauſes, one of good, and the other of evil things [*E*]. Dr Hyde in his excellent

'adored: he made men believe that he had power to 'bring down the ſtars and fire from heaven. He 'went to the Perſians, who called him Zoroaſter, 'that is, a living Star. Having alſo learned of 'him the cuſtom of worſhipping fire, they adored 'him as a god, after he had been divinely conſumed 'by fire.'

[*D*] *His Magic was only the ſtudy . . . . . of religious worſhip, as Plato expreſsly declares.*] There are four choſen perſons, ſaith he, appointed to educate the eldeſt ſon of the King of the Perſians. They chooſe the wiſeſt, the moſt juſt, the moſt temperate, and the braveſt man that can be found. The wiſeſt man inſtructs him in Zoroaſter's Magic, that is, the worſhip of the gods: beſides, he teacheth him the art of government. Ὧν ὁ μὲν μαγείαν τε διδάσκει τὴν Ζωροάςρȣ τȣ̃ Ὡρομάζȣ (ἔςι δὲ τȣ̃το θεῶν θεραπεία) διδάσκει δὲ καὶ τὰ βασιλικά. *Quorum primus magiam Zoroaſtri Oromaſii filii docet, eſt autem illa Deorum cultus; atque idem tradit inſtituta regia* (44). Obſerve that Zoroaſter is called the ſon of Oromaſius, and that Oromaſius is the name which he and his followers gave to the good God, or good principle. Whence to call him the ſon of Oromaſius ſhould ſeem to be the ſame, as calling him the Son of God. Dr Stanley conjectures, with great probability, that this laſt title was really beſtowed on him. 'Hinc 'colligas verba Platonis eſſe intelligenda de Mago Per'ſa, qui propter inuſitatam eruditionem figuratè, aut 'fabuloſè dicebatur *filius Dei*, aut alicujus boni Genii, 'quo honore affecti ſunt Pythagoras, Plato, aliique 'præſtantiſſimi viri (45). - - - *From hence we may in'fer that Plato's words muſt be underſtood of that Per'ſian Magus, who, on account of his uncommon learn'ing, was in an allegorical or fabulous manner, ſtiled 'the* Son of God, *or of ſome good genius: and this ho'nour was alſo paid to Pythagoras, Plato, and other 'learned men.'* Thoſe who deſire to ſee a great many paſſages which teſtify, that the Magic of the Perſians, inſtituted by Zoroaſter, was the ſtudy of religion and morality, need only read Briſſonius (46) and Bullingerus (47). Nor is any perſon ignorant that Gabriel Naudé hath learnedly and ſolidly juſtified our Zoroaſter againſt the accuſation of the black art (48). He mentions ſeveral authors who may be conſulted.

[*E*] *That there are two co-eternal cauſes, one of good, and the other of evil things.*] Plutarch having aſſerted that *this is the opinion of moſt, and of the wiſeſt of the Antients*, adds (49), Zoroaſter the Magician, who is 'ſaid to have lived five thouſand years before the Tro'jan war . . . called the good God Oromazes, and 'the other Arimanius (50) . . . and taught mankind 'to offer ſacrifices and prayers to the former, that he 'might beſtow upon us all good things, and accept of 'our thanks for thoſe which we receive: and to the 'latter, that he might avert all hurtful and evil things: 'for they (51) pound in a mortar a certain plant, 'named Homomy, and call upon Pluto and dark'neſs; then mixing it with the blood of a ſacrifi'ced wolf, they convey it to a certain place where 'the ſun never ſhines, and there caſt it away. For 'of herbs and plants, they believe that ſome belong 'to the good God, and others to the evil dæmon; 'and likewiſe they think, that land animals, ſuch as 'dogs, fowls, and hedge-hogs, belong to God, and wa'ter animals to the evil dæmon; for which reaſon they 'account him happy who kills the greateſt number of 'them.' However, theſe men relate a great many 'fabulous ſtories concerning theſe gods. They ſay, 'for inſtance, that Oromazes ſprung from the pureſt 'light, and Arimanius from darkneſs; that they are 'at war one with another, and that Oromazes made 'ſix gods, the firſt of whom is the god of Benevo'lence, the ſecond of Truth, the third of Juſtice, 'the fourth of Wiſdom, the fifth of Wealth, and the 'ſixth of Pleaſure which accrues from good actions; 'and that Arimanius likewiſe made the like number 'of dæmons, all oppoſite and enemies to the former. 'After this, Oromazes having firſt trebled his own 'magnitude, mounted up as far above the ſun, as 'the ſun is above the earth, and ſo beſpangled the 'heavens with ſtars, among which he eſtabliſhed one '(called Sirius, or the Dog-Star) as a miſtreſs or 'guide to all the reſt. After having made twenty'four gods more, he placed them in an egg-ſhell. 'But thoſe who were made by Arimanius (being alſo 'of the like number) grated and raſped this egg-ſhell 'to ſuch a degree, that they pierced it; and ever 'ſince that time bad things have been promiſcuouſly 'mingled and confounded with good. But the fatal 'and predeſtinated time will come, when Arimanius, 'who brought plagues and famines upon the earth, 'ſhall be ruined and utterly deſtroyed by the good 'gods; at which time, the earth ſhall be plain, 'ſmooth, and level, and there ſhall only be one man'ner of life, and one form of government among 'men, who ſhall all ſpeak the ſame language, and 'live happily. Theopompus alſo writes, that accord'ing to the Magi, one of theſe gods ſhall be victo'rious for the ſpace of three thouſand years, and ſhall 'be vanquiſhed during as long a time, and that for 'three thouſand years more, they ſhall contend and 'fight one againſt the other, and deſtroy each others 'works; till at laſt Pluto ſhall fail and utterly periſh, 'then mankind ſhall be happy, and neither need 'food nor yield a ſhadow; and that the god, who 'has wrought all theſe things, doth, for ſome time, 'take his repoſe and reſt; but that this time is not 'too long for a god, and would not ſeem conſiderable 'to a man aſleep. Theſe are the fables invented by 'the Magi.'

It was not a needleſs thing to ſet down this whole paſſage, ſince it contains ſomewhat at large the opinions and precepts of Zoroaſter; and we may obſerve from thence, that the aſſerters of two principles, involved themſelves in ſeveral abſurdities, when they deſcended to a particular explanation of their ſyſtem. I have obſerved the ſame thing when ſpeaking of the Manichees (52). But ſince, according to the moſt common tradition, Zoroaſter muſt paſs for the founder of the Magi, and it appears by a great number of authorities that they admitted a good god, whom they called Oromaſes, or Oromaſdes, and an evil god whom they named Arimanius; it is very probable that he really aſſerted this doctrine (53).

(*n*) Ibid. *pag.* 932.

(*o*) Huetius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 151.

(*p*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 458.

(*q*) Hornius, Hiſtor. Philoſ. *lib. ii, cap. iv, pag.* 79, 80.

(*r*) Huetius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 149, *& ſeq.*

(*s*) *Intituled,* Hiſtoria Philoſophiæ Orientalis.

(*t*) In the ſecond chapter, of the firſt book.

(*u*) See the remark [*B*], towards the end.

(44) Plato, in Alcibiade I, *pag.* 441, C.

(45) Stanleius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 11.

(46) Briſſonius, de Regno Perſarum, *lib. ii, pag.* 178, *& ſeq. Edit. Commel.* 1595.

(47) Jul. Cæſar Bullengerus, Eclog. ad Arnobium, *pag.* 346, *& ſeq.*

(48) Naudé, Apologie des grands Hommes, *pag.* 134, *& ſeq.*

(49) Plut. de Iſide & Oſiride, *pag.* 369.

(50) What is omitted here may be ſeen above, in the article MANICHEES, remark [*C*], at the firſt paragraph.

(51) That is, the Perſians.

(52) Above, remark [*B*], of the article MANICHEES.

(53) *See* Diog. Laërt. in Proœmio, *num.* 8, *and* Agathias Hiſtor. *lib. ii.*

excellent treatiſe on the religion of the antient Perſians, cites ſome authors who clear him

Let us obſerve, that Plutarch having recited what we have ſeen above, adds, *theſe are the fables invented by the Magi* (54). If we ſhould infer from thence that he rejected, in general, the whole hypotheſis of two principles, the one good, and the other evil, we ſhould miſtake his ſentiments. He might indeed very well condemn the particular explications of Zoroaſter's followers, but doubtleſs he admitted the whole foundation of their ſyſtem, that the god whom they called good, is not the cauſe of any evil. I have cited ſeveral paſſages of his works, wherein he declares himſelf very clearly on this head, and yet they do not diſcover the whole foundation of his doctrine (55). Wherefore I ſhall add here ſome paſſages which will more clearly explain it to us. I believe that it agreed very well with the opinion he aſcribed to Plato. ‘ That Philoſopher, *ſaith he* (56), admits two ſouls of the world, one good, and the other evil; and alſo acknowledges, betwixt theſe two, a third cauſe, which is not without either ſoul or reaſon, nor immovable of it ſelf, as ſome think, but adjacent, and adherent to the other two, yet always deſiring and purſuing what is beſt . . . becauſe the generation, compoſition, and conſtitution, of this world, is intermixed with contrary powers, which are not however equal, for the beſt prevails and is ſtrongeſt, but it is impoſſible that the worſt ſhould utterly periſh; ſo firmly is it ſettled in the body and ſoul of the univerſe, where it is perpetually at war with the good principle.’ In another place he more amply ſets forth this doctrine of Plato, and informs us that the original of evil is not lodged in an inſenſible, inanimate, matter, utterly void of action and qualities, and which is capable of receiving all imaginable forms; but in a matter which moves and is united to a ſoul, the diſorders of which cannot be wholly and entirely corrected. I ſhall hereafter declare why I cite ſuch a long paſſage.

‘ (57) The world, ſaith Heraclitus, was neither created by a God, nor by a man: as if he had been afraid, that, in caſe we denied that God is the Creator of the univerſe, we ſhould be obliged to own that man was the architect of it. But, according to Plato's opinion, it is far better to own that the univerſe was created by God, and in our ſongs of praiſe to aſcribe the glory of this ſtructure to him, the frame itſelf being the nobleſt maſter-piece, and God the moſt excellent architect, and the beſt of all cauſes; yet that the ſubſtance and matter of the univerſe were not created, but always ſubject to the ordering and diſpoſal of the builder, ſo as to be made as like himſelf as poſſible. For the creation was not out of nothing, but out of matter wanting beauty and perfection, like the rude materials of a houſe, a garment, or a ſtatue lying firſt in ſhapeleſs confuſion. For before the creation of the world the univerſe was a chaos, that is, a confuſion or diſorder of things: yet this chaos was neither without a body, without motion, nor without a ſoul: but the corporeal part was without form or conſiſtence, and the moving ſoul was raſh and inconſiderate, without reaſon or conduct. God did not make a body of that which was incorporeal, nor a ſoul of that which was inanimate; as the Muſician doth not make the voice, but only renders it ſweet, tuneful, and melodious, or as the dancer doth not make motion, but only renders it graceful and well-timed: thus God did not make the tangible ſolidity of bodies, nor the imaginative or moving faculties of the ſoul; but having found theſe two principles, the one obſcure and dark, the other turbulent and extravagant, both imperfect, diſordered, and confuſed, he ſo ordered and diſpoſed them both, that of theſe two principles he made the nobleſt and moſt excellent of all animals. Therefore the ſubſtance of body is no other than what Plato calls the nature ſuſceptible of all things, and the ſeat and nurſe of all created beings. As to the ſubſtance of the ſoul, in the book intituled *Philebus*, he calls it infinity, or the privation of all number, meaſure, and proportion, admitting neither of more nor leſs, greater nor ſmaller, like nor unlike. As to that ſubſtance which he ſays, in his *Timæus*, is mixed with the indiviſible nature, and becomes diviſible in bodies, we muſt not underſtand it to be a multitude in unity, or length and breadth in points; for theſe are qualities more proper to bodies than to the ſoul; but it is that unlimited principle, moving both itſelf and other ſubſtances, that, which in ſeveral places of his writings he calls neceſſity, and in his treatiſe of laws he openly ſtiles the diſorderly, evil, and miſchievous ſoul. For ſuch was the ſoul of itſelf; but at length it was endowed with underſtanding, ratiocination, and harmony, that it might become the ſoul of the world. Thus that all-receiving and material principle had both magnitude, ſpace, and diſtance, but was void of beauty, form, and proportion: however, all theſe it obtained, when it came to be formed into ſeas and land, the heavens, the ſtars, and that infinite variety of plants and living creatures. Now as for thoſe who attribute to matter, and not to the ſoul, that which Plato in his *Timæus* calls Neceſſity, in his *Philebus* Infinity, and the privation of meaſure and proportion, they cannot maintain it to be the cauſe of evil, becauſe Plato always ſuppoſes that this matter is void of form or figure, or any other quality or virtue, and compares it with oils that have no ſcent; ſuch as the Perfumers uſe in compoſing their perfumes. For Plato could not poſſibly ſuppoſe that to be the cauſe and principle of evil, which of itſelf is ſluggiſh, without any active quality, motion, or inclination; and at the ſame time give this infinity the epithet of wicked and miſchievous, and call it Neceſſity, which, in ſeveral caſes, is repugnant to, and rebellious againſt, God. For this Neceſſity, which defeats heaven (as he ſays in his Politics) and overturns it, together with that concupiſcence which is born with us, and that confuſion of antient nature, which was void of order, before it was formed into it's preſent beautiful ſhape, whence came they to be conveyed into the various forms and beings, if the ſubject, which is the firſt matter was void of all quality whatever, and deprived of all efficient cauſe? The architect being in his own nature good, intended a frame the neareſt approaching to his own perfections. For beſides theſe two, there is no third principle, and if we admit that there is evil, without any precedent cauſe or principle that produced it, we muſt fall into the difficulties and perplexities of the Stoics: for of thoſe principles that have a being, it is not poſſible that either the good one, or the other which is void of all quality, ſhould produce evil. But Plato did not act like thoſe who came after him, who not having perceived and underſtood the third principle and third cauſe which is between God and matter, fell into the moſt ſtrange and abſurd propoſition imaginable, affirming that the nature of evils came forth caſually, and by I know not what accident, or came forth of it ſelf: yet they will not allow a ſingle atom of Epicurus to ſhift ever ſo little in its place; for this, ſay they, would infer that there is motion without any prior cauſe. Nevertheleſs they affirm, that vice and wickedneſs, with a thouſand other deformities and imperfections of bodies ariſe by conſequence, and without any other efficient cauſe (58). But Plato does not ſay ſo, for denying that the firſt matter hath any quality, and removing from God, as far as is poſſible, the cauſes of evil, he has written thus concerning the world in his political diſcourſes. The world, ſays he, received from its maker all things beautiful and good; but as to things evil, wicked, and unjuſt, in heaven, they proceeded from its exterior habit, and former diſpoſition, and it conveys them to the ſeveral animals on the earth. A little lower, in the ſame treatiſe, he adds, In proceſs of time, when oblivion encroaches upon the world, the diſtemper of its antient confuſions prevails more and more, and the hazard is, leſt being diſſolved, it ſhould again be ſunk and plunged into the immenſe abyſs of its former confuſion . . . . . Plato does indeed give to matter the titles of mother and nurſe; but the cauſe of evil he makes to be the moving force reſiding within it, and which in body is diviſible, a motion not governed by order and reaſon, though not without a ſoul, which in his treatiſe of laws, he expreſsly calls the ſoul repugnant, and contrary to

What chaos is, according to Plato, as explained by Plutarch.

Of the ſubſtance of body, and the ſoul of the world, and what they are.

Supposing two principles of things, *viz.* the Artificer and the firſt matter, he endeavours to explain the cauſe of evil: but he loſes himſelf, being ignorant of what the holy Scripture ſays on this ſubject.

In order to illuſtrate what is ſaid above, he ſuppoſes a third principle between God and matter, and afterwards ſets forth Plato's opinion concerning the cauſe of evil.

---

(54) Ἡ μὲν οὖν μάγων μυθολογία τοιοῦτον ἔχει τρόπον. Hoc modo ſe habent magorum fabulæ. *Plut. de Iſide, pag.* 370, *B.*

(55) See, above, the article MANICHEES, remark [*C*]; the article PAULICIANS, citation (67); and the article PERICLES, citation (71).

(56) Plut. ibid. *pag.* 370, *F.*

(57) Plut. de creat. animæ, *p.* 1014, 1015. Note, that of the four ſummaries at the margin of this quotation, the three laſt were made by Simon Goulart.

(58) See, above, remark [*T*], of the article CHRYSIPPUS, the Philoſopher; and remark [*L*], of the aritcle PAULICIANS.

him on this head. I ſhall examine whether they deſerve credit [*F*]. It is even affirmed that

'that other which is the cauſe of all good. For tho' the ſoul be the cauſe and principle of motion, yet it is the underſtanding which is the cauſe and principle of the order and harmony of motion: God therefore hath not rendered matter ſluggiſh, but prevented it from being any longer troubled and diſordered by an extravagant and inconſiderate cauſe: neither hath he infuſed into nature the principles of mutation and paſſion; but when it was under the preſſure of all ſorts of paſſions, and diſorderly mutations, he removed all the diſorders and irregularities, making uſe of ſymmetry, proportion, and number, as the moſt proper inſtruments for that purpoſe.'

This explication of Plato's doctrine concerning the creation of the world, and the original of evil, is one of the moſt beautiful paſſages in Plutarch; and though this doctrine is not true, it deſerves to be read with attention, and contains ſeveral excellent ideas, and ſublime conceptions, of a ſurprizing fertility, with regard to thoſe who know how to make good uſe of conſequences. This is the reaſon which engaged me not to curtail this paſſage. How many people who ſhall read this, would not take the pains to recur to Plutarch, if I had only mentioned the pages of the author? Another reaſon prevented my being contented with this: I here find ſome particulars, which I ſhall make uſe of below (59).

[*F*] *Dr Hyde . . . cites ſome authors who clear him . . . I ſhall examine whether they deſerve credit.*] Thoſe who have read Mr Bernard's journal (60), need not be informed that the *Hiſtoria Religionis veterum Perſarum*, publiſhed by Dr Hyde (61) at Oxford, in the year 1700, in 4to, is one of the moſt excellent pieces that can poſſibly be written on ſuch a ſubject. The idea which the learned journaliſt hath given of this performance is ſufficient to convince us, that it contains a very curious erudition, and profound diſcuſſions, which diſcloſe ſeveral uncommon particulars, and diſcover a country which we ſcarce knew any thing of before. But to come to the matter. Dr Hyde affirms (62), that the antient Perſians acknowledged no more than one ſole uncreated principle, which was the good principle, or, in one word, GOD: and that they looked upon the evil principle as a created being. One of the names which they gave to GOD was Hormizda, and they called the evil principle Ahariman. And this is the original of the two Greek words 'Ωρομάσδης and 'Αρειμάνιος: one of which was the name of the good, and the other that of the evil principle, as we have ſeen above (63), in a paſſage of Plutarch. The Perſians pretended that Abraham was the firſt founder of their religion (64). Zoroaſter afterwards made ſome alterations in it, but it is ſaid that he made no manner of change, with relation to the doctrine of one ſole uncreated principle; but that his innovation in this particular, was only the giving the name of light to the good principle, and that of darkneſs to the evil one (65). Of which here is an evidence (66). *Zerduſht affirmavit Lucem & Tenebras eſſe . . . . duo Principia ſibi invicem contraria: & ſic eſſe Yezdân & Ahreman, qui fuerunt . . . . initium eorum quæ inveniuntur in Mundo: ex eorum miſtione* [ſeu *combinatione*] *extitiſſe Compoſitiones; & ex variis Compoſitionibus productas fuiſſe formas. Et quòd Deus qui creavit Lucem & Tenebras, utriuſque Autor unicus ſit, ſine Socio, ſine Pari aut Simili; nec ei referenda ſit . . . exiſtentia Tenebrarum, ſicut dicunt Zervanitæ: ſed Bonum & Malum, Integritas ac Corruptio, & Puritas ac Spurcities exiverunt ex miſtione* [ſeu *commiſſione*] *Lucis & Tenebrarum: & niſi hæc duo commiſta fuiſſent, non extitiſſet Mundus. Et hæc duo contra ſe invicem inſurgebant & de victoriâ contendebant, donec Lux vinceret Tenebras, & Bonum Malum. Tum poſtea ſalvum evaſit Bonum ad mundum ſuum, & Malum divertebat ad Mundum ſuum: & ſic fuit cauſa Liberationis. Cumque Deus excelſus hæc duo temperaverat & miſcuerat pro arbitrio ſuo, eaque in Compoſitione viderat, tum inſtituit Lucem ut originale quiddam, & indixit exiſtentiam ejus ut exiſteret. Sed Tenebræ ſecutæ ſunt ſicut umbra perſonam. Nam cùm videret eas quodammodo exiſtere, ſed non realiter exiſtere, tum planè produxit Lucem, & acquiſitæ ſunt Tenebræ per conſequentiam: nam ex neceſſitate extitit contrarium, quippe cujus exiſtentia fuit neceſſaria,* ſc. *ut contingens in creatione, non autem ex primâ intentione, ſecundum exemplum quod adduximus de Perſonâ & Umbrâ.* Theſe words clearly expreſs, that, in Zoroaſter's hypotheſis, the two principles, one of good, and the other of evil, Oromazes, Arimanius, or light and darkneſs, were, properly ſpeaking, no more than ſecond cauſes, and did not ſtrictly deſerve the name of principles: they were the effects of another cauſe, and the productions of GOD. There ariſe ſeveral abſurdities in the particular explication of the doctrine of this Magus; for he aſſerted, on the one ſide, that GOD alone had produced darkneſs; and on the other, that its exiſtence ought not to be referred to GOD. He ſaid, that GOD mixed the light with darkneſs, becauſe without this mixture the world could not have been produced; that good and evil, purity and impurity, proceeded from this mixture; that there was a ſharp engagement betwixt light and darkneſs 'till the latter was overcome; that after its defeat it retired into its own world, and light to its proper world alſo; that GOD having mixed theſe two contraries together, eſtabliſhed an original light, and made it exiſt; that darkneſs reſulted from it as a ſhadow from a body; for GOD ſeeing that darkneſs exiſted in ſome ſort, though not really, gave a plenary exiſtence to light, and ſo to darkneſs by an inevitable conſequence, and not according to the primitive and direct intention of the Creator (67). This chaos of thoughts is incomprehenſible to us weſtern people. None but the eaſtern nations accuſtomed to a myſtical and contradictory language can bear ſuch exceſſive nonſenſe without diſguſt and horror. But be it how it will, may they reply to me, Zoroaſter is thus cleared of the principal accuſation, and it muſt no longer be pretended that he acknowledged two uncreated principles, or an Arimanius eſſentially evil and ſelf-exiſtent. This is what remains to be examined.

I. I anſwer, in the firſt place, that it is unqueſtionable, that the Greek authors, who have aſcribed to Zoroaſter the opinion of two principles, deſigned to attribute to him a doctrine contrary to the common Theology, as well as to the principles of the Ariſtotelians and Stoics: thoſe two ſects agreed with the people on this head, that the ſame GOD who pours down good upon the earth, pours down evil alſo; and that if he puniſhes on one ſide, he rewards on the other, &c. But if they had aſſerted that Zoroaſter and the Magi were of a contrary opinion to that, they muſt have believed that theſe Magi taught that the principle which diſtributed good, is perſonally diſtinguiſhed from the principle which does the contrary, and that theſe two principles are independent of each other, and the one co-eternal with the other (68).

II. This is confirmed by reaſon, that this hypotheſis was recurred to on no other account, than in order to ſhun the perplexity (69) which they met with in the ſuppoſition, that the ſame Being, which is the cauſe of good, is alſo the cauſe of evil. But this difficulty had not been avoided, if Arimanius had been allowed to have been a production of the good GOD; for the queſtion would have turned, how Arimanius, the evil principle, could have been produced by a cauſe infinitely good. It is obvious to all men, that to aſſert that GOD himſelf produced all evils, or that he produced Arimanius, who conſequently is the neceſſary author of all evils (70), amounts to the ſame thing, *quod eſt cauſa cauſæ eſt cauſa cauſati. - - - that which is the cauſe of a cauſe, is alſo the cauſe of its effect.* So that Zoroaſter could not eſcape the force of any one objection, if his doctrine had been what Shahriſtâni ſays it was (71). Therefore let us grant that the Greeks have not without ground charged him with admitting two eternal principles.

III. I am not ignorant that it may be urged that the Grecians were very imperfectly acquainted with the opinions of the Philoſophers whom they called Barbarians, and that what they wrote of the Jewiſh nation, and the antiquities of Egypt is very inaccurate. But let this be repeated as often as you pleaſe, I ſhall anſwer, the Arabian writers are not more credible, when they ſpeak of a Philoſopher ſo remote from their own time as Zoroaſter was.

IV. I conjecture that his followers for their own intereſt have done him the favour to aſcribe to him the creation of the evil principle, and that they did it that he was no idolater, either with reſpect to the worſhip of fire, or that of

---

(59) In the following remark.

(60) Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, *for February*, 1701, *Art. iii, and for March* 1701, *Art. i.*

(61) Profeſſor of the Oriental languages, in the univerſity of Oxford.

(62) Thomas Hyde, Hiſt. Religionis veter. Perſarum, *cap. ix*, *pag.* 161.

(63) In the remark [*E*], citation (50).

(64) Id. ibid. *cap. xxi*, *pag.* 275.

(65) Id. ibid. *cap. xxii*, *pag.* 290.

(66) Shahriſtâni, *apud* Hyde, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 299. I have left out the Arabic words which are in this and the following paſſages of Dr Hyde, and in the room of them have put blanks.

(67) Compare what has been ſaid in the article CHRYSIPPUS, the Philoſopher, remark [*T*]; and in the article PAULICIANS, remark [*I*], at the third paragraph.

(68) Dr Hyde owns that this doctrine was taught by thoſe whom Plutarch mentions. See, below, citation (75).

(69) See Plutarch, in the paſſage which has been cited in the article MANICHEES, citation (28), and in the foregoing remark of this preſent article.

(70) Light and darkneſs, are cauſes acting neceſſarily and without any liberty.

(71) Above, citat. (66).

it ſince the time that they were ſubjected to the ſevere domination of the Mahometans who abhor them, and call them idolaters and worſhippers of fire. Being unwilling to expoſe themſelves ſtill more to their hatred, and inſults, under pretext that they acknowleged an uncreated nature ſovereignly wicked, and independent of God, they thought fit to varniſh over this part of their ſyſtem with another interpretation: they could not abſolutely deny that Zoroaſter admitted of two principles, ſince it is too well known that he acknowledged them. ‘The Tarikh Montekheb ſaith, that Zoroaſter, author of the ſect of the Megiouſch, or Magi, was alſo the firſt who taught the doctrine of two principles of all things, and that the firname of Megiouſch, beſtowed on them, is a word corrupted by the Arabians, from the Perſian word, Meïkhouſch, which ſignifies ſharp-ſweet, by reaſon of the two principles, good and evil, which he eſtabliſhed (72).’ Here is an author who aſcribes to Zoroaſter the firſt eſtabliſhment of this opinion; but Dr Hyde alledges a paſſage which makes this ſyſtem of a much older date, and beſides ſeems to hint that Zoroaſter only reformed it: ‘Quod Perſarum gentem . . . . . . ei eſt Religio pervetuſta: & in eâ Docti vocantur Keiomarſii. Iſti ſtatuunt aliquem Deum æternum quem vocant Yezdan, eo deſignantes *τὸν Θεόν*: & alium deum creatum ex Tenebris, quem nominant Ahreman, deſignantes Diabolum. Magnifaciunt Lucem, eo uſque dum colant Ignem: & cavent ſibi à Tenebris. Nec deſtiterunt ſic facere (73), DONEC prodiit Zerduſht jactans prophetiam. Aſſerunt itaque Deum Creatorem, quod ſcil. creavit Lucem & Tenebras; eumque eſſe Unicum, nec habere Socium. Et quod Bonum & Malum, & Probitas & Improbitas conquiſita ſunt ex mixtione Lucis & Tenebrarum: & quòd ſi hæc duo non fuiſſent mixta, non extitiſſet Mundus: &, quòd hæc duo hoc modo mixta non deſinent, donec Bonum approprietur Mundo ſuo & Malum Mundo ſuo; [*i. e. utrumque horum tandem concedet ad Mundum ſibi proprium, ſcil. in fine Mundi.*] . . . Et hanc eſſe Religionem Magorum (74). - - - - *There was a very antient religion among the Perſians; and thoſe who were learned in it, were called Keiomarſii. They hold that there is an eternal Deity, whom they call Yezda, meaning GOD, and that out of darkneſs was created an other god, whom they name Ahreman, by which word they denote the Devil. They highly eſteem light, inſomuch that they worſhip fire; and they have a great averſion to darkneſs. They continued in this practice,* UNTIL *Zerduſht appeared, who pretended to prophecy. Thus they affirm that GOD is the creator of the univerſe, becauſe he created light and darkneſs, that there is but one GOD, who is without any equal: that good and evil, probity and wickedneſs, ſprung from the mixture of light and darkneſs: that if theſe two had not been mixed together, the world would not have had a being: and that they will not ceaſe to be thus mixed, till good and evil be appropriated each to it's own world,* [*that is,* till each of them retires to the world proper to it, namely, at the end of the world.] *This is the religion of the Magi.*’

V. Laſtly, I ſay that Dr Hyde owns that there are yet ſome ſects, which by acknowledging God and the Devil to be two co-eternal natures, agree with the aſſerters of Zoroaſter's Oromazes and Arimanius. His words are: ‘*Dualiſtæ* Diaboli coæternitatem aſſerunt. Sunt enim ex Indo-Perſis & Dualiſtis Manichæis aliiſque Hæreticis (ut quidem ſunt in omni Religione,) qui opinantur Diabolum à ſeipſo proceſſiſſe, ut loquuntur, i. e. æternum fuiſſe, & malos Angelos ſibi creâſſe: ſed eſt Hæretica opinio, eaque ignorantium quorundam hominum qui peculiariter vocantur . . . *Thanavîa*, i. e. *Dualiſtæ* ſeu . . . . . . *Domini duorum*, ſcil. *Aſſertores* ſeu *Autores duorum principiorum*; *qui* (inquit Shahriſtâni,) *Lucem & Tenebras* ſeu *Deum & Diabolum ſtatuunt duo Principia coæterna, in contrarium Magorum qui Lucem æternam & Tenebras creatas ponunt.* Iſti tales fuerunt, qui *Oromazen & Arimanium duos eſſe Deos aſſerebant* ut Plut. lib. *de Iſide & Oſir.* (75) - - - - - - *The Dualiſts aſſert the co-eternity of the Devil. For there are ſome Indian Perſians, and Manichean Dualiſts, and other Heretics (as there are ſome in all religions) who imagine that the Devil proceeded from himſelf, as they term it, that is, that the Devil is eternal, and created the evil angels: but this is an heretical opinion, and held only by ſome ignorant men, who are diſtinguiſhed by the name* Thanavia or Dualiſts, or aſſertors or authors of the two principles, who affirm (ſays Shahriſtani) that light and darkneſs, God and the Devil, are two co-eternal principles, in contradiction to the Magi, who believe that light is eternal, and that darkneſs was created. *Such were they who aſſerted, as Plutarch informs us, that there are two gods, Oromazes and Arimanius.*’ There are ſome particulars which are very ſingular and extravagant concerning the ſyſtem of the Zoroaſtrian Magi in the book of a Mahometan. I ſhall cite from it what relates to the Dualiſts, who hold ſtill the co-eternity of the Devil, and with great importunity aſk whence evil could proceed, if the evil principle was not eternal? ‘*Addit Shahriſtâni,* Quòd Maguſæis peculiaris ſit . . . . . . Dualitas, adeò ut ſtatuant . . . . . Ductores *ſeu* Gubernatores duos æternos, qui dividuntur in Bonum & Malum, & Probitatem ac Improbitatem, Emolumentum ac Nocumentum. Horum unus nominatur Lux, & alter Tenebræ, ſc. Yezdan *ſeu* Deus, & Ahreman *ſeu* Diabolus. Eorumque Religionem eſſe ſec. hanc diviſionem *ſeu* diſtinctionem: & quòd omnes Magorum Quæſtiones vertantur ſuper duobus Cardinibus, quorum unus eſt Explicatio cauſæ Miſtionis Lucis & Tenebrarum, & alter eſt Explicatio Liberationis Lucis à Tenebris. Et quidem, quòd Miſtionem ſtatuant . . . . Initium *ſeu ſtatum à quo,* & Liberationem . . . . . . Reditum *ſeu ſtatum ad quem.* - - - - - - *The Magi alone, adds Shahriſtian, believe a duality, and that there are two eternal chiefs, or governours, who are divided into good and evil, probity and wickedneſs, advantage and hurt. One of theſe is called light, and the other darkneſs, the former is Yezdan, or GOD, and the latter Ahreman, or the Devil: and their religion is founded on this diviſion or diſtinction: all the queſtions of the Magi turn upon theſe two points, one of which is to explain the cauſe of the mixture of light and darkneſs; and the other to explain the deliverance of light from darkneſs. And they hold that this mixture was the beginning of things, or condition from whence they proceeded, and that this deliverance is the return of things, or condition into which they are to be brought.*’ I ſhall further cite what follows; ‘*Supradictus Shahriſtani pergit narrare,* Quòd Magi ſtatuant . . . . . . Principia duo, ſicuti dixerat: ſed quòd . . . . Magi originales non exiſtiment expedire ut ambo ſint . . . . . coæterna ab intio; ſed quòd Lux ſit . . . . . æterna ab initio, & Tenebræ . . . . productæ. Et quòd tum, differant de modo *ſeu* causâ productionis ejus; cùm à Luce producitur tantùm Lux, quæ non producit ullum Malum; & quomodo ergò productum Principium Mali aut alius cujuſvis rei, cùm nihil adjunctum (*ſeu* par fuerit) Luci quoad primam ejus productionem & æternitatem (76). - - - - - - - The ſame Shahriſtani continues to relate, *that the Magi lay down two principles; as he had ſaid before; but the original Magi,* ſays he, *do not think that both muſt be co-eternal; they hold that light alone is eternal, and darkneſs created: then they differ concerning the manner and cauſe of the production of darkneſs; ſince from light nothing can proceed but light, which doth not produce any evil, how then was the principle of evil, or of any other thing produced, ſince nothing was joined with light, (or equal to it) as to its firſt production and eternity.*’ Some of the Magi aſſert that Arimanius, or the evil principle, was created by an evil thought which aroſe in the Divine intellect. This thought was, *what will happen, if I meet with no oppoſition?* What can be ſaid more deteſtable? Would it have been more blaſphemous to allow this Arimanius to be eternal, than to aſcribe ſuch an original to him? ‘Aſſerentes Yezdân fuiſſe . . . . ſine initio æternum, & Ahreman fuiſſe . . . . . . productum & creatum. Yezdan cogitâſſe ſecum. Niſi fuerint mihi controverſiæ, quomodo erit? Hancque cogitationem pravam naturæ Lucis minùs analogam, produxiſſe Tenebras dictas Ahreman, qui naturâ diſpoſitus ad malum & diſſidium & improbitatem & noxam & omnia

‘ nocumenta:

---

(72) Herbelot, Bibl. Orientale, *pag.* 931, *col. i,*

(73) This ſeems to ſignify that Zoroaſter put an end to thoſe things.

(74) Ibn Shahna, *in libro* de Primis & Poſtremis *apud* Hyde, ubi ſupra, *cap.* ix, *pag.* 163.

(75) Id. ibid. *pag.* 164.

(76) Id. ibid. *cap.* xxii, *pag.* 295, *quoting* Shahriſtâni de Religionibus Orientis.

of Mithra [*G*]. What appears leaſt uncertain among ſo many things which are related of him, is that he was the introducer of a new religion into Perſia, and that he did it about the reign of Darius the ſucceſſor of Cambyſes. He is ſtill in great veneration amongſt thoſe Perſians, who are not of the Mahometan religion, but retain the ancient worſhip of their country. They call him Zardhuſt, and ſeveral people believe that he came from China, and relate a great number of miraculous things on that head. You may ſee a ſpecimen of them in Mr d'Herbelot's *Bibliotheque Orientale* (*x*), and in the Hiſtory of the religion of the Banians, written in Engliſh by Mr Lord, and tranſlated into French by Mr Briot (*y*). Conſult alſo Huetius's Evangelical Demonſtration (*z*), and Dr Hyde's book. Several authors believe that all the works which have gone under the

nocumenta: & prodiens contra Lucem, eam oppoſuit tam naturâ *(ſeu facto)* quàm dicto (77). - - - - - - *They affirm that Yezdan is eternal without beginning, and that Ahreman was produced and created: that Yezdan thought with himſelf,* what will happen, if I meet with no oppoſition? *And that this evil thought not being analogous to the nature of light, produced darkneſs, called Ahreman, which, being naturally diſpoſed to evil, diſcord, wickedneſs, and all manner of miſchief, came forth againſt light, and oppoſed it both in word and deed.*' They add, that a war aroſe betwixt the army of light, and that of darkneſs, which at laſt ended in an accommodation, of which the Angels were the mediators, and the conditions were that the inferior world ſhould be wholly left to Arimanius for the ſpace of ſeven thouſand years, after which it ſhould be reſtored to light. Before the peace Arimanius had extirpated all the inhabitants of the world. Light had called men to its aſſiſtance whilſt they were yet but ſpirits: which it did either to draw them out of Arimanius's territories, or in order to give them bodies to engage againſt this enemy. They accepted the bodies, and the fight, on condition that they ſhould be aſſiſted by the light, and ſhould at laſt overcome Arimanius. The reſurrection ſhall come when he ſhall be vanquiſhed. This, they conclude (78), was the cauſe of the mixture, and ſhall be the cauſe of the deliverance. The Greeks were not ignorant that Zoroaſter taught a future reſurrection (79).

[G] *It is affirmed that he was no idolater either with reſpect to the worſhip of fire, or that of Mithra.*] Dr Hyde affirms (80) that the followers of the ancient religion of the Perſians deny that they ever paid Divine adoration to the ſtars. They maintain that they do not adore the ſun, but only turn towards it when they pray to God. He has found amongſt Zoroaſter's precepts that we ought to ſalute the ſun, and beſtow praiſes on him, but not that we ought to ſerve him with religious worſhip. He proves that their ceremonies might very juſtly paſs for civil honours, and to this purpoſe he makes ſome exceeding curious obſervations. He applies to the fire what he ſays of the ſun; the bowings and proſtrations of the Perſians before the holy fire were not a religious adoration, but only a civil one: ‘Idem quoque dicendum eſt de eorum cultu Ignis, quem (ut ſupra tetigimus,) imitando Judæos in Pyreis ſervârunt. Nam quamvis ei exhibuerint Reverentiam quandam, eamque per Proſtrationes, hæ tamen non fuerunt Adoratio divina, ſed tantum civilis, prout ſe habet mos Orientis erga quoſvis Magnates, & olim fuit erga Angelos tanquam Dei Legatos ejus perſonam repræſentantes; cujus rei exempla affatim ſuppetunt non tantum in Vet. Teſt. ſed & in Novo, ubi fœminæ ad veram Fidem converſæ (viſis apud Chriſti ſepulchrum Angelis,) adorârunt procidentes faciebus in terram: idque quamvis probè ſcirent non eſſe Deum, ſed Angelos, ut conſtat ex verbis earum profitentium *ſe vidiſſe viſionem Angelorum* (81). - - - - - - *The ſame thing muſt be ſaid of their worſhipping fire, which, as I have mentioned above, they kept in their Pyrea in imitation of the Jews. For though they paid a certain reverence to the fire, and that by proſtration, yet this was not a religious, but only a civil, worſhip; as it is the cuſtom of the eaſtern people to proſtrate themſelves before any great man, and as it was antiently the cuſtom to fall down before Angels, as being the meſſengers, and repreſentatives of* GOD. *There are many examples of this kind of worſhip not only in the Old Teſtament, but alſo in the New, where the women who had been converted to the true Faith, (upon ſeeing the Angels at the ſepulchre of Chriſt), fell with their faces to the ground, and worſhipped. Yet they well knew that it was not* GOD *they ſaw, but his Angels, as appears from their own words,* we have ſeen a viſion of Angels.' He concludes (82) with obſerving that they are wrongfully called idolaters, and worſhippers of fire, and will have it that Zoroaſter was an inſtrument to oblige them to perſevere in the true faith (83). He was a man educated in the knowledge of the true God, whom he peculiarly worſhipped in a natural cave, in which he placed ſeveral ſymbols repreſenting the world. Mithra, repreſenting the ſun, filled the maſter's place. But it was not to Mithra, but to the true God, that he paid his adorations: ‘Is cùm eſſet inſignis Philoſophus, Religione auſterus, & totius Matheſeῶs peritiſſimus, hac ratione Perſas ſui admiratione perculit, & ſuæ Doctrinæ attentos reddidit. Præſertim coluit Deum in naturali quodam Antro, quod ille Mithriacum effecit & mirificè ac mathematicè comparavit, ubi ſcil. Mithra præſidens, hæc inferiora Regio modo regens, eaque imprægnans ſedebat: adeo ut omnes poſteà non tantùm in ſummis Montium jugis antiquiſſimo more Deum colebant, ſed & ſubinde illius exemplo, Sacra ſua Mithriaca in tali Antro præſtare & peragere didicerunt. In eo erant Mithræ & hujus Mundi Symbolica philoſophicè & mathematicè ſpectanda & contemplanda, non autem colenda; quâ itaque in re falluntur Autores: nam Perſæ tunc talia Simulachra non colebant (84). - - - - - - *As he was an eminent Philoſopher, ſtrict and auſtere in his religion, and greatly ſkilled in all the parts of the Mathematics, he ſtruck the Perſians with an admiration of him, and rendered them attentive to his doctrine. He worſhipped* GOD *chiefly in a certain natural cave, which he conſecrated to Mithra, and adorned in a wonderful and regular manner, placing in it ſeveral ſymbols which repreſented the world. There Mithra preſided, as the ſovereign of all earthly things, which he governed and impregnated: ſo that afterwards they all worſhipped* GOD *not only on the tops of the mountains, after the antient cuſtom; but alſo from his example they learned to perform their mithriatic rites in the like caves, where they placed ſymbolical figures of Mithra and of the world; theſe figures were to be beheld and contemplated in a Philoſophical and Mathematical manner, but were not to be worſhipped: ſo that in this point authors are miſtaken: for at that time the Perſians did not worſhip theſe images.*' Conſult this learned man in the fourth chapter of his work, where beſides other learned paſſages, you will find theſe words of Porphyry: ‘Referente Eubulo, Zoroaſtres primus omnium in montibus Perſidi vicinis Antrum nativum, floridum, fontibuſque irriguum in honorem Creatoris, & omnium Patris Mithræ, conſecravit: ita ut Antrum conditi à Mithrâ Mundi figuram ei repræſentaret: ea verò quæ intra Antrum, erant certis invicem intervallis diſpoſita, ut Elementorum Climatumque mundanorum ſymbola ſeu figuras gererent (85). - - - - - - *Eubulus relates that Zoroaſter was the firſt who, in the mountains nigh Perſia, conſecrated a natural cave, adorned with flowers, to Mithra the creator and parent of all things. This cave repreſented to him the figure of the world, created by Mithra; and the things which were within it, were diſpoſed at certain diſtances, in ſuch a manner that they were the figures, or ſymbols, of the elements and climates of the earth.*'

We may here obſerve that in this book of Dr Hyde there are ſome particulars which may be ſerviceable to the Jeſuits, on account of the charge brought againſt them concerning the honours paid to Confuſius, which they affirm to be purely civil. Father le Comte who hath been ſo much blamed for aſſerting that the true religion

---

(*x*) At the word *Zerdaſcht*.

(*y*) That tranſlation was printed at Paris in the year 1666, in 12mo.

(*z*) Pag. 152, & ſeq. and pag. 458, 459.

(77) Id. ibid.

(78) Ejuſmodi fuiſſe cauſam Miſtionis, hanc verò cauſam liberationis. *Id. ibid. pag.* 296.

(79) *See what* Diogenes Laërtius, in Proœmio, *num.* 8, *relates concerning the doctrine of the Magi.*

(80) Hyde, ubi ſupra, *cap. i, pag.* 5.

(81) Id. ibid. *pag.* 10.

(82) Id. ibid. *pag.* 14. *See alſo pag.* 22.

(83) Id. ibid. *pag.* 160.

(84) Id. ibid.

(85) Porphyr. de Nympharum antro, *apud* Hyde, ibid. *cap. iv, pag.* 118.

the name of Zoroaſter, ſome of which are yet in being, are ſuppoſititious. Dr Hyde is not of that opinion [*H*].

religion, or the knowledge of the true God, hath laſted in China for ſeveral ages (86), will find a very good aſſiſtant in this learned Oxford Profeſſor.

[*H*] *Several authors believe that all the works which have gone under the name of Zoroaſter . . . . are ſuppoſititious. Dr Hyde is not of that opinion.*] Suidas affirms that there were extant four books of Zoroaſter ϖερὶ φύσεως *de natura - - - concerning nature*; a book ϖερὶ λίϑων τιμίων *de gemmis - - - concerning precious ſtones*; and five books of judiciary Aſtrology, Ἀςεροσκοπικὰ ἀποτελέσματα, *prædictiones ex inſpectione ſtellarum*. It is very likely that what Pliny relates as quoted from Zoroaſter (87) was taken from thoſe books. Euſebius (88) cites a paſſage, which contains a magnificent deſcription of God, and gives it as the very words of Zoroaſter, ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ συναγώγῃ τῶν Περσικῶν, *in ſacro Perſicorum rituum commentario - - - in his ſacred commentary on the Perſian rites*. I know no body who doth not believe that Clemens Alexandrinus ſays, that Prodicus's followers boaſted of having Zoroaſter's ſecret books (89). But perhaps his words are intended in another ſenſe, and mean that they boaſted of having the ſecret books of Pythagoras. They have been lately printed, with the verſes of the Sibyls at Amſterdam in the year 1689, according to Opſopæus's edition, *Oracula magica Zoroaſtris cum Scholiis Plethonis & Pſelli*. Thoſe pretended magical oracles make but two pages. Here follows the opinion of Huetius concerning all the books in general which go under Zoroaſter's name. He calls them all ſupoſititious. ' Ex cujus (*Zoroaſtris*) fama & exiſtimatione provenit eorum fallacia, qui ſub ejus nomine ' Oracula quædam magica Græce ſcripta incautis ' obtruſerunt. Edita illa ſunt cum Pſelli & Plethonis ' ſcholiis: ſed ſi nares admoveris, fraus ſubolebit. ' Vetuſtiora quidem illa ſunt, nihilo tamen γνησιώτερα *(ſinceriora)* Oracula, quæ Crœſi temporibus ' extitiſſe narrat * Nicolaus Damaſcenus. Inſinceros ' quoque eos dixerim libros, quos Chaldaice ſcriptos, ' & Chaldaicis commentariis illuſtratos, & effata ac ' ſententias complexos Johannem Picum habuiſſe ferunt; inſincerum & librum Zind, mihi de nomine ' ſolum cognitum, quo ritus magicos, & ignis colendi ' diſciplinam ajunt contineri. . . . . . Inſinceros & ' quos Hermippus, Plinio teſte, ducentis verſuum ' millibus ſub Zoroaſtris nomine conditos indicibus ' quoque poſitis explanavit. Ex iiſdem falſariorum ' incudibus profectus eſt ſupra memoratus Perſicarum ' Legum codex Zundavaſtaw, quem vetuſtiſſimum ' tamen conjicio, & eumdem fortaſſe, qui ab † Euſebio ' Collectio ſacra Perſicarum rerum appellatur. Indidem ' profectus & quem ſe in arcanis habere jactabant, qui ' Prodici Philoſophi doctrinam ſectabantur, ut eſt apud ' ⸸ Clementem Alexandrinum; indidem & quos commemorat ‡ Suidas; & qui de Magia, Zoroaſtris ' nomine, ſcripti circumferebantur, ut habet ** Auctor ' Recognitionum; & quem tradit Auctor Aſtrologiæ ' cujuſdam Perſicæ, Ebraice redditæ, ab eo lucubratum, ' & Regnum Dei fuiſſe inſcriptum, & manibus Perſarum aſſidue geſtari eſſe ſolitum (90). - - - - - - - ' *The fame and reputation of Zoroaſter encouraged certain* ' *men fradulently to impoſe upon the unwary ſome magical* ' *oracles witten in Greek, as the genuine works of this* ' *Philoſopher. They are publiſhed with the commentaries* ' *of Pſellus and Plethon: but upon a ſlight examination,* ' *you perceive the fraud. Thoſe oracles which, as Nicolas* ' *Damaſcenus ſays, were extant in the time of Crœſus,* ' *are indeed much antienter, but not more genuine than* ' *the former. I may likewiſe call ſuppoſititious thoſe books* ' *written in the Chaldaic tongue, illuſtrated with Chaldaic commentaries, and containing the wiſe ſayings and* ' *opinions of this Philoſopher, which they ſay were in* ' *the poſſeſſion of John Picus. I alſo take to be ſuppoſititious the book of Zind, which I know only by the* ' *title, and is ſaid to contain the Magic rites, and the* ' *manner and form of worſhipping the fire. . . . . . The* ' *ſame thing may be affirmed of thoſe two hundred thouſand verſes, which went under the name of Zoroaſter,* ' *and were, as Pliny teſtifies, explained by Hermippus.* ' *Zundavaſtaw, the abovementioned book of the Perſian* ' *laws, is of the ſame ſtamp: yet in my opinion it is* ' *very antient, and the ſame with what Euſebius calls* ' the ſacred Collection of the Perſian Affairs. *To* ' *theſe we may add the book which the followers of the* ' *Philoſopher Prodicus boaſted they had ſecretly in their* ' *poſſeſſion, as we learn from Clemens Alexandrinus.* ' *The books mentioned by Suidas are likewiſe forged, as* ' *alſo thoſe on Magic, which went about under the name* ' *of Zoroaſter, as the author of the* Recognitiones, *ſays*; ' *and that which the author of a certain book on Perſian* ' *Aſtrology, tranſlated into Hebrew, mentions as the compoſure of Zoroaſter, and which he ſays was intituled* ' the Kingdom of God, *and was continually in the* ' *hands of the Perſians*.' Huetius adds (91), that Porphyry (92) reproached the Chriſtians with the forgery of ſeveral books, and boaſted of having proved that the apocalypſe of Zoroaſter was one of thoſe ſupoſititious pieces.

Dr Hyde acknowledges that the ancient Heretics falſly alledged, under the name of Zoroaſter, ſome ſuppoſitious prophecies concerning Jesus Christ; but he ſaith that they had not preſumed to do it, if they had not known that there were extant genuine works of Zoroaſter in which were contained ſuch prophecies (93). He believes (94) that God revealed to Zoroaſter the coming of the Meſſiah, and that Zoroaſter inſerted this wonderful revelation in his works. He takes the Zundavaſtaw, which Huetius rejects, to be an authentic piece: he gives us the true title and analyſis of it, and is perſwaded (95), that this author's works were written in the ancient Perſian language, and are preſerved to this preſent time.

(86) The Sorbonne condemned that propoſition on the eighteenth of October 1700.

(87) Plin. *lib. xviii, cap. xxiv, pag. m.* 501; *& lib. xxxvii, cap. x, pag.* 407, 410, 411.

(88) Euſeb. Præpar. Evang. *lib. i, ſub fin. pag.* 42.

(89) Clem. Alexandrin. Strom. *lib. i, pag.* 304.

* Nicol. Damaſc. Hiſt. l. 7. in Exc. Conſt. Porphyr.

† Euſeb. Præp. Ev. l. 1.

⸸ Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.

‡ Suidas, in Ζωροάςρης.

** Auct. Recogn. l. 4, c. 27.

(90) Huet. ubi ſupra, *p.* 159.

(91) Huet. ibid. *pag.* 160.

(92) Porphyr. in Vita Plotini.

(93) Hyde, ubi ſupra, in Epiſt. Dedicat. *See alſo cap. xxvi, p.* 340, 341.

(94) Idem, *cap. xxxi, pag.* 382, *& ſeq.*

(95) See his preface.

ZUERIUS BOXHORNIUS (Mark) Profeſſor at Leyden, the ſon of James Zuerius Miniſter at Bergen-op-Zoom, and of Anne Boxhorn the daughter of a Miniſter at Breda, of whom I ſhall ſpeak below [*A*], was born at Bergen-op-Zoom in September 1612 (*a*). He was but ſix years old when his father died. Some time after he followed his mother to Breda, and there was educated by Henry Boxhornius, his grand-father by his mother's ſide, till the Spaniards became maſters of that city in the year 1625. Then he was carried to Leyden by Henry Boxhornius, who having no male iſſue deſired him to take his name. This young ſcholar made ſo great and ſpeedy a progreſs, that he publiſhed ſome very good Poems in the year 1629, on the taking of Boiſleduc,

(*a*) He was a twin: his twin brother was the eldeſt, his name was Henry, he was a miniſter, and died in the year 1640, being but little above 28 years of age, and a very learned and hopeful man. *Jacob. Baſelius, in Vita*

Marci Zuerii Boxhornii, Epiſtolis Boxhornii præfixa. See alſo, *Epiſt. Boxhornii, pag.* 168, *Edit. Francof.* 1679.

[*A*] *He was grandſon to a Miniſter at Breda, of whom I ſhall ſpeak below.*] His name was Henry Boxhornius, or Boxhorn, and he was born in Brabant. He went through his ſtudies at Louvain, and after having there obtained the decree of Licentiate in Divinity, he was promoted to the Deanry of Tillemont, and expreſſed ſuch a warm zeal for the Romiſh religion that he was made Inquiſitor. But he changed his opinion, and embraced the Reformed religion. He was firſt of all a Miniſter in the duchy of Cleves, afterwards at Woerden in Holland, and at laſt at Breda (1). He left this laſt town, when the Spaniards took it in the year 1625, and retired to Leyden, where he took care of the education of his grandſon (2), who is the ſubject of this article. Henry Boxhornius wrote ſome books of controverſy. His antagoniſt was Henry Cuyckius, who accuſed him of falſely pretending to be of the family of the Boxhorns. This Cuyckius, Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Louvain, Grand-Vicar and Official to the Archbiſhop of Mechlen, and at laſt Biſhop of Ruremonde, publiſhed in the year 1596, an *Epiſtola Parænetica*, in which he exhorted Henry

(1) Taken from the Anti of Mr Baillet, *Tom. i, pag.* 158, 159.

(2) Jacobus Baſelius, in Vita Marci Zuerii Boxhornii.

Boiſleduc, and ſome other victories obtained by the Dutch. He was then only ſeventeen years of age. He was but twenty when he publiſhed ſeveral conſiderable works [*B*]. This acquired him ſo great a reputation, that, in the ſame year 1632, the curators of the univerſity of Leyden conferred on him the Profeſſorſhip of Eloquence. He made ſo great a figure in this poſt that Chancellor Oxenſtiern, then Ambaſſador-Extraordinary from Sweden in Holland, offered him an honourable employment, by order of Queen Chriſtina [*C*]: but Boxhornius preferred the poſt he enjoyed in his own country to all thoſe honours [*D*]; and continuing as well by his lectures as books to give frequent proofs of his learning, and exact knowledge in Politics, and Hiſtory, he was made Profeſſor of thoſe two ſciences in the room of Daniel Heinſius who was declared *emeritus*. He diſcharged this office in a manner very advantageous to his auditors, and very glorious to himſelf. He was for ſome time at variance with Salmaſius; but that quarrel which obliged him to take pen in hand againſt that formidable Critic, was at laſt compoſed [*E*]. He freely communicated his knowledge to other authors, as Valerius Andreas confeſſes in his *Bibliotheca Belgica*. He died after a tedious ſickneſs at Leyden on the third of October 1653. Aged forty-one years. He wrote on various ſubjects [*F*], and particularly

Boxhorn to return into the pale of the Church. To which Boxhorn anſwered that he would have nothing to do with ſuch a corrupt Church. Cuyckius returned to the charge: and Boxhorn replied by an Anti-Cuyckius, printed at Leyden, in the year 1598. Boxhorn was attacked on his nobility; for Cuyckius would not admit his pretenſion of being deſcended from the Boxhorns, a noble family in Brabant (3). See the hiſtory of the ſiege of Breda (4).

[*B*] *He was but twenty years of age when he publiſhed ſeveral conſiderable works.*] As *Theatrum Urbium Hollandiæ*; *Scriptores Hiſtoriæ Auguſtæ cum Animadverſionibus ac Notis* (5); *Poëtæ Satyrici minores cum Commentariis*; *Plinii Panegyricus.* He deſerved a place among the illuſtrious youths, of whom Mr Baillet hath drawn up ſuch a curious catalogue; for to ſay nothing of the verſes which he publiſhed at the age of ſeventeen, and which were very much applauded (6), it is certain that in the year 1631, he publiſhed an edition of Suetonius with notes, which induced the Profeſſors of the univerſity to adviſe him to put in for the Greek Profeſſorſhip, which was then vacant (7). He was therefore an author at the age of nineteen. How many conſiderable books did he publiſh in the following year? There was no occaſion for an officious lie to make him an early author: the ſtricteſt truth was ſufficient for it; I wiſh therefore Valerius Andreas had rigorouſly adhered to it, and had not ſaid that Boxhornius publiſhed books at the age of ſixteen, and that he was made profeſſor of Eloquence, and of the *Belles Lettres*, before he was nineteen years of age. The firſt of his productions appeared in the year 1629, and he was not Profeſſor before 1632. Add to this, that he was thirteen years old when he left Breda to go to Leyden: wherefore they are miſtaken by one year who make him but twelve years old when he was matriculated at Leyden (8). It happened to Boxhornius as to ſeveral others; when age increaſed his learning he grew ſomewhat aſhamed of his firſt productions, and accordingly diſcovered ſome deſire to diſown them. Neverthele ſs it appears that he had ſtill a tenderneſs for them, ſince whilſt he ſeemed to diſown them, he took care to publiſh the praiſes which Salmaſius gave them in his letters to him. ‘ Claudius Salmaſius juveniles hoſce conatus ſibi adeo probari tum temporis literis ad Boxhornium datis ſignificavit, ut maxima quæque ab ipſo non tantum ſperare, ſed ſibi & eruditorum orbi & quidem ex vero promittere adeoque præſagire fuerit auſus: quæ illius Herois verbis ipſis publice alibi (9) leguntur, eo nempe loco quo Boxhornius ipſe poſtmodum hæc ipſa aliaque Juvenilia damnavit, ac proinde inter ſcripta ſua vix numeravit. - - - *Claudius Salmaſius, in his letter to Boxhorn, ſays, that he was then ſo well pleaſed with theſe juvenile eſſays, that he not only entertained the greateſt hopes of him, but alſo ventured to promiſe to himſelf, and to the learned world, nay, to preſage the greateſt things of him. Theſe are the expreſſions of Salmaſius, which are publiſhed in that place where Boxhorn himſelf afterwards diſapproved of theſe, and other, his juvenile performances, and accordingly would hardly reckon them among his writings.*’ This we find in Boxhorn's life. It puts me in mind of what Grotius wrote to Scriverius (10).

[*C*] *Chancellor Oxenſtiern . . . . . offered him an honourable employment by order of Queen Chriſtina* (11).] The author of Boxhornius's life doth not mention in what year this Chancellor came into Holland; had he taken the pains to expreſs it, he would have avoided an error in Chronology: he would not have ſaid that ſome time after Boxhorn had refuſed to go to Sweden, he refuſed to go to Dort, whither he was invited by the magiſtrates to teach in the college which they re-eſtabliſhed in the year 1634. ‘ Non diu poſthæc cum Reip. Dordracenæ proceres illuſtre ſuum & vetuſtiſſimum à Reformatione in fœderato Belgio Gymnaſium anno quidem unde octogeſimo ſuperioris ſeculi erectum ſed collapſum reſtaurarent an. 1634, omnium calculis Boxhornius dignus judicatus & habitus eſt cui res literaria in eo promovenda committeretur. - - - *Not long after, in the year* 1634, *when the magiſtrates of Dort were re-eſtabliſhing their illuſtrious college, which was as antient as the Reformation in the United Provinces, being erected in the year* 1579, *they unanimouſly choſe Boxhorn, as a perſon worthy to be intruſted with the promoting of learning in that college.*’ The dates are confounded here; for it is certain that the Chancellor of Sweden did not come into Holland before the year 1635. The magiſtrates of Dort offered Boxhorn a better penſion than he had at Leyden, yet he did not accept their offers; which procured him an augmentation of his ſalary at Leyden. This is the uſual conſequence of refuſals of this kind, when men either are willing, or know how to make the beſt of them.

[*D*] *Boxhorn preferred the poſt he enjoyed in his own country to all theſe honours.*] Before the author of his life publiſhed this fact, Valerius Andreas ſpoke of it: How then comes Moreri to ſay *that Boxhornius went into Sweden, where his merit procured him conſiderable employments?* Is it thus that theſe words ought to be tranſlated? *Evocatus ſuperioribus annis à Suecorum ad Ordines fœderatos Legato, Reginæ & Procerum nomine ad ampliſſimas dignitates in Sueciam illi ſeptentrioni amorem prætulit patriæ* (12).

[*E*] *That quarrel with Salmaſius was at laſt compoſed.*] This muſt be underſtood with ſome diſtinction: The acts of hoſtility ceaſed, they did no longer openly profeſs themſelves enemies to each other, but their hearts remained the ſame, and could not ſuppreſs their ſallies and eruptions on all occaſions. Boxhornius a year before his death, when already ſeized by his mortal diſtemper, diſdainfully received the viſits of ſtrangers recommended by Salmaſius. ‘ Eos qui à Salmaſio venerant faſtidioſè excipiebat, jam tum nimio tabaci uſu correpta valetudine quæ altero poſt anno eum cum vitâ deſtituit. - - - *He diſdainfully received the viſits of thoſe who came from Salmaſius: his health was already impaired by an immoderate uſe of tobacco: he died two years after.*’ Theſe two facts I find in the funeral orations of John Caſpar Lentzius (13). And what relates to tobacco puts me in mind of what I have heard, that Boxhorn had a hat with a hole in the brim to hold his pipe, ſo that he could ſmoak both whilſt he was ſtudying and writing.

[*F*] *He wrote on various ſubjects.*] He muſt not only have been very laborious, but alſo have known a great many things, and have been endued with a very great facility in writing; for without that a life ſo ſhort as his would not have ſufficed for all the works, which he publiſhed. I have already mentioned

(3) *See* Mr Baillet, ibid. *pag.* 158, *& ſeq.*

(4) Pag. 153.

(5) In four volumes in 12mo. Moreri is miſtaken, when he ſays that this work, Pliny's Panegyric, Juſtin, and ſome ſatirical Poets were publiſhed by Boxhornius in the year 1631. Valerius Andreas has committed the ſame fault, as to the *Hiſtoria Auguſta*.

(6) Omnium applauſu lectos fuiſſe non ſemel audivi. *Jacob. Baſelius, in ejus* Vita.

(7) Suetonius tanto omnium favore exceptus eſt, ut clariſſimi hujus Acad. Profeſſ. ad linguæ Græcæ profeſſionem quæ jam vacat adſpirare me voluerint. *Boxbornius, in Epiſt. pag. m.* 15, *Edit. Francof. His letter is dated on the 29th of September* 1631.

(8) As Valerius Andreas does. *Hankius de Romanar. Rer. Script.* pag. 295, has tranſcribed moſt of his faults.

(9) In Apologia pro Commentario ad Agricolam Taciti adverſus Dialogiſtam.

(10) See the article THOMÆUS, citat. (6).

(11) Ab Axelio Oxenſtierna regni Cancellario Fœderis Germanici Directore, ad Fœderatos Belgas legato extraordinario Reginæ & eorundem Procerum nomine ad ampliſſimas dignitates in Zueciam evocatus fuit. *Baſelius, ubi ſupra.*

(12) Valerius Andreas, Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 641. *Baſelius adds,* Quare eas recuſavit, & apud ſuos mediocri in conditione eſſe maluit, quam apud exteros alto in faſtigio collocari.

(13) In Theatro Pauli Freheri, *pag.* 1180.

particularly on the invention of Printing [*G*]. On that ſubject he advanced an opinion very different from that of Mallinkrot, and yet his diſſertation procured him the friendſhip of that learned man. He very carefully ſtudied the antiquities of Gaul [*H*], which led him to dive into the Scythian tongue, and the antiquities of that nation, on which he wrote very ingeniouſly both in Dutch and in Latin. He had alſo compoſed an Hiſtorical account of women, illuſtrious for their learning, and writings; but this book never appeared [*I*]. Some have pretended that the Dutch were not pleaſed with the publication of a ſmall treatiſe which he had dictated to his ſcholars, and wherein he explained the conſtitution of the Republic of the United Provinces (*b*) [*K*]. His Sacred and

tioned ſome of his commentaries on the ancient authors, but have ſaid nothing of his notes on Juſtin, Tacitus, and Pliny's epiſtles, nor of his commentary on the life of Agricola publiſhed in the year 1642, and a little while after defended againſt the attacks of an anonymous writer. I have not mentioned his annals of Zeland and Holland, which he publiſhed in Dutch with large additions, and better digeſted; thoſe of Zeland in the year 1644, and thoſe of Holland in 1650. He endeavoured to obtain the title of Hiſtoriographer of Zeland (14), and afterwards that of Hiſtoriographer of all the United Provinces (15): but I believe he obtained neither; for if his requeſts had ſucceeded, the author of his life would have touched on this point: now I do not find that he ſaith one word of it. The Index to his letters mentions that he obtained his requeſt with regard to Zeland; but when one conſults the page to which it refers us, nothing like it appears. His hiſtory of the ſiege of Breda is written in good Latin. He wrote ſeveral treatiſes on political ſubjects, as an apology for the navigations of the Hollanders. *Diſſertatio de Trapezitis vulgo Longobardis qui in fœderato Belgio fœnebres menſas exercent: Diſſertatio de ſucceſſione & jure primogenituræ adeundo principatu ad Carolum II, magnæ Britanniæ Regem: De majeſtate liber ſingularis adverſus J. B. Cogitationes ſubitaneas in præcedentem diſſertationem.* It appears by this laſt piece that what he publiſhed in favour of Charles II King of England, when fled from his kingdom, had diſpleaſed ſome republicans. There is a collection of his *Diſquiſitiones politicæ, id eſt,* 60. *caſus politici ex omni hiſtoria ſelecti*, printed in the year 1651 in 12mo. He publiſhed a great number of Orations on ſeveral ſubjects, and after his death came out his *Ideæ orationum ex ſelectiori materia moderni ſtatus politici deſumptæ*, his *Inſtitutiones politicæ*, and his Latin Letters and Latin Poems. This laſt printed in the year 1659, was reprinted in Germany in 1679, with a preface written by James Thomaſius, Profeſſor at Leipſic, which very well deſerves to be read.

[*G*] . . . . . . *And particularly on the invention of Printing.*] He aſſerts that the glory of this invention is due to the city of Haerlem, and not to Mentz, as he formerly believed. *Cujus inventæ gloriam Harlemenſibus, non Moguntinis, ut olim, nunc denuo aſſertum imus* (16). His diſſertation on this ſubject was printed in the year 1641.

[*H*] *He very carefully ſtudied the antiquities of Gaul.*] Of this the author of his life gives us the following account. ‘Nunc hiſce finem imponerem, niſi paucis dicendum eſſet de iis, quæ ſuper Dea Nehalemia (17) 1647 primum in Walachriæ oris inventâ eſt commentatus, & inde ad Scythicæ gentis linguam, antiquitatem, & mores indagandos multa ingenioſè ſane ſcripſit & ſcripturivit non vernacule modo, prout inceperat, ſed & Latine: nominatim librum originum Gallicarum (18), in quo Gallos à Germanis ortos ex veteri ipſorum lingua aſſerere conatur, qui tamen non niſi à morte autoris & alia ejuſdem, prodiit in lucem, obſtetricante Georgio Hornio in profeſſione Hiſtoriarum non indigno ſucceſſore. - - - - - - *I ſhall conclude, after I have ſaid ſomething concerning the obſervations he made on the goddeſs Nehalemia, who was firſt found on the coaſts of Walchern, and concerning what he afterwards ingeniouſly wrote, and intended to write not only in Dutch, as he had begun to do, but alſo in Latin, in order to diſcover the language, antiquity, and manners of the antient Scythians, eſpecially concerning his book on the antiquities of Gaul; where he endeavours to maintain, that the antient Gauls were deſcended from the Germans, and to prove it by their antient language. Yet this, with ſome other of his books did not appear till after the author's death, being publiſhed by George Hornius, his worthy ſucceſſor, in the profeſſorſhip of Hiſtory.*’ It appears by Boxhornius's letters that his *Origines Gallicæ* were in the preſs in the year 1648 (19): and continued ſo in 1652 (20). He ſpeaks of it only as of a ſmall piece (21), but he had a good opinion of his ſyſtem. He hoped to prove that the Greeks and Romans owed all to the antient Frieſlanders (22). His treatiſe *de Scythicis originibus* was finiſhed in the year 1647 (23), but he had a hundred things to add to it; for in a letter written to Mr de Zuilychem in the year 1652. He ſpeaks thus: ‘De originibus noſtris & ſepultis hactenus Scythicis Antiquitatibus (nam & de iis quærere dignatus es) hoc eſt, ut ego accipio, Aſiæ totius & Europæ, ſuperbius forte & jactantius reſpondeo. Multa excuſſi diligenter, conquiſivi multa, multa meditatus ſum, multa etiam ignorata, feliciter, niſi fallor, tandem deprehendi; quæ aliquando publicis judiciis ſiſtere ac exponere tuo imprimis, quod ſcio eſſe & graviſſimum pariter, & æquiſſimum, audebo (24). - - - - - *You are pleaſed to inquire of my book on the antiquities of the Gauls, and thoſe of the Scythians, which are as yet unknown, being, as I take it, the antiquities of all Aſia and Europe. I anſwer with confidence, and perhaps with ſome vanity, that I have very diligently examined, collected and reflected on a great many things, and have at length, if I miſtake not, made ſeveral happy diſcoveries, which I may ſome time lay before the judgment of the public, and before your's in particular, which I know to be of great weight, and very impartial.*’ He publiſhed a Latin diſcourſe in the year 1650, to ſhew the affinity betwixt the Greek, Latin, and German languages.

[*I*] *He had compoſed an hiſtorical account of women, illuſtrious . . . . . . but his book never appeared.*] Valerius Andreas is to blame for inſerting in the Catalogue of Boxhorn's works, *Bibliothecam eruditione ac ſcriptis illuſtrium fœminarum*; and doubtleſs it was owing to him that ſeveral authors imagined, and even publiſhed, that Boxhorn put out this curious treatiſe. Voglerus affirms it as poſitively as if he had read the book (25), and is not cenſured for it by Meibomius (26). What is certain is, that Boxhorn had this project in his head: he had good collections on this ſubject, which he offered to Iſaac Pontanus (27), who had ſome thoughts of an undertaking of this nature (28); but if you think no more of it, added he, and will be pleaſed to transfer to me this commiſſion, I beg of you to ſend me your memoirs. Erneſtus Brinchius communicated to him a liſt of learned women. *Velim nobili viro Erneſto Brinchio gratias meo nomine agi, ob tranſmiſſum Syllabum eruditarum fœminarum. In quarum gratiam Bibliothecam meam, & amicorum ſcrinia nuper excuſſi. Deprehendi autem non pœnitendum earum numerum, quæ vulgò ignorantur. Si tibi animus ſit pergere in eo, quod aliquando cœpiſſe te intelligo, lubens qualiacunque mea tranſmittam, ſin verò tibi viſum lampada mihi tradere, ut tua non deneges, unicè rogo.* I ſhall here occaſionally ſay that Father Jacob, a French Carmelite, had compoſed a book of the like nature; which many authors cite and refer to, and yet it never was printed, nor ever will, for the manuſcript is loſt.

[*K*] *Some have pretended that the Dutch were not pleaſed, &c.* . . . . . .] Sorbiere writes this to Patin; his words are: ‘I have ſent you a curious little book intituled *Commentariolus de Statu Provinciarum fœderati Belgii*, the publication of which has very much diſpleaſed in theſe provinces, becauſe it gives a very clear and diſtinct idea of the government of this Republic, and this ought to remain *inter Arcana Imperii*. Boxhorn had made this commentary for his ſcholars in politics, and had dictated it to them in private; but the ſecret took wind, and there have been ſo many copies of it handed about, that at laſt a Bookſeller

---

(*b*) *Ex ejus* Vita, *conſcripta à* Jacobo Baſelio, *quæ extat in limine* Epiſtolarum Boxhornii.

(14) Boxhorn. in Epiſtol. *pag.* 219, 226.

(15) Ibid. *pag.* 308.

(16) Epiſtol. *pag.* 167.

(17) He wrote two tracts in Dutch upon that goddeſs: one of them was printed in the year 1647, and the other in 1648.

(18) *That book is intituled* Originum Gallicarum Liber in quo veteris & nobiliſſimæ Gallorum Gentis Origines, Antiquitates, Mores, & Linguæ aliaque eruuntur aut illuſtrantur. Cui accedit antiquæ Linguæ Britannicæ Lexicon Britannico-Latinum, inſertis explicatiſque paſſim Adagiis Britannicis. Prodiit Amſt. apud J. Janſſ. 1654, in 4to.

(19) Epiſt. Boxhorn. *pag.* 291.

(20) Ibid. *pag.* 315.

(21) Sub prælo jam eſt opuſculum Originum Gallicarum. *Ib. pag.* 315.

(22) Ibid. *pag.* 289.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Ibid. *pag.* 314.

(25) Similiter plane ad noſtrum inſtitutum deditaque opera id argumentum egregie tractavit Marcus Zuerius Boxhornius EDITA Bibliotheca eruditione ac ſcriptis illuſtrium fœminarum. *Voglerus, Introduct. univerſ. in Notitiam Scriptorum, cap. xxvii, pag. m.* 113.

(26) He publiſhed the book of Voglerus, with notes and additions in the year 1691.

(27) Epiſtol. *pag.* 137.

(28) Ibid. *pag.* 120.

and Profane Hiſtory, which extends from the birth of JESUS CHRIST to the year 1650, is well eſteemed: it is but one volume in 4to. The beſt part of it is that of the XVIth century, and the beginning of the XVIIth. Boxhorn was ſomewhat ugly, and ſo ſwarthy, that he was one day taken for a Spaniard [*L*]. Upon that occaſion he made an anſwer full of zeal for his country (*c*); but let the Caſuiſts determine whether it be conformable to the Spirit of the Goſpel [*M*]. Sorbiere ſeeing him ſomewhat angry with Grotius had the equity to excuſe him; and beſides, to ſuggeſt that this language was conformable to the laws of Policy [*N*].

Some learned Germans had no great opinion of his learning, and have obſerved ſeveral errors in his works. He had notice of this, and reſolved to revenge himſelf by a ſatire [*O*]: I cannot tell whether he executed his deſign.

. . . .

‘a Bookſeller put it to the preſs without placing his name to it; and the impreſſion was ſold before the public had time to find fault with it (29).’ I do not certainly know whether Sorbiere was in the right to ſay this, but I know that this ſmall treatiſe was printed at the Hague for John Verhoeve, in the years 1649, and 1650, and that the edition of 1650, was reviſed and enlarged. There were alſo other editions. I have ſeen the ſixth, printed at the Hague by Adrian Vlacq, in the year 1659.

[*L*] *He was ſo ſwarthy that he was one day taken for a Spaniard.*] This was in the year 1637, when the Spaniſh garriſon left Breda according to the capitulation. Boxhorn being then in the Prince of Orange's camp, and ſeeing that garriſon paſs, heard a Dutch ſoldier take him for a Spaniard: *You miſtake,* ſaid he, *do not judge of me by my hair and my aſpect; if you knew the candour of my heart, you would not doubt of my being a true Hollander. And if I were able, I would immediately throw the King of Spain into a fever, fix him ſo cloſe to his bed, and ſo terrify him, that he ſhould never more unjuſtly attack our liberty.* Thoſe who had rather read the original Latin, ſhall ſoon be ſatisfied. *Statura corporis ipſi fuit longa & erecta, & quam cum ſubfuſcâ facie crines efficiebant qualemcunque deformem: nigredinem eam candore animi ſui albicantem reddere ſolebat. Unde cum Bredâ captâ inter exeuntium Hiſpanorum ſpectatores & ipſe eſſet, & à noſtrate quodam milite ipſo audiente pro Hiſpano ob dictam nigredinem habitus, illi homini facetè non minus quam verè reſpondebat, ‘Tu me ex vultu & crinibus Hiſpanum judicas, ſed male: nam ſi candorem animi Belgici mei noſſes, qui tam magnus eſt ac nigri ſunt mei crines, & in mea eſſet poteſtate, pro amore in communem patriam vel hodie Hiſpaniarum Regem febri affligerem lectoque alligarem, & metu ſic terrerem, ut impoſterum abſtineret ab injuſta liberorum Belgarum oppreſſione & oppugnatione* (30).’

[*M*] *Let the Caſuiſts determine whether this anſwer was conformable to the Spirit of the Goſpel.*] The accuſation which appeared in a looſe ſheet in March 1694 (31), if juſt, would prove, that Boxhorn might eaſily obtain his abſolution, and even a full approbation of the Caſuiſts, who ſhould be like the preacher who is accuſed; for we are told that he preached that the precept of loving and bleſſing the perſecutors of the Church, doth not engage us to any more than to wiſh and promote their heavenly felicity. The temporal miſchief (32) which Boxhorn would have done to the King of Spain, would not have prevented his wiſhing the converſion of that Prince. Beſides, a diſeaſe is no aſſaſſination; but the ſaid preacher hath told us in one of his books, that except aſſaſſination, *all other means are allowable and fair againſt a declared enemy* (33). He hath made ſo lame an anſwer to the accuſation, and that with ſuch perplexed and ſophiſtical turns (34), that his anſwer, together with the induſtrious care he took to withdraw his ſermons from the preſs, have convinced all reaſonable men, that he was very juſtly accuſed. Conſult Mr Saurin's book (35).

See, below, the remark [*P*].

[*N*] *Sorbiere had the equity to ſuggeſt that this language was conformable to the laws of Policy.*] Boxhorn was thirty years of age when Sorbiere went to viſit him, and was known then by a great many, and perhaps too many books (36). By degrees he grew warm againſt Grotius in this converſation, and blamed him not only for his method of re-uniting Chriſtians, but alſo with reſpect to the political affairs of Holland. ‘Is viſus eſt τῷ πάνυ Grotio minus amicus; nam ſenſim procedente, ut fit, ſermone ad quæſtiones tunc temporis volitantes docta per ora virum & nupera ſcripta, non ſolùm diſſentire (quod faciunt multi boni & amici Grotio) ſe faſſus eſt circa initum conciliationis modum & tributam nimiam Rom. Pontifici authoritatem, ſed ipſum inſimulatus eſt circa politica patriæ negotia, una cum cæteris Remonſtrantibus (37). - - - *He ſeemed not to love Grotius; for the converſation, as it uſually happens, gradually falling upon the queſtions at that time among the learned, and upon the new books, Zuerius not only confeſſed that he differed with Grotius (which many of his good friends own they do) as to his manner of reconciling Proteſtants and Papiſts, and the too great authority aſcribed to the Pope; but alſo blamed him, and the reſt of the Remonſtrants, with regard to the political affairs of Holland.*’ Sorbiere excuſed Boxhorn, becauſe it would not have been prudent in a profeſſor, who intends to be ſucceſsful in his affairs, and uſe his endeavours for the advancement of his domeſtic proſperity, to expoſe himſelf to the diſpleaſure of the ruling party. *Quærens apud me rationem qua excuſarem Boxhornium; aut quia junior res geſtas audierat ab aliis non probatæ fidei teſtibus: aut quia profeſſorium munus exercens conductum mercede ſe putabat à Calvinianis, quorum excidere gratia, clavum Reipubl. tenentium, non eſt hominis bene rem familiarem gerere quærentis.* Perhaps there lurks a malignity in theſe excuſes; but ſince Sorbiere doth not deny that Boxhorn might ſpeak according to his perſuaſion, we ought not to ſuppoſe that he applied to him the ſaying, *beneficium accipere libertatem vendere eſt:* a well paid ſalary prevents ſpeaking one's thoughts.

[*O*] *Some learned Germans . . . have obſerved ſeveral errors in his works, he . . . . reſolved to revenge himſelf by a ſatire.*] This appears in a letter from Rupert to Reineſius. ‘Videtur *Boxhornius* nimium tribuere ingenio ſuo, & ante tempus togâ brachium exerere. Quum olim vidiſſem *Florum* ejus, occurrebant multa valdè putida; quæ privato ſtudio notata, ſed poſteà neſcio quâ fraude in vulgus ſparſa, in ipſius Boxhornii manus veniſſe dicuntur. Etiam Satyram, ut audio, minatus eſt in literis ad quendam Dreſdenſem; quaſi pro meis agnoſcere debeam univerſa, quæ inimica manus tranſmiſit: Vivimus enim hic in Viperina ſocietate. Sed quicquid velit, agat, & typographica tubâ proprium dedecus inſonet in eruditas aures: ego nullus trepido, quamvis illud poetæ inſuſurrare quiſpiam poſſit:

Occurſare Capro, cornu ferit ille, caveto (38).

‘*Boxhornius ſeems to be full of himſelf, and to ſhew his parts before they are ripe. Some time ago when I read his* Florus, *I met with ſeveral very bad things; theſe I noted for my own uſe; but afterwards, by I know not what fraud, theſe notes became public, and it is ſaid, even fell into the hands of Boxhornius himſelf. I am informed, that in a letter to a certain perſon at Dreſden, he threatens me with a ſatire; as if I ought to acknowledge all theſe to be my writings, which his enemies publiſh againſt him: for here we live together like vipers. But let him do as he pleaſes; let him proclaim to the world his own diſgrace. I am not afraid; though ſomebody may whiſper the ſaying of the Poet:*

Avoid the goat, who puſhes with his horn.

Reineſius, in a letter to Hoffman, hath theſe words: ‘*Tragocerotem Batavum* qui neſcio quid *Ruperto* noſtro minatus fuerat, confidentiſſimum Criticum eſſe & in Antiquitate videre præ calore parum, oſtendam ex

(*c*) See the remark [*L*].

(29) Sorbiere, Letter lxiii, *pag.* 438.

(30) Baſelius, *in ejus* Vita.

(31) *With this title* Nouvelle Héréſie dans la Morale touchant la Haine du prochain, prêchée par Mr Jurieu, &c.

(32) Note, that the miſchief which ſoldiers do to the enemy by wounding or killing them, and the miſchief which a private man ſhould do them, by giving them a draught, that occaſions a Fever, *&c.* are different things. The firſt is not brought into queſtion here, but is ſuppoſed without any difficulty.

(33) *See the* Entretiens ſur la Cabale chimerique, *pag.* 87, *& ſeq.*

(34) He reckons among the propoſitions complained of ſeveral conſequences, which the accuſer ſays might be drawn from the Hereſies charged upon him; but he does not ſay that the miniſter preached thoſe conſequences. It is therefore a baſe trick to complain that he is accuſed of having preached thoſe conſequences.

(35) *Intituled,* Examen de la Theologie de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 807, *& ſeq.*

(36) Inviſi Boxhornium juvenem annorum triginta . . . . doctum ſane, & multis, ne nimiis dicam, libris notum. *Sorberiana, pag.* 44, *Dutch Edit.*

(37) Ibid.

(38) Epiſt. xxi Reineſii ad Hoffmannum & Rupertum, *pag.* 64, 65.

. . . . [P]. . . . .

'ejus *Quæſtionibus Romanis*, ubi circa *Inſcriptiones* nonnullas pueriliter hallucinatur (39). - - - *As for that formidable Dutchman, who has threatened I know not what againſt our Rupert, I ſhall ſhew that he is a moſt audacious Critic, and very ſhallow in the knowledge of antiquity, being hurried away with his paſſion. This I ſhall prove upon him from his* Quæſtiones Romanæ, *where, explaining ſome inſcriptions, he blunders like a child.*' See alſo the 27th letter of the ſame Reineſius (40); where he treats Boxhorn with a great deal of contempt.

[P] . . . . . . : . . . . . .]

An important digreſſion on the accuſation of a new Hereſy, relating to the hatred of our neighbour.

Having here an occaſion to ſpeak of this accuſation of a new Hereſy, relating to the hatred of our neighbour, I ſhall make a digreſſion, which I think very important. I am perſuaded that a compiler of facts is wanting in his duty, if he neglects to engage the attention of his readers to thoſe accidents which are ſomewhat ſingular. Now there is not any thing more capable to gain their attention, than the pains which an author takes to reflect on thoſe accidents, and obſerve ſuch circumſtances of them as diſcover uncommon paſſions. All this furniſhes the reader with an ample matter of reflexion, with the art of judging of men, and of avoiding being ſurprized into a raſh credulity.

This is what engages me to make ſome remarks here on the conſequences of the accuſation; and as moſt of my readers may not know the contents of that looſe ſheet, and cannot now have a writing of that nature from the Bookſellers, it is fit that the groundwork of my digreſſion ſhould be an abſtract of that little piece.

The accuſer firſt relates the doctrine which had been preached, and ſecondly he ſhews the pernicious conſequences of it.

He affirms, that the doctrine of Mr Jurieu, the Miniſter accuſed, amounts to this: I. *That the ſentiments of hatred, indignation, and wrath, are allowable, good, and commendable, againſt the enemies of* GOD, *that is, as he himſelf explained it, againſt the Socinians, and the other Heretics of Holland, againſt the ſuperſtitious, idolators,* &c. II. *That we ought to ſhew this hatred and indignation, by breaking off all correſpondence with theſe people, neither ſaluting them, nor eating with them,* &c. III. *That we muſt not only hate the Hereſies and bad qualities of ſuch people, but that we ought to hate and deteſt their perſons. One of the objections which he ſtarted to himſelf, and rejected with the moſt diſdainful airs, is this, that we are bound to war againſt error and vice; and yet to have charity for the perſon of the ſinner.* After theſe general propoſitions, to which the doctrine of the accuſed perſon is reduced, he is charged in particular *with having objected to himſelf the hiſtory, or parable, of the Samaritan, the example of* Jesus Christ, *who converſed with people of a bad life, the command he gives us to love our enemies, to bleſs thoſe who curſe us, to pray for thoſe who perſecute us, and in general all that is uſually repreſented to a Chriſtian people, in order to make them renounce the ſpirit of revenge:* The Miniſter, I ſay, is charged with having raiſed all theſe objections to his doctrine, and *of having ſlighted and deſpiſed them. He pretended that theſe paſſages are not well underſtood; nay, he aſſerted, that the ſermons of our Saviour on the mount, are a hard doctrine which muſt needs be ſoftened, by taking it not in a litteral, but in a figurative ſenſe, and that by the perſecutors for whom our Saviour commands us to pray, we are not to underſtand thoſe who perſecute the Church, but ſuch private and perſonal enemies as a man may have in the place of his reſidence; that, for the reſt, we may fulfil the command of bleſſing thoſe who curſe us, provided we wiſh them ſpiritual happineſs, though we hate their perſons, and wiſh them temporal evils. Whereupon, addreſſing himſelf to his audience, he declared to them, that they might and ought to hate the King of France, and wiſh him ill; not, added he, becauſe he has taken your goods and eſtates from you; but becauſe he perſecutes your religion.*

Theſe are the tenets imputed to Mr Jurieu: I have given the very words of the perſon who accuſes him in their full extent, becauſe I was afraid leaſt an abridgment of them ſhould not be faithful. This is his firſt point; the ſecond is as follows.

The accuſer having ſet forth the Hereſy which had been preached, ſtrongly exhorts the paſtors and conſiſtories to cenſure it; and, in order to animate them the more, he points out the fatal effects it may produce, if it ſhould paſs unpuniſhed. He repreſents to them the aſcendant which Mr Jurieu has over the people, and how eaſily they are perſuaded into what flatters their paſſions, and adds, that *the ſtrongeſt and moſt natural paſſion of the heart of man is that of revenge and hatred of our enemies; that nothing is ſo grating to our corrupt nature, as not to be allowed to bear an ill will to thoſe who have tormented us on account of religion; that it would be a very great conſolation for a man, whom a Prieſt or Captain of dragoons has perſecuted, in order to make him go to Maſs, to be allowed, without any ſcruple of conſcience, to wiſh that ſuch a perſon had the plague, or the gravel, or was in the gallies,* &c. *and to load him with imprecations and abuſe; and that nothing is more irkſome than what we read in thoſe treatiſes, which are commonly peruſed by way of preparation for the Sacrament, that he who preſents himſelf at the table of the Lord, with a heart full of reſentment or hatred againſt any perſon whatſoever, communicates to his own damnation. But Mr Jurieu,* continues he, *removes all thoſe pious ſcruples. He allows us* (41) *to communicate with hatred in our hearts, and imprecations in our mouths, againſt thoſe who perſecuted the Refugees. He deſires us to hate them, and forbids us to wiſh them temporal felicity.* The accuſer affirms, that according to theſe doctrines it would not be allowable to procure temporal happineſs to our perſecutors, and would be *an unjuſtifiable action to relieve them in ſickneſs, or if their houſes took fire, to aſſiſt in extinguiſhing it.* He expreſsly exhorts the Synod of the Walloon Churches (42), to prevent the bad conſequences of theſe falſe doctrines, he alledges ſeveral arguments to induce them to it, and tells them, among other things, that the Hereſy which he attacks, is incompatible with the proſperity of the State; *For,* ſays he, *what diſtractions would not enſue, if the Proteſtants ſhould neither ſalute thoſe of a different religion, nor eat with them, nor trade with them; what if it was a thing allowed and commendable in them to hate all the Papiſts, all the Arminians, Mennonites,* &c. *what if the goſpel obliged them only to wiſh the ſpiritual felicity of ſuch people, but not to wiſh them any temporal good, nor to help them out of a ditch, if they ſaw them in one, nor to give them an alms, if they ſaw them in want? Could this country proſper upon the foot of ſuch maxims?* For the reſt, he declares that he does not deſire the Synod to give credit to his accuſation, that his ſole view is to induce them to inform themſelves of the fact, and oblige Mr Jurieu *to publiſh the two ſermons ſuch as they were preached.*

We muſt remember that theſe two ſermons were preached on the twenty-fourth of January, and the twenty-firſt of February 1694; and that this accuſation appeared in the month of March of that ſame year, at a time when the audience had freſh ideas of theſe ſermons. This circumſtance is remarkable.

Let us now take a view of the accuſed Miniſter's conduct. As ſoon as he knew that ſeveral of his hearers were ſhocked at his doctrine, he ſent theſe two ſermons to be printed. They were already in the preſs, and would have appeared ſoon after: but as ſoon as the accuſer's pamphlet was publiſhed, Mr Jurieu put a ſtop to the printing of them, and took other meaſures. He publiſhed remarks on this looſe ſheet, he affirmed that it was full of falſhoods; *for it is falſe,* theſe are the terms of the author of the remarks,

'1. That Mr J. ſaid, *that the ſentiments of hatred are good and commendable* againſt any perſon whatever, if hatred is taken for a human paſſion which has its principle in ſelf-love.

'2. It is falſe that he aſſerted abſolutely that we ought to ſhew this hatred againſt Heretics, by not ſaluting them, nor eating with them. What he advanced on this point is what St Paul and St John have affirmed, with the reſtrictions which will appear in theſe ſermons.

'3. It is falſe that he aſſerted that we ought to break off all the commerce of civil ſociety with Papiſts, Mennonites, Arminians, *&c.* that is to ſay,

(39) Ibid. Epiſt. xxvi, *pag.* 99.

(40) Ibid. *pag.* 111.

(41) Obſerve, this does not mean that he expreſly and particularly preached up ſuch a permiſſion. It is only objected to him as a conſequence of his doctrine, as we ſhall ſee below.

(42) It was to meet ſoon after in the city of Tergow.

that we ought neither to give to the Jews, nor take from them bills of exchange. An impertinence which he neither advanced nor imagined.

‘4. It is falſe that he rejected this maxim, *Love the perſon of a ſinner, but hate his vices*, as a dangerous or falſe one, he rejected it as being too ſubtile, as being not very intelligible, and, in ſhort, as not being applicable in all caſes. Theſe ſagacious gentlemen, no doubt, underſtand very well how it is poſſible to afflict the perſon of a parricide with the moſt horrible torments, with burning irons, melted lead, the rack, tearing him limb from limb, and at the ſame time love that perſon. But they ought to excuſe thoſe who cannot comprehend this.

‘5. It is falſe that Mr J. ſaid, directly or indirectly, in part, or in whole, *that by the perſecutors, for whom our Saviour commands us to pray, we muſt not underſtand thoſe who perſecute.*

‘6. It is falſe that *he addreſſed himſelf to his audience to tell them that they might and ought to hate the King of France, and wiſh him ill.* What was ſaid on that head will appear in theſe ſermons.

‘7. It is falſe that he *allowed of any man communicating with hatred in his heart, and imprecations in his mouth.*

‘8. It is falſe that Mr J. forbad to do good, or to wiſh temporal felicity to our perſecutors, and ſaid that we were not obliged to procure any temporal good to the Papiſts, Mennonites, *&c.*’

Obſerve, that he promiſes twice to publiſh theſe ſermons, as being the infallible way to detect and expoſe the falſhoods aſſerted by his accuſer. But in the ſame page 3, where this promiſe is made, he gives notice, that, inſtead of publiſhing theſe ſermons, he may, perhaps, put out a compleat treatiſe on this part of Morality. A little lower he acquaints us that honeſt people ſhall, *at a proper time*, be inſtructed in this matter; but that at preſent theſe ſermons will not be publiſhed, becauſe he is informed, *from ſeveral quarters, that his enemies have prepared their batteries, and were reſolved to find Hereſies in them at any rate* (43) . . . . *I ſhall wait a while*, continues he, *till their fire is ſpent.* I paſs by the reſt, it is only a heap of praiſes and invectives, which Mr Jurieu beſtows, the former on himſelf, commending his own great feats, and the latter on his enemies. I likewiſe paſs by a writing which appeared againſt this Miniſter's remarks, not with regard to the accuſation, but with regard to his quarrels with Mr de Beauval. That piece, and Mr Jurieu's Apology (44), and Mr de Beauval's Reply, are incidents entirely foreign to the accuſation, and conſequently to my digreſſion; my ſole deſign being to conſider what happened in conſequence of the accuſation.

If the accuſation made Mr Jurieu's two ſermons the ſubject of great talk, his remarks on it, made them ſtill more ſo, and as this happened on the day before the Synod met at Tergow, every body was impatient to know what reſolution that aſſembly would take in relation to an affair which was ſo nice, and ſo ſcandalous. That appeared very ſoon. The Synod treated both the pamphlet of the accuſer, and that of the perſon accuſed, as libels, and dropped the affair, as a thing which had never happened. This was very ſtrange and ſurpriſing to thoſe who had expected that the Synod would inform themſelves of the fact; nor did it remove the great ſcandal which had been given to the public, either by the accuſer, if he calumniated Mr Jurieu, or by the perſon accuſed, if he had preached the doctrine laid to his charge. Here is the queſtion which I deſign to clear up. It is a ſhame for our age that people dare to impoſe, with ſo much boldneſs, upon the public; this is the way to deprive us of the moſt ſpecious maxims we can offer againſt the incredulous in matters of fact. Since therefore the bulk of this work may probably withſtand the injuries of time better than a little book, I think myſelf obliged to communicate to my readers, whilſt the affair is freſh, an explanation of this charge of a new Hereſy, to the end that no importunate Sceptic may object, that in the year 1694, there having ariſen a diſpute whether a Miniſter, who had more than 1200 hearers, had preached a certain doctrine, or had not, it was impoſſible to decide it three days after the ſermon was preached. Thoſe who will duly conſider my remarks will own, I am perſuaded, that in this affair it is poſſible to diſcern the truth and the falſhood.

I. I begin with this conſideration, that no regard is to be had to the following principle, *If it was falſe that a Miniſter preached before 1200 perſons the Hereſy of the hatred of our neighbour, no body would have been bold enough publickly to accuſe him of it three days after.* The reaſon why this principle is here of no force, is becauſe another propoſition may be oppoſed to it, namely, *If it was true that a Miniſter preached that Hereſy before 1200 perſons, he would not have dared publickly to deny it three days after.* If you conclude from the former principle that ſuch an Hereſy muſt have been preached, ſince the Miniſter was immediately accuſed of it before the public, I may conclude from the other principle that it muſt not have been preached, ſince as ſoon as the accuſation appeared, the perſon accuſed publickly denied it. The ſhorteſt way is to ſet aſide this manner of arguing, and to balance the affirmative of the accuſer with the negative of the perſon accuſed. Let us imitate the Synod of Tergow, which paid no regard to either, and treated the pamphlet of the accuſer, and that of the perſon accuſed, as equally libellous. In general, let us lay down this as a maxim, that all the proof we can draw from one man's affirming any thing, is defeated by another man's denying it, and let us now determine, by the particular circumſtances of this queſtion, which is the ſafeſt ſide of it, the affirmative, or the negative. This is my deſign in the following obſervations.

II. The accuſer was not obliged to declare his name, ſince his deſign was only to engage the Synod to examine whether the Hereſy which he attacked, had been actually preached. So that nothing can be inferred in Mr Jurieu's favour from hence, that his accuſer did not publiſh his name.

III. The accuſer was not obliged to anſwer Mr Jurieu's pamphlet; for it became him to wait the determination of the Synod, in relation to a fact which he affirmed, and the other denied: and when he ſaw that they would not meddle in the queſtion, it became him to give it over, ſince no private man has a right to put interrogatories, and that was the only way of deciding the queſtion. Nothing therefore can be inferred in Mr Jurieu's favour from hence, that his accuſer did not ſupport his firſt writing by a ſecond; for let him have written what he would, all was to no purpoſe, unleſs witneſſes were judicially examined.

IV. It is a certain and unqueſtionable fact that the Walloon Synods favour Mr Jurieu. He has more than once boaſted of the regard they paid him, and has as often gloried in the triumphs which they gave him over his enemies. To be convinced of this we need only ſee his anſwer to the accuſation (45). His adverſaries complain of the indulgence, ſhewn him by the Synods, and obſerve *that he has abuſed their exceſſive lenity* (46). See the hiſtory of this Synodal favour in a book of Mr Saurin, a Miniſter at Utrecht (47). From hence we may draw two conſequences, one to juſtify the accuſer's ſilence, and the other againſt Mr Jurieu. In effect, if, as that Miniſter himſelf owns, the Synod of Breda threw aſide *among the rubbiſh* the accuſations brought againſt him by the deputies of ſome churches, if the Synod took into conſideration only four of them, from which they took care to juſtify Mr Jurieu; we may eaſily underſtand that the author of the accuſations ought to have been ſilent; and if in truth he was in the right, it was however prudent in him not to proſecute his firſt deſign, as it would have been to no purpoſe. The other conſequence I am to mention is this. A Synod, which manifeſtly favours a Miniſter, does not neglect to examine an affair, when it is certain that ſuch an inquiry would fully juſtify that Miniſter, and confound his accuſers. Since therefore the Synod, tho' ſtrongly ſollicited by the author of the accuſation to examine the fact, neglected to make any manner of inquiry, it is very probable that they feared leſt the event of it might not be favourable to Mr Jurieu. Thus it muſt be preſumed that this Miniſter preached the Hereſies laid to his charge.

(43) See the reflexions which Mr de Beauval made upon this, in his Conſiderations on two ſermons of Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 2.

(44) That Apology left Mr de Beauval's remarks in all their force; and this he made appear in his reply, in a manner which confounded Mr Jurieu ſo much, that not being able to diſentangle himſelf, he imitated the Miſſionaries of France, who finding themſelves too hard preſſed by a book of Controverſy, had recourſe to the Civil Magiſtrate, and obtained the ſuppreſſion of the book.

(45) Theſe gentlemen are very incorrigible. The Synod of Leyden tore their libel: and after they had renewed their objections under a greater authority; the Synod of Breda had ſo little regard for all that heap of accuſations, that they only conſidered four of them, from which they took care to juſtify Mr J. and left all the reſt among the rubbiſh: Tho' his abſence gave his adverſaries a full liberty, which they knew well how to employ.

(46) Dénonciation de la Nouv. Héreſie, *near the end.*

(47) *See the Preface, of the book intituled,* Examen de la Theologie de Mr Jurieu.

V. It

V. It is certain Mr Jurieu was perſuaded that the author of the accuſation was a Divine (48), and that the whole party, with which he has had ſo ſharp encounters, had a hand in that piece. Hence it is that in his remarks he generally uſes the plural number, *theſe gentlemen*. It cannot therefore be alledged that if he did not take an effectual method of refuting the accuſation, his reaſon was becauſe he would have only expoſed a ſingle perſon, and one unknown; for it is certain that he would have expoſed, as he imagined, all thoſe Miniſters with whom he is at variance. Why then did he neglect this advantage at ſo deciſive a juncture? Why did he not deſire the Synod to name commiſſioners who might be ſent to the place where his ſermon was preached, and interrogate the moſt intelligent hearers? Why has he not produced any depoſition in his favour, having ſo many friends who would not have refuſed him any thing, which their conſciences had allowed them to declare in his vindication? In a word, why did he not publiſh his two ſermons? The accuſation ſhould have made him deſirous to publiſh them; on the contrary, it occaſioned his putting a ſtop to the printing of them. A man muſt be a very ſtanch Pyrrhoniſt, who does not deciſively affirm that ſuch a conduct fully juſtifies the accuſation. All appearances incline us to believe, that Mr Jurieu reſolved to publiſh theſe ſermons, when he knew they had ſhocked his audience. Doubtleſs he wrapped up and diſguiſed the harſheſt maxims he had preached, and hoped that ſuch a remedy would remove the ſcandal which had been taken. But when he beheld with what an air of importance the matter was treated in the accuſation, and what an odious and ſeditious turn his doctrine would bear, he perceived that he had not ſufficiently ſoftened matters, and that, in order to blind his cenſurers, it was fit to make ſeveral more conſiderable alterations in his copy. Whereupon the only courſe he could take was to ſtop the impreſſion: for had he corrected the copy ſo far as to get beyond the reach of his enemies, he would have put forth the moſt horrible medley that ever appeared, his ſyſtem would have been a contradiction, from beginning to end; beſides, ſeveral people would have well remembred that the ſermons, as they were printed, were not the ſame which they had heard. The general talk would have been the inſincerity of this Miniſter, who preached one doctrine, and publiſhed another. An atteſtation of the Conſiſtory, that the printed ſermons were perfectly like thoſe which had been preached, was not eaſy to be obtained, and would not have convinced his auditors that they had heard ſuch a doctrine preached, which they well remembred they had not heard. He therefore had no option to make, he was obliged to reſolve upon ſuppreſſing them, and thereby deprive himſelf of the moſt effectual and expeditious method of covering his enemies with eternal ſhame, in caſe he had been innocent, in caſe the accuſation was falſe. This is a deciſive argument againſt him.

VI. Whoever has but a ſlender knowledge of the ſituation of affairs in this country, certainly knows that the Walloon Conſiſtory of Rotterdam grants every thing that Mr Jurieu can reaſonably demand (49). Nay, there are people who believe that his intereſt is not confined within ſo narrow limits. However, I ſuppoſe, that he obtains from the Conſiſtory nothing but what is reaſonable. Now had he not preached the doctrines laid to his charge, nothing was more juſt than to grant him a certificate of this. He would therefore have obtained it, had he aſked it of his Conſiſtory. Why then did not the Miniſter accuſed, inſtead of denying the accuſation, in an anonymous pamphlet, diſavow, in the face of the world, that he had preached the errors imputed to him, and ſupport his denial by an ample certificate from his colleagues, Elders, and Deacons? He paſſes for being very tender of his reputation, and does not ceaſe to ſay that his honour is neceſſary to the Church; it cannot therefore be pretended that he neglected to obtain a certificate, becauſe it was indifferent to him whether he was defamed, or commended, being contented with the teſtimony of his own conſcience, and that of honeſt minds who love him. Such a manner of defending him would be to impoſe upon the world, and upon himſelf in the firſt place.

VII. He well foreſaw that the ſuppreſſion of his two ſermons would be the triumph of his adverſaries. Accordingly he did not ſay that he intended to ſuppreſs them; he only gave ſome reaſons why the publication of them was ſuſpended for ſome time; and in caſe he ſuppreſſed them; he promiſed a compleat treatiſe on that ſubject. All this pleads in favour of the accuſer, better than an able Advocate could: for here are the reaſons of this delay. He was informed that theſe gentlemen intended to criticize the two ſermons, and did *not think it proper at preſent to give them the pleaſure of the attack. That would divert them; but that would ſcandalize the public. It is fit to wait a little till their fire is ſpent* (50). But it is obvious that theſe gentlemen would have only rendered themſelves ridiculous by criticizing two orthodox ſermons, ſince they had accuſed them as full of Hereſies. Where could they find theſe Hereſies, if the accuſation was ſuch as Mr Jurieu pretends? The public would not have been ſcandalized to ſee a famous Miniſter make out his innocence: on the contrary, the public would have been greatly edified to ſee a falſe accuſer put to ſhame. A diſpute on this ſubject in writing, could not appear too ſoon, ſince it would contribute ſo greatly to ſhew the innocence of the Miniſter, and the calumny of his cenſurer. The more his critics had acted according to their firſt heat and paſſion, the more would they have entangled themſelves. A man of parts would have taken advantage of their fury. But let us grant to Mr Jurieu that his delay was reaſonable, what will this avail him, ſince it now appears that he did not intend to publiſh theſe ſermons. A year is now elapſed without the publication either of them, or of any book on the hatred of our neighbour. Is not the fire of his adverſaries yet ſpent? But, if the reaſons he has aſſigned for the ſuppreſſion of theſe two ſermons betray his inſincerity, the remarks he has made on the occaſion betray it likewiſe.

VIII. He has not diſtinguiſhed thoſe two points which the accuſer has ſo clearly done. See, above, the two points of the accuſation. The firſt relates to the doctrines aſſerted by Mr Jurieu: the ſecond concerns the effects which theſe doctrines may produce. All thoſe who know the laws of diſputation, tell us, that the conſequences reſulting from any doctrine ought not to be imputed to the defender of that doctrine, when he is known to reject them; but let him reject, or admit them, it is ſtill allowable to point them out to him, becauſe this may be a means of converting him. How many people would abandon a principle, if they knew the bad conſequences which may juſtly be deduced from it? Thus the accuſer has done nothing but what was reaſonable, when, in order to induce and prevail with the Synods to cenſure the Hereſy which he accuſed, he pointed out the pernicious conſequences of it. He would have been in the wrong to aſſert that Mr Jurieu expreſly preached theſe conſequences; neither has he aſſerted it: the moſt ignorant readers may diſcern, as eaſily as the moſt learned, which are the propoſitions his accuſer imputed to him, and which are the propoſitions he infers from the former, without pretending that he preached them; can it therefore be thought that Mr Jurieu dealt ſincerely when he confounded theſe two kinds of propoſitions? Is it not manifeſt, that, in order to delude honeſt minds, and credulous people, he complained that he was accuſed of having preached, that *it is lawful for a man to communicate with hatred in his heart, and imprecations in his mouth?* All the hearers of whom it ſhould be aſked if they had heard him utter ſuch a propoſition, would anſwer, No, *and yet would they ſay with wonder, this is what the baſe accuſer imputes to him; after ſuch a calumny what may not be expected from him? This whole pamphlet is nothing but an infamous libel.* This artifice, groſs as it is, may have deceived a great many people; and for that reaſon Mr Jurieu employed it in his anſwer. Let us affirm the ſame thing of this other propoſition, namely, that he is accuſed of having preached, *that we ought to break off all the commerce of civil ſociety with Papiſts, Mennonites, Arminians,* &c. *that is, we ought neither to give bills of exchange to the Jews, nor take them from them.* It is very falſe that he was accuſed of having preached theſe words, and of having deſcended into theſe particulars;

(48) The author of the Libel heaps up ſo many falſhoods, that one could not believe that any Divine ſhould be capable of impoſing upon his neighbour, in ſo ſhameleſs a manner. *Réflexions ſur la Dénonciation, pag.* 1.

(49) In the year 1694, that Conſiſtory was extremely favourable to him.

(50) *See how Mr Saurin has refuted all theſe reaſons, in his* Examen de la Théologie de Mr Jurieu, *Tom. ii, p.* 812.

one muſt take him for a madman to accuſe him of ſuch things. It was only repreſented to the Synod that if we were to live according to the doctrines which he taught, we muſt renounce all manner of commerce with the enemies of the truth. It is his part to ſhew, if he can, that his principles do not inſer ſuch monſtrous conſequences.

Obſerve, that ſome conſequences have ſo cloſe and obvious a connexion with their principle, that we can never be perſuaded that a man of ſenſe, who teaches the principle, rejects theſe conſequences. If once you teach that it is lawful to hate, and to curſe thoſe who perſecute, how can you deny that it is not lawful for a man to preſent himſelf at the communion-table with his heart full of hatred, and his mouth full of imprecations againſt thoſe who perſecute. Is it not evident that in order to prepare one's ſelf for receiving the communion, it is enough to depart from things unlawful? But let that be as it will, what the accuſer imputes upon this head is an obvious conſequence, which he draws from the Hereſy charged upon him, and is not one of the propoſitions imputed to him. This diſcovers more and more the diſingenuity of the preacher. And from henceforth we may believe him very capable of denying that he preached ſuch a Hereſy, though it is very true that he did preach it.

IX. The ſame diſingenuity will evidently appear, if we conſider how he anſwers in relation to the doctrines imputed to him. Let us compare his anſwer with the terms of the accuſation. He is accuſed of having preached, *that the ſentiments of hatred are good and commendable againſt the enemies of God:* his anſwer is, *it is falſe that he affirmed that* the ſentiments of hatred are good and commendable *againſt any perſon whatever, if hatred is taken for a human paſſion, which hath its principle in ſelf love.* This is a downright impoſition upon his readers; for thus he ſuppoſes that he was accuſed of having ſaid, that hatred, even when it is a human paſſion, which hath its principle in ſelf-love, is good and commendable. But it is evident that this is not the queſtion: he is accuſed only of having ſaid that the ſentiments of hatred are good and commendable againſt the enemies of God. A man who deals plainly, and is conſcious of his own innocence, does not recur to ſuch artifices; he does not juſtify himſelf againſt chimerical accuſations, he faithfully repreſents the crime of which he is accuſed, and anſwers plainly and preciſely to the ſenſe of the words of the accuſation. Has Mr Jurieu done this? Has he anſwered, as a man ought to have done, who could juſtly deny the charge? *I did not ſay that the ſentiments of hatred are good and commendable againſt the enemies of God.* Not in the leaſt; he choſe rather to entangle himſelf in captious diſtinctions, *I did not ſay that the ſentiments of a human hatred which has it's principle in ſelf-love, are good and commendable againſt any perſon whatever.* But was you accuſed of this, might it be anſwered? What avails a juſtification of this nature, which is foreign to the accuſation? I go farther, and maintain that his own diſtinction undoes him; it proves that he preached that, provided the ſentiments of hatred be not founded in ſelf-love, they are good and commendable againſt the enemies of God, and ought not to be called a human paſſion; he therefore preached that his hearers might lawfully hate the Papiſts, provided their hatred was not grounded upon ſome injury received, but upon the war the Papiſts make againſt the truths which God hath revealed. Now this is what the accuſer calls a new Hereſy in Morality, relating to the hatred of our neighbour. He did not make this new Hereſy conſiſt in the following propoſition; *It is good and commendable to hate our enemies*; but in this, *It is lawful and commendable to hate the enemies of God*: and conſequently the perſon accuſed owns all that is charged, and, in ſpite of his wrangling, juſtifies the veracity of the accuſer.

It does not concern me to examine whether the doctrine in queſtion is juſtly ſtiled Heretical; I only inquire after the truth of the fact, and do not think it neceſſary to acquaint any body that this doctrine is really a pernicious Hereſy (51). None but ſuch as have never underſtood the New Teſtament, can doubt of it; and if once it was commendable to hate the perſon of our neighbour for the love of God, there is not one precept in Scripture which a man might not tranſgreſs for the love of God.

X. I expreſly ſet down the words, *hate the perſon of our neighbour*, becauſe this gives me a freſh occaſion of ſhewing the ſincerity of the accuſer. Mr Jurieu owns that he rejected this maxim, *We ought to love the perſon of a ſinner, and hate the vice*, not *as a dangerous or falſe one*, but *as being too ſubtile, as being not very intelligible; and, in ſhort, as not being applicable in all caſes.* For inſtance, ſays he, it is not applicable to thoſe who put a criminal to death. It would not have been an eaſy matter to give a better proof than this of the accuſer's ſincerity. He ſaid that *one of the objections which Mr Jurieu rejected with the moſt diſdainful airs is this, that we ought to war againſt error and vice, and yet have charity for the perſon of the ſinner.* Does Mr Jurieu own this charge, ſince he confeſſes that he rejected that objection as being too ſubtile, as not very intelligible, nor applicable to Judges who puniſh criminals? In the ſtile of diſputation, thoſe who reject a diſtinction as too ſubtile, and too obſcure, and thoſe who reject it as falſe and chimerical, differ only in their expreſſions. The former uſe polite terms, and a ſort of compliment; the latter an uncivil language: but, in truth, both of them form the ſame thought, and it is certain that the greateſt defect in the diſtinctions of the Iriſh, or Spaniſh, Logicians is, that they are not very intelligible, they are too abſtract, and too ſuſceptible of exceptions. Add to this, if the diſtinction between the crime, and the perſon of a criminal does not take place in the tribunals of Judges, it cannot take place any where elſe, ſince no man living lies under ſo great an obligation as a Judge does, to renounce all paſſion againſt the perſon of a criminal. I refer my reader to Mr Saurin (52), and ſhall only ſay, that Mr Jurieu's anſwer, concerning the two principal doctrines which had been imputed to him, raiſes a preſumption againſt him, which is not leſs forcible than a good proof.

If we would multiply preſumptions againſt him, we need only obſerve the paſſages in his remarks where he acts with diſingenuity.

XI. He acts with diſingenuity, and with a ſeditious and perſecuting ſpirit, when he affirms that his accuſer is a Socinian and Anabaptiſt, with regard to magiſtracy and war. His accuſer only ſaid *that the precepts of Jeſus Chriſt, and the maxims of charity are believed and taught* by thoſe very Heretics who attack the Trinity, the Incarnation, and Predeſtination. Does this mean that he approves what they teach concerning war and the magiſtrates?

XII. He acts with diſingenuity when he ſays, that he was obliged to preach theſe two ſermons, in order to refute, among other maxims, this, *that charity does not permit us to trouble any perſon under the pretext of piety and religion, and that Heretics ought not to be diſturbed, as enemies to God.* He preached theſe two ſermons in order to refute what one of his colleagues had lately preached. Now it is certain that this colleague never ſaid, nor ever believed, that Heretics ought not to be troubled, or diſturbed. He is well perſuaded that we ought to write againſt them, demonſtrate their chicaneries, preſs them hard upon their ſophiſms, and ſhew their ſyſtem in all its falſity and abſurdity: and theſe things cannot fail to trouble and diſturb the Heretics.

XIII. He acts with diſingenuity when he alledges what paſſed with relation to certain letters, which Mr Jurieu had written to the Duke of Montauſier, as a proof of a correſpondence with the court of France. Mr Jurieu's enemies have had tranſcripts of theſe letters, and of that Duke's anſwers, and have made uſe of them to vex, and, as they expreſs themſelves, to unmaſk him (53). They have publiſhed ſome extracts of them, which ſhew that he made moſt flattering compliments to the King of France, and ſuch as were the very reverſe of the language he held here in converſation, in the pulpit, and in his books. The accuſer touched upon this point by the way. This greatly angered Mr Jurieu: he affirmed that theſe gentlemen, by producing theſe extracts, had given *an unanſwerable proof*, that they held *an unwarrantable correſpondence with the enemies of the State* (54). He affirmed

(51) *See Mr Saurin's book, intituled,* Examen de la Théologie de Mr Jurieu, *Tom. ii, pag.* 807, *& ſeq. where he refutes* Mr Jurieu's Remarks, on the Accuſation, *and ſhews him that his Moral Doctrine, concerning the hatred of one's neighbour, is one of the looſeſt maxims of the Jeſuits.*

(52) Ibid.

(53) *See the* Cabale Chimérique, *pag.* 51, 52, *of the new edition, and* Lettre de Mr de Beauval ſur les Différens de Mr Jurieu & de Mr Bayle, *pag.* 35, 36.

(54) Réflexions ſur la Dénonciation, *pag.* 4.

affirmed that the court of France had ſent them back theſe letters, and had thereby ſhewn what confidence it placed in them. In a word, he maintained that *the proof is ſuch, that in any other government but this, theſe gentlemen had been lodged in a place from whence they had never come out.* No reaſonable man can perſuade himſelf that Mr Jurieu here deals ingenuouſly. Paſſion, I grant, may blind the underſtanding, and a thirſt after vengeance obſtruct the intellects; but all things have their bounds, and it appears impoſſible for a man to miſtake in certain caſes. Mr Jurieu well remembers, that in his letters he enlarged very much on the Fanatics of Dauphiné, and dropped ſome ſubmiſſions to the King of France, which ſet him at variance with himſelf. Theſe are the two paſſages on account of which the men of learning, and the men of wit, who made their court to the Duke of Montauſier came to know theſe letters. The Duke imparted to them, both what had been written to him, and what he had anſwered, and allowed tranſcripts to be taken of all theſe letters. Mr Jurieu's enemies in France were exceeding glad to have a proof, both of his hypocriſy, and of the negotiations in which he had engaged to maintain ſome cheats who pretended to prophecy. They ſent one of theſe tranſcripts to a Merchant in Holland, who ſhewed it to his friends, and among others to Mr de Beauval and Mr Bayle. The affair was not unknown to Mr Jurieu. At that time they were his intimate friends, and were the firſt to acquaint him that they had ſeen this tranſcript. Their intimacy was not the leſs on that account, and was not broken off till the beginning of the year 1691, on occaſion of the Chimerical Cabal of Geneva. Mr Jurieu was therefore perſuaded during a year and more, that the reception of this tranſcript was not a proof of a correſpondence with the court of France. He believed that certain learned men of Paris who had no reaſon to ſpare him, ſuch as the Biſhop of Meaux, Mr Peliſſon, Mr Nicolle, being informed by the Duke of Montauſier of the tenor of theſe letters, had been very well diverted with them, and heartily agreed that tranſcripts of them ſhould be diſtributed, and communicated to foreigners. After this how can he perſuade himſelf, that the only way of receiving the tranſcript of theſe letters is by holding an unwarrantable correſpondence with the court of France? Is it not obvious that the bare correſpondence of our Gazetteers at Paris is ſufficient to procure ſuch a tranſcript. Is it not therefore againſt his conſcience, and plainly at the hazzard of rendering himſelf ridiculous, that he has been ſo bold as to publiſh that the receiving of this tranſcript, unanſwerably proved ſo criminal a correſpondence with the Court of France, that in any other country but this, the perſons to whom it was ſent, would have been condemned to perpetual impriſonment (55)?

XIV. Mr Jurieu acts with diſingenuity, when he ſays, that what he wrote to Mr de Montauſier concerning Lewis XIV, amounts only to the not giving offenſive language, and making ſome general ſubmiſſions (56).

XV. He acts with diſingenuity when he ſuppreſſes all the reaſons which rendered thoſe letters worthy to be tranſcribed and communicated to ſtrangers. He only ſpeaks of them as propoſing the exchange of a miniſter in priſon for a man who had offered his ſervice to aſſaſſinate the King of France. Had he ſpoken of them as containing ſeveral remarks concerning the pretended prophets, he would not have dared to call it a ſtate-affair. Here is therefore a very malicious and fraudulent artifice.

We have now made great progreſs in diſcovering the impoſture. It is either on the ſide of the accuſer, or on that of the miniſter accuſed, and every thing ſpeaks in favour of the former againſt the latter.

XVI. Here are further preſumptions. Mr Jurieu's beſt friends cannot deny that he is choleric, paſſionate, and a very dangerous enemy. All who are acquainted with him, know that when he has any quarrels, and he is never without them, he leaves nothing unattempted to overthrow his enemy. Yet he would be reputed a devout and very zealous man. The way to make theſe things conſiſtent is to teach that the Goſpel does not forbid us to hate the enemies of the truth, and permits us to war againſt them to the uttermoſt, provided we are moved in it by a zeal for the houſe of the Lord. It is therefore highly probable that he preached the hereſy imputed to him: for there he could find an apology for his own conduct, and a certain way to perſuade the people that he does not depart from the paths of the Goſpel, by behaving in the manner he does againſt perſecutors, and againſt his enemies. His temper, his paſſions, his actions, are nearly concerned that the new hereſy ſhould be true. Aſk not the *cui bono*, the advantage of this, it is too viſible that he would reap a very great advantage from this falſe doctrine. It is therefore highly probable that he preached it (57). *The inclinations and actions have a mutual relation to each other. The inclinations produce the actions, and the actions bear the tincture and diſtinguiſhing marks of the inclinations. . . . . As bold Divines who fancy themſelves authorized, do not ſcruple to give out as doctrines, and articles of faith, their own paſſions and conduct, and to reduce their doctrines to practice, we have reaſon to fear that we ſee Mr Jurieu's heart, in his opinion of the hatred of our neighbour, as well as in his maxims on the rights of Chriſtians in war.* This is the preamble of a learned Miniſter (58), when he attacks Mr Jurieu on the affair of the accuſation.

XVII. I draw a new preſumption from hence, that Mr Jurieu does not deny that he puts a figurative ſenſe upon our Saviour's precept. *Love your enemies, bleſs thoſe who curſe you, &c.* So far is he from refuſing it, that he charges his accuſer with being a Socinian, and Anabaptiſt, becauſe he had diſapproved of his preaching that our Saviour's ſermons on the mount are a hard doctrine, which muſt be ſoftened by not taking it in a literal ſenſe. As Mr Jurieu has not ſaid that the precept of bleſſing thoſe who curſe us, and of loving our enemies, is one of thoſe which muſt be interpreted according to the letter, it manifeſtly follows that he accounts it a hard doctrine which ought to be taken in a figurative ſenſe, and conſequently it is very probable that he preached the doctrine imputed to him.

XVIII. The preſumption I am going to mention is much ſtronger: I take it from the *murmurs and emotions of his audience* (59). I am a witneſs that ſeveral people have been ſhocked at theſe two ſermons; but do not pretend that my evidence ſhould be reckoned. Let us therefore cite other witneſſes. *The moſt favourable thing we can ſay of theſe two ſermons, is, that all the honeſt people who heard them, were ſcandalized, and extremely grieved, and Mr Jurieu's friends were mortified.* This Mr Saurin, an evidence of great weight and authority, affirms in a book which bears his name (60). Another author goes farther, and aſſerts that *ſome of the hearers being ſhocked and ſcandalized by Mr Jurieu, have given over hearing him for the future* (61). This is a manfeſt proof that Mr Jurieu preached the pernicious morality imputed to him; for had he preached the eight maxims which he ſays will appear in the ſermons (62), he would have aſſerted nothing extraordinary, he would have kept in the road of all the other miniſters, and even in the rigid principles of the love of our neighbour.

XIX. I have one conſideration to add which is of great weight. The accuſer is unknown: he may be ſincere, and may not be ſo; we cannot judge of this by his preceding actions, ſince we know not who he is. But as for the perſon accuſed, he is known by all the world, and his beſt friends cannot deny that he has often advanced things which proved falſe. Read what was written on both ſides concerning the Cabal of Geneva, and the Advice to the Refugees: There you will find long catalogues of falſhoods, which his enemies have charged him to prove, and which never have been proved (63): long catalogues, I ſay, which will be ſurpriſing, whether we conſider the nature of the falſhoods, or the aſſurance a man muſt have to aſſert them publickly: there you will find that he was convicted of having miſrepreſented and falſified what his Bookſeller told him concerning the printing of a project of peace; I ſay, of having falſified it in the capital and eſſential points (64). Mr de Beauval a long time after ſo ſtrongly *convicted him of impoſture and calumny, that he could* oppoſe nothing to his convictions, but an order he obtained from the magiſtrates prohibiting the ſale of the book.

This

(55) *See Mr de Beauval*'s Conſidérations ſur deux Sermons de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 42, *& ſeq. where he gives the Hiſtory of theſe Letters, and ſolidly refutes the chicaneries of the accuſer.*

(56) Ibid. *pag.* 45.

(57) See Mr de Beauval's Conſiderations, *pag.* 4, *& ſeq.*

(58) Saurin, Examen de la Théologie de Mr Jurieu, *Tom. ii, pag.* 807, 808.

(59) Mr de Beauval, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 3.

(60) Examen de la Théologie de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 808.

(61) Mr de Beauval's Conſiderations, *pag.* 4.

(62) Reflexions ſur la Dénonciation, *pag.* 3.

(63) *See the preface to the* Chimere de la Cabale de Rotterdam démontrée, *pag.* 19

(64) *See the* Cabale Chimer. *pag.* 58, *of the firſt edition, and pag.* 62, *of the ſecond*; & la Chimere démontrée, *pag.* 6

This avails nothing; for when the magiſtrates prohibit a book, they do not warrant that it contains falſe facts. Mr Jurieu does not pretend that when the States of Holland prohibited the book intituled *l'Eſpirt de Mr Arnauld,* they determined that the facts contained in that book were lies. In fine, a miniſter venerable on account of his age, his gravity, piety, and learning (65), ſuch a miniſter, I ſay, who hath ſeen Mr Jurieu an hundred times in the Synods, affirms that *Mr Jurieu's preſence uſually ruins his affairs, becauſe he has fits of raving which he cannot keep up, and he* RASHLY ADVANCES THINGS OF THE FALSHOOD OF WHICH HE IS PRESENTLY CONVICTED. What man does not ſee that ſince either the accuſer, or the perſon accuſed, muſt needs be an impoſtor, reaſon and good ſenſe would have us ſuſpect the latter, rather than the former (66).

XX. Some body perhaps will ſay that in an affair of this nature, one might give more credit to a perſon unknown, if the queſtion was not concerning a falſhood to which ſo many perſons living were witneſſes. In anſwer to this objection, I ſhall make two remarks, one is, that Mr Jurieu was ſo bold as to publiſh in the year 1691, that the Burgo-maſters of Rotterdam had ſhewn a particular regard to him, when they ſent for him and the author of the *Cabale Chimerique,* to acquaint them with their reſolution. Yet it is certain that theſe gentlemen had held an even balance between the two parties, and required nothing of one, but what they required of the other (67). There were five witneſſes to this, the four Burgo-maſters, and the Penſionary of the city. Nevertheleſs, Mr Jurieu immediately publiſhed that they had ſhewn him this pretended regard, without fearing that any of theſe worthy perſons ſhould detect him in that falſe aſſertion. He had his evaſion at hand; viz. that he had not put his name to his factums or caſes; and beſides that, he well knew they would not go ſo far as to judicial proceedings. What he has done ſince that time is much bolder, he has ſaid (68), that theſe gentlemen *will ever lament the zeal which the worthy magiſtrates of Rotterdam ſhewed againſt their friend the profeſſor of Philoſophy.* A few days after he perceived that this made againſt him, for it plainly imports that this profeſſor loſt his poſt, only on account of religious opinions, and therefore that the accuſations of ſtate-crimes which Mr Jurieu laid againſt him, with ſo great a noiſe that it reſounded throughout all Europe, were not regarded. This comes very near to make him known for a public calumniator, or a raſh and heedleſs accuſer, utterly void of diſcernment. What has he done to ward off this blow? Why he has changed his tone; he has affirmed, that the book on comets was not the true cauſe of the Profeſſor's diſgrace, and that it was chiefly on account of the *Advice to the Refugees* that his ſalary, and permiſſion to teach, were taken from him, not without having been heard, but after the Magiſtrates had taken up a conſiderable time in examining all the pieces, anſwers, replies, *&c.* This is an aſſertion of the falſhood of which the whole city of Rotterdam is convinced, for there is not one citizen who did not aſk of ſome of the Counſellors how the affair paſſed, and conſequently muſt have known that the very firſt time it was propoſed in the council, whether they ſhould revoke the permiſſion granted to that Profeſſor, in the year 1681, to teach both in public and private, with a ſalary of 500 florins, the majority were for the affirmative: thus the affair was propoſed and concluded in the ſame meeting: I know not if it laſted a full hour. The *Advice to the Refugees* was not mentioned there, directly, nor indirectly. Some of thoſe who gave their opinions only alledged the *Thoughts on the Comets,* and repreſented the danger of ſuffering youth to be inſtructed in ſuch opinions as are contained in that book. How bold muſt the man be, who after two or three months, whilſt all the members of the Council are living, publickly aſſerts, that theſe gentlemen grounded their reſolution chiefly upon the *Advice to the Refugees,* and had thoroughly examined that affair long before? This boldneſs is the more ſurpriſing, as ſeveral of theſe gentlemen, when they came to the Council, knew not that ſuch a propoſal would be made, I mean that of revoking the ſalary, and the permiſſion to teach. Never had a word been ſaid of this matter in their meetings, never were the members exhorted to examine the pieces, never were commiſſioners named to examine them, and make their report. It is well known that moſt of theſe gentlemen do not underſtand French, and conſequently could not examine any factum (or caſe) on the accuſation of the *Advice to the Refugees,* nor examine the book on comets. Mr Jurieu's temerity, indiſcretion, and want of reſpect for the Council of Rotterdam, whoſe conduct he has unſeaſonably, and without the leaſt occaſion, taken upon him to juſtify, might be fully expoſed, if one knew as little as he does how to render to Cæſar, the things which are Cæſar's. The Council of that city has no need to juſtify their conduct in that affair. They are abſolute ſovereigns, with regard to the permiſſions of teaching; and may order, as they think proper, that every Philoſopher who would obtain a ſalary, and permiſſion to teach, ſhould follow this or that ſyſtem; ſo that the author of the book on Comets might have been removed from his profeſſorſhip merely becauſe he was no Voëtian, after the ſame manner as in other countries all Ramiſts, Carteſians, *&c.* are excluded from profeſſorſhips. Let us conclude, that a man, capable of aſſerting, that the Magiſtrates of Rotterdam, did a thing which they have not done; capable of aſſerting it, I ſay, whilſt theſe Magiſtrates are ſtill living, and have freſh ideas of the affair, is very capable of denying that he preached a doctrine, though it is certain that he did preach it.

XXI. I have one obſervation more to make, which appears to me conſiderable. It is eaſy to conceive, may our poſterity ſay, that the anonymous author of a pamphlet may wrongfully accuſe a famous Miniſter of having preached Heretical doctrines; whereas it is incredible that ſuch a Miniſter would dare to deny that he preached what he did actually preach. Two thouſand hearers, if you pleaſe, will deteſt the aſſurance of the falſe accuſer; but what harm can they do him? They know not who he is, nor where to find him, he is ſure never to meet with the ſhame which he deſerves. The Miniſter cannot flatter himſelf with theſe hopes. Two thouſand hearers, provoked at his boldneſs, or rather effrontery, would mortify him wherever he appeared. Common ſenſe teaches us that this puniſhment is inevitable. It is not therefore probable, that a Miniſter would expoſe himſelf to it; ſince therefore Mr Jurieu, a few days after he had preached theſe ſermons, publiſhed a pamphlet, in which he denied that he preached the Hereſy imputed to him, he deſerves more to be credited than the accuſer.

This is a plauſible objection, and may forthwith ſtrike foreigners; but they and our poſterity will eaſily avoid being ſurprized, if they conſider the two things which I am going to obſerve.

Firſt, this objection proves too much; for if it was a good one, Mr Jurieu had not publickly advanced what I have already mentioned; nor aſſerted in the Synods ſeveral falſhoods of which he was preſently convicted, as Mr Saurin, an eye-witneſs, has charged upon him in the face of the public (69). Fifty Miniſters, and about as many elders, all preſent together in a Synod, are more to be feared than a multitude of people ſpread in a city; I ſay, they are more to be feared by a Miniſter who dares to deny a known truth.

In the ſecond place, the greateſt number of hearers are not capable of certifying whether a Miniſter preached the propoſitions charged upon him, or thoſe which he owns that he preached. They have not attention, or penetration, or memory enough, to be able to anſwer that there were, or were not, ſuch and ſuch reſtrictions and explanations in the doctrine preached. So that a Miniſter may be very eaſy as to the greateſt part of his hearers; he may aſſure himſelf that he can ſafely deny that he preached what he has actually preached, and diſguiſe it as he thinks fit, without fearing the conſequences. As for intelligent hearers, they are to be feared; but Mr Jurieu is on ſuch a footing that he has no occaſion to fear them.

(65) Mr Saurin, *See his Preface to his* Examen la Théologie de Mr Jurieu.

(66) Semel malus (*and by ſo much the more reaſon* Sæpè malus) ſemper preſumitur in eodem genere mali, *ſay the Civilians.*

(67) *See* la Chimere démontrée, *pag.* 215, *and in the Preface, pag.* 64.

(68) Réflexions ſur la Dénonciation, *pag.* 5.

(69) *In the Preface to his* Examen de la Théologie de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* xxxx, 4. *See above the end of number xix.*

He foreſaw what has happened to him; I mean that he ſhould raiſe many enemies to himſelf: for this reaſon he had the addreſs to fortify himſelf more carefully than they fortify frontier towns the moſt expoſed. He ſhewed a zeal full of fury for the ruin of Popery, and that of France (70). He inſulted and affronted all the ſectaries in Holland, both as being Heretics, and Republicans, in order to make a merit of being odious to them. He made a great ſhow of his intereſt: and having perſuaded his emiſſaries that he had not this intereſt by the recommendation of others, but originally and directly by himſelf, they ſpread this news from houſe to houſe: ſo that thoſe of Mr Jurieu's congregation are perſuaded, that he can do a great deal of good to thoſe who are devoted to him, and a great deal of miſchief to thoſe who oppoſe him (71); I am perſuaded, that, by a ſubtle and artful gaſconade, he has increaſed the idea of his intereſt: but it is certain that he has powerful patrons, who, through maxims of ſtate, will bring him off in the worſt affairs, in which he can engage. Hence it is that there is hardly any body who does not carefully avoid incurring his indignation. He well knows this, and therefore was not concerned if two or three hundred private perſons were convinced that he denied the truth, by denying the accuſation. He was well aſſured that no body would ſtand as a witneſs againſt him: he knows that good Chriſtians are perſuaded that they ought to hide the faults of their paſtors, as Shem and Japhet hid the nakedneſs of their father. He has ſo often affirmed and repeated that it is not poſſible to blemiſh him, without injuring the Church, that he has perſuaded a great many people into the belief of it: he has ſo often, and ſo pathetically, repreſented that he has worn out his ſtrength and vigour in the ſervice of the cauſe, and now only leads a wretched, lingering, life, becauſe he has ſacrificed his watchings and labours to the good of the Church, that moſt of his brethren are perſuaded that they ſhould be guilty of a cruelty, if they ſhould caſt the leaſt ſtain upon his honour; and they will not reproach themſelves with having made his grey hairs deſcend with ſorrow to the grave. This is one of the reaſons of what his adverſaries call *the exceſſive lenity of the Synods*. Now ſince the appearing of his *Important Advice to the Public*, and his marvellous accuſation of the Cabal of Geneva, people are afraid of being incorporated in it, if they ſpeak or act in the leaſt like thoſe of that pretended Cabal. One would think they imagine that he is an open dealer in wares of this ſort. This puts me in mind of one thing, which, of all the expedients he has uſed to eſtabliſh his authority, I ought firſt to mention. He ſet up for an informer of two great conſpiracies, which he pretended to have diſcovered among the Refugees. One is a Cabal both of ſtate and religion, the other of religion only. The former is ſpread from ſouth to north, and has its center at Geneva, and its deſign is to render the King of France maſter of all Europe, in order that he may ruin the Proteſtants. The other is compoſed of a great many Miniſters come from France, who are infected with the Pelagian and Socinian Hereſies, and are reſolved to ſow them as much as poſſible, ſince they are no longer reſtrained by the fear, which, in France, obliged them to conceal their opinions. Theſe two conſpiracies proved to be equally chimerical; nevertheleſs, the informer reaped a great advantage by them. He thereby made himſelf conſidered as the rampart of Orthodoxy, and honeſt people were very near giving him the title of Marſhal of the Faith: I mean Marſhal, or Provoſt at leaſt, of the long robe. Several of the brethren have attributed his greateſt faults to an exceſs of zeal, and have only conſidered them as irregularities, which might, with a ſafe conſcience, be protected, or excuſed, that the Church might not be deprived of ſo neceſſary a defender. Several others did not dare to declare againſt him, leſt they ſhould paſs for members of one or other of theſe two imaginary Cabals. One is in fear for his penſion, another of being never promoted. After all, if we are ſurprized that the Miniſters, in a body, would not meddle in the affair of the accuſation, we ought not to be ſurprized that no private perſon gave his atteſtation in that cauſe. The lawful authority did not require it of any perſon, beſides the fact to be atteſted was ſcandalous, and the ſcandal ſeemed to be ſufficiently removed by the public diſavowal of the perſon accuſed. It is a great matter to ſee ſuch a man not dare to maintain what he has preached. It is a tacit retracting of his doctrines, which they thought might be ſufficient. And he well knew that they would be content with it.

Where is the man, who, after having reflected on all theſe things, thinks it ſtrange that Mr Jurieu dared to deny the accuſation.

Theſe are the weapons with which I thought it became me to furniſh poſterity againſt future Sceptics. A Sceptic glad to render all facts uncertain, might have ſaid thirty years hence, *It cannot be known for certain whether a famous Miniſter did or did not preach an Hereſy on ſuch a day: how then can we certainly know what paſſes in councils of ſtate?* He may be anſwered by virtue of my explanation, that it is very eaſy to aver that the Miniſter did preach the doctrines with which he is charged by the accuſer. If whilſt things were freſh, any perſon had taken the pains to explain them, as I have done this, we ſhould not be obliged on ſo many occaſions to fall in with Scepticiſm in hiſtory. The negative argument would not in that caſe be of any force. I call a negative argument the ſilence of cotemporary authors, with regard to remarkable accidents, whether mentioned by no body, or mentioned without being contradicted. We are in this laſt caſe. Mr Jurieu denies, and every body ſuffers him to deny; even the accuſer ſuffers it. For this reaſon, in future generations, the ſtrength of the negative argument might be uſed in his behalf, if they did not know the contents of my digreſſion.

There is no reaſon why what I have attempted to do in favour of our poſterity, may not extend even to foreigners: for as to the perſons who are now living in Holland, they do not want this information. They doubt not that Mr Jurieu preached the hatred of our neighbour in the ſenſe of the accuſation. The ſuppreſſion of theſe ſermons ſpeaks very clearly on this head, and ſuch of his hearers as can ſpeak out without fearing the effects of it, very frankly tell the truth when occaſion offers. This indeed is only the talk of converſation, and not a public certificate. It was ſaid once in the preſence of a Magiſtrate who had heard theſe ſermons, that Mr Jurieu denied the whole accuſation. *How*, ſaid the Magiſtrate, *does he deny he preached that a man fulfils the command, provided he wiſhes ſpiritual felicity to perſecuters?* Yes, it was anſwered, that is one of the points which he moſt boldly denies. The Magiſtrate ſhrugged up his ſhoulders, and proteſted that he diſtinctly remembered to have heard him ſpeak this new doctrine. I was preſent at that converſation.

(70) Here I only relate ſome of the expedients by which he is become formidable. The reſt are not known, or only known by hear-ſay, and were they known, it would probably not be prudent to publiſh them. I am not a writer of Anecdotes.

(71) There are examples of both kinds, and this is more perſuading than his boaſts. It is known that he has had the addreſs to become a kind of almoner, I mean the diſtributer of ſeveral ſums which other people give for pious uſes. This is a great lure, to make himſelf creatures.

ZUYLICHEM (Constantine Huygens, Lord of) Secretary and Counſellor to the Princes of Orange, one of the moſt ingenious men and beſt Poets [*A*] of the XVIIth Century, was born at the Hague, on the fourth of September 1596. He was the ſecond ſon of Chriſtian Huygens [*B*], Secretary to the Council of State of the Republic

[*A*] *And beſt Poets.*] There are of his compoſure an infinite number of Dutch verſes: he alſo publiſhed ſome Latin poems under the title of *Momenta deſultoria*.

[*B*] *He was the ſecond ſon of Chriſtian Huygens.*] This Christian was the ſon of Cornelius Huygens, a gentleman of Brabant, and of Gertrude Back (1). He was the firſt of his family who ſettled in Holland. He married (2) into a very conſiderable family of Antwerp, by taking for his wife Suſanna Hoefnagle, the daughter of James Hoefnagle, and Elizabeth Veſeler (3). This James Hoefnagle was ſo rich, that he gave three hundred thouſand florins for his redemption from the Spaniſh garriſon when it mutinied in Antwerp in the year 1576. This large ranſom ſecured him and his family from the fury of the ſoldiers,

(1) The daughter of Chriſtian Back, and Lucy Back de Weelden, of the ſame family with thoſe of Aſten.

(2) Being 26 years of age.

(3) The eldeſt daughter of George Veſeler, Intendant-General of the Mints of the King of Spain.

Republic of the United-Provinces, and was preferred to the poſt I have mentioned under Prince Frederic Henry. He continued in the exerciſe of it under his ſucceſſors, until he reſigned it to his eldeſt ſon (a). In the year 1661, he was ſent to the Court of France, to ſollicit the reſtitution of Orange, of which Lewis XIV had taken poſſeſſion. And in the year 1665, having at laſt obtained what he demanded, he took a journey to Orange, in order to cauſe that principality to be delivered to its lawful ſovereign. This was performed with great ſolemnity (b). He lived to a great old age, with the happineſs of retaining both the ſolidity of his judgment, and the vivacity of his wit, and alſo of ſeeing his family well ſettled, and the ſixty-two years ſervices he had done to the houſe of Orange well approved. He had kept a great epiſtolary correſpondence with the moſt illuſtrious learned men [C], and as he loved and underſtood the Liberal Arts, he delighted in favouring thoſe who made profeſſion of them. He died in the year 1687, aged ninety years and ſix months. He was Preſident of the Prince of Orange's Council. Mr Huygens, one of the greateſt Mathematicians of Europe, was one of his three ſons [D].

(a) See the remark [D].

(b) See the relation publiſhed by Mr Chambrun, Miniſter of Orange, in the year 1666.

ſoldiers, as well as the fine houſe which he had built; but did not prevent their killing, even in his arms, one of his relations who fled to him for protection. The country-ſeat which he built, about a quarter of a league from Antwerp, is ſtill known by the name of Lanternhorf. Balthazar Hoefnagle, his eldeſt ſon, married the daughter of the Chancellor of Brabant (4). As for CHRISTIAN HUYGENS, he ſerved Prince William in quality of his Secretary, ever ſince the foundation of the Republic of the United-Provinces. The hiſtories of Reydanus and Hooft relate a noble action of his, when he was Deputy to that Prince, after whoſe death he was Secretary of the Council of State. He died at the Hague, in the year 1624, leaving two ſons and two daughters. MAURICE HUYGENS, his eldeſt ſon, and godſon to Prince Maurice, was born at the Hague on the twelfth of May 1595, and was Secretary to the States after the death of his father, and left iſſue. CONSTANTINE HUYGENS, the ſecond ſon of Chriſtian, is the ſubject of this article. He had two ſiſters: GEERTRUDE HUYGENS, the eldeſt, was married to Philip Doublet, Lord of St Annelant, *&c.* Receiver-General of the United-Provinces. From this marriage proceeded Philip Doublet, Lord of St Annelant, *&c.* who married SUSANNA HUYGENS, his couſin-german, the daughter of our CONSTANTINE HUYGENS. The other ſiſter of the ſaid Conſtantine, named CONSTANTIA HUYGENS, was born on the ſecond of Auguſt 1602, and married David le Leu de Wilhem, as I have ſaid above (5).

[C] *He had kept a great epiſtolary correſpondence with the moſt illuſtrious learned men.*] Chiefly with Daniel Heinſius, Nicolas Heinſius, the ſon of Daniel, Voſſius, Ericius Puteanus, Balzac (6), Corneille, and ſtill more with Father Merſenne, and Mr Des Cartes (7). Obſerve alſo, that he is frequently mentioned in the printed letters of ſeveral learned men. See amongſt others thoſe of Mr de Wicquefort and Barlæus, lately publiſhed in Latin and French (8).

[D] *Mr Huygens, one of the greateſt Mathematicians of Europe, was one of his three ſons.*] His name was CHRISTIAN; he died on the eighth of July 1695, at the age of ſixty-ſix years, without ever marrying. Hymen could not well agree with a perſon like him, wholly devoted to the enquiry after what was moſt profound in Mechanics, Aſtronomy, Geometry, *&c.* See his elogy in the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned (9). To make it compleat, Mr de Beauval had no occaſion for any thing elſe beſides a catalogue of the writings and inventions of this great man. You will alſo find his elogy, as well as that of Mr de Zuylichem, his father, in a letter written by Sorbiere, on the thirteenth of July 1660 (10). Mr Huygens was then only thirty-one years of age (11). His eldeſt brother, named CONSTANTINE, was Secretary to the Prince of Orange, upon the reſignation of his father, and continued in the poſſeſſion of that poſt after the acceſſion of that great Prince to the Britiſh throne. He died at the Hague in November 1697. Mr de Zuylichem left a third ſon, who died at Rotterdam in the beginning of July 1699. He had the office of Deputy of the Admiralty of the Maeſe for life. He left a very fine family. His eldeſt ſon poſſeſſes the lordſhip of Zeelhem, of which Mr Huygens, the Mathematician, bore the title during the laſt years of his life.

---

(4) Called *Theodore van Liefvelt*, Lord of Hamme, Ste. Anne, Opdorp, *&c.*

(5) In the article WILHEM, remark [*F*]. All this is extracted out of a Memoir imparted to the Bookſeller.

(6) Balzac inſcribed to him his criticiſm upon Heinſius's *Herodes infanticida.* Several Letters which he wrote to him are printed.

(7) See Mr Baillet in his Life of Des Cartes, *paſſim.*

(8) At Amſterdam 1696.

(9) For Auguſt, 1695, Art. ix, pag. 542, & ſeq.

(10) Sorbiere, Lettres & Relations, *p.* 143, *& ſeq. Paris edition*, 1660, *in 8vo.*

(11) Sorbiere ſays he was but 24. He is miſtaken.

AN

Hiſtorical Diſcourſe

On the LIFE of

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS,

KING OF SWEDEN.

CHAP. I.

Containing his actions till the truce concluded with Poland in the year 1629, ſome time before he entered Germany, to make war on the Emperor Ferdinand II.

SWEDEN had been governed for almoſt a century, by Princes different from thoſe who reigned in Denmark, when GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS aſcended the throne. The vicinity and warlike temper of theſe two nations, raiſed ſo great an antipathy between them, that the one has always attempted to ſubdue the other. They have ſome times ſucceeded in theſe attempts, and Sweden and Denmark have reigned over each other by turns. Near the cloſe of the XVth century, it was the turn of Denmark to reign over Sweden: for CHRISTIERN, or CHRISTIAN I, King of Denmark, who died in the year 1482, was likewiſe King of Sweden, and left a ſon, named JOHN II, who for ſome time enjoyed both theſe kingdoms. He was expelled by the Swedes; and this made CHRISTIAN II, his ſon, more deſirous to re-unite theſe two kingdoms in himſelf. He at firſt ſucceeded in his enterprize; for notwithſtanding the valour and reſiſtance of the Swedes, he laid ſiege to Stockholm, and obliged them to acknowledge him as their King. But he did not long ANNO enjoy either this new kingdom, or that which he poſſeſſed already. His cruelties ren- 1523. dered him ſo odious, that, upon his return from Sweden, the Danes took from him the crown of Denmark, and gave it to his uncle FREDERIC, Duke of Holſtein, who 1523. having defeated CHRISTIAN, confined him in a caſtle, during the reſt of his life.

This change gave the Swedes an opportunity of ſhaking off the Daniſh yoke. Fortune was ſo favourable to the courage of a Prince of the houſe of VASA, called GUSTAVUS ERIC-SON, (that is the ſon of ERIC) deſcended from the antient Kings of the Goths, and from CHARLES CANUTE, who had ſixty years before been King of Sweden, that he drove the Danes out of all their garriſon-towns, and was afterwards proclaimed King of Sweden, amidſt the joyful acclamations of all the people. From him 1523. deſcended the famous GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, who is the ſubject of this diſcourſe.

This great revolution, by which in the ſame year Sweden and Denmark had each a new King, was not like to ſtifle the antient quarrels between theſe two kingdoms. One might have thought that FREDERIC, the better to juſtify the choice which had been made of him, would have laboured to recover to the Danes the ſuperiority which they had loſt; and that GUSTAVUS, for a like reaſon, would have uſed all his efforts to ſecure the advantage, which he had gained from the Danes: but the contrary happened: each of the new Kings only endeavoured to eſtabliſh himſelf in the throne which he had obtained by the voice of his ſubjects, and believing that the friendſhip of each other was neceſſary for that purpoſe, they contracted together a very ſtrict alliance, which doubtleſs greatly contributed to introduce the Lutheran religion into theſe two Northern kingdoms: for as Princes are uſually diſpoſed, they rarely embrace the ſame novelties, when they hate one another, and the attachment of their enemies to a new religion, is to them a ſtrong argument of the falſhood of it.

I ſhould depart from my ſubject, was I to explain how ERIC, the eldeſt ſon of GUSTAVUS ERIC-SON, was deprived of his crown by JOHN, his brother, Duke of Finland, and huſband to the Princeſs CATHARINE, ſiſter of SIGISMUND AUGUSTUS King of Poland; and how afterwards CHARLES, Duke of Sudermania, another ſon of King GUSTAVUS ERIC-SON, was made King of Sweden, in prejudice to Prince SIGISMUND, the eldeſt ſon of King JOHN, his brother. I ſhall only obſerve that this excluſion of SIGISMUND, ſowed great diſcord between the Poles and the Swedes, becauſe SIGISMUND having been elected King of Poland during his father's life, and not having been able to prevent his uncle CHARLES, Duke of Sudermania, from being declared King of Sweden by the States of the kingdom, he employed the forces of Poland, to take ſatisfaction for the injury he believed the Swedes had done him, and tranſmitted to his poſterity the care of making good his pretenſions. But notwithſtanding this, as the reign of SIGISMUND, and that of his ſon ULADISLAUS were very glorious in Poland; ſo CHARLES enjoyed Sweden with great reputation till his death, and left that kingdom to his ſon, under whom it became one of the moſt glorious and flouriſhing in Europe. ANNO 1587.

In the year 1611, upon the death of CHARLES, was raiſed to the throne of Sweden this illuſtrious ſon, who has done ſo great honour to his nation, the famous GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, the ſcourge of the Houſe of Auſtria, the terror of the Court of Rome, and deliverer of the Proteſtant religion. He was born at Stockholm on the ninth of December 1594, and his birth gave a moſt ſenſible joy to his father, and to the Princeſs CHRISTINA his mother, CHARLES's ſecond wife, and daughter to a Duke of Holſtein. SIGISMUND King of Poland, had in the ſame year been crowned King of Sweden, and returning to Poland, had left the regency of Sweden to CHARLES his uncle. In the year 1600 this regency was changed into a true and full royalty, by the States of the Realm, and in an authentic manner, ſuch as removes every juſt charge of uſurpation from the memory of that Prince. Otherwiſe, we muſt ſay that SIGISMUND ought to have laid no claim to the crown of Sweden, ſince he was the ſon of 1596. a Prince, who only aſcended the throne upon the excluſion given by the States to him who filled it. But tho' the royal name, and the royal authority had been conferred on CHARLES in the year 1600, he was crowned only in 1607, three years after the ſame States of the kingdom had ſettled on his family the ſucceſſion to the crown of Sweden by way of election, without excluding the daughters, if the male iſſue ſhould fail.

We may eaſily imagine that Poland did not lie quiet, and that CHARLES put himſelf in a condition to make head againſt the Poles. He immediately paſſed into Livonia, chuſing rather to carry the war out of his kingdom, than to wait for the enemy in his own dominions. 1600. He knew beſides that the places belonging to Sweden in that country, lay the moſt expoſed to the attacks of the enemy. Thus Livonia became the theatre of the war which aroſe between Sweden and Poland.

The firſt campaign was very proſperous to the King of Sweden, the greateſt part of Livonia having then been reduced. But the two following years, the Poles in their turn gained very conſiderable advantages over him, by the valour of JOHN ZAMOISKI, one of their moſt famous generals. Afterwards both ſides had their ſhare of ſucceſs, and taſted a little of good, and of bad fortune.

It having been reported in the year 1609, that SIGISMUND had attacked Muſcovy, in order to get himſelf declared Great Duke; CHARLES, thought himſelf obliged to traverſe that deſign, the ſucceſs of which could not but prove fatal to him. The affairs of Muſcovy were then in a bad ſituation, by reaſon of the frequent ſeditions, which in a very ſhort time had cut off three or four of their Emperors.

BASIL ZUSKI (1) who reigned at that time, aſcended the throne, by putting to death DEMETRIUS, who had got poſſeſſion of it, by making the people falſly believe that he was the ſon of the Great Duke JOHN BASIL, the ſecond of that name, who died in the year 1584. Under cover of this impoſture, he had formed a great party; and by the powerful ſuccours he received from the Poles, had cauſed the Great Duke FOEDOR-BORIS-LOWIZ to be ſtrangled. This FOEDOR-BORIS-LOWIZ had ſucceeded his father BORIS-GUDENOW, who died two months before (2) of the uneaſineſs that was given him by the warlike preparations of the pretended DEMETRIUS. No man was better acquainted with the impoſture of this DEMETRIUS than BORIS-GUDENOW; for he knew very well that he had rid himſelf of the true DEMETRIUS, the brother of the Great Duke THEODORE, as well as of THEODORE himſelf, whom he had

---

(1) He was crowned on the firſt of June, 1606.

(2) Boris-Gudenow died on the third of April, 1605.

had poiſoned in the year 1597. The good fortune which DEMETRIUS had to become Emperor, made a greater impreſſion on ſome turbulent ſpirits, than the violent death which precipitated him from the throne: for BASIL ZUSKI, who upon his death was become Great Duke, in a ſhort time found he had to contend with two falſe DEMETRIUS's, who raiſed great diſorders in Muſcovy. Such was the ſtate of affairs in that country, when the King of Poland carried the war into it. There was a great probability tha the would oblige the Muſcovites to chooſe him their Emper or, andeven that this new dignity would enable him to ſubdue the Swedes, whom he only conſidered as his rebellious ſubjects. All the maxims of policy determined CHARLES to give his aſſiſtance to the Great Duke, who ſtrongly importuned him for it.

The affair having been propoſed to the States-General of the kingdom, they reſolved to make a treaty of alliance with the Great Duke; whereupon King CHARLES ſent him ſome good troops under the conduct of Count JAMES LA GARDIE: theſe troops did the Czar great ſervice, and ſignalized themſelves on many occaſions. But the reſtleſs, wild, and odd, humour of the Muſcovites furniſhed the factious with too many means of ſupporting themſelves; beſides the Swediſh troops having mutinied, becauſe they did not receive the pay which the Czar owed them, that unfortunate Emperor, deſtitute of every reſource, was dethroned, and confined in a monaſtery. Upon this SIGISMUND conceived greater hopes either for himſelf, or for his ſon ULADISLAUS. There was indeed much talk of chuſing his ſon Emperor of Muſcovy. Some people alſo caſt their eye on Prince CHARLES PHILIP, the King of Sweden's ſecond ſon, and this was much talked of, even after the death of that King: yet neither was elected. The Muſcovites preferred a ſovereign born in their own country, and elected MICHAEL FEDEROWITS, a relation (3) of JOHN BASILIDES.

ANNO 1613.

During theſe laſt diſorders in Muſcovy, CHARLES was involved in a new war. CHRISTIAN IV, King of Denmark, being unwilling to loſe ſo favourable an opportunity, as the King of Sweden preſented to him, by engaging in the war with Muſcovy and Poland, reſolved to break with him. He found out ſeveral pretences, and ſeveral ſubjects of complaint, he wrote letters, he inſiſted much on his patience, and propoſed ways of accommodation, as they always do, who are fully determined to come to a rupture. In a word, he made uſe of all the formalities which are commonly employed either to hide from the public the injuſtice of the aggreſſor, or to retard the preparations of the enemy, and by which none but very ſimple people are enſnared. At laſt, after having uſed all thoſe little formalities, he wrote to King CHARLES, that he declared war againſt him, and at the ſame time ſet out in order to beſiege at once both Calmar and Elfſburg.

This was the firſt war in which GUSTAVUS ſerved, being only ſixteen or ſeventeen years of age. Something had been always obſerved in him, which promiſed that one day he would be a great man; and the King, his father, who had perceived this better than any other perſon, relying upon it, had taken an extreme care of his education, and neglected nothing that might render him an accompliſhed Prince, both in the qualities of his body and mind. Finding himſelf obliged to repel the Danes, who beſieged two of his towns at the ſame time, he carried his ſon with him to the army, and ſent him towards Chriſtianopel, a place which belonged to the Danes, hoping to give their forces a diverſion, by threatning one of their towns. The ſucceſs was greater than had been expected; for though there was a ſtrong garriſon in Chriſtianopel, yet the Swedes ſeized it at the firſt onſet, after having blown up the gates by petards. The garriſon not having had time to capitulate, was put to the ſword, and the city was ſet on fire.

GUSTAVUS tranſported by the ardour of his courage, run a great hazard in this expedition; for having expoſed himſelf too far, he was forced to eſcape the danger he was in, by puſhing his horſe into a water half frozen, where he had periſhed, if PETER BANNIER, knight of the order, and Senator of the kingdom, had not come to his aſſiſtance.

The taking and ſacking of Chriſtianopel, and ſome other attempts which were made on the Danes, did not hinder them, after they had made themſelves maſters of the town of Calmar, from taking likewiſe the Citadel. It is true that this was not ſo much owing to their valour, or to any neglect in CHARLES to relieve the Citadel, as it was to the treachery of the officer who commanded in it. The ſurrender of that place was ſoon followed by the invaſion of the iſland of Oeland, and by the taking of the caſtle of Borkholm.

Theſe diſgraces ſo much incenſed the King of Sweden, that not having been able to take ſatisfaction of the enemy, in ſome battles which he hazarded, he propoſed to the King of Denmark that they ſhould terminate their quarrel by a Duel. CHRISTIAN ridiculed this propoſal, and anſwered that ſuch a combat was rather the affair of an adventurer, than of a Prince. Nay he railled him on the infirmities of his old-age, as if there was but little glory to be won, by gaining an advantage over a man in his years, or as if it was an unfair dealing to place the lives of a young and of an old King in ballance, when the courſe of nature alone would ſoon put an end to that of the latter. A little after, he attacked the King of Sweden in his camp, and killed more of King CHARLES's ſoldiers, than he loſt of his own.

---

(3) Micheal Federowits was the ſon of Theodore Kikitits, Patriarch of Moſcow, and of Mary daughter of John Baſilides, and ſiſter to the true Demetrius.

We may eaſily imagine that all this grievouſly vexed the King of Sweden, who had never wanted vigour nor courage, and had acquired great glory on many occaſions. He thought of the means of revenge, and met with ſome: but doubtleſs the moſt pleaſing was that which GUSTAVUS procured him, by retaking the iſland of Oeland and the caſtle of Borkholm, ſhewing that his very firſt attempts were maſterly ſtrokes.

How unwelcome and afflicting muſt death be to the father of ſuch a ſon, from whom he might daily expect ſo many grounds of comfort? yet he muſt reſolve to die near the end of the ſame campaign: for on the thirtieth of October 1611, CHARLES IX, King of Sweden, died after a few days illneſs. Four days before his death he had been informed that Count LA GARDIE had retaken ſeveral places from the rebellious Muſcovites, and that the inhabitants of Novogrod whom he had ſubdued, had given him their promiſe to elect CHARLES PHILIP to the crown of Muſcovy: but he ſeemed to take little concern in all this. He ſhewed that from thenceforth his only care was to prepare for death, and that he left all the affairs of this world to his ſon GUSTAVUS. He died very piouſly in the ſixty-firſt year of his age, much regretted by his ſubjects, who conſidered him as the preſerver of the Proteſtant religion, which the artifices of the Jeſuits, backed by the credit of SIGISMUND, had infallibly baniſhed out of Sweden, if CHARLES had not prevented it.

The loſs of ſo great a Prince would have occaſioned a longer and more ſenſible grief to the whole kingdom, had it not been for the great qualities of the young GUSTAVUS, who ſucceeded. I have already ſaid that his father had conceived the greateſt hopes of a ſon who had ſuch natural endowments, and ſo careful an education. He had often expreſſed to his court the good opinion he had of his dear GUSTAVUS; for ſpeaking of various things which he had wiſhed for the grandeur and glory of the nation, but ſuch as he did not hope to accompliſh, he uſed to ſay to thoſe who were preſent, *this lad will do it*, laying his hand on the head of his ſon. And as this kind of diſcourſe never fails to paſs from the court to the city, and to run from mouth to mouth, throughout the whole kingdom, all Sweden knew the eſteem which King CHARLES had for his ſucceſſor, and had conceived very great hopes of him, as well as CHARLES. How great a burthen is this on a Prince! For, on one hand, nothing is more difficult for him than to anſwer the high ideas which a whole people have preconceived of him; and, on the other, nothing is more blaſting to his reputation, than not to anſwer them. We ſhall ſee hereafter that GUSTAVUS ſurpaſſed all that had been expected of him.

As a long interregnum could not but be prejudical to the Swedes, in the ſituation of the general affairs of the kingdom at that time, being at war with Poland, Denmark, and Muſcovy; the States of Sweden, without loſs of time, aſſembled at Nicoping, in the month of December which followed the death of the King, and, by the general voice of all the deputies, elected to the crown GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, his ſon. This Prince being only ſeventeen years of age, made a ſpeech which charmed the whole aſſembly, ſo full was it of greatneſs of mind, and of modeſty together. He ſaid, 'That conſidering his youth, and the difficulty of the affairs of the kingdom, he would rather 'have choſen not to take ſo heavy a burthen upon him; but that the States having 'thought it proper he ſhould, he would undertake that charge in the name of the moſt 'holy Trinity, and apply all his care, and all his forces to maintain all the orders of 'the ſtate in the true religion and in all their privileges.'

In the beginning of his reign, he applied himſelf wholly to the war againſt the Danes, becauſe that was the moſt preſſing evil, as it threatned the heart and center of the kingdom. He therefore took the field as ſoon as the ſeaſon permitted, being reſolved to recover Calmar, and drive the enemy from the frontiers: but before he ſet out, he diſpoſed of the principal offices of the crown, and filled them with perſons of a diſtinguiſhed merit, eſpecially the office of Great Chancellor of the kingdom, which he beſtowed on the famous AXEL OXENSTIERN, one of the ableſt men that ever appeared in Europe.

A King who had no other endowments but the courage of GUSTAVUS, would not have failed to open the campaign with the ſiege of Calmar; but as for him who notwithſtanding his fire, and the impetuoſity with which his youth inſpired him, was not incapable of entering into himſelf, and deliberately conſulting the maxims of prudence, he conſidered that the Danes had ſo ſtrongly fortified that place, that it was more proper to think of recovering it by gaining equivalent advantages, than by attacking it with main force. Therefore he did not lay ſiege to Calmar, but was only intent on giving the enemy a diverſion: and for this end the King himſelf entered Schonen as far as was poſſible, and having ravaged it, he returned to his camp, after having had a ſharp encounter with the enemy in his retreat.

But whatever pains GUSTAVUS took either to vanquiſh the Danes, or at leaſt to defeat their enterprizes, he had but little ſucceſs. CHRISTIAN IV King of Denmark, was a courageous Prince, ſkilled in the art of war, and had more troops than his enemy. He therefore took ſome towns from the Swedes, and put to ſea a fleet which alarmed the city of Stockholm, and to ſay the truth, the advantage of that war was on his ſide. For though by the treaty of peace concluded in the beginning of the year 1613, he reſtored to the Swedes all the places he had taken from them, yet they were obliged to pay him great ſums of money for his reimburſement, and to make him ſeveral conceſſions. From hence, to obſerve it by the way, we may learn that it is not always ſure to judge of the reign of a Prince by the firſt years of it, for here is one of the moſt glorious reigns that ever was, the beginnings of which were attended with a kind of diſgrace. Here you ſee the great GUSTAVUS, who being involved in a war in the beginning of his reign, only comes out of it by dearly purchaſing peace, at the mediation of the King of England.

His honour did not ſuffer by it; for there are a great many occaſions, when Princes have the diſadvantage without deſerving to be blamed. If we would juſtly blame an unſucceſsful Prince, it is not enough for us to ſay that he was unſucceſsful, we muſt add that he had but very ſmall obſtacles to encounter; and this could not be alleged againſt the King of Sweden. Moreover the maxims of policy determined him to make peace with the King of Denmark, for beſides the diſpoſition of the King of Poland, always to create troubles to the Swedes, he likewiſe ſaw the Muſcovites at variance with Sweden. King CHARLES, earneſtly ſollicited by the Great Guke to aſſiſt him againſt the enterprizes of SIGISMUND, and ſufficiently induced to it by his own intereſt, had ſent ſome good troops into Muſcovy, as I have ſaid already. Theſe troops greatly conduced to keep affairs in ballance; and if they did not obtain, as the Swedes had been made to hope, that GUSTAVUS's brother ſhould be choſen Great Duke in the room of BASIL ZUSKI, who was confined in a monaſtery, the Poles on their ſide could neither obtain the election of SIGISMUND, nor that of ULADISLAUS. The Muſcovites choſe an Emperor from among their own Princes, and at leaſt they ought to own that the aſſiſtance of Sweden had been uſeful to them, in procuring the liberty of that election. But no ſooner was the new Czar inſtalled, than he declared war againſt Sweden.

GUSTAVUS, to convince him that he had judged wrong, if he had founded his hopes on the youth of the King of Sweden, reſolved to invade Muſcovy in the year 1615. Accordingly he entered that country, immediately ſeized on ſome towns, beat the Muſcovites who durſt keep the field in his preſence, and laid ſiege to Pleſkow, a rich town, and one of the principal keys of Muſcovy. He opened the trenches with great vigour, and his batteries had already made a conſiderable breach in the walls of the town, when at the preſſing ſollicitations of the King of Great Britain, the greateſt peace-maker of the world, he raiſed the ſiege. The rigour of the ſeaſon, which was already far advanced, had not been able to make him take that reſolution; but the intreaties of King JAMES joining with this conſideration, GUSTAVUS raiſed the ſiege with a good grace, ſhewing, in oppoſition to the notions entertained by ſome people, that the greateſt generals, and thoſe who are appointed by Heaven to perform the greateſt exploits, do not take all the towns which they attack.

It muſt be added in his vindication, that he entered Muſcovy, not with the deſign of making conqueſts there, but only to oblige the Czar to make a peace. Had he aimed at conqueſt, he would not have caſt his eye on that quarter; he would have been contented to have nothing to fear from it. Thus the Ambaſſador of Great Britain, having aſſured him that the Great Duke deſired a peace, but that out of haughtineſs he would not enter upon a negotiation, while he ſaw his towns beſieged, GUSTAVUS abandoned the ſiege of Pleſkow, and wrote a handſome letter to King JAMES, wherein he did not fail to make him ſenſible of the ſacrifice which, in his conſideration, he had made to the work of peace, by raiſing the ſiege of a very conſiderable town, the taking of which appeared to him infallible. He then returned to Sweden, and held the States of Finland and Nordland, which he had ſumomned to meet on the nineteenth of January 1616.

As he was not a Prince who only ſought to be admired by his ſubjects for his valour, he made in the aſſembly a very eloquent ſpeech, and ſuch as was very proper to perſuade the people that he chiefly deſired to be loved by them, as a Prince incapable of ſacrificing their wealth and repoſe to his own glory. This was wiſely conſidered by GUSTAVUS: for we need not queſtion but there were ill deſigning perſons in the kingdom, who tacitly accuſed him of too great ambition, and ſaid that he had more regard for his own glory, than for the repoſe of his ſubjects, when he engaged in the war with Muſcovy. This was not only ſaid, but was alſo written in certain libels, which SIGISMUND, King of Poland, ſpread about in the kingdom, to ſow diſcord among the Swedes. In order to diſſipate theſe ſuſpicions, GUSTAVUS ſhewed in his ſpeech what conduct the Muſcovites had held with regard to Sweden, and from thence drew ſeveral reaſons to ſhew that they ought indiſpenſibly to undertake and purſue the war againſt them. He did not forget to warn his ſubjects againſt the artifices of SIGISMUND, and after having given a particular account of what had paſſed in Muſcovy, he concluded with a proteſtation that all his deſigns were only directed to obtain a good peace, and to ſecure the public tranquillity. This ſpeech produced the moſt deſirable effect for the King of Sweden, and procured him what he had thought the moſt difficult to obtain; for the States conſented to raiſe the ſupplies which were neceſſary for carrying on the war. It would not be a hard matter to make ſubjects approve of conqueſts and battles, provided they coſt them no money. The difficulty lies in perſuading them that it is often the part of policy and œconomy to expend a great deal of money for that purpoſe, which indeed is very true.

It appeared that Gustavus had ſpoken ſincerely; for in the year 1617, a peace was actually concluded with the Emperor of Muſcovy, by the mediation of England and Holland, and would have been concluded ſooner, had it not been obſtructed by the long preliminaries which were neceſſary in order to examine the full powers of the Ambaſſadors, and to agree on titles and dignities, which it is not an eaſy matter to regulate with the Ambaſſadors of the Great Duke; and generally the moſt important part of their embaſſy is over, when the affair of precedence and titles is terminated. By this peace the whole province of Ingria, which is very conſiderable, was yielded to Sweden.

After this peace, King Gustavus made ſeveral eſtabliſhments in domeſtic affairs, for the interior felicity of the kingdom: this is never more neceſſary than in the reign of a conquering Prince, becauſe it generally happens that a kingdom which acquires great glory abroad, is exhauſted and miſerable at home. He made uſeful regulations for the holding of the States, eſtabliſhed a council for maritime affairs, a Chancery, a court of Exchequer, and beſides, a chamber of Commerce, with ſeveral good ſtatutes concerning Merchants, whether Swedes, or foreigners.

But as it was not enough to provide for domeſtic affairs only, Gustavus did not forget what kind of a man his couſin the King of Poland was. He did not forget that Sigismund was a Prince who left nothing unattempted to recover the crown of Sweden, and had his emiſſaries in that kingdom, who diſperſed libels againſt the preſent government, and endeavoured to ſeduce as many people as they could from their allegiance to Gustavus. To prevent the effect of theſe ſecret practices, in the year 1614, an edict of the King had been publiſhed in the general aſſembly of the States of the kingdom, prohibiting all his ſubjects from ſtudying in the univerſities of Roman Catholics, and from travelling to the court of the King of Poland, or having any correſpondence with his courtiers or officers. Sigismund was not contented to ſeduce the Swedes by libels, but went ſo far as to ſpread about manifeſto's in Sweden, wherein he exhorted them take up arms againſt their King.

Gustavus found no better means of guarding againſt theſe indirect hoſtilities, than to attack Poland with open force. He had capacity enough to defend himſelf againſt his enemy by the weapons of the cabinet; but beſides, that theſe are not much in uſe among the northern nations, he had too great a ſoul to ſubmit to theſe artifices; and, to ſay the truth, the match had been too unequal in that reſpect, between a Lutheran Prince, and a Prince aſſiſted by the counſels of the court of Rome, who had at his ſervice as many Monks and Jeſuits as he pleaſed. Gustavus therefore very wiſely reſolved to repel Sigismund's intrigues by arms, and he had no difficulty to obtain the conſent of the States to the war with Poland.

After ſuch a reſolution had been taken, the important affair was to prevent his enemy. For this purpoſe, the King of Sweden, without loſs of time, ſent troops into Livonia, with a fleet of eighteen men of war, and ſeized Dunamond, a place which checks the town of Riga, at the mouth of the river Dwina, and defends the harbour. To this conqueſt he ſoon after added that of Pernaw and Windaw; and he might eaſily have carried his conqueſts farther, becauſe the King of Poland was at that time greatly preſſed by the Turks and Tartars: but he ſacrificed all theſe advantages to generoſity, and granted a truce for two years, which his enemy demanded of him. An example of moderation which the Swedes would have ſet off with many pompous panegyrics, had they been acquainted with the modern Rhetoric.

The moderation of Gustavus did not make him forget what he owed to the tranquillity of his dominions, and he would not gain any praiſe by this virtue, at the expence of his other qualities. When therefore he granted to Sigismund a truce, which gave him leiſure to defend himſelf againſt the Infidels, Gustavus thought himſelf obliged to join this condition with it, that during theſe two years they ſhould endeavour to put an amicable end to all the differences ſubſiſting between Sweden and Poland. This was reaſonable, for it was not to be expected that Gustavus ſhould renounce the advantages he poſſeſſed, without taking precautions againſt future evil; beſides, he granted as long a truce as could be deſired for the diſcuſſion of the differences between him and Sigismund. Two years would not perhaps have ſufficed for that diſcuſſion in the Diet of Ratiſbon, but they ought to ſuffice to the Poles; ſo that Gustavus, beſides the moderation of taking no advantage of the incurſions which the Turks and Tartars made on his enemy's frontiers, had likewiſe the generoſity not to preſcribe him too ſhort a time for the pacification of their differences. But as he was well perſuaded that Sigismund had only demanded the truce, that he might have leiſure to gather new ſtrength, and more forces, he took, with his Council and the States of the kingdom, all the neceſſary meaſures to prevent being ſurprized by that dangerous neighbour, and to begin the war as ſoon as the truce ſhould be expired.

If GUSTAVUS had valued himſelf on craftineſs, he would have concealed his deſign, and given ſeveral plauſible reaſons for all theſe warlike preparations; but his great courage would not ſuffer him to diſſemble. On the contrary, he ordered Count JAMES LA GARDIE, Governor of Eſtonia, and Great Marſhal of the kingdom, to write to the Governor of Livonia for the King of Poland, that he would not be kept eternally in ſuſpence between peace and war, and was therefore reſolved, as ſoon as the two years of the truce were expired, either to conclude with the King of Poland a perpetual and irrevocable peace, or at leaſt a truce for many years, or to attack him with all his might. Certainly this is a ſincerity which is no longer in practice; where are the Princes who give their enemies notice ſo long beforehand that they intend to declare war on them at a certain time? How many Princes do we ſee who attack their enemies while they are proteſting that they have no deſign to break the peace? They who on one hand will applaud the great candour of GUSTAVUS, will not blame him on the other for any want of prudence, when they know what great preparations he made for the war with Poland, for which he was willing that SIGISMUND ſhould alſo be prepared, ſince he gave him notice of his deſign. Theſe preparations were ſuch as manifeſted that GUSTAVUS was as great in prudence as courage. He gave full ſatisfaction to Chriſtian IV, King of Denmark, upon ſome grievances which he complained of, and had a perſonal interview with him on the borders of the two kingdoms, in order to confirm the friendſhip and good underſtanding which ſubſiſted between them, and that he might have nothing to fear from Denmark, while he ſhould make war in Poland.

As GUSTAVUS well knew the importance of naval forces in a war, he took particular care to equip a good fleet, and with ſo great ſucceſs, that he rendered it the principal hope and firmeſt ſupport of the State. He cauſed a great number of cannons to be caſt, and all ſorts of ſmall arms and warlike machines to be forged. He levied many troops, and ordered ſome officers, well ſkilled in military diſcipline, to make them perform their exerciſes regularly, to make them encamp, and in general to keep them enured to all the military functions. He was frequently preſent at all theſe exerciſes, and eſtabliſhed good order every where, to which his preſence contributed as much as his capacity.

ANNO 1620. Before he came to a rupture with Poland, he married the Princeſs ELEONORA, daughter of JOHN SIGISMUND, Elector of Brandenburg, and after the nuptials were over, he ſummoned the States of the kingdom, who took the neceſſary reſolutions for the charges of the war. They likewiſe appointed public prayers and rejoicings in memory of the Reformation, which had been introduced into the kingdom an hundred years before; ſo that this became a ſecular ſolemnity.

The truce being expired without the King of Poland's accepting the condition which had been propoſed to him, or ſhewing any inclination to a deciſive treaty of peace, 1621. GUSTAVUS began the war by making an irruption into Livonia. He ſent no Herald of Arms to SIGISMUND to declare war againſt him in form, becauſe he had plainly and publickly ſignified to him, that the very moment the truce ſhould be expired, he would attack him, if no treaty was then concluded. The Poles complained of having been attacked without any previous declaration of war, but this complaint was entirely groundleſs, ſince they had been threatened with a war two years before.

The firſt attempt which GUSTAVUS made was the ſiege of Riga, the ſtrongeſt and moſt important town in all that country. Such a conduct is not always attended with ſucceſs, and there ſeems to be ſome temerity in attacking the chief places at firſt; becauſe, if the attempt miſcarries, the General ſuffers in his reputation, or diſcourages his ſoldiers, whilſt he raiſes the courage of the enemy; whereas if he fixes on a leſs difficult ſiege, he may depend on ſucceeding, or gaining all the favourable opinions and prejudices that accompany happy beginnings. But, on the other hand, if he takes the capital, he makes all the reſt of the province tremble of courſe, and it is uſually by theſe deciſive ſtrokes that great things are brought about in a little time. GUSTAVUS having maturely weighed all the reaſons on both ſides, determined to open the campaign with the ſiege of Riga, the capital city of Livonia.

Riga is a large town, fortified with good baſtions and fraized half-moons, and has a large trade by reaſon of its ſituation, being only two leagues diſtant from the ſea, where the river Dwina, which runs through it, opens ſo commodious a harbour, that veſſels of all kinds paſs and repaſs within its encloſure. In the year 1181, it ſurrendered to STEPHEN BATTORY, King of Poland, having been formerly ſubject to the temporal juriſdiction of its own Archbiſhop. Livonia had already been almoſt wholly ſubdued by King SIGISMUND AUGUSTUS, the laſt of the JAGELLONS, who had overcome GOTHARD KETHLER, Great-Maſter of the Teutonic order in Livonia, and had obliged the Livonians to take an oath of allegiance to him, and acknowledge themſelves ſubjects of the crown of Poland. This SIGISMUND AUGUSTUS likewiſe forced the Great-Maſter to conſent to the ſuppreſſion of his order, and to yield all his rights on Livonia to Poland. In conſideration of this, in the year 1561, he was inveſted for himſelf and his deſcendants with the duchy of Courland and Semigalia. It was an eaſy matter to ſubdue Livonia; for the Great-Maſter, the knights of his order, and moſt of the eccleſiaſtics, having embraced the Lutheran religion, met with nothing but rebellion and diſobedience among their ſubjects; which formed ſeveral parties in that province. William of Brandenburg, brother of Albert, Duke of Pruſſia, nephew of the King of Poland, and Archbiſhop of Riga, having died a Proteſtant much about the ſame time that the Great-Maſter Kethler made his treaty with Sigismund, Riga was erected into a Republic, and Sigismund ſeized on the reſt of the dioceſe: but it afterwards ſurrendered to Poland, in the reign of King Stephen Battory, that it might enjoy the ſame privileges with Dantzic, and ſecure to itſelf a powerful protection. This is a ſhort account of the revolution which brought the town of Riga under the Poles, who poſſeſſed that place when Gustavus laid ſiege to it in the year 1621.

His fleet met with ſuch a violent ſtorm near the mouth of the Dwina, that a timorous and ſuperſtitious man would have imagined that Heaven warned him not to continue in his enterprize. But Gustavus, without being aſtoniſhed at this unhappy beginning, in which ſome of his ſhips were loſt, and others were diſperſed, continued firm in his firſt reſolution, ſo that having brought together his fleet, and landed his army, which conſiſted of about twenty or twenty-five thouſand men, he encamped before the city of Riga. The principal officers who ſerved under him were Prince Charles Philip, his brother; Count James la Gardie, Great Marſhal of the kingdom; Herman Wrangel, Field-Marſhal; Gustavus Horn, John Bannier, Mansfeld, Rosencrants, Oxenstiern, illuſtrious names in the Hiſtory of that age, and two brave Scotiſh Colonels, Seaton and Ruthwen. The quarters having been marked out, and occupied by the troops that were to be poſted there, they immediately began to throw up the lines of circumvallation; and in the mean time, the Admiral Charles Gyldentrilhm, and Claudius Fleming who commanded the fleet under him, had orders to keep at ſea at the mouth of the river, to prevent any ſuccours of men or warlike ſtores from entering the town.

The inhabitants made the greater preparations for a defence, as they judged by the manner in which Gustavus went about the ſiege, that he was reſolved not to leave the place till he ſhould make himſelf maſter of it. The citadel was ſufficiently provided with a garriſon, arms, and proviſion. The town indeed had only three hundred ſoldiers to defend it; but the citizens, jealous of their liberty, and well diſciplined, ſupplied that deficiency. We may judge of the reſiſtance they made by the length of the ſiege, by the capacity and intrepid activity of Gustavus; and we may form a pretty great idea of the difficulties he met with to reduce the beſieged, if I only ſay that they did not ſurrender to Gustavus, till after a ſiege of ſix weeks. I ſhall not enter into the particulars of all the aſſaults, and all the ſallies; theſe details, which do well in a journal, and would not be diſagreeable if I was ſpeaking of the laſt ſiege of Vienna, would ſtrangely tire the reader, when they concern a town which was attacked in the year 1621. I ſhall content myſelf with ſaying that the batteries of the Swedes overturned ſeveral ſteeples, and ſeveral public buildings, and made ſeveral breaches in the baſtions, and in the walls, that the Swedes ſpared neither grenado's, nor bombs, nor mines, nor countermines, nor any of the things which the reader well enough imagines of himſelf, when he knows that a town has been well attacked, and well defended.

The intrepidity and activity of Gustavus were conſpicuous every where, nay, ſometimes appeared a little too much; for it is ſaid that he did not always remember he was a King, ſo much did he expoſe himſelf to danger, like the meaneſt ſoldier of fortune. He was far from the circumſpection of thoſe Princes, who always keep without the reach of cannon-ſhot; for at the firſt approaches, Gustavus obſerving from an eminence what places were the moſt proper for the different quarters of the army, a cannon-bullet ſtruck the very place from whence he had juſt removed. Another time ſome people were killed with a cannon-ſhot ſo near him, that his cloaths were ſtained with their blood; and a third time, a bullet pierced into his tent, and made a kind of circular motion, as if it was to ſeek the head of the King, as they ſay who find wonders in every thing. In ſhort, Gustavus was very near diſproving the obſervation of Charles V, who ſaid one day to one of his Generals, who exhorted him not to hazzard himſelf ſo much, that there never was a King killed by a cannon-ſhot.

If upon this any one ſhould imagine that Gustavus had been ſorry to take the town without reſiſtance, he would certainly be miſtaken: for by his letters he frequently exhorted the Senators and citizens to ſurrender voluntarily, and not to wait for the ſad extremities which they might apprehend. He endeavoured to intimidate them. He promiſed to grant them an advantageous capitulation, and ſurely was not well pleaſed that they paid no regard to his ſummons. I am willing to believe that this conduct proceeded, in ſome meaſure, from his finding himſelf obliged to lay waſte a fine city, by his cannons and bombs, and to deſtroy many people: yet we muſt not doubt but that he had a more prevailing motive to it; and that was the ſaving of his time and preparations, which he might have employed to better purpoſe, had he ſoon been maſter of the town and citadel of Riga. Generals are glad to perſuade the towns they beſiege, that their only motive in exhorting them to a timely ſurrender is their good-will towards the beſieged: but for the moſt part clemency is not the motive to theſe exhortations, and the beſieged likewiſe do not believe it.

Though the King of Poland was then ſtill at war with the Ottoman Porte, yet he ſent ſome troops to the relief of Riga, under the conduct of Prince CHRISTOPHER RADZWIL. They approached the lines, but finding from ſome ſlight ſkirmiſhes that nothing could be done, they quickly retired. The inhabitants were made to hope they ſhould ſoon be relieved, and this rendered them more obſtinate in rejecting any capitulation.

At laſt GUSTAVUS vexed to be ſo long in taking a town, reſolved to ſpring the mines which were ready under the walls, at the ſame time to make a general aſſault, to expoſe the town to pillage, and afterwards raze it to the foundation. But the Prince, his brother, and the other great lords of the kingdom interceding for that town, obtained of the King that the inhabitants ſhould have notice of the deſtruction which threatned them, and that ſix hours ſhould be granted them to come to their final reſolution. The magiſtrates and inhabitants having maturely conſidered the condition they were in, reſolved at laſt to ſurrender; and thus they ſaved themſelves from a terrible deſtruction which hung over their heads.

The King uſed them with a ſingular clemency, though their obſtinacy had greatly provoked him, and promiſed not only to allow them the enjoyment of their liberty, but likewiſe to augment their privileges, provided they ſhould prove as faithful to him, as they had been to the King of Poland. The Poles were not wanting to publiſh that GUSTAVUS had made himſelf maſter of the town by means of a treacherous correſpondence, the faction in the city which favoured him having raiſed a ſedition in his behalf. Thus men endeavour to comfort themſelves in their diſgraces, by leſſening the glory of the enemy who has beat them: yet as it cannot be denied but that there is very frequently ground for attributing the taking of towns to the perfidy of their governors and inhabitants, it muſt likewiſe be owned that the vanquiſhed on many occaſions have recourſe very wrongfully to that weak conſolation, and would be more equitable, if they beſtowed greater praiſe on the valour of their enemy. The taking of Riga is one of theſe occaſions.

After this important conqueſt, the King ſecured Mittau, the reſidence of the Duke of Courland; ſoon after he re-eſtabliſhed him in it on certain conditions, having concluded a truce for one year with the King of Poland. The city of Riga appeared by it's deputies in the States-General of Sweden, ſummoned to meet at Stockholm the following year, and there took an oath of loyalty and allegiance to GUSTAVUS.

The truce ſeemed only to have been agreed upon, that both ſides might have time to make great armaments. It appeared by the ſteps which SIGISMUND took, that he was reſolved to make great efforts to invade Sweden. In effect, his preparations in Pruſſia were made with this view. To prevent this irruption, GUSTAVUS diſcuſſing ſome differences he had with the King of Denmark, concerning the duties on the importation and exportation of merchandizes, demanded of him not to ſuffer SIGISMUND to levy men in Denmark, nor his ſhips to paſs the Streight. Not content with this, GUSTAVUS obtained an order in the States of the kingdom, that the war ſhould be tranſported into Pruſſia, the better to ſecure to the Swedes their commerce in the Baltic; and becauſe the duties laid in the year 1620, on cattle and ſown lands were not a ſufficient fund for the charges of the war, it was moved in the aſſembly of the ſaid States that a new duty, till then unknown in Sweden, ſhould be laid on all proviſions conſumed in the kingdom; and though this motion at firſt ſtartled moſt of the members, yet they agreed to it. It appeared that this kind of impoſt would be leſs burthenſome to the inhabitants, and would produce a greater revenue, becauſe no perſon of whatever quality or condition would be exempt from it; and the more eaſily to obtain the conſent of all the orders, a promiſe was made that as ſoon as this new duty ſhould be laid, the other extraordinary duties ſhould either be taken off, or leſſened. Theſe promiſes are very often made, but very rarely kept.

Beſides, the King by a ſolemn edict took under his protection all thoſe who ſhould be appointed to collect this duty, for it was eaſily foreſeen that they would be expoſed to the fury of the populace, or would at leaſt bring upon themſelves a volley of imprecations and abuſe. In this edict it was declared that all who ſhould uſe theſe perſons ill, either in deed or in word, ſhould be puniſhed with death, as diſturbers of the public peace, and violators of the royal edicts; and becauſe it is very often uſeful to the Prince, (that he may be ſupplied with money all at once) to farm out his taxes, and it is to be feared that the Farmers and Underfarmers ſhould ſtir up tumults among the people, the King made another edict in which he preciſely determined what the Farmer could exact without fraud, and when, and in what manner he could exact it of every perſon.

I obſerve all theſe things the better to ſhew the capacity and prudence of GUSTAVUS; for it appears that he well knew what he had to fear from the people, and what was fit to be done in order to bring them into his meaſures, and to prevent the greateſt inconveniences on both ſides. It is in vain to murmur; a kingdom cannot poſſibly preſerve it's reputation abroad, and keep it's neighbours in awe, if the ſovereign has not the funds in readineſs; but for this purpoſe muſt there not be duties and exactors of

theſe

theſe duties, under the protection of the laws? It is true if we except the firſt beginnings, the public peace requires much more that laws ſhould be made againſt the exactor, to reſtrain his avarice, than laws to guard him againſt any inſult.

In the beginning of this year, King GUSTAVUS had the affliction to loſe his only brother. This loſs was the more affecting, as GUSTAVUS had no children, and thus the King of Poland ſeemed to have better pretenſions, at leaſt for a day to come. That King was a terrible pretender, and it would be hard to find a houſe which has in the ſame time produced two Kings ſo warlike as GUSTAVUS and SIGISMUND, one King of Sweden, and the other of Poland, both deſcended from the illuſtrious houſe of VASA, and firſt couſins. The misfortune was that they were on bad terms together, and this proceeded from reaſons of intereſt which rendered their differences irreconcilable. Accordingly we ſee that they never found the leaſt opportunity to treat of the foundation of their differences: all they could do, was to agree on a ceſſation of arms. But though they agreed on a ceſſation, in order the better to examine the bottom of the affair, and to commence a deciſive treaty of peace, they never came to that point; for the truce being expired, the buſineſs was either to prolong it ſtill for ſome time, or to renew the war.

The laſt of theſe two courſes was taken in year 1623. GUSTAVUS not being willing to give his enemy the advantage of making war out of his own country, embarked in a fleet of ſixty-ſix ſail which he ſtationed near Dantzic, and by this quick and bold expedition he not only prevented SIGISMUND from executing his deſign of carrying the war into Sweden, but likewiſe obliged him to demand the prolongation of the truce till the firſt of June 1625, which was granted him.

Among the pacific actions of GUSTAVUS during this ceſſation of arms, Hiſtorians make a particular mention of his liberalities to the univerſity of Upſal, to which he granted ſeveral conſiderable funds for perpetuity, even from his own patrimonial eſtate; which enabled that univerſity to maintain a great many profeſſors and neceſſitous ſtudents.

ANNO 1624.

Eight years after, he founded the univerſity of Derpt in Livonia; and this could not be forgot by Hiſtorians, who commonly, being men of letters, think it very incumbent on them to immortalize the honour which Princes do to learning by granting it their protection; and it may be ſaid that the more a Prince performs praiſe-worthy actions, the more he ought to procure the favour of the learned, becauſe it is only by the teſtimony of their books that poſterity is acquainted with the greateſt heroes. AUGUSTUS owes the greateſt part of his glory to the intereſt he had made among the learned men of his court. Nothing therefore was more politic in GUSTAVUS than to gain by his bounties the love of a famous univerſity.

It had been agreed upon between the Kings of Sweden and Poland, that if during the truce which was to continue till the firſt of June 1625, a peace was not concluded, one party could not attack the other without having declared war on him two months before that firſt of June. GUSTAVUS deſiring to obſerve this condition, diſpatched a courier to the King of Poland to acquaint him that he would attack him at the end of the truce. He diſpatched him I ſay, in the time agreed upon; but the rigour of the ſeaſon ſo much retarded his journey, that he did not finiſh it in two months before the truce was expired. The Poles loudly complained of this want of ſincerity; the Swedes excuſed themſelves by the badneſs of the roads, and complained in their turn of ſeveral things, and eſpecially of the little inclination which the King of Poland ſhewed towards a peace. The Poliſh Ambaſſadors were of opinion that all manner of hoſtilities ought to ceaſe, whilſt the accommodation of the two crowns was negotiating; but Chancellor OXENSTIERN who was at the head of the Swediſh embaſſy, ſhewed that there was ſome artifice in requiring ſuch a ceſſation, while Sweden appeared to be in ſo good a condition to make great progreſs in the war, and repreſented the loſs his his maſter would ſuffer, if he neglected ſo favourable an opportunity, and waited peaceably till his enemy's troops were reinforced. In ſhort he required that ſeveral articles ſhould be granted to him, before he would promiſe a ceſſation of hoſtilities.

The Poles giving no poſitive anſwer, but inveighing againſt the conduct of Sweden both in their ſpeeches and writings, GUSTAVUS reſolved to anſwer them with ſword in hand, and as his valour and good-fortune had acquired him a great authority in his kingdom, he obtained of the ſtates all the aſſiſtance he deſired. They augmented the tax on cattle, and laid a new duty on all milled grains, a duty which the more eaſily paſſed as the common people ſaw that it would lie heavier on the rich than the poor. Beſides all this, the States-General of the kingdom made an act for keeping a ſettled number of troops, and promiſed the King a ſum of money for the maintenance of land and ſea forces.

With ſo many good helps, GUSTAVUS, finding himſelf in a condition to make a powerful irruption into his enemy's dominions, ſet ſail for Livonia, with a fleet of ſeventy-ſix ſhips, and in a ſhort time drove the Poles from all the places which they ſtill held in that province, from the important fort of Kokenhuſen, from Felburg, Duneburg, Nidorp, and Derpt. He diſcovered the intelligence which the Poles had in the city of Riga, and totally defeated the young SAPIEHA, who with more courage than prudence, had dared to face GUSTAVUS. He paſſed the Dwina, entered Livonia, and ſiezed on Poſwol, whither the Coſſacks had retired, after having made ſome incurſions on the Swedes, and he took the ſtrong town of Birſen, where he found more than ſixty pieces of cannon. He returned through Courland and the province of Semigalia, ſeized on Mittaw, Bouſchia, and ſeveral other places, and did not forget in ſo great a train of ſucceſs, to preſs SIGISMUND to an accommodation.

This is not ſurprizing. GUSTAVUS, having a very ſolid judgment, well knew that the proper time for a Prince to make peace is the time of his enemy's ill fortune; for if he cannot entirely ruin him, he does better to ſecure his conqueſts by a good treaty, while his enemy is weak and unfortunate, than hazzard them by continuing the war, the event of which repeated experience ſhews to be very uncertain. Thus we ſee that worſted Princes generally defer an accommodation with the victor as long as they can; which ſucceeds ſometimes well, ſometimes ill, there being no fixed and certain rule of human actions.

GUSTAVUS therefore judging that he had now a favourable time of making peace, ſent ſafe-guards to the Ambaſſadors of the King of Poland, by Meſſieurs HARWITS and HORN, and by SALVIUS, Great Sub-delegate of Chancellor OXENSTIERN in the conferences of peace. But for the very ſame reaſon that GUSTAVUS deſired the renewal of the conferences, SIGISMUND deſired nothing leſs, ſo that they were obliged to turn their thoughts to the war, and GUSTAVUS, no doubt, brave as he was, ſoon reſolved upon it.

The event convinced the King of Poland that his hopes that fortune would quit GUSTAVUS, were vain. The Lithuanian troops commanded by General SAPIEHA, and reinforced with ſeveral regiments of Coſſacks, Huſſars, Heyducks, and Germans, thought themſelves ſure of the victory, if they could engage the enemy in the open field. But the Swedes defeated them in a plain of the province of Semigalia, near Walonia, and taught them to know GUSTAVUS better. Upon this occaſion GUSTAVUS ſhewed them that he was none of thoſe warriors whoſe talent is confined to one only manner of fighting, and who being fit for taking towns, are not capable of winning a field battle, or who being able to ſucceed in places full of defiles and mountains, know not how to fight in a plain and open country.

On that day he performed all the duties of an able and courageous General, and gained ſo memorable a victory, that we may juſtly wonder why Hiſtorians have not more exactly preſerved the memory of it. But perhaps the laſt campaigns of GUSTAVUS have appeared to them ſo glorious, that they have ſaved all their abilities to ſpeak worthily of them, without much minding the reſt. Count TURN who commanded the right wing, and GUSTAVUS HORN, who commanded the left, acquired great praiſe in that battle.

This new victory made no change either in the diſpoſition of GUSTAVUS towards a peace, or the repugnancy of SIGISMUND to treat with a victorious enemy; ſo that the King of Sweden reſolved to try whether by diſtreſſing him more, he could not at laſt oblige Poland to terminate the differences between the two kingdoms. It is not ſurpriſing that GUSTAVUS ſo earneſtly deſired to put an end to that quarrel; for beſides the reaſon which I have already mentioned, he loved his ſubjects, and was tenderly loved by them, and as he knew that SIGISMUND and his deſcendants would on all occaſions proteſt againſt the excluſion which the States of Sweden had given them, and thus that Poland would never want a plauſible pretence for making war againſt the Swedes, he would have been glad to extirpate the ſeeds of thoſe troubles, and to give his country peace on that quarter, as well for the preſent, as for the time to come. For this end he deſired to ſettle the pretenſions of SIGISMUND, and to fix them in ſuch a manner by a deciſive treaty, that the ſucceſſion to the crown of Sweden might certainly be known, without being continually expoſed to the viciſſitudes of fortune, and to the chance of a war between the two rivals.

In order to reduce the King of Poland to the neceſſity of entering once for all into a treaty on his pretenſions, the King of Sweden thought fit to carry the war into Pruſſia. This is the name of a very conſiderable province, ſituated between Pomerania, the Baltic ſea, Poland, Lithuania, Livonia, and Courland. It was poſſeſſed for a long time by the knights of the Teutonic order, whoſe valour and power appear in Hiſtory with luſtre. But that power fell at laſt by the two moſt general cauſes of the overthrow of human grandeur, namely by vanity and corruption of manners. The pride of that order having carried them ſo far as to aim at aggrandizing themſelves at the expence of their neighbours, created them enemies, which ruined them; and the debauchery of the knights rendered them ſo odious both to GOD and man, that the Pruſſians were glad to get rid of ſuch maſters. Accordingly when JAGELLON, Great Duke of Lithuania, and afterwards King of Poland, whom they had dared to provoke, had chaſtiſed them in a terrible manner, though they did not amend for all that, the Pruſſians ſhook off their yoke, and ſubmitted to CASIMIR III, King of Poland.

Yet the order was not aboliſhed; for the Great Maſter LEWIS OF ERTICHAUSEN having gained a victory over CASIMIR, made an agreement with him in the year 1466, by which he yielded the weſtern Pruſſia to the crown of Poland, and held the eaſtern

Pruſſia in loyalty and homage to the ſaid crown. After this manner the eaſtern Pruſſia became a fief of the crown of Poland, but becauſe the Great Maſter Albert of Brandenburg refuſed to pay the homage which he owed to King Sigismund, his uncle, the order was ſuppreſſed and converted into an hereditary duchy, dependent on the crown of Poland, with which Albert of Brandenburg was inveſted in the year 1525. This is now called Ducal Pruſſia, to diſtinguiſh it from Royal Pruſſia which belongs to Poland ſince the year 1466. The former belongs to the Electors of Brandenburg ſince the year 1611. But the Elector Frederic William *, full of life and of glory even to this day, has enjoyed the ſovereignty of it ever ſince the year 1657. I thought this little Hiſtorical digreſſion would not be diſagreeable to the reader.

From what I have juſt ſaid it appears, that when the King of Sweden went into Pruſſia, it belonged partly to Poland, and partly to the Elector of Brandenburg. Gustavus offered the latter a neutrality, and was glad that he accepted it; but for the greater precaution he demanded of him the port of Pillaw, as a pledge of his promiſe, and it was granted him. This port was very ſerviceable to Gustavus for exacting great contributions from the Dantzickers. Soon after he made himſelf maſter of Frawemberg and Braunſberg, from whence he expelled the Jeſuits, and ſent their library to the univerſity of Upſal; but it was not a compenſation to the Proteſtants for the library of the Elector Palatine, which had been ſent to Rome ſome years before; for there was no compariſon between theſe two libraries.

I know not whether the Jeſuits whom Gustavus had expelled from Riga in the year 1621, were ſorry to be treated in that manner by a Proteſtant Prince. As they are neither ſaid to be very humble, nor very diſintereſted, it is probable they were not much grieved to be uſed with that diſtinction, and to have ſo fine a pretence of glorying that it is to them chiefly the Heretics bear an ill will. It is certain they turn every thing to their own advantage, and ſo magnify their loſſes, repreſenting themſelves to the world as the ſole victims ſacrificed to the fury of ſectaries, that they get more wealth than they have loſt. But it is equally certain that Gustavus did not expel them through a ſpirit of perſecution; he expelled them, becauſe he had been informed that they meddled in too many affairs, and in a conquered town were obnoxious to a Prince whom they deemed an Heretic. They are therefore in the wrong to glory ſo much that the Proteſtants hate them more than the reſt of their communion. The moſt intelligent perſons of their church have been ſenſible that the true cauſe of the averſion which the Proteſtants bear them, is not a matter which they have reaſon to boaſt of. But let us return to Gustavus.

He was already one of thoſe warriors whoſe name alone ſtrikes the enemy with terror, and prevents ſtrong towns from preparing for a defence. Accordingly the report of his arrival having been ſpread throughout all Poliſh Pruſſia, in a very ſhort time Varmia, Ravenſburg, Elbing, Marienburg, Stum, Chriſtburg, Brodnitz, Wormitz, and the two iſles lying above Dantzic, between the branches of the Viſtula and the Nagpth, all fell into his hands. I am willing to believe that the abſence of Sigismund, and a ſecret jealouſy between his Generals, contributed to the ſucceſs of the King of Sweden. Notwithſtanding, it is certain that the principal glory of his ſucceſs is due to his diligence, his vigour, and the reputation he had acquired by his great exploits; his reputation going before him, aſtoniſhed his enemies, and prepared them to ſubmit: Beſides he had very good troops, and officers of conſummate experience, whom the example and glory of ſo great a King inſpired with a courage and ardour, capable of ſurmounting the greateſt difficulties.

The taking of Dantzic would have greatly augmented the glory of the King of Sweden. Nevertheleſs he did not attack that flouriſhing city, perceiving that he had neither troops, nor ſtrength enough to ſubdue it. He was contented not to have that town againſt him, and to threaten it from time to time, in order to draw the greateſt advantage from it, which he could, and to render it uſeleſs to the King of Poland. But the inhabitants proud of their riches, and full of themſelves, did not grant to Gustavus all he demanded. This obliged him to draw near them with his army, after he had paſſed the Viſtula and ſeized on Dirſchaw, which he put in a ſtate of defence. He ſignified to the Dantzickers that he expected that all their ſhips ſhould pay him a tribute; that they ſhould keep a perfect neutrality, furniſh him with proviſions for money, and ſend out of their harbour all Poliſh ſhips. They agreed to all theſe articles except the laſt; and not to irritate Gustavus by too blunt a refuſal of it, they ſent deputies to him ſeveral times, to lay before him their reaſons. By this means they carried their principal end, which was to amuſe Gustavus, and gain time, till the arrival of the King of Poland; for whom they deſigned to declare openly, as ſoon as they could do it, without putting themſelves too much in danger.

In effect, Sigismund arrived ſome time after in Pruſſia, with a conſiderable army. The loſs of ſo many towns and caſtles, and the impetuous courſe of Gustavus's victories had given him a cruel vexation, and raiſed in him an immoderate deſire of revenging himſelf. Having therefore brought together about twenty-thouſand men, he encamped at Graudentz; whereupon the Dantzickers eſpouſed his party ſo warmly, that

---

* Frederic William, Elector of Brandenburg, and firſt ſovereign Duke of Pruſſia, died on the twenty-ninth of April 1688. Therefore, as that Prince was living when Mr Bayle compoſed his *Hiſtorical Diſcourſe on the Life of Guſtavus Adolphus*, he muſt have written it before the year 1688.

they laid ſiege to Pautſke where GUSTAVUS had a garriſon, and made themſelves maſters of it; upon this likewiſe the Swedes treated them as enemies, and did them great miſchief.

After ſome attempts on Mariemburg, and the caſtle of Munden, which were very unfortunate to the Poles, SIGISMUND knowing that he ſhould loſe all his reputation, if he ſtayed longer in Pruſſia without doing any thing, decamped from Graudentz, and having paſſed the Viſtula, laid ſiege to Mew, in the ſmall province of Pomereillia. He knew GUSTAVUS too well to doubt of his coming to the relief of the beſieged. He therefore fortified himſelf upon an eminence, by which the Swedes muſt neceſſarily paſs in their way to Mew.

GUSTAVUS having drawn near that poſt, to attempt the relief of the place, was very much annoyed by the enemies cannon; but this only increaſed his deſire to force their intrenchments. Having therefore ſecured himſelf againſt the inſults of the Poles, he ordered the ground to be viewed, and underſtood that there was a ſmall by-path which led to the ſummit of the eminence. They were forced rather to climb than to walk, in order to reach it. Nevertheleſs, in a ſhort exhortation he made the ſoldiers, to ſhew them that there is nothing which courage and fidelity cannot compaſs, he ſo animated them, that they earneſtly deſired to march. Count TURN and General MUSTEN had the charge of this affair. They conducted it ſo wiſely that they gained the eminence, the ſoldiers having helped themſelves up by ſome branches of trees. They immediately killed the centinels and all they met, and were intrenching themſelves on the eminence, when they were warmly attacked by the Poliſh troops. The fight was maintained for two hours with great vigour, and the advantage was on the ſide of General MUSTEN, for he put the enemy to flight; notwithſtanding, when they returned to the charge, Count TURN retired, not to fly, but to gain a more favourable place. He was purſued, the fight began afreſh, and the Swedes boaſt of having ſlain a great number of the enemy. Was it otherwiſe, they cannot be denied the glory of having relieved the place, ſince SIGISMUND raiſed the ſiege of Mew.

Soon after he ſeemed to be diſpoſed towards an accommodation. They agreed on a place where the deputies of the two crowns ſhould confer on that important affair; but their conference came to nothing. The deputies having come out of their tents, obſerved one another for a long time; without opening their lips, or ſo much as ſaluting one another. Each of them was afraid leſt he ſhould not ſupport the honour of his maſter with a becoming gravity. Thus they were to take great care not to advance faſter than the deputies of the other party, and not begin to pay civilities. At laſt after ſeveral grave ſteps, ſeveral majeſtic looks, and a long ſilence, SCHEMUKI, one of the Poliſh Ambaſſadors, being probably tired of a countenance ſo forced, and ſo uſeleſs to the deſign which had brought them thither, opened the conference, and demanded for his maſter conditions which were abſolutely rejected. They prepared therefore for war. KONIECKSPOLSKI, a famous Poliſh General, formed an enterprize on Dirſchaw, but GUSTAVUS having thrown men and proviſions into that place, obliged him to retire with loſs. The other attempts which the King of Poland made on Mew and Mariemburg were not more ſucceſsful. Thus the campaign was very favourable to the Swedes.

To compleat his happineſs, GUSTAVUS became a father near the end of this ſame year 1626; it was indeed only of a daughter: but as the States of Sweden had already declared the daughters of the poſterity of CHARLES IX capable of ſucceeding to the crown, and as they renewed the ſame decree at this time, GUSTAVUS had no longer the grief not to ſee an heir to his kingdom. In effect, this daughter of whom the Queen of Sweden was delivered on the eighth of December 1626 ſucceeded him, and has at leaſt been as much known as GUSTAVUS, under the famous name of CHRISTINA.

What obliged the States to declare CHRISTINA heireſs of the kingdom ſoon after her birth, was that they obſerved SIGISMUND to be more proud and more inflexible, under pretence that there was no Prince in Sweden who could ſucceed GUSTAVUS. Therefore, in order to humble that pride, they thought fit to ſhew him that they had a ſucceſſor at hand, in the perſon of an infant newly born.

This was not the only reſolution which the States took at that time, in order to humble the pride of SIGISMUND; they came to ſeveral others which ought to mortify him ſtill more: for GUSTAVUS having laid before them the conditions of peace, which he had propoſed to the King of Poland, they reſolved that no better conditions ought to be offered to him, and that if he did not accept theſe, the war ought to be continued with greater vigour than ever. And the better to ſucceed in it, they promiſed the King not only the neceſſary ſupplies of money, but alſo their perſonal ſervices and their lives. In this we muſt admire the conduct and good fortune of GUSTAVUS: for whereas in ſeveral kingdoms, the aſſemblies of the States are only theatres of diſputes, where nothing is ever concluded but after a thouſand complaints, and a thouſand reproaches, the States of Sweden, meeting almoſt annually in the reign of GUSTAVUS, perfectly agreed to furniſh him with whatever he deſired, and even prevented his deſires. This is very remarkable; but it will appear more ſo, when we conſider that it was neceſſary to obtain the conſent of the deputies to the continuation, and even very often to the augmentation of the ſtate of the war, and that their buſineſs was almoſt always to provide

for

for new levies of ſoldiers, and new equipments of fleets. This good fortune muſt be attributed, 1. To the addreſs of GUSTAVUS, who perſuaded his ſubjects that he deſired nothing ſo much as an end of the war, and that all the pains he took, and all the dangers to which he expoſed himſelf, were only directed to that end, but that he had to do with an enemy who aimed at nothing leſs than invading the whole kingdom, and extirpating the Proteſtant religion out of it: 2. To the glory he had acquired; for tho' the conqueſts of a King are generally very uſeleſs to his ſubjects, and though it is indifferent to them whether their ſovereign contents himſelf with the dominions of his anceſtors, or extends them, yet they are taken with I know not what admiration mixed with love of their Prince, when he renders himſelf famous over the whole world. The *Te Deums* which they frequently hear, and the bonfires they make for the taking of towns, or gaining of battles, diſpoſe them more chearfully to contribute to the charges of the war. And as it has been very well obſerved, that though valour is not the virtue of women, yet they prefer ſoldiers to all other men, ſo it may be ſaid, that though the conqueſts of a monarch are not the affair of his people, yet they ruin themſelves with more ſatisfaction for the ſake of a warlike Prince, than for the ſake of any other.

GUSTAVUS, before he took the field, did two things which ſhew his humanity, and the care he took of his ſubjects. He publiſhed an edict in favour of thoſe who were forced to leave their country on account of their religion. He offered them a ſure retreat in his own dominions, and promiſed them a general exemption from all public duties. As theſe unhappy people were very numerous, by reaſon of the furious and tyrannical zeal with which the Emperor was wretchedly poſſeſſed, ſeveral of them took the benefit of GUSTAVUS's generoſity; and this rendered his kingdom ſtill more flouriſhing.

Beſides, he deſired the States carefully to examine the propoſal which had been laid before him, for eſtabliſhing a company to trade to the Weſt-Indies. That company was eſtabliſhed; but the ſucceſs did not anſwer the hopes which had been conceived of it. In this, however, we muſt praiſe the virtue of that great Prince, who was moved to make this new eſtabliſhment, only by the facility which he hoped from it of inſtructing the Infidels, and promoting the benefit of the whole kingdom.

In the ſpring of the following year GUSTAVUS returned to Pruſſia, being reſolved to conquer the haughtineſs of the Dantzickers. For this purpoſe he paſſed into one of the iſles of the Viſtula, where they had ſeveral forts, and attacked the principal one. He would certainly have taken it, had not a muſket-ſhot which he received in his belly, forced him to abandon that enterpriſe. This diſgrace was largely recompenſed by the advantage which the Swedes gained at Keſmarck, a fort where the Poles had a garriſon. They were diſlodged from it, and immediately after a detachment of the Poliſh army, which came to relieve the garriſon, was defeated.

Some time after there was a ſharp engagement between the two armies at Dirſchaw, where the Swedes were encamped. The Poliſh infantry having attacked them, were ſo warmly received by GUSTAVUS's cavalry, that they would have been cut to pieces, had not the cavalry of the King of Poland come to their aſſiſtance. The Poles being ſuperior in number could not be repulſed but with difficulty; yet they were repulſed, and had not GUSTAVUS been dangerouſly wounded with a fauconet-ſhot, while he was viewing from an eminence the King of Poland's camp, it is very probable that the Swedes would either have cut the Poles to pieces, or put them to flight.

On this occaſion the principal officers of the army, having Chancellor OXENSTIERN at their head, made a moſt humble remonſtrance to the King, intreating his majeſty to have more care of his perſon than he had hitherto had. They repreſented to him that his life was abſolutely neceſſary for the good of the whole kingdom, and therefore that he ought to preſerve it with the ſame care as he did the welfare of his ſubjects, for whom he had ſo great a tenderneſs. GUSTAVUS anſwered that he was ſenſible of this mark of their affection; but told them at the ſame time that he did not believe himſelf to be ſo neceſſary to his kingdom as they repreſented, and was perſuaded that after his death, the providence of God would diſplay itſelf for Sweden in the ſame manner as it had hitherto done, 'God hath committed this charge to me, continued he, neither fear 'nor ſloth muſt make me neglect it; and what can happen more glorious to me than 'to loſe my life in fighting for the glory of God, and the good of my ſubjects?' The event has but too well ſhewn that the remonſtrance made leſs impreſſion than the anſwer.

His courage ſupported him during the greateſt pain in ſuch a manner, that he then preſerved all his preſence of mind, and even his gaiety; for his Phyſician not contented to conſider the wound, but having likewiſe exhorted him to take more care of himſelf for the future, GUSTAVUS ſmiling exhorted him in his turn not to meddle in another man's profeſſion, which he expreſſed in the Latin proverb *ne ſutor ultra crepidam*. Another time his Surgeon not being able to take the muſket-balls out of a wound which they had made, *let them continue there*, ſaid he, *as an illuſtrious monument of a life which has not been ſpent in ſloth and idleneſs*, alluding, no doubt, to a ſaying of ALEXANDER the Great.

As Gustavus was the ſoul of his army, we are not to imagine that it did any thing conſiderable, while he could not act by reaſon of his wounds. The Swedes were content to obſerve the Poles, who likewiſe did nothing remarkable during the reſt of that campaign, though the Emperor had ſent them ſome auxiliary troops commanded by the Duke of Holſtein. A peace was propoſed, and there was room to hope that it would be accepted by both parties, when the Spaniſh Ambaſſador came to break all their meaſures. He had his own ends; the houſe of Auſtria began to fear Gustavus, and it was their intereſt to neglect nothing to keep him at variance with Poland. The Spaniſh Ambaſſador, guided by this principle, flattered Sigismund with a thouſand vain hopes. He promiſed him a fleet of twenty-four men of war, ten thouſand ſoldiers, and two hundred thouſand crowns in money, which, in his opinion, would render him maſter of Sweden. Sigismund was credulous enough to give into the ſnare, and reckoned that the following campaign would make him King of Sweden. He therefore would not hearken to any peace, and by this means Gustavus had another expedition to make into Pruſſia in the year 1628.

It was always his maxim to make war in the enemy's country. He therefore made haſte this year to return into Pruſſia, knowing that the Poles deſigned to carry the war into his own dominions. His thoughts were chiefly bent upon humbling the proud city of Dantzic, from whence Sigismund drew his beſt ſupplies for the war which had for ſome time continued in royal Pruſſia. With this view, before he embarked, he publiſhed an edict, wherein he declared that he would confiſcate all ſhips belonging to Dantzic, which carried contraband goods, and that, with regard to merchandiſes of another ſort, he would not ſuffer any to be brought into that city, without paying a certain duty to the ſhips which he ſhould keep at the entry of the Viſtula; this ſhews that he did not prepare to take the city, but only to humble it. Gustavus's firſt approaches were ſucceſsful; for his fleet meeting with ſeven Dantzic ſhips between the town and the mouth of the river, took three or four of them, and ſunk one. What followed did not anſwer this happy beginning, for a very ſmall number of Poliſh ſhips beat forty Swediſh. The aſſaults made on ſome forts of Dantzic were ſo vigorouſly repulſed, that the Swedes loſt a great many men, whereas the Poles recovered Potſke and Mew, without any loſs. Theſe diſgraces were ſomewhat leſſened by the ſurpriſing of one of the iſles of the Viſtula, where the Swedes got twenty braſs guns.

The Poles perceiving their advantages were not yet deciſive, endeavoured to bring on a pitched battle. For this purpoſe they encamped pretty near the Swedes, and had ſeveral ſkirmiſhes with them. Gustavus, who could not bear to be inſulted by the enemy, eſpecially when he was able to make head againſt them, finding he had twenty-four thouſand foot, two thouſand horſe, and three thouſand archers, drew up his army in battalia, to ſhew the Poles that he was as willing as they to come to a general engagement. They engaged and fought vigorouſly; but while Gustavus was bearing the efforts of the Poliſh army, and amuſing them with a part of his troops, he ſent the beſt of his horſe and foot, by a ſide-way, to attack the enemy in the rear; and by this march, well concerted and well executed, he put the Poles in diſorder, ſlew three thouſand of them, wounded Konieckpolski, the beſt of their Generals, took four of their field-pieces, fourteen colours, and returned victorious to his camp, with ſo much the more glory, as the loſs of ſeveral of his men ſhewed that the advantage had been obſtinately diſputed.

The city of Dantzic now began to be apprehenſive, becauſe after the battle it was more ſtraitened both from ſea and land. In effect, Gustavus was chiefly intent upon Dantzic, after he had gained that advantage over the Poliſh army. He ordered eight great men of war continually to cruize upon the coaſt, that nothing might enter into the town while he drew as near it as poſſible with his army. The inhabitants who deſired above all things to have the ſea open, and who were beſides very good ſeamen, were chiefly bent upon attacking theſe eight ſhips. They attacked them with ten of theirs, and after an engagement of three hours, put four of them to flight, made themſelves maſters of the admiral-ſhip, and would have alſo taken the vice-admiral, had not he who commanded it, blown it up, to deprive the enemy of the pleaſure and advantage of that capture. The Swedes loſt four hundred men, and the commander of their fleet. It is eaſy to imagine with what vexation and reſentment Gustavus was tranſported, when he ſaw that Merchants (for thus monarchs treat thoſe Republics which apply to commerce) triumphed over his ſhips, and led his Admiral into their harbour, to the view of all the citizens, and as a monument of their victory. But how could all this be helped? The beſt courſe that could be taken was unqueſtionably to ſend other ſhips in their room, inſtead of repining to no purpoſe; and this is what Gustavus did.

He ſent twelve ſhips to the mouth of the Viſtula to block up the town again on that ſide; by this means commerce began to be eſtabliſhed at Konigsberg, a town in Ducal Pruſſia, and to diminiſh in proportion at Dantzic. Theſe twelve ſhips not content to cruize, attacked the enemy's fleet upon the Viſtula, and after an engagement which laſted a whole day, they made themſelves maſters of one of the largeſt ſhips of Dantzic,

Dantzic, called *the Dutch houſe*. Yet they did not carry her off, becauſe a lighted match falling by chance into the powder-magazine, blew up the ſhip; but thereby they gained more than they loſt, for the conſternation which ſeized the enemy at the diſmal ſight of it, obliged them to fly, and their admiral-ſhip foundred on a ſand-bank, where ſhe was entirely deſtroyed by the Swediſh cannon.

In the mean time the King had occupied ſeveral poſts around the city, had, with great labour, paſſed a moraſs about three German leagues long, and built three bridges of boats to bring over his army into a foreſt, from whence he preſſed the city more cloſely; and then at laſt the inhabitants were no longer ſo proud. The magiſtrates were afraid of a ſedition among the populace, becauſe the ſtop put to commerce, and the blockade of the town, had made want ſucceed that plenty and affluence to which the Dantzickers were accuſtomed, and for this reaſon they preſſed the King of Poland to make peace with Sweden. SIGISMUND had all the motives in the world to a peace, but what might chiefly induce him to it was, that the promiſes of the Spaniſh Ambaſſador proved vain and fruitleſs; for ſo far were twenty-four men of war from coming to his aſſiſtance, that on the contrary he was obliged to ſend nine of thoſe which lay before Dantzic to WALSTEIN, who then commanded for the Emperor in the provinces near the Baltic. This was doubly prejudicial to Dantzic, 1. As it weakened the naval forces of that city: 2. As it irritated againſt them the King of Denmark; for WALSTEIN employed theſe nine ſhips to maintain the unjuſt dominion which he had uſurped in the Baltic, and to diſturb the two northern kingdoms.

CHRISTIAN IV revenged himſelf by permitting his ſubjects to ſeize all ſhips belonging to Dantzic, and all ſhips trading to that place. Notwithſtanding all this, the famous city of Dantzic was preſerved.

The rains came to its relief; the Viſtula overflowed with ſo great force, that it broke all the bridges; whereby the ſeveral quarters of the Swediſh army were deprived of communication and proviſions. The waters having ſubſided, the Swedes were obliged to leave that place, and comfort themſelves in their retreat as well as they could, by taking, with an immenſe booty, Newemburg on the Viſtula, and Straſberg on the frontiers of the kingdom.

Newemburg was re-taken ſome time after, and the covetouſneſs of the ſoldiers was the occaſion of it. As they found a great deal of booty in thoſe parts, they diſperſed and did not keep a good guard, ſo that the Poles falling upon them in a village, ſlew many of them. They who eſcaped retired into the city, and promiſed to ſurrender it, if the Poles would ſave their lives. The Poles promiſed they would, and afterwards put them to the ſword. Then GUSTAVUS, ſo much the more irritated againſt the Poles, as they had broken the law of nations, made incurſions even to the gates of of Warſaw, and overthrew whatever oppoſed him. Among the priſoners who had been made in theſe incurſions, there were ſeveral women and maids. GUSTAVUS ſtrictly ordered that they ſhould be treated with all manner of civilities, and his orders had ſo great an effect that no injury was done to their honour; this rarely happens to female priſoners of war.

GUSTAVUS had alſo twice the advantage of the enemy before he returned to Stockholm; for General WRANGEL, Governor of Elbing, being informed that the Poles were marching towards Brodnitz, in order to beſiege it, paſſed the Dwina, at a ford which was ill defended, and ſuddenly falling upon them, defeated them, and ſeized their cannon and baggage. Beſides, WRANGEL having been ordered to ſcour the country with eight thouſand men, in order to bring proviſions to the Swediſh camp, which was greatly in want of them, met, near Straſberg, a conſiderable body of Huſſars and Coſſacks, whom he was obliged to fight. He would not, perhaps, have ſucceeded, if they had agreed among themſelves; but perceiving ſome miſintelligence among them, he ſo dextrouſly improved the opportunity, not giving them time to put themſelves in order, that he took and killed a great number of them; and what was ſtill more neceſſary, he carried off a convoy of two thouſand chariots laden with proviſions. By this means plenty was reſtored to the Swediſh camp which had ſuffered very much for want of proviſions during the greateſt part of the campaign.

At this time the town of Stralſund, threatned by WALSTEIN, implored the aſſiſtance of the King of Sweden, who ſent it powder and a ſuccour of five hundred men. This action greatly provoked the Imperialiſts, and made them hold a conduct which put them at variance with GUSTAVUS. This proved a great and irreparable prejudice to the court of Vienna, as we ſhall ſee in its place.

It looks as if the houſe of Auſtria had ſome foreſight of what they were to ſuffer by GUSTAVUS, ſo much did they labour to keep him engaged in the war with Poland. We have already ſeen how the Spaniſh Ambaſſador made magnificent promiſes, in order to put off the concluſion of a peace between the Kings of Sweden and Poland. Spain had no intention to furniſh the King of Poland either with twenty-four men of war, or ten thouſand ſoldiers, or two hundred thouſand crowns in money, in order to diſpoſſeſs GUSTAVUS of his dominions. Nevertheleſs, Spain gave hopes of all this, becauſe it was of great importance to that kingdom that Poland and Sweden ſhould continue at war, and becauſe the Spaniards knew that they could more eaſily find excuſes for their want of ſincerity, than repair the miſchiefs they apprehended from Sweden. Therefore they did not ſcruple to make their Ambaſſador act according to the definition which has been given of perſons of his character, ‘ that they are men ſent abroad to ‘ lye for the good of the State.’

Spain had played its part in the year 1627: the court of Vienna played theirs in the following years, by ſending troops to Sigismund, in order to make him obſtinate in refuſing any accommodation. General Arnheim commanded theſe auxiliary troops, in the year 1629; they conſiſted of five thouſand foot and two thouſand horſe; and he had the misfortune to paſs for the cauſe of all the ill ſucceſs of Sigismund; whether he really did not act as he ought to have done for the advantage of Sigismund, or whether the latter ſeeking on whom to diſcharge his vexation (for there muſt always be ſomebody who may bear the blame) found no perſon more proper than the General of the Imperial troops. However, the campaign of this year 1629 was not ſo unſucceſsful to Sigismund, but that Gustavus ſhared with him in the caprices of fortune. For if on one ſide Herman Wrangel, Field-Marſhal, defeated Stanislaus Poloski, Caſtellan of Caminieck; the Swedes on the other ſide were forced to raiſe the ſiege of Thorn, and ſome time after there happened an engagement wherein Gustavus was made priſoner, but without being known, and in that manner he came back to his army. I am going to tell, in a few words, how the Poliſh authors relate this adventure.

They ſay that the great General Konieckpolski having attacked the Swediſh army, commanded by Gustavus in perſon, put them to flight, that Gustavus having rallied, returned to the charge, and fell into the hands of a trooper who ſeized him by the belt; that he eſcaped from this trooper by leaving with him his belt and hat, and that immediately after he was taken by another, who was going to kill him, when a German, who knew him, cried out that he was a ſervant of the Rheingrave, that upon this the trooper left him, and the German having given him a horſe, Gustavus rode all that night to Marienburg.

The Swedes ſay, that the army of the King of Poland, being re-inforced with Imperial troops, marched up to Gustavus, who prepared to receive them with his uſual intrepidity, and ordered the Rheingrave, who was nearer the enemy with a detachment of the army, not to engage; that notwithſtanding, the Rheingrave imagining he had a fair opportunity, attacked the Imperialiſts, but was forced to retire in diſorder, and with loſs; that Gustavus joined him, and obliged the Imperialiſts to retire; that after this the latter made as if they deſigned to march to the great iſle of the Viſtula, near Dantzic, that there was a ſharp engagement to hinder them, and that Gustavus, having mixed with them, was taken priſoner by a Polander, who knowing him in general to belong to the contrary party, commanded him to follow him; that Gustavus making a difficulty to obey, was upon the point of being killed, when a captain of the horſe, called Henry Soop, came up and brought the King off from this danger by killing the Polander, and that this captain was afterwards created Knight of the Order in the aſſembly of the States. What may be gathered as certain from theſe two different accounts, is, that the King of Sweden, tranſported by the heat of his courage, mixed among the enemy too far, and too ill accompanied. He was a great General, and weighed things with the greateſt ſedateneſs, but he ſometimes forgot himſelf in the action, and was not always maſter of his temper, heated with the paſſion of overcoming an enemy, who vigorouſly contended with him for victory.

The Swediſh Hiſtorians add, that from that day till the truce, there were ſeveral engagements, wherein Sigismund’s army was always worſted, and in ſome places with an irreparable loſs. But the Poliſh Hiſtorians ſay, on the contrary, that Sigismund being informed of the great advantage gained by General Konieckpolski over the Swediſh army, on the day when Gustavus ſo fortunately eſcaped, came immediately to his army, to improve that advantage, but that General Arnheim, who would not conſent to the ſiege of Marienburg, was the occaſion that all the fruit of ſo important a victory was loſt; that the King complained to Walstein of the perfidy of this General, and that Walstein recalled him, and ſubſtituted in his place, Adolphus, Duke of Holſtein, who did little ſervice, becauſe he was but little reſpected by the Germans who had ſerved under General Arnheim. Finally, that the laſt warlike exploit was performed by the Coſſacks in the iſle of Marienburg, where they defeated and killed the young Wrangel. According to this account, the Poles in that campaign ſuffered only by not improving their victory.

It would be a very difficult labour, and of a very doubtful ſucceſs, to enquire whether the Poles or the Swedes are moſt to be credited in their narratives. Let us be content to know that it is at leaſt unqueſtionable that Sigismund conſented to a truce for ſix years, tho’ the Emperor and the King of Spain diſſuaded him from it, as much as they could, and offered him great ſuccours, if he continued the war. It is equally unqueſtionable that Sigismund was a warlike Prince, and ſo paſſionately deſired to recover the kingdom of Sweden, of which he pretended that Gustavus was not the lawful poſſeſſor, that he conſented to the truce with the greateſt reluctancy. In fine, it is unqueſtionable that the truce was concluded on conditions glorious for Sweden; for it was agreed

agreed that the port of Memel in Pruſſia, Elbing, Brunſberg, Pillaw, and all the places which the King of Sweden held in Livonia, ſhould remain in his poſſeſſion, that Marienburg ſhould be depoſited in the hands of the Elector of Brandenburg, and that if a peace was not concluded, Marienburg and Dirſau, which were reſtored to Poland, ſhould return to Sweden.

The Poliſh Hiſtorians, after this, may falſify and obſcure, as much as they pleaſe, the detail of this war; they will never be able to obſcure this truth, that the glory and advantage of it remained to Gustavus, and that he was at leaſt *victor bello*, - - - *victorious in the war*, if he was not moſt frequently *victor pugna*, - - - *victorious in the battle.* The truce could hardly fail to be concluded at that time; for both parties were greatly ſollicited to it by the Ambaſſadors of France, England, and Brandenburg.

The Elector of Brandenburg had been very much embarraſſed during the courſe of this war: at firſt he ſecretly favoured Gustavus, afterwards finding Gustavus had conquered the beſt part of Pruſſia, he knew not which of his neighbours ought to have his good wiſhes, nor whether it was more his intereſt that the Swedes ſhould poſſeſs that province, or be driven out of it by Sigismund, and then his thoughts were ſo confuſed that even Gustavus doubted whether he ought to truſt him or not, and therefore told him that he gave him ſix months to reſolve upon taking one ſide, or the other. He treated ſecretly with Gustavus; but becauſe Sigismund, whoſe vaſſal he was with reſpect to Ducal Pruſſia, which was at that time a fief depending on the crown of Poland, threatened to diveſt him of it, if he did not openly embrace his party, he broke with Sweden, and ſent ſuccours to the King of Poland. To extricate himſelf from ſuch troubleſome circumſtances, it was his intereſt more than that of any other Potentate, that theſe two Princes ſhould come to an accommodation.

In the next place, the Republic of Poland was ſo weary of a war, undertaken by Sigismund only to revenge his private quarrels, and to recover a kingdom which he had loſt by too blindly following the maxims and counſels of the Jeſuits, this Republic, I ſay, was ſo weary of a war which did not concern it, and had only ſtraitened the antient boundaries of Poland, without any appearance of repairing that loſs, far from conquering a new kingdom, that their diſcontentment in this affair was now generally known. The Dantzickers in particular were ſo weary of a war which weakened their commerce, and by conſequence deprived them of their greateſt advantage, that they extremely preſſed the King of Poland to accommodate with Sweden.

In fine, we muſt not doubt but that Gustavus, however inſatiable of war he may be thought, deſired to make an accommodation with Poland, either by a peace, or a ceſſation of arms. For by that accommodation he did not loſe the hopes of gratifying his warlike inclinations. The diſorders in Germany, his own particular intereſt to leſſen the power of the Emperor, who had made himſelf formidable in the Baltic, the ſollicitations of ſeveral States, which wiſhed that the houſe of Auſtria were confined within its juſt bounds, and the deſigns of that houſe towards an univerſal monarchy, all this opened to Gustavus the largeſt field for military valour, and he only wanted to be free on the ſide of Poland, to engage in the boldeſt and moſt glorious deſign that has appeared theſe many years. The houſe of Auſtria was not ignorant of it, and for this reaſon had greatly laboured to foment the war between him and Sigismund. But the efforts of that houſe were in vain. Gustavus concluded a treaty with the King of Poland, in the year 1629, for a longer time than either of them was to live. Let us now ſee how he employed the years which followed that truce; and becauſe the better to comprehend the reaſons of his conduct, it is fit to know the ſtate of Germany at that time, let us here give a ſhort and faithful account of the enterprizes of the houſe of Auſtria on the liberty of Europe in general, and that of the Proteſtant religion in particular.

AN

Hiſtorical Diſcourſe

On the LIFE of

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS,

KING OF SWEDEN.

CHAP. II.

Of the ſituation of affairs in Germany, when GUSTAVUS entered it.

THE houſe of Auſtria owes the beginning of its glory and power to RUDOLPH, Count of Hapſburg, elected Emperor in the year 1273. The merit of RUDOLPH was ſo generally acknowledged, that the Electors of the empire, by giving him their ſuffrages, put a ſtop to all the factions and cabals which had for a long time created diviſions in Germany, and they united all parties in the approbation of their choice. He worthily maintained the dignity they had conferred on him, and ſtrenuouſly laboured to ſupport the honour of the empire, but without forgetting the particular intereſts of his own houſe. In effect, if he would not ſuffer OTTOCARUS, King of Bohemia, to ſeize on Auſtria, in prejudice of the rights of the empire, his only view in this was to beſtow that country on his own ſon.

Auſtria had been erected into a Markgraviate by the Emperor Otho I, in favour of LEOPOLD, his brother-in-law, who had worthily diſcharged the commiſſion he had received from the Emperor HENRY I, to guard that frontier againſt the incurſions of the Hungarians. It was afterwards erected into a duchy by FREDERIC BARBAROSSA, in favour of one of LEOPOLD's deſcendants; and, in fine, the laſt male of that family, Anno 1260. named FREDERIC, having periſhed in the unfortunate expedition of CONRADINE againſt CHARLES OF ANJOU, in the tragical manner which every one knows, OTTOCARUS ſeized it by virtue of his wife's pretenſions, ſhe being the heireſs of FREDERIC. RUDOLPH being arrived at the Imperial dignity, declared that OTTOCARUS had ſeized on a country, which did not belong to him, ſince it was a fief appropriated to the male heirs. But his reaſons not being perſuaſive enough, he enforced them with good troops, cut off OTTOCARUS in a battle he gained over him near Vienna, in the year 1278, and inveſted his ſon ALBERT with the duchies of Auſtria and Stiria, and the lordſhips of Carniola and Windiſmarc. Since that time the name of Hapſburg appears no longer. RUDOLPH's poſterity only took the name of Auſtria, and have rendered it very famous. They erected that fief into an archduchy, and endowed it with ſeveral ample privileges.

This houſe has furniſhed Germany with fourteen Emperors, all in an uninterrupted ſucceſſion, excepting the three firſt; and Spain with ſix Kings, if we reckon in that number PHILIP, the father of the Emperor CHARLES V. Though RUDOLPH left ſons capable of ſucceeding him, yet the Electors did not chooſe an Emperor out of his family, but out of the illuſtrious houſe of Naſſaw, which to this day is one of the moſt glorious and flouriſhing in Europe. We may eaſily imagine that ALBERT OF AUSTRIA, the ſon of the Emperor RUDOLPH, was diſpleaſed at this election, and improved every conjuncture which might ruin his rival. He had powerful friends. He raiſed a formidable faction, laboured to get him depoſed, and himſelf elected in his room; in a word, he overcame the Emperor ADOLPHUS OF NASSAW in the battle Anno 1298. of Haſenfuet near Spire. Having perceived him at the head of a ſquadron in the hotteſt part of the engagement, he ſingled him out, and killed him, and by this means ſecured to himſelf the Imperial crown. ALBERT was killed ten years after by his own nephew, leaving ſeveral children by his marriage with ELIZABETH OF CARINTHIA. This marriage united Carinthia and Tirol to the patrimony of the houſe of Auſtria, and was, as it were, the prelude to the aggrandiſement of that houſe.

FREDERIC, ALBERT's eldeſt ſon, was undoubtedly very much affected with the barbarous action of his couſin; but perhaps was ſtill more diſpleaſed that HENRY VII, of the houſe of Luxemburg was then raiſed to the Imperial throne. He comforted himſelf as well as he could, with the hopes of a favourable opportunity, which he thought he had found after the death of HENRY. For ſome of the electors choſe him 1314. Emperor. It was indeed the leaſt part of them, and conſequently his election was not regular. But he found too great an advantage in believing it valid, not to maintain that it was ſo; he knew beſides, that, provided a Prince overcomes his rival, he will not want the means to rectify the irregularity of his election: accordingly FREDERIC uſed all his endeavours to ruin LEWIS OF BAVARIA, who had been elected by the greateſt number of ſuffrages, and whoſe election was conſequently more regular. As theſe two competitors were very brave, and ſupported by many friends, their diſpute kindled a war in Germany, which laſted eight years. Whatever makes a war conſiderable, happened in this, ſeveral encounters, ſeveral towns either beſieged or taken, two battles, in the laſt of which fortune openly declared againſt FREDERIC, by making him fall into the hands of his competitor, who did not ſet him at liberty till after three years impriſonment, and after he had made him ſwear to content himſelf with the empty title of King of the Romans, without ever pretending to the empire. He kept his promiſe; though, by reaſon of the great diſputes between LEWIS OF BAVARIA, and the Pope, he was tempted to believe, that a man is not held by the promiſe which he makes in priſon; and though the Pope himſelf ſtrongly ſollicited him to come either to Avignon, or to Rome, and aſſume the Imperial dignity. After his death, which happened in the year 1330, there paſſed a century before the poſterity of RUDOLPH of Hapſburg came again to the Imperial crown: but in the year 1438, this houſe, which has been ſo greatly beholden to marriages, again recovered that crown by virtue of a marriage, and got ſo ſure a hold of it, that they have wore it ever ſince.

The houſe of Luxemburg which had loſt the empire by the death of HENRY VII, 1346. recovered it thirty three years after, by the election of CHARLES IV, grandſon of HENRY, which was made even during the life of the Emperor LEWIS OF BAVARIA, and at the inſtigation of the Pope, his mortal enemy; but CHARLES was hardly acknowledged till after the death of LEWIS; moſt of the Princes, and all the cities of the empire having judged that the thunderbolts of the court of Rome did not hinder LEWIS OF BAVARIA from being their lawful ſovereign.

WENCESLAUS and SIGISMUND, both ſons of CHARLES IV, ſwayed the Imperial ſcepter after him, the former immediately after his father, who died in the year 1378; and the latter after the death of RUPERT Count Palatine, who having ſucceed WENCESLAUS depoſed by the electors of the Empire in the year 1400, died in 1411. SIGISMUND left an only daughter; who was married to ALBERT Duke of Auſtria, and brought him the Imperial crown, with the kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary in the year 1438; for in all elective kingdoms he who marries the heireſs of the late King, is uſually preferred to all others. The reign of ALBERT was very ſhort; but in recompence FREDERIC OF AUSTRIA, his couſin, who ſucceeded him, filled the Imperial throne fifty-three years. He had the good fortune and addreſs to marry his ſon MAXIMILIAN with the richeſt heireſs in Europe, MARY OF BURGUNDY, only daughter of CHARLES THE BOLD, whoſe ambition and warlike temper are ſo well known. This marriage ſo conſiderably increaſed the power of the houſe of Auſtria, that perhaps it might have been wiſhed for the tranquillity of Chriſtendom that their power had not become greater. It might have been enough for one houſe to have annexed to it's antient partimony, and to the Imperial dignity, the provinces of the Low-Countries, ſo rich, ſo flouriſhing, and conveniently ſituated: nevertheleſs, the providence of GOD has been pleaſed to ſuffer the great power of ſome, and the jealouſy and diffidence of others to be a continual ſource of war; from whence we may conclude that the benefit of mankind requires that no Prince ſhould become too powerful.

However

However that may be, Maximilian having been elected Emperor in the year 1493, after the death of his father, married his ſon with Joan of Arragon, daughter of Ferdinand of Arragon, and Isabella of Castile, and by this means added to his houſe the great and vaſt eſtates which Ferdinand poſſeſſed, both in the new and the old world. The marriage of Ferdinand with Isabella of Castile brought him great advantages, both becauſe ſhe was heireſs of ſeveral great kingdoms, and becauſe ſhe was capable to ſecond her huſband in his great deſigns. To the kingdom of his fathers, and to thoſe of his wife, he added Granada, and Navarre, Naples, and Sicily, and all the countries diſcovered in the new world.

One could hardly have imagined that this great ſucceſſion concerned the houſe of Auſtria; for beſides that Ferdinand had a ſon, whom he took great care to marry betimes with the daughter of Maximilian, he had only beſtowed on Philip, ſon of the ſame Maximilian, the ſecond of his four daughters: yet notwithſtanding all this, ſhe became the heireſs of Ferdinand. The Prince, her brother, dying without iſſue, the Infanta Isabella, her eldeſt ſiſter, the wife of Dom Emanuel, King of Portugal, left only one ſon, who died in his infancy. Thus the Princeſs Joan inherited all this great ſucceſſion, and transferred it to her eldeſt ſon, who under the name of Charles V has been ſo famous in Europe. Anno

Charles, born at Ghent on St Matthias's day, which fell that year on the twenty-fifth of February, had loſt his father, when the death of his grandfather by the mother's ſide opened to him the ſucceſſion of all his kingdoms. His mother indeed was ſtill living, but the diſtraction of her mind not allowing her to reign, ſhe was obliged to reſign her authority; and thus Charles reigned alone ſome time after the death of King Ferdinand. Beſides the poſſeſſion of ſo many kingdoms, he had ſoon a new acceſſion of power. The Emperor Maximilian, his grandfather, dying on the twenty-ſecond of January 1519, he came to the Imperial crown ſix months after. For this he was partly beholden to his German extraction, and the ſeeming mediocrity of his genius. Otherwiſe, it is not to be doubted but that Francis I, King of France, would have been preferred to him; but the Germans were afraid of the temper, capacity, and courage of the latter, which had appeared on ſeveral occaſions. I need not ſay that Charles now became the moſt powerful Prince in Europe; that is obvious; but after what I have hinted of the ſeeming mediocrity of his genius, I muſt add either that the Germans knew him very ill, when they believed that he was not a great man, or that his genius opened by degrees, and was formed by experience in affairs. This Prince was certainly endowed with great qualities, and to his great courage was joined much judgment, and much of that capacity which is neceſſary for the ſovereign of a vaſt empire. 1500. 1516.

As miracles rarely happen, and it muſt have been a miracle if Charles V, endowed with ſuch qualities, and poſſeſſed of ſuch great power, had not aſpired after new kingdoms, ſeveral people believed that he introduced into the houſe of Auſtria the deſign of an univerſal monarchy, a deſign which that houſe is not now accuſed of, (the accuſation would be very unjuſt) but which was formerly imputed to them. Such a project neceſſarily required that his hereditary dominions ſhould border upon the dominions of Spain, or at leaſt that it ſhould not be difficult to bring troops from Spain to Germany, and from Germany to Spain. For this end Charles, not content to have added, to the patrimony of the houſe of Burgundy, what he wanted in the ſeventeen provinces of the Low-Countries, fortified himſelf in Italy as well as he could. Knowing alſo how neceſſary it is to be aſſured of England, in order to ſubject Europe, he did not paſs by the opportunity which was preſented, of marrying his eldeſt ſon with Queen Mary, the daughter of Henry VIII. I enter not into more particular conſiderations, becauſe they would carry me too far from my ſubject.

Several circumſtances made Charles V fail in the deſign of an univerſal monarchy, ſuppoſing he entertained it; but nothing traverſed that deſign more than the diſadvantage he had to live in an age ſo ill-timed for his purpoſe, as it produced a number of great men. For whereas there have often paſſed compleat centuries, in which we cannot obſerve any Prince of a diſtinguiſhed merit; in the age when Charles lived, appeared Henry VIII, King of England, a Prince courageous and bold, who never ſuffered the balance to incline too much to one ſide; Francis I, King of France, who thwarted the houſe of Auſtria in every thing, and every where, who had the heart of a lion, and the moſt active and ſtirring genius; Soliman, Emperor of the Turks, a great conqueror, and one of the moſt formidable neighbours that ever ravaged Hungary.

I ſay nothing of ſeveral brave and prudent German Princes, who oppoſed Charles V with great reſolution and glory.

He was too great a man to ſuffer himſelf to be poſſeſſed with a ſanguinary and ſuperſtitious ſpirit, which incites Princes to perſecute religions different from their own; ſo that it is probable whatever he did, with regard to the Proteſtants, proceeded either from a deſign of engaging the Pope to be always on his ſide, or from a fear leſt the eſtabliſhment of Lutheraniſm ſhould continue to be prejudicial to him, by reaſon of the too paſſionate zeal of the Papiſts. But as ſoon as he was ſenſible that it was not

his

his intereſt to perſecute the Lutherans, like a man of great ſenſe and courge, he threw off all the complaiſance he had formerly ſhewn to the Pope, and rejected the counſels of Eccleſiaſtics, enemies to the public peace. From hence proceeded the treaty of Paſſaw, which gave full liberty of conſcience to all the States of the empire. Had he done this twenty years ſooner, he would have probably removed ſeveral obſtacles to the execution of his great deſign; but he was ſomewhat too late in pacifying the differences in point of religion.

Fortune had already forſaken him, and favoured HENRY II, imitating coquets (as he himſelf mournfully ſaid) with whom it is a ſtrong reaſon for preferring one man to another, that he is fifteen or twenty years younger. The diſpleaſure he had to out-live his good-fortune made him take the reſolution of leaving the world; but in ſuch a manner, as he might claim great merit by it; for he confined himſelf in the ſolitudes of a monaſtry, knowing that Eccleſiaſtics would give a fine turn to this action, and that of all the actions of his life this would be by them the moſt extolled.

CHARLES had committed one fault which he in vain endeavoured to repair; he had cauſed his brother FERDINAND to be elected King of the Romans. He conſidered, but too late, that in order to preſerve and increaſe the power of his houſe, it was highly important than all it's dominions ſhould be united in one perſon. He would therefore have been glad to revoke the election of FERDINAND, and ſubſtitute PHILIP his ſon in his room. But as FERDINAND rejected this propoſal, CHARLES beſtowing the Spaniſh monarchy on his ſon, was obliged to leave the Imperial crown to his brother; and in effect FERDINAND, who was already King of Hungary and Bohemia, obtained that crown, upon the retreat of CHARLES V.

FERDINAND refuſing to yield the empire to his nephew, raiſed a kind of miſunderſtanding which laſted for ſome time between the two branches of the houſe of Auſtria, the elder of which reigned in Spain, and the younger in Germany, as they do to this day. FERDINAND entirely embraced the principles of Toleration, which had been ſo wiſely followed by his predeceſſor in the treaty of Paſſaw. He had confirmed that treaty in the name of the Emperor his brother, in a Diet held at Augſburg in the year 1555, and three years after, he confirmed it a new, no longer as the bare deputy of his brother, but as fully inveſted with the Imperial authority.

ANNO 1564. His ſon MAXIMILIAN II, who ſucceed him, followed this noble example of moderation, and extended it even farther than his father had done, for he tolerated the exerciſe of Lutheraniſm in his own dominions, he highly deteſted the maſſacre of Paris, executed by the order of CHARLES IX, his ſon in law, and told HENRY III, as the latter paſſed through Vienna, that a Prince who tyrannizes over the conſciences of men, invades GOD's right, and often loſes the things of this world, by meddling too much with thoſe of the other.

He died in the year 1576, greatly regretted by the Proteſtants, and made room for his ſon RUDOLPH II, whoſe conduct did not degenerate from that of his late predeceſſors, while he was guided by his own judgment; for he applied himſelf to maintain the public tranquillity which Germany enjoyed ſince the treaty of Paſſaw, and imitating the moderation of his father and grand-father, he diſturbed no man in the poſſeſſion of his privileges, judging, with great truth, that it is the principal virtue of a ſovereign to content himſelf with the power he lawfully poſſeſſes. Far from treading in the ſteps of thoſe Princes, whoſe ambition diſturbs the public peace, it may be ſaid that he loved peace too much, and had not even the ambition of being maſter in his own family. This was very hurtful to Germany, becauſe diſaffected perſons abuſing the facility of RUDOLPH, found means to inſinuate themſelves into the Imperial council, and to extort from this Prince ſome attempts on the liberties of Germany, as appeared chiefly in the affair of Juliers.

1608. This honeſt Emperor ſuffered for his too great facility. His brother MATTHIAS ſo greatly abuſed it, that he forced RUDOLPH to yield to him the kingdom of Hungary, and Auſtria, and to conſent to his being crowned King of Bohemia. Theſe unnatural and violent proceedings of MATTHIAS, and the weakneſs of RUDOLPH in giving credit to the predictions of TYCHO-BRAHE', who ſtudied Aſtrology as well as Aſtronomy, ruined this unhappy Emperor. For TYCHO-BRAHE' having told him that he was threatened with ſome imminent danger from his own relations, and that he ought to be on his guard, threw him into ſo great fears that he no longer ventured to go abroad, or ſee any company; and as the conduct of MATTHIAS confirmed the aſtrological warning, the Emperor ſunk at laſt under his uneaſineſs and grief, and died on the eighteenth of January 1612, in the fifty-ninth year of his age.

Though the Proteſtants of Germany had, generally ſpeaking, ſome reaſon to complain of RUDOLPH, who had ſome times been ſurprized into bad meaſures by the emiſſaries of the court of Rome, the Proteſtants of Bohemia, in particular, thought themſelves very happy under the clemency of this Emperor. In effect, he had granted a liberty of conſcience in Bohemia, Moravia, and Sileſia; and it is indiſputable that before the war in Bohemia, the Proteſtants of that kingdom were equal with the Papiſts in every reſpect but this, that they had not a King of their religion. This equality was not an uſurped power; but aroſe from the great privileges which RUDOLPH and his ſucceſſor Matthias had granted to the Bohemians of the communion *ſub utraque*; this was the diſtinction between the Proteſtants and thoſe of the Romiſh communion.

The Emperor MATTHIAS felt the ſame jealouſy of his authority, which he had raiſed againſt that of RUDOLPH, his predeceſſor. He had no children; his two brothers, the Archduke MAXIMILIAN, Grand-Maſter of the Teutonic order, and the Archduke ALBERT, Governor of the Low-Countries, had likewiſe none. Thus the ſucceſſion lay open to the children of the Archduke CHARLES, ſon of the Emperor FERDINAND.

This juncture was favourable to the Spaniards. They had the glory of the houſe of Auſtria extremely at heart, and believed it was the intereſt of that houſe that both the branches of it ſhould be governed by the ſame maxims; and as they had a better opinion of their own politics than of thoſe of the Germans, they were perſuaded that it would be more conducive to the common glory of the houſe of Auſtria, that the court of Vienna, inſtead of governing that of Spain, ſhould on the contrary be governed by it. Accordingly they reſolved no longer to defer making themſelves neceſſary to the Imperial court. Having obſerved that an opportunity of doing this ſeaſonably offered at the approaching election of an Emperor, they intimated to FERDINAND, the eldeſt ſon of the Archduke CHARLES that he had great need of their good offices, in order to ſucceed the Emperor MATTHIAS. This he believed, and attached himſelf to them as much as they deſired; ſo that they no longer doubted but if the empire was once in their hands, they ſhould diſpoſe of it as they would.

With this view they warmly undertook the affair, and propoſed FERDINAND to MATTHIAS as a perſon whom he ought immediately to adopt. They prevailed without much difficulty on the brothers of MATTHIAS to yield all their pretenſions to FERDINAND. In ſhort, they made it ſo much their buſineſs to inveſt him ſoon with the whole authority, that this gave the Emperor great uneaſineſs. So natural it is for Princes who have no children, and ſometimes even for thoſe who have, to be uneaſy when they obſerve the attachment of the people to their apparent ſucceſſor. But notwithſtanding this jealouſy, MATTHIAS acquieſced in the reaſons of the Spaniards, with regard to the crown of Bohemia, which they wiſhed he would diſpoſe of during his life, in favour of him whom they protected. They gave him to underſtand, that the affair was not to be left to the chance of an election made during the interregnum, leſt his heir ſhould be excluded; that after his death, the States of Bohemia, pretending that the kingdom was elective, might beſtow the crown on ſome Heretic Prince, and that in ſuch a caſe the empire would unqueſtionably paſs to another houſe. MATTHIAS, affected with a fear ſo dextrouſly inſpired, cauſed FERDINAND to be declared his ſucceſſor to the kingdom of Bohemia, in the year 1617.

Beſides the Spaniards made a ſecret treaty with FERDINAND, by which King PHILIP III renounced in his favour, all his rights to the hereditary countries of the houſe of Auſtria, ſituated in Germany; in conſideration of which FERDINAND engaged to deliver Alſacia to the Spaniards.

I thought it proper to make all theſe obſervations on the conduct of the four immediate ſucceſſors of CHARLES V, in order to undeceive the generality of readers, who taking only a ſuperficial and general view of things, falſly imagine that all the complaints which have been made againſt the houſe of Auſtria, fall as well on the German branch, as on the Spaniſh. Nothing is more untrue: for the whole conductof the houſe of Auſtria in Germany, while they were not directed by the Spaniards, was thought commendable, or at leaſt tolerable; and it is certain that the Princes of the empire would never have recurred to the remedies they uſed, had they not been perſuaded that the Imperial court blindly followed the orders which came from that of Madrid, and that the Jeſuits inſpired both theſe courts with the deſign of exterminating all the ſects, by ſetting up an Inquiſition. Here we have an inſtance of the weakneſs of our reaſonings. For what was ſeemingly more rational than to ſay, that, for the greater glory of the houſe of Auſtria, it was neceſſary that the court of Vienna ſhould act in concert with Spain, where there were ſo many wiſe men inſtructed in the politics of PHILIP II? And yet this concert has been the moſt hurtful both to the Emperor and the Spaniards, becauſe people were prejudiced with a frightful idea of the Spaniſh politics, on account of all that had paſſed in the Low-Countries, of the ſhare the Spaniards had taken in the civil-wars of France, of the invaſion of Portugal, of the extraordinary efforts they had made to dethrone Queen ELIZABETH, when they equipped their invincible Armada, and on ſeveral other accounts. Whether this prejudice was juſt or unjuſt, certain it is, that people had frightful thoughts of the government of Spain, and for this reaſon the German Princes ſtirred ſo much, as ſoon as they believed the Emperor was abandoned to the conduct of that ſtrange nation. Now from theſe great emotions aroſe the violent ſtorm which fell both upon the Emperor and Spain.

For the reſt, though I have ſaid, or may ſometimes ſay in the ſequel of this diſcourſe, that Spain was accuſed of aſpiring after univerſal monarchy, yet this muſt not be taken as if I aſſerted that the accuſation was juſt. In this I act merely as an Hiſtorian, who relates common reports, without warranting the truth of them. I have therefore no reaſon to be apprehenſive of provoking the Spaniards; and was I even to declaim againſt their former ambition, I do not think they would take it amiſs. In effect, they are at this day the firſt to blame thoſe Princes who hold a conduct like that which was imputed to them about fifty or threeſcore years ago, they are the firſt to exclaim againſt ambitious Princes who aggrandiſe themſelves at the expence of their neighbours, and they wiſh that all the powers in Europe would riſe in arms againſt them. They are in the right to wiſh this; it is enough for ambitious nations to indulge themſelves in the pleaſing imagination, that it is the part of a great ſoul to aſpire after the conqueſt of a great empire. It is not fit that they ſhould alſo have the pleaſure of conquering it. That would be too much. Let them freely enjoy pleaſing imaginations, but let them meet with a vigorous oppoſition, and ſuch as juſtice requires, when they would change their imaginations into realities.

Let us return to the Archduke FERDINAND. As ſoon as the Emperor MATTHIAS had cauſed him to be declared King of Bohemia, it was no longer doubted but that he would have him elected King of the Romans, eſpecially ſince, having ſome time after gone to Hungary, he cauſed him to be declared King of Hungary at Preſburg, on the firſt of June 1618.

The thoughts that FERDINAND would become Emperor extremely alarmed ſeveral German Princes, both becauſe they ſaw that the empire would by this means be inevitably perpetuated in the ſame family, notwithſtanding the golden bull, and becauſe FERDINAND would re-unite in himſelf all the hereditary countries of the German branch. They could not conceive how they ſhould preſerve their liberty under an Emperor ſo powerful, and governed by the Spaniards. The Proteſtant Princes feared him more than all the reſt, becauſe they looked upon him as a Prince educated by the Jeſuits, and who had already improved ſo much by the leſſons they had given him at Ingolſtadt, where he had ſtudied, that as ſoon as he had ſucceded his father, he had tolerated no ſect in his dominions. Yet he had found them full of people who followed the new opinions; but by menaces and ill-uſage he had forced a part of theſe people to change their religion, and had baniſhed all the reſt, whom neither the fear of exile, nor the confiſcation of their eſtates and goods, could force to go over to the Romiſh communion. This rendered him both odious and terrible to all the Proteſtants; but on the other hand, it greatly recommended him to the three eccleſiaſtical Electors; and as he wanted no more than one vote, and was ſure of giving that of the King of Bohemia to himſelf, he had great reaſon to depend upon ſucceeding the Emperor MATTHIAS.

The more this was likely to happen, the more did ſome Princes of Germany endeavour to prevent it. But none of them took this affair ſo much to heart as FREDERIC, Elector Palatine, the ſame who was King of Bohemia ſome time after. He was a Prince of great merit, and of exalted courage; and ſurely they who ſpeak otherwiſe of him, muſt be ranked among thoſe people of a vulgar underſtanding, who, judging of things only by the ſucceſs of them, imagine becauſe he was not ſucceſsful in his enterprize, that he was not a great man. This Prince therefore took great pains to repreſent to his colleagues how neceſſary it was not to proceed to the election of a King of the Romans during the life of MATTHIAS. He told them that they would be more at liberty, in the interregnum, to transfer the Imperial crown to another houſe, and that it was neceſſary to do ſo, becauſe if they did not interrupt the ſucceſſion of the Princes of the houſe of Auſtria at that juncture, when the direct line failed, they could never entertain any hopes of interrupting it, eſpecially if FERDINAND was elected, who being ſupported by a foreign power, and a numerous family, would eſtabliſh himſelf and his poſterity for ever in the Imperial throne.

But as theſe repreſentations were inſignificant ſpeeches, unleſs there was found a Catholic Prince fit to be Emperor, (for the Proteſtants had only three votes, and four at leaſt were neceſſary) FREDERIC caſt his eye on MAXIMILIAN, Duke of Bavaria, a Prince of diſtinguiſhed merit, and went to viſit him at Munich, on purpoſe to perſuade him to accept of the Imperial crown; promiſing him the votes of the three Proteſtant Electors, which, with that of the Archbiſhop of Cologn, whom he might depend upon, as being the Duke of Bavaria's own brother, would render the election infallible. The temptation was great: nevertheleſs, MAXIMILIAN reſiſted it, either becauſe he knew himſelf too well to oppoſe ſo ſtrong a party, or becauſe the Miniſters of the Pope and the King of Spain promiſed him other advantages, in the room of an empire which he could not preſerve againſt the enemies he would raiſe by accepting it; ſo that he preferred a fortune leſs exalted, but ſolid, to one more pompous but tottering. And who knows but that he was threatened in the name of GOD with ſome horrible chaſtiſement in this world, and with hell-torments in the other, if he accepted a crown, which, in the judgment of the court of Rome, could not be taken from the houſe of Auſtria, without manifeſt danger to religion?

I have already mentioned the journey of the Emperor MATTHIAS to Hungary. I add here, that during this journey the troubles of Bohemia broke forth; the Archbiſhop of Prague, and the Abbot Bruneau, gave the firſt occaſion to them; the former by demoliſhing a church which the Proteſtants had built at Cloſtergrab; and the latter by ſhutting up another. The Emperor RUDOLPH had permitted the Proteſtants, by his

Letters-Patent, dated the ninth of July 1609, to build churches, hoſpitals, and ſchools, on their own ground in whatever juriſdiction they were ſituated, even without the permiſſion of the lord of the fief or high-juſticiary. They had peaceably enjoyed this privilege in the reign of MATTHIAS, and on a ſudden ſaw two private men, without the Emperor's order, and merely by their own authority, demoliſh and ſhut up their churches. This provoked them to the higheſt degree, not ſo much on account of theſe two churches, as becauſe they looked upon this as an omen of FERDINAND's conduct, from which they could only preſage melancholy conſequences; for ſince, without waiting for the approaching death of the good Emperor MATTHIAS, he ſignalized the beginnings of his reign by violences exceeding ſevere, they might be ſure that he would not long delay to proſcribe them, and to follow all the ſuggeſtions of the Jeſuits who led him.

Theſe fears increaſed ſome time after, by the approbation which was given in the Emperor's council to the violences of the Archbiſhop of Prague, and the Abbot Bruneau. The Proteſtants then ſaw that the old-age of MATTHIAS had delivered him a prey to his ſucceſſor; ſo that having no hopes but from the reſolution which they ſhould diſcover, they thought themſelves obliged to make FERDINAND, and the Spaniards, whoſe ſuggeſtions he followed, ſenſible that they ſhould engage in a very difficult and dangerous affair, if they undertook to annul their privileges. They thought that the more ſubmiſſive they ſhould be, the more ſhould they be trampled upon, and that they ought to render themſelves formidable by ſome bold ſtep, in order to ſtifle in their birth, the pernicious counſels which had been ſuggeſted to FERDINAND.

Accordingly they took reſolutions not only too bold, but inexcuſable on account of their violence. For not content to ſummon the States of the kingdom, in order to deliberate on the proper means of preſerving the privileges of the country, they opened theſe States on the twenty-firſt of May 1618, without any regard to the Emperor's prohibition; and two days after ſent ſeveral lords and deputies of towns to the council, in order to make their remonſtrances. Theſe diſcharged their commiſſion with an air not like that of ſupplicants. Accordingly their petition was not received in the manner which they thought the equity of their cauſe required, which provoked them ſo highly, that they threw out of the windows, as traitors to their country, Count MARTINITZ, Count NAUATA, and PHILIP FABRICIO, Secretary of State.

After ſuch a proceeding, the Bohemians found themſelves engaged a new, to break with FERDINAND, becauſe they could hope for nothing but by rendering themſelves the ſtrongeſt. Accordingly Count LA TOUR having made them ſenſible of the neceſſity they were under to repel force by force, they immediately ſent commiſſions for levying troops throughout the whole kingdom. This Count had been very ill treated by FERDINAND from a hatred to his religion; for he had baniſhed him out of Auſtria, and deprived him of his eſtate; and the Count expected no better uſage when FERDINAND ſhould come to the crown of Bohemia. This perſonal intereſt greatly prevailed on him to raiſe a general inſurrection in the kingdom, and furniſhed him with a lively and animated eloquence in the ſpeech he made to an aſſembly which he had ſummoned to meet. He repreſented to them the charms of liberty to which he invited them. Then he laid open to their view the loſs of their privileges, and ruin of their religion, which they muſt unavoidably ſuffer under a Prince governed by Spaniſh counſels, and by Monks, both equally enemies to their liberty and religion; under a Prince inſpired from his infancy with a violent hatred of Proteſtants, and who ſufficiently diſcovered what meaſures he would take hereafter, by thoſe which he had already taken in his own dominions, where the baniſhment of his ſubjects, the ruin and deſolation of families, and the confiſcation of lands and goods were the only monuments he had raiſed to his glory. He concluded with theſe memorable words. *Remember that now there is room neither for repentance, nor for pardon. We muſt no longer reaſon, nor deliberate. We only want concord and ſteddineſs. The lot is caſt. If we prove victorious, we ſhall be a juſt, free, and ſovereign people; if we are conquered, we ſhall be traitors, perjured perſons, and rebels.* He animated them to that degree, that they all reſolved on an inſurrection. They who diſapproved it, durſt not diſcover their ſentiments, for fear of being ill-uſed by the reſt: thus it commonly happens that men of a peaceable diſpoſition are carried down with the torrent of a faction.

Upon the news of this great revolution, the opinions of the court of Vienna were divided. FERDINAND's cabal were for ſeverely puniſhing the rebels. MATTHIAS, on the contrary, thought it proper to reclaim them by moderation, and by offering them new privileges. This was alſo the opinion of Cardinal GLESEL, his firſt Miniſter. The true cauſe of this opinion was not ſo much the clemency either of the Emperor, or of the Cardinal, though they were both moderate enough, as their jealouſy of the Spaniards. MATTHIAS could not ſend forces to Bohemia, without giving the command of them to FERDINAND, and that was giving it to the Spaniards, whoſe conduct diſpleaſed him, as he had ſhewn by declaring for the new Republic of Holland. Therefore the Emperor and his firſt Miniſter would have greatly wiſhed to avoid the war: but they could not prevent it, nor refuſe the command of the army to FERDINAND.

All they could do was to limit his authority, by giving him a council made up of the creatures of MATTHIAS. This diſpleaſed him ſo much that at the inſtigation of the Spaniſh Ambaſſador, without whom he did nothing, he reſolved to ruin Cardinal GLESEL, whom he believed to be the cauſe of the reſtrictions put upon his authority. In effect, after ſome complaints againſt the Cardinal's conduct, which tended to diſcredit him as a man too favourable to the Heretics, and too little concerned for the aggrandiſement of the houſe of Auſtria, he was ſeized in the antichamber of the Archduke MAXIMILIAN, and immediately carried to Inſpruch.

Very ſubmiſive excuſes were made to MATTHIAS for this proceeding: but as he loved the Cardinal, and beſides as the ſeizing of the Cardinal was a notorious contempt of his authority, all theſe ſubmiſſions did not pacify him. Whether awake or aſleep, he was heard loudly crying that his GLESEL muſt be reſtored to him. Nay it is ſaid, that, in order to revenge that affront, he was upon the point of going over to the malecontents of Bohemia. Cardinal DIETRICHSTEIN appeaſed him a little, by bringing the King of Bohemia, and the Archduke MAXIMILIAN, into his chamber, to aſk his pardon, and to proteſt that from thenceforth they would make no incroachment upon the Imperial authority. Nevertheleſs, the ſhort time he lived, he paſſed it in continual apprehenſions, feeling the judgment of GOD upon him, who permitted his couſin FERDINAND to deprive him of that authority, of which he himſelf had deprived his brother, the Emperor RUDOLPH. MATTHIAS died on the twentieth of March 1619.

The better to underſtand how the diſorders of Bohemia agitated the whole empire, it is fit to know that ever ſince the year 1608, the Proteſtants, oppreſſed in ſeveral places, and fearing leaſt their patience ſhould bring upon them new hardſhips, had laid the foundation of a particular alliance among ſeveral of them for their mutual preſervation. This was done in the aſſembly of Ahauſen, on the fourth of May 1618; but the alliance was only concluded in the aſſembly of Hall in Suabia. The following year this alliance took the name of *the Union*, and the Princes who entered into it, that of *Correſpondents*. The Elector Palatine was choſen the chief of the Union.

The Papiſts having met at Munich, made at the ſame time another alliance among themſelves, and gave it the pompous title of *the Catholic League*; they choſe for the chief of it the Duke of Bavaria, a very artful Prince, who well knew how to improve the public calamities to the advantage of his own houſe. Theſe two great parties, or if you will, theſe two great Leagues, obſerved each other, without proceeding to extremities; but at laſt the troubles of Bohemia having taken birth from an affair of religion, and the whole empire being poſſeſſed either with the fears, or the hopes that the ſucceſſor of MATTHIAS would perſecute the Proteſtants, both the Union and the League prepared for a war which appeared inevitable.

But there was this difference between the chiefs of the Union, and thoſe of the League, the latter acted with greater prudence and concord than the former, and ſignally triumphed over them. The Princes of the Union were not diligent enough in preparing for a war: they ſuffered themſelves to be amuſed with propoſals of accommodation, they gave the League time to bring together great forces, and after that, they could no longer brave it. They committed the fault which is very common in civil-wars, *viz.* that people endeavour to ſave appearances. If a party would ſave appearances, they muſt lie quiet, but if they will not lie quiet, they muſt puſh things to an extremity, without keeping any meaſures. It rarely happens but that otherwiſe they are at once both criminal and unfortunate. Let this be ſaid without any prejudice to the rights of the German Princes, who aſſert, that it was as lawful for them, with regard both to their civil and religious intereſts, to favour the cauſe of the Elector Palatine againſt FERDINAND, as it was for the King of France to favour the United-Provinces againſt the Spaniards, and for the King of Spain to favour ſometimes the League againſt the lawful heir of the crown, and ſometimes the Duke of Rohan againſt LEWIS XIII. But if they had a right to ſuccour the Proteſtants of Bohemia, who took arms againſt FERDINAND, they muſt at leaſt own that they did them very little ſervice. He who gave the moſt reputation to the arms of the Bohemians was ERNEST Count Mansfeld; who being informed of their inſurrection, when he was in Piedmont, in the ſervice of the Duke of Savoy, eagerly embraced that opportunity of ſignalizing himſelf, and offered them his ſervice with two thouſand men, whom the Duke allowed him to chooſe out of his troops, and maintained till the Count arrived in Bohemia. He was a brave man, who ſought ſuch opportunities in order to raiſe himſelf, and to ſubſiſt with ſplendor. He was natural ſon to PETER ERNEST, Count Mansfeld, Governor of the Low-Countries for the King of Spain, and had abandoned Popery, after having made ſeveral campaigns in the Emperor's ſervice. He was cordially received by the malecontents of Hungary, who honoured him with the poſt of General of the artillery, and he became, with Count LA TOUR, one of the principal ſupports of the party.

The Imperial troops, which had been ſent into Bohemia under the command of Count BUQUOI, there exerciſed unheard-of cruelties and violences; this ſtill more exaſperated the Bohemians, and determined Sileſia and Luſatia to join them. The two parties fought, they beſieged, loſt, and took towns; but it is certain, that in the beginning, the Imperialiſts had the diſadvantage, and that almoſt all the towns of the kingdom fell into the hands of the male-contents.

As for the Princes of the Union, they contented themſelves with aſſembling at Rottemburg on the Tauber, from whence they ſent deputies to his Imperial majeſty, humbly deſiring him to conſider that all the Proteſtants of Germany had a great intereſt in the affair of Bohemia, and beſeeching him to recal his troops. The affair was brought to a negotiation. The Archbiſhop of Mentz, the Elector Palatine, the Elector of Saxony, and the Duke of Bavaria were nominated to make that accommodation; but the tedious proceedings ſo common in Germany in affairs of this nature, and the death of the Emperor MATTHIAS prevented all redreſs.

As the houſe of Auſtria pretended that the kingdom of Bohemia was hereditary, whereas the States of the kingdom maintained that it was elective, MATTHIAS would not ſubmit his couſin FERDINAND to the election of the Bohemians, when he made him their King; for that had been to acknowlege the juſtice of their pretenſions. Thus FERDINAND had not obtained the crown of Bohemia by election, and conſequently, according to the Bohemians, he had no right to it. For this reaſon, being informed that FERDINAND had been invited to the election of an Emperor as King of Bohemia, they repreſented to the Electoral College that he could not aſſiſt at the Diet in that capacity. Bnt theſe remonſtrances were not regarded. He was not only preſent at the election, but was alſo choſen Emperor on the twenty-eighth of Auguſt 1619.

The Pope, the King of Spain, and the whole Popiſh party, were ſo impatient to ſee FERDINAND upon the Imperial throne, becauſe they hoped he would deſtroy the Proteſtant religion throughout the whole empire, that there was no poſſibility of deferring the Diet which was to elect a ſucceſſor to MATTHIAS. They in vain repreſented that it was neceſſary to wait till theſe diſorders were ſomewhat appeaſed. The Popiſh party took all this for an artifice, and imagined that the Proteſtant Princes required time only the better to concert on the ways of excluding the King of Bohemia. Whereupon SUICOSD Archbiſhop of Mentz, one of the principal ſupports of the Catholic League, ſummoned the Electoral Diet to meet at Francfort on the twentieth of July 1619. This function belonged to him, both as great Chancellor of the German empire, in the capacity of Archbiſhop of Mentz; and as Dean of the Electoral College. FERDINAND was elected Emperor, as I have ſaid, on the twentieth of Auguſt following, and was crowned a few days after, to wit, on the ninth of September.

Never perhaps did he find himſelf in more perplexing circumſtances than the firſt year after the death of the Emperor MATTHIAS. The death of that Emperor revived the animoſity of the Bohemians, and their diffidence increaſed, as they knew that MATTHIAS, who was more inclined to ſoften than to irritate affairs, could no longer check the reſtleſs humour of FERDINAND. In vain he made them advantageous promiſes, they were not diſpoſed to hearken to them, nor to believe that they were any thing more than Jeſuitical artifices; beſides by accepting the amneſty which he offered them, they would have acknowleged him as their lawful ſovereign; which was very inconſiſtent with their pretenſions. Moſt of the neighbouring provinces followed their example. Sileſia and Luſatia had already done it; and Moravia did it ſome time after.

The States of upper Auſtria reſolved to keep the government in their own hands, till it ſhould be decided to whom the ſucceſſion lawfully belonged, whether to FERDINAND, or to ALBERT the brother of MATTHIAS; the Lower Auſtria was ſo full of male-contents, that it would have followed this example, had not the preſence of FERDINAND hindered it from revolting. But neither could his preſence nor authority ſtop the progreſs of Count LA TOUR, who drew near the Danube, paſſed that river, ſeized on the ſuburbs of Vienna, and beſieged the city with great hopes of taking it by the correſpondence he held with ſome perſons in it. Happily for FERDINAND Count DAMPIER defeated MANSFELD, which obliged LA TOUR to retire. Though this good fortune was followed by another more conſiderable, I mean the election of FERDINAND, yet he found himſelf plunged in new diſtreſſes, for on one ſide the Bohemians created FREDERIC Elector Palatine, their King, and on the other BETHLEN GABOR, Prince of Tranſilvania, entered like a torrent into Hungary, made himſelf maſter of Caſſovia, Altenburg, Preſburg, and ſeveral other places; while the Bohemian troops commanded by Count LA TOUR marching along the borders of Auſtria, threatned the capital city, and entered Hungary, to join the Prince of Tranſilvania.

All this was more than ſufficient to diſturb a Prince of the greateſt reſolution, and it muſt be owned that FERDINAND had more merit, and poſſeſſed more great qualities, than many Hiſtorians aſcribe to him, ſince he was proof againſt ſo many attacks, and not only acted like a man who was not aſtoniſhed, but likewiſe diſſipated all theſe factions, and rendered all the enterprizes of his enemies vain and fruitleſs.

If I did not remember that I mention theſe things only by way of digreſſion, I ſhould with pleaſure ſet forth all the events which heighten the fortune of this Prince; but as I muſt ſoon return to GUSTAVUS, I ſhall ſpeak of what followed only ſo far as it is neceſſary to give my readers a diſtinct idea of the State of Germany, when the King of Sweden entered it. Yet I ſhall do it in ſuch a manner, that the brevity of my narrative may not render it too dry, and obſcure the ſeries of the events.

To have a full view of the bad poſture of the Emperor's affairs, we muſt conſider that Bohemia, Sileſia, Moravia, Luſatia, and Auſtria, had taken arms againſt him, while the Tranſylvanian BETHLEN GABOR, a Prince of great credit at the Ottoman Porte, valiant, courageous, and already maſter of the greateſt part of Hungary, haſtens with extreme eagerneſs to make new conqueſts, and is on his march to join the malecontents. Beſides, we muſt look upon the inſurrection of theſe provinces, not as one of thoſe popular commotions which have no conſiderable chief, no diſcipline, nor counſel. They were great provinces, which, after having ſhaken off his yoke, were directed by wiſe and experienced men, who correſponded with the neighbouring States. Provinces which gave the command of their troops to famous Generals, or rather provinces very conſiderable for their number and forces, which choſe for their King one of the firſt Princes of the empire, young, valiant, ſon-in-law to the King of England, and nephew to Prince MAURICE, who was eſteemed a great General, and had great power in a flouriſhing Republic, at enmity with the Spaniards. Beſides, we muſt conſider that the houſe of Auſtria appeared too powerful to ſeveral Princes of Europe; that France, its antient enemy, was not the only ſtate which deſired to preſcribe limits to its great power; and that the Elector Palatine had accepted the crown of Bohemia with the conſent of the Proteſtant Princes of Germany; which ſuppoſes that they would aſſiſt him, with all their forces, againſt an enemy whom they all feared, being induced to it both by the intereſts of their religion, and of their States.

By ſhewing all the diſtreſſes and apprehenſions of FERDINAND in the beginning of his reign, methinks I have ſolidly refuted thoſe who have cenſured the Elector Palatine. Some have called him inconſiderate, as having accepted the crown of Bohemia againſt ~~all the~~ rules of prudence; others have ſaid that he was ſimple enough to yield to the importunities of his wife, a daughter of the King of England, and for that reaſon highly diſpleaſed that ſhe did not bear the glorious title of MAJESTY. All theſe cenſurers, I ſay, are people of a vulgar underſtanding, who think nothing commendable, but what is ſucceſsful, and blame all unfortunate enterprizes. Had they any penetration, they would find that human prudence is, properly ſpeaking, the ſport of the providence of GOD, who to humble us, and to convince us that he is the ſupreme governor of all things, very frequently permits that the beſt concerted enterprizes ſhould be defeated, and that the moſt raſh and inconſiderate ſhould ſucceed.

I will not give an inſtance of the former kind in the enterprize of the Elector Palatine, for I own it muſt be ranked among thoſe of a doubtful iſſue. But I believe when all things are carefully examined it will be granted me, that there was not more to be feared than to be hoped from that enterprize; and therefore that this Prince did nothing but what a man of courage might have done, without being guilty of imprudence. So that even if it was granted that the ambition and pride of his wife contributed to determine his accepting the crown of Bohemia, his conduct would nevertheleſs be commendable, ſince it is certain, that if a Prince may, without raſhneſs, engage in an enterprize, when the probability of ſucceeding in it, is equal to that of failing, and when a crown is the prize of the former, much more may he do it at the ſollicitation of his wife, who begs of him to give her a rank equal to her birth. But in ſpite of all that can be ſaid, the world will never be perſuaded that a Prince who has loſt all his dominions for having accepted a crown, acted prudently in accepting it. He who regulates his conduct according to the appearances of future events, is not, in the opinion of the world, a wiſe man, unleſs beſides he foreſees among future events, thoſe which happen contrary to all appearances. The world ridiculouſly imagines that ſucceſsful men forſaw all thoſe caprices of fortune to which they owed their ſucceſs, and conſequently that the unſucceſsful are much to be blamed for not having foreſeen thoſe caprices which defeated their enterprizes.

It was by ſeveral events which happened contrary to all appearances, that the Elector Palatine unhappily failed in his enterprize. It was eaſy to foreſee, ſay they, that King JAMES would aſſiſt his ſon-in-law no otherwiſe than by ſome offers of mediation, by letters and Ambaſſadors. This is the only ſervice he ever did to his allies: but this is exaggerated; for it was not improbable that a father, notwithſtanding his pacific temper would make ſome efforts in favour of his children; and even if we grant that the Elector ought to have looked upon England as a country loſt to the reſt of Europe, and whoſe fortune it ſeems to be not to concern itſelf for the oppreſſion of the weakeſt, were there not Princes enough beſides, from whom, according to all appearances, he might expect aſſiſtance?

Who could have believed that the Proteſtants of Germany would have abandoned the Elector Palatine, they, who under the name of Correſpondents had engaged from the year 1609 to maintain liberty, and the Proteſtant religion in the empire? They who believed that the Emperor was an enemy to both? They, in ſhort, who having been conſulted by FREDERIC, their chief, in the aſſembly held at Rottemburg on the twelfth of September 1619, anſwered that he ought to accept the crown of Bohemia, not only as being a new dignity, but alſo as what was neceſſary for the public good of Germany, and that of their allies, and adviſed him to ſet out immediately for Bohemia? Who could have believed that France, which, in thoſe times, exclaimed ſo loudly againſt Princes that are too powerful, and ſollicited all Europe to make leagues againſt the houſe of Auſtria, would neglect ſo favourable an opportunity of weakening it? Who could have believed that France would ſide with FERDINAND, againſt thoſe who aimed at depriving him of a part of his power? Who could have believed that BETHLEN GABOR, after ſuch fortunate beginnings, after all the reputation he had acquired, and all the intereſt he had with the Turk, would be of no ſervice to the Palatine. Let us therefore ſay, that FREDERIC was deceived by a train of events ſo ſingular, that the moſt refined prudence could never have ſuſpected it. Let us not believe thoſe who pretend that the vanity of the Duke of BOUILLON, his uncle, joined with that of the Electreſs, threw him into an imprudent undertaking. They ſay, that the Duke wrote to his friends at Paris, that while the King of France was making knights at Fountainbleau, he was making Kings in Germany. He might have ſaid ſo; but as he was one of the ableſt men of his age, it is not probable that he would have adviſed his nephew to accept a crown, if he ought in prudence to have refuſed it.

Obſerve that I only ſpeak of human and political prudence: I enter not into the queſtion whether FERDINAND was the true King of Bohemia, and whether, according to the ſpirit of the Chriſtian religion, the Palatine could accept that crown to which he was elected by the States of the kingdom. That is not the matter in queſtion. The queſtion at preſent is, whether according to the maxims of an ambition, vailed over with the notion of political prudence, FREDERIC did well to accept the crown of Bohemia; and after all I ſee no great difference between a Prince who accepts a crown which has been taken from a King depoſed, and a Prince who makes war on his neighbour in order to deprive him of his dominions. But though the Palatine had many reaſons to hope for ſucceſs in his enterprize, it was nevertheleſs unfortunate; ſo true it is that the divine prudence is pleaſed to confound the wiſdom of man.

As ſoon as FREDERIC was informed that the States of Bohemia, Sileſia, Luſatia, and Moravia, had unanimouſly choſen him their King, on the twenty-ſeventh of Auguſt 1619, (the very day before FERDINAND was elected Emperor at Frankfort) he aſſembled the Princes or Correſpondents at Rottemburg, who, as we have already ſeen, adviſed him to go to Bohemia as ſoon as poſſible, and take poſſeſſion of that crown. Neither he, nor the Electreſs his wife, had any averſion to it. Accordingly the ceremony of his coronation was only deferred till the fourth of November, and that of the Princeſs till the ſeventh. On the twenty-eighth of next April, the States of the kingdom choſe his eldeſt ſon, being ſix years of age, for his ſucceſſor. The Imperialiſts were not able to keep more than two places in Bohemia. Let us now ſee by what means FERDINAND ſurmounted all theſe diſtreſſes.

Religion was his principal machine for that purpoſe. He had approved his zeal for Popery by the two methods the moſt pleaſing to the people and the clergy; namely, by a great devotion for the Virgin Mary, the ſaints, relics, and images, and by perſecuting the Proteſtants. The firſt thing he did when he ſucceeded his father was to viſit the church of Our Lady of Loretto, and there to make a ſolemn vow, that even if it ſhould coſt him his life, he would exterminate all the ſects out of Stiria, Carinthia, and Carniola. He engaged in the like vow after he was crowned King of Bohemia and Hungary; for he made a ſhort pilgrimage to an image of the Virgin Mary, which is in great reputation on the frontiers of Stiria, and there he ſolemnly promiſed to GOD to purge Bohemia, and the adjacent provinces, from the venom of Hereſy. Several years before his death he made a third vow which concerned Hungary, and wherein he promiſed to employ all imaginable means to reduce all that kingdom under the obedience of the Virgin, whom he uſed to call *Generaliſſima* in his letters, and in the orders he ſent to his Generals.

This ſignal devotion, as the Papiſts called it, or ſuperſtition, according to the Proteſtants, was both of great ſervice and of great prejudice to FERDINAND. He reaped many advantages from it for a long time, but at laſt it proved very prejudicial to the whole houſe of Auſtria, and has rather weakened than ſtrengthened the Popiſh party in Germany. If after this we ſhould wonder how his ſucceſſors came to follow his example, not only with regard to the exceſſive worſhip paid to the creatures, and the ſpirit of perſecution, but likewiſe with regard to the blind complaiſance he paid to the Monks, we ought to conſider, (and then our wonder will be over) that the Monks had the cunning to make them believe that all the bleſſings which God beſtows on the moſt auguſt houſe of Auſtria, are the rewards of its zeal for the extirpation of the Proteſtants, and that all the afflictions which GOD ſends on that houſe, proceed from its not being rigorous enough againſt the enemies of the Church. But this is a manifeſt contradiction: for if the ſeverity of the houſe of Auſtria was great enough to be rewarded by GOD, the indulgence of it could not deſerve to be chaſtiſed. But Kings and Emperors do not much regard this.

Be that as it will, it is great pity that FERDINAND was inſpired with a zeal ſo ſuperſtitious and inhuman; for it cannot be denied that he had great merit, and that he ought

ought to be ranked among the illuſtrious men of that age. If we are not to believe that he deſerved all the encomiums beſtowed on him by the Jeſuit le Morman, his confeſſor, we muſt not on the other hand give credit to all that has been ſaid in his prejudice by the Hiſtorians of the contrary party. It is reported that Bethlen Gabor ſaid, it was dangerous to make war upon Ferdinand, becauſe he was neither daunted by adverſity, nor dazzled with proſperity. After the coronation of the Palatine, Ferdinand made it appear that he was able to do ſomething more than make vows to the Virgin Mary, for he uſed a very dextrous policy.

As his greateſt apprehenſion was leſt France ſhould ſend forces to the new King of Bohemia, he ſent Count Furstemberg Ambaſſador to the French court, and ordered him to repreſent that the deſign of the Proteſtants in Germany was only to ruin the Catholic religion, and that it was hoped his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty would powerfully aſſiſt the Emperor, who was engaged in ſo holy a cauſe. But he was far from repreſenting matters in this light to the correſpondent Princes. They held a famous aſſembly at Nuremberg, a little after the coronation of Frederic, who did not fail to be preſent there. Count Hohenzollern was ſent thither by his Imperial Majeſty, and proteſted in his name, that he never had any thing ſo much at heart as the public tranquillity, the peace of religion, and of the State, and the preſervation of the laws. He ſpoke afterwards of the affairs of Bohemia, and maintained that religion was only the pretext of the revolt, and that the Emperor had no difference with the Bohemians, on that account, nor would have any. At laſt he exhorted the aſſembly to find ways of accommodation, which might reſtore peace to the empire, in ſuch a manner as might conſiſt with the honour of his Imperial Majeſty.

This was very artful; for it was imagined that Ferdinand, prompted by the Jeſuits, aimed only at the ruin of the Proteſtant religion; and yet he intimates to the Proteſtant Princes that he has no ſuch deſign, that religion is no way concerned in the troubles of Germany, and that he does not deſign to make the leaſt attempt upon the liberty of conſcience. By theſe fine proteſtations he lulled them aſleep, ſo that they abandoned the unfortunate King of Bohemia.

It is true they did not come at once to ſuch a ſtrange reſolution, for the anſwer they gave to Count Hohenzollern made him fully ſenſible that they were aware of his artifice, and deſigned to aſſiſt the Palatine; but they did not long continue in that reſolution.

The Princes of the Catholic League meeting at Wirtſburg, at the ſame time that thoſe of the Evangelical Union met at Nuremberg, they reſolved to raiſe an army which ſhould be commanded by the Duke of Bavaria. This aſſembly at Wirtſburg was very numerous. There were preſent Ambaſſadors from the Emperor, Agents from the Spaniſh King, and Deputies from the Duke of Lorrain. Ferdinand's Ambaſſadors were far from ſaying that religion was not concerned in the quarrel, they ſtrongly inſiſted on the contrary. So that one of the chief affairs which were laid before this aſſembly, was the preſervation of the Catholic religion, threatned on all ſides with utter ruin. This was as artful a conduct at leaſt as that of declaring to the Proteſtants that religion was not concerned in the quarrel, and that the Emperor had no deſign to meddle in ſo tender a point: for moſt of the members of the Catholic League being either Prelates or Abbots, when Ferdinand perſuaded them that the Proteſtants intended to deſtroy the Romiſh Church, he affected them in the moſt ſenſible manner; thus Ferdinand intereſſed them in his cauſe by all that was deareſt to them, namely, by the fear of loſing a temporal and ſpiritual empire, which brought them great revenues, and made them lead a moſt delicious life.

The correſpondent Princes, alarmed at the great levies made by the Catholic League, ſent a deputation to the Duke of Bavaria, to acquaint him of their inclination to a peace, and preſented to him a long deduction of their ſentiments and demands. The Duke anſwered; they replied; and he alſo replied in his turn. There paſſed on both ſides complaints, reproaches, juſtifications, proteſtations, and, in general, whatever is employed in the quarrels of the pen which precede, or accompany, the firſt acts of hoſtility. The reſult was that the Catholic League made prodigious armaments, and artfully amuſed the Princes of the Evangelical Union, who were content to be on their guard.

We ſhall ſoon ſee the effect of Ferdinand's embaſſy to the court of France. As to the Ambaſſadors whom he ſent to Christian IV King of Denmark, and to the Duke of Brunſwic, they obtained all that their maſter could reaſonably expect, ſince theſe Princes promiſed to keep a perfect neutrality. The Ambaſſadors whom he ſent to Italy obtained of the Pope conſiderable ſupplies of money, beſides the troops ſent by ſome Italian Princes, and two levies made in Sicily and the kingdom of Naples. Ferdinand had ſo well perſuaded the world that his cauſe was the cauſe of the Church, that we may wonder the Pope did not publiſh a cruſade againſt the Correſpondents.

I know not whether it was owing to the addreſs of this Prince, or to the ſtupidity of the court of France, that the French loudly declared for him. But at leaſt it is certain that there never was a conduct more impolitic than this. France and the houſe of Auſtria had long been upon ſuch terms, that they took all advantages of each other, and it was then only ten years ſince the death of HENRY IV, when he was ready to begin a war, the deſign of which was to reduce both the Emperor and the King of Spain to a very low condition. That war had long been deſigned, and all the neceſſary preparations had been made for it. France had alſo for a long time openly ſupported the United Provinces of the Low-Countries, which had ſhaken off the Spaniſh yoke. The Spaniards had not been wanting on their ſide, and had like to have ruined the French monarchy, in the time of the League. In ſhort, no nation in Europe had more reaſon than France to weaken the houſe of Auſtria; and yet the French neglected the fineſt opportunity of doing it, and not content to do that houſe no prejudice, they rendered a ſignal ſervice to it, ſince they were the principal cauſe of the treaty of Ulm, which diſarmed the Correſpondent Princes, and ruined the affairs of the Palatine. The French boaſt of that overſight, which was a notorious and unpardonable blunder in politics. They have ſaid that France aſſiſted the Emperor for the love of religion. People muſt ſay ſomething to juſtify their faults, and cover them, if poſſible, with the cloke of religion. But on whom would they impoſe? If Popery was the cauſe why the French would not aſſiſt the King of Bohemia, why did they favour the Dutch, why did they make a League with the King of Sweden?

What is moſt probable is, that the Emperor's Ambaſſador arrived at Paris in the reign of a favourite who had meditated the ruin of Calviniſm. It is not certainly known whether the addreſs of the Spaniards, who at that time had many creatures at the court of France, whom they retained in good pay, inſpired the Conſtable DE LUYNES with the deſign of attacking the Huguenots; or whether he derived that deſign from the hopes he conceived that by ſignalizing his miniſtry by an enterprize extremely agreeable to the Monks and the rabble, he ſhould blot out the remembrance of the low and mean arts by which he had riſen to favour. But however that may be, he it was who kindled the civil wars which raged in France under the reign of LEWIS XIII. He had already broached this deſign, when FERDINAND ſent to demand aſſiſtance from the King of France. He had obſerved that the Emperor repreſented the quarrel between him and the new King of Bohemia, as an affair in which religion was concerned, and that the Duke of BOUILLON had not defeated this artifice, when he wrote to LEWIS XIII that the Catholics enjoyed all manner of liberty in the dominions of the male-contents, and therefore that the Emperor deceived him, when he affirmed that they deſigned to ruin his religion. Upon this the Conſtable had either honeſty, or ſimplicity enough to believe that it was not fit to aſſiſt Heretics abroad, while he perſecuted them at home.

Some have ſaid that he engaged in the deſign of ruining the affairs of the Palatine, becauſe the Spaniſh Ambaſſador had promiſed that his brother ſhould be married to the heireſs of CHAULNES, who was then at the court of the Infanta. Whatever might have been the cauſe of this conduct, it is certain that by his means it was reſolved that France ſhould favour the cauſe of FERDINAND. This was adding a ſecond fault to the former, for he had done very wrong to undertake the ruin of the Huguenots. By the treaty of Ulm he ſhewed that he was entirely ignorant of the principles which had guided the French politics for many years.

This treaty of Ulm was concluded on the third of July 1620, by the Duke of ANGOULESME, Count BETHUNE and Mr de CHATEAUNEUF Ambaſſadors extraordinary from France. By this treaty it was agreed that the Catholic League might act and undertake againſt Bohemia and the provinces incorporated with that kingdom, whatever they thought proper, and that the Evangelical Union ſhould not be allowed to make any oppoſition in favour of the Bohemians and their confederates. The Princes who compoſed that Union muſt have been ſtruck with ſtupidity, for they ſigned this treaty, which was certainly one of the greateſt blows to ruin the Elector Palatine and raiſe the fortune of the Emperor.

To this may be added two others; the firſt of which was the truce concluded with BETHLEN GABOR, and the ſecond the formidable armies levied by the Emperor, and commanded by the moſt experienced Generals in Europe. As for the truce, we muſt know that the Archduke CHARLES, brother to the Emperor FERDINAND, having been driven out of his Biſhopric of Breſlaw, when Sileſia ſhook off the yoke, retired to the court of the King of Poland, his brother-in-law, and obtained his permiſſion to levy ten thouſand men, who did the Emperor great ſervice, for HOMONAI, an Hungarian Baron, headed them, entered into Upper Hungary, defeated RAGOTSKI, General of BETHLEN GABOR's army, and very much contributed to the concluding of a truce for ten months between the Emperor, and the Prince of Tranſilvania. During this truce, FERDINAND's troops, freed from a great trouble, applied wholly to reduce the provinces which had withdrawn their obedience from the Emperor. And as theſe troops were very numerous, and had that affair only to execute, it is not ſurpriſing that they ſucceeded, nor muſt we praiſe ſo much the devotion of FERDINAND, as if in this affair it had wrought miracles, for ſure any other man, without being acquainted with the Holy Virgin, or St Ignatius, might have done the like exploits, had he been in the ſame circumſtances with FERDINAND.

Beſides the army of the Catholic League, which was in Suabia, conſiſting of thirty thouſand men, at the ſame time that the Emperor publiſhed the ſentence of proſcription
On the 27th of February 1620. againſt FREDERIC; I ſay, beſides this army the command of which the Duke of Bavaria gave to TILLY, a General of great reputation, the King of Spain ſent the Emperor five thouſand horſe, and twenty thouſand foot, without reckoning the Levies which he ordered Count Ognate, his Ambaſſador at Vienna, to make for the Emperor in the States of Italy, and in Auſtria. The King of Poland ſent the Emperor five thouſand Coſſacks, and ſeveral Italian Princes furniſhed him either with money or ſoldiers. The troops commanded by Count BUQUOI in Hungary, drew near the revolted provinces, as ſoon as the truce was concluded with BETHLEN GABOR, greatly preſſed the Bohemians on the ſide of Lower Auſtria, and defeated them in ſeveral engagements. At the ſame time, HOMONAI entered Moravia and Sileſia, and ravaged theſe countries, and Count DAMPIERRE purſued the troops of Count LA TOUR as far as Bohemia.

This being the State of affairs when the Princes of the Evangelical Union promiſed by the treaty of Ulm to ſuffer thoſe of the Catholic League to do whatever they thought proper in favour of FERDINAND, and againſt the Elector Palatine, it was humanly impoſſible but that the Emperor muſt entirely ruin that unfortunate Prince who was King of Bohemia. We muſt not forget that the King of Spain ſent the Marquis SPINOLA with an army of twenty-five, or thirty thouſand men into the Palatinate, where notwithſtanding the reſiſtence of the Correſpondent Princes, he made himſelf maſter of a great many places. Nor muſt we forget that the Elector of Saxony, though a Proteſtant, took upon him to execute the Imperial Ban againſt Bohemia, and attacked Luſatia, at the ſame time that the Duke of Bavaria was marching againſt FREDERIC.

In ſuch a ſituation of affairs, this Duke could not doubt of the ruin of FREDERIC. Nevertheleſs being very politic, he judged that he muſt uſe great diligence, leſt he ſhould loſe this opportunity by ſome unexpected change. Therefore as ſoon as the treaty of Ulm was ſigned, his army advanced to Auſtria, and, laid waſte the whole country in ſuch a manner, putting the peaſants to the ſword and ſetting the houſes on fire, that the cities were terrified, and deſpairing of their ſafety, returned to their
ANNO 1620. obedience, and ſubmitted to the diſcretion of the conqueror. Afterwards the Duke of Bavaria having joined BUQUOI, they reſolved to carry the war into the heart of Bohemia, and march directly to Prague, ſince FREDERIC, truſting to the promiſes of the Tranſilvanian, whoſe truce with the Emperor would ſoon expire, refuſed to reſign his crown. They actually entered it . . . .

CRITICAL REMARKS
UPON THE
NEW EDITION
OF
MORERI'S HISTORICAL DICTIONARY,
Publiſhed in the year 1704.

WITH

A Preface and ſeveral Obſervations written by Mr BAYLE, for the uſe of the new editors of that Dictionary.

Tranſlated into Engliſh from the third edition of the Original French.

To which are added, NEW OBSERVATIONS *upon thoſe Critical Remarks, and on the edition of* Moreri *printed in the year* 1725.

Mr BAYLE's PREFACE

CONCERNING

The ſecond edition of theſe CRITICAL REMARKS.

*THERE are few books of ſuch general uſe as an Hiſtorical Dictionary. The public is ſo convinced of this, that though it was well known that Moreri's Dictionary, even after it had been ſeveral times corrected, was full of faults, yet a great many editions of it have been ſold off. It is therefore doing a good ſervice to the Republic of Letters, to contribute to the correction of this Dictionary. For this reaſon it has been thought proper to reprint here (*at Rotterdam*) the Critical Remarks which an anonymous author publiſhed at Paris upon the laſt edition of Moreri. They may be uſeful both to thoſe who have already purchaſed that edition, and ſtill more ſo to thoſe who propoſe to make further amendments in that Dictionary.*

That laſt edition of Moreri, as well as the edition of Paris 1699, were reviſed by Mr Vaultier, and are undoubtedly much better than the preceding ones; for beſides that Mr Vaultier is a man of parts, his great vivacity does not hinder him from being extremely laborious and capable of a very long and deep application. This laſt quality is abſolutely neceſſary for thoſe who correct ſuch an extenſive and defective work as is the Dictionary of Moreri; but let a man be ever ſo much endowed with it, that he alone ſhould be able to perfect this work, does not ſeem poſſible; for there are certain little pains which a great genius cannot take, they are beneath him, he does not willingly undergo the trouble of correcting any thing elſe but the faults which are the moſt diffuſed through the body of the work, and while he beſtows his chief attention upon that, is it to be thought that he will take notice of a falſe date, of a proper name ill ſpelt, and of ſeveral other minute particulars, the correcting of which muſt be left to a man who is fit for examining punctilio's, and has more patience than vivacity of genius? Thoſe who ſhall attend to this will read the remarks of the anonymous author upon the edition in 1704, without leſſening the praiſes which Mr Vaultier has ſo juſtly merited.

In the preſent edition of theſe remarks, care has been taken to correct ſeveral errors of the preſs, beſides thoſe which are pointed out in the Errata *of the Paris edition. The notes that are put in the margin ſerve to rectify, or to explain the text, or to give hints to the correctors of Moreri. It was thought proper to follow this method, in order to hinder the readers from being ſometimes miſtaken in believing that the remarks of the anonymous writer are always juſt. He is no doubt a man of better ſenſe than to take it ill, that we have preferred the intereſt of the public to that of him in particular: and as he ſeems diſpoſed to continue his remarks, which is a very commendable deſign, and may contribute much to the public advantage, it was thought that he would execute his deſign, and improve his talent with greater vigilance, and in a more beneficial way to the editors of the Hiſtorical Dictionary, if his Critical notes were ſometimes criticized upon. I ſay ſometimes, becauſe in his work there are certain things upon which we have made no obſervations though we might have animadverted upon them in a remark. For example,*

He finds fault (a) *that* in enumerating the works *of James Almain there is no notice taken of* that which concerns the Laity. The very circumſtances of the time, *adds he,* ſhould have engaged the Editor to ſpeak of it with ſome exactneſs. *This cenſure may be juſtly blamed; for the greateſt part of his readers will not underſtand it. A book* which concerns the Laity, *is ſomething ſo indeterminate that one may form a hundred different ideas of it. The* circumſtances of the time *are not indeed ſuch a general object, but they nevertheleſs include ſeveral things, and thus a reader who does not preciſely know the character of that book of Almain, will never be able to gueſs the relation it bears to the preſent times. Now as an Hiſtorical Dictionary ought to ſerve inſtead of a library to the ignorant, it ſhould be ſo contrived that the reader may find perſpicuity enough in the work itſelf to under-*

(a) *Below at the article* ALMAIN.

ſtand whatever is told in it without any other aſſiſtance. The ſame perſpicuity ſhould have appeared in the remarks of the anonymous writer, ſince they are a kind of ſupplement to Moreri, and a model for correcting him. It is therefore a fault to point out a book of Almain in a manner that is ſo obſcure to a vaſt number of readers. We may add that to conſult the conveniency of Moreri's Editors one ſhould ſave them as much trouble as it is poſſible, and give them proper directions. This is what has not been done with reſpect to the omiſſion that we find fault with concerning Almain, and it is what would have been done, if particular notice had been taken of the nature of the book, the place and time of the impreſſion, &c. I would willingly ſupply this defect if I had the neceſſary helps, but the only conjecture I can frame of our author's meaning is, that Almain wrote a book wherein he treated of the authority of the people, and of the authority of the church, and maintained that as the power of the people repreſented by the aſſembly of the States of the kingdom, is ſuperior to that of the head of the nation, that is to ſay to the power of the King, ſo the power of a council repreſenting the whole body of the Church is ſuperior to that of the Pope, notwithſtanding his primacy, and quality of head of the Church. It is certain that James Almain having learned from John Major, a Scotchman by nation, this doctrine concerning the authority of the people, defended it vigorouſly and made uſe of it as a proof of the ſuperiority of councils over the Pope. The catalogue of his books given by Dr de Launoi, (b) *contains the following words:* 'Expoſitio circa deciſiones quæſtionum Magiſtri Guillelmi Occam de poteſtate ſummi Pontificis, liberque inſcribitur de ſuprema poteſtate Eccleſiaſtica & laïca, ubi certa quædam eſt propoſitio quæ tunc ut apparuit, tolerabatur, ſed nunc tolerari deſiit. - - - - - - *An expoſition concerning the deciſions of the queſtions of Maſter William Occam touching the authority of the Pope, and the book is intituled*; Of the ſupreme power, Eccleſiaſtical and Civil, *where there is a certain propoſition, which, as it appeared then, was tolerated, but has now ceaſed to be ſo.' There have always been Divines in France who maintained the ſuperiority of the Pope over the council, and dextrouſly objected that thoſe who lay ſo great a ſtreſs upon the writings of Almain and Major for the contrary ſentiment, authorize a republican tenet altogether injurious to the majeſty of kings. This is what contributed to the ruin of the famous Dr Richer in the reign of Lewis XIII, for it was not purely out of complaiſance to the court of Rome that he was perſecuted, they prepoſſeſſed the court of France againſt him, by ſhewing that he warmly maintained the inferiority of the Pope for no other reaſon but becauſe he was ſtrongly poſſeſſed with the tenet, That the States of the kingdom are ſuperior to the King, and may dethrone, expel, ſhut up in a monaſtery, and puniſh their King in what other manner they pleaſe. They produced a theſis which he had defended in the year* 1591, that the States were indiſputably above the King, and that Henry III, had been juſtly proceeded againſt as a tyrant.

Had our author thought fit to explain what he expreſſes obſcurely, and thereby to enable the editors of Moreri, to make the article of Almain curious, methinks he would have ſaid at leaſt in general what I have juſt obſerved; but in order to render himſelf thoroughly intelligible, it would have been neceſſary for him to particularize the relation which he finds between that Doctor's book, and the circumſtances of the time, *for in France there is no debate carried on concerning the queſtion, whether the authority of the people be ſuperior to that of the King; and as to what concerns the queſtion whether councils be ſuperior to the Pope, it was ſeaſonable at Paris during the pontificate of Innocent XI, but from that time it is fallen into oblivion, and whoever ſhould attempt to revive it, would render himſelf odious. It is not therefore eaſy to know that the* circumſtances of the time *ſhould have engaged Mr Vaultier to ſpeak of Almain's book* with ſome exactneſs.

We could ſhew, by other examples, that we had reaſon to ſay, we might have made more marginal notes than we have made. Notwithſtanding we do affirm, that the critical remarks of which we here give a ſecond edition, deſerve to be read: they are ſhort and lively, and will not tire any man's patience. If we had a mind to prepoſſeſs the readers in favour of them, we would not fail to take advantage of what is ſet forth in the Kings royal licence, that they have been approved by Mr Pouchard. *This is the name of a formidable Critic who has vexed ſeveral authors in the* Journal des Savans. *The ſociety that writes this journal had a great loſs by his death: he embelliſhed this work by the wit which he diffuſed through the articles that fell to his ſhare, and which good judges readily diſtinguiſhed; and he did not poſſeſs in a leſs degree than his brethren the talent of giving a ſufficient idea of a large book in few words. This is a rare talent among the Journaliſts, ſome of whom cruelly fatigue the reader by bringing him back three or four times to the ſame book, which ſometimes happens to be a very indifferent one, and would be treated with complaiſance enough if it were but once mentioned. I think Mr Pouchard ſufficiently ridiculed them, and with more reaſon than he ridiculed ſome other books, for it muſt be confeſſed that his criticiſm was a little too ſevere. People loudly complained of it, as will appear by the following inſtance. 'If the productions of wit had been formerly cenſured in the ſame manner as they are now, the empire of learning would be a deſart, and ſeveral of thoſe whoſe firſt performances ſucceeded ill would have ceaſed to write, and would not have become the ornament of France and the admiration of all Europe, where their writings are ſpread. At this day there are ſtill to be ſeen, ſome, who began to make their appearance in the world by nothing higher than plain elegies, and who are grown to be lights of the Church. In fine the church, the bar, and ſeveral*

(b) Page 613, of the Latin Hiſtory of the College of Navarre.

‘ *ſocieties of the kingdom are full of learned men whoſe firſt performances made no great* ‘ *figure* (*c*).’

(*c*) *Mercure Galant* for the month of January 1706 pag. 226 *in the place where it ſpeaks of the death of Mr Pouchard who condemned almoſt all the productions of wit.*

What a prejudice would it not be in favour of the remarks upon the new edition of Moreri, that Mr Pouchard had allowed them to be ſolid! But as we have no mind to impoſe upon the reader, we honeſtly declare here that the approbation which is ſpoken of in the privilege, conſiſts only in this, that Mr Pouchard declares he has read them by order of the Lord Chancellor, and that he has found nothing in them which can hinder their being printed. *The meaning of this is no more than that they contain nothing againſt religion, morality, or the government.*

If it be objected to our author that he ſhould have communicated his remarks to the Paris editor, and not have publiſhed them, he may anſwer that he was willing that the Dutch editors, and the tranſlators of Moreri into Engliſh, and German ſhould reap the advantage of them: and after all, none but ſuch moroſe Critics as can ſuffer nothing to eſcape their cenſure, will find fault with him for having publiſhed his diſcoveries, and for reſolvimg to make himſelf further uſeful to the editors of the Hiſtorical Dictionary; for, as I ſaid before, it is a matter of great conſequence that a work of ſuch a nature ſhould be purged of all its defects. It is ſurpriſing that after having paſſed ſo many times under the eyes of the reviſers and correctors of the preſs, it ſhould be ſo full of groſs faults, that, for example, we ſtill find there that Poſtellus born about the year 1477, *died in the year* 1581, *aged near a hundred years* (1). *No book ſhould have been made ſooner correct than this, for it has been read by more people than moſt other books, and the moſt ignorant readers are capable of diſcovering ſome faults in it. The firſt thing they do is to look out for their native country, and the towns where they have made ſome ſtay. The miſtakes of Moreri in ſuch articles cannot eſcape them. They ſhould therefore inform the Bookſellers of theſe miſtakes, which would be a very eaſy thing, and as every reader may obſerve the falſities of this Dictionary in matters that come within his reach, it would not be difficult for him to communicate a liſt of them which might ſerve for the correction of new editions. It muſt be confeſſed that the indolence of readers has been very extraordinary, for they have almoſt all neglected to give notice of the miſtakes which they had obſerved. How is it poſſible that among ſo many people who had been at Briſac, and who knew that according to Moreri that town had a ſtone bridge upon the Rhine, there has not been one who has had the charity to tell, or cauſe the Printers or editors to be told, that it was neceſſary to correct that paſſage* (2). *I ſhould be glad that this reproach might ſerve to cure the almoſt lethargic indifference of the greateſt part of readers.*

But it would not be enough that every one ſhould furniſh a liſt of the faults he had obſerved; the labour of thoſe who take upon them ex profeſſo *to correct Moreri, would ſtill be very great. There will never be a thorough correction made, unleſs they take the pains to viſit all the ſources from whence Mr Moreri has drawn his materials. It is a troubleſome piece of work, but not ſo terrible as it appears to thoſe who conſider the multitude of authors whom he quotes at the end of ſeveral articles, for we muſt not believe that he has conſulted all theſe authors. I am certain that with regard to the Greek, and Latin Hiſtorians, he has generally conſulted only Voſſius, and that with reſpect to Eccleſiaſtical affairs and Eccleſiaſtical writers he has hardly conſulted any but Baronius, Spondanus, Godeau, and Father Labbe. To what end therefore has he quoted ſo many others? I know not, but it ſeems to me that ſuch an affectation which coſt him little, ſince he did no more than name the authors whom Voſſius &c. had cited, tends much leſs to the profit of the readers, than to perſuade them falſly that he turned over an infinite number of books. He might have contented himſelf with referring to Voſſius &c. Thoſe who had Voſſius would have known at the ſame time all the other writers mentioned at the end of Moreri's articles. I would not however adviſe the ſtriking out theſe quotations which have ſtood ſo long, but it would be neceſſary to make them all intelligible; there are ſome of them which are not ſo, becauſe they have too much abridged the names of the authors or the titles of the books. They have done worſe ſometimes, for they have disfigured both the titles of the books and the names of the authors. A book* de Venatione *which Moreri had cited, has in the Dutch editions been metamorphoſed into a book* de Veneratione. *He has expreſſed himſelf ſo ill at the end of the article* CALENTIO, *that deſigning only to quote one author he quotes two, and disfigures the name of the latter.* Cornellius Tollius, *ſays he, in Append.* Pierre Valere, de infelicit. Litterat. *This ſhould be rectified in the following manner,* Cornelius Tollius in the appendix to the treatiſe of Pierius Valerianus de infelicit. Literat (3).

---

(1) Mr Bayle takes notice hereafter of a like blunder, with regard to Mr de Sallo. See his remarks on our author's concluſion.

In the laſt edition of Moreri, printed at Paris 1725, it is ſaid that Poſtel *died on the ſixth of September* 1581 *aged ſeventy-ſix years, three months, and nine days.* This date is taken from the *Memoires de Litterature* of Mr de Sallengre, Tom. I. pag. 24. who had it from the Hiſtory of the Priory of St Martin in the fields, by Martin Marrier, a Monk and Prior Clauſtral of that monaſtery, where Poſtel was buried: *Regalis Monaſterii Sancti Martini de Campis, Pariſienſis, Ordinis Cluniacenſis Hiſtoria; Pariſiis* 1637 in 4to. NEW OBSERVATION.

(2) See hereafter the preface of the author of the *Critical Remarks.* NEW OBSERVAT.

(3) In the edition of Moreri publiſhed at Paris in the year 1712, they changed *Pierre Valere* into *Petr. Valerius:* in that of 1725, they have corrected this fault, and put *Pierius Valerianus*; but they have left the reſt as it was, ſo that they continue to cite two authors, though they deſign to quote no more than one. NEW OBSERVAT.

By

By conſulting the authors whom Moreri has made uſe of, it will be found that he has often miſtaken their meaning, that he has not choſen the moſt material circumſtances, that he has maimed a great many things; and thus by comparing the copy with the original the work might be greatly improved and perfected.

In ſome things this compariſon would not be ſufficient. Moreri with reſpect to the Low-Countries had almoſt no other guide but Lewis Guicciardin, who made a very good deſcription of them; but as great changes have happened in the towns of that country ſince the year 1587, when Lewis Guicciardin publiſhed the laſt edition of that work, there are ſeveral things which he affirmed with truth, but which cannot be affirmed now without a groſs falſhood, and nevertheleſs Moreri affirms them juſt as he had read them in Lewis Guicciardin.

For example, Guicciardin ſays that near Mechlin, or Malines, a little beyond the gate St Catherine, on the road to Antwerp, there is a very large monaſtery built almoſt like a fortreſs, in which is a houſe conſecrated to St Alexis, where above 1500 and ſometimes even 1600 nuns continually reſide, having the liberty to take care of their affairs, to go abroad, and even to marry if they pleaſe. Moreri has not failed to copy this. There is to be ſeen, *ſays he*, in the ſuburbs of *Malines (or Mechlin)* the monaſtery of St Alexis, where there are fifteen or ſixteen hundred nuns who have the liberty to go out to take the air, to make and receive viſits, and to marry when they think fit. *This paſſage of Moreri always appeared ſuſpicious to me, for as in our time ſeveral armies have encamped in the neighbourhood of Mechlin, and as many officers have paſſed and repaſſed by the ſame city, it ſeemed to me incredible that no body ſhould mention this convent of fifteen or ſixteen hundred canoneſſes, and that nevertheleſs it ſhould be one of the rarities of Mechlin. My ſuſpicions were ſtrengthened by the reflexion I made, that when armies encamp near Remiremont, or Maubeuge &c. the public almoſt conſtantly hears of the aſſiduity of the principal officers in viſiting the canoneſſes of thoſe places. But I have diſcovered at laſt that it is a long time ſince this monaſtery of St Alexis is no more in being, it was razed to the ground during the civil wars near the end of the XVIth century. Thus we ſee that in order to rectify the Hiſtorical Dictionary, as to what concerns the Low-Countries, it is not ſufficient to compare it with Guicciardin, the original which Mr Moreri followed, we muſt likewiſe conſult more modern writers* (4).

Since an occaſion has offered to take notice of a groſs error in the article of Malines, which paſſed from edition to edition till the (*d*) *firſt reviſal of Mr Vaultier* 1699, *at leaſt incluſively; I ſhall add, that part of the other errors are corrected in the Dutch editions, but that theſe are ſtill left, viz.* the inhabitants of Malines are free from all taxes on account of the good ſervices which they did to Charles the Bold, Earl of Flanders, at the ſiege of Nans upon the Rhine. *He ſhould have ſaid* Nuis, *and not* Nans, *and* Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, *and not* Earl of Flanders, *for though he was Earl of Flanders, he never bore that title. The firſt of theſe two faults has been corrected in the edition of Paris* 1699, *but not the ſecond* (5). *Neither have they corrected the name of the river which runs by Malines: it is called* Dile, *and not* Dele (6). *They have not obſerved that the Seignory of Malines is one of the ſeventeen provinces of the Low-Countries, and that the great royal council inſtituted in the year* 1473, *was not then fixed at Malines. It was ambulatory (I mean that it followed the court of the Prince) till ſuch time as Philip of Auſtria, upon his going to Spain in the year* 1503, *ſettled it at Malines* (7).

(*d*) I ſpeak thus becauſe I have not that of 1704.

The more we ſhould deſcend to particulars, the more would the readers be convinced that a thorough correction of Moreri cannot be the work of a ſingle man. Mr Vaultier alone might very well be the director-general, and the laſt reviſer of the whole, but he would ſtand in need of coadjutors, I mean people who ſhould work under him according to the different parts he ſhould aſſign them. He would eſpecially want one of thoſe ſowre, and, if you pleaſe, humourſome and fantaſtical critics, in whom the leaſt ſhadow of irregularity breeds ſtrong ſuſpicions that the author is miſtaken. Such a critic would not have had the patience to read twice the firſt lines of the article Madruce (Madruzzo) *in Moreri, without ſuſpecting that they ſerved as a kind of den to ſome wild beaſt. It would have ſhocked him at the firſt glance. Theſe lines are as follows:*

MADRUCE or LIBER (Chriſtopher) called the Cardinal of Trent, was ſon to John Gaudence Liber, Baron of Madruce. *It is not impoſſible but that one and the ſame family*

---

(4) This miſtake had paſſed into the edition of 1707; and the reviſer of that of 1712, only added that theſe nuns were called *Beguines*. In the edition of 1725 (article MALINES) it is corrected thus: *In the ſuburbs was to be ſeen the monaſtery of St Alexis, where there were 1500 or 1600 nuns called* Beguines *who had the liberty to go out, to take the air, to make and receive viſits, and to marry when they thought proper: but this monaſtery was entirely demoliſhed during the civil wars near the end of the XVIth century.* NEW OBSERVAT.

(5) This ſecond fault was ſtill in the editions of 1707 and 1712. In that of 1725, it is ſaid that the inhabitants of Malines are free from all taxes on account of the good ſervices which they did to *Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, and Earl of Flanders, at the ſiege of Nuis upon the Rhine.* NEW OBSERVAT.

(6) The edition of 1707 had ſtill *Dele:* that of 1712 ſays *Deule:* and in that of 1725 there is *Dile.* NEW OBSERVAT.

(7) In the edition of 1725 they take notice that the *great royal council, inſtituted ambulatory by Charles Duke of Burgundy, in the year 1473, was fixed at Malines in the year 1503.* They have not obſerved that *the Seignory of Malines is one of the ſeventeen provinces of the Low-Countries,* they only ſay that this Seignory is *encloſed within one of the ſeventeen provinces, in Brabant.* Nevertheleſs at the word *Low-Countries,* it is reckoned among the *ſeventeen provinces.* NEW OBSERVAT.

may have the names of Madruce *and* Liber, *and that thus ſome ſhould call it* Madruce *and others* Liber, *and conſequently that the author of a Dictionary following the ſafeſt courſe might make uſe of the disjunctive* or *without committing a fault; but there is nevertheleſs in all this, I cannot tell what ſtrange want of probability that detains and ſtrikes a ſuſpicious and attentive reader. He conſiders before he proceeds further, and he may poſſibly conjecture that Moreri deceived by ſome French author, or not underſtanding the Latin writers who have mentioned this Cardinal of Trent, has improperly divided* Liber Baro, *and taken the firſt of theſe two words for the name of the family, inſtead of taking it for the character of the quality of Baron. It is well known that the Emperors of Germany create barons who hold immediately of the empire, and who are thereby diſtinguiſhed from the barons that are vaſſals to ſome other member of the empire. A baron that holds immediately of the empire, is called a free baron,* Liber Baro. *It is very (e) probable that the firſt of the family of* Madruce, *or* Madruzzo, *who was created baron, was one of thoſe free barons, and that from thence it comes that the Latin authors who have mentioned the Cardinal of* Trent *and his father, have given them the title of* Liber Baro. *If this be the caſe, what a blunder has Moreri fallen into? And how could it ſo long eſcape the editors* (8)?

(e) I expreſs myſelf thus becauſe I have not the Latin authors quoted by Moreri.

I ſhall occaſionally inform them that they ought to correct a miſtake concerning Cardinal Lewis Madruce (or Madruzzo). He was not made Biſhop of Trent after his promotion to the Cardinalſhip, as Moreri affirms, he was Biſhop of Trent before by the reſignation of his uncle Cardinal Chriſtopher Madruzzo, when Pius IV *preſented him with the hat in the year* 1561, *and ſent it to him even while he was at Trent, by a particular favour* (9). *They ought beſides to correct the alternative of the time of Cardinal Chriſtopher Madruzzo's promotion. They ſhould fix the date thereof to the year* 1542, *and not leave it undetermined as Moreri does between the year* 1542 *or the year* 1544 (10). *It is ſhameful not to know the true time of the creation of a Cardinal of the XVIth century, and when a perſon corrects the work of a man who was ignorant of that, and who was lazy enough not to clear up the fact, that perſon ſhould think himſelf obliged not to be guilty of the ſame lazineſs. We may likewiſe acquaint the editors that they will do well to make up ſome omiſſions. The State of Madruzzo erected into a barony, and ſituated in the country of Trent, requires a ſmall Geographical article which is wanting in Moreri* (11). *The family of* Madruzzo *wants a Genealogical article which ſhould bring it down from the time that it began to enjoy a title of honour, or to make a figure, to the preſent time. Cardinal Madruzzo the creature of Clement VIII, and who came to be ſo conſiderable that he was looked upon as a man qualified for being elected Pope in the conclave where Urban VIII was choſen in the year* 1623, *likewiſe requires an article* (12).

There are a great number of paſſages in Moreri which abound as much in omiſſions and blunders as the article of Madruzzo.

I am not ignorant that ſome people will pretend that it is of no manner of importance to the public to know whether the family Madruzzo *was called* Liber, *or whether Chriſtopher Madruzzo came to the Cardinalſhip in the year* 1542, *and not in the year* 1544, *or whether Lewis Madruzzo was already Biſhop of* Trent *when he obtained the Cardinal's hat. The Journaliſts of Trevoux may poſſibly make this objection, for after having treated as trifling (f) the remark made by our author that Giles Boileau died in the year* 1669, *and not as Moreri affirms, in* 1671 (13), *they add,* the world forſooth will think itſelf much concerned in this error of the Dictionary! *But the editors of Moreri, if they are wiſe, will not regulate themſelves upon this falſe taſte of the Journaliſts of Trevoux. They will be of opinion that it is the duty of every corrector of a book to take from it all the falſe facts, and to ſubſtitute true facts in their room, and that if under pretence that an error in fact hurts neither the fortune nor morals of any body, it muſt be left in a book; there would be very few lies in the Hiſtorical Dictionary which ought not to be ſpared and carefully preſerved. A judicious man is pleaſed with knowing the truth even in things that neither concern his virtue nor the welfare of his family, and one ought to look upon it as an undoubted truth that if Father Paul, who has made ſo much mention of the Cardinals Chriſtopher Madruzzo and Lewis Madruzzo, had fallen into the miſtakes which I have taken notice of, his antagoniſt Pallavicini would have cenſured him for it, and the Journaliſts of Trevoux would not condemn that cenſure. They themſelves would be very ſorry to be convicted of an error like that which concerns Giles Boileau, and if any one accuſed them falſly of ſuch a miſtake they would juſtify themſelves with a great deal of vivacity. They would not content themſelves with anſwering that the world does not concern itſelf much in errors of this nature.*

(f) In the Memoirs for June 1706. pag. 948.

---

(8) This fault had paſſed in the editions of 1707 and 1712. In that of 1725 we find:

‘ Madruce (Chriſtopher) called *the Cardinal of*
‘ *Trent*, ſon of *John Gaudence,* free Baron of Ma-
‘ druce, *&c.*’

They obſerve that *Pope Paul III gave* him *a Cardinal's hat in the year* 1542. New Observat.

(9) This is corrected in the edition of 1725. New Observat.

(10) See, above, note (8). New Observat.

(11) This Geographical article is to be found in the edition of 1725, at the word Madruzzo or Madruce. It is taken from the Dictionary of Maty. New Observat.

(12) In the edition of 1725, there are three or four lines added concerning Charles Madruzzo, created Cardinal by Pope Clement VIII. New Observat.

(13) See hereafter at the word Boileau. New Observat.

One of the things wherein the editors of the Hiſtorical Dictionary have ſucceeded beſt, is that they have reduced to more reaſonable bounds the exceſſive praiſes which Moreri had prodigally beſtowed upon a great many perſons, and the great ſlanders that he had thrown upon many others. He was guided by the ſpirit of a declaimer who frequently mounts the pulpit, and did not remember that he aſſumed the character of an Hiſtorian. But even in this point his work has not yet been brought to perfection. There remain ſtill in it ſeveral flatteries and injurious reflexions which ought to be left out, and it is certain that by ſtriking out ſome encomiums a perſon will do a good office to thoſe on whom they were beſtowed, and will act not only from a principle, of love for truth, but likewiſe from a motive of brotherly charity. I am going to give an example of this.

It is affirmed in Moreri that a Marſhal of France whoſe name I do not mention, commanded armies with a great deal of prudence, ſucceſs, and glory. *Let a reader be never ſo unattentive, and eager in purſuing his journey, he will ſtop ſhort at meeting with ſuch an encomium, and reflect upon ſo ſurprizing an object. For above the ſpace of fifteen years, will he ſay to himſelf, have I traced ſtep by ſtep the Gazettes, and other news-writers, and I do not remember any kind of event on which to ground this prudence, this ſucceſs, and this glory that I find here. I can point out the time and place where the enterprizes of this warrior were extremely unfortunate, but not the time and place of their good ſucceſs. His moſt glorious campaigns are thoſe where he formed no project, and where no project was formed againſt him. Either my knowledge is very imperfect or theſe encomiums are very unjuſt, for they cannot be juſt but in conſequence of ſome actions which had ſuch a fortunate and glorious iſſue, that they have been ſufficient to eclipſe the frequent and remarkable diſgraces of which all Europe is informed, and which have been the burden of a thouſand ſatirical ſongs ſpread over the whole world. Whence can it come that I ſhould be ignorant of theſe actions which are ſo glorious? I muſt go directly and enquire.*

It is plain that ſuch a reader will deſire all thoſe he ſhall meet with to inform him, and that he will find no body who knows more of the matter than himſelf, ſo that he will be the cauſe why an infinite number of people who thought no more of this Marſhal, will recapitulate all his diſgraces. It will therefore be doing him a piece of very good ſervice to leave this paſſage out of the Dictionary. By this means will they remove a ſtumbling block, a troubleſome Memento. *The readers not finding it in their way will proceed without ſtopping, and thus many reflexions will be ſuppreſſed, which would be to the diſadvantage of this Marſhal of France. This encomium is nothing leſs than an officious lie, and bears a much greater reſemblance to the praiſes which the moſt inveterate hatred and malice beſtows,* Peſſimum inimicorum genus laudantes. *However I own it was not made with that view.*

The editor could not but know the opinion of all France, and that if the wiſhes of the nation had been regarded, the warrior of whom we ſpeak had very ſoon been removed from the command of armies; but it looks as if the Prince had been willing to ſhew in this that he thought himſelf as much ſuperior to his ſubjects by the clearneſs of his diſcernment, as by the dignity of his character. The editor could not excuſe himſelf upon a certain humour which the French are obſerved to have, and which a modern author pretty well deſcribes: The French, *ſays he,* often times are very incomprehenſible. They love their King and their country, they love the honour of their nation, they entertain the higheſt opinion of it that it is poſſible for them to have: and yet their nation itſelf does nothing to pleaſe them: they always imagine that ſome thing better might be done. The wiſeſt anſwers, the moſt ſucceſsful enterprizes, and the beſt concerted meaſures ſeldom eſcape their cenſure. They commend foreigners, praiſe their works and their troops, admire their counſels, and extol their good ſucceſſes. *Diſtance heightens reſpect (g).* They deſpiſe and find fault with every thing that France produces. *Let the number of thoſe whom this character ſuits be as great as it will all over the kingdom, an author is not however obliged to be ruled by them in his praiſes or cenſures; but as they were not the only perſons that exclaimed againſt the general in queſtion, and ſince, on the contrary, they did no more than join their voice to that of the public, the editor could not clear himſelf without alledging ſome other reaſon than this. If he ſhould try to excuſe himſelf by ſaying that the perſon whom he commends has rather gained than loſt ground in his maſter's favour, it would be a very weak defence. This indeed proves that fortune which never followed him to the field, has been a faithful companion to him at court, but we can draw no conſequence from that againſt the public evidence, and if a Prince has a mind to diſtinguiſh himſelf by acting a part ſo ſingular, as that of magnificently rewarding ill ſucceſs, an author has no right upon that account to beſtow praiſes which all the world knows to be falſe. If inſtead of theſe words,* prudence, ſucceſs, and glory, *Moreri had made uſe of the terms,* affection, zeal, good intention, *he would not have ſcandalized the public, nor have done ſuch an ill office to the warrior whom he commends. But, once more, the beſt way will be to leave out the encomium and to put nothing in the room of it.*

To ſpeak once more of the pains which a good correction of Moreri requires. I ſhall obſerve that the firſt editions of that Dictionary, though they be more faulty than the Dutch ones, may nevertheleſs be of great uſe in *correcting them. The editors therefore ſhould always have theſe firſt editions before their eyes, and compare them line by line with the following. Among the ſeveral examples of the corruptions that have crept into the latter, I ſhall only take notice of one. Mr Moreri had ſaid in the article of* GILLES LE MAÎTRE, that the Duke of Mayenne, and the other chiefs of the League, named *John le Maître* Preſident of the *Parliament of*

(g) E longinquo reverentia major.

Paris in the room of Barnaby Briſſon, and that in this quality they were deputed to the pretended States of the kingdom held at Paris in the year 1593. That the Legate propoſed there the publication of the Council of Trent, without any reſtriction or modification, that it was a nice affair in itſelf; that le Maître and du Vair, then a Counſellor, had orders to examine it, &c. *There is a fault here which is corrected in the Dutch editions, where they have put* he was deputed, *inſtead of* they were deputed, *but they have committed an error in another place, for inſtead of* le Maître and du Vair, then a Counſellor, *they have put* le Maître and du Vair, then Counſellors. *This error is in the edition of Paris* 1699, *and ſhews that the attention of the editors is ſometimes very remiſs, for in reading the word* Counſellors *they did not remember that two or three lines before they had read that le Matîre was deputed* in quality of Preſident (14).

The laſt thing I ſhall obſerve is, that new errors will continually creep into the editions of Moreri notwithſtanding all the attention and ability of the reviſers, if they themſelves do not take the trouble exactly to correct all the proofs, or if they do not get them to be corrected by men who are both very knowing and very attentive. It is owing to the negligence of the corrector of the preſs that we find in the edition of Paris 1699, *at the article* Lodrin, *a very groſs fault which had been corrected in the Dutch editions. I ſhall quote this article according to the edition of Lyons* 1688.

LODRIN, a city and gulf of Albania in Greece. It muſt not be miſtaken for LODRON, a lordſhip of the country of Trent in Italy, near Braſlan.

All this is in the edition of Paris 1699. *Bnt in the Dutch edition which I make uſe of, and which is that of the year* 1698, *they have put, as it ſhould be,* Breſſan, *inſtead of* Braſlan, *and they have retained the line immediately following which is,*

LODRON. See Lodrin.

It has been left out in the Paris edition, but it would have been better to let it ſtand as it was, becauſe there are a great many readers who do not find that which they look for in a Dictionary, unleſs it appears there at the beginning of a new line. The beſt way of correcting it would be to leave out theſe words it muſt not be miſtaken for, *and to put what follows in a line by itſelf. They are words which without any further caution ſufficiently ſhew the readers that they ought not to miſtake* Lodron *for* Lodrin (15). *We may likewiſe hint to the editors that they will do well to lengthen the article* Lodron *both as Geographers and as Genealogiſts. They ought to know that the curioſity of the readers increaſes very much with reſpect even to places that are pretty obſcure, when the Gazettes happen to mention them often. Such perſons who never had the leaſt deſire to know where the Oglio is, and the Adda; nor what kind of places are Salo, Dezenzano, Gavardo, Montechiaro &c. have complained a thouſand times for theſe four or five years paſt, that they did not find in Moreri very particular articles upon the ſource, and the courſe of theſe rivers, and upon the ſituation, and the qualities of theſe towns. People have at preſent the very ſame curioſity with reſpect to Lodron. Beſides it is not a bare lordſhip, but an antient county, and it is a great while ſince the Counts of Lodron have made themſelves famous. The ſeries of their Genealogy would make a curious article in Moreri* (16). *The learned will think themſelves concerned in it becauſe Joſeph Scaliger pretended that his grand-mother Berenice, or Veronica, of Lodron, was daughter to the Count of Lodron. Scioppius in his* Scaliger Hypobolimæus *ſays this is falſe, and alledges ſeveral facts which may ſerve for materials to the editors.*

I make no excuſe for the length of this preface, or advertiſement, which I have joined to the ſecond edition of the Critical Remarks firſt publiſhed at Paris. Every one will ſee that this may ſerve as a ſupplement.

---

(14) In the edition of 1707 *&c ſeq.* we find a ſeparate article of JOHN LE MAÎTRE, where inſtead of *they were deputed,* they have put *he was deputed;* and the words *then a Counſellor* are left out. NEW OBSERVAT.

(15) In the laſt editions this article runs as follows:

LODRIN, *a city and gulf of Albania in Greece, ought not to be miſtaken for* LODRON, *an antient county of the country of Trent in Italy, near the Breſſan.*

Thus they ſtill make but one article of *Lodrin* and *Lodron,* inſtead of making two according to Mr Bayle's remark. NEW OBSERVAT.

(16) They have not yet given us in Moreri's Dictionary the Geographical deſcription of *Lodron,* nor the Genealogy of it's Counts. NEW OBSERVAT.

THE

PREFACE

TO THE

PARIS EDITION.

WHAT I now publiſh is not a criticiſm upon Moreri's Dictionary; I am not raſh enough to make ſuch an attempt. Mr Bayle, after great efforts, has not fully executed it (1). Mr le Clerc, who came after him, and had the advantage of his obſervations, has only committed new faults, added to the old ones which he has not taken the trouble to correct: and indeed the edition which he publiſhed in the year 1699, to ſpeak properly, is not exact in any thing beſides the articles that have ſome conformity with thoſe which we find in the Critical Dictionary of Rotterdam (2). The two editions which were publiſhed one upon the other at Paris, are not near ſo faulty as the former ones; and thoſe who had the care of them, have purged them of ſeveral errors which we ſtill find in the edition of 1699. The laſt eſpecially ſeems to have been carried to a degree of perfection which a work of that nature may attain to: the chronology has been corrected; inſtead of varying as it did in ſeveral places, it is fixed to a certain order. The articles are put in a form more convenient to the reader, and purged of a great many falſe facts, which only ſerve to ſtifle the true ones, and to make people queſtion the moſt fundamental points of hiſtory, when authors have had the indiſcretion to confound both together: in ſhort, every thing there is placed in an order that is agreeable to an eager reader, and uſeful to a learned one: and it muſt be ſaid to the praiſe of Mr Vaultier, who has ſuſtained alone the immenſe burthen of this labour, that it wanted a man of his patience and aſſiduity not to ſink under the weight of ſo great an enterprize; eſpecially when it is known that he was aſſiſted by none, and that if you except one Friar, whoſe knowledge is limited to one certain kind of erudition, he was abandoned by every body elſe. It is true it might be objected to him, that he has received ſome memoirs, and that if he had ſhewed that he made any account of them, people would have furniſhed him with more, during the impreſſion, and in proportion to the good reception they ſhould have ſeen him give to the firſt. But this is not the queſtion here, and as to what concerns me I have no complaint to make againſt him before the tribunal of the public.

---

(1) Our author pretends, that Mr Bayle undertook in his Dictionary to cenſure all Moreri's faults; but that *after great efforts*, he *has not fully executed* that undertaking. Mr Bayle never had ſuch a deſign. He does not criticize Moreri but when he gives an article that is likewiſe to be met with in the Dictionary of that author. *I have put by themſelves in a remark*, ſays he in his preface, *the errors I have imputed to Moreri. I have not touched upon thoſe that are found in the articles given by him, and not by me, though they are not leſs conſiderable, nor leſs frequent in theſe articles than in thoſe I have given.* A little after he ſubjoins: *For the ſake of youth, who want to have their judgment formed, and to be made ſenſible of the moſt ſcrupulous exactneſs, I have taken notice of the leaſt faults of Moreri in the ſubjects we both handle: as for the miſtakes that are in other places, I do not meddle with them as I ſaid before.* Here is a very plain proof of the little exactneſs of our Critic. His Remarks are almoſt every one taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, as will be ſhewn hereafter; and yet he has not at all attended to what Mr Bayle ſo expreſsly declares in his preface. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) This author does not do juſtice here to Mr le Clerc, who has corrected an infinite number of faults in the Dutch editions of Moreri's Dictionary, and has made very conſiderable additions to it. He has not ſeen theſe editions: what he ſays of them is borrowed from the reviſer of Paris, who, the better to recommend his labour, had undervalued that of Mr le Clerc, at the ſame time that he made uſe of it. Mr le Clerc ſhewed the injuſtice of his proceeding in a memoir inſerted in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for February 1700, Art. VII, pag. 207, & *ſeq.* He even obſerved, that the Paris reviſer had left ſome faults that were corrected in the laſt Dutch editions; for example, at the article CAB, there was *Cumbertund*, inſtead of *Cumberland*. This error ſtill continues in the edition of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

After ſuch a particular account, it will be eaſy to judge of the nature of this little work: it contains only ſome remarks that have eſcaped Mr Vaultier; they are even, if you will, ſome faults which any other author, over-charged with ſuch a prodigious labour, would infallibly have committed; and he might have eſteemed himſelf happy if he had not been guilty of ſtill greater ones. Among theſe faults there are ſome which particularly relate to certain nations, to certain countries, and even to certain diſtricts, and which conſequently do not much intereſt a reader, who has not ſeen theſe countries any where but in a map; but as I hope theſe Remarks may be of ſervice to the firſt edition that ſhall be publiſhed of Moreri's Dictionary, I would not omit taking notice of theſe ſlight errors, being perſuaded that it will be much eaſier for an editor to make a proper uſe of them when he finds them collected together in a ſmall volume. There are other faults among thoſe which I have cenſured, that will require a more ſerious conſideration, and the correcting of which, as any reader may obſerve, was eſſential to the perfecting of the Hiſtorical Dictionary.

For example, it would never perhaps have come into the thoughts of the new editors, that there is no ſtone bridge upon the Rhine, and perhaps alſo if it were not for the remark I make on this ſubject, an editor who might have been preſent at the laſt ſiege of Briſach (*a*), would notwithſtanding continue to write after Mr Moreri, that they croſs the Rhine there *upon a fine ſtone bridge*. The remark, I own, is trivial; it neverthelеſs ſerves to correct an error which has run thro' twelve editions, and into which that ſkilful Geographer Mr le Clerc, who pretends to criticiſe Quintus Curtius, has fallen as well as the reſt: I grant it is an error proceeding from want of attention, it cannot even be of any other kind (*b*); but is it the leſs an error upon that account? How many of thoſe little authors who have no other ſtock for compoſing books, but the great Hiſtorical Dictionary, will believe hereafter that they croſs the Rhine at Briſach *upon a fine ſtone bridge?* Theſe little books, which are copied one from another, having once given a run to that falſe tradition, would be ſufficient, in a few centuries, to make a probable opinion of what is ſaid now, *that there is a ſtone bridge at Briſach:* and from thence would ariſe controverſies among the Geographers; of the ſame nature with that which we ſee in our days, between Mr le Clerc, and Mr Perizonius, upon ſome paſſages of the celebrated Hiſtorian of Alexander the Great.

Will not what is ſaid in the new edition of Moreri, concerning the year in which King James II died, be likewiſe one day the ſubject of a diſpute among the Chronologers? Grounded upon inconteſtable records, ſome will place his death in the year 1701; others upon the authority of the edition of 1704, will maintain, that this Prince died (*c*) not 'till the year 1702. There will be a multitude of writings, and perhaps of ſlanders and abuſe, and all this through the negligence of an Hiſtorian.

(*a*) There is too much hyperbole here: it is not in the leaſt probable that an editor who ſhould have ſeen with his own eyes, that the bridge of Briſach is not of ſtone, ſhould neverthelеſs have neglected to correct this error of Moreri. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(*b*) Our author will give me leave to ſay, that the error he takes notice of may not only be of another kind than errors proceeding from want of attention, but that it actually is ſo, for though we attend ever ſo much to Moreri's words, we cannot judge that he is miſtaken in ſaying that the bridge of Briſach is a ſtone bridge. None but ſuch as know by ſome other way that the thing is falſe can perceive he is miſtaken. But here follows the example of an error that proceeds from want of attention. Moreri, ſpeaking of a river called LE MORIN, ſaid that it is *in Brie*, that *it takes its ſource near Sedane*, that *it runs through la Ferté Gaucher, through Colmier*, &c. He did not copy this laſt word right, for Coulon, his original, ſays, *Colomier* (he ſhould have ſaid *Colomiers*); but as for the word *Sedane* he copied it faithfully. They who have corrected Moreri, have changed *Sedane* into *Sedan*, although, without doubt, they knew enough of Geography, not to be ignorant that Sedan is at a great diſtance from Brie. It is therefore owing to want of attention that they have put in their editions of Moreri, that *the Morin, a river of France in Brie, takes its ſource near Sedan.* They ſhould have ſaid *near Sezane*. As to what concerns *Colmier*, they might believe that there was a place of that name in Brie, but with a little more application they would have found that it ſhould be *Colomiers*, and not *Colmier* (3). Perhaps Mr Moreri followed, more than he ought to have done, the cuſtom of ſeveral Frenchmen, which is to pronounce, with two ſyllables, the names that are written with three. It is thus that ſome authors who have written againſt Mr de Vallemont, call him *Valmont*, and that others call Malment an author who writes his name *Mallement:* from hence it will proceed one day or other that the Bibliographers will give us an author whoſe name is Vallemont, and another whoſe name is Valmont, *&c*; but Mr Moreri would not be excuſable from the cuſtom that he might have taken of pronouncing *Colgne* and not *Cologne*, *Colnie* and not *Colonie*. He ſhould have written proper names not according to his own pronunciation; but according to their Orthography. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(3) In the edition of 1725, it is ſaid that this river takes its ſource near *Sezanne*, and that it runs through *Coulomier*. NEW OBSERVAT.

(*c*) I believe this falſe date is an error of the preſs; neverthelеſs, the Critic was not obliged to enquire whether it came from the editor or Printers. It is the fate of authors that they muſt bear the blame of the negligence of the correctors of the preſs. I do not pretend to affirm in general, that an author may not ſometimes be miſtaken as to epochs, that are both very remarkable, and very late. The author of the Supplement to Moreri fancied, that Marſhal Turenne made the whole campaign of the year 1675. He did not remember one thing which all the world knew, *viz.* that Marſhal Turenne was killed by a cannon-ball on the twenty-ſeventh of July 1675. Here follow the words of the author of this Supplement in the article MONTECUCULI: *But in the year* 1675, Montecuculi *could do nothing in Alſatia, becauſe Marſhal Turenne broke all his meaſures.* Nothing can be more falſe than this, for Montecuculi did not go into Alſatia till after Marſhal Turenne's death (4). I ſhall ſay, by the by, that they ſhould not only have cor-

By theſe two inſtances, ſingled out from ſeveral others, one may judge of the uſefulneſs of theſe Remarks, which only relate to the matters themſelves; for if we had been willing to take the errors of the preſs into conſideration, there would have been matter enough to make a large volume.

---

rected this blunder in the Dutch editions, but likewiſe have made that article more compleat. It was not to be expected that the author of the Supplement ſhould have enlarged much upon the glory of Count Montecuculi. That General was not loved in France; they conſidered him as the principal cauſe of their loſing all the conqueſts of the year 1672; but for that very reaſon the Dutch editions ſhould have given us a long article of this General of the Imperial armies, and adorned it with the fineſt encomiums which he deſerved. Such an omiſſion is more blameworthy than to partake in the error which has not been corrected, concerning the age of Montecuculi. The Supplement ſays, that this General died in the year 1680, *aged more than eighty years*. It is nevertheleſs true that he lived but ſeventy-two years and eight months. He was born in the year 1608, as we find in his life printed before his memoirs, at Geneva in the year 1704, and thereby we correct the fault of the Printers of that life, who fix his death on the ſixteenth of October 1681, inſtead of 1680 (5). MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(4) This remained in the editions of 1707 and 1712. It was ſtruck out in that of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

(5) This likewiſe remained in the editions of 1707 and 1712. In that of 1725 it is ſaid, that Count Montecuculi *died on the ſixteenth of October* 1680, *aged ſeventy-two years and eight months*; and at the end of his article they take notice that *he had preſented to the Emperor, in the year* 1665, *his* Memoirs, *compoſed during his campaigns in Hungary, publiſhed in the year* 1704 *by Mr Hayſſen, a German gentleman, Governor to the Prince of Muſcovy*. NEW OBSERVAT.

CRITICAL REMARKS
UPON THE
NEW EDITION
OF
MORERI'S HISTORICAL DICTIONARY,
Publiſhed in the year 1704.

A.

ACTOR.

MR BAYLE had already cenſured Mr Moreri for changing this word into that of *Actorius*. This error indeed has been corrected in the new edition; as well as that where it is ſaid that Ovid ſpeaks of one *Actorius*: for theſe words, *quæ fuit Actoridæ cum magno ſemper Achille*, ought not to be underſtood of a man named *Actorius*, but of Patroclus, whom the Poets generally diſtinguiſh by the Patronymic name of *Actorides*, which ſignifies nothing elſe but *deſcended from Actor*. The explication which Mr Bayle has given of the Poet's thought is very full; and it is their fault who publiſhed the editions of 1699 and 1704, that they did not reap the benefit of it, ſince they needed only to have conſulted the Critical Dictionary. I confeſs it is troubleſome to conſult upon every article all the Critics, and all the interpreters; but in that very reſpect will theſe Remarks be of great uſe to thoſe who ſhall hereafter undertake to publiſh a new edition, ſince I collect into a very ſmall volume part of the faults which were left in the old editions, ſo that one may run them over in a ſhort time.

But if the new editor, on whoſe edition I make Remarks, has corrected this article in ſome places, he has changed it for the worſe in ſeveral others; the proof of which follows.

In the article of ACTOR *the Locrian*, the editor ſhould have obſerved, that Peleus, the ſaid Actor's ſon-in-law, was grandſon to his (*a*) wife Ægina; and that therefore Polymele, the daughter of Actor and Ægina, was at the ſame time Peleus's aunt and wife; ſhe was his aunt, as being ſiſter to his father Æacus (1): beſides, Jupiter was (*b*) grandfather

---

(*a*) That is to ſay, Actor's wife. The word *his* is very ambiguous here. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1725 it is ſaid, that ACTOR, *born in Locris, or according to others in Theſſaly, was ſon to Myrmidon, and grandſon to Jupiter*, that he *married the nymph Ægina*; and that he *gave his kingdom with his daughter Polymene* (it ſhould have been *Polymele*) *to Peleus, the ſon of Æacus, and father of Achilles*. NEW OBSERVAT.

(*b*) This wanted proof, for we do not ſee that Jupiter was father either to Actor or Ægina. He had a ſon by Ægina; but Polymele, daughter to the ſaid Ægina, was daughter to Actor, which made no conſanguinity between Jupiter and Polymele. MR BAYLE'S REM.

grandfather to Polymele, and likewiſe to Peleus. In the article of Actor, the ſon of Axeas, and father of Aſtioche, the editor is miſtaken when he ſays that Aſtioche had two ſons by Neptune; it was by Mars that ſhe had theſe two ſons, who commanded the troops of Aſpledon (c) and Orchomene at the ſiege of Troy (2). The editor might have taken this *Actor*, for the *Actor* of whom Pauſanias ſpeaks in his fifth book, and who was ſon to Neptune and Agamede, the daughter of Augeus (3). On this head you may conſult the tenth book of the Iliad. We ſee from thence that the editor has confounded theſe two articles, and that of two Actors he has made but one, whom he makes the father-in-law of Neptune; whereas that god was father to the ſecond of the two whom I have juſt now mentioned.

(c) Aſpledon and Orchomene are names of towns: the reader might poſſibly take them for names of men. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(2) In the ſame edition we find that Actor, *the ſon of Axeus, or Azeus, was father to Aſtioche, and that this nymph had by Neptune two ſons*, &c. Yet Mr Bayle had obſerved, that it was by the god *Mars* ſhe had theſe two ſons. New Observat.

(3) In this edition they have not given us the article of Actor, *ſon to Neptune and Agamede, the daughter of Augeus*, though they might have taken it from Mr Bayle.

Our author has copied almoſt every thing that he ſays here from Mr Bayle. But he is miſtaken in citing the *fifth book of Pauſanias*. That quotation in Mr Bayle relates to another Actor, *ſon to Phorbas*. New Observat.

ADAM.

Moreri ſays that Joſephus relates, that Adam engraved upon two different tables the obſervations which he had made upon the courſe of the ſtars. Theſe are not the words of that antient Hiſtorian; he only ſays in the ſecond chapter of the firſt book of his antiquities, that the offspring of Seth, the ſon of Adam, were the inventers of Aſtrology, and that they cauſed the principles which they had diſcovered, to be engraved upon two pillars, the one of brick and the other of ſtone, in order to ſecure them from the general deſtruction, which, as Adam had foretold, was to happen once by fire, and another time by water (1). Moreri likewiſe ſays, that the firſt man gave names to the plants, whereas the Scripture only aſcribes to him the invention of the names of beaſts. The editor has adopted the firſt of theſe errors (2), but has corrected the ſecond.

---

(1) This Remark is taken from Mr Bayle. New Observat.

(2) This is corrected in the edition of 1725. New Observat.

ADAMITES.

Moreri makes St Epiphanius ſay, that the churches of the Adamites were infamous places, on account of the abominable crimes which they committed in theſe caverns of horror and proſtitution. That holy Father does not ſpeak ſo in the ſummary of his ſecond book; he only ſays, ‘that the Adamites meet together as naked as they were born, and in that condition go thro’ their lectures, prayers, and other religious exerciſes.’ Beſides, Moreri has too raſhly affirmed, that there was a ſect of theſe Heretics in England. This is abſolutely falſe, and the editor has corrected that place, but he has not had the ſame precaution with reſpect to the text of St Epiphanius (1).

---

(1) All this is taken from Mr Bayle. What concerns St Epiphanius has been corrected in the edition of 1725; and Mr Bayle is quoted at the end of the article. New Observat.

ADRICHOMITES (*a*).

Moreri is miſtaken in this article, when he takes *Trajectum* for Utrecht, inſtead of taking it for Maeſtricht. He ſays afterwards that Adrichomites himſelf publiſhed his Theatre of the Holy Land; whereas it is certain that this book was not publiſhed till after his death; beſides, this ſame Bibliographer divides that work into two, by obſerving that the *Theatre of the Holy Land*, is different from the *Deſcription of the Holy Land*, whereas it is but one and the ſame work. The editor has corrected the firſt fault, and adopted the ſecond (1).

(*a*) He ſhould have ſaid *Adrichomius*, for ſo do we find that word written in the Dictionary of Moreri. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) This Remark is likewiſe taken from Mr Bayle, at the article Adrichomius. All theſe faults are corrected in the edition of 1725. New Observat.

ADRIAN VI.

In an article where mention is made of this Pope, he is ſaid to be of the houſe of Fieſchi. I ſee very well that the author meant Adrian V, who was really of that family. But, after all, it is ſtill a fault which it is neceſſary to correct in the editions that may be publiſhed hereafter; for nothing can be more different than Ottoboni di Fieſchi, who was Pope under the name of Adrian V, and Adrian Florentius, who was ſo under that of Adrian VI. The former lived in the XIIIth century, and the latter in the XVIth (1).

---

(1) They have put *Adrian V* in the edition of 1707, and the following ones. New Observat.

AINS.

This article was right in the preceding editions, and they have ſpoiled it in this. The river Ains *, which comes from the county of Burgundy, and divides Breſſe from Bugey, is in the laſt edition improperly called the river of Dain. Guichenon, who has written the hiſtory of theſe two little provinces, is the proper judge of this queſtion. We need only conſult him, and we ſhall ſee how he criticizes *Cognatus* (*a*) and Maſſo upon the ſubject of this river (1).

* *Ens*, *Indis*, *Indus*, *Danus*, & *Idanus*, in Latin.

(*a*) That is to ſay, Gilbert Couſin (*Gilbertus Cognatus*, who had been Eraſmus's ſervant), and Papyrius Maſſo. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1725, at the article AIN (l') it is ſaid that the river Ain *runs between Breſſe and Bugey*. NEW OBSERVAT.

ALCIATUS.

In the article of Andrew Alciatus, a Civilian of Milan, the editor has forgot to mention the following book, among thoſe which he aſcribes to him: *Rerum patriæ ſeu Hiſtoriæ Mediolanenſis, lib. iv. ex M. S. Bibliothecæ Ambroſianæ*. One would think he could not forget, in the article of a celebrated author, the work which he dedicated to the glory of his native country (1).

(1) There is no mention made of this work in the laſt edition: but at the end of this article they have added: *thoſe who would know the catalogue of Alciatus's works need only conſult the* Eloges des Hommes Sçavans de Mr de Thou, *by Teiſſier, Tom. I.* They ſhould have referred to the edition of theſe *Eloges*, publiſhed in 1715, where they have collected the judgments of ſome learned men upon that hiſtory of the Milaneze. NEW OBSERVAT.

ALEANDER.

Moreri, ſpeaking of this Cardinal's death, had not determined what book he was about to publiſh when he died; but the editor tells us, that Moreri's words are to be underſtood as relating to his great work againſt the Profeſſors (*Opera contra i Profeſſori: Lorenz. Craſſo*); nevertheleſs, it is not ſure that it was the ſame which the Cardinal was writing when he died, and Mr Bayle is not certain of it (*a*). Therefore when a Critic of that penetration wavers upon any ſubject, another ſhould not raſhly form his opinion (1). The editor, in reckoning up the works of that great Cardinal, has forgot to mention his *Tables of the Greek Grammar* (2).

(*a*) This ought not to be underſtood as if Mr Bayle expreſſed ſome doubt upon that head: he neither affirms nor denies any thing: he only quotes the words of Paul Jovius, and thoſe of Lorenzo Craſſo. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) Our author ſhould have aſſigned his reaſons for doubting that the *Work againſt the Profeſſors* was that which Aleander was writing when he died; and have ſhewn that Paul Jovius and Lorenzo Craſſo are miſtaken. Otherwiſe we have a right to conſider his doubt as a pure imagination: and indeed it is only grounded upon a falſe ſuppoſition that Mr Bayle had raiſed doubts concerning it. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) There is no mention made in the new edition of Moreri of Aleander's *Tables of the Greek Grammar*; though Mr Bayle ſpeaks of them, and it is from him that our author has taken this particular. NEW OBSERVAT.

ALEXANDER.

I ſhould have believed that the editor would have corrected in this article a bad phraſe which his author makes uſe of; at leaſt I call it bad, becauſe it is ſuſceptible of a double meaning: it is this; *Darius n'avoit point voulu faire le dégât dans l'Aſie, ſelon l'avis de Memnon* (i. e. *Darius had refuſed to lay Aſia waſte according to Memnon's advice*). To judge of this expreſſion according to its obvious ſenſe, we are as much inclined to believe that Memnon had not adviſed ſuch waſte to be made, as that he had adviſed it; ſo true it is, that the meaning often depends upon the order in which the words are placed, and upon the turn of a phraſe. If the editor had carefully peruſed all the Remarks that have been made upon the different editions of Moreri, this fault would not have eſcaped him (1).

(1) This ambiguous expreſſion has paſſed into the edition of 1725, where it is ſaid that Darius *n'avoit point voulu faire de dégât* dans l'Aſie *ſelon l'avis de Memnon*. Mr Bayle had already taken notice of it in the article *Memnon*, remark [*D*]; but in a more diſtinct and preciſe manner than our author, who ſtill copies him here. NEW OBSERVAT.

ALMAIN.

When Moreri ſpeaks of that famous doctor of the univerſity of Paris, and is enumerating his works, he ſhould not have forgot that which concerns the Laity. The very circumſtances of the time ſhould have engaged the editor to ſpeak of it with ſome exactneſs (1).

(1) Our Critic commits here ſeveral faults which Mr Bayle has particularized above in his *Preface*. NEW OBSERVAT.

ARLENIUS.

I ſhould have expected that this author, who lived in the reign of Charles V, and who called himſelf in the world (*a*) by the name of Peraxylus, would have found a place in the new edition of the Dictionary. The fine Greek edition of Joſephus, which he publiſhed from the excellent manuſcript of Dom Diego de Mendozza, the Emperor's Ambaſſador at Venice, in whoſe retinue he was, ſhould have entitled him to that place: beſides, Arlenius was an excellent Poet. Moreri, and thoſe who ſince him have been employed in reviſing his Dictionary, are not the only perſons who were ignorant of the merit of this great man (1).

(*a*) That is to ſay, in the learned world. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) Our author (as I ſaid before) has taken almoſt all his Remarks from Mr Bayle's Dictionary; but he has concealed or diſguiſed theſe little thefts as much as he could. Here, for example, he produces, under the word *Arlenius*, what Mr Bayle had ſaid in the article *Peraxylus*. What is ſingular in the caſe is, that he complains that *Moreri, and thoſe who ſince him have been employed in reviſing his Dictionary*, make no mention of *Arlenius*; and indeed they ſay nothing of him under that word; but they have given him a very good article, taken from Mr Bayle, at the word *Peraxylus*. NEW OBSERVAT.

B.

BASIN.

ARmand Baſin de Beſons is not Archbiſhop of Aix, as the editor affirms, but of Bourdeaux, and he ſucceeded in that dignity to the late Mr de Bourlemont (1).

---

(1) This miſtake is corrected in the edition of 1725, at the article BAZIN (*Claude*). NEW OBSERVAT.

BAVARIA.

This article is not exact, and the editor varies in his chronology. The Emperor Frederic III was not father-in-law to Albert IV, Duke of Bavaria, who is ſuppoſed to have married Cunegonda, that Emperor's daughter; on the contrary, Frederic III married for his ſecond wife Cunegonda, daughter to Lewis of Bavaria, his greateſt enemy; and he had by that ſecond marriage Elizabeth, wife to Walter, Count of Schwartberg (1). Now Lewis of Bavaria, who was afterwards Emperor, and the third of that name, was great grandfather's grandfather of Albert IV, Duke of Bavaria. How then was it poſſible for him to be ſon-in-law to the Emperor Lewis III (*a*), and conſequently his cotemporary (2)?

The editor perhaps meant that Albert IV, Duke of Bavaria, married Cunegonda, daughter to the Emperor Frederic IV. But if he calls this Frederic III, he muſt then not reckon in the number of Emperors Frederic, called *the fair*, the third of that name, ſon to the Emperor Albert I, and grandſon to the Emperor Rudolph I (3).

It

---

(1) Our author pretends that the Emperor *Frederic* III, (called *the fair*) married *Cunegonda*, daughter to *Lewis* of Bavaria, his greateſt enemy. He has probably taken this from the work he criticizes: for in Moreri, at the word *Auſtria*, pag. 877, we find that the Emperor *Frederic*, called *the fair*, married for his ſecond wife *Cunegonda* of Bavaria, daughter to the Emperor *Lewis*, by whom he had *Elizabeth*, wife to *Gonthier* Count of Schwartzemberg. But, 1. Ritterſhuſius does not take notice that *Frederic the fair* had two wives: he only mentions *Iſabella* of Arragon. 2. Heiſſ. in his *Hiſtory of the Empire*, only ſays that Duke *Frederic* of Auſtria, and Duke Lewis of Bavaria, who diſputed the empire with one another, were *couſin-germans*. 3. In Moreri, at the word *Bavaria*, and the article of the Emperor *Lewis*, pag. 135, we find no *Cunegonda* among the children whom he had by his two wives, and who are nine in number. Our author confounds here, after Moreri, *Frederic the fair*, who died in the year 1330, and had been competitor to Lewis of Bavaria, with *Frederic the Pacific*, who died in 1493. This laſt had by *Eleanor* of Portugal, a daughter named *Cunegonda*, who was married, in the year 1487, to *Albert IV*, Duke of Bavaria, as may be ſeen in Ritterſhuſius, fol. 57, and 66, of the edition of Tubingen 1664; and as it has been obſerved in Moreri, at the article *Bavaria*, pag. 136, (where the Printers have by miſtake put *Albert V*, inſtead of *Albert IV*) and at the word *Auſtria*, pag. 878. NEW OBSERTAT.

(*a*) He ſhould have ſaid *Frederic III*. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(2) Mr Bayle imagined that they had put here *Lewis III*, inſtead of *Frederic III*. In effect, the connection of the ideas and of the reaſoning required that our author ſhould have ended by proving that *Albert IV* could not have been *ſon-in-law* to *Frederic III*: but we muſt not expect that he ſhould be ſo exact. After laying it down as a certain fact that *Cunegonda* was daughter to the Emperor *Lewis* of Bavaria, he concludes from thence that *Albert IV* could not have been her huſband, ſince Lewis of Bavaria was *Albert* the fourth's *great grandfather's grandfather*, and conſequently was not even ſo much as his cotemporary. NEW OBSERVAT.

(3) Ritterſhuſius and Heiſſ. give the title of *Frederic III* to *Frederic the Pacific*. Other writers call him with our author, *Frederic IV*. This matter is

pretty

It is true that the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria diſputed the Empire with him; but Pope John XXII, and a great part of the Princes of Europe, acknowledged him. Be that as it will, the editor ſhould be conſiſtent in the principles of his Chronology, and he is ſo far from being ſo, that he calls that Prince *Frederic III*, when he makes him father-in-law to Albert IV, Duke of Bavaria, and Frederic IV, when he obſerves that Lewis of Bavaria called *the Rich*, tore by way of contempt the letters which that Emperor wrote to him in the year 1457 (4).

As for the reſt, it was the death of the Emperor Henry VII, of the houſe of Luxembourg, which gave occaſion to the double election of Frederic of Auſtria, and of Lewis of Bavaria: it is this ſame Henry who was ſaid to have been poiſoned by a hoſt or conſecrated wafer.

pretty well cleared up in Moreri. At the article of *Frederic* called *the Fair*, pag. 192, that Emperor is named *Frederic III*, and they add that *ſome authors do not reckon him among the Emperors*: and at the article of *Frederic* called *the Pacific*, pag. *ibid.* they put *Frederic IV*, Emperor, *or III. according to others.* They likewiſe call him *Frederic IV*, at the word *Auſtria*, pag. 878. The caſe is the ſame with reſpect to the Emperor *Lewis*, of whom mention has been juſt made. Our author ſays *Lewis* of Bavaria *III of that name*: Moreri at the word *Bavaria*, pag. 135, calls him IV *of that name*; and at the article *Lewis*, pag. 219, *IV*, *or V*, *of that name*: and Heiſſ. ſays V, *of that name*. New Observat.

(4) In the laſt edition, at the word *Bavaria*, pag. 136, there is *Frederic III.* New Observat.

BEAUPOIL.

Lewis de Beaupoil of St Aulaire is improperly called the Marquis *Danmarie*: they ſhould have ſaid (*a*) *Lanmarie*. It is a fault which is peculiar to this edition, and the editor where he ſpeaks of the late Mr Perrault has commited it (1).

(*a*) The Mercure Galant for the month of April 1702, ſays *Lamarie*, and ſpeaks of the Marquis de Lamarie Captain-Lieutenant of a company of the Gendarmery, married to the daughter of Preſident Perrault, a lady of above two hundred thouſand crowns fortune. But as proper names are ill ſpelt in the Mercure Galant, it would not be reaſonable to prefer *Lamarie* to *Lanmarie*. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) In the edition of 1707, and the following, at the article Beaupoil, they have always put *Lanmary*. They likewiſe write *Sainte Aulaire*, and not *Saint Aulaire* as our author does, who is likewiſe miſtaken in ſaying *Perrault*, for *Perault*. I have not been able to find the place where he pretends that this fault lies. New Observat.

BELLAY.

In all the editions of the Hiſtorical Dictionary, and in this laſt as well in the firſt, when they ſpeak of the dignities of the Church of Bellay, they omit that of Archdeacon, and ſubſtitute in the room of it that of Chanter. The latter is not a dignity in the ſaid Church, and that of Archdeacon is the ſecond (1): beſides the laſt letter but one of *Belley* is not an *a* but an *e*. This Church has produced great men.

(1) In the edition of 1725, at the word Beley, it is ſaid that the chapter of the Cathedral Church of Beley is compoſed of nineteen Canons, and *of four Dignitaries, which are the Dean, the Arch-prieſt, the Archdeacon, and the Primicier.* New Observat.

BOILEAU.

Gilles Boileau, Steward of the King's privy-purſe, brother to the celebrated Mr Deſpreaux, and to the Abbot Boileau, Doctor of the Sorbonne, was dead before the year 1671, which all the editions of Moreri aſſign for the year of his death; ſince Mr de Montigny who ſucceeded him in the French Academy, was admitted there in 1669. This fault has gone through all the editions, in this as well as in the former (1).

(1) This fault is corrected in the edition of 1707. Mr Bayle had taken notice of it in his *Réponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial*, Tom. I. chap. XVIII. pag. 134. New Observat.

BRANCAS.

The Abbot Brancas, who is ſtill living, is not the ſon of Magdalen Clara of Lenoncourt, firſt wife to the late Duke of Villars, but of Magdalen Girard his ſecond wife (1).

(1) Since theſe Remarks were deſigned for the correcting of Moreri, our author ſhould have pointed out the place where this fault lies. New Observat.

BRISACH.

There is a fault here which has eſcaped Mr Vaultier, as well as Mr le Clerc, and the other editors (*a*) of Moreri's Dictionary. Is it allowable for one to be ignorant that there is no ſtone bridge upon the Rhine? and that the rapidity of this river has always hindered any ſuch from being built? Nevertheleſs they all affirm very poſitively in the article *Briſach*, that this town is *ſituated upon the Rhine, which has there a ſtone bridge over it*: this river has no bridges but ſuch as are of wood (1), and even theſe are only

(*a*) We may add that Mr Baudrand is in the ſame caſe, ſince he ſays in his Geographical Dictionary, ſpeaking of Briſach *cum ponte lapideo ad Rhenum fluvium*; - - - - *with a ſtone bridge over the Rhine.* Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) In the edition of 1707 and the following ones, at the word Brisac or Brissac, they ſay that *there was formerly at that place a bridge of wood over the Rhine, which was demoliſhed after the peace of Riſwick.* In the edition of 1725, they always write *Briſach*. New Observat.

(*b*) We

only bridges *(b)* of boats. The firſt bridge that we find in going up towards the ſource of this river, is the bridge *(c)* of Conſtance; and the laſt is that of Straſbourg. It is true that formerly Cæſar built a wooden bridge below Mentz, in order to tranſport his army, but there is no ſuch thing now *(d)*.

(b) We can hardly conceive that the bridge of Briſach was a bridge of boats, when we remember that the reaſon alledged by France why ſhe did not forthwith evacuate that fortreſs, which by the treaty of Riſwick ſhe was obliged to reſtore to the Emperor, was that they wanted a great deal of time for pulling up the piles which ſupported the bridge. It had been ſtipulated by that treaty of peace, that the bridge of Briſach ſhould be demoliſhed. Thoſe who read the account of the battle that was fought in the year 1678, between the French and the Germans at the bridge of Rhinfeld will ſtill be at a greater loſs to conceive that this bridge is only a bridge of boats. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(c) The Sieur Coulon in his book of the rivers of France Tom. 2. pag. 504. Says that there are twelve bridges upon the Rhine, the firſt of which is at Stein, and the laſt at Straſbourg: now he ſays pag. 508, that Stein is near the place where the Rhine comes out of the lake of Conſtance. Our author had expreſſed himſelf more accurately if he had ſaid, *the laſt bridge that we find in going up towards the ſource of this river is the bridge of Conſtance*, (or of Stein according to the Sieur Coulon; but he is miſtaken for there is a bridge upon the Rhine at Conſtance) *and the firſt is that of Straſbourg.* Mr Bayle's Remark.

(d) As the end of theſe marginal notes is the ſame with that of the remarks of the text, *viz.* to make the future editions of Moreri's Dictionary more perfect, we ſhall ſay here occaſionally that there is ſomething in the article *Briſgaw* which ſhould be ſtruck out. We read there that *Briſach was formerly its capital, but afterwards Friburg got the ſtart of it, and is become memorable by its riches and other advantages. It is likewiſe ſo on account of the famous battle which the Duke d'Anguien . . . . won in the year 1644, where General Merci was killed.* It will be proper in a new edition to ſtop at *Friburg got the ſtart of it.* The reſt is miſplaced and ſhould come in under the word *Friburg* (2). Beſides it is not true that General Merci was killed at the battle of Friburg in 1644. He was killed at the battle of Nortlingen in the year 1645. He had a brother named Gaſpar who was killed at the battle of Friburg in 1644. This is what deceived Moreri. In the article of General Merci, Moreri obſerves that he was wounded at Nortlingen on the third of Auguſt 1645. It ſhould have been ſaid that he died of his wounds. This capital omiſſion ought to be ſupplied in the firſt edition that ſhall be publiſhed (3). Mr Bayle's Remark.

(2) This is corrected in the edition of 1725, after the following manner: *Briſach . . . . . was formerly the capital city, but afterwards Friburg, more famous on account of its riches, deprived it of that rank.* The reſt is wholly left out. At the article Friburg mention is made of the victory obtained by the Duke d'Anguien. New Observat.

(3) All theſe faults are corrected in the laſt edition. New Observat.

C.

CAMUS.

THE editor calls the famous Biſhop of Belley, *John-Peter le Camus*, inſtead *John-Peter Camus*. It is a fault which he has not taken from the old editions, but which he himſelf has made without doubt, by confounding the families of *le Camus* and *Camus*, which are nevertheleſs very different (1). The firſt is an antient family of the Robe at Paris; Cardinal le Camus is of that family. The ſecond is a family of military gentlemen though ſome branches of it at this day wear the Robe. Since I am ſpeaking of John-Peter Camus, Biſhop of Belley. I ought to remark that the author of the Paris Gazette, when he mentioned laſt year, or the year before, the death of Mr Camus, Abbot and General of the Order of St Ruf, is in the wrong to ſay that this Abbot was nephew to that Biſhop; they were of the ſame family, but certainly the Biſhop was not the Abbot's uncle.

(1) This fault is not in the edition of 1725. New Observat.

CANADA.

This article is curious enough, but it muſt be confeſſed that the author, ſpeaking of the firſt Apoſtles who planted the faith in theſe newly diſcovered countries, ſhould not have forgot to give the Jeſuits their due (1). There are few religious ſocieties to which the world is ſo much obliged as it is to this, and few that have acted with ſo much courage and zeal in declaring the truths of Chriſtianity to theſe ſavage nations.

(1) Nothing has been added thereupon in the laſt editions. New Observat.

CHRISTINA OF BADEN.

The editor has confounded himſelf when he ſpeaks of this Princeſs, who was third wife to Albert Marquis of Anſpach; it is in the article of Brandenbourg Anſpach. He obſerves firſt of all that Albert was only twice married (1), and afterwards forgetting

no

---

(1) This error is corrected in the edition of 1725, at the word *Brandenbourg*, pag. 455. New Observat.

no doubt the firſt propoſition which he had advanced, he names the three Princeſſes who were wives to this Marquis. I do not know our author's real opinion touching this hiſtorical point; but whatever it be, it is moſt certain that Chriſtina of Baden Dourlach was third wife to Albert of Brandenburg, Marquis of Anſpach, and this Prince is grandfather to the new Princeſs of Hanover (2).

(2) *Willelmina-Carolina,* the late Queen-conſort of England. New Observat.

CLAIRVAUX.

This abbey is not the chief of the order, it is only one of the four principal daughters of Citeaux. Now if this abbey were chief of the order, the Abbot would not be ſubject to the juriſdiction of the Abbot of Citeaux; it is nevertheleſs a certain fact, and eaſy to be proved that he is ſo (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725 it is ſaid, that *the abbey of Clairvaux is the third daughter of Ciſtaux, elective and regular.* New Observat.

CLEMENT XI.

There is a fault here which is owing to nothing but want of attention, for beſides that it is not common to all the articles where mention is made of this Pope, it is impoſſible to believe the editor ſo ignorant as not to know that Clement XI, who now fills St Peter's chair, is not the immediate ſucceſſor to Alexander VIII, ſince Innocent XII, whoſe government will one day be ſo famous in hiſtory, on account of the great events which happened in his time, reigned between theſe two Popes; it is nevertheleſs affirmed in the new edition, that Clement XI ſucceeded Alexander VIII (1).

(1) Our author ſhould have pointed out the place where this error lies. New Observat.

CLUSA.

They ſeem to doubt, in the article of James Cluſa, a Ciſtertian Friar, who became afterwards a Carthuſian, whether this author be a different perſon from him who is known under the name of James de Paradiſo; it even looks as if the author of the new edition was unwilling to diſtinguiſh theſe two authors. This article ſhould not have been treated ſo ſuperficially, and the authority of thoſe who diſtinguiſh James de Cluſa, and James de Paradiſo, is not of ſuch ſmall weight that this queſtion deſerved to be treated ſo careleſsly (1).

(1) In the laſt edition they have put Cluse (James de), *who, according to moſt authors, is the ſame with* James de Parades: and at the word James de Parades, they refer to de Cluse (*James*). New Observat.

COMO.

Among the authors who have ſpoken of Como, or of the lake of Como, the editor does not mention an hiſtory or a deſcription of that city, which does not indeed contain above two pages, and which was compoſed by Mr Duker, who took it from ſeveral authors. There has been added to it the plan of that city. Mr Duker was poiſoned in Sicily in the year 1635. Camillus Ghilini, a writer of the XVIth century, and one of the beſt Latin authors of that time, has alſo given a deſcription of the lake of Como. The piece does not exceed three pages, and has had no better fate than Duker's, that is to ſay, it has been forgot, as well as the deſcription of the lake of Como in eight pages, written by Paul Jovius. It is ſtrange that in one ſingle article three authors of ſuch diſtinction ſhould be forgotten (1).

(1) Theſe authors are ſtill forgotten in the edition of 1725. Their deſcriptions of the city and of the lake of Como are inſerted in the third volume of Mr Grævius's *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiæ.* New Observat.

CREMONA.

The editor, in reckoning up the authors who mention this city, has forgot Lewis Cavitelli, who wrote the annals of it from its foundation to the year 1583 (1). They are very extenſive, becauſe the author does not ſo much confine himſelf to his ſubject, but that he often takes in facts which have a relation to the general hiſtory of Italy, and even to divers other parts of Europe. This work, tho' written in an age when learning begun to revive, is not the more correct on that account. The editor, as negligent as Moreri was, does not ſo much as give a particular article of Cavitelli.

(1) This author is quoted in the laſt edition; but inſtead of *Cavitelli*, the Printers have put *Camtelli*. This work of Cavitelli's is likewiſe to be found in the third volume of the *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiæ.* New Observat.

CREQUI.

There is an error in the laſt edition, touching the Marquis de Crequi, who was killed at the battle of Luzzara. It is obſerved there that the ſaid Lord left ſome daughters by the lady N . . . . d'Aumont, his wife, which is abſolutely falſe: this Marquis left no poſterity, and by his death the Count de Canaples, his uncle, at preſent Duke de Leſdiguieres, who was ſecond ſon to Charles II, Sieur de Crequi, who was killed at the ſiege of Chambery, in the year 1630, has got poſſeſſion of the entailed eſtate: it is eaſy to judge that the entail would not have taken place in his favour, if the Marquis de Crequi had left daughters (1).

---

(1) All this is corrected in the laſt edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

D.

DENIS (*Dionyſius Ryckelius*).

THE encomium upon this Carthuſian Friar is exceſſive; it is juſt (*a*), I confeſs, but then the author ſhould have ſhown upon what he grounded it; and ſhould have ſaid ſomething of the admirable works of this Anchoret; of theſe works, I ſay, which obliged Pope Eugenius IV to cry out in reading them, *Lætetur Mater Eccleſia quæ talem habet filium.* - - - *Let mother church rejoice in having ſuch a ſon.* The book then which has done the greateſt honour to Denis, the Carthuſian, is his treatiſe concerning the authority of the Pope, and of the Council; and I do not doubt but it was the reading of that work which drew the exclamation from the ſovereign Pontif. Denis Rikel was certainly one of the greateſt lights of his order, and even of the Church (*b*).

(*a*) It is difficult to conceive how an *encomium* that is *exceſſive* can be *juſt*; or if it be *juſt*, how it can be *exceſſive*. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(*b*) Our author might have given ſeveral other hints touching this article; Moreri has forgot to mark the place where this Carthuſian died; it was the Charterhouſe of Ruremonde in Guelderland (1). He was in the wrong to ſay that they ſirnamed him *Extatic*, on account of his attachment to contemplation, he ſhould have added, that it was chiefly becauſe it was thought he had divine inſpirations during his extaſies (2). There are ſeveral ſingularities in his life which would much adorn his article in the new editions of Moreri. The moſt common opinion is that he died at the age of ſixty-nine years: nevertheleſs, Valerius Andreas, pag. 190, of his *Bibliotheca Belgica*, ſays, that Denys the Carthuſian affirms, that he compoſed his book of Meditations (which was his laſt production) at the age of ſeventy-nine years (3). MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1725 it is obſerved, that *he entered into the Carthuſian monaſtery at Ruremonde in 1423, and lived there forty-eight years.* NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) We ſtill find in the laſt edition that his *continual attachment to contemplation got him the name of* Extatic Doctor. NEW OBSERVAT.

(3) In the laſt edition it is ſaid that he *died on the twelfth of March 1471, aged ſixty-nine years.* They do not quote *Valerius Andreas* at the end of that article. NEW OBSERVAT.

DEODATUS (in Moreri) DIEU-DONNE'.

It is ſurpriſing that this article has not been corrected in any edition of Moreri's Dictionary; here they commit a capital error, for they confound two Popes into one. Certain it is that there have been two Popes of the name *Deodatus*, or *Deus-dedit*; the firſt ſucceeded Boniface IV, in the beginning of the VIIth century, that is to ſay, in the year 614: but beſides the Deodatus of whom Moreri ſpeaks, there was another, who ſucceeded Vitalianus about the year 669, the year in which the latter died. Moreri has taken this error from Platina and Onuphrius, who confound theſe two Popes. But what ſurprizes me is, that we find the two *Deodatus*'s in the chronological table of the Popes, at the article of *Rome*. This ſhews the little exactneſs and attention of the editors; beſides the ſecond *à Deo datus* reigned ſeven years, two months, and ſeventeen days; therefore the time of his adminiſtration is long enough to deſerve to be mentioned (1). His pontificate was even remarkable for ſome things, which might have ſerved as an epoch to the hiſtorians. It was this Pope who allowed the Venetians to chooſe a chief for themſelves, and to create a Duke.

---

(1) In the edition of 1725, theſe two Popes are very well diſtinguiſhed: but the article of the ſecond is brought in at the word ADEODAT. The chronology of our author is not followed there, for it is affirmed that Adeodatus ſucceeded Vitalianus *in the year* 671, and that *he died on the eighteenth of May* 676, *after having held the ſee five years, two months, and ſeventeen days.* NEW OBSERVAT.

DIEPPE.

Dieppe is twelve leagues from Roüen, even according to the moſt exact calculation; conſequently it is at leaſt a fault in point of exactneſs, to ſay that theſe two cities are only ten leagues diſtant from one another. I will confeſs, if you pleaſe, that the fault is of no great conſequence, but it may nevertheleſs appear worthy of a Geographer's attention; and in an Univerſal Dictionary care ſhould be taken to ſatisfy every body (1).

---

(1) In the laſt edition it is ſaid that Dieppe is *twelve leagues from Roüen*. New Observat.

E.

EGHMONT *(a)*.

It is not an exact way of ſpeaking, to ſay that the only perſon who remains of the illuſtrious *(b)* family of Eghmont is the Count d'Eghmont, who married Madam de Coſnac; however this is what our editor ſays, as if he had viſited all the provinces of Flanders, on purpoſe to ſee whether that great family was reduced to the ſingle perſon of the Count d'Eghmont now in France *(c)*.

(a) Our author ſhould have warned the editors to correct this Orthography: it ſhould be writ *Egmont:* and if cuſtom did not authorize *Egmont*, it would be ſtill better to write *Egmond:* the Latin authors ſay *Egmonda*, *Egmondanus* &c. Strada ſhould not have made uſe of the word *Egmontius* (1). Mr Bayle's Remark.

(b) Moreri ſays that it is the principal family in Holland. He ſhould have ſaid *one of the principal*, &c. (2). Mr Bayle's Remark.

(c) The editors ſhould have been told that Moreri is miſtaken, when he ſays that the Count d'Egmont who was beheaded at Bruſſels on the fifth of June 1568, left three ſons and eleven daughters; he ſhould have ſaid *three ſons and eight daughters* (3). He ſhould not have forgot the date of the erection of Egmont into a county, he ſhould have ſaid that it was done in favour of John d'Egmont by the Emperor Maximilian I, in the year 1488 (4). The Count who was beheaded at Bruſſels deſerved a longer article: they may enlarge it, if they pleaſe, in a new edition, and they will do well to conſult the laſt Hiſtory of the Duke of Alva (5). Mr Moreri has only followed the writers that were enemies to King Philip II. This was not diſcharging the duty of an Hiſtorian, he ſhould have conſulted the authors of both ſides, and perhaps it would appear from thence that the ſaid Count was not clear from the crime of high-treaſon. It is not unlikely that he artfully endeavoured to manage matters ſo that Philip II, ſhould not be King of the Low-Countries upon any other condition, than ſending ſuch orders there as were ſuitable to the advice given by the Nobility of the land. Thoſe who aſpired at this kind of ſovereignty, connived at the mutinies of the populace and the pillaging of the churches. Count d'Egmont was accuſed of this perhaps with a good deal of reaſon. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) In the laſt edition at the word Eghmont, *family*, they refer us to Egmond, where, in effect, we find the article of that family. This laſt article is preceded by that of *Egmont*, village, ſo ſpelt, though in the following article they write *Egmond*. New Observat.

(2) In the edition of 1712, and thoſe that follow, it is ſaid that the village of *Egmond has given its name to one of the principal families in Holland*, &c. New Observat.

(3) In ſome editions they ſay, that Count had three ſons and ten daughters. New Observat.

(4) Nothing has been added upon this head in the edition of 1725. New Observat,

(5) They have not enlarged this article in the laſt edition. New Observat.

ENCYCLOPEDIA.

This word puts me in mind that they have forgot to mention the book which Andrew-Matthew Aquaviva, Duke of Atri in the kingdom of Naples, compoſed under that title (1). The family Aquaviva has produced learned men.

---

(1) In the laſt edition at the word Aquaviva, and in the article of *Andrew-Matthew d'Aquaviva III of the name* (it is thus that our author ſhould have named him) they take notice that this Duke, after he he had been *preſent at two battles that were loſt* &c; *having a particular inclination for learned men and letters, conſecrated the remainder of his life to ſtudy, and even became an author*. But they make no mention of his *Encyclopedia*. New Observat.

ESPERNAY.

The author of the new edition does not do juſtice to the antient city of Eſpernay, when he makes it to be no more than a borough. One had reaſon to expect that he would have corrected the firſt editions in this article. Thoſe who are deſirous to be informed of the antiquity of that town, which is in Champaign, need only conſult a letter directed to Father de Villers, and inſerted in the Memoires de Trevoux for the month of May of this preſent year: but the writer of that letter wrongs the author of the new edition of the Dictionary, when he reproaches him with having ſaid, that Eſpernay

Eſpernay is only a village; the editor is nearer the truth, ſince he gives that place the title of borough (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725, they have put, ESPERNAY, *a city of France in Champain,* &c. and they quote the *Memoires de Trevoux*, 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

ESPINAY DU RETAL.

This Genealogical article is not exact; it is ſaid therein that Richard d'Eſpinay was High-ſteward and Great-Chamberlain of Bretagne; which is a miſtake, ſince it was Robert, father to Richard, that was poſſeſſed of theſe dignities (1). They commit another fault in the ſame article, when they affirm that Guy II d'Eſpinay married Jane d'Eſtouteville: it was not Guy II, who married that lady, it was Henry d'Eſpinay (2). In fine, they do not tell us that Claudius d'Eſpinay, who was ſon to Margaret d'Eſpreaux, and who married Jane de la Rochefoucauld, left beſides Frances, Charles d'Eſpinay, who married Margaret de Rohan, by whom he had no children, and conſequently his eſtate returned to his ſiſter (3). It will concern thoſe who ſhall have the care of the next edition of Moreri, to improve this article, purſuant to theſe Remarks.

(1) In the ſame edition we find that ROBERT *d'Eſpinay, the firſt of the name*, was *High-ſteward of Bretagne*, and *firſt Chamberlain* to Duke John VI; that ROBERT, *the ſecond of the name*, grandſon (and not ſon) to Robert I, was *High-ſteward of Bretagne*; and that RICHARD, ſon to Robert II, was *Chamberlain* to Duke Francis II. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) We likewiſe find there that GUY II married *Frances* de Villefranche; and that HENRY married *Catharine* d'Eſtouteville. NEW OBSERVAT.

(3) This is corrected in the laſt edition: but whereas our author ſays *Margaret d'Eſpreaux*, they have put Margaret de *Scepaux*; they have written *Dureſtal*, inſtead of *Du Retal*; and in the room of *Jane de la Rochefoucault*, there is *Frances* de la Rochefoucault. They obſerve there that CHARLES dying without iſſue, *his eſtate went to Charles de Schomberg, his ſiſter's ſon.* NEW OBSERVAT.

ESTE.

The editor has varied ſpeaking of Mary Eleanor d'Eſte, now Queen of England: in ſome places ſhe is omitted, and in others not put in her right place. This Princeſs is daughter to Alphonſo IV, Duke of Modena and Reggio, and to Laura Martinozzy, the late Cardinal Mazarin's niece; the late Duke of Modena, Francis II, was her brother, and the preſent Duke of Modena, formerly Cardinal d'Eſte, is her uncle. This Prince, who ſucceeded his nephew, who died without iſſue, is brother to the late Duke Alphonſo IV. Such are the amendments to be made in this article in the ſubſequent editions (1).

(1) This article is corrected in the laſt edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

F.

FELIBIEN.

IN the article of Meſſieurs Felibien, they have forgot the Abbot Felibien, Archdeacon of Chartres, and, if I am not miſtaken, brother to him who has given us that fine hiſtory of Painters. The Abbot Felibien is ſufficiently known in the learned world to deſerve being mentioned upon this occaſion. The *Pentateuchus Hiſtoricus*, &c. which he publiſhed ſome months ago, ſhould, methinks, have ſecured him a place in a Dictionary where his family holds a conſiderable one already (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725, we find the article of JAMES FELIBIEN, who is the man in queſtion here, brother to *Andrew Felibien des Avaux*. NEW OBSERVAT.

FRANCIS II.

In the article of this Prince, they place his birth in the year 1543 (on the twentieth of January); they meant (*a*), without doubt, 1544. The miſtake is of no more than one year; but one year is conſiderable when we talk of a Prince that lived only ſixteen years, and ſome odd months. This Prince died on the fifth of December 1560. Now from the twentieth of January 1543, to the fifth of December 1560, they would certainly find it to be more than ſeventeen years (1).

(*a*) This error proceeded from their making the year to begin only at Eaſter, and conſequently the month of January 1543, according to our way of reckoning, belongs to the year 1544. The editors of Moreri ſhould be very exact, either in giving notice of the difference which ariſes from the time of beginning the year, or in reducing the dates to the preſent calculation. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1707, it is ſaid that FRANCIS II *was born on the twentieth of January* 1543, *according to the old way of reckoning*. In that of 1712, the date of the day is corrected, and they put *the nineteenth of January*. But theſe words, *according to the old way of reckoning*, are left out in the laſt edition, and it is expreſly ſaid that this Prince was born on the nineteenth of January 1544. NEW OBSERV.

FURAN.

Is a ſmall river of Bugey, which goes winding at a league's diſtance from Belley, and falls into the Rhône near Pierre-chatel. The editor calls it improperly *le Foran* (1).

(1) As Moreri gives no particular article of this river under the name of *Foran*, or *Furan*; our Critic ſhould have pointed out the place where this fault is to be found. In the article *Bugey*, of the laſt edition, it is called *le Furan*. New Observat.

G.

GENOA.

IN ſpeaking of this city and of *James Bracelli*, who was of Sarzana, in the Republic of Genoa, Moreri and his Continuators make uſe of an unpardonable exaggeration. *James Bracelli*, ſay they, *left alſo a book concerning the illuſtrious men of Genoa, which he inſcribed to Lewis of Piſa a Jacobin*, &c. Do theſe words ſuit a ſmall piece of three or four pages, which is tacked to another of the ſame ſize, intituled, *A Deſcription of the coaſt of Genoa*, that is to ſay, of the country which extends from the Var to the Macra (1)? What Foglieta, Juſtiniani, Leander Alberti, Faſcio, and *de Voragine*, have written upon the ſame ſubject, is more particular. Philip Beroaldus compares Bracelli's ſtile to that of Cæſar.

(1) In the edition of 1725 the following alteration is made here: *James Bracelli alſo left a ſhort deſcription of the coaſt of Genoa; to which is added a ſmall treatiſe on the illuſtrious men of Genoa, inſcribed to Lewis of Piſa, a Dominican.* Theſe two pieces of Bracelli are inſerted in the firſt volume of the *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiæ*. New Observat.

GASPARD BARTHIUS.

The famous Gaſpard Barthius was aged only ſeventy-one years and three months wanting five days when he died; the editor does nevertheleſs ſuppoſe him *to have lived ſomewhat above ſeventy-two years*; which I thus prove to be a miſtake. Barthius was born on the twenty-ſecond of June 1587, and died on the ſeventeenth of September 1658: we need only reckon the difference between theſe two years (1). This author, ſo famous among the learned, was very ill treated by Voſſius, and he treated Scioppius very ill in his turn, being one of his ſevereſt adverſaries. Barthius was a copious writer; and if we may juſtly blame any thing in the books which he publiſhed, it is the eaſineſs with which he compoſed them.

(1) In the laſt edition they have put that Barthius *died on the ſeventeenth of September* 1658; which is taken from Mr Bayle, whom they quote. For the reſt, our author ſhould have ſpoken of *Barthius* under the letter *B*, and not under the letter *G*: but this prepoſterous order is pretty common with him. New Observat.

J.

JAMES II.

IN all the articles where mention is made of the late King of England, James II, they place his death in the year 1702. It is amazing that at three or four years diſtance from a matter of fact people ſhould be already miſtaken in a year. What would the caſe be then, if that Prince had died thirty or forty years ago? It is an inexcuſable fault, ſince to avoid it, the editor needed only to have taken up the firſt almanack that came in his way, he would have learned there that the ſaid Prince died in the year 1701, and he would have fixed his Chronology by that (1).

(1) They have corrected this fault in the laſt editions. New Observat.

S. JUSTIN.

In the article of this Father, the editor ſhould not have forgot to ſay, that he was one of Ariſtotle's greateſt adverſaries. If he had conſulted the ſeventh book of Euſebius, and St Jerom's catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, he might have ſeen with what warmth (*a*) this Father of the Church inveighed againſt the Prince of Philoſophers. He publiſhed a treatiſe, in which he confuted ſeveral tenets of Ariſtotle's Philoſophy, and wherein he ſhewed the dangerous conſequences that might be drawn from them (1). If we ſearch into paſt ages, we ſhall find few which have not produced adverſaries to the Peripatetic Philoſophy; it is true, all thoſe who have attacked it have not been alike ſucceſsful in decrying it; and it ſeems that it was reſerved for (*b*) Mr Des Cartes to give it the deepeſt wounds.

(*a*) All this wants to be corrected; for, 1. He ſhould have told us what work of Euſebius he means, when he ſays the ſeventh book is to be conſulted, whether it be his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, or his Evangelical Preparation, or his Evangelical Demonſtration. 2. In the catalogue which Euſebius has left us of St Juſtin's works in the eighteenth chapter of the fourth book of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, we find no mention made of any treatiſe againſt Ariſtotle. 3. St Jerom's catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Authors makes no mention of ſuch a treatiſe written by St Juſtin. The treatiſe againſt Ariſtotle, which appears among St Juſtin's works, is accounted ſuppoſititious. See the *Bibliotheque* of Mr du Pin in the article of that Father of the Church. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1712, and thoſe that follow, we find only that *Photius mentions ſome treatiſes of* Juſtin, *againſt Marcion and againſt Ariſtotle.* NEW OBSERVAT.

(*b*) Mr Des Cartes did not make any particular refutation of the Peripatetic ſyſtem: the miſchief he has done it proceeds from his having laid down other principles, which have given people a diſtaſte for the ſchool Philoſophy. It was Gaſſendus, who, by attacks in form, ſhewed the falſity of the Peripatetic doctrines. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

L.

LE FERON.

IN this article it is ſaid that the late Ducheſs of Chaulnes had neither brother nor ſiſters, in a word, that ſhe was an only daughter. The Marquis de la Frete, who is now living, would not readily agree to this aſſertion (1).

---

(1) In the laſt edition, at the word *Feron*, it is ſaid that *Elizabeth le Feron*, who married the Duke of Chaulnes, for her ſecond huſband, was the *only daughter* of *Dreux le Feron*. They add, that her mother, *Barbara Servien*, was married in ſecond wedlock to Peter de Gruel, Lord of *la Frete . . . and left children by him*. NEW OBSERVAT.

LE JAY.

This article is faulty, for they have ill ſpelt the name of Catherine de la Boutiere, who lately died, and who was married to the late Nicholas le Jay, Baron de Tilly, & *de la Maiſon rouge*, and Counſellor in the parliament of Paris, who died in 1700: they write it *N . . . . de la Boutire* (1). Beſides, in the ſame article they place the death of the late Mr le Jay, Biſhop of Cahors, in the year 1679; as to this laſt point there is only a miſtake of about twelve years, ſince the late Mr le Jay, who ſucceeded Mr de Noailles, at preſent Cardinal and Archbiſhop of Paris, in the biſhopric of Cahors, has been dead not above that ſpace of time (2).

---

(1) In the edition of 1725, we find at length, *Catherine de la Boutiere.* NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) In the ſame edition it is obſerved, that *Henry-William le Jay, named Biſhop of Cahors in the year* 1679, *died in* 1693: and in the article of the Cardinal de Noailles it is ſaid, that he was, *in the year* 1679, *made Biſhop of Cahors*, and *transferred to Chalons-ſur-Marne in* 1680. NEW OBSERVAT.

LODI.

In the article of Lodi, a town in Italy, no notice is taken of the Hiſtory which Otho Morena wrote upon that ſubject, and which his ſon Acerbus Morena continued (1). This work is, properly ſpeaking, the hiſtory of what Frederic Barbaroſſa did in Lombardy, from the year 1154 to the year 1168, chiefly with reſpect to the town of Lodi. The two Morena's died before that Prince, conſequently they could not bring their hiſtory further down. They were both in the intereſt of Frederic; from whence we we may juſtly conclude that their writings were not quite impartial. It was this no doubt that obliged Baronius to uſe them ill in his Eccleſiaſtical Annals: he ſpeaks of them in very diſobliging terms; but that Cardinal was ſtill more partial to the Pope, than the Morena's were to the Emperor, notwithſtanding that they writ, if we may ſay ſo, under his very eyes. What may be ſaid in favour of theſe two authors, is that they writ nothing but what they had ſeen. Their Latin ſtile is ſuch as prevailed in the XIIth century, that is to ſay, very bad. Felix Oſio, Profeſſor of Rhetoric at Padua, has made upon that Hiſtory long notes which deſerve to be read.

---

(1) In the laſt edition no mention is made of the *Hiſtory of Morena*; but only of that of *Defendente Lodi*. It is intituled, *Diſcorſi Iſtorici intorno la Citta di Lodi*, and was printed in the year 1629, at Lodi in 4to. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) In

The editor gives us an article of Morena, but he ſays in a very confuſed manner, that Otho Morena compoſed the Hiſtory of Frederic Barbaroſſa, and that his ſon finiſhed it; which is abſolutely falſe, ſince that Emperor out-lived them: beſides that book is rather the Hiſtory of the wars of Lodi, than that of the ſaid Emperor. By the *Hiſtory* of a man is commonly meant, a particular account of his actions, from the beginning of his life to his death. Now the Morena's could not poſſibly have writ a particular account of Frederic Barbaroſſa's actions, ſince both of them died before that Emperor (2).

(2) In the laſt edition, at the article MORENA, it is ſaid that OTHO MORENA *begun the Hiſtory of what the Emperor Frederic Barbaroſſa did in Lombardy, from the year* 1154 *to the year* 1168, *chiefly with reſpect to the town of Lodi*; and that his ſon ACERUS MORENA, *finiſhed what his father had not been able to do.* That Hiſtory is inſerted in the third volume of the *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiæ.* NEW OBSERVAT.

LE MERCIER.

The editor ſpeaking of John le Mercier, Royal Profeſſor of the Hebrew tongue at Paris, does not expreſs himſelf ſo exactly as he ought to do, when he ſays that this learned man tranſlated from Greek into Latin Harmenopulus. From theſe words, any body would be apt to believe that le Mercier has tranſlated all the works of that Greek author; it is nevertheleſs certain that he has only tranſlated his *Prochiron*, or *promptuarium juris civilis.* Thoſe who only know Harmenopulus's works by the idea which Moreri, or his Continuators, give of them, will not heſitate a moment in believing, by what they ſay, that le Mercier had tranſlated them all, becauſe they have been all collected in one body (1).

(1) Our author has taken this remark from Mr Bayle's *Réponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial*, Tom. I. Cap. LIII, pag. 482, *& ſeq.* In the edition of 1725 we find that John le Mercier, *when he ſtudied the Law at Avignon, tranſlated from Greek into Latin, the* Prochirum *or* promptuarium juris civilis *of Harmenopulus.* NEW OBSERVAT.

LEYME.

This word was right in the firſt editions, and they have made it wrong in the preſent by putting *Leyne*, inſtead of *Leyme*: it is an abbey of nuns in the dioceſe of Cahors, of which mention is made in the article *Noailles*, upon the ſubject of Frances de Noailles, great aunt to the Marſhal and to the Cardinal de Noailles, who was abbeſs there, and died not long ago (1).

(1) In the laſt edition at the word NOAILLES, and the article of HENRY *Lord of Noailles*, Count of Ayen &c. they have put *Leime.* NEW OBSERVAT.

LORRAINE.

In the article of Lorraine the editor has committed a very groſs fault: he ſays that Catherine de Bourbon, ſiſter to Henry IV, and wife to Henry Duke of Bar, was mother to the Princeſſes Nichola and Claudia de Lorraine; the firſt of whom was married to Charles, afterwards Duke of Lorraine, and the ſecond to Francis de Vaudemont, grand-father to the preſent Duke of Lorraine. Theſe two Princes, who were brothers, were firſt couſins to thoſe two Princeſſes who were daughters to Henry Duke of Bar, and afterwards of Lorraine, by his ſecond wife; for Catherine de Bourbon his firſt wife, lived only ſix months with him, being of different religions they fell out and parted; Catherine died in the year 1604 (1).

In this ſame article the editor is miſtaken in the liſt of the Dukes of Lorraine. *Gerard*, who died in the year 1048, was never *Marchis* of Lorraine, as it is ſaid in the new edition; it was his ſecond ſon *Gerard* who was ſo by his marriage with Hedwige, heireſs of the county of Namur, which her mother Hermengarde had left her (2).

(1) This is corrected in the edition of 1725, pag. 209, col. 1. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) In the ſame edition pag. 207. col. 2. *Gerard*, who died in 1048, is called *Count* and *Marchis of Alſatia*; and *Gerard, his ſon, Duke* and *Marchis of Lorraine.* NEW OBSERVAT.

LUCIAN.

It plainly appears that the editor had a mind to correct what Moreri ſays concerning the *Metamorphoſis, or golden Aſs of Apuleius*, nevertheleſs what he himſelf ſays on this occaſion is not ſo exact as it ought to be; for to ſay that *the golden Aſs is a paraphraſe on the ſame ſubject which Lucian had taken from Lucius of Patras, author of a book of Metamorphoſes, or transformations, which Photius* mentions, is not an exact expreſſion; he ought to have ſaid that Lucius of Patras had been abridged by Lucian, and paraphraſed by Apuleius: and thus that article ſhould have been corrected (1). In the ſame manner, when they ſpeak of Apuleius of Madaura (2), ſhould they have forgot in reckoning up his works, *the Letters to Corellia*, which, to ſay the truth, are *(a)* written in a very free ſtyle, and his other treatiſes *de Republica*, *de Numeris*, *de Muſica*, and his *Ludicra*, of which he ſpeaks himſelf in his apology (3)? It is *(b)* a pretty ingenious Poem (4).

---

(1) Our author has taken this remark from Mr Bayle's article of *Apuleius*, remark (*M*). They have made no alteration here in the laſt edition of Moreri, except that inſtead of *Lucius of Patras* they have put *Lucius Patras*; but *Lucius of Patras* was right. New Observat.

(2) By the manner of our author's expreſſing himſelf one might believe that *Apuleius of Madaura* is different from the *Apuleius* he was ſpeaking of: he is however the ſame. New Observat.

(a) He ſhould have ſaid *were*, for it is a long time ſince theſe letters have been loſt. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(3) Nothing has been added upon this in the laſt edition. New Observat.

(b) It is very probable that the *Ludicra* of Apuleius was a collection of divers pieces ſome of which were in verſe, and others in proſe. He ſays that a letter contained in that collection had been objected to him; which letter was writen in verſe, and treated of the care to be taken in keeping one's teeth clean, *de dentifricio*. This does not prove that the *Ludrica* was a Poem. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(4) Our Critic having found in Mr Bayle the following words of Apuleius: *legerunt è Ludicris meis epiſtolium de dentifricio, verſibus ſcriptum*, imagined that the *Ludicra* of Apuleius was *a Poem*; and though this work be not now extant, he ſpeaks of it as if he had read it, and aſſures us that *it is a pretty ingenious Poem*. New Observat.

LUCIUS BRUTUS.

Moreri has followed the authority of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis preferably to that of Livy, in ſpeaking of this generous Roman. Dionyſius Halicarneſſenſis makes him ſon to a daughter of Tarquinius Priſcus King of Rome, who was ſiſter *(a)* to Tarquin, whereas Livy makes him the ſon of Tarquinia ſiſter to the laſt Tarquin. Mr Bayle demonſtrates with an irreſiſtible evidence, that the ſentiment of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis, upon this occaſion is not to be defended, and that we muſt neceſſarily follow the opinion of Livy. I refer the reader to him (1).

(a) This is very obſcure, for to which Tarquin muſt we ſuppoſe that the daughter of Tarquinius Priſcus was ſiſter? Was it to the laſt Tarquin? But in that caſe the opinion of Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis, which our author rejects, would not be different from that of Livy, which he would have us follow; and we ſhould ſay that Tarquinius Priſcus was father to the laſt Tarquin, which is entirely wrong, as Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis has plainly proved. The Tarquin who is ſaid here to have been the brother of Brutus's mother, whom they make daughter to Tarquinius Priſcus, would neceſſarily be the ſon of Tarquinius Priſcus, but Hiſtory ſays nothing of ſuch a ſon except that he died before his father, and left two ſons behind him. See Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis at the beginning of the fourth book. Mr Bayle's Rem.

(1) In the edition of 1712, and thoſe that follow, it is ſaid Lucius Junius Brutus was *ſon to a ſiſter of Tarquin King of Rome*, and nephew *to Tarquinius Superbus*. New Observat.

LYCURGUS.

They have made ſome alteration in this article, I confeſs, and it is not ſo faulty as it was in the ſupplement of the Dictionary, but after all it is not yet exact: for they ſeem to me not to diſtinguiſh the two Lycurgus's, one an Athenian Orator, ſon to Lycophron, and grand-ſon to another Lycurgus whom the thirty tyrants put to death; the other the Lacedemonian Legiſlator. Theſe two perſons were entirely different, and it was a groſs fault to confound them, as the author of the Supplement *(a)* did; but in ſhort as we find only one Lycurgus mentioned in the new edition *(b)*, it ſtill ſhews a diſpoſition in the editor to confound them (1).

The author of the Supplement had committed a great many blunders in this article; one of the chief of them was, that by miſtaking Plutarch's words, he makes him ſay that Lycurgus drove out all idle and vagabond perſons, whereas the Greek word rendered by that of *maleficus* only implies that he drove out all bad people. He afterwards makes him conqueror in the games that were celebrated in the preſence of the people, though Plutarch, does not ſay a ſingle word of it. He committed ſeveral other groſs faults which convince me that this author was no great Grecian. Mr Faydit, when he ſpeaks of Lycurgus in his new book *, doubts *(c)* whether there had been two Lycurgus's, and he ſeems to confound the King of Thrace with that of

* Remarques ſur Virgile, &c.

(*a*) This cenſure is wrong, Moreri had given us the article of Lycurgus the Lacedemonian Legiſlator. Since therefore the author of the Supplement gave us the article of ſome other Lycurgus's, and particularly that of Lycurgus an Athenian Orator (by which epithet he diſtinguiſhed him from the very firſt line) he did not confound the Lacedemonian Legiſlator with the Orator of Athens. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*b*) As I have not this new edition, I content myſelf with ſaying that there are ſeveral Lycurgus's in the Paris edition of 1699, and that the Lacedemonian Legiſlator is there plainly diſtinguiſhed from the Athenian Orator. He has been placed among the other Lycurgus's. But in the Amſterdam edition of 1698 there are above fifty pages between theſe and Lycurgus the Legiſlator. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) The edition of 1707 diſtinguiſhes all the Lycurgus's very well; and there is reaſon to believe that the edition of 1704 does the ſame. New Observ.

(*c*) I have looked in this book of Mr Faydit for the neceſſary page, and without being at all aſſiſted by the index I found that it is page 540. I did not find there the fault which is taken notice of here, that is to ſay, the doubt whether there had been two Lycurgus's. Mr Faydit does not condemn the authors *who diſtinguiſh the Lycurgus King of Thrace, from the other of Lacedemon*, he only ſays *that they all agree that theſe two Lycurgus's lived more than three hundred years after the deſtruction of Troy*; it is upon this that he refers us to Moreri, and afterwards he concludes ‘ that ‘ it was abſurd in Virgil to make Æneas ſay, when ‘ ſpeaking to Dido, *that he had paſſed through the* ‘ *kingdom of the Thracians, where the ſevere Lycurgus* ‘ *had formerly reigned in old times*. Thraces arant, ‘ acri of Lacedemon. In ſhort after ſhewing that he was very uncertain on this head, he refers his reader to Moreri. This authority ſhould not be of any great weight for ſuch an high-ſpirited author as Mr Faydit appears to be in his works.

‘ acri quondam regnata Lycurgo.’ But, 1. We do not find in Moreri that Lycurgus, King of Thrace, lived after the war of Troy. We find nothing preciſely determined there as to the time of that King. We only find enough to make us conclude that he lived in the fabulous times. 2. It is certain that the Antients who have mentioned that Prince make him live before the war of Troy. Homer, in the ſixth book of the Iliad, introduces Diomedes (one of the Grecian Captains at the ſiege of Troy) relating, as an old ſtory, the puniſhment of that Lycurgus for having driven out Bacchus. Apollodorus, in the third book of his *Bibliotheca*, pag. m. 175, deſcribes the adventures of Bacchus, with reſpect to Lycurgus, King of Thrace, in ſuch a manner, that, by a plain conſequence, this Lycurgus muſt have lived ſeveral generations before the war of Troy. This juſtifies Virgil, and demands a reparation of the injury done him. I ſhould be very curious to know the name of the authors who have owned that Lycurgus, King of Thrace, *lived more than three hundred years after the deſtruction of Troy*. I do not know one that ſays ſo. As for the reſt, the article of that King of Thrace is ſtill very faulty in Moreri. There are ſeveral things wanting that ought to be there, and they have only quoted Plutarch and Propertius, who hardly ſay any thing of what is there related. MR BAYLE's REMARK.

M.

MARTIN AKAKIA.

MORERI and his Continuators have committed a great error concerning the native country of this Phyſician; they have tranſlated the word *Catalaunenſis* by *Catalan* or of *Catalonia*, inſtead of *Chalonois* or of *Chalons*. If they had carefully read Quenſtet, in his book *de patriis viror.* to which they refer us, they would not have been guilty of ſuch a blunder (1). I hope theſe remarks will prevent all miſtakes in the following editions, concerning the native country of the chief of a family that is very conſiderable in the faculty of Phyſicians at Paris.

(1) This remark is taken from Mr Bayle. In the edition of 1725, we find that *Akakia* was born at *Chalons on the Marne*. NEW OBSERVAT.

MATTHEW BOSSULUS.

He is different from another John Boſſulus likewiſe a Frenchman, who lived above a century before him, but who, as well as he, has been very much forgotten in his own country. Mr Bayle had complained much that Matthew was ſo little known in the Republic of Letters, notwithſtanding he had acted ſuch a conſiderable part in the world. He was preceptor to Don Carlos ſon to Philip II, King of Spain: he had before that taught Rhetoric in the Univerſity of Valencia. Theſe marks of honour have not however been able to reſcue him from oblivion; and notwithſtanding the tender anxiety of Mr Bayle he ſtill continues in oblivion. Who could have believed that Mr Vaultier, who is ſo much concerned for the glory of his country, would have neglected to inform poſterity, that France had given to the court of Spain a man of that conſequence? It has been thought that the cauſe of this oblivion was his not having writ any books. If immortality can only be had at the price of being an author, it muſt be confeſſed that it would often be a greater advantage to remain buried in the duſt with the generality of mankind, and to be of the number of thoſe whoſe name does not go beyond the firſt generation (1).

(1) In the laſt edition of Moreri we find a good article of *Boſſulus*; they have made great uſe there of Mr Bayle's Dictionary, of which our author is no more than the tranſcriber in this place. NEW OBSERVAT.

MAZZOLIN.

The editor has adopted the error which prevailed in all the other editions concerning Sylveſter Mazzolin, called *Prierio* or *Prierias*. That General of the Dominicans (a) did not die at Rennes in Bretagne on the twentieth of October 1520. Since he dedicated his book *de Strigi-Magarum Dæmonumque mirandis*, to Cardinal Auguſtin Trivulſo, on the firſt of March 1521. I do not wonder that the editors have copied that error one from another, ſince not one of them mentions this book, which would have ſerved to rectify their Chronology. I believe they have taken Francis Sylveſter, who

---

(a) There is reaſon to believe that Sylveſter Prierias never was General of the Dominicans. MR BAYLE's REM.

who was likewiſe General of the Dominicans for this Mazzolin. *Francis*, it is true, died in the courſe of his viſitation at Rennes in Bretagne; but if we ſhould even allow theſe two Generals, who are very different, to be no more than one and the ſame perſon, the error would not be the leſs groſs upon that account, ſince Francis Sylveſter died, not in the year 1520, but in 1528: ſo that granting the editor's ſuppoſition to be true, there would ſtill be an anachroniſm of eight years (1).

(1) All this is taken from Mr Bayle, *Réponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial.* Tom. I. Chap. LXVI, pag. 618, *&* *ſeq.* In Moreri's edition of 1725, they have given us the article of *Sylveſter de Priero*, at the word MOZOLINO, upon what Father Quetif and Father Echard ſay of him in their *Bibliotheque* of the Dominican writers. Mozolino died at Rome in the year 1523, being then Maſter of the ſacred palace. He never was General of the Dominicans. We find in Father Quetif and Father Echard the article of *Francis Sylveſter*, General of the Dominicans, who died at Rennes on the nineteenth of September 1528, aged fifty-four years. This article is not in the laſt edition of Moreri, where they will do well to correct the following reference: ' SYLVESTER called de Pri-' erio, *General of the Dominicans*, ſee MOZOLIN:' Theſe words, *General of the Dominicans*, ſhould be ſtruck out. There is likewiſe another fault to be corrected in the article *Mozolino:* the Printers have put *Edward Brow*, inſtead of *Edward Brown.* NEW OBSERVAT.

MEDICIS.

In reckoning up the authors who have wrote the life, or who have made mention, of the famous Marquis of Marignano, John-James de Medicis, brother to Pope Pius IV, it is ſurpriſing that the editor ſhould not ſpeak of the *Hiſtoria Ciſalpina* of *Erycius Puteanus*, or rather of the Hiſtory of the actions of John-James de Medicis on the borders of the lake of Como. *Erycius Puteanus* is ſo well known in the learned world, that one has reaſon to be ſurprized at Moreri and his Continuators for not naming him among the Hiſtorians of the Marquis of Marignano. The Hiſtory of John-James de Medicis, which he compoſed, ends with the unfortunate battle of Pavia, where Francis I. was taken priſoner by the Spaniards, and carried to Madrid. In a word, *Erycius Puteanus* was the chief author that ſhould have been conſulted in order to give us ſure and faithful memoirs concerning the life of the famous Marquis of Marignano, ſince he was beſt acquainted with it, and knew the moſt ſecret circumſtances of it (1).

Beſides, in the article of *Erycius Puteanus*, the editor, when he ſpeaks of his works, ſays nothing at all of that above-mentioned (2). Galeazzo Capella has compoſed a ſhort Hiſtory not exceeding five pages, which may ſerve by way of ſupplement to that of the Marquis of Marignano, written by *Erycius Puteanus:* and indeed they have been printed together: the latter is an account of the war of Muzzo, a ſmall town on the weſt ſide of the lake of Como. The Marquis of Marignano was, properly ſpeaking, the author of that little war; he got by it the town of Marignano, a large ſum of money, and the title of Marquis. This ſupplement has been forgotten as well as the work to which it is ſubjoined (3).

(1) In the laſt edition, at the word MEDICIS, MEDICI, *or* MEDIQUIN, (*John-James*) Marquis of Marignano, they quote, *Erycius Puteanus*, *Hiſt. Ciſalpina.* This Hiſtory is in the third volume of the *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiæ.* NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) In this edition at the article PUY (*Henry du*), or ERYCIUS PUTEANUS, they do not give the catalogue of this author's works: they only take notice in general, that *he left a very great number of treatiſes concerning Hiſtory, Rhetoric, Mathematics, Philoſophy, and Philology, an account of which may be ſeen in Valerius Andreas's* Bibliotheca Belgica. NEW OBSERV.

(3) They have not yet inſerted this particular in the article of the Marquis of Marignano; nor mentioned the book of Galeazzo Capella *de Bello Muſſiano*, which Grævius has inſerted in the third volume of his *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiæ.* NEW OBSERVAT.

MILLET.

That name has been ill ſpelt in this edition, where they have put *Milet* inſtead of *Millet*, and that fault is peculiar to this edition, ſince it is not in the others. It is very neceſſary to take notice of it, that it may be avoided in the following editions. When I ſay *very neceſſary*, it is with reſpect to one of the greateſt Mathematicians of the paſt age, who bore that name. I mean Claudius Francis Millet de Chales, a Jeſuit, who beſides, was of one of the moſt conſiderable families in Savoy; a family of which there have been Archbiſhops in the Tarentaiſe, firſt Preſidents to the Chamber of Accounts of Chambery, and ſeveral other dignified perſons (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725 we find, ' MILET DE ' CHALES (*Claudius Francis*), a Jeſuit, ſee CHALES:' and under the word *Chales*, there is CHALES (*Claudius-Francis Millet de*) a Jeſuit, *&c.* NEW OBSERV.

MILTON.

This article is not very correct. The editor would have given us a juſt idea of that author, if he had told us what were his true ſentiments concerning religion. Milton, who wrote ſo much in vindication of the wicked and ſucceſsful attempts which his countrymen made upon the life of the unfortunate King Charles I, their ſovereign, was a man of no religion; he indeed profeſſed ſeveral religions, but he did no more than flutter upon the ſurface of every one; for he was firſt of the church of England; afterwards finding the ſect of the Puritans, who are rigid Calviniſts, that ſprung up in

England in the year 1565 more to his liking, he embraced it. The ſame fickleneſs which had made him quit the church of England, made him likewiſe deſert the ſect of the Puritans, in order to join the Anabaptiſts; people believed then that Milton was entirely fixed, but they were miſtaken; the declaration which he made at his death that he was attached to no religon, ſhewed, at laſt, what he was, that is, a downright Infidel (*a*).

Milton was a very bad Poet, and ſtill a worſe Orator: his poems are wretched; there is hardly any line in them where the laws of quantity are truly obſerved; one perceives in reading them, that it is a ſchool-boy's performance; conſequently he had no occaſion to tell us ſo, it appears plainly enough upon a ſlight peruſal. Some authors pretend that he did not write the apology for the people of England, and that he only lent his name to the work of a French ſchoolmaſter, who at that time taught children at London (1).

The

(*a*) Our author ſhould not have contented himſelf with informing the editor of Moreri that theſe things are wanting in the article of Milton: he ſhould likewiſe have pointed out to him the ſources where the proofs were to be had, for one of the moſt eſſential laws which the author of an Hiſtorical Dictionary ſhould obſerve, is not to advance any thing without citing authorities. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) Although our author had before him Mr Bayle's Dictionary, where there is a very good article of Milton, he has nevertheleſs aſcribed to Milton ſentiments which he was far from entertaining. Inſtead of relating them ſuch as they were in themſelves, he has judged of them according to his own prejudices, and has afterwards denominated them according to the judgment he made of them. This is not acting the part of an Hiſtorian, but that of a diſputant, or of a declaimer. He even adds, of his own head, ſome circumſtances that are abſolutely falſe. Let us come to the fact. Mr Bayle, ſpeaking of Milton's religion, ſays after his Hiſtorian, that *the ſect which pleaſed him moſt in his youth was that of the Puritans*; *but*, adds he, *in his riper years he liked beſt the Independents and Anabaptiſts, becauſe they allowed more liberty to every private perſon, and in his opinion ſeemed to come neareſt to the primitive Chriſtians: but in the latter part of his life, he ſeparated himſelf from all communions, and did not frequent any Chriſtian aſſembly, nor in his houſe did he make uſe of the form of worſhip of any ſect. As for the reſt, he expreſſed the profoundeſt reverence to God, as well by his actions as by his converſation.* Theſe particulars have changed their nature and ſhape in paſſing through our author's hands. *Milton*, ſays he, *was a man of no religion; he indeed profeſſed ſeveral, but he did no more than flutter upon the ſurface of every one; he was firſt of the church of England; afterwards finding the ſect of the Puritans . . . more to his liking, he embraced it. The ſame fickleneſs which had made him quit the church of England, made him likewiſe deſert the ſect of the Puritans in order to join the Anabaptiſts; people believed then that Milton was entirely fixed, but they were miſtaken; the declaration which he made at his death, that he was attached to no religion, ſhewed at laſt what he was, that is to ſay, a downright Infidel.* Nothing can be more falſe than the idea which this author gives of Milton, as being *a man of no religion*, and a *downright Infidel.* The works which he publiſhed evidently ſhew that this is a falſe and ſlanderous aſperſion. The *declaration* which he is ſaid to have made *at his death*, that *he was attached to no religion*, is another notorious falſhood. How could our author have the aſſurance to advance a thing which all England knows to be a lye.

He adds, that *Milton was a very bad Poet, and ſtill a worſe Orator*; that *his poems are wretched*, and that *ſome authors pretend he did not write the apology for the people of England, and that he had only lent his name to the work of a French ſchoolmaſter.* He found all this in Mr Bayle, who took it from Salmaſius's anſwer to Milton, but Mr Bayle has obſerved that they were idle ſtories with which ſome flatterers amuſed Salmaſius. *All theſe are fables*, ſays he, *which I am glad to recite, that authors may learn to give no credit to calumnies wherewith people fill their heads againſt their antagoniſts. They think they make their court by this means to thoſe authors, and occaſion their publiſhing an hundred impertinencies.* This remark has made no impreſſion upon our Critic, it has not hindred him from making a grave and ſerious narrative of all thoſe *impertinencies.* In the laſt editions of Moreri, they have corrected the article of *Milton* from the Dictionary of Mr Bayle: but it is not yet entirely free from faults. I ſhall obſerve ſome of them here. 1. They call Milton's firſt wife *Mary Pouvel*, it ſhould be *Mary Powell*. 2. They give the book aſcribed to Charles I, the title of *Icon regia*, they ſhould have ſaid *Icon Baſilike*. 3. Mr Bayle obſerves that *Milton abſconded at the reſtoration of King Charles II, and did not appear in public till the amneſty was proclaimed. He obtained a pardon*, adds Mr Bayle, *and lay under no other penalty, but that of being excluded from all public offices.* In Moreri, it is ſaid that *he obtained from Charles II a pardon, without being ſubjected to any other penalty, than that of being excluded from public offices.* But this was the Parliament's buſineſs, not the King's. It is true the author of *Milton's Life* ſays that in the act of Indemnity, the Parliament contented themſelves with *excluding him from public offices.* But Milton is not named in that act; and this was ſufficient to ſhelter him, without his having occaſion for *a pardon*: for in the act itſelf it was declared that all thoſe who were not by name excluded from the Indemnity, ſhould be looked upon as compriſed therein, and exempted from all penalties, in the ſame manner as if they were expreſsly named. John Goodwin, a famous Divine, who had publiſhed a book to juſtify the execution of Charles I; was *excluded from public offices.* 4. The new editors ſay, that Milton in his book *of the true religion, &c, excludes none but Roman Catholics from ſalvation.* They ſhould have ſaid, as Mr Bayle has done, that he excludes none but Roman Catholics from the benefit of a *Toleration*; and ſhould have added the reaſon which moved him to exclude them from it. *Milton*, ſays Mr Bayle, *ſhews that Popery ought to be wholly deprived of the benefit of a Toleration, not as it is a religion, but as it is a tyrannical faction which oppreſſes all others.* 5. The editors have ſpun out this article by the recital of what paſſed at Oxford, in the year 1683. *The univerſity of Oxford*, ſay they, *being met in a body, on the 2d of July* (they ſhould have ſaid the 21ſt of July) 1683, *declared XXVII propoſitions, extracted out of Milton's works, to be heretical and ſcandalous, and contrary to the allegiance which ſubjects owe to their King*, &c. But theſe XXVII propoſitions were not all extracted from Milton: ſeveral of them were taken from Knox, Buchanan, Baxter, and ſome other Engliſh and Scotch writers. They add, that *the Engliſh very much changed their way of thinking afterwards*; *as well as Bayle himſelf, who had commended them at that time*, [in his *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for the month of April 1684, Art. III. p. m. 141] They ſhould not have ſaid that Mr Bayle *changed his way of thinking afterwards*, without giving proofs of it. As for the Engliſh, it would be eaſy to ſhew that they have not *changed their way of thinking.* By *the Engliſh*, we are not to underſtand the Court, nor the univerſity of Oxford; but the Engliſh nation in general: and if we conſult the Hiſtory of thoſe times, we ſhall find that the Engliſh nation was entirely averſe to the arbitrary government, which the court was labouring to introduce; and that the ſpirit of liberty, which reigned in the two laſt Parliaments of King Charles II, was the occaſion of their being diſſolved. 6. In the new edition of Moreri, they may add, that on the 23d of March 1710, the Houſe of Lords cauſed the decree of the univerſiry of Oxford, which we have been ſpeaking of, to be burnt by the hand of the hang-man. NEW OBSERVAT.

(*b*) Theſe

The two moſt tolerable poems of Milton (*b*) are in blank verſe; the firſt is intituled, *Paradiſe Loſt*: the ſecond, *Paradiſe Regained*. The firſt is much better than the ſecond; which gave occaſion for ſome people to ſay, that Milton is readily found in Paradiſe Loſt, but not in Paradice Regained. Salmaſius was the great (*c*) antagoniſt of Milton, he diſcredited him much.

(*b*) Theſe two poems are in Engliſh, and they are accounted maſter-pieces. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(*c*) This expreſſion is too indeterminate: Salmaſius having written an Apology for King Charles I, was confuted by Milton. He wrote a Reply, which was not printed till long after his death. It is therefore certain that he publiſhed nothing at all againſt Milton. Can this be a ſufficient reaſon for ſaying that he *was his great antagoniſt?* MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

MONTROSE.

It is ſurpriſing, that in ſpeaking of this Marquis, they have forgot the name of his family: this is the firſt thing that ſhould be obſerved when a perſon of diſtinction is treated of; and when a circumſtance ſo eſſential to Hiſtory is omitted, it is to be feared that the whole body of the article ſuffers by the author's negligence. But it would not be enough to make the reader take notice of this omiſſion, if I did not ſupply it: I muſt therefore tell him, that the name of the Marquis of Montroſe was *John Greme* (1).

---

(1) This Marquis was not called *John Greme*. In the edition of 1712, they have put *James Gremme*; and in that of 1725, *James Gremme, or Graham*. *James* is right; but the other word was never ſpelt *Greme* nor *Gremme*. If our author had conſulted ſome Engliſh book, he would have ſeen that it ought to be written *Graham*. It is true that the pronunciation of *Graham*, comes near the French *Gréam* or *Grême*: but we are not allowed to change the Orthography of foreign names, and to expreſs their pronunciation according to the French Orthography. By this means they would be entirely diſguiſed. For example, if a Frenchman ſhould write *Lak*, or *Lac*; who could gueſs that he ſpeaks of Mr *Locke*, that celebrated Philoſopher? As for the reſt, in the edition of 1712, they had wrongly writ *Mont-Roſe*, and placed that article among the names which are ſo divided: in that of 1725 they have put *Montroſe*, which is right; but they have thereby miſplaced that article; ſince it comes in before thoſe of *Montagnana, Montagne*, &c.

I ſhall add, that ſpeaking of the Marquis of Montroſe, they ſhould have obſerved after Father d'Orleans, that *this lord had at firſt gone with the torrent, and carried arms for the cauſe of liberty*. They ſhould likewiſe have ſet down the reaſons which the Scotch alledged to juſtify their manner of putting him to death; &c. The laws of Hiſtory require that the pro and con ſhould be fairly ſtated. Laſtly, they might have conſulted authors who were more impartial, and better informed, than *Du Verdier*, and Abbé *Raguenet*, who are quoted at the end of this article. NEW OBSERV.

MORIGGIA.

In this article they confound the Jeſuits and Jeſuates, ſince they give the title of General of the Jeſuits to Paul Moriggia, who was only General of the Jeſuates: theſe are two very different orders. This error has eſcaped all the editors of Moreri; and it is ſo much the leſs excuſable, as it is not natural to ſuppoſe that one ſhould be ignorant to what order a writer of Father Paul Moriggia's reputation belonged; a writer, I ſay, who has enriched the Republic of Letters, with ſixty-one different Treatiſes (1).

---

(1) In the laſt edition, at the word MORIGIA (*Paul*), they have very well ſaid that he was *General of the Jeſuates*. NEW OBSERVAT.

N.

NITARD.

THE editor is miſtaken with reſpect to Cardinal John Everard Nitard, whom he ſtiles Confeſſor to the King of Spain, Charles II. Father Nitard the Jeſuit, was not Confeſſor to the King of Spain, but to the Queen his mother, Mary-Anne of Auſtria (1); and the thing is ſo much the leſs to be doubted of, as it was the blind confidence which that Princeſs repoſed in him, that brought upon him thoſe diſgraces of which the late Madame d'Aunoy has given us ſuch a particular and curious account in her *Memoirs of the Court of Spain*. It is true that this good Father was obliged to leave the kingdom of Spain ſomewhat abruptly, but to comfort him he was preſented with a Cardinal's cap, upon his arrival at Rome. They had no other rewards to give him; for it is well known that the Jeſuits do not accept (*a*) of Biſhoprics, and that conſequently there is no way of crowning their ſervices, but by the Roman purple.

---

(1) This is corrected in the laſt edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

(*a*) It will be proper to read upon this ſubject what Mr Daillé ſays of it in the twentieth chapter of the third part of his Reply to Father Adam and to Cottibi. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

P.

PATRICIUS.

MR Bayle had taken care to warn the editors of Moreri, that Francis Patricius the Venetian, who lived towards the end of the XVIth century, never was a Profeſſor of Padua. If they had conſulted Thuanus's Hiſtory, they would not have copied this fault from the old editions. Patricius, after having been ſeventeen years a Profeſſor at Ferrara, retired to Rome, whither he was brought by the liberalities of Clement VIII, and from that time he never left it (1). This Antiperipatetic propoſed ſuch ſingular tenets (2) concerning the five Categories of Porphyry, that the greateſt part of the Philoſophers of his time fell upon him.

---

(1) In the edition of 1707, and the following, they have put, that he *taught Philoſophy at Ferrara, and at Rome*, &c. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) To know the error that is contained in theſe words, you muſt conſult Mr Bayle's Dictionary, in the article PATRICIUS (FRANCISCUS), remark [*B*]. NEW OBSERVAT.

PAUL III.

Moreri and his Continuators, only ſay that Paul III had a ſon and a daughter, before he was created Pope. That expreſſion is not particular enough; they ſhould have ſaid that this Pope had two children by a lawful (*a*) marriage, and this declaration was ſo much the more neceſſary, as the obſcure expreſſion of Moreri authoriſes the opinion which prevails among the greateſt part of readers, that the children of Pope Paul III were not legitimate, and conſequently that the preſent family of Parma is derived from the baſtards of the firſt houſe of Farneſe; which is abſolutely falſe: Alexander Farneſe, before he was Pope under the name of Paul III, had Conſtance, who married (*b*) Baſio Sforza, the ſecond of that name, Count of S. Fiore, and Peter Lewis Farneſe, who was firſt Duke of Caſtro, and afterwards of Parma and Placentia (1). The famous Alexander Farneſe, who came into France at the head of a numerous army, was his grandſon.

The Abbot Faydit, ſpeaking in his new book of the tragical death of Peter Lewis Farneſe, whoſe intereſt obliged him to join the Fieſchi againſt the Doria's, calls the latter *Dauria*'s, as in another place, where he mentions the Abbot Cotin of the French Academy, he calls him *Cautin*. This odd Orthography ſerves only to diſfigure names, and to make it impoſſible to know them. Thuanus, in giving them a Latin turn, has corrupted them, and others diſfigure them by ſpelling them ill: both he and they only affect to be (*c*) ſingular.

(*a*) It would have been proper here to give proofs of the marriage contracted by Alexander Farneſe, before he had entered into the Eccleſiaſtical Order; to name the wife that he married, to point out the time and place, and to quote creditable authors: till this is done, it is in vain to condemn thoſe who expreſs themſelves as Moreri does. MR BAYLE's REMARK.

(*b*) He ought to have ſaid *Buoſo*, and as I obſerved, before, he ſhould have named the wife, by whom Alexander Farneſe had this daughter, and the ſon from whom the Dukes of Parma deſcend. This was ſo much the more neceſſary, as he confeſſes here, that the greateſt part of the readers believe that the children of Paul III were not legitimate. Sanſovino, a famous Italian author in the XVIth century, expreſsly ſays, in his book of the Families of Italy, fol. 170, that Peter Lewis Farneſe was natural ſon to Paul III. He ſpeaks thus immediately after having beſtowed great encomiums upon that Pope. Could he have been ignorant of the marriage, which a man of ſo diſtinguiſhed a family, and who in the character of Cardinal, and afterwards in that of Pope, ſignalized himſelf ſo many ways, is ſuppoſed to have contracted? The Abbot Faydit, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 376, ſays that *Peter Aloiſio Farneſe was lawful ſon to Alexander Farneſe, who after his wife's death, was created Pope, under the name* of Onuphrius III, *and afterwards under the name* of Paul III. Our author has perhaps only this voucher for that Pope's marriage. We deſire both one and the other in a very ſerious manner, that they would communicate to the public, the proofs of a thing ſo little known as this is. I obſerve, by the by, that according to Sanſovino, ibid. Alexander Farneſe at firſt took the name of Honorius V. This is more probable, than to ſay that he took the name of Onuphrius III, for there has been no Pope called Onuphrius. He muſt therefore have taken the name Onuphrius I, and not of Onuphrius III. MR BAYLE's REMARK.

(1) In the edition of 1712, and thoſe that follow, they have ſaid that, *Paul III had been married before he entered into the Eccleſiaſtical Order, and by his marriage, had a daughter named* Conſtance, *who was married to* Boſio *Sforza, ſecond of that name; and a ſon called* Peter Lewis *Farneſe, whom he made duke of Parma.* But they give no proof of his marriage. NEW OBSERVAT.

(*c*) I believe that they who ſpell names ill are only to be charged with negligence, or a bad memory: I do not however pretend to excuſe them upon that account. MR BAYLE's REMARK.

PAULICIANS.

Moreri and his Continuators are only miſtaken in about a century, as to the time in which Paul and John, two brothers, who were heads of the ſect of Paulicians, lived. If the editor had given himſelf the trouble to read the celebrated Biſhop of Meaux's *Hiſtoire des Variations*, he would have ſeen in the 11th book, that theſe two brothers lived in the VIIth century, and not in the VIIIth, as he has too ſlightly advanced upon the credit of thoſe who had compiled before him the great Hiſtorical Dictionary (1). The fundamental doctrine of theſe Heretics, was, that there were two principles, Co-eternal, and Independent the one upon the other.

---

(1) In the laſt edition they ſay, after Mr Bayle, that the *Paulicians* were ſo called from one *Paul*, who made himſelf the head of that ſect in Armenia *in the VIIth century*. New Observat.

PELISSON.

I do not know whether the editor deſigned in this article to correct Mr Bayle, on the ſubject of Raymund Peliſſon, one of the anceſtors of Mr Peliſſon, Member of the French Academy: in the Critical Dictionary, Raymund Peliſſon is Firſt-Preſident of the Parliament or Senate of Chambery: and in the new edition of Moreri, they change this title into that of Firſt-Preſident of Dauphiné. It is nevertheleſs very certain that this Raymund was Firſt-Preſident of the Senate of Savoy, and not of the Parliament of Dauphiné: this is a fact known all the world over (1).

---

(1) In the edition of 1725 we find that *Raymund Peliſſon* was, in the year 1537, made *Preſident in the Senate of Chambery, and Intendant in Savoy*. Mr Bayle has cited Borel, *Treſor des Antiquitez Gauloiſes & Françoiſes*, who ſays that *Raymund Peliſſon* was *Firſt-Preſident at Chambery:* notwithſtanding this our author expreſſes himſelf as if Mr Bayle had ſaid that of his own head. New Observat.

PENELOPE.

I was ſurprized to find in the article of this Queen of Ithaca, the queſtion ſo ill diſcuſſed, whether Homer was really one of her lovers. The editor contents himſelf with telling us in general terms, that, according to ſome authors, Homer praiſed Penelope ſo much, only *becauſe he had been in love with her:* he would have been able to determine it in the negative, if he had taken the trouble to read Meziriac's notes upon Ovid's Epiſtles: that learned man brings demonſtrative reaſons (*a*) to prove, that Penelope was a very chaſt woman; beſides, what Auſonius ſays of her in his 135th Epigram (*b*), is an unanſwerable proof of her virtue. The kiſſes of Penelope were hardly known during ſo great a number of years to her ſon Telemachus, becauſe he was not her huſband, for whom ſhe kept all her careſſes. I agree that Floridus Sabinus, in his book *Lectionum ſubciſivarum*, Lycophron, Herodotus, and Dempſterus, in his *Paralipomena*, do not ſay the ſame thing: but after all, the proofs of Auſonius (*c*), ſet in their full force by the learned Mr de Meziriac, ought to prevail on this occaſion; and the editor ſhould have declared what he thought on this queſtion, as he has done on ſeveral other queſtions, perhaps much leſs intereſting (1).

(*a*) The reader will be a little at a loſs to underſtand our author's reaſoning, for to prove it to be falſe that Homer commended Penelope ſo much, only becauſe he had been in love with her, would require other reaſons than this, *viz.* that Penelope was very chaſt, which is nevertheleſs the only reaſon that he makes uſe of. Beſides, he does not think that Meziriac has proved by demonſtrative reaſons, that Penelope was a very chaſt woman, nor even that he has ſo much as attempted to confute thoſe who have ſpoken ill of her. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*b*) This Epigram is no proof. Auſonius makes Penelope ſpeak, it is therefore no more than a teſtimony which ſhe bears to herſelf, and one could only infer from it, that the Poet had a very good opinion of that lady's virtue. Every body ſees the difference there is between praiſing a woman, and ſhewing, by unanſwerable proofs, that ſhe was virtuous. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*c*) To make a right judgment of the ſolidity of theſe words one needs only examine the two foregoing Remarks. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) All the learning which our author diſplays here did not coſt him much; he has taken it from Mr Bayle: but the reaſonings are entirely his own. In the laſt edition of Moreri, after theſe words: *Some antient authors have ſpoken in a very diſadvantageous manner of Penelope's conduct, and have written that Homer commended her ſo much, only becauſe he had been in love with her*; they add, *ſee upon this head Bayle's Dictionary*. New Observat.

PHILIP D'AQUIN.

It was not a circumſtance to be omitted in the new edition, that Philip d'Aquin, who was Profeſſor of the Hebrew tongue at Paris, in the reign of the late (*a*) King Lewis XIII, and of whom great mention is made in the trial of the late (*b*) Marſhal d'Ancre, had been a Jew. The very nature of that trial ſhould have engaged the editor

---

(*a*) See the following remark at the end. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*b*) It was needleſs to put here the word *late*, conſidering what a long time it is ſince that Marſhal died; beſides, that his memory has always been held in abhorrence. Several people think that we ſhould never make uſe of this word *late* but when thoſe to whom we direct our ſpeech are ignorant whether the perſons talked of be alive or not. They maintain, that a woman, ſpeaking to people who know very well that ſhe is a widow, ſhould only ſay *my huſband*, and not *my late huſband*. They would not therefore approve of our author's writing in the year 1706; *The late King Lewis* XIII. Mr Bayle's Remark.

tor to examine this fact in a particular manner; beſides, the religion of authors ſhould always be the chief thing minded by Hiſtorians (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725, the article **Aquin** (*Philip*) is taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, which is cited; but they have not taken all that was eſſential in Mr Bayle. They ſhould have obſerved, 1. That d'Aquin had been a Jew. 2. That we find ſome curious particulars concerning him in the trial of the Marſhial d'Ancre. 3. That Flavigny accuſed him of having corrupted the Hebrew text of Mr le Jay's Bible. 4. They ſay that he *taught Hebrew at Paris in the reign of Lewis XIII, in the XVIIth century*. After naming *Lewis XIII* it was needleſs to add, *in the XVIIth century*. New Observat.

PHRÆA.

In the article of the Engliſhman John Phræa (not *Phreas*) the editor has forgot to ſpeak of that author's maſter-piece, which, at the ſame time, was the firſt attempt he made in writing: I mean his tranſlation of the diſcourſe of Syneſius, who, among the Greek authors, is the moſt difficult to be underſtood, and whom all the tranſlators before that time had been afraid to meddle with. That diſcourſe was an encomium upon baldneſs; Moreri and his editors are not the only perſons that have forgot to ſpeak of this tranſlation (1).

(1) In the laſt edition, at the word Phræa, they ſpeak of the tranſlation of Syneſius's diſcourſe, copying after Mr Bayle's Dictionary, from whence our author has taken what he ſays here. New Observ.

PHILOSTRATUS.

Moreri did not conſult this author, when he placed the death of Apollonius Tyaneus in the year 97 or 99. This fault ſhould have been corrected in the new edition, ſince it is certain that this Philoſopher died in the reign of Nerva, that is to ſay, in 96, or at moſt, in the beginning of the following year (1). There has been publiſhed, in the year 1704, a new book upon this ſubject, which ought to be conſulted (2).

(1) In the edition of 1725, at the article Apollonius Tyaneus, it is obſerved that *ſome make him die in the year* 97, *and others in the year* 99. New Observat.

(2) This book is intituled, *Hiſtoire d'Apollonius de Tyane convaincuë de fauſſeté & d'impoſture*. Mr du Pin is the author of it. They have made uſe of it in that edition, in relating the judgments of antient and modern authors concerning Apollonius Tyaneus. New Observat.

PRÆTEXTATUS.

It is a long time ſince Moreri has been cenſured for relating ill the ſtory that is told of the young Papyrius Prætextatus; but this has not hindered his Continuators from copying the faults which he had committed in this article, and for which he had been ſo many times reproved. Firſt, it is not true that Prætextatus, in order to get rid of the importunities of his mother, who preſſed him to tell her what had paſſed in the Senate, where his father had carried him one day, declared to her, that a reſolution had been taken, by which, for the time to come, every huſband ſhould have two wives; on the contrary, he told her the debate had been whether that would be more for the advantage of the Republic, than to order that a wife ſhould marry two huſbands. Thoſe two things, you ſee, are very different. Secondly, Moreri had been called upon to confirm that tradition by an authority of greater weight than that of Macrobius; in effect, that author's teſtimony alone would not be enough to ſilence the Critics. It is very well known that he loved a jeſt, and ſought rather to divert his reader, than to inform him of the truth of facts; but for all this they have added no other teſtimony to that of Macrobius in the new edition; they ſhould have quoted that of Cato, and that of Aulus Gellius, who ſpeaks of that affair in his firſt book (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725, they have corrected this article, at the word Papyrius, from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, from which our author has taken all he ſays here. New Observat.

PRIOLO.

I own they have done juſtice in the new edition to the memory of the late Mr Priolo, which had been cruelly beſpattered in the firſt edition of Mr Bayle's Critical Dictionary (*a*), and in the *Sorberiana*; but ſtill the editor might have been more particular in deſcribing the works which Mr Priolo had written, and which, I believe, have not yet been publiſhed: here follow the titles of them, which they may inſert, if they pleaſe, in the next edition of Moreri's Dictionary. *Libri iv. de ſtultitia humanæ gentis.* (He might at leaſt have compoſed a dozen more upon the ſame ſubject) *Libri iii. quæſtionum naturalium*, &c. *Opus emunctum, triginta annorum meditatio, quod jam celebratur ſub apertiori titulo*, &c. *De vita & geſtis Henrici Rohanni Ducis. De vita & moribus Cæſaris Cremonini.* It is even ſaid that he wrote notes upon that author's treatiſe of *the Soul. Vita Benjamini Prioli. Judicium de Scriptoribus Græcis & Latinis. Epiſtolarum ſenilium* ad

---

(*a*) Our author ſhould have obſerved here what he obſerves at the end of the article; *viz.* that Mr Bayle had only ſpoken *upon the credit of the* Sorberiana, which he had quoted in Italicks without warranting any thing. All readers ſhould take notice of this, and ſhould always go directly to the ſource and ſtop there, without making thoſe anſwerable who barely quote from it. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) In

ad maximos Europæ proceres centuria ſingularis (1). The author of the *Eſſais de Litterature*, had likewiſe uſed that author very ill *, upon the credit, no doubt (*b*), of Mr Bayle; as the latter had done upon the credit of Meſſieurs Sorbiere and (*c*) Graverol; but he (*d*) retracted afterwards †.

* Eſſay for Febr. 1703.

† Eſſay for April 1703.

(1) In the laſt edition, they have ſaid at the end of the article *Priolo*, that this author 'promiſed ſeven 'different books, the titles of which are in the laſt 'page of his Hiſtory. Among theſe we find his own 'life, and that of the Duke of Rohan, which are not 'yet publiſhed.' This is taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, of which our author is barely the tranſcriber here. New Observat.

(*b*) To know whether it was upon credit of Mr Bayle, we ſhould conſult the Memoirs of Trevoux, pag. 476 of the fifth volume, Amſterdam edition. Our Author would have ſpoke, otherwiſe if he had ſeen the cenſure paſſed in that Journal upon the *Eſſais de Litterature*. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*c*) Mr Bayle has neither quoted, nor was he obliged to quote upon that occaſion, Mr Graverol who has not joined his teſtimony with that of Sorbiere, Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*d*) That is to ſay, the author of the *Eſſais de Litterature*. Mr Bayle's Remark.

PRISCILLIAN.

Mr Bayle often cenſures Moreri; the Continuator of the latter, might, in his turn, have attacked that celebrated Critic. He furniſhed him with ſufficient matter for cenſure in the article of Priſcillian, eſpecially when he ſays that the Priſcillians (*a*) were condemned, in the IVth and Vth centuries, upon certain points that were canonized in St Auguſtin, and confirmed by the deciſions of the Church: we muſt conſult upon this head the XCIIId Epiſtle of St Leo (1).

(*a*) He ſhould have ſaid the *Priſcillianiſts*. It is very true that the matter is ample and conſiderable, but it does not properly belong to a Dictionary purely Hiſtorical. In an Hiſtorical and Critical Dictionary, ſuch a thing might properly be placed; it is a moſt curious ſubject, the queſtion is to know whether, as St Auguſtin makes liberty to conſiſt in this, that the mind wills without conſtraint although neceſſarily, we can approve his doctrine, and condemn that which ſuppoſes the acts of the human will to proceed from a fatal neceſſity, as the Priſcillianiſts taught. It is eaſy to prove that there is no diſtinction alledged by the followers of St Auguſtin, which the Priſcillianiſts had not adopted, and conſequently that their doctrine is at bottom the ſame with that of St Auguſtin. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) See Mr Bayle's Dictionary at the article Priscillian, remark [*H*]. New Observat.

PRODICUS.

An Heretic of the IId century, being founder of a new ſect, which, at that time, made a great noiſe, ſhould not have been forgot in the new edition; I ſpeak of the ſect of the Adamites (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725 we find the article of this *Prodicus*. They have made uſe of Mr Bayle's Dictionary there, though without quoting him. New Observat.

PUTEANUS.

The Continuators of Moreri had been told that they ſhould correct their Chronology concerning the death of Erycius Puteanus; but not much minding the informations that are given them, which they ſeldom take the trouble to read, they have continued to place his death in the year 1646 (*a*). Mr Bullard, in his ſecond volume of the *Academie des Sciences*, places that author's death preciſely (*b*) in the year 1644. Speaking of the book *Statera pacis & belli*, they might have added, (*c*) that it was a book wholly to the advantage of his Catholic Majeſty (1).

(*a*) They were in the right to continue to ſay that Puteanus died in the year 1646. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*b*) Bullard does not ſay in expreſs terms, that Puteanus died in the year 1644. We can only infer this from his making him ſeventy years old, and placing his birth in 1574. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*c*) But to add this ſo as to be underſtood, it would have been neceſſary to obſerve 1. That Puteanus adviſed the King of Spain to make peace with the United-Provinces (they inſinuate this in Moreri). 2. That this peace would have been ſerviceable to the King of Spain, if we judge of it by the ill ſucceſs of the war which he continued, and which, after a world of expence and diſgrace, he did not get rid of at laſt in the year 1648, but by an ignominious peace wherein he granted the Dutch every thing that they were pleaſed to aſk. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) Our Critic, who has taken all that he ſays here from Mr Bayle, would have us *place*, as Bullart does, *the death* of Puteanus *in the year* 1644. Yet Mr Bayle had obſerved, that *having conſulted the life of Puteanus*, he *had found there that he died in the caſtle of Louvain, on the ſeventeenth of September* 1646. The editors of Moreri have corrected the article of Puteanus from Mr Bayle's Dictionary. They had ſaid firſt: *It is obſerved in his life, that he died in the caſtle of Louvain, on the ſeventeenth of September* 1646: *other writers place his death in the year* 1644. They added afterwards: the *Funeral Oration upon Ericius Puteanus was pronounced at Louvain, on the nineteenth of September* 1646, *the day of his burial . . . . which ſhews the true time of his death*. New Observat.

Q.

QUINTUS CURTIUS.

IN this article the editor has corrected part of the faults that had been cenſured in Moreri: but after all he tells us nothing about the time or age in which Quintus Curtius lived. Nay he ſeems afraid to declare his opinion. But why not prefer to any other the ſentiment of Father le Tellier, who makes that famous author to have lived in the reign of the Emperor Claudius? This opinion appears more probable than that which the editor ſeems to favour: he does not venture to ſay that he lived in the reign of Veſpaſian, but he inſinuates it; ſuch caution ſhews his uncertainty (1).

---

(1) Our Critic pretends that the opinion of Father le Tellier, concerning the time in which Quintus Curtius lived, is the moſt probable; but as he does not prove it, his Remark cannot be of any uſe. NEW OBSERVAT.

R.

RAMUS.

THIS article ſhould have been more enlarged; the exact temperance of this Philoſopher, compared with the delicacy and profuſion at the tables of thoſe who live now-a-days, particularly deſerved ſome reflexions (1).

---

(1) The article of *Ramus* is very large in the laſt edition. They have corrected and improved it from Mr Bayle's Dictionary: but an error has crept into it. They ſay that Ramus was *ſon to a gentleman, who . . . was obliged to follow the buſineſs of a coal-man for his livelihood:* it was not his father but his grandfather, as may be ſeen in Mr Bayle. They do not ſpeak of the *temperance* of Ramus, which has furniſhed Mr Bayle with a Remark. NEW OBSERVAT.

RAPIN.

They have forgot a good many things in making an encomium on this learned Jeſuit, eſpecially when they give an account of his books; they have not ſaid a word of that which did him the greateſt honour: I mean the *Diſſertatio de nova doctrina, ſeu Evangelium Janſeniſtarum.* This book was printed at Paris in the year 1658. The anonymous letter *(a)* which he publiſhed in 1680, likewiſe made a great deal of noiſe, and annoyed the party which he attacked: the late Cardinal Cibo, to whom it was addreſſed, gratefully thanked the learned author for it (1).

(*a*) See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, January 1686, at the fourth article of the catalogue of new books. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) Our author copies Mr Bayle here, according to cuſtom. In the laſt edition of Moreri they have made great uſe of the Critical Dictionary to improve the article of Father Rapin. NEW OBSERVAT.

RIPAMONT.

All the editors of Moreri have forgot, in the article of Joſeph Ripamont, to ſpeak of his Hiſtory of the Milaneſe; they have indeed quoted the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the city of Milan, which he publiſhed; but beſides that work, he compoſed the Hiſtory of the Milaneſe; and theſe are two different books: beſides, thoſe editors conſtantly write *Ripamont*, whereas I maintain it ſhould be *Ripamonte* (1).

---

(1) In the edition of 1725, at the article of *Ripamonte*, they have added nothing concerning the Hiſtory of the Milaneſe, written by this author. Mr Grævius has inſerted it, together with the continuation, in the ſecond volume of his *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Italiæ*. NEW OBSERVAT.

RONSARD.

This article is not very exact: the editor places the birth of that famous Poet in the year 1524, and ſeveral authors ſay that he was born the ſame year that Francis I. was taken priſoner in the battle of Pavia: this æra will appear ſingular to the reader: however, ſome authors have made uſe of it. Now Francis I. was taken priſoner before

Pavia (and who does not know it?) on the twenty-fifth of February (*a*), in the year 1525. Ronſard was therefore born in the year 1525 (1). The editor names the mother of that Poet *Jane Chaudrier*, whereas it is Jane *Chandrier* (2). The family of Chandrier was ſo illuſtrious, that they ought to have known the true way of ſpelling its name. They might have told us ſomething of the law-ſuit, which Ronſard carried on againſt Joachim du Bellay, for the recovery of ſome Odes, which the latter had ſtole from him. This affair was for a long time an amuſement to the Court; but Ronſard did not conſider it as a trifle, he was extremely warm in it. Mr Gueret, in his ingenious fiction *, cenſures Ronſard, for the harſhneſs and obſcurity of his ſtyle, they are faults that other authors have likewiſe reproached him with; beſides this Poet often tranſgreſſes the rules of modeſty; and we find in his works ſome expreſſions that give us no great idea of the purity of his morals. The Critics eſpecially have very much exclaimed againſt ſome verſes in the ſecond Ode of the ſecond book, and not altogether without reaſon.

* Le Parnaſſe reformé.

The editor ſhould have cleared the queſtion whether Ronſard was really a prieſt, as ſome Proteſtant miniſters called him by way of reproach: for my part, I am convinced that he was in Holy Orders; but I do not believe he had taken that of prieſthood. I ground the firſt part of this propoſition upon the very terms of his anſwer, to the miniſters who had attacked him (3).

(*a*) Apply here, what has been obſerved above, in the article *Francis* II, Note (*a*), concerning the way of making the year begin at Eaſter. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) In the laſt edition, they ſay, that Ronſard *was born on the 25th of February*, 1525. New Observ.

(2) This error, is ſtill in the edition of 1725. New Observat.

(3) All that our author ſays here, is taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary. New Observat.

RUFINUS.

Mr Bayle refers us to Moreri's Dictionary, concerning the circumſtances, and the year of the death of this favourite to the Emperor Theodoſius. I readily agree to the circumſtances, but I abſolutely reject the epoch (*a*) of his death: in effect it is more reaſonable, upon this occaſion, to follow Mr Flechier, who places this death (*b*), under the year 397, in his Hiſtory of Theodoſius the Great, than to follow Moreri (1). Beſides ſome reflexions of the editor, upon the doubts which the inſolent fortune of Rufinus, raiſed in Claudian, whether there was any ſuch thing as a providence, would certainly have been a great embelliſhment to this article.

(*a*) That the readers might not have the trouble of conſulting other books, this author ought to have ſet down the year, in which, according to Moreri, Rufinus was killed. It was the year 395. He is in the wrong to reject this epoch; it is a true one, as might eaſily be proved. I content myſelf with ſaying that Socrates in the firſt chapter of the ſixth book, of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, fixes the death of Rufinus on the 27th of November, of that ſame year, in which the Emperor Theodoſius died. Now Mr Flechier ſays, and he ſays right, that this Emperor died on the 17th of January 395. For the further information of the reader, I muſt tell him, that Mr Flechier does not ſay, in expreſs terms, that Rufinus died in the year 397. It can only be inferred from this, that under the year 392, ſpeaking of ſome injuſtices, committed by Rufinus, he adds, that *five years after*, Rufinus *was one of the cauſes*, &c. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*b*) If our author had conſulted Mr Flechier's book, he would have expreſſed himſelf otherwiſe. See the foregoing remark. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) In the edition of 1712, and the following, they have ſaid that Rufinus *was killed in the year* 395, *or* 397, *according to Mr Flechier*. New Observat.

S.

SCHOMBERG.

In the article of this Cardinal, the editor has forgot to ſpeak of the fine letter which he wrote upon the death of Sir Thomas More, Chancellor of England. This Cardinal was a near relation (*a*) to the Nun whom Luther married (1). It was upon this ſubject, that he pronounced in the Sacred College a diſcourſe ſo moving, that it drew tears from ſeveral

---

(*a*) Mr de Seckendorf has confuted this: it would be neceſſary to know whether in the *Eſſais de litterature*, they quote any author who has mentioned this moving diſcourſe, on the ſubject of that Cardinal's relation having married Luther; for, as I ſaid before, the author of the *Eſſais de litterature*, is only to be credited ſo far as he brings good vouchers. It is even proper to conſult the authors whom he quotes, for ſometimes he makes them ſay more than they have ſaid. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) In the laſt edition, they have corrected the article of this Cardinal, from Mr Bayle's Dictionary; but they have not thought fit to ſpeak of the letter which he wrote upon the death of Sir Thomas More, nor

ſeveral of the Cardinals: mention has been made of this diſcourſe in one of thoſe periodical pieces * which have appeared in ſo great number for ſome time.

* Eſſais de Litterature.

---

nor of his pretended relation to the Nun whom Luther married; the firſt of theſe facts being not of conſequence enough to be inſerted in Moreri; and Mr Bayle having obſerved, that Mr de Seckendorf had affirmed the ſecond to be falſe. New Observat.

SCIOPPIUS.

It would ſeem that the editor could not clear up the true date of Scioppius's death, for he ſays nothing at all of it. It is true, that people have ſpoke very differently as to the time when it happened, but that very reaſon ſhould have obliged our author to declare what he thought of it. Mr Baillet relates the different opinions of the authors of that time on this point; but moſt certainly Scioppius died in the year 1649. The proofs which Mr Bayle alledges are deciſive: Patin likewiſe places his death in the ſame year, and we cannot doubt of it, when we read the fifteenth Letter (of the firſt edition) in the collection of that author's letters which are publiſhed (1). They have forgot in the new edition to ſpeak of the moſt virulent book which he publiſhed againſt the Jeſuits, for whom he had an implacable hatred; it is intituled, *Anatomia Societatis*, (a) *& de Stratagematis Jeſuitarum.* This book made a great noiſe, and did not do Scioppius all the honour he expected. His beſt books are thoſe (*b*) which have not been publiſhed, and which remained in the hands of the learned Pieruccius his univerſal heir. The conformity between the principles of that famous Critic, and thoſe of the Jeſuit Melchior Inchoffer has giving occaſion to believe that the memoirs of the one had paſſed through the hands of the other, who had made uſe of them againſt the Jeſuits.

---

(1) In the editions of 1707 and 1712, they had ſaid that Scioppius *died in* 1649, *aged above fourſcore*: but in that of 1725, they take notice that he *died in the year* 1649, *at the age of* 73. In effect, Mr Bayle quotes a paſſage of Scioppius, where he affirms that he was in his ſeventeenth year, in the year 1593. New Observat.

(*a*) The *Anatomia Societatis* is not the ſame book, with that *de Stratagematis Jeſuitarum*, as our author ſuppoſes here. They are two different works: the Jeſuit Forerus, who has anſwered this *Anatomia*, reckons up ſeveral other of Scioppius's books againſt the ſociety, and proves that he had often copyed himſelf. He falſely aſcribes to him the *myſteria Patrum Jeſuitarum*, which is a book written by Andrew Rivetus, Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden. For the reſt, I think the editors of Moreri ſhould labour to find out the cauſe of Scioppius's hatred to the Jeſuits, for he behaved in a civil manner to them for ſome time. He vindicated them in his *Eccleſiaſticus*, from the accuſations which the King of Great Britain had brought againſt them. It is true that his apology is indirect, for it only conſiſts of a numberleſs heap of paſſages from Luther, which animate the Proteſtants, &c. to extirpate the Kings and Princes who adhere to the Pope, and oppoſe the reformation of the Church. Never did any man more warmly excite the Roman Catholic Princes, to the extirpation of Hereſies than Scioppius, and neverthleſs he charges (in his *Stratagemata*) that ſpirit of violence, as a crime upon Forerus. So true it is that he only wrote out of paſſion. He rather choſe to contradict and criticiſe himſelf, than not to cenſure his enemies. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*b*) This may be true as to ſome of them; but there are others (thoſe for example which he wrote to explain the prophecies) that are not ſo good as what he publiſhed. Few people were more maſters of the Holy Scripture than he: upon all occaſions he found means to apply paſſages of Scripture in his diſputes againſt the Proteſtants: one may particularly obſerve this method in his *Eccleſiaſticus*, which was printed in the year 1611, and is a confutation of King James's apology for the oath of allegiance. But he puts new and forced conſtructions upon the greateſt part of the paſſages which he quoted from Scripture. If he did this before, he was a viſionary, judge what his writings upon the prophecies muſt be, when he was become a kind of fanatic. It is to be obſerved that his controverſial works have always ſome new turn; and as he had read from end to end, all Luther's works, in order to extract out of them every paſſage which a ſatirical wit can ſo repreſent, as to make that Reformer odious and contemptible, he improved his talent in this particular, more than the greateſt part of the other writers in controverſy have done. He ſhews more ſtrength in quoting facts than in alledging reaſons, tho' in this laſt reſpect, he is not weak. His fine Latin is no ſmall ornament to his writing. Mr Bayle's Remark.

SENNERT.

The editor is miſtaken as to the year of this famous Phyſician's birth, and he puts it five years back, without having any probable reaſon for it. He places it in the year 1577, whereas moſt certainly it comes under the year 1572; beſides our author ſays in a very conciſe and dry manner, that the opinion of this Philoſopher, *viz.* that *the ſouls of beaſts are not material*, cauſed him to be charged with impiety. Speaking of this tenet, he ſhould have told us every thing that accompanyed it, and the arguments by which Sennert ſupported it. This Phyſician did not only affirm, that *the ſouls of beaſts are not material*, but he rejected *(lib. 1. de plaſt. ſeminis facultate)* the opinion of thoſe who maintain, they are not of a more noble nature than the elements (1); and he ſaid that they are naturally as much immortal, as the ſoul of man; ſo that if the latter does not periſh with the body, as well as the former, it is owing to a particular favour of the Creator. He owned indeed that the ſouls of beaſts were not produced from matter, conſequently

---

(1) Our author, who has ſeldom or never given himſelf the trouble of quoting, has altered his method here; and to prove that Sennert *rejected the opinion of thoſe, who maintain that* the ſoul *is not of a more noble nature than the elements*, he quotes, in a parentheſis, (*lib. I. de plaſt. ſeminis facultate*;) to inform us that this was the book where Sennert rejected that opinion. He imagined, no doubt, that this ſtroke of learning, would embelliſh his remark. What pity it is, that he did not ſucceed? He went very artfully about it. Thus; Mr Bayle, whom he copies here *verbatim*, had quoted Sennert. *ubi ſupr. c.* 9. *p.* 137. Our Critic being willing to fill up this *ubi ſupr.* and to give the title of the book, to which this quotation refers, ran backwards over

conſequently he laughed at the eduction of the ſchoolmen. But after all, ſo long as he did not ſay that their ſouls were really immortal, there was no room for taxing him with impiety (2).

---

over a dozen of quotations; but unluckily for him he ſtopped at this: *vide Jacobum Schegkium, lib. i, de plaſt. ſeminis facultate, apud Sennert. ibid. cap. v, pag.* 127; where, as you ſee, Mr Bayle quotes a book of *Schegkius*'s, and not of Sennert's. New Observat.

(2) In the laſt edition this article is corrected from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, which has ſupplied our author with what he ſays here. New Observat.

SEXTUS AB HEMMINYA (*a*).

This article has been omitted, or perhaps this author is not known (1); he ſhould be very well known to the Aſtrologers, ſince he was in his (*b*) time with reſpect to them, what the famous Picus of Mirandola was in his: no man was ever more attached to that ſcience than Sextus in the firſt part of his life; but having had time to diſcover the fallacy and uſeleſsneſs of it, he became afterwards one of its greateſt adverſaries, and gave it terrible blows (*c*). Happy had it been for the world, if he could have ſucceeded in wholly undeceiving mankind as to an art which has already ſeduced ſuch great numbers. The Sextus, of whom I ſpeak, was a great Geometrician, and it was by the progreſs he had made in that mother of the ſciences (*d*), that he diſcovered the vanity of Aſtrology, and reſolved to write againſt its principles. Aſtrology has had illuſtrious favourers; Mr Faydit, in his Remarks upon Virgil and Homer, ſays, that Pope Paul III was ſtrongly attached to it, and that he gave the biſhopric of Civita Vecchia to Luke Gauricus de Fano, becauſe he was very well ſkilled in it: this fact wants ſome proofs (*e*).

(*a*) He ſhould have ſaid *Sextus ab Hemminga.* Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) We find this article in the edition of 1707, and the following ones, at the word *Sixte de Hemminga.* New Observat.

(*b*) Our author's Remarks ſhould be ſuited to the character of Moreri's Dictionary, which is a work chiefly deſigned for the inſtruction of readers that have no learning. A work of that nature ſhould explain every thing without making it neceſſary to conſult another book. Our author, after the manner he ſpeaks here, does not inform us when Sextus ab Hemminga and Picus of Mirandola lived; inſtead of *his age*, he ſhould have ſaid *the XVIth century*; and a little lower inſtead of *in his*, he ſhould have ſaid *in the XVth.* Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*c*) He ſhould have told us what method Hemminga took to combat Aſtrology. It was this. He drew the horoſcope of thirty perſons, moſt of them Princes, Kings, Popes, *&c.* obſerved in theſe horoſcopes the rules of art with great exactneſs, and ſhewed that nothing had happened to theſe thirty perſons of what ſhould have happened to them according to the rules of judicial Aſtrology. Thoſe who will give the article of that author may conſult Suffridus Petri, in the ninth chapter of the thirteenth decad of authors born in Frieſland. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*d*) I wiſh our author had quoted ſome authority upon this head, it does not appear, that, in order to know the vanity of Aſtrology, a perſon muſt make a progreſs in Geometry. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*e*) It is certain that Thuanus relates, in the fourth book of his Hiſtory, pag. m. 87. that Paul III being much attached to judicial Aſtrology, had for that very reaſon a great friendſhip for Luke Gauricus, admitted him to his converſation and table, and at laſt gave him the biſhopric *de Civitate. Ac tandem Civitatenſi Epiſcopatu donavit.* There are books written by Luke Gauricus, in the titles of which he is ſtiled *Epiſcopus Civitatenſis.* The Abbot Faydit is only miſtaken in believing that the biſhopric which Paul III gave to Gauricus was that of Civita Vecchia, and that Gauricus was a native of Fano. Civita Vecchia is not an epiſcopal city, and it belongs to the Pope, but the biſhopric which Gauricus had lies in Apulia, in the kingdom of Naples, under the Archbiſhop of Benevento, and is not the ſame with that of Civita Ducale, as is affirmed in Moreri at the word *Gauric (Luke).* Gauricus was not born in Fano, but in a place called in Latin *Geophanum,* and in Italian *Giſoni,* which is in the kingdom of Naples, in the hither principality five miles from Salerno. Conſult Mr Baudrand under the word *Geophanum.*

It will not be amiſs to confute here a thing which Mr Teiſſier, in his additions to Thuanus, has related on the teſtimony of Tollius, *in Appendice de infelicitate Litteratorum.* He tells us that Luke Gauricus *having foretold that John Bentivoglio ſhould be baniſhed out of his native country, and deprived of his ſovereignty, incurred the indignation of that Prince* who cauſed him to be tortured to death. This cannot be true for John Bentivoglio was expelled Bologne by Pope Julius II, in the year 1506, and died at Milan in 1508; and it is certain that Luke Gauricus was made a Biſhop by Paul III, whoſe Papal dignity commenced only in the year 1534. Mr Teiſſier ſhould have contented himſelf with ſaying, that John Bentivoglio, enraged at Gauricus's threatening predictions, cauſed him to be put to the rack; and he ſhould have added, that he did not die on that occaſion. Cardan treats him as a Quack, and accuſes him of having rather conjectured the ruin of the Bentivoglio's from the ſituation of things, than of having foreknown it by the ſtars. *Gauricus,* ſays he, in libro Geniturarum, pag. m. 206. *à Bentivolis tortus in eculeo. Id certe ex aſtris non viderat, quamvis excidium familiæ ominaretur plus ex conjectura rerum quam aſtrorum, fuit enim Sycophanta egregius.* Thuanus having ſaid in one place that Gauricus was a Biſhop, and in another, that he died in the year 1559, it was eaſy to infer that he did not die upon the rack. Is it reaſonable to think that a Biſhop of Italy ſhould have been treated in this manner, eſpecially by a family ſuch as that of the Bentivoglio's, who had no where any ſovereign power. Mr Bayle's Remark.

SIMONIS.

Theodore Simonis, or Simon, is an author who has made noiſe enough to deſerve a place among the many articles of the Simons and the Theodores that we find in the new edition. I confeſs I expected with impatience to ſee how the editor would treat this article: I do not know whether he had any reaſons for omitting it, or if it was a mere forgetfulneſs (1). Simonis was one of the moſt particular friends of the famous

---

(1) The article of Simon *or* Simonis was ſtill omitted in the edition of 1712: it is in that of 1725, taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary. New Observat.

Biſhop of Ypres (a), and if any thing did hurt to the memory of Janſenius, it was chiefly his intimacy with that German, to whom (b) is aſcribed the book *de Atheiſmo in Polonia, ex atheo libello*, &c. Some authors have attempted to clear him of this terrible accuſation, but they have not had all the ſucceſs they expected. There was one Francis Simonis, to whom has been aſcribed the book *de fraudibus Hæreticorum*, written by Father Heſtrier (c) (2).

(a) This appears to me very falſe, and is at leaſt very contrary to the facts which have been related in the Critical Dictionary, in the remark [*I*], of the article JANSENIUS, and in the remark [*Y*], of the article SIMON. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(b) It is by no means true that the impious book of which our author ſpeaks is aſcribed to Theodore Simon or Simonis, who had ſome conferences with Janſenius. He does not give us the right title of it which he might eaſily have found in the Critical Dictionary, pag. 2719, of the ſecond edition. The title of that book, printed at Cracow in the year 1588, is *Simonis Religio*. By the date of the impreſſion it is evident that the Theodore Simonis, of whom we ſpeak here, is not the author of that book, for he was a young man when he had ſome diſputes with Janſenius, about the year 1630. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(c) He ſhould have ſaid that Father Eſtrix, a Flemiſh Jeſuit, is the author of the book *de fraudibus Hæreticorum*, which has appeared under the falſe name of Francis Simonis. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(2) Our author has confounded himſelf ſtrangely in relating what he had found in Mr Bayle: this is a pretty common thing with him; but he may be ſaid to have out-done himſelf here. NEW OBSERVAT.

SOPHRONIA.

The editor has not corrected the faults which Moreri had committed on the ſubject of this Roman lady. It is true Euſebius Cæſarienſis ſpeaks of her beauty and chaſtity in the fourteenth chapter of his eighth book; but he does not name her, neither do we know from whence it comes that Hiſtorians afterwards gave her the name of Sophronia. Mr Bayle, whom few things eſcape, owns that he no where found the name of *Sophronia*; conſequently the editor ſhould not have cited Euſebius, as his voucher with reſpect to this name. This is not the only fault which he has copied from the firſt editions; for example, his expreſſion is not juſt when he ſays that this lady may be called the Chriſtian Lucretia; this is not the meaning of Charles Stephens's words, which Moreri and his Continuators have ill tranſlated (1).

---

(1) In the laſt edition the article of this lady is corrected from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, which our author continues to copy here. NEW OBSERVAT.

SPANHEIM.

In this article mention is made of the late King of England, William III, as if he were ſtill living: that Prince died in the year 1702, and the Dictionary was finiſhed about the end of 1704; conſequently the article *Spanheim* being in the laſt volume, which was printed more than two years after that Prince's death, they ſhould have avoided this expreſſion, *William, Prince of Orange, (a) now King of England*, ſince that King had been dead two whole years when they made uſe of the word *now* (1).

(a) That cenſure is well-grounded, and I ſhall take this opportunity to warn thoſe who ſhall publiſh new editions of Moreri in Holland, that they ought to rectify certain things in the article of William III, King of England. In the firſt place, they have ſaid in this article that while he was yet Prince of Orange he gave battle thrice to the French, at Senef, at St Denys, and at Mons. This ſhews they did not know that the battle of St Denys, and that of Mons, are the ſame; and thus inſtead of three battles they only mention two. They have forgot that of Caſſel. Beſides this they ſhould have ſet down the date of every one of theſe three battles, and not have made uſe of the word *gave*, as it ſignifies that the Prince of Orange was the attacker: which is not true. He was attacked at Senef; they met him at Caſſel; he attacked only at St Denys, and that too when the French, knowing that the peace was ſigned at Nimeguen, were not upon their guard. Laſtly, they ſhould have told us whether the Prince was victorious or vanquiſhed in every one of theſe three battles. In the ſecond place they affirm, that he ſet out in his expedition to England on the firſt of November 1688. They ſhould have ſaid the twenty-ninth of October 1688. In the third place they ſay, that contrary winds having obliged him to put back, he ſet out a ſecond time on the eighth, they ſhould have ſaid the eleventh. In the fourth place they affirm, that he afterwards gave battle twice to the French, once at Steenkerken, and another time near Londen (they ſhould have ſaid *Landen*). The ſame negligences that I have obſerved upon the firſt article are to be found here; the date is wanting as well as the circumſtance whether this Prince was the attacker or attacked, the vanquiſher or vanquiſhed. I make uſe of the Dutch edition of 1698. That of Paris 1699 has ſtruck out the greateſt part of this article of William III. I hope what I have been ſaying will be of ſome uſe to thoſe who ſhall take the trouble to give us new reviſals of Moreri. They will ſee in what manner an hiſtorical article ſhould be filled up, and that without being very long, it may contain the moſt eſſential circumſtances. They will do well to correct the article of the Marſhal de Luxembourg. It is falſly affirmed there that the Prince of Orange was obliged, in the year 1674, to raiſe the ſiege of Charleroi, and that he was worſted at the battle of St Denys near Mons, in the year 1678 (2). MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) This has been corrected in the edition of 1712. NEW OBSERVAT.

(2) See the advertiſement to the ſecond edition of the *Critical Dictionary*, near the end. NEW OBSERVAT.

STOFLERUS.

In the article of this famous Mathematician, it was natural to expect ſome account of the friendſhip which he had for his diſciple Munſter, to whom he left copies of all his works, of which the latter knew afterwards very well how to make a profitable uſe to himſelf, and by that means to publiſh excellent treatiſes in his own name (1).

(1) Mr Bayle, in the article of *Stoflerus*, ſays, that he *had a great friendſhip for his diſciple Munſter, and that this did no ſmall ſervice to the learned world; ſince if it had not been for the copies which he allowed him to take of his books, they would have been loſt for ever when the originals were burnt.* Here is the uſe that our author makes of theſe words, according to his manner of conceiving things, and of relating them. 1. He pretends that it *was natural to expect*, in the new edition of Moreri, *ſome inſtances of the friendſhip which* Stoflerus *had for his diſciple Munſter*, but this is ſaid at a venture, for Mr Bayle, his ſole and only author, takes notice of no other mark of his friendſhip than what we have juſt ſeen. 2. He affirms that Stoflerus *left* Munſter *copies of all his works*, which is as much as to ſay, that Stoflerus did himſelf write, or cauſed others to write, copies of his works, and that he left them at his death to Munſter: but neither of theſe things is true, he only *ſuffered him to take copies of his books.* 3. He adds, that Munſter *knew afterwards very well how to make a profitable uſe of them to himſelf, and by that means to publiſh excellent treatiſes in his own name*: that is to ſay, that Munſter gave himſelf for the author of Stoflerus's works, publiſhed them as his own, and took the glory of them from his friend: but what proof does he give of this? None at all: it is not his way to give proofs of what he aſſerts. NEW OBSERVAT.

STROZZY.

The article of Philip Strozzy is very dry: that generous citizen, who made himſelf a ſacrifice for the liberty of his country, deſerved to have ſomething more ſaid of him: particularly they ſhould not have forgot this line of Virgil, which that brave Florentine wrote upon his chimney with the point of his dagger, a moment before he died (*a*):

Exoriare aliquis noſtris ex oſſibus ultor (1).

(*a*) He ſhould have ſaid *before he killed himſelf.* This would have inſtantly informed the reader what kind of death that Florentine died, a remarkable particular. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the laſt edition we find a very good article of this Strozzy, taken from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, from which our author has borrowed what he ſays here. NEW OBSERVAT.

SULPICIUS SEVERUS.

The Continuators of Moreri had already been told, that it is not certain this Hiſtorian was of the Agenois, and that his ſaying in his works that Phœbadius of Agen was his Biſhop, is no reaſon for concluding he was himſelf of that dioceſe; they have nevertheleſs made ſhort work with the difficulty, which, notwithſtanding their deciſion, ſubſiſts ſtill, and is even favoured by many (1).

(1) Mr Bayle, in the article of SEVERUS (*Sulpicius*), obſerves, that *he was undoubtedly of the province of Aquitaine*; *but* that *it is not certain whether he was of the dioceſe of Agen*: and he puts the following note in the margin: *he ſays, that Phœbadius, Biſhop of Agen, was his Biſhop. This does not prove that he was born in that dioceſe.* This occaſioned our author's ſaying, that *the Continuators of Moreri had already been told*, &c. They have not yet made uſe of Mr Bayle's Remark. In the edition of 1725, we find that Sulpicius Severus *was born at Agen in Aquitain, or in that dioceſe, ſince, according to his own teſtimony, Phœbadius of Agen was his Biſhop.* NEW OBSERVAT.

T.

TASSO.

THE name of the author of this Poet's life is wrong, the editor writes it *Decharné*, inſtead of *de Charnes*: he is Dean of Villeneuve lez Avignon, a man diſtinguiſhed by his love for learning, and by the works he publiſhed ſome years ago: he is now writing the Life of Petrarch; but what the editor might have added to his article, and which would have been a great embelliſhment to it, is, that John Baptiſta Pigna, who compoſed the Hiſtory of the Princes of Eſte, to whom he was a domeſtic, was that enemy to Taſſo, of whom Taſſo complains on ſeveral occaſions without naming him, and whoſe character and manners he has deſcribed ſo ingeniouſly in his *Aminta*, under the name of Mopſus. This obſervation was neither made by Mr Menage in his Commentary upon the *Aminta*, nor by the Abbot de Charnes in his Life of Taſſo; I owe it to the author of the *Eſſais de Litterature*, who gave an extract of the Life of that Poet in his Eſſay (*a*) of June and July 1703 (1). Mr Bayle, who has ſaid

(*a*) As I have not read that *Eſſay*, I do not know whether the author quotes any writer who may have told him this particular concerning John Baptiſta Pigna: if he has cited no authority, the editors of Moreri would be very much to blame if they inſerted this particular in the article of Taſſo: they ought to miſtruſt, as a romantic invention, every thing that is aſſerted without proof in the *Eſſais de Litterature*. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) In the laſt edition no mention is made of Pigna in the article of Taſſo. They have written the name of the Abbot *de Charnes* well. In the *Memoires*

ſaid but two words of Taſſo, in the firſt edition of his Critical Dictionary, had promiſed to enlarge the article of that Poet in the ſecond edition; he has not kept his word; I call upon him in the name and behalf of the learned, to fulfil his promiſe in the Supplement to that Dictionary, which, as they write from Holland, he is going to publiſh.

Memoires de Litterature, of Mr de Sallengre, Tom. I, pag. 184, he is called *Mr de Charner*. This is, no doubt, an error of the preſs. New Observat.

TAVERNIER.

In the article of this famous traveller, the editor has forgot to tell us ſomething of the diſputes which he had formerly with the Dutch authors. He was the aggreſſor in his *Hiſtoire de la conduite des Hollandois en Aſie*, wherein he uſed the directors of the Eaſt-India company very ill. Soon after, the author of *l'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld* vindicated theſe gentlemen: Mr Jurieu eſpouſed their cauſe, and inveighed in a baſe manner againſt the poor Mr Tavernier, who likewiſe found himſelf engaged afterwards in the quarrel between Father Tellier, and Mr Arnauld. This traveller did not ſpeak of the Jeſuits with due moderation in the relation he gave of his travels; which conduct drew upon him ſome ſatirical ſtrokes in the ſecond part of the *Defenſe des nouveaux Chrétiens*. Mr Arnauld, it is true, afterwards vindicated him in the third volume of his *Morale pratique* (1). Who could ever have imagined that a Merchant ſhould have any-wiſe been concerned in the controverſy between theſe two learned Divines? Methinks this fact, and the firſt that I mentioned would have been no ſmall embelliſhment to the article *Tavernier* (2).

(1) Our author has taken all this from Mr Bayle. New Observat.

(2) In the edition of 1725, where the article of *Tavernier* is corrected from Mr Bayle's Dictionary, they mention this traveller's book concerning the conduct of the Dutch in Aſia: but no notice is taken of Father Tellier's complaints, nor of Mr Arnauld's anſwer. It was thought theſe particulars did not belong to Moreri's Dictionary, New Observat.

TETTI.

This article deſerved a place in the new edition: Scipio Tetti made ſo much noiſe in the XVIth century, that he ought not to have been forgotten in this work: he was a man, they will ſay, who held bad principles of religion, the remembrance of which it is proper to extinguiſh. According to this way of reaſoning we muſt ſay, that St Epiphanius had given himſelf a very needleſs trouble, and even that his work may have dangerous conſequences, he who has given us a collection of all the Hereſies that had been formed in the boſom of the Church down to his time. Such a work as that is ſo far from being dangerous to religion, that, on the contrary, I believe, with an holy Father, it is very uſeful towards the eſtabliſhment of it. Is not that diverſity of ſentiments, that perpetual oppoſition between thoſe who have abandoned the fixed point of unity, an invincible proof for the Divinity of our religion? Does it not ſhew, that without this unity of the Church, there is nothing but illuſions, precipices, and dangers?

To return to Scipio Tetti; what brought troubleſome diſgraces upon him, ſuch particularly as they are deſcribed by Thuanus (*in vita ſua lib.* 1.) was his ſhort treatiſe *de Apollodoris*. Mr Baillet, who ſpeaks of it in his works, puts a high value upon it; that Bibliographer ſhould nevertheleſs have praiſed it moderately; the errors of which Tetti was accuſed, and which they pretended were to be found in that ſmall piece, were not a juſt ground for Baillet to ground *his eſteem* upon (*a*). That work excepted, Tetti's morals were good, and Benedictus Ægius, who publiſhed that author's book, praiſes him very much in his notes; and I am perſuaded, that, if Tetti had not lived in a country where the appearance and ſhadow of a crime in certain matters paſſes for the crime itſelf, he would not have found himſelf in thoſe melancholy circumſtances to which he was reduced in his latter days (1).

(*a*) The treatiſe of Scipio Tetti *de Apollodoris*, was printed at Rome in the author's life-time, and from thence we may conjecture that it contains no Hereſies. But we ſhall be fully convinced by reading it, that there is nothing in that ſmall book which can offend the Inquiſition: neither indeed was this the thing which cauſed him to be perſecuted, and ſent to the gallies. Mr Baillet therefore was not in the wrong to commend that treatiſe, and could not have been hindred from doing it by the errors which they ſaid were to be found there: no body had ſaid ſo. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) In the edition of 1712 we do not find the article of *Scipio Tetti*: but they give it in that of 1725, taken word for word from Mr Bayle's Dictionary. New Observat.

TIMOMACHUS.

The editor ſometimes is miſtaken in his Arithmetical calculations; for inſtance, in the article of *Timomachus* he ſays, that Cæſar bought of this Painter the picture of Medea and Ajax, for 80 talents, which are equal to the ſum of 48000 crowns: he is miſtaken, 80 talents make a larger ſum in French money; if we believe the learned Jeſuit, who has given us that fine edition of Pliny, where mention is made of

Timomachus, and of the purchaſe which Cæſar made, we ſhall find that 80 talents are equal (*a*) to 19200 livres (1).

(*a*) Our author's Printers have omitted a cypher here, and have thereby made him contradict himſelf, for 19200 livres are a ſmaller ſum than 48000 crowns. Father Hardouin, (in Plin. tom. 5. pag. 230.) who is the Jeſuit quoted here, pretends, that the 80 talents of Pliny make 192000 livres. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) Our author, in copying Mr Bayle here, has very ill expreſſed himſelf. He ſays *the picture of Medea and Ajax*, as if it were only one picture. Mr Bayle obſerves that this Painter *drew an Ajax and a Medea, which were bought*, &c. In the laſt edition of Moreri, where they have corrected this article from the Dictionary of Mr Bayle, they have ſaid, that, *among other pictures, he drew a Medea and an Ajax, which Cæſar bought*, &c. New Observat.

TIRANNION.

This article has been pretty well corrected; but they ſhould not have forgot to mention the number of books which that author wrote. That which he compoſed to prove that the Latin tongue was derived from the Greek, deſerved particularly to be taken notice of in a book of the nature of a Dictionary (1).

(1) In the edition of 1725 the article of *Tirannion* is corrected from the Dictionary of Mr Bayle, from which our author has taken what he ſays here. But there is a fault committed in it. They ſay that Tyrannion *was before called* Diocle; it ſhould be as Mr Bayle writes it, Diocles. New Observat.

TIRESIAS.

Several things are wanting in the article of this antient ſoothſayer: by correcting it too much, they have entirely disfigured it. They ſay nothing concerning Necromancy, which Tireſias openly profeſſed, nor concerning the opinion which Lucian aſcribes to him in his treatiſe of *Aſtrology* (1).

(1) They have likewiſe corrected this article from Mr Bayle's Dictionary: but they have not inſerted the two particulars which our author mentions here, and which he has taken from Mr Bayle. New Observat.

TANAQUIL.

This article is maimed, the merit of that illuſtrious Queen is not known, by what Moreri and his Continuators ſay of her. The ſingle merit of knowing how to make ſtuffs (which is all that the editor ſays of her) would not have been a ſufficient reaſon to tranſmit her name to poſterity, and to engage St Jerom to ſpeak of her ſo advantageouſly, in his book againſt Jovinian. That Father obſerves, that Tarquinius Priſcus is much leſs known than his wife, and that the virtue of that Queen will ever have a place in the memory of men. The only fault ſhe was reproached with, is that of having been too imperious; Juvenal ſeems to charge her with it in his ſixth ſatire: but this reproach is not conſiſtent with the exceſſive praiſes which St Jerom has beſtowed upon her. The editor ſhould have employed his parts in reconciling theſe contradictions (1).

(1) In the laſt edition we find a very good article of this Queen, drawn up from Mr Bayle's Dictionary: but they tell us nothing of the fault which it ſeems ſhe was charged with, of having been too imperious. Let the reader decide whether this reproach, allowing it to be well-grounded, is inconſiſtent with the praiſes of St Jerom; and whether the too imperious humour of a woman, deſtroys the great virtues which ſhe may otherwiſe be poſſeſſed of. New Observat.

TANNERUS.

This article has been omitted, and I think that it ought not to be ſo in a new edition. Tannerus was a very learned Jeſuit in Germany, who has made himſelf famous by his works, and particularly by the anatomy of the Confeſſion of Augſburg, which he publiſhed, and which raiſed terrible adverſaries againſt him (1).

(1) We find the article of *Tannerus* in the laſt edition. New Observat.

TRUSCHES.

The editors of Moreri ſhould long ago have diſcovered a groſs fault, which they have committed in ſpeaking of Gebhard Truſches, Archbiſhop of Cologn, whom they make immediate ſucceſſor to John Gebhard of Mansfeld, likewiſe Elector of Cologn. Ought they not to know that there were three Electors between Mansfeld and Truſches; in this the laſt editor is leſs excuſable than the preceding ones, ſince if he had taken the trouble to conſult the works of the Critics, he would have diſcovered the error of thoſe who publiſhed the firſt editions, and of late he needed only to have conſulted the *Réponſe aux queſtions d'un Provincial*, of the celebrated Mr Bayle, where he would have found a particular article, in which that ſubject is very minutely handled. As *Truſches* is near the end of the Dictionary, which was only finiſhed in the laſt months of the laſt year; and as Mr Bayle's book had appeared in France about the middle of the ſame year, the editor had ſtill time enough to correct that fault, but it coſts people too much trouble to do things with the utmoſt exactneſs. There is a great reſemblance between the conduct of theſe two Electors. Truſches, after the example of Mansfeld, finding the law of celibacy too harſh for him, ſhook off the yoke, and married; but he did not imitate the docility of his predeceſſor, who, being convinced of the inconſiſtency between a wife and an Archbiſhopric, ſubmitted to the laws of the Church, and quitted his dignity with a good grace; whereas Truſches, to the laſt hour of his life, inſiſted upon keeping both. The likeneſs that there is between the adventures of theſe two Prelates, is, no doubt, what obliged Moreri and his Continuators to bring them ſo near one another (1).

---

(1) Mr Bayle had cenſured this fault of Moreri, in his *Réponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial*, Tom. I, Chap. LX, pag. 536. In the edition of 1725, they have made uſe of the particulars which he relates concerning *Gebhard Truſches*, though they do not cite him at the end of that article. New Observat.

U.

URCEUS.

THE native country of this learned man ſhould not have been the ſubject of a paradox *(a)*: the editor finding Mr Bayle uncertain in this point, and wavering (*b*) between the different ſentiments of Pierius Valerianus and Geſnerus, heſitated after his example. But the doubt was not difficult to remove, upon this occaſion the authority of Pierius Valerianus ought not to counter-balance that of Geſnerus, becauſe the latter ſpeaks upon the credit and teſtimony of Bartholomæus Bononienſis, who has written the Life of Urceus. Now an Hiſtorian, an author who has laboured *ex profeſſo* (to make uſe of that phraſe) in writing the life of a man, is much more to be credited than another who has done no more than compiled, and who has rather ſtudied to give us the elogies of ſome learned men, than to give us an exact Hiſtory of their Lives. An author of this laſt kind is not much ſollicitous to go to the bottom of every ſubject; that would carry him too far: he makes it more his buſineſs to collect a vaſt number of materials than to chooſe the beſt; but a particular Hiſtorian, ſuch as Bartholomæus Bononienſis, an author, I ſay, whoſe exactneſs is ſo well known, is much rather to be credited than Pierius Valerianus, who had more at heart the publiſhing his book (*de infelicitate Litteratorum*) as well as he could, than the giving a well connected and particular Hiſtory of every one of thoſe whom he mentioned in his work. Thus it is much more probable that Antony Urceus was born in Herberia, a little town in the territory of Reggio, ſeven miles from Mantua (*c*), than in Ravenna, as Pierius Valerianus affirms.

The editor might have given us the prayer which Spizelius puts in the mouth of Urceus *(d)*, juſt as he was ready to expire. It is remarkable, and very proper to convince Atheiſts, if any ſuch there be in the world, that there is no intrepidity which can hold out againſt the terrors of death, and that in theſe laſt moments the ſoul, being ready to break through the bonds of ſin, begins to diſpel the darkneſs which environed it, and at laſt to ſee things ſuch as they are in themſelves. Here follows the prayer.

'Qui cœlum incolis, fer quæſo opem peccatori, noli me, qui tuum in ſinum confugio ſupplicem rejicere. Si unquam peccantem hominem voti reum feciſti, ſic mihi extrema oranti dextram ab alto porrigas oro. - - - - *O thou who dwelleſt in heaven, help a ſinner, I beſeech thee, and do not reject me, while I thus fly, in a ſuppliant manner, to thy boſom. If ever thou didſt hear a miſerable ſinner, ſtretch forth, I beſeech thee, thy right hand to me from on high, now that I am making my laſt prayer.*'

For

(*a*) He ſhould have ſaid *of a problem*. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*b*) An author cannot be charged with being uncertain and wavering, unleſs he has confeſſed that he does not know which to chuſe between the two opinions he relates: for to relate two opinions without ſaying, in expreſs words, that he embraces this or that, is not a good proof that he wavers and heſitates, it is only ſhewing that he contents himſelf with being an Hiſtorian, and that he leaves the reader the liberty of chuſing. Mr Bayle has plainly enough intimated which is the preferable ſide of the queſtion, ſince he ſays that Geſnerus, quoting Bartholomæus Bononienſis, makes *Herberia* the native town of Urceus, and ſince he obſerves that Bartholomæus Bononienſis wrote the Life of Urceus. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*c*) He ſhould have ſaid *Modena*, and the ſame fault muſt be corrected in Mr Bayle's Dictionary. Mr Bayle's Remark.

(*d*) Note, That Spizelius only relates what he had read in the Life of Urceus, compoſed by Antony Bononienſis. It is the latter who may juſtly be ſaid to have put that prayer in the mouth of Urceus. Mr Bayle's Remark.

For the reſt, never did any learned man more juſtly deſerve a place in Pierius Valerianus's book, than Antony Urceus. The deſpair he ſhewed at the burning of his library and papers, is enough to terrify all thoſe who ſhall read the circumſtances of it. And indeed the reſolution which he took to withdraw for ever from the ſight of men, and to retire into the thickeſt part of the foreſts, could only have been dictated by the greateſt deſpair (1).

---

(1) In Moreri's edition of 1712, they corrected the article of *Urceus Codrus* from Mr Bayle's Dictionary: but what Mr Bayle ſays of that author is not exact. He had not the life of Codrus; and he was obliged to follow Spizelius and Pierius Valerianus, who have committed ſeveral faults in ſpeaking of Codrus. His life, written firſt in Italian by the brother of Codrus, was tranſlated into Latin, and publiſhed with additions by Bartholomeo Bianchino, *Bartholomæus Blanchinus*, who had been Codrus's diſciple, and his intimate friend. The authors quoted by Mr Bayle, call him *Bartholomæus Bononienſis*, taking the name of his country for his true name. This life is prefixed to the works of Codrus. See what Mr de la Monnoye has ſaid concerning Codrus, in his Additions to the *Menagiana*, Tom. I. pag. 336, and Tom. III. pag. 180, & ſeq. of the Paris edition.

Mr de Saint Hyacinthe has given us a very long extract of Codrus's Works, in his *Memoires Litteraires*, Tom. I. Art. V. pag. 259, & ſeq.

I ſhall take from that extract almoſt word for word a continued narrative of Codrus's life, which may ſerve as a corrective and Supplement to Mr Bayle's Dictionary; and the new editors of Moreri, may make uſe of it if they pleaſe.

URCEUS (Antony) ſirnamed Codrus, was born at Herberia, a ſmall town in the territory of Reggio, on the 15th of Auguſt 1446. His great-grandfather, a Potter's ſon in the country of Breſcia, was the firſt of the family, who ſettled at Herberia. He was ſo poor that all his labour could ſcarcely ſupply him with bread. He had a ſon called *Bartholomew*, who got his livelihood for ſome time by fiſhing; afterwards as he was digging in a field, he found a pot filled with a pretty large ſum of money, part of which he laid out in the purchaſe of the field itſelf, and with the reſt, he ſet up a Perfumers ſhop. *Cortheſius*, ſon to Bartholomew, had by his wife *Gherardine*, two ſons: *Antony*, who is the ſubject of this article, and another called *Peter-Antony*; the birth of the latter, coſt his mother her life. The father died after the eighty-firſt year of his age. He did not neglect the education of his ſons; he provided them with proper maſters: but it is ſaid that our Codrus, while he was ſtill very young, left him and went to Modena, with a deſign to ſtudy under *Tribac*, a man ſufficiently learned for thoſe days. Some months after, he returned to Herberia, from whence his father ſent him to Ferrara, to ſtudy under Baptiſta Guarini, a famous Profeſſor in the Greek and Latin tongues: he likewiſe attended the Lectures of Lucas Ripa, Profeſſor in Rhetoric, and a man whoſe modeſty was equal to his parts. Codrus made ſuch progreſs under theſe two maſters, that he far ſurpaſſed all his other companions, and thereby confirmed the great hopes, which his relations had conceived of him.

Some ſay that he began to teach children at Ferrara, tho' he was then ſcarce twenty-two years old; but Blanchini doubts of this particular. What we know for certain, is, that he remained five years at Ferrara, and afterwards was called to Forli, to teach the languages, where they gave him more conſiderable appointments, than had been allowed to his predeceſſors. He writes in his letter to Mengo, that he was there for ten years public Profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres*; and his Hiſtorian ſays (which does not at all contradict this) that for thirteen years Codrus inſtructed the youth there, and in particular Sinibaldo, ſon to the Prince of Forli, at whoſe houſe he had his board and lodging.

About this time an accident happened to him, which had like to have made him diſtracted. He had in the inner part of the palace, a room ſo dark, that without the aſſiſtance of a lamp, he could not ſo much as diſtinguiſh the walls of it at break of day; this obliged him when he had a mind to ſtudy early to make uſe of a lamp, which was very neatly wrought, and upon the top of which he had engraved theſe words, *ſtudia lucernam olentia optimè olent.* - - - *Studies that ſmell of the lamp, have an excellent odour*. One day that he went abroad without putting it out, his papers took fire, which ſpread to every thing that was in the room: (for no body perceived it till ſuch time as the flames came out at the windows:) a book which he had compoſed with the title of *Paſtor*, was burnt with all his papers. It is ſaid that when he heard the firſt news of this fire, he was ſo tranſported with rage, that he run to the palace, and ſtopping at the chamber-door, (for the flames would not allow him to enter) 'O Chriſt, *ſaid he*, what great crime have I then committed? Whom of thine have I ever offended, that thou ſhouldſt excerciſe ſuch an implacable hatred againſt me?' Afterwards turning towards an image of the Virgin Mary; 'O Virgin, *ſaid he*, hear what I ſay to thee ſedately, and from the bottom of my heart, if peradventure, at the hour of death, I ſhall come in a ſuppliant manner to implore thy aſſiſtance, do not hear me, I beſeech thee, neither receive me into the number of thine, I am reſolved to take up my reſidence in Hell.' Here follow the very words of his Hiſtorian: *Ad primum incendii nuntium, tantam animo imbibiſſe iram, ut exclamans veluti furore quodam concitus ad Regiam uſque præcipiti gradu ire pergeret: pro foribuſque cubiculi adſtans, (neque enim ob incendium late cuncta depopulans ingredi licebat) Quodnam ego, inquit, tantum ſcelus concepi,* Chriſte? *quem ego tuorum unquam læſi, ut ita inexpiabili in me odio debaccheris? Converſus poſtmodum ad ſimulachrum Virginis, Audi, Virgo, ait, ea quæ tibi mentis compos & ex animo dicam, ſi fortè cùm ad ultimum vitæ finem pervenero, ſupplex accedam ad te opem oratum, neve audias, neve inter tuos accipias, oro; cum in Infernis diis in æternum vitam agere decrevi.* Thoſe who were preſent, endeavoured to ſoften his paſſion, but he would hear nothing; he earneſtly begged his friends not to follow him, and, like a mad-man, he ruſhed with a precipitant pace into the middle of an huge foreſt, where he paſſed the remaining part of the day in the deepeſt affliction. He came back to the city in the evening; but finding the gates ſhut, he lay down upon a dunghil, and there waited the return of morning. At break of day, having got into the city, he went and hid himſelf in a Joiner's houſe, where he remained ſix months alone, and without books.

After the death of the Prince of Forli, and of Sinibaldo, his ſon, who died ſix months after him, Codrus ſtayed ten months longer in that city, being uncertain what reſolution to take. Then he went to Bologna, where he was choſen Profeſſor of the Greek and Latin tongues, and of Rhetoric, in the univerſity. He continued there all the reſt of his life, and died in the year 1500, in the monaſtery of St Salvatore, whither he had deſired to be carried. Codrus was at that time, fifty-four years of age.

The day before his death, his diſciples on their knees, and with their eyes bathed in tears, ſo earneſtly beſought him to tell them ſomething worthy of himſelf, that he found himſelf obliged to comply with their requeſt. His Hiſtorian relates the diſcourſe, which, as he ſays, Codrus made upon that occaſion: this diſcourſe is an exhortation to virtue, but it is ſo long and ſo methodical, that there is reaſon to ſuſpect Blanchini of having embelliſhed it. Codrus there betrays marks of an extreme vanity. He ſays to his diſciples, *pray to God that you may be like me.* The day on which he died, he made another ſhort diſcourſe, wherein he proves that death is the ſupreme good. He complained that he had not been able to write before he died what he had deſigned: 'If I die, *ſaid he*, for I can perceive that the hour of my death draws near, alas, how many fine things ſhall be buried with me!' *Si ego, inquit, moriar, nam prope ineluctabilem legem fati mei adeſſe ſentio, heu quot bona mecum interibunt!*

The night of his death, he ſhewed marks of a diſordered imagination; he fancied that he ſaw a perſon of an enormous ſize, with his head ſhaved, his beard reaching to the ground, and flaming eyes, carrying torches in either hand, and having his whole body in a violent agitation: Codrus quaking for fear, ſaid to this ſpectre, Who art thou, that thus alone with the air of a Fury, walkeſt about at the time when every body is aſleep? Come not to me as an enemy, to me, I ſay, who am God's friend. Tell me, what ſeekeſt thou? Whither wouldſt thou go? Having ſaid this, he jumped out of bed to ſhun the ſpectre.

People had always doubted, whether he had any religion while he lived, his Hiſtorian confeſſes, that he gave occaſion to it by his converſation, *circa Chriſtianum dogma, ſi non re, ſaltem verbis, plerumque claudicabat.* Nevertheleſs, at the hour of death, he himſelf deſired to have the Sacraments adminiſtred to him, and when they brought him the hoſt, he beat his breaſt like a man truly touched with repentance, ſaying, that he was a wretch, who had always been in a ſtate of blindneſs. He likewiſe raiſed his eyes and hands towards heaven, and fervently implored the aſſiſtance of the Holy Virgin: *fer quæſo opem miſero peccatori, noli me, qui tuum in ſinum confugio, ſupplicem rejicere.* He received the Viaticum with great reſpect, ſhedding tears, and recommending himſelf and his ſoul to God: *Deo & ſe animamque ſuam commendans.*

After his death, he was carried to the grave by his ſcholars, followed by all the ſtudents of the univerſity. Blanchini cauſed the following words to be engraved upon his tomb, CODRUS ERAM. Codrus had ſo deſired it.

The name of *Codrus*, was given him in this manner. Being at Forli, the Prince met him on the road, and recommended himſelf to him, the Profeſſor anſwered, ſmiling, 'things go well, Jupiter recommends himſelf to Codrus:' *Jupiter Codro ſe commendat.* From that time, every body called him *Codrus*.

Codrus was of a middle ſtature; his perſon was thin and ſlender, his face pale and meagre, his eyes whitiſh, and ſomewhat hollow, he had a Roman noſe, few hairs, and his looks were ſometimes ſilly, but always mild. He had been always ſickly, from his birth to the age of forty-four years. He had a weak ſtomach, and ſometimes laboured under ſo great a decay of his ſpirits, that he remained the whole day in bed, like a dying man, without ſpeaking, or even bemoaning himſelf; but as ſoon as the evening returned, his ſtrength returned alſo. He had a bad memory, which gave occaſion to his often reading his ſpeeches in public, inſtead of pronouncing them by heart; and tho' his pronounciation was diſagreeable, he was nevertheleſs heard with extraordinary pleaſure. He was ſuch a rigorous judge of the works of others, that the old Beroaldus uſed to ſay he knew no Critic of more ſeverity and penetration. He excelled in the art of teaching boys, he knew how to correct them, and make them fond of him, being ever ready to do them all the ſervices that lay in his power: it nevertheleſs ſometimes happened that he chaſtiſed them immoderately; for tho' he had a mild and complaiſant air, he was at the ſame time extremely ſevere and paſſionate. Blanchinus gives us inſtances of it. Another fault he cenſures in him, is, that he never praiſed any Modern. When any body aſked him his opinion concerning the great men of that age, he commonly anſwered, with reſpect to them all, *Sibi ſcire videntur*, they fancy themſelves to be learned.

No man of his time gave more credit to preſages than he, he believed that there was a particular providence concerned in them. For example, if his boy's lamp went out, 'take care, unhappy youth, take 'care, *would he cry to him*, ſome great misfortune 'threatens you;' and to preſerve him from it, if any thing was then to be done, Codrus would do it himſelf. But the moſt ſingular thing of all was, that when they told him of any prodigy, inſtead of thinking that it was either a Prince, or a country threatened with ſome misfortune, he only believed that it was a preſage which threatened him or ſome other Profeſſor. His Hiſtorian tells us, that in his orations, he pronounced ſeveral facetious things, which have not been preſerved in writing. We may judge by thoſe which Codrus has left in them, what theſe facetious things were, which he ſtruck out. When ſomebody aſked him upon this ſubject, why he mingled ſo many pleaſantries in his diſcourſes, he anſwered, 'men are ſo 'framed by nature, that jeſters are agreeable, and 'ſtory-tellers entertaining.'

Codrus made his will ſome days before his death. The will begins thus: *I* ANTONY URCEUS, *ſon to* Cortheſius Urceus, *hope and wiſh for Salvation from the eternal God.* . . . . Afterwards he recommends his ſoul to God, and adds that *he always believed it immortal, againſt the opinion of Epicurus, and of thoſe, who under the name of Chriſtians, do nothing that is Chriſtian.* After certain pious legacies, and ſome other, which he bequeaths to his brothers and ſiſters by a ſecond marriage, he names with a great deal of friendſhip, *Peter Antony* his brother by the mother's ſide, for his ſole heir and executor.

Concerning his works, *Blanchinus* ſays that Codrus has not put the laſt hand to them: that he applied himſelf firſt of all to make Greek and Latin verſes: that he added many things to the *Greek Vocabulary:* that he corrected many other books: that he reſtored ſome other things which had been loſt in the ruins of the Latin tongue. 'Among the moſt conſiderable 'works of this learned man, we find, *ſays he*, ſeveral 'fine orations, which may be compared to a table of 'diſhes, alike exquiſite and numerous: they are cor'rect, elegant, ſprightly, full of learning, and of a 'profound erudition. I never heard, *continues he*, 'any thing more agreeable: the diction of them is ſo 'pure, that one would be apt to ſay, that none but 'Codrus ſpeaks Latin: and tho' his orations be ſo 'full of graces, pleaſantries, mirth, and good humour, 'the gravity of the diſcourſe, is nevertheleſs not at all 'weakened by it.' This is the judgment of Blanchinus, in which friendſhip may poſſibly have had a great ſhare. After all, Codrus has paſſed for a learned man, and he deſerves that title better than many others, on whom it has been beſtowed, if it was not vanity that made him ſay, when ſpeaking of the learned, *Hic vivimus ambitioſa paupertate omnes, ſumus litterarum pauperes, & volumus videri omnia ſcire.* 'We live all in a ſtate of proud poverty, we are poor 'in knowledge, and we would ſeem to know every 'thing.'

Among the friends of Codrus, they reckon the Princes of Forli and of Ferrara, thoſe of Bologna, Politian, Buti, Aldus, Tiberti, Magnani, Garzoni, Guarini and Ripa who had been his maſters, Lambertini, Mimo Roſcio, Laurenzo Roſcio, and Pompeo Foſcarini. Galeazzo Bentivoglio, Apoſtolical Protonotary, had his picture drawn by Francia, a man that wonderfully kept up the reputation which the Francias had acquired by painting.

Among the great number of his ſcholars, they diſtinguiſhed John-Baptiſta Palmari, Cornelius Volta, Camillus Paleoti, Antony Albergatti, Peregrin Blanchini, and Philip Beroaldus the younger, who was alſo Profeſſor at Bologna.

The works of Codrus were printed for the firſt time at Bologn in the year 1502, by John Antony Platonides, *in folio.* They conſiſt of fifteen *Orations*; ten *Letters*; two books of *Sylvæ*; with ſome *Odes* to the number of twenty-two; two *Satires*; one *Eclogue*; ninety-ſix *Epigrams*; and one *Song* for Martinmas-day. But among the pieces of Codrus, we likewiſe find in this edition a preface written by Philip Beroaldus the younger, and inſcribed to Antony Galeazzo Bentivoglio, where we are informed that it is to the latter we owe the collection of Codrus's works, of which ſeveral people were endeavouring to take the honour. We likewiſe find there a letter of Boroaldus; ſeven Poems of Virgilius Portus; a Letter and an Epigram written by a learned man of Toulouſe called John Pin, and an Epitaph which he made for Codrus; an Epiſtle of Blanchinus; and the Life of Codrus, written by the ſame Blanchinus. The works of Codrus, together with the pieces juſt mentioned, were reprinted at Venice in the year 1506, *in folio:* at Paris, in the year 1515, *in 4to*; and at Baſil, in the year 1540, likewiſe *in 4to.*

We have ſeen that Blanchinus, ſpeaking of Codrus's works, ſays 'that he reſtored ſome things 'which had been loſt in the ruins of the Latin 'tongue:' he means chiefly the *Aulularia* of Plautus, which Codrus reſtored by ſupplying the end, which was loſt. This Supplement contains 122 verſes. There is an edition of that Comedy, printed at Leipſic in 1513, *in folio,* with the following title: *Plauti lepidiſſimi Poetæ Aulularia, ab Antonio Codro Urceo, utriuſque Linguæ doctiſſimo, priſtinæ formæ diligenter reſtituta; illius enim finis antea deſiderabatur.*

Codrus had written a book of antiquities, which is loſt; and another of fables, which death hindered him from finiſhing. He likewiſe deſigned to write, as well in Greek as in Latin, a book of ſecrets and hidden things.

Blanchinus

Blanchinus ſays that ſeveral perſons made fine epitaphs upon him, but particularly Hermico Caiado, a Portugueſe Poet, and Philip Beroaldus the younger. They have not publiſhed them in the works of Codrus, though they have inſerted thoſe which Virgilius Portus made upon him: I ſhall quote one of them:

Codrus eram, natale ſolum Herberia, ſed quæ
Me ſepelit Graium dixit & Auſonium.

'I was Codrus, Herberia is my native place; but 'that where I lie buried ſays that I was both a Grecian and a Roman.' New Observat.

W.

WESTPHALUS.

IT is true that the editor has corrected the article of John *Weſtphalus*, who is an imaginary Divine, to whom Moreri aſcribes abominable errors. But he has done more than was required at his hands, for it was not demanded of him that he ſhould ſuppreſs the whole article, but only that he ſhould take from John Weſtphalus the title of Divine, which certainly was not his due, and reſtore to him that of Printer, which belongs to him. This John Weſtphalus, or John de *Weſtphalia*, was not ſuch an obſcure perſon but that he deſerved a place in the Dictionary. He was the firſt Printer in the Low-Countries; he ſettled at Louvain in the year 1475, and Ariſtotle's Ethics was the firſt book *(a)* that he printed (1).

(a) This is the opinion of Gabriel Naudé, but the Sieur de la Caille, in his Hiſtory of Printing, pag. 30, affirms, that as early as the year 1473, John de Weſtphalia printed at Louvain ſeveral books, ſuch as *Petr. Creſcentius de omnibus Agriculturæ partibus, &c. in folio.* Mr Bayle's Remark.

(1) Here again our author does no more than copy Mr Bayle, who has made it appear that the *John Weſtphalus* of Moreri, *a Lutheran Heretic*, &c. is an imaginary perſon. *It is true*, adds Mr Bayle, *there was a John de* WESTPHALIA; *but this was a Printer who ſettled at Louvain in the year* 1475; and for that he quotes Gabriel Naudé. This Printer called himſelf ſometimes *Johannes de Weſtphalia*, ſometimes *Johannes Weſtfalia Paderbornenſis*, ſometimes *Johannes de Paderborn in Weſtphalia*, and ſometimes *Johannes Padelboern de Weſtphalia*. He printed not only at Louvain, but likewiſe at Aloſt and Nimeguen. In the year 1475 he entered into partnerſhip with *Theodoric Martini* of Aloſt. He put out in the year 1475 *Juſtiniani Inſtitutiones cum Gloſſa*, in folio, and added to it this kind of enigmatical advertiſement, according to the cuſtom of the firſt Printers: *Inſtitutionum præſens opus inſigne . . . Johannes de Paderborne in Weſtfaliâ almâ in univerſitate Lovanienſi reſidens non fluviali calamo ſed Arte quâdam characteriſandi moderniſſimâ ſuo proprio ſigno conſignando feliciter conſummavit Anno incarnationis Dominicæ MCCCC LXXV. menſis Novembris die XXI*, &c. Twenty years after he printed *Aur. Auguſtinus in libr. de Trinitate, Lovanii per Johannem Padelboern de Weſtphalia*, folio. At the end of the book we find this:

Numine ſancte tuo Pater ô tueare Johannem
Padelborn: præſens qui tibi preſſit opus.

Lovanii per Johannem Padelboern de Weſtphaliâ in profeſto nativitatis Chriſti finiente anno nonageſimo quinto.

Guard holy Father by thy pow'r divine
John Padelborn, a Printer here of thine.

See Mr Mattaire's *Annales Typographici*, Tom. I. New Observat.

X.

XENOPHANES.

THE article of this Philoſopher is very deficient: if we were to judge of his doctrine by what is ſaid of it in the new edition of the Hiſtorical Dictionary, and by what Diogenes Laërtius ſays of it in the Life of the Philoſophers, and Cicero in his book *de natura Deorum*, one would be tempted to think that they were ſpeaking of two different perſons. The editor only tells us that *he believed there were four elements, and an infinite number of worlds.* If his whole doctrine had been reduced to theſe two principal heads, would it have appeared ſo pernicious to ſome learned men? and would it have given them room to infer that Spinoza had taken the foundation of his impious ſyſtem from this antient Philoſopher? In ſhort, would there be any thing more in this doctrine than what we find contained in the ingenious works of the celebrated Mr Huygens and Mr de Fontenelle. But Xenophanes had other principles of a very different nature

nature; he expreſsly affirmed that the underſtanding is God, and that every thing which is infinite is God. Euſebius Cæſarienſis charges him with having taught that nature is eternal *à priori*, and *à poſteriori*, and that ſhe is always like to herſelf. If we believe the conjecture of a learned Critic, this Philoſopher pretended that the divine underſtanding endeavoured to give to all creatures a ſtate of perfection; but that having met with invincible obſtacles in matter or body, he could not always execute his deſigns; and conſequently was forced, on certain occaſions, to produce bad things: and this, without doubt, is the deteſtable ſource from which Manes took the doctrine of his two principles, the one the author of all good, and the other that of all evil. I do not ſay but that this principle, when conſidered in one particular light, is ſuſceptible of a favourable interpretation; for if this Philoſopher meant that the ſweets of life do not equal the bitters which accompany it, we ſhall eaſily judge that he was not much in the wrong, and that his moral ſeldom fails to be true; and I am of opinion it was from Xenophanes that the famous Natural Hiſtorian, who appeared ſeveral ages after him, borrowed this thought, when he ſaid in the beginning of his ſeventh book, that the good things which nature meaſures out to us, are mixed with ſo many evils, that he does not know *ſi parens melior homini an triſtior noverca fuerit.* - - - *whether nature is not rather a cruel ſtepmother, than an indulgent parent, to mankind* (1).

THESE are the Remarks which I have made upon the laſt edition of Moreri; I might have enlarged their number, but I was willing before-hand to know how the public would reliſh them: if they are approved of, and be eſteemed uſeful towards a new edition, I may poſſibly give the ſequel of them.

I muſt not however conclude without mentioning the conſiderable additions that we find in the new edition of 1704. It contains ſeveral articles that were not in the former ones; as Diſſertations, Genealogies, and other important Remarks. For example, we find in the firſt volume a very curious Diſſertation upon the title of *Royal Highneſs*, which has been given to ſo many Princes of late years. The article which concerns Mr de Sallo (*the father and author of all the literary journals*) has been corrected with a great deal of exactneſs (*a*). The article of Duranti is improved by a curious Diſſertation upon the book *de ritibus*, &c. It is the buſineſs of Father Merſenne (*b*), or his followers to examine the worth of it.

The article of the Abbey of la Trappe has been added: the genealogies are reduced to a very convenient and intelligible method. That of Saulz-Tavanes, it is true, wants reviſing, for the two branches of that family are not well enough diſtinguiſhed, and we do not know who was father to the laſt Count de Tavanes, who married Madam d'Agueſſau. I know that he was ſon to James de Saux, and Loüiſa-Henrietta Poitiers-Trêmes, whereas they make the latter to have been the father of the Marquis de Tavanes, who married N . . . . de Bourbon Buſſet, deſcended from a natural ſon of the Cardinal Charles de Bourbon (1).

---

(1) All this is taken, whether right or wrong, from Mr Bayle's Dictionary. In the edition of 1725, after theſe words, *he believed there were four elements, and an infinite number of worlds*, they have added, *he believed that the moon was inhabited, and had ſeveral other impious principles, as may be ſeen in Mr Bayle.* But why ſhould they rank among the *impious principles* of Xenophanes his having *believed* that *the moon is inhabited*; an opinion, which, on the contrary, *does him* a great deal of *honour*, as Mr Bayle has obſerved. NEW OBSERVAT.

(*a*) I am nevertheleſs told that an Arithmetical error, which has paſſed from edition to edition, is not corrected in that of 1704, no more than it was in that of 1699. This error conſiſts in ſaying that Mr de Sallo, who was born in 1626, died in 1669, aged forty-nine years. It plainly appears from theſe years of his birth and death that he lived no more than forty-three years (1). I wiſh the editor had confuted a lie which traduces Mr de Sallo in a cruel manner, and which, having at firſt been publiſhed by the Carthuſian Friar, who diſguiſed himſelf under the name of Vigneul Marville, has already appeared in a Latin book printed in Germany, and will, no doubt, in a little time paſs from book to book, and from country to country, if a ſtop be not put to the unlucky ſpreading of it. For this reaſon I affirm here, upon the authority of the Abbot Gallois, that nothing is more falſe than the following paſſage of Vigneul Marville, (tom. i. des Melanges, pag. 304.) *that Mr Sallo died in the year* 1665, *of a diſtemper to which the children of the Muſes are very little ſubject, and for which there is no remedy either in Hippocrates or Galen, for he died of grief for having loſt at play* 100000 *crowns, that is to ſay, his whole eſtate.* It is certain that he died in 1669, and that gaming did not in the leaſt contribute towards it. The book of a learned German (Struvius) where this paſſage of Vigneul Marville has been quoted, pag. 79, was printed at Iëna in the year 1704, with the title of *Introductio ad notitiam rei litterariæ & uſum Bibliothecarum.* We may juſtly wonder, that though Mr de Sallo left both children and friends, yet no body has contradicted a public lie which traduces him in ſuch a cruel manner, and that the authors of the *Journal des Sçavans*, who have a greater intereſt than others in his glory, and who have not ſpared Vigneul Marville upon other occaſions, have nevertheleſs ſpared him upon this. There is in the new letters of Mr Bourſault, pag. 357, of the Dutch edition of 1698, a thing ſo ſingular, and ſo much to the honour of Mr de Sallo that they will do well to adorn his article with it in the next edition of Moreri. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) This fault continued in the editions of 1707, 1712, and 1718, and was only corrected in that of 1725. NEW OBSERVAT.

(*b*) He ſhonld have ſaid *Martenne.* He is a Benedictine Monk of the congregation of St Maur. MR BAYLE'S REMARK.

(1) This is corrected in the laſt edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

The genealogy of Savoy has been very well cleared up, and ſeveral others have been added, ſuch as thoſe of Rouſſelet-Chateau-Renauld, of Roiſin, of Marca or la Marque, of Servient; of Tonnelier-Breteüil; of Tournebu; of Hoſtung-la Baume; of Tournemine, the ſame family from which the learned Jeſuit Tournemine is deſcended; of Conſtantin-Tourville; of Valbelle; of Vincent de Mauleon; of Saignez-d'Auſtraud de Cauſans; of Frezeau la Frezeliere, and Fouquet.

That of Phelipeaux has been corrected. That of Bignon has been put in its proper order.

In the genealogy of Voyer they ſhould correct the word *Revau*, which is wrong ſpelt, it ought to be *Rivau* (1).

---

(1) This is alſo corrected in the laſt edition. NEW OBSERVAT.

A
DISSERTATION
CONCERNING THE BOOK OF
STEPHANUS JUNIUS BRUTUS,
Printed in the year 1579.

IT is univerſally agreed, that he who compoſed under this name the book intituled, *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos, ſive de Principis in Populum, Populique in Principem legitima Poteſtate*, was not called ſo; but there are ſtill different opinions concerning his true name. The moſt virulent of all the libels that were ſent us from France by the poſt, in the year 1689, on account of the Revolution of England [*A*], aſcribes Junius Brutus's book to Mr du Pleſſis Mornai: which is ſomewhat ſurpriſing; for after the proofs that the author of another libel (*a*), has taken from ſeveral very common writings, no body ought to be ignorant, that Hubert Languet and Junius Brutus are the ſame perſon. Here follow ſome miſtakes concerning this famous book.

I. Deckher's error.

Mr Deckher (*b*) Advocate in the Imperial Chamber of Spire, pretends, that if the author had called himſelf Lucius Junius Brutus, he had taken a name more proper, and better founded on Livy's Hiſtory, than that of Stephanus Junius Brutus, which he took in the Hanaw edition of the year MDVC; and he obſerves that Boeclerus (*c*) has cited him under the name of *Lucius Junius Brutus*. But firſt, this ſhews he was ignorant that the Prænomen *Stephanus* had appeared in the preceding editions, and even in the firſt, which is pretended to have been made at Edinburgh in the year 1579. The French verſion printed in the year 1581, in 8vo, bears alſo the name of Stephen Junius Brutus. Secondly, why muſt the author have had more regard to Brutus, who delivered Rome from Tarquin's tyranny, than to Brutus, who delivered it from Cæſar's? If there was no reaſon for his preferring one of them before the other, there was no reaſon for his calling himſelf Lucius rather than Marcus; he might therefore, as well have taken the Prænomen Stephen, as any other. Let no man ſay, that the manner of Marcus Brutus's reſiſting the tyrant, is not as agreeable as that of the other Brutus to the author's principles; nor let it be added in confirmation of this, that he allows perſons in any office, as Lucius Junius Brutus, who was tribune of the Celeres, to excite the people to take up arms, but that he denies that privilege to private perſons, and much more, that of aſſaſſinating the tyrant, except in caſe of a Divine Inſpiration, in which he will even have a man to examine himſelf carefully. Let no one uſe theſe arguments, I ſay; for the author has clearly declared (*d*), that Brutus and Caſſius are in the caſe of thoſe murderers of tyrants, to whom the laws promiſe rewards, and erect ſtatues. He has ranked Cæſar in the number of thoſe uſurpers, againſt whom it is lawful for any man to conſpire. And ſo Mr Deckher's criticiſm is falſe, and little better than the pitiful and inſipid jeſt of ſome people, who have ſaid, that Hubert Languet diſguiſed himſelf, amongſt other names, under that of Stephen, not with reſpect to that Stephen, who aſſaſſinated the Emperor Domitian, to whom Apollonius Tyanæus cryed out at three

(*a*) Important Advice to the Refugees.

(*b*) De Scriptis Adeſpotis, *pag.* 89, *Edit. Amſtel.* 1686.

(*c*) In Grotium de Jure Belli & Pacis, *lib. i, cap. iv, pag.* 271.

(*d*) See his Queſtion III, *pag.* 198, & 211.

[*A*] *The moſt virulent of all libels ... concerning the Revolution of England.*] It is intituled *The new Abſalom*, &c. and it is aſcribed to Mr Arnauld: this opinion is printed in a book, called, *The Hiſtory of the troubles cauſed by Mr Arnauld after his death; or Mr Santeuil's quarrel with the Jeſuits* (1). This is found at page 29. If the author of this Hiſtory is not miſtaken as to the author of the libel, he is ſo at leaſt, as to the place of the impreſſion; for it is falſe that Mr Arnauld publiſhed this book in Holland. Nay, I do not think he was there at that time. The Hiſtorical and Political Mercury of the year 1696, has occaſioned the diſcovery of the author of this libel, ſpeaking of this Controverſy of Mr Santeuil.

(1) It was printed at Paris, in the year 1696; but neither the place of the impreſſion, nor the name of the Printer was put to it.

three hundred leagues diſtance, *cheer up, ſtrike the villain* (e) ; but with reſpect to St Stephen, the firſt martyr of the Goſpel, and the firſt victim of Chriſtian patience.

II.
Barclay's error.

But Deckher's criticiſm is nevertheleſs more tolerable, than the argument uſed by William Barclay (*f*), to prove Stephanus Junius Brutus's book to be pſeudonymous, and that the author only choſe the name of Brutus, to ſet out with greater diſtinction, on the foot of deliverer of the people; becauſe, ſays he, it is not probable, that the poſterity of him, who expelled Tarquin, continued to our age, ſince one of the beſt Hiſtorians affirms *, that he died the laſt of his family, in the war againſt the Veientes. Certainly, this is racking one's brain to no purpoſe: for it could never have entered into the head of any reader, that this writer might be deſcended in a right line from Junius Brutus, who aboliſhed the Roman monarchy; and I do not think, that in reading the books of modern authors, whoſe true names are Brutus, any one will be ſo ſilly as to believe they are deſcended from the family of the ancient Brutus's.

III.
Hotman thought to be the author of the book.

The error of thoſe, who father the book on Francis Hotman, is nothing near ſo great as the foregoing (*g*). There are ſtill ſome learned men, who aſcribe it to him; ſuch as Mr Conſtant (*h*), a famous miniſter and profeſſor at Lauſanne, in his abridgment of Politics (*i*).

IV.
The author of the News from the Republic of Learning cenſured.

He who wrote the three firſt years of the *News from the Republic of Letters*, having ſaid by the way (*k*), that Hotman was thought to be concealed under the name of Junius Brutus, gave ſome time after (*l*), for his voucher, a book printed at Paris in the year 1589, intituled, *A Treatiſe concerning the power of Kings againſt the King of Navarre.* But if he had been well acquainted with d'Aubigné's Hiſtory, he might have likewiſe informed us, both that Hotman was the reputed author of Junius Brutus's book, and that it was aſcribed to him without any foundation. I am going to ſhew what d'Aubigné has ſaid of it: I begin with an author, who has been very curious in theſe ſorts of inquiries (*m*); his words are theſe: 'Mr Daillé told me, he heard that the author 'of the book, intituled, *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, under the name of Stephanus Junius 'Brutus, was Hubert Languet, a learned man, and a great Politician. Which I have 'had ſince confirmed by Mr Legoux of Dijon, who added, that Mr de la Mare, Coun'ſellor of the ſame town, had obſerved this in making Hubert Languet's elogy. Others 'attribute this book to Mr du Pleſſis, to whom I could as readily aſcribe it on this te'ſtimony of d'Aubigné †: *There came out another book, called Junius Brutus, or a de'fence againſt tyrants, written by a learned gentleman of this kingdom, famous for many 'excellent books, and ſtill living with great figure.* In another place of his Hiſtory ‡, 'd'Aubigné ſays, that this gentleman confeſſed to him, that he was the author of it.' There was juſt reaſon upon ſuch paſſages to atribute the book to Mr du Pleſſis, *as readily* as to Hubert Languet. But if this author had known d'Aubigné's ſecond edition, he could not have been in ſuſpence; for he would have ſeen that after the year 1616, the date of the firſt edition, d'Aubigné had diſcovered the whole myſtery. Let us hear then what he ſays in the ſecond edition, which is of the year 1626. '(*n*) Many pens in all kinds of writing were imployed both on account of religion 'and government. The firſt ſubject produced a great many books; as for the ſecond, 'there was one in vogue, of which I will take a particular notice, called *A 'Defence againſt Tyrants*: in this, it was fully examined how far obedience to 'Kings extends, for what cauſes, and by what means, people may take up arms, and to 'whom it belongs to authorize them; whether foreigners may be called in; whether 'they may lawfully give aſſiſtance. Hotman was a long time wrongfully ſuſpected to 'be the author of it; but afterwards a French gentleman, who is living when I write, 'confeſſed to me, that he was the author of it. But it appeared at laſt that he was 'the editor, it having been depoſited with him by Hubert Languet, of Franche 'Comté (*o*), agent in France for the Duke of Saxony.' In another place of his Hiſtory (*p*), he repeats the ſame thing in theſe words: *There appeared another book which was intituled,* Junius Brutus, *or* A Defence againſt Tyrants, *owned by one of the learned gentlemen of this kingdom, celebrated for many excellent books, and living ſtill in great repute; treating the queſtions concerning the bounds of our obedience to Kings; in what caſes it is lawful to take up arms againſt them; who ought to attempt it; whether neighbouring foreigners may juſtly give their aſſiſtance; in what manner all things ought to be managed: all this he handles like a great Lawyer, and a great Divine. Since that, Hubert Languet* (*q*) *is known to be the true author of it.*

Colomie's cited, and a reflexion upon the citation.

V.
Three obſervations on d'Aubigné.

I ſhall make three obſervations upon theſe two paſſages of d'Aubigné.

The firſt is, that I do not believe the book in queſtion was ever called *Junius Brutus*, and ſo this Hiſtorian muſt have taken the name of the author for the title of the work; which, at moſt, is but a little deviation from rigorous exactneſs. Not but at bottom, the book might have been intituled, *Junius Brutus*, and might be cited ſo. But this is not the matter in hand; we know well enough that a proper name has often been the title of a book, and that there is a tract of Cicero intituled *Brutus*; we know likewiſe that cuſtom gives great privileges for the abridging of a citation. This is not therefore the matter in queſtion. The queſtion is, Whether the book we ſpeak of had the title which d'Aubigné and Boëclerus give it.

(*e*) Xiphilin. in Domit. *ſub fin.*

(*f*) Lib. iii. contra Monarchomachos, cap. i, pag. m. 311. Vide etiam, p. 189.

* Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. v.

(*g*) See the remark [*H*], of the article HOTMAN.

(*h*) He is known by many good Latin and French books, and lately by a ſyſtem of Morality in Latin.

(*i*) At p. 300, of the Frankfort edition 1687.

(*k*) In the News for Sept. 1684, Art. VI, pag. m. 697.

(*l*) See a Latin letter printed at the end of the treatiſe of *Deckherus, de Script. Adeſp.* p. 360, *edit. Amſt.* 1686.

(*m*) Colomiés, in his *Opuſcula*, *pag.* 130, *Utrecht edition* 1669, *the firſt edition is of Paris* 1668.

† Tom. ii, lib. ii, cap. ii, pag. 108.

‡ Tom. i, lib. ii, cap. xv, pag. 91.

(*n*) D'Aubigné, Tom. i, lib. ii, cap. xvii, p. 124.

(*o*) D'Aubigné is miſtaken, Languet was of Viteaux in the duchy of Burgundy.

(*p*) Tom. ii, lib. ii, cap. ii, pag. 670.

(*q*) D'Aubigné has it *Humbert Languet*, which is an error of the preſs.

My IId obſervation is ſomewhat more conſiderable. D'Aubigné was much in the wrong, to leave in his ſecond edition what he had ſaid in the firſt, to denote Mr du Pleſſis Mornai; for ſince he afterwards underſtood, that Hubert Languet was the true author of the book, and that du Mornai only publiſhed it, he ſhould no longer have affirmed, that du Mornai *had confeſſed to him*, *he was the author*, and that the book was owned by du Mornai. This was repreſenting Mr du Pleſſis Mornai to all Europe as a liar, who adorned himſelf with borrowed plumes. But this will never appear true to thoſe who know his virtue, and the glory he acquired. On the other hand, there is no probability that d'Aubigné would have inſerted ſuch a fact in his Hiſtory, if he had not firmly believed that he remembered du Pleſſis, who was ſtill alive, had ſpoken to him in thoſe terms. But what I am going to ſay ſeems to me the unriddling of the myſtery. Mr du Pleſſis had owned this work in expreſſions which are applicable both to the writer of a book, and to the editor of it; as for inſtance, that he had obliged the public with the book of Junius Brutus; that it was to him the public was indebted for that preſent; and d'Aubigné, not weighing well thoſe expreſſions determined them to the particular ſenſe of being the author of the book. Whilſt he had no other information, it was a ſmall fault to have limited to a definite ſenſe, what was capable of another; but having at laſt publiſhed the truth of the matter, he could not leave his text as it was at firſt, without making du Pleſſis Mornai paſs for a lying plagiary. Such a negligence in not recalling his memory, which probably might have ſhewn him, that this gentleman expreſſed himſelf no otherwiſe than as the editor of a book would have done, is much leſs pardonable, than the negligence we have obſerved elſewhere in the makers of additions (*r*).

(*r*) *See the article* ACIDALIUS, *remark* [*G*]; *and the ſecond article* MALDONAT, *remark* [*I*], *at the end.*

III. D'Aubigné ſeems to fall into a ſtrange anachroniſm by the two epochs he has fixed for Junius Brutus's book. By his firſt paſſage he will have it, that it came out before the conſpiracy of Amboiſe, and that it was one of the books which encouraged the Proteſtants; and by the other, that it appeared the year after the maſſacre of St Bartholomew's-day. Which ever of theſe two dates we chooſe, no credit can be given to the account I ſhall extract hereafter from Simon Goulart's Funeral Oration, which is the moſt authentic piece we have for the hiſtorical ſyſtem of Junius Brutus's book. This is not the only fault d'Aubigné falls into, with reſpect to the time and the ſubject of the libels of that age.

VI.
Reflexions upon Placcius.

Mr Placcius, Profeſſor at Hamburgh, has inſerted in his book concerning *anonymous* and *pſeudonymous* writers, Mr Colomiés's paſſage, without adding the amendment of d'Aubigné's ſecond edition. He recites alſo a paſſage of Boëclerus, which I find much altered in my edition (*s*), though there is no notice given in the title-page that it differs from the firſt; but as to the ſubſtance of what Mr Placcius relates, I find it entire in my edition, *viz.* 1. That Grotius in his Apology againſt Rivetus, aſcribes Junius Brutus's book to du Pleſſis Mornai: 2. That, nevertheleſs, ſome pages of this book were ſeen at Lauſanne, written with Languet's own hand, and as an author writes [*B*]. He means, doubtleſs, that there were ſeen in it references and raſures, or ſuch other characters as diſtinguiſh the original of an author from the tranſcripts. However, by that citation of Placcius it does not appear, that Boëclerus was fully certain that Languet compoſed the book; and he ſeems leſs ſo in another work cited by the ſame Placcius (*t*): but in his Political Diſſertations, printed after his death (*u*) by Mr Obrecht, his ſon-in-law, he expreſſes no uncertainty; but poſitively aſcribes this work to Hubert Languet (*x*).

(*s*) *Printed* Gieſſæ Haſſorum 1687.

(*t*) *It is his* Muſæum, *where he ſays,* qui ſe Bruti nomine diſſimulat, ſive *Mornæus* is eſt, ſive *Hubertus Languetus.*

(*u*) *At Straſbourg in* 1674, *with his* Inſtitutiones Politicæ.

(*x*) *See the IId Diſſertation, p.* 322, *and the XVIth, p.* 209.

VII.
Du Pleſſis Mornai accuſed by Gro-

The place where Grotius affirms that Junius Brutus's book was written by Mornai, is at the ninety-firſt page of his laſt book againſt Rivetus. It is a poſthumous piece, printed in the year 1645, with the title of *Rivetiani Apologetici pro Schiſmate contra*

THE firſt edition of Junius Brutus. An examination of what Voëtius ſays of it.

[*B*] *Some pages of this book were ſeen at Lauſanne, written with Languet's own hand, and as an author writes.*] The firſt edition of it might have been printed at Lauſanne. Rivetus above-cited certifies it was not done in France: no body believes the title importing that it was at Edinburgh. Barclay, according to Voëtius (2), ſays, *in* Præfat. *libri de regno, &c.* that he uſed a copy printed at Edinburgh in the year 1579, but this he takes to be a trick of the Bookſeller. I do not find that paſſage in my edition of Barclay, which is of Hanaw in 1617, wherein there is not even a preface: but I have lately found it in the Paris edition 1600, *in 4to*, which contains a preface of four pages. Beſides what Boëclerus ſays here of ſome pages of the original ſeen at Lauſanne, Deckher, page 90, affirms, he heard, in the year 1667, that the original was found in the ſame town. I do not know why Voëtius conjectured, that the firſt edition of this book was in the year 1587. I confeſs that Draudius's catalogues make nothing againſt his conjecture, though they ſay, that Junius Brutus's book was printed at Edinburgh in 1580; for as they have been brought down to the year 1610; in the edition cited by Voëtius (3), Junius Brutus's might have been ſo mentioned, whether it was printed the firſt time in 1587, with the antedate of 1580, or whether the firſt edition was of 1580, without any antedate. But what will he ſay againſt the Epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheque*, printed in 1583, where Junius Brutus is found as printed at Edinburgh in 8vo in 1580 (4)? What will he ſay of Francis du Verdier's *Bibliotheque*, printed in 1585, where (5) we find the French tranſlation of this book, as printed in 8vo by Francis Stephens in 1581? Theſe are convincing proofs, that if the firſt edition be not of the year 1579, as the title imports, yet, at leaſt, it preceded the year 1587 by ſome years.

(2) Voët. Diſp. Tom. iv, pag. 233.

(3) *According to* Voëtius, Draudius, *pag.* 913, *ſays,* Stephani Junii Vindiciæ contra tyrannos, &c. Edembergæ 80 & 81. Latinè & Gall. *Draudius's edition, which I uſe, is of* 1625. *It mentions this book four times,* viz. *pag.* 809, (*where the Edinburgh edition* 1579, *and the Straſbourg* in 12mo, *are mentioned,*) *pag.* 1235, *where the edition of Amſterdam* 1611 *is mentioned: pag.* 1275, *where the Straſbourg edition is again mentioned; and p.* 84, *of the French books, where we find the title of the tranſlation as it is in* Du Verdier.

(4) *Pag.* 766, *and thereby it appears that* Voëtius *ought not to take any advantage of* Du Verdier's *not mentioning* Junius Brutus *in the* Supplement to this Epitome, *ſince this* Supplement *concerns only the omiſſions of the* Epitome.

(5) *Pag.* 300.

tius of being Junius Brutus. How juſtified by Rivetus.

Votum Pacis facti, Diſcuſſio. In a former writing, I mean, in his *Appendix de Antichriſto*, he would not name Mornai. *Boucher's execrable book*, ſays he (*y*), *concerning the depoſition of Henry III, King of France, was taken, both as to the arguments and expreſſions, not from Mariana, or Santarel, but from Junius Brutus, (I know very well who he is; but let him be concealed, ſince he deſires it), and ſome other learned men of the ſame ſect. Liber flagitioſiſſimus Boucherii de abdicatione Henrici III Galliarum regis non argumentis tantum ſed & verbis deſumtus eſt, non ex Mariana aut Santarello, ſed ex Junio Bruto (quis is ſit ſat ſcio, ſed quia latere voluit, lateat) & ex viris doctis quidem at factionis ejuſdem.* In a letter (z) which he wrote from Paris on the twenty-eighth of February 1643, he does not uſe that reſerve. *I think I have written*, ſays he, *that the author of Junius Brutus is Philip de Mornai, and that Lewis Villiers was he who got it printed; I repeat it again, becauſe Mareſius ſays that he is an unknown author: the thing however is known to a great many. Puto ſcripſiſſe me antehac auctorem Junii Bruti eſſe Philippum Mornæum Pleſſiacum, editorem Ludovicum Villerium, Loiſelerium. Repeto id quia ignotum eſſe ſcriptorem dicit Mareſius, cùm plurimis ea res nota ſit: & idem Pleſſiacus teſtamento generos & amicos ſuos hortatus ſit, arma ut ſumerent, ſi Edicta à Rege non ſervarentur (aa).* In another letter (*bb*) he ſpeaks of one Ruſdorf, a German author, who has cited Junius Brutus under the name of Mornai. The Printers have blundered here; for inſtead of *Ruſdorfius in Defenſione cauſæ Palatinæ*, they have put *cauſæ politicæ*.

It is certain that Mareſius, in his anſwer to Grotius's Appendix in 1642, ſtill maintained that Junius Brutus was an unknown and obſcure perſon, whoſe work none of the Reformed would maintain, nor had ever praiſed or approved. He went ſo far as to ſay, that perhaps it was a Papiſt, as King James had ſuſpected, who had publiſhed this work under the diſguiſe of a Proteſtant, in order to render the Proteſtant religion odious. *Quid quæſo ille ipſe Junius Brutus quem nobis exprobrat (homo anonymus, obſcurus, ignotus, cujus ſcriptum privata emiſſum autoritate Reformatorum nemo tueri velit (cc);) ..... Junius Brutus quiſquis ille ſit (dd) .... Nobis multo crimini dandum quod quæ ſecus quàm par eſſet ille* (Junius Brutus) *ſcripſerat, homo à nemine noſtrûm nec laudatus, nec approbatus, Boucherius ex malis peſſima fecerit & in virus tranſmutârit (ee) .... Qui verò poſſet conferri Junius Brutus, qui ſine Autoris nomine, ſine ulla approbatione prodiit, forte etiam confictus ab aliquo Pontificio in odium Reformatorum, ut ſuſpicabatur Rex Jacobus, cum hoc Santarelli Tractatu, &c (ff).*

Rivetus, anſwering Grotius's poſthumous book, ſays indeed, that no proofs can be given of what is advanced againſt Mr du Pleſſis; but that in caſe he was the author of Junius Brutus, ſome regard muſt be had to his age, and the circumſtances of time, that is, he ought to be excuſed on account of his youth, and the horrible perſecutions the Proteſtants ſuffered at that time (*gg*). From whence it follows, that if Rivetus does not confeſs that Junius Brutus is the fictitious name of Mr du Pleſſis Mornai, he does not deny it neither: which ſhews that he was more inclined to believe it than not. The only thing he clearly affirms, is, that the book was printed out of the kingdom, during the heat of perſecutions and maſſacres, when Mr du Pleſſis was very young. But this plainly ſhews that Rivetus was not initiated into the myſtery, and that he knew little better than d'Aubigné the true date of the book. It is ſurpriſing that neither Grotius, whom hardly any thing eſcaped in the Republic of Letters, nor Rivetus, nor Mareſius, whoſe reading was very extenſive, ſhould know nothing either of what d'Aubigné had ſaid concerning Junius Brutus, in his ſecond edition in 1626, or of Simon Goulart's Funeral Oration, ſpoken and printed at Geneva, in the year 1628. The Learned are a ſtrange ſort of people, they run after remote and fleeting things, and neglect what they have as it were under their very noſes (*hh*). It is much like a hunter,

Tranſvolat in medio poſita & fugientia captat (*ii*).

As a huntſman loves to chaſe his prey
But would not take it if it lay in 's way. CREECH.

VIII. The diſcovery made by Goulart's Funeral Oration.

At the death of Simon Goulart, the ſeals were opened for a full revelation of the myſtery. Theodorus Tronchin (*kk*), Divinity-Profeſſor, making this Miniſter's Funeral Oration declared, that his memory and reading were almoſt infinite; and that people reſorted to him as to an oracle, to know the truth of what they deſired to know. A proof of which is, that King Henry III being exceedingly deſirous to know the author, who was concealed under the fictitious name of Junius Brutus, and all the means he uſed for this purpoſe having failed him, reſolved, at laſt, to effect it by a ſhorter way, as he ſuppoſed; which was to apply to Simon Goulart. But he, that he might not expoſe thoſe who were concerned in it, was ſilent at that time; though he had ſeen the original of the author, and knew it was compoſed by Hubert Languet, and that du Pleſſis Mornai having got the manuſcript into his hands after the author's death, cauſed it to be printed by Thomas Guarin.

By this it clearly appears, 1. That this book, at ſooneſt, was not printed till the end of the year 1581, ſince Languet died but on the firſt of October of that year.

2. That

(*y*) Grot. Append. de Antichr. pag. 59, *Edit. in 12mo, Amſt.* 1641.

(*z*) *It is the DCXLIſt of the ſecond part.*

(*aa*) Grot. Epiſt. *pag.* 949.

(*bb*) *The DCXLVth of the ſecond part.*

(*cc*) Sam. Mareſius, Antichr. revel. *lib. i, p.* 336, 337.

(*dd*) *Id. ib. lib. ii, pag.* 50.

(*ee*) *Ib. p.* 52.

(*ff*) *Ib. p.* 61.

(*gg*) Rivet. Operum, *Tom. iii, pag.* 1163.

(*hh*) *See* Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Arianiſm, *Tom. i, p.* 247, *Edit. of Holland.*

(*ii*) Horat. lib. i, Sat. II, ver. 108.

(*kk*) *See his article above in its place.*

2. That all was fictitious in the title of the firſt edition, the time and place of the impreſſion, as well as the name of the author; for the book was ſaid to be printed at Edinburgh in 1579 (*ll*). Beſides, there was a preface added to it in the name of the Publiſher, in which, he took the fictitious name of *Conon Superantius*, *Vaſco*, and a falſe date both of time and place was uſed; *viz.* Soleurre, the firſt day of January 1577. It is eaſy to prove, that du Pleſſis was not in Swiſſerland, in the interval between Languet's death and the publication of Junius Brutus's book; and I do not think, that any one will affirm, that Thomas Guarin was a Bookſeller of Edinburgh (*mm*). It appears in the third place that the excuſes alledged by Rivetus are not good, ſince it is certain, that when Languet died, France was no longer in a condition of perſecuting the Proteſtants, except by civil-wars, in which each party ſuffered, and that Mr du Pleſſis who was thirty-two years of age, had already written ſome very excellent books, the beſt perhaps he ever wrote, *viz.* his Treatiſe concerning the Church, and that concerning the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

IX. Voëtius's Diſſertation cenſured by Placcius.

Voëtius (*nn*), Divinity-Profeſſor at Utrecht, a man of immenſe reading, might perhaps, as well as Grotius, Rivetus, and Mareſius, have been ignorant all his life, of this unriddling of Theodorus Tronchin, had not the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos* been reprinted at Amſterdam, in the year 1660, in which, to theſe words, *Stephano Junio Bruto Celta*, this was added, *ſive, ut putatur, Theodoro Beza Auctore*. The magiſtrates of Geneva being informed of it, thought themſelves obliged to vindicate Beza's name, from this falſe imputation. They feared it would be a blot upon his memory, ſeeing that Junius Brutus's book was treated with the utmoſt ignominy: for when King James undertook to vindicate the Proteſtants, from the objections occaſioned by that book, he anſwered, that probably, ſome Papiſt had fathered it on the Proteſtants, with a deſign to make them odious. *Quem nobis objicit Junius Brutus, author eſt ignotus, & forte Romanenſis Eccleſiæ emiſſarius, ut per illum reformatæ religioni apud Principes conſlarent invidiam.* (*oo*). And when the Proteſtant writers were haraſſed on the ſame account, they failed not to ſay, that they objected to them an unknown perſon, a man without any name or figure in the Church, or in the world, a phantom. This was a new reaſon for them to juſtify this great ſervant of God; however, it was much better that the reproaches ſhould fall upon Lay-men, who were the true authors of the opinions objected againſt, than upon innocent Divines. For theſe cauſes, and other conſiderations, the Magiſtrates of Geneva wrote to the Magiſtrates of Amſterdam, the proofs of Beza's innocence (*pp*); and thereby, probably Voëtius came to the knowledge of the myſtery revealed by Simon Goulart. Be it how it will, Voëtius publiſhed in the year 1662 (*qq*), an anonymous Diſſertation, which he inſerted four years after, in the fourth volume of his Theſes, wherein he ſhewed by many arguments, that Beza was not Junius Brutus, and enlarged much upon Hubert Languet.

Mr Placcius has criticiſed one of his proofs in defence of Beza. For Voëtius having ſaid, that before the year 1660, no body, either among the friends or enemies of Beza and Languet, or among the editors of Junius Brutus, had aſcribed this book to Beza, either expreſsly, or by way of ſuſpicion; and that therefore the new conjecture of *an unknown man given at random* (*rr*), was of no weight; Mr Placcius ſhews him, that in the year 1652, one John Philips an Engliſhman, who wrote an anſwer to an apology for the King and people of England affirmed, that Beza was the author of Junius Brutus's book.

X. Beza accuſed before the time mentioned by Placcius.

The thing might have been carried higher, ſince ſome French Jeſuits had a long time been beforehand with this John Philips; ſo that Voëtius is wrong in taking advantage from the ſilence not only of Becanus, Gretſerus, and Eudæmon Johannes, but alſo of the whole ſociety of the Jeſuits, *totaque Jeſuitarum natio*; for in the year 1611, we find that Father Coton (*ss*) having collected ſeveral paſſages from Proteſtant authors, which he thought afforded matter for recrimination, and having not forgotten Junius Brutus, put in the margin *Theodorus Beza, ſive Stephanus Junius Brutus, in Libro cui titulus, Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, &c. The Jeſuit Richeome (*tt*), with the very ſame view, and on the ſame occaſion, thus addreſſed himſelf to his adverſary: *How will you excuſe Beza, who, being concealed under the ſham-name of* Junius Brutus, *as you under that of Anti-Coton with the addition of three letters, wrote a book, concerning the lawful power of a Prince*, &c. A miniſter of Gergeau, called David Home, anſwering in the year 1612, the *Apology of the Jeſuits, written by a Father of the ſociety of Jeſus of Loyola*, denied what the author of the apology had aſſerted, that Beza had taken the maſk of Junius Brutus. David Home's book is intituled, *le Contr'Aſſaſſin*. It has theſe words in page 329: *As for Stephanus Junius Brutus, whom he afterwards produces, we know no ſuch man; but we ſay, that the Jeſuit, in affirming him to be Theodorus Beza, without offering the leaſt conjecture in the world for his aſſertion, lyes Jeſuitically, that is, impudently, and like a Machiavelist, who holds that tho' a lye be ſpread about but for half an hour, it ſtill does good in ſtate matters; tho' God forbids us to bear falſe witneſs againſt any one, as this man does againſt Beza, in whoſe writings there is not one word of exhortation to kill tyrants*, &c. After ſome citations, the author goes on thus: *This is what Beza ſays, which ſufficiently diſproves the Jeſuit, who affirms that he is the author of the treatiſe produced under the name of Junius Brutus, which has no conformity with that of Beza*,

(*ll*) See the remark [*B*].

(*mm*) They feigned at that time, that ſeveral books were printed at Edinburgh; ſuch as in 1574. The *Reveille matin des François*, written by *Euſebe Philadelphe Coſmopolite* (it is a fictitious name) and the treatiſe *de Furoribus Gallicis* publiſhed under the falſe name of *Erneſtus Varamundus Friſius*, 1573.

(*nn*) Giſbertus Voëtius.

(*oo*) Operum Regiorum, *pag.* 478, *which has been thus tranſlated*; Junius Brutus, whom he (*Cardinal du Perron*) objects to us is an unknown author; and perhaps one of the Romiſh Church hath writ it on purpoſe to make the Proteſtants odious to Princes, *pag.* 137, 138, *of the* Vindication of the Rights of Kings; *printed in* 1615, *againſt* Cardinal du Perron's harangue.

(*pp*) Placcius, de Script. Anonym. *pag.* 169.

(*qq*) He himſelf mentions that year in the fourth volume of his Theſes, *p.* 230. Placcius, ibid. puts it in 1661.

(*rr*) The Greek phraſe he uſes, is perhaps more emphatical; ἀεροβατοῦντι στοχασμῷ τοῦ δεῖνα.

(*ss*) Réponſe Apologet. à l'Anti-Coton, & â ceux de ſa ſuite, *pag.* 173.

(*tt*) *At page* 471, *of the* Categorical Examination of the libel Anti-Coton, *printed in* 1613. *He puts in the margin*, Junius Brutus de Beze de legitima poteſtate, *&c.*

Beza, and is in all probability, the true name of the author, ſince there are ſeveral learned men, who are ſirnamed Junius. An Iriſh Jeſuit (*uu*) cited Junius Brutus's book as Beza's performance, in the year 1614. I queſtion not, but many others, both before, and after the anſwers to the Anti-Coton, have imployed this calumny againſt Beza, and I expect to have quickly returned to me, what I have lent Mr Placcius; I mean, that I ſhall be ſhewn, that I might have ſtill gone higher; from whence it will ſtill be more apparent, how reſerved we ought to be upon general affirmations, tho' we ſhould have the vaſt reading of the famous Profeſſor of Utrecht; for after all, the great knowledge he had of all ſorts of books, prevented not his being ignorant: 1. That before the year 1660, Beza had been often accuſed of writing the book of Junius Brutus. 2. That two years before the Funeral Oration of Simon Goulart, the public was informed by d'Aubigné, that Hubert Languet had taken that fictitious name. 3. That Grotius had publickly named Mr du Pleſſis Mornai as the author of that piece.

XI. The Proteſtants apology for the Roman Church, by Brereley.

Expecting the return of my loan, I will ſay here that one John Brereley, an Engliſh prieſt, in his book, intituled, *The Proteſtants Apology for the Roman Church* (*a*), cites an author, called Sutcliffe (*b*), who ſaid, that the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, was a book written either by Beza or Hotman. Tho' I cannot diſcover at what time this apology was firſt printed; yet I doubt not but it was before the Jeſuits anſwer to the Anti-Coton, ſince I learn from the tranſlator, that as ſoon as it appeared in Engliſh, Bancroft, then Archbiſhop of Canterbury, ordered ſome learned Divines, and particularly Morton, to anſwer it, and that Morton's anſwer is called, *Catholica Appellatio pro Proteſtantibus.* Now this doubtleſs is the book of Morton, which according to the Oxford Catalogue appeared in 1606, under this title, *A Catholic Appeal for Proteſtants*; and therefore I ought not to believe that this Catalogue mentions the firſt edition of the apology, in theſe words of page 107, *The Proteſtants Apology for the Roman Church* 1608. Now, as Sutcliffe's book, cited by Brereley, is an anſwer to a petition of the Preſbyterians, and the Oxford Catalogue places the impreſſion of this anſwer in the year 1592, with this title, *An Anſwer to a Petition of the Conſiſtorian faction, preſented to her Majeſty*, it is evident, that Junius Brutus's book was attributed to Beza long before the Jeſuits anſwered the Anti-Coton.

It does not appear that Brereley, who produces a prodigious number of Proteſtant authors upon all ſubjects, had read Junius Brutus; for he cites nothing out of it: and for that reaſon the Biſhop of Luçon (*c*) did not cite it in the book he publiſhed againſt the Proteſtants, in the year 1618, wherein he objects to them ſome other writers tainted with Hubert Languet's maxims, whoſe paſſages he had found in Brereley, as Rivetus intimates, in anſwering the Jeſuit Petra Sancta. *A quo* (libello Epiſcopi Luſſonenſis) *video non pauca te mutuatum fuiſſe, quemadmodum ille, aut potius ſacerdos Anglus qui tum ei fuit à manu ex laciniis Anglo-Papiſtarum* (*d*). I have not ſeen this book of the Biſhop of Luçon; but what makes me think that he has not mentioned Junius Brutus, is, that David Blondel (*e*) anſwering this prelate, ſays nothing to him concerning this diſguiſed author. We may eaſily ſee now, why Petra Sancta (*f*) ſpeaks not of this author neither; it is becauſe he borrowed from the Biſhop (as Rivetus taxes him with it) all his citations of Anti-Monarchical Proteſtant authors. Hence it appears, that the author of the large anſwer to Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm is miſtaken in ſaying, (*g*) *That the Method aſcribed to Cardinal Richelieu, and the Jeſuit Sylveſter à Sancta Petra, have furniſhed* Mr Arnauld with the objection he makes to us about the royal authority, in his Apology for the Catholics: for firſt, it is not in the Method, which was not publiſhed till after Cardinal Richelieu's death, but in a book he publiſhed before his Cardinalſhip, that he objected ſuch republican writings: In the ſecond place, if Mr Arnauld had taken his arguments from theſe two ſources, he would not have found there Hubert Languet's work, nor the Magdeburg writing, which make the ſtrength of his attack.

XII. The Magdeburg writing.

This piece of Magdeburg is intituled, *de Jure Magiſtratuum in ſubditos, & officio ſubditorum erga Magiſtratûs.* Brereley (*h*) ſpeaks of it only in general, and upon the credit of Sutcliffe, who aſcribes it to Beza. This book was publiſhed in 1550, under the name of the inhabitants of Magdeburg. I cannot tell whether it be the ſame with that of which Sleidan has given the abſtract (*i*). I know it only by the French edition of 1578, in 12mo. It is intituled, *du Droit des Magiſtrats*, &c. *Of the Right of Magiſtrates over their Subjects. A Treatiſe moſt neceſſary at this time, to admoniſh both Magiſtrates and Subjects of their duty: publiſhed by the Magdeburgers, in the year* MDL: *and now reviſed and inlarged with ſeveral reaſonings and examples.* There were ſeveral editions before this. Mr Arnauld (*k*) made uſe of a Latin tranſlation, printed in the year 1576, *apud Joannem Mareſchallum Lugdunenſem, in 8vo*, and done from the French. The author of the Commentaries *De ſtatu Religionis & Reipublicæ in regno Galliæ*, makes mention of a book publiſhed in the year 1573, which is the ſame with this. He owns that the author's deſign was to make an apology for the Proteſtants, who were then engaged the fourth time in a civil-war againſt Charles IX (*l*). Thuanus expreſly obſerves under the year 1574 (*m*), that there came out a new edition of a book which had been printed in Germany, at the time of the ſiege of Magdeburg, and that this new edition was enlarged with ſeveral examples and reaſonings. John Beccaria, who an-

---

(*uu*) Henry Fitz Simon, in Britannomachia Miniſtrorum, *printed at Douay*, in 1614.

(*a*) Page 636, of the Latin tranſlation done out of Engliſh by William Raynerius, and printed at Paris, in 1615 in 4to, and pag. 653, of the ſecond Engliſh edition, printed in 1608.

(*b*) It is he who is called in Latin *Matthæus Sutlivius* (Raynerius ſhould have called him ſo): He was a good Proteſtant, but moſt oppoſite to the Preſbyterians. I have given his article.

(*c*) Afterwards Cardinal Richelieu.

(*d*) Rivetus Operum, *Tom. iii, pag.* 505, *num.* 5. Blondel, *in his* Modeſt Declaration, *pag.* 287, *ſpeaks more expreſly:* They borrow, *ſays he*, from the apology of John Brereley, an Engliſh prieſt, the invention of curtailing ſome paſſages.

(*e*) Modeſt Declaration of the ſincerity of the Reformed Churches. Sedan 1619.

(*f*) Silveſt. Petra Sancta, Not. in Epiſt. Petri Molinæi ad Balzacum.

(*g*) Tom. ii, pag. 286, in 4to.

(*h*) In Apologia Proteſtant. *pag.* 613.

(*i*) Sleid. *lib. xxii, init. See the* Chimerical Cabal, *ſecond edition, pag.* 139, *& ſeq.*

(*k*) See his Apology for the Catholics, *Part.* i, *chap iv, p.* 50.

(*l*) Commentar. de Statu Reip. & Relig. *ad ann.* 1573. *fol. m.* 118, *verſo.*

(*m*) Thuan. *lib. lvii, pag. m.* 50. I have ſeen an edition in 8vo, printed in 1574.

ſwered this book in the year 1590, repreſented it as a very new book: ‘ Quum ſuperioribus diebus commentabamur aliquid de bello, liceret ne ſcilicet Chriſtiano bellare, vel non, prodiit libellus quidam cui hic erat titulus, De jure Magiſtratuum in ſubditos, & officio ſubditorum erga Magiſtratus (n). - - - - *A few days ago, when I was writing ſomething concerning war, namely on this queſtion; whether it is lawful for a Chriſtian to go to war: there came out a little book intituled,* Of the Right of Magiſtrates over their Subjects, and the Duty of Subjects to their Magiſtrates.’ This ſhews there was lately a new edition of it, and that he knew nothing of the preceding. Some ſuſpect that John Beccaria is not the true name of this author (o). What is certain, is, that he was not a Catholic: he was perhaps a kind of a Socinian. He uſes his adverſary very ill, and treats him as a ſanguinary ſoul, and an enemy to peace. ‘ Videri hominem eſſe verè ſanguinarium, bello, armiſque amicum, hoſtem capitalem paci, nomini regio infenſiſſimum, verſatum in literis humanis, præſertim hiſtoriis, atque ſi divinare licet leguleium, in divinis haud adeò multum: nihil prorſus habentem illius manſuetudinis & clementiæ illius pacifici, & mitiſſimi agni Jeſu Chriſti (qui quidem dixit: † Diſcite à me, quòd mitis ſum, & humilis corde: non autem dixit, Diſcite à me contendere, & litigare, multò certè minus bellare) ſed abundare ſpiritu contentionis, ambitionis, & ſuperbiæ: neſcire prorſus quid ſit vera concordia, quid pax, quid humilitas, quid patientia, quid ſit injuriam pati: ſed optimè ſcire quid ſit injuriam inferre, vel illatam vindicare: ignorare etiam omnino quid ſit proximus, illud bene ſcire, ‡ Proximus ſum egomet mihi: Chriſti crucem nec ſcire, nec ſcire curare: omnia humana ad trutinam, id eſt, ad ſuum arbitrium ponderare (p). - - - - *This author ſeems to be a ſanguinary man, a friend to war and to arms, a mortal enemy to peace, an implacable hater of the name of King; he ſeems to be ſkilled in human learning, eſpecially in Hiſtory; and if I may be allowed to conjecture he is ſome petty-fogger, very little verſed in Divinity, utterly void of the meekneſs and clemency of the mild and peaceable lamb Jeſus Chriſt (who ſaid,* Learn of me, for I am meak and lowly of heart; *but did not ſay,* Learn of me to be quarrelſome and litigious, much leſs learn of me to make war upon your neighbour) *he ſeems to be full of the ſpirit of contention, ambition, and pride, to be an intire ſtranger to concord, peace, humility, patience, and the bearing of injuries; but to know perfectly well what it is to do an injury; or to revenge an injury received; to be utterly ignorant of charity, but to abound with ſelf-love; he ſeems neither to know, nor care to know the croſs of Chriſt; and in judging of all human affairs to be guided by nothing but his own fancy.*’ We muſt confeſs that Mr Arnauld had but little knowledge of this piece of Magdeburg.

A Civilian of Bavaria, named *John Baptiſt Ficklerus*, knew only the edition of 1576, which induced him to anſwer it in a book which was printed at Ingolſtad in 1578, with this title: *De Jure Magiſtratuum in ſubditos, & officio ſubditorum erga Magiſtratus: Contra Libellum cujuſdam Calviniani, ſub eadem inſcriptione, ſed reticito nomine Authoris, & loci Typographiæ, ſuperiori anno editum; nunc autem veritatis ſtudio reformatum, retento quidem illius ſtylo, ſed pleriſque argumentis ad rei veritatem applicatis. Tractatus brevis & perſpicuus, hiſce ambiguis temporib. Chriſtiano homini lectu admodum utilis & neceſſarius.*

XIII. Father Labbe's miſtake.

Let me obſerve by the by, that it is dangerous to ſpeak of books which we have not ſeen. Father Labbe, who had an almoſt infinite reading, and yet had not ſeen Brereley's Proteſtants Apology, heard of it whilſt his Diſſertation upon Eccleſiaſtical Writers was in the preſs; he would add to it ſomething that was told him, but in three lines he made two faults (q): The one is, that he calls the author *Bretleius*, inſtead of *Brerleius*; the other is, that he aſcribes to him the preface in which the Pope, St Gregory, is juſtified, whereas it is the tranſlator who has wrote it.

XIV. Beza's adverſaries who could not accuſe him.

What I have ſaid of Sutcliffe, ſhews, that the proof Voëtius has founded upon the ſilence of all the Epiſcopalians, is not better than that which he has grounded on the ſilence of all the Jeſuits. Beſides, I obſerve that among Beza's adverſaries, who Voëtius ſays, would not have ſpared him, if they could have faſtened Junius Brutus's work upon him, he reckons at leaſt five, whoſe ſilence proves nothing. Theſe he names (r); *viz.* Charpentier, Baudouin, Caſtalio, Eraſtus, Morellus, Saravia, Montague, Tilenus, Ladus, and Dr Bramble. As for Charpentier, who ſpoke very ill of Beza, in the violent ſatire he wrote to Francis Portus, in the year 1572 (s), he could not ſpeak of Junius Brutus's book, which did not appear till ſome years after (t). Baudoüin and Caſtalio, who died, the former in the year 1573, the latter in 1563, were ſtill leſs able to ſpeak of him. Thomas Eraſtus, it is true, wrote againſt Beza on the ſubject of Excommunication; but this was long before Junius Brutus's book appeared. Eraſtus's anſwer is dated on the twenty-fourth of December 1569: Beza's name was not in the original (u); it was inſerted by thoſe who publiſhed it in the year 1589, after Eraſtus's death. Theſe two antagoniſts had been very civil to one another at Baſil after the diſpute. As for Morellus I do not think, that after the national ſynod held at Nimes in the year 1572, where his opinion was condemned, he entered the liſts. This man had maintained, in the year 1562, that the right of Excommunication belonged not to the Conſiſtories and Synods, but to the whole body of the Church. He

(n) Jo. Beccaria, Refutat. cujuſd. Libelli, *pag.* 1.

(o) Voët. Diſp. *Tom. iv, pag.* 238.

† Matth. xi.

‡ Terentius.

(p) Beccaria, ibid. *pag.* 9.

(q) *Tom. i, p.* 786.

(r) Voët. ibid. *pag.* 234.

(s) *Concerning this* Letter *ſee the remark* [*A*], *of the article* CHARPENTIER.

(t) *I do not think* Charpentier *wrote any thing after the impreſſion of* Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos.

(u) *See Beza's preface to the tract* de Vera Excommunicatione.

He was excommunicated for this opinion; and the writing he publiſhed on that ſubject was burnt, and the reading of it was forbidden (*w*). He nevertheleſs perſiſted in his opinion, and in the year 1572, was one of the members of the cabal, which endeavoured to make ſuch a change in the diſcipline of the churches, that thence forward the power of the keys ſhould be adminiſtred by the whole body of the people (*x*). Ramus was one of the heads of this cabal (*y*). Beza, who aſſiſted in the national ſynod of Nimes in 1572, oppoſed this faction *viva voce*, and by writing, and made it vaniſh into nothing. However, it cannot be denied, but that before the year 1660, Junius Brutus's Treatiſe was often aſcribed to Beza in printed books: nevertheleſs, he who publiſhed it that year at Amſterdam, knew nothing of it; for the only reaſon he gives why he would have the title lengthened out with theſe words, *ſive, ut putatur, Theodoro Beza Autore*, is, that he had ſeen a copy upon which a learned profeſſor had writ, that Beza had compoſed this book. This overthrows Mr Placcius's conjecture (*z*), *viz.* That the Engliſh author he cites, was the cauſe of Beza's name appearing in the edition of 1660. I wonder he did not quote Milton, who ſpeaks thus, in one of his books: 'Doctrina 'hæc nobis haud magis quam Gallis, quos tu hoc piaculo cupis eximere, debetur: 'unde enim Francogallia illa niſi ex Gallia? unde Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos? qui liber 'etiam Bezæ vulgo tribuitur (*aa*). - - - - *This doctrine is not derived from the Engliſh,* '*more than it is from the French, whom you deſire to vindicate from this crime. For whence* '*comes Francogallia, but from France? Whence the* Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos, *a book* '*which is alſo commonly aſcribed to Beza?*' For the reſt, ſeveral perſons believed, that Milton was the author of John Philips's Apology. Salmaſius affirms it roundly (*bb*). Others ſay, that he either wrote it, or adviſed the publiſhing of it: 'Eandem culpam 'commiſſam fuiſſe in *Reſponſione Philippi Angli ad Apologiam Anonymi cujuſdam, &c.* 'aliquando Hartlibo ſcripſi, cujus libri authorem eſſe Miltonium, ſaltem ejus conſilio 'publicatum, firmiſſime creditur (*cc*). - - - - *I formerly wrote to Hartlib, that the ſame* '*error was committed in the* Anſwer of John Philips, an Engliſhman, to the Apology 'of an Anonymous Writer, &c. *a book, which it is firmly believed was written by Milton,* '*or at leaſt publiſhed by his advice.*'

(*w*) *See Thomas Eraſtus's book,* de Excommunicatione, *pag.* 69, 70.

(*x*) Ant. Fayus, in Vita Th. Bezæ, *pag.* 49. *See alſo* Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. *lib. vi*, *pag.* 34.

(*y*) Simler. in Vita Bullingeri, *fol.* 45.

(*z*) Placcius, ubi ſupra.

(*aa*) Joannes Miltonus, Defenſ. ſecunda, *pag.* 99, *Edit. Hag.* 1654.

(*bb*) Salmaſ. Reſponſ. ad Jo. Miltonum, *pag. m.* 19.

(*cc*) Hadrianus Ulacq, *in Præfatione* Apologiæ ſecundæ Miltoni, *Edit. Hag.* 1654.

XV.
Some late authors have been ignorant who was Junius Brutus.

Since Voëtius's Diſſertation, it has been eaſier to know what to depend upon, as to Junius Brutus; and yet Mr Colomiés, and the author of the *News from the Republic of Letters*, had but a ſuperficial knowledge of this matter, the one in the year 1668, the other in 1686 (*dd*). Nay, Mr Arnauld, compoſing his apology for the Catholics in the year 1682, and taking from Junius Brutus's book all that he could find capable of rendering the Proteſtant doctrine ſuſpected to ſovereigns, never attempted to ſtrengthen his proofs with conſiderations taken from the perſon of the author; which makes it evident, that he knew not who he was. I obſerve all theſe little things to ſhew that thoſe Proteſtants, who have ſaid theſe laſt years (*ee*), that Junius Brutus was an unknown man, without name, character, or authority, might ſpeak in this manner without any fraud; tho' one of the libels I have mentioned at the beginning of this diſſertation, would inſinuate the contrary: I mean, that kind of ſermon wherein we are cenſured, for a pretended proneneſs to libelling and civil-wars, with as great vehemence, as ever a miniſter expreſſed in a faſt-day ſermon, when he lays the breach of the whole Decalogue to the charge of his hearers.

(*dd*) See, above, num. 4, citations (*k*), (*l*), (*m*).

(*ee*) Daillon, Examen de l'oppreſſion des Réformez, 1687. *Jurieu's Anſwer to Maimbourg*, 1683.

XVI.
The libels of ſome private perſons diſowned.

And ſince occaſion offers, it will not be improper to ſay, that this man's violent reproaches have had a good effect. They are not perhaps the cauſe that little ſorry ſatirical books, do not come ſo thick among us as before [C]; but it is certain at leaſt, that they have obliged the moſt excellent writers of the party (*ff*), to inform the public, that it was unjuſt to make the body of the Refugees anſwerable for theſe bad books. So that poſterity will always have ſome cotemporary records, to clear them from the malicious imputations that may be caſt upon them. Let it not be ſaid, that theſe excellent

(*ff*) *The author of the* Letters *upon the* Affairs of the Preſent Time; *that of the* Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned; *that of the* Defence of the Refugees againſt the Important Advice.

[C] *Perhaps they are not the cauſe, that little ſorry ſatirical books come not ſo thick among us as before.*] This *perhaps*, is not improper here; for it is very probable that two other things have leſſened their numbers; 1. The indignation that all honeſt men expreſſed againſt them. 2. The readers beginning to be tired with them; which never fails to happen when the ſame ragoo is ſerved up too often, and when amongſt the multitude of thoſe who pretend to cook it, many of them make it very flat and inſipid. It is a maxim that authors ought carefully to ſtudy; *viz.* that the greedineſs of the public, ought never to be abuſed, that ſatiety is to be avoided even in ſubjects of admiration; and therefore we ought not to yield with too great complacency, to this compliment of the Italian academies, *Di gratia, Signor, un' altra volta.* - - *Again, Sir, if you pleaſe.* This compliment is doubtleſs a teſtimony of approbation, and it is generally uſed to a Muſician, who has charmed more than ordinary; and then the company is not ſorry to be taken at their word: but he who ſhould abuſe the courteſy ſo far as to exceed the rule of the Greeks, *δὶς καὶ τρὶς τὸ καλὸν, bis & ter quod pulchrum,* - - - *a good thing may be twice or thrice repeated*, and even what a Latin Poet (6) has ſaid, that there are ſome poems which pleaſe, tho' ten times repeated, *decies repetita placebit*, would deſerve to be referred to the old proverb, *twice ſodden cabbage is death, δὶς κράμβη θάνατος, crambe bis poſita mors.* It is not fit the public ſhould be expoſed to the miſerable condition of thoſe teachers of Rhetoric heretofore, who were forced to hear the declamations of a whole claſs variouſly turned, concerning the overthrow of tyrants.

Declamare doces, ô ferrea pectora Vetti!
Cum perimit ſævos claſſis numeroſa Tyrannos.
Nam quæcunque ſedens modò legerat, hæc eadem ſtans
Perferet, atque eadem cantabit verſibus iiſdem.
OCCIDIT MISEROS CRAMBE REPETITA MAGISTROS (7).

(6) Horat. de Arte Poëtica.

(7) Juven. Sat. VII, ver. 150.

But

cellent writers, who diſowned thoſe libels, have done it without naming themſelves; for having anſwered for their brethren in general, whilſt none has excepted againſt their declaration, it is a proof that the whole body acquieſces in it. Add to this, that the name of him, who writes every fortnight on the affairs of the preſent time, in ſo polite and judicious a manner, is known to every body. And as for the author of the inimitable *Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned*, is any body ignorant of his name? A name, that has ſo long been famous both at the bar and in the church, both *viva voce*, and in writing; a name, which two brothers render more illuſtrious every day; the one *(gg)* by his eloquent ſermons, and learned anſwers to the Biſhop of Meaux; the other *(hh)* by the incomparable journal I have mentioned. To ſay nothing of a couſin *(ii)* who has relieved Caſaubon in the attack of Baronius's Annals. As to the defence of the Refugees againſt the *Important Advice*, the author of it is no doubt very worthy of credit *(kk)* when he affirms any thing in the name of his brethren. He fully anſwers the reproaches that concern the ſatirical ſpirit, and ſets forth his opinion on the other point, with a great dexterity of wit. All things well conſidered, it muſt be owned that tho' a diſavowal which had preceded the ſevere reproaches of the adverſary, and had been made by perſons appointed for this purpoſe by the Synod, would have been much more honourable and more authentic; yet none but extravagant cavillers, can henceforth renew theſe accuſations. But to return to my ſubject.

XVII.
The Funeral Oration of Goulart leaves ſome doubt.

Voëtius did not ſo far truſt to Simon Goulart's teſtimony, as to think it ſtrange, that any perſon ſhould ſtill be a Sceptic, with reſpect to Junius Brutus; and for my part, I confeſs, that I ſtill perceive in it ſome difficulties and intricacies, tho' I ſeemed ſo ſtrongly to declare for Hubert Languet, who is the perſon to whom Mr de la Mare adjudges the book. He does it in a work not yet printed [*D*], and I do not know whether the thing be there particularized, as in the oration of the Geneva Profeſſor, or otherwiſe; nor what proofs are given. If it could be proved that Junius Brutus's book was publiſhed before Languet's death, farewel Goulart's depoſition. This will perhaps excite ſome perſon, well furniſhed with books and time, to ſeek for ſome light upon this ſubject; and I hope Mr Baillet will exhauſt the matter in the great work the public expects from him, concerning authors who have diſguiſed their names.

XVIII.
A fault in the continuation of the *Menagiana*.

There is in the Continuation of the *Menagiana* an error which I ought not to paſs by. ‘Languet's letters have a great many good things in them. Mr Languet was Counſellor in the parliament, and a man of great merit. It is he who was the author of ‘that admirable work intituled, *Vindiciæ Regiæ contra Tyrannos.* He wrote this book ‘in defence of Henry the fourth's right. As the declaring himſelf the author, would ‘have endangered his life, he took ſo good meaſures with his Printer, and the ſecret was

But oh, what ſtock of patience wants the fool,
Who waſtes his time and breath in teaching ſchool!
To hear the ſpeeches of declaiming boys,
Depoſing tyrants with eternal noiſe!
Sitting or ſtanding, ſtill confin'd to roar,
In the ſame verſe the ſame rules o'er and o'er.

DRYDEN.

The condition of ſchoolmaſters is not better at preſent. They dictate an exerciſe to a whole claſs, to have it turned ſeveral ways by their ſcholars; literally by ſome, paraphraſed by others; in verſe or in Greek by a third ſort, and in two ſorts of Latin proſe by a fourth. It is ſtill the ſame exerciſe, ſtill the ſame thing under different words. The public not being paid for this, has no reaſon to ſuffer it. Now it is certain our ears have ſo often tingled with the ſame things, and the number ten hath been left ſo far behind, that we need not wonder that theſe ſhowers fall not ſo thick as formerly. Every body ſet up for the ſame trade (8); it is no wonder therefore that it proved good for nothing.

[*D*] *Mr de la Mare adjudges the book to Hubert Languet. He does it in a work not yet printed.*] I ſpoke thus in the year 1696; but now I muſt ſay that it has been printed at Hall in Saxony, in the year 1700. I have not found in it what I expected, but am left in all the uncertainty I was in before. Mr de la Mare ſays (9), that the year 1580 abounded with Political Writings, ſince beſides the treatiſe of Voluntary Slavery, compoſed by la Boëtie, and the *Franco-Gallia* of Hotman, there came out *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, written by Hubert Languet. This is moſt certain, ſays he, I have a great many proofs for it, and had I only this I am going to mention it would be ſufficient. *Ad Vindicias redeo, quas etſi nonnulli tribuere videantur Franciſco Hottomano, certiſſimum tamen eſt illarum auctorem eſſe Languetum, cujus rei quamvis alia me deficerent argumenta, ſunt autem quam plurima, unum inſtar omnium hoc erit, quod modo ſum prompturus Antonii Vioni Herovalli fide* (10). This great proof, the only one that Mr de la Mare has been pleaſed to communicate to the public, conſiſts in this, that he had heard Mr Vion d'Herouval ſay, that Henry III, underſtanding that Simon Goulart knew who was the author of the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, immediately ſent for him, and aſked his name; that Goulart only anſwered, that his oath obliged him to conceal it during the author's life; that the King in vain added threatenings to entreaties; and that nothing was capable of ſhaking Goulart's reſolution, who by a rare inſtance of fidelity and friendſhip, perſiſted to conceal, during Languet's life, the ſecret which had been truſted to him alone. *Cui* (Henrico III) *cum Gulartius præfracte reſpondiſſet, non niſi poſt auctoris obitum nomen illius revelare ſibi licitum eſſe, quod ſolemni ſacramento obſervaturum ſe promiſerat, Rexque precibus minas adderet, perſtitiſſe tamen in propoſito Gulartium, neque precibus neque minis adduci unquam potuiſſe, ut priuſquam fato functus fuiſſet Languetus, quod ſibi ſoli commiſerat arcanum proderet, raro conſtantis fidei & amicitiæ exemplo* (11). Now here is a proof which can be of no uſe to us: for though Mr Vion d'Herouval ſhould have better known the circumſtances of the fact, he would have taught us only what we knew before. It is plain that he had mediately or immediately, from the Funeral Oration of Simon Goulart, the particulars he related to Mr de la Mare. He could not therefore be a new evidence. Now either for want of memory, or becauſe others had miſinformed him of Theodorus Tronchin's account, he related it very ill, ſince it is falſe that Henry III ſent for Goulart, entreated and threatened him, and that Goulart anſwered, his oath engaged him to be ſilent, and that the ſecret was committed only to him. I wonder Mr de la Mare believed that a Miniſter anſwered Henry III, in that manner, with impunity. I ſay nothing of the falſe dates he gives of Stephen de la Boëtie's, and Francis Hotman's books.

[*E*] *An*

(gg) Mr Baſnage, *Miniſter of Rotterdam.*

(hh) Mr Baſnage de Beauval, *a Civilian.*

(ii) Mr Baſnage de Flottemanville, *Miniſter at Zutphen.*

(kk) It was a Miniſter called Coulan, *who died in England two or three years ago. I write this in* 1696.

(8) Expectes eadem à ſummo minimoque poëta. *Juven. Sat. I, ver.* 14.

(9) Vita Huberti Langueti, *pag.* 123.

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 124.

(11) Ibid. *pag.* 125.

'was ſo well kept, by the mutual intereſt they had in it, that it was not known to 'be his book till long after his death; and the Printer, who after the peace declared 'he had printed it, diſcovered alſo to Henry IV how the matter was ordered.' 1. This expreſſion, *Counſellor in the parliament*, ought to ſignify here that Hubert Languet had that place in the parliament of Paris. But it is certain he had it not in any parliament of France. 2. His book had not the title of *Vindiciæ Regiæ*, nor ought to have it. 3. Mr Menage would never have called it *admirable*, if he had known what ſubject it treats, and upon what principles it goes. 4. Nothing could be more pernicious to Henry IV, than Languet's book, ſince it authorized the French to depoſe Henry III, and to place the crown on the head of the Duke of Guiſe. 5. Laſtly, all the reſt of the account, the ſecret of the Printer, and the diſcovery of the myſtery after the peace, are quite contrary to truth, and all probability. I do not deny that in ſome ſenſe Mr Menage might have thought that this work of Languet is an admirable piece: he might have found in it learning and art, a great order and method, and the beſt and moſt ſolid arguments that can be offered for the rights of the people, which is a very problematical point. It has ſeveral fair ſides (*ll*), and may be maintained with ſo many plauſible reaſons, that it muſt not be thought ſtrange, that not only factious, turbulent, and reſtleſs men ſhould have eſpouſed it, but alſo ſeveral perſons of great judgment and of an exemplary virtue. I may reckon among the latter Stephen de la Boëtie, who wrote the diſcourſe intituled, *de la Servitude volontaire*, or *du* CONTRE-UN. *There never was a better citizen, nor a greater enemy to commotions than he, and he would have much rather employed his skill and learning in order to ſuppreſs them than to raiſe them* (*mm*). What cannot be juſtified is, that frequently the ſame perſons who write for the rights of the people, would write for arbitrary power, if affairs ſhould change; that is, if a deſpotic power came to be exerciſed in their favour, and to the great prejudice of a party which they hate. When the Catholics of France, in the XVIth century, ſaw the wars of religion ariſe, they wrote very much for the right of Kings; but when they ſaw the right of ſucceſſion devolved on a Proteſtant Prince, they changed their principles (*nn*), and wrote very much for the right of the people. We have ſeen this ridiculous caprice in the article of Claudius de SAINTES. I queſtion whether, after the death of Henry III, Arnaud Sorbin would have written what he publiſhed in the year 1576 (*oo*). Would Peter Charpentier have written againſt the civil-wars in the year 1590, what he wrote a little after the death of Charles IX? He received a ſmart anſwer intituled, *Petri Fabri Reſponſio ad Petri Carpentarii famelici Rabulæ ſacrum de retinendis armis & pace repudianda Conſilium ad V. C. Lomanium Terridæ, & Sereniaci Baronem.* - - - - *Peter Faber's anſwer to the advice of Peter Charpentier, a hungry pettifogger, concerning the continuance of the war, and the rejecting of a peace: dedicated to Mr de Lomanie, Baron of Terride and of Seriniac.* It was printed at Neuſtad in the year 1575, and publiſhed in French the year following with this title, *Traitté duquel on peut apprendre en quel cas il eſt permis à l'homme Chreſtien de porter les armes, & par lequel eſt reſpondu à Pierre Charpentier, tendant à fin d'empeſcher la paix, & nous laiſſer la guerre: par Pierre Fabre, à Monſieur de Lomanie, Baron de Terride & de Seriniac.* - - - *A treatiſe wherein we may learn in what caſe it is lawful for a Chriſtian to bear arms; and in which Peter Charpentier is anſwered, tending to hinder a peace and continue the war: by Peter Faber, dedicated to Mr de Lomanie, Baron of Terride and of Seriniac.* It was neceſſary I ſhould ſet down this French title; for the readers had never believed, by the Latin title, that Charpentier exhorted the people to lay down their arms, and only propoſed to them an evangelical ſubmiſſion (*pp*). In all parties there are ſome indiſcreet perſons who publiſh books, which are afterwards upbraided to the whole body. An Engliſhman, named William Allen, under Cromwell's uſurpation, publiſhed a book intituled, *Killing no murther.* A Canon of Aneci immediately imputed this doctrine to the Proteſtants, in a work that was anſwered by the late Mr Turretin. Was not this reproach ridiculous? Can the wiſeſt and the beſt regulated communions reſtrain the unruly pen of every private member? Guy Patin ſpoke judiciouſly of this Engliſh book, but he was ill informed of the circumſtances. *They have printed in Holland*, ſays he (*qq*), *a little book intituled*, A Political Treatiſe, *&c.* that the killing of a tyrant is no murther. *It is ſaid to be tranſlated from the Engliſh, but that book was firſt written in French by a gentleman of Nevers, called Mr de Marigni, who is a great wit. This doctrine is very dangerous, and it were better to be ſilent about it. I do not love that there ſhould be ſo many books* de venenis (*concerning poiſons*) *for the ſame reaſon: I have always the public good in view, and I do not love thoſe who do any thing that may be prejudicial to it.* It is not true that the Engliſh piece was written by Marigni: an Engliſhman is the author of it, and Marigni was not capable of writing ſo grave and ſo ſerious a book.

XIX. Another book publiſhed under the falſe name of Junius Brutus.

For the reſt, Languet is not the only perſon who diſguiſed himſelf under the name of Junius Brutus. The famous Socinian Crellius did it alſo in a book concerning liberty of conſcience. The catalogue of the Bodleian library mentions it in this manner: *Junius Brutus* Polonus; *Vindiciæ pro Religionis libertate*, and refers us to *Val. Magnus.* But if you conſult the article of Father Valerian Magni, you will find nothing relating to this Junius Brutus Polonus, except that there is mention made of a book printed like his

---

(*ll*) *We have here a notable inſtance of the uncertainty of human knowledge; for that ſame cauſe which has ſo many fair ſides, has others that are frightful.*

(*mm*) *See* Teiſſier, Eloges tirez de Mr de Thou, *Tom. i, pag.* 216. *He quotes* Montagne, *chap. xxvii, of the firſt book of his* Eſſays, *and* Thuanus, *book lvii.*

(*nn*) *See the article* HOTMAN, *remark* [*I*].

(*oo*) *He publiſhed a book intituled,* Le vray Reſveille-matin des Calviniſtes & Publicains François, où eſt amplement diſcouru de l'Autorité des Princes & du Devoir des Sujets envers iceux.

(*pp*) *The French title does not clearly expreſs the poſition which Charpentier had maintained.*

(*qq*) Patin, Letter CLIV, *pag.* 604, *of the firſt volume. It is dated the* 21*ſt of November* 1659.

his at Eleutheropolis (*rr*); and there alſo the catalogue refers us to Pet. Haberkornius, though Dr Hyde has not put under that name any thing relating to Father Valerian, or Junius Brutus Polonus. We are referred ſtill from the article Petrus Haberkornius, to that of Feurbornius, where we find nothing that has any affinity with the other articles. I am not ignorant of the relation that is between the Capuchin Valerian Magni, and the Profeſſor Haberkorn; they diſputed againſt each other *viva voce*, and Haberkorn has publiſhed, amongſt other books, an *Anti-Valerian* [*E*], which Mr Baillet has not forgotten in his curious collection of Anti's (*ss*). But ſince Dr Hyde mentions nothing of this, methinks his references are to no purpoſe, and that it is a little want of exactneſs, in one of the moſt exact works that have been made in that kind.

I ſhall conclude this Diſſertation with a paſſage of the preface to the *Sorberiana*. ‘I have not been able to know what is become of his (*tt*) little treatiſe *de Pace & Concordia inter Chriſtianos concilianda*, nor of the tranſlation he made of a book printed ‘in the year 1637, and intituled *Junii Bruti Poloni Vindiciæ pro Religionis libertate*, ‘which was not written, as ſome have thought by the learned Hubert Languet, tho’ ‘he formerly diſguiſed himſelf under that name in his *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, and ‘which ought to be looked upon as a continuation of the treatiſe *de Libertate Eccleſiaſtica*, printed in the year 1607, which was doubtleſs written by Caſaubon, who, ‘beſides, ſpeaks of it plainly enough in his 539th letter of the Hague edition, ‘though he had ſpoken of it in ambiguous words in two or three other foregoing ‘letters.’

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary I have learned a particular which I thought very curious (*uu*). It is in an Engliſh book which was printed at London in the year 1649, as an apology for a book which the Miniſters of that great city had lately publiſhed, and as an anſwer to the invectives diſperſed in a book of John Price. The book in which this particular is to be found, is intituled, *A modeſt and clear vindication of the ſerious repreſentation, and late vindication of the Miniſters of London, from the ſcandalous aſperſions of John Price, in a pamphlet of his intituled,* Clerico Claſſicum, *or The Clergies Alarum to a third war.* John Price had made this reproach to the Miniſters that ſeveral of them had publiſhed books which tended only to raiſe rebellions, and he had put Beza in the fourth rank, as being the author of the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*. You are much in the wrong, ſays the anſwer, to follow in this the Popiſh writer of a book intituled, *Imago utriuſque Eccleſiæ, Hieroſolymæ & Babylonis, per P. D. M.* This writer, who is thought to be Tobias Matthews, ſaid in the 105th page, that Junius Brutus's book was written by Beza: can you do juſtice to ſo orthodox a Divine as Beza, when you take up the calumnies of the Papiſts againſt ſo zealous a Proteſtant? Does not the ſame author, who accuſes him of writing the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, accuſe him alſo of having uſurped the pariſh and wife of another man? The firſt accuſation is as falſe as the laſt. It is eaſy to prove that he is not the author of that book: would ſo wiſe and ſo learned a man have affirmed, in one book, the contrary of what he had taught in another? In all his writings he labours to ſhew that we ought to be obedient to magiſtrates; he ſays nothing of the depoſing or murdering of Kings, which is the only end of Junius Brutus's book. A great many paſſages, directly oppoſite to Brutus's principles, might be drawn from the works of Beza: here is one or two. Private perſons, ſays he †, who are the ſubjects of a tyrant, have no remedy allowed them, beſides amendment of life, prayers, and tears. He will indeed have them to diſobey the orders of a Prince when they are contrary to the law of God, but not to take up arms againſt him. *Aliud eſſe non parere quàm reſiſtere, vel ad arma ſe comparare quæ à Domino non acceperis* ‡. - - - *There is a difference between diſobeying and reſiſting, or recurring to arms, which God has not put in our hands.* He wrote a book *de Hæreticis à Magiſtratu puniendis*; but he never ſaid one word *de Magiſtratibus ab Hæreticis puniendis*. This work of Junius Brutus, continue they, which good authors, as you ſay, aſcribe to Beza, was, in truth, written by a Jeſuit. We know from good hands that the Jeſuit Parſons was the author of it; ſome perſons ſtill living can witneſs, that one Rench, a Bookſeller, was condemned to be hanged for printing this book with another that the ſame author wrote under the name of Doleman. There is a parliament-man, now ſitting in the Houſe of Commons, who has cauſed Junius Brutus's work to be tranſlated into Engliſh by the ſame Walker who has written the monthly Mercuries. This tranſlation has been publiſhed; but leſt it ſhould be known that it is the

[*E*] *An Anti-Valerian.*] Mr Baillet (12), ſays that the Anti-Valerian was written againſt a book of Controverſy of Father Valerian Magni, printed at Vienna in Auſtria in 1641, with the title of *Judicium de Acatholicorum & Catholicorum Regula credendi*. This is true; but I obſerve that this Capuchin's work is compoſed of two treatiſes which are not twins. That which concerns the rule of faith of the Non-Catholics, is ſome years older than the other. It was publiſhed at Prague, in the year 1628. Several Proteſtants anſwered it. John Major, in the year 1630. James Martini, and John Botſac in 1631, Conrad Bergius in 1639. A Socinian attacked it in the year 1633, without naming himſelf: this was Joachim Stegman, whom I have mentioned above (13). He did more injury to the cauſe than good. This Capuchin's book was re-printed at Vienna in the year 1641, with the author's replies to thoſe five antagoniſts, and with the Treatiſe intituled, *Catholicorum Regula Credendi*.

(*rr*) *The* Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum, *which ſays, pag.* 117, *that* Crellius *wrote a book under the name of* Junius Brutus, *informs us, pag.* 133, *that this other book was written by* Joachim Stegman, *with this title,* Brevis Diſquiſitio quomodo vulgo dicti Evangelici Pontificios ac nominatim *Valeriani Magni de Acatholicorum credendi regula Judicium,* ſolidè atque evidenter refutare queant. *Eleutheropoli apud Godfridum Philalethium* 1633, *in* 12*mo*.

(*ss*) *Num.* xxxix.

(*tt*) *That is,* Sorbiere.

(*uu*) *Mr* Hill, *Miniſter of the Engliſh Church of Rotterdam, was pleaſed to acquaint me with it, and to lend me the book.*

† Nullum aliud remedium proponitur privatis hominibus tyranno ſubjectis præter vitæ emendationem, preces & lachrymas. *Beza, in Confeſſione Fidei Chriſtianæ, cap. v, circa finem.*

‡ Ibid.

(12) Baillet, Anti, *num.* xxxix.

(13) *Citation* (*rr*).

Jeſuit Parſons's book, Junius Brutus's name has been left out, and another title put to it.

This is the ſubſtance of the Latin extracts I cauſed to be made out of this Engliſh book. It is a curious thing, in my opinion, that Robert Parſons the Jeſuit ſhould paſs in England for the author of Stephen Junius Brutus's *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*: but I do not believe that this work ought to be aſcribed to him (*xx*). I can hardly think it poſſible that an Engliſh Jeſuit ſhould write at that time upon ſuch a queſtion, without ſaying any thing relating to England, and nothing but what beſpeaks him a good French Proteſtant.

(*xx*) Mr Hill *told me, that* Chriſtopher Love, *Miniſter of London, who was beheaded during Cromwell's uſurpation, maintained, in a book, that* Parſons *is the pretended* Junius Brutus.

A DISSERTATION CONCERNING DEFAMATORY LIBELS,

On occaſion of a paſſage of Tacitus, which I have recited in the article CASSIUS SEVERUS *(a), and which informs us that Auguſtus was the firſt who proceeded againſt thoſe libels by the law* de Majeſtate.

I. An innovation under the empire of Auguſtus, with regard to libels.

I Would fain know what reaſons the Emperor Auguſtus went upon, to involve Defamatory Libels, under the crimes of high-treaſon; for as Tacitus obſerves, before this, treacheries, which had weakened the armies, ſeditions which had weakened the people, and laſtly, an ill adminiſtration of offices which had weakened the majeſty of the Republic, were only comprehended under this kind of crimes: and actions indeed were puniſhed, but not words. 'Legem majeſtatis reduxerat; cui nomen apud veteres idem, ſed alia in judicium veniebant: ſi quis proditione exercitum, aut plebem ſeditionibus, denique male geſta Rep. majeſtatem populi Romani minuiſſet. Facta arguebantur, dicta impunè erant. Primus Auguſtus cognitionem de famoſis libellis ſpecie legis ejus tractavit, commotus Caſſii Severi libidine, qua viros feminaſque illuſtres procacibus ſcriptis diffamaverat (b). - - - *Auguſtus had revived the law concerning violated majeſty; a law, which in the days of our anceſtors, had indeed the ſame name, but implied different arraignments, and crimes; namely thoſe againſt the ſtate, as when an army was betrayed abroad, when ſeditions were raiſed at home; in ſhort, when the public was faithleſsly adminiſtered, and the majeſty of the Roman people was debaſed: theſe were actions, and actions were puniſhed, but words were free. Auguſtus was the firſt, who brought libels under the penalties of this wreſted law, being provoked by the inſolence of Caſſius Severus, who had in his writings wantonly defamed men and ladies of illuſtrious quality.*' For which reaſon another Hiſtorian obſerves, that it was a novelty to ſee a lady of the family of the Claudii accuſed before the people, as guilty of high-treaſon, for having ſaid in the hearing of a prodigious multitude, that ſtopt her coach, *would to God my brother would return into the world, and loſe another fleet, that there might be fewer people at Rome* (c). The Commentators obſerve here a two-fold novelty; one in the ſex of the accuſed, the other in entitling a ſimple wiſh, a treaſon. I do not ſee that even at preſent, it is a point of law, well eſtabliſhed, and conſtantly practiſed, that ſlanders upon the Prince's perſon, even in writing, ſhould be deemed ſtate-crimes, or high-treaſon (d). So that Auguſtus, did a thing, ſo much the more ſingular, becauſe he principally eſtabliſhed that law againſt ſatires, which did not concern his perſon. I have before related Tacitus's words, which ſhew that Caſſius Severus's libels againſt perſons of quality of both ſexes, obliged this Emperor to make this new law. I do not find that this Caſſius was accuſed of libelling Auguſtus, and I find in Suetonius, that this Emperor did not puniſh ſatirical diſcourſes nor writings that concerned him. 'Nec quidquam ultra aut ſtatim aut poſtea inquiſivit. Tiberio quoque de eadem re ſedulo violentius apud ſe per epiſtolam conquerenti ita reſcripſit, *ætati tuæ, mi Tiberi, noli in hac re indulgere, & nimium indignari quemquam eſſe qui de me male loquatur, ſatis eſt enim ſi hoc habemus, ne quis nobis male facere poſſit* (e). . . . . Etiam ſparſos de ſe in curia famoſos libellos, nec expavit, nec magnâ curâ redarguit, ac ne requiſitis quidem autoribus, id modo cenſuit cognoſcendum poſthac de iis qui libellos aut carmina ad infamiam cujuſpiam ſub alieno nomine ederent (f). - - - - *Nor did Auguſtus make any further inquiry after theſe libels, either as ſoon as they came out or afterwards. Tiberius having written a letter to him, wherein he very earneſtly and warmly complained of that affair, he wrote back thus.* My dear Tiberius, do not indulge the warmth of your youth in that matter, nor be too much provoked, that there is any body who ſpeaks ill of

---

(a) Citation (9).

(b) Tacit. Annal. *lib. i, cap. lxxii.*

(c) Novo more judicium majeſtatis apud populum mulier ſubiit, quod in conferta multitudine ægre procedente carpento palam optaverit ut frater ſuus pulcher reviviſceret, atque iterum claſſem amitteret quo minor turba Romæ foret. *Sueton. in Tiber. cap. ii.*

(d) Auberi, Hiſtory of Cardinal de Richelieu, *lib. iv, p. m.* 405, quotes an arreſt of the Parliament of Paris, of the 27th of April 1620, which condemned to the gallies a man convicted of high-treaſon for having had a hand in a libel againſt the ſtate.

(e) Sueton. in Aug. *cap. li.*

(f) Ibid. *cap. lv.*

'me; for it is ſufficient if we have this ſatisfaction, that no body can do us harm .... '*And when ſome libels which defamed him, were diſperſed in the court, he was neither much* '*concerned, nor did he take much care to ſuppreſs them; and, without inquiring after the au-* '*thors of them, he only ordered that, for the future, they who publiſhed under the name of* '*another man, poems, or libels which defamed any perſon, ought to be proſecuted.*'

II. Three Hiſtorians give an imperfect account of it, eſpecially Suetonius.

But who will not be ſurprized at this, that tho' three different authors have ſpoken one after another, of this law of Auguſtus, yet we do not find the circumſtances of it exactly explained and confirmed, by the mutual aſſiſtance of the three witneſſes? Tacitus barely tells us that the crime of writing Defamatory Libels, was brought under the law *de Majeſtate*. Suetonius who came after Tacitus, makes no mention of this law *de Majeſtate*; he only ſays Auguſtus ordered, that for the future, thoſe, who publiſhed ſuch Libels under another name, ſhould be proſecuted. Dion, who comes after Suetonius, likewiſe makes no mention of the law *de Majeſtate*, and only ſays, 1. That Auguſtus, two years before he died, ordered informations to be made againſt Defamatory Libels, and that the Ædiles of Rome, and the Governors of other places, ſhould burn all the writings of this kind that they ſhould diſcover. 2. That he puniſhed ſome Libellers. Of thoſe three Hiſtorians, Suetonius has the leaſt cleared up this matter, ſince his words would allow us to think, that provided a man wrote Libels under no name, or under his own (*g*), he might ſafely defame all the court and the city. Why then was Caſſius Severus baniſhed? Why were Labienus's writings burnt? Can any one believe it was becauſe theſe two authors had publiſhed their books under the names of others? What a fooliſh conceit would this be!

III. Vain attempts to juſtify Suetonius.

Torrentius would ſave Suetonius's honour by ſubſtituting, without the authority of any manuſcript, theſe words *ſuo alienove nomine*, - - *under his own name, or that of another man*, for theſe *ſub alieno nomine*, - - - *under the name of another man*. But I obſerve that this correction has been rejected with the utmoſt contempt; ſo far that Suetonius's Commentator *in uſum Delphini*, thought it did not make a new ſenſe, ſo little had he examined it. Others by *ſub alieno nomine*, &c. - - - *under the name of another man*, &c. will have the ſatires to be underſtood, in which the names of the perſons ſatirized, did not appear. But this explanation is only looked upon as a laſt ſhift: after all, notwithſtanding theſe expedients, might not the moſt abuſive ſatires have been publiſhed with impunity, according to Suetonius; provided they had been anonymous, or had not abuſed a man under a falſe name, but under his true name? And would not this be a ſhameful reproach to the Emperor's council? Laſtly, ſome ſay, that whereas the laws of the twelve tables had ſufficiently prohibited the making ſatires in one's own name, Auguſtus thought himſelf only obliged to condemn thoſe which were publiſhed under the name of another perſon. But 1. We do not ſee that the laws of the twelve tables concern anonymous ſatires more or leſs, than thoſe that appeared under a man's true name or falſe one. 2. It had been very needleſs to forbid only thoſe that ſhould come out with the names of the authors: and what probability is there, that the ancient laws of Rome ſhould have left ſo large a gap, for any one who had a mind to evade them? 3. Is it uſual in making any addition to a law not to renew and confirm the ancient orders? 4. Can it be conceived that if the ancient Roman laws had not puniſhed the moſt puniſhable ſatires, that is, the nameleſs ones, whoſe blows fall thickeſt and heavieſt, Auguſtus, when he was ſupplying what was wanting in them, ſhould have forgot the moſt neceſſary remedy, *viz.* the puniſhment of anonymous libels? It is far more probable, that it was he, who cauſed the law or the decree of the ſenate to be made, the words whereof, Ulpian has preſerved to us; 'Si quis librum ad infamiam alicujus pertinentem ſcripſit, compoſuit, 'edidit, dolove malo fecit quo quid eorum fieret, etiamſi alterius nomine ediderit, vel 'ſine nomine; uti de ea re agere liceat: & ſi condemnatus ſit, qui id fecit, inteſtabilis 'ex lege eſſe jubetur (*h*). - - - *If any perſon ſhould write, compoſe, or publiſh a book tending* '*to defame another man, or is unlawfully concerned in the writing or publiſhing of ſuch a* '*book, notwithſtanding he ſhould publiſh it in the name of another perſon, or without any name*; '*let him be proſecuted: and if the author of that book be found guilty, by virtue of this law,* '*he ſhall be incapable of making any laſt will or teſtament.*'

I confeſs the modern Hiſtorians are too prolix, and that ſome of them write more volumes upon the age they live in, than Livy wrote upon all the ages of conquering Rome, from the time of it's foundation, to the empire of Cæſar. But on the other hand the Antients are too ſhort, and it is better for our inſtruction, that a Hiſtory ſhould contain too many particulars, than omit too many.

IV. Whether libels were comprehended under the crimes of high-treaſon, becauſe they are an uſurpation of the ſupreme authority.

Perhaps ſome will think that Auguſtus needed no very refined reaſoning to ſhew, that Libellers deſerved to be proſecuted as guilty of high-treaſon, ſince it is evident that a ſubject who defames his neighbour, uſurps one of the rights of ſovereignty, and that it belongs ſolely to the ſovereign to inflict the pain of infamy, as well as that of baniſhment, impriſonment, death, *&c.* But this would be a very falſe way of reaſoning, and at once convert into high-treaſon, the violation of all the laws, adultery, theft, ſeducing a virgin, *&c.* for it may be ſaid that a robber not only deſpiſes the laws of his ſovereign, but alſo uſurps a right that belongs ſolely to him: none but a ſovereign can take away a private man's poſſeſſions, either in whole or in part. The right of fining, confiſcating, *&c.* muſt flow from the ſupreme power, as well as that of branding any one with infamy;

(*g*) Id modo cenſuit (Auguſtus) cognoſcendum poſthac de iis qui libellos aut carmina ad infamiam cujuſpiam ſub alieno nomine ederent. *Sueton. in Aug. cap. lv.*

(*h*) Baudouin, who relates thoſe words of the law, is of opinion that it was enacted under Auguſtus or Tiberius. See his treatiſe *in Leges XII Tabul. cap. ix, p. m.* 49, 50.

infamy; and conſequently we cannot ſay, that a ſatiriſt, who defames his neighbour, is guilty of high-treaſon, without concluding that a robber, and a fornicator, are ſo too. This would hold ſo much the truer with reſpect to fornicators, becauſe if they debauch a married woman, they hazzard the defrauding the true heirs, by the intruſion of an illegitimate coheir, and at the ſame time, they bring a great diſhonour upon the head of the huſband: if they debauch a maid, they caſt upon her an ignominious blemiſh, which reflects upon her family, and they cauſe her father a real damage and a pecuniary loſs, like that which conſiſts in the waſte of merchandiſes. For indeed a defloured maid, is like palled wine, which ſinks in its price; it is a commodity which the proprietor has ſtill upon his hands, unleſs he will put it off at a great loſs; I mean by undermatching his daughter, or giving her an exorbitant portion. We cannot therefore this way juſtify the new law of Auguſtus: the ſhorteſt way is probably to confeſs that it was not regular. I do not know but by a forced conſtruction, it was derived from a maxim or definition, that is found in Cicero, which makes it a diminution of the majeſty of the Roman people, to take any thing from the dignity, grandeur, or power of that people, or from thoſe to whom they communicated any power. *Majeſtatem minuere eſt de dignitate, aut amplitudine, aut poteſtate populi, aut eorum quibus populus poteſtatem dedit aliquid derogare (i).* I only believe, that by the law *de Majeſtate*, muſt be meant ſomething more, than Auberi means in the place I have cited, where he ſays, that Auguſtus did but renew the proſecution for a capital crime, which the laws of the twelve tables had enacted againſt the authors of Defamatory Libels. I ſhall obſerve by the way, that Mr Naudé has miſtaken the twelve tables for a decree of the ſenate. Nay, he affords a proof of his error, for what he cites from Arnobius, manifeſtly proves the juſtice of my cenſure. *If the parliament*, ſays he *(k)*, *had had leiſure to caſt their eyes upon all theſe Defamatory Libels, I dare ſay they would have hindred the ſale of a great part of them, had it been only to imitate the virtue of that antient Roman ſenate, of which Arnobius ſaid, if my memory does not fail me:* ‘ Carmen malum conſcribere, quo fama alterius coinquinetur, & vita, decemviralibus ſcitis evadere noluiſtis impunitum. - - - *By the laws of the Decemviri (or of the twelve tables), you did not ſuffer the man to paſs unpuniſhed, who wrote any malicious poem, to defame the character and life of another perſon.*’

Tiberius continued this innovation of Auguſtus, eſpecially on account of ſome ſlandering writers, who attacked his perſon, and touched the moſt tender ſores of his family. ‘ Mox Tiberius conſultante Pompeio Macro Prætore, an judicia Majeſtatis redderentur, exercendas leges eſſe reſpondit. Hunc quoque aſperavere carmina incertis auctoribus vulgata in ſævitiam ſuperbiamque ejus, & diſcordem cum matre animum *(l)*. - - - *Tiberius afterwards, when Pompeius Macer the Prætor conſulted him,* whether proceſs ſhould be granted upon this law? *anſwered,* that the laws muſt be executed. *He alſo was exaſperated by ſatirical verſes, written by unknown authors, and diſperſed, expoſing his cruelty, his pride, and his mind naturally alienated from his mother.*’ He afterwards extended this law to every body *(m)*: poor Cremutius Cordus in vain pleaded *(n)*, that he had written nothing offenſive, either againſt Tiberius, or the Empreſs, who were thoſe, ſaid he, whom the law *de Majeſtate* comprehended; this was not ſufficient to clear him from his pretended crime of having praiſed Brutus and Caſſius. ‘ Verba mea, Patres Conſcripti, arguuntur, adeò factorum innocens ſum. Sed neque hæc in principem aut principis parentem, quos lex majeſtatis amplectitur *(o)*. - - - - *As to facts, I am ſo guiltleſs, conſcript fathers, that my words only are accuſed: but neither are any words of mine pointed againſt the Emperor, or his mother, who are the only perſons comprehended in the law concerning violated majeſty.*’ Note, That Tacitus ſeems to have forgotten what he had ſaid in the ſeventy-ſecond chapter of the firſt book: for as he makes Cremutius Cordus ſpeak, one would think that only libels againſt the Emperor, and the Empreſs were comprehended under the law *de Majeſtate*: But there is not any ſhadow of that reſtriction in the ſeventy-ſecond chapter.

V.
Nero bore libels ſomewhat patiently.

But I muſt not forget to ſay, that this law *de Majeſtate*, was not always fatal. Nero, cruel as he was, not only did not annul the decree of the ſenate, which condemned the Prætor Antiſtius only to baniſhment, and the confiſcation of his eſtate, for having publiſhed ſome ſatires againſt the Emperor *(p)*; but he declared to the ſenate, that he permitted them fully to abſolve Antiſtius. *Se qui ſeveritatem decernentium impediturus fuerit, moderationem non prohibere. Statuerent ut vellent, datam etiam abſolvendi licentiam (q).* The ſenate ſtood to their firſt reſolution. Almoſt at the ſame time Fabricius Vejento, author of ſeveral libels againſt the ſenators, and the clergy of Rome *(r)*, having been tried by Nero himſelf, was only baniſhed Italy. His books were condemned to be burnt: they were afterwards bought up and read with the greateſt eagerneſs, whilſt there was danger in doing it; but when it was permitted to have them, they were no longer minded. *Convictum Vejentonem Italia depulit & libros exuri juſſit, conquiſitos lectitatoſque donec cum periculo parabantur, mox licentia habendi oblivionem attulit (s).* Suetonius obſerves, as a very ſingular thing, that Nero was ſo paſſive, as to detraction, that he ſhewed no greater mildneſs to any, than to ſuch as exerciſed their ſatirical wit upon him. Some galling verſes upon him were handed about and poſted up; but he was not concerned at it, he made no ſearch after the authors; and ſome of them having been proſecuted before the ſenate, he prevented their being rigorouſly puniſhed for it. *Mirum*

(i) Cicero, lib. ii, de Invent. *I ſay nothing of a paſſage of* Cicero, Epiſt. XI, lib. iii, ad famil. *wherein he ſays, as ſome will have it, that Sylla made it high-treaſon to defame any perſon*; eſt majeſtas (& ſic Sylla voluit) ne in quemvis impure declamari liceret; *I ſay, I do not ſpeak of it, becauſe I do not think it is well corrected. Beſides, I ſhould prefer Lambinus's explication to that of Manutius, though I am of opinion that they are both faulty.*

(k) Naudé, Dialogues de Maſcurat. *pag.* 18.

(l) Tacit. Annal. *lib. i, cap. lxxii.*

(m) *See* Suetonius, in Tiber. *cap. lviii.*

(n) Apud Tacitum, Annal. *lib. iv, cap. xxxiv.*

(o) Ibid.

(p) Probroſa adverſus principem carmina factitavit, vulgavitque celebri convivio. . . . Exin . . . majeſtatis delatus eſt. *Tacit. Annal. lib. xiv, cap. xlviii.*

(q) Tacit. ibid. *cap. xl.*

(r) Quod multa & probroſa in Patres & Sacerdotes compoſuiſſet, iis libris quibus nomen *codicillorum* dederat. *Ibid. cap. l.*

(s) Ibid.

& vel præcipue notabile inter hæc fuit, nihil eum patientius quam maledicta & convicia hominum tuliſſe, neque in ullos leniorem, quam qui ſe dictis aut carminibus laceſſiſſent, extitiſſe. . . . Vel contemptu omnis infamiæ, vel ne fatendo dolorem irritaret ingenia (t). All the puniſhment he ordered for the galling raillery of a Cynic, who had inſulted him in the open ſtreet, and for his being ridiculed on the ſtage, was the baniſhing the Philoſopher and Comedian out of Italy. Suetonius could not tell whether there was more indolence than policy in it: For Nero, by ſhewing his reſentment would have had reaſon to fear he ſhould encourage the detractors; and every one knows Tacitus's ſentence in the thirty-fourth chapter of the fourth book of his Annals, on occaſion of a doubt like that of Suetonius: an injury, ſays he, that is deſpiſed, falls of itſelf: if you are diſturbed at it, you propagate and ſtrengthen it. ‘Carmina Bibaculi & Catulli referta contumeliis Cæſarum leguntur: ſed ipſe divus Julius, ipſe divus Auguſtus, & tulere iſta & reliquere, haud facilè dixerim, moderatione magis an ſapientiâ: namque ſpreta exoleſcunt: ſi iraſcare, adgnita videntur. - - - *The poems of Bibaculus and thoſe of Catullus, ſtuffed with virulent ſatires againſt the Cæſars, are ſtill read. But even the deified Julius, even the deified Auguſtus, bore all theſe invectives and diſdained them, whether with greater moderation or wiſdom, I cannot eaſily ſay. For, if they are deſpiſed, they fade away, if you was wroth, you ſeem to avow them to be juſt.*’

VI.
It is very neceſſary to reſtrain the licentiouſneſs of libels. The antient Heathens reſtrained it.

This is well enough, if the queſtion is only about pardoning the ſlanders, in which a ſovereign is perſonally concerned; but his ſubjects ought not to be left expoſed to this outrage. Domitian would deſerve to be highly extolled, had he only puniſhed thoſe who had ſlandered the perſons of the beſt quality in Rome, in which he did not uſe too much rigour (u). It ſeems therefore that the exceſſive ſeverity of Auguſtus againſt defamatory libels, if ſeparated from the abuſe his ſucceſſors often made of that law, conſiſted only in the expreſſion and in the pompous word *de Majeſtate*, and ſo his conduct is not in reality blamable: for this licentiouſneſs of libels, is one of thoſe that ought chiefly to be reſtrained in a government. The honour, glory, and reputation of families, things a thouſand times more precious than gold or ſilver, would be very precarious, unleſs the inſolence, and malignity of ſatirical writers were repreſſed. Indeed they would begin with perſons of an ill life; but after ſuch a beginning they would ſpread like the plague, indiſcriminately upon places both ſacred and profane, upon chaſt as well as proſtitute families. Antiquity would have had a full experience of this, had it not been at laſt prevented by good laws, and by ſubmitting libellers to the ſecular power, when jeſts were carried too far, and when thoſe who were not yet bitten by theſe mad dogs, conſidered that their turn would alſo come, and that therefore they ought to concur with thoſe who had been already wounded, to put a ſtop to ſuch a diſorder. It is in this caſe as when a houſe is on fire; the neighbours labour as much to extinguiſh it, as they whoſe houſe is actually in flames (w). Let us ſee how Horace relates the affair.

Feſcennina per hunc inventa licentia morem
Verſibus alternis opprobria ruſtica fudit,
Libertaſque recurrentes accepta per annos
Luſit amabiliter, donec jam ſævus apertam
In rabiem cœpit verti jocus, & per honeſtas
Ire minax impune domos. Doluere cruento
Dente laceſſiti, fuit intactis quoque cura
Conditione ſuper communi: quin etiam lex
Pœnaque lata, malo quæ nollet carmine quemquam
Deſcribi. Vertêre modum formidine fuſtis
Ad benedicendum delectandumque redacti (x).

Hence grew the liberty of the looſer Muſe,
Hence they grew ſcurrilous and would abuſe;
Hence thoſe looſe dialogues at marriage feaſts,
Yet ſtill they were but mirth, and country jeſts.
At laſt, they ſhew'd their teeth, and ſharply bit
And railery uſurped their place of wit.
Good perſons were abu'sd, and ſuffer'd wrong;
They loudly talk'd no law to curb their tongue:
The wounded griev'd, the ſmart provok'd their hate;
And all untouch'd bewail'd the common fate:
Till laws commanded to regard men's fame,
Severely laſh the vice, but ſpare the name.
Fear made them civil, and deſign to write
With modeſty, ſpeak well, and to delight. CREECH.

Cicero had alſo obſerved, that the antient Greek comedies ſo much abuſed the liberty they had to cenſure the bad lives of private perſons, by name, and directly, that no body

---

(t) Sueton. in Nerone, *cap. xxxix.*

(u) Scripta famoſa vulgoque edita, quibus primores viri ac feminæ notabantur, abolevit non ſine auctorem ignominia. *Sueton. in Dom. cap. viii.*

(w) Dente Theonino cum circumroditur, ecquid
Ad te poſt paulo ventura pericula ſentis?
Nam tua res agitur, paries cum proximus ardet
Et neglecta ſolent incendia ſumere vires.
Horat. Epiſt. XVIII, lib. i, ver. 82.
Let him on thee, and on thy fame depend
Whom envy bites, for thou may'ſt plainly ſee
The danger will at laſt come o'er to thee:
For you're in danger when the next's on fire,
And flames neglected often blaze the higher.
CREECH.

(x) Idem, Epiſt. I, lib. ii, ver. 145. *To which may be added this paſſage*, de Arte Poëtica, ver. 281.
Succeſſit vetus his Comœdia, non ſine multa
Laude, ſed in vitium libertas excidit & vim
Dignam lege regi. Lex eſt accepta, choruſque
Turpiter obticuit ſublato jure nocendi.
Next theſe old comedy did pleaſe the age,
But ſoon their liberty was turn'd to rage;
Such rage as civil pow'r was forc'd to tame
And by good laws ſecure mens injur'd fame.
Thus was the chorus loſt, their railing Muſe
Grew ſilent, when forbidden to abuſe.
CREECH.

body eſcaped the ſlanders of the ſtage, not even Pericles, who had ſo long governed the Republic both in peace and war. It had been a tolerable thing, ſaid Cicero, if the wicked citizens had been expoſed to theſe inſults, though it were better that ſuch men ſhould be reproved by the Cenſor than by a Poet; but it is intolerable that ſuch a man as Pericles ſhould not be free from them. ‘Apud Græcos antiquiores fuit lege conceſſum, ‘ut quod vellet Comœdia nominatim vel de quo vellet diceret (y); itaque ſicut in eiſdem libris loquitur Africanus, quem illa non attigit, vel potius quem non vexavit, ‘cui pepercit? Eſto: populares homines improbos, in Rep. ſeditioſos, Cleonem, Cleophontem, Hyperbolum læſit: patiamur, inquit, etſi hujuſmodi cives à Cenſore melius ‘eſt quam à Poëta notari: ſed Periclem cum jam ſuæ civitati maxima autoritate plurimos annos domi & belli præfuiſſet, violari verſibus & eos agi in Scena non plus decuit, ‘quam ſi Plautus, inquit, noſter voluiſſet aut Nævius Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut ‘Cæcilius Marco Catoni maledicere (z). - - - - - *Among the antient Greeks, their comedy* ‘*was by law allowed to cenſure any action, and any perſon by name. Accordingly, as* ‘*Africanus ſays, whom has it not attacked, or rather whom has it not galled, whom has it* ‘*ſpared? Be it ſo: it wounded popular wicked men, who were ſeditious in the Republic, ſuch* ‘*as Cleon, Cleophontes, and Hyperbolus. Let us bear this, ſays he, though it is better that* ‘*ſuch citizens ſhould be ſtigmatized by the Cenſor, than by a Poet; but that Pericles when* ‘*he had now governed the Republic for many years both in peace and war, with great reputation, ſhould be abuſed in plays, and theſe acted upon the ſtage, was as intolerable, ſays* ‘*he, as if our Plautus or Nevius had reviled Publius and Cnius Scipio, or Cecilius inveighed* ‘*againſt Cato.*’ Of all the treaſures in the world, none could be more expoſed to moth and ruſt, and to the rapacious hands of robbers, than honour and a good name, unleſs the inſolence of theſe ſatiriſts was reſtrained: for as, by I know not what diſmal fatality, the ſpirit of ſlander and revenge is often united with a ſeeming auſtere life, the impunity of libels would give birth to vaſt numbers of them againſt the beſt men; and if a man ſhould provoke ever ſo little a bigot, or a choleric Enthuſiaſt, he would preſently find his reputation ſtained and blackened by that bigot's pen, and the proneneſs of the people to believe this ſort of writers would afford them a ſanctuary, even with reſpect to the moſt extravagant calumnies. If theſe people would not poſtpone the virtues with which they ought to begin a devout life, the virtues, I ſay, which make an honeſt man, and if they would follow the beſt advice that can be given them, *viz.* not to pretend to be devout before they are good men (aa), they would not diſtinguiſh themſelves as they do, by their ſatirical diſcourſes and defamatory libels.

VII.
What anſwer is to be made to thoſe who pretend to juſtify the writers of libels.

Hence we ſee what anſwer is to be given to thoſe, who ſay that libels are beneficial to ſociety, in as much as they hinder ſeveral perſons of both ſexes from tranſgreſſing the bounds of decency: it is a bridle, ſay they, that reſtrains them: free them from the fear of being defamed to the end of the world, and in all future ages, by ſome ingenious ſatires, and there is no extravagance but what they will run into. This is all wrong: we do not find that hitherto there has been any ſcarcity of libels, and yet the world has not been, and is not bettered by them. Beſides, would not this pretended curb become utterly uſeleſs, by the abuſe that would be made of the remedy, by defaming without quarter or diſtinction all ſorts of families?

But then, muſt ſome be allowed to commit infamous actions, whilſt others ſhall not be allowed to puniſh them with all the trumpets of fame? I anſwer, that as it does not belong to private perſons, to puniſh robbers and muderers, and the care of it ought to be left to thoſe whom the ſupreme authority has appointed for the puniſhment of malefactors; the like ought to be done with reſpect to the puniſhment of infamy. It is encroaching upon the right of the ſovereign, it is laying profane hands upon holy things, to pretend to inflict this ſort of puniſhment, when we are not commiſſioned for it by our governors. A criminal may then juſtly aſk the queſtion that was put to Moſes, *who made thee a ruler and a judge over us (bb).* What private perſons may lawfully do againſt thoſe who deſerve infamy, is juſt what they may do againſt a robber or an aſſaſſin. They may bring him before the Judges, and witneſs againſt him what they know; they may in like manner impeach the criminal commerce, and infamous life of others; but they muſt do it with all the characters of a formal accuſer: they muſt declare their names and the places of their abode; and eſpecially prove before the Judges, if there be occaſion for it, all their accuſations. Now where are the libellers that take this method? The firſt thing they obſerve is to conceal their names, their profeſſion, and abode. They are not very ſcrupulous about their proofs; the leaſt ſuſpicion or hear-ſay, the tattle in coffee-houſes or taverns, ſerves them for a demonſtration: and therefore they are juſtly liable to the puniſhment of ſlanderers and falſe witneſſes; for to deſerve this puniſhment, it is not neceſſary that what a man advances ſhould be really falſe; it is enough that he maintains it without knowing it, and without being able to prove it.

VIII.
Of the right of Hiſtory, and by whom

I am perſuaded that juſtice and the public good require that evil actions ſhould be brought to the tribunal of fame, there to receive the puniſhment due to them, *intereſt Reipublicæ cognoſci malos (cc)*: but every body ought not to pretend to do this. For if the evil action you deſire to make public, is of ſuch a nature that it may be puniſhed

2 by

(y) See Horace at the beginning of the fourth ſatire of the firſt book.

(z) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, *lib. ii, cap. ix*, ex Ciceronis, *lib. iv*, de Republicâ.

(aa) *See the* Réflexions ſur les Defauts d'autrui, *printed at Paris in the year* 1690.

(bb) Exod. ii. 4.

(cc) Exſequi ſententias haud inſtitui niſi inſignes per honeſtum aut notabili dedecore: quod præcipuum munus Annalium reor, ne virtutes ſileantur, utque PRAVIS DICTIS FACTISQUE EX POSTERITATE ET INFAMIA METUS SIT. - - - - *It is no part of my purpoſe to trace all the votes of particular men, unleſs they are memorable for integrity, or for notorious infamy: this I conceive to be the principal duty of an Hiſtorian, that he ſuppreſs no inſtance of virtue, and that* BY THE DREAD OF FUTURE INFAMY AND THE CENSURES OF POSTERITY, MEN MAY BE DETERRED FROM DETESTABLE ACTIONS AND PROSTITUTE SPEECHES. *Tacit. Annal. lib. iii, cap. lxv.*

it ought to be written. Great abuſe in this.

by the laws of the land, you muſt leave it to the Magiſtrates, or at moſt help them, by a judicial teſtimony, that the crime may at once bear a double puniſhment, that of public fame, and that of the Judges. We muſt remember that we are not to give an account of our conduct to a Poet, or any other ſuch writer, but to the Magiſtrates. This is the doctrine of a good author, as will appear by theſe Latin words. ‘ Noſtræ ‘ contra duodecim Tabulæ cum perpaucas res capite ſanxiſſent, in his hanc quoque ‘ ſanciendam putaverunt, *ſi quis occentaviſſet, ſive carmen condidiſſet, quod infamiam faceret* ‘ *flagitiumve alteri.* Præclarè, judiciis enim ac Magiſtratuum diſceptationibus legitimis ‘ propoſitam vitam, non poëtarum ingeniis habere debemus, nec probrum audire, niſi ‘ ea lege ut reſpondere liceat & judicio defendere *(dd)*. - - - - - - *Though in our laws of* ‘ *the twelve tables very few crimes are made capital, yet the following is of that number :* ‘ *namely*, if any perſon ſhould publiſh or write verſes, which defame another man, or ‘ injure his reputation. *This is an excellent inſtitution ; for our lives ought to be ſubmitted* ‘ *only to the lawful examination and judgments of the Magiſtrates, and not to the wit and* ‘ *raillery of Poets ; nor ought we to hearken to an accuſation againſt any man, but upon con-* ‘ *dition that he is allowed to anſwer, and judicially defend himſelf.*’ If the evil action be of another kind, and paſſes unpuniſhed, either on account of the indulgence of the Magiſtrate, or becauſe of the perſons who commit it, neither does it then belong to every man, to take upon him to write about it. This ſhould be done by Hiſtorians; and none ſhould write Hiſtory but men choſen and authorized by the government. By this means the brand which Hiſtory ſhould fix on the name and memory of thoſe who deſerve the public infamy, would proceed from its true channel, being derived from the power of the ſword, wherewith the ſovereign is armed for the puniſhment of the wicked. As the ſacred Hiſtory was not the work of a private perſon, but of men who had received from GOD a ſpecial commiſſion to write *(ee)* ; ſo the Civil Hiſtory ſhould be compoſed only by thoſe whom the ſovereign of each ſtate appoints for that purpoſe, and then it might be preſumed that Hiſtory would not defame people upon falſe grounds ; whereas, as the world goes at preſent, it diſtributes puniſhments and rewards, diſgrace and praiſe, condemnation and abſolution, upon the firſt reports of fame, ſophiſticated and wreſted by a thouſand paſſions. And what is ſurpriſing, is, that the meaneſt Hiſtorian claims the privilege which belong only to ſome ; he pretends he is not bound to produce his proofs and his witneſſes. *Quis unquam ab hiſtorico juratores exegit (ff)?* - - - *Whoever requires an Hiſtorian to bring affidavits for what he advances ?*

I do not ſay but that there are inconveniencies on the other ſide ; yet there being ſome every where, the greateſt ought to be avoided, as doubtleſs are that multitude of writers, who ſully hiſtorical facts with their impure hands, ſully them I ſay, not only for the preſent time but for future ages ; ſince there will ever be too many continuators of *Mellificium Pezelii*, *Sethus Calviſius*, Sleidan's Commentaries *&c. (gg)* too many writers of abridgments, *in uſum ſtudioſæ juventutis* ; in a word, too many writers who will fetch their informations from thence, and perpetuate the falſities that are daily divulged [*A*]. What is ſaid of the firſt impreſſions in general, that they are of long continuance,

> Quo ſemel eſt imbuta recens ſervabit odorem
> Teſta diu *(hh)*,
>
> *What ſeaſon'd firſt the veſſel keeps the taſte,* **Creech.**

is moſt true eſpecially with reſpect to the firſt alterations which events ſuffer from their beginning by the diſguiſed relations that are made of them in haſte, and diſperſed with all the expedition imaginable. This is an original ſin, the propagation whereof cannot be denied ; too many examples prove it ; and here lies the miſchief : for as all people pretty much reſemble thoſe of whom a Cardinal Legate ſaid, as he gave them his benediction,

ſince

(dd) Cicero, IV de Legib. apud Auguſt. *lib. ii*, de Civit. Dei, *cap. ix.*

(ee) 2 Pet. I, 20, 21.

(ff) Seneca, de morte Claudii.

(gg) If I ſpecify ſome authors, it is without any affectation or deſign ; but only becauſe I happen to remember ſcrivener's complaints *Act. in Schiſm. Angl. pag.* 2, *of the* Biblioth. Univerſ. *Tom. xvi, pag.* 44, *& ſeq. & paſſim alibi*, and thoſe of *Schoockius, Fabul. Hamel. pag.* 140. See alſo *Wicquefort, de l'Ambaſſadeur, Tom. i, pag.* 173.

(hh) Horat. Epiſt. II, lib. i, ver. 69.

[*A*] *Too many writers will . . . . . perpetuate the falſities that are daily divulged.*] I might have ſpoken of another ſort of writers. The Continuators of Pezelius, Calviſius ; the *Theatrum Europæ*, &c ; they who publiſh *Synopſes rerum toto orbe geſtarum*, and abridgements of Univerſal Hiſtory, *in uſum ſtudioſæ juventutis*, are I confeſs the greateſt propagators of falſe news ; but they are not the only ones, nor perhaps the moſt dangerous preſervers of falſities. There are ſome Hiſtorians, who taking a contrary courſe, deceive thoſe very perſons who pretend to be nice. I mean ſome Hiſtorians like Varillas : they love to ſay what is not to be found in common Hiſtories : they aſpire to the glory of having diſcovered ſecret memoirs, the occult qualities of the firſt miniſters, and the ſecret of intrigues and negociations, which no body knew before. If a thing has been left in oblivion by every body, they will be ſure to publiſh it for that very reaſon. Nay, they go farther ; they build a whole ſyſtem upon it : this ſerves them as a key to open the cabinets of Princes and they pretend to unfold many myſteries by this means. When thoſe gentlemen find in the corner of a library, or among the duſty old papers of an inventory, a printed piece which was unknown to them, they read it greedily, for which they are to be praiſed. But if they find in it any ſingular rare and ſuprizing particular they immediately take it up, and make it the baſis of the conjectures they deſign to vent as matters of fact, or Hiſtorical illuſtrations. For this they are not to be commended. It is very often the way to deceive people. If any of theſe men ſhould find an hundred years hence, a copy of the Paſtoral Letter, which was immediately ſuppreſſed by its author, he would make his advantage of it. He would boaſt of having diſcovered things unknown to all other Hiſtorians ; he would reaſon upon this at random, and give all Europe a new face, with reſpect to the ſecret motives

of

ſince they have a mind to be deceived, let them be deceived; and moreover ſince it cannot be doubted that a falſe report believed for three days may do a great deal of good to a nation [B], whereas a true piece of news, believed as long, may occaſion the ruin of it; it

of Princes. He would revive a falſity, which lived but a few days in the common news, and would perpetuate it; for there will always be ſome Hiſtorians, who will relate what they ſhall read in Varillas, for inſtance. I muſt acquaint my reader, that the ſuppreſſion of this Paſtoral Letter, came to my knowledge only by a little pamphlet of fifteen pages in 4to, dated on the twenty-fifth of January 1696 (1). I there found (2) that the author of the Paſtoral Letters having cited, *as a proof of the favourable intentions of* the Allies, *a project of peace drawn up by the Diet of Ratiſbonne . . . . . which had been contrived by a ſpeculative Politician of Amſterdam . . . . was ſo aſhamed of being impoſed upon by that ſpurious piece, that he immediately printed another edition of his Paſtoral Letter, in which he omitted that paſſage.*

[B] *A falſe report believed for three days may do a great deal of good, to a nation,* &c.] This maxim is aſcribed to Catherine de Medicis, *that a falſe piece of news believed three days may ſave a nation* (3). Hiſtories abound with the advantages of falſe news. The heads of the League maintained themſelves a long time in Paris by that means. The Duke of Maienne not being able to deny, that he had loſt the field of battle at Ivri, made people believe that the Bearnois (the King of Navarre) had been killed, and that in other places the League was triumphant (4). Theſe are the words of an Hiſtorian: *Seeing their army thus ſhattered, they had recourſe to their uſual artifices, which were to impoſe upon the Pariſians with lies, they publiſhed in abundance of papers, importing that at the firſt aſſault given at Dreux, the inhabitants had killed above five hundred of the King's troops, and wounded a greater number, and that the Marſhal Biron had been mortally wounded. That in an encounter near Poiſſi the League had obtained a great victory. That in the battle the fight was long, and the loſs almoſt equal, and that if the Bearnois was not dead, he was as good as dead* (5). Peter Matthieu relates that the Count de Charolois, being under the neceſſity of encouraging his troops by the hopes of a ſpeedy ſuccour, *ſuborned a Franciſcan who pretended to come from Bretagne, and ſaid that he had left the army ſo near, that it would be ſeen the ſame day . . . . . . This artifice increaſed if not the courage, at leaſt the patience of the moſt diſheartened, and the lie proved uſeful for the little time it was believed. The great deſire of ſeeing the troops of Bretagne, made it believed without any conſideration* (6). Theſe laſt words are not uſeleſs here, for they ſhew the bent and diſpoſition of the people to give into ſuch artifices: they eaſily believe what flatters them, and they wait patiently. Peter Matthieu's marginal note, deſerves to be tranſcribed. *When an army or a town,* ſays he (7), *is in expectation of relief, they muſt always be told that it is coming, and if there ſhould be news to the contrary, it is prudent in the General to ſpread about a different report. Syphax ſends word to Scipio that he cannot aſſiſt him, and that on the contrary he is for Carthage. Scipio treats and careſſes his Ambaſſadors, and gives them preſents, in order to make his ſoldiers believe that Syphax was coming, and that the Ambaſſadors returned to haſten his departure.* It is with reſpect to theſe ſtratagems, that it may eſpecially be ſaid, *nil ſub ſole novum*, - - - *There is nothing new under the ſun.* The Moderns in this point are but the imitators of the Ancients (8). Sincerity was never pretended to in the freſh accounts of public misfortunes, and it would be generally prejudicial to pretend to it. Livy juſtly cenſures the Roman Conſul, who after the fatal battle of Cannæ acknowledged to the deputies of the Allies all the loſs he had ſuſtained. ‘ Auxit rerum ſuarum ſuique contemptum Conſul nimis detegendo cladem nudandoque (9). - - - - *The Conſul rendered his army and himſelf ſtill more contemptible, by giving too bare and naked an account of the defeat at Cannæ.*’ The effect of this plain dealing was, that the Allies concluded from it that Rome would never be able to raiſe its head again, and therefore that they ought to join with Hannibal. We learn from Plutarch that an Athenian was cruelly tortured, for telling a piece of ill news, which however was very true (10). Having heard of Nicias's defeat from a ſtranger, who was come aſhore at the port of Pyræeus, he went in all haſte to acquaint the magiſtrates with that great misfortune. They aſked him how he came by it, and becauſe he could not produce his author, he was puniſhed as a cheat and a diſturber of the public peace (11): nor was he delivered from the rack till the truth of his news was known. Had he made a falſe report of a victory, he would not have ſuffered for it: the action of Stratocles makes me think ſo. He perſuaded the Athenians to offer a ſacrifice to the gods by way of thanks for the defeat of their enemies, and yet he knew that the Athenian fleet had been beaten. The news of the diſaſter was at laſt publiſhed. They were heartily vexed with the impoſtor; but his anſwer ſatisfied them, and there was an end of it: what injury have I done you? ſaid he: I have made you live three days happily. Πολλου δ' ἂν ἔτι καὶ Σπαρτιάτας δεῆσαι τὴν Στρατοκλέους ὕβριν ὑπομεῖναι καὶ βωμολοχίαν, πείσαντος μὲν αὐτοὺς εὐαγγέλια θύειν ὡς νενικηκότας. ἐπεὶ δὲ τῆς ἥττης ἀληθῶς ἀπαγγελθείσης ἠγανάκτουν, ἐρωτῶντος τὸν δῆμον, τί ἠδίκηται, τρεῖς ἡμέρας δι' αὐτὸν ἡδέως γεγονώς. *Nullo vero pacto arbitror Spartanos toleraturos fuiſſe Stratoclis ſcurrilem inſultationem, qui ſuis ut ob lætum partæ victoriæ nuncium acceptum, ſacrificarent perſuaſit: cumque ii de accepta clade vero allato nuncio ſuccenſerent, populum interrogavit ecquid injuriæ paſſi eſſent, qui ipſius opera triduum ſuavius vixiſſent* (12). It was ſo much gained over the enemy, you will ſay; the Athenians gained two or three days of rejoycing by it: they put off for that time the uneaſineſs which the ill news was to give them. But in reality it is but a ſmall advantage; it is a ſad thing to be brought off from a falſe perſuaſion that has raiſed a great joy; the weight of adverſity ſits more heavily afterwards. Beſides, public rejoycings for an imaginary victory, expoſe a whole nation to contempt, and make the enemy very merry. If Stratocles had been treated as he deſerved, he had been ſeverely puniſhed. For a private perſon to do as Cicero did is a thing of no great conſequence: nay, in ſuch particular conjunctures true prudence will not ſuffer us to believe any thing too lightly, *Cicero . . . . . cum Vatinii morte nunciata cujus parum certus videbatur autor, interim, inquit, uſura fruar* (13). It is not certain that my enemy is dead, and perhaps in a few days I ſhall hear he is alive and well; but in the mean time I will take advantage of the current report, I will believe it; it is ſo much gain to me. This is what Cicero ſaid; whether it was only a jeſt, or an ingenuous declaration of his thoughts, it matters not. But ſhould a nation uſe this method, and take ſome meaſures upon the falſe news of the defeat of the enemy, it would ſometimes run the riſk of great misfortunes. An Hiſtorian relates that it having been reported that Scipio Africanus, and his brother, were taken priſoners, and that Antiochus had defeated the Roman army they commanded, the Ætolians immediately ſhook off the yoke of the Roman people. This muſt needs have been a pernicious ſtep. I will relate Livy's words, which contain ſome remarkable particulars. We there find a remarkable inſtance of the deceits of fame: it appears from them that the very deputies of the Ætolians in the army of the two Scipio's had ſpread that falſe report, and that only one Hiſtorian has mentioned it. ‘ Valerius Antias author eſt, rumorem celebrem Romæ fuiſſe, & penè pro certo habitum, recipiendi Scipionis adoleſcentis cauſa Cos. L. Scipionem & cum eo P. Africanum in colloquium evocatos regis, & ipſos comprehenſos eſſe, & ducibus captis confeſtim ad caſtra Romana exercitum ductum, eaque expugnata, & deletas omnes copias Romanorum eſſe: ob hæc Ætolos ſuſtuliſſe animos, & abnuiſſe imperata facere, principeſque eorum in Macedoniam & in Dardanos & in Thraciam ad conducenda mercede auxilia profectos: hæc qui nuntiarent Romam, A. Terentium Varronem, & M. Claudium Lepidum ab A. Cornelio proprætore ex Ætolia miſſos eſſe. Subtexit deinde fabulæ huic, legatos Ætolos in ſenatu inter cætera hoc quoque interrogatos eſſe: ‘ unde it cannot be thought ſtrange that the firſt relations ſhould be ſo falſified: Politics, which ſome

---

(1) *It is intituled*, Parallele de trois Lettres Paſtorales de Mr Jurieu, touchant l'Accompliſſement des Propheties.

(2) *Pag.* 14, *he quotes the Paſtoral Letter of January* 1695.

(3) D'Aubigné, Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy, *livr. ii, ch. vi, pag. m.* 413, 414.

(4) D'Aubigné, Hiſtoire Univerſ. *Tom. iii, livr. iii, ch. vi, pag.* 322.

(5) Hiſtoire des choſes memorables avenues en France depuis l'an 1547, juſques au commencement de l'an 1597, *pag.* 720.

(6) Pierre Matthieu, Hiſt. de Louis XI, *livr. iii, pag. m.* 144.

(7) Ibid.

(8) *See the article* AGESILAUS II, *citations* (*b*), *and* (*c*).

(9) Titus Liv. *lib. xxiii, pag. m.* 355. *He relates the whole diſcourſe of the Conſul to the Deputies of Campania.*

(10) Plut. in Nicia, *ſub fin. pag. m.* 542.

(11) Δόξας λογοποιὸς εἶναι καὶ ταράττειν τὴν πόλιν, εἰς τὸν τροχὸν καταδεθεὶς ἐστρεβλοῦτο πολὺν χρόνον. ἕως ἐπῆλθον οἱ τὸ πᾶν κακὸν ὡς εἶχεν ἀπαγγέλλοντες. Pro mendace & civitatis turbatore in rotam deligatus & diu tortus eſt, donec advenerunt qui totam cladem ordine annuntiarunt. *Ibid.*

(12) Plut. de Repub. gerenda, *pag.* 799, *F. He mentions it alſo in the Life of Demetrius, pag.* 893, 894, *and makes him anſwer,* Εἶτα τί πεπόνθατε δεινὸν, εἰ δύο ἡμέρας ἡδέως γεγόνατε. Quid tandem injuriæ accepiſtis ſi duos dies tranſegiſtis per lætitiam? *This loſt battle is that of Amorgos.*

(13) Quintil. Inſt. Orat. *lib. vi, cap. iii, p. m.* 294.

‘ unde audiſſent imperatores Romanos in Aſia captos ab Antiocho rege, & exercitum deletum eſſe? Ætolos reſpondiſſe, ab ſuis legatis ſe, qui cum conſule fuerint, certiores factos. Rumoris hujus quia neminem alium authorem habeo, neque affirmata res mea opinione ſit, nec pro vana prætermiſſa (14). - - - - - *Valerius Antias relates that at Rome there went a famous report, which paſſed almoſt for a certainty. that King Antiochus having called Lucius Scipio the Conſul, and Publius Africanus, to a conference about the reſtoring of the young Scipio, had ſeized them, and having made the Roman Generals priſoners, had immediatly marched his army to their camp, attacked and taken it, and cut off all the Roman forces; that upon the news of this pretended overthrow, the Etolians had taken courage and refuſed to obey the commands of the Romans, and that their chiefs had gone into Macedon, Dardania, and Thrace, to levy auxiliary troops; that A. Cornelius, the Prætor, had ſent from Etolia Terentius Varro and M. Claudius Lepidus, to carry theſe tidings to Rome. What gave ſome authority to this falſe account was, that the Etolian deputies being aſked in the Senate among other queſtions,* Who had informed them that King Antiochus had made the Roman Generals priſoners, and cut off the Roman army in Aſia; *they anſwered* That they had it from their own deputies who were with the Conſul. *As I have no other authority for there having been ſuch a report, but that of Valerius Antias, I would neither affirm this as a certainty, nor paſs it over as an untruth.*’

Don ot think that Catherine de Medicis meant that a piece of falſe news believed three days, can ſave a nation upon all occaſions. Such maxims as theſe are not without exceptions. A falſe perſuaſion is ſometimes advantageous and ſometimes pernicious: and the ſame may be ſaid of a true one. But here is a thing more generally true, *viz.* that it is uſeful to conceal from the people, part of the loſs ſuſtained in battles and other great misfortunes. This deception is not what we call myſteries of ſtate, *Arcana Imperii,* but the common ſteps of political prudence. No body ought therefore to blame a fallacious relation, that immediately follows the event. The public good requires the uſe of rhetorical figures, in order to extenuate our loſs and our enemies advantages. But it were perhaps to be wiſhed that theſe relations ſhould not be written, or at leaſt, that they ſhould not be printed: for the printing perpetuates them, and makes them ſerve as a foundation for Hiſtorians. This brings a great uncertainty upon Hiſtory, and deprives future ages of the knowledge of the truth; which is a great counterpoize, as ſome think, to the profit and pleaſure that the reading of thoſe daily papers occaſions in the world. The moſt moroſe muſt acknowledge that this reading affords many uſeful and agreeable inſtructions, and even that it may be inſtructive to polite writers. But in ſhort, will ſome ſay, there is no ſincerity in thoſe relations: they are rather Pleas than Hiſtories. Now, what is a Plea? A diſcourſe, in which a man ſtudies to ſhew only the fair ſide of his own cauſe, and only the foul one of his adverſary's. If they, who ſpeak thus, could find out a good expedient to avoid what they condemn, they would have the beſt invention of all men living. After all, the underſtanding readers are not deceived by ſuch relations: they can diſtinguiſh ſuch as come neareſt to ſincerity; but it is not poſſible to publiſh in thoſe writings all that one knows; ſomething muſt be ſacrificed to the public good, and even ſometimes to our domeſtic intereſt. Beſides; ſtratagems being allowed in war (15), the artifices of News-writers muſt be excuſed; for the pains they take to thwart the relations of the enemy are a kind of war; and therefore their writings have been called *arma Anſerina* by a political author. ‘ Hoc ſaltem indictum non abeat, quod auſu temerario quodam, *Relationes ordinarias* ſeu *Novellas*, uti vocantur, *Armis Anſerinis* meis non adjunxerim: nam, ut probe ſciam, tales ſæpe non in *Sibyllarum foliis*, ſed hominum cerebris naſci, creduloſque facile incertæ famæ auram captare: interim tamen etiam temporis filia comprobat, atque hactenus comprobavit, harumce ſparſiones non ſemper *Oreſtis ſomnia* & vanitates eſſe atque fuiſſe. Sparguntur † enim Victoriæ, deprimiturque pars adverſa. Sic conſtat, quod *Literis* à *Pompeio* per omnes provincias civitateſque dimiſſis de prælio ad Dyrrachium facto elatius inflatiuſque multo, quam res erat geſta, fama percrebuerit, pulſum fugere Cæſarem, pene omnibus copiis amiſſis; quæ ‡ fama ſane Pompeianos multis partibus auxerat. Finguntur clades ad vulgum (quia mundus, ut dicitur vult decipi) dementandum, ut iſte faveat huic vel illi parti, &c. Ita poſt *cladem Ivrenſem, &c.* (16). - - - *I muſt not forget to mention, that I have preſumed, not to add the* ordinary relations, or news *(as they are called) to my* Arma Anſerina: *for though I well know, that ſuch relations proceed not from the leaves of the Sibyls, but are deviſed in the brain of man, and that the credulous readily catch at and ſwallow the common reports, however doubtful; nevertheleſs experience, the offspring of time, ſhews, and has already manifeſted, that the diſperſing of theſe news, is not always, nor has always been an unprofitable thing, like the dreams of Oreſtes. For to ſpread the news of our victories, and to leſſen the advantages of the enemy, is an art of policy. Thus it is known that Pompey having ſent letters into all the provinces and cities of the Roman empire, wherein he ſpoke of the battle of Dyrrachium, with much more courage and boldneſs than he had fought it, there went a report that Cæſar had been defeated, had loſt almoſt his whole army, and was now making his eſcape: and undoubtedly this report very much ſtrengthened Pompey's party. Overthrows are invented to impoſe upon the vulgar (becauſe the world, as they ſay, loves to be impoſed upon) and to make them favour this or that party, &c. Thus after the battle of Ivry, &c.*’ The author adds here what I have ſaid of the Duke of Maienne.

Note, that people are ſo uſed to the Gazettes, that they would look upon the ſuppreſſion of them as an eclipſe. It would occaſion a kind of public mourning. The Republic of Letters would loſe ſeveral pieces by it, which are the very kernel and cream of the Gazettes, and contain ſome rules for a profitable reading of them. Obſerve the following paſſage. ‘ Cum vero omnes novi quid ſciendi mira flagremus cupiditate, certaque juxta ac incerta avidiſſime arripientes, quiſque pro voto interpretamur, itaque NOVELLAS undique conquirimus, ut rerum geſtarum, imò & gerandarum (tanta enim ſcribentium vel credentium vanitas eſt) cognitione ſitientem animum expleamus. Hinc anxia curioſitate legimus aut rimamur, quid Novellæ apportent *Noſtrates, Jenenſes, Lipſienſes, Norinbergenſes, Hamburgenſes,* imo & *Pariſinæ, Hafnienſes, Amſtelodamenſes, Bruxellenſes,* aut aliæ, neſcio unde acceſſitæ: Ut autem varia ſint illorum, qui eas legunt vel mirantur ingenia, ita fieri haud poteſt, quin majorem ex illis fructum alius, alius minorem accipiat, quò igitur cum Voluptate, quam novitas ſuâ ſponte conciliat, Utilitas etiam jungatur, ideo inſigni cum commodo adhiberi poterit Nobiliſſimi & Conſultiſſimi Dn. AHASUERI FRITSCHII Diſcurſus, *De Novellarum, quas vocant* Reve Beitungen *hodierno uſu & abuſu. Imp. Jenæ* 1676, 4*to*. Itemque elegantiſſimè docti CHRISTIANI WEISII in illuſtri ad Salam Auguſtæo Polit. Prof. *Schediaſma curioſum, de Lectione Novellarum, quantum ſcil. illæ uſum habeant in Geographicis, Hiſtoricis, & Politicis, imò quovis curioſorum genere.* Cui etiam addidit *Specimen, quaſi Nucleum Novellarum, ſcil. ab Anno.* 1660. *ad ann. uſque* 1676. *Weiſſenfelſæ anno eod. exc.* (17). - - - - *As we all have an inſatiable deſire, and a wonderful curioſity to know ſomething new, and greedily catch at* NEWS, *whether certain or doubtful, whilſt every man interprets them according to his own wiſhes, we ſearch for* NEWS PAPERS *from all parts of the world, in order to ſlack this thirſt of the mind after the knowledge not only of paſt, but of future tranſactions: for ſuch is the preſumption of the writers of news, or thoſe who believe them, that they will pretend to the knowledge of things to come. Thus with anxious curioſity, we read and ſift the* home-news, *thoſe from Iëna, Leipſic, Nuremberg, Hamburgh, nay, thoſe from Paris, Copenhagen, Amſterdam, Bruſſels, and others which come from the Lord knows where. But as the genius's of thoſe who read and admire them are various, ſo it cannot but happen that ſome reap more, ſome leſs advantage by the peruſal of them. To the end therefore that profit may* ſome body has defined *ars non tam regendi, quam fallendi hominem - - - The art of deceiving rather than of governing men* [*C*], will have it ſo. But men ought to own their error, which they never can do with a good grace: and tho' ſome ſhould do it, this is of little ſervice; ſo many pens having already canonized the firſt reports, that people would at leaſt be divided in their opinions about them (*ii*).

---

(14) Tit. Liv. *lib. xxxvii, p. m.* 708.

(15) Dolus an virtus quis in hoſte requirat? *Virgil. Æneid. lib. ii, ver.* 390.

† *James Hurault des Offices d'Etat, fol.* 110.

‡ *J. Cæſ. de Bello Civil. lib. iii, pag. m.* 284.

(16) Arma Anſerina, ſive Armatura Epiſtolaris à Doctore militari Tacito ſubminiſtrata, & in Diſſertatione Politica diducta à G. C. W. *pag.* 19.

(17) Michael Hertzius, Bibliotheca Germanica, ſive Notitia Scriptorum Rerum Germanicarum, *Part. ii, ſub fin.*

It is not enough to compare theſe baſe writers to Harpies which defile whatever they touch (*kk*); it may be ſaid they are executioners who diſtort and wring the neck, legs and arms of Hiſtorical facts, and even ſometimes cut them off, and apply falſe ones in their room; and this even at the very moment that an event iſſues forth from the boſom of its cauſes, and the exploits of a battle are juſt born:

> Modo primos incipientes
> Edere vagitus, & adhuc à matre rubentes (*ll*).
>
> *As ſoon as e're they wail, as e're they ſpring,*
> *Still bluſhing, from the parent womb......*

It was formerly ſaid of the Muſes that they were the proſtitutes even of ſlaves; this may eſpecially be affirmed of the Muſe who preſides over Hiſtory (*mm*): ſhe is a true *ſcortum triobolare*, who plies upon the high-ways, and ſells her ſelf to the firſt comer for a morſel of bread. Her bargain with the Bookſellers is much beneath that of Baudoin and

(*ii*) *See the paſſage of Tacitus which I have cited above, citat.* (57), *of the article* USSON.

(*kk*) At ſubitæ horrifico lapſu de montibus adſunt Harpyiæ, & magnis quatiunt clangoribus alas, Diripiuntque dapes contactuque omnium fœdant Immundo: tum vox tetrum dira inter odorem. *Virg. Æn. lib. iii, ver.* 225. *.... From the mountain tops, with hideous cry, And clattering wings the hungry harpies fly, They ſnatch the meat, defiling all they find, And parting leave a loathſome ſtench behind.* DRYDEN.

(*ll*) Juven. Sat. VII, ver. 195.

(*mm*) *It is Clio.* Λέγεται τῶν μουσῶν ἡ μὲν Κλειὼ ευρηκέναι τὴν ἱστορίαν. Scholiaſt. Apollonii, in lib. iii.

‘ *accompany pleaſure, which novelty of itſelf creates, it* ‘ *will be of ſignal advantage to read the diſcourſe of the* ‘ *moſt excellent and learned* Mr AHASUERUS FRITSCHIUS, *intituled,* Of the modern uſe and abuſe of ‘ the news; which they call *Reve Beitungen*; printed ‘ at Iena 1676, 4to. *Likewiſe* the curious and moſt ‘ elegant diſſertation *of the learned* CHRISTIAN WEISIUS, Profeſſor of Politics, concerning the reading ‘ of news, ſhewing the great uſe of them in Geogra‘ phy, Hiſtory, Politics, and all other branches of ‘ curious learning. To which he has added, a Speci‘ men, being, as it were, the kernel and quinteſſence ‘ of news, from the year 1660 to 1676: printed at ‘ Weiſſenfels in the ſame year.'

I have read ſomewhere in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres,* that it were to be wiſhed that ſome body was employed in taking an account at the end of every year, of all the falſe reports that had been ſpread during that year. This would not be neceſſary with reſpect to all of them; there are ſeveral, that the Gazettes themſelves take notice of: ſuch an employment had been more neceſſary when daily news were not printed. If it had been eſtabliſhed at Rome when the Turks took Rhodes, we ſhould know abundance of falſities that were then vented in Italy. Some of them are known by the letters which Ruſcelli has collected: we know by thoſe letters, that on the tenth of December 1522, the News-writers of Rome, gave out that the ſiege of Rhodes was raiſed (18). On the twenty-eighth of February 1523, they gave out that it was not certain that Soliman had taken the town (19); and yet it had capitulated on the twenty-ſecond of December 1522. But what man will wonder at this news, when he knows, that in the year 1500, it was given out at Padua as a certainty, and even from Rome, that the Pope had been killed with a thunder-bolt on St Peter's day, and that all the citizens had taken up arms. It is only by chance, that we know that ſuch an untruth was reported. It is mentioned in a letter of Matthew Boſſus; without which probably we ſhould have known nothing of it. ‘ Hac ſub hora Auguſtine ‘ ad te dum ſcribo, ecce rumor aures implet civitatis, ‘ ſolemni Petri Apoſtoli die, paulo poſt vigeſimam ho‘ ram, Alexandrum Romanæ Eccleſiæ magnum Pon‘ tificem ictu fulminis interiiſſe, & de perjucundis ſuis ‘ Pileatis unum tactum, pariter ſuum dominum paren‘ taſſe, populares in armis eſſe, vias urbis obliquas pa‘ rum tutas, Curiales quati timoribus, Hiſpanos infe‘ ſtos & hoſtes haberi (20). - - - - *At this very hour,* ‘ *while I am writing to you, there goes a report through* ‘ *the city, that a little after two of the clock in the af*‘ *ternoon, of St Peter's day, Pope Alexander was killed* ‘ *by a thunder-bolt, and that one of his merry cardinals* ‘ *had the ſame fate, that the people are in arms, that the* ‘ *by-ſtreets of the city are not ſafe, that the magiſtrates are* ‘ *in the greateſt fears, that the Spaniards are diſaffected* ‘ *and accounted enemies.*' The King of Spain, the King of France, and the Duke of Alba, were at the ſame time reported in Holland to be dead, in the year 1580. This falſity was preſerved by chance in a letter of Juſtus Lipſius (21). A compilation of ſuch things would be uſeful.

Mr de Vigneul Marville has made ſome good obſervations on the Paris Gazette. Here is one of his reflexions. ‘ There is but one thing diſſerviceable to ‘ the writer of it, which is, that he is not abſolute ‘ maſter of his work, and being ſubject to ſuperior or‘ ders, he cannot ſpeak the truth with that ſincerity ‘ which Hiſtory requires. If this point was granted ‘ him, we ſhould have no need of other Hiſtorians (22).' The latter part of this paſſage is ſomewhat hyperbolical; however it is certain that author mentions the main cauſe of the miſchief; the weekly News-writers, or of any other period longer or ſhorter, dare not ſpeak all they know. It would coſt them too dear; for not to mention the puniſhment they might fear from their ſuperiors, their news would not ſell well, and they would make themſelves odious as diſaffected perſons, and in ſome manner enemies to the public good. No body will have them vent groſs lies, for the ſake of their country; but when they lie ingeniouſly, and with conjectures and reflexions equally witty, flattering and ſatirical, they are praiſed, admired, and loved, and every body reads their works. So that they find their account in following the example of the antient Comic Poet, who only deſigned to pleaſe the people.

> Poëta cum primum animum ad ſcribendum appulit,
> Id ſibi negotii credidit ſolum dari,
> Populo ut placerent quas feciſſet fabulas (23).
>
> *Our Poet when he ſet his mind on writing,*
> *Believ'd he had no more to do, but make*
> *Such plays as ſhould be to the people's liking.*

[*C*] *Politics which ſome body has defined,* Ars, &c.] Guy Patin mentions this definition after having a little ridiculed the Jubilees. *Thus you ſee new factions in Rome, that will give us a new Pope, and then* pro jucundo adventu ad Papatum, - - - *for his happy acceſſion to the Papacy, a new Jubilee. The new wine of this preſent year, which is a liquor drawn from the vine, will produce more ſenſible effects in mens heads than this new devotion, which in its kind, returns but too often,* ab aſſuetis non afficimur: - - - *Things to which we are accuſtomed do not affect us. But the world is ſo made,* populus vult decipi: - - - *People love to be impoſed upon. The late John Camus, Biſhop of Belley, a learned worthy prelate, if ever there was any, ſaid, that* Politica ars eſt non tam regendi quàm fallendi homines: - - - - *Politics is the art of deceiving, rather than governing men. I heard him ſay this once in his chamber, in the year* 1632, *and I have often remembred it ſince* (24). This letter of Patin is dated on the thirteenth of December 1669. He had not recited the Biſhop's words in that manner in a letter of the eighth of May 1665. He recited them on the following occaſion. *Six writers, ſays he,* ‘ *who* and du Ryer, whoſe ſtated price was *to tranſlate for half a crown, or a crown a ſheet, and to write verſes for ſix ſhillings a hundred, when they were long ones, and for three ſhillings when they were ſhort* (*nn*).

---

(18) *It is thought that the ſuccours will prove needleſs, if the ſiege be raiſed, as the report goes.* Jerom Negro, Letter to Mark Antony Micheli, written from Rome the 10th of December 1522, *folio* 86, of the Epiſtles of Princes, collected by Ruſcelli, and tranſlated by Belleforeſt.

(19) *See the ſame Letter, fol.* 88. *It contains ſeveral things which ſhew how people deceive themſelves in things which they wiſh.*

(20) Matthæus Boſſus, *Part iii, Epiſt. XXI.*

(21) *Mors Regis Hiſpaniæ, Galliæ, & Ducis Albani nunciata nobis ſub idem tempus. Vera fama ſit in uno ſaltem ex triade illa.* Lipſius, Epiſt. IV ad Theodorum Leeuwium, *pag.* 9, *Edit. Lugd. Bat.* 1649. It is dated the firſt of December 1580.

(22) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges d'Hiſt, *Tom. ii, pag.* 198, *Dutch Edit.*

(23) Terentius, *in Prologo* Andriæ.

(24) Patin, Letter DIII, *pag.* 479, *of the third tome.*

> *Ah! pudor extinctus, doctæque infamia turbæ*
> *Sub titulo proſtant, & queis genus ab Jove ſummo*
> *Res hominum ſupra evectæ & nullius egentes,*
> *Aſſe merent vili, ac ſancto ſe corpore fœdant.*
> *Scilicet aut Menæ faciles parere ſuperbo,*
> *Aut nutu Polycleti, & parca laude beatæ.*
> *Uſque adeo maculas ardent in fronte recentes,*
> *Heſternique Getæ vincla, & veſtigia flagri* (*oo*).

Lucian has unwittingly drawn the picture of our age, ſpeaking of a war, which had produced ſuch a multitude of Hiſtorians, that one would have thought it was a modiſh trade. He compares it to the epidemical diſtemper of the Abderitæ (*pp*). We have ſeen, continues he, the truth of the proverb, that war is the parent of all things. Ἀφ᾽ οὗ δὴ τὰ ἐν ποσὶ ταῦτα κεκίνηται, ὁ πόλεμος ὁ πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους, καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ τραῦμα, καὶ αἱ συνεχεῖς νῖκαι, οὐδεὶς ὅς τις οὐχ ἱστορίαν συγγράφει. μᾶλλον δὲ Θουκυδίδαι, καὶ Ἡρόδοτοι, καὶ Ξενοφῶντες ἡμῖν ἅπαντες. καὶ ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀληθὲς ἄρ᾽ ἦν ἐκεῖνο, τὸ, Πολέμος ἁπάντων πατὴρ, εἴ γε καὶ συγγραφέας τοσούτους ἀνέφυσεν, ἀπὸ μιᾷ τῇ πληγῇ. Ex quo res præſentes moveri cœperunt, puta bellum iſtud contra barbaros, & acceptum in Armenia vulnus, & continuæ illæ victoriæ, nemo non hiſtoriam conſcribit. Imò verò Thucydides, Herodoti, & Xenophontes nobis facti ſunt omnes. Et ut apparet, verum fuit illud, Bellum omnium pater eſt, quandoquidem hiſtoriarum ſcriptores tam multos una hac plaga procreavit (*qq*). - - *Since theſe things happened, namely the war with the Barbarians, the overthrow received in Armenia, and thoſe frequent victories, all the world writes Hiſtory. Nay, every man ſets up for a Thucydides, an Herodotus, and a Xenophon. And it appears to be a true ſaying, that war is the parent of all things, ſince it has begot ſo many Hiſtorians in this ſingle country.* The antient Romans had infinitely more reſpect for the dignity of hiſtory; for before Pompey's time no body pretended to write it but ſuch as were eminent for their birth and merit, and when this great man's tutor undertook to write the hiſtory of Pompey, and that of his father, ſome kind of inconveniency was found in that novelty, as Suetonius inſinuates. Yet this innovator had ſenſe and learning, and had taught Rhetoric, but he was a man of no birth. He was a freed-man. That was the grievance. ‘ Lucius Octacilius Pilitus ſerviſſe dicitur; atque etiam oſtiarius, veteri ‘ more, in catena fuiſſe: donec ob ingenium ac ſtudium literarum manumiſſus, accu‘ ſanti patrono ſubſcripſit. Deinde Rhetoricam profeſſus, Cnæum Pompejum Magnum ‘ docuit; patris ejus res geſtas, nec minus ipſius, compluribus libris expoſuit: primus ‘ omnium libertinorum, ut Cornelius Nepos opinatur, ſcribere hiſtoriam orſus, non ‘ niſi ab honeſtiſſimo quoque ſcribi ſolitam (*rr*). - - - *It is ſaid that Lucius Octacilius* ‘ *Pilitus was a ſlave, and even a door-keeper, and that he was chained to the door, after the* ‘ *antient cuſtom; till on account of his parts and inclination to learning he was made free,* ‘ *and aſſiſted his patron. He afterwards profeſſed Rhetoric, and was Præceptor to Pompey* ‘ *the Great: he wrote in many books a Hiſtory of Pompey, and of his father. Cornelius* ‘ *Nepos is of opinion, that Octacilius Pilitus was the firſt freed-man who engaged in writing* ‘ *Hiſtory, which was uſually the employment of none but men of diſtinction.*’

What

(*nn*) *See* Baillet, Jugemens des Sçavans, *on the French tranſlators, article* 948, 949.

(*oo*) *See* Balzac, Entret. IV, *chap. iv.*

(*pp*) Τὸ Ἀβδηριτικὸν ἐκεῖνο πάθος καὶ νῦν τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν πεπαιδευμένων περιελήλυθεν. Abderiticum illud malum etiam hoc tempore pleroſque doctorum invaſit. *Lucian. quomodo ſit conſcribenda Hiſtoria, pag. m.* 658, *Tom. i.*

(*qq*) Ibid.

(*rr*) Sueton. de clar. Rhetor. *cap. iii.*

who got their livelihood by writing news, have been ſent to the Baſtille, within theſe three days, hominum genus audaciſſimum, mendaciſſimum, avidiſſimum ut faciant rem, &c. - - - *a kind of people, who are extremely audacious, given to lying, and greedy of gain, &c. They fill their news with things they know not, and ought not to write. They have printed here and cried about the ſtreets,* the Bull of our Holy Father the Pope, againſt the Janſeniſts, *and three days after it was forbidden, and even,* ne quid deeſſet ad rationem veræ fabulæ, - - - *that nothing might be wanting to compleat the comedy, a report was publiſhed and ſpread that the commiſſary was ordered to impriſon the Printer, if he had been found in his houſe. The late Biſhop of Belley, who was an incomparable man,* told me in the year 1632. *Politica eſt ars tam regendi quam fallendi homines,* - - - *politics is the art both of governing and deceiving men, and this is no new invention, it is the ſame play acted over again; the ſame comedy, and farce; but they are new actors: the worſt of it is that this play will laſt a long time, and mankind ſuffer too much by it* (25). There is a manifeſt difference betwixt the ſecond and firſt definition of politics: the ſecond is more diſcreet than the firſt; but neither of them turns to the diſhonour of the maſters of that art, ſince they aim only at the public good, which they cannot arrive to without imitating Phyſicians with reſpect to their patients. If you would know Patin's judgment upon the Paris Gazette, read what follows. *They write nothing here that is good for any thing except the Gazette every Saturday, which is a very diverting and comfortable thing, for as much as this pratler never tells us bad news, though we perceive a great deal at this ſeaſon* (26). Remember what Petronius ſays, *Mundus univerſus exercet hiſtrioniam,* - - - *The whole world is a farce,* and theſe verſes of Politian againſt ſuch as condemned the plays that were acted in colleges.

> Sed qui nos damnant, hiſtriones ſunt maxumi.
> Nam Curios ſimulant, vivunt bacchanalia:
> Hi ſunt præcipue quidam clamoſi, leves,
> Cucullati, lignipedes, cincti funibus:
> Superciliosſum, incurvicervicum pecus,
> Quique ab aliis habitu & cultu diſſentiunt,
> Triſteſque vultu vendunt ſanctimonias:
> Cenſuram ſibi quandam, & tyrannidem occupant:
> Pavidamque plebem territant minaciis (27).
>
> *But none are greater mountebanks than they*
> *Who can't in colleges endure a play;*
> *For whilſt their lives are leud and diſſolute,*
> *Upright and pious men they perſonate:*

The

(25) Ibid. Letter CCCLVI, *pag.* 61, *of the ſame tome.*

(26) Ibid. Letter XL, *pag.* 173, 174, *of the firſt tome. It is dated from Paris on the ſeventh of June* 1650.

(27) Politianus, *in Prologo in* Plauti Menaechmos, *ad calcem* Epiſt. xv, *lib. vii, folio m.* 165, *verſo.*

IX. The abuſe juſt mentioned favours Scepticiſm in point of Hiſtory.

What would become of the enemies of Hiſtorical Scepticiſm, if this miſchief had prevailed in the time of antient Greece and antient Rome? They are to be congratulated becauſe Printing is ſo modern an invention, and they may juſtly exclaim *bono Hercule publico iſta licentia poſt caſum imperii Romani inventa eſt* (*ss*). - - - - *It is certainly an advantage to the public that this licentiouſneſs came not into uſe, till after the fall of the Roman empire.* For if the antient Greeks, Romans, Perſians, Carthaginians, &c. had done what is now practiſed, they would have much ado to prove any thing to us, even with the help of inſcriptions and medals (*tt*), which the moderns boldly make uſe of to ſatisfy their caprices, without building upon any real fact.

X. Modern ſatires againſt ſome gallantries. Holland complained of without reaſon.

Before I go further I muſt obſerve that there have been ſuch men as Caſſius Severus at all times. We have ſeen in our days a man of quality, who not content to write ſome relations diſadvantageous to ſome court ladies, did not ſpare, as it is ſaid, the royal family, and even the head of it [*D*]: which ſhews that one may truly ſay of ſatires, what Malherbe ſaid of death,

Que la Garde qui veille aux barrieres du Louvre
N'en defend pas les Rois.

The guards which watch the palaces of Kings
Can ne'er ſecure them from fell ſatire's ſtings.

This

The chief of theſe are certain noiſy Friars,
With hoods, and wooden ſhoes, and rope attires;
A ſupercilious ſtiff-neck'd generation,
Differing in dreſs and mein from all the nation,
Who ſell with ſolemn face their holy wares,
Set up for Cenſors, and in all affairs
Aſſume a tyrant pow'r, and terror ſpread,
By clam'rous threats, among the trembling herd.

Take notice, that the definition which the Biſhop of Bellay gave of Politics, would expreſs a very great fault, if it denoted the mutual deceits of ſovereigns. They are not ſo uncommon as they ſhould be. I have read, within theſe three days, a very ſprightly thought: it is this; *The Politicians have a language peculiar to themſelves: words and phraſes with them do not ſignify the ſame thing with other men. I do not know whether the gentlemen of the French academy have comprehended politics in the number of the arts and ſciences of which they have given us a Dictionary. This, in my opinion, would be neceſſary. For inſtance, in the political ſtile, to ſwear upon the holy Goſpels to obſerve ſuch or ſuch a treaty, ſignifies ſometimes barely that one ſwears it, but not that one will obſerve it; nay, it ſometimes ſignifies, that nothing of the treaty ſhall be performed. The generality of people do not underſtand this language; but the Politicians underſtand it well, and take their meaſures accordingly* (28). I add, that if the gentlemen of the French academy would give us an Univerſal Dictionary of all arts, they would engage in an endleſs work. They would daily diſcover new arts which have terms of a particular ſignification. The art of weekly relations is one of them; the art of controverſy is another. Words do not go there in their uſual ſenſe: you ſee people who charge one another with horrid doctrines; they reply, and rejoin, and ſtill reciprocally find their adverſaries doctrine more and more abominable (29). This complaint appears almoſt in every page; and alarms the readers as if there was reaſon to fear, that, without a ſpeedy remedy, this gangrene would diffuſe its infection through the whole body. Such as are not uſed to this ſtile conceive a thouſand ſcruples; they fear they have diſobeyed St Paul's precept, *a man that is an heretic reject* (30); for they have converſed with the conteſting parties. Who would have believed, ſay they, that ſuch Divines, who have eat for a long time the bread of the Orthodox, ſhould have nouriſhed ſuch monſters in their hearts? We know not whom to truſt. Either one or the other of them, or perhaps both, muſt be diſguiſed wolves rather than ſhepherds. But have a little patience; ſtay till ſome expert arbitrators, initiated in that language, have reconciled the parties, and you will find thoſe words ſignify nothing leſs than what you believed. The accuſers on both ſides will be declared Orthodox. They ſhall not be cenſured, but only admoniſhed to correct ſome improper expreſſions which had eſcaped them. It is ſuppoſed then that in reality they only charged each other with theſe expreſſions, and that therefore the words *pernicious Hereſy*, and the like, ſignify with them only an ill choice of words. We may very well wiſh that the gentlemen of the French academy would not forget, in a Supplement which they may give to the Dictionary of arts, the proper ſignification of the words *impious, Heretic, deſtroyer of the fundamentals of the Goſpel, abettor of the Socinians,* &c. when they are to be found in the writings of a Theological proceſs; for otherwiſe our mother tongue will grow barbarous and unintelligible to moſt readers.

[*D*] *A man of quality did not ſpare, as it is ſaid, the royal family, and even the head of it.*] I add, *as it is ſaid*, becauſe, though common fame has aſcribed to the ſame author *l'Hiſtoire amoureuſe des Gaules*, and *les amours du Palais Roial*, yet this author diſowned the latter. He even denied judicially that he had compoſed it. For it is of this book we are to underſtand what he wrote to Mr de Saint Aignan in theſe words: 'My enemies ſeeing me in the Baſtille, thought my 'impriſonment would not permit me to defend my 'ſelf, and that they might ſafely accuſe me; they 'therefore told the King that I had written againſt 'him. But his Majeſty, who never condemns a 'man before he be heard, ſurprized them ſtrangely 'by ſending the Lieutenant-Criminal to examine me '(31) . . . After having ſhewn me the Hiſtory written 'with my own hand, I mean the original I have 'mentioned to you, he aſked me whether I had 'written nothing againſt the King. I anſwered that 'I was much ſurprized to have ſuch a queſtion put 'to me. He told me he had orders to do it: I 'anſwered I had not, and that there was no probability that having ſerved twenty-ſeven years without having received any favour, being twelve years 'Major-General of the light horſe, and expecting 'every day ſome recompence from his majeſty, I 'ſhould be wanting in my reſpect to him: that to 'deſtroy this probability my own hand-writing, or 'unexceptionable witneſſes ſhould be produced againſt 'me. That if either of them could be produced in 'the leaſt thing contrary to the reſpect I owed to the 'King and all the royal family, I would be willing to loſe my head: but that I alſo beſeeched his 'majeſty to appoint the ſame puniſhment for thoſe, 'who ſhould accuſe me without being able to convict 'me (32) . . . . From that time not having ſeen the 'Lieutenant-Criminal nor any other judge, I have 'been perſuaded that ſo black and ſo ridiculous a 'calumny had made no impreſſion upon the King, 'who is ſo diſcerning and hard to be ſuprized (33).' What he ſays, in another place of the late Ducheſs of Orleans, is an argument that the chief perſons of the court did not believe him guilty of this ſecond head of accuſation. *The death of the Princeſs Henrietta of England*, ſays he (34), *was a new misfortune to me; ſhe had done me many good offices with his majeſty, and*

(*ss*) This is a parody of Seneca, *Præfat. lib. v, Controv.*

(*tt*) See Rec. Fr. *in 4to, pag.* 781.

(28) Lettres Hiſtoriques, *September* 1696, *p.* 251.

(29) *A ſmall piece of Dorſcheus, Profeſſor of Divinity at Straſbourg, intituled,* Latrocinium Famæ Theologorum, *affords ſome inſtances of this. To which one might add many others.*

(30) Tit. iii, 10.

(31) Le Comte de Buſſy Rabutin, Uſage des Adverſitez, *pag.* 271, *Dutch Edit.*

(32) Ibid. *pag.* 272.

(33) Ibid. *pag.* 274.

(34) Ibid. *pag.* 292.

This lord has been wiſer and happier than the ſatiriſt of Auguſtus's court. The latter not amending in his exile, made his condition ſo miſerable that at laſt he had ſcarce wherewithal to cover his nakedneſs (*uu*); but he whom I ſpeak of, came off cheap, and applied himſelf to things more worthy of his fine wit and charming pen [*E*].

It would be an unjuſt thing to impute to him the bad imitations, of which he was only the accidental cauſe. But it muſt be confeſſed this maxim has been well verified,

that

I hoped for others from her. For beſides that ſhe had a great deal of wit, and ſuch a carriage as made her beloved and reſpected by every body, ſhe was naturally generous and kind. Let us wonder at the ſtubbornneſs of the public; they ſtill perſiſt to believe that theſe two pieces were written by Count de Buſſy. Nothing can diſſuade them, neither the paſſages before cited, nor the difference that is to be found betwixt theſe two pieces, which is manifeſt to good judges: for there is, much more art and genius in the firſt than in the ſecond; the latter hath none of Petronius's thoughts like the firſt. The journaliſt of the Royal Society was not ignorant of thoſe imitations of Petronius. The following words are to be found in his journal, of the month of Auguſt, 1669. 'Of late 'comparing Buſſy's *Hiſtoire Amoureuſe de Gaule* with 'Petronius Arbiter, out of whom I was made to 'believe he had taken two of his letters word for 'word, beſides other love-intrigues, I found in running him over, what ſatisfied me not a little in this 'very ſubject of ſnails; *viz.* That theſe very animals, as well as other odd things in nature, as 'truffs, muſhrooms, and no doubt too the Coſſi, or 'great worms in the oak (another Roman dainty) 'were made uſe of by the antients to incite Venery. 'You will there find that the diſtreſſed and feeble 'lover prepares himſelf with a ragouſt of ſnails necks '(*Cochlearum Cervices* (35).') I do not know why this Count inſerted in his Hiſtory a moſt ſharp raillery againſt Mr Menage who briſkly revenged himſelf by ſix Latin verſes, as galling as can be written (36). For the reſt I do not believe what Patin ſays, in his letter of the twenty-eighth of December, 1665 (37). Mr de Buſſi Rabutin, *by the King's command, hath reſigned his employment and is removed from the Baſtille to the mad-houſe, where he has two chambers* (38). Mr de Buſſy ſays, that upon the report of the King's firſt Phyſician and firſt Surgeon, *he was ſet at liberty to be cured in Paris* (39). This is more credible. The grief he expreſſed for having compoſed the *Hiſtoire Amoureuſe des Gaules* ſerved for an encomium in the ſpeech of the Academiſt who ſucceeded him: it was the Abbot Bignon. *He praiſed him with delicacy, and ſhewed that if the work, which had occaſioned all his misfortunes, deſerved the cenſure of all wiſe men, the repentance which he had manifeſted for having made it, could not be ſufficiently praiſed* (40).

[*E*] . . . . *And applied himſelf to things more worthy of his fine wit and charming pen.*] There went a report that he was writing the Hiſtory of France. Afterwards it was ſaid that he confined himſelf to the Hiſtory of Lewis XIV. But the event has ſhewn that the firſt report was falſe; and that the ſecond was not very well grounded; for if this Count had ſeriouſly applied himſelf to write the Hiſtory of Lewis XIV, we ſhould have ſeen a better work upon that ſubject, than that which came out in the year 1700, of which there is an extract in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (41). This extract will not permit us to doubt that this work of his was compoſed with the utmoſt negligence. Certainly he went about it when he was weary of ſome other buſineſs, and little cared to be well informed of what he wrote, or to wait till the firſt news of his village were confirmed. He threw them haſtily upon the paper, and took no pains to correct them afterwards. We cannot account more favourably for what he ſays of the paſſage of the Boyne. All Europe knows that King James quitted that poſt, and returned to France a few days after, and that King William ſucceſsfully paſſed that river, and afterwards made all the ſteps of a conqueror. And yet Mr de Buſſy affirms (42) that the Count de Lauzun, who commanded the troops of France, won the battle of the Boyne. Had he ſpoken thus out of flattery, and againſt his conſcience, he would be more to blame; it is therefore explaining the thing in the moſt favourable ſenſe, to ſay he was deceived by ſome reports which went in his village, and that valuing but little this work, he did not care whether this paſſage was right or wrong.

It had been better to have ſaid that in his diſgrace he employed himſelf in keeping a large correſpondence by letters, and in writing the memoirs of his life; for the works that were publiſhed after his death, ſhew that this was his chief occupation. To this muſt be added the care he took to make his own Hiſtory ſerve for an inſtruction to his children. His treatiſe *concerning the uſe of adverſities* (43), ſhews that this was his deſign. It is a little book full of good morality and religion. His memoirs in two volumes publiſhed in the year 1697, are curious and well written. His letters, printed in four volumes the ſame year deſerve the ſame encomium. They would have pleaſed more, if, upon good conſiderations, many proper names had not been ſtruck out, and many paſſages which affected the reputation of certain perſons. Perhaps ſome time or other there will come out an edition of them, which will not be caſtrated, or will have a key to them. There are ſeveral letters which ſhew that Count Buſſy weaned himſelf by degrees from the vanities of this world, that he was ſenſible of the emptineſs of it, and that at laſt he was deeply affected with the importance of his ſalvation, and the truths of the Goſpel. The beſt Chriſtians in the world could not be more charmed than he was, with Mr Abadie's excellent work concerning the truth of the Chriſtian religion (44). But obſerve that his converſion was ſomewhat ſlow. For a long time he looked behind him like Lot's wife, and tried all the means that the moſt obſtinate deſire of returning to court could ſuggeſt to an ambitious man, who could not live out of it. The ill ſucceſs of his petitions was a terrible mortification to him, but did not diſcourage him from preparing others on every occaſion. This we learn from the writings which his heirs have publiſhed: had they ſuppreſſed theſe monuments of his impatience, they had ſheltered his memory from the cenſure of ſome people, who cannot pardon a brave man his want of courage in bearing the loſs of his employments. It is not enough, ſay they, to be courageous in a battle, a man muſt alſo expreſs a great ſteddineſs and reſolution under the loſs of his eſtate. They wiſh Count Rabutin had imitated thoſe heroes of ancient Rome, who encountered a ſentence of baniſhment with contempt and indifference; and they think it ſtrange that being diſgraced like Ovid, for ſome treatiſes concerning Love, he ſhould have alſo imitated that Poet's conduct in his diſgrace: every body knows what repeated complaints Ovid ſent to Rome, in order to be recalled. That vaſt number of poems full of ſupplications and humble lamentations do more honour to his wit than to his virtue or courage. But have thoſe, who thus cenſure Count Buſſy, known the allurements of a court life? Do they know what habits and diſtempers are contracted in it? If they did, they would perhaps be more indulgent to him. However, he at laſt reſigned himſelf to the providence of GOD. Read what he wrote on the twenty-ſixth of January 1680 (45). *It was a long time before I could believe it was for my good, (as my ghoſtly fathers told me) that providence laid theſe calamities upon me by ruining my fortune. But at laſt I have been convinced of it, for theſe three years; not only for my good in the other world, but alſo for my repoſe in this. GOD does already reward me in ſome meaſure for the pains of my reſignation, and I ſay at preſent of this good maſter what in my fooliſh youth I ſaid of love.*

Il paye en un moment un ſiecle de travaux,
Et tous les autres biens ne valent pas ſes maux (46).

God

(*uu*) *See, above, citation* (30), *of the article* CASSIUS SEVERUS.

(35) Philoſophical Tranſactions, *for Auguſt* 1669.

(36) *See, above, citation* (3), *of the article* MENAGE.

(37) *It is the cclxxxviii.*

(38) Patin, *Tom. iii, pag.* 153. *He had ſaid in his cccliv th Letter:* Mr de Buſſy Rabutin has been this day (the 18th of April 1665) committed to the Baſtille, for writing a libel, at which the ſuperior powers are offended. The Prince of Condé complained of it to the King, who has cauſed him to be ſeized and impriſoned.

(39) Buſſy, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 281.

(40) Mercure Galant, *of June* 1693. *The Count* de Buſſy *died of an Apoplexy at Autun, the ninth of April* 1693. *The Abbot* Bignon *ſucceeded him in the French Academy in June following.*

(41) February 1700, *pag.* 162, *& ſeq.*

(42) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *ibid. pag.* 168.

(43) *It was printed in the year* 1694, *and reprinted with the author's Memoirs in* 1697.

(44) *See the ſecond volume of his Letters, pag.* 44, 128, 131, 135, 138, 142, *Dutch Edit.*

(45) Buſſi Rabutin, Letter cxxxv, *of the ſecond part, pag.* 328, *Dutch Edit.*

(46) *See Mr de St Evremont's Reflexions on Religion, Vol. ii, of his Works, pag.* 333, 334, *of the Engliſh tranſlation. You will there find theſe words.* The Chriſtian Religion makes us enjoy misfortunes as bleſſings, and we may ſay ſeriouſly of it what was gallantly ſaid of love. *The pains of it are better than all other pleaſures.*

that bad examples riſe higher and higher without ſtint [*F*]. How many Hiſtories have been publiſhed againſt the principal perſons of the court of France, that of Bruſſels, *&c.* with the names, ſirnames, and titles, of every one of them, with the moſt ſecret circumſtances, and diſcourſes, and an hundred things of ſuch a nature, that it was impoſſible ſhould have come to the writers knowledge? Gabriel Naudé might, upon this occaſion ſay, with better grounds, what he ſaid of Procopius's Secret Hiſtory, of Mathew Paris's Hiſtory, of the ſcandalous Chronicle of Lewis XI, of the Memoirs of the League, *&c* (*ww*). Here one might reaſonably exclaim,

Quod genus hoc hominum? quæve hunc tam barbara morem
Permittit patria (*xx*)?

What men, what monſters, what inhuman race,
What laws, what barbarous cuſtoms of the place! DRYDEN.

But this exclamation ought not to be applied to the Republic of Holland, ſince it is not true that it ſuffers the moſt illuſtrious families to be thus barbarouſly abuſed. That Republic made the following anſwer, in the year 1665, to the Biſhop of Munſter, who complained, amongſt other things, of ſome writings. ‘ Quidquid vero ſeu de hoc ſeu ‘ de aliis negotiis in noſtris terris typis divulgatum eſt, de iis aliud nihil dicemus niſi ‘ illud ſolum, non tantum hic, verum paſſim in aliis quoque regionibus ægre admodum ‘ frenari & inhiberi poſſe typographicas licentias quantumvis diligens fuerit cautela; ‘ noſque ipſi contra iſtiuſmodi abuſus ſevera ſæpe promulgaverimus edicta, eademque ‘ ſævis & rigidis confirmaverimus executionibus. - - - - *As to what has been printed and* ‘ *publiſhed in our provinces with relation to this, or other affairs, we ſhall only ſay that the* ‘ *licentiouſneſs of the preſs is ſo great, not only in this country, but in many others, that it is* ‘ *extremely difficult to reſtrain and bridle it, notwithſtanding all the diligence and care taken* ‘ *for that purpoſe; and that we ourſelves have often publiſhed ſevere edicts againſt abuſes of* ‘ *this nature, and have confirmed theſe edicts by the moſt rigorous and exemplary puniſhments.*’ Theſe words contained in a Letter of their High Mightineſſes, dated the twenty-ninth of September

God in a moment's bliſs rewards an age of woes,
All pleaſures are not worth th' afflictions he beſtows.

A thought like this had been communicated to him a long time before: theſe are the words: *Do not you think I converſe with devout people as much as I can? It is indeed becauſe I find them more happy, both in their life and at their death, and I would gladly partake of their condition. There is nothing like devotion for an unfortunate perſon; it not only ſolaces troubles, but converts them into pleaſures* (47). This confirms what I have ſaid in the *Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes* (48), and the remark [*R*], of the article EPICURUS.

Note, that tho' this Count's poſthumous works are ingenious and polite; yet this *Hiſtoire amoureuſe des Gaules* will make him more known as an author, than any other book he wrote. His fate in this is like that of Boccace (49).

For the reſt, the falſhood abovementioned, concerning the paſſage of the Boyne, calls to my mind Father Londel's Faſti (50), where we find theſe words on the eleventh of July 1690. *The battle of the Boyne in Ireland: Schomberg is killed at the head of the Engliſh.* This is a downright trick, which cannot be excuſed by the reaſon I have alledged to leſſen Count Buſſy's fault; for this work of Father du Londel, was compoſed with attention, and was doubtleſs carefully poliſhed and reviſed: writings of that kind are only commendable for a great exactneſs. And therefore it will be no raſh judgment to affirm that the author purpoſely uſed equivocal words, to conceal from the reader the diſadvantage of his party, and the true ſucceſs of that battle. He not only ſuppreſſed the moſt eſſential circumſtance, which is to ſhew whether the victory was doubtful, or whether it declared entirely for this or that nation; but he has artfully ſlipt in a true circumſtance, which is only fit to make one conclude that King James had the honour of that day. Schomberg falling at the head of the Engliſh is a principle, from which an hundred thouſand readers would draw this conſequence, *Therefore King William was repulſed.* Give it what turn you pleaſe, you will find nothing to excuſe this author: inſincerity, ſhame, or the fear of diſpleaſing, made him ſpeak as he did. Notwithſtanding this fault and ſome others of the ſame nature (51), his book is good, curious, uſeful, and convenient, and of a fine invention. Such books will be compoſed in other countries (52), but of whatever ſect or nation a man be, he ſhould get his book read by ſome impartial perſon well verſed in the art of qualifying things; for prejudices do not ſuffer us to define things exactly, a mere fight we call a battle; the loſs of a battle a check; an engagement, an encounter. The worſt is, that ſome call a defeat what others call a victory. The definitions of theſe things are no leſs different among Hiſtorians, than the definitions of doctrines among Controverſiſts (53). And as an opinion which is Orthodox in one religion, is Heretical in another; that, which is a battle won in the Hiſtorians of one nation, is a battle loſt in the Hiſtorians of another. It is a very antient abuſe, for which we ſee no remedy.

[*F*] *Bad examples riſe higher and higher without ſtint.*] Velleius Peterculus very well expreſſes this maxim, after having related that Tiberius Gracchus was maſſacred without any trial. This was, ſays he (54), the beginning of the ſlaughter of the citizens in Rome itſelf; from hence proceeded the impunity of maſſacres. *Quod haud mirum eſt*, adds he (55), *non enim ibi conſiſtunt exempla, unde cœperunt; ſed quamlibet in tenuem recepta tramitem, latiſſime evagandi ſibi viam faciunt: &, ubi ſemel recto deerratum eſt, in præceps pervenitur: nec quiſquam ſibi putat turpe, quod alii fuit fructuoſum.* ‘ And no wonder; for bad examples ſtop not where ‘ they begin: but tho' the path through which they ‘ get in be ever ſo narrow, as ſoon as they are admitted they make a new way, and extend themſelves ‘ on all ſides without any bounds. Thus when a man ‘ once quits the right road, he commonly arrives to ‘ the brink of a precipice: and no body thinks that ‘ can be a diſgrace to him which proves advantageous ‘ to another.’ The ſame maxim may be ſeen in a ſpeech of Julius Cæſar, related by Salluſt. He there ſhews that all bad examples ariſe from a good beginning (56), becauſe the innovations, which at firſt are good and uſeful, quickly give occaſion to diſorders, that continually increaſe. To this may be applied the thought of Juvenal: that man never keeps within the bounds of permiſſion (57).

[G] *Theſe*

(*ww*) Alii denique ſimiles libelli qui ſtatim in vulgus effundunt, *quid Rex in aurem Reginæ dixerit, quid Juno fabulata ſit cum Jove.* Hi autem omnes quoniam facta plerumque atque infecta canunt, nunciique tam ficti quam veri tenaces exiſtunt, *&c.* - - - *In fine, there are ſeveral other libels of the ſame kind which immediately give the people to know* what the King whiſpered in the Queen's ear, and what converſation paſſed between Juno and Jupiter. *As all theſe writers relate, for the moſt part, things which have happened, as well as things which have not, things real, as well as imaginary*, &c. Gabriel Naudæus, Bibliogr. Polit. *pag. m.* 70. *See concerning the words printed in* Roman, Plautus *in* Trinummo, *Act. I, Sc. II, ver.* 170, *pag. m.* 735.

(*xx*) Virgil. Æneid. lib. i, ver. 543.

(47) Buſſi Rabutin's Letters, *Part iii, Letter* CC, *(dated the 14th of April* 1672) *p.* 361.

(48) *There is no ſweetneſs in a ſinful courſe of life, that can be compared to the ſweetneſs which a devout ſoul enjoys.* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, *pag.* 570.

(49) *See, above, remark* [*I*], *of the article* BOCCACE.

(50) *They are mentioned in the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *Febr.* 1699, *p.* 223.

(51) *For inſtance, when he ſays upon the* 11*th of Auguſt* 1675, The defeat at Conſarbruck, *without ſaying who thoſe were who were defeated.*

(52) *This has already been done in Brandenbourg.*

(53) *Compare with this the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, 1686, *pag.* 277, 309, *& ſeq.* 354, 645, 960.

(54) Vell. Paterculus, *lib. ii, cap. iii.*

(55) Ibid.

(56) Omnia mala exempla ex bonis initiis orta ſunt. *Salluſt. in Bello Catilin. pag. m.* 146.

(57) Nemo ſatis credit tantum delinquere, quantum Permittas: adeo indulgent ſibi latius ipſi. *Juven. Sat. XIV, ver.* 233.

September 1665, and printed with licence, may ſerve for a general anſwer to all complaints of the ſame nature [G].

XI.
An avowal of Count Buſſy. The Secret Hiſtory of Pope Alexander VI.

It will not be amiſs to inſert here the public avowal of Count Buſſy Rabutin. ‘Five years ago being in the country, and not knowing how to divert my ſelf, I verified the proverb, that idleneſs is the mother of all vices: for I fell a writing an Hiſtory, or rather a ſatirical romance, indeed without any deſign to make a bad uſe of it; but only to employ my ſelf, and at moſt to ſhew it to ſome friends, in order to divert them, and to be praiſed by them as a tolerable writer *(yy)* . . . . As true events are never extraordinary enough to be very entertaining, I had recourſe to invention, which I thought would be more pleaſing; and without any ſcruple of offending the perſons concerned, becauſe I did it almoſt only for my ſelf, I wrote a thouſand things which I had never heard of. I made ſome perſons happy, who had not ſo much as heard of it, and others who had never thought of being ſo; and becauſe it had been ridiculous to chooſe two women for the heroines of my romance, who had neither birth nor merit, I made choice of two who wanted no good qualities, and even poſſeſſed ſo many, that envy might contribute to render credible all the ill things I could invent of them *(zz)*.’ You have here a true picture of the conduct of ſatirical writers. Whether they write out of revenge or jealouſy; or whether they do it to diſplay their thoughts, and exerciſe their pen; the main thing they aim at is the diverſion of the readers, and to be praiſed for their parts. Now becauſe they are afraid

[G] *Theſe words . . . may ſerve as a general anſwer to all complaints of the ſame nature.*] And yet there are very few French Roman Catholics, but ſay that certainly the States are not diſpleaſed with the liberty which the Bookſellers take to publiſh all ſorts of ſatires againſt thoſe who are not in the intereſt of their country, ſome on long and narrow ſlips of paper, and ſome in many pages, all full, ſay they, of heinous lies, eſpecially during the laſt war: This is a maſter-ſtroke of policy, ſay they, the States were very glad, to foment animoſities, and to keep up the hopes of the people, that they might more patiently bear the charges of the war, and by their hatred of a foreign government, grow more in love with their own country. The Athenians uſed the ſame policy, and if we had all they ſaid and publiſhed againſt the Perſians and Macedonians, we ſhould find that the magiſtrates gave their helping hand to it, in order to inſpire more zeal for the preſervation of a government, which beſides the public ſhews, and many other ſuch things agreeable to the multitude, afforded them the pleaſure of compoſing and reading a vaſt number of libels againſt the enemy. Beſides it was a good way of purging the ſatiriſts, by giving vent to the peccant humours which might have occaſioned defluxions on the internal parts; for had they been reſtrained with reſpect to ſtrangers, they would have vomited their gall on their own maſters. This is what the French ſay, without forgetting that their nation had been kept pure and clean from this licentiouſneſs, and that it is one of their nobleſt triumphs. But a ſatisfactory anſwer is made to them, as to all thoſe political myſteries they mention, which are only imaginary: they are deſired to conſider the conſtitution of a free ſtate, wherein it is eſſential that every member ſhould be ſecured from that rigorous proſecution, practiſed in monarchies. However I will quote an author who makes ſome complaints (58): ‘They have printed in Holland, within theſe few years, a great many libels againſt France; there are ſatirical Hiſtories againſt the moſt illuſtrious perſons of the court. It were to be wiſhed that ſome of our authors would undeceive the public on that head, and ſhew that thoſe ſorts of Hiſtories are ſuppoſititious. The authors of them are ſorry wretches, who write them in order to get a little money from a greedy Printer, and write all that comes into their head. How could ſuch people know all the ſecret particulars which they relate? How came they by the letters which they have the impudence to print as genuine? They who beſt know the court, and have been there ſeveral years, could ſcarce tell ſo many particularities. Is it likely that a poor ſcribbler lodged in a garret, who correſponds with no body but a Bookſeller greedy of money, ſhould be ſo well acquainted with all thoſe adventures, if they were true? The late Mr Mezerai, whoſe Hiſtory of France is deſervedly ſo much eſteemed, could not endure theſe ſorts of Hiſtories and Novels; he would have all to be true or falſe (59): a mixture of both appeared monſtrous to him, and even of dangerous conſequence to poſterity; and indeed who knows but that two or three hundred years hence, they who ſhall write the Hiſtory of our times, may take theſe ſatirical books for original and authentic Memoirs written by cotemporary authors, who ought to be credited (60)? Since we cannot extirpate thoſe plagues of Hiſtory, we muſt at leaſt warn thoſe, who ſhall come after us, not to be deceived by them.’

We muſt own there are very good things in this paſſage, and that the author has very good reaſon to ſay that it were to be wiſhed, that care was taken to refute what can be refuted; for what will our poſterity think, when they ſhall read ſo many things made current, without any oppoſition? How will they be able to forbear believing that they are true? Will they not ſay that if they had been falſe, they would have been confuted for the honour of thoſe whom they blemiſh? How many people are there, whom the ſatires of the XVIth century keep ſtill in error? Thoſe of our time will not be leſs active in future ages, and we muſt not imagine, that they will not laſt long, becauſe they diſappear in the Bookſellers ſhops in two or three months time. They will be preſerved in the moſt famous libraries, in which they have been carefully collected. I do not pretend that there is a neceſſity to confute all libels; that would be an endleſs work and oftentimes very needleſs. It were ſufficient to refute thoſe which have ſomething of the character of an Hiſtory, and to give ſome general rules for diſcerning the truth, and ſecuring ones ſelf againſt the boldneſs of ſatirical writers. For example, a man of ability, and well informed, ſhould criticiſe the book, intituled, *Annales de la Cour & de Paris pour les années* 1697, & 1698 (61). - - *Annals of the French Court, and of Paris, for the years* 1697 *and* 1698. If he ſhould demonſtrate the falſity of five or ſix of the moſt remarkable particulars, all the reſt would fall of itſelf; eſpecially if the readers were told that they cannot reaſonably believe what is advanced by ſuch writers, unleſs their relations be attended with certain characters, for want of which one ought to ſuppoſe that all their ſtories are only the diſcourſes of taverns and coffee-houſes. Theſe places are the magazines and ſtore-houſes of falſe news, and may be rightly compared to the Mythology of Natalis Comes. Such a work as the refutation I ſpeak of, would ſerve as a preſervative an hundred years hence, and would be of great uſe to thoſe who ſhould endeavour to find out Hiſtorical Truths.

The author whom I have quoted has forgot a neceſſary reflexion: he ſhould have complained of France as much as of Holland; for it is particularly in France, that the writings of which he complains ſell well. If the French would neither read nor buy them, the Bookſellers would not print them, and thus the greedineſs of the French contributes as much as any thing elſe to the production of libels: the liars and the credulous feed one another mutually; each of them lives upon the purſe of the other.

[*H*] *The*

(yy) Buſſy Rabutin's Letters to the Duke of St Aignan, *inſerted in the book concerning* the Uſe of Adverſity, *pag.* 265, *of the Dutch edition. That Letter is dated the* 12*th of November* 1665.

(zz) Ibid. *pag.* 266.

(58) Diverſitez Curieuſes, *Part.* x, *p.* 173, 174, *Dutch Edit.* 1699.

(59) Compare this with the remark [*C*], of the article NIDHARD.

(60) Compare with this what has been ſaid in remark [*A*], of this Diſſertation.

(61) Printed in 1701.

afraid that meer truth would afford but little diverſion, and that their work would be accounted a very indifferent performance, they ſeaſon their relations with a thouſand falſe ſtories; they invent extraordinary adventures, and converſations, and apply to thoſe they ſpeak of whatever they have read that is moſt proper to give a high reliſh. If you examine the ſmarteſt and beſt written ſatires, you will find the ſpirit of the author, his ſtile and character, in all the letters and converſations he aſcribes to lovers. Is not this a proof that he writes a romance? If the Hiſtory of Donna Olympia, and an hundred other pieces of the ſame nature, were written with the ſimplicity which is to be obſerved in Burchardus's Journal (zz*), they would be incomparably more credible. I do not ſay that the readers would be more perſuaded of the truth of them, but only that they ought to be ſo; for I know that the readers proportion their perſuaſion to the probability the writers obſerve, and to the pleaſure they afford by ſatirical ſtrokes in their writings, and by the wonderful events they relate. This is ſo true, that, notwithſtanding the public confeſſion of Count Rabutin, moſt people do ſtill believe, that his relations are truly hiſtorical. Take notice of the words, in which he tells us, that his manuſcript was falſified by a lady to whom he had lent it. ‘ She added to, or left out of that Hiſtory, what ſhe pleaſed, to expoſe me to the hatred of moſt of thoſe I ſpoke of: which is ſo true, that the firſt copies that were ſeen were not falſified; but as ſoon as the others appeared, as every body loves the ſharpeſt ſatires, the true ones were thought inſipid, and ſuppreſſed as falſe (*a*).’

The journal I have juſt now mentioned was written by a German, Maſter of the Ceremonies at the court of Pope Alexander VI. His nation and the poſt he was in aſſure us of two things, one that he relates things faithfully, the other that he was able to come to the truth of what he relates. So that there is no reaſon to doubt of thoſe infamous ſights, wherewith the Pope and his daughter fed their eyes, I mean that collation which the Duke of Valentinois gave to fifty courtezans, and the combat of four ſtone-horſes let looſe upon two mares. Beſides, as I have already ſaid, the plain and barbarous ſtyle of the writer does not permit to ſuſpect that he wrote for the diverſion of the reader and his own commendation. You may judge of it by this little ſpecimen. ‘ Dominica ultima menſis Octobris in ſero fecerunt cœnam cum Duce Valentinenſi in camera ſua in palatio Apoſtolico quinquaginta meretrices honeſtæ, Cortegianæ nuncupatæ, quæ poſt cœnam chorearunt cum ſervitoribus & aliis ibidem exiſtentibus, primo in veſtibus ſuis, deinde nudæ. Poſt cœnam poſita fuerunt candelabra communia menſæ cum candelis ardentibus & projectæ ante candelabra per terram caſtaneæ, quas meretrices ipſæ ſuper manibus & pedibus nudæ candelabra pertranſeuntes colligebant, Papa, Duce, & Lucretia ſorore ſua præſentibus & aſpicientibus: tandem expoſita dona ultimo, diploides de ſerico, paria caligarum, bireta & alia, pro illis qui plures dictas meretrices carnaliter agnoſcerent, quæ fuerunt ibidem in aula publicè carnaliter tractatæ arbitrio præſentium, & dona diſtributa Victoribus. Feria quinta, undecima menſis Novembris intravit urbem per portam viridarii quidam ruſticus ducens duas equas lignis oneratas, quæ cum eſſent in plateola S. Petri, accurrerunt ſtipendiarii Papæ, inciſiſque pectoralibus & lignis projectis in terram cum baſtis, duxerunt equas ad illam plateolam quæ eſt inter palatium juxta illius portam, tum emiſſi fuerunt quatuor equi curſerii liberi ſuis frœnis & capiſtris ex palatio, qui accurrerunt ad equas, & inter ſe propterea cum magno ſtrepitu & clamore morſibus & calceis contendentes aſcenderunt èquas & coierunt cum eis, & eas graviter piſtarunt & læſerunt, Papa in feneſtra cameræ ſupra portam palatii & Domina Lucretia cum eo exiſtente, cum magno riſu & delectatione præmiſſa videntibus (*b*). - - - - - - *On the evening of the laſt Sunday in the month of October, fifty reputable harlots, called courtezans, ſupped with the Duke of Valentinois, in the chamber he had in the Pope's palace; after ſupper they danced with the ſervants and others who were preſent, firſt in their cloaths, and afterwards ſtark naked: then candleſticks were brought upon the table, with candles burning, and before them were thrown upon the ground a great many cheſnuts, which theſe naked harlots ſcrambled for, creeping upon all four, and paſſing backward and forward before the candleſticks, while the Pope, the Duke, and Lucretia, his ſiſter, were preſent and looking on. At laſt ſeveral ſilk doublets, pairs of breeches, and ſtockings, caps, and other rewards, were offered to thoſe who ſhould lie with the greateſt number of theſe courtezans: whereupon thoſe who were preſent publickly lay with as many of them as they pleaſed, and afterwards the rewards were diſtributed to the victors. On Thurſday the eleventh of November a peaſant entered the city, driving two mares laden with wood; when he came to St Peter's Square, the Pope's ſervants immediately run to the mares, cut their girts, threw off their wood and their pack-ſaddles, and brought them to the little court which is nigh the palace-gate: then they let looſe four ſtone-horſes, without any halters or bridles, who run to the mares, and with great noiſe and clamour, biting and kicking one another, mounted and covered them, and greatly bruiſed and hurt them. The Pope being at the window of a chamber over the palace-gate, and the lady Lucretia with him, beheld all this with great mirth and delight.*’

XII.
Laws of Charles V, &c. againſt

Was I further to enlarge upon the ſubject of this Diſſertation, I ſhould hope the reader would excuſe my prolixity, if he conſidered the abundance and importance of the matter, and the care I ſhould take, as I have done hitherto, not to tranſcribe the

---

(zz*) Johannes Burchardus, *Argentinenſis, Capellæ Alexandri Sexti Papæ Clericus Ceremoniarum Magiſter. The* Excerpta, *out of his* Diarium, *were printed at Hanover in* 1696, *by the care of Mr* Leibniz, *with this title,* Specimen Hiſtoriæ Arcanæ ſive Anecdotæ de Vita Alexandri IV Papæ.

(*a*) Buſſy, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 269.

(*b*) Specimen Hiſtor. Arcanæ ſeu Anecdotæ de Vita Alexandri VI Papæ, *pag.* 77, 78.

libels. How Pope Hadrian VI was diſſuaded from overthrowing Paſquin's ſtatue.

Civilians who have written ſo many books upon this queſtion [*H*]. It is eaſy to be copious upon a ſubject which affords ſo many reflexions, and wherein the public is ſo much concerned, that all legiſlators concur in ſeverely puniſhing the authors of defamatory libels. We have ſeen that the laws of the twelve tables ſentenced them to death, and it is not true that Auguſtus repealed them in this reſpect (*c*): we have ſeen the contrary above. One of the greateſt Emperors that lived ſince Auguſtus, appointed the puniſhment of Retaliation (*d*); for he ordered that libellers ſhould undergo the ſame puniſhment with thoſe whom they defame, and who ſhould be convicted: nay he would not have them to go unpuniſhed, tho' they ſhould ſay nothing but truth. 'Per hoc 'autem quod verum ſcripſerit infamans nullam meretur excuſationem, ſiquidem veri'tatem criminis per libellum famoſum pandere non licet, & edens libellum famoſum 'injuriarum tenetur, nec admitti debet edens libellum famoſum & injuriarum conventus 'ad probationem veritatis criminis. Joannes Thilemannus de Benignis, alias Goth. '*Obſ. Practi.* 86. Quod etiam confirmatur per conſtitutionem Caroli V. criminal. '*arti.* 110. *in f.* ubi hæc verba habentur: Et licet illata injuria prætenſi facti vera eſſet, 'debet tamen diffamator talis injuriæ ſecundum jus & arbitrium judicis puniri (*e*). '- - - - *But a defamer deſerves no excuſe, though his defamation ſhould prove true: for it* '*is not lawful to divulge in a defamatory libel the truth of a crime, and the publiſher of ſuch* '*a libel is guilty of an action of treſpaſs, nor ought he, or the publiſher of many accuſations,* '*to be admitted to prove theſe accuſations. . . . . This is alſo confirmed by the conſtitution of* '*the Emperor Charles V, where theſe words are to be found.* And tho' the defamation 'were grounded upon truth, yet the defamer ought to be puniſhed according to the 'power and at the diſcretion of the judge.' In France the famous edict of January condemned them and their abettors to be whipped, and in caſe of relapſe, to be puniſhed with death. *Ne quis infames libellos ad quemquam traducendum faciat, divendat, aut divendendos curet. Qui ſecus faxit, primùm fuſtigium, ſecundùm, capitalis pœna indicta eſto* (*f*). I mean here by abettors thoſe who procured the publication, or the ſale of a libel. This was renewed by King Henry III, in the year 1577. The law of the Emperors Valentinian and Valens is very ſevere; for it condemns to a capital puniſhment ſuch as meeting with a libel by chance, divulged it inſtead of tearing or burning it. 'Si quis famoſum libellum, ſive domi ſit, ſive in publico, vel quocunque loco 'etiam ignarus repererit, nec ſtatim corruperit, aut igne conſumpſerit, ſed vim ejus 'manifeſtaverit, quaſi auctor hujuſmodi delicti ſententiæ capitali ſubjiciatur. - - - - - - '*If any perſon ſhall meet with a defamatory libel, either in a private or public place, even if* '*he meets with it only by chance, and does not immediatly deſtroy or burn it, but divulges the* '*ſame, let him be ſubject to a capital puniſhment, as the author of ſuch a treſpaſs.*' See Naudé's Maſcurat, at the 657th page. But ſo many temptations to prolixity will not hinder me from putting an end to this diſſertation, when I have related a thing which I remember I have promiſed, and made three or four other conſiderations.

Pope Hadrian VI hearkened to reaſon, when it was repreſented to him that the remedy he was going to employ againſt Paſquinades, would be uſeleſs. I will uſe Mr Flechier's words: 'An infinite number of libels were then current in Spain, againſt 'the court of Flanders, and againſt Ximenes himſelf. The Flemings *, who were not 'uſed to this ſort of ſmart and ingenious ſatires, complained of them, and the Cardinal 'had orders to ſearch after the authors and Printers, and to puniſh them ſeverely. He 'cauſed, out of form, ſome Bookſellers houſes to be ſearched, but ſo lightly that no 'body was diſturbed at it. He was of opinion that inferiors ſhould have the liberty of 'revenging themſelves for their ſufferings by words or writings, which laſt no longer 'than a man's offended at them, and which loſe their charms and venom when they 'are deſpiſed. Alphonſo Caſtile, governor of Madrid, having met with ſome of theſe 'works reflecting upon Cardinal Hadrian and La-Chaux, Ambaſſadors of Charles, 'ſhewed them to them, and they were very much diſpleaſed at it, eſpecially Hadrian, 'who was for ſome time inconſolable. It is ſaid that being afterwards raiſed to 'St Peter's chair, and not being able to bear the ſtatues of Paſquin and Marforio, 'whom the facetious and ſatirical wits have choſen for the confidents and authors of 'their calumnies, ordered them to be thrown into the Tiber; which had been executed, 'if the Duke of Seſſa, the Spaniſh Ambaſſador, had not very wiſely told him: *What* '*are you going to do, holy father? It is much better ſtill to pardon thoſe two mutes, than to* '*open*

(*c*) Lewis Gilhauſen, *p.* 222, *of his Commentary upon the Pandects,* De injuriis & famoſis Libellis, *does falſly aſcribe this to that Emperor, and wrongly alledges* Horace *for it, whoſe authority would do him no ſervice, though he had quoted him better than he has done.* Hanc pœnam capitalem, *ſays he,* Auguſtus ſuſtulit, ut videre eſt ex Horatio, *lib. i, epiſtolar. ad Auguſtum.*

(*d*) *Charles V,* Conſtitutio Caroli V. Cæſaris de Cauſſis capitalibus, *Art. cx. Edita in infamantem, pœnam eamdem irrogat quam mereretur diffamatus libello, ſi ejus criminis reus quo accuſatur peractus eſſet.* Petrus Gregor. Syntag. juris, *lib. xxxviii, cap. vi. See alſo* Gilhauſen, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 225.

(*e*) Gilhauſen, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 225, 226.

(*f*) Commentar. de ſtatu Relig. & Reip. in regno Gall. *ad ann.* 1561.

* *Alvar. Gomez de reb. geſt. Ximen. lib. vii.*

[*H*] *The Civilians, who have written ſo many books upon this queſtion, &c.*] Mr Furetiere has quoted four or five in one of his Caſes. It is where he would prove that his book againſt ſome Academiſts deſerved not to be called a libel by the ſentence of the Chatelet. I have in vain ſearched after Gabriel Naudé's book, intituled, *Marfore, ou Diſcours contre les Libelles.* It was printed at Paris by Lewis Boulenger in 8vo. I know not in what year. Leo Allatius mentions it in a book, (62) which he publiſhed in the year 1633. Mr Baillet (63) cites a book which I would fain have read. It is the *celeſtial ſhield of John Baptiſt Nocette a Genoeſe, againſt Defamatory Libels.* The abbot Michael Juſtiniani (64), ſays, the firſt edition was printed at Paris, in the year 1653, in 4to; and the ſecond, at Lyons 1664, in 12mo. It is written in Italian. Alegambe's Continuator (65) mentions but one edition, *viz.* that of Paris 1655. See the Margin (66).

(62) *Intituled,* Apes Urbanæ.

(63) Baillet, Jugem. des Sçavans, ſur les Préjugez des libelles diffamatoires, &c. *part ii, ch. viii.*

(64) Gli Scrittori Liguri deſcritti, *pag.* 337, 338.

(65) Nathan. Sotuel, Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jeſu, *pag.* 415.

(66) *The authors quoted by* Furetiere, *pag.* 12, *of the third Caſe, are* Franciſcus Balduinus, *Paris* 1562: Fredericus Banvinus: Aurelius de Vergeriis, *printed in the year* 1564, *in 8vo:* Joan. Conradus Rokembach, *at Straſbourg, in* 1660, *in 4to: and* Henricus Boceerus, *at Tubingen* 1611, *in 8vo. I believe that his* Fredericus Banvinus *is an imaginary author, whoſe name has by degrees been taken from* Franciſcus Balduinus *thro' ſome errors of the preſs, and the abbreviations of the ſirname. The book of this Banvinus is mentioned in ſuch a manner by Draudius, pag. m.* 782, *as perfectly agrees with Balduinus's book.*

‘ *open the mouths of all the town. If you throw them into the river, the frogs will croak* ‘ *the railleries which we read as we go by them: and what two dead ſtones ſhall no longer* ‘ *ſpeak, will be divulged by all perſons living.* The Pope followed this advice, and was ‘ afterwards leſs nice upon this ſubject (*g*).’ That you may ſee more particularly the ſenſibility of this Pope, I will ſet down the words of Paul Jovius, who tells us that the Spaniſh Ambaſſador was forced to renew his advice. ‘ Graviſſime etiam tulerat ſe ‘ famoſis carminibus apud Paſquilli ſtatuam fuiſſe laceratum, ſed id poſtea civili animo ‘ tulit, cum didiciſſet, eam maledicendi licentiam obſcurorum hominum libertati atque ‘ nequitiæ dari, ut cum inſignes viros impunè carpſerint, fortunam ſuam ea vindictæ ‘ voluptate conſolentur. Decreverat Hadrianus uti poëtis non obſcurè ſubiratus, Paſquilli ‘ ſtatuam, quæ erat in Parione, demoliri, atque eam in Tyberim præcipitare: ſed ‘ Ludovicus Sueſſanus urbano ſalſoque ingenio id fieri debere pernegavit, ſubdens, Paſquillum vel in imo vado ranarum more, non eſſe taciturum, ad id verò pontifex, ex‘ uratur ergo, inquit, in calcem, ne ejus veſtigii ulla omnino memoria ſuperſit: Tum ‘ rurſus Sueſſanus, rectè inquit, ſed tam crudeliter concremato poëtæ clientes non ‘ deerunt, qui patroni cineres invidioſis carminibus proſequantur, & ſupplicii locum ‘ quotannis ſtatuto ſolenni die concelebrent. Quibus verborum luſibus pontifex ab ‘ iracundia ad jocos hilaritatemque ſenſus omnes leniſſimè revocavit (*h*). - - - - - - *Pope* ‘ *Hadrian was alſo highly offended at ſome ſatirical verſes written upon him, and faſtened to* ‘ *Paſquin's ſtatue; but he afterwards bore this with great calmneſs, when he came to know* ‘ *that this licentiouſneſs of defaming was to be tolerated in obſcure and invidious men, that* ‘ *they might comfort themſelves in their hard fortune, by the pleaſure and revenge they took in* ‘ *being ſuffered to defame eminent men. Hadrian, being highly incenſed againſt the Poets,* ‘ *had reſolved that Paſquin's ſtatue ſhould be taken down, and even caſt into the Tiber. But* ‘ *Lewis Duke of Seſſa, a man of wit and humour, repreſented that ſuch a thing ought not to* ‘ *be done, alledging that if Paſquin was in the bottom of the river, he would not be ſilent, but* ‘ *would croak like the frogs. To this the Pope anſwered,* let him therefore be burnt to ‘ aſhes, ſo that there may not remain the leaſt remembrance of him. Right, *ſaid the* ‘ *Duke,* but if Paſquin ſhould be ſo cruelly burnt, he would not be abandoned by the ‘ Poets, his clients, who would attend the aſhes of their patron with many ſatirical ‘ verſes, and would ſet a part a day yearly for celebrating the place of his ſuffering. ‘ *Theſe facetious words appeaſed the Pope's anger, and put him in a merry and chearful* ‘ *humour.*’

XIII. Princes who have deſpiſed ſlanders.

Some Princes have been as inſenſible to ſlanders as Cardinal Ximenés. See in Seneca (*i*) how Antigonus (*k*) pardoned ſome ſoldiers who had lampooned him. The ſame author alledges (*l*) the patience of Philip of Macedon, and that of Auguſtus. This Emperor expreſſed an admirable good humour towards a ſatirical Hiſtorian (*m*), who had abuſed him, his wife and children. Nothing was more likely to exaſperate a potent Prince, who beſides knew that the witiciſms of the Hiſtorian had been taken up and ſpread over all the town. This is cuſtomary. The Chevalier de Meré has wiſely ſaid, *That ſlanders are very much to be feared, when they are expreſſed in witty ſayings, becauſe people delight to repeat them, and love always to commend a good thought* (*n*). But Seneca ſays with more reaſon ſtill, that witty ſayings, which expoſe their authors to ſome danger, are more ſtudiouſly obſerved than any others. ‘ Multa & divus Auguſtus digna ‘ memoria fecit, dixitque, ex quibus appareat illi iram non imperaſſe. Timagenes hi‘ ſtoriarum ſcriptor, quædam in ipſum, quædam in uxorem ejus, & in totam domum ‘ dixerat, nec perdiderat dicta: magis enim circumfertur, & in ore hominum eſt, te‘ meraria urbanitas (*o*). - - - - *Many of the actions and ſayings of Auguſtus deſerve to be re-* ‘ *membred, and manifeſt that he was far from being maſtered by anger. Timagenes, an* ‘ *Hiſtorian, had paſſed ſome invidious jeſts on the Emperor, his wife, and his whole family;* ‘ *and theſe jeſts were not diſregarded and forgot; for men love to ſpread and repeat witty* ‘ *ſayings, when they are indiſcreet, and expoſe the authors of them to danger.*’ However it be, the detraction of this Hiſtorian brought but a ſmall diſgrace upon him. Add to this what I have cited above (*p*). Nothing can be more rational than Mæcenas's arguments about the contempt that this Emperor ought to expreſs for ſlanders (*q*). He adviſed him not to hearken to the informers againſt ſatiriſts, and to puniſh no body for ſpeaking ill of him. You may ſee in Dion Caſſius the reaſons of this advice. The ſame Hiſtorian will inform you, why Cæſar took no notice of the injurious things that Cicero, and ſome others divulged againſt him (*r*). He thought they aimed at the glory of equalling themſelves with him they abuſed, and that it was better to deprive them of this advantage, by avoiding to contend with them. The reaſon he went upon was contained in an oration of Quintus Metellus Numidicus, if we judge of it by this diſcourſe of Aulus Gellius; however, I would not have it to be extended ſo far as to Cicero. ‘ Cum inquinatiſſimis hominibus non eſſe convicio decertandum, neque in maledictis ‘ adverſus impudentes & improbos velitandum, quia tantiſper ſimilis & compar eorum ‘ fias, dum paria & conſimilia dicas atque audias, non minus ex oratione Q. Metelli ‘ Numidici ſapientis viri cognoſci poteſt, quàm ex libris & diſciplinis philoſophorum. ‘ Verba hæc ſunt Metelli adverſus Cn. Manlium tribunum plebei, à quo apud populum in concione laceſſitus jactatuſque fuerat dictis petulantibus, *Nunc quod ad illum at-* ‘ *tinet, Quirites, quoniam ſe ampliorem putat eſſe, ſi ſe mihi inimicum dictitaverit, quem ego*

(*g*) Flechier, Hiſtoire du Cardinal Ximenés, *livr. vi, p.* 814, *Dutch Edit.*

(*h*) Paul. Jovius, in Vita Hadriani ſexti, *pag. m.* 277, 278. *See alſo* Camerarius's Hiſtorical Meditations. *He ſuppoſes that the ſecond anſwer was made by a Cardinal, and not by the Ambaſſador, and that it was a wooden ſtatue,*

(*i*) Seneca, de Ira, *lib. iii, cap. xxii.*

(*k*) *He was not grandfather to Alexander the Great, as Seneca ſays.*

(*l*) Seneca, ubi ſupra, *cap. xxiii.*

(*m*) Called *Timagenes.*

(*n*) Chevalier de Meré, Diſcours de la Converſation, *p.* 81, 82, *Dutch Edit.*

(*o*) Seneca, ubi ſupra, *cap. xxiii, pag. m.* 570.

(*p*) *At the beginning of this Diſſertation, citations (e) and (f).*

(*q*) *See* Dion Caſſius, *lib. lii, pag. m.* 556.

(*r*) Dion, ibid. *lib. xxxviii, p. m.* 71, 72.

mihi neque amicum recipio, neque inimicum reſpicio, in eum ego non ſum plura dicturus; nam eum indigniſſimum arbitror, cui à viris bonis benedicatur: tum ne idoneum quidem, cui à probis maledicatur: nam ſi in eo tempore hujuſcemodi homunculum nomines, in quo pœnire non poſſis, majore honore quam contumelia afficias (s). - - - *That we ought not to contend in defamation and reproaches with baſe and diſhoneſt, or with impudent and wicked men, (for by returning the ſame or the like invectives and abuſe we put ourſelves on a level with ſuch perſons) we may learn not only from the writings and doctrines of the Philoſophers, but likewiſe from the oration of Quintus Metellus Numidicus, who was a very wiſe man. Theſe are the words of Metellus, againſt Cneius Manlius the tribune, who had made an harangue to the people, in which he had treated him in the moſt opprobrious and abuſive manner.* Now, Romans, as for this Manlius, becauſe he expects to paſs for a man of greater importance, by often calling himſelf an enemy to me, a man whom I neither admit to my friendſhip, nor regard as my enemy, I will ſay no more of him, for I think he is far from deſerving to be commended by honeſt men, nor even worthy to be cenſured by good men: for the very naming of ſuch a wretch, at a time when he cannot be puniſhed, does him more honour than diſcredit.' But Cæſar not being yet Emperor, his conduct on this occaſion is not of ſo great weight for this part of my work as that of Tiberius mentioned by Tacitus. A lady was charged with having ſpoken ill of Auguſtus, of the Empreſs Livia, and of Tiberius. She was proſecuted upon the law *de Majeſtate*. Tiberius would have a diſtinction made; I will not, ſaid he, have her proſecuted for what concerns me; but if ſhe be found guilty as to Auguſtus, let her be puniſhed. He anſwered nothing the firſt day about his mother; but the next day he declared, that ſhe deſired no body ſhould be brought into trouble for ſatirical words ſpoken againſt her. ‘Adoleſcebat interea lex majeſtatis; & Apuleiam Variliam ſororis Auguſti neptem, quia probroſis ſermonibus divum Auguſtum, ac Tiberium, & matrem ejus inluſiſſet, Cæſarique connexa adulterio teneretur, majeſtatis delator arceſſebat. *De adulterio ſatis caveri lege Julia* viſum: *majeſtatis crimen diſtingui* Cæſar poſtulavit; *damnarique ſi qua de Auguſto irreligioſe dixiſſet: in ſe jacta nolle ad cognitionem vocari.* Interrogatus à conſule *quid de his cenſeret, quæ de matre ejus locuta ſecus argueretur,* reticuit: dein proximo ſenatus die, illius quoque nomine oravit, *ne cui verba in eam quoquo modo habita crimini forent:* liberavitque Apuleium lege majeſtatis (t). - - - *The law of violated Majeſty, in the mean time, began to be of more force; and by it an accuſer impleaded Apuleia Varilia, grand-niece to Auguſtus by his ſiſter, for having by opprobrious words reviled the deified Auguſtus, Tiberius, and his mother, and as ſhe was nearly allied to the Emperor, for having ſtained by adultery the Ceſarean blood.* Concerning the adultery, ſufficient proviſion was *thought* already made by the Julian Law: and as to the crimes of ſtate, Tiberius deſired they might be ſeparated: if ſhe had uttered impious ſpeeches of Auguſtus, ſhe muſt be condemned, but for invectives againſt himſelf, he would not have her called to any account. *The Conſul asked* what would be his ſentiments, if ſhe was convicted of defaming his mother. *To this he made no anſwer, but next ſitting of the Senate, he prayed too in her name,* that no words ſpoken againſt her might, to any one, be imputed for crimes, *and acquitted Apuleia of treaſon.*' Suetonius will give you a more particular account of this Emperor's indolence (*u*), I would not repeat what I have ſaid before of Nero's moderation, and as for Veſpaſian, I refer you to Suetonius (*w*). But upon this head can any thing be nobler than this edict of the Emperor Theodoſius? ‘Si quis modeſtiæ neſcius & pudoris ignarus improbo petulantique maledicto nomina noſtra crediderit laceſſenda, ac temulentia turbulentus obtrectator temporum noſtrorum fuerit; eum pœnæ nolumus ſubjugari neque durum aliquid nec aſperum volumus ſuſtinere, quoniam ſi id ex levitate proceſſerit contemnendum eſt, ſi ex inſania miſeratione dignum, ſi ab injuria remittendum: unde integris omnibus hoc ad noſtram ſcientiam referatur, ut ex perſonis hominum dicta penſemus, & utrum prætermitti an exquiri debeant cenſeamus. Datum VI. Id. Auguſt. Conſtantinopoli, Theodoſio anno III. & Abundantio Coſſ. - - - *If any perſon, void of modeſty and ſhame, ſhall by wicked and ſlanderous detraction, go about to blaſt our reputation, and wantonly traduce and defame our government, it is our pleaſure that he be not ſubjected to puniſhment, nor ſuffer any hardſhip or ſeverity on that account, becauſe, if this proceeded from levity, it ought to be deſpiſed, if from madneſs, it deſerves pity and compaſſion, if from a deſign to do an injury, it ought to be forgiven. We therefore will that no man be puniſhed, or proſecuted, for ſuch ſlanderous ſpeeches, and that they be referred to our cognizance, that we may weigh and conſider the ſayings of men by their characters, and may judge whether they ought to be paſſed by or inquired into.*' This conſtitution is in the Code, in the title, *Si quis Imperatori male dixerit.*

Modern Hiſtory likewiſe affords ſeveral inſtances of this forbearance. You will find ſome in a Latin letter of Balzac (*x*), but not that of Lewis XII, which I have related in its proper place (*y*), nor that of Catherine de Medicis. We learn from Brantome (*z*), *that ſhe read even the invectives that were made againſt her, at which ſhe jeſted and laughed, without any emotion, calling them babblers, and authors of idle-ſtories:* Being told that the Huguenots in the ſecond troubles had with them *a very fine culverin,* which they called *the Queen-mother, ſhe deſired to know the reaſon of it. Some body being preſſed by her to tell it,*

(s) Aulus Gellius, *lib. vi, cap. xi.*

(*t*) Tacit. Annal, *lib. ii, cap. l.*

(*u*) Sueton. in Tiber. *cap. xxxviii.*

(*w*) Idem, in Veſpaſ. *cap. xiii.*

(*x*) Ad Phil. Coſpeanum, *p.* 251, *Edit.* 1651, *in* 12*mo.*

(y) In the remark [*L*], *of the article* LEWIS XII.

(*z*) Brantome, *in his* Elogy upon Catherine de Medicis.

it, anſwered, it is, Madam, becauſe it has a greater and wider bore than any other. She was the firſt that laughed at it (aa). What ſhe told ſome ſoldiers who ſpoke moſt horrible infamies of her, is to be ſeen in Coſtar's letters with ſome flouriſhes. ‘ (*bb*) Catherine de Medicis, tho' ſhe was of a country where they ſay, *God has reſerved vengeance to himſelf, becauſe it is the dainty bit*, found nevertheleſs more daintineſs in pardoning than in puniſhing, when ſhe ſaw ſome ſoldiers by her coach, who ſaid of her all the filthy things imaginable, without minding her, or ſo much as lowering their voice; for this Princeſs only looked out of the coach, and fixing her eyes upon thoſe rogues told them: *Friends, if you do not go farther off to ſpeak ill of me, I will keep you from roaſting the gooſe (cc), and eating it ſo quietly as you do.* The Cardinal of Lorrain would have had them hanged for an example; but ſhe choſe rather to let poſterity know that a perſon, who was at once a woman, a queen, and an Italian, could command her paſſion, and deprive herſelf of the pleaſure ſhe would have found in revenge.’ I am much miſtaken, if this ſtory is not originally in d'Aubigné's Hiſtory. But to ſhew how Coſtar accommodated the circumſtances of facts to his own humour, without conſidering the great abuſes which ariſe from ſuch a liberty, it will not be amiſs to ſet down the words of that Hiſtorian (*dd*). *I have it,* ſays he, *from the Sieur de Talſi (ee), that the King of Navarre, and the Queen-mother being (ff) at the window of a low room, overheard two black-guards, who were roaſting a gooſe on a wooden ſpit, and ſinging infamies againſt the Queen: one often ſaid that the Cardinal had lain with her, and that ſhe had a pig in her belly, the other ſaid it was a mule-colt; and then they curſed the bitch that did them ſo much miſchief. The King of Navarre was taking his leave of the Queen to go and have them hanged; but ſhe looking out of the window ſaid,* Why, what has ſhe done to you? You may thank her that you roaſt the gooſe, *and turning to the King of Navarre, and laughing, ſhe told him,* Couſin, our anger muſt not deſcend ſo low; that is beneath us. *This I mention to ſhew that there was nothing mean in her.*

Francis I, is one of the examples alledged by Balzac. But I find one thing in him to be blamed, which is that this King ſuffered his miniſters and courtiers to be abuſed upon the ſtage, at the ſame time that he permitted his own faults to be cenſured. This was imitating a conduct which Antient Greece and Rome found detrimental to them. It was introducing an ill cuſtom: and if it be an act of magnanimity in a Prince to deſpiſe the ſatires that concern his own perſon, and to forgive the authors of them; it is a viſible neglect of his duty to ſuffer his ſubjects to be expoſed to the inſults of a ſatirical pen. He may abate of his own right; but the honour of his ſubjects ought to appear inviolable to him. Note, That Francis I. did not ſuffer the Players to name people. ‘ Accepimus tacitè, libenterque etiam ferre ſolitum, ſe præcipuoſque Regni ſui proceres, quorum ipſe opera conſiliiſque utebatur, in Fabulis & Comœdiis publicis rodi & configi maledictis; tecte id quidem & involute, ſed tamen ut ab omnibus perſpiceretur (*gg*). - - - *We are informed that King Francis I, was wont patiently, and even willingly to ſuffer himſelf and the chief nobles of his kingdom, men whom he employed in the higheſt offices, to be inveighed againſt, and ſatirized in the public Comedies. It is true theſe invectives were concealed and diſguiſed; yet ſo as that every body could perceive them.*’

XIV.
The Romans were more jealous of their honour than of that of their gods.

The Romans did not permit the Comic Poets to abuſe the Magiſtrates, but they left them an entire liberty to make ſport with the gods. St Auſtin upbraided them with it ſeverely. ‘ At Romani, *ſays he* (*hh*), ſicut in illa de (*ii*) republica diſputatione gloriatur Scipio, probris & injuriis poëtarum ſubjectam vitam famamque habere noluerunt, capite etiam punire ſancientes tale carmen condere ſi quis auderet. Quod erga ſe quidem ſatis honeſte conſtituerunt, ſed erga Deos ſuos ſuperbe & irreligioſe. Quos cum ſcirent non ſolum patienter, ſed etiam libenter poëtarum probris maledictiſque lacerari, ſe potius quam illos hujuſcemodi injuriis indignos eſſe duxerunt, ſeque ab eis etiam lege munierunt, illorum autem iſta etiam ſacris ſolennitatibus miſcuerunt. Itane tandem Scipio laudas, hanc poetis Romanis negatam eſſe licentiam ut cuiquam opprobrium infligerent Romanorum, cum videas, eos nulli Deorum pepercisse veſtrorum? Itane pluris tibi habenda eſt exiſtimatio veſtræ curiæ, quam Capitolii, imo Romæ unius quam cœli totius: ut linguam maledicam in cives tuos exercere poetæ etiam lege prohiberentur, & in Deos tuos ſecuri, tanta convitia nullo ſenatore, nullo cenſore, nullo principe nullo pontifice prohibente jacularenter? Indignum videlicet fuit, ut Plautus aut Nævius Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius M. Catoni malediceret: & dignum fuit, ut Terentius veſter flagitio Jovis optimi maximi adoleſcentium nequitiam concitaret. - - - *But the Romans, as Scipio boaſts in that diſputation concerning the Republic, would not ſuffer their lives and reputations to be expoſed to the reproach and abuſe of the Poets, having decreed that if any perſon ſhould be guilty of writing a Defamatory Libel, he ſhould be put to death. The decrees they made relating to themſelves were commendable enough, but thoſe which related to their gods were haughty and irreligious. For knowing that though the gods were abuſed and reviled by the Poets, yet they bore it not only with patience, but alſo willingly, the Romans thought that they themſelves deſerved ſuch abuſe, leſs than their gods, and likewiſe made laws to protect themſelves againſt it; but they ſuffered the invectives againſt the gods to be mingled even with their ſacred ſolemnities. Is it ſo Scipio? do you commend this decree which made it unlawful for your Poets to inflict reproach and diſhonour upon any Roman, whilſt you ſee they have ſpared none of your gods? Have you*

‘ *then*

(*aa*) Id. ibid.

(*bb*) Coſtar, *pag.* 729, of the firſt volume of his Letters.

(*cc*) This is abſurd, being ſeparated from the circumſtances mentioned by d'Aubigné here below.

(*dd*) D'Aubigné Hiſt. Univerſ. *Tom. i, livr. iii, ch. v, pag.* 198.

(*ee*) *He is probably the ſame, who was* d'Aubigné's *father-in-law, and whoſe name was John Salviati. See* d'Aubigné's *Hiſtory, Tom. ii, livr. v, ch. xviii, p.* 1143.

(*ff*) *During the parley for a peace at Talſi, in the year* 1562.

(*gg*) Balzacius, Epiſt. ad Coſpeanum, *pag. m.* 254.

(*hh*) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, *lib. ii, cap. xii.*

(*ii*) *See chap. ix, of the ſame book,* de Civitate Dei.

then more regard for your Senate-houſe, than for the Capitol, for Rome alone, than for the whole Heavens; that the Poets who are by law forbidden to exerciſe their malicious tongues againſt your citizens, ſhould be by no Senator, Cenſor, Prince, or Pontif, forbidden to load your gods with ſo many reproaches? Was it an heinous offence in Plautus or Mevius, to ſlander Publius and Cneius Scipio, or Cecilius to defame Marcus Cato, and was it commendable in Terence to exhort the youth to leudneſs by the wicked and profligate example of almighty Jupiter.’ This thought is older than St Auſtin, for Arnobius had made uſe of it before. ‘Nec à vobis ſaltem iſtum meruerunt honorem (*Dii*) . . . Carmen malum conſcribere, quo fama alterius coinquinetur & vita, decemviralibus ſcitis evadere noluiſtis impune: ac ne veſtras aures convitio aliquis petulantiore pulſaret, de atrocibus formulas conſtituiſtis injuriis. Soli Dii ſunt apud vos ſuperi inhonorati, contemptibiles, viles: in quos jus eſt vobis datum, quæ quiſque voluerit dicere: turpitudinem jacere, quas libido confinxerit atque excogitaverit formas (*k k*). - - - - *Neither ought you at leaſt to pay this honour to the gods. By the laws of the twelve tables, you have not ſuffered the authors of libels, which defame the life and reputation of any perſon, to eſcape unpuniſhed; and to the end, that no man might grate your ears with abuſive reproaches, you have decreed that defamation ſhould be puniſhed as a capital crime. With you the gods alone are diſhonoured, deſpiſed, and vilified, you are permitted to ſay of the gods whatever you pleaſe, and even to reproach them with thoſe very things, which your luſt prompted you to feign and deviſe.*’ A modern author does not mention it upon an occaſion wherein it would have ſerved his purpoſe. It is in a letter wherein he deſigned to attack the Houſe of Auſtria. He enters upon the matter in hand, not citing Arnobius or St Auſtin, but Livy. ‘(*ll*) The Spaniards, who firſt ſought the ſame alliance (*m m*) which their partiſans blame at preſent, took no care to preſerve the veneration, due to holy things, or to maintain the immunities and privileges of the prieſthood. Perhaps the reaſon of it was, becauſe thinking themſelves to be the lawful ſucceſſors of the Romans, particularly in their deſign of forming an univerſal monarchy, they fancy they may ſay as well as they, *As for religion, it is more the intereſt of the gods than ours. They may give orders if they pleaſe for hindring ſacred things from being polluted by impure hands. Ad * Deos id magis quàm ad ſe pertinere, ipſos viſuros ne ſacra ſua polluantur.* Is it not very likely that Charles V acted by this principle, when in the year 1552, he diſplaced three Lutheran miniſters in Augſburg for abuſing him, and ſuffered the reſt to vilify God, his mother, and his ſaints; as the Duke of Nevers reproached him in a diſcourſe he made to Pope Sixtus V (*nn*), upon the preſent ſtate of affairs. Doubtleſs the Emperor Charles remembred this ſaying of Tiberius, and not without putting it in practice. *Let us leave to the immortal gods the care of revenging injuries that are done to them. Deorum ** injuriæ Diis curæ.*’

XV.
The council of Trent aſcribes the power of puniſhing the writers of libels to the tribunal of the Church.

I muſt not forget a thing which very much diſpleaſed the Civilians who were tender of the rights of the ſecular power. They looked upon the authority given to the Biſhops by the council of Trent, as an uſurpation. Let us hear William Ranchin (*o o*). ‘This council, to the prejudice of the ſecular juriſdiction, aſſigns to the Biſhops † the puniſhment of the authors of Defamatory Libels, and of the Printers of them, &c. . . . . . Our Civil Laws commit the cognizance and puniſhment of them to the judges and magiſtrates, and not to Eccleſiaſtics. Some would except thoſe that concern religion; but this exception is not pertinent; and here is an argument againſt it. The laws of Conſtantine the Great, and of Conſtantius, made againſt ſuch libels, were enacted at ſuch a time as this, that is, at a time when ſeveral writings were publiſhed in matters of religion againſt the honour of both ſides. Dr Balduin ⸸ has very judiciouſly obſerved it. *It is a material thing*, ſays he, *to remember what were the times of Conſtantine and Conſtantius, in which the contentions of religion, not unlike ours, inflamed the paſſions of the parties, who thereupon ſent out horrid calumnies and Defamatory Libels, as is done at preſent.* He ſays this, explaining three laws of the Emperor Conſtantine, and two of Conſtantius, made upon this account, which we find at preſent in the Theodoſian Code. Theſe words ‡ of the Emperors Valentinian and Valens are alſo remarkable: *If any one is concerned for his religion and the public ſafety, let him declare his name, and ſpeak with his own mouth what he would have ſaid in Defamatory Libels.* This very well agrees to libels in point of religion, and was never ſaid in any other ſenſe by thoſe Emperors. Now * all the abovementioned conſtitutions, as alſo ſome others of the ſame Valentinian and Valens, of Arcadius, Honorius, and Theodoſius, inflict penalties on the authors of ſuch libels, and the publiſhers of them, and commit the cognizance and puniſhment of them to their officers and magiſtrates, directing ſuch laws to them, that they may obſerve them in their ſentences. A great many ordinances of our Kings mention in expreſs words Defamatory and Scandalous Libels that concern religion, preſcribe the puniſhment due to them, and the particular penalties to be inflicted on the authors, printers, and publiſhers, and expreſly give this juriſdiction to the royal judges. As that of King Henry II, of the eleventh of December 1547, made at Fontainebleau, and another of the ſame Prince made at Chaſteaubriant in the year 1551. That of King Charles IX, made at Mante on the tenth of September 1563. That of the States of Molins in the article LXXVII, and a great many others. I ſhall only ſet down the

(*k k*) Arnobius, *lib. iv, pag.* 150, 151.

(*ll*) Coſtar, Letter cccxciv, *of vol. i, pag.* 974, 975.

(*m m*) *That of Cromwell.*

* *Livy, book x.*

(*n n*) *See in Mr Arnauld's Apology for the Catholics, Part. i, cap. vi, pag. 78, 79, a long paſſage of this Duke's diſcourſe.*

** Tacit. *lib. i, Annal.*

(*o o*) Reviſion du Concile de Trente, *livr. vi, cap. iii, pag. m.* 247.

† *Seſſ.* 24, *cap.* 1.

⸸ *Franciſcus Balduinus in commentar. ad leges de famoſ. libell. pag.* 13.

‡ *L.* 7 *C. Theod. de famoſ. libell. l. unic. C. Juſtin. eod.*

* *Vide Totum Titul. C. Theodoſ. de famoſis libellis.*

‘ words of them, *viz.* that of King Charles IX, made at Mante on the tenth of ‘ September 1563, which ſpeaks of Defamatory Libels, bills poſted up, books, and ‘ ſuch-like things concerning religion; and as to juriſdiction, it provides thus: *Injoining all public magiſtrates, juſtices of the peace, and our other officers to whom it ſhall* ‘ *belong, to take a due care of them, charging our attorneys and advocates to do their duty* ‘ *therein, and to lay aſide all other affairs, in order to examine and puniſh the offences they* ‘ *ſhall find. And it is moreover enjoined, that they ſhall obſerve the ſame ordinance in every* ‘ *point, and proceed briefly againſt the infractors, by the puniſhments herein ſpecified.*’

XVI. Libels complained of as being the cauſes of ſedition.

As there in nothing ſo uſeful, but in ſome reſpects is the cauſe of evil, it fell out that printing, among a thouſand conveniencies it has brought with it, has occaſioned a notable inconvenience, which is, that it has afforded ſatirical and ſeditious men a thouſand opportunities of quickly diſperſing their venom every where. Du Verdier Vau-Privas has inſerted in one of his books (*p*) a Latin Poem, entituled, *Encomion Chalcographiæ*, where, after ſeveral praiſes beſtowed upon printing, many complaints are brought in againſt the licentiouſneſs of libels. The author of this Poem being a Roman Catholic, it muſt be obſerved that he ſuits his ſtyle to his prejudices in the following verſes:

Omnia dente petunt, fœdant ſpurcaque ſaliva,
  Digni qui Anticyræ præmia ſana ferant.
A quibus & Nemeſis turpiſſima facta repoſcat,
  Quo meritas pœnas improba turba luat.
Principis ac Princeps lacerat caput, atque tacenda
  Conſilia in chartis vendere quiſque ſolet.
De rebus magnis populi ſuffragia vana
  Captant, quæ ſemper mens animoſa fugit.
Quid non aubebit furioſa licentia vulgi,
  Talia ſi primi dant documenta duces?
Quæ non his oritur funeſta Tragœdia nugis?
  Accendit quas non hæc quoque flamma faces?
Ruſtica ſeditio belli cur cornua ſumpſit?
  Chartæ pellaces hoc docuere nefas.
Has quoque Gorgoneo perſudit ſacra cruore
  Progenies vulgi, quam nova ſecta tenet.
Quæque Numam ſimulat modo religione prophana,
  Et geminos fertur ferre ſub aure polos.
Omnia confundit, vertit ſurſumque, deorſumque,
  Ac gerras præter nil ſua ſylva crepat.
Hæc auſa eſt Aquilæ Romanæ vellere pennas,
  Atque aras magni commaculare Dei.
Non adeò lædunt Bombardæ fulmina dira:
  Nil præter clades ſit licet illa tonent:
Nec tantùm nocuit cuiquam vis ſæva cicutæ,
  Quantùm famoſi ſtigmata nigra libri.
His & mille modis eſſent hæc ſæpe notanda,
  Aſt iter immodicum noſtra Thaleia fugit.

With theſe advantages from printing ſprung,
Swarms of defaming libels alſo come;
Where ſland'rers ſtain and poiſon with their breath,
And madly rage, and tear with furious teeth.
Let vengeance overtake this odious crew,
Bare their moſt hidden crimes to public view
And with diſgrace their blaſted names purſue.
Defamers ſpare not the moſt ſacred things,
Haunt and infeſt the palaces of Kings;
They ſlander Majeſty, and all the great,
Divulge th' important ſecrets of the State,
Greedily catch th' applauſe of th' ign'rant croud,
A vain applauſe ſhunn'd by the wiſe and good.
What limits can the pop'lar fury know,
  While ſuch examples inſtigate to vice?
What fatal tragedies and civil woe,
  What broils and diſcords will there not ariſe?
Libels of tumults firſt the cauſes are,
And then inflame them to a civil-war.
But none ſo bloody libels are, as thoſe
Which Heretics with laviſh hand diffuſe:
This inauſpicious offspring of the croud,
Subverting all things, nought but miſchief brood,

Inſult

(*p*) *At the end of the* Supplementum Epitomes Bibliothecæ Geſnerianæ.

Inſult th' Imperial throne, provoke th' avenging ſword,
Dare Heaven, and profane the altars of the Lord.
Not ſlaught'ring guns, whoſe iſſue wrapt in ſmoke,
And wing'd with death, flies hiſſing to the ſtroke;
Nor deadly draught, which mixing, with the blood,
Corrodes the heart and taints the vital flood,
Such woful miſchief and deſtruction bring,
As Printing, whence defaming Libels ſpring.

Eraſmus exclaimed againſt the abuſes of the preſs, and confuted the ridiculous excuſes of the Printers, who alledged that they ſhould want bread if they did not publiſh libels. ‘Dicet hic aliquis: Heus divinator, quid hæc ad Typograhos? Quia nonnullam mali partem invehit horum impunita licentia. Implent mundum libellis, non jam dicam nugalibus, quales ego forſitan ſcribo; ſed ineptis, indoctis, maledicis, famoſis, rabioſis, impiis ac ſeditioſis: & horum turba facit, ut frugiferis etiam libellis ſuus pereat fructus. Provolant quidam abſque titulis, aut titulis, (quod eſt ſceleratius) fictis. Deprehenſi reſpondent: Detur unde alam familiam, deſinam tales libellos excudere. Aliquanto meliore fronte reſpondeat fur, impoſtor aut leno: Da quî vivam & deſinam his artibus uti, niſi forte levius crimen eſt, clam minuere rem alienam, quam palam eripere famam alienam: aut ſine vi ad quæſtum abuti tuo alienove corpore, quam vitam alterius ac famam vita quoque chariorem impetere (q). - - - - *Here ſome body may aſk, what is all this to Printers? I anſwer, it does concern them, becauſe the unpuniſhed licentiouſneſs of theſe men, is partly the cauſe of the evil I complain of. They fill the world with writings, which I will not call trifling and inſignificant, ſuch perhaps as are mine, but writings that are impertinent, unlearned, ſcandalous, defamatory, furious, impious and ſeditious libels; and there come forth ſuch multitudes of them, that they prevent the reading of uſeful books, and obſtruct the good effect they might have. Some come forth without any titles, or (which is ſtill more wicked) under fictitious ones. If you diſcover the Printers of theſe libels, they ſay, give me wherewithal to ſupport my family, and I will leave off printing ſuch books. With more modeſty might a thief, a cheat, or a pander ſay, give me wherewithal to live, and I will leave off committing theſe crimes; and perhaps it is not ſo criminal ſecretly to deprive another man of his property, as openly to rob him of his good name, not ſo criminal to proſtitute one's own body, or that of another perſon, for the ſake of gain, without uſing violence, as it is to attempt upon another man's life, and what is much more dear to him, his reputation.*’ I think that the author of the abovementioned poem does the ſatirical writers more honour than they deſerve, by accuſing them to be the cauſe of wars and ſeditions. It is certain that very often they aim at ſuch a thing, and are over-joyed to think that their libels have produced ſo great an effect. They flatter themſelves with it, even when they have no reaſon to do it, and are very well pleaſed to have this laid to their charge. Can one build any certain fact upon this ſubject? I do not think any general rule can be grounded upon it. At certain times Defamatory Libels do not ſtir the people, and the Publiſhers are diſappointed in their expectations. But at other times they are real incendiaries, and trumpeters of ſedition. Beſides, the difference of parties and intereſts is to be conſidered; for the effects of libels are in that reſpect very different, and even contrary to one another: They ſometimes unite thoſe whom they would divide, and divide thoſe they would unite. What is certain is, that the tongue and pen of a ſingle man are ſometimes more uſeful to a cauſe, than an army of forty thouſand men. Francis I, confeſſed that the Biſhop of Sion had done him more miſchief by his words than all Swiſſerland by their arms. *Maxime vero ei glorioſum fuit Franciſci Regis judicium, quum aſſeveraret, me audiente, aliquanto plus ſibi ſumptus atque periculi Sedunenſis facundiæ indomitam vim, quàm tot legionum ejus gentis cuſpides attuliſſe (r).* I will not mention the confeſſion of a King of England (*s*); for it would be departing from the matter in hand, and miſapplying a thought to the preſent ſubject. The queſtion is not here about the great things a King can do without going out of his cloſet, and by the ſole power of his pen; nay, the queſtion is not in general about the power of the pen in a war. A little book came out upon this ſubject in the year 1679 (*t*).

XVII.
Whether it be too ſevere a thing to inflict the ſame puniſhment upon the diſperſers of libels as upon the authors of them. Some remarks againſt thoſe who approve libels.

I have called the law of Valentinian and Valens, a ſevere one which condemns to a capital puniſhment thoſe who accidentally meeting with a libel do not deſtroy it, but on the contrary encourage it. Does this ſignify that I blame this law? By no means: For I cannot conceive that a man who in this caſe diſperſes a libel, is leſs deſirous of doing miſchief than the author himſelf, and therefore he deſerves the ſame puniſhment with the author. But what ſhall we ſay of the pleaſure that is taken in the reading of a Defamatory Libel? Is it not a very ſinful thing before God? Here we muſt make a diſtinction. Either this pleaſure is only an agreeable ſenſation, which affects us when we light upon any thought that is ingenious, and well expreſſed; or it is a joy grounded upon the diſhonour of the perſon defamed. I have nothing to ſay upon the firſt caſe; for perhaps ſome would think that my morality departs too much from that of the Rigoriſts, if I ſhould affirm that a man is not maſter of thoſe agreeable ſenſations, any more than of thoſe occaſioned by ſugar or honey when they touch his tongue: but in the ſecond

---

(*q*) *Eraſmus, in Explicatione Proverbii* Feſtina lente. *It is the firſt of the Iſt century of the ſecond Chiliad. Compare what is ſaid in the article* ERASMUS, *remark* [*X*].

(*r*) Paulus Jovius, Elog. Virorum bellica virtute inſign. *lib. v. pag. m.* 389.

(*s*) *He ſaid this of the ſaid King Charles V. There never was a King in France who made fewer wars than he, who never ſtirs from his cloſet, being always writing letters; and yet no King did ever cut out ſo much work for me.* Belleforeſt, Chroniques & Annales de France, *fol. m.* 357, *ad ann.* 1364.

(*t*) *Intituled,* Arma Anſerina, ſive Armatura Epiſtolaris, à Doctore militari, Tacito, ſubminiſtrata & in Diſſertatione Politica diducta à G. C. W.

cond caſe, every body will own that pleaſure to be a great ſin. The pleaſure in the firſt caſe is of no continuance; it precedes the uſe of our reaſon and our reflexion, and is immediately ſucceeded by the grief of ſeeing our neighbour's honour blaſted. If it does not ceaſe immediately, it is a ſign that the inſolence of the ſatiriſt does not diſpleaſe us, and that we are glad to ſee him defame his enemy by all ſorts of ſtories; and then we juſtly deſerve the puniſhment to which the writer of the libel is liable. I have juſt light upon a modern author, here are his words: *St Gregory excommunicating the auhors who had diſhonoured the Deacon Caſtorius, does not except thoſe who read that book; becauſe, ſaid he, if calumnies have always been the delight of the ears, and the happineſs of the people, who have no other advantage over honeſt men, is not he who takes pleaſure in reading them, as guilty as if he gloried in compoſing them (v)?* It is a certain maxim, that they who approve an action would willingly do it if they could; that is, if ſome reaſon of ſelf-love did not hinder them. There is no difference, ſaid Cicero (*w*), betwixt adviſing a crime and approving it when it is committed. To deſire that an action ſhould be done, and to be glad that it is done, are the ſame thing. The Roman law confirmed this maxim, having ſubmitted the approvers and authors of evil to the ſame puniſhment. ‘ Et ſi erat ‘ ſervus omni modo fugiturus, vel furtum facturus, hic vero laudator hujus propoſiti ‘ fuerit, tenetur. Non enim oportet laudando augeri malum (*x*). - - - - *If a ſlave deſigned to run away from his maſter, or to rob him, and if another perſon approved his deſign,* ‘ *the latter ſhall be liable to the ſame puniſhment with the ſlave: for evil muſt not be encouraged* ‘ *and increaſed by commendation.*’ We may therefore ſay, that thoſe who are pleaſed with reading Defamatory Libels, ſo far as to approve the authors and diſperſers of them, are as guilty as if they had compoſed them; for if they do not write ſuch libels, it is either becauſe they have not the talent of writing, or that they will run no hazzard. See in one of the Provincial Letters (*y*), the mortal contagion of calumny: St Bernard is cited there, who maintained that calumny kills not only thoſe who publiſh it, but alſo thoſe who do not reject it. The Heathens were not ignorant of this maxim of morality: they ſaid that ſlandering was criminal, both in the ſlanderer, and in him who believed ſlanders. *Διαβολὴ γάρ ἐστι δεινότατον· ἐν τῇ δύο μὲν εἰσι οἱ ἀδικέοντές, εἷς δὲ ὁ ἀδικεόμενος· ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαβάλλων, ἀδικέει, οὐ τῶν παρεόντων κατηγορέων· ὁ δὲ ἀδικέει, ἀναπειθόμενος πρὶν ἢ ἀτρεκέως ἐκμάθοι· ὁ δὲ δὴ ἀπεὼν τοῦ λόγου τάδε ἐν αὐτοῖσι ἀδικέεται· Διαβληθεὶς τε ὑπὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου, καὶ νομισθεὶς πρὸς τοῦ ἑτέρου κακὸς εἶναι.* Detractio namque importuniſſima res eſt: in qua duo ſunt qui injuriam faciunt, unus cui injuria fit. Qui enim detrahit, injurius eſt, quod non præſentem accuſat; item qui huic credit injurius eſt, quod prius credit quam rem compertam habeat; & illi cui abſenti detrahitur, ob id fit injuria quod ab altero inſimulatur ut malus, ab altero talis putatur (*z*). - - - - *Defamation is a moſt dreadful thing: in it there are two perſons who do an injuſtice, and one who ſuffers it: for he who defames does an injuſtice, becauſe he accuſes another man in his abſence, and he who believes the defamation does alſo an injuſtice, becauſe he believes it before he knows the truth of the matter. On the other hand the perſon defamed ſuffers an injuſtice from both, being accuſed as a bad man by the one, and deemed to be ſuch by the other.* See the book intituled, *Queſtion ſi Mr Arnaud eſt Heretique (a a)?* On the other hand, we ought to believe that the ſame baſeneſs which induces ſome people to fire a muſquet upon their enemy, would induce them to defame him by a ſatire, if they had no other arms but their pen. It is juſt as amongſt beaſts: ſome do not gore with their horns, but bite (*b b*), it is becauſe they have no horns, and know how to uſe their teeth. Let us alſo ſay, that a ſatiriſt who attempts upon the honour of his enemy with libels, would attempt upon their life with ſword or poiſon, if he had the ſame opportunity. ‘ Maledicum à Malefico niſi occa‘ ſione non differre, non minus verè quàm eleganter ſcripſit Fabius: vix enim eſt ut qui ‘ verbis ultro lædit, re etiam lædere non nolit (*c c*). - - - - *It was a very true and inge-* ‘ *nious obſervation of Fabius, that a calumniator and a villain differ in nothing but op-* ‘ *portunity: for the man who, without provocation, wounds with his tongue, would very pro-* ‘ *bably wound with his hand, if he had a fit opportunity.*’ As for the reſt, it is not always a good excuſe to ſay, ſuch a libel has not been anſwered, therefore we ought to believe it: Seneca laughed at this way of reaſoning. ‘ Res falſa & inanis niſi corrigatur ha‘ bet nonnunquam fidem, multique ſunt homines judicii parum firmi qui nihil audiant ‘ legantve quod non credant niſi refutatum ſciant (*d d*). - - - *A falſe and fooliſh aſſertion,* ‘ *unleſs it is refuted, is ſometimes believed; and there are many men of weak underſtanding,* ‘ *who believe all they read, and all they hear, unleſs they know that it is refuted.*’

(*v*) Clavigny de ſainte Honorine, Uſage des Livres ſuſpects, *pag.* 41, 42.

(*w*) Tu omnium ſtultiſſime, non intelligis, ſi id quod me arguis voluiſſe interfici Cæſarem, crimen ſit, etiam, lætatum eſſe morte Cæſaris, crimen eſſe: quid enim intereſt inter ſuaſorem facti, & probatorem? aut quid refert, utrum voluerim fieri, an gaudeam factum? *Cicero, Philipp. II, pag. m.* 722.

(*x*) Ulpianus, *in Lege* 1. *D.* de ſervo corrupto. *See apud* Th. Raynaud. Hoploth. *pag. m.* 359, 360, *how great a ſin it is, according to the Fathers, to praiſe evil actions.*

(*y*) *It is the XVIth, towards the end, pag. m.* 282.

(*z*) Herodotus, *lib. vii, cap.* x, *pag. m.* 388.

(*aa*) *Page* 210, 211.

(*bb*) *See the* Penſées ſur les Cometes, *pag.* 517.

(*cc*) Menagius, *Epiſt. dedicat.* Vitæ Mamurræ.

(*dd*) Seneca.

A
DISSERTATION
CONCERNING THE
HIPPOMANES.

I.
Two ſorts of Hippomanes. Servius and Pliny quoted wrong.

THE Hippomanes ſignifies chiefly two things: 1. A certain liquor that flows from the privy-parts of a mare ready to take horſe; 2. An excreſcence of fleſh which the new-foaled colts have upon their foreheads. It is black, round, and of the bigneſs of a dry fig. It is pretended that thoſe two Hippomanes's have a peculiar virtue in philtres, and other ſuch compoſitions deſigned for faſcinations; and that the laſt kind is of ſuch a nature, that a mare has no ſooner dropped her colt, but ſhe eats this piece of fleſh, without which ſhe would not ſuckle it. It is added, that if ſhe gives any perſon time to take away this Hippomanes, the meer ſmell of it makes her mad. Let us prove, but without heaping up many paſſages, that if this be not true, it is found at leaſt in the moſt authentic authors. Let us hear Virgil:

Hinc demum, Hippomanes vero quod nomine dicunt
Paſtores, lentum diſtillat ab inguine virus.
Hippomanes, quod ſæpe malæ legere novercæ,
Miſcueruntque herbas & non innoxia verba (*a*).

. . . . . From their groins they ſhed
A ſlimy juice . . . . .
The ſhepherd knows it well, and calls by name
Hippomanes to note the mother's flame:
This, gathering in the planetary hour,
With noxious weeds, and ſpell'd with words of pow'r
Dire ſtep-dames in the Magic bowl infuſe,
And mix for deadly draughts the pois'nous juice. DRYDEN.

I do not add to Virgil's authority that of his Commentator Servius, cited on this ſubject by Fungerus in his Philological Lexicon, by Calepinus, Decimator, *&c.* for I do not find that Servius does any thing more than explain the ſenſe of the Poet: but I will not forget the authority of Ariſtotle. He ſays, that what they call Hippomanes is a certain thing proceeding *ex pudendis equæ ſimilis genituræ, ſed multo magis tenuis quàm ſemen maris* (*b*). Now let us hear Pliny, who has this paſſage: ' Equarum virus à coïtu ' in lychnis accenſum Anaxilaus prodidit equinorum capitum viſus repræſentare monſtrificè: ſimiliter ex aſinis. Nam Hippomanes tantas in veneficio vires habet, ut affuſum æris mixturæ in effigiem equæ Olympiæ admotos mares equos ad rabiem coïtus ' agat (*c*). - - - *Anaxilaus relates, that the liquor which flows from mares when ready to take ' horſe, being kindled in lamps, ſhews a frightful apparition of horſes heads. It is the ſame ' with aſſes. For the Hippomanes has ſo much power and efficacy in faſcination, that being ' mixed with the braſs which made the ſtatue of an Olympic mare, it fires all the horſes who ' are brought near to it, with a moſt furious deſire after copulation.*' Thus much concerning the firſt ſignification: now for the ſecond. *Et ſanè equis amoris innaſci veneficium, Hippomanes appellatum, in fronte, caricæ magnitudine, colore nigro: quod ſtatim edito partu devorat fœta, aut partum ad ubera non admittit. Si quis præreptum habeat olfactu in rabiem id genus agitur* (*d*). Ariſtotle had ſaid the ſame thing (*e*); Virgil hinted at it, ſpeaking of the enchantments the unfortunate Dido had recourſe to in her deſpair:

Quæritur & naſcentis equi de fronte revulſus
Et matri præreptus amor (*f*).

I And

(*a*) Virgil. Georg. *lib. iii, ver* 280. Tibullus, Eleg. IV, *lib. ii, ſpeaks thus:* Et quod, ubi indomitis gregibus Venus afflat amores, Hippomanes cupidæ ſtillat ab inguine equæ.

(*b*) Ἐκρεῖ αὐταῖς ἐκ τοῦ αἰδοίου ὅμοιον γονῇ, λεπτότερον δὲ πολὺ ἢ τὸ τοῦ ἄῤῥενος καὶ καλοῦσι τοῦτο τινὲς ἱππομανές. Humorem emittunt ſuis genitalibus ſimilem genituræ, ſed multo tenuiorem quam mares, quem Hippomanes nonnulli appellant. *Ariſt. Hiſt. Anim. lib. vi, cap. xviii, p. m.* 668. *See, below, num. X.*

(*c*) Plin. *lib. xxviii, cap. xi, ſub fin.*

(*d*) Idem, Plin. *lib. viii, cap. xlii.*

(*e*) Ariſt. ubi ſupra, *cap. xxii.*

(*f*) Virgil. Æneid. *lib. iv, ver.* 515.

And cuts the forehead of a new born fole
Robbing the mother's love . . . DRYDEN.

It is eaſy to ſee that Calepinus has quoted thoſe two paſſages of Pliny wrong, to prove the Hippomanes to be a little excreſcence of fleſh upon the forehead of a new-born colt; for Pliny ſpeaks of it in this ſenſe, only in the forty-ſecond chapter of the eighth book. Beſides, Calepinus (g) has quoted the eighteenth book inſtead of the twenty-eighth, and put *cariæ* inſtead of *caricæ*; and he aſcribes five or ſix words to Servius, which are not to be found in the commentary of that Grammarian, and which ſignify, that the Hippomanes, being eaten by a man, makes him mad; *quod in humana viſcera deſcendens hominem in furorem agat*. Decimator's Dictionary aſcribes the ſame thought to Servius. Martinius, in his Dictionary, mangles the paſſage of the eighth book of Pliny; he puts *equi* for *equis*; *fœtus* for *fœta*, (which is nonſenſe); and a comma inſtead of a full-ſtop betwixt *admittit* and *ſi quis*. See Father Hardouin upon Pliny (h). It may be ſaid in general, that the writers of Dictionaries take more pains to compile new things, than to mend the faults of their predeceſſors.

II. A plant called Hippomanes by Theocritus.

I had reaſon to ſay that the Hippomanes does chiefly ſignify two things; for there is a third kind not near ſo remarkable as the others, ſince it is found only in a paſſage of Theocritus: beſides, one muſt engage in a controverſy with one of the moſt learned men of the XVIIth century to find it there [*A*]. This paſſage ſays, that the Hippomanes is a plant in Arcadia, which makes mares and colts run mad (i). Salmaſius will by no means admit of this plant; he maintains that Theocritus did not ſay φυτὸν, but χυτὸν, and that he meant by χυτὸν the brazen mare that was near the temple of Jupiter Olympius, which excited luſt in horſes in like manner as if ſhe had been alive; a quality ſhe had derived from the Hippomanes that had been mixed with the braſs in her caſting. We have already related a paſſage out of Pliny where mention is made of ſuch a thing; but it will be better to conſult Pauſanias, who will give us a larger account of it. And as what he ſays is the key of almoſt all the criticiſms contained in this article, it is neceſſary to inſert his words at large.

III. A brazen horſe which excited luſt.

Hear then how Pauſanias ſpeaks (k): *Phormis going out of Menalos, his native country, went into Sicily, where he ſignalized himſelf in ſeveral expeditions under Gelon ſon of Dinomenes, and Hiero brother of Gelon. Having acquired a great fortune, he offered up gifts not only to Jupiter Olympius, but likewiſe to Apollo Delphicus. Thoſe he offered to Jupiter are two horſes with two grooms, for each horſe has a groom: Dionyſius of Argos made one, and Simon of Ægina the other. Upon the ſide of the firſt horſe was engraven an inſcription, the beginning of which is in proſe, and much to this purpoſe, viz.* Phormis, the Arcadian of Menalos, but now of Syracuſe, offered it. *The people of Elea ſay, that through the artifice of a Magician ſome Hippomanes had been mixed in the caſting of this horſe, to the end it might afford a ſurpriſing ſhow. He is both ſmaller and leſs beautiful than ſeveral other horſes in Altis* (l), *and has a cut tail, which renders him yet more ugly; nevertheleſs he ſtirs up luſtful deſires in horſes, not only in the ſpring, but all the year round; for they break their halters, or eſcape out of the hands of thoſe who hold them, to ruſh with greater fury* (m) *on this ſtatue than if they were to leap the fineſt mare that ever was. It is true, their feet ſlip, but they do not give over neighing and renewing their furious encounters till they have been forced from the braſs by mighty whipping and downright ſtrength.*

IV. Servius juſtly cenſured by Salmaſius.

Salmaſius (n) has written a long diſcourſe to ſhew that Theocritus ſpoke of this ſtatue, and not of a plant called Hippomanes. Let us examine his reaſons a little; we cannot fail to benefit ourſelves by following the footſteps of ſo great a man. It is true, he ſeems not to love the taineſt and moſt natural paths, but rather chooſes to break a paſſage through the midſt of buſhes; yet one may ſometimes learn more by running after him through wilds, than by taking a direct way to truth under other guides. He very juſtly cenſures Servius for ſaying that Virgil pretended that the plant Hippomanes was

[*A*] *The third kind of Hippomanes is only found in a paſſage of Theocritus: beſides, one muſt engage in a controverſy with one of the moſt learned men of the XVIIth century*, &c.] I am not ignorant that in Dioſcorides we find an herb called ἀπόκυνος, and κυνοκράμβη, and ἱππομανὲς; and in Theophraſtus an Hippomanes made of the herb called Tithymallum, which was excellent and much cultivated at Tegea, a town of Arcadia (1). But becauſe Salmaſius (2) pretends that none but cavillers, like him who concealed himſelf under the borrowed name of Cercoëtius (it was Father Petau), would make uſe of the authority of Dioſcorides, ſince that would be to give us the ſpurious additions made to that author for his genuine writings, I think we ought to paſs by his teſtimony. As for Theophraſtus, it is not certain whether we ought to read ἱππομανὲς in the paſſage I have quoted; Salmaſius (3) corrects the reading of it, and ſubſtitutes in its place ὁ ὀπὸς μόνος, pretending that the author meant, that juice only was drawn from the Tithymallum. Thus we ſee theſe teſtimonies are only matter of diſpute. We muſt not ſay the ſame of that of Theocritus, ſince beſides the reaſons by which I have overthrown the χυτὸν of Salmaſius, it cannot be denied but that from the time of the Grammarian Servius the word φυτὸν was in the text of that Poet. Nothing can be ſaid poſitively as to the herb of which he has ſpoken. Aloiſius Anguillara, Cratevas, Dodoneus, and Wecker, who take it for the Stramonia (4), called by the Arabians *Nux Methel*, and by the French *Pomme du Perou*, do not give us better conjectures concerning it than Rodericus à Caſtro (5), who has taken it for Fern, or Gaſpar à Reies, who took it for the herb *Flavia* (6).

[*B*] *Concerning*

(g) *The edition I make uſe of is that of Lyons* 1681.

(h) *In the ſecond volume, p.* 272.

(i) Ἱππομανὲς φυτόν ἐστι παρ' Ἀρκάσι, τῷ δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσαι Καὶ πῶλοι μαίνονται ἀν' ὤρεα καὶ θοαὶ ἵπποι. Hippomanes planta eſt apud Arcades qua concitati omnes & equulei inſaniunt in montibus & celeres equæ. *Theocrit. in Pharmaceutria, pag. m.* 15.

(k) Pauſan. *lib. v, ſub fin.*

(l) *It was the name of one of the dependencies of the temple of Jupiter. See* Pauſan. *pag. m.* 156, *and below, num. VIII.*

(m) Πολλῷ δή τι ἐμμανέστερον. Romulus Amaſæus *tranſlates it* nihil hercle minus furenter, *which weakens the ſenſe.*

(n) Salmaſ. Exercit. Plinian. *pag.* 939, & *ſeq.*

(1) *It is thus perhaps that the Greek words of Theophraſtus ought to be rendered, lib. ix,* Hiſt. Plant. *cap. xv,* Καὶ τὸ τιθύμαλλον ἐξ οὗ τὸ ἱππομανὲς, ἄριστον δὲ τὸ περὶ Τεγέαν, καὶ ἐκεῖ μάλιστα σπουδάζεται. Salmaſius, Exercit. Plin. *pag.* 941, *refers* ἄριστον, &c. *to* ἱππομανὲς.

(2) Ib. p. 940.

(3) Ib. p. 941.

(4) *As it is obſerved by the Phyſician* James Ferrand, *in page* 226, *of his treatiſe* Of the Malady of Love. *I rank theſe four Phyſicians as he has done, though I know* Cratevas *is more antient than the others by ſeveral ages.*

(5) Medic. Polit. *lib. iv, cap. ii.*

(6) *In* Campo Elyſio jucundar. Quæſt. XXIX.

was improperly ſo called (*o*). Servius's reaſon is, that Virgil, ſpeaking of another Hippomanes, obſerves it was properly ſo called, *vero quod nomine dicunt*. This reaſon is of no force, for the Poet did not expreſs himſelf after this manner, but becauſe he ſaw in the very name the property of the thing: now if this property agreed with ſeveral other things, with the plant of Theocritus, with the matter that proceeded from a mare, and the like, the ſame name might be given them in the proper ſenſe. Salmaſius imagines with a great deal of probability, that Servius miſtook Heſiod for Theocritus, when he ſaid upon the third book of the Georgics, that Heſiod makes mention of an Herb called Hippomanes, which made horſes mad; for having had occaſion to ſpeak of the ſame thing in his comment on the fourth book of the Æneid, he quotes only Theocritus. Had he known two Poets who had ſpoke of this plant, he would doubtleſs have named them both either in the firſt place or the ſecond; but he has not done it, therefore we muſt believe he had only the authority of Theocritus. He has nevertheleſs been the cauſe that even at this day the Dictionary of Decimator, and the Theſaurus Fabri, have quoted Heſiod and Theocritus for the herb Hippomanes.

V
Servius and Philargyrus, unjuſtly cenſured by Salmaſius.

Servius and Philargyrus ſeem to have had more reaſon when they ſay, the former, that this herb made thoſe horſes mad who eat of it; and the latter, that it excited an exceſſive luſt in mares. Salmaſius pretends that they do not underſtand the matter, and that Theocritus meant only that the horſes were enflamed with a violent deſire of poſſeſſing the Hippomanes; ſo that if this Poet ſpoke of an herb, it muſt be underſtood that the horſes were tranſported with a furious inclination to eat of it. It is thus he explains the Greek phraſe μαίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τινὶ (*p*). Be it ſo; but it ſeems to me that the explication of thoſe two antient Grammarians is not amiſs. The prepoſition ἐπὶ has ſo many ſignifications, that it would be ſtrange if it had not ſometimes that which we give to the prepoſition *upon* in theſe phraſes: *He was enraged, he was tranſported, he became furious upon it.* Theſe are all phraſes where the prepoſition *upon* does not denote the object of the paſſion, but the cauſe of it.

I do not deny but Philargyrus has made Theocritus ſay, what he does not preciſely ſay, *viz.* That the herb Hippomanes excites in mares who eat of it an ardent luſt; but it is nevertheleſs very likely Theocritus underſtood it ſo. For proof of this, we need only conſider his wiſh, that the object of his love ſiezed with a deſire like to that of thoſe mares, might come to him; as alſo what the Naturaliſts obſerve as to the exceſſive luſt of theſe animals. Ariſtotle ſays (*q*) no female creatures equal theſe in luſt; and that to expreſs the luſt of other females exceſſively amorous, they made uſe of the name which denotes that of mares. Ælian obſerves the ſame thing in the eleventh chapter of the fourth book of his Hiſtory of Animals. Others have remarked, that they will go in queſt of the males, even over mountains and through rivers (*r*).

Scilicet ante omnes furor eſt inſignis equarum.
- - - - -
Illas ducit amor trans Gargara tranſque ſonantem
Aſcanium; ſuperant montes & flumina tranant (*s*).

But far above the reſt, the furious mare,
Barr'd from the male, is frantic with deſpair.

For love they force through thickets of the wood,
They climb the ſteepy hills, and ſtem the flood. DRYDEN.

Laſtly, Horace foretelling to a miſtreſs who had ſlighted her lovers, while ſhe was in her prime, that the time would come mankind would be even with her, tells her ſhe would then feel the rage that tranſports mares.

Cum tibi flagrans amor & libido,
Quæ ſolet matres furiare equorum,
Sæviet circa jecur ulceroſum (*t*).

Let us infer from hence by the by, that gallant poetry, was not in the reign of Auguſtus, as now-a-days, an enemy to all groſs ideas; but let us chiefly remember to conclude from the authorities which have been quoted, that Servius and Phylargyrus have well enough underſtood the paſſage of Theocritus, not to deſerve the cenſure Salmaſius paſſed upon them. It was much more natural to underſtand it of an amorous paſſion excited by the herb Hippomanes, than of a deſire of eating that herb: and it ſignifies little, that only Theocritus has ſpoken of this plant (*v*), ſince he might have grounded his aſſertion on ſome old tradition which might be contradicted by the following ages. In truth, it would not be very ſurprizing that there ſhould be ſuch an herb, as could produce this effect. That which the Italians call *Sferra-Cavallo*, becauſe it is pretended that horſes no ſooner tread on it, but they are unſhod (*w*), ſeems to me much more miraculous.

(*o*) Philargyrus, *another old Commentator on Virgil, is alſo involved in this cenſure, ſince he has inſinuated the ſame thing with Servius.*

(*p*) Μαίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τινὶ non dicitur qui alicujus rei guſtu vel hauſtu ad inſaniam adigitur, ſed qui rei ejus cujus cupiens eſt quocunque modo potiundæ ardore inſanit. *Salmaſ. ubi ſupra.*

(*q*) Τῶν δὲ θηλειῶν ὁρμητικῶς ἔχουσι πρὸς τὸν συνδιασμὸν μάλιςα μὲν ἵππος. Incenduntur libidine ex fœminis equæ potiſſimum. *Ariſt. Hiſt. Anim. lib. vi, cap. xviii.*

(*r*) In furias agitantur equæ, ſpacioque remota Per loca dividuos amne ſequuntur equos. *Ovid. lib. ii, ver.* 487, de Arte Am.

(*s*) Virgil. Georg. lib. iii, ver. 266.

(*t*) Horat. Od. XXV, lib. i.

(*v*) See the remark [*A*].

(*w*) See Matthiolus upon Dioſcorides, *lib. iii, cap.* 135.

Pliny mentions an herb by means of which the woodpecker makes a wedge thruſt into a tree jump out (*x*). Yet of this he ſeems to doubt in another book of his (*y*).

(*x*) Plin. *lib. x, cap. xviii.*

(*y*) *Idem, lib. xxv, cap. ii.*

VI.
Confutation of the opinion of Salmaſius.

Let us examine more cloſely the opinion of Salmaſius, and we ſhall better ſee that the changing the word φυτὸν into χυτὸν was not happily conjectured. To juſtify that change, we muſt ſuppoſe, 1. That Theocritus believed that the temple of Jupiter Olympius was not in Elis, but in Arcadia; or that knowing it was not in Arcadia, he has nevertheleſs affirmed it, either by reaſon of the nearneſs of thoſe two provinces, or becauſe Phormis who conſecrated this brazen mare was of that countrey. This firſt ſuppoſition is very abſurd; for who can ſuppoſe that the ceremony of the Olympic games could permit a fine wit to doubt in what province of Greece they were celebrated? In this reſpect the Greeks were all good and exact Geographers, inſomuch that it can never enter into the thoughts of any attentive man that Theocritus could err upon this head, or dare to deprive the people of Elis, in favour of thoſe of Arcadia, of the temple of Jupiter Olympius, one of the ſeven wonders of the world; and to deprive them of it for two bad reaſons. But here are other ſuppoſitions not leſs ſtrained than the foregoing. We muſt ſuppoſe in the ſecond place, that ſpeaking only of the luſt of horſes, Theocritus made uſe of the feminine gender πᾶσαι καὶ πῶλοι, *and all the mare-colts*; καὶ θοαὶ ἵπποι, *and all the mares* (*z*). What reaſon for this? A brazen mare is the object deſired; her Hippomanes excites the luſt only of the horſes, as Pauſanias obſerves; and yet Theocritus meant only the luſt of the mare-colts and mares. The reaſon is this: the Doric dialect made uſe of the feminine article to denote a horſe, in like manner as the common dialect employed the maſculine to denote a mare. Be it ſo; but as Pauſanias, even in the paſſage which Salmaſius quotes for proof of the remark concerning the common dialect, makes uſe of the maſculine article for horſes, and the feminine for mares, we muſt believe that thoſe who made uſe of the Doric dialect applyed to each ſex its proper article upon certain occaſions: and it would be eaſy to prove that no Greek author has made a horſe *feminine*, as the French do the word *perdrix*; or *maſculine*, as they do the word *lièvre*. Now if a like uſage cannot be ſhewn in the Doric dialect, Salmaſius's anſwer will appear to be no better than a chimera. 3. We muſt ſuppoſe that the Hippomanes of the brazen mare extended its virtue a great way, ſince the horſes of which Salmaſius will have Theocritus to ſpeak, ran raging over mountains, and flew to enjoy their beloved object *ſuperatis montibus*. No ſuch thing is hinted in the relation of Pauſanias, and the quite contrary is to be found in theſe words of Pliny, *mares* ADMOTOS *ad rabiem coitus agit*.

(*z*) *I do not tranſlate* θοαὶ, *which ſignifies* ſwift-footed.

Salmaſius finding himſelf perplexed with theſe mountains of Theocritus, changed them into ſomething elſe that might better agree with his notions: he pretends therefore we ought to read ἐν ὥρα, *in the ſpring*; and not ἀν' ὤρεα, *thro' the mountains*; but by misfortune nothing agrees worſe than this criticiſm of his with the text of Pauſanias, where it does plainly appear, that without any diſtinction of ſeaſons, the horſes were inflamed with luſt after the ſtatue, whatever time of the year it was (*a a*). Laſtly, Salmaſius had no reaſon to ſuppoſe that this ſtatue, impregnated with the virtue of the Hippomanes, was a mare. I know very well Pliny has ſaid it before him; but Pauſanias, who made it his principal ſtudy to examine the monuments of Greece, and who is an author incomparably more exact than Pliny, leaves us no reaſon to doubt that this ſtatue was a horſe, ſince he every where makes uſe of the maſculine article when he ſpeaks of it, and employs the feminine in the ſame place to denote a mare (*b b*).

(*a a*) Ἀνὰ πᾶσαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὀργῶσιν ἡμέραν.

(*b b*) Ἐπιπηδῶσιν αὐτῷ πολλῷ δή τι ἐμμανέστερον ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν καλλίστην ἵππον ζῶσάν τε καὶ ἠθάδα ἀναβαίνεσθαι. *Id. eſt juxta Verſionem Romuli Amaſæi*, Illum invadunt nihil hercle minus furenter quàm & viventem pulcherrimam equam gregalem inituri adorirentur.

VII.
A Reflexion upon what Pauſanias relates.

I ſhall not examine what credit is to be given to what Pauſanias relates concerning the virtue of this ſtatue, which was a kind of Taliſmanic virtue; but ſhall however ſay, that the extreme fury of luſt incident to horſes, might well enough be raiſed by a ſtatue without the help of any philtre. Let us ſuppoſe them to have a ſoul; could they not fancy that a ſtatue is the animal it repreſents, or at leaſt that it is a very fine ſtatue? In the firſt caſe, why might not the ſame thing happen to them, *mutatis mutandis*, as to thoſe birds who pecked upon the picture of a vine? An horſe painted by Apelles made the living horſes neigh (*c c*). In the ſecond caſe, why ſhould they not be ſubject to the infirmity many men have been guilty of, that is, to the laſcivious loving of a ſtatue (*d d*). I confeſs it may be objected amongſt other things, that in love the eyes are not the ſole guides of animals (*e e*), as they are very frequently of men; and that the ſmell is the principal vehicle of this paſſion in the machines of animals; whence it follows, that a ſtatue is deſtitute with reſpect to them of the main ſprings of love. But the queſtion is, whether the ſkill of the ſtatuary might not ſupply this defect by imitating the attitudes of a mare exceſſively luſtful; and whether the ſtory ſo celebrated by the Greek Poets, and by Auſonius after them, concerning Myron's brazen heifer, can be doubted of [*B*]? Livy, more credible alone than an hundred Poets, relates that at Syracuſe

(*c c*) Plin. *lib. xxxv, cap. x.* Valer. Max. *lib. viii, cap. xi, ſays it was a mare*, quo excuſabilior eſt error equi, qui viſâ picturâ equæ hinnitum edere coactus eſt.

(*d d*) *Several Moderns have made a collection of them, amongſt others* Balthaſar Bonifac. Hiſtor. Ludicr. *lib. xiv, cap. xiii.*

(*e e*) *See the paſſage of Lancelot of Perugia, in remark* [*B*].

[*B*] *Concerning Myron's brazen heifer.*] Myron a native of Eleuthera in Bœotia, made an heifer of braſs which furniſhed a fine topic for the Poets. There are in the Anthology (7), near forty epigrams upon this ſubject. Auſonius has made eleven on the ſame theme, which are ingenious enough; this is one of them:

(7) *Lib. iv, cap. xii.*

Bucula ſum cælo genitoris facta Myronis
Ærea: nec factam me puto, ſed genitam.

racuſe, a bull performed the carnal act upon the ſtatue of an heifer. *Vaccam æream Syracuſis ab agreſti Tauro qui pecore aberraſſet, initam ac ſemine aſperſam (ff).* As much has been ſaid of ſome other animals. ‘ Myronis æream buculam Taurus inſcenderet, caniculam, columbam, anatem coloribus expreſſas mares congeneres inſilirent (*gg*). - - - - ‘ *A bull leaped Myron's brazen heifer: dogs, doves, and drakes, have leaped the pictures of* ‘ *their reſpective females.*’ It muſt be owned that Livy relates this fact as one of the prodigies of that year, and that in point of prodigies we cannot well depend on him. If, with the Carteſians, we allow beaſts to be meer machines, we may nevertheleſs conceive how a lively imitation of poſtures might have notable effects.

VIII.
Cardan's miſtakes upon the ſame fact.

Cardan (*hh*) who doubts not of the fact related by Pauſanias, but even aſſigns the beſt natural reaſons he can for it, did not here take the male for the female. He was ſo well ſatisfied that Pauſanias ſpoke of the ſtatue of a horſe, that it is one of the objections he attempts to ſolve: but otherwiſe he does not ſeem to have well examined the paſſage of that Hiſtorian; for he makes him ſay that this brazen horſe was at Heraclea of Elis, a Province of Peloponneſus, in a place called *Quialten* (*ii*). A ſtrange complication of blunders. For, 1. Heraclea is the name of a great many cities (*kk*), but is not the name of any one province (*ll*). 2. At leaſt it is certain that there was not any province of that name in all Peloponneſus. 3. There was indeed in Elis a city or town of that name (*mm*), but it was not a place that contained any pieces of the treaſure of Olympia. 4. Laſtly, This *Quialten* is a monſtrous abſurdity. Heraclea and Quialten, in my opinion, came to be foiſted in thus: Pauſanias having mentioned ſome gifts which the city of Heraclea upon the Euxine-Sea, a colony of the Megarians, had conſecrated, obſerves, that overagainſt them there were others conſecrated by Phormis, &c. and that the two horſes which this Phormis preſented to Jupiter, were in the Altis, that is, in the *lucus*, or grove that was an appendage to the temple.

IX.
Miſtakes of John Baptiſt Porta, and of Boaiſtuau, and of the Commentary on Du Bartas.

I have ſeen in a French tranſlation of the Natural Magic of John Baptiſt Porta (*nn*), a pretty long chapter of the Hippomanes, which I have not in my Latin edition (*oo*). Pauſanias's relation is there faithfully enough reported, excepting two falſhoods; one is, that Arcas an Olympian mingled ſome Hippomanes with the metal of the ſtatue; the other, that he made a mare. He ſays that Ælian relates the ſame ſtory; but it is a miſtake. John Wierus (*pp*) has only avoided the firſt of theſe three miſtakes: he ſays that Phormis of Arcadia, experimented the Hippomanes at Olympia, *novit vim Olympiæ Phormis Arcas*. Note, That Baptiſt Porta's Natural Magic, printed in Latin at Francfort 1607, is divided into twenty books; ſome preceding editions, from which the French verſion cited by me was made, have but four. The original Latin of this author

(ff) T. Livius, *lib. xli.*

(gg) Balth. Boniſac. ubi ſupra. *See Athenæus cited in the remark* [*B*].

(*hh*) De Subtilit. *lib. xviii.*

(*ii*) In Heraclea Elidis Peloponneſi Provinciæ equum æneum fuiſſe narrat in loco cui nomen erat Quialten.

(*kk*) *See* Salmaſ. in Flor. *lib. i, cap xviii.*

(*ll*) *I do not deny that there were ſome little iſlands of this name.*

(*mm*) *Strabo, Pauſanias, and Stephanus Byzantinus mention it, but not Emmius in his* Græcia Antiqua, *nor* Ortelius, *nor* Lloyd, *nor* Hofman, *nor* Baudrand, *in their* Dictionaries.

(*nn*) *Printed at* Roan, 1626, *in* 12mo. *The chapter upon the* Hippomanes, *is the 27th of the ſecond book. It is found among* Weckher's *ſecrets, as written by* Baptiſt Porta.

(*oo*) *That of* Francfort 1607, *in* 8*vo.*

(*pp*) De Lamiis, *cap. xxxviii.*

Sic me taurus init: ſic proxima bucula mugit,
  Sic vitulus ſitiens ubera noſtra petit.
Miraris, quod fallo gregem? gregis ipſe Magiſter
  Inter paſcentes me numerare ſolet (8).

I am the brazen heifer Myron fram'd.
I think, not art, but nature gave me birth.
Thus thinks the bull, and me he eager leaps.
Thus thinks my ſiſter heifer, when ſhe lows.
Thus thinks the thirſty calf, and ſeeks my milk.
Thus thinks the maſter of the lowing herd,
And me he numbers, with the grazing herd.

Mr Menage has exerciſed his Greek muſe upon this heifer with better ſucceſs in Father Hardouin's opinion than all the reſt. See his Commentary upon the thirty-fourth book of Pliny (9), where he ſays that Tzetzes has mentioned the ſame heifer in the 194th ſtory of the eighth chiliad. See alſo the Anti-Baillet (10), in which a Greek epigram of Andrew Laſcaris is cited. Note, that Dom Lancelotti of Perugia, reckons amongſt the fables whatever the Antients have ſaid of the love of beaſts for pictures. ‘ De gli animali, *ſays he* (11), porto l'iſteſſa opinione, perche queſti ‘ non ſi riſentono al coito ſolamente per la viſta, ma ‘ per lo moto, per l'odore, e per la voce, niuna delle ‘ quali tre coſe ha la pittura, Farfalloneggi quanto ‘ vuole Plinio, Valerio, e chi chi ſia. - - - *As to animals, they are incited to copulation not only by the ſight,* ‘ *but alſo by motion, by the ſmell, and the voice, neither* ‘ *of which three things are in a picture; and therefore* ‘ *I am of opinion that they are not incited to copulation* ‘ *by a picture, whatever idle ſtories may be vented by Pliny,* ‘ *Valerius Flaccus, or any other author.*’ I have ſaid in the article ZEUXIS, that he is miſtaken about other things of the ſame nature, which he has denied; and why may he not about theſe? However, I will cite Athenæus. Τῇ τε γὰρ περὶ τὴν Πυρήνην χαλκῇ βοῒ βοῦς ἐπανέβη, καὶ γεγραμμένῃ κυνὶ καὶ περιστερᾷ καὶ χηνὶ, τῇ μὲν κύων, τῇ δὲ περιστερά, τῇ δὲ χὴν προσῆλθον καὶ ἐπεπήδησαν. φανέντων δὲ πᾶσι τούτοις ἀδυνάτων ἀπέστησαν. Circa Pyrenæos montes in æneam vaccam bos tanquam initurus conſcendit: pictis verò cani, columbæ, anſeri, fœminis mares ejus generis ſeſe cùm adjunxiſſent & inſiluiſſent, deſtiterunt, quoniam id fieri non poſſe cognoſcerent (12). - - - *Near the Pyrenees, a bull leaped a brazen heifer. As to painted dogs, doves, and geeſe, their reſpective males have joined and leaped them, but finding they were inanimate, they deſiſted.* Perhaps there is nothing more ſatirical, or ingenious in Lelio Capilupi's *Cento Virgilianus* againſt the Monks, than the application of one of Virgil's verſes, which I ſhall cite below. Here follows a piece of it:

O fortunatos nimium, ſua ſi bona norint,
Non abſunt illis ſaltus, armentaque læta.
Cælati argenti ſunt, auri multa talenta,
Sacra deum, ſanctique patres, & chara ſororum
Pectora mœrentum tenebris & carcere cæco
Centum ærei claudunt vectes, & ſæpe ſine ullis
Conjugiis vento gravidæ, mirabile dictu,
Religione ſacræ, non hæc ſine numine divum.
Jam nova progenies cælo demittitur alto.
Credo equidem, nec vana fides, genus eſſe Deorum.

O happy, did they know their happy ſtate,
They who abound in groves, and flocks, and gold;
Bleſt venerable men, and lovely dames,
Repentant holy ſiſters, who, ſhut up
In gloomy priſons, fenc'd with braſs, are oft
(O wonderful to tell!) impregnated
By the ſoft wind, without th' approach of man.
Such is the pleaſure of the heav'nly pow'rs.
A ſacred progeny from heav'n deſcends!
A race, whoſe origin is ſure divine.

[C] *He*

(8) Auſon. Epig. lviii.

(9) *Tom. v, pag.* 113, *and not* 213, *as is ſaid in the* Anti-Baillet, *Part. ii, Art. cxviii.*

(10) *Part. ii, Art.* cxxxii.

(11) Secondo Lancelotti *da Perugia Abbate Olivetano, Accademico Inſenſato, Affidato, e Humoriſta*, l'Hoggidi, overo il Mondo non peggiore ne piu calamitoſo del paſſato, *Part. ii, Diſinganno XV, pag.* 309.

(12) Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 605.

anthor does not ſay that Arcas the Olympian mingled ſome Hippomanes, &c. but that Phormis the Arcadian diſcovered the virtue of the Hippomanes at Olympia, *tantam in eo vim novit Olympiæ Phormis Arcas.* I believe Cardan occoſioned the error of one Peter Boaiſtuau, ſirnamed Launai, a native of Bretagne, (for theſe are the titles he loved to diſtinguiſh himſelf by) highly praiſed by la Croix du Maine. *Who would not be ſurprized,* ſays he *(qq)*, *at what Pauſanias the Greek Hiſtorian relates concerning the brazen ſtatue of of an horſe, formed by a certain artiſt in Heraclea, a province of Peloponneſus, having a cut and deformed tail, but perfect in all the other parts of the body, which however the other horſes endeavoured to leap with ſo much heat and tranſport, as to break their hoofs by their frequent rearings upon it, whilſt the ſlipperineſs of the braſs it was compoſed of ſtill caſt them off; and notwithſtanding all the blows that could be given them, they could not be driven away, but neighed after the ſtatue as if they had met with a mare ready to take horſe?* Du Bartas hinted at the ſame wonder in theſe verſes *(r r)*.

(qq) Treatiſe concerning the excellence of man, printed at the end of the Theatre du Monde, *by ſame anthor.*

(r r) Sixth day of the firſt week, ver. 826.

Cette jument d'airain ſur qui les eſtalons
Lançoient eſtant en rut leurs fragiles talons.

That brazen mare, by famous Myron caſt
Which horſes leap'd, and as a mare embrac'd.

But Simon Goulart, his Commentator, has wrongfully imagined that this related to Myron's maſterpiece, *who made*, ſays he, *a mare or heifer of braſs ſo very natural, that the horſes ran to leap her.* If he had remembred the paſſage of Pauſanias, or rather that of Pliny, and conſidered that the epigrams he ſpeaks of in the ſame place do not permit us to doubt whether Myron made an heifer or a mare, he would not have fallen into this little error. See, above, the remark [*B*].

X.
Whether there is a fourth ſort of Hippomanes.

Beſides the three ſorts of Hippomanes I have ſpoken of, there are ſome authors who mention a fourth. They ground themſelves upon Ariſtotle's authority, pretending that he acknowledged two ſorts of Hippomanes in mares, one that flows before the horſes approach, the other after they have allayed their appetite by the firſt congreſs. Salmaſius, who finds this diſtinction in Ariſtotle *(s s)*, put me upon reading attentively the words of this Philoſopher *(t t)*: but I have not found it there, tho' I ſaw the remark concerning the Hippomanes, repeated twice over in a very few lines. That repetition ought not to carry our thoughts to two different things: for tho' Ariſtotle be conciſe, it is nevertheleſs true that he conſiders the ſymptoms of laſcivious mares at two different times; and the reaſon of his doing it is, that he particularly explains the accidents of thoſe mares that took wind, if I may ſo ſpeak, *quæ* ἐξανεμοῦσθαι, *eventari dicebantur.* He intimates that this happened not to mares who had an horſe at hand; I ſay, he intimates it in the place where he obſerves that by reaſon of this accident the Cretans left the mares and ſtallions together: and having ſpoken of the courſes which thoſe mares took towards the north or ſouth, to whom this accident happened, he ſpeaks in general of the ſigns by which the mares are known to want the horſe; and as he had ſpoken of the Hippomanes with reſpect to thoſe who do nothing but run, he ſpeaks of it alſo with reſpect to all mares in general [*C*]. I ſee no ground from hence for multiplying the kinds of Hippomanes: but yet ſuppoſe they were multiplied *(v v)*, Salmaſius would ſtill be miſtaken, in

(s s) Differentiam itaque conſtituit Ariſtoteles inter hoc ἱππομανὲς quod equæ tum ejiciunt ubi ſemel ſalitæ fuerint, eſtque ſimile καπρία, & illud ἱππομανὲς quod illis defluit ab inguine eo tempore quo maris cupiditate ardeſcunt nec dum admiſerunt. *Salmaſ. Exercit. Plin. pag.* 941.

(t t) Ariſt. Hiſt. Animal. *lib. vi, cap. xviii.*

(v v) Father Hardoüin in Plin. *Tom. ii, pag.* 211, *acknowledges two kinds of it.*

Mares that took wind.

[*C*] *He ſpeaks of it alſo with reſpect to all mares in general.*] It is thus I explain that paſſage of Ariſtotle, becauſe otherwiſe there would ſeem to be a contradiction in it as may be ſeen by this abſtract. We ſee there that the luſt of the mares, is called a furious appetite of enjoying the male, ἱππομανεῖν; that it is ſaid alſo that at that time they take wind, ἐξανεμοῦσθαι; that in that condition they depart from other mares and horſes; that they run not towards the eaſt or weſt, but towards the north or ſouth; that they ſuffer nothing to come near them, except they are tired down, or come near the ſea-ſide; that then they caſt out ſomething called Hippomanes; that the mares at the ſeaſon of copulation gather together; that they love company more than before; that they move more frequently their tails; that their neighing changes; that they caſt the Hippomanes. *They ſtale alſo*, ſays Ariſtotle, *more frequently, and ſport with one another when they are ready to take horſe.* I am ſorry, I am not clear-ſighted enough to perceive much perſpicuity and exactneſs in theſe words: but however it be, if ἐξανεμοῦσθαι does not differ from ἱππομανεῖν, as the ſpecies differs from the genus, it will follow that Ariſtotle would teach us that mares ready to take horſe, avoid all company, and yet that they aſſociate with greater pleaſure than before. Now, as this would be a ridiculous contradiction, it muſt be concluded that Ariſtotle by ἐξανεμοῦσθαι meant only a kind of heat; or if it be pretended that this contains ſomething common to all mares, we muſt conclude, that it was a ſtate that preceded the maturity of the paſſion, and what Ariſtotle a little after calls ὥραν τῆς ὀχείας, *tempus coïtus.* But this utterly overthrows Salmaſius's ſyſtem, I mean that explication he is ſo fond of, and repeats more than once in another page, after having juſtly cenſured the great man who thought that Ariſtotle's ἐξανεμοῦσθαι ought to be underſtood of the mares that were impregnated by the operation of the wind. It is certain that Ariſtotle does not ſpeak of this, and there would be no objection againſt Salmaſius, if he had contented himſelf with affirming that this Greek word ſignifies *the refreſhing one's ſelf with the wind ſucked in with open mouth:* but he is unfortunate in what he adds to this interpretation. 'Ἐξανεμοῦσθαι, *ſays he* (13), eſt eventilari & vento excepto hiante ore refrigerari, quod equæ faciunt ubi ad ſatietatem initæ non fuerint. Ex eo quidem interdum & concipere autores tradidere, idque in Hiſpania tantum. Non tamen ἐξανεμοῦσθαι ſignificat ex vento concipere. Loquitur Ariſtoteles de iis equabus quæ admiſerint ſed non ſatis, nec meminit eo loco conceptionis ullius quæ ex vento fiat. - - - 'Ἐξανεμοῦσθαι, *ſignifies to be eventilated or fanned, and to be cooled by taking in air with open mouth, as the mares do, when their luſt is not fully ſatisfied. Authors indeed have ſaid, that by this they are ſometimes impregnated, and that this happens only in Spain. But* ἐξανεμοῦσθαι *does not ſignify to be impregnated by the wind.*

(13) Salmaſ. Exercitat. Plin. *pag.* 943.

in pretending that Ariſtotle's diſtinction reſpects the non-enjoyment of ſome mares, and the enjoyment of ſome others far ſhort of ſatiety, and that thoſe mares who took wind, were of the latter ſort. This is by no means Ariſtotle's doctrine; on the contrary, we ſhould infer from his diſcourſe, that they totally abſtained, ſince, beſides the reflexion he makes upon the conduct of the Cretans, he ſays in expreſs words, that they wandered from the herd, and never ſuffered themſelves to be approached till they were tired, or came near the ſea *(ww)*, and that then they caſt the Hippomanes. Ὅταν δὲ τοῦτο πάθωσι, θέουσιν ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἵππων . . . ὅταν δὲ ἐμπέσῃ τὸ πάθος οὐδένα ἐῶσι πλησιάζειν, ἕως ἂν ἢ ἀπείπωσι Διὰ τὸν πόνον, ἢ πρὸς θάλασσαν ἔλθωσι· τότε δὲ ἐκβάλλουσί τι. *&c. Cùm vero ita affectæ fuerint, currunt relicta ſocietate . . . . nec appropinquare quemquam patiuntur donec vel defatigatæ deſiſtant vel ad mare deveniant; tum aliquid emittunt, &c (xx).*

Mr Hofman

' *wind. Ariſtotle ſpeaks of thoſe mares who have admitted the male, but have not fully ſatisfied their luſt;* ' *nor in that place does he mention any conception made by* ' *the wind.*' Note, that Salmaſius is miſtaken when he affirms that this has been ſaid only of Spaniſh mares, ſince the ſame thing has been ſaid of thoſe of Cappadocia (14).

THE pretended fœcundity of thoſe mares.

Let us not leave this ſubject without obſerving that it is very probable Ariſtotle has divided into two parts, what was told him concerning the heat of mares ready to take horſe, rejecting what he thought incredible, and preſerving the reſt. But he would perhaps have done well to have rejected all thoſe rambling courſes from one pole to the other; to have rejected them, I ſay, as well as the conceptions produced purely by the winds (15). Virgil, inveſted with all the privileges of Poetry, would dot depart from the tradition; he has ſuppoſed that the mares ſought the winds, and found them endued with a prolific virtue. Theſe are his words:

Continuoque avidis ubi ſubdita flamma medullis,
Vere magis (quia vere calor redit oſſibus) illæ
Ore omnes verſæ in Zephyrum, ſtant rupibus altis,
Exceptantque leves auras: & ſæpe ſine ullis
Conjugiis, vento gravidæ (mirabile dictu)
Saxa per & ſcopulos & depreſſas convalles
Diffugiunt, non, Eure, tuos, neque ſolis ad ortus,
In Borean, Caurumque, aut unde nigerrimus Auſter
Naſcitur, & pluvio contriſtat frigore cælum (16).

. . . . and when in ſpring the flame
Burns fiercer (for in ſpring the flame returns),
On lofty rocks they ſtand, and in their mouths,
Ope'd to the weſtern breeze, the gentle air
Receive; and oft (prodigious to relate!)
Without connubials, pregnant by the wind,
O'er cliffs, and hills, and lowly vallies fly;
Not tow'rds the eaſt, or to the riſing ſun,
Nor tow'rds the north, or northweſt, or that point,
Whence the black ſouth blows, ſcowling on the world
With fogs, and rain, and ſaddens all the ſky.

TRAPP.

From this deſcription it may be inferred, that it was the weſt wind that impregnated the mares, and that they reſted upon ſome riſing ground to receive it, turning their heads or tails to it, (for that is a point that has not yet been cleared by the critics, there being reaſons on both ſides) after which they ran as if they had been mad, either from north to ſouth, or from ſouth to north. Theſe fictions are pardonable in the Poets; but we cannot tell how to pardon (17) Varro, Pliny, Solinus, Columella, and ſome others, for having affirmed, as a certain fact, that in Portugal the mares bring forth colts without any other ſire than the wind. The Hiſtorian Trogus Pompeius has much ridiculed this (18). Andrew Reſendius, a learned Portugueſe, ſays (19), that there is no inſtance of it in his country. Francis Fernand of Corduba (20), has confuted the ſame ſtory with arguments, authorities, and experience.

This ſhews that St Auguſtin has not well choſen all the examples he has oppoſed to the incredulity which he obſerved among the Heathens, with reſpect to the myſteries of the goſpel: for, amongſt other things which he ſays (21), were not doubted of, but yet were unaccountable, he ſpeaks of the mares impregnated by the wind. It was not a point that all the Heathens generally agreed in. We find it exploded in Juſtin, with the approbation of Leonard Coquæus (22). Euſtathius, Biſhop of Theſſalonica (23), looks upon it as a fable, and every body at preſent laughs at it (24). But after all, a better reaſon might be given for it in the new Hypotheſis, that all animals proceed from an egg, than from the courſes the mares made from one pole to the other. If Ariſtotle, who appears not to doubt of this fact, would have exerciſed his principles of Phyſic upon it, he would have found himſelf more work than Des Cartes did in the direction of the loadſtone. Mr Des Cartes himſelf might here have been put to a ſtand, for want of a channelling, or rebates of the inſenſible parts, ſuch as would be neceſſary to explain the virtue of the ſouthern and northern winds upon mares that had ſucked in the weſtern. However it be, I do not think that the preſent managers of the ſtuds could ſupply Ariſtotle with memoirs to confirm thoſe he has publiſhed. Who would believe, for example, that there was at Opûs (25) a ſtallion which could do his office at forty years old, tho' he wanted aſſiſtance to raiſe his fore-legs (26)? Pliny has well copied this paſſage of Ariſtotle, when he ſays, *Opunte & ad quadraginta duraſſe aiunt adjutum modo in attollenda priore parte corporis* (27). But Solinus has performed the part of a very bad tranſcriber in theſe words: ' Notatum etiam advertimus Opuntem nomine equum ad gregariam venerem duraſſe ' in annos quadraginta (28). - - - - *We find it alſo recorded that a ſtallion named* Opus, *was able to leap the* ' *mares when he was forty years old.*' This horſe belonged to an inhabitant of Opus, and Solinus has taken the name of the place for that of the horſe. Salmaſius (29) has not forgot to cenſure him for this blunder. The omiſſion of his wanting to be helped up by the fore-feet, which was the principle rarity of the fact, did not leſs deſerve to be cenſured.

What I have ſaid of St Auguſtin is applicable alſo to Origen (30) and to Lactantius, who have endeavoured to perſuade us of the immaculate virginity of the mother of Jeſus Chriſt, by the examples of conceptions without the uſe of a male, ſtoried by the Heathens. ' Quod ſi animalia quædam vento aut aura ' concipere ſolere omnibus notum eſt, cur quiſquam ' mirum putet cum Spiritu Dei cui facile eſt quidquid ' velit, gravatam eſſe Virginem dicimus (31). - - - *If* ' *it is univerſally known, that ſome animals are impregnated by the wind, or air, why ſhould any man* ' *think it wonderful that the Virgin Mary conceived by* ' *the Spirit of God, who can eaſily do whatever he* ' *pleaſes.*' The Fathers made any ſhift, *& ex omni ligno Mercurium.* If they had only alledged this as an argument *ad hominem*, they could not be blamed; but they affirm it as a certain fact. I do not know whether they cite what Pomponius Mela relates of ſome ſavage Æthiopian women, who became mothers without the concourſe of any man: ' Super eos grandis ' littoris flexus grandem inſulam includit, in qua tantum fœminas eſſe narrant, toto corpore hirſutas, & ' ſine coitu marium ſua ſponte fœcundas: adeo aſperis efferiſque moribus, ut quædam contineri ne reluctentur vix vinculis poſſint. Hoc Hanno retulit, ' & quia detracta occiſis coria pertulerat, fides habita ' eſt (32). - - - *Above theſe turnings of the great coaſt,* ' *there is a very large iſland, which, they ſay, is inhabited by women, whoſe bodies are all over hairy, and* ' *who conceive of themſelves, without the help of men.* ' *Their manners are ſo rough and wild, that ſome of them* ' *can hardly be ſubdued and maſtered, even when they* ' *are in chains. This is related by Hanno, and as he* ' *brought over ſome of the ſkins of theſe women who had*

' *been*

(ww) *The Geneva edition,* 1605, *and the* Paris, 1629, *have* marem *inſtead of* mare.

(xx) Ariſt. ubi ſupra.

(14) *See* St Aug. de Civitate Dei, *lib. xxi, cap. v.*

(15) *Several authors, as Fr. Modius* Nov. Antiq. Lect. *Epiſt. lxxiv*, Dauſqueius in Silium Italicum, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 134, *falſely father upon Ariſtotle theſe conceptions.*

(16) Virgil. Georg. lib. iii. ver. 271.

(17) *See* Jo. à Wower. de Polymath. *cap. xi.*

(18) Juſtin. *lib. xliv, cap. iii.*

(19) Antiq. Luſitanicar. *lib. i.*

(20) Didaſcal. multipl. *cap. xlviii.*

(21) De Civitat. Dei, *lib. xxi, cap. v. See the laſt paragraph of this remark.*

(22) *In his notes on* St Auſtin de Civit. Dei, *lib.* 21, *cap. v.*

(23) In Iliad. *lib. xx, ver.* 225.

(24) Harduin. in Plin. *Tom. ii, pag.* 212. *Note, that ſome believe it, ſuch as* Lewis Carrion, Obſervat. *lib i, cap. xvii, & lib. ii, cap. iv.*

(25) *A town of the Epicnemidii Locri.*

(26) Ariſt. Hiſt. Anim. *lib. vi, cap. xxii.*

(27) Plin. *lib. viii, cap. xlii.*

(28) Solin. *cap. xlv.*

(29) Exercit. Plin. *pag.* 936.

(30) *In libris adverſus Celſum.*

(31) Lactant Divin. Inſtitut. *lib. iv, cap. xii, pag. m.* 246, 247.

(32) Pomp. Mela, *lib. iii, cap. ix.*

XI. Remarks upon Hofman and Furetiere.

Mr Hofman (yy) ſpeaks of the Hippomanes according to Salmaſius's ideas, as well upon the paſſage of Theocritus as that of Ariſtotle; and therefore we need only refer him to what has been ſaid above. Only let me be allowed to tell him, that if he well conſults Pauſanias, he will not cite him *de Arcad.* (zz), nor find there that Phormis dedicated a mare in Olympia; for that author expreſsly ſays at the end of the fifth book, that Phormis conſecrated two horſes and two grooms. As to Mr Furetiere, I have no conſiderable faults to tax him with; I only obſerve, that he has been a little unexact in citing Pliny only for the Hippomanes on the forehead of colts. That naturally leads us to this fallacious thought, that Pliny ſpeaks of no other Hippomanes. I could wiſh alſo he had cited Ariſtotle, whoſe authority is juſtly greater than Pliny's. As to the other ſort of Hippomanes, he ſhould not have cited Servius, but Virgil; Servius being only his interpreter, without ſaying whether the fact be true or falſe. Neither Cæſar de Rochefort's Dictionary, nor Caſtellus's *Lexicon Medicum* copiouſly enlarged by Bruno, ſay any thing of the Hippomanes.

XII. What is to be believed of the Hippomanes.

I will not conclude this article without obſerving what Ariſtotle has ſo judiciouſly determined concerning the Caruncula on the forehead of the foal. He ſays, that it is ſaid to grow there, but that the dam takes it off by licking, and that the ſtories concerning its virtue are to be reckoned fables invented by women and enchanters. Τὸ δὲ ἱππομανὲς καλούμενον ἐπιφύεται μὲν, ὥσπερ λέγεται, τοῖς πωλοῖς. αἱ δὲ ἵπποι περιλείχουσαι καὶ καθαίρουσαι περιτρώγουσιν αὐτὸ. τὰ δὲ ἐπιμυθευόμενα πέπλασται μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν περὶ τὰς ἐπῳδάς. *Quod Hippomanes vocant, hæret quidem fronti naſcentis pulli, ut narratur, ſed equæ perlambentes abſtergenteſque id abrodunt: quæ autem de hoc fabulantur, figmenta muliercularum & profeſſorum carminis incantamentorum eſſe credendum potius eſt* (a). Neverthelefs this virtue has been talked of in all ages, and one may eaſily ſee that the perſuaſion which firſt obtained of its being ſerviceable as a philtre, was grounded upon the ſtory, that if the mare did not ſwallow it, ſhe did not ſuckle her young. An antient Poet, cited by Apuleius, enumerating philtres, calls this *hinnientium dulcedines*; which agrees extremely well with the *Matri præreptus amor*, which I have cited from Virgil. But as philtres rather produced fury than love, thence the Hippomanes came to be conſidered as a baneful drug. Juvenal ſays that Cæſonia, by employing it upon her huſband Caligula, cauſed that mad rage which made him commit ſo many crimes.

Et furere incipias, ut avunculus ille Neronis
Cui totam tremuli frontem Cæſonia pulli
Infudit.
Ardebant cuncta & fracta compage ruebant,
Non aliter quàm ſi feciſſet Juno maritum
Inſanum.
- - - - - - - - - - -
Hæc poſcit ferrum atque ignes, hæc potio torquet,
Hæc lacerat mixtos equitum cum ſanguine patres,
Tanti partus equæ, tanti una venefica conſtat (b).

Some nimbler juice would make him foam and rave,
Like that Ceſonia to her Caius gave,
Who plucking from the forehead of the foal
His mother's love, infus'd it in the bowl;
The boiling blood ran hiſſing in his veins,
Till the mad vapour mounted to his brains.
The thund'rer was not half ſo much on fire,
When Juno's girdle kindled his deſire.
- - - - - - - - - -
But this fierce potion calls for fire and ſword,
Nor ſpares the commons, when it ſtrikes the lord:
So many miſchiefs were in one combin'd,
So much one ſingle pois'ner coſt mankind, DRYDEN.

The world is not yet cured of this ſuperſtition; for we find in a pretty late romance (c), which is a faithful and agreeable copy of the conduct of many perſons; we find there, I ſay, ſome Pariſian ladies paſſing a whole night in *watching a mare, to catch I know not what they were made to believe a foal brings into the world on his forehead, and to dreſs it with certain ceremonies, which in their opinion, would become a wonderful and irreſiſtible*

(yy) *Vol. iii, pag.* 162; *and Vol. iv, pag.* 495.

(zz) *The book concerning Arcadia is the eighth, that wherein he ſpeaks of Phormis is the fifth, and the firſt of the two wherein the author treats of Elis.*

(a) Ariſt. Hiſt. Anim. *lib. viii, cap. xxiv, pag.* 699, 700.

(b) Juven. Sat. VI, ver. 614.

(c) Avantures de Henriette Sylvie de Moliere, *Part. iii, pag.* 50, *Dutch Edit.* 1674.

' *been ſlain, what he ſaid was believed.*' You ſee that Lactantius quotes Hanno; but he miſrepreſents him, for Hanno has not ſaid that the women of that iſland were without men: ' Non recte Hannoni adfingit, inſulam hanc habitari à feminis ſolis, & quidem ſua ' ſponte fœcundis, cum Hanno contrarium dicat: utriuſque enim ſexus homines in ea inſula fuiſſe ſcribit, ' quamvis multo plures feminas (33). - - - - *He wrongfully aſcribes to Hanno, the having related that this iſland was inhabited by women only, and that theſe women conceive of themſelves: whereas Hanno ſays the contrary; for he writes that there are both men and women in that iſland, though a great many more women than men.*'

(33) Iſaacus Voſſius, in Pompon. Melam, *ibid.* Gaſpar. à Reies *quem vide in* Elyſ. jucund. Quæſt. Campo, *Quæſt. XLI, num.* 13, *& ſeq. knew not Mela's errror.*

philtre. This philtre was to be given cunningly to the ſoldiers, and to the captain himſelf, if there was occaſion for it, and immediately both the captain and ſoldiers were to run through the ſtreets, and offer to do all that ſhould be deſired of them. The towers and gates ſeemed, if I may ſo ſpeak, to be ready to fall of themſelves, to give liberty to whomſoever the ladies pleaſed. If we conſult the journal of the German Naturaliſts (*d*), we ſhall be fully convinced that the colts are foaled with the Hippomanes on the forehead; for they give us the anatomical figure and deſcription of one of them, which had been brought quite hot to a Phyſician, called Mr Raygerus. He had often deſired to ſee ſome of them freſh, having before ſeen ſome that were dry: he experienced that the mare gave milk to the colt as uſual, tho' that part was taken from it; ſo that if on one hand he lends aſſiſtance to the Antients, he diſcredits them much on the other. His Hippomanes is much larger than Ariſtotle or Pliny repreſent it.

(*d*) Annus Octavus, impreſſus 1678, *pag.* 94, *& ſeq.*

A
DISSERTATION
UPON THE
DAY.

I. Reflexions upon the definition of the Natural and Artificial Day.

EVERY body knows that the word Day has ſeveral acceptations, and that there is the Natural Day, the Artificial Day, the Civil Day, the Aſtronomical Day, *&c.* I could make many obſervations to ſhew that in the definition of theſe ſeveral ſorts of Days there is hardly ever any perfect exactneſs; but as the particularizing theſe punctilio's might carry me too far, I ſhall omit more of them than I ſhall mention.

It is ſomewhat ſtrange that authors are not agreed in the definition of the Natural and of the Artificial Day. Some define the Natural Day, *the time betwixt ſun-riſing and ſun-ſetting*; and the Artificial Day, *the ſpace included in twenty-four hours* (*a*). Others define the Natural Day, *the ſpace of time the ſun takes to make a complete revolution about the earth*; and the Artificial Day, *the time from ſun-riſing to ſun-ſetting* (*b*). I own this difference lies more in the words than in the thing it ſelf, and that we are not obliged to give words the ſame ſenſe that others give them; but it would be very convenient for readers if the ſignification of certain terms was fixed, and was not converted from white to black in paſſing from one book to another. Beſides, they who define the Day, *the time from ſun-riſing to ſun-ſetting*, chuſe the leaſt common ſignification; ſince, for one Coſmographer who meaſures each Day's extent by it, in treating of the difference of climates, (in which it is certain that the ſun's riſing and ſetting are only regarded) there are millions of people who underſtand by the word Day all the time that the Horizon is enlightned. This appears by theſe common phraſes, *At break of Day*; *It was already Day*; *It was Day ſtill*; whereby the morning twilight and evening twilight are manifeſtly denoted. It is therefore expoſing the books of the Dogmatiſts to the complaints and cenſures of moſt people, to ſay that the revolution of the ſun comprehends the Day and the Night; but by the Day is meant the time from the riſing to the ſetting of the ſun, and by the Night the time from its ſetting to its riſing. It would be better to ſay that the Day is all the time we enjoy the light of the ſun (*c*), and that the Night is only the time we are deprived of it. Beſides, it is not very reaſonable to call that the Artificial Day, which nature makes by the real or apparent revolution of the firmament about the earth: this title much better agrees to that part of the revolution in which artificers are employed in their labour; and even this ſhews that the Artificial Day ought not to be terminated by the riſing and ſetting of the ſun; it is not by that the workmen can meaſure their labour in the frigid Zones, nor always meaſure it in the temperate ones.

We ſee every where elſe that thoſe things which borrow their names from nature, are much more general than thoſe that take them from art: It is therefore more reaſonable that the Natural Day ſhould be that which is uniform throughout the world, and the Artificial Day that which varies according to places, than to eſtabliſh the contrary. Let us ſay therefore that the word Day in its moſt proper ſignification ought to be taken for the time betwixt the ſun's leaving the Meridian, to its returning to it again; that this is the Natural Day, which comprehends twenty-four hours [*A*]; that in this ſenſe the

Of the duration and equality of Natural Days.

[*A*] *The Natural-Day, which comprehends twenty-four hours.*] What I ſay here of the duration of twenty-four hours, ought not to be rigorouſly underſtood: for, if the Aſtronomers and Coſmographers do not deceive us, when they unanimouſly affirm that the ſpace of an hour correſponds to the aſcenſion of fifteen degrees of the Æquator upon the horizon, the ſun's return to the meridian will require ſomewhat more than twenty-

---

(*a*) *Father* Labbe, Abrégé Chronol. *Tom. i, and before him Cenſorinus, as to the Natural Day, to which he oppoſes the Civil Day.*

(*b*) Coutel, *pag.* 13, *of the* Calcul. Eccleſ. Furetiere, *and before them* Gaſſendus, Inſtit. Aſtronom. *lib. i, cap. xxii.*

(*c*) *Take in alſo the light that precedes the ſun-riſing, and ſucceeds the ſun-ſetting.*

the Days are not longer nor leſs numerous under the Poles than under the Æquator; that they are equal in all parts of the earth; but that as the moſt excellent parts of a whole have often the privilege of bearing the name of the whole without addition, and by way of pre-eminence, it happens that where the Natural Day is compoſed of two parts, one dark and the other light, this, as the more noble, has been only named *the Day*; whereupon they thought they might ſay, that in the temperate Zones each Day is longer or ſhorter than the preceding. This was doubtleſs the origin of this ſecond ſignification of the word *Day*. Order requires, that they who treat theſe ſubjects dogmatically, ſhould characteriſe it by the addition of ſome epithet, of *Artificial* for inſtance. But in common ſpeech there is no need of any addition, in order to conceive that the Day excludes the Night (*d*). However, this is not univerſal; there are popular phraſes in which the Day is taken for twenty-four hours; as when we ſay, that *a child lived but four days*, *that a journey or a marriage continued but fifteen days*; and thus of ſeveral other ways of ſpeaking, in which it is plain that the Day excludes not the Night.

II. The Gauls and other nations reckoned by nights.

The antient Gauls gave the Night the preference over the Day, calling the time of twenty-four hours, which makes up the Night and Day, a Night. Cæſar informs us of this, and attributes the origin of this cuſtom to an ancient tradition of the Druids, that the Gauls deſcended from Pluto (*e*). The Germans alſo practiſed the ſame thing of reckoning by Nights (*f*). Vigenere in his notes upon Julius Cæſar (*g*), pretends there are ſtill ſome remains of this practice. *As for the Germans*, ſays he, *they ſtill obſerve this way of ſpeaking*, *and commonly ſay*, vor drey nachten, *before it be three Nights*, *inſtead of before it be three Days*; *and* Sant Johans nacht, Sant Martins nacht, *Saint John's Night*, *Saint Martin's Night*, *for Saint John's Day*, *Saint Martin's Day*. *The French alſo in many places of this kingdom uſe the ſame way of ſpeaking*, anuict (to Night) *meaning* to Day (*h*). Nicolas Bergier, Advocate in the Preſidial of Rheims, adds to theſe remarks of Vigenere, *That the French who came from Germany*, *and ſeized on that part of Gaul which is ſituate betwixt the Rhine and the Maeſe*, *and were called* Ripuarian French, *uſed the word Night to ſignify the Natural Day of twenty-four hours*, *as appears from theſe words in one of their laws*: Si infra Ducatum eſt ſuper 14 noctes auctorem ſuum repræſentet. He ſpeaks thus in his poſthumous treatiſe *du Point du Jour* [*B*]. The Printers have committed ſome errors in it, as Xipuarian inſtead of Ripuarian, in the foregoing paſſage. Mr du Cange in his Latin Gloſſary has cited many Laws, Capitularies and Formularies, which ſhew that not only the French, but alſo the Northern people, the Saxons, Engliſh, &c. reckoned by nights. Nay he ſhews, that it is a very ancient cuſtom among the Arabians. See Cluverius chap. xxxiii. of the firſt book *de Germania Antiqua*.

III. Of the Civil and Aſtronomical Days.

Cenſorinus (*i*), as I have already obſerved, divides the Day into Natural and Civil, and calls the Natural Day the time betwixt the two ſuns, if I may be allowed that vulgar expreſſion. The Civil Day he takes for the ſpace of twenty-four hours, or for an entire revolution of the heavens. Bergier affirms (*k*) that *Pliny and Macrobius hold the ſame diviſion of the Day*, *calling the Civil Day that of twenty-four hours*, *and the natural only the time of light*, *commonly of twelve hours*, *or a little more or leſs*: But I have not found this diviſion in either of theſe two authors, or in Aulus Gellius (*l*), followed upon this head by Macrobius; but only that they give twenty-four hours to the Civil Day, and relate the different beginnings it had in different countries. At preſent moſt writers

(*d*) Vulgus omne à luce ad tenebras diem obſervat. *Plin. lib. ii, cap. lxxvii.*

(*e*) Galli ſe omnes à Dite, patre prognatos prædicant, idque à Druidibus proditum dicunt. Ob eam cauſam ſpatia omnis temporis non numero dierum, ſed noctium definiunt, & dies natales & menſium & annorum initia ſic obſervant ut noctem dies ſequatur. *Cæſar, de Bello Gall. lib. vi.*

(*f*) Nec dierum numerum ut nos, ſed noctium computant Sic conſtituunt, ſic condicunt: nox ducere diem videtur. *Tacit. de Germ. cap. xi.*

(*g*) *Pag. m.* 319.

(*h*) *There are ſome places where* anuict, *ſignifies* the night paſt, *others where it ſignifies* the night to come.

(*i*) Cenſor. de Die natali, *cap. xxiii.*

(*k*) *Preface to the* Point du Jour, *citing* Pliny, *lib. ii, cap. lxxvii, and* Macrob. *lib. i,* Saturn. *cap. iii.*

(*l*) Aulus Gellius, *lib. iii, cap. ii.*

---

twenty-four hours. In fact, if the time taken up in the aſcent of fifteen degrees of the Æquator upon the horizon be one hour, this circle will require twenty-four hours for its revolution: but when that is finiſhed, the ſun is not yet returned to the meridian, becauſe it has a peculiar motion, by which it advances near a degree eaſtward, whilſt the Æquator makes one revolution; and therefore the ſun muſt be carried near the ſpace of a degree weſtward, to make it anſwer to the ſame point of the firmament or the ſame meridian it anſwered to the day before. Here is therefore an Aſtronomical Day a little longer than twenty-four hours. But moreover, one Aſtronomical Day is not perfectly equal to another, becauſe, by reaſon of the obliquity and excentricity of the ecliptic, the ſun does not make the ſame progreſs each day towards the eaſt (1). It advances 59 minutes $\frac{1}{6}$ each day, by the mean motion; when it goes ſwifter, it advances near two minutes more; when it goes ſlower, it proceeds near two minutes leſs. Nature loves variety even in the heavens. The Ephemerides which Mr Dalencé printed at Paris ſome years ago (2), ſhew a great deal of variety in the proportions of the increaſe of Days. For example: the fifth of January is longer by two minutes than the fourth; the ſixth is longer by two minutes than the fifth; the ſeventh is longer by two minutes than the ſixth; but the eighth is no longer than the ſeventh. All the other months are full of the like inequalities, both in the increaſe and decreaſe; and even the increaſes of January do not always anſwer the decreaſes of July. *It is certain*, ſays the author of thoſe Ephemerides (3), *that November and December jointly are longer by half an hour and half a quarter*, *than September and October*, *tho' there are on both ſides an equal number of days*, *viz.* 61.

Of Bergier, author of the *Traité du Point du Jour*.

[*B*] *In his poſthumous treatiſe* du Point du Jour.] I call this book poſthumous, becauſe the edition of Rheims, 1629, which I uſe, ſhews, that John Bergier, Attorney in the Preſidial of Rheims, printed this work of his father deceaſed. The Epiſtle Dedicatory to Mr du Lys, Advocate-General in the court of Aides of Paris, is written by the ſame John Bergier, and ſhews that this magiſtrate was the author's patron. The Abbot de Marolles ſpeaks of another patron in his alphabetical catalogue of authors who had preſented him with their books. *Claude du Buiſſon*, ſays he, *expreſſed to me the particular eſteem he had as well as I for Nicolas Berger* (4) *of Rheims*, *who has written the book of the high-ways of the Roman Empire*, *and who had gone farther had he not been prevented by death*, *for he died at Grignon*, *in the houſe of the Preſident Belliévre*, *who honoured him with his friendſhip*. I wonder that in the edition of 1629, there is no mention of any preceding edition; for in the catalogue of Thuanus's library (5), we find *Archemeron*, *or a treatiſe concerning the beginning of Days*, *by* Nic. *Berger*, 8vo. *Paris*

(1) *See* Gaſſendus. Inſtit. Aſtronom. *lib. i, cap. xxii. In the abridgment of Mr Bernier, Tom. iv, pag.* 80, *there is* 56 *mintues inſtead of* 59.

(2) *The title is*, La Connoiſſance des Tems, *&c. The knowledge of the times, or a Calender and Ephemerides, of the riſing and ſetting of the ſun, &c. They began to be publiſhed in the year* 1679.

(3) *Pag.* 38.

(4) *He has committed the ſame error with the authors of the catalogue of Thuanus's library, who thrice put* Berger *for* Bergier. *La Mothe le Vayer, in the* Hexam. Ruſtic. *pag.* 25, *where he cenſures two of his faults, calls him* Berger.

(5) *Pag.* 67, *of the ſecond part.*

writers conſider the Natural and Civil Day as different, not in duration, but only as the Natural Day in a general manner ſignifies an entire revolution of the ſun about the earth, and the Civil Day contains in particular the choice that certain nations have made of two points, to denote the beginning and end of this revolution. Some have choſen the riſing or ſetting of the ſun; others rather mid-day or mid-night. Hence the Civil Day of ſome countries has been included betwixt two riſings or ſettings of the ſun, or betwixt two noons, or two mid-nights. The ancient Romans followed this laſt way, which is at preſent almoſt univerſal in Europe. Theſe different ſorts of the Civil Day cannot be perfectly equal, neither to one another, nor to the true Natural Day, becauſe of the continual mobility of the moment of the ſun's riſing or ſetting: but as this inequality is not ſenſible from one day to another, it is not regarded. And therefore the nations whoſe Civil Day reaches from one riſing or ſetting of the ſun to another, no leſs take the Day for the ſpace of twenty-four hours, tho' the ſun every Day advances or retards his riſing and ſetting, and that unequally, according as it is near the Equinoctial or Solſtitial points, than if they comprehended it betwixt two noons. Whence it appears, that I had reaſon to ſay that the true Natural Day in its moſt proper ſignification, is the time betwixt the ſun's quitting the Meridian to his returning to it. It is by this the Aſtronomical Day is meaſured; for the Aſtronomers begin the Day at the inſtant the centre of the ſun touches the Meridian Line, and end it at the inſtant the ſame centre comes to touch it again. This is the leaſt unequal Day which it is poſſible to find, and that according to which all Aſtronomical tables are calculated. An author whom I have cited (m) tells us, that the Aſtronomers *begin their Natural Day at the noon of the preceding Day; that for inſtance the ſecond Aſtronomical Day of the month of May begins at noon the firſt day of May, and ends at noon the following Day, which is the ſecond of May, the noon whereof commences the third Aſtronomical Day.* For a greater illuſtration he ſhould have added, that tho' all the Aſtronomers begin their Day at noon, yet they are divided; ſome (n), as Ptolomy, and Tycho-Brahe, begin their day where Alphonſo King of Caſtile ends his. They, for example, begin the firſt day of January at the noon of the firſt day of our Civil Year: Alphonſo begins the firſt day of January at the noon of the thirty-firſt of December; ſo that the firſt day of the year to him is the laſt day of the preceding year for the others.

IV.
Bergier's book upon the Point of Day.

Since I have cited this little work of Bergier, it will not be amiſs to explain here the ſubject of it; it will ſerve for a connexion or introduction to the reſt of this article. I ſay then, that this author's deſign was to aſſign a point upon the earth, in which the Civil Day ſhould begin in ſuch a manner, that the ſame day (Monday or Tueſday for inſtance) ſhould be carried ſucceſſively throughout the world, and begin again at the end of twenty-four hours in a place that ſhould immediately touch the point given. By this means there would be two places upon the earth perfectly contiguous, one whereof ſhould have the beginning of Monday, whilſt the other had but the beginning of Sunday; whence it would happen, that each Day would laſt forty-eight hours, not with reſpect to a certain place, but to all the earth; each holy-day, for example, would be kept forty-eight hours together. The point Bergier choſe for the beginning of the Day, was that wherein the 180 and 181 degrees of Longitude touch one another in Mercator's maps: and thus one of the three Subadibe iſlands under the Æquator, cut into two by the 180th degree of Longitude, would firſt receive the Day; Sunday would begin there in the weſtern part, whilſt Saturday's noon would be under the firſt Meridian, and the ſame Sunday would not begin in the eaſtern part till Monday began in the other. It was the Pope's buſineſs, according to this author, to make this new Eſtabliſhment, and to appoint that for the future each holy-day, and each Day of the week ſhould begin when it is midnight upon the confines of the 180 and 181 degrees of Longitude; prohibiting all the Catholics in the world to begin their Day before the midnight which followed that which was under that place. It is plain, that after ſuch an order they who live under the 181ſt degree of Longitude would not be at the end of Lent till twenty-four hours after thoſe under the 180th degree had kept Eaſter-day. This would be very advantageous to them, if their deſire of eating fleſh was very preſſing; for they would have but a little way to go, to be in a country where they might eat it by the laws of the church. I need not tell the reader that this advantage was not put into the account by Bergier; it would rather be an objection againſt him [C]: but this is

Paris 1617. We alſo find there the *Hiſtory of the high-ways of the Roman Empire*, by the ſame *Nic.* Bergier, 4to. Paris 1622 (6). It is a very learned work, Father Bacchini, a Benedictine of the congregation of mount Caſſin, one of the authors of the journal of Parma, has tranſlated it into Latin (7), and illuſtrated it with notes. The author deſerved to be cited in a more honourable way than la Mothe le Vayer has cited him, who ſays (8), *one Bergier, who after his treatiſe of the high-ways, has written another little diſcourſe concerning the break of day, has bethought himſelf,* &c. It appears by Thuanus's catalogue, that this other little book did precede, and not follow the Hiſtory of the high-ways. Mr Henninius (9), has tranſlated this Hiſtory of the high-ways, and publiſhed it with learned notes in the tenth volume of the *Theſaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum*. Mr Oudinet (10), and the Abbot du Bos ſent him ſome notes, moſt of which were taken from the copy in which the author had written many things. There is a fine encomium on our Bergier in Father Commire's Latin poems.

INCONVENIENCIES of the line of the point of Day.

[C] *It would rather be an objection againſt him.*] They who cenſure a project, and by their adverſaries anſwer, find themſelves obliged to reply, ſo diligently collect whatever is not favourable to the adverſe cauſe, that we may reaſonably wonder the Sieur Michalor has is the principal advantage he finds in this new eſtabliſhment of the point of Day, *viz.* that there would be no more diſputes about the celebration of holy-days, when in going round the world, either thro' the eaſt or weſt, people ſhould not reckon the ſame Day of the week with the inhabitants of the countries they would land in.

(m) Bergier, *preface to the* Point du Jour.

(n) *See* Father Labbé, Abrégé Chronolog.

(6) Pag. 288, *of the firſt part.*

(7) *I do not believe this verſion has been printed, but I know that the Italian tranſlation made by Father Bacchini has been publiſhed. It is without notes.*

(8) Géograph. du Prince, *ch.* viii, *tom.* vi, *of the Edit. in* 12mo.

(9) *Profeſſor of Duitſbourg.*

(10) *Keeper of the King of France's cabinet of medals.*

V. They who go round the world, get or loſe a Day.

It is needleſs to explain this, for no body is ignorant that they who went round the world eaſt-ward, found themſelves older by a day at their return than thoſe who ſtaid at home; and that the contrary happened to thoſe who travelled round the world weſtward. They who returned to Seville on board the Victory, which had carried Magellan as far as the Molucca iſlands, after the diſcovery of the Straits to which this great man gave his name, found by their journal that the day of their arrival was the ſixth of September, but at Seville they reckoned the ſeventh (*o*). If they had gone from Seville to the Molucca iſlands, and then to the Straits of Magellan, they would have found the eighth of September reckoned at Seville, when they counted the ninth. Whence it is eaſy to underſtand, that there may be three calculations at the ſame time in the ſame place. For if two veſſels arrived at Seville which had made the circuit of the globe, one eaſtward, and the other weſtward, it is certain that Saturday the third of September at Seville would be Sunday the fourth according to the computation of the firſt veſſel, and Friday the ſecond according to the journal of the other. Let each continue his own reckoning, and you will quickly find three Chriſtmas-days or three Eaſter-days, &c. in one and the ſame week, and it would be no longer a jeſt to bid people ſtay (as the French ſaying is) *till the week when three Thurſdays come together*, I add, that a Day is gained or loſt, not only with reſpect to thoſe we find in our return home, but alſo to thoſe we meet in the way. Thus, the Dutch who diſcovered the Strait *le Maire* in the year 1616, being arrived at the Molucca's on the thirty-firſt of October, found there the firſt of November, and were obliged to ſkip from Monday to Wedneſday, in order to agree with the reckoning of their country-men ſettled in thoſe iſlands (*p*). It is thus alſo, that according to the relation of Joſ. Acoſta, the Portugueſe and Spaniards who penetrated into the Eaſt-Indies, the latter by the weſt, and the former by the eaſt, eſtabliſhed there a different reckoning of Days; ſo that when it is Sunday at the Iſle of Macao, diſcovered by the Portugueſe, it is but Saturday at Manille in the Philippine iſlands diſcovered by the Spaniards; and yet it is but about 100 miles from the iſland of Luſſonia, in which is the town of Manille, to the iſle Macao. This was the reaſon why Alphonſo Sanctius, being arrived from the Philippines at this iſle on the ſecond of May in his reckoning, and going to read in his Breviary the office of St Athanaſius, found that this was not the Goſpel for the Day in that place, and that the calendar there noted the third of May, which is the *Invention of the Holy Croſs* (*q*). His ſurprize was probably greater than his perplexity, for it is no great matter to paſs from one Day of the Breviary to another; and if Cardinal Pellevé, carried unawares from the Day of St Paul's Converſion to that of St Polycarpus, could have remedied this diſappointment by the help of the Breviary, he would have harangued better than he did at the opening of the States of the League. 'Id multum Cardinali Pellævæo incommodavit qui Orationem meditatus fuerat occaſione ex converſione B. Pauli ſumpta, quam tranſlato in ſequentem diem conventu vix ac ridiculè ad B. Polycarpi feſtum accommodare conatus eſt (*r*). - - - - - *This was very inconvenient to Cardinal Pellevé, who had compoſed an Harangue on occaſion of St Paul's Converſion: For the opening of the States being put off till the next Day, he with difficulty and ridiculouſly endeavoured to accommodate his Harangue to the feaſt of St Polycarpus.*' Nicolas Bergier had no reaſon to ſay (*s*), that they who travel round the world enter upon a different calculation of the Day but two ways; one is, when they compare their computation with that of the city in which they finiſh their circuit; the other is, when they compare it with the calculation of thoſe whom they meet upon the Oriental Ocean, and who make the tour of the world another way. It is certain, that this Eoick Sea, as he calls it, has nothing particular in this, abſolutely ſpeaking, ſince in whatever other part of the world two veſſels meet, making the circuit of the earth, one eaſtward and the other weſtward, they would find the difference of

has not objected to Ericius Puteanus, that the circle he propoſed, made way for a thouſand abuſes. In effect, through the whole extent of the hemiſphere, it would be the eaſieſt thing in the world to elude the laws of the Church concerning the days of abſtinence. A man might come off with abſtaining from fleſh for one day a week, if he would recur to the ſophiſtry of the Spaniards *Medianoche*. Going from home on Friday at midnight, he might find himſelf a moment after in a country where it is Sunday, and where without violating the canons of the holy Mother-Church, he might feaſt upon capons for his ſupper. He might leap over all the vigils by making but a journey of two or three ſteps under another meridian, where it is holy-day; and if he would not celebrate any holy-day, no not Sunday itſelf, (I ſpeak of Holy-days that come not two together) it were only paſſing from one meridian to another, which would coſt but little time: for tho' one degree in the heavens anſwers to the ſpace of ſeveral leagues upon earth, yet it is certain that each degree is contiguous to another; ſo that the degree where the day begins muſt neceſſarily touch another degree were the ſame day begins not till twenty-four hours after. To prevent therefore the paſſing in a ſmall time from the place where it is unlawful to eat fleſh, to another where it is lawful, it ſhould be ordered that the eaſtern part of one of theſe two degrees, and the weſtern part of the other, ſhould remain uncultivated and uninhabited. Who knows not, that any one who would continue the carnaval with impunity to the firſt Sunday in Lent, needs but go to Milan, where there is no obligation to faſt till four days after Aſhwedneſday?

(*o*) *Sir Francis Drake, and Thomas Cavandiſh, Engliſhmen, and Oliver Vander Noort of Utrecht, who made the tour of the world thro' the ſame ſtraits, have experienced ſuch a miſreckoning of a Day.*

(*p*) *See William Schouten's journal.*

(*q*) Id quidem. F. Alphonſo Sanctio contigit, qui cum è Philippinis ſolviſſet, venit ſupputatione ſua, in inſulam Macaum poſtridie Kalendas Maji. Recitaturus autem preces horarias in honorem S. Athanaſii, deprehendit loci incolis Inventionem S. Crucis celebrari, quinctum enim Non. Maji faſti inibi exhibebant. Idem illi, alio etiam tempore, ſed contrario calculo huc redeunti evenit. *Joſeph. Acoſta, Hiſt. Ind. Occident. lib. iii, cap. xxiii.*

(*r*) Thuanus, *lib. cv, ad ann.* 1593.

(*s*) *Ubi ſupra, pag.* 118, 119.

of a Day betwixt their dates. There is no reaſon therefore on this account to place the point of Day on the Eoick Ocean rather than in another place.

After having repreſented the inconvenience which Bergier would prevent by his line of the point of Day, I think I ought to ſay in a few words, that it might be ſo conveniently remedied without this, that it is no wonder his counſels had no effect. There are three calculations at once in the ſame place; ſome reckon Saturday, others Sunday, and others Monday. Well! Let the whole matter be regulated by the date of the inhabitants, and every feaſt be kept by their calendar, and you remove all this diſorder. This remedy would fail but very rarely; namely, in caſe that thoſe who had taken the eaſtern road, and others who had taken the weſtern, ſhould meet in a country wherein there were no Chriſtians; then they could not conform to the date of the inhabitants, and each would ſtand perhaps upon his own calculation. This diſorder would be a very little one.

VI. Erycius Puteanus has written concerning the point of Day.

I pretend not however to leſſen this author's merit: ſuch propoſitions are ſeldom imagined but by men of a ſtrong and extenſive genius; beſides, there is in the treatiſe I ſpeak of, a ſtock of learning which alone might recommend it. If the author had lived long enough, he would have complained, perhaps, of a profeſſor of Louvain who is celebrated for his numerous writings, and who a long time enjoyed the place of Juſtus Lipſius. To ſpeak freely, Erycius Puteanus does not ſeem to have dealt fairly with Nicolas Bergier. That profeſſor publiſhed a little piece in the year 1632, with the title of *Circulus Urbanianus, ſive Linea* ἀρχημερινὴ *compendio deſcripta, qua dierum civilium principium hieraticum in orbe terrarum hactenus deſideratum conſtituitur.* The year following he publiſhed a larger book, to defend the firſt againſt the attacks of one Michalor, a Canon of Urbino. Theſe two pieces in their moſt material points are wholly grounded upon Bergier's thoughts; for it is no conſiderable difference to place the line of the point of Day not in the Meridian oppoſite to that which is the firſt in Mercator's Atlas, as Bergier does, but in the Meridian oppoſite to that of Rome, as Erycius Puteanus does. This, I ſay, would not ſecure a man from the imputation of a tranſcriber and a Plagiary; and yet Puteanus ſays not a ſyllable of the treatiſe of the Point of Day, printed in the years 1617, and 1629, but ſets up for the man who firſt ſpoke of this ſubject. Here we may admire the good fortune which preſides over ſome books. That of Bergier, which was incomparably more an original than the other, and which we may ſay had been at all the charges, lay grovelling in the duſt, whilſt Puteanus's was enriched with the encomiums of many learned men, with the compliments of a Nuncio, of a Cardinal Patron, of another Cardinal, and of the Pope himſelf, and came out with thoſe glittering ornaments. Bergier might have well ſaid, *Hos ego verſiculos feci, tulit alter honores.*

VII. How two contiguous places may differ 24 hours as to the beginning of the Day.

It may here be aſked me, whether there is any part of the world where the Day takes its riſe; and whether it was poſſible for two contiguous countries to differ twenty-four hours with reſpect to the Point of Day? I anſwer, firſt, that a circle has, abſolutely ſpeaking, neither beginning nor end; and therefore the Day depending upon a circular motion, can neither begin nor end, but with reſpect to certain places; ſo that it is always beginning and ending in different reſpects, and is always in all the parts of its duration, at Mid-night, at Mid-day, at five, at ſix of the clock, *&c.* with relation to different countries. Secondly, it was hardly poſſible, otherwiſe than by a divine or human inſtitution, for two contiguous countries to differ more than a moment upon the Point of Day; for in whatever point of the ecliptic we ſuppoſe the ſun to have been created, it muſt neceſſarily have illuminated at once ninety degrees round, which is half the globe; and the Day muſt have begun all at once upon that half, naturally ſpeaking. If the queſtion was about the Civil Day, that is, if all men ſhould agree not to begin the Day till a certain hour, or if GOD had commanded them to begin it preciſely in that manner, I confeſs there might be two countries entirely contiguous, one of which would not enter upon Sunday till the other left it. But in this caſe a Day muſt be ſunk, and this ſentence of Excommunication, or rather of annihilation, ſhould be pronounced againſt it:

> Que ce jour ſoit raié des choſes avenües,
> Jupiter le commande aux trois filles chenües,
> Qui tiennent regître des tems (*t*).

Jupiter commands this Day to be raſed out of the records of time.

But ſtay a little. Chance, without the aſſiſtance of any divine or human order, or the nulling of a Day, may make two contiguous countries differ twenty-four hours as to the beginning of the Civil Day. For which we need only ſuppoſe two ſhips, which in making the circuit of the globe, one eaſtward, and the other weſtward, meet, for inſtance, in the mid-way: ſuppoſe their crews ſhould ſettle, one on the one ſide, and the other on the other ſide of an iſland, and each ſhould preſerve their own computation: Sunday will begin on one ſide, whilſt beyond the line of partition they will only be

---

(*t*) *I have recited theſe verſes above, in remark* [*B*], *of the article* FONTARABIA.

be beginning Saturday. This is what the Portugueſe and Spaniards experienced towards Japan.

VIII. Puteanus has ill expreſſed himſelf in ſaying that thoſe who go round the world eaſtward, loſe a Day.

Now ſince they who ſail round the globe eaſtward think they are at Saturday, whilſt it is only Friday at the place they return to; and ſince thoſe who make the circuit weſtward only reckon Friday, whilſt their countrymen are already at Saturday, it is plain that the former gain a day, and that the latter loſe one. And yet there have been writers who have ſo confounded their ideas upon this ſubject, that they have aſcribed the loſs to the former, and the gain to the latter; this Erycius Puteanus did (u). Michalor, his Critic, did not let this fault paſs uncenſured; the conſequence of which cenſure was, that Puteanus, who might eaſily have come off by confeſſing ingenuouſly that he had uſed improper terms, obſtinately defended his expreſſion. Had it not been better to have frankly owned his fault, ſince the diſpute turned only upon words? But why; muſt a man after ſo many years profeſſorſhip in Juſtus Lipſius's chair, after being the author of ſo many books, confeſs that he has expreſſed himſelf inaccurately? No, God forbid he ſhould do ſo much injury to his rank. He therefore choſe rather to have recourſe to all the cavils his wit and reading could ſuggeſt to him, than to own his fault. He found himſelf the worſe for it; his adverſary returning to the charge, unmercifully ſcanned him even to the leaſt punctilios, and both as to this part of the diſpute, and the pretended neceſſity and uſes of the line of the Point of Day, he perfectly routed him, and remained ſole maſter of the field of battle. His firſt critical book is in Latin, but the reply is in Italian.

I believe Erycius Puteanus forgot but one cavil, which would have been, to maintain that on one hand it is a loſs to bring an additional Day from a long voyage, and on the other hand it is a gain to return to one's country with a Day decreaſed. In point of gallantry, this theſis would paſs for a principle; and there is no loſs more conſiderable than the getting of many years, nor a gain more important than the having lived leſs than another. The generality of people in this point follow the lovers ſtyle, looking upon the ſuperiority they have over their neighbour in number of Days, to be a diſadvantage. But how much ſoever ſuch ſort of cavils might avail in a diſpute, where the buſineſs ſhould be only to jeſt, they would be entirely uſeleſs in a diſpute like that of Michalor and Puteanus: for the queſtion betwixt them was not to know whether thoſe who make the tour of the world eaſtward or weſtward, grow older or younger by twenty-four hours than thoſe who ſtay at home. It is manifeſt that the age of both is preciſely what it would be if they had not ſtirred from their houſes; and that the only reaſon why one counts leſs Days than the other, is, that the Days of thoſe who travel weſtward contain above twenty-four hours each, and the others contain leſs. I own if two men born the ſame day began at fifteen years of age to travel round the earth, one eaſtward and the other weſtward, and made thirty turns each year; the firſt would believe himſelf fifty-four years old, when the latter would think he was only forty-eight. But this difference, which in caſe of marriage, if it was real, might render the latter of theſe travellers the more eligible match, would be a meer chimera in this caſe: they would be mightily deceived who ſhould rely upon that advantage. Weſtern voyages are not that fountain of youth, which removes old age; and, properly ſpeaking, a man neither gets nor loſes a moment whatever way he ſails round the world. However it is true that Erycius Puteanus uſed a moſt improper expreſſion; for in ſhort, it would be a very wrong way of ſpeaking, to ſay that we get years by reckoning as the Chriſtians, and loſe them by counting as the Mahometans. It is juſt the contrary, ſince a thouſand of our years anſwer to a thouſand thirty two Mahometan years, as is manifeſt, ſince the year 1622, was the 1032, of the Hegira (w). This example removes all the difficulty, becauſe the ſame reaſon that leſſens our years with reſpect to thoſe of the Mahometans, leſſens alſo the number of the Days of thoſe who go round the world weſtward. That reaſon is, that the years of the Hegira being lunary, are ſhorter by eleven Days than ours.

IX. Authors who have committed the ſame fault as Puteanus.

Puteanus is not the only perſon who has been miſtaken in this. I ſay nothing againſt Wendelinus (x), whom he calls the Hipparchus of our age, and who uſes a (y) phraſe which ſeems to import that he believes the eaſtward circuit gives a Day leſs, and the weſtern gives a Day more; for he pretends that if the Pope followed Puteanus's counſel, the Rubricks of the Breviary would ſhew the weſtern travellers the Day they ſhould ſink, and the eaſtern travellers that which they ought to intercalate (z). Does it not ſeem that the intercalary Day ought to belong to thoſe who have fewer Days than the others? How then comes this learned man to give it to thoſe who travel eaſtward, who are already at Tueſday, when the others are but at Sunday? I decide nothing upon this point; there will ever be a ſubterfuge by the equivocation of *exemptilis* and *intercalaris*. I ſhall therefore only ſay that in one ſenſe Wendelin's expreſſion is not exact. The reader will own it, if he compares the Pope to a father, who would reduce the profit his three ſons had made to an equality, the firſt by ſtaying at home, the ſecond by making the circuit of the world weſtward, and the third eaſtward. Let us ſuppoſe that the capital of the firſt is advanced from 10 to 15, that of the ſecond from 10 to 14, and that of the third from 10 to 16. To make all their gains equal, is it not neceſſary to take from the third and add to the ſecond? And yet, according to Wendelin, the

---

(u) Ab ortu in occaſum navigantibus dies unus uno circuïtu in lucro eſt, ab occaſu in ortum unus interit. *And a little after*, Demat tranſeuntibus quantum unus in occaſum ambitus addit; addet quantum unus in ortum eripit.

(w) *It is thus they call the Mahometan Æra, or Epoch, which begins on our fifteenth of July* 622.

(x) *Godefridus Wendelinus, much eſteemed by Gaſſendus, who had been his diſciple. See* Val. Andr. Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 294.

(y) *In* Approbatione circuli Urbaniani.

(z) Ut inter Breviarii Rubricas illa quoque cum primis neceſſaria lex emineat, quæ dierum ſacrorumque navigantibus in Occidentem exemptilium, contendentibus in Orientem intercalarium formulas preſcribat.

Pope muſt do the quite contrary. The inhabitants of Seville who remained at home paſſed from the 10th to the 15th day; the weſtern travellers from the 10th to the 14th; and the eaſtern form the 10th to the 16th. We muſt, ſays Wendelin, take one day from thoſe that have but 14, and give one to thoſe that have 16. Let him rather ſay one is to be taken from the latter, and given to the former; but the way of giving it is to reckon it to their account as if they had furniſhed it: for it is not giving, to quit arrears? Once more let us ſay nothing againſt Wendelin, for his expreſſion is good in a certain ſenſe. Take a Day from the weſtern travellers, and they will leap from Sunday to Tueſday; oblige the eaſtern to intercalate their Tueſday, that is, to count it twice together, and you will take from them a Day, and ſo the weſtern and they will arrive the ſame time at Wedneſday.

X.
Bembus criticiſed.

A man might more eaſily take to taſk Peter Bembus, who ſpeaking of the return of Magellan's companions, ſays, that they found the years of their voyage to be grown longer by a day; but that if they had ſailed eaſtward, they would have doubtleſs found them grown ſhorter by a Day: for, continues he, the farther they had advanced, the farther they would have gone towards the riſing ſun; and therefore, after they had finiſhed their tour about the world, they would have ſeen that luminary riſe a day ſooner than when they ſet out. *Semper enim tanto citius Orienti ſoli occurrens quanto plus itineris poſt ſe circumvectus reliquiſſet, emenſo demum totius terræ globo die uno prius ſolem ſibi Orientem, quàm cum viæ ſe dederat, profecto habuiſſet* (*a a*). Is not this a very fine reaſon? This Hiſtorian proves that the year of thoſe who circuit the globe eaſtward is ſhorter by a day, becauſe it contains a ſun-riſing more. But is not this rather a proof that it contains 366 Days, and conſequently that it is longer by a Day? Note, That the year being equal, that is, 365 times 24 hours, *&c.* both for thoſe who ſtay at home, and thoſe who go round the globe eaſtward or weſtward, is nevertheleſs divided into more or leſs ſun-riſings; into 365 for thoſe who ſtay at home, into 366 for thoſe who return by the weſt, and into 364 for thoſe who return by the eaſt. This is all the myſtery. Michalor has not cenſured Bembus for this bad way of reaſoning, but only for his reverſing the change which a circuit round the world gives to the year. Bembus did not perſiſt all his life-time in his error, but expreſſed himſelf as he ſhould do in the Italian tranſlation he publiſhed of his Latin Hiſtory, and inſtead of theſe words, *Uno ſibi annos illos die longiores factos . . . . uno breviores die redeunti ſane fuiſſent*, he put, *Quelli anni tutti e tre eſſere d'un giorno fatti minori . . . . . d'uno piu lunghi ſtati ſarebbono* (*b b*). Bergier (*c c*) did not perceive this inverted ſenſe of Bembus; for, far from reproving him, he cites him in Latin to confirm the ſame inverſion he had been making, ſaying, that the time of Magellan's companions was lengthened by a Day, and that if they had returned by the weſt, it would have been ſhortned by a Day (*d d*).

XI.
Julius Cæſar Scaliger criticiſed.

Theſe confuſions will the leſs ſurprize us, when we find the Great Julius Cæſar Scaliger could not avoid them. When he criticiſes Cardan upon this queſtion, *Why the ſtars ſeem to ſailors to follow them, and the ſhoars to remove from them* (*e e*)? He repreſents to him, that ſo common a ſubject as that ought to have been ſeaſoned with ſomething new, as for inſtance, that even when we ſail towards the eaſt, the ſtars ſeem to go before us. Whereupon he relates what the Portugueſe and Spaniards experienced in going round the world, and gives this reaſon for it: *The Spaniards*, ſays he, *go to China, and from thence to the Cape of Good Hope, following the courſe of the ſun*; *the Portugueſe, on the contrary, ſail againſt its courſe*; *and therefore the days grow longer to the Spaniards, both becauſe they accompany the ſun, and enjoy the light longer, and alſo becauſe the ſun retrogrades, and comes to meet them: but it leaves the Portugueſe behind it at noon, who on their part turn their backs to it, and in the morning it goes from them when they expect its riſing, for it riſes later* (*f f*). What can be more falſe than to ſay that the ſun goes before thoſe who ſail towards the Cape of Good Hope, in the courſe taken by the Spaniards? What falſer ſtill than to pretend that the days grow longer to thoſe whom the ſun comes to meet. It is the very reverſe, for the ſun brings them a new Day ſo much the ſooner. What can be more falſe in the third place, than to ſay that the ſun goes from the Portugueſe in the morning, and that they ſee it riſe later? How is this poſſible, ſince the readieſt way to meet by a circular motion, is to go to China by the eaſt as the Portugueſe did, and to go thither weſtward as the ſun did, after having left them behind it? In fine, what can be falſer than to pretend that if the ſun riſes later, the Civil Day muſt be ſhorter? Michalor (*g g*) has only cenſured Scaliger's third fault, except that he has farther obſerved, that there was no need of conſidering whether the Portugueſe had as good a wind as the Spaniards. In effect, ſince Scaliger did not conſider the ſwiftneſs of motion, *celeritatem motus nunc non intelligo*, what ſignified the winds to him (*h h*)? Let the Portugueſe finiſh their round in three weeks, and the Spaniards take a thouſand for it, this will neither make the difference of Days, greater nor leſs.

XII.
Several faults of Pliny in a few words.

The Ancients were not abſolutely ignorant, that the Artificial Day muſt be longer to a man travelling weſtward, and that the ſun ſets ſooner with reſpect to the eaſtern parts of the earth than to the weſtern: But if we were to judge of their knowledge by that of Pliny, we ſhould conclude they had no manner of notion of this.

In the firſt place, this Naturaliſt ſays, that it has been often experienced that the beacons kindled on high towers at the ſixth hour of the day, to give notice of the approach of

---

(*a a*) Bemb. Hiſt. Venet. *lib. vi, pag.* 131, *Edit. Paris,* 1551, *in* 4*to*. Bergier, *cites lib. ii, pag.* 218, *Baſil.*

(*b b*) *I have cited this Italian as I find it in Michalor.*

(*c c*) *Ubi ſupra, pag.* 198, 199.

(*d d*) *Theſe deluſive expreſſions might be rectified, by ſaying that they who return home weſtward find, not their year, but that of their country, a day ſhorter; and thoſe who return by the eaſt, find it in like manner a day longer.*

(*e e*) *Cardan examines it, lib. iv,* de Subtil. *but does not examine either there or in the xiith book, cap. lxii, quoted by Erycius Puteanus (who did not know that the books* de Subtilitate, *are not divided into chapters) the ſubject which Puteanus aſcribes to him.*

(*f f*) Longiores ita dies fiunt Hiſpalienſibus. Tum quia ſolis comites ſunt, lux eis productior eſt: tum quia retrocedit ſol atque in eorum occurſum abit. Luſitanos autem & relinquit à meridie non ſolum averſus ſed etiam averſos, atque ab eis mane refugit cum ejus exortum expectant, ſerius enim oritur. *Jul. Cæſ. Scalig. Exercit. lxxxvi, de Subtilit.*

(*g g*) Antapocriſi, *Part. i, pag.* 44.

(*h h*) Non eadem celeritate æquis tamen ventis Luſitani atque Bæthici parem marium tractum metiuntur. *Scal. ubi ſupra.*

of pirates, have been ſeen even in thoſe places where it was then three hours night *(ii)*. A man needs not above three lectures on the globe, to ſee that this is a ſtory perfectly abſurd. This ſixth hour of the Day with moſt interpreters ſignifies noon. Alciatus will have it to mean ſun-ſetting, and by this means he bates Pliny two thirds of his diſtance; but to little purpoſe, ſince he leaves him ſtill too much: for to make it three hours of night in one place, whilſt the ſun ſets in another, you muſt allow 45 degrees difference of Longitude betwixt theſe two places. Now each degree of Longitude under the Æquator, comprehends twenty-five French leagues, of 2500 Geometrical paces each; the beacons muſt therefore have been perceived at the diſtance, not indeed of 1125 leagues, but at a diſtance differing from it only in proportion to the ſpace which ſeparates the parallel ſpoken of by Pliny from the Æquator; notwithſtanding which abatement, this diſtance would contain ſome hundreds of leagues. Judge what this would be, if Pliny's ſixth hour was mid-day; the diſtance would then be triple, and a beacon would have been ſeen at a greater diſtance than one third of the circumference of a good large parallel. This had been a more wonderful thing than what the ſame author ſpeaks of in the twenty-ſecond chapter of the fifth book, where he ſays that mount Caſius is ſo high as to be enlightened by the ſun three hours before day *(kk)*. And yet Father Hardouïn will not allow of Alciatus's modification, but will have it that theſe beacons were kindled at noon, and pretends to have cleared all the difficulties of this paſſage *(ll)*. He finds no matter for criticiſm in all this chapter. Note, That this paſſage of Pliny, concerning mount Caſius is liable to ſeveral difficulties. Ariſtotle has ſaid as much of Caucaſus; but ſome learned men *(mm)* maintain that there is no mountain in the world from whence the ſun may be ſeen, if he be more than four degrees below the horizon. According to this aſſertion, the ſun itſelf placed upon the top of a mountain, could not be perceived above an hundred leagues diſtance. How then was it poſſible to ſee Pliny's fires? Father Hardouïn, upon the paſſage where mount Caſius is mentioned, affirms that Cabeus has very well ſhewn that Ariſtotle was right in what he relates of Caucaſus. We ſhall ſhew the contrary under the word CAUCASUS, by examining what three learned and ſubtile Italians, Mazzoni, Blancanus, and Cabeus, have ſaid upon this paſſage of Ariſtotle.

In the ſecond place, Pliny ſays, that Philonides, a courier of Alexander, went in nine hours from Sicyon to Elis *(nn)*; but in returning was forced to travel three hours by night. The diſtance of theſe two cities was 1200 Stadia *(oo)*, and the way of the former to the latter, was an aſcent: and thus this courier employed one while nine hours, and another fifteen, in performing the ſame journey: nine hours going to Elis aſcending, fifteen hours in returning to Sicyon deſcending. If you aſk the reaſon of this prodigious difference betwixt going and coming, Pliny will tell you that this meſſenger, as he went to Elis followed the ſun, but in returning to Sicyon, he travelled contrary to it. But this reaſon is ſo far from compenſating the difference betwixt nine and fifteen hours, that it cannot even compenſate the advantage of the declivity of the road; for to gain an hour in following the ſun, one muſt make a ſtage of fifteen degrees, and conſequently our courier gained but ſomewhat under ten minutes when he travelled ſixty leagues from eaſt to weſt.

Laſtly, Pliny ſays, that the reaſon before given is the cauſe that the Navigators towards the weſt proceed farther in the Day than in the Night, even when the Days are very ſhort *(pp)*. Here are ſeveral falſities. For not to ſay that our Pilots, whoſe obſervations are more certain than thoſe of the Ancients, do not obſerve that ſhips go ſlower by Night than by Day, other things being equal, who ſees not that this pretended ſlowneſs cauſed by the Night, cannot amount to the proportion Pliny aſſigns, nor proceed from the cauſe he alledges? Let us ſuppoſe that a ſhip in full ſail weſtward, makes eighty leagues in nine or ten hours of a winter's day, ſhe gains not a quarter of an hour *(qq)*; and what is a quarter of an hour in compariſon of five or ſix hours, more or leſs, by which the winter-night exceeds the Day in the countries Pliny might have had in view? Add to this, that in ſailing weſtward, we follow the ſun no leſs by Night than by Day; whence it follows, that a ſhip ought to ſail as far in the dark as during the Artificial Day, ſince the time of darkneſs, when we ſail weſtward, lengthens in the ſame proportion with the time of light. The navigations of theſe later times have taught us, that there reigns a conſtant wind from eaſt to weſt in the Torrid Zone: ſo that thoſe who ſail there from eaſt to weſt, have always the wind behind them, and thoſe who ſail from weſt to eaſt, have always the wind againſt them *(rr)*. This is the reaſon why a voyage from Spain to the Weſt-Indies, requires leſs time than a voyage back again. But we muſt not believe, as the Abbot de la Roque did *(ss)*, a ſtory that *(tt)* was laughed at, *viz. That the Spaniards ſometimes ſail to the Weſt-Indies in twenty-four hours, but cannot return in leſs than four months, let them have ever ſo favourable weather.* Pliny might eaſily be deceived by ſuch as did not well underſtand what they had heard of the effect of this eaſtern wind. There is no ſea in which the eaſt winds are more favourable than the Pacific; and yet the Spaniſh veſſels which croſs it in their way from America to the Philippine iſlands, ſpend two months and an half, though they ſail 130 leagues a day *(uu)*. I wonder that the Commentary *Variorum* on Pliny, printed at Leyden, does not examine and determine this matter. There can be nothing more

dry

(ii) In queis prænunciativos ignes ſextâ horâ diei accenſos, ſæpe compertum eſt tertiâ noctis à tergo ultimis viſos. *Plin. lib. ii, cap. lxxi.*

(kk) Cujus excelſa altitudo quartâ vigiliâ orientem per tenebras ſolem aſpicit. *Id. lib. v, cap. xxii.*

(ll) Nihil opus iſtis ambagibus, ubi ſunt omnia per ſe perſpicua, luciſque pleniſſima, ut vel ex interpretatione noſtra liquet. *Harduinus, in Plin. Tom. ii, pag. 227.*

(mm) See Iſaac Voſſius, in Melam, *pag.* 90.

(nn) Ex Sicyone Elin mille & ducenta ſtadia novem diei confecit horis, indeque quamvis declivi itinere tertia noctis hora remenſus. *Plin. lib. ii, cap. lxxi.*

(oo) That is to ſay 60 *leagues, of* 2500 *geometrical paces each.*

(pp) Qua de cauſa ad occaſum navigantes quamvis breviſſimo die vincunt ſpatia nocturna navigationis, ut ſolem ipſum comitantes. *Plin. ubi ſupra.*

(qq) To lengthen the day an hour by a progreſs weſtward, one muſt travel fifteeen degrees, which under the Æquator make 375 *leagues.*

(rr) See Varenius's Geography, lib. i, cap. xxi, and Robault's Phyſics, Part. iii, cap. xi, where he aſſigns the reaſon of this Phænomenon, by the motion of the Earth according to Copernicus's ſyſtem: but ſee in the Philoſophical Tranſactions, the Hiſtorical Relation of the Monſoons, or Trade-winds, made by Dr Halley.

(ss) Journal des Sçavans, 1678, *pag.* 30, *Dutch Edit.*

(tt) Ibid. p. 57.

(uu) Halley, *ubi ſupra, citat.* *(rr)*.

dry and wretched than what we find there upon this ſubject. We find nothing in it that inſinuates any diſtruſt, except two or three words, which inform us that Melichius (*w w*) thought the ſtory incredible concerning the beacons of the towers, and that concerning the courier Philonides. But I much more wonder at the goodneſs of Salmaſius, who has reported (*x x*) the ſtory of this meſſenger with marks of approbation, and ſo little doubted of his diligence, that he makes his journey longer than Pliny did. Obſerve that Allatius (*y y*) relates the opinion of Julius Cæſar Scaliger without cenſuring it, and defends Pliny againſt Milichius.

(*w w*) *It ſhould be Milichius, a Profeſſor of the Mathematics at Wittemberg, who publiſhed a* Commentary on *the ſecond book of Pliny, in the year* 1534. *See above, remark* [*E*], *of the article* ZIEGLER.

(*x x*) Salm. Exercit. Plin. *pag.* 45, *where he computes Pliny's* 1200 *ſtadia to be* 160 *miles; they are but* 150.

(*y y*) *In Libro* de Menſura Temporum, *pag.* 14.

XIII. Some faults of du Pinet and la Mothe le Vayer.

I would fain know how this chapter of Pliny has been interpreted by Erycius Puteanus, who boaſts of being the firſt that underſtood it (*z z*). Du Pinet has put in the margin of his tranſlation, *That the waves of the ſea incline more to the weſt than to the eaſt*, and that this is the reaſon of what Pliny relates concerning veſſels ſailing weſtward. But would not this reaſon be as good for the Night as for the Day? I omit the fault he has committed in tranſlating theſe words, *Eundem* (Solem) *remeans obvium contrario prætervertebat occurſu*, thus, *He met the ſun, and paſſed it, he went ſo ſwift*. I believe that *prætervertebat* there, ſignifies more than Father Hardouïn thinks, more than *offendebat*; and that Pliny's meaning is, that the courier going towards the ſun, went beyond it, and left it behind him. This does not ſignify that he went ſwifter than the ſun. La Mothe le Vayer (*a*) alledges this example of ſwiftneſs without finding any thing falſe in Pliny's paſſage: nay, he obſerves that Philonides *almoſt equalled the courſe of the ſun*; and yet he had been juſt computing Philonides's ſwiftneſs at the rate of about eight leagues an hour (*b*).

(*z z*) **Quem locum per Mazzonium ſuppletum, hactenus tamen non intellectum in Theorefibus noſtris explicamus.** *Putean. Vindic Circuli Urban. Note, That Michalor tells him, that Mazzoni, author of a learned apology for Dante, has only cited this place of Pliny, without adding any thing to the common reading.*

(*a*) *Letter* xxviii, *Vol.* x, *of the Edit. in* 12*mo.* 1681. *Pliny is there wrong cited in chap.* vii, (*it ſhould be* lxxi) *of book* ii.

(*b*) *Reckoning* 75 *leagues, of* 2000 *paces each, in nine hours.*

A
DISSERTATION

Which was printed before ſome eſſays or Fragments *of this work in the year* MDCXCII,

Under the title of,

A Project of a Critical Dictionary, in a letter to Mr du Rondel, Profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres* at Maeſtricht.

It has been reviſed and corrected (in this ſecond edition) but not enlarged, except with ſome citations, and a few notes put at the bottom of the pages. We have alſo placed there ſome of the citations which in the firſt edition were in the margin. They will be here by way of a comment.

SIR,

YOU will doubtleſs be ſurprized at the reſolution I have taken. I have reſolved to make the largeſt compilation I can of the faults which are met with in Dictionaries, and not to confine my ſelf within theſe bounds, however large and extenſive, but to make ſallies upon all ſorts of authors, whenever occaſion offers. What! will you ſay, a man from whom we expected quite another thing, and much rather a work of reaſoning than a compilation, is he going to engage in an enterprize which requires a much greater expence of body than of mind? It is certainly a very wrong ſtep. He undertakes to correct Dictionaries; His moſt malicious enemies could not have preſcribed to him a harder taſk, had they over his deſtiny the ſame power that Euryſtheus had over that of Hercules. It is worſe than going to fight monſters; it is attempting to lop off the Hydra's heads; it is at leaſt attempting to cleanſe Augeas's ſtables (*a*); in fine, it is, the penance which ought to be enjoined thoſe turbulent men who have abuſed their leiſure and the credulity of the people, to vent under the name and authority of the Revelation all ſorts of Chimera's, *juſſit quod ſplendida bilis* (*b*), I pity him. Why did he not leave this employment to thoſe robuſt conſtitutions who can ſtudy ſixteen hours a day without prejudice to their health; who are indefatigable in citations, and all the other functions of a tranſcriber, and much better qualified to acquaint the public with matters of fact than with reaſonings?

I. The reaſons and deſign of this undertaking.

If theſe are your thoughts, Sir, you ought to fear leſt your friendſhip for me ſhould miſlead you, and correct your error by this ſincere confeſſion of mine, that I find my capacity very inconſiderable which ever way I turn my ſelf. I confeſs, that in this undertaking I apply my ſmall forces by their weak ſide, inſtead of chuſing a ſubject that might diſplay them to leſs diſadvantage. But, in truth, there is no difficulty in the choice, when a man is convinced, as I am, that the difference between his ſtrong and his weak ſide is almoſt imperceptible. And beſides, I will tell you freely, that if I had turned my pen on what you believe the moſt advantageous ſide, I ſhould have been involved in the alternative, either of diſpleaſing ſome perſons whom prudence forbids to provoke (*c*), or of diſpleaſing my ſelf. Now you well know that in writing our genius ought not to be forced (*d*), and you are ſenſible that the judicious anſwer of an ancient Greek might in ſeveral ſenſes be applied to one's ſelf [*A*]. And after all what is

(*a*) *It is ſaid that Mr .... deſiring one of his friends to ſet down upon ſome little piece of paper the faults he ſhould obſerve in his Dictionary, was anſwered, that it required quires and reams of paper, and not little pieces.*

(*b*) Horat. Sat. III, lib. ii, ver. 141.

(*c*) *See in Eraſmus's* Adagia, *the ſaying,* Noli irritare crabrones.

(*d*) Tu nihil invita dices facieſve Minerva. *Horat. de Art. Poet. ver.* 385.

[*A*] *The judicious anſwer of an antient Greek.*] We find it in Stobæus. Θεόκριτος ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τί οὐ συγγράφει, ὅτι εἶπεν ὡς μὲν βούλομαι, οὐ δύναμαι, ὡς δὲ δύναμαι οὐ βούλομαι: Theocritus quærenti quare non ſcriberet, dixit, quoniam ut libet non poſſum, ut verò poſſum non libet (1). - - - *Theocritus being aſked why he did not write, anſwered, it is becauſe I am not allowed to write as I would, and cannot write as I am allowed.*

(1) Stobæus, *Serm. xix, fol. m.* 81, *verſo.*

is the diſadvantage of not ſhewing our ſelves on the beſt ſide? It is depriving our ſelves, perhaps, of the praiſes one might have received. I ſay perhaps; for the caprices of men and chance have a ſtrange influence in this. But omit the perhaps; what then would this be, but a privation of praiſe, which is a meer nothing to a man who never acted, and at preſent acts leſs than ever by this principle? I could wiſh that the ancient Poet, who had ſo well begun to ſhew the emptineſs of human affairs, had carried his thought ſo far as to ſay, *cornea mihi fibra eſt:* you would here ſee the application that might be made of the three verſes he would have left us in this caſe.

> Non ego cum ſcribo, ſi forte quid aptius exit.
> Quando hæc rara avis eſt, ſi quid tamen aptius exit,
> Laudari metuam, neque enim mihi cornea fibra eſt (*e*).

(*e*) Perſius, Sat. I, ver. 45.

> . . . . *If I, by chance ſucceed*
> *In what I write, (and that's a chance indeed;)*
> *Know I am not ſo ſtupid, or ſo hard*
> *Not to feel praiſe, or fame's deſerv'd reward.* DRYDEN.

If on one hand I am not ignorant that my enterprize requires great ſtrength of body, I conſider on the other, that natural patience, joined with the habit of meddling only with books, of going little out of one's ſtudy, and avoiding as the plague the ways of thoſe turbulent men whom I have ſpoken of, who buſily thruſt themſelves into all affairs, even thoſe of ſtate, may ſupply a great many things.

As for thoſe learned men, whoſe erudition in matters of fact is proportioned to the indefatigable application their robuſt conſtitution allows them, I declare to you, Sir, that I do not pretend to intrude upon their province; on the contrary, I only propoſe to furniſh them with an eſſay, or rough-draught, which may determine ſome of them to perfect this plan, and to enlarge this Critical Dictionary with ſeveral volumes. I heartily agree they ſhould ſay of me in this reſpect, what was ſaid to Varro upon matters of Philoſophy, *that he had ſaid enough to create a deſire for it, but not to give the knowledge of it (f).* I even ſubmit to thoſe who ſhall ſay it would be a greater favour than juſtice in the public to treat me according to the rule that Ariſtotle approves in one of his writings. Οὐ μόνον δὲ χάριν ἔχειν δίκαιον τούτοις ὧν ἄν τις κοινωνήσαι ταῖς δόξαις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἔτι ἐπιπολαιότερον ἀποφηναμένοις· καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι συμβάλλονταί τι. τὴν γὰρ ἕξιν προήσκησαν ἡμῶν· εἰ μὲν γὰρ Τιμόθεος μὴ ἐγένετο πολλὴν ἂν μελοποιΐαν οὐκ εἴχομεν. εἰ δὲ μὴ Φρύνις, Τιμόθεος οὐκ ἂν ἐγένετο. Verùm non ſolùm illis agendæ ſunt gratiæ quorum opinionibus quis acquieſcet, ſed illis qui ſuperficie tenus dixerunt: conferunt enim aliquid etiam iſti, habitum namque noſtrum exercuerunt. Si enim Timotheus non fuiſſet, multum melodiæ nequaquam habuiſſemus: ſi tamen Phrynis non extitiſſet, ne Timotheus quidem (*g*). - - - *We ought to return thanks not only to thoſe whoſe opinions we approve and agree with, but even to thoſe who are meer ſuperficial writers. For the latter contribute ſomething to our good, as they have put us upon thinking. If there had never been a Timotheus, we ſhould have had no excellent Muſic; but had there not been a Phrynis, we ſhould never have had a Timotheus.* And I very ſincerely make the ſame declaration as the ingenious author of the Hiſtory of the Royal Society: *In anſwer for my ſelf,* ſays he (*h*), *I ſhall alledge, that what I have to offer, ſo far from preventing the labours of others who could adorn ſo noble a ſubject, is no otherwiſe deſigned than as thoſe ſtately edifices uſed at firſt to be repreſented by ſome few* ſhadows *and little* models, *which are not intended to equal the principal ſtructure, but only to ſhew by way of abridgment, with what* materials, *how much* expence, *and how many* hands *it might be afterwards raiſed.* I write with the ſame intention; propoſing only to give the ſketch of a deſign to ſuch as ſhall have the capacity of executing it; and that they may fall to work as ſoon as may be, I will make all the haſte imaginable to publiſh my Eſſay, which will contain but one volume in folio.

(*f*) Philoſophiam multis locis inchoaſti ad impellendum ſatis, ad edocendum parum. *Cicero, Academ. Quæſt. lib. i.*

(*g*) Ariſt. Metaphyſic. *lib. ii, cap. i, pag. m.* 645.

(*h*) Dr Thomas Sprat (*afterwards Biſhop of Rocheſter*) Hiſtory of the Royal Society, *pag.* 2.

II. That there are many faults in books.

They will not want matter for larger editions: For if this ſubject can furniſh me with materials for a large volume, notwithſtanding the other indiſpenſable occupations which take up all my time, and the ſcarcity of books I am reduced to, what will not men of great learning and great leiſure do, who have great libraries at hand, if they would undertake to make collections of this kind? Theſe will be excurſions from which they will always return laden with booty; and no Prince, whatever care he takes for laying the toils, and diſpoſing all things for a great hunting match, can be more certain of catching a great many wild beaſts, than a learned critic, who goes in chace of errors, can be certain of diſcovering a great many of them. It would be ſomething curious, if this work ſhould have the ſame fate, with that of a learned Swiſs (*i*), intituled, *Theatrum*

(*i*) Theod. Zuinger, *a Phyſician, Native of Baſil, who died in the year* 1588.

---

allowed. An antient Rhetorician gave this anſwer for the reaſon of his ſilence: *What I know, it is not ſeaſonable to ſpeak; and what would be ſeaſonable, I do not know.*

You will find the words of this antient Rhetorician, with thoſe of Stobæus, in the remark [*F*], of the article ARISTARCHUS. And ſince that remark will ſuffice for all the comment I might have occaſion for here, I need only refer to it, repetitions being to be avoided as much as poſſible.

Theatrum vitæ humanæ, which has been enlarged ſo often, that it now contains eight great volumes in folio. Doubt not but the faults of authors would ariſe to as maſſy a bulk as this: Now, Sir, would a theatre of theſe faults in as many large volumes, be, in your opinion, leſs diverting or inſtructive than that of human life? You may acquaint me, when you pleaſe, whether the book intituled, *The Hunters*, which contained the catalogue of Theopompus's thefts, had not its title founded on the compariſon or metaphor of hunting I have uſed? You may acquaint me with it, I ſay, when you pleaſe, no body having diſcovered the moſt hidden particulars of antiquity, ſo well as you have done.

It will eaſily be granted that there are an infinite number of faults in books, if we conſider that the writings of the greateſt men are not exempt from them, and that the meaneſt critic can diſcover a great many. How often do we find in the contents and indexes of the meaneſt performances, *Scaliger notatus, hallucinatio Scaligeri, - - - Scaliger cenſured, a blunder of Scaliger*, and the like? Mr Morus imagined that this was a ſorry affectation of a proud author, who deſires to be talked of (*j*). This may be true; but no man of learning can deny that Scaliger may be cenſured juſtly in a great many things; we need no other proof of this than the works of Salmaſius, where at every turn we find Scaliger reprehended (*k*). It is true, he is not named, but pointed at by the lofty title of *vir magnus, vir ſummus:* but all theſe great civilities do not leſſen the reality of the fault, when the cenſure is well grounded. Salmaſius, who had not the ſame reaſons for reſpecting other learned men, exaſperated ſome of them, who revenged themſelves with unmerciful criticiſms upon his writings. He made his defence, and attacked them in his turn. The battle was principally fought betwixt him and the Jeſuit Petavius, and was ſo obſtinate, that it hardly ceaſed till their deaths. We may affirm, that they were two champions worthy of each other, and that never gladiators were better matched than they: for it would be unjuſt to determine the matter, by what thoſe have ſaid who were both judges and parties in the quarrel (*l*). They were the two moſt learned men in France, and they might not only have enlightened their age, but alſo have done it much honour by their long controverſies, if, to the ſhame of learning, they had not tainted them with the exceſſive venom of their ſpleen, which dictated almoſt as many abuſes as words. All the other antagoniſts of Salmaſius were not capable of returning blow for blow, I mean of diſcovering as many faults in his writings as he diſcovered in theirs; but nevertheleſs they made him ſenſible he was often miſtaken. Who can doubt, after this, that there is a vaſt crop of faults of this kind? Where will the harveſt be wanting, when it is ſo plentiful in the productions of the Scaliger's and Salmaſius's; and who would be diſheartened with his errors, upon this conſideration?

A perſon of your judgment needs not be put in mind that I have propoſed the example of theſe two great men, not ſo much to reaſon from the greater to the leſs, as to give ſome ſort of conſolation to authors of a ſecond claſs, and to thoſe who, like my ſelf, are of the loweſt. The conſolation might be more effectual than the reaſoning could be juſt; for it is certain that authors of the firſt rank are thoſe who ſometimes let ſlip the greateſt number of faults: whether becauſe they are too bold in their deciſions, and too much addicted to new ways, or whether they yield ſooner or later to the vanity of diſtinguiſhing themſelves by the multitude of their writings, or for ſeveral other reaſons, which I could eaſily enumerate, if I meant to characterize any one by them; but it is no leſs certain, that theſe examples afford ſome conſolation. In matter of comfort, men are rather touched by popular and plauſible thoughts, than by reaſonings the moſt conformable to the rules of Logic. We may ſay then, that the Scaliger's and Salmaſius's ought to have the ſame effect as to other authors, that Carthage had as to other nations: *Poſt Carthaginem vinci neminem puduit* (*m*); No body was aſhamed to be conquered after Carthage was conquered.

I might join Baronius to theſe two famous authors. He was undoubtedly a great man: they who have examined his work in order to write againſt him, are perhaps his greateſt admirers; and yet how many faults are there in his annals? They are not reckoned by hundreds, but by thouſands. ‘Baronii Annales is quem dixi Blondellus mille ‘caſtigavit notis, aliquando prodituris, quibus oram exemplaris ſui prætexuit: quod ‘exemplar ære ſuo redemptum bene proceres Amſtelodamenſes Bibliothecæ publicæ in‘ferri curaverunt. Super hæc vero & ea quæ ab aliis animadverſa ſunt, quæ ſubnota‘vimus etiam nos juſtum fere volumen implerent (*n*). - - - - - - *Blondel, whom I have* ‘*mentioned, made a thouſand corrections cn the annals of Baronius; theſe corrections may ſome* ‘*time be publiſhed: he wrote them on the margin of his copy, which the magiſtrates of Amſter*‘*dam have bought and placed in the public library. But beſides theſe corrections, and ſome* ‘*made by other authors, thoſe which I have alſo made, would almoſt fill one volume.*’ He was miſtaken, not only through a party-intereſt, and a prejudice in favour of the court of Rome, but even in a thouſand things which are of no ſervice to the pretenſions of that court. This has been proved as often as he has been attacked, and very lately the public had an opportunity of being thoroughly convinced of it (*o*). Baronius ſeems to have taken delight in deceiving himſelf, and purpoſely to have interſperſed his work with lies, ſo thick do they grow every where.

(*j*) Illos omitto, qui ſatis ad famam nominis adipiſcendam putant ſi præſcribere poſſunt illud: *contra Scaligerum*, vel *Scaligeri error oſtenſus*: hec eos præcipuè tango, &c. Alex. Morus, *Præfat. Edit.* Scalig. in Euſebium, 1658.

(*k*) I do not ſpeak of the charge that Scioppius, the moſt terrible and furious of all the Critics, brought againſt him (that would be too odious) pretending he had committed 500 falſities in a piece of 120 pages, concerning the antiquity of his family. It is very certain that there are among theſe 500 lies imputed to him, many that are imputed with reaſon: to be convinced of it, we need only read what Scaliger and his friends anſwered, and what was replied to them.

(*l*) *As Father Labbe in his French* Chronologer, *Tom. v. anno.* 1652. *Father Denys Petau*, ſays he, *the moſt learned man in the world, died on the* 11*th of November, in the ſeventieth year of his age. Salmaſius, who had tried his ſkill with him in ſome points of Grammar*, impar longe congreſſus Achilli *in all the reſt, died . . . on the third of September. See, remark* [*A*], *of the article* PETAVIUS.

(*m*) Florus, *lib. ii, cap. vii.*

(*n*) Alex. Morus, ubi ſupra. *Holſtenius could ſhew* 8000 *falſhoods in Baronius, and prove them by the manuſcripts of the Vatican. See* Patin, Letter CLXIV, *pag.* 17, *Tom. ii, Edit.* 1691.

(*o*) *By the* Critica Hiſtorico-Chronologica *of Father Pagi, printed at Paris in folio, in the year* 1689, *and by the* Exercitationes Sam. Baſnagii Flottemanvillei, *printed at Utrecht, in* 4*to, in the year* 1692.

III. Yet a good compilation of them cannot be made without much labour.

I am not apprehenſive you ſhould conclude from hence that there is nothing eaſier than to compile faults, and that theſe ſorts of collections require but little time, it being but tranſcribing the cenſures authors have made upon one another; I am not afraid, I ſay, that ſo judicious a man as you, ſhould argue after that manner. You know too well, Sir, that there is no diſpute in which it is more neceſſary to hear both parties, than in thoſe which ariſe among the learned. It would be madneſs to depend upon the obſervations of the aggreſſors; prudence requires we ſhould hear both the anſwers of the defendants and the replies of the aggreſſors. I aſk no more than this; I know that the reader's patience commonly does not go ſo far. But in a deſign like this, it is not too much, with reſpect to many things, to compare together four pieces publiſhed ſucceſſively; two by the aſſailant, and two by the aſſaulted; and I dare even ſay, that in ſome particulars this is not ſufficient. It will be granted me that there are many cenſors who commit more faults than they correct (p); at leaſt it will be owned, that the moſt learned men give occaſion to be cenſured in their turn. This is what Caſaubon has been taxed with in reſpect to his critical work on Baronius. Some have reproached him with this very moderately (q); others in an outrageous manner; tho' we muſt own, that by I know not what fatality this work, which is very good and very learned in other reſpects, did more harm than good to the reputation of the author. But, in ſhort, I deſire only this example to ſhew that after the reading of a critical book, we muſt ſuſpend our judgment till we have ſeen what the criticiſed author or his friends have to ſay. They who think all that is cenſured by the aggreſſor to be faulty, and whatever he does not oppoſe to be good, commonly find themſelves in the end the dupes of that writer; for it may be proved to them, that he has condemned good things, and paſſed by what really deſerved condemnation, and that he himſelf has been guilty of many blunders. An author who in other reſpects cannot endure to be cenſured, will turn Critic upon himſelf, when thereby he can hope to mortify his cenſurers, by ſhewing them they were ignorant that ſuch and ſuch things deſerved to be cenſured. I would give you inſtances of this, was I not ſatisfied they are well known to you, with the reflexion naturally reſulting from it: which is, that a man chuſes rather to hurt himſelf, provided he hurts his enemy at the ſame time, than do himſelf any good that might turn to his enemy's advantage. Now, as the fate of the cenſurer is ſometimes the ſame with that of the Apologiſt, that is, neither of them ſees but part of his adverſary's defects, and both commit faults each in his turn, we ſee the neceſſity of following them through the whole progreſs of their diſpute, when one attempts ſuch a collection as that I undertake; For it ought to conſiſt only of faults averred and certain, ſuch, for inſtance, as are thoſe which the authors animadverted upon, do themſelves acknowledge either expreſly, or by their ſilence, and thoſe which they are diſabled from defending otherwiſe than by notorious abſurdities. Not, Sir, that I deny there are faults which are made evident by the firſt cenſure: ſo that if I reſumed the metaphor of hunting I uſed before, I ought to ſay, that indeed thoſe who purſue the faults of authors, frequently find the beaſt already ſlain, or that he bays; but ſometimes alſo they find one that puts them on a wrong ſcent, or avoids the blow, or ſtill vigorouſly defends himſelf, tho' wounded in an hundred places. The cavils ſuggeſted by vanity and a falſe ſhame, to writers who are cenſured, make the application of the metaphor but too juſt. This however proves that tranſcribing is not ſufficient to ſucceed in this hunting, and that the edifice muſt be very coſtly, notwithſtanding the plenty of materials. Let us go farther, and ſay, that of all Dictionaries there is none more difficult than this. When we write other Dictionaries, we meet with a great many things ready prepared in the preceding ones, which coſt only the taking them; and as many others that want but a little alteration. Whatever we find good in them, is lawful prize. But all this is of no uſe to me: what I find wrong and defective is the only thing that can ſerve me, provided I know how to rectify it.

IV. The uſefulneſs of ſuch a compilation.

You have ſeen a reflexion, ſuggeſted to me by the reading of ſome of thoſe diſputes, which contain anſwers, replies, rejoinders, &c. See here another ariſing from the ſame ſource. After having read a criticiſm on a book, we think ourſelves undeceived in many falſe things, which were taken for true when we read the book. Hence we paſs from the affirmative to the negative. But if we happen to read a good anſwer to this criticiſm, we ſeldom fail, with reſpect to ſome things, to return to our firſt affirmation: whilſt, on the other ſide, we proceed to the negation of ſome things which we had believed upon the credit of the animadverter. We experience a like revolution of thoughts, when we come to read a good reply to the anſwer. Now, is not this capable of making the greateſt part of readers continually diffident? What can eſcape the ſuſpicion of falſhood with reſpect to thoſe who have not the key of the ſources in their hands? If an author advances things without citing the places he takes them from, he leaves room to believe that he only ſpeaks by hearſay; if he cites, it is feared that he unfairly relates the paſſage, or underſtands it ill, ſince we ſeldom fail in reading a critical work to find a great many ſuch faults in the book which is criticiſed. What muſt be done then, Sir, to remove all theſe reaſons of diſtruſt, whilſt there are ſuch a great number of books that were never anſwered, and ſuch a great number of readers who have not the books containing the ſequel of theſe literary diſputes? Were it not to be wiſhed

(p) Sæpe in judicando majus eſt peccatum judicii quàm peccati illius de quo fuerat judicatum. *Ambroſius, in Pſal. L.*

(q) *Mr Godeau for inſtance, in the preface of his Hiſtory of the Church: Caſaubon,* ſays he, *who was a man of learning, ſhould have treated Baronius with more civility, he who never names Scaliger without the title of Divine, and contents himſelf with cenſuring the things he believed him miſtaken in, without attempting to make him paſs at every turn for a man who had no good learning. If he had engaged in a career as long as his, we ſhould have ſeen whether he would not have made falſe ſteps. His* Exercitationes *have produced other works of the ſame kind. Juſt matter of cenſure has been found in his cenſures, by which it appears that in ſuch ſubjects there is nothing but may be defended and oppoſed with almoſt an equal probability, eſpecially as to the dates.*

there was extant a Critical Dictionary, to which recourſe might be had, in order to be aſcertained whether what we find in other Dictionaries and in all ſorts of other books be true? This would be the touch-ſtone of other books; and you know a man ſomewhat preciſe in his language, who would not fail to call a work of this nature, *The Inſurance-office of the Republic of Letters.*

Thus you have a general idea of my project. My deſign is to compoſe a Dictionary, which, beſides the conſiderable omiſſions of others, ſhall contain a collection of falſhoods concerning each article. And you may eaſily ſee, Sir, that if, for inſtance, I had been able to collect under the word SENECA, all that is falſely attributed to that famous Philoſopher, it would only be neceſſary to conſult this article in order to know whether we ought, or ought not, to believe what we read concerning Seneca in any book whatever. For if it was a falſhood, it would be noted in the collection; and whatever would not be inſerted there as falſe, might be looked upon as true. This ſuffices to ſhew, that if this deſign was well executed, the work would be moſt uſeful and moſt convenient to all ſorts of readers. I am very ſenſible, methinks, what ought to be done for the perfect execution of this enterpriſe; but I am much more ſenſible of my incapacity to execute it: And therefore I give here only a ſpecimen, and leave the continuation of it to perſons of the requiſite abilities, in caſe it be thought that this project, rectified whereever it is deficient, deſerves to employ the pens of the learned.

V.
Why theſe fragments are publiſhed beforehand, and the nature of them.

But as I ſoon foreſaw that my ſpecimen would be extenſive enough to engage me in a moſt laborious taſk; and beſides, as I am very diffident of my ability to execute this project: do you know, Sir, the reſolution I have taken haſtily? I deſign to hazzard ſome fragments of my ſpecimen, and to ſend them abroad as the forlorn-hope to ſcour the country, ſound the fords, and get intelligence of the enemy. If they make an unſucceſsful ſally, and return not with good news, I will take a Stoical reſolution of lying quiet; if the ſucceſs prove otherwiſe, I ſhall proſecute my deſign. Thus you ſee what obliges me to ſet out with this little forerunner. Whatever fate it meets with, it will afford me the opportunity of giving a public teſtimony of my particular eſteem and friendſhip for you; and if any thing be capable of diſturbing me for its ill ſucceſs, it will perhaps be the conſideration that it was unworthy of being inſcribed to you.

In the mean time let me tell you a little ſecret; which is, that in compoſing this prelude, I have been ſo far from chuſing the leaſt exceptionable fragments of the Critical Dictionary, that I have choſen thoſe I moſt ſuſpected. It is not hard to conjecture the reaſon of my conduct, ſince common ſenſe teaches us, that the ſureſt way of prognoſticating the fate of a book, by feeling the pulſe of the public, is to take the pattern we ſhew, from the worſt part of the piece, rather than from the beſt. Beſides, when we deſire to profit by the reader's advice, and to know which is the beſt way of executing a project, we ought chiefly to lay before him thoſe parts which are of the moſt doubtful value. I have therefore choſen thoſe fragments which I moſt ſuſpected, or ſuch as contained each in its kind the moſt obvious irregularities, as you may ſay a long train of remarks, a digreſſion reſembling a diſſertation in form, *&c.* I praiſe the ſimplicity of a plan; I admire the uniform and neat execution of it; and in this I place the idea of perfection. But when I come from the theory to the practice, I own, I find it difficult to follow this idea of perfection. A mixture of ſeveral forms, a party-coloured variety, and not ſo much uniformity, are much my talent.

I fancy this falſe taſte is an effect of my lazineſs. I would have the ſame book ſatisfy my curioſity on all the things it ſuggeſts to my thoughts, and I do not love to be obliged to paſs from book to book for this ſatisfaction. As it is natural to judge of other people by one's ſelf, methinks an author does a great pleaſure to his reader when he ſpares him the trouble of going out of his place, and ſearching in another book for ſome little explanations he may deſire. You now begin to fear that my book will be ſtuffed with parentheſes all over: but fear it not; for in favour of thoſe who love not interruptions, I will take care to keep the text clear from acceſſory obſervations, and ſhall place them in the margin, and at the end of each article, in favour of thoſe who deſire to know immediately the dependances or relations which connect things together. To refreſh the readers, I will take care to give them now and then ſome gayer touches, without making too much uſe of the privilege allowed to works of this kind, namely of uſing free expreſſions; nothing is more neceſſary than ſuch paſſages in a Dictionary, which is of itſelf a dry and fatiguing book. Would to God theſe were all the bad ſides of it; but there are others more diſcouraging, ſince there is no work that is judged of by ſo bad principles as this. You find a great many readers complaining that they meet with common things in it. What then would they have? Nothing but exquiſite learning, and what they knew not before? But in that caſe, it would not be ſuch a book as it ought to be, that is, a book ſuited to the uſe and capacity of every reader.

I appeal to you, Sir, who are an excellent judge of every thing relating to literature: would it be reaſonable to exclude from this Dictionary the cenſure of a fault, under pretence that this fault cannot miſlead learned men, though it be ſpread in the works of a great many writers? Doubtleſs you will not be of this opinion: every falſhood which is diſperſed in ſeveral books may deceive many people, and that is a ſufficient reaſon for pointing it out in a Critical Dictionary: for this reaſon the faults of the firſt editions may be taken notice of, tho' they have been corrected in the ſecond; for how many people uſe the firſt edition all their lives, without ever conſulting any other.

Have I not reaſon to fear that by thus giving you the character of my work, you ſhould aſk me whether this be the way of diſcharging my obligations to you; and whether I am not aſhamed to dedicate to you a book ſtuffed with the errors and blunders of authors, and a heap of the traſh and filth of the Republic of Letters [*B*]. I am as fully perſuaded as any man living, that nothing ſhould be dedicated to you but a collection of fine thoughts, and curious erudition, and that the preſent might be worthy of you, it ought perfectly to reſemble the writings you have publiſhed. Am not I then very blameable to deviate ſo much from this model; and without any reaſon, and even in quite different circumſtances to recur to the expedient of Catullus, and put his menace in practice?

> Ad librariorum
> Curram ſcrinia, Cæſios, Aquinos,
> Suffenum, omnia colligam venena,
> Ac te his ſuppliciis remunerabor (*r*).

(*r*) Catull. Epig. xiv.

I will run to the Bookſellers ſhops, and collect the Cæſii, Aquini, Suffenus, *and other books of that ſtamp, and, to puniſh you, I will preſent you with them.*

But, whatever may be ſaid of it, I am certain, upon mature conſideration, that if my collection is not worthy of your patronage, it is not for the reaſon I have aſſigned. I ſhould think it a much more tolerable preſent, if it was compoſed of a far greater number of lies; and I ſhould not deſpair of procuring one day, your intire approbation of it, if I had as good a noſe for the falſities of authors, as a Poet of your acquaintance boaſts he had in other reſpects (*s*).

(*s*) Namque ſagacius unus odoror,
Polypus an gravis hirſutis cubet hircus in alis
Quam canis acer, ubi lateat ſus.
Horat. Epod. Od. xii.

I ſhould now conclude this long letter; but I have ſome difficulties to clear up, which will ſtay me ſome time longer.

VI. Anſwer to ſome objections; 1. That this book may create enemies.

Firſt, Sir, the liberty I take to gather into heaps the falſities ſcattered in divers books, may be taken for a notorious raſhneſs: Is not this wantonly creating to one's ſelf a vaſt number of enemies? When we cenſure the Antients, we provoke their numerous partiſans among the Moderns; and when we cenſure the latter, we incur either their own reſentment if they are living, or that of their family if they are dead. Now the reſentment of authors is no ſmall matter. They paſs for a very touchy, choleric, and vindictive race of men; and it looks as if their relations thought themſelves obliged to perpetuate, after their death, the blind love they had for their productions. As for the intereſt which ſeveral Moderns take in the reputation of the Antients, I cannot better repreſent it than by the paſſage I cite, where la Mothe le Vayer is angry with Balzac, who had criticiſed an anſwer of Pompey. In truth, I confeſs to you, that ſo unjuſt a treatment of all antiquity raiſes ſuch an indignation in my ſoul, that I had rather it ſhould be you, or any body except myſelf, who ſhould give this ſort of temerity the name it deſerves. ' Exclamet Melicerta periiſſe Frontem de rebus. - - - *Well may we ſay, that ' modeſty is fled from the earth.*' A man muſt have loſt all modeſty and judgment to proceed to ſuch a want of reſpect, and to ſo preſumptuous an extravagance, ' ut inſolenter parentis artium antiquitatis reverentiam verberemus (*t*). - - - *As inſolently to ' cenſure*

(*t*) *Macrob.* 1. *Saturn.* Hexam. Ruſtic *pag.* 142, 143.

[*B*] *A book ſtuffed with the errors and blunders of authors, and a heap of the traſh and filth of the Republic of Letters.*] As every thing has two faces, perhaps ſome people will pretend that I incur the cenſure we read in a fine treatiſe of Plutarch. But this would not be conſidering the matter by it's fair ſide; this would be viewing it by it's wrong ſide. It ought to be conſidered according to the idea of thoſe collections of Phyſical Obſervations, which only contain the Diſtempers incident to human bodies, but which treat of them only to teach us how we may avoid, or be cured of them. However it be, theſe are Plutarch's thoughts (2): ' If ' any one rummaging the wrtings of the Antients, ' ſhould pick and cull all the worſt things he could ' find, and make a book of them, as the defective ' verſes of Homer, beginning with a ſhort ſyllable, or ' the incongruities met with in Tragedies, or the obſcene and baſe objections Archilochus makes againſt ' the female ſex, diſgracing himſelf by it; would he ' not deſerve this tragical malediction,

(2) Plut. de Curioſitate, *pag.* 520.

> *Pox on your taſte! muſt you, like lice and fleas,*
> *Be always fed with ſcabs and naſtineſs?*

' But ſetting aſide that curſe, ſuch a collection would ' neither bring him honour nor profit, as it rips up ' all the faults of other men; thus we read that Philip ' gathered together the moſt wicked and incorrigible ' men of his time, whom he lodged together in a city ' he built for them, and called it Poneropolis, that is, ' the city of villains: ſo curious people collecting and ' amaſſing from all hands the faults and imperfections, ' not of verſes or poems, but of the lives of men, make ' very diſagreeable archives and regiſters of their memory, which they carry always about them. And ' juſt as at Rome there are perſons who care not to ' buy handſome pictures, or fine ſtatues, or even ' handſome boys and girls of thoſe who expoſe them ' to ſale, but rather affect to buy monſters in nature, ' ſuch as have no legs, or their arms wrong placed, or ' three eyes, or the head of an oſtrich, and delight ' in viewing them, and enquiring

> *Where kinds of unlike form oft blended are*
> *Into one hideous deformity.*

' But he who ſhould commonly carry us to ſuch ſhows, ' would trouble and torment us with the ſight of them. ' So thoſe who pry into other mens imperfections, ' the infamies of extractions, and the faults and errors happening in families, ought to call to mind ' as the former, that ſuch obſervations have neither ' conduced to their pleaſure nor profit.

'*cenſure and ſtigmatize men for that veneration, which they juſtly pay to antiquity, the parent*
'*of arts.*'

In anſwer to this difficulty, I ſay, Sir, that I do not think my deſign to be dangerous in that reſpect; and therefore this ſentence might reaſonably be applied to me,

> Periculoſæ plenum opus aleæ
> Tractas, & incedis per ignes
> Suppoſitos cineri doloſo (u);
>
> *A dangerous work you write, and tread*
> *O'er flames by treacherous aſhes hid.* CREECH.

and yet, properly ſpeaking, I could not be called raſh. I do not repreſent authors under the diſadvantageous idea by which ſlanderers characteriſe them; I think they are too reaſonable to take it amiſs, that for the good of the public I ſhould ſhew they have been ſometimes in the wrong. I declare that in doing this I have no deſign to leſſen the glory they have acquired, and that I ſhall carefully abſtain, wherever civility requires it, from all diſobliging terms, with reſpect either to their perſons, or to the main of their work. The fate of a book depends not on ſome little faults, ſcattered up and down in it; nor will they deprive it of its juſt value, or rob the author of the praiſes due to him. The injuſtice and malice of mankind, great as they are, are not grown to ſuch a pitch that the generality of readers will not commend a good book, becauſe there may be a few faults here and there in it. This fine maxim of a Poet of Auguſtus's time will always be true:

> Ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis
> Offendar maculis, quos aut incuria fudit,
> Aut humana parum cavit natura (w).
>
> *If num'rous graces ſhine in what he writes,*
> *I'll not condemn tho' ſome few faults appear,*
> *Which common frailty leaves, or want of care.* CREECH.

Eſpecially we forgive the faults, though numerous, of thoſe who are the authors of large Dictionaries; and this maxim is particularly to be urged on their behalf,

> Opere in longo fas eſt obrepere ſomnum (x);
>
> *Yet if the work be long, ſleep may ſurprize,*
> *And a ſhort nod creep o'er the watchful'ſt eyes.* CREECH.

and in confidence of this I ſhall be the leſs ſcrupulous to criticiſe them, for I ſhould be very ſorry to leſſen the regard which they deſerve. The public is very much indebted to them for the inſtructions they have given with the ſweat of their brows, and with the moſt oppreſſive toil that can be undergone in the productions of the pen. I refer my reader to Mr Morus's preface already cited, where he ſhews that the faults of Scaliger, Salmaſius, and Baronius, ought not to deprive them of the glory they have obtained. You ſee, Sir, the nature of my excuſes: I do not deſign to injure the merit of authors, nor to depart from the rules of civility towards them; and I have ſo good an opinion of their modeſty, and their zeal for the inſtruction of the public, that I do not believe they will reſent the liberty I ſhall take to ſhew wherein they have been miſtaken. Moſt commonly I ſhall not be the diſcoverer of their faults, but only the relater of what others have ſaid. I ſcrupulouſly take care never to appropriate to my ſelf what I borrow from other hands; ſo that the reader may be aſſured, that when I note a fault without citing any author who obſerved it, I knew not of its being ever made public. After all, I do not think I ought to ſhew a greater indulgence to other authors than to my ſelf, and it will appear that I do not ſpare my own faults. In fine, it ought to be conſidered that the intereſt of the public muſt be regarded before that of private perſons; and that an author deſerves no complaiſance, who is ſo unjuſt as to chuſe rather that his faults ſhould be concealed, than the public undeceived. 'Nimis
'perverſè ſe ipſum amat qui & alios vult errare ut error ſuus lateat: quanto enim me-
'lius & utilius, ut ubi ipſe erravit, alii non errent quorum admontui errore careat:
'quod ſi noluerit, ſaltem comites erroris non habeat (y). - - - - - *A man muſt have an*
'*exceſſive degree of ſelf love, who, in order to conceal his error, deſires that other people*
'*ſhould err as well as himſelf: Is it not much better, and more uſeful to warn other men not*
'*to fall into the error which he has committed, and by thus warning them, to remove his*
'*error? But if he does not incline to take ſuch a courſe, let him at leaſt be contented with*
'*erring by himſelf.*'

I know

(u) Horat. Od. I, lib. ii.

(w) Horat. de Art. Poët. ver. 351.

(x) Id. ibid. ver. 360.

(y) Auguſtin. Epiſt. vii, pag. m. 28.

I know not whether it proceeds from my judging of other men by my ſelf; but methinks thoſe authors whoſe miſtakes I ſhall relate civilly, will not be offended at it. For this reaſon I mention ſome faults which concern perſons for whom I have a very great eſteem, and who honour me with their friendſhip. Thoſe whom I ſhall ſpare will have ſome reaſon to complain, becauſe it will be a ſign that I think them incapable of hearkening to reaſon, or unable to bear the ſmalleſt loſs. This laſt motive is not always abſolutely to be rejected: for if there are any authors whoſe faults ought to be concealed, they are chiefly thoſe poor ones whom we could quickly ſtrip to their ſhirts, ſhould we fall upon them; and if there be others whoſe faults ought to be diſcovered, they are principally the great and famous ones, ſince, beſides that their errors are infinitely more contagious than thoſe of indifferent authors, they have ſuch ample ſunds of reputation and treaſures of fame, that an hundred ſhipwrecks could not hurt them. Theſe words of Juvenal may be applied to them for their comfort:

. . . . Non
Tam tenuis cenſus tibi contigit ut mediocris
Jacturæ te mergat onus (z).

(z) Juv. Sat. XIII, ver. 6.

But more Corvinus; thy eſtate can bear
A greater loſs, and not implore thy care:
Thy ſtock's ſufficient, and thy wealth too great
To feel the damage of a petty cheat. DRYDEN.

For this reaſon there are few who retract with leſs reluctancy (*a a*), or bear cenſure with a better grace, than thoſe who have moſt juſtly obtained the title of great authors (*b b*). Prepare, Sir, to ſee your ſelf in this Dictionary, if any miſtake has eſcaped you; but I have no hopes of being able to give you this proof of my good opinion of you. You are too exact and penetrating, not to exclude all ſorts of falſhood from your writings; and beſides, you are ſo deeply ſkilled in the Greek and Roman antiquities, that you have taken nothing from them but what is rare and curious; ſo that a man ought to be I know not how much more learned than I am, in order to diſcover whether you have erred or not. If theſe anſwers are not ſatisfactory, I add on one hand, that the inſtruction of the public well deſerves I ſhould ſacrifice my ſelf to the ill humour of ſome private men; and on the other, that I ſhall give but too much occaſion to the authors I cenſure to revenge themſelves. I heartily conſent to a retaliation either from themſelves or their poſterity. I will take it as a kindneſs done me to correct my writings, and to furniſh me with better light; and I beſeech this favour of all my readers. I will endeavour not to commit faults, but am very certain I ſhall commit but too many. The complaint therefore will not lie againſt me, which is urged againſt thoſe critics who print nothing for fear of repriſals [*C*].

In

(*a a*) A ſuturis ſe deceptum eſſe Hippocrates memoriæ tradidit, more ſcilicet magnorum virorum & fiduciam magnarum rerum habentium. Nam levia ingenia quia nihil habent, nihil ſibi detrahunt. Magno ingenio multaque nihilominus habituro convenit etiam ſimplex veri erroris confeſſio. - - - *Hippocrates hath related that he was deceived by the ſutures (in the ſcull). This was acting like a great man, whoſe reputation could not be hurt by a few miſtakes. For men of ſuperficial parts have nothing to loſe, as they poſſeſs but little. But it becomes a great genius, who, notwithſtanding his faults, will ſtill have a great ſtock of fame, to make a plain and ingenuous confeſſion of his error.* Celſus de Medic. *lib. viii, cap. iv. See alſo* Quintil. *lib. iii, cap. vi.*

(*b b*) Nulli patientius reprehenduntur, quam qui maxime laudari merentur. *Plin. Epiſt. xx, lib. vii.*

[*C*] *The complaint againſt thoſe Critics who print nothing for fear of repriſals.*] Regnier in his ninth ſatire, calls upon his cenſors to publiſh ſomething.

Qu'ils facent un ouvrage,
Riche d'inventions, de ſens, & de langage,
Que nous puiſſions draper comme ils font nos eſcris,
Et voir, comme l'on dict, s'ils ſont ſi bien apris,
Qu'ils monſtrent de leur eau, qu'ils entrent en carriere.

Let our cenſurers publiſh a work of theirs, rich in invention, ſenſe, and language; which we may criticiſe, as they do our writings, and may ſee if they can write ſo well as they criticiſe; let them give a ſpecimen of their performances, and enter the liſts with us.

To which he applies the Italian ſtory.

Qu'une fois un paiſant,
Homme fort entendu, & ſuffiſant de teſte,
Comme on peut ayſement juger par ſa requeſte,
S'en vint trouver le Pape & le voulut prier,
Que les Preſtres du temps ſe puiſſent marier,
Afin, ce diſoit-il, que nous puiſſions nous autres
Leurs femmes careſſer ainſi qu'ils font les noſtres.

Once on a time a Peaſant, who, as you may eaſily judge by his requeſt, was a very knowing man, came to the Pope, and begged his holineſs would ſuffer the prieſts to marry, that we laymen, *ſaid he,* may careſs their wives, as well as they careſs ours.

Martial had thoughts of this nature before in his xciid epigram of the firſt book.

Cum tua non edas, carpis mea carmina, Læli:
Carpere vel noli noſtra, vel ede tua.

Lelius either ceaſe to criticiſe my poems, or publiſh your own.

And he ſaith in the lxivth epigram of the xiith book,

Corrumpit ſine talione cœlebs:
Cæcus perdere non poteſt quod aufert.

The bachelor, who debauches a married woman, is no more liable to retaliation, than a blind man is liable to loſe his ſight.

See Mr Saldenus, pag. 44 & 419, of the treatiſe *de libris varioque eorum uſu & abuſu.*

You will find a ſupplement to this in the article ARISTARCHUS (3). I have obſerved in another place, that thoſe readers who never write, are very often more rigid and unjuſt in their cenſures, than thoſe who know by experience the pains of compoſition. I think I may ſay there are two things which hinder the univerſal and unmerciful Critics from ſhewing themſelves in print. One is, the fear that every body ſhould fall upon their works, and make them ſuffer the puniſhment of retaliation without mercy: the other that they themſelves perceive that they come not up to the idea of perfection which was the rule of their cenſures. *It is eaſier to imagine an high perfection than to find it; and it is the fate of moſt Critics to be able to find fault, and not be able to do better* (4): *they do not ſeem to have the*

faculty

(3) ARISTARCHUS *the Grammarian, remark* [*C*].

(4) *Compare what is above, in the remark* [*G*], *of the article* ZEUXIS.

VII.
2. That it will cenſure little faults.

In the ſecond place it will be thought very ſtrange that I amuſe my ſelf with cenſuring little matters, where the want of exactneſs is almoſt imperceptible. I have my reaſons for this, Sir: I well foreſaw what would be ſaid of it, and that the *minutiſſimarum rerum minutiſſimus ſciſcitator* - - - - - *a minute examiner of minute affairs*, would be applied to me; nevertheleſs I have conſidered that theſe ralleries were to be deſpiſed, and that even the leaſt faults were to be obſerved; for the more we criticiſe things with reaſon, the more we ſhew how difficult it is to be perfectly exact. Now, by carrying the idea of perfect exactneſs ſo high, we oblige authors to be the more upon their guard, and to examine every thing with the utmoſt circumſpection. Man is but too much accuſtomed to fall ſhort of the rules ſet before him (*cc*); we muſt therefore ſtrain them to as high a pitch as poſſible, if we would have him come near the point of perfection. And moreover, ſince this book may be ſerviceable to thoſe who will compoſe a correct Hiſtorical Dictionary, a work which is very much wanted, I ought to deſcend into particulars with ſome kind of nicety, nay, if they will, with ſome captiouſneſs. It is not out of inclination, but choice, that I inſiſt upon trifles, and I ought to be thanked for it, ſince it is in ſome manner a ſacrificing one's ſelf to the good of others (*dd*). It is taking a road which does not lead to praiſe, to bring others to a juſt accuracy; and is not this a conſiderable ſacrifice? There are not many people who would make the like, I appeal to Quintilian. 'Sive contemnentes tanquam 'parva quæ prius diſcimus ſtudia . . . . ſeu, quod proximum vero, nullam ingenii 'ſperantes gratiam circa res etiamſi neceſſarias, procul tamen ab oſtentatione poſitas '(*ee*). - - - - - - *Whether this happens becauſe we look down upon our early ſtudies, as little* '*and puerile; or, which is more likely, becauſe we do not hope to be praiſed for our parts,* '*when we employ them in ſtudies, which, though neceſſary, yet are far from having a ſplendid* '*and ſhowy appearance.*'

I ſhall ſay ſomething hereafter, that may ſerve as a ſupplement to the diſcuſſion of this ſecond difficulty.

VIII.
3. That it will contain uſeleſs diſcuſſions.

In the third place, I may be charged with giving my ſelf an uſeleſs trouble: for what is it to us, will they ſay, to know whether one Caſſius Longinus has been miſtaken for another; whether he was capitally puniſhed, or only baniſhed? Truly the public is very much concerned for this! What matters it whether Scaliger was angry or not angry with Eraſmus for calling him a ſoldier? and ſo of the reſt. To this, I have a thouſand things to anſwer; and from the multitude of thoughts which now offer themſelves to my mind, I could make a long diſſertation upon this ſubject, which would perhaps be tolerable: but as it is time to conclude, I reduce my ſelf to a few notes; the reſt may appear at another and more ſeaſonable time, or perhaps is unneceſſary, ſince every one may eaſily find it, either by his own meditation or in books.

I ſay then, Sir, that this objection, which might perhaps be a ſolid one, abſolutely ſpeaking, and without reſpect to time and place, is of no force when referred to the age and the part of the world we live in. If men were perfectly reaſonable, they would employ themſelves wholly in the care of their eternal ſalvation; one thing alone would be neceſſary, as our Saviour told Martha, *Porro unum eſt neceſſarium* (*ff*), who knows not alſo the good and wiſe maxim, *nature is content with a little?* Who can doubt but that if we contained our ſelves within the bounds of natural neceſſity, we muſt aboliſh almoſt all the arts as things ſuperfluous? But man can be no longer treated upon that foot; it has been time out of mind his practice to ſeek the conveniences of life, and all ſorts of pleaſures and delights. Among other unneceſſary things, about which the Europeans have been pleaſed to employ themſelves, they deſired to underſtand the Greek and Latin tongues, or at leaſt to know the matters contained in the books which are extant in thoſe two languages. Nor were they content to know in general what is contained in thoſe books, but they would examine whether every thing in them was certain, and whether they could not clear up thoſe paſſages where one antient author contradicts another: and when they have been able to clear theſe difficulties, and thoſe of all ſorts of Hiſtories, they have found it a very agreeable ſatisfaction, have very much diverted their readers, and procured great encomiums to themſelves, though theſe illuſtrations were of no uſe to bring down the price of proviſions, or to keep off cold or heat, rain or hail. It ought not therefore to be deemed an impertinent raſhneſs in me to expoſe, as wares of great value, things which have been rejected by all mankind as uſeleſs; for in this I only fall in with the taſte which I find has long prevailed, and is fully eſtabliſhed. Whether men be in the right or the wrong to be pleaſed that they are not in an error upon any point of Geography, Chronology, or Hiſtory, is nothing to me: I am in no wiſe anſwerable for that; it is ſufficient for my purpoſe, that the public (*gg*) deſireth exactly to know all the falſhoods that are current, and values theſe diſcoveries (*hh*).

Let

(*cc*) *Compare with this what has been ſaid above, in remark* [*F*], *of the* Diſſertation concerning Defamatory Libels.

(*dd*) *See, above in remark* [*B*], *of the article* ANTESIGNANUS, *what Eraſmus has ſaid of the laborious taſk of compoſing Dictionaries.*

(*ee*) Quint. *lib.* i, *in Proœmio.*

(*ff*) *Luke* x. 42.

(*gg*) *By this word I do not mean that every body is pleaſed with the ſame confutations, but that ſome are pleaſed with one ſort, and others with another.*

(*hh*) *If it is not neceſſary to know them, neither is it neceſſary to be ignorant of them. Scaliger, at the beginning of his notes on Catullus, has this ſaying,* Etſi candide lector, hoc epigrammate patienter carere poteras, habet tamen quod te ſcire melius fuit quàm ignorare. - - - *Though, candid reader, thou mighteſt well be without this epigram, yet it contains certain things, which it is better thou ſhouldſt know than be ignorant of. See the* News from the Republic of Letters, *in the advertiſement of Auguſt* 1684. *Lipſius was curious of truth, even in the leaſt things:* Admirabilis *Lipſius* alicubi ait ſe cupere etiam in minimis vera ſcire. *Epiſtola Hoffm. ad Reneſium, p.* 100.

---

faculty of ſpeaking or writing, they are ſo dry and barren (5). The author of this judgment obſerves, *That Mr Conrart, who had an excellent judgment and delicate taſte, and whoſe criticiſms were juſt, and penetrating into all the folds and corners of a work, had the prudence to publiſh nothing of his own, and that the few things of his which came out are not very conſiderable.*

(5) Vigneul Marville, Melanges d'Hiſt. & de Litterature, *Tom. iii, pag.* 183, *Rouën, Edit.* 1701.

Let it not be ſaid that our age, being cured of that critical taſte which reigned in the preceding, looks upon the writings of thoſe who correct falſities, concerning either the particular Hiſtory of great men, or the names of cities, or the like, as mere pedantry; for it is certain, when all things are conſidered, that men were never more devoted than they are at this day to ſuch ſorts of illuſtrations. For one experimental Philoſopher, for one Mathematician, you find an hundred men who throughly ſtudy Hiſtory with all its dependencies; and antiquarian ſcience, I mean the ſtudy of medals, inſcriptions, baſſo relievo's, *&c.* was never cultivated as it is at preſent. To what does it tend? To the better fixing the time when certain particular facts happened; to prevent one town or perſon from being miſtaken for another; to corroborate the conjectures which have been made upon certain rites of the ancients; and to an hundred other curioſities which the public has nothing to do with, according to the ſupercilious maxims upon which this third difficulty is grounded; maxims that have not diſcouraged a great man (*ii*), as conſummate in the affairs of ſtate as in the ſtudy of the *Belles Lettres*, from publiſhing a large book upon the excellence and uſefulneſs of medals.

You, Sir, of all men living are moſt convinced of the impertinence of theſe maxims; they tend to nothing leſs than the ruin of all the liberal arts, and almoſt of all the ſciences which chiefly poliſh and exalt the mind of man (*jj*). According to theſe fine reaſonings, we ſhould have nothing left but the uſe of Mechanical arts, and as much Geometry as is neceſſary to perfect Navigation, Carriages, Agriculture, and the Fortification of Towns. For Profeſſors, we ſhould have ſcarce any, but Engineers to invent only new ways of deſtroying mankind. It muſt be owned the public has a very great intereſt in all theſe things, ſince by theſe means we may commodiouſly ſtore our towns with plenty, and maintain an offenſive or defenſive war. But it muſt be owned on the other hand, with Cicero's leave (*kk*), that all the beauties of painting, ſculpture, and architecture, ſerve only to pleaſe the eyes, and to give an agreeable admiration to good judges. The coarſe productions of all thoſe arts ſerve to ſatisfy the neceſſities of men; a man may be ſafely and commodiouſly lodged without the help of the Corinthian or the Compoſit order, without frizes, cornices, and architraves. Much leſs is it neceſſary for the conveniences of life, to know all that is ſaid either of the incommenſurability of the Aſymptotes, or of Magical Squares, or the Duplication of the Cube, *&c.* The Turks in the midſt of their groſs ignorance, are no leſs robuſt, and ſpend no leſs merrily ten thouſand livres a year, when they have them, than the Chriſtians; and that Governour of Neuhauſel, who after the raiſing of the ſiege of Vienna complained of the perfidy of the French, who had given the King of Poland paſſage through their country (*ll*), enjoyed the authority of his poſt as agreeably as if he had been better ſkilled in Hiſtory and Geography. So that if a man was allowed to deſpiſe a work which treats not *de pane lucrando - - - of earning one's bread*, or is of no uſe πρὸς τα ἀλφιτα, *for getting victuals*, as your good friends the ancient Greeks ſaid, or in ſhort when the public may do without it, there are few books but would be contemptible, and deſerve the blunt ſaying you have doubtleſs read in the life of Malherbe. Mr de Meziriac, attended with two or three of his friends, brought him his commentary on Diophantus; thoſe *friends greatly praiſed this book, as very uſeful to the public: Malherbe asked them whether it would bring down the price of bread?* Another time he approved the giving recompences to thoſe only who ſerved the King in his armies and public affairs; and he ſaid *that a good Poet was no more uſeful to the ſtate than a good player at nine-pins.*

It muſt therefore be granted me, that there are a great many productions of the mind of man, which are eſteemed, not becauſe they are neceſſary, but becauſe they divert us: and ſince it is ſo, is it not proper to obſerve the falſities of authors, when there are ſo many men who delight to know the truth, even in things wherein their fortune is not in the leaſt concerned?

Is it not certain that a Shoemaker, a Miller, a Gardener, are infinitely more neceſſary to the ſociety, than the ableſt Painters or Statuaries; than a Michael Angelo, or a Cavalier Bernini? Is it not true that the meaneſt Bricklayer is more neceſſary in a town, than the moſt excellent Chronologer or Aſtronomer; than a Joſeph Scaliger, or a Copernicus? And yet the works of theſe great men which the world might well enough diſpenſe with, are infinitely more valued than the abſolutely neceſſary productions of theſe trades. ' Plus interfuit Reipub. Caſtellum capi Ligurum quàm bene defendi ' cauſam M. Curii. Credo, ſed Athenienſium quoque plus interfuit firma tecta in do' miciliis habere, quàm Minervæ ſignum ex ebore pulcherrimum: tamen ego me ' Phidiam eſſe mallem quam vel optimum fabrum lignarium; quare non quantum quiſ' que proſit, ſed quanti quiſque ſit ponderandum eſt: præſertim cum pauci pingere egre' giè poſſint aut fingere, operarii autem aut bajuli deeſſe non poſſint (*mm*). - - - - - *It ' was more beneficial to the commonwealth that the fort of the Ligurians ſhould be taken, ' than the cauſe of M. Curius ſhould be well defended. I believe it, but it was likewiſe more ' beneficial to the Athenians to have well built houſes, than to have the beautiful ivory ſtatue of ' Minerva. But I would rather be Phidias, than the beſt Carpenter in the world: ſo that ' we are to conſider, not how beneficial every man is, but what real merit he has: eſpecially*

(*ii*) *The Baron de Spanheim.*

(*jj*) *See the* News from the Republic of Letters, *September* 1684, *Art. iv.*

(*kk*) *He endeavours in book iii,* de Oratore, *to prove this poſition,* In pleriſque rebus incredibiliter hoc natura eſt ipſa fabricata, ut ea quæ maximam utilitatem in ſe continerent eadem haberent plurimum vel dignitatis vel ſæpè etiam venuſtatis. - - - *Nature itſelf has wonderfully contrived that moſt of thoſe things, which are of the greateſt uſefulneſs, ſhould likewiſe have in them very much dignity, and alſo frequently, very much comelineſs and beauty.*

(*ll*) Du Vignau, l'Etat préſent de la Puiſſance Ottomane, *pag.* 177, *Hague edition* 1688.

(*mm*) Cicero, in Bruto.

‘ *ſince few men are excellent Painters or Statuaries, whereas there are always workmen and* ‘ *porters abundance.*’ So true it is, that there are things whoſe worth and value is determined only with reſpect to an honeſt diverſion, or a mere ornament of the mind.

IX.
The ſame reaſons which prove the uſefulneſs of other ſciences, prove the uſefulneſs of critical learning.

Here, Sir, you will not fail to foreſee that the enemies to the *Belles Lettres* will invent an hundred exceptions. As they cannot deny that their maxims tend to revive barbariſm in all reſpects, they will expatiate on the uſefulneſs ariſing from certain ſciences. But they will get nothing by it; for as ſoon as they place in the number of things uſeful, ſuch as have an utility either by *reſult* or *emanation* (permit me to uſe this old ſchool diſtinction, ſince it ſo well comprehends both thoſe kinds of acceſſory utilities, which may here be alleged (*nn*),) they will find themſelves obliged to bring in the *Belles Lettres* and Critical learning. I can retort all their obſervations againſt them. Here is a ſmall ſpecimen of it.

If they tell me that the moſt abſtract theorems of Algebra are very uſeful to life, becauſe they render the mind of man more capable of perfecting certain arts: I may alſo ſay that a ſcrupulous enquiry into all Hiſtorical facts, is capable of producing very great advantages. I dare affirm, that the ridiculous obſtinacy of the firſt Critics, who laviſhed their time upon trifles, for example, upon the queſtion whether we ought to ſay *Virgilius* or *Vergilius*, has by accident been of great uſe; they thereby inſpired men with an extreme veneration for Antiquity; they diſpoſed them to a ſedulous enquiry into the conduct of antient Greece and of antient Rome, and thus gave occaſion to their improving by thoſe great examples. And what effect, Sir, do you think, would not a grave and majeſtic ſentence, taken from Livy or Tacitus, and uttered as having heretofore inclined the Roman Senate to one ſide of a queſtion, have upon hearers thus diſpoſed (*oo*)? I will not ſcruple to ſay that it is capable of ſaving a nation, and perhaps has ſaved more than one. The Preſident of an aſſembly pronounces thoſe Latin words with an emphaſis; he makes an impreſſion upon their minds by the reſpect they have for the Roman name; every one goes home convinced, and infuſes into his neighbours the ſentiments of obedience; and thus you ſee a civil war ſtifled in its birth. Malherbe had no notion of this when he ſaid, that a Poet is no more uſeful to a nation than a good player at nine-pins: for, not to deſcend to all the good things a Poet can effect (*pp*), do not you think, Sir, that one of the topping men of a pariſh has often by a ſtanza of Pibrac emphatically pronounced, happily deſtroyed all the contrivances of a factious declaimer? And in domeſtic affairs, do you think that thoſe golden ſentences recommended by Moliere (*qq*) are always ineffectual? I believe they are often ſo, but not always; and I do not think that Horace, in the verſes I here cite, ſpoke only of an imaginary profit.

Os tenerum pueri balbumque poëta figurat:
Torquet ab obſcœnis jam nunc ſermonibus aurem;
Mox etiam pectus præceptis format amicis:
Aſperitatis, & invidiæ corrector & iræ (*rr*).

They teach our boys to hate all words obſcene,
To follow gen'rous rules, and ſpeak like men,
And then ſlide gently down with virtuous rules
Into the tender breaſt, and form their ſouls;
Reſtrain their envy, and correct their rage,
Tell them what's good, inſtruct their tender age
With fit examples, and their griefs aſſwage. } CREECH.

It will be ſaid, perhaps, that what ſeems the moſt abſtracted and unfruitful in Mathematics, brings at leaſt this advantage, that it leads us to undoubted truths; whereas Hiſtorical diſcuſſions, and enquiries after human actions, leave us always in the dark, and always ſome ſeeds of new diſputes. But how imprudent it is to harp upon this ſtring! I maintain that Hiſtorical truths may be carried to a greater degree of certainty than what Geometrical truths are brought to, provided we conſider theſe two ſorts of truths in the kind of certainty peculiar to them. I explain myſelf. In the diſputes that ariſe betwixt Hiſtorians, to know whether a certain Prince has reigned before or after another; it is ſuppoſed on both ſides that a fact has all the reality and exiſtence of which it is capable out of our underſtanding, provided it be not of the nature of thoſe related by Arioſto and other fabulous authors; and no regard is had to the difficulties alledged by the Sceptics, to make it doubtful whether the things which ſeem to exiſt do really exiſt out of our minds. Thus an Hiſtorical fact is placed in the higheſt degree of certainty that can belong to it, when once we have been able to prove its apparent exiſtence: for no more is required for this ſort of truths; and it were denying the common principle of diſputants, and going from one kind of things to another, to bid us prove not only that it appeared to all Europe that a bloody battle was fought at Senef in the year 1674; but alſo that the objects are ſuch *ad extra - - - out of our underſtanding* as they appear to us to be. Thus we are delivered from the importunate cavils which the Sceptics

---

(*nn*) *Here I give a greater latitude to this Diſtinction than the ſchools.*

(*oo*) *Compare with this Seneca's xcivth epiſtle. I have cited above ſome part of it in remark* [*B*], *of the article* ARISTO.

(*pp*) Horat. Epiſt. I, lib. ii, *reckons them up. See, below, citation* (*rr*).

(*qq*) Moliere, Comédie du Cocu imaginaire.

(*rr*) Horat. Epiſt. I, lib. ii, ver. 126.

Sceptics call *reaſons for ſuſpending our aſſent*; and though Hiſtorical Scepticiſm cannot be rejected in a great many facts, it is certain there are ſeveral others which we can prove with a full certainty; ſo that Hiſtorical enquiries are not fruitleſs in that reſpect. We certainly ſhew the falſity of ſeveral things, the uncertainty of ſeveral others, and the truth of ſeveral others: and thus you have ſome demonſtrations which may be of uſe to many more people than Geometrical ones; for few people have a taſte for theſe, or find occaſion to apply them to the reformation of manners: but it will be confeſſed, Sir, that a great many people may profit, morally ſpeaking, by the reading of a collection of Hiſtorical falſhoods, well proved to be falſhoods, though it were only by growing more circumſpect in judging of other men, and more capable of avoiding the ſnares which ſatire and flattery lay on all ſides for the unwary reader. Now, is it of no uſe to correct the bad inclination we have to make raſh judgments? Is it of no uſe to learn not to believe lightly what we ſee in print? Is it not the very nerve and ſinew of prudence not to believe haſtily? Νῆφε καὶ μέμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν· ἄρθρα ταῦτα τῶν φρενῶν. Sobrius eſto atque illud teneto nervos atque artus eſſe ſapientiæ non temere credere (*ss*). - - - - *Be vigilant, and remember, that not to believe haſtily is the nerve and ſinew of wiſdom.*

In vain ſhould we ſeek for theſe moral advantages in the moſt refined books of Algebra. Beſides, by the leave of the Mathematicians, it is not ſo eaſy for them to arrive at that certainty which is neceſſary in the Mathematics, as it is for Hiſtorians to arrive at that certainty which is ſufficient in Hiſtory. No ſolid objection will ever be made againſt this truth of fact, that Cæſar vanquiſhed Pompey; and whatever principles we diſpute upon, nothing will ſtand more immovably than this propoſition, *Cæſar and Pompey have exiſted, and were not a mere modification of the minds of thoſe who wrote their lives.* But as for the object of Mathematics, it is not only very hard to prove that it exiſts out of our mind, but it is very eaſy to prove that it can be nothing but an idea of our mind (*tt*). And indeed the exiſtence of a ſquare circle without us, ſeems not much more impoſſible, than the exiſtence of the circle of which Geometry gives us ſo many fine demonſtrations; I mean, of a circle from the circumference of which, to its centre, as many ſtrait lines may be drawn as there are points in that circumference. It is manifeſt, that the centre, which is but one point, cannot be the common ſubject where there terminate as many different lines as there are points in the circumference. In a word, the object of Mathematics being points abſolutely indiviſible, lines without breadth or depth, and ſurfaces without depth; it is evident that this object cannot exiſt out of our imagination. Thus it is metaphyſically more certain that Cicero has had a being out of the underſtanding of any other man, than it is certain that the object of Mathematics exiſts out of our underſtanding. I omit what the learned Huetius (*uu*) has repreſented to theſe gentlemen, to teach them not ſo much to undervalue Hiſtorical truths.

The abſtracted depths of Mathematics, it may be ſaid, give us ſublime ideas of the infinity of God. Be it ſo: But do you think that a great moral good may not reſult from a Critical Dictionary? The infallible Oracle affirms, that ſcience puffeth up; and therefore there is no caſe wherein it is more important to humble the pride of man than in this. He who mentions pride mentions the fault which is the moſt remote from true virtue, and the moſt diametrically oppoſite to the ſpirit of the goſpel. Now what could be imagined more proper to give man a true notion of the emptineſs and vanity of the ſciences, and of the weakneſs of his underſtanding, than to ſhew him the numberleſs falſe facts with which books abound. A great many men of letters, the moſt penetrating and ſublime wits, have made it their buſineſs for many years to illuſtrate Antiquity. That taſk of the Critics having the actions of men for its object, ſhould be more eaſy than that of the Philoſophers, which has the actions of God for its object, and yet the Critics have given ſo many proofs of human infirmity, that one may compoſe large volumes of their falſhoods. Theſe volumes may therefore mortify man with reſpect to his greateſt vanity, I mean his knowledge or ſcience. Theſe are ſo many trophies or triumphal arches erected to human ignorance and infirmity.

Hence you ſee, Sir, that the ſmalleſt falſities will here have their uſe, ſince by the very collection of numerous lies upon every ſubject, man will be the better taught to know his weakneſs, and ſee the prodigious variety his errors are capable of. This will make him more ſenſible that he is the ſport of malice and ignorance; that one ſeizes him when the other leaves him; that if he be intelligent enough to know a lie, he is wicked enough to vent it againſt his conſcience; or if he is not wicked to this pitch of propagating falſhood, he is blind enough not to diſcern the truth. For my own part, when I think that perhaps I ſhall make it my ſerious employment for all my life to gather materials for this kind of triumphal arches, I find my ſelf thoroughly penetrated with the conviction of my nothingneſs. This will be a continual leſſon to me of ſelf-contempt. No ſermon, no not of the Eccleſiaſtes, or Preacher, by way of excellency, could more firmly rivet in me this grand maxim (*ww*), *I have ſeen all the works that are done under the ſun,* AND BEHOLD ALL IS VANITY AND VEXATION OF SPIRIT (*xx*). You ſee how conceited I am of my own work: I ſhall think worſe

of

(*ss*) Epicharmus, apud Ciceronem, Polybium, Lucianum, &c.

(*tt*) *See, above, the article of* ZENO, *the Epicurean Philoſopher, remark* [*D*], *towards the end.*

(*uu*) *Præfat.* Demonſtrat. Evangel.

(*ww*) *Eccleſiaſt.* i. 14.

(*xx*) *Compare with this what is ſaid by Vigneul Marville,* Melang. *Tom. iii, pag.* 206, *&* *ſeq. and pag. ult. edition of Roüen,* 1701.

of it than any body elſe, and I eſteem that circumſtance more than all the reſt.

I was going to finiſh with this moral reflexion, when I remembered I had not intimated that I ſhall uſe the ſame liberty and civility towards all authors, of whatever nation or religions they may be; I therefore declare it here. Nothing is more ridiculous than a Dictionary where the author turns Controverſiſt. This is one of the greateſt faults of Moreri's Dictionary: we find in it an hundred places that ſeem to be taken from a true cruſade ſermon. For my part, I ſhall not ſay with Hannibal, *Hoſtem qui feriet mihi erit Carthaginienſis, quiſquis erit (yy) Civis (zz)*: - - - *I ſhall look upon him, whoever he be, who ſlays an enemy, as a citizen of Carthage*: but rather that all thoſe who depart from truth ſhall be equally ſtrangers to me. You know ſome people who will complain of this, but who will rejoice at it in the bottom of their ſoul, becauſe it will furniſh them with pretexts for ſlander, and for playing the zealots, two things which in theſe perſons always go together. But though there are not many civilities that paſs between us, I ſhall go on my uſual way, let them ſay what they will, and ſhall not envy them the bones they may find to pick in it. Here is the reaſon of my proceeding after this manner.

As this Dictionary does not concern errors in reaſoning, partiality in it would be incomparably more inexcuſable than in Hiſtorical Dictionaries; for a man is obliged in theſe to relate a thouſand things which are true in the judgment of ſome, and falſe in that of others: he ought therefore to ſuppoſe a great difference of principles in readers, and to imagine that in the hands of ſome he will be in an enemy's country, and in the hands of others among friends; and for that reaſon it is juſt he ſhould proportion his ſtile and way of deciding accordingly. But when a man only propoſes to collect errors of fact, he reaſonably ſuppoſes that all his readers have the ſame principles, and that there is no man but will admit as falſe what he ſhews to be ſo: for the proofs of a falſity in fact are not the prejudices of a particular nation or particular religion, but maxims common to all men. You hereby ſee, Sir, that Philoſophical or Theological falſities enter not into the plan of my work: however it is true that books wherein they are diſcuſſed might furniſh out a kind of falſities in fact, which would not perhaps be the leſs uſeful to the reader.

It moſt commonly happens that diſputes in writing upon any point of doctrine degenerate into perſonal altercations, and for the moſt part turn only upon the queſtion, whether an adverſary's paſſage has been well or ill cited, well or ill interpreted. Here the public abandons the diſputants, and, as was not long ſince ſaid by a man of wit, the antagoniſts are obliged to part for want of readers or Bookſellers. If any body had patience enough to make an analyſis of theſe perſonal quarrels, he would have a great many faults within the province of this Dictionary, many falſe citations, or falſe interpretations. Now theſe are errors in fact. You will own, Sir, there could be no Logic comparable to this, to teach the juſtneſs of reaſoning; beſides this great moral advantage, that we ſhould at the ſame time diſcover a great many frauds, or at leaſt the imperfections of our ſouls; for what proceeds not from inſincerity, muſt ariſe from dimneſs or weakneſs of mind.

It is a misfortune that frauds of this kind ſhould go unpuniſhed ſo much as they do, by the little care that readers take to compare the anſwers and replies together. But if any one took the pains to deſcribe in a few words the progreſs of a diſpute, he would bring to light all the windings and turnings of the caviller, and make them deteſted.

Pardon me, Sir, ſo long an Epiſtle Dedicatory, and make haſte to enrich the Republic of Letters with the learned works they expect from you. Your modeſty and our friendſhip forbid me to praiſe them: but I could gladly wiſh the public might ſoon give you the praiſes you will receive when they ſhall appear. I am with the greateſt attachment

SIR,

Your moſt humble and moſt obedient ſervant,

May 5, 1692. * * * * * *

Note, that in the compoſing of this Dictionary I have not followed all the ideas of this Plan. The deference I had to the advices I received from ſome intelligent readers made me follow another method in certain matters.

(yy) *Thus* Cicero, Orat. pro Corn. Balbo, *pag. m.* 979, *relates the words of Ennius; but to make it a verſe it ſhould be* ferit, *and not* feriet.

(zz) *Some Critics would have it read* cujati' ſiet.

REMARKS

ON

A PAMPHLET

INTITULED,

The judgment of the public, and particularly of the Abbot Renaudot, on Mr Bayle's Critical Dictionary.

MY principal deſign in this piece is to acquaint the public, that I am preparing a defence, which to every unprejudiced reader will demonſtrate the injuſtice of my cenſurers. But that Apology not deſerving the fate of looſe ſheets, which commonly do not outlive the week in which they firſt appear, I keep it to be placed at the beginning or end of a book *in folio* (1). For the ſame reaſon I refer to it almoſt every thing conſiderable that may be ſaid againſt the pamphlet which is juſt publiſhed. Here I confine myſelf to a few obſervations made in haſte and negligently. It would be prodigal in a writer to beſtow ornament and ſtile on a piece, like this, of ſeven or eight pages.

I. That libel has a very improper title: it ought to be intituled, *The judgment of the Abbot Renaudot commented upon by the publiſher*; for all the other judges are leſs than phantoms: they are inviſible beings, no body knows whether they are black or white. Therefore their evidence and a cypher are of the ſame value. I except the agents of the States of Holland; but upon this point, I beg the reader to take notice of what I ſhall mention hereafter of Tertullian.

II. What manner of proceeding is this! to make the judgment of the public conſiſt in ſuch pieces. I could produce a great many much ſtronger in my favour, if modeſty would permit. And beſides, how many letters could I produce, wherein my adverſary is repreſented both as a bad writer, and a bad man. But God forbid that I ſhould imitate him in the uſe he makes of what people write one to another in confidence. This is a conduct deteſted by the Heathens themſelves. What kind of people have we here? One writes what he pretends to have heard a Biſhop ſay, and the other publiſhes it to the world. Neither aſks his permiſſion. They name him without it. Can any thing be more audacious? And is not this tyrannizing over converſation, more than ever Phalaris did over the people?

III. The author of this pretended Judgment of the Public has not been very wiſe in the choice he has made. He conceals the names of all his witneſſes, except one whom he ought chiefly to have concealed, a name odious and deſpiſed in all the countries which are at war with France. I will not take advantage of the prepoſſeſſion of the public: I will not conſider him with regard to his Gazette, which every where diſcredits him, as a man who has got a habit of giving a malicious turn to lies. I will conſider him on his fair ſide. The Abbot Renaudot has the character of a very learned man, and of having a taſte ſo delicate, that nothing can pleaſe him. We can therefore conclude nothing from his contempt of any thing: It is an equivocal proof. I have been told likewiſe that he is exceedingly devout. We muſt not therefore be ſurprized that he finds ſome things too free, which at bottom do not go beyond the liberties an honeſt man may allow himſelf, after the examples of ſo many great authors. Can a ſevere Moraliſt, Tertullian for inſtance, find in the houſe of a gentleman, any thing remote enough from luxury? It is no matter though the public be charmed with the good order obſerved in it. Let the miſtreſs of the houſe go to plays and balls but now and then: let her engage in gaming only upon certain occaſions. Let the world applaud the modeſty of her dreſs and converſation. Tertullian, notwithſtanding, exclaims that ſhe is immodeſt; ſhe ſhows too much her breaſt and her arms; ſhe wears ribbons, and dances, and rallies ſometimes. And this is enough to damn her. It is not by the taſte of ſuch a cenſurer that we are to judge whether the commentary of a layman on the Hiſtory of particular perſons be not ſometimes in too worldly a dreſs; for by following ſuch a taſte, though conformable to the rigorous laws of the goſpel, we muſt baniſh all romances, and a great many other books which the civil laws authorize, and muſt compoſe works of piety only. It may be ſaid that ſome perſons, who are not *Rigoriſts*, find in my Dictionary a few gayeties ſomewhat too ſtrong. But the Apology I am preparing, will, I hope, give full ſatisfaction on that head. I ſhould make another Apology for what Abbot Renaudot calls *Impieties*; but as I know not upon what the accuſation is grounded, I ſhall defer it till I am better informed. I have declared on all occaſions, and I do here publickly declare, that if there are any heterodox opinions in my work, I am the firſt who will deteſt them, and that I will throw them out in my ſecond edition. I only want to have them pointed out to me. As to the article of DAVID, the Abbé is much in the wrong to ſay that I have there ſhewn no reſpect for the Scripture: ſince the explanation I have joined to it, is full of a moſt reſpectful ſubmiſſion to that divine book. For this I appeal to all my readers. I add that in the way I propoſe to reviſe that article, it will furniſh my cenſurers with no further pretence of declamation. After all, will any of them be ſo bold as to ſay that my Dictionary comes near the licentiouſneſs of Montagne's Eſſays, either with regard to Scepticiſm, or obſcenities? But did not Montagne publiſh ſeveral editions of his book, without being called to an account for it? Has it not been printed a hundred times over? Was it not dedicated to the great Cardinal de Richelieu? Has it not a place in every library? What a hardſhip and injuſtice would it be; if I was denied that liberty in Holland, which Montagne enjoyed in France?

---

(1) *That Apology was placed at the end of the ſecond edition of the* Critical Dictionary, *and contains the* IV Explanations *which follow theſe* Remarks.

IV. If ever I anſwer Abbot Renaudot's judgment, it will only be after being aſſured that he owns it to be his, ſuch as it is printed: for it is ſo full of blunders, falſhoods, and impertinences, that I imagine it not to be agreeable to the original: ſome ſpurious things have perhaps been foiſted into it in copying. He had prejudiced a great many people: but ſome judicious men having read my Dictionary, quickly put an end to that prejudice. The Abbot himſelf is not ignorant of this: for he ſays in one of his letters *that I ought to be ſatisfied with the approbation of ſo many people*. And ſo I am. People were ſurprized to find ſo many idle things in his report. The only queſtion was whether my book contained any thing which could offend the Church of Rome, or France. They did not aſk him whether I had read the beſt authors, or whether I equal the Moderns with the Antients. If ſeveral of my readers have contradicted him with reſpect to my ignorance, I diſown them. He has not ſaid enough on that head; I know a great deal more of it, and if he has a mind to draw my picture in that light, I will furniſh him with a good many memoirs. But I beg leave to tell him that he has not well choſen his proofs of my incapacity; for example, when he would prove it by my tranſlating *Librarii*, *Bookſellers*, he cenſures me moſt unjuſtly, ſince in a marginal note I have apprized the reader that by *Librarii*, *muſt be underſtood the Tranſcribers and Bookbinders*, *according to the cuſtom of fitting up books at that time* (2). I did therefore underſtand the thing as it ought to be underſtood. I do not impute to him the impertinence of the marginal note which is made on this paſſage of his report, publiſhed in this town. That muſt be laid to the charge of the publiſher *.

V. He has publiſhed the Abbot's paper with little judgment, for it fully proves the untruth of thoſe accuſations, which he has ſo often trumpeted out againſt me, of my holding a correſpondence with the court of France. A chimera which no man but himſelf could have deviſed: and for this he would have made reparation to the public at the end of this piece, which he has printed, and which ſo fully juſtifies my innocence, if it was poſſible for him to act the part of an honeſt man. But on this head he is profoundly ſilent, and has only laboured to throw a rank poiſon upon what I advanced in favour of the Proteſtants, and againſt the Church of Rome. Sure he muſt be an enemy to the edification of his neighbours, ſince he deprives the Proteſtants of that which Abbé Renaudot's judgment affords them; and in order to do ſo, copies himſelf twenty times over, repeating calumnies frequently detected, and which he never ſupported but by heaping falſhoods upon falſhoods, as it appears by the long catalogues of them, which were publickly pointed out to him.

VI. I ſhall take a little notice of his reflexions. In theſe he only gives a looſe to ſpleen and paſſion: they are either rambling judgments, the fallacies of which an intelligent reader will perceive of himſelf, or calumnies refuted a hundred times, or new lies which do not deſerve to be refuted, or which ſhall be ſo on a proper occaſion. Upon the whole, after having declaimed ſo long, it will appear that he himſelf is confounded by the three examples he produces. He alledges a compariſon on the fall of Eve, a paſſage of St Paul applied to the Abelians, and a phraſe on the deſign of Abelard. The firſt example is an objection which I propoſed to the Socinians, and expreſſed with that caution which the ſubject required, or an objection which I ſuppoſe the Manichees make to the Jeſuits. There is not the leaſt profanation in the ſecond, nor any obſcenity in the third. This I ſubmit to the judgment of any impartial and intelligent reader, and am willing that he decide it without hearing me. Such is the common fate of declaimers. While they only make general complaints, they gain people over to their ſide by ſurprize; but bid them point to a particular paſſage, and it then appears that they miſapprehended the matter, that they miſtook for my opinions the conſequences

(2) *See citation* (38), *in the article* ATTICUS.

* Mr Jurieu's marginal note ran thus. *This word* (Librarii) *ſignifies what weighs a pound*; Libraria fruſtra; *pieces weighing a pound*. REM. CRIT.

ſequences reſulting from thoſe Hereſies which I attack, and made mountains of mole-hills. This obliges me to give them a charitable word of advice. *Gentlemen, I tell you as a friend, never ſpeak of my Dictionary but before people who have it not; for if it is produced, and you are obliged to prove your aſſertions, you will be catched. This happens to ſome of you every day. You have not been artful enough; paſſion has blinded you, your hyperboles made people expect to find in every page, ſome abominable things, like thoſe in the* Parnaſſe Satirique, *whereas nothing was found in it, but ſuch trifles as are ſaid every day in good company, and ſuch as you yourſelves might very well ſay, either when you take a walk, or are at table with your friends. Give over exaggerating; ſay rather too little, than too much. Such a way of hurting will not recoil on you.*

VII. We may add to the three examples he quotes what he alledges againſt the article wherein I recite ſome paſſages of a book of Tagereau (3). He could not chuſe a worſe ſubject for the ground of his objections; for I ſhall make it appear on a proper occaſion that I was fully authorized to inſert in my work, what I have ſaid concerning the congreſs. As an Hiſtorian I might ſay, that Quellenec was accuſed of impotence, and that it was his mother-in-law, and not his wife, who commenced that law-ſuit. Indeed I owed this remark to the memory of an heroine of our party. It became me, as a faithful Hiſtorian, to cenſure thoſe who ſully the glory of that lady, by ſuppoſing that at ſo early an age ſhe raiſed ſuch a law-ſuit. This is declaring that I do not at all think it reputable in a woman to engage in ſuch proceedings. Every author has a right to declare the reaſons of his ſentiments. Thus, as a Commentator on my own text, I might and ought to offer the proofs of the opinion which I advanced, and by conſequence relate what Tagereau publiſhed againſt the practice of that time. We would appear wiſer than our fathers, and we are not ſo wiſe as they were. That Advocate of the Parliament of Paris readily obtained a privilege for publiſhing a book wherein he deſcribed all the filthineſs of the congreſs; and ſhall a clamour be raiſed in Holland againſt an author who copies a few paſſages of that book? Is not this a reſpect of perſons, proceeding either from a very fantaſtical mind, or a bad heart?

VIII. But it may be ſaid, that author publiſhed thoſe particulars only with a view of obliging the judges to put a ſtop to a cuſtom inconſiſtent with modeſty and liable to iniquitous practices. And do not I declare, even with the greateſt indignation, that the cuſtom was infamous, becauſe it weakened the principles of modeſty, the moſt precious ſource of chaſtity? Is it poſſible for a man to take the honeſt ſide with greater warmth than I have done in that article.

Beſides, had I not, as an Hiſtorian, the right to relate a practice which continued long in the juriſdiction of the Parliament of Paris, and which is not yet aboliſhed in any other place. The manner of proceeding in all civil and criminal cauſes belongs unqueſtionably to Hiſtorical facts, and if there is any thing ſingular in it, many travellers and many writers of relations are curious to be informed of it. What pleaſure would it have been to a Pietro della Valle to find a book in Perſia, which would have informed him of an extravagant cuſtom, ſo well as Tagereau's book might inform him of the ceremonial of the congreſs. I aſk whether the verbal proceſſes of Juries and Matrons, in ſome caſes, are pieces to be rejected by thoſe who would make complete collections of all the uſes and cuſtoms of a country? Furetiere, who did not write an Hiſtorical Dictionary, with comments on it, but only a Grammatical one, made uſe of theſe verbal proceſſes. And did any body complain of it?

IX. Let me not diſmiſs this ſubject without acquainting our bawlers, copiers, and diſtributers of extracts of letters, that Dr Menjot, with whom perhaps they were particularly acquainted, and who was a very honeſt man, has inſerted many leud things in his Diſſertation on the *Furor Uterinus*, and barrenneſs. It would be ridiculous to cenſure him for it, becauſe, as a Phyſician, he had a right to do ſo: his ſubject required, or allowed it. Now I muſt inform them that a compiler who relates and comments, has all the rights of a Phyſician, and of an Advocate, &c. as occaſion requires, and may uſe their verbal proceſſes, and their terms of art. If he gives an account of the divorce of Lotharius and Tetberga, he may publiſh extracts from Hincmar, Archbiſhop of Rheims, who wrote the impurities which were averred in that trial. We ought never to cenſure an Hiſtorian Commentator, 'till after being inſtructed in the laws of Hiſtory, and the privileges of a commentary. Had theſe gentlemen read Andrew Tiraquellus's commentary on the laws of matrimony, they would have found in it obſcenities in much greater number. Yet he was a Counſellor of the Parliament of Paris, and one of the moſt illuſtrious men of the laſt century, both on account of his knowledge and his virtue.

X. Obſerve that it becomes no man leſs than my adverſary to declaim againſt me: he, who in a ſermon, which laſted almoſt two hours, criticized the conduct of the patriarch Jacob; he, whom a Synod cenſured for having been too free with the dignity of prophecies; he, from whoſe books a liſt of profane propoſitions was extracted, and ſent to a Synod: he, who had inſerted ſo many impurities in his anſwer to Maimbourg, that he was forced to ſuppreſs a part of them upon the remonſtrances of two magiſtrates; he, who in a ſevere criticiſm on a book of Abbot Dangeau uſed ſeveral licentious expreſ-

(3) *In the article* QUELLENEC.

ſions; he, who revived and bought out of a regiſtry-office, the moſt monſtrous obſcenities that can be read, and filled a caſe with them; he, whoſe myſtical Theology would pollute the moſt obdurate imagination; he, in ſhort, who, rejecting the way of authority, avows that the way of inquiry and examination is impracticable. He therefore accuſes his own doctrine of Atheiſm in another perſon.

XI. Never was romance more fabulous than what he ſays of the pretended hopes which I founded on my Dictionary. It is falſe that my friends did before-hand extol it with the triumphant airs he imputes to them. They are too judicious to fall into ſuch a miſtake. And for myſelf, ſo far was I from expecting any advantage by it, that I ſaid and wrote on a hundred occaſions to thoſe who ſpoke to me of it, that it was only a rhapſody, that there would be a good deal of traſh in it; and that the public would be very much diſappointed if they looked for any thing better than an irregular compilation; that I was but little able to confine myſelf, and having the greateſt indifference for praiſe, the fear of being criticized did not hinder me from running full career wherever my fancy guided; that being an author of no conſequence, pretending to nothing leſs than to dogmatize, I gave a looſe to my thoughts, ſuch as they were, ſometimes one way, ſometimes another, being perſuaded that no body would read them but by way of amuſement, that is, that they would only ſerve to unbend the mind, tired with the reading of many other things ſerious, curious, and uſeful, which I have collected with great patience, but without hoping that the world would mind in my favour that candid maxim, *Ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis Offendar maculis*, &c. The ſucceſs was beyond my hopes. A great many critical readers followed that rule. I only began to think the work not ſo deſpicable as I had imagined, when I obſerved how eagerly and how buſily ſome people went about to diſcredit it, and with what exceſſive pains the partiſans of a cabal, as formidable by its extent as by its credit, wrote one to another letters on that ſubject, and copied extracts of letters handed about among the whole fraternity, and every where elſe.

XII. As to the employments which he affirms I expected in the Republic of Letters by means of my Dictionary, I anſwer that he is as much miſtaken in this, as he was in ſaying that Mr Arnauld had done certain things, in order to recover his benefices. He then received a mortification which ought to have made him more cautious. Had he peruſed my preface, he would have known my diſpoſition with regard to employments. He may make himſelf very eaſy on that head. I never would take any employment, and will have none. My inclinations have been ſounded many ways, and from different places, during the printing of my work, and they always found that I would not depend on any body, nor part with the full liberty which I enjoyed of diſpoſing of all my time. It is only by his extracts that I am informed of a report which went that a Miniſter had made an attempt of this kind at Amſterdam. I believe it to be falſe: but let that be as it will, it was a thing which never entered into my thoughts, and which I would have refuſed.

XIII. Let us come to the main article, to the favourite, the darling, paſſage of our cenſurer, that which chiefly induced him to draw his pen: This was ſurely his real motive; in ſhort, it is that paſſage, where, with triumphant airs, he glories in having reduced me to live on the penſion of a Bookſeller. There cannot be a better picture of his pride: his ambition is ſo refined and ſo conſpicuous, that it incites him to wiſh above all things for the latter part of Sylla's epitaph. Soon after he ſhews a great deal of joy in imagining that *I am completing my own ruin*. This is very ingenuous: It would be very wrong to accuſe him of counterfeiting the honeſt man and the good paſtor, never was any man leſs dextrous in hiding his foible. But what is become of my penſions from the court of France? Have they been ſtopped? and even if it was ſo, could a Philoſophical life like mine have ſunk all that fund? How; no reſerve for futurity: nothing remaining but the penſion of a Bookſeller! Very hard indeed. I knew not that my income was ſo well or ſo ill computed. A thouſand diverting things might be ſaid of him, with regard to his Bookſellers: But it would be a pity to place them in this piece, which will as well as his, be thrown aſide among the rubbiſh of libraries in a day or two: Such is the fate of looſe ſheets.

XIV. He boaſts of having done me more harm than any man living, by diſcovering me to the world. He is ſurely a very fit perſon to hurt a man by his accuſations. I refer him to the Synodal aſſembly of the Brill, which declared the ſame Mr Saurin orthodox, againſt whom he had written two volumes full of defamation, almoſt as black as that which he has publiſhed againſt me. He was confident that he ſhould get Mr Saurin depoſed, and had long caballed about it. But he had the confuſion to ſee him acquitted. After ſuch a diſgrace, any man but my detractor would have hid himſelf in an hermitage, during the reſt of his life. But as for him he has publickly declared that he perſiſted in his ſentiment, notwithſtanding the decree of the Synod, and now boaſts to have been the accuſer. What value ought we to have for his judgment? Would not the man be very ſimple, who ſhould mind his calumnies?

XV. The pleaſure of boaſting that he had done me a prejudice, was the more agreeable to him, as he expected to make a great advantage of his boaſts: for he fancied that what I had written againſt him in my Dictionary would do him no prejudice, provided the public knew that I was prompted to it by a ſpirit of revenge. I make two Remarks againſt his cunning. He is miſtaken both in his ſuppoſition, and his inference.

I have always believed, and am ſtill perſuaded, that he had no ſhare in the ſuppreſſion of my employment, but as a remote cauſe. Indeed he was very buſy, for two or three years, to bring it about, but had not ſome perſons of his cloth, and of another language, whoſe enmity he had formerly diſcovered to me, been active in it, his labour would have been in vain. Be it as it will, that ſuppreſſion gave me ſo little uneaſineſs, that I never harboured the leaſt reſentment againſt any body concerned in it. I bleſs the day and the hour when it happened, and ſhall all my life lament my loſs of the time which was ſpent in ſuch employments. He will hardly believe me, becauſe he knows very well that he would mortally hate thoſe who ſhould leſſen his ſalary, notwithſtanding that the greateſt part of it was continued; notwithſtanding, for inſtance, that the ſalary of a preacher was left him, and that he was only ſtripped of the wages of a Profeſſor, which he has enjoyed almoſt ſixteen years, without having given above twenty leſſons in Latin, and a few more in French. Examining his own temper, he cannot think it poſſible for a man chearfully to ſupport the total loſs of his ſalary. But I beg he would not judge of me by himſelf. I am an old faſhioned man, *Vir antiqui moris*, and not like him of a modiſh turn. I value not the loſs of that ſalary a ruſh. He would therefore do me juſtice, if he believed that I wrote not againſt him from any reſentment. If he refuſes to give credit to my words, let him at leaſt give credit to my actions. Have I not ſpared his name on a thouſand occaſions, and if his friends pretend that I pointed at him, when I ſpoke of certain diſorders, and gave the picture of ſome inquiſitors, ſuch as my reading had furniſhed me with, ought he not to impute it to the misfortune he has of reſembling them, and to the penetration of his friends in diſcovering his reſemblance? Nay, have I not avoided pointing at him on a hundred occaſions which naturally admitted it, as my intelligent readers may eaſily perceive? Have I not commended his Apology of Theodore Beza? Was it known to how many of his falſe quotations and ſophiſms I have given quarter, my moderation would be admired. Did I not vindicate him whenever I thought him wronged? This indeed happened rarely: but it is not my fault. Why, is he not ſuch a perſon that it would be an injuſtice to ſpeak ill of him? He has been againſt all the world, and all the world againſt him: He has undergone all manner of abuſe, complaints, and reproaches: and yet I have ſcarce found any occaſion to criticize his cenſurers. I have ſomewhere applied to him the ſaying of an Emperor, *taurum toties non ferire difficile eſt.* But now we muſt turn the tables, and ſay, *taurum toties ferire difficile eſt.* It is very ſtrange that ſo many authors, having pointed their arrows, and exhauſted their quivers againſt his perſon, ſcarce one aim has miſcarried. I ſhould have been glad to diſcover any falſities in his cenſurers; for I would have mentioned them, not only as they were things which came within my province, or agreed with the Plan of my Work, but likewiſe with a view of doing an honour to myſelf. The moſt eminent glory of an Hiſtorian is to do juſtice to his greateſt enemies. This is true heroiſm. By this Thucydides has immortalized his name, more than by all the reſt of his Hiſtory. Therefore, though reaſon and the precepts of the goſpel, had not determined me to take that courſe, it ſhould at leaſt be believed that ſelf-love alone would have induced me to it. Let my adverſary's friends put me to the trial. Let them furniſh me with convincing proofs that his adverſaries have accuſed him falſly, and I promiſe to employ their memoirs to the beſt advantage. But after all, will they ſay, you bring him too often into your Dictionary: not more frequently than Varillas, will I anſwer, nor near ſo frequently as Moreri, two authors with whom I never had any difference. If I ſpeak of him oftener than of many other authors, it is becauſe I am more intimate with his writings. He thinks himſelf happy that I have placed him in my Dictionary; and I am very glad that he is pleaſed with it. Can there be a greater inſtance of my good nature? This is enough againſt his ſuppoſition; I now proceed to the conſequence he draws from it.

XVI. I deny it: for granting that the Remarks which relate to him, proceeded from my deſign to be revenged, the conceſſion would be of no ſervice to him, ſince theſe Remarks are always ſupported by proofs. It is certain that neither of us can be admitted as evidence againſt the other, in any affair whatever. We are not allowed either to judge or to vote. We do not deſerve to be believed when we ſpeak, either againſt the other, but ſo far as we ſolidly prove what we advance. But let our motive to ſeek and employ proofs be what it will, theſe proofs are ſtill of the ſame intrinſic force. This is moſt evident. The reader ought to take particular notice of it.

XVII. This is a full confutation of his laſt writing: There he rails at me in the moſt violent manner, and yet alledges no evidence but his own, if we except the judgment of Abbé Renaudot: and the agent's letter. He produces anonymous letters: the amount of all this is his whole authority. As if he had ſaid to the public, you ought to to believe all this, becauſe I affirm it. And does he know that his evidence is of no manner of authority in my affairs? How dares he then abuſe the patience of the public? Was he to ſay a thouſand times over that he has read my Dictionary, and found impieties and obſcenities in it, his words would be to no purpoſe: for, once more, he can be no evidence againſt me. He is naturally and peremptorily exceptionable. He can only be admitted to copy paſſages, and to prove that they ought to be condemned. If he cannot prove it, he muſt be ſilent. By how much more reaſon ought we not to give a hearing to his reflexions, ſince he owns that he has neither read nor ſeen the Critical Dictionary, and does not let us know the perſons who write to him concerning it. I make no queſtion but that as he is the firſt who ever impoſed, with ſo much aſſurance, upon the public, ſo he will be the laſt; for there is no probability that ſuch monſtrous things will ever be imitated.

XVIII. We have no reaſon to believe that his news-mongers are exact, ſince they tell him that I have abridged Rabelais. I am greatly miſtaken if I have cited him more than once, and had I done it on ſeveral occaſions, I ſhould have only followed the examples of eminent authors. His book does not pleaſe me much; but I know, and my adverſary knows likewiſe, that many perſons of probity and honour have read it over and over, know all the fine paſſages of it, and take a pleaſure in repeating them, when they converſe agreeably with their friends. If ſuch people were to make large compilations, there is no doubt but Rabelais would frequently appear in them.

XIX. The extracts of the *News from the Republic of Letters*, which are here objected to me, might be the ſubject of a curious Diſſertation. I may perhaps write it one time or other. It would give me an opportunity of clearing myſelf to thoſe who blame me for having beſtowed too great encomiums on the writers whom I mentioned in that journal. One might make a large catalogue of authors who have ſaid many injurious things of thoſe perſons whom they had formerly extolled. He who attacks me on this quarter, would be of the number. He very much praiſed, and afterwards abuſed Mr Simon. He has ſometimes been pleaſed to extol me, and even a little before our quarrel, in one of his caſes againſt Mr de la Conſeillere. But I have ſomething ſtronger than examples to plead: for about twelve years ago, I publickly owned myſelf guilty of a failing, which I have not yet wholly mended. I ſhall by that confeſſion avoid the dilemma he would put me to. It is not a mere invention to ſerve a turn: I take it from a work which I publiſhed at a time when I did not foreſee that I ſhould ever have occaſion for it.

I have ſaid, in the 575th page of the *New Letters* againſt Maimbourg, that ſeveral books, deſpiſed by men of parts, appeared to me to be good. This want of diſcernment was excuſable: if I was not very young in the world, I was ſo at leaſt in the Republic of Letters. I had begun very late to ſtudy, almoſt never had any maſters, never followed any method, never conſulted on that ſubject either the living or the dead. All this, joined with other obſtacles, rendered me a very young man with regard to learning, and however, I eaſily ſuffered myſelf to be duped by authors. I may even at this time make the ſame acknowledgment that Mr Arnauld made, which I have related in the 577th page of the ſame Letters. There is hardly any book which I do not think a good one, when I read it only for the ſake of reading; to find it's faults, I muſt read it attentively on purpoſe to diſcover them. I never did ſo, while I was writing the *News from the Republic of Letters*. I was not then acting the part of a Critic, and had put myſelf on the foot of civility. Thus I only obſerved in books what made them valuable. Their defects eſcaped me. If I therefore ſpoke civilly of them, it was not againſt my conſcience; and ſurely at the worſt the rules of civility cleared me from any imputation of blameable flattery. To flatter authors with the views of a paraſite, or from other motives of intereſt, is infamous. But when a man is ſo fully diſintereſted as I was, it is only at the moſt, a little too much civility and complaiſance. And will this be deemed a crime?

In ſuch a diſpoſition of mind it was impoſſible for me to avoid being duped by my adverſary's books. His deciſive manner, his lively ſtile, his chearful, brilliant, fertile imagination unwarily dazzled me. The dangerous illuſions of friendſhip ſtrengthened the charm. Thus his books appeared admirable to me: I thought therefore that in order to do them juſtice, I ought to employ ſtrong expreſſions: for common epithets of praiſe, when they come from an author who has put himſelf on the foot of courteſy and compliment, would only be an ordinary commendation, which is more offenſive to proud authors than being wholly ſilent about them. My readers were not miſtaken in this. They only took for an encomium in my journal that which was expreſſed in the moſt ſuperlative terms. But the charm began to vaniſh, when, being no longer concerned in that journal, I ſeriouſly compared his books with thoſe in which he was refuted. Then I read them critically; I obſerved the weak paſſages of them, and by degrees found many defects. Some time after I was obliged to peruſe them in order to refute ſome of his works. This gave me a complete notion of them, and had a retroſpective effect on his other productions. The ſame thing has happened to me with regard to him, as with regard to Moreri and Varillas, two authors of whom I have been ſucceſſively

ceſſively the Admirer and the Critic, according as I read them either by way of amuſement, or with the deſign of equiring into the truth of their writings.

XX. Let us make one remark more. It will not be found that what I blame in his *Prophecies*, and his *Eſprit d'Arnauld*, is the ſame with what I formerly commended in theſe pieces. I praiſed the invention, the wit, the turn, the ſtile, the fluency of thoughts, and I now blame the opinions, the ſlanders, *&c.* which they contain. He has not therefore caught me between the extremes of a *baſe flatterer*, and an *infamous calumniator*, as he imagined, according to his inveterate habit of departing from the accuracy of Logic. There is a very wide medium, between theſe two terms. The oppoſition had been more juſt between a *Panegyriſt* and a *rigid Cenſurer*. But ſetting Logic aſide, I anſwer to his queſtion, that I formerly commended him very ſincerely; and that I now cenſure him with reaſon, being better informed. Let me give an inſtance of my ſincerity. His book of *Prejudices* having appeared to me to be inferior to the reſt, I ſpoke more ſparingly of it (which I know he complained of); and as I thought that his *Criticiſm* on the Abbé Dangeau was defective in ſome paſſages, I cenſured it very frankly.

I can therefore only be blamed for having followed the dictates of an erroneous conſcience: but as theſe are faults which the tribunals of the Republic of Letters doth not pardon, the ſhorteſt courſe I can take is to lament that time of darkneſs, and to confeſs that theſe are productions which ought to be diſowned. I do accordingly diſown them; and this is the beſt reparation I can make.

I need not obſerve that in order to know a man well, we muſt rather view him in thoſe writings, where he is always criticiſed upon good proofs, than in ſuch as praiſe him without aſſigning the proofs of his merit.

September 12, 1697.

Continuation of the REMARKS

ON THE PRETENDED

JUDGMENT OF THE PUBLIC.

THIS is all I thought neceſſary to ſay on that pretended Judgment of the Public, but having peruſed it again, before the preceding Remarks were publiſhed, I have thought it proper to add a few more.

XXI. Let us diſpatch in a few words what the cenſurer objects to me concerning Solomon. I ſaid that *a policy in ſome reſpects of the ſame nature with that of the Ottomans occaſioned* Adonija*'s death*. This means nothing more but that Solomon put him to death, to the end that he might not be expoſed to the civil-wars, which he had reaſon to apprehend. No body is ignorant that this is likewiſe the reaſon of the Ottomans. Where is the harm of comparing in that reſpect a Jewiſh Prince with Infidel Monarchs, the Sectaries of Mahomet; a Prince, I ſay, who had not yet that wiſdom which God gave him afterwards? Would the author make any ſcruple to ſay that Solomon took ſeveral wives, from an oſtentation like that of Pagan kings, and of Sultans. Obſerve his artifice. He knew that the term Ottomans would not ſtrike the populace, but that the word *Turk* would alarm them. For this reaſon, inſtead of repeating my words, he has metamorphoſed them into theſe, *a Turkiſh policy*, which he has quoted in Italics. This is his habitual ſin; every artifice pleaſes him, let it but ſerve to deceive the ignorant. But what will he ſay againſt ſo many authors who maintain that Solomon was perſonally an Idolater, and doubt of his ſalvation. This is much worſe than comparing for once his policy with that of the Turks.

XXII. He accuſes me of having abuſed Cameron and Mr Daillé. Would he have dared to ſay ſo, had he caſt his eye on my Dictionary? Would he not have ſeen there that

that Du Moulin his grand-father, and the works of Rivetus, brother-in-law to Du Moulin, furniſhed me with what I ſaid to Cameron's diſadvantage? Would he not have ſeen there that for what concerns Mr Daillé, I quote Mareſius, Paſtor and Profeſſor of Divinity at Groningen, and plainly declare, that I decide nothing on that point? Many people do not yet know the difference between an Hiſtorian and an Encomiaſt. Let us take a ſhort review of the pamphlet, in order to mark ſome of the falſities in fact, which may be found in it; for as to the fallacies in reaſoning, it would be in vain to ſhew them. They are general reproaches: my adverſaries affirm, I deny, and we are juſt where we ſet out: we cannot paſs from this equilibrium, till every propoſition with which they are diſpleaſed, is particularly examined. They ſhall always find me ready to ſatisfy them. I ſhall even give a little ſpecimen of their fallacious reaſonings in the XXVIIIth and XXXIId Remarks.

XXIII. There are ſome falſities in fact in Abbé Renaudot's judgment: I do not point them out; for I know not whether they proceed from him, or from the tranſcribers. Beſides that every reader may eaſily convince himſelf how falſe it is that I beſtow greater encomiums on Mr Abelli, than on Meſſieurs de St Cyran and Arnauld; that I commend Father Maimbourg's Controverſial Treatiſes, more than thoſe of Mr Nicolle, that I blacken the latter, *as having publiſhed certain Doctrines which he did not believe.* How could I blacken him on that account, ſince I expreſsly ſay that if his ſilence might be aſcribed to ſuch a principle, it might alſo conſiſt with his perſuaſion? I leave to the reader's judgment ſome other falſities of the ſame nature.

XXIV. The Commentary on the judgment of that Abbot, among other falſities, contains this, that it was owing to the war that my Printer obtained by ſurprize his privilege. This lie has more heads than Cerberus; for he ſuppoſes that the States of Holland would have given my book to be examined, had they not been too much employed. A chimerical fancy! As if an order given in two words to ſome Profeſſors at Leyden could have interrupted the application to public affairs. Beſides this, our Commentator ſuppoſes that in times of peace privileges are granted only to ſuch books as have been examined and approved. Another chimera! The States grant them only for the ſecurity of the Printer, and not in the leaſt as a mark of their approbation of thoſe books: for they do not pretend to authorize the contents of them. In fine, never was any privilege obtained leſs by ſurprize than this; for it was not granted till after a long examination of the oppoſition which was made to it by the Printers of Moreri.

XXV. In the firſt extract it is affirmed that *I ſuppoſe there was no Hiſtorian of the Moors.* But it is manifeſt that I only ſuppoſe we have no particular Hiſtory of Abderamus. In the ſecond extract it is ſaid that I have compoſed my Dictionary by the help of memoirs, which were ſent me from France. I have always given notice from what place I received any materials. If thoſe which I have received from that country were put together, they would not fill ten pages.

XXVI. There is in the ninth extract a particular which I ſhall always look upon as a horrible lie, unleſs I ſee a certificate of it from the Biſhop of Saliſbury. Such a diſcourſe is ſo little conſiſtent with the idea I have of the ſenſe and learning of that prelate, that I cannot believe him capable of holding it. Would a man of his parts find Atheiſtical opinions in a work wherein it is aſſerted on a hundred occaſions that reaſon ought to be ſilent when the word of God ſpeaks? Is not this the ſevereſt principle of Orthodoxy in both communions? I have another reaſon for believing that there are ſeveral lies in this extract. *The public has nothing to do with their perſonal differences,* ſaid that Prelate *with indignation,* if we rely on the extract. Is it likely that he ſpoke in that manner, ſince it is notorious that I make no mention of theſe differences? I cenſure my adverſary for the faults which I ſhew in his books, or by general reflexions, which may be applied to him, but I take no notice of our quarrels. In a word, all that I have done, came within the province of an author who writes a Hiſtory accompanied with a Critical Commentary. This muſt be granted me by all thoſe who are thoroughly acquainted with the matter. I have, for example, a full right to alledge, as facts, all the blunders and errors, with which my adverſary has been taxed in Mr Saurin's four volumes. I uſe this example, to ſhew, by the way, how ridiculous his hopes are. He may be made to live in a critical book, not as the mortal enemy of Libertines, but as arraigned and convicted of a thouſand ſhameful blunders, by a famous miniſter, whom a ſynod has declared Orthodox.

XXVII. In the ſecond extract it is affirmed that *Abbot Renaudot taxes me with many miſtakes in Hiſtory, Geography, Chronology, and other ſciences.* This is not true. He only ſays, 1. That there are many falſities in my work: 2. That in the articles of curious erudition, I commit more miſtakes than Moreri. The falſities he means concern what I ſay either againſt the Popes, &c. or to the glory of the Reformers, &c. By virtue of his prejudices, he preſuppoſes that in thoſe articles there muſt be ſeveral lies. But however they will not be ſuch with reſpect to me, ſince I take them from works which I quote, and declare in my preface, that I only warrant the faithfulneſs of the quotations. He places among thoſe falſities the *project of re-union, propoſed to Amyraldus, by the Jeſuit Godebert, in the name of Cardinal Mazarine.* It ſhould have been *Audebert in the name of Cardinal Richelieu.* In this I have only followed the memoir of Amyraldus the ſon, and I have cited it. It is his buſineſs to warrant it. As to the faults in erudition, the Abbot does not ſay, wherein they conſiſt, and conſequently the Publiſher of the extracts proves the raſhneſs of his own witneſſes. He teaches us how to convict them of their having taken upon themſelves to write what they were ill informed of. One of them ſays that *I praiſe too much in the opinion of ſeveral people*, The Publiſher, on the contrary, maintains that I have abuſed all the world. Behold the perſons, whom he produces to aſſure us of the general opinion.

XXVIII. In the thirteenth extract, it is ſaid, that *in the article* PYRRHO, *and ſeveral others*, *Libertiniſm is taught in a very dangerous manner*, and that I have taken from Meziriac all the obſervations, being ſometimes of a tedious length, which I make on the *Heathen gods*, *and heroes*, *and the Heathen Mythology*. The firſt point cannot be diſcuſſed in a looſe ſheet. It is ſufficient for me to obſerve in this place, that my pretended Libertiniſm is a very ſolid juſtification of our moſt Orthodox Divines. They continually object to the Sectaries that the Socinian principles, tend to Pyrrhoniſm, Deiſm, and Atheiſm. Whereupon I ſay, either you are defamers, or it is moſt true that without captivating our underſtanding to the obedience of faith, we are led by the principles of Philoſophy to doubt of every thing. But you are not defamers, therefore it is true, *&c.* You complain that I make it appear by evident examples, that you do not calumniate the Socinians. Ought you not rather to thank me for this? Do not you know that in Italy, under the yoke of the Inquiſition, books are printed with impunity, in which it is aſſerted, that, ſetting Revelation aſide, we know not with certainty that there are bodies? And would you impoſe on this country a yoke more galling than that of the Pope. I can prove that at Bologna, at Padua, *&c.* Profeſſors of Philoſophy have maintained publickly and with impunity, that the immortality of the ſoul can only be proved by Scripture. I ſhall make it appear in the Supplement of this Dictionary, in the article POMPONATIUS, which is already compoſed, that there was never any perſecution worſe founded than that which Pomponatius ſuffered on this account.

With regard to Meziriac, if it is pretended that I have taken any obſervations from him, without quoting him, I am calumniated. Neither he nor any other writer has furniſhed me with any thing which I have not acknowledged, by quoting them, and almoſt always uſing their own words. As the author of the letter does not ſay whether I quoted Meziriac, or not, I cannot accuſe him of giving me the title of a Plagiary: but I impute that lie moſt juſtly to the Publiſher of that extract: for he makes this reflexion on it: *One of our extracts ſays*, *that he has taken from Meziriac on Ovid's epiſtles*, *all that he ſays of the Heathen gods: and that Meziriac's book is pretty ſcarce. This is his great art: he underſtands books very well: he knows which are ſcarce and which are common: and boldly pillages the former*, *being ſure that few people will perceive the theft.* Here we have an example of the danger which any man runs, when he takes upon him to ſpeak of a book which he has never read. Had the Publiſher of that extract peruſed my Dictionary, I doubt whether he would have preſumed to ſay, that I have pillaged Meziriac. He would have ſeen that I always quote him. In the ſame manner, I have quoted all thoſe who have ſupplied me either with facts or reflexions.

XXIX. I eaſily believe that the Mythological obſervations have appeared pretty tedious: ſome of my acquaintance wrote me the ſame thing, with regard to the Chronological diſcuſſions, and in general to all that may be called erudition. I had foreſeen this, and therefore on a thouſand occaſions I conſidered thoſe things as the cards thrown out of a hand at piquet. I diſcarded them and took in other cards, weaker indeed, but abler to win the game: for we live in an age where they read rather for amuſement than in order to grow learned. If I had written my Dictionary according to the taſte of Abbot Renaudot, no body would have printed it, and had any body run the hazzard of putting it to the preſs, he would not have ſold a hundred copies. If I had ſtruck out all the literature, the firſt edition would have been ſold off in three months. If he imagines that I took all the things I uſed in it, for matters of importance, he wrongs me. I have taken them for what they are, and employed them only to ſuit the malady of the times. Thus we muſt do, when we cannot cure it. If I had written in Latin, I ſhould have taken another method; and had the taſte of the former age prevailed, I ſhould have given a place in my book to nothing but literature. But the times are altered. Good things alone do not take, but diſguſt. We muſt mingle them with others, if we would have the reader take the patience to peruſe them. *Veluti pueris abſinthia tetra medentes, Cum dare conantur prius oras pocula circum &c.*

XXX. Here I muſt anſwer the laſt lines of page 29. *Thoſe of the beſt taſte among his own friends acknowledge that the half of his work at leaſt*, *might be cut off*, *without hurting it.* Theſe perſons ſay not ſo much as I do. I give up two thirds, and even three fourths and more: and if I was required to abridge my Dictionary, ſo that in the judgment of Henry Valeſius, it might contain nothing but what was good, I ſhould reduce it to a pocket-ſize. Valeſius and the learned men of his rank deem that to be ſuperfluous in a book which they know already, or do not hope to turn ſome day to their advantage. But they ought to ſympathize with the neceſſities of the half-learned, and the vulgar of the Republic of Letters. They ought to know that it is divided into many more claſſes

claſſes than the Roman Republic ever was. Each claſs has it's wants, and it is the part of compilations to ſerve them all, ſome one way, and ſome another. They are therefore miſtaken notwithſtanding their great knowledge, when they ſay abſolutely, *this thing is uſeful and neceſſary, that is ſuperfluous.* Are not theſe terms relative? Say rather, *this is uſeful or uſeleſs to me, and to thoſe that are like me, uſeful or uſeleſs however to a hundred other* men of letters. It is not a juſt way of reaſoning to ſay, ſuch a book would better deſerve the approbation of the moſt learned men in Europe, if it was ſhorter, therefore it ought to have been ſhorter. Softly, gentlemen; there is nothing uſeleſs in theſe volumes which you mention; for what may not ſerve you, may ſerve ſeveral others: and I am very ſure that if all the citizens of the Republic of Letters were brought together, that each might give his opinion upon what ſhould be taken away, and what ſhould be left, in a vaſt compilation, it would appear that the paſſages which ſome would throw out, would be preciſely thoſe which others would retain. A hundred reflexions might be made not only on the true properties of works of this kind, but likewiſe on the inſeparable union of criticiſm and trifles. Many might alſo be made on the difference which lies between a good book and an uſeful one: between an author who only propoſes to himſelf the approbation of a few ſcientifics, and an author who prefers the general benefit to the glory of meriting that approbation, which is not leſs hard to attain than a crown. But we ſhall find ſome fitter occaſions of ſpeaking on this ſubject.

Before we proceed any further, let us take notice of a growing lie in the thirteenth extract. The anonymous writer from London, who dates his letter the 28th of May 1697 affirms that the Bookſeller Cailloüé had not ſold forty copies. Now it can be proved from a letter which Cailloüé wrote on the 22d of March 1697, that he had ſold fifty-two: and obſerve this circumſtance; the Printer of the Dictionary had written to him that he had been informed that he (Cailloüé) had ſold ſixty copies of it before the end of February: to this Cailloüé anſwered, that he had only delivered fifty-two. In this he does not deny that he had ſold ſixty. Obſerve that he had only received his copies in December. From hence, I conclude, that the anonymous authors who are produced, are ill-informed, and that we cannot depend upon their intelligence.

XXXI. It is ſaid in the fourteenth extract, that what I mentioned of Lewis XIII, *particularly obliged the Chancellor to burn my* Dictionary, *and to prohibit it.* If this means that the Chancellor burnt in his own houſe the copy which was ſent him, I am perſuaded it is a miſtake. If it means that he cauſed my Dictionary to be publickly burnt by the hand of the hangman, I make no queſtion but that it is a notorious falſhood. The Commentator on the extracts has taken that expreſſion in the latter ſenſe.

XXXII. Let us make a ſerious reflexion on the laſt extract: it is that which is fraught with the greateſt fury. The anonymous writer, who is ſo ſtrangely tranſported with paſſion, needs only read my additions to the Thoughts on the Comets: If he does not ſee that I had reaſon to *proclaim to the whole world as Calumniators*, thoſe who have accuſed me of Deiſm or Atheiſm, he muſt be very ſtupid, and muſt be ſtill more ſtupid, if he imagines that my Dictionary may excuſe my ſlanderers. For the reſt, I would have him know that of whatever profeſſion he be, it will always be greatly to his honour, to ſay, that his conduct is as regular as mine has always been and is ſtill. I make this reflexion, in order, that he and others may learn to weigh their words, when they ſpeak of *conduct*. He acquaints me, that my article of ADAM, is one of thoſe which juſtly raiſe *the indignation of good men*. I am glad to know it; for I ſhould never have believed that this was the ground of ſuch an accuſation, and nothing can be more proper than this, to demonſtrate to intelligent readers that offence is taken without reaſon. He affirms that he does not ſee how I can eſcape excommunication: this is talking like a new convert from Paganiſm. He muſt therefore be informed that we have no ſuch cuſtom, neither have the Churches of God. We excommunicate people only in theſe two caſes; one, when a perſon by his crimes, as inceſt, proſtitution, adultery, fornication, murder, *&c.* gives ſcandal to the public: the other, when he dogmatically maintains heretical opinions, and is obſtinate in defending them, in oppoſition to the judgment of the Church. Thus the Remonſtrant Miniſters were excommunicated; for after having maintained their opinions with great warmth, during more than ſeven or eight years, they declared that, notwithſtanding the canons of the Synod of Dort, they would live and die in their ſentiments. But it was never known that a Church proceeded by eccleſiaſtical cenſures againſt an author who ſpoke Hiſtorically of the impurities of human life, or who having declared, that he firmly adheres to the faith of that Church, relates only for arguing ſake, what reaſon may ſuggeſt on this or that point. I ſay, it was never known, that ſuch an author was excommunicated, when he declares, as I do, that all theſe vain ſubtilties of Philoſophy can only ſerve to make us take Revelation for our guide, as the ſole and true remedy againſt the darkneſs with which ſin covers the faculties of our mind, and that he is ready to throw out all thoſe wild arguments, if it was thought proper. Obſerve that my adverſary's Newſmongers have had honeſty enough to tell him, *That I every where provide a ſcreen, behind which I ſave a retreat for myſelf, in caſe of neceſſity*; to wit, that *we muſt adhere to Revelation, and ſubmit reaſon to faith.* Could I chuſe a better retreat? The man who has ſought his felicity in worldly advantages, and who, having been able to find it no where, betakes himſelf to God as the only ſoveraign good, does he not make the beſt uſe which is poſſible of his reaſon? Muſt we not ſay the ſame thing of a Philoſopher, who having inquired in vain after certainty by the light of reaſon, concludes that he muſt have recourſe to ſupernatural light, and adhere to that alone? Would not this be the advice which David and all the other Prophets and the Apoſtles would give to the wiſe men of this world? And ſhould not I be ſheltered from the thunderbolts of excommunication in an azyle ſo ſacred, and ſo inviolable? Would Divines themſelves be the firſt to invade it? I cannot believe this? and thus our anonymous writer judges raſhly.

I cannot believe that the informers have always been ſincere; for they have made my cenſurer believe that I only ſpeak of ſubmiſſion to Scripture, *by ſaying, and after having ſaid every thing imaginable in order to weaken the authority of Revelation and of the ſacred writers*. This is very falſe, and I defy them to give the leaſt proof of it. It does not appear that they have alledged any other reaſons but thoſe which I have refuted above in Numb. VI, and Numb. XXI, and that which they have grounded on the article David. I know not whether they mentioned my explanation to him, or not; if they took no notice of it, they are very much to blame: and if they give him a faithful account of it, he cannot clear himſelf from being guilty of an artifice, which is very unbecoming a man of Honour: for the laws of diſputation do not allow a man to ſuppreſs any thing which may juſtify his adverſary. This is his eternal cuſtom; he only betakes himſelf to that which may ſerve his turn, and wreſts it in the moſt odious manner by violent hyperboles. All that I ſaid of ſome of David's actions amounts to this, that they may be accounted conformable to the art of government and human prudence, but not to the rigorous laws of piety. To conclude from thence that *I have repreſented him as a villain*, is trampling under foot all the laws of reaſoning, by a furious paſſion. I only demand impartial judges. Such will never find that a man by remarking the faults of the perſons inſpired, attacks the authority of inſpiration, we all agree that adultery and murder, did not hinder David from being a great Prophet. St Paul was not afraid that by giving a ſtrong idea of the infirmities of the old man, which made him groan, and required a moſt violent remedy, he ſhould weaken the efficacy of his writings. But this ſubject cannot be handled in a few words. Let us return to the anonymous author, and his menaces of excommunication.

XXXIII. Did ever the eccleſiaſtical tribunals proceed againſt the tranſlators of Boccace's Novels, againſt the tales of Ouville, or la Fontaine? I alledge theſe examples as an argument *à fortiori*; for no man dares ſay that I come near the licentiouſneſs of theſe writers. The horrible impurities of their books, which cauſed the Tales of la Fontaine to be condemned to the flames by a ſentence of a magiſtrate of Paris (4), are in ſome manner their own inventions; whereas I have only copied what is found in Hiſtorical books, known to all the world, and with theſe citations have almoſt always joined a mark of my diſapprobation: I have only ſpoken of them as things which diſcover the exceeding depravity of mankind, and gives us reaſon to lament our corruption. There is hardly any Commentator whoſe gravity would hold out againſt ſome of Abelard's Pieces, or againſt the ſimplicity imputed to honeſt Robert d'Arbriſſelles. A great ſubject of clamour truly, if I have been merry upon ſuch things, that is, if I have cenſured them by turning them into ridicule. But you will ſay I only alledge examples of the indulgence of the Romiſh communion; and may not I anſwer that this is an argument *à fortiori?* Have you not exclaimed a thouſand times againſt the tyrannical government of that Church? If this cannot ſatiſfy you, let us view the affair in another light.

(4) *See, below, citat.* (10), *of the Explanation concerning Obſcenities.*

XXXIV. Did our fathers cenſure Ambroiſe Paré, whoſe French books on Anatomy, are full of obſcenities? Did they cenſure thoſe writers who publiſhed in ſhocking praiſes the leud practices of the Court of Charles IX, and Henry III? Did they cenſure d'Aubigné, who had not only a moſt ſatirical pen, but likewiſe a moſt ſmutty one? Did they cenſure Henry Stephens for having publiſhed ſo many fooliſh, bawdy, burleſque ſtories in his Apology for Herodotus? In this country, did not St Aldegonde, in a book of Controverſy, uſe all kinds of jokes, and many ſmutty expreſſions? And was this cenſured? Did the Commentaries of Scaliger on the Priapeia, thoſe of Douza on Petronius, full of filthy and laſcivious matters, create any trouble to the authors of them, one a Profeſſor and the other a Curator in the univerſity of Leyden? Can any thing be more obſcene than *Baudii Amores*, a book publiſhed at Leyden by Profeſſor Scriverius? Does not the collection of the poems of Daniel Heinſius, a Profeſſor likewiſe at Leyden, contain ſeveral laſcivious pieces? Have not all theſe writings and ſeveral others been tolerated? Have the conſiſtories and ſynods proceeded either againſt the authors, or againſt the books? I ſay nothing of the Commentary of a Profeſſor of Franeker on the paſtoral of Longus, having ſpoken of it in my Dictionary. I only wiſh the reader would obſerve that a Commentator, who cites impurities, is a thouſand times more excuſable than the Poet who compoſes them. When I am let into the ſecret of collecting in a compilation all that the Antients have ſaid concerning the courtezan Laïs, without mentioning leud actions, I ſhall own myſelf guilty. It muſt at leaſt be proved againſt me, that

that a Commentator has not the privilege of collecting whatever hath been ſaid of Helen; but how can it be proved? Where is the legiſlator who hath ſaid to compilers, *So far you may go, but you muſt advance no further. You muſt not quote Athenæus, nor ſuch a Scholiaſt, nor ſuch a Philoſopher.* Has it not been their conſtant practice to make their writings as full and extenſive as their reading? But here is a better way of ſatisfying our Critics. I will correct in a ſecond edition, the defects that are in the firſt. I am employing myſelf in this with all poſſible application. I ſhall not content myſelf with rectifying whatever is faulty with regard to Hiſtory, or Chronology, *&c.* But I ſhall throw out the expreſſions, and turns which are too free, *&c.* and I beſeech all my readers, but chiefly thoſe who are members of the Dutch, French, *&c.* Conſiſtories in this country, to aſſiſt me, by their remarks, in order to improve my Dictionary for a new edition. Works of this nature, and eſpecially when they are compoſed in haſte and with few helps, are at firſt only a looſe ſketch. They are improved by degrees. Every body knows examples of this kind.

XXXV. The laſt lie which I ſhall point out may be found in the laſt page of the pamphlet. There we find, 1. That I am preparing *a new Dictionary, which will contain nothing but what is ſerious, ſober, chaſte, and judicious:* 2. That they have it from very good hands that *I am inquiring for ſome great name, diſtinguiſhed not only by birth, but by merit and piety, to be placed at the head of my Dictionary.* I have nothing to ſay to the firſt point: for ſince my adverſary acquaints me, that my Dictionary ſuffered much by the great encomiums which were beſtowed on it beforehand, I ought to make a good uſe of ſo kind a hint. For how ſtrange would it be, if I myſelf praiſed a book which I have not yet written? His malice to the Bookſellers appears in this place: he would prepare the public to ſlight my Supplement. As to the ſecond point I declare to him, that he has been very ill-ſerved by his Newſmongers. By what I can perceive, they play with his credulity, as they did about ſix or ſeven years ago. I was never more ſurprized, than to ſee in his libel that deſign of a dedication to be prefixed to my Dictionary, of which I have no thoughts, nor ever had, any more than of diſcovering *Terra incognita.*

XXXVI. I obſerved that he lays the affair of Bellarmine much to heart: this is not ſurprizing: but it had been a more prudent part in him not to have made this the ſubject of a Poſtſcript to his pamphlet. The beſt courſe he could take, was to be entirely ſilent upon that head. In certain circumſtances, the leſs a man ſtirs, the leſs is he entangled. What I ſaid on the ſubject of Bellarmine is not an example of *trifles and malice.* I ſhould not have otherwiſe diſcharged the duty of an Hiſtorian, ſince the original deſign of my work was to obſerve the falſe accuſations which had been imputed to the perſons of whom I was to ſpeak. Had I omitted that accuſation in the article of BELLARMINE, might I not have been called partial very juſtly, and charged with forgetting matters of which I could not pretend to be ignorant? I have not taken it from any ſatirical book, as he ſays falſly, but from a book of Controverſy, and from the *Journal des Sçavans.* I do not examine the art he uſes to hide his fault. I only beg the reader to look into my Dictionary, and compare with his remark, the authorities I have alledged. Such a parallel will ſhew what agonies he is in, when he is obliged to make any humble and ingenuous confeſſion. I am not ſurprized at this, for a bow which has always been bent to one ſide, can hardly be bent to the other at the firſt attempt. And it is thus with the fibres of our brain.

XXXVII. I conclude with a ſhort remark on my adverſary's long ſilence. I had expected that as ſoon as my two volumes were publiſhed, there would appear a little pamphlet of his, wherein he would proclaim to the whole world, (often repeating the burden of his ſongs, about the *Advice to the Refugees*, &c. which have been ſo often exploded) that my Dictionary was the moſt abominable, the moſt frightful, the moſt deteſtable book, that ever came into the world, a heap of enormous impieties, and monſtrous obſcenities, with ſuch a wretched collection of literary trifles, as would diſgrace a ſchool-boy. I was aſſured that he would not engage in refuting my criticiſms, in order to juſtify himſelf; I only expected a ſudden volley of looſe and general invectives. But in this I was miſtaken. He was not delivered, before the time, of the pamphlet he was big with. He only brought it forth in the tenth month. *Matri longa decem tulerunt faſtidia menſes.* If I had leſs averſion to quibbling, I might add that his child is notwithſtanding an abortive. I am ſurprized that Abbot Renaudot's two pieces, together with all the other extracts were not ſent to the preſs on the ſame day that the poſt brought them. That he ſhould content himſelf with making copies of them fly about for ſeveral months ſucceſſively, is what I do not comprehend. For we muſt not ſay the *pangs of labour*, but *the pleaſures:* the perſon I ſpeak of is never more in his element than when he publiſhes invectives. I am likewiſe ſurprized that a greater number of extracts has not been produced; for during the ſhort ſway of Abbot Renaudot's judgment, the literary Newſmongers no doubt wrote to their friends in the country and abroad, what was ſaid to the prejudice of my work. Twenty men of Letters having heard it ſaid in an aſſembly that a new book is not eſteemed, communicate that piece of news to all the curious whom they meet that day, and in the evening they write it to their correſpondents. Great books advance but ſlowly, and muſt long be expected;

upon

upon that account, when they firſt launch forth, they have a thouſand ſtorms to encounter. The Dictionary of the French Academy compoſed, reviſed, and poliſhed, through the courſe of fifty years, by the fineſt genius's in France, no ſooner appeared but it was battered by ſtorms on every ſide: ballads, epigrams, libels, private letters, converſations; all poured upon that work. It is full, ſaid they, of ſmut, Billinſgate, and quibbles. Yet it bore off, and now ſteers on with full ſail towards immortality.

I beg leave to place here a thought of Mr la Bruyere. *What ſay you of* Hermodorus*'s book? That it is a bad one, anſwers* Anthimus. *That it is ſo bad, that it hardly deſerves the name of a book, or at leaſt that the world ſhould take any notice of it. But have you read it? No, ſays Anthimus. Why does he not add that* Fulvia *and* Melania *have condemned it without reading it, and that he is Fulvia's and Melania's friend?* This reflexion ſeems to have been made on purpoſe for me.

If I have been more prolix than I at firſt intended to be, it is becauſe I thought it neceſſary to enlarge on certain matters, in order that I might not for the future be taken off from my labours, ſhould my enemies publiſh any more libels. I ſhall let them ſay whatever they pleaſe, and go forward with my undertaking. Let them clamour as much as they will; I promiſe to read their ſatires, and will improve by them if poſſible; but I ſhall loſe no time, as I have already done, in anſwering them.

September 17, 1697.

EXPLANATIONS

Concerning certain things diſperſed in this Dictionary, which may be reduced to four general heads:

I. *The praiſes beſtowed on perſons who denied either the providence or the exiſtence of GOD.* II. *The objections of the Manichees.* III. *The objections of the Sceptics.* IV. *Obſcenities.*

A general and preliminary obſervation.

WHILE I was compoſing this work, I eaſily perceived that certain reflexions crept in, which were ſomewhat free, and little agreeable to ordinary readers; but I did not foreſee that they could give any offence. I imagined that the perſons whoſe judgment ſerves for a rule, and corrective to that of others, would take notice of many things which might furniſh me with an apology.

I. I hoped in the firſt place, that the reader would conſider the nature of this Dictionary. It is a vaſt compilation, neceſſarily loaded with ſeveral minute criticiſms, which will diſguſt and tire to the laſt degree thoſe who are not verſed in theſe matters; and I was obliged in this immenſe variety to bear two characters, that of Hiſtorian, and that of Commentator. It was not poſſible to reſcue it from the contempt of a great many readers, otherwiſe than by introducing ſome uncommon things into it. They who neither value Grammatical diſputations, nor the adventures of an inconſiderable private perſon, are a numerous party, and deſerve that we ſhould have ſome regard for their taſte. It is therefore allowable for an author to ſeaſon his book with ſomething that will recommend it to their palate; and if he writes as an Hiſtorian, he ought not only to relate what Heretics have done, but alſo to ſhew wherein the ſtrength and weakneſs of their opinions conſiſt. This muſt eſpecially be done by him, if he be himſelf the Commentator of his narratives; for in his commentary he muſt diſcuſs things, and compare together the arguments *pro* and *con*, with all the impartiality of a faithful relator.

II. I hoped in the ſecond place, that it would be conſidered in what manner, and with what an air I mention ſome opinions; it being neither in the ſtrain of a Dogmatiſt, nor with the fondneſs of one who ſeeks to make converts. They are thoughts thrown out at random, and I am willing the reader ſhould take them for nothing more than flights of wit, and reject them as he thinks proper; and that with a greater liberty than I have taken to advance them. It is eaſy to perceive that an author who deals thus has no ſiniſter intentions, and is not laying ſnares; and if any reflexions ſhould eſcape him, which, being under another form, might be dangerous, no great offence is to be taken at it.

III. I hoped in the third place, that the readers would conſider the circumſtances which either make an error dangerous or harmleſs. The conſequences of it are to be feared when it is taught by thoſe who ſtand in ſuch a relation to the people as furniſhes them with great authority, and with opportunities of forming a party. An error ought to be followed cloſe, to be obſerved, and carefully reſtrained, when a man of a venerable character, a Paſtor, a Profeſſor of Divinity, ſows it in his ſermons, in his lectures, in little ſyſtematical tracts, or by way of catechiſm, and by emiſſaries who go from houſe to houſe to recommend the reading of his books, and invite people to the conventicles where the author explains his reaſons and his method more particularly (1). But if a layman, who bears no public office, as myſelf, ſhould drop amongſt vaſt collections of Hiſtory and Learning, ſome error in Religion or Morality, I do not ſee any reaſon why any body ſhould be concerned at it. It is not in ſuch works as theſe that the reader ſeeks for the reformation of his faith. No man takes for his guide in this matter, an author who only ſpeaks by the by, and occaſionally; and who by his very throwing his ſentiments, as pins into a meadow, ſufficiently ſhews that he cares not to be followed. The errors of ſuch a writer are of no conſequence, nor deſerve that the world ſhould be diſturbed about them. Thus the Faculties of Divinity in France dealt with Michael de Montagne's book. They left untouched all this author's maxims, who, without following any ſyſtem, method, or order, heaped up and tacked together whatever his memory preſented to him: but when Peter Charron, a Prieſt, and a Doctor of Divinity, came to vent ſome of Montagne's ſentiments in a methodical and ſyſtematical treatiſe of Morality (2), the Divines were no longer ſilent (3).

(1) *Note, That I join all theſe things together, without pretending that we ought only to guard againſt thoſe who are guilty of them all. A part is a ſufficient motive for it.*

(2) *Compare with this, remark* [O], *of the article* MONTAGNE.

(3) *See the remark* [F], *of the article* MONTAGNE.

IV. I hoped in the fourth place, and this was the main foundation of my hope, that theſe two points would eaſily be diſtinguiſhed: 1. That I never advance, as my own opinion, any doctrine, which is repugnant to the articles of the Confeſſion of Faith of the Reformed Church in which I was born, and of which I make profeſſion. 2. That when I relate as an Hiſtorian what may be objected and replied to the Orthodox, and when I own that by natural light we cannot ſolve all the difficulties of the unbelievers, I always make a digreſſion, to draw from thence a conſequence in favour of the principle which the Reformed continually oppoſe to the Socinians; *viz.* That our reaſon being ſo weak as it is, ought not to be the rule or meaſure of our faith.

Theſe are the reaſons which made me believe, that if I ſometimes uſed, what they call the liberty of philoſophiſing, it would not be taken amiſs. I ſhould not have uſed it, had I foreſeen that the foregoing conſiderations would not be regarded.

But the event has diſappointed my hopes. Complaints have been made, and clamours have been raiſed, againſt thoſe paſſages in my Dictionary. I could never believe theſe complaints were juſt; yet I am ſorry I ſaid any thing that was diſliked, and have always been diſpoſed to remove any objections in a ſecond edition. Having been informed wherein the grievances conſiſted, I thought it was no hard matter to redreſs them, by leaving out ſome pages, altering ſome expreſſions, or by explanations that might ſet things in a due light. I have engaged in this without any reluctancy, as all authors ought to do who are not bigotted to their opinions, but are ready to ſacrifice them to the edification of the reader. I wiſh the public may be ſatisfied with my conduct, both as to what has been ſuppreſſed, and to thoſe things I am going to explain; and methinks I have reaſon to promiſe myſelf that they will. This has been my deſign, and I have uſed great application to effect it.

EXPLANATION I.

The obſervation which has been made on the good morals of ſome perſons who had no religion, cannot any ways prejudice the true Chriſtian Faith.

THEY who were offended at my ſaying, that ſome Atheiſts and Epicureans have, with reſpect to Morality, outdone moſt idolaters, are intreated to attend to the following conſiderations; which if they pleaſe to do, the offence they have taken will entirely be removed.

I. The fear and love of God are not the only ſpring of human actions. There are other principles that actuate a man; The love of praiſe, the fear of diſgrace, the natural temper, puniſhments and rewards in the magiſtrates hands, have a very great influence upon men. He who doubts of it, muſt be ignorant of what paſſes in his own breaſt, and what the common courſe of the world may demonſtrate to him every moment. But it is not probable that any man ſhould be ſo ſtupid as to be ignorant of ſuch a truth. What therefore I have aſſerted concerning theſe other ſprings of human actions, may be placed in the number of truths which are beyond diſpute.

II. The fear and love of God are not always a more powerful principle than the others: The love of glory, the fear of infamy, death, or torments, the hopes of preferment, act with greater force upon ſome men, than the deſire of pleaſing God, and the fear of breaking his commandments. If any one doubts of it, he is ignorant of ſome of his own actions, and knows nothing of what is doing daily under the ſun. The world abounds with people who chooſe rather to commit a ſin, than diſpleaſe a Prince who can either make or ruin their fortune. Men daily ſubſcribe formularies of faith againſt their conſcience, in order to ſave their eſtates, or to avoid impriſonment, exile, death, &c. An officer who has quitted all for his religion, finding himſelf under the alternative either of offending God if he revenges himſelf for having received a box on the ear, or of being accounted a coward if he does not, never reſts till he has ſatiſfaction for this affront, though at the peril of killing or being killed in a ſtate that muſt be followed with eternal damnation. It is not likely that any man ſhould be ſo ſtupid as to be ignorant of ſuch things. Therefore let this moral aphoriſm be placed among indiſputable truths, *That the fear and love of God are not always the moſt active principle of human actions.*

III. This being ſo, it ought not to be reckoned a ſcandalous paradox, but rather a very poſſible thing, that ſome men, without religion, ſhould be more ſtrongly excited to a good moral life by their conſtitution, in conjunction with the love of praiſe and fear of diſgrace, than ſome others by the inſtinct of conſcience.

IV. The ſcandal ought to be much greater, when we ſee ſo many people convinced of the truths of religion, and at the ſame time plunged in all manner of vice.

V. Nay, it is more ſtrange that Heathen idolaters ſhould do good actions, than that Atheiſtical Philoſophers ſhould live like virtuous men; for the former muſt have been

been excited to crimes by their very religion; they muſt have believed, that, in order to become imitators of God, which is the end and ſubſtance of religion, they ought to be cheats, envious, fornicators, adulterers, pederaſts, *&c.*

VI. Whence we may conclude, that the idolaters who lived virtuouſly, were only guided by the ideas of reaſon and virtue, or by the deſire of praiſe, or by their natural temper, or ſuch other principles as may all be found in Atheiſts: Why then ſhould we expect to find more virtue amongſt the idolatrous Heathens, than amongſt men who have no religion?

VII. I deſire it may be obſerved, that ſpeaking of the good morals of ſome Atheiſts, I have not aſcribed any true virtues to them. Their ſobriety, chaſtity, probity, contempt of riches, zeal for the public good, good offices to their neighbour, neither proceeded from the love of God, nor tended to honour and glorify him. They themſelves were the principle and end of all this: ſelf-love was the only ground and cauſe of it. They were only ſhining ſins, *ſplendida peccata*, as St Auguſtin ſays of all the good actions of the Heathens. I have therefore done no prejudice to the true religion, by what I have ſaid of ſome Atheiſts. It will ſtill remain true, that good actions cannot be effected without it: and what is it to the true religion if the worſhippers of the falſe gods are not better in their actions than thoſe who have no religion? What advantage would accrue to it, if the adorers of Jupiter and Saturn were not equally plunged in the gulph of perdition with the Atheiſts?

VIII. If they who were offended thought that one cannot praiſe the good morals of Epicurus, without ſuppoſing it the ſame thing with reſpect to a good life, to have no religion, or to profeſs any religion whatever, they are ignorant in the art of drawing conſequences, and perfect ſtrangers to the queſtion. I never compared Atheiſm but with Heatheniſm; and therefore the true religion is no way concerned in it; the queſtion is only about religions introduced and kept up by the Devil; the queſtion is whether they who have profeſſed a worſhip ſo infamous in its origin and progreſs as this, have been more regular in the practice of Morality than the Atheiſts. I ſuppoſe this as a point undoubted and fully determined, *viz.* That in the true religion there is not only more virtue than elſewhere, but that out of it there is no true virtue at all, nor any *fruits of righteouſneſs*. To what purpoſe then do they pretend to fear that I injure true religion? Is it concerned in the cenſure that may be paſſed on the falſe one? And is it not to be feared that their zeal will ſhock men of ſenſe, who ſee that this is ſhewing a particular tenderneſs for a worſhip deteſted by God, and ſet up by the Devil, as is owned by all our Divines.

IX. I could not juſtly find fault with theſe complaints, if I had written a romance in which the perſons were both virtuous and Atheiſtical: For, as I had been maſter of their words and actions, I was at liberty to deſcribe them in a manner ſuited to the taſte of the moſt ſcrupulous readers. But my Dictionary, being an Hiſtorical work, I ought not to repreſent people as they ſhould have been, but as they actually were. I can neither ſuppreſs their vices, nor their virtues. Therefore, ſince I advance nothing concerning the morals of ſome Atheiſts, but what the authors I cite relate of them, no body has reaſon to be offended with me. To make my cenſurers ſenſible of the truth of what I ſay, I need only aſk them, whether they believe the ſuppreſſion of true facts to be the duty of an Hiſtorian? I am ſure they will never ſubſcribe to ſuch a propoſition.

X. Not but I believe there are ſome perſons who will frankly maintain, that a matter of fact ought to be ſuppreſſed by an Hiſtorian, when it is likely to leſſen the abhorrence of Atheiſm, or the veneration of religion in general. But I moſt humbly intreat them, not to take it amiſs that I continue to believe, that God has no need of theſe Rhetorical artifices; and if this may be allowed in a Poem, or a piece of Eloquence, it does not follow that I ought to admit it in an Hiſtorical Dictionary. They muſt give me leave to tell them, that it is enough for me to promote the intereſt of true religion; for all that ſhould be done for religion in general, would ſerve as well for Paganiſm, as Chriſtianity.

XI. I had been ſo much the more blamable for ſuppreſſing the truths complained of, becauſe, beſides the acting againſt the fundamental laws of Hiſtory, I ſhould have omitted things, which, at the bottom, are moſt advantageous to the true ſyſtem of grace. I have ſhewn in another place (1), that nothing can be more proper to prove the corruption of men, which is naturally invincible, and can only be overcome by the Holy Ghoſt, than to ſhew, that thoſe who have no ſupernatural aſſiſtances, are as bad under the practice of a religion, as thoſe who live in Atheiſm. I add here, that nothing can be more acceptable to the Pelagians, than to ſay, that the fear of the falſe gods was able to induce the Heathens to renounce ſome vices; for if through the fear of incurring the malediction of heaven, they could abſtain from evil, they might alſo riſe up to virtue by the deſire of ſpiritual rewards, and to procure to themſelves the love of God; that is, they might not only have been able to fear, but alſo to love God, and act upon this good principle. The two handles by which man is moved, are the fear of puniſhment, and the deſire of reward. If he can be moved by the former, he may alſo by the latter; for one cannot well be admitted without the other.

(1) *See the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, *pag.* 437, 490, 599: *and the* Additions *to that book, pag.* 58, 110.

XII. If ſome perſons, more equitable and intelligent than ordinary, ſhould alledge, as the only reaſon of their ſcandal, the affectation wherewith they think I have acquainted my readers with the good lives of ſome Atheiſts; I would deſire them to conſider, that in the preſent caſe, affectation is very excuſable, and may even be looked upon as a ſubject of edification. To underſtand this, one needs only call to mind an epiſode of my treatiſe concerning comets. The true deſign of that book was to confute, by a Theological argument, what is commonly ſaid concerning the preſages of comets (2). The neceſſity of inforcing this argument, put me upon drawing a parallel between Atheiſm and Paganiſm, without which my proof had lain open to an objection which would have made it unfit to evince what was neceſſary for me to demonſtrate. Therefore there was a neceſſity for me either to leave that objection unanſwered, or to confute the arguments of thoſe who ſay, that the Pagan idolatry was not ſo great an evil as Atheiſm. All the ſucceſs of the combat depended very much upon the ſucceſs of this attack, and therefore according to the rules of diſputation, and by virtue of the rights belonging to an author, I was obliged to take advantage of whatever Logic and Hiſtory could afford me, to anſwer the objection. It was not therefore deſignedly, or through any audaciouſneſs, that I alledged ſome matters of fact tending to prove, that Atheiſts are not neceſſarily more diſorderly in their lives, than idolaters. The laws of diſputation, and the right every one has to anſwer the objections to which his aſſertion is expoſed, laid me under a neceſſity of taking ſuch a courſe. Great complaints have been made againſt this part of my book, and ſome endeavours have been uſed to make it appear dangerous. I was therefore obliged to juſtify it, as far as reaſon and truth would permit; and conſequently, no body ought to be offended, if I acquaint my readers, when occaſion offers, that Hiſtory informs us, that ſuch and ſuch perſons, who denied either the exiſtence or the providence of God, or the immortality of the ſoul, did nevertheleſs live like virtuous men. This affectation, which would perhaps be a juſt ſubject of ſcandal in another book, is none at all in mine: on the contrary, it may ſerve to edify my readers, ſince it ſhews I have not advanced a paradox out of vanity, but made an obſervation, which, at the bottom, is moſt certain, and ſeems falſe to none, but ſuch as have not examined it. No man renders himſelf more odious than he, who, in order to diſtinguiſh himſelf, raſhly leaves the common road: and if there are any writers, who have been ſuſpected on that account, not through their own fault, but becauſe the readers were not throughly acquainted with the matter, nothing can be more edifying than to ſee ſuch authors juſtify themſelves.

XIII. In order to remove all ſuſpicions of a vicious affectation, I have taken care to mention, as often as poſſible, the bad morals of Atheiſts (3). If I have not done it oftner, it was becauſe I wanted materials. The public knows, that I called for information (4): no body has been pleaſed to give me any, and I have not as yet been able to make any farther diſcovery by my own inquiries. I do not pretend to deny, that there have been in all countries, and at all times, men, who, by their debaucheries, and long criminal habits, have ſtifled the explicit belief of the exiſtence of a God; but Hiſtory having not preſerved their names, it is impoſſible to ſpeak of them. It is probable, that among thoſe banditti, and hired aſſaſſins, who commit ſo many crimes, there are ſome who have no religion; but the contrary is ſtill more probable, ſince, among ſo many malefactors who paſs through the hangman's-hands, there are none found to be Atheiſts (5). The ordinaries, who prepare them for death, find them always ſufficiently diſpoſed to deſire the joys of heaven. As for thoſe profane Epicures, who, in the judgment of Father Garaſſe, and many other writers, are downright Atheiſts, I could not bring them into the liſt; the queſtion not being concerning thoſe we call practical Atheiſts, people that live without any fear of God, though they are perſuaded of his exiſtence; but concerning theoretical Atheiſts, ſuch as Diagoras, Vanini, Spinoza, &c. whoſe Atheiſm is atteſted, either by Hiſtorians, or by their own writings. The queſtion only turns upon the morals of this claſs of Atheiſts, examples of whoſe bad lives, I deſired might be ſhewn me. If I had found any, I had made an exact mention of them. There is nothing eaſier to be found in Hiſtory than ſome wretches, whoſe abominable actions make the readers tremble; but their very impieties, and blaſphemies, are a proof that they believed a Deity. This is a natural conſequence of the conſtant doctrine of Divines, that the Devil, the moſt wicked of creatures, but incapable of Atheiſm, is the promoter of all the ſins of mankind; whence the greateſt wickedneſs of man, muſt have the character of that of the Devil; that is, to be joined with the perſuaſion of the being of a God. A maxim of the Philoſophers confirms this reaſoning (6).

XIV. If what I have been ſaying, is capable of edifying people of a tender conſcience, ſince they will ſee that the aſſertion which frighted them, agrees with the moſt Orthodox principles, they will find no leſs a ſubject of edification in what I am going to propoſe. That the moſt wicked men are not Atheiſts, and that the greateſt part of Atheiſts, whoſe names are come down to us, were virtuous men, as the world goes, is a character of the infinite wiſdom of God, and ought to make us admire his providence. It has ſet bounds to man's corruption, that there might be ſocieties upon earth; and

---

(2) *See the preface of the third edition.*

(3) *As in the articles of* Bion *the* Boryſthenite, *and* Critias.

(4) *See the additions to the* Penſées ſur les Cometes, *pag.* 86, *See alſo, pag.* 75.

(5) *I ſpeak thus, becauſe I do not remember I have ever read, or heard of any relations concerning the final Atheiſm of theſe people.*

(6) Ἀεὶ δι᾽ ὃ ὑπάρχει ἕκαστον, ἐκεῖνο μᾶλλον ὑπάρχει. Propter quod unumquodque eſt *tale*, illud ſemper eſt magis *tale*. Ariſtot. Analyt. poſter. *lib. i, cap. ii, pag. m.* 105. *etiam* Metaphyſ. *lib. ii, cap. i, pag.* 645, *F.*

and if it has favoured but a few with a ſanctifying grace, it has diſperſed a general *Repreſſing* grace (7), which like a ſtrong bank reſtrains the floods of ſin, as much as is neceſſary to prevent an univerſal inundation, which would deſtroy all monarchical, ariſtocratic, and democratic governments. It is commonly ſaid, that the means God has made uſe of to arrive at this end, have been, to preſerve in the ſouls of all men the ideas of virtue and vice, and a ſenſe of a providence which ſuperintends all, puniſhes vice, and rewards virtue. You will find this notion in the bodies of Divinity, and in a great many other Orthodox books. What is the natural conſequence of this propoſition? Is it not this; that if there are ſome perſons whom God does not forſake ſo far as to ſuffer them to fall into Epicurus's ſyſtem, or that of the Atheiſts, they are chiefly thoſe brutiſh ſouls, whoſe cruelty, audaciouſneſs, avarice, fury, and ambition are capable of bringing a large flouriſhing country to ſpeedy ruin. Is it not this. That if he forſakes ſome people, ſo far as to permit they ſhould deny either his exiſtence, or providence, they are chiefly perſons, whoſe temper, education, lively ideas of virtue, love of fame, or ſenſe of diſhonour, ſerve as a ſtrong curb to keep them to their duty? Theſe are two conſequences that naturally flow from the above-mentioned Theological principle. Now, as by informing my readers in ſome places of this Dictionary, that the moſt profligate wretches had ſome religion; and that thoſe who had none, have lived according to the rules of virtue, I ſaid nothing but what agrees with theſe two conſequences; there is no longer any ground for a juſt offence.

XV. It will be much better to conſider in this the finger of GOD, and the admirable conduct of his providence; he arrives at the ſame end by different ways: the *repreſſing* principle, ſo neceſſary for the preſervation of ſocieties, as Divines teach us, exerts its power by the curb of idolatry, in ſome countries, and in certain perſons, and by the natural temper, or the vivacity of ideas, and a liking to moral virtue in ſome others. The Greeks, ingenious and voluptuous, and thereby obnoxious to a horrid train of crimes, had need of a religion that ſhould burden them with infinite obſervances. They would have had too much time to run into vice, if the multitude of ceremonies, ſacrifices and oracles, had not given them many avocations, and ſuperſtitious terrors had not alarmed them. The Scythians, a ſtupid people, who were neither luxurious in cloaths or diet, needed only to deſpiſe pleaſures, or not to know them. ‘ Aurum & argentum perinde aſpernantur, ac reliqui mortales appetunt..... Hæc continentia illis morum quoque juſtitiam edidit, nihil alienum concupiſcentibus: QUIPPE ibidem divitiarum cupido eſt, ubi & uſus. Atque utinam reliquis mortalibus ſimilis moderatio & abſtinentia alieni foret...... Prorſus ut admirabile videatur, hoc illis naturam dare, quod Græci longa ſapientium doctrina, præceptiſque philoſophorum conſequi nequeunt (8). - - - - - *Gold and Silver are as much neglected and deſpiſed among the Scythians, as ſought after and coveted by all other nations...... This abſtinence has produced another virtue among that people, namely juſtice in the behaviour of every private man, for they covet not what is the property of others. And indeed wherever the uſe of riches prevails, there a covetous deſire of them is inſeparably annexed. Would to* GOD *other nations were endowed with the like moderation and contentment with their own...... It ſeems very wonderful and admirable that nature ſhould have beſtowed on the Scythians what the Greeks have not been able to attain by the repeated doctrines of their wiſe men, and all the precepts of their Philoſophers.*’ This alone maintained their republic, and hindred them from injuring one another. They were ſo framed, as to be all content with what they had at home. Such a nation has neither occaſion for a Code, nor a Digeſt (9).

Theſe fifteen conſiderations ſeem ſufficient to remove the ſtumbling-block, which was thought to be laid in ſome places of my Dictionary. They might afford matter for a large book: I have only curſorily propoſed them; for I have ſomewhat more largely treated of them in another place (10), and I ſhall treat of them more amply in a work that I have promiſed (11).

EXPLANATION

(7) *I have been told by a Divine, that this is the expreſſion they uſe, when they ſpeak of the Providence of God, in as much as it has not permitted ſuch an inundation of crimes as would deſtroy ſocieties.*

(8) Juſtin. *lib.* ii, *cap.* ii.

(9) Juſtitia gentis ingeniis culta, non legibus. - - - *Juſtice is maintained among the Scythians, not by the laws of the country, ſo much as by the genius and diſpoſition of the nation.* Id. ibid.

(10) *See the* Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes.

(11) *See the preface of the third edition of the ſaid* Penſées.

EXPLANATION II.

How what I have ſaid concerning the objections of the Manichees, ought to be conſidered.

THEY who are offended at ſome things which I have obſerved in the articles wherein I treated of Manicheiſm, would be wholly inexcuſable if they went only upon my ſaying, that the *Queſtion about the origin of evil is very difficult.* For the Ancient Fathers ingenuouſly confeſs it (1), as does every Orthodox Divine at this day. I do not think therefore that the ſtumbling-block lies in this; but rather, in my ſuppoſing the objections of the Manichees unanſwerable, whilſt only diſcuſſed at the bar of reaſon.

This muſt needs ſcandalize thoſe, whoſe great zeal for the truths of the goſpel perſuades them, that it triumphs over error in all kinds of combat, and whatever arms it oppoſes. They find ſo much pleaſure in the reading a book, wherein Tranſubſtantiation is routed, whether it be attacked by the teſtimony of the ſenſes, and the principles of Philoſophy, or whether impugned by the Scripture, and the tradition of the firſt ages; they find, I ſay, ſo much ſatisfaction in ſo complete a victory, that they eaſily fancy all other diſputes of orthodoxy have the ſame fate. Flattered with ſo agreeable a perſuaſion, they fret and fume if any one maintains, that all the articles of the Chriſtian Faith, defended and attacked by the arms of Philoſophy alone, do not come off honourably; that ſome of them give ground, and are forced to retire into the fortreſſes of Scripture, and to aſk leave for the future to arm themſelves in another way, or otherwiſe they will refuſe to enter the liſts.

They, who are vexed to ſee themſelves thus diſturbed in the poſſeſſion of an imaginary complete triumph, fear moreover that by the confeſſion of a ſort of inferiority, religion will be expoſed to a total defeat, or at leaſt its certainty notably weakened, and the intereſt of the enemies of the Goſpel advanced.

An offence grounded on theſe notions, has two favourable circumſtances; one, that it proceeds from a good principle; the other that it may be eaſily removed. It is produced by the love of truth, and if we do but riſe up to the conſideration of the character of Evangelical truths, we ſhall be delivered from this diſturbance. For we ſhall ſee, that far from being the property of thoſe truths to be reconciled with Philoſophy, it is on the contrary eſſential to them, not to be ſquared by its rules (2).

THAT the myſteries of the Goſpel being above reaſon, it follows, that the objections of the unbelievers cannot be anſwered by reaſon.

The Roman Catholics and Proteſtants diſpute concerning ſeveral articles of religion, but they perfectly agree in this point. That the myſteries of the Goſpel are above reaſon. There are even ſome Divines who own that the myſteries denied by the Socinians, are againſt reaſon. I will not take advantage of that conceſſion; it ſuffices me, that they are unanimouſly acknowledged to be above reaſon; for from thence it neceſſarily follows, that it is impoſſible to ſolve the difficulties of the Philoſophers; and conſequently, that a diſpute, wherein natural light only is employed, will always terminate to the diſadvantage of the Divines, who will be forced to give ground and to retire under the cannon of ſupernatural light.

It is evident, that reaſon can never reach what is above itſelf; but if it could afford anſwers to the objections which attack the Doctrine of the Trinity, and that of the Hypoſtatic Union, it would reach to theſe two myſteries, it would get the maſtery of them, manage and ply them, even to the comparing them with its firſt principles, or with aphoriſms deduced from common notions, till at laſt, it had concluded, that they agree with natural light. It would therefore exert it ſelf beyond its ſtrength, and exceed its own limits, which is a dowright contradiction. We muſt therefore ſay, that it cannot furniſh anſwers to its own objections; and conſequently they remain victorious, till recourſe is had to the Divine authority, and the neceſſity of captivating the underſtanding to the obedience of faith.

Let us endeavour to put this in a clearer light. If ſome doctrines are above reaſon, they are out of its reach; if they are out of its reach, it cannot attain to them; if it cannot attain to them, it cannot comprehend them; if it cannot comprehend them, it cannot find any idea or principle that can afford ſolutions; and conſequently, its objections will remain unanſwered; or, which is the ſame thing, will be anſwered by ſome diſtinction as obſcure as the poſition itſelf which is attacked. Now it is certain, that an objection founded upon diſtinct notions remains equally victorious, whether no anſwer is made to it, or ſuch an anſwer is made as no body can underſtand. Can the match be equal betwixt you and another perſon, if that perſon makes objections which each of you clearly comprehends, and you make no anſwers but ſuch as neither of you comprehends?

(1) *See the article* PAULICIANS, *citat.* (108).

(2) *This is only to be underſtood of Evangelical truths, which contain myſteries; for it muſt be confeſſed, that the moral precepts of Jeſus Chriſt, are eaſily reconciled with natural light.*

THE end of a philoſophical diſpute, and that it cannot be attained when the diſpute turns upon myſteries.

Every Philoſophical diſpute ſuppoſes the contending parties to be agreed upon certain definitions, and to admit the rules of ſyllogiſms, and the characteriſtics of falſe reaſoning. After this, the whole buſineſs conſiſts in examining, whether a poſition be mediately or immediately conſiſtent with the principles agreed upon; whether the premiſſes of an argument are true; whether the conſequence is well drawn: whether the ſyllogiſm uſed has four terms; whether no maxim contained in the chapter *de Oppoſitis*, or *de Sophiſticis Elenchis*, &c. be contradicted. The victory is obtained either by ſhewing that the ſubject of the diſpute has no connexion with the principles agreed upon, or by reducing the reſpondent to an abſurdity. And this may be done, either by ſhewing that the conſequences of his poſition are contradictory, or by driving him to ſuch anſwers as are wholly unintelligible. The end of theſe ſorts of diſputes is to clear up obſcurities, and make evidence ſhine forth. Hence we judge, that during the courſe of a diſputation, victory declares more or leſs for the opponent or reſpondent, according to the greater or leſſer perſpicuity in the propoſitions of the reſpective diſputants; and at laſt we determine that it wholly declares againſt him whoſe anſwers are ſuch as are to us unintelligible, and who acknowledges they are incomprehenſible. Hereupon we condemn him by the rules of adjudging the victory to a party; and even when he cannot be purſued into the miſt he has covered himſelf with, which forms a ſort of abyſs betwixt him and his antagoniſts, we conclude him utterly defeated, and compare him to an army, which having loſt the battle, eſcapes the conquerours purſuit only by the favour of the night.

The concluſion we ought to draw from this is, that the myſteries of the goſpel being of a ſupernatural order, neither can nor ought to be ſubjected to the rules of natural reaſon: they are not ſuited to the teſt of Philoſophical diſputes; their greatneſs and ſublimity hinders them from ſtooping to them. It would be againſt the nature of things, for them to come off victorious from ſuch a combat, their eſſential character is to be the objects of faith, and not of ſcience: they would be no longer myſteries, if reaſon could ſolve all the difficulties of them; and therefore, inſtead of thinking it ſtrange that any one ſhould ſay that Philoſophy may attack them, but not repulſe the attack, it ſhould be a ſubject of ſcandal to hear the contrary (3).

If they, whoſe ſcruples I would remove, yield not to theſe conſiderations, in which they will find, perhaps, ſomething too abſtracted, I intreat them to have recourſe to reflexions that are more adapted to every one's capacity: I beſeech them to conſider a little the genius that reigns in the New Teſtament, and in the miſſion of the Apoſtles.

SOME conſiderations upon the method that Jeſus Chriſt and the Apoſtles and antient Fathers have obſerved in teaching.

The humour of diſputing is what ſeems the leaſt approved in the œconomy of the Goſpel. The firſt thing JESUS CHRIST requires is faith and ſubmiſſion. This is commonly his firſt precept, and alſo of his apoſtles, *Follow me*, (4) *Believe, and thou ſhalt be ſaved* (5). Now, that faith which he required was not obtained by a train of Philoſophical diſcuſſions and long reaſonings; but was the gift of GOD, a pure grace of the Holy Ghoſt, which commonly fell on ignorant perſons (6). It was not even produced in the apoſtles by their reflecting on the holineſs of the life of JESUS CHRIST, and the excellency of his doctrine and miracles. They ſtood in need of a Revelation from GOD himſelf, to know that he whoſe diſciples they were, was his eternal Son (7). If JESUS CHRIST and his apoſtles ſometimes happen to reaſon, they did not take their proofs from natural light, but from the books of the Prophets, and from miracles; and if ſometimes St Paul made uſe of ſome arguments *ad hominem* againſt the Gentiles, he did not much inſiſt upon them. His method was entirely different from that of Philoſophers: theſe boaſt of ſuch evident principles, and a ſyſtem ſo conſiſtent, as to fear no other obſtacles to perſuaſion but the ſtupidity of the auditors, or the malicious artifice of their competitors; and they offer to give an account of their doctrine to all the world, and to defend it againſt all gainſayers. St Paul, on the contrary, owns his doctrine to be obſcure, that he knows it but imperfectly (8), and that nothing of it can be underſtood, unleſs GOD communicates a ſpiritual diſcernment, without which it muſt be reckoned fooliſhneſs (9). He confeſſes (10) that the greateſt number of thoſe converted by the apoſtles were ignorant and of mean condition. He does not challenge the Philoſophers to diſputation, but exhorts the believers to ſtand well upon their guard againſt Philoſophy (11), and to avoid the conteſtations of that ſcience, which had ruined the faith of ſome perſons (12).

The antient Fathers governed themſelves by the ſame ſpirit; they required a ready ſubmiſſion to the authority of GOD, and looked upon the diſputes of Philoſophers as one of the greateſt obſtacles the true faith could meet in its way (13). Celſus the Philoſopher laughed at the conduct of the Chriſtians, *Who*, ſaid he (14), *will neither hear your reaſons, nor give you any for what they believe, contenting themſelves with ſaying*, Examine not, only believe; *or* Your faith will ſave you; *and it is a maxim with them, that the wiſdom of the world is an evil . . . . If, as uſually, they confine themſelves to their* examine not, only believe, *they muſt at leaſt tell me what things thoſe are they would have me believe* (15). But obſerve how he is anſwered (16). 'If it were poſſible for all men, 'neglecting the affairs of this life, to apply themſelves to ſtudy and meditation, we 'need ſeek no other way to make them embrace the Chriſtian religion: for, not to

---

(3) *Note, that we mean not to condemn thoſe who labour to reconcile theſe myſteries with Philoſophy; their motives may be good, and their labour, by the bleſſing of God, may ſometimes be uſeful.*

(4) *Luke v.* 27, *and ix.* 59.

(5) *Acts xvi.* 31.

(6) *Matt. xi,* 25.

(7) *Ibid. xvi.* 17.

(8) 1 *Cor. xiii.* 12.

(9) *Ibid. ii,* 14.

(10) *Ibid. i,* 26.

(11) *Coloſ. ii.* 8.

(12) 1 *Tim. vi.* 20, 21.

(13) *See the paſſages of the Fathers which Mr de Launoi has compiled, ch. ii, of his book,* de varia Ariſtotelis fortuna.

(14) *Origen againſt Celſus, book i, cap. ii, pag. m.* 5.

(15) *Id. ibid. pag.* 7.

(16) *Id. ibid. pag.* 5.

‘ſay any thing offenſive to others, no leſs exactneſs will appear in it than elſewhere, whether in the diſcuſſion of its doctrines (17), or in the illuſtration of the enigmatical expreſſions of its prophets, or in the ſignification of its Goſpel parables, and abundance of other things which happened, or were ſymbolically ordained. But, ſince neither the neceſſities of this life, nor the infirmities of men, will permit many perſons to apply themſelves to ſtudy, what more profitable method could be found for all the reſt of the world, than that which Jeſus Chriſt was pleaſed to uſe for the converſion of the people? And I would fain be told, with reſpect to the great number of thoſe who believe, and thereby have eſcaped the deluge of corruption in which they were plunged, which is better for them, to have thus changed their morals, and mended their lives, by believing without examination, that there are puniſhments for ſins, and rewards for good actions; or to have put off their converſion till they not only believed, but had carefully examined the foundations of thoſe doctrines? It is certain, that in following this method few people would have arrived ſo far as their plain and naked faith has conducted them; but moſt of them would have remained in their corruption . . . But ſince they make ſo much noiſe about believing without examining, we muſt further tell them, that as for us who obſerve the profit which hence redounds to the greateſt number, we frankly confeſs, that we recommend it to thoſe who are not in a capacity of forſaking all things to apply themſelves wholly to the ſearch of truth (18).’

This paſſage of St Paul, *We walk by faith, and not by ſight* (19), would alone ſuffice to convince us, that in a diſpute between two Philoſophers there is nothing to be gained by him who attempts either to prove the myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion, or to ſtand upon the defenſive. For herein lies the difference betwixt the faith of a Chriſtian and the ſcience of a Philoſopher; this faith produces a complete certainty, but its object ſtill remains inevident; ſcience, on the contrary, at once produces the evidence of the object, and a complete certainty of perſuaſion. A Chriſtian therefore attempting to maintain the myſtery of the Trinity againſt a Philoſopher, would oppoſe an inevident object againſt evident objections. Would not this be fighting blind-fold and with hands tied, againſt an adverſary who has the uſe of all the faculties of his body and mind? But if the Chriſtian could ſolve all the Philoſopher's objections, only by the principles of natural reaſon, the aſſertion of St Paul would not be true, *that we walk by faith, and not by ſight:* for ſcience, and not Divine faith, would be the portion of a Chriſtian.

Now can any man take offence at my acknowledging a truth which naturally reſults from the ſpirit of the goſpel, and the doctrine of St Paul?

MAXIMS common to Romiſh and Proteſtant Divines.

If theſe reflexions upon the conduct of the firſt ages have not ſufficient force; if, I ſay, ſuch objects conſidered at a diſtance, make not an impreſſion deep enough, let me intreat you to examine the maxims of the modern Divines. Both Papiſts and Proteſtants agree in this poſition, that reaſon is to be rejected in the judging of a controverſy about our myſteries; which amounts to this, that this conceſſion ſhall never be made, *viz.* That, if the literal ſenſe of a paſſage of Scripture includes inconceivable doctrines impugned by the moſt evident maxims of the Logicians and Metaphyſicians, it ſhall be declared falſe; and Reaſon, Philoſophy and Natural Light ſhall be the rule to be followed in the choice of a certain interpretation of Scripture preferably to all others. They not only ſay, that all thoſe are to be rejected who make ſuch a preliminary demand in the diſpute, but alſo maintain that they are ingaged in a way that can lead only to Scepticiſm, or Deiſm, or Atheiſm: ſo that the moſt neceſſary Barrier to preſerve the Chriſtian religion, is the obligation to ſubmit to the authority of God, and humbly to believe the myſteries he has been pleaſed to reveal, however inconceivable they be and impoſſible they appear to our reaſon.

It ſeems that the Papiſts and Lutherans ought more ſtrongly to inſiſt upon this principle than the Calviniſts; for the doctrine of the Real Preſence has a more particular need of it; and yet the Calviniſts are as jealous of this poſition as the others, and urge it with great zeal againſt the Socinians; and whenever they ſee ſome of their Divines go out of this common road, to make more room for reaſon, they write ſeverely againſt them, and make them ſuſpected of the Socinian Hereſy.

It would be eaſy to gather up the proofs of all I have ſaid, but this would be to very little purpoſe; for whoever is acquainted with books of controverſy, muſt know that the Roman Catholics continually recommend the ſacrificing our reaſon, and captivating the underſtanding, and that the Proteſtant Miniſters impute the Socinian impieties to the refuſal of this ſacrifice. The diſputes of the univerſity of Franeker, ſilenced by authority (20), and thoſe of the two French Miniſters (21) terminated (22) by the Walloon Synod, have made too much noiſe, and are of ſo late a date, that there is no need of proving it by any citations. I only ſay, that one of thoſe two miniſters maintained as the *univerſal doctrine of the Church, and particularly of Calvin and his followers*, that the foundation of faith is neither the evidence of the objects, nor the evidence of revelation; and that the Holy Ghoſt perſuades us of the myſteries of the Goſpel, without evidently ſhewing us what we believe, or the Divinity of the Scripture, or the truth

(17) *This muſt be underſtood not with reſpect to the principles of Logic and Metaphyſics mentioned in this explanation (for it is certain the Fathers did not diſcuſs the doctrines of the Trinity, and Incarnation by thoſe rules) but with reſpect to principles taken from the word of God, when the queſtion is about a myſtery of the goſpel.*

(18) Origen. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 6.

(19) 2 *Cor. v.* 7.

(20) *In* 1687. *There are in the the* Bibliotheque Univerſelle, *Extracts of many books publiſhed pro and con upon this controverſy.*

(21) *Mr Jurieu, and Mr Saurin.*

(22) *In Sept.* 1696.

truth of the ſenſe of ſuch and ſuch paſſages. He was acknowledged to be orthodox; his adverſary obtained a like teſtimony of his orthodoxy; but this proves nothing againſt me, for he owned that faith is inevident as to the object, and that the evidence accompanying it as to revelation is an effect of grace. He is therefore one of thoſe who ſay that myſteries are not under the juriſdiction of reaſon, and that reaſon or philoſophical light is not the rule we are to conſult when we diſpute on that matter.

Now, if all the Divines who are orthodox, with regard to the myſteries of the Trinity, and hypoſtatic Union, both Roman Catholics and Proteſtants unanimouſly reject the arbitration of reaſon, it is a manifeſt ſign they find it incapable of giving proofs or ſolutions in the controverſies concerning thoſe myſteries; for when the queſtion is about the exiſtence of God, they deſire nothing better than to diſpute by the light of reaſon, becauſe it furniſhes arms both to attack and repulſe the enemy, and to gain an entire victory. The reaſon therefore why they act quite otherwiſe, with reſpect to the Trinity and Incarnation, *&c.* is their knowing that Philoſophical principles are unable, inſufficient, to do good, but capable of doing much harm. If juſtice and prudence allow the excepting againſt a judge, it is only in caſe of incompetence and partiality. The more zeal a man has for his cauſe, the leſs he neglects his advantages; and if he has alſo a true ſenſe of his intereſt, he never excepts againſt well-affected perſons.

From all this I conclude, that there is nothing eaſier than to ſatisfy thoſe who have been offended with my conceſſion; for I need only deſire them to obſerve, that if they will be ſcandalized at it, they muſt complain that all the orthodox Divines are a ſcandal to them. There is no medium in this caſe: they muſt either approve what I have ſaid, or diſapprove what is ſaid by thoſe Divines who are moſt averſe to the Socinian Hereſies.

An anſwer to ſome objections: the firſt is, that we give too great advantage to Heretics and Infidels, by owning that their philoſophical objections againſt the myſteries of the New Teſtament cannot be anſwered.

If it is objected, that offence was juſtly taken at my conceſſion, ſince it is giving too great an advantage to the unbelievers, to allow that their objections againſt our myſteries cannot be anſwered philoſophically: I reply two things. Firſt, that they muſt then be offended not only at what I have ſaid on this ſubject, but alſo at what the moſt orthodox Divines have publiſhed concerning it. I ſay ſecondly, that this is not giving to the unbelievers any advantage they can juſtly boaſt of, as they might do if our preachers imitated thoſe Philoſophers, who give public notice that they are ready to defend ſuch and ſuch propoſitions againſt all oppoſers, and that at ſuch a day, and at ſuch an hour and place they will make them appear as clear as noon-day. If the Apoſtles, St Paul for example, when among the Athenians, had petitioned the Areopagus to permit him to enter the liſts with all the Philoſophers; if he had offered to maintain a diſputation upon the three perſons which are but one God, and upon the unity of the hypoſtaſis of the Divine and human nature in Jeſus Chriſt; and if before he began the diſpute he had acknowledged the truth of the rules eſtabliſhed by Ariſtotle in his Logic, either concerning the terms of oppoſition, or the requiſites of the premiſſes of a demonſtrative ſyllogiſm, *&c.* In fine, if theſe preliminaries being adjuſted, he had anſwered that our reaſon is too weak to comprehend the myſteries againſt which they propoſed their objections, he had been expoſed to all the ſhame that a nonpluſſed reſpondent can ever ſuffer. The victory of the Athenian Philoſophers had been complete; for he would have been judged and condemned by the very maxims which he had already owned to be certain. But if theſe Philoſophers had attacked him by the ſame maxims, after he declared to them the foundation of his faith, he might have oppoſed this barrier to them, *viz.* That his doctrines were unknown to reaſon, that they were revealed by God, and that we ought to believe them, though we do not comprehend them. The diſpute, to be regular, muſt not have turned upon the queſtion, Whether theſe doctrines were contrary to the maxims of Logic and Metaphyſics; but upon the queſtion, Whether God had revealed them. St Paul could not have the worſt of it, except it had been proved to him that God did not require the belief of thoſe things.

You ſee by this how imaginary is the pretended triumph of the unbelievers; for our Divines do not pretend to prove the Trinity and Incarnation by Philoſophical arguments; they admit only the word of God for the foundation and ſource of their proofs and ſolutions. This is their fortreſs, their place of arms, it is enough for them to defend it, and ward off all the blows levelled at it by an Heretic, who bottoms upon the ſame principle with them, *viz.* the Divine authority of the Scripture. It is no great matter if the enemy ſeize the reſt, being a country which they have voluntarily abandoned. It is no great victory to ſeize on a place which no body deſigned to keep. *Facile erat vincere non repugnantes* (23). - - - *It was an eaſy matter to vanquiſh thoſe who made no reſiſtance.*

To the end that thoſe who read this, and have no other book on this ſubject, may be fully aſſured that I do not advance a thing at random. I will fully convince them of what I have advanced. I will cite the teſtimony of two famous writers (24), one a Prieſt, and the other a Miniſter, and both very orthodox upon the Trinity, Incarnation, ſatisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſome other myſteries. ‘ This proceeding (25) is

‘ unreaſonable,

(23) Cicero, Tuſcul. Quæſt. *lib. i, init. fol. m.* 245, C.

(24) *Mr Nicolle and Mr Claude.*

(25) *That is, to make a collection of reaſons which have ſomething ſurprizing againſt the Trinity,* &c.

‘ unreaſonable, as being contrary to the firſt principles, and the very foundations of the Chriſtian religion. If this religion told men, that it propoſes to them a faith free from all difficulties; that nothing can be alledged againſt its myſteries with any ſort of probability; and that the proofs on which it eſtabliſhes the truths it teaches, are ſo clear as to overcome the incredulity and reluctance of all ſorts of perſons, however prepoſſeſſed; this would be a juſt ground for pretending to overthrow its doctrines, by thus heaping up probable objections againſt what it would make us believe. But it is very far from ſpeaking thus: it not only does not tell them that the truths it teaches cannot be attacked by any probable reaſons, but tells them it is neceſſary they ſhould be ſo, and that it is an infallible conſequence of the deſign God had in diſcovering himſelf to mankind by the true religion (26).’ Mr Claude having objected nothing to this paſſage of Mr Nicolle, muſt be deemed the approver of it; for if he had found any matter for cenſure in it, he was indiſpenſibly obliged to cenſure it in refuting, as he did, the book concerning the Perpetuity of Faith.

The ſecond objection is, that anſwers have been found to theſe philoſophical objections.

Let us ſee whether any juſt offence could be taken, under pretence that the Philoſophical objections againſt the doctrine of the Trinity, *&c.* ſilence not the Profeſſors of Divinity, and that in their public diſputations on theſe points, they ſolve all the difficulties that can be propoſed to them. I deſire ſuch as ſhall urge this to conſider two things: one is, that their objection cannot be good againſt me, without being ſo againſt all the Divines who acknowledge that the great myſteries of the goſpel are inexplicable by natural reaſon: the other is, that the Proteſtants cannot make uſe of this objection; for it proves too much; namely, that the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is not liable to invincible attacks, philoſophically ſpeaking. It is the general doctrine of the Roman Catholics, that a body may be in ſeveral places at the ſame time. The Thomiſts, contenting themſelves with what is neceſſary, have not dared to affirm it can be ſo *circumſcriptively*, but at moſt as Jeſus Chriſt is under the ſacramental ſpecies. The other ſchoolmen, eſpecially the Jeſuits, have been much bolder; they have maintained the *circumſcriptive replication* (27), and in this have reaſoned more conſequentially than the Thomiſts; for if the reaſons alledged againſt this *replication* were good, the *definitive replication* (28) would not be maintainable. The *replication* is not only taught by the Divines, but alſo in all the bodies of Philoſophy, and it is always one of the theſes ordered to be publickly maintained by the ſtudents in Natural Philoſophy. All imaginable objections are diſcuſſed in the books of ſcholaſtic Divines, which treat of the ſacrament of the Euchariſt, and in the bodies of Philoſophy, in the place where the queſtions *de loco* are explained: not one of thoſe objections remains unanſwered: Does this hinder the Proteſtants from perſiſting to maintain that this poſition, *viz.* a body is in ſeveral places at the ſame time, is liable to a thouſand contradictions, and abſolutely impoſſible? Nothing therefore can be inferred in favour of an opinion, from the poſſibility of oppoſing ſome diſtinction or ſchool-term againſt whatever the moſt ſubtle adverſaries can object (29). All does not conſiſt in making an anſwer, but in giving a ſolution which raiſes ſome idea, and is exempt from the *petitio principii*, and which ſhews the objection to be grounded upon foundations that have no connexion with common notions. Here you ſee three requiſites which are wanting in the ſchoolmens anſwers to the objections againſt Tranſubſtantiation: therefore their laſt and principal refuge is to ſay, that the omnipotence of God ſupplies what reaſon cannot comprehend, and that it is our duty to captivate our underſtanding, and ſacrifice our reaſon to the authority of the Church.

They have been no leſs ſubtile and fertile in inventing either difficulties, or anſwers, with reſpect to the Trinity, than with reſpect to Tranſubſtantiation. But the Socinians are as ill ſatisfied with theſe two kinds of anſwers, as the Proteſtants are with thoſe relating to Tranſubſtantiation: Both, ſay the Socinians, want the three requiſites abovementioned: they take for granted what is in queſtion; they are as obſcure, or even obſcurer than the doctrine itſelf, which is the ſubject of controverſy; they are too inconceivable to be confuted; it is a diſpute wherein night parts the combatants; for if the reſpondent wraps himſelf in a diſtinction wholly incomprehenſible, the opponent muſt neceſſarily retire; or if he ſtays, he does not ſee where he can ſtrike a blow. No man will ſhoot where there is not the leaſt glimpſe whereby to diſcover or gueſs at the mark; and as the higheſt degree of evidence has this property, that it cannot be proved, the loweſt degree of inevidence has this deſtiny, that it cannot be attacked. So that no conſequence can be drawn in favour of a doctrine from this, that its opponents, though never ſo well provided with Philoſophical weapons, at laſt meet with an intrenchment of diſtinctions, involved in ſo impenetrable a cloud, that they are forced to proceed no farther.

There are both in the Proteſtant and Romiſh communion a great many perſons who are diſſatiſfied with the explications of the ſchoolmen, and think that theſe people have more confounded than explained the myſteries of religion. Some Proteſtant Divines could wiſh that the ſcripture-terms had only been made uſe of, that the whole doctrine of the Trinity had been expreſſed in five or ſix lines, and that, inſtead of following the diſputants from one objection to another, they had been told, *We do not propoſe*

(26) Nicolle, Perpetuité de la Foi, *pag. m.* 92, 93.

(27) *It is thus the Schoolmen call the poſition of the ſame body in ſeveral places, without a penetration of dimenſions.*

(28) *Thus they call the poſition of the ſame body in many places at once, with penetration of dimenſions.*

(29) *Compare with this what I have ſaid in the article* ZENO *of Elea, concerning the objections relating to the diviſibility of matter.*

this to you as a thing you are to comprehend, but as a thing you are to believe: if you cannot believe it, beg the grace of God that you may; if you obtain nothing by your prayers, your diſtemper is incurable: our diſtinctions and ſubtilties will ſerve only to harden you; you will never leave off complaining that we explain to you one obſcure doctrine by another more obſcure, obſcurum per obſcurius. It is very probable that this myſtery propoſed in a few words, according to the ſimplicity of the ſcripture, would much leſs ſtartle and fright reaſon, than it does by that great train of explications which accompanies it in Thomas Aquinas's Commentators. Many Roman Catholics would heartily ſay, if they durſt, againſt the ſubtilties of the ſchoolmen, what the Abbot Faydit has publiſhed of them: but though they had not the ſame courage he had to publiſh a ſtrong invective on this ſubject, they nevertheleſs think as he does. See the margin (30).

Mr Balzac has ſaid excellent things in the fifth diſcourſe of his *Socrate Chrêtien* (31). I ſhall give ſome part of it. ‘They who have tranſlated from one language into another with the greateſt reputation, have miſtaken rivers for mountains, and men for cities. The miſtakes of your Divines are not leſs than thoſe. Human reaſon falls into more ſtrange miſtakes when it treats of divine things: being weak and defective it ought to be cautious, and conſider its own ſtrength; it ought to be more diſcreet and reſerved: there may be an exceſs in the deſire of learning and enquiring: it is a vice to know too much news; ancient morality has condemned it: Theophraſtus's characters do not forget it. And if that be true which was heretofore ſaid, THAT WE OUGHT NOT TO BE CURIOUS IN A FOREIGN REPUBLIC; what audaciousneſs is it, I pray, what ſacrilege, for a citizen of the lower world, an inhabitant of the earth, to meddle ſo much with the things above, and the affairs of heaven? In what country is he more a ſtranger than in that? Is there any Republic more unknown to him? Is there any foreign place he is more remote from, or has leſs ſociety and correſpondence with? The profound reſpect we owe to that majeſty which conceals himſelf, forbids our prying into it with ſo much diligence and forwardneſs. Let us ſtop at his outworks and ramparts, without purſuing him into his fort and intrenchments; let us adore the veils and clouds he has placed betwixt us and him. Since he inhabits a light inacceſſible, let us leave off attempting the place of his abode: let us not endeavour to ſurprize him by the ſubtilty of our queſtions, to force him with the violence of our arguments. If the preſervation of our eyes be valuable, if our life be dear to us, let us ſhun that formidable preſence, that fatal light, that light which dazzles angels and kills men (32). . . . At the unmeaſurable diſtance we are from him, confined to the loweſt ſtation of the world he has built, we would aſcend his throne, and touch his crown. We aſpire to his ſtricteſt confidence and familiarity; at leaſt, we pretend to ſee him with the eyes of fleſh, to comprehend him with a mind drowned in blood, and buried in matter. We undertake to diſcourſe of his nature and his eſſence, to give an account of his conduct and deſigns, with the jargon of Ariſtotle's Philoſophy (33).’

Balzac, in this diſcourſe, had the Spaniſh ſchoolmen in view; but there is no ſubject in which they better deſerve this cenſure, than their explications of the myſtery of the Trinity: ſo little reaſon is there to conclude they have ſucceeded well, under the pretence of their inventing anſwers to objections.

But to be impartial to every body, we muſt ſay, that thoſe who engage in diſputes with the Socinians, and take new roads, ſeldom fail to loſe their way. This has been ſeen in England five or ſix years ago (34): a famous Divine, thinking he could not confute ſome Socinian tracts by the hypotheſis of the ſchools, imagined another; but it was pretended that he eſtabliſhed Tritheiſm, and his hypotheſis was not ſuffered to take footing. From whence we may infer how impoſſible it is to confute the Philoſophical objections of the Socinians; and ſince they acknowledge the ſcripture, they ought immediately to be attacked by it. This is the weak ſide of their defence; the other is the ſtrong ſide.

As deſirous as I am to be ſhort, I muſt obſerve the method taken by an able Divine, who has ſince been many years Biſhop of Saliſbury, to refute the objections of a famous Atheiſt (35) whom he converted. He has given us an account of the conferences he had with him, where we find, amongſt other things, that in anſwering the difficulties upon the myſteries of the goſpel, he had only recourſe to this, that the incomprehenſibility of a doctrine is not a ſufficient reaſon to reject it, ſince there are a great many moſt certain things in nature which it is impoſſible to comprehend. He mentioned ſome of them, and particularly the union of the ſoul and body. It had been objected to Dr Burnet, that it is not in the power of man to believe what he does not conceive; and that it is opening a door to all the cheats and impoſitions of prieſts, to give credit to myſterious doctrines. *He excepted to the belief of myſteries in the* Chriſtian Religion; *which he thought no man could do, ſince it is not in a man's power to believe that which he cannot comprehend: and of which he can have no notion. The believing myſteries, he ſaid, made way for all the jugglings of prieſts, for they getting the people under them in that point, ſet out to them what they pleaſed; and giving it a hard name, and calling it a* Myſtery, *the*

---

(30) *To know to what a ſtrange perplexity the Abbot Faydit has reduced the Schoolmen, we need only conſult the author who has attempted to anſwer him, or the excellent extract Mr de Beauval has given of his anſwer, in the* Hiſt. des Ouvr. des Savans, *May* 1699, *pag.* 214, *& ſeq.*

(31) Intituled, *Concerning the too great ſubtilty in matters of religion,*

(32) Balzac, Socrate Chrêtien, *pag. m.* 57, *& ſeq.*

(33) *Id. ibid.* 62, 63.

(34) *I write this in November,* 1701.

(35) *John Wilmot E. of Rocheſter, born April* 1638, *who died penitent in* 1680. *A man who diſtinguiſhed himſelf both by his wit, and his writings which are full of ingenious and ſatirical ſtrokes; and one of thoſe Atheiſts who live according to their principles; for he plunged himſelf into the greateſt exceſs of drunkenneſs and lewdneſs. See the Hiſtory of his converſion by Dr Gilbert Burnet.*

people were tamed, and eaſily believed it (36). The Doctor anſwered (37), that we muſt not wonder that the eſſence of God is incomprehenſible, ſince there is in every being ſomething we cannot account for (38), and the poſſibility of ſeveral facts acknowledged to be true by all the world, may yet be attacked by ſpecious arguments (39); and therefore the revelation of the myſtery of the Trinity and Incarnation, and ſome others, being certain we ought to ſubject our reaſon to them; for the ſole argument that can be oppoſed to them is, that they are above our reaſon; but is not the ſame difficulty to be found in ſeveral things which we admit to be true (40). He was ſo far from reckoning the ſchoolmens anſwers any thing, that on the contrary he confeſſed they only ſerved to render the difficulties more obſcure. *There have been too many niceties brought in indeed, rather to darken than explain theſe: They have been defended by weak arguments, and illuſtrated by ſimilies not always ſo very apt and pertinent. And new ſubtilties have been added, which have rather perplexed than cleared them. All this cannot be denied; the oppoſition of* Heretics *antiently, occaſioned too much curioſity among the* Fathers: *which the* Schoolmen *have wonderfully advanced of late times. But if myſteries were received, rather in the ſimplicity in which they are delivered in the ſcriptures, than according to the deſcantings of fanciful men upon them, they would not appear much more incredible, than ſome of the common objects of ſenſe and perception* (41).

Let us not forget this obſervation. Luther, and ſeveral other Proteſtant Divines had never maintained that there are things falſe in Philoſophy which are true in Divinity (42), if they had believed that the anſwers made to the objections of the Philoſophers againſt our myſteries were ſatisfactory to reaſon; for they maintained this only on account of thoſe myſteries (43).

I do not ſee therefore that hitherto the objections I had to ſolve in this explanation have been able to put me to any difficulty. Let us try in ſome others.

The third objection, is, that I ought not to have applied to the arguments of the Manichees, what might be acknowledged with reſpect to the arguments againſt the myſteries of the Goſpel.

If it be objected, that my conceſſion is ſcandalous, becauſe it relates not to the Philoſophical reaſons which may impugn the Trinity, Incarnation, and ſome other myſteries, but to the diſputes about the origin of evil; that objection will be very faulty: For, firſt, the objector will be ignorant that the decrees of God concerning the fall of man, and the conſequences of this fall, are one of the moſt incomprehenſible myſteries of religion; ſecondly, That our moſt orthodox Divines acknowledge it.

The writings of St Paul teach us, that this great Apoſtle, propoſing to himſelf the difficulties concerning Predeſtination, could get out of them no otherwiſe than by aſſerting the abſolute power of God over his creatures (44), with an exclamation upon the incomprehenſibility of his ways. Could he more clearly ſignify, than by ſuch a ſolution, that the doctrine of the decrees of God concerning the deſtiny of the Elect and Reprobate is inexplicable? Is not this telling us in plain terms, that Predeſtination is one of the myſteries which moſt overwhelm human reaſon, and moſt unavoidably require it to humble itſelf under the authority of God, and ſacrifice itſelf to the ſcripture? The objections it ſuggeſts againſt the myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, are for the moſt part ſenſible only to thoſe who have ſome tincture of Logic and Metaphyſics; and belonging to the ſpeculative ſciences, they have leſs force upon the generality of men: but thoſe it ſuggeſts againſt Adam's ſin, and Original Sin, and the eternal damnation of an infinite number of people, who cannot be ſaved without an efficacious grace, which God grants only to his Elect, are founded upon principles of Morality, which are known to every body, and which conſtantly ſerve for a rule both to the learned and ignorant to judge whether an action be unjuſt or not. Theſe principles are the moſt evident, and work upon the mind and heart; ſo that all the faculties of man revolt, when we muſt impute to God a conduct which is not conform to this rule. Nay, the ſolution which is drawn from God's infinity, and is employed as a powerful motive to captivate the underſtanding, is not exempt from a new difficulty; for if that infinite diſtance which raiſes God above all things, ought to perſuade us that he is not ſubject to the laws of human virtues, we cannot be certain that his juſtice engages him to puniſh evil, and we could not confute thoſe who ſhould maintain that he is the author of ſin, and yet puniſhes it very juſtly, and in all this does nothing but what is conſiſtent with the infinite perfections of a ſupreme being; becauſe thoſe perfections are not to be adjuſted to our ideas of virtue.

It is plain therefore, that the doctrine concerning Adam's ſin, with its dependences; is, of all the myſteries unconceivable to reaſon and inexplicable by its maxims, that which moſt neceſſarily obliges us to ſubmit to revealed truth, notwithſtanding all the oppoſitions of Philoſophical truth.

It were to be wiſhed that this point had been always remembered; for the unhappy diſputes about grace, which have cauſed ſo many troubles, were only derived from the treating of this myſtery as a thing reconcileable with our weak reaſon. The Roman Catholics here have acted inconſiſtently; they have inſulted Calvin with the utmoſt fury, for literally following St Paul's doctrine, whilſt they would explain it in a milder ſenſe, that human reaſon might be ſatisfied with it. They had not the ſame regard for reaſon in the explication of the paſſages relating to the Trinity, and the Sacrament of the Euchariſt. Balzac's ſtrokes againſt the Proteſtant Divines would do well againſt the

---

(36) *Some paſſages of the life and death of John, Earl of Rocheſter, &c.* pag. 100, of the Edit. 1680.

(37) Ibid. *pag.* 101, *& ſeq.*

(38) *For myſteries it is plain there is in every thing, ſomewhat, that is unaccountable.* Ibid. *pag.* 101.

(39) Ibid. *pag.* 103, 104.

(40) *Note, That the author who publiſhed a treatiſe of religion againſt the Atheiſts, Deiſts, and new Pyrrhoniſts, at Paris, in 1677, ſtrongly preſſed the argument,* That unbelievers cannot avoid in their principles believing things incomprehenſible. *See chap. iii, iv, and v, of the ſecond part.*

(41) *Some paſſages,* &c. *Ibid. pag.* 106, 107.

(42) *See, remark* [C], *of the article* Hoffman (Daniel), *and remark* [*KK*], *of the article* Luther.

(43) *See remark* [*KK*], *of the article* Luther.

(44) *See remark* [*E*], *of the article* Arminius.

the Papiſts. *The Miniſters*, ſays he (45), *ought to be laughed at as fools*, ‘ after the advances they have made, and the reſerves they would keep to themſelves. When they ‘ have granted us the more, can they refuſe us the leſs? Having given us the myſteries ‘ of the Trinity and Incarnation, they have reſerved themſelves nothing afterwards. ‘ By granting theſe two great ſtrange and aſtoniſhing truths, they have given up the ‘ liberty of their mind; which liberty muſt either lie loſt or preſerved full and entire. ‘ The ſame authority which aſſures them of the certainty of the Apoſtles Creed, aſſures ‘ them of the validity of all the other parts of religion; and they have no better ‘ grounds for conteſting the latter, than the former. The authority being infallible, it ‘ is univerſally infallible; it is equally infallible. The Chriſtian being a captive to ‘ faith, and not a judge of doctrines, ought to obey the voice which ſpeaks, without ‘ deliberating about the words, becauſe the words would not perſuade him, if the voice ‘ had not already done it. A man has no longer a right to his firſt freedom, after he ‘ has taken upon him the yoke of the commanding and victorious God. It is too late ‘ to make uſe of our reaſon, after we have ſubmitted it to the *obedience of faith*. How ‘ ridiculous, I pray, would it be, one while to quit reaſon, and another to reſume it; ‘ to make choice of ſome pleaſing parts of Chriſtianity, and to reject the diſpleaſing ‘ ones; to be half Infidel, and half Believer! This would be making terms with Jeſus ‘ Chriſt, and entring upon articles with the Church. It would be doing ſomething ‘ worſe, paſſing from complaiſance to giving the lie, admitting part of what ſhe pro‘ poſes to our belief, and maintaining the reſt to be falſe.’ Calvin might thus have defended himſelf againſt thoſe who diſliked his hypotheſis of Predeſtination; he might have told them, You are prepoſterouſly ſqueamiſh, after having digeſted the difficulties of one God in three perſons, and thoſe of Tranſubſtantiation. You will not hearken to Philoſophical arguments on that head; you talk of nothing but the omnipotent power of God; you complain of our denying it, when we deny the preſervation of accidents without a ſubject, and the preſence of a body in different places: Why then do ye attack the myſtery of Predeſtination by human arguments? Why do not ye believe that the power of God extends even to the reconciling the liberty of creatures with the neceſſity of his decrees, and his juſtice with the puniſhment of a ſin neceſſarily committed?

Be it how it will, it cannot be denied that the introduction of moral evil, with the doctrines annexed to it, is one of the moſt impenetrable myſteries which God has revealed to men. I will cite ſome authors upon it.

I repeat not what may be read in another place of this work (46), *viz.* that a Proteſtant Divine publickly confeſſes that the hypotheſis of St Auſtin and Calvin is to him an inſupportable burden, and that he embraces it only becauſe none of the other hypotheſis are able to eaſe him. Calvin's words which I have cited (47) deſerve a place here. ‘ Throughout his writings he conſtantly declares that wherever the queſtion is about ‘ ſin, the name of God ought not to be engaged in it, ſince nothing belongs to the nature ‘ of God but perfect juſtice and equity. It is therefore a baſe and horrible calumny to ‘ involve in this crime a man who has ſerved the Church of God ſo well, as if he made ‘ God the author of ſin. It is true he every where affirms, that nothing is done but ‘ by the will of God; and yet he maintains, that the wicked actions of men are ſo ‘ directed and governed by the ſecret judgment of God, that he has no communication ‘ with their vices. The ſum of his doctrine is, that God directs all things, by ‘ means wonderful and unknown to us, to what end he pleaſes, ſo that his eternal will ‘ is the firſt cauſe of all things. And he confeſſes it to be an incomprehenſible myſtery, ‘ that God ſhould will what to us appears unreaſonable; and neverthelеſs he affirms, ‘ that we are not to enquire too curiouſly or audaciouſly into his conduct, ſince the ‘ judgments of God are a profound abyſs, and that it is better to adore with all re‘ verence the myſteries and ſecrets which exceed our capacity, than to ſcan them, or ‘ intrude too far into them (48).’ You ſee how he adiviſes us not to approach this abyſs, but with a ſpirit of ſubmiſſion and reverence for this great and incomprehenſible myſtery. Mr Morus being Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity in the ſame city of Geneva as Calvin had been, vehemently declaimed againſt the reformed Divines who diſputed about the univerſality of Grace. He had an eye to Amyraldus and Spanhemius. He gave them the ſame reprimand as is uſed to audacious writers, who have the boldneſs to dive into the moſt hidden ſecrets of the Creator. He puts them in mind of the weightieſt maxims that are employed to recommend to us the ſacrificing of our reaſon, and the captivating our underſtanding to the authority of God with reſpect to the moſt incomprehenſible myſteries. His words have ſo much emphaſis, that they cannot be tranſlated without loſing a great deal of their energy. I will therefore give the original. ‘ Quis non videat quæ de Trinitate, quam ſibi ſoli notam vetus ait ſcriptor, ‘ deque decretis Dei, quorum non aliter conſtat ratio, quam ſi nemini reddatur, deque ‘ aliis ejuſmodi, quæ nec licet ſcire, nec prodeſt, anxie diſputantur, non tuto, ſed fru‘ ſtra, diſputari? Nemo cœleſte myſterium diſcutiat ratione terrena, divina verba modis ‘ non penſemus humanis, inquit Chryſologus. Credere, quod juſſum eſt, non eſt diſ‘ cutere permiſſum, ait Ambroſius. Lauda, venerare, tuum eſt neſcire, quod agitur, ‘ inquit Author de vocatione Gentium. Quæ Deus occulta eſſe voluit, non ſunt ſcru-

(45) Balzac, Socrate Chreſtien, *Diſcourſe xii, pag. m.* 320, *& ſeq.*

(46) *See, above, the article* PAULICIANS, *citations* (44), (45).

(47) *See citat.* (16), *of the article* SYNERGISTS.

(48) *Calvin's brief anſwer to the calumnies of a certain pragmatic, attemping to defame the Doctrine of God's eternal predeſtination, pag.* 2037, *of his Tracts, Geneva* 1611.

tanda; quæ manifeſta fecit, non ſunt negligenda, ne & in illis illicite curioſi, & in his damnabiliter inveniamur ingrati. Nos autem faſtidimus aperta in ſcripturis, clauſa, & obſignata, in cœlis quærimus, nunquam viſa perambulare, oculis quoque ſubducta calcare pedibus, ἐμβατεύειν, Pauli vox agnoſcitur, ſatagimus ardeliones. Quare hi ſic, illi aliter, abſit ut dicamus judicium eſſe luti, non figuli, quæ ſunt Auguſtini verba, compeſcat ſe humana temeritas, & quod non eſt, non quærat, ne id, quod eſt, non inveniat: Ὅτι ἀκατάληπτον τὸ Θεῖον Damaſcenus aliique præſcribunt. Quid æternis minorem conſiliis animum fatigas? Audi Tertullianum: Præſtat, inquit, per Deum neſcire, quia ipſe non revelaverit, quam per hominem ſcire, quia ipſe præſumſerit; cedat curioſitas fidei, cedat gloria ſaluti. Audi Scripturam: ARCANA DEO, revelata nobis, & filiis noſtris. Moſes Dei Vocem audivit; faciem non vidit; quia fide, non viſu, ambulamus, & cujus ferre Majeſtatem non poſſumus, à poſteriori, ut loquuntur, opera cum Moſe luſtramus. Deus abſconditus habitat in caligine, inquit Rex Pacificus; in luce, ſed inacceſſa, inquit cœleſtis Apoſtolus. Hic ſubvectus in tertium cœlum quæ viſere potuit, non potuit enarrare: nos humi ſerpentes adhuc enarramus velut conſcii, quæ nunquam, ne per nebulam quidem, vidimus. Non conſtat ſine arcano Majeſtas, nubes Dei gloriam obumbrat, Arca oppanſo velo tegitur: nos in horribile Dei Sacrarium emiſſitios oculos evibramus, & nondum bene initiati Epoptas agimus. Ut ad ignem, Solemque, ſic ad Deum accedamus, hactenus ut calore foveamur, non voraci flamma, non radiis æſtuantibus hauriamur (49). - - - - - - *As for thoſe diſputes relating either to the Trinity, which an ancient author ſays that no body knew except himſelf, or to the decrees of God, for which no man can preſume to render a reaſon, or other points of the like nature, which we are neither permitted nor concerned to know, is it not obvious that theſe controverſies are not only bold and dangerous, but alſo vain and unprofitable.* Let no man, *ſays Chryſologus*, examine a heavenly myſtery by earthly reaſon; neither let us weigh the word of God in the ſcale of human judgment. What we are commanded to believe, let us believe, *ſays Ambroſius*, but we are not permitted to ſift and canvaſs matters of faith. Praiſe and adore the diſpenſations of providence, it becomes you to be ignorant of the reaſons of them, *ſays the author of the book on the calling of the Gentiles. We muſt neither pry into what God hath thought fit to conceal from us, nor refuſe our aſſent to the truths he hath been pleaſed to manifeſt and reveal, leſt in the former caſe we ſhould be found ſinfully curious, and in the latter, ungrateful, even to our condemnation. Nevertheleſs, while we deſpiſe the truths revealed to us in Scripture, we pry into the ſecrets of heaven, and would there diſcover what God hath concealed, tread in paths unſeen and unknown, intrude upon, and are buſy after things the moſt remote from our knowlege and diſcernment. From hence ariſes the great diverſity of our opinions, even in matters of the higheſt importance. Let us therefore check our raſhneſs, let us not ſeek after what is hidden, leſt we ſhould miſs of what is revealed.* Divine things are to us incomprehenſible, *as Damaſcenus and others have written. Why ſhouldſt thou rack thy thoughts, and buſy thyſelf about the eternal purpoſes of God, ſince they are beyond thy reach? Hear the words of Tertullian.* It is better for us not to know what God hath concealed, becauſe he has not revealed theſe things, than to know what man hath diſcovered, becauſe he is preſumptuous; let our curioſity give place to our faith, and our vanity to our ſalvation. *Hear the words of the Scripture.* THE MYSTERIES OF GOD belong unto GOD, but the things which are revealed, to us and to our children. Moſes heard the voice of God, but did not ſee his face, becauſe we walk by faith, and not by ſight, *and of that God the glory of whoſe majeſty we are not able to bear, we behold, with Moſes, the works, only as it were in their back parts.* God being hidden dwelleth in darkneſs, *ſays Solomon*; in light, but inacceſſible, *ſays St Paul. That Holy Apoſtle was carried up to the third heavens, but what he beheld, he was not able to relate; whereas we who are reptiles on this earth, pretend to relate what we never ſaw, no not through a cloud, as if we were thoroughly acquainted with theſe ſecrets. Majeſty never appears open or expoſed to our view, a cloud overſhadows the divine glory, the ark is covered over with a large vail. Yet we pierce with prying eyes into the tremendous myſteries of God, and before we are well initiated, pretend to a thorough knowledge of them. Let us approach the divine majeſty, as we would the fire, or the ſun, that we may be nouriſhed by the heat, but not deſtroyed by the devouring flames, and ſcorching beams of his glory.*’ Very lately one of thoſe who ſucceeded Calvin in his chair, has in a moſt diſtinct manner acknowledged the incomprehenſibility of Predeſtination. I have not as yet had the pleaſure of ſeeing his new ſyſtem of Divinity; but we find this account of it in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*: ‘He begins with a queſtion extremely difficult, and which is a ſtumbling-block to the profane and the weak; namely, why God has permitted ſin, which is the cauſe of ſuch a number of evils, and which he might eaſily prevent? Mr Pictet does not conceal the ſtrength of the difficulty, but propoſes it in its full force. They who ventured to affirm that God knows not futurity, when it depends on the freewill of intelligent creatures, eaſily diſengage themſelves from this difficulty, by ſaying God has not prevented what he has not foreſeen: But this is leaping into an abyſs to avoid a precipice; and it is ſtill more difficult to conceive that God ſhould not know futurity, than it is to conceive he has not hindered ſin, though he foreſaw it. The opinion of thoſe who ſay God has permitted it to manifeſt his wiſdom, or to exerciſe his

(49) Alexander Morus, Oratione de Pace, *pag.* 53, & *ſeq. Edit. Amſterd.* 1648, *in* 12mo.

‘ his juſtice and mercy, ſeems more reaſonable. And yet all this is not ſatisfactory; for, beſides that it was not perhaps impoſſible for God to manifeſt his attributes otherwiſe, is it, for inſtance, a great ſign of mercy, to permit a great evil which might be prevented, in order to have an occaſion of remedying it? Mr Pictet ſincerely confeſſes, that as the Scripture gives us no reaſon of God's conduct on this occaſion, and ſufficiently intimates that there are here depths impoſſible for us to ſound, we ought not to attempt it (50).’

Any man who can be reaſonably offended at what I have ſaid in the articles concerning Manicheiſm, may likewiſe be juſtly offended with this Profeſſor of Geneva's doctrine, as orthodox as it is.

Let us add alſo the teſtimony of a Roman Catholic, that nothing may here be wanting. ‘ There are ſome ſhallow wits, who had rather condemn boldly what they do not underſtand in the holy Fathers of the Church, than humble themſelves, as They did, under the weight of the difficulties that are found in the explication of the myſteries of our faith. For the juſtification of a ſinner, and the ſanctification of a Chriſtian, is a myſtery, and a great one. And becauſe men do not look upon it as a myſtery, they boldly attempt to remove all its difficulties, they frame ſyſtems which bring every thing to evidence and demonſtration, if we believe the authors of them; and they imagine a *Scientia media* in God, invented at firſt by the Semi-Pelagians, and *whereof Pope Clement VIII, who well underſtood this ſubject, was wont to ſay,* as Lemos * relates, *that it was an human invention to accommodate all things in appearance.* Away with thoſe human inventions, which explain not the myſteries but by deſtroying them, and give not the mind ſatisfaction but by ſeducing it with the fallacious appearances of light and evidence. Let us receive with humility what the Scripture and tradition diſcover of them. Let us willingly be ignorant of what God will conceal from us. Let us ſtop where the Apoſtles and Doctors of the Church have ſtopped; and when we read St Auſtin, ſo far from inſulting him as a writer who goes aſtray and leads his followers to the precipice of error, let us acknowledge it is not from his expreſſions the difficulties proceed, but from the ſubject itſelf, as he anſwers Julian (51).’

THE fourth objection is, that I have uſed a moſt ſhocking compariſon.

Let us ſee whether they could be juſtly ſhocked at a certain compariſon which I have mentioned (52). I know ſeveral people have complained of it, ſome becauſe they were not uſed to controverſial books, and others becauſe they had not freſh ideas of what they had formerly read in ſuch books. Whatever be the ground of the offence they have taken, it may be eaſily removed. We need only repreſent to them that the moſt uſual method of the controverſiſts is what they call *reductio ad abſurdum*, reducing their adverſaries to an abſurdity. They chiefly endeavour to make it appear that the neceſſary conſequence of the opinion they refute, is that the conduct of God would be execrable, and they make no ſcruple of ſpeaking very ill of the God of their adverſaries, that is of God conſidered ſuch as he would be in caſe the opinion in queſtion was received. They boldly employ the moſt ſhocking compariſons. The Roman Catholics maintain that Calvin introduced *a God who is deceitful, cruel, and inhumane, a God void of juſtice, reaſon, and goodneſs* (53), leſs innocent and leſs a God, than the God of Epicurus (54). *A God who hath two wills, one public, by which he declares that he is willing to ſave all mankind, and the other ſecret, by which he drives into impiety, all thoſe whom he loves not, in order to find a pretext for puniſhing them* (55); ..... *an inhumane maſter, who commands his ſervants to do things impoſſible, and inflicts on them an eternal puniſhment, becauſe they did not perform them, as the tyrant Caligula did* (56). In fine, a God who like Caligula commands *his laws to be written in ſo ſmall a character that no body can read them* (57). The Arminian Bertius, diſputing with Piſcator, charged him with making God hold ſuch a conduct towards man, as was perfectly like that which Tiberius held towards Sejanus's daughters. He ſhewed this parallel (58) in two columns in one of which he ſet down what that Emperor did in order that Sejanus's daughters might not be ſtrangled againſt the laws. He ſet down in the other what Piſcator makes God do, in order that the Reprobate may not be puniſhed againſt the uſual forms. A reformed Divine makes uſe of a like battery againſt the Socinians. He maintains againſt them that their God *is the greateſt of all the monſters that ever entered the imagination* (59); that Plato and Zeno would have diſliked him (60); that he is a very ignorant and powerleſs God (61), full of imperfections (62), a fantome of a God defeated every moment by unforſeen events (63); a ſtrange God little better than the God of Epicurus (64), and lives from hand to mouth (65).

Such being the cuſtom of the controverſiſts, I had been a very bad Hiſtorian of the diſpute concerning the origin of evil, and an unfaithful relater of the reaſons on each ſide of the queſtion; if I had not mentioned the compariſon which has diſpleaſed certain perſons. It is that of God with a mother who forſeeing that her daughter *&c*; and obſerve that I have ſhewn that this compariſon may be retorted againſt the Socinians.

THE fifth objection is, that we ought not to own diſadvantageous truths.

If there are any who are offended at my departing from the maxim, that we ought never to own to our adverſaries that we cannot anſwer their objections; I ſhall not want a long apology, having but this ſhort queſtion to aſk them: is it not a commendable

---

(50) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *November* 1701, *pag.* 493, 494, *in the extract of the Chriſtian Theology of Mr Pictet, Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity at Geneva.*

* Inventum humanum ad accommodandum in apparentia omnia. *Lemos, Tom. i, pag. 2, Tract. 5. cap. xxxv, pag.* 289.

(51) St Auguſtin juſtifie de Calviniſme, *pag.* 179, 180. *It is a piece printed in* 1689, *with the letters of the Prince of Conti to Father de Champs.*

(52) *See, above, citat.* (50), *of the article* PAULICIANS.

(53) *See* Mr Daillé, Replique à Adam & à Cottibi, *Part. ii, chap. i, pag.* 2.

(54) *Ibid. pag.* 3.

(55) *Ibid.*

(56) *Ibid. p.* 4.

(57) *Ibid. pag.* 12.

(58) *Mr Andrew Carolus, a Lutheran Divine has inſerted this parallel, in his* Memorabilia Eccleſiaſtica Sæculi XVII, *lib. ii, pag.* 385, 386.

(59) *See the* Jugement ſur les Méthodes d'expliquer la Grace, *pag.* 10.

(60) *See the* Tableau du Socinianiſme, *Lettre i, p.* 20.

(61) *Ibid. pag.* 23.

(62) *Ibid. pag.* 25.

(63) *Ibid.*

(64) *Ibid. pag.* 27.

(65) *Ibid. pag.* 34.

able thing to act ſincerely? If we are not obliged, are we not at leaſt permitted to act thus? The anſwer muſt be in the affirmative. I may therefore, ſhall I reply, make uſe of this laudable liberty, eſpecially when there is no decree of a ſynod or conſiſtory to tie a man's hands in that reſpect. If any one can produce a doctrinal determination ſigned by four Profeſſors of Divinity, and ſealed with the ſeal of ſome univerſity, which is no great demand; if any one, I ſay, can ſhew me ſuch an act, importing that no orthodox man ought to own, not even when it is moſt true, that certain objections of the heterodox are unanſwerable otherwiſe than by Scripture, I will engage to do every thing they will have me; for I am certain I ſhall never ſee ſuch an act.

But for a more ample ſatisfaction of the moſt ſcrupulous readers, I am willing to declare here, that wherever it is ſaid in my Dictionary that ſuch and ſuch arguments are unaſwerable, I do not deſire my readers ſhould believe they are actually ſo; I mean no more than that they ſeem to me unanſwerable. This has no ill conſequence; every one may imagine, if he pleaſes, that I am of this opinion for want of due penetration. I wiſh they would add, that in conforming my ſelf to the rules of ſincerity rather than to the public maxims of the ſpirit of a party, I nevertheleſs conſider that neither Hereſy nor Heatheniſm can draw any advantage from the unanſwerableneſs of their objections againſt myſteries (66).

The fixth objection is, that I have not confuted the Manichees.

The remaining difficulty will require a little longer examination. It is founded on my relating at large the objections of the Manichees, and not taking the trouble to produce the arguments which confute them. What follows will give ſatisfaction to all reaſonable readers. Four reaſons hindered me from inſiſting on the confutation of Manicheiſm.

The firſt is, that conſidering the preſent diſpoſition of men, there is no Hereſy leſs to be feared than this. People cannot but abhor an hypotheſis which admits an eternal and increated Being diſtinct from God, an enemy to God, and eſſentially wicked. And as for Free-thinkers, or in general all thoſe who have cultivated the ſtudy of Metaphyſics, and have any inclination to make a wrong uſe of it, they diſlike nothing more than a multiplicity of principles. The depravity of their taſte inclines them rather to be perfect Unitarians (67), than to declare for the Dualiſts (68).

In the ſecond place, all Chriſtians, however ignorant they be, ſo clearly include omnipotence and infinity in the idea of the Divine Nature, that they have no need of borrowed arms to fight the Manichees. This idea alone renders them ſtrong enough in an offenſive war; it affords them a ſolid confutation of that hypotheſis: I therefore did not think it neceſſary to ſhew any of my readers how it was to be attacked.

Thirdly, the obſervation I made, and ſufficiently enlarged upon in the remark [*D*] of the article Manichees, contains all that is neceſſary to make judicious perſons averſe to the doctrine of two principles. I ſaid the reaſonableneſs of a ſyſtem conſiſts in including nothing repugnant to evident ideas, and accounting for the phænomena. I added, that the ſyſtem of the Manichees has at beſt but the advantage of explaining ſeveral phænomena, which ſtrangely perplex the followers of the unity of a principle, but otherwiſe it ſtands on a ſuppoſition repugnant to our cleareſt ideas; whereas the other ſyſtem is built upon thoſe very notions. By this reflexion alone I give the ſuperiority to the Unitarians, and I take it from the Dualiſts. For all rational perſons will grant that a ſyſtem is much more imperfect, when it wants the firſt of the two qualities I have mentioned, than when it wants only the ſecond. If it be grounded upon an abſurd, confuſed, improbable ſuppoſition, this imperfection is not made up by a lucky explication of the phænomena; but if it does not explain them all ſucceſsfully, this is made up by the clearneſs, probability, and conformity, that is found in it with the laws and ideas of order; and they who have embraced it for this perfection, do not uſe to be diſcouraged under pretence that they cannot account for all matters of experience. They impute this defect to the narrowneſs of their minds, and imagine that in time, they ſhall be able to diſcover the true means of reſolving the difficulties (69). A Carteſian Philoſopher finding himſelf preſſed with an objection concerning the reaſon given by Des Cartes of the ebbing and flowing of the ſea, anſwered among other things, that an opinion ought not to be lightly abandoned, *eſpecially when it is well grounded in other reſpects. It was objected to Copernicus, when he propoſed his ſyſtem, that Mars and Venus ſhould appear much greater at a certain time, becauſe they came nearer the earth by ſeveral diameters. The conſequence was neceſſary; and yet nothing of this appeared. Though he knew not what to anſwer, he did not think himſelf obliged to forſake it, but only ſaid that time would diſcover it, and that perhaps it was by reaſon of the great diſtance. This anſwer was taken for an evaſion, aud there ſeemed to be ſome reaſon for it: But the teleſcopes having been ſince invented, it appeared that what was oppoſed to him as a great objection, is the confirmation of his ſyſtem, and the overthrow of Ptolomy's* (70).

Obſerve here by the by, a remarkable example of what I have ſaid concerning the perfection of a ſyſtem: that of Copernicus is ſo diſentangled, ſo ſimple, and ſo mechanical, that it ſhould be preferred before Ptolomy's, though it could not ſo well reſolve ſome phænomena.

---

(66) *See what I anſwer to the firſt objection.*

(67) *Thus for brevity ſake we may call thoſe who with the Spinoziſts acknowledge but one ſubſtance in the univerſe: but note, that below I give that name to thoſe who acknowledge but one firſt cauſe of all things.*

(68) *Thus the Perſians call the followers of two principles. See citat.* (77), *of the article* Zoroaster.

(69) *Compare the article* Zeno (of Elea) *citat.* (61).

(70) Gadroys, Lettre à Mr de la Grange-Trianon, pour ſervir de Reſponſe à celle que Mr Caſtelet à écrite, *pag.* 13, 14. *That letter was publiſhed at Paris in* 1677.

Laſtly, my fourth reaſon is, that I pointed out ſo good and ſo certain a remedy, that it would have been needleſs to uſe any other expedient to compenſate the diſadvantage. The ſyſtem of the Dualiſts accounts much better for ſeveral matters of fact than that of the Unitarians; but, on the other hand, it contains monſtrous abſurdities directly repugnant to the ideas of order. The Unitarian ſyſtem has the perfection oppoſite to this defect, and therefore, all things duly conſidered, is preferable to the other. This might in ſome meaſure have been ſufficient, but I further obſerved that the Unitarian ſyſtem was conſonant to ſcripture, and that of the Dualiſts invincibly confuted by the word of God. Can any one deſire a ſtronger and more demonſtrative proof, that the former ſyſtem is true, and the latter falſe? Muſt I after this, in order to remove all ſcruples, philoſophically confute Manicheiſm! Would not he have little faith, who ſhould want ſuch a diſcuſſion? God ſpeaks, and does not this fully convince you? Would you have other ſecurities? Would you have his teſtimony ratified by human reaſon (71)? Is not this unworthy of a man of common ſenſe? Do you fear the objections of the Manichees, when you have the authority of Revelation againſt them?

Why do you not ſay with the Scripture, *If God is with us, who ſhall be againſt us* (72)? If your reaſon cannot anſwer the difficulties which they raiſe againſt you concerning the origin of evil, and the decrees of Reprobation, anſwer them as the leſſer Catechiſm of the Reformed Churches anſwers this queſtion concerning the Trinity, *How is this poſſible? It is a myſtery above our reaſon, and nevertheleſs very certain*; FOR GOD HATH DECLARED IT TO US IN HIS WORD (73). Every Philoſophic ſubtilty, that tends to deprive us of a divine truth, ought to paſs with you for one of thoſe attacks which St Paul would have us repel by taking *the buckler of faith* (74). Take it therefore, and you will be pretty well armed; remember likewiſe that by fearing leſt this ſhould prove but a weak defence you expoſe yourſelf to the raillery which fell upon a Cardinal who pitied the Popes, when they had no other aſſiſtance but that of the Holy Ghoſt (75). ‘Non ho potuto d'hora in hora non compaſſionare i Pontefici con venti fra loro contrarii e tutti infeſti al corſo di lei eccetta l'aura dello Spirito Sancto (76). - - - *I could not help frequently pitying the ſad caſe the Popes were in, when the courſe they ſteered was oppoſed by every wind except that of the Holy Ghoſt.*’

But let us have ſome regard to the men of little faith, and propoſe in this place ſome arguments againſt Manicheiſm.

SOME arguments againſt Manicheiſm.

I will not attack it on its weak ſide; that is, I will not take advantage of the palpable abſurdities the Manichees ran into when they came to particular explications of their doctrine. They are ſo wretched, that it would be a ſufficient confutation of them, barely to relate them. We have ſeen a ſpecimen of it above (77). Let us ſpare them as to the ridiculous part of their ſyſtem, and only conſider it in the greateſt ſimplicity it can be reduced to.

I will not make uſe of this objection of Simplicius (78): the principle of good and the principle of evil would be contrary; but they could not be contrary without being under the ſame genus; therefore there would be ſomething above them, and that thing would be but one, and have all the eſſence of a principle: that thing therefore would be properly a principle, and conſequently there would not be two firſt principles; and thus the ſuppoſition of two contrary principles implies a contradiction. This is more ſubtle than ſolid; for genus's and ſpecies exiſt only in our underſtanding; and therefore the genus including the two contrary principles, would be at moſt but an idea of our mind, as the general idea of Being, which, according to ſome Chriſtian Philoſophers, is univocal to God and the creatures (79).

Simplicius's other arguments are much more ſolid (80). He ſhews to thoſe who admit two principles, one good, and the other evil, that their opinion is highly injurious to the God whom they call good; that it takes from him at leaſt half his power, and makes him timorous, unjuſt, imprudent, and ignorant. The fear, ſaid they, he was under of an irruption from his enemy, obliged him to forſake part of the ſouls, in order to ſave the reſt. Theſe ſouls were portions and members of his ſubſtance, and had committed no ſin. Simplicius concludes from thence, that ſuch a treatment was unjuſt, eſpecially ſince they were to be tormented, and in caſe they contracted any guilt, they were to remain eternally in the power of evil. So that the good principle not knowing how to manage his intereſt, expoſed himſelf to an eternal and irreparable mutilation. Add to this, that his fears were ill-grounded; for ſince the dominions of evil were from all eternity, and by their own nature, ſeparate from the dominions of good, there was no reaſon to fear that evil ſhould make an inroad upon the territories of its enemy. Simplicius taxes his adverſaries with giving leſs foreſight and power to the good principle than to the evil. The good principle did not foreſee the misfortune of the detachments he expoſed to the enemy's aſſaults (81), but the evil principle had very well known what detachments would be made againſt him, and had prepared the neceſſary engines to defeat them. The good principle was ſimple enough to ſuffer a mutilation, rather than receive into his diſtricts the detachments of the enemy, who by that means would have loſt part of his members. The evil principle had always been ſuperior (82);

had

---

(71) *See remark* [*L*], *of the article* PERROT (Nicolas).

(72) *Romans* viii, 31.

(73) Petit Catechiſme, §. *ii*.

(74) *Epheſ. vi*, 16.

(75) *If the Popes, who have none but God with them, are pitied by Cardinal Palavicini a Jeſuit, and appear to be in the ſame pitiful condition to other men, how could they convert the Mohametans? They muſt therefore have ſome other aſſiſtance, beſides that of the Holy Ghoſt, in order to bring about ſuch converſions, and truly a Pope, who had no other aſſiſtance, would be in a very pitiful caſe.* Evang. nouveau du Cardinal Palavicin, *ch. iv, Art. i, pag.* 142, *Dutch Edit.*

(76) Pallav. Iſtor. del Concilio di Trento, *lib. v, cap. xiii, I tranſcribe theſe words as I find them in the* Evangile nouveau, *chap. iv, Art. i, pag.* 142.

(77) *In the remark* [*B*], *of the article* MANICHEES, *and in the remark* [*F*], *of the article* ZOROASTER. *See alſo the remark* [*E*], *of this laſt article.*

(78) Simplic. in Epicteti Enchir. *cap. xxxiv, pag.* 163. *Edit. Lugd. Bat.* 1640.

(79) *See the article* ARNAULD (Anthony) *Dr of the Sorbonne, remark* [*B*].

(80) Id. ibid. *pag.* 165.

(81) Id. ibid. *pag.* 166.

(82) *Note, that it appears from this that they acknowledged that evil exceeds good in this world.*

had loſt nothing, and preſerved the conqueſts which he had made; but the good principle voluntarily had given up many things out of fear, injuſtice, and imprudence. The author concludes, that by refuſing to acknowledge that God is the author of evil, they make him evil all manner of ways. Τὸ δὲ ἀγαθὸν, ὡς οὗτοι φασὶν, ἑκουσίως ἑαυτὸ τῷ κακῷ συνέμιξε, καὶ δειλῶς καὶ ἀδίκως καὶ ἀνοήτως κατ' αὐτοὺς, μέχρι νῦν διεγένετο. ὥστε φεύγοντες αἴτιον αὐτὸν τοῦ κακοῦ εἰπεῖν, πάγκακον ὑπογράφουσι· καὶ κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν φεύγοντες τὸν καπνὸν, εἰς πῦρ ἐμπεπτώκασι. *Cum BONUM ultro ſeſe cum MALO commiſcuerit, ſeque & timidè, & injuſtè, & amenter (ſi illis credimus) geſſerit. Itaque dum mali cauſam dicere Deum recuſant, ab omni parte malum deſcribunt: & ut proverbio dicitur, fumum fugientes in ignem inciderunt* (83).

I omit ſeveral other obſervations of Simplicius, againſt the hypotheſis of two principles, becauſe they attack thoſe parts of it, which were weak only through the particular defects in the arbitrary explications of thoſe who defended it. There is ſomething of this in his objections which I have abridged; but I will produce one that ſtrikes home the doctrine of two principles, though it be conſidered with the greateſt ſimplicity.

He ſays (84), it entirely deſtroys the liberty of our ſouls, and neceſſitates them to ſin, and conſequently implies a contradiction; for ſince the principle of evil is eternal and incorruptible, and ſo potent that God himſelf cannot conquer it, it follows that the ſoul of man cannot reſiſt the impulſe with which that principle moves it to ſin. But if a man be invincibly driven to it, he commits no murder, no adultery, *&c.* by his fault, but by a ſuperior external force, and in that caſe he is neither guilty nor puniſhable. Therefore there is no ſuch thing as ſin, and conſequently this hypotheſis deſtroys itſelf, ſince, if there be a principle of evil, there is no longer any evil in the world: but if there be no evil in the world, it is evident there is no principle of evil; whence we may infer, that they who ſuppoſe ſuch a principle, deſtroy, by a neceſſary conſequence, both evil and the principle of evil. Εἰ οὖν τούτων ὡς κακῶν ὄντων τὴν αἰτίαν ζητοῦντες, ἀρχὴν ὑπέθεντο κακοῦ· ἐκείνης δὲ ὑποστεθείσης καὶ βιαζομένης οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν ἔτι κακόν· χαριέντως αὐτοῖς ὁ λόγος περιτέτραπται. συνάγεται γὰρ, ὅτι εἰ ἔστιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ, οὐκ ἔστι κακὸν ὅλως· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔστι κακὸν, οὐδὲ ἀρχὴ ἂν εἴη τοῦ κακοῦ, ὥστε εἰ ἔστιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ, ὥς φασιν, οὔτε κακὸν ἔσται, οὔτε ἀρχὴ τοῦ κακοῦ. *Quod ſi talium facinorum ut malorum cauſam inquirentes, MALI principium ſtatuerunt; eoque ſtatuto, & quidem vim inferente, malum nullum relinquitur: feſtivè ſuo ipſi (quod ajunt) gladio jugulantur. Nam inde colligitur: ſi MALI principium ſit, nullum omnino eſſe malum. Si vero malum non eſt, ne principium quidem MALI eſſe. Itaque ſi eſt principium mali ut ajunt, nec malum erit nec mali principium* (85).

This objection is no leſs ſolid than ſubtle. It may be ſtrengthened by that which I have propoſed in another place (86), *viz.* That the doctrine of the Manichees is deſtructive of all religions, ſince if they argue conſequentially, they can hope for nothing from their prayers, nor fear any thing from their impiety. They muſt be perſuaded, that whatever they do, the good principle will be always propitious to them, and the evil one always adverſe: one of them can do nothing but good, and the other can do nothing but evil. They are determined to this by their nature, and they purſue this bent to the utmoſt extent of their power.

The argument I am going to make ſeems to me very ſtrong. The beſt way we can take in Philoſophical diſcuſſions, is to conſult the ideas of order. If we conſult them in the preſent diſpute, we ſhall plainly ſee that unity, and infinite power, and happineſs, belong to the maker of the world. The neceſſity of nature required that there ſhould be cauſes of all effects; and therefore a power ſufficient for the production of the world muſt have neceſſarily exiſted. Now it is much more conſonant to order, that this power ſhould be united in one ſubject, than divided into two or three, or an hundred thouſand. Let us therefore conclude, that it has not been divided, and that it reſides entire in one ſole nature, and that therefore there are not two firſt principles, but one only. There would be as much reaſon to admit an infinity of them, as the Atomiſts did, as to admit only two.

If it be contrary to order, that the power of nature ſhould be divided into two ſubjects, generally ſpeaking; it would be much more ſtrange, if thoſe two ſubjects were enemies, and diametrically oppoſite: Nothing but all manner of confuſion would ariſe from it: What one would do, the other would undo; and ſo either nothing would be done, or if any thing was done, it would be an odd and diſorderly work, and very far from the regularity of this univerſe. Thus you ſee Manicheiſm refuted by a very ſtrong argument. If the Manichees had admitted two principles acting in concert in all things, they had been expoſed to leſſer difficulties.

Such a ſyſtem would have neverthelеſs been contrary to the idea of order, with reſpect to the maxim, that beings ought not to be multiplied without neceſſity (87); for if there are two firſt principles, either they have each all the power neceſſary to the production of the univerſe, or they have it not. If they have, one of them is ſuperfluous: If they have not, that power was vainly divided, and it had been better to unite it in one ſubject; it would have been more active, *virtus unita fortius agit* ſay they in the Peripatetic ſchools. Beſides, it is not eaſy to conceive how a cauſe that is ſelf-exiſting, can have but a portion of power. Who could have confined that

---

(83) Id. ibid. *pag.* 168.

(84) Id. ibid. *pag.* 169.

(85) Id. ibid.

(86) *In the remark* [*G*], *of the article* PAULICIANS, *at the end.*

(87) Non ſunt multiplicanda entia ſine neceſſitate.

that to ſuch or ſuch a portion? It depends upon nothing, but ſtands upon its own bottom.

Rabbi Maimonides ſeems to me too nice, when he rejects the five proofs of the unity of God, made uſe of by the Philoſophers of the ſect of the Speakers, and when he praiſes one of theſe Philoſophers, who finding himſelf perplexed by the weakneſs of thoſe proofs, ſaid, that the unity of God was not known or could not be proved, but by Revelation ſupported by Tradition. ‘Hæc argumentorum iſtorum debilitas ſic defatigavit & exercuit nonnullos, ut quidam illorum dixerit, Unitatem Dei haberi ex lege per Cabbalam; ſed à reliquis ludibrio tantùm fuit habitus & non niſi ſannis exceptus. Mihi autem videtur, Virum illum fuiſſe ſani admodùm ingenii ac judicii. Nam cum nihil ſolidum & demonſtrativum in ipſorum rationibus vidiſſet, in quo animus ipſius acquieſcere potuiſſet, dixit, per Cabbalam ſive Traditionem hoc haberi ex lege (88). - - - - - - - *The weakneſs of theſe arguments in proof of the unity of God, ſo much perplexed certain Philoſophers, that one of them ſaid that it could only be proved by Revelation ſupported by Tradition. But this Philoſopher was laughed at, and his opinion deſpiſed by the others. Nevertheleſs he ſeems to me to be a man of good underſtanding and ſound judgment. For he found nothing ſolid and demonſtrative in their arguments, nothing wherein his mind could acquieſce, and therefore aſſerted that the unity of God was known no otherwiſe than by Revelation ſupported by Tradition.*’ The fourth of thoſe five arguments was this: either one God was ſufficient for the production of the world, or was not. If one ſufficed, another God would have been needleſs; and if he wanted the aſſiſtance of another God, each of them wanted the neceſſary power; but there can lie no imperfection in the Deity. Maimonides anſwers, that though one God alone had not been able to frame the ſtructure of this world, there would be no juſt reaſon to call him impotent, or inſufficient, ſince none ought to be called ſo becauſe he cannot do what exceeds his nature. It is no impotency in God not to be able give himſelf a body, or to make a ſquare whoſe ſide ſhould be equal to the diagonal line. This hinders not God from being omnipotent; the natural impoſſibility of ſome things does no prejudice to the omnipotence of God. If therefore it be aſſerted that it is naturally impoſſible for one only God to create the world, the want of two Deities to create it will be no ſign of imperfection or defect in either of them. *Sicut non eſt attribuenda Deo Impotentia, quia non poteſt ſeipſum corporeum facere, vel alium ſibi ſimilem creare, aut quia nequit creare quadratum, cujus latus æquale ſit diametro: ſic illi, qui duos Deos ſtatuunt, poſſunt dicere, non eſſe illis Omnipotentiam derogandam ideò, quia nullus illorum ſolus creat; eò quòd neceſſitas exiſtentiæ ipſorum requirat, ut ſint duo. Hoc verò non eſſe ex indigentia, quaſi unus alterius ope indigeret, ſed ex neceſſitate, contrariumque eſſe impoſſibile. Et ſicut non ideò dici poteſt, Deum non eſſe omnipotentem, nulloque modo Indigentiæ, Impotentiæ, vel Inſufficientiæ titulo appellandum, quòd non poſſit exiſtere facere corpus aliquod, niſi creet Subſtantias individuas, illaſque per Accidentia, quæ itidem creat, conjungat, ut illi* Loquentes *aſſerunt; quia ſcilicet, ut aliter fiat, eſt impoſſibile. Sic, qui duos Deos ſtatuit, dicere poteſt, impoſſibile eſſe, ut unus ſolus faciat omnia, nec tamen Imperfectioni ipſius hoc adſcribendum eſſe, quia illa talis ſit, ut duo ſimul & unà ſint & operentur (89).*

It might be ſhewn that theſe are meer cavils; but to avoid too long diſcuſſions, I am contented to ſay that the Manichees cannot uſe this ſubterfuge; for if any power ought to be eſſentially contained in the nature of God, it is that of doing what he moſt earneſtly deſires. The idea of God includes no attribute more clearly and evidently than that of happineſs *(90)*. If therefore any want of power is capable of making God unhappy, we muſt ſay that it is eſſential to the nature of God to be without this want; but he muſt neceſſarily be ſubject to it, if the opinion of the Manichees was true: therefore their ſyſtem is utterly falſe.

Such is the nature, ſay they, of the good principle, that he can produce nothing but good, and with his whole might he oppoſes the introduction of evil. He wills therefore, and moſt ardently deſires, that there be no evil: It is therefore a great ſorrow to him that there is evil in the univerſe. He has done all that he could to prevent this diſorder; if therefore he wanted a neceſſary power to prevent it, his moſt earneſt deſires have been in vain, and conſequently he is deſtitute of the power which was the moſt neceſſary to his happineſs; therefore he has not the power which is the moſt neceſſary to the nature of his being. But can any thing be more abſurd than this? Is not this an hypotheſis which implies a contradiction?

The two principles of the Manichees would be the moſt unhappy of all beings; for the good principle could not caſt his eyes upon the world, but he would ſee a dreadful multitude of all kinds of evils: nor could the evil principle view it without ſeeing a great deal of good. The ſight of evil would afflict the one, and the ſight of good the other. This would not be a ſight interrupted ſometimes, but continual, and without the leaſt intermiſſion. The moſt unfortunate men have not ſo ſevere a fate; they ſucceſſively paſs from ſorrow to joy, and at laſt death ſecures them from the miſeries of this life. But the two principles of the Manichees are eternal, they can ſee no end or interruption of thoſe unpleaſant objects, which diſturb them to the higheſt degree.

---

(88) Maimonides, in More Nevochim, *Part. i, cap. lxxv, pag. m.* 175.

(89) Id. ibid.

(90) *See the article* SPINOZA, *remark* [*N*], *numb. v.*

All that the Manichees could ſuppoſe, concerning the firſt introduction of evil, and its firſt combination with good in the heart of man, was liable to a thouſand difficulties. Their own weapons turned againſt them: they could not bear the Hypotheſis, that evil proceeded from the ill uſe of free-will. God, ſaid they, who is infinitely good, would not have ſuffered his creatures to degenerate from their original goodneſs; and yet they did not own them to be incorruptible in a moral ſenſe. We have ſeen that Simplicius objected to them, that the ſouls the ill principle had ſeized on, and which were portions of the good principle, became evil, and lived eternally in corruption and miſery, under the empire of the conqueror. But here follows ſomething worſe. We know by experience, that the ſame numerical ſoul ſins and does good actions. When a man repents and implores the mercy of God, and makes amends for his ill life by alms, *&c.* this is not done by two ſubſtances, but by one and the ſame ſubject; we know it by our inward conſciouſneſs (91), and reaſon will have it ſo: for why ſhould a man afflict himſelf for, and repent of, a fault which he had not committed? I aſk the Manichees, whether the ſoul which does a good action, was created by the good principle or by the evil? If it was created by the evil principle, it follows that good may ariſe from the fountain of all evil: If it was created by the good principle, it follows that evil may ariſe from the fountain of all good (92), becauſe the ſame ſoul, on other occaſions, commits crimes. Thus you ſee yourſelves reduced to overthrow your own reaſonings, or to maintain againſt the internal and evident ſenſe of every man, that the ſoul which does a good action, is not the ſame which does a bad one.

To extricate themſelves from this difficulty it would be neceſſary for them to ſuppoſe three firſt principles; one eſſentially good, and the cauſe of all good; another eſſentially evil, and the cauſe of all evil; and a third eſſentially ſuſceptible of good and evil, and merely paſſive. Then they ſhould ſay; that the human ſoul is made up of this third principle, and does ſometimes a good action and ſometimes a bad one, according to the influence it receives from the good and evil principle.

The concluſion of this explanation.

They who will attentively conſider what I have alledged in this explanation, will, I preſume, be no longer offended with what I ſaid in the article PAULICIANS, *&c*; they will ſee that this article and thoſe wherein the ſame matter is treated, may be read without ſcandal, and even with edification, provided they well remember,

I. That it is the property of the myſteries of the goſpel, to be liable to objections which cannot be cleared by natural light.

II. That the unbelievers cannot juſtly draw any advantage from this, *viz.* That the maxims of Philoſophy do not afford ſolutions to the difficulties which they raiſe againſt the myſteries of the goſpel.

III. That the objections of the Manichees, concerning the origin of evil and Predeſtination, ought not to be conſidered in general as impugning Predeſtination, but with this particular regard, that the origin of evil, the decrees of God concerning it, and the reſt, are one of the moſt inconceivable myſteries of Chriſtianity.

IV. That it ought to ſatisfy every good Chriſtian, that his faith is founded on the teſtimony of the word of God.

V. That the ſyſtem of the Manichees conſidered in it ſelf is abſurd and indefenſible, and contrary to the ideas of order; that it is liable to retortions, and cannot remove difficulties.

VI. That in all events no body can be offended at my conceſſions, unleſs he looks upon the doctrine of the moſt orthodox Divines as ſcandalous, ſince all that I have ſaid is a natural and unavoidable conſequence of their doctrine; and I have only related more at large what they teach more compendiouſly.

Some perhaps will think my confutation of Manicheiſm imperfect, becauſe I anſwer not the objections I have ſet forth, as coming from the Manichees. I deſire thoſe who may ſtart this objection to remember, that as for evident anſwers drawn from natural light, I know none; and as for the anſwers which the Scripture affords, they may be found in a great many controverſial books.

They who aſk of what uſe are the diſcuſſions that have offended them, will ſee my anſwer in the third explanation.

(91) *See the article* RORARIUS, *remark* [*K*], *towards the beginning.*

(92) *That is, by the ill uſe of free-will beſtowed upon men by the good principle.*

EXPLANATION III.

That what has been ſaid of Scepticiſm in this Dictionary, cannot prejudice religion.

I. FIRST I lay down, as the baſis of this third explanation, this certain and undoubted maxim: *That Chriſtianity is of a ſupernatural order, and centres in the ſupreme authority of God propoſing myſteries to us, not that we may comprehend them, but that we may believe them with all the humility that is due to the infinite being, who can neither deceive nor be deceived.* This is the teſt, the polar ſtar, of all the diſcuſſions and diſputes concerning the articles of the religion, which God has revealed by Jeſus Chriſt.

Hence neceſſarily reſults the incompetency of the tribunal of Philoſophy to judge of controverſies among the Chriſtians, ſince they ought only to be carried to the tribunal of Revelation.

Any diſpute concerning the matter of right, or the reaſonableneſs of the thing, ought immediately to be rejected. No man ought to be admitted to examine, whether we ought to believe what God commands to be believed. It ought to be reckoned a firſt principle in point of religion. It is the part of the Metaphyſicians to examine, whether there be a God, and whether he be infallible (1); but Chriſtians, as Chriſtians, ought to ſuppoſe it as a thing already determined.

The queſtion then is only about a matter of fact; *viz.* Whether God requires our belief of this or that thing? Two ſorts of people may doubt of it; they who do not believe the ſcripture to be of divine inſpiration, and they who do not think the ſenſe of the Revelation to be ſuch as is put upon it by this or that ſect.

The only diſpute therefore that Chriſtians can enter upon with Philoſophers, is on this matter of fact; Whether the Scripture was written by inſpired authors? If the arguments the Chriſtians alledge on this ſubject, do not convince the Philoſophers, they ought to break off the diſpute; for it would be to no purpoſe to enter into the particular diſcuſſion of the Trinity, *&c.* with people who diſown the divine inſpiration of the Scriptures, the ſole and only way to judge who is in the right, or wrong in ſuch controverſies. Revealed authority ought to be the common principle of diſputants hereupon, and therefore there is no diſputing when one denies this principle, and the other admits of it. *Adverſus negantem principia non eſt diſputandum.*

If they who deny it, perſiſt to clamour and diſpute, they ought to be coldly anſwered, you depart from the queſtion, *Non feritis theſim, non probatis negatum*; and if they laugh at this anſwer, their laughing ought to be deſpiſed and pitied.

The character of the Sceptics.

II. But of all the Philoſophers who ought not to be allowed to diſpute concerning the myſteries of Chriſtianity, before they have admitted Revelation for a rule, there are none ſo unworthy of being heard as the followers of Pyrrho; for they make profeſſion of admitting no certain marks of diſtinction between truth and falſhood; ſo that if truth, by chance, appeared to them, they could never be ſure that it was truth. They not only attack the teſtimony of the ſenſes, the maxims of Morality, the rules of Logic, the axioms of Metaphyſics, but endeavour to overthrow the demonſtrations of Geometry, and the moſt evident principles of the Mathematicians. If they went no farther than the ten reaſons for ſuſpending our aſſent, and only uſed them againſt Natural Philoſophy, we might ſtill treat with them; but they will go much farther: they have a ſort of arms they call the *diallel* (2), which they lay hold of on the firſt occaſion; and afterwards there is no withſtanding them in any ſubject whatever. It is a labyrinth, from which no clue of Ariadne can wind one out. They loſe themſelves in their own ſubtilties, and are wonderfully pleaſed with it, ſince this ſerves to ſhew more clearly the univerſality of their hypotheſis, that every thing is uncertain, from which they except not even the arguments againſt uncertainty. They proceed ſo far in their method, that they who have well conſidered the conſequences of it, are forced to ſay, that they know not whether any thing exiſts (3).

Divines ought not to be aſhamed to confeſs, that they cannot enter the liſts with ſuch diſputants, and that they will not expoſe the goſpel-truths to ſuch an encounter. The veſſel of JESUS CHRIST is not made to float upon that tempeſtuous ſea, but to ride ſecure from this tempeſt in the haven of faith. It has pleaſed the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, muſt Chriſtians ſay, to lead us by the way of faith, and not of ſcience, or diſputation. They are our inſtructors and directors, we cannot err having ſuch guides, and reaſon itſelf commands us to prefer them before its own direction.

But is it not a ſcandalous thing, will ſome ſay, that I have related the converſation of an Abbot, who owns that Scepticiſm finds ſeveral arguments in the doctrines of Chriſtianity, which render it more formidable than it was? I anſwer, that this can offend none but ſuch as have not examined the character of Chriſtianity. It would be a falſe notion

(1) *See remark* [*L*], *of the ſecond article* MALDONAT.

(2) *See* Sextus Empiricus, Pyrrhon. Hypotyp. *lib. i, cap. xv; & lib. ii, cap. iv.*

(3) *See what* Sextus Empiricus, adv. Math. *lib. vii, relates of* Gorgias Leontinus, *and remark* [*E*], *of the article* ZENO *of* Elea.

notion to imagine, that JESUS CHRIST had any deſign to countenance, either directly or indirectly, ſome of the ſects of Philoſophers in the diſputes they had againſt the reſt. His deſign was rather to confound all Philoſophy, and to ſhew the vanity of it. He was willing that his goſpel ſhould claſh not only with the religion of the Heathens, but with the aphoriſms of their wiſdom; and that notwithſtanding this oppoſition betwixt his principles and thoſe of the world, his doctrine ſhould triumph over the Gentiles, by the miniſtry of a few illiterate men, who had neither Eloquence nor Logic, nor any of the inſtruments neceſſary to all other revolutions. He would have his diſciples, and the wiſe men of this world, to be ſo diametrically oppoſite, that they ſhould mutually call one another fools: he deſigned, that as his goſpel appeared folly to the Philoſophers, their ſcience ſhould in its turn appear folly to the Chriſtians. Conſider well theſe words of St Paul: ‘ For Chriſt ſent me not to baptize, but to preach * the goſpel: not with wiſdom of words, leſt the croſs of Chriſt ſhould be made of none ‘ effect. For the preaching of the croſs is to them that periſh, fooliſhneſs: but unto us ‘ which are ſaved, it is the power † of God. For it is written +, I will deſtroy the ‘ wiſdom of the wiſe, and will bring to nothing the underſtanding of the prudent ‡. ‘ Where *is* the wiſe? Where *is* the ſcribe? Where *is* the diſputer of this world? Hath ‘ not God made fooliſh the wiſdom of this world? For after that, in the wiſdom of ‘ God, the world by wiſdom knew not God, it pleaſed God by the fooliſhneſs of ‘ preaching to ſave them that believe. For the Jews require a ſign, and the Greeks ‘ ſeek after wiſdom: but we preach Chriſt crucified, unto the Jews a ſtumbling-block, ‘ and unto the Greeks, fooliſhneſs; but unto them which are called, both Jews and ‘ Greeks, Chriſt, the power of God, and the wiſdom of God. Becauſe the fooliſhneſs ‘ of God is wiſer than men; and the weakneſs of God is ſtronger than men. For ye ſee ‘ your calling, brethren, how that not many wiſe men after the fleſh, not many mighty, ‘ not many noble *are called*. But God hath choſen the fooliſh things of the world, to ‘ confound the wiſe; and God hath choſen the weak things of the world, to confound ‘ the things which are mighty; and baſe things of the world, and things which are ‘ deſpiſed, hath God choſen, *yea*, and things which are not, to bring to nought things ‘ that are: that no fleſh ſhould glory in his preſence. But of him are ye in Chriſt Jeſus, ‘ who of God is made unto us ** wiſdom, and righteouſneſs, and ſanctification, and ‘ redemption: that, according as it is written ††, He that glorieth, let him glory in ‘ the Lord (4). And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of ‘ ſpeech, or of wiſdom, declaring unto you the teſtimony of God ++. For I determined not to know any thing among you, ſave Jeſus Chriſt, and him crucified. ‘ And I was with you ‡‡ in weakneſs, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my ‘ ſpeech, and my preaching *was* not with enticing words of mans wiſdom, but in demonſtration of the Spirit *, and of power: that your faith ſhould not ſtand in the ‘ wiſdom of men, but in the power of God. Howbeit we ſpeak wiſdom among them ‘ that are perfect: yet not the wiſdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, ‘ that come to nought. But we ſpeak the wiſdom of God in a myſtery, *even* the hidden ‘ *wiſdom* which God ordained before the world unto our glory. Which none of the ‘ princes of this world knew: for had they known *it*, they would not have crucified ‘ the Lord of glory. But as it is written †; Eye hath not ſeen, nor ear heard, ‘ neither have entred into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for ‘ them that love him. But God hath revealed *them* unto us by his Spirit: for the ‘ Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the ‘ things of man, ſave the Spirit of man which is in him? Even ſo the things of God ‘ knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the Spirit of ‘ the world, but the Spirit which is of God? that we might know the things that are ‘ freely given to us of God. Which things alſo we ſpeak, not in the words which ‘ mans wiſdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghoſt teacheth +; comparing ſpiritual ‘ things with ſpiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of ‘ God: for they are fooliſhneſs unto him; neither can he know *them*, becauſe they are ‘ ſpiritually diſcerned (5).’

III. Do you think, that if the Apoſtles had been told that their doctrine expoſed the dogmatizing Philoſophers to new attacks from the Sceptics, they would have been concerned at it? They would have ſaid, Let us not trouble our ſelves with their diſputes; *Let the dead bury the dead*; the more they contend and diſable one another, the more they will diſcover the vanity of their pretended ſcience. Neither the Dogmatiſts nor the Sceptics will ever be able to enter into the kingdom of God, unleſs they become little children, unleſs they change their maxims, renounce their wiſdom, and make a burnt-offering of their vain ſyſtems at the foot of the croſs to the pretended folly of our preaching. This is the old man they muſt chiefly put off, before they can be qualified to receive the heavenly gift, and to enter into the way of faith appointed by God for eternal Salvation. If the Sceptics make an ill uſe of our myſteries to root themſelves deeper in uncertainty, and if they object againſt us arguments *ad hominem*, ſo much the worſe for them, unleſs God make uſe of their errors to make them ſee the neceſſity of ſubmitting to his word. This is what St Paul and his fellow Apoſtles would have anſwered to ſuch objections. We ought to be fully perſuaded, that if there had

2 been

* 2 *Pet. i.* 16. *infr. ii.* 1, 4, 13.

† *Rom. i,* 16.

+ *Iſa. xxix.* 14.

‡ *Iſa. xxxiii.* 18.

** *Jer. xxiii,* 5.

†† *Jer. ix,* 23, 24. 2 *Cor. x.* 17.

(4) 1 *Cor. i.* 17, & *ſeq.*

++ *Sap.* 1. 17.

‡‡ *Act. xviii.* 1.

* 2 *Pet. i.* 16.

† *Iſa. lxiv.* 4.

+ *Sap.* 1. 17. 2. 1. 4. 2 *Pet. i,* 16.

(5) 1 *Cor. ii.* 1, & *ſeq.*

been occaſion to give their deciſion upon the nature of the Heathen Philoſophy with reſpect to the difficulty or readineſs of embracing the goſpel; they would have poſitively determined, that the method, principles, practices, and diſputes of the Peripatetics, Academics, *&c.* were ſo great an obſtacle to faith, that the moſt neceſſary preliminaries to enter into the kingdom of God, were to forget or lay aſide all this train of a falſe ſcience (6). I believe they would have made ſuch a determination both for the preſent and the time to come.

I have cited an author who ſeems to believe that the ſubtilties of the ſchools of Philoſophy, may upon favourable occaſions ſerve to propagate the true faith. *It may be,* ſays he (7), *that theſe ſubtile doctors were neceſſary to the world; I mean the curious, diſputing, and contradicting world. Perhaps they entred into the deſign of the providence of God, for the accompliſhment of his Son's kingdom; for the laſt perfection of the œconomy of his Church. You know that the Son of God ſent ſeveral Apoſtles to ſeveral nations; you know that all the miſſions he ordained, were not made at the ſame time, and by the twelve firſt Apoſtles. He never wanted, and will never want ſuch Ambaſſadors. He has always meſſengers ready to receive his orders, to execute his commands, to ſet out for his ſervice. We ought not to doubt that he has more than one St Peter, and St Paul. He has alſo more than one St Thomas. How do we know but that he has ſent the St Thomas of the latter times to the ſucceſſors of Ariſtotle, to treat them according to their own humour, and to convert them in their way, in order to gain them by their own ſyllogiſms and Logic? How do we know but St Thomas of the ſchools has been choſen to be the Apoſtle of the Peripatetic nation, which was not yet well conquered and ſubdued? a preſumptuous and mutinous nation, which has ſo little regard to authority, which goes always upon reaſon, which continually demands why things are ſo and ſo, which is ſo reſtleſs, ſuch an enemy to peace, and ſo fond of innovations? Methinks this laſt miſſion has not been uſeleſs, and there is ſome probability in what I ſay.* If there is no irony in this diſcourſe; if it be all in a ſerious ſtrain, it is

A ſplendid nothing dreſs'd in lofty words.

All men in all ages have required and will require, that the knowledge of revealed truths ſhould be ſearched after by other methods than thoſe of Philoſophy. Philoſophy does not cure a floating mind, which muſt be cured, if we deſire to obtain true wiſdom by our prayers. Let us here give the authority of an Apoſtle. *If any of you lack wiſdom, let him aſk of God that gives to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it ſhall be given him. But let him aſk in faith nothing wavering, for he that wavereth, is like a wave of the ſea, driven with the wind and toſſed; for let not that man think that he ſhall receive any thing of the Lord* (8). Judge whether the Sceptics, who are always ſo much the more pleaſed, as the efforts they make to invent reaſons for doubting of every thing, have furniſhed them with ſpecious objections againſt certainty, are capable of receiving the grace of God by the way of diſputation. The modern miſſionaries of the Goſpel, ought to treat them as the firſt would have done; they ought to adviſe them to lay aſide all diſputes and contentions, and to believe God upon his word; and if they prove untractable, they ought particularly to remember this precept of St Paul; and apply it to thoſe men, *Avoid fooliſh queſtions and genealogies, and contentions, and ſtrivings about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain. A man that is an Heretic after the firſt and ſecond admonition, reject* (9). It would be fine work to ſee our Thomiſts and Scotiſts undertake the converſion of the new world by public diſputations as in Europe: they would be ſorry converters at that rate. Balzac did not conſider it, or elſe gravely ridiculed the Schoolmen; their public diſputes convert no body; every body goes away with the ſame opinions he brought with him. If we propoſed to the Chineſe Philoſophers the Thomiſtical explications of our myſteries, and if they aſked, how can we believe this, ſince we have no idea of it, we ſhould do well to refer them, not to a diſputation, but to an anſwer pretty like that which the angel Gabriel made to the Virgin Mary (10).

We may affirm at this day, juſt as in Lactantius's time, that true religion ought to be enquired after by applying to the pretended and ſeeming fooliſhneſs under which God has been pleaſed to hide the treaſures of his wiſdom (11). 'Quid putemus fuiſſe 'cauſæ, cur tot ingeniis, totque temporibus ſummo ſtudio, & labore quæſita (*ſapientia*) 'non reperirietur; niſi quod eam philoſophi extra fines ſuos quæſierunt? Qui quoniam 'peragratis, & exploratis omnibus, nuſquam nullam ſapientiam comprehenderunt; & 'alicubi eſſe illam neceſſe eſt: apparet, illic potiſſimum eſſe quærendam, ubi STULTITIÆ titulus apparet; cujus velamento Deus, ne arcanum ſummi ſui divini operis in 'propatulo eſſet, theſaurum ſapientiæ, ac veritatis abſcondit (12). - - - - *What is the 'reaſon why wiſdom, which has been ſo frequently ſought after by ſo many men of parts, 'with the greateſt application and labour, has never been found; unleſs that the Philoſo'phers have ſought after wiſdom where ſhe is not. Now ſince theſe Philoſophers who have 'examined and explored all things, have found wiſdom no where, and ſince ſhe muſt neceſ'ſarily be ſomewhere, it is evident that ſhe muſt be ſought after chiefly where there appear 'the characters of* FOOLISHNESS, *under the cover of which, God, leſt the myſteries of his*

(6) *Theſe words in St John's Goſpel, chap. iii, ver.* 3. Except a man be born again, he cannot ſee the kingdom of God, *are chiefly true with reſpect to Philoſophers: they want to be born again more than other men: they want one regeneration as men, and another as Philoſophers.*

(7) Balzac, Socrate Chreſtien, *Diſcours v, pag. m.* 71, *& ſeq.*

(8) *Jam. i.* 5, *& ſeq.*

(9) *Tit. iii,* 9, 10.

(10) *How ſhall this be, ſeeing I know not a man. And the angel anſwered, and ſaid unto her, the Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee.* Luke i, 34, 35.

(11) *This ought to be underſtood with reſpect to the Infidels.*

(12) Lactant. *lib. iv, cap. ii, pag. m.* 226.

‘ *Divine works ſhould be divulged, hath hid the treaſures of wiſdom and truth.*’ The ſame Lactantius has judiciouſly obſerved in another place, that it becomes the ſupreme majeſty of God to ſpeak with authority, and to ſay in a few words, this is true, and not to argue and add proofs to his deciſions. ‘ Quæ *(divina)* quidem tradita ſunt breviter, ‘ ac nude ; nec enim decebat aliter : ut cum Deus ad hominem loqueretur, argumentis ‘ aſſereret ſuas voces, tanquam fides ei non haberetur : ſed, ut oportuit, eſt locutus, ‘ quaſi rerum omnium maximus judex ; cujus eſt non argumentari, ſed pronuntiare verum (13). - - - - *Divine truths are declared in a few words, and without being ſupported* ‘ *by reaſonings. Nor was it fit that God, when he ſpeaks to men ſhould ſupport his words* ‘ *by arguments, as if he ought not to be believed without proofs : but God hath ſpoken, as it* ‘ *became him, like the ſoveraign judge of all things, who is not to argue, but to pronounce* ‘ *the truth.*’ If Seneca ſaid that there is nothing more inſipid than a law with a preamble, and that a law ſhould not diſpute, but command ; if he ſaid this of human laws, much more ought it to be ſaid of the law of God ? ‘ Non probo, quod Platonis legibus ‘ adjecta principia ſunt. Legem enim brevem eſſe oportet, quò facilius, ab imperitis ‘ teneatur, velut emiſſa divinitus vox ſit. Jubeat, non diſputet. Nihil videtur mihi ‘ frigidius, nihil ineptius, quàm lex cum prologo. Mone, dic quid me velis feciſſe : ‘ non diſco, ſed pareo (14). - - - - *That reaſons are annexed to the laws of Plato, is* ‘ *what I do not approve ; for a law ought to be comprized in a very few words, that men of* ‘ *the meaneſt capacity may the better comprehend it, and conſider it as a voice from heaven.* ‘ *Let it command, and not diſpute. Nothing ſeems to me more inſipid, nor more fooliſh, than* ‘ *a law with a preamble. Warn me, tell me what you command me to do, and I do not learn* ‘ *of you, but obey.*’

From all that has been ſaid, it is eaſy to conclude, that we cannot be alarmed with the objections of the Sceptics, without diſcovering the weakneſs of our faith, and taking things in a wrong ſenſe, which ought to be taken in a right one.

IV. A true Believer, a Chriſtian who well underſtands the ſpirit of his religion, does not expect to ſee it agree with the aphoriſms of the Lyceum, nor to find it able by the mere ſtrength of reaſon, to confute the difficulties of reaſon. He well knows that natural things have no proportion to the ſupernatural ; and that if a Philoſopher was deſired to level and adjuſt the myſteries of the Goſpel with the Ariſtotelian axioms, it would be requiring of him what is inconſiſtent with the nature of things. You muſt neceſſarily make an option betwixt Philoſophy and the Goſpel : if you will believe nothing but what is evident and agreeable to common notions, chooſe Philoſophy, and leave Chriſtianity : if you will believe the incomprehenſible myſteries of religion, take Chriſtianity and leave Philoſophy ; for to enjoy at the ſame time evidence and incomprehenſibility, is a thing impoſſible ; the conjunction of theſe two things is no leſs impoſſible than the conjunction of the properties of a ſquare, and of a circle. You muſt neceſſarily make an option between them : if the conveniences of a round table do not ſatisfy you, make a ſquare one, and do not pretend that the ſame table ſhould furniſh you with the conveniences both of a round and of a ſquare table. Once more, a true Chriſtian well inſtructed in the character of ſupernatural truths, and well grounded in the principles peculiar to the Goſpel, will laugh at the ſubtilties of Philoſophers, and eſpecially of the Sceptics. Faith will place him above the regions, wherein the ſtorms of diſputation rage. He will find himſelf in a poſt, from whence, being calm and undiſturbed, he can hear the thunder of argumentations and diſtinctions roar below him. A poſt, that will prove the true Olympus of the Poets (15) ; and the true temple of the ſages (16), from whence he will ſee in a perfect tranquillity the weakneſs of reaſon, and the errors of men who have no other guide. Every Chriſtian who ſuffers himſelf to be ſtartled and offended with the objections of unbelievers, is in the ſame lamentable condition as they are.

An anſwer to thoſe who aſk what need was there to recite the objections, which the myſteries of the Goſpel may afford the Sceptics.

V. What I am going to ſay, may teach us how important it is to know the true uſe of things. Several people have aſked, to what purpoſe I have ſet forth many Sceptical and Manichean objections ? They might have found the anſwer to this queſtion, if they had looked for it in my Dictionary, where it is to be ſeen in an hundred places, and particularly in the remark [*C*], of the article PYRRHO (17). But ſince they would not, or did not attend to it, let us here examine their objection more at large. I think they could not much complain, if I ſhould only aſk them, to what purpoſe are ſo many particulars we find in Hiſtorians ? Is it not certain that Hiſtorians relate ſeveral things, whoſe only uſe conſiſts in pleaſing the readers, and which may be hurtful in the hands of thoſe who abuſe the beſt things ? Does this free an Hiſtorian from the obligation he is under, of relating the truth with all poſſible exactneſs ? Muſt not therefore an Hiſtorian of opinions exactly and fully ſhew the ſtrong and weak ſides of them, tho’ it ſhould accidentally occaſion ſome diſturbance, and tho’ no other good ſhould proceed from it, but the amuſement of the reader, and an example of the regard that is due to the laws of Hiſtory ? But this is neither the ſole nor the principal anſwer I am to give.

Nothing is more neceſſary than faith, and nothing more important than to know well the worth of this Theological virtue. But is any thing more proper to acquaint us

---

(13) Id. *lib. iii, cap. i, pag.* 149.

(14) Seneca, Epiſt. xciv, *pag. m.* 388.

(15) Ut altus Olympi
Vertex, qui ſpatio ventos hiemeſque relinquit,
Perpetuum nulla temeratus nube ſerenum,
Celſior exſurgit pluviis auditque ruentes
Sub pedibus nimbos, & rauca tonitrua calcat.
Claudian, de Mall. Theod. Conſul. ver. 206, *pag. m.* 6.

(16) Nil dulcius eſt, benè quàm munita tenere
Edita doctrina Sapientum templa ſerena ;
Deſpicere unde queas alios, paſſimque videre
Errare, atque viam palanteis quærere vitæ.
Lucret. lib. ii, ver. 7.
But above all, ’tis pleaſanteſt to get
The top of high Philoſophy, and ſit
On the calm, peaceful, flouriſhing head of it ;
Whence we may view deep, wondrous deep below,
How poor miſtaken mortals wandring go,
Seeking the path to happineſs.
CREECH.

(17) *See alſo the remark* [*G*], *in the article of* ZENO of Elea, *at the end.*

us with it, than meditating on the attribute which diſtinguiſhes it from the other acts of the underſtanding? Its eſſence conſiſts in imprinting in us a ſtrong perſuaſion of revealed truths, by the ſole motive of God's authority. They who by philoſophical reaſons believe the immortality of the ſoul, are Orthodox, but while they go no farther they do not partake of the faith we ſpeak of. They partake of it only as they believe this truth, becauſe God has revealed it, and humbly ſubmit to the voice of God the moſt plauſible arguments Philoſophy offers to perſuade them of the ſoul's mortality. Thus the merit of faith is enlarged, in proportion, as revealed truth, which is the object of it, exceeds all the powers of our underſtanding: for the more the incomprehenſibility of this object increaſes by the numerous maxims of natural light which oppoſe it, the more we muſt ſacrifice to God's authority a ſtronger repugnance of reaſon, and conſequently we ſhew ourſelves more obedient to God, and give him a greater proof of our reſpect, than if the thing was moderately difficult to believe. Whence was it that the Father of the Faithful, had ſo eminent and illuſtrious a faith? Was it not becauſe *he believed in hope againſt hope* (18)? There had been no great merit in hoping upon the promiſe of God for a thing, naturally very probable; the merit therefore conſiſted in this, that the hope grounded on this promiſe was contrary to all appearances. Let us ſay likewiſe, that the moſt precious faith is that which upon the Divine teſtimony embraces ſuch truths as are the moſt repugnant to reaſon.

This thought has been expreſſed in a ludicrous way by a maſterly hand. *The Devil take me if I believed a ſyllable then,* said the Mareſchal d'Hocquincourt; *but ever ſince I could endure to be crucified for religion. Not that I ſee more reaſon in it now; but on the contrary, leſs than ever: but for all that I could ſuffer myſelf to be crucified, without knowing why, or wherefore. So much the better, my Lord, replied the Father, twanging it devoutly through the noſe, ſo much the better; theſe are not human motions; they proceed from God. No reaſon! That is the true religion: No reaſon. What an extraordinary grace, my Lord, has heaven beſtowed upon you!* Eſtote ſicut infantes, *be ye as children: children have ſtill their innocence, and why? Becauſe they have no reaſon.* Beati pauperes ſpiritu, *Bleſſed are the poor in ſpirit; they ſin not; the reaſon is becauſe they have no reaſon. No reaſon; without knowing why or wherefore: Oh excellent words! They ought to be written in golden letters.* Not that I ſee more reaſon in it now; but, on the contrary, leſs than ever. *In truth this is Divine for them that have any taſte of heavenly things: No reaſon. What an extraordinary grace, my Lord, has God beſtowed upon you* (19)! Give this thought a more ſerious and modeſt turn, and it will become reaſonable. Here is the proof of it. I take it from a book wherein ſome thoughts of Mr de St Evremond are examined; and this amongſt others, that our underſtanding is not ſufficiently convinced of the truth of religion.

'To anſwer clearly to this, we muſt remember a maxim commonly received among Divines: *viz.* That the mind is induced to believe myſteries in a quite different way from that which gives it an evident knowledge of natural things. It knows the latter by demonſtration, and it believes myſteries upon motives of *credibility*, ſuch as are the miracles wrought by Jeſus Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, the unanimous belief of all the faithful for ſeventeen centuries, *&c.* All which motives ought to induce us to believe *prudently* the faith which the church propoſes to us: and this very well explains theſe words of St Paul, *That in this preſent life we ſee the myſteries as riddles, waiting to ſee them evidently in heaven.* But Mr de St Evremond requires demonſtrations. He therefore admits no faith. St Thomas * ſays expreſly in ſome places of his *Summa*, *that no body ought to go about to demonſtrate the myſteries of religion*; and he adds in other chapters, *that when the Fathers proved the faith, they did not pretend their arguments were demonſtrative, but only ſolid motives to induce us to believe the doctrines propounded to us.* Why, ſays Mr de St Evremond, is not our reaſon enlightned? Becauſe, as St Thomas ſays, reaſon muſt ſubmit to faith. Upon which I call to mind ſome words of Petrus Bleſenſis in his 140th epiſtle written to Petrus Diaconus, who was with the King of England. After he had ſpoke of the myſtery of Tranſubſtantiation, *reaſon, purſues he, does not go ſo far, but we are carried thither by faith; a faith that is ſo much the ſtronger as it is not ſupported by natural reaſon. Reaſon grows weak where faith grows ſtrong: reaſon is overcome that faith may be more meritorious: however, do not think,* adds this Father, *that reaſon envies the ſuperiority of faith; on the contrary, it voluntarily and humbly ſubmits to it. It will reſume its light in heaven, where faith will not be, and then reaſon will reap what faith ſows in the preſent life; and it is juſt it ſhould reap the fruits of faith, ſince at preſent it debaſes it ſelf, that faith may reign in its full power* (20).'

VI. This is the doctrine of the Roman Catholics: take from it Tranſubſtantiation, and put the Trinity, for inſtance, in its room, and the moſt Orthodox Proteſtant Divines will ſubſcribe to it. I ſhall quote two Proteſtants, whoſe teſtimony will have the more weight, becauſe they are of ſuch profeſſions, as are not thought to inſiſt much upon the humbling of reaſon, and the exaltation of faith: one is a Phyſician, the other a Mathematician; the former declares, that when he meditates on myſteries, he always ſtops when reaſon is arrived to this point, *O the depth* (21). He proteſts, that if rebellious reaſon, or the Devil, endeavour to perplex him, he diſengages himſelf from

(18) *Rom.* iv, 18.

(19) Mr de St Evremond, in his *Converſation between Mareſchal d'Hocquincourt, and Father Canaye,* Tom. i, p. 181, *of the Engliſh tranſlation, London* 1728.

* *Part.* i. *qu.* 1. *a.* 8. *ad.* 2.

(20) Diſſertation ſur les Oeuvres de Mr de St Evremond, *pag.* 249, *&* *ſeq. Paris* 1698.

(21) *I love to loſe myſelf in a myſtery, to purſue my reaſon to an* O Altitudo! *Sir T. Browne, Religio Medici,* Part. i, §. viii, pag. m. 46.

all their ſnares, by this one paradox of Tertullian, this is certain, becauſe it is impoſſible. *It is my ſolitary recreation to poſe my apprehenſion with thoſe involved ænigma's and riddles of the Trinity, with the Incarnation and Reſurrection. I can anſwer all the objections of Satan and* my rebellious reaſon, with that odd reſolution I learned of Tertullian, *It is true, becauſe it is impoſſible* (22). There are ſome, continues he, who believe more eaſily becauſe they have ſeen the ſepulchre of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Red-ſea; but, for my part, I congratulate my ſelf for not having ſeen Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles, nor having lived in the age of miracles; my faith would then have been involuntary, and I ſhould have no ſhare in this bleſſing, *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen and yet believed.* He highly values the faith of thoſe who lived before Jeſus Chriſt; for though they had nothing but ſhadows and types, and ſome obſcure oracles, they waited for things that ſeemed impoſſible. *Some believe the better for ſeeing Chriſt's ſepulchre; and when they have ſeen the Red-ſea, doubt not of the miracle. Now contrarily, I bleſs myſelf, and am thankful that I lived not in the days of miracles, that I never ſaw Chriſt nor his diſciples; I would not have been one of thoſe Iſraelites that paſſed the Red-ſea, nor one of Chriſt's patients on whom he wrought his wonders; then had my faith been thruſt upon me; nor ſhould I enjoy that greater bleſſing pronounced to all that believe and ſaw not. It is an eaſy and neceſſary belief, to credit what our eye and ſenſe hath examined: I believe he was dead and buried, and roſe again; and deſire to ſee him in his glory, rather than to contemplate him in his cenotaphe, or ſepulchre. Nor is this much to believe; as we have reaſon, we owe this faith unto Hiſtory: they only had the advantage of a bold and noble faith, who lived before his coming, who upon obſcure prophecies and myſtical types could raiſe a belief, and expect apparent impoſſibilities* (23). He ſays, that faith may not improperly be called a ſword which cuts all the knots we meet with in the myſteries of religion; but however, he uſes it rather as a ſhield, finding that a man becomes invulnerable in theſe ſorts of combats, who arms himſelf with it (24). He mentions the objections which reaſon and experience ſuggeſted to him on ſome points; and adds, that notwithſtanding this his faith is very ſteady, and that faith, in order to be perfect, muſt make us believe things not only above reaſon, but that ſeem repugnant to reaſon, and to the teſtimony of the ſenſes. *Yet do I believe that all this is true, which indeed my reaſon would perſwade me to be falſe; and this I think is no vulgar part of faith, to believe a thing not only above, but contrary to reaſon, and againſt the arguments of our proper ſenſes* (25).

Note, That this writer ſpeak thus in a book intituled, *Religio Medici, the Phyſician's Religion*, and which, as ſome ſay, might be called, *The Phyſician of Religion*; a book, in ſhort, that made ſome people believe, that the author was ſomewhat remote from the kingdom of heaven (26). Therefore theſe words of the goſpel might be applied to him, *I have not found ſo great faith, no not in Iſrael* (27).

VII. The Mathematician I am to quote, publiſhed at London, in 1699, a tract, of 36 pages in 4to, intituled, *Theologiæ Chriſtianæ principia Mathematica.* He pretends, that the principles of the Chriſtian Religion are only probable, and reduces the degrees of their probability, and of the decreaſe of it, to Geometrical calculations. He finds that it may ſtill laſt 1454 years, from whence he concludes, that Jeſus Chriſt will return before that time. He dedicates this book to the Biſhop of Saliſbury, and ſhews, in his Epiſtle Dedicatory, that they who ſhall blame him for calling the principles of Chriſtianity only probable, are ſuch as have not well examined the grounds of their religion, and do not well underſtand the nature of faith. Whence, ſays he, has this virtue ſo many encomiums given it in the Scripture, and ſo many rewards promiſed it? Is it not becauſe it makes men walk in the right way, notwithſtanding all the ſtumbling-blocks they meet with, and the fetters that are put upon them? I ſhall ſet down his words: ‘Quoſdam fore non dubito, majori ductos zelo quam judicio qui meos prorſus con‘demnabunt labores, meque Religionem potius evertere quam aſtruere temere nimis ‘concludent. Illi utique omnia Religionis dogmata tanquam certiſſima amplectentes ‘rem Chriſtianiſmo indignam me præſtitiſſe putabunt, qui ejus probabilitatem tantum ‘evincere conatus fuerim. Illis vero ego nihil jam habeo quod dicam, niſi quod præ‘judiciis ſuis præoccupati, Religionis quam profitentur, fundamenta non accuratè ſatis ‘hactenus examinaverint, nec fidei, quæ tantopere in ſacris literis laudatur, naturam ‘ritè intellexerint. Quid enim eſt fides? niſi illa mentis perſuaſio qua propter media ex ‘probabilitate deducta, quaſdam propoſitiones veras eſſe credimus. Si perſuaſio ex cer‘titudine oriatur, tum non fides ſed ſcientia in mente producitur. Sicut enim proba‘bilitas fidem generat, ita enim ſcientiam evertit & è contra: Certitudo ſcientiam ſimul ‘generat & fidem deſtruit. Unde ſcientia omnem dubitandi anſam aufert, dum fides ‘aliquam ſemper hæſitationem in mente relinquit: & propterea fides tantis inſignitur ‘laudibus, tantaque ſibi annexa præmia habet, quod homines non obſtantibus omnibus ‘illis quibus premuntur ſcrupulis in recto virtutis & pietatis tramite progrediantur, ‘quæque Creatori ſuo omnipotenti grata futura credunt ſumma ope præſtare conentur: ‘Se tam paratos eſſe juſſis quibuſcunque divinis obſequi oſtendunt, ut ne ea quidem quæ ‘probabiliter tantum ab ipſo proveniant, rejicere velint (28). - - - *I doubt not but cer‘tain perſons, more zealous than judicious, will abſolutely condemn my work, and raſhly con‘clude that I rather ſubvert and overthrow religion, than ſupport and defend it. For they, ‘embracing all the doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion as moſt certain, will think that I have*

‘ *written*

(22) Id. ib.

(23) Id. ibid. *pag.* 21, 22.

(24) *With an eaſy metaphor we may ſay the ſword of faith; but in theſe obſcurities I rather uſe it in the adjunct the Apoſtle gives it, a Buckler; under which I conceive a wary combatant may lie invulnerable.* Id. ibid. §. ix, pag. 22, 23.

(25) Id. ibid. *pag.* 26.

(26) *See* Patin, Letter iii, *pag.* 13, *of the firſt volume.*

(27) *Matt. viii.* 10.

(28) Johannes Craig, *Epiſt. Dedicat.*

‘ *written a book unbecoming and unworthy of a Chriſtian, ſince I there have endeavoured to ſhew only the probability of that religion. To theſe perſons I have at preſent nothing more to ſay but this, that being prepoſſeſſed with prejudices, they have not yet ſufficiently examined the foundation of that Religion which they profeſs, nor well underſtood the nature of that Faith, which is ſo much praiſed in the ſacred writings. For what is Faith, but that perſuaſion of the mind, whereby we believe certain propoſitions to be true, for reaſons drawn from probability? If the perſuaſion ariſes from Certainty, it is not Faith, but Science that is produced in the mind. For as probability begets Faith, ſo it deſtroys Science; and ſo* vice versâ *Certainty begets Science and deſtroys Faith. Thus Science removes all manner of doubt, whereas Faith always leaves in the mind ſome heſitation: and it is for this reaſon that Faith is ſo highly commended, and ſo many rewards are annexed to it, namely, becauſe men, notwithſtanding all thoſe ſcruples wherewith their minds are oppreſſed, walk in the ſtrait road of virtue and piety, and with all their might endeavour to perform thoſe duties which they believe will be acceptable to their omnipotent Creator. They ſhew themſelves ſo ready to obey all divine commands, that they will not reject even thoſe, which only appear probably to be ſuch.*’

THAT it is proper to enumerate largely the arguments which reſpect the difficulties of the Chriſtian Faith.

VIII. Moſt men ſo little examine the nature of divine Faith, and reflect ſo ſeldom upon this act of their mind, that they want to be rouſed from their negligence, by a long enumeration of the difficulties that encompaſs the doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion. It is by a lively ſenſe of thoſe difficulties we learn the excellency of Faith, and of this gift of God. Hereby we learn alſo to miſtruſt reaſon, and have recourſe to grace. They who know nothing of the great conteſt between reaſon and faith, and are ignorant of the force of Philoſophical objections, have but an imperfect ſenſe of God's goodneſs to them, and of the manner of triumphing over all the temptations of incredulous and preſumptuous reaſon.

The true way of humbling it is to know, that if it be capable of inventing objections, it is incapable of reſolving them, and, in a word, that it is not by reaſon that the goſpel was eſtabliſhed. ‘ It is Faith alone that can teach that Divine Philoſophy, which none of the princes of this world had known *. Whoever opens his eyes to ſo pure a light is truly enlightened. It was not by ſtrength of ſyllogiſms and argumentations that this Philoſophy recommended itſelf to men; but by its ſimplicity and the ignorance of thoſe who preached it to the world . . . . Faith having diſcovered to men the falſe glimpſes that ſhone in the Heathen Philoſophy, accuſtomed them not to reaſon any longer upon things which God would not ſubmit to reaſoning, and taught them, that it is better to be ignorant of what God has been pleaſed to conceal, and with a reſpectful ignorance to adore the ſecrets he has not revealed, than to attempt to fathom this abyſs of light, by the raſhneſs of our conjectures, and the faint views of our reaſon. It was to this Divine ray of Faith, that the Chriſtian took pleaſure to ſacrifice that inſolent curioſity, which made him too raſhly examine the works of God, by examining the effects of nature, and ſtifle all the views of that proud reaſon, which fixes him to the creatures, and makes him a rebel againſt the Creator. It was by the rays of this celeſtial light, that the Chriſtian perceived it was better to yield than to argue in point of religion; that narrowneſs of wit is more advantageous to a Chriſtian, than all the force and penetration of the mind, and that the ſimplicity of Faith is preferable to all the pomp of ſcience. Since, after all, the works of God, which bear the moſt the ſtamp of his omnipotence, and his character, are thoſe we the leaſt comprehend, therefore nothing is more juſt than to humble our reaſon, and ſubmit it to the light of eternal reaſon, which is the rule of all reaſons: and indeed there is no ſcience but requires ſubmiſſion for the eſtabliſhment of its principles (29).’ I conclude with two very fine thoughts of Mr de St Evremond. ‘ In things purely natural, it is the mind's part to conceive, and its knowledge goes before the affection for the objects: in things ſupernatural, the ſoul is taken, it is affected, it adheres and unites itſelf without ever comprehending them. Heaven has better prepared our hearts for the impreſſion of God's grace, than our underſtandings for illumination. His immenſity confounds our narrow intellects: his bounty agrees better with our love. There is I know not what within us, that ſecretly pleads for a God, whom we cannot comprehend . . . To conſider well the Chriſtian Religion would make one think, that God had deprived it of the light of our minds, that it might turn more upon the motions of our heart (30).’ . . . *Provided a man has reduced his reaſon ſo far, as not to argue upon things which God would not ſubject to reaſoning, it is all we can deſire. I not only believe with Solomon, that a wiſe man's ſilence is better in this caſe than the diſcourſe of a Philoſopher, but I have a greater eſteem for the faith of the moſt ſtupid peaſant, than for all the leſſons of Socrates* (31).

This, I think, is more than ſufficient to remove the ſcruples which the pretended triumph of the Sceptics had raiſed in the minds of ſome of my readers.

* Veritas per Chriſtum: *Joann. cap.* 1. Loquimur ſapientiam quam nemo principum hujus ſæculi novit. *Paul.* 2. *Cor. c.* 6.

(29) Rapin, Réflexions ſur la Philoſophie, *pag. m.* 447.

(30) *St Evremond's Works, Vol. ii, pag.* 88, 89. *of the Engliſh tranſlation, London* 1728.

(31) Oeuvres meſlées, *Tom. ii, pag. m.* 24.

EXPLANATION IV.

CONCERNING OBSCENITIES.

That if there are ſome Obſcenities in this book, they are ſuch as cannot be juſtly cenſured.

I. WHEN people ſay that there are Obſcenities in any book, they may underſtand,

I. Either that the author gives the deſcription of his debaucheries in leud terms, applauds and congratulates himſelf for them, exhorts his readers to plunge themſelves into all manner of leudneſs, recommends it to them as the moſt effectual means of leading a ſweet and happy life, and pretends, that the cenſures of the public are to be laughed at, and that the maxims of virtuous men ought to be ſlighted as old womens tales.

II. Or, that the author relates, in a free and gay ſtile, ſome love-adventures, feigned as to the ſubſtance, or at leaſt as to their circumſtances, and embelliſhments; and introduces into his narrative ſeveral immodeſt incidents, which he dreſſes in all the charms imaginable, in order to make them diverting, and fitter to raiſe the deſire of love-intrigues than any thing elſe.

III. Or, that the author, in order to revenge himſelf on an unfaithful miſtreſs, or to excuſe the tranſports of his paſſion, or make invectives againſt an old courtezan, or celebrate his friend's marriage, or divert himſelf with merry thoughts, gives a free ſcope to his Muſe, and writes Epigrams, Epithalamiums, *&c.* full of impure and ſmutty expreſſions.

IV. Or, that the author, inveighing againſt leudneſs, deſcribes it in too lively, naked, and groſs colours.

V. Or, that the author in a tract of Phyſic, Natural Philoſophy, or Civil-Law, expreſſes himſelf filthily on the ſubject of generation, or, the cauſes and remedies of barrenneſs, or the motives of divorce, *&c.*

VI. Or, that the author, commenting upon Catullus, Petronius, or Martial, has inſerted in his commentary ſeveral leud diſcourſes or expreſſions.

VII. Or, that the author, giving the Hiſtory of a ſect, or perſon, whoſe actions were infamous, has related, in too open a manner, a great many things offenſive to chaſte ears.

VIII. Or, that the author, treating of caſes of conſcience, and enumerating the different ſpecies of carnal ſins, has ſaid many things which modeſty cannot eaſily digeſt.

IX. Or, laſtly, that the author relates Hiſtorical facts mentioned by other authors whom he carefully cites, which facts are filthy and immodeſt, and adds a commentary on his Hiſtorical narrations to illuſtrate them by teſtimonies, by reflexions, and by proofs, *&c.* in which he ſometimes alledges the words of certain authors who have wrote freely, ſome of them, as Phyſicians, or Lawyers; others, as Gallants, or Poets; but he never ſays any thing containing either explicitly, or even implicitly, the approbation of impurity; that, on the contrary, he endeavours, upon many occaſions, to expoſe it to our abhorrence, and to confute looſe Morality.

Theſe, I think, are the chief caſes wherein a writer can be charged with venting obſcenities.

In the firſt caſe, he deſerves not only all the ſevereſt puniſhments of the Canon-Law, but ought alſo to be proſecuted by the Magiſtrate as a diſturber of the public modeſty, and a profeſſed enemy to virtue.

As to thoſe of the ſecond, third, fourth, fifth, ſixth, ſeventh, and eighth claſſes, let every one judge of them as he pleaſes: I am not concerned in them, mine being only the ninth caſe; and it is ſufficient for me to examine what concerns that ninth kind of obſcenity. However, I will make two or three general reflexions upon the reſt.

THREE general obſervations upon ſome ſorts of obſcenities that are to be found in ſeveral authors.

II. I ſay in the firſt place, that there are ſeveral degrees in the ſeven claſſes of writers, whom I leave to the reader's judgment (1). A man may keep himſelf within certain bounds, or may exceed them: this prodigiouſly varies the differences and proportions; and it would be very unjuſt to pronounce the ſame ſentence againſt all the writers of the ſecond claſs. The hundred *Nouvelles nouvelles* (2), thoſe of the Queen of Navarre, Boccace's Decameron, la Fontaine's Tales do not deſerve the ſame rigour as Aretin's Raggionamenti, and the Aloiſia Sigæa Toletana. The authors of theſe two laſt works deſerve, as well as Ovid, to be placed in the firſt claſs of obſcene authors.

Secondly I obſerve, that in all times a great number of men have agreed in condemning obſcenities; and yet this never ſeemed to be a deciſion of equal force with the Civil Laws, a deciſion to which the Poets, Commentators, *&c.* were obliged to conform

(1) *Note, that I nevertheleſs approve of thoſe obſervations which I have made in ſeveral places, as in the article of the Poet* LUCRETIUS, *the article* QUILLET, *&c.*

(2) *They have been reprinted at Amſterdam in* 1701, *in two volumes in* 12mo.

form on the penalty of being excluded the rank of honeſt men. The cenſurers of obſcenities ſeem to be ſo much the more capable of terminating the queſtion by a deciſive and executive ſentence, in the whole Republic of Letters, becauſe they might make up a Senate out of all ſorts of men. There would be in it not only perſons venerable for the auſterity of their lives, and ſacred character, but alſo military men, and profeſſed gallants, and, in a word, many who give offence by their voluptuous life. This is an authority of great weight; for the liberty of leud verſes muſt needs be an ill thing, ſince it is diſliked by thoſe very perſons who live in debauchery. But in vain have obſcene writings been exclaimed againſt, it has had no effect to diſtinguiſh between honeſt and diſhoneſt men. There has always been in the Republic of Letters, a right or liberty of publiſhing writings of this nature. This right has never been liable to preſcription; ſeveral perſons of a diſtinguiſhed merit have prevented it by the freedom they have allowed themſelves in ſuch ſort of works; and this has brought no diſgrace upon them, nor any ways incapacitated them for the enjoyment of all the honours and privileges belonging to their condition, nor prevented the preferments they might hope for from their fortune (3).

He would be laughed at who ſhould go about to prove that Boccace was not a man of probity, becauſe he wrote the Decameron; or conclude, that the Queen of Navarre, ſiſter to Francis I, was not a Princeſs of admirable virtue, whoſe praiſes reſounded every where, becauſe ſhe wrote ſome Novels of Gallantry. Antony Panormita loſt nothing, either of his fortune or good reputation, by his ſmutty poem of the Hermaphrodite (4). The ſame may be ſaid of Benedict le Court, and the famous Tiraquellus: the former gave himſelf great liberty in writing a commentary on Martial d'Auvergne's Decrees of Love: *Nonnunquam etiam*, ſays he in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to a Counſellor of the Parliament of Paris, *quod in amore jocatus ſim laſciviente calamo:* and every body knows how many obſcene collections Tiraquellus inſerted in his commentaries upon matrimonial laws (5). Did Scipio du Pleix uſe any periphraſes or reſerves in his book called, *La curioſite naturelle redigée en queſtions ſelon l'ordre alphabetique?* Did he not explain things in the moſt natural terms imaginable? What did he loſe by that book? Nothing at all. I ſhould never have done, ſhould I undertake to give a liſt of all the Civilians, who, in trials of adultery, or impotency, have alledged many obſcenities, without any prejudice to their reputation. I have named three or four, Antony Hotman, Sebaſtian Roulliard, Vincent Tagereau, and Annæus Robert (6). This is enough: let us name ſome perſons of another rank.

The Dutch could not endure that any body ſhould defame Secundus as a wicked and profligate man, or ſo much as deny that he was an honeſt man, under pretence that he wrote very laſcivious verſes (7). Ramirez de Prado, who wrote notes upon Martial, printed at Paris with the King's licence in the year 1607, and full of leud explications, loſt nothing by this of his reputation or fortune, no more than Gonzales de Salas for his commentary of the ſame kind upon an obſcene author (8). Joubertus, Chancellor of the univerſity of Montpellier, and Phyſician to the King of France, and to the King of Navarre, loſt neither his penſions, nor his honourable poſts, for inſerting ſeveral obſcenities in his book of Vulgar Errors. Nor is he on that account eſteemed a leſs illuſtrious and honeſt man. Did Quillet's Callipædia hinder him from being recompenſed with an abbey by Cardinal Mazarin (9)? Feramus, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, did not find that his merit was leſs extolled, or acknowledged after he had wrote verſes againſt Montmaur, wherein he ſported with very obſcene fictions. And to come nearer our own time, was Mr de la Fontaine, who publiſhed ſo many leud tales leſs careſſed by every body at court and city? Lords and Princes, the ladies of the higheſt rank, the moſt illuſtrious perſons of the long robe, have all courted and admired him. Was he not admitted into the French Academy? And is not that honour for a man of his character, equivalent to a mareſchal's ſtaff for a military man? I doubt not but Mr de la Reinie would have gladly entertained him at his table the very day that he condemned his new tales (10); for in ſuch books wiſe men know how to diſtinguiſh between the perſon of the author, and his writings.

III. Let us ſee whether the Proteſtants have been more rigid. I do not think that the Conſiſtories ever thought of cenſuring Ambroſe Paré, whoſe Anatomical books written in the vulgar tongue, were full of filthy things. There are many obſcenities in Joſeph Scaliger's commentaries upon the Priapeia, and upon Catullus. There are more ſtill in Janus Douza's commentary upon Petronius. One of thoſe two writers was Profeſſor at Leyden, and the other was one of the Curators of that univerſity. They did not loſe upon that account their credit, and the great eſteem they were in; and though Beza mightily exclaimed againſt them in an Epiſtle Dedicatory to the States-General (11), his out-cries were not minded. Daniel Heinſius, Profeſſor in the ſame univerſity, enjoyed all the honours he could pretend to; he was one of the Secretaries of the Synod of Dort, and received, on a thouſand occaſions, ſeveral proofs of the eſteem they had for his perſon; and yet he publiſhed ſome poems that are far from being modeſt. What he and Scriverius called *Baudii amores*, is a very wanton collection; and it is to be obſerved, that Scriverius was a man of merit, and of great note among the learned in Holland. Notwithſtanding Beza's exhortation, Theodore de Juges (12) put out an edition

---

(3) *I do not pretend to extend this to particular caſes, exceeding certain bounds, nor to perſons who are otherwiſe infamous for their actions.*

(4) *See remark* [*I*], *of the article* PANORMITA.

(5) *See the article* SANCHEZ (Thomas) *citation* (14).

(6) *See the articles* QUELLENEC, *and* ROBERT.

(7) *See, concerning Grotius, who wrote laſcivious verſes*, Rivet. Oper. *Tom. iii*, *pag.* 1112, 1224. Grot. in Diſcuſſ. Rivet. Apolog. *pag.* 237.

(8) Petronius.

(9) *See remarks* [*C*], [*D*], *of the article* QUILLET.

(10) *It was on the fifth of April* 1675. *The ſentence may be ſeen at the end of the third caſe of Furetiere, whereby the ſale of the book is prohibited, and it is ordered that an information ſhall be made about the impreſſion and ſale of it. What has been ſaid in my* Remarks on the Judgment of the Public, &c. *numb. xxxiii. viz. That the Tales of la Fontaine were condemned to the flames by the ſentence of a Magiſtrate of Paris, was affirmed to me by a perſon who came from France. I am perſuaded he was miſtaken, and that there was no other ſentence, but that of Mr la Reinie. I ſhould have been more cautious, had I deſigned to inſert that particular in my Dictionary. But the piece I then wrote being only a looſe ſheet, I was not ſo careful as I ought to have been.*

(11) *That of his ſermons on Chriſt's reſurrection.*

(12) *Mr Mentel under the feigned name of* Johannes Caius Tilebomenus *calls him* Thomas de Judicibus, *in the preface to the* Judicium de Fragmento Traguri enſi Petronii. *His miſtake about the Chriſtian name is more excuſable than that of Mr de* Clavigny de ſainte Honorine, *who, page* 25, *of his treatiſe*, Concerning Suſpicious Books, *pretends that Theodore de Juges was called* Golſtadius. *He meant that Goldaſtus and Theodore de Juges were the ſame author.*

edition of Petronius with his *Prolegomena*, wherein he endeavoured to juſtify thoſe who explain the obſcenities of that Roman author. It does not appear that Theodore de Juges did ſuffer in his reputation or fortune upon that account. He was a Proteſtant, and ſome perſons of his family were Counſellors in the court of Caſtres, whoſe members were one half Proteſtants and the other Roman Catholics; and he ſpent a conſiderable part of his life at Geneva. Goldaſtus had enjoyed the ſame impunity after his edition of Petronius, which he publiſhed with his *Prolegomena*, wherein he undertook to juſtify the reading of ſuch an author, and made a particular anſwer to Beza's reflexions. Shall I ſay that the famous d'Aubigné was very much reſpected at Geneva, though the cynical liberty of his pen was a notorious thing? Shall I obſerve that the conſiſtory of Charenton never had any thoughts of complaining of Dr Menjot, though his writings concerning Phyſic are intermixed with many obſcene things? Shall I add, that Iſaac Voſſius being a Canon of Windſor, when he publiſhed a book full of filthy things, the Dean and the Chapter did not meet to inflict upon him even the ſlighteſt puniſhment, *viz.* that of being reprimanded?

It is therefore no wonder if the faction contrary to thoſe who condemn obſcenities, did always maintain itſelf in the Republic of Letters: for beſides their alledging ſeveral reaſons for their opinion, they ſhelter themſelves under the authority of ſeveral examples. You may ſee theſe reaſons and theſe examples in the *Prolegomena* of Goldaſtus upon Petronius. All thoſe who have apologized for the authors who as Phyſicians, or as Caſuiſts, advance obſcene things (13), alledge reaſons againſt reaſons, and authorities againſt authorities. They want neither great names nor grave authorities, *magno ſe judice quiſque tuetur* (14). But do not think that I ſuppoſe that their reaſons and thoſe of their adverſaries, have an equal force. I have declared in ſeveral places, that I abſolutely condemn Catullus's obſcenities, and thoſe of his imitators, and the exceſſive freedom of the Caſuiſts; and I add now, that the arguments alledged by thoſe who plead for the liberty of inſerting obſcenities in an epigram, ſeem to me very weak, if compared with the contrary arguments (15). I further add, that an obſcenity ſoftened, and only meant as a jeſt, ſeems to me to be more blamable than a very obſcene invective deſigned to create an abhorrence for impurity. And as for the obſcenities of the ſtage, I am of opinion, that they ought to be ſeverely puniſhed by the magiſtrate. They are a ſchool of debauchery, and belong rather to the firſt claſs than to the ſeven claſſes that follow it, and are the ſubject of theſe preliminary remarks. I have ſtill one more to offer.

An anſwer to thoſe who blame a thing for this reaſon, that a better one might be done.

IV. For I ſay in the third place, that if any one ſhould alledge that it were better for the writers of theſe ſeven claſſes, to apply themſelves only to ſerious matters, and to treat them with all the modeſty required by the goſpel, he would depart from the ſtate of the queſtion. This advice, though very good in it ſelf, is not pertinent on this occaſion, ſince they might anſwer, that the queſtion is not, whether they have choſen the good part, and whether they have made the beſt uſe they could make of their leiſure and pen, but only whether they have taken a liberty condemned, upon pain of ignominy, by the ſtatutes of the Republic of Letters, the regulations of civil policy, and the laws of the ſtate? They would readily acknowledge, that they could not avoid being condemned, if they were judged by the laws of the goſpel; but they would maintain that all writers are in the ſame caſe ſome more, ſome leſs, there being none but may be told, that he might have employed himſelf in a more Chriſtian-like manner than he has done: for to give an inſtance of it, a Divine who has ſpent all his time in writing commentaries upon the Scripture, might have made a more pious uſe of it. Had it not been better for him to divide the day between mental prayer and works of charity? Why did he not ſpend part of the day in meditating upon the greatneſs of God, and the four laſt things? Why did he not ſpend the other in going from one Hoſpital to another to relieve the poor, and from houſe to houſe, to comfort afflicted perſons and inſtruct little children? ſince therefore no man, will they ſay, can give a good account of his time at the ſevere tribunal of the Divine juſtice, and every body ſtands in need of mercy on account of many uſeleſs things, and for having erroneouſly choſen what was not the moſt neceſſary part; we appeal to another juriſdiction, and deſire it may be enquired whether we have done any thing for which in the Judgment of the Public, and before the tribunal of the magiſtrates, we deſerve to loſe the title of good men, and to be deprived of the rank and privileges of men of honour. We deſire a thing, would they ſay, which cannot be refuſed to ſeveral virtuous women who go to plays and to balls, who love gaming and fine cloaths, and who have ſuch regard for their beauty, that they carefully ſtudy what ornaments will ſet it off to the beſt advantage. They know very well that their conduct is not agreeable to the precepts of the goſpel; but whilſt they do nothing elſe, they may lawfully [illegible] the quality, rank, and privileges of virtuous women. They deſerve to be [illegible] and the Chriſtian Moraliſts, I grant it: but till the public, or the [illegible] a note of infamy upon ſuch a courſe of life, they cannot be [illegible] whoever ſhould call them ſo, would be obliged to make [illegible]. They may alledge the practice of all ages, ſince there have [illegible] many virtuous women, who loved gaming, plays, balls, and jewels; [illegible] all, they do not

---

(13) *See remark* [D], *of the article* ALBERTUS Magnus; *and remark* [C], *of the article* SANCHEZ (Thomas).

(14) Lucan. Pharſ. *lib.* i, *ver.* 127.

(15) *The reaſons pro and con may be compared together, by reading Father Vavaſſeur's book* de Epigrammate, *ch.* ii, *intituled* de Obſcenitate in Epigrammate vitanda.

not offend againſt the Civil Laws, nor againſt the rules of human honour, and are not guilty of that kind of diſorder, which is the peculiar character of gallant women. The Poets, who in an *Epithalamium* make too naked a deſcription of a wedding-night, may alledge the ſame reaſons: they will own that their Muſe might have pitched upon a more laudable ſubject, and that the compoſition of a Chriſtian ſonnet was preferable to that; but this very compoſure would not have been the beſt thing they could have done. It had been better for them to ſpend their time in praying, and ſerving the poor in Hoſpitals, *&c.* There is hardly any buſineſs but what may be blamed for this reaſon, that a better one might have been pitched upon; and of all the occupations of this life, there is hardly any that is more blamable, if we judge of it by the rules of religion, than that which is moſt common; I mean the occupation of thoſe who endeavour to get money either by trading or other fair means. Humanly ſpeaking, the moſt lawful means of growing rich are contrary, not only to the Spirit of the Goſpel, but alſo to the literal prohibitions of Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles. And therefore it highly concerns all men, that God ſhould be merciful to them for not making the beſt uſe of their time. The Poets I ſpeak of, having laid down this principle, add, that they only tread in the ſteps of many perſons illuſtrious for their virtue and wiſdom; that the liberty they take, always prevailed among honeſt men; that if it had been laid aſide for ſome ages as the peculiar character of debauchery, they could not be excuſed; but that it will appear they may claim the right of poſſeſſion, and that a thing which has been practiſed by ſo many honeſt men, cannot be accounted diſhoneſt (16). This is a maxim of Pliny on the preſent queſtion. He was one of the greateſt wits, and one of the moſt honeſt men of his time; he made ſome verſes that were thought to be ſomewhat impudent (17), and was blamed for it: he alledged many great examples in his vindication, and would not inſtance in the Emperor Nero, though, ſaid he, I am not ignorant that things do not grow worſe, becauſe they are ſometimes practiſed by wicked men, but that they continue to be honeſt, when they are often practiſed by honeſt men (18).

Thus much for the Poets. Now I muſt obſerve in a few words that the authors belonging to the other claſſes abovementioned, may alledge the ſame reaſons. Nay, ſome of them may ſay ſomething more ſpecious: A natural Philoſopher, for inſtance, and a Phyſician, may maintain, that their profeſſion requires they ſhould explain what concerns generation, barrenneſs, the green-ſickneſs, a woman's delivery, and the *furor uterinus*, as well as fermentation, and what concerns the Spleen, the Gout, *&c.* A Caſuiſt will ſay, that it is no leſs neceſſary that confeſſors and penitents ſhould be informed of the ſeveral ways of offending againſt chaſtity, than of the ſeveral frauds that are committed in purchaſes.

At leaſt we ought to do thoſe authors the juſtice they claim, *viz.* not to judge of their morals by their writings (19). No neceſſary conſequence can be drawn from either of thoſe two things to the other. Some Poets are chaſte in their verſes, and in their morals; ſome are neither chaſte in their verſes nor in their morals; ſome are only chaſte in their verſes; and ſome are not chaſte in their verſes, but they are ſo in their morals, and all their fire lies in their heads (20). All the wanton ſtrokes of their epigrams, are only witty conceits; their Candida's and their Leſbia's are fictitious miſtreſſes. The Proteſtants cannot deny it of Beza, ſince he declares that he lived a regular life when he wrote the Poems, intituled, *Juvenilia*, of which he did ſo much repent (21).

Particular remarks concerning the obſcenities pretended to be in this Dictionary, three precautions which I have taken.

V. After theſe general obſervations, I ſhall proceed to the examination of what concerns this Dictionary; and the firſt thing I ſhall obſerve upon this head is, that if thoſe obſervations are not looked upon as a ſolid juſtification, I ſhall not be prejudiced by it; but if they are approved as ſuch, they will be of great uſe to me. I am in far better circumſtances than all the authors I have mentioned (22); for though Catullus, Lucretius, Juvenal, and Suetonius, be never ſo much condemned, a writer who cites them, cannot be blamed for it. Thoſe authors are to be had in all the Bookſellers ſhops; the paſſages quoted out of them, cannot be more dangerous than they are in thoſe authors themſelves; and there is a vaſt difference between the firſt authors of an obſcenity, and thoſe who mention it only as the proof of a fact, or of an argument which the ſubject in hand obliges them to alledge. Granting that Joubertus expreſſed himſelf too immodeſtly, does it follow from thence that I could not alledge his authority, when I was to criticize a very weak argument alledged againſt thoſe who accuſed the Phyſician Herlicius of lewdneſs? However it be, if the excuſes alledged in favour of Suetonius, Joubertus, *&c.* are good and ſolid, ſo much the better for me; if they are not good, it can do me no prejudice; my caſe is different from theirs, and much better. By the argument *à fortiori* what they may ſay in their vindication, may be alledged by me with greater reaſon; and what is a weak argument for them, may be a very ſtrong one for me. You need only compare together the nine claſſes I have mentioned, and you will find that the laſt, which ſuits my work, is leſs liable to a juſt cenſure.

This will more clearly appear, if to what I have ſaid above (23), concerning the nature of my caſe, I add this conſideration, *viz.* That I have avoided three things that might have occaſioned juſt complaints.

(16) *I ſay nothing of the liberty Mr de Voiture takes in his poems. It is no new thing for the Poets to take this vicious liberty. They have long-ago proſtituted the chaſtity of the Muſes. They alledge their multitude in their vindication. There is no conteſting with them concerning a poſſeſſion, which they have enjoyed for ſo many ages by the conſent of all nations.* Girac. Reſponſe à la Défenſe de Voiture, *pag.* 74.

(17) *See the fourteenth Letter of the fourth book of Pliny, and the third of the fifth book.*

(18) Neronem tranſeo, quamvis ſciam non corrumpi in deterius, quæ aliquando etiam à malis, ſed honeſta manere quæ ſæpius à bonis fiunt. *Plin. Epiſt. iii, lib. v, pag. m.* 289.

(19) *See remark* [*D*], *of the article* Vayer.

(20) *Compare with this what Count Buſſi Rabutin mentions concerning Madam* .... The paſſion of jeſting is predominant with her, and when ſhe is in that humour, ſhe joyfully liſtens to the freeſt diſcourſes, provided they are diſguiſed. Nay ſhe anſwers with improvements, believing that her wit might be called in queſtion, if ſhe did not improve upon what was ſaid to her ... She is of a cold conſtitution; at leaſt if we may rely on her huſband: to this he partly owed her virtue, as he ſaid, all her fire lies in her mind: indeed ſhe makes ample amends for the coldneſs of her conſtitution. *Hiſt. Amoureuſe des Gaules*, pag. m. 174, & ſeq.

(21) *See the article* Beza, *remarks* [*V*], *&* [*X*].

(22) *That is the eight claſſes of authors, abovementioned.*

(23) *See, above, number* ix.

In the firſt place, whenever I have ſaid any thing as my own, I have avoided all words and expreſſions that are contrary to common civility and decency. This is ſufficient in a work of this nature, intermixed with Hiſtorical narratives, and all ſorts of diſcuſſions; for to pretend that a compilation which is to contain matters of Literature, Law, or Natural Philoſophy, according to the various ſubjects treated on, ought to be written according to the moſt ſtrict rules of decency obſerved in a ſermon, or in a book of devotion, or a novel, would be confounding things, and ſetting up a kind of tyranny over mens minds. A word that would be thought unbecoming in the mouth of a preacher, and in a ſmall romance deſigned for the entertainment of the ladies, would not appear ſo in a caſe written by a lawyer, nor in the verbal proceſs of a Phyſician, nor in a book of Natural Philoſophy, nor even in a piece of Literature, or in the faithful tranſlation of a Latin book, ſuch as for inſtance, the relation of Abelard's miſfortune. It is therefore certain, that there are ſeveral degrees of decency, with reſpect to the ſtyle: the higheſt degrees belong to ſome writers, and not to all. If an ingenious man was deſired by ſome ladies to write a romantic Hiſtory of Jupiter's or Hercules's adventures, he would do well never to uſe the words, *to geld*, *to deflower*, *to get with child*, *to lie with a nymph*, *to raviſh her*; he ſhould either lay aſide the particulars that might excite thoſe ideas, or keep them at a diſtance by general and enigmatical expreſſions. But if the writers of an Hiſtorical Dictionary, wherein the reader expects to find an exact tranſlation of what is to be found in the ancient Mythology concerning Jupiter's adventures, uſed long circuits, and far fetched expreſſions, whereby the fate of ſome nymphs might be gueſſed at, they would be accounted finical and ridiculous. They do not offend againſt decency, provided they keep within the bounds of common civility, that is, provided they abſtain from ſuch words as are uſed by the rabble, and which even a debauchee carefully avoids in a ſerious converſation. They may boldy uſe all the words that are to be found in the Dictionary of the French Academy, and in that of Furetiere, unleſs the authors of theſe Dictionaries give notice, that thoſe words are odious and obſcene. This is the firſt thing I have obſerved; *viz.* that I keep to the rules of common decency, when I ſay any thing as my own. I now proceed to give an account of the courſe I have taken as to paſſages quoted by me out of other authors.

I have avoided, in the ſecond place, to expreſs in our language the meaning of a quotation, which contained ſome immodeſt thing, and have only ſet it down in Latin. The paſſages I cite out of Brantome and Montagne are not the moſt offenſive which may be found in thoſe authors; and I may ſay the ſame with reſpect to D'Aubigné, and other French writers ſomewhat too free, whom I have ſometimes quoted to prove what I ſaid.

In the third place, I have avoided mentioning, in any language whatſoever, ſuch things as had a character of extravagancy and enormity unknown to the vulgar; and I have quoted nothing out of certain books that are little known, and which I had rather leave in darkneſs than excite the deſire of buying them, in thoſe who ſhould find them cited in this work. I never cited on this ſubject any authors but ſuch as may be had every where, and are reprinted almoſt every year. I could name a very honeſt man, who never was a debauchee, who wrote from London to one of his friends, that he expected to find quite other things in my Dictionary, from the clamours of certain people. I imagined, ſaid he, that it contained unknown obſcenities, but I could find nothing in it, but what myſelf and my companions knew before we were eighteen years old.

After what has been ſaid, it will be no difficult matter to know whether I have been juſtly or wrongfully blamed. The whole affair may be reduced to theſe two points, 1. Whether I am liable to cenſure, becauſe I have not ſufficiently wrapped up in ambiguous periphraſes the obſcene facts which have been found in Hiſtory. 2. Whether I am to blame, becauſe I have not wholly ſuppreſſed thoſe facts.

The firſt of the two queſtions to which the preſent diſpute may be reduced, runs upon words or expreſſions. An anſwer to that charge.

VI. The firſt of theſe two queſtions, properly ſpeaking, belongs only to the Grammarians: Morality is not concerned in the matter; the civil Magiſtrates have nothing to do with it, *Nihil hæc ad edictum prætoris*; neither are the Moraliſts or the Caſuiſts concerned in it. If an action was to be brought againſt me, it could only relate to the unpoliteneſs of my ſtile; whereupon I would appeal to the French Academy, as the proper and competent judge of ſuch cauſes. I am ſure thoſe gentlemen would not condemn me; otherwiſe they would condemn themſelves, ſince all the words I make uſe of, are to be found in their Dictionary, without any note of diſhonour. When they do not declare that a word is obſcene, all writers are thereby authorized to uſe it; I mean ſuch words as they have defined. But further, I ſhould readily conſent to be condemned by them; for I do not pretend to politeneſs of ſtile, I have declared in my preface that my ſtile *is very incorrect, and not free from expreſſions either improper, or which begin to be obſolete, or even from barbariſms, and that in theſe reſpects I am not very ſcrupulous*. Why ſhould I pretend to it, ſince ſeveral famous authors, who lived at Paris (24), and were members of the French Academy, did not care for it? Why ſhould a man hamper himſelf in a book deſigned for things, and not for words, and which containing all ſorts of matters ſome ſerious, and others ludicrous, neceſſarily

(24) *Mr le Laboureur, for inſtance, (See the preface to his* Additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs*) and Mr de Mezerai, Secretary to the French Academy.*

requires one ſhould uſe various ſorts of expreſſions? The author of ſuch a work needs not to be ſo cautious as a preacher; and though the latter ought, in the pulpit, to avoid this phraſe, *They who get a maid with child, ought either to marry her, or give her a portion*, yet he may uſe it without any indecency in a book concerning caſes of conſcience. So true it is, that an author may expreſs himſelf differently, according to the nature of his books.

But if any thing can excuſe the writers, who have no regard to I know not what refined delicacy which increaſes every day, it is this, that there will be no end of it; for, in order to act conſiſtently, a vaſt number of words which the French tongue cannot be without, muſt be accounted obſcene; and the writers who pretend to be ſo nice, may eaſily be convicted of abſurdity. It may be proved to them, that according to their principles there are no preciſe or foppiſh women, and that thoſe whom we call ſo, are very reaſonable, and argue conſequentially. I deſire them to tell me, why the verb *to geld* appears obſcene to them. Is it not becauſe it offers an obſcene object to our imagination? But for the ſame reaſon the word *adultery* cannot be pronounced without a greater obſcenity. Thus this word muſt be baniſhed. There will be a neceſſity to baniſh likewiſe the words *marriage*, *wedding-day*, *bride's-bed*, and a vaſt number of ſuch expreſſions, which excite very obſcene ideas, and incomparably more offenſive than that, at which the preciſe lady in one of Moliere's plays was ſo much offended. *For my part, uncle*, ſays ſhe, *all that I can ſay is, that marriage ſeems to me to be a very ſhocking thing. How can a woman endure the thought of lying by a naked man* (25)? According to the principles of our Puriſts nothing could be more reaſonable than ſuch a diſcourſe, and every virtuous maid ſhould turn out of her chamber all perſons who ſhould come and tell her of a deſign to marry her. She might juſtly complain, that they have ſo little regard for her modeſty, as to offer to her a frightful obſcenity without any veil or diſguiſe. To aſk a married woman, whether ſhe has had any children, would be a monſtrous obſcenity; politeneſs would require that we ſhould uſe figurative expreſſions, and imitate, for inſtance, the finical lady, who ſaid, 'That her companion 'had given into lawful love *(which was marriage)*, and that ſhe knew not how ſhe 'could reſolve to taſte brutiſh pleaſures with a man; That ſhe had done it to leave be'hind her ſome traces of herſelf, *that is, ſome children* (26).'

According to the notions of the Puriſts, it would be a very reaſonable thing to exclaim againſt Moliere's School of Women, with all the fury he has ſo handſomely ridiculed, and which is, at the bottom, a downright extravagance. Every virtuous perſon ſhould ſay that expreſſion, *Children coming out through the ear, is abominable . . . Can any one that has any virtue, be pleaſed with a piece that keeps modeſty in a conſtant alarm, and continually defiles the imagination? . . . . I poſitively affirm, that an honeſt woman cannot ſee* that play, *without being put to ſhame, I have diſcovered ſo many leud and filthy things in it* (27). . . . . *Thoſe obſcenities, God be thanked, appear bare-faced, they have not the leaſt covering: The boldeſt eyes are frighted at their nakedneſs . . . . That paſſage of the ſcene, wherein Agnes mentions what was got from her, is more than ſufficient to prove what I ſay. . . . . Fy . . . .* (28). *I repeat it again, the filthy things of that piece fly into one's face. . . . . Is not modeſty viſibly offended by what Agnes ſays in the place we ſpeak of* (29)? If ſome Urania ventured to anſwer, 'Not at all. Agnes does not ſay a word but what is 'very modeſt; and if you will have it, that ſhe means ſomething elſe, the obſcenity 'proceeds from you, and not from her, for ſhe ſpeaks only of a ribbon that one got 'from her (30):' the following anſwer would be a wiſe one: '(31) Ah! you may 'talk of a ribbon as much as you pleaſe; but that *my* where ſhe ſtops, was not put 'there for nothing: it occaſions ſtrange thoughts; that *my* is furiouſly ſcandalous: and 'ſay what you will you can never juſtify the inſolence of that *my* . . . . There is an in'tolerable obſcenity in it (32).' That diſcourſe, though never ſo impertinent, would be proper and honeſt, according to this principle, *All words which defile the imagination, that is to ſay, which denote an obſcene object, ought to be laid aſide.* According to this principle, all thoſe who have ſome modeſty, would be like the Marquiſe Araminta, whoſe character is as follows: 'She ſays every where it is a horrid piece (33), and 'that ſhe could never endure the obſcenities it is ſtuffed with . . . . She follows the ill 'example of thoſe women, who being in the decline of their age, have a mind to 'ſupply what they ſee they are loſing, by ſomething elſe; and would have the gri'maces of a ſcrupulous prudery ſerve them inſtead of youth and beauty. This lady 'carries the thing farther than any body, and is ſo nicely ſcrupulous, that ſhe finds ob'ſcenities where no body elſe had diſcovered any. It is ſaid her ſcruples are ſuch as 'will disfigure our language, and that there is hardly any words but what ſhe would 'curtail, either at the beginning or end, by reaſon of the immodeſt ſyllables ſhe finds 'out in them (34).'

I think I have read ſomewhere, that preciſeneſs has been carried ſo far that ladies would not ſay *J'ai mangé des confitures*, but *des fitures*. At this rate, above one half of the words of the Dictionary of the French Academy ſhould be ſtruck out, and then the reſt would be inſignificant, for they would want a connexion; and thus we ſhould be obliged to explain ourſelves by ſigns only, which would occaſion more ſcandalous and more dangerous obſcenities than thoſe that come into one's ears (35). Here follows a

(25) Moliere, Précieuſes ridicules, *Scene iv*, *pag. m.* 17.

(26) Sorel, de la Connoiſſance des bons Livres, *pag.* 470, *Dutch Edit.*

(27) Moliere Critique de l'Eſcole des Femmes, *Scene iii*, *pag. m.* 13.

(28) Id. ibid. *pag.* 14.

(29) Ibid. *pag.* 16.

(30) Ibid.

(31) Ibid.

(32) *Note, That in this paſſage of Moliere, every body expects to hear Agnes ſay, that ſome body has got her maidenhead; which excites a very obſcene idea.*

(33) *That is, the play intituled,* The School of Women.

(24) Moliere, ubi ſupra, *Scene v.*

(35) Segnius irritant animos demiſſa per aurem,
Quàm quæ ſunt oculis ſubjecta fidelibus, & quæ
Ipſe ſibi tradit ſpectator.
Horat. de Arte Poet. ver. 180.
But what we hear moves leſs than what we ſee.
ROSCOMMON.

paſſage of the *Chevræana*, whereby my aſſertion will be extremely well confirmed. ‘ A lady who has a great deal of wit, but is too finical, told me one day ſhe never uſed any words which might excite an obſcene idea, and that when ſhe was in company with polite people ſhe ſaid, *Un fond d'Artichaut*; *un fond de Chapeau*; *une rue qui n'a point de ſortie*, for what we call *un Cul de ſac*. I told her ſhe did very well, and that I would not fail to do the ſame. However, I added, that on ſome occaſions we were obliged to ſpeak like others. She very civilly defied me to give her any inſtance of it; and I aſked her how ſhe called in common converſation a piece that is worth ſixty pence? Sixty pence, replied ſhe. But, Madam, how do you call that letter of the alphabet that comes next to P? She bluſhed, and at the ſame time replied, *Truly, Sir, I did not think you would brink me back to my* a, b, c (36).’ You ſee Mr Chevreau approves that we ſhould never uſe any *words, which may excite an obſcene idea*; and by virtue of that principle, he is of opinion, that we ſhould never ſay, *un Cul de ſac*. He muſt therefore ſtrike out not only above two pages of Furetiere's Dictionary (37), corrected by one of the politeſt writers of our days (38), but alſo a vaſt number of words, whoſe firſt ſyllable excites more immodeſt ideas than the ſyllable *Cul*. He muſt alſo baniſh the words *adultery*, *fornication*, *incontinence*, and a thouſand more: but as rigid as he is with reſpect to obſcene words, he was not willing to grant upon one ſingle point what that preciſe lady required; therefore he was not conſiſtent with himſelf [*A*]. But let us forgive him that inconſiſtency; for the conſequences of his aſſertion are ſo abſurd, and ſo impracticable, that he is not to blame for not keeping to them

(36) Chevræana, *Part. ii, pag.* 101, 102, *Dutch Edit.*

(37) *At the beginning of the ſyllable Cul.*

(38) Mr Baſnage de Bauval.

[*A*] *As rigid as Mr Chevreau is with reſpect to obſcene words . . . he was not conſiſtent with himſelf.*] Immediately after having ſaid with Marſhal de Baſſompierre, that *all men carry about them the key of the treaſure* (*a*), that is, of the ladies virginity; he affirms, that Faire des Enfans, *is an obſcene expreſſion* (*b*), *and* that *it ought never to be uſed before ladies, who have nice ears.* Thoſe two obſervations were not fit to appear cloſe together. Here is another that is a falſity. *The Latins (*Mr Chevreau goes on*) had the ſame niceneſs as to* liberis dare operam; *which has been obſerved in the ſixteenth letter of the ninth book of Cicero to Papirius Petus, where we may further ſee, why they rather choſe to ſay* nobiſcum *than* cum nobis. Inſtead of the ſixteenth letter, Mr Chevreau ſhould have quoted the twenty-ſecond; but this would have only prevented the leaſt fault, ſince it is not true that Cicero ſays what he aſcribes to him. He ſays nothing of *nobiſcum*, nor of *cum nobis* (*c*), and affirms, that *liberis dare operam* is a modeſt expreſſion (*d*). Mr Chevreau has found ſome obſcenities in Malherbe's poems, by reaſon of ſome words that have a double meaning (*e*), but which were only uſed by Malherbe in a modeſt ſenſe. Mr Menage ſaid upon this, and upon St Amant's taking this hemiſtich of the ſame Poet, *qu'on ſurvit à ſa mort*, to be obſcene, ‘ That a man muſt have his imagination ſtrangely corrupted, to find ſuch obſcenities in authors. *Quod ſi recipias, nihil loqui tutum eſt*, ſays Quintilian, ſpeaking of a man, who found an obſcenity in theſe words of Virgil, *Incipiunt agitata tumeſcere (f)*. But, to return to Malherbe's verſe, *Je veux bander*, &c. They who find an obſcenity in it, have more reaſon than thoſe who found ſomething obſcene in Terence and Salluſt; the words *aures* and *animos* removing all ambiguity (*g*).’ Mr Chevreau anſwered, (*h*), *That a man muſt be blind not to ſee ſuch things, and that when he does not perceive thoſe obſcenities, it is a ſign he is very much uſed to them . . . The reader does not expect to find thoſe obſcenities in books, and bluſhes when he meets with them. What would Mr Menage have ſaid, if after he had approved my obſervation, he had read in a ſmall book I have juſt now read,* Je ſuis convaincu qu'on examine aujourd'huy les choſes, *&c. and in another,* On vit dans le Conſiſtoire tout autrement? *If it be a ſhameful thing to ſhew thoſe obſcenities, it is more ſhameful ſtill to write them; and there is a neceſſity to diſcover them, that others may avoid them.* A little after he blames this expreſſion of Malherbe, *elle étoit paroiſſante juſques au Nombril, - - - She was to be ſeen down to the navel,* he pretends (*i*), that *this laſt word is one of thoſe that cannot be now modeſtly written. . . . That word, in its proper ſenſe, belongs only to Phyſicians and Midwives, who call every thing by its name; and herein decency and modeſty do not permit us to imitate them* (*k*). One would think he had a mind to revive the old cuſtom, when the words *ſhoe*, *foot*, *bed*, *breeches*, were not ſpoken without adding *under correction*, *with reverence*, &c. This was one of the moſt material points of civility, whereby one might know well-bred children; at preſent all this paſſes for country breeding. But to proceed, ‘ One cannot too carefully avoid ſuch obſcenities as leave filthy ideas in the mind, and offend ears that are not over nice. C. Servilius Glaucia Quæſtor in the year of Rome 641, was looked upon as the filth of the ſtreets, by reaſon of the meanneſs of his ſoul; and yet the moſt eloquent man among the Romans, could not bear that he ſhould be called *Curiæ ſtercus* *, nor that the great loſs the commonwealth ſuſtained by the death of Scipio, ſhould have been expreſſed in theſe words, *Reſpublica morte P. Scipionis Africani caſtrata.* Mr de Balzac did not obſerve decency, nor the precepts of the antient Rhetoricians, whom he often called his maſters, when he wrote to a friend concerning a certain perſon, *Qu'il étoit tout composé de parties honteuſes.* Our language has been ſo modeſt for theſe ſixty years, that we ſeldom uſe the words *whore* and *bawdy-houſe*, which the preachers formerly uſed without any ſcruple in their beſt ſermons (*l*).’

From all theſe paſſages, it appears, that Mr Chevreau was very ſevere in his theory; but his practice was not anſwerable to it: for ſhould one ſtrike out of his works every thing that defiles the imagination, there would be abundance of gaps in them. To ſpeak only of the Chevræana, wherein he appears ſo rigid a Moraliſt; how many things are there in it that excite very obſcene idea's? Some of thoſe paſſages are quotations, and others are his own compoſures. Why ſhould a man preſcribe any rules which cannot be obſerved either in a general Hiſtory, or in a collection of obſervations of all kinds?

It will not be improper to give here an inſtance of what he ſays concerning the preachers of former times; and therefore I ſhall ſet down ſome paſſages out of a ſermon of John de Monluc, Biſhop of Valence, and one of the moſt eminent preachers of the XVIth century. ‘ He who deflowers and corrupts a virgin, is guilty of fornication, a crime mentioned in *Deuteronomy* xxii, and yet in our days no account is made of acts of Fornication, which are daily committed: many poor maids are enticed, ſeduced, and brought to perdition; and thoſe who have debauched them, glory in it, and think it much to their honour that they have been able to conquer thoſe women, who had for ſome time reſiſted the temptations of the fleſh. But if they are not puniſhed in this world, the moſt high God, who ſees every thing, will in time call them to an account: they ſhall give an account of the time they have loſt, of the money they have ſpent upon pimps and bawds, they ſhall be anſwerable for the ſins committed by the maid after ſhe has been ſeduced, and for her being forſaken and finding no body to marry her. Then they will know whether they had any reaſon to boaſt of ſuch an execrable action (*m*). . . . . They likewiſe infringe this commandment who contrary to the order of nature, commit that enormous and deteſtible crime called Sodomy: ſuch perſo [illegible] mned to death by the law of God, as [illegible] *iticus* xx. (*n*). That command is alſo [illegible] oſe, who [illegible] monly

---

(*a*) Chevræana, *Part. i, pag.* 350.

(*b*) *See what Mr Arnauld ſays in his* Défenſe de la Traduction de Mons, *livr. iv, ch. ii, pag.* 334.

(*c*) *Note, That* Quintilian, *lib. viii, cap. iii, obſerves, that inſtead of* cum notis hominibus, *it ſhould be ſaid* cum hominibus notis.

(*d*) Liberis dare operam quam honeſte dicitur? *Cicero, Epiſt. xxii, lib. ix ad famil. pag.* 58. *Edit. Græv.*

(*e*) Chevræana, *Part. ii, pag.* 122.

(*f*) Menage, Obſerv. *upon* Malherbe, *pag.* 388.

(*g*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 581.

(*h*) Chevræana, *Part. ii, pag.* 123.

(*i*) Ibid. *p.* 124. *Note, That Girac, in his Reply to Coſtar,* §. *viii, pag. m.* 74, *pretends this expreſſion of Coſtar is too obſcene, viz.* the thigh of a boy ſo white and ſo well ſhaped.

(*k*) Ibid. *pag.* 125.

* *Quintilianus Inſtitut. Orat.* lib. viii, cap, vi, De Tropis.

(*l*) Chevræana, ibid. *pag.* 275, 276.

(*m*) *Monluc, Biſhop of Valence*, Sermons ſur les dix Commandemens de Dieu, *pag.* 504, *Edit. of Vaſcoſan* 1558, *in* 8*vo.*

(*n*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 506.

them. His only fault lies in not perceiving the falſity of a principle, whereof the moſt neceſſary conſequences are abſurd, and plainly tend to the deſtruction of the uſe of ſpeech. It is to be obſerved, that there are ſome ladies as virtuous as that preciſe woman, who do not ſcruple to ſay, *Cul d'Artichaut*, and *Cul de ſac*. This you may ſee in a paſſage of Coſtar; which has a great affinity with the ſubject in hand [*B*].

I have already obſerved that it is impoſſible to ſatisfy the Puriſts, againſt whom I am writing. The ground they go upon will make them lay aſide, whenever they pleaſe, abundance of words not yet condemned by them, which, according to their maxims, do not leſs deſerve to be rejected than thoſe which they have actually laid aſide. There is no avoiding their cenſure. Though you relate things in modeſt words, as has been done in the ſecond volume of the *Menagiana*, they will ſay, *That there are ſome paſſages in it plainly contrary to modeſty, which cannot be read without horror, by virtuous perſons* (39). Could Father Bouhours avoid being criticiſed, though in his French tranſlation of the Goſpels he took all poſſible care to lay aſide every word that might appear never ſo little unbecoming (40)? Was not Mr Boileau, whom the illuſtrious Preſident de la Moignon *often commended, for having purged ſatirical poetry from the obſcenity, which till then had been, as it were, peculiar to it* (41), charged with ſmuttineſs, for having uſed (42) the words *Embryon, voix luxurieuſe, morale lubrique?* If ſuch words cannot be admitted, there will be no end of cenſuring.

I know ſeveral perſons who blame Mezerai for ſaying that ſome ſparks, who had committed adultery, were *mutilated in the parts wherewith they had offended* (43). Their cenſure is grounded upon theſe two reaſons: one is, that there was no need to mention a circumſtance which offers ſuch an obſcene object: the other is, that he ſhould at leaſt have omitted all the words after *mutilated*, that word being ſufficient to expreſs the thing. I deſire thoſe Critics not to take it ill of me, if I believe that the circumſtance which they ſay ſhould have been omitted, is one of thoſe which an Hiſtorian ought never to forget; for if there is any thing extraordinary in the puniſhment inflicted upon a malefactor, it ought to be particularly mentioned. The ſecond Remark does not appear to me better. A ſentence of death may import that a malefactor's hands, noſe, or ears ſhall be cut off, before he be put to death; and therefore the word *mutilated* would not ſufficiently expreſs the circumſtance which Mezerai was to inform us of. But ſuppoſing that this word is ſufficient, does it follow from thence, that the addition of the reſt is a fault? Do not we commonly ſay, *I have ſeen it with my own eyes*, &c. There are ſeveral needleſs words in ſuch phraſes, and yet no body finds fault with them. Laſtly, I ſay that thoſe Critics contradict themſelves: they only blame this addition as being unneceſſary; the thing, ſay they, had been well enough underſtood without it. They are not therefore againſt offering an obſcene image to the mind, they would only have two or three needleſs ſounds omitted. Their zeal for purity would have been edifying, had they been altogether againſt the uſe of any thing in Hiſtory that may excite an obſcene idea; but they allow of it, provided it be done without any needleſs words. Thus they deſtroy in this laſt Remark what might have been edifying in the firſt. Such is the nice taſte of our Puriſts: they blame one expreſſion, and

'commonly live in delights and pleaſure, who ſpend 'their time in feaſting and banquetting, and pamper 'their body to make it a veſſel of luxury and whoredom. St Peter gives a lively deſcription of them in 'the ſecond chapter of his ſecond epiſtle (*o*) ... *Sporting themſelves with their own deceivings, whilſt they 'feaſt with you; having their eyes full of adultery, and 'cannot ceaſe from ſin, beguiling unſtable ſouls.* That is, 'their only end and intention is to deceive poor ſouls, 'and by their banquets and feaſts, to allure them to 'adultery and all manner of filthineſs. So that their 'habitations are bawdy-houſes, where aſſemblies are 'held, matches are made, and women are ſeduced: 'in a word, they are the plague of a country; and 'yet ſuch people are moſt eſteemed and honoured, 'eſpecially thoſe who are the ring-leaders, and as it 'were, the cocks of their pariſh (*p*).'

The uſe we may make of the paſſages extracted from that ſermon, is to know that the liberty of expreſſing one's ſelf in ſuch a plain manner, is not ſinful in itſelf, for then it would not have been lawful in Henry the ſecond's time. Now if it was lawful then, ſhould a preacher uſe it in our days, his only fault would conſiſt in not conforming to the mode. But if any one ventured at this preſent time to wear a ruff, would he not offend againſt the mode? And yet it would be no ſinful action.

[*B*] *A paſſage of Coſtar, which has a great affinity with the ſubject in hand.*] The polite Voiture (who would believe it?) was charged with uſing obſcene expreſſions (*q*), tho' he [illegible] acquainted with the genteel part [illegible] company with perſons of [illegible] what his apologiſt anſwered: 'There is hardly any lady who ſcruples to 'repeat and ſing the verſes which Mr de Voiture 'made upon a lady's back-ſide, and I do not know 'one who makes any difficulty to ſay, *un cul d'artichaud*, and *un cul de ſac* (*r*).' The apologiſt alledges afterwards the paſſage I have recited in another place (*s*), and adds theſe remarkable words: *Let us hear our peeviſh Critic* †. It was feared there was not enough of this ſort of wit in Mr de Voiture's letters, and that in this reſpect he would not come up to Plautus and Ariſtophanes; and therefore it was thought neceſſary to add theſe words in the laſt edition, which were wanting in the 178th letter. *I conſent to the caſtrating of Ulpian, ſince you will have it ſo, and even of Papinian; for they beget nothing but law-ſuits. This thought is very ingenious. Hitherto I have always heard people ſay, without any ſcruple, that a* book *was* caſtrated, *to denote a book which is not entire, but curtailed. If our adverſary had any intereſt in the academy, he would get this licentious expreſſion aboliſhed, and this modeſt* phraſe *ſubſtituted in its room*, to injure books and make them eunuchs. *The paſſages of Quintilian* ‡ *quoted by him, are wrongly quoted, and that author maintains, that if ſome expreſſions of Salluſt were accounted obſcene, it was not the writer's but the reader's fault. As for Celſus, who pretended to find an obſcenity in a hemiſtich of Virgil, the ſame Quintilian blames him for it, and ſays, that if ſuch a niceneſs was allowable, no man could be ſure he ſpeaks well, and every body ſhould be ſilent* (*t*). It is to be obſerved, that Coſtar, who affords me this paſſage, was none of thoſe learned men who are unacquainted with the genteel part of the world. He was acquainted and kept company with people of faſhion.

(39) Journal des Sçavans, *for February* 21, 1695, *pag.* 145, *Dutch edition.*

(40) *See the third letter of a learned lady to another lady her friend, pag.* 8.

(41) *See the preface to Boileau's Works.*

(42) *In the tenth ſatire.*

(43) *This is in the ſecond volume of his* Chronological Abridgment, *ad ann.* 1313, *where he ſpeaks of ſome ſparks who courted the daughters-in-law of Philip the Fair.*

(*o*) Id. ibid. *pag.* 507.

(*p*) Ibid. *pag.* 501.

(*q*) *See the eleventh ſection, of Girac's anſwer to the apology for Voiture.*

(*r*) Coſtar, Suite de la Defenſe de Voiture, *pag.* 189.

(*s*) *In the article* HOSPITAL (Michael de l') *citat.* (113).

† *Pag.* 72, 73.

‡ *Page* 73. *Ductare exercitus, & patrare bellum* apud Salluſtium dicta ſanctè & antiquè ridentur à nobis, ſi Diis placet: quam culpam non ſcribentium quidem judico, ſed legentium. *Quintil. lib.* 8, *cap.* 3. Si quidem Celſus cacophaton apud Virgilium putat *Incipiunt agitata tumeſcere*: quod ſi recipias, nihil loqui tutum eſt. *Ibid.*

(*t*) Coſtar, ibid. *pag.* 191, 192.

and approve another, though they equally offer the ſame obſcenity to the mind. The *Obſervations* printed at Paris in the year 1700, againſt Mezerai, will be very acceptable to thoſe Critics. See the margin (44). He is blamed in that book (45) *for commonly uſing the words* concubine, baſtard, *and* adultery, *which are inconſiſtent with the niceneſs of our age.* I am ſure they would not condemn the words *favourite*, *natural ſon*, *and conjugal infidelity*, which have the ſame ſignification. How inconſiſtently do they argue!

IX. The new whims of thoſe, who, as I am told, begin to reckon the words *gliſter* (46) and *phyſic* among obſcene terms, and uſe the general word *remedy* in their room, would be leſs unreaſonable. The word *cliſtere (gliſter)* was laid aſide, as including too many circumſtances of the operation, and the word *lavement* took its place as having a more general ſignification. But becauſe the idea of the word *lavement* is become ſpecific, and takes in too many circumſtances, it will be quickly laid aſide for fear of ſullying the imagination, and none but general phraſes will be uſed, ſuch as *J'étois dans les remedes*, *un remede lui fut ordonné*, &c. which do not more particularly denote a gliſter or a purge, than a bag of herbs hung about the neck. Theſe are certainly very ſtrange whims, and were they approved and followed in all their conſequences, they would deſtroy a great many expreſſions, to which every body is uſed, and which are very neceſſary to thoſe who recover from a ſickneſs, and to their viſitants; otherwiſe it would be no eaſy matter to keep up a converſation in their chambers, and there would be a neceſſity to uſe the whole jargon of the preciſe ladies: But after all, thoſe whims are better grounded than thoſe of the Puriſts, who are willing that an obſcene image ſhould be imprinted in the mind, provided it be with ſuch and ſuch words, and not with others.

To ſum up what I have ſaid upon this head, I obſerve,

I. That the queſtion is not about a point of Morality, but is a mere Grammatical diſpute, which ought to be decided by thoſe who are judges of the politeneſs of ſtile.

II. That I ſhall ingenuouſly confeſs, I did not aim at the honour that may be acquired by ſuch politeneſs.

III. That I do not think all authors are obliged to ſubmit to the new notion of politeneſs of ſtile; for were it exactly followed, there would be no need at laſt of any Dictionary but that of the preciſe ladies.

IV. That the title of this new politeneſs is not ſo well eſtabliſhed as to obtain the force of a law in the Republic of Letters. The antient title remains ſtill (47), and may be uſed till a preſcription begins.

V. That in ſuch a book as this, it is enough not to act againſt the common practice; but any one who keeps within thoſe bounds as carefully as I have done (48); may uſe ſeveral expreſſions which would be improper in a ſermon, or a book written by a finical author. It is enough for him that they are uſed in Anatomical books, in caſes drawn up by Lawyers, and in the converſations of learned men (49).

AN examination of what ſome alledge, *viz.* that certain things offend modeſty.

X. But that it may the better appear that Morality is not concerned in the preſent queſtion, I muſt obviate another objection of my cenſurers. Let us ſee whether they can alledge this pretence, that every phraſe which offends modeſty, is an attempt upon Morality, ſince it is prejudicial to chaſtity.

Whereupon I obſerve in the firſt place, that they who ſay that certain things offend modeſty, muſt needs mean either that they weaken chaſtity, or exaſperate the perſons who are chaſte. In the firſt ſenſe their poſition cannot be admitted; and if women are to decide the caſe, the cenſurers will be infallibly caſt. But doubtleſs women are the moſt competent judges of ſuch a thing, ſince ſhame and modeſty are allotted to them in a much greater degree than to men. Let them therefore be pleaſed to tell us what paſſes in their ſoul, when they hear or read a diſcourſe which offends modeſty. They will not ſay, I am ſure, that it not only fills their minds with obſcene thoughts, but alſo that it excites in their hearts a laſcivious deſire which they cannot reſtrain without great difficulty; and, in a word, that they feel themſelves expoſed to temptations which ſtagger their virtue, and carry it to the brink of ruin. We may be ſure, that inſtead of ſuch an anſwer, they will ſay, that the idea which riſes againſt their will in their imagination, fills their mind at once with the higheſt degree of ſhame, indignation, and anger. Now it is certain that nothing can be more effectual than this, to corroborate chaſtity, and remove the contagious influence of an obſcene object imprinted on the imagination; ſo that inſtead of ſaying, according to the firſt ſenſe, That what offends modeſty, endangers chaſtity, it ought to be ſaid on the contrary, that it is a fence, a preſervative, a bulwark for that virtue; and conſequently, if we underſtand this phraſe, *Such a thing offends modeſty*, in the ſecond ſenſe, we ought to believe, that inſtead of weakening chaſtity, it revives and corroborates it.

Therefore it will ſtill be true that the cenſuring of an author for not following the moſt refined politeneſs of ſtile, is a mere Grammatical controverſy, in which Morality is not in the leaſt concerned.

AN obſervation concerning the vexation of readers. Groſs obſcenities are leaſt dangerous.

XI. If it be replied, that Morality is concerned in it, ſince the author has expreſſed himſelf in ſuch a manner as angers the readers: I anſwer, that this argument is grounded

---

(44) Mezerai having ſaid, that a prieſt was depoſed for being ſurprized with a woman, and mutilated in thoſe parts that are uſeleſs to an honeſt prieſt, *the author of the* Obſervations, *pag.* 64, *aſks this queſtion:* 'Had 'he not ſpoke 'with more decency, if he 'had ſaid only 'that he was 'mutilated? 'Had not the 'thing been ſufficiently underſtood? 'However he 'might have 'pitched upon 'an expreſſion 'leſs ſcandalous.

(45) *Pag.* 18, 19.

(46) *See* Garaſſe's Apology, *pag.* 107.

(47) *Mr Menage's friends were, in the year* 1695, *charged with publiſhing obſcene things in a book printed with the King's licence.*

(48) *Nay, I have obſerved Quintilian's precept in relation to ſome words that are grown obſcene by the depravation of the readers.* Vel hoc vitium ſit quod κακὸφατον vocatur: ſive mala conſuetudine in obſcœnum intellectum ſermo detortus eſt, ut *Ductare exercitus*, & *Patrare bellum*, apud Salluſtium dicta ſanctè & antiquè, ridentur à nobis, ſi diis placet; quam culpam non ſcribentium quidem judico ſed legentium, tamen vitanda quatenus verba honeſta moribus perdidimus, & evincentibus etiam vitiis cedendum eſt, ſive junctura deformiter ſonat. *Quintil. lib. viii cap. iii, pag. m* 367.

(49) *As thoſe that were held in Mr Menage's's houſe.*

upon a falſe hypotheſis; for no writer can prevent the ſpite, vexation, and anger of the readers, on a thouſand occaſions. Every Controverſiſt, who defends his cauſe with great art and ſubtilty, continually vexes the zealous readers of the contrary party. Whoever in an account of a journey, or in the Hiſtory of a nation, relates things that are glorious to his own country and religion, and ſhameful to foreigners and other religions, cruelly vexes the readers, who are not prepoſſeſſed as he is. The perfection of an Hiſtory conſiſts in being unacceptable to all ſects and nations; for it is a ſign the writer neither flatters, nor ſpares any of them. Many readers fall into ſuch a rage when they meet with certain things in a book, that they tear the leaf, or write in the margin, *Thou lieſt, rogue, and deſerveſt to be baſtinadoed* (50). None of theſe things (51) can be alledged as a reaſon why authors ſhould be tried at the bar of Morality: the Critics are their only judges.

(50) *I have ſeen ſuch things written in the margin of ſome books.*

(51) *I except hereſies, the reading of which may have vexed the orthodox Chriſtians.*

The only thing therefore that may be further objected, is, that Morality is concerned in the repreſentation of obſcene objects, becauſe it is apt to excite unlawful deſires and leud thoughts. But this objection is not ſo ſtrong againſt me as againſt thoſe, who uſe the covers, reſerves, and nice ways of wrapping up things, which ſome complain I have neglected; for they do not hinder the impreſſion of the object upon the imagination, but imprint it without exciting any ſhame and indignation. They who uſe ſuch covers, do not intend to make themſelves unintelligible; they know every body will underſtand what they ſay, and it is certain they are perfectly underſtood. The delicacy of their touches has only this effect, that people look upon their pictures the more boldly, becauſe they are not afraid of meeting with nudities. Modeſty would not ſuffer them to caſt their eyes upon them, if they were naked obſcenities; but when they are dreſſed up in a tranſparent cloth, they do not ſcruple to take a full view of them, without any manner of ſhame, or indignation againſt the Painter: and thus the object inſinuates itſelf more eaſily into the imagination, and is more at liberty to pour its malignant influence into the heart, than if the ſoul was ſtruck with ſhame and anger; for thoſe two paſſions exhauſt almoſt the whole activity of the ſoul, and put it into ſuch a trouble that it can hardly have any other ſentiment. At leaſt it is certain, that obſcenity cannot act ſo ſtrongly upon a ſoul overwhelmed with ſhame and anger, as upon one that is free from confuſion and vexation. *Pluribus intentus minor eſt ad ſingula ſenſus.* When the ſoul is affected with one paſſion, it is leſs ſuſceptible of another.

Add to this, that when an obſcenity is expreſſed only by halves, but in ſuch a manner that one may eaſily ſupply what is wanting, they who ſee it finiſh themſelves the picture which ſullies the imagination; and therefore they have a greater ſhare in the production of that image, than if the thing had been fully explained. In this laſt caſe they had been only paſſive, and conſequently the admiſſion of the obſcene image would have been very innocent; but in the other caſe they are an active principle, and conſequently, are not ſo innocent, and have more reaſon to fear the contagious effects of that object, which is partly their work. Thus this pretended regard to modeſty, is really a more dangerous ſnare; it makes one dwell upon an obſcene matter, in order to find out what was not clearly expreſſed. And is this a matter fit to be ſuggeſted to the reader's meditation? Were it not better to prevent his ſtopping at it?

XII. This is ſtill of greater force againſt the writers who ſeek for covers and reſerves. Had they uſed the firſt word they met with in a Dictionary, they had only touched upon an obſcene thing, and gone preſently over that place; but the covers they have ſought out with great art, and the periods they have corrected and abridged, till they were ſatisfied with the fineneſs of their pencil, made them dwell ſeveral hours upon an obſcenity. They have turned it all manner of ways; they have been winding about it, as if they had been unwilling to leave ſuch a charming place [C]. Is not this *ad ſirenum ſcopulos conſeneſcere*, to caſt anchor within reach of the ſyren's voice, and the way to ſpoil and infect the heart? It is certain, that excepting thoſe who are truly devout, moſt of our other Puriſts are not in the leaſt concerned for modeſty, when they avoid ſo carefully the expreſſions of our anceſtors; they are profeſſed gallants, who cajole all ſorts of women, and have frequently two miſtreſſes, one whom they keep, and another who keeps them. Truly it becomes ſuch men very well to exclaim againſt a word that offends modeſty, and to be ſo nice when ſomething is not left to be ſupplied by the reader's imagination! We may apply to them what Moliere ſaid of a pretended

[C] *They have been winding about it, as if they had been unwilling to leave ſuch a charming place.*] This puts me in mind of an inſcription *engraved in golden letters on a black marble* upon the bridge *Nôtre Dame* at Paris.

Sequana cum primum Reginæ allabitur urbi,
Tardat præcipites ambitioſus aquas.
Captus amore loci, curſum obliviſcitur anceps,
Quo fluat, & dulces nectit in urbe moras.
Hinc varios implens fluctu ſubeunte canales,
Fons fieri gaudet qui modo flumen erat.
Anno MDCLXXVI (*u*).

When the ſeine firſt enters the metropolis of France, he ambitiouſly ſtays his rapid ſtreams, and being enamoured with the place, he forgets his courſe, is uncertain whither to flow, and winds in ſweet meanders through the town, thence filling the pipes with his waters, he who was once a river, joys to become a fountain. Anno 1676.

Theſe verſes were made by Mr de Santeuil.

(*v*) Deſcription Nouvelle de la Ville de Paris, *Tom. ii, pag.* 206, *Dutch Edit.* 1685.

pretended prude: ‘ Believe me, thoſe women who are ſo very formal, are not accounted more virtuous for it. On the contrary, their myſterious ſeverity, and affected grimaces, provoke all the world to cenſure their actions. People delight to find out ſomething to blame in their conduct. And to give an inſtance of it, there were the other day ſome women at this play oppoſite to our box, who by their affected grimaces during the whole repreſentation, and turning aſide their heads, and hiding their faces, made people tell many ridiculous ſtories of them, which had never been mentioned if they had not behaved ſo; nay, a footman cried out, that their ears were chaſter than all the reſt of their body (52).’ The men I ſpeak of, think only of making themſelves admired for the delicacy of their pen.

The Janſeniſts are accounted the beſt Moraliſts; and I do but follow their opinion, when I ſay, that a groſs obſcenity is leſs dangerous than one that is nicely expreſſed. I am not ignorant, ſays one of them (53), ‘ that people call *ordures* only ſuch words as are groſsly obſcene; and *gallantries*, thoſe which are expreſſed in a nice, delicate, and ingenious manner; but groſs obſcenities, though covered with a witty ambiguity, as it were with a tranſparent veil, do not ceaſe to be obſcenities; they do not leſs offend chaſte ears, defile the imagination, and corrupt the heart; a ſubtile and imperceptible poiſon, is not leſs mortal than a violent one. There are ſome encomiums upon modeſty, which modeſty itſelf cannot bear, Witneſs that of * Father le Moine. The groſs obſcenities of a Carman or Porter, are not by a great deal ſo pernicious, as the ingenious words of a cajolling ſpark.’ This Janſeniſt having mentioned ſome gallant thoughts vented by Father Bouhours, under the name of an interlocutor in a dialogue, which are expreſſed in very nice words, goes on thus (54): *All* parents, *not excepting thoſe who are moſt engaged in the world, will acknowledge that thoſe pernicious fooleries are* MORE DANGEROUS *than* GROSS *obſcenities* (55); *that they corrupt the hearts, and make the worſt of impreſſions upon the minds of youth.* I have quoted in my Dictionary (56) a paſſage of Mr Nicolle, wherein he poſitively affirms, that unlawful paſſions are the moſt dangerous, when they are covered with a veil of modeſty.

This cannot be denied: Nay, women of an imperfect virtue would run leſs danger among brutiſh men, who ſhould ſing filthy ſongs, and talk rudely like ſoldiers, than among polite men who expreſs themſelves in reſpectful terms. They would think themſelves indiſpenſably obliged to be angry with thoſe brutes, and to quit the company, and go out of the room with rage and indignation. But ſoft and flattering compliments, or at moſt ſuch as are intermixed with ambiguous words, and ſome freedoms nicely expreſſed, would not ſtartle them; they would liſten to them, and gently receive the poiſon.

A man who courts a maid would immediately deſtroy all his hopes, ſhould he groſsly and filthily propoſe his ill deſign: he is a perfect ſtranger to the Art of Love, if he has no regard to modeſty in the choice of his expreſſions.

There is no father but would rather have his daughters bluſh than laugh at ſome ſtories told in their preſence. If they bluſh, they are ſafe (57); ſhame prevents the ill effect of the obſcenity; but if they laugh, it makes an impreſſion, and nothing diverts the ſtroke. If they laugh, it is doubtleſs becauſe the obſcenity was artfully wrapped up, and ſeaſoned with an apparent modeſty. Had it been groſsly expreſſed, it would have excited ſhame and indignation. Farces in our days are more dangerous than thoſe of our anceſtors: in former times they were ſo obſcene, that virtuous women durſt not appear at them; but now they do not ſcruple to ſee them under pretence that obſcenities are wrapped up, though not in impenetrable covers. Are there any ſuch? They would bore them through, were they made up of ſeven hides like Ajax's ſhield.

If any thing could make la Fontaine's Tales very pernicious, it is their being generally free from obſcene expreſſions.

Some ingenious men, much given to debauchery, will tell you, that the ſatires of Juvenal are incomparably more apt to put one out of conceit with leudneſs, than the moſt modeſt and moſt chaſte diſcourſes that can be made againſt that vice. They will tell you that Petronius is not ſo dangerous, with all his groſs obſcenities, as he is in the nice dreſs of Count de Rabutin; and that the reading of the book intituled, *Les Amours des Gaules*, will make gallantry much more amiable than the reading of Petronius.

It were wrong to conclude from what has been ſaid, that the leaſt evil would be to uſe the expreſſions of Porters. That is not the caſe. I know the Stoics laughed at the diſtinction of words, and maintained, that every thing ought to be called by its proper name, and that there being nothing diſhoneſt in the conjugal duty, it could not be denoted by any immodeſt word, and that therefore the word uſed by clowns to denote it, is as good as any other. You may ſee their ſophiſms in a letter of Cicero (58). Perhaps, it were no eaſy thing to ſilence them by the way of diſputation (59), but they do not deſerve to be admitted to diſpute on that ſubject. What has been accounted a rule of decency and modeſty in all ſocieties, time out of mind, and with the unanimous conſent of the public, ought to be looked upon as a firſt principle,

(52) Moliere, Critique de l'Eſcole des Femmes, *Scene iii, pag.* 15.

(53) Réponſe à l'Apologie du Pere Bouhours, *pag.* 73, & *ſeq. Edit.* 1700. *See alſo the* Lettres curieuſes de l'Abbé de Bellegarde, *pag.* 253, *Hague Edit.* 1702; *and the article* ACCORDS, *remark* [C], *at the end.*

* *Lettre Provinciale xi. Peintures morales*, by Father le Moine, *livr. vii.*

(54) Ibid. *pag.* 78.

(55) *See the* Trevoux's Journal, *for February* 1703, *Edit. of France, on the romance intituled* La Princeſſe de Porcien.

(56) *In the article* MARETS (John des). *citat* (11).

(57) Erubuit, ſalva res eſt. *Terent.*

(58) *The xxiid, of the ninth book*, ad Famil.

(59) *Compare with this what has been ſaid in the article* HIPPARCHIA, *remark* [*D*].

which no man is allowed to contradict. And therefore when a whole nation are agreed in calling ſome words immodeſt, inſomuch, that the very Porters who uſe them moſt, are perſuaded of their obſcenity, and abſtain from them before perſons of honour, and would be offended to hear them pronounced in a public aſſembly; no private perſon can be admitted to oppoſe ſuch a judgment. All the members of the ſociety are obliged to reſpect it. The courts of juſtice afford us a remarkable inſtance of it; for Lawyers are not allowed to repeat ſuch words, when they plead for the puniſhment of thoſe who have uſed them in reviling their neighbours. They will have public modeſty reſpected in the hearing of a cauſe; but when they judge by report, they not only permit the reporter to mention the very words of the offender though never ſo obſcene, but alſo command him to do it. This I have from a Counſellor in the Parliament of Paris, who told me within theſe few years, that having uſed a circumlocution the firſt time he reported ſuch a cauſe, the Preſident gave him to underſtand, that there was no occaſion to have a regard to chaſte ears, but to judge of the nature of the offence, and that therefore he was obliged to ſpeak the very word it conſiſted in. I fancy the Inquiſition uſes the ſame method [*D*].

The Stoics muſt have followed very near the ſame rule, and if in their private conferences they did not think fit to prefer one word to another, there was at leaſt a neceſſity for them to conform in public to the common way of ſpeaking. The unanimous conſent of nations ought in that reſpect to be the ſtandard of all private perſons.

Wherefore if the word *putain* (a whore) which our forefathers uſed in their graveſt books (60), as freely as the Romans uſed the word *meretrix*, begins to be generally decried, it is fit all authors ſhould begin to diſuſe it, and ſubſtitute the word courtezan in the room of it, ſince the world will have it ſo. But this is at the bottom a groundleſs nicety for either the word courtezan excites as ſtrong an idea as the other, or a weaker one. If the former, there is nothing gained by it, every body will ſtill have a notion of an infamous object: if the latter, it is leſſening the abhorrence which the public ought to have for a proſtitute. But does ſuch a creature deſerve ſuch a regard? Were it not better to aggravate the infamous notion of the trade ſhe profeſſes? Are you afraid of making her too odious? You are for giving her a favourable name which formerly ſignified a court-lady (62). One would think you are afraid of offending her, and willing to ſoften peoples mind by giving her a quaint name. The conſequence of which would be, if people reaſoned right, that the word courtezan would quickly grow obſcene, and a ſofter one ſhould be uſed for it. One ſhould ſay, *a woman who behaves herſelf ill*, and then, *a woman that is talked of*, and then, *a ſuſpicious woman*, and then, *a woman who does not live a holy life* (63), and at laſt deſire the moſt finical ladies to invent ſome other circumlocution.

(60) *The tranſlators of the Bible of Geneva uſed it.*

(62) *See the* Chevræana, *Part. ii, pag.* 415.

(63) *Note, That Sandoval ſpeaking of the abominable actions commited at Rome by the army of Charles V, in the year* 1527, *is contented to ſay it was not a holy action*, obra no ſanta. *See* La Mothe le Vayer, *pag.* 177, *of the ſecond volume, of the edition in* 12*mo*.

An anſwer to the objection grounded upon incivility.

I am juſt now ſenſible of another objection. It is a piece of incivility, will ſome ſay, to inſert in a book what cannot be ſpoken in the preſence of virtuous women; and therefore ſince incivility is blameable, morally ſpeaking, the fault for which you may be blamed, does not concern Grammar, but Morality.

I anſwer in the firſt place, that incivility morally ſpeaking is an ill thing only when it proceeds from pride, or a wilful contempt of other men; but when one is wanting in point of civility, either becauſe he knows not the way of expreſſing it, or does not think himſelf obliged to follow it, he is guilty of no ſin. Do ye think that an old Profeſſor of the Sorbonne, is bound to know all the arts that are practiſed by the young Abbés of the court, to expreſs their reſpect to the ladies with great politeneſs? That Profeſſor has other things to learn, which are much more important; and though he were informed what ſort of civility is in faſhion, he might lawfully diſpenſe with it. His age and character do not require he ſhould conform to it, but rather the contrary. I add,

[*D*] *I fancy the Inquiſition uſes the ſame method.*] I do not think the inquiſitors will allow ſuch abjurations, as contain horrid obſcenities, to be publickly read; but during the trial they hear them, and when they are written down, they are read with a loud voice in ſome private place. Such was the method of the inquiſitors of Rome in the year 1698, towards brother Peter Paul, of St John the Evangeliſt, a bare-footed Auguſtin Friar, convicted of prophanation, impiety, and of an abominable leudneſs. I have a copy of the abjuration, *Abjura ſemipublica*, which he made in a chappel *al Sacello di Caſa Graniſi*, and I find that among other things this was read to him: *Diceſti haver tu moſtrato e rimoſtrato alle tue ſopradette devote con le quali tu proſequivi gl' abbracciamenti in parte naſcoſte che tu per la dolcezza di quelli eri rapito in eſtaſi, e ſentivi un godimento infinito dell' amor divino, e che tu t'infervoravi in quell' eſtaſi . . . . Hai detto haver bacciate alle tue donne le parti vergognoſe, e che doppo haverle coſi bacciate e toccate l'hai benedette & li hai aperti li meati, e pregavi dio che li conſervaſſe in tutto quello benedetto clauſtro verginale . . . . Hai detto che alcune donne ti hanno lavato le parti baſſe tre volte, la prima per purgarſi dalle colpe mortale, la ſeconda dalle veniali, e la terza dalle imperfettioni. Hai detto che alcune volte in godere delle donne tu ſentivi ſpecie di martirio . . . che un giorno parimente l'hai fatte radunare e ad una per una invocare e bacciare il tuo membro genitale* (*w*).

It is not to be queſtioned that the Inquiſition would publiſh thoſe things, were it neceſſary to undeceive a formidable cabal, and an exaſperated populace, who ſhould maintain that a Monk had been ſeverely puniſhed for ſmall faults. Thus it was thought neceſſary to publiſh the informations made againſt the Knights Templars, tho' never ſo full of horrid obſcenities, rather than people ſhould think their order had been deſtroyed without a juſt cauſe.

(*w*) *I have followed the Orthography of the manuſcript copy imparted to me by Dr Sylveſtre at his return from Rome in the year* 1700.

I add, that new civilities are a ſlavery introduced by great men, or invented by their flatterers to the prejudice of ancient liberty. But if it be lawful for every private perſon to depart from the old cuſtom, it is alſo lawful to keep it till every body has laid it aſide, and it becomes ſome perſons not to be too haſty in taking up new modes. It is with this as with faſhions in cloaths. Worldly people immediately appear in the new faſhion, but the grave and wiſe do it only when it is grown adult, if I may be allowed to ſay ſo. A medium ought to be kept in thoſe things; a man muſt not be one of the firſt who takes them up, nor the laſt who leaves them; and none makes himſelf ridiculous by keeping the old faſhion, but when it is quite out of doors.

I anſwer in the ſecond place, that an author is not bound to ſuppreſs all the words that cannot be civilly ſpoken in the preſence of virtuous women: witneſs Mr de St Olon, who is no ſtranger to the ways of the court: he would not have ſaid before the ladies in a ſerious converſation what he has writ concerning the marriages of the Africans (64).

There are many reaſons for taking a greater liberty in a book than in converſation. An obſcenity ſpoken before virtuous women in good company, makes them very uneaſy; they cannot ward off the ſhocking blow; it is not in our power to hear or not to hear, what we are told in the Vulgar Tongue. The accidental meeting of a naked man, or the ſight of a leud picture, is not without remedy; we may immediately turn aſide, or ſhut our eyes; but we cannot ſtop the mouth of a talking man. The ſhame occaſioned by an obſcene idea, is much greater when we are ſurrounded with people who obſerve our looks. The confuſion and perplexity of a virtuous woman on ſuch an occaſion, makes her very uneaſy: this uneaſineſs is attended with indignation, becauſe men do not uſe to talk ſo before women whom they reſpect, and think to be honeſt, but before women of whom they have an ill opinion. There are no ſuch inconveniencies with reſpect to a book. If there is any thing in it which in your opinion is unchaſte, you may read it or let it alone. For inſtance, you may foreſee that the article of the courtezan LAÏS in my Dictionary, will contain ſome lewd quotations; do not read it. Let ſome truſty perſons take a view of the book, before you undertake to read it, and let them inform you of what is to be paſſed over. Beſides, a woman who is alone when ſhe reads a book, is not expoſed to the looks of a company, which is the thing that moſt perplexes and confounds her (65): and becauſe an author ſpeaks to no body in particular, ſhe does not think herſelf ſlighted or offended.

But after all you could not but know, will ſome ſay, that there are now many women who read books of literature; and therefore you ſhould not have been contented with what you call common civility; you ſhould have obſerved the niceſt and the moſt rigid civility, that the fair ſex might not find any thing in your book that might ſully their imagination. My anſwer is, that had it been poſſible by obſerving ſuch a rigid civility to prevent the reader's finding any ſuch thing in my Dictionary, I had willingly ſubmitted to the rules of the Puriſts, who come neareſt to the taſte of preciſe women; but I was fully convinced that the greateſt niceneſs cannot remove any image of an obſcene object from the mind of the reader. This will not be eaſily believed, unleſs I ſhew the truth of it with the utmoſt evidence.

THAT the niceſt words ſully the imagination as much as the moſt obſcene.

In order to do it, I need only prove this ſingle propoſition, *the moſt obſcene and the moſt modeſt words that can be uſed to denote a filthy object, do both paint it with an equal force and livelineſs in the imagination of the hearer, or the reader.* This ſeems at firſt a great paradox, and yet it may be made ſenſible to every body by a popular argument. Let us ſuppoſe one of thoſe adventures, which are ſometimes the talk of a whole town, a marriage ready to be celebrated, and ſuſpended all of a ſudden by the oppoſition of a third perſon. This third perſon is a young woman, who happens to be with child, and demands that the marriage her lover has contracted with another ſhould be declared void. Let us ſuppoſe that a very virtuous woman, who has only heard of this oppoſition in general, is willing to know what reaſons that young woman has for it. She might be anſwered a hundred different ways, without uſing the words which a porter, or a debauchee uſes in ſuch caſes. She might be told, *ſhe has the misfortune to prove with child*; *he has enjoyed her*; *he has kept her company*; *they have been too intimate together*; *he has had to do with her*; *he has had the laſt favour of her*; *ſhe has granted him the moſt precious thing ſhe had, as it appears from the conſequences*; *what paſſed betwixt them, cannot be modeſtly ſpoken, chaſte ears would be offended at it*; *ſhe is obliged to get her honour repaired.* Several other phraſes better wrapped up might be found out in anſwer to the queſtion of that virtuous woman; but all of them would imprint in her mind the filthy and brutiſh action, which has produced that young woman's pregnancy, as ſtrongly as Michael Angelo could have done it upon a cloth: and if that virtuous woman had heard by chance the bawdy word whiſpered by a debauchee in the ear of another debauchee, to let him know the matter, ſhe could not have a clearer notion of the thing. No perſon though ever ſo modeſt, can ſincerely deny what I have been ſaying, if they will examine what paſſes within their breaſt: It is therefore certain, that the moſt modeſt and the moſt obſcene words equally defile the imagination, when the thing denoted by them is a filthy object.

---

(64) *In his relation of the empire of Morocco, printed at Paris in the year* 1695.

(65) *The moſt virtuous perſons, when alone, are not aſhamed when they get out of bed, but they would be aſhamed if they were ſeen by others.*

Though you uſe the moſt modeſt expreſſions employed in the Scripture, to repreſent what we call conjugal duty: *Adam knew his wife Eve* (66): *Abraham went in unto Hagar* (67): *I went unto the propheteſs* (68): you will never be able to blot out the image of that object; it will be imprinted in the mind as ſtrongly as if you uſed the moſt porterly language. The ſame may be ſaid of the phraſes, *to conſummate a marriage*, *the marriage was conſummated*, *the marriage was not conſummated*, expreſſions which, if I may ſay ſo, are conſecrated, and cannot be avoided in the moſt ſerious relations, and the moſt Majeſtic Hiſtories (69): thoſe words raiſe the ſame idea as the words of a ploughman. See the margin (70).

But how comes it then, will ſome ſay, that a virtuous woman is not offended with veiled expreſſions, and is angry with a filthy word? I anſwer that their indignation proceeds from the acceſſory ideas which attend ſuch a word, but do not attend a phraſe which is veiled. The impudence of thoſe who expreſs themſelves like porters, and their want of reſpect, is the true cauſe of ſuch an indignation. Their expreſſion excites three ideas: one is a direct and main idea; the others are indirect and acceſſory. The direct idea repreſents the filthineſs of the object, and does not do it more diſtinctly than the idea of another word. But the indirect and acceſſory ideas repreſent the diſpoſition of the perſon who ſpeaks, his brutiſhneſs, his contempt of the hearers, and his deſign of affronting a woman of honour (71). This is what ſhe is angry at. She is not offended, as ſhe is a modeſt woman; for under this notion nothing can offend her but the object itſelf which ſullies the imagination: but ſhe is not offended at that object; for if it had been repreſented to her imagination with other phraſes expreſſing the obſcenity as effectually as the filthy word, ſhe would not have been angry; and therefore her vexation proceeds from ſome other reaſon, I mean from her being uncivilly uſed. Hence it is that a woman of gallantry will often expreſs a greater indignation againſt thoſe who talk obſcenely to her, than a virtuous woman, becauſe ſhe takes it for an inſult, and a bloody affront. Her reſentment does not proceed from the love of chaſtity, but from pride and a deſire of revenge. As for virtuous women, who are provoked at a groſs obſcenity, they are ſo out of a reaſonable principle of ſelf-love; for reaſon requires they ſhould reſent an injury which deprives them of the reſpect due to their ſex; and beſides, it is very reaſonable they ſhould keep up a good reputation, which they could not do, ſhould they ſuffer the ſame things to be ſaid to them which are ſaid to leud women.

Thus I prove that it was impoſſible to leave out of this Dictionary every thing that ſullies the imagination. It muſt be ſullied, which way ſoever the reader be told that Henry IV had natural children.

IT is impoſſible to prevent objects from ſullying the imagination.

It is therefore enough for me to keep within the bounds of common civility. If any one was ſo great a lover of purity, as to wiſh not only that no immodeſt deſire ſhould ariſe in his mind, but alſo that his imagination ſhould be conſtantly free from every obſcene idea, he could not attain his end without loſing his eyes and his ears, and the remembrance of many things which he could not chooſe but ſee and hear. Such a perfection cannot be hoped for whilſt we ſee men and beaſts, and know the ſignification of certain words which make a neceſſary part of our language. It is not in our power either to have or not to have certain ideas, when certain objects ſtrike our ſenſes; they are imprinted in our imagination whether we will or not. Chaſtity is not endangered by them, provided we do not grow fond of them, and approve of them. If chaſtity was inconſiſtent with impure ideas, we ſhould never go to church, where impurity is cenſured, and ſo many banns of matrimony are bid: we ſhould never hear that office of the Liturgy that is read before the whole congregation on a wedding-day: we ſhould never read the moſt excellent of all books, I mean the holy Scriptures; and we ſhould avoid, as ſo many infectious places, all the converſations where people talk of pregnancies, childbirths, and chriſtenings. Imagination is a rambler which runs in a moment from the effect to the cauſe, and finds the way ſo well beaten, that it goes from one end to the other, before reaſon has time to ſtop it.

There is another conſideration which may teach the compilers of Literature, that it is enough for them to keep within the bounds of common decency; I mean, that they muſt not expect to be read by people, whoſe ears and imagination are ſo tender as to receive dangerous impreſſions from the leaſt obſcene object. I do not know whether it was reaſonably ſuppoſed in ancient Rome, that the filthy words which little children were taught to ſpeak in the chamber of a bride (72), were the firſt ſhe had heard; but I am perſuaded, that in our days, any perſon of either ſex, who has been converſant in the world four or five years, has heard abundance of obſcene things, eſpecially in ſuch countries where jealouſy is not tyrannical: there people enjoy a great freedom; merry converſations, parties of pleaſure, feaſts, and country-journies are very common; they only think of paſſing away the time merrily. It is true, the preſence of the fair ſex prevents obſcenities from appearing bare-faced, but they appear in a diſguiſe; which, as I have ſhown above, does not hinder the impreſſion of a filthy object, no more than if one ſhould uſe the plain words of a clown. Women dare not be angry when things are wrapped up (73) for fear of being accounted finical and preciſe (74). This is a mere diſpute about words: the thing ſignified is admitted, but not all the

(66) *Gen. iv*, 1.

(67) Ibid. *xvi*. 4.

(68) *Iſaiah viii*, 3.

(69) *Thoſe for inſtance which treat of the divorce of Henry VIII, and Catherine of Aragon.*

(70) *This expreſſion*, The parts which it is not fit to name, *is accounted very modeſt, and very chaſte; yet it is as ſignificant as any other: It is at bottom naming the thing which we ſay it is not fit to name; and denoting it in ſuch a manner, that no body can be at a loſs to know what is meant.*

(71) *Compare with this the article* BEZA, *citation* (36), *where I cite the* Art of Thinking.

(72) *See the article* LYCURGUS, *remark* [*G*].

(73) *See, above, citat.* (52).

(74) *See, above, citat.* (20).

words which ſignify it. Therefore an author may very well believe that his readers will not be ſurprized, being ſtrengthened and hardened by cuſtom.

It is certain, that women who read a book of Literature, do not begin with that: they have already read romances, plays, and love poems. They are therefore ſufficiently experienced. There is nothing in my Dictionary that can daunt them, after they have encountered ſuch enemies. If the *luxurious* (75) Muſic of Opera's, the tenderneſs of Tragedies, the licentiouſneſs of Comedies, and the affecting deſcriptions of the effects and diſorders of love, make no dangerous impreſſions upon them, they need not be afraid of reading the articles of **Abelard** and **Heloisa**. If they find ſhocking paſſages in my Dictionary, their pain will ſoon be ſucceeded by the agreeable pleaſure they will feel, in having given to themſelves freſh proofs of the ſtrength of their modeſty. If they delight in ſuch paſſages, and ſpoil themſelves by dwelling on them, that will not be my fault, they muſt blame their own depravity. Do I not ſhew theſe things to be criminal?

(75) *It is an epithet of Mr Boileau in his tenth ſatire.*

Second queſtion. It cannot be ſaid that there are any obſcenities liable to cenſure in this book, as they conſiſt in the very facts related by me.

This is what I had to ſay upon the firſt of the two queſtions which I was to diſcuſs. I hope the reader will be ſenſible of the whole force of my juſtification, and own, that if there is in my Dictionary any obſcenity liable to cenſure, it does not proceed from the expreſſions I uſe when I ſpeak of myſelf. Let us inquire now whether it conſiſts in the things themſelves, either when I have ſet down the words of other authors, or have only given the ſenſe of them. This is the queſtion I have undertaken to examine.

No man can anſwer this queſtion in the affirmative, without laying down theſe two poſitions: 1. That an Hiſtorian is obliged to ſuppreſs all the leud actions which are to be found either in the lives of Princes, or in thoſe of private perſons. 2. That a Moraliſt, who condemns leudneſs, ought never to mention any thing that offends modeſty. The Puriſts I have been ſpeaking of, muſt neceſſarily admit theſe two poſitions, and it is certain, there have been at all times many people, who have condemned the hiſtories and invectives, in which the diſorders of leudneſs appear under dreadful images.

If our Puriſts are willing to argue conſiſtently, and to keep conſtantly to their maxims, they muſt admit the two poſitions I have mentioned. They muſt ſay, 1. That an Hiſtorian ought barely to obſerve, that Charlemagne, the two Joans of Naples, and Henry IV of France were not chaſte. 2. That a Preacher, and a ghoſtly Father, and any other man who deſires the reformation of manners, ought to cenſure leudneſs only in general. I have quoted (76) an author, who continually condemns the Hiſtorian Mezerai for mentioning ſome particular facts which offend chaſte ears. He cenſures him particularly for what he ſays of Margaret de Valois, the firſt wife of Henry the Great.

(76) *See, above, citat.* (44), (45).

There have been ſuch Puriſts in all ages; but there have always been alſo great authors who laughed at the ſcruples and fancies of theſe men; ſo that the Republic of Letters has always been divided into two parties upon this head: each of them alledged their reaſons and authorities; each of them raiſed objections, and made anſwers, and no ſupreme tribunal did ever determine the matter. I am therefore diſpenſed with entring upon a long diſcuſſion; this affords me a ſhort way to come off. For if they who deſpiſed the maxims of the Puriſts, did always make a conſiderable party in the Republic of Letters, if they always maintained their right, if that difference has never been decided, every private man may lawfully ſide with them, and believe at leaſt, that it is probable they are in the right. No man can reaſonably be denied the privileges of the doctrine of probability in this caſe. They who follow the Anti-Puriſts (77), are not reduced to two or three grave authors: they may be reckoned by hundreds, and may ſtrengthen their cauſe by the deciſive example of the inſpired writers (78). If you peruſe the book of Geneſis you will find that Moſes tells us, without any compaſs of words, that two daughters having made their father drunk, lay with him, and had children by him (79); that Dinah, Jacob's daughter, was raviſhed (80); that Judah, the ſon of the ſame Patriarch, defiled himſelf in an open road with a woman he took for a proſtitute, but ſhe was his daughter-in-law, and knew him very well (81); that one of the ſons of Judah * * * (82); and that Reuben, eldeſt brother to Judah, committed inceſt with a wife of his own father (83). There are many things in Leviticus, which are not proper to be read in Proteſtant churches. An abominable action is related in the book of Judges (84). The Prophets uſed the moſt energic expreſſions to repreſent the turpitude of leudneſs. See alſo the deſcription of the whore in the Apocalypſe. They have uſed ſome compariſons which the Miniſters durſt not mention entire [*E*]. All the Proteſtant tradeſmen in France could tell the Popiſh miſſionaries, diſputing

(77) *So I call for brevity ſake thoſe who laugh at the pretended niceneſs of the Puriſts.*

(78) *See the article* **Sforza** (Catherine) *citat.* (18).

(79) *Gen. xix.*

(80) Ibid. *xxxiv.*

(81) Ib. *xxxviii.*

(82) Id. ibid.

(83) Ibid. *xlix.* 4.

(84) *Chap. xix.*

[*E*] *The Prophets uſed ſome compariſons, which the miniſters durſt not mention entire.*] The following paſſage of Dr Menjot will ſerve for a commentary on the text of this remark. *Hic obiter obſervabimus mulierem menſtruatam dici* ἀποκαθημένην *à ſeptuaginta . . . veteris Teſtamenti Græcis interpretibus,* ὡς ῥάκος ἀποκαθημένης πᾶσα ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἡμῶν, † omnis noſtra juſtitia eſt quaſi pannus menſtruatæ; *eò quod Iſraëliticæ fœminæ* αἷς ἦν τὰ κατ᾽ ἐθισμὸν τῶν γυναικῶν, ‡ *ut alibi loquuntur, iidem interpretes,* during their monthly courſes, *ſedere conſueviſſent, ut conſtat ex hiſtoriâ Rachelis* ‡ . . . . *Ità idem Eſaias anteà dixerat* * λικμήσεις

† *Eſaiæ cap. lxiv.*

‡ *Geneſ. cap. xxxi.*

‡ *Loc. cit.*

* *Ibid. cap. xxx.*

diſputing about the merit of good works, that *all our righteouſneſs is as filthy rags*; but the remaining part of the paſſage was unknown to them, becauſe it was not put into Controverſial books. Has St Paul, in his Epiſtle to the Romans (85), ſuch a regard to chaſte ears as our Puriſts require? Does he not deſcribe, both in ſtrong and plain expreſſions the abominable impurities of the Heathens?

If it be objected, that the ſacred writers have privileges peculiar to them, *ſunt ſuperis ſua jura*; I anſwer, that not only the graveſt Heathen writers, but alſo the antient Fathers of the Church, wrote with the ſame freedom. When Livy does ſo gravely and majeſtically relate the ſuppreſſion of the Bacchanalia (86), he diſcovers ſeveral abominations, which ſully the imagination, and cannot be read without horror. Seneca, the graveſt and moſt rigid Philoſopher of antient Rome, deſcribes the moſt infamous leudneſs in the plaineſt words (87). He condemns it with all the ſeverity of a Cenſor, but at the ſame time he makes a plain and almoſt naked deſcription of it. When the Fathers of the Church ſpeak of the Gnoſtics or Manichees, or ſuch ſects, they relate ſeveral things which not only defile the imagination, but alſo make one's ſtomach riſe, and might ſerve for a vomit. Arnobius, in his invectives againſt the Heathens, is ſo little cautious in his words, that Mr de la Fontaine would certainly have dreſſed ſuch things more cleanly, and had been more reſerved in what concerns Priapus. St Auguſtin, on ſome occaſions, expreſſed himſelf in very plain and obſcene words (88). St Ambroſe and St Chryſoſtome have done the like; nay, the latter maintained, we ought to do it in order to inſpire a true abhorrence for ſuch leud actions as we deſcribe. Caſaubon did not approve this method [*F*]; but he muſt permit us to believe, that his opinion about moral queſtions, is not to be compared with that of ſo great a Saint.

If a catalogue was made of all the Hiſtorians from Suetonius down to Mezerai, who have groſsly related leud actions, it would fill up many pages; and if it be ſaid, that Suetonius has been blamed by famous authors, my adverſaries can take no advantage of

(85) *Chap. i.*

(86) Titus Livius, *lib. xxxix, pag. m.* 749, *& ſeq. Note, That Antony de la Faye in his French tranſlation of Livy, has not weakened the original.*

(87) *See the* Hexameron Ruſtique, *Journée II, pag. m.* 45, *& ſeq.*

(88) Ibid. *pag.* 58, *& ſeq.*

λικμήσης ὡς ὕδωρ τῆς ἀποκαθημένης, ventilabis, *hoc eſt diſperges* ea *(de idolis loquitur)* ſicut immunditiam menſtruatæ, *ut fert textus vulgatæ lectionis* (x).

[*F*] *Caſaubon did not approve this method.*] It becomes him very ill to pretend to be wiſer than the antient Fathers. If the queſtion was about the ſenſe of a paſſage of Polybius, Suetonius, or Athenæus, one might reaſonably prefer his judgment. But for a man, who made the ſtudy of Philological learning his chief buſineſs, to pretend to tutor the moſt holy Fathers of the Church, upon matters of conſcience, is what cannot be digeſted. However, we muſt acknowledge his candour: he did not diſſemble that his cenſure upon Perſius, might be confuted by the maxims of St Chryſoſtome; he very ingenuouſly quotes the words of that Father. ‘Poëta alioquin graviſſimus, & verecundiæ virginalis, ut teſtantur de illo veteres, à moribus ſuis heic diſceſſit. Sic enim alienam impudicitiam caſtigat, ut ſermonis licentia, etſi figuris obſcurati, caſtas aures offendat meritò. Omnino ſatius erat verecundiam ſilentio vindicare. Sed neſcio quomodo pervaſit etiam ſapientiſſimorum hominum mentes illa opinio, obſcœnitatem obſcœnitate aut liberiore ſaltem dictione eſſe caſtigandam. Quod quàm à recta ratione alienum? & tamen ſummis viris ita olim placitum. Quis ſine rubore quæ de ſpeculo Hoſtii ſcripſit Seneca legat, paullo qui ſit αἰδημονέστερος? quid beatus Hieronymus, ille tantus caſtitatis & virginitatis buccinator? nonne & ipſe aliquando in turpia turpiculè invehitur? ſanè quidem: neque id uno loco. Sed cauſſam quæ viros graves compulit, ut ita ſentirent, itaque ſcriberent, aperit Johannes Chryſoſtomus, plenum illud omni virtute & ſanctimonia pectus. Ait ille homilia quarta in epiſtolam ad Romanos, eos quorum eſt ſcopus flagitia hominum nequam atque impudicorum reprehendere, cogi neceſſariò fœditatem illorum denudare, & quaſi ob oculos ſpectandam proponere: quia parum aliter profecturi ſint. Ἂν μὲν γὰρ, inquit, σεμνῶς εἴπῃς, οὐ δυνήσῃ καθικέσθαι τοῦ ἀκούοντος· ἐὰν δὲ βουληθῇς καθάψασθαι σφοδρῶς, ἀνάγκην ἔχεις ἀπογυμνῶσαι σαφέστερον τὸ λεγόμενον. Solet etiam in eam rem chirurgi exemplum afferre, qui ut tabo ac ſanie manans ulcus ſanet, non veretur ſibi manus inquinare, atque in fœtidiſſimum pus immittere. Ὁ ἰατρὸς, inquit, in priorem ad Corinthios, σηπεδόνα ἐκβαλεῖν βουλόμενος, οὐ σκοπεῖ πῶς καθαρὰς διατηρήσειε τὰς χεῖρας, ἀλλ᾽ ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπαλλάξειε σηπεδόνος. Quam ſententiam totidem ferè verbis ſæpe repetit, idemque in eam ad Theſſalonicenſes diſtinguendum monet, utrum dicantur ejuſmodi ſermones, ἐξ οἰκείου πάθους, an ἀπὸ κηδεμονίας: ex loquentis affectu, an curandi voluntate (y). - - - - *Perſius, a Poet, very grave, and exceedingly modeſt, as the Antients teſtify of him, did here depart from his character. For he laſhes immodeſty and leudneſs in ſuch a manner, that the licentiouſneſs of his expreſſions, though veiled and wrapped up in figures, gives juſt offence to the modeſt reader. It had been much better for him to have cenſured immodeſty by his ſilence. But I know not how it has happened, that even the wiſeſt men are come into an opinion, that obſcenity muſt be laſhed by obſcenity, or at leaſt by licentious expreſſions. How unreaſonable and abſurd is this opinion! and yet it has been received in antient times by the moſt eminent men. Can any modeſt perſon read without bluſhing what Seneca has written concerning the mirrour of Hoſtius? And even St Jerom, who ſo highly extolled chaſtity and virginity, does he not ſometimes inveigh againſt filthy matters in a filthy manner? He certainly does, and that in more than one place. The reaſon which induced ſober and grave men to think and write in this manner is explained to us by John Chryſoſtome, a man of the moſt conſummate virtue and piety. In his fourth Homily on the Epiſtle to the Romans he ſays, that they who purpoſe to cenſure the vices of leud and profligate men, lie under a neceſſity of unveiling their leudneſs, and of expoſing it as it were naked; becauſe otherwiſe their cenſures would do no good.* For, *ſays he,* if your expreſſions are decent and modeſt, you will not be able to gain the attention of your hearers; but if you would force their attention, and ſtrike your audience, you are under a neceſſity of giving them an open and naked account of things. *He likewiſe alledges upon this ſubject the example of a Surgeon, who when he would cure a ſore that emits a filthy corrupt matter, is not afraid of ſtaining his hands, and putting them into the moſt loathſome corruption.* The Surgeon, *ſays he, upon the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians,* when he would remove the corrupt matter, is not ſollicitous about keeping his hands clean, but only about curing the ſore. *This ſentence he frequently repeats almoſt in the ſame words; and upon the Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, he obſerves that we muſt diſtinguiſh between licentious expreſſions, when they come from the heart, and have the approbation of the perſon who uſes them, and when they proceed only from a deſign of reſtraining men from immodeſty.*’ See the margin (z).

(x) Antonius Menjotius, de Paſſione uterina, *pag.* 4, 5.

(y) Caſaub. Comment. in Perſ. Sat. IV, *pag. m.* 344, *& ſeq.*

(z) *Note, That St Chryſoſtome, and Caſaubon look upon this as a true point of morality: one will have it to be advantageous to good manners, and the other to be contrary to them. Wherefore I might ſay, that in a caſe of conſcience and morality Caſaubon's judgment ought not to be preferred; and I might ſay ſo without advancing any thing contrary to what I have ſaid above that the thing I could be blamed for would be only a Grammatical affair.*

of it, ſince thoſe who vindicate him, are as eminent as thoſe who find fault with him [G].

There is a vaſt number of Moraliſts who have deplored the corruption of their age, and given a plain and naked account of the ſeveral exceſſes committed in it (89). I do not pretend to excuſe all the Caſuiſts; but I can poſitively affirm, that in the Church of Rome none of them can avoid ſaying many things that offend modeſty. It is well known, that Father Natalis Alexander declared for rigid Morality, and was engaged in many quarrels upon that account. I peruſed the other day in his Moral Doctrines what concerns the ſins forbidden by the ſeventh commandment (90), and hardly found any period in it, but what contains groſs obſcenities: and yet I think he is one of thoſe who treat ſuch matters with the greateſt modeſty; but it is a ſubject that does not permit a writer to have a tender regard for modeſty. The ſame may be ſaid of the Canoniſts (91), and thoſe who write Anatomical books: and to ſhew that to this very day men of a good taſte and great politeneſs ſide with the Anti-Puriſts, I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of the author, who criticized Mr de St Evremond. *Do not we ſee ſtill*, ſays he (92), *in the Theological treatiſes of human actions, the explication of all the leud thoughts and actions that can be ſuggeſted by luſt? Thoſe explications are not contrary to modeſty, being neceſſary to thoſe whom God has appointed for the direction of others, who ought to have a perfect knowledge of ſins, with all their circumſtances, in order to make a ſinner ſenſible of the condition he is in, and work his repentance. But if you inſiſt, that thoſe treatiſes are inconſiſtent with modeſty; find out a ſcience more contrary to it than Anatomy, wherein all the parts of human bodies are viewed? Yet there is no law againſt thoſe who teach it* (93).

The party of the Anti-Puriſts would be more numerous than it is, were it not that the vanity or malice of the Critics engage ſeveral writers to ſide with the contrary faction. There is hardly any book but what is criticized, and narrowly examined; and if there are any thoughts or expreſſions in it that want a certain niceneſs, with regard to obſcenity, ſeveral writers will riſe up againſt it, and expreſs a great zeal for offended modeſty (94). They fall upon that topic, and raiſe many clamours. Nothing can be more eaſy, nor more proper to prepoſſeſs the public. A Critic who ſtrikes upon that key is cried up by devout and polite people, and accounted the protector of purity: this is the reaſon which induces him to declare for the Puriſts. He raiſes his reputation two ways: he ſets up for a man who is concerned for good manners, and who converſes with the polite world. This is only a piece of craft in an author: Morality is no farther concerned in it than is neceſſary to form a fair out-ſide. Many who criticize books only in converſation, follow the footſteps of the Critics in print.

How many people inveighed againſt the book *de contactibus impudicis*, and the *Hiſtoria Flagellantium* (95), becauſe Dr Boileau was none of their cabal in the faculty of Theology? Had the author been of their party, who is a man famous for his probity and learning, they would have approved his giving a lively deſcription of the obſcenities cenſured by him; but becauſe they did not love him they ſided with the Puriſts.

But though this faction be ever ſo numerous, either through ſuch motives, or more honourable ones, it is certain the contrary party is conſiderable enough to juſtify thoſe who ſtand for it. The authority of the antient Fathers of the Church who followed it, and therein imitated the Prophets and Apoſtles, makes their opinion ſo highly probable, that if any one ſhould obſtinately maintain that it cannot be held with a ſafe conſcience, he would not deſerve to be minded.

If the Puriſts were contented to ſay that their opinion is better, we might think ourſelves obliged to debate the matter with them, and to compare together the reaſons of

(89) *See among others Joannes Sariſberienſis, Biſhop of Chartres*, de nugis Curialium, *lib. iii, cap. xiii, who alledges the example of St Paul in his excuſe.*

(90) *Or, the ſixth, according to the Roman Catholics.*

(91) *When they explain the title* de Frigidis *and other matrimonial ſubjects.*

(92) Diſſertat. ſur les Oeuvres de Mr de St Evremond, *pag.* 216, 217. *Paris* 1698.

(93) *Mr Devaux, Provoſt of the ſociety of Surgeons at Paris, has publiſhed a book mentioned in the* xxiſt Journal des Sçavans, *for the year* 1703. *Tho' the Journaliſts cenſure the obſcenities of that author, they nevertheleſs tranſcribe ſome of them.*

(94) *Luther, whoſe expreſſions were very free, cenſured Eraſmus. See the anſwer of the latter, pag.* 34, 35.

(95) *That there were other books moſt pernicious, printed at Paris, and written by ſome Doctors, againſt which the ſacred faculty ſhould thunder out anathema's, whereas they were ſilent: whereupon he named a ſet of books, among which that of Dr Boileau* de Contactibus impudicis *was one.* Afaire de Marie d'Agreda, *pag.* 11.

[G] *Thoſe who vindicate Suetonius are as eminent as thoſe who find fault with him.*] Beſides what I have quoted in another place (*a a*), I ſhall ſet down here a fine paſſage of Henry Glareanus. ‘De vitiis diſſertio ſive diſputatio duplex eſt. Una, qua ad vitia homines allicimus ſuaſionibus, exhortationibus, ac lenociniis: ut qui amare docent noſtra ætate, proh dolor! etiam potare, qui amatoria ludunt, ut juvenum mentes veluti inebrient, quales impudici Poëtæ. Ea diſſertio vitioſa eſt ac deteſtanda, maximè homini Chriſtiano, plus etiam illis, qui juventuti ut magiſtri præſunt. Altera eſt diſſertio de vitiis, ut ea deteſtemur ac execremur: imò quoties de eis fit mentio, ut ab iis dehortemur, ab iis abſtineamus, & execremur. Hæc diſſertio neutiquam reprehendenda eſt; multi enim ſancti viri ac Doctores quemadmodum de virtutibus ſcripſerunt, ita è regione de vitiis copioſè diſſeruerunt. Itaque Cæſarem refert vitia Suetonius, in odium illorum monſtrorum id facit, ut ea ſcilicet fugiamus ac evitemus: imò cogitemus in quanta cæcitate fuerint perditi illi nebulones: & multò magis in quanta ſtupiditate mundus, qui talia portenta dignatus eſt ullo honore, cum nihil illis tetrius ac magis abominabile fuerit (*b b*). ---- *Diſcourſes on vice are of two ſorts, one wherein by perſuaſions, exhortations, and allurements the authors entice us to the practice of vice; ſuch are they who in our days inſtruct people how to carry on intrigues and amours, (how ſhameful a thing is this?) they who bring people into a habit of drinking, they who write amorous plays, and thereby, as it were, intoxicate the minds of youth, ſuch as the leud Poets. This ſort of diſcourſe is vicious and to be deteſted by all men, eſpecially Chriſtians, and ſtill more by thoſe who have the charge and inſpection of youth. The other kind of diſcourſe on vice is that which is deſigned to raiſe an abhorrence and deteſtation of it, and to refrain, diſſuade, and frighten, us from the practice of vice, as often as it is mentioned. Diſcourſes of this kind are far from being blameable, for many pious men and many Divines, as they have employed their pens on the ſubject of virtue, have on the other ſide written at large concerning vice. Thus Suetonious, by relating the vices of the Cæſars, deſigned to raiſe our hatred and abhorrence of thoſe monſters, and to make us avoid their example; nay, to make us conſider how blind thoſe abandoned wretches muſt have been, and in what a woful ſtupidity the world muſt have been ſunk, when they went ſo far as to pay them any honours, ſince nothing in nature could be more baſe, foul, and abominable, than thoſe prodigies of vice.*’

(*a a*) *In the article of* SUETONIUS, *remark* [*E*].

Casarum

(*b b*) Henricus Loritus Glareanus, *Præfat. in* Sueton. apud Goldaſt. Prolegom. in Petronium, *cap. ii, pag. m.* 30.

of both parties, though in truth it ſeems very ſtrange that Chriſtians ſhould queſtion whether there is a better courſe to be taken than that of the ſacred writers. However we might yield our right, hear their objections, and propoſe our difficulties. I have no need of ſuch diſcuſſions; it is enough for me that the conduct of the Hiſtorians or Cenſurers, who relate obſcene things, is not only allowed and authorized by a conſtant practice, but alſo very good.

For if thoſe authors could lawfully write what I have written, I might imitate them, and lawfully quote them. I deſire no more. Others may examine, if they pleaſe, whether I had done better in taking quite another method.

The right I have to quote what I have quoted, is grounded upon two reaſons: one is, that if every body is allowed to read Catullus and Martial, *&c.* an author may be allowed to quote out of thoſe Poets ſuch paſſages as he thinks fit: The other is, that if it be lawful for an Hiſtorian to relate a leud action of Caligula, an author may relate an obſcene thought or remark of Montagne or Brantome; for ſuch a thought or remark is not near ſo criminal as the infamous actions of Caligula. Whoever has a right to mention the latter, has *à fortiori* a much greater right to mention the former: and it would be a contradiction or an abſurdity, to ſuffer that Petronius and Suetonius, and the moſt laſcivious Poets, ſhould be printed and publickly ſold with notes explaining their moſt brutiſh obſcenities, and to forbid the author of a Critical Dictionary, attended with a Commentary, to alledge a paſſage of thoſe writers for the confirmation or illuſtration of ſome particular.

An anſwer to three objections.

Here I muſt examine three objections that are commonly raiſed: It is ſaid that a Phyſician and a Caſuiſt are obliged, by the nature of their ſubject, to rake into many filthy things, but that my work required nothing like it. 2. That they who write in Latin, may take a liberty which the French tongue will not bear. 3. That what was allowable in former ages, ought to be forbidden in ours, becauſe of its prodigious corruption.

The firſt objection can only be made by ſuch readers as are utter ſtrangers to the nature of my book. It is not a book like thoſe that are intituled *Bouquet Hiſtorial*, *Fleurs d'Exemples*, *Parterre Hiſtorique*, *Lemniſci Hiſtoriarum*, in which an author inſerts only what he pleaſes. It is an Hiſtorical Dictionary with a Commentary. LAÏS ought to have a place in it as well as LUCRETIA; and becauſe it is a Dictionary which comes out after ſeveral others, it ought chiefly to contain what is not to be found in others. The reader muſt find in it, not only a general account of ſuch actions as are moſt known, but alſo a particular narrative of thoſe which are leaſt known, and a collection of what is diſperſed in ſeveral places. Proofs ought to be alledged, examined, confirmed, and cleared. In a word, it is a compilation. Now every body ought to know, that *a compiler, who relates things, and comments upon them, has all the privileges of a Phyſician, and of an Advocate,* &c. *as occaſion requires; he may uſe their verbal proceſſes, and their terms of art. If he gives an account of the divorce of Lotharius and Tetberga, he may publiſh extracts from Hincmar, Archbiſhop of Rheims, who wrote the impurities that were averred in that trial* (96). This is what I ſaid in my Remarks upon the pretended Judgment of the Public, in the year 1697. I repeat it with this other paſſage: 'When 'I am let into the ſecret of collecting in a compilation all that the Antients have ſaid 'concerning the courtezan Laïs, without mentioning leud actions, I ſhall own myſelf 'guilty. It muſt at leaſt be proved againſt me, that a Commentator has not the privi'lege of collecting whatever has been ſaid of Helen; but how can it be proved? Where 'is the Legiſlator who has told the compilers, *Hitherto you may go, but you muſt advance no* '*further: You muſt not quote Athenæus, nor ſuch a Scholiaſt, nor ſuch a Philoſopher?* 'Has it not been their conſtant practice to make their writings as full and extenſive as 'their reading (97).' I could name many Divines, who having pitched upon a certain ſubject, have quoted out of all authors whatever they thought fit, though they were things that defiled the imagination; I ſhall only name three, Lydius (98), Saldenus, and Lomeier. They were Dutch Miniſters, the firſt at Dort, the ſecond at the Hague, and the third at Zutphen. They were very much eſteemed for their learning and virtue. Whoever reads the dialogues of the firſt concerning nuptial ceremonies (99), the Diſſertations of the ſecond *de Canis pretio*, and *de Eunuchis* (100); and the Diſſertation of the third concerning kiſſes (101); will find in them horrid obſcenities, and abominable quotations.

It will be ſaid, that thoſe books are written in Latin. This is the ſecond objection I am to anſwer, and I ſhall ſhew eaſily the weakneſs of it: for an obſcene object is no leſs offenſive to modeſty, when it offers itſelf in Latin to thoſe who underſtand Latin, than when it offers itſelf in French to thoſe who underſtand French; and if it were a fault to imprint obſcene objects in our own and the reader's imagination, theſe three Miniſters could not be juſtified. They underſtood what they wrote, and made it intelligible to their readers, and conſequently they have defiled their imagination, and do every day defile the imagination of thoſe who read their books. But were it not a very unjuſt thing to charge them with ſuch immorality? They who write in French ought not therefore to be charged with it, for they do no more than underſtand what they write, and make it intelligible to their readers.

I know

---

(96) *Theſe words are taken from my* Remarks upon a piece intituled, *The Judgment of the Public, &c. num. ix.*

(97) Ibid. *num. xxxiv.*

(98) *James.*

(99) *I have given the title of it in the article* LYDIUS, *remark* [*B*].

(100) *In the book intituled,* Otia Theologica, *printed in the year* 1684.

(101) *In a book, intituled,* Dierum Genialium ſive Diſſertationum Philologicarum Decas I, *printed in* 1694.

I know two differences will be alledged, one is, that they who underſtand Latin, are not ſo many as they who underſtand French: The other is, that they who underſtand Latin are better provided than others, againſt the malignant influence of obſcene objects. I make three anſwers to this. I anſwer in the firſt place, that Latin is underſtood by ſo many people all over Europe, that the firſt difference would not be ſufficient to juſtify thoſe who relate or quote obſcene things in that language; the miſchief would ſtill be great, and very great. I anſwer in the ſecond place, that it is only by degrees that ſtudy corroborates a man againſt objects which ſully the imagination; and therefore Latin obſcenities would ſtill have a dangerous effect upon young ſcholars. We hardly find, generally ſpeaking, that they are more chaſte and leſs debauched than other young men. Laſtly, I ſay that moſt of my readers are perſons who have applied themſelves to ſtudy; for they who have not ſtudied, little mind a book intermixed with Greek and Latin paſſages as mine is. However, they cannot underſtand the chief obſcenities, ſince they are in Latin. I conclude, that if there is any ſolidity in the differences objected to me, I may make an advantage of it.

I proceed to the third objection, which concerns the great corruption of our age. We have loſt ſay they, modeſty both in morals, and in expreſſions. The words that were formerly modeſt, are no longer ſo; we muſt uſe others which only excite modeſt ideas: otherwiſe we ſhould loſe the little virtue that remains. I ſhall not examine whether there is any reaſon to believe that men are now more corrupt than they were in former times (102). The ſame complaints have been made at all times (103), and that very thing ought to make us ſuſpect the truth of them. I can hardly believe that the corruption of our age is equal to that of the reign of Charles IX, and Henry III. But allowing it to be ſo, I ſhall draw a quite contrary concluſion from it; for it is never ſo neceſſary to repreſent in a ſtrong and lively manner the turpitude of vice, as when it prevails moſt [*H*]; and it is a wrong way of ſtemming the current of leudneſs, to cry it down with ſoft words, and to ſcruple to give an odious name to a proſtitute. Beſides, if there is ſo great a corruption, what benefit has the world got by that chaſtity of words introduced into the French tongue within theſe ſixty years, according to Mr Chevreau's calculation (104)? Is it not a proof that the proſcription of pretended obſcene ideas is an inſignificant remedy? Who told you they ought to be proſcribed, for fear of entirely deſtroying modeſty? Have you conſulted the women for whoſe ſake you chiefly abſtain from thoſe words? Have they confeſſed to you, that their honour is very much endangered by them? Would they not rather ſay, that you ſlander them if

you

[*H*] *It is never ſo neceſſary to repreſent in a ſtrong and lively manner the turpitude of vice, as when it prevails moſt.*] See, above (*cc*), what induced Peter Damian to write the *Gomorrhæus*, and conſider how the Dominicans reſolved to preach againſt Sodomy, when they came to know that it was grown very common. Preaching being allotted to them, they deliberated whether they ſhould thunder out againſt that ſin, or ſay nothing of it; and they concluded that there was a neceſſity to thunder out againſt it, ſince it was grown ſo crying. ‘*Fratres Ordinis Prædicatorum, qui eum apud Chriſtianos locum invaſerunt, quem olim apud Gentiles obtienurant Poëtæ & Satyrici, in tracta, de Turcis:* Quæſitum extitit de gravi infectione populi Chriſtiani, quoad prædicta vitia (Sodomitica) an videlicet tam gravis infectio ex negligentia officii prædicationis contingeret, dum ipſi prædicatores gravitatem hujus vitii fidelibus non proponerent? Quæſitumque ulteriùs extitit, an propter ſimplices & innocentes expediret Prædicatoribus ſub ſilentio pertranſire de hujuſmodi vitiis differendo? Reſponſum fuit, quòd quia officium prædicationis eſt præcipuum in Eccleſia ad extirpationem vitiorum & plantationem virtutum, ſi gravitas hujus vitii fidelibus ardenter proponeretur, ut quia videlicet pro vindicta clamat ad cœlum, &c. Ad ſecundum quæſitum reſponſum fuit, quòd omnino ſub ſilentio pertranſire non expediret, etiam propter quoſcunque innocentes, multiplici ratione. Primò, quia videmus quod tales innocentes, etiam ex diabolica ſuggeſtione continuè ſeducuntur abſque auditione verbi Dei, & declaratione illorum vitiorum. Unde utriſque tam reis quam innocentibus expedit talis declaratio verbi Dei. Secundò ad hoc nos admonet Scriptura, prout eſt illud; Si non annunciaveris iniquo iniquitatem ejus, ſanguinem ejus de manu tua requiram. Et iterum; Clama, ne ceſſes: annuncia populo meo ſcelera eorum. Ratione etiam concludebatur. Nam Apoſtolus Paulus expreſſiſſimè loquitur ad Roman. 1. de hujuſmodi vitiis, & ſicut cuncta alia ſcripta ipſius neceſſariò prædicantur, ita & præſens hæc materia, cùm non ſit data diſtinctio inter ſuas doctrinas, quare videlicet una magis debeat eſſe prædicabilis quam altera. Ad hoc eſt Gregorius in Moralibus; Sicut incauta locutio in errorem pertrahit, ita indiſcretum ſilentium in errore relinquit (*dd*). - - - - *A queſtion was ſtarted concerning the exceeding corruption of manners which prevailed among the Chriſtians, namely, whether the Sodomitical practices to which they were addicted, ought to be imputed to the remiſſneſs of the preachers, who forbore to inculcate the heinouſneſs of ſuch crimes? There was alſo ſtarted another queſtion, viz. Whether out of a regard for the ſimple people, who were ignorant of thoſe crimes, the preachers ought to paſs them over in ſilence? To the firſt of theſe queſtions it was anſwered, that becauſe the chief office in the Church, was that of preaching, an office deſigned for the rooting out of vice, and implanting of virtue, if the heinouſneſs of that crime was repreſented to Chriſtians in its ſtrongeſt colours, and as crying for vengeance from Heaven, &c. To the ſecond queſtion it was anſwered, that it ought not to be paſſed over in ſilence, for the ſake of ever ſo great number of people ignorant of theſe crimes; and that for many reaſons. Firſt, becauſe we ſee that ſuch people are continually ſeduced to vice by the ſuggeſtions of the Devil, when they hear not the word of God preached to them, and the ſinfulneſs of thoſe vices declared. And therefore ſuch a declaration of the word of God was neceſſary both for the guilty and innocent. In the ſecond place the Scripture enjoins it; as in that paſſage.* If thou declareſt not to the wicked the iniquity of his ways, I will require his blood at thy hands: *and again in this*, cry aloud and ſpare not, and declare to my people their tranſgreſſions. *This was further confirmed by reaſon. For the Apoſtle Paul in his Epiſtle to the Romans, mentions this kind of vice in expreſs terms, and as all his other writings ought to be the ſubject of preaching, ſo ought alſo the preſent matter ſince there is no diſtinction made between the doctrines of that Apoſtle, nor any reaſon aſſigned why one may not be preached as well as any other. Moreover Gregory ſays in his Morals,* as an unwary ſpeech ſeduces people into error, ſo an injudicious ſilence ſuffers them to abide in it.’

---

(102) *I am willing to own that certain orders of men are more corrupt than they were formerly; this is what I meant by theſe words in my* Remarks on the Judgment of the Public: *We would appear wiſer than our Fathers, and we are not ſo wiſe as they were.*

(103) *See a fine paſſage relating to this in the third volume of* Vigneul Marville's Melanges.

(104) *See, above, citat. (l).*

(*cc*) *Remark* [B], *of the article* DAMIAN.

(*dd*) Goldaſt. in Prolegom. Petronii, *cap. ii, pag. m.* 32, 33.

you believe they are not proof againſt an idea and a word? Would they not tell you, that if they are for words, that expreſs leudneſs faintly, it is in order to give a better idea of their virtue which has a ſtronger attachment to modeſty, than that of their predeceſſors? They are not therefore afraid to be ſeduced by obſcene objects. Such objects would rather give a new ſtrength to their modeſty. They are only offended with them, becauſe they think there is ſome unpoliteneſs and incivility in certain words. They who pretend that conſidering the prodigious corruption of our age, all ſtories which they call obſcene, ought to be avoided, are like a traveller, who in order to keep his dirty cloak from ſoiling, ſhould take care not to put it in a ſmoaking room. If the depravation is ſo great, that the reading of an obſcene Hiſtorical fact might excite young people to commit adultery, you may be ſure theſe young people are ſo many perſons infected with the plague, whom you are afraid of making worſe, by placing them near a man who has got the Itch. A polite ſtyle, and nice expreſſions will not cure ſuch people, and ſtop them upon the brink of a precipice.

Certainly this is the Sophiſm called, *à non cauſa pro cauſa.* - - - - - - *To aſſign for the cauſe of a thing, what is not the true cauſe of it.* The fate of chaſtity does not depend upon that: you do not go to the ſource of the evil; it requires a quite different remedy. Young people have their minds full of obſcence thoughts, and go through a courſe of filthy obſenities, at leaſt in words, before they read Suetonius. Ill converſations, unavoidable to every lad who is not under continual inſpection, are a thouſand times more dangerous than Hiſtories of debauchery. A learned man ſays, that the French tranſlation of Plutarch by Amyot, *is dangerous to morality, becauſe things are deſcribed in it with too great freedom and plainneſs, and there are ſome words in it that have now an immodeſt ſignification* (105). He will give me leave not to be of his opinion. The deſcriptions and phraſes of Amyot's tranſlation have nothing in them that comes up to thoſe that are daily heard and uſed in the world. To which I add, that if this verſion of Plutarch was dangerous to Morality, any other verſion of Plutarch would be ſo too, unleſs the tranſlator took care to leave out all the paſſages wherein things are deſcribed *with too great freedom and plainneſs.*

(105) *Dacier, Preface to his tranſlation of ſome lives of Plutarch.*

There is no medium: either a book muſt never mention any impure action, or our cenſurers muſt own it will always be dangerous, though written ever ſo nicely. One tranſlation will be more polite than the other; but if they are faithful, the obſcene objects that are in the original will appear in them.

Mr Chevreau affirms, that *faire des enfans* is a groſs expreſſion, and that we ſhould ſay *avoir des enfans* and this may be granted to him; but if any one ſhould further ſay, that the firſt expreſſion is very prejudicial to good manners, and that the ſecond is very beneficial to them, he would be accounted a ſilly fooliſh man.

Upon a due examination of things, it will appear that the word *paillard* ought to be rejected only for the ſame reaſon that we reject the words *contaminer*, *vilipender*, *vituperer*, and a great many old French words: That is, it has no other fault but to be obſolete. They who have nice ears would be grated with the words I have juſt now mentioned. For the ſame reaſon they are offended with the words *paillard*, and *paillardiſe*; for if the thing ſignified by them was the cauſe of their diſguſt, they could not endure the word *impudique*, whoſe idea is no leſs ſignificant than that of *paillard.*

The inconſiſtency of the Puriſts.

I ſhall make two further obſervations: the firſt is, that our Puriſts approve in general what they condemn in particular. Aſk a Roman Catholic who is an enemy to the Quietiſts, whether an Hiſtorian ought not to avoid touching upon things that ſully the imagination? He will anſwer you, *it is his duty to do ſo.* Tell him ſome days after, that a relation of Quietiſm is come out, containing a particular account of the abominable impurity of Molinos's followers; give him to underſtand that you have been offended with the reading that book, and that modeſty cannot bear ſuch things; he will anſwer you, that it is neceſſary to diſcover the abomination of thoſe hypocrites, in order to undeceive many people who are inclined to Quietiſm, and that the author of that relation is therefore to be commended for expoſing to the public view the infamous practices of that ſect. You will find a thouſand other perſons who will agree with you, that we cannot have too great a regard for modeſt ears, and will exclaim with great zeal againſt Suetonius and Lampridius: but if you aſk them ſome days after, whether we ought to excuſe the Hiſtorians who have related ſo many abominable things concerning the Albigenſes, the Fratricelli, Adamites, Picards, Lollards, and Turlupins, they will anſwer that the character of Hiſtorians and zealous Catholics, engaged them to acquaint the world with the obſcenities of thoſe heretics, the forerunners of the Lutherans.

The Engliſh Papiſts, who fled into France or Spain, did not offend the chaſte ears of their friends, when they publiſhed ſeveral ſatires againſt Queen Elizabeth, wherein they repreſented her as a monſter of leudneſs. The Leaguers did not blame the libels, which contained impudent deſcriptions of the leudneſs of the court of Henry III.

The ſame inconſiſtency is obſerved among the Proteſtants. They did not complain that thoſe libels againſt Henry III their perſecutor, were offenſive to chaſte ears. Buchanan, who publiſhed a book concerning the lewdneſs of Mary Queen of Scotland (106), is a man of bleſſed memory among all the Preſbyterians; and yet that book horribly defiled the imagination. Nicolas de Clemangis, Pelagius Alvarez, Baptiſta Mantuanus, and ſeveral others, who made a very plain and obſcene deſcription of the leudneſs of the Court of Rome, are placed by the Proteſtants among the witneſſes of truth. They quote them to this very day upon all occaſions, and long paſſages out of thoſe authors are to be found in moſt controverſial books. You will find many of them in a French book of the famous du Pleſſis Mornai (107): not long ſince three Miniſters, two of whom are Swiſs, and the third a French-man (108), have revived thoſe quotations. Henry Stephens, who tells ſo many obſcene ſtories in his apology for Herodotus, did not diſpleaſe thoſe of his party: that book was thought very proper to ridicule the Church of Rome, and was approved upon that account; there are ſeveral editions of it, and I hear it has been lately reprinted at the Hague. Can there be a greater collection of ſilly jeſts, quirks, and mean and obſcene words, than what is to be found in ſome books of Sainte Aldegonde, who nevertheleſs was very much eſteemed and praiſed? The book which a German advertiſed in the *Nova Literaria Maris Balthici* in the year 1699, which is to be intituled, *Sacra Pontificiorum Priapeia, ſeu obſcœnæ Papiſtarum in auricularibus confeſſionibus quæſtiones, quibus S. Confeſſionarii innocentes puellas fœminaſque ad laſciviam ſollicitant*, will doubtleſs meet with a very favourable reception, and yet it will be very offenſive to chaſte ears, ſince it will contain a collection of the obſcene queſtions of confeſſors. This puts me in mind of the illuſtrious Peter du Moulin, who objected to the Roman Catholics the obſcenities that are to be found in their books concerning auricular confeſſion. He took notice (109) of ſome that are horrid, and no leſs abominable than the lewdneſs wherewith Procopius accuſes the Empreſs Theodora. Several Proteſtants controverſiſts (110) have publiſhed the obſcenities that are to be found in the books of confeſſors.

But to ſpeak of a thing of a later date, I ſay that the book intituled *Les Avantures de la Madona & de François d'Aſſiſe*, publiſhed (111) in the year 1701, is indeed written in very modeſt words; but the ideas which the author (112) excites in the mind of the reader, are ſo infamous, horrid, and monſtrous, that none but Lucian, and ſuch like men, can bear their enormity. The Proteſtants are not offended at it; on the contrary, they believe that the author deſigning *to make every body ſenſible of the ridiculouſneſs of Popery without engaging in any controverſy*, has done a ſervice to the good cauſe. Some complaints have been made of what he ſays in favour of Neſtorius, but he has not been blamed for the other things he advanced, which, as I have ſaid already, ſtartle, terrify and ſmite both the ſoul and body (113). The Biſhop of Meaux being obliged to mention a thing of the ſame nature in order to ſhew the extravagance of a fanatical woman (114), thought he had contracted ſome uncleanneſs, and for a remedy had recourſe to this prayer: ‘ But let us paſs to another ſubject: and thou, O Lord, If I durſt, I ‘ would beſeech thee to ſend one of thy ſeraphims with a hot burning coal to purify ‘ my lips defiled with this narrative, though neceſſary (115).’ Take notice of this laſt word: it makes much againſt thoſe who ſay that the imagination of the reader ought to be regarded even at the expence of truth. That prelate, who is otherwiſe ſo careful to avoid obſcenities, that he dares not uſe the word *paillarde* (whore) without making an excuſe for it (116); did not think that the obſcene and horrid extravagances of Madam Guyon ought to be ſuppreſſed.

I do not mean, that generally ſpeaking, all the Proteſtants who have behaved as I have mentioned, deſign to bring Hiſtorians, Compilers, and Commentators under the yoke of the Puriſts. I only believe that ſeveral of them pretend to do it in general; but ſince they approve afterwards when they come to particulars, what they had condemned; their taſte and their teſtimony can do me no prejudice, and I may take advantage of the opinion of all the reſt who are conſiſtent with themſelves, both in general and in particular.

It cannot be pretended that for the good of the Church, an author may be allowed to write things that ſully the imagination, and that in this caſe he is to be commended for doing it: this aſſertion I ſay cannot be admitted; for if the publiſhing of obſcenities was an ill thing in itſelf, it could not be uſed for the benefit of the good cauſe, without tranſgreſſing againſt a command of God, importing that we muſt not do evil, that good may come (117).

I proceed to the ſecond obſervation. Have I not acted againſt this precept of Iſocrates, *believe that whatever cannot be honeſtly done, cannot be honeſtly ſpoken* (118)? And ought not this precept to be a law to all Chriſtians, ſince St Paul would not have any thing that is filthy to be named among them (119)? I anſwer, that this excellent axiom condemns only the ill cuſtom [*I*] which prevails both among young people and married men,

(106) *See the article* BUCHANAN, *citat.* (9).

(107) *Intituled*, Le Myſtere d'Iniquité.

(108) *Mr Heidegger, in his* Hiſtoria Papatus, *in the year* 1684; *and* in Magna Babylone, *in the year* 1687; Mr Zuinger, in Tractatu de feſto Corporis Chriſti, *in the year* 1685; *and Mr Jurieu, in his* Prejugez Legitimes contre le Papiſme, *in the year* 1685.

(109) *In his* Nouveauté du Papiſme.

(110) *Mr Jurieu among others, in his* Apologie de la Reformation, *Tom. i, pag.* 150, *& ſeq. Edit. in 4to.*

(111) *At Amſterdam.*

(112) *Mr Renoult heretofore a Franciſcan, and now a Miniſter of the Goſpel, at London.*

(113) *See the article* NESTORIUS, *remark* [*H*].

(114) *But what dream was it, and what did that woman ſee? A mountain, in which ſhe was received by Jeſus Chriſt; a chamber where ſhe aſked, whom the two beds ſhe ſaw were for:* There is one for my mother, and another for you my ſpouſe. *And a little after,* I have choſen you to be here with me. *Biſhop of Meaux's Relation,* ſur le Quietiſme, *pag.* 28. *Bruſſels* 1698.

(115) Id. ibid.

(116) *This holy Apoſtle took care not to call the proſtitute he ſpeaks of, an adultereſs,* μοιχάδα, μοιχαλίδα, *but a public woman, and if I may be allowed to uſe but once theſe odious names, a whore, a proſtitute,* πόρνης. Id. Preface to the *Revelation, pag.* 27, *of the edition printed at the Hague.*

(117) *Rom. iii.* 8.

(118) Ἃ ποιεῖν αἰσχρὸν, ταῦτα νόμιζε μηδὲ λέγειν εἶναι καλόν. Quæ factu ſunt turpia, ne dictu quidem decora eſſe puta. *Iſocrates ad Demonicum, pag. m.* 6.

(119) *Eph. v.* 4.

[*I*] *That excellent axiom condemns only the ill cuſtom.*] Here ſollows the obſervation of a Commentator upon theſe words of Iſocrates. ‘ Prohibetur hic omnis αισχρολογία καὶ βλασφημία καὶ κακηγορία: quibus nihil eſt indocto vulgo jucundius aut uſitatius, cum ‘ nihil ſit turpius & homine indignius. . . Huc accerſatur ‘ D. Pauli men, to ſpeak on all occaſions of their lewd practices, and impudently to diſcourſe of every thing relating to that ſort of ſenſuality. It is at leaſt certain that the apoſtle never meant that men ſhould forbear talking ſeriouſly, honeſtly, and hiſtorically of a lewd action. He did not deprive parents of the liberty of examining their children concerning the Hiſtorical facts contained in the Bible, and making them repeat that Jacob's daughter was raviſhed, that a ſon of David raviſhed his own ſiſter, *&c.* nothing can be more diſhoneſt than this action of David's ſon; and yet there is no diſhoneſty in repeating, preaching, and printing it? Could St Paul forbid the mentioning of it? Would he have prohibited the reading of the Bible? Was he not willing that his letters ſhould be read, and that the very children ſhould know what he wrote to the Romans concerning the abominable lives of the Heathens? A man muſt be mad to think that the precept of Iſocrates means that a ſchool-boy ſhould never give an account to his tutor, or to his father, of ſuch paſſages of the Iliad as concern the adulteries of the gods.

If one had a mind to carry the diſpute to the utmoſt, he might ſay that robbing, betraying, lying, and killing, are diſhoneſt things, and that there is no diſhoneſty in mentioning thoſe crimes; but as it is evident that the precept of Iſocrates concerns only ſins contrary to chaſtity, ſuch an objection would be a meer cavil. The Cynics and the Stoics made uſe of it to juſtify their doctrine, that there is no obſcenity in any word: Cicero confutes them only by ſuppoſing that there is a natural ſhame (120).

It is time to conclude this long diſſertation. The clearing up of this matter is more difficult than people imagine. I hope my juſtification will be fully approved, not by thoſe who are too preſumptuous to ſee that we labour to undeceive them, but by thoſe who have been induced to believe on the credit of other perſons, or upon light and ſuperficial reaſons. If they were excuſable for being dazzled with ſpecious appearances, before I publiſhed theſe four EXPLANATIONS, they can be no longer ſo if they obſtinately perſiſt in their error. They would have done well to follow the command of Jeſus Chriſt, *judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment* (121). They have yielded to the firſt impreſſions of the objects, without waiting for the reaſons on both ſides; which is always neceſſary, eſpecially when we are to judge of a writer who does not follow the moſt common road. We ſhould immediately ſuſpect that he has ſome reaſons for it, and that he would not make ſuch a ſtep, if upon a long examination of his ſubject, he had not conſidered it on every ſide more carefully than thoſe who only read his work. This well grounded ſuſpicion ſhould have made people very cautious and ſlow in giving their judgment: but what is done cannot be undone; all that can be hoped is, that their ſecond thoughts will be better than the firſt.

I ſhall here acquaint my readers, that in ſeveral places of this Dictionary, they will find ſome apologetical reflections (122) immediately after ſuch things as may offend ſcrupulous perſons.

‘ D. Pauli præceptum: πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία ἐν ὑμῖν μηδ᾽ ὀνομαζέσθω. Chriſtum etiam ματαίως λόγους ὑπευθύνους ἐποίησε. Sed nos parum curamus, proh dolor; reddendam Deo rationem de verbis. Nec mirum, cum tam flagitioſa & conſcelerata vitæ ſit & morum licentia. Væ væ nobis, niſi maturè reſipuerimus (*ee*). - - - - *All blaſphemy and filthy diſcourſe is here forbidden, than which nothing is more grateful to, or more frequently uſed by the unlearned vulgar, and nothing more ſcandalous and unworthy of a man. Here let us cite the precept of St Paul*; All uncleanneſs . . . let it not be once named amongſt you. *Our Saviour likewiſe ſays, we ſhall be accountable to God for our very words. Nor is it to be wondered at, ſince our lives and manners are ſo wicked and licentious. Wo, wo unto us, unleſs we timely repent.*’

(*ee*) Hieronym. Wolfius Annotat. in Parænesin Iſocratis, *p.* 132.

(120) Nec vero audiendi ſunt Cynici, aut ſi qui fuerunt Stoici pæne Cynici, qui reprehendunt & irrident, quod ea, quæ re turpia non ſint, nominibus ac verbis flagitioſa ducamus: illa autem quæ turpia ſint, nominibus appellemus ſuis. Latrocinari, fraudare, adulterare, re turpe eſt; ſed dicitur non obſcœne: Liberis dare operam re honeſtum eſt, nomine obſcœnum: pluraque in eam ſententiam ab eiſdem contra verecundiam diſputantur. Nos autem naturam ſequamur, & omne quod abhorret oculorum auriumque approbatione, fugiamus. - - - *Nor ſhould we liſten to the Cynics, or thoſe almoſt Cynical Stoics, who cenſure and deride us, becauſe we eſteem ſome things ſcandalous and filthy in names and words, which in reality are not ſo; and call ſome things by their proper names, which are really filthy. To rob, defraud, or commit adultery, are in themſelves ſcandalous actions, but they are mentioned without obſcenity. To get children, is in reality honourable, but in name obſcene. The ſame Philoſophers alledge other arguments againſt modeſty to the ſame purpoſe. But let us follow nature, and ſhun every thing, which offends either the ears or the eyes.* Cicero, de Officiis, *lib. i, cap. xxxv, pag. m.* 140.

(121) *John* vii, 24.

(122) *Eſpecially with reſpect to obſcenities.*

BRITISH MUSEUM

FINIS.

A
CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE
Of all the
EMINENT PERSONS
Treated of in this
DICTIONARY:

Exhibiting the Synchroniſms of the times wherein they flouriſhed; and ſhewing, at one view, which of them were cotemporary.

N. B. *We make uſe of three Æra's,* viz: *the year of the World, the year of Rome, and the year of our Lord.*

A. M.
1 *ADAM*, and
Eve, his wife.
100 *Abel*, and
Cain, his elder brother.
800 *Lamech*, a deſcendant from Cain.
1000 *Lamech*, the father of Noah.
1700 *Cham*, one of Noah's ſons.
2000 *Pheron*, King of Egypt.
2100 *Abimelech*, King of Gerar.
Abraham, the Patriarch.
Agar, his concubine; and
Sarah, his wife.
2350 *Job*, the Patriarch.
2525 *Aaron*, High-Prieſt of the Jews.
Mary, or *Miriam*, his ſiſter.
2650 *Ganymede*, ſon of Tros, King of Troy.
2700 *Europa*, daughter of Agenor.
Melampus, a famous Soothſayer.
Olen, a Greek Poet.
2725 *Gorgophone*, daughter of Perſeus and Andromeda.
Perimede, a famous witch.
2750 *Alcmena*, wife of Amphitryon.
Amphiaraus, the ſon of Oicles.
Amphitryon, the ſon of Alcæus.
Byblis, the daughter of Miletus.
Chryſippus, natural ſon of Pelops.
Pelias, the ſon of Neptune.
Talaus, King of Argos.
Tireſias, a famous Soothſayer.
2775 *Abderus*, Hercules's favourite.
Adonis, minion of the goddeſs Venus.
Adraſtus, King of Argos.
Alcinoë, wife of Amphilochus.
Alcmæon, ſon of Amphiaraus.
Amphilochus, a famous Soothſayer.
Anchiſes, father to Æneas.
Ariſteus, ſon of Apollo and Cyrene.
Callirhoë, wife of Alcmæon.
Cinyras, father of Adonis.
Hercules, ſon of Alcmena.
Hipſipole, daughter to Thoas, King of Lemnos.
Manto, daughter of Tireſias.
Myrrha, the mother of Adonis.
Peribœa, wife of Telamon.
Pygmalion, King of Cyprus.
Telamon, King of Salamis.
2800 *Nauſithous*, King of the Phæacians.
Tamiras of Cilicia.
2825 *Acamas*, ſon of Theſeus.
Achilles, ſon of Peleus.
Ajax, ſon of Oileus.
Ajax, ſon of Telamon.

A. M.
Andromache, Hector's wife, and
Aſtyanax, their ſon.
Briſeis, a concubine of Achilles.
Calchas, a Soothſayer.
Caſſandra, daughter of Priamus.
Chryſeis, a concubine of Agamemnon.
Egialea, wife of Diomedes.
Helen, wife of Menelaus.
Oenone, wife of Paris.
Tecmeſſa, concubine of Ajax.
Tenes, ſon of Cygnus.
Teucer, ſon of Telamon.
Ulyſſes, King of Ithaca.
2850 *Ajax*, the ſon of Teucer.
Alcinous, King of the Phæacians.
Harpalicus, King of the Amymnians.
Nauſicaa, daughter to Alcinous.
Pyrrhus, ſon of Achilles.
2875 *Sampſon*, a Judge of God's people.
2900 *Thamyris*, a Greek Poet.
2950 *David*, King of the Jews.
3075 *Ageſilaus* I, King of Sparta.
3100 *Elijah*, the Prophet.
Pygmalion, King of Tyre.
3125 *Eliſha*, the Prophet.
Lycurgus, the Lacedæmonian Legiſlator.
3200 *Jonas*, the Prophet.

U. C.
1 *PSammatichus*, King of Egypt.
50 *Crantor*, a Greek Philoſopher.
75 *Alcman*, a Lyric Poet.
100 *Archilochus*, a Greek Poet.
Judith, a Jewiſh heroine.
Timeſius of Clazomenæ.
125 *Periander*, King of Corinth.
150 *Achemænes*, grandfather to Cyrus.
Alcæus, a Lyric Poet.
Lycophron, ſon to Periander.
Phaon of Mitylene.
Sappho, famous for her verſes and amours.
Tanaquil, wife of Tarquinius Priſcus.
Thales, one of the ſeven wiſe men of Greece.
175 *Abaris*, the Scythian.
Eſop, the firſt or chief author of fables.
Ezekiel, the Prophet.
Rhodope, a Courtezan.
200 *Anthermus*, a Sculptor.
Ariſteas. the Proconneſian.
225 *Anacreon*, the Poet.
Anaxandrides, King of Lacædemon.
Bathyllus, Anacreon's Minion.

U. C.
Brutus (Lucius Junius) who expelled the Tarquins.
Bupalus, a Sculptor, and ſon to Anthermus.
Calenus (Olenus) a Soothſayer.
Darius I, King of Perſia.
Hipponax, a Greek Poet.
Lucretia, wife to Collatinus.
Pythagoras, the Philoſopher.
Xenophanes, the Philoſopher.
250 *Caſſius Viſcellinus* (Spurius) a Roman Senator.
Horatius (Publius) ſirnamed Cocles.
Simonides, a famous Greek Poet.
275 *Achæmenes*, brother of Xerxes.
Ameſtris, wife of Xerxes.
Ariſtides, ſirnamed the Juſt.
Artabanus, the ſon of Hyſtaſpes.
Artemiſia, Queen of Caria.
Chryſis, Prieſteſs of Juno at Argos.
Cimon, the ſon of Miltiades.
Cleonice, a young lady of Byzantium.
Eſchylus, a tragic Poet.
Hiero I, King of Syracuſe.
300 *Anaxagoras*, the Philoſopher.
Diagoras, a famous wreſtler.
Diogenes of Apollonia.
Hiero, head of the colony which rebuilt Thurium.
Leucippus, a Greek Philoſopher.
Simonides, grandſon to the Poet of that name.
Zeno of Elea, an eminent Philoſopher.
325 *Agathon*, a tragic and comic Poet.
Archelaus, a Greek Philoſopher.
Archelaus I, King of Macedon.
Ariſto, a Greek Philoſopher.
Aſpaſia, miſtreſs to Pericles.
Democritus, the Philoſopher.
Diagoras, ſirnamed the Atheiſt.
Dorieus, ſon of Diagoras the Wreſtler.
Euripides, a tragic Poet.
Pericles, the Athenian.
Prodicus, a celebrated Sophiſt.
Zeuxis, a famous Painter.
350 *Aſpaſia*, miſtreſs to Cyrus the younger.
Berenice, daughter of Diagoras the Wreſtler.
Camillus (Marcus-Furius) the Roman Dictator.
Cyrus, ſon of Darius Nothus.
Conon, an Athenian General.
Critias, one of the thirty tyrants of Athens.
Euclid of Megara, a Philoſopher.
Hanno, a Carthaginian General.

BRITISH MUSEUM

U. C.
Laïs, a famous Courtezan.
Metrodorus of Chios, a Philoſopher.
375 *Ageſilaus* II, King of Sparta.
Ageſipolis I, King of Sparta.
Alcæus, a tragic Poet.
Anaxandrides, a comic Poet.
Calliſtratus, an Athenian Orator.
Eneas, or *Æneas Tacticus*, a Greek author.
Eurydice, wife of Amyntas, King of Macedonia.
Philiſtus, a Greek Hiſtorian.
Tachus, King of Egypt.
400 *Artemiſia*, wife of Mauſolus.
Aſclepiades, a Greek Philoſopher.
Cotys, King of Thrace.
Diogenes, the Cynic.
Euphratus, a diſciple of Plato.
Hegeſilochus, a licentious debauchee.
Lycurgus, an Athenian Orator.
Mauſolus, King of Caria.
Olympias, mother to Alexander the Great.
Philomelus, General of the Phoceans.
Stilpo, the Philoſopher.
Theopompus, an Orator and Hiſtorian.
425 *Ada*, Queen of Caria.
Amaſtris, wife of Dionyſius, tyrant of Heraclea.
Apelles, a famous Painter.
Ariſtander, a famous Soothſayer.
Ariſteus, the Geometrician.
Ariſtotle, the Philoſopher.
Cleopatra, ſiſter to Alexander.
Cleophis, an Indian Queen.
Diyllus, a Greek Hiſtorian.
Dionyſius, tyrant of Heraclea.
Ephorus, an Orator and Hiſtorian.
Harpalus, a Macedonian Lord.
Hipparchia, wife to the Philoſopher Crates.
Lyſimachus, tutor to Alexander.
Macedonia (Alexander the Great, King of).
Memnon, a Perſian General.
Philetas, a Grammarian, Critic, and Poet.
Philla, daughter to Antipater, Governour of Macedonia.
Pyrrho, a Greek Philoſopher.
Pytheas, author of ſome Geographical books.
Pythias, Ariſtotle's daughter.
Silanion, a famous Sculptor.
Thais, a Greek Courtezan.
Timoleon, General of the Corinthians.
Xenocrates, a Greek Philoſopher.
450 *Arceſilas*, a famous Philoſopher.
Aſclepiades, a Greek Philoſopher.
Bion, the Boryſthenite.
Craterus, author of a collection of the decrees of the Athenians.
Dicæarchus, a diſciple of Ariſtotle.
Epicurus, the Philoſopher.
Hermeſionax, an elegiac Poet.
Lamia, a celebrated Courtezan.
Lycophron, a Greek Poet.
Timæus, a Greek Hiſtorian.
475 *Ariſto* of Chios, a Philoſopher.
Arſinoë, wife of Magas, King of Cyrene.
Bion, a Bucolic Poet.
Cleonymus, ſon to a King of Sparta.
Danaë, daughter of Leontium.
Duellius (Caius) a Roman Senator.
Fabricius Luſcinus (Caius) a Roman General.
Leontium, an Athenian Courtezan.
Pyrrhus, King of the Epirotes.
500 *Agis*, King of Lacedæmon.
Amphares, one of the Lacedæmonian Ephori.
Berenice, wife of Antiochus Theus.
Chelonis, wife of Cleombrotus, King of Lacedæmon.
Conon, a Mathematician.
Hiero II, King of Syracuſe.

U. C.
525 *Achæus*, couſin-german to Antiochus the Great.
Apollonius of Pergamus, a famous Geometrician.
Archimelus, a Greek Poet.
Chryſippus, a Stoic Philoſopher.
Lacydes, a Greek Philoſopher.
Pergamum (Attalus, King of).
Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, grandſon to the Pyrrhus abovementioned.
550 *Ariſtarchus*, a Greek Philoſopher.
Dicæarchus, a Macedonian Admiral.
575 *Artabanus* I, King of Parthia.
Artaxias I, King of Armenia.
Carneades, a famous Greek Philoſopher.
Diogenes, the Babylonian.
Metrodorus, a Painter and Philoſopher.
Porcius (Marcus) commonly called Cato the Cenſor.
600 *Ariſtarchus*, a Grammarian
Fannius Strabo (Caius) a Roman Senator.
Hipparchus, a great Aſtronomer.
Titius (Caius) a Latin Poet, and Orator.
625 *Albutius* (Titus) an Epicurean Philoſopher.
Apellicon, who bought Ariſtotle's library.
Attilius, a Latin Poet.
Caſſius Hemina (Lucius) an Hiſtorian.
Caſſius Longinus (Lucius) a Judge, famous for his ſeverity.
Caſtor, the Chronographer.
Catius, an Epicurean Philoſopher.
Fannius (Caius) an Orator.
Fannius (Caius) an Annaliſt.
Licinia, a Veſtal Virgin.
Lucilius (Caius) a Latin Poet.
Perſius (Caius) a learned Roman.
Sulpicia, wife of Fulvius Flaccus.
650 *Accius* (Lucius) a tragic Poet.
Antony (Marc) the Orator.
Druſus (Marcus Livius) tribune of the people.
Lævius, a Latin Poet.
Soranus (Quintus Valerius) a learned Roman.
675 *Andronicus*, a Peripatetic Philoſopher.
Andronicus (Marcus Pompilius) a Grammarian.
Antony (Caius) Cicero's colleague in the Conſulſhip.
Antony (Marc) ſirnamed Creticus.
Aſclepiades of Pruſa, a famous Phyſician.
Caſtritius (Marcus) a Magiſtrate of Placentia.
Chelidonis, a woman of an ill life.
Eſop, reader to Mithridates.
Eſop (Clodius) a celebrated Comedian.
Fannia, wife to Caius Titinius.
Flora, a Courtezan.
Fulvia, who diſcovered Catiline's conſpiracy.
Hortenſius (Quintus) a great Orator.
Laberius (Decimus) a Roman Knight and Poet.
Laudice, ſiſter and wife of Mithridates.
Lucretius (Titus) Carus, a Roman Poet.
Metellus Celer (Quintus) a Roman Senator.
Monima, wife of Mithridates.
Mucia, wife of Pompey.
Ptolomy Auletes, King of Egypt.
Rutilia, wife of Marcus Aureſius Cotta.
Servilia, mother to Marcus Brutus.
Servilia, wife to Lucullus.
Tyrannion, a celebrated Grammarian.
Valeria, wife to Sylla.
Zeno of Sidon, an Epicurean Philoſopher.

U. C.
700 *Antipater*, an Idumean.
Artavaſdes I, King of Armenia.
Atticus (Titus Pomponius) one of the moſt honourable men in antient Rome.
Berenice, daughter of Ptolomy Auletes.
Catullus (Caius Valerius) a Roman Poet.
Ceſar (Caius Julius) firſt Emperor of Rome.
Cornelia, wife of Pompey.
Cratippus, a Peripatetic Philoſopher.
Dejotarus, King of the leſſer Armenia.
Demetrius (Magnes) a Greek author.
Dolabella (Publius Cornelius) Cicero's ſon-in-law.
Fulvia, wife of Clodius, and afterwards of Marc Antony.
Glaphyra, wife to Archelaus, High-Prieſt of Bellona.
Hortenſius (Quintus) ſon to the great Orator of that name.
Mamurra, a Roman Knight.
Metellus (Lucius) a tribune of the people.
Nigidius Figulus (Publius) a learned Roman.
Surena, General of the Parthians.
Tarpe (Spurius Metius) a licenſer of plays.
Tarruntius (Lucius) ſirnamed Firmanus, a Mathematical Philoſopher.
Timomachus, a famous Painter.
Tullia, Cicero's duaghter.
725 *Antony* (Marc) one of the Triumvirs.
Antony (Caius) and
Antony (Lucius) his brothers.
Archelaus, King of Cappadocia.
Artavaſdes, King of Media.
Artavaſdes II, King of Armenia.
Bathyllus, a freedman of Mæcenas.
Bathyllus, a Latin Poet.
Berenice, niece to Herod the Great.
Brutus (Marcus Junius) and
Caſſius Longanus (Caius) two of Ceſar's murderers.
Dellius (Quintus) a Greek Hiſtorian.
Fannius (Quadratus) a Latin Poet.
Lycoris, alias *Cytheris*, a famous Courtezan.
Ligarius (Quintus) one of Cæſar's murderers.
Lollius (Marcus) a Roman Conſul.
Octavia, wife of Marc Antony.
Parthenius, a Greek author.
Pylades, a famous Pantomime.
Porcia, wife of Marcus Brutus.
Quirinus (Publius Sulpicius) a Roman Conſul.
Severus (Cornelius) a Latin Poet.
Tyrannion, diſciple to the Tyrannion abovementioned.
Trebatius (Caius) ſirnamed Teſta, a great Civilian.
Virgil, the Poet.

A. D.
1 ALbutius Silus (Caius) a famous Orator.
Alfenus Varus (Publius) a Roman Conſul.
Antony (Marcus Julius) ſon of the Triumvir.
Antonia, ſiſter to the foregoing, and mother of Germanicus.
Antonia, younger ſiſter to the foregoing, and wife of Lucius Domitius Ænobarbus.
Caſſius Severus (Titus) a famous Orator.
Druſus (Nero Claudius) brother of Tiberius.
Glaphyra, wife to Alexander the ſon of Herod.

A. D.
Ovidius Naſo (Publius) the Poet.
25 *Apelles*, an excellent Tragedian.
Apion, a Mathematician.
Artabanus II, King of Parthia.
Artaxias III, King of Armenia.
Caligula (Caius Cæſar) Emperor of Rome.
Caſſius Chærea, Captain of Caligula's guards.
Druſilla (Julia) ſiſter to Caligula.
Druſus, ſon of Tiberius.
Druſus, ſon of Germanicus.
Lutorius Priſcus (Caius) a Roman Knight.
Macro (Nævius Sertorius) Captain of Tiberius's guards.
Numantina, wife of Plautius Sylvanus.
Paulina (Lollia) wife to Caligula.
Phædrus, author of the fables.
50 *Afer* (Domitius) a famous Orator.
Afranius Quinetianus, a Roman Senator.
Apollonius Tyanæus, a moſt extraordinary perſon.
Burrus (Afranius) Nero's Governour.
Claudius (Tiberius) Druſus, Emperor of Rome, and
Octavia, his daughter.
Philo, the Jew.
Quintius Curtius, a Latin Hiſtorian.
Suetonius Paulinus (Caius) Governour of Numidia, and afterwards of Britain.
75 *Akiba*, a famous Rabbin.
Andromachus Phyſician to Nero.
Artabanus III, King of Parthia.
Berenice, daughter of Agrippa I, King of Judea.
Caſſius Longinus (Caius) a great Civilian.
Domitia Longina, wife of Domitian.
Druſilla, wife of Felix.
Fannia, wife of Helvidius.
John (St) the Evangeliſt.
Quintilian (Marcus Fabius) a teacher of Rhetoric at Rome.
Veſpaſian (Titus Flavius) Emperor of Rome.
100 *Apollodorus*, a famous Architect.
Ariſto (Titius) a Roman Lawyer.
Plotina (Pompeia) the wife of Trajan.
Tacitus (Caius Cornelius) a great Hiſtorian.
Trajan, a Roman Emperor.
125 *Antinous*, Hadrian's Minion.
Artemidorus, the Epheſian.
Barcochebas, a famous impoſtor.
Caſtritius (Titus) a teacher of Rhetoric.
Fannius (Caius) a Latin author.
Hadrian (Publius Ælius) Emperor of Rome.
Prodicus, founder of the ſect of the Adamites.
Suetonius Tranquillus (Caius) an Hiſtorian.
150 *Apollinaris* (Caius Sulpitius) a Grammarian.
Apuleius (Lucius) a Platonic Philoſopher.
Phlegon, ſirnamed *Trallianus*, a Latin Author.
Polyænus, a Greek author.
175 *Athenagoras*, an Athenian Philoſopher.
Cerinthus, an Arch-Heretic.
200 *Julia*, wife of Septimius Severus Emperor of Rome.
225 *Artabanus* IV, the laſt King of Parthia.
Athenæus, a Greek Grammarian.
Babylas, Biſhop of Antioch.
Origen, a Father of the Church.
250 *Amelius*, a Platonic Philoſopher.
275 *Arnobius*, Profeſſor of Rhetoric at Sicca.
Aurelianus (Lucius Domitius) Emperor of Rome.

A. D.
Zenobia, wife of Odenatus a Saracen Prince.
300 *Sophronia*, a Roman lady ſo called by ſome modern writers.
325 *Acyndinus* (Septimius) a Roman Conſul.
Alypius, a Philoſopher of Alexandria.
Arius, the Heretic.
Cyril, Deacon of the Church of Heliopolis.
Fauſta, wife of the Emperor Conſtantine.
350 *Marcellinus* (Ammianus) an Hiſtorian.
375 *Ajax*, an Eccleſiaſtic.
Alypius of Antioch.
Alypius (Faltonius Probus) Prefect of Rome.
Arſenius, a Deacon of the Roman Church.
Auſonius, a Latin Poet.
Heliodorus, Biſhop of Trica.
Hierocles, ſon of Alypius of Antioch.
Leontius, an Athenian Philoſopher.
Nazianzen (Gregory) a celebrated Father of the Church.
Obſequens (Julius) a Latin writer.
Priſcillian, a Spaniſh Heretic.
Prudentius, a Chriſtian Poet.
Rufinus, a favourite of the Emperor Theodoſius.
Theon, a Greek Sophiſt.
400 *Alypius*, Biſhop of Tagaſta.
Auguſtin (St).
Honorius, a Roman Emperor.
Nemeſius, a Chriſtian Philoſopher.
425 *Abdas*, a Biſhop in Perſia.
Hierocles, a Platonic Philoſopher.
Neſtorius, Biſhop of Conſtantinople.
Oroſius (Paul) a Spaniſh Prieſt.
Sedulius (Caius Cælius) a Prieſt.
Severus (Sulpitius) a Lawyer, and afterwards a Prieſt.
Vigilantius, a Spaniſh Prieſt.
450 *Attila*, King of the Huns.
Leo I, Pope, ſirnamed the Great.
Marullus a Poet of Calabria.
Quintus (Calaber) a Greek Poet.
475 *Amable*, a Prieſt of Riom in Auvergne.
Baſina, mother to Clovis, King of France.
Honoria, ſiſter of Valentinian III. Emperor of Rome.
550 *Jornandus*, Biſhop of Ravenna.
625 *Mahomet*, the grand impoſtor.
650 *Fatima*, daughter of Mahomet.
675 *Alpaide*, a concubine of Pepin.
700 *Lambert*, Biſhop of Maeſtricht.
725 *Abderame*, a great Saracen General.
Abumuſlimus, a Saracen General.
Damaſcen (John) an illuſtrious Father of the Lower Empire.
Eudo, Duke of Aquitain.
Munuza, a Mooriſh Captain.
Virgil, Biſhop of Saltzburg.
750 *Abucaras* (Theodore) a Prelate.
800 *Abgillus* (John) called in Engliſh Preſter John.
825 *Eginhart*, Secretary to the Emperor Charlemagne.
850 *Achmet*, the ſon of Seirim.
Pope Joan.
Radulphus, Archbiſhop of Bourges.
925 *Abudhaber*, chief of the Karmatians.
975 *Aragon* (Mary of) wife of Otho III, Emperor of Germany.
Capet (Hugh) King of France.
1000 *Boliſlaus*, King of Poland.
Emma, wife of Ethelred King of England.
Otho III, Emperor of Germany.
1025 *Aretin* (Guy) a Benedictine.
Alchindus, an Arabian Phyſician and Aſtrologer.
1050 *Damian* (Peter) Cardinal, &c.
1075 *Anſelm*, Archbiſhop of Canterbury.
Bennon, Biſhop of Miſnia.
1100 *Actuarius*, a Greek Phyſician.

A. D.
Arbriſſel (Robert d') founder of the Abbey of Fontevraud.
Hildebert, Biſhop of Mans, &c.
Urraca, daughter and heireſs of Alphonſo VI, King of Leon and Caſtile.
1125 *Abelard* (Peter) a famous Divine.
Berengarius (Peter) diſciple to the foregoing.
Bernard (St) Abbot of Clairvaux.
Foulques, Prior of Deuil.
Heloïſa, concubine and afterwards wife of Abelard.
Tandemus, a German Heretic.
Alchabitius, an Arabian Aſtrologer.
1150 *Averroës*, an Arabian Philoſopher.
Bulgarus, a famous Civilian.
Jarchi (Solomon) a famous Rabbi.
Lewis VII, King of France.
Noradin, Sultan of Aleppo.
Radulphus, a Benedictine Monk ſirnamed Flaviacenſis.
1175 *Harravad* (Iſaac Ben) a noted Rabbi.
Henry IV, Emperor of Germany.
Irnerius, a German Civilian.
Sariſberi (John of) Biſhop of Chartres.
1200 *Ammonius*, ſirnamed Saccas, a famous Philoſopher.
1225 *Accurſius*, Profeſſor of Civil Law.
Caſtile (Blanche of) Queen of France.
Elmacin (George) a Saracen Hiſtorian.
Francis of Aſſiſi, a ſaint of the Romiſh Church.
Gualdrada, a Florentine lady.
Scotus (Michael) a learned author.
Thibaut V, Earl of Champagne.
1250 *Accurſius* (Cervot) ſon to the Profeſſor abovementioned, and
Accurſius (Francis) his elder brother.
Albertus Magnus, Biſhop of Ratiſbon.
Colonna (John) Archbiſhop of Meſſini.
1275 *Abulpharage* (Gregory) a Phyſician.
Arſenius, Patriarch of Conſtatinople.
Bacon (Roger) an Engliſh Franciſcan.
Balbi (John) a Dominican.
Burnettus (Latinus) author of ſeveral books.
Caſtile (Alphonſo X, King of).
Cavalcante (Guido) a noble Florentine.
Guillelma, or *Guillelmina*, the head of an infamous ſect.
Polonus (Martin) a Dominican.
1300 *Apona* (Peter of) a famous Philoſopher.
Aurelius (Peter) a Franciſcan.
Barberini (Francis) a Poet and Civilian.
Dante, an Italian Poet.
Reynier (Peter de) Knight of the Order of St John of Jeruſalem.
1325 *Abulfeda* (Iſmael) Prince of Hama.
Acyndinus (Gregory) a Greek Monk.
Arſenius, Biſhop of Monembaſia.
Ciccus, an Italian author.
Cinus, a famous Civilian.
Laurentio (Nicolas) author of a ſurprizing revolution at Rome.
Menandrino (Marſilius de) a learned Civilian.
1350 *Andreas* (John) a famous Canoniſt.
Arioſta (Lippa) concubine and afterwards wife to Opizzo Marquis of Eſt and Ferrara.
Cauliac (Guy de) a Phyſician.
Coronel (Alphonſus) a Spaniſh Lord.
Naples (Joan I, Queen of)
Padilla (Mary de) miſtreſs to Peter the Cruel, King of Caſtille.
Rimini (Gregory of) a ſchoolman.
Roquetaillade (John de la) a Franciſcan.
Ruyſbroeck (John de) founder of a Convent of Canons regular of the Order of St Auguſtin.
Taulerus (John) a Dominican Fryer.

Baldus,

A. D.

1375 *Baldus*, a famous Civilian.
Froiſſard (John) an Hiſtorian.
Gueſelin (Bertrand du) Conſtable of France.
Guiſe (James de) a Franciſcan Monk.
Wickam (William) Biſhop of Wincheſter.
1400 *Ailli* (Peter de) Biſhop of Cambray, *&c.*
Montaigu (John de) High Steward of France.
Savonarola (Michael or John-Michael) a Phyſician.
1425 *Alamandus* (Lewis) Archbiſhop of Arles.
Aretin (Charles) Secretary to the Republic of Florence, and
Aretin (Leonard) his immediate predeceſſor.
Barbarus (Francis) a noble Venetian.
Blondus (Flavius) Secretary to ſeveral Popes.
Burgundy (Philip Duke of) ſirnamed the Good.
Caraccioli (John) gallant to Joan II, Queen of Naples.
Camaldoli (Ambroſe de) Abbot-General of the Order of Camaldoli.
Capiſtran (John) a Franciſcan.
Chaſtelux (Claudius Sire de) Viſcount d'Avalon, *&c.*
Chatel (Tanneguy du) Marſhal of the wars of the Dauphin.
Conecte (Thomas) a Carmelite Fryer.
Eugenius IV. Pope.
Franciſca, a devout lady.
Naples (Joan II, Queen of)
Parts (James des) a Phyſician.
Patricius (Francis) Biſhop of Gaeta.
Sebonde (Raymundus) Profeſſor of Phyſic, *&c.* at Toulouſe.
Sforza (Giacomuzzo) founder of the family of Sforza.
Vegius (Maphæus) an Orator and Poet.
Vergerius (Peter Paul) a Civilian.
1450 *Amyrutzes*, a Peripatetic Philoſopher.
Andreas (John) author of a book againſt the Mahometan religion.
Andronicus of Theſſalonica, a Profeſſor at Florence.
Aretin (John) ſirnamed Tortellius, Chamberlain to Pope Nicolas V.
Ariſtotle, a famous Architect.
Auriſpe (John) Secretary to Nicolas V.
Buridan (John) a famous Philoſopher.
Franc (Martin) Provoſt and Canon of Lauſanne.
Guarinus, one of the firſt revivers of learning in Italy.
Naples (Alphonſus I, King of) and
Panormita (Antony) his Secretary.
Philelphus, an Italian author.
Sforza (Francis) Duke of Milan.
Valla (Laurence) a great critic.
Weſalia (John de) Doctor of Divinity.
1475 *Abrabanel* (Iſaac) a celebrated Rabbi.
Acciacoli [Donato] a learned Florentine.
Agricola [Rodolphus] a learned Frieſlander.
Altilius [Gabriel] a Latin Poet.
Aretin [Francis] a tranſlator of ſome of Chryſoſtome's works.
Argyropylus [John] a learned Greek.
Barbarus [Hermolaus] a learned Venetian.
Barletta [Gabriel] a Dominican.
Bergamo [James Philip de] an Auguſtin Monk.
Bonfinius [Antony] an Hiſtorian.
Boſſus [Matthew] a regular Canon.
Brandolinus [Aurelius] an Auguſtine Fryar.
Brezé [Peter de] Lord de la Varenne, *&c.*

A. D.

Britannicus [John] a learned Commentator.
Burgundy [Charles Duke of] and
Burgundy [Mary of] his only daughter.
Calderinus [Domitius] a teacher of polite learning.
Campanus [John Antony] a learned Prelate.
Cattho [Angelo] Archbp of Vienne.
Chaſtelan [Geo.] a Flemiſh gentleman.
Donatus [Jerome] a noble Venetian.
Dante [Peter Vincent] an Italian Poet.
Edward IV, King of England.
Experiens [Philip Callimachus] tutor to Albert King of Poland.
Fontius [Bartholinus] a teacher of Rhetoric at Florence.
Fulginas [Sigiſmund] an Hiſtorian.
Gentilis de Bechis, Biſhop of Arezzo.
Guarinus [Baptiſt] Profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres*.
Hibten [John] a German Franciſcan.
Innocent VIII, Pope.
Lamponiano [John Andrew] a domeſtic of Galeazzo Sforza Duke of Milan.
Laſcaris [Conſt.] a learned Greek.
Laſcaris [John] ſirnamed Rhyndacenus.
Leonicenus [Nicolas] Profeſſor of Phyſic in the Univerſity of Ferrara.
Lewis XI, King of France.
Mahomet II, Emperor of the Turks.
Mainus [Jaſon] a Civilian.
Majus [Jurianus] teacher of the *Belles Lettres*.
Mancinellus [Antony] a Grammarian.
Marche [Oliver de la] High Steward to Maximilian of Auſtria.
Marſus [Peter] a Commentator.
Marullus [Michael Tarchaniota] a Poet.
Monſtrelet [Enguerrard de] Author of a Chronicle of France.
Nannius [John] a Dominican.
Nero [Bernard del] a Florentine Nobleman.
Nevers [John of Burgundy Count of]
Omnibonus, a noted Grammarian.
Oricellarius [Bernard] a Florentine author.
Patricius [Aug.] Biſhop of Pienza.
Politian [Angelo] a learned and polite author.
Præpoſitus [Nicolas] a Phyſician at Tours.
Savonarola [Jerome] a Dominican Fryar.
Scala [Bartholomew] a learned Florentine, and
Scala [Alexandra] his daughter.
Sforza [Catherine] wife of Jerome Riario.
Sixtus IV, Pope.
Sulpitius [John] ſirnamed Verulanus.
Tiphernas [Gregory] Greek Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Paris.
Torquato [Antony] a famous Aſtrologer.
Triſtan l'Hermite [Lewis] Great Provoſt of the King's houſhold.
Valla [George] a Phyſician, *&c.*
Valla [Nicolas] Doctor of the Civil Law, *&c.*
Vaquerie [John de la] firſt Preſident in the Parliment of Paris.
Urceus [Antony Codrus] a learned Italian.
Utinus [Len. de] a Jacobin Monk.
Weſſelus [John] a learned Dutchman.
1500 *Abſtemius* [Laurence] teacher of the *Belles Lettres*.
Acciaioli [Zenobius] a Dominican.
Alexander ab Alexandro, a Civilian.

A. D.

Alexis, a Piedmontois.
Almain [James] Doctor of Divinity.
Ammonius [Andrew] a Latin Poet.
Andrada [Diego de Payva d'] a Portugueze Divine.
Andrelinus [Publius Fauſtus] Profeſſor of Poetry in the Univerſity of Paris.
Anteſignanus [Peter] a good Grammarian.
Aquaviva [Andrew Matthew] Duke of Atri.
Aragon [Iſabella of] wife of John Galeazzo Sforza, Duke of Milan.
Auton [John d'] Abbot of Angle.
Badius [Jodocus] ſirnamed Aſcenſius, a learned author.
Berſala [Anne] wife to Philip of Burgundy.
Briſſot [Peter] a Phyſician.
Bunel [William] Profeſſor of Phyſic in the Univerſity of Toulouſe.
Buſleiden [Jerome] illuſtrious for his embaſſies, *&c.*
Carteromachus [Scipio] a learned Italian.
Decius [Philip] a famous Civilian.
Delphinus [Peter] General of the Order of Camaldoli.
Durer [Albert] an excellent Painter and Engraver.
Flaminius [Antony] Profeſſor of Polite Literature in the college of Rome.
Gonzaga [Iſabella de] wife of Guido Ubaldo de Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino.
Grapaldus [Francis Marius] a learned Italian.
Hadrian, a Cardinal, *&c.*
Jacettius [Francis Cataneus] an excellent Platoniſt.
Julius II, Pope.
Krantius [Albertus] a famous Hiſtorian.
Langius [Rodolph] Provoſt of the Cathedral Church of Munſter.
Lewis XII, King of France.
Linacer [Thomas] an Engliſh Phyſician.
Machiavel [Nicolas] Secretary to the Republic of Florence.
Manard [John] a Phyſician.
Marlianus [Raimond] a learned Frenchman.
Molſa [Francis Maria] a Poet.
Muſurus [Marc] Greek Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Padua.
Parrhaſius [Janus] a Profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres*.
Phædrus [Thomas] Profeſſor of Eloquence at Rome.
Pomponatius [Peter] teacher of Philoſophy at Padua.
Prierias [Sylveſter] a Dominican.
Ritius [Michael] a Civilian.
Sylvius [Francis] Profeſſor of Eloquence, *&c.* at Paris.
Simonetta [Hyacinthus] a brave and experienced ſoldier.
Stoflerus [John] a famous Mathematician.
Thomæus [Nicolas Leonicus] a Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Padua.
Valdes [John] a handſome young Spaniard.
Vigerius [Mark] a Cardinal, *&c.*
Zabarella [Francis] Archbiſhop of Florence, *&c.*
1525 *Accurſius* [Mariangelus] a Critic.
Adrichomia [Cornelia] a Nun.
Agricola [George] a German Phyſician.
Agricola [John] a Saxon Divine.
Agrippa [Henry Cornelius] a Phyſician.
Akakia [Martin] a Profeſſor of Phyſic.

A. D.

Alciatus (Andrew) a great Civilian.
Alcyonius (Peter) a learned Italian.
Aleander (Jerome) a Cardinal.
Aleſius (Alexander) a famous Divine.
Altenſtaig (John) Doctor of Divinity.
Amaſæus (Romulus) Profeſſor of Greek and Latin at Bologne.
Ammonius (Livinus) a Carthuſian.
Andronicus (Tanaquillus) a teacher in the univerſity of Leipſic.
Apianus (Petrus) a German Mathematician.
Aquæus (Stephen) Lord of Beauvais.
Aragon (Joan of) wiſe to the Prince of Tagliocozzi.
Aretin (Peter) a ſatirical writer.
Aventine (John) an Annaliſt.
Aurogallus (Matthew) a Profeſſor in the uinverſity of Wittemberg.
Balmis (Abraham de) a Jewiſh Phyſician.
Bandel (Matthew) a Dominican.
Barbara, wiſe to the Emperor Sigiſmond.
Barbarus (Daniel) author of ſome Commentaries.
Barnes (Robert) Chaplain to Henry VIII, King of England.
Beda (Noel) Doctor of Divinity, in the univerſity of Paris.
Bellai (William du) Lord of Langey.
Bellai (John du) a Cardinal.
Bembus (Peter) a Cardinal.
Berauld (Nicolas) Tutor to Admiral de Coligny.
Bibliander (Theodorus) Profeſſor of Divinity at Zurich.
Bigot (William) a Phyſician and Philoſopher.
Blomberg (Barbara) a Lady of a good family at Ratiſbon.
Boleyn or *Bullen* (Anne) wiſe to Henry VIII, King of England.
Bombaſius (Paul) Secretary to Cardinal Pucci.
Bomberg (Daniel) a famous Printer.
Bore (Catherine de) wiſe of Luther.
Bouchet (John) a French author.
Braſavolus (Antony Muſa) a Phyſician and Profeſſor at Ferrara.
Brodeus (John) a learned Critic.
Budæus (William) a learned Frenchman.
Bunel (Peter) a good Latin writer.
Burana (John Francis) a Profeſſor at Bologne.
Buteo (John) a famous Mathematician.
Cæſarius (John) a Phyſician and Philoſopher.
Calderinus (John) a Profeſſor of the Civil-Law.
Capycius (Scipio) a famous author.
Capiſucchi (Paul) Canon of the Vatican.
Carion (John) Profeſſor of the Mathematics, in the univerſity of Francfort.
Carmilianus (Peter) a Latin Poet.
Caſtellan (Peter) great Almoner of France.
Ceratinus (James) a good Grecian.
Changy (Peter de) Eſq;
Charles V, Emperor, and King of Spain.
Chateau-Briand (the Counteſs of)
Ciolek (Eraſmus) Biſhop of Ploczko.
Cochlæus (John) Doctor of Divinity.
Cordier (Maturin) a Schoolmaſter.
Coricius (John) an encourager of learned men.
Cornelius (Antony) Licentiate of the Civil-Law.
Dolet (Stephen) a learned Frenchman.
Dryander (John) a Proteſtant martyr.
Driedo (John) Doctor of Divinity.

A. D.

Durant (Samuel) Miniſter of Charenton.
Egnatius (John Baptiſt) a learned Eccleſiaſtic.
Emeri (Sebaſtian) Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.
Emilius (Paul) an Hiſtorian.
Eppendorf (Henry) a German nobleman.
Eraſmus (Deſiderius) a famous Latin author.
Eſtampes (Anne de Piſſeleu, Ducheſs of)
Ferrarienſis, a Scholaſtic Philoſopher, whoſe true name was Francis Sylveſter.
Ferretus (Æmilius) an able Civilian.
Feras (John) Warden of the Franciſcans at Mentz.
Fevre of Etaples, a learned Frenchman.
Finæus (Orontius) Profeſſor of Mathematics, in the royal college of Paris.
Flaminius (Marc Antony) a Latin Poet.
Florimont (Galeacius) Biſhop of Seſſa.
Francis I, King of France.
Francus (Sebaſtian) an Anabaptiſt.
Geldenhaur (Gerard) a Monk, and afterwards a Proteſtant.
Gelenius (Sigiſmund) corrector of a printing-houſe.
Gonzaga (Eleonora) wiſe to Francis Maria de la Rovere, Duke of Urbino.
Gonzaga (Julia) Ducheſs of Trajetta, *&c.*
Gonzaga (Lucretia) wiſe of John Paul Manfrone.
Grammont (Gabriel de) a French Cardinal.
Graſſis (Paris de) Maſter of the Ceremonies under ſeveral Popes.
Grynæus (Simon) a Profeſſor of Greek at Heidelberg.
Guevara (Antony de) Preacher and Hiſtoriographer to Charles V.
Guicciardin (Francis) the Hiſtorian.
Guindano (Sigiſmund) a Poet.
Guiſe (Claudius de Lorraine, Duke of)
Hadrian VI (Pope).
Helvicus (Chriſtopher) Profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity of Gieſſen.
Hochſtratus (James) a Dominican, *&c.*
Hoffman (Melchior) a dogmatical Preacher.
Hortenſius (John) a Phyſician.
Hungary (Mary Queen of)
Hungary (Iſabella Queen of)
Hungerus (Wolfgang) a Civilian.
Hutten (Ulric de) a Poet.
Jovius (Paul) an Hiſtorian.
Juſtiniani (Auguſtin) Biſhop of Nebbio.
Laciſcus (Paul) a regular Canon of the congregation of Lateran.
Lambert (Francis) a Franciſcan Monk.
Landa (Catherine) a learned Italian lady.
Langius (Paul) a German Monk.
Leland (John) Antiquary to Henry VIII.
Lemnius (Lævinus) a famous Phyſician.
Leo X. (Pope)
Lizet (Peter) firſt Preſident in the Parliament of Paris.
Loyola (Ignatius) founder of the Jeſuits.
Lucidus (John) author of a book of Chronology.
Luther (Martin) a Reformer of the Church.

A. D.

Macrin (Salmon) a Poet.
Majoragius (Marc Antony) Profeſſor of Eloquence at Milan.
Marot (Clement) a French Poet.
Marulus (Marcus) a Dalmatian author.
Melanchthon (Philip) a famous Proteſtant author.
Micyllus (James) a Profeſſor at Francfort.
Mutius (Huldric) Profeſſor at Baſil.
Navagiero (Andrew) a noble Venetian.
Navarre (Margaret de Valois, Queen of)
Nevizan (John) an Italian Civilian.
Niphus (Auguſtin) a celebrated Civilian.
Nonius (Peter) a learned Portugueze.
Ochinus (Bernardin) a Capuchin.
Oecolampadius (John) one of the Reformers of the Church.
Padilla (John de) one of the ringleaders of a ſedition in Spain.
Palingenius (Marcellus) a Latin Poet.
Parthenai (Anne de) wiſe of Antony de Pons, Count de Marennes.
Periers (Bonaventure Des) Valet de Chambre to the Queen of Navarre.
Pighius (Albertus) a Sophiſtical writer.
Pin (John du) Biſhop of Rieux.
Pinet (Antony du) Lord of Noroy.
Poitiers (Diana de) miſtreſs to Henry II, King of France.
Polydamus (Valentinus) an Italian Phyſician.
Prat (Antony du) Chancellor of France, *&c.*
Quiqueran (Peter de) Bp. of Senez.
Regius (Urban) a Lutheran Divine.
Ricius (Paul) Profeſſor of Rhetoric at Pavia.
Rorarius (Hierome) Nuncio of Clement VII.
Rucellai (John) a noble Florentine, and good Poet.
Sabeus (Fauſtus) keeper of the Vatican library.
Samblancai (James de Beaume, Baron de) Superintendant of the Finances.
Schomberg (Nicolas of) Cardinal, *&c.*
Schorus (Antony) a Grammarian.
Seymour (Anne, Margaret, and Joan) three ſiſters illuſtrious for their learning in England.
Selve (John de) firſt Preſident in the Parliament of Paris.
Sforza (Iſabella) a learned woman.
Sylvius (James) a famous Phyſician.
Socinus (Marianus) a Profeſſor of the Civil-Law.
Stifelius (Michael) a Lutheran Miniſter.
Sturmius (James) famous for the deputations he performed.
Tapperus (Ruardus) Profeſſor of Divinity at Louvain.
Tartaglia (Nicolas) a famous Mathematician.
Tiraquellus (Andrew) a learned Frenchman.
Turrel (Peter) Rector of the College of Dijon.
Valdes (John) a Civilian.
Villamarini (Iſabella) wiſe to the Prince of Salerno.
Virgil (Polydore) an Hiſtorian.
Volſius (Paul) an Abbot.
Urſinus (John) a French Phyſician.
Wechel (Chriſtian) a famous Printer.
Wida (Hernan de) Archbiſhop of Cologn.
Wimpina (Conrad) Profeſſor of Divinity at Francfort.

A. D.

Ziegler (James) a Profeſſor of Divinity.
1550 *Acontius* (James) a Philoſopher, Civilian, and Divine.
Acronius (John) teacher of Mathematics, *&c.* at Baſil.
Adriani (John Baptiſt) an Hiſtorian.
Agricola (Michael) a Lutheran Miniſter.
Altaemps (Mark) a Cardinal.
Althamerus (Andrew) a Lutheran Miniſter.
Amboiſe (Michael de) Eſq;
Amyot (James) Biſhop of Auxerre.
Aramont (Gabriel) an Ambaſſador of France, in the reign of Henry II.
Baduel (Claudius) a learned author.
Baronius (Dominic) a Florentine Prieſt.
Baudouin (Francis) a Civilian.
Belleau (Remi) a French Poet.
Bertelier (Philibert) Regiſter, *&c.* at Geneva.
Billon (Francis de) Secretary of William du Bellai.
Bonfadius (James) Hiſtoriographer to the Republic of Genoa.
Bononia (John de) Archdeacon of Palermo.
Bouquin (Peter) a Carmelite Fryer.
Broſſe (James de) a great warrior.
Bruſchius (Gaſpar) a Latin Poet.
Buchanan (George) a famous Latin Poet, *&c.*
Bullinger (Henry) one of the Reformers of the Church.
Calvin (John) Miniſter at Geneva.
Caninius (Angelus) a Grammarian.
Capiſucchi (John Antony) a Cardinal by the title of St Pancrace.
Caraccioli (John Antony) Biſhop of Troyes.
Cardan (Jerome) a Phyſician.
Carranza (Bartholomew) a Dominican.
Caſtalio (Sebaſtian) Profeſſor of Greek at Baſil.
Caſtelvetro (Lewis) a ſubtle writer.
Chabot (Peter Gualtherus) a good Humaniſt.
Chocquet (Lewis) a French Poet.
Cipierre (Philibert de Marcilli, Lord of).
Clarus (Julius) a Civilian.
Couſin (Gilbert) a Canon at Nozeret.
Creſpinus (John) a famous Printer.
Curio (Cælius Secundus) a learned Piedmontois.
Daurat (John) a learned Humaniſt and Poet.
Doni (Antony Francis) an Italian author.
Donzellinus (Jerome) an Italian Phyſician.
Eſmendreville (John du Boſc, Lord of).
Eſſe (Andrew de Montalembert, Lord)
Fauno (Lucio) an Italian author.
Fernelius (John) a Phyſician.
Feron (John le) Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.
Ferrara (Renata of France, Ducheſs of).
Ferrier (Arnaud du) Preſident of the Parliament of Paris.
Funccius (John) a Lutheran preacher.
Gallars (Nicolas des) a Miniſter of Geneva.
Gambara (Laurence) a Latin Poet.
Garnache (Francis de Rohan, Lady de la).
Gentilis (John Valentinian) an Arian.
Gratarolus (William) a Phyſician.
Gribaldus (Matthew) a Civilian.
Gropper (John) a Cardinal.
Grynæus (Thomas) a Profeſſor at Baſil.

A. D.

Gryphius (Sebaſtian) a famous Printer at Lyons.
Guiſe (Francis de Lorraine, Duke of).
Hartungius (John) Profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres* at Friburg.
Henry II, King of France.
Herold (Baſil John) a Proteſtant Miniſter and author.
Hyperius (Andrew Gerard) a Profeſſor of Divinity.
Hortenſius (Lambert) a learned Dutchman.
Huarte (John) a Spaniſh author.
Illyricus (Matthias Flacius) a learned Proteſtant Divine.
Julius III (Pope).
Junius (Hadrian) a Phyſician.
Knox (John) a Scotch Reformer.
Labe (Loyſa) a Courtezan of Lyons.
Leon (Peter Cieça de) a Spaniſh Hiſtorian.
Leovicius (Cyprian) a famous Aſtronomer.
Lippoman (Aloiſio) a learned Prelate.
Liſmanin (Francis) a Doctor of Divinity, *&c.*
Longiano (Fauſtus da) an Italian author.
Longvic (Jaqueline de) Ducheſs of Montpenſier.
Lotichius (Peter) Abbot of the convent of Solitar.
Lotichius (Peter) ſirnamed Secundus, and nephew to the foregoing.
Lotichius (Chriſtian) younger brother to the foregoing, and Vicar to the Abbey of Solitar.
Maldonat (John) a Prieſt of Burgos.
Marillac (Charles de) Archbiſhop of Vienna.
Marinello (John) a Phyſician.
Marius, ſirnamed Æquicola, an Italian author.
Martinenghus (Titus Proſper) a Benedictine.
Maſſarius (James) a Doctor of Phyſic.
Maugin (John) a French tranſlator.
Modrevius (Andrew Fricius) Secretary to the King of Poland.
Monardes (Nicolas) a Spaniſh Phyſician.
Morlin (Joachim) Profeſſor of Divinity at Konigſberg.
Muſculus (Wolfgang) a famous Divine.
Muſſo (Cornelio) Biſhop of Bitonto.
Naogeorgus (Thomas) a Latin Poet.
Navarre (Joan d'Albret, Queen of).
Orichovius (Staniſlaus) a Poliſh gentleman.
Oſorius (Jerome) a Portugueze Prelate.
Palearius (Aonius) Profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres* at Siena.
Paré (Ambroſe) Surgeon to Francis II, King of France.
Pariſet (Lewis) a Latin author.
Patricius (Andrew) Bp of Wenden.
Peraxylus (whoſe true name was Arnoldus Arlenius) a great Grecian.
Pereira (Gomeſius) a Spaniſh Phyſician.
Piccolomini (Alexander) Archbiſhop of Patras, *&c.*
Piccolomini (Francis) a famous Philoſopher.
Pienne (Joan de Halluin) maid of honour to Catherine de Medicis.
Place (Peter de la) Preſident in the court of Aids at Paris.
Poinet (John) Biſhop of Wincheſter.
Pontius (Conſtantine) preacher to Charles V.
Quintin (John) Profeſſor of the Canon-Law at Paris.

A. D.

Radziwil (Nicolas) Palatin of Vilna, *&c.*
Ramus [Peter] Royal Profeſſor of Philoſophy and Eloquence.
Raſario [John Baptiſt] an Italian Phyſician.
Rataller [George] Preſident of the Council of Utrecht.
Rauber [Andrew Eberhard] a German Knight.
Richer (Peter) a Carmelite, *&c.*
Robert (John) Profeſſor of the Civil-Law in the univerſity of Orleans.
Rohan (Renata de) wife of Francis de Rohan, Lord de Gié.
Ronſard (Peter de) a French Poet.
Roſeo (Mambrin) an Italian author.
Ruſſilianus (Tiberius) a ſubtle Philoſopher.
Saint-Cyre, a brave ſoldier.
Serbellone (Gabriel) a great Captain.
Serbellone (Fabricius) brother to the foregoing.
Soubiſe (John de Parthenai, Lord of) a zealous Proteſtant.
Spifame (James Paul) Biſhop of Nevers.
Stancarus (Francis) a zealous promoter of the Reformed Religion in Poland.
Strigelius (Victorinus) a Proteſtant Divine.
Sturmius (John) Rector of the college of Straſbourg.
Sulacha (Simon) a Neſtorian Monk.
Suſanneau (Hubert) Doctor of Law and Phyſic.
Taiſnier (John) a teacher of Mathematics.
Taveau (Renata) wife to Francis Rochechoüart, Lord of Tonnay Charente.
Tetti (Scipio) a learned Neapolitan.
Tillet (John du) Protonotary and Secretary to the King, *&c.*
Tillet (John du) younger brother to the foregoing, and a learned Eccleſiaſtic.
Truberus (Primus) a Sclavonian author.
Tulenus, a learned Frenchman.
Tuppius (Laurence) a Civilian.
Valla (Nicolas) Counſellor in the Parliament of Paris.
Velſius (Juſtus) Doctor of Phyſic.
Vergerius (Peter Paul) famous for his embaſſies, *&c.*
Villegaignon (Nicolas Durand de) a Knight of Malta.
Viret (Peter) a Proteſtant Miniſter.
Weidnerus (Paul) a Jewiſh Phyſician.
Weſtphalus (Joachim) a Lutheran Miniſter.
Wicelius (George) a Divine.
Zanchius (Baſil) Keeper of the Vatican library.
1575 *Abdiſſi*, Patriarch of Muſal in Aſſyria.
Abelly (Antony) Doctor of Divinity.
Accords (Stephen Tabourot, Lord of).
Acidalius (Valens) Rector of the ſchool at Breſlaw.
Adrichomius (Chriſtian) a Dutch Prieſt.
Aguirre (Michael de) a Civilian.
Ayrault (Peter) Lieutenant-Criminal in the Preſidial Court of Angers.
Akakia (Martin) Doctor of Phyſic of the Faculty of Paris.
Alciatus (John Paul) a gentleman of Milan.
Aldrovandus (Ulyſſes) Profeſſor of Philoſophy, *&c.* at Bologne.
Althuſius (John) a Civilian.

A. D.

Anania [John Laurence d'] an Italian author.

Angiolello [Maria] an Hiſtorian.

Antoniano [Sylvio] a Cardinal.

Arigoni [Pompeio] a Cardinal.

Arrera [John d'] Counſellor in the Parliament of Bourdeaux.

Audebert [Germain] a Latin Poet.

Auge [Daniel d'] Greek Profeſſor in the univerſity of Paris.

Auſtria [Don John of] natural ſon to the Emperor Charles V.

Babelot, Chaplain to the Duke of Montpenſier.

Bachovius [Reinier] a Civilian.

Baius [Michael] Profeſſor of Divity, at Louvain.

Barclay [William] a learned Civilian.

Barleus [Melchior] a Latin Poet.

Baron [Peter] Profeſſor of Divinity, in the univerſity of Cambridge.

Baſta [Nicolas] an Officer in the Spaniſh ſervice.

Bautru Des Matras [Maurice] chief Lieutenant of the Provoſtſhip of Angers.

Beaucaire de Peguillon [Francis] Biſhop of Metz.

Beaumont [Francis de] Baron Des Adrets.

Begat [John] Counſellor in the Parliament of Dijon.

Belleforeſt [Francis de] a French author.

Beme, murtherer of Admiral de Chatillon.

Bencius [Francis de] an Italian author.

Beroaldus [Francis] Sieur de Verville.

Beroaldus [Matthew] Teacher of the Hebrew.

Bertram [Cornelius Bonaventura] Hebrew Profeſſor at Geneva.

Beza [Theodorus] a famous Proteſtant Miniſter.

Belli [James de] an Abbot.

Blandrata [George] a Phyſician.

Bodin [John] a learned author.

Boi, a famous player at Cheſs.

Boiſſard [John James] Governour to the Baron of Clervant's Children.

Bolſec [Jerome] an abuſive writer.

Borgarutius [Proſper] an Italian Phyſician.

Boſquet [George] an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.

Boſſu [James le] Doctor of Divinity, in the univerſity of Paris.

Boſſulus [Matthew] a great Orator.

Botal [Leonard] Phyſician to Henry III, King of France.

Botero (John) tutor to the Duke of Savoy's children.

Boucher [John] Doctor of the Sorbonne.

Bouchet [William] Sieur de Brocourt.

Braun [George] Archdeacon of Dortmond, *&c.*

Brocardus [James] an Apocalyptical writer.

Brunus [Jordanus] a Philoſopher.

Brutus [John Michael] a learned author.

Buſbequius [Augerius Giſlenius, Lord of]

Caniceus [James] author of a romance.

Capilupus [Camillus] author of a book called *The Stratagem.*

Capiſucchi [Blaſius] Marquis of Monterio, *&c.*

Carbon [Lewis] Profeſſor of Divinity at Perugia.

Caurres [John des] principal of the college of Amiens.

Carafi [Tiberius] an Advocate.

Ceſalpinus [Andrew] a Profeſſor at Piſa.

A. D.

Chalvet [Matthew de] Preſident of the Inqueſts in the Parliament of Toulouſe.

Charpentier [Peter] a teacher of the Civil-Law.

Charron [Peter] a French author.

Chaſtel [John] a famous Aſſaſſin.

Cipierre [Renatus de Savoie, Lord of]

Clavius [Chriſtopher] a Jeſuit.

Cologne [Peter de] Miniſter of Metz.

Corbinelli [James] Preceptor to Henry III, King of France.

Cotta [Catellian) a Latin author.

Creſpet [Peter] a Celeſtin Friar.

Criſpus [John Baptiſt] a Divine and Poet.

Criton [James] a prodigious wit.

Dalmatin [George] a Lutheran Miniſter at Laubech.

Dalmatin [George] a Lutheran Miniſter in Upper Carniola.

Dante [Ignatius] a Jacobin Monk.

Dinoth [Richard] an Hiſtorian.

Doneau [Hugh] a Civilian.

Dreſſerus [Matthew] Profeſſor of Polite Learning, in the univerſity of Leipſic.

Eimeric [Nicolas] a Dominican.

Eiſengrein [Martin] Doctor of Divinity.

Elizabeth, Queen of England.

Fauchet [Claude] firſt Preſident of the Court of the Mint at Paris.

Feuardent [Francis] a famous Franciſcan.

Freigius [John Thomas] Rector of the college of Altdorf.

Fugger [Hildric] Chamberlain to Pope Paul III.

Furius [Frederic] a learned Spaniard.

Galés [Peter] a learned Spaniard.

Gallutias [John Paul] an Italian Aſtronomer.

Gardie [Pontus de la] Great Marſhal of the armies of Sweden.

Gediccus [Simon] Doctor of Divinity, and Miniſter at Magdeburg.

Gentilis [Alberic] Profeſſor of Civil-Law at Oxford.

Gentillet [Innocent] a Civilian.

Gifanius [Obertus] a good Humaniſt and Civilian.

Golius [Theophilus] Profeſſor of Ethics at Straſbourg.

Gontaut [Armand de] Baron de Biron.

Gorlæus [Abraham] a man curious in collecting medals.

Goſelini [Julian] Secretary to ſeveral perſons of a high rank.

Gregory [Peter] a learned author.

Grillon, a valiant gentleman of Provence.

Guarini [Baptiſt] author of the Paſtor Fido.

Guignard [John] a Jeſuit.

Guiſe [Henry de Lorraine, Duke of]

Hacket [William] an Engliſh Fanatic.

Hay [John] a Scotch Jeſuit.

Haillan [Bernard de Girard, Lord of] Hiſtoriographer of France.

Hall [Richard] an Engliſh Divine.

Harchius [Jodochus] a Phyſician.

Hardenberg [Albert] a Proteſtant Divine.

Hemmingius [Nicolas] Profeſſor of Divinity at Copenhagen.

Henry III, King of France.

Heſhuſius [Telemannus] a Divine of the Augſburg confeſſion.

Hoffman [Daniel] Superintendant and Profeſſor at Helmſtadt.

Horſtius [James] Profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Helmſtadt.

Hoſius [Staniſlaus] a Cardinal.

A. D.

Hoſpital [Michael de l'] Chancellor of France.

Hotman [Francis] teacher of the Civil-Law.

Hunnius [Giles] Doctor of Divinity.

Jodelle [Stephen] a French and Latin Poet.

Joubertus [Laurence] Counſellor and Phyſician in ordinary to Henry III, King of France.

Junctin [Francis] a Mathematician, *&c.*

Junius [Francis] Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden.

Kilianus [Cornelius] a corrector of the preſs.

Koornhert [Theodore] Secretary of the town of Haerlem.

Kuchlin [John] a Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity.

Languet [Hubert] Counſellor to the Elector of Saxony.

Laſicius [John] a Poliſh Gentleman.

Latinus [John] a Schoolmaſter.

Launoy [Matthew] a violent Leaguer.

Lazzarelli [N.] a Prieſt, and Provoſt of Mirandola.

Lentulus [Scipio] Miniſter of Chiavenne.

Leon [Aloiſio] Profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity of Salamanca.

Leon [Gonſalez Pontius de] a Spaniſh author.

Leonclavius [John] a learned German.

Leonin [Elbret] Profeſſor of the Civil-Law.

Leri [John de] a Proteſtant Miniſter.

Lydius [Martin] Profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker.

Liebaut [John] a Phyſician.

Lipſius [Juſtus] a Great Critic.

Limeuil [Iſabella de la Tour de Turenne Demoiſelle de] maid of honour to Catherine de Medicis.

Lyſerus [Polycarp] a famous Proteſtant Divine.

Livineius [John] a Chanter and Canon at Antwerp.

Lorme [Philibert de] a famous Architect.

Louet [George] a Counſellor of the Parliament of Paris.

Magius [Jerome] a famous Engineer.

Mahomet [Galadin] Emperor of Mogul.

Maldonat [John] a Spaniſh Jeſuit.

Malherbe [Francis de] a French Poet.

Margunius [Maximus] Biſhop of Cythera.

Mariana [John] a Jeſuit and Hiſtorian.

Martellus [Hugolin] Biſhop of Glandeves.

Molſa [Tarquinea] an eminent Italian lady.

Monantheuil [Henry de] King's Profeſſor of Mathematics at Paris.

Monin [John Edward du] a French Poet.

Montecatinus [Antony] Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Ferrara.

Mont-joſieu [Lewis de] an excellent antiquary.

Navarre [Margaret de Valois, Queen of]

Niphus [Fabius] Profeſſor of practical Phyſic at Padua.

Oſſat [Arnaud d'] a Cardinal.

Pacard [George] Miniſter at Rochefoucaut.

Pacheco [Alvarez] a Spaniſh Colonel.

Pareus [David] a Reformed Divine.

Parthenai [Catherine de] wife to Renatus de Rohan, the ſecond of the name.

Paſchali

A. D.	
	Paſchali [Giulio Cæſare] an Italian Poet.
	Patricius [Francis] Biſhop of Gaeta.
	Peckius [Peter] Profeſſor of Canon-Law at Louvain.
	Perrot [Nicolas] an Italian author.
	Pezelius [Chriſtopher] Profeſſor of Divinity at Bremen.
	Pincier [John] a Proteſtant Miniſter.
	Piſtorius [John] Doctor of Phyſic.
	Poncet [Maurice] Doctor of Divinity.
	Puccius (Francis) a Proteſtant Divine.
	Quellenec [Charles de] Baron of Pont, *&c.*
	Raphelengius [Francis] Profeſſor of Hebr. in the univerſity of Leyden.
	Rapin [Nicolas] a Provoſt-Marſhal and Poet.
	Remond [Florimond de] Counſellor in the Parliament of Bourdeaux.
	Rhodoman [Laurence] Profeſſor of Hiſtory in the univerſity of Wirtemberg.
	Rochefoucaud [Alexander de la] Abbot of St Martin.
	Roſe [William] Biſhop of Senlis.
	Roſier [Hugh Sureau du] a famous Miniſter of the Church of Orleans.
	Rotan [John Baptiſt] Miniſter of Rochelle.
	Rua [Peter] a learned Spaniard.
	Ruggeri [Coſmo] Abbot of St Mahé.
	Sabellicus [Marc Antony Cocceius] an Hiſtorian.
	Sacratus [Paul] a Canon of Ferrara.
	Saint-Aldegonde [Philip de Marnix, Lord du Mont].
	Santa-Croce [Proſper] Cardinal.
	Sancteſius [Claudius] Bp of Evreux.
	Sanders [Nicolas] an Engliſh Prieſt.
	Sarnanus [Conſtantius] a Cardinal.
	Schilling [Chriſtopher] Rector of the college of Heidelberg.
	Schomberg [Theodorus of] a brave ſoldier.
	Schomberg [Gaſpar de] Count of Nantueil.
	Schultingius [Cornelius] a Licentiate in Divinity, *&c.*
	Schutze [John] a Lutheran Miniſter.
	Scribonius [William Adolphus] a German Phyſician and Philoſopher.
	Simonides [Simon] a good Latin Poet.
	Simonius [Simon] a Phyſician and Philoſopher.
	Socinus [Fauſtus] founder of a ſect that goes by his name.
	Spina [John de] a Proteſtant Miniſter.
	Spinoza [John de] a Spaniard of great abilities.
	Spondanus [John de] Lieutenant-General to the Preſidial of Rochelle.
	Stevin [Simon] an excellent Mathematician.
	Strozzi [Philip] ſon to Peter Strozzi, Marſhal of France.
	Surgier [Francis] a Friar.
	Taſſo [Torquato] a famous Italian Poet.
	Taurelius [Nicolas] a Phyſician and Philoſopher.
	Texera [Joſeph] a Portugueze Friar.
	Typotius [James] a Civilian.
	Tyſſander [N.] a French author.
	Torelli [Pomponio] Count of Montechiarugula.
	Tori [Jeffery] King's Printer at Paris.
	Touchet [Mary] miſtreſs to Charles IX, King of France.
	Valerius [Auguſtin] Cardinal.
	Valle [Rolandus] an Italian Civilian.
	Verſoris [Peter de] Lord of Fontenai le Viſconte, *&c.*
	Villavicentius [Laurence] preacher to Philip II, King of Spain.
	Ulfeld [James] a Daniſh Senator, *&c.*
	Urſinus [Zachary] a famous reformed Divine.
	Urſus [Nicolas Raimarus] author of ſome Aſtronomical tracts.
	Vulcanius [Bonaventura] Greek Profeſſor in the univerſity of Leyden.
	Xylander [William] Profeſſor of the Greek tongue at Heidelberg.
	Zabarella [James] a Profeſſor in the univerſity of Padua.
	Zanchius [Jerome] a famous Proteſtant Divine.
	Zarlino [Joſeph] an excellent Muſician.
1600	*Accariſi* (Francis) a Civilian.
	Adam, Archdeacon of the Patriarchal Chamber, and Superior of the Monks of Chaldæa.
	Akakia (Martin) Doctor of Phyſic at Paris.
	Alabaſter (William) an Engliſh Divine.
	Alcaſar (Lewis de) a Spaniſh Jeſuit.
	Amboiſe (Francis d') an Advocate, *&c.*
	Amboiſe (Adrian d') Biſhop of Freguier.
	Amboiſe (James d') Doctor of Phyſic.
	Arminius (James) Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden.
	Arnauld (Anthony) Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.
	Arriaga (Robert d') a Spaniſh Jeſuit.
	Baldus (Bernardin) Abbot of Guaſtalla.
	Bandole (Antony de) Advocate in the Parliament of Provence.
	Barclay (John) a Latin author.
	Baſta, a famous General.
	Bauderon (Brice) a French Phyſician.
	Baudius (Dominic) Profeſſor of Hiſtory in the univerſity of Leyden.
	Bautru des-Matras (John) Mayor of Angers.
	Bellarmin (Robert) a Cardinal.
	Beloy (Peter de) Advocate-General in the Parliament of Toulouſe.
	Beni (Paul) Profeſſor of Eloquence in the univerſity of Padua.
	Berault (Michael) Miniſter, and afterwards Profeſſor of Divinity at Montauban.
	Bergier (Nicolas) an Advocate.
	Boccalini (Trajan) an Italian author.
	Bochius (John) a Latin Poet, *&c.*
	Bonciarius (Marc Antony) a ſchoolmaſter at Perugia.
	Bongars (James) famous for his Embaſſies, *&c.*
	Botereius (Rodolphus) Advocate in the grand Council at Paris.
	Breauté (Charles de) a Norman gentleman.
	Broughton (Hugh) an Engliſh Divine.
	Broſſier (Martha) a woman that pretended to be poſſeſſed with a Devil.
	Buſtomantinus [John] a Profeſſor in the univerſity of Alcala.
	Cayet (Peter Victor Palma) Doctor of Divinity in the Faculty of Paris.
	Camden (William) an Hiſtorian.
	Carthagena (John) a Jeſuit, and afterwards a Franciſcan.
	Chamier (Daniel) a famous Proteſtant Divine.
	Cheſne [Joſeph du] Sieur de la Valette.
	Ciconia [Flaminius] a Philoſopher.
	Concini [Concino] known by the name of Marſhal d'Ancre.
	Cremoninus [Cæſar] Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Padua.
	Criton [George] Greek Profeſſor in the royal college at Paris.
	Criton [William] a Jeſuit.
	Daillé [John] miniſter of the church of Paris.
	Dandini [Jerome] a Jeſuit.
	Dauſqueius [Claudius] Canon of Tournay.
	Dempſter [Thomas] a Schoolmaſter.
	Druſius [John] Hebrew Profeſſor in the univerſity of Franeker.
	Elich [Lewis Philip] a German author.
	Elmenhorſt [Geverhart] a learned Hamburgueſe.
	Emmius [Urbo] a Profeſſor at Groningen.
	Eremita [Daniel] Secretary to the Duke of Florence.
	Feithius [Everard] a learned Dutchman.
	Fenoillet [Peter] Biſhop of Montpellier.
	Ferrier [Jeremiah] Profeſſor of Divinity at Niſmes.
	Frachetta [Jerome] a Political writer.
	Gaigneur [William le] a man who excelled in the art of writing.
	Galligay [Leonora] wife of the Marſhal d'Ancre.
	Gallonius [Antony] a prieſt of the Oratory of Rome.
	Gamon [Chriſtopher de] a French author.
	Gentilis [Scipio] Profeſſor of the Civil-Law at Altorf.
	Gomarus [Francis] a Profeſſor of Divinity.
	Gontaut [Charles de] Duke of Biron.
	Goulart [Simon] Miniſter of Geneva.
	Gournay [Mary de Jars de] a learned Frenchwoman.
	Grain [Baptiſt le] an Hiſtorian.
	Grawerus [Albert] a Doctor of Divinity.
	Gretſerus [James] a Jeſuit.
	Gruterus [Janus] a learned Philologer.
	Guaguin [Alexander] Governour of the fortreſs of Witebſk in Poland.
	Guiſe [Lewis de Lorraine, Cardinal de]
	Hacker [James] Profeſſor of Divinity at Friburg.
	Hemelar [John] a Canon of Antwerp.
	Henry IV, King of France.
	Herlicius [David] a Philoſopher, *&c.*
	Herwart [John George] Chancellor of Bavaria.
	Hæſchelius [Dav.] Rector of St Anne's college at Augſburg.
	Hoſpinian [Rodolphus] a Swiſs author.
	Hutterus [Leonard] Profeſſor of Divinity at Wittemberg.
	Jeniſchius [Paul] a learned Flemiſh man.
	Jonas Arngrimas, a learned Iſelander.
	Jungerman [Godfrey] a corrector of the preſs.
	Keckerman [Bartholomew] Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Dantzick.
	Keller [James] a Jeſuit.
	Kornmannus [Henry] a German Civilian.
	Labourlotte [Claudius] a brave Captain.
	Langius [Joſeph] Profeſſor of Mathematics, *&c.* at Friburg.
	Laurens [Andrew du] Profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Montpellier.

A. D.

Lingelſheim [George Michael] Preceptor, and afterwards Counſellor to the Elector Palatine.
Lorme [N. de] a French Phyſician.
Loyer [Peter le] Counſellor in the Preſidial Court of Angers.
Lubert [Sibrand] Profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker.
Lubin [Eilhard] Profeſſor of Poetry, and afterwards of Divinity in the univerſity of Roſtoc.
Maccius [Sebaſtian] a learned Humaniſt.
Maginus [John Antony] Profeſſor of Mathematics in the univerſity of Bologna.
Marinella [Lucretia] a Venetian lady.
Marnix [John de] Baron des Potes.
Matman [Rodolphus] a Jeſuit.
Mendozza [John Gonſales de] an Auguſtin Friar.
Montgaillard [Bernard de] Abbot of Orval.
Mongne [Roberta] a learned Proteſtant lady.
Narni, an Italian Capuchin.
Newton [Adam] Dean of Saliſbury.
Pineau [Severin] a Surgeon.
Pineau [Gabriel du] Counſellor in the Preſidial of Angers.
Pinſſon [Francis] Profeſſor of the Civil-Law at Bourges.
Pitiſcus [Bartholomew] Preacher to the Elector Palatine.
Plantevit-la-Pauſe [John] Biſhop of Lodeve.
Politian [Giovanni Angelo] teacher of Logic.
Politian [Antony Laurentin] Profeſſor of Logic in the univerſity of Piſa.
Puteanus [Erycius] Hiſtoriographer to his Catholic Majeſty.
Refuge [du] author of a treatiſe on the court.
Renou [John de] Counſellor and Phyſician to Henry IV, King of France.
Rinuccini [Ottavio] gentleman of the bed-chamber to Henry IV.
Rocco [Girolamo] a great maſter in the art of writing.
Rubenus [Leonard] a Benedictine.
Sanchez [Francis] a Phyſician.
Sanchez [Thomas] a Spaniſh Jeſuit.
Scot [Reginald] an Engliſh gentleman.
Scultetus [Abraham] author of ſeveral books.
Segla [William de, Sieur de Cayras] Counſellor in the Parliament of Toulouſe.
Smiglecius [Martin] a Jeſuit.
Stouppa [John Nicolas] Profeſſor of Phyſic at Baſil.
Sutcliffe [Matthew] an Engliſh Divine.
Val [John du] a Phyſician.
Valdes [James] an Advocate at Valladolid.
Verſerus [Mark] a learned Civilian.
Volkelius [John] a Socinian Miniſter.
Vorſtius [Conrad] a Profeſſor of Divinity.
Uſher [Henry] Archbiſhop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland.
Windeck [John Paul] Doctor of Divinity.

A. D.

Wower [John de] Counſellor to the Duke of Holſtein.
1625 *Aarſens* [Francis] Lord of Somelſdyck, and Spyck, &c.
Abbot [George] Archbiſhop of Canterbury.
Abbot [Robert] Biſhop of Sarum.
Abram [Nicolas] a Jeſuit.
Accariſi [James] Doctor of Divinity.
Acoſta [Uriel] a Portugueze gentleman.
Acuna [Chriſtopher] a Spaniſh Jeſuit.
Adam [Melchior] Rector of a college at Heidelberg.
Agreda [Mary de] a religious viſionary.
Airault [Renatus] a Jeſuit.
Alamos [Balthazar] a Civilian.
Alciatus [Terence] an Italian Jeſuit.
Aldringer, a famous General.
Aleander [Jerome] Secretary to Cardinal Octavio Bandini.
Alegambus [Philip] a Jeſuit.
Allatius [Leo] Librarian of the Vatican.
Alſtedius [John Henry] a German Divine.
Altingius [Henry] Profeſſor of Divinity at Heidelberg.
Amama [Sixtinus] Hebrew Profeſſor in the univerſity of Franeker.
Ameſeus [William] Profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker.
Amyraut [Moſes] Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity at Saumur.
Aquinas [Philip] a converted Jew.
Archirota [Alexander] an Abbot.
Arnauld d'Andilli [Robert] eldeſt ſon of Anthony Arnauld the Advocate.
Arniſæus [Henningus] Profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Helmſtadt.
Arſenius, a Greek Monk.
Aubertin [Edmund] Miniſter of the Church of Paris.
Audiguier [N. d'] a French author.
Bacon [Francis] Lord High-Chancellor of England.
Bagni [John Francis] a Cardinal.
Balzac [John Lewis Guez, Sieur de].
Baranzon [Redemptus] a Barnabite Friar.
Barleus [Gaſpar] Profeſſor of Phyſic at Amſterdam.
Barleus [Lambert] Greek Profeſſor in the univerſity of Leyden.
Barnes [John] an Engliſh Benedictine.
Barthius [Gaſpar] a famous author.
Baſnage [Benjamin] Miniſter of Charenton.
Baudier [Michael] a French author.
Bautru [William] Count de Serrant, and
Bautru [Nicolas] Count de Nogent, his brother.
Bedell [William] Biſhop of Kilmore.
Belot [N.] Advocate in the King's Privy-Council.
Berigardus [Claudius] Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Piſa.
Berulle [Peter de] Cardinal.

A. D.

Blondel [David] a Proteſtant Miniſter.
Borſtel [Adolphus de] a German gentleman.
Boſc [N. du] a Franciſcan.
Bouchin [Stephen] Counſellor and King's Attorney in the Royal Courts of Beaune in Burgundy.
Braunbom [Frederic] a Proteſtant author.
Brezé [the Marſhal de] and
Brezé [Armand de Maillé] his only ſon.
Bzovius [Abraham] a Dominican.
Cameron [John] a famous Proteſtant Divine.
Capriata [Peter John] a Civilian and Hiſtorian.
Cauſſin [Nicolas] a Jeſuit.
Ceriſantes, a Swediſh Reſident at Paris.
Charnaie [the Baron de].
Croius [John] a Proteſtant Miniſter.
Dieu [Lewis de] Miniſter of Leyden.
Digby [Sir Kenelm] an Engliſh gentleman.
Donaldſon [Walter] Principal of the college of Sedan.
Druſbicki [Gaſpar] a Poliſh Jeſuit.
Elichman [John] a Phyſician.
Emilius [Antony] Profeſſor of Hiſtory in the univerſity of Utrecht.
Epiſcopius, a learned Arminian.
Eſpagne [John d'] Miniſter of the French Church in London.
Eſpagnet [John d'] Preſident of the Parliament of Bourdeaux.
Eſſars [Charlotte des] wife of the Marſhal de l'Hoſpital.
Fakreddin, Prince of the Druſians in Syria.
Farel [William] a Proteſtant Miniſter.
Farnaby [Thomas] a learned Philologer.
Faucheur [Michael le] a Proteſtant Miniſter.
Ferrand [James] Doctor of Phyſic.
Ferri [Paul] a learned Divine.
Fevret [Charles] Advocate in the Parliament of Dijon.
Forbes [Patrick] Biſhop of Aberdeen, and
Forbes [John] his ſon.
Forbes [William] Biſhop of Edinburgh.
Gallutius [Tarquin] a Jeſuit.
Gamache [Philip] Doctor of the Sorbonne.
Garaſſe [Francis] a Jeſuit.
Gariſſoles [Antony] Profeſſor of Divinity at Montauban.
Gilles [Peter] a Proteſtant Miniſter.
Gioachino [Greco] a famous player at Cheſs.
Goldaſt [Melchior Haiminsfeld] a learned Calviniſt.
Gombauld [John Ogier de] a French Poet.
Gorlæus [David] a learned Dutchman.
Goulu [John] General of the Feuillants.
Goulu [Jerome] a Phyſician of the Faculty of Paris.
Gramond [Gabriel Bartholomew de] Preſident in the Parliament of Toulouſe.

A. D.

Gramont [Scipio de] Lord of St Germain.

Grandier [Urban] Curate and Canon of Loudon.

Grævius [John] an Arminian Miniſter.

Grotius [Hugo] a famous author.

Gruterus [Peter] a Phyſician.

Gryphiander [John] Doctor of the Civil-Law.

Guadagnolo [Philip] Reader of Arabic and Chaldee at Rome.

Guebriant [Renata du Bec] widow of the Marſhal de Guebriant.

Guimené [the Princeſs of].

Guiſe [Charles de Lorraine, Duke of].

Guyet [Francis] a great Critic.

Hall [Joſeph] Biſhop of Norwich.

Heraldus [Deſiderius] Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.

Hoe [Matthias] a famous Lutheran Miniſter.

Hoelzlin [Jeremiah] Greek Profeſſor in the univerſity of Leyden.

Horſtius [Gregory] firſt Phyſician of the city of Ulm.

Hortenſius [Martin] Profeſſor of Mathematics at Amſterdam.

Hoſpital [Francis de l'] Marſhal of France.

Janſenius [Cornelius] Biſhop of Ipres.

Jarrige [Peter] a Jeſuit.

Javerſac [N.] a French author.

Inchofer [Melchior] a Jeſuit.

Jungerman [Lewis] an excellent Botaniſt.

Junius [Francis] ſon to the abovementioned Francis Junius.

Kepler [John] a great Aſtronomer.

Keſler [Andrew] a Lutheran Divine.

Kircher [John] a proſelyte to the Church of Rome.

Kirchman [John] a famous author.

Knot [Edward] an Engliſh Jeſuit.

Kotterus [Chriſtopher] a Fanatic.

Kyriander [William] a German Civilian.

Langle [John Maximilian de] a Proteſtant Miniſter.

Lanſbergius [Philip] a Mathematician.

Leſcarbot [Mark] an Advocate.

Lewis XIII, King of France.

Lingendes [Claudius de] a Jeſuit.

Lingendes [John de] a celebrated Preacher.

Loges [Mary Bruneau, Lady des].

Longomontanus [Chriſtian] Profeſſor of Mathematics at Copenhagen.

Lotichius [John Peter] a Phyſician.

Lugo [Francis de] a Spaniſh Jeſuit, and

Lugo [John de] his brother; a Jeſuit and Cardinal.

Lydiat [Thomas] an Engliſh author.

Linde [Sir Humphry] an Engliſh gentleman.

Maets [Charles de] Profeſſor of Divinity at Utrecht.

Magni [Valerian] a Capuchin.

Mayerne [Theodorus Turquet, Sieur de] a Phyſician.

Makowſki [John] Profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker.

Mareſts [John des] Sieur de St Sorlin, and

Mareſts [Roland des] his elder brother.

Marillac [Lewis de] Marſhal of France.

A. D.

Maſcardi [Auguſtin] Chamberlain to Pope Urban VIII.

Meynier [Honoratus de] a French author.

Meſplede [Lewis] a French Dominican.

Meſtrezat [John] a Miniſter of the Church of Paris.

Meziriac [Claudius Gaſpar Bachet, Lord of].

Micrælius [John] Profeſſor of Divinity at Stetin.

Milletiere [Theophilus Brachet, Sieur de la) a Lawyer, and afterwards a Divine.

Monſerrat [Montanus Michael] a Spaniſh Proteſtant.

Montmaur [Peter de] Profeſſor of the Greek tongue in the College Royal of Paris.

Morgues [Matthew de] Sieur de St Germains.

Morinus [John Baptiſt] Phyſician and Royal Profeſſor of Mathematics at Paris.

Motte-Aigron [James de la] a French author.

Moulin [Peter du] a famous Proteſtant Miniſter.

Muſac, a gentleman of Burgundy.

Muſtapha, Emperor of the Turks.

Neufgermain [Lewis de] a French Poet.

Nibuſius [Barthold] a famous Divine.

Oginſki [Charles] a gentleman of Lithuania.

Okolſki [Simon] a Dominican.

Oregias [Auguſtin] a great Philoſopher.

Oſman, Emperor of the Turks.

Ottoboni [Peter] Pope under the name of Alexander VIII.

Padilla [Louiſa de] Counteſs d'Aranda.

Pallavicino [Ferrante] a ſatirical author.

Paravicin [Vincent] a Proteſtant Miniſter.

Pareus [Philip] a Grammarian, and

Pareus [Daniel] his ſon.

Paſor [Matthias] Profeſſor of Divinity at Groningen.

Peyre [James d'Auzoles] a ridiculous author.

Peyreſc [Nicolas Claudius Fabri, Lord of].

Petavius [Dionyſius] a Jeſuit.

Prideaux [John] Bp of Wincheſter.

Racan [Honorat de Beuil, Marquis de].

Raynaud [Theophilus] a Jeſuit.

Reihing [James] Profeſſor of Divinity at Tubingen.

Reineſius [Thomas] a Phyſician.

Ryer [Andrew du] Sieur de Malezair.

Rittangelus [John Stephen] a converted Jew.

Rohan [Anne de] ſiſter to the Duke of Rohan.

Rorenco [Marco Aurelio] Grand Prior of St Roc at Turenne.

Ruarus [Martin] a Socinian Miniſter.

Saint-Cyran [John du Verger de Hauranne, Abbot of].

Sancta-Clara [Francis of] an Engliſh Franciſcan.

Sanſon [James] a barefooted Carmelite.

Saporta [Antony] Royal Profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Montpellier.

Scheiblerus [Chriſtopher] Superintendant of the Church, and Rector of the College at Dortmund.

A. D.

Schiller [Elias] author of a book of Controverſy.

Schomberg [Henry de] a Marſhal of France.

Simon [Theodorus] famous for frequently changing his religion.

Soubiſe [Benjamin de Rohan, Duke of].

Sozomenus [John] a Civilian.

Spanheim [Frederic] Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden.

Strozzi [Philip] a zealous republican in Florence.

Theron [Vital] a French Jeſuit.

Thomas [Paul] Sieur de Girac.

Triſtan l'Hermite [Francis] Gentleman in Ordinary to the Duke of Orleans.

Tronchin [Theodore] a Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity.

Vedelius [Nicolas] a noted reformed Divine.

Villareal [Emmanuel Fernandes] Conſul for the Portugueze nation at Rouën.

Vinay [Alexander de] Miniſter of the Reformed Church of Annonay.

Vorſtius [William Henry] Miniſter of the Arminian congregation at Warmond.

Uſher [James] Archbp of Armagh.

Wert [John de] a great warrior.

Wilhem [David le-Leu de] Counſellor in the Council of the Princes of Orange.

1650 *Abelly* (Lewis) Biſhop and Earl of Rhodes.

Acheri (Luke de) a Benedictine of the congregation of St Maur.

Adam (John) a Jeſuit.

Aitzema (Leo de) Reſident for the Hans-towns at the Hague.

Altingius (James) Profeſſor of Divinity at Groningen.

Ancillon (David) a Proteſtant Miniſter.

Andreas (Tobias) Profeſſor of Hiſtory, &c. at Groningen.

Anglus (Thomas) an Engliſh Prieſt.

Annat (Francis) Confeſſor to Lewis XIV.

Anſelm, a barefooted Auguſtine.

Antonio (James) Knight of the Order of St James, and Canon of Seville.

Aproſio (Angelico) a learned Italian.

Aproſio (Paulo Auguſtino) a Lawyer, &c. at Florence.

Arnauld (Antony) Doctor of the Sorbonne.

Aubertin (N.) a French Hiſtorian.

Baldus (James) a Jeſuit and Latin Poet.

Baleſdens (John) Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.

Balthaſar (Chriſtopher) a learned Proteſtant in France.

Banck (Laurence) Profeſſor of the Civil Law in the Univerſity of Franeker.

Bangius (Thomas) Doctor and Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Copenhagen.

Barde (John de la) Counſellor of State, Marquis de Marolles, &c.

Baron (Vincent) a Dominican.

Baroni (Leonora) a fine Singer.

Beaulieu (Lewis le Blanc Sieur de) Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity at Sedan

Benedictis (Elpidio de) Cardinal Mazarin's Secretary, and afterwards his Agent at Rome.

Benſerade (Iſaac de) a celebrated French author.

A. D.

Billaut (Adam) a pretty good French Poet.

Blondel (Francis) Profeſſor of Phyſic in the Univerſity of Paris.

Bochart (Matthew) Miniſter at Alençon.

Bochart (Samuel) Miniſter at Caen.

Boſquet (Francis) Biſhop of Montpellier.

Boulu (Cæſar Egaſſe du) Regiſter and Hiſtoriographer of the Univerſity of Paris.

Bourignon (Antoinette) a famous Fanatic.

Brezé (Clara Clementia de Maillé) daughter to the Marſhal of that name.

Bruyn (John de) a Profeſſor at Utrecht.

Brun (Antony le) Ambaſſador of Spain at the Hague.

Chigi (Fabio) Pope under the name of Alexander VII.

Cygne (Martin du) a Jeſuit,

Comenius (John Amos) a Grammarian and Proteſtant Divine.

Coſta (Margaret) an Italian Poeteſs.

Daſſouci (Charles Coypeau Sieur) a Muſician and French Poet.

Des-Barreaux (James de Vallée Lord).

Diana (John Nicolas de) a Jeſuit.

Drabicius (Nicolas) a famous Enthuſiaſt.

Drelincourt (Charles) Miniſter of the Church of Paris.

Duaren (Francis) Profeſſor of the Civil Law at Bourges.

Dury (John) a Proteſtant Divine.

Ecchellenſis (Abraham) a learned Maronite.

Euſtache (David) a Proteſtant Miniſter.

Fabricius (Vincent) a good Poet, Phyſician, *&c.*

Ferrier (John) a Jeſuit.

Gaffarel (James) a learned Provencial.

Gallutius (Angelus) a Jeſuit.

Golius (James) Mathematic and Arabic Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Leyden.

Graſwinckel (Theodore) a Civilian.

Grenaille (Francis de) a Monk.

Guichenon (Samuel) an Hiſtorian.

Guiſe (Henry de Lorraine) Duke of.

Hali-beigh, firſt Dragoman at the Grand Seignior's court.

Heidanus (Abraham) Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden.

Henichius (John) Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Rinthel.

Hobbes (Thomas) author of the Leviathan.

Hoornbeeck (John) Profeſſor of Divinity at Utrecht, and afterwards at Leyden.

Hottinger (John Henry) a learned Swiſs.

Hugues (James) a Divine and Canon.

Joly (Claudius) Chanter and Canon of the Church of Notre Dame at Paris.

Yſe (Alexander d') Miniſter of Grenoble.

Larroque (Matthew de) a famous Proteſtant Miniſter.

Launoy (John de) Doctor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Paris.

Leſſeville (Euſtachius Leclerc de) Biſhop of Coutance.

A. D.

Lubienetzki (Staniſlaus) a Socinian Miniſter.

Macedo (Francis) a Jeſuit, and

Macedo (Antony) his brother, likewiſe a Jeſuit.

Maignan (Emmanuel) a Philoſopher and Minim Friar.

Maimbourg (Lewis) a Jeſuit.

Marca (Peter de) Archbiſhop of Toulouſe.

Mareſius (Samuel) a Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity.

Margarin (Cornelius) Abbot of mount Caſſin.

Mey (John de) a Doctor of Phyſic, *&c.* at Middelburg.

Menage (Giles) one of the moſt learned men of his time.

Milton (John) a famous Engliſh Poet.

Montfleuri, a famous Comedian.

Morinus (Simon) a Fanatic.

Moriſon (Robert) a Phyſician and Profeſſor of Botany at Oxford.

Morus (Alexander) Profeſſor of Divinity at Middelburg.

Nidhard (John Everard) a Jeſuit.

Paſcal (Blaiſe) a famous French author.

Patin (Guy) Profeſſor of Phyſic in the Royal College of Paris.

Peyrarede (John de) a Latin Poet and Critic.

Peyrere (Iſaac la) famous for his Treatiſe concerning the Pre-Adamites.

Perrot (Nicolas) Sieur d'Ablancourt one of the great wits of his age.

Piaſecki (Paul) Biſhop of Premiſlia in Poland.

Pinon (James) Abbot of Condé.

Pinſſon (Francis) an advocate at Paris.

Poquelin (John Baptiſt) known by the name of Moliere.

Price (John) a learned Engliſhman.

Priezac (Daniel de) a Member of the French Academy.

Prynn (William) an Engliſh Lawyer.

Priolo (Benjamin) a French Hiſtorian.

Quillet (Claudius) a Latin Poet.

Reverend-de-Bougy (John) Marquis de Bougy.

Ryer (Peter) a Member of the French Academy.

Roberval, Profeſſor of Mathematics at Paris.

Rodon (David de) Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Die, and afterwards at Orange.

Roſen (Reinhold) a good warrior.

Rovenius (Philip) a titular Archbiſhop of Philippe.

Ruffi (Antony de) Counſellor in the Seneſchal's court of Marſeilles.

Scheffer (John) a Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Upſal.

Scheſtad (Annibal) a Daniſh Nobleman.

Schomberg (Charles de) Duke of Haluïn and Marſhal of France.

Sengebere (Polycarp) a Civilian.

Sennertus (Andrew) Profeſſor of the Oriental Tongues in the Univerſity of Wittemberg.

Souches (Lewis Rattuit Count de)

Tabor (John Otto) a German Civilian.

Tavernier (John Baptiſt) Baron d'Aubonne, a great traveller.

A. D.

Vayer (Francis de la Mothe le) Member of the French Academy, *&c.*

Vander-Linden (John Antonides) Profeſſor of Phyſic at Leyden.

Verdier (N. du) Hiſtoriographer of France.

Wart (Bernard de) a Dominican Friar, *&c.*

Zuerius (Boxhornius Mark) Profeſſor at Leyden.

Zuylichem (Conſtantine Huygens Lord of) Secretary and Counſellor to the Princes of Orange.

1675 *Apaſi* (Michael) Prince of Tranſylvania.

Arnoldus (Nicolas) Profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker.

Bacone (Leo) Biſhop of Glandeve.

Barlow (Thomas) Biſhop of Lincoln.

Baſnage (Henry) an Advocate in the Parliament of Normandy.

Berault (Claude) Regius Profeſſor of Syriac.

Bigot (Emeric) a learned Norman.

Blondel (Francis) the King's Profeſſor of Mathematics and Architecture.

Borri (Joſeph Francis) a famous Chymiſt, Quack, and Heretic.

Borrichius (Olaus) Profeſſor of Philology, Poetry, *&c.* in the Univerſity of Copenhagen.

Boſc (Peter du) a French Miniſter.

Bouhours (Dominique) a Jeſuit.

Bourſault (Edmund) a French author.

Brun (Charles le) chief Painter to the French King.

Capiſucchi (Raimond) a Cardinal.

Chevreau (Urban) a French Hiſtorian.

Claude (John) Miniſter of the Church of Paris.

Collatius (Peter Apollonius) a Prieſt of Novarra.

Colomiés (Paul) reader in the French Church at London.

Cotin (Charles) one of the French Academy.

Dati (Carlo) Profeſſor of Philology at Florence.

Donatus (Marcellus) Count of Ponzano.

Drelincourt (Charles) Profeſſor of Phyſic at Leyden.

Felibien (Andrew) Sieur des Avaux, *&c.*

Flavigny (Valerian de) Doctor of Divinity.

Fonte Moderata, a Venetian Lady, whoſe true name was Modeſto Pozzo.

Gabriel (Giles) Licentiate of the Univerſity of Louvain, *&c.*

Gonet (John Baptiſt) a Dominican.

Guarini (Guarinus) a Theatin Monk, *&c.*

Hallé (Peter) Profeſſor of Canon-Law in the Univerſity of Paris.

Henault (N.) a French Poet.

Hermant (Godfrey) Doctor of the Sorbonne.

Huybert (Peter de) Lord of Burgh, *&c.*

Jardins (Mary Catherine des) famous for her romances.

Innocent XI, Pope.

Kirſtenius (Peter) Profeſſor of Phyſic at Upſal, *&c.*

Knuzen (Matthias) an avowed teacher of Atheiſm.

Konig (George Matthias) Profeſſor of Poetry, *&c.* in the Univerſity of Altorf.

A.D.	
	Kortholt (Chriſtian) Doctor and Profeſſor of Divinity at Kiel.
	Kuhlman (Quirinus) a Viſionary.
	Lambecius (Peter) firſt Librarian to the Emperor.
	Lancelot (Claudius) a Benedictine Monk.
	Liſola (Francis de) a man famous for his embaſſies.
	Lyſerus (John) author of the *Polygamia Triumphatrix.*
	Maraſcia (Joſeph Vincent) of the Oratory of St Jerom de la Charité.
	Maſcaron (Julius) Biſhop of Agen.
	Nicaiſe (Claudius) a learned Frenchman.
	Nicolle (Peter) one of the fineſt Pens in Europe.
	Orobio (Iſaac) a Jewiſh Phyſician.
	Pageau (N.) an Advocate of the Parliament of Paris.
	Pays (Renatus le) a Knight of St Maurice.
	Peliſſon (Paul) one of the French Academy.
	Perez (Joſeph) Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Salamanca.
	Pezelius (Chriſtopher) a Proteſtant Divine.
	Pincier (John) a Proteſtant Miniſter.
	Portugal (Alphonſo VI, King of).
	Pradillhon (John Baptiſt) a Feuillant.
	Quetif (James) a Dominican.
	Rangouze, a French author.
	Rapin (Renatus) a Jeſuit.
	Reſenius (Peter) Counſellor and Profeſſor at Copenhagen.
	Rez (Antony de) Advocate in the Parliament of Paris.
	Ricci (Michael Angelo) a Cardinal.
	Rocaberti (John Thomas de) Archbiſhop of Valencia.
	Roy (James le) Baron of the Holy Empire, and Lord of St Lambert.
	Roſe (Touſſaint) Marquis de Coye, Secretary to the King's Cabinet, *&c.*
	Schomberg (Frederic de) Marſhal of France.
	Serroni (Hyacinthus) firſt Archbiſhop of Alby.
	Spinoſa (Benedict de) a Jew by birth, and a Syſtematical Atheiſt by profeſſion.
	Tellier (Michael le) Chancellor of France.
	Triſtan de Saint Amand (John) an Antiquary and Medalliſt.
	Turretin (Francis) a Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity at Geneve.
	Vaumoriere (Peter Dortigue Sieur de) Sub-Director to the Academy of the Abbot d'Aubignac.
	Viviani (Vincentio) a great Mathematician.
	Weile (Frederic Ragſtat de) Miniſter at Spiik.
	Wittichius (Chriſtopher) Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden.
1700	*Aulnoy* (Maria Catherina le Jumel de Berneville Counteſs d') famous for her writings.
	Tauvry (Daniel) Doctor of Phyſic of the Faculty of Paris.

A LIST of thoſe ARTICLES which are not mentioned in the CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

A*Bbeville*, the capital city of the Duchy of Ponthieu in Picardy.
Abdera, a maritime town in Thrace.
Abdias of Babylon, a Legendary Impoſtor.
Aberdeen, an Epiſcopal city of Scotland.
Abydos, a city of Egypt.
Acarnania, a country ſituated on the Ionian ſea.
Acco, a fabulous old woman.
Achilles, the name of ſeveral perſons.
Achillea, an iſland of the Euxine ſea.
Actor, the name of ſeveral perſons mentioned in fabulous Hiſtory.
Adamites, a ridiculous ſect.
Agricola, a name which a vaſt many authors bear.
Aguirre: perſons of this name.
Aguillon, a ſmall town of Guienne.
Aimon, a Prince in Romance.
Alains, a barbarous people.
Alais, a city of France.
Alalcomenium, a ſmall town of Bœotia.
Albret, a family.
Albunea, a famous place in Italy.
Alcmæon: perſons of this name.
Altieri: Cardinals of this name.
Amelia, a city of Italy.
Ammonius: writers of this name.
Anabaptiſts, a ſect.
Andlo (Petrus ab) a fictitious name.
Andrinople, or *Adrianople*, a city of Thrace.
Andromachus: perſons of this name.
Anicius, a Roman family.
Anna, the name of ſome perſons mentioned in the Scripture.
Antinoë, or *Antinopolis*, a town in Egypt.
Antony, a Roman family.
Apicius; perſons of this name.
Apollodorus; perſons of this name.
Archelaus: perſons of this name.
Arimanius, one of the chief deities of Perſia.
Arion, a wonderful horſe.
Arnauld, a family of Auvergne.
Arodon (Benjamin d') a Jew.
Arria, the name of ſome Roman ladies.
Arſinoe: Queens of this name.
Artaxata, the capital city of Armenia.
Athenæum, a public edifice in Rome.
Atrax, or *Atracia*, a city of Theſſaly.
Auriege, or rather *Ariege*, a river in France.
Azotus, a city of Paleſtine.
Babylon, a city of Meſopotamia.
Balbus, ſome perſons of this name.
Balzac, a ſmall lordſhip in Angoumois.
Bellai, a family in Anjou.
Belley, a city of France.
Berenice, the name of ſeveral women and Cities.
Berytus, a maritime town of Phœnicia.
Bezanites, or *Bezanians*, an imaginary ſect.
Byblos, a maritime town of Phœnicia.
Bigois, a Tuſcan nymph.
Bodegrave, a village of Holland on the Rhine.
Boreas, one of the four Cardinal winds.
Brachmans, Indian Philoſophers.
Burgundy (Houſe of)
Burgundy, one of the circles of the empire.
Buſiris; perſons of this name.
Butas, a Greek Poet.
Cainites, a ſect of Heretics.
Capiſucchi, a family in Rome.
Cappadocia, a country in Aſia.
Caracciol, or *Caraccioli:* perſons of this family.
Caſſius, the name of a Roman family.
Cethegus, a Roman family.
Chederles, which among the Turks is, what St George is among the Chriſtians.
Chigi, a noble family of Siena.
Comana: cities of this name.
Combabus, a Syrian Lord.
Conrad (Herimannus) a fictitious name.
Conſtance, a city of Germany.
Crito, the name of ſeveral antient authors.
Dinant, a city in the Netherlands.
Dioſcorides, an iſland in the Red-Sea.
Dioſcurias, a city of Colchis.
Dryades; the name of certain Pagan female deities.
Drummond, a moſt noble and antient family of Scotland.
Druſus, a Roman family.
Egnatia, a city of Italy.
Ereſus, a place in the iſle of Leſbos.
Erfurt, a city of Germany.
Eſop, the name of ſeveral antient Perſonages.
Eſop, a Greek author of a romantic Hiſtory of Alexander the Great.
Eſtampes, a city of France.
Eurydice, an Illyrian lady.
Fakeddin, a Mahometan author.
Fannius, a Roman family.
Fervaux (John) the true author of the Annals of Bavaria.
Flora, an imaginary Courtezan.
Fontarabia, a city of Spain.
Fontevraud, or rather *Frontevaux*, a famous Abbey in the dioceſe of Poitiers.
Frangipani, a very antient Roman family.
Fratricelli, a ſect of Heretics.
Garonne, one of the four great rivers of France.
Gergenti, a town of Sicily.
Goſſelin, authors of this name.
Guiſcard, the name of a family.
Guiſe, a town of Picardy.
Gymnoſophiſts, a ſect of Philoſophers.
Hay, a family of Scotland.
Halicarnaſſus, the capital city of the kingdom of Caria.
Hamadryades, a kind of nymphs.
Harpalice, a beautiful young woman in fabulous hiſtory.
Hierocles, a Greek author.
Hierophylus, an Athenian Phyſician.
Hirpini, a people of Italy.
Hortenſius, the name of a Plebeian family of Rome.
Japan, the name of a country.
Joachim, the fabulous huſband of St Anne.
Ipres, or *Ypres*, an epiſcopal town in the Earldom of Flanders.
Iſlebians, a ſect.
Italica, a town in Spain.
Juba; Princes of this name.
Julis, a town of the iſle of Cea.
Juno, ſiſter and wife of Jupiter.
Jupiter, the greateſt of all the Heathen gods.
Kermatians, a ſect in Arabia.
Lamia, a Roman family.
Lamia, a town of Theſſaly.
Lamia, the daughter of Neptune.
Landau, a city of the Lower Alſace.
Lemnos, an iſle in the Ægean ſea.
Leſbos, an iſland of the Ægean ſea.
Leſley, an illuſtrious family of Scotland.
Leſtrygons, or rather *Læſtrygons*, a very brutal people.
Leucas, firſt a Peninſula, then an iſland.
Lewentz, a town of Hungary.
Loudun, an antient town in the Upper Poictou.
Lupercalia, a feaſt celebrated by the Romans.
Luxemburg, the capital city of the province of that name.
Macon, a city of Burgundy.
Mamillarians, a ſect among the Anabaptiſts.
Manducus, a name which the Romans gave to certain figures.
Manichees, an infamous ſect of Heretics.
Marcionites, a ſect of Heretics.
Mary, the Egyptian.
Mauſoleum, the name of a magnificent monument erected to Mauſolus.
Mecca, a town of Arabia.
Melchiorites, an imaginary ſect.
Metella, name of ſome Roman ladies.
Methydrium, a city of Peloponneſus.
Minutoli, perſons of this family.
Molionides, two brothers who have a good ſhare in the fabulous Hiſtory.
Montauban, a city of Guienne in Quercy.
Mopſus, perſons of this name.
Moſynians, or *Moſynoecians*, certain mountaineers in the neighbourhood of the Euxine ſea.
Motte, or *Motthe* (La) a town in Lorrain.
Naucratis, a city of Egypt.
Nymphodorus of Amphipolis, a Greek author.
Nully, perſons of this name.
Paraclete, an Abbey of Nuns founded by Abelard.
Parthenai, a city of Poitou.
Parthenai, a family.
Paulicians, a ſect of Heretics.
Pelias, the name of a lance.
Perga, a city of Pamphilia.
Pergamum, a city of Aſia in Myſia
Phaſelis, a ſea-town in Lycia.
Phaſis, a river that runs through Colchis into the Euxine ſea.
Philyra, daughter of Oceanus.
Picards, the followers of a certain Heretic.
Pithom, a city of Egypt.

Pozzuolo, a town in the kingdom of Naples.
Prætextatus (Papyrius) a Patrician of Rome.
Reckheim, a county, &c. of the empire.
Rigorists, a name given in the Spanish Netherlands, to the Jansenists, the Fathers of the Oratory, &c.
Roses, a town in Catalonia.
Rotterdam, a city of Holland.
Sadducees, a sect among the Jews.
Sancta-Maura, an island.
Salmacis, a fountain at Halicarnassus.
Scamander, a river of Phrygia near Troy.
Serbellone, an Italian family.
Sicyon, a town of Peloponnesus.
Synergists, a name given to certain Germ. Divines in the XVIth cent.
Siris, a river of Italy.
Sommona-codom, a name given by the Siamese to a certain extraordinary man.
Soubise, a town in Saintonge.
Stellingi, a name which certain Saxons took.
Teleboæ, a people who inhabited an island in the neighbourhood of Acarnania.
Telmessus, a sea-port town in the furthest part of Lycia.
Tenedos, an island in the Ægean sea.
Teos, one of the twelve cities of Ionia.
Termessus, a town of Pisidia.
Tettix, a native of Crete.
Thesmophoria, festivals celebrated in honour of Ceres, considered as a law-giver.
Tibarenians, a people of Asia.
Tibur, a city of Italy.
Tilli, or *Thilli*, a Lordship in Brabant.
Toulouse, a city of France.
Trabea (Quintus) a comic Poet.
Traerbach, a small town in the Palatinate.
Turlupins, a sect of impudent and scandalous Heretics.
Verona, a city of Italy.
Villena, a Marquisate on the confines of New Castille.
Ulm, an Imperial city.
Usson, a small town in Auvergne.
Westphalus (John) an imaginary person.
Zahuris, a name bestowed on a certain sort of men in Spain.
Zia, or *Zea*, an island of the Archipelago.

BRITISH MUSEUM

AN
INDEX
Of the moſt
MATERIAL THINGS
Which are mentioned or explained in this Work.

For the uſe of this Index it muſt be obſerved, that the Roman numbers denote the volume, and the figures the page; when the figures ſtand alone they denote the text, and when they are followed by the letter *a* or *b*, they denote the firſt or ſecond column of the remarks: and if the letter *n* be added, it denotes ſome marginal note.

A.

ABBEY of St Denys, the court had ſo much the more authority over it, as the Monks thereof were debauched. I. 31. *b.*

Abbey. An Abbey given as a reward for a ſong. I. 428. *n.* (*c.*)

Abbots. Court-Abbots compared to lap-dogs. IV. 64. *b.*

Abbot (George) Archbiſhop of Canterbury; it was adjudged that an involuntary murther had not diſqualified him. I. 11, 12.

Abbreviators ought to have a good taſte. I. 74. *b.* Should not ſuppreſs ſingular facts. 422. *b.* 423. *a.* Often give us balderdaſh. II. 712. *a.* See *Abridgments*.

Abdera, a city of Thrace, where on certain days a perſon was devoted, and then ſtoned to death. I. 20. Its laws ſet a note of infamy upon thoſe who had ſpent their patrimony. II. 635. *a.*

Abderame compared to Alexander and Scipio in point of continence. I. 14. *b.* He did not plunder the city of Tours. II. 851. *a.* How he diſpoſed of the daughter of Eudo, Duke of Aquitain. IV. 283.

Abderites, the diſtemper which they had. I. 19. *a. b.* The opinion which they entertained of Democritus. 20. *b.* Whether they wrote to Hippocrates to deſire him to come and ſee Democritus. II. 638. *a.* What Cicero underſtands by an Abderite. 642. *b.*

Abderus, Hercules's favourite. I. 18. *a.*

Abdias's book the ſource of ſeveral fabulous ſtories. III. 577. *b.*

Abdiſſi, Patriarch of the Neſtorians, whether he aſſiſted at the Council of Trent. III. 359. *a. b.*

Abel (Leonard) is ſent to the Levant with the character of Apoſtolic Nuncio. III. 259. *b.* He compoſed a book concerning the ſtate of the Oriental Chriſtians. *ibid.*

Abelard, his turn of wit. I. 27. *a.* Vanity was his diſtinguiſhing foible. *ibid.* He had an inclination to retire among the Infidels in order to ſecure himſelf from the proſecutions of the Inquiſitors. 199. *a.* A catalogue of his manuſcripts. 248. *b.* the printing of which did him no honour. 249. *a.* A liſt of his particular ſentiments whether truly or falſely aſcribed to him. 759. *a.* He continues ſtill to be charged with the errors that were imputed to him. 760. *a. b.* St Bernard endeavours to prepoſſeſs all the world againſt him. 773. *b.* 774. *a.* His apology is laughed at. II. 533. *b.* His learning draws auditors to him from all parts. III. 70. *a.* He is reduced to indigence by women. 71. *a.* Suſtains an irreparable loſs. 73. *a.* His misfortune is lamented. 75. *a.* particularly by his wife, who goes the length to murmur againſt providence. *ibid. b.* The arguments made uſe of to comfort him were not all good ones. 73. *b.* Two of his aſſaſſins were puniſhed. 76. *b.* He would believe nothing but what was proved by natural reaſons. IV. 80. *b.* Is perſecuted, by whom, and for what. 469, 470. To whom we are indebted for the edition of his works. I. 248. and *b.* There are copies of them which carry the name of Francis d'Amboiſe, and others which carry that of Andrew Du Cheſne. 249. *a. b.*

Abenſperg. What name that city bore in the Roman Hiſtory. I. 548. *a. b.*

Abiram. It is pretended that the Pagans alluded to the ſtory of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram. I. 275. *a.*

Ablancourt (Fremont d') facts that concern him. IV. 589. *b.* 590. *a.* An examination into one of his notions, *viz.* that Princes ought to underſtand Latin. 590. *b.*

Ablancourt (Perrot d') reviſed ſix times the books he had a mind to publiſh. I. 487. *b.*

Abnepos, Grammarians are not agreed upon the ſignification of that word. II. 709. *b.*

Abortions, untimely or anticipated, are real murthers. IV. 500. *a.* Have been practiſed a great while. *ibid.*

Abortive children, or untimely births, how great their number is. IV. 498. *b.* 499. *a. b. as far as* 502. *a.*

Abrabanel, his books are full of venom againſt the Chriſtians. I. 43. *b.* His impious notion about the motive of God's forbidding our firſt parents to touch a certain fruit in the garden of Eden. II. 854. *a.*

Abraham, his diſſimulation. I. 37. *a. b.* Is the Patriarch of the Refugees. 44. *a.* It is ſaid that he became a converter. 45. *a.* Idle traditions touching the moſt conſiderable circumſtances of his life. 44. *a. b. as far as* 46. *a. b.* The print of his feet honoured by the Saracens. 124. *a.* He lies with Hagar in obedience to Sarah. V. 54. *b.* 55. *a.* He is falſely ſaid to have written the book of the creation. I. 173. *a.* Whether he authorized a law of Solon's touching marriage. II. 504. *b.* Whether he feared death more than any conjugal diſhonour. V. 50. *b.*

BRITISH MUSEUM

Abram (Father) his notes upon the paraphraſe of Nonnus. I. 47. *b.* He draws a ſtrange conſequence from a paſſage of Cicero, relating to the Lupercalia. III. 933. *b.*

Abridgments: The neceſſary qualities of a good abridgment. I. 510. *b.* It requires a very good diſcernment. 518. *a.* Advice to thoſe who write abridgments. II. 685. *a.* They would be found very faulty, if compared with the originals. 703. *b.* *Abridgments and copiers of abridgments:* great ſources of falſification. IV. 609. *a.*

Abſolution from the crimes of Fornication, Sodomy, Beſtiality: what it coſts. I. 628. *a. b.* An abſolution of a very rigorous kind. 96. *b.*

Abſtinence: It is poſſible that a man may abſtain long from eating and drinking. III. 582. *b.* Objections made to Laurence Joubert, touching the abſtinence of Moſes, Elias, and Jeſus Chriſt; his anſwer. *ibid.*

Abu-Gabſhan parts with a conſiderable employment for a bottle of wine. IV. 176. *b.*

Abuſes, in what caſe it is thought that they ſhould be tolerated in the Church. II. 374. *a.* When they have taken ſuch deep root that a Magiſtrate would only endanger his authority by oppoſing them, in that caſe they ought to be tolerated. V. 179. *b.* Monks and pariſh-prieſts at this day call for a reformation of abuſes, though they continue to be Catholics and great enemies to the Proteſtants. 68. *b.* The remedy of one abuſe is often-times the introduction of another. II. 106. *b.*

Abyſſins, why their Emperors have born the name of Preſtor-John. I. 36.

Academy; the founder of the middle or ſecond Academy. I. 409. *a.* The founder of the third followed the doctrine of the ſecond. II. 326. *a.* III. 697. *a.*

Academy (the French) injuriouſly treated. IV. 257. *a.* The Hiſtory of it has always been looked upon as a maſter-piece. 534. *n.* (*b*). A diſagreement between two liſts of its members. I. 627. *b.*

Acamas, the iſle of Cyprus had formerly that name. I. 53. *a.*

Acarie, Maſter of Accompts, called *the Lacquey of the League,* and for what reaſon. IV. 243. *a.*

Acarnanians, often at war with the Etolians. I. 55. Their generous policy. *ibid.*

Acatalepſia, ſee *Incomprehenſibility.*

Acciaioli, his daughters portioned for marriage at the public expence. I. 56.

Acciaiolus (Zenobius) his paraphraſe upon a poem of Marc Muſurus in praiſe of Plato. IV. 295. *a.*

Accidents, Peter d'Ailli explained them in the ſame manner as Des Cartes does. I. 166. *a.* The idea which Philoſophers give us of them. V. 221. *a. b.* They are not diſtinct from ſubſtances. III. 558. *a.* Their manner of ſubſiſting without a ſubject in the Euchariſt. IV. 59. *a.*

Acciſſare, or ἀκκίζεσθαι, the ſignification of that word. I. 63. *a. b.*

Accius (Lucius) his character. I. 60. *b.* 61. *a. b.*

Accords (the Sieur des) cited. I. 346. *b.* III. 762. *b.* IV. 157. *a.*

Accommodation: worſted Princes generally defer an accommodation with the victor as long as they can. V. 661.

Accords (*des*) an imaginary Lordſhip. I. 66. *a. b.*

Account; the firſt that was given of what had been ſaid was unfaithful. II. 852. *a.* which was a bad omen for the time to come. *ibid.*

Accurſius (Mariangelus); a paſſage of that author explained. I. 33. *a.* Why he called Salluſt his countryman. 69. *a.*

Accuſations; Some admirable heads of accuſation. I. 391. *a.* Who thoſe privileged perſons are that may accuſe with impunity. I. 758. *a. b.* 759. *a.* It is almoſt in vain to oppoſe reaſons drawn from probability to an accuſation that is attended with circumſtances of fact. II. 240. *b.* To accuſe people of ſtate-crimes an ordinary artifice with perſecutors. I. 30. *a.* It was not lawful to receive accuſations againſt thoſe who were abſent in the ſervice of the Republic. 351. II. 345. *a.* Whether a perſon is always obliged to repel accuſations in order to be reckoned innocent. I. 784. *a. b.* A ſure way of knowing whether they be ſlanderous. 795. *a. b.*

Accuſed. In certain caſes nothing can be concluded from the ſilence of accuſed perſons. I. 784. *a.* They ought to be believed, when they publickly deny things which may be eaſily proved, and which their adverſaries do not prove. IV. 217. *b.*

Accuſers meet with too much indulgence. I. 327. *a.* ought to undergo the puniſhment of retaliation when they accuſe falſely. *ibid.* Thoſe whom we have moſt reaſon to fear are the prieſts. 468. *a.* Profeſſed accuſers were hated among the Pagans, and that too at a time when accuſing gave young Advocates of quality an opportunity of exerciſing themſelves. II. 356. *b.* A reflexion upon that. *ibid.* Accuſers have at all times taken notice of the manner how people talk of news, in order to ground their accuſations thereupon. 627. *a.* The character of thoſe who make it their buſineſs to accuſe others of Hereſy. IV. 780. *b.* Very often make uſe of religion for a pretence. I. 307. *a.* If people were reaſonable they would make accuſers ſtand in awe of them. 780. *a.* Ought to be ſeverely puniſhed when they ſuborn domeſtics to depoſe againſt their maſters. II. 627. *a.* Are capable of doing any thing to make their adverſaries odious. V. 170. *b.* See *Informers.*

Achillea (a fountain ſo called), whether that word be a noun ſubſtantive or adjective. I. 86. *b.*

Achilles, that name was given equally to the champions of Venus, and to thoſe of Mars. I. 82. *a.*

Achilles appeared to Homer ſurrounded with ſo much glory, that he could not bear the ſplendor of it. I. 85. *b.* Birds ſwept the temple of Achilles every morning. 85. *a. n.* (20). Whether love made a part of his character. II. 140 *a. b.* He would not ſuffer any other Greek to ſhoot darts at Hector. III. 183. *b.* By what name he was called whilſt he wore woman's cloaths. IV. 659. *a.* How his deſigns upon Hemithea were prevented. V. 315. *a.* What was to be his deſtiny. *ibid. a. b.*

Achilleum Argumentum, what it ſignifies, and why. I. 82. *b.*

Achilleus Index (the) of Mr Drelincourt very much improved in the ſecond edition. II. 140. *b.*

Acidalius, why the Diſſertation intituled *Mulieres non eſſe homines* was aſcribed to him. I. 89. *a.*

Acontius, what has been ſaid of him and of his book of the ſtratagems of the Devil. I. 92. *a. b.* 93. *a.*

Acrotatus, the ingenuous acclamations with which the women and old men of Lacedemon followed him, as he was returning from the place where he had repulſed the enemies aſſaults. II. 523.

Act: An act that has been purloined from the records of the parliament of Paris. III. 297. *b.* 298. *a.*

Action of a Catholic gentleman the moſt ſingular and ſtrange that ever was known. II. 91. *a. b.*

Actions: We find examples of good actions in each country, age, and religion. I. 561. *a.*

Actions (human), the fear and love of God are not their only ſpring. V. 811.

Actions (remarkable) are aſcribed by the people ſometimes to one King, ſometimes to another. The ſame thing is practiſed with regard to ſaints. II. 770. *b.*

Actors on the ſtage, the advantage they have over Advocates. I. 61. *b.*

Acts of the Apoſtles and *Apocalypſe* in French rhyme calculated for the ſtage: a very uncommon work. II. 477. *a. b.* Acted at Paris in the year 1541. *ibid.* The undertakers and Bookſellers proſecuted. *ibid. b.* Extracts from that work. *ibid. a. b. &c.*

Acts (public): at what time they began to be drawn up in the vulgar tongue in France and Spain. II. 379. *a.* III. 97. *a.* and in Germany. *ibid.* They were made in Latin for ſeveral ages almoſt all over the weſt. II. 517. *a.* The Spaniards, Germans, and French, began very late to make uſe of their own language in thoſe writings. 518. *b.*

Actuarius, a particular dignity belonging only to the Phyſicians at the court of Conſtantinople. I. 99. *a.*

Acugna (Don Antonio d'), to what length his violence proceeded in the civil-war of Caſtille. IV. 456. *a. b.*

Adam, how long he continued in the ſtate of innocence. I. 22. *a. b.* Dreams of the Rabbins about his mourning for Abel's death, and divorcing himſelf from Eve's bed. 23. *a* and about his knowledge. 101. *b.* 102. *a.* What the Talmudiſts ſay of his ſtature. *ibid.* From whence proceeded his fall according to Agrippa. 154. Whether he was an Hermaphrodite. 102. *a. b.* II. 856. *a. b.* An hypotheſis which is not at all well calculated to juſtify the providence of God with reſpect to his fall.

857. *a.* What was his eſcutcheon. III. 27. *b.* His article in this Dictionary raiſes the indignation of divers perſons; the author's anſwer. I. 103. *b.* V.

Adam (Antonius ab): what that author was. V. 461. *a. b.*

Adam (Father), what he ſaid of St Auguſtin, and St Paul. I. 106. *a. b.* One of his ſermons gave occaſion to a jeſt. 108. *b.*

Adam (Melchior) cenſured for ſeveral anachroniſms. I. 139. *a.* He does not much examine what he compiles. V. 520. *a. b.*

Adamites, were calumniated. I. 111. *b.* Whether there be ſtill any ſuch in England and Italy. 112. *a. b.* Their error with reſpect to nakedneſs renewed, and carried to a more extravagant length in the XVth century. IV. 628. *a. b.* 629. *a. b.* Their uncleanneſſes. 784. *a. b.* 785. *a. b.*

Additions. It is difficult to make pertinent additions to a book. IV. 79. *b.*

Adeſora (Marques) a Preacher who converted a Mahometan by one of his ſermons. I. 326. *n.* (*a*).

Adiatorix baſely maſſacres a colony of the Romans. II. 532. *b.* But he is puniſhed for it by Auguſtus. *ibid.*

Adjectives, whether thoſe ending with an é maſculine, may be placed before their ſubſtantives. IV. 887. *b.* 888. *a.*

Adolphis, an Epic Poem dedicated to Chriſtina Queen of Sweden. III. 140. *b.* 141. *a. b.*

Adolphus of Naſſau choſen Emperor of Germany. V. 67. Killed in an engagement by Albert of Auſtria. *ibid.*

Adonijah, why Solomon cauſed him to be put to death. V. 803.

Adonis (the) of Cavalier Marini, cenſured and defended. I. 387. *a.*

Adonis, ſon to Cinyras by Metharme his wife. IV. 641. Or ſon to Cinyras by his own daughter. 642.

Adoptions, what the practice of them was in old times. I. 325. *b. n.* (10).

Adrian (Matthew) a converted Jew, was the firſt Profeſſor of the Hebrew tongue in the college of the three languages at Louvain. II. 236. *b.*

Adverſaria, that word ridiculouſly tranſlated *Adverſaries,* V. 43. *a.*

Adverſaries: An adverſary accuſed of a falſe doctrine cannot mortify his enemies more than by appearing quite different from their repreſentations. I. 654. *b.* One ought never to deny their good qualities by affecting an air of contempt for them. 696. *b.* Some people are concerned that they have not a ſufficient number of adverſaries. 339. *b.* People have always endeavoured to turn the perſon and doctrine of their adverſaries into ridicule. III. 698. *b.* It is prudent, when one gets the better of them, to be ſatisfied with a moderate advantage. 972. *b.* Authors hardly ever conſult their writings. IV. 637. *a. b.* 638. *a.* See *Antagoniſt.*

Adverſaries in point of religion, a perſon ſhould never make a merit of their hatred. II. 695. *b.* Why he ſhould not. *ibid.*

Adverſity, the unſettled way in which people have reaſoned upon adverſity and proſperity. IV. 194. *a.* Falſe conſequences that are drawn from adverſity and proſperity. 55. *a. b.* 216. *a.* The manner in which adverſity is accounted for, makes the condition of human life incomprehenſible. 468. *b.*

Advice: it is dangerous to give advice about public affairs. IV. 795. *a.*

Advocates: who is their idol. I. 66, 67. They are ſubject to contradict themſelves and for what reaſon, 351. *b.* 352. *a.* II. 626. *a. b.* IV. 805. *a.* It is even a privilege which Cicero allows them. I. 352. *b.* The humorous anſwer of an advocate touching the bad cauſes which he had taken upon him to plead. 224. *b.* Their buſineſs is more difficult than that of preachers. 61. *b.* Their labours avail nothing againſt the raſhneſs of a corrupt judge. 224. What Ammianus Marcellinus ſays againſt thoſe of his time. 226. *a. b.* They lay hold of every thing which they think advantageous to their cauſe. II. 343. *b.* The diſadvantage which modern advocates lie under, when compared with thoſe of antiquity. 724. *b.* Their qualities deſcribed in verſe. 309. *a. b.* 310. *a.* An advocate refuſes to charge himſelf with the intereſts of the Ducheſs of Angoulême at the time of her difference with the Conſtable of Bourbon. 761.

Adultery, whether it may be innocently committed to ſave the life of an huſband or wife. I. 91. *a. b.* In what manner the antient Romans puniſhed women that were taken in the fact. 592. *a. b.* And by whom that cuſtom was aboliſhed. *ibid.* Adultery wiſhed for by way of imprecation. II. 247. *b.* The encouragement people have to commit that crime. V. 17. *a. b.* How common it is. 425. *a. b.* Reflexions upon a trial for adultery. 112. *a. b.* 113. *a. b.* A very odd kind of puniſhment that was antiently inflicted on adulterers. I. 191. *a. b.* And which ſerves to explain a paſſage of Catullus. *ibid.* How thoſe were puniſhed that were taken in the very fact. III. 74. *a. b.* Adulteries puniſhed with death at Orleans, and the reflexions which people about court made upon that puniſhment. V. 17. *a.* What puniſhment the Roman laws inflicted upon thoſe that were guilty of it. 113. *a. b.* A plant that hindered women from committing adultery. IV. 610. *a. b.*

Æneid, a diſtich on the order which Virgil gave to burn it. I. 375. *a. b.*

Ædeſius gives a governour of Egypt a box on the ear. III. 445. *a. b.*

Ælii, the Antonini, Emperors of Rome were deſcended from that houſe. III. 711. *a.*

Æra (Chriſtian) a new beginning which a Viſionary gives it. II. 123. *a.*

Ætius, the method he followed in explaining the Catechiſm. I. 472. *a.*

Ætna, a city built by Hiero King of Syracuſe. II. 823. *a.* 825. *b.*

Affairs, what ſort of people great affairs require. I. 178, 179. *a.* There are few great affairs but what owe their ſucceſs as much, at leaſt, to the miſconduct of one of the parties, as to the prudence of the other. 588. *a.* To excel both in learning and the tranſaction of affairs is a very rare talent. II. 314. *b.*

Affairs of State, there are perſons who render you ſuſpected if you differ from them on theſe affairs. I. 681. *a.* Savonarola meddled too much with ſtate affairs, and ruined himſelf thereby. V. 61. *b.* 62. *a.*

Africa, a deſign to ſend ſome perſons ſecretly there to inform themſelves of the ſtate of Chriſtianity. III. 527. *a.*

Agamede, according to the Scholiaſt on Theocritus was the ſame with Perimede. IV. 585.

Agamemnon, his amorous diſpoſition makes one queſtion the truth of his having obſerved the oath which he made to Achilles. II. 139. *a.*

Agathion, his diſcernment with reſpect to a veſſel of milk that was preſented to him. II. 636. *b.* Philoſtratus called him a *Diviner* upon that account. *ibid.*

Agathocles, plunders and ravages the iſlands of Corfu and Ithaca, the ridiculous reaſon he gives for it. I. 54. *b.*

Agathon: ſome of his ſentences. I. 126. *a.*

Age, women are not the only perſons that conceal it. III. 177. *a.* It is the only only thing which they never tell. 309. *a. n.* (8). Princeſſes cannot conceal their age. IV. 333. *a.* The extent of its autumn, and when a man is in the winter of life. I. 125. *b.* IV. 163. *a.*

Ages. Our age is almoſt as eaſy to be impoſed upon as any whatſoever. I. 7. *b.* In every age they can hardly believe what Hiſtorians ſay of antient times, if it is too remote from the modern cuſtoms. II. 710. *a.*

Ageſilaus, deſpiſed by the Egyptians on account of his ſmall ſtature. V. 278. *a. b.* 279. *a. b.* Why his ſtratagems of war did not ſucceed. IV. 654. *n.* (9). He lived in great ſimplicity. I. 130. *a.* The theory of that Prince. *ibid. b.* 131. *a.* He was rather willing that the Perſians ſhould break the truce. 131. *a.* What anſwer he made to the perſon that ſurpriſed him riding on a hobby-horſe. *ibid.* He regrets the loſs of Ageſipolis. 134. *a. b.* A fine anſwer that Ageſilaus made. 130. *b.* He is compared with Conon. 550. *a. b.*

Ageſipolis. II. what anſwer that Prince made to thoſe who told him that he had been an hoſtage. I. 133. *b.*

Ageteridas goes to Memphis, and on what errand. I. 208. *b.*

Agis, is the firſt King of Lacedæmon, who was put to death in the city. I. 273. *a.*

Agnes, widow to Henry III. A queſtion which ſhe put to Peter Damianus. III. 80. *b.*

Agnus Caſtus, what the virtue of that herb is, and why it was ſtrewed on the beds of the Greek women, during certain ſolemn rites. V. 334. *a. b.* Its virtue not near ſo great as that of the plant Leucophillus. IV. 610. *b.*

Agreda (Mary d') extracts from a pamphlet touching the condemnation of her book. I. 137. *b.* 138. *a.*

Aggreſſor. Whether in perſonal reproaches he ſhould ſuffer the defendants writings to go without an anſwer. I. 697. *a.* The aggreſſor is not he who gives the firſt blow, but he who prepares to give it. II. 104 *a.* Puffendorf's opinion in this point. *ibid.* According to John Bouchet and the Baron du Villars, this was the caſe of Henry II, with Charles V. *ibid.*

Agricola (John) was founder of the Antinomian ſect. I. 140. Was one of thoſe who drew up the *Interim.* 141.

Agricola (Rodolph) dedicates his Latin verſion of the Axiochus of Plato to Rodolph Langius. III. 725.

Agrigentum, at what time and by whom that city was founded. III. 157. *a.* In what condition it was when the Romans ſettled there. *ibid. b.* What the qualities of it's ſalt were, and what uſe St Auguſtin made of thoſe qualities. *ibid. and* 158. *a.* To what a pitch the devout zeal of the inhabitants for the ſtatue of Hercules roſe. 158. *b.*

Agrippa (Henry Cornelius) had not much credit with the Devil. I. 148. *b.* He at firſt looked upon Luther as a deliverer of the oppreſſed. 149. *b.* Was not for the raiſing of altar againſt altar. 155. *a.* Foretold that the conſtable of Bourbon would ſtill be victorious in the year 1526. For which he was diſgraced. 147. *b.* 148. *a.* Sutcliffe charges him with having ſpoke diſhonourably of Sixtus IV. V. 164. *b.*

Agrippina wife to Germanicus, what ſhe ſaid of the orator Afer. I. 120. *a.* Overcame the weakneſs of her own ſex, by imitating the fortitude of the other. 523. *a.* An encomium which a Roman Hiſtorian has beſtowed upon her. II. 757. *a.* She wanted to marry a ſecond huſband. *ibid. b.* What Tiberius ſaid to her. IV. 143. *b.*

Agrippina, Nero's mother, all her rivals with the Emperor Claudius were reduced to two. III. 860. *a.* She cauſed one of them to be murthered in her exile. 861. *b.*

Agrippina, a piece writ by Cirano Bergerac, which was ſuppreſſed on account of ſome impieties which he had inſerted in it. II. 825. *a.*

Agropoli (the Marquis of) particulars that concern him. V. 467. *a. b.*

Aguirre (Cardinal d') writ againſt the deciſions of the Clergy of France aſſembled in the year 1682. I. 157. *a. b.* His zeal for the court of Rome raiſed him from being a ſimple Monk to the dignity of a Cardinal. *ibid. b.*

Ajax, what anſwer he made to his father who recommended to him that he ſhould pray to God. I. 160. *b.* Invoked by the Greeks. 161. *b.* He and his ſon were extremely honoured by the Athenians. V. 304. His deſcendants were not very illuſtrious. *ibid. b.* His ſtature was like unto Saul's. I. 160.

Ajax (the Locrian) in what manner the crime which he committed upon Caſſandra was expiated by the Locrians. II. 340. *a. b.*

Ayeſha, the Hiſtory of that woman. IV. 48. *a. b.*

Ailli (Peter d') bigotted to judicial Aſtrology. I. 164. *b.* 165. *a.* He condemned ſeveral tenets of the Church of Rome. 165. *b.*

Aymar (James) relies upon the virtue of his wand. I. 7. *a. b.* 8. *a. b.* 9. *a. b.* Confounded at the palace of Condé, where he confeſſes his impoſture. 7. *b.* reflexions thereupon. 8. *b.* 9. *a.*

Air is the principle of all things according to ſome Philoſophers. II. 672. *a. b.* III. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.*

Akiba is accuſed of having altered the Hebrew text of the Bible. I. 173. *a.*

Alamanni (Lewis or Aloïſio) III. 90. *a.* IV. 11. *b.*

Alarcon charged with the perſon of Francis I, after his being taken priſoner at the battle of Pavia. III. 97. *b.*

Alba (The Duke of) his anſwer to Henry II. II. 444. *a.* A mark of his fierceneſs. III. 274. *b.* 275. *a. b.*

Albert (the Archduke) the author of his Hiſtory printed at Cologne in the year 1693 ſhews very little exactneſs. II. 128. *a. b.*

Albertus Magnus, it is ſaid that his body was preſerved from putrefaction. I. 183. *b.* He was ſo little that he was thought to be on his knees, while he was really ſtanding. 184. *a.* His ſagacity made him diſcover the miſ-conduct of his ſervant maid by the tone of her voice. II. 636. *b.*

Albertus (Leander) his deſcription of Italy. III. 693. *a.* When it was publiſhed. IV. 165. *b.*

Albigenſes, it is not true that they were Manichees. IV. 97.

Albret (a certain Lord) killed in his tent, in the arms of his miſtreſs. IV. 302. *a.*

Albret (Joan d') Queen of Navarre: Garaſſe ſharply cenſured for publiſhing the tale of her Tapeſtry. III. 134. It was affirmed that he had caſt groſs reflexions on that Princeſs, but he cleared himſelf from that charge. *ibid.*

Albunea, a goddeſs worſhipped by the Heathens. V. 350. *b.* 351. *a. b.*

Alcaçar, whether it is a village, a borough, or a town. IV. 382. *a.*

Alcadenus, Profeſſor of Philoſophy and Phyſic; ſeveral Princes deſired very much to have him. IV. 763. *a.*

Alcæus in deſcribing his houſe ſpeaks of nothing but helmets and bucklers. I. 426. *b.*

Alcander (the Great) the Hiſtory of his amours printed with notes. II. 245. *b.*

Alciatus (Andrew) united polite Literature with the Civil Law. I. 67. *a.* In what manner he juſtified himſelf as to his inconſtant humour 195. *a.* He learned by the action of a peaſant the ſenſe of a paſſage of Plautus. III. 154. *b.* He talks pretty freely of the Pope, in a letter to one of his friends. III. 590. *b.* 591. *a.* His miſtake as to the time when Marc Antony harneſſed a ſet of lions. 960. *a.* He never was Profeſſor of the Civil Law at Milan. V. 139. *b.*

Alcibiades, by whom he was recalled to Athens. II. 571. *a.* He was always attended by two concubines. III. 703. *a.* He was the greateſt lover of pleaſures in the world, and the readieſt to quit them when the exigency of his affairs required it. 414. *a.*

Alcinoi Menſa and *Alcinoi Apologus*, are two different proverbs. I. 201. *a.*

Alcmena, the ſtory went that ſhe diſappeared during the ceremony of her funerals, and that the Thebans paid her divine honours. I. 208. She wore three moons on her forehead, and for what reaſon. 284. *a.* She is a very fit example to prove that a ſincere ignorance is a good excuſe. 206. *a.* Upon what conditions ſhe offers herſelf for a wife. V. 306, 307, 308. Different opinions on that head. 307. *b.* 308. *a. b.*

Alcoran, it's text corrected by Bibliander. I. 801. *b.* The veneration which the Turks have for it. IV. 41. *a. b.* Whether Mahomet declared to ſome, that only the third part of it was true. 47. *a.* After what manner it was compoſed. *ibid.* It's chapter of the Elephant. 177. *a.* Revealed in one night to Mahomet at Mecca. I. 326. *a.* Compoſed in twenty years. *ibid.* Tranſlated into the language of Arragon. 326. Andrew du Ryer's French tranſlation of it cenſured by Windet. IV. 872. *b.* The Engliſh tranſlation which is made upon the French one is alike faulty. *ibid.*

Alcoran of the Cordeliers, adorned with marginal notes: What it is. III. 82. *a. b.*

Alcyonée, a tragedy very much eſteemed. IV. 873. *b.* 874. *a.*

Aldegonde (the Sieur de Sainte) receives a commiſſion to go upon a new tranſlation of the Bible into the Dutch tongue. II. 705. *a.*

Adhelme (Saint) in what manner he mortified his luſt. III. 80. *a. b.* And how he likewiſe expoſed himſelf to danger, to make the Devil mad. *ibid.* What he required of one of his devotees, in order to make trial of himſelf. 280. *b.*

Aldobrandin (Thomas) commits three faults in ſpeaking of the temple of Venus Lamia. III. 715. *b.*

Aleander (Cardinal) whether he was a Jew. I. 215. *a. b.* 216. *a.*

Alegambe (Father) publiſhes a falſhood touching Theodorus Beza. I. 726. *a.* Commits a fault for which

Mr Ogier ſhould have demanded reparation. III. 133. *b.* Alegambe and his continuator were ignorant of the diſguiſes which a writer of their order made uſe of. 657. *a. b.* Alegambe is not always ſo exact as people imagine. IV. 76. *a. b.* He does not ſuppreſs what may enhance the birth and riches of the writers of his order. I. 747. *a.* is confuſed in his computations. *ibid.*

Alençon (The Duke of) there was a prodigious antipathy between him and the King his brother. III. 407. *b.* 408. *a.* He is put upon very wicked deſigns by two of his favourites. IV. 935. *a. b.*

Alethæus (Theophilus) a fictitious name which Lyſerus borrowed. III. 973.

Alexandra (a Statue) why ſo called. II. 342. *b.*

Alexandra, a Poem that has very much exerciſed the Critics. III. 957. *a. b.*

Alexander the Great, his anſwer to the perſon that offered him the lyre of Paris. I. 83. *a.* A fine anſwer which he made to a Queen who ſent him delicious refreſhments. 100. He is alarmed on the propoſals of Pexodares's Ambaſſador. *ibid. b.* He deſires to ſee and honour the tomb of Ajax. 161. *a.* Whether he was chaſte. 366. *b.* Whether he was treated by Apelles in the manner as is pretended *ibid. and* 367. *a. b.* He was very ſuperſtitious, and put an extreme confidence in ſoothſayers. 447. *a.* His ſoothſayer did him more ſervice than any of his generals. *ibid.* He ſometimes lends a helping hand to the ſoothſayers, in order to make their predictions ſucceed. *ibid.* Sometimes alſo he diſregards them. *ibid. b.* One ought not to be too much ſurprized at his ſuperſtition. *ibid.* He acquired no ſmall ſkill both in the theory and practice of Phyſic. 465. *a.* Whether in the like ſituation others would have done no leſs than he. II. 414. *a. b.* Democritus could not have laughed at him. 637. *a.* He ſaid that if he was not Alexander he would wiſh to be Diogenes. 666. *b.* Had once a deſign of returning into Europe, and upon what occaſion. III. 356. *b.* Had books ſent him into Aſia, and particularly the productions of the Poets. *ibid.* Whether he had drank the cup of Herules when he fell ſick. 428. *a. b.* The thought which he made uſe of to comfort the King his father afflicted with a wound that he had received in a battle 485. *b.* He draws theſe words from the mouth of the Prieſteſs of Delphi, *My ſon, thou art invincible.* 568. *b.* By what invention his tutor made himſelf agreeable. 973. *a. b.* The oppoſition between his character and that of his father. IV. 8. *a. b.* Whether he could have any reaſons for ſuppreſſing miracles that had been wrought in his favour. 607. *b.* 608. *a. b.* In what other Kings endeavoured to imitate him. 660. *b.* 661. *a.* He ruins Perſepolis. V. 320. *a. b.* A reflexion upon his birth-day. III. 59. *a. b.* V. 360. *a.* He expended fourſcore thouſand talents upon learning the properties of animals. 351. *b.* He deprives Cleophis of her kingdom, enjoys her, and ſettles her again upon the throne. II. 523.

Alexander, King of the Indies, ſon to Alexander the Great by Cleophis. II. 523. *a. b.*

Alexander Severus (Emperor) had the image of Apollonius in the ſame place where that of Jeſus Chriſt was. I. 381. *a.* He had in his chapel the images of Apollonius, Jeſus Chriſt, Abraham, Orpheus, *&c.* and practiſed religious ceremonies in honour of them. *ibid. b.* Encolpius's Hiſtory of that Emperor is not extant. II. 770. An impoſter pretends to have tranſlated it from the Greek. *ibid. a.* He aſſociates to the empire Ovinius Camillus, who had aſpired to it, and who renounces it. *ibid. a. b.*

Alexander VI (Pope) loſes his life, by drinking of the poiſon which he had cauſed to be prepared for another. III. 321. *a.* There was in him neither truth, nor faith, nor religion. 765. *b.* Journal of his life. V. 757. He had like to have been cruſhed to death on St Peter's day. II. 472. *a. b.* He orders Mancinellus's tongue to be cut out, and his hands to be cut off. IV. 89. Cauſes Lorenzo to be thrown into the Tyber. 90. *b.* His conduct with reſpect to Savonarola, *&c.* V. 61. *b.* 62. *a. b. & ſequent.*

Alexander VII (Pope) a ſtory that is told about his religion. II. 474. *b.* 475. *a.* He diſapproves the Duke of Savoy's conduct towards the Vaudois. 475. *b.* He ſpeaks to ſome Engliſh gentlemen with a great deal of good-nature. *ibid.* He preaches up to them maxims which Mr Jurieu has praiſed, without foreſeeing that he ſhould one day oppoſe them 476. *a.* It is pretended that he was related to the Grand Signior. *ibid.* He was baſely deceived by three Dutch Bookſellers whom he had brought to Rome. *ibid. b.* He died much more lamented by the Jeſuits than by the Janſeniſts. 476.

Alexander (Natalis) the character of his *Theologie Morale* V. 853.

Alexandria: the feaſt of Adonis was celebrated there in the time of St Cyril. I. 116. *a.* It's ſchool deprav'd by the vain ſubtilties of the diſputants. 268. Reſtored to a wonderful luſtre by Ammonius. *ibid.* A Heathen Philoſopher teaches there openly the eternity of the world in the VIth century. 270. *b.* The inhabitants thereof ſend Embaſſadors to Caligula to complain againſt the Jews. 374. It's chronicle gives us a pleaſant chimera touching the daughter of Aquila. III. 316. *b.* 317. *a.*

Alfonſines. Aſtronomical tables, who the author of that work is, and what it coſt. II. 379. *a.*

Alhazen, what he writ on the twilight, joined to Father Nonius's treatiſe upon the ſame ſubject. IV. 382. *b.*

Alypius, inſtead of perſuading St Auguſtin to live ſingle, ſuffers himſelf to be perſuaded to marry. I. 563. *a. b.* The character of his diſpoſition of mind. II. 401. *a. n.* *.

Allatius, no man ever carried the power of the Pope a greater length than he. I. 231. The pleaſant reaſon he gave to Pope Alexander VII, why he did not take orders. *ibid. b.* The character which Mr Claude, Mr Simon, and Mr Sallo give him. *ibid. a. b.* 232. *a.*

Alliance. A monſtous alliance between the worſhip of the gods and the moſt filthy paſſions. I. 597. *a. b.*

Alliances, reflexions on thoſe that are entred into with Heretics or Infidels. I. 407. *a. b.* The mutual reproaches which the French and Spaniards beſtow upon one another, on account of their entring into alliances with Heretics. II. 338. *a.* The Pope may with a ſafe conſcience make uſe of Infidel ſoldiers. *ibid. a.*

Allix declares that Antichriſt ſhall periſh either in the year 1716, 1720, *or* 1736. II. 125. *b.*

Allum, whether there be a virtue in Allum to make wood incombuſtible. I. 424. *a. b.*

Alluſions: ridiculous alluſions borrowed from a paſſage of St Bernard. I. 492. *a.*

Almachius (St) killed by the Gladiators. I. 230. *b.* It is nevertheleſs conjectured that he is an imaginary ſaint, and for what reaſon. 230. *b.* 231. *a. b.*

Almanack, that word being abridged was taken for a man's name, and the man ſuppoſed to be a martyr. I. 230. *b.* 231. *a. b.*

Almanack. Leon Morgard condemned to the gallies, on account of the predictions which he had put in his Almanack. III. 955. *b.* The contempt which the Phyſician Sylvius expreſſed for the Almanack. V. 138. *a.*

Almanon Calif, diſturbs the devotion of the Muſſulmen V. 286. By what means. *ibid.*

Almoner, at what time the title of the King's Great Almoner, and that of the Great Almoner of France, began to take place. II. 393. *a.* When and upon what occaſion the Great Almoners of France were created, in virtue of their office, commanders of the order of the Holy Ghoſt. I. 258. *b.*

Alms, bad reaſons to excuſe one's ſelf from giving any. II. 110. *a. b.* 112. *a. b.*

Almucheſi, a looking-glaſs, what the virtue of it is. I. 598.

Aloïſia Sigæa Toletana, the book compoſed under her name is abſolutely to be condemned. V. 837.

Alopo (Pandolfo) is beheaded, and for what reaſon. IV. 306. *b.*

Alphonſo King of Naples, how far he expreſſed his eſteem for Ovid. IV. 433. *a.*

Alphonſus X, King of Caſtile, the cenſure which he is ſaid to have paſſed on the works of God. II. 379. *b.* 380. *a.*

Alphonſus, two Kings of that name have been confounded, and ſeveral things taken from the one and aſcribed to the other. II. 381. *a.* But neither of theſe took the pains to compile the Law-book or Code. 380. *b.* 381. *a.*

Alſace, whether the free towns of that province could have continued to hold immediately of the empire, under the protection or guardianſhip of a King of France. III. 717. *b.* 718. *a.*

Altieri (Cardinal) was greatly concerned when he received the news of the conqueſts which Lewis XIV made upon the United Provinces. II. 758. *b.*

Altieri: Cardinals of that name. I. 237.

Altingius, a ready reply which he made. I. 240. *a.* His ſhift compared to that of St Athanaſius. *ibid.*

Alviano (Bartholomew d'): Navagiero goes to the wars with him, and compoſes his Funeral Oration. IV. 315.

Amadæus Guimenius, who the author of that book was. IV. 833. *b.*

Amadis; the reading of the Amadis inclines one to laſciviouſneſs. I. 65. *b.*

Amalricus Augerii, what he ſays of the She-Pope. IV. 739. *a.*

Amama (Sixtinus) proves Roſweide to be in an error. II. 150. *b.*

Amand Flavien, the fictitious name of an author. II. 27.

Amantius, the praiſes which he beſtows on Capriata. II. 309. *a. b.* 310. *a.*

Amaſæus (Romulus) has miſunderſtood a paſſage of Pauſanias touching the epitaph of Æſchylus. II. 826. *a.*

Amaſis, the tranſmigration of his ſoul into the body of a lion. I. 382.

Amaſtris, the Hiſtory of that Princeſs. II. 676. *a. b.* And of the town which bore her name. *ibid. b.* 677. *a. b.*

Amaulry, an Heretic condemned at Paris, and for what reaſon. I. 103. *a.* His doctrine touching the reunion of the two ſexes. *ibid.* A reflexion upon that head. *ibid. b.*

Amauri, King of Jeruſalem, aſſiſts Dorgan. IV. 383.

Amazons, their impiety puniſhed by Achilles. I. 85. *b.* 86. *a.*

Ambition confounded for being too refined. II. 737. *a. b.* The want of it often proves the beſt ſanctuary. III. 438. *a.* It ſtifles all natural affection. 647. *a.*

Ambitious: The ambitious live in a ſtate of ſervitude. II. 427. *b.*

Amboiſe (Adrian d') publiſhes his father's treatiſe of devices. I. 248. *a.* His moral devices. *ibid.* His other works. *ibid.*

Amboiſe (Francis d') is miſtaken when he fancies that Accurſius ſpoke of Abelard. I. 32. *b.* 33. *a.*

Ambres caſtle: it is not true that Francis I. was carried to that place. III. 97. *a.* The Mareſchal de Villeroi is ſhut up there. *ibid. b.*

Ambroſe (St) his apology for the conduct of Sarah and Abraham. V. 55. *a.* In what manner he treated Theodoſius. I. 593. *a. b.*

Ambroſians, a title which ſome ſorcerers of Nancy in Lorrain gave themſelves. III. 126. *a.*

Ambrun. The Archbiſhop of Ambrun preſents a petition to the King againſt the Janſeniſts. IV. 765. *a.*

Amé II, Count of Savoy, a piece of Hiſtory concerning him. I. 739. *a. b.*

Amelot tranſlates a paſſage of Father Paul ill. III. 499. *b.* 500. *a.*

America, the firſt voyage that was made into that part of the world, under the protection of France. III. 783. *a. b.*

Americans, the depravity of their manners. III. 773. *a. b.* 774. *a. b.*

Amynias, how he touched the judges that were ready to condemn his brother. II. 824. *b.*

Amyntas, what he did in favour of Antony, and how he was rewarded for it. II. 628. *a.*

Amyot miſleads Vigenere in explaining a paſſage of Plutarch. I. 75. *b.* Whether he changed his religion. 260. *a. b.* He is cenſured for tranſlating ſome paſſages of Plutarch ill. II. 14. *b.* 486. *a. b.* III. 56. *a.* What occaſioned his being made Great Almoner of France. III. 323. *b.* He does not underſtand a paſſage of Plutarch touching Laïs. 705. *b.* Nor another paſſage of Plutarch where mention is made of Lyſimachus. 713. *b. n.* (12).

Amyraut is reconciled to his moſt violent oppoſers. I. 261. *b.* 262. *a. n.* (9). His reſolution in withſtanding an Arrêt of the Council of State. 265. *b.* He was much eſteemed by the Duke of Longueville. II. 475. *a.* A great imitator of Cameron. 288. *b.* 289. *a.*

Ammianus Marcellinus; Mariangelus Accurſius pretends to have corrected five thouſand faults in that Hiſtorian. I. 69. Quoted. 228. *a. b.* Ridicules the Advocates of his time. 226. *a. b.* Is cenſured for confounding one Mopſus with another. IV. 253. *a.*

Ammonius, an excellent maſter in Philoſophy. IV. 688.

Ammonius Saccas, upon what account he was called Theodidactus. I. 269. *a.* All his works are loſt, if we may believe Henry Valeſius. 270. *a.*

Amours of the royal palace, an order to buy up all the copies of that book, and to burn them upon the ſpot. IV. 506. *b.* Whether Buſſi-Rabutin be the author of it. V. 753. *b.* 754. *a.*

Amphiaraus was called the royal Prophet. I. 278. *a.* He won the prize in a horſe-race by the fall of Polynices. 446. *a. b.*

Amphilochus was both a King and a Prophet. I. 281.

Amphitheatre of honour, a book againſt the royal authority, wrote by a Jeſuit. I. 220. *b.*

Amphytrion: The Amphytrion of Moliere ſurpaſſes that of Plautus. I. 283. *a.* Obſervations upon the piece which bears that name. V. 308. *a. b.* 309. *a. b.*

Amurath cauſes Fakreddin to be ſtrangled in his own preſence. III. 4.

Anabaptiſm, the reaſons of the great progreſs which it has made. I. 287. *a.* The beginning of its fury. II. 83. *a. b.* A woman of that ſect makes a judicious reflexion. IV. 852. *a. b.*

Anabaptiſts refuted by a Proteſtant writer in the ſame manner as the Catholics refute the Proteſtants. I. 287. *a. b.* Reaſons why they are tolerated in the United-Provinces. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* They are charged with an extravagant doctrine. 290. *a. b.* The anſwer they return, when aſked what would become of the magiſtracy, if all the world was of their opinion. III. 313. *a.* Who was their firſt Patriarch in the Netherlands and Lower Germany. 481. *b.* They are very rigid in their morals. IV. 86. *a. b.* 87. *a.* Certain Fanatics among them had a mind to renew the extravagancies of the Adamites, and were put to death for it. 628. *a. b.*

Anchoret (an) who boaſts that he had ſeen the place where heaven and earth touch one another. IV. 678. *a.*

Anachroniſms, moſt of the elogies of illuſtrious men are full of them. II. 403. *b.* The Annaliſts themſelves are not always exempt from them. *ibid.*

Anacreon, his diſſolute life excuſed by le Fevre. I. 675. *a. b.* His ſtatue placed near that of Xanthippus in the citadel of Athens. V. 48. *a.* Of what country he was. 316. *b.*

Anagrams, who was the firſt reſtorer of them. II. 618. And where he found the pattern. *ibid.*

Anarchy: There is a ſource of anarchy in the ſtate of man, which can never be wholly rectified. I. 499. *a.*

Anaſtaſius the Library-keeper: It does not appear that he has mentioned the She-Pope. IV. 725. *a. b.* 726. *a. b.* That fable has been foiſted into the manuſcripts of his Hiſtory. 725. *a. b.* Blondel obſerved that they were the very words of Martinus Polonus. *ibid. b.* Sarravius obſerved that in the manuſcript of the King's library the ſtory of the She-Pope was an additional piece. 726. *a.* It is only told there by an *it is ſaid, that*, &c. *ibid.* An examination into what Salmaſius, ſaid touching an edition of that author publiſhed by the Jeſuits of Mayence. *ibid. b.* 727. *a. b.*

Anatomy, a doubt propoſed to Caſuiſts touching a curious point of Anatomy. I. 109. *a.*

Anaxagoras, his indifference about the good things of this world. I. 294. *a. b.* II. 635. *b.* His doctrine touching the firſt formation of men and animals. I. 296, 297. *a. b.* 414. *a. b.* 415. *a. b.* His falſe ſuppoſition in eſtabliſhing Homogeneities. 303. *a. b.* 304. *a. b.* 305. *a. b.* He was ſirnamed νȣς, or *the mind*. 297. *b.* His ſentiments explained. 298. *a. b.* He was the firſt who ſuppoſed that an intelligence was the efficient cauſe of the world. 299. *a. b.* 300. *a. b.* Was ſirnamed *the Atheiſt*. 301. *b.* His doctrine of the *Homœomeriæ* is full of contradictions. 303. *a. b.* 304. *a. b.* 305. *a. b.* He was accuſed of impiety, and in danger of being ſtoned as an Atheiſt. 307. *a. b.* IV. 566. *b.* His witty ſayings. I. 308. *a. b.* He ſuffers perſecution for having dogmatized againſt the popular opinions. II. 864. He taught a rational religion, while he explained by natural reaſons what appeared extraordinary. IV. 565. *a.* He is accuſed of irreligion, under pretence that he explained meteors by philoſophical reaſons. 579. *b.*

Anaximenes, his hypotheſis corrected. I. 302. *a. b.* 303. *a.* He taught that the air was the principle of all things. III. 649. *b.*

Ancients, a great many of them gave no credit to fables. I. 76. *a.* They had not variety enough of invention. 115. *b.* A controverſy which has been raiſed of late years, about the ſuperiority or inferiority of the Ancients. 283. *a.* If they were to come back to the world, they would ſee that many things were ſuppoſed to be contained in their books, which they never dreamt of. 462. *a. b.* A reflexion upon the compariſon between the Antients and Moderns. II. 553. *a. b.* How people come to be ſo ready to praiſe and ſupport the Ancients. IV. 414. *b.* The difference between them and the Moderns, with reſpect to comedies. 743. *a. b.* The diſeaſe of admiring only them prevailed no leſs formerly than now. V. 492. *b.*

Ancre (the Marſhal d'), a paſſage cited out of his trial. I. 397. *b.* 398. *a.* Feigned by Malherbe the Poet to be curſed by the god of the Seine. II. 543. *a.*

Ancyranum Monumentum, a moſt curious and inſtructive inſcription, but not entire. II. 231. *a.*

Andlo (Daniel ab) his book againſt Samuel des Marets. I. 322.

Andradius, his book very ſcarce, is nevertheleſs very often quoted. I. 324. *a.* The reaſon of it. *ibid.*

Andreas (James) attacked by Hemmingius. III. 391. A great promoter of Ubiquitiſm. *ibid.*

Andreas (Valerius) cenſured with reſpect to Buſbequius and his embaſſies. II. 230. *b.* He is miſtaken in the title of a book which he aſcribes to Badius. I. 602. *b.*

Andreis, a province of Bœotia ſo called from Andreus, the ſon of the river Peneus. IV. 626. *a.* It was afterwards named Phlegyantis. *ibid.*

Andrinople, built by Oreſtes whoſe name it bore. I. 331. *a. b.*

Androgynes, thoſe of Plato a kind of Hermaphrodites. I. 102. *b.* What they were, what they attempted, and what became of them. V. 6. *a. b.* 7. *a.*

Androïs, what it was. I. 182. *b.* 183. *a.* A word abſolutely unknown, and invented by Naudé. 184. *b.*

Andromache, a tragedy fit to kill players. I. 333. *a.*

Andromachus, founder of a city in Sicily. V. 357. *a.*

Andromeda, a tragedy of Euripides. I. 19. *a.*

Andronicus (Emperor), what he did to upbraid the inhabitants of Conſtantinople with their wives leudneſs. III. 631. *b.*

Anean (Bartholomew) is killed in a religious tumult. III. 624. *b.*

Anecdotes, what their ſources are. I. 361. *a.* A curious fact for ſuch as are fond of them. 724. *a. b.*

Angelocrater, there was little honour to be got by confuting him, and for what reaſon. III. 388. *b.* He publiſhes in 1601 a piece on Chronology, and is deputed in 1618 to the Synod of Dort. IV. 731. *a.*

Angels, there were two ſorts of bad angels according to Athenagoras. I. 532. *b.* Nothing can be more needleſs than to diſpute, whether they form unto themſelves an human body when they appear. V. 215. *a. b.*

Angels (tutelar or guardian) the doctrine of the Heathens concerning them. II. 249. *b.* 250. *a.* And of ſome Proteſtants. III. 595. *a. b.* The doctrine of theſe angels antienter than the Chriſtian religion. IV. 689. *b.* 690. *a.*

Angerone, a goddeſs that was the patroneſs of Silence. V. 184. *b.*

Angers, the corruption of that city. III. 60.

Angevin (the) or *the little Angevin*, John Maugin was thus ſirnamed. IV. 173. A ſign of his mean extraction. *ibid. a. b.*

Angevin. Who was the moſt learned Angevin. III. 308. *b.*

Anglara, a town in Tuſcany which Thuanus confounds with one in the Milaneze called *Angleria*. II. 294. *a.* Quenſtedt is almoſt guilty of the ſame miſtake. *ibid. n.* (2).

Angoulême (the Ducheſs of), at the time of the difference between her and the Conſtable of Bourbon, an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris refuſed to charge himſelf with her intereſts. II. 761.

Anicetus, his baſeneſs and villany. IV. 399. *a.*

Animals, how they were produced according to Anaxagoras and Archelaus. I. 296. 415, 416. III. 650. *a. b.*

Anjou (Fulk Rechin, Earl of): his wife leaves him. III. 62. *a.* He makes a thouſand mean ſubmiſſions to her. *ibid. b.*

Anjou (Charles of) created King of Naples and Sicily by the Pope, did not obtain the peaceable poſſeſſion of them, till he had defeated Manfred and Conradin. IV. 300. *a.*

Annaliſt, it is proper that he ſhould have ſeveral copies of his annals, and that he ſhould lodge ſome of them in the hands of his friends. II. 283. *b.*

Annat (Father), a parallel betwixt his conduct and that of Father Nidhard. IV. 366. *b.*

Anne (St), how many huſbands and children ſhe had. III. 572. She is no where ſpoken of in the Scriptures, nor in the writings of the three firſt centuries. I. 342. The ridiculous ſtories that are told about her. III. 570. *a. b.* 571. *a. b.*

Anne, daughter to Phanuel: whether ſhe was a cloyſtered religious. I. 342.

Anne, ſiſter to Dido: perſecuted after her ſiſter's death by their brother Pygmalion. IV. 642. *a. b.*

Anne of Auſtria, Queen of France, liked the reliſh of the fruits which came from Pompone. I. 487. *b.* The King could not conſent to declare her Regent. III. 816. *b.* 828. *a.* She gets the Parliament of Paris to make the King's laſt will void. *ibid. b.* Maſcaron makes her Funeral Oration. IV. 172. Provoked at the ſcandalous reflexions that were thrown out againſt her during the ſiege of la Motte, ſhe cauſes that place to be raſed contrary to the articles of capitulation. 278. *a. b.* This piece of reſentment blamed by the Marquis de Beauvau. *ibid. b.*

Anonymiana quoted. V. 280. *a. b.* 330. *a.*

Anſelme (Father) much leſs intelligible than Mr le Laboureur, whom he epitomizes. II. 133. *b.* He is miſtaken when he ſays that a good part of the inheritance of the houſe of Bourbon was reſtored. III. 864. *a.* His error with reſpect to the age of Madam de Rohan. IV. 481. *a.*

Anſwer; whether it be better to anſwer certain fiery and impetuous tempers, or not to do it. II. 195. *b.*

Antagoniſt. Whether a perſon ought not to take as much pains to repreſent his antagoniſt's reaſons as his own in a fair light. II. 486. *b.* 487. *a. b.* 488. *a. b.*

Anti-Anicianus, a book that was never printed, and for what reaſon. I. 341. *a. b.*

Anti-Baillet, a paſſage of that book examined and cenſured. II. 180. *a. b.*

Anti-Coton, the author of that book quoted and cenſured. IV. 772. *b.* 773. *a. b.*

Antichriſt, a very ſingular opinion concerning him. II. 113. *a. b.* In what manner he was to ſeize on fortified towns. IV. 265. *b.* 266. *a.* An author who deſcribes all the periods of his reign. II. 122. Aloiſio de Leon applies to Mahomet the predictions of the Apoſtles concerning Antichriſt. III. 772. *b.*

Antyllus betrothed to Auguſtus's daughter, but murdered on account of his virile gown. III. 119. *b.*

Anti-Mondori, who was called by that name, and for what reaſon. IV. 82. *a.*

Antinomians, the followers of John Agricola were ſo called. III. 597. Father Garaſſe's ſcurrilities on that head. *ibid. a. b.* 598. *a. b.*

Antioch, the feaſt of Adonis was ſtill celebrated in that city when Julian the Apoſtate made his entry there. I. 114. *b.*

Antiochide finding herſelf barren, has recourſe to a pretended delivery. II. 304. *b.*

Antiochus the Great vanquiſhed by the Romans. IV. 559. *a. b.*

Antiochus was deſperately in love with his mother-in-law. V. 45. *a.*

Antipater, his diſputes with Carneades. II. 329. *a.* How that Philoſopher defined God. IV. 572. *a.*

Antipathy is the true cauſe of quarrels between huſband and wife. III. 663. *a.*

Antiperiſtaſis takes place in religion. III. 949. *a.*

Antiphates, King of the Leſtrygons: eats one of Ulyſſes's Deputies. III. 786. *a.*

Antipodes placed by Pope Zachary in the number of chimeras that are pernicious to religion. V. 493. *a. b.*

Antiquarians, ſnares are often laid for them. III. 215. *a. b.*

Antiquity can never be admitted as a proof for any doctrine, without firſt determining the duration that is ſufficient to diſtinguiſh truth from error. III. 744. *a.*

Antiquities (Roman), Flavius Blondus was almoſt the firſt who attempted to reſtore them. II. 32.

Antiſthenes, whether at the time that Diogenes was his ſcholar, he could have had Socrates for his maſter. II. 665. *a. b.* 666. *a.* In what manner he made the Athenians ſenſible of the abuſe committed in the promotions to public poſts. III. 616. *b.*

Antocles, what health he drank with Epicles. IV. 571. *b.*

Antony (Caius), the ill treatment that he met with from his nephew. III. 115. *a. b.* 116. *a.*

Antony (Caius), the Triumvir's brother, what his end was, and how his death was revenged. III. 496. *a. b.*

Antony (Lucius), to whom he was indebted for his authority, and his triumph. III. 111. *b.*

Antony (Marc) ſends to ſignify to Cleopatra, that ſhe ſhould come into Cilicia to juſtify her conduct. II. 631. The debauching of his wife hindered the city of Rome's being involved in an horrible confuſion. 679. His anſwer to Julius Cæſar upon his demanding an account of the ſale of Pompey's goods. *ibid. b.* 680. *a.* His difference with Dolabella. 680. *a.* He harangues the Senate upon peace and concord, and his harangue charms the men of probity. *ibid.* He ſends his ſon for a hoſtage to the conſpirators, who durſt not come down from the capitol. *ibid.* With what ſpectacle he entertained himſelf at table during the time of the proſcriptions. III. 113. *a.* How his firſt wife was called. *ibid. b.* How his ſecond wife was called, and why he put her away. 114. *b.* He commits a thouſand extortions at Rome. 119. *a.* He has even the audaciouſneſs to ſell Pompey's goods by inch of candle. *ibid.* He did not marry Cytheris. *ibid.* He cauſes lions to be yoked in his chariot. 959. *b.* 960. *a.* The trick which he ſerved his wife, and the conſtruction that was put upon it. 991. *a. b.* He enters himſelf into the ſociety of the Luperci. 932. *a.* He cauſes Arſinoë to be killed, out of complaiſance to Cleopatra. IV. 791. *b.*

Antonia, whether that family was a Patrician or Plebeian one. I. 356. *a. b.* 357. *a.* How it ſhould be divided. 356. *a.* And what names belong to its different branches. *ibid.*

Antoniana Margarita, that book is grown very ſcarce. IV. 546. *a.*

Antoninus, Archbiſhop of Florence, quotes John Columna, and in ſeveral places copies James Columna. II. 529, 530. *a. b.*

Antoninus Liberalis, what he tells us about Alcmena. I. 208.

Antonio, King of Portugal: Philip II takes Portugal from him. V. 319.

Antonio (Don Nicolas), the faults of that author cenſured. I. 41. *a. b.* 42. *a.*

Ants, a falſe reaſon given for their wiſdom. III. 528. *b.*

Antwerp, how the five baſtions of its fortreſs were called. IV. 453. *a.* The King of Spain is adviſed to order that city to be burnt. V. 293. *a.* A popular inſurrection there in 1567. II. 121.

Apelles, his adventure at the court of Egypt. I. 366. *a. b.*

Apelles, the tragedian, cried out in a muſical tone while he was whipped. 370.

Apellicon, his library tranſported to Rome. V. 378. *b.* The hiſtory of him. 379. *b.*

Aphrodiſienſis (Alexander), whether he believed the mortality of the ſoul. II. 567. *a.*

Apicius Cælius, who the author of that book is, and what it treats of. I. 371. *a. b.*

Apion tells an incredible ſtory of a certain Phyſiognomiſt. I. 370. *a. b.* Boaſted that he beſtowed immortality on thoſe to whom he dedicated his works. 373. *b.*

Apocalypſe, See *Revelations.*

Apollo, ſirnamed the Hyperborean. I. 4. *b.* The wonderful effects of the dart with which he had killed the Cyclops. 5. How he recovered that dart. *ibid.*

Apollo is blamed for commending a Poet that had wrote a thouſand obſcene things. I. 427. *a.* His temple and oracle at Daphne rendered very famous by ſuperſtition and debauchery. 594. *a.* He acted the Merchant; for he did nothing *gratis.* II. 258. *a.* The prieſteſs of Apollo at Daphne was to be a virgin. 339. *a.* The virtue of his ſpittle. *ibid. b.* Apollo tells a lie in the oracle which he pronounced upon the deſtiny of Euripides. 863. *b.* 864. *a.* Who it was that built him a temple at Claros. IV. 97. *a.* The Athenians plunder him by ſea and by land. 621. *a. b.* 622. *a. b.* Why he is called *Smintheus.* V. 312. *a.* Why ſpared by Verres. 315. *b.* He gets Coronis with child, and kills her father Phlegyas with arrows. 626. IV,

Apollonius Pergæus: Mr Viviani reſtores the fifth book of his Conic ſections. V. 498.

Apollonius, the Poet, is very excuſable in having followed the crowd with reſpect to Chiron. I. 79. *a.*

Apollonius Tyanæus had mimicked the Son of God. I. 380. *a.* How he cenſured the Athenians. II. 81. *b.* The ſtory that they tell of him with reſpect to the aſſaſſin of Domitian. V. 731, 732.

Apologia pro Puritanis, what that book is. II. 681.

Apology for John Chaſtel and the Jeſuits: An analyſis of that work. II. 457. *b.* 458. *a. b.* 459. *a.* Aſcribed to the Jeſuits, but it is highly probable that it was compoſed by John Boucher. 459. *b.* It is very ſcarce. *ibid.* The Jeſuits ſuppreſs it, and for what reaſon. *ibid.*

Apologies ſhould be conſulted by thoſe who write the lives of learned men, and by the author of ſuch a book as this. II. 8. *b.*

Apologiſt: There is often room to believe that the ſharpneſs of an Apologiſt offends people more than that of the aggreſſor. II. 296. *b.*

Apologiſts: It is a difficult matter to reduce the Apologiſts for certain people to a non-plus. V. 66. *a.* Savonarola's Apologiſts. *ibid. b.* 67. *a. b.* They are ſuſpected of being guided by infatuation, or the intereſt of their community. 70. *a.*

Apologues, to whom the glory of inventing them belongs. II. 832. *a.* Whether the Antients believed that they came down from heaven. *ibid.*

Apopompæus, a name which the Jews gave to one of their victims. IV. 828. *b.* 832. *b.*

Apoſtate; a certain Engliſh Lord called an Apoſtate by the people of Geneva, becauſe he did not believe that their diſcipline was Apoſtolical. II. 150.

Apotheoſis, what the ſureſt way of obtaining it was. IV. 572. *a. b.*

Apparition, whether, from the apparition of a ſoul, one can draw any proof of its immortality. II. 66. *b.* 67. *a. b.* An apparition may occaſion a mortal diſtemper. 715. *b.* 716. *a.* There are apparitions againſt which the moſt ardent warriors could not be proof. *ibid.* Obſervations upon ſome of them. III. 881. *a. b.* See *Phantoms.*

Appearances are deceitful. I. 126. *a. b.* 127. *a.* A proof of the raſh judgments which are only grounded on firſt appearances. *ibid.* 733. *b.*

Applauſe: The hopes thereof a great encouragement to authors. IV. 450. *a.*

Apple: The golden apple adjudged to Venus. III. 644. *a. b.*

Application. Too long application produces bad conſequences. III. 342. *a.*

Apuleius, if he was a Magician, his crime was leſs than that of the Magicians of theſe times. I. 390. *a.* What things he was reproached with. 391. *a. b.* The Pagans compared his miracles to thoſe of Jeſus Chriſt. 394. One of his epiſodes has furniſhed Moliere with matter for a dramatic piece, and Mr de la Fontaine for a romance. 396. *b.*

Aquapendente (Fabricius d'), it is not true that du Laurens profited by his converſation with him. III. 746. *b.*

Aquaviva (Andrew-Matthew), celebrated for the ſame thing as Mr de Montauſier. I. 397. *b.*

Aquaviva, General of the Jeſuits, whether he approved Mariana's book *de Inſtitutione Principis.* IV. 130. *a. b.*

Aquila, a city that roſe upon the ruins of Amiternum. I. 69. *a.*

Aquileia, the ſentence of Pilate found in that city was a ſuppoſititious piece. II. 556. *b.*

Aquinas (Thomas) knew ſomething of the Cabala. II. 114. *a.* Was called the *mute ox* by his ſchool-fellows, and for what reaſon. 802. *b.* Is cenſured by Vogelſang. 877. *b.* 878. *a.*

Aquitain (Eudo Duke of) what his daughter's name was. IV. 282. *a. b.* How ſhe fell into the hands of the Calif of the Saracens. 283. *a. b.*

Aquitain. The annals of Aquitain by John Bouchet. II. 103. The judgment which Robert Cenalis and John Quintin paſs upon it. *ibid. a. b.* 104. *a.*

Aquitainians, were formerly the ornament and glory of the Gauls in point of wit and eloquence. V. 124. *a. b.*

Arabia, the women there have a great deal of modeſty. IV. 34. *a.*

Arabians, what they ſaid of the ſtature of our firſt parents. I. 104. *a.* What they ſaid of Adam's books. *ibid. b.* They worſhipped a ſtone. 124. *b.* Their Philoſophers rather chuſe to ſwerve from the opinions of their Prophet Mahomet, than to contradict Ariſtotle. 469. *b.* The Arabians have introduced many things into the practice of Phyſic, that are contrary to the precepts of Hippocrates and Galen. II. 140. They continue exactly to obſerve the cuſtom of marrying with the women of their own tribe. IV. 27. *a.* Some of their authors boaſt of having ſeen a copy of the Goſpel, where mention was made of Mahomet. 46. *b.* 47. *a.*

Aragon (Ferdinand of) unjuſtly deprives John d'Albret of his kingdom. III. 623. *a.*

Arbriſſel (Robert d') how he lived with his Nuns. III. 63. *a. b.* 64. *a. b.*

Arcadia, men were ſacrificed to Jupiter in that country. III. 651. *b.*

Arcadius was ordered by Theodoſius, to ſtand uncovered before his Preceptor. I. 507.

Arceſilas was a Pyrrhoniſt without bearing the name. I. 408. *b.* 409. *a.* He was the firſt diſturber of the public peace among the Philoſophers. 409. *b.* He carried the Hypotheſis of uncertainty farther than Socrates. *ibid.* Why he eſpouſed the ſide of the Epoché. *ibid.* 410. *a.* He did good and endeavoured to conceal it. 412. *b.* 413. *a.* What he ſaid to Carneades the Epicurean. 413. *b.* Ariſto of Chios was his antagoniſt upon the Hypotheſis of uncertainty. 462. *a.* Whether he abſolutely denied the exiſtence of truths. II. 327. *a.* What difference there was between his opinions and thoſe of Pyrrho. IV. 653. *a. b.* If he ſhould return into the world he would be formidable to the Divines. 654. *a.*

Arthagathus was the firſt Phyſician that ever came to Rome. II. 353. *a.*

Archambald, Archbiſhop of Bourdeaux, is depoſed, and afterwards becomes Lord of St Maixent. IV. 479, 480.

Archelaus, upon what terms Pompey gave him the pontificate of Comana. II. 531. *b.* 532. *a.*

Archelaus, *King of Macedon*, a witty ſaying of that Prince. I. 418. *a.* What he ſaid upon his ordering a golden cup to be given to Euripides. II. 869. *a.* He delivers up Decamnichus to Euripides to be uſed by him at diſcretion, and why. 868. *b.* 869. *a.* One of his dogs ſacrified and eat. 870. *b.*

Archelaus (The Philoſopher) what he taught touching the production of men and other animals. I. 416. *a. b.*

Arch-Heretics, one of them works a kind of miracle at Rome. II. 86. *b.*

Archidamia comes with ſword in hand into the Lacedemonian ſenate, to complain of the ill opinion that was entertained of the womens courage. II. 523.

Archidamus fined by the Ephori, and for what reaſon. I. 128. *b.*

Archilochus valued himſelf more upon being a ſoldier, than a Poet. I. 426. *b.* Whither the man that killed him was ſent. V. 317. *a. b.*

Archon. Who the laſt perpetual Archon was. I. 208.

Arci (the Marquis of) commits an aſſaſſination in Frejus, for which the Prince of Condé, and the Admiral are exceedingly concerned. II. 511. *a.*

Arcturus called Phaſis, and for what reaſon. IV. 609.

Aremberg: (the Count d') his anſwer touching the troops of the circle of Burgundy, which were introduced into the Electorate of Cologne. II. 224. *b.*

Arena, a city, whence it was ſo called, and by whom it was built. III. 194.

Areopagites: The Areopagites could neither endure Atheiſts nor impious perſons. II. 572. *a.* 573. *a.* A cauſe referred to them. 681. *b.* They cauſe Menedemus and Aſclepiades ſo be ſummoned before them. I. 525. *b.*

Aretin (Peter) whether his books of devotion ſavour of a true convert. I. 438. *b.* His *Raggionamenti*, a book abſolutely to be condemned. V. 837.

Arezzo, the inhabitants thereof obliged to kneel before a lion of ſtone, and for what reaſon. II. 633. *a. b.*

Argenis, a famous book, tranſlated into Italian, to ſatisfy the curioſity of the women. I. 644. *b.* Continually read by Cardinal Richelieu. 645. *b.* Likewiſe very much eſteemed by Balzac. *ibid. b.* 646. *a.* It is nevertheleſs writ in bad Latin. 646. *a.* Tranſlated into French. 646. *b.*

Argenterius, a Lawyer, writ every thing that he heard in converſation. III. 154. *b.*

Argentocoxus, how his wiſe excuſed the adulteries that were committed in Great Britain. III. 604. *a. b.*

Argentum purum putum, the meaning of theſe words. I. 227. *a.*

Argentré: (Bertrand d') confounds Franciſco Sylveſtro with Sylveſter Prierias. III. 32.

Argonauts, their arrival and their exploits in the iſle of Lemnos. III. 465. *a. b.* They are obliged to ſail up the river Phaſis. IV. 610. They are ſirnamed Minyans from Minyas. 626. *b.*

Argonauts; what the Argonauts of the Painter Cydias were ſold for. III. 492. *a.*

Argos, Juno's temple there was entirely burnt down by the careleſſneſs of the prieſteſs. II. 498. *a. b.* The inhabitants thereof made a vow to Apollo, when they plundered the city of Thebes. IV. 97.

Argument, whence it comes that the principal argument of a ſect is called it's *Achilles*. I. 82. *b.* In what caſe a negative argument takes place. II. 115. *b.* and in what caſe it is a good demonſtration. 392. *b.* Books have been writ for and againſt it's authority. III. 457. *a. n.* (15). A conſideration on the force of it with reſpect to the She-Pope. IV. 734. *a. b.* 735. *a. b.* A refutation of the reaſons that may be objected to it. 736. *a. b.* The Proteſtants allow it to be demonſtrative in the queſtion: whether St Peter was at Rome, and will not hear of it in the affair of the She-Pope. 737. *a.* Character of that argument. V. 648. *b.*

Argumentum; an inexcuſable miſtake of thoſe who took *Argentum* for *Argumentum* in Aulus Gellius. I. 82. *b.*

Arianiſm, its extent and duration. I. 476. *a. b.* The inſurmountable difficulties in which a Proteſtant Divine has engaged himſelf upon that head. *ibid.* It is extirpated in Spain by Recaredus. 477. *b.*

Arians. The Arians ſeem to have been of a more tolerating ſpirit than the Orthodox. I. 477. *b.* Calvin's explications accuſed of favouring them. III. 538. *b.* A ſect of them ſprings up at Lyons, againſt which Viret exerts himſelf V. 483. *a. b.* They are ſolidly confuted by Laſicius. III. 732. *a.*

Arioſto, the judgment which Cardinal Hippolyto d'Eſt paſſed upon one of his poems. III. 764. *a.* A bull expedited in favour of his poems. *ibid.* The beginning of his poem coſt a great deal of pains. 837. *b.* Whether he lived in lodgings. V. 400. *b.* 401. *a.*

Ariſtagoras, whether there was a Philoſopher of that name, who was Socrates's maſter. II. 653. *a. b.*

Ariſtarchus, whether he was called the Prophet or Diviner. I. 451. *b.*

Ariſteus, the ſon of Apollo, diſappears. I. 456. Is placed among the ſtars. 457. The conformity of his Hiſtory with that of Moſes. *ibid.*

Ariſteas (the Proconneſian) appeared in the world three ages after he had compoſed a poem. I. 458. *b.* 459. *a.* He boaſted that his ſoul had left his body and rambled thro' different places. 458. *b.*

Ariſteus: Mr Viviani's divination on that author. V. 499.

Ariſtænetus, what he tells us of his miſtreſs. III. 704. *a.*

Ariſtides, his daughters portioned for marriage at the public expence. I. 56. His virtue. 278. *b.* From what motive he contributed towards Cimon's advancement. II. 504. *b.*

Ariſtippus, what his footman ſaid to him about Lais. II. 670. *a.*

Ariſtodemus, the Kings of Lacedemon were deſcended from him. I. 130. *a.*

Ariſtomenes, the greateſt hero that was among the Meſſenians. II. 650. *a.*

Ariſtophanes, why he compoſed the Comedy of the clouds, according to ſome. I. 418. *b.* To whom the public is indebted for the firſt edition of that author. IV. 295. In what manner he ſpoke of devotional watchings. V. 336. *b.* 337. *a.*

Ariſtotle, his learning compared to that of Adam. I. 101. *b.* 102. *a.* He ridicules Xenocrates. 112. *b.* His doctrine as to the neceſſity there is for ſome principle to be the firſt mover of matter. 299. *a.* He obſerves that Anaxagoras admitted an intelligence for the production of things only as a *θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχάνης*. 301. *a.* Whether he was a Proſelyte of righteouſneſs, or even a Jew. 466. *a. b.* His anſwer to thoſe who demanded the reaſon of his retreat. 468. *a.* The greateſt part of his works was brought to Rome with Apellicon's library. V. 377. *b.* Several copies of them were taken full of faults. *ibid.* They added to them the tables, which we have at preſent, after putting them in order. *ibid.* Who writ the paraphraſe upon his Ethics. I. 336. *a.* Some have attempted to explain the myſteries of religion by his principles. 339. His Philoſophy has been violently ſhaken in the XVIIth century. 464. but ſtrongly ſupported by the Proteſtant and Catholic Divines. *ibid.* The extravagant praiſes that have been beſtowed upon him. 468. *b.* 469. *a.* His conformity with Spinoza. 470. II. 411. *a.* 412. *b.* Whether he believed the immortality of the ſoul, and the Trinity, and whether he had any glimpſes of the Incarnation of the Son of God. I. 470. *b.* 471. *a. and* IV. *from* 714. *a.* to 719. *a.* Whether he ought to be put in the number of the Refugees. I. 471. *b.* Whether he threw himſelf into the Eurypus. 473. *a. b.* 474. *a.* The profeſſors that are ſtrongly prejudiced in favour of Ariſtotle's Hypotheſes, have much leſs reaſon on their ſide than the parliaments which proſcribed all others. 470. Some authors have believed that his doctrine went the length of Atheiſm. 470. What is ſaid as to his converſation with a Jew, does not ſeem to be well grounded. 465. *b.* 466. *a. b.* It is not probable that he behaved ſo ill to Plato, as he is ſaid to have done 466. *b.* 467. *a.* Nor that he was guilty of impiety and idolatry in his amours. 467. *a. b.* It is doubted whether he acknowledged the immortality of the ſoul. 470. *b.* 471. *a.* It is not certain what kind of death he died. 473. *a. b.* 474. *a. b.* He was extremely honoured in his own city. 471. *b.* Who was the firſt and almoſt the laſt of the moderns, that comprehended Ariſtotle's opinions. II. 411. *a.* His Doctrine touching an univerſal intellect, which is the ſame in all men. 565. *b.* Whether he burnt all the books of thoſe who had philoſophized before him, and the books of Solomon. 643. *b.* 644. *a.* A fooliſh ſtory of the Jews to that purpoſe. 644. *ibid.* He looks upon the eternal motion of matter to be an abſurd ſuppoſition. 787. *b.* He is very ill uſed by Luther. III. 952. *a. b.* When and how nature forms women, according to that Philoſopher. 144. *b.* It was with good reaſon that he ſpoke ill of the Lacedemonian women. 968. *a.* To what he compares thoſe who leave off Philoſophy, and apply themſelves to other ſciences. IV. 543. *a.* His opinion about the ſouls of beaſts. 549. *a. b. to* 551. *b.* It is in vain that ſome people endeavour to find in his writings the ſeeds of Des Cartes's opinion, touching the ſouls of beaſts. 551. *b.* 552. *a.* The reverſe of Ariſtotle's Doctrine has been publickly defended, which occaſioned great troubles. 835. *a. b.* The fate of his works Hiſtorically deſcribed. V. 377. *b.* 378. *a.* An inference very glorious for him, but which may raiſe ſome doubts concerning his works. 379. *a. b.* He is unjuſtly cenſured by the author of the Art of Thinking, in favour of Parmenides. 575. *b.* He advances facts which cannot be confirmed. 772. *a. b.* His Rhetoric tranſlated into Latin, by M. A. Muretus, and explained by Bencius. I. 747. *b.* The agreement between the ſects of Ariſtotle and Plato. 268. *a. b.*

Arithmetic: the authors that have writ upon that ſubject. V. 297. *a. b.* Tartaglia excels in it, and all the reſt copy and plunder him. *ibid.*

Arius: Nicolas, Biſhop of Mirra, gives him a box on the ear, in the council of Nice. II. 530. *a. n.* (15).

Ark: whether matrimonial functions were ſuperſeded and ſuſpended in the ark. II. 431. *a. b.*

Arles: none is admitted into the academy of Arles, but upon requeſting it. IV. 459. *a.* The Cardinal of Arles. I. 178. How deſcribed by a Polander. *ibid. a. b.* 179. *a.* He dies in the odour of ſanctity. *ibid. a. b.*

Arliquiniana quoted. I. 750. *b.*

Arminianiſm, is of an inſinuating nature V. 513. *a.*

Arminians. The Arminians ſhould not have exceeded the bounds ſet them by the Reformers. I. 481. *a. b.* Their Hypotheſis cannot ſolve the principal difficulties upon the ſubject of Predeſtination. *ibid.* 482. *a.* They reject the authority of the Synod of Dort. II. 793. They are depoſed and baniſhed. *ibid.* The populace curſes them as the firſt cauſe of the diſorders, both in Church and State. *ibid a.* They retire to Antwerp during the truce, *ibid. b.*

Arminius, a conjecture upon his diſputes with Gomarus. I. 687. *a.* 688. *b.* His recommendations and thoſe of Uytenbogard are prejudicial to Druſius. II. 705. *a.* He denies that his opinions were the ſame with thoſe of Pelagius. III. 173. *a.* There is no fundamental hereſy in them. 174. *a.* What he anſwered touching the writings which he had orders to confute. III. 676. An exhortation which Joſeph Hall addreſſes to him. 343. *a. b.*

Arms (Coats of) John le Feron's book upon that ſubject. III. 27. *a.* Another book upon that ſubject. *ibid b.* Adam's coat of arms, what? *ibid.*

Arms, people who have confeſſed that they threw down their arms when they fled. I. 189. *a. b.* What the arms of the Church were in primitive times, when ſhe was perſecuted. 592. *a.* Whether it is lawful for a private perſon, to bear arms againſt the allies of his ſovereign, when he may either liſt or not, as he pleaſes II. 196. *a.* A book wherein it is maintained that miniſters have a call to bear them, and the trouble which that brought the author into. I. 756. *a. b.* Mr Amyraut condemns one's taking up arms againſt his Prince upon any occaſion whatever. 264. *b.* 265. *a.*

Army. A ſpiritual army, which was to be raiſed by the advice and inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt, and commanded by the King of France, to extirpate impieties and hereſies. IV. 115. *a. b.* A Janſeniſt's reflexion thereupon. *ibid. b.* 116. *a.*

Arnauld (Antony) Advocate, whether he was of the Reformed religion. I. 484. *b.* 485. *a.* There were ſeveral perſons of the Reformed religion in that family. II. 727. *a.* Among others Mr Arnauld, Comptroller of the Reſtes. *ibid.* In his pleading againſt the Jeſuits he employs the words of Lepidus. III. 956. *a.*

Arnauld (Antony) Doctor of the Sorbonne, the ſource of his quarrels with the Jeſuits. I. 487. *a. b.* 488. *a.* He did not deſerve to be ſtiled *one Arnauld.* 489. *b.* 490. *a.* The ſecret of ſilencing him. *ibid. b.* The reaſons which he gave for his ſilence, with regard to two books that were publiſhed againſt him. 494. *b.* His diſpute with le Fevre Doctor of the Sorbonne. III. 70. *b.* A pretended letter from the King of France: 593. *a. b.* He is in the wrong to blame Quiſtorpius. 246. *a. b.* He is contradicted by Mr Claude with reſpect to Allatius and Hottinger. 528. *b.* Acknowledges that he had been in the wrong to Mr Mallet, as to the extravagancies of which he had believed him to be the firſt author. 854. *b.* Received a ſmall ruffle on account of a citation from Luther. 950. *a.* Is quoted. IV. 719. *a. b.*

Arnobius vented very dangerous errors. I. 501. *a. b.* He grounds a very bad objection upon a falſe aſſertion. II. 498. *a.* He ridicules the Pagans for making nine nights neceſſary to Jupiter to get one child. III. 427. *b.* His way of arguing againſt Jupiter's adulteries. 646. *a. b.* He puts Paganiſm to a nonplus. 647. *a. b.* What anſwer he made to the Pagans when they accuſed the Chriſtian religion, as being the cauſe of all the misfortunes which befel the empire. IV. 423. *a. b.* He is leſs orthodox upon the ſubject of matter conſidered as one of the principles, than the Stoics. 521. *a.* Has very ſtrongly refuted thoſe two ſorts of gods, ſome whereof are beneficent and others miſchievous. *ibid.* But he went too far. *ibid.* His notion touching the ſoul of man. 903. *b.* 904. *a.* A paſſage of his examined. *ibid.* What he obſerves concerning the nature of God. V. 146. *a.* The confeſſion he makes with reſpect to thoſe who deny the Deity, or a providence. 217. *a. b.* 218. *a.* What his view was in ſaying that the Pagans had the Amphytrion of Plautus acted in order to appeaſe Jupiter. 309. *b.* His anſwer to ſuch of the Pagans as required ſome of Cicero's books to be prohibited. 506. *b.*

Arnoldus, the tranſlation of a paſſage of his cenſured. I. 48. *a. b.*

Arras, the treaty of Arras relating to the ſubmiſſion of Charles VII King of France. II. 212. *a. b.*

Arria kills herſelf to give an example to her huſband. IV. 594.

Arriaga quoted. V. 223. *b.* IV. 545. *a. b.* V. 611. *a.* 618. *a.*

Arrian, his extreme credulity for fables. I. 85. *a. b.*

Arrow: the flying arrow. I. 4. *a. b.*

Arſinoë cauſes Achillas to be put to death. She is received into Megabyzus's houſe. Marc Antony cauſes her to be killed out of complaiſance to Cleopatra. IV. 791. *a. b.*

Art. The Civil Law requires that a perſon who excels in any art ſhould have his life given him, altho' he may have deſerved to loſe it. III. 197. *b.* 198. *a.*

Art of Love: Ovid's books on that ſubject were leſs the cauſe than the pretence of baniſhing him. IV. 445.

Art of Writing: A man ſtyled *the firſt* of all the writers of the kingdom. III. 123.

Art of Slandering: there is one according to Scaliger. Thoſe who are ignorant of it hurt themſelves more than they hurt others. I. 343. *b.*

Art of War; it was formerly very far from the ſtate of perfection to which it is come now. I. 162.

Art of Poetry; one of its rules examined. IV. 744. *a. b.*

Art of French Poetry: Des Accords promiſed that work. I. 66. *a.* Daniel d'Auge's book upon that ſubject. 562. *a.*

Art of Thinking: that book referred to. I. 791. *a. n.* (36).

Artagnan: the Memoirs publiſhed under that name are ſuppoſititious. III. 881. *a.*

Artemidorus cited on the ſubject of dreams and their ſignification. I. 6. *a.*

Artillery, by whom invented. I. 183. *b.*

Artiſts. Famous artiſts are liable to be capricious. I. 377. *b.* And have often reaſon to repent it. *ibid.*

Arundel, (Earl of) his Marbles. IV. 771. *a. b.*

Aſiatics were the aggreſſors in the firſt wars which they had with the Europeans. III. 372. *a. b.* Their readineſs to believe the moſt ridiculous traditions. 576. *a.*

Aſcribe: ſeveral perſons aſcribe to others, pieces which they themſelves have compoſed. II. 353. *a.*

Aſking: people often meet with a refuſal, becauſe they are too free in aſking. I. 418. *b.*

Aſmodeus transforms himſelf into an angel of light, in order to ſurprize devout women. II. 110. *a.*

Aſpaſia abuſed by the Poets, and upon the ſtage, IV. 569. *a.* Her Hiſtory. 578. *b.* 579. *a. b.* 580. *a. b.*

Aſpaſia, Cyrus's miſtreſs, an abridgment of her hiſtory. IV. 512. *b.* 513. *a. b.* 514. *a. b.* 515. *a.*

Aſprenas accuſed of having poiſoned an hundred and thirty gueſts with one diſh. II. 354. *b.*

Aſs: An aſs that had a wonderful attention for Poetry. I. 267, 268. A ſtory that is told of a Collier's aſs. III. 804. *a.*

Aſs (Buridan's), the original of that proverb. II. 226. *b.* 227. *a. b.*

Aſs (golden), who is the author of its firſt tranſlation into French. I. 395. *b.* It is a continued ſatire. 396. *a.* One might draw up a very good commentary on that romance. *ibid. a. b.* Some perſons believe that it contains the myſteries of the grand operation. *ibid. a.*

Aſs: Who firſt brought aſſes-fleſh into vogue. IV. 768. *a. b.*

Aſſacan: eldeſt ſon to Cleophis an Indian Queen. II. 523. *a.*

Aſſaſſins, or *murderers of Kings,* their panegyriſts rewarded by the Spaniards. II. 103. *b.*

Aſſaſſins, ſuch as John Chaſtel, diſcover as much conſtancy as the moſt illuſtrions martyrs. II. 459. *a.* The proceed from the ſchool of the Jeſuits. *ibid. b.*

Aſſembly: one ought not ſlightly to believe all that is charged upon the religious aſſemblies of the Heretics. I. 111. *b.*

Aſterites, a ſtone which the rays of the ſun can ſet on fire. II. 834.

Aſtrea, what people blame in that romance. III. 866. *b.* 867. *a.*

Aſtrology (Judicial) the vanity of that ſcience. I. 164. *b.* 165. *a.* Whether the birth and miracles of Chriſt could have been foretold by it. *ibid.* According to its rules a man ought ſometimes to die ſeveral years before his death. 194. *b.* Perſons that have been infatuated with it. 599. *a.* III. 591. *b.* 592. *a. b.* 619. *b.* 804. *a. b.* V. 254. *b.* 255. *a. b.* Its rules prove falſe. II. 321. *a. b.* The judgment which Caſtellan makes of it. III. 401. *a.* There are ſome fortuitous conjunctures which hinder people from ſeeing the vanity of it. 438. *a.* It's fatal effects. 499. *a. b.* The greateſt men ſuffer themſelves to be infatuated with it. IV. 260. *b.* 261. *a. b.* 262. *a.* A reflexion on its horoſcopes. 369. *a. b.* 370. *a.* It would be a kind of Magic, if it could foretel future events. 938. *a. b.* 939. *a.* II. 391. *a.*

Aſtrologer. An Aſtrologer who ſtarved himſelf to death, to confirm his prediction. II. 320. *b.* An Aſtrologer who frightens the Duke of Guiſe. III. 873. The greateſt part of Aſtrologers are not cautious enough in their predictions. 436. *b.* They can turn their horoſcopes to the advantage of their religion. 935. *a. b.* Aſtronomers ſent to the Gallies, and for what reaſon. IV. 936. *a.* Their vanity and tricks. 261. *b.* Their ſubterfuges. 264. *a. b.* They rather chuſe to relate facts which are little to their credit, than to conceal the reaſons which they can aſſign for them by their principles. 267. *b.* Aſtrologers expoſed by Gaſſendus. 531. *b.* 532. *a. b.* Aſtrologers confounded. V. 243. *a. b. to* 246. *a. b.* It is not an eaſy matter to diſcredit them. 245. *a. b.* Few of them venture to draw retrograde horoſcopes. 295, 296. *a. b.* Why they cannot ſee the gallantries of their wives in the ſtars. 322. *a. b.* They threaten a deluge for the year 1524, and cauſe a general alarm. IV. 380.

Aſtronomers muſt needs have been free from ſenſuality. I. 295. *b.* 296. *a.* In what manner Ovid and Pliny ſpeak of them. III. 462. *a. b.*

Aſtronomy, Socrates diſſuaded the ſtudy of it. I. 311. *a. b.*

Aſylums very ſcarce. An enquiry made at Rome into falſe ones. IV. 555. *b.* 556. *a.*

Atellanæ, what ſort of Comedies they were. IV. 90.

Atheiſm, does not give us more falſe notions of the nature of God than the Pagan religion. I. 132. *a.* Whether it be a leſs evil than the worſhip of the Pagan deities. 382. *a.* Whether it be not a kind of Atheiſm to admit a firſt mover, and to maintain at the ſame time that the world is eternal. 562. *b.* It isalmoſt without example among women. 639. *a.* It requires a certain degree of force and furious ſtrength of mind to fall into Atheiſm. II. 450. *b.* 451. *a. b.* 452. *a. b.* 648. *b.* It is not by ſatires that Atheiſm muſt be combated. III. 132. *a. b.* There are three degrees of it. V. 324. *a. b.* When it began to appear in France and in Italy. 286. *a. b.*

Atheiſts, what, according to them, was the cauſe and origin of the laws that are eſtabliſhed among men. II. 571. *b.* Their ſyſtem. 552. *a. b.* 553. *a. b.* Thoſe who are ſo by perſuaſion do not amuſe themſelves with preaching up impiety. III. 648. *b.* Whether it is poſſible for them to be Magicians. IV. 938. *b. to* 940. *a. b.* One is accuſed of being an Atheiſt, whenever he refuſes to adopt all the particular articles of his ſect. III. 470. *b.* 471. *a.* When and how men begin to turn Atheiſts. 768. *b.* An Atheiſt hanged and burnt at the Greve. IV. 845. *b.* Who, as ſome ſay, write the beſt againſt Atheiſts. III. 132. *a. b.* An explanation concerning the remarks which are diffuſed thro' this Dictionary, touching their good morals. V. 811. *to* 814. It is leſs ſurprizing that they ſhould have lived like honeſt men, than that Idolaters ſhould have done good actions. 811. Self-love was the end of their good actions. 812. Examples of their bad morals cited by the author, who had enquired after more. 813. Theoretical Atheiſts, Diagoras, Vanini, Spinoza, *&c. ibid.*

Athenæus is cenſured for a fault againſt good ſenſe. I. 116. *a. b.* To whom the public is indebted for the firſt edition of that author. IV. 295. He makes

Herodotus ſay what he does not ſay, with reſpect to the Egyptian prieſts, 789. *b.* 790. *a.*

Athenæus the Philoſopher, what he ſaid after he was ſet at liberty by Auguſtus. I. 537. *b.*

Athenagoras, whether as Deputy for the Chriſtians he preſented his apology to the Imperial Court. I. 531. *a. b.* 532. *a.* He had heterodox opinions. *ibid. b.* 533. *a.*

Athenians offer ſacrifices in behalf of all the Greeks. I. 5. *a.* The worſhip which they paid to the god Boreas. II. 81. They introduce fictions and idle ſtories into their ſyſtem of religion: *ibid. b.* 82. *a. b.* When and by whom they were delivered from the dominion of the thirty tyrants. 548. *a.* What value they ſet upon the freedom of their city. 558. *b.* They aſſiſt Ariſtagoras, and help him to burn the city of Sardis. 599. *b.* What they do againſt Diagoras. 652. *a.* 653. *a. b.* 654. *a. b.* An explication of their decree, touching the Tragedies of Æſchylus. 826. *b.* A law of theirs which prohibited women and ſlaves to ſtudy Phyſic. 453. A curious piece of Hiſtory on that ſubject. *ibid. a. b.* The Athenians cenſured for their want of courage, by Demetrius. 714. *a.* Their laws abrogated by Chriſtianity. IV. 128. *a.* How they were cured of a panic that was occaſioned by an eclipſe of the ſun. 565. *b.* 566. *a.* They put ſix of their generals to death moſt unjuſtly. 581. *a.* Plunder Apollo by ſea and land. 621. *b.* 622. *a.* Forbid their Sophiſts to plead cauſes. 784. *a.* They ſuffered a man to marry his ſiſter by the father's ſide but not by the mother's V. 49. *b.* Baniſhment the common fate of thoſe who governed them. II. 259.

Athens, a conteſt between Neptune and Minerva, which of them ſhould give a name to that city. I. 445. A man was in danger of loſing his life there, when he entertained certain notions touching the properties of the ſtars. 307. *b.* It was fertile in producing informers. 468. *a.* We have nothing but a fair repreſentation of that Republic, which in truth was enſlaved by the Demagogues. IV. 581. *b.* It was propoſed there to add a new tribe to the ten old ones. 557. *b.* A collection of the decrees of the people of Athens, a work that is loſt, and the loſs of which is to be regretted. II. 562. *a.* The Areopagus of Athens, was formidable to Atheiſts and impious perſons. 572. *a. b.* 573. *a.*

Athenion, by what means he became very powerful in Athens. V. 379. *b.*

Athletics, their abſtinence. I. 142. *a.* The antient Greeks and Romans made them wear girdles. III. 964. *a.*

— *Atia*, the mother of Auguſtus, what country ſhe was of. IV. 397. *a.* She durſt not go into a bath, and for what reaſon. 407. *b.*

Atlas, the coaſt of Teuchira is called the manſions inhabited by him. IV. 252. *b.*

Atomiſts, are not ſo abſurd in their ſyſtem as the Spinoziſts in theirs: the reaſon of it. II. 644. *a.* They admit an infinite number of firſt principles. V. 827.

Atoms, the difference between the atoms of Democritus and thoſe of Epicurus. II. 779. *a.* The advantage that may be drawn from the ſuppoſition of their being animated. *ibid. b.* 790. *a. b.* 791. *a. b.* 792. *a. b.* III. 790. *b.* 791. *a. b.* 792. *a.* Their motion of declination did no ways ſerve the two purpoſes for which Epicurus deſigned it. II. 791. *a. b.* 792. *a.* The abſurdity of ſuch a motion. *ibid.* Who was the inventer of atoms. III. 788. *a.* They are admitted with a vacuum, by a ſect of Philoſophers in the Eaſt. 792. *a.* An obſervation upon that Hypotheſis. IV. 437. *b.* 438. *a.* The bare motion of atoms, is not able to produce that regularity which is to be ſeen in plants. 266. *b.* 267. *a.*

Attack: the greateſt generals, and thoſe who are appointed by Heaven to perform the greateſt exploits, do not take all the towns which they attack. V. 655.

Attention of a profound and ſingular kind. II. 597. *b.* 637. *b.* 638. *a.*

Atticus (Pomponius) the longer his epiſtles were, the finer they were. I. 427. *b.* Statues were erected to him at Athens. 539. *b.* He was of the ſect of Epicurus, and nevertheleſs a man of great worth. 541.

Attila kills himſelf on his wedding-day, by too much drinking. III. 482. *a.* Being ſoftened by a ſpeech he marches back beyond the Danube. 758. *b.* 759. *a.* His ſeverity to one of his Panegyriſts. IV. 169.

Attilius, whether he ought to be ranked among the Tragic or Comic writers. I. 60. *b.*

Attorneys: There never was a ſaint of that profeſſion. IV. 487. *b.*

Avarice, a ſentence of Bion's touching that vice, canonized by St Paul. II. 15. Bad excuſes for that vice. V. 147. *b.* 148. *a. b.* The ſordid avarice of a Profeſſor of Phyſic. 136. *a. b.* 137. *a.*

Avaux (the Count d') ſends ſeveral copies of the book intituled, *Lux in Tenebris*, &c. to Paris. III. 679. *a.*

Aubertin, the plan of his book on the Euchariſt. I. 545. *a. b.*

Aubeterre (the Viſcount d') what trade he followed at Geneva for a livelihood. V. 187. *b.*

Aubignac (the Abbot d') his academy was compoſed of perſons of merit and erudition. V. 444. *b.*

Aubigné (d') has improved upon a paſſage of Thuanus. I. 119. *a. b.* A paſſage of his criticized. 711. *a.* Examination of a ſtory which he relates. II. 148. *a. b.* He renders his other ſtories ſuſpected by his ſatirical ſtrokes. *ibid. b.* His miſtake as to the place where Goudimel was maſſacred. III. 197. *a.* Whether he was deſcended from Joan d'Albret, Queen of Navarre. IV. 331, 332. *a. b.* What he ſays of a book of taxes. 649. *b.* 650. *a.* Remarks upon two paſſages of his. V. 733. He is deputed by the King of Navarre touching the affront offered to his wife. IV. 341. *b.* Cenſured on that head. *ibid.*

Aubigné (Conſtant d') ſon to the foregoing: his children. I. 546. *b.*

Audebert, a Jeſuit, offers in the name of his communion to give up many things for the ſake of peace. I. 263. *b.* He enters into ſecret negotiations with ſome miniſters for the re-union of the two religions. III. 123. *a. b.* Gives in a project of re-union to Cardinal Richelieu. V. 804.

Audiguier (d') quoted. II. 128. *b.* 129. *b.* III. 300. *b.* 301. *a.* 857. *a.* 859. *b.* Two authors of that name. I. 548.

Auditors, their memory is a terrible thing to preachers, and advocates who contradict themſelves. I. 351. *b.*

Avein, the ſmall advantages that were reaped from that victory. III. 829. *b.*

Aventine (John) The Proteſtants publiſhed his annals from an entire manuſcript. I. 549. *a.* His fate may be compared with that of Father Paul. 551. *a.* He is accuſed of having forged ſeveral ſatirical reflexions, in order to ſlander the Popes. III. 233. *b.* 234. *a.* He reſolutely denies the ſtory of the She-Pope, and paves the way for all thoſe who have denied it ſince. IV. 731. *b.* 732. *a.* 710. *b.* He is cried down by the Cardinals, Baronius and Bellarmin. 732. *a.*

Aventinus (Mount) the mutinous populace withdraws to it. III. 490. *b.*

Averroës was Avicenna's rival and enemy. I. 553. *a.* His opinion touching the ſoul, or univerſal intellect, common to all particular underſtandings. 554. *a. b.* 555. *a. b.* II. 316. *b.* IV. 913. *a.* At preſent no body waſtes time in reading him. I. 556. *a.* His irreligion. *ibid. b.* 557. *a. b.* He wiſhed his ſoul might be among the Philoſophers. IV. 704. *b.* N. Vernias, and A. Niphus maintain his opinion on the unity of the intellect. 377. *b.*

Augſburg, the magiſtrates of that city erect a ſchool, which they call St Ann's. III. 145. *b.* When and how their library was enriched with good manuſcripts. 478. *a.* What office is that of *Duumvir*, and that of *Prætor* in that city. V. 447. *a.* Popery is baniſhed from thence. IV. 285. *b.* 286. *a.*

Auguries, reaſons againſt the ſcience of Auguries. II. 629. *b.* The Roman ladies went to ſeek for nuptial Auguries or preſages. IV. 200. *b.*

Auguſtin (Saint) the reaſon he gives why Adam did not conſummate his marriage till after his fall. I. 22. *a. b.* He is cenſured for his looſe morality on a capital point. 91. *a. b.* In what he makes the opening of our firſt parents eyes to conſiſt. 101. *a. b.* He is called an *African*, violent and full of heat. 106. *a.* is called *obſcure* in his writings, and *fickle* in his notions with reſpect to the doctrine of Grace. *ibid.* He is ill treated by ſome Proteſtants. 109. *b.* He approves of Cicero's raillery upon a religious worſhip which conſiſted in weeping. 114. *a.*

His

His exclamation on Abraham's concubinage. 123. *a.* He found an apology for perſecution in Sarah's. treatment of Hagar. *ibid.* Is deſervedly reprimanded for it in the Philoſophical Commentary. *ibid.* A paſſage of that Father againſt perſecution. 287. *b.* 288. *a.* What he ſaid of Apollonius Tyanæus. 282. *a.* and of Apuleius. 394. *a.* His authority with the Roman Catholics. 470. *a.* The picture which he has drawn of his youth. 562. *a. b.* 563. *a. b.* He gave himſelf up betimes to debauchery. 563. *a. b.* His ſyſtem, for which the Church of Rome has engaged her reſpect, caſts her into perplexity. 564. *a. b. to* 566. *a.* He aſks of God the gift of continency, but is afraid of being taken at his word. 108. *a.* Has ſolidly refuted the doctrines of Democritus. 643. *a.* And has ſhewn us the difference between that Philoſopher and Epicurus. *ibid.* He begs of God the grace of being delivered from certain dreams. III. 73. *a.* He is ſeverely reprimanded by a modern author, on account of ſome notions touching the practice of the Cynics. 458. *b.* By what arguments he ſupports the miracles of the Scripture againſt the Heathens. 578. *b.* Reflexion on one of the effects of prejudice. *ibid. and* 579. *a.* He throws the blame of an ignominious peace which Jovian had made, upon Julian. 586. *a.* Ridicules Paganiſm. 642. *a.* One of his objections examined. 912. *b.* 913. *a.* It was an happy thing that he abandoned the Manichean Hereſy. IV. 95, 96. He is unjuſtly cenſured by Tanaquillus Faber with reſpect to the licentiouſneſs of the ſtage. 568. *a. b.* Was more fortunate than wiſe in his notions touching the ſoul of beaſts. 901. *b.* His exaggeration of Sarah's decay. V. 53. *b.* He has not made a good apology for the conduct of Sarah and Abraham. 54. *b.* 55. *a. b.* People have no great opinion of the learning of St Auguſtin's Friars. 235. *a.* He made an improper choice of examples to convince the Heathens, that the mother of Jeſus Chriſt was a virgin. 772. *a. b.* His maxim touching the neceſſity of ſpeaking about obſcene things. III. 135. *b.* What he ſaid of the gods Stercutius and Cloacina, and of ſome people who ſeemed to ſing when they broke wind. *ibid.*

Auguſtin (Antony) cenſured upon the ſubject of the *Familia Hortenſia.* III. 490. *a.* He is ſent by the Pope to Philip II. IV. 200. Is a friend of John Metel's. *ibid.*

Auguſtus remits an hundred talents to the inhabitants of the iſland of Coos, for the Venus Anadyomene. I. 369. *a.* One of his jeſts. II. 356. *b.* He was the firſt who took cognizance of Defamatory Libels, in order to puniſh the authors of them. 353. *a. b.* 354. *a. b.* 355. *a. b.* 356. *a.* His deſign was to marry his daughter Julia to Cotiſon, King of the Getæ, and that he himſelf ſhould marry the daughter of the ſame Cotiſon. 560. *a.* He makes choice in the enemies army of thoſe whom he intended to admit to his greateſt familiarity. 632. *b.* The Poets of his court were animated with the ſame ſpirit as the Poets of the preſent time. 715. *a.* He had a ſingular tenderneſs for Druſus. 717. *a.* How he would have the ſupreme authority called. 718. *a.* He cauſes a library to be erected in the temple of Apollo Palatinus. III. 8. *a.* To what length his weakneſs, touching dreams, proceeded. IV. 73. *b.* The empire was foretold to him when he was an infant. 369. *a.* Reflexion on that prediction. *ibid. b. and* 370. *a.* It was under him that dancing came to its perfection. 646. *b.* A fine edict of that Emperor for preſerving the chaſtity of maids. V. 337. *a.* His treatment of Ovid. IV. 445. Idolized literally by that Poet. *ibid. and* 446. *a. b.* His grief and his anger muſt have been awakened when Ovid mentioned what he had ſeen, and what was the cauſe of his baniſhment. 443. *b.* Suetonius ſays nothing to inſinuate his amours with his daughter or grand-daughter. 444. *a.* Reaſons againſt the conjecture of his being guilty of inceſt with his grand-daughter. *ibid. b.* His policy in not recalling Ovid from baniſhment. *ibid. and* 445. *a.* He orders all inſtruments concerning debts, which occaſioned calumnies and quarrels, to be burnt. III. 278. *a.*

Avignon ſold to the Pope for a very inconſiderable ſum. IV. 301, 304.

Aulus Gellius, a whole chapter of his quoted. I. 127. *a. b.* Examination of his apology for Virgil. II. 234. *a. b.* His opinion touching the abſurdities that were aſcribed to Democritus. 639. *b.* He did not underſtand a *graſhopper* by the word *ſaltatricula.* III. 491. *b.* He is falſely corrected upon the ſubject of Lævius. 699. *a. b.* Cenſured. II. 259. *a.* The difference of that author's chapters according to the different editions. 385. *a.*

Aunoi (Madam d') quoted. IV. 365. *a. b.*

Aurelian, the ſeverity of his morals was only fit for the ſect of the Montaniſts. I. 571. *a.* What ſirname was given to him. *ibid. b.* The judgment which Vopiſcus paſſed upon that Prince. 576. *b.* His elogy. 575. *b.* 576. *a.* In what manner he juſtifies himſelf for having led a Queen in triumph. V. 603. *a.*

Aurelius (Marcus), the piece attributed to that Emperor is not the hiſtory of his life, as Naudé believed it was. II. 321. His anſwer to thoſe who adviſed him to divorce his wife. III. 793. *a.*

Auſonius, whether or not he was a Chriſtian. I. 582. *b.* 583. *a. b.* He was cenſured with reſpect to the dead body of Hector. 81. *b.* To what a degree an epigram of that Poet was admired. II. 619. *b.* He ingeniouſly obviates an objection in his acknowledgment to Gratian. III. 107. *a.*

Auſpices, reaſons againſt the ſcience of Auſpices. II. 629. *b.* 630. *a.* Who invented it. V. 386.

Auſterities of ſome Indian Philoſophers. II. 115. *a. b.* 116. *a. b.* III. 312. *b.* 313. *a. b.*

Auſtralians, their particular make. V. 4. *a. b.* 5. *a.* Their notion of eternal reſt. *ibid. a. b.* Why they never ſpeak of God. *ibid. b.* Their origin, and the notion they have with reſpect to that of the Europeans. *ibid.* 6. *a.* Who the author is that ſpeaks of the Auſtralians. 7. *a. b.*

Auſtria (the houſe of), from whence it derives its pedigree, according to the Benedictine Monks. I. 341. *a. b.* Who reſtored that houſe to all its former ſplendor in Germany. II. 692. It carries on the negotiation at Munſter with great policy. 691. *b.* Its proſperity notwithſtanding the threatenings of ſome pretended Prophets. 537, 538, 539. 690, 691, 692. III. 682. *a. b.* 683. *a.* Richelieu formed a deſign to humble it. I. 785, 786. *a.* Cardinal de Berulle oppoſes it, and is ſeconded by Marillac, Keeper of the Seals, *&c. ibid. a.* It cauſes the troops of the Circle of Burgundy to enter the Electorate of Cologn. II. 224. *a. b.*

Auſtria (Anne of) her anſwer to a Bookſeller. I. 544. *b.* See *Anne.*

Auſtria (Don John of) headed a party that oppoſed the Queen-Regent. IV. 365.

Authority (the way of), people come back to it after having cried it down. I. 242. *b.* 243. *a.* IV. 474. *a.* Without it every ſect is liable to be ſplit into a great variety of ſubdiviſions. I. 287. Whether the Roman Catholics and Proteſtants differ in that reſpect. IV. 65. *a.* The difficulties attending the ſaid way. 361. *a. b.* to 364. *a.* 535. *a. b.* 536. *a.* It neceſſarily leads every particular man to be of the national religion. 792. *a.* To make a right uſe of the ſaid way in our ſearch after truth, we muſt firſt examine where it reſides. 536. *a.* to 538. *a.*

Authority of the Pope: John-Thomas Rocaberti writes ſeveral volumes in defence of it, and cauſed to be printed at his own expence a collection in twenty volumes *in folio* under the title of *Bibliotheca Pontificia.* IV. 883.

Authors: An author divided into three, and his works in the ſame manner. I. 12. When a perſon has a mind to deſcribe an author by his relations, he ſhould ſpeak of relations that are known. 652. *b.* At what time an author may be ſaid to flouriſh and become illuſtrious. II. 396. *b.* His age may almoſt be as eaſily known by the ſtrokes of his pen, as by the features of his face. IV. 689. *a.* Authors who quote no body hope to be quoted themſelves. I. 20. *a.* They copy after each other. 23. *b.* Ought not to be cited for conjectures which other perſons have advanced. 63. *b.* Ought to make their retreat in time. 120. *a. b.* II. 619. They are very unwilling to confeſs a miſtake. 161. *b.* No authors cite themſelves ſo often as thoſe who ſuppreſs their names. 181. *b.* Several of them falſify facts in order to make them ſerve their purpoſes. 198. *a. b.* Some perſons, thro' too much care of becoming good authors, never become authors at all. 200. *b.* Authors that were only rich

in

in words. 330. *a.* Thoſe who amplify what they quote cannot be too much cenſured for it. 338. *b.* They ought never to ſuppreſs the principal circumſtances of a fact. 372. *a.* It would be of great uſe to criticize on their falſe Logic. 394. *b.* They ſometimes put off their creditors with an aſſignment on the next dedication. 442. *a.* Their addreſs and policy. 451. 460. *b.* II. 643. *b.* Their rude and unpolite behaviour in former times, when they were at war with one another. I. 514. *b.* They occaſion a great deal of obſcurity by their neglecting to put the words in their natural order. 602. *b.* They change maxims as their occaſions require; but chiefly Divines do ſo. 616. *a.* 617. *a. b.* A moral reflexion which may ſerve to comfort authors of a low rank. 701. *a.* It is very uſeful to collect examples of their inſincerity. 799. *b.* Authors ought continually to be on their guard againſt diſtractions of mind. 759. *a.* Profane authors may be conſulted in order to explain the chronology of the Scripture. 775. *b.* They ought to be acquainted with the moſt common books, and the moſt ſcarce pamphlets. II. 94. *a.* There are things which authors never publiſh when they rightly underſtand their duty. 266. *b.* There are ſome who would never have been authors if they had not been attacked. 328. *a.* Many falſely brag of having been familiarly acquainted with an author that is grown into reputation by his writings. 284. *b.* 404. *b.* Severe tribunals ſhould be ſet up againſt ſome authors. 451. *b.* An author who is a Layman is more at liberty than a Preacher to ſpeak his ſentiments. 454. *b.* There are ſome authors who do not publiſh every part of a work according to its order. 484. *b.* They relate what the Antients tell us, with a thouſand alterations. 535. *b.* It is hardly poſſible that future ages ſhould not put ſeveral quite different conſtructions upon what authors ſay. 595. *b.* III. 447. *b.* The different circumſtances in which they are, contribute much to make them more or leſs famous. II. 518. *b.* Their diſputes never fail to produce effects that are fatal to the reputation which they had as men of worth. 583. *b.* Perſons who have wrote books concerning authors of the ſame name. 633. *a. b.* They do not love that another ſhould interfere with them. 683. *a.* The groſs artifice of thoſe who make a merit of being hated by people of other perſuaſions. 695. *b.* Whether ſome Proteſtant authors were hated by the Romans Catholics, becauſe they defended the good cauſe well. *ibid.* Authors that quote no body do not deſerve to be quoted. 778. *a. b.* 779. *a.* The moſt effectual method of reſtraining ſuch of them as are given to ſlander. 800. *a. b.* Thoſe of the firſt rank ought to die, as ſoon as their glory is arrived at its meridian. 825. *a.* It is ſometimes dangerous to be too laviſh in beſtowing praiſes upon them. III. 249. *b.* Their tenderneſs for their own works is immoderate. 377. *a.* 378. *b.* 384. *a. b.* Their fate is deplorable: for even when they think that they apply their utmoſt attention, they miſtake the ſenſe of the eaſieſt paſſages. 838. *b.* They forget in one place of the ſame book, what they have ſaid in another. 14. *b.* There are ſome who compoſe treatiſes which are only fit to be poſthumous ones. 175. *b.* 176. *a.* There are ſome who ſeem to compoſe with a wonderful facility, who nevertheleſs take great pains in writing. 261. *b.* 262. *a. b.* IV. 85. *a. b.* 86. *a.* They ought ſometimes to prefer their own judgments before the judgments of others. 337. *b.* What they ought to do in order to obtain rewards from the public. 340. *a. b.* A cauſe of their miſtakes, that ſpreads itſelf farther than is imagined. 451. *b.* There are ſome who correct their writings too much. 836. *a. b.* 877. *a.* There are ſome who are harder to be pleaſed in the beginning than in the ſequel of their work. *ibid. b.* There are others, who, reviſing a work they deſire to reprint, are at greater pains, than at the firſt compoſition. *ibid.* There are ſome who are only learned in their collections. 195. *a. b.* One of the cauſes which have produced chimerical authors. 402. *b.* There are ſcarce any who do not complain of the ingratitude of the age. 459. *b.* to 461. *a.* It is impoſſible that thoſe who have a great many adverſaries ſhould not contract an habit of reproachful language. 475. *a.* They ſhould miſtruſt their memory, and not alledge any thing without firſt conſulting over again the books where they had read it. 568. *b.* They ſeldom give any thing for nothing, in point of praiſes and compliments. 595. *a. b.* Have a right to coin new words. 743. *a. b.* It were to be wiſhed that they were neither poor nor rich. 894. *b.* 895. *a.* In what ſenſe thoſe who traffic with their works are to be commended, and in what ſenſe to be blamed. 843. *a.* What authors have wrote collections of proverbs. V. 199. *a. b.* One is ſeldom at a loſs to find out the religion of the preſent authors. 235. *a.* Their bad way of quoting. 325. *b.* 326. *a.* Famous authors get honour by indifferent performances. 340. *b.* Reflexion upon the conduct of thoſe who procure the prohibition of their adverſaries books. 343. *a.* And upon the conſequences that may be drawn from their writings to their morals. 420. *a. b. &c.* There are ſome of them whom it would be very difficult to enrich. 403. *b.* Modern authors ſhould advance nothing but what they have credible witneſſes for. II. 639. *a.* A maxim which they ought carefully to ſtudy. V. 738. *a.* There are no authors ſo ſubject as Poets to forget their promiſes not to print any more. II. 83. *a.* Fontaine's verſes upon that ſubject. *ibid.* Menage's chapters upon the ſame ſubject. *ibid. b.* It is a method of obliging an author in the moſt agreeable manner, to adviſe people to buy his books. 314. A great author of little books, who was ſo called, and in what ſenſe. 528. An author who ſuffers ſome things to be inſerted in his works gives a handle for ſaying that they are not his. 688, 689. The ſmalleſt change of letters in their proper names multiplies them without reaſon. III. 534. It is a crying injuſtice to deſpiſe authors who had great obſtacles to ſurmount at a time when literature was but beginning to revive. IV. 166. *a.* Some authors ſurpaſs them at preſent, who would not have equalled them, if they had lived in their time. *ibid.* It is not without example, that a lacquey has become a diſtinguiſhed author. 173. *b.* Typographical errors multiply them. 193. One cannot do an author a greater diſſervice than by proclaiming his works under too pompous a character. 284. *a.* Several are negligent in correcting their works, and give it over. 451. *a.* The ableſt authors rather chuſe to be ſilent than to attack a book that is too ſtrong for them. V. 179. *b.* 180. *a.* It is allowable for them to contrive the matter ſo as to make their books acceptable. 810.

Automata: The hypotheſis of Automata is the only way to get out of the plunge. II. 779. *b.* Whether or not, and how far, Des Cartes was the inventer of them. IV. 546. *b.* Whether the Antients taught that the ſouls of beaſts were only Automata. 552. *a. b.* to 554. *a. b.* The greateſt difficulties which attend that ſyſtem. 908. *b.* 909. *a. b.* The Automata of Des Cartes are very advantageous to the true religion. 901. *b. & ſeq.*

Autumn of age, how far it reaches. IV. 163. *a.*

Auvergnates (in Latin *Arverni*) boaſted to have Julius Cæſar's ſword. II. 419. *b.* When and by what means they appeared at the court of France in the higheſt poſts. I. 482. *a.*

Auvergne (the Count Dauphin of) killed in the King's preſence, and in full council. II. 463. *a. b.*

Auxerre, the rebellion of that city. I. 258. *b.* The ſervice which the Sieur de Chaſtelux performed to the Chapter of that city, and what privilege was granted to him by the Chapter. II. 461. *a.*

Axtius (the Phyſician) condemned to make a public recantation of a calumny which he had vented. IV. 504. *b.*

Azizus, King of the Emeſenians, cauſes himſelf to be circumciſed, to marry a Jew. II. 701.

Azotus, the length of its ſiege. I. 590. IV. 790.

Azrun, twin-ſiſter to Cain occaſions the death of Abel, and how. I. 24. *a.* She marries Cain. *ibid.*

B.

Babylonian numbers, Horace would not ſuffer them to be conſulted. II. 125.

Babylonians: They boaſted of an antiquity which far exceeded the age of the world. I. 595. *a. b.* Father Hardouin's correction of a paſſage of Pliny touching the antiquity of letters among them, explained. 596. *a. b.*

Bacchus, the celebration of his feaſt required continence the preceding night. III. 934. *a.* He was adored by the Pagans under an infamous name. V. 134. *a. b.* He encroaches leſs upon Venus in the ſouth, than Venus upon Bacchus in the north. II. 823. *a. b.*

Bacon: his new Atlantis. III. 345. *a.*

Baden, how the Swiſs bathe there. V. 423. *b.*

Baden (the Marquis of) introduces the reformation in his dominions. III. 256.

Baduellus: his quarrel with William Bigot. II. 8. *a. b.*

Bagnio-keepers. The Bagnio-keepers of Paris had a mind to aſſaſſinate James des Parts, becauſe he forbid the uſe of baths in time of peſtilence. IV. 484. *b.*

Baïard fought a duel with Alphonſo de Sotomajore, in the year 1503. V. 139. *b.*

Bajazet ſets the Count de Nevers at liberty upon his paying his ranſom. II. 206. *a. b.* 207. *a.* He ſends to Rome the iron of the lance, which pierced the body of our Saviour. III. 566. *a. b.* He loved Philoſophy. 729. *a. b.*

Baif (Lazarus de) goes as far as Rome to attend the leſſons of a Greek Profeſſor. IV. 295. *b.*

Baif (John Antony de), what he ſays of his poverty and education. V. 462. *a. b.*

Baillet quoted. I. 219. *b.* 220. *a. b.* III. 662. *a. b.* *& paſſim alibi.* Praiſed for his civility and equity. I. 796. *a.* His judgment upon what paſſed in the Conference of Ratiſbon. III. 536. *a.* He has forgot an *Anti* in the collection that he has made. 701. *b.* His civility to the author of this Dictionary is an exceſs of ceremony, prejudicial to the liberty which every body ought to enjoy in the commonwealth of learning. IV. 548. *b.* His diſcourſe of the life of the ſaints. V. 433. *b.*

Bains, the Emperor Charles V is magnificently feaſted there. III. 530. *a.* Henry entirely burns down the magnificent palace which was there. *ibid. b.*

Baldus, a quick repartee which he made. I. 616. *a.*

Baldus Lupatinus, upon a ſuſpicion of Hereſy is thrown into the ſea, after he had been impriſoned twenty years. III. 557. *a.*

Ballets: The uſe of ballets was eſtabliſhed in France, before Mary de Medicis brought Rinuccini there. IV. 879. *a. b.*

Balls dangerous to chaſtity. V. 23. *a. b.* to 25. *a. b.*

Balqhane, a noble family in Scotland. III. 784.

Baltaſarini, See *Beaujoyeux*.

Baluzius, the hiſtory of his diſpute with the Abbot Faget. IV. 102. *b.* 103. *a. b.* He has furniſhed the author with divers memoirs. 427. *n.* (*a*). V. 111. *n.* (*a*). *a. n.* (1).

Balyra, a river of the Peloponneſus, whence ſo called. V. 326. *b.*

Balzac, his pleaſant reflexion on Alexander ab Alexandro. I. 224. *a.* *Balzac* and *Balſac* are very different. 622. *a.* A curious piece, which gives room to ſuſpect that Balzac had once a mind to turn Huguenot in Holland. 623. *a. b.* Very ill uſed by Theophilus. *ibid. b.* His jokes on the impatiency of modern women who have too cold huſbands. II. 79. *a. b.* Quoted. 350. *a.* V. 333. *a. b. n.* (1), (2). He looked upon it as a ſad puniſhment to be obliged to praiſe all new printed books. II. 620. *b.* He ridicules a Grammarian who hectored the Deity. 648. *b.* 649. *a.* His criticiſm on Alexander cenſured by Coſtar. 667. *b.* What he ſays of ſome devout women in Spain. III. 82. *a. b.* One plainly perceives that his productions coſt him a great deal of pains. 262. *b.* IV. 85. *a. b.* The ſource of his difference with Phyllarchus. III. 204. *a.* How much he contributed to the politeneſs which is ſpread over the kingdom of France. 855. *a.* He inveighs againſt Montmaur. IV. 249. *a. b.* 250. *a. b.* He would fain have been thought the author of a work which he did not write. 279. *a. b.* 280. *a. b.* What he ſaid of the contrariety of ingredients in the human compoſition. 441. *a.* He had too much vanity. 459. *b.* He expreſſes himſelf too eloquently upon the ſubject of his diſeaſes. 461. *a.* How he ſpeaks of the Prince of Condé with reſpect to a civil war. 488. *b.* He ſays that he loved the Proteſtants much. 528. *a.* Could not endure the word *Pangloſſia.* 531. *b.* He tells a witty ſaying of Cato the Cenſor. 754. *b.* 755. *a.* He is guilty of a ſmall piece of plagiariſm in making uſe of the words which Famianus Strada applied to Quintus Curtius. 811. *b.* A judgment paſſed upon his works. V. 345. *b.* 346. *a. b.* His character of d'Audiguier. I. 548. *b.* He brings a ridiculous charge againſt ſome anonymous perſons. 801. *a. b.* He ridicules the vain diſplay of reading, which was a cuſtom that formerly prevailed at the bar. II. 105. *b.* A trick which he made uſe of to give one a great idea of his reading. 398. *b.* A ſupplement to the hiſtory of his diſpute with Father Goulu. IV. 284. *a. b.* 285. *a. b.* Jokes upon his works. 284. *b.* He beſtows hyperbolical praiſes on the Abbot de St Cyran. V. 15. *b.*

Bandel relates an elogy given to Luther by Leo X. III. 766. *b.*

Bangius, a learned Dane, would not accept the place of Hebrew Profeſſor, but upon condition that he ſhould go to Paris to perfect himſelf under Gabriel Sconita. IV. 493. *a.*

Baniſhment; ſome people have looked upon it as a piece of good fortune. I. 637. *b.* The common fate of thoſe, who had the greateſt ſhare in the government of the commonwealth of Athens. II. 289.

Banquet of the wiſe-men; is a defamatory Libel compoſed by Father Garaſſe, againſt the honour of one of the firſt Magiſtrates of France. III. 134. Alegambe does not deny it. *ibid.*

Banquets, there are ſome which are as dangerous to certain people, as a ſet battle to a Colonel. III. 846. *a.*

Baptiſm, in the Primitive Church, people received it naked, of what age or ſex ſoever they were. III. 331. *a.* And ſeveral put off receiving it till the laſt moment of their lives. V. 257. *b.*

Bar, its tireſome wranglings. II. 724. *a. b.* The vain reading which people formerly diſplayed there. 105. *b.*

Baram, interpreter of dreams at the court of the King of Perſia. I. 87.

Barbaroſſa (Frederic), whether he was trod under foot by the Pope. II. 406. *a.*

Barbaroſſa, King of Algiers, takes Fondi by aſſault, and what was his motive. III. 189. *b.*

Barbo (Nicholas), a noble Venetian, father to Pope Paul II. IV. 509.

Barchobebus paſſes for the Meſſiah. I. 173. Akiba declares for him. *ibid.*

Bark, how that powder was called at firſt. III. 931. *b.*

Barnes, editor of Euripides, his explication of Lucian's Balance examined. II. 865. *b.* 866. *a.*

Barnevelt, what he ſaid to Gomarus and Arminius before the States of Holland. III. 174. *a.* One of his ſons was beheaded at the Hague, and for what reaſon. 802. *b.*

Barocius (Petrus), his gentle remonſtrances to Nicoletus Vernias, and Auguſtin Niphus. IV. 377. *a. b.*

Baronius dares not decide the point between Theodoret and Socrates, touching one of the Kings of Perſia. I. 13. *a.* Is cenſured with reſpect to St Anne. 342. *a.* Deceives the Proteſtants in the idea of a book of Damian's, to the diſadvantage of his own communion. II. 589. *b.* Why he never named, even while he confuted, the centuriators of Magdeburg. 643. *b.* Whence it comes to paſs that he confirms certain ſlanders of the Pagan authors. III. 20. *b.* He commits a fault in Chronology, which was not known to Mr du Pin. 219. *a.* Is an enemy to ſovereigns; and his annals are full of lies. V. 93. *b.* Expected to be made Pope after Paul V. 96. *b.* Continuation of his annals. II. 241. He is cenſured for what he ſays of Florimond de Remond's book touching the She-Pope. IV. 732.

Barrenneſs: The Jews ſay that an huſband ought not to cohabit with his wiſe, after he has found her barren for the ſpace of ten years. I. 122. *b.* An obſtacle to a widow's marriage. 393. *b.* Philoſophers who pretended to cure it. III. 311. *b.*

Barriere: (Don John de la) firſt Abbot of the Feuillants, his conduct during the troubles of the league, and his attachment to Henry III repreſented by Father Pradhilon. IV. 764. *a. b.*

Bartas (du) his Week is attacked with ſome ſort of reſpect. III. 128. *a. b.*

Barth (John) beats the Dutch men of war, and ſaves the corn which was in the ſhips under his convoy. IV. 211. *a.*

Barthius cenſured. I. 538. *b.* He paſſes a reaſonable judgment upon the works of Marſus. IV. 166. *a. b.* The juſtice which he does to authors who lived in the time that learning began to revive. *ibid.* He engages himſelf in a ſuperfluous refutation touching the marrow of lions. I. 76. *a.* He is not conſiſtent with himſelf. 118. *a.* His cauſeleſs fear of dying without poſterity. 664. *a.* He cenſures ſeveral great men for ranking a modern Poet among the antient authors. II. 524. *b.* His blunder touching a courtezan, whom he takes for another. III. 701. *b.* He is cenſured with reſpect to Patricius of Siena. IV. 507. *a. b.*

Bartholomew (Maſſacre of St) Charpentier's apology for that maſſacre. II. 446. *a. b.* 447. *a.* The cauſes of it falſely related. IV. 700. *b.* 701. *a. b.* An author who was not aſhamed to make an ode in praiſe of it. II. 399.

Bartolus deſires ſome time to anſwer an objection. I. 615. *a.* Cinus was his maſter, not his ſcholar. II. 508. *a.*

Baſiarians, a queſtion whether there ever will be ſuch a ſect among the Anabaptiſts. IV. 87. *b.*

Baſil, all its relics were, in the time of the council, carried and placed in the room of the abſent Biſhops. I. 178. The memory of Eraſmus is very much reſpected there: proof of it. II. 804. *a. b.* They ſhew his cloſet, *&c.* there. *ibid. b.* Twelve cart-loads of images are burnt there before the town-houſe. 813. *a.*

Baſil (St) would not have people truſt to the mutilations of eunuchs. II. 533. *b.* A compariſon which he alledges for that purpoſe. *ibid.* He makes a bad anſwer to the Manichees. IV. 112. *b.* 113. *a.* 515. *a. b.*

Baſilides (the great Duke) plunders the country of the Livonians. II. 42. *a. b.*

Baſnage quoted. II. 301. *b.* III. 943. *b.* IV. 91. *a.* 97. *See* the Diſſertation upon Junius Brutus. V. 731, *& ſeq.*

Baſnage Sieur *de Beauval*: his *Conſiderations ſur deux Sermons de Mr Jurieu*. V. 642. *a. b.* His *Lettre ſur les Differens de Mr Jurieu, & de Mr Bayle*. 645. *b. n.* (53). His *Mr Jurieu convicted of Impoſture and Calumny*. 646. *b.* 647. *a.*

Baſſompierre quoted. III. 301. *a. b.* 302. *a.* V. 531. *a.* 532. *a.* The head of that family is ſprung from the commerce of a woman with a ſpirit. IV. 408. *b.* The Hiſtory of ſome of his gallantries. V. 391. *a. b.*

Baſſora (the Prince of) pretends to be Mahomet's chief favourite, and by his credit with him to give ſuch or ſuch a place in Paradice. IV. 123. *a.*

Baſtard, whether it is a diſhonour to be one. III. 722. *a.*

Baſtards have commonly a good ſhare of wit. II. 228.

Bath: it was againſt decency among the Pagans, that a father and a ſon ſhould bathe in the ſame place. I. 563. *a. n.* (6). See *Baden.*

Baths were in uſe at Paris in the time of Charles VII. IV. 484. *b.*

Bats (Violente de) cauſes her huſband to be aſſaſſinated by her adulterers. V. 107. *a. b.* 108. *a.*

Battle, it is ridiculous for a man to boaſt of having won a battle, when he draws no advantage from it. II. 413. *a. b.* The moſt common cauſe of its uſeleſſneſs, is when the commander of the victorious army fears peace. *ibid. n.* (6).

Battles; the gaining of battels more ſubject to Hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm, than the taking of fortified places. III. 719. *b.*

Bavaria (Lewis of) excluded from the rank of Emperors, but reſtored to it by a public retractation. II. 238. *a.* His reign counted for nothing by Rainaldus, who affects to call him by no other name than *the Bavarian. ibid.* His apology by Herwart is condemned by the Inquiſition, and for what reaſon. 238. *a. b.* Who the true author of the annals of Bavaria is. III. 43. *a. b.*

Bavaria (the Elector of) ſurprizes Ulm by an admirable ſtratagem which was well executed. V. 504.

Bauderon, the ſon, accuſes John de Renou of Plagiariſm. IV. 864.

Baudouin, King of Jeruſalem, is poiſoned by his own Phyſician. IV. 383.

Baudouin (the Civilian) changes his religion as often as his linnen. I. 690. *b.* What he adviſed to be done for defeating the conference of Poiſſy. 692. *a.* He has writ a treatiſe of the means of attaining to a good reformation. 697. *b.* His anſwers to Calvin and Beza. III. 523. *a. b.* 524. *a.*

Baudrand cenſured with reſpect to Antinoe. I. 346. *a. b.* The change which happened to the city of Azotus, was juſt the reverſe of what he makes it. 590. *b.*

Baudri (Paul) Profeſſor of ſacred Hiſtory at Utrecht, made himſelf very much eſteemed by his Lectures. I. 672.

Beans, who was the firſt that abſtained from them. I. 277. *b.* The Egyptians abſtained from them. IV. 670. *a. b.* The Pythagoreans likewiſe abſtained from them, and for what reaſons. *ibid. b.* 671. *a.* The *Schola Salernitana* forbids the eating of them. *ibib. b.* Whether they can be converted into blood. 672. *a.*

Bearn, put in a better condition than it was in before. IV. 317. *a. b.* The progreſs which the Proteſtant religion makes there. 325. *a. b. to* 327. *a. b.* The exerciſe of the Catholic religion is aboliſhed there. *ibid.*

Bearnois (or *He of Bearn*) a name which thoſe concerned in the League gave to Henry IV. III. 276. *a.*

Beaſt. A diſcovery which was made of the number of the beaſt. I. 719. *b.* 720. *a.*

Beaſts, the great diſadvantages that attend moral reflexions grounded on their conduct. I. 640. *a. b.* 641. *a. b.* Theſe moral reflexions are liable to be be turned into a jeſt and ſo to be eluded. 640. *a.* Whether they could determine themſelves, if two objects were preſent, which drew them with equal force, one one way, and the other another. II. 226. *b.* 227. *a.* Anaxagoras attributed to them an intelligent ſoul, to which he gave the ſame name as to God. I. 301. *a.* Their actions perhaps are one of the moſt profound myſteries, on which our reaſon can be exerciſed. 641. *b.* Several of them have been celebrated by the wits. III. 209. *b.* Whether Des Cartes may be looked upon as the inventer of the opinion which he had about them. IV. 548. *a. b.* What was the opinion of the antient Philoſophers about the ſouls of beaſts. *ibid. b.* 549. *a. b.* 550. *a. b.* Whether the Antients taught that they were no more than *Automata.* 551. *b. to* 554. *a. b.* The facts which concern the capacity of beaſts are no leſs puzzling to the followers of Ariſtotle than to thoſe of Des Cartes. 901. *a. b.* A catalogue of thoſe who have believed that the ſouls of beaſts were rational. 902. *b. to* 905. *a. b.* The ill conſequences of the opinion which gives beaſts a ſenſitive ſoul. 905. *b.* 906. *a. b.* &c. Beaſts expoſed for a ſpectacle after their death, in order to keep other beaſts in awe. 908. *b.* Authors who have maintained that they have rational ſouls. 911. *b.* 912. *a. b.* &c. Their actions imputed to an external principle. 913. *a.* Authors who have maintained that beaſts are mere machines, or who have confuted that opinion. *ibid. b.* 914. *a. b.* &c. Different opinions about their ſouls. V. 115. *a. b.* 116. *a. b.*

Beaujoyeux renders himſelf famous at the Court of France in the reign of Henry III, by his inventions of ballets, concerts, *&c.* IV. 879. *b.*

Beaume Montreuïl (Francis de la) was ſo learned that ſhe converted a Rabbin in a regular diſputation. V. 298. *b.*

Beauty, the picture of a perfect beauty. I. 399. *a.* Of a laſting kind. 401. *a.* II. 514. *a. b.* 515. *a.* III. 371. *a. b.* 372. *a.* It wounds us at a diſtance. 65. *a.* Thirty things neceſſary to make it perfect. 363. *b.* Wherein its force conſiſts. 377. *a. b.* After ſome

ſome time the beauty of wives begins to affect their huſbands leſs. 646. *a.* Not only the ſpring but likewiſe the autumn of beauty is agreeable. IV. 236. *a.* There have been cities where not only the women, but alſo the men diſputed about beauty. V. 312. *b.* *n.* (15).

Beauvais, privileges that were granted to the women of that city. II. 217. *a.* *b.*

Becanus, his calumnies, and his falſe conſequences againſt Calviniſm. V. 441. *a.* *b.*

Bees, what we are told of their acute ſmell. II. 636. *a.*

Behme was an Enthuſiaſt. III. 689. *a.*

Being: whether the idea of Being may be applied ſynonimouſly to God and his creatures. I. 488. *b.* The general doctrine of Philoſophers touching the idea of it. V. 221. *a.* *b.* *to* 223. *a.* *b.*

Bela, King of Hungary, in what manner he recompenſed the Frangipani's who had aſſiſted him with money. III. 101. *a.* *b.*

Believe. Des-Barreaux pretended that there was nothing ſo difficult to a man of wit as to believe. II. 649. *b.*

Belino (Gentile) a famous Venetian Painter returns from the Sultan's Court loaded with preſents. IV. 54. *a.*

Bellai: Meſſieurs du Bellai concern themſelves extremely in the good ſucceſs of Henry VIIIth's divorce. I. 716. *a.* *b.* The Cardinal's conſcientious marriage. 724. *a.* The art which William du Bellai uſed with the Proteſtants of Germany. 721. *a.* *b.* Facts that concern Martin du Bellai. 721. *b.* 722. *a.* They are the patrons of William Bigot. II. 8. *a.* *b.* Tarcagnota tranſlates into Italian a treatiſe of the Military Art, which is aſcribed to William du Bellai. IV. 918. Different editions of Martin du Bellai's Memoirs. I. 722. *a.*

Bellay (the Biſhop of) is puzzled about the power that is attributed to the Holy Virgin. III. 84. *b.*

Bellantes (Antony) a Nobleman of Siena, how he got off when accuſed of ſeveral miſdemeanors. IV. 463.

Bellarmin, his contradictions. I. 132. *a.* A Proteſtant Profeſſor makes a recantation of what he had charged him with. 727. *b.* 728. *a.* One of his uſual ſayings. 732. *b.* The vow which he made in caſe the Papal dignity ſhould be conferred upon him. 733. *b.* 734. *a.* Said there were too many Chriſtians. V. 525. *b.* Acknowledges and reckons up two hundred and thirty-ſeven contrarieties of doctrine among the Romiſh Divines. III. 343. *b.* Cenſured. I. 769. *a.*

Belleforeſt, ſcruples to tranſlate what an Italian Monk had writ about love. I. 630. *b.*

Bellier (Peter) tranſlates into French a part of Philo's works: the verſion is reviſed and augmented by Frederic Morel. III. 623.

Bellievre, his embaſſy to ſave the life of Mary, Queen of Scots, was a meer farce. II. 760. *a.* Sent by Henry III to the King of Navarre, about the affront given to the Queen of Navarre. IV. 341. *a.* *b.* His negotiation in that affair. *ibid.*

Bellievre (Pompone de) Firſt Preſident in the parliament of Paris, reſtores to the ſtudents of the Canon-Law the privilege of pleading. III. 346. *a.*

Bellona; what her prieſts had in common with the prieſts of Cybele. II. 531. *b.*

Beloi (John) repreſents to the Leaguers that the Canon-Laws excommunicate thoſe who engage in intrigues about the ſucceſſion in a Prince's life-time. III. 955. *a.*

Belonius cited. IV. 35. *b.* His obſervations. III. 749. *b.* 750. *a.*

Belvederenſis (Theodorus) his writings againſt the Vaudois, and the refutations of them by Peter Gilles. III. 162. *b.*

Bembus (Cardinal) the queſtions which he put to Sabinus. IV. 193. *b.* Confounds himſelf in ſpeaking of thoſe who go round the world eaſtward or weſtward. V. 781.

Bencius: four brothers of that name, Jeſuits. I. 747.

Benedict XII (Pope): The taxes of the Penitentiary of Rome, appeared under his Pontificate. I. 629. *b.*

Benedictines, of what family the founder of their order was. I. 341.

Beneficed. A beneficed man deprived of all his revenues for not pronouncing the letter *q* as others did. IV. 837. *a.* *b.*

Benefices, the Venetian miniſters at the Court of Rome durſt not accept of any. I. 634. What anſwer Pope Hadrian VI made to thoſe who objected to him his inconſiſtent conduct with regard to their plurality. III. 330. *a.* Eccleſiaſtical Benefices given to Poets as rewards for the leud and profane verſes which they had compoſed. IV. 896. *b.* John du Tillet is the author or promoter of the edict, which prohibits the remitting money to Rome for the diſpatching of Benefices. V. 354, 355.

Benefit. To receive a benefit is to loſe one's liberty. II. 206. *a.*

Benerque, a town where the neighbours meet in arms on the 25th of April. IV. 611. *b.*

Bengy, Profeſſor at Bourges, particular facts that concern him. IV. 652. *a.* *b.*

Benivenius (Dominic) writes a book of the miracles and prophecies of Savonarola. V. 66. *b.*

Bennon, his miracles. I. 749. *a.*

Benoit (Renatus): whether he is the author of a book which clears the Proteſtants from the charge of Hereſy. IV. 373. *b.*

Benſerade; the anſwer he made when he was but ſeven or eight years of age. I. 749. *a.* Another anſwer which he made to a courtier. 753. *a.* He contradicts himſelf in his ſonnet upon Job. 967. *b.* 968. *a.* One of his Roundels quoted. V. 401. *b.*

Benſyrah, a great Cabaliſt, how he was conceived in his mother's womb. II. 114. *a.*

Benzonius (Rutilius) defends the ſtory, that Trajan's ſoul was delivered from Hell by the prayers of St Gregory. V. 397. *b.*

Berault (John) his tranſlation of Barclay's Euphormio, with a key and commentary ſubjoined. I. 647. *b.* Quoted. II. 163. *b.* *n.* (21).

Berchere (de la) Memoirs ſent for that Preſident's life. I. 264. *a.*

Berenice, her leudneſs. I. 765. *a.* *b.* 766. *a.* *b.* Titus ſends her away. 766. *b.* Her Jealouſy againſt her ſiſter Druſilla. 767. *b.* II. 701. *b.*

Berenice, a play, the judgment that was paſſed upon it. I. 767. *a.* *b.*

Bergamo (Matthew de) created a Count Palatine by the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria. I. 769. *a.* *b.*

Bergier, his treatiſe on the Point of Day. V. 776.

Bergius (John) his diſpute with Micrælius. IV. 210. *a.*

Berigardus looked upon as a great favourer of Pyrrhoniſm, and a propagater of impiety. I. 770. *b.* 771. *a.* *b.*

Bern: conferences which give occaſion to the reformation of that Canton. I. 235. The churches of that Canton diſapproved of their aboliſhing unleavened bread, the baptiſmal fonts, and the feſtivals at Geneva. II. 264. *b.*

Bernard (St) one of his maxims. I. 126. *a.* His character. 758. *and* *a.* *b.* *&* *ſeq.* He preaches up the cruſade, and promiſes very different ſucceſs from that which attended it. III. 796. *a.*

Bernartius (John) injudiciouſly cenſures Pliny, with regard to an Egyptian King. IV. 667. *a.*

Berneggerus (Matthew) aſcribes to a Jeſuit, the ſpeech which came out againſt the United Provinces, under the name of Herimannus Conrad. II. 550.

Bernier (Francis) miſtakes a word in a paſſage of Gaſſendi. IV. 763. *a.* *b.* Quoted 42. *b.* 264. *a.*

Bernier (John) his character and works. III. 967. *a.* IV. 897. *b.*

Beroaldus (Philip): how ridiculous he makes himſelf, while he endeavours to juſtify Martial and others like unto him. V. 421. *a.* He obſerves that Boccace has taken one of his beſt tales from Apuleius. II. 37. *b.* 38. *a.*

Beroaldus (Matthew) cenſured. I. 538. *a.*

Bertelier, a new confutation of his pretended act. I. 783. *b.* 784. *a.* *b.* II. 61. *b.*

Bertier, Bookſeller, what anſwer the Queen-Mother, made to him. I. 544. *a.* *b.*

Bertrade, Queen of France, her Hiſtory. III. 62. *a.* *b.* Her death. *ibid.* *b.*

Bertrand (the Preſident) is very much out with regard to the Caſſius that was ſo renowned for his integrity. II. 347. *and* *b.*

Berulle: perſons of that family. I. 786.

Beſa, the name of a city, and of a particular deity that was adored there. I. 348. *b.* The oracle of that god was ſtill in being in the reign of Conſtantius. 37. *and* *a.*

Beſançon, Thomas Buyrete admitted Miniſter at nineteen years of age, founds a private church there. II. 694. *a.*

Beſſarion (Cardinal) ſaid that the new ſaints made him call in queſtion the old ones. III. 740. *a.* How he was hindered from being made Pope. IV. 587. *a. b.* Being threatened with excommunication by Paul II, he ſigns a decree which he had not ſeen. IV. 511. *b.*

Beſtiality; Abſolution from it, what it coſt. I. 628. *a. b.*

Beton (David), Archbiſhop of St Andrews, is killed in the revolutions of Scotland. III. 666. *a.*

Betuſſi (Joſeph) his book intituled *Imagini del Tempio della Signora Donna Giovanna Aragona*. I. 402. *a.*

Beuningen (Conrad van), what he ſaid in favour of the toleration which was granted to the Mennonites in the United-Provinces. I. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* His opinion of a book which the Spaniards put out, to diſprove the pretenſions of the King of France. III. 850. *a. b.*

Beza (Theodore) treats Joſephus as he deſerves. I. 39. *a.* One of his letters was by ſome thought to be the foundation of the pretended Mahometaniſm of Paul Alciatus. 198. *b.* He is cleared from the abominable calumny which had been charged upon him. 546. *a. b.* 547. *a. and* 795. *b.* 796. *a.* His diſputes with Baudouin. 695. *a.* Whether he owned that Bellarmine had overthrown all the Proteſtant authors. 726. *a.* A cruel and impudent invective of Scioppius againſt him. 745. *b.* 746. *a.* He is calumniated. 790. *and a. b.* 795. *a. b.* 798. *a. b.* Whilſt he was young he kept a woman under the promiſe of marriage, which he performed at laſt. 791. *b.* 792. *a. and* 795. *a.* He does not explain all his reaſons for leaving Lauſanne. 792. *a.* II. 274. *a. b.* Is reproached on account of the frequent corrections which he made in the editions of his New Teſtament. I. 792. *b.* A little Macaronic book is aſcribed to him. 791. *b.* As likewiſe the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*. V. 735. Bolſec's accuſation of him is not to be credited. II. 60. *b.* 61. *a. b.* He deſerves more credit than Maimbourg and Varillas, as to the hiſtorical order of Calvin's travels, in ſuch things as neither tend to increaſe nor diminiſh the reputation of the latter. 236. *a. b.* He is upbraided with having too eagerly picked up the flying reports that were ſpread about his enemies. 364. *a.* His epigram on the picture of Eraſmus criticized. 810. *b.* He preſerves a commendable moderation in ſpeaking of the death of Henry II. III. 400. *b.* Is ſtruck with the Plague. 575. *a.* A ſtanza made on that occaſion. *ibid.* He looks upon the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy as a fundamental corruption. 666. *b.* What he ſays of Marot's morals. IV. 154. *b.* 155. *a.* His verſion of 100 Pſalms. 157. *b.* He does not give a fair anſwer to Dudithius, touching the ſentence of Zurich againſt Ochinus. 389. *a. b.* Broughton aims particularly at him, and writes him very rough letters. II. 150. He is blamed by Colomiés for altering a paſſage in the French verſion of the Pſalms. IV. 164. *b.* He expreſſes a proper indignation againſt Simon Simonius. V. 150. *b.* 151. *a.* He writes the life of Calvin in Latin and in French. II. 274. There are ſome things in the one which are not in the other. *ibid.* He retired from Lauſanne for reaſons that have not been well explained. *ibid. a. b.* His narrative touching Caraccioli different from that of Peter Martyr. 313. *b.* 314. *a. b.* He refutes the doctrine of Harchius upon the Euchariſt. III. 352. *and a. b.* He is miſtaken about Marot's age. IV. 162. *b.* How he mentioned the ſtory of the She-Pope at the conference of Poiſſi. 735, 736, 737. What he relates of a woman and her two daughters. 882. *a. b.*

Bias, a maxim of that Philoſopher. III. 601. *b.* His dilemma upon marriage may receive a different turn. IV. 844. *b.*

Bible, the Hebrew text of it altered in what relates to the age of the Patriarchs. I. 173. *a.* The deſign of publiſhing it tranſlated into the Iriſh language meets with great oppoſition. 718. *a.* A queſtion which Bochart is ſaid to have been aſked touching that ſacred book. II. 41. *a.* It is tranſlated into the vulgar language in Spain. 379. A commiſſion ſent to Druſius, empowering him to go upon a new tranſlation of the Bible into the Dutch tongue. 705. *a.* Luther's tranſlation, and that which the Churches of the Low-Countries made uſe of judged defective. *ibid.* An objection ſcandalouſly retorted againſt the authors of that holy book. IV. 373. *and a. b.* What Politian is charged with ſaying of it. 704. *a. b.* Tranſlated into the Poliſh language. 825. *b.*

Bible (French) firſt printed at the deſire of Charles VIII. I. 1. *a.* Falſified as well by the way of ſuppreſſion, as by that of addition. *ibid. b.*

Bible of Zurich, by whom it was reviſed and corrected. I. 802. *a.*

Bible, tranſlated into the Sclavonian tongue by George Dalmatin. II. 585.

Bibliotheca Maxima Pontificia. See *Authority of the Pope.*

Bibliotheque of the Jeſuit authors; by whom it was begun, and by whom continued. I. 219. *and a. b.* Qualities requiſite to make a good Bibliotheque, and the ordinary fault of thoſe who are employed in a work of that nature. *ibid. b.* 220. *a. b.* 221. *a. b.*

Bibliothoque Univerſelle quoted. I. 116. *b.*

Biblus, the Egyptians ſend thither every year a paſteboard head, without any other ceremony than throwing it into the ſea. I. 116. *a.*

Bibulus (Conſul) is wholly taken up in making Paſquinades. I. 425. *a. b.*

Bigarrures & Touches (*i. e.* The Miſcellany and Touches) of Des Accords, books which are too free and trifling. I. 63, 64. *a. b.* 65. *a.* The editions of them. 64. *b.* 65. *a.* The Touches compoſed in two months, what the nature of that work is. 65. *a.*

Bigot (Emeric), what he ſaid to a man who waited for the ſecond editions of books. I. 319. *b.*

Bigot (John), father to William. II. 7.

Bigot (William) promiſed a treatiſe upon the neceſſity of matrimony. I. 603. *a.*

Bigots, their artifices to make a great many devout women fall into the ſnare. II. 110. *a.* There is no paſſion which they do not juſtify at the expence of religion. III. 533. *b.*

Bilia lived to be old without knowing that her huſband, who had a ſtinking breath was different in that from other men. II. 726, 727. *and a.*

Billichius (Everard) defends the Univerſity and Clergy of Cologn againſt Melancthon, Bucer, and others. III. 240. *b.*

Billon quoted. I. 720. *a. b.* III. 280. *b.* 281. *a.* IV. 359. *b.* 360. *a. b.*

Bindoni (Bernardino) makes additions to the Italian edition of Philip de Bergamo's Chronicle. I. 769. *a.*

Binet (Stephen) a Jeſuit, declares, though not without trembling, for the ſalvation of Origen, while he examines the matter in the form of a rehearing of his trial. IV. 415. *b.* 416. *a.*

Binet (Claudius) cenſured for an inſipid hyperbole which he makes uſe of in ſpeaking of the birth of Ronſard. IV. 890. *b.*

Bion, his anſwer to Antigonus. II. 11. *a.*

Bionei Sermones, what one is to underſtand by that. II. 12. *a.*

Birds that ſwept the temple of Achilles every morning. I. 85. *a. n.* (20). A bird which can take up into the air a horſe with his rider. III. 132. *b.* Birds deſtroy an army of Ethiopians. IV. 177. *a.* Their language underſtood by ſome people. 181, 182. *and a.* Worſhipped in Lemnos. III. 755. *and b.* The language of birds. V. 381. *b.* 382. *a.*

Biroat convicted of impurities, according to the teſtimony of Jarrige. I. 108. *b.* 109. *a.*

Biron (the Marſhal de) receives a terrible reprimand from the Duke of Anjou, and the occaſion of it. III. 178. *a. b.* He performed great ſervices to Henry IV. *ibid. b.* 179. *a.* He gives that Prince too ſenſible a proof of his thinking himſelf a moſt neceſſary man. 179. *b.* He could not bear to ſee the faith given to the Huguenots violated. 180. *a.* He was fit for all ſorts of employments. *ibid. a. b.* He was too much given to wine. *ibid. b.* And was unwilling to finiſh the war. *ibid. and* 181. *a.* He becomes credulous and ſuperſtitious. *ibid. a. b.*

Biron (the Marſhal Duke de) his impious wiſh. III. 182. *b.* He affects to hate the Huguenots. 183. *a.* He diſplays an inſupportable vanity. *ibid. a. b.* He is confounded with his father in the point of learning.

learning. *ibid. b.* 184. *a.* Henry IV ſaves his life three times. *ibid. b.* That Prince had a mind to make him his ſon-in-law. *ibid. a. b.* His duel with Carency. 856. *a. b.*

Birth. Few people care to have the meanneſs of their birth talked of. I. 256. *b.* V. 125. *a. b.* It has ever been common to debaſe the birth of thoſe whom fortune raiſes to the higheſt dignities. I. 350. *b.* V. 125. *a. b.* 126. *a.* 189. *a.* A mean birth is no crime. I. 360. *b.*

Biſhopric: a biſhopric procured by the Muſes. I. 237. *and* 238. *a. b.*

Biſhoprics: the abuſe of giving biſhoprics to children prevailed in the XVIth century. IV. 819.

Biſhops of the Eaſt ſubject to the King of Portugal, acknowledge no Patriarch. I. 22. There are Biſhops, who having once obtained the mitre by preaching, preach no more after they are made Biſhops. 238. *a.* Lent-Biſhops; who were ſo called, by whom, and for what reaſon. 703. *a.* The dignity which is poſſeſſed, and the functions that are exerciſed by the Biſhops of the Church of England. II. 759. *b.* A Biſhop that was of an apoſtolic character. III. 69. *and a.* Biſhops were highly reſpected by the Pagans themſelves when their morals were good. IV. 104. *b.* They diſhonour their profeſſion when they ſet up for informers. *ibid.* 105. *a.* Good Biſhops faithfully diſcharge their miniſterial office. III. 772. *b.* The Proteſtants acknowledged Caraccioli for Biſhop, after he had publickly embraced their religion. II. 313. *and a. b.* 314. *a. b.* By divine right all Biſhops are equal to the Pope. IV. 198.

Biſhops of France prevailed with the King to deprive Caraccioli, who was acknowledged for Biſhop by the Reformed, of his biſhopric. II. 313. *a. b.* 314. *a. b.*

Bitings (of an immodeſt kind), Orators as well as Poets have mentioned them. III. 56. *a. b.*

Bitter, ſtories which the Rabbins tell concerning the ſlaughter of the Jews, at the taking of that city by the Romans. I. 649. *a.*

Blackſmith of Salon: It is not poſſible for private men to diſcover certainly what concerns him. II. 386. *b.*

Blæſus (Junius) obtains the honour of a triumph from Tiberius. V. 277. *a. b.* 278. *a.*

Blanc (William le) tranſlates Xiphilin into Latin. V. 589. *a.*

Blanc (Richard le) tranſlates Cardan's book *de Subtilitate* into French. II. 322. *b.*

Blancanas, the Jeſuit, cenſured for a double miſtake. I. 49. *a.*

Blanche (Queen) expoſed to detraction more than one way. V. 337. *a. b.* 338. *a.*

Blanchinus (Bartholomew) writes the life of Urceus. V. 515.

Blaſphemies. The horrible blaſphemies of a fanatic. III. 815. *a. b.* A blaſphemy of a horrid and ſingular kind. V. 514. *a. b.* 515. *a.*

Bleeding. The practice of frequent bleeding introduced at Paris by Botal. II. 99. *and a. b.* A diſpute on that head between Botal and the Phyſicians of the Faculty. *ibid.* The uſe that Averrhoës made of it. *ibid. b.*

Bleſkenius falſely relates ſeveral things of the Iſlanders, both with reſpect to witchcraft, III. 580. *a. b.* and laſciviouſneſs. *ibid. b.* 581. *a. b.*

Blind. One born blind cured by Hadrian. III. 319. *a.*

Blois: A motion made by the States of Blois for excluding the King of Navarre from the ſucceſſion to the crown of France. II. 5. *a.*

Blond (John le) tranſlates Carion's Chronicle into French, and writes an appendix to it. II. 324. *a.*

Blondel (David), the character of his wit and memory. II. 22. *a. b.* 23. *a.* He cenſures Suidas touching the Sibyl Lampuſa unjuſtly. 252. *b.* What he ſays of the Fathers. III. 55. *a. b.* Omits ſeveral authors who have affirmed the ſtory of Pope Joan. 78. *b.* Is miſtaken as to the time when Lucidus flouriſhed. 904. What he ſays of the ſtory of the She-Pope. II. 24. *a. b.* 25. *a. b.* IV. 729, 730. Is not for loſing time in enquiries about its origin, and cenſured on that account. 739. Finds that the ſaid ſtory in a manuſcript of Anaſtaſius the library-keeper is framed in the very words of Martinus Polonus. 725. *b.* 726. *a.* 738. *b.* 739. *a.*

Blondus (Flavius), certain works of his tranſlated into Italian by Lucio Fauno. III. 18.

Blount (Charles) his writings condemned. I. 383. *a.* His tranſlation of Philoſtratus. *ibid.* His tragical end. *ibid.*

Boarders: the avarice of thoſe who keep Boarders in univerſities. III. 167. *b.*

Bobowſki, in Latin *Bobovius* and *Bobonius,* is the ſame with Halibeigh in the Dictionary. III. 341.

Boccace falls in love with a Princeſs, and writes two excellent books for her ſake. IV. 302. *b.* 304. *b.* What he relates of Guido Cavalcante. II. 398. *a. b.* His Decameron univerſally known. *ibid.* Of a thouſand perſons who read it, ſcarce two or three remember any thing that is not an adventure of gallantry, or pleaſantry. *ibid.* What he ſays of Pope-Joan. IV. 730. *b.* 731. *a.* How far his Decameron is to be condemned. V. 837.

Boccalini, againſt what kind of authors he ſhould have made Apollo hold his extraordinary ſeſſion, and ſummon all the forces of Parnaſſus. II. 528. *a.* Does not follow the advice which he himſelf gives to Hiſtorians. 65. *a. b.* Complains with great wit of thoſe who brought in the Neopolitan diſeaſe. IV. 284. *b.*

Bochart has read a paſſage in Strabo, concerning Telmeſſus, wrong. V. 311. *b.* His conjecture upon a paſſage of Suidas, where that author ſpeaks of the cray-fiſh of Tenedos, is one of the beſt that he has made. 312. *a.*

Bodies, an explication of the doctrine of ſome of the Carteſians concerning the formation of bodies. II. 251. *a. b.* The difference between living Bodies and Bodies void of life according to Des Cartes. 660. *b.* 661. *a. b. n.* (51). Bodies are incapable of thinking. 661. *b. n.* (53). 662. *a. b.* The qualities of Bodies which ſtrike our ſenſes are only mere appearances. IV. 654. *a. b.* 655. *a. b.*

Bodies (dead) that have remained exempt from corruption. I. 183. *a. b.* II. 442. *b.* III. 233. *a. b.*

Bodin, one of the reaſons for which he wrote his *Demonomania.* I. 385. *b.* 386. *a.* His panegyric. II. 48. *a. b.* 49. *a.* He has wrote a dialogue about religions, in which he gives the advantage to the Jewiſh. 45. *a.* Is taken for a man without religion. 50. *a. b.* 51. *a. b.* An ingenious anſwer which an Engliſhman made to him. 53. *a.* He is cenſured for what he ſays of Cato's lending his wife. III. 495. *a.* Quoted. 403. *b.* 404. *a. b.* IV. 502. *a.* His prevarications to ſave the honour of the Aſtrologers. V. 244. *b.* to 246. *a. b.* A groſs miſtake charged upon him by la Mothe le Vayer. 112. *b.* He relates a ſingular anſwer of Henry II. III. 405.

Bœotia, what puniſhment was inflicted there upon bankrupts. II. 863. *a.*

Bohemia, all the Miniſters of that kingdom proſcribed. II. 536. Facts which concern the revolution that happened there. V. 102. *a. b.* to 104. *a. b.*

Bohemia (the King of), Elector Palatine: his exerciſes are to be ſeen in the Vatican library at Rome. I. 239. *a.*

Bohemians divided into three ſects. IV. 629. *a. b.* Laſicius writes a book on the confeſſion of faith of the Proteſtants of Bohemia. III. 732. *b.* 733. *a. b.* They degenerate from from their anceſtors. *ibid. n.* (6).

Boboritſch (Adam): he and Dalmatin tranſlate the Bible into the Sclavonian tongue. II. 565. *and a. b.*

Boileau (Dr), complaints againſt two of his books. V. 853.

Boiſleduc; an edict prohibiting the public exerciſe of the Romiſh religion in that town. III. 548. *a.* Diſputes occaſioned by the ſaid edict. *ibid. and b.* Its Magiſtrates tolerate a fraternity of the Virgin, and enter themſelves into it. IV. 121. *a. b.* 122. *a.*

Boiſſieu (the Preſident of) juſtly cenſures Caſaubon, and Corradus for what they ſay about Pyrrhus, and the place of his interment. IV. 660. *b.* A character of his commentary on Ovid's poem againſt Ibis. 452. *a. b.*

Bolduc, a Capuchin. Nothing can be more ſcandalous than what he ſays of Job's diſtemper. III. 573. *a.*

Boleyn (Anne), her bad qualities. II. 57. *b.*

Bologna, its colony was ſettled four years before that of Piſaurum. I. 62. *b*.

Bolſec, a witneſs not credited even by the Roman Catholics. II. 61. *b*. 62. *a*. *b*. Inſults Calvin for the frequent corrections of his Inſtitution. 262. *b*. All his fooliſh ſtories againſt Calvin are given out as matters of fact by Cardinal Richelieu. 62. *a*. And will be ſo eternally by thoſe who write againſt the Calviniſts, if we except authors of reputation and gravity. *ibid*. *and*. 61. *a*. *b*. What concerns the proſtitution of his wife is not to be found in the French life of Calvin. 274. *n*. (*p*). A more particular account of the differences betwixt Calvin and him given in that life. *ibid*. *b*.

Bona (Cardinal). An author undertakes to criticize him, becauſe he had never quoted him. IV. 2. *a*.

Bona Sforza, Queen of Poland, gives people large room to talk of her. I. 405. *b*. She is very angry with her ſon for marrying Barbara Radzivil. III. 847. *and a*. *b*. Their mutual reproaches on that head. 848. *a*.

Bonanni (a Jeſuit) ſets about compoſing a catalogue of the writers of his ſociety. I. 219. *a*. Quoted. V. 164. *b*. Maintains a kind of paradox about Moſchus. II. 11. *b*.

Bond, the elogy of his Commentary upon Perſeus. IV. 598. *a*. *b*.

Bone; what the Jews tell us of a ſmall bone. I. 649. *b*. 650. *a*. *b*.

Bonet (Honoratus) Doctor of the Canon-Law, is the author of a book, intituled, *The Tree of Battles*. III. 78. *b*. Affirms the ſtory of Pope-Joan. *ibid*. Several miſtakes which concern that writer. 79. *a*. *b*.

Bonfires. What are the fineſt Bonfires that can be lighted up to pleaſe the people. III. 317. *b*. 318. *a*.

Bongars quoted. II. 69. *a*. *b*. What Velſer wanted to have him reproached with, is probable enough. 70. *a*. The author of the new tranſlation of his letters, cenſured. III. 155. *b*. V. 538. *a*. *b*. Bongars was ſomewhat credulous. III. 696. *b*. Falſely accuſed as being the author of the *Idolum Hallienſe*. 838. *a*. *b*.

Boniface VIII, being ſollicited by one of the parties which divided the commonwealth of Florence, prevails with Charles de Valois, to compoſe the confuſions of that city. II. 296. *a*.

Bonifacius (Balthaſar) raſhly attempts to criticize Athenæus touching Democritus, and the manner in which he prolonged his life. II. 637. *b*. *n*. (38).

Bonnivet (Admiral) his attempt upon Margaret de Valois. I. 724. *a*. IV. 322. *b*.

Book of the Creation, the Cabaliſts pretend to work miracles by it. I. 173. *a*.

Book. A French book formerly was no more than a certain number of Latin pages, with a few lines of French. II. 105. *b*.

Book of ſentences condemned to be burnt under the name of Abelard. I. 761. *b*.

Book de tribus Impoſtoribus, it is not probable that there ever was ſuch a book. I. 437. *a*. IV. 861. *a*. V. 536. *b*. 537. *a*. Some ſay that Averroës ſupplied the materials of it. 557. *a*.

Books, their faults ought to be carefully remarked, when they may miſlead a great many readers. I. 77. *b*. A book that ſhould treat of the religion of a ſoverereign would ſell well. 130. *b*. Some books are taken no notice of by zealots for a long time. 153. *a*. Authors who enlarge them, ſeldom take proper care to alter the dates. 154. *a*. They forget to make the proper alterations, when they abridge or tranſcribe paſſages. 158. *a*. The firſt editions of books only ſerve to make an author's works appear in a fairer character. 318. *a*. *b*. There is no edition ſo bad but ſome advantage may be reaped from it. 319. *a*. *b*. One ſhould always ſet down the titles of books in the language that the author made uſe of. 344. *b*. Suppreſſions that are made in them only ſerve to draw one's attention the more. 498. *a*. *b*. 499. *a*. II. 94. *a*. *b*. Books deceive people ſometimes, by the falſe prints that are put into them. 100. *b*. The faults of books are not excuſable when they concern the principal ſubject. I. 579. *a*. The faults of great men lead other great men into errors. 523. *b*. Are like ſparks of fire. 671. *b*. A conſideration which ſhould oblige authors to avoid the very ſmalleſt miſtakes. II. 22. *a*. Books called *Gentlemen* in a compliment. 626. *b*. A perſon may very eaſily be miſtaken as to thoſe whom he fancies to be authors of ſuch and ſuch books. 682. *b*. V. 396. *b*. There are many books againſt which nothing would be ſaid, if authors were obliged to inſert them at length in their anſwers. II. 25. *a*. A book of admirable uſe, if we judge of it by the title. 236. *and a*. *b*. Bochart quotes it ſometimes. *ibid*. *b*. Some books become more perfect by being reviſed and printed. 279. *a*. A beautiful paſſage of Mr Smith on that head. *ibid*. *a*. *b*. Books can never be good, when an anthor writes them purely for bread. 321. *a*. Faults that are often to be found in them. 323. *a*. *b*. Books condemned to be burnt. 355. *a*. *b*. 356. *a*. Callimachus ſaid that a great book is always a great evil. 526. *b*. A book dedicated to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. 578. *a*. There is no book ſo deſpicable, but ſome advantage may be reaped from it. 582. *a*. The firſt that a man publiſhes is ſometimes an accompliſhed piece. *ibid*. *a*. *b*. Some books are publiſhed under the names of celebrated authors, chiefly ſuch books as concern magic. 640. *b*. 641. *a*. Conſiderations upon books that are full of quotations. 778. *b*. 779. *a*. Examiners of books detain manuſcripts long, and ſtrike many things out of them. 809. *a*. Some have been ſuppreſſed, others forged, and others fitted up as people had a mind. III. 67. *a*. What a man expoſes himſelf to, when he only judges of a book by the title of it. 134. *a*. How dangerous impure books are. V. 38. *and a*. *b*. &c. It is of great uſe to publiſh ſeveral books upon the ſame ſubjects, when they are important. III. 335. *a*. *b*. Whether the condemnation of a book by a ſynod hinders it from being read. 377. *b*. 378. *a*. They are moſt of them extracts and copies of others. 471. *b*. Are often ſpoiled by too much poliſhing 836. *a*. *b*. 837. *b*. The riſk that poſthumous books run. 848. *b*. The blind zeal of thoſe who retrench whatever diſpleaſes them in books. 948. *a*. *b*. It is a more difficult taſk than people imagine to make additions to books. IV. 79. *b*. A book that contained nothing but the reproaches which two profeſſors divulged one againſt the other. 122. *a*. In what manner thoſe of the antient Arabs were made. 177. *b*. A man that ſeeks to paſs for the author of a book which he did not write, is guilty of a wilful cuckoldom. 280. *b*. Reaſons which ſhould hinder the greateſt part of authors from publiſhing many books. 493. *b*. They generally contain nothing new. 590. *b*. Thoſe who write books ſhould firſt of all read Quintilian. 814. What Pliny ſays of the pompous titles of ſome. V. 2. *b*. Whether every word that cannot be ſpoken before a modeſt woman ſhould be baniſhed out of them. 132. *b*. 133. *a*. *b*. There are ſome which have been printed a great while, and which nevertheleſs remain unknown to the moſt learned authors. 462. *a*. Whether ſingle men ſtudy better, and compoſe more good books, than thoſe that are married. 524. *b*. 525. *a*. *b*. A great author of little books; who was called ſo, and in what ſenſe. II. 528. The multiplicity of books debauches the mind. I. 65. *a*. The title of a book which alarmed the Court of Rome, and in conſequence thereof was reformed. III. 122. Nothing is more apt to make them be looked upon as bad, than the pompous idea under which they are repreſented. IV. 284. *a*. A book too hard; the moſt underſtanding authors rather chuſe to be ſilent, than to attack it. V. 179. *b*. Several books which are deſpiſed by men of parts; ſeem good to the author: how he read them. 802. How Antony Arnauld read them. *ibid*. Character of Jurieu's books. *ibid*. *and* 803. Why the States of Holland grant privileges to them. 804. The difference between a good and an uſeful book. 806. Great books are long expected, and meet with a thouſand ſtorms, when they firſt launch forth. 808. 809. A reflexion of la Bruyere upon the way that people judge of books. 809.

Books of Devotion, it does not belong to a vicious man to write them. I. 439. *a*. *b*.

Books of Heretics: whether thoſe who prohibit the ſale of Heretical books, ought to permit the objections of Heretics, to appear in the writings of the orthodox who confute them. II. 488. *a*. *b*. 489. *a*.

Books (Apocryphal) the objections made to theſe books are retorted. III. 601. *a*.

Bookſellers, what they do in order to enhance the price of books. I. 521. *b*. II. 23. *a*. *b*. 38. *b*. 809. *b*. Bookſellers who impoſe upon Alexander VII. 476. *b*. 477. *a*. *b*. They have a cuſtom to print many titles for one and the ſame book. 524. *a*. III. 274. *b*.

It is not of them that we ought to complain, if they print bad books. II. 562. *b.* Some of their ſly tricks. 621. *a. b.* 809. *b.* Whether we can rely upon the commendations which they procure to the authors they print. 763. *b.* They give corrected editions of the French authors, with reſpect to the antiquated phraſes. IV. 427. *b.* 428. *a.* The confuſion which they cauſe, by reprinting the title pages of books. 476. *a.* The German Bookſellers generally add good indexes to the books they reprint. 498. *b.* Bookſellers are often ruined by authors. 834. *a. b.* A cuſtom which they have, impoſes on the Bibliographers. V. 547. *b.* An author who had ſworn never to have any thing to do with them. II. 82. *a. b.* 83. *a.* The extream negligence of a Bookſeller. 322. *b.*

Boreas was very warm in his love. II. 79. *a. b.* 80. *a. b.*

Boreel (Adam) tranſlates Broughton's Commentary on the Prophet Daniel into Latin. II. 150. *a.*

Borel (Peter) his miſtake with reſpect to Deſpauterius. IV. 538. *a. b.*

Borello (Camillo) takes a great deal of pains to prove in a book, that the ſentence of Pilate found in the city of Aquila is fictitious. II. 556. *b.*

Borri (the Cavalier) had a ſtrange thought concerning the conception of the Virgin. III. 571. *a. b.*

Borſel (Francis de) facts that concern him. II. 90. *a.*

Borſtel: perſons of that family. II. 90. *a. b.*

Boſc (du) a miniſter; what a Catholic gentleman did at his return to Caen. II. 91. *a. b.*

Boſſu (the Count de) his treachery. II. 841. *b.* 842. *a.* Why he was not puniſhed for it. *ibid.*

Boſſuet, Biſhop of Meaux, his error touching Ubiquity, and the firſt authors of that tenet. V. 549. *b.* Quoted. IV. 65. *b.* *& paſſim alibi.*

Bouchavanne (Mr de) takes the Preſident de la Place privately to the caſtle of Couſſy. IV. 682. *a.*

Bouchel, his *Bibliotheque* of the French law quoted. IV. 806.

Boucher (John) thought to be the author of *the apology for John Chatel*. II. 101. *a.* 103. *a. n.* (15). 459. *b.*

Boucherat receives an extraordinary commiſſion to preſide at trials for poiſoning and witchcraft. II. 345. *b.*

Bouchet (Peter) takes the poiſon which a neighbour's wife had prepared for her huſband, and dies. II. 104.

Bouhours, his judicious advices touching the French tongue. II. 775. *b.* Quoted. V. 361. *a. b.*

Bouillon (the Duke of) promiſed to abjure his religion when he married Mademoiſelle de Berghes. IV. 120. *a.*

Boulai (Du) commits faults, upon the ſubject of Faunus and Omphale. III. 934. *b.* His miſtake touching a Roman lady, whom he took for a Veſtal Virgin. V. 516. *a. b.* Quoted. 130. *a.*

Boulduc (Father) laughed at for the monaſteries which he ſuppoſes to have been erected at Haran. I. 45. *b.*

Boulogne (Claudius Dormi Biſhop of) is treated as a rebel, and caſt into priſon. IV. 258.

Bouraque, what ſort of an animal it is. IV. 42. *b.*

Bourbon (Antony de) King of Navarre, ſollicited to procure an agreement in religion. I. 691. *b.* See *Antony*.

Bourbon (the Conſtable of) animated to the ſiege of Rome by predictions. I. 147. *and b.* 148. *a.* Makes his eſcape upon horſes ſhod backwards. 482. Conſpires againſt the ſtate. IV. 694. *a. b.* How this conſpiracy was diſcovered. 695. *b.* 696. *a.* At what time he entered into the party of Charles. V. II. 845.

Bourbon (Cardinal de) ſets up, at the ſollicitation of the League, for the lawful ſucceſſor to the crown of France. III. 520. *a. b.*

Bourbon (Frances de) eldeſt daughter to the Duke of Montpenſier, openly profeſſes the Proteſtant religion. III. 864. *and b.*

Bourbon (James de) impriſoned by his wife in the caſtle of Ovo. IV. 307. *b.* Eſcapes to Taranto, where he is beſieged: he ſurrenders the place, and goes to be a Monk in France. *ibid.*

Bourbon (Nicholas) quoted. IV. 247. *b. n.* (19). Praiſes exceedingly the poem *de Crucifixo*, wrote by James Pinon. 651.

Bourdeaux. The parliament of Bourdeaux reprimanded. III. 512. *a. b.* Rejects the claim of two Proteſtant captains, whom it had condemned to death, not allowing them the privilege of being tried by a judicature of half Proteſtants and half Catholics. II. 289. *a. b.* And condemns a libel on that ſubject to be burnt. *ibid. b.*

Bourel, who that author is in the tranſlation of Thuanus's Hiſtory. II. 237. *b.*

Bourg (Antony du) Lieutenant-Civil of the Provoſt of Paris, and afterwards Chancellor. II. 556. *a.*

Bourg (Anne du) what Henry II ſaid to him. III. 400. *a.* He diſowns the concluſions of his advocate who tried to ſave his life by an officious lie. IV. 139. *b.* 140. *a.*

Bourg en Breſſe, when its citidel was razed. I. 738. *b.*

Bourg-Fontaine, the chimerical aſſembly of Bourg-Fontaine. I. 486. 491. *a.*

Bourgoign (Edme) Prior of the Dominicans; directs his diſcourſe in the pulpit to James Clement, and calls him the holy martyr of Jeſus Chriſt. III. 601. *a. b.* Is treated as a confeſſor and martyr by John Guignard. 276. *a.*

Bourgoign (Francis) General of the Oratory, collects the works of Cardinal Berulle, and adds a preface to them. I. 786. *b.*

Bourignon (Antoinette) her viſions touching Adam. I. 102. *b.* 103. *a. b.* The ſpirit which governed and led her. II. 111. *a. b.* Who was the learned man that ſhe eſteemed moſt. 540. *a.* How ſhe diſcovered that John Rothe was no more than a falſe prophet. III. 690. *a.* Whether ſhe had foretold the bombarding of Bruſſels. IV. 889. *a. b.* What her notion was of the perfect ſtate of man, with reſpect to his generative faculty. V. 4. *a. b.*

Bourignoniſm, makes ſome noiſe in Scotland. II. 114. *a. b.*

Bourſaut, a paſſage quoted from one of his letters. II. 647. *b.* 648. *a.* IV. 806. *a. b.*

Bonthiller de Rance (Armand) Abbot de la Trappe, underſtood the Greek Poets at ten years of age. I. 293. *a. b.* What he ſaid upon hearing of the death of Mr Arnauld, Doctor of the Sorbonne. 498. *a.*

Box on the ear; Ædeſius gives a governor of Egypt one. III. 445. *a. b.*

Bozius (Thomas) his errors touching the Lœſtrigons. III. 786, 787.

Braccio, the inhabitants of Perugia, choſe him for their Prince on account of his valour. II. 292. *a.*

Brachmans always carry a ring and a ſtaff. I. 5. *a.*

Braggadocio (in learning) his character. I. 373. *a. b.* II. 253. *a.*

Brandenburg (the Elector of) what he wrote to Richard Cromwell touching the invaſion of Poland by the Swedes. II. 539. *b.*

Brandon (Charles, Duke of Suffolk) his intrigue with the Princeſs Royal. III. 88. *a.*

Brandt (Sebaſtian) his work intituled, *Navis Stultorum*. I. 602. *b.*

Brantome quoted. I. 256. *a. b.* 592. *a. b.* 723. *a.* 724. *a. b.* II. 207. *b.* 208. *a.* V. 36. *a.* 337. *b.* What he ſays of the beauty of Donna Maria of Aragon. I. 401. *a.* And of Don John of Auſtria's birth. II. 20. *a. b.* 21. *a.* His falſe way of reaſoning about the children of great Lords. *ibid.* He ſpeaks with too much diſdain of the other Princes, who oppoſed the ambition of Charles V. 435. *b.* He improperly alledges the apology of the Prince of Orange, on occaſion of Charles the fifth's ſentiments in point of religion. 441. *and a. b.* His narrative touching Mary of England, Queen of France, is different from that of Mezerai, and Varillas. III. 88. *a. b.* According to him it is poſſible that a Queen may ſuppoſe a child in the midſt of a numerous Court. 89. *a.* He is miſtaken in two things with reſpect to a cup which Helen cauſed to be made by the pattern of one of her breaſts. 363. *a.* A curious paſſage of his, touching a certain Prince and a certain Lady of a very good family. 835. *a. b.* What he ſays of the Cardinal de Lorrain's liberality towards the poor and the ladies. 872. *a.* What he thinks of the ladies who accompanied their huſbands in the holy war. 795. *b.* 796. *a. n.* (25). He affirms four things touching Joan of Naples, which are all four falſe. IV. 305. *a.* Applauds the complaiſance of Henry II, for the Ducheſs of Valentinois. 698. *b.* 699. *a.* His miſtake touching Laurenza Strozzi, a Dominican Nun. V. 252. *b.*

Braſil, the Savages of that country have no religion. III. 781. *a. b.*

Bravery, whether there be any connexion between bravery and luſt. III. 414. *b.* 415. *a. b.* Of all virtues it is the only one that is ſubject to fanatical tranſports. IV. 664. *a.* Joined with effeminacy and a ſtrong inclination for pleaſure. V. 271. *a. b.* 272. *a. b.*

Brazen: Some popular ſtories about certain brazen heads. I. 598. *a.*

Breaſts; the ſeverity of the Anabaptiſts againſt a man's handling of his miſtreſs's breaſts. IV. 87. *b.*

Breda confounded with Bretta. V. 357. *b.*

Bredenbourg (John) accuſed of being a Spinoſiſt, and for what reaſon. V. 207. *b.* 208. *a.* He dies nevertheleſs with lively ſentiments of religion. 208. *a.*

Bread. What is meant by chapter-bread. II. 815. *b.*

Bregi, the French Embaſſador at the Court of Poland, what his pretenſions were. III. 264. *a. b.*

Bremen, in what manner Calviniſm was introduced into that city by Hardenberg. III. 352, 353. *a. b.*

Brentius, a zealous Ubiquitarian, forewarns all ſtates not to allow the Zuinglians a toleration. II. 196.

Brerley, whether he and thoſe he quotes have calumniated John Knox. III. 668. *a. b.* 669. *a.*

Breſman (Gregory) a Profeſſor at Leipſic, praiſes Baduel, and his diſcourſe on the marriage of men of learning, which he cauſes to be reprinted. I. 603. *a.*

Bretagne (the Duke of) neglects his wife, who was daughter to the King of Scotland, and falls in love with Antoinette de Maillezé, wife to the Lord Villequier. II. 464. *b.* One of his moſt faithful ſervants makes remonſtrances to him, againſt it in vain. *ibid.*

Bretagne (Anne of) becomes barren, and at length loſes her life by the ignorance of the midwives, who aſſiſted at her laſt delivery. III. 28. *a.*

Breviary of Burgos, the correction of it. IV. 76. *a. b.*

Breuin (William) the circumſtance which he added in the ſtory of Pope Joan. IV. 729.

Brezé (the Marſhal de) deſires to be prayed for in the Proteſtant Church of Saumur. I. 263. *b.* Draws his ſword againſt the Marſhal de Chaſtillon, and for what reaſon. III. 821. *a.*

Brezé (James de) puniſhes his wife's infidelity. II. 132. *a. b.*

Brianville (the Abbot de) invents the Heraldry cards. III. 51.

Bride: a bride whom a man carried to Church in his arms, to be married. IV. 324. *a.*

Briefs, ſome compoſers of briefs. I. 361. *a. b.*

Briet (Father) his faults with reſpect to Collatius. II. 524. *b.* 525. *a.* In ſpeaking of Lucretius, he commits eight faults in eight lines. III. 917. *b.*

Brin, particulars relating to the ſiege of that place. V. 192. *b.*

Brinvilliers (the Lady de) among other proofs, her judges made uſe of her written confeſſion, in order to condemn her. II. 460. *b.*

Briſac and *Friburg*, remained in the poſſeſſion of France by the peace of Nimeguen. III. 720. *a.*

Briſſac, his zeal for the glory of the French monarchy. III. 396. *a.*

Briſſon (Barnaby) quoted. V. 17. *b.*

Britons, the barbarities which they exerciſed upon the Romans. V. 260. *a. b.*

Brixen (a town in Tirol) the aſſembly there declares that Gregory VII, had forfeited the Pontificate. III. 231.

Brochard (Bonaventure) the age in which he lived. II. 529. *a. b.* Writes a deſcription of the Holy Land. *ibid.*

Brodeau, perſons of that family. II. 145. *b.* 146. *a. b.*

Broekhuſius, his conjecture upon a paſſage of Propertius. IV. 585. *b.*

Brogitarus buys the Pontificate of Peſſinus, and is put in poſſeſſion of it. II. 628. *b.* But he was driven out as an Uſurper. *ibid.*

Broſſe (René de) condemned to loſe his head by an Arrêt of the parliament of Paris. II. 840. *a.* How his ſon John entered again upon the poſſeſſion of his father's eſtate. *ibid. b.*

Broſſier (Simon) diſputes with Villegaignon, and confounds him. V. 478. *b.*

Brother. A lay-brother that occaſions a whole convent being ſet on fire. III. 284. *b.*

Brothers, a proverb of the Antients touching the hatred of brothers. II. 701. *b.*

Broukolakas, what the Greeks underſtand by that word. I. 508.

Brown (Thomas) his thoughts concerning the manner of human propagation. V. 6. *a.*

Bruce (Robert) in vain ſollicited by William Criton to put the Chancellor of Scotland to death, and accuſed to the governor of the Low-Countries. II. 577.

Brueys, in what manner he attacks Mr Jurieu upon his propheсies. II. 683. *b. to* 685. *a. b.* Wherein he is blame-worthy on that head. 684. *b.* 685. *a.* His reflexions upon Mr Jurieu's gay humour. 954. *a. b.*

Brugenſis (Lucas) what he ſays of the Scribes. V. 8. *a. b.* An obſervation which he makes. 11. *b.*

Bruyere (La) quoted. II. 118. *a. b.* 119. *a.* 452. *b.* Delicately touches the curioſity of the fair ſex for nudities. III. 964. *a.* The character he gives us of children. 815. *b. n.* (7). He ridicules the profuſion of reading which certain authors ſhew. II. 105. *b.*

Brun, in Latin *Braunius*, his anſwer to Mr Stoupp's book. V. 204. *a.*

Brune (La) was not ſufficiently guarded in what he publiſhed, concerning the Nuncio Chigi. II. 474. *b.* 475. *a. b.*

Brunchaut extravagantly commended by Gregory the Great. III. 222. *b.* 223. *a.*

Brunſman (John) refutes the *Polygamia triumphatrix*, of Lyſerus, by a book intituled, *Monogamia Victrix*. III. 973.

Brunſwic (the Electoreſs of) named to ſucceed to the crown of England. V. 194. *b.*

Bruſquet, a King's Jeſter, famous in his way. II. 668. *a. n.* (32).

Bruſſels, whether the bombarding of that city was foretold by Mademoiſelle Bourignon. See *Bourignon.*

Brutum Fulmen, a miſtake of Thuanus and Deckher, touching that book. III. 521. *a.* How the author was rewarded for it. *ibid.*

Brutus (Decimus) was a good judge of Poetry, and, was well verſed both in the learning of Rome and Greece. I. 60. *and a.*

Brutus and Cicero had not the ſame taſte in Oratory. II. 166. *a.*

Brutus (Lucius Junius) does himſelf condemn his own children to death. II. 162. *a.*

Brutus (Marcus Junius) his intrepidity. IV. 746. *a. b.*

Brutus (Stephanus Junius) a diſſertation upon that diſguiſed author. V. 731. *& ſeq.*

Brutus (John Michael) differs from other Hiſtorians in his opinion touching Conſtantia, Queen of Sicily. III. 395. *b.*

Buccafoco: the family-name of the Cardinal Sarnanus, or de Sarnano. V. 57.

Bucer ſaid that if Thomas's works were ſuppreſſed, he could deſtroy the Church of Rome. I. 472. *b.* Conjecture upon the pretence there was for accuſing him of Judaiſm. II. 175. *a. b.* His writing was very bad. IV. 285. *a.* He endeavours to make out that the ſentiments of Luther and Zuinglius concerning the Lord's Supper, were at bottom the ſame. V. 103. *b.* Is recommended by Gropper to Herman de Wida, Archbiſhop of Cologne. III. 240. *a.* His intimacy with Gropper. *ibid. a. b.*

Buceriſm, in what it conſiſted. II. 171. *a. b.*

Buchanan, the horrible ſlanders of Garaſſe and Barclay againſt him. II. 181. *a. b.* 182. *a.* Whether his political maxims, are not the maxims of the Proteſtants. *ibid. and b.* His enemies cannot deny but that he was at leaſt once in his life a Philoſopher. 185. *b.* He is accuſed of having blackened Queen Mary. 282. *a. b.*

Budæus (William) compared to Badius. I. 601. *and a. b.* Repreſents himſelf as married to two wives. II. 189. *b.* Makes himſelf feared. 192. Gives a taſte for uniting Polite Literature with the Civil-Law. I. 67. *a.* How his body was carried to the grave. IV. 845. *b.* He would have kept William Bigot at Paris, but Caſtellan prevented. it. II. 8. *a.*

Budos (Louiſe de) wife to the Duke of Montmorency, hearkens to a propoſal of marriage before her huſband's death. III. 184. *b.*

Bueil, a baſtard ſon to the Count de Sancerre, murthered at Orleans, by whom and for what. IV. 887. *a. b.*

Buyrette (Thomas) falls into the hands of the murderers, at the maſſacre of Paris. II. 694. *a.*

Buiſſiere, his letter on the real effects of James Aymar's wand. I. 8. *a. b. and n.* (71). His letter to the author. 9. *a. n.* (75).

Bulgaria, the Manichean Hereſy takes deep root there. IV. 512. *a. b.*

Bulgarus, a lecture which he makes, raiſes a laugh in the audience. II. 193. *and b.*

Bulls, who it was that was denoted by the title of Bull-Carrier. I. 217. *a.* A Bull where the placing of the words, and the omiſſion of a comma, occaſions great obſcurity. 607. *a. b.* One which declares the King of Navarre, to have forfeited the ſucceſſion only on account of his Hereſy. 739. *a.*

Bupali Odium and *Bupali Pugna*, whether or not they are proverbs, and what they ſignify. II. 203. *a. b.*

Burchard, his Journal. V. 757. Amply quoted, touching the affair of Savonarola. 63. *b.* 64. *a. b.* &c.

Burdeus (Peter Areas) an Auguſtin Monk is hanged and quartered for Adultery and Murther. V. 107. *a. b.*

Bure (Idelette de) Calvin's wife. II. 267. *b.* Her death. *ibid.*

Burgundy (Adolphus of) a letter which Eraſmus writ to him. I. 782. *b.* He died in the year 1558. *ibid.*

Burgundy (James of) Grandſon to Baldwin, a natural ſon of Philip the Good, turned Proteſtant. II. 215. *a.* But taking offence at the diſputes between Calvin and Bolſec, he fell off. *ibid.*

Burgundy (John Duke of) after having cauſed the Duke of Orleans, the brother of Charles VI, to be murthered, is treacherouſly aſſaſſinated himſelf. II. 462. *b.* 463. *a.*

Burgundy (the branch of) always confederated with the greateſt enemies of the French name. II. 462. *b.* 463. *a.* Aggrandizes itſelf very much. 214. *b.* The States of the province of Burgundy, reſolve to diſobey the King's edict. I. 720. *a. b.*

Burial refuſed from a motive of religious zeal. I. 139. *b.* 140. *a.* Was a thing indifferent to Diogenes the Cynic. II. 668. *b.* 669. *a.* We ſhould never refuſe it to our enemies. IV. 194. *b.* 195. *a.*

Burleſque defended. II. 603. *a. b.* 604. *a.*

Burman quoted. III. 651. *a. n.* (67).

Burnet, examination of his controverſy with Mr Varillas about Camden's Hiſtory. II. 283. *b.* 284. *a.* What he ſays of the Proteſtant Divines who were named to reviſe the Liturgy of Edward III. — 563. *a. b.* Makes a convert of the Earl of Rocheſter, and writes a book upon that head. V. 804. What they make him ſay concerning this Dictionary, and a confutation of it. 805. His criticiſm upon Sanders. 43. *a. b.*

Burrhus, by what argument he diſſuaded Nero from divorcing Octavia. III. 794. *a.*

Buſbequius, his letters are a model of writing well for Embaſſadors. II. 232. *a.* Quoted. V. 529. *b.*

Butas made Plutarch by frequent correction. II. 237. *b.*

Butcher, whether that word ought to be taken in a literal ſenſe, in Dante's ſatire againſt the third race of the Kings of France. II. 296. *a. b.*

Butter-women (the thanks of) it is the name of a ſatire, which was one of the ſequels of the Anti-Coton. III. 207. *a.*

Buzenval very ill received at the Court of Queen Elizabeth, and for what reaſon. II. 754. *a. b.*

Bzovius, whether a good anſwer has been made to the cenſurers of his Annals. II. 240. *a. b.*

C.

CAbala finds any thing in every text of Scripture. I. 174. *b.* 175. *a. b.* 176. *a. b.* What it teaches concerning the alliance of the elementary inhabitants with our ſpecies. 314. *a.* Its followers have a great eſteem for the book of the creation. 173. *a.*

Cacus, the ſon of Vulcan; why the Romans ſaid that he caſt fire and flame out of his mouth. V. 45. *a.*

Cadenet aſpires to an alliance with the royal-blood, after a Profeſſor's widow had refuſed to marry him. II. 576. *a. b.*

Cælius Apicius, what that book treats of, and who was the author of it. I. 371. *and a. b.* 372. *a.*

Cajado, a Portugueſe Poet, puts an impoſture on the public. III. 215. *b.* 216. *a.*

Cajetan, his opinion about the formation of women. III. 144. *b.*

Caille (John de la), his miſtakes touching Badius. I. 602. *b.* and Wechel. V. 537. *b.* 538. *a.*

Cayet, a learned man, and a fool. III. 883.

Cain, the occaſion of his quarrel with Abel. I. 23. *b.* 24. *a. b.* In what manner he killed the latter. *ibid. b.* Why God took upon himſelf the immediate cognizance of that murther. II. 247. *b.* Abundance of fantaſtical conjectures about the mark which God ſet upon him. *ibid.* Reaſons for which it is pretended that his offering was rejected by God. 248. *a.*

Calamity (public), exiles who would not return to their native country at ſuch a price. II. 259. *a. b.* 260. *a. b.*

Calais, how long it was in the hands of the Engliſh, and when taken by Henry II. III. 25. *a.*

Calanus makes away with himſelf in the retinue of Alexander, to ſhun diſgrace. III. 312. IV. 7. *a.*

Calcagnini accuſed of falſhood with regard to Venus. I. 368. *b.* Attacks Cicero. IV. 69. *a.* Writes obſcene verſes. V. 422. *a.*

Calchas dies of vexation, and for what. IV. 253, 254.

Calderinus has been undeſervedly placed among the witneſſes of the truth by the Proteſtants. II. 252. *b.*

Calendar, ſee *Kalendar*.

Calepin, his Dictionary compoſed or corrected without exactneſs. I. 534. *a.* Pliny is falſely quoted there about the *Lamiæ*. III. 712. *b.* 713. *a. b.* The judgment that has been paſſed on that Dictionary. IV. 586. *b.* 587. *a.*

Calf (golden); the Rabbins tell us that the powder of that calf which Moſes made the children of Iſrael ſwallow, ſtuck upon the beards of thoſe who had worſhipped it. I. 1. *a.* And had almoſt the ſame effect as the waters of jealouſy. *ibid. b.*

Caligula takes for a reproach an inſcription which was made with a deſign to pleaſe him. I. 121. Is charmed with a piece of his own compoſing. *ibid. a. b.* The queſtion he aſked a Player. 370. *and a. b.* Surprized in the act of inceſt with his ſiſter. 358. II. 255. *a. b.* 702. *a. b.* His impiety. 255. *b.* 256. *a.* And his extravagancies to honour the memory of Druſilla. 703. *a. b.* He makes away with his coheir. 718. *b.* 719. *a.* The Jews refuſe to put up his ſtatue in the temple of Jeruſalem. I. 374. *b.* What he ſaid to his brother. 758. *b.* He reſtores books which had been ſuppreſſed for their invectives. II. 357. *a.* How he was killed. 359. *a. b.* At what age he took the virile gown. 702. *b.* Complains that in his reign there happened no great misfortunes. III. 433. *b.* Was not ſuperſtitious. IV. 7. *b.* How Macro endeavoured to inſinuate himſelf into his favour. 20. *b.* 21. *a.* His ingratitude. *ibid. b. and* 22. *a. b.* He ſaid that his mother was ſprung from the inceſtuous embraces of Auguſtus and Julia. 332. *b.* In the flower of his youth he falls deſperately in love with Cæſonia, who was not young. II. 256. *a. b.* IV. 695. *b.* A falſhood touching his nurſe, which Guevara affirms, as if he had read it in Dion. II. 339. *b.* 340. *a.* His whimſical regard for his horſe. IV. 918. *a.*

Callimachus had a maxim that a great book is always a great evil. II. 526. *b.*

Callipædia, what judgment ought to be formed of that poem and its author. IV. 808. *a. b.*

Calliſthenes, what Suidas ſays of him. V. 360. *a.*

Callonge, Barony erected into a Marquiſate. IV. 866. *b.*

Calprenede, what he ſays of his Caſſandra and Cleopatra. IV. 192. *b.* Made no memoirs nor collections for his works. V. 444. *a.*

Calvary; it is thought that Adam was buried there. I. 104. *b.*

Calvin, his quarrel with Baudouin. I. 694. *a. b.* Bertelier's teſtimony againſt him of no weight. 782. *a. b.* 783. *a.* II. 61. *b.* What weight Bolzec's teſtimony againſt him can have. 58. *a. b.* 59. *a. b.* 60. *a. b.* 61. *a. b.* He writes letters againſt Blandrata. 17. *a. b.* Bucer's letter to him. 173. *b.* 174. *a. b.* Being accuſed of making God the author of ſin, he pleads his own cauſe at Bern, but they came to no deciſion there about his doctrine. 601 *a.* He was never in Prieſt's orders. 260. *a.* Did not know that there were two Seneca's. *ibid. b.* When and why he publiſhed his Inſtitution. 261. *a.* 262. *a. b.* 263. *a.* Refuſes to ſubmit to the regulations made by the Synod of Bern. 264. *b.* Commended for not commenting on the Revelations. 265. *b.* The pleaſant ſtories which they ſpread about of his devotion for St Hubert. 266. *a. b.* His diſintereſtedneſs. 269. *b.* 270. *a.* His differences with Caſtalio. 361. *b.* 362. *a.* He is upbraided for having too eagerly picked up the flying news which was ſpread concerning his enemies. 364. *a.* Has not ſaid much more againſt the Popes and the court of Rome than Caſtellan has. 370. *b.* 371. *a.* Whether he was ever in England. 663. *a.* Goes to Paris upon his return from his ſtudies of the law. IV. 318. *b.* Had ſeverely handled ſome perſons whom the Queen of Navarre protected. 319. *b.* 320. *a.* Judges freely of the conduct of Sarah and Abraham. V. 53. *b.* 54. *a. b.* 55. *b.* In ſpeaking of the Euchariſt he makes uſe of phraſes which ſeem to imply a ſubſtantial preſence. 103. *b. n.* (47). Calumniated by a Lutheran. 548. *b.* 549. *a. b.* His ſermons tranſlated into Latin by Claudius Baduel. I. 603. He had been Maturin Cordier's pupil, and dedicates one of his books to him. II. 554. Divers of his books tranſlated by Des Gallars. III. 124. *a. b.* A dæmon ſuggeſted to him his falſe gloſſes on the Scripture. 538. *b.* 539. *a. b.* Is not treated as an Arian by Hunnius, who ſays no more than that his expoſitions are favourable to the Arians. *ibid.* His Inſtitution tranſlated into Italian by Giulio Ceſare Paſchali. IV. 492. See Peter de la Place at Poictiers. 681. *a.* Meſſieurs Du Tillet were his pupils. V. 356. *a.* He diſputes at Frankfort with Juſtus Velſius. 450. *b.* Some people wrongfully aſcribe the Anatomy of the Maſs to him. 461. *b.* He converts Paul Volſius. 507. What he ſays about the origin and effects of ſin. 822. What God he has introduced, as the Roman Catholics pretend. 824. His advertiſement touching the general inventory of relics. II. 274. *b.* His nephew Prior of the Carmelites at Paris. V. 43. Schultingius undertakes to refute his Inſtitution. 86. His Inſtitution compared to Martyr's Common-Places. *ibid. b.* The great eſteem in which that book is held. *ibid. b.* 87. *a.* Abridgments that are made of it. *ibid.* A ſupplement to what has been ſaid of its different editions. 87. *a. b. &c.* How they vary from one another. *ibid. a. b.* Marlorat compoſes the indexes of it. 88. *a.* It has been printed times without number. *ibid. b.* Faults of the author of the *Eſſais de Literature* touching that Inſtitution. *ibid. b.* His Geneva Catechiſm, and a remark upon the date of it. *ibid. a.*

Calviniſm, the author of the *True Hiſtory of Calviniſm* cenſured for his minute obſervations. I. 796. *a. b.* Whether Calviniſm favours the paſſions. II. 843. *a. b.* The judgment which ſome Lutherans paſs upon it. III. 477. *a. b.* Introduced into Bremen by Hardenberg, and how. 352, 353.

Calviniſts, violences that were exerciſed upon them by the Lutherans. III. 535. *a. b.* 536. *a.* Their martyrdom looked upon as a falſe martyrdom by ſome Lutherans. 541. *b.* 542. *a.* Are falſely accuſed of deſigning to eſtabliſh an equality of conditions. IV. 919. *a. b.* 920. *a. b.* The Lutherans join with the Catholics againſt them. II. 121.

Calvino-Turciſmus cited. I. 789. *b.* 790. *a.* 797. *a.* Who was the author of that book. V. 275. *a. b.*

Calvinus Judaïzans, the hiſtory of that book. III. 537. *a. b.*

Calviſius (Sethus) cenſured as to the time of Ovid's death. IV. 447. *a. b.*

Calumniator (public), every one that owns himſelf to be ſuch with reſpect to things of conſequence, ſhould hide himſelf from the eyes of men. III. 554. *b.* 555. *a.*

Calumniators meet with too much indulgence. I. 327. *a.* Are capable of putting in practice the moſt ſhameful artifices. 393. *b.* 394. *a.* The beſt way to be revenged of them ſometimes is to return them no anſwer. 784. *b.* The way to diſcover them. 795. *a. b.* Their knaviſh tricks. 714. *b.* 715. *a.* There are ſeveral Eſcobar's and Banni's who abſolve them. II. 154. *a.* Policy finds its intereſts in letting them go unpuniſhed ſometimes. 626. *b.* 627. *a.* A good ſaying of Simonides touching calumniators. 726. *b.* How they were treated in the time of Gregory I. III. 221. *b.* 222. *a.* How they muſt be ſilenced. IV. 25. *a. b.* They have nothing to fear when they are powerful. 351. *a. b.* 352. *a.* Bring thoſe whom they calumniate into great trouble ſometimes. V. 249. *a. b.* 250. *a.* Calumniators on the ſcore of hereſy, they ſeldom receive the puniſhment which they deſerve. 512. *b.*

Calumny, its ſpirit. I. 393. *b.* In what caſe calumnies ſhould be left unanſwered and deſpiſed. 491. *b.* Such as are eaſily refuted do ſervice to thoſe they were deſigned to defame. 727. *b.* 728. *a.* Plain and diabolical calumnies which have nevertheleſs turned to the advantage of thoſe that were the authors of them. III. 90. *b.* 91. *a. b.* Advantages drawn from them in religious diſputes. IV. 101. *b.* What thoughts calumny raiſed in St Baſil. V. 102. *b.* Peoples readineſs to believe it. 103. *a.*

Calzaveglia (Vincent), a Phyſician at Breſcia, publiſhes a book, which is confuted by Donzellinus. II. 689.

Cambyſes, to what he compares new ſtratagems of war. I. 129. *a. b.*

Cambles eats his wife, and then kills himſelf. IV. 563. *a. b.*

Cambray, a powerful league formed againſt the Venetians there. III. 811. *a.*

Camden, his teſtimony concerning Buchanan's repentance is not altogether ſolid. II. 182. *b.* 183. *a.* But preferable at the ſame time to that of Mr du Puy related by Varillas. *ibid. a.* The praiſes that have been beſtowed upon him. 279. *b.* 280. *a.* A gentleman breaks off the noſe of his ſtatue. 284. *b.* In what manner part of the memoirs he made uſe of were loſt. *ibid. and* 285. *a. b.*

Cameleon, who is the author of the book which treats of the occult qualities of that animal. II. 639. *b.*

Camels, the Turks have a great veneration for them. IV. 40. *b.* According to theſe a certain camel will riſe again. 41. *a.*

Camener (Timan) propoſed by Alexander Hegius, and choſen director of the ſchool at Munſter. II. 242.

Camerarius (Joachim) changes the ſtate of the queſtion in defending Herodotus, who attributes envy and jealouſy to God. IV. 575. *a. b.*

Camerarius (Philip) does not find it likely that Francis I. deliberated in his council whether he ſhould make Charles V priſoner or not. II. 437. *b.*

Cameron, his conference with Tilenus. II. 285. *b.* 286. *a.* What he got by preaching up Paſſive Obedience. *ibid. and b.* Thought that many things in the Reformed Church wanted a farther reformation. 288. *a. b.* It was from him Mr Amyraut had the doctrine of Univerſal Grace. *ibid. b.* 289. *a.*

Camillus, the greateſt action of his life. II. 290. His deſcendants lived in obſcurity. *ibid. b.* 291. *a. b.* Whether it be true, that he forced the Gauls to reſtore the money which had been given to them, when they beſieged the capitol. 709.

Camillus (Ovinius) having aſpired to the empire, is aſſociated to it by Alexander Severus, and begs it as a favour that he may have leave to reſign. II. 770. *a. b.* Is killed. *ibid. b.*

Campagnelle (Madam. de), Balzac's niece, the hiſtory of her marriage. I. 622. *b.* 623. *a. b.*

Campanella; his city of the ſun. III. 345. *a. b.*

Campanus (John) makes the peaſants of Juliers believe that the end of the world was near. V. 238. *a. b.*

Campbel (Alexander), a Dominican, his tragical end. I. 221. *a.*

Campian, his diſpute with Whitakers. III. 940. *a. b.* 941. *a. b.*

Camps (the Abbot of), his diſſertation upon medals. V. 122. *a. b.*

Camus (John-Peter), Biſhop of Belley, what he ſays of the epiſcopal ſee of that town. I. 737. *b.* 738. *a. b.* His differences with the Monks of that dioceſe. *ibid.*

Cana (marriage of), who were the two betrothed perſons. III. 577. *a. b.* And whether they conſummated the marriage. *ibid.*

Canathus, what virtue that fountain had. III. 636. *a. b.*

Candale (the Duke of) challenged by Ceriſantes. II. 408. *a. b.*

Canibals; the cruelty of canibals was exerciſed in America. III. 774. *a.*

Canonizations, the vaſt expence made at them. III. 330. *a. b.*

Canons (goſpel) to whom the invention of them is to be aſcribed. I. 269. *b.* The difference between them and the harmony of Ammonius. *ibid.*

Cantel (Father) his falſe quotation with reſpect to Lucius Caſſius. II. 345. *a. b.*

Canterbury (St Thomas, Archbiſhop of), his perſecutor becomes his votary. III. 797. *b.*

Canterus (Andrew) was a prodigy of learning in his younger years. III. 217. *b.*

Capilupi, his *Cento Virgilianus*. V. 770. *b.*

Capiſtran (a Franciſcan) obliges the Jews to wear the letter Thau. IV. 309. *b.*

Capitals or *large Greek letters*, who brought them again into uſe. III. 732.

Capitol, the dogs who guarded it were not to bark in the day-time, at thoſe who came to pay their devotions in the temple. I. 773. *b.* Application of this to myſtical dogs. *ibid.*

Capitulation; the ſudden news of one coming after a great many falſe miſrepreſentations aggravates the diſguſt which people have at being impoſed upon. III. 719. *b.* Should not be granted to thoſe whom there is a deſign to puniſh. IV. 278. *b.*

Cappadocia, at what time it became a province of the Roman empire. I. 423. *a.*

Cappadocians very ſuperſtitious. II. 304. *a.*

Cappel (William) tranſlates Machiavel's Prince. IV. 15. *a. n.* (59).

Caprea, the leaps of that iſland immortalized. IV. 19. *a. b.*

Captains, what qualities they muſt have in order to ſucceed in great enterprizes. II. 413. *a. b.* 414. *a.* Several have dreaded the ſovereign judge of the world, upon remembring the blood that they had ſhed in wars which they thought juſt. 417. *a.* Some Captains branded with infamy, and for what reaſon. III. 284. There are ſome who love their pleaſures, but who love glory ſtill more. IV. 414. *a.* V. 271. *a. b.* 272. *a. b.*

Capuchins, when that order of Monks commenced. IV. 386. *a. b.* How far Pope Paul III was incenſed againſt the whole order, and for what reaſon. 388. *b.* A charge of forgery which proved unfortunate to the Capuchins of Paris. III. 896. *a. b.*

Caracalla, a perfidious action of his, which may be looked upon as the model of the St Bartholomew. I. 513. It is not true that he married his ſtepmother. III. 604. *b.* 605. *a. b.* 606. *a.* He was no leſs Julia's ſon than Geta. 606. *a.* He puts four Veſtals to death, one of whom he had enjoyed. 605. *b.* Kills his brother Geta in the arms of his mother. 605. When, and upon what occaſion, he was proclaimed by the ſoldiers an aſſociate to the empire. 607. *b.* How far his zeal for Alexander the Great went. IV. 7. *b.*

Carben (Victor de), a Rabbin converted to Chriſtianity. V. 540. *a. b.* 541. *a.*

Cardan, there are according to him twelve ſublime geniuſes who have excelled in the ſciences. I. 191. *a.* His heavieſt misfortunes. II. 315. *b.* He was rather a ſuperſtitious man, than an hardy unbeliever. *ibid.* Had more of the Fanatic in him than the Atheiſt. 316. *a.* A madman. 321. *a.* He abſtained from nouriſhment, that his prediction might prove true. 320. *b.* What he ſays of the Magic ſchools that had been in Spain. IV. 725. *b.* His ingenuity. II. 7, 8. His diſputes with Tartaglia. V. 297. *and a.*

Cardinal of quality, a competent judge in the affair of beauty. I. 399. *a.* Why there are ſo few Cardinals in the catalogue of Saints according to Bellarmine. 732. *b.* They are very ſeldom quite unanimous in the election of Popes. II. 472. Begin to be luxurious. 860. *and b.* 861. *a. b.*

Cardinals: the Pope ſhuts the mouths of the new Cardinals, and opens them again in another conſiſtory. IV. 284. *b. n.* (5). Obliged by Paul II to ſign bulls and decrees which they were wholly ignorant of. 511. *a. b.*

Carians were the firſt who ſet creſts on their helmets. IV. 790. *a. b.*

Carlos (Don), a book wrote concerning his ſtubbornneſs, caprice, whims, and maggots. II. 96. *a.*

Carmel, the oracle of the god ſo called. V. 466. *b.* 467. *a. b.*

Carmelite-Nuns introduced into France. I. 785. *a.* Their direction given to the ſuperior of the oratory. *ibid.* The Monks of the ſame order who wanted the direction of them, clamour loudly. *ibid.* Certain Carmelite-Nuns intermeddle with the political differences of Richelieu and Berulle. 786. *a.*

Carmelites (Friars), upon what they ground the antiquity of their order. V. 466. *b.* 467. *a. b.* They libel Cardinal Berulle. I. 785. *a.* A narrative of that quarrel. *ibid. b.* 786. *a.*

Carneades cenſures a common-place of conſolation: his objections anſwered. I. 280. *b.* He limits in ſome degree the doctrine of incomprehenſibility which Arceſilas taught. 410. *b.* Is very ill uſed by Numerius. II. 327. *a. b.* Had doctrines for his friends, and others for his ſcholars. *ibid. a.* It was impoſſible to diſcover what he thought the moſt probable. *ibid.* 334. *b.* It is ſaid that the ſun was darkened at the time of his death. 335. *b.* What he ſaid of Chryſippus. 486. *a. b.* He entirely demoliſhes an invention of Chryſippus. 494. *a. b.* In what manner he uſed to joke, when he happened to fall upon any ſubtile diſputes. 675. *a.* Whether he philoſophized at the ſame time with Epicurus. 777. *a.* How he explained human liberty. 792. *b.* He argued againſt juſtice. 330. *a. b.* IV. 752. *a.*

Carnival, to continue it to the firſt Sunday in Lent, one needs only go to Milan. V. 778. *b.*

Caroli, ſome of his tricks. III. 15. *a. b.*

Carpocratians, they pretended to have the image of Jeſus Chriſt, which was procured by Pilate. I. 472. *a.*

Carranza, his being ſuſpected of hereſy gave ground for ſuſpecting Charles V of the ſame thing. II. 336. *a. b.* Reflexion on the juſtice which the people did to his memory. 337. *a. b.*

Carrouſels, a law which is obſerved in them. III. 302. *b.*

Carſula, a town in Italy, at this day called Caſcina. IV. 713. *b. n.* (66).

Carſulanus (Martinus), the ſame with Martinus Polonus. IV. 713. *b.*

Carteſianiſm, what retards the progreſs of it. I. 472. *b.* Involved in Theological diſputes. II. 696. *a. b.* 697. *a.* Introduced into the ſchools by Wittichius. V. 564. Which procured him a great number of opponents. *ibid.* It is the leaſt in favour with the great and powerful in Holland. *ibid.*

Carteſians, the judgment which la Bourignon paſſes on their principles. II. 111. *b.* The ableſt among them are obliged to admit of mediate intelligences. 251. *a. b.* An explication of the doctrine of ſome of them concerning the formation of bodies. *ibid.* A Carteſian called *learned*, for ſaying that this propoſition *two and two make four*, admits of no difficulty. 389. *b.* The arguments of theſe Philoſophers againſt ſubſtantial forms prove too much. V. 116. *b.* Their principle for proving the immortality of the ſoul is not evident to all the world. IV. 717. *b.* 718. *a. b.* & *ſeq.* What incommodes them moſt in the ſyſtem of *Automata*. 908. *b.* 909. *a. b.* & *ſeq.* 912. *b.* 913. *a. b.* The advantage which they give to the Pyrrhoniſts. 654. *a.*

Carthage built an hundred and twenty-ſix years after the temple of Solomon. IV. 642.

Carthaginians, who was the firſt of all the Romans that beat them at ſea. II. 726.

Carthuſians: the pleaſant anſwer which a Carthuſian made to Philip de Comines. III. 223. *a.* Carthuſians fined in two thouſand piſtoles by whom, and for what. 541. *b.*

Cartigni, a demoniac in Savoy, who was tried in ſixteen languages. III. 211. *b.*

Cart-load; whether a cart-load of ſkins was the ſource of the war between the Duke of Burgundy and the Swiſs. II. 219. *a.*

Carvial (Cardinal) is the only one that withſtands Paul II. Who obliged the Cardinals to ſign bulls and decrees which they had never ſeen. IV. 511. *b.*

Caſa (John de la), why the Proteſtants have exclaimed ſo much againſt his verſes. IV. 235. *a.* He writes againſt Vergerius, and why. 410. *a.* What he aimed at in his abominable *Capitolo del Forno.* V. 422. *a. b.* Many have condemned it, without reading it. 423. *a.* A poem which he addreſſes to the Germans. 458. *a.* His book againſt Vergerius. *ibid. a. b. &c.*

Caſaubon (Iſaac), a conſiderable omiſſion of his. I. 519. *b.* His conjecture on a paſſage of Strabo approved. II. 632. *a. b.* He wrongfully cenſures Xiphilin touching Hadrian's Genealogy. III. 316. *b.* Had freed himſelf from the ſlavery of writing over and blotting out. IV. 85. *b.* Contradicts the great Julius Scaliger, but at the ſame time humbles himſelf with reſpect at the foot of his throne. 597. *b.* 598. *a.* His opinion about the four verſes that are aſcribed to Nero, is very odd. 596. *a.* Juſtly cenſured with reſpect to the place of Pyrrhus's burial. 660. *b.* Is cruelly taken to pieces in a ſatire. V. 98. *a. b.* Laughs at the fable of the She-Pope. IV. 739. *b.* 740. *a.* Blames St Chryſoſtome for telling obſcene ſtories. V. 852. *and a. b.* Is himſelf cenſured in his turn. *ibid. &c.*

Caſaubon (Meric), his obſervation on Homer with reſpect to the good and evil that there is in nature. V. 576. *b.* In what reſpect he conſidered Euripides as an inſpired writer. *ibid.*

Caſelius, Profeſſor at Helmſtadt; thoſe who had an eye to Eccleſiaſtical preferments, durſt not ſtudy under him. IV. 772. *a. b.*

Caſpian Sea taken for the *Pontus Euxinus.* IV. 678. *a.*

Caſſander, his conſultation. I. 691. *b.* 692. *a.* Compoſes a Latin diſcourſe, which is the origin of a very ſharp quarrel. 694. *a. b.* 695. *a.* From whom he took his conciliating ſpirit. V. 551.

Caſſini commiſſioned to find means for preventing the inundations of the Chiana. V. 499. *a. b.*

Caſſini (Samuel de) calumniates the Vaudois. IV. 916. *b.*

Caſſius (Lucius), his tribunal was called the *rock of the accuſed.* I. 351. II. 345. *and a.* His maxim *cui bono.* 345, 346. *and b.* 347. *a.* His ſeverity gave occaſion to all rigid judges being ſtiled *Caſſiani. ibid. a. b.*

Caſſius Longinus (Caius) harangues his ſoldiers. II. 350. *b.*

Caſſius Severus (Titus) took pleaſure in accuſing people. II. 356. *b.* Gave occaſion to the law which Auguſtus made againſt defamatory libels. V. 743.

Caſſock: one ought never to deſpiſe a man in a caſſock, how low an object ſoever he may ſeem. I. 361.

Caſſolus could not anſwer the queſtion that was put to him. I. 616. *a.*

Caſtalio diſguiſed under the name of Martinus Bellius, wrote againſt puniſhing Heretics. I. 789. *a. b.* Broached ſome very ſingular opinions. II. 360. *b.* Gave ſignal examples of moderation. 364. *b.* His extreme poverty. 365. *b.* 366. *a.* Whether he be the author of a dialogue againſt the right which is allowed to the Civil Magiſtrate, of putting Heretics to death. V. 167. *a. b.* His differences with Calvin more particularly related in the French life of Calvin than in the Latin one. II. 274. *b.*

Caſtellan, a pleaſant anſwer which he made to Francis I. who aſked him if he was a gentleman. II. 367. *a. b.* Gets his landlord's daughter with child. 369. *b.* 370. *a. b.* His application to ſtudy was ſurpriſing. *ibid. b.* He did not ſtay long at Rome, and the reaſon of it. *ibid. and* 371. *a.* Was of opinion that indulgence ſhould be uſed towards inquiſitors and informers. 372. *a. b.* How he checked a Cardinal for the reproaches he had caſt upon him with reſpect to Dolet. 683. *b.* 684. *a.* What he ſaid of Aſtrology. 401. *a. b.*

Caſtellan (John), an account of his martyrdom wrote by Lambert. III. 708.

Caſtello (James de) was of ſuch a ſmall ſtature that Pope Boniface VIII ordered him to riſe, thinking he was upon his knees. I. 326.

Caſtile, when, and on what occaſion, the Kings of that country began to lay hands on the Eccleſiaſtical revenues. II. 378. *a.* And who was the firſt that permitted all the public acts to be drawn up in the vulgar tongue. 379. Diſorders occaſioned in that kingdom by a dream which a woman had. IV. 456. *a.*

Caſtor and Pollux make an inroad into Attica. I. 52. *a.*

Caſtor; whether the Caſtor who compoſed many books, be the ſame with the ſon-in-law of Dejoatarus. II. 630. *b.* 631. *a.* Three reaſons for the negative. *ibid.* There was another Caſtor beſides, who was an excellent Botaniſt. 631. *b.*

Caſtrate; perſons who caſtrated themſelves out of complaiſance. II. 535. *and a. b.*

Caſtration, the puniſhment that was inflicted on adulterers. III. 74. *a. b.* What other perſons were condemned to it. 77. *a.*

Caſtritius, his anſwer to the Conſul Carbo was like that which had been made by ſome others. II. 384. *and b.* The meaning of that anſwer. *ibid.*

Caſtro (Alphonſus de) cenſured for two reaſons, with reſpect to Damaſcen and the time in which he lived. II. 586. *a.*

Caſtro (Roderigo à) ſeconds Marinello in the compoſition of his book on the diſeaſes of women. IV. 148. *a. b.*

Caſtrocaro perſecutes the Vaudois. III. 757, 758.

Caſuiſts, a doubt propoſed to them on an Anatomical curioſity. I. 109. *a.* They are obliged to treat of ſubjects full of obſcenity, in order to ſolve caſes of conſcience. 182. *a.* Their books teſtify that there are married women who make uſe of drugs to cauſe abortion. II. 314. *b.* Their books contain the art of cavilling with God. III. 894. *b.* Nothing that concerns matrimonial cauſes eſcapes their curioſity. V. 40. *b.* 41. *a. b.* Looſe Caſuiſts take a great advantage of Abraham's conduct with regard to Sarah. 51. *a.* Write down minutely all kinds of immodeſty, which they only know by the report of vicious men. III. 135. *b.* Are obliged to write or ſay things which are ſhocking to modeſty. V. 853.

Caſus Regius: whether that book be juſtly aſcribed to the Abbot de St Cyran. V. 15. *b.* 16. *a.*

Cat. A penſion left to a cat, and a famous law-ſuit about it. IV. 918. *b.*

Catalans, what they did to obtain from heaven the recovery of Mr de Marca. IV. 100. *b.*

Catalogue of the witneſſes of the truth, by whom collected. I. 165. *b.* The occaſion of that book. III. 560. *a. b.*

Catalogues of Heretics, the writers of them follow one another like ſheep. I. 760. *b.*

Catalonia, Lewis Meſplede's book concerning the right which the crown of France has to that province. IV. 199. *a.*

Catechiſm explained according to the method of Ariſtotle's Categories. I. 472. *a.*

Catechiſm of Calvin criticiſed by John d'Eſpagne. II. 837. *a. b.* Does not differ much, in explaining the Euchariſt, from the opinion of J. Poinct, who admits a Real Preſence, but which is no more than ſacramental at the ſame time. IV. 693. *b.* The date of it. V. 88. *a.*

Categories, a queſtion concerning them. V. 436. *a.*

Catherine de Medicis, her conferences with the Duke of Alba. I. 119. *a. b.* Her terrible rebuke to Amyot. 258. *a.* Her own artifices played againſt her. III. 419. *b.* The anſwer which Henry the Great made to her one day. 422. *a.* It is ſaid that ſhe made Machiavel's Prince her peculiar ſtudy. IV. 15. *and b.* 16. *a.* A letter that was wrote to her. 160. *a. b.* 161. *a. b.* Fables uttered in her Funeral Oration. V. 36. *a.* Reflexion upon her conduct. 255. *a.* Her inſenſibility with regard to ſlanders. 760, 761. A maxim aſcribed to her. 750. See *Medicis.*

Catherine de Navarre, ſiſter to Henry the Great, refuſes to marry with the condition of going to Maſs. IV. 330. *a. b.* Found no great ſatisfaction in her marriage. *ibid.* 331. *a.* She continues ſteadfaſt in her religion. *ibid.*

Catholic: of what Prince it was ſaid, that he *was a good Catholic, but a very bad Chriſtian.* III. 809. *b.*

Catholicon ; who was the firſt that made uſe of that word for the title of a Dictionary. I. 614. *b.*

Catholicon, a paſſage from that book ; deſcribing a proceſſion of the League. IV. 243. *b.*

Catholics and Proteſtants reproach each other with having Adamites among them. I. 712. *and a. b.* Several Roman Catholics have all their life-time made profeſſion of the Catholic religion, although they wiſhed for a reformation in many things. 659. They are not at all ſcrupulous when the queſtion is about the conqueſts which they make upon the Proteſtants. II. 246. *b.* What their making the ſign of the croſs ſerves for. 616. *b.* Engliſh Catholics, their threatenings and imprecations againſt their country. III. 521. *b.* The reaſon of ringing a bell at noon in Roman Catholic countries. IV. 50. *a.* The free exerciſe of their religion is promiſed them in Holland. III. 675. *a.*

Catiline, by what means his conſpiracy began to be diſcovered. III. 112. *b.* 113. *a.* How we may ſuppoſe him to have paſſed for one of Fulvia's huſbands. 112. *b.*

Catinat (Mr de) did not raiſe the ſiege of Suſa, on the contrary he took it, and kept it till the peace. IV. 210. *b.* Was not beaten at Coni. *ibid.* 211. *a.* Gains the battle of Marſaglia. *ibid.* It is falſe that he was forced by the allies, to return beyond the Alps. *ibid.*

Cato the Cenſor expels one Manlius from the ſenate, and why. I. 40. *b.* What he ſaid in order to deride Iſocrates's ſchool. 615. *a.* It is ſaid that no one durſt aſk an unjuſt thing of him. II. 27. *a. b.* The offers which he made to King Ptolomy, in order to engage him to ſurrender up the iſland of Cyprus to the Romans. 507. The reſpect which the people ſhewed him, at the Floral Games, and Martial's raillery. III. 54. *a.* He harangues vehemently againſt the liberty which the women took of running in crowds. IV. 769. *b.* The judgment he paſſed upon the three Philoſophers that came Embaſſadors from Athens. II. 329. *b.* And why he adviſed them to be ſent back immediately. *ibid. and* IV. 751. *b.* 752. *a.* His *Origines*. 750. *a. b.* His contempt for all the Greek literature. 751. *b.* He is blamed for indulging the leudneſs of his Domeſtics. 754. *a.* His uſury. *ibid. and. b.* He is rallied. V. 434. *a.*

Cato Uticenſis ſays that God does not hear the prayers of the ſlothful. I. 94. *b.* Deſired rather to be an honeſt man, than to ſeem ſo. II. 420. *b.* 421. *a.* Part of his Hiſtory. IV. 745. *a. b.* 746. *a.* His ſurprize at a letter which he read. V. 123. *a. b.* He cenſures Cæſar's opinion touching the puniſhment of bad men ; but he only does it indirectly and with moderation. II. 418. *a.*

Cattho (Angelo) his gift of prophecy. II. 391. *b.* 392. *a.* Reflexions on that head. *ibid. a. b.* 393. *a.*

Catullus writes verſes againſt Cæſar. IV. 88. *a. b.*

Caucaſus (Mount) why ſo called. II. 82. *b.*

Cave (William) treats the ſtory of Pope Joan as a mere fable, and maintains that it has been thruſt into the chronicle of Martin Polonus, by another hand. IV. 709. *a.*

Cavern : what uſe the Lacedemonians made of a cavern near the mountain Taygetus. III. 965. *a. b.*

Cauſe, the Schoolmen plagued themſelves to aſſign a cauſe for every effect. II. 227. *a.*

Cauſe (Firſt) the doctrine of ſome Philoſophers concerning it. II. 672. *a. b.* 673. *a. b.*

Cauſes, ſome are very eaſily defended, though the Defendant be a little in the wrong. I. 391. *b.* The beſt may be loſt in certain circumſtances. IV. 852. *b.* 853. *a.* Some cauſes which bear the name of luſcious. 799. *a. b. to* 802. *a. b.*

Cauſes (Occaſional) whether the Devil makes uſe of the ſtaff as an occaſional cauſe. I. 4. *b.* Reflexion upon the Hypotheſis of occaſional cauſes. II. 251. *a b.* Its uſe. 767. *b.* There is no Hypotheſis more capable of giving an account of events. IV. 690. *a.* May be of ſome uſe towards accounting for dreams. 72. *a.* And explaining the Phænomena relating to bodies. 94. *b.* Whether they produced the miracles of the antient law. 609. *a. b.* This ſyſtem does not bring in God acting miraculouſly. 914. *b.* Whether it can be of any uſe towards reſolving ſome difficulties touching Providence. V. 371. *a. b.* 372. *a.*

Cauſſin, to what he compares St Paul and St Auguſtin. I. 109. *b.* His ſympathy with the ſun. II. 402. *b.* And Henry the fourth's prognoſtication concerning him. *ibid. and* 403. *a.* He gives us the long particulars of a ſtory all taken out of his own head. III. 19. *b.* 20. *a.* Condemns a cenſure of Longin. V. 328. *b.* 329. *a.*

Cea, the inhabitants of that iſland place Ariſteus, ſon to Apollo, in the number of the gods. I. 456. *a.* See *Zia.*

Cedrenus, miſtaking Xiphilin's meaning falls into a groſs error, touching Hadrian's extraction. III. 316. *b.*

Ceylon, a comical opinion of the inhabitants of that iſland, touching the tears of Eve. I. 23. *a.* A mountain of that iſland, called the Peak of Adam, and for what reaſon. 104. *a.*

Celeſtin III, what he did to ſhew that he could give the Imperial crown to whom he pleaſed. III. 394. *a.*

Celibacy ; Agrippa declaimed againſt the law of Celibacy. I. 156. *b.* That law has terrible conſequences, and is an inexhauſtible ſource of impurities and diſorders. II. 554. *b.* 588. *a. b.* III. 13. *b.* 14. *a. b.* 224. *b.* 225. *a. b.* IV. 240. *and a. b.* The vow of Celibacy is raſh. III. 13. *b.* The number of Clergymen who cannot bear the yoke of it is innumerable. 235. *a.* Whether Philoſophers ought to prefer it to marriage. 382. *b.* Whether it be poſſible to be obſerved. 595. *a. b.* The ſuppreſſion of Celibacy was very inconvenient to the great Proteſtant Lords in Germany. 727. *b.* Cannot be defended by the diſorders of ſome married perſons. V. 425. *b.* 426. *a.* Joſeph Hall diſputes upon that ſubject. 344. *a. b.* 345. *a.* A curious paſſage of the Hiſtory of Huldric Mutius on the ſame ſubject. IV. 296. *a. b.* 297. *a.* Paſſages from others to the like purpoſe. 411. *a. b.*

Celſus laughs at the Chriſtians, and at their *Do not examine, only believe.* V. 816. Confuted by Origen *ibid. and* 817.

Celſus, has raiſed beaſts above men. IV. 911. *b.*

Celtæ, whence ſo called. III. 433. *a.*

Celtes (Conrad) there were ſome famous Latin Poets in Germany before him. III. 724. *and b.*

Cenalis (Robert) his judgment on John Bouchet's Annals of Aquitain. II. 103. *a.*

Ceneus, killed in the quarrel between the Centaurs and Lapithæ. I. 537. *a.*

Cenſor. He who is very guilty, himſelf ought not to ſet up for a Cenſor. 210. *b.*

Cenſors of Books, their little attention. I. 101. *a.* They detain manuſcripts too long, and ſtrike many things out of them. II. 809. *a.*

Cenſure ; the inclination which people have for cenſure. I. 696. *a.* Cenſures that are groſs and indiſcreet, produce very bad conſequences. 377. *b.* The inconveniencies which attend thoſe Cenſures, which fall upon a multitude of propoſitions, in a looſe and indeterminate manner, and without particularizing each propoſition. 340. *a.* 607. *a.* The fatal effects of it, when it is ill managed. III. 464. *a. b.* 465. *a. b.*

Centula, city, why ſo called. I. 10. *a.*

Centuriators of Magdeburg, what they relate touching Gregory the Great, deſerves no credit. III. 224. *b.* 225. *a. b. &c.* How they were treated. 600. *b.* Some facts which concern their work. 560. *b.* 561. *a. b. & ſeq.* Their Epiſtle Dedicatory to Queen Elizabeth. 562. *a. b.* 563. *a. b.*

Century, the XVIth and XVIIth, compared in point of learning. I. 92. *b.* 220. *b.* 221. *a. b.*

Cepio favours the Knights cauſe againſt the pretenſions of the Senate. II. 711. *b.*

Ceramica ; there was in Athens, a fine ſtreet, and likewiſe a ſuburb, which were called by that name, but for different reaſons. IV. 343. *b.*

Cerdagne, taken for the iſland of Sardinia, by a learned Civilian. II. 464. *b.*

Ceremonies (Sacred) ought not to be divulged. III. 216. *b.* It is better to bear with them, than to diſmember the Church. 343. *a. b.*

Ceres, for what benefactions the world ſtood indebted to her. V. 333. *a.* In what manner her feaſt called *Theſmophoria*, was celebrated. *ibid. b.* How Baubo cured her of her melancholy. 336. *a. b.* And what was the conſequence of that. *ibid.*

Cerigo. See *Cythera.*

Ceriſantes has wrote ſome very pretty Latin verſes, which are quoted by Menage. III. 102. *b. n.* (18).

Cervantes (Michael) his novels tranſlated by d'Audiguier. I. 548. *a.*

Ceſar (Auguſtus) owes the greateſt part of his glory to the intereſt he had among the learned men of his Court. V. 660.

Ceſar (Julius) whether that which Valerius Maximus relates concerning Accius, ought to be applied to him. I. 59. *a.* Was a Poet when very young. *ibid.* His ſoul ſuppoſed to have been changed into a ſtar. 348. *b.* He deſerved death, but it was not the buſineſs of three or four private perſons, to undertake to puniſh him. II. 165. *b.* What weapons his murderers made uſe of to kill him, and with what weapons they were killed themſelves. 349. *a.* Valerius Maximus is the only Hiſtorian who ſpeaks of his apparition to Caſſius. *ibid. b.* Whether he ever returned into Gaul after the paſſage of the Rubicon. 394. *b.* An inſtance of his moderation. *ibid. a.* Whether ſome others in the like ſituation could have done what he did. 414. *a. b.* The three celebrated words which he wrote to a friend. 415. *b.* Different judgments on his Commentaries. 417. *b.* 418. *a.* Some facts relating to the ſame book. 425. *a. b.* Who was the firſt that publiſhed it in Greek. III. 620. *and a.* He does not vouchſafe to riſe up to the Senate. II. 421. *b.* 422. *a. b.* V. 399. *a.* Attempts of his favourites to procure him the title of King. II. 420. *a.* Why he gave no deciſion in Dejotarus's cauſe. 626. *a. b.* 627. *a.* Said he had nothing to fear from ſuch fat and well-dreſſed men as Dolabella and Marc Antony. 679. *b.* What ſort of friends he made choice of, according to Cicero. 680. *a.* The effect which Cicero's oration for Ligarius had upon him. III. 831. *b.* He is too fond of diſcourſing upon the profeſſion of others. 871. *a.* Seizes upon the treaſure which was kept in the temple of Saturn. IV. 204. *b.* 205. *a. b.* Suppreſſes that action in his Hiſtory. *ibid.* Makes Pompey his ſon-in-law. 281. *a.* Was wont to forget nothing but injuries. 488. *b. n.* (48). Receives a love-letter in the Senate-houſe. V. 123. *b.* Indulged his ſoldiers in all manner of debauchery after a great victory. 271. *a.* Wiſhed for a ſudden death. 439. *b.* The Arverni ſhewed his ſword hung up in one of their temples. II. 419. *b.* His Commentaries tranſlated and commented on by Vigenere. I. 631. *a.* A parallel drawn between him and Henry IV, by Antony de Bandole. *ibid.*

Ceſarius, a letter of St Chryſoſtome to that Monk. II. 5. *b.*

Ceſy-Sancy, on what terms he married the Counteſs de Moret. III. 266. *a. b.*

Ceſonia, Caligula's wife, facts that concern her. II. 256. *a. b.*

Cevennes: it was falſely affirmed that the Count de Souches, was born there. V. 192.

Chabot (Joan) publickly profeſſes the Proteſtant religion without quitting the habit of a Nun. IV. 470.

Chains; why Kings were loaded with Chains of gold or ſilver, I. 516. *b.*

Chaiſe (Father de la) a ſatire againſt him. I. 343. *a. b.* 344. *a.*

Chalcondyle has ſpoke of the Bohemians from very bad authority. II. 298. *a.*

Challenges of a remarkable kind. II. 208. *a. b.*

Chamber-maid: a young fellow in the diſguiſe of a Chamber-maid. I. 405.

Chambers of the Edict, when granted to the Huguenots. III. 156. *b.*

Chambers of Meditations: places into which the Jeſuits carry the greateſt ſinners. *&c.* II. 457. *a.* Deſcribed. *ibid.*

Chambre (the Abbot de la) what he took for his text in the funeral oration on the French Queen. III. 601. *b.*

Chamier dies like Zuinglius, with his ſword in his hand. II. 432. *a. b.* 433. *a.* His character. *ibid. and b.*

Champion des Dames, who was the author of that Poem. III. 77.

Chanaan, the cauſe of his wickedneſs, and the firſt ſymptoms of it. II. 431. *b.*

Change: we ought to continue in the communion we were brought up in, unleſs we can be gainers by the change. IV. 375. *a.*

Changes in point of belief, proved by authentic facts. IV. 737. *a.* Maintained to be impoſſible by the Roman Controverſiſts, with regard to the Euchariſt, by Meſſieurs de Port-Royal, and with regard to all the articles of Faith by Langevin. *ibid. n.* (150).

Changy; that land is in Burgundy. II. 435. *b.*

Chanvalon, Queen Margaret's gallant. V. 529. *b.* 530. *a.*

Chaos, who was the firſt of the Philoſophers that ſuppoſed an Intelligence to reduce it into form. I. 299. *a. b.* 300. *a. b.* The antient Philoſophers went back as far as the Chaos, and the firſt original of all things. 302. *a. b.* 303. *a.* Whether the ideas of the Antients, who have mentioned the Chaos are juſt, and whether they could pretend with any ſhew of reaſon, that this ſtate ſubſiſted no longer. 304, 305, 306. IV. 434. *b. as far as* 442. *b.* Different ſignifications of that word. V. 323. *a. b. &c.* What it was according to Plato. 634. *b.*

Chapelet du S. Sacrement: a piece compoſed by a ſiſter of Antony Arnauld, aſcribed to the Abbot de St Cyran, and condemned by the Sorbonne. V. 16. *and b.*

Chapter of Paris, its tyrannical treatment of the *Paſtouraux* puniſhed. II. 383. *a. b.* When thoſe kind of affranchiſings became very common. *ibid. b.*

Chapuzeau (Samuel) quoted. III. 93. *a.* Convicts Mr Jurieu of having reflected on the Dutch, very little leſs than Tavernier has done. V. 300. *a.*

Character. The true Character of turbulent zealots. I. 716. *a. b.*

Characters (Round) in Printing; who was the firſt that brought them into France. I. 600. *a.*

Charenton, its national ſynod of 1631, charges its Deputies not to deliver their ſpeech to the King on their knees, but ſtanding as the Clergy of the kingdom do. I. 261. *a.* After a long conteſt, an audience is obtained in the manner it was deſired. *ibid.* Fruitleſs attempts to ſet up a college there. II. 686. On what occaſion their was preaching in the church-yard of Charenton. 695. *b.* 696. *a.*

Charicles diſgraces himſelf by his conduct, with reſpect to Pythionice's tomb. III. 357. *a.*

Chariot (Triumphal) drawn by four white horſes, was looked upon by the Romans, as a thing peculiarly ſacred to the ſovereign of the gods. II. 290. *a.*

Chariots (ſailing) invented by Stevin; Grotius writes a Poem on that ſubject. V. 236. *and b.*

Charivari (or Mock-Muſic) which was given to a woman that was married again immediately after the death of her huſband, authorized by law. II. 104. *a.* Approved of by a great many Lawyers. *ibid. n.* (3). Diſapproved of by Faber and Chaſſaneus. *ibid. n.* (3).

Charlemagne, his life aſcribed to Plutarch by Wicelius. I. 57. How that Emperor diſcovered his daughter's intrigue with his Secretary, and in what manner he behaved after the diſcovery. II. 744. *b.* 745. *a.* Whether he created the Peers of France. III. 336. *a.* The book which John du Tillet publiſhed under his name, is as old as his time at leaſt. A diſpute on that head. V. 355. *a. b.* 356. *a.*

Charles, Duke of Sudermania, declared King of Sweden, by the States of the Kingdom. V. 652. Propoſes to the King of Denmark, that they ſhould terminate their quarrel by a duel. 653.

Charles V, whether he made uſe of the counſels of Agrippa. I. 152. *a.* Accuſes to the Princes and States of the Empire, Henry II, of having entered into a League with Soliman. 407. *a. b.* Agrees with the Pope to accuſe him in full council. *ibid. a.* An excellent ſaying of his. 587. *a.* He diſcovers to Philip II the true birth of Don John, and charges him to acknowledge him as his brother. 587. *and a. b.* What he ſaid of Langey's pen. 720. *a.* What occaſioned people to ſay that he died a Lutheran. II. 336. *a. b.* 440. *a. b.* He offers to fight Francis I, in ſingle combat. 437. *a.* Whether he was very chaſte. 442. *a. b.* Who aſſiſted at his laſt moments. 336. *a.* And with what ſentiments he died. *ibid.* Facts concerning his confeſſor. *ibid. and b.* The reaſon of his being preferred to his competitor for the empire. 435. *b.* 436. *a.* By what intrigues he prevented his being ſtopped at the Court of Francis I. 841. *a.* And reduced the Court of France to ſtrange extremities. *ibid. b.* 842. *a.* Of which he did not know how to make a proper uſe. 841. *b.* His impoſtures againſt Francis I, produce all the effect that he could expect from them. III. 90. *b.* 91. *a. b. &c.* He repents of having neglected the Latin tongue.

323. *a*. *b*. Does violence to nature two different ways in two marriages. 966. *a*. A Lord in the Low-Countries blew up the houſe where he had entertained that Emperor. IV. 40. *b*. A generous action of his. III. 950. *b*. He takes poſſeſſion of the Milaneſe. V. 129. *a*. Subdues Conſtance. II. 551. What it was that chiefly traverſed his deſign of an univerſal monarchy. V. 671. He was ſomewhat too late in pacifying the differences in point of religion. 672.

Charles VI, King of France, the miſery and diſorder of France under that Prince. II. 213. *b*. 214. *a*.

Charles VII, King of France, the bad reputation of the Queen his mother. II. 209. *a*. *b*. A ſentence paſſed againſt him. 210. *a*. *b*. 211. *a*. He makes a kind of *Amende honorable*. 212. *a*. *b*. 213. *a*. If he had had courage and genius enough, he never would have proſtituted his honour as he did. 213. *b*. What Mezerai ſays of him. III. 798. *b*.

Charles VIII, King of France; Haillan gives out that he was ſuppoſititious. III. 337. *a*. His education. 799. *a*. He was extremely infirm both in body and mind; and the reaſon of his being ſo. 813. *a*. *b*. Before his time the Pox was unknown in France. IV. 574. *a*. A Surgeon kneels before his ſtatue, and for what reaſon. *ibid*. Savonarola had propheſied that he ſhould return into Italy. V. 59, 60. That Monk's affection to him, and the reaſon of it. 72. His death. 58. *b*. 60. *a*. It contributed nothing towards Savonarola's downfal. 58. *b*. His expedition looked upon as one of the greateſt miſfortunes that ever befel Italy. 60. *a*. Savonarola exhorts him by letters to return into Italy. 70. *b*.

Charles IX, King of France, what he ſaid to the Admiral de Coligni. I. 14. *a*. *b*. He harangues his Parliament with a courageous and threatening boldneſs. 256. *a*. III. 512. *b*. Does not eſteem Amyot's Poetry. I. 259. *a*. And reproaches him with his avarice. 256. *a*. To whom he owed his ill qualities. II. 509. *a*. His policy with reſpect to Poets. 617. *b*. And witty authors. IV. 894. *b*. Threatens the King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé. III. 418. *a*. *b*. Did himſelf, from his chamber-window, fire upon the Huguenots that were flying from the maſſacre. IV. 471. *a*. It was unjuſtly laid to his charge that he did not love women. V. 392. *a*. *b*. 393. *a*. *b*.

Charles X, pretended King of France: what the League did for him againſt Henry IV. IV. 730. *a*.

Charles I, King of England; his death being imputed to the Preſbyterian party, occaſions the drawing of a thouſand odious conſequences againſt the Proteſtants of France. I. 265. *a*. His execution condemned by ſeveral Proteſtant writers. III. 426. *a*. He is ſuppoſed to have died a member of the Romiſh Church, in a book that was dedicated to his ſon. IV. 215. *b*. Was not the author of a book which was aſcribed to him. 221. *a*. *b*. &c. His *Prayer in the Time of Captivity*. 222. *b*. 223. *a*.

Charles II, King of England, papers that were found in his ſtrong-box concerning the controverſy between the Proteſtants and the Church of Rome. II. 700. *b*. A book which was dedicated to him by Milletiere. IV. 215. *a*.

Charles II, King of Spain, to what his recovery was aſcribed. IV. 355. *a*.

Charles, Duke of Calabria, enjoins a Neapolitan gentleman to maintain an old horſe which he had abandoned, after having received conſiderable ſervices from him. IV. 918. *b*.

Charlevois, what ſnares were laid to ruin him. III. 265. *a* *b*.

Charpentier commits a blunder in an harangue which he had prepared. III. 649. *a*.

Charron, placed by Garaſſe in the catalogue of Atheiſts. II. 450. *a*. *b*. Had a mind to be a Carthuſian. 448. *a*. Contracted a very ſtrict friendſhip with Montagne. *ibid. and b*. Quoted. 453. *a*. *b*. 454. *a*. What Sorel obſerves concerning this author. *ibid*. *b*. 455. *a*. It has been ſaid that he was more dangerous than Montagne. 454. *b*. His doctrine touching the incomprehenſibility of the Divine Nature. V. 145. *a*. *b*. 146. *a*. He approves the doctrine of John Huarte concerning wits. III. 528. *b*. *n*. (4). How the faculties of Divinity in France dealt with his treatiſe *Of Wiſdom*. V. 810.

Chartier (Alain), ſeveral pieces not compoſed by him were mixed with his works. IV. 163. *a*.

Chaſſaneus, what ſtory he relates concerning the Virgin Mary. IV. 805. *a*.

Chaſtel (John), the apology for him. II. 101. *a*. 103. *a*. *n*. (15). His attempt on the life of Henry IV, and its conſequences. 456. *a*. *b*. & *ſeq*. Who was the author of his apology. 459. *b*. A conjecture upon what moved the Parliament of Paris to involve the Jeſuits in his cauſe. III. 280. *and a*. *b*.

Chaſtelet (du) quoted. III. 818. *b*. IV. 142. *b*. 143. *b*. &c.

Chaſtity did not continue long upon earth. I. 380. *a*. A ſurprizing example of that virtue. II. 108. *b*. 109. *a*. V. 603. *b*. 604. *a*. Chaſtity not only immanent, but tranſitive or penetrative. II. 108. *b*. 109. *a*. Why private perſons ſtumble more in that reſpect, than with regard to all the other virtues. 382. *a*. The moſt ardent love of it does not neceſſarily exclude the mechanical diſpoſitions to incontinency. 556. *b*. 557. *a*. III. 99. *b*. In order to preſerve it, one ought to wiſh for a quality like that of the Hirpes. 72. *b*. It is not incompatible with bravery. 414. *b*. Attended with an incredible circumſtance. 186. *a*. *b*. 187. *a*. Some nations have quite loſt the ideas of honour with regard to this virtue. 580. *b*. 581. *a*. *b*. 604. *a*. *b*. *and* 773. *a*. *b*. See *Continency*. It is reported that the emerald is a great friend to chaſtity: a curious example on that head. IV. 864. *b*.

Chaſtity of Converſation: a new proof againſt what Mr Chevreau advances concerning it. V. 540. *a*. *b*.

Châtel (John du), a ſoothſayer and fortune-teller, his depoſition againſt Concini and his wife. III. 126. *b*.

Chatillard, a French gentleman beheaded in Scotland, for making an attempt upon the honour of the Queen. IV. 896. *b*.

Châtillon (Marſhal), the firſt ſeed of diviſion betwixt him and Marſhal Brezé. III. 821. *a*.

Châtillon (Admiral) plainly pointed at in a ſeditious harangue that was pronounced in the name of the Clergy. IV. 815. *b*.

Chavagnac, obſervations upon his memoirs. V. 191. *b*. 192. *a*. *b*.

Chaumont, his negligence when he read the books that he went about to confute. II. 580. *a*.

Cheeſe, who invented the ſecret of making it. I. 455. *a*.

Chelonis frees herſelf from a nice and difficult juncture. II. 467.

Chemnitius treated as a formidable adverſary by Don Nicolas Antonio. I. 323. *a*. *b*.

Chenailles, an agreeable houſe upon the Loire. II. 647. *a*.

Chereſtrata, mother to Epicurus, why that woman could not fail to form a ſage. II. 775. *a*.

Cheriſs are held in ſuch veneration among the Turks, that they alone wear the green turbant. IV. 40. *b*.

Cherſeoglis turns Mahometan out of ſpite. III. 730. *b*.

Cheſne (Andrew du), it is probable that the world is indebted to him for the edition of Abelard's works. I. 249. *b*.

Cheſs, a book treating of that game is ſpoken of as ready to come out. II. 53. *a*. *b*. 54. *a*. *b*. A famous player at it. III. 162.

Chevillier, his treatiſe on the origin of Printing at Paris: a curious paſſage of that book. I. 780. *a*. Quoted with reſpect to Aretin's ſonnets. 440. *a*.

Chevreau (Urban) confounds himſelf while he relies on the teſtimony of Herodotus. I. 72. *a*. *b*. Is put right with reſpect to the martyrdom of St Babylas. 594. *b*. 595. *a*. A very probable conjecture touching a miſtake in his hiſtory. II. 352. *b*. What he ſays of old men who marry. IV. 88. *b*. And of a cauſe about adultery. V. 112. *a*. *b*. 113. *a*. His judgment concerning the quarrel between Girac and Coſtar. 345. *and b*. His notions with regard to politeneſs of ſtile, and a confutation of them. 843. *and a*. *b*. 856.

Chevreuſe (the Duke of), as proxy to the King of Great-Britain, marries the Princeſs Henriette-Mary of France. III. 300. *a*.

Chevreuſe (the Ducheſs of), the miſchief ſhe occaſions. III. 303. *a*. *b*. 304. *a*. *b*. 305. *a*.

Chiabrera (Gabriel) looked upon as the inventer of the Anacreontic ſongs. IV. 879.

Chicocius, an author unknown to Guy Patin. V. 74. *a. b.*

Chievres, governour to Charles V, whether it be true that he diſcouraged his pupil from ſtudying Latin. III. 323. *a. b.*

Child (Suppoſititious): Ageſilaus pretends that Leotychides is a ſuppoſititious child. I. 128. *a.*

Child-births; French women are not ſo ſcrupulous in that ſituation as the women of other countries. III. 453. *b.* Fictions of the Antients touching the goddeſs that preſided over them. 633. *a. b.* 641. *a. b.* What term the Antients allowed for them. I. 128. *a. n.* (5). A woman, who, under the pains of child-birth, diſcovers an extraordinary courage and reſolution. IV. 324. *and b.* A ſpiritual child-birth, which gave the ſame pains as a child-birth in a proper ſenſe. II. 110. *b.*

Childeric, the ſtory that is told of him and Baſina. I. 668. *a. b.* 669. *a. b.* 670. *a. b.*

Childhood: an ambition that diſcovers itſelf in one's childhood deſerves to be feared. II. 711. *a.*

Children, it is their inevitable fate to follow the religion of thoſe who educate them. I. 44. *b.* The cuſtom of frightening them is very antient. 63. *and b.* Songs with which they are lulled to ſleep. 69. *b.* Formerly people were perſuaded that the ſuckling of children made part of their education. II. 382. *a. b.* A proof thereof taken from a very ſingular fact. *ibid.* Their education. 495. *a. b.* They are made to believe any thing. III. 645. *b.* Whether it be better to educate them at home, or to ſend them to the univerſities. 662. *a.* Their character. 815. *b. n.* (7). Some infirm children grow ſtrong and healthy. IV. 117. *a. b.* A child of a prodigious capacity for learning. II. 707. *a. b.* A child who grows three cubits in three years, and decreaſes with the like proportion. V. 283. *b.* It is ſuppoſed that Tapperus had never heard how children come into the world. 294. *a.* A maxim for their education. 573. *b.* A Phyſician treats of the formalities requiſite in order to beget children of good capacities. III. 529. *a. b.* Their diſpoſitions ought to be conſulted in the choice of employments. *ibid. b.* Sacrificed to the *Dii Penates*, and to Mania, the mother of the Lares. II. 163. *b.* The cruelty of that ſacrifice aboliſhed by Lucius Junius Brutus. *ibid.*

Chiliaſts ſuffer a great mortification by the peace of Piſa. IV. 122. *b.*

χιλὸς, the ſignification of that word. I. 77. *b.*

Chymiſts, an order made againſt them by the Parliament of Paris. I. 469. *b.*

China, the greateſt part of *Literati* there are Atheiſts, being idolaters only through diſſimulation and hypocriſy. IV. 81. *b.* Whether it be prudent to grant an edict of toleration to the miſſionaries in that country. 223. *b.* 224. *a.* The Hiſtory of that Empire, which was wrote by John Gonzalio de Mendozza, tranſlated into French by Luke de la Porte. 198. *and a. b.* 199. *and a. b.*

Chineſe, a ſect that is in vogue among them. II. 118. *a.* V. 180. *b.* 181. *a.* How many figures they make uſe of in writing. III. 171. *b.* Moſt of them are much addicted to the opinion of the tranſmigration of ſouls. 341. *b.* What doctrine the ſect of their *Literati* have embraced. II. 412. *b.* V. 180. *b.* 181. *a.* 217. *a. b.* 218. *a.* The Theology of one of their ſects. 202. *a. b.* 203. *a.* An hypotheſis that is greatly in vogue among them. 217. *a.*

Chios, Cicero's anſwer to the inhabitants of that iſland. V. 350. *b.*

Chirocmeta; remarks concerning that book. II. 640. *a. b.*

Chiron and Phœnix cannot both have been Preceptors to Achilles. I. 78. *a. b.* 79. *a. b.* The birth of Chiron. IV. 617. *and b.*

Chytræus (David) publiſhes the apology for the Confeſſion of Augſburg wrote by George Braun. II. 122. *b.* His Hiſtory of the Confeſſion of Augſburg. *ibid.* Tranſlated into French. *ibid.*

Chœnix; what it is not to ſit upon a Chœnix. IV. 670. *a.*

Choler very fit to ſupport certain maxims. V. 194. *b.*

Chryſippus did not approve of frightning us from our ſins by Divine juſtice, and for what reaſon. I. 63. Refuted by Carneades. II. 328. *a. b.* Deſires to write much out of envy to Epicurus. 485. *b.* Collects ſo many arguments for the Hypotheſis of uncertainty, that he could not refute them afterwards. 486. *a. b.* 487. *a. b.* 488. *a. b.* 489. *a. b.* 490. *a. b.* 491. *a. b.* Lays down a wrong maxim, and contradicts himſelf. 486. *b.* 487. *a. b.* Is accuſed by Plutarch of making God the author of ſin. 489. *a. b.* &c. IV. 519. *b.* There never was a greater diſturber of all things in the empire of Philoſophy. 495. *a.* According to Plutarch, he compares God to King Dejotarus. 627. *a. b.* He takes a vain precaution to eſtabliſh what was called Fatum. 790. *b.* 791. *a.* Amuſes himſelf too much with explaining the traditions of the Poets. III. 648. *b.* 652. *b.* 653. *a.*

Chryſopolis, whence that city took its name. II. 482. *a.*

Chryſoſtome (St) magnifies without reaſon the courage and prudence of Abraham. I. 38. *a.* And the obedience of Sarah. *ibid.* Pays the Gentiles in their own coin, with reſpect to their renouncing the world. 294. *b.* He is miſtaken about the cauſe of St Babylas his death. 592. *a. b.* It appears that he had but little conſulted Hiſtory on that ſubject. *ibid. b.* He errs very innocently in affirming ſeveral falſities. 593. *a.* The general grounds of ſome of his miſtakes. *ibid. b.* His letter to Cæſarius the Monk, expreſs againſt Tranſubſtantiation. 672. *a.* II. 5. *b.* He does not reaſon better than Bion (or Bias) upon the ſubject of marriage. 14. *a.* Ill-uſed by Eraſmus. 813. *b.* 814. *a.* Why he did not appear before the Synod of Theophilus. IV. 347. *b.* His exaggerations on Sarah's decay. V. 53. *b.* His letter to Cæſarius with the diſſertations of James Baſnage. I. 672. *a.*

Chriſt, whether he ought to manifeſt himſelf at the end of about ſix thouſand years. I. 173. *b.*

Chriſtian, Elector of Saxony, far from being ſo rigid a Lutheran as his father. III. 972.

Chriſtian II, King of Denmark, lays ſiege to Stockholm, and obliges the Swedes to acknowledge him as their King. V. 651. Depoſed for his cruelties, and confined in a caſtle, during the reſt of his life. *ibid.*

Chriſtian IV, King of Denmark, having a deſign to divorce his wife, the Judges give it againſt him. V. 80. His amours, his marriage to, and divorce from, Chriſtina of the antient houſe of Monch. 500. *b.*

Chriſtianity, treated like an old palace which wants props on every ſide. I. 94. *b.* What Averrhoës ſaid of it, when he reflected on the practice of the Romiſh communion. 556. *b.* The ſcandal of the diviſions which prevail among thoſe who profeſs it. II. 455. *b.* 456. *a.* It is not always the ſame. III. 551. *a.* Fired with the ſpirit of perſecution. *ibid.* Its ſpeedy propagation alone ſufficient to prove its Divine original. 889. *b.* Has been eſtabliſhed by other methods than it was in the three firſt ages of the Church. IV. 32. *a. b.* The truth of it not ſufficiently proved from its large extent. *ibid. b. and* 33. *a.* Nor from its proſperity. *ibid. and b.* An inconvenience which happened in its infancy. 41. *a. b.* A great many abuſes like thoſe of the Heathens have crept into it. 584. *b.* Why impudent ſects have been oftener ſeen in it than under Paganiſm. V. 415. *a.* Its Divine inſtitution and character. 830, 831, 832.

Chriſtianopel, a city belonging to the Danes, taken and ſacked by the Swedes. V. 653.

Chriſtians, a bloody victory gained over them by the Saracens. I. 15. *a.* When they diſputed moſt ſtrongly againſt the Jews. 173. *b.* What they ought to do when they are perſecuted. 264. *b.* 265. *a.* Have no right to inſult the Heathen Philoſophers, touching promiſed fidelity. 380. *a.* Have left off patience and ſubmiſſion a great while. *ibid.* Their motto. V. 154. *a.* In what country they do not underſtand one word of the religion they obſerve. II. 677. *b.* Who is the author of an impudent invective made againſt them, which is related in the dialogue of Minutius Fœlix. III. 109. *a. b.* Many of them, in the time of St Gregory, wavered in their belief of the immortality of the ſoul, and the reſurrection of the body. 267. *a.* Nothing is more ſcarce than a Chriſtian worthy of that name. 172. *b.* Whether one may be a Chriſtian without embracing any particular communion. 246. *a. b.* It is much harder for them to make a right uſe of riches, than to go without them. III. 738. *a.* Quadratus and Ariſtides, preſent apologies on their behalf. 320. Thoſe of the IVth century, made frequent mention of the antiquity of their families. 379. *b.* The prepoſſeſſion of their communions one againſt another. 579. *a.* It is ſtrange that they, whoſe ſyſtem is ſo pure, ſhould be ſo corrupt in their manners. 649. *a.* There were Chriſtians found among the Senators themſelves who endeavoured to maintain the celebration of the Lupercalia. 933. They cannot juſtly reproach the Infidels, as to morals. IV. 33. *b.* 34. *a.* Have been infinitely more cruel than the followers of Mahomet. 32. *a. b.* Were accuſed of being the cauſe of all the public calamities. V. 454. *a. b.* And in their turn accuſed their enemies of the ſame thing. *ibid.* Rallied and laughed at by Celſus for their, *examine not, only believe.* 816. Defended by Origen. *ibid. and* 817. Captives to faith, and not judges of doctrines. 822. Every good Chriſtian ought to be ſatisfied with his faith being founded on the word of God. 829. Their diſputes ſhould only be carried to the tribunal of Revelation. 830.

Chriſtina de Piſe, what ſhe relates concerning Novella. I. 325. *a.*

Chriſtina, Queen of Sweden, writes to the general of the Jeſuits, deſiring that two of their ſociety might be diſpatched to her. IV. 3. *and a. b.* How ſhe was taken out of a lake, into which ſhe fell. 526. *a. n.* (122). Never a day paſſed but ſhe read ſome pages of Tacitus. V. 281. *a.*

Chriſtmas Songs. The Catholics reproached with the prophane tunes of their Chriſtmas Songs. IV. 160. *a.*

Chronicle (Martinian) ſo called from Martinus Polonus the author of it: tranſlated into French with the additions of Verneron and Caſtel. IV. 713.

Chronicle-Writers, many of them copy the ſame falſe ſtories. I. 30. *a.*

Chronologers, ſome of them relate their own Hiſtory very confuſedly. I. 389. *a.*

Chronology; whether the Chronology of the Scripture could have been diſentangled without the help of prophane authors. I. 775. *b.* There is little Chronology in moſt of the Greek and Latin Hiſtorians. II. 309. *b.* Several authors have neglected it, where there was no occaſion to give a preciſe account of the time in which people lived. 352. *b.*

Chronological Accounts: It would be of great ſervice to the compilers of Hiſtory, if Chronological Accounts were publiſhed like that of Father de Londel. IV. 211. *b.* Chronological Accounts that claſh with appearances, are never to be admitted, but in the utmoſt neceſſity. II. 162. *b.*

Chronologies are very liable to the gloſſes and additions of thoſe into whoſe hands they fall. IV. 728. *a.*

Church, it was ſaid to have begun in Abel. I. 23. *b.* Whether, if it had not been for Ariſtotle, the Church would have wanted ſome of its articles of Faith. 469. *a. b.* Whether it be true that the Church never employed the ſecular arm againſt the ſects. 476. *b.* 477. *a. b.* The infallibility of it cannot be maintained as to facts. 494. *a.* Cannot ſubſiſt without her liturgy and diſcipline. II. 112. *b.* When it is proper to tolerate abuſes therein. 374. *a.* Thoſe who are poſſeſſed of great dignities in the Church, may eaſily give a free ſcope to their paſſions. III. 223. *a.* A Fanatic taught that there was no pure Church upon earth. 673. *a.* What rendered the reformation of the Church difficult, and even impoſſible. 686. *b.* 687. *a.* What uſe ought to be made of its revenues. IV. 271. *b.* What it has moſt to fear. 474. *a. b.*

Church of England accuſed of tarrying ſtill in the ſuburbs of Babylon. III. 343. *a.* Looked upon as an heaven in compariſon of Amſterdam. *ibid.*

Church Militant, thoſe who talk ſo much of it, are more in the right than they think. II. 149. *b.* 150. *a. b.*

Church (New ſyſtem of) whence that book of Mr Jurieu, which has ſo many imperfections, came to be looked upon as his maſter-piece. IV. 363. *b.* 364. *a.*

Church of Rome, whether it may be accuſed of having condemned the doctrine of St Auguſtin. I. 609. *b.* 610. *a.* Receives with open arms any one that offers himſelf to it. II. 246. *b.* There are ſeveral abuſes in that Church, which in all probability will laſt as long as it. III. 87. *b.* Junius believed that ſalvation might be obtained in the Church of Rome. 628. *a. b.* It ſeems to have adopted the religion of the god Terminus. 744. *a.* Has the advantage over the Laity in point of revenge. 567. *b.* 568. *a. b.* With what vigilance it minds the buſineſs of converſions. IV. 373. *a.* Whether there were warrantable reaſons for quitting the communion of that Church. 375. *a. b. n.* (35). It has not been weakened in the laſt ten years of the XVIIth century. II. 125. *b.* See *Popery.*

Church (Gallican) its origin rendered obſcure by the falſe zeal of the Monks. II. 94. *a. b.*

Churches: the privilege of ſome Churches in London. IV. 637. *a. b.*

Churches of the Vaudois: Peter Gilles, by order of his ſuperiors, compoſes the Hiſtory of them. III. 161, 162. They ſend Yſe into England. 597.

Churchmen, great flatterers of Princes. I. 233. *b.* There are few Churchmen of great abilities, who do not endeavour to make a noiſe in the world. 717. *b.* See *Eccleſiaſtics.*

Ciaconius writes a treatiſe upon the deliverance of the ſoul of Trajan from Hell, by the prayers of St Gregory. V. 397. *b.*

Cicero blames thoſe who deſpiſe their own tongue, and the authors of their own nation. I. 60. *a. b.* Ridicules the worſhip of Adonis. 114. *a.* St Auguſtin approves his raillery. *ibid. and b.* A paſſage of that Orator corrected with regard to Albutius. 185. *a. b.* Another explained. 186. *a.* His treatiſe *De Gloria.* 202. *and b.* &c. How he juſtifies himſelf as to the contradictions he was reproached with. 352. *b.* 353. *a.* Believed to be author of the letters to Cerellia. 395. *a. b.* What he ſays of his friend Atticus's letters. 427. *b.* Ridicules the interpreters of dreams. 448. *a.* Was afraid of Atticus's nails. 452. *b.* His letters to Atticus comprehend the Hiſtory of thoſe times, and in ſome ſort a prophecy of what was to follow. 541. *b.* A thought of his concerning the dogs of the Capitol. 773. *b.* II. 372. *a.* His eloquence was not reliſhed by all the world. 166. *b.* He is made Governor of Cilicia. 303. *b.* Demands quarter from Arceſilas, and Carneades. 330. *b.* There are certain facts with regard to which his authority is not deciſive. 343. *a. b.* It was, according to him, a great blemiſh on the family of *Junia,* to have produced an Orator, who exerciſed the trade of an Accuſer. 356. *b.* 357. *a.* He laughs at the notion of hell. 418. *b.* 419. *a.* If he did not believe what he ſaid of Cæſar, he ought to have believed it. 423. *b.* 424. *a.* He is reproached as guilty of an unpardonable fault, for ſpeaking Greek in a Greek Senate. 516. *b.* Took many things out of Crantor's book of Conſolation, when he compoſed a book upon the ſame ſubject. 562. *a.* Contradicts himſelf. 626. *a. b.* 627. *a.* He diſplays his eloquence on occaſion of the Pontificate of Peſſinus being ſold. 628. *b.* 629. *a.* The judgment that he paſſes on a tenet of Democritus. 642. *b.* 643. *a.* His deference to the authority of Dicæarchus. 657. *a. b.* Either he did not underſtand the doctrine of that Philoſopher, or elſe the latter contradicts himſelf. 660. *a.* His Rhetorical Legerdemain. 678. *a. b.* 679. *a.* He gives a very ill character of Cæſar as to the choice of his friends. 680. *a.* His wife by order of the Veſtal Virgins, ſignifies to him that he ſhould put his deſigns in execution for the good of his country. 746. *b.* The judgment he paſſes on an hypotheſis of Epicurus. 792. *a.* What he ſays of a ſolution which Carneades invented for the Epicureans. *ibid. b.* To perfect himſelf in the action of an Orator, he put himſelf under the diſcipline of two famous Actors. 835. He was killed while he was reading the Medea of Euripides. 871. *b.* Whether he was confuted in a demonſtrative manner by his friend Atticus, on the ſubject of Fannius the Hiſtorian. III. 8. *a. b.* His taſte is different from Plutarch's, with reſpect to a witticiſm, which concerns the birth of Alexander. 59. *a. b.* A baſe and brutal vengeance exerciſed upon him. 113. *a.* His inclination for peace. 515. *b.* He upbraids the Philoſophers with having introduced gods that were deſtitute of life and knowledge. 653. *a. b.* His maxim, that a doctrine which grows old muſt be true. 744. *a.* His oration for Ligarius. 831. *and a. b.* He contradicts himſelf with reſpect to Lucilius. 907. *a.* The injury which his freed-man did by publiſhing after his death, a collection of his jeſts. 939. *a.*

Two paſſages of his, which St Auguſtin has preſerved to us. IV. 441. *b.* His works that are loſt were ſome of the fineſt that he wrote. 509. *a. b.* He could not anſwer the difficulties which Cotta ſtarted upon the queſtion, Whether the faculty of Reaſon in man be a gift of the gods. 516. *b.* 517. *a.* He makes Cotta wiſh that his objections againſt the exiſtence of the gods might be confuted. 516. *b. n.* (34). According to him providence labours to procure pleaſures to mankind. 573. *a.* His taſte, with reſpect to the hiſtory of a tyrant, who was a very crafty man. 619. *a. b.* Whether he taught that beaſts were no more than Automata. 552. *a. b.* Reflexion upon what he ſays concerning the Divinity of Romulus. V. 77. *b.* 78. *a.* He is accuſed of improprieties and barbariſms by Scioppius. 94. *b.* His raillery touching one of the daughters of Servilia. 123. *a.* His religion was more in his heart than in his head. 208. *a. b.* Admired the verſes of Pacuvius concerning Telamon's being angry with Teucer. 317. *a. b.* 318. *a.* What Pliny relates as a witty repartee of his. 350. *b.* Whom he employed to put his library in order. 379. *and b.* 380. *a. b.* He divorced his wife Terentia ſeveral years before his death. 380. *a. b.* He treats Dolabella tenderly. 408. *a. b.* 409. *a.* Offers to go with him to Syria as his Lieutenant. 408. *b.* He inveighs ſtrongly againſt him after the death of Trebonius. 409. *a.* Is inconſolable after his daughter's death. *ibid. b.* 410. *a. b.* Is accuſed of having had an inceſtuous paſſion for her. *ibid. b.* Wants to build a temple to her. 411. *a. b.* Was ignorant of the reaſon why God placed us in the world. 412. *a. b.* In his affliction he would have reliſhed Arnobius better than Lactantius. 413. *b.* The idolaters required that ſome of his books ſhould be prohibited by the Senate. 506. *b.* His obſervation concerning the antient Greek Comedies. 746, 747. Sentences extracted from his familiar epiſtles by Daniel d'Auge. I. 562. *a.* An analyſis of his orations publiſhed by Martin du Cygne. II. 499.

Ciceronians, why ſo called. II. 804. *b.* The whimſical ſuperſtition of that ſect. IV. 69. *b.*

Cid, how that piece was received by the public. IV. 620. *a.*

Cydias (Painter), how much his Argonauts coſt. III. 492. *a.*

Cyllene; the height of that mountain. II. 659. *b.*

Cymbalum Mundi, who was ſo called. I. 373. *b.* One does not underſtand the meaning of that expreſſion, when it is oppoſed to *Tympanum famæ publicæ*. *ibid.*

Cymbalum Mundi, extracts from that book. IV. 583. *b.* 584. *a.*

Cimon had put in practice the ſtratagem which Ageſipolis made uſe of. I. 133. *a.*

Cynegirus, we are to believe nothing but what Herodotus tells us concerning the action which he did. II. 827. *b.*

Cynics (a ſect of Philoſophers), who was their founder. II. 665. They preached up ſome very good moral precepts. 671. *a. b.* Why called Cynics. III. 458. *b.* 459. *a.* The ſophiſm by which they defend their infamous practices. *ibid.*

Cinyras, ſome will have him to be Noah. II. 506. *b.* Reigned in Cyprus when the Grecians made war againſt Troy. IV. 641. Had Adonis by his own daughter. 642.

Cyniſca was the firſt woman that obtained the prize in the chariot-races of the Olympic games. I. 131. *b.*

Cyniſm, according to the Stoics, was the ſhorteſt way to attain to virtue. II. 671. *b.*

Cinq Mars, the ſource of his averſion for Cardinal Richelieu. I. 826. *a. b.* Is condemned to death. IV. 142. *a.*

Ciofanius: his hypotheſis touching Ovid's death. IV. 447. *a.*

Cypreſſes, called *the Virgins*, and for what reaſon. I. 210. *b.* Why they were formerly put in the houſes of the dead. III. 73. *a. n.* (21).

Cyprus; that iſland was formerly called Acamas. I. 53. *a.*

Cypſelus; the firſt inſtitution of tyranny is aſcribed to him. IV. 563. *a.*

Cyran (Abbot of St), what he thought of the Council of Trent. I. 36. *b.* The eſteem which he expreſſes for the ſociety of the Jeſuits. III. 133. *a.* His criticiſm on Garaſſe is an excellent piece. *ibid.*

Circe, the virtue of her wand. I. 5. *a.*

Circle, perſons who pretended to have found out the quadrature of it. III. 862. *b.* 863. *a.* According to Mathematicians, it can only exiſt ideally. V. 612. *b.*

Circumſtances, of what conſequence it is to be placed in ſuch and ſuch circumſtances. II. 518. *b.*

Cyrenaïcs, a ſect of Philoſophers. III. 424. *b.* Wherein they differed from the Cynics. *ibid.* 425. *a.*

Cyril (St), his conduct cenſured by the Emperor. IV. 347. *b.* His irregularities, with reſpect to Neſtorius. *ibid.* 348. *a.* He does not deſerve to be uſed tenderly. 885. *b.*

Cyril Lucar, his confeſſion was conformable to the opinions of Geneva. I. 509.

Cyrus, how he liked Aſpaſia. II. 512. *b.* 513. *a. b.* Why he judged himſelf more worthy of the ſceptre than his elder brother. 598. *a.*

Citeaux, Abbey, by whom founded. II. 383. *b. n.* (12).

Cythera: an iſland of the Archipelago, now called Cerigo. IV. 124. *n.* (*a*).

Cytheris, how Mark Antony, whoſe concubine ſhe was, behaved to her. III. 118. *a. b.* 119. *a. b.* He did not however marry her. 119. *a. b.* See *Lycoris* in the Dictionary.

City; one that was reputed holy among the Pagans. I. 420. *a. b.* Cities that oppoſe burthenſome edicts only make their condition worſe. IV. 353. *a.*

Clarence (Duke of), in what manner he was put to death. II. 739. *a. b.*

Claros, who built a temple there to Apollo. IV. 97. *a. b.*

Claude, Miniſter at Charenton, has reproached the Janſeniſts with inconſiſtencies. I. 18. *b.* His diſpute with Mr Arnauld. 493. *a. b.* II. 518. *b.* He accuſes St Auguſtin of having been a turncoat in his opinion, concerning the penal laws againſt Heretics. I. 566. *b.* His opinion on that ſubject might have expoſed him to cenſure. *ibid.* His *Plaintes des Proteſtans* quoted. IV. 815. *a. b.* The advice he gave to a man who had been a prodigious reader. III. 70. *a.* Reflexion upon what he ſays touching the Devil's conference with Luther. V. 73. *a. b.*

Claudia, Queen of France, how ſhe came by a vile diſtemper which haſtened her death. III. 89. *b.*

Claudian, Mariangelus Accurſius ſaid that he had corrected near ſeven hundred faults in that Poet. I. 69. *a.* Reflexions upon his doubts about providence. IV. 932. *b.* 933. *a. b. &c.*

Claudin, a famous Muſician. III. 197. *a. b.*

Claudius, ſaluted Emperor in the camp of the Pretorian cohorts. II. 359. The Senate was forced to approve this election, whether they would or not. *ibid.* How his mother treated him. I. 358. *b.* He knew nothing of the infamy of his wife Meſſalina, when all the world knew that ſhe proſtituted herſelf in the ſtews. III. 382. *a.* All the ladies of beauty and diſtinction rival one another in their pretenſions to marry him. 860. *b.* 861. *a.*

Claves (de), an excellent Chymiſt of the XVIIth century. II. 468. *a.* Had the ſecret of making the forms of plants revive from their aſhes. *ibid.*

Cleanlineſs. In what true cleanlineſs conſiſts. I. 187. *b.*

Cleanthes ſaid that Arceſilas deſtroyed the duties by his words, but eſtabliſhed them by his actions. I. 413. *a.* What he has related touching Boreas, the mountain Niphates, *&c.* II. 82. *b.*

Clearchus, what he relates touching the conferences which Ariſtotle had with a Jew. I. 465. *b.* Whether he deſerves to be credited. *ibid.* 466. *a.*

Clemency is pernicious on certain occaſions. II. 528. *a. b.*

Clemens Alexandrinus, what his opinion was concerning Diagoras, and ſome others who paſſed for Atheiſts. II. 656. *a. b.*

Clement VII (Pope), the anſwer which he made to Pompey Colonna. II. 529. *a. b.* And when he was ſollicited to grant a diſpenſation to ſome ladies. V. 161. *b.* 162. *a.* When he was created Pope. III. 592. *b.*

Clement VIII (Pope), in order to incline Scipio Gentilis to accept of a Profeſſor's place at Bologna, promiſes him liberty of conſcience. III. 155. *a.* His ſentiments touching the *Scientia Media*. V. 824.

Clement (James) ſtabs Henry III, prompted thereto by a viſion which was approved by a Monk. III. 601.

601. *a. b.* It is probable that the Preachers of the League had been acquainted with the deſign of that parricide. II. 101. *b.* Some have been ſo bold as to maintain that he did not kill Henry III. 411. *b.* 412. *a. b.* 413. *a.* The Jeſuits commend him. IV. 129. *a.* His action is looked upon as a gift of the Holy Ghoſt by John Guignard. III. 276. *a.* He is inſtructed by Bourgoign, and compared to Judith by Guignard. *ibid.*

Clenard ſent to Braga to ſet up a ſchool there. III. 734. *a.*

Cleopatra, wherein the force of her charms conſiſted. II. 631. *a. b.* 632. *a.* She had a criminal converſation with Dellius. *ibid. b.* Did not well entertain thoſe who made her taſte the ſweets of love. *ibid. a.*

Cleopatra, ſiſter to Alexander, had great intereſt with him, and likewiſe with their mother Olympias. II. 675. *a.*

Cleoſtratus, his cycle corrected. III. 254. *a.*

Clerc (le), his letter to Mr Jurieu concerning Epiſcopius. II. 795. *b.* 796. *a.* Reflexions upon that letter, and the conſequences of it. *ibid. and b.*

Clergy, their debaucheries are agreeable to the court. I. 30. *b.* It is more dangerous to offend them than to offend religion. 468. *a.* They are a true *Imperium in Imperio.* II. 149. *b.* The ſame ſpirit, which, under Chriſtianity, has enriched the Clergy, prevailed alſo under the Pagan religion. 531. *a.* Their leudneſs in keeping concubines. 545. *b. n.* (20). And their bad lives. III. 328. *b.* 329. *a. b.* See *Concubinage* and *Celibacy*.

Clergy of Africa ſollicits the ſecular arm againſt the followers of Pelagius. I. 229. *a. b.* 230. *a.*

Clergy of France have made great uſe of St Auguſtin's reaſons to juſtify perſecution. I. 567. *a.* See *Eccleſiaſtics.* They make an ill-grounded complaint againſt the Proteſtants. IV. 479. *a. b.* What they propoſe to the court for the extirpation of Heretics. 815. *a.* They accuſe the Proteſtants of having blotted out of their Pſalms a prayer for the King. 164. *a.* Mr Daillé's anſwer to this charge. *ibid. b.*

Clergyman. A Clergyman who owns that continence is beyond his power, gives people great reaſon to ſuſpect his conduct in the time that preceded his marriage. III. 344. *b.* See *Eccleſiaſtics.*

Clermont in Auvergne; the hiſtory of two married perſons whom the inhabitants of that city call the two lovers. III. 381. *a. b.* A ſynagogue of the Jews pulled down there. 220. *a.*

Clervant diſpatched by the King of Navarre to demand the removal of the garriſons from his fortified places. IV. 341. *b.*

Clevis (Lewis de), Bachelor in Divinity, whoſe theſis concerning Epiſcopacy meets with difficulties, and for which Flavigny made an apology. III. 53. *and a. b.*

Clitarchus is not a faithful writer. IV. 9. *a.*

Clitomachus, what he ſaid of Carneades. II. 327. *a. b.* 334. *b.* His book of Conſolation. 331. *b.*

Cloaths: a man tears his cloaths, and for what reaſon. II. 159. *and b.* 160. *a.*

Clodia, Catullus's miſtreſs. II. 394. Proſtituted herſelf to the firſt Comer. *ibid.* Accuſes Cœlius of ſeveral crimes. IV. 202. *a.* Gets the ſirname of *Quadrantaria. ibid. b.* Was the ſame whom Catullus called Leſbia. *ibid. a.*

Clodius ſells the Pontificate of Peſſinus. II. 628. *b.* Which gave Cicero an occaſion to diſplay his eloquence. *ibid.*

Cloyſters, what Eraſmus thought of them. I. 272. *a. b.* They have occaſioned a proverb. V. 23. *b.*

Cloſe-ſtool: rare precepts relating to the cloſe-ſtool. I. 174. *a. b.*

Clovis, whether Aimonius was the firſt who loaded the birth of that Prince with ignominy. I. 669. *a.* There is ſcarce any truth in what is told of the Kings of France before him. V. 494. *b. n.* (13).

Clovis, an Epic Poem, by whoſe aſſiſtance it was finiſhed and poliſhed. IV. 114. *and a. b.*

Coach: learning ſeldom enables a man to roll about in his coach. II. 708. *a.*

Cobourg, a city in Franconia, Prince John Caſimir, Duke of Saxony erects a famous ſchool there. III. 660.

Cocceius, his doctrine was the leaſt in favour with the great and powerful in Holland, but was moſt to the reliſh of young people, and of ſuch as ſet up for men of wit. V. 564.

Cochleus, what kind of a machine he employed, tho' to no purpoſe, againſt the Lutherans. III. 143. *b.* 144. *a.* His accuſations againſt Luther. 942. *a.* A book which he intitles *Luther with ſeven Heads*, and in which he relates all his impurities. 136. *a. b.*

Cock; the Jews offer a cock for their ſins in the feaſt of Reconciliation. III. 125. *b.* The ceremonies which attend that oblation. *ibid.*

Cock-fighting; the Antients were exceedingly fond of that diverſion, and wagered all they were worth that ſuch or ſuch a cock would be victorious in the battle. IV. 819. *b.* Quinqueran cenſured for being too much addicted to ſuch paſtime. *ibid.*

Coconas, his crime and puniſhment. IV. 935. *a. b.* 936. *a.* His confeſſion upon the rack. 939. *b.* 940. *a.* By whom his head was buried. V. 526. *a. b.*

Codes, compilation of divers Codes. II. 380. *b.* 381. *a.*

Codinus, who firſt publiſhed his book *de Officialibus Palatii Conſtantinopolitani & Officiis magnæ Eccleſiæ.* III. 627. *a.*

Coëffeteau complains of Du Pleſſis Mornai upon the ſubject of Gregory VII. III. 230. *a.* Very much perplexed in one part of his anſwer to Du Pleſſis. 565. *b.* Makes but a poor anſwer to Du Pleſſis with reſpect to the praiſes which Langius beſtows on Luther. 723. *a. b.* Takes a town for a man. IV. 763. *b.* Is cenſured by Rivet with reſpect to Turpin, and Pope Calixtus. V. 417. *b.* Does not make a ſolid anſwer to Du Pleſſis, touching John de Weſalia. 542. *a. b.*

Cœlius defended by Cicero againſt the accuſations of Clodia. IV. 202. *a.*

Coffin, whether it is poſſible to ſuſpend an iron coffin between two loadſtones. IV. 43. *a.*

Coglione, Minion to Joan II, Queen of Naples. IV. 309. *b.*

Coiffé; whence comes this proverb, *il eſt né coiffé.* III. 591. *b.* 592. *a.*

Colbert, his moderation with regard to a ſonnet, wherein he was very much abuſed. III. 393. *b.* He hinders the printing of ſeveral books againſt the houſe of Auſtria. 767. *a.*

Coligny (Admiral de) refuſes to be a churchman. I. 754. *b.* 756. *a. b.* The miſtakes of the author who wrote his life. IV. 696. *b.* 697. *a.* How he was killed. I. 746. *and b.* Paſſionate verſes wrote on his death by John des Caurres. II. 399.

Coligny (the Count de) fights a duel with the Duke of Guiſe. III. 303. *a. b. &c.* His brother carries off a young lady. 365. *b.*

Colin falls into diſgrace with Francis I, and loſes his office of reader. II. 371. *b.* 372. *a.* How this happened. *ibid.*

Collado, or *Colladon*, carries his cenſure againſt Laurens too far. III. 746. *a. b.*

Collection of ſeveral impertinent authors. III. 854. *b.*

Collections, in what caſe they are to be looked upon as precious treaſures. I. 536.

Collections: The collections of men of letters reſemble Virgil's fame. I. 19. *a.* Collections of ſpiritual ſongs ſet to the moſt burleſque tunes. 478. *a. b.*

Collections made for the churches of Germany, and particularly for thoſe of the Palatinate. I. 241.

College, the foundation of that of Navarre. II. 224. *b.* The building of its library. I. 164. *a.* The college *della Sapienza* at Rome, by whom the building of it was finiſhed, and by whom it was adorned with a fine library. II. 476.

Collenuccio; his Neapolitan Hiſtory tranſlated into Latin by Stouppa. V. 247, 248.

Colletet, what Mr Menage deſigned to do with reſpect to him. II. 139. *b.*

Colletet (Francis) makes an abridgment of the Annals of Paris. IV. 270. *a.*

Collier, a ſtory that is told of a Collier's aſs. III. 804. *a.*

Cologn, its Divines cenſured by Luther on the ſubject of Ariſtotle's doctrines. I. 470. *b.* The young people who turn Catholics are educated in a college there. IV. 372. *b.* 373. *a.* The univerſity of that city oppoſes the deſign of Langius to make learning flouriſh again. III. 724. *a. b.*

Cologn (the Elector of), a converſation which he had with a peaſant concerning his train. III. 768. *b.* The laſt Elector very much exclaimed againſt, and for what reaſon. II. 224. *a. b.* Laid under the ban of the empire. *ibid.* His method of juſtifying himſelf. *ibid.*

Cologn: a congreſs held there to make peace in the Low-Countries. II. 223. *a.* The quarrel which its chapter had with Gebhard Truchſes. 224. *b.*

Colomiés cited. I. 259. *b.* Blamed for telling a certain ſtory on the authority of Iſaac Voſſius. 666. *b.* What he ſays concerning one of Grotius's books. III. 247. *b.* He wrongfully aſcribes an oration of Broughton's to Druſius. II. 150. *b.* Cenſures Blondel touching the ſtory of the She-Pope inſerted in a manuſcript of Anaſtaſius. IV. 738. *and b.*

Colonies uſually took the arms of their mother town. I. 20. *a.*

Colonius is ſuſpected of Heterodoxy becauſe of his moderation, when the Arminian diſputes began to riſe. III. 360.

Colonna (Antony) ſends Galeacius Florimond to Paris in quality of his agent. III. 58.

Colonna (Aſcanio) his misfortunes. I. 400. *b.* 401. *a.* 402. *b.*

Colonna (Marc Antony) procures his father to be impriſoned for high-treaſon. I. 400. *b.* 401. *a.*

Colonna (Proſper) at the age of ſeventy years, falls in love with Clara Viſconti, and proceeds to public extravagancies. IV. 378. *b.* 379. *a.*

Colonna (the Conſtable) his ſon cannot obtain the niece of Prince Marc Antony Borgheſe in marriage. II. 471. He marries a niece of Cardinal Mazarin. 472. *a.* Which proved an unhappy marriage. *ibid.*

Colophon: that city deſtroyed by Lyſimachus. III. 779. *a.* Who it was that built it. IV. 97. *a.*

Coloſſus of Rhodes, the inattention of Scaliger, when he computed the weight of it. II. 390. *a.*

Colours are not in bodies. IV. 654. *a. b.*

Column: a column of marble, erected in honour of Julius Cæſar, has Divine honours paid to it. II. 680. *a.* What thoſe called *Roſtratæ* were. 726. Miracles told of one. I. 274. *a.*

Columna (James) an Hiſtorian whom Antony, Archbiſhop of Florence copies in ſeveral places. II. 529, 530. *and a. b.* Several authors make mention of him. *ibid.*

Com, a city in Perſia, what Saint is worſhipped there by the Muſſulmans. III. 16. *a. b.* 17. *a. b.* *Lela,* is the name given there to the Bleſſed Virgin. *ibid. a.*

Comana, the Pontif of that place was likewiſe its ſovereign. I. 421. *a.*

Combat: a Combat, twenty-two againſt twenty-two. II. 128. *and a.*

Combats: the inequality of ſucceſs in Combats where juſtice ſeems to be equal. III. 300. *b.*

Combination: a remarkable Combination of Moral and Phyſical things, which Father Malebranch ſpeaks of. II. 16. *a.*

Comedian; See *Player.*

Comedies; one favoured with a prodigy. IV. 300. *and a. b.* Another repreſented before the King and Queen of Navarre. 324. *b.* 325. *a.* Wherein the difference betwixt the Antients and Moderns conſiſts with reſpect to Comedy. 741. *b.* 742. *a.* One employed to repreſent the abuſes of Popery. V. 85. *a. b.* Which is the ſame that was acted before the King and Queen of Navarre. *ibid. b.* The licence which the Greek Comedy had to vent ſcandal. IV. 568. *a. b.* 569. *a.*

Comenius, his portraiture very like that of ſome other Fanatics. II. 538. *a. b.* 539. *a.* Some perſons have been ſurprized that he lived ſo long. 539. *and b.* The cordial and ſpiritual eſteem which Mrs Bourignon and he had for one another. 540. *a.* How he extricated himſelf from the embaraſſment he was in between the fear of God and the fear of man. 692. Deputed into Hungary. *ibid. a.* His *Janua Linguarum* tranſlated into Greek by Theodore Simonis. III. 548. *b.* He is ſuſpected of Political contrivances. 682. *a.*

Comes (Natalis) blamed. II. 82. *b.* See *Noel le Compte.*

Comets, a ſtrange opinion about them. II. 51. *a.* Are looked upon as evil preſages. 113. It was entirely for his book intituled, *Thoughts on the Comets,* that the Magiſtrates of Rotterdam depoſed the author, and there was no mention made of his *Advice to the Refugees.* V. 647. *a. b.* The deſign of the *Penſées ſur les Cometes.* 813.

Comforters, are troubleſome, when they do not take a proper time. II. 564. *b.*

Comines (Philip de) Haillan's judgment of him. III. 335. *b.* 336. *a.* He praiſes Savonarola, and aſcribes to him the glory of having propheſied. V. 58. *b.* 59. *a. b.* Reflexions upon his narrative. *ibid. b.* 60. *a.* He was better acquainted with ſtate affairs than with the conduct of thoſe who deal in prediction-makers. 59. *b.* Is too good-natured with reſpect to Savonarola, and puts too favourable a conſtruction upon his prophecies, in order to help him out with them. 60. *a.* He ſerves as a witneſs to thoſe who cenſure that Monk. *ibid. b.* 61. *a.*

Commendon puts a ſtop to a paper-war. II. 605. *a.*

Commentaries and marginal notes are very uſeful for the right underſtanding of ſatires. I. 35. *b.*

Commentator (Hiſtorical) ſhould compare together the reaſons pro and con, with all the impartiality of a faithful relater. V. 810.

Commentators; what they ought to aim at. III. 45. *a.*

Comminges (Mr de) what he ſaid to Mr Amyraut. I. 264. *a. b.*

Commire (Father) his name was Commere. IV. 854. *b.*

Commiſſary-General of the Horſe, that office was unknown in the Netherlands before the year 1567. I. 673. *a.*

Commiſſioners are ever ſuſpected, and for what reaſon. IV. 241. *b.* A decree of the parliament of Paris relating to them. *ibid.*

Commodus, a Roman Emperor, expoſes a man to be devoured by wild beaſts, for reading the life of Caligula. V. 265. *b.*

Common-wealth of learning, has a greater number of ſubtle men now, than it had in the preceding age. I. 92. *b.* The liberty which every body ought to enjoy in it, and how far that liberty ſhould extend. IV. 548. *b.*

Commonwealths, it is a misfortune to them that ſome Philoſophers have applied themſelves wholly to the ſtudy of nature. I. 295. *a.* An alteration of government will always be inevitable in ſuch as amuſe themſelves with conqueſts. II. 165. *b.* 166. *a.* See *Republics.*

Communion, the effect of diſputes which are raiſed in a Communion. I. 241. *b.* It is not for the temporal intereſt of any Communion, that all the members of it ſhould be men of judgment. II. 708. *a.*

Company; there is nothing worſe than bad company. I. 279. *b.*

Compariſon of the minds of men with apples. I. 60. *b.* 61. *a.* Of able men with beaſts for ſacrifice. 619. *b.* A remark upon the deſign of compariſons. V. 360. *b.* 361. *a. b.* A compariſon of the author's, which gave offence to ſeveral, vindicated. 824.

Compel them to come in. Reflexion on that maxim. III. 40. *a. b.*

Compilations, their ordinary defects. I. 219. *b.* Thoſe who continue and enlarge them oftentimes, occaſion confuſion by their neglect. 615. *a. b.* If they every where pleaſed one kind of people, they would not be good. III. 337. *b.* Should be calculated to ſerve every body. V. 806. What the nature of them ought to be. *ibid.*

Compilers often want exactneſs, and the reaſon of it. I. 60. *a.* Such a Compiler whom our age might not eſteem in the leaſt, would be admired a thouſand years hence. 536. A paſſage that ought to ſerve for a looking-glaſs to Compilers. II. 232. *b.* 233. *a.* An inſtance of the alterations which facts undergo, by paſſing through their hands. 802. *a.* They highly injure the reputation of great men, by compiling all that they ſay without any diſcernment. III. 939. *a. b.* One that relates and comments has all the privileges of the writers that he makes uſe of. V. 799.

Compliments, an example of the falſities with which they are generally ſtuffed. IV. 101. *a.*

Conchini and his wife make uſe of the Cabala, and the Jewiſh books. I. 397. *b.* 398. *a.*

Conclave; there is nothing more rare, than for a Cardinal to be ſure of his Election to the Papal Dignity, before he enters the conclave. III. 608. *a.* How the beſt concerted intrigues are fruſtrated there. I. 361. *b.*

Conclaviſt, the pleaſant anſwer of one, whoſe allowance they wanted to retrench at the council of Baſil. I. 178. *a. b.* 179. *a.*

Concord in the Church, the earneſt deſire of Joſeph Hall to ſee it once eſtabliſhed. III. 343. *b.*

Concord: what the book of the Concord is. III. 250. *a. b.*

Concord (the book of) ſternly rejected by the King of Denmark. III. 390. *a.* A magnificent copy of it, which that Prince threw into the fire. 391. *a.* Does more harm in Germany, than if the Turks had entered it with fire and ſword. *ibid. b.* A letter from the Reformed Churches in Holland againſt that book, and who is ſuppoſed to have writ the letter. *ibid.* 392. *a. b.*

Concord between the Lutherans, and Calviniſts, why it has never been brought about, and why it probably never will. III. 526. *a. b.* By what emblem the Antients, repreſented the power of Concord. IV. 232.

Concordate paſſed between Francis I and Leo X, and the abuſes which it occaſioned. IV. 764. *a. b. to* 766. *a. b.*

Concubinage of the prieſts, the time has been, when it was hardly looked upon as ſhameful. III. 887. *a.*

Concubine: A concubine and a whore are commonly eſteemed two very diſtinct characters. II. 315. *a.* The power of the concubines of Princes offends none but ſuch as hardly read any thing. IV. 455. *b.* There have been pariſhes which obliged their prieſts to keep a concubine, in order to ſecure the honour of their wives. III. 345. *a.*

Condé (Lewis I, Prince of) condemned to be beheaded. III. 287. *a. n.* (11). IV. 327. *b.*

Condé (the Princeſs of) a narrative of the ceremonies that were obſerved at her abjuration, and a remarkable particular on that occaſion. V. 319. *a. b.*

Condé (Lewis II, Prince of) by whom he was arreſted, and by whom conducted to Bois de Vincennes. I. 184. Whether he married below himſelf, when he took to wife the Marſhal de Brezé's daughter. II. 135. *a. b.* 136. *a.* Particulars that do honour to his memory. 137. *b.* He writes with his own hand a little before his death, to recommend the Princeſs his wife to the King. 138. *b.* The declaration which he made of his Orthodoxy at his death. IV. 504. *a. b.* How he concerned himſelf in the buſineſs relating to the author of the Pre-Adamites. 530. *b.* The judgment which ſome paſſed upon his conduct at the battle of Senef. V. 190. *b.* 191. *a. b.* He ſends for Spinoza, and talks with him. 205. *a. b.*

Condé (the Princeſs of) wounded by one of her Domeſtics. II. 138. *and a. b.*

Condé, *Condæus*, there was no French General of that name in the year 1691. IV. 210. *b.*

Condé (Henry Julius, Prince of) his diſcernment fatal to impoſtors. I. 7. *b.* He draws from James Aymar, a confeſſion of his tricks. 8. *b.*

Condere, the ſignification of that word. I. 252. *b.*

Conditions, there is none more deplorable than that of a man who cannot die when he deſires it. III. 319. *a. b.* Thoſe are often the happieſt which ſeem leaſt to be ſo. I. 308. *b.*

Conduct, an example of a very uniform conduct. I. 580. *a. b.*

Conecte, how he triumphed over the head-dreſſes and the attire of the women. II. 544. *a.* IV. 667. *b.*

Conference, the miniſters once looked upon every propoſal of a conference as a ſnare. II. 520. *b.* A conference, broke off and renewed with regard to the Ducheſs of Bouillon. IV. 921. *a* A conference between Cardinal du Perron and Sieur Beraud, and the iſſue of it. 923. *a. b.*

Conference of Poiſſy, an intrigue deſigned to break it off. I. 691. *b.* The miniſters of that conference conſulted on the queſtion, whether children, baptized by a woman, ſhould be re-baptized. 704. *b.* Offence taken by the prelates of that conference. 790. *b.* 791. *a.*

Confeſſion by letters maintained by Suarez, and condemned by Clement VIII. I. 661. *a.* Ought not to be revealed on any account, or in obedience to the command of any one whatever. II. 460. *a. b.* The abuſes of it, and complaints that are made againſt them. *ibid. a.* Their own written confeſſions are made uſe of againſt criminals. *ibid. b.* Sick perſons put it off as a bad omen. IV. 537. *b. n.* (24).

Confeſſion of Augſburg; remarks upon the variations of it. II. 122. *a. b.* Preſented to the Emperor at the Diet in that city, in the year 1530. IV. 185. Laurens Tuppius tranſlates into Latin a book which the Princes of that Confeſſion cauſed to be wrote, touching the Council of Trent. V. 514. *a. b.* 515. *a. b.*

Confeſſionaries, what impure caſes are heard there. V. 41. *a. b.*

Confeſſors would not be qualified to remedy the complaints of their penitents, if they had not a thorough inſight into all manner of obſcenities. I. 182. *a.* V. 40. *a. b.* Whether others beſides them muſt not know the obſcenities of the confeſſionary. I. 182. *a.* Laymen diſguiſed as Prieſts, and ſent to confeſs criminals. II. 459. *b.* 460. *a. b.* Named with a prohibition to apply to others. *ibid. a.* Several Prieſts revealed confeſſions to Savonarola. V. 61. *a.*

Confucius, is as blind as the other *Literati* of China, with regard to the true God. IV. 81. *b.*

Congreſs, what an uncertain and ſhameful way it is of diſcovering a man's impotency. IV. 801. *a. b.* &c. The author's apology for what he has ſaid of it in this Dictionary. 803. *b.* 804. *a.* 881. *a. b.* 882. *a. b.* The immodeſt practice of it condemned. V. 799.

Coni, Mr Catinat was not forced to raiſe the ſiege of it, neither was he beaten there. IV. 210. *b.* 211. *a.* It was Mr de Dulonde who commanded the beſiegers there, and who was diſgraced for retiring, as the French believed, without any neceſſity. *ibid.*

Conjectures, a perſon may be happier in his Conjectures, without being conſequently a man of more ſkill. I. 148. *a.*

Conjunctions of the planets, how many great Conjunctions there have been ſince the creation of the world. I. 164. *b.*

Conquerors; reaſon prompts them both to ſtop, and not to ſtop. I. 14. *a.*

Conqueſts: though the conqueſts of a monarch are not the intereſt of his people, yet they ruin themſelves with more ſatisfaction for the ſake of a warlike Prince, than for the ſake of any other. V. 664.

Conrart, his opinion touching the tranſlations of Amyot and the Abbot Tallemant. I. 259. *a.* Conſults Laurence Drelincourt on the French tongue. II. 694. *b.* The verſes which Lewis de Neufgermain made for him. IV. 357. *b.* 358. *a.* He is conſulted by the Sieur d'Ablancourt. 591. *a. b.* Mr Roſe ſucceeds him in the French Academy. 917.

Conſcience; a doubt upon a caſe of conſcience. I. 109. *a.* A man ſhould not hazard his conſcience in order to puſh himſelf. 224. *b.* One is obliged to follow its dictates always. 166. *b.* The people whoſe intereſt it was moſt to defend this maxim, have been for ſome time the oppoſers of it. *ibid.* One cannot be too reſerved in accuſing others of preaching againſt their conſciencies. II. 374. *a.* Whether it can be forced to embrace the true religion. III. 220. *b.* 221. *a.* The contradictions which thoſe who aſſert ſuch a thing, fall into. *ibid.* The directors of conſciences ought to have but ſhort converſations with devout women. 230. *b.* The light of conſcience is not able to withſtand the greateſt part of the paſſions. 375. *a. b.* 376. *a.* Its liberty. 676. *a. b.* 677. *a. b.* A compariſon of the Power of conſcience with that of the point of honour. IV. 500. *a. b.* A tender conſcience will grieve even for a fault that is purely material. 929. *b.*

Conſcience (erroneous), the privileges of it. I. 166. *b.* Never did any Philoſopher ſay a more ſenſible thing on that ſubject than what Archelaus ſaid. 418. *a.* An author who confutes himſelf in writing upon that ſubject. II. 476. *a.*

Conſcientiaries, a ſect of Atheiſts. III. 671. *and a. b.*

Conſequences (oppoſite) drawn from the ſame principle, but ſolidly refuted by Seneca. II. 14. *b.* 15. *a.*

Conſequences: it is allowed to point out to an adverſary thoſe which reſult from his doctrine, whether he rejects or admits them. V. 644. *b.* 645. *a.* Some of them have ſuch a cloſe connexion with the principle from which they are drawn, that it is impoſſible

impoſſible to conceive how a man of ſenſe can admit that and reject theſe. 645. *a.*

Conſiſtory (Walloon) *at Rotterdam*, their proceedings againſt this Dictionary. I. lxxix, lxxx, lxxxi.

Conſolation, a common-place of Conſolation examined. I. 280. *a. b.* Carneades refuted it. *ibid. b.* III. 73. *b.* A pernicious maxim of Conſolation. I. 428. *a.* A common-place of Conſolation. 699. *b.* 700. *a. b.* Another common-place. II. 561. *a. b.* 562. *a. b.* Another. III. 73. *a. b.*

Conſpiracy requires diſpatch; and this ſpoils all very often. II. 428. *a.* Some perſons ſuffer themſelves to be drawn into one by motives which they think good. 553. *b.* A law which makes thoſe who have notice of a conſpiracy, and do not reveal it, guilty of a capital crime. III. 802. *a. b.*

Conſpiracy, the not diſcovering one is a crime puniſhable with death. IV. 346. *a. b.*

Conſtance, Queen of Sicily, is with child at the age of fifty-two, and reſolves to be brought to bed publickly. III. 394. *b.* 395. *a.*

Conſtantine, the ſtrange and ſurprizing extravagancy of his decree againſt the Arians. I. 474. *a. b.* 475. *a.* His donation. II. 594. *b.* 595. *a. b.* His cruelties. III. 18. *a. b.* 19. *a. b.* To what cauſe the Pagan authors aſcribe his converſion. 20. *a.* He orders all contentious libels to be burnt. 278. *a.*

Conſtantine (Copronymus) fouls the baptiſmal font without knowing it. II. 422. *b.*

Conſtantine (Dame) the midwife, her crimes and puniſhment. IV. 498. *a.* 499. *a. b.*

Conſtantinople, its Patriarch ſtrangled during the ſeſſion of the Council of Florence. I. 266.

Conſtantius; why he throws himſelf into a terrible paſſion. I. 37. *a.*

Conſtitution; an effect of the ſtrange power of it. II. 719. *a. b.*

Conſul, whether he re-deſcended to the Pretorſhip. II. 345. *a. b.* Two Conſuls depoſed from their Conſulate, for ſhewing diſreſpect to a letter from the Senate. 291. *a.*

Conſulate, two brothers diſcharge that office at the ſame time, a thing which had never been ſeen before. I. 341. Who was the firſt ſtranger that was honoured with it at Rome. 611. *b.* There were not two degrees of it. 613. *a.* The cauſe of their miſtake who have thought ſo. *ibid.*

Contempt: one ought not to ſhew contempt for any perſon whatever. I. 366. 376, 377. *a. b.* 421. *b.* 422. *a.*

Conti (the Prince of), his judgment of two ſonnets. I. 752. *a.*

Continence, a rare example of that virtue. I. 14. *b.* 357. Found in a married life. 34. *and a. b.* Such a ſtate between a man and a woman who have every thing elſe in common, is too great a violence offered to nature. *ibid.* Prejudicial to the health of the fair ſex ſometimes. 390. *b.* 391. *a.* The gift of it is not a thing on which a man may depend. III. 13. *b.* How thoſe who make a vow of Continency ought to conduct themſelves. 64. *b.* Men devoted to it ought to wiſh for the ſame qualities as the Hirpes had. 72. *b.* What it ought to cauſe in order to be a true virtue. 620. Is rather a quality of conſtitution than of Morality. IV. 332. *a.* Whether it be poſſible: Reaſons *pro* and *con.* III. 344. *b.* 345. *a.* Reckoned impoſſible among Proteſtants, and among ſome Roman Catholics. 345. *a.* A Clergyman who owns that it is beyond the power of man, gives great reaſon to ſuſpect his conduct in the time that preceded his marriage. 344. *b.* This controverſy ought to be handled with circumſpection. *ibid.* See *Fornication.*

Continuation of an hiſtory: when authors find one ready done, they chuſe rather to copy it, than be at the trouble to compoſe a new one. IV. 210. *b.*

Contradictions, Polemic Divines and Lawyers are very ſubject to them. I. 351. *b.* 352. *a.* Theſe have ſincerity enough to own it, but not thoſe. *ibid. and b.* 353. *a.* The excuſes which Baldus makes for them. 616. *b.* It is an ill character to be of a ſpirit of contradiction. II. 376. *b.* Whether they are of any uſe. III. 135. *a.*

Contraries. One may feel one of the Contraries without having ever felt the other. IV. 514. *a. b. &c.*

Controverſies, thoſe who handle them give too much injurious language to their adverſaries, and diſguiſe their ſtrongeſt arguments. I. 718. *b.* The way of handling them right. *ibid.* Who has given them the beſt form. 734. *a.* There are ſome, where neither peace nor war can be made but to one's confuſion. III. 84. *a.* Cannot be ended by indeterminate, ambiguous, and intricate forms of expreſſion, where each party finds its own account. IV. 287. *a.* It is chiefly in the matter of controverſy that the underſtanding is the dupe of the Paſſions. 737. *a.*

Controverſiſts, examples which are a little puzzling to thoſe of the Roman party. I. 179. *a. b.* Two of their greateſt faults. 718. *b. n.* (14). Are great liars. 790. *a.* Their zeal very often ſtifles their knowledge and their virtue. *ibid. b.* An Hiſtorian ought to lay no ſtreſs on the abuſive language which they give each other. 795. *a.* Moſt of them aggravate the evil of the other party, and extenuate the evil of their own cauſe, as much as they can. II. 136. *b.* All of them mutually complain of the artifices of thoſe who write againſt them. 488. *b.* Thoſe among the Proteſtants who defended their cauſe like men of honour have never been hated by the Roman Catholics. 695. *a. b.* Of what weight the teſtimony of a Controverſiſt is upon a fact reflecting on the other party. III. 764. *b.* One muſt take care not to be ſurprized by their air of triumph. IV. 56. *a.* Moſt of them are inclined to give things a malicious turn. 137. *b.* See *Diſpute.* They know not how to diſtinguiſh between what is to the purpoſe, and what is mere cavilling. I. 236. *b.* After they have uſed all their ſtrength againſt ſome weak part of the oppoſite cauſe, they leave the ſtrongeſt unanſwered, and aſſume a diſdainful arrogance. II. 223. *b.* Ought not to ſtop at the authors of their own party, without conſulting thoſe who write againſt them. IV. 825. *a. b.* Are wont to reduce their adverſaries to an abſurdity. V. 824. Such as defend their cauſe well vex their adverſaries. 846.

Controverſiſts (Roman), their perplexity touching the book of Taxes. I. 629. *b.*

Contzen, Jeſuit, deſcribes the violences exerciſed by the Lutherans upon the Calviniſts. III. 535. *a.* Refutes the viſions of Braumbom. II. 126. *b.* 127.

Convents, the inſtitution of them aſcribed to the devil. I. 272. *a.* The ſpirit of the goſpel does not reign there. II. 109. A ſtrange corruption of morals there in the XVth century. 276. *a. b.* 277. *a. b.*

Converſation, thoſe who have the addreſs to revive a languiſhing converſation, are a great help in the world. I. 701. *b.* 702. *a.* There are ſome who write down what they hear there. III. 154. *b.* Such perſons are dangerous. *ibid.* People that are very agreeable in converſation. IV. 591. *a.* The ſtrange ſlavery of thoſe who have the reputation of excelling in it. 707. *b. n.* (93). Things are miſerably confounded in the indeterminate diſcourſes of Converſation: we have a thouſand inſtances of it in the *Scaligerana*, and in the *Menagiana*. 727. *b.*

Converſions, writers who undertake to ſpeak of them, are apt to fall into contradictions. I. 477. *b.* Converſions wrought by dragooning will be eternally abhorred by honeſt men. IV. 535.

Converts are almoſt forced to ſpeak ill of the party which they forſake. II. 130. *b.*

Cookery. The hiſtory of a book of Cookery. I. 371. *a. b.*

Cooks. What Cooks are the moſt excellent. I. 100.

Coos, Auguſtus remits to the inhabitants of that iſland, an hundred talents of the tribute which they were indebted to his Exchequer, and upon what account. I. 369. *a.*

Cop (Luke le) tranſlates into French the Hiſtory of the Confeſſion of Augſburg, wrote by Chytræus. II. 122. *b.*

Copernicus: the beauty of his ſyſtem. V. 825.

Copies become imperfect in proportion as they multiply. I. 747. *b.*

Coppenius (Bartholomew) cannot obtain leave to go and diſpute with the Jeſuits. IV. 74. *a.*

Coquets, the fate of people depends very often upon their caprices. II. 841. *a.* A ſign by which one may know them. IV. 688. *a.*

Coras, a famous Civilian at Toulouſe. III. 580. *b.*

Coras, an apoſtate Miniſter, ſome of his adventures. III. 579. *b.* 580. *a. b.*

Cordemoi, an examination of what he ſays concerning Eudes and Charles Martel. I. 15. *a.* His reflexion upon the boldneſs of ſome modern authors. 16. *b.* 17. *a. b.*

Corderius (Maturinus), his pious fraud with regard to his ſcholars. IV. 574. *b.*

Cords for diſcipline; two thouſand crowns were laid out upon them in one week. IV. 314. *a.*

Coryciana, a collection of verſes printed at Rome. I. 68. *b.* 69. *a.*

Corinna; that name does not ſtand for Julia in Ovid's Art of Love. IV. 444. *a.*

Corythus raiſes the jealouſy of Paris, and is killed by him. IV. 401. *a.*

Corinth, in what manner Venus was ſerved and worſhipped there. III. 699. *b.* 700. *a.* The women of that city, at the tyrant's ſummons, repair to Juno's temple, where they are ſtripped, and their cloaths burnt. IV. 563. *a.*

Corinthians, what they do to diſcharge themſelves of the infamy of having killed Medea's ſons. II. 874. *a.*

Cornarius (John) has tranſlated a paſſage of Parthenius ill. I. 52. *b.* Tranſlates out of Greek into Latin Parthenius's book *de Amatoriis Affectionibus.* IV. 482. *a.* Is miſtaken about the motive of the dedication to Cornelius Gallus. *ibid. b.* 483. *a.*

Cornelia, her fidelity to Pompey proved the accidental cauſe of his deſtruction. IV. 282. *a. b.*

Cornelius Gallus: Parthenius dedicates his book *de Amatoriis Affectionibus* to him. IV. 482. *b.* The falſe motive which Cornarius aſſigns for it. *ibid.* 483. *a.* The reaſon which Parthenius himſelf gives for the dedication. *ibid.*

Cornelius à Lapide, in a great paſſion with certain authors. I. 40. *b.* Attributes his own thoughts to the Jews. 104. *b.* 105. *a.*

Cornelius Nepos, Verona and Cataneus diſpute between them the honour of having produced him. II. 357. *b.*

Cornelius (Antony), a name borrowed to conceal the true author of a book, which Father Garaſſe calls impious. V. 536. *a. b.*

Cornetz (Cornelius), upon what condition he married the daughter of Dideric de Groot. III. 241. *b.*

Cornuel (Madam), her frank reflexion upon ſeeing a man, who ſhe had been told was impotent. II. 534. *b.* 535. *a.*

Corona Regia, a ſatire againſt King James I. II. 338. *a.*

Coronis is got with child by Apollo; where, and when, ſhe was delivered of Æſculapius. IV. 626.

Corradus commits a blunder in not having rightly underſtood Aſconius. II. 347. *b.* Miſtakes Plutarch's meaning with reſpect to Lucullus, and the ſocial war. III. 493. *b.*

Correcting: ſeveral authors find the correcting or reviſing of their works too troubleſome, and give it over. IV. 451. *a.* An author ſhould be adviſed by his friends in correcting his works. 591. *a. b.*

Correctneſs. There is a certain degree of correctneſs beyond which nothing can be done but what inſtead of perfecting the work, and giving it more nerves and ſtrength, weakens and diſpirits it. III. 836. *b.* 837. *a.* IV. 896. *b.* 897. *a.*

Correctors of the preſs are often very innocent of the faults that are to be met with in printed books. III. 661. *a. b.*

Corrupt: men can never be ſo generally corrupt, but ſome will avoid the contagion. III. 272. *b.*

Corruption of the heart of man: Nothing can be a better proof of it than ſhewing that thoſe who have no ſupernatural aſſiſtance, are as wicked under the profeſſion of a religion, as others who live in a ſtate of Atheiſm. V. 812.

Corſairs (Turkiſh) made tractable by the game at Cheſs. II. 53.

Corunna, what is ſaid concerning the foundation of it is a mere fable. III. 431. *b.*

Coſmetic, what is the object and uſe of that art. II. 575. *a.*

Coſroës, King of Perſia, what he did to vex the Emperor Heraclius. IV. 350. *a.*

Coſtar, unjuſtly accuſed of a groſs ignorance by Girac. I. 75. *a.* Took the ground or baſis of his collections from Bacon's works. 599. *b.* 600. *a.* Did not comprehend Horace's thought with regard to Catius. II. 389. *b.* Juſtly cenſures Balzac, who had criticized Alexander. 667. *b.* Quoted. III. 262. *a.* 939. *a.* Has no reaſon to cite Eraſmus on the ſubject of Bilia. II. 727. *and b.* Was ignorant of what the Antients had ſaid concerning that Roman Lady. *ibid.* Is cenſured by Girac with reſpect to the cuſtom which Pompey had of biting his miſtreſs. III. 56. *a.* Cenſured for making uſe of one of Frangipani's jeſts. 102. *a.* Is charged with treaſon by Girac. 399. *a.* Cenſured with reſpect to Hercules, and the poſture in which he deſired to be painted. 430. *a. b.* How he argued againſt the Politician, who maintained that the moſt dangerous ſovereigns were thoſe who were too much ſovereigns. 825. *a.* He juſtly cenſures Girac, with reſpect to the two veſſels of Jupiter. IV. 93. *a. b.* Is rallied for his way of explaining ſome verſes of Horace. V. 134. *a. b.* The Hiſtory of his quarrels with Girac. 341. *a. b. &c.* Is ſtrongly attacked upon his jokes of Gallantry. 343. *a. b.* A judgment on his diſpute with Girac. 345. *a. b.* He does not approve a thought of Longinus. 360. *a. b.* Endeavours to find out the reaſons why Sylla wanted to take the ſirname of Fortunate. 366. *b.* 367. *a.* Finds himſelf at a loſs when he is obliged to account for a thing which he had advanced. 400. *b.* 401. *a.*

Coſte (Mr de la) a particular of which he informs the author. I. 602. *b. n.* (30).

Cotin (the Abbot de) quoted. I. 94. *b.* What he ſays of an epitaph that Menage had compoſed. III. 739. *a. b.* And of Epicurus. 929. *b.* 930. *a. b.*

Coton (Father) great outcries raiſed againſt him with reſpect to a woman poſſeſſed with the Devil. III. 214. *b.* Vindicated from the charge of leudneſs. 891. *a. b.* Diſcovered by his ſmell thoſe who had violated the laws of chaſtity. IV. 125. *a.*

Cotta (Pontiff) his objection againſt the Divine providence. II. 713. *a.* His anſwer to thoſe who inſtead of arguments only alledged public ſtories. III. 743. *b.* Overpowers with arguments thoſe who ſay that reaſon is a gift which the gods have beſtowed upon man. IV. 516. *b. n.* (34). 517. *a.* Why, according to him, it was dangerous to deny the exiſtence of the gods. V. 239. *b.*

Cottibi (Miniſter) writes againſt a certain faſt, after having changed his religion. I. 108. *n.* (*e*). A pleaſant ſtory which he tells. II. 581. *a. b.* Gives the epithet of Saint to Origen, for which he is cenſured by Daillé. IV. 412. *a.*

Coverdal (Milon) carried always a woman about with him, and what name he gave her, according to Sanders. V. 42. *b.*

Council of Baſil; upon a ſeſſion-day, the relicks of Baſil were brought there, and placed in the room of the abſent Biſhops. I. 178.

Council of Conſtance: a project of reformation laid before it. I. 165. *b.* Cautious not to diſoblige the Duke of Burgundy. IV. 605. *a. b.*

Council of Piſa promiſed the canonization of Savonarola to the Dominicans, upon condition that they would take part againſt Pope Julius II. V. 69, 70, 71.

Council of Trent, what the Abbot of St Cyran ſaid of it. I. 36. *b.* V. 15. *b.* The ſpirit of that council. 704. *a.* Who was regarded as the right hand of it. IV. 291. *b.* Reaſons why it was declared to Vergerius, that he could not aſſiſt there. V. 454. *b.* 455. *a.*

Councils, when that of Soiſſons, and when that of Sens was held. I. 29. *b.* 30. *a.* Whether many volumes of the councils be proper to convert Heretics. 604. *b.* 605. *a.* A ſatirical deſcription of the council which condemned Abelard. 757. *a.* Who are the fitteſt perſons to draw up the deciſions of one. 703. *b.* 704. *a.* The Pope can do nothing againſt the canons of councils. III. 741. *a.* Compared with the States General. IV. 139. *b.* Why it is neceſſary that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould preſide in them. 348. *a. b.* They have only ſerved to render Heretics obſtinate, when they oppreſſed them by the Imperial authority. 349. *b.* 350. *a.* Whether general councils lawfully aſſembled, can err in points of faith. III. 595. *a. b.*

Councils of war, by what kind of proofs people ſometimes maintain the opinions they have given there. I. 515. *a. b.*

Counſellor: a counſellor who burns the writings of the two contending parties. II. 647. *a.*

Counſels or *Precepts* (Evangelical) the wrong uſe that may be made of them, by the ſpinning out of conſequences. I. 735. *b.*

Countryman, one who makes the preſent of a turnip to Lewis XI, King of France. III. 803. *b.*

Courage. Whether a man can lawfully be condemned to death for want of courage. III. 59. *b.*

Court; a remarkable inſtance of the intrigues of Courts. I. 100. *b.* Their uneven conduct. II. 210. *b.* 211. *a.* A court without women is ſomething abſurd. IV. 354. *b.* It is the great model of moſt religions. 355. *b.* A deſcription of the different parts that are acted there by thoſe who ſollicit affairs. 460. *b.* How nice they are in the choice of men there. V. 419. *a. b.* Du Refuge's treatiſe on the Court, a very good one. IV. 850. *a. b.* 851. *a. b.*

Court. It is often the trueſt policy to pay one's court, even when they are in diſgrace, to thoſe whom we ſee in the road to high preferment. I. 422. *a.*

Court of Rome, its corruption. II. 370. *b.* 371. *a.* The Cardinals reſent its being diſhonoured in the Diet of the empire. III. 329. *a.* Was deeply dipt in James Clement's crime. 413. *a.* Its tyranny. IV. 330. *b.* 331. *a.* Marſilius of Padua, diſplays in a lively manner its pride, luxury, and other irregularities. 198.

Court of France, its corruption. IV. 329. *a.* 330. *b.* 333. *b.*

Courtezan; whether that word be leſs ſhocking than the word *Putain* (W...). V. 848.

Courtezans have always been, and ſtill are, the way to preferment. II. 426. *b.* 427. *a.* And to the gaining of law-ſuits. 466. *a. b.* 467. *a.* Reduce their galants to beggary. III. 71. *a. b.* A courtezan who honoured and diſhonoured learning at the ſame time. 694. *and a.* How they ought to die according to the principles of the Pagans. 702. *b.* Have very often a power over mens hearts, even when they are grown old. IV. 694. *b.* 695. *a.* Their pictures conſecrated in temples. III. 57. *a. b.* Courtezans conſcientious. IV. 582. *b.* 583. *a.*

Courtiers, a remarkable inſtance of their intrigues. I. 100. *b.* The turn of a fine courtier. 583. *b.* They ought not in their court devotions to imitate the Huguenots who invoke none but God. II. 602. *b.* Compared to the Euripus. III. 585. *a.* Are commonly more ambitious than jealous. IV. 21. *a.* What talent they ſtand moſt in need of. 397. *b.* 398. *a.*

Couſin (Preſident) denies a thing concerning Preſident Ferrier, and the Chancellor de l'Hoſpital, which appears very probable. III. 38. *a.* Quoted. 215. *a. b.*

Coza, the name of the Sultan's Preceptor. IV. 425. *a.*

Cragius criticized with reſpect to the Lacedemonian habit. III. 968. *b.*

Craig (John) the deſign of his *Theologiæ Chriſtianæ Principia Mathematica.* V. 835.

Cramail (the Count de) engages the Abbot of St Cyran to handle his *Queſtion Royale.* V. 16. *a.*

Cramier (Daniel) Profeſſor of Divinity at Stetin, and Super-intendant of the churches of Pomerania. IV. 210. *n.* (*a*).

Crantor, his book of Conſolation. II. 561. *a. b.*

Craon (the Baron de) what effect a ſermon had upon him. III. 60.

Crapula, the meaning of that word in the time of St Auguſtin. I. 567. *a. b.* 568. *a.*

Craſſus, the Orator, does not deſire that his readers ſhould be altogether ignorant or very learned men. IV. 593. *a.*

Craſſus rallies Dejotarus; but his raillery is returned. II. 630. *b.* His defeat and death. V. 273.

Cratea commits inceſt with her ſon. IV. 562. *b.* 563. *a.*

Crates, what he did to diſſuade Hipparchia from the reſolution ſhe had taken to marry him. III. 457, 458. Where and how he conſummated his marriage. 458. *a.*

Cratippus, his conference with Cicero and Nigidius. IV. 370. *b.*

Cray-fiſh, whoſe ſhell repreſented an ax. V. 312. *b.* 313. *a.*

Creation; there is a book of the creation which was aſcribed to Abraham. I. 45. *b.* All the Philoſophers are conſtrained to admit of a creation. 304. *b.* 305. *a. b.* Thoſe who deny it, muſt neceſſarily admit of miſchievous *Genii*, as well as beneficent ones in the univerſe. II. 251. *a.* The importancy of this doctrine. *ibid. and b.* It is neceſſary to admit of the creation of matter. III. 650. *a. b.* 651. *a.* And of that of motion, if we would conceive that God framed the world. IV. 436. *b.* 437. *a. b.* &c.

Creatures, their *Obediential* power, according to the Schoolmen. II. 662. *a. b.* Their conſervation is a continual creation. IV. 886. *a. b.*

Credulity, deſtroyed by her own fruitfulneſs. I. 87. *a.* Is the ſource of the multiplication of miracles. *ibid.* Blame-worthy in the Orthodox as well as in Heretics. 198. *a.* Reflexions upon the inclination of people to Credulity. II. 879. *b.* 880. *a.*

Creed (Apoſtles) whether the Apoſtles formed it by pieces. V. 435. *b.* 436. *a.*

Cregut, his apology. III. 596. *a. b.* 597. *a. b.*

Crellius, his opinion about the ſouls of beaſts. IV. 905. *a.*

Cremutius Cordus, put to death by Tiberius, and for what reaſon. II. 355. *b. n.* (37).

Crequi (the Marſhal de) his jugment of a Prior after having converſed fifteen days with him. II. 374. *b. n.* (57).

Crequi (the Duke of) Embaſſador at Rome, receives an inſult there which is ſaid to have proceded originally from a paſſion of gallantry. II. 470. *b.* A Legate *à Latere* comes to Paris to make ſatisfaction for it. *ibid. n.* (19).

Creſcentius endeavours to retain to himſelf the ſovereign power at Rome. IV. 428. In what manner he was puniſhed for it. 429. *a. b.*

Creſſy, reaſons which facilitated the treaty of peace that was concluded there. III. 95. *a.* The Dauphin's proteſtation againſt. it. *ibid.*

Crevant, the ſiege of that town. II. 461. *and a.*

Creutz (Erneſt John) has tranſlated into Latin Boccalini's *Pietra del Paragoni Politico.* II. 39. *a.*

Crimes; whether it be lawful to ſave one's life, or that of any other, by a crime. I. 91. *a. b.* Crimes of ſtate are generally hooked in by Prieſts in their accuſations. 30. *and a.* Crimes are maintained by crimes. II. 736. *b.* No crimes are committed without ſome proſpect of advantage. 346. *b.* There are ſome which can only be committed by great men. III. 228. *and a.* The common excuſe of thoſe who commit very great ones. 858. *b.* It is a principle of the Natural as well as of the Divine law, that a man ought not to commit crimes with an intention to ſerve God. II. 576. *a.*

Crinitus (Peter) cenſured touching the name of a Tragedy. I. 59. *b.* His miſtakes concerning Caſſius Severus. II. 358. *a. b.* He confounds a paſſage of Suetonius with regard to Cæſar and Catullus. 394. *a. b.* Makes verſes in praiſe of an Aſſaſſin. III. 716. *a. b.*

Criſpus, put to death by Conſtantin. III. 18. *a. b.* 19. *a. b.* 20. *a.*

Critias was an Atheiſt. II. 571. *b.* &c.

Critical Learning, the ſtudy of it is fallen. I. 220. *b.*

Criticiſm, a fatality inſeparable from it. II. 773. *a.* It is permitted to jeſt in Criticiſm, but not to reaſon wrong. III. 631. *b.* How dangerous a work it is. 853. *b.*

Critics are liable to heap chimera's on chimera's. I. 35. *b.* Such as take advantage of an equivocal expreſſion, ought not to omit the favourable ſenſe. 119. *b.* The edge of their genius is often greatly blunted. 419. *a.* An inſtance of the confuſion which they ſometimes occaſion in the commonwealth of learning. 543. *and a. b.* They ſeldom agree on the reading of the manuſcripts. *ibid. a.* They ſometimes change the readings to ſerve a turn, and when they do not underſtand them. *ibid. b.* It is ſurprizing that two excellent Critics ſhould not have known a fact which few men of letters are ignorant of. *ibid.* Nothing contributes more to the multiplying of miſtakes in their writings, than the licence which they take of extending, farther than they ought, the authorities upon which they build. II. 351. *a.* Such as criticize books, ought not to be confounded with the writers of ſatires and defamatory libels. 389. *a. b.* The reaſon of it. *ibid.* Thoſe Critics who found fault with the book *de Uſu Patrum*, do really commend it. 582. *a.* The moſt learned are apt to give us very falſe corrections. 633. *a.* Their illuſions. 634. *a.* They were wont to put a piece of wax upon ſuch places of of a book as ſeemed obſcure to them. 640. *b.* The quarrels of Critics are uſeful in one ſenſe, and ſcandalous in another. III. 253. *b.* 254. *a.* Whether ſuch of them as are authors themſelves, be more to be dreaded than others. 337. *a. b.* Their taſte is far from being uniform. 589. *a.*

Critolaus, the Peripatetic, ſent to Rome. II. 329. *b.*

Cræſus diſmiſſes Solon without giving him any mark of his eſteem. II. 831. *a.* Cauſes golden tiles to be conſecrated in the temple of Delphos. IV. 622. *b.*

Croiſes (or the members of the Cruſade) why they did not ſucceed. I. 774. *b.*

Croix (Mr de la) his *Etat préſent des Nations & Egliſes*, &c. III. 4. *n. (f).*

Croſs, it is ſaid that the inſcription of it was found at Rome in the Pontificate of Innocent. VIII. III. 566.

Crotona reformed from its luxury and debauchery by Pythagoras. IV. 667. *a. b.*

Crown: a woman that recovered, by her leudneſs, a crown which ſhe could not preſerve by her courage. II. 523.

Crown-lands. The States-General in France, will not conſent to alienate them. III. 409. *a.*

Croze (Mr de) cited. I. 47. *a. n.* (3). II. 398. *n.* (*a*). 558. *a. n.* (3). IV. 809. *a. n.* (5).

Crucifix, the nocturnal apparitions of one to Bencius. I. 747. *a.*

Cruelties juſtified. I. 710. *a.*

Cruquius, his blunder with reſpect to Stobæus, in a paſſage where he mentions Epicurus. II. 774. *a. b.* Other blunders of the ſame author. 775. *a.*

Cruſade proved unſucceſsful, and for what reaſons. V. 339.

Cuckold, (voluntary) II. 239. *a.* Such an one excites the indignation of all the world againſt him. 60. *a.* A diſpute about that word. III. 630. *b.* 631. *a. b.*

Cuckoldom, a common-place of conſolation for that diſgrace. I. 699. *b.* 670. *a.* It was what the Antients prayed might light upon evil-doers. II. 247. *b.* Wiſhed for in the form of an imprecation. 742. *a.* In ſome climates, huſbands learn to bear that diſgrace with patience. 743. *a. b.* Whether a man ſhould carry it to be regiſtered in the parliament rolls. 845. *a.* V. 112. *a. b.* In what caſe a huſband may publiſh it without reproach. *ibid.*

Cuckolds, a Comedy writ upon them, intituled, *Nephelococugy* or *Cloud of Cuckolds*, which is very obſcene, but full of invention, and ſeaſoned with a good deal of ſprightlineſs and wit. III. 883. *a. b.*

Cujas; an account of his daughter's conduct. V. 240. *b.* 241. *a.*

Cui bono, who was the author of that maxim. II. 346. *and b.* 347. *a.* And upon what principle it is founded. 346. *b.*

Cunæus abuſes Ariſtotle for a piece of folly, which he never was guilty of. I. 466. *a.* An anecdote letter of his. V. 535. *a. b.*

Cunilago; the virtue of that plant. V. 334. *a. b.*

Cups of a prodigious ſize. III. 205. *b.* 206. *a. b.*

Curate, one who could not read the church books of the faireſt character, and yet diſtinguiſhed the ſmalleſt dice. III. 762. *b.* How the Curate of Midiani was excited to pray for the King. IV. 457. *a. b.* One who refuſed to pray for the health of a ſick perſon, and why. 487. *b.* Thoſe of Paris at law with the Jeſuits. I. 167. *a. n.* (2).

Curates, there have been pariſhes which obliged them to keep each a concubine, that the honour of their wives might be ſecured. III. 345. *a.*

Curator of the univerſity of Leyden, to whom that office was commonly given. I. 787.

Curcellæus cenſured. II. 27. *a. b.* An extract from one of his letters to the Sieur Sorbiere touching Pope Alexander. VII. 475. *b.* He engages to attack Mareſius. 583. *b.*

Curio (Auguſtin) confounds himſelf greatly in ſpeaking of the Saracens. I. 15. *a.*

Curioſity. A remarkable example of private curioſity. I. 212.

Cuſanus (Cardinal) quoted. I. 617. *a. b.*

Cuſpinian, notes upon his Cæſars by Hungerus. III. 534.

Cuſtom, its authority. I. 446. *a. b.* It concerns every body to conform to the cuſtoms of the places where they are. II. 645. *a.* Why it blunts the ſenſation. IV. 514. *a. b.* Can render innocent in one country, that which is contrary to public decency in another. II. 645. *and a.* Its caprices. 634. *a.*

D.

Dacier (Mr) limits the epithet of Achæmenidæ, to the time of Darius the ſon of Hyſtaſpes. I. 72. *b.* 73. *a.* Cenſures Voſſius for confounding an Orator with a Poet. II. 354. *a.* Examination of that cenſure. *ibid.* His inattention. 388. *a. b.* III. 907. *a.* What he ſays concerning the genealogy of Druſus and Tiberius. II. 714. *b.* What he ſays of Lollius. III. 860. *a. b.* Gives a proof of his excellent judgment, in declaring for Horace againſt Quintilian, with reſpect to Lucilius. 908. *a.*

Dacier (Madam) underſtood a paſſage of Plato concerning Prodicus, better than Creſollius. IV. 783. *b.*

Dacquin, a converted Jew, gives in a depoſition againſt Concini and his wife. III. 125. *b.* 126. *a.*

Demonomagia, a book of Elichius's, which the Magiſtrates of Marpurg had a mind to ſuppreſs; but which he got publiſhed, notwithſtanding their prohibition. II. 750. *and a. b.*

Dæmons: whether Dæmons can be the paſſive or active ſubjects of any generation. II. 751. *b.* Their original according to the Rabbins. 855. *b.* The doctrine of the Pagans concerning them. V. 572. *a. b.* A treatiſe on the nature of Dæmons. I. 294. Whether their apparitions were related by Rhetorical figures. V. 73. *a. b.*

Daillé, his anſwer to Father Adam has remained without a reply. I. 108. *and a. b.* What he ſays of the Fathers in general, and of St Auguſtin in particular. 109. *b.* His books are commended by the Archbiſhop of Paris. 264. *a.* His treatiſe concerning the right uſe of the Fathers. II. 582. *a. b.* His quarrel with Mareſius was ſoon ended. 583. *a.* He had a great ſhare in Balzac's eſteem. 584. *b.* His anſwer to the inveſtives of ſome paſſionate Lutherans. III. 218. *a.* Has not traced Campain and Whitaker's diſpute. 940. *a.* The reproaches which are caſt upon him by Cottibi, and Father Adam, touching Mr Morus. IV. 274. *a.* The opinion which Mr Morus had of him. 276. *b.* What cenſures he paſſes upon the title of Saint given to Origen by Cottibi. 412. *and a. b.* 413. *a. b.* &c. What he ſays of Tertullian. V. 142. *b.* With what view he read the accounts of travellers. 427. *b.* He filled the place of Samuel Durant at Charenton. II. 727. His anſwers to the reproaches of the Catholics touching the alteration of a paſſage in the Pſalter. IV. 164. *a. b.*

Daillé, the ſon, quoted touching a book of his father's. I. 108. *a.*

Daimachus: whether Ephorus could be his plagiary. II. 773. *a. b.*

Dalechamp, a famous Phyſician, and of great practice. I. 536. *b.* Unhappy thoſe who take things upon truſt from him. 372. *b.* His tranſlation of the verſes of Ibicus, cited by Athenæus, is neither free from faults of omiſſion nor commiſſion. IV. 232. *a.* A paſſage in his tranſlation of Athenæus cenſured. II. 557. *a. b.* 558. *a.*

Damage; whether one is always obliged to make it up by reſtitution, or ſome other way. I. 13. *b.*

Damagetus, King of Jalyſus, for what reaſon he aſked Ariſtomenes to give him one of his daughters in marriage. II. 650. *a.*

Damianus (Peter) what anſwer he made to the queſtion which Agnes, widow to the Emperor Henry III, aſked of him. III. 80. *b.* His Gomorrhæus. II. 588. *a. b.* 599. *a. b.* V. 855. *a. b.*

Damnation (Eternal) the Myſtics are much exclaimed againſt, for giving their conſent to it. IV. 943. *a. b.*

Damned: what the opinion of Prudentius was, concerning their ſtate and number. IV. 788. *b.* 789. *a.*

Damophila; her hymns compoſed to the honour of Diana. IV. 554.

Danaë, a Courtezan, being condemned to death, when ſhe came to the place of execution, dropt a moſt inſolent murmur againſt providence. III. 779. *b.*

Dancing juſtly condemned by the Reformed Churches. V. 23. *b.*

Daneau (Lambert), cabals againſt the authority of the States of Holland in favour of England. II. 688. *a.* Commits ſome faults in ſpeaking of Marcion. IV. 107. *a. b.*

Danes defeated in Scotland by the valour of a peaſant. III. 332.

Danger: when the danger is over, people are apt to forget the vows which they made to God. II. 649. *a.*

Danhawerus overthrows the pacific deſign of the Elector Palatine. III. 526. *b.*

Daniel, neither he, nor the Angel which inſtructed him, nor the ſoul of Jeſus Chriſt, underſtood his numbers. II. 122. *a. b.*

Daniel (Father) his hypotheſis concerning the ſouls of beaſts refuted. IV. 909. *a. b.* Quoted. I. 670. His defence of St Auguſtin againſt Mr de Launoi. III. 745. *b.*

Daniſh women, what is ſaid of them in the memoirs of Beaujeu. II. 821. *a.*

Dante, the Poet; what revenge he took upon Prince Charles de Valois, and the reaſon of it. II. 296. *a. b.* His Comedy of Hell, Purgatory, and Paradiſe. 592. *b.* 593. *a. b.* He affords ſome proofs to thoſe who ſay that he was a good Catholic, and to thoſe who ſay he was not. 595. *b.* The anſwer which he made to the Prince of Verona. 596. *b.* He boaſts of the ſhare he had in Guido Cavalcante's friendſhip. 399.

Darius, the different anxieties which he undergoes on his wife's account. IV. 6. *a.*

Darkneſs; the removal of the darkneſs mentioned by Moſes, was only with reſpect to the corporeal eye. I. 306. *a.* The darkneſs which happened during our Saviour's paſſion. IV. 624. *b.* 625. *a. b.*

Darmſtadt bravely defended, but taken by ſtorm during the war of Smalcalde. III. 386. *b.*

Darnalt quoted. IV. 610. *b.* V. 528. *b.*

Daſſoucy called an Heretic in point of love. II. 601. *b.* His zeal for the Ducheſs of Savoy. 602. *b.* 603. *a.* He is ill uſed by Loret. 604. *a. b.* Incurs the diſpleaſure of the ladies at Montpellier. 601. *b.* III. 406. *a.*

Date ought to be nicely obſerved in prefaces. I. 493. *a.* The date of the ſetting up of a monument, taken for that of his death who was to be buried there. II. 515. *n.* (*c*).

Dathenus (Peter) obtains, from the Elector Palatine, a retreat at Frankendal. III. 362. *b.* 363. *a.*

Daughter: It is not true that a daughter always follows her mother's example, whether it be good or bad. II. 702. *a.* Of what uſe daughters are in families ſometimes. V. 34. *a.*

Daughters of Adam, their names. I. 23. *a.*

David, whether two families of his race paſſed into Spain at the time of the deſtruction of the firſt temple. I. 41. *a.* The explanation which the author has joined to that article, full of ſubmiſſion to the holy Scripture. V. 798. 807. The author's correction of that article. *ibid.*

David, Preacher to the King of Navarre, ſome particulars concerning him. IV. 324. *b.* 325. *a.*

Davila, his calumnies againſt Francis I, are unluckily too eaſy to be confuted. III. 94. *a.* He and Maimbourg directly contradict each other in their narrative touching the Duke of Guiſe. 292. *b.* 293. *a.* He falſely accuſes a Miniſter of having preached up, that the French ought not to obey their King, and that they might lawfully kill him. IV. 920. *a.* Quoted and cenſured. *ibid. and b.* V. 529. *a. b.*

Daviſon renounces Aſtrology, and applies himſelf to Phyſic. IV. 258. *b.*

Dauphin of France; they give him Bongar's letters to read. II. 68. *a.*

Dauphiné; what a conſiderable place was that of the Civil and Criminal Recorder to the Parliament of Dauphiné. IV. 538. *a.*

Daurat compares the Parliament of Paris to Plato's Androgynes. III. 873. *b.*

Day, a Diſſertation upon that ſubject. V. 775. Remarks on the definition of the Natural and Artificial Day. *ibid.* Nations who reckoned by nights. 776. Of the Civil and Aſtronomical Day. *ibid. and* 777. Inconveniencies of the line of the point of Day. *ibid. b.* 778. *a. b.* They who go round the world, get or loſe a Day. 778, 779. Puteanus has ill expreſſed himſelf in ſaying, that thoſe who go round the world eaſtward loſe a Day. 780. Authors who have committed the ſame fault as he. *ibid.* Pliny, Bembus, and Scaliger, criticiſed. 781. *& ſeq.* How two contagious places may differ twenty-four hours, as to the beginning of the Day. 779.

Dead; Urban Regius was of opinion that we ſhould pray for them. IV. 854.

Death; there is little ſtreſs to be laid on the reports that are ſpread about the death of great men, and of diſtinguiſhed authors. I. 88. *a. b.* 655. *and b.* 656. *a. b.* Moraliſts ought to be reſerved in their reflexions on this head. I. 88. *a. b.* What ſhould be the diſpoſition of all men at the approach of death. 216. *a.* A thought of Arceſilas concerning death. 413. Perſons who promiſed to appear after their death. 631. II. 65. *and b.* 66. *a.* A common-place of conſolation for death. I. 699. *b.* 700. *a. b.* An extraordinary death which was attributed to a juſt judgment of God, both by the Orthodox and Heterodox. II. 19. *a.* Raſh and haſty reflexions are made on the death of Heretics. 373. *b.* 374. *a.* What ſome Pagans ſaid of death. 418. *a. b.* 419. *a. &c.* It is a favour to the wretched. III. 643. *b.* 644. *a.* Lewis XI, King of France, had given ſtrict charge that no man ſhould pronounce that word to him. 803. *b.* 807. *a.* IV. 320. *b.* The grounds of conſolation, which Epicurus and Lucretius alledged againſt death, conſidered. III. 926. *a. b.* 927. *a. b.* The Spinoziſts have no ſolid ground of conſolation againſt it. 928. *b.* A reſolution taken that the decrees of death ſhould not be executed till the tenth day after ſentence. 955. *b.* The doctrine of ſeveral Pagans concerning the characters of death. IV. 788. *a.* Reflexions upon ſudden death. V. 439. *a. b.* How the Pagans recommended themſelves to God, at the point of death. 628. *b.*

Debauchees raiſe people's contempt and horror, when they do not obſerve the rules of decency. IV. 232. *a. b.* They deſerve to have no countenance ſhewn them, but their books ought to be cried down. III. 136. *a.*

Debts: Princes do not always make a conſcience of paying their debts. II. 206. *b.*

Decalogue; its laws are impracticable in the ſtate that mankind is in. II. 65. *b.* The ſenſe of the ſeventh commandment perverted. 243. *a.*

Decameron of Boccace, facts concerning that book. II. 35. *b.* 36. *a. b.* The old tranſlator of it. 36. *a.*

Decamnichus conſpires againſt Archelaus, and for what reaſon. II. 869. *a.*

Deceive: Sometimes a man deceives people by declaring his true intentions to them. I. 129. *a. b.* Nothing is more eaſy than to deceive thoſe who never deceived others. 745. *a.* It is lawful to deceive children and ſick perſons. III. 319. *a.*

Decemvirate abrogated, and for what reaſon. I. 350.

Decency. The moſt diſſolute perſons are often religious obſervers of decency. IV. 407. *a.*

Dechales: his judgment of Peter Nonnius. IV. 382. *b.*

Decimator: a criticiſm on his faults touching the Preceptor of Achilles. I. 78. *a.* Statius is not in the leaſt favourable to him. 79. *a. b.*

Deciſive authors find themſelves ſometimes lead into a ſcrape. I. 76. *b.*

Decius was not denied entrance into the Church by St Babylas. I. 592. *a. b.* 593. *a. b.*

Decius (Philip), to what height the jealouſy of profeſſion between him and Mainus was carried. IV. 67. *a.*

Deckher, his miſtake touching the book intituled *Brutum Fulmen.* III. 521. *a.* And touching the writing of Optatus Gallus. IV. 100. *b.*

Deckher (Conrad), accuſed by Father Labbe of having confounded Radulphus Flaviacenſis with Ralph Higden. IV. 824. *a.*

Declaimers: their common fate. V. 798.

Declamatory Speeches that were made on imaginary ſubjects. II. 358. *b.*

Decorum: a decorum is always obſerved by the moſt profligate men when they can reap no advantage by offending againſt it. V. 160. *a.*

Decrees (Academical, Synodal, *&c.*) the manner in which they are extorted ſometimes. I. 137. *b.* 138. *a. b.* 715. *b.*

Decrees often contain honourable things, which, properly ſpeaking, are nothing but compliments. IV. 147. *b.* Were formerly ſtuffed with Greek and Latin. II. 105. *b.*

Decrees (the compilers of). The contempt and indignation which Mr de Mauſſac expreſſes againſt the modern compilers of Decrees or arrêts. II. 562. *a.*

Dedication; one that was rewarded with a penſion of three hundred crowns. I. 428.

Defects: ſome defects have given names to illuſtrious families. I. 610. *a.*

Deification (Poetical) of an illuſtrious lady. I. 398. *a. b.* All ſorts of languages were employed in it. 399. *a.*

Dejotarus conceals his true ſentiments from Cæſar. II. 625. *b.* A verſe which he applied to two pieces of news which he had received at the ſame time. 627. *a.* He refuſes to acknowledge that the ſcience of Auguries, to which he was extremely addicted, had deluded him. 629. *a.* Cicero's Reflexions upon that head. *ibid. n.* (43). The ingenious anſwer which that King made to Craſſus's raillery. 630. *b.* His Embaſſadors over-reached by Mark Antony. III. 116. *b.*

Deiſm, when it began firſt to be talked of. V. 482. *b.* 483. *a.* See *Impious.*

Deity: The moſt profligate wretches mentioned in Hiſtory have acknowledged a Deity. II. 257. *b.* A Deity which was ſo much the more reſpected by being unknown. 418. *a.* It requires a certain maniac force of mind to deny the exiſtence of a Deity. 450. *b.* 451. *a. and* 648. *a. b.* 649. *a.* There are two ſorts of unbelievers, with regard to the exiſtence or non-exiſtence of the Deity. 648. *a.* Why Lucan imagined that the Deity was better known in Greece and Italy than at Marſeilles. 678. *a.* The Pagans laid great weight upon tradition, when they were to prove the exiſtence of a Deity. 872. *b.* Whether a perſon that has loſt all ideas of this may not ſtill retain the ideas of virtue. III. 671. *a.* Some Heathens maintained the mortality of the deities of the ſecond rank. 349. *a.* Numa would not have the Deity to be repreſented by any images. IV. 675. *a.* The fear and love of the Deity are not the only ſpring of human actions. V. 811.

Delicacy. The ridiculous delicacy of Garaſſe, with regard to the word *lavement.* III. 136. *b.*

Delivered: a ridiculous cuſtom obſerved in ſeveral countries, with reſpect to women newly delivered. V. 346. *and a. b.* 347. *a. b.*

Delos, its inhabitants were the firſt that crammed hens. III. 6. *a.*

Delphians, what they did in order to deliver themſelves from the Peſtilence and Famine with which they were puniſhed for the death of Eſop. II. 831. *a.*

Delphos, its temple ſeized upon and pillaged. IV. 621, 622. The gold and ſilver taken out of it, when turned into current money, amounted to ten thouſand talents. 623. *a.* Its temple burnt by Phlegyas, and the puniſhment which Apollo inflicted upon him. 626.

Del-Rio confuted touching the Magic art of Agrippa. I. 152. *a. b.* 153. *a.*

Deluge; it is impoſſible to penetrate beyond it without the aſſiſtance of Moſes. II. 854. *b.* Mechlinius, diſciple of Albertus Magnus, maintains, that it was cauſed by the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, *&c.* IV. 940. *b.* 941. *a. b.*

Deluge: the alarms that were occaſioned by the prediction of an univerſal deluge. V. 243. *a. b.* 244. *a. b.* A prophecy that it was to happen in the year 1524 cauſes a mighty conſternation. *ibid.*

Demades propoſes to the Athenians that Alexander ſhould be put in the number of the great gods. IV. 405. *a.*

Δημαγωγὸς, how that word ought to be tranſlated. II. 714. *b.*

Demagogues kept the Republic of Athens in a ſtate of true ſlavery. IV. 581. *b.*

Demeſn: there is not any more inalienable than that which is founded upon mechanical paſſions. II. 531. *a.*

Demetrius cenſures the Athenians for their want of courage. III. 714. *a.* His thought has been diſfigured by Athenæus's tranſlator. *ibid.* He demands 250 talents of the Athenians, to be laid out in buying ſoap for his courtezans. *ibid.* Was eaſily induced to new marriages. IV. 662. *a.*

Democritus, the judgment which the Abderites formed of him. I. 20. *b.* II. 638. *a.* He neglects his temporal concerns. 635. *a. b.* A ſtory that is told of his ſagacity. 636. *a. b.* Was thought worthy of divine honours on account of ſome of his predictions. 641. *a.* What we are to think of his opinion about nature, which he calls God. 642. *b.* Whether it be very different from the opinion of Father Mallebranche. *ibid.* Whether a man of mean parts is capable of forming ſuch an opinion. *ibid.* 643. *a.* His ſyſtem of Atoms is not by much ſo abſurd as Spinoziſm. 644. *and a.* How he defines the Venereal Act. *ibid. a. b.* He attributed all things to a neceſſitating deſtiny. 790. *a. b.* Seems to have aſſigned a ſoul to every atom. III. 790. *b.* 791. *a. b.*

Demonſtration (moral), the true nature of it. I. 707. *a. b. &c.*

Demonſtrative: why the brighteſt orations have been aſcribed to the demonſtrative kind. IV. 783. *a.*

Demoſthenes: the longer his orations were, the finer they were. I. 427. *b.* A witty ſaying of his to thoſe that were praiſing Philip as a great drinker. II. 598. *a.* He feigns a ſore throat npon a certain occaſion, that he might not be obliged to ſpeak. III. 355. *b.* His apoſtrophe to Minerva. IV. 582. *b.* He is told in jeſt that his orations ſmelt of oil. 678. *b.* Calliſtratus induced him to dedicate himſelf entirely to the ſtudy of Eloquence. I. 259. Some pretend that he was a diſciple of Plato. *ibid.*

Demoſthenes (Poliſh), Staniſlaus Orichovius was ſo called. IV. 411.

Dempſterus; there is no relying upon the authorities which he cites. IV. 542. *a.*

Denier Royal: a book wrote by Scipio de Grammont under that title. III. 210. What Naudé ſays of it. *ibid. a. b.*

Denis the Carthuſian anſwers Gerſon's Critical Diſſertation upon the ſpiritual marriage of Ruyſbroeck. IV. 942. Is not one of thoſe who turned into Latin the works of Ruyſbroeck. 943. *b.*

Denmark; what the power of the High-Steward was there. V. 500 *a. b.*

Denores abuſes the authors of Tragi-Comic Paſtorals very much. III. 259. *a.*

Derpt, its univerſity founded by Guſtavus Adolphus. V. 660.

Des-Adrets; the reaſon why he embraced the Proteſtant party. I. 712. *b.* 713. *a.* He imitates St Paul's Evangelical Salutation. *ibid. b.*

Des-Barreaux was a famous Libertine. II. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.*

Des Cartes, his epitaph. I. 309. *a.* Accuſed of Atheiſm. 327. *a.* Has juſtice done him. *ibid.* His argument for the exiſtence of a God. 345. *b.* V. 495. *b.* 496. *a.* His followers have diſcovered a want of moderation. I. 472. *b.* From whom he borrowed ſome of his notions. II. 158. *b.* Des-Barreaux comes from Paris to Holland on purpoſe to ſee him. 647. *a.* His is praiſed in a Funeral Oration, by order of the firſt Magiſtrate of Utrecht. 766. *b.* His diſintereſtedneſs. III. 340. *b.* 341. *a. b.* The judgment he paſſes upon Aſtrology. 499. *a. b.* Who was his maſter in Optics. 659. *b.* 660. *a.* In what he has only revived the notions of other Philoſophers. 788. *b.* 789. *a.* Reflexion upon the doubting which he requires, in order to come at the certainty of truth. IV. 81. *b.* His modeſty truly Philoſophical. 267. *a. b.* His maxim touching the ſuſpenſion of our judgment ought not to be admitted in the affair of religion. 363. *a.* His notion of the manner in which the world might have been made. 437. *b.* His objections againſt a piece of Mr de Fermat. 485. *a.* Mr de Roberval anſwers theſe objections. *ibid.* Whether he may be looked upon as the inventer of the opinion which he had concerning the ſouls of beaſts. 546. *and a. b.* 547. *a. b. &c.* Whether the ſeeds of his doctrine about the Automata are to be found in the Antients. 551. *b. to* 554. *a. b.* He acknowledges that his maxim, God can neither deceive nor be deceived, admits of a great many exceptions. 875. *and b.* 876. *and a. b. &c.* His doctrine about the ſouls of beaſts rids us of a great many difficulties. 901. *b.* 902. *a. b. &c.* He is nevertheleſs deſerted in this point by ſeveral of his followers. 902. *b.*

Deſerters: their buſineſs is to pleaſe by agreeable lies. III. 719. *b.*

Deſerters of a ſect are generally not to be credited in what they ſay againſt it. II. 782. *b.*

Deſiderius (Archbiſhop of Vienna), ſharply reproved by St Gregory, and for what reaſon. III. 223. *b.* 224. *a.*

Deſires; one ought to confine them within narrow bounds. II. 200. *a.*

Deſlandes (the Abbot) has related an apocryphal ſtory concerning Charnace. II. 446. *b.* Touching Fernelius. *ibid.* III. 25. *a.*

Deſlyons (John), Dean and Theologal of Senlis, has publiſhed ſome treatiſes againſt the rejoicings of the twelfth-day. IV. 299.

Deſpauterius; ſome of his verſes taken for violent exorciſms. II. 147. *a.*

Deſpœne, a title of honour which the Greeks gave to the eaſtern Chriſtian Princeſſes. IV. 52. *a. b.*

Deſpreaux; his ſatires ſtand in need of a commentary already. I. 35. *b. n.* ‡. II. 600. *b.* His ſatire on the fair-ſex. I. 639. *a.* His rutting hind a falſe compariſon. 641. *a.* He has perfectly well tranſlated what Horace and Juvenal have ſaid of the war which men make with one another. 639. *b.* 640. *a.* What it is he puts among the moral impoſſibilities. II. 650. *a. b.* Cenſured by Des Marets on the ſubject of Alexander. IV. 9. *a. b.* One cannot come into his opinion touching the four verſes which he aſcribes to Nero. 596. *b.* An obſervation in his *Art Poëtique* examined. 744. *a. b.* He makes an excuſe for not celebrating the King's victories. V. 361. *a.* Has not contradicted himſelf with reſpect to Moliere. IV. 744. *a. b.*

Deſtiny. See *Fate.*

Devils. The Devil mimicks God in all his works. I. 5. *a.* Whether he makes uſe of a rod as one of his occaſional cauſes. *ibid.* In what caſe it would be better to harangue the Devils than men. 491. *b.* Two Devils examined. 698. *b.* 699. *a.* Several have been of opinion that the Devils could beget children. II. 113. *b.* 114. *a.* A compact entered into with the Devil. 243. *a. b.* The conqueſt which he obtained over the firſt woman was not a very glorious one. 852. *b.* It is aſtoniſhing that Chriſtian Judges ſhould admit the teſtimony of Devils as true, and reject the exceptions made againſt them. III. 213. *a.* The Devil oppoſes the truths which God declares to men. IV. 46. *a.* How he came to oppoſe the eſtabliſhment of Mahometiſm. *ibid. b.* Whether it can well be concluded from the exiſtence of Devils, that there is no God. 938. *b.* 939. *a.* The denying that the Devil has any power cannot be reconciled with the Scripture. 938. *b.* The great extent of his kingdom. V. 577. *b. &c.* How far the progreſs of his arms goes. 578. *a. b.* He reigns much more in the time of war than in the time of peace. *ibid.* Martin del Rio does not argue conſequentially upon certain extraordinary facts which he aſcribes to the Devils. 597. *and a. b.* The Devil incapable of Atheiſm, and the promoter of all the ſins of mankind. 813. The ſquabbles which the Devils had with Savonarola, of whom they were afraid. 72. *b.* A dramatical writer who often brings the Devils upon the ſtage. II. 478. *a. b.* The Devil ſuggeſts falſe gloſſes on the Scripture to Calvin, according to Hunnius. III. 538. *b.* 539. *a.* Diſcovers all his malice in Pareus's book. *ibid. and b.*

Devotees; thoſe who are fond of them, aſcribe many more things to them than they themſelves pretend to. V. 72. *a.*

Devotion; what is the moſt powerful motive to keep it up in the heart of man. II. 783. *b.* 784. *a.* There is nothing more dangerous to the mind, than too myſtical and too abſtracted devotions. IV. 87. *b.*

Devout. The jargon and myſtical phraſes of ſome devout women. IV. 926. *a. b. &c.* A devout life ſuitable even to the temporal intereſts of men. V. 754. *b.* 755. *a.*

Deuteroſes, or Jewiſh traditions, by whom compiled. I. 173. *b.* The obſervance of them reaches even to the cloſe-ſtool. 174. *a. b.*

Dexippus, his love for his native-country. IV. 175. *b.*

Dhona, an illuſtrious houſe. V. 194. *a.*

Diabolus Sacramentarius: the title of a book compoſed by the Lutheran John Schutzius. V. 89.

Diacettin conſpires againſt Cardinal Julian de Medicis. IV. 11. *b.*

Diagoras (the Rhodian) a famous Athlet. I. 762. *b.* A compliment which a Lacedemonian made to him, differently related by Cicero and Plutarch. II. 651. *a. b.* He was the ſon of Mercury. 652. *a.*

Diagoras, ſirnamed the Atheiſt, what it was that hurried him into his impiety. II. 652. *a. b.* He publiſhes the motives of his apoſtacy. 654. *a.* Was really an Atheſt. 656. *b.*

Diallacticon, a book writ by John Poinet upon the ſubject of the Euchariſt. IV. 692. Printed together with Bertran's treatiſe *de Corpore & Sanguine Chriſti. ibid. b.* And with the book of the Phyſician Harchius. 693. *b. n.* (15). And inſerted in the firſt volume of Beza's Opuſcula. *ibid. a.* Tranſlated into French, and aſcribed to Antony Cooke. *ibid.* The Doctrine of it explained by Andrew Rivet, and John Couſin. *ibid.*

Dialogue; the rules of it. II. 809. *b.* 810. *a.* The title of a very pleaſant dialogue, againſt thoſe writers who love to make uſe of obſolete phraſes. I. 69. *b.* 70. *a.*

Diamond; one ſold at a very low price. II. 219. *b.*

Diana had not a Virgin-ſacrifice, in the perſon of Iphigenia. I. 84. *a.* An admirable ſtatue of that goddeſs. II. 203. Several Pagan cities boaſted that they had the true ſtatue of Diana. 530. *a. b.* 531. *a.* In what place her prieſteſſes boaſted of being able to walk on burning coals without hurt. *ibid. a.* An Hiſtorian's reflexion on the way how ſhe came to let her temple at Epheſus be burnt. III. 59. *a. b.* IV. 405. *b.* V. 360. *a.* Where and when it was that they ſung the hymns, which Damophila had compoſed to the honour of that goddeſs. IV. 554.

Diana of Poitiers: facts that concern her. IV. 160. *a. b.* 161. *a.*

Dias (John) in what manner he was maſſacred by his brother. II. 697. *a. b.*

Dicæarchus oppoſed the immortality of the ſoul. II. 657. *b.* A reaſoning againſt his ſyſtem. 658. *a. b.* The objections to that reaſoning conſidered. 660. *b.* 661. *a. b.* &c.

Dictator; who was the firſt Roman that died in that office. III. 490.

Dictionary; what an hard matter it is to compoſe a Dictionary of Authors. I. 547. *b.*

Dictionaries, nothing ſhould be ſuppreſſed in them. I. 80. *b.* Advice to thoſe who make Supplements to them. 86. *b.* It is a great misfortune when people that compoſe them, have not all the neceſſary books. 331. *b.* An unpardonable omiſſion cenſured. 398. *a.* The Italian Dictionary of the Academy della Cruſca meets with almoſt as many Critics as Readers. 748. *a.* Hiſtorical Dictionaries do not ſufficiently clear the chaos of facts, which they relate. 768. *b.* It is the fate of Dictionaries to improve by being often printed. II. 279. *a.* Dictionary of the Bible; a remark on one of its articles. 615. *b.* 616. *a. b.* The author of this Dictionary thought himſelf obliged to pleaſe ſometimes one ſort of people, and ſometimes another. III. 173. *b.* Why he gives ſometimes a greater extent to his remarks than the text requires. 871. *b.* The author of a Dictionary is ſometimes tranſcribed by perſons who know more than himſelf. IV. 496. *b.* A general obſervation againſt thoſe who cenſure this one. 744. *b.* 745. *a.* Of all writers, thoſe of Dictionaries ought leaſt to be over ſcrupulous. V. 133. *b.* The nouns adjectives of inhabitants ſhould be inſerted in Geographical Dictionaries. 235. The reader ought not to be ſurprized, when the author ſometimes make it appear in this Dictionary, that with reſpect to the moſt myſterious evangelical ſubjects, reaſon puts us to a ſtand. 615. *a.* If the gentlemen of the French Academy, would give us an univerſal Dictionary of all arts, they would engage in an endleſs work. 753. *a.* The writers of them take more pains to compile new things, than to mend the faults of their predeceſſors. 767. The nature of this Dictionary. 810. 854. Complaints made againſt ſome parts of it, and the authors conduct thereupon. 811. Had no right to repreſent people, otherwiſe than they actually were. 812. Remarks on a pamphlet intituled, *The Judgment of the Public, and particularly of the Abbot Renaudot,*

Renaudot, on Mr Bayle's Critical Dictionary. 797. *to* 809. How that libel ſhould have been intituled, and its character. 797. The idea which the author had formed of his Dictionary. 800. &c. It is not true that the Chancellor of France burnt it in his houſe, or that he cauſed it to be burnt by the hand of the hangman. 806. Advertiſement concerning the reprinting of part of this Dictionary. 808. Proceedings of the Walloon Conſiſtory of Rotterdam againſt it. I. lxxix, lxxx, lxxxi. How that of the French academy was received. V. 809.

Dictionary of French rhimes; who the author of that book is. I. 65. *b.* 66. *a.*

Didius (Julianus) Emperor, cauſed all thoſe to be burnt who conſulted the Diviners, upon the Emperor's fortune. III. 955. *a.*

Dido no ſooner ſaw Æneas, but ſhe forgot all her fine reſolutions. III. 189. *a.* An application of that. *ibid.* Was otherwiſe called Eliza. IV. 642. She was married to Sicharbas. *ibid.* Retires to Carthage. *ibid.*

Die: it is a miſerable thing not to have it in our power to die when we earneſtly long for it. III. 319. *and a. b.* A young lady who died jeſting. 835. *b.*

Dying. Whether the oaths of dying perſons ought to be taken for proofs. II. 55. *b.* They are often made to ſay things which they never ſaid. III. 289. *a.* The Pagans applied their mouths to that of dying perſons. IV. 135. *b.*

Dieppe; the precaution of Lewis XIV, was of no uſe to the inhabitants of that city. II. 31. *b.*

Dieu (Lewis de) in what manner he excuſed himſelf to Prince Maurice. II. 663. *a.*

Difficulties; it is only ſhallow wits that find difficulties no where. IV. 690. *b.*

Digby (Sir Kenelm) praiſed by Anglus. I. 339. *a.*

Dignities; when an honeſt man ought to refuſe them. I. 540. *a.* People deſpiſe thoſe who ſhew an indifferency about them, and admire thoſe who court them. II. 201. *a.*

Digreſſions. Effects of the ſpirit of digreſſion. III. 373. *b.* They are a fault of which a very good uſe may be made. IV. 619. *b.* 620. *a.* People are not always reaſonable in the cenſure which they paſs upon them. V. 329. *b.* 330. *a.*

Dijon; a miracle which is told of a Senator of that city. III. 386. *b.*

Dilemma againſt marriage, who is the author of it. II. 13. *b.* 14. *a.*

Dina, a Daniſh woman, convicted of ſlander, and as ſuch condemned to loſe her head. V. 501. *a.*

Dinant; that town treated with the utmoſt rigour. II. 216. *a. b.*

Diocles; his ſurprize the firſt time he ſaw Epicurus in a temple. II. 784. *a.*

Diocleſian uſed to ſay that there is nothing more difficult than to reign well. I. 573. *b.*

Diodorus Siculus; what he ſays of the faults of Hiſtorians. V. 358. *a.* 359. *b.* What Pliny ſays of him. II. 82. *a.*

Diodorus the Sophiſt, a witty anſwer which Herophilus the Phyſician made to him. V. 618. *b.* 619. *a.*

Diogenes Laërtius generally did not know what he ſaid, when he abridged the opinions of the Philoſophers. I. 298. *b.* Although an Epicurean, he does not blame the *peccavi* of Bion. II. 13. *b.* Was not acquainted with all the ſtratagems of authors. 643. *b.*

Diogenes of Apollonia; his doctrine touching the firſt cauſe. II. 672. *a. b.* His ſyſtem hardly differed at all from Spinoziſm. *ibid. b.* How he philoſophized upon the production of the world. *ibid. &c.*

Diogenes the Cynic; his anſwer to Antiſthenes, when he took a cudgel to turn him out. II. 665. *a.* And to Alexander. 667. *b.* 668. *a.* His eloquence. 669. *a. b.* He ſtood up in defence of the moſt abominable impurities. 669. *b.* III. 458. *b.* 459. *a. b.* Whether he was an Atheiſt. II. 670. *and a. b.* 671. *a.* He is taken by a Pirate, and draws an argument againſt providence from his ſlavery. III. 357. *a. b.* What muſt have been his ſentiments touching the ſouls of beaſts. IV. 547. *a. b.* He was not ſo far from Platoniſm, as it is commonly thought. *ibid. b.* Laboured to make himſelf inſenſible. *ibid.* Whether he made a good anſwer to the Philoſopher who denied motion. V. 617. *b.* 618. *a.*

Diogenes the Stoic ſent to Rome. II. 675. *b.* Preaches by example upon patience. 674. *a.*

Diomedes; the explication of the fable which makes him to have fed his mares with the fleſh of his gueſts. III. 712. *b.*

Dion; a wrong obſervation which he makes upon Hadrian's omitting the common preamble in his letter to the Senate. I. 649. *b.* Dion and Tacitus do not agree upon the reaſon, which induced Auguſtus to make a law againſt defamatory libels. II. 356. *a.* Dion ſpeaks either as a bad Geographer, or as a bad Hiſtorian, touching the journey of Tiberius, towards Druſus. 716. *b.* He aſcribes to Cicero a ſpeech which he himſelf had forged. III. 114. *b.* He falſifies two things there, which ought to make us ſuſpect his veracity in many others. *ibid.* An idle ſtory which Guevara falſely warrants by his authority. II. 399. *b.* 400. *a.*

Dionyſius the tyrant, how he expreſſed himſelf when he had a mind to ſay that a tyrant ought never to renounce his tyranny. IV. 564. *b.*

Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis; his good taſte with reſpect to narratives. II. 635. *b.* What he relates touching the religion which Romulus eſtabliſhed. III. 914. *b.* 915. *a. b.*

Dionyſius falſely believed to be the Areopagite. II. 678. *b.*

Dionyſius the Areopagite; who was called the ſecond. IV. 942.

Dioſcorides: it is believed that Fauſtus da Lo[illegible] had tranſlated him into Italian, before Ma[illegible] publiſhed a like verſion. III. 861.

Directors of conſciences are pretty often co[illegible] ſeldom obeyed by the Chriſtians. II. 41[illegible] *a.* [illegible] ſeldom weary of the company of devout w[illegible]. IV. 827. *b.* Have a great deal of buſineſs on their hands. V. 525. *b.*

Diſagreement between Joſephus and Tacitus, in the main circumſtances of matters, that were near their time. I. 512. *b.*

Diſcipline; the terrible effects of that inſtrument. II. 700. *a.*

Diſcipline (Eccleſiaſtical) fallen into a very great relaxation. I. 223. *a.*

Diſcipline (Military) of a very ſtrict and ſevere kind. I. 570. *a. b.*

Diſcover: not to diſcover a plot againſt the Government: a crime of itſelf capital. IV. 346. *a. b.*

Diſcourſe: perſons who find it much eaſier to diſcourſe well off-hand, than to write a good book. II. 566. *a. b.* IV. 251. *b.*

Diſcourſes: the ill effects of ſuch diſcourſes as are too free. III. 966. *a.*

Diſcuſſions (Philoſophical) one ſhould conſult in them the ideas of order. V. 827.

D'Iſe, or rather d'Yſe, Miniſter. III. 594. His diſputes with Cregut. 596. *a. b.* &c.

Diſeaſe (Pedicular) the Philoſopher Pherecydes died of it. I. 211. *b.*

Diſgrace. It is policy to pay one's court, even when they are in diſgrace, to thoſe whom we ſee in the road to high preferment. I. 422. *a.* The diſgrace of cuckoldom and death have the ſame commonplace of conſolation. 669. *b.* 700. *a.* Men endeavour to comfort themſelves in their diſgraces, by leſſening the glory of the enemy, who has beat them. V. 659.

Diſpenſation of marriage; abſtracts of the reſult of a congregation held at Rome for that purpoſe. IV. 633. *a. b.*

Diſputation, what the laws of it require. IV. 934. *a.*

Diſpute: what was the Diſpute between Cain and Abel, according to the Targum of Jeruſalem. I. 23. *b.* The effects of heat in a Diſpute. 90. *a.* 309. *b.* Men who engage in Diſputes, are commonly ſtronger in the offenſive, than in the defenſive. 598. *a.* Among all the Philoſophical exerciſes, there is none where moderation is more neceſſary than in this. II. 847. *a.* We loſe ſight of truth by too much diſputing. 848. *b. and n.* (33). A Diſpute between two Divines, which laſted ſeventeen years. III. 972. *a.* There is not a more commodious way of coming off in a Diſpute than a witty jeſt. IV. 713. *a. b.* The ill effects of Diſputes. V. 229. *a. b.* In what the ſcandal of Diſputes ſhould be made at preſent to conſiſt. I. 244. *b.*

Their fate is ſuch that one is ſcarce ever at full liberty to make uſe of maxims that are purely univerſal. 494. *a.* It is a great misfortune for ſome perſons to engage in perſonal Diſputes. One would think that their evil genius brings them to thoſe unlucky circumſtances. II. 584. *b.* Whence it comes that thoſe about univerſal grace, are not conſidered now as Diſputes of importance. *ibid.* The misfortune in Diſputes of religion is, that the ſame perſons are judges and parties. IV. 231. *a.* See *Controverſies.* What a number of them would ceaſe, would but the diſputants underſtand one another. 347. *a.* The humour of diſputing, is what ſeems the leaſt approved in the œconomy of the Goſpel. V. 816. A diſreliſh for Diſputes, and the love of eaſe induce Thomas Grynæus to retire from his employ. III. 256. When a perſon mentions the Diſputes of authors, he ſhould not forget to take notice of what firſt occaſioned them. V. 352. *b.* Thoſe between Calvin and Bolſec, ſcandalize James of Burgundy, who falls off from the doctrine of the Reformed. II. 215. *a.* The odious conſequences which they force one to draw. III. 504. *b.* 505. *a. b.*

Diſpute (Philoſophical) the deſign of one. V. 816.

Diſtempers: the mind is ſubject to Epidemical Diſtempers as well as the body. I. 19. *a.* III. 948. *b.* Whether they made part of the primitive ſcheme [illegible] providence. II. 496. *b.* 497. *a.* Phyſicians for- [illegible] made them depend much upon the influence [illegible] ſtars. III. 620, 621, *and a. b.* Feigned Di- [illegible] have been the means of preſerving the [illegible] of ſome people. IV. 767. *b.*

Di[illegible]o; the meaning of that word when it is taken for a diſtemper. I. 619. *a.*

Diſtruſt is often neceſſary. I. 71. *b.*

Dyteutas; a very generous action which he performed. II. 532. *b.*

Diverſions (public) are ſchools of leudneſs. III. 261. *a.*

Divination; how Cratippus reaſoned upon that ſubject. II. 565. *b.* 566. *a.*

Diviners are generally ramblers. I. 6. *a.* The difference between thoſe who foretel things after the manner of an Oracle, and other Diviners. 276. *b.* A Diviner who performs greater ſervices to a Prince than any of his Generals. 447. *a.* Is happy when he ſerves a Prince whom providence deſigns for great purpoſes. *ibid. b.* It is not to be wondered at, if they ſhould boaſt of being maſters of the ſcience of dreams. 520. *b.* How vain their anſwers are. 542. *a. b.* In antient times an army never marched without having ſome Diviner to go along with them. II. 251. A falſe argument which is alledged to prove that they certainly foretold future things. IV. 182. *b.* The ſad fate of ſome Diviners. 254. *a.*

Divines, a judgment that was paſſed upon their debates. I. 242. *b.* 243. *a.* Their diſputes occaſion a great many miſchiefs. 261. *a. b.* Their anſwers cannot always be ſo ſtrong as the objections of a Philoſopher. II. 455. *b.* 456. *a. b.* Their Controverſies have always very much embarraſſed the Princes and Magiſtrates. III. 504. *a. b.* 505. *a. b.* In an aſſembly where a re-union is treated of, they ſhould be reduced to the bare plain function of Advocates. 526. *b.* They will always be worſted in a diſpute wherein people ſhall only have recourſe to the light of nature. V. 815. Maxims of the modern Divines concerning myſteries. 817.

Divines (Polemic) apt to contradict themſelves. I. 352. *a.*

Divines: Court-Divines concern themſelves too much with Political affairs. V. 103. *b.*

Divinity and Philoſophy are two faculties, which cannot well agree about their juſt boundaries. I. 472. *b.* Human ſciences are the handmaids of Divinity. II. 698. Zealots would have a man to be more determinate and reſolute than Bartolus in matters of Divinity. 706. *a.* Whether a thing that is true in Divinity can be falſe in Philoſophy. III. 479. *a.* 951. *a. b.* 952. *a. b.* 953. *a.* 970. *a. b.* See *Theology.*

Divinity (Myſtical) a ſpecimen of that doctrine. V. 302. *a. b.* IV. 926. *a. b.* 927. *a. b.* Ruyſbroeck paſſed for one of the greateſt maſters in that ſcience. 942. *and a. b.*

Divinities. The Pagans imagined that there were Divinities jealous of the proſperities of mankind. II. 289. *a.* An heroic prayer on that head. *ibid. and b.* See *God, Gods,* and *Deity.*

Diviſibility in infinitum would hinder all manner of contiguity. V. 611. *b. & ſeq.* Several difficulties againſt the Geometrical proofs of a diviſibility *in infinitum.* 612. *a. b.* 613. *a.* It would ſuppoſe the penetration of dimenſions. 611. *b.* 612. *a.*

Diviſion; there are ſome caſes wherein ſocieties are not deſtroyed by it. IV. 271. *a. b.*

Divorce; whether it be true that all the antient and modern Divines are agreed about that matter. IV. 217. *b.* 218. *a.*

Divorce (ſatirical), a book wrote by the Sieur d'Aubigné, quoted. IV. 334. *a. b.* 340. *a.*

Doctors would often be taken for great Comedians, if it were lawful for one to judge of the thoughts of others. I. 564. *b.* It is happy for ſome of them that the people never trouble themſelves to demand of them any account of their doctrine. *ibid.* Some of them may be compared to thoſe Engliſh maſtiffs which Father Maimbourg ſpeaks of in one of his ſermons. 773. *b.* IV. 64. *a. b.* Do not deſerve to be blamed if their minds are not always bent in converſation. II. 566. *a.* IV. 251. *b.* Doctors in Law; when, where, and upon what occaſion, the cuſtom of creating them was introduced into the univerſities. III. 594. Paſſionate Doctors, what revenge their adverſaries take of them. 542. *a. b.* It is very rare to find among them a perſon that is altogether exempt from avarice and ambition. 737. *b.* Many Doctors forced to renounce a theſis, in which they maintained that *Ego amat* was as good a phraſe as *Ego amo.* IV. 837. *b.* 838. *a.*

Doctors (Eccleſiaſtical), whether they have any reaſon to ſtand in fear of the capacities of the people. I. 565. *a.*

Doctors Degree: Laurens is obliged to paſs through all his exerciſes again, in order to take his Doctor's Degree a ſecond time. III. 745. *a.*

Doctrine. There are a great many authors who can diſcover the weak ſide of a doctrine to admiration, but never where the force of it lies. I. 506. *b.* There is hardly a better way of attacking a doctrine, than by turning it into ridicule. V. 20. *a.* 481. *b.* Thoſe who are over-fond of particular doctrines, conſider all thoſe who oppoſe them as falſe brethren. I. 739. *b.* Doctrines very oppoſite to the true faith. II. 156. *a.* What a perſon muſt know in order to judge of the nature of a doctrine. V. 231. *b.*

Dogmatiſts; the ordinary and inevitable rock which they ſplit upon. I. 410. *a.* Did not propoſe the arguments of both parties with the ſame force. II. 487. *b.* Have too much preſumption to be good Chriſtians. IV. 655. *b.*

Dogs. Whether Agrippa's dog was not a natural one. I. 150. *b.* 151. *a.* A thought of Cicero concerning the dogs of the Capitol. 773. *b.* III. 372. *a. b.* IV. 74. *b.* Never enter into the churches or moſques of Miſitra. III. 430. *b.* 431. *a.* Good dogs bark againſt all ſtrangers, though they may be the greateſt friends of their maſter's houſe. IV. 74. *b.* A ſermon upon the different kinds of dogs. 64. *a. b.*

Dog-ſtar; its raging heat abated by Ariſteus. I. 456. *b.* 457. *a.*

Dolabella, why thwarted by M. Antony. III. 115. *a.* His manners, his conduct, and the troubles of which he was the cauſe. V. 406. *b.* He nevertheleſs performs a fine action for which he is highly praiſed. 408. *a. b.*

Dolet (Stephen) his Epiſtle to Marot, and his Annotations on that Poet's Hell. IV. 163. *a.* The friendſhip between theſe two men. *ibid. b.*

Domeſtic Affairs; a rule which every body ought to obſerve in the management of them. I. 241. *b.* 242. *a.* Thoſe who have the moſt intereſt in knowing how they proceed, are the laſt who receive notice of it. 28. III. 382. *a.*

Domeſtics; one ought to take pains to marry them. III. 193. *a.* How Cato the Cenſor regulated his domeſtics. IV. 753. *b.* 754. *a.*

Domine non ſum dignus, &c. The words of the Centurion, with which a Spaniſh Embaſſador received a viſit of James I, King of England. I. 725. *a.*

Dominic (St), according to Mayer, had the knowledge of the Philoſophers ſtone. I. 182. *a.* Whether or not he gave blows with a ſpit to Francis of Aſſiſi. III. 82. *b.* A Nun in an extacy ſees him come into her chamber, and bring an ointment wherewith he rubbed her leg. IV. 137. *a. b.*

Dominicans are ever at war with the Franciſcans. II. 239. *a.* The earneſtneſs of their Generals to get the *Pugio Fidei* publiſhed. IV. 167. *b.* Their diſſenſions. 199. *a. b.* See *Jacobins.*

Dominion; two things neceſſary to acquire and keep it. II. 421. *b.*

Dominis (Marcus Antonius de), Joſeph Hall writes a letter to him repreſenting the neceſſity of remaining ſeparate from the communion of the Church of Rome. III. 344.

Domitian returns the dignity of Empreſs to a woman who had proſtituted herſelf to a Player. II. 685. *a.* Employed others to compoſe his letters, ſpeeches, and edicts. III. 317. *a.* What is told of Apollonius Tyanæus, with reſpect to the perſon who aſſaſſinated Domitian. V. 731, 732. A decree of the Senate againſt his memory. IV. 729. *b.*

Domna; what that name was. III. 606. *b.*

Donatiſts; their error about Baptiſm condemned in a general council. III. 742. *b.*

Doricus, ſon to Diagoras, the hiſtory of him. II. 651. *b.*

Dorotheus; whether there was at Tyre a Biſhop of that name who ſuffered martyrdom. II. 752. *a. b.*

Dort; its Synod would not admit the Remonſtrants as members, but only as perſons cited before them. II. 793. IV. 75. *a. b.* V. 510. *a. b.* 511. *a.* 513. *b.* 514. *a. b.*

Dortmund; facts which relate to the eſtabliſhment of Lutheraniſm in that city. II. 121. *a. b.*

Doukan (the Sieur Count de), Conſtable of Scotland; is defeated and taken priſoner by the Sieur de Chaſtelux. II. 461. *a.*

Douza (George), affectionately received by Simon Simonides. V. 149. *and a. b.* 150. *a. b.*

Dowry. To receive a great dowry is to loſe one's liberty. II. 206. *a.*

Drabicius; ſome people expected that he was to baptize the grand Turk. II. 693. *a.* Whether the name of Drabicius was unknown in France, in the year 1690. III. 679. *a.* He ſays nothing of Tekeley. 680. *a.* His tragical end. 681. *a.*

Draco wrote his laws in blood; the meaning of that expreſſion. III. 969. *a.*

Dragooning will eternally be abhorred by honeſt men, whatever country or religion they be of. IV. 535.

Dreams. Cicero ridicules the interpreters of dreams. I. 448. *a.* Very judicious reaſonings upon that ſubject. 510. *a. b.* The vanity of them. 520. *a. b.* Are ways of inſtructing not at all worthy of thoſe intelligences to whom we impute them. *ibid. a.* Divers authors who have written on the interpretation of dreams. *ibib. b.* 521. *a.* Remarks upon a dream. III. 877. *b.* 878. *a. b.* 879. *a. b.* How much they employ the mind ſometimes. IV. 63. *b.* A reflexion on the truth or falſhood that may be contained in dreams, and whether they are ſent to advertiſe us of future things. 72. *a. b.* 73. *a. b.* 74. *a. b.* There are dreams which confound unbelievers more than they are willing to own. 78. *a. b.* The dream of a woman produces ſtrange confuſion through a whole kingdom. 456. *a.* A Philoſophical dream. V. 242. *b.* 243. *a. b.*

Drelincourt (Charles), Miniſter, the anſwer which he made to a Biſhop. I. 505. *b.* Preached ſeven times in one day. II. 695. *b.* Defends the Proteſtant Ritual by the ſentiments of a famous Franciſcan. III. 43. *a.* Anſwers a complaint of the Clergy of France. IV. 479. *and a. b.* His reproachful words to the Biſhop of Belley. 650. *a.* An extract from his anſwer to Prince Erneſt, Landgrave of Heſſe. 826. *b.* 827. *a.* Quoted. III. 267. *a. b.* IV. 356. *b.*

Drelincourt, Profeſſor of Phyſic, his Elogium. I. 74. The information which he gave the author, touching one of the Akakia's. 172. *a. b.* His character. 335. *a.* II. 140. *b.* 694. *b.* 695. *a.* 696. IV. 497. *n.* (*c*). 505. *a. n.* (76). V. 504. *and a. b. & paſſim alibi.*

Dreſs: women forbid all ſuperfluity of dreſs. II. 98. *a. b.* 99. *a. b.*

Drielenburch (Vincent) ſets up for a prophet. I. 654. *a.*

Drink. Their way of drinking at Lacedæmon. II. 574. *b.*

Drinker. What Demoſthenes ſaid to thoſe who praiſed Philip, King of Macedonia, as a great drinker. II. 598. *a.* Hard drinkers were eſteemed among the Perſians. *ibid.*

Drunkenneſs: the horrible prevalency of that vice in the univerſity of Franeker. I. 247. *a. b.* Who put a ſtop to it. *ibid. a.* More deteſted than fornication. II. 823. *b.* A freſh proof that it becomes faſhionable among women. V. 540. *a.*

Druſians; a ſmall part of the hiſtory of that people. III. 3, 4.

Druſilla, daughter of Agrippa, whether ſhe renounced the Jewiſh religion. II. 701. *a.*

Druſilla (Julia), her inceſt with her brother Caligula. II. 702. *a. b.* Impieties committed after her death to honour her memory. 703. *a. b.*

Druſius, the judgment which Father Simon paſſes upon him. II. 704. *a. b.* Accuſed of not being a ſincere Proteſtant; and what anſwer he made to this charge. 705. *b.* 706. *a. b.* His only daughter is reduced to great miſery. 707. *b.* 708. *a.* He is taken for the author of a letter of Broughton's, by Roſweide and Colomiés. 150. *b.*

Druſus (Marcus Livius), the fine anſwer which he made to an Architect. II. 713. *and* 714. *a. b.*

Druſus, brother to Tiberius; it is ſaid that he preſerved his conjugal fidelity. I. 357. *b.* His elogy. II. 714. *b.* 715. *a. b.* 717. *a. b.*

Druſus, ſon to Tiberius, his friendſhip for Germanicus. II. 719. *a. b.*

Druſus, the ſon of Germanicus and Agrippina; a report ſpread that he had eſcaped out of priſon. II. 721. *a. b.*

Dualiſts, Magi who admit of two co-eternal principles. V. 636. *a. b.*

Duaren was reported to have been a Proteſtant. II. 722. Gives a reaſon why he perceived the paſſion, which he had for going over to the Proteſtants, diminiſh. 726. *b.* Cited. III. 768. *b.*

Dubravius; what he tells us of the modes which a King of Bohemia brought from France. III. 969. *a.*

Ducherius (Gilbertus) his epigram againſt Julius II. III. 610. *a. b.*

Duel; the effects of a ſermon againſt that way of fighting. III. 18. *a.* A book upon the true and antient uſage of duels. I. 547. *a. b.*

Dueliſts, what reaſon induces them to right themſelves. IV. 887. *a. b.*

Duncan; particulars concerning that family. II. 408. *a.* 411. *a. b. n.* *.

Du-Pleix (Scipio), ſee *Pleix*.

Du Prat, the prudent advice which he gave to the Count of Angouleſme. III. 88. *a.*

Duræus not being able to unite the Reformed and Lutherans, undertakes to re-unite all the ſects of Chriſtians. II. 731. *b.* His conference with Ferri and Ancillon. III. 34. *a. b.* He becomes a ſort of viſionary. *ibid. b.* 35. *a.* Mr Amyraut's miſtake touching the time of his death. 34. *a. b.* The Oxford catalogue confounds him with a Jeſuit. II. 731. *b.* A great pacificator, publiſhes ſeveral pieces. III. 343. *b.* 344. *a.*

Durel; his book in defence of Epiſcopacy, and the anſwer which was made to it. II. 313. *a.*

Duret, Phyſician; playing on the equivocal meaning *Saigneur* (Bleeder) uſed to ſay that he was a very little *Seigneur* (Lord). II. 99. *a.*

Duronius, while he was tribune of the people, repealed a law, reſtraining the immoderate expences of feaſts. I. 351.

Durazzo; a hiſtory of the Princes of that name. IV. 305. *a. b.* 306. *a. b.*

Durazzo (Charles of) put to death, and for what reaſon. IV. 305. *a.*

Durazzo (Lewis of) impriſoned and poiſoned in the caſtle *dell' Ovo*. IV. 306. *a.*

Durazzo (Robert of), Prince of the Morea, comes into France, where he is killed fighting. IV. 306. *b.*

Duty (Conjugal), rules touching that duty. I. 504. *a. b.* III. 80. *b.* 81. *a. b.* What the Cynics taught upon that head. II. 669. *b.* 670. *a.* III. 458. *b.* 459. *a. b.*

E.

EArs; a catalogue of perſons who had the faculty of moving them. III. 429. *b.*

Earth. Ariſtarchus was one of the firſt who maintained that the earth turned round upon its center. I. 449. *a. b.* Whether it be animated. III. 659. *a. b.* Whether its bowels are divided like the air into three regions. IV. 258. *a.*

Earth: a kind of Earth which had great virtues. III. 751. *b.* 752. *a. b.*

Earthquakes; ſacrifices which the Romans offered up on thoſe occaſions. V. 185. *b.*

Eaſe. There is a real and an apparent Eaſe in writing. III. 261. *b.* &c. IV. 85. *a. b.* 86. *a.*

Eaſtern people, a ſmall ſpecimen of their legends. I. 49. They are extravagant in their commendations. 51. The reaſon of it. *ibid.* It was their cuſtom to conſecrate golden figures, which repreſented thoſe parts of the body in which they had ſuffered any inconvenience. 116. *b.* They uſed to ſay that thoſe who recovered from a great fit of ſickneſs, or eſcaped any imminent danger, were raiſed again out of the grave. *ibid.* They turned their faces towards one particular point of the Heavens when they prayed. IV. 176. *a.* Conſiderations upon their religion. 939. *a. b.*

Eat. To die of exceſſive eating, is ſcandalous in any one, much more in men of letters. I. 443. *a.* It is a folly for people to adore what they eat. 556. *b.* Renaud de Beaune could eat a vaſt deal without being thereby made heavy or drowzy. V. 35. *b.*

Eaters. We have I know not what natural averſion for great Eaters. II. 598. *a.*

Eberard, a pretended Prince of Weſtphalia; what is told of him. III. 166. *b.* 167. *a. b.*

Eburones; what people we are to underſtand by that. IV. 834. *a.*

Eccleſia (Auguſtin ab) writes the Hiſtory of the Biſhops of Piedmont. IV. 772. *a.* Another book of his intituled, *Corona Regia Sabaudica. ibid.*

Eccleſiaſtics; their irregular lives turned to advantage by the ſovereigns. I. 30. *b.* 31. *a.* Love to change their poſts. 56. *a.* Thoſe of the XVIth century exerciſed their tyranny over the minds and conſciences of men. 149. *b.* Are much to be dreaded, when they turn Accuſers. 468. *a.* It is happy for them that the people under their direction have no great capacity. 564. *b.* Some Eccleſiaſtics who have writ love-verſes. 630. *b.* Of what conſequence it is to keep a cloſe rein on them. II. 95. *a. b.* 96. *a.* The ſame ſpirit which has procured them ſo much wealth and honour, prevailed alſo under the Pagan religion. 531. *a.* The rigour of the antient Canons with reſpect to them. III. 221. *a. b.* They praiſe all thoſe who are liberal to the Church. 223. *a.* Many of them chuſe rather to be excommunicated by the Pope, than to part with their wives. 229. *a.* Thoſe of the northern countries ſubmit to the law of Celibacy, more unwillingly than thoſe of the ſouthern. *ibid.* Thoſe who cannot bear the yoke of Celibacy are innumerable. 235. *a.* Their vices incurable. 329. *a. b.* Who it was that introduced the cuſtom of depoſing ſuch as lay with their wives after their ordination. 378. They ſhould not be ſuffered to keep young ſervant maids, when they are not married. 736. *b.* It is dangerous to attack them. V. 434. *b.* 435. *a.* For what ſum they obtained abſolution from Fornication, Sodomy, Beſtiality. I. 628. *a. b.* See *Clergy.* The artifices which they make uſe to excite a liberal piety. 738. *b.* 739. *a. b.* Thoſe who formerly abſtained from Adultery and Fornication, were looked upon as Eunuchs or Sodomites. III. 345. *a.*

Eckius; his Obeliſks againſt Luther's theſis on Indulgences, publiſhed by Luther himſelf. IV. 772. *b.*

Eclipſes; who was the firſt among the Greeks, that could foretel the time of them. III. 462. *a.* An eclipſe of the ſun which happened during our Saviour's paſſion. IV. 624. *b.* 625. *a. b.* An eclipſe of the moon occaſions the ruin of a fleet to the Athenians. 566. *a. b.*

Edeſſa (Joſſelin de Courtenay, Count of) dies in irons at Aleppo. IV. 383.

Edinburgh. When the caſtle of Edinburgh was built. III. 783, 784.

Edict: what the Edict of January 1562 was, and in what ſituation the affairs of the Romiſh religion were then. III. 507. *b.* &c. The parliament of Paris refuſes to regiſter it. 509. *b.* 513. *a.* Edict of July 1561, its reſtrictions. 507. *b. n.* (28). Edict of Nantes, by whom drawn up. II. 433. *and b.*

Edicts frequently contain honourable things which muſt not be taken in a literal ſenſe. IV. 147. *b.*

Editions: what Mr Loyſel uſed to ſay of firſt editions. I. 318. *b.* The indolence of thoſe who wait for the ſecond. 319. *a. b.* There is no edition which ſome advantage may not be reaped from. *ibid. b.* There are authors who beſtow more pains upon the ſecond edition than they did upon the firſt. III. 837. *b.* Francis I, praiſed for having encouraged the printing of excellent editions. 97. *b.* The taſte of preferring the moſt ample ones, has always prevailed. IV. 544. *b.* 545. *a. b.* There are perſons who dare to falſify ſecond editions, even in the author's life-time. 711. *b.*

Education ſinks under the weight of nature. I. 80. *a.*

Edward (Saint) his ſimplicity contributed much to his obtaining a place in the Kalender. II. 707. *a.* He undergoes the penance of being ſcourged, and for what reaſon. *ibid. and b.*

Edward I, King of England makes an irruption into Scotland. III. 332. *a.*

Edward III, King of England, offended at an inſcription that was put upon Windſor caſtle. V. 559. *a. b.* His miſtreſs could do every thing with him, and her power ended only with the life of that Prince. 556. *a. b.*

Edward VI, his death occaſioned great joy at Rome; but the reaſons of that joy ceaſed in a little time. III. 617. *b.* 618. *a.* The Court of Rome offended at the title of King being given to him. 621.

Effigy: ſome perſons have ſaid that they had never been ſo cold as they were that day on which their effigy was burnt. II. 85. *b.*

Egg, according to the doctrine of the Antients, ſerved for the generation of things. I. 101. *a.* 444. *a. b.* Compared with the words of Moſes in his account of the creation. *ibid. a.* Another Egg, which, hatched by a dove, produced Venus, or Love. *ibid.* The myſterious meaning, which Dr Burnet finds in it. *ibid. and b.*

Egypt, prieſts in the nature of Deans or Superiors there were called prophets. I. 347. *a.* Who built the moſt celebrated pyramid in Egypt. III. 57. *b.* When and upon what occaſion people of a different language came firſt to ſettle in that country. IV. 790. Which of their Kings drank wine firſt. *ibid.*

Egypt (the going out of) a Tragedy; who is the author of it. II. 880. *and b.*

Egyptians deſpiſe Ageſilaus. I. 129. *a.* 130. *a.*

Egnatius (Baptiſt) what anſwer he gave to the criticiſm which Robortellus had writ upon his works. III. 464. *b.*

Ehud: every Proteſtant has received an order like unto that which he received. II. 123. *a.*

Εἴδωλα; what Epicurus underſtood by that term. II. 388. *a.* And how it was interpreted by the Schoolmen. *ibid.*

Electus; that word taken for a proper name, and for a title by Florimond de Remond and by Bodin. IV. 106. *a. b.*

Elegy. An Elegy compoſed in honour of thoſe who had loſt their lives at the battle of Marathon. II. 825. *b.*

Elements: whether the war of the Elements ceaſed after the chaos was diſentangled IV. 438. *b.* 439. *a. b.* 440. *a.*

Eleanora (Heireſs of Guienne) is divorced from the King of France, and married to the King of England. III. 794. *a. b.* Her gallantry with Saladin. *ibid. b.* 795. *a.* Her jealouſy, vengeance, and puniſhment on that account. 796. *a. b.* Her death. 797. *a. b.* She has been put in the catalogue of learned women. *ibid. b.*

Elect. The Elect among the Manichees were not allowed to exerciſe Agriculture. IV. 97. *a. b.*

Elephants; the chaſtity of thoſe animals. I. 641. *b.* White ones are held in great veneration in the eaſt. III. 549. *b.* When ſeen by the Romans for the firſt time. IV. 663. *a.*

Elephantis was a Courtezan, who had compoſed a book full of obſcenities. III. 703. *b.*

Eleuſina Sacra patefacta; who is the author of that book. IV. 648. *b. n.* (3). Quoted. 88. *a.*

Elian (or rather Ælian) excuſes Anacreon. I. 292. *a.* Vents a corrupt maxim of morality. II. 654. *b.* His unjuſt partiality as an Hiſtorian. *ibid.* He or his tranſcribers wrote Pericles for Epicles. IV. 571. *b.*

Elias; whether his complaint was that of a man inſpired. I. 106. *b.* 107. *a.*

Eliot (Thomas) wrote a book which he falſely aſcribed to Encolpius. II. 770. *a.*

Elis. The ſevere law which the inhabitants of Elis made againſt all women, who by ſtealth ſhould be preſent at the Olympic games. I. 762. That city grants the privilege of immunity to all Philoſophers. I. 656. *b.*

Eliza, ſiſter to Pygmalion, King of Tyre, is infinitely better known by the name of Dido. IV. 642.

Elizabeth, Queen of England; how ſhe called Bodin. II. 49. *b.* Why in her reign no endeavours were uſed to juſtify her mother. 55. *a.* The difference there was between her and Agrippina. 757. *b.* 758. *a.* In what manner ſhe diſcourſed about the Earl of Eſſex. III. 182. *a.* A Fanatic curſes her with all manner of imprecations. 315. *b.* What Prince ſhe moſt deſired to ſee. 397. *b.* The reformation which ſhe eſtabliſhed. 562. *b.* 563. *a. b.* She commands William Criton the Jeſuit to be ſet at liberty. II. 576. *b.* More policy than ſincerity in what ſhe ſaid upon that occaſion. *ibid.* Thoſe who made her head of the Church, ſaid to be more criminal than the electors of the She-Pope would be. IV. 735. *a. n.* (126). Called Jezabel by a preacher of the League. V. 273.

Ellebodius (Nicaſius) his Latin verſion of Nemeſius's book *de Natura hominis.* IV. 345. *a. b.* He treats George Valla's tranſlation with the utmoſt contempt. *ibid. b.* 346. *a.*

Elogies; lying is not any more allowable in a writer of Elogies, than in an Hiſtorian. I. 693. *b.* An Elogy which is a mixture of good and bad. 754. *b.* An ill cuſtom of thoſe who write them. II. 253. *b.* See *Encomiums.*

Eloquence. The jealouſy of Eloquence. I. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* III. 492. *b.* 493. *a. b.* It generally appears finer to one's auditors than readers. II. 358. *b.* The ſurprizing effects of it. 299. *a. b.* 300. *a. b.* 374. *b.* 375. *a.* How great the force of it is. IV. 566. *b.* 567. *a. b.* 568. *a.* The talents of Eloquence, and a vaſt erudition ſeldom meet together. 757. *b.* 758. *a. b.* Calliſtratus's force of Eloquence, raiſed in Demoſthenes a ſtrong deſire of diſtinguiſhing himſelf the ſame way. II. 259.

Eloquent. A perſon may be Eloquent, tho' he does no more than pronounce the diſcourſes which have been compoſed by others. III. 410. *a. b.*

Elpinice; why ſhe met with a refuſal, when ſhe ſollicited for her brother Cimon. IV. 578. *b.* Kept by her own brother. *ibid.*

Embaſſador of the United Provinces; who was the firſt that was acknowledged for ſuch at the Court of France. I. 3.

Embaſſadors; an inſtance of their little ſincerity. I. 721. *a.* An article of their Catechiſm. *ibid.* They have as much occaſion for their ſwords as for their tongues. 724. *b.* A compliment which a Spaniſh Embaſſador made to James I, King of England. 725. *a.* Embaſſadors are of the ſame make, be their religion what it will. II. 70. *a.* Do not ſcruple to divulge falſe news, and calumnies forged by themſelves. 154. *a.* Buſbequius's letters are to them a model of writing well. 232. *a.* Embaſſadors who refuſe to make their court to ladies of pleaſure. 427. *a. b.* Their children are reckoned natives of the place where their fathers would reſide, were they not Embaſſadors. III. 930. *b.* They ought to be cautious in writing news. V. 19. *a.* Tricks which are common with them. 20. *b.* 21. *a. b.* 22. *a. b.* The definition that has been given of them, *viz.* that they are men ſent abroad to lie for the good of the ſtate. 667.

Embaſſadreſs extraordinary, what lady was inveſted with that character. III. 263, 264. *and a. b.*

Embaſſy. The denomination of an Embaſſy, is not taken from the town where the Embaſſador has his audience, but from the court to which he is ſent. II. 230. *a.*

Embezzling: whether the embezzling of the public moneys ought to be puniſhed with death. IV. 143. *b.* 144. *a.*

Embroidery (Gold) by whom invented. IV. 561. *b.*

Emerald preſerves from the falling-ſickneſs, ſtrengthens the memory, and enables one to reſiſt carnal concupiſcence. IV. 864. *b.*

Emeritus; no man ſhould be declared ſuch, while he begets children. II. 618. *b.*

Emilius, or *Æmilius*, author of an Hiſtory of France, cannot be put upon the ſame level with the Salluſts and Livys. II. 764. *b.* 765. *a.*

Emilia, or *Æmilia Lepida*, her crimes and death. II. 721. *b.*

Emilius, or *Æmilius*, (Antony) refuſes a profeſſorſhip. III. 477. *a.*

Emmerick was formerly a good ſchool. II. 194.

Empedocles divided into two. III. 157. *b.* Was miſtaken in annexing to the four elements amity and enmity. IV. 439. *b.* What Ariſtotle ſays of him. V. 584. *b.*

Empire (Roman) there were not ſo many diſorders as people fancy, committed there, after the ſoldiers took upon them to create and kill their Emperors. I. 572. *b.* In all the Roman empire there were but three Cities, which were permitted to have ſchools of law. 771. *a.*

Empire and *Emperor* did not concern themſelves with the troubles of the Low-Countries. II. 222. *a. b.* 223. *a. b.* The Emperor acted only as a mediator between the King of Spain and the revolted Provinces. *ibid.* The empire is diſcharged of what concerns the circle of Burgundy. *ibid.*

Empiricus (Sextus) the ſubtilty and uſeleſſneſs of his Logic. IV. 655. *b.* 656. *a. b.* His ways of ſuſpending the judgment. *ibid.*

Employments, the author did not deſire any, and had refuſed ſome. V. 800. How he came to loſe his employment, and his behaviour thereupon. 801.

Employments (Public) when a public employment is to be conferred, the vigour of a man ſhould be conſidered, and not his age. IV. 784. *b.* Great application to ſtudy generally diſqualifies a man for them. II. 314. *b.* They do not leave an author time to finiſh his writings. 515. *a.* It were to be wiſhed that every man had an employment aſſigned to him, ſuch as beſt fitted his natural diſpoſition and capacity. III. 529. *b.*

Ἐνχειρῶν νόμῳ; the meaning of that phraſe. I. 427. *a.*

Encomiaſts, many do not know the difference between them and Hiſtorians. V. 804.

Encomiums; we ought to be ſparing of them. III. 896. *b.* 897. *a.* See *Panegyriſts* A great abatement ſhould always be made with regard to public Encomiums beſtowed by friends. IV. 651. *b.*

Encomiums (Poetical) Expreſſions made uſe of in them, are not to be conſtrued literally. II. 309, 310.

End. In what Anaxagoras and Carneades make the chief end of man to conſiſt. I. 295. II. 332. *a.* The principle of Chriſtians, with regard to the chief end of life, is a principle only in Theory. 200. *b.* See *Happineſs.*

Enemies. There are no enemies worſe than thoſe who praiſe immoderately. I. 469. *a.* An author is not to be underſtood too rigorouſly, when he is ſpeaking of his profeſſed enemy. 2. *b.* We ought never to condemn any man upon the teſtimony of his enemies. III. 551. *b.* It is not always policy to oppoſe their conqueſts. 806. *b.* There is nothing more dangerous than to deſpiſe them in hard and difficult times. V. 22. *a.*

Engage; if it be an imprudence to engage in certain attempts, it is ſtill a greater one to abandon them after being once engaged. I. 365. *b.*

Engaſtrimiths; what they can do. III. 854. *a.*

England; the number of Heretics that were daily burnt there, ſo great, that it raiſed the price of wood. I. 272. *b.* The Parliament of England exerciſes an arbitrary power. II. 56. *a.* The Lutherans and Papiſts burnt there at the ſame time. 180. A project there to reform the colleges of the

the nation, hindered by the civil war. 536. In what reſpect the Engliſh nobility ſurpaſſed in former times, and to this day ſurpaſſes all other nations. 803. *b.* What difference there was between the feaſts of the churchmen there, and thoſe of the nobility. *ibid.* The learned men of that country have not been ſo eaſily impoſed upon with reſpect to Euripides, as thoſe of France. 871. *a.* The Emperor Hadrian cauſes a wall to be built there, and for what end. III. 318. Richard Smith is ſent there in quality of Ordinary over all the Catholics, but the Jeſuits force him to leave the kingdom. 665. *a.* Cruelties which the Romans and Britons exerciſed there by turns. V. 260. *a. b.* An encomium upon the univerſities there. 513. *b.*

Engliſh; how they were converted to Chriſtianity. III. 219. *b.* 220. *a.* Taken for gods by the inhabitants of New Albion, and why. IV. 572. *b.* Whether the Engliſh did almoſt conquer France. II. 463. *b.* Whether they made it tributary. 739. *b.* 740. *a.* Their Divines accuſed of inclining to Pelagianiſm and Socinianiſm. I. 656. *a.* The Engliſh Catholics throw out a thouſand imprecations againſt their country. III. 521. *b.* It had not begun to be an uſual thing amongſt them in the year 1613, to publiſh diſcourſes in the form of letters. 344, 345. Joſeph Hall did not approve of Engliſh gentlemen travelling in foreign countries. 345. *and b.* Sanders's Hiſtory of the Engliſh Schiſm. An account of that book, its editions and tranſlations. V. 41. *b.* 42. *a. b.* 43. *a. b.*

Engraving ſometimes is the means of falſifying Hiſtory. II. 100. *a. b.*

Ennius, what Quintilian ſaid of him. IV. 161. *b.*

Enoch. The Hebraizers may ſay that the Pagans alluded to the hiſtory of Enoch. I. 276. *a.*

Enochia; that city compared with *Poneropolis.* II. 248. *a.*

'Εντελέχεια, a word eſſential to Ariſtotle's Natural Philoſophy, but almoſt unintelligible. I. 636. *a.*

Enterprize. An enterprize diſcovered by a very ſurprizing accident. II. 577. *a.*

Enthuſiaſts, whether their extaſies be compatible with the opinion of thoſe who ſay that the ſoul is not diſtinct from the body. II. 660. *a.*

Entremangeries Monachales; a book wrote in oppoſition to the *Entremangeries Miniſtrales* of Feuardent. V. 57. *b.*

Envy, its tortures. III. 643. *b.* 644. *a.*

Enzinas, author of a Spaniſh tranſlation of the New Teſtament. II. 697. *b.* 698. *a.*

Epaminondas, his grave reply to Calliſtratus. II. 259.

Eparchus, Biſhop of Corfu, had made a collection of excellent manuſcripts, with which the library of Augſburg was enriched. III. 478. *a. b.*

Epernon (the Duke d') maintains his haughty ſpirit even on his death-bed. III. 289. *a.* A preſent which the city of Roüen makes to him. 409. *a.* He was ſatisfied with his good fortune. V. 369. *b.*

Ephemeris of Cæſar, a work wholly diſtinct from his Commentaries. I. 613. *a.*

Epheſians, one of their laws. I. 318. *a.* Their readineſs to believe the moſt abſurd traditions. III. 576. *a.*

Ephori, the fortune of the Lacedæmonian Kings depended upon their caprices. I. 135. *a.*

Ephorus, an Hiſtorian; the character of his genius. V. 327. *b.* 328. *a.*

Epyaxa behaves with all manner of courteſy to Cyrus. II. 512. *a.*

Epic Poetry formerly admitted childiſh meanneſſes. I. 81. *a.* Does not allow of them at preſent. 333. *b.*

Epicharmus, an excellent doctrine of his. I. 275. *b.*

Epicles, what health he drank with Antocles. IV. 571. *b.*

Epictetus; at what price his lamp was ſold. III. 939. *a.*

Epicureans would not acknowledge any thing ſupernatural in dreams. I. 85. *b.* Whether one Epicurean was allowed to rally another, and on what. II. 389. *a.* Some of them lived up to the rules of Morality with more exactneſs than the greateſt part of the Heathens. 347. V. 398. Their union. II. 777. *a. b.*

Epicurus; no antient Philoſopher came nearer the truth than he. II. 63. *b.* Some of his followers were very regular in their morals. 350. *a. b.* What was the voluptuouſneſs that he recommended. 388. *a.* The hypotheſis of preſages and fortune is directly oppoſite to the ſyſtem of that Philoſopher. 419. *b.* He did himſelf wrong in not owning his obligations to Democritus. 642. *b.* III. 789. *a.* His opinion touching the compoſition of the ſoul. 790. *b.* His civility and extreme meekneſs. II. 776. *b.* 777. *a.* Whence proceeds the ill opinion which people have of him and his ſect. 781. *b.* 782. *a. b. to* 786. *b.* A fictitious diſpute between him and a Platonic Philoſopher. 787. *a. b.* Another between him and a Pagan Prieſt. 789. *b.* 790. *a.* He takes unneceſſary precautions. *ibid. b.* Epicurus ſhould have allowed ſpirits, if he had reaſoned conſequentially. III. 919. *b.* 920. *a.* Whether he could poſſibly have reconciled his ſyſtem to the public worſhip, and deceived the Athenians. 923. *a. b.* Cenſured by Plutarch. 926. *a. b.* And by Muretus. *ibid.* The hypotheſis of the exiſtence of the gods is the weakeſt part of his ſyſtem. 929. *a. b.* Whether he owned a Providence. *ibid. b.* 930. *a. b.* His objection touching the evil which happens in the world ill refuted by Lactantius. 513. *b.* 514. *a. b.* He rejected Geometry and the other branches of the Mathematics. V. 626. *a. b.*

Epidemical diſtempers; the mind is ſubject to them as well as the body. I. 19. *a.*

Epigones, how that word ſhould be tranſlated. I. 117. *a.*

Epigrams. An epigram rewarded with five thouſand quarters of corn. I. 428. Another cruelly cenſured. 654. *b.* 655. *a. b.* An epigram of Auſonius admired by Daurat. II. 619. *b.* What ſhould be the qualities thereof. IV. 364. *a. b.*

Epilepſy: who defined the pleaſure of love *a little epilepſy.* II. 644. *a. b.*

Epinac (Peter d'), Archbiſhop of Lyons, a famous Anti-Royaliſt, at the conferences of Surenne. V. 34.

Epiphanius (St) does not ſay that acts of uncleanneſs were committed in the aſſemblies of the Adamites. I. 111. *b.* Has no other ground but a falſe tradition for the bellowing of a golden calf. II. 752. *a. b.* 753. *a.*

Epirotes almoſt deſtroyed by famine, and for what cauſe. IV. 665.

Epiſcopacy, as diſtinct from the prieſthood, is no ſacrament. III. 53. *and b.*

Epiſcoparians (Engliſh), a Monk undertakes to ſhew that the thirty-nine articles of their Church may be reconciled with the Council of Trent. V. 25.

Epiſtles Dedicatory; a common-place topic which is ſeldom omitted in that kind of epiſtles. I. 346. *b.* No longer produce any thing. III. 16. *a.* Are prepared for thoſe who are likely to reward the author beſt. IV. 843. *a. b.* It is a fault not to date them. V. 256. *a.* When an Hiſtorian addreſſes an Epiſtle Dedicatory to ſome powerful patron, he gives room to ſuſpect that he has not ſtrictly adhered to the laws of Hiſtory. II. 311. *and b.* 312. *a. b.* That of an Hiſtorian to a Prince, whoſe conduct he had juſtly blamed, would be imprudent. 312. *a. b.* The deſign of ſuch Epiſtles. *ibid.* Nothing is more neceſſary to the author of ſuch a work as this, than to conſult them. II. 8. *b.* The editors of books do wrong to leave them out. I. 225. *b.* IV. 164. *a.* A piece of raillery upon thoſe who affirm, in their Epiſtles Dedicatory, that their works have, in a manner, been taken out of their hands by force. 173. *b.* 174. *a. b.*

Epiſtolæ obſcurorum Virorum; an effect which the reading of them produced. II. 812. *b.* Who the author of that book is. III. 474. *b.* 475. *a.*

Epitaphs. Deceitful epitaphs. I. 105. *b.* One not well underſtood. 216. *a. b.* That of an Actreſs buried in holy ground. 328. *a. b.* When an author cites one, he ought not to change the leaſt letter. III 697. *a.* An epitaph full of preſumption and orthodoxy. IV. 468. *a.* Many of them are only mere ſallies of wit, and were never engraved upon tombs. I. 437. *a. b.* Rules to be obſerved by thoſe who cite them. *ibid. b.* 438. *a.* They are more to be relied on than Hiſtories, as to the day of a perſon's death. II. 698. *b.*

Epoch. The epoch of an event ſhould not be marked with the indefinite term of *this year.* I. 50. *a. b.* 329. *a.*

Epoché; to whom the invention of it is to be aſcribed. I. 409. *b.* The opinion of the Academics concerning it. II. 325. *a. b.* 326. *a. b.* 327. *a. b.*

Equivocations; Prierias Sylveſter's doctrine on that ſubject is very looſe. IV. 772. *and b. &c.*

Eraſiſtratus; how he diſcovered the diſtemper of Antiochus, who was deſperately in love with his mother-in-law. V. 45. *a.*

Eraſmus cenſured for his explication of a Greek proverb. I. 17. *a. b.* And for the meaning he gives to a paſſage of Cicero. 19. *a.* Why he did not embrace the Proteſtant religion. 139. *a.* What Agricola prognoſticated concerning him. 144. *a.* He conſidered Luther in the beginning as a deliverer. 149. *b.* Abuſes Alexander. 216. *b.* Paſſes for a favourer of Lutheraniſm. *ibid.* 217. *a. b.* His letters are often ill dated and miſplaced. 271. *a.* II. 325. *b.* The advice he gave to one of his friends concerning the proper ways of puſhing his fortune. I. 271. *a. b.* He did not hate wine. 272. *a. b.* Cenſures the poems of Andrelinus. 330. *a.* Miſrepreſents a fact which Ælian relates in ſpeaking of Alexander. 367. *a. b.* His conteſts with Beda. 714. *a. b.* 715. *a. b.* 716. *a. b.* The judicious advice which he gave to Berquin. 777. *a. b.* Quoted. 781. *a. b.* 782. *a.* One of his letters which had never been made public. II. 77. *a. b.* He could never obtain the favour to be quoted by Budæus. 191. *b.* 192. *a.* Is ill uſed by Egnatius. *ibid. and b.* His works were corrected by Caſtellan. 369. *a. b.* His ſtrength did not lie in Greek language. *ibid. a.* Employed too little time in compoſing his books. *ibid.* His miſtake touching the impure practice of Diogenes. 669. *b.* 670. *a.* His diſpute with Eppendorf. 797. *and a. b.* 798. *and a. b.* 799. *and a.* An effect which the reading of a book, intituled, *Epiſtolæ obſcurorum Virorum*, had upon him. 812. *b.* Why old-age was agreeable to him. 814. *a. b.* His heroic ſentiments towards one of his adverſaries. III. 47. *a. b.* Turns a coward with regard to the court of Rome. 146. *a.* Was not of opinion that Princes ſhould be exhorted to take away from the Monks the great eſtates which they poſſeſſed. 147. *a. b.* How he explained this proverb, *Take heed of a man with a black breech.* 429. *a. b.* His Printers play him a malicious trick. 531. *a. b.* It is ſtrange he had not read what authors ſay of Jupiter's being transformed into a cuckoo, to lie with Juno. 632. *a.* He writes a falſe piece of news touching the too haſty lying-in of Luther's wiſe. 947. *b.* Opens the way for the Reformation by his railleries. 948. *a.* 954. *and b.* Underſtands a ſentence of Ariſtophanes, better than Valerius Maximus. IV. 577. *b.* 578. *a.* The Magiſtrates of Baſil offer to buy his ſtatue. 926. *a. b.* What he ſays touching the uſefulneſs of Hiſtory. V. 265. *b.* Endeavours uſed to deſtroy all his works. 293. *a.* He does an action which ought to ſerve for a model to all authors. 494. *a.* The reproachful things Polydore Virgil ſaid of him. 497. *a. b.* Noel Beda charges, as a crime upon him, his giving the title of *King of France*, to the King of England. I. 715. *a.* 801. *b.*

Erfort; the Augſburg Confeſſion, and Hebrew, are taught in that univerſity, by the conſent of the Profeſſors, who were all Roman Catholics, except one. II. 697.

Erhardus (George), his cenſure on a very obſcene epigram of Campanus. II. 293. *b.*

Eric, King of Sweden, is dethroned. III. 138. Makes William Lemnius his Phyſician. 750.

Eric-ſon (Guſtavus) drives the Danes out of all their garriſon towns in Sweden. V. 651. Is proclaimed King of that country. *ibid.*

Eryngo (white), the virtue of that herb. IV. 607. *a. b.*

Erythreus (Valentine) was the firſt who enjoyed the Rectorſhip of the college of Altorf. 105.

Erpenius did not underſtand a paſſage of Elmacin. I. 52. *b.*

Err. It requires a ſuperiority of reaſon and genius, to know how to pity thoſe who err. IV. 323. *a. b.* A Monk favourable to ſuch as err with a good intention. V. 25.

Errata. In what part of the book a perſon that acts fairly, ſhould place the *Errata.* III. 257. *a.* The very large *Errata* of a very ſmall book. V. 455. *b.*

Errors; whether thoſe of the Antients be more excuſable than thoſe of the Moderns. I. 501. *a. b.* 502. *a.* The ſervile caution that is obſerved with reſpect to errors. II. 94. *b.* A pleaſing error is in ſome caſes better than a diſagreeable truth. 369. *b.* 370. *a.* Every particular man has the right of the ſword with reſpect to error. 389. *a.* How difficult it is for men to avoid it. IV. 538. *a.* When they are, or when they are not, to be feared. V. 810.

Errors (popular), whether a man ought to regulate his conduct by them. I. 680. *b.*

Errors in religion, by accident, take deeper root when they are attacked. IV. 353. *a.*

Errol, an eminent family in Scotland, its greatneſs and original. III. 332.

Erudition. France ſeems too much diſguſted with all that ſavours of erudition. V. 428. *a.* See *Learning.*

Eſchylus, or *Æſchylus*; for how much his table-book was ſold. III. 939. *a.*

Eſchines, or *Æſchines*, ignominiouſly reproached, and for what reaſon. II. 775. *b.* A ſtory that he tells. V. 77. *a. b.*

Eſcodeça (Peter d'), although a Huguenot, and married man, was Abbot of St Sulpice of Belley; his conduct with the Monks, *&c.* is aſſaſſinated by thoſe of his own party. I. 737. *a. b.* 738. *a. b.*

Eſculapius, or *Æſculapius*, is born near Epidaurus: his mother was Coronis, the daughter of Phlegyas. IV. 626.

Eſculapius of Germany; Gregory Horſtius had that ſirname given him. III. 487.

Eſop, or *Æſop*, a Player; his ſon ſwallows a pearl of great price. IV. 200. *a.*

Eſpencæus (Claudius), takes upon him to publiſh a ſilly ſtory againſt Calvin. II. 267. *a.*

Eſpence (Claude d'), exclaims loudly againſt the enormities of the book of Taxes of the Romiſh Chancery. I. 629. *b.* The Inquiſition cauſes this paſſage in the Doctor's book to be expunged. *ibid.* His ſix books of Continence tranſlated into French by Creſpet. II. 567. *a. b.*

Eſprit de Mr Arnauld; the Hiſtory of that book. I. 490. *a. b.* Its calumnies. 492. *b.* The author of it did not underſtand what good raillery was. II. 527. *a.* He reflects upon the Epiſcopal Clergy. *ibid. b.* The promiſe which he makes to the King of France in the name of Drabicius, and in that of all the Proteſtants. 537. *b. and n.* (8). He did not know his *Scaligerana* well. 706. *a.* Makes no ſcruple to lye. V. 176. *a. n.* (72). He is accuſed and convicted of Socinianiſm by his own reaſonings. 177. *a. b.* 178. *a.* Could bring no proofs to ſupport the heinous accuſation which he publiſhed againſt the gentlemen of Port-Royal. 178. *a. b.* It is aſtoniſhing that the author of ſuch a book ſhould have remained without anſwer. 300. *b.*

Eſprit des Cours de l'Europe, the author of that book cited. III. 234. *a. b.* 235. *a.*

Eſprit (James), when admitted into the French Academy. V. 419. *a.* A paſſage of that author examined. IV. 441. *a.*

Eſſays on Literature; the author of that book commits groſs blunders in ſpeaking of Ruyſbroeck. IV. 943. *b.* 944. *a. b.*

Eſſars (Charlotte de), her Hiſtory. III. 307. *b.* 308. *a.* 517. *a. b.* 518. *a.*

Eſſex (the Earl of), whether Queen Elizabeth ſhewed his head to the Duke of Biron. III. 182. *a.*

Eſtampes (the Ducheſs of) deſires Francis I. to take from Madam de Chateau-Briand the jewels which he had given her. II. 462. *a.* Reflexions upon her Calviniſm, and the motives, which, according to Varillas, induced her to embrace it. 843. *a. b.* Her pretended Lutheraniſm. *ibid. b.* Her huſband cauſes a judicial enquiry to be made after her conduct, and for what reaſon. *ibid.* 844. *a.* Juſtification of the Duke of Eſtampes concerning the enquiry againſt his wife. *ibid. b.* 845. *a.* She forms a faction to oppoſe that of Diana de Poitiers. III. 401. *a.*

Eſtate: an anſwer very like that of a Philoſopher, who boaſted that he carried about him his whole eſtate. V. 146. *b.*

Eſte (Borſa d') was the firſt who had the title of Duke of Ferrara and Modena. V. 57. *n.* (*c*).

Eſthonians, a people of Livonia who adored a pine-tree. IV. 928. *a. b.*

Eſtrix, a Jeſuit, writ the book *de Fraudibus Hæreticorum*. IV. 847. *a.*

Eternal duration of puniſhment, conſiderations upon that doctrine. V. 175. *b.*

Eternity; the definition which Boëtius gives of it, is more incomprehenſible than the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. V. 596. *a. b.* 597. *a. b.*

Ethelred, King of England, refuſed to hear the Pope's Miſſionaries but in the open field, and why. III. 219. *b.* Is converted to Chriſtianity, and the greateſt part of the Engliſh follow his example. *ibid.*

Ethiopia; Lucian pretends that the ſcience of the ſtars had its beginning there. III. 311.

Etolians often at war with the Acarnanians. I. 55.

Etrée (Gabrielle d') what ſhe ſaid upon ſeeing the pictures of two Princeſſes, when it was reported that Henry IV would marry one of them. V. 392. *a.*

Eu (the Count d') his amiable and good qualities. III. 865. *a.* His marriage. *ibid.* His infidelity to his wife. *ibid. b.* His death. *ibid.*

Evagrius, what he tells of certain Monks. I. 112. *a.*

Evarigus, King of the Goths; one of his Counſellors compared with Apollonius. I. 383. *b.*

Eubates; his wife erects a ſtatue to him, to recompenſe his fidelity. III. 704. *b.*

Eubulides was the inventer of divers ſophiſms. II. 846. *b.* 847. *a.*

Euchariſt. The Church of England has given no poſitive definition of the manner how the body of Chriſt is preſent in the Euchariſt. I. 718. *b.* Beza calumniated on this ſubject. 797. *b.* &c. *to* 800. *a.* The manner how God preſerves accidents without a ſubject in the Euchariſt. IV. 59. *a. b.* 60. *a.* Expreſſions of Calvin on this head, which ſeem to admit of a corporal preſence. V. 103. *b. n.* (47). The advocates for Tranſubſtantiation make a wrong uſe of the words *Change*, *Converſion*, or *Tranſelementation*. 209. *b.* Bucer's ambiguous way of ſpeaking on this ſubject. II. 177. *a. b.* After thirty-four years labour, the miniſters could not agree in this point. *ibid. b.* Harchius attempts to find out a middle way in the doctrine of the Euchariſt, between the Catholics and Proteſtants, but his project is laughed at by both. III. 352. John Poinet tries to reconcile the controverſies about it, and particularly thoſe of the Lutherans and Zuinglians. IV. 692. That author's opinion. 693. *b.* The opinion of the Calviniſts in this point extreamly ill uſed by John Schutzius, and a reflexion thereupon. V. 89. *b.* The warmth of diſputes on this ſubject, between the Lutherans and Calviniſts is over. *ibid.*

Euchrocia: a Heretic gets her with child. IV. 780. *a.* She is put to death. *ibid.*

Eudes (Duke of Aquitain) acts a cunning part with Charles Martel. I. 15. *a.* Did not favour the irruption of the Saracens. 16. *a.* There was much more room for ſuſpecting Charles Martel than him in that affair. *ibid. and b.* To which of theſe two chiefs, the honour of the victory belongs. *ibid.*

Eudoxia ſends privately to Giſeric, and conjures him to come and revenge the death of Valentinian. III. 759. *b.*

Eve, what her reaſon was for giving the name of Seth to one of her ſons. I. 23. *a.*

Events: what thoſe ought to do, who relate myſterious events. II. 386. *a. b.* 392. *a. b.* There are ſome which occaſion much ſpeculation, and are little ſpoken of. 400. *a.* The moſt conſiderable may depend upon a trifle. 422. *a.* It is of the laſt conſequence to find them ranged in their natural order. 756. *b.* The difference between the accounts of Catholics and Proteſtants chiefly conſiſts in the order of events. *ibid.* Great events hit our taſte exceedingly. III. 433. *b.* 434. *a.* The Antients affirmed that a man's prudence had a leſs ſhare in them than his good or ill fortune. IV. 460. *a. b.* We hardly ever judge of things but by the event. V. 104. *a. b.* We cannot read with pleaſure a deſcription of thoſe events which were diſagreeable to us. II. 311. *b.*

Eugene of Savoy (Prince) is not a brother's ſon of the Duke of Savoy, but Charles Emmanuel's great-grandſon. IV. 210. *b.* Commanded only the Emperor's troops of Italy. *ibid.* Did not force the lines of the beſiegers at Coni. *ibid.* 211. *a.*

Evidence; whether it be the mark and meaſure of truth. IV. 654. *b.* 655. *a. b.* V. 586. *b.*

Evil. Chimerical evils forged by the Poets, have ſerved as an apology for real evils. I. 54. *a. b.* How it fares with people who judge of complicated evils. 95. *a.* Such is the condition of mankind, that they can only chuſe between the leſſer and greater evil. II. 211. *b.* Whether there is a greater proportion of evil than of good in the conditions of men. 832. *a. b.* IV. 844. *a. b.* V. 415. *a.* 423. *b.* 424. *a.* 576. *a. b.* & *ſeq.* Whether it be nothing. II. 846. *a.* Many people complain of the evil which they ſuffer, and ſay nothing at all of that which they themſelves did before. III. 42. *a. b.* A reflexion upon the Heathens ſaying that the gods puſhed men on to do evil. 374. *a. b.* IV. 441. *b.* 442. *a.* A phyſical evil ought never to be remedied by a moral evil. III. 965. *a.* The difficulties about the origin of evil are very antient. IV. 92. *a. b.* 93. *a. b.* It is impoſſible to ſolve them without having recourſe to Revelation. 94. *a. b.* &c. 112. *b.* 113. *a. b.* The origin of evil is incomprehenſible. 513. *a. b.* &c. 524. *b.* 525. *a. b.* &c. 788. *a. b.* 932. *b.* 933. *a. b.* &c. V. 212. *b.* &c. How ſome excuſed providence with reſpect to the origin of evil. 576. *a. b.* See *Principles* (the doctrine of two). Thoſe who approve it deſerve the ſame puniſhment as thoſe who commit it. 764, 765. 824. The queſtion about its origin, very difficult. 815, 816. 830, 831. The introduction thereof with the doctrines annexed to it, is one of the moſt impenetrable myſteries of religion. 822. 830. 831.

Eumenes, King of Pergamum, lived in a ſtrict friendſhip with his brothers. IV. 558. *a. b.* 559. *a.*

Eumenius, the Rhetorician, had a yearly penſion of fifteen thouſand crowns. I. 196. *a.*

Eunapius ſaid that the Hiſtory of Apollonius ſhould have been intituled, *The Deſcent of a God upon Earth.* I. 382. *a.*

Eunuchs; whether women may be ſafely truſted to their keeping. I. 31. *b.* II. 533. *a. b.* What St Baſil ſays of them. III. 56. *b.* Two ſorts of Eunuchs. *ibid.* Compared to oxen, whoſe horns are cut off, and who nevertheleſs do not ceaſe to ſtrike with their heads. 383. *b.* II. 533. *b.* Their impotence with regard to women, is no obſtacle to their having the other qualities of great men. III. 414. *b.* They may be very brave. *ibid.*

Eunus, the trick which he made uſe of in order to raiſe an inſurrection. I. 647. *and. b.* 648. *a.*

Euphorbia, an herb; whence it had that name. III. 598. *a. b.*

Euphormio; that book ſeverely cenſured. I. 646. *a.* Condemned by the Inquiſition. *ibid.* Which did not hinder the author from being much careſſed at Rome, and receiving favours on account of that very book. *ibid.* Tranſlated into French by John Berault. *ibid.* Two other tranſlations which leave the work at leaſt as difficult as they found it. 647. *b.*

Euphorus; whether there has been any author of that name. II. 772. *b.* 773. *a.*

Euphrates, when it was the boundary of the empire. III. 317. *and a. b.*

Evremont (St) author of a ſatire againſt the French academy. I. 59. *a. n.* (7), (8). Quoted. IV. 492. *b.* 615. *b.* 797. *b.*

Eurymedon; how he was puniſhed by Jupiter, and for what. III. 630. *b.*

Euripides was delighted with a maxim of Agathon. I. 126. *b.* The energy of one of his ſentences. *ibid.* Said that God concerns himſelf only with great things, and leaves the leſſer to chance. 310. *a. b.* His cuſtom was to introduce perſons upon the ſtage, in whoſe mouths he put impious ſentiments. II. 572. *a. b.* 573. *a. b.* An argument *ad hominem* which a courtezan alledged to him. III. 705. *a.*

Europe. The Chriſtians in Europe are addicted to drunkenneſs and lewdneſs. II. 819. *b.*

Europeans; it was only by way of repriſal, that they ſtole away the King of Tyre's daughter. III. 372. *a.*

Euſebius; what he ſays of Apollonius Tyanæus, examined. I. 381. *b.* 382. *a. b.* He makes an improper uſe of a paſſage of Porphyrius, which he has preſerved to us. II. 773. *b.* How he refuted the ſlanders of Hierocles againſt the Chriſtian religion. III. 448. *a. b.* What he quotes from Phlegon. IV. 624. *b.* &c.

Euſebius Captivus, a controverſial work of Jerom Maſſarius, under that title, where he feigns that a true believer gives an account of his faith before the Pope and the Inquiſition. IV. 173. *a. b.*

Euthymenes; how much his ſon grew in three years, and what happened to him afterwards. V. 283. *b.*

Euthymius Zigabenus; the ſtory which he tells of a ſtone. I. 124. *a.*

Eutychius; his narrative concerning the quarrel between Cain and Abel. I. 24. *a.*

Eutropius; whether a paſſage of that author has been well tranſlated by the Abbot de Marolle. II. 255. *a. b.*

Exactions impoſed under divers pretences. II. 421. *b.*

Examination (the way of) when people have no further occaſion for it, they return to the way of authority. I. 241. *b.* The difficulties which attend it. IV. 361. *a. b.* 362. *a. b.* 363. *a.* 535. *a. b.* 536. *a.* There are ſome who affirm that no body makes uſe of that way. *ibid. and b.* What are the greateſt obſtacles to a proper examination. 537. *a.* A common place againſt the way of examination. V. 441. *a. b.* See *Authority*.

Example. An example which a modern author alledges to prove that a ſincere ignorance is a good excuſe. I. 206. *a.* An example of the bad cuſtom which prevails of intereſting religion in the diſputes of learned men. II. 141. *a. b.* Thoſe who ſet bad examples, ought to be ſeverely puniſhed. IV. 18. *a* The contagion of bad examples. V. 755. *b.*

Excommunication, a ſeverer puniſhment ſometimes than the afflictive pains which the civil magiſtrate impoſes. I. 96. *a.* Againſt what authors it is made uſe in the Proteſtant churches. V. 806. How Savonarola behaved, when he found himſelf lying under the ſentence of excommunication, and the opinion of the Proteſtants upon that head examined. 70. *b.* 71. *a.*

Excuſes; however good they may be, it is ſtill better not to ſtand in need of them. II. 794. *a. b.* 795. *a.*

Exerciſes of the King of Bohemia, preſerved in the Vatican Library. I. 239. *a.*

Exerciſes (public) Oecolampadius does not trouble himſelf about the honour that is to be gained by them in the univerſities. IV. 400.

Exile. An Exile is not qualified to write an Hiſtory. III. 345.

Exorciſm. Deſpauterius's Grammar preſented to a woman poſſeſſed with a devil, as a formulary of exorciſm. II. 147. *a.*

Exorciſts, and mean and mercenary employment among the Pagans. II. 775. *a. b.* In what manner it was exerciſed. *ibid. n.* (15). What ſort of queſtions they generally put to the poſſeſſed. III. 214. *b.*

Exploits; ſeveral give the glory of them to God, only out of policy. V. 366. *a. b.* 367. *a. b.*

Expreſſions. Some expreſſions offend us, though they import no more than other expreſſions at which we are not at all offended. I. 790. *b.* 791. *a.* We are apt to be deceived, when we ſtick to the firſt ſenſe, which they offer to our mind. 595. *b.*

Extemporè. A boy of ten years of age. who compoſed verſes *extemporè*. I. 360. *and a. b.*

Extenſion. Whether we have any idea of an extenſion that is immaterial. V. 143. *b.* 144. *a.* Extenſion is made up of parts which are each a particular ſubſtance. 208. *b.* 209. *a.* Objections againſt its exiſtence. 608. *b.* 609. *a. b.* 610. *a. b. & ſeq.* Whether there can be two ſorts of it, the one diviſible, moveable, and impenetrable, and the other immoveable, indiviſible, and penetrable. 615. *b.* 616. *a. b.* 617. *a. b.*

Extracts. Unfaithful extracts. I. 714. *b.* 715. *a.*

Extravagancies: to what extravagancies the human mind is liable. I. 103. *a. b.*

Eye-brows (joining each other) paſſed for a beauty among the Phrygians. II. 140.

Ezekiel; what a Rabbin affirms concerning his tomb. V. 544. *b.*

F.

Faber (Antony) his judgment concerning the greateſt Lawyers of his time. III. 201. *a.*

Faber Stapulenſis delivered out of the hands of the Inquiſitors by the Queen of Navarre. II. 261.

Faber (Tanaquillus) who are the perſons qualified to judge of his books. I. 189. *a.* Cenſured for quoting Plato and Herodotus, on the ſubject of Anacreon. 290. *b.* 291. *a.* What he ſays to a Journaliſt. 452. *a.* Gives us a piece of ſecret Hiſtory. 675. *a.* A common-place which he made uſe of. 745. *a. b.* Cenſured by Mr Dacier with little ſucceſs. II. 388. *a. b.* In what he has very well ſhewn the miſtakes of the interpreters of Horace, with regard to Catius. *ibid. b.* 389. *a.* He wrongfully pronounces a definitive ſentence upon a paſſage of Plutarch, touching Critias and his Atheiſm. 573. *b.* 574. *a.* Unjuſtly cenſures St Auguſtin touching the liberties which the Comic Poets gave themſelves. IV. 568. *a. b.* He and *Madlle* his daughter criticized on the ſubject of Anacreon and his cotemporaries. V. 44. *a. b.*

Fables of the Antients very ill concerted. I. 80. *a.* They applied the unravelling of them to too many ſubjects. 115. *b.* People are unwilling to be undeceived as to Fables, when they find their account in them. 362. Who invented, and who brought them to perfection. II. 828. *a. b.* The difference between a Fable and a fabulous narration. 829. *a.* Freinſhemius's miſtake upon this head. *ibid.* Which are the moſt uſeful of all the Fables of antiquity. 831. *b.* 832. *a.* The apology which Strabo makes for them. *ibid.* How Seneca could ſay that the Romans had never attempted this ſort of compoſitions. 833. *and b.* They ſhould never be made uſe of to explain the myſteries of religion. IV. 896. *a.* A conjecture about the origin of the antient Fables. V. 288. *a.* Jewiſh Fables with reſpect to a falſe Meſſias. I. 648. *a. b.*

Faces. Some women have disfigured their faces, leaſt they ſhould occaſion a temptation. II. 109. *a. n.* (5).

Faciendaire; an old French word which is very expreſſive, and which deſerved to have been kept up. IV. 640. *a.*

Factions. It is ordinary for all factions to produce libels. III. 517. *b.* There is nothing more advantageous, according to the notions of the world, than to be always for the ſtrongeſt faction. V. 250. *a.* It commonly happens that men of a peaceable diſpoſition, are carried down with the torrent of a faction. 675.

Facts; there are ſome which one may pronounce to be falſe, purely becauſe they are doubtful. I. 67. *b.* To make one a credible witneſs in certain facts nothing more is neceſſary than the truth of the relation. 75. *a.* A fruitful ſource of falſifications in matters of fact. 186. *b.* Whether it be ſufficient on all occaſions to deny a fact, when an adverſary does not prove it. 199. *a. b.* 200. *a. b* The reaſon why they come to be ſo variouſly reported. 308. *b.* An exactneſs in relating them is inſeparable from a tireſome prolixity. 335. *a.* Contrariety in matters of fact. II. 28. *b.* 29. *a. b.* There are many remarkable facts for which we have but a ſingle teſtimony. 349. *b.* One ſhould forbear to ſpeak of facts till time has ripened them. 65. *a.* There are ſome which reduce Philoſophy to a nonplus. 391. *b.* 392. *a. b.* There are others the publiſhing of which only offends, becauſe they are true. III. 148. *b.* We ſhould in matters of fact follow the advice which Des Cartes gives with reſpect to philoſophical ſpeculations. 204. *a.* The ill-placing of circumſtances makes a fact doubtful, though it be never ſo certain and true in itſelf. 226. *a.* How the circumſtances of facts come to be changed. 314. *a. b.* There is ſometimes a great illuſion in proving a fact by a reaſon of right. V. 11. *a. b.* They are exaggerated in paſſing from mouth to mouth. I. 747. *b.* Should not be affirmed as certain, when one does not find them in credible authors. III. 779. *b.* Thoſe which are to be found every where, have leſs need to be ſupported by quotations than ſingular facts. *ibid.* The probability of a thing does not warrant the affirming it as a certain fact. *ibid.* Hiſtorical facts are very ſubject to a metamorphoſis. IV. 89. *b.* A world of tranſcribers and great authors confound them with their conjectures. 609. *a.* A compiler of facts ſhould not neglect to engage the reader's attention to thoſe which have ſomething ſingular in them. V. 642. *a.*

Fæneſte (the Baron of), one of his adventures pleaſantly related by d'Aubigné. II. 243. *b.*

Faërnus, his fables. IV. 613. *a. b.*

Faget (the Abbot), a diſpute between him and Baluzius. IV. 102. *b.* 103. *a. b.*

Fagnanus, his intimate acquaintance with Pradilhon, General of the Feuillants. IV. 764. *a.*

Fay (du), a new remark upon his writings. III. 516. *b.* 517. *a. b.*

Faydit (Abbot) quoted. III. 739. *b.* After what manner he ſpeaks of the author of the memoirs of M. L. C. D. R. V. 84. *a.* A very ſtrong invective which he makes on the ſubject of the Trinity againſt the explications of the Schoolmen. 820. The inſuperable perplexities to which he reduces them. *ibid. n.* (30). A long paſſage of his *Telemacomanie* cited and cenſured. IV. 643. *a. b.* 644. *a.*

Fair: whether any thing is lawful and fair againſt an open enemy. II. 154. *a.*

Faith. There is a local, and a temporary faith. I. 477. *a.* Bucer's judgment on this theſis, *We are juſtified by faith alone.* II. 178. *a. b.* What makes it become a true act of religion. 662. *b.* IV. 592. *b.* 593. *a. b.* 717. *a. b.* &c. *to* 720. *a. b.* Nothing but Faith can convince us that bodies do really exiſt. 654. *a. n.* (12). All the articles of Faith defended and attacked by the arms of Philoſophy alone, do not come off honourably. V. 815. The firſt thing required by Chriſt and his Apoſtles. 816. It is a gift of God; and is not to be acquired by reaſonings, and a train of Philoſophical diſcuſſions. *ibid.* Wherein the Faith of a Chriſtian, and the Science of a Philoſopher differ. *ibid.* It ought to ſatisfy every good Chriſtian, that his Faith is founded on the word of God. 829. It is the way by which it has pleaſed God to conduct Chriſtians. 831. The moſt precious Faith is that, which, upon the Divine teſtimony, embraces the moſt oppoſite truths to Reaſon. 834. A raillery upon this notion. *ibid.* Confutation of that raillery. *ibid.* It ſerves for a ſword and buckler againſt the knots of difficulties. 835. Few people ſeriouſly examine the nature of it. 836. It is proper to enumerate the arguments which reſpect the difficulties of the Chriſtian Faith. *ibid.*

Fall of Adam: it is one of the greateſt myſteries. V. 821.

Falſhood. There are ſeveral things the falſhood whereof is ſufficiently expoſed by barely relating them. I. 245. Whether it may appear in the ſame guiſe as truth. 410. *b.* People are ever publiſhing notorious falſhoods. 343. *a. b.* 344. *a.* Whether time deſtroys them. III. 744. *a.*

Famagoſta; the Turks take that town. IV. 23, 24.

Families; there are few which may not be reproached with ſome adventure. I. 490. *b.* An antient Roman family that was illuſtrious for chaſtity. II. 291. *b.* Fabulous traditions that are kept up in old families. 709. *a.* V. 400. The fabulous genealogy of ſeveral families. 468. *a. b.* 469. *a. b.* See *Genealogiſts.*

Families (Patrician), ſome of them became Plebeian. II. 167. *a.*

Fanaticiſm; its prodigious variety. III. 692. Is a more contagious evil than is imagined. *ibid.* A proof of Savonarola's fanaticiſm. V. 71. *a. b.*

Fanatics of Amſterdam who ran about ſtark-naked. I. 112. How dangerous thoſe perſons are to a ſtate. 647. *b.* 648. *a.* They are perfect incendiaries. II. 143. *and a. b.* 537. Their uſual faults. 538. *a. b.* Their firſt works overthrow their laſt. *ibid. a.* They are touched to the quick when they are upbraided with contradictions of that kind. *ibid.* Are watchful over events, in order to amend their predictions according to the news of the Gazette. *ibid. b.* Have often no other aim than to ſtir up the people. 539. *a.* Chuſe rather to expoſe the authority of the Scriptures, than to own themſelves in the wrong. *ibid.* Loſe nothing of their credit, though they have deceived the public a hundred times. *ibid.* Are never at a loſs. 692. *a.* Their obſtinacy in finding out evaſions. *ibid. b.* 693. *a. b. n.* (23). They will never want patrons, provided they have cunning enough to accommodate themſelves to the paſſions of the times. 693. There are two ſorts of them: which are the moſt ſuſpected. III. 682. *a.* A touch-ſtone to diſcover whether they are ſincere Fanatics. IV. 36. *a.* They cannot anſwer for themſelves, and why. 115. *b.* Do not trouble themſelves about the greateſt difficulties. 116. *a. b.* The XVIIth century was fruitful in Fanatics. 269. *a.* The ſect of the Fanatics very well characterized. I. 241. *b.*

Fannia; at what time the law, which goes by that name, was made. V. 386. *and b.* 387. *a.*

Fano (Barthelemi Denys de) continues the Hiſtory of Tarcagnota, and of Mambrin Roſco. IV. 918.

Farces. The preſent farces are more dangerous than thoſe of our anceſtors, and for what reaſon. V. 847.

Fardella, his Logic. V. 614. *b.* 615. *a.*

Farel ſent with the character of a Deputy into Germany. I. 790. *a.* His diſpute at Baſil. III. 10. *a.* His too paſſionate zeal. *ibid. and b.* His intrepidity. *ibid.* Eraſmus has uſed him very ill. *ibid.* 11. *a. and* 14. *a.* His marriage. 13. *a. b.*

Farelliſts: a chimerical ſect. 15. *b.*

Faret; his *Honnête Homme* tranſlated into Latin by Charles Oginſki. IV. 402. Tranſlated into Spaniſh, Italian, Engliſh, and High-Dutch. *ibid.*

Fargis, the French Embaſſador in Spain, makes a diſadvantageous treaty. I. 786. *a.*

Farmers of the Taxes are very ſeldom honeſt. V. 465. *a. b.* Would have aſſeſſed moſt of the gods if they had been ſuffered to go on. I. 280. *b.* 281. *a. b.*

Farnaby criticized on the ſubject of an epigram againſt Fulvia. III. 163. *a.*

Farnace (P. de) writes the life of Peter de la Place. IV. 681. *a. b. n.* (2).

Farts: ſome people could diſpoſe of them in ſuch a manner, that they ſeemed to make them ſing. III. 135. *b.*

Faſting is a thing which the Northern nations cannot eaſily bear. III. 231. *a.* May be of a very long continuance. 582. *b.* An objection propoſed to Laurence Joubert about the faſting of Moſes, Elias, and Jeſus Chriſt. *ibid.* A ſyſtem, according to which one might elude the laws of the Church with reſpect to faſt-days. V. 777, 778.

Fatality annexed by the Pagans to certain inanimate things. II. 254. *a.*

Fate. The doctrine of the Stoics, touching Fate, made God the author of Sin. II. 489. *a. b.* 490. *a. b.* 491. *a.* IV. 519. *b.* &c. How they endeavoured to reconcile it with human liberty. II. 490. *b.* 491. *a.* This doctrine does not exclude all wiſhes. III. 924. *a.* Invectives of the Pagans againſt Fate. IV. 811. *a. b.* They believed that one word was ſufficient to change it. II. 253. *a. b.*

Father. A father who gives his ſon a very good education. IV. 754. *b.* Nature has given a great deal of force to the affection of a father. 637. *a.*

Fathers of the Church: ſome of them were ignorant that it is unlawful to ſave either one's own life, or another's, at the expence of a crime. I. 38. *a. b.* Have inſerted the moſt ſhocking impurities in their works. 103. *b.* Generally believed that Adam was buried upon mount Calvary. 104. *b.* Whether thoſe of the firſt three centuries taught Arianiſm implicitly. 477. *a. b.* People are more or leſs tender of them in proportion as they are more or leſs of their way of thinking. 564. *and a. b.* They ſometimes alledge very weak arguments againſt the Gentiles. II. 498. *a.* III. 55. *a.* Had reaſon to reproach the Pagans with the infamous amours of Jupiter. 130. *a. b.* What anſwer they made to the railleries of the Heathens upon the adventure of Jonas. 578. *a. b.* The doctrine of thoſe of the firſt three centuries concerning the Trinity. IV. 601. *a. b.* 602. *a. b.* When the Proteſtant Divines of France began to read them. I. 756. The Fathers have publiſhed the impieties and obſcenities of the antient Heretics. III. 135. *b.* 136. *a. b.* Are blame-worthy, if at bottom it was a pernicious and ſinful thing. 136. *a.* Whether it be true that they wrote only for the learned, and in a language not underſtood by the vulgar. *ibid.* What they required of believers in a particular manner. V. 816. Did not diſcuſs the myſteries of religion by the rules of Logic and Metaphyſics. 817. *n.* (17).

Faula, Hercules's whore, has Divine honours paid to her. III. 55. *b.*

Faults. A reflexion on hidden faults. I. 619. *b.* It requires a great deal of dexterity to tell people their faults, without giving them room to be angry. 753. *a.* Men do not love to be told publickly of their faults. II. 311. *b.*

Faults in books. See *Books.*

Favour; what Regnier ſays of it. V. 370. *b.*

Favourites; people court their daughters, however ſmall their fortunes be. I. 460. *b.* The judicious reflexion of a great wit on that head. *ibid.* They labour to procure to themſelves, or their relations, the moſt profitable and honourable employments. III. 826. *and a.* A favourite can bring into faſhion not only ſuch cloaths, but alſo ſuch meats as he likes. IV. 768. *a.* People take a pleaſure in charging them with more crimes than they are really guilty of. V. 370. *b.*

Fauſta; her leud practices. IV. 201. *a. b.*

Fauſtina; how far ſhe carried her immodeſty. III. 794. *b. n.* (5).

Feaſts. The prodigious ſumptuouſneſs of a feaſt made at Rome by the Pope's Financier. II. 469. *a.* Another of a vaſt expence. 835. *a. b.* A law, which reſtrained the immoderate expence of feaſts, repealed by Duronius. I. 351. A magnificent feaſt which was given by a gentleman of Lombardy. 402. *a. b.* Regulations for moderating the expence of them. III. 6. *a.* The Romans did not ſuffer maids to be preſent at feaſts; and the Greeks did not even allow women to be there. 966. *b.* 967. *a.*

Felix does not go into Judæa, till after the condemnation of Cumanus. II. 702. *b.* Married three Queens. *ibid.*

Feltri (Victorinus of), one of the firſt reſtorers of antient Latin. IV. 408.

Ferdinand I. beſieges Buda, and his army is cut in pieces by Soliman. III. 532.

Ferdinand II, ſucceeding to the empire, ſaw himſelf diſpoſſeſſed of two kingdoms. 819. *b.*

Feria (the Duke of) dies of grief, occaſioned by the ill conduct of Aldringer. I. 211. *b.*

Feronniere, miſtreſs to Francis I, why infected by her huſband. III. 89. *a. b.*

Ferrand is to be pitied for having engaged to apologize for St Francis. III. 83. *a. b.* Quoted. IV. 109. *b.* 110. *a.*

Ferrara (Renée de France, Ducheſs of) receives as many Refugees as ſhe can at Montargis. V. 193. *a.*

Ferrier (Father), Confeſſor to the King, writes a little book concerning probable opinions. IV. 64. *a.*

Ferrier (Arnoul du), a famous Profeſſor of the Civil-Law at Toulouſe. II. 687.

Feuardent; the impertinence of that Franciſcan. II. 751. *a.* The apology he makes for the worſhip of the bleſſed Virgin. III. 85. *a. n.* (49). The accuſations which he brings againſt Calvin. V. 53. *b.* 54. *a. b.*

Fever (purple), James des Parts was the firſt that wrote upon that ſubject. IV. 484.

Feuillant (the little), ſee the article *Montgaillard*, in the Dictionary.

Feuillants: the abbey and chief of the order ſituated in the dioceſe of Rieux. IV. 764.

Fevre de la Boderic (Guy le), tranſlates from Italian John Andreas's book, intituled; *The Sect of Mahomet demoliſhed.* I. 326. *b.*

Fevre (John le), author of a Dictionary of French rhimes. I. 65. *b.* 66. *a.*

Fevrier (John), a Jeſuit, confounded with Father John Ferrier by Southwell. III. 43. *a. b.*

Fichard (John) publiſhes the writings of Julius Clarus. II. 515. *a. b.* The praiſes which he beſtows on him are juſt. *ibid. b.*

Ficinus (Marſilius), what we are to underſtand by his Commentaries. IV. 689. *a.* See *Marſilius Ficinus.* He explains the doctrine of Guido Cavalcante, touching the nature of love. II. 399. *b.*

Figures (Arithmetical) have both their conveniencies and inconveniencies. I. 249. *a.*

Filleau, the King's Advocate at Poitiers, gloried in perſecuting the Proteſtants upon all occaſions. IV. 479. *b.* His account of what paſſed in the chimerical aſſembly of Bourg-Fontaine. I. 491. *a.*

Financier; probity is a rare thing to be met with in that employment. V. 465. *a. b.*

Finæus (Orontius), Peter Nonnius corrects ſeveral of his miſtakes. IV. 382. *b.*

Finland; who was the firſt that tranſlated the New Teſtament into the language of that country. I. 141.

Fire has often fallen upon ſacrifices. I. 24. *b.* The Pagans boaſted of having had this mark of approbation from heaven. 25. *b.* Who invented divinations by fire. 277. *b.* Trial by fire. 405. Prieſteſſes who boaſted that they could walk upon it without receiving any damage. II. 531. *a.* A lucky preſage, when it kindled of itſelf upon the altars. 746. *a. b.* Which neverthleſs had not always that conſtruction put upon it. *ibid. b.* The ſtory of a people who trod upon fire without being burnt. III. 466. *and a. b.* 467. *and a. b.* Was the principle of all things according to Heraclitus. V. 323. *b. n.* (23).

Fiſh: a fiſh adorned with ear-rings. I. 358.

Fitz-Simon, a Jeſuit, quoted. I. 756. *a.* III. 937. *b.* 945. *b.* Whether he diſputed with Uſher. V. 525. *a. b.*

Flaccus, a ſirname to be found in ſeveral cities of Italy. IV. 599. *b.*

Flacius (Matthias): a Roman Catholic having praiſed him without knowing him, repented of it after he came to know him. V. 124. *b.* See *Illyricus.*

Flaminius had like to have been refuſed the honour of a triumph, for not opening a letter from the Senate, till after he had routed the enemy. II. 291. *a.*

Flaminius (Lucius) cauſes a criminal to be put to death in his preſence, while he was at dinner, and for what reaſon. IV. 17. *b.*

Flatterers do not regard a mere title. I. 233. *b.* Their ſharping tricks. IV. 430. *a. b.*

Flattery; the effect which it muſt naturally have upon the minds of Princes. II. 256. *b.* 257. *a.* A ſtrange inſtance of that vice. III. 222. *b.* 223. *a.* Is one of the plagues of Hiſtory. IV. 142. *b.* 143. *a.* A ſuperannuated piece of flattery. I. 349. *a.*

Fled. Perſons who owned that they had thrown down their arms and fled. I. 189. *a. b.*

Fleece (golden), on what occaſion that order of Knights was inſtituted. II. 215. *a. b.*

Flemings; whether or not their writers are paſſionate. II. 437. *b.* What Comines ſaid of them. III. 806. *a.*

Fleſh: the Brachmans eat no fleſh. II. 115. *and b.* 116. *a.*

Fleuri (Abbey). When the Proteſtants plundered it, they found there a great many good manuſcripts. II. 69. *a.* Some of them were ſold to the Queen of Sweden, and the reſt fell to the Vatican. *ibid.*

Floyd, the Jeſuit, quoted. I. 745. *b. n.* (49).

Floral Games; after what manner they were celebrated. III. 53. *b.* What paſſed one day between the people and Cato with reſpect to that celebration. 54. *a.* When, and by whoſe authority, they were exhibited for the firſt time. *ibid. b.* 55. *a.* How a fund was raiſed to defray the charges of them. *ibid.*

Florence, in Savonarola's time, was ſplit into factions. V. 61. The great authority which that Monk had there. 57.

Florentines, their ridiculous geſtures and motions repreſented in a Comedy. IV. 10. *a. b.* It is pretended that they were more effectually converted by Savonarola's Sermons, than the Ninevites were by the preaching of Jonas. V. 57. *b.*

Florilegium, its author and uſe. III. 725. *a. b.*

Floron (a ſpirit of the order of Cherubims), his anſwer when he was aſked what the ſpots in the moon were. II. 498. *b.* 499. *a.*

Florus cenſured for a groſs fault which had not been taken notice of in the *Variorum* of Holland. II. 161. *a.* Commits a fault in Geography, with regard to the town of Heraclea. IV. 662. *b.* 663. *a.*

Fluſhing, a city in Zealand, drives out the Spaniſh garriſon. IV. 453.

Focaria; the uſe which the Latin of the lower age has made of that word. III. 736. *b.*

Foe, was the firſt founder of a ſect among the Chineſe. V. 202. *a. b.* 203. *a.*

Fœtus: the formation of it is the moſt exquiſite production of an intelligent Being. I. 305. *b. and n.* (129).

Foix, a college at Toulouſe, has neither Profeſſors nor any other teachers in it. II. 95. *a.*

Foix (Paul de) why he refuſed to ſee Francis Patricius at Ferrara. I. 472.

Foix (Gaſton de) a true thunderbolt of war. III. 812. *a.*

Folembray, a palace built by Francis I, entirely burnt, by whom, and for what. III. 530. *b.*

Folly. Eraſmus's praiſe of it is very well received by the public; eſpecially by people of diſtinction. II. 810. *a.* It has been printed about a hundred times, more or leſs. *ibid.*

Fondi; Barbaroſſa, King of Algiers, beſieges and takes it by aſſault. III. 189. *b.*

Fontaine (la) quoted on the jealouſy of ſiſters. II. 701. *b.* Makes a ſophiſm in defence of his works. III. 260. *a.* Is cenſured on the ſubject of Æſop's life, written by Planudes. II. 829. *a. b.* Has not adjuſted his reckoning in an Hiſtorical performance, ſo well as Madam Scuderi has done in a romance. 830. *a.* He might have given a better account of the tranſlation which Socrates made of Æſop's fables. *ibid. b.* Whom he owns for maſters. IV. 156. *a.* One of his tales is taken from Boccace and Apuleius. II. 38. *a. b.* He does not always point out the fountain he draws from. *ibid. b.* His verſes on the vain promiſes which Poets make to print no more. 83. *a. b.* His tales, how far to be condemned. V. 837. Condemned by the ſentence of a magiſtrate of Paris. 807. 838. *n.* (10). So much the more pernicious, as the expreſſions made uſe of in them, are not groſly obſcene. 847.

Fontanus (Petrus) an Adulterer meets with the puniſhment of Abelard. II. 8. *b.*

Fontevraud; the complaiſance that was ſhewn to an Abbeſs of that abbey. III. 67. *a.* The family of one of its Abbeſſes. V. 298. *b.* And her death. II. 67. *b.*

Forbes (John) ſee in the Dictionary, the article *Leſley.* III. 783.

Force (James de la) how preſerved in the maſſacre of St Bartholomew. III. 180. *a.*

Foreſti; Philip de Bergamo was of that family. I. 769. *a.*

Foretel. Thoſe who take upon them to foretel things to come, are happy when they ſerve a Prince, deſigned for great purpoſes. I. 447. *b.* Whether it be poſſible to foretel things to come, which have no dependence upon a neceſſary cauſe. II. 332. *b.*

Formiæ the capital city of the Læſtrigons, built by Lamus. III. 786.

Forms (Subſtantial) a reflexion upon that doctrine. II. 250. *a. b.* 251. *a. b.* The inexplicable difficulties of it. III. 196. *a. b.* 362. *a.* Into how many abſurdities they lead thoſe who maintain them. IV. 266. *a. b.* Conſequences that may be drawn from them. V. 594. *b.* 595. *a. b.* &c.

Formularies; the more general they are, the better calculated are they to prevent ſchiſms. I. 718. *b.* It is difficult to draw up one that ſhall cut off all occaſion of diſpute. III. 390. *b.* People ſign them every day againſt their conſciences, in order to avoid impriſonment, exile, death, &c. V. 811.

Fornication; whether the magiſtrate has a right to puniſh it. I. 222. *a. b.* 223. *a. b.* The indulgence which is ſhewn to that vice. 222. *b.* 223. *a.* And for what reaſon. *ibid.* See *Uncleanneſs.*

Fortune; one ought not to abuſe her favours. I. 71. *b.* Her favours are ſooner acquired by unlawful than by lawful means. 224. *b.* Fraudulent ways of making one's fortune. 271. *a. b.* People debaſe as much as they can the birth of thoſe whom ſhe raiſes to the higheſt dignities. 350. *b.* People often complain without reaſon of what they call her caprices. 698. *a. b.* The ſyſtem of the Atheiſts is inconſiſtent with the account that is given of ſuch a being. II. 419. *b.* 438. *a.* IV. 55. *a. b.* She reſembles women in this, that ſhe prefers young perſons to the old. II. 438. *a.* Scioppius unſeaſonably acts the part of a Divine upon this head. *ibid.* She loves to have her favours ſnatched from her. 736. *a.* Is never ſo much honoured, as when curſed and reviled. III. 428. *b.* 429. *a.* What Pliny ſays of Fortune. IV. 933. *b.* 934. *a.* She has among her creatures ſome that are elect, and ſome that are reprobate. 460. *b.* How a man ought to behave to her. *ibid.* Complaints againſt her. 477. *and b.* 478. *a.* A ſacrifice which the Roman ladies offered to her. V. 130. *a.* What the Antients ſaid of her influence. 367. *b.* &c. Whether ſhe favours ſome in a manner independent on their prudence, and perſecutes others in a manner independent on their imprudence. 368. *a. b.* &c. It is hard to know what to make of her. 369. *b.* 370. *a. b.* The idea which the Pagans formed of her. 367. *b.* 368. *a. b.* 369. *a. b.* People often impute to her what they ought to charge on their own imprudence. 372. *a.* But on ſeveral occaſions a man that is unhappy by his own fault, has as much right to complain of Fortune as an unfortunate man, who has punctually diſcharged his duty. *ibid.*

Forum; there was a time when people could not have their ſtatues placed there without a ſpecial privilege. II. 290. *b.*

Foſſeuſe; her intrigue with Henry the Great. IV. 335. *b.* 336. *a.*

Foucher, Canon of Dijon quoted. II. 331. *b.* 332. *a. n.* (101), (102), (104).

Fougaſſe has tranſlated into French the firſt century of Boccalini's *Ragguagli di Parnaſſo.* II. 38. *n.* (*a*).

Founders of orders, have generally had female votaries, who conſtantly attended them. III. 888. *b.*

Fountains which had a ſingular property. III. 636. *a. b.* 644. *a. b.*

Fracaſtor dedicates one of his pieces to Marc Antony Flaminius, and to Galeacius Florimont. III. 58.

France; the Prelates of that country have not the liberty of propoſing what they pleaſe in their aſſemblies. I. 157. *a. b.* Carried on a correſpondence with Count Tekeli. 171. *a.* Choſe to wage war with the edict of Nantes, rather than with the houſe of Auſtria. 305. *b.* From whom its Kings are derived according to ſome. 529. *a. b.* 530. *a. b.* Has been full of ſeditious preachers. II. 95. 101. *b.* 102. *a.* And expoſed to horrible factions. 208. *b.* 209. *a.* Was formerly a ſtate like the empire of Germany. 222. *a.* The court of France ſends an Embaſſador extraordinary to the States General, in favour of the houſe of Orange. 153. *b.* Formerly its Kings were not of age till twenty-one years complete. 381. Was bubbled, and ſhamefully betrayed in a treaty of peace. 443. Its monarchy brought to the brink of ruin, by the immoderate ambition of the branch of Burgundy. 462. *b.* 463. *a.* Makes a peace which was very diſhonourable in ſome reſpects. 739 *b.* 740. *a. b.* Goes upon the antient maxim *Divide & impera.* III. 851. *a.* Not lawful for its Kings to marry baſtards. 797. *b.* Makes a peace with England, that was more uſeful than glorious. 800. *a. b.* More money raiſed in it by Lewis XI, than by any of his predeceſſors. 800. Why its ſubjects are more quiet at this time than ever they were. 815. *a. b.* A great ſlavery for the court of France to want the Pope's bull for the making of Biſhops. IV. 100. *a.* Its limits in the county of Rouſſillon. 102. *b.* Was very unfortunate in the XVth and XVIth centuries. 310. *a. b.* The office of Prime Miniſter there compared to a net, in which all madmen are catched. V. 95. *a.* There is hardly a word of truth in what is related of its Kings before Clovis. 494. *b. n.* (13). France is become more Popiſh between the year 1690, and the year 1701. II. 125. *a. b.* A new plan upon which John du Tillet undertakes to write the Hiſtory of France. V. 351.

Francfort; the magiſtrates of that city order a ſpeech to be ſtruck out of the catalogue of their fair. III. 169. *b.* The Dutch congregation there is entirely diſperſed by perſecution. 173. The Jews are driven from thence by popular commotions. 387. The diviſions of the Reformed Church there. V. 450. *b.*

Francfort upon the Oder, when its univerſity was erected. III. 539.

Franché-Comté and the ſeventeen provinces of the Low-Countries, made up the circle of Burgundy. II. 222. Conquered in the year 1674. IV. 211. *b.*

Francis I, King of France, an extemporary harangue made to him by Alciatus. I. 194. *b.* 195. *a.* Whether he enquired what an Ariſtotelian Phiſopher was. II. 6. *b.* Makes a progreſs to the coaſts of Normandy in hopes of finding a cool air. 189. The evaſion which he made uſe of to curry favour with the Proteſtants. I. 721. II. 261. *b.* 262. *a.* His indignation upon reading a paſſage of Dante. 296. *b.* His ſoul goes directly to Heaven without ſtopping

ping at Purgatory. 372. *b.* 373. *a.* The merry reaſon which his ſteward gave for it to the deputies of the Sorbonne. *ibid.* He boaſted that he had never ſeen any learned man, whoſe knowledge he had not exhauſted in two years. 374. *b.* Ill paid for all his cabals, to favour the amours of Henry VIII. 435. *a.* Deſires one of his miſtreſſes to return ſome jewels, which having received in ingots, he ſends back again to her, and approves of her conduct. 462. *a. b.* What we are told concerning his amours with the Counteſs of Chateau-Briand. *ibid.* What we ought to think of the proteſtation which he is ſaid to have made, with regard to the Ducheſs of Eſtampes. 845. *and a. b.* His complaints againſt providence. III. 89. *and b.* The prudent advice which was given him, before he came to the crown, by Gouffier Boiſy, or Du Prat, or Mr de Grignaux. 88. *a. b.* 89. *a.* Ill ſerved by his own mother. 90. *b.* The calumnies with which he is blackened. *ibid.* 91. *a. b.* 92. *a. b.* 93. *a.* He charges his children to revenge him on pain of his curſe. 95. *b.* Judgment of the Hiſtories that have been writ of him in his own time, or in that of his ſon Henry. 334. *b.* 335. *a.* He grew worſe humoured as he advanced in years. 395. *b.* Was very unhappy in the choice of his miniſters. *ibid.* Diſgraces his favourite the Conſtable de Montmorenci, at the ſame time that Solyman diſgraces and puts to death his favourite Ibrahim Baſha. 588. *b.* Approves Marot's verſion of the Pſalms. IV. 157. *a. b.* 160. *b.* 161. *a.* Deſires Melanchthon to come into France. 185, 186. *and a. b.* 191. *b.* Receives ſignal ſervices from his ſiſter, and has an extraordinary friendſhip and eſteem for her. 316. *a. b.* 317. *a.* Is ſomething ſhaken with the propoſal of a maſs of ſeven points. 318. *b.* Whether his love for the Ducheſs of Eſtampes, began before his confinement, or after it. II. 845. When he was ſet at liberty. *ibid.*

Francis II. The Proteſtants had been entirely ruined in France, if he had lived two years longer. III. 400. *and b.*

Francis de Paula; a falſe miracle that has been aſcribed to him. III. 95. *b.* 96. *a.*

Francis de Sale has a great eſteem for Peter Fenoillet, and gives him a benefice. III. 22. Said of Lewis XI, that he was a good Catholic, but a bad Chriſtian. 809. *b.*

a man like

Franciſcans; a continual jealouſy reigns between them and the Dominicans. II. 239. *a.* Very much puzzled about a book. III. 84. *a. b.* 85. *a.* Do not obſerve the rules of their order. *ibid. b.* 86. *a.* Preach abſurd things concerning their founder. *ibid. and b.* Can have no property in any thing. IV. 198. The concern they had in Savonarola's affair, and the generous and open proceeding of one of them, in what related to the challenge about the trial of fire. V. 62. *b.* 63. *a. b.* 64. *a. b.* The advantage was wholly on their ſide in this affair. 64. *a. b.*

Frankenſtein faulty in his notes upon Priolo. III. 266. *b.*

Franco-Gallia; a judgment paſſed on that book. III. 519. *b.* 520. *a.*

Franeker; by whoſe care the garden of that univerſity was enlarged. V. 442. Who was the firſt that read lectures there. *ibid. a.* The diſputes of that univerſity ſilenced by authority. 817.

Fraſſen, Cordelier, would have been puzzled to anſwer Spinoza. I. 26. *a.*

Fraternity: a fraternity or brotherhood, founded upon adoption, was no leſs an obſtacle to marriage than a natural fraternity. V. 49. *b.* 50. *a.*

Frauds (pious). I. 726. *b.* 727. *a.* 777. *b.* 778. *a.* 793. *a.* 796. *b.* 797. *a.* II. 176. *a. b.* 177. *a.*

Frederic II, King of Denmark, rejects the articles of Union. III. 390. *a.*

Frederic Barbaroſſa, and *Lewis of Bavaria*: Hungerus writes an apology for theſe two Princes. III. 534.

Frederic, Elector Palatine, created King of Bohemia. V. 677. Accepts that crown with the conſent of the Proteſtant Princes of Germany. 678. Whether, in accepting it, he acted contrary to the rules of prudence. *ibid. and* 679.

Freedom of Rome; thoſe who obtained it, took upon them the name of him who procured them that honour. I. 610. *a.*

Free-will; the different ideas that people form of it. I. 661. *a. b.* There are certain articles which it is difficult not to adopt, when once the doctrine of Free-will is embraced. 759. *a.* The definition of Free-will properly ſo called. II. 226. *b.* Does not hinder all the actions of man's will from being unavoidable conſequences of Fate. 496. *a.* Was not poſſible to be explained by the ſyſtem of Epicurus. 790. *a. b.* 791. *a.* His motion of declination did not mend the matter. *ibid. b.* 792. *a. b.* Carneades invents a more ſubtle ſolution. *ibid. b.* Some perſons have made it a doubt whether a man was endowed with it. III. 374. *b.* The Thomiſts, the Janſeniſts, and the Calviniſts, maintain the ſame ſide of the queſtion here. 548. *a.* Difficulties upon this head. IV. 94. *a. b.* 95. *a. b.* 96. *a.* Whether it can be of any uſe, to ſolve the difficulties concerning the origin of evil. 112. *b.* 113. *a. b.* 414. *b.* 415. *a. b.* 416. *a.* 517. *a. b. to* 521. *a. b.* 788. *a. b.* 789. *a.* Ochinus's labyrinths upon this ſubject. 390. *b.* 391. *a.* A doctrine which ſeems to deſtroy it. 782. *b.* Whether it be a good proof of the ſpecific difference between the ſouls of men and thoſe of beaſts. 907. *a. b. to* 909. *a. b.* Victorious objections are made *pro* and *con.* V. 151. *a. b. to* 156. *a. b.* Reaſon is againſt it. 208. *a. b.* One cannot ſee how to reconcile it with the quality of a being that is created out of nothing. 212. *b.*

Fregoſa, the French Embaſſador, is killed, and falſe inſtructions are forged and aſcribed to him. III. 91. *a.*

Freber (Marquard) it is ſaid that the Jeſuits played him a ſhameful trick, and that he complained of it in a Manifeſto which is not to be ſeen now. IV. 726. *b.* 727. *a.*

Freber (Paul) his contradiction with reſpect to Geldenhaur. III. 148. *and b.* 149. *a. b.*

Freigius (Nicolas) particulars concerning him. III. 105. *a.*

French are very apt to let the life of an illuſtrious kinſman fall into oblivion. I. 705. II. 433. It is not true that they obtained a victory over the Dutch at Bodegrave. 43. *and a.* Beſieged in little Leith, are forced to capitulate, and leave Scotland for ever. 146, 147. After having rendered themſelves odious there. *ibid.* So diſfigure proper names, that they cannot be known. III. 722. *b.* 723. *a.* Are driven out of Italy. 766. *a.* Have extremely magnified the part they had in the defeat of the Turks at the paſſage of Raab. 793. *b.* Their folly ſet in oppoſition to the wiſdom of the Venetians. 814. *b.* They do not idolize their monarchs, ſo much as they are ſaid to do. 815. *a.* Their genius full of vivacity and variety. I. 64. *b.* It is againſt their inclination to be tied down to one ſcience. *ibid.* Whether a Frenchman may give the title of King of France to the King of England. 800. *b.* 801. *a.* Whether by ſo doing he declares his maſter an uſurper, and renders himſelf guilty of Felony and Treaſon. *ibid.* St Romuald, Balzac, and N. Beda affirm it, and are confuted. *ibid. and* 801. *b.* They are to blame for having eſteemed Guevara's *Dial of Princes*. III. 270. *and a. b.* Compared to the Romans by Langolius. V. 417.

Friburgh and *Briſac* remain in the poſſeſſion of France by the peace of Nimeguen. III. 720. *a.*

Fricius (Andrew) Orichovius diſputes with him. IV. 411.

Friderickſburg; the Unitarians who had obtained leave to reſide there, are ordered to depart by the Duke of Holſtein. III. 902.

Friends. What judgment we ought to form of thoſe perſons who keep even the leaſt notes of their friends, with a deſign to take advantage of them, in caſe of a rupture. III. 553. *a.* The illuſions to which friends are liable. IV. 272. *a. b.* Good advice that was given to a couple of friends. V. 148. *b.* 149. *a. b.*

Friendſhip; an inſtance of a tender friendſhip. I. 525. *a. b.* 526. *a.* It is ſeldom of a very long continuance. II. 5. *b.* A rare proof which the wife of Auguſtin Niphus gave of it. IV. 379. *b.*

Frieſland; the writers of that country publiſh a thouſand fables. II. 769. *a.*

Froila, King of the Aſturias, whether his wife was daughter to Eudes, Duke of Aquitain. IV. 283. *a. b.*

Froiſſard; the harangue which he puts into the mouth of Joan, Queen of Naples, contains divers falſities. IV. 303. *b. n.* (49). Quoted. 897. *a. b.* 898. *a. n.* (1), (4).

Frontoniani, a ſect of Orators. III. 107.

Frugality. The extraordinary frugality of Ageſilaus. I. 130. *a.* A remarkable inſtance of that virtue. III. 1. *a. b.*

Fruterius; the uſe that was made of his manuſcripts after his death. III. 159. *b.* 160. *a.*

Fugitives for Religion; nothing more common than to ſee them ringing the alarm againſt the ſects. III. 758.

Fulnec, a ſmall town, erects a ſchool. II. 536. Is plundered by the Spaniards. *ibid.*

Fulvia receives the Roman ladies, who had recourſe to her interceſſion againſt the Triumviri, in a very rough manner. III. 489.

Fulvii; the origin of that family. III. 114. *a. b.*

Fumbling is more uſed in the little towns, than in the great ones. IV. 461. *b.*

Funds: a kingdom cannot poſſibly preſerve its reputation abroad, and keep its neighbous in awe, if the ſovereign has not the funds in readineſs. V. 659.

Furetiere has committed a groſs blunder in ſpeaking of Caſſius. II. 348. *b.* 349. *a.* The ſatirical ſtrokes which he levels at thoſe writers who live by their pen. IV. 843. *a.* His Dictionary corrected and improved by the Sieur de Beauval. I. 672. *b.*

Furius. The Furius of Catullus is very different from the Furius mentioned by Horace. II. 395. *a. b.* Voſſius cenſured on that head. *ibid.*

Furmerius; the fact which he alledges to prove that the antient Kings of Frieſland were very long-lived is altogether improbable. I. 542. *b.* 543. *a.*

Furſtembergh (the Prince of), his being forcibly carried away diſſolves the conference about the general peace which was treating at Cologn. IV. 122. *a.*

Future events; thoſe who venture to foretel them, are happy when they ſerve a Prince whom the providence of God deſigns for great purpoſes. I. 447. *b.* A wiſe man ought to be extremely reſerved concerning them. 749. *b.* II. 749. *b.* The difficulty of foretelling them, when they have no dependance upon a neceſſary cauſe. 332. *b.* Thoſe who take upon them to foretel future events are the moſt dangerous peſts of mankind. III. 321. *a.*

G.

G*Abay Faro* (Aaron), a Portugueſe Jew that was converted to Chriſtianity. V. 539. *n.* (*d*).

Gabalis (le Comte de), whether that piece ought to paſs for an original. II. 87. *a.* A fragment of it concerning Noah and his wife. 431. *b.* 432. *a.*

Gaguin does not defend Joan, Queen of Navarre, well againſt the calumnies with which ſhe is blackened. II. 224. *a. b.* 225. *a.* Unjuſtly put upon a level with Paulus Æmilius. 764. *b.* 765. *a.*

Gaillard (Giles) turns Proteſtant, and publiſhes the motives of his converſion. IV. 884. *a.*

Gain: the love of gain occaſions a great deal of meanneſs. I. 194. *a. b.*

Galatinus (Peter), a Franciſcan, accuſed of having ſtolen from Porchettus Salvago. IV. 168. *and a.*

Galba would have been thought worthy of a crown, if he had never wore one. III. 405. *and a.* His complaiſance to Mæcenas. IV. 21. *a.*

Galeazzo (John) dies by poiſon, and not by over careſſing his wife. I. 404. *a. b.*

Galen, his objection againſt animated atoms. II. 779. *b.* He thinks it ſtrange that Chryſippus ſhould trouble himſelf to give a ſerious explication of poetical traditions. III. 648. *b.* Who was the firſt that tranſlated his works into Latin. 775.

Galileo ſtiled Firſt Mathematician to the Grand Duke of Tuſcany. V. 499. His buſt honourably placed and reſpected by Viviani. *ibid.*

Galiſſard is guilty of two overſights concerning John Damaſcen. II. 586. *a.*

Gallant, one that meets with the puniſhment of Abelard. II. 8. *b.*

Gallantry; what is the greateſt ſin that can be committed in its empire. II. 602. *a.*

Gallantries of the Kings of France; the author of that work has adopted all the miſtakes of Varillas, and even made them worſe. IV. 697. *b.* The firſt edition of it has more the air of a true Hiſtory than the ſecond. V. 393. *b.*

Gallois (le) cenſured for ſeveral errors with reſpect to Aretin's plagiariſm. I. 435. *a. b.*

Gall-nut, certain inſects produce it by pricking the oak. V. 499. *b.*

Gallucci (Father) confounds himſelf in the deſcription of a fight. II. 130. *b.*

Gallus Romæ Hoſpes: a book compoſed under that title by Lewis de Mont-joſieu. IV. 245. *a. b.*

Gameren (Hanard), who that author was. V. 236. *n.* (*a*).

Games (Compital) re-eſtabliſhed by Tarquin the Proud. II. 163. *b.*

Games (Olympic), women were forbid to be preſent at them. I. 761. *and a. b.* III. 964. *a.*

Gammut; from whence that word comes. I. 633.

Ganges (King) put to death by the Gymnoſophiſts. III. 311. *b.* The evils which happened after his murther. *ibid.*

Gantois. The Gantois reduced to reaſon by Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy. II. 214. *a. b.*

Gap; its national Synod orders that a new article ſhould be inſerted in the Confeſſion of Faith, importing that the Pope is properly Antichriſt. III. 39. *a.*

Garamont (Claudius) makes puncheons, and prepares moulds for the Roman capitals. V. 388. He was Tori's diſciple. *ibid.*

Garaſſe; a paſſage concerning alabaſter quoted from him. I. 174. *a. b.* One of his calumnies againſt Beza refuted by a Roman Catholic. 798. *a.* The pitiful ſhift he made uſe of. 799. *a. b.* His character. *ibid. b. and* 800. *a.* An impertinent ſtory in his *Doctrine Curieuſe*. II. 180. *a. b.* Another that is ſtill more impertinent. 181. *a. b.* He vents a falſhood againſt Calvin with reſpect to Servetus. 265. *a.* Is a calumniator. 361. *a.* A train of his impertinences. 666. *a. b.* His judgment of Democritus and Diogenes ſeverely cenſured. 667. *a. b.* His ſcurrilities with reſpect to the Antinomians. III. 597. *a. b.* 598. *a. b.* The liberty he takes to change facts in the Hiſtory of Athenais. 780. *a. b.* How he abuſes the authority of Prateolus to blacken the Calviniſts. 936. *a. b.* Cenſures Paſquier, and takes occaſion to give examples of a ridiculous ignorance. 908. *b.* Is guilty of ſeveral miſtakes concerning ſome Magicians. IV. 939. *b.* 940. *a. b.* Publiſhes two violent ſatires under the name of Andreas Scioppius. V. 98. *a. b.* Is convicted of a groſs miſtake, with regard to Lucan and Tacitus. 282. *a. b.* Treats as an Atheiſt the anonymous author who concealed himſelf under the name of Antony Cornelius. 536. *a. b.* A ſuggeſtion of this Jeſuit examined. 523. *&c.* His miſtakes concerning the *Querela Infantium*. II. 556. *a. b.*

Garcia (Martin) cauſes the Alcoran to be tranſlated into the language of Arragon. I. 326.

Gard (Guy de la) tranſlates into French Baduel's diſcourſe on the marriage of men of letters, and gives it a wrong title. I. 604. *a. b.*

Garden (George) writes the life of John Forbes. III. 69.

Gardens of Adonis paſs into a proverb. I. 114. *b.* And thoſe of Alcinous likewiſe. 201. *a.*

Gardie (de la) traduced by Typotius. V. 374. *a. b.* 375. *a. b.*

Gardiner depoſed in the reign of Edward VI, for not ſupporting the rights of the crown. IV. 692. *a.* And reſtored by Queen Mary. *ibid. b.* A jeſt concerning John Poinet aſcribed to him, but falſely. 694. *a. b.*

Garlick; thoſe who had eat of it were not allowed to enter into the temple of the mother of the gods. V. 240. *a.*

Garnier (Giles), a man who transformed himſelf into a were-wolf, condemned to be burnt by an arrêt of the Parliament of Dole. I. 562. *b.*

Gaſſarus (Achilles), a Phyſician, was a true *Heluo Librorum*. III. 110.

Gaſſendus drops his deſign of writing a criticiſm upon Ariſtotle for fear of perſecution. I. 470. *a. n.* (80). Cenſured for taking an ironical praiſe in Horace for a ſerious one. II. 389. *b.* His elogy. *ibid.* Whether he ſuffered himſelf to be deceived by the Latin tranſlator of Plutarch, with reſpect to Carneades and Leontium. 782. *a.* None has wrote ſo well as he in behalf of Epicurus. 783. a. b. Wherein he differs from Des Cartes. III. 790. a. He was never in better health, than at the time when he ſhould have died according to the predictions of the Aſtrologers. IV. 264. a. Was a dreadful adverſary to that ſort of men. 531. b. 532. a. b. Peireſkius deſires him to write upon the Aſtronomical operation concerning Marſeilles. 678. a. Uſes all his ſkill to enervate Des Cartes's arguments for the immortality of the ſoul. 718. a. His doctrine relating to the conſervation of the creatures abſurd. 886. a. b. What he obſerved with reſpect to Mathematicians, and particularly Geometricians. V. 620. b.

Gaſſion (the Marſhal de), a panegyric on him forbid to be ſpoke. III. 438. a. How he refuted the reflexions of the Abbot de la Riviere at the ſiege of Courtray. IV. 460. a. A ſaying of his. V. 326. b.

Gauden is the author of *Icon Baſilike*. IV. 221. b. 222. a.

Gaulard (Sieur), tales under his name. I. 64. a.

Gaultier (James) multiplies the ſects of the Proteſtants as much as he can. II. 434. b. Enlarges his catologue of Heretics with the Melchiorites, an imaginary ſect. IV. 193.

Gauric (Luke), what he declared to Henry II, in his horoſcope. III. 401. b. 402. a.

Gautruche (Father), his faults remarked the more carefully becauſe he is in every body's hands. I. 77. b. n. (38).

Gaza, what he did for Argyropilus. I. 442.

Gazetteers, their relations not to be truſted to. I. 15. b. The moſt ſcurvy ones may promiſe themſelves immortality for the groſs lies they invent. II. 265. b. 266. a. 296. a. It is as difficult to reconcile the Gazetteers with themſelves, as to reconcile thoſe of different parties. III. 718. b. 719. a. The ignorance of the Paris Gazetteer. *ibid. and* b. Their ſhifts to augment and diminiſh the troops of a place beſieged. *ibid.* Thoſe of the Imperial towns generally great liars. V. 504.

Gazettes; the former are more to be truſted than the latter in certain caſes. I. 15. b. The invention of them was not the firſt way that was made uſe of to deceive the public. 129. Whether the Catholic Princes do right in ſuffering their vows and their pilgrimages in order to obtain a glorious campaign, to be put in the Gazettes. 161. a. Thoſe of Amſterdam are not uſed to celebrate the praiſes of the Popes. II. 475. b. They nevertheleſs praiſe Alexander VII. *ibid.* An obſervation upon the news which they contain. III. 271. b. The uſefulneſs of an office that might be ſet up with reſpect to the Gazettes. V. 751. a. The judgment which Guy Patin paſſes upon the Paris Gazette. 752. b. Their uſe with reſpect to dates. IV. 211. b.

Gediccus has not rightly comprehended the true intention of the author, who made it a doubt whether women were human creatures. III. 143. a. b.

Gela; by whom that city was built. III. 157. a. Its inhabitants ſend a colony to Agrigentum. *ibid.*

Gelée (Theophilus) tranſlates the Anatomical Hiſtory, and ſeveral other pieces of Du Laurens. III. 745. b.

Geminius (Livius), his infamous flattery, and his horrible imprecations. II. 703. b.

Genealogies; thoſe of the Jews attended with inſurmountable difficulties. I. 41. a. Figures are not much more neceſſary in matters of Geometry than in matters of Genealogy. II. 133. a.

Genealogiſts, their impertinences. IV. 650. a. b. V. 468. b. 469. a.

Genebrard treats Joſephus as an impious perſon for having compared Alexander's paſſage through the ſea of Pamphylia, with that of Moſes through the Red-Sea. IV. 608. b. 609. a. A difficulty relating to the firſt edition of his Chronicle. 509. b. 510. a. He treated thoſe who were not Catholics with ſevere calumnies. III. 733.

Gener, that word is taken indifferently in antient writers, for father-in-law and brother-in-law. IV. 644. b.

Generals of armies ſometimes ſupply the enemy with an after-game. I. 764. a. There are a great many of them whoſe victories turn only to the profit of thoſe who deal in mourning cloaths. II. 413. b. The Romans changed their Generals often. *ibid.* How much it concerns them to be diligent. 414. b. A political craft proves ſometimes more uſeful to them than all their ſkill in war. 547. b. Their tricks to render themſelves always neceſſary. V. 126. a. It concerns no body ſo much as them to be free from the ſuperſtitions of Judicial Aſtrology. 255. a. b. Too much circumſpection is hurtful to them ſometimes. 261. a. b.

Generation. The moſt excellent Naturaliſts before Ariſtotle admitted no generation, properly ſpeaking. I. 470. b. The relations which Phyſicians pretend to find between the organs of generation, and the throat. II. 636. b.

Generoſity; a very ſingular example of that virtue. I. 482. b.

Geneſt (St) ended his days by a tragedy. IV. 487. b. n. (37).

Geneva; a falſe preſage of Scaliger with reſpect to that city. I. 794. a. b. Diſorders prevailed there, notwithſtanding the reformation of doctrine. II. 264. The Italian Conſiſtory draws up articles of Faith there. III. 152. a. Its academy reſolves to admit no other ſyſtem but that of Ariſtotle. IV. 840. b. When, and upon what occaſion, a ſchool for the languages, &c. was erected there. II. 274. a. An oration which Broughton addreſſed to the inhabitants of Geneva. 150. a. A Greek and Latin copy of that oration. *ibid. and* b.

Genevois (the Prince of), why ſo called. III. 142. In attempting upon Beauvois he becomes his mother's priſoner. *ibid.*

Genii; whether they may not preſerve their ſpecies by generation. II. 66. b. Whether any ſuch beings really exiſt. 350. a. b. The doctrine of the Heathens touching a particular genius that attends every man. 249. b. 250. a. What Cardan ſays of his particular genius. 318. b. A ſmall pattern of the Platonic doctrine concerning them. IV. 689. b. 690. a.

Genius: men of an extraordinary genius. II. 661. b. 662. a. That kind of genius which inclines to ſport and toy with the Muſes, is generally a preſervative againſt the ill effects of too ſtrong an application to ſtudy. III. 883.

Gennadius, Patriarch of Conſtantinople, receives the croſier from the hands of Mahomet II himſelf. IV. 53. a.

Genoa; that city, from Luitprandus's time, was rather called *Janua* than *Genoa*, and for what reaſon. I. 614. a. Deſires to have Charles VII for her Lord. II. 464. a.

Gentiles; one does not know what the Fathers dreamed of, in ſome of their arguments againſt them. II. 498. a.

Gentilis; his differences with Calvin are more particularly deſcribed in the French than in the Latin life of Calvin. II. 274. b.

Gentius, King of Illyricum, is led in triumph at Rome. I. 340. b. 341. a.

Gentlemen: moſt of the gentlemen of France come from a village. III. 137. a.

Geometrical exerciſes, a ſaying of Plato, that God is continually employed in them. V. 621. b.

Geometricians; the ſmalleſt degree of inattention may occaſion a great many miſreckonings in their calculations. II. 388. b.

Georgians; their manners. IV. 33. b.

Gerard (Balthazar), what example encouraged him to aſſaſſinate William I, Prince of Orange. III. 601. a. He aſſaſſinates that Prince. II. 459. a. n. (27). III. 601. a.

Germain (St), Biſhop of Auxerre, reſtored to the Calendar by a decree of the Parliament. III. 897. a. b.

Germanicus; to whom that ſirname was given, and for what reaſon. II. 716. What Tacitus ſays of him in deſcribing his triumph. III. 921. b.

Germans; they require that the very hour of a perſon's birth ſhould be inſerted in his elogy. II. 429. a. But Roland Des-Mareſts blames them for it. *ibid.* n. (1). Who is the moſt antient Hiſtorian of that nation. 743. The Germans, at a time, tricked by Pope Julius II. III. 614. b. Refuſe to follow more than one profeſſion at once. I. 64. b. The loſſes which they ſuſtained at the ſiege of Landau. III. 718. b. 719. a.

Germany; ſeveral Catholic Princes of that country ſend Deputies to Lewis XIII, to recommend to him the intereſts of their religion. II. 134. b. What place was

was called the paradiſe of Germany. 816. *b.* What was the ſource of the war, which deſolated Germany from the year 1618, to the peace of Munſter. III. 657. *a.* It produced ſome famous Latin Poets before Conrad Celtes. 724. *b.*

Gerſon criticizes Ruyſbroëck's treatiſe of the ſpiritual marriage. IV. 942. John de Schoonhove and Denis the Carthuſian, write anſwers to his Critical Diſſertation. *ibid.*

Gervaſe of Tilbury makes mention of the She-Pope, in his *Otia Imperialia.* IV. 738. *b.* 739. *a.* Martin Polonus takes from him the materials of his Chronicle. *ibid. and b.*

Geſner has expreſſed himſelf ſo ill in ſpeaking of Tortellius, that he might eaſily occaſion ſeveral groſs faults. I. 433. *b.* 434. *a.* His inattention. II. 142. *a.* The books of an author which Geſner gave hopes would be publiſhed, have been miſtaken for books actually printed. IV. 544. *a. b.*

Getæ; their Embaſſadors who were ſent on a treaty of peace or a truce, to perſons whoſe wrath was provoked, preſented themſelves playing on the lyre. I. 83. *a.* They were the moſt warlike of all men, and for what reaſon. III. 312. *b.* Are in this reſpect a ſhame to the Chriſtians. *ibid.* Treat Ovid with a great deal of humanity and civility. IV. 448. That Poet writes a poem in their language to the praiſe of Auguſtus. 445, 446. *a. b.*

Ghoſt. A Ghoſt which was ſaid to have haunted a perſon every night. II. 522. *and a. b.*

Ghoſt (the Holy) why he deferred his coming into the world for ten days. I. 652. *a.* A mean and unworthy anſwer to that queſtion. *ibid.* Among the Turks certain perſons born of a virgin-mother, are called ſons of the Holy Ghoſt. IV. 346. *and a. b.* The Popes moved Cardinal Pallavicini's pity, when they had no other aſſiſtance but his. V. 826.

Gibbets; the extraordinary height of ſome, and for what end. I. 591. *and a. b.*

Gibieuf (Father) enriches the works of Cardinal Berulle, with arguments and ſummaries. I. 786. *b.*

Gieſſen; the Landgrave of Heſſe erects a college there, on which the Emperor did the year following beſtow the title of univerſity. III. 386, 387. The univerſity of that town tranſported to Marpourg. V. 80.

Gifanius; a ſolution of the difficulties propoſed about him. III. 158, 159, *and a. b.* 160. *a. b.* 161. *a.* It was he that wrote the life of Lucretius. IV. 476. *a.*

Gifts are commonly ſeparated, ſome fall to one man's ſhare and ſome to another's. IV. 758. *a. b.*

Gyges; what his maxim was touching women who ſtript themſelves naked. III. 331. *a.*

Gil (Father) a Jeſuit, never knew any woman by ſight. IV. 125. *a.*

Gilles (Peter) compoſes, by order of his ſuperiors, an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the churches of the Vaudois. III. 161, 162.

Gymnoſophiſts, there were two ſorts of them II. 117.

Girac cenſures Coſtar moſt injudiciouſly, I. 75. *a.* Does not act the part of an exact Critic. *ibid.* Does not reaſon conſequentially. *ibid.* Is ignorant of what he ſhould have known. *ibid. and b.* Explains Plutarch ill. *ibid. b.* Does not take the right way of confuting facts borrowed from the Pagan Mythology. *ibid. b.* 76. *a.* Quoted. 259. *a.* II. 813. *b.* 814. *a.* The judgment which he paſſes upon Amyot's tranſlation of Plutarch. I. 259. *a. b.* He conſtrues into treaſon a paſſage of Coſtar's reply. III. 399. *a.* Juſtly cenſures Coſtar with reſpect to the two veſſels of Jupiter. IV. 93. *a. b.* The Hiſtory of his quarrels with Coſtar. V. 341. *a. b. &c. to* 346. *a. b.*

Giraldus miſerably confounds things with reſpect to Parthenius. IV. 483. *b.*

Girardus (Albertus) tranſlator of Stevin's works. V. 236. *a.*

Girl. Whether a girl that ſhould read lectures, would promote or retard the improvement of her hearers, by hiding her handſome face. I. 325. *a. b.* The behaviour of one that was a novice in the affairs of love. II. 513. *a. b.* A girl who contradicts her father's words as to a promiſe which he made in her name. III. 258. *a.* IV. 87. *b.* 797. *a.* See *Maid.*

Giſeric, King of the Vandals, takes Rome, *&c.* III. 759. *b.*

Gladiators; their ſhews aboliſhed by Honorius. I. 230. *a.* They hired themſelves to the firſt comer to kill one another. II. 196. *a.*

Glandorpius cenſured for making three Conſuls out of one. I. 612. *b.* For dividing one Poet into two. II. 354. *a. b.* He cenſures Rutilius unjuſtly with reſpect to the Parthian war. 348. *a. b.* His notion about the time when the law Fannia was made, does not at all agree with what Pliny ſays of it. III. 6. *a. b.* 7. *a. b.* He impoſes upon the reader twice, in ſpeaking of Fulvia. 119. *b.* His error in taking Hortenſius for Sylla's Lieutenant-General. 491. *a. b.*

Glaphyra; her dream; with the moral reflexions which Joſephus has added to it. III. 164. *a. b.*

Glaſs. It was a cuſtom with lovers, in drinking to apply their lips to the ſame part of the glaſs, to which their miſtreſſes had applied theirs. III. 867. *a. b.*

Glycera, a courtezan, rallies Stilpo. V. 242. *b.*

Glory; men are extremely greedy of it. II. 298. *a. b.* 299. *a.* It is inſeparable from what is uſeful in affairs of war. 413. *a. b.* Thoſe who aſpire to the ſame glory, may very well eſteem, but can never love one another. 867. *a. b.* The deſire of it is the laſt thing which a man parts with. V. 325. *b.* There is nothing more uncommon than for a man to know how to enjoy quietly the glory that he has acquired. 365. *b.*

Gloſſographers; the great authority of thoſe who commented upon the Civil-Law. I. 66. *a. b.* 67. *a.* Their ignorance of good literature made them fall into divers miſtakes. 67. *a.* Who was the firſt of the French Lawyers that exploded their barbariſms. II. 721.

Gloves of Frangipani, whence ſo called. III. 102. *a. b.*

Gnoſtics; one need not ſcruple to believe that they admitted thoſe powers and principles which it is ſaid they did. II. 251. *a.* The impertinent ſtories which they told about the ſouls that aſcended up to Heaven. 751. *b.* They ridiculed thoſe who ſuffered martyrdom. IV. 108. *b.*

Goat. A Goat ſacrificed to a Poet by his friends, in a carnival ſport. III. 574. *and a. b.* What conſtruction was put upon it. 575. *a. b.* A ſhe-Goat, the miſtreſs of an Italian General. I. 675. *a.* The ſhe-Goats of a whole country burnt, and for what reaſon. *ibid. b.* Whether the blackneſs of a ſhe-Goat can give any particular quality to her milk, and whether it be poſſible for a man to diſcern that quality. II. 636. *a. b.* The drinking of Goat's blood makes a man look pale. 712. *a.*

Gobelin (John) his judgment of Flavius Blondus. II. 32. *a. b.*

Goblet of the world; what the Arabian Philoſophers underſtood by it. I. 469. *b.*

GOD. The doctrine of the School-men, touching the diſtinguiſhing character of God, and of his creatures. I. 136. *b.* His name called the *Tetragramma.* 244. *b.* 245. *a. b.* What the Heathens thought of a God that had died. 281. *a. b.* God has the ideas of an infinity of worlds, different from each other, but regular to the laſt degree. 311. *a.* An argument to prove his exiſtence. 345. *b.* Not to know him is a leſs evil than to attribute to him what the Pagans attributed to their gods. 382. *a.* His vengeance is leſs dreaded than that of men. 435. *b.* 436. *a.* One cannot perceive his greatneſs better than by deſpairing to comprehend it. 461. *b.* Whether the incomprehenſibility of his nature, is a reaſon for neglecting the worſhip of him. 462. *a.* A maxim of ſome people, that we never have recourſe to him, except when we diſtruſt the valour and prudence of the Princes of this world. 573. *a.* His fore-knowledge is ſo far from deſtroying man's liberty, that, on the contrary, it eſtabliſhes it. 661. *b.* Whether the things which never were, nor ever ſhall be, are poſſible to him. 759. *a.* 760. *b.* 761. *a.* God in the Scripture acts after the manner of men, and this his behaviour is anſwered in ſuch a manner as if he were really taken for a man. II. 247. *a.* To obey his laws out of a due regard to his majeſty, and againſt the ſtrongeſt inclinations of nature, is the moſt acceptable worſhip that can be paid to him. 315. *b.* 316. *a.* A bold and blaſphemous cenſure paſſed on his works 379. *b.* In what manner the author of that cenſure was puniſhed for it. *ibid.* 380. *a.* The uncertainty of tradition upon that head. *ibid.* Every body does not agree that there is a neceſſary connexion between his providence, and the immortality of the ſoul. 419. *a.* The Sadducees are a proof of this. *ibid.* It is poſſible to believe in him, and at the ſame time be perſuaded that ſhame is only founded on a poſitive law. 670. *a.* Every objection againſt his exiſtence, does not convince a man that there is no God. *ibid. b.* How far his glory was proſtituted by the Pagan Poets. 742. *b.* The moſt perfect way of loving him, is to love him for his own ſake. 780. *a.* In what ſenſe it may be ſaid that he is ſubject to laws. III. 462. *b.* Thoſe who deny his exiſtence have leſs right to deny Magic and Sorcery than others. 471. *a.* The great efficacy of his word. 625. *a. b.* Some nations are ignorant of his exiſtence. 781. *a. b.* His ſpirituality proved. 791. *b.* The belief of his exiſtence, without the belief of his providence, can neither be a motive to virtue, nor a reſtraint to vice. 923. *b.* The anſwer that was made to a Prince who aſked the definition of God. V. 141. *a. b. to* 145. *a.* He could have made things otherwiſe than he has made them. 155. *a. b.* An objection againſt this, and the anſwer to it. *ibid.* As ſoon as he declares a new doctrine to men, the devil oppoſes it. IV. 46. *a. b.* It has always been lawful and even neceſſary to prove his exiſtence. 80. *a. b.* He is perfectly good. 416. *b.* 417. *a. b.* 418. *a. b.* 419. *a.* 572. *a. b.* 788. *a. b.* The way to be like him. 675. *b.* He is incapable of envy and jealouſy. I. 311. *b.* IV. 574. *b. &c.* It is infinitely more advantageous to believe that he exiſts, than to believe that he does not. 489. *a.* The deſire of vindicating him has obliged the Divines to turn themſelves a thouſand ways. 523. *a. b.* Whether the doctrine that ſhould make him the author of ſin, would lead to Atheiſm. *ibid. b.* That ſyſtem which places him in the higheſt degree of glory and elevation, ought to be preferred to all others. 524. *a.* Two oppoſite things lead men to the knowledge of him. 572. *b.* An examination of what is uſually ſaid, that we muſt not meaſure his privileges and duties by the line of ours. 655. *a.* Whether it be as eaſy for him to produce a new ſoul every moment, as to reproduce the ſame. *ibid. b.* None but he is wiſe. 675. *a.* Whether he can lie or deceive. 876. *a. b.* Whether it can well be concluded from the exiſtence of God, that there are dæmons. 938. *b.* 939. *a. b.* A reflexion on the incomprehenſibility of his nature. V. 5. *b.* His immutability inconſiſtent with the nature of extenſion. 209. *b.* He cannot be the ſubject of inherence of the thoughts of men. 210. *a. b.* He muſt neceſſarily be happy. 211. *b.* Whether he be the immanent cauſe of the alterations in the univerſe. 588. *b.* A reflexion upon the conſequences from the eternity or of the beginning of motion with reſpect to his exiſtence. 593. *b.* 594. *a.* Whether nothing but the eternity, of motion can prove the exiſtence of a mover diſtinct from matter. *ibid. a. b.* Facts ſhewing that it is lawful for the Orthodox to diſpute about the arguments for his exiſtence. 595. *b.* 596. *a.* He is continually employed in Geometrical exerciſes, according to Plato's maxim. 621. *b.* The opinion of Divines touching his eſſence and ſubſtance being diffuſed through all bodies, is liable to a thouſand difficulties. II. 100. *b.* He may be preſent in imaginary ſpace. *ibid.* It was pretended that Savonarola converſed with him. V. 72. *a. b.* What the God of Calvin is, if we believe the Catholics and Bertius. 824. What the God of the Socinians is, according to Mr Jurieu. *ibid.* It becomes his Majeſty to ſpeak with authority, and not to argue. 833.

Goddeſſes; a tradition that prevailed concerning mortals that lay with them. I. 314. *a.*

Godeau; what he ſays of the facility in compoſing. III. 262. *b.* Attacked by a Critic on the ſubject of an hymn. 823. *and b.* 824. *a. b.*

Godfroy (Theodore) publiſhes John d'Auton's Hiſtory of Lewis XII. I. 589.

Gods; their amours. I. 454. *a. b.* Their Pederaſty. II. 482. *a. b.* 483. *a.* Reflexions upon the Heathen ſyſtem of a multitude of gods. 250. *a. b.* The Hebraicians pretend that they have all been taken from the Jewiſh tradition. 431. *b.* The falſe arguments which the Fathers alledged to deſtroy their worſhip. 498. *a.* Chimera's touching their original. 673. *a. b.* The Pagans accuſed their gods of forcing them to evil. III. 374. *b.* 375. *a. b.* 376. *a.* Their condition was very miſerable. 641. *a. b.* II. 788. *b.* 789. *a.* Great Philoſophers have aſſigned for the cauſe of their exiſtence, a being that was not God. III. 649. *a. b.* 650. *a. b.* Others have deprived them of life and knowledge. 653. *a. b.* Cicero ſays that they were formerly men. V. 411. *b.* See *Divinities.* Knowledge their chief priviledge. 587. *b.* 588. *a.* I. 311. *a. b.* The Romans were leſs jealous of the honour of their gods than of that of their countrymen. 761, 762. The Pagans repreſented them under the notion of beings which puniſhed one crime by inducing the offender to commit another. IV. 229.

Gods (tutelar) of towns were called forth by the beſiegers, when they thought it likely that they would be obliged to ſurrender. V. 185. *a. b.*

Goldaſt (Melchior) his brother murders a gentlewoman in the high-way near Straſbourg. III. 168. *b.* 169. *a.* He inſerts the *Defenſor Pacis* of Marſilius de Mambrino, in the ſecond tome of his monarchy. IV. 198. *a.*

Golius (James) was a good Proteſtant. III. 389. His profound knowledge of the Oriental tongues. *ibid.* 525.

Golius (Peter) his voyages to the Levant, where he is treated with great civility on his brother's account. III. 389. *a. b.*

Gomarus; what Baudius prognoſticated, would be the iſſue of his controverſy with Arminius. I. 687. *b.* 688. *a.* What Joſeph Hall ſays of it. III. 343. *b.* He procures an edition of the *Defenſor Pacis* writ by Marſilius of Padua. IV. 198. *a. b.*

Gombauld is rallied on his being ill lodged. V. 401. *b.*

Gomez (Ruy) by what device he acquired the friendſhip of Philip II. V. 326. *b. n.* (10).

Gomorrhæus; what book it is. II. 588. *a. b.* 589. *a. b.*

Gonzaga (Cecilia of) deſpiſes the pleaſures of the world, and conſecrates herſelf to God. II. 551.

Gonzaga (Louiſa Mary de) an Aſtrologer promiſes her a crown, and the prediction was fulfilled. III. 826. *b.* See *Poland* (the Queen of).

Good ſurpaſſed by Evil according to Xenophanes. II. 834. *b.* Whether it ſurpaſſes evil in the nature of things. V. 576. *a. b. &c.*

Good-fortune, one of the three qualities of a good Phyſician. III. 487, 488. *and a.* Reflexions on this head. *ibid. and b.* Whether good and bad fortune are the effect, one of them of prudence, and the other of imprudence. *ibid. and* 489. *a. b.* Whether there be in human life good-fortune independent on prudence. V. 367. *b.* 368. *a. b.* 370. *a. b.* 371. *a. b.* 372. *a. b.* 373. *a. b.* People call by this name and impute to fortune that which is ſometimes the effect of prudence. 371. *a. b.*

Good (Public) a cloak for avarice. II. 259, 260.

Goodneſs. What is the idea that we ought to have of perfect goodneſs. IV. 416. *b.* 417. *a. b.* 418. *a. b.* Taken for ſimplicity. II. 164. *a. b.*

Goods. Whether it comes nearer perfection to have a community of goods, or to keep every man his own, in order to ſupply therewith the neceſſities of others. II. 776. *a. b. &c.* People aſcribe to worldly good all the defects which the Pagans aſcribed to fortune. 369. *b.*

Good ſouls take it ill that a book which attacks their party ſhould remain unanſwered; and they are not able to diſcover the weak ſide of a bad confutation. V. 180. *a.*

Gooſe. A gooſe in love with a boy. I. 282. *b.* 283. *a b.* Another in love with a Philoſopher. III. 697. *b.*

Gordian (Emperor) Philip cauſes him to be depoſed, and afterwards to be killed. I. 593. *b.*

Gordius, what preſage he had of the crown. V. 310. *and a. b.*

Gorgias; to whom he ſerved as a model for the loftineſs of writing. II. 571. *a.* Harangued without preparation, and for what reaſon. IV. 784. *a.*

Gortynians, an Atheiſtical people of Phocis, the ſame with the Phlegyans. IV. 626. *a.*

Gortys, a city of Crete; by whom it was built. II. 875. *a.*

Goſpel; Jeſus Chriſt was willing it ſhould claſh not only with the religion of the Pagans, but likewiſe with their wiſdom. V. 831.

Goſpel according to St John; a Pagan quotes the beginning of it, to confirm Plato's doctrine. I. 255.

Goſpel (New), ſeveral of Cardinal Palavicini's maxims are cenſured in it. III. 326. *b.*

Goſpels publiſhed in the Anglo-Saxon tongue. III. 629. *a.* What Luther is charged with ſaying of the firſt three goſpels. 940. *a.* 942. *a.*

Goſſelin (William), French tranſlator of Tartaglia's Arithmetic. V. 297. *a. b.*

Goudron (the Marquis de) marries a proſtitute enriched by the great gifts of the Duke of Vitry. IV. 499. *a. b.*

Gouffier de Boiſy put for *Duprat* in ſeveral relations. III. 88. *a. n.* (6).

Goulu; his anſwers to a criticiſm on a paſſage of his tranſlation of Socrates's apology, examined. I. 514. *a. b.* A Supplement to the Hiſtory of his diſpute with Balzac. IV. 284. *a. b.*

Governors beſieged always ſend to know where a King fixes his quarters, when he aſſiſts at a ſiege. III. 718. *a. b.*

Gown: an action of damages brought againſt a man for diſordering the pleats of a gown. III. 492. *a.*

Gracchi; they transfer all the courts of judgment from the Senatorian to the Equeſtrian order. II. 710. *a. b.*

Grace; St Auguſtin, Calvin, Janſenius, the Thomiſts, were, at bottom, of the ſame way of thinking on that head. I. 106. *a.* III. 548. *a.* Bellarmin was likewiſe of the ſame opinion. I. 729. *a. b.* There is no ſyſtem which can remove all the difficulties which are to be met with on that ſubject. 481. *b.* 482. *a.* The inamiſſibility of Grace determined by the Synod of Dort. II. 70. *a. b.* It has been ſaid, that the doctrine of Grace is a ſea that has neither ſhore nor bottom. III. 548. *a.* The weak ſide of this doctrine. IV. 846. *b.* 847. *a.* A perſon may err in this point through good motives. V. 153. *a. b.* It is a ſcandal that the diſputes about Grace ſhould produce ſo many diviſions. 153. *a.* The cauſe of theſe diſputes. 821.

Grace (Univerſal), whether that hypotheſis be far from ſatisfying reaſon. I. 261. *b.* 262. *a.* The diſputes which it occaſioned. *ibid. and b.* Theſe diſputes are looked upon now with another eye than they were formerly. II. 584. *b.* See *Predeſtination.*

Gracian; two ſorts of readers complain of his works. IV. 457. *a. b.*

Grævius is miſtaken about the death of Francis Junius. III. 629.

Grammar; the not knowing one of its rules by heart, occaſions a learned man being ſent back to his rudiments. II. 404. *a.*

Grammar (French) more exact than the Greek or Latin grammar. I. 74. *b.* V. 327. *b.*

Grammar (Iriſh), who wrote the firſt. I. 718. *a.*

Grammarians: one that was made Emperor. I. 375. Another who thought that diſputing on any material queſtions of Divinity, was ſo much time ill employed. II. 190. *b.* Cenſured for looking after the misfortunes of other people, while they are ignorant of their own diſorders. 671. *a. b.* Grammarians and Philologers are eaſily provoked, and difficultly appeaſed. IV. 476. *a.*

Grammont (Marſhal), how he talked of the Proteſtant religion. IV. 276. *a.* It was thought that he loſt a battle on purpoſe. III. 59. *b.*

Grand (Mr le), his vindication of Sanders againſt Burnet. V. 43. *b.*

Grandeur. Our minds are not very capable of knowing true grandeur. IV. 669. *b.*

Grandier; what is affirmed of him in Mr d'Artignan's memoirs. III. 880. *b.* 881. *a.*

Grangier (Bonaventure) writes againſt the frequent practice of Bleeding introduced by Botal. II. 99. *a.*

Grape-ſtone; Anacreon choaked by one. I. 292. *and a. b.*

Gras (Henry) publiſhes Antony Saporta's treatiſe *de Tumoribus præter Naturam.* V. 44.

Gratitude is not ſubject to the ſame laws among Princes, as it is among private perſons. II. 755. *a. b.*

Great men are not ſo happy as people imagine. II. 219. *b.* 220. *a.* V. 581. *b.* 582. *a. b.* 583. *a. b.* In all places one ſhould ever ſpeak of them with reſpect. II. 754. *b.* It is neceſſary to watch the favourable moments for preſenting one's ſelf before them. III. 281. *a. b.* They eaſily make up their differences. IV. 698. *a.*

Greece deſerves the epithet of *lying*, of *fabulous*, and of *malè feriata*. I. 74. *a.* The General Hiſtory of Greece is a book full of faults. IV. 581. *b.* 582. *a.*

Greek language, what work deſerves to be called the treaſure of it. II. 295.

Greeks; what title they gave to the King of Perſia. I. 130. *b.* 514. *b.* A precept addreſſed to them to live in peace, to honour the Muſes, and to compoſe their differences, according to the rules of equity. 208. *b.* They are reproached with being always children. II. 82. *a.* Decried for their falſe evidences. 303. *a.* Their affection for their own tongue. 517. *b.* In what reſpect the Trojan war was uſeful to them. III. 317. *a.* Being ingenious and voluptuous, they ſtood in need of a religion burthened with ceremonies. V. 814.

Greeks (modern) complain of the little affection which the Church of Rome has for them. I. 508. *and a. b.* Follow the opinions of John Damaſcen more than thoſe of any other Father. II. 587. *b.* Their Prieſts falſely boaſt of a miracle every year at Eaſter. 746. *a.* What was the cauſe of the evils which they ſuffered at the taking of Conſtantinople. IV. 55. *a. b.* Four learned men of that country fled for refuge into France, under the reign of Charles VII. 169. *b.*

Gregory Nazianzen; an apology for him with reſpect to what he ſays of the kind of death which Ariſtotle died. I. 473. *a. b.* What he ſaid of his father. III. 729. *a. b.* See *Nazianzen.*

Gregory Nyſſenus; ſome think him author of the book which goes under the name of Nemeſius. IV. 346.

Gregory the Great; whether he was a Benedictine Monk. III. 126. *a. b. &c.* By what means he was found out in his ſolitude. 219. *a.* Whether he was obliged to revoke the law of Celibacy. 225. *a. b.* He once doubted of the reſurrection. 267. *a.* A book of *Radulphus Flaviacenſis* aſcribed to him. IV. 824. The ableſt men of the Church of Rome confute now-a-days the ſtory that is told of this Pope's having delivered the ſoul of Trajan from Hell. V. 397. *and a. b.*

Gregory V, Pope, how he was a near relation to Otho. IV. 428. *a. b.*

Gregory VII, Pope; a ſupplement to one of the remarks in his article. III. 517. *b.* Another ſupplement. IV. 296. *a. b.* 297. *and a. b.*

Gregory XI, Pope; complains to the Deputies of the Faculty of Theology at Paris, againſt the French tranſlation of the *Defenſor Pacis* of Marſilias of Padua. IV. 198. *b.*

Gregory (Peter) did not underſtand the author he cites in ſpeaking of Diagoras. II. 655. *b.*

Grim (Egbert) quotes the teſtimony of 135 writers for the ſtory of Pope Joan. III. 78. *b.*

Grynæus; famous men of that name. III. 255. *b.*

Grind; what the ſignification of that word is among the Hebrews. V. 37. *a. b.*

Griſons; their edict againſt Heretics. III. 757. *a.* They publiſh an edict againſt the Heretics, and Scipio Lentulus writes an apology for it. 758.

Groendal; Ruyſbroeck founds a convent of Canons-Regular of the order of St Auguſtin at Groendal. IV. 942.

Groningen. Who firſt preached the reformation in the territory of Groningen. I. 238. *a.* And in the great church, after the reduction of that place to the power of the States-General. *ibid. b.* The Lutherans there drive out all thoſe who followed the Reformation of Calvin. II. 768. That city aſſociates itſelf with the United-Provinces. *ibid.* Erects its college into an univerſity. *ibid.* Defends itſelf vigorouſly againſt the Biſhop of Munſter, and when. IV. 211. *b.*

Gropper betrays his maſter. V. 559. *b.* Compared to Judas, and accuſed of having ſtrangled himſelf. *ibid.*

Gros (Valerius) defends the Vaudois againſt the Prior Rorenco. IV. 917. *b.*

Grotius; whether one has reaſon to be ſurprized at his taking Caligula for that man of ſin whom St Paul deſcribes. II. 257. *n.* (*i*). He was in the wrong not to have ſent a copy of his hiſtory to his friends. 283. *a. b.* What made King Guſtavus reſolve to make uſe of him. III. 247. *a.* His book *de Veritate Chriſtianæ Religionis.* 394. *a.* What he ſays with reſpect to the ſuccours which the Spaniſh Embaſſador ſollicited in England for the Duke of Rohan. 397. *b.* The confeſſion which he makes uſe of to refute Mahometaniſm. IV. 28. *a. b.* He is accuſed of not ſpeaking with reſpect enough of the rights of Kings. 120. *a.* It was ſaid that he followed the religion of learned or prudent men. 860. *a.* What he ſays of an external intelligence with regard to ſome of the actions of beaſts. 913. *a.* An incident of his diſpute with Rivet. I. 235. *a. b.* 236. *a. b.* Cenſured by Rivet, anſwers nothing to the purpoſe. II. 173. *b.* 178. *b.* 179. *a. b.*

Gruterus treated unkindly by Baudius. III. 254. *a.* And ſcandalouſly by Philip Pareus. *ibid. b.* How many cruel reproaches he threw out againſt one of his adverſaries. IV. 476. *b.*

Guaſt (du) an arrant villain. III. 858. *b.*

Guaſto (the Marquis del) exhorts Aretin not to ſpare his faults. I. 436. *b.*

Guaſtala (the Counteſs of) founds a fraternity, where a very ſingular method was taken to overcome the fleſh. V. 426. *a.*

Gueinceſtre; his fury and ſcurrilous invectives againſt Henry III. III. 294. *a.*

Guelderland (the province of) erects an univerſity at Harderwic. III. 361.

Guerche (Sylveſter de la), though not learned himſelf, had a great affection for learned men. III. 60. *a. b.*

Guerchi (Mademoiſelle de), the hiſtory of her amours and death. IV. 498. *b.* 499. *a. b.*

Gueret (John), a Jeſuit; the Profeſſor under whom John Chaſtel had ſtudied Philoſophy. II. 456. *a. b.* 457. *a.* Is put to the torture, confeſſes nothing, and is baniſhed for ever. *ibid. b.*

Guevara (Antony de) impoſes upon men of ſenſe by his falſities. III. 705. *b.* His ſevere rebuke to the Biſhop of Zamora. IV. 456. *a. b.* He has publiſhed an infinite number of falſhoods. 927. *a. b.* A Spaniſh impoſtor. II. 400. *a.* Fathers upon Dion a falſhood touching Caligula's nurſe. *ibid.* Des Caurres robs him of ſeveral things without naming him. *ibid.* He trumps up an hiſtory of Marcus Aurelius. 770. *a.* III. 270. *a. b.*

Guibelet (Jourdain) confutes Huarte's *Trial of Wits.* III. 528. *b.* 529. *a. b.*

Guicciardin (Francis), his Hiſtory put in the Index, and for what reaſon. III. 273. *a.* Was naturally averſe to jeſting. 274. *b.* He ſhews too great an inclination to excuſe Savonarola. V. 62. *b.* 63. *a.* Amply quoted with reſpect to that Monk's affair. 58. *b.* 64. *b.* Cenſured on that head. 65. *a. b.*

Guicciardin (Lewis) impriſoned. III. 275. *a. b.*

Guichenon refutes a pious fraud concerning the foundation of a monaſtery. I. 739. *a. b.*

Guienne (Eleonora, heireſs of) is courted in marriage by the King of England, after ſhe had been divorced from the King of France on account of her leudneſs. III. 794. The ſequel of her adventures. *ibid. b.* 795. *a. b.* 796. *a. b.* 797. *a. b.* Is put in the catalogue of learned women. 797. *b.*

Guignard (John), a Jeſuit, is looked upon as a martyr. II. 459. *a. n.* (31).

Guilleminot (John), his vain efforts with regard to ſubſtantial forms. III. 362. *b. n.* (6).

Guillet vindicates two great men ill from the reproach of jealouſy. II. 299. *a.* Should not have attempted to apologize for the nakedneſs of the Lacedemonian maids. III. 967. *b.* 968. *a.*

Guyon (Lewis), his raſh judgment concerning the deſcription which Niphus gives of Joan of Arragon. I. 399. *a. b.*

Guyon (Madam), an obſcene ſtory of that viſionary. V. 857. *n.* (114).

Guiſe (Meſſieurs de), the title of Prince is refuſed to them. III. 285. *b.* Whether they had ever any thoughts of turning Proteſtants. 286. *a. b.* 287. *a.* The hatred which the Proteſtants had conceived againſt them. 286. *b.* 287. *a.* The perſecution which they exerciſed againſt the Proteſtants. V. 478. *b.*

Guiſe (the Chevalier de) kills the Barons of Lux, father and ſon. III. 300. *a. b.*

Guiſe (Francis, Duke of), why his death wrought a great alteration in the Council of Trent. III. 871. *a. b.*

Guiſe (Henry, Duke of) killed at Blois. III. 408. *a. b.* 857. *a. b.*

Guitaut arreſts the Prince of Condé. I. 184. What he ſaid to Madam de la Trimouille. 264. *b.*

Guitmond, author of three books againſt Berengarias confounded with Guy Aretin by Voſſius. I. 433. *a. b.*

Guns: what great guns are in kingdoms. V. 62. *n.* (*f*).

Gurtler believes that Babylon ſhall fall in the courſe of the XVIIIth century. II. 125. *b.*

Guſtavus (Adolphus), King of Sweden; a ſtory that is told of him. II. 135. *b.* Grants a truce of fifteen days to the Princes of the Catholic League. *ibid. a.* The eſteem which he had for a book of Grotius. III. 247. *a.* He calls an aſſembly at Leipſic, of Lutherans and Calviniſts, in order to endeavour at an accommodation. 476. *a.* Received ſome checks in Germany. V. 581. *b.* His victories give weight to Braunbom's prophecies, which were neglected before. II. 123. *b.* His death ſinks their credit again. *ibid.* See the Hiſtorical Diſſertation on his life. V. 651. *&c.*

Guſtavus (Charles), King of Sweden, had no deſign againſt the Catholic religion, when he entered Poland. II. 539. *b.*

H.

H*Aberkorn*, his *Anti-Valerian.* V. 741. *and a. b.*

Habit, how that of the maids of Lacedæmon was made. III. 968. *b.* 969. *a. b.* The faſhion of wearing ſhort habits. *ibid. b.*

Habit (of a Monk) does not cure a man of his inclinations. I. 345. *b.*

Habſburg (Rodolphus, Count of) is elected Emperor by a re-union of the ſuffrages which had been divided betwixt two other Princes. II. 377. And acknowledged by the Pope, who by threatenings obliges Alphonſus, King of Caſtille, to a renunciation of his rights. *ibid. and* 378.

Haddarſchan; what he relates concerning Abraham. I. 44. *b.* 45. *a.*

Hadrian (a Roman Emperor), reliſhes an old piece of flattery. I. 349. *a.* Roughly ſpoken to by an Architect in preſence of Trajan. 376. Diſperſes the Jews in a very cruel manner. 648. *b.* 649. *a.* Looked upon by that people as one of the greateſt deſtroyers of their nation. 649. *a. b.* Whether he was perſonally in the war againſt them. *ibid. b.* In what manner he travelled. III. 320. *b.* His gratitude to his benefactreſſes. IV. 692. *and b.* He cauſed his wife to be poiſoned. V. 266. *b.* 267. *a.*

Hadrian VI, how he was elected Pope. III. 272. *b.* Was too ſcrupulous. I. 733. *a.* III. 326. *b.* Perſiſts in his firſt opinion, that a Pope may err even in matters belonging to faith. 328. *a.* Was ſo far from running into the luxury of his predeceſſor, that his charge was not above twelve crowns a-day. 327. *a.* How he was diſſuaded from demoliſhing the ſtatue of Paſquin. V. 758, 759.

Haemſted; from whom that family is deſcended. III. 542. *a. b.* 543. *a.*

Haerlem beſieged and taken by the Spaniards. III. 622.

Hagar is introduced into Abraham's bed by his wife. V. 54. *b.* 55. *a. b.*

Hagenau: which were the ten towns that made up what they call the Prefecture of Hagenau. III. 717. *a. b.* Subject to France. *ibid.* The French made it ſerve as a rampart in 1675. IV. 211. *b.*

Hay (Alexander), a Jeſuit, is baniſhed by an arrêt of the Parliament of Paris, and why. III. 333. *a. b.*

Hailbrunnir pretends to be ſick, and for what reaſon. III. 656. *a.*

Haillan (du) the reproaches which Du Pleix caſts upon him. III. 338. *a.*

Hair the loſs of it prejudicial to beauty. I. 292. *a.* III. 376. *b.* A man who had the power of moving his hair without any motion of his hand or head. 429. *b.* Whether it be lawful for men to wear long hair. IV. 22. *b.*

Halicarnaſſeus (Dionyſius) his own miſtakes, in cenſuring thoſe of Fabius Pictor, concerning the Tarquins. V. 290. *b.* 291. *a. b.*

Halicarnaſſeus, who were the tyrants of that city. IV. 114. *b.*

Hall (Joſeph) Quoted. III. 947. *b. n.* (126). What he wrote againſt Lipſius concerning his Hiſtories of the miracles of the Holy Virgin. 846. *b.* 847. *a. b.*

Hallier (du) forced by the Duke of Lorrain to retire from before La Motte. IV. 278. *a.*

Hamburgh, it's magiſtrates are very much troubled, on account of the diſputes of their miniſters, that divided the people. III. 504. *b.* 505. *a.* When that town began to have ordinary Syndics. 686. *a.*

Hameſton, the only ſanctuary of the faithful, during a certain time. III. 666. *a.*

Hamilton, (Patrick) the elogy of that martyr. I. 221. *a.*

Hamilton (John) an Archbiſhop, whether it be likely that Cardan foretold him he ſhould be hanged. II. 316. *b.* 317. *a.*

Hammon, that god adviſed King Tementhis to beware of cocks. IV. 790. *a.*

Hand: what Anaxagoras ſaid of our hands. I. 301. *b.* Several people ſend the picture of their hands in order to get their fortunes told. V. 285. *and a.*

Handſome: it is thought that Ageſilaus II, forbid his picture to be drawn, becauſe he was ſenſible he was not an handſome man. I. 130.

Hangeſt (Claudius) Calvin dedicates his Commentary upon Seneca's treatiſe *de Clementia*, to him. II. 260. *a.* 274. *b.*

Hangings, when, as it is pretended, they begun to be known at Rome. IV. 561. *a. b.*

Hanover (the Ducheſs of) diſcovers the impoſtures of James Aymar. I. 8. *b.*

Happineſs of man, what is the formal and efficient cauſe of it. II. 780. *b.* Examination of Mr Arnauld's opinion concerning it. 781. *a. b.* It is one of the moſt evident Attributes of God. V. 828. Wherein Anaxagoras and Carneades made it to conſiſt. I. 295. II. 332. *a. b.* Wherein Epicurus placed it. 780. *b.*

Haran, the brother of Abraham, how he died, and for what reaſon. I. 45. *a.*

Haranguers very often diſpleaſe thoſe whom they praiſe. III. 823. *a.*

Harangue, who was the firſt that wrote his Harangues before he recited them. IV. 567. *b.* An indifferent one recited by an excellent Orator, may charm the hearers. *ibid.* The effect which one ſpoken by Calliſtratus had upon Demoſthenes. II. 259.

Harangues formerly too much ſtuffed with Latin and Greek. II. 104. *b.* 105. *a. b.* 106. *a. b.*

Hardouin (Father) did very well to correct a paſſage of Pliny, relating to Lucilius. IV. 593. *b.* Makes a ſuppoſition concerning Pythagoras, that is inconſiſtent with the account given by Herodotus. 667. *a.* Prefers Plutarch to Varro and Verrius, with reſpect to ſome monuments. V. 288. *b.* 289. *a.*

Harlai (Achilles de) firſt Preſident of the parliament of Paris, brutally uſed. II. 459. *a.*

Harlotry of Rome: the authors of ſuch ſort of books, are not original authors. I. 267. *a.*

Harma, what was ſaid of that village in relation to Amphiarias, I. 274. *a. b.* 275. *a.*

Harmony of the Goſpel, which goes under Ammonius's name, different from the Goſpel-Canons. I. 269. *b.* 270. *a.* Whether Ammonius wrote it. *ibid.*

Harpax, the ſon of Boreas and Chloris. II. 82. *b.*

Harphius (Henry) his character. IV. 942. *b.* 943. *a.* Borrows a great deal from Ruyſbroeck. *ibid.*

Harpocration, a paſſage of that author corrected by Mauſſac, which Voſſius mentions as his own. I. 267. *a. b.*

Hart (Von der) his opinion of Cham's crime. II. 432. *b.* If believed might do hurt to the narratives of Moſes. *ibid.*

Hartnaccio (Daniel) writes the life of Micrælius. IV. 210. *a. n.* (2). Continues his *Syntagma Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ*, and his *Syntagma Hiſtoriæ Politicæ. ibid.* A criticiſm upon that continuation. *ibid. and b.* 211. *a. b.* Found fault with concerning Radulphus Flaviacenſis. 824. *b.* 825. *a. b.*

Haſenmullerus (Elias) left the order of the Jeſuits, to turn Lutheran. III. 555. *a. b.*

Hatred. That of ſiſters more violent than that of brothers. II. 701. *b.* A long digreſſion on the accuſation of a new Hereſy, relating to the hatred of our neighbour. V. 642. *a. b. & ſeq.* An abſtract of that accuſation. *ibid.*

Hautefort (Madam d') Calumniated by a ſatirical author. V. 83. *b.* 84. *a.* But vindicated by the Abbot Faydit. 84. *a.* The ſequel of her Hiſtory. *ibid. b.*

Hazart (A Jeſuit) his intereſt againſt the Janſeniſts. III. 245. *b.*

Head, a paſtboard head ſent every year by the Egyptians to Byblus. I. 116. *a.*

Heads brazen, an account of ſeveral that are alledged to have ſpoken. I. 182. *b.* 183. *a.*

Heads of garlic and poppies offered in ſacrifice inſtead of the heads of children. II. 163. *a. b.*

Health: better a little learning than no health. III. 342. *a.* Ought not to be neglected through a miſtaken zeal for the ſervice of the public. *ibid.*

Hearſays ought never to be reported, but in two caſes. I. 615. *b.* We ought to be diſtruſtful of ſtories which have no other foundation. II. 475. *b.* What ought to be done with regard to ſuch ſtories as are only grounded upon Hearſay. IV. 379. *a.*

Heart, the marks of a kind one. I. 464. *a. b.* It is malicious to ſearch the intention of the heart, in order to judge of an action that is good in itſelf. IV. 571. *a.*

Heaven, the great men of Rome make a lottery of it. II. 713. *b.*

Heavens, objection againſt their motion. II. 29. *b.* Whether they are animated. IV. 872. *a. b.*

Hebe, what employment ſhe had among the gods, and why ſhe loſt it. III. 131. *a.* 637. *a.*

Hebraicians, according to them all the gods of the Pagans were taken from the Jewiſh tradition. II. 431. *b.* The proof which they alledge for it. *ibid.*

Hebrew text of the bible, when and why it was altered by the Jews. I. 173. *a. b.*

Hecatomythium, what it is. I. 47.

Hedge-ſparrow, Juvenal gives that name to a young fellow whoſe wife was unfaithful to him, and why he does it. III. 631. *a. n.* †.

Hegeſippus attempted perhaps to enſnare the oracles. I. 132. *b.* 133. *a.*

Hegira, what that word ſignifies. IV. 27. *b.* 28. *a.* Is the Æra or Epoch of the Mahometans. V. 780. *n.* (10).

Hegius (Alexander) teaches at Deventer. II. 242. Declines the direction of the ſchool of Munſter, and propoſes J. Cæſarius. *ibid.*

Heidegger did not well underſtand the thought of Father Merſenne concerning Hottinger. III. 525. *b.* Relates a pleaſant ſtory concerning St Germain and Loyola. 897. *a. b.*

Heidelberg, diſorders committed in that town, when Tilly took it by aſſault. I. 239. *and a. b.* Its profeſſors retire to Newſtad, and why. III. 173. *n.* (*a*). The univerſity there is reſtored. *ibid. n.* (*b*). The plundering of the Electoral library there. 252. *a.* The Pope's Commiſſioner has orders to tranſport all the manuſcripts from thence to Rome. *ibid.* Ruined for oppoſing the Emperor, and for being faithful to him. IV. 475. *a.* Sacked by Tilly's troops. 492.

Heifer: a brazen heifer which raiſed luſt. V. 769. *and a. b.* 770. *a. b.*

Helen, a conduct worſe than her's. I. 669. *a.* A thouſand people talk of her, who know nothing of her being hanged. III. 367. *a.* Is guilty of a monſtrous inceſt, which few writers have mentioned. IV. 402. *a. b.*

Heleneion. The qualities of that herb. III. 367. *a.*

Helinand, a Monk of Fromond, when he lived. IV. 824. *n.* (*b*).

Heliogabalus gave beautiful youths to his Magicians to be ſacrificed. I. 348. *a.* Often eat peacocks and nightingales tongues. 370. *b.* 371. *a.*

Hell, the road to it as ſhort from one place as from another. I. 308. *b.* All that was ſaid concerning the torments of Hell called fables and dreams by Cicero. II. 418. *b.* III. 743. *b.* And by Urceus. V. 515. *b.* Leſs than its porch. IV. 501. *a. b.* Prudentius believed that the damned have a day of reſt every year, and that it is the day on which Our Saviour came out of Hell. IV. 787. *a.* If Spinoza had reaſoned conſequentially, he would not have treated the fear of it as a chimera. V. 216. *a. b.* Ruyſbroeck's reſignation with regard to its torments. IV. 942, 943. *and a. b.* Whether Trajan's ſoul was delivered from Hell by the prayers of St Gregory. V. 397. *a. b.*

Hellebore taken to render the conception free and ſerene. II. 328. *a. b.* A kind of it called Melampodium. IV. 183. *a.*

Helviſa, the greatneſs of her grief, when ſhe heard of Abelard's loſs. III. 75. *b.* 76. *a.* What the Nuns of Paraclete do, that it may not be forgot, that ſhe underſtood Greek. IV. 470.

Hemithea purſued by Achilles, and how the deſigns of the latter were prevented. V. 315. *and a.*

Hemſbach, on what occaſion the Reformation was ſettled there. IV. 472. *a. d.*

Henao (Gabriel) his conjectures on the happineſs of Paradiſe. III. 895. *a.*

Hennius, an head-dreſs of a prodigious height, which the women of the Low-Countries wore in former times. II. 544. *a. b.* What means a preacher made uſe of to put it out of faſhion. *ibid. b.*

Henry IV Emperor deprived of the Imperial Dignity by the Pope. III. 229. *b.* Forced to ſubmit to the moſt unheard of indignities. 230. *b.* 231. *a.* Depoſed a new. *ibid. a. b.* But at laſt prevails over his enemy. 231. *and b.* 232. *and a. b.*

Henry II, King of France ſends his proteſtations againſt the Council of Trent. I. 257. *a. b.* In vain courts the Swiſs to renew an alliance. II. 195. Makes himſelf maſter of the city of Metz. 445. *b.* Undergoes interrogotaries in favour of the Duke of Eſtampes. 843. Takes the title of *Protector of the German liberty.* III. 397. *b.* 403. *b.* Burns the fine houſe of Binche. 530. *b.* 531. *a.* And why. *ibid.* Is willing to give one of his daughters in marriage to John Sigiſmund. 533. *b.* Particulars relating to him. IV. 160. *a. b.* 161. *a.* His Differences with Pope Paul IV. 632. *b.* 633. *a. b.* Makes an edict againſt clandeſtine marriages. 636. *a. b.* To whoſe counſels the perſecution of the Reformed under his reign ought to be attributed. 699. *a.* Employs againſt the Pope, a man whom he would have cauſed to be burnt in France. V. 457. *a.* According to John Bouchet, and the Baron du Villars, he was not the firſt who broke the truce of 1556. II. 104. *a. b.*

Henry III, King of France, a diſcourſe on the juſtice of deſpoſing him. II. 100. *b.* Reprimands the Divines of Paris. 102. *b.* Provokes the Ducheſs of Montpenſier by his indiſcretion. 257. *b.* Endeavours to diſcover the author who diſguiſed himſelf under the name of Stephanus Junius Brutus. III. 201. Some curious pieces relating to the action brought againſt him. 294. *b.* 295. *a. b.* Called nothing but Brother Henry in a certain Conclave. 410. *a.* Myſteries which were found in the circumſtances of his death. 412. *a. b.* Particulars concerning the houſe where he was aſſaſſinated. 413. *a. b.* Forty-five gentlemen choſen for the ſecurity of his perſon. 857. *a.* Knew how to ſhew reſolution and greatneſs of mind. *ibid. b.* 858. *a.* Was obliged to recompenſe the treaſons of his ſubjects. *ibid. b.* 859. *a.* No Prince ever became more unlike himſelf than he did. IV. 132. *b.* 133. His inconſtancy in point of religion. 333. *a.* Puts a barbarous affront upon his ſiſter Margaret Queen of Navarre. 337. *b.* 338. *a.* A ſatire on his court, under the fiction of an iſland of Hermaphrodites newly diſcovered. V. 33. *b.* One of the moſt ſhameful paſſages of his reign. 254. *a. b.* An account of his death. II. 459. *a.* Acquaints the King of Navarre that his wife's behaviour had given him ſome uneaſineſs, and removes from about her the Ladies de Duras and de Bethune. IV. 341. *a.*

Henry IV, King of France, the apology that was wrote for him, called a libel by the Leaguers. I. 739. *a. b.* Perefixe's miſtake in ſaying that this Prince entered into Geneva. 793. *a.* Ceremonies of his abſolution. II. 100. *a. b.* III. 418. *a.* The Sieur d'Aubigné's railleries upon it. II. 100. *b.* Seditious ſermons made againſt him. 101. *b.* 102. *a.* How he was prevailed upon to follow the advice which had been given him to go ſpeedily to Paris. 553. *a.* His apology on account of the edict of Nantes. III. 209. *b.* A witty ſaying of his upon the Venetian Embaſſador's burning ſome papers before him. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* Brings the Duke of Savoy to reaſon. 406. *b.* His converſation with Mr de Roui, about the qualities he thought proper in a wife. 417. *a. b.* What he is made to ſay concerning his wife. IV. 334. *a.* 339. *b.* 340. *a.* Did not deſerve a faithful one. 336. *a.* Demands ſatisfaction for the affront given his queen. 338. *a. b.* And does not obtain it. *ibid.* 339. *a. b.* Through what motives he pardoned ſome of the Leaguers that deſerved death. V. 27. *b.* Could not procure from his ſubjects the liberty of ſerving God according to the light of his own conſcience 35. *a.* A parallel between Cæſar and him. I. 631. Wounded by John Chaſtel. II. 456. What he ſaid when he heard that that aſſaſſin was a diſciple of the Jeſuits. *ibid.* Looked upon as an excommunicated and relapſed Prince, a profaner of things ſacred, a public enemy, an oppreſſor of religion, and conſequently a tyrant and an uſurper. 458. *a.* The abſolution of the Pope not ſufficient to re-inſtate him. *ibid. b.* How many degrees he was diſtant from the crown. *ibid.* John Guignard refuſes to acknowledge him for King of France. III. 276. *and a. b.* Accuſed of negligence and even of fear with reſpect to the accuſations againſt Guignard. 278. *a.*

Henry II, King of England, in what manner he promiſed to expiate his ſhare of the crime committed in the murther of Thomas, Archbiſhop of Canterbury. III. 425. *b.* Breaks his promiſe, and why. *ibid.* 426. *a.*

Henry VI, King of England, proclaimed King of France. IV. 730. *a.*

Henry VII, King of England, a mad freek of his. III. 835. *b.* Deſires Polydore Virgil to write the Hiſtory of England. V. 496. *b.* 497. *a.*

Henry VIII, King of England, cenſured in a paſſage of *The vanity of Sciences.* I. 150. *a.* Proteſtants and Papiſts ran equal hazard in his reign. 272. *b.* Opinion of the Divines of Wirtemberg, on his divorce. 657. *b.* 658. *a.* The deſign which Francis I. had to cauſe the Sorbonne to give a favourable opinion for it. 716. *a. b.* 717. *a. b.* Calvin complains of his being called the ſupreme head of the Church. II. 273. *b.* 274. *a.* He and Charles V, divide France between them. 435. *a.* Francis I is ſenſibly affected with his death, which he ſhould have looked upon as very lucky to him. III. 94.

Henry d'Albert II, King of Navarre, begins to like the Reformation. IV. 318. *a. b.* 320. *a.*

Henricias, a judgment of that work. IV. 808. *b.*

Henricus (Lewis) his thoughts on the pleaſures which the ſaints enjoy in Heaven. III. 895. *a.*

Hens, what people firſt introduced the cuſtom of cramming them. III. 6. *a.*

Heraclides, a paſſage of his treatiſe of Republics explained. I. 427. *a.*

Heraclidæ were forbidden to have children by a foreign woman. I. 135. *a.*

Heraclitus ſaid that one and the ſame thing is and is not. I. 507. *a.* Conceals his writings in the temple of Diana, and why. II. 865. *a.* Says that the parts of the world live by the death of each other. IV. 525. *a.* Admits only fire for the principle of all things. V. 323. *b. n.* (23).

Heraclius recovers by a treaty of peace the croſs which the Perſians had carried off. III. 425. *a.* What he did to vex Coſroës, King of Perſia. IV. 350. *a.*

Herbelot (Mr de) Regius Profeſſor of Syriac, who it was that ſucceeded him. I. 756.

Herbert (Baron) a great deiſt. I. 383. *a.* Scandalous annotations borrowed from a manuſcript of his. *ibid.*

Hercules, different accounts given by the Antients, of what he did with Diomedes and his mares. I. 17. *b.* 18. *a.* His ſtature judged of by the length of his foot. 104. *a.* Is called *The Lion of three Nights*, and why. 206. *a.* A Greek Poet introduces him decrying virtue. II. 164. *a. b.* An idol of him put into the fire by an Atheiſt. 654. *a.* The zeal which the Agrigentines had for his ſtatue. III.

158. *b.* The prodigious bigneſs of his cup. 206. *a. b.* There have been ſix heroes of this name according to Cicero, and forty-four according to Varro. 426. *a. b.* 427. *a.* Upbraids the Argonauts with their giving themſelves over to their pleaſures. 754. *a.* Whilſt he digs the ground, he cauſes the head of a river to ſpring out of it. V. 76. *b.* The places where he was honoured moſt. 350. *b.* 351. *a. b.*

Heretical Teachers, whether it ought to be imputed as a crime peculiar to them, that they make uſe of methods ſuited to the capacities of the ignorant, in inſtructing them according to the falſe lights of their conſciences. I. 478. *a. b.*

Hereſy, whether obſtinacy be its character. I. 477. *b.* 478. *a.* A contradiction, into which writers, who undertake to ſpeak of converſions, are apt to fall in this reſpect. *ibid.* What Hereſies were formerly the moſt dangerous in the opinion of the court of Rome. II. 545. Faults which are found in the catalogue of thoſe of the XVIth century. V. 231. *a.* A common-place to aſſign them as the cauſe of the heavy ſtrokes of Divine Juſtice. 473. *a.*

Heretics, all ſtories reported to their diſadvantage are ſwallowed down, and numberleſs fables are raiſed about them among all ſects, an hundred pious frauds are practiſed at their death, and many reflexions made thereupon. I. 51. *a. b.* 198. *a. b.* 726. *b.* 727. *a.* 780. *a.* 796. *b.* II. 373. *b.* 374. *a.* Heretics who jumbled together the doctrines of the goſpel and of the Philoſophers. I. 253. Some people are ſatisfied, provided they can defame them. 290. *b.* Whether orthodox Princes can make alliances with them for the ſecurity of their States. 407. *a. b.* What methods were uſed againſt them by the orthodox Emperors. 476. *b.* 477. *a.* The ignorance or contradiction of a Proteſtant Divine, in relation to this point. *ibid.* It is dangerous to diſpute with Heretics that are ſubtile and eloquent. 563. *b.* 564. *a.* Whether the Magiſtrates ought to puniſh them. 789. *a. b.* The reproaches which the French and Spaniards mutually fling upon each other concerning their alliances with Heretics. II. 338. *a. b.* Upon ſeveral occaſions a man appears to be an Heretic only by his manner of expreſſing himſelf. 455. *a.* Reflexion on the puniſhments which ſome pretend ſhould be inflicted on them. III. 147. *a. b.* Whether they ought to be tolerated in the ſame manner as Infidels are. 220. *a. b.* Scruples of the Church of Rome about the praiſes beſtowed upon them. 438. *b.* 439. *a.* Thoſe who write catalogues of them are commonly guilty of three pieces of injuſtice. 443. *b.* 444. *a. b.* Tolerated by the Emperor Jovian. 585. *a. b.* The uſe of penal laws againſt them. IV. 96. *a. b.* 97. *a.* A diſpute between Mr Jurieu, Mr Maimbourg, and Mr Ferrand, concerning the number of their martyrs. 108. *b. as far as* 112. *a.* Examination of all the pieces of this diſpute. *ibid.* The uſefulneſs of ſuch an examination. 112. *a. b.* An account of the methods put in practice to convert Heretics. 373. *b. as far as* 376. *a.* Cuſtomary to ſuppoſe that they all come to a tragical end. 349. *a.* Whether they ought to be excuſed by the compariſon taken from Judges and Phyſicians. 930. *a. b.* 931. *a. b.* Whether it be permitted to write againſt them in a fair, genteel manner, and to acknowledge their good qualities. V. 258. *a.* Princes do not preſerve a conſiſtent conduct with regard to Heretics. 457. *a.* Hoſius would have them extirpated. III. 501. Accuſed of having corrupted the manuſcripts of the Scriptures. 733. Accuſed of being almoſt continually guilty of ſome enormous crime. V. 388. *and a.*

Hermandovilla (Henry de), chief Phyſician of Philip the Fair. II. 399.

Hermaphrodites; whether Adam was one. I. 102. *a. b.* Their origin, and the moral reflexions which may be drawn therefrom. V. 31. *a. b.* 32. *a.* An Hermaphrodite Monk that was brought-to.bed. 4. *b.* 5. *a.*

Hermaphroditus, an abominable piece. IV. 468. *b.* 469. *a.*

Hermeſianax, an antient Poet, writes love-verſes. III. 779. *a.* And a Poem upon the city Colophon. *ibid.*

Hermit, one that let fall his Breviary at the ſight of a couple who were diverting themſelves at the ſport of love. III. 63. *b.* 80. *b.*

Hermonymus took upon him to explain authors which he did not underſtand. II. 186. *a.*

Herodotus never indulges his imagination more than when he makes Artabanus argue. I. 510. *a. b.* 511. *a.* Attributes envy and jealouſy to the Divine Nature. IV. 574. *b.* 575. *a. b.* 576. *a. b.* 577. *a. b.* What Cicero ſays of him. V. 330. *a.*

Heroines, thoſe of romances are very often raviſhed. III. 365. *a. b.*

Heroiſm, Homer had no idea of it. I. 81. *b.*

Herold (John) publiſhes Marianus Scotus from the original ſent him by Latomus. IV. 728. *a. n.* (28). And Martin Polonus. 709. *a.* Accuſed raſhly and ignorantly by Florimond de Remond of having thruſt the ſtory of the She-Pope into his edition of that author. *ibid. and b.*

Hero of an Epic Poem ought not to be buried in the Poem itſelf. I. 81. *b.* Antient Heroes, dangerous fellow-travellers. V. 305. *b.*

Herwart (John-Henry) encourages Xylander to tranſlate Dion Caſſius into Latin. V. 588. *b.* 589. *a.*

Heſhuſius, a man of a turbulent ſpirit. I. 98. The diſtich which was handed about againſt him. *ibid.*

Heſycaſtes, Monks of Mount Athos. I. 89, 90. Are like the Quietiſts. *ibid.*

Heſiod becomes a Poet whilſt he feeds his ſheep. IV. 818. *a.* His genealogy of the gods. III. 649. *a. b.* 650. *a. b.*

Heſſe, Fr. Lambert was one of the principal inſtruments employed to introduce the reformation there. III. 709. *b.*

Heſſe (Philip, Landgrave of) his conſtitution obliges him to aſk permiſſion to have two wives at the ſame time. III. 942. *a. b.* The conſequences of that affair. *ibid. b.* 943. *a. b.*

Heſſe (Maurice, Landgrave of) rewards the dedication of a book of epigrams with an epigram. III. 880. *b.* See *Maurice*.

Heucourt (Marquis of) diſclaims a letter which was wrote in his name againſt Mr Arnauld. I. 485. *a.*

Hyccara (a town of Sicily) taken, and its inhabitants ſold. III. 699. *a.*

Hide (Profeſſor at Oxford) has wrote upon the religion of the antient Perſians. V. 635. *a.*

Hierarchy, Bucer did not condemn that in England. II. 171. *a. b.* 172. *a.*

Hieres, iſles, called the golden iſles. I. 407. Erected into a marquiſate by Henry II, for Gabriel d'Aramont. *ibid.*

Hierocles, why he gives Ammonius the name of Theodidactus. I. 269. *a.* Draws a parallel between Jeſus Chriſt and Apollonius. 380. *b.*

Hiero, King of Syracuſe, founder of the city of Ætna. II. 823. *a.* 825. *b.*

Hyginus, a paſſage of that author propoſed to the readers, in order to find out the meaning of it. III. 633. *a.* What advices he would have it Minerva gave to Penelope. IV. 543. *b.*

Hilarion de Coſte, his omiſſions in relation to Queen Margaret. V. 532. *b.* 533. *a. b.* Quoted. III. 185. *b.* 186. *n.* (*a*). *and a. n.* (2). *b. n.* (6). 187. *a. n.* (1). 188. *n.* (*c*). *and a. n.* (7). *b. n.* (13). 189. *n.* (*b*). (*d*). *and a. n.* (1). *ibid. n.* (5). 530. *a. n.* (5). *b. n.* (13). 531. *b. n.* (26), (27), (28), (30), 532. *b. n.* (4), (6), (7), (8). 533. *a. n.* (10), (13). *b. n.* (15), (17), (18). *& paſſim alibi.*

Hylobians. A ſort of Indian Philoſophers. II. 117. *a.* Why ſo called. *ibid.*

Hyperius; John Pincier was his brother-in-law. IV. 647.

Hypocrites. Nothing is to be got by drawing their pictures and making them known. III. 204. *b.* 205. *a.* The moſt impious find Apologiſts. V. 58.

Hypoſtaſis, the modern Apothecaries have profaned that word by applying it to the urine of their patients. III. 136. *b.*

Hippias, all he had about him was his own handywork. II. 779. *a.*

Hippocrates, whether the letters that concern Democritus, which are among his, be genuine or not. II. 638. *a.* A paraphraſe upon one of his letters by Alardus. V. 583. *a. n.* (105). Owns that he was miſtaken. 791. *n.* (*aa*).

Hippodamia, the wife of Perithous. I. 538. *a. b.*

Hippomanes. A diſſertation on that ſubject. V. 766. &c.

Hipponax. A Poet of a contemptible figure. II. 202. Repreſented in a ridiculous form. *ibid.*

Hippon, its inhabitants oblige Pinianus to promiſe them that he would embrace the prieſthood in their city. I. 229.

Hired mourners who cried more than the relations of the dead. III. 842. *a.*

Hirpi, a people that walked upon fire. III. 466. *and a. b.*

Hiſſers, regulations to reſtrain their fury. IV. 646. *b.*

Hyſtaſpes, father of Darius, applied himſelf to Magic. V. 631. *b.*

Hiſtory, its privileges. I. 103. *b.* III. 460. *a.* V. 747, 748. &c. Qualifications requiſite for writing a good one. IV. 861. *b.* 862. *a. b.* 863. *a.* Writers of Hiſtory are diſpenſed from taking an oath, their word being ſufficient. I. 343. *a.* V. 748. Might clear up a great variety of particulars, without conſiſting of many pages. I. 422. *b.* 423. *a.* The undertaking of a general Hiſtory a very difficult matter. 594. *b.* A proof of this. *ibid.* 595. *a. b.* The common fault of thoſe who write one. V. 1. *a. b.* Whether it be permitted to relate infamous and abominable actions in a Hiſtory. II. 31. *a. b.* A ſmall matter ſuffices to metamorphoſe it into ſatire. 160. *b.* 161. *a.* The knowledge which is acquired by travelling, is very uſeful to thoſe that compoſe a Hiſtory. 168. *a. b.* In many caſes Hiſtorical truths are not leſs impenetrable than Phyſical ones. 543. *b.* We ought not to truſt one written by a Domeſtic that has received great favours. III. 148. *b.* What rules ſhould be followed in order to diſtinguiſh true and falſe facts in a Hiſtory. 269. *a.* The inconveniencies of writing that of monarchs lately dead. 334. *b.* 335. *a.* In what caſes it is lawful to write a Hiſtory already handled by others. *ibid.* Reflexions on ſome facts that render it uncertain in a thouſand things of importance. 856. *b.* Wherein the art of writing it well conſiſts. IV. 126. *a. b.* Whether flatterers corrupt the truth of it more than ſatirical writers. 142. *b.* 143. *a.* Is nothing elſe but a repreſentation of the miſery of mankind. 424. *and b.* Whether the art of Oratory be of uſe in its compoſition. V. 328. *a. b.* There are authors who never would have dreamed of writing one, if they had not been prompted to it by perſonal diſcontent and modiſh paſſions. 362. *b.* By whom it ought to be written: great abuſes in this reſpect. 747. 748. & *ſeq.* The reſpect which the antient Romans had for it. 752. The difficulty of writing it. II. 310. *a. b.* A paſſage of Salluſt on this ſubject. 311. *a.* More particularly that of our own country, and of our own times. 310. *b.* 311. *a.* If he who compoſes one ought to be void of all paſſion, he who judges of the work ought to be ſo too. 311. *a. b.* Books of Hiſtory above all others verify that obſervation, *pro captu lectoris habent ſua fata Libelli. ibid. b.* Cannot give pleaſure in deſcribing thoſe things which gave pain when they happened. *ibid.* Is quite otherwiſe true than the reports of the people. 770. *b.* Writers of romances are obliged to follow it when they tell in a preface the foundation of their fictions. III. 166. *b.* Ought not to be handled, but by clean hands. 345. *b.* Its perfection conſiſts in being unacceptable to all ſects and nations. V. 846.

Hiſtory Eccleſiaſtical. There is little order and exactneſs in it. I. 476. *a.*

Hiſtory fabulous, full of contradictions. I. 78. *a. b.* 79. *a. b.*

Hiſtory of France, who was the firſt that compoſed a body of it in French. III. 334. *a. b.*

Hiſtory (Genealogical) commonly preceded by fabulous times, is often interrupted by ſome periods of obſcure times. I. 750. *a.*

Hiſtory (Roman) Paterculus's abridgment of it is very curious. IV. 495. *a.*

Hiſtorian Commentator, we ought never to cenſure one, till after being inſtructed in the laws of Hiſtory, and the privileges of a Commentary. V. 799.

Hiſtorians. Thoſe who ſuppreſs certain facts, ought to be treated like thoſe ſellers who conceal what they ought to acquaint the buyers with. I. 13. Do not always ſtick cloſe enough to the truth. 16. II. 763. *b.* 764. *a.* The antient Hiſtorians took too great a liberty in altering and embelliſhing their memoirs. I. 39. *b.* III. 19. *b.* And accuſtomed themſelves too much to relate things only in the groſs. I. 422. *b.* An Hiſtorian ought to diſtruſt pious frauds. 780. *a.* Hiſtorians deny all the facts by which they find themſelves incommoded. II. 55. *b.* The laws which are preſcribed to them are impracticable. 65. *b.* It is dangerous for them to ſpeak truth. 284. *b.* There is little Chronology in moſt of the Greek and Latin Hiſtorians. 309. *b.* Are found to have contradictory opinions ſometimes. 351. *a. b.* Which the Commentators have neglected to clear up. 352. *a.* Fall oftner into the ſophiſm *à non cauſa pro cauſa,* than the Peripatetics. 403. *b.* 550. *a. b.* Particular Hiſtorians of a province are more to be credited than others, except in what is Apologetic. 463. *a.* Hiſtorians by their neglecting to circumſtantiate things aright, throw us into inextricable uncertainties. 615. *a. b.* III. 485. *a. b.* The antient Hiſtorians do not equal ſome of our Moderns. II. 550. *a* Hiſtorians ſometimes contradict one another ſo much, that it is difficult to chuſe the beſt account. 635. *b.* Ought never to ſuppreſs any thing that may ſerve to diſcover their Actors characters, and mark the extent of their virtues and vices. 685. *a.* It is good to accuſtom young readers to ſeek among their variations for the ground of the greateſt probabilities. 727. *a.* Are guilty of an unpardonable crime by ſuppreſſing ſome facts. 759. *b.* Deſerve but little credit when they relate prodiges. 771. *b.* There are people among them as well as among the populace. 850. *b.* It fares with them as with travellers. III. 121. *a.* Their duty in relation to facts which they do not believe to be true. 226. *b.* 227. *a.* Have been very bold as to the ſpeeches mentioned by them. 274. *a.* One of the cauſes of the variations which creep into their accounts. 314. *a. b.* The true character of an Hiſtorian. 336. *a. b.* IV. 861. *b.* 862. *a. b.* 863. *a.* Moſt of them are credulous and liars. III. 416. *a. b.* Very often vent the fancies of their own brain, in order to make uſe of their collections. 418. *a. b.* 419. *a.* Love to deſcribe great events. 433. *b.* People ſeldom diſpute about what religion they were of. IV. 104. *a. b.* 105. *a.* Ought to be diſintereſted. 258. *a. b.* Their variations about the moſt memorable adventures. 746. *a.* Ought not to diſguiſe things through an affected modeſty. V. 420. *a. b.* 421. *a. b.* That which charms moſt in an Hiſtorian. 263. *a. b.* And what is the moſt difficult part of his taſk. 264. *b.* Whether he ought to ſuppreſs the obſcenities of thoſe whoſe Hiſtory he writes. 265. *a. b.* 266. *a. b.* When their miſtakes ought to be excuſed, and when not. 359. *b.* 360. *a. b.* A ſatirical genius is incapable of diſcharging the duties of an Hiſtorian well. 362. *a. b.* Sometimes miſrepreſents the moſt eſſential qualities of an action. *ibid. b.* The modern ones are too prolix, and the antient ones too conciſe. 744. Many of them perpetuate falſities. 748. *and a. b.* One of the cauſes of their illuſions. *ibid.* Whether they ought to have gratitude. 531. *a. b.* Are often accuſed of being partial for no other reaſon, but becauſe thoſe who accuſe them are remarkably ſo themſelves. II. 310. *a. b.* It is more difficult to appear a faithful Hiſtorian, than to be ſuch in reality. *ibid. b.* The imprudence of an Hiſtorian, who ſhould dedicate his book to a monarch, whoſe miſconduct he had taken the liberty to cenſure. 311. *b.* 312. *a. b.* Ought not to follow popular opinions, when they agree not with authors. 770. *b.* Ought to be perfectly diſintereſted. III. 345. *a. b.* Whoever conceives a reſentment againſt a nation, ought to abſtain from writing its Hiſtory. *ibid. b.* An exact Hiſtorian always chuſes his words with ſo much care that he does not leave his readers to gueſs. IV. 211. *a.* Morally and even naturally impoſſible, that they ſhould all be ſilent upon ſome remarkable adventures. 734. *b.* Ought to relate not only the actions of Heretics, but likewiſe the ſtrong and the weak ſide of their opinions. V. 810. Ought to deſcribe people as they really were, and to ſuppreſs nothing. 812. Their higheſt glory is to do juſtice to their greateſt enemies. 801. A great many people know no difference betwixt them and Encomiaſts. 804.

Hiſtories general, it is the cuſtom of thoſe who reprint them, to add ſuch things as have happened between

between the former editions. IV. 210. *b*. And when they find a continuation ready done, they chuſe rather to copy it, than be at the trouble to compoſe a new one. *ibid.*

Hiſtories Sacred, at the ſame time that the people were forbidden to ſee them in the book which contains them in purity, they were allowed to ſee them upon the ſtage, ſullied with a thouſand groſs inventions. II. 477. *b*. 478. *a*.

Hiſtoriographer, is not to be truſted to. II. 131. *b*. A famous one who confeſſed ingenuouſly, that he did not know in what age Philip the Fair lived. 374. *b*.

Hobbes, his principles of Philoſophy were not proper to rid him from the fear of the apparitions of ſpirits. III. 471. *a*. *b*. What he did to put the Engliſh out of conceit with the republican ſpirit. 467. *and*. *a*. *b*. 468. *a*. IV. 581. *b*.

Hofman (Caſpar) cenſured with reſpect to du Laurens. III. 746. *b*. *n*. (12).

Hofman (Melchior) Prateolus and Gualtier pretend that he was the founder of an imaginary ſect, called Melchiorites. IV. 193.

Hog (Trojan) what the antient Romans underſtood by that. V. 387. *b*.

Holland (Philemon) tranſlates Bauderon's Pharmacopœia into Latin. I. 677. *b*. 678. *a*.

Holland, if Horace had ſeen the exceſſive care that is taken by the people of that country, in keeping their houſes clean, he would have called it a falſe neatneſs. I. 187. *b*. Its ſtates order a theſis concerning the ſovereignty to be condemned. II. 688. *a*. Holland and Zeland offer to acknowledge Queen Elizabeth for their ſovereign. 753. The Roman Catholics are promiſed a free exerciſe of their religion there. III. 675. *a*. It is the great ark of the Fugitives. 688. What a Turkiſh Emperor ſaid of it. 806. *a*. It is difficult to find Printers there, except in two caſes. IV. 476. *b*. 477. *a*. *b*. *n*. (7).

Hollanders, how vindicated from the accuſation of having ruined the French army. III. 822. *a*. *b*. Had rather have the Spaniards for their neighbours than the French. 829. *b*.

Homœomeries. The true idea that ſhould be formed of them. I. 296. *b*. 297. *a*. *b*. Have conſequences full of difficulties. 297. *a*. *b*. The very foundation of this hypotheſis may be deſtroyed. 297. *b*. It implies many contradictions. *ibid.* Whether their formation requires an intelligence. 304. *b*. 305. *a*.

Homer cenſured for the ſpeech of Phœnix. I. 79. *b*. One of his epiſodes has ſerved Virgil as a model for one of the beſt paſſages of the Æneid. 80. *b*. Had no manner of idea of Heroiſm. 81. *b*. Obtains by his offerings a ſight of Achilles, but cannot bear the ſplendor of the glory which ſurrounds him. 85. *b*. There are three verſes in the Iliad which it is pretended are not his. 157. Anaxagoras was the firſt, who ſuppoſed that his poems were moral works. 306. He was too talkative and too downright. 333. *b*. Myſteries which are ſaid to be contained in the two firſt letters of his Iliad. 374. *a*. Recourſe is had to Magic, in order to diſcover his country. *ibid.* Arceſilaus called him his miſtreſs. 408. *a*. His poems reviſed by Ariſtarchus the Grammarian. 450. *and* *b*. 451. *a*. And his two great works divided by the ſame author. 451. *b*. 452. *a*. The tradition concerning his death. 473. *b*. The Poets that have come after him, have made uſe of his inventions. II. 58. *a*. *b*. The ideas of reaſon were very much confuſed in his time. 139. *b*. Introduces a thouſand miſchiefs by his poetical impieties. III. 134. *b*. Deſcribes no body by names borrowed from the mothers. IV. 232. *a*. His ſimplicity. 344. *b*. Does not make Telemachus ſpeak with reſpect enough to his mother. 540. *b*. Two great provinces ſtrive which ſhall have him. 594. *a*. Compares men to the leaves of trees, to birds and to flies. 657. *a*. *b*. Whence it happens that there has been ſo much difficulty in fixing upon the place of his birth. 924. *a*. *b*. Whether he has mentioned the Jews. V. 309. *a*. *b*. Was very ignorant of the globe. III. 787. J. Spondanus is the firſt that writes notes upon him in Latin. V. 224. *a*.

Homonymi, the meaning of that word. I. 232. *a*. Antient authors have wrote *de Homonymis* as well as Allatius. *ibid.*

Honey, who invented the ſecret of extracting it. I. 455. *a*. Its virtue for preſerving health. II. 638. *b*.

Honorius, Alypius preſents to him the requeſt of the Clergy of Africa. I. 229. *a*. *b*. 230. *a*.

Honour, its laws looked upon as mere chimeras by a lady. I. 496. *a*. Some people want to enjoy it, and to have the glory of deſpiſing it at the ſame time. 680. *b*. What power the point of honour has over women. IV. 502. *a*. *b*. &c.

Honſdorf, or *Hondorf*, compiler of examples of the Divine Juſtice. III. 573. *b*. 574. *a*. Cited. 165. *n*. (*a*), (*d*), (1).

Hoornbeeck, that Divine's juſt complaint againſt the Antitrinitarians. II. 19. *b*.

Horace gives elogies to Homer which he does not deſerve. I. 79. *b*. Cited with regard to Poets, that write in their old-age. 120. *a*. *n*. (2). Juſtified in his cenſuring Agamemnon for having left Ajax unburied. 161. *a*. *b*. Whence it is that he was ſo ingenious as to confeſs that he fled from battle, and threw down his arms. 189. *a*. *b*. Ridicules a Poet that made two hundred verſes in an hour. 665. *a*. Makes uſe of a pitiful argument. II. 139. *b*. 140. *a*. 342. *a*. Is miſunderſtood concerning the laws againſt ſatires. 355. *a*. *b*. Whether, being himſelf an Epicurean, he could laugh at his brethren. 388. *b*. 389. *a*. Falls upon the admirers of the Antients with a *Sorites*. 494. *a*. Why he inſults the Jewiſh nation, where he ſpeaks of the miraculous ſtone at Egnatia. 745. *a*. *b*. A paſſage of this Poet concerning Fannius very difficult to be underſtood. III. 8. *a*. *b*. 9. *a*. *b*. A thought of his applied to the Guiſes. 292. *b*. *n*. (3). What he would have preferred to the reputation of being a fine writer. IV. 743. *a*. *n*. (16). What he ſays of thoſe who affected to make uſe of old words. 830. *b*. *n*. (49).

Horantius writes a piece againſt Baius. I. 609. *a*.

Horne (John van), his notes upon Botal's works. II. 99.

Hornius, a miſtake of that author's. II. 16. *b*. 17. *a*.

Horns (metaphorical), the Antients prayed that they might light upon evil-doers. II. 247. *b*. A very curious diſpute about them. III. 631. *a*. *b*. 632. *a*.

Horoſcopes, Aſtrologers who made that of Jeſus Chriſt. I. 164. *b*. II. 319. *b*. 320. *a*. Their uncertainty. III. 401. *a*. *b*.

Horſe which Pliny ſpoke of. I. 120. *b*. Mares which neighed at the ſight of a painted horſe. 369. *a*. *b*. A fatality which was ſaid to attend the horſe of Sejanus. II. 348. *b*. 349. *a*. Horſes that grew better as they grew older. 309. *b*. A brazen horſe that ſtirred up luſtful deſires. V. 767. A horſe thirty-eight years old, whoſe maſter leaves him a penſion, with a meadow, and his liberty. IV. 917, 918. Other examples of gratitude to horſes. 918. *a*. *b*. Others. *ibid.* A contrary example. *ibid.*

Hoſmannus, a chimerical Hereſiarch which Moreri has given us, having been deceived by an error of the preſs. IV. 193.

Hoſpinian (Rodolphus) gives a very large detail of the variations of the Confeſſion of Augſburg. II. 122. *b*.

Hoſpital (Michael de l'), his maſs becomes a proverb. III. 506. *b*. Called an Atheiſt by ſome men. 510. *a*. Approved the doctrine of the Proteſtants in his heart. *ibid.* *b*. Diſcharged the duty of a Chancellor well. 513. *b*. 514. *a*. Supported the French monarchy by his extraordinary qualities. 865. Reſembled Ariſtotle. IV. 504. *b*.

Hoſt, a miracle which is ſaid to have been manifeſted upon a hoſt. III. 840. *a*. *b*.

Hoſtienſis, the advice which he gives to midwives, touching the women they inſpect. IV. 800. *b*.

Hôtel de Flandres, the place where they exhibited dramatical repreſentations of the ſtories of ſacred Scripture. II. 477. *b*.

Hot-headed men, how apt they are to judge raſhly. III. 42. *a*. *b*.

Hotman (Antony) affirms, that the method of waſhing women who are to be inſpected at a congreſs is deceitful. IV. 800. *b*.

Hotman (Francis) ill-defended by Beza. III. 523. *b*. 524. *a*. Turns into ridicule a queſtion which Calderini aſked his wife, and the anſwer that ſhe gave him. I. 325. *b*. Criticized concerning an epigram upon Julius II. III. 610. *b.* 611. *a.* His complaints againſt Stouppa for want of religion. V. 247. *a. b.* Thoſe that anſwered his *Franco-Gallia.* 417. *a. b.*

Houliere (Madam. des) cited. III. 393. *a.* What ſhe ſays of Reaſon. IV. 440. *a. n.* (69). A ballad of her's. 503. *b.* 504. *a. n.* (64). The elevation and depth of her morality. 687. *a. b.* Gives way her ſelf to the vanity which ſhe blames in others. *ibid. a.*

Houſes (Noble), a book of John le Feron upon that ſubject. III. 27. *and a.*

Houſſaie (Amelot de la) refuſes to reform Oſſat's language. IV. 427. *a. b.*

Howard, Admiral of England, is the cauſe of the Earl of Eſſex's death, and why. II. 759. *a. b.*

Huber, his apology for the Hollanders in anſwer to the accuſations of Cavalier Nani. III. 822. *a.*

Huberus (Samuel), Miniſter of a village near Bearn, gets himſelf expelled by his boldneſs in contradicting ſome of the doctrines of Beza. III. 535. *a. b.* Retires to Wirtemberg, and is expelled from thence for teaching that God has elected all men to eternal life. *ibid. b.* Retires to Ratiſbon, where, continuing obſtinate in his errors, he is deprived of his place. *ibid.* Had the two chief qualifications of a good Diſputant. V. 102. *a.*

Huet, Biſhop of Avranches, why he did not finiſh his Latin tranſlation of a Greek romance. III. 866. *a.* What he thinks of the character of theſe kind of writings. *ibid. and b.*

Huguenots, what ſort of ſermons they like beſt. II. 520. *b.* Party-Huguenots, and State-Huguenots. III. 39. *a. n.* (7). What opinions they were of each of them in the aſſembly of Saumur, and who the heads of thoſe opinions were. *ibid. a.* An Abbot of the monaſtery of the order of Citeaux, who was a Huguenot. I. 737. *b.* 738. *a. b.*

Humility is not always found with the ſtaff and the wallet. II. 665, 666. *and b.*

Humouriſts, how much their academy is eſteemed at Rome. IV. 531. *a.*

Hunaud ſubmits to Charles Martel, and has the Duchy of Aquitain granted him. II. 851.

Hungary (Lewis, King of), loſes a battle againſt the Turks, and is ſmothered in a bog. III. 871. *a.*

Hungary (Andrew, ſon of Charles, King of), ſtrangled, how, and for what reaſon. IV. 300, 301. *a.* How uſed after his death. 305. *a. b.*

Hunting, the Biſhops of the XVIth century gave themſelves to it very much. IV. 819. *b.* It was forbid them by the canons. *ibid.*

Hurtado, his writings are full of ſolecisms. IV. 829. *a.*

Hus (John), the advice that was given him before his condemnation. I. 165. *a. b.* By whom he was condemned to death. *ibid.* An account of his puniſhment given by Poggius. II. 277. *a. b.* Alledges the adventure of the She-Pope before the Council of Conſtance, and is not cenſured for it. IV. 710. *b.*

Huſband, in what caſe it is a piece of leudneſs in him to come near his wife. IV. 761. *a.* A huſband that is an author, may be either an eaſy huſband, or a troubleſome one. V. 380. *b.* 381. *a.*

Huſbands: our laws do not ſuffer them to revenge the unfaithfulneſs of their wives, by putting them and their galants to death. II. 133. *b.* Should not be too long abſent from their wives. 743. *b.* Antiquity repreſents thoſe who were diſhonoured by their wives as extremely good-natured. III. 306. *a.* Are very often unacquainted with the galantries of their wives when they are the town-talk. 381. *b.* 382. *a.* Are no longer affected with their wives beauty at a certain period of time. 646. *a. b.* Love their wives beſt when they do not approach them but by ſtealth. 964. *a. b.* Are kind to their ſpouſes. IV. 220. *b.* Thoſe who are impotent ſhould, at leaſt, be civil and complaiſant to them. 760. *b.* The right which they had over their wives in antient times. V. 427. *a. b.*

Huſſites reproach the Roman Catholics with the ſtory of the She-Pope. IV. 710. *b.*

Hutten (John) killed by Duke Ulric of Wirtemberg. III. 539. Is digged up four years after his murther, and bleeds when they touch him. *ibid. a. b.*

Hutten (Ulric) publiſhed an invective againſt Alcander. I. 215. *b.*

Hutterus loads Bucer with reproaches for his ſentiments concerning Juſtification. II. 178. *a. b.*

J.

Achæus, a ſubtle Peripatetic, brings the queſtion concerning ſubſtantial forms into great repute in the univerſity at Leyden. III. 361, 362. *and a.*

Jacobins of Cologn, how they were forced to give ſatisfaction to the Count of Nevenar. III. 473. *a. b.* Launoi ſaid that he feared the Jacobins penknife more than their pen. 742. *b.* Thoſe of Florence make a ſtout reſiſtance when their convent is attacked in order to take Savonarola from thence. V. 66. *a. b.* The Council of Piſa promiſed them the canonization of this Monk, provided that they would declare themſelves againſt Pope Julius II. 69, 70, 71. Their behaviour in the affair of Savonarola, when challenged to the trial of fire. 62. *a. b. &c.*

Jaldabaoth, what that is, according to ſome antient Heretics. II. 851. *b.* 852. *a.*

Iambics, a ſort of verſe, by whom invented. III. 464. *a.*

James (Epiſtle of St), what Luther called it. III. 939. *b.* Was ſuſpected by a great many in the antient Church. 941. *b.* Althamerus attacks it with the utmoſt brutality. I. 235. *and a. b.* 236. *a. b.*

James I, King of England, is extremely angry with Thuanus for his Hiſtory. II. 281. *b.* Commands Camden to ſend him a catalogue of errors concerning the troubles of Scotland. *ibid.* Whether Camden's Annals were patched and curtailed by his order. 280. *b.* 281. *a.* Cauſes Pareus's Commentary on the Epiſtle to the Romans to be burnt by the hands of the hangman. IV. 473. *a. b.* Is cruelly treated in a ſatire. 795. *a. b.* His zeal againſt the Heretics. V. 509. *a. b.* How he uſed. Lipſius's book concerning N. D. of Hall. III. 847. *b.*

Jane of France, prodigies which Father de Bony ſays were obſerved upon the diſſolution of her marriage. III. 810. *b.*

Janſeniſm, what place it proceeded from in Holland, and who was its apoſtle. I. 499. *b.* What is its weak ſide according to the Moliniſts. IV. 846. *b. n.* (6).

Janſeniſts, the complaint that one of them makes againſt the Archbiſhop of Aix. I. 35. *b.* The reaſon of this complaint. *ibid. and* 36. *a. b.* Publiſh a pamphlet againſt Father Adam. 106. *a.* Thoſe who cenſured Odoricus Raynaldus are themſelves liable to cenſure. 179. *b.* 180. *a. b.* War raiſed betwixt them and the Jeſuits. 498. *a. b.* 499. *a.* Some of them are drawn into Noordſtrandt, which is attended with great law-ſuits. II. 111. *a.* The origin of their war with the Jeſuits. III. 133. *a. b.* The bulls of the Popes do not hinder them from proceeding in their diſputes. 390. *b.* Their Deputies, in their return from Rome to Paris, paſs by Zurich, where they viſit Hottinger. 526. *a.* Are very zealous in cauſing two decrees of the court of Rome to be printed. 567. *a. b.* Father le Tellier's Reflexions thereupon. *ibid.* The Janſeniſts compared in a ſermon to bull-dogs. IV. 64. *a. b.* De Marca oppoſed them greatly. 101. *a. b.* 102. *a.* Are accuſed of Calviniſm, for what reaſon. 123. *b.* Denote themſelves commonly in French by *on*, and why. 492. *a. b.* Are looked upon as the beſt Moraliſts. V. 847.

Janua (Joannes de), whether he and Jacobus de Voragine are one and the ſame author. I. 614. *a.* Miſtakes about this. *ibid. and b.*

Janua Cœlorum reſerata, what is made to appear in that book concerning Arianiſm. I. 476. *b.* Its author attacks *The Syſtem of the Church* in the ſtile of a Peripatetic Philoſopher, and quite overturns it. II. 540. *b.* What pretence was made uſe of for leaving it unanſwered. *ibid.*

Janua Linguarum reſarata, how many times printed, and in how many languages. II. 536. *a. b.*

Japoneſe, whether there is any thing ſurpriſing in their having perſecuted the Chriſtians. III. 551. *a.*

Jaqueline of Bavaria. Her Hiſtory. II. 211. *b*. 212. *a*. Marries Francis de Boiſel. 90. *a*. *b*. Gives all her dominions to the Duke of Burgundy to ſave her huſband's life. *ibid*. Died in 1436. *ibid*. *b*.

Jaquemot (Theodore) tranſlates ſeveral of Joſeph Hall's books into French. III. 342.

Jardins (La Demoiſelle de) cited. I. 460. *b*.

Jarrige cited. I. 108. *b*. 109. *a*.

Jaſon chief of the Argonauts. III. 465. *a*. *b*. The conqueſt of the Golden Fleece is propoſed to him. IV. 532. *b*. 533. *a*.

Jaſon, a Civilian, has given the Doctors of Law a very bad example. I. 196. *a*.

Javerſac, railleries on him. IV. 284. *b*.

Jaureguy (John) aſſaſſinates the Prince of Orange. II. 459. *a*. *n*. (27). A Jacobin chuſes rather to be ſtrangled than reveal his confeſſion. 460. *b*.

Ibycus, why he called the Lacedæmonian maids Phænomerides. III. 968. *b*.

Ibis: no piece ever diſcovered more gall than Ovid's poem againſt Ibis. IV. 451. *b*. 452. *a*. *b*. The beſt commentary extant upon that ſatire is Mr Boiſſeu's. 452. *a*. The Abbé de Marolles dedicates his tranſlation of that Poem to James Pinou. *ibid*. *b*. 651.

Icarius erects a ſtatue of modeſty. IV. 538. *a*. *b*.

Iche (d') Governor of la Motte is taken off by a canon-ball, whilſt he defends it. IV. 278. *a*.

Icon Baſilike, the author of that book. IV. 221. *a*. *b*.

Iconoclaſts. Their proceedings againſt images, leſſen the cruelty of the revenge which their enemies took. II. 512. *a*. *b*. Thoſe that have wrote againſt them, have made the truth of their Hiſtories ſuſpected by their idle ſtories. 587. *a*. *b*.

Ideas: Mallebranche's doctrine, that our ideas are diſtinct from our underſtanding, is an old one. I. 255. 555. *a*. II. 642. *b*. What difference there is between our ſenſations and our ideas. 781. *a*. *b*. Nothing is more difficult for a Prince than to anſwer the high ideas which a whole people have preconceived of him, and nothing more blaſting to his reputation, than not to anſwer them. V. 654.

Idem; that word is ſometimes uſed for *ſimile*. V. 214. *a*. *b*.

Idolaters, it is more ſurprizing that they have done good actions, than that Atheiſts have lived like honeſt men. V. 811.

Idols, who was the firſt that made them of clay. I. 44. *b*. What Democritus and Epicurus underſtood by that word. II. 388. *a*.

Jealous, thoſe that are moſt ſo, truſt their wives to the care of eunuchs. I. 31. *b*.

Jealouſy, a ſingular example of its force. II. 277. *a*. The jealouſy of men is not ſo copious in inventions as the love of women. 533. *a*. Diſpoſes men to rail againſt the fair ſex in general. 857. *a*. *b*. The rack which thoſe who are poſſeſſed with it ſuffer. III. 643. *b*. Whether it be neceſſary in ſociety. 965. *a*. Is not always uniform, in its cauſes and effects. IV. 48. *a*. Some conſiderations on this paſſion. V. 110. *a*. *b*.

Jeniſon (Robert) a Jeſuit, challenges Sir Humphry Lynde, and anſwers his *Safe Way*. III. 971. *a*. *b*.

Jeremiah, a paſſage of his letter, as it is inſerted in the book of Baruch. I. 597. *a*. *n*. (14).

Jerom, his friendſhip for Paula, makes ill-natured people ſlander him. I. 31. *b*. Said that the ſnares of beautiful women ought to be avoided by flight. III. 65. *a*. *b*. His maxims concerning marriage in general, and ſecond marriages in particular. 192. *a*. How he explains what is ſaid of David's taking the Shunamite to bed with him. 281. *a*. *b*. What he affirms concerning the ſhame that people ought to have of their own nakedneſs. V. 130. *b*. Was againſt young girls being ever abſent from their mothers, in devotional watchings. 337. *a*. His invectives againſt Vigilantius. 471. *a*. *b*. Whether we ought to truſt the repreſentation which he gives us of that man's opinions. *ibid*. *b*.

Jeruſalem, its deſtruction is a powerful argument againſt the Jews. I. 173. *b*. Its temple is tried to be re-built in vain. 228. The deſcription of its temple is a very difficult thing. 618. *a*.

Jeſſe, the ſtory which the Rabbins tell of him. II. 605. *a*. *b*.

Jeſters, what thoſe who have wit do. I. 128. *b*. 701. *b*. Prefer their jeſts to their frauds. 187. *a*. Never ought to rally upon a falſe fact. II. 527. *a*. Thoſe who ſet up for Jeſters, find themſelves obliged to divert people at their own coſt. 599. *a*. Sacrifice every thing to their paſſion for putting off a jeſt. III. 137. *a*. *b*.

Jeſting: the power of the habit of jeſting. I. 751. *a*.

Jeſts: a jeſt ſaves a ſoldier's life. I. 709. *a*. Some jeſts examined. II. 527. *a*. *b*. See *Railleries*.

Jeſuits, why they are more diſagreeable to the Senate of Venice, than the other Monks are. I. 30. *b*. Some of them ſpeak diſreſpectfully of St Auſtin. 106. *a*. 109. *a*. *b*. Entice away young men, whoſe education is committed to them. 169. 642. The anſwer made by their Provincial. 169. *a*. *b*. Their ſociety has been hitherto the moſt learned of all regular ſocieties. 220. *a*. Authors of a great many libels. *ibid*. *b*. Whether they are as learned now as formerly. *ibid*. 221. *a*. *b*. Very ſevere ſpeeches made againſt them. 251. From whoſe pen their Catechiſm came. 484. *b*. Were formidable, notwithſtanding the decree of their baniſhment. *ibid*. The war betwixt them and the Janſeniſts breaks out again. 498. *a*. Whether they acted imprudently in cauſing the elogies of Mr Arnauld and Mr Paſcal to be ſuppreſſed. *ibid*. *and b*. 499. *a*. It is doing them ſervice to publiſh calumnies againſt them, which may eaſily be confuted. 726. *b*. 727. *a*. The ſmall number of Anti-Moliniſts which they ſuffer in their great body is of ſome uſe. 728. *a*. *b*. Who was the firſt of their order that taught Philoſophy at Paris. II. 590. A certain Jeſuit does a kind thing to a Proteſtant. 663. *a*. There are very few univerſities with which the Jeſuits have not had ſome diſpute. 700. *b*. *n*. (2). Their cabals to hinder the examination of their books. III. 133. *a*. *b*. A ſatire againſt them. 563. *b*. 564. *a*. *b*. Diſpute with the other Catholics concerning Epiſcopal juriſdiction. 665. *a*. *b*. Whether their inſtitution, as well as that of other Monks, be founded on Fanaticiſm. 885. *b*. Were called Theatins, and why. 887. *a*. *b*. Have been calumniated from their firſt eſtabliſhment. 888. *b*. The moſt horrible things that can be ſaid againſt them become probable without any proof. 891. *a*. *b*. 892. *a*. *b*. They turn the hatred of the world againſt them to their advantage. *ibid*. *b*. 893. *a*. *b*. The doctrines which have rendered them odious, were hatched before their time: they have only raiſed conſequence upon conſequence. *ibid*. *b*. 894. *a*. Why they have been formally and expreſsly charged with theſe doctrines. *ibid*. *b*. Whether there be two ſorts of them, the one married and the other unmarried. 897. *b*. 898. *a*. *b*. And whether they have great credit with the Imperial Court. 898. *a*. *b*. What their motive is for teaching the immaculate conception of the Holy Virgin. 932. *a*. How they attacked Stephen Paſquier, concerning his plea againſt them. IV. 80. *a*. *b*. How far ſome of them have carried the love of chaſtity. 125. *a*. *b*. 126. *a*. And by what means they ſaid in Spain, that they kept themſelves always chaſte, though converſing familiarly with fine women. 125. *b*. 126. *a*. How the faults in the government of their ſociety were publiſhed. 131. *b*. They decry the fathers of the Oratory in Mons and Liege, as Neſtorians. 350. *a*. *b*. How they vindicate themſelves from the accuſation of corrupting Chriſtian Morality. 475. *a*. *b*. Very few of them turn Proteſtants. 855. *b*. 856. *a*. Their plea, that the knowledge of the true God has laſted among the Chineſe, for a great many ages, and that the Divine honours paid to Confucius, were purely civil, may be ſupported by what Mr Hyde affirms concerning the Perſians. V. 637. *b*. 638. *a*. Their Chamber of Meditations, what it is. II. 457. *a*. Say that it is lawful to kill the King, as being out of the Church, and not approved of by the Pope. *ibid*. Suſpected of having had a hand in the aſſaſſination committed by Chaſtel. 456. *a*. *b*. 457. *a*. 459. *b*. The difference there is in the accounts of this aſſaſſination. 460. *b*. 461. *a*. *b*. Baniſhed from France by an arrêt of the Parliament of Paris. 457. Spread about an advertiſement in Latin and French againſt that arrêt. *ibid*. *b*. It is from their ſchool that Aſſaſſins proceed. 459. *b*.

The hardſhips to which they reduce their Father William Criton. 577. *a. b.* Articles propoſed to Lewis XIII, for their reformation. *ibid. a.* Joſeph Hall bore a great hatred to them. III. 342. *a. b.* Their colleges riſe every where. *ibid. b.* Fare beſt when they are moſt curſed. *ibid.* A prophecy concerning them. *ibid.* An examination of what Salmaſius ſaid touching the edition of Anaſtaſius, publiſhed by the Jeſuits of Mayence. IV. 726. *b.* 727. *a. b.* Their diſputes with the Proteſtants were never ſo violent, as during the firſt thirty years of the XVIIth century. 727. *a.* A conjecture upon one of the reaſons which obliged the Parliament of Paris to involve them in the cauſe of Chaſtel and Guignard. III. 279. *and b.* 280. *and a. b.* What they anſwered when they were reproached with giving J. Guignard a place in their Martyrology. 277. *a. b.* Extenuate the outrageouſneſs of his tenets. *ibid. b.* 278. *a. b.* Do not pretend to vindicate him as to his propoſition about killing the King. *ibid.* Antimonarchical maxims are attributed eſpecially to them. 279. *b.* 280. *a.* Four brothers who were Jeſuits. I. 747.

Jeſuiteſſes, a ſociety of certain women and maids who took that name. IV. 26. *a. b.* Aboliſhed by the bull of Urban VIII. *ibid. b.*

Jeſus Chriſt, according to Antoinette Bourignon, his human nature was produced by Adam. I. 102. *b.* 103. *a.* Whether his birth and his miracles could have been foretold by Aſtrology. 164. *b.* 165. *a.* II. 319. *b.* 320. *a. b.* Explication of his remaining three days and three nights in the bowels of the earth. I. 174. *a. b.* The Pagans drew a parallel between him and Apollonius Tyanæus. 380. *b.* They compared his miracles likewiſe with thoſe of Apuleius. 392. *a. b.* The Carpocratians had his image, which they ſaid was procured by Pilate. 472. *a.* Whether his birth impoſed ſilence on the oracles of Paganiſm. 592. *a.* What authors have prophanely attempted to calculate his nativity. II. 319. *b.* 320. *a.* In what ſenſe he is called the *Word* and the *Image*. 434. *b.* Arnobius ſays that he ſpoke but one language, which every one of his auditors took to be his own natural tongue. 517. *a. b.* The hiſtory of his life written in the Perſian language, by the Jeſuit Jerome Xavier. 663. *b.* Some have taught that he died both as to his human and divine nature. IV. 288. *b.* Whether he be our Mediator only as he is man. V. 228. *b.* 229. *a. b.* 230. *b.* His ſoul did not underſtand the numbers of Daniel. II. 122. *a. b.* A pretended letter of Lentulus, containing a portrait of Jeſus Chriſt, is given as an authentic piece by J. Huarte. III. 528. Ruſſilian ſays that he was ſubject to the influences of the ſtars. IV. 940. *a. b.*

Jewels. The Apoplexy of which the Emperor Leo IV, and Pope Paul II, died, was occaſioned by their weight or coldneſs. IV. 512. *a. b.*

Jews, the fabulous accounts which they have publiſhed upon the ſtory of Abimelech's diſtemper. I. 38. *b.* 39. *a.* Are obliged to the number of three hundred thouſand, to depart out of the diminions of the Catholic King in one day. 41. *b.* Believe that Adam, Abraham, and David, have had the ſame ſoul, which will likewiſe be that of the Meſſiah. 46. Their fantaſtical opinion about Adam's creation. 102. *a. b.* Plutarch pretends that their religion, their feaſts, their ceremonies were much the ſame with thoſe practiſed in Greece to Bacchus. 115. *a.* Think that an huſband ought not to cohabit with a woman after he has found her barren, for the ſpace of ten years. 122. *b.* The people of Alexandria complain againſt them to Caligula. 374. *and b.* Are the only ſubjects who refuſe to honour that Emperor as a God. *ibid.* There were ſome who gave them the ſame original as the Gymnoſophiſts. 466. *a.* What proof of their courage thoſe that followed Barcochebas were obliged to give. 648. *a.* Are diſturbed on account of circumciſing their children. 647. *a.* Their cuſtom at the birth of a ſon or daughter. *ibid. and b.* The great ſlaughter of this people. 649. *a. b.* Their abhorrence for the fair of the turpentine-tree. 648. *b.* Are prohibited from returning to Jeruſalem. *ibid.* And even from coming near it. *ibid.* And which is ſtill more from entering into the country of Judea. *ibid.* Have their ears cut off, and are tranſported into Spain. *ibid.* What they ſay of Ariſtotle. II. 644. *a.* Their abſurd whims concerning Elijah and Eliſhah. 752, 753. *and b.* And concerning Ezekiel and his tomb. 879. *and a. b.* 880. *and a.* V. 544. *b.* 545. *a.* The invocation of the ſaints has been long ſince practiſed by them. II. 879. *b.* The Jews of the VIth Century who only quote traditions handed down by word of mouth, are no more to be believed, than the Jews of the XVIIth, in things which concern the Patriarchs and Prophets. 829. *b.* Are all ordered by Tiberius to depart from Rome, and why. III. 119. *b.* Forced to be baptized. 220. *a.* What ſynagogues the laws permit them to poſſeſs. *ibid.* Driven from Francfort by popular commotions. 387. Are falſely accuſed of having pricked an hoſt with needles, in order to draw blood from it. 840. *a. b.* The diſputes which they pretend Alexander determined in their favour, are chimeras. IV. 8. *b.* Why the Turks deteſt them above all other people in the world. 50. *b.* 51. *a.* Are made to wear the letter *Thau*. 309. *b.* Whether they believed the doctrine of a future ſtate as an article of faith. V. 8. *a. b.* Had a Sadducee ſometimes for their high-prieſt. 12. *b.* What a Rabbin has related concerning their antient library. 544. *b.* 545. *a.* The Hiſtory of the Jewiſh religion by J. Baſnage. I. 672. *a.*

Ignatius (St), Vedelius's notes upon his letters, what character they bear. V. 445. *b.*

Ignatius (de Loyola) his conformity with St Auguſtin. IV. 1. *a. b.*

Ignorance. What Heſiod ſays of it. I. 411. *a.* Is one of the impenetrable ſhields againſt the darts of the Pyrrhoniſts. IV. 654. *a.* Whether that which they call invincible will excuſe. 874. *a. b.* 875. *a. b.* 929. *a. b.* 930. *a.* May do a great deal of miſchief. V. 229. *b.* 230. *a.* Diſtinguiſhed from error. 372. *b.* &c. Is the cauſe that Ruyſbroeck is looked upon as inſpired. IV. 942. *a. b.*

Ignorance (invincible) a Monk who excuſes it. V. 25.

Iſlands Cyclades, Dicæarchus attacks them againſt all right and juſtice. II. 662.

Iliad, Andromache's dialogue with Hector, is one of the beſt paſſages in it. I. 333. *b.* Which however has too much ſimplicity. *ibid.* Myſteries contained in the two firſt letters of this Poem. 374. *a.* Obſervation upon the two Poems of the Iliad and the Odyſſey. *ibid. and b.*

Iliad (leſſer) Pindarus Thebanus is the author of it. I. 81. *b.*

Illyricus, his omiſſion in his *Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis*, made amends for by other compilers. III. 687. *a.* Would not have ſacrificed a ſurplice for the ſake of peace. IV. 185. *b.*

Images, the objects of devotion are repreſented by theſe in the air and ſhape which workmen pleaſe to give them. II. 729. *a. b.* III. 57. *a. b.* John du Tillet, Biſhop of Meaux, inveighs with great force againſt the abuſe of them. V. 356. *a.*

Images of wax, made uſe of to cauſe love or ſickneſs. IV. 936. *a. b.* 937. *a. b.* 939. *b.* 940. *a. b.*

Imma, daughter to Charlemagne, her amours with the Secretary of the Emperor her father. II. 744. *a. b.* 745. *a. b.*

Immenſity. The received opinion of the Immenſity of God, productive of many empty and conceited notions. III. 100. *a. b.* 101. *a. b.*

Immortality, it is not the quantity of a man's works, that procures it. IV. 598. *a.* Increaſes miſery. III. 643. *b.* Whether the Immortality of the ſoul can be proved by Ariſtotle's principles. V. 593. *a.* See *Soul.*

Immutability, the idea we ſhould form of it. V. 219. *a. b.* &c.

Impiety; acts of impiety. I. 160. *b.* 161. *a.* 701. *a. b.* Impieties touching the miracles of Moſes, and generally touching the whole Scripture. II. 156. *a.* Great piety and great impiety are equally uncommon. 451. *b.* Dicæarchus erects an altar to it, upon which he celebrates the Divine ſervice. 662. The Fathers of the Church relate the impieties of Heretics. III. 135. *b.*

Impious men bely their courage, when they lie on their death-bed. II. 12. *b.* 13. *a.* 647. *and b.* 648. *a. b.*

Impoſition of hands, burleſqued in *the Acts of the Apoſtles in verſe*. II. 479. *a. b.*

Impoſſible: whether all that is not, all that never was, and all that never ſhall be, is impoſſible. II. 495. *b.* 496. *a. b.*

Impoſtors (public) the puniſhing them ſeverely would have a good effect. I. 790. *a. b.* The advantages which factious people make of Impoſtors. II. 721. *a. b.*

Impotency reckoned a very great misfortune. II. 315. *a. b.* A wife who concealed this infirmity in her huſband, and comforted him under it. III. 187. *a. b.* How diſhonourable it is for women to enter proceſſes of impotency. IV. 799. *a. b. &c.*

Impotent, whether the devil can make people impotent, by doing what in French is vulgarly called *nouer l'aiguillette.* I. 38. *b.* 39. *a.* A French Phyſician pretends that there is daily experience of this, and injudiciouſly quotes Tacitus thereupon. IV. 385. *a. b.*

Imprecation: a ſingular effect of an imprecation. I. 560. *a. b.*

Imprudence: ill ſucceſs ſhould not be always attributed to imprudence. I. 365. *b.*

Impunity makes ſome people more fierce and inſolent. II. 195. *a. b.*

Impurity, Diogenes the Cynic endeavoured to juſtify this vice. II. 669. *b.* 670. *a.* Its connexion with good chear. 822. *a. b.* A method made uſe of at Rome to hinder its exceſs. V. 268. *a.* See *Leudneſs.*

Impurities; there are ſome that ought never to be deſcribed under any pretence. V. 39. *a. b.* 40. *a. b.* 41. *a. b.*

Impute: a rule which thoſe ought to follow who impute certain things to an author. I. 652. *a.*

Inattention: remark upon the effects of inattention to which even the greateſt men are liable. II. 388. *b.* 389. *a. b.* 390. *a. b. &c.*

Incarnation, the firſt prelude to it. I. 102. *a.* Whether Ariſtotle had glimpſes of it. 471. *a. b.* An argument *ad hominem* in favour of the incarnation againſt the Rabbins. IV. 94. *a. b.*

Inchanters are more rare than ſorcerers. II. 243. *b.*

Incivility, whether the inſerting of obſcene things in a book deſerves that name. V. 848, 849.

Incomprehenſibility of things taught by Arceſilas more expreſly than was ever done before. I. 410. *b.* How far puſhed by the Academics. II. 325. *a. b.* 326. *a. b.* 327. *a.* A ſtory which is told in oppoſition to this doctrine. III. 697. *b.* 698. *a.* It is not men of a mean capacity who give into this opinion. V. 587. *b.* A remark which may ſtrengthen this opinion. 610. *b. & ſeq.* It is not a ſufficient reaſon for rejecting a doctrine. 820, 821. See *Pyrrhoniſts, Pyrrhoniſm.*

Incontinency is the ſtrongeſt pillar of the empire of gallantry. II. 602. *a.* Is a quality of conſtitution. IV. 332. *a.* See *Chaſtity.*

Incontinent: an example which is propoſed to all incontinent perſons. I. 686. *b.*

Incredulous: there are two ſorts of incredulous people, with reſpect to the exiſtence or the non-exiſtence of a Deity. II. 648. *a. b.* The myſteries of the goſpel being above reaſon, the objections which they make thereto cannot be anſwered. V. 815. Our confeſſing this gives them no manner of advantage. 818, 819. 829.

Incubus's, hypotheſes concerning thoſe ſpirits. II. 113. *b.* 114. *a.*

Independants are againſt the Church's having the power of Excommunication. I. 96. *a.*

Index of the Inquiſition of Rome; the wrong judgment of its cenſors. IV. 719. *b.* Ordereth to expunge all praiſes given to Heretics. III. 438. *b.* 439. *a.* See *Inquiſition.*

Indexes have been called the ſoul of books. I. 319. *b.* A thought on Indexes. 362. *a.* Should be compoſed by the authors themſelves. *ibid.*

Indians, their inclination for wine. IV. 7. *a.* The Indian Hermits drive away all impure thoughts, by a cane which they hold in their hands. 126. *a.*

Indies, how far known before Ptolomy's time. IV. 808. *a. b.* 809. *a.*

Indifference in point of religion ſhocks more than a falſe worſhip, and why. I. 97. *b.*

Indiſcretion of boaſting to have received favours is never forgiven. I. 315. *a.*

Indolence: what Crantor ſaid againſt the indolence which was a doctrine of the Stoics. II. 561. *b.* 562. *a.*

Indulgences, a ſtanza on that ſubject. I. 139. *a.* Their credit is very little leſſened in the Romiſh Church. III. 87. *a.* How far the abuſe of them was carried in the court of Rome. 766. *b.* Were the firſt thing which Luther attacked. IV. 772. *a.*

Infallibility of the Church cannot be maintained as to facts. I. 494. *a.*

Infamy: Magiſtrates ought to be extremely cautious in inflicting a note of infamy. IV. 500. *b.*

Infant Baptiſm; in what manner Caſſander proves the doctrine of Infant Baptiſm to be apoſtolical. I. 288. *a.*

Infatuated Agents are a neceſſary evil to a party. II. 708. *a.*

Inferni (gli), a book of Doni with this title, where the different conditions of life are repreſented. II. 688. *b.* 689. *a.*

Infidels leſs dreaded than the promoters of Orthodoxy. I. 199. *a. b.* Whether Chriſtian Princes ought to make alliances with them for the good of their States. 407. *a. b.* Whether they ought to be converted by force as the Heretics are. III. 220. *b.* 221. *a.*

Informers, the only victory that an innocent and wiſe man ſhould deſire over them, is to eſcape whole and ſafe out of their hands. I. 777. *a.* Their character. *ibid.* Some of them will neither retract nor make good their accuſation. II. 253. *a.* Compared to dogs, who for the ſake of the public good are left to bark againſt every body. 372. *a. b.* Which makes the fate of mankind to be lamented. *ibid. b.* Take notice of the manner how people talk of news. II. 627. *a.* See *Accuſers.*

Ingratitude chiefly appears in the behaviour of children towards their fathers. II. 439. *b.* Produced by ſervices which cannot be acknowledged. 737. *a. b.*

Injuries: a treatiſe about the bearing of injuries, wrote by Donzellinus. II. 690. *a. b.* It was a rule of Bion's, that we ſhould bear injuries and civilities with the ſame tranquillity. 15. *a.* Princes are extremely nice and punctilious on this head. 445. *b.* An injury that is deſpiſed, falls of itſelf. V. 746.

Injurious reflexions which occaſioned the deſtruction of a town. IV. 278. *a. b.*

Injuſtice; it is uſual for thoſe who commit one to juſtify it by another. I. 718. *a.* Whether it be a means of proſperity. II. 165. *a. b.* Argued for by Carneades. 330. *a. b.* Dicæarchus erects an altar to it upon which he celebrates the Divine ſervice. 662.

Inlaudatus, Grammatical remarks on that word. II. 234. *a. b.*

Innocence proved by the fiery trial. I. 405. Oppreſſed innocence ſooner or later finds defenders. II. 783. No innocence can be proof againſt the choice of judges. III. 212. *b.* Is the moſt neceſſary qualification of an accuſer. IV. 781. *a.*

Innocent X, the Duke of Guiſe ſaid that he was a very great diſſembler. II. 472. *b.*

Innocent XI, his ill humour againſt the court of France was ſufficient to make him ſay that he did not approve of dragooning. II. 475. *b.* Feared the increaſe of the power of France more than he deſired the progreſs of the Catholic religion. 758. *b.* His partiality againſt France has done infinite ſervice to the Proteſtants. IV. 430.

Innovations are prejudicial to the public and academical tranquillity. I. 242. *b.* 243. *a.* People ſhould be contented to oppoſe fundamental innovations. 243. *a.* There are ſome which laſt long, and ſome which do not. IV. 353. *b.* 354. *a.*

Innovators boaſt of doing nothing but in imitation of the Antients. III. 230. *b.* A terrible maxim againſt them. V. 315. *b.* They are ſometimes neceſſary. I. 577. *a.* They affect to have devotees, and to make uſe of their intrigues. IV. 27. *b.*

Inquiſition has been ſilent with reſpect to a book full of abſurdities. I. 138. *b.* How people ought to behave towards this tribunal, whenever they paſs a ſentence like that which was paſſed by it upon Carranza. II. 337. *a. b.* Is a real abomination introduced into the holy places. *ibid. b.* Its unjuſt proceedings are ſometimes condemned. 656. *a. b.* 657. *a. b.* Hindered from being introduced into France. III. 506. *b.* 507. *a.* A certain author proves

proves the juſtice of this tribunal by ſcripture, and places the firſt inſtitution of it in the terreſtrial paradiſe. IV. 3. *b.* On what account chiefly it may be always turned into ridicule. 782. *a.* Its conduct is by no means uniform. V. 551. *b.* Condemns the book of the *Taxe de la Chancellerie Romaine* only as it is corrupted by the Heretics. I. 628. *b.* Brochard ſays that it is the abomination of deſolation foretold by Daniel and St Paul. II. 145. *a. b.* See *Index.*

Inquiſitors, of whatſoever religion they are, make all the cities where they grow powerful, enemies to learning. I. 147. The people will not ſuffer any recrimination to be uſed againſt them. 154. *b.* Their partial indulgence. *ibid.* It is a great triumph to eſcape out of their hands. 777. *a.* A reflexion of Mr Arnauld's on their behaviour with reſpect to certain books. II. 37. *a. b.* Whether indulgence ſhould be uſed towards them for the ſake of the public good. 372. *a. b.* Their immenſe power. III. 473. *b.* 474. *a.* Are often impoſed upon with reſpect to ſuch books as people have a mind to put out. V. 293. *a. b.* The quarrels which Valla had with them. 435. *a. b.* 436. *a. b.* Their villany and injuſtice. 453. *b.* 454. *a. b.* Their *Directory* by Nicolas Emeric, of which Francis Pegma publiſhed two editions. II. 749.

Inſcription, a proud one. III. 237. *b.*

Inſcriptions, the jealouſy which they have occaſioned ſometimes. V. 552. *b.* 553. *a. b.*

Inſects, their organs are infinitely more nice than thoſe of men. II. 636. *a.*

Inſpiration, whether it muſt be allowed with regard to the expreſſions in Scripture as well as the doctrines. I. 106. *a. b.* 107. *a. b.* Thoſe perſons who pretend to it are dangerous to a ſtate. 647. *b.* 648. *a.* No coherency muſt be expected from one that aſcribes every thing to inſpiration. II. 112. Exceſſive pride is the general fault of thoſe who pretend to it. 538. *a. b.* There is no great glory acquired by confuting them. III. 388. *a. b.* Ruyſbroëck, by reaſon of his ignorance, was looked upon as one who wrote by inſpiration. IV. 942.

Inſtability, an example of the inſtability of human things. I. 566. *b.*

Inſtitution (Calvin's), the Epiſtle Dedicatory of that book is one of the three or four prefatory diſcourſes that are admired the moſt. II. 261. *b.* An account of its different editions and corrections. 262. *a. b.* 263. *a.* For which Bolſec inſults Calvin. 262. *b.* Compared with Martyr's Common-Places. V. 86. *b.* The extraordinary eſteem which people have for it. *ibid.* 87. *a.* Abridged. *ibid.* A ſupplement to what has been ſaid of its different editions. *ibid. b.* & *ſeq.* Variations that are fouud between them. 87. *a. b.* Marlorat makes Indexes of them. 88. *a.* It has been printed an infinite number of times. *ibid. a. b.* Faults of the author of the Eſſay on Learning, touching this Inſtitution. *ibid.*

Inſtitutes of Juſtinian, the beautiful order, and the ſymmetry of that work are deſervedly admired. V. 87. *b.*

Intellect, its unity in all men taught by ſome Philoſophers. I. 553. *b.* 554. *a. b.* 555. *a. b.* II. 411. *a. b.* 412. *a. b.* 565. *b.* 566. *a. b.* The abſurdity of that doctrine. I. 554. *b.* 555. *a. b.* Which nevertheleſs could only be invented by great genius's. *ibid. a.* Averrhoë's opinion on its unity maintained by Vernias and Auguſtin Niphus. IV. 377. *and b.* See *Spirit.*

Intelligence: Anaxagoras ſuppoſes an intelligence to be the firſt mover of all things. I. 299. *a. b.* 300. *a. b.*

Intelligences charged with different employs throughout the univerſe. II. 251. *a.*

Intereſt of party, is generally predominant over the love of truth. II. 24. *a. b.* The public intereſt is the law of Policy, and the law of State. 755. *b.*

Interim, by whom drawn up. I. 141. *and b.* It was neither ſatisfactory to the Proteſtants nor the Catholics. *ibid.* Couragiouſly rejected by the Miniſters bordering upon the Earldom of Hanaw. III. 875. A new interim. 672. *and a. b.* 673. *a.*

Interpreters, the Merchants of Rome kept a hundred and thirty of them in one of the towns of Colchis. II. 678.

Interpreters of the Canon-Law, Cinius was no friend to them. II. 507.

Intrigues, an inſtance of ſome of the beſt contrived ones. II. 417. *a.*

Invectives, authors who have made them. V. 438. *a. b.*

Invention: two perſons may pretend to the invention of the ſame thing, though the one is not aſſiſted by the other. III. 62. *b.*

Inventions, it is agreeable to know their original and progreſs. IV. 879. *a. b.*

Invocation of the dead very much uſed among the Pagans. II. 716. *b.*

Joan II, Queen of Naples, the manner in which ſhe diſcovers her love. II. 312. *a.* The fable of the mare may be applied to her. IV. 309. *b.*

Joannes Januenſis, ſee *Janua.*

Joconde, the judgment of a good Critic upon two pieces which bear that name. I. 752. *a. n.* (31).

John (St) would not enter into the bath where an Arch-heretic was. II. 405. *b.* The beginning of his goſpel cited by Amelius. I. 252.

John the Faſter, Patriarch of Conſtantinople, his ambition gives riſe to a very great quarrel betwixt the Biſhop of Rome and him. III. 223. *a.*

John XXII, Pope; the taxes of the Romiſh Chancery began under his Pontificate. I. 629. *b.* Excommunicates Marſilius of Padua. IV. 198.

John XXIII, Pope; his depoſition propoſed in a Council, V. 590.

John without Land ſuccours his mother, who was beſieged in Mirebeau, takes Prince Arthur priſoner, and murthers him ſome time after. III. 797. *a.*

John Caſimir, Duke of Saxony, erects a famous ſchool at Coburg. III. 660.

Joy, a ſingular effect of that paſſion. II. 676. *a.* They who die of it, die ſuddenly. III. 766. *a.* Joys of this world, a pleaſant thought of a Princeſs thereupon. V. 383. *b.* 384. *a.*

Joyeuſe (Admiral de) gave an Abbey for a ſong. I. 428. *n.* (*c*).

Joinville, they have done us an injury in changing many of the old words in his book. IV. 428. *a.*

Joke: an obſervation on a Latin joke. II. 702. *a.*

Joly (Claudius), his reflexions on the life of Lewis XI are very judicious. III. 809. *and b.* 810. *a.* Seems to think that the *Rozier des Guerres* was compoſed by Lewis XI. *ibid. and b.*

Jon (William du) ennobled for his good ſervices. III. 623. *a.*

Jon (Denys du) performs a bold action, for which he incurs the hatred of the Franciſcans, and is, at laſt, maſſacred. III. 623. *a. b.*

Jonas, in what manner he remained three days and three nights in the whale's belly. I. 174. *a.*

Jopoli, a city in Calabria; Auguſtin Niphus was a native of that place, and not of Seſſa. IV. 377. *a.*

Jordan (William) tranſlates ſome of Ruyſbroëck's books. IV. 942.

Jornandes, his hiſtory of the Goths tranſlated into French. III. 581.

Joſeph (the Patriarch), the place where it is ſaid he was buried. I. 37. *b.*

Joſeph (St) had the gift which they call infrigidation. II. 108. *b.* Has been made a martyr of a new kind. 338. *b.* 339. *a.* Refutation of ſome impious opinions vented thereupon. 339. *a. b.*

Joſephus, a Jewiſh Hiſtorian, contradicts Moſes. I. 39. *a. b.* Several Critics riſe up againſt his Jewiſh Antiquities. 374. *b.* 375. *a.* Aſcribes an anſwer to Samuel's mother quite different from what the Scripture aſcribes to her. 342. *b.* Mr d'Andilli's tranſlation of him. 487. *b.* Has ſuppreſſed a miracle in the book of Numbers. 2. *b.* Reaſons like a Jew that ſeems to have forgot the elements of his religion. II. 248. Thinks that a ſtory of Moſes is not ſufficiently circumſtantiated. IV. 133. *a.* Cenſured for having compared the paſſage of Alexander with that of Moſes. 608. *b.* 609. *a.* Says that God commanded Sarah to put Hagar in Abraham's bed. V. 51. *a.* What he relates concerning a quarrel between the Jews and Samaritans. 314. *b. n.* (10).

Joram (King), whether Elijah wrote a letter to him from heaven. II. 752. *and b.*

Joubert (Claudius) forgets himſelf when he fancies that he knew Camden at Padua. II. 284. *b.*

Joubertus (Laurence) what he ſaid concerning his learning. III. 582. *b.* Reſtores Cauliac's Surgery. II. 399. *b.*

Jovian (Emperor) whether before him neither Emperor nor Conſul gave up an inch of ground to the enemy. III. 317. *b.* The Chriſtians endeavour to clear him, and the Heathens to condemn him with reſpect to the ſcandalous peace which he made. 585. *b.* 586. *a.*

Jovius, refuted in relation to the Magic of Agrippa. I. 150. *b.* 151. *a.* Condemns Savonarola with moderation enough. V. 62. *a.* See *Paul Jovius.*

Journal, it is neceſſary to conſult a good one, in order to rank things according to their dates. IV. 211. *b.*

Journal des Sçavans, cenſured. I. 48. *a. b.* Has ſpoken of the treatiſe *de Equuleo* too haſtily. III. 620. *a. b.* Who its authors are. IV. 505. *b.*

Journal de Trevoux, the remarks which is made in it concerning the analyſis of quantities infinitely ſmall. V. 620. *b.* 621. *a.* Cited. 596. *a. n.* (37). *& paſſim alibi.*

Journaliſts cited in relation to a book of the life of the Holy Virgin. I. 136. *a. b.* 137. *a.*

Journey: a journey remarkable both for ſpeed and ſlowneſs. II. 716. *a. b.*

Iphigenia, was not a virgin when offered in ſacrifice to Diana. I. 84. *a.* Two cities of Cappadocia boaſted to have her true knife. II. 530. *b.*

Ireland, what a certain perſon ſaid after it's reduction. I. 366. *a. b.*

Iron (hot) in what manner it was made uſe of to find out the truth of an accuſation. II. 767. *a.* Reflexion upon that cuſtom. *ibid. b.*

Irregularity, is ſometimes a happy fault in an ingenious work. IV. 619. *b.* 620. *a.*

Irreligion, its ſource. I. 639. *a.* Robs us of a thouſand comforts. II. 786. *a. b.*

Iſaac makes his wife paſs for his ſiſter, and why. I. 40. His trick found out. *ibid. and a.* St Auſtin juſtifies his behaviour. *ibid. b.*

Iſabel of Bavaria, Queen of France, her ill reputation. II. 209. *a. b.*

Iſabella Villamarini, Princeſs of Salerno, the love ſhe bore her huſband. II. 297. *b.*

Iſdegerdes, King of Perſia, favourable to the Chriſtians. I. 13. Perſecutes them at laſt, and why. *ibid. and a.* Reflexion thereupon by the author of this Dictionary. *ibid. b.* 14. *a. b.*

Iſelanders calumniated by Bloſkenius. III. 580. *a. b.*

Iſhmael, of what kind of people he was an emblem. I. 123. *a.* Conjectures upon the mocking, by which he offended Sarah. *ibid. b.* How old he was when baniſhed by Abraham. *ibid.* 124. *a.* There is a difficulty attending what the Scripture ſays of him. *ibid.* There is a ſtone at Mecca which paſſes for his ſepulchre. 125. *b.* It is ſaid that a ſpring of water was produced under his feet, when he was dying with thirſt. IV. 179. *a.*

Iſhmaelites: what deity the antient Iſhmaelites worſhipped. I. 124. *a.*

Iſocrates the reaſon he gave for not ſaying ſomething when he was deſired. I. 453. *a.* Never had a deſign of making a Panegyric on Buſiris. II. 235. *a. b.* Servius's want of Exactneſs with reſpect to this. *ibid. b.*

Iſraelites, ſtories which ſome Ægyptian writers tell of them. IV. 679. *and a. b.*

Iſſel. Who it was that joined that river to the Rhine. II. 717. *a.*

Iſſoudun, the ſuperior of the Franciſcans of that town, preaches impudently againſt the Queen of Navarre. III. 622. *a.* In what manner he was puniſhed. *ibid.* The Catholics there commit a thouſand violences againſt the Reformed. *ibid. b.* Its walls are ordered to be demoliſhed, but Cipierre by his intereſt gets the decree changed. *ibid.*

Italy, was the Land of Promiſe, which the Deſtinies commanded Æneas to go in ſearch of. I. 316. Who was the firſt who reſtored the purity of the Greek tongue there. 434. *a.* The greateſt part of the Monks in Italy think of nothing leſs than of God. II. 649. *b.* 650. *a.* When Leandro Alberti's deſcription of it was publiſhed. IV. 165. *b.*

Italians ſent into France by the Pope, their leudneſs. I. 675. *a. b.* Some of them have made themſelves ridiculous by an affected way of making uſe only of ſuch terms as are to be found in the beſt Latin authors. 741. *a. b.* 742. *a.* II. 68. *b.* Do not in the leaſt degrade themſelves by being merchants. IV. 791. *b.*

Ithacius, his character. IV. 780. *b.* 781. *a. b.* Declared innocent in a conventicle. *ibid. b.*

Jubilate, what a Jubilate religious among the Monks is. I. 753. *b.* A Jubilate author. *ibid. and* 754. *a.*

Jubilee. It was Paul II, who reduced it to twenty-five years. IV. 511. Guy Patin ridicules Jubilees. V. 751. *b.* 752. *a. b.*

Judicium, the letters of that word, which are all numeral, and make 1613, induced ſeveral Divines to think, that the laſt judgment would be in the year 1613. II. 124. *a.*

Judith, a woman who took it into her head to imitate her, is puniſhed with death. IV. 723. *a. b.*

Judge: there is a vaſt number of people, who judge of their neighbour by themſelves. I. 744. *b.* 745. *a. b.*

Judge: a Judge who fell aſleep ſometimes on the bench. I. 757. *a.*

Judgment (laſt) a great many make their wills, tho' they firmly believed that this was to happen in the ſame year. III. 780. *b.* Several Divines thought it would be in 1613, becauſe they found that number in the word *Judicium*, all the letters of which are numeral. II. 124. *a.*

Judgments (raſh) the two ſources from whence they proceed. I. 550. *b.*

Judges are not all of the ſame humour. I. 61. *b.* Whatever pains a man takes in ſtudying the Civil-Law, it will avail nothing againſt the raſhneſs of a corrupt Judge. 224. Men of honour always decline the office, when they are excepted againſt by the parties accuſed. 489. *b.* How rigid judges were called. II. 347. *a. b.* Ought to be miniſters of the law. III. 802. *b.* People have no great opinion of the integrity of ſuch as are created by commiſſions. 212. *b.* IV. 142. *a. b. &c.* 241. *a. b.* Whether thoſe whoſe ſentences are unjuſt contrary to their intention, deſerve excuſe. 929, 930. *and a. b.* 931. *a.* Judges in point of wit, diſagreed formerly as well as now. V. 360. *a. b.* 361. *a. b.* Learning diſplayed profuſely in a plea, ſerves but to withdraw their attention, and hide the true ſtate of the cauſe. II. 105. *b.* 106. *a. b.* Judges who are men of honour, exclude themſelves when they are intereſted in a cauſe. III. 345. *b.* A Judge, that meeting with a ſharp conteſt between Bartolus and Baldus put in the margin of his book, *a queſtion for a friend.* IV. 733. *b.*

Julius II. Pope, compared to Julius Cæſar. III. 615. *a. b.* An enemy of France. 814. By what artifices he ſaved himſelf after the French had won the victory at Ravenna. 812. *a. b.*

Julius III. Pope, ſummons Henry II, King of France to appear before God, who anſwers that he would appear there, but that the Pope would not appear. III. 405.

Julia, the origin of that family. II. 424. *a. b.*

Julia, wife of one Marc Antony, unhappy in huſbands. I. 354. *b.* What ſhe did to ſave her brother. *ibid.*

Julia, daughter of Auguſtus, her anſwer to thoſe who were ſurprized, that her children ſhould be like her huſband. V. 78. *b.* Had like to have been drowned in a river. *ibid.* Was ſeveral years gone from Rome, and become the object of her father's indignation, before he baniſhed Ovid. IV. 443. *a. b.* 444. *a. b.* 445. *a. b.*

Julia. Grand-daughter of Auguſtus, her exile, and that of Ovid happened much about the ſame time. IV. 444. *a.*

Julian the Apoſtate, endeavours to rebuild the temple of Jeruſalem, but is obliged to deſiſt from the undertaking. I. 228.

Julis, a town of the iſle of Cea, has been the native-country of many great men. III. 608.

Julius (Canus) what Seneca relates of him. II. 66. *a.*

Junia, Cicero's raillery in relation to her. II. 347. *a. b.* 348. *a.*

Junianus Majus, was the Artemidorus of his age. I. 47.

Junius, the praiſe which Joſeph Hall beſtows on him. III. 343. *a. n.* (20).

Juno, her temple at Argos, wholly burnt. II. 498. What ſhe did out of affection for Combabus. 535. *b.* Juno Lacinia, the wonders of her temple. III. 640. *a.*

Ivory, whether it can be made of any thing beſides Elephants teeth. V. 350. *a.*

Jupiter, which was the firſt, and which the laſt mortal whom he lay with. I. 206. *b.* What was his employment according to Æſop. II. 832. *a.* Stole away Ganymede to gratify his pederaſty. III. 130. *a.* The Celtic Jupiter is the moſt antient of the Jupiters. 433. *a.* Where and how Jupiter calmed the tranſport of his paſſion. 630. *a. b.* Jupiter Hammon, why he had horns upon his head. *ibid. b.* 631. *a.* What Stratagem Jupiter uſed to make Juno return to him. 632. *b.* That which made his adulteries more inexcuſable. 646. *a.* Whether he turned the whole rabble of the gods out of heaven. 739. *b.* How he acted in the caſe of benefits and rewards. IV. 355. *a. b.* 572. *a.* Moſt people knew his Divinity better by thunder and lightening than by the diſtribution of benefits. III. 651. *a. b.* IV. 572. *a.* Throws Saturn from Mount Niphates into Tartarus, orders that mountain to be called Caucaſus, and faſtens Prometheus to it. II. 82. *b.*

Juret, criticiſed by Father Sirmond, and defended in relation to Hildebert. III. 454. *a. b.*

Jurieu, his ſentiments concerning the inſpiration of the Prophets, criticiſed. I. 107. *a. b.* Difficulties to which he has reduced himſelf in his *True Syſtem of the Church*. 476. *a. b.* In his *Preſervative againſt a Change of Religion*. *ibid. b.* 477. *a.* And in his *Paſtoral Letters*. 477. *a. b.* Has very well refuted the Calumniators of Theodorus Beza. 546. *n.* (*c*). Changed his opinion concerning Penal Laws againſt Heretics. 566. *b.* 567. *a.* Why he changed it. *ibid* Declamation of Father Tellier againſt him. 784. *a. b.* Supplies the Infidels with weapons by his manner of rejecting a certain miracle. II. 587. *a. b.* What he thinks of the ſentiments of the Remonſtrants, and of their condemnation by the Synod of Dort. III. 174. *a.* His Paralogiſm touching the authority of Councils, for the deciſion of controverſies. IV. 65. *a.* Diſpute between him and Mr Maimbourg, concerning the pretended martyrdom of Heretics. 108. *b.* 109. *a. b.* 110. *a. b.* What he thinks of thoſe who give the title of *Mother of God* to the Holy Virgin. 351. *a.* Is involved in a thouſand difficulties, relating to ſin and the Preſcience of God. 518. *a. b.* Ridicules in a very ſmart manner, thoſe who write chimerical things concerning relics. V. 252. *b.* Aſcribes to the Fathers a ſentiment as impious as that of Spinoza. 588. *b. n.* (165). His prophetical calculations refuted. II. 124. *b.* Finds miracles every where. 552. *a.* May cry out as long as he will, Princes will not ſtir an inch in the matter. *ibid. b.* Criticiſed touching the time when perſecution was hotteſt. IV. 158. *a. b.* *&c.* Touching the manuſcripts, and the editions of Martinus Polonus. 709. *a. b.* His doctrine concerning the love of our neighbour, (V. 642. *a. b.* *& ſeq.*) is one of the looſeſt maxims of the Jeſuits. 645. *a. n.* (51). His anſwer to the accuſation that was brought againſt it. *ibid. b.* 646. *a. b.* Commends his own great feats. 643. *a.* Favoured by the Walloon Synods. *ibid. b.* The Walloon Conſiſtory grants him every thing. 644. *a.* His letters to the Duke of Montauſier, and how they became public. 645. *b.* 646. *a.* A choleric, paſſionate, and dangerous enemy. *ibid.* His policy. 648. *a.* Chimerical conſpiracies of which he accuſes his adverſaries, and which he does not fail to make his advantage of. *ibid. a. b.* The hypotheſis of Auguſtin and Calvin concerning Predeſtination, is to him an inſupportable burden, and yet he ſticks to it. 822. A libel of his under this title, *The Judgment of the Public*, &c. *concerning the Dictionary of Mr Bayle*. 797. *to* 809. Part of his character. 800. *to* 804. Character of his books. 802, 803. He paſſed his judgment on the Critical Dictionary, without having read it. 805. His malice to the Bookſellers. 808.

Juſtice. Whether in war it gives reaſon to hope for ſucceſs. I. 280. *a.* The ſeverity of the laws ſometimes tranſgreſſes the bounds of juſtice. 313. *a. b.* IV. 502. *a.* Enjoins all things which become proper to the times. I. 616. *b.* 617. *a. b.* Whether it is a real being, and not a fantom. II. 164. *b.* 165. *a.* How Carneades argued againſt it. 330. *a. b.* IV. 752. *a.*

Juſtified: Bucer's judgment of this theſis, that we are juſtified by faith alone. II. 172. *a. b.* 173. *a.*

Juſtin Martyr, an apology for him, with relation to Ariſtotle's death. I. 473. *a. b.* 474. *a. b.*

Juſtin is an Hiſtorian of little judgment. I. 510. *a.* Vindicated from the accuſations of Freinſhemius. 763. *a. b.* Is guilty of an Anachroniſm, with regard to the famous battle of Cnidus, and the time when the Athenians began to recover their liberty. II. 547. *b.* 548. *a. b.* *&c.*

Juſtinian compared to an aſs, and why. III. 429. *b.* 430. *a.*

Juvenal a paſſage of his ſatires explained. I. 191. *a.* Another. 768. *a. b.* His ſatires more apt to put one out of conceit with leudneſs, than the moſt chaſte diſcourſes againſt it. V. 487.

Juvenile works, obſervations concerning them. V. 340. *a. b.*

Ixion, for what reaſon and in what manner puniſhed by Jupiter. III. 636. *b.* 637. *a.*

K.

Kalendar. In what it has moſt need to be reformed. III. 739. *b.* 740. *a.* Reformed. V. 247. *a. b.*

Kamea, what the Jews mean by that word. III. 126. *a.*

Karmatians, a ſect which having riſen in Arabia, laid waſte Mecca, and profaned its temple. I. 48, 49. Intend to raiſe ſcruples in mens minds. 49. *and b.*

Καθανμὸς, the ſignification of that word. IV. 182. *b.* 183. *a.*

Καταφυγὼν, ought not to be preferred before Καταφαγὼν, in a paſſage of Nicander. I. 116. *a. b.*

Keys, the power of them never falls to the petticoat in the Church. I. 442. *b.* Thoſe of St Peter thrown into the Tyber. III. 610. *a. b.*

Kempis (Thomas à) his imitation of Jesus Christ tranſlated into Arabic, and by whom. III. 171. *a.*

Kill: whether it be lawful for a man to let himſelf to hire, to kill thoſe who have done him no wrong. II. 196. *a.* In how many caſes a celebrated author pretends that people may kill themſelves innocently. V. 14. *a.*

Kingdom divided againſt itſelf, &c. How far that maxim of Jesus Christ is true. IV. 271. *a.*

Kingdoms, thoſe which fall to the diſtaff are ſubject to ſeveral inconveniences. IV. 309. *a.* V. 519. *b.* It generally happens that a kingdom which acquires great glory abroad, is exhauſted and miſerable at home. 656.

Kings, a great many have aſſumed the title of the great King. I. 513. *a. b.* 514. *a. b.* The pride of eaſtern monarchs was not ſo well flattered with the title of King of Kings, as with that of the great King. 514. *b.* Their very enemies have had a veneration for them. 273. *a.* Their authority very little regarded ſometimes in France. 720. *a. b.* A people that could not be without them. II. 303. *b.* 304. *a.* The reaſon we do not ſee them oftener dethroned, is, becauſe the people have not been ſollicited to revolt by intrigues well enough managed. 608. *a.* The ſervices which they cannot acknowledge commonly make them ungrateful. 736. *b.* The facility and goodneſs of Kings is more prejudicial to their kingdoms than rigour and auſterity. III. 403. *b.* 404. *a.* 409. *a. b.* A King whoſe condition was very miſerable. IV. 276, 277. *a. b.* It is hard to judge of their conduct. 328. *b.* See *Sovereigns*. It is more difficult for a King who has brothers and children to govern his family, than to govern his kingdom. 558. *a. b.* People change their principles concerning the right of Kings. V. 740. A practice which has been obſerved for a long time towards thoſe who aſſiſt at a ſiege. III. 718. *a.*

Kircher. A conteſt between him, and Father Maignan. IV. 61. *b.* 62. *a. b.*

Kiſs: in ſome countries it was ſuppoſed that the firſt kiſs a maid received from her galant, was that of her betrothing. IV. 87. *b.* The Romans had a cuſtom of kiſſing their kinſwomen, to know whether they had drunk wine. 756. *a. b.* 757. *a.* The power which Socrates aſcribed to a kiſs. 796. *b.* 797. *a. b.* When, and on what occaſions, it is allowed to kiſs other peoples wives, and maidens. *ibid.* Parallel between the cuſtom of kiſſing and dancing. V. 24. *b.* 25. *a. b.*

Knight (William) publiſhes Joſeph Hall's *Mundus alter & idem.* III. 345. *a.*

Knight: by what means, and at what time the Roman Knights were admitted to the Senatorial dignity. II. 712. *b.* Their order diſhonoured two manner of ways. III. 696. *b.* A Knight who confers the title upon another. 282. *a.* An Italian author did not acknowledge any out of the Romiſh communion. V. 388.

Knobius (Chriſtopher) praiſes the King of Denmark for having thrown the book of Concord into the fire. III. 391. *a. b.*

Know: the manner in which we know things is very obſcure. I. 555. *a. b.* Whether it be likely that any Philoſopher could be ſo extravagant as to maintain, that he knew not whether any thing exiſted. IV. 206. *a. b.*

Knowledge: it is a crime to have more knowledge than the people. I. 307. *b.* Knowledge puffeth up, but there is another talent which puffs up yet more. 479. *b.* The bounds of human knowledge. III. 582. *and b.* It rendered people ſuſpected at the court of Rome. II. 187. *and b.* 188. *a.* Is the principal characteriſtic and privilege of the gods. V. 587. *b.* 588. *a.*

Knox accuſed of inconſtancy in the diſpute concerning the government of women. III. 670. *a. b.*

Konig cenſured for referring his readers to books which he had not ſeen himſelf. I. 547. *b.* Has made three men of one. II. 243. *b. n.* (13). Cenſured in relation to Patricius. IV. 507. *a.* and Pereira. 546. *a.* Cenſured touching Rozarius, and his native country. 911. *a. b.* Blamed. I. 603. *a. n.* (*i*). Thinks oftentimes that a book is compoſed the year in which it is printed, or ſome tranſlation of it. IV. 919. *a. b.*

Konigſberg, when its academy was erected. I. 223.

Kortholt (Chriſtian), his book *de tribus Impoſtoribus magnis.* V. 208. *b.*

Kortholt (Sebaſtian) quoted. V. 206. *a. n.* (66). 216. *a. n.* (140).

Κύριος, a Pagan author has given that name to God. II. 833. *a.*

L.

LAbbadie, a ſchiſmatic preacher, and followed as if he had been another apoſtle. I. 4. *b.* By what ſpirit he was led, according to Antoinette Bourignon. II. 111. *a. b.* A ſtory which is told of him. IV. 87. *a.* Aſſerts that God will and can deceive. 877. *a.*

L'abbé (Father), his *Pharus Galliæ antiquæ* almoſt ruined. I. 11. *a. b.* He exclaims againſt Rivetus. 21. *a. b.* Cenſured touching Ammonius. 269. *a. b.* A paſſage of Zanchius related by him. V. 602. *a. n.* (38). Puſhes Mareſius in an unmerciful manner, touching the curtailed edition of Anaſtaſius, with which the Jeſuits are reproached. IV. 727. *a. b.* A ſingular anſwer which is made to his objections by D. Francus. *ibid. n.* (23).

Laberius, reflexion upon the reaſon, which, according to him, moved Democritus to blind himſelf. II. 641. *b.* 642. *a.*

Labienus, his books condemned to be burnt. II. 355. *b.* Reſolves to die that he may not ſurvive the productions of his wit. *ibid.*

Labyrinths, four buildings of that kind. III. 750. *b.*

Labyrinth of the Free-will. IV. 390. *b.* 391. *a.*

Labyrinth of love, a new French tranſlation of that book. II. 37. *b.*

Laboureur (le), a paſſage of that writer criticized. I. 711. *b.* Cenſured in relation to Dolet. II. 684. *a. b.* Has not given an impartial account of the French Embaſſador in Poland. III. 264. *a.* What he ſays of the impertinencies of Genealogiſts. IV. 650. *a. b.* 651. *a.* Reflexion of his upon ſome preachers. 722. *a.* Says ſomething very remarkable concerning Poltrot's conſpiracy. V. 186. *b.* 187. *a.* Inveighs ſharply againſt thoſe who aſſume the name of Lands that their family does no longer poſſeſs. 187. *a. b.*

Lacedæmon, its Kings deſcended from Ariſtodemus. I. 130. *a.* The veneration which its enemies had for them. 273. *a. b.* The courage of the women of Lacedæmon. II. 522. *b.* 523. *a.* The cuſtom that was obſerved there with reſpect to their feaſts. 574. *b.* The reaſon why the women and girls of that city were ſo immodeſt. III. 962. *a. b.* 963. *a.* In what manner diſobedient children were puniſhed there. 965. *b. &c.* In what terms its decree for the deification of Alexander was conceived. IV. 405. *a.*

Lacedæmonians took away a crown for trifling reaſons. I. 128. *a. b.* Were the beſt huſbands in the world. 134. *b.* Their dialect was harſh. 205. *b.* Who was the only man of their country who had two wives at once. 312. When they began to conquer the Tageates. *ibid. and a. b.* and why. *ibid.* Pretended to be beholden to Apollo for their glory and proſperity, and yet joined in a confederacy with thoſe who plundered his temple. IV. 622. *a.* Had liberty to marry their ſiſters by the mothers, but not their ſiſters by the father. V. 49. *b.*

Lacquey: it is not without example that a lacquey has become a diſtinguiſhed author. IV. 173. *a. b.*

Lactantius produces a teſtimony in proof of the worſhip, which was ſtill paid to Apollonius, in the beginning of the IVth century. I. 381. *b.* What he ſays of Apollonius Tyanæus, and of Apuleius. 394. *a. b.* In what manner he pretends to deſtroy all Philoſophy. 411. *a. b.* 412. *a.* And particularly Acatalepſy. 411. *b.* Pretends to have demonſtrated that there is no ſcience among men, and confeſſes this with relation to Phyſics. 412. *a.* His anſwer to Carneades in the behalf of juſtice. II. 330. *a. b.* Upbraids the Pagans with paying infamous worſhip to a proſtitute. III. 53. *and a. b.* Makes uſe of a fallacious ſyllogiſm of Cicero's againſt Dicæarchus. II. 658. *b.* Is miſtaken as to an objection which he makes againſt the Heathens. III. 53. *a.* Rallies them upon the greateſt of the gods at laſt ceaſing to beget children. 431. *b.* How he anſwered Hierocles, touching the ſlanders which he had publiſhed againſt the Chriſtian religion. 444. *a. b.* 445. *a.* Does not ſeem to have underſtood the meaning of Ariſtippus in theſe words, *Habeo & non habeor.* 701. *a.* Makes bad objections to the ſyſtem of atoms. 789. *a. b.* 790. *a.* Had no reaſon to charge Lucretius with contradicting himſelf. 928. *b.* 929. *a.* His anſwer to Epicurus concerning the evil which happens in this world is weak and full of errors. IV. 513. *b.* 514. *a.* His opinion about the ſoul of beaſts. 903. *b. n.* (28). What he thinks of Cicero's book *de Conſolatione.* V. 411. *b.* 412. *a.* Finds fault with the thought which is in the beginning of it. *ibid.* Laughs at Xenophanes for believing that the moon is inhabited. 576. *a.* How he endeavoured to convince the Pagans that the mother of Jeſus Chriſt was a virgin. 772. *b.*

Ladies, when they fall in love with their inferiors, they are obliged to make all the advances. I. 315. *a.* It is uncommon for great ladies, who do not marry a ſecond time, to live without giving occaſion to cenſure their conduct. 358. *a.* The poetical deification of a lady. 398. *a. b.* 399. *a.* The tranſcendent merit of another. 781. *a. b.* 782. *a. b.* The Roman ladies dedicate all their jewels in order to make a veſſel of gold, which the Senate had reſolved to ſend to Delphos. II. 290. *a.* The honour that was allowed them in conſideration of this. *ibid.* One of the moſt dangerous principles wherewith ladies can be prepoſſeſſed, is, that there are conjunctures which permit them to neglect the outſide of their honour. 381. *b.* A Spaniſh proverb concerning them. 515. *a.* Explication of that proverb. *ibid.* The young ones do not commonly make the greateſt noiſe in the courts of Princes. 632. *a.* Whether they entertain thoſe well, who make them taſte the ſweets of love. *ibid.* When the cuſtom of their going to court was introduced, and the miſchiefs ariſing therefrom. III. 93. *a. b.* Corruption which they brought into the court of France. *ibid.* Our modern ladies are not of the ſame temper with Dido. 141. *a. b.* Are the plagues of a court, when they intrude into ſtate-intrigues. 304. *b.* 305. *a.* See *Women.* What kind of affront gives them the moſt ſenſible pain. 405. *b.*

406. *a.* Are addicted to all the fortune-telling ſuperſtitions with which the citizens wives are infatuated. IV. 200. *b.* 201. *a.* A ſcandalous cuſtom that was practiſed by the Roman ladies. V. 130. *a. b.* Immodeſt ladies turn devout women at laſt; and the effect which this produces. 533. *b.* 534. *a.*

Ladoder, an Engineer that betrayed the Governour of Landau. III. 721. *a. b.*

Lælius, his chaſtity. IV. 745. *b.* 746. *a.*

Laërtius (Diogenes) not very exact in his reaſonings and narrations. II. 777. *b.* 778. *a.*

Lætus (John) cenſured. II. 17. *n.* (*b*). IV. 803. *a.*

Layette (a Drawer) taken for a man. IV. 2. *a.*

Laymen diſguiſed like Prieſts, and ſent to confeſs criminals. II. 459. *b.* 460. *a.* Whether it ought to be believed that recourſe was had to this artifice in the proceſs againſt J. Chaſtel. 460. *b.* Have no buſineſs with things appertaining to the altar. V. 62. *a.*

Laïs, a famous Courtezan, was a model for the fineſt Painters to copy after. I. 367. *b.* The anſwer Apelles gave in relation to her. *ibid.* In what manner ſhe uſed Diogenes. II. 670. *a.* Her favours to Diogenes the Cynic. *ibid.* Whether Apelles got her maidenhead. III. 702. *b.* 703. *a.*

Lakes, whoſe water bore up men that could not ſwim. III. 158. *a.*

Lallemant (John) borrows a good deal from Rataller, in his Latin verſion of Sophocles. IV. 848, 849.

Lamb (Paſchal), when it was ſlain according to Lewis de Leon. III. 772. *b.*

Lambert (St) murthered, by whom, and for what reaſon. I. 233. *and a. b.*

Lambinus corrects a paſſage of Plutarch unneceſſarily. I. 129. *b.* Had no very nice taſte upon the ſubject of modeſty. III. 920. *b.* Did not underſtand a paſſage of Pauſanias concerning Sappho. V. 48. *a.*

Lame man in the Acts of the Apoſtles, his cure, and what followed after it, burleſqu'd in the Acts of the Apoſtles in rhime. II. 479. *b.*

Lamy (William) accuſed of Hereſy becauſe he diſputed againſt the motion of the heavens. II. 29. *b.* In a lecture of Anatomy, ſpeaking of the virginity of thoſe whom his auditors ſhould marry, he fortifies them againſt all events. 370. *a.* Cited. I. 311. *a. n.* (200). Examination of a notion of his about the Epicurean hypotheſis. IV. 438. *a.* Gives an account of two ſigns by which one may know whether a woman has had any children. 503. *a.*

Lampagia, the wife of Aimon, King of Saragoſſa, whether ſhe was the daughter of Eudo, Duke of Aquitain. IV. 282. *a. b.* 283. *a. b.*

Lampridius, his judicious obſervation upon the duty of an Hiſtorian with reſpect to popular opinions. II. 770. *b.*

Lamus, King of the Leſtrygons, built the city called Formiæ. III. 786. *and b.*

Lancaſter (the Duke of) ſuſpected to be guilty of ſome ſiniſter deſign. V. 554. *a. b.* Whether he was ſuppoſititious. 555. *a. b.*

Lance, which became a tree. I. 274. *a.* The iron of the lance that pierced the body of our Saviour ſent to Rome. III. 566. *and a. b.* V. 469. *and a. b.* 470. *a. b.*

Lancelot (Mr), his remark upon the edition of Abelard's works. I. 249. *a. b. n.* (17). 651. *n.* (*c*). 740. *b. n.* (15). Memoir concerning William Bigot, communicated by him. II. 7. *b.* 8. *a. b. n.* (15). Informs the author of a memoir concerning Antony Cornelius. 556. *b.* Memoir concerning Simon Morinus communicated by him. IV. 269. *b.* 270. *a. b. n.* (13). Concerning Francis Hotman. V. 417. *b. n.* (2). Concerning James Sanſon. 43. *a. n.* (2).

Langius explains a paſſage of Cicero wrong. I. 80. *a.*

Langres, the King's council oppoſeth the eſtabliſhment of a Proteſtant Church there. II. 694. *a.*

Language, whenever the old is made uſe of now-a-days it is by way of pleaſantry. I. 63. *a. b.* Is impoveriſhed by being too much changed. III. 208. *b.* IV. 743. *a. b.* Nothing ought to be altered in that of the old French writers. IV. 428. The old ought not to be altered in the leaſt when antient works are publiſhed or republiſhed. II. 838. *and b.* The zeal of ſeveral Princes for the language of their country. I. 543. *b.* II. 516. *a. b.* 517. *a. b.* 518. *a.* Judgment of ſeveral languages. II. 436. *b.* There is not one which is not more or leſs barren. IV. 842. *a.* The judgment which Cicero paſſes on thoſe who deſpiſe their own language. I. 60. *a. b.*

Language (unknown), it is not true that the Fathers of the Church wrote the impieties and obſcenities of the antient Heretics in an unknown language. III. 136. *a. b.*

Language (Latin), authors who are fond of its oldeſt phraſes. I. 62. *b.* 63. *a. b.* 741. *a. b.* 742. *a.* Who was the Vaugelas of it. III. 319. *b.* Whether thoſe who ſpeak it eaſily, ſpeak it likewiſe politely. IV. 408. *a. b.* Greater liberty was taken in the uſe of the words of this language than there is in the French. II. 140. *b.* It is difficult to write very clearly in Latin. I. 644. *b.* II. 681. *b.* Plutarch affirms that there were few people in his time that did not ſpeak it. 517. *a.* From whence derived. III. 309.

Language (French) puzzles us when the uſual order of the words is altered. I. 602. *b.* II. 134. *a. b.* Has been a long time in vogue amongſt foreigners. 228. *a. b.* Is very much eſteemed. 436. *a. b.* Its advantage over the Greek. 628. *b.*

Language (Gothic) is the mother of all the other Teutonic languages. III. 628. *a. b.* 629. *a.*

Language (vulgar), whether it ought to be uſed in works of learning. I. 741. *b.*

Languages (dead) loſe a great deal of their force and grace in a tranſlation. I. 216. *b.* Are obſcure, and why. 602. *b.*

Languages living, their inconſtancy. III. 208. *a. b.* 209. *a. b.*

Lanſius (Thomas) declaims on the bad effects of travelling. III. 345. *b.*

Lanuvium, its inhabitants made Roman citizens. III. 639. *b.*

Laodice puts Danaë to death. III. 779. *b.*

Laodicea, daughter of Priam, falls in love with Acamas, the ſon of Theſeus, and finds means of enjoying him. I. 52. *and b.* 53. *a.*

Laomedon refuſes to recompenſe Neptune, and is puniſhed for it. III. 432. *b.*

Lapithæ, four modern authors affirm that Phlegyas was their King. IV. 626.

Larebonius demonſtrates, in his *Janua Cœlorum reſerata*, the faults of the new ſyſtem of the Church. IV. 363. *b.* Had he thought of Mr Saurin's reflexion, he would have charged his adverſary home. 414. *b.* 415. *a.*

Laſcus (John), Miniſter of the Flemiſh Church at London, is baniſhed from thence. V. 550. *a.*

Latin, the want of that tongue hinders Bourſault from being Sub-preceptor to the Dauphin. II. 115. The Spaniards are generally too negligent when they write in Latin: an example of it. III. 774. *a. b.*

Latin (antient), Victorinus of Feltri was one of its firſt reſtorers. IV. 408.

Latomus compared the Chriſtian Church to a bear's cub. V. 294. *a.*

Lavardin, a noble family of Vendomois. III. 455. *b.*

Lavement, ſignifications of that word. III. 136. *b. n.* (57). Formerly ſignified only gargles. *ibid. b.* Ridiculous delicacy of Garaſſe about it. *ibid.*

Laudice poiſons five of her ſons. II. 305. *a.* 308. *a.*

Launoi (John de), clamour of the Provençals againſt him. I. 362. Some miſtakes of that learned man. II. 9. *a. b.* He did not underſtand Greek. *ibid. b.* The unſucceſsfulneſs of his labours for crying down falſe devotion. III. 742. *b.* 743. *a. b.* 744. *a.* Is very much to blame for having beſtowed ſo many encomiums upon a prelate who had made the *Amende honorable.* IV. 917. *and a. b. n.* (*a*). He, and ſome other writers who oppoſe ill-grounded traditions, diſpleaſe many, and do credit to their Church. 739, 740.

Laurea, Cardinal. III. 390. *b.*

Lauſanne, the Synod held there makes regulations with which Calvin refuſes to comply. II. 264. *b.*

Law: there were but three cities in the Roman empire, which had ſchools of law. I. 771. *a. b.* Who was the firſt that renewed the profeſſion of the Roman

Roman law, interrupted ever ſince the invaſion of the Barbarians. III. 593, 594. The Civil-Law has been debaſed ſometimes. II. 846. *b.*

Law of Lamego, Princeſſes of the royal blood of Portugal are excluded from the crown by virtue of that law, IV. 762. *b.*

Law (Salique) is founded on good reaſons. IV. 406. *a.* Whether it was inſtituted by Pharamond. III. 336. *a. b.* Thoſe kingdoms where it is not of force, are ſubject to great diſturbances. V. 519. *b.*

Law (unwritten) who it was that taught it the Jews. I. 173. *b.* 174. *a.*

Lawyers, their qualifications deſcribed in verſe. II. 309. *a. b.* 310. *a.* Write down at length robberies which they neither approve nor practiſe. III. 135. *b.*

Laws, there are none which factious perſons will not evade to come at their ends. I. 128. *a. b.* Compared to bread and eggs. 223. *a.* And to the maxims of Phyſicians in their mutability. 616. *b.* Exceed the bounds of juſtice ſometimes. 313. *a. b.* Were the ſpring and origin of moral good and evil, according to ſome Philoſophers. 416. Their power. 446. *a. b.* There was a very odd one at Babylon. 597. *a. b.* There are three ſorts of men, who make almoſt no uſe of the laws they preſcribe to others. II. 38. *a. b.* When, by whom, and with what deſign that called *Lex Agraria* was propoſed. 344. *a. b.* That called *Lex Tabellaria,* what the deſign of it was, and by whom propoſed. 345. *a. n.* (6). The laws by permitting ſome particular things, do not free from blame thoſe that commit them. 501. *b.* 502. *a. b.* 503. *a. b.* 504. *a.* What pretence was made uſe of at Rome, to abrogate ſuch as were diſliked. 713. *b.* The benefit of laws ſhould not be ſtopped under pretence of ſome inconveniences. IV. 500. *b.* 501. *a.* 637. *a. b.* Laws are overturned for a little time, in order to make them laſt a very long time. 881. *b.* Are oftentimes not executed, becauſe of the greatneſs of the evil. V. 17. *b.* A preamble makes them inſipid: they ſhould not diſpute but command. 833.

Laws (Penal) in matters of conſcience, are the *Ratio Ultima* of Divines. I. 285. *a. b.* 286. *a.* Whether the Church never made uſe of them againſt Heretics. 476. *b.* 477. *a.* Enacted againſt the Papiſts in England. III. 345. Odious concluſions drawn from them. 501.

Laws (ſumptuary) how they were hindered from paſſing. III. 492.

Laws of the Union of the ſoul and the body, diverſities which they occaſion in men. II. 451. *b.* 452. *a. b.*

Lead, Philetas put ſome to his ſhoes, leſt the wind ſhould carry him away. IV. 616. *a.*

League, who was called it's Poſtillion. I. 718. *a.* Violence of the preachers of the League. II. 95. 101. *a. b.* What ſerved as a pretence for it. III. 407. *b.* 408. *a.* That which the Deputy of the League was ordered to repreſent to the Pope. 411. *b.* 412. *a. b.* 413. *a.* The crime of James Clement, was the crime of the whole League. 412. *b.* 413. *a.* Puts it into Cardinal de Bourbon's head to ſet up for the lawful ſucceſſor to the crown of France. 520. *a. b.* Who were its Advocate-Generals. *ibid.* Who was called its Lacquey. IV. 243. *a.*

Leaguers in France, call the apology for the King of Navarre an infamous libel. I. 739. *a. b.* In the time of Henry IV, obtain more preferments than his old ſervants. II 443. *b.* Make the Duke of Mayence their head. III. 297, *a. b.*

Leah, whether ſhe committed Adultery the firſt time that Jacob knew her, and whether Jacob did not. IV. 540. *a.*

Learned: a perſon may be learned, tho' he cannot give an immediate anſwer to a great many queſtions. II. 374. *b. n.* (57). Reflexion upon the poſterity of learned men. III. 155. *a. b.* Sometimes deny things the moſt eaſy to be known. I. 76. *a.* People through policy may affect not to paſs for learned men. 353. *a. b.* Learned men, poor or unfortunate. 600. *a. b.* II. 365. *b.* 366. *a.* 617. *b.* 686. *a. b.* III. 50. *b.* 862. *a.* IV. 17. *a. b.* 294. *b.* 295. *a.* V. 400. *a. b.* 401. *a. b.* 402. *a. b.* 403. *a. b.* 589. *and a. b.* It is the miſfortune of thoſe who make themſelves eminent, that ſooner or later they will be publickly reproached with the leaſt faults of their youth. I 615. *b.* One that was famous while he was a beardleſs boy. 664. *b.* They ought to print books. II. 96. *a. b.* A perſon is not the more fit to negotiate nice affairs, becauſe he is one of the moſt learned of his age. 188. *b.* Some of them are niggard of their learning. 287. *a.* It is a common thing enough for thoſe who are born in ſome village, to pretend themſelves natives of the next neighbouring city. 367. *b.* No perſons are more to be feared by them, than great lords who love learning. 374. *b.* Some of them will not confeſs, that they are indebted to their cenſors for a little information. 503. *b.* One whoſe only daughter is reduced to a miſerable condition. 707. *b.* 708. *a.* Which of them may be compared to rough diamonds. 646. *a.* Few of the learned will expoſe themſelves to raſh judgments. 708. *a.* They never ought to have a curioſity for the town news. III. 254. *b.* Marks of a ſtudious diſpoſition in ſome of them. 322, *a. b.* Learned men diſappointed in their hopes of gratifications. 328. *a. b.* In their elogies and epitaphs, it is generally affirmed, that they lived well with their wives, but this is not to be depended upon. 437. *a.* Women may fall in love with them upon account of their learning, without being in love with learning itſelf. 460. *b.* What value they ſometimes ſet upon their productions. 658. *a.* It is a great miſfortune for them to have to do with the intendants of the Finances. *ibid. and b.* There are learned men who know every thing but what they ought to know beſt. 882. *a.* Moſt of them are only fit to cultivate the lands, which have been already tilled. IV. 104. *b.* Why ſome learned men decline the ſpeaking of Latin. 409. *a. b.* Too many trifling circumſtances are inſerted in the journals of their lives. 493. *b.* Who are the authors of the *Journal of the Learned.* 505. *b.* Learned men diſhonoured by the impurities of their wives or their daughters. V. 240. *b.* 241. *a.* Hunt after remote things, and neglect that which they have as it were under their very noſes. 734. What ſort of writings ought to be conſulted in order to find the particulars of their lives. II. 8. *b.* To excel both in buſineſs and learning, is a very rare talent. 314. *b.* Thoſe who write the lives of learned men, never fail to praiſe their wives for conjugal affection. I. 796. *a.* Arrogance is ill-becoming them. II. 50. *a.* Their mercenary ſpirit. III. 339. *b.* 340. *a. b.* It is a great happineſs for them to be free from ambition and avarice. IV. 187. *b.* See *Authors* and *Writers.*

Learning, whether it be in a declining condition. I. 220. *b.* 221. *a. b.* The character of a braggadocio in learning. 373. *a. b.* The decay of learning. IV. 209. *a. b.* Some men would be glad that the key of learning ſhould not be imparted to the people. 629. *b.* A thing that muſt needs create a contempt for it. 859. *a.* Learning cannot diſpel the darkneſs of Idolatry. V. 77. *b.* 78. *a.* Complaints againſt it. 229. *b.* Accuſed of having a bad influence on religion. 286. *and a. b.* France ſeems to have too great an averſion for every thing that looks like learning. 428. *a. b.* Too much learning diſplayed at the bar, only ſerves to withdraw the judges attention. II. 106. *b.*

Leer. The ſchool there becomes more famous than that of Norden, and why. II. 768.

Legate. The ignorance of the Legate, who condemned Abelard. I. 760. *b.* A Doctor's raillery upon it. *ibid.*

Legendaries, their falſe zeal has ſtuffed the Hiſtory of the ſaints with fabulous ſtories. III. 708. *b.* The judgment which Melchior Canus gave about them. IV. 554. *b.* Aſcribe extraordinary actions ſometimes to one ſaint, ſometimes to another. II. 770. *b.* Ought to follow the example of Lampridius in what regards popular opinions. *ibid.*

Legends. The origin of the falſe Legends of martyrs. V. 432. *a. b.* 433. *a. b.*

Leger (John) reproaches Quichenon with having ababjured the Proteſtant religion. III. 275. *b. n.* (5). Juſtifies his uncle Antony Leger. *ibid.*

Legiſlators order and forbid the ſame things according to times and ſeaſons. I. 616. *b.* Are more worthy of admiration than the greateſt conquerors. IV. 669. *b.* Intended the good of the public, when they made it be believed, that they converſed with the deity. V. 69. *b.* A thought of of Machiavel's concerning that which makes them ſucceed or miſcarry. 73. *b.*

Lehman (Chriſtopher) obſerves that there are abundance of lies in William Eyſengrein's *Centenarii* XVI, againſt Flacius Illyricus. II. 750. *a. b.*

Leibniz. Is a very extraordinary man. IV. 535. *a.* It is ſurprizing that he writes ſo good French as he does. *ibid.* Whatever fine inſights he has given us into the ſouls of beaſts, his Hypotheſis cannot well be preferred to that of Des Cartes. 909. *b.* 910. *a, b.* 911. *a.* Obſervations upon his reflexions. 914. *a. b. as far as* 916. *a. b.* Reflexions upon his anſwers. *ibid.* His letter concerning the divining wand. I. 8. *b.* 9. *a.*

Leiceſter (Earl of) forms a faction in Holland, and aſpires to the ſovereignty. II. 687. *b.* 688. *a.*

Leyden, the judgment which its Divines gave. I. 242. *and b.* 243. *a.* When its univerſity was founded. III. 241. See *Univerſity.* The Curators of that univerſity make a decree that is criticized. III. 358. *a. b.* When the college of Divinity there was erected. 574. A preſent of rarities made to the univerſity of Leyden. V. 561. *and b.*

Leipſic, its univerſity at variance about the Philoſophy of Ramus. II. 696. The great Guſtavus calls an aſſembly at Leipſic, of Lutherans and Calviniſts, in order to endeavour at an accommodation. III. 476. *a.* The *Journal of Leipſic*, or *Acta Eruditorum Lipſienſia*, its praiſe. I. 493. *a.* Quoted. V. 202. *a. n.* (25). *&* *paſſim alibi.*

Lela, a name which is commonly given to the great ladies of Africa. III. 17. *a.* It is alſo the title of honour which the Mahometans gave to the bleſſed Virgin. *ibid.*

Lemnos. A maſſacre of all the men of that iſland, and the cauſe of it. III. 465. *and a.*

Lent, a thing which the Clergymen that preach during that time, are often reproached with. IV. 616. A ſuppoſition that would ſhorten it a little. V. 777. Does not begin at Milan till four days after Aſhwedneſday. 778. *b.*

Lentulus, a pretended letter of that Proconſul's containing a portrait of Jeſus Chriſt, given as an authentic piece by John Huarte. III. 528.

Leo Judæ, what Thuanus meant by thoſe words. I. 802. *b.*

Leo the Hebrew, what he ſays of the two ſexes of Adam. II. 856. *a. b.* 857. *a.*

Leo I, (Pope) confutes an opinion which had been approved by the Church in St Auguſtin. IV. 782. *b.*

Leo IV *and Benedictus* III. The She-Pope cannot be placed between theſe two Popes, the one of which was elected immediately after the death of the other. IV. 726. *a. b.* 738. *a.*

Leo X. Whether it be true that he publiſhed a threatning monitory againſt the Elector of Saxony. III. 272. *b.* By what means people got into his favour. 327. *a.* He was ſometimes preſent at a Comedy. IV. 11. *a.* Was the firſt that threatened thoſe with excommunication, who read a prohibited book. 13. *b.* His bull againſt ſuch as affirmed that there was but one ſoul in all men. V. 214. *b.* 215. *a.*

Leo Iſauricus, abuſes the credulity of the Calif of the Saracens by a remarkable trick. II. 586. *b.* 587. *a.*

Leontium, a Courtezan, her letter to Lamia is a forged piece. II. 781. *b.* 782. *a.* Was at worſt the concubine of Metrodorus. 782. *a.*

Leontius ſuffered martyrdom in Veſpaſian's reign. III. 316. *b.*

Leopoldſdorf (Jerome Beck of) brings the Turkiſh Annals from Conſtantinople. III. 774. *b.*

Leotychides, the Lacedæmonians exclude him from the crown with great injuſtice. I. 128. *a. b.*

Lepanto, Raſario receives an order from the Doge of Venice, to make an oration upon that victory. IV. 848. *and a. b.* Zarlino compoſes airs which are ſung at the rejoycings made for it. V. 602.

Lepreus, a great eater. III. 427. *b.* 428. *a.*

Lerida (the Biſhop of) makes a clamour againſt the congregation of the *Index*, on account of a Spaniſh Catechiſm. II. 337. *b.*

Lerma (the Duke of) Paul V, in favour of him, departs from the cuſtom of not ſending the red hat to the Cardinals newly elected. I. 604. *b.*

Leſbia is the ſame with Clodia, the wife of Metellus Celer. IV. 202. *a. b.*

Leſcalopier (Father) alledges a fact which is nothing to the purpoſe, and reaſons againſt himſelf, whilſt he is reaſoning againſt Diogenes. III. 357. *b.* What he means by the ſacred diſeaſe. 789. *a. n.* (10). His remark upon God's Incomprehenſibility. V. 144. *a. n.* (42).

Leſdiguieres, by what intrigues he endeavoured to deprive the Proteſtant aſſemblies of a good head. II. 433. *b.*

Leſna, a town, burnt by the Poles, and why. II. 539. *b.*

Letter (Paſtoral) ſuppreſſed. V. 748. *b.*

Letters, the antiquity of their uſage among the Aſſyrians. I. 595. *b.* 596. *a.* The changing of one ſingle letter has diſhonoured the memory of a great man. 611. *b.* 612. *a.* The ſuppreſſion of two by an error of the print has robbed an author of four years glory. 633. *a.* A treatiſe of their proportions by Jeffery Tori. V. 388. The capital letters of the Greek, by whom brought again into uſe. III. 732.

Letters: too great a correſpondence by letters, overpowers the learned. I. 625. *b.* Difference between thoſe that are wrote to a perſon's ſelf, and thoſe that are wrote to others concerning him. 330. *b.* IV. 276. *b.* V. 566. *b.* Letters that paſs between friends, ought to be kept in inviolable ſecrecy. III. 553. *a.* 844. *b.* The ſlavery which thoſe are under, who have the reputation of writing fine letters. IV. 707. *b.* Even the Pagans deteſted the practice of publiſhing of what people wrote to one another in confidence. V. 797. It was not uſual in England before the year 1613, to publiſh diſcourſes in form of letters. III. 344. An author that inſerts letters in a book, which are not of his own writing, leaves room for the authors of thoſe letters to arrogate the merit of the whole performance to themſelves. II. 688, 689.

Letters (men of) a reflexion upon their faults. IV. 859. *a. b.* A diſcourſe on the marriage of men of letters by Claudius Baduel. I. 603. *a. b.* 604. *a. b.*

Letters (Hiſtorical) quoted. V. 753. *a. n.* (28). *&* *paſſim alibi.*

Letters (Provincial) divers particulars concerning that book. IV. 489. *b.* 490. *a. b.*

Lettres (*the Belles*) charged with cauſing a great deal of confuſion. V. 286. *b.* Their revival in Italy. III. 258. *a. b.* Their decay. IV. 209. *a. b.* The reſtoration of them opened the way for the Reformation. V. 286. *b.*

Leucas, people were cured of the paſſion of love, by leaping from the top of its promontory. III. 787. *b.* 788. *a.* Names of thoſe that took the leap. *ibid.* Its promontory was called the Lover's leap. V. 47. *a.*

Leucophyllus, a plant which hinders women from committing Adultery. IV. 609. Its effect upon drunken people. 610. *a.* Its virtue more remarkable than that of the *Agnus Caſtus. ibid. b.*

Leve (Antony de) whether he had a correſpondence with Agrippa. I. 151. *a. b.* From whence he took money to pay his ſoldiers. IV. 456. *b.*

Levis, the houſe of that name is one of the moſt noble in all France. IV. 585. *a.*

Leviathan, what the deſign of that book is. III. 469. *a. b.*

Levites, why they were ſo called, according to Plutarch. I. 115. *a.*

Leudneſs, whether it prevails more in hot countries than cold. II. 820. *a. b.* 821. *a. b.* *&c.* The toleration granted at Rome for this ſin, compared with that granted in other countries for drunkenneſs. 820. *b.* 821. *a.* The way to baniſh it. III. 186. *a. b.* 814. *a. b.* V. 98. *b.* 99. *a. b.* A Queen recovers by her leudneſs, a crown which ſhe could not preſerve by her courage. II. 523. See *Incontinency.*

Lewis VII, King of France, his ſcruples of conſcience. III. 797. *b.* 798. *a.* Diſpoſſeſſes himſelf entirely of the territories of his divorced Queen. V. 518. *a.*

Lewis IX, King of France, the ſtrange ſervitude to which he ſubmits himſelf, in order to pleaſe the Queen his mother. II. 382. *b.* 383. *a.* The oath which it ſeems they would have required from

from him. III. 92. *a. n.* (43). And which he refuſes to take. 98, *b.*

Lewis XI, King of France, his inclinations always oppoſite to thoſe of Charles, Duke of Burgundy. II. 215. *a. b.* Would not marry his ſon to the heireſs of Burgundy. 221. *a. b.* 222. *a.* Had leſs courage than policy. 221. *b.* 222. *a.* His little pad carried him and all his court. 131. *b.* Let many years paſs, before he re-imburſed the ſums which were advanced for the funeral of Charles VII. 464. *a.* A very good thought of his. 737. *a. b.* Is afraid leſt the Engliſh ſhould repent of their having made peace. 740. *a.* Threatens the Parliament of Paris. V. 443. *a. b.* Is not the firſt who made it a capital crime to conceal a conſpiracy. IV. 346.

Lewis XII, King of France, a generous ſentiment of his. I. 421. *b.* III. 896. *b.* Kills himſelf by careſſing his Queen too much. 88. *a.* A witty ſaying of this Prince's. 814. *b.* For what reaſon he ſaw the forces of England, Swiſſerland, and Spain againſt him. 613. *b.* 614. *a.* Is preſent at a lecture of Civil-Law, and embraces the Profeſſor. IV. 67. *a.* His hiſtory wrote by John d'Auton, and printed by Theodore Godfry. I. 589.

Lewis XIII, King of France, exhorts the Catholic Princes of Germany to forſake the Emperor. II. 134. *b.* 135. *a. b.* His conduct towards the Queen, his mother. 400. *a. b.* 401. *a. b.* Who it was that undertook to take away the barrenneſs of the Queen, his wife. 401. *b.* And to reconcile him with her. *ibid.* III. 816. *a. b.* His ſervitude under the Marſhal d'Ancre. II. 542. *a. b.* Declares that he did not mean to comprehend the Proteſtants in the oath made at his coronation, of employing his ſword for the extirpation of Hereſies. III. 209. *b.* Is very much afraid of the Devil. 212. *a. b.* Confuſions to which the kingdom was expoſed under his minority. 301. *a.* A witty ſaying of his. 823. *a. b.* The hiſtory of him promiſed to us. IV. 257. *b.* A falſe prediction concerning the day of his death. 260. *b.* Has a fall, and will not let it be told to his Aſtrologer. *ibid.* Reſpects his miſtreſs, and is jealous of her at the ſame time. V. 84. *b.* Capriata beſtows ſo much praiſe on his conduct that he has been copied by a Frenchman. II. 311. *a.*

Lewis XIV, makes himſelf protector of the Heretics at the capitulation of Landau. III. 721. *b.*

Lewis of Bavaria, Bzovius razes him out of the catalogue of Emperors. II. 238. He, and Frederic Barbaroſſa: an apology for thoſe Emperors by Hungerus. III. 534. *a. b.* Marſilius of Padua writes an apology for him. IV. 198. *and a. b.* Perſecuted by three Popes. *ibid. b.*

Liar: the ſophiſm called the Liar, is a mere childiſh ſubtilty. IV. 616. *b.* 617. *a. b.*

Liars, their ordinary fate. I. 198. *a. b.*

Libanus, a mount where Venus had a temple. II. 4. *b.*

Libels (defamatory), it is a favour to believe writers of them even upon their oath. I. 343. *a.* An advice to thoſe that write libels. *ibid. b.* 344. *a.* What was ſaid concerning thoſe of Aretin. 436. *a.* Auguſtus was the firſt that ordered information to be taken againſt this kind of writings. II. 355. *a. b.* 356. *a.* And who involved them under the crimes of high-treaſon. V. 743. *& ſeq.* For what cauſe. 744, 745. Tiberius continues this innovation of Auguſtus. *ibid.* Why it is unlawful to publiſh them. II. 389. *a. b.* They do a great deal of miſchief. III. 290. *b.* 291. *a.* Moſt of them are compoſed by perſons very little known, and of bad characters. 291. *a.* It is of great uſe to diſplay the impudence of thoſe that write them, and the credulity of thoſe that read them. V. 103. *a.* A thing which the authors of them do not conſider. 459. *a.* See *Slanders.* Thoſe of ſome private perſons diſowned. 738, 739. Diſſertation concerning defamatory libels. 743. *as far as* 765. Should never go unpuniſhed. 746, 747. The anſwer which ſhould be made to thoſe that write an apology for them. 747. All Legiſlators have agreed in puniſhing them ſeverely. 758. The Council of Trent aſcribes the puniſhment of them to the tribunal of the Church. 762. Whether they be the cauſes of ſedition and war. 763, 764. Remarks againſt thoſe that ſpread them about, or approve them. 764, 765. It is ordinary for all factions to produce libels. III. 517. *b.*

Liberality; ſingular effects of liberality. I. 412. *b.* 413. *a.* III. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* Should be practiſed towards our enemies. I. 559. *a.*

Liberty: there are ſome who love not liberty, but the perſon of him who declares for it. II. 167. *a.* The liberty of indifference is not an eſſential attribute of creatures. IV. 907. *a. b.* 908. *a. b.* 909. *a. b.*

Liberty (human), ſee *Free-will.*

Liberties of the Gallican Church, the hiſtory of that book. IV. 98. *b.* 99. *a. b.* 100. *a. b.* Receive a terrible blow. II. 125. *a. b.* All that was done for ſupporting them under Innocent XI, overturned in 1693. *ibid.*

Libertines, in the affair of religion, are of two kinds. II. 648. *a. b.* Thoſe who write againſt them ſhould be very careful not to afford them any ſubject for laughter. III. 132. *a.* A reflexion on the complaints of ſome perſons, againſt thoſe who repreſent the objections of the Libertines with all their force. V. 537. *a. b.* See *Mockers in point of Religion.*

Library: by whom the library of the college of Navarre was built. I. 164. *a.* Reflexion on the fate of ſome libraries. 319. *a. b.* 320. *a.* A ſpeaking library; who was called ſo. II. 646. *a.* A library erected by Auguſtus in one of the temples of Rome. III. 8. *a.* A library that had as many books as there are ſtars in the firmament. 110. *b.* A fault which the overſeers of public libraries are guilty of. 950. *b.* Some very noble libraries. IV. 555. *a. b.*

Libraria del Doni, how it is divided, and what it contains, according to Teiſſier. II. 689. *a. b.*

Librarii, the ſignification of that word. V. 798.

Lyceus, miracles which are related concerning that mount. IV. 205. *a. b.*

Lycæum, Ariſtotle's ſchool, its doctrines will always triumph over all others. I. 469. *a.* It is taught in Perſia, and in the dominions of the Great Mogul. *ibid. b.*

Lychettus (Franciſcus) treats Niphus with good manners. IV. 380. *b.*

Lycians loved to wear long hair. IV. 174. *a.*

Lycophron, his Caſſandra is very obſcure. IV. 598. *a.* Different readings of a paſſage in him. I. 538. *b.*

Liebaut, his work on the diſeaſes of women is not a tranſlation of that work of Marinello's, which has the ſame title. IV. 148. *a. b.* Accuſed of plagiariſm by Lazarus Pe. *ibid.*

Liebler (George) tranſlates a homily of Martin Eyſengrein, and writes notes upon it in order to refute it. II. 749. *a. b.*

Liege, a town, treated cruelly. II. 216. *b.* 217. *a.*

Lies: there is no lie, how abſurd ſo ever, but will be handed down from book to book, and from age to age. II. 296. *a.* There are ſome lies which make people angry, and others which make them laugh. 181. *a. b.* Whether it be permitted to tell a lie. V. 748. *and a. b.* How they are perpetuated. *ibid. & ſeq.*

Life, reaſonings of an uncommon nature upon the ſhortneſs of it. I. 511. *a. b.* Philoſophical ſentiments about long life. II. 185. *b.* The principle of Chriſtians, touching the chief end of life is only a principle in Theory. 200. *b.* A few years of life remaining, are not worth the making a falſe ſtep. 384. Was a ſtate of penance and puniſhment for a ſin committed before men came into the world, according to ſome Philoſophers. 561. *a. b.* 562. *a. b.* IV. 441. *b.* V. 412. *a. b. &c.* Democritus laughed at human life. II. 642. *a.* Whether the good things of life ſurpaſs the evil. 832. *a. b.* IV. 844. *a. b.* V. 414. *b.* 423. *b.* 424. *a.* 576. *a. b.* 577. *a.* The limits of its duration, according to Heſiod. III. 348. *b.* 349. *a.* The immoderate deſire which Lewis XI, King of France, had to prolong his life. 803. *b.* 804. *a.* 806. *b.* 807. *a. b.* 808. *a.* Life is ſhort and miſerable. *ibid.* Few wiſe men would chuſe to begin the race of life afreſh. V. 423. *b.* 424. *a.* Life does not conſiſt in living, but in enjoying health. III. 342. *a.* Perſons who delighted ſo much in retirement as to ſay, that during the whole of their life before, they had by no means lived. II. 430. *and b.*

Life to come, what the Japaneze believe about it. III. 550. *and a. b.* According to Lucas Brugenſis, the Jews had the doctrine of it from the Pagans. V. 8. *a. b.*

Light of nature: Divines will always be worſted in a diſpute that is carried on upon no other principles than thoſe of the light of nature. V. 815. The myſteries of the goſpel neither can nor ought to be ſubjected to its dictates. 816. 829. It is eaſy to reconcile the moral precepts of JESUS CHRIST with it. 815. *n.* (z).

Likely: Agathon's aphoriſm concerning what is likely. I. 126. *a. b.*

Lilly: a ſtory that is told of a lilly which Charles V had planted. II. 444. *b.* 445. *a.*

Limbo of children, is the porch of hell. IV. 501. *a. b.* Virgil owned it. *ibid. b.* 502. *a.*

Limbourg, to whom it belongs. II. 223. *a.*

Lindanus created a great many ſects. I. 790. *a. b.*

Lindenbrouch was enraged againſt Wouwer. V. 565. *b.* 566. *a.*

Lionne, by what means he mounts to the chiefeſt places in the government. IV. 807. *a. b.* 808. *a.*

Lions, whether they are without marrow. I. 75. *b.* 76. *a.* The Hiſtory of the Lion of Androcles is known only by the relation of Apion. 375. *a.* Notwithſtanding what Tertullian ſays, lions are more than once fathers. 448. *a. b.* Who was the firſt among the Romans that yoked lions in his chariot. III. 959. *b.* In Africa ſome of them were nailed to a croſs, in order to frighten others. IV. 908. *b.*

Lipſius (Juſtus), advice which he gives to young men. I. 61. *a.* And to Baudius. 678. *a. b.* 680. *b.* His judgment of Paul Emilius's Hiſtory of France. II. 763. *a. b.* What is thought to be one of the principal reaſons of his having turned Papiſt. III. 673. *b.* Is ill-uſed in a book, and anſwers nothing. 838. *a. b.* Is ſaid to have compoſed books to convince the world that he was not lukewarm and indifferent in religion, as many ſuſpected he was. 842. *a.* Addreſſes verſes to the planet Venus in behalf of his garden. 922. *b.* Writes a letter full of malice againſt Holland. IV. 795. *a.* Approves of Roulliard's Capitulary concerning the validity of a marriage. 804. *a. b.* 805. *a.* His miſtakes with regard to Tacitus. V. 281. *b.* 282. *a. b.* His declaration touching his reading of Petronius. 485. *b.* Approves of travelling, and has given very good inſtructions concerning it. III. 345. *b.*

Lyre, the Embaſſadors of the Getæ preſented themſelves playing upon the lyre. I. 83. *a.*

Lyſander, his character. I. 128. *a. b.* Wreſts the ſenſe of an oracle. *ibid. b.*

Lyſerus conceals himſelf under the fictitious name of *Theophilus Alethæus.* III. 973.

Lyſimachus, the ſon of a daughter of Ariſtides, got his living by interpreting of dreams. I. 521. *a.*

Lyſimachus puts two Princes to death for deſtroying their mother. II. 676. *b.*

Lyſimachus fights with a lion, and receives ſeveral wounds. III. 713. *a. b.*

Liſle, the ſiege of that town. III. 718. *a. b.*

Liſola (Baron) affirms, that the States of the empire are obliged to defend the circle of Burgundy. II. 223. *and b.*

Lyſtrius, his commentary upon the praiſe of Folly is diſliked by a great many, and why. II. 810. *a. b.*

Litanies, the expreſſions which indiſcreet zealots had inſenſibly introduced into them, condemned by Bellarmin. I. 728. *b.*

Live: to live a quiet life is all we ſhould aſpire at. II. 200. *a. b.*

Lives, thoſe who write them ſhould write the lives of great criminals. V. 519. *a. b.*

Lives of learned men, where we are to ſeek for the particulars of them. II. 8. *b.*

Livia (Empreſs) carried her complaiſance to Auguſtus too far. I. 332. *a.*

Livia, daughter of Nero Claudius Druſus, her Hiſtory. II. 718. *a. b.*

Livilla, her death. I. 358. *b.* 359. *a.*

Livius (Titus), ſee *Titus Livius.*

Lizet (Peter) is Advocate-General in the Parliament of Paris. II. 429.

Lloyd aſcribes to the Scholiaſt of Apollonius, a great many things concerning the iſland of Taphos, which are not to be found in him. V. 307. *a.*

Locke, his anſwer to thoſe who blamed him for having ſaid, that natural reaſon does not prove the immortality of the ſoul. IV. 592. *b.* 593. *a.* Wherein he makes the difference between men and beaſts to conſiſt. 912. *b.* 913. *a.* Cited. V. 616. *b.*

Locrians, how they appeaſe Minerva. II. 340. *b.* In what manner they expiate the crime of Ajax. *ibid.* 341. *a. b.*

Locuſts: the water-locuſts at Minturnæ are as large as thoſe upon the coaſts of Africa. I. 372. *b.* A pleaſant ſtory concerning this. *ibid.*

Loeffenius makes collections of the ſeditious things that are to be found in the writings of the Jeſuits. III. 656. *b.*

Logic is a great help to the other ſciences. I. 163. *a. b.* IV. 189. *a. b.* It would be of great uſe to criticize on the falſe Logic of authors. I. 394. *b.* 395. *a.* Logic compared to Penelope by Chryſippus. II. 495. *a.*

Logicians, a good Logician is ſcarcer than is imagined. II. 655. *b.* The Iriſh and Spaniſh Logicians make diſtinctions that are too obſcure and abſtracted. V. 645. *b.*

Loiſel reſigns the canonry of *Notre Dame* at Paris, to Claudius Joly. III. 577.

Lombard (Peter), the firſt who was made Doctor of Divinity, in the univerſity of Paris. III. 594. How much Stancarus eſteemed him. V. 227. *b.* 228. *a.*

Londel (Father du), his *Faſti* criticized. V. 755. *a. b.* The uſefulneſs of his Chronological Tables. IV. 211. *b.*

Longiano (Fauſto da), his criticiſm upon Quevara's Marcus Aurelius, is good and learned. III. 270. *b.* He promiſes the life of that Prince, compoſed from the teſtimony of the antient Hiſtorians. *ibid.* The ſtudies to which he applies himſelf. *ibid.*

Longinus, his judgment of ſome Philoſophers. I. 255. *a.* Had an exquiſite judgment and penetration. IV. 690. *a. b.* What he ſays of Theopompus. V. 328. *b.* A paſſage where his good taſte does not appear. 360. *a. b.*

Longitude, a great many have believed that they had diſcovered it. IV. 262. *b.* 263. *a.*

Longolius, his oration concerning the praiſe of the French, compared with the Romans. V. 417. He praiſes Peter Turel in it. *ibid.*

Looking-glaſs was one of the principal parts of Otho's equipage of war. I. 392. *a.* Fables concerning looking-glaſſes. IV. 672. *a. b. &c.* A ſtory concerning one in which Cardinal Mazarin ſaw every thing that paſſed in Portugal. 676. *b.* The faſhion which women had of wearing them over their bellies. II. 400. *a. b.*

Looſe ſheets, it is their fate to be thrown aſide among the rubbiſh of libraries. V. 800.

Lopez (Dominicus), a fictitious name which Fauſtus Socinus aſſumed, when he publiſhed his treatiſe *de Auctoritate S. Scripturæ.* V. 180. *b.*

Loredana (Leonard), Navagiero makes his Funeral Oration. IV. 315.

Loredano, his work of the life of Adam. II. 857. *b.* 858. *a. b.* Cenſured. V. 432. *a. b.*

Lorenzo (John) writes libels againſt Alexander VI, in Greek, his brother tranſlates them into Latin, and is thrown into the Tyber. IV. 89. *b.* 90. *a. b.*

Lorrain approves the revolt of ſubjects, and the attempts of the court of Rome againſt the temporalities of Princes. I. 642. *b.*

Lorrain (Charles, Cardinal of), what has been ſaid of him. I. 121. *b.* 704. *a. b.* What Brantome ſays of him. III. 287. *a.* 874. *b.* Glories in being hated by the Huguenots. 290. *a.* A ridiculous deſcription of this Cardinal's tribulations. V. 29. *b.* 30. *a.* His behaviour with reſpect to J. du Tillet. 353. *b.* 354. *a. b.*

Lot: a Painter in Pruſſia having read in Luther's tranſlation of the Bible, what Lot did to his daughters, behaved in the ſame manner to his own. IV. 723. *a.*

Lotharius allows the Stellingi to profeſs Paganiſm, and turns Monk to do penance for it. V. 233. *a. b.* 234. *a. b.*

Lots: the book of the Acts of the Apoſtles in rhime ſuppoſes that the drawing of lots was made uſe of in the election of St Matthias. II. 478. *a.*

Loudun (la Cordonniere de), a libel againſt Cardinal Richelieu. III. 212. *a.*

Loudun: all the devils-craft of the nuns of Loudun confounded by Quillet. III. 212. *b.*

Louvain, who founded the college of three languages in that univerſity. II. 236. *and b.* And who was the firſt that taught the Hebrew tongue there. *ibid. b.*

Love, its origin according to Plato. I. 102. *b.* Who was the firſt that introduced the cuſtom of ſinging love-ſongs in company. 205. When love adventures began to be brought upon the ſtage. 313. The purſuits of ambition, ſecure women againſt the follies of love, better than they do men. 523. *a.* A lively deſcription of love. II. 1. *b.* 2. *a. b.* 3. *a.* Reigns in the moſt icy climates. 80. *a.* Is the cauſe of the blackeſt treacheries. 333. *a.* Of all declarations of love, none coſts a Queen ſo dear as a verbal one. 312. *a.* Heroic love, what is called ſo. 318. *a.* Love of women, why people ſtumble much more in that regard, than in all the other duties of Chriſtianity. 382. *a.* And why this holds true with reſpect to Princes, much more than to private perſons. *ibid.* How exceſſive ſoever the jealouſy of men may be, yet it is not ſo copious in inventions as the love of women. 533. *a.* The work of love deteſted by Democritus. 638. *b.* The pleaſure of love has been called a little epilepſy. 644. *a. b.* III. 81. *a. b.* 82. *a.* A man who has always his pen and books in his hand cannot find time to devote himſelf to it. II. 814. *a. b.* 815. *a.* The extent of its empire. 822. *b.* 823. *a. b.* One of its caprices. 857. *a. b.* What is its great mover. III. 13. *b.* 14. *a. b.* The Heathen Poets philoſophized upon nothing ſo profoundly as upon love. 28. *a. b.* Its rage and brutality. 56. *a. b.* 57. *a.* An inſtance of its triumph and power. 165. *b.* 166. *a.* Commonly leaves honour in poſſeſſion of all its rights. 383. *a.* People were cured of this paſſion by leaping from the rock of Leucas. 787. *b.* 788. *a. b.* Names of thoſe that took the leap. *ibid.* The difference between a poetical love and a real one. IV. 82. *a. b.* V. 420. *b.* 421. *a. b.* There is no need of any other witchcraft to make people guilty of a thouſand diſorders. IV. 454. *b.* Creeps in every where. 635. *b.* Whether all would go to ruin in its empire if women were to attack, and men to ſtand upon the defenſive. V. 31. *b.* 32. *a. b.* Love is a divine fury, which produces the moſt violent Enthuſiaſm. 45. *b.* The evils which this paſſion draws after it. 110. *a.* Guido Cavalcante's ſong on terreſtrial love, has been commented on by ſeveral learned men. II. 398. *b.* 399. *a. b.* An explication of the doctrine of Cavalcante, touching the nature of love, by Marſilius Ficinus. 399. *b.* A very ſingular character of that of A. Niphus. IV. 378. *b.* 379. *a.* A book of Parthenius, concerning this paſſion. 482. The diſtemper of love ſometimes ends in madneſs, or a conſumption. *ibid. a.* What a Spaniſh author ſaid of virtuous love. V. 225. *b.*

Love (ſelf-) a refinement upon ſelf-love. I. 134. *a.* Reflexion upon ſelf-love. 460. *a. b.* Makes people deſpiſe riches ſometimes. *ibid.*

Love of our neighbour. A Portugueze Monk preaches that we are bound to love all men, of whatſoever religion, ſect, or nation, they be, even the Caſtilians. V. 319.

Lovers ought to make uſe of the key of the heart to come at the enjoyment of their miſtreſſes. I. 454. *a. b.* Their impertinent gallantries. III. 867. *b.* The Hiſtory of two married perſons, who were always called *the two lovers*. 386. *a. b.* A lover who by his amorous embraces cured his miſtreſs that was infected with the Plague. 3. *a. b.*

Low-Countries loſt by the jealouſies, and other hidden paſſions of Philip II. I. 588. *a.* A project of peace which is propoſed to them. III. 120. *a. b.* 121. *a.* Have furniſhed a theatre of war for two ages. 806. *a.*

Lubbertus brings fifty heads of accuſation againſt one of his Colleagues before the Synod of Dort. IV. 75. *a. b.* A great enemy to innovations. 474. *a.*

Lubec, the ſchool there decays, and why. III. 663. *b.*

Lubin (Father) his complaints againſt the gentlemen of the French academy. V. 234. *b.* And againſt the Dutch. *ibid.* 235. *a.*

Lucan affirms in a profane manner, that the Gods are only angry with the unfortunate. II. 418. *b.* For what reaſon he imagined that in Greece and Italy, the Deity was better known than at Marſeilles. 678. *a. b.* His miſtake in this reſpect. *ibid.* Why he joined with the conſpirators againſt Nero. IV. 597. *a.*

Lucar (Cyril of) a great many of his letters were depoſited in Rivetus's hands. V. 560. *b.*

Lucian, the anſwer which he puts into the mouth of a Courtezan. I. 54. *b.* 55. *a.* What he affirms to have ſeen at Byblos. 116. *a.* What he ſays of the thunder that was darted at Anaxagoras. 307. *b.* 308. *a.* Cenſured for a blunder, in relation to the picture of Calumny, which is attributed to Apelles. 367. *b.* 368. *a. b.* Let a man turn himſelf all ways imaginable, he will never avoid the ſatirical ſtrokes of ſuch a man as Lucian. II. 117. *b.* Does not ſhew much judgment on the ſubject of Sthenobæa and Phædra. 535. *a.* Tells a pretty ſtory concerning Democritus. 638. *a.* The character which he gives of that Philoſopher. 639. *b.* 640. *a.* Tho' he ridicules falſe gods, he deſerves notwithſtanding to be deteſted. IV. 584. *b.* A dialogue which has been accounted one of his pieces. V. 446. *b.*

Lucilius, a Satiric Poet did not get ſatisfaction of the Comedian who had offended him, by naming him on the ſtage. I. 61. *b.* Did not deſire that his readers ſhould be altogether ignorant, or very learned men. IV. 593. *a.*

Lucretius, one of the arguments which he uſes againſt the doctrine of the Homœomeries. I. 297. *a. b.* Was not aware of an objection, which would have deſtroyed the very foundation of that hypotheſis. *ibid. b.* Refutes an anſwer of Anaxagoras tolerably well. 303. *b.* His ſentence, that men pull off the maſk, at the point of death, is not always true. III. 288. *b. n.* (26). What he ſays about ſeeing a ſhipwreck. IV. 34. *b. n.* (93).

Lucullus courts a lady of pleaſure, in order to obtain an employment. II. 426. *a. b.*

Lucumon, from what preſage his wife aſſured him of good fortune. V. 287. *a. b.*

Lude (Count de) what kind of ſhots he ſhot upon the government. III. 265. *a.*

Ludolphus (Job) acquired a wonderful knowledge of Æthiopia. III. 527. *a.*

Lufnen (Herman) a Phyſician of Rotterdam, his letter upon the ſympathetic virtue. I. 9. *b. n.* (76).

Lugoly, the Provoſt de l'Hoſtel's lieutenant, diſguiſed as a prieſt, and ſent to confeſs John Chaſtel, plays his part ill. II. 459. *b.* 460. *a. b.*

Luſignan (Brother Stephen of) rallied upon his extraordinary learning. I. 53. *a.*

Luſſon (Biſhop of), ſee *Cardinal de Richelieu.* He writes a letter to Marſhal d'Ancre in very ſubmiſſive terms. III. 209. *a. b.*

Luſt: whether courage and luſt flow from the ſame principle in the conſtitution. III. 414. *a. b.* 415. *a. b.*

Luther. His reputation was every body's concern in Saxony. I. 140. *a. b.* Looked upon as a Hero by ſome great Geniuſes of the Romiſh communion. 149. *b.* Accuſes Aleander of being a Jew. 215. *a. b.* Called thoſe Divines Anaxagoriſts, who find every thing in every text of Scripture. 304. *a.* Diſapproves of the rebellion of the Anabaptiſts. 284. *a. b.* 285. *a.* What he reproaches the Divines of Cologn, and thoſe of Louvain, with. 470. *b.* Reflexions upon what ſome people affect to ſay, that Luther marrried a very handſome Nun. II. 72. *a. b.* 73. *a.* Facts relating to his marriage. 73. *and a. b.* 74. *and a. b.* 75. *and a. b.* 76. *and a. b.* 77. *and a. b.* A reſolution is taken of anſwering him in a vigorous manner, to make him more moderate for the future. 195. *and a. b.* 196. *a.* His tranſlation of the Bible. 705. *a.* In what diſpoſition he was, when he ſaw himſelf put to the ban of the empire. III. 272. *b.* The efficacy of his preaching foretold about thirty years before it happened. 456. *a. b.* Accuſed by Cochlæus of having publiſhed prefaces that were injurious to the Scripture. 942. *a.* Whether it became him to divert himſelf with jeſts and banters. 954. *a.* He diſperſes the ſchools of Magic in Spain and Germany. V. 385. *b.* His conferences with Vergerius. 452. *a. b.* Favoured by the enormity of abuſes. II. 126. *a.* A book intituled, *Luther with* *ſeven heads*, in which Cochleus relates all his impurities. III. 136. *a. b.* Compoſes a preface to Fr. Lambert's book *de Minoritarum regula*. 709. *b.* Silveſter Prierias ſucceeds very ill in writing againſt him. IV. 772. *a.* Controverſial writings between that Monk and him. *ibid. and b.* Reflexion upon what Mr Claudé has ſaid concerning his conference with the Devil. V. 73. *a. b.*

Lutheraniſm: what made Caſtellan ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm. II. 372. *b.* Who was called its ſword and ſhield. III. 218. *b.* Its preſervation amidſt the ſchiſms which diſtracted it. IV. 271. *a. b.* When, and how introduced, and eſtabliſhed in Dortmund. II. 121. *a. b.* Introduced into Carinthia, Carniola, and the territories of the Grand Seignior by the Sclavonian tranſlations of Truberus. V. 405.

Lutherans, a great number of them refuſes to communicate with the Church of Ireland. I. 718. *a. b.* The hiſtory of their eleventh ſchiſm. III. 442. *a. b.* Meet at Leipſic with the Calviniſts, by order of the great Guſtavus, to endeavour at an accommodation. 476. *a.* What gave riſe to the thirteenth ſchiſm which happened among them. 478. *a. b.* What was the cauſe of their fourteenth ſchiſm. 535. *b.* The opinion which the rigid Lutherans have of Calviniſm. 841. *a.* Treat the Calviniſts, that were baniſhed out of England, very ill. V. 550. *b.* Join with the Catholics to reſiſt the Calviniſts. II. 121. Their doctrine concerning the Euchariſt, ſeemed to Bucer to attribute too much to the Real Preſence. 177. *a.* The diſturbance which their book of concord produces, and how it is treated by the King of Denmark, and by Queen Elizabeth. III. 390. *a.* 391. *a. b.*

Luxury, by what Gradations it crept in among the Romans. II. 710. *a.* When it is at the heighth, they treat what is ſaid of the antient frugality as fabulous. *ibid.* Pope Innocent XI attempts to reform it. III. 569. *a. b.* An author wiſhes that all thoſe women who addict themſelves to luxury were called whores. II. 400. *b.* People are readier to give it over at the commandment of the King, than that of God. *ibid.*

Luz, the incorruptibility of that bone, according to the Jews, and its virtue towards the reſurrection of the body. I. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.*

Luzara, the winning of that battle very much controverted by the writers of both ſides. III. 719. *b. n.* (24).

M.

M That letter's being ill printed, occaſions a great error. II. 42. *a. b.*

Mabillon (Father) his indignation at ſeeing a famous man buried without an epitaph. II. 277. *b.* 278. *a. b.* A curious fact which he has related to us, and which had been cut off from a manuſcript. 633. *a. b.* Cenſured for praiſing Epiſcopius. 795. *a. b.* There is an untruth concerning the Turks in the Hiſtory of the Holy War publiſhed by him. IV. 41. *a.*

Macarius, four of his Homilies tranſlated by Daniel d'Ange. I. 562. *a.*

Macerata, at what time its academy was founded. V. 167. *b.*

Machiavel cited. III. 798. *b.* What he ſays of Peter and Jerome Riario. V. 163. *a. b.* A thought of his concerning that which makes Legiſlators ſucceed or miſcarry. 73. *b.*

Macrinus ſends Caracalla's aſhes to Julia, and writes a very obliging letter to her. III. 606. *b.* But at laſt orders her to depart from Antioch. *ibid.*

Macrobius conſigns over all ſuch romances as *the Golden Aſs*, to nurſes. I. 395. *a.* Confounds the places of the Knights with thoſe of the Senators. III. 695. *b.* 696. *a. b.* What judgment ought to be made of the ſtories which he relates. IV. 769. *b.*

Madneſs. The greateſt wits have all a mixture of madneſs. II. 321. *a.* As likewiſe madneſs has ſometimes a mixture of great wit. *ibid.* It is wiſdom to feign it on ſome occaſions. V. 373. *b.*

Madmen, perſons who have feigned themſelves to be ſo. I. 422. *b.* They have a privilege to ſin with impunity. II. 254. *a.*

Mæcenas, what argument he made uſe of to perſuade Auguſtus to keep the empire in his own hands. IV. 564. *a.*

Mænius puniſhes his freedman ſeverely, for having kiſſed his daughter. 797. *a.*

Maeſtricht ſubdued in the year. 1673. IV. 211. *b.*

Maffeus (the Jeſuit) repeated his Breviary in Greek, for what reaſon. IV. 409. *a. b.*

Magalotti, Cardinal Mazarin's nephew, beſieges la Motte. IV. 278.

Magdeburg, whether the ſacking of Magdeburg was foretold by a Poet. III. 877. *b.* 878. *a. b.* 879. *a.* A book publiſhed under the name of the inhabitants of this town. V. 736.

Magdalenes (the convent of) deſigned for receiving debauched women, who ſhould be reclaimed. IV. 888. *a. b.*

Magi of Perſia, the impoſtures which they uſed, to engage their King to deſtroy Chriſtianity. I. 13. *a. b.*

Magia Diabolica, Elich maintains a public diſpute, and writes a book upon that ſubject. II. 750.

Magic. Perſons that have been accuſed of it. I. 145. *a.* 182. *a. b.* 384. *b.* 385. *a. b.* 392. *b.* 393. *a. b.* 598. *and a. b.* II. 51. *b.* III. 211. 231. *b.* 232. *a. b.* 233. *a.* IV. 369. *a. b.* 370. *a.* 533. *b.* 534. *a.* V. 100. Whether books of Magic be neceſſary. I. 182. *b.* Who are thoſe that have touched upon natural and lawful Magic. 192. Their was a time when Magic required that beautiful youths ſhould be ſacrificed. 347. *b.* 348. *a.* Who was the inventer of it, and how it was tranſmitted from the old world to the new. II. 431. *a. b.* 432. *a. n.* (15). Illuſtrious names are prefixed to books, eſpecially to ſuch as treat of Magic. 640. *b.* A good many Chriſtians laugh at it, and yet continue to own the Divinity of the Scriptures. V. 12. *b.* Called *Ars Atracia*, and why. I. 538. *a.* See *Witchcraft*.

Magicians: whether a man's poverty may be uſed as an argument to prove that he is a Magician. I. 152. *a. b.* Their accuſers fall into contradictions ſometimes. 385. *b.* 386. *a.* Are very guilty of romancing. II. 639. *a. b.* Attack one another's reputations. 641. *a. b.* Whether they can be accuſed without any danger, and when this may be done. III. 211. *b.* 212. *a.* Whether the ſtories which are told of them be true or chimerical. V. 100. What difference there is between them and ſorcerers. 385. *b.*

Magiſtrates: the Magiſtrate has a right to puniſh fornication. I. 222. *a. b.* 223. *a.* Illuſtrious Magiſtrates, and good Catholics called Heretics, in the Bibliotheque of the ſociety of the Jeſuits. 220. *a.* Make ſeveral edicts againſt the Anabaptiſts. 285. *a. b.* 286. *a.* Whether they ought to puniſh Heretics. 789. *a. b.* Their readineſs in letting themſelves be led away by cabals. II. 141. *a. b.* There is no better way to gain the applauſe of the mob than to declaim againſt them. 357. *a.* Mankind could not poſſibly ſubſiſt without them. III. 671. *a.* Ought to be extremely cautious in inflicting a note of infamy. IV. 500. *b.* and why. *ibid.* Thoſe who maintain that men ought to be puniſhed by the Magiſtrate for their opinions, fall into a thouſand contradictions. 782. *a.* When authors have recourſe to them, to get their adverſaries writings ſuppreſſed, it is a plain ſign that they are convinced of having the worſt in the diſpute. V. 343. *a.*

Magni (Valerian) his *Judicium de Acatholicorum & Catholicorum regula credendi*. V. 741. *a. b.*

Mahomet of glorious memory, whether a Chriſtian can ſpeak of that impoſtor in ſuch honourable terms. II. 760. A treaty of peace between him and the Chriſtians. IV. 38. *b.* Was not of a baſe extraction. 176. *b.* Subdues Mecca. 177. *b.* 178. *a.* Could neither read nor write. 177. *b.* Commands his followers to go in pilgrimage to Mecca. 178. *a. b.* Propheſies upon his death-bed, and not at all like a falſe prophet. 349. *b.* Lewis de Leon applies the predictions of the apoſtles concerning Antichriſt to him. III. 772. *b.* Some hold him to be Antichriſt, and appropriate to him the number 666, in the Revelations. 733. A book intituled, *the ſect of Mahomet demoliſhed*. I. 326.

Mahomet II. His letter to Pope Pius II. I. 54. *b.* Reproached with illegitimacy. 338.

Mahometans, their religion ſuffers a great calamity. I. 49. *a.* Cannot think it poſſible that a man of genius ſhould die a Chriſtian. 51. *a. b.* Some of their ſectaries call themſelves men of truth. 52. *a.* Whether it be true that their women have no hopes of entering into Paradiſe. IV. 34. *b.* 35. *a. b.* Are greatly alarmed by a certain prediction. 43. *a. b.* 44. *a. b.* 45. *a.* Leave legacies to an unknown Prophet, who is to come and deliver the world from the tyranny of Antichriſt. 123. *a.*

Mahometiſm honours the aſſumption of virgins as well as the Romiſh Church does. III. 17. *b.* Muſt be deſtroyed very ſoon, according to the prophecies of a great many perſons. IV. 43. *a. b.* 44. *a. b.* 45. *a.* Through what motives theſe prophecies were publiſhed. 44. *b.* 45. *a.* There is ſome reaſon to wonder that it ſhould be ſo little advantageous to the female ſex. 48. *b.* The influence which that ſex had upon its foundation. *ibid.*

Maid: the advantages of a maid above a widow. I. 393. *a. b* Old maids are pleaſed with telling that they have been courted for marriage. II. 109. *b.* The Greeks and Romans called a married woman, or one that had children, by that name. 140. *b.* Whether maids ſhould be allowed to marry very young. III. 965. *b.* The Romans would not ſuffer them to be preſent at feaſts. 966. *a. &c.* Signs by which one may know whether a woman that paſſes for a maid has had any children. IV. 52. *a. b.* 53. *a. b. &c.* See *Ladies.* A maid, when ſhe is deflowered, is like palled wine that has loſt its value. III. 112. *a.* What Agur ſays about a maid. II. 369. *b.*

Maid of honour to a Queen, is a function very difficult to execute. III. 832.

Maid of Orleans, her hiſtory. III. 336. *a. b.* 337. *a.*

Mayenne (Duke of) makes himſelf the ſtrongeſt in the council of the League. III. 297. *a. b.*

Mayer (John Frederic), Profeſſor of Divinity, his Diſſertation upon Catherine Bore. II. 76. *a. b.* 77. *a.* Cited. I. 730. *a. n.* (37). 732. *a.*

Maimbourg, a great falſity of his. I. 709. *b.* Cenſured on what he ſays concerning Beza. 795. *a. n.* (80). Anachroniſms of this author. II. 17. *a.* His violence againſt the Calviniſts in relation to Cayet. 244. *b.* Is guilty of a great fault, in point of Chronology, concerning Gregory the Great. III. 219. *a.* Animadverts upon a fault of Peter du Moulin concerning the ſame Pope. *ibid. and b.* His character. 224. *b.* Confutes a falſity of Davila's, in relation to the Duke of Guiſe, that was murthered at the caſtle of Blois. 292. *b.* 293. *a.* An exceptionable witneſs in whatever concerns the Proteſtants. 397. *a.* Cenſured injudiciouſly by the author of the *News from the Republic of Letters*, in relation to the hatred which the ladies bore Henry III. 405. *b.* 406. *a.* Stuffs in an epiſode upon the affair of the *Regale*, in his hiſtory of Lutheraniſm. 454. *b.* 455. *a.* Cenſured in relation to John Sigiſmund. 533. *b.* Is miſtaken in a notable fact concerning Luther's burial. 947. *a.* Falls into the ſame contradiction with Paul Jovius, whom he tranſcribes, concerning the Atheiſm of Mahomet II. IV. 52. *b.* Cenſured in relation to the miſchiefs which the Greeks ſuffered under Mahomet II. 55. *a. b.* Has not acquitted himſelf like a faithful Hiſtorian, with regard to Joan I, Queen of Naples. 304. *a. b.* Is by no means exact in what he ſays of Ochinus. 388. *b.* Criticized in relation to thoſe among the Calviniſts that were accuſed of having betrayed their cauſe. 924. *b.* And in relation to Lelius Socinus. V. 167. *b.* A paſſage of his Hiſtory of Calviniſm examined. 474. *a. b.* 475. *a. b.* Cenſured and defended, touching the manuſcripts and the editions of Martinus Polonus. IV. 709. *a. b.*

Maimonides (Moſes) ſhews himſelf too nice in rejecting the proofs of the unity of God alledged by the ſect of the ſpeakers. V. 828.

Maine (la Croix du), Daurat's opinion of his works. II. 617. *b.*

Mainferme (Father de la), a She-Pope would find her apology in that which he has made for the founder of Fontevraud. III. 63. *a.*

Major (John) writes verſes againſt the Divines of Wittemberg, for which he is expelled the univerſity. III. 972. *b.*

Majorca (James, Infant of), his wife cauſes his head to be ſtruck of for adultery. IV. 302. *a. b.*

Maire de Belges (John le) quoted. III. 609. *a. b.* 645. *a.* IV. 156. *a. b.* Teaches Marot the eliſion of the *e* feminine. *ibid. b.* 163. *b.*

Maitland (John), Chancellor of Scotland, hinders the Biſhop of Dublin from ſucceeding in his negotiation for the marriage of James VI, with the Infanta of Spain. II. 577. William Criton endeavours to engage Robert Bruce to kill him, but cannot bring it about. *ibid.*

Malateſta (Paula), a lady of learning. III. 185. *a.*

Maldonat cenſured for the wrong he does the Calviniſts in ſaying that their principles lead to Atheiſm. V. 440. *a. b.* 441. *a. b.* 445. *a.* Sent to Metz to make proſelytes. IV. 921.

Malefactors, there is not an Atheiſt to be found among ſo many who paſs through the hangman's hands. V. 813.

Malherbe, a miſtake of his imitated by Sarrazin, and corrected in the latter by Menage. I. 80. *b.* 81. *a.* Expreſſes himſelf like one who is well ſatisfied that Achilles had but one preceptor. 78. *b.* Introduces the god of the Seine curſing Marſhal d'Ancre. II. 543. *a.* Never praiſed, nor hardly eſteemed any body. III. 855. *a.* A blunt expreſſion of his concerning a book of Meziriac's. IV. 208. *a. b.* Would have been offended at ſome verſes where Boileau mentions him. 596. *b.* On what account he was moſt inconſolable. 82. *b.* V. 384. *a.* His epitaph. 402. *b.*

Mallebranche, his doctrine that our ideas are diſtinct from our underſtanding, and that we ſee all things in God, is an antient one. I. 255. It is Democritus's doctrine unfolded and mended. II. 642. *b.* He eſtabliſhes a principle of which Chryſippus had given the firſt draught. 496. *b.* 497. *a.* Refutes thoſe who deny the creation. 789. *b.* What he ſays of the exiſtence of bodies. V. 614. *a. b.*

Malo, a Miniſter, refuſes to adminiſter the ſacrament to the lady of Montpenſier. III. 864. *b.* And why. *ibid.*

Mamaca, an imaginary caſtle into which it is ſaid the Kings of the Merovingian race retired through ſlothfulneſs. II. 744. *a.*

Mamilians, there were two ſaints of that name, according to Maraſcia. IV. 98.

Man: the Pagans owned that man was compoſed of two parts, each of which re-unites itſelf to its principle. I. 275. *a. b.* The opinion of ſome Philoſophers concerning the formation of the firſt men. 416. *a. b.* II. 411. *a. b.* 412. *a. b.* III. 649. *a. b.* 650. *a. b.* 651. *a.* It is the nature of man to run into extremes. I. 527. *a.* In what manner he may be defined. II. 126. *a.* Men ſold very cheap. 303. *b.* How diverſified by the laws of the union of ſoul and body. 451. *b.* 452. *a. b.* They give their neighbours falſe reaſons for their conduct, reſerving the true ones to themſelves. 726. *b.* Man is an undiſciplinable animal. 832. *b.* To how high a degree men are wicked. III. 469. *a.* Their paſſions render the fineſt ſyſtems of politics uſeleſs. *ibid.* By what method a man may become a god. IV. 572. *b.* Man is like a little republic, that changes its Magiſtrates often. 657. *b.* His ſtate and condition is one of the moſt incomprehenſible myſteries. 187. *a.* 468. *a. b.* His deplorable condition. V. 230. *a.* 287. *a.* Suffers a perpetual conflict within himſelf. IV. 440. *a. b.* 441. *a.* Whether he be leſs perfect than the plants, as to the manner of producing his like. V. 4. *a. b.* Nothing is more mortifying than to conſider that one is a man. 145. *a. b.* 146. *a.* His prerogatives deſcribed by Socrates. 583. *b.* 584. *a.* Great men do not like to ſpeak of their mean extraction. I. 256. *a. b.* Their memory fails them very often. 369. *b.* The ſtars of ſome men have power to immortalize a ſtory, however improbable it be. II. 7. *a.* Men deſerve ſatire more than women. V. 426. *b.* 427. *a.* The two handles by which man is moved, are the fear of puniſhment, and the deſire of reward. 812.

Mancionus (Jerom), Cæſar Borgia orders his tongue to be cut out for his ſatirical ſtrokes. IV. 90. *b.*

Mandeville, the account of his travels is fabulous. I. 46. *b.* 471. *b.*

Manducation (oral), J. Poinet does not allow of it, though he allows of the word Tranſubſtantiation. IV. 693. *a. b.*

Manducus, what uſe the Romans made of that word. I. 63. *b.*

Manes fleed alive, and why. IV. 90. *b.* 91. *a.*

Mania, a goddeſs to whom children were ſacrificed. II. 163. *b.* Her effigy hung up at the doors of the houſe to avert dangers. *ibid.* Preſided at births. *ibid.*

Manichees revive one of the principal tenets of Zoroaſter. I. 444. Become powerful under the name of Paulicians. IV. 512. Are grievouſly perſecuted. *ibid.* Their Hereſy ſpreads itſelf into all the parts of Europe. *ibid.* They cannot eaſily be refuted, except by reaſons *à poſteriori.* 512, 513. *and a.* An explanation, as to what the author had ſaid concerning them. V. 815. *to* 829. Their objections are unanſwerable, ſo long as they are diſcuſſed only at the bar of reaſon. 815. Why the author has not refuted them. 825. People cannot but abhor their hypotheſis: it goes upon a ſuppoſition which is repugnant to our moſt diſtinct ideas. *ibid.* 829. Their doctrine is deſtructive of all religions. 827. Reaſonings againſt their tenets. *ibid. and* 828, 829. Objections of Simplicius. 826, 827.

Manicheiſm aroſe from the contrariety of paſſions which toſs and pull men ſometimes one way, ſometimes another. III. 261. *a.* People have been ſurprized to find it ſaid, that they could raiſe puzzling objections. IV. 187. *a.*

Manilius degraded. IV. 755. *a.* 757. *a.*

Mankind, proofs of their bad taſte. III. 433. *a. b.* 434. *a.*

Manlius expelled from the Senate by Cato, and for what reaſon. I. 40. *b.*

Manlius, how he believed that the gods aſſiſt us. V. 373. *a.*

Manners, whether they change with our fortunes. IV. 571. *a. b.*

Manſfield (Count), how delivered from the trouble of a moſt unlucky marriage. III. 696. *a. b.*

Manſur, whether he is the ſame with Meſue. II. 587. *b.*

Mante: the conference of Mante between Perron and Berault. I. 756.

Mantineans, what ſort of laws they had, and who it was that framed them. II. 654. *b.* 655. *a.*

Mantua, by whom founded. IV. 98. *b.*

Mantreville put for Eſmandreville. II. 828. *b.*

Mantuanus, his poem intituled *Alphonſus*, what it is. V. 157. *b.*

Manutius (Aldus), an inſcription which he cauſed to be put upon the door of his ſtudy. V. 521. *b.* Cenſured touching the cauſe of Ovid's diſgrace. IV. 443. *b.* 444. *a.* And touching the time of his death. 447. *a.*

Manutius (Paulus), refutation of his opinion concerning the meaning of this phraſe, *Quærere conditiones.* III. 116. *b.* 117. *a. b.* Is under a miſtake when he ſays that Atius and his daughter were not of Aricia. IV. 397. *a.* Troubles which his daughter brought upon him. V. 241. *a.*

Manuſcripts are the ſport of fortune. I. 525. *a.* IV. 833. *b.* People alter the reading of manuſcripts, according to the model of their own underſtandings. I. 543. *b.* Some antient ones do not contain all that is to be found in others, and yet no blanks have been left in them. II. 572. *b.* Catalogue of thoſe of the Emperor's library at Vienna. III. 707. *b.* Application of Peraxylus in the ſearch of them. IV. 544. Conſideration on the cauſes of their difference. 710. *a. b. &c.* Are corrupted by additions and ſubſtractions. 710. *a.* Want of ſincerity does not always occaſion their difference; ſeveral innocent cauſes may contribute towards it. 711. *b.* A rule whereby to judge whether they are altered from motives of intereſt. *ibid.*

Manuſcripts of the Scripture altered and corrupted by the Heretics. III. 733.

Mar, the ſignification of that word. I. 51. *b.*

Marais (Mr), extracts communicated by him to the author, concerning the affront which the Queen of Navarre received. IV. 341. *a. b.*

Marble, a diſpute betwixt Arnauld and Jurieu, whether it may be worſhipped. III. 100. *b.* 101. *a. b.*

Marca, the judgment which has been paſſed on him with regard to one of his books. IV. 100. *b.*

Marcellus (Claudius-Marcus) his untimely death, Virgil's reflexion thereupon. III. 921. *b.* His elogy, and the conſequence inferred from it. *ibid.*

Marcellus, by his venerable preſence hinders the common people from killing the Heretic Manes. IV. 111. *a.*

Marcilius Ficinus ſends an account of himſelf from the other world. II. 65. *b.* 66. *a.*

Marcion, neither he nor his followers did well underſtand the ſtrength and weakneſs of the orthodox. IV. 113. *a.*

Marcus Aurelius (Emperor), the ſpurious life of that Prince by Guevara. II. 770. *a.* III. 270. *a. b.* Fauſto da Longiano writes a criticiſm upon it. *ibid. b.* And promiſes a life of M. Aurelius, compoſed from the teſtimony of the antient Hiſtorians. *ibid.*

Mare Hiſtoriarum, or *the ſea of hiſtories*, a work under that title compoſed by John Columna. II. 529. *a. b.* Called by miſtake *Mater Hiſtoriarum*, and *the mother of hiſtories. ibid. a.* Divers things have been inſerted into it, and the œconomy of it has been changed. *ibid. b.*

Mareſcot, for what things he was indebted to the profeſſion of Phyſic. IV. 504. *b.* 505. *a.*

Mares, their exceſſive luſt. V. 768. Some ladies paſs a whole night in watching a mare. 773. Mares that took wind, and which people believed to be with foal. 771. *a. b.* 772. *a. b.*

Mareſius (Samuel), his method of teaching, and his authority. I. 242. Prolegomena of his diſpute againſt Daillé. II. 583. *a. b.* 584. *a. b.* His *Hydra Socinianiſmi expugnata.* V. 505. *b. &c.* Blames the Engliſh for their indulgence to the Socinians. 506. *b.*

Mareſts (John des) a viſionary, his tricks to draw another viſionary into a ſnare. IV. 268. *a. b.* 269. *a.*

Margaret of Anjou, Queen of England, falls into the hands of a company of highway-men. II. 131. *a.*

Margaret de Valois, Queen of Navarre, ſiſter to Francis I, intercedes for a Franciſcan who had preached againſt her. III. 623. *a.* Transformed into a Fury in a comedy. IV. 318. *b.* Her Heptameron. 321. *b.* 322. *a. b.* Her Heroiſm. 323. *a. b.*

Margaret, ſiſter to Henry II, and wife to the Duke of Savoy, was a learned woman, and loved learned men. III. 200. *b.* Suſpected to have imbibed the new opinions. 397. *b.* 398. *a.* Suſpected likewiſe to have feigned herſelf with child. 398. *a.* She bubbles the court of France very advantageouſly for her huſband the Duke of Savoy. *ibid. and b.* Every body murmurs at it. *ibid. b.*

Margaret de Valois, Queen of Navarre, ſiſter to Charles IX, was very averſe to the marrying Henry IV, by reaſon of the difference of religion. IV. 333. *b.* Her temper. 334. *a. b.* Common fame makes her loved criminally by two of her brothers. 335. *a. b.* Almoſt did the office of a midwife to her huſband's miſtreſſes. 336. *a.* The counterartifice which ſhe employed againſt Catherine de Medicis. III. 419. *b.* Her gallanting humour. IV. 339. *b.* 340. *a. b.*

Margaret, daughter to the Emperor Maximilian, who was her actual huſband. III. 323. *a.*

Mariamne, a tragedy which coſt a Player his life. V. 400. *a.*

Marianus Scotus, what he ſays of the She-Pope. IV. 725, 726, 727, 728. Many think that he is the firſt who ſpoke of the She-Pope; others maintain he ſaid nothing about her. 727. *b.* 728. *a.* From what manuſcript the edition of Marianus was printed. *ibid.*

Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland, how we ought to judge of the ſatires that were wrote againſt her. II. 181. *a.* That which encourages hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm in relation to her adventures. 282. *a. b.* Buchanan publiſhes a book concerning her leudneſs. V. 857.

Mary of Burgundy had a deſire to be married to the Dauphin of France. III. 805. *a.* Dies of a fall from her horſe at hunting. II. 222. *b.*

Mary de Medicis, Queen of France, ſcruples raiſed in the mind of Lewis XIII, with relation to the hardſhips exerciſed towards that Princeſs. II. 400. *a. b.* Thoſe who formed factions with her were altogether inexcuſable. IV. 143. *b.* Anſwer which ſhe cauſes to be publiſhed. 256. *a.*

Mary Magdalene, whether ſhe be the ſame with Mary the ſiſter of Lazarus, and the woman who was a ſinner. III. 47. *b*. 48. *a*.

Mariendal, Marſhal Turenne is defeated there. IV. 917. *b*.

Marigni gives teſtimonies very favourable to the Prince of Condé's virtue. II. 137. *b*. The inſenſibility which he attributes to a governour of the Low-Countries, with reſpect to the ladies. V. 421. *b*.

Marillac, Keeper of the Seals, ſeconds Cardinal Berulle in oppoſing Cardinal Richelieu's deſign of humbling the Houſe of Auſtria. I. 786. *a*.

Marillac (Marſhal de) whether he was put to death for any other cauſe, than his having diſpleaſed Cardinal Richelieu. III. 818. *a*. *b*. IV. 141. *a*. *b*. 142. *a*. *b*. 143. *a*. *b*. &c.

Marini (Chevalier) his thought concerning the ſpots in the moon. I. 113. *b*.

Marius (Hieronymus Vicentius) the fictitious name that Maſſarius gives himſelf, and which Placcius has not mentioned. IV. 173. *a*.

Marlorat makes Indexes for Calvin's Inſtitution. V. 88. *a*.

Marolles (the Abbé de) tranſlates Ovid's Poem againſt Ibis into French, and accompanies it with notes. IV. 452. *b*. Dedicates this tranſlation to James Pinon, and a long paſſage in praiſe of that man. 651. *a*. *b*.

Marot declares that he had learned in Italy never to ſpeak of God. IV. 154. *a*. *b*. Whether the Proteſtants ought to be reproached with the public uſe of his verſion, ſuppoſing he had been puniſhed for his adulteries. 154. *b*. 155. *a*. What Cayet ſays of him is not probable. 154. *b*. His falſe propheſy. II. 29. *b*. 30. *a*.

Marpurg: when the univerſity of Marpurg was founded. III. 709. *b*. *n*. (10). And when opened. 148. *b*.

Marry: whether a wiſe man ought to marry. I. 633. *b*. Formerly people were prohibited to marry after a certain age. 120. *a*. Thoſe who marry a ſecond time excluded from the miniſtry by the canons. II. 174. *b*.

Marriage joined with continency. I. 34. *a*. What is its principal character. *ibid. and b*. Formerly the Legiſlators prohibited it to women of fifty, and men of ſixty years of age. 120. *a*. Its efficacy. 223. *a*. *b*. 446. *a*. *b*. What it is a remedy for. 390. *b*. 391. *a*. Gives an opportunity of making experiments. 549. *b*. 550. *a*. Sentiments of Socrates, Diogenes, and Euripides, concerning marriage. 549. *a*. *b*. Reflexion upon the beauty and riches, or the uglineſs and poverty of the woman that one deſigns to marry. 549. *b*. 550. *a*. *b*. A falſe dilemma againſt marriage. II. 13. *b*. 14. *a*. Whether it is forbidden to make choice of a handſome wife. 72. *a*. *b*. 73. *a*. Whether it was a recommendation among the party, at the beginning of the Reformation. 174. *b*. 175. *a*. III. 13. *a*. *b*. 14. *a*. *b*. Is a neceſſary troubleſome ſtate. II. 384. *a*. Speech of Metellus to recommend marriage. *ibid*. The Athenian laws allowed a man to marry his ſiſter by the father, and forbid him his ſiſter by the mother, the Lacedæmonian laws permitted the latter, and prohibited the former. 503. *a*. *b*. 504. *a*. *b*. Several extravagant fancies concerning the marriage of Adam and Eve. 853. *a*. *b*. Deluſion of Heretics that profeſſed to abſtain from it. III. 63. *b*. The Theory of it is well known before a woman be marriageable. 187. *a*. Whether it is convenient and proper for Philoſophers. 382. *b*. The Divinity that preſided over it, according to the Poets. 641. *a*. *b*. A cuſtom relating to it which was obſerved among ſome nations. 773. *a*. *b*. Strange ſuperſtition of the Roman ladies, in ſeeking after omens for marriage. IV. 200. *b*. 201. *a*. Is ſometimes ſo irkſome, that a man to free himſelf from it would go to the end of the world. 313. *b*. Clandeſtine marriages ſhould be declared void. 636. *a*. *b*. 637. *a*. The Canon-Law countenances the abuſes of marriage. 748. *a*. *b*. Thoſe who marry a poor wife to be quiet at home, do not obtain their ends. 753. *a*. Reflexion on its conſequences. 844. *a*. *b*. Reflexion on St Paul's words, wherein he ſeems to command the Biſhops to marry. 856. *b*. 857. *a*. Could not be contracted between brother's and ſiſters by adoption. V. 49. *b*. Scandalous cuſtoms which were obſerved in relation to it. 129. *b*. 130. *a*. *b*. 131. *a*. *b*. What are the inconveniencies of marriage. 425. *a*. *b*. 426. *a*. *b*. Whether it be a good remedy againſt incontinence. 426. *a*. It is dangerous to men of learning. 604. *a*. Edict of Henry II, concerning clandeſtine marriages. IV. 636. *a*. *b*. Is the moſt difficult of all things to determine with judgment. I. 603. *a*. The impatience of youth hurries us into it without reflexion. *ibid*. It is neceſſary to begin with earneſt prayer, when we deliberate upon a point ſo nice and hazardous. *ibid*. *b*. William Bigot promiſes a treatiſe to prove the neceſſity of marriage. *ibid*. *a*. A diſcourſe on the marriage of men of learning, by Claudius Baduel. *ibid*. *a*. *b*. This diſcourſe full of good inſtructions. *ibid*. *b*. And tranſlated into French by Guy de la Gard. 604. *a*. *b*. A common argument, that marriage diverts too much from ſtudy. III. 344. *a*. It does not deaden the ſpirits nor ſlacken the hands. *ibid*. There ought to be marriage-makers in a well ordered commonwealth. 529. *b*. Leontium wrote a book againſt Theophraſtus, becauſe he had publiſhed ſeveral good things relating to marriage. 779. Fine pieces on the ſubject of marriage, muſt diſpleaſe a Courtezan. *ibid*. *b*. The anſwer which ſome ladies made to thoſe that propoſed a ſecond marriage to them. III. 189. *a*. 191. *a*. *b*. 192. *a*. Thoſe who gave their daughters in marriage, demanded a wedding-preſent from their ſons-in-law. IV. 180. *b*.

Marriages: the primitive Chriſtians declared ſtrongly againſt ſecond marriages. I. 533. *a*. *b*. That which St Jerome ſaid againſt them. III. 192. *a*. They have been ſubject formerly, and are ſtill to canonical penalties. *ibid*. *b*. Sentences againſt ſecond marriages. IV. 747. *a*.

Married. The firſt woman in Peloponneſus that was married a ſecond time. III. 194. The advantage of thoſe that are ill-married. II. 14. *a*. Whether thoſe who are not married ſtudy better, and write more good books than thoſe that are. V. 524. *b*. &c.

The Disadvantage — Vol. 5. 524. a.

Marrow, viz. whether lions have any. I. 76. *a*. *b*. It is in the marrow, that the ſpecific parts of the animal are contained. *ibid*. *b*.

Mars was the Patron of the countries which the Alains inhabited. I. 177. *b*. In what action the Romans pretended that this god had fought viſibly for them. III. 1. *b*.

Marſaglia, the ſucceſs of that battle is not doubtful, Marſhal de Catinat gained it. IV. 211. *a*.

Marſeilles. A poiſoning liquor was kept there for thoſe who wanted to kill themſelves. V. 628. *a*. *b*. The people of Marſeilles could not but know what Narbonne was. I. 11. *b*. They rejoiced at Cæſar's having ordered a ſacred wood to be cut down, thinking that ſo great an impiety would not remain unpuniſhed. II. 418. *b*. A profane thought of Lucan's with regard to this. *ibid*. They were inſpired with greater reverence and fear for their unknown deities, than for thoſe whom they fancied they knew. 678. *a*. They are queſtioned concerning Britain. I. 10. *a*. IV. 677. *a*. *b*.

Marſus (Octavius) a wretched Roman Senator. II. 680. *b*. 681. *a*.

Marteau (Peter) obſervation concerning the books printed by that chimerical Printer. II. 441. *b*.

Martel (Charles) and his ſon Pepin found it a very hard matter to ſubdue the Duke of Aquitain. I. 16. *a*. The ſuſpicion of having invited the Saracens into France, ſhould fall upon him rather than upon this Duke. *ibid. and b*. It has been publickly affirmed that he was damned. III. 707. *b*.

Martel, Profeſſor of Divinity at Montauban. II. 518.

Martia goes to Cato, after Hortenſius's death, to whom Cato had lent her, and intreats him to take her again. III. 495. *b*.

Martia, puniſhed with the utmoſt rigour, for having violated her veſtal vow. III. 830. *a*. *b*.

Martial ſuppoſes a falſe fact in relation to Catullus. II. 395. *b*. 396. *a*. Juſtly laughs at the behaviour of Cato with regard to the Floral Games. III. 54. *a*. *n*. (9). A Venetian Gentleman burns his works in a ſolemn manner, as a ſacrifice to the Manes of Catullus. IV. 433. *a*. Martial's wiſh in relation to a wiſe. 793. *a*. Who was the firſt that

that took it into his head, to clear him of his obſcenities. V. 136. *a. b.* Navagiero had a great averſion againſt him. IV. 315.

Martin (John) a famous Phyſician. I. 171, 172.

Martin (St) refuſes to communicate with ſome Biſhops, and why. IV. 781. *and b.* He yields to it at laſt, and why. *ibid.*

Martin (Bernardin) author of ſeveral books on Phyſic, alſo wrote a relation of his travels. V. 442. *b.*

Martyr (Peter) conforms himſelf for ſome time to Bucer's ambiguous way of ſpeaking, concerning the Euchariſt, but at laſt leaves it. II. 177. *b.* 178. *a.* His account concerning Caraccioli, different from that of Beza. 313. *b.* Invited into England to aſſiſt in the Reformation. IV. 381. *b.* His Common-places compared with Calvin's Inſtitution. V. 86. *b.*

Martyrdom is a doubtful ſign that truth is on the ſide of that religion, which it is ſuffered for. IV. 108. *b.* 109. *a. b.* 110. *a. b. &c.*

Martyrology, there are ſome Anabaptiſts in that of Geneva. I. 287. *b.*

Martyrs, many pious frauds are handed about concerning their death. I. 780. *a.* There is one who was a Comedian. IV. 487. *b. n.* (37). The origin of the falſe legends of martyrs. V. 432. *a. b.* &c. Diſorders which happened in their churches, whilſt the Faithful were aſſembled there. 472. *a.* Acts of the Proteſtant martyrs publiſhed by Claudius Baduel. I. 603. Savonarola has been looked upon as one. V. 66. *b.* 67. *a.* Whether he deſerves that title. 69. *a. b.* Some Proteſtants give it him. *ibid.* The public records ought to be carefully conſulted before ſuch and ſuch a perſon, is declared to be a martyr. 70. *a. b. & ſeq.*

Martius goes from the burial of his ſon to the Senate. I. 683. *a.*

Maſcati. The advantage which its inhabitants have over the other Mahometans. IV. 48. *a. b.*

Maſs, called the public error, and by whom. II. 252. *b.* Whether thoſe who have no faith in it may be preſent at it, as at a Comedy. IV. 391. *a.* It is the Lord's Supper diſguiſed, which has turned a Nun. *ibid.* What Stuppanus thought of it. V. 247. *a. b.* A book intituled *the Anatomy of the Maſs*. 461. *a. b.*

Maſſacre of St Bartholomew. See *Bartholomew.*

Maſſo (Papyrius) ill tranſlated by le Laboureur. V. 392. *b.*

Mathematicians are not commonly well verſed in the knowledge of matters of fact. III. 461. *a.* They are not very devout. IV. 487. *b.*

Mathematics: perſons that learned Mathematics without any one's reading lectures to them in that ſcience. IV. 61. *a. b.* 63. *b.* Have their defect as well as other ſciences. V. 621. *a.* Their object. 622. *a. b.*

Mathias (Corvinus) King of Hungary, invited all ſorts of learned men to come to him without excepting the Magicians. II. 68. *a.* Roughly treated by Bonfinius. 67. *b.* 68. *a.*

Mathilda (Counteſs) her liberality to the Popes. III. 593. *a.*

Matignon puts a garriſon into Bazas, and ſome other places near Nerac, where the King of Navarre reſided. IV. 341. *a.*

Matrimonial duty, precepts concerning it. I. 504. *a. b.* 505. *a. b.* II. 80. *b.* 81. *a.* 447. *b.* Whether it was ſuperſeded and ſuſpended in the ark. 431. *a. b.*

Matrons (ſworn) curious atteſtations made by them, in obedience to an order of the judges. III. 581. *a. b.* 582. *a.*

Matter, a compariſon of its three dimenſions with the Trinity. I. 29. *b.* What Philoſopher ſuppoſed firſt that an intelligence put it into motion. 299. *a. b.* Thoſe who maintain it to be increated, are very much puzzled. 300. *a.* III. 447. *a. b.* Is uncapable of thinking. II. 661. *b.* 662. *a. b.* III. 649. *a. b.* 650. *a. b.* 651. *a.* 790. *b.* 791. *a. b.* IV. 718. *a. b.* 719. *a. b.* All the Philoſophers of antiquity believed it to be increated. II. 786. *b.* V. 218. *a.* Upon the ſuppoſition of its eternal exiſtence, natural Philoſophers cannot admit of a providence, without reaſoning worſe than thoſe that deny it. II. 786. *b.* 787. *a.* Ariſtotle acknowledges the ſuppoſition of its eternal motion to be abſurd. 787. *b.* Had a real defect, according to the Platonics, which was an obſtacle to God's project. 788. *a. b.* Had likewiſe, according to the ſame Platonics, a ſoul before the formation of the world. 792. *b.* If it is ſelf-exiſtent, we cannot well conceive that God either could or ſhould give it motion. IV. 436. *b.* And if it moved itſelf independently of God, there is no need for employing him in the conſtruction of the world. 437. *a.* Whether phyſical evils be an unavoidable effect of the diſpoſition of matter. 525. *a. b.* Whether one can comprehend that it is eternal and diſtinct from God, and that it was created out of nothing. V. 211. *b.* 212. *a. b.* In what ſenſe diviſible *in infinitum.* 609. *a. b.* Abſurdity of this opinion. 611. *b.* Its exiſtence cannot be proved by any good demonſtration. 614. *a. b.* 615. *a.*

Matthias (St) the apoſtle, his election burleſqued in *the Acts of the Apoſtles in rhime.* II. 478. *a. b.* 479. *a. b.*

Matthieu (Peter) his reflexions upon the holy Scripture, in relation to the conference of Ratiſbon. III. 536. *a.*

Matthiolus, it is believed that Fauſtus de Longiano had tranſlated Dioſcorides before him. III. 861.

Maucroix, his French French verſion of Sanderus's Hiſtory of the Schiſm of England, is a very polite one, and has undergone three editions. V. 43. *a.*

Maurice, Emperor of Conſtantinople, is delivered to Phocas. III. 222. *a. b.*

Maurice, Landgrave of Heſſe, makes verſes in honour of the youth, who took the degree of Bachelor. II. 818. *a.* What healths he drank with other Princes. *ibid. and b.*

Mauſoleum, was one of the ſeven wonders of the world. I. 524. *and a.*

Mauſſac cenſures Dalechamp juſtly upon the tranſlation of a paſſage of Athenæus. II. 558. *a.* 563. *b.*

Maximilian I, deceived by Pope Leo X. III. 540. *a.* Fights a duel. IV. 184. *a.*

Maxims claſh with each other no leſs than errors and truth. I. 784. *b.* II. 27. *b.* A collection of ſome. IV. 778. *a. b.*

Maxims of ſtate. Their appurtenances. I. 682. *a.*

Maximus is defeated by Theodoſius, and killed by the ſoldiers at Aquileia. IV. 781. *b.*

Maximus Tyrius, what he relates concerning Achilles, and the place where he reſided. I. 85. *a.* His explication of the origin of evil. IV. 525. *a. b.*

Mazarine (the Ducheſs of) an expreſſion in her memoirs imitated, and properly applied. II. 692. *a. b.*

Mazarine (Cardinal) deſires to be acquainted with Amyraut. I. 264. *a. b.* One of his maxims. 619. *b.* Juſtified as to the accuſation of having made an auction of books in the palace d'Eſtrée. IV. 172. *a. b.* Uſed to ſpin out the execution of his promiſes to a great length of time. 417. *a.* His readineſs to forgive an injury. 808. *a.* Why he did not anſwer all the letters which were wrote to him. V. 94. *b.* 95. *a.* Would not be complimented with a falſe genealogy. 469. *a. b.* Cauſes Father Cauſſin to be baniſhed into Britany. II. 403. There was not one ſtory which people did not believe, when it defamed him. IV. 511. *a.*

Meaux (the Biſhop of) ſeems to have tranſcribed a paſſage of Mr Daillé, and made it the principle of one of his books. II. 583. *a.* V. 294. *a.* See *Boſſuet.* A paſſage of his examined. II. 708. *a. b.* A reflexion of his. III. 390. *b.* Upon the prodigal ſon. V. 534. *b.* Takes a great deal of pains to ſet forth the alterations of the Lutheran confeſſion. II. 122. *b.*

Mecca, who began to build its temple. I. 46. *a.* And who profaned and laid it waſte. 48, 49. Upon what model the Oratory of the temple of Mecca was built. 46. *a.* A ſtone which hung in the air there. 49. 124. *b.* 125. *a. b.*

Mechanics, a ſurprizing effect of that ſcience. I. 474. *a. b.*

Mechlinius was a diſciple of Albertus Magnus. IV. 940. *b.* His opinion concerning the deluge. *ibid.* 941. *a. b.*

Medals, there are authors who forge falſe ones. III. 195. *b.* Medals which have two faces upon the ſame neck, what they ſignify. V. 314. *a.*

Mede (Joſeph), a Viſionary: his prophetic calculations ſeem inſpired to Jurieu. II. 124. *b.* 125. *a.*

Medea, what ſhe did with her children. II. 874. *a.* The enchantment which ſhe uſed in order to make people young again. IV. 533. *a. b.* 534. *a.*

Mediana, how a prieſt of that village behaved himſelf in the ſedition that was raiſed in Caſtille. IV. 457. *a. b.*

Mediators ſometimes hurt the parties which they endeavour to reconcile. I. 578. *a. b.*

Medicis (Cardinal John de) diverted himſelf with the feuds of the learned. I. 202. *a.* Was but fifteen years of age when he was named to the Cardinalate. II. 97. *a.* By what accident he was choſen Pope. III. 761. *and a. b.*

Medicis (Cardinal Julian de), a conſpiracy is formed againſt him. IV. 11. *b.*

Medicis (Lorenzo de) filled with confuſion and deſpair, how, and for what. IV. 232. *b.* 233. *a.* His library. III. 729. *a. b.* 730. *a.* He, and his brother Julian attacked by aſſaſſins in a church, in the middle of divine ſervice. V. 157. *a. b.* J. Savonarola ſent for to prepare him for death. 57.

Medicis (Peter de), what he did to make his equipage appear the more magnificent. III. 151. *b.* Contrives a plot againſt the government. IV. 346. *and a. b.* Perſons that were executed for being concerned in it. *ibid. a. b.* Driven out of Florence. V. 59. *a.*

Medicis (Alexander de), Duke of Florence, aſſaſſinated. V. 251. *b.* 252. *a.* And when. IV. 379.

Medicis (Catherine de) cured of her barrenneſs, and how. III. 24. *and a.* Her huſband's liberality in rewarding this cure. *ibid.* Cauſes the Duke of Alençon, and the King of Navarre to be kept at Vincennes, and why. III. 416. *b.* 417. *a.* Did not puniſh the debauchery of her maids of honour, but the want of art to conceal it. 832. *a. b.* 833. *a.* Was very near being a Calviniſt. V. 186. *a. b.* Bore with ſatires. 760, 761. Deſpiſed injurious reflexions. IV. 278. *b.* Introduces the firſt Rucellai into France. 410. Frightened with a ſermon of de Menot's. V. 298. *a.* Baniſhes the lady de Mortemart for having given her advice. *ibid.*

Medicis (Mary de), during the four years of her Regency, ſhe never kiſſed, not ſo much as once, the King, her ſon. IV. 544. *b.* Diſtruſted by her ſon. III. 816. *a.* Jealous of her authority. IV. 143. *b.* Rinuccini, a gentleman of Florence, in love with her. 878. *a.*

Medina (Michael) ſuſpected for having defended Ferus. III. 43. *b.* 44. *a.* Retrenches ſeveral things from the writings of that Franciſcan. 44. *a. b.*

Megabyzes reproved for having talked of a thing which he did not underſtand. I. 367. *a.*

Megrin (St), by whom aſſaſſinated, and why. III. 296. *a. b.*

Meibomius, his collections concerning tyranny. IV. 564. *a. n.* (26).

Meynier, the Jeſuit, an harangue which he was thought to be the author of. II. 877. *a. b.* Accuſes the gentlemen of Port-Royal of holding intelligence with Geneva. V. 16. *b.*

Melac, whether he had a dog that was a familiar ſpirit. I. 151. *a.* Suſpected of dealing with the Devil. III. 718. *b.* A witty anſwer which he made in relation to this. *ibid.* His behaviour at the ſiege of Landau. 720. *a. b.* 721. *a. b.*

Melampus, how he acquired the gift of underſtanding the language of birds. II. 340. *a.* IV. 182. *a.* V. 381. *b.*

Melanchthon, whether it became him to divert himſelf with jeſts and banters. III. 954. *a.* Was of a peaceable diſpoſition. IV. 185. *b.* 186. *a. b.* 187. *a. b.* 188. *a. b.* 189. *a. b.* Determines to retire into Paleſtine. 188. *b.* His opinion concerning Grace, was contrary to that of Luther and Calvin. V. 151. *a. b.* 152. *a. b.* Wiſhed to die. 250. *b.* Prints the Confeſſion of Augſburg in Latin and German, and varies from the original. II. 122. *a.* The long friendſhip between him and Simon Grynæus. III. 255. Pezelius publiſhes ſome extracts of his works, in which he puts the objections and anſwers in a very good method, and interlards ſome ſhort obſervations. IV. 606. *b.*

Melanopus, an Athenian, ſuffered himſelf to be gained over to Calliſtratus by money, and ſaid to the people, that he ſubmitted to him for the good of the public. II. 259, 260.

Meliſſus could not have anſwered the objections of Zoroaſter againſt thoſe who acknowledged but one principle of all things. IV. 519. *a.* Argument which he made uſe of againſt the exiſtence of motion. V. 615. *b.* 616. *a. b.*

Melchiorites, an imaginary ſect. IV. 193.

Melchites, a name which the Eutychians gave the Catholics, and for what reaſon. IV. 349. *b.*

Mellerſtat, a celebrated Phyſician to Frederic, Elector of Saxony. V. 562. *a. b.*

Melos, all the people of that iſland had the reputation of being Atheiſts, and why. II. 653. *a. b.*

Melvil quoted. V. 273. *a.*

Melun, Amyot was mortified at that city. I. 256. *b.* Some Prelates and Doctors aſſemble there to prepare the inſtructions of thoſe who were to be deputed to the Council of Trent. II. 372. Varillas refuted in relation to this aſſembly. 375. *b.* 376. *a. b.*

Memoirs of Mr L. C. D. R. publiſhed in the year 1687; their author cenſured. II. 136. *a.* V. 84. *a.*

Memory: the ſurprizing memory of Alcander. I. 215. *a.* That of hearers is to be dreaded by Lawyers who contradict themſelves. 352. *a.* Men of the greateſt memory often forget what others remember commonly enough: an inſtance of this. 551. *a.* Examples of a great many, who for want of memory were at a ſtand. II. 191. *a. b.* People whoſe memory was much decayed in the laſt years of their life. 624. *b.* Perſons of a prodigious memory. I. 215. *a.* II. 22. *a. b.* 23. *a.* 265. *a. b.* 645. *b.* 646. *a.* 747. *b.* 748. *a.* 769. *b.* III. 60. *a.* 491. *b.* IV. 196. *b.* 197. *a. b.* 198. *a.* 248. *a.* 289. *a. b.* 290. *a.* V. 140. *b.* Is the firſt thing that dies in a learned man. IV. 196. *b.* 197. *a.* May create us enemies. 248. *a.* Local memory, to whom the invention of it is aſcribed. V. 140. *b.*

Men of Letters, ſee *Authors*, *Writers*, *Letters*.

Menage has made a falſe obſervation on Malherbe's Poems. I. 78. *b.* Juſtly cenſures Malherbe for the ambiguity of an expreſſion. 80. *b.* His genealogy. 168. *b.* Knew how to make the moſt of his reading. 441. *a. b.* Thinks it ſtrange to ſee a preacher in the pulpit with a hat on his head. II. 93. *b.* Forms a criticiſm upon Horace that is very well grounded. 139. *and b.* Accuſes Mr Baillet wrongfully in relation to Daurat's age. 621. *a.* Quoted as to the proofs produced againſt Robert d'Arbriſſelles. III. 66. *b.* 67. *a.* Did not know all the Eccleſiaſtics who have written love-verſes, and of whom he has publiſhed a liſt. 106. *and a. b.* Says it is falſe that Father Sirmond ever repented the publiſhing a letter of Geoffry of Vendôme to Robert d'Arbriſſelles. 66. *b.* Cenſures Voſſius in relation to the Poet Hermeſianax. 779. *a.* Sounds the alarm againſt Montmaur. IV. 246. *a.* 251. *a.* Excuſes himſelf for having compoſed a ſatirical piece. 248. *b.* Judgment concerning ſome of his Poems. 250. *b.* 251. *a.* Cenſures Marſilius Ficinus with great reaſon, in relation to Prodicus. 782. *b.* Beſtows two chapters to prove, that Poets, after they have ſwore to write no more, do ſtill write on. II. 83. *b.*

Menagiana, thoſe who publiſhed it forgot a good jeſt. I. 605. *a.* A witty ſaying in that book. II. 534. *b.* 535. *a.* Elogy of that work, and of thoſe who publiſhed it. IV. 195. *a. b.* That collection cited in relation to a congreſs. 803. *a. n.* (43). Cited again. V. 112. *a. n.* (1), (2). What is related there of one Blunet. 381. *a. n.* (8). A fault in the Continuation of that work. 739, 740. A good many things are miſerably confounded there. *ibid.*

Menetrier (Father) cited. III. 302. *b. n.* (37). IV. 134. *a. n.* (8). *ibid. b. n.* (11). V. 269. *a. n.* (1).

Menjot, a celebrated Phyſician, expreſſes himſelf in very obſcene terms, in his treatiſe *de Sterilitate*. III. 920. *a.* Character of his diſſertation upon the *Furor Uterinus*. V. 799.

Mennonites, ſee *Anabaptiſts*.

Menot, one of his ſermons frightens Catherine de Medicis, and makes her cry. V. 298. *a.*

Mentz receives a French garriſon; and the French loſe it after a long ſiege. IV. 211. *b.* Deſtroyed by the Pope. V. 541. *a.*

Mercerus underſtood nothing but Hebrew books. IV. 842. *b.*

Mercure Galant, ignorance of the author of that book. III. 718. *b.* 719. *a.*

Mercure Suiſſe, a book wrote by Frederic Spanheim. II. 551. *a.* A paſſage of it concerning the pretended miracles which happened during the ſiege of Conſtance. *ibid. b.*

Mercure Hiſtorique & Politique, its author has acted like an honeſt man, and ought to be imitated. V. 84. *a. b.*

Mercury, a deſcription of his rod, and its virtues. I. 4. *b.* 5. *a.* Gets a woman with child. II. 652. *a. b.* His memory ſlips him in a ſurprizing manner. IV. 542. *b.*

Mercurialis cited. III. 782. *b.* 783. *a.*

Mere (the Chevalier de), obſervation upon one of his letters. V. 621. *a. b.* Cited. III. 374. *a. n.* (150). 376. *b. n.* (172).

Merit is very often prejudicial to thoſe who aſpire to great offices. I. 354. *a.* 733. *b.* II. 436. *a.* Examples of extraordinary merit. I. 580. *a. b.* 581. *a. b.* 781. *a. b.* 782. *a. b.* The being ſuperior to another in merit, does not make one ſuperior likewiſe in reputation. 459. *a. b.*

Merklinus, an error of that author's in *Lindenius renovatus*, touching Myrepſus. IV. 764. *b.*

Meſſias, according to the Jews, he ought to diſcern by the ſmell, whether a perſon accuſed be innocent or guilty. I. 650. Whether he is not yet come under the principal characters which the Prophets attribute to him. II. 175. *b.* A collection of paſſages which ſhew, that the antient Jewiſh Church believed his Divinity. IV. 880. *a.* What Laurentius Valla ſaid of him. V. 437. *a.*

Meſſina, whether it be true that the holy Virgin wrote to the inhabitants of that town. III. 563. *a.*

Meſtrezat, his treatiſe concerning our communion with JESUS CHRIST, tranſlated into Italian by Vincent Paravicin. IV. 471.

Meſue, whether he be the ſame with Mauſur. II. 587. *b.* When, where, and under what name his books were printed. *ibid.*

Metamorphoſis, Ovid threw that book into the fire; but there were ſome copies of it in private hands. IV. 447. *b.* 448. *a.*

Metaphors: whether there is nothing real in metaphors. II. 434. *b.*

Metaphoriſts, a chimerical ſect. II. 434. *b.*

Metapontines, their ſacrifices were eſteemed to belong in common to Apollo and Ariſteas. I. 459. *a.*

Metals and minerals, how formed in the earth. V. 117. *b.* 118. *a. b.*

Metempſychoſis, ſome Jews believed it. I. 46. *n.* (*f*). Different from that of Pythagoras. 52. *a.* Is at the bottom the ſame thing with Spinoziſm. 52. *and a. b.* Deſtroys hell. IV. 669. *a.* Pythagoras learned it of the Egyptians. 674. *a.*

Metharme, wife of Cinyras, and mother of Adonis. IV. 641.

Methodius, his revelation is a mere invention. I. 23. *a.*

Methods: divers methods of converting Heretics. IV. 373. *b.* 374. *a. b.*

Metz deprived of its liberty by Henry II. II. 445. *b.* The King permits the demoliſhing of its temple. 525. The juriſdiction of the Judges, which were called the Thirteen, is ſuppreſſed there. III. 33. *a.*

Meurſius confounds two Pygmalions together. IV. 642. *a.*

Mezerai criticized in relation to the ſiege of Aiguillon. I. 162. *b.* 163. *a.* Judgment of the firſt and ſecond edition of his abridgment. 319. *b.* Conduct altogether unworthy of this ſamous Hiſtorian. 794. *b.* 795. *a.* Is often miſtaken in Chriſtian-names. II. 828. *b.* Rejects, as a mere ſtory, the reaſon which is alledged why Charles V was not ſtopped in France. 841. *a.* His obſervation upon a quality that recommends us to the fair ſex. III. 296. *b.* 415. *b.* Is miſtaken about Munuza and Abderama. IV. 284. *b.* Criticized in relation to Joan II, Queen of Naples. 307. *a.* Perhaps it will be wondered ſome time hereafter how he came to be ſo much eſteemed. 319. *b.* His miſtake in relation to the Baron du Pont, and the ſuit of impotency which he had upon his hands. 482. *b.* 799. *a.* Cenſured in relation to the Ducheſs of Valentinois. 699. *a. b.* Injudiciouſly blamed for obſcenity. V. 841. Did not mind politeneſs of ſtile. *ibid. n.* (24).

Meziriac anſwers weakly to an objection which he raiſes himſelf, concerning the praiſes which Homer beſtows upon Penelope. IV. 543. *b.* Conduct of the author in quoting paſſages from his writings. V. 805.

Michael (Captain), Arquebuſier to Charles IX, his behaviour towards the Preſident de la Place. IV. 682. *a.*

Mycillus dies Profeſſor of Greek at Baſil, in 1558. V. 589.

Midwives, why called *Sages-Femmes* in French. V. 46. *b.* A midwife hanged at Paris for having made ſeveral women ſuffer abortion. IV. 498. *b.* 499. *a.*

Migonitis, a name given to Venus, and why. III. 368. *b.* A temple built to Venus under that name. *ibid.*

Milan (the Duke of) ſhut up in an iron cage, without having ſo much as the comfort of being able to read or write. III. 814. *a.*

Milaneſe abandoned by the French. III. 611. *b.*

Milaneſe look upon the Cardinals of the aſſembly of Piſa with averſion. III. 761. *a.* Ruin their deſign of ſetting themſelves at liberty. V. 128. *a.*

Mileſians enter into one of the mouths of the Nile, make a deſcent, and build a wall there. IV. 342. *a.*

Miletus, ſtrange madneſs of the virgins of that town. I. 19. *b.*

Milichius cited. V. 630. *b. n.* (12). 783. *n.* (*ww*).

Millenarians have no other aim than to ſtir up the people. II. 539. *a.* Whether their doctrine is conducive to this. IV. 122. *b.* 123. *a.* Loſe nothing of their credit though they deceive the people a hundred times. II. 539. *a.*

Millennium: Cerinthus's doctrine touching the Millennium. II. 405. *a. b.* When the reign of the Millennium ought to begin, according to Comenius. 539 *a. b.*

Milliæus, his deſcription of Moſes's ſong. IV. 134. *a. b.*

Milo vexed at loſing the ſtrength of his arms. I. 82. *a. b.*

Milton, his toleration-principles. IV. 223. *a. b.* Excludes the Papiſts from the benefit of it. *ibid. b.*

Mimes, what they were deſigned for. III. 695. *b.*

Mind liable to epidemical diſtempers as well as the body. I. 19. *a.* And to ſtrange extravagances. 103. *a.* III. 315. *a.* Its inequalities and caprices. II. 210. *b.* 211. *a. b.* A particular turn of mind. 317. *a. b.* 318. *b.* 319. *a.* The mind undergoes the ſame viciſſitudes with the body. IV. 689. *a.* It is not in our power to calm it. 811. *a. b.* Some heavy minds unfold by little and little. II. 500. *b.* Whether by denying that Free-thinkers have any ſtrength in their turn of mind, they might be brought to acknowledge it. 452. *b.*

Minerva, the virtue of her rod. I. 5. *a.* Who educated her. 178. *and a.* How ſhe took revenge upon a woman. 200. Cotys pretends to marry her. II. 557. *a. b.* Gives advices unworthy of a goddeſs, to Penelope. IV. 543. *b.* Miraculous image of this goddeſs. I. 6. *and a. b.*

Miniſters, ſeveral of them, recommended only by the credit of their eloquence or learning, have married to great advantage. I. 503. *a. b.* Taken to taſk whenever they took upon themſelves the title of Paſtors. 544. *a. b.* II. 39. *b.* 40. *a. b.* In what caſe it is permitted them to go to war. 433. *a.* They could not be beloved by their churches, and pleaſe the court of France at the ſame time. *ibid.* They looked upon all propoſals of diſputes or conferences, that were made to them in France, as a ſnare. 520. *b.* The Miſſionaries did ſooner vex a Miniſter of great parts and learning, than one of leſs note. III. 36. *a.* A paſſage which has been ſtrained to make the world believe that the Proteſtants deſpiſe them. IV. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* Miniſters accuſed of going about a deceitful project. 923. *b.* 924. *a.* What qualities Miniſters of the Goſpel ought to have. I. 241. *b.* 242. *a. b.* 321. *a. b.* II. 200. *b.* 201. *a. b.* Nothing can blacken them more than a proud and vindictive ſpirit. IV. 272. *a. b.* When thoſe of France began to read the Fathers. I. 756. A book where it is maintained that they have a call to bear arms. *ibid. a. b.* Are always in the wrong to meddle with politics, but chiefly in a ſtate which is divided into factions. V. 61.

Miniſters of State, whatever intrinſic greatneſs they may have, it is an advantage for them to live at one time rather than at another. II. 414. *a. b.* Their duty. III. 513. *b.* 514. *a.* When they are hated by the people, it is ſcarce ever believed that thoſe whom they puniſh are guilty. IV. 20. *b.*

Miniſtry of the Goſpel, they who devote themſelves to it ſtand in need of all their time. I. 321. *a.*

Minutius Fælix, what he ſays of the nature of God. V. 146. *a.*

Miracles, credulity multiplies them, and their multiplication deſtroys them. I. 87. *a. b.* The Romiſh Church has behaved in this reſpect juſt like the Pagans. *ibid.* A mere relation of ſome miracles makes their falſity evident. 245. The Pagans compared thoſe of JESUS CHRIST with thoſe of Apollonius and Apuleius. 380. *b.* 382. *a.* 394. *and a. b.* A miracle of humility oppoſed againſt all the miracles of Leſſius. 607. *b.* What Montagne ſays of ſome miracles. II. 149. *a. b.* A falſe miracle refuted by an argument which holds as good againſt the true miracles of Moſes and JESUS CHRIST. 587. *a. b.* One half of the world laughs at the other on this head. IV. 49. *a. b.* Whether thoſe of the antient law were produced upon occaſion of the will of a creature. 609. *b.* What we ought to underſtand by them, and if they are poſſible. V. 215. *b.* 216. *a.* Thoſe which are ſuppoſed to have happened during the ſiege of Conſtance. II. 551. *a.* Criticized upon by the author of the Swiſs Mercury. *ibid. and b.* In all religions, people are ſtrangely inclined to think themſelves favoured by them. 552. *a.* There are ſome Miniſters who ſee a miracle in all events, and who find one every where. *ibid.* Are an object of faith, and conſequently an obſcure object. *ibid. b.* How the Fathers of the Church proved the miracles of the Scripture againſt the Pagans. III. 578. *a. b.* 579. *a.*

Myrepſus (Nicolas), his antidotary. IV. 764. *a. b.* Confounded with Nicolas Alexandrinus by Merklinus. *ibid.*

Myron, what he did to obtain favours from a Courtezan which had been already refuſed to him. III. 705. *b.* 706. *a. b.*

Myrhha, ſome ſay ſhe made uſe of the artifice of Lot's daughters, in order to lie with her father. I. 113.

Myrtle forbid at the feaſt of the good goddeſs. II. 237. *a. b.*

Misfortunes, whether there be any in human life that are not occaſioned by imprudence. V. 366. *a. b.* 367. *a. b.* 368. *a. b.* 369. *a. b.* 370. *a. b.* 371. *a. b.* 372. *a. b.* 373. *a. b.* That which ought to be aſcribed to imprudence is called by this name, and aſcribed to fortune. 372. *a.*

Miſitra, the dogs do not enter into the moſques, nor into the churches of that city. III. 430. *b.* 431. *a.*

Miſſionaries, the great length which they go in their knavery. II. 585. *a. b.* From whence they draw their ſharpeſt invectives againſt the Proteſtants. III. 218. *a.*

Myſteries, the greateſt part of allegorical myſteries ought to be unknown to the world. I. 40. *b.* Myſteries expoſed to the railleries of profane men, by the impertinence of ſome Divines. II. 338. *b.* 339. *a. b.* Whether the anſwers of a Divine about myſteries may be as clear as the objections of a Philoſopher. 456. *b.* The explication of them increaſes their obſcurity. 588. *b.* The Pagans would not ſuffer them to be divulged. III. 216. *b.* Whether the rejection of them be a good way to get a great many followers. V. 172. *a.* What the Pagans ſaid of them. 173. *a.* Above, or even contrary to, reaſon. 815. Ought not to be ſubmitted to the rules of natural reaſon. 816. 829. There would be no more myſteries if reaſon could ſolve the difficulties of them. *ibid.* The Fathers of the Church did not examine them by the principles of Logic and Metaphyſics. 817. *n.* (17). The Catholics and Proteſtants equally reject reaſon, in their controverſies concerning them. 817, 818. The explications of myſteries have rather perplexed than cleared them. 819. Neither Hereſy nor Heatheniſm can draw any advantage from the unanſwerableneſs of their objections againſt myſteries. 825.

Myſteries (dramatical), the life of JESUS CHRIST acted and repreſented by myſteries and perſonages at Poictiers. II. 104. The myſtery of the Acts of the Apoſtles, and of the Apocalypſe printed and acted at Paris. 477. *a. b. &c.* Full of groſs inventions, and expreſſed after a low manner, they were ſuffered upon the ſtage, at the ſame time that the people were forbidden to read the Bible. *ibid. b.* 478. *a.* Devils are very often introduced in them. 478. *a. b.* 479. *a. b.* Origin of this kind of theatrical pieces. 480. *b.* 481. *a. b.* Italy had public theatres for the repreſentation of theſe myſteries about the middle of the XVIth century. 481. *a. b.*

Myſtics took their unitive way from the Platoniſts. IV. 690. *b.* There is no doctrine for which they are ſo much exclaimed againſt as for that of conſenting to their own eternal damnation. 943. *a.*

Miſtreſs: a lover excuſes the imperfections of his miſtreſs. I. 77. *a.* The addreſs and arts of a miſtreſs between thirty and forty will ſecure her empire far better than the artleſs beauty of a girl of fifteen. II. 256. *a. b.* A lady who would think it a ſcandal to be a private gentleman's miſtreſs, will glory to be the miſtreſs of a King or Emperor. I. 586. *a.* Thoſe who marry the miſtreſſes they have diſhonoured are nevertheleſs ſubject to ſatire. II. 503. *a.* Marks of bravery in a lover are very acceptable to a miſtreſs. III. 296. *b.* 297. *a.* 415. *a. b.* The quality of miſtreſs is more grateful than that of wife. 385. *a. b.* A great many are loved merely for their name and quality. IV. 201. *a. b.*

Mythology: in what manner facts borrowed from the Pagan Mythology ought to be confuted. I. 75. *b.* 76. *a.* Is very uncertain. 160. *a. b.* IV. 180. *b.* 533. *a. b.* 534. *a.* The principal difference betwixt it and our modern romances. III. 465. *b.*

Mythological obſervations, the author's reaſons for thoſe which he has made. V. 805.

Mythologiſts, their moſt common faults. III. 348. *a. b. &c.* Their varying from one another. 364. *b.* 365. *a.*

Mithra, how honoured by the antient Perſians. V. 637. *a. b.*

Mithridates, his treachery. II. 305. *b.* 306. *a.*

Miziere (Francis) gives us the beſt edition of Marot's works. IV. 163. *b.* 164. *a.*

Mockery, what that of Iſhmael was. I. 123. *b.* 124. *a.*

Mockers find ſome ſubject of ridicule in every thing. II. 117. *b.*

Mockers in point of Religion, a ſerious refutation does not near ſo much harm as their jeſts do. II. 12. *b.* When they fall ſick, they run into another extreme. *ibid* 13. *a*

Moderate meaſures ordinarily diſpleaſe both parties. III. 506. *b.* 507. *a.*

Moderns, a reflexion upon the parallel between the Antients and the Moderns. II. 553. *a. b.* The difference between them and the Antients, with regard to comedies. IV. 743. *a. b.*

Modes have their ebbing and flowing. II. 544. *a.*

Modes, what the Philoſophers underſtood by that word. V. 221. *a.*

Modeſty, a virtue rarely to be found among men of great abilities. I. 717. *a. b.* Is of no uſe to the making of one's fortune in the world. III. 624. *b.* When it is once turned out of doors it ſeldom returns again. II. 110. *a.* There is a kind of modeſty, which, carried to exceſs, deſerves our admiration. 222. *b.* Icarius erects a ſtatue to it, and why. IV. 538. *a. b.* 539. *a.*

Modifications (inconſiſtent) require diſtinct ſubjects. V. 209. *a. b.*

Moien de parvenir, the title of a book cited. III. 386. *a. n.* (74). IV. 574. *a. n.* (100).

Moyne (Etienne le) goes out of France with leave from the court. II. 42. *a.* His remarks concerning Scaliger and Salmaſius. III. 603. *b.* 604. *a.*

Mole (la), his crime and puniſhment. IV. 935. *a. b.* 936. *a. b. &c.* His anſwers when he was put to the rack. 939. *b.* 940. *a.* By whom his head was buried. V. 526. *a. b.*

Moliere, author of Polyxena, aſſaſſinated. I. 548. *n.* (*a*).

Moliere preferred to Plautus for his fine turns. I. 283. *a. b.* His own genius could eaſily furniſh him with inciden[illegible] IV. 234. *b.* 235. *a.* Cited. V. 485. *b. n.* (18[illegible]

Molinifm oppoſed by three ſorts of people, who, though unwilling to own it, are at the bottom of the ſame mind. III. 548. *a.*

Molinoſiſm, the abjuration which a Monk who was guilty of it was obliged to make. III. 853. *a. b.* Its conformity with carnal Origeniſm. IV. 420. *b.* 421. *a.*

Mollerus, his reflexion againſt thoſe who make their enemies ſuſpected of Atheiſm. III. 671. *b.*

Monarchy, the weak ſide of that form of government. II. 211. *a. b.* Which a mixed monarchy cannot help. *ibid.* To be preferred before Democratical government in certain caſes. 165. *b.* 166. *a.* Compared with a Republic, as to diſorders and confuſions which may happen. III. 467. *a. b.* 468. *a.* Whether it be the public intereſt that parliaments ſhould have a great deal of authority in a monarchy. 512. *b.* 513. *a. b.*

Monarchy (French) on the brink of ruin, by the fault of the Princes of the blood. II. 462. *b.* 463. *a.* The Queens there preſerve almoſt always the foreign heart which they bring with them. 542. Which has very near overthrown it a great many times. *ibid.*

Monarchy of women, there was a diſpute concerning it in the XVIth century. III. 670. *a. b.*

Monarchs, contradictory doctrines concerning their authority. II. 51. *b.* 52. *a. b.* Are ſubject to a furious jealouſy towards thoſe of their own blood. 717. *a. b.* Whether it be a good thing that the power ſhould be divided between them and the great Lords. III. 301. *a. b.* 302. *a.* Inconveniences in writing the Hiſtory of Monarchs lately dead. 334. *b.* 335. *a.* Their ill qualities are ſometimes compenſated with others. 801. *b.* 802. *a.* Their paſſions do not always turn with the wind of their intereſt. 805. *b.* When a Monarch is hated by the people, it is ſcarce ever believed that thoſe whom he puniſhes are guilty. IV. 20. *b.* How Monarchs ought to behave themſelves, with reſpect to the puniſhments which they inflict, and the favours which they diſtribute. 354. *b.* 355. *a.* 573. *b.* See *Princes* and *Kings*.

Monaſteries, their ſtrange corruption in the XVth century. II. 276. *a. b.* 277. *a.*

Monconis in his travels, names an hundred perſons who taught him receipts and ſecrets for cures. I. 78. *b.* Cited. 104. *a. n.* (40). Finds out the cheat of the ſuperior of the Urſulines of Loudun. III. 213. *b.* 214. *a.* The idea which he had of God. 471. *a.*

Money compared with pitch. III. 596. *a.* An unlawful means of getting it. V. 163. *b.* 164. *a. b.* A piece of money changed into a ſerpent, which wreathes itſelf about a gentleman's neck, and why. III. 487. *a. b.*

Mongifore (Antony) cauſes Maraſcia's book concerning the two St Mamilians to be printed. IV. 98. *a. b.*

Monks, what Pliny ſaid of the Eſſenians is every day applied to them. I. 34. *b.* There have been ſome Monks who wore nothing but a girdle, and who made themſelves inſenſible to women. 112. *a. b.* The Monks of the XVIth century were ignorant and voluptuous, and would not ſuffer that any one ſhould ſtudy polite literature. 149. *b.* The habit of a Monk does not alter the inclinations of him that wears it. 345. *b.* The falſe zeal of the Monks was the firſt cauſe of fabulous traditions. II. 94. *a. b.* A Monk of St Sabas at Jeruſalem, orders one of his diſciples to keep a perpetual ſilence. 587, 588. How he puniſhed him for not obſerving that order. 588. Good offices which they mutually do one another. III. 87. *a. b.* Perſuade their Devotees to whatever they have a mind. 331. *a.* Parallel betwixt thoſe of the Eaſt and thoſe of the Weſt. 549. *a.* They have no privileges by virtue of which they ought to refuſe to acknowledge the juriſdiction of Biſhops. 739. *a.* What muſt be done in order to obtain teſtimonials of a good life from them. 797. *a.* There is no example of any converted Monk, who continued a bachelor for want of finding a woman whom he might marry. IV. 393. *b.* Compile the chronicles of their orders with very little judgment. 394. *b.* Some of their impoſtures. 393. *b.* 394. *a. b.* It does not belong to them to put their hand to the helm of government. V. 61. *b.* 62. *a. b.* The life which they led in the convent of St Sulpice at Belley, and the difficulties which the Biſhop of that city met with, in endeavouring to make them reform it. I. 737. *b.* 738. *a. b.* 739. *a. b.* There have been Monks who have paſſed whole nights with women, in order to get a complete victory over their concupiſcence. III. 66. *a. b.*

Monkey, what Cardinal was called by that name, and for what reaſon. III. 616. *a.*

Monkeys ſometimes ſmother their young ones with careſſes. I. 113. *b.* A fable of a monkey. IV. 600. *a. b.*

Monliard the Hiſtorian, a paſſage which he had been forced to ſuppreſs, is reſtored. III. 413. *a. b.*

Monluc, Marſhal of France, compared with Des-Adrets. I. 711. *a. b.* His impudent ſayings concerning the Queen of Navarre. IV. 327. *b.* 328. *a.* Makes a great ſlaughter at Mont de Marſan. 328. *b.* 329. *a.* Quoted. III. 415. *b.*

Monluc, Biſhop of Valence, what means he made uſe of in his negotiations with the Poles about the election of the Duke of Anjou. IV. 839. *a.*

Monmouth (Duke of) There were people in England who maintained that he was not taken. II. 721. *b.*

Monod (Father) confeſſor of the Ducheſs of Savoy. II. 401. *a.*

Mons (the verſion of) cenſured by Mallet. III. 576. *a. b.*

Monſters, there are five which ought to be proſecuted to the utmoſt. IV. 669. *b.*

Montagne (Michael de) cited in relation to Mahomet II. I. 54. *b.* Cited again in relation to du Bellai's memoirs. 722. *a.* Cited again. II. 366. *a.* 677. *b.* 737. *b.* 823. *a.* III. 81. *b.* V. 368. *a.* His reflexion upon the education of children. I. 80. *a.* His judgment on an elogy given to Aretin. 436. *a.* A good obſervation of this writer's againſt falſe miracles. II. 149. *a. b.* Had an intimate affection for Charron. 448. *a. b.* What he ſays of the ill effect of diſputing. 848. *b.* What he thinks of women who marry old men. III. 64. *b.* How he ridicules the Catholics, in relation to certain maxims that change according to the times. 521. *b.* Did not well know the origin of an adventure which he takes from Plato. 633. *and b.* 634. *a.* Had naturally an averſion for a lie. IV. 778. *b. n.* (42). What he ſays of kiſſes of civility. 797. *b.* And of the power which the ſoul has to put itſelf alternately in oppoſite ſituations. V. 272. *b.* Laughs at thoſe who called the epiſtles of Guevara golden ones. III. 270. *b.* In what manner the faculty of Divines in France dealt with his eſſays. V. 810. Dedicated to Cardinal Richelieu, and kept in all libraries. 798. There is not near ſo much licentiouſneſs in this Dictionary, as there is in his Eſſays, either with regard to Scepticiſm or obſcenities. *ibid.*

Montagne (John de la) tranſlates two books of Sir Humphrey Lyndes, intituled *the Sure Way*, and *the Wrong Way*. III. 971. *and a. b.*

Montalto (Cardinal de) ſaid that he would never deſpiſe a man in a caſſock and little band. I. 361. His letter to the council of the holy Union. II. 459. *a.*

Montalto, a famous Jew, reſolves to make an open profeſſion of Judaiſm at Paris. III. 125. *a.*

Montargis. The Proteſtants find harbour there. III. 30. *a. b.* But however are obliged to leave it. *ibid.*

Montauzier (the Marquiſs of) his elogy in two verſes. I. 397. *b.* Wants to know from whom Balzac had what he ſays of Penelope. IV. 543. *b.* 544. *a.* Has a great affection for Bourſault, and recommends him for Sub-Preceptor to the Dauphin. II. 115. How his letters to Jurieu, and that miniſter's letters to him, came to be publiſhed. V. 645. *b.* 646. *a.*

Montauzier (Mr de) compared with A. M. Aquaviva. I. 397. *b.*

Montbelliard, the conference which was held there proceeded from political reaſons more than from any thing elſe. I. 792. *a.*

Montbriſſon, the ſoldiers of the garriſon there thrown down headlong. I. 709. *a.*

Montecuculi (Sebaſtian) poiſons the eldeſt ſon of Francis I. II. 94. *b.*

Montecuculi diſappoints all the deſigns of Mr de Turenne. V. 191. *b.* What he brought about by the taking of only one town. *ibid.*

Monte-Major cited. I. 354. *a.*

Montenay (Matthew de) a great and experienced Magician. III. 126. *a.*

Monteferrat, two wars carried on there. II. 311. *a.* Its miſerable condition in the year 1551. *&c.* V. 440. *a. b.*

Montgomery recovers the dominions of the Queen of Navarre. IV. 327. *b.* An article of the capitulation which he made was not obſerved. 328. *b.* 329. *a. b.* Paſſionate verſes made on his puniſhment, by John des Caurres. II. 399.

Montjoy (William) a great friend of Eraſmus's. III. 456. *a.*

Montmaur worſe treated by Feramus, than by any other who wrote againſt him. IV. 246. *b.* 247. *a.* People were not able to make head againſt him with their tongue. 248. *a.* His good and bad qualities. 250. *b.* 251. *a. b.* 252. *a. b.*

Montmor, or rather *Mommor*, an epigram which he made on a Poet. V. 410. *a. b.*

Montmorenci, from whom that family is deſcended. I. 341. *a.*

Montmorenci (Anne de) Conſtable, his want of abilities, and the miſchief he did to France. III. 395. *a. b.* 396. *a. b.* His conduct with regard to the Ducheſs de Valentinois, very much blamed by Thuanus. IV. 699. *a.* Was of opinion that learning made men effeminate, and gave riſe to Hereſies. V. 354. *a.*

Montmorenci (Francis de) ſollicits a diſpenſation of marriage at the Court of Rome. IV. 631. *a. b.* 632. *a. b.* His unfair dealing. 634. *a. b.* 635. *a. b.* Is croſſed by the Houſe of Guiſe. 637. *b.*

Montmorenci (Henry de) Conſtable, his wife hearkens to propoſitions of marriage while he is alive. III. 184. *b.*

Montmorenci (the Duke of) deſires unuſual honours for his wife. III. 210. *a.* Beheaded at Toulouſe for treaſon. 817. *a. b.* To how high a degree he was beloved. *ibid.* Whether his judges could have done otherwiſe than condemned him. 819. *a. b.*

Montmoriſme, that which is called ſo. IV. 246. *b.*

Montpellier is one of the principal cities of France, in which the Roman law was read publickly. I. 68. *a. b.* Its univerſity obliges du Laurens to paſs through all his exerciſes again, in order to take his Doctor's Degree a ſecond time, before he is admitted. III. 745. *a.* This Phyſician founds a Phyſic garden there, where he places this inſcription, *Argos eſto non Briareus. ibid. and b.*

Montpenſier (the Duke of) in what manner he uſed his priſoners. I. 592. *a. b.* Cauſes a conference of Doctors and Miniſters to be held, in order to reclaim his eldeſt daughter. III. 864. *b.* His daughter Charlotte eſcapes into Germany, where ſhe abjures Popery. 864. He uſes the Proteſtants with the utmoſt ſeverity. 865. Believes that the Ducheſs of Bouillon would renounce Calviniſm, provided ſhe would hear Dr Vigor. IV. 920. *b.* 921. *a.*

Montpenſier (the Ducheſs of) the true cauſe of her hatred to Henry III. II. 257. *b.* It was ſaid that ſhe was in love with her nephew the Duke of Guiſe. III. 299. *a.*

Monuments (public) particular care ought to be taken not to let Printers falſify them. II. 698. *b.* There are abundance of ridiculous ſtories which people endeavour to prove by them. III. 165. *a. b.*

Moon, a thought of the Chevalier Marini, concerning the ſpots that are ſeen in it. I. 113. *b.* The women of that region lay eggs, from whence are bred men fifteen times bigger than thoſe who inhabit the earth. III. 369. *b.* Whether it be true that people can read in it what is written on a looking-glaſs. IV. 672. *b.* Whether it be inhabited. V. 576. *a.*

Moors, a prodigious number of them are converted by the ſermons of John Andreas. I. 326.

Mopſus: Ammianus Marcellinus confounds one Mopſus with another. IV. 253. *a.*

Moral: combination of Moral and Phyſical things. II. 16. *a.*

Morale Pratique: whether Mr Arnauld be the author of the ſecond volume of the *Morale Pratique*. I. 493. *b.*

Moralis Diabolica, the title of a book, which the author was obliged to alter. III. 122.

Moraliſts ought to be very reſerved in their reflexions on the ſickneſs and death of illuſtrious perſons. I. 88. *a. b.* Ought not to regulate their opinions by the practice of the Civil-Law, in points concerning the relaxation of manners. III. 944. *b.* Extream into which the too rigid ones fall. V. 797, 798.

Morality, maxims which overthrow it. I. 35. *b.* 36. *a. b.* Abominable morality publickly taught among Chriſtians. III. 54. *a. b.* It is a blot on the perſon who is the firſt that introduces a relaxation in the practice of morality. 194. In what manner people ought to ſtudy it, in order to know it aright. 894. *b.* It is neceſſary that all men ſhould be taught a morality, which admits of the direction of a good conſcience, acknowledged by the Heathens themſelves. I. 35. *b.*

Morals: Silveſter Prierias carries the relaxation of morals too far. IV. 772 *and b.* 773. *a.* We muſt not judge of a man's morals by his writings. 595. They are not at all concerned in the obſcenities which the author relates. V. 846. Whether ours be more chaſte than thoſe of our Anceſtors. 855. *&c.*

More (Sir Thomas) his verſes againſt an Aſtrologer who was a cuckold. V. 322. *a. b.* Favours which he grants to Grynæus, at the recommendation of Eraſmus. III. 255. *a. b.*

Morel (Frederic) reviſes and augments P. Bellier's tranſlation of Philo's works. IV. 623.

Morellus was of the cabal which wanted to change the diſcipline of the Church. V. 738.

Moret (the Counteſs de) a diſtich on the loſs of her ſight. I. 206. *b. n.* (17). On what condition ſhe marries the Count de Ceſy-Sancy. III. 266. *a. b.*

Morgues (Matthew de) what opinion a fine wit had of him. IV. 257. *b.* Was very unfit to write the Hiſtory of Cardinal Richelieu. 258. *a. b.*

Morhoff, his words are not rightly underſtood in an extract that is given of his book. IV. 795. *b.*

Morgard (Leon) an Almanack-maker, condemned to the Gallies on account of his predictions. III. 955. *b.*

Mornac: the leaps of Mornac. I. 709. *b.*

Mornai (Du Pleſſis) cited. II. 594. *b.* Refutes in a ſolid manner the anſwer of Coëffeteau, in relation to Gregory VII. III. 232. *a.* His letter to Montagne. IV. 338. *b.* Cruelly uſed in a ſatire. V. 93. *a.* The wrong which d'Aubigny does him 733.

Morocco (the King of) admires a petition which was preſented to him by the Ambaſſador of the United Provinces. III. 171. *a.* Shews himſelf particularly well pleaſed with the preſent which Erpenius ſent him. *ibid.*

Mortemar, ſee *Rochechouart.*

Morus (Alexander) a witty ſaying of that Miniſter's. II. 520. *b. n.* (30). A paſſage of his againſt the Univerſaliſts, and particularly Amyraldus and Spanhemius. V. 822, 823. Quoted. 786. *n. (i).*

Moſchus, whether he was the inventer of atoms. III. 788. *a.*

Moſcovy (the Czar of) in what manner the choice of the maid, whom he is to marry, is made. III. 117. *b.*

Moſes, what the Poets have feigned of a great many rods, was all borrowed from the Hiſtory of his rod. I. 5. *a.* Accuſed of overthrowing the religion of nature. 96. *a.* What wood he made uſe of to ſweeten the bitter waters. 105. *a.* Some aſſert that he was maſter of the profoundeſt ſecrets of Chymiſtry. 2. *a.* It is ridiculous to penetrate beyond the deluge, without the aſſiſtance of this Hiſtorian. II. 854. *b.* A parallel betwixt him and Hercules. III. 432. *b.* In what manner his mother was choſen to be his nurſe, by the daughter of Pharaoh. IV. 133. *a.* Stories which ſome Egyptian Hiſtorians relate of him. 679. According to Machiavel, in order to give force to his laws, he was obliged to put to death a vaſt number of men, who oppoſed him in it. V. 73. *b. n.* †.

Mothe le Vayer. See *Vayer.*

Mother, one who hindered her ſon and her daughter-in-law, from performing the conjugal duty. II. 382. *b.* 383. *a.* A mother, who never ſuckles, breeds the more readily. IV. 449. *b.*

Motion: objections againſt motion. I. 82. *b.* V. 608. *b.* 609. *a. b.* 610. *a. b.* 613. *a. b.* To which Ariſtotle makes an inſufficient anſwer. 610. *a. b.* Cannot be produced but by creation. I. 304. *b.* 305. *a.* If God was not the firſt and the only principle of it, there would be no need for ſuppoſing that his interpoſition was neceſſary in the conſtruction of the world. IV. 436. *a. b.* 437. *a. b.* 438. *a. b.* 439. *a. b.* Reflexion upon the conſequences of its eternity, or of its beginning, with reſpect to the exiſtence of God. V. 594. *a.* Whether its eternity be the only thing that can prove the exiſtence of a mover diſtinct from matter. *ibid. a. b.* 595. *a. b.* There has not been a right definition of it as yet. 610. *a. b.* Reflexions upon the incomprehenſibility of motion. 614. *a. b.* A proof from the impoſſibility of a vacuum, that there is no real motion. 617. *a. b.*

Motive: thoſe who deſpiſe riches are more commendable than thoſe who are covetous, tho' they act from the ſame motive. I. 460. *a. b.* Motives ſingular and refined againſt giving charities. II. 110. *a. b.* 112. *a. b.*

Motte-Aigron declares that he could not endure to have his books made for him. I. 624. *b.* Elogy of this author. IV. 279. *a. b.*

Moulin (Peter du) his conference with Cayet. II. 244. *b.* 245. *a.*

Moulin (Peter du), the ſon, cited. V. 426. *a. n.* (72).

Moulin (Lewis du) what he affirmed concerning the Hiſtory of Camden. II. 280. *b.* 281. *a.* Cauſes a letter of Dury's, to Peter du Moulin his father, to be printed. 732.

Mountain dug quite through, by the orders of Francis I, to open a paſſage into Italy. III. 97. *b.* 98. *a. b.* Mount Genevre more convenient. 98. *a.*

Mufti the fate of the Sultans depends upon him. IV. 425. *b.* 426. *a. b.*

Mugwort, whence that herb had the name of Artemiſia. I. 523. *a.*

Mules which were not barren. II. 302. A mule kept by the Athenians at the public expence. III. 701. *b.*

Mulhuſinus, a Jeſuit, inſults David Paræus. II. 173. *b. n.* (14).

Mulieres non eſſe homines, a diſſertation which raiſes a terrible outcry. I. 88. *and b.* 89. *a. b.*

Mulius killed by Neſtor. IV. 585.

Munckerus (Philip) publiſhes a Poem of Marcus Muſurus. IV. 295. *a.*

Mundus alter & idem, an allegorical book of Joſeph Hall's: the Court of Rome is not ſpared in it. III. 345. *a. b.* Mr Naudé's opinion concerning it. *ibid. b.*

Munitus, his birth, and by whom he was brought up. I. 52. *and a. b.* Is made known to his father. *ibid. a.* His death. *ibid. b.*

Munſter: facts relating to the peace of Munſter. II. 472. *a. b.* Its Canons pique themſelves upon their nobility, and ſkill in war. V. 13. *a.* A ſchool founded in that city about the end of the XVth century. II. 242. A ſchool and library eſtabliſhed in that city. III. 724. This ſchool ſerves Germany as a nurſery of literature. *ibid.*

Munus Adventitium, what that book contains. IV. 122. *a. b.*

Munuza, a Mooriſh General, revolts againſt the Saracens, who had truſted Cerdagne to him. II. 850. Is reduced to the neceſſity of killing himſelf. I. 14.

Muretus makes Scaliger believe that a copy of verſes, which he had compoſed himſelf, were compoſed by Trabeas. V. 394. *a. b.* 395. *a.* His invective againſt Sueton. 264. *b.* 265. *a.* A trick which he puts upon Scaliger. 394. *a. b.* 395. *a. b.* 396. *a. b.* His funeral oration by Bencius, who was his ſcholar. I. 747. *b.* Dedicates his Latin verſion of Ariſtotle's Rhetoric to Bencius. *ibid.*

Murtola, how he revenged himſelf upon the Chevalier Marini, for a ſatire which he wrote againſt him. III. 464. *b.*

Muſceus (John) a Lutheran profeſſor, why he took upon him to refute an Atheiſt. III. 671. *a. b.*

Muſarium, the anſwer which Lucian puts into the mouth of that Courtezan. I. 54. *b.* 55. *a.*

Muſcovites, their courage enervated by the Germans and Livonians. II. 42. *b.*

Muſculus his books are no longer read by any body. II. 286. *b.*

Muſes ſometimes procure large penſions for thoſe who engage in their ſervice. I. 329. *b.* 330. *a.* The men of learning in the city of Alexandria met in their temple. 534. *b.* The ſervice of the Muſes is in many things like the ſervice of the ladies. II. 620. *a.* Ought to inſpire their votaries with a true generoſity. III. 340. *a.* Great warriors and the Muſes ſtand in need of one another. 434. *a. b.* To whom they owe their birth. 652. *a.* Let out for hire. V. 148. *a. b.* 751, 752. Naturally tatlers, but moſt of all ſo in adverſity. IV. 449.

Muſhrooms: four perſons die by eating muſhrooms. II. 868. *b.*

Muſic, who it was that invented its ſix notes. I. 433. And from whence they were taken. *ibid.* Its ſurprizing effects. III. 197. *a. b.* The paſſion which Nero had for it. V. 466. *a. b.* Rinuccini, or Caveleri, looked upon as the inventers of Theatrical pieces ſet to muſic. IV. 878. *and a. b.* 879. *and a.*

Muſicians, what a Muſician ſaid one day to Philip. I. 448. *b.* Are lucky fellows. IV. 398. *b.*

Muſſo was called the *Chryſoſtome of the Italians.* IV. 290. *b.* Looked upon as the right arm of the Council of Trent. *ibid.* 291. *a. b.*

Muſtapha, Emperor of the Turks, how raiſed to the throne. IV. 425. *a. b.* And why depoſed. *ibid. b. and* 426. *a. b.*

N.

N*Aerden* ſacked by the Spaniards. III. 498.

Nagelius, a viſionary who foretold ſurprizing revolutions. V. 237. *a. b.*

Naked: there have been Solitaries who went naked. I. 112. *a.* Why the impudence of going naked is ſo often put in practice again among Chriſtians. V. 415. *a.*

Nakedneſs: opinion of ſome Solitaries about nakedneſs. I. 112. *a.* A ſort of nakedneſs of ſome women. II. 593. *a.* 645. *a.* A horror for nakedneſs even in a picture, inſtilled into the female ſex by all civilized nations. III. 963. *b.* 964. *a.* The curioſity of women to view nakedneſs in the original. 964. *a.* Scandalous cuſtoms with reſpect to nakedneſs. V. 129. *b.* 130. *a. b.*

Name: what Altingius ſays of the name *Tetragramma.* I. 244. *b.* 245. *a.*

Names: the Kings of certain countries affected all to take the ſame name. I. 40. *a.* The leaſt miſtake in proper names, is enough to lead the reader into an error. 108. *a.* The ſmalleſt change of the letters in proper names, multiplies writers without reaſon. III. 534. Milantia ſaid, that if names were to be ſold, the fineſt ought to be bought. I. 325. Names untractable with reſpect to rhiming. 620. *a. b.* Unfit for Poetry. II. 866. *a. b.* A plain name may prejudice an author. I. 622. *a. b.* A name changed through vanity. II. 367. *a. b.* The cuſtom which people formerly had of taking a name to themſelves. I. 170. *a. b.* 171. *a.* And of changing it. *ibid. and* IV. 477. There are ſome names which ought to be changed. III. 202. *b.* 203. *a. b.* And there are ſome which ſeem to have an influence upon the manners of the perſons that bear them. 604. *b.* Prohibition of changing names. IV. 853. *b.* 854. *a. b.* Ought to be made uſe of in a free manner, according to the Stoics. 706. *b.* The French authors diſfigure proper names. III. 722. *a. b.* 723. *a.*

Nangis (William de) inſerts all the chronicle of Sigebert into his own. IV. 728. *b.* 729. *a. b.*

Nani (Chevalier) judges of the manners of the Hollanders, by the manners of the Italians. III. 821. *a. b.* 822. *a.*

Nannius (Peter) Juſtus Velſius gives lectures for him in the college of the three languages at Louvain. V. 450.

Nantes (edict of), who it was that drew it up. II. 433. *and b.* What Cardinal Mazarin ſaid concerning this edict. I. 264. *b.* See *Edict.*

Napkin wore about the left arm, was the ſignal taken by the maſſacrers at St Bartholomew. IV. 682. *a.*

Naples (Joan II, of that name, Queen of), by what ſervices people obtained great employments from her. II. 312. How ſhe diſcovered her paſſion one day. *ibid. a.*

Naples, (Ladiſlaus, King of) dies of poiſon which he received in the boſom of pleaſure. IV. 308. *a.*

Naples, who firſt began to practiſe Printing there. IV. 71. *a.* An attempt to ſet up the Inquiſition there occaſions troubles. 387. *a. b.* What was called the Portico there. 466. *b.* 467. *a.* Fables concerning that city. V. 489. *a. b.* 490. *a. b.* Some Libertines have appeared there. IV. 719. *a. b.*

Narni (Father), who is the author of the tranſlation of his ſermons. II. 90. *and a.*

Naſſau (Maurice of) had great ſkill in Mathematics. V. 236.

Nations, there are ſome that one would take for brute beaſts. I. 177. *b.* Their boundaries have been often altered. 537. Free nations are eaſily accuſtomed to ſlavery, provided it have not that name. II. 420. *a.* In what all nations are alike. III. 172. *b.*

Natural Philoſophers did not admit of an intelligent Being for the firſt mover before Anaxagoras. I. 301. *b.* 302. *a. b.* 303. *a.* The reaſon of it. 302. *b.* 303. *a.*

Natural Philoſophy, it would be ridiculous to pretend to confute, from the principles thereof, the fables of Antiquity. I. 76. *a.* An event which is explained thereby cannot be the preſage of a future contingent. IV. 565. *a. b.* See *Phyſics.*

Nature obſerves no laws. I. 313. *b.* Where ſhe ſtrongly inclines to any one thing, the Monk's habit never cures a man of it. 345. *b.* Corrupt nature, when ſhe cannot plunge men into pleaſures, frequently makes it up by other faults. III. 223. *a.* The effects of nature cannot be preſages of future contingents, unleſs they be appointed for that end by a particular intelligent Being. IV. 565. *a. b.* 566. *a. b.* Her ſecrets are impenetrable. 653. *b.* She ought not to be forced by ſtudy. III. 342. *a.*

Navagiero, or *Nangier,* dies of the ſpotted fever at Blois. IV. 316. He follows Bartholomew d'Alviano to the wars, and makes his Funeral Oration. 315.

Navailles (the Duke of), his behaviour to the Deputies of the Imperial towns of Alſace. III. 717. *a. b.*

Navarre (the King of) had law-ſuits and a Council in three of the Parliaments of France. III. 37. *b.* See *Henry* IV.

Navarre (Margaret, Queen of), how far her novels are to be condemned. V. 837.

Navarre (Jane, Queen of) calumniated and ill defended. II. 224. *a. b.* 225. *a.*

Navarre (Margaret, Queen of), ſpouſe to Henry IV, charms the Embaſſadors of Poland with her beauty. IV. 40. *b.* Loved Mathematics. V. 297. *a.* See *Margaret.*

Navarre opens a way through a mountain for the French army to paſs into Italy. III. 98. *a. b.*

Naudé, it does not appear that he ever believed the tales of Sorcerers and Magicians. II. 243. *b.* Quoted. 432. *b.* V. 755. *n.* (*w w*). What he relates touching the exaltation of Pope Hadrian VI. III. 324. *b.* Cenſured on the head of Alexander's deification. IV. 405. *b.* 406. *a.* Who was his favourite author. 465. He cenſures highly the conduct of Savonarola. V. 60. *b.* 61. *a. b.*

Navicula ſtultarum mulierum: a book improperly aſcribed to Badius by Valerius Andreas. I. 602. *b.*

Navis Narragoniæ or *Stultorum* of Sebaſtian Brandt. I. 602. *b.*

Nazianzen (Gregory of), the opinion which he entertains of Councils. IV. 348. *a.* See *Gregory.*

Nearchus, tyrant of Elea; the different ſentiments of authors touching what happened to him with Zeno. V. 606. *a. b.* 607. *a. b.*

Necklace fatal to all that wore it. II. 257. *a. b.* By whom it was made, and of what matter. *ibid. a.* The fatal effects of that which Menelaus conſecrated in the temple of Delphos. III. 372. *b.* 373. *a.*

Nectanebus, when driven out of his kingdom. IV. 404. *a.*

Nemean Games were games inſtituted in honour in Archemorus. I. 446.

Nemeſis, why called *Adraſtea.* I. 118. *and b.*

Nemours (the Duke of), a Prince of an admirable talent to win men over to his ſide. I. 710. *b.* He leaves France, and for what reaſon. III. 141. Is recalled and ſerves againſt thoſe of the Reformed Religion. *ibid.* In what manner he was rewarded for it by the court of Rome. *ibid.*

Nepenthes, what it was. III. 373. *a. b.* 374. *a.*

Nephelococugie, or *The Cloud of Cuckolds,* a comedy wrote by Father le Loyer, where there are abundance of coarſe expreſſions. III. 882. *a.* 883. *b.* It is full of invention and ſpirit. *ibid. a.*

Nepos, what it ſignifies in good Latin. I. 632. *b.* III. 194. *a.* It may have the ſame ſignification in Italian as in good Latin. 258. *b.*

Nepotiſm; there are times when the greater and the leſſer Nepotiſm are not both in vogue at once. I. 343. When it gathered all its force. IV. 430. *a. b.*

Nero, ſeveral perſons have falſely taken that name. I. 513. *a. b.* The laſt dying words of thoſe whom that Prince had put to death, by whom compoſed. III. 9. *a. b.* He did not himſelf compoſe the Funeral Oration of Claudius, which he recited. 317. *a.* For what reaſon wiſe men connived at his diſorders. IV. 398. *b.* Whether the four verſes, beginning with *Torva Mimalloneis,* are of his compoſition. 596. *a. b.* 597. *a. b.* His paſſion for Muſic. V. 466. *a. b.* He bore libels ſomewhat patiently. 745, 746.

Nerva, his reign worſe than that of Domitian, and for what reaſon. III. 109. *a.* A very ſolid apophthegm of which he made a good uſe. *ibid.* He dies a little after he had adopted Trajan, Pliny's reflexion upon that head. 431. *b. n.* (67).

Neſtor, what the ſize of his cup was. III. 205. *b.* 206. *a.* He kills Mulius. IV. 585.

Neſtorianiſm, the Sieur de Moni believes that it is only a verbal Hereſy. I. 105. *a. b.* IV. 356. *a.*

Nevenar (the Count of), the pleaſant manner in which he obliged the ſuperior of a convent to give him ſatisfaction. III. 473. *a. b.*

Nevers (the Duke of) is reproached with affecting to ſignalize himſelf at the King his maſter's coſt. III. 398. *b.* Who was the firſt Duke of Nevers. 518. *a.*

Neuſville (la) affirms that Grotius had begun to mold his work anew in Holland. III. 248. *b.*

Neuſville; Marot was page to one Nicolas de Neuſville. IV. 162. *b.* He dedicates the temple of Cupid to him. *ibid.*

Neuhauſel yielded to the Turks by a treaty. III. 793. *a. b.*

Neuilly (Stephen de), after being poſſeſſed of the Preſident de la Place's office, ſtrives in vain to hinder his being reſtored to it again. IV. 682. *a.* Made Preſident *au Mortier* by the Duke of Mayenne. *ibid.*

Neutrality; the inconveniences that attend it during the civil wars either of church or ſtate. II. 799. *b.* The Imperial towns of Alſace cannot obſerve it. III. 717. *b.* 718. *a.* It does not not hinder an Hiſtorian's favouring one party more than another. II. 310. *a. b.* 311. *a. b.* 312. *a. b.*

New Abſalom, &c. to whom that libel is aſcribed. V. 731. *a. b.*

Newburg, what motives induced a Prince of that family to change his religion. IV. 854. *a. b.*

News; a falſe piece of news, believed for three days, is capable of deſtroying a ſtate, or of ſaving it. II. 216. *b.* V. 749. *a. b.* There are people who know all the news of a town, except what diſhonours their own family. III. 381. *b.* 382. *a.* Compared to the bidding at an auction. 414. *a.* It is a vice to know too much news. V. 820.

News-writers are not to be credited. I. 15. *b.* IV. 51. *a.* 179. *b.* Do not ſtand in need of being exhorted to acknowledge the goodneſs of God. III. 3. *a.* Magnify things. IV. 536. *b.* V. 493. *b.* Ought to remember a ſentence of Agathon. I. 127. *a.* Carry on a kind of war with their *Arma Anſerina.* V. 750. *a. b.* The artifice they make uſe of to inſpire people with a pleaſing credulity. III. 718.

718. *b.* 719. *a. b.* 720. *a.* The perplexities into which their inſincerity throws them. 719. *a. b.* The ſiege of important places will always be a troubleſome rock for them. 719. *b.* 720. *a. b.* 721. *a. b.* Their prepoſſeſſion and partiality. IV. 737. *b.*

Nicarete, a Courtezan; illuſtrious for her birth and learning. V. 239. *a.*

Nice; the moderation of the Council of Nice, with reſpect to Arius. I. 475. *a.*

Nicephorus is a fabulous and injudicious writer. III. 572. *b.*

Nicias, the fright he was in on account of an eclipſe of the moon. IV. 566. *a.*

Nicodemites do ſometimes more harm than an open enemy. II. 48. *b.*

Nicolas, Biſhop of Mirra, gives Arius a box on the ear in the Council of Nice. II. *a. n.* (15).

Nicolas Tollentin, the particular devotion which Philip de Bergamo had for him. I. 769.

Nicolle makes uſe of all the ſame objections as the meaneſt miſſionaries. III. 945. *a.* Why he only anſwered one part of a book of Mr Jurieu. IV. 535. *a. b.* His objections lead to Pyrrhoniſm. *ibid.* It is not true that the author has blackened him as having wrote certain doctrines which he did not believe. V. 804.

Niem (Thierry de), what he adds to the ſtory of Pope Joan. IV. 729.

Niger (Peſcennius), what he ſaid to an Orator who preſented himſelf before him to ſpeak a panegyric in his praiſe. III. 335. *a.*

Nymphs, there were ſome that ſurpaſſed for length of life all other mortal natures. III. 348. *b.* 349. *a. b.*

Ninus, which was the laſt of his victories. V. 630. *a.*

Niphates, a mountain where Saturn took refuge, and from whence he was thrown into Tartarus. II. 82. *b.* Jupiter orders it to be called Caucaſus, in honour of a ſhepherd of that name whom Saturn had killed there. *ibid.*

Niphus was of a very amorous complexion. I. 399. *b.* Is cenſured for the want of judgment. *ibid.* And for contradicting himſelf. *ibid.* He writes againſt Pomponatius. IV. 715. *a.*

Niſmes, the Synod of that place gives all manner of explications to the Church of Zurich. II. 196.

Noah, by what means he could know that it was Cham who had diſcovered his nakedneſs. II. 431. *b.* What was the injury which he received from Cham, according to Mr Vonder Hardt. 432. *b.*

Nobilis Familia, how theſe words are to be underſtood in Latin elogies. I. 250. *a.*

Nobilis and *Plebeius* were not inconſiſtent words in antient Rome. III. 490. *a.*

Nobility, an invective againſt thoſe who value themſelves upon it. I. 360. *b.* It is generally more eaſy to prove that of the father, than that of the grandfather or great grandfather. 750. *a.* An oration of Philo, on true nobility, tranſlated by Daniel d'Auge. 562. *a.*

Noble (le) confounds all in his romance of Zulima, or Pure Love. III. 166. *b.* 167. *a. b.*

Noble families generally give chimerical accounts of their firſt founders. IV. 888. *a. b.*

Noel le Compte blamed. I. 402. *b.*

Noyon, the Canons of that place make a ſolemn proceſſion to thank GOD for Calvin's death. I. 783. *b. n.* (8). II. 265. *a.*

Nonnus, the Hiſtory of the Adultereſs, which was wanting in his Paraphraſe, has been ſupplied by Father Abram. I. 47. *a.*

Nonnus or *Nonnes* (Duard), particulars touching that man. V. 319. *b.*

Non-toleration, in affairs of religion, the Lutherans exerciſed it againſt Altingius. I. 240. *b.* 241. *a.* The advantage that accrues from it is ſmall, in compariſon of the evils which it produces. 789. *a. b.* Condemned. III. 675. *a.* 676. *a. b.* 677. *a. b.* In what caſe it ought to be allowed. IV. 522. *a. b. &c.*

Non-toleration (the Advocates for), the inconveniences which they expoſe themſelves to. I. 13. *b.* 14. *a. b.* They reſemble Cæſar, who could bear no maſter, and then Pompey, who could ſuffer no partner. *ibid. a.* They would have been very glad that JESUS CHRIST had allowed them to follow Elijah's example as a precedent. II. 750. *a. b.* Their unjuſt extravagancy. IV. 337. *a.* See *Laws* (Penal) *in matters of conſcience.* Being reduced to a non-plus, they have recourſe to unfair means, in order to render their adverſaries odious. V. 28. *a. b.* Their principle overthrows all the rules of natural equity. III. 238. *a.*

Noradin, his daughter falls in love with a Prince of Weſtphalia, makes her eſcape with him, and becomes his ſecond wife. III. 166. *b.*

Norden, why its ſchool was ſurpaſſed by that of Leer. II. 768.

Notables aſſembled at Fontainbleau. IV. 138.

Notary; in the XIVth century a Notary's place was not reckoned unfit for a gentleman. III. 747.

Notes, or Scholia, added to a book in order to confute it. II. 749. *a.*

Not long ſince, we ought never to make uſe of that phraſe, without ſetting down the year in which we thus expreſs ourſelves. IV. 165. *b.*

Novara (John of), General of the Auguſtins. I. 769. *b.*

Novella, why John Andreas calls one of his Commentaries by that name. I. 325. *a.*

Novella, daughter to a Profeſſor of Civil-Law read lectures for her father. I. 325. *a.* She hid her face while ſhe was in the chair. *ibid.* Which may occaſion a diverting problem. *ibid.*

Novelties: as Princes are diſpoſed, they rarely embrace the ſame novelties, when they hate one another. V. 652.

Novice: what a novice ſaid one day to Charles V. II. 438. *b.*

Nȣ̃ς, why Anaxagoras was ſo called. I. 297. *b.* 298. *a.*

Numa Pompilius forbad all leud women to enter into the temple of Juno. III. 639. *b.* Reſtrained maids to the decency of their ſex better than Lycurgus. 962. *b.* Whether he introduced the community of women. 965. *a.* He would not have the Deity to be repreſented by any images. IV. 675. *a.*

Number (Golden), who is the author of that cycle. III. 254. *a.*

Numenius ſays that Arceſilas fixed himſelf in the Pyrrhonian inconſtancy. I. 408. *a.* And abuſes him very much. *ibid.* He has nevertheleſs ſaid very advantageous things of him. 412. *b.*

Nuns, whoſe diſorders Pope Sixtus IV endeavoured to correct. II. 97. *a.* For what ſum they obtained abſolution from fornication. I. 628. *a.* The direction of Nuns by Monks is held in abhorrence at Rome, for reaſons which experience ſufficiently evince. 785. *a.* Monks who maintain that the Pope cannot give the direction of Nuns to any but Monks of the ſame order. *ibid. b.* A Biſhop was obliged to nip their dugs in order to examine their virginity. III. 344. *b.* 345. *a.* The ſingular anſwer of a Nun to the Biſhop of Belley, and his reply. I. 738. *b.*

Nuns, whethey they may be allowed to hear a lecture of Anatomy, on thoſe parts which ſerve for generation. I. 109. *a.* They ought to be divided into two claſſes according to ſome Fathers. III. 61. *b.* What condition thoſe who have had to do with Nuns are in after their death. IV. 125. *a.*

O.

O*AK of Mamre*, what has been ſaid of it. I. 46. *b.*

Oaths, one of a ſingular form. I. 70. *b.* Whether the oaths of dying perſons ought to be taken for proofs. II. 55. *b.* 57. *b.* They ought to be made without equivocations. 871. *b.* 872. *a.* The Magiſtrates of Athens exempt Xenocrates from an oath. V. 570. *a.* An author who had ſworn never to have any thing to do with Bookſellers, breaks his oath, and compares himſelf in this to women in the pains of child-birth. II. 82. *a. b.*

Obedience; how perſons may be ſaved in two diſtinct kinds of obedience. I. 179. *a. b.*

Obedience (Paſſive) ſtrongly defended. I. 264. *b.* 265. *a.*

Objections, it were to be wiſhed that we had a general rule to diſtinguiſh thoſe which proceed only from fleſh and blood. I. 708. *b.* Complaints were made that Bellarmin propoſed thoſe of the Heretics better than he confuted them. 730. *b.* The anſwers

of

of a Divine cannot be ſo clear as the objections of a Philoſopher. II. 456. *b.* An objection founded upon very diſtinct notions remains alike victorious, whether no anſwer is made to it, or ſuch an anſwer as no body can underſtand. V. 815.

Obliged; there are few men who can love thoſe to whom they are too much obliged. IV. 22. *b.*

Obſcenities, whether it be not allowable to relate them. II. 684. *a. b.* 685. *a.* V. 132. *b.* 133. *a. b.* 264. *b. &c.* An apology for thoſe which are to be found in ſome parts of this Dictionary. III. 460. *a. b.* IV. 803. *b.* 804. *a. b.* 805. *a. b.* 806. *a. b.* Neceſſity obliges a man to ſpeak of them ſometimes, but decency requires him to ſpeak of them with circumſpection. III. 135. *b.* 136. *a. b.* The Fathers of the Church have related thoſe of the antient Heretics. *ibid.* The greateſt part of the Poets ſucceed beſt when they turn their Poetry this way. IV. 156. *b.* Obſcenities writ by a wiſe and virtuous Queen. 322. *a. b.* A preſervative againſt thoſe of the antient Poets. V. 99. *b.* La Mothe le Vayer makes an apology for thoſe which he had diffuſed through his works. 420. *a. b. &c.* Accords is reproached with them, and juſtifies himſelf. I. 65. *a. b.* Groſs obſcenities are leſs dangerous than ſuch as are delicate. *ibid. b.* V. 845. *to* 848. Give one a diſguſt at the pleaſure with women. I. 65. *b.* Garaſſe cenſured for quoting them, and how he defended himſelf. III. 135. *b.* 136. *a. b.* There are obſcenities in the *Examen des Eſprits* of John Huarte, and in the tranſlation which Chappius has made of it. 528. Naudé endeavours to excuſe thoſe of Niphus. IV. 380. *a. b.* The boundleſs liberty which many authors have taken in this reſpect. *ibid.* An explanation touching thoſe made uſe of by the author. V. 837. *to* 858. The different ways they are made uſe of in books. 837. General remarks on thoſe which are to be met with in books. *ibid. and* 838. *&c.* Obſcene writings do not diſtinguiſh between honeſt and diſhoneſt men. 838. Honeſt authors who have writ of ſuch. 807. 837. 839. Two parties with reſpect to theſe authors. 838. Remarks upon thoſe which are to be found in this Dictionary. 840, 841. *&c.* What method the Inquiſition uſes in proſecutions, where obſcenities have a place. 848. *a. b.* It is impoſſible to exclude them abſolutely. 850. Examples of thoſe which are in the Bible. 851. *and a. b. &c.* And in profane Hiſtorians. 852, 853. And in the Fathers of the Church. *ibid.* Whether they ſhock modeſty the leſs for being writ in Latin. 854, 855. The author's apology is to be found in divers parts of his work immediately after thoſe which he relates. 858. Whether our modern Poets are leſs guilty this way than the antient Poets were. 388. *a. b.*

Obſequens (Julius), a prodigy which he relates. V. 269. *a. b.*

Obſtinate men, what is their fate when they fall into groſs miſtakes. IV. 80. *b.*

Ocean (Northern), who was the firſt Roman General that embarked upon it. II. 715.

Ochin: ſome of his books tranſlated by John Poinet. IV. 693.

Ocriſia; how ſhe was got with child, and of whom ſhe was brought to bed. V. 288. *a.*

Octavius ſwears that he had not conſummated his marriage with Fulvia's daughter. III. 112. *a.*

Octavius of Minutius Felix; that book has been aſcribed to Arnobius. I. 502. *a.*

Odes; a law-ſuit carried on about ſome odes that were ſtolen. IV. 895. *a.*

Odium Theologicum: that paſſion finds Hereſies wherever it pleaſes. I. 605. *b.* One of its moſt cunning touches. 644. *b.*

Oecolampadius, his advice to Farel. III. 10. *a. b.* He did not trouble himſelf about the honour that is to be gained by the public exerciſes in univerſities. IV. 400.

Oenomaus reproaches Apollo for acknowledging Archilochus as a ſon of the Muſes. I. 427. *a.*

Officers: hiſtory of the great officers of the kingdom of France by John le Feron. III. 27. *a.*

Offices; merit, credit, power, are often great obſtacles in a man's way to them. I. 354. *a. b.* 733. *a. b.* II. 436. *a.* It is better to renounce them, than to obtain and exerciſe them at the expence of one's conſcience. I. 224. *a. b.* 540. *a.* 587. *a.* The mercenary ſpirit of thoſe who poſſeſs them. III. 339. *b.* 340. *a. b.* 341. *a. b.*

Ogier (the Prior) cenſures Father Garaſſe. I. 798. *a.* II. 190. *a. b.* One of his funeral orations quoted. IV. 40. *b.*

Ogier (Charles) what he ſays about the incontinence of the people of the North. II. 821. *b.* The relation of his voyage to Denmark and Sweden is curious. V. 503. *b.* That relation quoted. IV. 247. *a. b.* 928. *a. n.* (1).

Old age; there are few people who find it ſo agreeable as Eraſmus did. II. 814. *a.* It finds comfort in reading. IV. 630. *a. b.* Some of the inconveniencies that attend it. V. 147. *b.* 148. *a.*

Old men never incline to die. I. 121. *b.* 122. *a.* Marry as much for the benefit of their neighbours as for their own. II. 618. *b.* Their bed is contagious to a young woman. III. 869. *a.* The imprudence of thoſe who marry. IV. 88. *a. b.* A law which ordered them to be thrown headlong from a precipice. V. 347.

Older: few people like to be accounted older than they are. V. 333. *b.*

Olympias, what ſhe ſaid to a pretty lady that Philip was in love with. I. 392. *b.*

Oliva, a treaty of peace carried on there. III. 901.

Olivarez (the Duke d') favours the amours of Philip IV. I. 589. *b.* Compared with the Cardinal de Richelieu. V. 373. *b.*

Olive-tree: how and upon what occaſion Minerva produced an olive-tree. I. 445.

Olivier, Chancellor of France, ſaid that the French reſembled apes. III. 515. *a.* A funeral oration on that Chancellor by Daniel d'Auge. I. 562. *a.*

Olivier (Antony) Biſhop of Lombés, brother to the Chancellor. I. 562.

Olonne (Madam d') her amours afforded matter to the authors of the XVIIth century. IV. 202. *b.*

Omiſſions; there are ſome which are unpardonable crimes in an Hiſtorian. II. 759. *b.* Pure omiſſion, ſeveral Philoſophers maintain that it is never free. V. 372. *b.*

On, why certain French writers generally denote themſelves by that word. IV. 492. *a. b.*

Oneſicritus was much eſteemed by Alexander, followed him in his wars, and had great poſts beſtowed upon him. II. 669. *b.*

Opera; the firſt eſſay of Opera's. II. 557. *b.* Who was the firſt author of them. V. 269. *a. b.* In the XVth *and* XVIth centuries the Opera's were the pſalms and the proſe devotions of the Church. II. 481. *b.* Rinuccini, or Caveleri, looked upon as the inventers of them. IV. 878. *and a. b.* 879. *and a.*

Opiniators, what ſort of people they are. IV. 362. *b.* 363. *a.*

Opinions, their diverſity very often occaſioned by miſtakes. I. 284. *a. b.* It is by opinion alone that we judge of all things in this world. III. 57. *b.* The infatuation of men, in favour of the opinions commonly received. II. 141. *b.*

Oppidum; that word is equivocal, and ſignifies ſometimes a borough, ſometimes a town. I. 747. *a.*

Oracles of Paganiſm, ſeveral of them were conſulted upon the ſame points. I. 132. *a.* And the greateſt of the gods did not preſerve his ſuperiority in this reſpect. *ibid.* The difference between ſoothſayers that foretold things after the manner of an Oracle, and other ſoothſayers. 276. *b.* Plutarch obſerves that all thoſe of Bœotia were ceaſed. *ibid.* 277. *a.* That of Amphiaraus was very much revered. 276. *a. b.* 277. *a.* Whether they ceaſed upon the planting of Chriſtianity. 281. *a.* Whether one ought to acknowledge any diabolical operation in them. 594. *a. b.* They did nothing gratis. II. 258. *a.* They were full of balderdaſh. III. 783. *a. b.* An oracle ſilenced. V. 386. Oracles that were conſulted among the Pagans. 350. *b.* 351. *a. b.*

Orations (Funeral) when and upon what occaſion the honour of them was granted to the Roman ladies by the Senate. II. 290. *a.*

Orange, the cruelties that were exerciſed in that town preceded the leaps of Mornac and Montbriſſon. I. 709.

I. 709. *b.* The horrible cruelties that were commited there, when Serbellone took it by Aſſault. V. 120. *a. b.*

Orange (William I, Prince of), Brantome improperly alledges the apology of that Prince with reſpect to Philip II, and his ingratitude towards his father. II. 441. *a. b.* Goes to Straſbourg to ſell all his plate and moveables there. V. 82. *b.* 83. *a.* Twice aſſaſſinated. II. 458. *a.* 459. *a. n.* (27). How he was treated by Richard Hall. III. 345. *a. b.*

Orange (Frederic Henry, Prince of) how he ſtood affected to Cardinal Richelieu. III. 821. *a.* The Princeſs, his wife, being diſpleaſed with Cardinal Mazarin, labours to procure a ſeparate peace with Holland. II. 153. *a.*

Oratory (the fathers of the) cried down at Mons and Liege. IV. 350. *a. b.* The founder of that order in France. I. 785.

Orators, whether they ſhould affect to paſs for learned men. I. 353. *a. b.* They are not much concerned whether the facts they advance be true or not. II. 166. *b.* 167. *a.* Were rare in Cappadocia. 309. *b.* They make no ſcruple of extenuating or amplifying things according to the intereſt of their cauſe, to which they make whatever they can ſubſervient. 343. *b.* 502. *b.* Are often guilty of falſifications. 406. *b.* Have great influence in cauſing a war to be begun or continued. 547. *b.* Are not ſubjected to ſuch narrow rules as Hiſtorians are. 548. *a.* An Orator who made a ſtrange pother to ſatisfy the deſire he had to harangue. III. 151. *a. b.* Their art depends almoſt wholly upon action. IV. 567. *b.* The definition of an Orator. 581. *b.* 863. *a.* They are eaſily bribed with money. III. 355. Their tongue can do a great deal of miſchief in a commonwealth. *ibid.* It is a kind of a miracle, when two famous Orators live together as good friends. 492. *b.* 493. *a. b.* They are always ready to declare for the party that is uppermoſt. 647. *a.* Thoſe who are vehement, excite ſtorms for nothing. IV. 479. *a. b.*

Orchomenians: two nations ſo called. IV. 626. *b.*

Order; it is very conſiſtent with order that ſome things ſhould be done out of order. I. 126. *a.*

Order of the Holy Ghoſt, who drew up the office of that order. I. 258. *b.*

Orders (Holy), who were thoſe that might be admitted into them according to the antient canons. III. 221. *a. b.*

Orders of Knighthood, a treatiſe on their origin and inſtitution by Peter de Beloy. I. 740. *b.*

Oreſtes, the length of his tomb and bones. I. 312. *b.* 313. *a.* The founder of the city of Adrianople, to which he gave his name. 331. *a. b.*

Organization, whether the general laws of motion are ſufficient for it. V. 114. *b.* 115. *a.*

Orichovius confeſſes that he had married a wife while he was a prieſt, but not that he had broke with the Church of Rome. V. 232. *b.* 233. *a.*

Origen, his opinion touching the hidden works of the Prophet Elias, rejected by St Jerome. II. 751. *b.* 752. *a.* What he anſwered to the Manichees concerning the origin of evil. IV. 112. *b.* 113. *a.* 416. *a. b.* 417. *a. b.* 418. *a. b.* 419. *a. b.* 420. *a. b.* 421. *a. b.* 422. *a.* Had a grain of Spinoziſm. 421. *b.* Whether it be proper to put him in the hands of all the world. 422. *b.* He and the other Fathers looked upon the queſtion concerning the origin of evil, as one of the moſt perplexing. 524. *b.* He choſe his proofs ill to maintain the virginity of the Mother of Jeſus Chriſt. V. 772. *b.* His anſwer to Celſus, who laughed at the faith of the Chriſtians. 816, 817. Nemeſius eſpouſed ſome of his errors. IV. 346.

Origeniſm; there were two ſorts of it, the one carnal and the other ſpiritual. IV. 421. *a.*

Original pieces, the confuſion that thoſe fall into who do not conſult them. II. 229. *a. b.*

Original: whatever helps to ſhew the original and progreſs of things, deſerves to be taken notice of. II. 99. *b.*

Orleans, the ſtrange diſorders of the prieſts that were in that dioceſe. II. 373. *a. b.* Who was the firſt that ſettled the German library there. III. 158.

Orleans (Lewis of France, Duke of) aſſaſſinated in Paris by his uncle the Duke of Burgundy. III. 810. *a.*

Orleans (Lewis d') the Advocate of the League, what he makes the Engliſh Catholics ſay. III. 521. *b.* 522. *a.*

Orleans (Father d') much more reaſonable than Sanders. II. 57. *a. b.* Quoted. 736. *b. n.* (25), (28). 737. *n.* (*g*). *a. n.* (31), (32). 738. *n.* (*b*), (*i*), (*k*), (*l*), (*o*), (*q*), (*r*), (*s*). *a. b. n.* (42), (43), (45). What he ſays of a late repentance. V. 556. *b.*

Oropus was a long time a matter of diſpute between the Athenians and the Thebans. I. 274. *b.* Its inhabitants were the firſt who deified Amphiaraus. 276. *a. b.* Pillaged by the Athenians. II. 329. *b.*

Orpheus torn in pieces by the women of Thrace, and for what reaſon. I. 115. *a. b.*

Orthodox, every orthodox perſon ought not to engage himſelf in diſputes. I. 564. *a.* Nothing makes a man ſo much out of conceit with being ſo, as to ſee himſelf perſecuted by other orthodox men. V. 513. *a.* In what ſenſe the Orthodox ſeem to admit of two firſt principles. IV. 520, 521.

Orthodoxy, the great inconveniencies to which thoſe people expoſe themſelves who make uſe of the ſecular arm to eſtabliſh it. I. 14. *b.* The Promoters of it are ſometimes more to be feared than Infidels. 199. *a.* Three things, none of which can be a mark of Orthodoxy. 287. *a.* Whether it be a right maxim that provided Orthodoxy triumphs, it matters not by what means, or how. II. 451. *a. b.* There is a Philoſophical Orthodoxy and a Theological one. 662. *a. b.* By what means it is preſerved againſt the attempts of Hereſy. III. 902. *a. b.*

Orthography, how neceſſary it is to obſerve it exactly. II. 838. *and b.* The antient Orthography ought to be preſerved in the firſt or following editions of old books. IV. 427. *and a. b.* 428. *and a.*

Orthography (French) Laurence Joubertus was the firſt that innovated in it. III. 582.

Oriz, one of the Pope's Penitentiaries ſent to Ferrara on purpoſe to convert the Ducheſs. III. 31. *a.*

Oſanna, a ſaint who is held in great veneration at Mantua. III. 32. *b.*

Oſiander, what he taught concerning the mediation of Jeſus Chriſt. V. 230. *b.* 231. *a.*

Oſiris, where his tomb was. I. 37. There was no Muſic employed in the ſacrifices that were offered to him. *ibid. a. b.* They ſacrificed all the red-haired people, that they could find to his ghoſt. II. 233.

Oſorius (Jerome) takes John Metel, his friend, and Antony Auguſtin for interlocutors in his dialogues *de Gloria*. IV. 200.

Oſorius writes the life of Jerome Oſorius, his uncle. IV. 426.

Oſſat (Cardinal d') prevailed with the Jeſuits to ſide with him in the affair of Martha Broſſier, who pretended to be poſſeſſed by the devil. IV. 883. *a. b.*

Oſtentation, few learned men keep themſelves free from it. II. 338. *a. b.*

Oſtraciſm, who was the inventer it. I. 73, 74. Why that puniſhment was inflicted. II. 501. *b.* 502. *a.*

Otho, the Roman Emperor, his looking-glaſs was one of the principal parts of his equipage of war. I. 392. *a.* Overcome by Vitellius. V. 262. *a. b.* The inequality of his life. 273. *b.* A maxim which he quoted at his death. 628. *b.*

Otho I, Emperor, died in the year 973. II. 90. *b.*

Otho III, Emperor, loved pilgrimages. II. 58. *a. b.*

Otho IV, Emperor, was charmed with the chaſte anſwer of a girl. III. 258. *a.* IV. 87. *b.*

Ottoman: the word Ottoman does not ſtrike the common people ſo much as that of Turk; Jurieu's artifice in the uſe he makes of theſe words. V. 803.

Ottoman Emperors, nothing can be more precarious than their authority, although it ſeems to have the ſureſt foundation. IV. 426. *a. b.* A hiſtory of them in medals promiſed. V. 223. *n.* (*c*).

Overcome; there are captains who know how to overcome, but not how to make uſe of their victory. II. 413. *a. b.* 414. *a.*

Ovid quoted with reſpect to Alcmena's lying-in. I. 207. *b.* Was a maſter Painter in the affair of love. II. 1, 2. Does not ſufficiently obſerve the rules of probability in ſpeaking of Oenone. IV. 401. *a.* What he ſays of Ceneus and of Hippodamia. I. 537. *a. b.* 538. *a.* Cenſured concerning Pygmalion, whom he is not careful to prevent his readers from taking for a meer ſtatuary. IV. 641. *a. b.*

a. b. What he ſays of the proſtitution of the women of Cyprus. *ibid. b.* 642. *a.*

Our lady of Hall and of Zichem, judgment which Joſeph Hall forms of them, as well as of their Hiſtories wrote by Lipſius. III. 846. *b.* 847. *a. b.*

Oxenſtern (Axel) made Great Chancellor of Sweden by Guſtavus Adolphus. V. 654. One of the ableſt men that ever appeared in Europe. *ibid.*

Oxford, who was the firſt profeſſor of Hiſtory in that univerſity. II. 283. The title of Maſter of Arts is conferred there on thoſe who have run through a courſe of ſeven years. 278. *a.* The foundation of its college. V. 554. *b.*

Oil, who invented the ſecret of making it. I. 455. *a.*

Oyſters ſent to Trajan into Parthia. I. 371.

P.

PAdua is obliged to ſubmit to the Republic of Venice. V. 590.

Paets, his great merit. I. 787. *a. b.*

Paganiſm is founded on notions of the Deity as falſe as Atheiſm. I. 132. *a.* The Philoſophers and not the Prieſts writ in favour of it. 255. *b.* Whether it be a leſs evil than Atheiſm. 382. *a.* Who was the cauſe of its oracles being put to ſilence. 594. *a.* Its prieſts feared nothing ſo much as the eyes of the incredulous and curious. *ibid. and b.* It preſerved a monſtrous alliance between the worſhip of the gods and the moſt filthy paſſions. 597. *a. b.* Was formed upon the witty conceits of ſome Poets. 65. *a. b.* III. 642. *a. b.* 652. *b.* 653. *a. b.* Nothing worſe concerted than its ſyſtem. II. 339. *a.* Wherein it made part of its Divine ſervice conſiſt. 531. *b.* Who were the Phariſees of it. 780, 781. Arnobius gives it a home thruſt. III. 647. *a.* The venality of its oracles. IV. 405. *a.* Its religious ceremonies were rather appointed to avert miſfortunes, than to draw down favours from Heaven. 572. *a.* Its prieſts heartily received the offerings of Courtezans. 869. *a. b.*

Pagans underſtood the nature of virtue thoroughly. I. 278. *b.* 279. *a. b.* What ſeveral have believed concerning the ſalvation of Pagans. 471. *b.* They reaſoned very inconſequentially on the reality of virtue. II. 164. *b.* 165. *a.* Their doctrine with reſpect to guardian angels. II. 249. *b.* 250. *a.* Reflexions upon their ſyſtem of a multitude of gods. *ibid. a. b.* They could anſwer the objections of the Manichees better than the Chriſtians. 251. *a. b.* IV. 519. *a. b.* 520. *a. b.* 521. *a. b.* The greateſt part of them lived as the Chriſtians do, who have faith without charity. II. 418. *b.* 419. *a. b.* Their diſtinction between the known and unknown gods, reſembled very much the diſtinction that was made in the ſchools of Ariſtotle, between occult and manifeſt qualities. 677. *b.* Their gods were ſo ridiculous, that a man might laugh at them without being an Atheiſt. 872. *b.* The contradiction that appeared in their conduct, with reſpect to theſe ſame deities. 873. *a.* They have been juſtly reproached, on account of the utmoſt villany of the greateſt of their gods. III. 130. *a.* They are afraid leſt Chriſtianity ſhould be publickly tolerated, and for what reaſon. 320. *b.* 321. *a. b.* One of the effects of their prepoſſeſſion. 578. *a. b.* 579. *a.* It may be ſaid to their honour, that ſeveral of them were wiſer and purer than their gods. 649. *a.* Thoſe who pretended to the pureſt Orthodoxy, were at bottom no better than Atheiſts. 654. *a. b.* They could not throw the blame upon the Poets of thoſe abominations, which were publiſhed of their gods. 653. *a. b* They have been more eaſy to be converted than the Turks. IV. 41. *a.* The notions which the antient Pagans had of the Deity, agree with ſound Theology. 572. *b.* The Pagans committed as great a ſin, in plundering the temple of Apollo, as the Jews would have done, in plundering the temple of Solomon. 622. *b.* 623. *a.* They can boaſt, as well as Chriſtians, of having had Kings who cured diſtempers. 664. *b.* 665. *a.* Muſt have taught the Jews the doctrine of a life to come, according to the Hypotheſis of Lucas Brugenſis. V. 8. *a. b.* Took advantage of thoſe paſſages of Scripture, which ſeem to aſcribe ſome imperfection to God. 13. *b.* Their opinion about the ſtatues of the gods. 239. *b.* It does not appear that they aſked the gods to forgive their ſins, when they were at the point of death. 628. *b.*

Page, the bold action of a page. I. 712. *a.*

Page (- - - le) miniſter at Dieppe, and afterwards at Rotterdam; author of the book intituled, *L'Impieté des Communions forcées*, dies in the year 1701. IV. 243. *a. n.* (2).

Pain; the diſpute between the Stoics and Peripatetics about the nature of it, a meer diſpute of words. III. 423. *a.* One may feel pain, without having ever felt pleaſure. IV. 514. *a. b.*

Painters, whoſe pictures deceived men and beaſts, are not the more excellent on that account. I. 369. *a. b.* V. 624. *b.* 625. *a. b.* Who made the goddeſſes like their miſtreſſes. III. 57. *a.*

Palace (Engliſh) a houſe near the Vatican, why ſo called. III. 322. *b.*

Paladins, the fables that are writ of them, have been introduced into religion. I. 166.

Palatine (the Elector) reſtored to his dominions by the treaty of Munſter. III. 247. *a.* Promiſes a retreat to the Socinians in the town of Manheim. 903. Cauſes the acts relating to the affair of the Landgrave of Heſſe, to be publiſhed, on account of the need in which he himſelf ſtands of them. 943. *b.* 944. *a. b.*

Palatinate, where the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of that country is to be found. I. 241. *a.* The revolution which happened there upon the death of Frederic III. V. 521.

Palavicin (Cardinal) a thought which he borrows from Ariſtotle. I. 126. *b.* 127. *a.* What he acknowledges with reſpect to the deciſions of the council of Trent. 704. *a.* A diſappointment that happens to him. II. 473. *a. b.* Much leſs prudent in refuting Father Paul, than Baronius, in refuting the Centuriators of Magdeburg. 643. *b.* He did not know that Preſident Ferrier had changed his religion. III. 38. *b.* Several of his maxims cenſured in the *New Goſpel*. 326. *b.* He pitied the Popes, when they had no other aſſiſtance, beſides that of the Holy Ghoſt. V. 826.

Paleſtine, ſome Monks there had abandoned the cloaths and ſentiments of men, I. 112. *a.* There is a mountain of gold promiſed there to the Chriſtians, when they ſhall have conquered the Turks. V. 95. *a.*

Palingenius (Helias) a name which John Pincier borrowed. IV. 647. *a.*

Palladium, by whom made, and of what materials. I. 6.

Pamphlets; ſmall Pamphlets, however good they be, are eaſily diſſipated. IV. 652. *a.*

Pan puniſhed by Venus, for giving the prize of beauty to another. I. 74. *a.* His birth. IV. 541. *a. b.* 542. *a.* Whoſe ſon he was, and how he comes to have goat's feet. *ibid. b.*

Panætius, a great Philoſopher of the ſect of the Stoics. III. 7.

Pancrates, the baſe complaiſance of that Poet for Hadrian, and the reward which he received for it. I. 348. *a.*

Pandects: firſt book of the Pandects neglected by the Doctors. I. 477. *a.* Contains the fineſt laws of nature, and of Moral and Civil Philoſophy. *ibid.*

Panegyrics, an eaſy way of compoſing one. II. 819. *b.* A multitude of them only ſerves to diſfigure Hiſtories. III. 708. *b.*

Panegyriſts; extravagant Panegyriſts do more harm than good to thoſe whom they praiſe. I. 469. *a.* Are too apt to make uſe of great words. 646. *b.* 647. *a. b.* Diſguiſe what is diſadvantageous to the memory of their heroes. 690. *a.* Thoſe who praiſed the murtherers of Kings, rewarded by the Spaniards. II. 103. *a. b.* Panegyriſts who praiſe wicked things, Iſocrates not one of their number. 235. *a. b.* The modern Panegyriſts carry their ideas farther than the Antients did. 715. *a.* Are very apt to contradict themſelves. IV. 495. *a.* Love to exceed one another. 589. *a.* See *Encomiums*. Panegyriſts are much more ingenious than the Princes whom they praiſe, in heightening every thing that may tend to their honour. IV. 608. *a.* We ought not to imagine that the diſcourſes of a Panegyriſt, ſhould influence either his converſation, or the Moral and Hiſtorical books he writes. V. 331. *a. b.*

Pangloſſia, Balzac expreſſes ſome contempt for a book which had that title. IV. 531. *b.*

Pannonius (Johannes), his verſes concerning the ſearch which the Popes were obliged to undergo before their election. IV. 730. *b.* And upon the baſtard daughter of Paul II. 510. *a.*

Panſophia, the author of that book, and the ſubject it treats of. II. 536, 537.

Panſtratia, a book of Chamier's, how called by the author of the *Bibliotheque de Dauphiné.* II. 434. *a. b.*

Pantaleon corrects his error with reſpect to Bibliander's death. I. 803. *b.*

Pantomimes, when introduced upon the ſtage. I. 676. *a.* Zoſimus places the introduction of the dances of the Pantomimes, among the cauſes of the deſtruction of the Roman empire. *ibid.* They were great provocatives to luſt. 676, 677. It was under Auguſtus that theſe dances came to perfection. IV. 646. *b.* How the Antients have repreſented the manual language of the Pantomimes. 647. *a. b.*

Papacy, how difficult it is to exerciſe it. III. 564. *b.*

Papebroch has ſtruck ſeveral ſaints out of the Kalendar. II. 740. *a.* Quoted. III. 330. *a.* 441. *b.* V. 467. *a.*

Papers torn in pieces and thrown into the ſea, preſerved by a very ſingular accident. II. 577. *a.*

Paper-wars are ſometimes violent and of a long continuance. I. 322. *b.*

Paphnucius converts a woman of pleaſure. V. 321. *b.*

Papiſts formerly joined with the Turks and Pagans in the public prayers of the Proteſtants. IV. 199. *b.* Their diviſions. III. 343. *b. n.* (30).

Pappus, Profeſſor at Straſburg, what he aſked of God for the Proteſtants of France, and for all the perſecuted churches. V. 258. *a.*

Paracelſus, his notion about our firſt parents. I. 103. *b.*

Paraclete, how that word ought to be pronounced. IV. 470. *a. b.* 471. *a. b.*

Paradiſe, the great men of Rome diſtribute the places thereof for money. II. 713. *b.* It is pretended that Machiavel ſaid in one of his works, that he had rather be ſent to hell after his death, than go to Paradiſe. IV. 15. *b.* Whether that which Mahomet promiſed, was one of the cauſes that drew ſo many followers to him. 30. *b.* 31. *a. b.* What has been ſaid concerning the occupations of Paradiſe. III. 895. *a.* What town was called the Paradiſe of Germany. II. 816. *a.*

Paradiſe of Seneca, a kind of union which may be ſo called. II. 119. *a.*

Paradiſe Loſt, an Engliſh Poem which is greatly eſteemed. IV. 219. *a. b.*

Paraſite, one that runs after a good bit. II. 469. *b.* 470. *a.* The moſt famous Paraſite of his time. IV. 246. *a. b.* 247. *a. b.* 248. *a. b.* 252. *a. b.* What is the compaſs and polar-ſtar of a Paraſite. *ibid. b.*

Parchment, the invention of it. IV. 555. *a.*

Pardaillan (Segur) undertakes a deputation to the Proteſtant Princes, and the cauſe of that deputation. II. 143. *a.*

Pardies (Father), why it was ſuſpected that he had no real deſign to confute Des Cartes. IV. 902. *b.*

Pardon; people do not ſo eaſily pardon reflecting words as injurious actions. V. 364. *b.* 365. *a.*

Parent (Francis), his Majeſty's Greek Profeſſor in the univerſity of Paris. I. 562.

Pareus (Daniel) his *Medulla Hiſtoriæ Profanæ* is a work of Altingius. I. 241. *a.* The Devil expreſſes all his malice in that author's *Calvinus Orthodoxus.* III. 539. *a. b.*

Pareus (David) inſulted by the Jeſuit Mulhuſinus. II. 173. *b. n.* (14).

Paris was very effeminate. III. 297. *a.* His judgment concerning the beauty of the three goddeſſes. 644. *a. b.* He grows jealous of Corythus and kills him. IV. 401. *b.* 402. *a.*

Paris, the Comedian, was killed by Domitian's orders. II. 684. *a.*

Paris, what is ſaid of that city in the *Saint-Evremoniana.* IV. 439. *b.* How far the corruption of it goes with reſpect to the women. 498. *b.* 499. *a. b.* & *ſeq.* It is nevertheleſs thought to be leſs impure than the greateſt part of the capital cities in the Weſt. 500. *a.* The fabulous ſiege of it by the giant Iſaurus. 738. *b.*

Pariſhes; every pariſh ſhould be ſummoned to produce the proofs of its devotions. IV. 556. *a.*

Pariſians, what judgment they paſs upon books that are compoſed by an author who never went out of his province. IV. 458. *a.* The ſedition which they carried on in the year 1648. 488. *b.*

Parliament of Paris; the order which that Parliament made againſt the Chymiſts. I. 469. *b.* And concerning the theſes which attacked Ariſtotle's doctrine. *ibid.* An act which was purloined from its records. III. 297. *b.* 298. *a.* Refuſes to regiſter the edict of January. 509. *b.* 510. *a.* 512. *b.* In what ſtile Charles IX harangues it. I. 256. *a.* III. 512. *b.* Severely mortified. 825. *a. b.* Makes a very remarkable decree with reſpect to commiſſions. IV. 241. *b.* Remonſtrances which it makes to Lewis XI. V. 443. *a. b.* A conjecture upon the reaſons which moved that Parliament to involve the Jeſuits in Chaſtel's affair. III. 279. *b.* 280. *a. b.* Its conduct juſtified in that reſpect. *ibid.* In what manner it treated Francis Surgier, a ſeditious preacher. V. 273. *and a. b.* 274. *and a. b.*

Parliament of Bourdeaux, Chancellor Hoſpital gives that Parliament a ſmart reprimand. III. 512. *a. b.*

Parliaments have too much grandeur for the trifling cauſes which are decided therein. II. 724. *b.* Parliaments of France, their ſtiffneſs is ſometimes prejudicial to the ſtate. III. 825. *a. b.* V. 443. *b.* Ought never to differ from the King in affairs of ſtate. 444. *a. b.* Whether the intereſt of the kingdom requires that they ſhould have more power than at preſent they enjoy in France. III. 512. *b.* 513. *a. b.* They have been long excluded from a ſhare in the ſovereignty. 825. *b.* 826. *a.*

Parma (the Duke of) endeavours to amuſe Queen Elizabeth with ſecret propoſals of peace. II. 662. *a.*

Parmenides, his opinion about the univerſe. V. 575. *b.* What his ſyſtem was. 587. *a.*

Parrhaſiana quoted. III. 248. *b. n.* (91), (92). An examination of what is advanced there that an Origeniſt can reduce a Manichee to ſilence, in diſcourſing upon the origin of evil. IV. 416. *a. b.* 421. *a. b.*

Parry (William) being convicted of having deſigned to kill the Queen, is puniſhed with death. II. 576. *a. b.*

Parthians, a piece of conduct which ſhews, that they deſerved the name of Barbarians, that the Greeks and Romans gave them. V. 273. *a.* Beſiege Antioch, raiſe the ſiege, and their General is killed. II. 348. Fought as they fled. III. 521. *b.*

Party; it is difficult to preſerve the affection and eſteem of two contrary parties. I. 538. *a. b.* If any one fairly repreſents all the force of the oppoſite party's arguments, he draws down reproaches upon himſelf. 730. *a. b.* II. 456. *b.* 487. *b.* Whether a man ought to ſet the arguments of the oppoſite party in a weak light. *ibid.* 488. *a. b.* Whether it does ſervice to a party to employ, in its defence, all ſorts of reaſons, good or bad. 708. *a.* Each party makes falſe ſteps which reciprocally ſerves to ballance and ſupport the other. III. 954. *b.* The ſame things appear to us true or falſe, according as they favour our own or the oppoſite party. IV. 733. *b.* 734. *a. b.* 735. *a. b.* 736. *a. b.* 737. *a. b.* A ſtrange effect of the ſpirit of party. 711. *b.* Party at all times determines the fate of dramatical performances. I. 867. *a. b.* Its ordinary artifices. 774. *a. b.*

Partial, oftentimes people accuſe an Hiſtorian of being partial for no other reaſon but becauſe they are remarkably ſo themſelves. II. 310. *a. b.*

Particles, thoſe which are termed *cauſales* expoſe people to great illuſions. V. 184. *b.*

Particular perſons are no more exempt from diviſions than communities. III. 343. *b.*

Particulariſm, a great diſpute raiſed on that ſubject. I. 261. *a. b.*

Partridge, a ſtory that is told of the partridge. II. 725. *a.*

Parts (James des), Nicolas Præpoſitus ſteals from his Diſpenſatory. IV. 764. *and a. b.* Particulars which concern him. *ibid. and n.* (1), (2).

Paſcal, the happy turn which he had naturally for the Mathematics. IV. 61. *a.* What the Abbot du Mas ſays of him. 491. *a.* One of his apologiſts would perhaps be puzzled by ſeveral remarks in the hiſtory of the five propoſitions. 492. *a.* Why, after having confeſſed himſelf in a diſtemper, he delayed communicating. 537. *b. n.* (24). What he eſteemed moſt in Mr Des Cartes's Philoſophy. 548. *b.* He deſpiſed Mathematics even before he gave himſelf up to devotion. V. 621. *a.*

Paſchalius quoted. I. 577. *b.*

Paſquier cenſured for ſeveral conſiderable blunders. I. 25. *b.* Did not at all underſtand a paſſage of Abelard. *ibid.* A quarrel that was commenced with him. 670. *a. b.* Quoted. 792. *b. n.* (58). III. 399. *b. n.* (52), (53). 411. *a. n.* (82), (83), (84), (85), (86). V. 405. *a. b. n.* (*a*), (1), (2). 443. *b. n.* (4), (5), (6). Cenſured for the manner after which he tries to excuſe Dante, with reſpect to the word Butcher. II. 296. *b.* He does not reaſon juſtly in the application he makes of a general theſis to Pyrrhus and Cæſar, to Pope Leo and Pope Nicolas. 414. *a.* His ſons revenge his quarrel on a Jeſuit who had traduced him. III. 132. *b.* 133. *a.* His judgment concerning thoſe who have writ upon the Civil-Law. 201. *b.* He ridicules a man who was ſoon after canonized. 896. *b.* What account he gives of the Jeſuits. 897. *b.* Is guilty of an anachroniſm which is cenſured by Garaſſe, and but ill defended by his ſons. 908. *b.* 909. *a.* A paſſage of his plea againſt the Jeſuits confuted. IV. 80. *a. b.* 81. *a. b.* 82. *a.* Cenſured by Garaſſe with reſpect to the word Paraclete. 470. *b.* 471. *a. b.* What he ſays of clandeſtine marriages, and of rapes. 636. *a. b.* 637. *a. b.* What he anſwers in defence of Mercerus who was accuſed of being a caballing man. 842. *b.* He diſapproves of Tabourot's making additions to his Miſcellany. I. 64. *a. b.* The judgment which he paſſes on le Feron's books of Heraldry. III. 27. *a. b.*

Paſſage: a remarkable paſſage left out in a ſecond edition, but preſerved by Uſher. II. 94. *a. b.* The fate of paſſages which people copy from the firſt modern writer that comes in their way. 334. *b.* A curious paſſage of a manuſcript left out in the printed edition. 633. *a. b.* One ought to diſtruſt ſuch as are cited by halves. V. 350. *a.*

Paſſaw (the treaty of) gave full liberty of conſcience to all the States of the empire. V. 672.

Paſſelaigne (John de), Biſhop of Belley: Lewis XIII grants him the antient privileges of his dioceſe. I. 737.

Paſſer, what the Paſſer of Catullus ſignifies in Martial. II. 396. *a.*

Paſſeratius, what he ſays againſt a certain faction of Grammarian Antiquarians. IV. 830. *b.* And againſt thoſe who contemned Ovid. 432. *b.* 433. *a.*

Paſſions reſemble animals which ſeek their food. II. 3. *a.* Cover themſelves with a ſpecious pretext. 30. *a. b.* Whoever deſigns to cure them muſt take a proper time for it. 564. *b.* Their firſt motions are not voluntary. 676. *a.* Their uſefulneſs after ſin. 855. *a. b.* They make us ſuppreſs circumſtances which we do not like. III. 304. *a.* The greateſt part of them, as well as their effects, are involuntary, and reaſon is too weak to deſtroy them. 376. *a.* IV. 440. *b.* 441. *a. b.* 442. *a. b.* 857. *b.* There is almoſt as much neceſſity for being above the paſſions to come to the knowledge of ſome kind of truths, as to act virtuouſly. 323. *b.* If they were once rooted up people would find no difficulty in the practice of virtue. 441. *a. b.* 442. *a. b.* Beaſts are not capable of them, according to the opinion of the Stoics. 552. *b.* 553. *a. b.* 554. *a. b.*

Paſtor Fido has produced bad effects. III. 259. *b.* 260. *a. b.* 261. *a.*

Paſtorals (Tragi-Comic), pieces invented contrary to the rules of antient Poetry. III. 259. *a.*

Paſtorals, a romance upon the amours of Daphnis and Chloe, what are the faults of it. III. 866. *a. b.*

Paſtors, wicked Paſtors abuſe their authority to bring about their own ends. III. 772. *b.* Good Chriſtians are perſuaded that they ought to hide their faults. V. 648. *a.* See *Miniſters.*

Paſtoureaux, the name of certain Fanatics; people did not at firſt diſcover their pernicious errors. II. 383. *a.* The moſt judicious reflexion of an Hiſtorian, upon that head. *ibid.*

Patience; examples of an extraordinary patience. I. 559. *a.* II. 674. *a.* IV. 487. *b.* 488. *a.* A patience which went beyond the neceſſary bounds. I. 734. *b.* 735. *a. b.*

Patin (Guy) his Cynical Liberty. I. 171. *b.* His miſtake touching certain verſes of Paſquier. 792. *b.* Quoted. II. 138. *a. b.* 268. *a. n.* (101). 650. *a. n.* (23), (24), (25). IV. 89. *a. n.* (8). His judgment with reſpect to Calvin's wit and learning. II. 268. *a.* We are obliged to him for the publication of that Reformer's life writ by Papyrius Maſſo. *ibid. a. b.* In what manner he ſpeaks of Mr Tardieu and his wife. III. 40. *b.* 41. *a.* The neceſſity of rectifying his letters by notes. 266. *a.* A confutation of what he has ſaid of Thuanus's death. 827. *a. b.* His invective againſt Joſeph du Cheſne. II. 468. *b.* Cenſured for a particular he relates of Auguſtin Niphus's Life. IV. 380.

Patin (Charles) the cauſe of his diſgrace. IV. 505. *b.* 506. *a. b.*

Patriarch of Conſtantinople, ſtrangled during the ſeſſion of the Council of Florence. I. 266.

Patricius is an equivocal word. IV. 638. *b.*

Patrimony: there were Philoſophers that renounced their patrimonies before the preaching of the Goſpel. I. 294. *a. b.* The contempt of one's patrimony, is a more valuable poſſeſſion than the patrimony itſelf. 390. *b.* The laws of Abdera put a mark of infamy upon thoſe who had ſpent it. II. 635. *a. b.*

Pattins, women that wore very large ones. II. 599. *a. b.*

Pavia: the battle of Pavia foretold to the Queen-Regent by Turrel, according to Paradin. V. 417.

Pavia (the Cardinal di) obliged to ſign briefs which he had not ſeen. IV. 511. *a. b.*

Pavin (St) a famous Libertine, whoſe converſion has been put among the moral impoſſibilities. II. 650. *a. b.*

Paul (St) whether he pretended that a huſband had power to diſpoſe of his wife's body, in favour of another man. I. 91. *b.* Accuſed of ſtraining his expreſſions. 106. *a. b.* 107. *a. b.* Compared to a great ſea which ſwells by the impetuoſity of the wind. 109. *b.* And treated with great irreverence by the Italians. *ibid.* 110. *a. b.* How Bembus treated his epiſtles. 743. *a.* He ſtood in need of a ſtrong check and ſevere mortification, leſt the excellency of the revelations that were communicated to him, ſhould have puffed him up with pride. V. 367. *b.* Simon Simonius affirmed that he could propoſe objections, which that apoſtle would not have been able to anſwer. 150. *b.* 151. *a.* He acknowledges that his doctrine is obſcure, and that he knows it but imperfectly. 816. Gets out of the difficulties of Predeſtination, no otherwiſe than by aſſerting the abſolute power of God over his creatures. 821. This Apoſtle's aim, when he forbids us to name any thing that is filthy. 857, 858.

Paul (Father) his extream joy in beholding Mr Sommerdyk at Venice. I. 3. *a.* His jeſt upon one of the ſeſſions of the Council of Trent. 469. *b.* More imbued with the Proteſtant than the Catholic faith. 717. *a.* His friendſhip for Mr Daillé. II. 580. *b.* 581. *a.* Criticized by Palavicini with reſpect to the letters, which the Council of Trent was to diſpatch. III. 51. *a. b.* A thought of his concerning the circumſtances which favoured the reformation. 948. *a.* A ſtrange maxim of this great man. V. 14. *a.* His narrative of the interview, which Vergerius had with Luther. 452. *a. b.* And of the former's aſſiſting at the aſſembly of Worms. 453. *a. b.* It is ſaid that he made great uſe of Vergerius's libels. 456. *a. b.* His Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, tranſlated into Latin by Adam Newton. IV. 360. Conſiderations which hinder him from confuting the *Squittino della Liberta Veneta.* V. 449. *a. b.*

Paul Jovius, takes too much pleaſure in collecting together popular traditions. II. 878. *a.* Quoted impertinently on the ſubject of Hadrian VI. III. 327. *b.* 328. *a.* Cenſured by Nonnius with reſpect to the pillars of Hercules. 431. *a.* His faults with reſpect to the book intituled, *Obſcurorum Virorum Epiſtolæ.*

Epiſtolæ. 474. *b*. 475. *a*. Cenſured for the characters he gives Ajacetus and Alamannus. IV. 11. *b*. Blamed for his negligence, on the ſubject of Alphonſo, King of Naples. IV. 311. *b*. 312. *a*.

Paul II (Pope) treats a company of learned men cruelly, and for what reaſon. II. 877. Turns all the abbreviators out of their places. IV. 683. They preſent a petition to him, but he returns a very rough anſwer. 684. *and a*. In what ſenſe he condemned the word *Academy*. 685. *a*. *b*. Laments the rigour of the law which binds prieſts to celibacy. 411. *a*. *b*.

Paul III (Pope) his indignation againſt the whole order of the Capuchins. IV. 388. *b*. What Alciatus ſays of him. III. 590. *b*. 591. *a*. Accuſed of Magic, and of holding intimate converſation with Magicians. II. 499. *a*. *b*.

Paul IV (Pope) refuſes a diſpenſation of marriage from a regard to the private intereſt of his family. IV. 632. *b*. 633. *a*. *b*. The acknowledgment which he made. *ibid*. *b*. 634. *a*.

Paul V (Pope) in favour of the Duke of Lerma, departs from the cuſtom of not ſending the hat to Cardinals newly elected. I. 604. *b*.

Paula Malateſta, a very eminent lady. III. 185. *a*. *b*.

Paullina wore in her dreſs and on her head, jewels to the value of four millions of Crowns. III. 861. *b*.

Paulus Samoſatenus protected by Zenobia. V. 604.

Pauſanias aſſaſſinates Philip, King of Macedonia. IV. 404. *a*. What were the conſequences of that aſſaſſination. *ibid*.

Pauſanias, a paſſage of that author miſunderſtood by Romulus Amaſæus. II. 826. *a*.

Pe (Lazarus) tranſlates Marinello's book on the diſeaſes of women, and accuſes Liebaut of Plagiariſm. IV. 148. *a*. *b*.

Peace; there are circumſtances, in which each of the Princes, that conclude a peace, incur a general blame. II. 740. *a*. A puniſhment which in antient times was imprecated on thoſe who ſhould violate a treaty of peace. 742. *a*. Is eaſily concluded, when both parties find themſelves under a neceſſity of ending the war. III. 90. *a*. They break the peace, not who firſt make war, but who fraudulently carry on ſecret practices. II. 104. *a*. *b*. The proper time for a Prince to make peace, is the time of his enemy's ill-fortune. V. 661.

Peacocks, who was the firſt among the Romans, that introduced the cuſtom of eating peacocks in entertainments. III. 492. Thoſe birds were extreamly valued by the antient Greeks. IV. 569. *b*. *n*. (44).

Pedant, his character. I. 373. *a*. *b*. 376. *a*. *b*.

Pederaſty, in antient times, that ſort of love was not branded with infamy. I. 292. The Heathen gods reproached with it. II. 482. *a*. *b*. 483. *a*.

Peers of France, whether the creation of them ſhould be aſcribed to Charlemagne. III. 336. *a*. *b*.

Pegna (Francis) publiſhes two editions of the Directory of the Inquiſitors. II. 749.

Peyrat reproaches the Lutherans with ſuppreſſing all the copies they could find of a certain Miſſal. III. 558. *b*. 559. *a*. The reaſons which he alledges to ground that reproach upon, are not ſolid. *ibid*. *a*. *b*.

Pelagians, ſevere decrees againſt them. I. 229. *a*. *b*. 230. *a*. Nothing can be more acceptable to them, than to ſay, that the fear of the falſe gods, was able to induce men to repent. V. 812.

Pelagius II (Pope), ſends to Conſtantinople to demand ſuccours againſt the Lombards. III. 219.

Pelaſgi carry off the Athenian women. III. 754. *b*. 755. *a*.

Pelion, the height of that mountain. II. 659. *a*. *b*.

Peliſſon, a reflexion upon four verſes of his making. II. 420. *b*. What he ſays of the difficulty there is in compoſing with an eaſy air. III. 262. *a*. *b*. His reflexion upon the injuſtice of thoſe who condemn the occupations of others. IV. 843. *a*. While he was at Toulouſe, he formed the plan of a club of wits. V. 394. *a*.

Pellevé (Cardinal) an unlucky thing that happened to him with reſpect to an harangue which he had prepared. V. 778.

Peloponneſus, the expedition in which the Heraclidæ retook it, precedes the Hiſtorical time. I. 241. *a*. Whether all the cities thereof were maritime cities. 657. *a*. *b*.

Peloponneſian war, the cauſe of it was not known. IV. 570. *b*. 571. *a*.

Pelops, the wonderful qualities that are aſcribed to one of his ribs. V. 289. *a*.

Pen, one that had laſted forty years. I. 231. *b*. 232. *a*. A pen dipt in good ſenſe. 469. *a*. Pens conſecrated to the Holy Virgin. 617. *b*. III. 841. *b*. There is nothing ſo execrable, which mercenary pens will not attempt to juſtify. II. 100. *and b*. 101. *and a*. *b*. The great effects of the pen. I. 720. *b*.

Pen of gold: a witty jeſt of Henry IV, upon an Hiſtorian who boaſted that he had a pen of gold. III. 339. *b*.

Pen by way of bravado, ſaid to be made with a ſword, I. 548.

Penance: an example of a rude penance. I. 96. *a*. *b*.

Penates (Dii) children were ſacrificed to them. II. 163. *b*.

Penelope governs herſelf much more prudently than Helen. III. 367. *b*.

Penetration: ſeveral people make themſelves ridiculous by their affecting too great a penetration. IV. 687. *a*. *b*.

Penitence put off to death-bed, as well as extreme unction. I. 701. *b*. Is liable to be ſuſpected. V. 556. *b*. A remarkable abuſe of this ſacrament, and the complaints that were made of it. II. 459. *b*. 460. *a*. *b*.

Penitentiaries, their complaints to the firſt Preſident of Paris. IV. 499. *a*.

Pennafort, General of the Dominicans, cauſes it to be decreed in a chapter held at Toledo, that they ſhould apply themſelves to the ſtudy of Hebrew and Arabic. IV. 167. Is deſirous of purging Spain from Judaiſm and Mahometiſm. *ibid*.

Pennetier (Henry) an apoſtate Miniſter. III. 735. *b*.

Penſioners: State-Penſioners do not enjoy their penſions without care and trouble. III. 176. *a*. *b*.

Penſions aſſigned on the revenues of the Church. I. 751. *a*. *b*. Whether large penſions procure eſteem to men and their productions. III. 340. *a*. *b*.

People; their folly. I. 154. *b*. Often puniſhed for the faults of Princes. 158. *b*. 159. *a*. II. 340. *a*. *b*. 341. *a*. *b*. Have a ridiculous fondneſs for every thing which they find eſtabliſhed. I. 349. Would be formidable to the Clergy, in caſe they had a ſufficient capacity to demand of them an account of their doctrine. 564. *b*. 565. *a*. Demand nothing but bread and public ſhews. 573. *b*. 574. *a*. Stand in need of being nouriſhed with a blind and artificial hatred to the enemies of the ſtate. 681. *b*. 682. *a*. Their rights ſtrongly maintained by Bodin. II. 46. *b*. 47. *a*. *b*. 48. *a*. They ſometimes do juſtice to oppreſſed innocence. 337. *a*. There are certain things in which they love to be deceived. 539. *a*. When they are mutinous, there is no poſſibility of making them hearken to reaſon. 542. *a*. There is no ſtreſs to be laid on their fidelity. 608. *a*. They will remain quiet, if not agitated by ſome external force. 741. *a*. *b*. Their capricious and uneven diſpoſition. III. 452. *a*. *b*. 467. *a*. *b*. 468. *a*. IV. 603. *a*. *b*. They are fated to ſuffer for the follies of many others. III. 530. *b*. How far their weakneſs goes, when they are prepoſſeſſed and impoſed upon by perſecutors. 626. *and a*. Their ordinary diſpoſition, with reſpect to treaties of peace, and to war. V. 104. *a*. *b*. The people likened to coquets. III. 798. *a*. *b*. Are more tender of their private intereſt than of the fundamental laws of the State. IV. 603. *b*. The rights of the people have fair ſides, they have likewiſe ugly ones. V. 740. What a Cardinal ſaid of the people. 748, 749. They eaſily believe what flatters them. 749. *a*. *b*.

Pepin, whether he divorced Plectrude and married Alpaïde. III. 707. *b*. 708. *a*.

Peraſia, the prieſteſſes of that place boaſted of being able to walk on burning coals without hurt. II. 531. *a*.

Perault (Charles) is miſtaken with reſpect to Cardinal Berulle. I. 786. *b*. His judgment concerning Homer and his dialogue between Hector and Andromache. 333. *b*. He is obliged to ſuppreſs ſome elogies. 498. *a*. *b*. Laughs at a place of the

Iliad. II. 481. *a. b.* His lines upon the diſadvantage our lawyers lie under, compared with thoſe of antiquity. 724. *b.* As yet there has been no anſwer made to his parallel. IV. 741. *b.*

Perhaps: it is a very common fault to change into an affirmation what an author has only delivered with a *perhaps*. IV. 381.

Pericles aſſiſted Anaxagoras with his riches. I. 295. *b.* The ſuſpicion of irreligion is faſtened upon him. 307. *a.* The anſwer he made when he ſuffered an old woman's remedy to hang about his neck. II. 649. *b.* Being thrown upon the ground in wreſtling, he perſuaded the ſpectators that he did not really fall. III. 390. *b.* IV. 567. *b.* An offer which he makes to the Athenians. V. 552. *b.*

Perimede, according to the Scholiaſt on Theocritus, is the ſame with Agamede. IV. 585.

Peringſkioldus (John) cauſes the Hiſtory of Theodoric by Cochlœus to be reprinted with additions and notes. II. 523. *a.*

Periods: two periods bordering upon one another, and beginning with the ſame word eaſily eſcape the tranſcribers. IV. 711. *b.* There are half-periods, which may be taken out of a book, and ſtill leave a tolerable ſenſe behind. *ibid.*

Peripatetic Philoſophy, why it finds ſo many protectors. I. 472. *b.* Could not prove the immortality of the ſoul. IV. 717. *a. b. & ſeq.*

Peripatetics, reflexions upon their ſubſtantial forms. II. 251. *a.*

Perjury unpuniſhed changed a ſuperſtitious man into an Atheiſt. II. 652. *b.* 653. *a.*

Perpetuity of the Faith, who is the author of that book. I. 493. *a. b.*

Perron (Cardinal du) always had his works twice printed. I. 318. *b.* What he thought of Bellarmin's controverſial books. 730. *a. b.* His excuſe to a Princeſs before whom he was obliged to ſpeak ſitting. II. 422. *b.* Particulars concerning him. IV. 240. *a. b.* His invidious reflexion upon the Proteſtants. III. 42. *b.* He gives Mrs de Gournai a moſt ſatirical rub. 206. *b.* 207. *a.* He had notwithſtanding a regard for her. *ibid. a. b.* Diſputes with Michael Berault in the conference of Mante. I. 756.

Perſecution for religion's ſake, how unjuſt it is. I. 240. *b.* 241. *a.* A fine paſſage of St Auguſtin againſt perſecution. 287. *b.* 288. *a.* Whether in time of perſecution it be not neceſſary to make outward profeſſion of the truth. 663. *a. b.* Perſecution ſharpens the wit, and makes a man wonderfully clear-ſighted in diſcovering the myſtical ſenſe. III. 772. *b.* See *Non-toleration in affairs of religion.*

Perſecutors of religion, their cunning. II. 30. *a. b.* The fineſt maxims of Chriſtian morality, when alledged by them, become trifling. III. 289. *a. b.* The conformity between Pagan and Chriſtian perſecutors. 446. *a. b.* An inſtance of their perfidy. 623. *b.* 624. *a.* Their different conduct according to the difference of times. IV. 815. *a. b.* They are very much puzzled how to juſtify their conduct, eſpecially when they themſelves complain of the perſecutions that they have ſuffered. V. 22. *b.* 23. *a.* According to Jurieu we fulfil the command that enjoins us to love our neighbours, when we wiſh ſpiritual felicity to them. 648. *b.*

Perſepolis, who was the cauſe of its deſtruction. V. 320. *a. b.*

Perſia, the Chriſtians are perſecuted there. I. 13. *a. b.* The artifices made uſe of by the Magi in that country to deſtroy the Chriſtian religion. *ibid.* The epithet that was given to the King of Perſia. I. 130. *b.* 514. *a. b.* II. 513. *b. n.* (11). What the Kings of Perſia did for their language. III. 172. *a. n.* (14). The women there are handſome. IV. 35. *b.* What notion the learned men in that country have of the Supreme Being. V. 201. *a. b.*

Perſians, whence ſo called, and what was the origin of their firſt Kings. I. 72. *a. b.* They are indebted to Zoroaſter for their Philoſophy. 444. What was the happineſs that they expected from their principal deity. *ibid.* They very much eſteemed thoſe who could bear a great deal of wine. II. 598. *a.* They believe that Mahomet Mahadi is not dead, and that he is one day to reunite all men in the ſame belief. IV. 123. *a.* Their antient religion. V. 635. *a. b.* 636. *a. b.*

Peſcia (Dominic de) a Jacobine, hanged with Savonarola, and for what reaſon. V. 64.

Petavius (Father) why he refuſed to anſwer a Miniſter. II. 578. *a.* Has contradicted himſelf in repreſenting the doctrine of the three firſt centuries. IV. 601. *b.* 602. *a.*

Peter (Saint); a viſionary pretends that he was the Janus, the Æneas, the Romulus, of whom the Sibyl ſpoke. III. 529. *a. b.*

Peters (Father) a ſatire againſt him. I. 344. *a.*

Petition of the Dictionaries, Menage ſuppreſſed that petition. I. 620. *a.* Quoted. III. 208. *a. b.*

Petitions: an infinite number of petitions of the Proteſtants of France, have been printed without ever being preſented to the King. I. 532. *a. b.* The qualities with which they muſt be accompanyed, if the petitioners would obtain any thing at court. III. 341. *a. b.*

Petra Sancta (Sylveſter à) a Jeſuit, his notes upon a letter of du Moulin to Balzac, *&c.* IV. 280. *a. b.*

Petrarch was not born when Guido Cavalcante died. II. 399. He may paſs for Cinus's Scholar, and ſteals ſome thoughts from him. 508.

Petronilla. Abbeſs of the order of Fontevraud, ſometimes accompanyed Robert d'Arbriſſel in his travels. III. 64. *a. b.*

Petronius leſs dangerous with all his groſs obſcenities, than he is in the nice dreſs of Count de Rabutin. V. 847.

Peucer, what he ſays concerning the death of Paul II. examined. IV. 510. *a. b.* 511. *a.*

Phalaris, the letters which bear his name are a ſuppoſititious work. I. 5. *a.* V. 607. *a.* On what conditions he was willing to abdicate. IV. 563. *b.* The advice which he gave Steſichorus. V. 149. *b.* His bull. 358. *b.* At what time he lived 607. *a.*

Phalerum was the port of the Athenians before the Piræus was built. II. 832. *b.*

Phantoms, there were ſome that haunted a houſe. I. 225. Another appears to Brutus. II. 350. *a. b.* May occaſion a mortal diſtemper. 715. *b.* 716. *a.* Whether it be not poſſible that a man may believe, when awake, that he ſees one. III. 741. *a. b.* A ſtory concerning them. IV. 725. *b.* Whether Spinoza had reaſon to deny that there were any. V. 215. *a. b.* See *Spirits.*

Pharamond; whether he inſtituted the Salic Law. III. 336. *a. b.* We have but little certainty that there ever was ſuch a man in the world. 338. *a.*

Phariſees were leſs honeſt men than the Sadducees. V. 11. *a. b.*

Pharus; A cunning device of him that built it. V. 553. *b.*

Pharſalia torn in pieces by ſome young men. IV. 623. *b.*

Phavorinus, the raillery which he made uſe of againſt a young man that was a great lover of old-faſhioned words. IV. 830. *a.*

Pharſina, the feigned name of a maid of honour to the Princeſs of Salerno whom Auguſtin Niphus was in love with. IV. 380. *b.*

Pherecydes died of a pedicular diſtemper. I. 211. *b.*

Pheroras was in love with a ſervant maid. II. 140. *a.*

Phidias, his maſter-piece. III. 756. *a.* Under what pretence, and with what view he drew the ladies to his houſe. IV. 569. *b.*

Philammon, killed by the Phlegyans, while he ſtrove to defend the temple of Delphos. IV. 626. *a.*

Philelphus, the advice which he gives to Laurence Valla. V. 435. *a.*

Philetærus; the Hiſtory of him. IV. 554. *b.* 555. *a.*

Philip, King of Macedonia, the dream which he had after marrying Olympia, differently expounded by his Diviners. I. 448. *a. b.* Whether one has reaſon to ſurmiſe, that he had read the holy Scriptures. *ibid.* He is praiſed as a great drinker. II. 598. *a.* A joke of demoſthenes on that head. *ibid.* An author undertakes to write his Hiſtory for the uſe of the United Provinces. 768. *a.* By whom killed, and for what. IV. 404. *a.*

Philip, another King of Macedonia, an Ode writ againſt him. I. 191. How he defended himſelf againſt Alcæus. *ibid. a.*

Philip, the Conſul has a great violence committed upon him. II. 711. *b.* 712. *a.*

Philip, the Emperor, whether he was a Chriſtian. I. 593. *a. b.*

Philip I. King of France excommunicated in the councils of Autun and Clermont, and for what reaſon. III. 62. *a.*

Philip de Valois, King of France, confirms a knighthood conferred on another perſon by a knight. III. 282. *a.*

Philip of Burgundy, natural ſon to Philip the Good, was not very chaſte. III. 148. *a. b.*

Philip II, King of Spain, his jealouſy and his myſterious politics did him harm ſometimes. I. 588. *a.* What people thought of him after he had cauſed Conſtantius Pontius to be burned in effigy. II. 336. *b.* Upon what conſideration, after having thus tarniſhed his father's memory, he would not however ſuffer him to be indicted as a Heretic. *ibid.* His anſwer to Cardinal de Granville touching the retirement of Charles. V. 439. *a.* His ingratitude towards his father. *ibid. b.* He cauſes his father's ſcourge to be brought to him, and gives it to his ſon. *ibid.* Makes a diſhonourable peace. III. 419. *b.* 420. *a. b.* Aſpires to the Imperial crown. II. 223. Conquers Portugal from D. Antonio. V. 319.

Philip III, King of Spain, cenſured as a lazy Prince. IV. 127. *a.* Renounces all his rights to the hereditary countries of the houſe of Auſtria, ſituated in Germany. V. 673.

Philip IV, King of Spain falls in love with an actreſs. I. 589. *b.*

Philipſburg is left in the poſſeſſion of France by the treaty of Munſter. III. 720. *a.*

Philiſtines muſt have been terrible folks in love-matters. I. 40. *b.* Had nevertheleſs a great regard for marriage. *ibid.*

Phyllarchus, the original of his quarrel with Balzac. III. 204. *and a.*

Philo would diſcover myſteries which we ought not to pry into. I. 122. *b.* His embaſſy to Caligula. 374. *b.* He condemns three ſorts of legiſlators with reſpect to marriage. II. 504. *b.* His oration on true nobility tranſlated by Daniel d'Auge. I. 562. *a.*

Philologers are eaſily provoked, and difficultly appeaſed IV. 476. *a. b.* V. 92. *a. b.*

Philoſophers: the antient Philoſophers had tenets for the vulgar, and tenets for diſciples initiated into their myſteries. I. 472. *b.*

Philoſophers (Heathen) were not impious men. I. 255. *b.* Were the only writers whom the Chriſtians had to oppoſe. *ibid.* Some of them parted with all their worldly goods. 294. *a. b.* 295. *a. b.* The antient Philoſophers went back as far as the Chaos, and the firſt origin of all things. 302. *b.* Complain that every thing is involved in darkneſs. 305. *b.* Who was the firſt Philoſopher that publiſhed books. 309. *b.* It is an axiom with the ſchoolmen that a Philoſopher ought not to have recourſe to God in order to explain the effects of nature. 310. *a.* Are not qualifyed to judge of the machine of the world. *ibid. b.* 311. *a.* Whether the Philoſophers who uſed all their induſtry to come at the knowledge of the true God, and to honour him religiouſly, had that faith by which the juſt live. 323. *b.* The true deſcription of a perfect Philoſopher. 383. *b.* Among their diſciples, there was always one that was his maſter's favourite. 408. *a.* The antients have left the Hiſtory of the Philoſophers in a wretched ſtate. 415. *b.* 416. *a.* A Philoſopher by practice and not by profeſſion. 464. *a.* They ſhould dip their pen in good ſenſe. 469. *a.* It has been ſaid that there is nothing ſo abſurd but has been maintained by ſome Philoſophers. II. 31. *b.* Antiquity had two ſorts of Philoſophers; ſome were like the advocates, and others like thoſe who report a cauſe. 487. *b.* Their Hiſtory has been intermixed with as many prodigious adventures as that of the knights errant. 637. Nothing was more worthy a Philoſopher, fully perſuaded of the exiſtence of the true God, than to laugh at the ſuperſtitions of the Pagans. 670. *a.* Philoſophers and Rhetoricians expelled from Rome. III. 6. *a.* There are ſeveral things which the laws tolerate in the people, and which would not be allowed in a Philoſopher. 312. *b.* 313. *a. b.* Bore the puniſhment of the folly of the prieſts. 642. *b.* The difficulty they have in explaining the conduct of providence. 919. *a. b.* The antient Philoſophers believed the ſouls of men to be material, as well as thoſe of beaſts. IV. 548. *b.* 549. *a. b.* 550. *a.* Some of them made no diſtinction between thought and ſenſation. *ibid. b.* The people would not ſuffer them to treat of natural cauſes. 566. *b.* Philoſophers who were of no particular ſect. 860. *a.* Philoſophers always accuſed of irreligion. V. 286. *a. b.* Undertake to give an account of their doctrine to all the world. 815, 816. St Paul does not challenge them to a diſputation, on the contrary he exhorts believers to ſtand well on their guard againſt Philoſophy. 816. Their diſputes looked upon by the Fathers as great obſtacles to faith *ibid.*

Philoſophers (Indian) the auſterities of ſome among them. II. 115. *a. b.* 116. *a. b.*

Philoſophy will deſtroy both errors and truths, if ſhe be allowed to have her full ſcope. I. 97. *a.* II. 848. *a. b.* III. 459. *a. b.* 460. *a. b.* In what ſenſe it ought, and ought not, to have recourſe to God in order to explain the effects of nature. I. 310. *b.* 311. *a.* By what means Lactantius pretends to deſtroy all Philoſophy. 411. *a. b.* 412. *a.* And particularly that of the Acataleptics. 411. *b.* Who was the firſt that brought it over to Athens. 414. *a. b. &c.* Philoſophy and Divinity are not well agreed upon their proper boundaries. 472. *b.* Philoſophy can carry a man no farther than to make him confeſs at laſt that he is only aſſured of one thing, *viz.* that he knows nothing. II. 202. *a.* Whether Divinity can ſubſiſt without it. *ibid. b.* It's diſputes reſemble that about the oyſter. 485. *b* 486. *a.* Strabo ſays it could not lead us to faith. 832. *a.* It has been ſometimes debaſed. 845. *b.* 846. *a.* Whether a doctrine that is falſe in Philoſophy can be true in Divinity. III. 479. *a.* 951. *a. b.* 952. *a.* 970. *a. b.* See *Reaſon.* The Peripatetic Philoſophy is only fit to foment the diviſions of the Divines. 558. *a.* Whether Theology ought to be ſubjected to it. IV. 419. *b.* Philoſophy is at a ſtand in anſwering the objections of the Manichees, with reſpect to their two principles. 522. *a.* It is a remedy for impiety and ſuperſtition. V. 287. *b* Is disfigured by the vain ſubtleties of the ſchoolmen. 339 *a. b.* It is eſſential to the truths of the Goſpel, not to be conſiſtent with Philoſophy. 815.

Philoſophy (Civil and Political) a book of Politics by Arrerac. I. 505. *a. b.* Judgment which is paſſed upon it. *ibid. b.*

Philoſophy (Soldier's) a work of Audiguier's. I. 548. *a.*

Philoſophy (Occult) the Hiſtory of that book. I. 154. *a.* And the key to it. *ibid. and* 155. *a. b.* 156. *a.*

Philoſophize: it is impoſſible to philoſophize juſtly without the evidence of ideas. I. 470. *b.* One ought to obſerve a juſt medium in it. II. 847. *a. b.* 848. *a. b.* The natural conſequences which a diſputing and dialectician ſpirit produces. 848. *a. b.* 849. *a.*

Philtre prepared for one perſon and taken by another. III. 876. *and a.*

Phineas, whether he be ſtill living in the terreſtrial paradiſe. II. 750. *a.* Kills a Midianitiſh woman whom he ſurprized in the act of fornication. V. 133. *a.*

Phyſic, it's ſucceſs depends on the bleſſing of Heaven. III. 664. *b.* The Faculty of Phyſic at Paris were formerly very moderate in the practice of drawing blood. II. 99. *a.* They oppoſe the practice of frequent bleeding introduced by Botal. *ibid. b.*

Phyſical: a Phyſical receipt. II. 197. *a. b.* 198. *a. b.*

Phyſical: combination of moral and Phyſical things. II. 16. *a.*

Phyſicians ought to profit by the ſentence of Agatho. I. 127. *a.* An oath which they take upon receiving their degree. 399. *b.* What are the privileges of their profeſſion. *ibid. a.* Formerly exerciſed the Apothecaries trade. 465. *a.* A Phyſician who laid a ſurprizing wager. 526, 527. *and a.* In what manner the common people made uſe of Phyſicians formerly. III. 23. *a. n.* (5). Their conſtant practice in the XVIth century was to bleed in the oppoſite ſide to where the pleuriſy was. II. 141. A civil war raiſed among the Phyſicians of Portugal to ſupport that practice. *ibid. a.* The Emperor's inclination to favour it, if it had not been for the death of Charles III, Duke of Savoy. *ibid. b.* Who was the firſt Phyſician that ever came to Rome. 353. *a.* The practice of the Paris Phyſicians is to bleed very much. 696. *a. b.* They had formerly a public library in their ſchools. III. 497. The Phyſicians formerly were wont to aſcribe much to the influence of the ſtars, in diſcourſing upon diſtempers. 621. *b.* A multitude of Phyſicians kill the patient. 318. *b.* Baniſhed from Rome. IV. 752. *a. b.* Whether thoſe whoſe remedies prove mortal, notwithſtanding their honeſty and learning, deſerve to be puniſhed. 931. *a. b.* It is an infamous thing in a Phyſician to make himſelf work. II. 259. *b.* 260. *a. b.* The three qualities of a good Phyſician. III. 487, 488. Reflexions upon the queſtion whether they have good or bad fortune. 488. *a.*

Phyſicians who wrote in verſe: a liſt of them publiſhed by Bartholinus. III. 351. *b.*

Phyſics; it is thought Alcmæon was the firſt who wrote upon that ſcience. I. 210. Lactantius confeſſes that with reſpect to Phyſics, there is no ſcience. 412. *a.* What is the ſource of the defect in Ariſtotle's Phyſics. 470. *a. b.*

Phocas, his uſurpation and cruelties. III. 222. *a. b.* The praiſes which the Pope beſtows upon him. *ibid. b.*

Phoceans ſeize upon the temple of Delphos, to enable them to make war with the Thebans. IV. 621. *and a. b. &c.* They are ſupported in that war by the Athenians and Lacedæmonians. *ibid.*

Phocion, what he ſaid to the officers that attended him when a fellow ſpit in his face. I. 460. *b.* His integrity. III. 355.

Phæacians led a voluptuous life. I. 201. *b.*

Phorbas, King of the Phlegyans, his cruelty: he is conquered by Apollo. IV. 626. *a.* Divers perſons of that name. *ibid. a. b.*

Φορτικώτερον, ill rendered by the word *importunius.* II. 12. *a.*

Photius, what he relates concerning a man, whoſe name was Oe. I. 101. *a.* He makes Joſephus ſay things, which he has not ſaid concerning Antipater. 349. *a. b.* 350. *a.* His tranſlator has not entered into his thought, with reſpect to the chaſte loves of Theagenes and Chariclea. III. 379. *a. b.* Who firſt publiſhed his *Bibliotheca*. 478. *a.*

Phraſes; young ſcholars take more notice of ill phraſes, and barbarous expreſſions, to divert themſelves, than of ſuch as are polite. II. 555. *a. b.*

Phrygians adored a plain ſtone for the mother of the gods. I. 124. *b.*

Phryne, a Courtezan, makes an offer to the Thebans. V. 553. *a. b.* Could not triumph over the chaſtity of Xenocrates. 568. *a. b.*

Pianeſſo (the Marquis de) obliges Guichenon to inſert in his works whatever he thinks fit. III. 275. *b.*

Pibrac, his ſpeech ill received in the Council of Trent. I. 235. Was in love with Margaret de Valois, the Queen of Navarre III. 419. *b.* IV. 340. *b.* 341. *a.* Extracts of a ſpeech which he made to Henry III, to juſtify the King of Navarre's conduct. III. 341. *a. b.*

Picardy, all put to fire and ſword there. II. 217. *a.*

Picighitone: the caſtle where Francis I. was ſhut up after the battle of Pavia, before he was carried into Spain. III. 97. *b.*

Picinin maſſacred by the order of Ferdinand, King of Naples, and with the conſent of Paul II. IV. 509.

Pictor (Fabius) his negligence, with reſpect to Tanaquil and two of the Tarquins, cenſured by Dionyſius Halicarnaſſenſis. V. 290. *a.*

Picture: Ageſilaus II, by his laſt will, forbad his picture to be drawn. I. 130. What people conjecture to have been his reaſon for it. *ibid.* Other perſons that would not ſuffer their pictures to be drawn. II. 191. *a.* V. 97. *b.* 98. *a.* 449. *b.* 450. *a. b.*

Picture of Adam and Eve, two verſes writ in praiſe of it. II. 728. *a.*

Picus (Johannes) Count of Mirandola, is reproved for having entertained a favourable opinion of Origen's ſalvation. IV. 412. *a. b.* 413. *a.* Ruſſilianus tries to imitate him, and renews ſeveral of his propoſitions. 940. *a. b.* He dies, notwithſtanding the contrary prediction of Savonarola. V. 61. *a.*

Picus (Johannes Franciſcus) writes the life of Savonarola, and is extreamly warm in his defence. V. 66. *b.* 67. *a.* Divers extracts of that life, diffuſed through the whole article of SAVONAROLA. Father Quetif publiſhes it in the year 1674, and Dr Bates cauſes it to be reprinted. *ibid.*

Piety; it does not belong to a profane perſon, to compoſe works of piety. I. 439. *a b.* Great piety and great impiety are equally uncommon. II. 451. *b.* To labour at bringing about a coalition of religions, is an undertaking that requires a great deal of piety. I. 689. *a. b.*

Piety (liberal) the artifices which the Clergy make uſe of, in order to raiſe it. I. 738. *b.* 739. *a. b.*

Pigenat, how far he carried his ſeditious fury againſt Henry III. III. 293. *b.* 294. *a.*

Pighius falls upon the Council of Conſtantinople, and for what reaſon. IV. 350. *a.* Whether he was orthodox on the article of Juſtification. 638. *b.* 639. *a. b.* 640. *b.* 641. *a. b.*

Pignerol, France was happy in poſſeſſing that place, at the time of the alliance which the Duke of Savoy entered into with the houſe of Auſtria, *&c.* in the year 1690. III. 407. *a.* Beſieged by the allies, who were not able to take it, and whoſe bombardment did no great miſchief to it. IV. 211. *a.*

Pylades, he and Bathyllus were inventors of a new manner of repreſenting all ſorts of Dramatic pieces in dances. I. 676. *a. b.* An anſwer which he made to Auguſtus. 677. *b.*

Pilate, the ſentence that is aſcribed to him, found at Aquila. II. 556. A book in which they have taken a great deal of pains to prove that the ſaid ſentence is fictitious. *ibid.*

Pylatus (Leontius) what he was. II. 34. *a. b.*

Pilgrims gave occaſion to the devout repreſentations that were exhibited on the ſtage, in the XVth and XVIth centuries. II. 480. *b.* 481. *a. b.*

Pillar: the pillar of fire which went before the Iſraelites, had nothing in common with the fire which Timoleon ſaw in a dream. V. 364. *a. b.*

Pin, Secretary to the King of Navarre, how he treated the Catholics. IV. 336. *b.*

Pin (Lewis Ellis du) the judgment which that Doctor paſſes on the miracles related by St Gregory. III. 226. *a. b.* His diſpute with the Abbot Antelmi, touching ſome of St Proſper's writings, that were aſcribed to Pope Leo. 760. *b.* His recantations. IV. 356. *a.* Some people were offended with Mr du Pin, for publiſhing in French, a new Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical writers. 457. *b.* Cenſured for ſome obſcure expreſſions, which he makes uſe of in ſpeaking of Hœſchelius and Perſona. 599. *a.* He believes that the ſtory of Pope Joan has been added to the chronicle of Martin Polonus. 709. *a.*

Pinczovia was looked upon as the Athens of Poland. IV. 825. *b.* Two reformations in that city. V. 233. *b.*

Pindarus Thebanus is the author of the leſſer Iliad. I. 81. *b.*

Pine: a pine-tree adored by the Eſthonians, a people of Livonia. IV. 928. *a. b.*

Pineda, a Spaniſh Jeſuit, his ſcandalous reflexion upon Job. III. 573. *a.*

Pinedo cenſured for his explication of a proverb. I. 17. *a. b.*

Pinet (Antony du) makes two Roman gentlemen of two ſorts of marble. IV. 651. *b.* Cenſured. V. 135. *a. b.* His edition of the taxes of the Romiſh Chancery, is different from the others. I. 628. *a.* The author's conjecture on that head. *ibid. b.*

Pinianus, a promiſe is extorted from him, but he does not keep it. I. 229.

Piracy (Literary) is not in all things like to that of Privateers. II. 773. *b.*

Piræus, when built. II. 832. *b.*

Pyramid: a pyramid or pillar, raiſed to perpetuate the memory of the parricide, attempted on the perſon of Henry IV, by John Chaſtel. II. 457. *b.*

Pyramids, the principal one was built before the reign of Amaſis. IV. 869. *a.*

Pyrenean peace was concluded without the Pope's intervention. II. 474. *a.*

Pirot (Father) it is eaſier to perceive that his book intituled, *Apologie des Caſuiſtes*, contains dangerous doctrines, than to anſwer the objections contained therein. III. 894. *b.*

Pyrrho, it has been objected that his article in this Dictionary, contains Libertine principles; the author's anſwer. V. 830. *to* 836.

Pyrrhoniſm is ſometimes poorly attacked, and as poorly defended. I. 462. *a. b.* Prevails in moſt diſputes. II. 27. *b.* Pyrrhonian objections. III. 416. *a. b.* 424. *a. b.* What is ſufficient to make one give into it. IV. 188. *a. b.* 189. *a.* The advantages it draws from the New Philoſophy, and from Divinity. 653. *b.* 654. *a. b.* 655. *a. b.* Whether it be a good means to make us ſubmit to the authority of faith. 655. *b.* 656. *a.* What ſeems to have given birth to it. V. 586. *b.* Seneca relates all the degrees of it. 607. *b.* 608. *a.* See *Incomprehenſibility of all things.*

Pyrrhoniſm (Hiſtorical) obſervations that might ſtrengthen it. I. 118. *a. b.* II. 260. *a.* III. 485. *a. b.* V. 608. *a.* In what caſe it is the wiſeſt courſe. II. 829. *a. b.* An abuſe that favours it. V. 753. Battles are more ſubject to it than ſieges. III. 719. *b.* Why we are ſo often obliged to adopt it. IV. 562. *b.* 563. *a. b.* 564. *a. b.*

Pyrrhoniſts are expoſed to the raillery and inſults of banterers. I. 410. *a.* Had a theory favourable to virtue. 413. *b.* Took advantage of an invention of Chryſippus. II. 495. *a.* An example which they make uſe of. 630. *a. b.* Democritus ſupplied them with all that they ſaid againſt the teſtimony of the ſenſes. 642. People have always endeavoured to turn them into ridicule. III. 698. *b.* Favoured by thoſe who demonſtrate a vacuum. 793. *a. b.* Sometimes forgot themſelves in the exerciſe of their doctrines. IV. 657. *b.* 658. *a.* Under pretence of confuting only the arguments of the Dogmatiſts, they actually undermined the doctrine of the exiſtence of a God. 935. *b.* An explanation concerning what the author has ſaid of them. V. 830. *to* 836. Their character. 830. Divines ought not to be aſhamed of refuſing to enter the liſts with them. *ibid.* The author's anſwer to thoſe who aſk what need there was to ſet forth their difficulties. 833. *to* 836.

Pyrrhus, what he ſaid upon his viewing the Roman army. I. 511. *b.* Compared to thoſe gameſters, to whom chance gives a fair game, but who know not how to make uſe of it. II. 414. *a.* Beſieges Lacedæmon without ſucceſs. 522. His Phyſician makes an offer to the Romans of poiſoning him: the different accounts which authors give of that affair. III. 2. *a. b.* How many battles were fought between that Prince and the Romans. *ibid. b.* The chimerical foundation of his hopes. IV. 662. *a. b.*

Piſa: the Council of Piſa ſends Cardinal Cajetan's book to the Faculty of Divinity of Paris, to be confuted by them. I. 232. That Council declared to be a pretended Council by Lewis XII. III. 611. *a. b.*

Piſaurum: the Colony of Piſaurum was not ſettled till four years after that of Bologna. I. 62. *b.*

Piſcopia Cornara (Helina) ſtudied to tread in the ſteps of Minerva. III. 662. *b.*

Piſqueton. See *Picighitone.*

Pythagoras extorts a confeſſion from Abaris by a trick. I. 4. *b.* His prophetical ſpirit, and his power to work miracles. 6. *b.* What he ſays of the tranſmigrations, in which he had a ſhare. IV. 580. *b.*

Pytheas, what he was. I. 10. *b.* IV. 676. *a. b. & ſeq.*

Pytheas the Orator, his quick repartee. IV. 678. *b.*

Pythias, a woman ſervant, the anſwer ſhe made to Tigellinus. IV. 398. *b.*

Pithois had been a Friar Minime, and was profeſſor of Philoſophy at Sedan: he is the author of the *Apocalypſe de Meliton*. V. 57. *a. n.* (2).

Python is commended at Athens for a murder which he had committed, but he aſcribed all the glory of the action to a deity, pretending that he had been no more but the inſtrument. II. 558. *a.*

Pittacus, his moderation. I. 190. *b.*

Pius II (Pope) his letter to Mahomet. IV. 55. *b.* 56. *a.*

Pius IV (Pope) why he refuſed to terminate himſelf a diſpute about Precedency. IV. 574. *a.* Of what family he was. V. 118. *a.*

Pius V (Pope) had a mind to ſignalize the beginning of his reign, by the puniſhment of ſome famous Heretics. IV. 463. *n.* (*ſ*). His brief touching children baptized by the Innovators. V. 27. *a.*

Placcius has only judged of the *Rabelais Reformed*, by its title; which has led him into a miſtake. III. 133. *b.* 134. *a.* Was ignorant of ſeveral things, touching diſguiſed names. IV. 832. *b.* 833. *a.*

Place (Preſident de la) cenſured with reſpect to John du Tillet's book of the King's Majority. V. 352. *b.* 353. *a. b.*

Place (John de la) approves of Laurence Joubertus's anſwer, with reſpect to the faſting of Moſes, Elias, and Jeſus Chriſt. III. 582. *b.*

Place (Native) why that of great men who are meanly born, is uncertain. I. 570. *a.*

Places (important) their ſiege will always be a troubleſome rock for the News-Writers. III. 719. *b.* The taking of them is not ſubject, like the gaining of battles, to Hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm. *ibid.*

Placette, his judgment upon Mr Nicolle's method. IV. 536. *a. n.* (13).

Plagiary, that term taken in an improper ſenſe. II. 39. *a. b.* The faults which Plagiaries are commonly guilty of. 685. *a. b.* 686. *a. b.* The Plagiary of a book who got a penſion by it. V. 474. *a. b.*

Plagiariſm in the affair of books, when is a perſon guilty of it, and when not? II. 168. *b.* 169. *a.* Obſervations upon the various ways of it. 773. *b.* 774. *a.* The juſtification of a perſon that was accuſed of Plagiariſm, conſidered. IV. 375. *b.* 376. *a.* Plagiariſm approved of by Strigelius. V. 250. *b.* The remarkable Plagiariſm of Alcyonius. I. 202. *b.* Of Alſtedius. 234. Of Daniel Pareus. 241. *a.* Of John Andreas, of Durandus. 326. *b.* Of Leonard Aretin. 435. Of Gerard Voſſius. II. 276. A great law-ſuit about a theft of that kind. 682. *a. b.* Whether it be a ſin, and if an honeſt man may be guilty of it. IV. 294. *a. b.*

Plague, Philip de Bergamo believes that he was cured of it by the interceſſion of Nicolas Tollentin. I. 769.

Player: a Player puniſhed for having mentioned Accius on the ſtage. I. 61. *and b.* The extravagance and luxury of another Player. II. 835. *and a. b. & ſeq.* The riches he left at his death. 836. To what pitch he ſuffered himſelf to be tranſported. *ibid. b.* Players may be buried in holy ground. I. 328. *a. b.* Have furniſhed a martyr to religion. IV. 487. *b. n.* (37).

Plays: what ſort of men are moſt affected with the repreſentation of Plays. I. 19. *a. b.* The Romans were very apt to apply particular ſentiments of a Play to the preſent times. 60. *b.* Politian's verſes againſt thoſe who condemned the Plays that were acted in colleges. V. 752. *b.* 753. *a.*

Planche (Regnier de la) what ſort of a man he was. IV. 699. *b.*

Plane: a plane-tree, from which every body deſired to have plants. II. 876. *a. b.*

Planets: thoſe perſons confuted, who ſay that every planet is a god. V. 571. *b.* 572. *a. b.* 573. *a.*

Plantin reproached with a piece of negligence. III. 779. *b.*

Plants, the ſecret of raiſing an appearance of them from their aſhes. II. 467. *a. b.* 468. *a.*

Planudes, his groſs ignorance in a point of Chronology. II. 829. *b.*

Platina, his miſtake in ſpeaking of the Councils of Soiſſons and Sens. I. 29. *b.* 30. *a.* Quoted. III. 223. *b. n.* (60). IV. 51. *b. n.* (22). What he adds to the ſtory of the She-Pope. 729. 712. *a. n.* †: Some pretend that the ſaid ſtory has been added to his book. 711. *b.* 712. *a.* That pretenſion ſifted. *ibid.*

Plato, a very tender diſtich which he compoſed. I. 127. *a. b.* His doctrine confirmed by the beginning of St John's Goſpel. 255. He alledges the doctrine of Anaxagoras as a ſymblol of the chaos. 304. *a.* Why he never cited Democritus. II. 643. *b.* He ſuppoſes that matter had a ſoul even before God had framed the world. 792. *b.* V. 634. *a. b.* 635. *a.* What he ſays of the licence which the

Poets take. III. 134. *b.* 634. *a. b.* Whether he admitted two principles collateral, eternal, and independant of one another. 447. *a. b.* His contempt for the dexterity of Anniceris. IV. 10. *a. b.* Quoted. 568. *a. n.* (29). His laws concerning the two ſexes. 802. *b.* His judgment of Ariſtotle and Xenocrates. V. 568. He is in the wrong to accuſe Zeno of having been Parmenides's Minion. 605. *a.* For which he is cenſured by Athenæus. *ibid. a. b.* His ſentiments touching Palamedes. *ibid. b.* 606. *a.* He admitted two ſouls of the world. 634. *b.* 635. *a.* Demoſthenes quits his academy to attach himſelf to Calliſtratus. II. 259. His Republic tranſlated and reduced to a more diſtinct order by John Sozomenes. V. 193.

Platoniſts, the agreement between that ſect and the Ariſtotelians, I. 268. *a. b.* Aſcribed to good Genii what people now a days only aſcribe to bad ones. 390. *a.* Said that there was in matter a real defect, which was an obſtacle to God's project. II. 788. *a. b.* Their hypotheſis about the origin of evil. IV. 524. *b.* 525. *a. b.* &c.

Plautus, an unluckly alternative for him. I. 207. *a.* Quoted. V. 577. *a. n.* (54).

Pleadings: there are ſome which, without counting the Greek and Latin verſes, have almoſt as much Latin as French in them. II. 104. *b.* 105. *and a. b.* When too much learning is mixed with them, it can only ſerve to withdraw the judge's attention. 106. *b.*

Pleaſure: one may feel pleaſure without having ever felt pain. IV. 514. *a. b.* Pleaſures of the ſenſes, whether they can be ſpiritual. II. 781. *a. b.*

Plebeians, in what year of Rome they obtained to be admitted to the Conſular dignity. I. 343.

Plebeius and *Nobilis* were not inconſiſtent words in antient Rome. III. 490. *a.*

Pleiad imagined by Ronſard. II. 619. *a. b.* Who are the perſons that were comprehended in it. *ibid.*

Pleix (du) his recantation touching Antony Arnauld the Advocate. I. 484. *b.* 485. *a.* He is ill rewarded for having been ſo partial to the Jeſuits. *ibid.* What he has publiſhed concerning the wife of Henry IV. V. 530. *a. b.* Vindicated in that point againſt thoſe who cenſured him. *ibid. b. & ſeq.* Cenſured with reſpect to what John Chaſtel replied to his judges. II. 460. *b.* 461. *and a. b.*

Plenipotentiary, one at the age of ninety-five years is a much rarer thing than a man of a hundred years of age. II. 464. *b.*

Pleſſis Mornay (du) writes to Father Paul, and recommends his grand-children and their governour to him. II. 580. *b.* 581. *a.* He meets with a very cold reception at the court of England, and for what reaſon. 754. *a. b.* Quoted. III. 231. *b. n.* (30). 232. *a. n.* (32). *& alibi paſſim.* Reflexions on one of his Epiſtles Dedicatory. II. 126. *b.* 127. *a. b.* Cenſured, and ill defended by Rivet. *ibid.* Looked upon as an incendiary. *ibid.* Deputed by the King of Navarre to Henry III. IV. 341. *a.* Held intelligence with all the Proteſtant world. 727. *a.* The weak confutations of his book on the Euchariſt cauſe it to be eſteemed. V. 179. *b.* His extracts from Mutius touching the Celibacy of Prieſts. IV. 296. *a. b.* 297. *a.*

Pleſſis Pralin (du) for what enterprize he was made a Marſhal of France. IV. 919.

Pliny, quoted. I. 306. *a. n.* (138). II. 253. *n.* (*a*). 254. *b. n.* (4). V. 579. *b. n.* (73). *& paſſim alibi.* Only glanced upon the ſubjects which he treated of. I. 212. A paſſage in him corrupted. 595. *b.* 596. *a. b.* Hermolaus Barbarus corrects near five thouſand paſſages of that author. 633. *and b.* 634. *a. b.* The place of his birth. 637. *a.* What he calls Magical romancing. II. 639. *a. b.* Ought not to have believed that Democritus was the author of ſeveral works that went under his name. *ibid. b.* In what manner he ſpeaks of the Aſtronomers. III. 462. *a. b.* What he relates concerning Apelles. 836. *b.* And concerning the cauſe of Sappho's love for Phaon. V. 47. *a.* He ſeems to condemn thoſe who write annals. 133. *a.* Cenſured with reſpect to the time in which he places Zeuxis. 622. *b.* Several of his faults in a few words. 781, 782. Six books of him tranſlated into French by Peter de Changy. II. 435. *a.* The ſummary of his firſt ſixteen books by the ſame de Changy. *ibid.*

Pliny the Younger has almoſt exhauſted in his panegyric all the ideas of the perfection of a Prince. II. 819. *b.* 820. *a.* Very poſſibly he may have gone beyond the truth in ſome things which we find there. IV. 691. *a. b.* Was one of the greateſt wits, and one of the worthieſt men of his age. V. 840. His juſtification with reſpect to ſome looſe verſes which he had writ. *ibid.* Quoted. I. 121. *b. n.* (10).

Plutarch relates two ridiculous facts. I. 54. *b.* Applies facts ſometimes one way and ſometimes another. 83. *a.* The reaſon he aſſigns for the Jews abſtaining from ſwine's fleſh. 115. *a.* Makes a reflexion that is both impious and contradictory. 300. *a.* Contradicts himſelf touching the death of Caſſius. II. 349. *a.* Is no good guide in Chronology. 506. *b.* Quoted. 414. *a. n.* (14). 785. *b. n.* (148). 786. *a. n.* (150), (151). He aſcribes to a King of Libya things which only concern Dejotarus. 630. *a.* Made the ſame Hiſtory ſerve ſeveral ends. 869. *a. b.* His judgment concerning the Poets. III. 135. *a.* How he came to underſtand the Latin Hiſtorians. 195. *b.* He did not underſtand a paſſage in Livy concerning Camillus and Juno. 638. *a. b.* Wherein he contradicts Ariſtotle, while he is ſpeaking of the laws of Lacedæmon. 967. *b.* 968. *a.* Full of ſophiſms. *ibid.* His paralogiſm with reſpect to Sylla, and the reaſon for which he had divorced Cælia. IV. 201. *b.* 202. *a.* He pretends that it would be better to ſay that Jupiter wants power, than to ſay that he wants goodneſs. 519. *b.* Solidly confutes the paradox of the ſtories concerning the uſefulneſs of vice. *ibid.* 520. *a. b.* He was of opinion that beaſts do reaſon. 550. *a. b.* That paſſage examined where he ſays poſitively, that, in the opinion of Diogenes, beaſts had no ſenſe. *ibid. a.* 552. *b.* 553. *a.* He defends the vulgar opinion concerning preſages in a ſpecious manner. 565. *a. b.* His reflexion on the difficulty of finding out the truth in Hiſtory. 570. *b.* 571. *a.* He aſcribes only a bountiful providence to God. *ibid. b.* 572. *a.* But his opinion in this reſpect was not the moſt common. *ibid.* He accuſes Herodotus of Impiety. 574. *b.* 575. *a. b. &c.* Plutarch cenſured, with reſpect to certain monuments that were to be ſeen in the temple of Sancus. V. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* What idea he gives of Zeno's Logic. 605. *b.* James Pinon procures an edition of his works tranſlated by Amyot. IV. 651.

Plutarch (French) who had that name given him. V. 419. *a.* And for what reaſon. *ibid.*

Pocock, it is hard that we cannot depend upon him as a ſure guide in the eaſtern learning. I. 49. *b.* What he relates concerning the black ſtone which the Saracens honoured. 124. *b.*

Poem, one rewarded with a bag of money which the author had much ado to carry upon his ſhoulders. I. 329. *b.* Poems in which there was wanting but one ſyllable. 330. *a.* A Poem muſt be very good when it is aſcribed to an excellent Poet. II. 572. *b.* A Poem for which the author received no more than half the price that was agreed upon. V. 140. *a.*

Poems (French) the Bookſellers are very ready, to make collections of ſuch as had the good fortune to pleaſe ſeparately, but they are not ſo with reſpect to Latin Poems. IV. 652. *a. b.*

Poet (Heteroclite) to Monſeigneur only brother to his Majeſty, who ſtyled himſelf ſo. IV. 357. *a.*

Poeta Regius, who was honoured with ſuch a title. II. 618. *a.*

Poetry, contrary to the acquiſition of riches. II. 33. *a. b.* A new kind of Poetry which has been added to the antient. I. 752. *b.* Whether its only aim ſhould be to divert us. II. 377. *a. b.* The judgment that Daſſouci made of the moſt impertinent Poetry. 603. *b.* 604. *a.* It has introduced a thouſand impieties. III. 134. *a. b.* 135. *a. b.* Impieties expreſſed in Poetry are as criminal as thoſe which are expreſſed in proſe. *ibid.* The antient Pagan Poetry burnt at the inſtigation of the Prieſts. IV. 345. *b.*

Poetry (genteel) who was looked upon as the father of that kind of Poetry. I. 205. *and b.* Its profane licence. 752. *a.* Was not in Auguſtus's time an enemy to all groſs ideas. V. 768.

Poetry (Iambic) by whom invented. I. 427. *and b.*

Poetry (Italian) is greatly obliged to Cavalcante. II. 399. *a.* Lyric Poetry receives a grace from Cinus. 508. Enriched by the inventions of Rinuccini. IV. 878. *a. b.* 879. *a. b.*

Poetry (Epic) Homer did not keep up the majeſty of it. I. 79. *b.*

Poets: the antient Poets adjuſted their Chronology very ill. I. 80. *a.* They ought to quit betimes the ſervice of Apollo. I. 120. *a. b.* II. 620. *a. b.* Formerly carried their fictions very far on the ſtage. I. 158. *b.* A Poet who furniſhes a ſingular example. 329. *b.* 330. *a.* All thoſe who are lovers of Poetry are not Poets. 375. *b.* They every where find flowers to crown Princes with. 516. *b.* Whether they formerly recited their verſes in a hired houſe. 535. *a. b.* The poverty of their trade. *ibid. b.* Their are ſeveral of them who have a two-handed pen. 653. *a.* They very often exaggerate their neceſſities. II. 9. *a. b.* The affection which they have for their works. 232. *b.* The liberties which they take in them. 234. *b.* 235. *a.* Give themſelves a great juriſdiction over time. 388. *b.* Their fondneſs for their own productions. 395. *a.* They are not fit authors to prove a fact. 502. *b.* They give themſelves the liberty to touch upon great myſteries under too bold metaphors. 543. How Charles IX treated the Poets. 617. *b.* A French Poet who prepared ſonnets for books that were to come out. 620. *b. n.* (58). A court Poet does not avoid fabulous hyperboles, but when he does not want them. 715. *a.* A Poet whoſe verſes did a ſignal ſervice to ſoldiers that had been overcome. 866. *b.* 867. *a.* They ought never to ſet up for Prophets. III. 29. *b.* 30. *a.* Gambara lays a heavy yoke upon them. 128. They produce bad effects in France. IV. 322. *b.* They are eaſily put in a paſſion. 323. *a.* Are always ready to declare for the party that is uppermoſt. III. 647. *a.* Their fictions were tranſplanted into the Pagan ſyſtem of Divinity. 642. *a. b.* 652. *b.* 653. *a. b.* Whence it comes that they appear to be ſo much inflamed with love in their verſes. 876. *b.* 877. *a. b.* Poets that are natural Philoſophers have a greater liberty than others, to ſpeak of natural things. 920. *a. b.* What judgment we are to form of their miſtreſſes. IV. 82. *a. b.* 83. *a.* They have always taken the liberty of praiſing themſelves. 86. *a. b.* The greateſt part of them never ſucceed better than when they lay aſide all modeſty. 156. *b.* The oſtentation of learning has often drawn impertinent things from them. 181. *a.* Make no ſcruple of anachroniſms. 183. *b.* They ſometimes boaſt of their good fortune in love intrigues, which are only fictions of their brain. 332. *a.* Poets that hit upon making the ſame verſes. 822. *a. b.* Can write paſſionate verſes, without being in love with the perſon that is the ſubject of them. 894. *a.* It often falls out that their ſecond thoughts are not ſo good as the firſt. 896. *b.* 897. *a.* The antient Poets were not aſhamed of praiſing their own wives. V. 76. *b.* A preſervative againſt their obſcenities. 98. *b.* 99. *a. b.* It is a common thing to jeſt upon their poverty. 400. *a. b. &c.* What it is that reduced ſeveral of them to poverty. 402. *b.* 403. *a.* Whether ſuch whoſe verſes are not chaſte, ought to be looked upon as leud perſons. 420. *a. b. &c.* There are no authors more ſubject to forget that they promiſed to print no more. II. 83. *a.* La Fontaine's verſes on that ſubject. *ibid. a. b.* Two chapters of Menage on the ſame ſubject. *ibid. b.* Good Poets reſerve the moſt exquiſite ſtrokes for the fifth act of their tragedies. III. 720. *b.* The vicious liberty which they take to write obſcene verſes. V. 840. *and n.* (16).

Poets (Chriſtian): there are ſome, who, though they are baniſhed for their religion, do not not ceaſe their leud courſes. IV. 448.

Poets (Greek and Latin) the reading of them neceſſary towards forming the refined taſte of a complete Poet. II. 399. *a. b.*

Poets (Latin) there were ſome famous ones in Germany before Conrad Celtes. III. 724. *b.* 725. *a.*

Poets (Italian) there once reigned a great licentiouſneſs among them. IV. 235. *a. b.* 236. *a.*

Poggius (John) writes a book upon the falſe predictions of Savonarola. V. 61. *a. b.*

Poggius (Florentinus) one of his facetious ſtories. I. 324. *b.* 325. *a.* Laſhes on all ſides in his dialogue againſt hypocrites. II. 275. *a. b.* Gives an account of John Huſs's puniſhment. 277. *b.*

Poyet (Chancellor) the cauſe of his diſgrace. II. 841. *a.* Accuſed of having baſely offered incenſe to Fortune. 761. A ſevere ſatire againſt him. *ibid.*

Point: ſome have pretended to ſhew that it is not poſſible to find the fixed point, which determines preciſely the nature of every thing. II. 493. *a.*

Pointing: the falſe pointing of a paſſage has given occaſion to its being ſaid that Ariſtotle was a Jew. I. 466. *b.* A perſon cannot be too exact in it. II. 703. *a. b.*

Points; whether the points of the Tetragramma are proper to that name. I. 244. *b.* 245. *a. b.*

Poiret, what he has writ on the diſpute about the eternity of the world. V. 596. *a. b.* Quoted. IV. 910. *a. b. n.* (82), (83), (84), (85), (86).

Poiſſy, See *Conference of Poiſſy*.

Poitiers beſieged by the Proteſtants. II. 300. *a.*

Poitiers (Diana of) the chief of a faction oppoſite to that of the Ducheſs of Etampes. III. 401. *a.* See *Diana of Poitiers*.

Poitiers (Apology of the Biſhop of) who is the author of that piece, and how it was called. V. 13. *a. b.*

Pol (St) killed by the Duke of Guiſe. III. 299. *and a. b.*

Poland erected into a kingdom. II. 58. *and b.* Intrigues formed to place the crown of Poland on the head of the Duke of Longueville. I. 171. *a. b.* Thoſe who began the work of the reformation there, made a ſtrange falſe ſtep in oppoſing the marriage of Sigiſmond Auguſtus. III. 847. *a. b.*

Poland (the Queen of) takes upon her to elect a ſucceſſor in the King's life-time. III. 852. *a.* She gives two thouſand crowns towards the charge of publiſhing a book of Aſtrology. IV. 265. *a. b.*

Polemo, his converſion. V. 570. *a. b.*

Polyander, Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, was the moſt moderate adverſary that the Arminians had. I. 654. *a. b.*

Polyanthea, the Hiſtory of that work. III. 725. *a. b.*

Polybius, what he relates of Pruſias. IV. 556. *a. b.* The judgment which Caſaubon paſſes on Perot's tranſlation of that author. 585. *b.* 586. *a.* What he ſays of the duty of an Hiſtorian. V. 359. *b.* Peraxylus publiſhes an edition of him. IV. 545. *b.*

Policy makes uſe of the moſt ridiculous pretences. I. 54. *a. b.* Frequently occaſions the breach of promiſe. 419. *b.* It is oftentimes the trueſt policy to pay one's court to perſons in diſgrace. 422. *a.* Every thing is ſacrificed to it. II. 103. *a. b.* The policy of Princes, has ſomething that is capracious, when it conſiſts in debauching each other's ſubjects. 360. *b.* It requires ſometimes that perſons ſhould declare themſelves betimes enemies to the ſtrongeſt party. III. 569. *a.*

Polycrates cauſes Smerdias to be ſhaved. I. 292. *a.*

Polygamy: there is a ſpiritual Polygamy which churchmen fall into. I. 56. *a.* Polygamy allowed by a Pope. III. 166. *a.* Made a capital crime by Henry II. 404. *b.* 405. *a. b.* The nations which practice it, have a frightful idea of the Chriſtian doctrine in this point. IV. 57. *a. b.*

Polygamia Triumphatrix, how the author of that book explained theſe words, *increaſe and multiply.* III. 709. *a. b.* It was condemned, and the author baniſhed from Denmark. 973.

Polygamites never formed a ſect. IV. 392. *b.* 393. *a.*

Polynices, by his fall Amphiaraus obtains the victory. I. 446. *a.*

Politian, his retrograde Latin verſe. II. 248. *a.* A thing which John Laſcaris reproaches him with. IV. 705. *b.* How his vanity was checked. V. 165. *a.* Quoted. 265. *b.* 266. *a. n.* (29).

Politeneſs very much neglected. V. 540. *a.*

Politicians have a language peculiar to themſelves. V. 753. *a.*

Politics: a diſorder unavoidable in Politics. II. 224. *b.* Why the fineſt ſyſtems of Politics fail in practice. III. 469. *a.* How defined by ſome body. V. 751. *b.* &c.

Politics of the Clergy of France, a character of that book. I. 490. *a. b.*

Polyxena took care to ſpread her gown about her feet, that ſhe might fall decently. II. 56. *a.*

Pollio (Aſinius) his judgment of Cæſar's Commentaries. II. 417. *b.* By pleading well he acquired the facility of pleading, and by pleading often, he rendered himſelf the leſs capable of pleading well. IV. 408. *a. b.*

Polonus (Martin) enlarges upon the ſtory of Pope-Joan. IV. 728, 729. Takes his materials from the *Otia Imperialia* of Gervaſe of Tilburi. 738. *b.* 739. *a. b.* Remarks upon the editions and enlargements of his Chronicle. 708. *a. b.* The manuſcripts of his Chronicle very different: ſome of them contain the ſtory of the She-Pope, others not, the teſtimony of celebrated authors on that head. *ibid. b. to* 712. *a. b.*

Pompey, it was thought that he would not have made a good uſe of the victory, in caſe he had obtained it. II. 167. *b.* From a deſire to ſpare blood-ſhed, he loſt an opportunity of putting an end to the war. 416. *a.* It has been obſerved that he did not begin to be unfortunate, till ſuch time as he defended the beſt cauſe. 565. *a.* What Flora ſaid of him. III. 56. The women were fond of him. 57. Marc Antony orders his goods to be ſold by inch of candle. 119. *a.* He knew nothing of his wife's intrigues, tho' they were publickly talked of. 382. *a.* What he did in order to aggrandize himſelf. IV. 281. *a.* He was not very happy in his marriages. *ibid. b.* Flies to Egypt for refuge. 282. *a. b.* His ability, as a General, was eclipſed in the battle of Pharſalia. V. 372. *a. b.* Cæſar ſaid that he had acquired the ſirname of Great, for having vanquiſhed ſome people, that knew nothing of war. 180. *a. b.*

Pompeia placed Cæſar in the ſame category, wherein he had put ſo many other huſbands. II. 424. *b.*

Pomponacius treats Auguſtin Niphus, with a great deal of reſpect and good manners. IV. 380. *b.*

Pompone, Anne of Auſtria liked the fruit which came from that place. I. 487. *b.*

Pomponius Lætus, impeached at Rome, for changing the names of young men. IV. 685. *a.*

Ponceau (James) cauſes the works of James des Parts to be printed. IV. 484. *a.*

Ponect, what he preached at Paris againſt a new fraternity. III. 410. *a.*

Poneropolis, a city which a King of Macedonia cauſed to be built. II. 248. *a.*

Pons (the Biſhop of St) eſteemed by the Proteſtants, and for what reaſon. IV. 243. *a.*

Pons (Antony de) Count de Marennes, the change that appeared in him, after the death of his firſt wife. IV. 480. *a. b.* His family deemed as antient as that of Aeſt. *ibid. b.*

Pontanus (Jovian) the ſtory that he tells of a Spaniſh Monk. II. 386. *b.* 387. *a. b.* What he ſays of Fortune. V. 371. *b.* 372. *a.* Verſes which he made upon a lady that ſhewed her breaſt. 421. *b.* 422. *a.*

Ponthieu, who is the author of the Genealogical Hiſtory of its Counts. I. 11.

Pontifical, Graſſis is ſorry at its being made public. III. 217. *a.*

Pontifs, who enjoyed a very great power among the Heathens. II. 531. *a. b.*

Pontius (Conſtantius) his conviction gave ground for ſome ſuſpicions relating to Charles V. II. 336. *b.* Whether he was that Emperor's confeſſor. *ibid.* His death. *ibid.* Facts that concern him. 440. *b.* 441. *a.*

Pontius (Herennius) what he declared in relation to the conduct of his ſon. I. 732. *a.*

Poor; Michael Savonarola took no fee for preſcribing to them. V. 57.

Pope Joan, the book which Blondel publiſhed concerning her, gave offence. II. 24. *a. b.* Matters of fact concerning that book. *ibid.* 25. *a. b.* Mr Spanheim writ a book, to re-eſtabliſh Pope Joan. 25. *a.* Verſes in old French about her. III. 77. *a. b.* 78. *a. b.* John des Caurres, a Roman Catholic author, tells the ſtory of Pope Joan, without the leaſt doubt of the truth of it. II. 400. A little part of the controverſy concerning that woman. 530. *b.* The Proteſtants now-a-days write books to maintain the ſtory of Pope Joan. IV. 732. This Controverſy has been thought an affair of the utmoſt conſequence, but when all is done, it is a trifle. 733. Conjectures about the origin of the ſaid ſtory. 738, 739. It was forged by Prieſts and Monks in the breaſt of Popery. 728. *b.* 736. *a. b.* 737. *a.* 709. *a. b.* And adopted by a vaſt many others. 709. *a. b.* &c. The ſtory of Pope Joan, according to the moſt circumſtantial account that is given of it. 730. *a. b.* 731. *a. b.* Proteſtant authors who maintained the truth of it, after Florimond de Remond's book, and that of Father Labbe, came out. 732. *a. b.* 733. *a.* Proteſtant authors who have not believed it. 733. *a. b.* Whether the ſaid adventure, reflects ignominy on the Church of Rome. 736. *a. b.* The moſt antient author that has mentioned it, is poſterior by two hundred years, and inconſiſtent with the cotemporary authors. 738. *a. b.* It was a proper ſtory for all ſorts of authors. *ibid. b.* The Proteſtants are accuſed of obſtinacy, with reſpect to it. 739. *b.* 740. *a. b.* It is to be found in the Chronicle of Martin Polonus; although ſome learned men do not believe that part of the Chronicle to be his. 708. *and b.* 709. *a. b. & ſeq.* Peter du Moulin did not believe the ſtory of Pope Joan. 280. *and a. b.* Its partizans reckon Radulphus Flaviacenſis among their evidences. 824. *a. b.*

Popeliniere (la) draws a bad parallel. II. 764. *a. b.* Had like to have been cruſhed to pieces, for ſome things which he had related. IV. 862. *b.* Quoted. V. 496. *a. b. n.* (38). Promiſes to publiſh the memoirs of Villegaignon's life, and does not do it. 478. *b.*

Popery has repaired one of its breaches in France. II. 125. *a. b.* The conduct of the Romiſh Clergy, contributed much to its deſtruction. V. 482. *a.* A digreſſion againſt thoſe who have ſo often foretold its fall in vain. II. 122. *a. b.* 123. *a. b.* 124. *a. b.* 125. *a. b.* 126. *a. b.* 127. *a. b.* No body imagined that it would fall by its own crazineſs. 123. *a. b.* It has not been weakened in the laſt ten years of the XVIIth century. 125. *b.* The intrigues and plots of the Jeſuit William Criton, to re-eſtabliſh it in Great Britain. 576. Joſeph Hall was very zealous againſt it. III. 342. *a. b.* Two authors both alike fooliſh, wrote the one upon the deſtruction of Popery, and the other upon the deſtruction of the Proteſtants. V. 237. *a. b.* 238. *a. b.*

Popes; how perſons may be ſaved, that obey two different Popes. I. 179. *a. b.* Privileges which their flatterers aſcribe to them. 231. *a. b.* An inſtance of great ſubmiſſion to their cenſurers. 606. *a. b.* It is an article of the Roman faith, that the Pope may depoſe ſovereigns. 656. *a. b.* The medium which Bellarmin choſe, with reſpect to the Pope's power over the temporalities of Kings, pleaſed no party. 731. *b.* 732. *a.* Whether it be neceſſary that a Pope ſhould be ſcrupulous and devout. 732. *b.* 733. *a.* The interval of time between the death of one Pope, and the election of another, produces a thouſand diſorders. II. 238. *b.* 239. *a.* They concur with the Princes, in extending the Latin tongue. 517. *a.* Ought not to oppoſe the Emperors with temporal arms. 588. *a.* Nor uſurp a power over the temporalities of Kings. 594. *a. b.* 595. *a. b.* As ſovereign Princes, they follow the principles of the religion of a ſovereign. 758. *b.* The authority which they have acquired in Rome, is much more ſurpriſing than that of its antient Emperors. III. 228. *a. b.* Who it was that freed them from a ſervile dependance on the Emperors. *ibid. b.* Whether the eſtabliſhment of their exceſſive power, muſt have been a difficult undertaking. *ibid.* 234. *a. b.* 235. *a. b.* 236. *a. b.* To be a good Pope, it is not enough to have all the virtues of a good Clergyman. 326. *b.* The corruption of morals that appeared in the perſons of ſome Popes. 328, 329. What glory they may promiſe themſelves, if they ſet up to reform abuſes. 330. *b.* Who was the firſt Pope that gloried in having baſtards. 565. *a.* They can do nothing againſt

againſt the Canons of Councils. 741. *a.* The cuſtom of kiſſing their hand, changed into that of kiſſing their feet. 760. *a.* The acknowledgment which a Pope made. IV. 633. *b.* 634. *a.* When a perſon may lawfully exhort the Princes who are not Catholics, to make war upon the Pope. II. 127. *b.* Their authority reſtored to its firſt ſplendor. 125. *a. b.* Verſes upon the ſearch, which they were formerly obliged to undergo, before their election. IV. 730. *b.*

Popes and Cardinals accuſed of making a jeſt of the Chriſtian religion. II. 274. *b.* 275. *a. b.* Prieſts of the Pope's palace, make a jeſt of it likewiſe. *ibid.*

Poppæa, Nero kills her by a kick on the belly. II. 256. *a.*

Populace: to what lengths the populace, when in a mutiny, are capable of carrying their fury. III. 39. *b.* 40. *a.*

Porcien (the Prince of) what he deſired of his wife, not long before he died. III. 296. *a.*

Porphyry, his prepoſſeſſion. I. 268. *a.* Upon what it was grounded. 269. *a.* He ſpeaks only of Ammonius's Philoſophical doctrine. *ibid. a. b.* Whether he believed that beaſts were no more than *Automata.* IV. 553. *a.* Having reſolved to kill himſelf, his maſter diſſuaded him from it. 690. *a.* He believed that beaſts had the faculty of reaſoning and ſpeaking. 911. *b.* What he ſays of Theopompus. V. 332. *a. b.* He accuſes the Chriſtians of forging ſeveral books. 638. *b.*

Portail (Mr) Advocate-General in the Parliament of Paris, marries Mr Roſe's daughter. IV. 917. *b.*

Portico: there went a proverb, that without Chryſippus, there would be no Portico. II. 492. *a.*

Port-Royal, Hiſtorical facts relating to that monaſtery. I. 485. *b.* 486. *a. b.* Whether the children of quality, of twelve or thirteen years of age, were ſuffered there to read the Socinian books. 492. *b.* What arguments the gentlemen of Port-Royal made uſe of to perſuade Mr de Turenne, to change his religion. II. 518. *a. b.* 519. *a.* They had once ſchools, but thoſe have been ſuppreſſed. IV. 364. *a. b.* Accuſed of having intelligence with Geneva, by Father Meynier the Jeſuit. V. 16. *b.* Reflexions on the Controverſy between the gentlemen of Port-Royal and Mounſier Claude, about the Devil's conference with Luther. 73. *a. b.*

Portugal (Sebaſtian, King of) upon the perſuaſion of the Jeſuits hazards a battle with the Moors, who were three times ſtronger than he. III. 871. *b.*

Portugal (the Infanta, daughter to Dom Pedro, King of) dies a maid in the year 1690. IV. 762. Her marriage with the Duke of Savoy, had been concluded upon, reaſonings which that occaſioned, and a confutation on that head pointed out. *ibid.*

Portus (Francis) his anſwer to Peter Charpentier, contains many particulars that are greatly to the ſhame of the latter. II. 447. *b.*

Poſidonius, we muſt not rely on his teſtimony, as to what concerns the invention of the Atomical ſyſtem. III. 788. *a. b.* What honours he had paid to him by Pompey. IV. 67. *a.*

Poſſeſſed perſons, who neither underſtand Greek nor Latin. II. 148. *b.* 149. *a.* An obſervation upon the knowledge of tongues, that is aſcribed to them. III. 211. *a. b.*

Poſſevin, an anachroniſm which that author is guilty of. I. 651. *a.* He gets a book, which he had never read, to be condemned by the inquiſition. IV. 13. *b.* 14. *a.* Sets up for a Converter in the vallies of Piedmont. III. 944. *a. b.* Sometimes judged of books which he had never read. V. 68. *b.* Cenſured. I. 769. *a.*

Poſſible: whether a thing that never was, nor ever ſhall be, is poſſible. I. 759. *a.* 760. *b.* 761. *a.* II. 495. *b.* 496. *a. b.*

Poſtel, a learned man, and a fool. III. 883.

Poſthumous: a model propoſed to thoſe who publiſh poſthumous books. IV. 594.

Poſts, who ſettled them in France. III. 801.

Poverty obliges ſeveral perſons to cultivate learning. V. 589. *a. b.*

Pours (Jeremiah de) a Walloon miniſter, quoted. I. 1. *a. n.* (3). III. 330. *a. n.* (92). IV. 158. *a. b. n.* (82), (83), (84). 159. *a. b. n.* (85), (86), (87), (89), (91), (92), (93). 160. *a. n.* (94), (95).

Power: the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical power, ſtand in need of each other. I. 244. *a.* V. 514. *b.*

Power (Regal) Althuſius quoted as one that had ſpoken diſreſpectfully of it. I. 237. *b.*

Powerful: the benefit of mankind requires that no Prince ſhould become too powerful. V. 670.

Powers (Eccleſiaſtical) deſigned by the Watchmen of the city, in the Song of Solomon, an explanation occaſioned by the author's impriſonment. III. 772. *a. b.*

Poxed: who is the Patron of ſuch as are poxed in the Church of Rome. III. 573. *a.*

Pragmatic Sanction, the abuſes under it, were not fewer than they have been ſince the Concordate. IV. 766. *a. b.*

Pray: it was the cuſtom of the Eaſtern people, to turn their faces towards one particular point of the heavens when they prayed. IV. 176. *a.*

Prayers are oppoſed by counter-prayers. I. 161. *a.* The doctrine of the Peripatetics, concerning prayers and ſacrifices. 468. *a.* The prayers of the ſlothful are unacceptable to God. II. 691. *a.* There are difficulties to be examined touching their efficacy. V. 181. *a. b.* A perſon ſhould begin with them, when he is deliberating upon ſuch a dangerous point as that of matrimony. I. 603. *b.*

Praiſe: the deſire of praiſing people, occaſions many faults. III. 489. *a.*

Praiſe is ſeldom the only end of thoſe, who are not ſatiſfied with the teſtimony of their own conſciences I. 279. *a.* Extravagant praiſes do more hurt than honour to a perſon. 601. *a. b.* It is not an eaſy matter to renounce praiſe. II. 298. *a. b.* 299. *a.* A perſon cannot be ſaid to be worthy of praiſe, when he only abſtains from doing a perfidious action. 437. *b.* We ſhould delay beſtowing praiſes on people till they are dead. IV. 431. *b.* The praiſes that are beſtowed on people, are not always in a juſt proportion to their merit. II. 515. *b.*

Praſſicius (Luke) behaves handſomly to Auguſtin Niphus. IV. 380. *b.*

Prateolus cenſured in point of Chronology. I. 90. *a. b.* Aſcribes an extravagant doctrine to the Anabaptiſts. 290. *a. b.* He put in his alphabet a great many ſects that never exiſted. 790. *a.* Trumps up an imaginary ſect of Melchiorites. IV. 193.

Pratum Spirituale, its viſions. IV. 415. *b.* 416. *a.*

Preach: a ſingular manner of preaching. II. 287. *b.* Formerly it required a prodigious deal of learning to preach very ill, and now a man needs but little to preach well. 105. *b.*

Preacher: the ignorance of a Preacher. I. 101. *a.* Another is mortified at being told that he ~~hired~~ tired the patience of his hearers. II. 287. *b.* Another produces ſurprizing effects. 299. *a. b.* 374. *b.* 375. *a.* One that was prodigiouſly followed. 544. *a.* A Preacher, who upon an extraordinary occaſion, preached ſeven times in one day. 695. *b.* One who coughed exactly at ſuch and ſuch a period. III. 18. *a.* One who compoſed in Latin, the ſermons he was to preach in French. 839. *a. b.* A turbulent and factious Preacher, does not deſerve the name of Orator, and why. IV. 581. *b.* One that drinks in the pulpit. 725. *a.* Another whoſe way of preaching was ſomewhat comical. 722. *b.* Preachers have a great advantage over Lawyers. I. 61. *b.* Are to be feared. 89. *b.* They are very ill uſed. 654. *a.* Nothing more fatal to a State, than hot-headed Preachers. II. 95. *and a. b.* 96. *a.* Preachers like much to ſee the churches full of hearers. 112. *b.* They get nothing by being obſtinate againſt the torrent of the faſhions. 544. *b.* 545. *a. b.* Whether one ought to take every thing they ſay in a literal ſenſe. III. 895. *b.* 896. *a.* There are ſome of them who may be compared to the nightingale. IV. 290. *b.* Whether thoſe that are famous ſhould print their ſermons. 315. *b.* Tycho Brahe wiſhed that a good many of them were Mathematicians. 680. *a.* Preachers who can enter into the intereſt of the people, are to be feared. 722. *a.* The moſt famous Preachers, generally ſpeaking, are not very profound Divines. 757. *b.* 758. *a. b.* There are ſome of them, who rather chuſe to be baniſhed, or not to preach at all, than to cut ſhort their ſermons. 759. *b.*

Preachers (ſeditious) France was full of them in the year 1594, and in the year 1595. II. 95. *and a. b.* 96. *a.* 101. *b.* 102. *a.* A paſſage of Cardinal d'Oſſat, d'Oſſat, and of his Commentator, on that head. III. 279. *b.* Supported by the people, they are capable of bringing about any revolution whatſoever. *ibid.* The adventure of one who had foretold the end of the world. V. 236. *and a. b.* 237. *and a. b.*

Pre-Adamites, ſome of their difficulties. II. 246. *a. b.* 247. *a. b.*

Pre-Adamites, who is the author of that book. IV. 529. *a.* And what happened to him and it. *ibid. a. b. &c.*

Predeſtination; there is no Hypotheſis, touching the doctrine of Predeſtination, which removes all difficulties. I. 481. *a. b.* 482. *a.* The doctrine of St Auguſtin, of Janſenius, of Calvin, and of the Thomiſts, is entirely the ſame on that ſubject. 564. *a. b.* Bellarmin did not follow the doctrine of the Jeſuits on that ſubject. 728. *a. b.* Bolſec inveighs againſt it. II. 59. *a. b.* The diſputes about the conſequences of Predeſtination, had a being among the antient Philoſophers. 332. *b.* 333. *a.* Had the diſputes which it occaſions at this day, prevailed in the time of the Manichees, they would have given great advantages to them. IV. 517. *a. b.* 518. *a. b.* 519. *a.* Abſolute Predeſtination is not a fit ſubject to begin with, in preaching the Goſpel to Infidels. 846. *b.* 847. *a.* One may err in that point, through a good motive. V. 153. *a. b.* 154. *a.* It is a ſcandal, that the diſputes about Predeſtination, ſhould produce ſuch an invenomed hatred. 154. *a.* St Paul has no other way to get rid of the difficulties that attend it, but by having recourſe to the abſolute power, which God has over his creatures. 821. It is one of the myſteries that bear hardeſt upon reaſon. 822. The diſputes on that ſubject have only proceeded from this, that people have handled them, as if they could be reconciled with reaſon. *ibid. and* 823. Paſſages of Morus and Mr Pectet, touching the incomprehenſibility of it. *ibid. and* 824. See *Grace.*

Predictions: what Poetical predictions reſemble. I. 794. *a.* Aſtrological predictions, tho' in themſelves they be no more than chimera's, do nevertheleſs produce real evils. II. 380. *a. b.* Philoſophy is nonpluſſed by what is ſaid of them. 392. *a. b.* Thoſe who cry them up have too much neglected to guard againſt an incredulous reaſoner. *ibid. b.* 393. *a.* A Dilemma againſt the authors of predictions. III. 232. *a. b.* The moſt chimerical have had ſome parts of them confirmed by the event. 481. *b.* What is the univerſal ſpirit of the makers of predictions. IV. 116. *a. b.* The anſwer that one of them made to an objection, ſtarted by the Queen of Poland. *ibid. b.* The weakneſs of the argument that is made uſe of to prove the certainty of them. 182. *b.* Reflexions on what is ſaid of them. 369. *b.* 370. *a.* It would be of great uſe to keep a regiſter of ſome predictions. 431. *b.* We ought not to be ſurprized, if ſeveral of thoſe which have been made by falſe Prophets, come to paſs. 899. *a.* Whether Savonarola's predictions were grounded upon his knowledge in Scripture and human reaſoning, or on Divine revelation. V. 64. *b.* 65. *a. b.*

Prefaces and Epiſtles Dedicatory, ought never to be left out in the editions of books, *cum Notis Variorum.* I. 225. *b.* Should be dated with exactneſs. V. 256. *a.* There are falſhoods in prefaces, which ought not to paſs for venial ſins. I. 496. *b.* 497. *a.* It is a greater fault than is commonly believed, not to read them. II. 142. *b.* There is nothing more neceſſary to be conſulted by the author of ſuch a work as this. 8. *b.* Prefaces that are moſt admired. 261. *b.* They ought not to be left out in the new editions of books. I. 225. *b.* IV. 164. *a. b.* A piece of raillery upon thoſe who affirm in their prefaces, that they have been forced to publiſh their works. 173. *b.* 174. *a. b.* Peliſſon's preface to the works of Saraſin, is a maſter-piece. 538. Excellent prefaces. *ibid. n.* (*c*).

Prejudices: things are praiſed or blamed, according to the different prejudices of men. I. 294. *b.* How difficult it is for a man to get the better of them in his ſearch after truth. IV. 537. *a.* Their bad conſequences. V. 153. *a. b.* 154. *a.* The ſtrange effects of prejudice. IV. 46. *a.*

Prejudices in religion, their bad effects. I. 784. *a. b.*

Prejudices: who is the author of the book intituled, *Lawful Prejudices againſt the Calviniſts.* I. 493. *b.*

Prelates: the advice that was given to a Prelate one day by his miſtreſs. I. 743. *b.* At what time they began to frequent the Court, and the ill effects it produced. III. 93. *b.* Their reſidence in their Dioceſes, has no manner of influence towards the reformation of manners and abuſes. 591. *b.* They are often made a ſacrifice to the Pope, in the quarrels that Princes have with him. 611. *b.*

Premonſtratenſes, the founder of that order, converts a great many Heretics. V. 292.

Preſages, the vanity of them. II. 445. *a. b.* Reaſons againſt the doctrine of Preſages. 629. *a. b.* 630. *a.* Reflexions on what people commonly think of them. IV. 565. *a. b.*

Preſcience: God's Preſcience is no-ways inconſiſtent with the liberty of the creature. I. 661. *b.*

Preſcription is ſometimes an invincible proof that a fact is falſe. II. 61. *a.*

Preſence (Real): John Poinet admits a Real Preſence, but he will have it to be no more than ſacramental at the ſame time. IV. 693. *b.*

Preſents ought to be made by the perſons who love, and not by thoſe who are loved. II. 508. *a.*

Preſs: famous men that have been correctors of the preſs. II. 293. *and a. b.* III. 731. *b.* 732. *a.* IV. 295. *a.* 843, 844. The abuſes of the preſs. V. 764.

Preſter John, why the Emperors of the Abyſſines have been called by that name. I. 36.

Pretorſhip, when that office was inſtituted in Rome. II. 290. *a.* Whether a Conſul ever deſcended to that employment. 346. *a. b.* In what caſe this happened ſometimes. *ibid.*

Preuil (St) whether he was put to death for no other reaſon, but becauſe he had diſpleaſed Cardinal Richelieu. III. 818. *a. b.* 819. *a.*

Priam, wherein his happineſs conſiſted, according to Tiberius. II. 719. *a.* Where, how, and by whom he was killed. IV. 659. *a. b.*

Pride, it may have ſome ſhare in our moſt commendable actions. I. 460. *a. b.* It is the ordinary paſſion of thoſe who are not addicted to pleaſures. III. 223. *a.* Called *the Sacred Diſeaſe.* 789. *a.* It is the failing of moſt great wits. *ibid.*

Prideaux, Quoted. IV. 47. *b. n.* (267), (269), (270). 48. *a. b. n.* (271), (273), (274), (275). 176. *a. b. n.* (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7). 177. *a. b. n.* (8), (9), (10). 178. *a. b. n.* (11), (13).

Prierias (Sylveſter) confounded with Ferrarienſis. III. 32.

Prierio, a village in Italy, where ſituated. IV. 772. *n.* (*a*).

Prieſt: a reflexion on the Jewiſh High-Prieſt not being allowed to marry unleſs with a virgin. I. 533. *a. b.*

Prieſthood: what excluded people from the prieſthood, even at the time when married perſons were not excluded from it. I. 533. *a. b.*

Prieſts are the moſt terrible of all accuſers. I. 468. *a.* According to Montagne, there is nothing more ridiculous than their ſquare caps. II. 93. *b.* A Prieſt turns informer againſt an Abbeſs whom he was in love with. 277. *a.* There are a great many of them who go about, and offer themſelves from door to door, to ſay Maſſes at a low rate. 373. *a. b.* What they oppoſed to Farel's eloquence. III. 11. *a. b.* The Prieſts of the North are more difficultly brought to undergo the yoke of Celibacy than thoſe of the South. 229. *a.* There was a time when concubinage was not looked upon as ſhameful among them. 887. *a.* A Prieſt who beat Viret in ſuch a violent manner that he was left for dead. V. 481. *a. b.* George Braun's oration againſt the Prieſts that kept concubines. II. 121.

Prieſts (Salian) what Quintilian ſaid of them. IV. 161. *b.*

Princes, A reply that a Prince made. I. 130. *b.* A Prince cannot expreſs any ſort of a command more abſolute than that of a requeſt. 583. *b.* People pay dear ſometimes for attacking a Prince by libels. II. 216. *b.* Their goodneſs contributes more than their wickedneſs towards dethroning them. I. 273. *b.* II. 100. *a. b.* 739. *a.* They are not acquainted with every thing that is contained in books dedicated

cated to them. I. 338. People ought to be cautious how they behave to young Princes. 377. *b.* What we look upon as their unhappineſs, is only a leſs evil. II. 220. *a.* We ought not to be ſurprized at their being leſs deſerving than they ſhould be. 256. *b.* 257. *a.* Their politics have ſomething that is capricious, when it conſiſts in debauching one another's ſubjects. 360. *b.* The neceſſity to which they are reduced of doing certain things is more the cauſe of their unhappineſs than glory. 416. *b.* 417. *a.* They have no greater enemies than Flatterers, Poets, Panegyriſts, Soothſayers, and Aſtrologers. 437. *a.* They neglect thoſe whom they think themſelves ſure of, and labour chiefly to gain thoſe whom they diſtruſt. 443. *a. b.* III. 421. *a.* One word from them will have a greater influence towards reforming the faſhions, than all the ſermons in the world. II. 545. *b.* It is not ſufficient to make our court to them in order to obtain ſomething from them, if we do not likewiſe make our court to their favourites. 602. *a. b.* 603. *a.* They are ſerved with more zeal than God, and are nevertheleſs very often the ſlaves of their ſlaves. *ibid.* The moſt part of great Princes are unfortunate in their own families. 607. *b.* 608. *a.* They play upon the Public. 675. *b.* They govern the people, but intereſt governs them. 754. *b.* 755. *a.* A man ought to wiſh for good Princes, and bear with thoſe that are bad. 785. *a.* Their honour is very often ſacrificed to the intereſt of a Miniſter. III. 59. *b.* Their perſecuting edicts expoſe them to great inconveniences. 397. *a.* Their inſincerity diſapproved of by Henry the Great. 422. *a. b.* They ſeldom end their quarrels with the Pope, but to their own confuſion. 611. *a. b.* They have few enemies whom they ought to look upon as inconſiderable. 715. *b.* They have had a power to make laws concerning the obſtacles of marriage, and no body has taken it from them. 741. *b.* Whether it is proper that they ſhould be ſcrupulous. 797. *b.* 798. *a.* Their interviews do more harm than good. 809. *a. b.* Their jealouſies. 816. *b.* 817. *a. n.* (22). They cannot always govern their ſtates with their beads in their hand. IV. 13. *a.* It may be ſaid with reſpect to them that people generally forſake the ſetting ſun, and ſhew reſpect to the riſing ſun. 21. *a. b.* Their edicts often contain honourable things which are nothing but lies. 147. *b.* There are Princes, who are much more at a loſs than other men, what reſolution to take when their wives are unchaſte. 339. *a. b.* They ought never to expoſe their Majeſty unguarded. 429. May ſhare the cares of the government with a Miniſter. 494. *b.* 495. *a.* It is ſcarce poſſible to be ſincere when we ſpeak of thoſe that are living, or of thoſe whoſe ſons do ſtill reign. *ibid.* Good Princes take pleaſure in diſtributing their favours themſelves, and intruſt their Miniſters with the care of puniſhing people. 573. *b.* They make war upon one another, and are reconciled when they pleaſe. 698. *a.* See *Kings.* It is dangerous to adviſe them. 795. *a.* They ſhould never offend any body with railleries. V. 278. *a. b.* 279. *a. b.* A book where there are ſome good things concerning the qualities which they ought to have. II. 403. Different authors who have writ for their inſtruction, and the different methods which they have taken. IV. 918. *a. b.* People rather chuſe to commit a ſin than to diſpleaſe thoſe who have it in their power to make or ruin their fortune. V. 811. We cannot form a certain judgment of them from the writings that are publiſhed againſt them in the heat of factions. III. 516. *a. b.* The attachment of their enemies to a new religion, is to them a ſtrong argument of the falſhood of it. V. 652. There are a great many occaſions, when they have the diſadvantage, without deſerving to be blamed for it. 655.

Princeſſes are obliged to make the firſt advances in love to their inferiors. II. 312. *a. b.* Cannot conceal their age. IV. 333. *a.* Could never ſucceed in any intrigue of gallantry, if they had not their confidents. 335. *a.*

Principalities (Elective) generally thoſe who are raiſed to them are men of very aſpiring minds. I. 364. *a.*

Principle: divers opinions concerning the principle of all things. II. 298. *b.* 299. *a.*

Principles; to embrace one we muſt not wait till it be free from all difficulties. I. 241. *b.* Moſt perſons alter their principles as they change their country and intereſts. 642. *b.* Men are little governed by their principles. IV. 39. *b.*

Principles (the doctrine of two) the one good, and the other bad: the origin of that doctrine IV. 517. *a. b.* 518. *a. b. to* 522. *a.* 571. *b.* 572. *a.* Empedocles was the firſt who ſuppoſed two principles. IV. 584 *b.* See *Evils.*

Printers (famous). I. 602. *a. b.* Their errors are ſometimes of great conſequence. 633. *a.* How they multiply writers. II. 541. *b.* Which may lead compilers into ſtrange miſtakes. *ibid.* The confuſion that one of their blunders occaſioned. 734. *b.* 735. *a. b.* Authors are greatly diſturbed thereat. V. 582. *b.* They are not to be charged with all the faults that are to be met with in books. III. 661. *a. b.* Authors ſhould not apply to a Printer the moment they are paſſed their childhood. IV. 164. *b.* 165. *a.*

Printing, when it was invented. I. 166. *a.* Was not uſed in Europe, till about the middle of the XVth century. 578. *b.* Illiterate perſons judged incapable of exerciſing that art. 755. *b.* 335. *b.* 336. *a.* Tori contributed greatly to the bringing the Printing types to perfection. V. 388. A book which he writ on that ſubject. *ibid.*

Prints: authors ought not to put falſe prints into their books. II. 100. *b.*

Priolo (Benjamin) what he ſays of the Princeſs of Condé. II. 137. *b.* 138. *a.* And of the lady de Guebriant. III. 265. *a. b.* 266. *a.* And of four court ladies. 265. *b.* 266. *a.*

Priorato (Galeazzo Gualdo) what he ſays with reſpect to the conſequences of the victory of Avein. III. 829. *b.*

Priſcianenſis (Franciſcus) publiſhed the firſt edition of Arnobius's works. I. 503. *a.*

Priſcillian is put to death for his hereſies. III. 758. *a. b.*

Privileges to Books, why the States of Holland grant them. V. 804. The privilege to this Dictionary was not granted, till after a long examination of the oppoſition which the Printers of Moreri made to it. *ibid.*

Probity, how Seneca the Father defines it. I. 185.

Proceſs: A ſingular proceſs raiſed about a penſion left to a cat. IV. 918. *b.*

Proceſſion: A proceſſion made by Francis I, to expiate the wicked attempt of the Heretics. II. 191. *a.*

Proclus, whether he believed that beaſts were no more than *Automata.* IV. 553. *a. b.*

Procopius, who firſt publiſhed his Hiſtory in Greek. III. 478. *a.*

Proculus, his laſciviouſneſs. III. 415. *a.*

Prodicus was the founder of the ſect of the Adamites. I. 110. *a. b.* 111. *b.*

Prodigies multiplied through the facility of the Pagans. I. *a. b.* Frequently make more noiſe in remote countries than in thoſe where it is pretended that they happened. III. 487. *b.*

Προηροσίαι, ſacrifices which the Athenians offered in behalf of all the Greeks. I. 5. *a.* And for what. *ibid.*

Profanation: an horrible profanation of ſeveral holy things under Hadrian. I. 648. *b.* 649. *a.*

Profeſſions: an important advice to thoſe who exerciſe any particular profeſſion. I. 337. *a.* A man ought to keep himſelf within the bounds of his profeſſion. V. 367. *b.* The Germans learn but one. I. 64. *b.* The French apply themſelves readily to ſeveral. *ibid.*

Profeſſors, the meanneſſes of ſome, and their ſordid love for gain, which makes them run from one poſt to another. I. 56. *a. b.* 193. *b.* 195. *a. b.* II. 622. *a. b.* A profeſſor who makes an extraordinary acknowledgment. I. 488. *a. b.* The profeſſors of Philoſophy in the univerſities of France do not explain Politics. II. 6. *b.* The death of one profeſſor may reſtore peace to the ſocieties. 29. *b.* There are ſome profeſſors who reſerve the ſolution of the greateſt difficulties, for thoſe who give them moſt money. 287. *a.* The greateſt part of them have their writings under their eye, when they read a lecture. 722. *a.* What ſome of them put over the doors of their ſchools.

ſchools. 861. *a*. Some of them permit their boarders to do what they pleaſe, and for what reaſon. III. 663. *a. b*. A book which contained nothing but the reproaches which two famous profeſſors divulged one againſt another. IV. 122. *a*. Complaints againſt the multitude of profeſſors. V. 229. *b*. 230. *a*.

Prognoſtics, the credulity with which people collect and apply them. III. 811. *a*.

Prometheus, how puniſhed by Jupiter, and for what. III. 630. *a*. Faſtened to mount Caucaſus. II. 82. *b*.

Promiſes, which are often made, but very rarely kept. V. 659.

Pronunciation: a profeſſor whoſe pronunciation was exceeding agreeable. IV. 477. *a*. The country pronunciation does prejudice to a man's eloquence. V. 183. *and a. b*.

Propœtides, women that Venus inſtigated to proſtitute themſelves, becauſe they would not own her to be a goddeſs. IV. 642. *a*.

Properties of things, no reaſon can be given for them, but when theſe things have been made freely by a cauſe, that had ſome reaſons and motives in producing them. II. 644. *a*. There are many natural properties which are aſcribed to miraculous cauſes. III. 645. *b*. 646. *a*.

Propertius criticized. IV. 181. *a*.

Prophecies, thoſe who explain them will never own themſelves to have been in the wrong. I. 7. *b*. What excuſe St Bernard made for his falſe prophecies. 774. *b*. Are trumped up for political ends. II. 387. *a. b*. An example of prophetic cheats. *ibid*. A ſpecimen of the frauds which are committed by the help of prophecies. 444. *a. b*. The moſt chimerical may bring about great revolutions. 693. *b*. Prophecies have at all times been forged by thoſe who had a mind to induce people to a revolt. III. 684. *a*. Braunbom's new diſcoveries on the explication of them. II. 122. To talk of accompliſhing them is endeavouring to introduce ſlaughter and maſſacre every where. 127. *b*. Thoſe who have the ſovereign authority among the Proteſtants have no regard to the vain interpretations that are put upon them. *ibid*.

Prophets, the imperfection of their knowledge. I. 280. *a*. In the colleges of the Egyptian Prieſts, they were called prophets, who were in the nature of Deans or Superiors. 347. *a*. The illuſions and evaſions of the modern prophets. II. 692. *b*. The Princes who laugh at them moſt, do nevertheleſs make uſe of them with great ſucceſs. 693. *b*. How they come to be ſo often miſled. III. 436. *b*. A good touch-ſtone to know whether they be true prophets. IV. 36. *a. b*. Some people endeavour to vindicate the new prophets, at the expence of the old ones mentioned in the Scripture. 889. *b*. 890. *a*. Their end and deſign in balloting the numbers of the Apocalypſe. II. 123. *b*. Are as bold as ever, when they find themſelves contradicted by the event. 124. *a*. One of their artifices. V. 72. 73. Thoſe who are not ſupported by the ſecular arm, are expoſed to terrible changes of fortune. 73. *and b*.

Propoſitions that are condemned ſhould be each of them particularized. I. 340. *a. b*. A reflexion on the indeterminate way of cenſuring them. *ibid. and* 607. *a*. The method of extracting them when there is a deſign to have a book cenſured. 606. *a. b*. Whether two contradictory propoſitions are ſometimes true and ſometimes falſe. 506. *b*. 507. *a*. Whether it follows that every propoſition being either true or falſe, all things happen by the force of deſtiny. II. 790. *b*. 791. *a*.

Proſperity, whether it be a mark of the true church. IV. 31. *b*. 322. *a. b*. 33. *a. b*. 50. *b*. 51. *a. b*. 52. *a*. An inſtance of the vanity thereof. III. 815. *b*. 816. *a*. The inconſtancy of mens reaſonings with reſpect to adverſity and proſperity. IV. 51. *a*. The falſe conſequences that are drawn from proſperity and adverſity. 55. *a. b*. 216. *a. b*.

Protagoras looked upon religion as a problematical thing. II. 652. *b*.

Protection, gratitude towards a Prince that affords it, renders a man unfit to write of thoſe things in which that Prince is intereſted. III. 345. *and a. b*.

Protector, a name given to Hugh Capet's ſon-in-law, and for what reaſon. I. 9.

Protectores Domeſtici; to enter into that body, it was neceſſary for a man to be of a good family. IV. 104.

Proteſtant Religion, there are ſome perſons, who could wiſh that we had the Hiſtory of the growth and progreſs of it, written neither by a Roman Catholic, nor by a Proteſtant. IV. 862. *a. b*.

Proteſtants; when and where their ruin was projected. I. 119. *a. b*. It has been ſaid that after they had ſhaken off the Pope's yoke, they found that the yoke of the Secular Power is not eaſier. 214. They have always maintained, that there was no need of miracles to juſtify the Reformation. III. 737. *b*. An aſſembly of them is detected at Paris, in the year 1557, to the number of four hundred perſons, ſeven of whom were burnt. I. 790. *a*. They obtain almoſt every thing they pleaſe, after the flight of Charles V, before Duke Maurice. II. 440. *a*. Thoſe whom the Emperor had baniſhed out of his dominions, were always in hopes of being reſtored. 691. *b*. Their affairs cannot fail to be in a happy ſituation, and why. 758. *b*. How uſeful the emulation of Charles V, and Francis I, proved to them. III. 94. *a. b*. The Duke of Orleans, Francis the firſt's ſecond ſon, offers to allow them the free exerciſe of their religion. 96. *a. b*. Favoured by the Roman Catholic Princes. 94. *a. b*. 397. *b*. 403. *a. b*. Their deſign to form a kind of league againſt the enterprizes of the Jeſuits. 504. *a*. They do not calumniate the Catholics, when they reproach them with the miracles that are to be found in their Legends. IV. 28. *b*. Their re-union is treated of. 286. *b*. Should leave off writing controverſial books againſt one another. 680. *a. b*. 681. *a. b*. They very much miſtruſt the Jeſuits that are willing to embrace their religion. 855. *a*. Informations againſt ſome of their meetings at Paris. 882. *a. b*. There was nothing captious in the clauſe of the confeſſion, which they preſented to the King at Poiſſy. V. 28. *a*. Why a Pope prognoſticated that their religion would be of no long continuance. 172. *a*. Penſioned by the Cardinal of Lorrain. III. 874. *b*. Every one of them has received an order like that which Ehud received. II. 123. *a*. They become maſters of ſeveral cities. *ibid. b*. Weakened and oppreſſed by the Catholics, during the laſt ten years of the XVIIth century. 125. *b*. When a man may lawfully exhort them to make war upon the Pope. 127. *b*. Thoſe who have the ſovereign authority among them, do not meaſure their conduct by the predictions of their writers. *ibid*. They ſtill write books to maintain the ſtory of Pope Joan. IV. 732. Have not underſtood the intereſt of their party, in relation to that ſtory, which is of little moment to them. 739. Are not equitable in their behaviour to Blondel, whom they ſhould have imitated. *ibid*. Their diſputes with the Jeſuits were never ſo violent, as during the firſt thirty years of the XVIIth century. 727. *a*. Proteſtant authors, who maintained the ſtory of Pope Joan, after Florimond de Remond's book, and that of Father Labbe came out. 732. *a. b*. 733. *a*. Proteſtant authors who have not believed it. 733. *a*. They ſpeak very diſadvantageouſly of Pope Paul. II. 509. Did not add the ſtory of Pope Joan, to the Chronicle of Martin Polonus. 709. *a*. Eſteem Ruyſbroeck's works. 942. *b*. Their way of proceeding, with reſpect to the obſcenities related by their own writers, or by the Papiſts. V. 857. Have declared for Savonarola, but they only conſidered him on his fair ſide. IV. 67. *a. b*. 68. *a. b*. Gave him the title of Martyr. 69. *a. b*. 70. *a. b*. Accuſed of a violent and ſeditious humour. 89. *a. b*. Two authors, both equally mad, write the one upon the ruin of the Proteſtant religion, the other upon the ruin of Popery. 562. *and a. b*. 563. *and a. b*. They make uſe of Windeck's maxims, as a handle to throw the blame of the wars in Germany, upon the Court of Vienna. 263, 264. *a. b*.

Protogenes, a Painter who was never ſatisfied with his own works. III. 836. *b*. V. 135. *b*.

Provençals, their clamours againſt Mr de Launoi, upon his attempting to cure them of ſome errors. I. 362.

Provence; Peter de Quiqueran, writes a book on the praiſes of that Province. IV. 818.

Proverb, the original of the Proverb *Græcum eſt, non poteſt legi*. I. 67. *a.*

Providence, the vanity of man makes him doubt of it. I. 24. *a.* The axiom of a modern author on Providence. 94. *b.* Is ſuperior to all our deſigns however well concerted. 361. *b.* Whether a man may be virtuous, without fearing it. 541. II. 783. *b.* 784. *a.* People diſpoſe of it a little too raſhly. I. 776. *a.* And are too ready to ſearch into its counſels. IV. 55. *a. b.* 73. *a.* Whether the Providence that made the world, made alſo the diſeaſes and vices to which men are liable. II. 496. *b.* 497. *a.* The Poets ſpeak of it under too bold metaphors. 543. The proſperity of wicked men, never makes thoſe queſtion a Providence, who ſhare in that proſperity, or who at leaſt receive no damage from it. 652. *b.* The reaſons which are drawn from the common courſe of Providence to prove it, are not good for all ſorts of unbelievers. 655. *b.* It has been ſaid that the puniſhment of ſome impious perſons, was a ſentence of abſolution for Providence. 670. *b. n.* (93). We very often ſee thoſe, who fancy themſelves inſpired, diſtruſting it. 691. *a. b.* Providence does not hear the prayers of the ſlothful. *ibid.* Whether ſuch as deny it are not capable to live in ſociety. 776. *a. b.* 777. *a. b.* In what reſpects it is eaſy for Providence to pleaſe every body. III. 2. *b.* 3. *a.* Its decrees break through all obſtacles. 293. *a.* A complaint againſt it, on account of the proſperity of the wicked. 357. *a. b.* A ſect which denies it, and goes even farther than Epicurus. 550. *and a. b.* How far Providence raiſes and depreſſes men, when it pleaſes. 747. The ill qualities of men, are at ſome ſeaſons more proper than their good ones, to execute the decrees of Providence. 945. *a.* Whether it can be ſaid that Providence overthrows worldly greatneſs and proſperity, to ſhew it is a power. IV. 575. *a. b.* 576. *a.* Is called in queſtion, on account of the proſperity of wicked men. II. 670. *b. n.* (93). IV. 932. *b.* 933. *a. b.* 934. *a. b.* 935. *a. b.* Conſidered one way, it is of no great uſe to lead worldly people to virtue. V. 181. *a. b.* 182. *a.* How much the doctrine of Providence can contribute towards making us virtuous and happy men. 326. *a. b.* It ſometimes blinds men. 373. *a.*

Province: on what the glory of a Province depends at certain times. I. 482. *a.* It is a ſign that a man is of a mean extraction, when he bears the name of his Province. IV. 173. *a. b.*

Provinces, their boundaries have often been altered. I. 537.

Provinces of the Low-Countries, together with Franche Comté, formed the circle of Burgundy. II. 222. Charles V had a deſign to erect them into a kingdom, and give it the name of *Regnum Leoninum*. *ibid.* 223.

Provinces (United) who was their firſt Ambaſſador at the Court of France. I. 3. And what rank was given to their Ambaſſadors there, after that time. *ibid.* The affairs of the United Provinces went on better and better every day, from the time that a Viſionary had threatened them with the vengeance of heaven. III. 690. *b.* They are the bulwark of the empire, the ſtrongeſt ſupport of the Netherlands, and the mediators and guarantees of peace. 851. *b.* Very ill treated in a ſpeech, under the name of Herimannus Conrad. II. 550. See *States General*.

Provincial (letters to the) See *Letters* (Provincial).

Provincials (or country Squires) ridiculed by Moliere, and for what. I. 188. *a.* Are great fumblers. IV. 461. *b.*

Prudence, whether it allows us to reſiſt violent ſpirits. I. 195. *b.* Human prudence is, properly ſpeaking, the ſport of the Providence of God. V. 678.

Prudentius, a ſhort account of that Poet's life. IV. 786. *b.* 789. *a.*

Pruſſia erected into a kingdom. V. 194. *a.*

Pſalms tranſlated into French verſe, to what tunes they were ſung. I. 478. *b.* Facts concerning Marot's tranſlation of them. IV. 157. *a. b.* 158. *a. b.* 159. *a. b.* 160. *a. b.* 161. *a. b.* And concerning Beza's tranſlation. *ibid.* The church of Geneva, which was the firſt that made uſe of Marot's and Beza's verſion, was alſo the firſt that forſook it. 161. *b.* 162. *a.* Reckoned inferior or equal to Pindar. 704. *b.* 705. *a.* Sainte-Aldegonde's tranſlation had the ſame fate with that of Conrart. V. 20. *b.* An alteration of taſte, with reſpect to theſe ſpiritual ſongs. 446. *a. b.* Tranſlated into Italian verſe by Giulio Cæſare Paſchali. IV. 492.

Pſalms and proſe devotions of the Church: they were the Opera's of the XVth and XVIth centuries. II. 481. *b.*

Pſalter, the Proteſtants reproached with an alteration which they had made in their's. IV. 164. *a. b.* When the Pſalter of the Proteſtants was printed with a licence. *ibid.*

Pſammenius weeps not for the misfortune of his children, but weeps for that of his friends. IV. 570. *b. n.* (52).

Pſammitichus brings the whole kingdom of Egypt under ſubjection to himſelf. IV. 343. *a.*

Pterelaus, obſervations on his cup. V. 307. *b.* 308. *a.*

Ptolomy, the intricacy and confuſion of his ſyſtem, with reſpect to the celeſtial ſpheres. II. 379. *b.* Who firſt publiſhed his Almageſt in Greek. III. 255. *b.*

Public was impoſed upon, long before the invention of the Gazette. I. 129. The ingratitude of the Public. 212. *a. b.* For the inſtruction of the Public, it is neceſſary to diſcover both the good, and the bad, of great men. 564. The capricious humour of the Public, with reſpect to the works of the learned. 625. *b.* II. 523. *a. b.* 524. *a.* Deſerves reſpect. I. 668. *b.* Whether vices are ſometimes more beneficial to the Public than virtues. III. 293. *b.* The mercenary ſpirit of thoſe who ſerve the Public. 339. *b.* 340. *a. b.* 341. *a. b.* With what boldneſs people impoſe upon the Public. V. 643. *a.* A girl married at the public expence. I. 56.

Publican; the character of a Publican decried in the Goſpel, and profane authors. V. 465. *a.*

Puer; in good Latin authors, a perſon goes ſometimes under that denomination, at twenty years of age. IV. 171. *b.*

Puis (Madam de) leaves a penſion to her cat, and thereby occaſions a remarkable law-ſuit. IV. 918. *b.*

Pulmo Marinus, what it is. IV. 677. *b.* 678. *a.*

Pulpit, formerly a prodigious deal of uſeleſs reading was diſplayed there. II. 105. *b.*

Puniſh: a whole people puniſhed for the crime of a particular perſon. I. 158. *b.* 159. *a.* What Bion ſaid with reſpect to the common obſervation, that Divine juſtice puniſhes the faults of the Fathers in their children. II. 12. *b.* The Pagans, repreſented their gods under the idea of Beings, who puniſh one crime by inducing the offender to commit another. IV. 229. *and b.*

Puniſhment: conſideration on the eternity of puniſhment. V. 175. *b.*

Puns are at preſent quite out of doors. II. 616. *a.*

Purgatory: what a banterer ſaid of Francis I, with reſpect to Purgatory. II. 372. *b.* 373. *a.*

Puriſts have impoveriſhed the French language too much. III. 208. *a. b.* 209. *a.* Their ſtrange principles. V. 840, 841, 844, *&c.* Do not conſult the intereſt of modeſty in their affected expreſſions. 846. There have been ſome ſuch in all ages. 851. The inconſiſtency of their conduct. 856, 857.

Puritans, whence ſo called. I 256. *a. b.*

Purum Putum, the meaning of that expreſſion. I. 227. *a.*

Puteanus (Erycius) has written concerning the point of day. V. 779. Has expreſſed himſelf ill in ſpeaking of thoſe who go round the world eaſtward. 780. Confuted by Michalor, who forgets to object one thing to him. *ibid.*

Q

Q, A beneficed man is deprived of his revenues, for his manner of pronouncing that letter. IV. 837. *a. b.*

Qualities: the effect of the proportions and diſproportions, between the qualities of one and the ſame man. I. 698. *a. b.* The difference there is between manifeſt and occult qualities. II. 677. *b.*

Qualities (Corporeal) are not in the objects. IV. 654. *a. b.*

Quarters: an anſwer which has been made at different times, concerning the King's Quarters. III. 718. *a. b.*

Queen of France: a title given to Elizabeth, Queen of England; and Beza ridiculouſly charged with it as a crime. I. 800. *a. b.*

Queens, what they ought to do, in order to place their ſex upon a good foot. III. 814. *a.* Conſiderations upon their unlawful amours. IV. 308. *b.* 309. *a.* A Queen that was nurſe to her ſon. II. 382. *a. b.*

Queens Dowagers often raiſe cabals to the prejudice of their children. IV. 558. *a.*

Queens of Spain, that have been educated in France or Germany, fall into a kind of ſervitude. IV. 368. *b.*

Quercetanus has a very bad character given him by Patin. IV. 58. *a.*

Querela Infantium, there are divers copies of that book in the libraries of Paris. II. 556. *a. b.*

Quernus promoted to the dignity of Poet Laureat, and ſolemnly crowned. III. 763. *a.*

Queſtion: it is almoſt impoſſible to determine any queſtion by verbal diſputes. IV. 688. *b.*

Queſtion Roiale & ſa Deciſion: an explanation touching that book. V. 15. *b.* 16. *a. b.*

Quæſtorſhip, perſons that had been Conſuls, did not decline that office, though it was a dignity inferior to that of a Prætor. II. 346. *b.*

Quid pro quo: nothing is more frequent among authors, than *Quid pro quo*'s. I. 78. *b.*

Quick commended for his collection of the Synods of France. I. 671. *b. n.* (6).

Quietiſm, notions that come very near it. I. 155. *a. b.* Its conformity with ſpiritual Origeniſm. IV. 421. *a.* We find the ſeeds thereof in Plato. 690. *b.* Taught in the eaſt as well as in the weſt. V. 202. *b.* 203. *a.* 302. *a. b.*

Quietiſts, a ſpecimen of their viſions. II. 118. *a. b.* 678. *a. b.* They pretend that their principles are as antient as myſtical Divinity. *ibid. b.* What they ſay of the falſity of the notions, under which the Deity is commonly repreſented, approved of by ſome Philoſophers. *ibid.*

Quinaut, verſes wrote upon him. V. 400. *a. b.*

Quintilian, the judgment that he paſſes on Pacuvius and Accius. I. 61. *a.* Has preſerved a reflexion full of good ſenſe. *ibid. b.* What he ſays of a profeſſed accuſer. II. 356. *b.* And of facility in writing. III. 262. *b.* And of a writing which the author is continually mending and new-molding. 837. *a. n.* (21). He cenſures thoſe authors who can never be ſatisfied with themſelves. IV. 85. *b. n.* (49).

Quintin (John) his judgment of the annals of Aquitain, by John Bouchet. II. 103. *a. b.* 104. *a.*

Quintus Curtius had a greater effect in curing a ſick perſon, than Avicenna, and the other writers upon Phyſic. IV. 311. *a.* A tranſlation of that author into the Turkiſh language promiſed. V. 223. *b. n.* (c).

Quiſterpius blamed without reaſon by Mr Arnauld. III. 246. *a.*

Quotation: ſometimes thoſe who undertake the correction of a work, ſtrike out certain things in one place, and leave elſewhere a quotation of the very ſame things. V. 276. *b.*

Quotations, reflexion on thoſe that are falſified. III. 203. *a.* It would be a very uſeful thing to make a collection of falſe quotations. IV. 108. *b.* It is dangerous to truſt them, when they have not been compared with the original. V. 255. *b.* The ridiculous practice of thoſe who heaped quotations on quotations, and intermixed the ſacred and profane. II. 105. *b.* 106. *a.*

Quote: people ſhould ſtick religiouſly to the words of the authors whom they quote. I. 338. *a. b.* 610. *a.* V. 307. *b.* 308. *a.* It is a bad cuſtom not to quote authors. I. 453. *a.* II. 324. *b.* Balzac's artifice in this point. 398. *b.* What a perfect exactneſs requires of us in quoting a book. 634. *a.* The impertinence of thoſe who quote Plato and Ariſtotle, to prove a thought common to all ages and nations. IV. 209. *b. n.* (24). An advice to thoſe who quote authors. 231. *b.* A reflexion upon a certain way of quoting. 376. *a.* Rules to be obſerved in quoting. 770. *a. b.* A wrong way of quoting authors. V. 325. *b.*

Quoters reduced to two claſſes. II. 778. *b.* 779. *a.* Whether they have more trouble in compoſing, than authors that do not quote. *ibid.*

R.

R*ABBI:* a famous Rabbi converted by a learned woman in a regular diſputation. V. 298. *b.*

Rabbins, their idle ſtories with reſpect to Adam's lamenting the death of Abel, and abſtaining from any carnal commerce with Eve. I. 23. *a.* How ſome of them explain the ſeventh verſe of the 51ſt Pſalm. II. 612. *a.* Their explication of that verſe does not well agree with the doctrine of Original Sin. *ibid.* What they have imagined in order to explain the variations of nature. IV. 94. *a. b.* What they ſay about a ſmall bone which is in the human body, and which they call *Luz*. I. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.* IV. 376. *b.* 665. *b.* Thoughts of ſome Rabbins upon the ſouls of beaſts. 904. *b.* 905. *a. b.* 906. *a. b.*

Rabec ſuffers martyrdom. V. 197. *a. b.*

Rabelais, what Girac ſays of him. IV. 542. *b.* The author was not much pleaſed with him: he is nevertheleſs read and eſteemed by many people of honour and worth. V. 802.

Rabelais Reformed, what that book is, and by whom compoſed III. 133. *b.* 134. *a.*

Rabutin (Buſſi) quoted. I. 446. *a. n.* (2). V. 76. *a. n.* (8). What an Abbot wrote to him. III. 166. *a.* A Latin epigram writ againſt him. IV. 196. *a.* Facts that concern him. 753. *b. &c.* What he ſays about the contrariety of ingredients in the human compoſition. IV. 441. *a.* Whether he be author of the book intituled *Amours du Palais Royal*. V. 753. *b.* 754. *a.* An acknowledgment that he makes. 756. His *Amours des Gauls* more dangerous than the ſatire of Petronius. 847.

Racan, what thing about him he ſet the greateſt value upon. V. 384. *a.*

Rack, the inconveniencies that attend the uſe of it. III. 238. *b.*

Racovia, when and upon what occaſion the college which the Unitarians had erected there, was demoliſhed. V. 168. *a.* 173. *b.* 174. *a.*

Ragguagli di Parnaſſo, who is the author of that book. II. 38.

Ragotſki (Sigiſmond) what commiſſion he received in the name of God. II. 691. *b.* His perplexity with regard to the war that he was ſollicited to make. 692. Revelations are publiſhed after that Prince's death, which ſuppoſed him ſtill alive. *ibid. a.*

Ragotſki (George) initiated into the myſteries of Drabicius, II. 693. *a. b.*

Raguenau, a ſatire againſt him. II. 604. *a.*

Railleries of perſons that were burnt in effigy. II. 85. *b.* Cannot be good if they have no other foundation but lies. 527. *a.* III. 378. *b.* 379. *a.* 631. *b.* See *Jeſts*. There are ſome raillieries ſo ingenious that though a perſon be nettled at them, he has not a good pretence to complain. IV. 777. *b.*

Raynaud (Theophilus) concealing himſelf under the name of S. Emonerius, writes againſt John Barnes's treatiſe of equivocations. I. 660. *a.* Accuſed of having cenſured the Apoſtles creed. III. 144. *a.*

Raynoldi (William) what is reported of him and his brother. V. 275. *a. b.*

Ralph Higden, a Benedictin Monk, confounded with *Radulphus Flaviacenſis*. IV. 824. *a. b.*

Ralph the Black, otherwiſe called Radulphus Flaviacenſis. IV. 824.

Rambouillet-Houſe, an encomium upon it. III. 177. *a.*

Rambouillet (Madam de) her virtue. IV. 83. *a.*

Ramiſm involved in Theological diſputes. II. 696. *a. b.* 697. *a.* Flouriſhes in Swiſſerland. IV. 842. *b.*

Ramiſts, their diſputes involved in the diſputes of Divines. II. 696. *a. b.* 697. *a.* We juſtly laugh now-a-days at their quarrels wtih the Peripatetics. 697. *a.*

Rampalle (the Sieur de) what he tells us of a King of Lydia. IV. 563. *a.*

Ramus, an epigram writ againſt him. IV. 474. *b.* 475. *a.* He was one of the heads of the cabal which endeavoured to change the form of church diſcipline. V. 738. His method greatly eſteemed by William Adolphus Scribonius. 100.

Rapes puniſhed with death in France. IV. 636. *b.* Cannot be juſtified. *ibid.* 637. *a. b.* Reflexion upon the rapes of fair damſels in romances. III. 365. *a. b.* 366. *a.*

Rapin (Nicolas) Lieutenant of the ſhort robe, his converſation with the Jeſuit Guignard, as the latter was going to be executed. III. 276. *b.*

Rapin (Father) is of opinion that the XVIIth century is ſuperior to the XVIth, in knowledge and ingenuity. I. 92. *b.* Cenſured for ſeveral errors touching the ſtudies and different employments of Ariſtotle. 464. *a. b.* 465. *a. b.* He did not give himſelf the trouble of conſulting originals. 472. *a.* A fine reflexion which he makes upon great men. 619. *b.* His error with reſpect to a paſſage of Plutarch where Epicurus is mentioned. II. 775. *b.* 776. *a.* Quoted. 849. *a. b. n.* (40), (42).

Ratan, a very malignant ulcer. I. 39. *a.*

Ratiſbon: the Hiſtory of the conference of Ratiſbon. III. 535. *b.* 536. *a. b.* 537. *a.* Baillet's judgment upon what paſſed in that conference. 536. *a. b.*

Ravaillac, whether he could have been induced by the doctrine of the Jeſuits to aſſaſſinate Henry IV. IV. 128. *b.* 129. *a. b.* 130. *a.* What moved him to commit ſuch a Parricide. 131. *a.*

Ré, the confounding of that iſle with the iſle of Rié, occaſions an anachroniſm. V. 188. *a.*

Readers are ſeldom mortified when they do not underſtand an author, and why. I. 218. *a. b.* The moſt part of them are ſeldom ſenſible of an error in reaſoning. 419. *a.* What ſort of readers are moſt prone to criticize. III. 337. *a. b.* An author ſhould wiſh for ſuch as are neither ignorant nor very learned. 905. *b.* 906. *a.* Are ſometimes more prejudiced than the author whom they accuſe of partiality. II. 310. *a. b.* Are not candid enough. *ibid. b.* 311. *a.* There are ſome readers ſo warm that they tear out of their copies ſuch things as are ignominious to their ſect. IV. 711. *b.* Many of them do not compare one whole book to another whole book. V. 180. *a.* There are ſome who in the margin of their books write abuſive reflexions, or give the authors the lie. 846.

Reading; one of the greateſt uſes that may be drawn from it, is to learn the weakneſſes of the heart of man, and the ill effects of prejudices in point of religion. I. 784. *b.* Too profuſely diſplayed towards the beginning of the XVIIth century. II. 105. *b.* 106. *a. b.* A paſſage of la Bruyere on that head 105. *b.* A paſſage of Balzac on the ſame ſubject. *ibid.* 106. *a.* An advocate who pleaded thus, pleaded more for himſelf than for his Client. *ibid. b.* It could only ſerve to withdraw the Judge's attention. *ibid.*

Real (the Abbot de St) unjuſtly cenſured, with reſpect to the *Squittinio della Libertà Veneta*. V. 449. *a. b.* Quoted. III. 808. *a. b. n.* (124), (125), (126), (127), (128), (129). IV. 657. *a. n.* (36). V. 366. *a. b. n.* (26), (27), (28).

Reaſon has different faces. I. 681. *b.* Whether the light of reaſon ought to be conſulted. II. 111. *b.* The vanity and weakneſs of it. 799. *a. b.* IV. 95. *b.* 96. *a.* 323. *a. b.* 513. *a. b.* 514. *a. b.* 515. *a.* A reflexion upon its weakneſſes. III. 459. *b.* It can only diſcover to us our ignorance and weakneſs, and the neceſſity of a revelation. IV. 96. *a.* It wages a continual war with the body and the ſenſes. 440. *a.* Is not able to make us do what ſhe makes us approve. 442. *a.* The Philoſophers obſerved the ſlavery of reaſon, and ſuſpected the cauſe that produced it; they were not ignorant that the power of reaſon is loſt, and its light nevertheleſs preſerved. 441. *a. b.* How deplorable its fate is. 514. *b.* 515. *a.* It is uſeful to humble it. 519. *a.* Its weakeneſs ſhould conduct us to the light of revelation. *ibid.* What Cotta ſays of it. 516. *b.* 517. *a.* Is a ſource of deception as well as the ſenſes. 592. *a.* V. 441. *a. b.* It is not reaſon but faith that makes us Chriſtians. IV. 591. *b.* 592. *a.* Whether evidence which is the *Non plus ultra* of reaſon can be what they call *Criterium Veritatis*. 654. *b.* V. 586. *b.* Whether by following the light of reaſon, and ſhaking off the yoke of tradition a perſon is led to Atheiſm. 441. *a. b.* See *Philoſophy*. The beſt reaſons loſe their weight, when they are alledged by a perſon in miſerable circumſtances. IV. 852. *b.* 853. *a.* The myſteries of the Goſpel are above it, or even contrary to it. V. 815. Divines will always have the worſt in a diſpute where they ſhall only appeal to the light of reaſon. *ibid.* It cannot furniſh anſwers to its own objections, we muſt have recourſe to the authority of God. *ibid.* The Catholics and Proteſtants agree to reject it in the controverſies about the myſteries of religion. 817. Such Proteſtants as ſtudy to make more room for it in Divinity, are ſuſpected of Socinianiſm. *ibid.* Its ſtrange miſtakes, when it treats of divine matters. 820. A perſon ſhould renounce it, in order to receive faith. 834. The ludicrous way in which this reflection has been expreſſed, and the authors confutation. *ibid.* Reaſon ſhould be ſilent when the word of God ſpeaks. 817. 830.

Reaſonings, there are ſome which one may elude by turning them into a jeſt. I. 639. *b.* 640. *a. b.*

Re-baptize: whether children, baptized by a woman, ſhould be re-baptized. I. 704. *b.*

Rebellion: the head of the rebellion, requires a greater ſubmiſſion than the true maſter. III. 299. *b.*

Rebels, whether they do all that they can, whereas thoſe who fight for their Prince do no more than they ought. I. 711. *a. b.* Their artifices. 265. *a.* Their common proteſtation that they have no deſign againſt the King. II. 735. *a.*

Rebenſtock, his *Colloquia Menſalia*, the Hiſtory of that book. III. 938. *b.*

Recollects; Aloiſio de Leon draws up their rules. III. 772.

Recommend: it is very dangerous to recommend an abler perſon than one's ſelf. II. 372. *a.*

Reconciliation, a feaſt which the Jews ſolemnize by the oblation of a cock and other ceremonies. III. 125. *a. b.*

Red-hair'd People ſacrificed to the ghoſt of King Oſiris. II. 233.

Redi, his book on the generation of inſects, quoted. IV. 517. *a. n.* (38).

Reform: an attempt to reform abuſes may ſometimes have criminal motives. V. 459. *b.* 460. *a.*

Reformation of the Church, what it was that gave ſeveral perſons a diſlike to it. I. 139. *a. b.* And retarded the progreſs of it. 285. *a.* Perſons who all their life-time made profeſſion of the Catholic religion, though they wiſhed for a reformation. 659. Baudouin writes a treatiſe of the means of attaining to a good reformation. 697. *b.* Cameron found many things in the Reformed Church, which wanted a farther reformation. II. 288. *and a. b.* A perſon may believe that the Church ſtands in need of reformation, without approving a certain manner of reforming it. 374. *a.* What judgment ſome paſſed upon it in the beginning. 799. *a. b.* 810. *b.* 811. *a. b.* Perſons that were not far from it in their hearts, but who diſapproved of the conduct of thoſe that were eſtabliſhing it. 799. *a.* It was ſupported by the emulation of Charles V, and Francis I. III. 94. *a. b.* The reformation which Queen Elizabeth eſtabliſhed. II. 754. *b.* Attacked in Holland. III. 675. *a. b.* It could not have been undertaken at a more favourable time. 947. *b.* 948. *a. b.* 954. *b.* V. 482. *a. b.* Inconveniencies that ſprung up at its birth. IV. 46. *and a. b.* What faults Eraſmus obſerved in the meaſures that were taken againſt it. III. 954. *b.* Melanchthon did not approve all the manners of it. IV. 185. *b.* Favoured by Margaret de Valois Queen of Navarre. 317. *b.* 318. *a. b.* 319. *a. b.* 320. *a.* 321. *a. b.* And by Joan Queen of Navarre. 324. *b.* 325. *a. b.* 326. *a. b.* 327. *a. b. &c.* The progreſs it made by means of the King and Queen of Navarre. 325. *b.* 326. *a. b.* 327. *a. b.* The reſtoration of polite literature made way for the Reformation. V. 286. *b.* The project of reformation which was drawn up at Cologn. 557. *a. b.* 558. *a. b.*

Reformation of Manners is of a ſhort continuance. IV. 353. *b.* 354. *a.*

Reformed; Thuanus calls them a ſuſpicious people. I. 119. *a.* Some of them would have adopted the ſlanders that were publiſhed againſt Beza, if he had written againſt their party. 797. *a. b.* They had very near got the upper hand in France. III. 507. *b.* 508.

b. 508. *a. b.* Whether they behaved at that time in too oſtentatious a manner. *ibid. b.* 509. *a.* To what they aſcribed the perſecution which they ſuffered under the reign of Henry II. IV. 698. *b.* The libel which George Boſquet writ againſt them condemned to be burnt. II. 95. *a. b.* They laughed at Brocard's Prophetical viſions. 144. *b.* Acknowledged Caraccioli as a Biſhop, after he had publickly embraced their religion. 313. *a. b.* 314. *a. b.* An Arrêt of the Parliament of Paris, by which any one is permitted to kill them. 458. *b.* Cenſured with reſpect to an alteration made in their Pſalter. IV. 164. *a. b.* Their affairs were not in a bad ſituation at the time of the conference of Poiſſy. *ibid. a.* Baniſhed out of England, and cruelly perſecuted in Germany. V. 550. *b.* They are very jealous in the point of a total ſubmiſſion to the myſteries of religion, and defend it zealouſly againſt the Socinians. 817. Accuſed of a violent and ſeditious humour. 89. *a.*

Reformers; they clamoured loudly againſt the Peripatetic Philoſophy, and for what reaſon, according to Father Rapin. I. 472. *b.* 473. *a.* The keen ſtyle of two among them did them great ſervice. II. 60. *b.* 61. *a.* A reproach caſt upon them, as if they warred againſt Rome for the ſame reaſons the Grecians did againſt Troy, for the ſake of a woman. 266. *b.* The violent diſpoſition of ſome of them has been looked upon as neceſſary. III. 11. *a.* The calumnies publiſhed againſt them are deſtitute of all probability. 935. *a. b.* 936. *a. b.* 937. *a. b.* 938. *a. b.* 939. *b.* 945. *a. b.* 946 *a. b.* 947. *a. b.* 948. *a. b.* 949. *a.* The fabulous impertinencies that were publiſhed againſt them. *ibid. b.*

Refuge, See *Aſylums*.

Refugees, Abraham is their Patriarch. I. 44. *a.* They hoped that their re-admiſſion would be made an article of the peace of Munſter. II. 691. *b.*

Refutation: a ſlight refutation of a book does only ſerve the more to recommend it. V. 179. *b.*

Refutations: certain refutations have contributed to the increaſing of Socinus's ſect. V. 179. *a. b.* There is no refutation ſo pitiful as not to diſcover ſome defects in the book of an adverſary. 180. *a.*

Refute: there are people who take a much greater pleaſure in refuting what was advanced by others, than in laying down any thing certain of their own. I. 620. *and b.* The moſt frank and fair way of refuting an adverſary's book. V. 505. *b.* 506. *a.*

Regius, his maxim, when the queſtion is to ſpeak of God exactly. IV. 876. *b.*

Regiſter to the Parliament of Paris, that office was enjoyed by the Tillet family for above a century. V. 354. *and b.*

Regius Profeſſor at Utrecht, brought into trouble for a Theſis concerning the union of the ſoul and body. III. 195. *and a. b.* 196. *a. b.*

Regius (Raphael) frequents Greek lectures at ſeventy years of age. IV. 292. *a. b.* 293. *a.*

Regnier, ſome of his verſes. III. 517. *b.* 518. *a.* An examination of what he ſays, that every one is the author of his own fortune. V. 368. *b.* 369. *a. b. &c.* Quoted. 402. *b. n.* (26).

Regnier Deſmarets (the Abbot) quoted. V. 582. *b. n.* (102).

Regnum Leoninum; Charles V, had a deſign to erect the provinces of the Low-Countries into a kingdom under that name. II. 222. 223.

Regulus, his maxim ought to be followed in a ſpecial manner when the queſtion is how Heretics are to be dealt with. I. 789. *a. b.*

Reign: it is not always ſure to judge of the reign of a Prince by the firſt years of it. V. 655.

Reign: the deſire of reigning ſtifles all ſentiments of humanity. II. 381. *and b.* Why it is a difficult matter to reign well. I. 573. *b.*

Reineccius compoſes the elogy of James Horſtius. III. 487.

Relations; whether ſuch truths as may appear ſhocking to modeſty ſhould be ſuppreſſed in them. II. 30. *a. b.* 31. *a. b.* After what manner people flouriſh upon them. II. 405. *b.* 406. *a. b. &c.* The falſe relations that are given of public miſfortunes ſerve as a foundation to Hiſtorians. 749. *a. b.*

Relations in Proſe, it would be often neceſſary to give notice that they are ſet off with poetical fictions. I. 747. *b.*

Relicks, ſeveral Pagan cities boaſted of having the ſame. II. 530. *a. b.* 531. *a.* What Pomponatius ſaid of them. IV. 716. *b.* Certain relicks loſt, and others ſubſtituted in their place. 826. *a. b.* 827. *a.* A collection of relicks that was made with great pains: the price of them falls after Luther's reformation. V. 457. *b.* 458. *a.* Calvin's advertiſement concerning the general inventory that it would have been proper to make of them. II. 274. *b.* The deſtruction that was made of them in France. *ibid.*

Religio Medici, the religion of a Phyſician; a book which according to ſome might be intituled: *The Phyſician of Religion.* V. 835. Paſſages of that book. *ibid.* The author of it: what his notion was concerning the manner after which men propagate their ſpecies. 6. *a.*

Religion is ſo far from making the ſovereigns maſters of their ſubjects, that it gives their ſubjects a power over them. I. 13. *a.* It is not a mere human invention. *ibid.* Diſputes in religion cauſe terrible diſorders. 23. *b.* 24. *a.* Policy dares not commit the ſupport of it to God only. 94. *a. b.* Indifference in the point of religion is a very odious thing. 97. *b.* It is the fate of all religions to be the worſe for age. 223. *a. b.* Religion often ſerves for a pretence to accuſers. 307. *a.* Mockers at religion are apt to miſlead young perſons. II. 12. *b.* Whether a man deſerves praiſe for reſiſting temptations to change his religion. 27. *a. b.* It comes in every where, and even in the moſt fierce duels. 128. *b.* The ill cuſtom of intereſting religion in the diſputes of the learned. 141. *b.* The goodneſs of a religion is not to be judged of by the good or bad ſucceſs of a battle. 195. What Charron ſaid of it. 453. *b.* 454. *a.* A piece of a parallel between different religions. 465. 466. It cannot be concluded whether a man has any religion or not, from his witty ſayings either for or againſt it. 670. *a. b.* 671. *a.* It is a more common thing than people imagine, to be wholly ignorant in matters of religion. 677. *b.* 678. *a. b.* Revolutions in religion ſeldom happen, but when people at firſt aſk for themſelves a toleration which they refuſe to others. III. 147. *a. b.* Religion is divided into factions, juſt as commonwealths are. 172. *b.* The inconveniences that attend the diſputes which Divines raiſe about religion. 360. *a. b.* 361. *a.* Religion alone can furniſh us with ſtrong weapons againſt the Sophiſtry of the Cynics. 459. *b.* Many people leave their country for it, without renouncing their vices. 586. *b.* An inconveniency ariſing from the unity of religion. 642. *b.* Diſputes about religion that were carried on in Holland. 675. *a. b.* 676. *a.* The maxims of a Latitudinarian on that head. *ibid. b.* 677. *a. b.* There are nations which have no religion at all. 781. *a. b.* Whether the great changes that happen ſometimes in religion ſhould be attributed to the conſtellations. 948. *a. b.* Controverſies about religion make but few Sceptics. *ibid. b.* 949. *a.* Who thoſe are, that ought carefully to conſider the miſchiefs which are produced by civil wars on account of religion. IV. 18. *a. b.* 19. *a.* In the affair of religion heaven has been repreſented as reſembling the earth. 354. *a. b.* A man ſhould never change his religion, unleſs he can be a gainer by the change. 375. *a. b.* It is more advantageous to believe than not to believe what it teaches. 489. *a. n.* (55). The diſorder in which it leaves the hearts and minds of men, when it is falſe. 562. *a. b.* There is one which is called the religion of prudent men. 859. *b.* 860. *a.* Falſe religion in ſome ſort degrades a man to the condition of a brute beaſt. V. 77. *b.* There are ſome men whoſe religion is in their mind, and not in their heart, and there are others whoſe religion is in their heart, and not in their mind. 208. *a. b.* Perſons accuſed of abſtaining from the public exerciſes of religion. 257. *and a. b.* 258. *a.* The deſign of changing one's religion carries with it ſomething aſtoniſhing, and even thoſe who are fully reſolved to execute it, can hardly bring themſelves to do ſo. 539. *a.* How remarkably Lucius Junius Brutus mitigated an article of religion. II. 163. *a. b.* The United Provinces accuſed of taking no care of religion, but as far as it appears uſeful to them to aggrandize themſelves. 550. *a. b.*

We ought not to affect ſubtilties in matters of religion. III. 343. *b.* Perſons who have fled for their religion: nothing is more common, than to ſee them ringing the alarm againſt the ſects. 758. Perſons that have no religion, by what they are excited to a good moral life. V. 811. The end and ſubſtance of religion, is to imitate God. 812. Without the true religion, there is no true virtue. *ibid.* Reflexions upon the ſlanders that are publiſhed againſt thoſe who change their religion. 225. *a. b.* 226. *a.* The extravagancies of romances have crept into religion. I. 166.

Religion (the prevailing) has its ſtate-tricks as well as temporal Princes. III. 948. *a. b.* A maxim againſt a man, who goes about to oppoſe it. V. 314. *a b.*

Religion of the Sovereign. See *Sovereign.*

Religion (Natural) a falſe way of reaſoning, may bring a man to deny it. I. 97. *a.* What it is. *ibid. a b.*

Religion (Chriſtian) the Celſus's and Porphyry's would have attacked it with the weapons which Mary d'Agreda furniſhes them with. I. 137. *b.* What Hierocles wrote againſt it. III. 444. *a. b.* 445. *a.* The Popes and Cardinals accuſed by Calvin, of making a jeſt of it. II. 274. *b.* 275. *a.* Eraſmus quoted on that head. *ibid. a. b. n.* †. (189). There are good proofs of the truth of it, in Socinus's treatiſe *de Auctoritate S. Scripturæ.* V. 180. *b.* Its principle. 830. Its diſcuſſions, diſputes, and controverſies cannot be carried to the Tribunal of Philoſophy, but only to that of Revelation. *ibid.*

Religion (Romiſh) the exerciſe of it is abſolutely forbid in Bearn. IV. 327. *a. b.* See *Church of Rome.*

Religion (Reformed) the teſtimony which a Libertine finds himſelf obliged to give to it. II. 649. *b.*

Religion (Jewiſh): Bodin in his dialogue concerning religions, gives the advantage to the Jewiſh. II. 45. *a.*

Religion (Mahometan) profaned. I. 49. *a.* How much larger the extent of it is, than that of the Chriſtian religion. IV. 26. *a.*

Religions: a treatiſe on the toleration of Religions by Mr de Beauval. I. 672. *a.* A work deſigned to effect the coalition of Religions. 689. *a. b.* In all Religions, people are ſtrangely inclined to think themſelves favoured by miracles. II. 552. *a.*

Remedy: it is a remedy for ſome people to diſcharge their choler upon paper. I. 43. There are remedies which do more harm, than the diſorders which they are deſigned to cure. IV. 578. *a.* A Phyſician who implored the bleſſing of God upon his remedies. III. 486. *a. b.*

Remond (Florimond de) what he relates touching a project, to re-unite Sweden to the Church of Rome. III. 138. *b.* 139. *a.* Quoted with reſpect to the Pſalms. IV. 157. *a. b. n.* (69), (70), (71), (72), (73). The anſwer that was made to him concerning the conformity of the tunes of ſome Pſalms with thoſe of ballads. 159. *a. b.* 160. *a.* Is the Purveyor-General of the Roman Catholic writers, who ſpeak of the Reformers of the XVIth century. 393. *a.* What he ſays of Brocardus. II. 144. *a. b.* 145. *a.* A groſs blunder which Blondel reproaches him with. IV. 106. *a. b.* What he ſays with reſpect to what Beza had advanced, concerning the She-Pope, at the conference of Poiſſi. 736, 737. The Proteſtants were not confounded at his work concerning the She-Pope, they deſpiſed it. 732. *a. b. & ſeq.* The work is not bad, but too full of digreſſions and declamations. 733. *b.* Many aſcribe it to the Jeſuit Richeome. *ibid.* He unjuſtly accuſes Heroldus, of having added the ſtory of the She-Pope, to the Chronicle of Martin Polonus. 709. *a.*

Remonſtrants, their five articles are no fundamental Hereſies. III 174. *a.* Accuſed of having troubled the Church. 343. *a. b.*

Renatus, King of Sicily, was a Painter. IV. 307. *and b.* 308. *a.*

Renaudie (la) harangues his accomplices. III. 285. *a. b.* The cauſes of John Du Tillet's averſion for him. V. 353. *and a. b.* 354. *a. b.*

Renaudot (the Abbot), reflexions upon his judgment concerning this Dictionary. V. 797. *to* 809. The characters of him, and of the judgment which he paſſes. 797, 798. There are falſities in that judgment: the reaſon for which the author does not point them out. 804. What ſorts of faults he imputes to the author. *ibid. and* 805.

Rennes, the diſorders of that dioceſe occaſioned by the Clergy. III. 60.

Renou (John de) his *Antidotary* quoted. I. 677. *a. b. n.* (1), (2). He pretends that there are certain words, which prevent a man's enjoying a woman. IV. 385. *a. b. n.* (2). Cites Tacitus ill. *ibid.* The cenſure which he paſſes upon Nicolas Præpoſitus. 764. *a. b.*

Repentant maids: a houſe where perſons are ſhut up, who very often are neither the one nor the other. II. 373. *a.*

Reports: town reports are little conſiſtent with truth. I. 243. *a.* Hiſtorians ought not to follow popular reports, when they agree not with authors. II. 770. *b.* A judicious obſervation of Lampridius upon that ſubject. *ibid.* Truſting too raſhly to common reports, is the general fault of thoſe who ſuffer perſecution for their religion. V. 42.

Repriſals neceſſary in war. I. 709. *b.* 710. *a.*

Reprobation (abſolute) why Arminius would needs inſiſt upon it, in his diſpute with Gomarus. III. 174. *b.*

Republic of Rome, to what Cæſar had reduced it. II. 420. *a.*

Republics become corrupt as they grow old. I. 223. *a. b.* Cannot endure a diſtinguiſhed merit. II. 547. *b.* Have an advantage which kingdoms want. III. 420. *b.* Are liable to horrible confuſions. 452. *a. b.* 467. *a. b.* 468. *a.* IV. 581. *b.* How it is poſſible to retain ſome ſhadow of liberty in them, after they have been reduced to a Monarchical form of government. 204. *b.* We ought not to be curious in a foreign Republic. V. 820. See *Commonwealths.*

Reputation: a ſtratagem, to ſhew of what conſequence a good reputation is. I. 432. *b.* A great reputation for integrity in a perſon, diſpleaſes many. 460. *a.* Its influence is of great efficacy, either in advancing or retarding events. 498. *b.* Is an incumbrance to men of letters. 626. *b.* It is difficult to have a great reputation, without being expoſed to the laſh of cenſorious tongues. V. 337. *b.* 338. *a. b.*

Res, what was the ſignification of that word, among the Latins. III. 691. *b.* 692. *a.*

Reſcius (Staniſlaus) publiſhes the works of Cardinal Hoſius, and affirms that they had been printed thirty-two times. III. 501. *b.*

Reſentment: whenever a man conceives a reſentment againſt a nation, he ought to abſtain from writing its Hiſtory. III. 345. *b.*

Reſident: the Reſident of a Court, who quarrels with a perſon, and ſends him a challenge. II. 408. *a. b.*

Reſtitution: whether any pretence whatſoever, can excuſe a man from making Reſtitution. I. 13. *a.*

Reſurrection; the Jews reckon that there is a ſmall bone in us, out of which God will reſtore our bodies at the Reſurrection. I. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.* IV. 376. *a. b.* 665. *b.* The poſſibility of it taught by Chryſippus. II. 496. *b.* It ſeems that Democritus promiſed a Reſurrection to bodies buried in honey. 638. *b.* A ſingular notion concerning it. IV. 376. *b.* Believed by learned men among the Heathens. V. 332. *a.*

Retreat: few perſons know how to retreat in time. I. 120. *a.* Poets and Orators ought to be moſt careful of doing it. *ibid. a. b.* II. 620. *a. b.*

Reuchlin, the Hiſtory of his differences with Hochſtratus. III. 473. *b.* 474. *a.*

Revelation, without it, reaſon can avail us nothing, with reſpect to our getting over difficulties in point of religion. IV. 95. *b.* 96. *a.* The diſputes of Chriſtians ſhould be carried to its tribunal only. V. 830. Accuſations againſt the author, with reſpect to it, and his juſtification. 807.

Revelation of St John, what we have ſeen concerning an explication of that book. I. 7. *b.* Thoſe who promiſe the greateſt ſucceſſes, as if they were foretold there, are apt to be miſtaken. 127. *a.* It would be difficult to find ſureties to warrant the explications of it. 188. *a. b.* The needleſs labour of the Commentators upon it. *ibid.* Calvin's opinion concerning this book. II. 265. *b.* Some have believed that St John was not the author of it. 405. *b.* III. 595. *a.* The Commentators upon it loſe nothing of their credit, though they have deceived people an hundred times. II. 539. *a.* The reaſon of it. *ibid.* The moſt chimerical explications of it, may be of great uſe to ſtir up the people. 693. *b.* Sovereigns generally manage the interpreters of that book. III. 476. *b.* The judgment that we ought to paſs upon thoſe who vary in their explication of it, according to the different turn which affairs take. IV. 47. *a. b.* The whole ſtory of it embroidered upon a garment. 430. There has always been people, who pretended to know the ſecrets of this book. 899. *a.* Thoſe who pretend to explain it, would have Miniſters of State neglect all their affairs, to hear them, or read their writings. V. 94. *b.* 95. *a.* The firſt Reformers did not underſtand it. II. 122. *a. b.* The deſign of thoſe who ballot the numbers of it. 123. *b.* The ill ſucceſs of the Commentators on it, does not reſtrain the temerity of others. 124. *a.* The explications of it are oil to the fire. 127. *b.* Put in French rhime, and fitted for the ſtage. 477. *a. b. &c.*

Revelations (Divine); Savonarola pretends to partake in them. V. 57.

Re-union of the Lutherans and Calviniſts, attempted in vain. II. 731. *a.* Dury ſaid that only ſome miniſters oppoſed that work. III. 34. *b.*

Re-union of the Catholics and Proteſtants, a book wrote for the bringing it about. III. 595. *a. b.*

Re union of the religions, perſons who have been full of that ſcheme. IV. 213. *a. b.* 214. *a. b.* 215. *a.* 231. *a.*

Re-united: the new re-united were ſcandalized at the weak and timorous cenſure that was paſſed upon the myſtical city of Mary d'Agreda. I. 138. *b.* 139. *a. b.*

Revolutions of State, the greateſt commonly proceed from a trifle. II. 711. *b.* Their principles and ſprings. 741. *a. b.* 742. *a. b.* The ordinary preparatives towards them. III. 138. *b.* 139. *a. b.* What is almoſt continually the chain of the greateſt revolutions. IV. 281. *a.* The tricks that are employed to make them ſucceed. IV. 467. *b.* 468. *a.*

Reward: a man muſt ſeek the reward of a fine action in the action itſelf. I. 559. *a. b.* How an author ought to behave, in order to obtain rewards from the Public. III. 339. *b.* 340. *a. b.* 341. *a. b.*

Rhadamanthus marries Alcmena, who was tranſported for that end, to the fortunate iſlands. I. 208.

Rhan (George) his apology for the confeſſion of Augſburg, publiſhed by Chytræus. II. 122. *b.*

Rheſcuporis, his perfidiouſneſs. II. 559. *a. b.*

Rhetoric has rules that are little conformable to the laws of Hiſtory, or to ſincerity. II. 341. *b.* 342. *a.* Demoſthenes quits Philoſophy, to apply himſelf to Rhetoric. 259.

Rhetorical: a Rhetorical figure occaſions the loſs of a cauſe. I. 185. *a. b.*

Rhetoricians: who was reckoned the moſt famous Rhetorician of the XVIIth century. II. 499. An example of their Legerdemain. 678. *a. b.* Commentators ſhould take notice of their artifices. 679. *a.* The Rhetoricians and Philoſophers expelled from Rome. III. 5. 6.

Rhimes: a Dictionary of French Rhimes. I. 65. *b.* 66. *a.*

Rhinfeld: John de Wert taken priſoner at the battle of Rhinfeld. V. 539.

Rhodes; an error in computing the weight of its Coloſſus. II. 390. *a.* Its form of government changed by the authority of Mauſolus. III. 359. The Hiſtory of the violences and debaucheries that were committed there afterwards. *ibid. and a. b.* 360. *and a. b.* Its Democracy changed into an Ariſtocracy, during the confederate war. IV. 174.

Rhodians ſend Ambaſſadors to King Ptolomy. I. 71. *a.* Thought themſelves ſo ſure of defeating the Romans, that they had prepared chains for thoſe they ſhould take priſoners. II. 349. *b.* Their temples pillaged by Caſſius. *ibid.*

Rhodiginus (Lewis Cœlius) uſes the labours of Eraſmus with ingratitude. II. 813. *a. b.* Convicted of a falſity with reſpect to Euripides. 874. *b.* Commits a groſs ſoleciſm. V. 624. *a.*

Riario: what has been ſaid of Peter and Jerome Riario. V. 163. *a. b.*

Riario (Cardinal) aſſiſts Marſus in the reviſal of his Commentary on Tully's Offices. IV. 165. *a.*

Ribadeneira retracted what he had ſaid about the miracles of the founder of the order of the Jeſuits. III. 889. *a. b.* 890. *a. b.*

Ricaut, his error touching the hopes of Mahometan women. III. 341. *b.* He miſunderſtood Buſbequius with reſpect to the ignorance of the Turks, in point of Chronology. 572. *b.*

Richard (the Abbot) quoted. II. 589. *a. b. n.* (8), (9). III. 954. *b. n.* (173), (174), (175), (176), (178), (179). V. 542. *b. n.* (18). His anſwer to Jurieu, with reſpect to the taxes of the Romiſh Chancery. I. 629. *b.* The inſufficiency of that anſwer. *ibid.*

Richardus (Stephanus) Nivernenſis deſigned to have compoſed forty-two chapters upon Ovid's invective againſt Ibis. IV. 452. *a.*

Richelieu (Cardinal de) deſires to confer with Amyraut. I. 261. *a.* Did not love to be aſked. 418. *b.* Never forgave any one. 488. It is reported that he was continually reading the Argenis. 645. 5. He paid an author well for his elogy. 653. *b. n.* (3). It is ſurprizing that he ſhould lay any ſtreſs on Bertelier's pretended act, with reſpect to Calvin. 783. *b.* 784. *a.* II. 62. *a.* And on Bolſec's calumnies againſt the ſaid Calvin. 265. *b.* He makes uſe of ſome of the rhapſodies of Beza's calumniators. I. 800. *and a.* Required a great deal of complaiſance from thoſe who belonged to him. II. 134. *b.* Secret practices to expel him from the court. 401. *a. b.* His method. 518. *a.* What Lewis XIII ſaid to him, after the Marſhal d'Ancre's death. 542. *b.* His amours with Marion de Lorme. 647. *a.* His deſign to reconcile both religions, hindered by his death. III. 34. *a.* His friends and enemies loſt battles, the latter with a view to hurt, and the former with a view to ſerve him. 59. *b.* The Miniſters of Languedoc wait upon him, and tell him that they ſaw but little probability of effecting a re-union in matters of religion. 123. *a.* He was very liberal to the Muſes. 176. *a.* The reproaches he caſts upon the Proteſtants, with reſpect to the majeſty of Kings, and the anſwers which have been made to theſe reproaches. 668. *a. b.* 669. *a.* Whether under his miniſtry people were put to death, whoſe only fault conſiſted in their misfortune to diſpleaſe him. 818. *a. b.* 819. *a.* IV. 141. *a. b.* 142. *a. b.* 143. *a. b.* 144. *a.* His power laſted longer than his life. III. 827. *and b.* He was vaſtly hated. IV. 141. *a. b. &c.* Was of a delicate taſte and haughty ſpirit. 85. *a.* How he employed himſelf, after he had ſpent ſome hours in ſettling affairs of ſtate. 114. *a.* It was for the good and ſervice of Lewis XIII, that his troops ſhould be commanded by the friends of that Cardinal. 146. *a.* He was extreamly affected by ſatires. III. 212. IV. 256. *a.* Was obliged to ſpread his ſnares every where. 257. *a.* The ſpeech which Gueret puts in his mouth. *ibid. b.* Thoſe who have had to do with that Cardinal, have left us wretched pictures of him. 258. *b.* All the misfortunes of Europe are imputed to him. 260. *a.* He makes uſe of Silvius's writings, for finding out the Philoſopher's ſtone. 262. *b.* What he ſaid to a Captain of the guards. V. 370. *b.* He would not allow any other cauſe of unhappineſs than imprudence. 373. *b.* Procures a penſion to a plagiary Genealogiſt. 474. *a. b.* Oppoſed in his deſign of humbling the Houſe of Auſtria, by Cardinal Berulle. I. 786. *a.* Charged with having poiſoned that Cardinal. *ibid. b.* Mr le Vaſſor does not adopt this calumny. *ibid.* There was no ſtory which people did not believe, when it defamed him. IV. 511. *a.*

Richeome commits a miſtake advantageous to his deſign. IV. 79. *a. b.* Quoted. III. 956. *a. b. n.* (18), (19). IV. 81. *a. n.* (51). 930. *b. n.* (8). Looked upon as the author of Florimond de Remond's book, intituled, *l'Anti-Papeſſe.* 733. *b.* The Jeſuits looked upon him as their beſt French writer. *ibid.* Diſguiſes himſelf under the name of Francis de Montagnes, in his anſwer to the plea of Antony Arnauld. III. 278. *b. n.* (24). Divers extracts from his books touching the affair of John Guignard. 277. *a. b.* 278. *a. b.* 279. *a.*

Richer, John Boucher was one of his adverſaries. II. 103.

Richerians, a chimerical ſect. IV. 870. *b.* 871. *a. b.*

Riches, there were Philoſophers who renounced them, before the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt. I. 294. *a. b. &c.* Some deſpiſe them from a principle of ſelf-love. 460. *a. b.* It requires a great deal of magnanimity to deſpiſe them. II. 269. *b.* It is much eaſier for us to renounce riches than praiſe. 298. *b.* They have ſometimes been the cauſe of the perſecution of great men. 351. *b.* 352. *a.* An anſwer of Simonides, wherein he ſaid that riches were better than learning. V. 146. *b.* 147. *a.*

Ride: the only thing young Princes are inſtructed in, is how to ride the great horſe. II. 334.

Ridiculous: a perſon can never be ridiculous who follows only the common cuſtom. II. 527. *a. b.*

Riga, the capital city of Livonia, beſieged and taken by Guſtavus Adolphus. V. 657, 658, 659.

Right: the only meaſure of right (or law) in ſtates is the advantage they can get by it. I. 130. *a. b.* Some Philoſophers did not admit a natural right. 416. What it is. II. 30. *a. b.* Whether there is a natural impreſſion which enables all men to diſtinguiſh between right and wrong. III. 581. *a. b.* 604. *a. b.* Certain nations are ignorant of it. 781. *a. b.*

Rigoriſm, what it is. IV. 874. *and a. b.*

Ring; the reaſon why the Antients wore a ring on the finger next to the little finger of the left hand. I. 375. *a* A ring ſold at an auction had almoſt occaſioned the ruin of the Roman Republic. II. 711. *b.*

Rio (Martin del) cenſured for ſeveral falſities touching Agrippa. I. 152. *a. b.* Quoted. V. 597. *n.* (*a*). *and b. n.* (2).

Riolan writes ſome books againſt Joſeph du Cheſne. II. 468.

Ripeneſs: when the regulation of the ripeneſs of girls and boys by inſpection, was forbidden. IV. 802. *b.* See *Maidenhead.*

Riſe: the Egyptians or Phœnicians uſed to ſay, that they who recovered from a great fit of ſickneſs roſe again out of the grave. I. 116. *b.*

Riſhton (Edward) publiſhes Sanders's Hiſtory of the Engliſh Schiſm, and adds a preface of his own to it. V. 41. *b.* 42. *a.* Dies at St Menehou in the year 1585. *ibid.*

Riſwick: the treaty of Riſwick advantageous to the Allies. III. 683. *a.*

Ritual, that of the Jews contains rare obſervances. I. 174. *a. b.*

Riverius, Phyſician to Henry IV, treated as a mountebank by John de Renou. IV. 864.

Rivers: a river whoſe water makes thoſe immortal who drink of it, but which is always covered with a dark night. II. 465. Rivers at this day may be very unlike what they were in antient times. V. 78. *b.*

Rivet (Andrew) harſhly cenſured by Father Labbe. I. 21. *a. b.* His opinion about Abimelech's diſtemper. 38. *b.* 39. *a.* His reflexion againſt St Auguſtin for his looſe morality. 91. *b.* It is ſurprizing that ſuch a man as he ſhould have been ignorant that Calvin was a father. II. 267. *a.* His judgment upon a work of Sedulius. III. 84. *a.* How he refutes Coëffeteau's anſwer to du Pleſſis Mornai, with reſpect to the praiſes which Langius beſtows on Luther. 723. *b.* He has not exactly traced Campian and Whitaker's diſpute. 940. *a.* Is one of thoſe who quote from the modern writers, without conſulting the originals. V. 183. *b.* Was the depoſitary of ſeveral of the Patriarch Cyril's Letters. 560. *b.* An incident of his diſpute with Grotius, where he cavils ridiculouſly. I. 235. *a. b.* 236. *a. b.* His defence of the two Epiſtles and Preface of Mr du Pleſſis. II. 127. *a. b.* He does not bring him off in one particular. *ibid. b.* Endeavours to juſtify Robert Stephens. 173. *a. b.* Is miſtaken with reſpect to the ſtatue of Pope Joan. 530. *b.* Quoted, and cenſured, for what he ſays of Harchius. III. 352. *b. n.* (8). A partizan of the tradition of the She-Pope. IV. 280. *b.* The moſt curious man in the world about books of controverſy. 727. *a.*

Rivinus makes his complaints to the magiſtrates againſt Reineſius. IV. 858. *b.* 859. *a.*

Robbers, two famous ones. V. 198. *a.* Phyſically ſpeaking, they may deſerve ſome eſteem. IV. 843. *a.*

Robert, the King's Attorney at the Chatelet of Paris, his letter concerning James Aymar's wand. I. 8. *a. b.*

Robert d'Arbriſſel; ſee *Arbriſſel.*

Roberval anſwers the objections of Des Cartes againſt a piece of Mr de Fermat. IV. 485. *a.*

Rochechoüart, perſons of note in that family. V. 298. *and b.*

Rochefoucaut (the Duke de la) his memoirs will ever be eſteemed better than thoſe of Cæſar. II. 418. *a.*

Rochelle, its national Synod. II. 196. *b.* That city is not allowed to have any others paſtors than ſuch as are born there. 694. *a.* It is beſieged by the Duke of Anjou. III. 178. *a.* The tumultuous reſolutions of its aſſembly. IV. 212.

Rochemaillet took care to have the arrets of George Louët printed, from the manuſcript which Antony Seguier had given him. III. 882.

Rocheſter (the Earl of), a famous Atheiſt, converted by Dr Gilbert Burnet; particulars that concern him. V. 820, 821. *n.* (35).

Rochus (John), General of the Auguſtins. I. 769. *b.*

Rock of the accuſed, who and what was ſo called. I. 167. II. 345. *a.*

Rod, that of Moſes was the model of the Devil's apiſh tricks. I. 5. *a.*

Rodon (David de) taught certain ſophiſms only to thoſe who paid him for it. IV. 783. *b. n.* (18).

Rodriguez; his book of Chriſtian Perfection tranſlated by d'Audiguier. I. 548. *a.*

Rodriguez (John), ſee *Gabay Faro.*

Rohault deſcribes the natural conſequence of the method of philoſophizing contracted in the ſchools. II. 848. *b.* 849. *a.* What he ſays of the Guiſes. III. 298. *b.* 299. *a. b.*

Roi (Lewis le), Greek-Profeſſor in the univerſity of Paris, his death. I. 562.

Royalty is a very chargeable thing. IV. 755. *a.*

Roye (Eleonor de) dies of grief. III. 833. *a.*

Roland, where ſtatues are erected to him. III. 256. *b.*

Romance of Theagenes and Chariclea, an original and plan for almoſt all other romances. III. 377. *a.* The author of it ſeverely rallied. 378. *a. b.*

Romances, their extravagancies have crept into religion. I. 166. Reflexion upon the rapes of fair damſels in romances. III. 365. *a. b.* 366. *a.* IV. 636. *b.* 637. *a. b.* Wherein conſiſts the chief difference between Mythological authors, and the writers of romances. III. 465. *b.* Thoſe of the new faſhion ſpoil the taſte of young people. 552. *a. b.* IV. 365. *b.* 366. *a.* The authors of them very often ſhew a want of judgment in their fictions. III. 296. *a. n.* (32). The new romances make true hiſtory extremely obſcure. IV. 366. *a.* How tender the author of a romance ſhould be of his heroine's virtue. 114. *b.* The heroine of a romance, with a big-belly, or lying-in, is a ſtrange image. III. 866. *b.* The writers of them are obliged to follow Hiſtory, when they tell in a preface the foundation of their fictions. 166. *b.* Thoſe of the Counteſs d'Aulnoi have been univerſally read. I. 569. *b.*

Romans were very apt to apply particular ſentiments of a play to the preſent times. I. 60. *b.* Their firſt conqueſts compared with thoſe they made afterwards. 163. *a. b.* They did not approve, that a ſuperior magiſtrate ſhould be accuſed by his Subaltern. 186. *a. b.* Are cruelly inſulted by the Parthians. 515. Who were called the laſt Romans. II. 164. *a.* What perſon had this encomium given him, that he was called the laſt of the Romans. 347. The antient Romans had not laid down thoſe polite rules in point of debauchery, which prevail now-a-days. 394. They ſhewed much leſs regard to thoſe who gained battles, than to thoſe who finiſhed a war. 413. *b.* It was for that reaſon a part of their good policy to change their Generals often. *ibid.* Their ambition with reſpect to the propagation of their language. 516. *a. b.* 517. *a. b.* By what gradations they paſſed from frugality to luxury. 710. *a. b.* Would rather have choſen to loſe their lives than their virility. III. 75. *b.* Were not very religious obſervers of treaties. 584. *a. b.* Allowed the honour of a triumph only to thoſe who extended their frontiers. *ibid.* 586. *a.* Their policy to extend their conqueſts. *ibid.* Called *Ravenous Wolves*, by Teleſinus, General of the Samnites. 686. *b.* The antient Romans were as ridiculous in point of Genealogy, as people are at preſent. 711. *a.* The difference between the antient and modern Romans, and the occaſion of that difference. IV. 50. *b.* To ſave Italy, the Romans carry the war into Africa. 193. *a.* They forbad the Poets to abuſe their magiſtrates, and permitted them to ridicule their gods. 568. *b.* 569. *a.* When they attempted the abolition of certain nocturnal feaſts. V. 336. *b.* Called forth the tutelar gods of the towns which they beſieged, and which they expected to take. 185. *a. b.* Their cruelty to the Britons. 260. *a. b.* They had recourſe to *Venus Verticordia*, that a ſtop might be put to the prevailing leudneſs of the times. 268. *and a. b.* Were more jealous of their honour, than of the honour of the gods. 761, 762.

Rome, the end of a war is ſooner heard of there, than the beginning of it. I. 340. *a.* Who was the firſt Senator there that embraced the goſpel. 341. *a.* Changed from a monarchy to a commonwealth. II. 161. Its firſt inhabitants had need of a monarch. 163. *a.* It could not be any longer without one, when Julius Cæſar was murthered. 165. *b.* Who was called her ſecond founder. 289. Who firſt practiſed Phyſic there. 353. *a.* Who was the firſt of its Generals that embarked upon the northern ocean. 715. The limits of its empire ſhrink contrary to the preſage of idolaters. III. 317. *a.* St Auguſtin's raillery on that head. *ibid. a. b.* It ſubmitted to the will of Cæſar at the very firſt. IV. 203. *and a. b.* 204. *a.* The conformity between the foundation of Rome, and that of the univerſe. 424. *b.* A judgment concerning the moſt celebrated writers of antient Rome. 778. *b.* 779. *a. b.* The ſtatues of its deities in the beginning were made of baſe materials. 925. *b.* It had two names, the one known, and the other unknown. V. 184. *a. b.* 185. *a. b.* Was ſcarce known to the Greeks in Alexander's time. 329. *b.* Why the maids who married there, were followed by a perſon who carried a diſtaff and ſpindle, with wool and yarn upon them. 288. *b.* To what an exceſs they had carried the vice of Drunkenneſs there. 387. *a. b.*

Rome (Chriſtian), who was the firſt Greek that taught Philoſophy there. I. 443. *and a.* The harſhneſs of that court with reſpect to the Patriarch of Babylon. 105. The rewards wherewith the court of Rome pays the zeal of thoſe who declare for her. 157. *b.* Thoſe who had been courageous enough to exclaim againſt the uſurpations of that court overthrown. II. 125. *a. b.* The ſtrange corruption of its Popes and Cardinals deſcribed by an unſuſpected author. 370. *b.* 371. *a.* That court is no leſs concerned than others to preſerve the ballance of power between all the powers of Europe, whether Catholic or Proteſtant. 758. *b.* 759. *a.* Its avarice and impurity. III. 76. *a. b.* The monarchy of the Popes there is more to be wondered at than that of the Cæſars was. 228. *a. b.* We may apply to New Rome what Virgil obſerves concerning the Old. 235. *b.* That city alarmed at a bull that was going to be publiſhed againſt Sodomites. 327. *a. b.* A very ſmart letter writ againſt the court of Rome. 455. *a.* A deſcription of that city in verſe. *ibid.* The mode, with reſpect to women, has very much changed there. 458. *a.* The court of Rome has as much to fear from certain Catholic Princes, as from the Proteſtant ones. 568. *b.* Rome, notwithſtanding the reſidence of its Biſhops, is more corrupt than other cities. 591. *b.* Rome ſacked by the troops of Charles V. 615. *a.* The court of Rome maintains its rights with greater policy than the court of France. 742. *a.* A conſternation cauſed at Rome by the victory of Ravenna. 812 *a.* The partizans of the court of Rome alarmed at the volume of the liberties of the Gallican Church. IV. 98. *b.* 99 *a. b.* 100. *a.* That city preſents a woman with the privilege of its freedom, on account of her rare qualities. 237. *and b.* 238. *a. b.* To what the yearly income which the Pope draws from the Courtezans there, amounts. V. 162. *b.* Its acquiſitions in the Indies, by the vaſt number of Chriſtians that were in that country. 267. *a. b.* With what violence its inhabitants diſcovered their partiality for the Emperor or France. II. 310. *b. n.* (5). *No peace with Rome*, a treatiſe of Joſeph Hall under that title. III. 342. *b.*

Romiſh Divines, Cardinal Bellarmin reckons up two hundred and thirty-ſeven contrarieties of doctrine among them. III. 343. *b.*

Rommelin (James de) takes Simonetta, a gentleman of Milan, priſoner, and afterwards gets the better of him in a duel. V. 139.

Romorantin, the edict of that name. III. 506. *and a.*

Romulus, laws which he eſtabliſhed for divine ſervice, according to Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus. III. 914. *b.* 915. *a.* His retrograde horoſcope. V. 295. *and a. b.*

Rondel (du), the author of this Dictionary propoſes a point of Chronology for him to clear up. II. 15. *a.* What is his profeſſion, and what his works are. 782. *b.* He deſerves the praiſes of all the Journaliſts. *ibid.* Two obſervations that he makes examined. III. 914. *b.* 915. *a. b.* 916. *a. b.* He ſends a memoir touching the ſouls of beaſts to the author of this Dictionary. IV. 547. *a. b. n.* (20). His objection againſt the neceſſity of believing a providence, in order to embrace virtue and ſhun vice, and the anſwer to that objection. V. 180. *a. b.* 181. *a. b.* 182. *a.* His judgment of Balzac. 345. *b.* 346. *a. b.*

Rondelet truſts Joubertus, his favourite diſciple, with his manuſcripts, and deſires him to publiſh them. III. 582.

Ronſard, his ſonnet on the privileges which Phyſicians have with the fair ſex. I. 400. *a.* His *Trowel Croſiered.* III. 868. *a. b.* On what occaſion he wrote a poem againſt the Atheiſts. IV. 845. *b.*

Roque (the Abbot de la) aſcribes to Father le Tellier a thing which he does not ſay of Quintus Curtius. IV. 809. *a. b. n.* (6). Cenſured. 242. *a. b.* Quoted. V. 122. *b.* *& alibi.*

Roquelaure, what he ſaid upon hearing a ſatire againſt Henry IV read. IV. 482. *b.*

Rorenco, his books againſt the Vaudois. III. 162. *a.*

Roſe (the romance of the), who is the author of it. I. 28. *b.* Was written an hundred years after Abelard. III. 381. *b.*

Roſeo (Mambrin) makes an imperfect tranſlation of Guevara's Dial of Princes into Italian. III. 270. *b.*

Roſes, whence they ſprung. IV. 45. *a. b.*

Roſier (du), a Miniſter, changes his religion during the maſſacre of Paris. IV. 76. *b.* And contributes a great deal to the abjuration of ſeveral perſons of the firſt quality. 77. *a.*

Roſni does all he can to diſengage Henry IV from Mademoiſelle d'Entragues. V. 391. *a.*

Roſſano (the Princeſs of), widow to Prince Borgheſe. II. 471. *a. b.*

Roſweide aſcribes to Druſius a letter of Broughton. II. 150. *b.* His miſtake cenſured by Sixtinus Amama. *ibid.*

Rothe (John), a Fanatic, who was firſt a proſelyte of Labadie's, but afterwards ſeparated from him. III. 689. *a. b.* 690. *a.*

Rovere, an illuſtrious family in Piedmont, which poſſeſſed a ſtrange prerogative there. V. 162. *b.* 163. *a.*

Rouillard (Sebaſtian) confuted, as to what he ſays of Amyot, and his journey to Trent. I. 257. *a. b.* His capitulary concerning the validity of a marriage. IV. 804. *a. b.* 805. *a. b.* 806. *a. b.*

Rozier des Guerres, what that book is. II. 838. *a. b.* A remark concerning it. III. 809. *b.* 810. *a. b.*

Ruarus, his conjectures about the pretended Mahometiſm of Alciatus. I. 198. *a. b.*

Rubenus (Leonard), what he ſays of Blandrata's death. II. 20. *b.*

Rudolph II, his weakneſs in giving credit to the predictions of Tycho Brahe. V. 672.

Rufinus (Cornelius) degraded from the dignity of Senator for his luxury. II. 710. *a. b.* III. 2.

Ruys (the Monks of) their poſſeſſions ſeized on by a Britiſh Lord, on account of their vicious lives. I. 31. *a.*

Rule of equity which thoſe ought to follow, who impute certain things to an author. I. 652. *a.* A rule to know whether it is out of weakneſs or contempt, that a perſon does not anſwer an adverſary. II. 90. *b.* 91. *a.* The application of rules is more difficult than the art of diſcourſing well of them. 38. *a.*

Rumours: the ſecret ſprings which excite certain rumours. II. 721. *a. b.*

Ruſbach and *Ruſberus*, two chimerical authors formed from the corrupted name of Ruyſbroeck. IV. 944. *a. b.*

Rutilius, his generous way of thinking, with regard to his countrymen who had baniſhed him. II. 259. *a. b.*

Ruzé (Dr) would not allow ſome Miniſters to begin a conference with a prayer. IV. 921. *a.*

S.

SAbbathi Tzebbi, a falſe Meſſiah, a book where we find ſome very extraordinary particulars touching his impoſtures. V. 539.

Sabbatical Aſſemblies, a confutation of thoſe who doubt of people's being really carried to them. II. 750. *a. b.*

Sabina (a Roman Empreſs) poiſoned by her huſband's orders. V. 266. *b.* 267. *a.*

Saci (Mr de) ſucceeds Mr Roſe in the French academy. IV. 917.

Sacraments, ſome people put off that of Penitence to their laſt hours. I. 701. *b.* Laymen have a right to adminiſter them in certain caſes of neceſſity. III. 267. *and a. b.* When the cuſtom of uſing wafers in the ſacrament of the Lord's Supper was aboliſhed at Geneva. 343. *a. n.* (16).

Sacrifices: the Pagans boaſted that fire from heaven fell upon their ſacrifices. I. 25. *b.* A tenet of the Peripatetics concerning ſacrifices and prayers. 468. *a.* See *Victims*.

Sadducees, whether they wholly denied a providence. V. 9. *a. b.* 11. *a. b.* 12. *a. b.* The Jewiſh High Prieſt was ſometimes one of their ſect. 12. *b.*

Sadi, the Prince of the Perſian and Turkiſh Poets. IV. 872. *a.*

Sadolet (Cardinal) writes a letter to the people of Geneva. II. 264. *n. (d).*

Sagacity: proofs of an extraordinary ſagacity. II. 636. *a. b.* 637. *a.* If there were any ſuch thing as a certain ſagacity, it would be odious to all man kind. 636. *b.*

Sage of the Stoics exiſts only in idea. II. 310. *b.*

Sayings: remarkable ſayings are aſcribed ſometimes to one perſon, ſometimes to another. II. 770. *b.* People cannot bring themſelves to loſe a witty ſaying. 671. *a.* People are apt to report a good ſaying, not as it was ſpoken at firſt, but according to the form which they believe to be the beſt. I. 460. *b.* Perſons that excelled for witty ſayings. 308. *a.* 699. *a.* 753. *and a.* IV. 754. *b.* 755. *a.* Bion's witty ſayings. II. 12. *a. b.* The general fault of moſt witty ſayings. *ibid. b.* V. 152. *b.*

Saints: a ſaint created by ignorance and chance. I. 230. *b.* 231. *a. b.* There are numberleſs ſaints in Turkey, who have each of them a particular office. II. 466. *a. b.* The invocation of them has been long ſince the practice of the Jews. 879. *b.* They are always beautiful according to their pictures. III. 57. *a. b.* Their credit is very little diminiſhed in the Church of Rome. 87. *a. b.* The precipitation wherewith miracles upon miracles are crowded in their legend. 95. *b.* 96. *a.* IV. 556. *a.* The compilers of their lives have been the boldeſt of authors. III. 577. *b.* Not long ſince the queſtion was diſcuſſed at Rome whether the ſaints of the Old Teſtament deſerved the worſhip that is paid to the canonized ſaints. 573. *b.* There is leſs certainty in the antient than in the modern ſaints. 740. *a.* It is not by their miracles, but by their charity that we are to judge of their ſanctity. 889. *b.* An unlucky inconvenience which ſometimes attends the worſhip that is paid to them. 896. *b.* How the worſhip of ſaints has been introduced. IV. 353. *b.* 354. *a. b.* 355. *a. b.* A notion upon the invocation of ſaints. 376. *a. b.* There have been ſaints of all profeſſions, excepting that of an attorney. 487. *b.* The invocation of them is ſtill exceſſive. II. 126. *a. n.* (40).

Sainte-Aldegonde writes to the States the falſe news of the Duke of Alençon's marriage with Queen Elizabeth. V. 19. *a.* See *Aldegonde*.

Saint Brigitt: the fort of St Brigitt was beſieged in form, and the French defended it many days. IV. 211. *a.*

Saint-Evremoniana. See *Evremond*.

Saint Romuald (Peter de) brings a ridiculous charge againſt Beza. I. 800. *and a. b.* His errors. *ibid.*

Saint Sulpice, an abbey of the order of Citeaux at Belley: the diſorders which the Biſhop of that city found there. I. 737. *b.* 738. *a. b.* The pious fraud that was publiſhed concerning the foundation of it. *ibid. b.* 739. *a. b.*

Saïs, a city, where ſituate. IV. 342. *a.*

Saladin, his gallantry with Eleanora of Guienne ſpouſe to Lewis VII. III. 794. *b.* 795. *a. b.*

Salamina, a town in Cyprus, why ſo called, and when the cuſtom of ſacrificing men to Jupiter was ſuppreſſed there. V. 318. *a. b.*

Salamis, how that iſland came to be the property of the Athenians. V. 304. *b.*

Salernitana: the *Schola Salernitana* forbids the eating of beans. IV. 671. *b.*

Sales (Francis de) propoſes the elephant for an example of chaſtity. I. 641. *b.*

Salian (Father) cenſured for ſeveral epitaphs. I. 105. *b.* Cenſured by Noldius for what he ſays of Juba. III. 164. *a.*

Salian Prieſts, what Quintilian ſaid of them. IV. 161. *b.*

Salic Law condemned to caſtration ſlaves taken in adultery and theft. III. 77. *a.*

Sallo, what he ſays of Allatius's taſte. I. 232. *a.* A thought of that Journaliſt. II. 643. *b.* His reflexion on that book of the Liberties of the Gallican Church. IV. 100. *a.*

Salluſt, the lie given to one of his maxims by the manner in which Sanches King of Caſtile exerciſed an uſurped authority. II. 378. *b.* How he was treated at Fauſta's houſe. IV. 201. *a.* Has been cenſured perhaps too ſeverely for making uſe of old words. 831. *a.* It does not become him to declaim againſt the corruption of his age. V. 420. *a. b.* Why Accurſius called him his countryman. I. 69. *a.*

Salmaſius has learnedly corrected an epigram inſerted in Plutarch. I. 205. *a.* Is often miſled by truſting too much to his memory. 369. *b.* Cenſures Solinus for one blunder, and falls himſelf into another. 424. *b.* 425. *a.* A great miſtake which he mentions. 656. *b.* Did not anſwer Blondel's treatiſe concerning Pope Joan, after he had promiſed to do it. II. 25. *a.* Was of opinion that Æſchylus is more obſcure than the Holy Scripture. 827. *a.* His contradictions with reſpect to Grotius. III. 246. *b.* 247. *a.* To whom he was a ſcare-crow. 310. *b.* He chuſes rather to reaſon ill than to loſe his diſcoveries. 319. *a.* How one of his adverſaries boaſted that he had made him loſe his life. IV. 217. *a. b.* His Latin verſes on a thing that has been ſaid of monkeys. 600. *a. b.* He believed that Brutes were endowed with reaſon. 912. *a.* An examination of what he ſaid touching the edition of Anaſtaſius by the Jeſuits of Mayence. 726. *b.* 727. *a. b.*

Salmeron accuſed of Plagiariſm. III. 44. *b.*

Salmuthus (Henricus) cenſures a very obſcene epigram of John Antony Campanus. II. 293. *b.*

Salt of Agrigentum, its qualities, and the uſe that St Auguſtin made of them. III. 157. *b.* 158. *a.*

Saltatricula, that word of Aulus Gellius is very ill rendered Graſhopper. III. 491. *b.*

Saluces (the Marquiſate of) is a part of Piemont. II. 16. *a.*

Salvian, his opinion touching the impurities of the ſtage. V. 40. *b.*

Samaël falls in love with Eve. II. 855. *b.*

Sammarthani ſuppreſs in their *Gallia Chriſtiana* the elogy which they had made on the Abbot of St Cyran. V. 16. *b.*

Sammarthanus (Abelius) writes an elogy on the family of Schomberg. V. 83. *n. (b).*

Samos, iſland, why called Parthenia. III. 635. *a.*

Samoſatenians ſolidly confuted by Laſicius. III. 732. *a. b.*

Sanar, Sultan of Egypt, diſpoſſeſſed by Dorgan. IV. 383.

Sancerre, the memorable Hiſtory of that town by John de Leri. III. 781.

Sanchez counts it a venial ſin to ſee one's own nudities, and a mortal ſin to ſee thoſe of another perſon. I. 112. *b.*

Sanction: there were as many abuſes under the Pragmatic ſanction, as there have been ſince the Concordate. IV. 766. *a. b.*

Sanctuary, whether it be more exempt from the caprices of fortune, than other things. I. 607. *b.*

Sancus, whoſe were certain monuments that were to be ſeen in his temple. V. 288. *b.* 289. *a.*

Sanders, his calumnies againſt Anne Bullen. II. 56. *a. b.* 57. *a.*

Sandis (Edwin) quoted. I. 109. *b. n.* (35.) 730. *b. n.* (46).

Sandoval is not comparable to Thuanus in the praiſes which he beſtows on Charles V. II. 442.

Sannazarius, his Poem intituled *Chriſti Lamentatio* is printed with notes by Daniel d'Auge. I. 562. *n.* (*d*).

Sanſeverino (Robert de) invites Auguſtin Niphus to Salerno. IV. 378. *a.*

Sanſon (Nicolas) his miſtake touching the capital of Ponthieu. I. 10. *a.* Attacked by Father Labbe. *ibid. b.* 11. *a. b.* Cenſured on a point of Chronology, in relation to Pytheas. IV. 677. *a. b.* Anſwers Father Labbe. *ibid. b.*

Santeüil writes verſes which bring him into a quarrel with the Jeſuits and Janſeniſts. I. 497. *a. b.* 498. *a.*

Saocondarius, how his chief city was called. II. 628. *a.*

Sapores, King of Perſia, his ſon dies in the arms of Manes. IV. 91. *a.*

Saracens, how vaſt their dominion was. I. 14. *a.* A prodigious victory which they obtained over the Chriſtians. 15. *a.* They honour a ſtone, which they call Brachtan. 124. *a.* Are defeated before Thoulouſe. II. 850. Deſtroy the city of Aix. *ibid. b.* Spilt leſs blood in all their perſecutions of the Chriſtians, than was ſpilt in the maſſacres alone on St Bartholomew's day. IV. 39. *a.*

Sarah, her diſſimulation commended by the Fathers of the Church. I. 38. *a. b.* It is pretended that ſhe was a converter. 45. *a.* Compared with the wife of Dejotarus. II. 630. *a. b.*

Saramita (Andrew) an impious fanatic. III. 281. *b.*

Sarraſin, his famous ſonnet. II. 857. *a.* Quoted. III. 366. *a. n.* 38. The preface to his works by Peliſſon is a maſter-piece. IV. 538.

Sarravius ſuppreſſes a circumſtance that was not favourable to the Count de Coligni. III. 304. *a.* Concludes, after a careful examination of the manuſcript Anaſtaſius in the King's library, that the ſtory of the She-Pope had been tacked to it. IV. 726. *a.*

Satires want commentaries from the time that they are compoſed. I. 35. *b. n.* ‡. It is a favour done to the writers of them, when they are believed upon their oath, confirmed by witneſſes. 343. *a.* The fatal effects which they produce. 426. *a.* III. 464. *a. b.* 465. *a. b.* Satire may eaſily be metamorphoſed into Hiſtory. II. 160. *b.* 161. *a.* Is one of the plagues of Hiſtory. IV. 142. *b.* Who were the firſt authors of ſatire. III. 905. *b.* They publiſh a thouſand things in them, which it was impoſſible ſhould have come to the writers knowledge. V. 755. A general anſwer to thoſe perſons who complain of the ſatires that are publiſhed in Holland. *ibid. and* 756. As to the profit which may ariſe from the art of being formidable by ſatire, it is a diſputable point. 225. *b.*

Satirical: it is a ſatirical ſtroke to mention the particulars of ſome peoples eſtates. II. 543. *b.*

Satiriſts are too ſparing in the article of ſpy-money. I. 682. *b.* Neceſſary qualifications for a good ſatiriſt. 727. *a.* They often vent ſlanders which may very eaſily be confuted. II. 56. *a. b.* 57. *a.* Their impudence in lying. 136. *a.* Their method. 148. *a.* They ſhould not be let go unpuniſhed. 528. *a. b.* Ought to be no leſs ſubject to the laws of reaſoning than others. IV. 136. *a.* Do not pretend to any exactneſs. *ibid. b.* Are not to be depended upon. *ibid.* It often happens that magiſtrates who neglect to puniſh them, are puniſhed for their unconcernedneſs. 251. *a.* They put criminal interpretations upon the moſt pious actions. V. 459. *b.* See *Calumny.* A true picture of theſe writers. 756. All legiſlators concur in puniſhing them ſeverely. 758. They would attempt upon the lives of their adverſaries, if they had the ſame opportunities which they have to attempt upon their honour. 765.

Saturn was dealt with according to the *Lex Talionis,* in being dethroned. III. 646. *a.* His leudneſs. IV. 617. *a. b.* He eſcapes to the mountain Niphates, and kills there the ſhepherd Caucaſus, from whom that mountain afterwards took its name. II. 82. *b.*

Saul, King of Iſrael it was thought ſtrange that he did not know David, when he was going out againſt Goliah. II. 606. *a.*

Savoy, one of its Dukes ſpent an hundred thouſand crowns to find inchanters. II. 243. *b.* There is a diſpute concerning the precedence between the Duke of Savoy and the Republic of Venice. III. 216.

Savoy (Charles Emanuel Duke of) a medal which he cauſed to be ſtruck. III. 406. *b.* 407. *a.*

Savoyard (the) a famous ſinger of the Pontneuf. II. 600. *a. b.* V. 540. *b.*

Saurin (Elias) quoted. I. 107. *a. n.* (12). 501. *b. n.* (9), (10). 502. *a. n.* (11), (12). Cenſured. V. 155. *a. b.* His diſpute about the principle of faith. I. 706. *a. b. n.* (12), *, (13), (14). 707. *a. n.* (18), (19), (21). 708. *b. n.* (28). What he ſays of invincible ignorance. IV. 875. *b. n.* (10), (12), (13). The particulars of his diſpute with Jurieu. V. 642. *a. b. to* 648. *a. b.* Declared orthodox by the Synodal aſſembly of Brill, notwithſtanding Jurieu's accuſations. 800.

Saxon (John) Rector of the univerſity of Wittenberg, publiſhes in a Programma, lies unworthy the Gazette. III. 93. *a.*

Saxons: Lotharius grants leave to thoſe Saxons who were called Stellingi, to make profeſſion of the Pagan religion. V. 233. *and a. b.* 234. *a. b.*

Scaliger (Julius Cæſar) does not ſpeak in a very complaiſant manner of the Neapolitans. I. 237. *b.* 238. *a.* The judgment which he paſſed on Cardan. II. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* He is cenſured for writing only to gratify a ſpirit of contradiction. 321. *b.* 322. *a.* And for ſeveral other conſiderable faults. *ibid.* The original of his hatred to Dolet. 683. *a.* A book which he boaſted to have read. 765. *a. b.* His extreme warmth in defending the Ciceronians. 804. *b.* 805. *a. b.* 806. *a. b.* He valued himſelf upon having been in the wars. 805. *b.* The Hiſtory of his orations againſt Eraſmus. *ibid.* 806. *a.* He did not well underſtand Horace's meaning, with reſpect to Laberius's Mimes. III. 695. *b.* His invective againſt the government of Athens. IV. 582. *b.* In the letters of his naturalization he bears only the character of a Phyſician born at Verona. V. 463. *n.* (*c*). *and a. b.* Confounds himſelf in ſpeaking of thoſe who ſurround the world eaſtward and weſtward. 781. Confutes Cardan's book *de Subtilitate.* II. 322. *b.*

Scaliger (Joſeph) has collected a great deal of curious learning touching Jacob's Stone. I. 124. *b.* Every thing that he ſays is not to be depended upon. 139. *b.* His temerity in judging of the thoughts of the heart. 731. *b.* His prediction proves falſe. 794. *a. b.* His inattention when he computed the weight of the Coloſſus of Rhodes. II. 390. *a.* He commits groſs faults in ſpeaking of Helen. III. 371. *b.* 372. *a.* Is called the top-critic. 837. *b.* His judgment was not always to be relied upon. *ibid.* Being ready to give up the ghoſt he declares the abhorrence he had for an affected ſtyle. 846. *b.* A thought of his examined. IV. 331. *b.* He is miſtaken when he ſays that after the paſſage of the Rubicon Cæſar went no more into Gaul. II. 394. *b.* Tells a ridiculous ſtory. 707. *b.* He relates things of his father, which are confuted by public and original pieces. 805. *b.* 806. *a. b.* Is to be commended for ſuppreſſing certain of his father's letters againſt Eraſmus. *ibid. a.* Has writ about the ſquaring of the circle. III. 50. *a.* Cenſured by Father Morin and Mr de Mauſſac, for what he ſays of Raymond Martini. IV. 168. *b.* He writes with his own hand ſeveral groſs abuſes in Junius's books. III. 627. *b.* What Scioppius reproached him with. V. 99. *b.* Intrapped by Muret. 394. *a. b.* 395. *a. b.* 396. *a. b.*

Scaligerana, there is little exactneſs in that book. II. 617. *a. b.* Several things are miſerably confounded in it. IV. 727. *b.*

Scandalize: people are not ſcandalized enough at the writings which authors publiſh againſt one another. I. 244. *b.*

Scanderbeg lays ſiege to Belgrade. IV. 313. *a.*

Scarron quoted on ludicrous ſubjects. I. 315. *a. b.* III. 644. *b.* 645. *a.*

Scazons, a kind of verſe, who was the inventer of them. III. 464. *a.*

Sceptics, Scepticiſm. See *Pyrrhoniſts Pyrrhoniſm.*

Scepuz, the Baron Gregory Horwath, ſets up a new college there. III. 218. *a.*

Scevola (Mutius) his jeſt. I. 185. *a. b.*

Schedia, a town, where ſituated. IV. 342. *a.*

Schegkius, his diſputes with Simon Simonius. V. 151. *b.*

Schenk ſurprized by the Count of Embden. III. 820. *b.*

Schluſſelburg (Conrad) calls the change from a Lutheran to a Calviniſt, apoſtacy. III. 841. *a.* Quoted. I. 790. *a. n.* (27). III. 600. *b.* V. 258. *a. n.* (26).

Scholars, maſters who deſire to have a great many, ſhould not ſet up for authors. I. 337. *a.* A ſcholar who has wit, and loves diſputing, gives a great deal of trouble to his maſter. II. 622. *a.* Formerly a ſcholar, that learned Philoſophy before he was twenty, was thought very forward. III. 26. *a.* A good leſſon to encourage their ſtudying hard. IV. 103. *b.*

Scholaſtic: who among the Greeks began to handle a ſubject according to the Scholaſtic method. II. 587. *b.* 588. *a.*

Σχολαϛικὸς in Ariſtotle's time, was not uſed to ſignify a Scholar, a Diſciple, or a Student. I. 465. *b.*

Schomberg, his memorial. III. 411. *a. b.*

Schomberg (the Marſhal de) a ſtory that is told of him. IV. 676. *b.*

Schoockius (Martin) proſecuted by Des Cartes for groſs ſcandal. I. 327. *a.* Cenſured for a miſtake. 618. *b.* Quoted on the ſubject of dancing. V. 23. *a. n.* (63), (65), (67), (68). 24. *b. n.* (81), (82), (25). *a. b. n.* (83), (84), (86).

School-maſters, who did not become Pedants. II. 183. *b.* The ſervitude of their condition. V. 738. *b.* 739. *a.* A School-maſter, who does a courageous action. II. 645. *a.*

School-men: what Democritus and Epicurus call εἴδωλα, the School-men call intentional ſpecies. II. 388. *a.* Religion does not ſtand in need of their Jargon, for the defence of its fundamental doctrines. III. 196. *a.* Their chimerical qualities baniſhed. 790. *a.* They debate very needleſs queſtions and things that never happen. V. 41. *a.* Retort againſt the Carteſians, the arguments about ſubſtantial forms. 116. *b.* They only ſtudied the art of raiſing objections and anſwering them. 339. *a.* Their wrangles neglected by OEcolampadius. IV. 400. Their ſubtleties on Tranſubſtantiation, the Trinity, &c. V. 819. Have more confounded than explained the myſteries of religion. *ibid.* The ſtrange perplexity to which the Abbot Faydit has reduced them. 620. *n.* (30). Their anſwers only ſerve to render difficulties more obſcure. 821.

Schools, thoſe who teach and diſpute moſt in them, are not the moſt ſtrongly convinced of the truths of Chriſtianity. I. 51. *a. b.* In order to raiſe a great ſchool, a man muſt apply himſelf entirely to his profeſſion. 337. *a.*

Scotch: a Scotchman beaten for Paſſive Obedience. II. 286. *a. b.*

Scotland delivered from the Daniſh yoke, by the valour of a countryman. III. 332. How many Kings have reigned there, and what treatment they met with. 669. *a.* The Catholics of that country form a deſign. II. 577.

Schottus (Andrew) ridicules the Frenchmen for eſteeming Guevara's works. III. 270. *b.*

Schucker cuts off his brother's head. I. 286. *a.*

Schultingius (Cornelius) publiſhes a letter of Broughton to Theodore Beza, and ſeveral other things. II. 151. *a. b.*

Schurman, the modeſty of that lady. IV. 148. *and a. b.*

Science or *Learning:* better a little of it than no health. III. 342. *a.*

Sciences: Lactantius pretends to have demonſtrated, that there is no ſcience in men. I. 411. *a.* An attempt to run down all ſcience, is the boldeſt that ever was formed. 412. *a.* The trial of wits proper for the ſciences, a book of John Huarte. III. 528. *and a. b.* See *Knowledge* and *Learning.*

Scientia Media does not mend the matter againſt the objections of the Manichees. IV. 518. *a. b.* A reflexion upon that head. 519. *a.* How it was looked upon by Pope Clement VIII. 824.

Scioppius acts the part of a Divine unſeaſonably, with reſpect to a witty ſaying that is aſcribed to Charles V. II. 438. *a.* Rallies Strada for ſaying that the whip of Charles V, is yet ſtained with his blood. 439. *b.* Inſults the two Scaligers. V. 99. *b.* Was very ſatirical. II. 817. *b.* 818. *a. b.* 819. *a. b.* His tricks and plagiariſms with reſpect to Giſanius. III. 161. *a. b.* His exaggerations. 169. *b.* His blaſphemy againſt the Holy Scripture. 500. *a.* His jeſt upon a part of Peter Deza's ſermon. 896. *a.* He writes a moſt abuſive ſatire againſt King James I. IV. 795. *b.* Is traduced by Ogier. V. 91. *a. b.*

Scipio, Abderame is compared to him in point of continence. I. 14. *b.*

Scythians, what they told Alexander. IV. 572. *b.* A ſtupid people, needed only to deſpiſe pleaſures, or not to know them. V. 814.

Scythianus, an Arabian, his impieties. IV. 90. *a. b.* 91. *a.*

Sclavonian: the Bible tranſlated into the Sclavonian tongue by George Dalmatin, and Adam Bohoritſch. II. 585. Truberus was the firſt who taught the art of writing in it. V. 405. A book which he tranſlated into that language. *ibid.*

Scotiſts, their opinion concerning the nature of Univerſals, is only a diſguiſed Spinoziſm. I. 26. *a.* II. 412. *b.* 413. *a. b.*

Scotus, his ſubtilties deſpiſed by OEcolampadius. IV. 400.

Scourge: who was called *the Scourge of Princes*, and for what reaſon. I. 435. *and a. b.*

Scribere, what is to be underſtood by that word. I. 351. *a. b.*

Scripture (Holy): a doctrine, which attacks the authority of it. I. 106. *a. b.* 107. *a.* Alabaſter's method of explaining it. 174. *a. b.* 175. *a.* Whether the materials and principles of all arts and ſciences may be fetched from it. 234. *and a. b.* Whether in the intention of the Church of Rome, the Laity were excluded from reading it. 495. *a.* The ſimplicity of its ſtyle, diſguſts St Auguſtin. 563. Whether the Laity are obliged to underſtand it in the originals. 599. *a. b.* According to certain Controverſiſts, the interpretation of it ſhould be accommodated to the time. 616. *b.* 617. *a. b.* Whether the Divinity of it can be proved. 706. *a. b.* 707. *a.* Bedell ſets on foot a tranſlation of it into the Iriſh language. 718. *a.* Salmaſius declares that the Holy Scripture is leſs obſcure than Æſchylus. II. 827. *a.* Unworthily treated by ſome Roman Catholic Doctors. III. 500. *a. b.* A thought of the Hiſtorian Peter Matthieu, concerning the manner of teaching it. 536. *a.* How a viſionary would have had it read to the people. 672. *a. b.* 673. *a.* It is not always to be explained according to the rules of Grammar. IV. 857. *a.* Has been handled by the Chriſtians, much after the ſame manner as Juſtinian's Code. *ibid.* There are certain things and expreſſions in it, which will confound the deepeſt Metaphyſicians. 876. *a. b.* What freethinkers ſay of the ſpirit that dictated the Holy Scripture. V. 35. *a.* Is not afraid of ſhocking modeſty, by expreſſing things naturally, and without circumlocution. 133. *a.* See *Bible.* A ſingular example, to prove that the letter of it killeth. IV. 723. *a. b.* The Socinians ſhould be attacked by it, ſince they acknowledge its authority. V. 820. Should be the principle of the diſputes among Chriſtians. 830. The variations and corruptions which the Heretics have introduced into the manuſcripts of the Holy Scripture. III. 733.

Scriverius, what he cites from Scaliger. V. 395. *a. b.* &*c.*

Scuderi, his complaints that his penſion was ill paid. III. 176. *a. b.*

Scuderi (Madam de) writ all her works out of her own head. II. 778. *b.* Delivered romance from an œconomy injurious to her ſex, and to decorum in general. III. 867. *a.* What ſhe ſays of authors who love to dedicate their books. IV. 843. *b.* Is called the Sappho of our days. V. 44. *b.*

Scullion: the ſtory of a Scullion's converſation with Lewis XI, King of France. III. 803. *a.*

Sculptors who were never pleaſed with their own works. V. 134. *a. b.*

Scultetus was extreamly deſirous to ſee the Lutherans and Reformed re-united. IV. 681. *b.*

Sea, whether it ought to be ſubject, as well as the earth, to the dominion of ſome States. III. 217. *a.*

Sea of Hiſtories. See *Mare Hiſtoriarum.*

Sebaſta changes its name into that of Eleuſa. I. 421. *b.* A conjecture concerning that alteration. *ibid.*

Seckendorf, a particular which he found concerning Aleander. I. 215. *b.*

Secret: a ſecret diſcovered, which was pleaſing to many. I. 36. *b.* It is a great misfortune to know ſecrets that are diſagreeable to one's ſovereign. IV. 443. *a. b. &c.* The beſt courſe a man can take is to behave, as if he had entirely forgot them. 444. *b.*

Sect: a new ſect think themſelves happy at firſt, if they can obtain liberty of conſcience, but they ſoon want to be upon an equal footing with others, and laſt of all to be maſters. I. 13. *b.* 14. *a. b.* II. 121. *a. b.* Nothing is more common than to ſee perſons, who have fled for their religion, ringing the alarm againſt the ſects. III. 758.

Sectaries, when they quarrel, hate one another more than they hate thoſe from whom they have ſeparated themſelves. I. 198. *b.*

Sects, a prejudice which prevails in all ſects. I. 51. *and a. b.* A ſect may very ſoon become unlike its founder. III. *b.* The means employed to hinder their growing powerful, are pretty much alike every where. 288. *a. b.* 289. *a. b.* 290. *a.* Why tolerated by the States-General. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* The deſire of revenge may induce a man to embrace a ſect. III. 29. *b.* Sects that are tolerated, have generally this injuſtice done to them, that they are ſuſpected of ill deſigns. 42. *b.* It is natural for a ſect that is ill uſed, to rejoyce at the troubles in which the State is involved. 396. *b.* 397. *a.* There is no ſect which entirely triumphs over the others. IV. 908. *b.* They change their ſpirit and maxims, in proportion as they change their ſtate and condition. V. 454. *a. b.* 473. *a.* The diviſions that reigned among thoſe which are ſeparated from Popery. 450. *b.* Several ſects are formed among the Proteſtants at Lyons. 483. *and b.* Viret employs the authority of the Papiſts to curb them. *ibid. and n.* (25).

Secular Games, when the fifth were celebrated. II. 397. *a.* Voſſius affirms without any foundation, that they were celebrated in the beginning of the VIIIth century of Rome. 396. *b.* 397. *a.*

Seditions: a ſedition quelled by the ſilence of a Pythagorean. I. 379. *a. b.* 380. *a.* What they are in Republics. V. 62. *n. (f).*

Seditious: how criminal ſeditious perſons are in the ſight of God. IV. 488. *a. b.* The Catholics and Proteſtants mutually accuſe one another of a ſeditious ſpirit. V. 89. *a. b.*

Seed, whether that of all living creatures be animated. V. 114. *a. b.* 115. *a.*

Seem: perſons who rather choſe to be virtuous, than to ſeem virtuous. I. 278. *b.* 279. *a. b.* II. 420. *b.* 421. *a.* III. 697. *a. b.* 729. *and a. b.*

Segrais quoted. V. 488. *a. n.* (39). 490. *n.* (*d*).

Seguin (Peter) a famous Phyſician in the faculty of Paris. I. 172.

Segur-Pardaillan deputed to the Proteſtant Princes. II. 142. *b.* 143. *a. b. &c.* He revered Brocard as a ſecond St Paul. 144. *b.*

Sejanus, a fatality which was ſaid to attend a horſe of that name. II. 348. *b.*

Sejanus kept up a criminal correſpondence with the wife of Druſus. II. 718. *a. b.* His artifices. 719. *a. b.* 720. *a.* Is praiſed immoderately. IV. 494. *b.* 495. *a.*

Seine, the god of that river curſes the Marſhal d'Ancre. II. 543. *a.*

Self-murther. III. 911. *a. b.* 912. *a. b.* 913. *a. b.* A furious doctrine concerning it, and the murther of our neighbours. V. 14. *a. b.* Authorized by the laws of a country. 627. *a. b.* 628. *a. b.*

Selim, Emperor of the Turks, was a Painter. IV. 387. *b.* 308. *a.*

Seller, we ought not to take advantage of his ignorance, when he does not know the juſt price of his merchandize. III. 440. *a. b.* A law to puniſh thoſe ſellers who conceal what they ought to acquaint the buyers with. I. 13.

Selvaggi (Ricciarda de') we are obliged to her for the preſervation of Cinus's *Canzoniere.* II. 508. *n. (d).*

Semiramis was prodigiouſly laſcivious. I. 523. *a.* Whether ſhe built Babylon. 596.

Senate (Roman) diveſts two conſuls of their office, for the diſreſpect which they had ſhewn to a letter from them. II. 291. *a.* Makes Cæſar proud by the honours which they confer upon him, and then hate him for being proud. 422. *a.* Was ſubject to all the laws made by the people. III. 490. *a. b.*

Senators cenſured for appearing in an unbecoming dreſs. II. 384. *b.* 385. *a. b.* Deprived of all their tribunals of juſtice. 711. *b.* Reſtored to the poſſeſſion of them. 712. *b.*

Senef: particulars of the battle of Senef. V. 190. *b.* 191. *a.*

Seneca makes uſe of a thought of Agathon. I. 126. *b.* How he defines probity. 185. An excellent rule which he preſcribed. 278. *b.* 279. *a.* A thought of that Philoſopher. 453. *a.* Is cenſured for having aſcribed to Ariſtides what he ſhould have applied to Phocion. 460. *b.* Recommended poverty in the midſt of opulency. 751. *b.* A judicious criticiſm of his. II. 483. *a. b.* 484. *a.* He looked upon what the antients have ſaid of Jupiter's thunderbolt as a pious fraud. 573. *b.* His anachroniſm, with reſpect to Alexander, and his converſation with Diogenes. 667. *a.* What he ſays of Ephorus, and in general of all Hiſtorians. 771. *b.* 772. *a.* Quoted. 847. *b.* 848. *a. n.* (31). How he could lay it down for matter of fact, that no Roman had applied himſelf to write fables. 833. *b.* His rules concerning the chaſtity of women. III. 601. *b.* 602. *a.* In what caſe he thinks a man commits adultery in lying with his own wife. IV. 540. *a.* He has refuted himſelf in his writings, as to what he ſays of the ſouls of beaſts. 549. *b.* According to him, none can be a good man without the aſſiſtance of God. 573. *a. b.* He laughs at the great number of books which had been writ on the Sophiſm called *the Liar.* 617. *a. b.* Diſplays all the degrees of Scepticiſm. V. 607. *b.* 608. *a.* Some fine maxims which he lays down. II. 259. *a. b.* His works tranſlated into French by Matthew de Chalvet. 430. *and a.* The judgment that was made of that tranſlation. *ibid. a.*

Seneca (Chriſtian): a good piece of Joſeph Hall under that title. III. 345.

Seneſcay, Prevoſt de l'Hotel; his behaviour to Preſident de la Place. IV. 682. *b.* 683. *a.*

Senſation: why cuſtom blunts the edge of our ſenſations. IV. 514. *a. b.* If it be a modification of body, then all bodies are ſenſible ſubſtances. II. 658. *a. b.* 660. *b.* 661. *a. b.* It cannot be the effect of the ſole diſpoſition of the organs. *ibid. b.* Is diſtinct from all the modifications of body that are come to our knowledge. *ibid. and* 779. *b.* Whether it depends upon our free will. V. 764. 765.

Senſe (common) there are perſons who loſe it with regard to ſome things, and who nevertheleſs ſhew their judgment through all the reſt of their conduct. V. 405. *b.*

Senſe (Myſtic) perſecution makes a man wonderfully clear-ſighted in diſcovering it. III. 772. *b.*

Senſes: whether the pleaſures of the ſenſes are not ſpiritual. II. 781. *a. b.* Whether the evidence of the ſenſes is proved by theſe words of JESUS CHRIST, *Handle me, and ſee.* V. 614. *b.* 615. *a.*

Sentences ſtrongly affect the mind. I. 461. *a.* Should be incorporated with the thread of the diſcourſe in an imperceptible manner. V. 327. *and b.*

Sepher Jezirah, a book of great weight with the Cabaliſts. I. 173. *a.*

Sequar, a ſtrange accident occaſioned by the pronunciation of that word in a tragedy. I. 175.

Serarius (Nicolas), a Jeſuit; Broughton communicated to him copies of very harſh letters which he writ to Beza, with full liberty to publiſh them. II. 150. *b.* 151. *a. b.*

Serarius (Petrus) depoſed from the miniſtry for his errors. IV. 123. *a.*

Series, diſcourſes ſuppoſed to have paſſed in evening converſations; a book writ by William Bouchet. II. 103.

II. 103. There is a good deal of learning in it, mixed with many jokes, puns, and groſs obſcenities. *ibid.*

Serena (Stilicon's wife) marries her two daughters to the Emperor, who both die maids. III. 482. *a. b.* 483. *a. b.*

Sermons, what Peter Aretin ſaid of them. I. 436. *a.* What kind of ſermons are moſt approved by the Proteſtants. II. 520. *b.* Bloody ſermons. III. 874. *a. b.* Sermons preached upon the letter O. IV. 828. *b.* The great ſucceſs of Savonarola's ſermons. V. 57. *a. b.*

Serpents: divers reflexions on the ſerpent which tempted our firſt parents. II. 851. *a. b.* 852. *a. b.* A faculty that is aſcribed to them. IV. 182. *a.* Serpents that grew tame and familiar with women and children. 403. *b.* Several have paſſed for the fathers of ſeveral great men. 407. *b.* 408. *a. b.* A ſingular ſtory about a piece of money that was changed into a ſerpent. III. 487. *a. b.*

Serranus (Joannes), a falſe name taken by Francis Lambert. III. 709. *a. b.*

Serres (John de) adds a particular to the ſtory of Pope Joan. IV. 731. *b.*

Serres (Lewis de) tranſlates into French John de Renou's tracts. IV. 864. *and a. b.* Was of Dauphiné. *ibid. b.*

Servant-Maids: perſons that have married their own ſervant-maids. I. 446. *a. b.* II. 139. *b.* 140. *a.* 618. *b.* V. 403. *b.* Are more liable to be debauched than other women, and are likewiſe in great danger of being puniſhed. IV. 503. *a.* One that lies with her maſter, is not puniſhed, but rewarded. II. 508. *a.*

Servetus, in what year he was burnt at Geneva for his Hereſies. IV. 388. *a.* Strange conſequences are drawn from an axiom of his concerning the preſence of God. III. 100.

Services, that cannot be rewarded, produce ingratitude. II. 737. *a. b.*

Servien (Mr) loſes his temper in an aſſembly of the States-General. II. 153. *a.*

Servin (Lewis) Advocate-General of the Parliament of Paris, treated in a brutal manner. II. 459. *a.* Cenſured for diſplaying too much reading and learning in his pleadings. 106. *a. b.*

Seſterce, its value reduced to the French Coin. II. 837. *a. b.*

Sethians, Heretics, vented an Apocalypſe of Abraham. I. 46. *a.*

Severus (the Emperor) complains to the Senate of the honours paid to Clodius Albinus. I. 395. *a.* What enquiries he chiefly made, when he reſolved to marry again. III. 603. *a.* Why he ſo patiently bore with his wife's leudneſs. 604. *b.*

Severus (Sulpicius) highly diſapproves the puniſhment of Heretics. III. 758. *a. b.*

Severity: the ſtrange ſeverity of a father to his own ſon. II. 343. *b.* 344. *a.* Different accounts of that matter. *ibid.*

Seville, when the admiralty was eſtabliſhed there. I. 362.

Sexes, a Monk that had both ſexes. V. 4. *b.* 5. *a.*

Sforza (Lewis) his wickedneſs and cruelty. I. 403. *b.* 404. *a.* He falls into the hands of the French. III. 811. *a. n.* (17). 814. *a.* Would have no ſoldier that ſet up for a wit in his ſervice. IV. 460. *a.*

Sforza (Bona), Queen-Dowager of Poland, dies in poverty and infamy. I. 405. *b.* Rewards a dedication with a penſion of 300 crowns. II. 462.

Sforza (Galeazzo) aſſaſſinated, by whom, and for what. III. 715. *and a. b.* 716. *and a. b.*

Sforza (Blanche) is killed by a fall from her horſe while ſhe was a hunting. III. 530. *a.*

Shame is no leſs ſubject than other things to the caprice of the faſhion. III. 453. *a. b.* 454. *a. b.*

She-Pope, if ever the Church of Rome ſhould make one, ſhe will find her apology ready drawn up in Father Mainferme's works. III. 63. *a.*

Ship: what the antients ſaid of the tree that ſerved to build the firſt ſhip. IV. 363. *a.*

Shipwreck: it is pleaſant to ſee a ſhipwreck, which we are not in fear of. IV. 34. *b.*

Shock: men know not whom they ſhock when they reprehend the ignorance of thoſe, who would paſs for artiſts in the preſence of greater maſters. I. 377.

Shunamite: how we are to underſtand the Hiſtory of the Shunamite, according to St Jerome. III. 281. *a. b.* 869. *a.*

Siam (the King of) is pulled down from the throne for having too much favoured the Chriſtian miſſionaries. I. 13. *a. and n.* (6).

Siameſe acknowledge no Deity, though they believe the apparition of ſpirits. IV. 939. *a.* By what motives they may be prevailed upon to embrace virtue and fly from vice. V. 180. *a. b.* 181. *a. b.* 182. *a.* They believe that Jesus Christ and Thevathat are the ſame. 183. *b.*

Sybil of Cumæ tempted by Apollo. II. 339. *a.*

Sicharbas marries his niece Dido, and is killed by his brother-in-law Pygmalion. IV. 642. *and a.*

Sick People, the tricks which are put upon them ſometimes. III. 614. *b.* Whether we ought to pray to God for their recovery, when ſickneſs makes them better men. IV. 487. *b.*

Sickneſs: there are people who put off believing in God till ſickneſs preſſes them. II. 12. *b.* 13. *a.* 647. *b.* 648. *a. b.* 649. *a.*

Siege: a cuſtom which has been obſerved for a long time with reſpect to Kings, who aſſiſt at a ſiege. III. 718. *a. b.*

Sigebert, what he ſays of the She-Pope. IV. 728. *b.* 729. *a. b.* It is not to be found in ſome manuſcripts. 728. *b.* Spanheim owns that it is a parentheſis, which may be taken away without injuring the thread of the diſcourſe. 729. *a. b.*

Sigeth beſieged and taken by Sultan Solyman, in the ſight of the Emperor. III. 780. *a.*

Sigiſmond (Auguſtus) gives over his project of a reformation in Poland. III. 848. 849. Whether he baniſhed all the Antitrinitarians out of Poland. 901.

Sigiſmond (John) embraces the doctrine of the Socinians. II. 17. *a.*

Silence quells a ſedition. I. 379. *a. b.* 380. *a.* Juſtified by ſhameful nonſenſe. 758. *a.* Whether we ought to keep ſilence, when we have to do with people of an impetuous temper. II. 195. *b.* It is the moſt difficult thing in the world to an author that is attacked. IV. 839. *a.*

Silenus, what he thought of life. V. 414. *a. b.*

Silk-worms, who invented the art of ſpinning their production. V. 627. *a.*

Sylla ſends Apellicon's library to Rome. I 335. *a.* His library-keeper permits the Bookſellers to get Ariſtotle's works tranſcribed. *ibid. b.* What he ſaid of Cæſar. II. 417. *a.* Though he was very far from Atheiſm, he paid no regard to things ſacred, when his intereſt was concerned. 419. *a.* He knew nothing of the gallantries of his wife, when they were the town-talk of Athens. III. 382. *a.* Treats the city of Athens very harſhly, and for what reaſon. IV. 200. Boldly tranſgreſſes the Sumptuary laws which he himſelf had enacted. 202. Thought fit to aſſume the ſirname of Fortunate. V. 366. *b.* 367. *a.*

Syllogiſm, what is the foundation of it. II. 327. *b.* Carneades ſtrongly oppoſed it. *ibid.* Chryſippus undermined the foundation of it. 494. *b.* 495. *a.*

Sylva Nuptialis, the Hiſtory of that book. IV. 358. *and a. b.* 359. *and a. b.*

Sylvanus (Plautius) being accuſed of the murther of his wife, puts himſelf to death, in order to eſcape condemnation. V. 516. His wife being accuſed of having occaſioned his diſtraction by witchcraft, is declared innocent. IV. 385. *and a. b.*

Sylveſter II, Pope, his genealogy. II. 240. *b.* 241. *a.*

Sylveſter of Florence, a Jacobin Friar, hanged with Savonarola, and for what reaſon. V. 64. 65.

Sylveſter de Laval, a Capuchin, reproaches the Proteſtants with their obſtinacy in the article of Pope Joan. IV. 739. *b.* 740. *a. b.*

Sylvius, a Chymiſt, condemned for his crimes. IV. 262. *b.* Cardinal Richelieu makes uſe of his writings. *ibid.*

Sylvius (Æneas) who was afterwards Pope under the name of Pius II, is the firſt who called the ſtory of the She Pope in queſtion, and that too very faintly. IV. 731. *and b.* 732. *a.* 710. *b.*

Similis, his epitaph. II. 430. *b.*

Simon (Richard) quoted concerning the Dutch tranſlation of the bible. I. 246. *a.* His judgment of St Auguſtin. 565. *a. b.* 566. *a.* And of le Fevre's commentaries

commentaries on the Bible. III. 48. *a. b.* And of a book of Father Petavius. IV. 601. *a. b.* What he ſays of the Benedictins. III. 126. *a. b.* 127. *a. b.* And of a pretended diſciple of Port-Royal. V. 178. *b.* 179. *a.* Quoted. IV. 77. *b. n.* (20), (22). 78. *b. n.* (26). 79. *a. n.* (32), (34). 391. *a. n.* (56). *& paſſim alibi.* Praiſed and afterwards abuſed by Jurieu. V. 802.

Simoneta adviſes the Pope not to ſend a new Legate to Trent, and why, III. 499. *a. b.*

Simonides, one of his ſayings. II. 726. *b.* IV. 654. *a. n.* (9).

Simonis Religio; a conjecture concerning that book. V. 151. *a.*

Sympathy: an inſtance of a ſurprizing ſympathy. III. 305. *b.* 306. *a.*

Simplicity without elegance is much better than a fine Latin ſtile which corrupts the ſenſe of the original. V. 60. *a.*

Simplicius, the difficulty about the origin of evil was thought by him to be of great importance. IV. 527. *b.* His reaſonings againſt two principles. V. 826.

Sin, a whole nation puniſhed for that of a particular perſon. I. 158. *a. b.* 159. *a.* What was Eve's firſt ſin. II. 856. *a. b.* 857. *a.* How the ſin of uncleanneſs is ſucceſsfully reſiſted. III. 64. *b.* Whether it be an accident of the ſoul. 558. *a. b.* The unnatural ſin. 612. *b.* The origin of ſin explained by a new hypotheſis. 904. *a.* The difficulty of finding the origin of it. IV. 513. *a. b.* 514. *a. b.* 515. *a. b.* 516. *a. b.* 517. *a.* What uſe is to be made of the diſpute on that ſubject. 519. *a.* There is no ſect which does not abhor the doctrine that makes God the author of ſin. 522. *b.* 523. *a. b.* The queſtion about the ſin of ignorance is ſurrounded with precipices on all ſides. 874. *a. b.* 875. *a. b.* People rather chuſe to commit it, than to diſoblige a Prince who can make or ruin their fortune. V. 811. See *Ignorance.*

Sin (Original) an explication not agreeable to that doctrine. II. 605. *a. b.* 606. *a.* A tenet which differs from the doctrine of Original Sin, in its circumſtances only. V. 412. *a. b. &c.*

Sin (Philoſophical) a maxim that would carry it to the utmoſt point. III. 705. *a.*

Sin againſt nature, who is ſaid to have been the firſt inventer of it. V. 325. *a.*

Sin: whether a man that ſins mortally, ceaſes to believe the truths of the Goſpel. II. 176. *a.*

Synagogue, a ſpecimen of its ceremonies. I. 96. *a. b.* What are the ſynagogues which the laws ſuffer the Jews to poſſeſs. III. 220. *a. b.*

Synagogue of Amſterdam is ſuppoſed to have writ a letter to Mr Jurieu. II. 175. *b.*

Syneſius, his inſtitution of a Chriſtian Prince tranſlated by Daniel d'Auge. I. 562. *a.*

Singers: a famous ſinger of the Pontneuf at Paris. II. 600. *b.* 601. *a.* How they lived in former times. III. 224. *a.*

Synod of Dort, its deciſion. IV. 64. *b.* 65. *a.* Its correſpondence with the court. V. 513. *b.* 514. *a. b.* The Arminians except againſt it. II. 793.

Synod (Walloon) complains to the Synod of the iſle of France, and for what. II. 583. *a. b.* No longer looks upon the doctrine of Univerſal Grace as a dangerous opinion, and why. 584. *b.*

Synodicon in Gallia Reformata, remarks on that book. I. 671. *a. b.*

Synods attempts made to ſtrip them of their authority. IV. 839. *b.* 840. *a.*

Synods of France; their decree relating to the Oriental tongues. I. 246. *b.* 247. *a.* There were four perſons in them, who formed what was called the Table. 265. *b.* The national Synod of Charenton gives a particular charge to its deputies, not to deliver their ſpeech to the King on their knees. 261. *a.* And after ſeveral conteſts an audience, ſuch as they deſired, was granted. *ibid.* A great difference between the Synod of Rochelle in the year. 1581. And that which was held at Middelburg in the ſame year. II. 144. *a.* Calvin refuſes to comply with the regulations of the Synod of Lauſanne. 264. *b.* The Synod of the iſle of France makes an act, forbidding all flights of imagination, in expounding the word of God. IV. 274. *b.*

Sinope, a city of Paphlagonia, and a city of Pontus at the ſame time. IV. 113. *b.*

Sionita (Gabriel) a Maronite, his quarrel with one of his brethren. II. 733. *a.* Whether it could be of any ſervice to Mr Claude in his diſpute with Mr Arnauld. *ibid. b.* 734. *a.* When he was a profeſſor at Paris, he had not three auditors, though his reputation was great in foreign countries. IV. 493. *a.*

Syracon cauſes Sanar to be aſſaſſinated, and makes himſelf maſter of Egypt. IV. 383.

Syracuſe, confuſions that happened there. III. 452. *a. b.* 467. *b.* 468. *a.*

Syracuſians put two tyrants to death. V. 365. *a.*

Syricius; Orichovius remonſtrates to Pope Paul III, the injuſtice of his law touching the celibacy of Prieſts. IV. 296. *a. b.* 411. *a. b.*

Sirmond (Father) what he called Blondel. II. 27. *a.* Whether he repented of having publiſhed a certain letter of Geoffroy of Vendôme. III. 66. *b.* 67. *a.* unjuſtly attacked by Mr Tollius, and defended by the Jeſuits. 853. *a. b.*

Syrnacham was an interpreter of dreams. I. 87.

Sirname, what was the uſe of it among the Romans. I. 357. *a.* Several families have taken their ſirname from ſome defect. 610. *a.*

Sirvela (Martin Vaſques) had a fine library at Seville. IV. 615. *n.* (*c*).

Siſenna, an Orator affected to make uſe of obſolete expreſſions. I. 63. *a. n.* (62).

Syſtem of the Church, that book fully juſtifies the Church of Rome. I. 476. *a. b.*

Syſtems: falſe ſyſtems are incoherent. I. 210. If we depart from the ſyſtem of a God who freely created the world, we muſt neceſſarily admit of a multiplicity of principles. II. 644. *a.* What it is that makes the ſyſtem of Atoms leſs abſurd than Spinoziſm. *ibid.* The uſefulneſs of the ſyſtem of occaſional cauſes to ſolve certain difficulties. 767. *b.* The inconveniences and motives of the reformation of ſyſtems. III. 863. *b.* They require two things to make them good. IV. 94. *a.* Their reaſonableneſs conſiſts in including nothing repugnant to evident ideas. V. 825.

Siſters, their hatred is more violent than that of brothers. II. 701. *a.*

Sixtus IV, Pope, one of his firſt cares after his exaltation. II. 97. *a. b.* His anſwer to Weſſelus, who cnly aſked him a copy of the Bible. V. 545. *b.* 546. *a.*

Sixtus V, a witty ſaying which is attributed to him. I. 34. *b.* His bull againſt the King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé. II. 71. *a. b.* His eſteem and deſire with reſpect to Queen Elizabeth. 758. *a. b.* How he ſtood affected to the King of Spain and the League. *ibid. b.* 759. *a.* What he ſaid of Henry III, III. 408. *b.* He choſe rather to countenance Henry IV, and Queen Elizabeth, than to ſuffer the King of Spain to grow too powerful. 568. *b.* Introduced the cuſtom of not ſending the hat to Cardinals newly elected. I. 604. *b.* Cauſes an offer to be made of the Infanta of Spain to James VI, King of Scotland, and upon what conditions. II. 577.

Sizé (Francis) tranſlates the Anatomical Hiſtory of Du Laurens. III. 745. *b.* Why that tranſlation has no figures. 746. *a.*

Slander does not even ſpare the greateſt actions. I. 14. *a.* That of Archilochus occaſions proverbs. 425. *a. b.* Every body has reaſon to be afraid of it, and why. 490. *b.* It is impoſſible that perſons of different ſexes ſhould have frequent converſations together, without being expoſed to it. II. 767. *a.* The mortal effects of it. III. 464. *a. b.* 465. *a. b.* It ſpares certain women. 601. *b.* 602. *a. b.* Great men deſpiſe it out of policy and a greatneſs of ſoul. IV. 569. *a. b.* It is a very difficult matter to confute ſlanders that have the air of probability. 692. *a. b.* Slanders ought not to be ſlightly credited. V. 334. *a. b.* See *Satires.* Princes that have deſpiſed them. 759. *&c.* They are to be feared when they are accompanied with witty ſayings. 759. Reflexions upon thoſe that are publiſhed againſt men who change their religion. 224. *b.* 225. *a. b.* 226. *a.*

Slanderers do not even ſpare themſelves ſometimes. I. 426. *a. b.*

Slaves, the practice of the antient Romans in enfranchiſing them. II. 100. *a*. Slaves who gave occaſion for a proverb. 302. *b*.

Sleidan juſtified againſt Father Maimbourg's accuſations. I. 721. *a. b*. His Hiſtory. V. 255. *b. n.* (10). 293. *a*. Cenſured on the head of Gauricus's country. II. 499. *b*. Confuted as to what he ſays of Gropper's having once inclined to Lutheraniſm. III. 240. *and a. b*. Tranſlates ill a paſſage of Philip de Comines. V. 60. *a*. Pezelius writes a Commentary intituled, *Mellificium Hiſtoricum*, on his treatiſe *de Quatuor Monarchiis*. IV. 606. *b*.

Sloane (Sir Hans) a Phyſician of London; his fine library. II. 477. *a. n.* (1).

Sloth offends Heaven, which does not hear the prayers of the ſlothful. I. 94. *b*.

Smalcalde (the League of) their army overcome by Charles V, at the battle of Mulberg. III. 878. *a*.

Smerdias ſhaved by an effect of jealouſy. I. 292. *a*.

Smetius (Martin) runs over all Italy, to make a collection of inſcriptions. III. 251. *a*. Is hanged at Bruſſels by the ſoldiers. *ibid. a. b*.

Smiglecius, a Jeſuit, unjuſtly ranked among the Socinians. III. 661. *a*.

Smith (Richard) Biſhop of Chalcedon, being ſent into England, is obliged to leave it, and for what reaſon. III. 665. *a*.

Smyrna, a woman of that city poiſons her huſband, and for what reaſon. II. 681. *a. b*. There is a wild cherry-tree there, which the Greeks ſay was the ſtaff of St Polycarp. III. 431. *a*.

Sober: whether a man may be ſo, and yet drink a great deal. I. 567. *a. b*. 568. *a*. V. 576. *a*.

Sobieſki, King of Poland, two or three hundred leagues off, deſtroys a book which was juſt ready to be put to the preſs. III. 680. *a*.

Societies: in all Societies there muſt be a tribunal, to give ſentence without appeal, in the diſputes of private perſons. IV. 65. *a*.

Societies (Religious) how they are kept pure. III. 903. *a. b*.

Socinianiſm begun to take root in Poland and Tranſilvania. II. 16. *a*. Why there is no reaſon to fear that Princes will embrace it. V. 171. *b*. It is only fit for ſome perſons. 172. *a. b*. Whence it took its riſe in Poland. 229. *a. b*. Thoſe who are for making uſe of reaſon in matters of Divinity, become ſuſpected of it. 817.

Socinians, the difficulties into which they involve themſelves by denying the creation. II. 789. *a. b*. Their ſect not calculated, to anſwer the objections of the Manichees, touching the origin of evil. IV. 419. *b*. By denying the Preſcience of God, they reduce him to a pitiful form of government, without removing the grand difficulty, which makes him the author of ſin. 518. *a*. They have drawn great advantages from a book of Father Petavius. 601. *a. b*. Their ſentiments touching the ſouls of beaſts. 905. *a*. They commend in the Dutch, a conduct which Socinus had very much blamed. V. 170. *b*. 171. *a*. A general objection that is raiſed againſt them. 178. They take advantage of their adverſaries forbidding the reading of their writings. 506. *b*. Their ſentiments touching the mutability of an eternal nature. 588. *b*. Keſler ſucceſsfully employed Logic in refuting them. III. 660. *a. b*. 661. *a. b*. The difficulty of confuting their Philoſophical objections: we muſt attack them by Scripture, the authority of which they acknowledge. 820. What their God is, according to Jurieu. 824.

Socrates played with his Children. I. 131. *b*. The way that he propoſes for attaining to virtue. 279. *a*. He ridicules the Sophiſts of his time. 294. *a. b*. Says that the Fanatics reſemble Poets. 303. *a*. His cenſure on a book of Anaxagoras. 309. *b*. 310. *a*. And the anſwer to that cenſure. *ibid. a. b*. 311. *a*. His way was to diſpute *pro* and *con*. What he ſays on occaſion of the palace of Archelaus being beautified. 417. *b*. 418. *a*. He refuſes to go to the Court of Macedon. *ibid. a. b*. His maxim, *quod ſuprà nos nihil ad nos*. 462. *a*. The faults of ſome of his ſcholars unjuſtly imputed to him. II. 569. *b*. 570. *a*. Why ſirnamed *the Melian*. 653. *a. b*. What he did to obey the god of dreams, who had ordered him to apply himſelf to the Muſes. 830. *a. b*. Whether Euripides had an eye to him in his Palamedes. 874. *a. b*. What he ſaid of Beauty. III. 65. *a*. What he did, in order to lay in a good ſtock of patience. 312. *b*. What he ſaid of a kiſs given to a fine face. IV. 796. *b*. 797. *a*. Why his marriage with Xantippe did not interrupt his lectures. V. 165. *a*. The deſcription which he gives of the prerogatives of human nature. 583. *b*. 584. *a*.

Sodomy committed in temples, as a pious action. III. 773. *b*. Whether it be true that a petition was preſented to Sixtus IV, for leave to exerciſe it, during certain months of the year. V. 157, 158. *and b*. 159. *a. b*. 160. *a. b*. *&c*. Whether John della Caſa intended to make an encomium upon it in his deteſtable *Capitolo del Forno*. 422. *a. b*. 423. *a. b*. Abſolution from that crime, what it coſts. I. 628. *a. b*. The Dominicans take a reſolution to exclaim loudly againſt it. 855. *a. b*.

Soldier, one who ſaves his life by a jeſt. I. 709. *a*. Women prefer ſoldiers to all other men. V. 664.

Solyman cuts in pieces Ferdinand's army, which beſieged Buda. III. 532. Puts to death his favourite Ibrahim Baſha. 588. *b*.

Solipſians, or *Monarchia Solipſorum*. III. 563. *b. and n.* (§ *a*). 564. *a. b*.

Solitar, an abbey in the county of Hanaw, how reformed. III. 875.

Solitude (the love of), what judgment ſome people have made of it. I. 583. *a*.

Sollicitors in the affair of love, generally pay themſelves with their own hands. II. 632. *b*.

Solomon, the Jews and ſeveral Mahometans maintain that he underſtood the language of birds. V. 382. *a*. His views in cauſing Adonijah to be put to death. 803.

Solon, his anſwer to Piſiſtratus. II. 384. *b*. Unacceptable to Crœſus, and why. 831. *a*. His anſwer to thoſe who repreſented to him, that his tears could be of no ſervice. III. 73. *b*. One of his maxims examined. 777. *b*. 778. *a*.

Son: a ſon reproached on his expoſing his mother's love-letters. I. 388. *a*. Sons, to whom their father left no portion of inheritance, and why. II. 32.

Son of God; a man burnt for taking that title. IV. 269. *b*.

Song of Songs (the book of) Caſtalio's judgment upon that piece. II. 361. *b*.

Songs may be uſeful to States. V. 20. *a. b*. A ſong rewarded with an abbey. I. 428. *n.* (*c*). Thoſe of which John de Wert was the burthen, have been revived ſeveral times, and the original of them. V. 540. *a. b*.

Songs (ſpiritual) ſet to the moſt burleſque ballad-tunes, by whom compoſed. I. 478. *b*. Whether we are to condemn ſuch as are ſet to the ſame airs with prophane ballads. *ibid. a. b*.

Sonnet, what Boileau ſays of it. III. 177. *b*. The Sonnet of Job compared with that of Urania. I. 752. *a. b*. Sonnets prepared for books that were to come out. II. 620. *b*. A devout Sonnet. 647. *a. b*. Sonnet of the Abortive, by whom compoſed III. 392. *a*.

Soothſayers. See *Diviners*.

Sophiſms, that called *the Liar*, was only a vain ſubtilty. II. 846. *b*. 847. *a*. IV. 616. *b*. 617. *a. b*.

Sophocles, the circumſtances of his triumph over Æſchylus. II. 825. *a. b*. Why he brought none but good and honeſt women on the ſtage. 868. *a*. He eſteemed it a great pleaſure, that old age had delivered him out of the hands of the fair ſex. IV. 84. *a. n.* (24), (25). Rataller makes a fine Latin tranſlation of him. 848. *a. b*. 849. *a. b*.

Soracte, a mountain where the Hirpi walked once every year on fire. III. 466. *b*. 467. *a*.

Sorberiana, a falſe thing advanced there concerning Bagni. I. 604. *b*. 605. *a*.

Sorbiere quoted. II. 87. *a. b. n.* (13), (14), (17). Complaints occaſioned by his account of England. 278. *b*. He ſees nothing at Rome but what edifies him. 475. *b*. An extract of a letter which he wrote on that ſubject, ill told by the author of the *Preſervatif contre le changement de Religion. ibid.* 476. *a*. What he ſays of the abſence of mind, for which Poets are remarkable. V. 402. *b*. 403. *a*.

Sorbonne: the cenſure which the Sorbonne paſſed on the works of Mary d'Agreda, betrays a want of reſolution. I. 137. *a.* A little book on that ſubject. *ibid. b.* 138. *a.* Had not the courage to publiſh the cenſure without qualifying it. *ibid. a. b.* Cenſured by Agrippa, on occaſion of Henry the eighth's divorce. 150. *b.* Taught as an article of faith, the immaculate conception of the Bleſſed Virgin. IV. 77. *b.* 78. *a.* Cenſures the book intituled, *Curioſitez inoüies*, &c. III. 122. *b.* Its decree againſt Henry III. 294. *b.* Strongly cenſures three ſermons, upon the beatification of Loyola. 895. *a. b.* 896. *a. b.* Marot's verſes againſt that ſociety. IV. 153. *a. b.* Who are allowed to propoſe arguments againſt the Theſes that are maintained in the Sorbonne. 276. *b.*

Sorcerers are much more numerous than Inchanters. II. 243. *b.* What is the difference between them and Magicians. V. 385. *b.* A diſcourſe on their impoſtures. I. 64. *b.* See *Inchanters*, *Magic*, *Magicians*, *Witchcraft*, and *Witches*.

Sorcery, what a Roman citizen, that was accuſed of it, did. V. 524. *a.*

Sorel, the cenſure which he paſſes on the obſcene collections of the Poets. I. 65. *b.* And upon Paulus Æmilius's Hiſtory of France. II. 763. *b.* 764. *a.* He blames thoſe who alter the language of the old French authors. IV. 427. *b.* 428. *a.* Quoted. I. 65. *b. n.* (18), (19). His judgment of d'Audiguier. 548. *and a. n.* (1). And of John Huarte. III. 528. *b.* 529. *a. b.*

Sorites, a ſophiſm which puzzled the Philoſophers much. II. 492. *b.* 493. *a. b.* &c. What that ſophiſm was. 846. *b.* 847. *a.*

Sotades, an antient Poet treated with contempt, and why. I. 478. *a.*

Sotuel [or *Southwell*] (Father) latinizes a name after a wretched manner. I. 108. *a.* Read but few books of Controverſy. *ibid.* Is inferior to Alegambus. 219. *a. b.* Confounds two Jeſuits, Father Fevrier with Father Ferrier. III. 43. *a. b.*

Souches (de) was a Frenchman indeed, but not General of the French. III. 793. *b.*

Sovereigns, religion enervates their authority. I. 13. *a.* III. 624. *a.* Whether a perſon be obliged to reſtore to them what he has taken from them. I. 13. *b.* A good book might be wrote on the religion of ſovereigns. 130. *b.* 460. *a.* II. 440. *a.* They commit faults, for which their ſubjects are puniſhed. I. 158. *b.* 159. *a.* In puniſhing tranſgreſſors, are not directed by the ſinfulneſs of the action. 223. *a.* The taking up arms againſt them condemned by Amyraut. 264. *b.* 265. *a. b.* We ought never to ſlight thoſe, who have a chance for riſing to that dignity. 421. *b.* 422. *a.* Authors engage them in their petty quarrels. 670. *b.* An article of their religion. 721. *a.* What their religion is. II. 754. *b.* 755. *a.* III. 94. *a. b.* They are often tricked by their Generals. I. 764. *a.* The neceſſity of the times diſpenſes them from the obligation even of an oath, according to the laws of policy. II. 213. *a.* III. 182. *a.* IV. 698. *a.* Their unavoidable dependence on the clergy. II. 149. *b.* Whether a private perſon may lawfully bear arms againſt his ſovereign. 196. *a.* A caſe wherein it is lawful to depoſe ſovereigns. 254. *a.* They are often unfortunate in their families. 607. *b.* 608. *a.* Whether they ought to depend upon the fidelity of their ſubjects. *ibid.* Their gratitude is not ſubject to the ſame laws, with the gratitude of private perſons towards one another. 755. *b.* There is a great difference between their paſſions and thoſe of private men. III. 182. *a.* IV. 698. *a.* They ſacrifice to their temporal intereſt that of their religion. III. 234. *b.* 235. *a.* 397. *b.* 403. *a. b.* V. 457. *a.* They do not always ſuit themſelves in their rewards, to the extent of their dominions. III. 275. *a.* Have at all times been curious to know the ſecrets of families. 320. *a. b.* The Proteſtants and Catholics have been obſerved to change maxims with reſpect to the right of ſovereigns. 670. *a. b.* See *Monarchs*. They may be good, if we conſider them as ſovereigns, and bad, if we conſider them as men. 767. *b.* 768. *a.* It is a crime to conſult the future events of their lives. 955. *a. b.* They are generally unhappy at home. IV. 691. *b.* Whether they have children, or no children, their condition is ſtill to be pitied. 758. *b.* 759. *a.* What their prerogative is, when their lives are concerned V. 501. *a.* It is become cuſtomary to flatter them in dedications. II. 312. *b.*

Sovereignty, whether the rights of it belong to the people. I. 236. *a. b.* 237. *a. b.* 499. *a. b.* 500. *a.*

Soul (human) converted into a ſtar by the Pagans. I. 348. *b.* 349. *a. b.* Is an aëreal being according to Anaxagoras. 311. And according to Diogenes, the Natural Philoſopher. II. 672. *b.* Is part of the ſubſtance of God according to Ceſalpinus. 412. *b.* The doctrine of the propagation of ſouls, ſubſiſted to the end of the XIth century. I. 345. *a.* An inquiry into the original of the ſoul, is a very obſcure ſubject. 555. *a. b.* The mortality of the ſoul taught by Averrhoës. 557. *b.* 558. *a.* What it is acccording to the ſame Averrhoës. II. 316. *b.* What St Bernard believed concerning the ſtate of the ſoul, when ſeparated from the body. I. 774. The nature of the proof, drawn from the apparition of a ſoul, to evince the immortality of it. II. 66. *a. b.* 67. *a. b.* All the world does not admit of a neceſſary connexion between the immortality of the ſoul, and the providence of God. 450. *b.* 451. *a. b.* Notable diverſities of the ſtrength of the ſoul. *ibid. b.* 152. *a. b.* The ſtrongeſt proofs of its immortality, are taken from the word of God. 455. *a.* Whether the eternity of it can be maintained, in caſe Ariſtotle's opinions were to be followed. 567. *a. b.* An invincible objection againſt Dicæarchus, who would not allow the ſoul to be diſtinct from the body. 658. *a. b.* Objections to the objection againſt Dicæarchus. 660. *b.* 661. *a.* Is diſtinct from all the modifications of body, that are come to our knowlege. *ibid. b.* Where you muſt find the principles of the greateſt ſouls, without the help of Revelation. 673. *b.* Whether it be poſſible for a ſoul, ſeparated from the body, to feel the ſame pain that a perſon feels when burnt. 781. *a. b.* Impious ſentiments touching its mortality. III. 392. *b.* Moſt of the Pagan Philoſophers ſuppoſed that it was material. 650. *b.* Was compoſed of ſeveral parts, according to the doctrine of Epicurus. 790. *b.* 791. *a.* Other Philoſophers are divided on that head. *ibid. b.* He who denies it to be a ſubſtance diſtinct from matter, reaſons childiſhly, unleſs he ſuppoſes that all the univerſe is animated. 919. *b.* What becomes of it, when the man dies, according to Epicurus's ſyſtem. 929. *a.* Luther's opinion touching the ſtate of the ſoul. 949. *a.* Whether it be ſubject, as well as the body, to certain diſtempers. 948. *b.* Whether it ſeparates locally from the body, at the moment the man expires. IV. 320. *b.* It has ſtrange inequalities. 322. *b.* The antient Philoſophers believed that the ſouls of men, as well as thoſe of beaſts, were material. 548. *b.* 549. *a. b.* Reflexions concerning the immortality of the ſoul. 591. *b.* 592. *a. b.* Whether God creates a new ſoul, or re-produces the ſame. 655. *b.* Whether its immortality can be proved by good natural reaſons. 714. *a. b.* 715. *a. b.* 720. *a. b.* Whether the doctrine of its mortality, would induce men to all manner of crimes. *ibid.* What idea the Pagans had of it. 787. *b.* 788. *a.* Whether the ſoul, being united with matter, can form to itſelf an organized habitation. V. 114. *a. b.* 115. *a.* Its unity in all men taught by ſome Philoſophers. 214. *b.* 215. *a.* Whether a Spinoziſt ought to believe that it is immortal, and ſubject to the caprice of ſome inviſible perſecutor. 216. *b.* 217. *a.* Its capacity, whereby a man may turn his mind ſometimes one way and ſometimes another. 272. *b.* Francus pretended, that not only beaſts, but the inanimate creation partook of a general ſoul, that was Divine. III. 100. Too much ſubjected to corporeal qualities, by John Huarte. 528. *b.* 529. *a.*

Soul of the world, the doctrine of it is not new. It made the principal part of the ſyſtem of the Stoics. V. 200. *b.* 201. *a. b.*

Souls of beaſts, Anaxagoras ſaid they were intelligences, and gave them the ſame name which he gave to the firſt mover of matter. I. 301. *a.* Ceſalpinus affirmed that they were part of the ſubſtance of God. II. 412. *b.* Authors who believed that they are endowed with reaſon. IV. 911. *b.* 912. *a. b.* 913. *a.*

Space, whether it be nothing elſe but the immenſity of God. V. 616. *a. b.* Suarez endeavours to explain how God may be preſent in imaginary ſpace. III. 100. *b.*

Spain, ſeveral falſe Chronicles have been publiſhed there, to impoſe upon the credulity of people. I. 362. *b.* The women of that country are very glad to be alone with a man, who deſires the laſt favour of them. II. 27. *b.* A ſmart repartee which an Ambaſſador of that Court made to the Pope. 474. *b.* Its Ambaſſador ſollicits ſuccours in England, for the Duke of Rohan. III. 397. *b.* There is a certain convent in that kingdom, which every year furniſhes a Monk that ſhuts himſelf up in a hot oven, and comes out in the ſight of a multitude of people. 467. *b.* Its aſcendant over France in the XVth and XVIth centuries. IV. 310. *a. b.* Who were the firſt that diſcovered the darkneſs of Spain. 723. *a.*

Spanheim (Ezekiel) his learning and conſiderable employments. V. 194. *a.* 793. *n.* (*ii*).

Spanheim (Frederic) his Swiſs Mercury. II. 551. *a. b.* He refutes there the pretended miracles, which were ſaid to have happened during the ſiege of Conſtance. *ibid. b.* 552. *a. b.* If he had wrote the Hiſtory of a ſiege, ſuſtained by a Proteſtant town, perhaps he would have made obſervations, not unlike thoſe which he confutes. *ibid. a.* Inherits the books of Samuel Durant, whoſe ſermons he prints. 727. He does not anſwer the queſtions which Father Labbe propoſed to Mareſius, touching the maimed edition of Anaſtaſius, which the Jeſuits were reproached with. IV. 727. *a. b.*

Spaniards, their complaints againſt France, for concluding alliances with the Proteſtant powers. II. 338. *a. b.* And the anſwer that was made to their complaints. *ibid.* They are reproached with doing the very ſame thing, which they had found ſo much fault with in France. 755. *a.* The cauſe of the antipathy between them and the French. III. 809. *a. b.* The ſtratagem they made uſe of, when they re-took Maeſtricht. IV. 373. *a.* The Spaniards taken for gods by the Americans. 572. *b.* Are ſtill more to blame than the French, on account of their eſteem for Guevara. III. 270. *b.* The barbarity with which they treat Chriſtopher Marcellus. IV. 106. An expreſſion which diſcovered Texera's ſtrong hatred againſt them. V. 319. They are generally negligent, when they write in Latin: an inſtance of it. III. 774. *a. b.*

Sparrow, one that gives notice to the other birds, by his ſinging, that a cartful of millet was broke near *Porta Maggiore*. III. 232. *b. n.* (40).

Sparta, Spartans. See *Lacedæmon, Lacedæmonians.*

Speakers, a ſect of Philoſophers, who give five proofs of the Unity of God. V. 828.

Speech, one abridged in a very ſhort time. I. 633. *a. b.* Another ſtruck out from the catalogue of the fair of Francfort. III. 169. *b.*

Species (Intentional) how called by Democritus and Epicurus. II. 388. *a.* Are the ſhame of the Peripatetics. 643. *a.*

Spectacles of Devotion. See *Myſteries* (Dramatical).

Spectres, how the Pagan Exorciſts uſed to drive them away. II. 775. *a. b.* That trade was looked upon as mean and mercenary. *ibid.*

Sperlingen (John) defends du Laurens againſt the extravagant cenſure of Colladon. III. 746. *a. b.*

Speuſippus, his zeal for Plato. I. 467. *a.*

Spies have at all times taken notice of the manner how people talk of news. II. 627. *a.*

Spigelius tranſlates into High-Dutch the Turkiſh Annals which Jerome Beck of Leopoldſdorf brought from Conſtantinople. III. 774. *b.*

Spinoza, his conformity with Ariſtotle. I. 470. II. 412. *b* And with the Scotiſts. *ibid.* What he ſays of a man that ſhould be in the condition of Buridan's ſhe-aſs. 227. *b.* There is no ſyſtem which can leſs diſpenſe itſelf from acknowledging, what is ſaid of good and bad angels, among the people, than his. 251. *a.* 412. *b.* There is ſcarce any age, wherein his doctrine has not been taught. IV. 688. *b.* 689. *a.* A liſt of thoſe perſons who had the ſame opinion with him. V. 199. *a. b.* 200. *a. b.* 201. *a. b.* And of thoſe who have confuted him. 207. *a. b.* 208. *a. b.* 213. *a. b.* His ſhifts and equivocations. 208. *b.* 209. *a. b.* 210. *a. b.* 211. *a. b.* 212. *a.* According to him, God and Extenſion are the ſame thing. 208. *b.* 209. *a. b. &c.* He deprives us as much as in him lies, of a principle, without which all our reaſonings would be inſignificant. 223. *b.* A demonſtration againſt his ſyſtem, taken from the principles of Xenophanes. 574. *b.* 575. *a. b.*

Spinoziſm: a diſguiſed Spinoziſm. I. 26. *a.* Hypotheſes which differ not at all, or very little, from it. 52. *a. b.* II. 672. *a. b.* III. 550. *a. b.* V. 186. *a. b.* 574. *a. b.* 575. *a. b.* An opinion that is more dangerous than it. 587. *b.* How it is unanſwerably confuted. I. 553. *b.* 554. *a b.* 555. *a. b.* Is more abſurd than the ſyſtem of atoms. II. 644. *a.* Was at bottom taught by ſome Philoſophers, and almoſt in all ages. III. 649. *b.* 650. *a. b.* 651. *a.* IV. 688. *b.* 689. *a.* Origen had a tincture of it. 421. *b.* It is incompatible with the hypotheſis of a vacuum. V. 617. *a.*

Spinoziſts, wherein their fallacy lies. I. 26. *a.* An abſurdity to which their hypotheſis reduces them. II. 496. *b.* A thought of Seneca, which they would eaſily approve. 573. *b.* They would be ſtrangely puzzled, if they were forced to admit Mr Newton's demonſtrations. III. 793. *b.* Have no ſolid conſolation againſt death. 928. *b.* May take advantage of the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, nay perhaps, they will have recourſe to the myſtery of the Trinity. V. 223. *a.*

Spirits: perſons who lodged in rooms that were haunted with ſpirits. I. 225. II. 522. *and a. b.* 638. *a.* Whether it may be ſaid that there are ſpirits of a more limited nature than man. I. 520. *b.* In what their motion conſiſts according to the Carteſians. IV. 288. *a. b.* Hobbes's principles are no ways proper to make one deny the exiſtence and operations of ſpirits. III. 471. *a. b.* 919. *b.* 920. *a.* Nor yet Spinoza's principles. V. 215. *a. b.*

Spirits (familiar); what was Plato's doctrine concerning ſuch ſort of ſpirits. IV. 689. *b.* 690. *a.*

Spiritual ſubſtances, whether among ſuch as are created, the ſoul of man only is ſubject to change. II. 767. The Carteſians maintain that we can form no idea of a ſpiritual ſubſtance. V. 144. *a.* See *Soul*, underſtanding.

Spiritualia (Heteroclita) the title of a book. IV. 833. *b.*

Spizelius, what he tells of an impious perſon, to give ſome idea of his impiety. V. 138. *b.*

Spon (Dr) was unwilling to have it believed, that he made the ſtudy of antiquity, his principal employ. I. 337. *a.*

Spondanus (John) his anſwer to Calvin, touching the ſmall regard which the Popes and Cardinals had for the Chriſtian religion. II. 275. *a.*

Spondanus (Henry) confuted, as to a premeditated deſign, which he imputes to Theodore Beza. I. 776. *a.* Is as much accuſtomed as any one, to diſpoſe of the particular providence of God. *ibid.* What he did, when he perceived the artifice of the Spaniſh Hiſtorians, with reſpect to Charles V, and Carranza. II. 336. *a.* Appears altogether Ultramontane. 594. *a.* His miſtake touching Illyricus, and his *Catalogus Teſtium Veritatis.* III. 559. *b.* 560. *a.* He goes beyond the bounds of an Hiſtorian, as to what he ſays of the advice which King James gave to his ſon. 667. *a.* His negligence with reſpect to Ochinus, and his adventures. IV. 388. *a. b.*

Sponges: three holy Sponges ſent by the Pope to Eudes Duke of Aquitain, and for what uſe. I. 16. *b.*

Squittinio della Liberta Veneta, opinions concerning the author of that book. V. 448. *b.* 449. *a. b.*

Staff, whether the Devil has choſen it for one of his occaſional cauſes. I. 4. *b.* 7. *a. b.*

Stage: it was neceſſary to condemn the impurities of the ſtage, without deſcribing them. V. 40. *b.* When they began to introduce love-adventures on the ſtage. I. 313. Who firſt practiſed the rule of not ſtaining it with blood. II. 824. *b.* No piece could be recited on the ſtage at Rome, without being firſt approved. V. 295. *and a.* The French ſtage is more nice than that of Athens. 304. *a.* St Auguſtin is unjuſtly cenſured, with reſpect to the licentiouſneſs of the ſtage. IV. 568. *a. b.*

Stage (French) ſome fragments that ſhew what it was in the time of Francis I. II. 477. *a. b.* 478. *a. b.* 479. *a. b.* 480. *a. b.* A paſſage of Boileau on that head. 480. *b n.* (18).

Stancarus, Calvin and he gave one another the ſame hard words. V. 230. *b.* He married a wife being a Prieſt. 232. *b.* 233. *a.* Staniſlaus Orichovius diſputes againſt him. IV. 411.

Stars, the antient Poets made them often the ſubject of their metamorphoſes. I. 348. *b.* 349. *a.* In what part of the world the ſcience of the ſtars had its beginning. III. 311. What the longitude and the latitude of the ſtars are. 461. *b.* Whether revolutions in religion are to be imputed to them. 948. *a. b.* The ſtar which led the wiſe-men to Bethlehem has nothing in common with the burning torch which Timoleon ſaw in a dream. V. 364. *b.*

State of Innocence, the duration of it. I. 22. *a. b.*

State-Catholic, a book highly eſteemed, who is the author of it. III. 41. *a. b.*

States: it is generally ſpeaking the maxim of ſtates to obſerve no other law but what tends to aggrandize them. I. 130. *a. b.* Thoſe who govern them find themſelves oftentimes obliged to commit acts of injuſtice. 448. *a. b.* The great revolutions which happen in them often proceed from a trifle. II. 711. *b.* A temperature that is often to be obſerved in the government of ſtates. III. 506. *b.* 507. *a.* Their temporal good is generally preferred to religion. IV. 621. *a. b.*

States-General of France limit the royal authority in ſome reſpects. III. 409. *a.* Whether it be for the intereſt of France that they ſhould meet. IV. 139. *a. b.*

States General, or the United Provinces of the Low-Countries, make an edict, prohibiting the public exerciſe of the Romiſh religion in Boiſleduc. III. 548. *a.* A diſpute which that edict occaſioned. *ibid. and b.* Send an Ambaſſador to Muley Zidan King of Morocco. 170. *b.* 171. *a.* What they did in favour of the Grecians. 172. *a.* How they juſtify themſelves with regard to libels. V. 755.

Statics, Stevin's treatiſe on that ſubject is excellent. V. 236. *b.*

Statius congratulates himſelf on having writ 278 Hexameters in two days. I. 664. *b.* A commentary on that author, *in uſum Delphini*. 756. Navagiero's averſion againſt him, which was ſtrange and full of prejudice. IV. 315. *a. b.* 316. *a.*

Statius (Achilles) may very poſſibly have made the ſame trial of the public taſte, that Muretus made of Scaliger's. II. 353. *a.*

Statues: A ſtatue which appeared with a quite different countenance to thoſe who came into the temple, than it did to thoſe that went out. II. 203. It was a very rare privilege for great men to have their ſtatues placed in the Forum, during the firſt ages of the Roman Republic. 290. *b.* Cities have been ravaged for inſulting the ſtatues of a ſovereign Prince. 665. *b.* Statues hung in the air by virtue of the load-ſtone. IV. 41. *b.* 42. *a.* Cato the cenſor's anſwer to ſome who wondered that there was no ſtatue erected to him. 750. *a.* Pygmalion falls in love with one, and how he behaved to it. 641, 642. Clemens Alexandrinus and Arnobius alledge that, to ſhew the Pagans the vanity of their idols. 641. *a.*

Stature: perſons that were of a very ſmall ſtature. I. 184. *a.* 326. *b.*

Step-Mothers, there is a certain fate which inſpires them with a great deal of ill-humour. III. 189. *a.*

Stephens (Charles) paſſes an error upon us, which has been bandied from one Dictionary to another. II. 258. *b.* Dies in the Chatelet, greatly in debt. III. 830. *b.* His miſtake concerning Pyrrhus. IV. 660. *a. b.* Did not underſtand a paſſage of Philoſtratus. 784. *a.*

Stephens (Robert) his houſe was always full of people who ſpoke nothing but Latin. I. 602. *a. b.* Protected by Caſtellan againſt the Sorbonniſts, and afterwards given up to them. II. 372. *b.* Being perſecuted by the Sorbonniſts, he retires to Geneva. III. 830. *b.* Accuſed of having altered a paſſage in Bucer's commentary on the ſecond Pſalm. II. 173. *a.*

Stephens (Henry) how he expreſſes himſelf, in ſpeaking of the good tables of the Clergy. II. 815. *a. b.* His cavillings on the death of Lucretia. III. 911. *b.* 912. *a. b.* He a makes bad defence for Herodotus, who had aſcribed envy and jealouſy to God. IV. 575. *a.*

Stephens (Nicole) a learned woman. III. 830. *a.*

Steſichorus loſes his ſight, and recovers it again, for what, and how. III. 368. *a.*

Stetin beſieged in vain by the troops of the Emperor and thoſe of Brandenburg. III. 901. *a.*

Stevinus (Simon) cenſures Peter Nonius, whom he nevertheleſs acknowledges to be a great Mathematician. IV. 382. *a.*

Stews, Cayet accuſed of having writ an apology for them. 242. *b.* 243. *a.* 246. *and a. b.*

Style: affectations in point of ſtyle. I. 63. *a. b.* There was a time when a barbariſm of ſtyle was much in vogue. 432. *a. b.* An author does not much entertain the world, when by changing his ſtyle, he gets out of his element. 438. *a. b.* The pompous ſtyle is generally not the ſtyle of a man of quality. 722. *a. b.* Who boaſted that his ſtyle was of a high ſtrain and glittering. II. 191. *b.* The deceitfulneſs of proofs drawn from a likeneſs of ſtyle. 808. *a.* We ought to avoid a ſtyle that is too conciſe, and for that very reaſon obſcure. III. 248. *b.* There are ſeveral degrees of decency with reſpect to the ſtyle. V. 841. The author declares that he did not pretend to politeneſs of ſtyle, which was likewiſe neglected by Mezerai and le Laboureur. *ibid. and n.* (24).

Stock-fiſh; ſome people at Rome valued that fiſh, in complaiſance to the Pope. III. 327. *a.*

Stoics, no Philoſophers were farther from the truth than they. II. 63. *b.* Confuted with reſpect to religion. 331. *a. b.* Accuſed by Plutarch of perverting the common conceptions, more than the Academics. 495. *a,* Said that Cyniſm was the ſhorteſt way to attain to virtue. 671. *b.* The pain which they feel from their evils, is the beſt objection that can be made to them. III. 423. *a.* They ſpoke too pompouſly of the empire of Reaſon. IV. 441. *a. b.* Are ſtrongly refuted by Plutarch, with reſpect to the uſefulneſs of vice. 520. *a. b.* Were more orthodox than Arnobius, with reſpect to matter conſidered as one of the principles of all things. 521. *a.* Their maxim concerning the uſe of words. 706. *b.* Their ſage exiſts only in idea. II. 310. *b.* They laughed at the diſtinction of words. V. 847. An objection which they made uſe of. 858.

Stones: a black ſtone carried away out of the temple of Mecca by the Karmatians. I. 49. The ſame ſent back. *ibid.* How it was proved to be genuine. *ibid.* The author's reflections upon that head. *ibid. a. b.* A ſtone honoured by the Saracens 124. *a. b.* Another worſhipped by the Arabians. *ibid. b.* Falls of ſtones foretold and reverenced. 306. *a. b.* Tranſparent ſtones. II. 303. *a. b.* Miraculous ſtones which people formerly pretended to have in ſeveral places. 745. *and a. b.* 746. *and a. b.* The Ligurians are knocked on the head by a ſhower of ſtones. III. 434. *a. b.* 435. *a. b.*

Stories: little ſtories are very proper to entertain a company pleaſantly. I. 666. *b.* Some men have the power to immortalize any ſtory, whether it be true or falſe. II. 7. *a.* However ridiculous the ſtory may be that a perſon confutes, he ought to be exact. 267. *a.* Stories that were forged in the times of ignorance, for good ends. IV. 615. *a. b.* It is not allowed to alter any thing in thoſe that are to be found in the beſt antient writers. *ibid. b.* How a perſon ought to behave, with regard to ſuch ſtories as are grounded only upon hear-ſay. 379. *a. b.*

Stoupp, author of a book intituled *La Religion des Hollandois*. V. 203. *a.* Was killed at the battle of Steinkerken. *ibid.*

Strabo, what he ſays of fables. II. 832. *a.* His judicious reflexions on the miraculous ſtatues which cities boaſt of having. V. 156. *a. b.*

Straſburg, the indulgence of its Magiſtrates for fornication. I. 222. *a.* Its ſchool. V. 256. *a. b.* 257. *a.* That city neither will, nor can always preſerve its neutrality. III. 718. *a. b.*

Stratagems of the Devil, what is ſaid of that book and the author of it. I. 92. *a.*

Stratocles perſuades the Athenians to offer a ſacrifice to the gods by way of thanks for the defeat of their enemies, the news of which he knew to be falſe. V. 749. *b.*

Stratonice, Queen of Syria; what reaſons induced her to make herſelf drunk. II. 533. *a.*

Stratonice adviſes Dejotarus, her huſband, to make uſe of another woman. II. 630. *a. b.*

Streinius, why his book, intituled, the *Anti-Anicianus*, has never been printed, I. 341. *a. b.*

Strong: there is nothing more advantageous than to be always for the ſtrongeſt faction. V. 250. *a.*

Strozza (Charles) dies, notwithſtanding Savonarola's cap and contrary prediction. V. 61. *a.*

Stuart (Mary), Queen of Scotland; the Hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm that one has reaſon to chuſe, with reſpect to her adventures. II. 282. *a. b.* How ſhe eluded the deſign which her uncle had of keeping her jewels. III. 873. *b.*

Study, the moſt libertine youths, and thoſe who have no inclination for it, do not fail to ſucceed therein ſometimes. I. 562. *a. b.* 563. *a.* Extreme application to ſtudy. II. 370. *b.* 637. *b.* 638. *a.* The ſtratagem that a father made uſe of to make his ſon reſume his ſtudies. 687. *and a.* Whether ſtudy raiſes leud thoughts. III. 260. *a. b.* Happy are they who can ſtudy fourteen or fifteen hours a day, without being ever ſick. 342. *a.*

Studying: a method of ſtudying. I. 319. *b.* 320. *a.*

Stupid people, a man of wit is ſometimes uncapable to deceive them. V. 147. *a.*

Stupidity is not ſuch a great misfortune as people imagine. I. 480. *b.*

Sturmius writes things to the diſadvantage of Hotman. III. 523. *a. b.* Had been ſeveral years without receiving the communion. V. 257. *b.* What he tells us of Cæſarius, and ſome other Saxons. II. 242. *a. b.*

Suarez went through his courſe of Philoſophy with ſo little ſucceſs, that he thought he never ſhould be able to attain to any competent knowledge in it. II. 802. *b.* Endeavours to explain how God may be preſent in imaginary ſpace. III. 100. *b.*

Subjects are not pleaſed to ſee their prince beſtow his treaſures and favours on his friends, in an extravagant manner. I. 571. *a.* The doctrine of their obedience propoſed with too much indiſcretion. 687. *a.* Whether they ought to take up arms to deliver themſelves from tyranny, or wait till their neighbours come and deliver them from it. II. 52. *b.* Maxims about their obedience. 423. *a. b.* Loyal ſubjects are generally neglected. 443. *a. b.* III. 421. *a.* It would not be a hard matter to make them approve of conqueſts and battles, provided they coſt them no money. V. 656. A ſubject cannot make himſelf formidable to his maſter, without having committed a thouſand acts of injuſtice. II. 541. *a. b.*

Subſtance: the idea which the Philoſophers form of a ſubſtance. V. 221. *a. b. &c.*

Subtilties (ſophiſtical) are only fit to corrupt the mind. V. 241. *a. b.* 242. *a. b.* We ought not to affect ſubtilties in matters of religion. III. 343. *b.*

Succeſs, that of an enterprize is not always anſwerable to appearances. I. 365. *b.* 366. *a. b.* Vanity does not hinder men from allowing God to have been the cauſe of a good ſucceſs. II. 298. *a. b.* 299. *a.* Several have aſcribed the glory of a happy ſucceſs to God, only for a political end. V. 366. *a. b.* 367. *a. b.* People often judge of matters by the ſucceſs. 369. *b.* 370. *a. b. &c.*

Sueſſa, there were two towns of that name. III. 905. *a.*

Suetonius (Tranquillus) his candour and ſincerity. V. 263. *a. b.* 264. *a. b.*

Suffridus Petri, his credulity. I. 36. II. 769. *a.*

Suidas, that author is ſo mutilated and corrupted that there is no depending upon him. I. 44. *b.* His groſs ignorance, with reſpect to Dejotarus. II. 628. *b.* He is ill underſtood, as to the cauſe which obliged Æſchylus to retire into Sicily. 825. *b.*

Sulmo reſpected by Alphonſo, King of Naples, and why. IV. 433. *a.*

Sulpitius (Servius) exceeded his maſters. I. 613. *b.*

Sultans, who was the only one amongſt them that durſt ſend a body of regular troops into Italy. IV. 50. *a.*

Sun, what it is, according to Anaxagoras. I. 307. *a. b.* An example of a very particular ſympathy with the ſun. II. 402. *b.* 403. *a.* The Spaniſh Hiſtorians ſay, that the ſun ſtopped its courſe in favour of Charles V. 443. *b.* 444. *a.* There are ſeveral perſons to whom the ſun is a ſenſible god. 449. *a.*

Superfœtation, an inſtance of ſuperfœtation often quoted. I. 283. Who was a famous inſtance of it. *ibid.*

Superintendant of the Finances; the ſincere and ingenuous confeſſion of ſuch a ſuperintendant's wife. V. 16. *b.*

Superiors, their bad life is imitated, but not their good. III. 385. *a.*

Superſtition; nothing is accounted too coſtly, when once people are intoxicated with ſuperſtition. I. 2. How uſeful it is to a General, when he employs it either to rouze or moderate the ardour of his ſoldiers. 542. *a. b.* Thoſe who are infatuated with it, generally make no ſcruple to commit the greateſt crimes. II. 629. *a. b.* It is difficult to be extirpated when it is a ſource of gain to private perſons. IV. 178. *a. b.* It deſtroys good ſenſe. V. 77. *b.* It is a misfortune that we do not know all the ſuperſtitions of the antient Romans. III. 646. *b.* There are two ways of ridiculing it, the one good and the other bad. IV. 584. *b.*

Supplements: ſome readers write, in the margin of an Hiſtory or Calendar, a great many ſupplements. IV. 728. *a.*

Supralapſarians and Infralapſarians maintain the ſame thing at the bottom. IV. 524. *a.*

Sura compoſes orations for Trajan. III. 317. *a.*

Surena, what concluſion one may draw from his perfidious behaviour to Craſſus. V. 273. *a.*

Surius (Laurence) tranſlates all Ruyſbroeck's works. IV. 942.

Suſpicions: people are very ready to give the reins to ſuſpicion. I. 479. *b.* Prejudices againſt thoſe who are apt to entertain ſuſpicions. 745. *a. b.* Their bad effects. 588. *a.*

Sutcliffe is miſtaken, as to the time in which Ciechus lived. II. 499. *a. b.* Falſely aſcribes to Agrippa ſome things which he has not ſaid concerning Sixtus IV. V. 164. *b.*

Suſa; it is not true that Catinat was obliged to raiſe the ſiege of that place; on the contrary he took it, and kept it till the peace. IV. 210. *b.*

Sweating-Sickneſs in England, what kind of ſickneſs it was. I. 271. *b.* A dangerous diſtemper which has frequently made great havock in England. V. 42. *b.* Confounded with the pox by a perſon who tranſlated Sanders into French. *ibid.*

Sweden, what Maimbourg tells us of a treaty about the reduction of that kingdom to the obedience of the Church of Rome. III. 139. *b.*

Swedes invade Poland. III. 553. Make ſo many conqueſts upon the King of Denmark that they force him to give up to them three fine provinces. *ibid.* Had no good opinion of the Emperor's intentions, when he offered them his mediation. 851. *b.* Beſiege Conſtance without ſucceſs. II. 551. *and a. b.*

Swertius taken for a Calviniſt, and confounded with the author of the *Athenæ Batavæ*. IV. 942. *b.*

Swiftneſs in running was antiently an heroic quality. I. 77. *a.*

Swine's Fleſh, what reaſon Plutarch gives for the Jews not eating it. I. 115. *a.*

T.

T[illegible]*ria:* the deſign of the *Lex Tabellaria*. II. [illegible]45. *a. n.* (6).

Tabl[illegible]at of Alcinous paſſed into a proverb. I. 201. *a.*

Tableau de l'Amour conſideré dans l'état du Mariage, who is the author of that book. III. 581. *b.* Quoted. IV. 801. *b. n.* (24).

Tables (Alphabetical) See *Indexes.*

Tables (Aſtronomical) called Alfonſines, coſt the author of them the empire of Germany. II. 379. *a.*

Tables (Chronological) cenſured by Tanaquillus Faber. III. 388. *a.*

Tabourot (William) Father to Des Accords. I. 66.

Tabulæ Novæ, what they were among the antient Romans. II. 679. *a.*

Tachard quoted. V. 182. *a. b. n.* (12), (13), (14), (16), (17), (18). 183. *b. n.* (20), (21).

Tacitus, the difference of opinions with reſpect to a Spaniſh tranſlation of that Hiſtorian. I. 180. *a. b.*

What he ſays, on the ſtatues of Brutus and Caſſius not appearing at a funeral ſolemnity. 498. *b.* II. 94. *b. n.* (11). Swallowed the marvellous. I. 518. *b.* His ſtyle is too conciſe and obſcure. III. 248. *b.* What, according to him, is the ſtrongeſt inclination of the Deity with reſpect to man. IV. 572. *b.* 573. *a.* Whether he was much more ſcrupulous than Suetonius in deſcribing obſcene actions. V. 264. *b.* 265. *a. b.* 266. *a. b.* A judgment upon that Hiſtorian. 330. *a.* Althamerus publiſhes notes upon his *Germania.* I. 235.

Tacitus, Emperor, the ſpeech that he made in the ſenate. I. 575. *b.* 576. *a.*

Taffin, Miniſter of Metz, conſults the Miniſters of the conference of Poiſſy, touching the baptiſm of children baptized by women. I. 704. *b.*

Tagaut (John) enlarges and improves the chirurgery of Guy de Cauliac. II. 399. *a.* His Latin as pure as that of Cicero. *ibid. b.*

Tahureau (James) greatly ridicules the Aſtrological books of Peter Turrel. V. 417.

Talents: the ſtory of talents multiplied. I. 47. *a. b.*

Talents: there is a certain mixture, which hinders the fineſt talents from advancing us. I. 698. *a. b.* It is a very conſiderable and a very uſeful talent to be able to receive a languiſhing converſation. 701. *b.* 702. *a.*

Tallard (Count) takes Traerbach in the year 1702. V. 396.

Talmudiſts, their opinion concerning Adam's ſtature before and after he had tranſgreſſed. I. 103. *b.* They are ſo obſcure, that they are not to be underſtood. IV. 598. *a.*

Talon, Advocate-General, taxes the Janſeniſts with having zealouſly adhered to the cauſe of the Popes. III. 567. *a.*

Tamerlane cauſes his daughters to learn Magic, in order to facilitate his conqueſts. IV. 940. *b.*

Tammuz in Ezekiel was the ſame with Adonis, according to St Jerome. I. 125. *b.* 116. *a.*

Tandemus, the head of a ſect. IV. 629.

Tandler (Tobias) his harange *de Faſcino & Incantatione*, and his anſwer to Elich. II. 750. *a. b.*

Tapeſtry; Garaſſe ſharply cenſured for publiſhing the tale of the Tapeſtry of Queen Joan d'Albret. III. 134. IV. 332. *b.*

Tapyri had a law, by which the huſbands gave their wives to others, when they had two or three children by them. III. 495. *a.*

Tapper (Ruard) how he cried out one day, on account of Baius's doctrine. I. 608. *a.*

Taranto: Lewis, ſon to Philip Prince of Taranto, kills himſelf by immoderately careſſing his wife. IV. 301. *b.* 302. *a.*

Tareagnota, Mambrin Roſeo continues his Hiſtory of the world. IV. 918.

Tardieu, Lieutenant-Criminal at Paris, murthered with his wife. III. 40. *b.* 41. *a.*

Tarentines fall out with the Romans without a cauſe. IV. 662. *b.*

Targum of Jeruſalem relates to us what the diſpute was between Cain and Abel. I. 23. *b.*

Tarphan an interpreter of dreams at the King of Egypt's court. I. 87.

Tarquin, King of Rome, was a tyrant in two reſpects. II. 162. *b.* 163. *a.* He and his brother were very different in their manners. V. 290. *a.* He re-eſtabliſhes the Compital games. II. 163. *b.* Cauſes children to be ſacrificed in honour of the *Dii Penates*, &c. *ibid.*

Taſſo was ſubject to fits of madneſs, whi[illegible] not hinder his writing excellent verſes. II[illegible]. *a.* Spoiled his Poem by too much correcting. [illegible] 897. *a.* Whether he lived in lodgings. V. 401. *a.*

Taſſoni (Aleſſandro) quoted. III. 700. *b.* 701. *a. n.* (35). 773. *a. n.* (7). IV. 835. *a. n.* (8).

Taſte, an inſtance of its capriciouſneſs. V. 374. *a. b.*

Tatian reaſons ill againſt the Gentiles. II. 653. *b.*

Tavanes, Confident to the Duke of Orleans, brother to Henry II, performs a conſiderable exploit againſt the garriſon of Calais. III. 401. *a.* IV. 17. *and a. b.*

Taulerus praiſed immoderately by Luther. V. 301. *b.*

Taxation, that for which Cyrenian had a ſpecial commiſſion. IV. 820.

Taxes of the Romiſh Chancery, facts concerning that book. IV. 649. *a. b.* 650. *a.* The edition of it that was publiſhed by Laurence Banck. I. 627. *b.* 628. *a. b.* 629. *a. b.* Other editions of it, and among the reſt, that of Rome, in 1514. 628. *b.* The difference of thoſe editions. *ibid.* Put in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum. ibid.* The juſt reproaches of the Proteſtants, with regard to that book. *ibid.* 629. *a.* The Romiſh Controverſiſts are much puzzled what to ſay about it. *ibid. b.* A Chancellor of Bois-le-duc, who promiſes to abjure his Catholiciſm, if any one could ſhew him thoſe abominations which the Proteſtants quote, as taken from that book. *ibid. a.* There are ſeveral obſervations upon it, in a work tranſlated by Laurence Tuppius. V. 415. *a. b.*

Taxites, a cuſtom that they obſerved, with reſpect to their daughters. V. 131. *a. n.* (39).

Teachers are obliged to avoid ambiguous maxims, and to prevent falſe gloſſes. I. 463. *a.*

Teeth, William Bigot was born with two. II. 7. *b.*

Teians built Abdera. I. 17. *a. b.*

Teiſſier (Antony) cenſured. I. 747. *a. b. n.* (1), (10). IV. 848. *and a. n.* (3). Should have added corrections to the paſſages, where Thuanus is miſtaken, in the elogies he beſtows on learned men. *ibid. b.*

Tekeli, the correſpondence which France carried on with him. I. 171. *a. b.* His misfortunes. III. 682. *b.*

Telamon never laughed. V. 317. *a.*

Telemachus, an eaſtern Monk ſo called, his adventure, his courage, and his martyrdom. I. 230. *a. b.*

Telemachus, the author of his adventures, cenſured for the character he gives to Pygmalion. IV. 643. *a. b.* 644. *a. b.* 645. *a. b.*

Teleſinus, General of the Samnites, for what reaſons he wanted to deſtroy the city of Rome. III. 686. *b.*

Tellier (Father) takes advantage of ſome ſtories, which are ſpread abroad, without knowing whether they be true or falſe. I. 727. *a.* His reflexions on the zeal which the Janſeniſts ſhewed to have two decrees of the Court of Rome printed. III. 567. *b.*

Tementhes adviſed by the god Hammon, to beware of cocks. IV. 790. *a.*

Temenus, one of the chiefs of the Heraclidæ in the expedition, in which they retook the Peloponneſus. II. 240. *b.* 241. *a.*

Temerity, whether a lucky raſhneſs deſerves that name. V. 370. *b.*

Temermans (Antony Antonine) ſuffers himſelf to be ſtrangled, rather than he would reveal the confeſſion of Jaureguy. II. 460. *b.*

Temper: a man's temper has a great influence upon his mind. II. 452. *a. b.* It is almoſt always the firſt and principal ſpring, even in perſons who are God's inſtruments. III. 11. *a.*

Temperance, a diſcourſe on that virtue converts a famous Debauchee. V. 570. *a. b.*

Tempeſt, an Atheiſt's anſwer to thoſe who reproached him with being the cauſe of one. II. 655. *b.*

Temple of Jeruſalem, Julian the Apoſtate could not rebuild it. I. 228. Ezekiel's deſcription of it is a difficult matter. 618. *a.*

Temple of the Earth, facts concerning it. II. 344. *b.* 345. *a.*

Temple of Epheſus, the reflexion which an Hiſtorian makes, on Diana's ſuffering it to be burnt. III. 59. *a. b.* IV. 405. *b.* V. 360. *a.* How the Epheſians eluded the deſire which Alexander had, to appropriate the whole inſcription of that temple to himſelf. 553. *a.*

Temporal: the Temporal character generally abſorbs the Eccleſiaſtical, when they are joined together. III. 768. *a. b.*

Tennis, the antiquity of that play. IV. 344. *a.*

Terah, ſome Fathers of the Church, have thought that he neither was a believer in his life, nor at the point of death. I. 45. *b.*

Tercera Iſles, a bloody affront which the French received there. V. 254. *a. b.* No ſatisfaction was required for it. *ibid. b.* Which is a ſhameful paſſage of Henry the third's reign. *ibid.*

Terebinthus, heir to the eſtate, money, and impieties, of Scythianus, comes to a tragical end. IV. 90. *a. b.*

Terence commended for having wrote no Tragedies. I. 59. *b.* Who is the author of the verſes, prefixed to his Comedies. 375. *a.* How he wrote his Comedies. II. 39. *b.*

Terentia divorced by Cicero. V. 380. *b.*

Terminus, a Heathen god, ſtands more in fear of Hadrian, than of Jupiter himſelf. III. 317. *a. b.* St Auguſtin's raillery on that head. *ibid.*

Tertullian makes uſe of a miracle of Achilles againſt the Epicureans. I. 85. *b.* His imaginary triumph over the wiſe Heathens, conſidering the fact he goes upon. II. 642. *a.* What he ſays of the connexion between gluttony and luſt. 822. *a.* And of the privileges which the Heathens granted to women, who had married but once. III. 192. *a.* An examination of a propoſition which he affirms, *viz.* That the meaneſt Chriſtian tradeſman, finds God and declares him. V. 141. *b.* & *ſeq.* A thing that he reproaches the Pagans with. 454. *a.*

Ter-Veer. See *Vere.*

Teſtament (the New) ſome body ſaid that there is not a jot in it, but what is taken from the Jewiſh antiquities. IV. 880. *a. b.*

Tetragramma: whether the points of the Tetragramma are proper to that name. I. 244. *b.* 245. *a.* Abuſive reflexions on that head. *ibid.*

Text (Hebrew) whether the Jews altered it. I. 173. *a.*

Tezelius (John) is the perſon who wrote firſt againſt Luther. IV. 772. *b.*

Thales, whether he acknowledged a God, who had formed all things. I. 300. *b.* V. 321. *a. b.* 322. *a.* He taught that water was the principle of all things. III. 650. *a.* An anſwer which is aſcribed to him, touching the definition of God. V. 141. *b.* 142. *a.*

Thalia, a Poem, what the matter and form of it are. I. 478. *a. b.*

Thames, in leſs than nine hours, ebbs and flows three times contrary to cuſtom. V. 42. *b.*

Thargalia gains the affection of the principal Grecians by her wit and beauty. IV. 578. *b.*

Thaumaſius (Mount) the wonders that were told of it. IV. 205. *b.*

Theagenes, the hero of a romance, gives his heroine a box on the ear. III. 378. *a. b.* See *Romance.*

Theatins, their quarrel with the Jeſuits. III. 887. *a. b.*

Theatrum Urbium, who is the author of that work. II. 121.

Thebans were forbidden to ſleep in the temple of Amphiaraus. I. 277. *a.* Paid Divine honours to Alcmena. 208.

Thebes called the *City of the Sun*, by the Egyptians. II. 233.

Theft was allowed among the antient Egyptians. I. 464. *b.*

Thelin, his Divine eſſays. I. 562. *a.*

Themiſtocles, his anſwer to an inhabitant of Seriphus. II. 414. *b.* The envy which people bore him, was one of the cauſes of Cimon's advancement. 504. *b.* 505. *a.*

Theocritus, his anſwer to the queſtion, why he did not write. I. 453. *a.*

Theocritus, the Poet, a paſſage in him, corrected by Mr de Longe-Pierre. I. 113. *b.*

Theocritus of Chios, his judgment of Anaximenes's ſpeeches pleaſantly expreſſed. I. 330. *a.*

Theocritus, the Sophiſt, his raillery upon hearing of Alexander's death. IV. 404. *b.*

Theodidactus, why that name was given to Ammonius Saccas. I. 269. *a.*

Theodorus, the Atheiſt, boldly denied there were any gods. II. 652. *b.* After what manner he anſwered the objection which a woman made to him at a feaſt. III. 460. *a. b.*

Theodorus Studita, his teſtament tranſlated by Father Sirmond, and by Livineius. III. 853. *a. b.*

Theodoret decides a point like a bad Divine. I. 13. *b.* 14. *a. b.* He ſhould have built upon the authority of Iſocrates, when he reproached the Pagans with the Divine honours which they paid to Helen. III. 368. *a.* Alledged an author who is againſt him, with reſpect to the impurities of Prodicus. IV. 784. *a. b.* 785. *a.* What he ſays againſt Plato's laws, concerning the two ſexes. 802. *b.*

Theodoric, King of the Oſtrogoths, his Hiſtory wrote by Cochlœus. II. 523. *a. b.*

Theodoſius, Emperor, was offended, when he found his ſon ſitting at his leſſon, while his maſter ſtood. I. 507. How St Ambroſe treated him. 593. *a.* An edict of this Emperor. V. 760.

Theodoſius the Younger, Emperor, his ſudden change with reſpect to Neſtorius, gives room to believe what Acacius of Berœa ſays of it. IV. 348. *b.*

Theology, what Accurſius ſays of it. I. 67. *and b.* Cannot ſubſiſt without Philoſophy. II. 202. *b.* Ramiſm and Carteſianiſm involved in its diſputes. 696. *a.* It ought not to be ſubjected to Philoſophy. IV. 419. *b.* See *Divinity.*

Theology (Pagan) what it made a tyrant expect. II. 557. *a. b.* 558. *a.*

Theon, the Sophiſt, a precept of Rhetoric which he gave. II. 341. *b.* What he tells us concerning Ephorus. 772. *b.*

Theophilus, a French Poet, reproaches Balzac with two or three unpleaſant adventures. I. 623. *b.* It is pretended that he was in love with Des-Barreaux. II. 646. *b.* Of what kind his impieties and obſcenities were. III. 135. *b.* 136. *a.*

Theophraſtus, a leud woman wrote againſt him, which occaſioned a proverb. III. 779. *a. b.* The reaſon which Vives gives, why Leontium wrote a book againſt him. *ibid. b.*

Theopompus, his double dealing, in ſaying one thing with the tongue and another with the pen. IV. 174. *b.* His vanity. V. 332. *b.* 333. *a. b.* He and Timæus are looked upon as a couple of ſatirical and fabulous Hiſtorians. 358. *b.*

Theory, oppoſite to Practice. I. 130. *b.* 131. *a.* A Theory which engages a Doctor to practice. II. 193. *and a. b.*

Theſeus, one of his wives has been multiplied into four. V. 305. *a.* He is obliged to prove his Divine original. *ibid. b.* 306. *a.*

Theſpeſius led a good life after his reſurrection. I. 282. *b.*

Theſſaly was very much cried down for witchcraft. V. 310. *a.*

Thetis pimps for her ſon. I. 84. *a.* Is at variance with her huſband the Ocean. III. 634. *b.*

Thevathat, the Hiſtory of that man. V. 182. *a. b.* 183. *a. b.*

Thevet confuted, as to the Magic art, of which he accuſes Agrippa. I. 151. *a. b.* 152. *a.* His want of judgment in recommending certain books. 165. *a.* His diſhoneſt proceeding. 736. *a.* He cenſures the ingratitude of great men, who overlook the miſery of ſeveral perſons of diſtinguiſhed learning. III. 50. *b.*

Thomas Aquinas, his authority among thoſe of the Church of Rome. I. 470. *a.* Cenſured. IV. 877. *b.* 878. *a. b.*

Thomas à Becket, his perſecutor becomes his votary. III. 797. *b.*

Thomaſius (James) his harangue concerning the predictions of the new Prophets. III. 436. *b.* 437. *a.*

Thomaſius (Chriſtian) is about an apology for thoſe who have been unjuſtly accuſed of Atheiſm. III. 671. *b.* V. 323. *a. n.* (16).

Thomaſſin (Lewis) one of his ſentiments examined. I. 302. *a. b.* His reflexion touching the original of the Manichees, Neſtorians, and Eutychians, that are in Aſia. IV. 513. *a.*

Thomiſts, their Hypotheſis about Tranſubſtantiation. V. 819.

Thonis, an Egyptian Courtezan, ſummoneth a young man before the Judges, and for what. III. 714. *b.*

Thornax, a mountain of Laconia, why called *Coccygius*, or *Coccyx*. III. 632. *a.*

Thorns (fabulous) whoſe flowers were of the ſhape of a crown. I. 37. *and b.*

Thought, the formation of it is a very difficult ſubject. I. 555. *b.* If it be a modification of the body, then all bodies are thinking ſubſtances. II. 658. *a. b.* 660. *b.* 661. *a. b.* V. 215. *a. b.* It cannot be the ſole effect of the diſpoſition of the organs. II. 661. *b.* Is diſtinct from all the modifications of body that are come to our knowledge. *ibid. and* 779. *b.* Can only be found in an indiviſible Being. III. 790. *b.* 791. *a. b.*

Thoughts, there is not leſs wit required in applying them right, than in being the firſt authors of them. II. 779. *a.* A thought muſt be true in order to be fine. 527. *a.* There are no thoughts ſo much to be ſuſpected, as thoſe which are put off in an aſſuming manner, and with a majeſtic tone. III. 809. *a.* There are thoughts, which being eſſentially good, are reliſhed every where, and at all times. IV. 741. *b.* 742. *a.*

Thoughts of Morinus, a book which brought its author to the ſtake. IV. 269. *b.* 270. *a. b.*

Throne, thoſe who ſit upon it, have more need than others of the aſſiſtance of a happy temper, to become ſaints. II. 767. *a.*

Thuanus (James-Auguſtus) a fault which muſt needs have crept into his Hiſtory, corrected. I. 22. *b.* He calls the Proteſtants a very ſuſpicious people. 119. *a. b.* His ſon was ſo ſharply reproached by King James, that it threw him into a fit of ſickneſs. II. 183. *a.* He forgets an eſſential thing, in ſpeaking of Buſbequius. 232. *a.* An examination of what has been ſaid, as to Camden's having furniſhed him with memoirs different from what he (Camden) publiſhed afterwards in his Annals. 283. *b.* 284. *a.* A precaution which he took to hinder his Hiſtory being ſuppreſſed. 283. *a. b.* He admired the judgment which Julius Cæſar Scaliger paſſed upon Cardan. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* One page of Thuanus, upon Charles V, is to be preferred before a volume of Sandoval. 442. He is miſtaken in his judgment of the *Brutum Fulmen.* III. 521. *a.* His contradiction with regard to Charlotte, daughter to the Duke of Montpenſier. 864. *b.* 865. *a.* He would not ſpeak Latin. IV. 409. *a. b.* Diſfigured proper names. III. 722. *b.* 723. *a.* He inveighs ſtrongly againſt the conduct of the Conſtable de Montmorency, with reſpect to the Ducheſs of Valentinois. IV. 699. *a.* Cenſured. II. 399. IV. 848. *b.* Did not ſufficiently enquire into what concerned the lives of the learned. *ibid.*

Thuanus (Francis), ſome particulars relating to his trial. III. 802. *a. b.* 827. *a. b.*

Thucydides, whether or not his ſtile was imitated by the writers of his time. II. 570. *b.* 571. *a.* He has gained immortal honour by doing juſtice to his greateſt enemies. V. 801.

Thuringia, the Archbiſhops of Mentz renounce their right to that country. II. 815.

Tyana, the inhabitants of it built a temple to their countryman Apollonius. I. 380. *b.*

Tiara (Pontifical), whether the word *Myſterium* was writ upon it. II. 708. *a. b.*

Tyard (Pontus de) cenſured. IV. 609. *a. b.*

Tyber, projects formed to prevent its inundations. V. 499. *a. b.*

Tiberius (the Emperor) conceals a moſt dangerous ſnare under the appearance of frankneſs. I. 422. *a. b.* Is very ill-uſed by Artabanus II, King of Parthia. 511. *and b.* 512. *a.* Puts an author to death for having praiſed Brutus and Caſſius. II. 355. *b.* Is flattered in full Senate. 356. *a.* One of his beſt-conducted intrigues. 559. *b.* Was deſtitute of all natural affection. 719. *a.* Lays aſide his ordinary diſſimulation. 720. *b.* 721. *a.* Rejects a petition very harſhly, and his ſeverity is diſliked by the Senate. III. 497. What he did to conceal his being the death of the accuſed. IV. 21. *b.* Praiſed immoderately. 495. *and a. b.* Grants the honour of a triumph to Blœſus, and refuſes it to Dolabella. V. 277. *a. b.* 278. *a.* His conduct with reſpect to Sejanus's daughters. 824.

Tiburnus was a Pagan deity. V. 350. *b.*

Tycho Brahe ſettles in Bohemia. III. 657. Wiſhed that the number of Mathematician Preachers was greater. IV. 680. *a.*

Tigranes put to death by Tiberius. III. 164. *b.* Another Tigranes made King of Armenia by Nero. *ibid.*

Tigre (Le), a ſatire which occaſioned the death of two perſons. III. 290. *a. b.*

Tilbury (Gervaſe of) quoted. IV. 738. *b.* 739. *a.*

Tilenus confers with Cameron. II. 285. *a.* His advertiſement to the aſſembly of Rochelle. IV. 212. *a. b.*

Tillet (Lewis de) engaged Calvin to compoſe ſhort exhortations, which were read as homilies in ſome pariſhes. II. 261. *a.* Was only Canon and Archdeacon of Angouleſme, and not a Biſhop or Archbiſhop. IV. 681. *a. n.* (1). V. 356. *and a. b.*

Tilly, General of an army, was very chaſte. III. 414. *b.* V. 357. Acquired honour, partly by his own good conduct, and partly by the bad conduct of his enemies. 180. *a.*

Timæus, what he ſaid of Ariſtotle's ſhop. I. 465. *a.* He does not do juſtice to Agathocles in his Hiſtory. V. 359. *a. b.*

Timanthus, how he drew the face of Iphigenia's father, in order to repreſent his grief. IV. 505. *b.*

Time; a Grammarian was of opinion, that diſputing on any material queſtions of Divinity, was ſo much time ill employed. II. 190. *b.* It is difficult to averr things which paſſed in remote times. 386. *b.* Whether time be diviſible *in infinitum.* V. 609. *a.*

Time to come, God has very wiſely covered it in thick darkneſs. II. 126.

Time (unſeaſonable), all thoſe who are to preſent their works to great men, ought to avoid unſeaſonable time. III. 281. *a. b.*

Timocrates, the calumnies which he vented againſt Epicurus. II. 782. *b.*

Timoleon, the elogies which Timæus beſtows upon him. V. 360. *a.* A dream that he had. 364. *b.* What anſwer he made when ſome perſons in Syracuſe publickly accuſed him. 365. *a. b.*

Timotheus, how he anſwered thoſe who reproached him with his mother's ſcandalous life. II. 548. *b.* What Plutarch relates concerning that Athenian General. V. 367. *a.*

Tyndarides, a ſtory that is told of their apparition. V. 140. *a.*

Tindium; whence it came that the thorns which grew about the temple of Tyndium, were thought to be always in bloom. I. 37. *b.*

Typographical errors in names multiply perſons. IV. 193. An error of that kind is the reaſon that Mr Moreri has given us a chimerical Hereſiarch. *ibid.*

Tyre, the cruelty which Alexander exerciſed upon the inhabitants of that city. IV. 7. *a.*

Tyranny; in deſtroying one, people very often eſtabliſh a greater. III. 452. *a. b.* 467. *a. b.* 468. *a.* Who invented moſt of the ways by which it is eſtabliſhed and kept up. IV. 562. *a.* One of the greateſt misfortunes that attend it is, that there is no way to renounce it. 563. *b.* 564. *a. b.* Tyranny exerciſed without arms. 566. *b.* 567. *a. b.*

Tyrants, whether faith is to be kept with them. II. 164. *a.* There are who hate the tyrant, but not the tyranny. 167. *a. b.* They would have us fear leſt the walls and floors of our chambers ſhould witneſs againſt us. 627. *a.* Can lay no ſtreſs upon the fidelity of their ſubjects. III. 139. *a.* It is lawful to put them to death. I. 237. *b.* Authors who maintain that doctrine. II. 458. *a. b.* 459. *a.*

Tiraquellus produced every year a book and a child. III. 662. *b.* 663. *a.* V. 380. *a.* Quoted. 129. *b. n.* (26), (27), (28). He was one of the moſt illuſtrious men of the XVIth century. 799. The character of his Commentary on the laws of matrimony. *ibid.*

Title of a book, which alarms the Court of Rome, and which the author reforms. III. 122.

Titles: how fond people are of pompous titles. II. 170. *a. b.* Titles given to Princes, are only according to the uſage. I. 800. *b.* A private perſon who gives Princes the titles which they uſually aſſume, does not ſet himſelf up as a judge of their pretenſions. *ibid.*

Titus Livius, what he ſaid of the Republic of Rome. I. 138. *a. b.* The difference there is betwixt him and Valerius Maximus, with reſpect to the marble tiles, which had been taken from the temple of Juno Lacinia. III. 640. *a. b.* 641. *a.* He contradicts himſelf in ſpeaking of Alexander. IV. 9. *a.* An eſtate ſold to purchaſe him. 467. *b.* 468. *a.* Quoted. 749. *a. b. n.* (18). His maxims incorporated in the body of the diſcourſe. V. 327. *b.* He and Ovid die in the ſame year. IV. 447. *b.*

Tobacco, when and by whom made known in Italy. V. 26. *and a.* A Poem on that ſubject. *ibid. a. b. and* 346. *a.*

Toledo, flies do not enter into the ſhambles there, and why. III. 430. *b.* The fifth Council of Toledo makes decrees againſt thoſe who are inquiſitive about the ſucceſſion, in a Prince's life-time. 955. *a.*

Toleration in point of religion, a juſtification of that which the States-General grant to the Mennonites. I. 288. *b.* 289. *a.* A compariſon between the toleration of the Mahometans, and that of the Chriſtians. IV. 39. *a. b.* 349. *a. b.* Milton's principles on on that head. 223. *a. b.* Whether the Roman Catholics ſhould be excluded from it. *ibid. b.* 224. *a. b.* That which the Jews granted to the Sadducees, was an exceſſive toleration. V. 11. *b.* 12. *a.* The Sieur de Beauval's treatiſe on that ſubject. I. 672. *a. b.* Oppoſed by Viret, who employed the authority of the Papiſts, to curb the ſects of Lyons. V. 483. *and b.*

Toleration (the Advocates for), it is not true that they pretend to take from Princes the power of the ſword, which they hold from God. III. 147. *b.*

Tollius, the blundering miſtake of that Critic, with reſpect to Father Sirmond. III. 853. *a. b.*

Tombs; ſome miraculous adventures have been related concerning Ajax's tomb. I. 161. *b.* And concerning that of Alcmena. 208. *b.* The Pagans believed that it was not ſafe to remove them. *ibid.* A memorable tomb. 210. *b.* Lightning falling upon them, is looked upon as a glorious accident. II. 870. *a.* Three famous Lawyers in the ſame tomb. 507. *a. b.*

Tongue: a boy who continued to ſpeak, after he had loſt his tongue. II. 410. *b.* It is a fine victory to be able to command it. 438. *a. b.*

Too much: the maxim *too much of nothing* ſuffers infinite varieties, when the queſtion is to fix the bounds between too much and enough. I. 766. *a.*

Tooth (golden): it was a meer impoſture. III. 486. *a.* Horſtius was groſsly deceived about it. *ibid.*

Top-knots, their antiquity. I. 333. *a. b.* II. 544. *a. b.* 545. *a. b.*

Torigni, confident to Margaret de Valois, Queen of Navarre, is removed from that Queen. IV. 335. *a. b.*

Torſtenſon beſieges Brin, loſes 4000 men there, and abandons the ſiege. V. 192. *b.*

Torture, whether the uſe of it ſhould be allowed. III. 238. *and a. b.* 239. *a. b.*

Torvobatius, the fictitious name of Des Accords. I. 66. *b.*

Totan (William) believed to be author of the *Fortalitium Fidei*, of which he publiſhed a new edition. V. 197. *a.*

Totila, the Hiſtory of him wrote by Cochlæus, was never publiſhed. II. 523.

Toulouſe, the Inquiſition there, puniſhes certain Heretics, on account of their leudneſs. III. 280. *b.*

Tour (Count la) ſeizes on the ſuburbs of Vienna, and beſieges the city. V. 677.

Tournament, it does not ſuit the majeſty of a King, to be one of the Combatants. III. 399. *b.*

Tourneur (le) was the name of the family of Verſoris, which is no more than that French word turned into Latin. V. 464. *a.*

Touronenſis (Gregorius) cited about a ſon Ham. V. 632. *b.* 633. *a.*

Tours was not plundered by Abderame. II. 851. *a.*

Touches. See *Bigarrures.*

Tower of wood, which defended the Pyreum. I. 424. *a. b.* And which was ſaid to have been proof againſt fire. *ibid.* An Architect who could tranſport an entire ſtone tower from one place to another. 474. *and a. b.*

Towns (Imperial) of Alſace, whether they can retain their immediate holding of the empire, under a protector or guardian that is King of France. III. 717. *b.* 718. *a.* Cannot preſerve a neutrality. *ibid.*

Tractatus de Libertatibus Ecceſiæ Gallicanæ, who is the author of that book. I. 157. *a. b.*

Trade, what is the ſcience neceſſary to make one ſucceed in it. II. 33. *a. b.*

Traditionaries, who was the chief of them among the Jews. I. 173. *b.*

Traditions, we cannot be too diſtruſtful of ſuch as are only grounded upon hearſays. II. 473. *b.* 474. *b.* 475. *a. b.* Whether they ought to be credited, when they concern things that are ſuppoſed to have happened a great while ago. 829. *b.* What weight the Pagans laid upon them, when they were to prove the exiſtence of a Deity. 872. *b.* Whether we ought to have any regard to fabulous traditions. III. 743. *b.* 744. *a. b.* The long duration of the moſt fabulous. 751. *b.* An author who carefully followed them in his Dramatical repreſentations of the myſteries. II. 480. *b.*

Traditions (ill grounded) Launoi and ſome other writers who oppoſe them, do credit to their Church, and diſpleaſe many. IV. 739, 740. Baronius and Bellarmin maintain with might and main, ſeveral traditions as ill grounded as the ſtroy of the She-Pope. 734. *a.* One does not much examine thoſe that may ſerve for an ornament to the ſubject one treats of. 738. *b.* Sometimes people blame and reject them, at the ſame time that they admit very childiſh ones. 864. *and b.*

Traditions of Slander are more to be miſtruſted than traditions of praiſe. IV. 511. *a.* At the end of three or four generations they ought not to be received. *ibid.*

Tragedy: the laſt word of a tragedy occaſions a terrible accident. I. 175. The alterations which the antients made in tragedy. II. 824. *a. b.* Several women with child miſcarried at ſeeing the tragedy of the Eumenides acted. *ibid. b.* What was the fineſt part of the antient tragedy. 872. *a.* It is unreaſonable to charge the author of a tragedy with all the ſentiments he puts in the mouth of the actors. 873. *a.* Plato is againſt any tragedies being acted, wherein the gods are abuſed. 825. *a.* We are not to place what we find there among Hiſtorical facts. IV. 660. *a.* How it was defined by Gorgias. V. 147. *a.* Tragedies upon religious controverſies. IV. 299. *a. b.* Rataller repreſents in a very noble manner the uſefulneſs of tragedy in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his Latin tranſlation of Sophocles. 849. *b.* Some Poets do wonders in the four firſt acts of a tragedy, and ſucceed very ill in the laſt, for which good Poets reſerve their moſt exquiſite ſtrokes. III. 720. *b.*

Trajan, what was the moſt magnificent of all his buildings. I. 376. An extraordinary action attributed to him by Lampridius. II. 770. *b.* Though none of the Hiſtorians of that Prince ſpeak of it. *ibid.*

Tranſcribers: haſty tranſcribers fall into the greateſt miſtakes. I. 209. *b.* To how many faults they are liable. 536. *a.* The author mentions divers things only to ſerve for a warning to tranſcribers. II. 232. *b.* A ſtory that is told of the fault of a tranſcriber. V. 106. *b.* 107. *a.* They introduce alterations. I. 538. *b.* Confound facts with their own conjectures, *&c.* IV. 609. *a.*

Tranſlations; one ſingle point, either taken away, or added, or altered, produces quite oppoſite things in a tranſlation. I. 525. *a.* They require more capacity than one would think. IV. 873. *and a. b.* How difficult they are. V. 409. *a.*

Tranſlations of the Bible into the Vulgar Tongue, a ſurprizing inſtance of the abuſe that may be made of them. IV. 723. *a. b.* Blamed by Mr Ponect; his advice on that head to Peter de Gondy Biſhop of Paris. *ibid. a.* The book which Ponect writ on that ſubject is extremely trifling in Mr Arnauld's opinion. *ibid. b.* A collection of authors who have diſapproved them, and Mr Arnauld's judgment of that collection. *ibid.*

Tranſlators often aſſume a right which they have not. I. 77. *a.* Some times ſow diſſenſion, when they leaſt think of it. 205. *a.* A rule which they ought to follow. 510. *a.* They ought never to paraphraſe, nor depart in the leaſt from their original, without being thoroughly acquainted with the matter in queſtion. II. 43. *b.* Are generally the Panegyriſts of the authors whom they tranſlate. 590. Cannot well be truſted. IV. 169. *a. b.* How liable they are to commit great blunders. V. 384. *b.* Their miſtakes. 820.

Tranſitions, how difficult it is to manage them well. IV. 619. *b.*

Tranſubſtantiation, John Poinet admits that word, but ſo as not to include Oral Manducation. IV. 693. *b.* Thoſe who maintain it, confound the notion of things, and the ſignification of words. V. 219. *a. b.* 220. *a. b.*

Trappe (Abbot de la) his prodigious progreſs in the ſtudy of the Greek Poets. I. 293. *a. b.*

Travellers: what a traveller anſwered to thoſe who made a jeſt of his unſettled temper: and the anſwer that was made to another traveller. I. 540. *a.* Their relations ordinarily ſhew us what is their prevailing taſte, whether they are Antiquaries, Phyſicians, Geographers, *&c.* III. 342. *b.*

Travelling, the bad effects of it complained of. III. 345. *b.* Condemned by Joſeph Hall, Lanſius, *&c.*

Approvd

Approved of by Lipſius, who gives good inſtructions concerning it. *ibid.*

Treacle, who invented it. I. 334. *and a. b.* 335. *a. b.*

Treaties of Peace, it is their fate to be found fault with. III. 420. *b.* The antient Romans made no great ſcruple to violate them. 583. *b.* 584. *a.*

Trebonius treacherouſly put to death at Smyrna II. 680. *b.*

Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, what the prohibition to eat of it ſignified. II. 856. *a.*

Trees: an extraordinary tree planted by Abraham. I. 46. *a. b.* The great age of certain trees. 281. *b. b.* The Gentiles had a religious veneration for ſuch as they believed to be very antient. III. 349. *b.*

Trent (the council of) they were willing to conclude it by acclamations. III. 870. *b.* 871. *a.* See *Council of Trent.*

Treſlon incenſed againſt the Duke of Alba, and for what reaſon. IV. 453. *and n.* (*b*).

Treus (Servilius) a Venetian Lawyer, excelled both in buſineſs and learning. II. 314. *a. b.*

Trezenians eat their fruits too green, that oracle explained. III. 965. *b.*

Tribes: one of the tribes of Athens was named Acamantis. I. 53. *and b.* Another of them bore the name of Ajax. 161. *b.*

Tribunals favourable to fornication. I. 222. *a. b.* 223. *a. b.* In all ſorts of tribunals men of honour decline ſitting as judges, from the moment that they are excepted againſt. 489. *b.* The people generally preſume in favour of tribunals. 610. *b.* A tribunal which was called *the Rock of the Accuſed.* II. 245. *and a.*

Tribunes of the people, the ordinances made at their requeſt, were not properly called laws but *Plebiſcita.* III. 490. *a.*

Tribuneſhip of the people, an employment peculiar to Plebeian families. I. 356. *a. b.*

Tribunitian Power, a name given by Auguſtus to the ſupreme authority. II. 718. *a.*

Tribute, it ſometimes has the ſpecious name of a penſion. I. 541. *a. b.*

Triceſſius (John) a man of learning and quality, clandeſtinely ſows the ſeeds of the Reformation at Cracow. III. 147.

Trifles; a perſon ought neither to dwell upon them, nor return to them: they ſhould be the amuſements of youth. I. 64. *a.*

Trifling particulars do not want their uſe. II. 309. *a. b.* Are inſeparable from criticiſm. 773. *a.*

Trimouille, the pretenſions of that houſe to the kingdom of Naples. IV. 313. *b.* 314. *a. b.*

Trinity, moſt people are not ſatisfied with words upon that myſtery. I. 29. *a.* The doctrine of the Trinity compared to the three propoſitions of a Syllogiſm. *ibid. b.* And to the three dimenſions of matter. *ibid.* According to ſome authors Ariſtotle was not ignorant of it. 471. *a.* What was the belief of the Fathers of the three firſt centuries concerning it. 477. *a. b.* A collection of paſſages, which ſhew that the antient Jewiſh Church believed it. IV. 880. *a.* The Spinoziſts will perhaps have recourſe to that doctrine, in order to ſave their hypotheſis. V. 223. *a. b.* What it was that opened a door in Poland for the overthrow of this myſtery. 228. *b.* 229. *a. b.* The ſubtleties of the ſchoolmen on this head. 819, 820, 821. Some Proteſtant Divines could wiſh that the whole doctrine of it had been expreſſed in five or ſix lines. 819. A ſtrong invective of the Abbot Faydit on this ſubject, againſt the explications of the ſchoolmen 820. *and n.* (30). There is no ſubject that has been more perplexed by the Spaniſh ſchoolmen. 820. The anſwer of the leſſer Catechiſm of the Reformed Churches on this ſubject. 826.

Tripoli beſieged and taken by the Turks. I. 406.

Triſtan falls into two groſs miſtakes in a paſſage of Lampridius touching the Emperor Hadrian. III. 318. *b.* His miſtake, with reſpect to Julia, wiſe of Septimius Severus. 603. *a. b.* Cenſured by Perizonius, for what he ſays of Marcellus's mother. IV. 397. *a. b.*

Trithemius (Abbot) his catalogue. III. 559. *b.* 560. *a.* Convicted of a falſehood with reſpect to Platina and his impriſonment. IV. 685. *b.*

Triumph: who was the firſt ſtranger honoured with a triumph at Rome. I. 611. *b.* A taſte different from that of an antient Father, who wiſhed he had ſeen a triumph at Rome. III. 646. *a.*

Triumph (Naval) who was the firſt Roman that had it decreed to him. II. 726.

Triumvirate diſpoſſeſſed of their lands, thoſe who had cultivated them. I. 319. *a.*

Triumvirate mentioned in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, of whom it was made up. III. 269. *a. b.*

Triumviri condemn 1400 Roman Ladies to declare what eſtates they poſſeſſed. III. 489. *and a.*

Trivulcio cauſes a paſſage to be made through a mountain for the introduction of the French army into Italy. III. 98. *a. b.*

Troy: all the miſfortunes of the war of Troy were occaſioned by women. II. 481. *b.*

Trojans, how they treated the daughters of the Locrians. II. 340. *a. b.* 341. *a. b.*

Trophy, religion forbad the violation of it. I. 525. *b.*

Truchſes (Gebhard) Elector of Cologn, under what name the Spaniards are employed againſt him. II. 224. *b.* His complaints on that head. *ibid.* Waramund writes in his defence, and Gonſalez Pontius de Leon confutes him. III. 774.

True: what appears true to us to day, may not appear ſo at another time. IV. 188. *b.*

Truquis (the Preſident) obliges Guichenon to inſert in his works whatever he pleaſes. III. 275. *b.*

Truth, is centered in an impenetrable abyſs. IV. 653. *a. b.* 654. *a.* Evidence cannot be the rule and meaſure of truth, or what they call its *Criterium. ibid. b.* V. 586. *b.* Whether it be not neceſſary to make outward profeſſion of it in time of perſecution. I. 663. *a. b.* There are truths againſt which the moſt prejudiced and the moſt paſſionate men will not diſpute. 708. *b.* The depoſitaries of truth compared to the dogs of the Capitol. 773. *b.* Thoſe truths, which are called maxims, no leſs claſh with each other, than errors and truths. 784. *b.* They are two very different things, to love truth in itſelf, and to love the party which one takes for the true one. II. 24. *a. b.* It avails little that there ſhould be ſuch a thing, if we have no rule to diſtinguiſh it from falſehood. 327. *a. b.* Whether it ought to be ſupreſſed. 451. *b.* We loſe it by diſputing too much. 485. *b.* It does not need to be ſupported by ill means. III. 55. *a. b.* There are ſome who preſerve it as they do a piece of China-ware. 902. *b.* The ſoul is more ſtrongly faſtened to it by the weight of the paſſions than by the charms of light. IV. 188. *b.* Whether we ought to own diſadvantageous truths. V. 824. 825.

Truths (Evangelical) it is eſſential to them not to be ſquared by the rules of Philoſophy. V. 815.

Truths (Hiſtorical) are not leſs impenetrable than Phyſical ones, on many occaſions. II. 543. *b.* Who were called the three pillars of truth in Spain. IV. 723. *a.* The ſuppreſſion of a truth is a real lie, when it is done with an intention to deceive him who aſks a queſtion. V. 51. *b.* 52. *a.*

Tudelenſis (Benjamin) makes David the co-temporary of Romulus. IV. 763. *b.*

Tudeſque, the ſignification of that word, according to Menage and Bouhours. V. 540. *a. n.* (2), (3).

Tullius (Servius) what was the preſage of his riſe to the kingly dignity. V. 288. *a.*

Tunic of JESUS CHRIST, Bajazet boaſted that he had it. V. 469. *a. b.* 470. *a. b.*

Turenne (the Marſhal de) is fond of re-uniting both religions. I. 705. *b.* The gentlemen of Port-Royal are very buſy to make him change his religion. II. 518. *a. b.* He did not pretend to learning. 520. *b.* The impertinence of a country ſquire in ſpeaking of that great Captain. 774. *a.* On what occaſion his gallantries were talked of. III. 265. *b.* 266. *a.* His meals reckoned too ſhort. V. 35. *b.* Killed. IV. 211. *b.* Maſcaron compoſes his funeral oration. 172. Beaten at Mariendal. 917. *b.* Puts Colonel Roſen under guard. *ibid.*

Turenne (Madam de) her character. IV. 331. *b.*

Turin, by whom and when its citadel was built. IV. 453. *b.*

Turk, that word ſtrikes the common people more than the word Ottoman; Jurieu's artifice in the uſe he makes of theſe words. V. 803.

Turks cannot forbear laughing, when they ſee the image of St George in the Chriſtian Churches. II. 466.

II. 466. Very much in conceit with their own language. 517. *b.* Are not ſo deſtitute of books as people imagine. III. 171. *a. b.* Some of them believe the tranſmigration of ſouls. 341. *b.* They introduce the miniſtry of religion into the deſign of making conqueſts. 586. *a.* Their defeat. 682. *b.* 683. *a.* They are defeated at the paſſage of Raab. 793. *b.* Have a greater averſion to the Jews, than to any people in the world. IV. 40. *a.* Several among them pull out their eyes, after having ſeen Mecca. *ibid. b.* Have a great veneration for a camel. *ibid.* Who was the firſt of their Emperors, to whom the weſtern nations gave the title of Grand-Seignior. 49. *a.* Who are thoſe called among them the ſons of the Holy Ghoſt. 346. They have no ſort of moderation in their paſſions, with reſpect to their Princes. 425. *a.* Sacrifice to the reigning Prince, the life or the liberty of all his brothers. 558. *a.* When and for what reaſon they ſolemnly curſe the Chriſtians. V. 390. *b.* Conceive a jealouſy againſt Fakkreddin, and put him to death. III. 3.

Turn: the turn which ſometimes popular injuſtice gives to things. V. 188. *b.*

Turnebus, in what ſuperior to Bodin. II. 44. *b.* Makes a ſpeech againſt an Atheiſt. IV. 845. *b.*

Turreau (Peter) Regent at Dijon, tried for a conjurer, but defended by Caſtellan, and abſolved by the Judges. II. 368. *a.*

Tzerelas, the family name of Tilli. V. 356, 357.

Tzetzes is too modern an author to deſerve to be followed in a matter of fact, which can neither be reconciled with Homer, nor with the antient authors. I. 79. *b.*

V.

Vacuum: a Vacuum, and the Hypotheſis of atoms, admitted by ſome Philoſophers in the Eaſt. III. 792. *a. b.* Gets the ſtart of Des Cartes's doctrine by degrees. *ibid. b.* Thoſe who demonſtrate a vacuum, do a pleaſure to the Sceptics. 793. *a. b.* Reaſons againſt the exiſtence of a vacuum. V. 615. *b* 616. *a. b.* 617. *a. b.*

Vayer (la Mothe le) cited upon the Pagan Oracles. I. 132. *b. n.* (3). Cenſured for what he ſays of Socrates and Alcibiades. 131. *b.* He commits ſeveral faults, in ſpeaking of Stratonice and Combabus. II. 535. *a. b.* His anſwer to Garaſſe's invectives againſt two Philoſophers. 667. *b.* 668. *a.* Cenſured with reſpect to Auguſtus's ſucceſſor. III. 816. *a.* He tranſlates ill a paſſage of Quintilian touching the contempt which Alexander had for a man of extraordinary ſkill. IV. 9. *b.* 10. *a.* Blunders in explaining a paſſage of Homer concerning Ulyſſes and Penelope. 540. *a. b.* Is miſtaken with reſpect to Pyrrho. 658. *b.* His blunders in ſpeaking of Tacitus, and his Anachroniſm with reſpect to Thucydides and Demoſthenes. V. 282. *b.* He makes a ſtrange clamour againſt Alciatus and Ferret, for what they ſay of Tacitus's Latin. *ibid.* 283. *a. b.*

Vair (du) one of the decrees pronounced by that preſident. IV. 747. *a.* What he quotes from St Jerome. 799. *a. b.*

Val (du) the Phyſician, ſent to the gallies, and for what reaſon. III. 954. *b.*

Valdagnia (Joſeph) a Phyſician in Breſcia, is driven from thence, together with his defender Donzellinus. II. 689.

Valenciennes taken by aſſault the eighth day of the ſiege, but not by treachery. IV. 211. *a.*

Valentina of Milan ſuſpected of practiſing againſt peoples lives by poiſon. II. 205. *a.*

Valentinian, (Emperor) although a very chaſte man, compoſes a moſt laſcivious Poem. I. 583. *b.* 584. *a. b.*

Valentinois (the Duke of) orders the hand and the end of the tongue of a man, who had ſpoken ill of him, to be cut off. IV. 89. *b.* Cauſes——— Lorenzo to be thrown into the Tiber. 90. *b.* Orders the tongue of Jerome Mancionus to be cut out. *ibid.*

Valera (Cyprian de) his Spaniſh tranſlation of Calvin's Inſtitution. II. 262. *b. n.* (39).

Valery: how the eſtate of Valery came into the family of the Princes of Condé. III. 832. *a.*

Valerian, Emperor, durſt not put his ſon under the direction of Aurelian. I. 570. *b.*

Valerius (Marcus) why ſirnamed Corvinus. II. 290. *b. n.* (6).

Valerius Maximus, we find a thought of his in a ſatire againſt the French Academy. I. 59. *a.* He is far from being an exact compiler. II. 343. *a. b.* Speaks too negligently of the temple of the earth. 344. *b.* Cannot be excuſed for what he ſays of the riches of Democritus's father. 635. *a.* Has taken Diagoras for Protagoras. 652. *b.* His miſtake concerning Ariſtophanes. IV. 577. *b.* What he does to improve a jingle of Antitheſes and Parallels for his purpoſe. V. 569. *b.* 570. *a.*

Valeſiana quoted. III. 569. *a. b. n.* (29). 740. *b. n.* (44). IV. 246. *a. n.* (4). *& paſſim alibi.*

Valeſius (Henricus) cenſured. I. 100. *b.* His defence of Herodotus, who had attributed to God a jealous humour. IV. 576. *a. b.* His character. V. 805.

Valette (the Duke de la) condemned to loſe his head, and for what reaſon. III. 59. *b.*

Valiere (Madam de la) what family ſhe was of. V. 390. *a.*

Valla (George) his tranſlation of Nemeſius's book *de Natura Hominis,* treated with the utmoſt contempt by Nicaſius Ellebodius. IV. 345. *b.* 346. *a.*

Valla (Laurentius) to be commended for his modeſty. II. 432. *b.* A ſtory that was applied to him. IV. 600. *b.* An ill-natured jeſt that was made upon him after his death. V. 434. *a. b.*

Vallier (St) what family he was of. IV. 694. *a.* Where and by what means he received his pardon, after being condemned to loſe his head. *ibid. a. b.* His puniſhment of death changed into a perpetual impriſonment. 700. *a. b.*

Valois (Prince Charles de) is prevailed upon by the Pope to compoſe the confuſions of Florence. II. 296. *a.*

Valour: the extraordinary valour of a young gentleman fighting againſt the Saracens. II. 136. *a. b.*

Van Dale, his anſwer to an objection. I. 281. *b.* He ſupplies the author with ſome remarks. IV. 424. *b.* V. 536. *a.*

Vanini, what he would have to be done in great cities. II. 627. *b.* A profeſſed Atheiſt. V. 813.

Vanity: the fooliſh vanity of men, with reſpect to providence. I. 24. *a.* In what the vanity of human occupations chiefly conſiſts. II. 671. *a. b.* It does but too much prevail among the moſt pious perſons. IV. 331. *b.* How many crimes it is the cauſe of. 684. *b.* A vanity that bought flattery by a teſtamentary legacy. V. 566. *a.*

Vanity of Sciences, a book which gave great offence to many. I. 153. *a. b.* 154. *a.*

Vannozzi ſays that the Italian writers ſhould not diſcover their mother's nakedneſs. III. 273. *b.*

Vardes, Governour of la Cappelle, condemned to death for contempt of the court, and afterwards declared innocent. III. 263. *a.*

Vardes (the Marquis de) diſgraced by reaſon of ſome intrigues mentioned in a book. III. 263. *a.*

Variations, the Hiſtory of the Xth century is quite full of them. IV. 429. *b.*

Varillas cenſured for his paraphraſe on a paſſage of Paul Jovius. I. 57. *b.* Commits ſeveral remarkable blunders in ſpeaking of Agricola. 144. *a. b.* And about the learned men whom he has mentioned in his Anecdotes of Florence. 201. *b.* What he ſays there concerning the book *de Gloria,* is inconſiſtent with what he has ſaid of it in the life of Lewis XI. 202. *b.* 203. *a. b.* He has tranſlated ill a paſſage of Jovius. *ibid.* Quoted. 403. *a. b. n.* (4), (5), (6), (7). 404. *a. n.* (9). 405. *b. n.* (18). III. 151. *a. b. n.* (2), (4), (5). *& paſſim alibi.* His moderation commended, and the liberty taken by the author of the ſecond edition of the Menagiana, cenſured. I. 586. *b.* 587. *a.* He is cenſured for ſeveral miſtakes, with reſpect to Calvin. II. 62. *a. b.* And to Luther. 75. *b.* 76. *a.* In the public confeſſion which he makes of a fault, he commits [illegible] others. 137. *a. b.* Cenſured for a miſtake [illegible] in a point of fact and in a point of right. [illegible] 185. *a.* His errors touching one of Calvin's books, 260. *a. b.* They are ſo enormous, that they are enough to make one renounce the ſtudy of Hiſtory.

ibid. a. He advances things that do not deſerve to be confuted. 266. *b.* Had not the courage to publiſh his ſentiments of a ſtory publiſhed againſt Calvin. 267. *b.* A paſſage of his concerning the life of that Reformer, wrote by Papirius Maſſo, examined. 268. *b.* 269. *a.* His manner of reading the books which he conſulted, muſt be unaccountable. *ibid.* His diſpute with Dr Burnet about Camden's Hiſtory, examined. 283. *b.* 284. *a.* He is cenſured for two faults, which he commits in ſpeaking of Caſtellan, and the Aſſembly of Melun. 375. *b.* 376. *a. b.* Reflexions on his account of the Calviniſm of the Ducheſs of Eſtampes. 843. *a.* His miſtakes touching the motive from which that lady's huſband cauſed a juridical enquiry to be made againſt her. 844. *a. b.* He is cenſured with reſpect to Calvin's going to ſee the Ducheſs of Ferrara. III. 28. *b.* 29. *a. b.* And with reſpect to the motives which engaged that Princeſs to renounce Popery. *ibid. b.* Commits ſeveral faults in ſpeaking of Mademoiſelle de Rohan, and the Duke of Nemours. 142. *a. b.* 143. *a. b.* He did not know all thoſe who have wrote the conſpiracy of the Count of Fieſque. 196. *b.* Makes a curious obſervation upon the maſſacre of Goudimel, whom he improperly calls Claudin. 197. *and b.* 198. *a.* Maintains againſt the Spaniſh Hiſtorians, that Charles V was not ignorant of the Latin tongue. 323. *b.* Cenſured with reſpect to the correſpondence which Henry II, while he was Dauphin, kept up with the Conſtable of Montmorency. 395. *a. b.* Is liable to cenſure, with reſpect to a certain ſpeech which is ſaid to have been pronounced by Pompey Colonna againſt the Popes. 614. *a. b.* Whence come all his different Hypotheſes. 864. *a.* He would have no reaſon to complain that his Hiſtory of Hereſy had been taken for a romance. IV. 192. *b.* His Romantic flouriſhes on the ſtory of Muſurus. 293. *b.* 294. *a.* He takes one Alphonſo for another, in the preface to his Anecdotes. 312. *b.* 313. *a.* He relates a very ſingular fact, tho' a little doubtful, touching Macrin. 19. *a. b.* Tells a great many falſities of Ochinus. 392. *a. b.* Did not know that a certain ſatire pointed at Henry IV. 482. *b.* Cenſured for what he ſays of Platina. 687. *b.* And of the reaſon why the Calviniſts hated the Ducheſs of Valentinois. 696. *b.* He is fit to ſpoil a great many authors. 697. *a.* Does not ſpare the mother of Charles IX. 803. *a.* It is not eaſy to apprehend why he has ſtruck the Count de Laval out of the houſe of Montmorency, after having once made him deſcend from it. 887. *b.* He has put in his Hiſtory of Hereſy a marginal note, which has been a ſnare to ſome learned men. 920. *b.* Is criticized with reſpect to Charles IX, and the cauſe of his death. V. 392. *b.* 393. *a.* Loves to ſay what is not to be found in common Hiſtories. 748. Did not publiſh all that people had ſeen in his manuſcripts, and why. IV. 712. *a.*

Variorum: the editors of books, *cum Notis Variorum,* ſhould never leave out the Epiſtles Dedicatory, and the Prefaces. I. 225. *b.*

Varro, what he ſaid of the nuptials of virgins, and of the nuptials of widows. IV. 192. *b.* Nigidius was reckoned not inferior to him. IV. 368. *a.* Stories that are attributed to him. 370. *a.*

Varus, the Tragic Poet, recites, for his own performance, a Tragedy compoſed by another. V. 485. *a. n.* (13).

Vaſſi, to whom the maſſacre, that was made of the Huguenots there, ought to be imputed. III. 287. *b.* 288. *a.*

Vaſſor (le) what he relates, concerning the Duke of Orleans, Francis the firſt's ſecond ſon. III. 96. *a. b.*

Vatican, its thunders highly contemned. II. 378. *b.* 379. *a.* Who was the founder of the Vatican library. V. 545. *b.*

Vavaſſeur (Father) the overſight that author falls into in his treatiſe of the burleſque ſtile. I. 350. *a. b.* He knew authors who would rather have loſt the greateſt advantages, than have given up the praiſe which they thought they had merited by their romances. III. 379. *b.* His reaſons againſt the liberty of inſerting obſcenities in an epigram. V. 839. *n.* (15).

[illegible] (Mr de) employs his whole ſkill in fortifying Landau. III. 718.

Vaudois, the Hiſtory of their Churches by Peter Gilles. III. 161, 162. Traduced by Guichenon. 275. *b.* Send Yſe into England. 597. Teazed by Poſſevin, and perſecuted by Caſtrocaro. 757. *and a. b.* 758. *and a. b.* Perſecuted by Marco Aurelio Rorenco. IV. 916. *a. b.* Calumniated by Samuel de Caſſini. *ibid. b.* And defended by the Sieur Valerius Gros. 917. *b.* Sums of money raiſed for them. III. 595. *b.* 596. *a.*

Vaugelas, his excellent advice, with reſpect to the French language. II. 775. *b.* Who was the Vaugelas of the Latin tongue. III. 319. *b.*

Vautier propoſes the erecting a place of Court-Aſtrologer. IV. 260. *b. n.* (26).

Uberti (Farinata de gli) lodged in the ſhades by Dante. II. 399. *b.* Guido Cavalcante married his daughter. *ibid.*

Ubiquity, who were the firſt authors of that doctrine. IV. 288. *a. b.* V. 549. *b.* The troubles which it occaſioned in Germany. III. 391. *a. b.*

Udalric, his letter deſerves to be rejected. III. 225. *a. b.*

Vedelius (Nicolas) confutes Elias Schiller, and does it in eleven days. V. 81. *and b.*

Venator, the deſcription he makes of Divines. III. 250. *b.* 251. *a.*

Vendôme (Geoffry, Abbot of) whether it be true that he put Robert d'Arbriſſel in mind of his faulty conduct, with reſpect to women. III. 63. *a. b.* 66. *b.* 67. *a.*

Vendôme (the Duke of) Henry IV deſigns him for his ſucceſſor. III. 184. *a.*

Venetians order their Ambaſſadors to make very advantageous offers to the Emperor Maximilian. III. 274. *a.* Several States confederate to humble them. 811. *and a. b. &c.* They repulſe the Emperor Maximilian, who had beſieged Padua. IV. 293. *a.* Being animated to wage war with the Turks, they hinder the peace which the Emperor was deſirous of concluding with the Porte. 430. It is not the cuſtom of their nobles to have private miſtreſſes. 775. *a. b.* Complained of being ill uſed by Capriata in his Hiſtory. II. 311. *b.* How he juſtified himſelf in that point. *ibid.* Digby takes ſeveral prizes from them, and beats their fleet near Scanderoon. 664.

Vengeance, that of men is oftentimes more dreaded than the vengeance of God. I. 435. *b.* 436. *a.*

Venice: why the Senate of Venice is pleaſed with the irregularities of the clergy. I. 30. *b.* That Senate is offended, becauſe Pope Innocent VIII, beſtowed the Patriarchate of Aquileia, without conſulting them. 634. The laws of that Republic forbid all her miniſters at Rome to accept any benefice. *ibid.* Its Senate inflexible on that head. *ibid.* The Republic of Venice diſputes the precedence with the Duke of Savoy. III. 216. Its Ambaſſador burns, before Henry IV, all the papers in which he owned himſelf indebted to that Republic. 317. *b.* 318. *a.* Its Ambaſſadors arrive in Holland, to congratulate King Williiam. IV. 505. *a. n.* (77).

Venus riſing out of the ſea, painted upon the model of one of Alexander's miſtreſſes. I. 368. *b.* Auguſtus remits the inhabitants of Coos an hundred talents, which they were indebted to him, for the purchaſe of that picture. 369. *a.* A doubt concerning the ſaid Venus. *ibid.* Fault found with the temple of Venus built by Hadrian. 377. *a.* She had a temple on mount Libanus. II. 4. *b.* How people were initiated in her myſteries. 507. *a. b.* What the Fathers ſaid of the Venus that was adored in Cyprus. *ibid.* The Paphian Venus, when, and for what reaſon her prieſthood begun to be in the hands of a Prince of the blood. 507. Her vengeance againſt Diomedes and Clio. 742. *b.* A continual miracle performed in one of her temples. 746. *b.* Incroaches more upon Bacchus in the North, than Bacchus does upon Venus in the South. 823. *a. b.* Venus Migonitis, where, and by whom, a temple was built to her. III. 368. *b.* 369. *a.* The original of the pretended Divinity of Venus. 375. *b.* She obtained the golden apple. 644. *a. b.* 645. *a.* There was a Venus ſirnamed Melænis. 700. *a. b.* Venus the beſt ſerved of all the Pagan deities. 701. *b.* The temple of Venus Homicide, what it was. 702. *a.* Venus Urania, her temple plundered by ſome Scythians. IV. 790. What is the proper way to mortify her. V. 98. *b.* 99. *a. b.* A ſacrifice which the Roman ladies offered to her. 130. *a. b.*

An honour which was done to her, that ſhe might put a ſtop to leudneſs. 268. *a. b.*

Vercel, the capitulation of that town faithfully obſerved. V. 504.

Vercail (Dulcineus of) an impious Fanatic. III. 281. *b.*

Vercingentorix comes to the relief of Alexia with 300000 men. II. 413. *a.* Defeated by Cæſar. *ibid.* A fine obſervation which Plutarch makes on that defeat. *ibid.*

Verdier (Antony du) Sieur de Vau-Privas, cenſured for his negligence, with reſpect to the Acts of the Apoſtles, wrote in French rhyme, and fitted for the ſtage. II. 478, 479, 480.

Verdier (Claudius du) Cenſor-General, is angry with Lycophron, for what he ſays of Penelope. IV. 542. *b.*

Vere, a Lordſhip in Zealand, vulgarly called Ter-Veer. I. 781. *a.* II. 90. *a.*

Vergece: See the article VERGERIUS (*Angelus*).

Vergerius (Peter-Paul) challenges an Apoſtolic Nuncio, to a public diſpute. III. 840. *b* The reaſon why it was declared to him, he could not take his place in the Council of Trent. V. 454. *b.* His abridgment of the Anatomy of the Maſs. 455. *b.* 456. *a.* His book againſt the proclaiming of the Council. *ibid.* His books quickly loſt their credit. 457. *a.* They very much galled the Court of Rome. 456. *b.* A book is dedicated to him, to congratulate him for having abandoned the party of Antichriſt. II. 749.

Vernias (Nicoletus) Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Padua, his dangerous opinions. IV. 377. He maintained the opinion of Averrhoës, on the unity of the Intellect. *ibid. b.*

Veron, a Miſſionary, according to Rivet, was ignorant both in Greek and in Hebrew. II. 40. *b.*

Verſes: amorous verſes, and well ſung, have a great efficacy in touching the hearts of women. I. 27. *b.* Verſes upon the loſs of a battle, which offended the victor as well as the vanquiſhed. 191. To be fond of verſes, is not enough to make a man a Poet. 375. *b.* Amorous verſes thrown into the fire. 560. *b.* Eccleſiaſtics who have wrote ſuch verſes. 630. *b.* It does not follow that a man who writes ſuch is a Pagan. 584. *a. b.* A wonderful facility in making verſes. 664. *b.* 665. *a.* III. 573. *a. b.* Ephorus writes a verſe in the ſame place, where he condemns the cadence and numbers of diſcourſe. II. 772. *b.* The recital of ſome verſes inſpired conquerors with humanity. 866. *b.* 867. *a.* Hexameter verſes were not uſed in Tragedies. IV. 596. *b.* The ſame verſes wrote by ſeveral Poets. 822. *a. b.* Verſes compoſed at four livres a hundred, and others at forty pence. 873. *b.* Profane and leud verſes, rewarded with church-benefices. 896. *a. b.* Making verſes which we can read to no body, and walking in the dark, is the very ſame thing. 450, 451. Who firſt begun to comment on the verſes of another compoſed in the vulgar tongue. II. 398. *b.*

Verſes for Interludes, Benſerade was an original in that kind. I. 752. *b.*

Verſions, there are authors who only conſult them. I. 205. *a.*

Verus (Ælius) Emperor, what were the books he read moſt. III. 260. *a.*

Veſalius (Andrew) Borgarutius finds the manuſcript of his *Great Surgery*, and publiſhes it. II. 83. *and b.*

Veſpaſian, Orators were pretty well paid in his time. I. 196. *a.*

Veſſels: ſome fine veſſels of earthen ware broke, and for what reaſon. II. 558. *b.*

Veſtal Virgins condemned for Inceſt. II. 345. *b.* A noble piece of Hiſtory on that ſubject, loſt. *ibid.* It was the cuſtom of the High Prieſts, to appoint certain ladies to take care of the veſtal virgins, that were obliged by ſickneſs to leave their convent. III. 5. *b.* It is ſurprizing that they ſhould ever have fallen into incontinence. 830. *b.*

Ughelli (Abbot) takes the chronicle of Martin Polonus from him, and gives it to one Martin, a Monk of the order of Citeaux. IV. 708. *b.*

Vial of Rheims, Paul Emilius has ſaid nothing of it. II. 763, 764. *and a.*

Vic (Mr de) his turn of mind. II. 817. *a.*

Vicentinus, the meaning of that word. III. 777.

Vices, there is a leſs affinity between them than people commonly imagine. I. 232. *b.* II. 719. *a.* The benefits which ariſe from them do not hinder their being in their own nature evil. I. 159. *b.* IV. 188. *b.* Some prevail in all countries, religions, and ages. I. 561. *a.* There are ſome which are vices of the climate, and not vices of religion. II. 820. *a. b.* Whether, without vice, there could not be ſuch a thing as virtue. IV. 519. *a. b.* 520. *a. b.* 521. *a. b.* Whether vice is always puniſhed with adverſity in this world. V. 11. *a. b.*

Viciſſitude of human affairs, how ſurprizing it is. III. 547. *b.*

Vico (the Marquis del) cauſes the Anatomy of the Maſs to be tranſlated from Italian into French. V. 461. *a. b.*

Victims (human) were acceptable to the gods. III. 651. *b.* See *Sacrifices.*

Victoria, or *Victorina*, called in her armies the mother of the camp. III. 531. *a.*

Victories, few of them can by their conſequences decide the diſputes of Gazetteers. II. 413. *a.* Many obtain victories, but few know how to make a good uſe of them. 414. *a. b.* IV. 3. *a.*

Vidal (Mr du) complains of the oppreſſion which the Proteſtants ſuffer in the Palatinate, *&c.* II. 125. *b. n.* (34).

Vienna: a Biſhop of Vienna changes his maxims, on his becoming a Miniſter of State. IV. 13. *b.*

Vigenere (Blaiſe de) tranſlates and comments on Cæſar's Commentaries. I. 631. Miſtakes the meaning of a paſſage in Martial. 18. *b.* And of another in Plutarch. 75. *b.* A curious paſſage of his concerning an enterprize of the Amazons. 85. *b.* 86. *a.*

Vigneul Marville quoted. III. 145. *and a. b. n.* (15). *& paſſim alibi.* What he tells us of a certain Philoſopher. IV. 913. *b.* Judges too harſhly of La Mothe le Vayer's works. V. 427. *b.* 428. *a. b.*

Vignier (Nicolas) not to be excuſed for a fact he relates concerning Franciſca. III. 99. *b.* Confounds Radulphus Flaviacenſis with Ralph Higden. IV. 824. *a.* Cenſured on that head. *ibid. a. b.*

Villars (Francis de Boyvin Baron du) his maxim, *that they break the peace, not who firſt make war, but who arm privately, and uſe ſecret practices in prejudice of treaties and alliances.* II. 104. *a. b.*

Villars (Abbot de), ſee *Gabalis.*

Villavicentius accuſed of plagiariſm. III. 456. *b.*

Villegaignon, his character. IV. 870. *a.* He puts three Proteſtants to death. V. 477. *a.*

Villena (Henry de), a ſtory that goes in Spain relating to that Marquis. V. 480. *a. b.*

Villennes (the Marquis de) pretended to Aſtrology. IV. 263. *a.*

Villeroi (the Marquis de) obliges the governour of La Motte to capitulate, and the Queen-Mother does not obſerve the capitulation. IV. 278.

Villeroi (the Marſhal de) priſoner in the caſtle of Ambres. II. 97. *b.*

Villiers (Peter de), Chaplain to William I, Prince of Orange, reckoned the author of the apology for that Prince, and of a letter againſt the book of Concord. III. 392. *a. b.* Gerard de Reneſſe reprints the ſaid letter with notes. 391. *b.*

Villon poſts up theſes againſt Ariſtotle's doctrine. IV. 262. *a.*

Vincent, Miniſter of Rochelle, his reflexion upon a comedy. IV. 324. *b.* 325. *a. n.* (13). V. 82. *b.*

Vindingius, a fault of his adopted by the author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres.* I. 657. *b.*

Vinnius (Arnold) writes notes on Peckius's Commentary *ad tit. d. Nautæ*, &c. IV. 528. *a. b.*

Violence; in what caſe violence ſhould be uſed towards people. IV. 526. *a. b.*

Viret (Peter), the method he made uſe of in attacking Popery. V. 482. *a. b.* He turned his arms likewiſe againſt Deiſm. *ibid. b.* 483. *a.*

Virgil has taken one of Homer's epiſodes for a model. I. 80. *b.* No Poet, before him, ever ſaid what he ſays concerning the dead body of Hector. 81. *a.* A precept of his applied to old authors. 120. *a. b.* He gave orders to burn the Æneid. 375. *a. b.* Is criticized and defended, with reſpect to the word *illaudatus*, II. 234. *a. b.* Cento's have been made of him. 298. *and a.* What ſect of Philoſophers he was of, and who was his maſter. 390. *a.* A deſign

deſign to juſtify him at any rate. III. 127. *a.* It was pretended that ſome of his words had the power of driving out devils. 890. *b.* 891. *a.* A ſupplement to his Æneid. V. 446. *b.* Malateſta cauſes his ſtatue to be thrown down. 451. *a. b.* The honour which the Roman people did him one day. 487. *a.* Parthenius taught him Greek. IV. 483. *a.*

Virgil (Polydore) his book *de Inventoribus Rerum* contains ſeveral things which the Inquiſition diſliked. V. 495. *a. b.*

Virgin, the Antients uſed that word in a more general ſenſe than we do. II. 140. *b.* The Turks call certain perſons, born of a virgin-mother, the ſons of the Holy Ghoſt. IV. 346.

Virgin (the bleſſed) the Monks are not her only indiſcreet votaries. I. 36. A book full of viſions concerning her. 136. *a.* Whence it comes that no one has yet ſaid that ſhe governs the world alone. 137. *a. b.* To what danger they expoſe themſelves, who diſapprove the errors that magnify her honours. 138. *a. b.* Her epithet of *Mother of God* leads one to troubleſome conſequences. *ibid. and* IV. 356. *b.* One is ſometimes more ſpeedily ſaved by invoking her name, than by invoking that of JESUS CHRIST. I. 198. *a.* The expreſſions of her indiſcreet votaries condemned by Bellarmin. 728. *b.* She is put as a fourth perſon of the Godhead. II. 85. *and a. b.* Had a penetrative chaſtity. 108. *b.* Of what efficacy the prayers are, which are addreſſed to her, the firſt of April, at eight in the morning. 316. *a.* Her immaculate conception received as an article of faith, by the Faculty of Divinity at Paris. IV. 77. *b.* 78. *a.* 366. *b.* 367. *a. b.* Drawn after the model of women, ſuch as pleaſed the Painters. II. 729. *a. b.* III. 57. *b.* How much people are puzzled to defend her worſhip. 84. *b.* Whether ſhe wrote a letter to the inhabitants of Meſſina. 563. *a.* And to St Ignatius. *ibid.* A book wherein Oriſons are addreſſed to all the parts of her body. 569. *a.* Idle traditions concerning her father and mother. 570. *and a. b.* 571. *and a. b.* 572. *and a. b.* Whence proceed the extravagant honours which ſo many Chriſtians pay to her. 636. *a.* A contract made in her favour, by Lewis XI, King of France. 808. *a. b.* Whether exemption from Original Sin be comprehended in the quality of the Mother of God. 931. *a.* From what motive the Jeſuits teach her immaculate conception. *ibid.* The Proteſtants enter themſelves into one of her fraternities. IV. 121. *a.* The abuſes that have been committed, with reſpect to her, were equally to be feared, whether ſhe was called the Mother of JESUS CHRIST, or the Mother of GOD. 347. *a. b.* 352. *b.* 353. *a.* Conjectures upon the cauſes of the progreſs of her worſhip. 354. *a. b.* 355. *a. b.* People are obliged to her for all the benefits they receive, and not to God. 354. *b.* 355. *a. b.* What Clemens Alexandrinus ſays of her. 805. *a.* She has not been able to eſcape calumny. V. 84. *a.* It is not probable, according to Mr Patin, that St Luke drew ſo many pictures of her as he is ſaid to have done. 156. *b.* Stiled Generaliſſima, and by whom. 679. How the Fathers of the Church proved her virginity. 772. *b.*

Virginity, whether the loſs of it makes any alteration in the outſide. II. 636. *a. b.* A Biſhop that was fain to explore the virginity of certain Nuns by ſqueezing their dugs. III. 344. *b.* 345. *a.*

Virtue, a good reputation is not always the conſequence of it. I. 279. *b.* Virtue and vice are ſometimes in alliance. 413. *b.* A diſtinguiſhed virtue never fails to raiſe envy. 460. *a.* The candor of an Athenian in owning this. *ibid.* It muſt be acquired by the ſweat of our brows. 573. *a.* Whether it be no more than an empty name: the complaint of Brutus examined. II. 164. *a. b.* 165. *a.* V. 9. *b.* 10. *a. b.* 11. *a. b.* One of the greateſt victories which it can obtain over nature. II. 269. *b.* Cannot be without a conflict. III. 620. 889. *a.* It is ſometimes eaſier to have the reality than the appearance of it. I. 279. *a. b.* III. 602. *b.* There is no virtue but what proceeds from a victory diſputed with the paſſions. 889. *a.* It is diſcouraging virtue, to rob it of its temporal recompence. 814. *a.* Its bad conſequences on ſome occaſions. IV. 188. *b.* Who are thoſe who maintain, that virtue ought to be followed by reaſon of its excellency. V. 204. *b.*

Virtuous; it ſignifies nothing for a man to be virtuous, if he is not maſter of a noiſy bluſtering eloquence. I. 459. *a. b.*

Viſion: a viſion may occaſion a mortal diſtemper. II. 715. *b.* 716. *a.*

Viſion ratified, what is meant by it. II. 113. *b.*

Viſionaries (les) a dramatic piece, who is the author of it. IV. 114.

Viſionaries, the chimerical notions of a viſionary. II. 84. *b.* 85. *a.* Viſionaries and interpreters of prophecies are very often impoſtors and incendiaries. 143. *and a. b.* Their true character. 538. *a. b.* They will always be well received, provided they have cunning enough to accommodate themſelves to the paſſions of the times. 693. Are never at a loſs. 692. *a.* Our age ſeems to be more terrible to them than the preceding ones. III. 691. *a.* What lengths they carry their knavery or folly. *ibid. b.* And their extravagance. 692. *b.*

Viſits are an incumbrance to learned men. I. 626. *b.*

Vitellius foreſaw the advancement of thoſe whom fortune had a mind to favour. IV. 397. *b.* 398. *a.* Gains the battle againſt Otho. V. 261. *and b.*

Vitex, what name it has at preſent. V. 334. *a.*

Vitruvius, his ſepulchre found near Formium. IV. 311. *a.* Particulars concerning his book. V. 269. *a. b.* 270. *a. b.*

Vives (Ludovicus) what he ſays of the falſe zeal of the Legendaries. III. 708. *b.* His Inſtitution of a Chriſtian woman tranſlated into French by Peter de Changy. II. 434. *and* 435. *a. b.* Tranſlated alſo by Lewis Turquet. *ibid. b.* The reaſon he gives why Leontium wrote a book againſt Theophraſtus. III. 779. The tranſlation of his work *de Fœmina Chriſtiana* is defective. *ibid. b.*

Ulyſſes, what puniſhment he inflicted on Penelope's maids. IV. 542. *b.* 543. *a.*

Ulme ſurprized and taken by the Elector of Bavaria. III. 719. *b.* It is ſaid that Spinoza lived there, and there begun his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. V. 225. *and n.* (*c*).

Ulmus (Marc-Antony) author of a treatiſe *de Barba humana*, quoted. III. 81. *b. n.* (21).

Unbelievers are not always induced to unbelief by the motives of ſelf-love. II. 350. Perhaps there never were ſo many as in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries. III. 267. *a.* See *Libertines*.

Uneaſineſs, a paſſage of St Evremond on that ſubject. V. 585. *b.* A criminal remedy that is often made uſe of to remove it. 584. *a.*

Unheard: no man ought to be condemned unheard. I. 757. *b.*

Unitarians excluded out of the amneſty granted to others that were not Catholics, in Poland. III. 901. The hiſtory of their eſtabliſhment, growth, and deſtruction in Poland. V. 168. *a. b.* 169. *a. b.* & *ſeq.* The different attempts which they made to ſettle in Holland. 173. *b.* 174. *a. b.* 175. *a. b.*

Unitarians, in what ſenſe the author takes that word. V. 825. *and n.* (67). Their ſyſtem preferrable to that of the Dualiſts. *ibid.*

Univerſalia, the danger there is in denying the reality of them. V. 542. *a.*

Univerſity of Paris, the Hiſtory of it. II. 106. *a.* Verſoris pleads for the Jeſuits, in the trial they had with that univerſity, and gains the cauſe. V. 464. *and b. n.* †. ‡.

Univerſity of Leyden revives the degree of Doctor. I. 239. Pronounces a judgment worthy to be taken notice of. 242. *b.* A reflexion upon that judgment. *ibid.* 243. *a.*

Univerſity of Upſal, Guſtavus Adolphus's liberalities to it. V. 660.

Univerſities, the debauchery which prevailed in ſome. I. 247. *a. b.* Their intereſt ſhould be preferred to that of the churches. 260. A good agreement there among the colleagues is a thing rarely to be met with. 261. A great many brag of a familiarity in the univerſity with ſuch or ſuch an one, who is grown into reputation for his writings. II. 284. *b.* The greateſt part of the quarrels which divide univerſities, are ridiculous. 697. *a.* There are very few with which the Jeſuits have not had ſome diſpute. 700. *b. n.* (2). Luther turned the univerſities and their doctors into ridicule. III. 953. *a. b.* Complaints againſt the multitude of them. V. 229. *b.*

Univerſities of England, an encomium on them. V. 513. *b.*

Voetius, his diſputes with Mareſius. IV. 121. *a. b.* 122. *a.* Quoted. 583. *a. n.* (3). 584. *a. b. n.* (7), (8). *& paſſim alibi.*

Vogelſang confutes an explication of Wolzogue. IV. 877. *b.* 878. *a. b.*

Voiture, it has been ſaid of him, that he had a ſimple look, but nevertheleſs agreeable. II. 617. *a.* The great eaſe which appears in his works coſt him no ſmall pains. III. 262. *a.* What he writ to the Duke of Enguien. 748. *a. n.* (2). What he would have done, if he himſelf had publiſhed his works. 939. *a.* His friends threatened with military execution thoſe who ſhould dare to cenſure him. V. 344. *b.* The liberty he takes in his Poems. 840. *n.* (16). Charged with uſing obſcene expreſſions. 844. *a.*

Voice; a fine voice has a great influence upon the fair ſex. I. 27. *b.* One of the fineſt in the world. 662, 663. *and a. b.*

Volaterran, what he relates of Franciſca, a Roman lady. III. 98. *b.* 99. *a.* The table of his book is not good. *ibid.* He roundly affirms that Savonarola was a cheat, *&c.* V. 60, 61.

Volumnius, facts concerning his life. III. 958. *a. b.* 959. *a. b.*

Voluptuous perſons, it is a matter indifferent to them what way they obtain pleaſure, provided that they do obtain it. IV. 30. *b.* 31. *a. b.* How they uſe their riches. 87. How they endeavour to juſtify themſelves. V. 30 *a.* They may be brave and laborious. 271. *a. b. &c.*

Voragine (Jacobus de) whether he and Joannes de Janua are one and the ſame author. I. 614. *and a. b.*

Vorſtius (Conrad) gives an account of his faith before an aſſembly of the Faculty of Theology at Heidelberg. IV. 606. Cauſes Socinus's treatiſe *de Auctoritate S. Scripturæ* to be reprinted, with his notes. V. 180. *b.*

Voſſius is very particular in his apology for the Abderites. I. 18. *b.* 19. *a.* Cenſures Pliny. 82. *a.* His inattention. 57. *a.* 62. *a. b.* He refutes himſelf in writing againſt Corradus. 59. *a. b.* Commits a fault in cenſuring that of Sigiſmund Gelenius. III. 711. Conſults Grotius about an objection againſt one's changing his religion. IV. 375. *a.* Cenſuring Quintilian, with reſpect to the queſtions that were put to Xenophon's wife, he is miſtaken in his turn. 580. *a.* Complains of the great number of overſights which he found in antient and modern authors. 594. *a. b.* Is cenſured for a thing which Sandius has taken no notice of. 600. *a. b.* Cenſured for the liberty he takes in quotations. 783. *a. b.* He follows Rhodomannus in what he ſays of Cointus, and commits the ſame miſtakes. 817. *b.* Very judiciouſly cenſures the perverſe humour of Julius Cæſar Scaliger. II. 321. *b.* 322. *a.* Advances a conjecture touching Craterus, which is not probable. 563. *a. b.* For want of attention he falls into a miſtake touching a paſſage of Lactantius. III. 55. *b.* Why he would not juſtify his father-in-law againſt the miſtakes of Thuanus. 627. *b.* 628. *a.* Quoted with reſpect to the ſeverity of the Lutherans againſt the Flemiſh Church baniſhed from London. V. 550. *a. b. n.* (24), (25), (26). Found fault with. II. 32. *a. n.* (6). 173. *a. n.* (10). 179. *b. n.* (72). IV. 713. *and b. n.* (69).

Voſſius (Iſaac), Francis Junius dies at his houſe. III. 629.

Vows made at ſea are too commonly forgot on ſhore. II. 83. *a.* An Italian proverb on that head. *ibid.*

Vows (Monaſtical) are prejudicial to the ſtate. II. 174. *b.*

Ur, that word has given occaſion to ſeveral fables. I. 45. *a.*

Urban VI (Pope) is pleaſed with the news of Charles of Durazzo's death. IV. 305. *a.*

Urban VIII (Pope) writes verſes in praiſe of Aldrovandus. I. 213. *b.* Cauſes a Poet to die with grief by reproaching him for his impudence. III. 465. *a. b.* Complains to the King of France of his alliance with the Swedes. 819. *b.*

Urfé (the Marquis d') cenſured by Aſtrea for expoſing her quite naked to the eyes of Celadon. III. 866. *b.* 867. *a.*

Urquiola (John-Baptiſt de), an inſtance of the ſingularity of his Latin orthography. III. 774. *a. b.*

Urraca, the eternal diſgrace of Spain. V. 518. *b.* 519. *a. b* The French Ambaſſadors would not chuſe for their maſter a Princeſs of that name. 519, 526.

Uſeful: people prefer what is uſeful to juſtice and religion. I. 130. *b.* 131. *a.* 460. *a.* IV. 618. 621. *a. b.* 622. *a.*

Uſher, his miſtake touching Lollia Paulina. II. 256. *b.*

Uſurper, it is ſeldom ſeen that thoſe who raiſe one to the throne, do long enjoy his favours. II. 737. *a.*

Utrecht, the French carry away a book out of its library. IV. 235. *a.*

Vulcan, upon what conditions he made a ſuit of armour for Achilles. I. 80. *b.* Is thrown headlong from heaven to earth. III. 751. *a. b.* What the veſſel was which he made a preſent of to Pelops at his marriage. 373. *b.*

Vulgar: the vulgar ſuffer themſelves to be eaſily impoſed upon. II. 148. *b.*

Vulgate, its authority is not preferred to that of the originals. I. 246. The author of it commended by Lewis de Dieu. II. 663. *b.*

W.

W*Afers*, at what time they left off making uſe of them in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper at Geneva. III. 343. *a. n.* (16).

Wagerers, what is a good bait to draw them in. I. 76. *a.*

Wagnerus (Tobias) Chancellor of the Univerſity of Tubingen, writes againſt Hottinger's book about the Re-union. III. 526. *b.* 527. *a.*

Way (Milky) how formed. III. 637. *b.*

Wand, the cauſe of ſeveral fine diſcoveries. I. 4. *b.* 5. *a.* A reflexion on its uſefulneſs. 6. *b.* 7. *a.* Whether that of James Aymar loſt its credit. *ibid. b.* 8. *a. b.* 9. *a. b.*

War, what are its uſual fruits. I. 239. *a. b.* The conſequence of a war raiſed in a communion. 241. *b.* Whether in a war juſtice gives us reaſon to hope for good ſucceſs. 280. *a.* Its laws are very cruel. 518. *b.* Which makes people deteſt the cauſes of it. *ibid.* An unfair war occaſioned by the vengeance of the Duke of Montpenſier. 591. One of its calamities. II. 159. *b.* An advantage poſſeſſed by the widows of thoſe who had been ſlain in the wars. 289. There is nothing like the tongues of orators to cauſe a war either to begin or to continue. 547. *b.* To conduct a war according to the laws of religion, is a Platonic idea. 511. *b.* Dicæarchus ſaid that it deſtroyed more men than any other thing. 657. *b.* Thoſe whoſe profeſſions ought to lead them to diſſuade from war, are often the inſtigators of it. 811. *a. b.* The wickedneſs of ſome particular perſons, and the folly of the people, are the ſource of almoſt every war. *ibid. a.* It is a diſgrace to return from a long war with empty hands. III. 396. *b.* Reflexions upon the wars which Clergymen adviſe. 871. *b.* The Cardinal's war, what it was. 873. *b.* A perſon that has learnt the art of war only by reading, ought to keep to the theory. IV. 14. *b.* The ſacred war, by whom occaſioned. 621. 622. War has maxims which become pernicious, when applied to the affairs of religion. 178. *a. b.* 179. *a.*

Waramund (Leonhart) writes in defence of Gebhard Truchſes Archbiſhop of Cologn, and is refuted by Gonſalez Pontius de Leon. III. 774.

Warriors, there are a great many who know how to conquer, but few who know how to make uſe of their victory. II. 413. *a. b*

Wars (Civil) ſometimes produce good effects. I. 577. *a. b.* Whether in civil wars the Prince's party gives itſelf more liberty than the rebels. 711. *b.* The ſcruples which Bongars had about the civil wars of the Proteſtants. II. 70. *and a. b.* The uſual proteſtations that attend them. 515. *a. b.*

Wars (Religious) are horrible. I. 648. *a.* From whence proceeded the firſt religious war in France. III. 513. *a.*

Wars (Literary) are ſometimes violent and of a long continuance. I. 322. *b.* The hoſtilities that are committed in them. II. 433. *a. b. &c.* Reſemble much thoſe of Princes. 798. *b.*

Warſaw, Guſtavus Adolphus makes incurſions to the gates of that city. V. 666.

Watchings: impurities were committed in the devotional watchings that were obſerved in the antient Church. V. 337. *a. and n.* (35). 472. *a.*

Watchmen of the City, in the Song of Solomon, explained by the Eccleſiaſtical powers: an explication occaſioned by the author's impriſonment. III. 772. *a. b.*

Water, who taught men to mix it with their wine. I. 284. *b.* A certain water, which had a wonderful property. II. 876. *b.* It was the principle of all things, according to Thales. III. 650. *a.* V. 323. *a. b.* A health drunk and pledged with a large glaſs of water. 346. *a. b.* The proof of water in the proſecution of witches held lawful by William Adolphus Scribonius. 100.

Wavre is a Priory of Benedictins, and not a monaſtery of Canons regular. IV. 943. *b.*

Weeks of Daniel, Peter de Beloy's expoſition of them. I. 740. *b.*

Were-Wolf: a diſcourſe on the ſentence that was paſſed on a man accuſed and convicted of being a were-wolf. I. 562. *b.* A man who transformed himſelf into one condemned to be burnt by an Arrêt of the Parliament of Dole. *ibid.*

Wert, a village of the province of Guelderland, to which the General, who bore that name, belonged. V. 539.

Weſſelus, his life is little known. V. 544. *b.* Albert Hardenberg writes his life. III. 353.

Whitaker retracts part of what he had advanced in giving Campian the lye. III. 940. *b.* 941. *a. b.*

Whole: the word *all* or *whole* has both a collective, and a diſtributive ſenſe. I. 298. *b.*

Whore, whether that word be more ſhocking than the word courtezan. V. 848.

Whore (Royal) what perſon was ſo called. II. 381.

Whoredom, whether the magiſtrate may and ought to puniſh it. I. 222. *a. b.* 223. *a. b.* What the abſolution of it coſt. 628. *a.* See *Fornication.*

Whores occaſion a general war in Greece. IV. 579. *a.* An author wiſhes that it were permitted to give that name publickly to all women who are guilty of luxury. II. 400. *b.*

Wicked Men, their proſperity has at all times made people murmur againſt the providence of God. IV. 932. *b.* 933. *a. b. &c.*

Wickedneſs, in what manner God reſtrains it. II. 736. *a.*

Wickliff expelled from the Univerſity of Oxford. V. 556. *b.*

Wicquefort, a thought of his. I. 129. *a. n.* (16). The judgment which he paſſes on the greateſt part of thoſe who attempt to write the Hiſtory of the United Provinces without permiſſion. 170. *a. b. n.* (1). His morality is a great deal purer and more evangelical than that of ſome Divines. II. 154. *a.*

Widows, how much of their riches muſt be abated, when they have had no children. I. 393. *b.* An advantage poſſeſſed by thoſe whoſe huſbands had been ſlain in the wars. II. 289. Such as would never marry again, have always been moſt admired. III. 191. *b.*

Widows of the Kings of France, what they were obliged to do, till ſuch time as their huſbands were buried. III. 874. *a.* 828. *b.*

Wierus, his teſtimony concerning a black dog which Agrippa had. I. 151. *a.* And touching a fourth book attribtued to the ſame Agrippa. 154. *a.*

Will: the will is not diſtinct from the underſtanding according to Spinoza, and has no liberty. V. 206. *b.* 207. *a.*

Will: ſick perſons put off making their will, as a bad omen. IV. 537. *b. n.* (24).

William the Conqueror, his laws condemned to caſtration thoſe who forced a woman. III. 77. *a.*

William I, Prince of Orange, conſults Baudouin. I. 692. *b.* His manifeſto. III. 674. *b.*

William III, never beſieged a place, the governour of which acknowledged him as a King. III. 718. *a.*

Willis, his doctrine concerning the ſouls of Brutes. IV. 912. *a. b.*

Wilmot (John), See *Rocheſter.*

Wimphen, when the Margrave of Baden was defeated there by Count de Tilli. V. 357. *b.*

Wincheſter, the foundation of its college. V. 554. *b.* 555. *a.*

Wind; it has been found by obſervation, that there reigns a conſtant wind from eaſt to weſt in the Torrid Zone. V. 782.

Windet cenſures the French and Engliſh tranſlations of the Alcoran. IV. 872. *b.*

Windſor, who had the direction of the building of that caſtle. V. 552.

Wine, who taught men to mix water with it. I. 284. *b.* Made ſerviceable in the cure of diſtempers. 526. The faculty of bearing much wine, is, phyſically ſpeaking, a good quality, but it is moſt commonly attended with a moral irregularity. II. 598. *a.* Prieſt-wine, what it is. 815. *b.* Effects of wine with relation to impurity. 822. *a.* The Romans forbid their women the uſe of it. *ibid. a. b.* 823. *a. b.* III. 967. *a.* IV. 756. *a. b.* 757. *a.*

Wings that a perſon made uſe of to fly with. II. 598. *and a. b.*

Winter of life, when it begins. I. 125. *b.* IV. 163. *a.*

Wirtemberg (Ulric Duke of) kills the Marſhal of his court. III. 539. Seizes the Imperial town of Reutlingen, which occaſions his being driven out of his dominions. *ibid.*

Wirtemberg (the Duke of) promiſes to abandon the Calviniſts of France. III. 287. *b.* 288. *a.* Kills a gentleman, whoſe wife he was in love with. 541.

Wiſe: whether none but wiſe men live free from ſervitude. II. 427. *b.* Whether a wiſe man ought to marry. III. 382. *b.* What the inſenſibility of a wiſe man ought to be. IV. 669. *b.* The different ſignifications of that word. V. 46. *b.*

Wiſh, one becoming a Philoſopher. I. 560. *b.*

Wiſigoths had a law which condemned Sodomites to caſtration. III. 77. *a.*

Wit: a bar ſhould be oppoſed againſt all the ſubtilities of human wit. I. 481. *a.* Whether leſs wit be required to apply than to invent a thought. II. 778. *a. b.* 779. *a.* Wit may prevent the effects of uglineſs. IV. 869. *b.* Your greateſt wits have a mixture of madneſs. II. 321. *a.*

Witchcraft, a woman accuſed of it, and put to the torture. I. 147. *b.* Little credit is to be given to it. 621. *a. b.* The moſt incredulous Philoſophers are puzzled on that head. III. 214. *b.* There are ſome people who believe nothing that is ſaid about it. IV. 716. *a. b.* A poſture that was taken for a kind of witchcraft. I. 207. *b.* 208. *a.* See *Magic.*

Witches: a witch ſtiled a broomſtick rider. I. 4. *a.* They ſteal children, and conſecrate them to the Devil. II. 838. *a.* A confutation of thoſe who doubt of the truth of what is ſaid of them by Elich. 750. *a.*

Witneſſes: what is ſaid of the witneſſes of ſome countries. II. 302. *b.* 303. *a.* There is a great difference between a hear-ſay witneſs and an eye-witneſs. 708. *b.* Their retractations ſhould not be admitted as an evidence, and why. IV. 761. *a.* A perſon is not obliged to produce more than one witneſs, after making uſe of the phraſe, *there are who have ſaid,* &c. I. 236. *b.*

Witneſſes of the Truth: a remark upon the character of authors, to whom the Proteſtants have given that title. II. 252. *b.* V. 71. *b*

Wittemberg, its Divines do not reaſon at all conſequentially upon the divorce of Henry VIII. I. 657. *b.* 658. *a. b.* Who firſt introduced the ſtudy of Chymiſtry into that Univerſity. V. 113.

Wives, there are ſome who make uſe of drugs to cauſe abortion. II. 314. *b.* A young and beautiful wife is not at all convenient for a traveller. IV. 282. *a.* Diſloyal wives generally make ſome amends for the injury they do their huſbands, by their flatteries and ſubmiſſion. 760. *b.* An uncommon inſtance of a wife's affection for her huſband. 379. *b.*

Wolfius (Jerom) cauſes the Rectorſhip of the new college of Altorf to be given to John-Thomas Freigius. III. 105.

Wolzogue advanced this propoſition, that God might deceive, if he would. IV. 876. *b. &c.*

Woman in Labour; the ſtory of one who cauſed the bleſſed candle to be put out, in order to make it ſerve her another time. II. 83. *a.* An author who compares himſelf to one, after having violated the oath which he had taken never to have any thing to do with the Bookſellers. 82. *a. b.* The reaſons which

which very juſtly diſcharge a woman from any thing ſhe may have ſworn on ſuch an accaſion. 83. *a.*

Womb: a ſeal fixed to all the wombs of the houſe of Abimelech. I. 38. *b.* What the Scripture means by the opening and cloſing of the womb. 448. *b.*

Women have in all ages been the occaſion of ſeveral wars. I. 24. *a. b.* Are eaſily gained by verſes and muſic. 27. *b.* A woman who proſtitutes her honour, with her huſband's conſent, in order to ſave his life. 90. St Auguſtin's looſe principle of morality on that head. 91. *and a. b.* A woman put to the torture, purely becauſe ſhe was ſuſpected to be the daughter of a witch. 147. *b.* Women are ſometimes obliged to hear very diſagreeable things in certain judicial proceedings. 391. *a. b.* 392. *a. b.* 393. *a. b.* What are the parts of their happineſs. 392. *b.* 393. *a. b.* What is the moſt dangerous rock for their honour. 405. A doctrine more extravagant than the community of women. 290. *a. b.* The ſtory of the woman that was twice carried to be buried. 526. *b.* 527. *a.* A reflexion upon the qualities of handſome and rich, or poor and ugly, with reſpect to marriage. 550. *a. b.* What puniſhment the antient Romans inflicted upon women taken in Adultery. 592. *a. b.* They ſeldom fall into Atheiſm. 639. *a.* Were not permitted to aſſiſt at the Olympic Games. 761. *and a. b.* Are very fond of fine cloaths and ornaments. II. 98. *a. b.* 99. *a. b.* III. 185. *b.* 569. *b.* 570. *a.* Whether it be praiſing a woman, to ſay that ſhe rejected an immodeſt propoſal. II. 27. *a. b.* How a modeſt woman was revenged upon her ſeducer. 220. *a. b.* There are ſome who are neither young nor handſome, and who nevertheleſs inſpire men with as much or more paſſion, than thoſe who have theſe qualities. 256. *b.* Thoſe of high quality are forced to make the firſt advances in love to their inferiors. 312. *a. b.* They occaſion a great many misfortunes. 481. *b.* The courage of thoſe of Lacedæmon. 522. *b.* 523. *a.* It is a mortal offence to them, to ſee the advances which they make to men deſpiſed. 535. *a.* III. 20. *b.* 21. *a. b.* A woman that makes uſe of a ſtrange remedy to kill her concupiſcence. II. 556. *a. b.* 557. *a. b.* III. 99. *a.* Another bites her tongue off, and ſpits it in the tyrant's face. II. 557. *a.* A kind of nakedneſs for which ſome were blamed. 593. *a.* 645. *a.* Of a very ſmall ſtature. 599. *a. b.* The Romans forbid them the uſe of wine. 822. *a. b.* 823. *a. b.* III. 967. *a.* IV. 756. *a. b.* 757. *a.* And left the puniſhment of their crimes, to the diſcretion of their huſbands and relations. 756. *a.* Such of them as are cruel and ambitious, exceed men in thoſe two vices. II. 862. *b.* One muſt fly them, in order to avoid temptation. III. 65. *a. b.* 66. *a.* The complaint which one made at a time. 75. *b.* 76. *a.* One of the ſureſt ways to draw them, is to ſet up fraternities of an auſtere reformation. 103. *a. b.* Men who lay with them, in order to prove their continence. *ibid. b.* 104. *a.* In what manner the women of Mentz expreſſed their grief for the death of an author, who had beſtowed great praiſes on their ſex. 105. *and a. b.* It has been maintained that they are not of the human ſpecies. 144. *a. b.* And that they are not made after the image of God. 145. *a. b.* A Pope grants a diſpenſation for a man to have two at the ſame time. 165. *and a. b.* What influence they have towards eſtabliſhing or overthrowing religious opinions. 220. *a.* There are ſome very learned women. 249. *a. b.* Thirty things requiſite to make them perfectly handſome. 364. *a. b.* French women are leſs ſcrupulous in their child-births, than thoſe of other countries. 453. *b.* What is the greateſt encomium that can be beſtowed upon a woman. 601. *b.* 602. *a. b.* They are capable of reigning well. 530. *a.* A chaſte woman frights away calumny. 601. *b.* When they have a ſhare in the government, they are more honoured and reſpected, than their huſbands themſelves. 636. *a.* Who was the firſt woman that propheſied among the Greeks. 712. The antient Greeks would not ſuffer them to be preſent at feaſts. 966. *b.* Such as love ſtudy, ought not to marry. 815. *a.* They ſell their modeſty ſometimes at a very dear rate to their huſbands. 814. *b.* Are very ill taken care of by Mahomet's law. IV. 34. *a. b.* 35. *a. b.* Books publiſhed upon the excellency of their ſex. 147. *and a. b.* 148. *a. b.* The ſovereign power ought not to be lodged in their hands. 308. *b.* 309. *a.* 406. *a.* V. 519. *b.* A ſevere law againſt thoſe that ſhould conceal either their pregnancy, or their lying-in. IV. 499. *b. &c.* Whether religion has more power over them, than the point of honour, to engage them to Continency. 500. *a. b.* An admirable Plant which hindered them from committing Adultery. 610. *a. b.* They are ſuſpected of love-intrigues ſo ſoon as they ſhew their affection to a man. 692. *a.* A poor woman that a man marries, is very often not the leſs proud on that account. 753. *a.* The Romans were obliged to repeal a law which forbid the women to wear any ornaments. 769. *b.* 770. *a.* Privileges granted to them. II. 217. *a. b.* How they ſuffer themſelves to be ſeduced by leud Heretics. 779. *and a. b.* 780. *a. b.* An impudent action of ſome women. V. 131. *and a. b.* A woman that ſwam quite naked over the Seine. 393. *a. b.* A ſuppoſition concerning their ſouls. 139. *a. b.* A collection ſhould be made of ſuch as were a ſcandal to their ſex and country. 519. *a.* See *Maids.* They would ſeldom do evil, if they were not enticed to it by the men. 426. *b.* The confeſſion of their ſins is always defective. 533. *a. b.* A time when they wore looking-glaſſes over their bellies. II. 400. *a. b.* An author who wiſhes that it were permitted to call all thoſe Whores, who give themſelves up to luxury. *ibid. b.* They would rather abandon their luxury for the King than for God. *ibid. b.* There is ſuch a one, that debauches as many women as he can, that yet would cruelly uſe his ſiſters and ſiſters-in-law, and even his mother, if he catched them in the fact. IV. 609. *b.* They can ſo ſtraiten themſelves that no man can have to do with them: examples. 800. *b.* 801. *a.* A woman that lies with her footman, deſerves to be puniſhed. II. 508. *a.* Drunkenneſs, a common vice among them. V. 540. *a. b.* Why a virtuous woman is not offended with veiled expreſſions, and is angry with a filthy word. 850. 856. It is not for their honour, to enter into ſuch proceedings as the congreſs is. IV. 799. *a. b.* 800. *a. b. &c.* V. 799.

Wood, the price of it raiſed in England, by the great number of Heretics burnt there. I. 272. *b.* What thoſe Heretics were. *ibid.* Whether allum can make wood incombuſtible. 424. *a. b.*

Word of God is to Divines, the foundation and ſource of their proofs and ſolutions. V. 818. It ought to ſatiſfy every good Chriſtian, that his faith is founded on the Word of God. 829.

Words, people run more eagerly after the new than the old. I. 63. *a.* Words that were made uſe of to frighten little children. 63. *and b.* Their ſignification may vary from time to time. 568. *a.* Complaints which have been made againſt the change that happens to them, and which are very ill grounded. III. 208. *a. b.* 209. *a. b.* They will ſometimes go as far as the ſword. IV. 663. *b.* The ſtage is a good forge for new words. 743. *a. b.* A dialogue wrote to ridicule thoſe who make uſe of antiquated words. I. 69. *b.* 70. *a.* IV. 831. *a.* They ought to be ranged with great nicety. V. 327. *b.* Some of them are obſcene in certain books, and not obſcene in others. 844. What makes them obſcene. *ibid. and* 845. The Stoics laughed at the diſtinction of words. 847. The niceſt ſully the imagination, as much as the moſt obſcene. 849.

Workman: the Civil-Law requires that a workman who excels in any art, ſhould have his life given him, though he may have deſerved to loſe it. I. 197. *b.* 198. *a.*

Works, when an adverſary attacks them by way of the ſecular arm, it only ſtrengthens the good opinion which people had of them before. I. 544. There are ſome excellent ones which have great imperfections. 752. *a.* The poſthumous works of an author are ever faulty, when enlarged by means of his undigeſted memoirs. II. 429. *b.* A work, how ever ſtrong in itſelf, will hardly appear ſo in the fragments that an adverſary alledges out of it. 488. *a. b.* A work, the loſs whereof ought to be regretted. 562. *a. b.* They ought not to be compared with one another by bits, but a whole work compared with a whole work. 653. *a. b.* The firſt work that a man publiſhes may be a moſt accompliſhed piece. 582. *b.* We ought to ſpeak with great caution of a work, that we know only by the report of others. 589. *a. b.*

People are frequently miſtaken about the names of the true authors of them. 808. *a.* Works by which people are impoſed upon. III. 236. *b.* A man ſhould ſtudy the rules well, before he pronounces that a work is good or bad. 337. *b.* There are works of ſuch a nature, that there is no avoiding miſtakes in them. 622. *b.* Eaſier to be underſtood by the abſtracts which are given of them, than by themſelves. 344. *a. b.*

Works: of the merit of good works. II. 172. *a. b.* Bucer's ambiguous expreſſions and variations, on the merit of works. 178. *a. b.* 179. *a. b.* The difficulties to be met with in that matter. 178. People would eaſily agree on that ſubject, according to Grotius, if they would but baniſh Chicanery. *ibid. b.*

World, the calculation of its duration, according to the Greek Bible, preferred before the calculation of the Hebrew text. I. 165. *a.* How many great conjunctions there have been ſince its creation. 164. *b.* 165. *a.* The eternity of it taught publickly at Alexandria in the VIth century, by a Pagan Philoſopher. 270. *b.* We cannot demonſtrate by particular reaſons, that each body in the univerſe is in the beſt ſtate it could poſſibly be in. 310. *b.* 311. *a.* An egg had been employed in the production of it, according to the Pagan Theology. 444. *a. b.* Was too narrow for two brothers. II. 249. *b.* Hypotheſes touching its origin and production. 119. *a. b.* 672. *b.* 673. *a.* 786. *b.* 787. *a. b.* 788. *a. b.* 789. *a.* One half of the world laughs at the other. 697. *a.* The world is a true wheel of fortune. 832. *a.* IV. 435. *a. b.* Had not two principles collateral, eternal, and independent of one another. III. 447. *a. b.* A tradition about its end. 780. *b.* 781. *a. b.* A mark of its depravation. IV. 83. *b.* It does not grow worſe and worſe. 305. *a.* To reaſon well upon the production of it, we muſt acknowledge that God is the author of matter, and the firſt and ſole principle of motion. 436. *b.* & *ſeq.* Its end foretold on Jeſus Chriſt's being born under the watery triplicity. III. 780. *a.* An Aſtrologer foretels the end of it, after which he affirms that all the powers will fall into the hands of the Turks. V. 246. *b.* The principles of the Pagan Philoſophers, touching the production of the world, were incoherent. 324. *a.* Ambiguities that are to be met with in the controverſy, concerning the eternity of the world. 596. *a. b.* 597. *a. b.*

Worms, its council declares the election of Pope Hildebrand to be void. III. 229.

Worſhip: a religious worſhip that conſiſted in weeping. I. 114. *a. b.* And where the mourning ended in joy. *ibid. b. and* 116. *a.* What is the moſt acceptable to God. II. 315. *b.* 316. *a.* How difficult a matter it is to correct the abuſes of worſhip. III. 743. *b.* 744. *a. b.*

Worthies: the expedition of the ſeven Worthies. I. 117.

Wotton (Dr) convicts Thomas Elyot of a fraud. II. 770. *a.*

Wower diſliked ſeveral things in the reformation of Luther and Calvin. V. 565. *a.*

Write: an expedient which the antient Arabs made uſe of for writing. IV. 177. *b.* Perſons who could write a whole ſpeech, though the Orator ſpoke never ſo faſt. 811. *b.* Perſons who excelled in that art. 883. *b.* The reputation of writing well, is a great burthen upon a man. 707. *b.*

Writers: antient writers have been made to ſay ſeveral things, which they never thought of. I. 309. *a. b.* Several of them make uſe of the property of other men, without mentioning their benefactor. 396. *a.* II. 78. *b.* Give us inconſiſtent accounts of one and the ſame perſon. I. 525. *a. b.* Some of them pleaſe at firſt for their novelty, and at laſt for their antiquity. 556. *a.* They ſhould relate matters ſo, that there may be no need of having recourſe to conjectures, in order to underſtand them. II. 180. *a.* One of the faults of a writer. *ibid. and n.* (2). A writer is very negligent, when he only quotes the title of a book in a general manner. 136. *b.* Neither the French nor Spaniſh writers thought much of what was to come, in what they wrote againſt one another. 338 *a.* A line of Virgil applied on that head. *ibid.* Writers too fruitful, and who compoſe too haſtily. III. 69. *b.* 70. *a.* When paſſion governs them, they never think of the future, and thus they furniſh arms againſt their own party. 520. *a.* There are many of them who quoting an author, make him ſay whatever they think he ſhould have ſaid. 636. *b.* They often baniſh moderation and ſincerity from their writings, when they are of a different religion. IV. 54. *a.* How we ought to explain their complaints againſt the ingratitude of their own time. 459. *b.* 460. *a.* A judgment concerning the moſt celebrated writers of antient Rome. 778. *b.* 779. *a. b.* Some of them are glad to hear that their works have been put into the Index. 827. *b.* A ſpecimen of the fidelity of ſeveral. V. 569. *b.* 570. *a.* Many of them add divers things to the teſtimonies which they quote. 234. *b.* How thoſe ought to do, who are not bigotted to their own opinions. 811. See *Authors.*

Writing (Greek) which was made uſe of as an original or pattern, by thoſe who engraved the types of that language. V. 461.

Writings which may be called inlaid work. I. 188. *b.* How we ought to judge of ſome ſort of writings. II. 279. *a. b.* We cannot give much credit to poſthumous writings, eſpecially when they come from remote countries. IV. 833. *b.* The good fortune of ſome writings. V. 779. What ſort of writings are neceſſary to be conſulted by the author of ſuch a work as this. II. 8. *b.*

X.

X*Anthippus* is the firſt man to ſpeak ill of his own father. IV. 570. *a.*

Xeniades, what he ſaid, after he had bought Diogenes. II. 669. *a.*

Xenocrates, his continence occaſions his being called a ſtatue. III. 704. *b.* Rallied by Ariſtotle. I. 112. *b.*

Xenocrates (the Carthaginian) did not deny that beaſts had the knowledge of God. IV. 904. *a. b.*

Xenophanes, his principles in their natural connexion. V. 585. *b.* 586. *a. b.* 587. *a. b.* 588. *a. b.* His genius unjuſtly deſpiſed by Ariſtotle. 587. *a.*

Xenophon makes an end of the ſacrifice, notwithſtanding the news of his ſon's death. I. 683. *a.* Said that God humbles the great and raiſes the little ones. 575. *a. b.*

Xerxes, a witty ſaying of that Prince. I. 522. *and b.*

Xiphilin ſhould not have ſuppreſſed the feigned madneſs of Archelaus. I. 422. *b.*

Y.

Y*EAR,* the Engliſh do not begin it in their public records till the 25th of March. II. 576. *a. n.* (3). According to Albategni and Lucidus, every hundred and ſix years occaſions the difference of a day in the Solar and the Julian year. III. 904. *b.*

Young: whether it be the part of a wiſe man, to wiſh to grow young again. IV. 755. *b.*

Young men ought to have many ſuperfluities, which might be pruned. I. 61. *a.*

Youth; perſons that come to diſtinguiſh themſelves, are often upbraided with the follies of their youth. IV. 724. *b.*

Youths: a new author to be added to the famous youths of Mr Baillet. III. 33. *a.* A perſon who has been juſtly reckoned among illuſtrious youths. IV. 184. *a. b.*

Z.

Z*Abarella* (Francis) his book *de Schiſmate.* V. 591. *a.*

Zachary, (Pope) ranks the antipodes among the chimera's prejudicial to religion. V. 493. *a. b.*

Zaleucus, his law againſt thoſe who propoſed any innovation. V. 314. *b.*

Zamoſki (John) the greateſt Hero that was in Poland, chuſes Simon Simonides for his Secretary, and procures him the honour of Knighthood. V. 149.

Zanchius (Jerom) makes uſe of a mental reſervation, in ſigning a formulary. V. 599. *a. b.* 600. *a. b.* The confeſſion which he drew up. 601. *a.* A paſſage quoted by Father Labbe, where Zanchius ſpeaks very ill of the Proteſtant writers. *ibid. b.* 602. *a. b.*

Zapoliba (John) on the news of the birth of a ſon, drank to ſuch exceſs, as occaſioned his death. III. 532. *and a.* Soliman had an inclination to ſee that child, made him rich preſents, and careſſed him much. *ibid. a. b.*

Zeal: unſeaſonable zeal, how fatal to the Church. I. 13. *b.* 14. *a. b.* The effects of falſe zeal. 140. *a. b.* 545. *b.* 546. *a.* 790. *a. b.* II. 246. *b.* IV. 517. *a. b.* 518. *a. b.* 856. *a. b.* It ſometimes ſuffers real or pretended impieties to lie dormant a great while. I. 468. *a.* Religious zeal, to what a furious exceſs it proceeds ſometimes. 545. *b.* 546. *a.* Moſt of thoſe who have a great zeal, become credulous and ſuſpicious. 758. *a.* What zeal makes people believe to the prejudice of Heretics. II. 796. *b.* A reflexion upon the effects of falſe zeal. III. 624. *a.* Religious zeal, to what exceſs does it not proceed, when it is falſe. 947. *a. b.* What is ſufficient to moderate it. IV. 188. *b.* An inſtance of a furious zeal. 270. *a. b.* 271. *a.* A ſtrange inſtance of its extravagance. 698. *b.*

Zealots; in point of religion, are dangerous enemies. I. 29. *b.* 30. *a. b.* 31. *a.* Falſe Zealots have recourſe to accuſations of impiety, in order to ſupport themſelves in a moſt unjuſt authority. 374. *b.* The greateſt part of them fear nothing more than the Orthodoxy of thoſe, whom they accuſe. 491. *b.* The character of many of them. 716. *b.* They would have people to be determinate and reſolute, when the queſtion is about embracing or anathematizing an opinion. II. 706. *a.* The paſſions raiſed by them is more formidable to Princes, than the arms of the Infidels. III. 624. *a.* Their uſual artifice. IV. 815. *a. b.* They condemn in their neighbour what they themſelves do. V. 471. *b.* 472. *a.* The moſt honeſt find accuſers. 58.

Zemzem, the ſacred well of Mecca. IV. 179. *a. b.*

Zeno, chief of the Stoics, maintained opinions directly oppoſite to thoſe of Arceſilas. I. 409. *b.* 410. *a.* One of his tenets was far from being juſt. 462. *b.*

Zeno of Elæa, a difficulty which he propoſed againſt the reality of motion. I. 82. *b.*

Zeno, the Epicurean; it is pretended that the Poet Lucretius was his diſciple. III. 924. *b.* 925. *a.*

Zieglerus got nothing by curtailing Aventine's Annals. I. 549. *a.*

Zindikites (a Mahometan ſect) whence ſo called, and what their ſentiments are. V. 199. *a.*

Zocotora, an iſland, the religion of its inhabitants. II. 677. *and a. b.* 678. *a. b.*

Zones are all torrid with reſpect to love. II. 80. *a.* 823. *b.*

Zoroaſter teaches the Perſians Philoſophy. I. 444. He lays down two firſt principles, one of good and the other of evil. *ibid.*

Zoſtrianus, an antient Heretic. I. 255.

Zuinglians, to procure peace between them and the Lutherans, Bucer choſe general and ambiguous expreſſions. II. 177. Bucer thought their doctrine concerning the Euchariſt too narrow. *ibid. a. b.* John Schutze's rancour againſt them. V. 89. *a. b.*

Zurich, the diſputes occaſioned by the agreement, which the Lutherans and Calvininiſts entered into there. V. 548. *b.* 549. *a.*

Zuſki (Baſil) Great Duke of Muſcovy, is dethroned and confined in a monaſtery. V. 653.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM